FEB 12 1947

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 92 — PART 11

MAY 7, 1946, TO JUNE 24, 1946

(PAGES A2487 TO A3714)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1946

COPY 2

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Appendix

International Trade Barriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very able, masterful, and scholarly article on international trade barriers, prepared by Dr. Edwin Borchard, of the Yale Law School, be inserted in the RECORD. I may say that Dr. Borchard is one of the outstanding authorities on international law in the world today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL TRADE BARRIERS

(By Edwin Borchard)

It is commonly assumed that the quest for foreign exchange, including among other methods excessive tariffs, import quotas, embargoes, preferences, subsidies, licenses, exchange controls, clearing agreements, currency depreciation, multiple currency, barter deals and discriminations of all kinds,[1] and similar means of crippling international trade, were the voluntary means by which certain countries gained advantage over others,[2] resulting ultimately in an artificial channeling of international trade and stagnation on a wide scale. It is not sufficiently observed that the unwise arrangements of the Treaty of Versailles in keeping down the subsistence level of certain countries while promoting that of others had much to do with the difficulties created for trade in the period between the two wars. Indeed, a strong argument could be made to show that the support of such a phenomenon as Hitler by the German people was itself a product of that despair in which Central Europe found itself.

It is now proposed to lift the barriers to international trade by injecting into the blood stream a large amount of American funds through UNRRA, the Bank for Development and Reconstruction, and the Monetary Fund of the Bretton Woods agreements, loans from the Export-Import Bank, whose lending power has been vastly increased, and similar loans and devices. At the same time the powers that be have planted in the system such a treaty as is contemplated by the Potsdam Declaration, which under the guise of reparations eradicates the distinction between private and public property, reintroduces the element of slave labor, amputates territory, compels migrations, and eliminates Germany[3] as an industrial competitor. The same dispensation is contemplated for Japan.

Students of international relations look with trepidation upon this artificial destruction of economic values. The question remains whether that destruction can be compensated by the loans made on American credit by the American taxpayer and whether any more hopeful prospect is to be found in present conditions than prevailed after the so-called First World War. Although the writer disclaims any authority to speak as an economist, experience indicates that the restoration of international trade, which implies the lifting of tariff barriers and other artificial and unilateral national methods, must operate coordinately and not disparately. In other words, if there is any serious intention to restore international trade, the attempt must be made on all fronts at approximately the same time. Otherwise, the effort becomes contradictory and is likely to fail. That is to say, it is insufficient to lend money which merely postpones the day of reckoning without effecting a fundamental cure in the conditions which brought about the disease involved.

Unless the peace treaties look to some recuperation of entire continents and particularly of great industrial areas, no amount of artificial aid can breathe life into a weakened system. UNO itself, based upon a theory that force can be used by certain powers to make peace prevail, is handicapped by the fact that incentives are furnished to the disinherited to resent the settlements made by the peace arrangements. In other words, the lifting of international trade barriers must be attacked on all fronts in a constructive way, and simultaneously, and not be handicapped by the fact that political arrangements make necessary the continuation of trade barriers. Under such circumstances loans become a stopgap only. Not only are they likely to be lost irrevocably, but the disease will be as acute after the loans are exhausted as it was before they were made.

Some reference has been made to the peace treaties. Perhaps the writer can explain his meaning by the fact that peace treaties in the nineteenth and earlier centuries looked to a different object from the treaties now made. Indeed, one could say that the art of peacemaking has become a lost art. In the nineteenth and earlier centuries the object of a treaty was rarely to eliminate the unsuccessful adversary, but while attempting to cure some of the evils which led to the war, to win back that adversary to the western system as soon as possible, leaving him with his means of livelihood and binding up the wounds of war as quickly as possible. The twentieth century on the other hand, has seen two world wars in which passions were aroused beyond anything heretofore known. The result was that the object of the war became the subjugation of the enemy, so that he would never thereafter become a menace to the victorious powers. This has led to the destruction of industrial values and annihilation by bombardment from the air in a fashion unprecedented. It left in its train resentments and frustration which are hardly conducive to the hope that the spirit of peace can be restored to the hearts of men either in the countries of the vanquished or in the countries of the victors.

Besides, we have for the first time in 1945 an important power which believes it finds advantage in the destruction of its competitors. There is, therefore, no universal desire to reconstruct the devastated regions, but on the contrary an assumed profit in the continued destruction of large areas. In the nineteenth century the economic system was accepted as valid, whereas today it is challenged by many countries under the leadership of Russia. This is a condition hardly conducive to the lifting of trade barriers. In addition, it may be observed that the docile condition of colonies can no longer be counted upon to maintain a fragile status quo. Asia is in revolt against its European masters and will probably throw off the yoke before the century is out. This creates new nationalisms which are hardly conducive to a dropping of trade barriers. Each country, as it reaches the stage of nationalism, seems likely to seek survival and the cultivation of the means deemed necessary to that end.

We must, moreover, note another phenomenon which affects the prospects of lifting trade barriers. There has been a peculiar silence on the subversion of law during two world wars in which no large power remained a neutral so as to keep the belligerents within legal restraint. Belligerents found it to their advantage, so they thought, to conduct the war on an unlimited scale without regard to the restraints exercised by law. As to each other the struggle reached so high a degree of lawlessness that not even the fear

[1] Speech of Mr. Clayton, reported in New York Times, April 12, 1946, p. 17.

[2] Department of State Bulletin, vol. XIV, No. 352, March 31, 1946, p. 520:

"* * * if the loan [to Great Britain] is not granted she has no other alternative but to attempt to form such a bloc and to extend her trade and financial agreements with every other country who will negotiate with her.

* * * * * *

"We would each have to use devices such as bilateral clearing agreements, exchange controls, currency depreciation, tariff quotas, and the like. Neither Britain nor the United States wants this."

[3] Id. at p. 511.

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

of reprisals restrained the belligerents in more than a minor degree. The writer leaves out of account completely the invention of the atom bomb with all its implications.

The theory of united force against an aggressor, even if it is not seen on a wide scale, put the fear of strangulation in every small country. The larger powers, the coercers themselves, are likely to maintain heavy armaments in order to fulfill their assumed duties as well as to protect themselves against each other. We are thus likely to conclude that Milton was right in suggesting that war breeds war, and far from witnessing that process of disarmament which should follow the elimination of a dangerous rival, we are witnessing a competition in armaments on a scale never before known. The abolition of neutrality alone eliminates the voice of law and reason in holding the belligerants within legal restraint and the assumption that a universal orgy will produce peace seems a contradiction in terms. Thus, by promoting force to a pinnacle never heretofore reached, the voice of law has become ever more silent. Were it not for the fact that the peaceful relations of states will continue from time to time to prevail and that they must conduct their relations according to a code many hundreds of years old, we might be led to the conclusion that international law itself has given way to force. There should be no doubt on the question that the force which is to constitute the governing rationale of international conduct hereafter will be used by the great powers, if at all, to perpetuate their will and not the objective rule of law which by inference no longer exists. Force used by nations has always heretofore been identified as war. Can it reasonably be supposed that they will now use that force in the objective interests of peace?

To make the subject concrete, the writer will deal with only one aspect of the economic problem facing the world. Rules of law that prevail in international law have been largely developed because of their economic foundation and because the interests of trade predominate over the interests of unrestrained force. If trade is to be developed on a large scale, foreign investments and foreign private property must have the protection of law. Otherwise, no foreign investments are likely to be made, at least from private sources. The confiscation of private property because of conflict between nation and nation is one of the most serious inroads upon the institution of private property that could well be imagined. As long ago as the eighteenth century, when trade was still conducted in sailing ships and had not reached its present proportions, Alexander Hamilton wrote two of his Camillus Letters in defense of article 10 of the Jay treaty of 1794. His argument against confiscation was so conclusive and classic that, while often repeated, it can truly be said that it has not been improved upon by others. He remarked:

"The right of holding or having property in a country always implies a duty on the part of its government to protect that property, and to secure to the owner the full enjoyment of it. Whenever, therefore, a government grants permission to foreigners to acquire property within its territories, or to bring and deposit it there, it tacitly promises protection and security. * * *

"The property of a foreigner placed in another country, by permission of its laws, may justly be regarded as a deposit, of which the society is the trustee. How can it be reconciled with the idea of a trust, to take the property from its owner, when he has personally given no cause for the deprivation?

* * * * *

"There is no parity between the case of the persons and goods of enemies found in our country and that of the persons and goods of enemies found elsewhere. In the former there is a reliance upon our hospitality and justice; there is an express or implied safe conduct; the individuals and their property are in the custody of our faith; they have no power to resist our will; they can lawfully make no defense against our violence; they are deemed to owe a temporary allegiance; and for endeavoring resistance would be punished as criminals, a character inconsistent with that of an enemy. To make them a prey is, therefore, to infringe every rule of generosity and equity; it is to add cowardice to treachery. * * *

"Moreover, the property of the foreigner within our country may be regarded as having paid a valuable consideration for its protection and exemption from forfeiture; that which is brought in commonly enriches the revenue by a duty of entry. All that is within our territory, whether acquired there or brought there, is liable to contributions to the Treasury, in common with other similar property. Does there not result an obligation to protect that which contributes to the expense of its protection? Will justice sanction, upon the breaking out of a war, the confiscation of a property, which, during peace, serves to augment the resources and nourish the prosperity of a State?" [4]

In his Camillus letter XVIII, Mr. Hamilton stated:

"No powers of language at my command can express the abhorrence I feel at the idea of violating the property of individuals, which, in an authorized intercourse, in time of peace, has been confided to the faith of our Government and laws, on account of controversies between nation and nation. In my view, every moral and every political sentiment unite to consign it to execration." [5]

Some inroad upon the institution of private property was adumbrated in article 297 of the Treaty of Versailles. But that article gave the nations only an option to confiscate of which some, unfortunately, took advantage. As the writer understands the Potsdam Declaration, it confers no option but purports to make the confiscation of private property in the enemy country and in the home country of the victor obligatory. Not only this, but the victors have imposed the obligation of surrendering private property upon the neutrals under threat of such sanctions, e. g., blacklists and "freezing" of assets, as they could impose on neutrals. If they are successful in this quest it will indicate that the neutrals no longer are sovereign states but mere appendages of the belligerent powers and function without regard to law under domination of the Great Powers.

The rule that private property is immune from confiscation is established not only in modern international law,[6] and in the annex to article IV of the Hague Convention, but is the product of a long historical process which realized that trade and confiscation were incompatible. Down to the eighteenth century confiscations occasionally occurred, but it was realized that trade could not go on under this dispensation. As early as 1215 Magna Charta had perceived that foreign merchants must be given protection for their property on a basis of reciprocity,[7] in the event of the outbreak of war. While this principle was not easy to adopt it became a more or less established practice after the Reformation and the origin of the state system in 1648. Napoleon was one of the last to use confiscation, although he did it sparingly. The nineteenth century had become completely convinced of the economic importance of preserving private property against all contingencies, even war. Such a rule stimulated the making of foreign investments, direct and indirect.

During the last war there were some sacrificial sales made by the Alien Property Custodian and some effort was made to destroy the values in his possession. With reference to the confiscatory policy thus subtly reflected, John Bassett Moore has remarked:

"In the original statute the function of the Alien Property Custodian was defined as that of a trustee. Subsequently, however, there came a special revelation, marvelously brilliant but perhaps not divinely inspired, of the staggering discovery that the foreign traders and manufacturers whose property had been taken over had made their investments in the United States not from ordinary motives of profit but in pursuance of a hostile design, so stealthily pursued that it had never before been detected or even suspected, but so deadly in its effects that the American traders and manufacturers were eventually to be engulfed in their own homes and the alien plotters left in grinning possession of the ground. Under the spell engendered by this agitating apparition, and its patriotic call to a retributive but profitable war on the malefactors' property, substantial departures were made from the principle of trusteeship.

* * * * *

"The subject has also another aspect. During the past 10 years the investments abroad of citizens of the United States have enormously increased, and the process has only begun. Considering the question, therefore, purely as one of selfish calculation, I venture to think it directly contrary to the interests of the United States to resuscitate the doctrine that enemy private property found in a country on the outbreak of war may be confiscated. Such a doctrine might even create a temptation.

"But there is yet another and higher reason. The United States has an honorable past as well as an expedient future to consider.

"Of all the illusions a people can cherish, the most extravagant and illogical is the supposition that, along with the progressive degradation of its standards of conduct, there is to go a progressive increase in respect for law and morality. Again may we remark that 'there is no new thing under the sun.' The world never will be rid of the problem of preserving its elementary

---

[4] See Works of Alexander Hamilton (Lodge's edition), vol. V, pp. 414, 415, 416–418. See the extended quotations from Hamilton and the references to the treaties concluded by the United States in John Bassett Moore, *International Law and Some Current Illusions* (New York, 1924), pp. 14 et seq.

[5] Works of Alexander Hamilton (Lodge's edition), vol. V, pp. 405–406.

[6] Edwin Borchard, Enemy Private Property, American Journal of International Law, vol. XVIII, No. 3 (July 1924), p. 523.

[7] Article 41 reads:

"All merchants shall have safety and security in coming into England, and going out of England, and in staying and in traveling through England, as well by land as by water, to buy and sell, without any unjust exactions, according to ancient and right customs, excepting in the time of war, and if they be of a country at war against us: and if such are found in our land at the beginning of a war, they shall be apprehended without injury of their bodies and goods, until it be known to us, or to our Chief Justiciary, how the merchants of our country are treated who are found in the country at war against us; and if ours be in safety there, the others shall be in safety in our land."

Boyd C. Barrington, Magna Carta and Other Great Charters of England with an Historical Treatise and Copious Explanatory Notes (Philadelphia, 1900), pp. 239–240.

virtues. Three hundred years ago Grotius declared that, as he who violated the laws of his country for the sake of some present advantage to himself, 'sapped the foundation of his own perpetual interest, and at the same time that of his posterity,' so the people that 'violated the laws of nature and nations' broke down 'the bulwarks of its future happiness and tranquillity.'

"No less pertinent is the confession of Alexander Hamilton, made a century and a quarter ago, that, serious as the evil of war had appeared to him to be, yet the manner in which it might be carried on was in his eyes 'still more formidable. It was,' said Hamilton, 'to be feared that, in the fermentation of certain wild opinions, those wise, just, and temperate maxims, which will forever constitute the true security and felicity of a state, would be overruled,' and that, one violation of justice succeeding another, measures would be adopted which even might 'aggravate and embitter the ordinary calamities of foreign war'." [8]

Yet in this war we find that standards of public morality have so far been reduced that the Alien Property Custodian has authored a bill [9] authorizing the United States to confiscate the private property of Germans, Japanese, and possibly Italians in the Custodian's possession. A hearing on this bill was held April 17, 1946.

As against this confiscatory policy of the Alien Property Custodian, we may print two extracts from recent Secretaries of State. Said Secretary Hughes in his address at Philadelphia November 23, 1923:

"A confiscatory policy strikes not only at the interest of particular individuals but at the foundations of international intercourse, for it is only on the basis of the security of property, validly possessed under the laws existing at the time of its acquisition, that the conduct of activities in helpful cooperation, is possible. * * * Rights acquired under its laws by citizens of another state, [a State] is under an international obligation appropriately to recognize. It is the policy of the United States to support these fundamental principles." [10]

As recently as May 27, 1935, Secretary Hull stated in a letter to Senator CAPPER:

"Such action would not be in keeping with international practice and would undoubtedly subject this Government to severe criticism. Moreover, the confiscation of these private funds by this Government and their distribution to American nationals would react against the property interest (some very large) of American nationals in other countries. It would be an incentive to other governments to hold American private property to satisfy claims of their nationals against this Government and to pass upon such claims in their own way. It is important from my point of view, therefore, that the United States should not depart in any degree from its traditional attitude with respect to the sanctity of private property within our territory whether such property belongs to nationals of former enemy powers or to those of friendly powers. A departure from that policy and the taking over of such property, except for a public purpose and coupled with the assumption of liability to make just compensation, would be fraught with disastrous results." [11]

If the conception is now to prevail that war is to be levied upon noncombatants, the so-called total war which excuses all lawlessness, the human race will have deteriorated beyond redemption. We shall find its first evidence in the fact that foreign investments will be made with great reluctance. And rarely will this be done by private bankers, who will not risk a long-term loan on such a precarious political position as now faces the world accompanied by the rule that confiscation is the penalty of belligerency. Possibly it is for that reason that we already find that such loans as are made are made from country to country, with all their political implications and at the expense of the taxpayer. The whole economic system is disrupted at the source by discouraging foreign investment. That was one of the main reasons for the rule of immunity of private property. With the breaking of that rule the result is not likely to remain outstanding.

It seems, therefore, unwise to expect the lifting of trade barriers on a wide scale and on any permanent footing so long as we make the underlying conditions difficult for trade. One of these conditions is the free flow of capital from country to country, and if the system of private enterprise has any validity whatever from private sources. The rule of confiscation invalidates at the source any hope for foreign private investment, and for that reason seems likely to frustrate our larger aims.

This survey will have indicated that the lifting of trade barriers is associated with the lifting of all the other restrictions upon international trade, including the political, and that unless these measures have a constructive orientation the result is likely to be one-sided and eventually unsuccessful. To deal successfully with the subject, therefore, requires a reexamination of the methods used in recent years to safeguard private property.

[8] John Bassett Moore, International Law and Some Current Illusions (New York, 1924), pp. 22, 24–25; Collected Papers of John Bassett Moore (New Haven, 1945), pp. 27, 28–29.

[9] S. 1322, 79th Cong., 1st sess. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

[10] Edwin Borchard, Enemy Private Property, American Journal of International Law, vol. XVIII, No. 3 (July 1924), p. 531.

[11] Edwin Borchard, Confiscations: Extraterritorial and Domestic, American Journal of International Law, vol. XXXI, No. 4 (October 1937), p. 680.

Louis Bromfield Analyzes OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it has been very evident, since the administration announced last fall that you could raise wages without raising prices, that price control was not for the purpose of holding the line. The writer, Mr. Louis Bromfield, has analyzed what the OPA is doing, and I wish to extend my remarks by including therein an article written by him. The article is as follows:

A VOICE FROM THE COUNTRY—ALIEN INFLUENCE BACKS CONTINUATION OF OPA

(By Louis Bromfield)

There is much more behind the fight over continuation of the OPA than meets the eye—much more, indeed, than merely a fight over the issues of possible serious inflation. Issues are involved which are more important to the Nation in the long run than the question of controlling prices.

Perhaps first among these is the question of whether we are going ahead in our history as a free nation, spearheading the whole advance of civilization and democracy from the time of the Greeks. Or whether we are to become a regimented, totalitarian nation, based upon the ideals of central Europe and Asiatic influences.

The issue becomes finite and exact in the struggle between those who want to maintain and increase Government controls, and those who believe in a free economy and the maximum of personal liberty for the citizens of the Nation. In this struggle we are at the crossroads.

During the depression and the war which succeeded it controls and regulations over the lives of our citizens became very much a part of Government. Once established, these controls are very difficult to do away with, especially when aggressive and well organized political minorities fight with every weapon from lobbying to political blackmail to maintain and increase them.

That is why it is important now—more important even than fighting the threat of inflation—to clean house and get back to the principles of democracy and western civilization.

The danger lies in the fact that certain elements, including the late President Roosevelt and certain of his followers, have sought not only to maintain emergency control measures but to mold them into fixed Government policy.

THE NATION DIVIDED

The struggle over continuance of OPA has crystallized more than any other event the growing division of the Nation between the industrial population of our great and monstrous cities and all the rest of the Nation.

This conflict has been becoming slowly apparent for a long time. It was clarified the other day by the rather crude statement of a southern Congressman when he said that in the OPA a few citizens from Brooklyn and the Bronx were seeking to run the whole of the country.

He should have been both more generous and more clear by saying that these influences came from the industrial workers' minority left-wing elements of our great cities. These are the elements who, to put it baldly, ask for higher and higher wages while they attempt to curtail any rise in prices for farmers, manufacturers, small businessmen, department-store proprietors, or people engaged in the services such as filling stations, garages, etc.

This element has no objection to inflation in wages, but cries to high heaven about inflation on any other score whatever. It is behind the policy of subsidies and all the other dishonest dodges which the OPA has consistently employed since the beginning. Such policies merely shift the burden of higher prices from one pocket of the consumer to the other.

Instead of paying higher prices across the counter, the consumer pays them in taxes plus the drain on expansion, production, and initiative which heavy taxes impose upon the economy of a free nation and the expense of the huge and inefficient bureaucracies which inevitably accompany government controls.

In other words the elements which are fighting hardest for the maintenance of OPA controls want the OPA to continue for their benefit and not for the benefit of any other element of our society.

The OPA has not checked inflation. The bulge caused by wage increases was not a bulge as Mr. Bernard Baruch pointed out, but a break of the most serious nature. It was followed in a few weeks by more subsidies or by raises of manufactured commodities all along the line. This had to be

done in order to get production—the only real answer to inflation. It was something that any honest man knew and any fool could predict.

OPA PRODUCES SCARCITY

The truth is that any agency such as the OPA works inevitably to produce scarcity and dislocation of both production and the whole economy of the Nation.

It has produced the black markets which cannot exist save in scarcity and regimentation.

We are suffering a shortage of butter and of first-quality milk today, not because of the specious reasons set forth by the OPA, but because of the dairy herds which were dispersed 2, 3, and 4 years ago under pressure irom the OPA and cannot be restored overnight.

The OPA and most Government regimentation is essentially a process of dealing with effects rather than with causes, and as such it is expensive, inefficient, and the producer of scarcities. To continue it a moment longer than necessary is folly, not only because of its immediate failure to check inflation and its effect in producing scarcities, but also because, like all Government regimentation, it violates the most fundamental principles both of democracy and western civilization.

The issue is much greater than merely the question of whether OPA shall or shall not survive. It is a question of whether we shall rid ourselves of an alien system of Government controls. Whether the whole of the country shall be dominated and regimented by a small, aggressive, and tightly organized minority from the great cities for its own selfish ends and at the behest and pressure of other nations which cannot afford economic or even individual freedom.

Coal Famine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the latest word from the front indicates that no progress has been made in settling the pending coal strike. The President has condemned the strike in no uncertain terms. He has apparently been satisfied with such condemnation. No action or recommended action has come from the White House. However, where there is life there is hope. A genuine feeling of apprehension and fear is abroad in the land. This strike truly is disastrous. The Solid Fuels Administrator advises the country that even if the strike were to end now it will be necessary to ration fuel in the coming winter. For five long weeks these soft-coal mines have been idle, and the country has the assurance of John L. Lewis, the president of the United Mine Workers' Union, that whether or not coal is produced will depend on the direction given by Mr. Lewis. Already brown-outs and a curtailment of power and light in our principal cities is akin to that of war days. The steel furnaces are closing, factories are discontinuing work. Many are unemployed, and we are told that by June 1 the Nation will be at an industrial standstill unless the miners return to work now. Already reconversion has been set back months. The foundation for fuel shortage next winter has already been laid, and at the moment there is no prospect for immediate relief. Mr. Lewis is adamant and if he has his way the country will only have coal on the terms and under the conditions which he permits. Indeed, we are confronted with a crisis. Surely there is some power somewhere, somehow, in the Government that is greater and more powerful than the will of any individual whether he be the head of a labor union or a representative of management. Patience has ceased to be a virtue. Time for action by the Government has long since passed. If there is no remedy for present conditions then the country might as well know it. On the other hand, if the Government in Washington still lives, the people have a right to expect that it will function in such an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, the people in Michigan are becoming desperate. They just cannot understand the vacillating, inarticulate, and unrealistic position of the Washington Government at this grave hour.

As indicative of this attitude I have just received a telegram from William E. Brown, Jr., the mayor of Ann Arbor, in which city is located the University of Michigan and where more than 6,000 veterans are now depending upon coal and public utilities if they are to carry on.

The telegram reads as follows:

The following telegram was sent to President Truman today: "The council of the city of Ann Arbor has unanimously recorded itself as being strongly in favor of the Federal Government seizing the soft coal mines and operating the same. The national health and welfare of the country is being jeopardized by privileged groups. Now is the time for a show-down. With the council's support I, as mayor of the city of Ann Arbor, urge that you as our Chief Executive act now and immediately seize and operate the mines."

Possibly the general public does not fully understand the controversy causing the strike. This morning I received, through the mail, a statement by the National Coal Association which purports to contain the facts as assembled by that association. The statement is short and there can be no misunderstanding of its meaning. Pursuant to the permission granted to me, I am including it as a part of these remarks. It is as follows:

WHY YOU FACE A COAL FAMINE!

This is not an argument. It is not an attempt to convince anybody of anything. It is presented as a public service in an effort to tell the people about the coal strike—what caused it—what the coal operators have done to try to settle it—what the coal famine we now face means to the people.

Usually there are two reasons given for strikes:

First. Failure of management to grant union demands for wages, hours, or working conditions.

Second. Refusal of management to bargain collectively with the union.

Neither of these is the cause for the coal strike.

As to the first: Coal mine operators have offered the highest wage ever paid to coal miners. They have volunteered the highest offer made by any large industry since the end of the war. They voluntarily offered to follow the wage pattern set in the steel, oil, and automotive industries. They offered to reduce the working hours per day. They made a number of specific offers regarding working conditions.

As to the second: The wage conference was called at the request of John L. Lewis, president of the miners' union. The operators' negotiating committee readily agreed to it. The conference began March 12, 1946. Union officials consumed almost a week in speechmaking. They made no specific demands. The operators replied in less than 1 day and then promptly submitted proposals to prevent a strike. The proposals were ignored by the union officials. A strike was called on April 1.

The operators submitted additional proposals to bring the strike to an end. These also were dismissed by the union's leaders.

UNION LEADERS REFUSE TO BARGAIN—UNLESS

Union officials walked out of the conference on April 10, admitting that there had been no negotiations for making a new wage agreement since the conference had opened.

For more than 2 weeks, union officials declined to return to the conference.

The union leaders warned that there would be no negotiations—that they would not bargain collectively—until the operators had agreed in principle:

1. To a tax to be levied on every ton of coal mined. Ten cents a ton has been the figure mentioned. This royalty payment would go into the union's treasury (at the rate of over $50,000,000 annually) to be administered entirely by the union as a so-called health and welfare fund.

2. To compel mine supervisors, foremen, and other managerial personnel of the mines to join the rank-and-file union.

These were not concrete demands. They were presented in general terms in speeches by the union officials. The mine operators were asked to agree to them without knowing exactly what such agreement would mean. Otherwise the miners refused to negotiate at all. They refused to discuss these or any other subjects in detail. They refused to bargain collectively. They called a strike and the strike continues.

This is the reason for the coal strike.

WHAT DID THE COAL OPERATORS OFFER?

The coal operators made definite offers to the union's general proposals. The offers were made specific in an effort to get negotiations under way; to establish a basis for real collective bargaining.

1. Regarding welfare: They offered to explore the establishment of a reasonable fund to help in unusual hardship cases arising directly out of accidents in coal mines and to join equally with the union in paying the cost if the findings and facts so warranted.

2. Safety: They offered to work out codes of safety standards—any desirable changes to be supported by the miners and the operators and jointly recommended to the legislatures of the several coal-producing States. They proposed also to give the miners at each mine the right to have a safety committee to make examinations, recommendations, and jointly assist in preparing and enforcing safety rules and regulations.

3. Compensation laws: They agreed to make mandatory the acceptance of workmen's compensation laws in any State where acceptance is optional.

4. Hospital and medical funds: They agreed to turn over to the designated agents of the mine workers' union all funds collected from the mine workers for payment of

doctors, hospitals, burial funds, benefit funds, and for any similar purposes where the union's locals are dissatisfied with existing arrangements.

5. Wages: In their offer to conform to the Government's wage-price pattern, they offered to the miners the highest wages ever paid in the coal industry. (This offer would add between $100,000,000 and $150,000,000 a year to the cost of producing bituminous coal.)

6. Hours: They offer to reduce the working day by 1 hour.

These offers the union refused to discuss.

WHAT THE COAL FAMINE MEANS TO YOU

Coal supplies the power for more than half the country's electricity. It supplies half of the industrial power of the Nation. It runs all but a fraction of the country's railroads.

Coal is the most basic of all industries. Without it steel cannot be manufactured. * * * Without steel, automobiles, washing machines, refrigerators, homes, vacuum cleaners and many other essential things people have wanted for so long cannot be made.

Steel and automobile companies are closing down. * * * Railroad service is being curtailed. * * * Electric light and gas plants are reducing their output. If coal mining is longer delayed the coal famine will affect your corner grocery.

Already hundreds of thousands of workers, including thousands of world war veterans, are being forced into idleness. The Nation faces today its most serious crisis since Pearl Harbor.

The only real solution to the coal strike must eventually come through constructive legislation. Your action could help speed this solution.

NATIONAL COAL ASSOCIATION,
JOHN D. BATTLE,
Executive Secretary.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is the facts that the country wants, and if the above statement is not factual, then I hope that Mr. Lewis will answer the statement, and I shall be glad to insert in the RECORD his answer of like length. I have no coal mining in my district. I have not conferred in any way with any of the operators, and am only interested in having essential coal produced in keeping with American standards, and American justice, having in mind always the public interest as distinguished from the interest of either employer or employee.

Why Pass the Buck?

REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Congressmen had a field day berating John L. Lewis. But John is only doing to all of us what Phil Murray, Walter Reuther, and other labor politicians did to steel, the motor industry, Westinghouse, General Electric, and several thousand employers of hundreds of thousands of employees. John is just doing it in a bigger way.

Not long ago, the transit workers of Washington and Detroit; the elevator operators in New York, had hundreds of thousands of people hoofing it and climbing the stairs. The tugboat operators in New York harbor had the people of that city wondering where their next meal was coming from.

On the last day of December, in 1936, Lewis, with the CIO and a few communistic operators, took possession of southeastern Michigan. They threw the workers out of the factories; they took possession. They welded shut iron doors. They smashed windows. They destroyed machinery. They disregarded court orders and told the law-enforcement officers to peddle their papers, not serve them.

Frank Murphy, in daily communication with the President, called out more than 3,000 State officers to protect John's invading goon-squads, prevent the police and the sheriffs from enforcing the law.

So why should not John think he is a big man? Murray and Reuther and Hillman have been getting away with it. Why not John?

And whose fault is it if factories throughout the country close? If we have now, in peacetime, brown-outs and black-outs in our cities? If the railroads cannot operate their transportation systems? If the whole economy of the Nation bogs down? Whose fault is it, I ask?

Bad boys seldom get better when they are coddled and encouraged. Bad boys are bad boys. When they are little, they need a spanking. Sometimes, when they grow older, they must be sent to reform school. If that doesn't do any good, a few of them land in the jail or on the hot seat.

Sometimes the parents are at fault. The Congress has not given John and Phil and Walter and a few others the right kind of treatment. The Congress has ducked and dodged and failed to act, and today the people are reaping the harvest, just because and only because the Congress has lacked either the courage or the inclination—and I repeat those words so that you get the meaning—the courage or the inclination—take your pick—to outlaw the illegal activities of these gentlemen.

If the basic labor law was amended, as was proposed 'way back in 1939, so as to impose equal liabilities, grant equal privileges to employees and employers, much of our present trouble could be avoided.

If the Congress, and more especially the other body had the courage or the inclination to pass a bill introduced long ago, which would have prevented prolonged strikes in industries affecting the public welfare, we would not be, as the President said the other day, threatened with a "national disaster."

There is legislation pending before both branches of Congress which could be passed in 2 days, which would go a long way to put an immediate end to present disputes and strikes which have been detrimental to the public welfare and security.

The Congress has no one to blame but itself, and we are not deceiving the people by our shouting, our raging, and our ranting.

Prefabricated Housing Manufacturer Cites Need for Guaranteed Market—Says Industry Cannot Mass Produce Homes Without Investment Protection—Seeks Congressional Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been some sincere doubt in the minds of several of my colleagues in Congress as to the necessity of the use of guaranties for marketing prefabricated homes. I have before me a telegram from such a manufacturer which explains very clearly one of the basic reasons for the necessity of this type of operation.

It is simply this: Prefabricators producing houses by mass production methods are involved in a tremendous financial operation. Even at the comparatively minor rate of production of 150 houses a month, if houses are estimated to be worth $5,000 apiece, a prefabricator does $750,000 worth of business that month.

It takes money—lots of money—more money than most small prefabricators have, to handle that volume. It requires more capital than the average businessman cares to risk at the outset of a new industry.

In a situation like that, the home manufacturer has but two choices. If his enterprise cannot be underwritten so that he can get into mass production immediately, he must start out on an exceedingly small scale, building as many houses as his own capital will permit, selling them, plowing the profits back into the business, and thus gradually stepping up his production.

Two things are wrong with this. First, he cannot realize the low cost per unit which is the true advantage of mass production. Second, the industry as a whole would not be able to supply the tremendous number of houses which these builders have pledged themselves to build under the requirements of the President's housing program.

However, if these enterprises can be underwritten through the guaranteed market provision of the administration's housing bill, a flood of private venture capital will be attracted to this type of business. Properly financed companies can go immediately into the mass production which will hold the cost of houses down to the level that our veterans can pay. As my correspondent says, "actually, the Government will not have to take over any houses, even if it gives a guaranteed market, but the guaranty will give the necessary assurance to the bank and RFC to give us the financing we need."

I should like to point out that under this arrangement it would be utterly impossible for a manufacturer of jerry-built shacks to take advantage of this program. Before the RFC would offer any

such guaranty, the company building such homes would be thoroughly investigated. The homes must meet the same exacting standards as to durability and solid construction that the FHA has set up for conventional housing. Thus, both the legitimate, established manufacturers would be protected, as well as the buyer, from so-called fly-by-night operators.

This is a part of the veterans' emergency-housing program.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include this telegram from Mr. Jacques Willis, president of the Home-Ola Corp.:

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 1, 1946.*

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN,
Congressman From Texas,
New House Office Building:

We are building five-room houses completely equipped, including plumbing, heating, and chimney for under $3,500. We have 400 retail lumber dealers from Maine to San Diego, all well rated, who have given us more orders than we can fill. We shipped 90 houses in April. We will ship 150 houses in May, 250 in June, 600 in July, and not less than 1,500 per month thereafter. It takes a lot of money to handle this volume. If you will give us an insurance policy similar to the policy you have given to buyers on FHA loans, we will have no trouble in securing the necessary finances to carry on this large operation. Unless we get the "guaranteed market," we will "poor boy" it with our own money and you will get fewer houses. Actually, the Government will not have to take over any houses, even if it gives a guaranteed market but the guaranty will give the necessary assurance to the bank and RFC to give us the financing we need. We need a guaranteed market, although our houses have been accepted by FHA for financing we need no money for plant expansion but we do need working capital for operation on the scale called for. You may believe that this is an easy problem through RFC but RFC is of no help to us because they ask us to store the material before they will make us a loan. This we do not want to do because houses are needed and should not be stored. Also, we can borrow money on our invoices through our own bank. It would be quite easy for us to sell our stock on Wall or La Salle Streets. We are not in the promotion business. We want to build houses. Back in the early thirties you passed a law organizing RFC. This was to salvage defunct banks and railroads. It helped the whole so it was good. Later you organized FHA, the best thing that was ever done to help people own their own homes, but the people you really helped were the banks, the insurance companies, and the loaning agencies, guaranteeing that they would get their money. In 1940 and 1941 you wanted industry to build guns and munitions of war. Industry refused to make any plant expansions so you gave them a "certificate of necessity" permitting them to write off plant expansion and equipment in 5 years, or for the duration of the war. The taxpayers paid 95 percent of these expenses. We won the war so it was a good thing for all. In time of war people will put up with all sorts of inconveniences because "C'est la guerre" but when peace comes they need food, clothing, and shelter. We believe that the housing emergency is greater than any emergency during the war. If I have not made myself clear, please permit me to appear before your committee and explain further. I may be reached at the Lafayette Hotel, Washington, D. C., room 201.

JACQUES WILLIS,
President, the Home-Ola Corp.

The Coal Strike and the PAC

REMARKS
OF
HON. DAN R. McGEHEE
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, our Nation and its people are today facing the greatest crisis not only of the time, but in its history. This country has faced great crises heretofore in many respects, each of which only comprised a single problem, but the one which faces us today is one that can cause a disintegration of this great Republic and change our democratic form of government to one of dictatorship.

The strike which is being fostered by John L. Lewis and the activities of the PAC, led by Sidney Hillman, Phil Murray, Harold Ickes, and others, who met in Atlantic City yesterday, according to a newspaper report to purge at least 100 Congressmen, those 100 being, as they say, reactionary Republicans and poll-tax Democrats. The two taken together if not squelched by this administration and allowed to continue their activities, especially the strike, for any length of time, the entire economic program of this Nation will be destroyed. Chaos will exist and you will find 130,000,000 people floundering on an uncharted sea, their course controlled only by the waves of lawlessness fostered by these minority groups.

You can purge the membership of the representative branch of our Government and we will continue to carry on, but to purge them and the strike fostered by John L. Lewis, if continued and successful, as I have stated, will destroy the very economic structure of this country.

The manufacturers of clothing, automobiles, machinery, the utility plants, transportation systems and even the cooking of food for the individuals, are all being curtailed by reason of this strike and if it continues for another 60 days, the black-out over the entire country will be perfected.

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the leadership of this administration and the Representatives of the mass of patriotic American citizenship are going to sit idly by, as they have in the past few weeks, and permit the disintegration of this great Republic, as will be the ultimate result? This body has passed legislation and sent it to the other body which would somewhat curtail the authority to create such conditions, but we find inaction by the administration and the other branch on every occasion. I am wondering why. Is it for political expediency so as to continue to incur the favor of these little organized minorities. If not, I pray someone give me an answer?

The saving of my country, the greatest country on earth, the only country wherein any human being within the bounds of this earth can look to as a haven of freedom, and its preservation should be more sacred to each and every individual, whether in the administrative, judicial, or legislative, than any political, administrative, legislative, or judicial position which they now hold. Each of us should be ready to sacrifice that position, if necessary, to preserve and conserve the democracy of this great Nation.

I, as one of the Representatives of the people, am ready to make any sacrifice to save my country and I am asking of you, I am asking the administration leadership are they ready to do likewise. The power is vested in certain of our governmental officials to stop the strike and place the fuel in the channels of consumption so as to keep the machinery of progress going.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand, John L. Lewis has not as yet revealed to the coal operators a succinct statement of the terms under which he called the strike, intimating it is an increase in wages, social security, and a royalty on each ton of coal. Evidently his demands are such that they would destroy this industry.

Mr. Speaker, I will gamble with you that 90 percent of the laboring class of the coal miners are not in sympathy with the strike; they are patriotic American citizens and they realize what this continued strike will mean in the destruction of our country. The trouble with John L. Lewis, Sidney Hillman, Phil Murray, these racketeering labor leaders, is they have been petted and pampered ever since the initiation of the New Deal, being so treated for the sole reason of political expediency. They have not only been so treated by the administration officials, but by the judicial and a majority of the elected until today they feel they have impregnated themselves into the political picture of this country to the extent they have placed the fear of themselves into the hearts of those who think more of their political jobs than they do the future of their country and can continue to sit on their small thrones of dictatorship without any fear of retaliation by Government representatives.

It is too well known that it is their intention if within their power, to change the form of this great Government of ours and destroy the fundamental principles and precepts upon which it was founded by our forefathers and enunciated by the adoption of our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I, as one Representative in this great legislative branch, am demanding that action be taken at once, it matters not how drastic, to start the wheels turning, because the damage already done is almost irreparable.

Equal Rights Amendment to the Federal Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be

inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the equal rights amendment to the Federal Constitution, by Dr. Lena Madesin Phillips, which appeared in the Connecticut Bar Journal for January 1946. Dr. Phillips is president of the International Federation of Business and Professional Women.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION

I

In favor[1]

Many persons take it for granted that women share our Constitution equally with men. Because this is not true I advocate the passage of the equal rights amendment, now before Congress. This proposed amendment reads:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"Congress and the several States shall have power within their respective jurisdictions to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"This amendment shall take effect 3 years after the date of ratification."

It is true that the phraseology of the Constitution of the United States does not discriminate against women as such. It uses the words persons, people, citizens. The word male appears only three times, and then not until the fourteenth amendment. But the courts have ruled that the Constitution must be interpreted in the light of that English common law that prevailed unmodified when the Constitution was adopted.

"The interpretation of the Constitution of the United States is necessarily influenced by the fact that its provisions are framed in the language of the English common law and are to be read in its history" (*Smith* v. *Alabama* (124 U. S. 465)).

Under the old English common law the courts ruled and the law holds that women are chattels with no legal rights to their property, their wages, or even their own children. Women had no right of contract, nor could they sue or be sued. Various State laws may correct certain of such injustices. But the Constitution today fails to guarantee those rights. An ignorant man, a loafer, a thief, or a murderer may claim the full security of the Constitution. But not a wife, a mother, or any American woman.

American women have been granted the right to vote by the nineteenth amendment, but in no other particular does the Constitution of the United States grant them any rights that English women of 1789 did not have. To grant women an equal right to vote was to grant only one of the rights to which women are entitled.

The original "rights" of the Constitution have therefore been interpreted as "rights for men." Conditions today differ greatly from the time when the Constitution was written. The whole life of women has changed. However, because of the traditional interpretation of the law, the general rule is still that men have all the rights that laws do not take away, while women have only those rights that the law specifically gives them.

There are now in the law of the land more than a thousand discriminations against women, wholly out of line with our conception of human rights and the position of women today. For instance, in many States, property acquired after marriage by the joint effort of husband and wife belongs to the husband and is subject to his control. In certain States the husband can take his wife's wages against her will and spend them. In some States a wife may not engage in business unless the court establishes her capacity to do so. New York is among the States where, in the absence of a written contract, a wife's earnings in the home belong to the husband. In some States the father is preferred as the guardian of a minor child. In many States women are barred from jury service. In short, there is not a single State in the Union today where men and women have equal legal rights.

It is perfectly clear that the inequalities between the rights of women and those of men violate the fundamental principle, enunciated often by the Supreme Court, that all citizens of a Republic should have equal rights. In *United States* v. *Cruikshank* (92 U. S. 542, 555), the Court declared "the equality of the rights of citizens is a principle of republicanism. Every republican government is in duty bound to protect all its citizens in the enjoyment of this principle, if within its power."

Our Constitution will never protect women as it protects men until this principle of equality is incorporated therein. When women obtained the vote their national organizations united in an effort to wipe out discriminations through State legislation. Yet in over 20 years, less than 150 of these discriminatory laws have been changed. In addition, State laws do not have the security and permanence of a constitutional amendment. What one State legislature does, the next can undo. This has often been the case. Our founding fathers foresaw this for themselves and accepted nothing less than a constitutional guaranty of their liberties.

Moreover, it is apparent that to remove these handicaps one by one is a wasteful procedure. The equal rights amendment would at one stroke cause both Federal and State governments to observe the principle of equal legal rights since the Federal Constitution is the supreme law of the land. It is true that there will be a period of adjustment during which the provisions of this amendment must be worked out. This has been the case with all the other amendments. Every amendment requires legislation for its enforcement and court action for its interpretation.

Opponents of the equal rights amendment often say that women need special protective legislation against long hours, night work, occupational hazards. What women? Does special legislation protect housewives and house workers against long hours? Or nurses, war workers, and office cleaners against night work? Or one whose hand is deft and whose life expectancy exceeds her brother's against the average strain of the machine? Or is it not rather that woman is thus protected against the better job and in times of unemployment against any job?

As far as we have been able to discover, it was in 1836 that special protective legislation for women was first proposed. Then, the New England association of farmers, mechanics and other workingmen, at the outset of the factory system in the United States adopted the following resolution: "Whereas labor is a physical and moral injury to women, and a competitive menace to men, we recommend legislation to restrict women in industry." This resolution speaks for itself as to its intent.

Whatever the situation may have been in the past, the Fair Labor Standards Act has now set the standard of absolute job equality with equal provisions for men and women in all interstate commerce. Under the Fair Labor Standards Act, men and women doing the same work draw the same pay and work the same number of hours, and the Supreme Court has held this to be constitutional (*United States* v. *Darby* (312 U. S. 100)). This supersedes the former position that minimum-wage and maximum-hour laws could not be applied to men, because such laws infringed their freedom of contract guaranteed by the Constitution, but that they could be applied to women because the Constitution does not guarantee women freedom of contract. In the past, many people really believed that women would lose by the adoption of the equal rights amendment because, since 8-hour laws and similar legislation could not be applied to men, equality would be achieved at the price of beneficial legislation. But now that this decision of the Supreme Court gives constitutionality to such laws for men, there is no argument against the amendment on this score either theoretically or practically.

If it is unhealthy for women to work more than a certain number of hours it is almost certainly unhealthy for men to work more than that number of hours. Working conditions unfavorable to the health of women are apt to be unfavorable to the health of men. It is far better to pass legislation making provisions concerning hours of labor, minimum rates of wages, and working conditions, for all workers, whether men or women.

All labor laws, if based on the pattern of the Fair Labor Standards Act, could protect workers. They should apply to the nature of the work and not to the sex of the worker. Women need the protection of equal constitutional status in this postwar period in order to prevent discriminatory legislation that would interfere with their ability to earn, at a time when the death or disability of husbands, fathers, or sons will make paid work imperative for them.

The language of the amendment is broad in its scope. This is necessary because it covers a broad field. The evil that it seeks to remedy is broad in extent. The language of the amendment would permit the various statutes to insure equal rights for men and women throughout the United States.

Some will say that this is no time to press the equal-rights amendment. We have just concluded a war for freedom and justice and human rights. I say that equality of status for women is inherently a part of the war aims. This principle is a part of the fight for justice and the democratic way of life.

The equal-rights amendment should be considered in the light of world trends. The United Nations Charter declares for "the equal rights of men and women." Both major political parties in the United States have specifically endorsed submission by Congress to the States of an equal-rights amendment. The 1944 Republican platform declares: "We favor submission by Congress to the States of an amendment to the Constitution providing for equal rights for men and women." The 1944 Democratic platform declares: "We recommend to Congress the submission of a constitutional amendment on equal rights for women."

In this Congress the equal-rights amendment was introduced in the Senate by Senator GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, of Maryland, with 23 Senators as supporting cosponsors. It was introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative LOUIS LUDLOW, of Indiana, with 75 Congressmen cosponsoring. In this Congress, the House Judiciary Committee has favorably reported the equal-rights amendment by a 15 to 7 vote, and the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee has also reported the amendment favorably.

The Legislature of New York, by a resolution passed March 24, 1945, has memorialized Congress to act on the equal-rights amendment during this session of Congress.

My experience as president of the International Federation of Business and Professional Women, which has had branches in 30 countries, and a strong branch in this country, has proven to me that the example set by the United States through the passage of the equal-rights amendment will have immeasurable effect throughout the world. Let it not be said that the United States has shed its best blood for principles of equality and justice that it is unwilling to put into effect for its women at home.

[1] By Dr. Lena Madesin Phillips, a member of the New York Bar and president of the International Federation of Business and Professional Women.

Freedom of Speech Over the Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Journal-American of May 5, 1946:

FREEDOM OF SPEECH OVER THE RADIO

The radio is one of the world's newest mediums of expression and opinion, of information and instruction, and has swiftly come to be one of the most important mediums.

Probably the first amendment to the Constitution, which is the source of the freedom of speech and publication which the American people enjoy, was expected to be broad enough to cover all mediums of public expression, and it was surely intended by its framers to do so.

Of course the framers of the Constitution did not include the radio specifically among the mediums of expression which were to be kept free in the interest of unhampered public information, having no knowledge of the device and no means of anticipating its discovery.

But they were well aware that the American people in the future would be resourceful and inventive, and would unquestionably evolve and perfect new and improved methods of publication and communication.

It was their clear intent, therefore, and their obvious purpose that when they decreed that there was never to be any abridgement of "the freedom of speech or of the press," they included such an instrument as the radio.

However, since the radio achieved its present universal use and importance, neither the industries operating it nor the Government policies pertaining to it have adhered to the intent and purposes of the framers of the Constitution.

The attitude, or rather the plight, of the radio industries in this situation is one of virtual helplessness under an iniquitous system of Federal licensing which largely deprives them of the right to function according to the standards of free enterprise.

The Government licensing of radio, originally intended to provide for orderly allotment of broadcasting wave lengths in the obvious interest of both the industries and the public, has gone far beyond that sound and necessary objective.

It has come to be an arbitrary and arrogant instrument of Government bureaucracy, creating the absolute and sometimes capricious and malicious power by which the radio industries are not only allowed to do business but by which they can be put out of business.

The Federal licensing power over radio has become the power of life and death.

The radio broadcaster is licensed according to the current whim or caprice of the political administration in power, and his license may be revoked by the same authority at any time and for any reason.

The spectre of revocation or nonrenewal of the Federal license haunts the broadcaster, and inevitably influences and dictates the manner in which he conducts his business—since he is ever mindful of the investments he has in the business, and of the disaster that would fall upon those investments if he should be deprived of or denied a Federal license.

The American people do not have a free radio today because it is Federally controlled and ruled in its every move and policy.

Obviously it has become necessary for the constitutional guaranty of free speech to specifically say with respect to radio what the framers of the Constitution plainly intended it to mean in all matters and measures of free speech and free publication.

Since the Government and the radio industries have not seen fit to honor the intent of the Constitution, the Congress should clarify and if necessary amend the Constitution to include the radio among the free mediums of expression and opinion and publication utilized and enjoyed by the American people as an inviolable right.

GOP Adopts Poor Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by J. H. Vanwinkle from the Oregon City Banner Courier:

GOP ADOPTS POOR POLICY

Republicans cannot win a majority in Congress in November unless party leaders change their attitude and tactics.

Pointing a critical finger at the ins will not win over enough votes to boost Republican candidates into office.

Voters want to know what the Republican candidates can do for them that the Democratic Congressmen have not done. They want to hear and see a solemn pledge of action before they are going to trade incumbents for hopeful unknowns.

Voters are critical of the present Congress, but they are not going to turn it out of office for that reason alone. They know what to expect from their present Representatives and will string along with them unless the opposition comes out with a clear and appealing platform of intentions.

Church Leader Changes Views on Extending Selective Service

REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have just received an interesting letter from Dr. G. W. Sadler, an important official of the Southern Baptist Convention, referring to his change of views with reference to the extension of the Selective Service Act. It is a timely statement, and I therefore wish to give the House the benefit of Dr. Sadler's views.

The letter is as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAYS: Last June I wrote Congressman ANDREW J. MAY, in part, as follows:

"In view of the fact that unprecedented efforts are being made to establish a just and durable peace, in my opinion the passage of a law providing for compulsory military training of all the youth of our land during peacetime would be untimely. Such action would indicate clearly a lack of faith in the possibility of establishing peaceful world conditions. Let us first use every conceivable means for bringing about happy international relations. If, after exerting ourselves to the fullest to achieve this end, some bully should begin to prepare to wage war, we might then revamp our preparation for military action. Until we have done our utmost to establish and maintain peace and have had occasion to contemplate the response of the governments of other nations to that kind of approach, we should take no steps in the direction of preparing for war."

In the light of what has happened in Europe and the Far East during the intervening months, I have been forced to change my point of view. When WILLIS ROBERTSON heard about my conversion, he requested that I make it public. This I did in an address which was delivered yesterday in the Cannon Memorial Chapel of the University of Richmond. I quote the pertinent paragraphs of that address:

"Since that communication was forwarded, my travels have taken me into Palestine, Egypt, Italy, France, and Yugoslavia. My observations have convinced me that the policy I once advocated is impracticable. Many of the peoples of the world are not prepared to live in accordance with the ideals for which our sons died. I am still opposed to the principle of compulsory peacetime military training, but I strongly advocate the extension of the draft as a temporary expedient.

"Disarmament should be our goal, but, for the time being, an internation police system is required. We have obligated ourselves to occupy certain areas in Europe and the Orient. In the spirit of Thomas Jefferson we 'have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.' If to make good that pledge it is necessary to draft men for military service, our Representatives in Washington should not hesitate to make provision for the emergency. It has been suggested that 'thus far the chief purpose of our armies, navies, and air forces has been to win wars. From now on their chief purpose must be to avert them.'

"You will observe that I am recommending the extension of the draft as a 'temporary expedient' and that I used the expression 'for the time being.' All persons of intelligence and insight know that armies and navies and air forces and atom bombs cannot solve international problems. We are convinced MacArthur appraised the situation correctly when he declared, 'the problem basically is theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement in human character. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh.' "

I am advised by my son, a former prisoner of war in Germany and now a senior in the University of Richmond, that a number of his veteran friends are in favor of the extension of the draft.

With all good wishes, I am

Cordially yours,

GEORGE W. SADLER.

A Public Declaration by the Committee for a Just Peace With Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am in thorough accord with the aims and purposes of the Committee for a Just Peace for Italy. The declaration is as follows:

America cannot be indifferent to her responsibility of exercising international leadership in the rebuilding of a war-stricken world.

More than 6,000,000 Americans of Italian origin, whose contributions to the war effort bespeak their deep and abiding loyalty to America, are united with all other Americans in the conviction that the first concern of humanity today is a just and lasting peace.

It must be recognized that Italy has, for nearly 2 years, fought on the side of the Allies with its entire fleet and with its land and air forces. The spirit of resistance and sacrifice was exemplified by the Italian partisan who, in the words of Marshal Alexander and General Clark, constituted the most effective resistance movement in Europe.

It must be recognized also that a free democratic Italy in the heart of Europe is essential to the maintenance of the very peace of Europe.

It is in this spirit that we urge our Government to insist with all its authority and prestige that Italy be given a peace in accordance with the Potsdam declaration and the pledges made by President Roosevelt and President Truman.

For the good name and faith of America, and in the interests of a lasting world peace, the Government of the United States should insist:

1. That the boundary between Italy and Yugoslavia be based on the Wilson line as modified by the State Department in September 1945; that Trieste remain, as it is in fact, an Italian city; and that if the port of Trieste is internationalized, it then be put under Italian administration.

2. That France and Italy find an amicable solution to their frontier problems; that because of their importance to the economic life of Italy, Tenda and Briga remain Italian.

3. That the present Austrian-Italian frontier be maintained in view of the paramount economic importance of that region to Italian national life.

4. That all colonies acquired by Italy before the Fascist assumption of power remain Italian. The proposal to transfer such colonies to the United Nations Organization does not meet with our approval unless this principle is given universal application and is not used as a pretext to give these Italian colonies to other nations.

5. That war reparations or indemnities be not exacted of Italy—this, in accordance with the declared policy of our Government.

6. That restrictions presently imposed on Italian sovereignty by the terms of the Armistice be abolished forthwith and in advance of the final peace treaty which may yet require several months before it is concluded. This would recognize Italy's rights as a cobelligerent nation.

7. That all restrictions to Italy's resumption of normal commercial and financial relations with other nations be removed forthwith to enable her to acquire basic commodities such as foodstuffs and raw materials which are indispensable to her national recovery.

8. That the remaining units of Italy's merchant marine, without which she cannot survive, be restored to her.

9. That in accordance with the Potsdam Declaration, Italy be actually granted the rights of a friendly, peace-loving nation. Italy has clearly earned this distinction through her enormous sacrifices and her gallant contributions to the Allied cause.

10. That Italy be accorded membership in the United Nations Organization.

THE COMMITTEE FOR A JUST PEACE WITH ITALY,
CHARLES POLETTI,
Chairman of General Committee.
EDWARD CORSI,
Chairman of Executive Committee.
JOSEPH DI FEDE,
Executive Secretary.

British Slick Trick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister Attlee told the House of Commons the other day that the admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine as recommended by the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine would have to wait upon the disbanding of illegal armies in Palestine and the surrender of weapons. He called for joint American military and financial responsibility in settling the proposed numbers of Jews.

First. I call this a slick trick because candor would have compelled Attlee to have laid down these conditions when the committee was formed. Now we are back where we started. The report is now sabotaged. President Truman might not have joined in the inquiry if such conditions had been appended.

The committee went to work with no such additions in mind. There is no mention in the report of any joint Anglo-American military or financial action for the purpose of implementing the recommendation. The committee members now find themselves deceived as does the whole world.

Second. Prime Minister Attlee refuses to accept the recommendation concerning immediate immigration unless and until Jews and Arabs alike are disarmed. Such disarmament would take years. Time is of the essence. In the meanwhile, those who were meant to be helped must continue in their suffering. In effect, what Prime Minister Attlee is saying is that he wants to hold the dispossessed as hostages. The members of the committee had surveyed this situation and had voted against this proposal. They knew the history of Arab pogroms against the Jews and that Jews were, therefore, entitled to arm in self-defense. They knew that Jews in the past had been deprived of arms supplied to the Arabs so that Jews had to meet Arab assault with bare knuckles.

Third. Americans are now caught in at trap set by Mr. Attlee. American members of the committee agreed to the compromise of 100,000 immigration certificates for the Jews in return for a pronouncement against a Jewish State. Now the American members having committed themselves, more or less, against a Jewish State find that the British now repudiate the agreement to grant 100,000 certificates. It is a case of the British winning, heads or tails, and all President Truman apparently got was his labor for his pains.

Fourth. Mr. Attlee wants American troops to help quell Arab terrorism. It would be well for the British to clean house first. If the British are eager to prevent trouble in the Holy Land, it could easily do so by placing Arab terrorists like Jamal Effendi Huesseini under arrest. The British Government should likewise discourage every effort to bring back the notorious Axis criminal, the so-called Grand Mufti of Jerusalem. That gentleman has been the cause of prolonged trouble in Palestine. He is most skillful in organizing assassination groups in the name of a holy war.

Bloc versus Bloc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 30, 1946

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article, Bloc versus Bloc, by William Philip Simms, which appeared in the Washington News of May 2, 1946:

BLOC VERSUS BLOC

As relentlessly as the unfolding of the plot of a Greek tragedy, the United States and the British Commonwealth are being driven into precisely the sort of fraternal association envisaged by Winston Churchill in his speech in Missouri.

Russia is notoriously hostile to the formation of any such bloc. Yet, by her own actions, she is making it inevitable. Not only is she steadily building up a Soviet bloc reaching across Europe and Asia, but every utterance of Soviet leaders indicates (1) the Kremlin has little or no faith in the United Nations, and (2) that it intends to make the Russian bloc into the most powerful military force the world has ever seen.

Stalin is setting the pace. He has made only two public speeches in recent months—on Red Army Day and May Day—and both took the same slant. Yesterday he declared that "international reaction" is "hatching plans for a new war," hence it is necessary to be constantly vigilant "to protect the apple of one's eye the armed forces and defensive power of our country." In his previous speech he warned that Russia was being "encircled" by capitalist countries and so needed to strengthen her armed forces.

Stalin did not name names, but there are only two powers in the world today that could possibly put up any kind of fight with Russia. They are the United States and Britain. And both are now disarming fast—especially the United States. The two of them together would be no match for Russia. Thus Russia is not menaced from any direction.

Nevertheless—probably because of this weakness on the part of the rest of the world—Russia is almost feverishly consolidating her spheres of influence. In Europe, already her bloc is composed of herself, Finland, Poland, the three Baltic States, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. Hungary and Austria are likely additions and, if Spain goes Communist, France, Italy, and Greece may be next. And Germany probably will follow the rest once the United States and Britain grow weary of occupation.

There is an excellent chance, therefore, that all Europe will be engulfed. In Asia, Outer Mongolia is now inside the Soviet bloc and Chinese Turkestan (Sinkiang) is being readied for swallowing. All north China, including Manchuria, has been, or is being, taken over by the Chinese Communists in direct violation of the Sino-Russian pact. And qualified observers on the spot express grave doubts regarding Korea.

Today, therefore, Russia is in a fair way to dominate the whole of Europe and Asia. What is left of China—if the Soviet-supported native Communists take over—will

not be able to resist. Nor will an independent but weak India. And—as in the case of Germany—the Japanese may go the way of the rest of the Asiatics when the Americans pull out.

Such, at least, is the conviction of more than one of the United Nations diplomats who have been observing developments through Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco down to the meetings of the Security Council in New York and the Big Four foreign ministers in Paris.

Already she is well started on a bloc comprising more than half of the habitable globe along with two-thirds of the population. Outside chiefly are only the western hemisphere and part of the British Empire. Despite themselves, they may be forced into a bloc of their own in sheer self-defense. The only alternative is an effective United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I also include the following article, New Approach, by William Philip Simms, which appeared in the Washington News of May 3, 1946:

NEW APPROACH

(By William Philip Simms)

Behind-the-scenes reports from Europe and Asia are bad and growing worse. World peace seems as far away as ever. In Paris, French Foreign Minister Bidault has warned the Big Four conference against prolonging the stalemate, saying, in effect, that "if you are ever going to achieve anything, you will have to try a new approach."

United Nations observers almost unanimously agree with M. Bidault. This is especially the case with the smaller members, who need peace so desperately but are utterly powerless to do anything about it because the Big Three insist on making all the decisions. Yet Russia, Britain, and the United States seem as far apart as the poles.

There is no mystery, however, about what is wrong. Allied war aims have been betrayed. The things subscribed to in the Atlantic Charter have been tossed into the ashcan. The Allied peace objectives, as set forth in the various pacts of Moscow, Tehran, Cairo, Yalta, and Potsdam, are forgotten, while the San Francisco Charter, so solemnly signed less than a year ago, seems already forgotten. To some of the great powers, at least, all these pronouncements apparently were just wartime window dressing to fool the people.

United Nations members—it seems strange to have to recall this so soon—all gave their written word that they "seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other." Also, that they "desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned," and that they "respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live."

These Atlantic Charter promises subsequently were further solemnized and implemented at meetings of the Great Powers. Liberated countries—even former Axis satellites—were to be allowed "free and unfettered elections." What was China's was to be returned to China. Korea and Austria were to be independent. Iran's sovereignty was not to be interfered with. And so on.

These promises have not been kept. World chaos is increasing as the European armistice now goes into its second year. Famine is taking its toll in Europe, Asia, and Africa, and the Department of Commerce in Washington predicts it will be at least 5 years before the world food situation returns to normal. Even so, many fear the forecast is too optimistic.

Edward T. Leech, editor of the Pittsburgh Press, who has just returned from Europe, also brings a warning. Food and Russia, he said, were the biggest problems he found across the Atlantic. The Allies and Russia simply do not see eye to eye. She is up to something but no one knows what it is.

United Nations diplomats share Mr. Leech's forebodings. Russia still seems bent on having her way at the peace table. And every time he makes a speech Stalin treats his former allies as war-bent Fascist enemies against whom Russia must arm herself to the teeth.

So, say United Nations observers, the French Foreign Minister was indulging in understatement when he said a "new approach" must be found if there is to be peace. But that approach is clearly indicated. The big powers need only to live up to their historic promises. Russia must not seek to make herself master of Eurasia in place of Nazi Germany.

What Would the Angel Gabriel Do in This Case?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, of all the puzzling matters with which we have been forced to wrestle in the conflicting claims of producers and OPA, the claims of the milk producers take, I think, first rank. Since milk is one of the most important human foods, it goes without saying that it is the height of folly to minimize its production or to make any move which will put it beyond the reach of that large proportion of the human family which requires it as a food. I believe that to take off all price controls on milk now would skyrocket the price to entirely unreasonable amounts, and I can realize what that would mean to our moderate and low-income groups. I have told OPA of my steadfast and loyal support of the OPA program. I have also told OPA on numerous occasions what I sincerely feel with regard to the necessity of slight increases in the price of milk, or else an adequate increase in milk subsidies, so that milk production may not be curtailed, but rather increased. My mind is not at all clear what the law and the administration of the law ought to be at this time on this particularly important commodity. However, I have just received a very thought-provoking letter from a personal friend who is a dairyman near Phoenix, Ariz. Under leave to print, I hereby include a copy of this letter, which is as follows:

ARIZONA MILK PRODUCERS,
Phoenix, Ariz., May 1, 1946.

Hon. JOHN R. MURDOCK,
United States House of Representatives, Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JOHN: Thank you for your letter of April 24. I note you stated belief that milk producers have been hit harder than most producers and that you hope the situation will grow better.

Since the current decline in milk production, both locally and nationally, is the result of the operation of certain positive and definite governmental policies, it seems to me to be useless to hope that the situation will get better unless positive steps are taken to correct the policies which have brought the present situation about.

I think you will agree with me that there is no basic or physical reason why Arizona consumers should not have an adequate milk supply. We produce alfalfa hay and other roughages, and feed grains greatly in excess of the amounts required to feed the number of dairy cows necessary to produce the needed supply. Cows have calves in Arizona, just as they do in other places, and by the law of averages, about half of them are heifers, capable of becoming milk cows. There is no reason why the State's dairy herd could not be increased by 15 or 20 percent annually, if the needs of the population for milk and milk products require it. While scarcity of labor might have been a limiting factor during the war years, the United States Employment Service now reports in excess of 16,000 unemployed in the State. While all of these are not dairy workers and few of them are looking for dairy work, it seems reasonable to assume that a sufficient number of them could be induced to become dairy workers, if financial returns were comparable to returns in other lines of work.

Yet, the record shows that from 1940 through 1943 the cow population of the State increased only about 8 percent, and that in the past 2 years half of that increase has been lost. During this period the population of the State increased 25 or 30 percent.

Since there is an unusually large proportion of our population such as invalids and disabled veterans to whom an adequate supply of milk and milk products is essential, this record is especially significant and I believe constitutes a severe indictment of those responsible for policies which have brought the situation about.

The principal culprit, of course, is OPA; though the use of subsidies instead of price increases to the consumer, and the application of directives as to the usage of butterfat, which should never have been applicable to areas deficient in milk supply, have been contributing factors.

I believe it has been conclusively demonstrated that OPA will not treat the dairy industry fairly or intelligently. Such price increases as they have been forced to make have been delayed as long as possible, and have been inadequate in amount. They have refused to recognize the need of increased milk production as a basis for price increases. In determining milk production costs they have given little if any consideration to studies made by the agricultural college at Tucson, but insist on using studies made by their own accountants who are untrained and inexperienced in calculating farm costs and are in many cases incompetent. They are obsessed with the desire to hold the political support of consumer groups by holding food costs down, without regard to the effect on consumers of inadequate supply. They have insisted on the payment of subsidies in lieu of price increases, in spite of the fact that subsidies are in themselves more inflationary than justified price increases, and that subsidies do not get the same results in increased production as would equivalent price increases, because dairymen know the political motives and uncertainties behind subsidy payments, and are unwilling to expand their investments and operation on that uncertain basis.

OPA's proposals to remove ceilings when supply overtakes demand mean nothing to the milk industry because, under their present and announced policies production will continue to decline.

There are several provisions in the OPA bill as passed by the House, which might remove the milk industry from further interference and sabotage by OPA. Section 2, which prohibits the establishment of ceilings which do not reflect costs plus reasonable profits, would probably do the job, though with OPA's well-known propensity for stalling, relief under that section might be unduly delayed.

Paragraph (B) of section 1A would no doubt remove ceilings from milk, as such,

but it seems to me that if butter were regarded as a separate commodity, ceilings on butter might be retained. Even if that were the case, I should think OPA would be smart enough to keep the ceiling price of butter somewhere in line with other milk and milk product prices. Not much butter will be made anyway, until such time as the demand for other milk products is satisfied.

I do not believe that removal of ceilings on milk would result in runaway prices. The demand for milk or other foods is not cumulative, as is the case with refrigerators or automobiles. Even though a housewife may not have been able for some time past to buy as much milk as she desired, she is not going to try to buy milk to make up for past deficiencies, but will only try to buy enough to satisfy her current requirements. The fact that there is a wide seasonal variation in the volume of milk production will always operate to keep milk prices in line. Whenever enough production is developed to take care of the demand during the fall and winter months of low production, there will necessarily be a surplus during the spring period of flush production, and this surplus will keep prices leveled off.

Had the ceiling price on milk been removed in March, when OPA gave us the increase of 1 cent per quart instead of the 2 cents which we asked for, I am quite sure that the price would not have gone up more than 2 cents, and we could have developed enough new production by next fall to have satisfied the demand. As it is, the increase of 1 cent has had little effect in stimulating increased production, because, in the first place, it is not enough, and there is no certainty that it will be continued after June 8, when the temporary order expires.

If satisfactory relief to the milk industry cannot be obtained by any other method, then I believe the Congress should attach the Russell amendment, which requires farm labor to be added in figuring farm parity prices, to the OPA bill.

I think it may help you to realize the absurdity of holding milk prices down to such a level that production is throttled when I tell you what has happened to certain building costs. In 1941 we added a classroom to our school house. The contract price was less than $2,600. We need three more rooms now and the architect tells us they will cost between $6,000 and $8,000 each. Last winter we could buy only half as much milk as we needed for our school lunch program, because the price was held down to little more than prewar level.

I sincerely hope that you will support amendments to the OPA bill which will remove the arbitrary powers which they have so flagrantly abused. With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

NAT M. DYSART,
Manager, Arizona Milk Producers.

Survey Shows Small Business Throughout the Country Opposed to OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the administration, with its army of 45,000 propaganda publicity persons on the Federal pay roll, with a budget of $74,000,000 taken from the taxpayers' pockets, have been trying to create the impression that the only opposition to the OPA is from big business. The common people of this country who, because of their wisdom and discrimination, now realize that these agencies cannot be relied upon to tell them the truth relating to legislation and other governmental matters. It is interesting to note that with all the effort of the New Deal propaganda machine the truth, like murder, will out.

On April 10, 1946, the National Small Business Men's Association, with headquarters in Akron, Ohio, asked its thousands of members throughout the United States to fill out and return a questionnaire regarding the OPA. The replies have poured in from every State in the Union, and a careful analysis of these replies shows that smaller business is predominant in opposing the OPA. It is significant that of 288,142 business establishments, the approximate number of employees in the month of February 1946, in each company was 65:

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESSMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Akron, Ohio, April 10, 1946.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON OPA

Please answer the questions which pertain to your business.

	Check with an X: Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
1. Are you satisfied with OPA substantially as is?	------	96.0
2. Do you have difficulty figuring out what you are supposed to do under OPA regulations?	88.5	------
3. Do you consider that OPA requires excess paper work?	87.5	------
4. Do you think OPA regulations could be greatly modified without danger of serious inflation?	94.6	------
5. Have you found OPA too inconsiderate and unyielding in the handling of appeals?	88.8	------
6. Are you reluctant to approach OPA because:		
(a) Of the excessive cost of getting any changes made?	83.7	------
(b) They demand too much information of a private nature?	86.2	------
(c) You fear they will use retaliatory tactics on anyone who questions their regulations	77.1	------
(d) You do not think there is any chance of getting reasonable consideration?	64.2	------
7. Do you feel that Government agency practices limit your freedom of speech?	75.8	------
8. Are your prices figured on a base period that is unjustly low?	83.8	------
9. Are your margins being badly squeezed because of OPA increases being allowed to producers in the primary markets without compensating increases being allowed to you?	88.5	------
10. Have OPA regulations forced you to reduce your quality of merchandise or service?	60.0	------
11. Do you expect to experience genuine hardships before June 30, 1946, unless:		
(a) OPA is thoroughly overhauled?	85.8	------
(b) Methods of temporary relief are rushed through	86.0	------
12. Are you keeping some of your former products out of production because making them would be unprofitable under your established ceilings?	63.9	------
13. Are some of your needed materials or merchandise unavailable because:		
(a) OPA ceiling prices on them are too low?	91.5	------
(b) Of OPA delay in pricing them?	83.5	------
14. Would prompt approval of temporary prices requested by your sources of supply be of considerable help?	94.5	------
15. If OPA issued a regulation permitting you to fix your own prices, the top limit being an increase of not more than 15, or 18, or 20, or 25 percent above October 1941 would you: (Check increase you need) 15-36.5 percent; 18-10.1 percent; 20-28.4 percent; 25-25.0 percent		
(a) Be able to operate at a satisfactory profit?	99.3	------
(b) Increase employment?	91.4	------
(c) Expand your sales force?	79.0	------
(d) Increase your advertising and sales promotion?	88.6	------
(e) Bring out new products or increase your stock of merchandise?	92.4	------
16. If some such regulation, as above, is not issued within 60 days, what will be the effect on your business? (Use separate sheet for reply if necessary.)	------	------
17. Would you like to have Congress investigate the background of a healthy cross section of the personnel of the OPA?	92.5	------
18. Do you think that some sort of price control will be necessary until:		
(a) June 30, 1946	46.2	------
(b) Dec. 31, 1946	46.2	------
(c) Until approximately (date) (1947-48)	7.6	------
19. What is your line of business		
20. Approximate number of employees February 1946....288,142 average per company, 65.		
21. How many would you employ if permitted to go ahead on your own as outlined in question 15....387,668—an increase of 34.5 percent.		
22. Estimate of volume for 1946 under existing conditions....$3,239,701,000, if permitted to increase prices as checked in question 15....$5,051,815,000 an increase of 55.9 percent.		

Keynote Speech of Hon. Robert L. Doughton, of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. KERR
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following keynote speech of Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, before the North Carolina Democratic State convention:

[From the News and Observer, Raleigh, N. C., of May 3, 1946]

KEYNOTER DOUGHTON REVIEWS PARTY'S LONG RECORD OF SUCCESS—OUTLINES RECORD IN STATE AND NATION—BUSINESS AND FARM RECOVERY UNDER ROOSEVELT CITED IN CONVENTION SPEECH

(This is the text of the keynote speech delivered at the State convention yesterday by Representative ROBERT L. DOUGHTON:)

Today we launch another Democratic campaign. Standing before this impressive gathering, I am reminded of a war cry sounded years ago by the brilliant and inimitable Thomas Bickett, Governor of North Carolina, during the First World War. As this crusader for democracy campaigned up and down the State he would frequently make reference to history for truths to clinch his arguments.

"The record is the reason," Bickett would shout to his audience. And the record never failed him. For in its pages were imprinted the beneficial works of a party—the Democratic Party—which, since the days of Jefferson, had held that constructive deeds for humanity mean more than nonproductive promises.

Today, more than a quarter century later, the record remains the reason—the reason for continuing Democratic rule in State and Nation. In fact, the record constitutes our party's real platform.

But before opening up the record, let me thank my dear friend, Chairman Umstead, for his generous and gracious introduction. In my 35 years in Congress I have served with no one who, in point of ability, industry, sound practical judgment of purity of motive, surpasses William B. Umstead. His voluntary retirement from Congress was a heavy blow not only to his district but also to our State and to the Nation.

I also compliment this vast outpouring of militant, forward-marching partisans assembled here to reconsecrate their hearts and minds to the principles of democracy.

I am glad to see the women—God bless them—in plenteous proportion. My long experience has taught me that they strengthen, edify, dignify, beautify, and glorify any cause they espouse. One of them, trained in our State organization, has become a power in the Nation—Mrs. Charles W. Tillett, of Charlotte, vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

WELCOMES VETERANS

And I welcome you veterans of World War II who are here today. We are all proud of you—proud of your record and devotion to duty. Pridefully I can say that no nation in the history of the world has done as much for her returned war heroes as we have tried to do for you and your families. The Democratic Party has not, and will not, forget you men and women who fought the good fight and kept the faith, nor those who made the supreme sacrifice, in order that liberty, freedom, and the American way of life might survive.

First, let us briefly consider the national record of the Democratic Party. Occasionally we will point an accusing finger in the direction of the Republicans—but I see no reason why we should spend too much time in discussing their derelictions and shortcomings. They are well known to each and every one.

In these days of sound banks, prosperous farms, good wages, full employment, and profitable businesses, we may be prone to forget—we may fail to recollect—the condition of the Nation when the Democratic Party took over the administration of her affairs in 1933. On March 4 of that year a Republican President, who for 3½ years had refused to acknowledge that there was anything particularly wrong with the country, passed over the reins of executive authority to the greatest American of his time—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Throughout the years of Mr. Hoover's administration, the Nation had been rushing toward utter ruin. Millions were facing starvation—but nothing had been done by the Federal Government in response to the plea of humanity. Other millions were being evicted from their homes, and agriculture was in a state of complete collapse. Upwards of 30 million farming people had, through no fault of their own, been dropped from the purchasing class—but nothing had been done to help them. More than 5,000 banks had failed during that one Republican administration but the man in the White House insisted that "prosperity was just around the corner." Factories were closing their doors by literal thousands—merchants were beating a trail to the courts of bankruptcy—and the army of the unemployed in swelling ranks was tramping the streets of every city, town and hamlet, and the highways and byways of every countryside in the Nation.

The truth is, the Nation's economy was on its last legs back in 1933. And nowhere in the Republican Party was there the imagination or the leadership to start the wheels of industry and keep them going.

ROOSEVELT PROGRAM

Backed by an overwhelming Democratic majority in the Congress, Roosevelt launched a campaign to prove to America that something was wrong with their governmental philosophies, and that something could be done about it.

Fear, the great destroyer, was quickly driven from the minds of the people—then Roosevelt and the Congress went to work. Legislation was enacted which vested the workingman with a new dignity and security—the legal right to bargain collectively, the Wagner Act, the minimum wage law, the Railroad Retirement Act, the Social Security Act—all of these acts, and many others, required courage and vision. I ask you when will any party—Democratic or Republican—ever write one of these laws off the books?

In 1932 and early 1933 few people had any money to put in banks. What they had they were afraid to put in. And what they had in they were rushing to get out. When the Democratic Party took over, the savings of the people still remaining in banks were quickly brought under the protection of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and the confidence of the people in their banking institutions was restored. The history of the past 13 years shows how their confidence has grown, and their deposits have increased—increased from forty-one billion to $166,000,000,000.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, by the wise lending of funds made available by Congress, enabled banks, railroads, insurance companies, and other business individual and corporate, which had managed to survive the Hoover disaster, to play their part in the great economic revival of their country.

The Securities Acts gave the people a new faith in the stock and investment markets, a faith which had been lost in the mad days of wildcat speculation under previous Republican administrations.

CITES FARM RECORD

Traditionally the Democratic Party has proved itself ever faithful to the farmer. In 1933 it set about to revive America's languishing agriculture. Our total farm income had dropped to $4,500,000,000 in 1932. The forgotten men of Republicanism become a matter of constant concern to the Roosevelt administration. Foreclosures were shaking and shattering the very foundation of rural life just 13 years ago, but Farm Credit loans have enabled farmers to save their lands, protect their firesides, and hold their homes.

Our Government, under Democratic administration, has opened new vistas of prosperity to the farm population of America. Realizing that the soil is the country's greatest natural resource, and the contented family on the farm its greatest asset, millions of eroded acres were brought back to profitable production as a result of soil-conservation legislation written in the statute books by our party.

From the very beginning, the Republican Party viewed Democratic reform with jaundiced eye. Most of the legislation responsible for the free and prosperous America which we now enjoy, drew nothing but dire prediction from the stubborn Republican opposition. But in spite of Republican resistance and ridicule farm income grew from $4,500,000,000 in 1932, to $8,000,000,000 in 1940, and $20,000,000,000 in 1945. In spite of Republican criticism and obstruction, the national income rose from $38,000,000,000 in 1932 to $76,000,000,000 in 1940, and to $160,000,000 in 1945. In spite of Republican propaganda, most of the 16,000,000 men and women who were jobless in 1933 had found employment at good wages before we entered the war.

Order had been brought out of chaos, the American idea of government had been saved, and the policy of the good neighbor had welded a bond of friendship with the other nations of the western world. An unbounded confidence in our system of free enterprise had replaced the fear and panic instilled by years of reactionary do-nothing administrations.

So America, built by the toil of three centuries of pioneers, was able to meet the test—morally, spiritually, and industrially—when Jap bombs at Pearl Harbor swept the Nation to war.

From that day to now, the record and the great objectives of the Democratic Party are described in two words—victory and peace. The President instilled into the fiber of America the courage, the determination, the will of a united fighting army.

With victory in sight and the foundations for a lasting peace already laid, Roosevelt, the superb Commander in Chief, was called from us. The tears of men and women the world over attested his greatness and the immortality of his unconquerable spirit.

Stricken down as he was, like a soldier in battle, his standard was picked up by another great American—Harry S. Truman. In the modest, capable, and firm hands of Harry Truman, of Missouri, the victory was concluded and the negotiations for peace are far on the way to consummation.

DIFFICULT PROBLEMS

I do not need to remind you that modern warfare dislocates the entire world—not just the nations engaged in war. President Truman inherited the most difficult and perplexing problems—both domestic and foreign—ever to fall suddenly and without warning on the shoulders of any public man.

But it is the glory of our democracy that we have been able to produce a man fit and suitable for every period. Divine providence did not take Roosevelt from us as long as the roar of guns threatened our safety. And now, as we face economic and social problems at home and abroad, it is good to know that we have in the White House an honest, capable and fearless champion of the American way.

One does not have to search for the monuments of the Democratic Party. They are to be seen along the streets of every town and city—along every road the length and breadth of America. They are, in a great many instances, the very streets and highways you travel. They are in the form of modern school buildings, playgrounds, and recreational centers. They are the vast dams that control flood waters—they are national parks and scenic highways. Even the rural free delivery boxes alongside the highways and country roads, and the transmission poles that carry electricity to remote farm families, are visible monuments to Democratic achievement. So are the smoking factory chimneys and lines of efficient workmen checking in for the first, the second, or the third shift.

The conduct of a victorious world war and the revival of America's depressed economy called for vast national expenditures. Reference to either inevitably leads to the subject of taxation.

While taxes must remain for a considerable time at a higher level than they were prior to the war, we must see to it that reductions are made just as rapidly as feasible. Last year, shortly after the war's end, we were able to remove 12,000,000 low-income Americans from the Federal tax rolls, and to reduce rates on all individuals. Congress also reduced taxes on corporations to stimulate increased employment and to help busi-

ness and industry expand and reconvert for full peacetime production.

SEES CUT IN COSTS

It is my hope and belief that further substantial reductions can and should be made in the cost of Federal Government. We can do this by abolishing functions rightfully belonging to the several States and by turning a deaf ear to the special groups who flock to Washington for financial assistance for nonessential purposes.

I am gratified to report to you that the Treasury now finds itself able to begin paying off debt. Since January 1, 1946, it has retired some four billions of maturing obligations.

The administration and the Congress are so confident that the Government debt has reached its peak and has begun to recede that the Congress is in process of reducing the permissible debt limit from three hundred billion to two hundred and seventy-five billion. It is not unrealistic to assume that in 1947 we will have a balanced budget which will include a reasonable program of reduction in the public debt.

And listen: With all the complaint about extravagances made necessary by our successful fights against depression within and total war beyond our boundaries—some of which is undoubtedly justified—the American dollar remains the soundest piece of money in all the world—a solid rock of strength in a sea of monetary confusion.

Every 2 years the old Republican elephant lumbers forth to battle with the same moss-covered arguments, but in bright new headgear. Possessing no record on which to predicate its case, he must of necessity declare himself in favor of something. This year the platform on which he hopes for a victory is a masterpiece of evasion and indecision. A wordy, if meaningless, document on national and State issues, it comes out strongly for a free America, for mother love, for brotherhood and affection in the ranks of Republicanism, and for complete and utter destruction of the Democratic Party.

Despite the almost universal criticism with which it was received, I must say a few kind words for this so-called platform of principle. Roughly, 80 percent of its text was devoted to praise of social and economic reforms accomplished by Democrats during this and preceding administrations.

STATE RECORD

Now let us briefly review our State record.

Some of us older men and women recall as a nightmare the miserable conditions which prevailed here in North Carolina during the dreary days of Republican "mugwump" rule. Primitive school buildings and brief, spasmodic school terms were pitiful excuses for an educational system. The health of the people was not envisioned as a responsibility of State government. Worst of all, State pride had been shattered in a reign of inefficiency, fostered and led by the party of the opposition.

Shocked into action by these intolerable conditions, the people routed the fusion regime and took complete control of the public affairs of North Carolina in 1901. This crusade was headed by the beloved Charles B. Aycock—an unforgetable Governor who electrified North Carolina in his crusade for public education.

From that day to this good hour, we have enjoyed 46 uninterrupted years of Democratic progress—from Aycock to Cherry. What a glorious record of accomplishment. Our party, under the wise leadership of each of its Governors, has made lasting contribution to the State's onward march—the efforts of one administration making possible the program of the next.

Opening up the record of this 46 years is a pleasure, indeed.

Back in 1900, when Aycock went about the State pleading with the people to build schools, and kindling anew their faith in the future, North Carolina was one of the poorest States in the Union. Inertia and self-pity had submerged the land. The torch carried by Aycock in those days was not extinguished by his death. It has been passed along from one Democratic administration to another—and the glowing results are reflected in the statistics of the present.

More than 900,000 children attend the State's public schools, housed in buildings of modern design, and staffed by well-trained cultured teachers—trained for the most part in North Carolina's own colleges and universities. The State today transports over 350,000 children to and from their schools, a school transportation system surpassing that of any State.

CITES SCHOOL GROWTH

While all States provide the facilities of education for a certain number of months and grades, North Carolina provides 9 months and 12 grades for all of its school children, and our basic constitutional term is supported entirely by the State itself and from sources requiring no tax on property.

The growth of higher education is equally as outstanding. The Consolidated University of North Carolina and our other institutions of higher learning devoted to Christion education have truly made North Carolina the Athens of the South.

Regarding a good transportation system as necessary to a well-balanced economy, the democracy of North Carolina inaugurated a program and has piloted to reality a network of highways unexcelled in the Nation. During President Woodrow Wilson's administration, laws were enacted which provided for a system of Federal roads, and aid from the United States Treasury for those States that would match, dollar for dollar, the funds appropriated by Congress for the construction of the more important highways. It was my privilege to serve on the Roads Committee of the House of Representatives at the time—and I lent my best efforts to the drafting of this legislation which laid the foundation for our State system. From 1917 to date, $4,500,000,000 have been allotted to the States under this legislation, and of this total amount North Carolina has received $105,000,000.

In 1921, a great Democratic Governor, Cameron Morrison, told a Democratic legislature that the time had come when North Carolina should construct a system of hard-surfaced trunk highways so that the people of the State could enjoy uninterrupted travel from the mountains to the sea. It was a colossal undertaking—one involving the expenditure of millions of borrowed dollars—but also one which has richly proved its value.

Ten years later, another progressive Democratic Governor, O. Max Gardner, backed by another forward-looking general assembly, made bold to have the State take over the complete upkeep of all the secondary roads in the State.

Sixty thousand miles of primary and secondary roads now crisscross North Carolina—memorials to the party of democracy. Free labor is a thing of the past—and not a penny of tax is levied on land for road upkeep.

Our present Governor, able and progressive Gregg Cherry, endeared to the people by his positive and understanding leadership—has set his heart and hands to the further improvement of the State's secondary roads. He plans to help where help is needed most. He has 30,000 miles of these rural roads which will be surfaced to make all-weather travel practicable on all secondary roads at all times of the year. The school bus, the mail carrier, the doctor, and the churchgoer will then be able to make the trip in all weather. The people of the State back him in this vital program.

The health and well-being of the people have, throughout the years, been a matter of prime concern in this succession of Democratic administrations.

The general assembly of 1945, under the leadership of Governor Cherry, provided for a State-wide medical care and hospital program for all the people of North Carolina. This was an action of tremendous importance—an action which, if developed and supported as it should and must be, will have far-reaching effect on the health, lives, and happiness of the people.

Mindful of the great debt of gratitude owed to our 350,000 sons and daughters fighting our war, the legislature of 1945, at the request of our Governor—himself a World War I veteran—created a commission to assist North Carolina veterans in securing the bountiful benefits provided for them by Congress.

SOUND GOVERNMENT

Sound government—that is the key to this 46-year period of extraordinary progress. Our reputation for sane, progressive government—for careful handling of fiscal matters—is the admiration of other States from coast to coast. It inspired President Roosevelt to refer to North Carolina as the best-balanced State in the Nation.

During these years of building, the way has not always been easy. Schools, colleges, roads, institutions for the sick, homes for the aged—their construction and operation has called for the expenditure of tremendous sums. Millions and millions had to be borrowed. By the end of the Hoover depression, the public debt of the State and its subdivisions had reached a half billion dollars. During these past 13 years we have been paying our way out. One of Governor Cherry's first actions upon taking the oath of office was to ask the legislature to pay off the bonded debt of the State out of our surplus.

In January of this year payment of the last of the $132,000,000 owed by the general fund was provided in full. The highway debt has been greatly reduced. The full remainder may be retired 5 years hence, leaving our State government entirely free from debt.

Honest and efficient government is our tradition. It has done much to attract and hold venture capital. It has provided a feeling of security in investment. It has been responsible, in important ways, for the tremendous growth of our industry.

Let us view what has been accomplished since the turn of the century.

Manufacturing in North Carolina was a modest thing in 1900. The total capital investment was only $78,000,000; the average number of employees was only 70,000; the gross value of manufactured products was only $94,000,000. By 1939 we had 3,000 plants, employing 300,000 people, produced $1,500,000,000 of manufactures. I do not have the figures for 1945, but I am informed that our manufactures went substantially above $2,000,000,000.

In agriculture, the value of North Carolina crops rose from $68,000,000 in 1900 to $242,000,000 in 1939, bringing us to sixth among the States. The value of livestock had increased from $30,000,000 to $90,000,000—the total value of agriculture to $342,000,000.

What a glorious record. Let those who would challenge it show an example of any State anywhere equaling it—much less excelling it.

In the days of old, Moses addressed the children of Israel as they stood on the plains of Moab, in sight of the Promised Land. He reminded them of the glorious past, of a future of plenty, a future in which they would occupy cities they had not built, pasture their herds and flocks on lands they had not prepared, drink water from wells they had not dug—that all this great inheritance would be theirs because of the covenant which Jehovah had made with their ancestors.

He warned them, however, that in the days of their great possession not to forget Jehovah, who had made possible such an inheritance.

GREAT INHERITANCE

Fellow North Carolinians, we are the possessors of an equally great inheritance. In the fundamental law of the State are these words: "* * * We hold it to be self-evident that all men are created equal; that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights; that among them are life, liberty, the enjoyment of the fruits of their own labor, and the pursuit of happiness; that all political power is vested in and derives from the people."

The Democratic Party has subscribed to this doctrine through all its history. It has counseled government only with the consent of the governed. It has encouraged every individual to be self-reliant and to achieve his full stature. It has sought to make him secure in the enjoyment of the fruits of his labor.

We must continue to pilot our ship of state away from the stagnating shoals of reactionism and also away from the equally dangerous quicksands of radicalism. The truth is seldom, if ever, found in extremes. We must continue to make progress but we must do so sanely and not recklessly or blindly.

We must not be diverted from the straight and narrow path of sensible progress by the allurements and blandishments of those individuals or groups who would put their own selfish interests above the welfare of all the people.

The democracy of North Carolina has grown with the aspirations and the achievements of her people. It has never wavered in its loyalty to all the people of our State—the rich and the poor, the high and the low, the white and the colored—those who are in the vigor of health and those who are ill physically or mentally—all of these and their happiness are the prime concern of our party.

To the young people here, and through you to all the young people of our State, I adjure you that your force and your life be on the side of always keeping our Democracy clean, efficient, forward-looking. Become workers in the vineyard—in precinct and in county. Let us ever carry forward the banner of a great party—great now and forever to be great because it is, in truth and in fact, the party "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Next fall the voters of the State and Nation must again choose between us and the Republicans. We need have no fear of the outcome, if we are not lulled by overconfidence, indifference, and neglect. I remind you that eternal vigilence is the price of victory as well as liberty.

As it is writ in the Psalms, "Let him who would rule Israel neither slumber nor sleep."

The Small Businessman Has His Troubles These Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the question of inflation involves much more than mere price control. It takes into account the problems between management and labor, particularly as it affects the cost of manufacturing certain commodities. It particularly involves production.

Organized labor is determined to acquire for itself the highest possible wages, although the white-collared unorganized workers often are unable to get necessary adjustments in their wages. Higher wages necessarily mean that cost of manufacturing is increased. Unless the manufacturer has had an exorbitant profit from which to pay the increased cost—and this is the great exception—he must pass it along to the consumer. This is inflationary. However, most practical economists declare it is necessary if private business is to exist.

When manufactured goods increase in price the cost of goods sold over the counter in retail stores also increases. In a great many cases the small businessman has been compelled by OPA to absorb the increased cost of his merchandise out of his already narrow margin of profit. In addition, in most instances, he has been unable to secure sufficient quantities of merchandise to fill the demands of his customers. Therefore, the small merchant loses in two ways—his profits are cut and his supply is insufficient to meet the demand and assure him a volume large enough to provide sufficient income.

The same story can be applied to small manufacturers scattered throughout the small towns in the United States. An editorial in the Fergus Falls Daily Journal, of Fergus Falls, Minn., on April 19, 1946, expresses very well the effect Government regulation and control has on small industry.

The editorial follows:

HOLDING DOWN PRODUCTION

It will surprise many people to learn that 60 percent of the production of the United States comes from small business as distinguished from the huge billion dollar corporations, and 80 percent of industrial labor is employed in smaller plants. In this connection, Robert E. Outman, a manufacturer of building material, has an article in the Atlantic Monthly, claiming that the small businessman is being squeezed between the Government and the huge corporations, and the result is that everything is scarce, and scarcity means high prices. He goes on to say:

"While the labor leaders, industrial giants, and various Federal agencies jockey for top spots in the new era of push-button prosperity, the small manufacturer cannot even get the material to make the push buttons. Their labor costs rise whenever the powerful unions effect a wage boost, the cost of their raw materials goes up whenever the large corporations break through a price ceiling, and the daily changes in Federal rules multiply their clerical work and overhead costs.

"The small manufacturers, whose production is most needed, would rather take their chances on the open market, where speed and ingenuity pay off. When we need spare parts, we need them at once and not at the end of a 5-week exchange of correspondence with Washington. We have better luck with junk yards than priorities."

"Macedonia for the Macedonians"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, there was a development of significance in respect to the future peace of the world when four distinguished spokesmen of the friends of Macedonia in America came to Washington a few days ago and made impressive representations to our President and Secretary of State in behalf of the establishment of Macedonia as an independent autonomous entity.

For half a century the brave people of Macedonia, with indomitable spirit, born of their unquenchable love of freedom and their determination to assert their God-given rights, have been waging a bitter struggle for independence; but they have been unsuccessful and Macedonia is today dominated by other southeastern European nations.

It was for the purpose of lending a hand to the Macedonians in their age-old battle against alien rule that the committee came to Washington to see the President and the Secretary of State. The visitors represented the central committee of the Macedonian Political Organization of the United States and Canada and they spoke for its entire membership, representing many thousands. The delegation that called at the White House and State Department was composed of the following officials of the organization, all outstanding leaders in the cause of Macedonia:

Mr. Kosta Popoff, of Detroit, president.

Mr. Christ Anastasoff, of St. Louis, vice president.

Mr. Methody Chaneff, of Canton, Ohio, vice president.

Mr. Luben Dimitroff, of Indianapolis, secretary.

From time immemorial, historians have described the Balkans as "the powder keg of Europe," and the incubating place of wars. It is clear as noonday, observers agree, that there can be no permanent and satisfactory peace in the Balkans while the status quo remains. Friends of Macedonia say that recognition of Macedonia as an independent state would stabilize peace in the Balkans, and in that way would exert a marked influence in stabilizing the peace of the world. Thus the issue presented to the President and the Secretary of State by the four visitors has a world-wide significance.

By unanimous consent granted by the House, I offer for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the memorandum which these gentlemen presented to President Truman, as follows:

MAY 3, 1946.

Memorandum to the President of the United States, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The tragic history of the Balkan States, especially during the past 50 years, has been closely connected with Macedonia, often referred to as the "powder keg of the Balkans." The political friction among the various Balkan States has often culminated in armed conflict.

The wars, especially the Balkan Wars (1912–1913), have not solved any of the political Balkan controversial questions. The only apparent result of these struggles has been an economic exhaustion and an everlasting self-destructive hatred among the various Balkan people. It is obvious that should the Balkan States continue to follow the traditional policy of discord their social, political, and economic development will be retarded.

Every responsible statesman now believes that after the Allied victory on the battlefield there must be a settlement that will give

the world a lasting peace. The principles of the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms are the cornerstone for a future lasting peace. Peace will be lasting, especially in the Balkans, only when all the causes for disagreement and conflicts are neutralized.

The outstanding cause for disagreement and eventual conflicts among the Balkan States is Macedonia, this geographic and economic unit of 23,000 square miles between Shar Mountain and the Aegean Sea, inhabited by 3,000,000 people, with Salonica as its chief port.

The Macedonian problem is not of recent origin but has occupied the minds of European statesmen ever since 1878. Article 23 of the Treaty of Berlin (July 1878) provided for an autonomous status of Macedonia. The Turkish Government ignored the provisions of this article and its maladministration of Macedonia is a historic record. After the Macedonian insurrection for freedom, August 2, 1903, King Edward VII, of England, and Nicholas II, of Russia, met at Raval and proposed a program for Macedonian autonomy. The "young Turks" revolution of 1908 thwarted the corrective efforts of the great powers.

For decades Yugoslavia, Greece, and Bulgaria have been quarreling and fighting for the conquest and annexation of Macedonia. Macedonia was and still is the apple of contention between them. The most unfortunate thing so far has been that the Macedonian people have never been asked to decide on their political destiny.

Conquered and partitioned at Bucharest in 1912, the Paris peace treaties of 1919 did not change the fate of Macedonia. Judging from the diary of the American representative, David Hunter Miller, the Committee on New States, which also drafted the so-called minority treaties, for the first time considered the Macedonian question on July 19, 1919. Italy stood for the autonomy of Macedonia, while England proposed that the League of Nations should appoint its own representative in Macedonia, to see that the rights of the people there were respected. But the Franco-Yugoslav opposition thwarted any solution of the Macedonia problem, and the Paris Peace Conference thus sanctioned the Bucharest Treaty of 1913, and Macedonia remained divided between Serbia, Greece, and Bulgaria.

Since the conclusion of the peace treaties of 1919, the Macedonian problem became an open wound in the Balkans. This wound is still unhealed, simply because the proper treatment has not yet been administered. The treatment which will invariably cure the Balkan wound has been formulated by the great English statesman, William Gladstone, and expressed in four words: "Macedonia for the Macedonians." This means the geographic unity of the three parts of Macedonia as an independent political unit, where all of its people can enjoy equal rights, obligations, and opportunities. Only under such condition the Macedonian people shall be masters of their own destiny. Macedonia will cease to serve as a medium of exchange in the transactions of the Balkan States. A united and independent Macedonian state shall play the role as a link of unity among the Balkan States. The proper solution of the Macedonian problem will lay the foundation for a Balkan federation of confederation which is so essential for the future economic and political stability of that region. This can readily be accomplished through the creation of an economic union of this area and political good-neighbor relationship, all consonant with a world-wide spirit of the good neighbor.

Mr. President, to remove this area—Macedonia—as a focal point of contention among the Balkan States, we pray that, in the coming peace negotiations, the American delegation help to develop the acceptance of this geographic, economic, and political unit as an independent entity.

Having experienced the value of human rights and liberty in this country, the Macedonian Americans earnestly work to apply the American way of life and government in their unfortunate country of origin—Macedonia.

Yours very respectfully,

CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE MACEDONIAN POLITICAL ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

KOSTA FOPOFF, *President,*
CHRIST ANASTASOFF,
METHODY CHANEFF,
Vice Presidents.
LUBEN DIMITROFF, *Secretary.*

Address of Hon. Harold E. Stassen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Harold E Stassen to the Republican State Convention at Bangor, Maine, April 12, 1946:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, fellow Republicans. I salute the Republican Party of Maine. You have made an outstanding record. It has been a record not only of winning elections, but even more important, of service to the people. In fact, we could well slightly paraphrase an old sentence and bring it up to date and say, "It is time for the Nation to go the way Maine has been going."

There are many reasons why I take particular pleasure in responding to your invitation to meet with you this afternoon. The natural beauties of Maine were very appealing as we flew in yesterday afternoon. In many respects they reminded me of the northern part of our own Minnesota. This similiarity undoubtedly attracted many of the sons of Maine, who a century and more ago played such a significant part in the opening and devolping of Minnesota. In fact our city of Stillwater in Minnesota was founded by John McKusick, of Maine, and named after his home city in this State. For many years it was one of the great logging centers of Minnesota on the St. Croix River The Washburns of Livermore, Maine, played a part in the establishment of our early flour mills and one of them served Minnesota as Representative in Congress from 1879 to 1885, and as United States Senator from 1889 to 1895.

Perhaps this early association between our States has given us more than the usual appreciation of the contemporary sons of Maine who are among the significant statesmen of our time. I cherish the friendship of and have respect for a number of your distinguished sons. Included preeminently among these is your senior Senator, the able Republican leader of the United States Senate, the Honorable WALLACE WHITE. Likewise I greatly respect your junior Senator, with whom I had the privilege of visiting when he traveled through the South Pacific on a military inspection trip during the war. His outstanding service on the Truman committee contributed much to the effectiveness of that committee. He is much in demand as a speaker throughout the Nation and has been rendering constructive service in frank discussions with audiences in many States of the issues before us in this postwar period. I commend the public service of the Honorable OWEN BREWSTER. Your congressional delegation—MARGARET CHASE SMITH, ROBERT HALE, FRANK FELLOWS—are likewise highly regarded in the Republican councils at Washington. We have also enjoyed the opportunity of becoming personally acquainted with your Governor whose efficient and upright administration of the affairs of your State have attracted attention beyond your borders, the Honorable Horace Hildreth.

Equally do we acclaim the service in an organization way of the outstanding vice chairman of the Republican National Committee, Marion Martin, of Maine.

At the very opening of my remarks may I express the hope that you will so thoroughly present the issues to the people of Maine in this coming campaign, that you so effectively organize and bring out the vote, that your election in 1946 will show a definite increase in the Republican percentages in this key State. This increase will give encouragement to the Republican organizations throughout the Nation and will be one of the signposts pointing the way to victories in the congressional elections in 1946 and to a complete change in the national administration with a Republican victory in 1948.

It is my view that victory will come if the Republican party is forthright, constructive, progressive and dynamic. The Republican party nationally must clearly demonstrate that it is not a weak and spineless "Me too" party. Equally must it show that it is now a blindly obstructing "Me against" party. It must definitely convince the people of its intention to be a positive, constructive, "We will" party. It must clearly and directly indicate what it intends to do if it is placed in a position of authority. This is the manner in which it won victories in many of the States of the Union. It is the policy that should be followed by the party nationally.

In discussing with you frankly some of the specific positions which I believe the Republican Party should take nationally, I do so in the full realization that there is some divergence of views in the Republican Party. This is not a bad thing. It is a good thing. The Republican Party should be big enough to have room within it for a divergence of views. This is a vital part of the functioning of our two-party system. If we were to seek to make the party narrow and uniform, we would soon find that we were developing a multi-party system, with third parties, fourth parties, and fifth parties splitting off. This fragmentation which would result would create a situation in which none of the political parties of the country could give effective leadership. This multi-party split-up is a part of the weakness of government that affected France before the war. It is a part of the difficulty with which Belgium is struggling now. It is a part of the background of the weakness of the Weimar Republic in Germany which gave Hitler his chance for his diabolical rise to power.

On the other hand, if the Republican Party maintains a broadness of membership, and if the debate proceeds internally as to its position on specific issues, with openness and frankness, we will find our way through to the positions which the informed active majority of the rank and file wish to have taken on major questions and we will serve our part in the successful functioning of this magnificent Government of freemen. If properly conducted, internal discussions of differences of view are constructive and stimulating and prevent a party from going to seed. It is important, however, that the debate within the party be conducted on a high plane. We should not indulge in bitter personal attacks within the Republican Party.

By the same token, the party in its machinery must always be open to new membership, to contests over leadership, and to

infusions of new strength. We must vigorously oppose any and all attempts to control the Republican Party by means of narrow confined organizations which do not permit the rank and file to express their views or to participate in party machinery. I congratulate you in Maine in this respect on the openness and fairness with which you conduct the internal affairs of your party from the precincts to the capital.

It is in this spirit of making a contribution in this formulative period of party policy that I present to you my views of some of the positive measures that the Republican Party should advocate.

The Republican Party should make it clear that it would be its objective to present to every American citizen the opportunity to retain his individual freedom and to work at a productive job that would earn for him a high standard of living. This is an objective of full employment in its best sense. We should make it clear that it is possible to have full employment and a low standard of living through a destruction of productiveness and initiative, but we do not propose to follow that route. We should make it equally clear that it's possible to have full employment and to lose the liberties and individual freedom of the men and women of the country. We do not propose to follow that route. But it is our view that it is possible, by alert and dynamic governmental leadership, to have full employment in the sense of a real job opportunity for every citizen who wishes to work at productive efforts, returning to him a good standard of living and at the same time retaining for him those individual liberties that make it possible for him to enjoy the fullness of life, and to fear no man.

Obviously, this general objective must be supplemented by specific proposal. One of these should be the flat position that we are opposed to the nationalization or socialization of any industry. Some urge that we should consider partial nationalization because in the tragic wake of war some of the other countries are trending in that direction. But it is my view that there are ample experiments in nationalization and socialization now being carried on in the world. What is needed is the vigorous, enthusiastic support of the American system of enterprise to demonstrate to the world anew its remarkable productivity and effectiveness.

It should further be our position that we will prepare and adopt a new labor policy for America. The need is clear. But it must not be an antilabor policy. It must spring genuinely from the safeguarding and developing of the rights of individual workmen in the factory and shop, in trade and transportation. It is clear that both in its terms and in its administration, the present national labor policy must be changed. In fact, the administrative bungling and ineptness in labor relations since VJ-day has caused a minimum of a $5,000,000,000 loss in the standard of living of the American people in 1946. The basic stoppages in steel and other fundamental industries would never have occurred if there had been an early facing of basic economic questions. Instead we heard expounded entirely impossible economics with the statement that it was possible to raise wages 30 percent without raising prices. We, of the Republican Party, should bring clearly to the people the basics of our American economics. The elementary facts for example that for every dollar of profit there are at least $10 of wages, and if we try in an artificial manner to squeeze out this dollar profit, we do not in fact thereby raise wages, but rather reduce the total volume of employment, the total initiative and resilience of our economic system, and reduce the amount of wages to workers as a whole.

The new labor policy should clearly provide for machinery for extensive negotiations before a strike takes place, respected by management and labor alike, and enforced by law, to make it certain that the maximum of peaceful negotiations have been carried on before the tragic loss of wages and production and profits occurs through a strike. This clearly involves a negotiating period fixed by Government during which either strike or lock-out would be unlawful.

This new labor policy must then provide assurance that the rank and file of the workmen have a chance to pass upon or vote upon the best offer that has been developed in the negotiations, before they go on strike. Likewise, the requirement should be made that the workmen have an opportunity to select their own leadership at periodic intervals and by proper ballots. Financial accountability of unions to their own members is another desirable provision.

Of particular importance now when we have the two large national labor organizations and a number of major independent unions will be governmental machinery for the settlement of jurisdictional disputes. This should include some type of governmental labor court with the authority to make substantive decisions on the jurisdiction between labor unions. Unless this is done, we will see an unusual amount of warfare between unions and consequent loss of wages to the men and of production and of business. The strike is not a proper weapon with which to settle a jurisdictional dispute between two labor organizations.

Our entire approach to the labor policy must be that of being fair to all economic groups, of emphasizing the common interest of all in production and the success of the economic system and in safeguarding the proper rights of the general public. The labor policy must not include measures to take away the basic freedom of men. The basic right to strike must be inviolate. Compulsory arbitration is not an answer. But, in keeping with the basic principles of the freedom of the individual, I am convinced it is possible to work out a labor policy that will result in an increased measure of harmony between labor and management and capital, with greater production and a higher standard of living for our people.

The Republican Party must make it clear that it will develop a new affirmative agricultural policy to meet the conditions that will arise after the immediate extreme demands for food and products have been filled in the next 2 or 3 years. This policy must be based on high production, and on the development of large volume markets for agricultural products, with safeguards to prevent economic distress and make possible the economic success of those who till the soil. It must be simple and efficient in its administration. I will not endeavor to spell out in detail such a policy at this time, but will do so on an appropriate future occasion.

The Republican Party should make it clear that it will seek to raise the standards of public service, that it will insist on a very high standard of integrity and efficiency from those who work for the Government. The Republican Party should pledge that it will not appoint men to high public office where special interests which they hold, whether it be oil or otherwise, could conflict with their service to the people. The Republican Party should seek to develop a Cabinet of the most able men and women in the country to carry on the extremely important administration of this Government in the critical years ahead. This development of the high standards of service, with special training of public officials is particularly important in our foreign and diplomatic service. As one of the leading nations in the world, having left behind the isolationist role, we desperately need large numbers of competent, trained career men and women to represent us in the important tasks of peaceful relations with other nations of the world and in participation in the United Nations Organization. We have had an excellent West Point and Annapolis to train officers for service in our armed forces. It is well that we have had these. But how much more important it is that we now develop an equally outstanding academy and train those who will serve the Nation in the tasks of peace.

As to our foreign policy, it is my view that the Republican Party should make it clear that it would give vigorous continuous support to the growth and development of the United Nations Organization. This organization is not perfect, but it is the best hope for lasting peace and progress in the welfare of mankind. We should emphasize that it would be our view that the use of a veto in the United Nations Security Council will not be permitted at any time to sanction or permit aggression. It should be our position that the full strength and support of the United States will back up the decisions of the United Nations Organization and we will consider our obligations to maintain the peace under the charter to be continuing regardless of the exercise of a veto.

The Republican Party should pledge that it will be open and frank with the people of America in the conduct of world affairs and that we oppose secret diplomatic agreements. It should be our position that we do not believe in tying down the foreign policy of America to that of any other one nation, but that we will pursue both our traditional friendships and our new friendships in the world; that we will be firm and forthright, but yet friendly in dealing with other nations; that we will not seek to impose our will on others but that we will be vigorous champions for individual human rights and fundamental freedom around the world. We should further emphasize by word and deed that we will cooperate thoroughly in the social and economic problems of United Nations relationships, that we will discharge our responsibility as the great creditor nation of the world, and we will pursue such policies as will result in steadily increased trade between the nations of the world.

Above all we should make it clear that we recognize the greatness of America and that we will seek to have America discharge humbly the responsibility of that greatness. This means that America as a Nation must seek to cultivate the same qualities of greatness which we admire and approve in the conduct of an individual man among us. We must be calm and confident and courageous. We must not be jittery or cowardly or of little faith. We must be generous and considerate but not careless or extravagant. We must search our own souls for answers that are moral and are just. We must be open and frank and forthright and not duplicitous and evasive. We must be strong and industrious and loyal, and not divided, or shiftless or disloyal. We must rigidly respect both the letter and the spirit of our agreements, and require and inspire our friends to do likewise. We must act deliberately without provocation and without excitement. We must hold up the light of liberty of men that all might see, and not grow timid before dark shadows.

I consider that the Republican Party should definitely state that it will be our position that any citizen of our country who treasonably and persistently follows the line of any other nation to the exclusion and harm of the freely determined policy of our own nation, whether that other line be communistic or imperialistic or fascist, serves neither mankind nor his country and deserves neither citizenship, nor public office, nor civic leadership. We should explain to the world that the basic concepts of individual human rights and the freedoms of religion, of press, of speech and of property have been the root cause of the great strength and resilience and the high standard of living of our country. We should not hesitate to encourage in a friendly manner the gradual

change of other peoples through their own decisions toward the attainment of similar individual rights and freedom as a means of improving their own standards of living, their own supply of consumer goods, their own stability of government, their own enjoyment of life.

Fellow citizens, the responsibilities and opportunities of the Republican Party in the years ahead presents a real challenge. I am confident that with steadily increasing support of the rank and file of the people of America, the young men and young women, the veterans who have returned from the war, the laboring men and the farmers, joining in large numbers to the solid strength of the party that already exists, we will meet that challenge. The Republican Party will be a vehicle of service, a vehicle of service for the future welfare of the men and women and children of America and of the world.

Air Mail Postage Rates Should Be Reduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much interested in the reduction of the postage rate on air mail letters and cards.

In fact quite some time ago—November 19, 1945—I introduced a bill in Congress which would provide for a reduction of the air mail rate from 8 to 5 cents per ounce or fraction thereof. This bill is H. R. 4734.

This morning our House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads approved a similar bill to my own—H. R. 5560—introduced by Representative McKENZIE, of Louisiana. It is a good bill and should be approved by the Congress.

I feel that with the improved aerial transportation facilities and service, this reduction can be made without detrimental effect insofar as revenue to the Post Office Department is concerned. In fact, lower rates will result in increased use of air mail and add to the earnings of the Post Office Department, in my opinion.

I recently read an excellent article on the outlook for further reduced air mail postage rates written by Mr. Robert S. Burgess, Superintendent of the Domestic Air Mail Service, United State Post Office Department. The article appeared in the April issue of the magazine called Pegasus, which is the official publication of the Fairchild Aircraft . Division, Hagerstown, Md., of the Fairchild Engine and Airplane Corp., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

The article follows:

THE OUTLOOK FOR 3-CENT AIR MAIL—A POSTAL VIEW

(By Robert S. Burgess, Superintendent of Domestic Air Mail Services, United States Post Office Department)

Faster and better service for the users of air mail is an immediate objective of the Post Office Department's Division of Domestic Air Mail Service. Many of the principal cities of the country are now linked by trunk line air service affording overnight delivery of air mail and in some instances mail posted at one office is delivered to the addressee in another city on the same day, especially when a special delivery stamp is affixed. This overnight and same-day service will be made available between other communities separated by greater distances by the use of faster aircraft, improvements in ground transportation between post offices and airports, and streamlining of the processing of mail at offices of origin, en route, and at destination.

Many of the air-line routes of today were laid out, pioneered, and sponsored by the Post Office Department and, when one considers the vast network of air routes connecting all of the important cities and the leadership which the Nation has achieved in both civil and military aviation, it is obvious that the Post Office Department's so-called subsidy to air transportation through the years has been one of the wisest investments any Government agency has ever made in encouraging private enterprise.

Since the inauguration of domestic air-mail service in 1918, over the first 218-mile route between New York and Washington, the Post Office Department has expended for the transportation of mail by aircraft through the fiscal year 1944 a total of $299,112,791.94. The total direct and allocated costs of air-mail service for the same period amounted to approximately $415,681,859. The Post Office Department's estimated revenues derived from air-mail postage since the beginning of the service, through the fiscal year 1944, amounted to $334,833,870.53, leaving an all-time deficit of $80,847,989.33. However, during the fiscal year 1944, large volumes of air mail to and from members of the armed forces, paid at the rate of 6 cents per one-half ounce, were transported in the domestic air-mail service. Neither the revenues nor expenditures for this mail are included in the totals above. The Cost Ascertainment Division of the Post Office Department credits foreign air mail with the revenues and charges the costs against that service.

Although the division has not as yet published the air-mail revenues and expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, it is possible that the all-time deficit will have been wiped out by that date. Also, that if the revenues attributed to so-called "soldier mail" were credited to domestic air-mail service there would be a substantial excess of revenues over expenditures.

During the early years of Government-operated air-mail service, no segregation of air-mail postage revenue was made. From 1918 to 1928, the air-mail postage rates varied from 2 cents to as high as 24 cents an ounce, and, in some instances, there were special zone rates which included special-delivery service. Also, mail carried by air was not confined to matter paid at air-mail postage rates. However, for that period the revenues have been obtained by applying an average rate of 6 cents per piece to the known number of pieces carried.

The Post Office Department's encouragement to the development of civil aviation is evidenced by the year-by-year increase in the amounts appropriated by the Congress for payments for the transportation of mail by aircraft, beginning with the first appropriation in 1918 of $100,000 and reaching over $43,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946.

Recent surveys of the Post Office Department indicate the feasibility of reducing the air mail postage rates and the possibility of establishing an air mail parcel post system at an early date. The downward revision of air postage rates, looking eventually to transporting all long-haul first-class mail by air, depends upon: (first) the rates which the Post Office Department pays the air carriers for air transportation, as determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board, pursuant to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and (second) improved performance in air transportation.

According to the Division of Cost Ascertainment, in the fiscal year 1944, 47.7 cents of each dollar of postal revenue came from first-class mail; whereas, only 7 cents was derived from air mail. In the allocations and apportionments of postal revenues and expenditures, first-class, nonlocal mail produced $428,212,832 in revenues and is charged with $296,525,914 expenditures, while domestic air mail, exclusive of 6 cents per one-half ounce so-called "soldier-mail," produced $79,412,510 in revenues and is charged with $49,881,593 expenditures.

Of the approximate $296,500,000 expenditure for nonlocal first-class mail, only $26,500,000 was expended for transportation; whereas of the approximate $50,000,000 expenditure for domestic air mail, about $23,000,000 is chargeable to transportation. Or on a weight basis $26,500,000 was paid for the transportation of 403,885,465 pounds of nonlocal first-class mail while approximately $23,000,000 was paid for the transportation of only 34,307,348 pounds of domestic air mail.

From this it can be seen that transportation cost is a major item in handling mail by air, and the feasibility of transporting long-haul first-class mail by air and the establishment of an air-parcel system at postage rates which will produce volume depend upon securing lower rates for air-mail transportation.

The postal service must function under all conditions of weather, and until the carriers are able to operate, land, and take off planes regardless of the elements, it would not be practicable to place all first-class long-haul mail in the air. Operational difficulties have always beset every new mode of transportation and, as other problems in air transportation have been solved, it is to be expected that these will be overcome in the not distant future. A gradual transition from surface to air can be achieved by reductions in air-postage rates without disrupting the postal service and will, no doubt, be accomplished when both air-carrier performance and postal facilities are perfected to provide a service which is both expeditious and dependable.

Few patrons realize the complicated process through which an air-mail letter must pass, and the many individual handlings which it must receive from the time it is dropped in a street collection box until it is finally delivered to the addressee at destination. Suppose we trace an air-mail letter deposited in a collection box on the street in Washington, D. C., at say 3 p. m., addressed to Mr. John Doe, 201 Main Street, Hanford, Calif., and see just what happens.

The notice on the box may state that the next collection from this box will be at 5 p. m.; therefore our letter must remain in the box for 2 hours before it will start on its journey. It is very important that patrons take note of the collection times posted on collection boxes, especially in residential sections, as a letter deposited therein after the last afternoon or evening collection may remain in the box until collected by a letter carrier the following day, thereby causing serious delay in arrival at destination.

Our letter, which was picked up by the collector's truck at 5 p. m., may reach the main post office within a few minutes or maybe it will require over an hour, depending on the truck schedule and other boxes which are to be visited before returning to the post office. However, we will assume that the letter will reach the post office at 5:30 p. m. Along with many hundreds of other letters, both air mail and first class, it will be dumped onto a separating or set-up table where air mail will be separated from other classes, the letters faced, so that all stamps are on top and in the same corner, and fed through a machine which cancels the stamps and affixes

the postmark showing the date and time of cancellation.

Along with thousands of air mail letters addressed to every State and to foreign countries our letter will reach a letter case where a primary separation will be made and the letter placed in a box labeled "California." Now, the State of California extends some 800 miles north and south and there are only 18 cities in the State which have direct air lines service. In addition, there are several routes from Washington over which California mail can be dispatched. It is obvious, therefore, that all the letters for the State should not be sent by air to any one place. A further or secondary distribution is necessary, and all the air mail letters for California are sent to another letter case where our letter for Hanford will be placed in a box labeled "Fresno, Calif. Dis.," as Fresno is the air line stop from which air mail is forwarded to Hanford by surface carriers.

You may ask, "How did the clerk who handled the letter know that an air mail letter for Hanford, Calif., should be sent to Fresno? And of how many places like Hanford would he be required to know the location?"

Well, the answer to that is, all post offices and air mail field postal units on air mail routes are furnished with schemes for the distribution of air mail. At the small offices a very simple scheme is provided which indicates in sequence the dispatches to be made of air mail for each State. At larger offices and at air mail field postal units additional State schemes are furnished. These schemes list all the first- and second-class post offices with key numbers to show the air line stop point to which the mail for each office is due to be sent for surface transportation to destination. The names of the small third- and fourth-class offices are not shown and air mail destined to these is sent to a point within or adjacent to the State where distributors, who are familiar with the exact location, will route the letters to destination.

Since there are 7,946 first- and second-class offices which receive about 90 percent of the mail, the process of distribution at air-mail field postal units where air mail is concentrated for handling would be very slow if the clerk had to refer to schemes to determine the dispatch of each letter. Therefore, at these offices the clerks are required to pass frequent examinations on the schemes of the States for which there is sufficient volume of mail to warrant making the various separations.

We will assume that 1 hour is required for the processing of our letter after it reaches the post office and that at 6:30 p. m. the letter, with others addressed to Fresno and vicinity, will at that time be tied in a bundle labeled "Fresno, Calif. Dis." This bundle, along with many others, for destinations west and southwest of Washington, will be enclosed in a pouch addressed to "Air Mail Field, Washington, D. C.," the postal unit at the National Airport in which transit air mail is handled and prepared for plane dispatch.

This pouch will be transported to the airport by a post-office truck operating via the Ben Franklin Station to pick up air mail at that office and will arrive at the airport in 35 minutes. In the air mail field post office the pouch will be opened, the contents distributed, and combined with other mail accumulated at that office in a pouch addressed to "Air Mail Field, Los Angeles," and prepared for air dispatch over flight 9 of American Airlines' routes AM 23 and 4.

At approximately 7:55 p. m. all of the pouches of mail addressed to points on these routes between Washington and Los Angeles, as well as others for transfer at the junction points of other routes, will be closed, locked, weighed, and billed to American. The weight of each pouch is endorsed on the label since every pound aboard the plane must be accounted for and payment to the carrier for the carriage of mail is computed from pound-miles of service performed.

If Flight 9 operates on schedule, the pouch in which our letter is enclosed will be delivered from the plane to the air mail field, Los Angeles, located at the Burbank Airport, at 12:35 p. m. the following day. In this office the pouch will be opened, the contents distributed and the bundle of letters addressed to "Fresno, Calif, Dis." thrown into another pouch addressed to that office and prepared for dispatch over United's Flight 559 of Route 13, due to leave Los Angeles at 1:20 p. m., and arrive at Fresno at 3:02 p. m.

Upon arrival at the Fresno airport, the pouch enclosing our letter for Hanford will be carried to the Fresno post office by mail messenger, arriving there about 3:40 p. m.

In this office the bundles of letters will be removed from the pouch and sent to letter cases where clerks familiar with the location and correct dispatch of the 1,414 post offices in California will place our letter in a box labeled "Hanford," and, at about 8 p. m., these letters will be tied into a package addressed to Hanford and enclosed in a pouch addressed to "San Fran. & Barstow R. P. O. Train 24."

This pouch, containing first-class and air mail for points between Fresno and Barstow and beyond Barstow will be carried to the railroad station by truck and delivered into the postal car of Santa Fe train 24, where railway postal clerks, performing distribution en route will open it and distribute the contents, placing the packages for Hanford in a pouch for delivery at the Hanford railroad station. This train is due Hanford 9: 42 p. m., and the mail will arrive at the post office about 10 p. m.

As this post office is open at night for the receipt of incoming mail, no doubt our letter will receive immediate attention by clerks who know the location of the streets and house numbers of the city and the carrier route which serves each. We will assume that letter-carrier route No. 15 delivers mail to 201 Main Street.

In sorting the letters to lock boxes, general delivery, rural routes, and city carrier routes, our letter will be placed in a separation for carrier No. 15, who when he comes on duty early the following morning will sort the letters in sequence for delivery as he progresses along his route. If No. 201 Main Street is near the beginning of his route he will carry the letter from the post office in his satchel and deliver it to John Doe in a short time. However, if No. 201 is far along his route he may send the mail for the latter half of the route by relay truck to a collection box where he will pick it up and make delivery to the addressee.

After numerous handlings and transportation by trucks, planes, and train our letter to John Doe, posted in a letter box on the street in Washington, will be delivered to him by letter carrier the morning of the second day after mailing.

How soon an air-mail letter will be delivered after it is posted depends a great deal upon the place and time of mailing; as, for example, if our letter to Hanford, Calif., had been mailed at the airport station, LaGuardia Airport, New York, in time for dispatch over Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc., Constellation flight 3 at 2 p. m. it would have been delivered to John Doe at Hanford the following day.

During the war period, when the number of planes operated in the domestic air-mail service was reduced to 166, because of requisitioning of equipment for the armed forces, and priorities for air transportation were in effect, the volume of air mail increased enormously. The necessity for utilizing the few planes to best advantage required that the time to deliver mail to the air lines at large centers be advanced to 25 minutes prior to departure. The slow running time of trucks operating to and from the airports because of wartime limitations and a short of vehicles, and the reduced efficiency in processing of the mail, resulting from loss of experienced postal personnel, added up to slower service.

The removal of restrictions and the return from the armed forces of experienced and efficient postal and airline personnel are already resulting in more efficient handling of the mails.

Constant attention is being given to the streamlining of the processing of the mail. A new and better system of simple air mail schemes for use of postal clerks in distributing the mail was recently placed in use. The operation of faster and more frequent schedules on trunk-line routes permits more direct routings of the mail in place of the circuitous routings which have been necessary. In some instances air mail has not been given expeditious handling due to inadequate space at key airports for the distribution of transit air mail. A recent survey indicates that of the 30 units performing this necessary activity only two have adequate and satisfactory quarters. This situation has resulted in mail, arriving by plane for processing at the airport and onward dispatch by either air or surface transportation, having to be sent to a postal unit located in the city for distribution where space and facilities were satisfactory. The time lost in this procedure means connections missed and in some cases a full day's delay in delivery of a letter to the addressee. The Post Office Department, in co-operation with the air carriers and airport authorities, is now taking action to remedy these conditions, which for obvious reasons could not be corrected during the war.

From the earliest days of this Republic, the Post Office Department has been the first and best customer of every improved method of transportation. Celerity has been, and will continue to be, an important factor in postal transportation. Undoubtedly, there are still potential domestic routes, and feeder air-line areas, awaiting wise selection, where early self-sufficiency, or possible public benefit clearly transcends the factor of cost. However, few of the many proposals for local and feeder air service will meet the searching test of practicability and economy.

In giving all proper encouragement and assistance to the development of this type of air service, the Post Office Department is mindful of a like responsibility to other forms of short-haul transportation also vital to the welfare and safety of the Nation. The peculiar advantages of each must be utilized in order to provide a fully effective, expeditious, dependable, and economical postal service.

Food Plank for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am proud to insert in the RECORD an essay written by Miss Melba Park, Nephi, Utah, on the subject Food Plank for Peace. This essay was written in response to an invitation by the Pillsbury Institute of Flour Milling. The essay, I think, represents the thought and feeling of many Americans regarding the part that food and the generous spirit of American leadership can play in bringing peace to a stricken world.

FOOD PLANK FOR PEACE

(By Melba Park, Juab High School, Nephi, Utah)

The American tradition, "It's American to share" should, I believe, be adopted by all the United Nations. We all should make an all-out effort to meet the present catastrophe which threatens the lives of millions of innocent men, women and children. Leading men everywhere believe the future peace of these countries and of the world depends upon restoring the economy of these countries so that human beings everywhere may have a decent and acceptable standard of living.

Most of the people in these liberated countries are getting rations that provide less than the minimum requirement of 2,000 calories a day, while we Americans have consumed more food last year than we did in prewar days. The United States Department of Agriculture has estimated that we can take cuts that are necessary to provide food for Europe this year and still have about 3,200 calories per day and they have shown that the requirement for the average civilian is not more than 2,700 or 2,800 per day.

The people in the liberated countries want to produce their own food and they will as soon as they get the necessary equipment and physical strength.

The European harvest is expected to be 10 to 15 percent below that of last fall. There are thousands of acres of land in Europe that are mined and flooded. The people of these countries are doing a magnificent job in demining the soil and getting it back in production and just as soon as the flood recedes, people are plowing and spading the land to get it back in production.

It took us all, working together to win the war and it will take us all working together to keep the peace. As long as men remain hungry they cannot perform the physical labors which are necessary to rebuild their countries and get them back in production.

After liberating these countries, if we leave them to their own devices, they will start planning revenge and a fine crop of dictators will spring up.

In the countries where there are large areas, where there is suffering and hunger, there is bound to be revolution, dissatisfaction, unrest, and dictatorship. Therefore, it seems, peace is dependent upon people everywhere being fed. Americans may have to tighten their belts a little but it won't hurt them. There will be plenty of food, maybe not the kinds we want but there will be enough food.

For our own stability and security, we can and must think long and hard with a sense of humble responsibility and intelligent sympathy about Europe's calamity, because fate has given America the decisive role and power in future world events.

Meanwhile for Europeans, the future is the next meal.

Squeezing the Retailer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the real danger of our entire national economy soon jamming on the dead center of unworkable theories and policies of the OPA has been forcefully emphasized in an article published by the Small Business Men's Association and it follows in part:

SQUEEZING THE RETAILER

One of the OPA's most damaging policies—the one which has crippled distribution in more lines than any other regulation—is called "cost absorption."

In a word, cost absorption means that when OPA permits an increase in the producer's price, the increase shall be absorbed by the wholesaler and retailer—that there shall be no corresponding increase in price to the consumer.

The American Retail Federation has placed before OPA a detailed study tracing the impact of price control in the retail field since 1942. This study lists 127 different price increases approved by OPA at the manufacturing level. But in 96 cases the retailer was required to absorb the entire price increase, as approved by OPA. The result has been a steady pinching in of retail margins, until the incentive to wider distribution of goods, in many lines, already has been stifled.

The hold-the-line policy, as applied, attempted to hold the retail level, while permitting basic production costs to inch upward, through wage increases approved by the War Labor Board, and higher raw material prices in all the basic agricultural products. As a general rule, OPA has required wholesalers and retailers to absorb most or all of these approved price increases out of normal operating margins.

Cotton sheeting well illustrates the problem, which applies with equal force to practically every major item found in a department store, hardware store, or general variety store.

In September 1941, before price control, the average retail mark-up on a standard bed sheet was roughly 30 percent. OPA advanced the retail ceiling on this item from $1.19 to $1.29, but in so doing approved manufacturers' increases from 83 cents to $1.23. As a result, the retailer's gross margin was squeezed from about 36 cents per sheet to 6 cents.

This theory of "cost absorption" applied straight across the board now threatens to drive many retailers from their shops.

In addition to this executive order price squeeze, retailers were compelled by wartime tax rates to pay about 9 cents of every sales dollar to the Federal Government, against 1 cent before the war. Only by eliminating delivery services and other normal costs, were most retailers able to keep afloat.

But now, with the war over, OPA tells the business community that these haphazard emergency theories of price management must be retained for the reconversion period.

The fact that more than 250,000 retail establishments closed their doors during the war period is conclusive evidence, says the American Retail Federation, that the cost absorption theory held the line only by a process of slow death to normal distribution.

On what ground, then, does OPA contend that such suffocating policies are suited to the postwar era, in which expansion must be the watchword if we are to maintain a healthy state of full employment?

All the evidence at hand appears to support the conclusion of the organized retailers that, "where sound pricing requires upward revision, such adjustment is more economic and socially desirable than damming up recovery through inadequate distribution inevitably arising from cost absorption."

There is real danger today that the entire national economy soon may jam on the dead-center of unworkable theories and policies in OPA. In the words of the American Retail Federation: "To stimulate employment both in production and distribution, the price structure must be released from the rigid mold into which our wartime policy has frozen it."

GOVERNMENT BY MIMEOGRAPH

Businessmen complain that OPA itself cannot keep abreast of its own flood of revisions, amendments, and exceptions. Many letters to Congress indicate that retailers and plant managers have waited as long as 3 months for an official interpretation of a cloudy, confusing, or obscure OPA order.

The reason for this confusion and uncertainty apparently lies in the fact that during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, OPA issued no fewer than 44,259 orders, regulations, amendments and revisions of its price-control, rationing, and rent-stabilization decrees.

This means that during every month about 3,700 new orders were issued by OPA, which was but one of a dozen emergency agencies governing by similar directive orders.

For the convenience of those harassed businessmen who feel that OPA creates more problems than it solves, we present below the official tabulation of OPA orders and rules for the fiscal year 1945:

National orders	23,135
Amendments	13,970
Field orders	3,276
Amended regulations	2,484
Protests acted upon	1,179
New regulations	215
Total orders for year	44,259

In addition, OPA issued 195,000 orders authorizing individual rent adjustments, and circulated 331 general questionnaires—or about 1 new questionnaire every working day.

These breath-taking figures, as we read them, present a clear picture of bureaucracy slowly hanging the national economy with paper ropes from its mimeographs. Whatever the merits of wartime price controls, common sense tells us that the job did not require 148 administrative orders and a new questionnaire every day.

This appalling record appears to give substance to the indictment presented by Senator E. H. MOORE, of Oklahoma, when he described OPA as "a bureaucratic tyrant whose word cannot be trusted, and in whom the public has lost confidence."

RADIO MOBILIZED BEHIND OPA

At mid-February 1946, just as the House Banking and Currency Committee began hearings on various resolutions to extend OPA authority beyond June 30, a shake-up occurred in the top personnel of the emergency bureaus in Washington. Chester Bowles was moved up to the post of Stabilization Director, and Paul Porter, formerly publicity chief of the Democratic National Committee, was transferred from the chairmanship of the Federal Communications Commission to be the new OPA Administrator.

This shift served to place the Federal ruler of the radio industry temporarily up front as the personal leader of the campaign to extend OPA. The significance of this move, in terms of radio's influence in news reporting from Washington, was at once recognized by leaders in the House and Senate. The official before whom the manager of every radio station must appear periodically for renewal of his license, is now the leader of the propaganda campaign to renew OPA. With the prospect always in mind that Mr. Porter one day may return to his former position as Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, no radio manager in the United States will feel free to broadcast the reports and findings of those who believe OPA is prostrating the economic life of America. On the other hand, every radio program director will feel instinctively that prudence demands, in his own broadcasts, the best possible face on the OPA record. News reporters and commentators who find only froth, evasion, concealment and juggled figures in OPA's official utterances

will merit no place on the networks. Radio is on the side of OPA.

Representative HOWARD H. BUFFETT, of Nebraska, examined the OPA machinery for public enlightenment on February 14, 1946—the day Mr. Porter's transfer from FCC to OPA was announced by the White House.

"The OPA is carrying on a gigantic propaganda drive," he said. "It seems designed to force Congress into extending the OPA for a year or more with blanket powers.

"Obviously, a propaganda machine fueled by OPA's $150,000,000 appropriation is well financed. With gigantic tax funds, plus effective use of the radio, the administration has propaganda weapons to mold most people's opinions on inflation and prices. These weapons, like those of the late Nazi propaganda minister, Goebbels, would seem to be irresistible. Accordingly, getting the inflationary problem fairly before the people may become almost impossible. If the administration, to protect its political power, determines to mislead the people, it may do so successfully.

"So the road back to economic freedom in America may be very difficult.

"Besides the propaganda blitzkrieg, other devices are being used to fool the people on price control. Examples are the peacetime subsidy on coffee, the citrus fruit frame-up, and the hamstringing of the building industry by OPA. * * * Price fixing is crippling production. As plants lose money and close down, goods disappear from the market place. Then a ruthless Gestapo is set up to cope with the scramble to get food, clothing, and shelter. Witness the effect of the closing already of over 500 butter-making plants. * * * By crippling production OPA will make legally impossible the satisfaction of human needs for food, clothing, and housing. But these needs must be met. Americans will satisfy them by transactions outside the law. Our current experiences with black markets, to say nothing of the prohibition era, have demonstrated that Americans know no law when their needs or appetites are thwarted by arbitrary governmental decrees.

"Should Congress now fail to insist on the restoration of free production and free markets quickly, it will mean that this generation has given up for a mess of temporary pottage the American birthright of liberty, justice, and opportunity."

A Food Plank for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an essay that has recently been written by a high-school student in my congressional district, Edgar Kleiner, of Greenville, Ill. Edgar wrote this prize-winning essay for the Food for Peace essay contest sponsored by the Pillsbury Milling Co., of Minneapolis, Minn. I am indeed proud to bring this extremely well-written piece to the attention of the Congress. It reflects a grasp of the world food shortage that is very unusual among Americans. Edgar has demonstrated that the keen analytical mind is still a product of the American town and that our destiny as a Nation is safe in the hands of our youth.

A FOOD PLANK FOR PEACE

Hunger is mankind's greatest and most lethal enemy. Today, one out of every four inhabitants of the world is starving. It is easy to see that hungry people are discontented people, and discontent can lead to war. A hungry nation has only one goal in mind—to be well fed. You must have a healthy well-fed nation before international cooperation can be expected.

We must find means of increasing world production and a method of marketing this food at a fair price to the producer. A method of distribution will have to be found so that everyone will have enough food to eat. Many of the war-ravaged countries are not only incapable of adding to the world's food supply but have no food supply of their own. Thus, we have more than just a problem of growing more food.

The urgent need is to get enough food to the destitute countries of the world to prevent starvation in the near future. The most active organization to this end is the UNRRA. This organization has been doing a tremendous job, but its resources are entirely too meager in relation to the unlimited needs of the world. Larger shares of each country's resources should be directed for UNRRA purposes and more support will have to be given if starvation is to be averted.

The problem to maintain adequate food production and distribution is manyfold. First of all, countries will have to get the maximum food returns for their labor. They will have to be educated as to the types of food to produce to assure them of the highest possible nutritional value. An agricultural program should be organized somewhat like the one in this country, with experimental stations and highly trained technicians to introduce scientific farming and improved breeds of domestic animals in order to produce more food with higher nutritional content.

The demand for more food always exists and will exist but money to buy this additional food is sometimes nonexistent. This could be overcome by an international agreement permitting the importation of surplus comodities at a submarket price into the destitute areas. The goods would be shipped without import duties and other trade charges and the producer would at least receive more for his product than by destroying the surplus to keep the market price up.

By using these measures, we have a good chance of eliminating economic warfare by keeping nations from dumping their surplus goods on foreign markets. If successful, it will be a big step forward in keeping the peace. Since society as a whole will benefit by healthier, well-fed people (through less crime, disease, social distress) we must encourage the Food and Agriculture Committee to formulate some type of food plan similar to that illustrated here. Freedom from want is essential to peace, human welfare, and decent living. Let us do all in our power to build a peaceful world in which to live.

National Service Life Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act, as first enacted, and until the amendment of September 30, 1944, beneficiaries were divided into two age groups, with a different method of payment of benefit payments for each. Section 602 (h) 1 provided 240 equal monthly installments if the beneficiary to whom payment was first made was under 30 years of age; and section 602 (h) 2 provided for the beneficiary over 30 years of age 120 equal monthly installments certain, such payments continuing beyond 120 months during the remaining lifetime of such beneficiary.

By amendment of September 30, 1944, a proviso was added authorizing the insured or the beneficiary to elect, in lieu of the original payment methods as provided for each group:

A refund life income in monthly installments payable for such period certain as may be required in order that the sums of the installments certain, including a last installment of such amount as may be necessary, shall equal the face value of the contract, less any indebtedness, with such payments continuing throughout the lifetime of such beneficiary.

The amendment, however, denied this option to those beneficiaries whose servicemen insured had died prior to September 30, 1944, and whose claims had been settled and payments commenced prior to the date of the amendment.

Under the amendment of September 30, 1944, it was further provided (sec. 602 (h) 3) that in the event of the death of a beneficiary who had elected to receive a refund income before the payment of all the payments certain under the option, the remaining installments certain should be paid to residuary beneficiaries in the order listed, A, B, C, and D, unless designated by the insured in a different order.

This meant that if a widow who had elected to receive a refund income died before receiving all the installments, the remaining installments would be paid to the child or children of the serviceman. If he left no children, then to his parents, and if the parents were deceased, to his brothers and sisters. Or, if this insurance were left to a mother who died before receiving all the payments certain, and no widow or children survived, the payments would continue at the same rate to the father, if he was living, until all installments certain had been paid.

Obviously, the purpose of the amendment was to provide a method of settlement which would guarantee to the dependents and the family of the deceased serviceman at least the face value of the policy for which he had paid, and as to those cases settled after the adoption of the amendment, September 30, 1944, this option and the benefits under it are fair and just.

However, by the denial of the option retroactively to those beneficiaries, particularly those over 30 years of age whose claims had been settled and to whom payments had commenced prior to September 30, 1944, two situations have been created which are decidedly inequitable. For example, the serviceman named as his beneficiary his mother. He gave his life, and payments had commenced before September 30, 1944. She is perhaps in her early forties, and is assured 120 payments certain. She dies before the end of 10 years. The remainder of the

120 payments only can go to the father—a total of between $5,000 and $6,000. Even should the mother live several years beyond the 120 payments certain, she may still not have received the face value of the policy, and there would be nothing remaining for the father.

Or, another example. The serviceman gave his life prior to September 30, 1944, leaving a widow, 31 years of age, and 3 children, aged 2, 4, and 6 years. The widow is assured 120 monthly payments certain, such payments to continue throughout the remainder of her life, but misfortune strikes and this widowed mother dies after about 5 years, leaving 3 orphaned children aged 7, 9, and 11. They will receive the remainder of 120 payments only, a total of about $5,000. The serviceman had given his life for his country and had paid his Government out of his monthly pay for $10,000 of protection for his family. The remaining $5,000 would contribute materially to the case of these children during a further period which would substantially cover their minority.

The inequities are not so pronounced for the beneficiaries under 30 years of age, for 240 payments are equal in almost every case to the face value of the policy or more. The advantage of the option here is to guarantee to the beneficiary an income throughout life.

Mr. Speaker, to cure the inequities herein pointed out, I am introducing a bill to repeal the second proviso of section 602 (h) 1, reading:

That such optional settlement shall not be available in any case in which payments of insurance installments have been commenced prior to the date of this amendatory act.

Substituting another proviso reading:

Provided further, That in any case in which insurance benefit payments were commenced prior to September 30, 1944, the present beneficiary shall have the right to elect to receive a refund life income, as provided in such optional settlement, payable in monthly installments adjusted as of the date of the maturity of such policy, credit being allowed for payments heretofore made under the present mode of payment; and that the right of election herein provided shall terminate 1 year from the date of the passage of this act, notice of which shall be sent by registered mail to each such beneficiary at his or her last known address within 30 days after the passage of this act.

And to insert a colon after the word "months" of the second proviso of section 602 (h) 2, and repeal the remainder of the proviso, reading:

Nor in any case in which payments of insurance installments have been commenced prior to the date of this amendatory act.

And add a third proviso, reading:

Provided further, That in any case in which insurance benefit payments were commenced prior to September 30, 1944, the present beneficiary shall have the right to elect to receive a refund life income, as provided in such optional settlement, payable in monthly installments adjusted as of the date of the maturity of such policy, credit being allowed for payments heretofore made under the present mode of payments; and that the right of election herein provided shall terminate 1 year from the date of the passage of this act, notice of which shall be sent by registered mail to each such beneficiary at his or her last known address within 30 days after the passage of this act.

By adopting these amendments, beneficiaries now receiving monthly payments subject to the inequities of the original settlement plans will be given the opportunity to overcome the inequities by exercising this option provided for settlements after September 30, 1944. The loved ones for whom the serviceman sought to provide protection can be assured there is available to them at least the face value of the policy paid for.

Conservation Work Brings Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], over the past several years has done an outstanding job in calling the attention of our people to the need of conservation of our fish and wildlife resources and in leading the way toward such a conservation program.

Recently there was given to Mr. ROBERTSON the Field and Stream award in recognition of his able work and leadership in the conservation field. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the May 1946 issue of the National Grange telling of this award and discussing Mr. ROBERTSON's work. It follows:

CONSERVATION WORK BRINGS AWARD

(By Fred Brenckman)

Congressman A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, who represents the famous Shenandoah Valley district in the House, recently received the annual Field and Stream award for outstanding accomplishments in the conservation of our wildlife resources.

Those who are familiar with Mr. ROBERTSON's long and useful career in this connection will agree that the honor which came to him was well earned and fittingly bestowed.

His work in this field bears the stamp of true statesmanship and redounds to the well-being of the entire country.

It was in 1915, 31 years ago, that Mr. ROBERTSON was elected to the Virginia State Senate, representing two fine agricultural counties, Rockbridge and Bedford. One of his campaign pledges was that he would sponsor legislation to create a State game department, with a paid force of wardens which, in addition to enforcing the hunting and fishing laws of the State, would likewise see to it that there should be no hunting or fishing on private property, except in unfenced mountain areas, without the written permission of the landowner.

PROTECTED FARM INTERESTS

Prior to the enactment of that law, farmers had no protection against unscrupulous hunters, who killed off their game, tore down their fences, and sometimes shot their livestock.

Realizing the heavy losses that farmers suffered from the depredations of dogs, which terrorized and killed sheep and poultry, Mr. ROBERTSON introduced legislation providing for a license fee on dogs, which was enacted. The fund so derived is used by county boards of supervisors (commissioners) in payment of claims for damages for the loss of livestock and poultry killed by dogs.

Without the protection afforded by that law, the sheep industry of Virginia, which is now a major source of farm revenue, could not have been developed.

For 6 years, from 1926 to 1932, Mr. ROBERTSON served as chairman of the Virginia Commission on Game and Inland Fisheries. During that time he distributed free to the farmers of the State thousands of pounds of Korean lespedeza seed. That is a type of clover which is a soil improver, yields a fine hay crop, besides being a good cover crop. Owing to the distribution of this seed, lespedeza is now grown throughout Virginia. In many sections it is a regular farm crop. It will grow on thin and sour land and reseeds itself.

In all of his conservation activities, Mr. ROBERTSON has sought to put the interests of the farmer first.

Elected to Congress in 1932, and regularly reelected every 2 years since then, Mr. ROBERTSON was appointed to the chairmanship of the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources, in which capacity he still serves, while also being a member of the important Committee on Ways and Means.

FRIEND OF SOIL CONSERVATION

As chairman of the committee first named, Mr. ROBERTSON has placed great emphasis on the activities of the Soil Conservation Service, headed by Hugh Bennett, knowing that if we permit the farmer's top soil to be washed into the rivers, he not only loses the value of his land, and ultimately his home, but that the birds of the air and the beasts of the field will likewise lose their homes.

"I have worked against stream pollution," says Mr. ROBERTSON, "to protect for our farmers the purity of the waters for domestic use, as well as for the benefit of the fish in the streams. I have urged the United States Forest Service to give full cooperation to the owners of private woodlots in its program of fire prevention and protection and, through precept and example, to assist the farmers to adopt scientific timber management, realizing how seriously the subterranean water level has fallen throughout the entire country, and mindful of the damaging effects of recurrent drouths on farm crops."

HELPED PROMOTE FISH PONDS

Mr. ROBERTSON sponsored a pond development program in the work of the Civilian Conservation Corps and of the Soil Conservation Service, accompanied by the stocking of such ponds with Government fish. The first lake of this nature built by the CCC in the United States was located in Augusta County, Va.

"Under proper conditions," declares Mr. ROBERTSON, "what are called farm fish ponds will produce fish valued at $300 a year, to say nothing of the recreational value of such a pond to the farmer, his family, and his friends."

Mr. ROBERTSON takes the position that wildlife conservation is essentially a farm program. Land practices which hurt wildlife, he says, hurt the farmer, and those which help the farmer also help wildlife.

"To me," says Mr. ROBERTSON, "the conservation of our wildlife resources is not a hobby for the pleasure and enjoyment of a limited group of sportsmen, but it is an integral part of a wise and farseeing land program which we need for the preservation in a condition of prosperity and contentment of the 30 percent of our people dependent upon agriculture for a livelihood. Morally, that 30 percent of our people has been the backbone of the Nation. The purchasing power of our farm population exerts a tremendous influence upon the financial well-being of the remaining 70 percent of our people."

Mr. ROBERTSON helped draft the Duck Stamp Act, which was introduced by Congressman Kleberg, of Texas, a member of the House Committee on Agriculture.

ROBERTSON was cosponsor with Senator Key Pitman, of Nevada, of the Grants-in-Aid-to-States Act. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee ROBERTSON sponsored an amendment to the United States Internal Revenue Code segregating the proceeds of the excise tax on sporting arms and ammunition for appropriations made to the States under the provisions of the Robertson-Pittman Act.

Among other good legislation, Mr. ROBERTSON sponsored an amendment to the Flood Control Act of 1944 to protect wildlife interests in flood control and power projects.

A lawyer by profession, Mr. ROBERTSON lives at Lexington, which is the seat of justice for Rockbridge County and the home of Washington and Lee University. Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson are both buried in the town.

Congressman ROBERTSON joined Middletown Grange in Frederick County 12 years ago. He has been a loyal and active member of the organization ever since and has been a supporter of Grange legislative policies in Congress. He and Senator BYRD belong to the same grange, which was organized in 1928.

Forest Station and Research Center in Delaware River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me today before the Senate Committee on Appropriations regarding an amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill to provide adequate funds for the establishment and maintenance of an experimental forest station and forest research center in the Delaware River Basin.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am here today on behalf of my proposed amendment to the Agriculture appropriation bill (H. R. 5605) for an increase of $75,000 in the item for forest research on page 38, line 19. The purpose of the amendment is to provide adequate funds for the establishment and maintenance of an experimental forest and forest research center in the Delaware River Basin. The need for this work was called to the attention of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations by my colleagues, Congressman WALTER and Congressman FLOOD.

From an examination of the House Appropriations Subcommittee report I discovered that an increase was granted by the committee for the establishment of a series of experimental forests. But among the list of new stations as given on page 985 of the hearings before the House committee I found that nothing is provided for the northeastern section of the United States and, of course, nothing for work in the Delaware River Basin.

This was a great surprise to me because I was under the impression that local interests in the Delaware River Basin felt that they had clearly established with the United States Forest Service the need for an experimental forest research center in that area.

It is my understanding that the Department, in complying with a request by the House committee for a comprehensive forest and range research program, submitted a 5-year plan setting forth a list of recommended locations for the establishment of research centers where various studies would be advantageous. This recommendation called for an increase in the total appropriation of approximately $1,000,000 for the first year of the program. However, the House committee approved an increase of only $750,000 to provide for the expansion of existing stations and for the establishment of 16 new experimental centers where specific locations had been selected on the basis of preliminary examinations. I further understand that the Department intended to use the $250,000 included in its recommendation but not appropriated by the House committee for the installation of additional stations during the first year in areas where locations had not been definitely decided upon. The Delaware River Basin was one such area in question since the variety and complexity of the problems requiring technical study in that area did not permit the selection of an exact station location without further examination.

Inasmuch as department officials have assured me that the program is virtually needed in the Delaware River Basin, and because I am under the impression that the House Appropriations Subcommittee unwittingly overlooked the needs of the Delaware River Basin, I consider it highly desirable and proper to request further consideration of the matter by this committee.

You gentlemen, undoubtedly, are familiar with this tremendously important interstate watershed. Portions of the States of Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware comprise this region. These States, by legislative action, have delegated the responsibility of planning for the development of the resources of that basin to a joint governmental agency known as the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin, or, more popularly, as Incodel.

Incodel and the people of the Delaware River watershed feel that proper consideration has not been given in the past to research and to investigation of measures for the control and management of soil and forests; that these matters are closely related to programs for the development, utilization and conservation of the waters of the Delaware River region.

It has learned enough about the results of watershed studies elsewhere in the United States to appreciate the need for this type of work in the Delaware River Basin in order that a fully comprehensive plan for the control and conservation of the natural resources of this tremendously valuable interstate river system may be developed.

I am in full accord with the program which the Forest Service has established in maintaining experimental centers at which such regional problems are being intensively studied. But I believe that no such experimental forest located in any region of the United States involves problems of greater importance than those existing in the Delaware Basin. Our problems are so large, the need for high-quality water so imperative, the necessity for establishing stream-flow regulatory measures so pressing, that I feel an experimental forest should be established in the Delaware River watershed without further delay.

I am confident that I can assure you that full cooperation will be forthcoming at all times from the States and local governmental agencies, from the schools and research centers, and from the land owners and the people of the Delaware River region.

We are in need of the station now because it will take some time for results to become available, and we need these results at the earliest possible date.

I am suggesting that this experimental forest be started with a modest sum of $75,000. This in our judgment will be adequate to begin the work and to carry it forward the first year on a modest scale. I very much hope, Mr. Chairman, that you and members of the committee can give heed to this request, in which I am joined by my colleagues from the four States in the Delaware Basin.

The Coal Strike

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I remember quite well when Mr. Lewis came out for Willkie. The remarks of the gentleman from Illinois about Mr. Lewis being a strong supporter of the Republican Party in 1940 and in 1944 are correct.

Nevertheless, Mr. Lewis is very likely ashamed of himself for that since he has been reading the vicious speeches the Republicans have been putting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD against the miners as well as against other workers. Also the vast amount of antilabor legislation introduced by the Republicans would make Mr. Lewis ashamed of misappropriating his political strength. But I still think Congress is at fault if the workers have to strike to get the conditions that they need. The mining companies are killing off a lot more workers than is necessary because they do not live up to the laws and safety regulations pertaining to the operation of the coal mines. They burn out the workers before they reach 60 years of age with bad air and hazardous conditions and the men have to wait until they are 65 years of age before they are entitled to social security. Congress could create a welfare fund by law to take care of such incapacitated miners and alleviate the necessity of the miners' striking for such a humanitarian principle. Congress could pass laws such as the minimum wage law and allay the necessity of the workers striking to establish a proper wage structure.

It must be gratifying to the coal mine operators to see so many Members of Congress jump in and introduce legislation to outlaw the workers' right to request the industry to maintain a welfare fund to take care of crippled veteran miners.

It must be gratifying to the companies to know that if they refuse the workers' request long enough that Congress will break the strike for them. Such activity

in Congress, such encouragement to the employers is certain to prolong the strike.

The mine owners sit safely in their offices while mine workers, who are also people, work in blackdamp and die in explosions because of greedy negligence of the operators. The employers lounge in their palatial homes while the workers and their families exist in shacks and hovels. The employers give their children fine educations while the workers' sons also die in mine accidents. Then in a contest between the workers and the employer many here want Congress to take sides against the workers. I ask you, Is that the kind of equality the American Congress is supposed to perpetuate?

As long as the workers do not have a Congress that will see to it that they have the right kind of wages and conditions, they cannot do anything but take economic action.

United Jewish Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the United Jewish Appeal, Atlantic City, N. J., May 5, 1946:

UNITED JEWISH APPEAL

Only a week ago, I thought of how I would talk to you, how in calm, dispassionate phrases I would lay before you the indisputable facts that disclosed all the fond and good reasons why you should—and must—give your share to the United Jewish Appeal. I thought I would marshall the facts before you in a logical pattern, and that you, out of your reasonableness, would respond. For we are a reasonable and patient people.

We have gone through the turbulent ages, watched empires grow fat with power and watched dynasties die, for we are a reasonable and patient people.

That was last Sunday. By Tuesday, at 7 o'clock, when the report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine was made public, I forgot that I came from a reasonable and patient people. And if I should remember that we are a reasonable and patient people, then let me remember, too, the 6,000,000 dead, the million and a half now scattered over Europe. Then let me remember they are there now, and that the dead are lying where they lie now, because we were told to wait, and we waited, reasonable and patient.

I cannot now talk to you in a gentle and persuasive tone or temper with dispassion and objectivity in my remarks. For I am biased and I am prejudiced and passionately in favor of the Jews, for there is none to help us now but ourselves.

I read that report through, and as I turned the pages of that shocking, heartless document, I recalled how from 1933 to 1939, they said the persecution of the Jews in Germany was none of our business, strictly private party. I recalled how in 1939 when Jews fleeing death could find no haven—not even in the land that had been promised them—and how off the shores of Palestine boatload after boatload of frightened, hopeless Jews were turned back and then drowned in the sea. I recalled how in the years of the war when we pleaded and cajoled and argued with the Allied authorities to help whatever Jews we could out of Festung Europa, how we pleaded and cajoled that the doors of Palestine be opened to at least those who could escape and we were told that military expediency forbade, and that we must jeopardize Allied victory. And so millions more perished. And I recalled how while the world shouted the world "liberation," the surviving Jews were herded into DP camps like so many lepers and told this was "liberty." And when the deeply-rooted anti-Semitism struck out against them in the countries to which some dared to return—Poland, Hungary, France, Rumania, denied their jobs, denied their property, denied their homes, denied their very dignity—there seemed no end to the tragedy that had befallen those who had no guilt save that they had been born Jews.

Earl Harrison, as special envoy sent by the President to investigate the plight of the displaced Jews, stated flatly that there was no difference between the way these Jews lived now and the way they lived under Hitler, except that they were not being killed. Judge Rifkind, General Eisenhower, the Joint Distribution Committee, the National Refugee Service, men and organizations of high repute, came back with similar bitter reports. And yet, and yet again, we were told to be reasonable and patient.

President Truman, following the Harrison report, requested Great Britain to permit 100,000 Jews to enter Palestine, and then, listening to the wily voice of Great Britain, consented to put aside his request until a joint Anglo-American committee of inquiry on Palestine made its investigations and its findings. Four months passed and now we have the report.

Four months ago I called the British maneuver to create a committee of inquiry on Palestine a dodge and a stall, and the report issued on April 30 more than amply justifies the comment. We are expected, I gather, to rejoice unrestrainedly over the proposed admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine, and the lifting of restrictions on land acquisition. We are also expected, I suppose, to ignore the committee's overriding of 3 congressional resolutions, its perversion of the Balfour Declaration, and the declared international intent of the terms of the mandate. President Truman is asked to accept the recommendations of a committee that are contrary to the plank of his political party, and to the declarations of party leadership. While the British members hewed strictly to the line laid down for them at Whitehall Street (compare the tone of the report with Bevin's Palestine statement made on the eve of the committee's appointment), the American members forgot the injunction of the American people and the American Congress.

On reading the report, one would never suspect that the purpose of the Committee had been to find a solution to the plight of European Jewry. It would have been better if no report at all had been made. The report serves more to inflame than to impress.

After stating "We have to report that such information as we received about countries other than Palestine gave no hope of substantial assistance in finding homes for Jews wishing or impelled to leave Europe," it recommends the admission of only 100,000 Jews into Palestine, leaving the remaining million and a quarter Jews to cope as best it can with—and I quote from the report—"a legacy of antisemitism, * * * "We do not suggest that any country should be asked to make a permanent change in its immigration policy," the report states. It recommends, instead, "guaranteed civil liberties and equal rights." I need only point to the minorities guaranty clause following the last war and the testimony of 6,000,000 dead. It is enraging to read the Committee's own words, "We know of no country to which the great majority can go in the immediate future other than Palestine. Furthermore that is where almost all of them want to go. There they are sure that they will receive a welcome denied them elsewhere" and then read the recommendations that follow:

The certificates are to be awarded "as far as possible in 1946" and that actual immigration is to be pushed forward as rapidly as "conditions will permit." The escape clauses are obvious. Both present and future Jewish immigration are left to the British to administer, in spite of the fact that British hostility to Jewish immigration is specifically noted. The Committee seems to have made a startling discovery that Palestine lies at the crossroads of the Arab world and bases in main its argument that Palestine cannot be a Jewish state on such discovery. Apparently, not Balfour, nor the League of Nations, nor the 52 signatories to the mandate, nor the political leaders of the United States in affirming and reaffirming the purpose and intent of the mandate knew that.

Arab-Jewish hostility is so implacably stressed and the deadlock depicted is so unbreakable that it is almost farcical to read throughout the report the pious pleas of the committee asking the whole world to reform and to be good to each other. The report then goes on to depict a picture of Arab poverty and illiteracy, recommending that the Arab standard of living and literacy be raised to the level of the Jews in Palestine, and that such ends be achieved with moneys derived from the taxation of the Palestine Jews. Nowhere are such aims made the responsibility of the Arab landowners or the British treasury. It is practically made to appear as if the low Arab standards are the result of Jewish settlement when exactly the contrary is true. It is only with the coming of Jewish settlements that the rise in Arab standards began to take place. Indeed, throughout the report, it would actually seem that the Jews are the villains in the piece, richly endowed with worldly goods, aggressive and riding roughshod over the unsupported, undefended Arabs.

Future immigration is not fixed at a specific sum, though a suggestion is made of 12,000 yearly. That's a far cry from the demand of the congressional resolution that immigration into Palestine be free. Perhaps the best touch of all is the statement of the Commission that "any person * * * qualified to enter Palestine must not be refused admission or subjected to discrimination on the ground that he is not a Jew." Whenever had anyone except a Jew been disqualified from Palestine which the report almost ironically calls the Jewish National Home?

It would seem that after all these months of investigation, the committee would know the Zionist position. Yet it makes the most confounding statement when it states that some Zionist quarters consider that every Jew is a citizen of Palestine. That has never been the Zionist position. It has always been strongly stressed by Zionists that citizenship in Palestine is a voluntary affair and does not spring from adherence to the faith. That is a grave imputation and greatly to be deplored.

The report flays the policy of the Jewish National Fund policy not to alienate the land, losing sight of the fact that its very purpose is to prevent the exploitation of land for individual unearned enrichment. It is hardly becoming to the British Labor Party to berate so high a purpose. No large project like the Jordan Valley Authority is to be attempted without the consent of the neighboring Arab states and without the management and control of the mandatory

power. On one hand the report laments the limited absorptive capacity of Palestine and on the other hand goes to great pains to recommend that expansion of the absorptive capacity be drastically curtailed.

In my opinion, it is a heartbreaking document which loses sight entirely of the tragic plight of the Jews. It was aparently thought that in granting the admission of 100,000 Jews to Palestine, that this appeasement of Arab effendi, that the gratuitous insults to the pioneer spirit and labor of the Jews who built Palestine would be overlooked. The attitude throughout is literally that of "throwing a dog a bone." The Committee, it appears, thought that if it could accede to Mr. Truman's request for 100,000 certificates of immigration, it could therefore with ease proceed to tear Zionist aims and aspirations to pieces. Nor could even that accession be given gracefully.

President Truman must consider carefully the consequences in accepting the report in full. He must consider the weight of American public opinion which has already been clearly defined and he must consider carefully the redemption of the moral and political obligations he undertook when he stated he stood four square behind the platform of the Democratic Party. He must consider first American declared policy. Mr. Truman is not in office to preserve the principles of British imperialism.

Strangely enough, some of our Jews applauded the recommendation that only 100,000 Jews be permitted to enter Palestine as soon as possible without regard to the rest of the report. They could not see that even that clause held a joker. On Wednesday, Prime Minister Attlee, gallant Labor Party leader, who before election professed sympathy for the Jew and after election shrugged his shoulders, announced to the House of Commons that 100,000 Jews would not get into Palestine unless the "illegal" armies, as he termed it, disbanded and surrendered their weapons, and then pulled the trump card out of his bag of tricks by demanding that America join in military and financial responsibility in the resettlement of the dispossessed. It is sharply obvious that in bringing in the question of the use of American troops, the attempt is thereby being made to alienate American public opinion from its heretofore favorable stand on Palestine as expressed in the congressional resolutions and party platforms. It was tragic enough to note how the American members submitted all the way down the line to British policy in order to gain consent to the admission of 100,000, but to now find that even that proviso is being skillfully throttled to death is to realize the full measure of how completely and overwhelmingly we have been sold down the river.

Very well, then, the issue has been very clearly drawn. If the beneficiaries of the United Jewish Appeal needed you before, how much more do they need you now? If before they looked for succor, for a dignified way of life, for a bit of bread, for a garment on their bare backs, for the way out to a new life—for all these are the ways the moneys of the UJA will be spent—how much more do they look to you now? We'll take care of our own; we'll cherish our own; we'll honor our own in spite of base betrayal of governments, of broken pledges and discard of faith. We, who only by the mere accident of birth escaped the fate of our brethren, we are asked to give not our lives, not our homes, not our children, but money. We surely cannot find such giving, certainly, beyond us.

The UJA is one of the answers to the challenge that has been flung to us. It is one of our weapons in a resistance fight, a fight against callous disregard of human lives and human values. This is our challenge, and this is our responsibility. For the center of Judaism has shifted from the old world to the new. The synagogue, the temple of learning, the communal strength have departed from Europe. The torch of Judaism lies in our hands now, for we have the strength, and we have the numbers. Yours is the choice to hold the torch aloft, to keep its light clear through the ages yet unborn, as the Jews of the Old World did in the civilizations that have crumbled. Or you can let it drop, dimming and then extinguishing the culture, the tradition, the love of God, and all the spiritual richness that has given the world its code of morality from the hands of Moses. I say yours is the choice. You can, if you will, turn back in smugness and complacency, feeling secure because your back never felt the lash of the whip and because you never had to wear the yellow badge of David on your sleeve, and forget. And you can, if you will rise to meet the challenge of the stormy, confused, tear-driven world, and, in your way, try in some measure to set the world right again. And remember if pity is dead for them, it is dead for you, and they lose their humanity, as you lose yours. For insomuch as one man, one Jew, shall suffer, it adds to the sum total of all the pain of the world. The million and one-half Jews in Europe, the Jews in Palestine, the refugees can learn to live again through you, and through you Palestine shall be redeemed.

Address of Hon. James P. McGranery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. BYRNE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. James P. McGranery, the assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, at the banquet of the Order of Ahepa, Hotel Statler, Boston, Mass., May 3, 1946:

Mr. Toastmaster, honored guests, friends, and members of Ahepa, ladies, and gentlemen, I deem it a high honor and privilege to be with you this evening. I bring you the greetings of the President of the United States of America. He, like his countrymen, is conscious of the contributions that Americans of Greek descent are making to the cause of humanity the world over. I extend you his very best wishes for the complete success of your endeavors.

I am always happy to have an opportunity to visit Boston, the city that sent to the Congress of the United States our illustrious majority leader, my warm personal friend, JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

Your organization, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, since it was founded by George A. Polos and his courageous group of 17 Greek Americans, almost a quarter of a century ago in Atlanta, has always been in the forefront of the forces of progress and patriotism and has ever been loyal to those ideals which commonly spell out the American way of life. From your modest beginnings you have now grown to a strong and powerful organization, consisting of hundreds of chapters in the United States of America and in Canada, together with your auxiliaries, the Sons of Pericles, the Daughters of Penelope, and the Maids of Athens. But what is more important, your group has been a potent force in encouraging loyalty to the United States, and its Constitution and in fostering obedience to its laws and traditions. Thus you have helped make our country the great homeland that it is for all of us. You have lived up to your motto "Education and progress through service." It is no wonder that you comprise one of the most law-abiding elements in our population.

Your service to our Nation was never better demonstrated than by your efforts during this war. Your war service units commanded the love, admiration, and respect of all in our armed forces. As one of the agents for the sale of United States war bonds by authority of the Treasury Department in Washington, you sold over $300,000,000 worth, an amazing total considering your numbers. Besides, many of you, together with your sons and daughters, served our country in the armed forces, with courage, distinction, and honor.

Nor have you forgotten your kin in your homeland. What you have already given in funds and effort to the Greek War Relief Association, Inc., will forever be indelibly emblazoned in the glorious record of unselfish relief during World War II. Your present effort in that direction is but a continuation of your unceasing endeavors to "leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way" and in the words of the psalmist to "defend the poor and fatherless, to do justice to the afflicted and needy."

But, no one can speak of Ahepa without recalling to mind one of the salient purposes of your organization, namely, "to arouse mankind to the realization that tyranny is a menace to life, liberty, and prosperity." That motto epitomizes the glorious history of Greece; it is an inspiration to all liberty-loving people throughout the world.

Civilization as we have known it for centuries is greatly indebted to your homeland. All Americans, whatever their origin, have always had a deep appreciation for the cultural and political heritage handed down to us by the Greek people. Together with Milton, we have all admired Athens, the eye of Greece, mother of arts and eloquence. All thinking men are aware that practical democracy and regard for the rights of the individual sprang from ideals conceived and nurtured in that historic peninsula. No wonder your city of Boston points with pride to its reputation as the Athens of America.

Our first principles of self-government were learned from the early practices of the Greek people. Plato's Republic and Aristotle's Politic have nourished the spirits of men for centuries. Just think what it has meant to the world to possess the dramas of Sophocles, Aeschylus, and Euripedes, the comedies of Aristophones, the orations of Pericles and Demosthenes, the chronicles of Homer in the Iliad and the Odyssey, and the many types of Greek sculpture and architecture. What expressions of perfect art and beauty your forbears have given us.

But, more than anything else, Americans understand and honor the love of freedom that your people have always championed; your constant willingness to pledge to the cause of freedom your very life, fortune, and honor. In fact, it is not an exaggeration to say that the great bond of friendship which exists between the people of Greece and of the United States was forged and tempered by their mutual struggles for freedom and liberty.

In this connection, it is well to recall that only about 6 weeks ago, on March 25, you and your kin everywhere proudly observed the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of that brilliant and heroic battle for independence which was begun when Archbishop Germanos and his loyal band of brave men and women raised the blue and white cross in the Morea in 1821, and which was not concluded until the treaty of Adrianople was signed in 1829, and Greece again resumed her true place in the family of free nations.

Living up to the traditions of Thermopylae and Marathon your people rose triumphantly to strike the chains of tyranny imposed by the harsh conqueror whose cruelty was manifested by the terms of the receipt issued for a

head tax imposed on all Greeks over 12 and which read "The holder hereof may bear his head on his shoulders for 1 year." Think of that?

No wonder Lord Byron, that illustrious poet, who came to Greece to aid in her struggles sang "Clime of the unforgotten brave. Whose land from plain to mountain cave, was freedom's home, or glory's grave, shrine of the mighty." It is well to recall the words of President Monroe on December 3, 1822, when in referring to that epochal struggle for civilization he said:

"The mention of Greece fills the mind with the most exalted sentiments and arouses in our bosoms the best feelings of which our nature is susceptible. Superior skill and refinement in the arts, heroic gallantry in action, disinterested patriotism, enthusiastic zeal and devotion in favor of public liberty are associated with our recollections of ancient Greece. That such a country should have been overwhelmed and so long hidden, as it were, from the world, under a gloomy despotism, has been a cause of unceasing and deep regret to generous minds of ages past. It was natural that the reappearance of these people in their original character, contending in favor of their liberties, should produce the great excitement and sympathy in their favor, which have been so signally displayed throughout the United States.

Greece in 1821 was one of the first nations in Europe to follow the United States of America in breaking away from the bonds of old world tyranny. It demonstrated then what it had exhibited throughout its long history: That in times of oppression as well as of freedom the Greek mind has clung with an unbelievable tenacity to the principle that life is of small value unless freedom is retained.

If 1821 was a manifestation of this inherent attribute of your great heritage, the events of World War II gave further and more shining proof of its everlasting presence in your very souls. When the history of the titanic struggle of the forces of God and humanity against the diabolical onslaught of nazism and fascism is fully recorded, the part played by your little country with is 8,000,000 souls will loom large and significant. What a glorious chapter in history was written as a result of the crushing defeat Greece, to the astonishment of the world and of the aggressors, administered to Mussolini who, like the jackal that he was, treacherously attacked your homeland in 1940! When Mussolini "yelped" to Hitler for help, and the latter in April of 1941, let loose his hordes on your homeland, your kinsmen, well aware of the superior power of the axis armies, certain of eventual doom, and with full knowledge of a cruel fate, dared to resist and to defend their freedom. On that early spring dawn of 1941 when the frightening roar of the Stukas, and the deafening rumble of the Panzers descended upon your countryside, the world was paralyzed with the fear of Nazi invincibility. The people of Greece punctured that myth with a bravery never equaled in the annals of history. Hungry and cold, often with bare hands, in mud and in slush, they defended every inch of their homeland. This fierce resistance to the Nazis not only upset Hitler's program, but gave the allies breathing time to build the foundation of eventual victory.

The resistance of your countrymen did not end with Nazi occupation but continued with equal vigor. The temper of this resistance may be judged by the ferocity of the reprisals which were used. With usual German efficiency, systematic cruelty was applied in Greece as it was elsewhere; innocent hostages were shot, villages were totally destroyed and priceless art treasures were desecrated and plundered. Yet, in spite of all, your people continued the struggle for freedom.

Every battle demands its toll, and Greece has paid in a most frightful manner. A wounded Greece, devastated by the barbaric invader is now struggling to rise again. The flower of her youth has perished on the field of battle; her industry has been virtually wiped out by the depredations of the Axis Powers, and her agriculture has been devastated. Railways and other means of transportation are practically nonexistent, about 300,000 homes were destroyed. Only the brave and miraculous Hellenic spirit has enabled the survivors to carry on. The war has been won, but Greece is still in pain; she is still suffering from the assault. Her people are starving. Inflation has raised havoc with the economic structure. Though the Parthenon still gleams beautifully on the Acropolis in the moonlight, all around it are hungry and undernourished. In the words of Daniel Webster uttered over 120 years ago.

"What I have to say of Greece concerns the modern, not the ancient; the living and not the dead. It regards her not as she exists in history triumphant over time and tyranny, and ignorance, but as she is now, contending against fearful odds: for being, and for the common privilege of human nature."

It is the human damage which is most appalling and heartrending. Out of 8,000,000 souls, over 800,000 perished from starvation alone during Nazi occupation. Ill fed for so long, resistance to disease has dropped materially. Tuberculosis and malaria are taking a heavy toll. Malnutrition and inadequate housing account for much of this. It is reliably estimated that one-fourth of the present Greek population is too ill and too weak to work. In other words, one out of every four Greeks must be considered an invalid who needs immediate medical care. Inadequate facilities to treat these sick and diseased provide a poignant and shocking manifestation of the horrible plight of your people. We, who have suffered only temporary inconvenience, cannot possibly imagine it.

That is why the purpose of your great gathering this evening assumes such great significance. This meeting tonight is but one of the many events reflecting the sentiments of our President, who on January 10, 1946, wrote to your supreme president, Boston's own Mr. Booros, that "It is a noble sentiment which prompts Americans of Hellenic descent through the order of Ahepa to dedicate themselves to the mitigation of pestilence, starvation, and misery in every form in Greece."

That million-dollar hospital in Athens must be built and equipped, and it must be done quickly. All people of all creeds and nationalities must rally to the cause.

Your organization has demonstrated by its past achievements that you will succeed again. Ahepa can be depended upon. You appreciate the price of moral freedom, and you will readily pay it. You possess the courage so clearly manifested by your Styliano Kyriakides, who just a few weeks ago won the classic BAA marathon, and who, though starved and deprived of all comforts and conveniences for years, displayed, because of his love for his country and people, the stamina which enabled him to win over his competitors.

My friends, this distraught world demands courage and vision on our part. The Greeks are free from the fear of Nazi cruelty and oppression, but they are not yet free from the menace of disease and hunger. Let us resolve that those who have died in the battle of freedom shall not have died in vain. Let us not permit the dead to knock on the doors of our conscience. Let us do all we can to bring to a speedy end this chapter of misery and sorrow. We are being asked a sacrifice, and yet the very mention of the word "sacrifice" belittles the sacrifices your people made for us. As our late great President Franklin Delano Roosevelt has said, "The people of Greece have risen triumphant from the ashes of every tyrannical fire * * * the qualities of the soul of Greece have earned for her * * * the designation 'the birthplace of democracy.'"

Let us resolve that this birthplace of democracy shall remain forever the cradle of freedom, liberty, and justice by providing the means necessary to maintain it. We of this country have indeed been fortunate. We have suffered but little; let us show our gratitude to those who have suffered much. Equip more rooms in that hospital as did the Sons of Pericles and the Maids of Athens. Purchase beds, medical equipment, provide quarters for nurses and doctors and thus enable the weak to grow strong and healthy, so that Greece, with her regained independence, may continue to provide a beacon of freedom, and to inspire among all people the noble ideals of liberty under God.

In the words of the poet, we must resolve that your land will forever be "the first garden of liberty's tree." Greece is now in her hour of greatest need. It is our duty to aid her. She has contributed so much to the civilization we cherish that we must do our utmost so that she may achieve a glorious future, that will far exceed the accomplishments of her glorious past.

The million-dollar hospital which will be built from the proceeds of your generosity will result in the saving of many human souls who will make that future possible. It is significant that the Hippocratic oath, which is the doctors' creed, originated in Greece. The hospital will make it possible for the doctor to fulfill the tenets of that sacred oath in your homeland, among your own needy.

I am certain you will not fail. Your membership is resolute and persistent, courageous and indomitable, human and benevolent. With God's will we shall once again be able to sing with that famed lover of your people, Lord Byron:

"The mountains look on Marathon,
And Marathon looks on the sea,
And musing there an hour alone,
I dreamed that Greece might still be free."

Justice to the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill which I would like to call to the attention of the House and to the attention of my esteemed friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL], to whose committee the bill undoubtedly will be referred. The bill calls for the repeal of section 601 of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 which was signed by the President 1 week ago today.

The Philippine Rehabilitation Act originated in the Senate as S. 1610 and was extensively amended by the House. Among the amendments was section 601 which prohibits payments of war-damage claims in excess of $500 until a trade agreement has become effective between the United States and the new government of the Philippines. The only trade agreement that can become effective between our two Governments in the immediate future is the agreement authorized under the Philippine Trade Act

of 1946 which was also signed by the President on April 30, 1946.

Section 601 of the Rehabilitation Act reads as follows:

SEC. 601. No payments under title I of this act in excess of $500 shall be made until an executive agreement shall have been entered into between the President of the United States and the President of the Philippines, and such agreement shall have become effective according to its terms, providing for trade relations between the United States and the Philippines, and which agreement shall also provide for the same offenses, and penalties upon conviction thereof, as are set forth in section 107 and section 108 of title I of this act.

Time was of the essence in the passage of the Rehabilitation Act as well as the Trade Act. Both bills were in conference on the same day. No one realized, until it was too late, that section 601 of the Rehabilitation Act would force the Philippines to accept the provisions of the Trade Act at the expense of critically needed rehabilitation funds. We did not realize, because of the haste and urgency of the situation, that we were coercing the Philippines into signing a trade agreement and making other fundamental adjustments in their laws in order to obtain allowances of war-damage claims in excess of $500 each. That was the farthest thing from our minds in the passage of these two bills.

President Truman himself recognized the evils of section 601 when he said, in signing these two bills:

While it is unfortunate that the Congress saw fit to provide in S. 1610 that no war damage payment in excess of $500 shall be made until the executive agreement shall have been entered into between the President of the United States and the President of the Philippines under the terms of H. R. 5856, to all practical purposes this provision is surplusage, as the benefits which will flow under the enactment of the two bills are so great as to ensure execution of the executive agreement by the Republic of the Philippines.

We cannot allow section 601 to remain in the Rehabilitation Act. To do so is to place ourselves and our good intentions toward the Philippines in a false light. We made a serious mistake in permitting this section to be written into law and I urgently request that the Committee on Insular Affairs, to which my bill will undoubtedly be referred, to proceed to an early consideration of the measure with the view that this repealer may be enacted without further delay.

Shortage of Feed in Northeastern United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and accompanying statement by the Association of Commissioners and Secretaries of Agriculture of the Northeastern States meeting in Albany, N. Y., April 30, 1946:

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
State House, Boston, May 1, 1946.

Hon. PEHR G. HOLMES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HOLMES: Attached is a copy of a statement prepared yesterday by the Commissioners and Secretaries of Agriculture of the Northeastern States.

The grain supply for Massachusetts is steadily dwindling, and with no greater opportunity of purchasing needed replacements of feed now being distributed.

It is our belief that every effort should be made to secure distribution of some grain and feed into New England channels of trade in the interest of maintaining our supply of milk, eggs, and poultry for the consumers of the Commonwealth.

Very truly yours,

FREDERICK E. COLE,
Commissioner.

The present shortage of feed in northeastern United States constitutes the gravest threat yet to the supply of fresh milk, eggs, and poultry for the millions of consumers in this area.

There is no doubt that the United States must do everything possible to help feed starving peoples of Europe and Asia. But at the same time, the health and welfare of consumers of northeastern United States must be safeguarded through sufficient production of fresh milk, eggs, and poultry.

Northeastern farmers have been able to barely get by thus far, while feed supplies were being used up at a rapid rate in the areas where they are produced. Now, with the Nation's livestock at a high level and supplies of feed steadily dwindling, it is more imperative than ever that the Northeast receive its fair share of available feed.

Recent renewed efforts to get grain moving off farms where it is produced emphasize the fact that the Northeast is not getting its proper amount of feed for cattle and poultry.

The situation has been brought about by inequitable price relationships which make it more profitable for a farmer in the Grain Belt to feed grain to livestock than to sell it as grain.

Proof of the seriousness of the situation lies in the wholesale cancellation of hatchery orders. These cancellations are proceeding at an unprecedented rate. The number of chicks booked for delivery during May and June was 55 percent less than the number booked for delivery during these months last year. There is just cause for alarm.

Northeastern feed distributors are unable to secure feed from their suppliers, many of whom have stopped booking orders and canceled earlier orders. There must, however, be no public criticism of the feed industry which has done an almost superhuman job in obtaining feeds under extremely adverse conditions.

Producers and consumers in this area will suffer unless prompt steps are taken to speed up the flow of feed into the Northeast.

Approved by Commissioner Frank H. Peet, Connecticut; Secretary Ralph C. Wilson, Delaware; Commissioner A. K. Gardner, Maine; Commissioner Frederick E. Cole, Massachusetts; Commissioner Andrew L. Felker, New Hampshire; Secretary W. H. Allen, New Jersey; Commissioner C. Chester Du Mond, New York; Secretary Miles Horst, Pennsylvania; Commissioner Stanley Judd, Vermont.

Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAT ARNOLD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter received from a constituent in my district that I feel bespeaks the attitude of a great many people throughout the country with respect to conditions in general:

Since you became the representative of our congressional district in the United States Congress, I have frequently noticed your appeal to your constituents to contact you and express their opinions and desires relative to national problems. In line with your expressed wishes, I am writing this letter. If at times I appear critical please do not construe my remarks as being personal to you for such is far from my intent.

But, my dear sir, I am and have been for several years highly incensed and thoroughly disgusted by the manner in which the American citizen has been relegated to the position of "yes" man or else horse thief or worse.

We have been served with promises, pledges, statements of policy, and siren songs of Utopian lavishness as a main course and with repudiations of policy, alibis, contradictions, pleas of ignorance, secret commitments, and plain falsehoods, for dessert.

I have always had to do clear thinking to make satisfactory progress with my own affairs and to command the respect of my fellow farmer neighbors.

I maintain that neighbor nations are little different from neighbor farmers. I also maintain that our national supposed leaders are not doing clear thinking; it would appear that these leaders are incapable of unbiased clear thinking.

In the first place, no farmer with the idea of dictating the affairs of fellow farmers, thereby carrying a chip on his shoulder continually, has ever to my knowledge been successful; sooner or later his insolence is subjugated by a coalition of superior forces and so it will always be with nations.

So we as a nation are short-sighted to believe that we must dictate the policy of all nations and demand that the international policy of every nation be subject to the censorship and shaping of our State Department; we are witnessing the proverbial chip on the shoulder, by the continued demand of this administration that this nation remain a militaristic dictatorship. It is and has been just that since December 8, 1941, and rightly so until VJ-day. Now those promises to terminate militaristic regimentation should be honored by Congress, it may mean that many stars will have to fall. It may mean that many gold-braided coats will of necessity be exchanged for blue denim jumpers and the wearers return to shoveling coal or delivering ice or hoeing corn but after all is that not the American way?

I resent the drafting of 18-year-old boys at any time. What has America come to when we expect our teen agers and women to fight our battles for us.

We are told by propagandists that army life does great things for 18-year-old boys physically, morally, and mentally.

Yes; but what distorted ideas some have of greatness. I have an 18-year-old boy in Fort Bragg. Physically he is no better off than when he worked on his dad's farm. Morally, he admitted when he was home on furlough

that he had to guard his conversation very carefully when speaking before his mother for fear he would unloose some of the barracks-acquired commonplace vulgarity which was routine in his outfit. As to mentality his perspective has narrowed to what he has to do and does not have to do and how little he gets for doing this, and the above attributes are typical of the average GI, not his fault but that of environment, bad enough in war, intolerable in peace. Please, Mr. Arnold, in behalf of one-half million fathers and mothers and their sons work against and help vote down peacetime selective service and universal military training. They are the chips which Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito carried to bring about the downfall of Germany, Italy, and Japan. It can happen here, my dear sir, in fact is about to happen here. America's only real hope of escape lies in the clear thinking and true fidelity to the American way of life by our Congress.

This administration cannot be expected to act sensibly. It seldom ever has, and is still punch drunk by overwhelming victory obtained at the polls, under the stress of war mania.

For 14 years the American people have been buffeted from the peak of one crisis, real or imaginary, to the crest of a like emergency; on this strategy one-man rule by directive has been established with the consent of Congress and the unsuspecting gullibility of the people.

The gullibility of the people ended with the Pauley scandal and now is the time to strike the decisive blow at military dictatorship and emergency bureaucracy.

What America needs to do is to throw away the chip by laying away her guns, thus practicing the peace she advocates while getting down to hard work and real old-fashioned economy and American living.

There is not a major power in position to fight a major war—as far as finance is concerned, least of all America, England, and Russia. America probably is the most favored in this respect. At that our position is not enviable with $271,000,000,000 hanging over unborn millions for generations to come. So why bankrupt ourselves at the rate of ten to twenty unnecessary billions per year for militarism if debt or no debt we must get ready to fight somebody. Russia for example. Let's be honest about the matter and say what our aim is and get it over with. If we are not going to fight Russia, any moron knows that not more than 500,000 men are needed in the United States Army. Proper treatment and good pay will entice those so inclined to do the job voluntarily.

My dear sir, I wish to apologize to you for so lengthy an eruption but it's what I feel and it just had to come out.

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERMAN ADAMS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Boston News Bureau is worth perusing. It raises the question not only whether a single individual can grow to be greater than his Government but whether the Government is virtually to abdicate in his favor. It makes food for thought:

NO COAL—NO HOPE?

Second thoughts may have occurred yesterday to 600 workers in the big Lackawanna plant of Bethlehem Steel Co. when they were laid off for lack of coal, with probably more to follow as other furnaces are banked. Did they reap any consolation from the fact that they had won their own steel strike "victory" earlier?

That the fuel pinch will grow worse was indicated by the Iron Age assertion that the steel industry, having already lost a million tons of ingots for lack of coal, faced a probable loss of 1,750,000 tons if the strike ran into June. Or was there any further consolation for some of these steel workers in imagining that their own wage losses evinced some sort of sympathy for the 400,000 soft-coal miners?

That Lackawanna plant curtailment was just one of many repercussions of the soft coal stoppage. Youngstown reported several more thousand steel workers (and consequently many railroaders) thus made idle. So far as the railroads as a whole were concerned, there was the Association of American Railroads estimate that class 1 carriers had but 26 or 27 days' supply of soft coal. Some lines have only enough to keep running 10 days. Certain roads have cut local freight runs from three to one a week.

Add in the assured spreading effect upon the electric utility industry, as yet another reconversion cloud or blot. That latter consequence was dramatized by the Illinois Commerce Commission order for a return to a wartime brown-out in Chicago and 600 other places in northern Illinois. Nine utilities were permitted to reduce the use of electricity for the duration of the coal strike. Other communities have started limiting the hours when "juice" may be employed.

The incidents cited are evidently just the first faint forerunners of what is quite definitely threatened. Already the New York City health commissioner has termed the situation very grave, and promises to demand, unless there are signs of the coal strike's ending within a week, that subway operations be curtailed, a metropolitan brown-out be ordered, and New York City's disaster control board be reconvened.

Meanwhile there is another sort of brown-out ordained by John L. Lewis. It may yet become a black-out—certainly of once bright reconversion hopes. Mr. Lewis keeps not only the coal industry in the dark, but also the Government. Both must remain ignorant and impotent, so far as his yet unrevealed objectives and strategy are concerned. He merely rouses new vain surmises by calling his policy committee of 200 to meet Tuesday.

"Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed that he hath grown so great?" We may well repeat that Shakespearean quip about such a labor leader as John L. Lewis. And also about James Caesar Petrillo, who has just tried anew to assert his domination over an industry by decreeing in effect that films may not be used for television.

We seem now to be made the vassals or serfs of both by an abdicating Congress which passed the Wagner Act.

Wheat Bonus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill providing for the payment of a bonus of 30 cents per bushel on wheat and corn sold by producers between January 1, 1946, and April 18, 1946. This would also include wheat under loan to the Commodity Credit Corporation, which was delivered to that Corporation when the loans were called.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the passage of this legislation is but an act of simple justice to farmers who sold their wheat during the period mentioned. During that time, an intensive drive was conducted by the Department of Agriculture to induce farmers to sell wheat and corn at the prevailing ceiling prices. Farmers were given to understand both by inference and directly, through representatives of the Department of Agriculture, that there would be no increase in ceiling prices before the next crop year. They were urged to sell their wheat and corn upon humanitarian grounds in order to relieve suffering throughout the world. Many, if not most of the sales made during that period were made for that reason.

It does not seem fair to penalize those, who in a spirit of humanity sold their grain, and then pay a bonus to those who held it. I am not criticizing members of either group. It was an individual problem in each case. Each had a right to decide as he thought best. In the interest of fairness and justice, however, all who were persuaded to sell their grain should be treated alike.

I shall urge that the Committee on Agriculture take this matter up at an early date.

Plenty of Room in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article entitled "Plenty of Room in Russia," which is taken from the American Legion Bulletin of May 1946, a monthly publication of North Shore Post, No. 21, the American Legion, Department of Illinois.

The article referred to follows:

PLENTY OF ROOM IN RUSSIA

In the April issue of the Sentinel, which carries this line, "Devoted to unity in Jewish life," we find this line: "Passage of the Dickstein resolution is a step forward in the drive to abolish the un-American gestapo, politely known as the House Committee on un-American Activities."

Referring to a committee of the United States Congress as a gestapo is extremely aggravating to Americans and no doubt irritates and exasperates those whom the author professes to represent. In referring to the committee as a gestapo, she is using typical communistic smear bund technique such as is used by the American Civil Liberties Union, Ira Latimer's Chicago Civil Liberties Union, Friends of the Soviet Union, and 219 other organizations which were listed as subversive

by the United States Naval Intelligence Bureau.

The communistic smear bund originated in the gutter, it thrives on filth, and as the British Communist Laski said, "The end, in fact, is too great to be nice about the means employed."

Americans do not fear investigation by the committee; Communists know that this committee will eventually uncover their machinations, that the results of investigations will mean long terms of confinement in Federal penitentiaries for them, deportation in the end.

Communists will use any method to destroy the congressional committee which is blocking their attempts to destroy constitutional government in America.

The smear bund author wants the committee abolished. * * * We want this committee to remain active to investigate traitors such as M. J. Adler, of the Chicago University, who said, "We must do everything we can to abolish the United States"—October 28, 1945, in Cleveland, Ohio, to 400 young students. Lee R. Pennington, chief inspector of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has warned us that the communistic rats are attempting to take over the American Legion. Our national headquarters recently denied charters to five recently formed posts; investigation disclosed that the organizers had communistic affiliations.

A member of North Shore Post Americanism committee visited Mr. S. B. Komaiko, of the Chicago Board of Underwriters membership committee to discuss the article which was published in the Sentinel. Mr. Komaiko writes for the Sentinel. Mr. Komaiko was asked if he approved of the author referring to the congressional committee as the "un-American gestapo." Mr. Komaiko said, "The committee is un-American in spirit."

We Legionnaires are supporting the congressional committee which is investigating un-American activities in the United States of America. We recommend that M. J. Adler, of the Chicago University, be brought before the committee for investigation. We recommend that L. X. Frost, author of the article in the Sentinel, take up residence in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Plenty of room for the smear bund over there; room here for Americans only.

Amvets' Recommendations on Disposal of Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to the Amvets—American Veterans of World War II—interesting and far-reaching proposal to distribute adequately and fairly the billions of dollars' worth of Government surplus property.

This newly organized veterans' group have been spearheading a national drive aimed to protect the interest of all former soldiers who are anxious to purchase property no longer needed by the Federal Government.

On a number of different occasions Amvets have come forward with some worth-while suggestions in the sincere hope of attempting to help clarify the confusing and deplorable surplus muddle. At their first national convention held in Chicago, Ill., last October Amvets respectfully demanded a congressional investigation of the unfortunate runaround that many veterans received when they sought to purchase surplus Government commodities. As far back as last December, their legislative director, J. H. Leib, appeared before Senate and House committees studying the problem of surplus disposal, and out of those hearings have come the recently adopted amendments to the Surplus Property Act. Part of Amvets' testimony on this matter was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator CARVILLE, of Nevada, on April 8, 1946.

At this time I present a set of new proposals as adopted by the Michigan Department of the Amvets in conjunction with the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Allied Veterans Council of Detroit. Representatives of these organizations are now in Washington conferring with Members of Congress and Government officials.

The document follows:

MICHIGAN VETERANS' PROGRAM FOR THE DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS WAR GOODS

Set up on May 3, 1946, by the following men: Mr. Neil Holland, Amvets; Mr. Brooks, Amvets; Mr. Bischoff, Allied Veterans Council; Mr. Lyle, VFW; Mr. Treen, Amvets; Mr. Dollar, American Legion; Mr. Malcomson, American Legion; Mr. Kaplan, Amvets; Mr. Burrows, Amvets; Mr. Korn, Amvets.

The following proposals are submitted, after consultation among representatives of the above organizations, in order that the disposal of surplus war goods, under provisions of the legislation which was signed on May 3, 1946, by the President of the United States:

1. Types and percentages of surplus goods to be made available solely to veterans should be made with the advice and consent of a national committee of veterans, representatives of all major service organizations.

(a) A veteran surplus property board be established to replace present Special Service Director of War Assets Administration.

2. Complaints by veterans of their rights to purchase surplus property should be investigated on the local level, by a committee of veterans, empowered to make recommendations. This committee should report to local WAA, General Gregory, and the National Veterans' Advisory Committee. The records and books of WAA should be available without restraint to this committee, and findings reported to local disposal agency, National Headquarters of Agencies, and National Advisory Committee.

(a) The local veterans' organizations shall recommend the appointment of a representative to handle veterans' complaints in the veterans' surplus property office.

3. A quarterly report of the amount of surplus goods sold, and the dollar sales and percentages sold to veterans. All major veterans' organizations, and all national and regional veterans' advisory committees to receive copies of this audit.

4. A considerable amount of surplus clothing and similar items have been sold to merchandising jobbers by the Army Quartermaster Corps. All surplus goods released by the Army, Navy, Marines, and Coast Guard should be sold through the WAA.

5. Key positions in the disposal agencies, national, regional, and local, should be manned principally by veterans, nominated by the several service organizations.

6. Consumer goods should be disposed of in the following manner:

(a) Federal agencies should be notified periodically of all surplus commodity goods and be given 30 days after notice of declaration to screen required material.

(b) Every major city in the United States should have a Quartermaster Store where all surplus commodities of the Army and Navy, the consumer agencies, and all other war surplus goods can be disposed of. All military small stores shall dispose of goods, and goods shall be priced according to their worth at a reasonable depreciation figure which will be at a fair price to everybody. No surplus equipment shall be sold in lots, but should be sold directly to the users, with first priority to men leaving the service or who have left the service.

(c) No Government property shall be sold without first publicly being offered to veterans.

7. Disposal of capital goods should be made in the following manner:

(a) Once capital goods have been declared surplus, and of no further use to the Government, no sale of such goods should be made to other than veterans until it has been determined that no priority request for such items by veterans is at hand.

(b) Where Government operated a plant during the war, or leased said plant to an operator, and the equipment and other capital goods in that plant have been declared as surplus by the Government, if the first lessee waives his right of purchase, the veteran shall enjoy the same priority right on a fixed item in that plant, as though a fixed item were declared surplus.

(c) All goods must be sold at a fixed price and veterans shall have the exclusive right to purchase this equipment for 90 days. If the goods are not disposed of at the fixed price within the 90-day period, the bids shall be accepted for these items, and in all cases of a tied bid, the veteran shall execute his privilege.

8. Notices of sale of surplus goods should be issued to parties eligible to participate in such sale on a class basis. The present policy of issuing a single list of all goods originally available is outdated immediately by Federal agencies' screening of desirable goods. It has been the experience of veterans wishing to buy vehicles that they travel hundreds of miles anticipating an opportunity to purchase any of the items listed in the original notice of sale. Our recommendation is that separate lists of the goods available to Federal agencies, veterans, and succeeding eligible purchasers be submitted 30 days prior to sale by registered mail.

(a) Public notice of sale shall be published in the appropriate newspapers and notice shall also be given where lists of goods available may be obtained by class or priority.

San Francisco Bay Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, it has been well demonstrated during the recent war that adequate highway facilities are as important to the successful prosecution of national defense as they are to the continuous development of our peacetime economy. To plan proper highway facilities requires long-range vision and understanding. A bridge is an integral part of a highway.

The importance of San Francisco and the entire San Francisco Bay area to national defense is amply demonstrated by the large number of naval and military

establishments in that area and the further fact that San Francisco became the world's greatest port of embarkation. Located in or near San Francisco are the Presidio Military Reservation, Fort Winfield Scott, Fort Mason, the Army Transport Docks, the United States Risdon Naval Plant, the United States Naval Base at Hunters Point, Mare Island Navy Yard, Oakland Naval Air Base, Oakland Naval Supply Base, the United States Army Moffett Air Field, Fort Barry, Fort Baker, the United States Bombardment Base, and many other military and naval establishments.

It is imperative that adequate highway facilities be always available to connect all of these establishments. There is, however, at the present time, a single bridge—the San Francisco-Oakland Bridge—connecting the city of San Francisco with the eastern or continental side of the Bay. Further facilities are absolutely essential. The opposition that developed to the construction of the San Francisco-Oakland Bridge, which was founded on short-sightedness and lack of vision as to future requirements, must not be permitted to develop in connection with an investigation and recommendation to be made during coming months. Those future needs are all too apparent now. Either a second trans-Bay Bridge or a system of causeways and dams must be constructed, to include facilities for railroad traffic. To this end, I introduced, and the House of Representatives unanimously passed, House Resolution 520, calling for the appointment of a joint Army-Navy board to conduct a full investigation and to make a report with recommendations to Congress on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an editorial which recently appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle, dealing with this proposed investigation. I invite the attention of Members of the House to it. The editorial is as follows:

A SECOND BAY BRIDGE

Congressman RICHARD WELCH has sought President Truman's help in obtaining full and open hearings on the project of a second bridge linking San Francisco with the East Bay. In performing this valuable service, Congressman WELCH has taken another step toward setting in motion the tedious but necessary legislative proceedings which will one day result in the completed span.

The California Representative disclosed that his interview with the President resulted from an expression by the Navy that the hearings proposed by WELCH were "inadvisable at this time." The Navy was represented as attempting to justify this stand by asserting that the new bridge could not be undertaken as long as bonds for the present bay bridge were still outstanding.

Without going into the question of what business it is of the Navy whether bonds are or are not retired, it is worth recalling that the Navy took a similar obstructionist stand, as far back as 1928, on the building of the present bay bridge. Backbone of its argument at that time was that (a) the bridge might be bombed and obstruct shipping in the bay in wartime, and (b) the bridge piers would be hazards to navigation, especially in the fog.

It is now apparent that the Navy's fears proved largely groundless during the war. It is also worth considering that the Navy found it a great deal easier to wage its war because it was able to haul its supplies to Treasure Island and the San Francisco waterfront across the very bridge it had so strenuously opposed.

In the light of those circumstances, it is to be hoped either that the Navy will desist from raising short-sighted and untenable objections to the second bridge, or that Congress will pay them the minimum of attention they merit.

The entire bay area will benefit immeasurably by construction of a second bridge to cut down the present intercity bottlenecks and weld a greater cosmopolitan community. It can even be presumed that the Navy, among others, will use the new bridge and derive benefit therefrom.

Barre Granite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I am inserting as an extension of my remarks a radio tribute to Art in Granite and an Immortal Poet, which the First National Stores featured recently on its New England network radio program:

A granite monument may seem a cold subject, but back of this particular one is a world of warmth and humanity, for it's a memorial to Robert Burns and to Scotland, for which he is an immortal voice.

Someone once said, "Let me write the songs of a people and I care not who writes the laws!" Bobby Burns, from an environment of stern poverty and unremitting labor, wrote great poems, yes; but in many a heart the world around, it is the songs of Burns—Flow Gently Sweet Afton, Auld Lang Syne, Scots Wha' Hae Wi' Wallace Bled, O Wert Thou in the Cauld Blast, My Luv is Like a Red Red Rose, Highland Mary—and almost 300 other lyrics—which stir the pulse and furnish the heart with old, dear memories. The stone of the Burns memorial in Barre is a lasting materialization of an ever-living tenderness which the Scotch poet sang and which Vermont granite has helped to render imperishable.

MARBLE AND MILK AND GRANITE

Now—Vermont, which has a justifiable pride in this Burns monument, always reminds one of Scotland. In Vermont, its marble, and milk, granite, and maple sap. In Scotland, it's bleak moors and heather and thistle, and the rushing streams and the cattle, and the gem-like lochs with the soft, close-clinging clouds overhead; rugged nature combined, as in Vermont, with qualities of the spirit which have enriched human character for generations.

STANCH AND HUMBLE

The granite in the Burns memorial is from Vermont's stanch hills. Bobby Burns was from stanch and humble stock. He was a farmer. Farming is Vermont's basic industry.

The history of the Burns monument in Barre dates to July 21, 1896, the centenary of Robert Burns' death, when members of the Barre Burns club conceived a monument to the poet, and since Barre was the granite center, it was felt that the memorial should be granite and should be the finest work of art in granite in the world. Today, as one studies the exquisite detail cut in stone, it is impossible not to feel that the wish of the originators has been fulfilled.

TWENTY-TWO FEET FOUR INCHES HIGH

On July 21, 1899, Miss Florence Inglis, now Mrs. Ernest Trembley, dressed and crowned as the Scottish muse, unveiled the Burns statue on its pedestal of unsurpassed beauty. The entire monument stands 22 feet and 4 inches above the foundation. The 9-foot, 4-inch statute of Burns depicts the poet, dressed as a ploughman, bareheaded, his sleeves rolled up, his coat over his arm, his eyes on the ground. The attitude and expression are of thoughtful meditation—a plain man whose image in solid stone somehow has caught the feeling of ineffable tenderness which breathes through Burns' poetry.

NO BRONZE USED

This is the only great work of art of its kind entirely of granite. Bronze tablets customarily are used for panels. But the artists who collaborated on the Barre Burns memorial scorned any material other than their beloved native stone, and the artistry of their work makes one catch his breath, especially as one examines the four carved panels. They are in high relief. Many of the figures are chiseled so beautifully it is hard to believe they are in stone. The front panel is a representation from The Cotter's Saturday Night, that poem based on Burns' own family life, and one of the really great poems in any language.

VIVID, TRUE ATTITUDES

Eight figures are gathered about the kitchen table. Burns' father is reading from the Bible. The attitudes and expressions are so vivid and true, it seems impossible that human hands depicted them in stone. Beneath are the words from the poem, "From scenes like these old Scotia's grandeur springs."

MAGGIE LEAPS THE "BRIG"

On the right-hand panel there is a change in tone and treatment to the hilarious scene from Tam O'Shanter, where the mare Maggie leaps across the bridge, with one of the witches grasping Maggie's "tale"—"Ae spring brought off her master hale," reads the chiseled couplet from the poem, "but left behind her ain gray tale," and the stone depicts the glee of the witches and the grim satisfaction of his satanic majesty. The left-hand panel is a favorite. It was inspired by that incident when Burns, in plowing, cut a mountain daisy. He is holding the broken flower in his hand. The plow, the horses, the reins, the daisy, the watching dog, the furrow, the poet show surpassing life and beauty. Underneath are those words from the poem, "To a mountain daisy"—"wee, modest, crimson-tipped flower; Thou's met me in an evil hour."

LIFELIKE WHEELBARROW

The back panel shows the Burns cottage. Foliage on the trees, the cottage, and other details are faithfully delineated. One detail is a marvel of craftsmanship—a wheelbarrow on its side appears so real that you want to reach over and set it right side up. Naturally, a great deal of cooperation was necessary to produce this splendid memorial. The money to buy it included gifts from Burns' admirers throughout Vermont but largely was from the generosity of the people of Barre. All the principal Barre granite quarries are represented in the raw material. William Barclay, a Barre man who died in 1907, was the designer. J. Massey Rhind conceived and modeled the statue. James D. King, of Milford, N. H., modeled the four panels. Eli Corte, of Barre, carved them. Samuel Novelli cut the statue at the firm of Barclay Bros.

THE WORK OF CREATION

How do you produce a granite work of art? Chauncey M. Willey, of Barre, and William Barclay have kindly sent many details, only a few of which there is time to mention. First, of course, the granite is quarried.

Then the blocks are chosen and the outline drawn on them. And then the cutting and chiselling. Cutting an artistic and beautiful statue is no easy, simple procedure. One tool, for example, is the bull-set, operated by two men. One man holds this stubby chisel-like tool of about 8 pounds weight against the part of the stone to be broken off, while the other man strikes the tool with a 12-pound sledge hammer. Other tools, many of them of high-carbon steel, scientifically tempered, are used—and there are compressed-air machines, together with the chisels, points, tooth tools, bush hammers, and so on. One of the heavier points is about an inch square, 6 to 10 inches long—the cutting edge sharpened to a point; and the workman strikes it with a steel hand hammer weighing about 3 pounds.

BEFORE THE FINAL INSPIRATION

Of course, beyond and above the tools must be the skilled hands, eyes, and minds of workmen. Granite cutters have an apprenticeship of 3 years, and the journeymen follow their natural bent, some becoming sculptors, some carvers, some letter-cutters, and so on. And there must be a lot of hard work before the final inspiration stands chiseled and complete. This great work of granite art to Robert Burns, standing in Barre, Vt., cannot but bring to a Burns lover those lines, one word of which we take the liberty of changing:

"From scenes like these old Vermont's grandeur springs—
That makes her loved at home, revered abroad—
Princes and lords are but the breath of kings—
An honest man's the noblest work of God."

Is It Grain Conservation—Or Disguised Prohibition?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appears in the issue of Liberty magazine of May 11, 1946. As one unalterably opposed to the return of prohibition it might be well if the Members of the House carefully considered the contents of this editorial. We do not want the return of the bootleggers:

IS IT GRAIN CONSERVATION—OR DISGUISED PROHIBITION?

Americans are willing to take any sensible steps to cut down our use of grain in order to save the lives of folk in less fortunate lands. However, it is foolish and futile to take steps based upon inadequate facts or a wrong interpretation of such facts as we do have. It is also tragic, because while thus salving our conscience we are likely to neglect other measures which would result in real conservation.

It is, of course, simple and makes good headlines to put the distilling and brewing industries on the spot. In the popular mind these industries are thought to be big consumers of grain.

Ergo, shut them down and we solve the food problem.

Actually, the distilling and brewing industries use comparatively a small amount of grain.

Normally 60 percent of the total grain crop of this country is used for livestock feeding. Somewhat less than 2 percent is used for distilling and brewing. Only a tiny portion of this is wheat, the chief grain for human food. But even this 2 percent does not represent a drain on the supply, because after use the residue is returned as animal feed, immensely enriched by the processes through which it has gone. When it is returned, it represents a greater food value for animals than it did in its original state.

For example, the figures show that it takes 275 bushels of corn to produce 1 ton of meat on the hoof. However, only 268 bushels of corn are required per ton if 10 percent of it is first passed through the distilling processes and the residue converted into feed. Thus brewing and distilling, far from using up scarce grain, make more of it available for relief than would be the case if we had no brewing and distilling industries.

Our whole farm economy and our food supply are built around livestock production. Obviously we can't eliminate our livestock population altogether. Of necessity we must continue to feed a high percentage of our grain crops to animals. This being the case, we gain rather than lose by first putting some portion of this grain through distillation and brewing.

Furthermore, these industries employ more than a million people and pay nearly $3,000,000,000 in excise taxes. It is the height of foolishness to destroy these sources of revenue and employment and at the same time make ourselves worse off for food grains than we were before.

These are the facts and the way they add up. When added up any other way, we had better be sure that it isn't being done by a prohibitionist pencil. If a subtle return to modified prohibition is the objective, rather than the conservation of grain, it's time the American people became aware of it. Actually, brewing and distilling would continue—illegally. But the return of the bootleggers would cost us grain.

They would use more than legitimate distillers and brewers, and the residue would be thrown away and wasted rather than returned as cattle feed. With the present dearth of food grains, we can't afford a return of the bootlegger.

PAUL HUNTER.

Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Medford (Mass.) Courier of May 2, 1946. I present this as further evidence that the independent weekly newspapers of the country, which usually reflect pretty accurately the sentiments of their readers, are satisfied that there is something radically wrong in the process we are using in this period of changing over from a war to a peacetime economy.

The editorial follows:

REGULATION

Every Medford housewife, and her husband, is pretty well confused over the issue of whether OPA should continue to control prices and production or whether there should be an open market with supply and demand alone regulating prices.

During the war the public was willing to do its part toward conserving materials and maintaining price ceilings. But since war has ended, conditions have grown worse instead of better. Wages have been raised in some industries, prices have continued to advance on such articles as can be obtained, but more and more merchandise has disappeared from the open market, until today it is a struggle not only to procure foods for all the family but to secure clothing and supplies.

Today we are advised to cut down on foods but the average family has been cutting down on foods since war ended, not because it wanted to perform a patriotic duty but because of the scarcity of staple foods. The housewife is urged to save fats, but fats are so hard to obtain that most housewives are obliged to use and reuse what fats they can secure. Eat less bread! We've been doing that for a long time. And we've eaten substitutes after substitutes as one after another they have disappeared from the store shelves.

Our food troubles started years back when we "plowed under" crops and paid farmers for doing it. Surpluses which should have been built up for the "lean years" were not built up. "Regulated production" it was called. "Regulated prices" followed.

Friend husband finds himself, in the matter of clothing, what the wife has to contend with in foods. He is still wearing the suits and the shirts and the socks and the underclothes that he bought before the war—or what is left of them. Not because he isn't willing to buy new ones and pay more for them, although his salary may have had no increase in the past 5 or 6 years, but because he can't get them at any price.

Returning veterans are looking for jobs. The public is looking for the necessaries of life. The era of prosperity which was to follow the war, with jobs for everybody and supplies for everybody, is so far just a myth. The public has the money ready to spend and is crying for the opportunity to spend it. There is a shortage of everything except money.

It is a condition which never before existed in this free country of ours. It is a condition which "regulation" has brought about.

What good is price control if it stifles production and creates shortages and black markets?

Export News Service Established

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the announcement being made today of the establishment of the Export News Service.

This new agency, of which Mr. Joseph A. Jones is general manager, will use radio wireless transmission of news to promote American business in foreign markets and thus strengthen the international economic interests of the United States. The announcement follows:

TO BEAM UNITED STATES BUSINESS NEWS ABROAD—EXPORT NEWS SERVICE ORGANIZED BY FOREIGN TRADE GROUP

CHICAGO, May 6.—A new trade promotional service featuring radio wireless transmission of news about American business to overseas

markets is seen in the announcement today of the establishment of the Export News Service.

Specializing in export public relations, the new agency has headquarters in Chicago and is directed by men who have had wide experience in foreign trade promotion both in this country and abroad.

Joseph A. Jones, formerly secretary of the overseas contact committee of the Automobile Manufacturers Association and vice president of the American Public Relations Association has been named general manager of Export News Service. Since 1934, he has engaged in public relations activities on behalf of the United States Government's reciprocal trade agreements program.

Donald S. Fairchild, who for many years engaged in newspaper work in London, Paris, and New York, and who has edited a number of best sellers, is associate editor. He is currently conducting a series of weekly radio broadcasts on foreign trade for the Library of International Relations of which he is trustee.

Francis H. Byrne, formerly combat photographer with the United States Coast Guard in Europe and the Southwest Pacific, and for 20 years news photographer with the Chicago Daily News, the Chicago Tribune, and the Chicago Daily Times, is senior news photographer.

Augmenting export advertising efforts of American companies, XNS will gather, write and furnish news stories, news photos, news broadcast materials about business developments, new products, and other commercial and financial news events in the United States to newspapers, magazines, and radio stations in 71 countries. Transmission will be via radio wireless or air mail, depending on the character and urgency of the news, and extended coverage in one or more of the 71 nations will be undertaken when necessary.

"As in the United States," Jones explained, "the general public abroad pays more attention to news stories, photos, and broadcasts than they do to paid space advertising. Such news, of course, will not take the place of advertising copy and art work for product description. It will, however, add to the effectiveness of overseas advertising—and further prestige and consumer good will.

"Wartime improvements in international wireless transmission of news," he said, "enables American manufacturers today to keep their business associates and customers in other countries immediately informed on developments in their production and export programs."

Jones declared that "particularly during the present world readjustment period there is need for extending American business and public relations abroad, and in carrying out this objective XNS hopes to serve not only the commercial interests of exporters but also the long-ranged international economic interests of the United States."

Problems of the Commercial Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the National Fisheries Institute held its first annual meeting in the city of Chicago, Ill., on April 25, 26, and 27, 1946. The attendance was very large and reached all branches of the fisheries. The meetings were harmonious, well attended, and all action taken was practically unanimous. The first annual meeting of the institute promises well for the future and shows that the fishermen of America, in all segments of the industry, are united as they have never been before toward making a determined and practical effort to work out their problems. I ask leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article on the problems of the commercial fisheries delivered by Oscar L. Chapman, Under Secretary of the Interior. The address well deserves the careful perusal and consideration of all persons interested in the fishery industry and discloses the keen interest that is being devoted to the fisheries by the Department of the Interior.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, President Alphen, ladies, and gentlemen, I am particularly pleased to have been asked to speak at this first national convention of the National Fisheries Institute. Fishing, as all of you are proud to say, is America's first industry. It drew the first European visitors to this continent long before Columbus appeared in this hemisphere. It was the basis of our first international trade. It provided the initial profits on which many of our port cities were founded and on which their citizens thrived. It is today one of our great industries in the value of its products, in invested capital, in the employment it provides for thousands of Americans.

I wish to compliment you first on your war record, which was fine. I am not unmindful that high prices for fish were something of a stimulus, but just the same the industry had more problems brought about by the war than most industries faced. Your best vessels were taken by the Army or the Navy, sometimes whole fleets, your best fishermen and engineers and captains were naturally in demand by the armed services. You lacked packaging and manila rope; you sometimes lacked ice and prompt transportation. Yet with all these things the industry came through with a good record of production; a better record than many people expected it could make under such handicaps.

I am not going to burden you in this speech with a lot of figures, but there are some I want to quote to you. The fishing industry is so spread out that it is sometimes difficult to really see how large and important it really is. The general public has little conception of its size; and, as a matter of fact, I doubt whether many people in the industry itself are fully aware of its vastness.

According to the most recent study by the Fish and Wildlife Service, the total capitalized value of United States fishery resources is $5,855,000,000. The consuming public in 1943 paid nearly $600,000,000 for the industry's products. And in that year the annual profit earned by fishermen, processors, wholesalers, and retailers amounted to $243,000,000.

It is perhaps fortunate that ownership of the fishing industry is so widespread and that in the United States proper it has not, as has happened in so many industries, come under the domination of a handful of huge corporations. I am aware that in an industry of the size of this that there are bound to be some companies of considerable size, yet it is substantially true that the fishing industry still largely belongs to what economists call little business.

From many points of view this is a valuable thing socially and economically. But on the other hand it has some disadvantages as well. The great diversity of the industry has in the past prevented it from using its influence effectively. Few companies in the industry have the means or the desire to do much about research. Vigorous efforts to open up new mass markets for fishery products have been impossible because individual firms in the industry have lacked the resources to tackle such a job. The very nature of the industry has prevented it from keeping pace with advances made in other industries, even, sometimes in competing industries in the food field.

Today I am going to talk with you about some of the problems which the industry faces. I am going to be frank as I can, and I know you will permit me to be so because of the close relationship between the Interior Department and your industry. And I would like to say right now that the Department of the Interior is proud to have the commercial fishing interests of the country assigned to it for guardianship. We hope that association will continue and that we shall work together in the future in the best interests of your industry and of the country as a whole.

The fact that this is the first annual convention of the National Fisheries Institute is an example of some of the things I want to talk to you about. Despite the fact that progressive members of the industry have for many years recognized the need for an association such as this, all previous efforts to establish an effective national trade organization have failed. Perhaps no industry so large and so important has waited so long to perfect such an organization. Certainly lesser industries have for many years had such agencies to speak in their general interest, to stimulate industry advancement, and to help over the rough places.

It was the diversity of the commercial fishing industry, and the competition between sections of it which, I think, prevented the establishment of such an organization before. Now that the industry has finally demonstrated that it can get together on such an issue, I hope that it will work together on other problems as well.

We, at Interior, were happy to see this organization founded because in the past, and to some extent still, the fishing industry has often worked at cross purposes. The east coast has opposed the west coast. The fisherman has opposed the dealer, the fresh fish dealer has opposed the processed fish dealer. The shrimp man has looked askance at the oyster man. The Middle West has different ideas on the tariff and on legislation than other sections.

I understand perfectly well that some sections of the fishing industry seem naturally competitive. I know that the interests of the coasts may not always be the same. It is true, however, that the fishing industry has problems common to all sections of it and that the failure of the industry to get together in a really representative fashion before now has worked to the disadvantage of the industry.

The most obvious problem the industry has is the one of markets. Instead of competition within the industry for the market that has existed in the past, it would appear to be the sensible thing to widen that market so that it could absorb a larger production of fish and shellfish. As every member of the industry knows, the inland portions of the United States consume far less fish per capita than is true of the coastal sections. There has never been a determined and continuing drive to broaden this market. If the great inland States could be captured as a major market for fish, shellfish, and fishery products, many of the present bones of contention in the industry would disappear. There would be less talk of the necessity for increasing the tariff on certain imported fishery products, for instance, if this could be done.

To point up the job you will have to do, I'd like to tell you about a conversation I heard in Washington the other day. Some youngsters in their early twenties, and obviously from Nebraska or Iowa, were chatting at the next table in a restaurant. The boy said, "I had a fish dinner last night at Harvey's."

"You did?" said the girl with some surprise. "I never have had a fish dinner." She thought for a moment, looked at her boy friend, and said, "You know, I didn't know you were a Catholic."

In order to penetrate the inland areas of the country more effectively will require cooperation from all segments of the industry. And you may be sure that the Fish and Wildlife Service will enthusiastically support anything the industry seeks in this direction. It will take more than that, however.

The theme of this meeting is "quality," and I know no more important or pressing subject which the commercial fishing industry might discuss. Most of the effort to expand the present market, or even to hold the market that the industry now has will come to naught unless the quality of your products is improved wherever possible and held to a high level.

The commercial fishing industry has been slow and backward in this field. There are many individual firms, I know, which pride themselves on the quality of their products, but too many just do not seem to care. The consumer does not quickly forget poor quality merchandise, and poor quality fish is about the poorest of poor quality merchandise. Even a relatively small amount of poor quality fish placed on the market may very well mean that the industry loses some customers not for the time being, but for good.

Some of the most progressive firms and individuals in this industry are represented in this association and are in this room today. As leaders of the industry, you must by your example set the pace for the rest of the industry. Insist on quality, both in what you buy and what you sell. If necessary, take a loss on bad fish rather than put it on the market and lose customers for the whole industry.

We have fish just as good as they are anywhere else in the world. The sardines canned in Maine are similar to the fish canned in Norway. But if you wish an object lesson in the value of quality, just walk into a delicatessen and see how much more a can of high quality imported sardines will bring than a can of low quality sardines of domestic origin.

I singled out sardines, because today the eastern sardine packers are trying to improve the quality of their product. At Interior we are working on some of the technical problems involved. It is an important project, although a small one and I hope it has great success.

I am told that efforts are being made by some sections of this industry to increase the tariff or obtain a quota on the importation of fillets. Normally, these imported fillets sell well in the American market, partly because of their generally high quality. My own feeling is that the average housewife will resent efforts to keep high quality products of any kind out of this country if it means the substitution of lower quality produce of domestic origin. If competition either from domestic producers or from foreign sources requires the industry to raise its standards, I say that is all to the good.

The Department of the Interior has long prided itself on being the preeminent agency of the Federal Government concerned with the conservation of the Nation's natural resources. There is still a great deal of confusion in the public mind as to just what conservation means. This is true because the aims and methods of conservation differ widely among the various resources themselves. The basic principles for conserving our petroleum, our minerals, our water supply, and our soils cannot apply directly to our forests, fisheries, game animals, or to our human resources. These elements of national wealth are commonly divided broadly in two great classes on the basis of their permanency: (1) The inorganic resources, such as those I named first, were present on our continent when it was first discovered. They cannot be added to; they can only be used wisely and cautiously. They are nonrenewable. (2) The organic resources, on the other hand, while existing in great richness since the beginning, are subject to use, abuse, and destruction on the one hand, or they can be augmented, nurtured, and increased both in extent and value. They are subject to natural replacement year by year, which process can be hindered or accelerated by man's influence. They are renewable.

We are concerned here with an important national resource—the fisheries—which enjoys a rate of natural replacement that is more rapid, relatively speaking, than that of any other resource. At the same time the resource is more vulnerable to misuse and destruction. Correspondingly, the fish supply exhibits great and rapid changes in magnitude and value. This presents a great handicap to stabilized or permanent industrial development, but it also provides a great opportunity for intelligent control and improvement.

We, as a Nation, have not gone very far toward acquiring an understanding of the forces of nature that affect the food supply taken from our seas, lakes, and rivers. We have not taken advantage of these forces for our own good. Progress in this field is being made by fishery biologists and other scientific workers, but their progress is slow. This is partly because their work is not understood by the general public, and partly because the scope and inherent difficulties of their research have resulted in long-delayed practical applications. Yet the work of fishery biologists is the very foundation of conservation programs, and conservation in turn is the foundation of industrial development. The commercial fishing industry must be assured of an abundant and continuous supply of raw materials; that is, there must be fish to catch in order to have fish to sell. This is a simple statement of the problem of conservation. The fishery biologist is concerned with maintaining natural production, and he is, therefore, an essential team-mate with the fishing industry in conservation.

I think that the commercial fishing industry is beginning to show a more adequate appreciation of the work of our scientists in its behalf. But it is still possible to hear members of your industry snort that the only thing the biologists are interested in is the sex life of fishes.

It is quite true that our biologists are interested in the sex life of fishes and shellfishes. They are interested in the whole life process of these animals from birth to death, and with their relationship to other living things, and to all the world in which they live.

It was this kind of study which helped them discover the grounds of the jumbo shrimp which has been worth millions to the fishing industry already although those grounds have been exploited for a relatively few years.

It was the study of the life cycle of the North Pacific halibut which enabled the United States and Canada, working together under an international treaty, to increase the yield of that choice fish, once threatened with near extinction as a commercial species, to a figure greater than was produced during the early years of excessive fishing. Today this fishery produces 13,000,000 pounds more per year than it would have without control, and the profits to the fisherman are from one to two million dollars a year greater.

What the scientist found was that this deep water fish matures so slowly that hundreds of thousands of baby fish were being taken every year. The fish were big enough to sell, but they were being taken before they had the chance to spawn and increase their race. As the years have gone under regulations designed to prevent the taking of immature fish, the annual allowable catch has been substantially increased, and should continue to grow in the future. Through scientific research and conservation practices based on its findings, we are helping nature to produce more halibut—that is true conservation for use.

There are many well-developed scientific plans for restoring the yields of fisheries that are now severely shrunken. There are plans for developing fisheries that are now unexploited. These only await opportunity for practical application.

Our scientists, for example, tell us that the haddock catch off the New England coast can be increased by 50,000,000 pounds a year. There are also few physical limitations which would prevent the restoration in great part of the Atlantic shad fishery from a present annual harvest of 10,000,000 pounds to the former harvest of 50,000,000 pounds. Studies of the oyster fishery show that its yield can be materially increased by extending scientific oyster culture, for cultivated grounds produce three times the yield of natural beds and six times the value of the product.

If the methods we already know about were applied, America's harvest from the seas and lakes and rivers could increase from the present four or five billion pounds to more than six billion pounds in the mere matter of a decade or so.

There is still much to be found out about the animals which are the basis of your industry. We need, for your benefit, and for the benefit of the people of the United States, more research, better equipped and better financed.

A great industry has developed along the Pacific coast based on the various tunas. That industry is worth about $30,000,000 a year. Men readily invest as much as a quarter of a million dollars each in tuna clippers, they invest tens of thousands of shore plants. But the truth is that neither they nor we know exactly where the tuna comes from. We can guess at its origin, at its migrations, at its life history. On some occasions an industry has been built about such a tuna as albacore only to have the runs disappear completely after a few years leaving shore plants idle and useless.

For the sake of the large investment involved, if for no other, we should know all that we can learn about the tuna resources of the Pacific. We should know, as well, about a great many other species which are now commercially important or may become so in the future. Yet the United States has not now, and has not had for a number of years, a single vessel equipped for research on the high seas. The United States is the only major maritime power in the world without such a vessel. Congress has before it now a proposal for such a vessel, but we will in the future need more if we are to do the job we ought to do for the fishing industry.

My point in this is to ask the cooperation, support, and understanding of the commercial fishing industry in the scientific work of the Department of the Interior. That scientific work has a genuine bearing on the welfare of the industry.

In the field of technology, as well, research is well in advance of application. That does not mean that scientific work of this nature should be discontinued to wait for the industry to catch up. Technological improvement is a never-ending spiral to promote efficiency, develop the most economic utilization, and improve quality.

It seems to me that our fisheries have a particularly fertile field in the utilization of millions of pounds of waste fish and fish offal discarded every year. A great deal of research has already been devoted to byproducts production. While waste products in the past have largely gone into the making of meals for animal feeding and oil for both feeding and industrial uses, there may be even more valuable uses for such products.

Considerable work has been done on the extraction of vitamin A and D oils from

fish livers and other viscera, but less has been done on developing other pharmaceuticals and chemicals. In view of the large variety of chemicals and minerals known to be stored in the bodies of aquatic animals, the possibilities for such research are great. As facilities permit, the Fish and Wildlife Service will do more work of this type. It will continue, as well, with its programs for exploring fishing grounds, developing better gear and more efficient methods of fishing to reduce costs, will expand its studies of sanitation and pollution control, and seek improvements in the standards for handling and processing fishery products.

We invite you to draw upon our technical knowledge and upon our facilities for solving your problems in this field.

If I have today been mildly critical of some phases of the industry, I must say that I discern hopeful signs of change.

The industry is becoming more aware of its problems and is actively discussing them, and this is always the basis of any improvement. More and more, also, the industry is relying on the judgment of the scientists and technologists and is more often assisting actively in their work. Developments in retailing, such as the frozen-food cabinets which will shortly be placed in almost all the grocery stores in the Nation offer a challenge to the fishing industry to further develop its packaging and merchandising methods, which it appears ready to do. And, you have finally got a national organization soundly on its feet.

I want to congratulate you, in closing, on the completion of your first year as an organization. I know that it has actually been only 9 months since you stole Charlie Jackson away from us, but he has got around the country so much, and said so much about fish that it seems like a year. Personally, and on behalf of the whole Department of the Interior, I would like to say that I am proud of the good start that we have made working together, and I wish you, not years, but decades of success.

Price Increases for Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have received many communications from farm organizations expressing their views with reference to the plight of farmers. Faced, as they are, with the shortage of feed for their cattle and poultry, and the dairy industry being destroyed by OPA regulations and subsidies, I am not surprised to receive the communication, which I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of my remarks.

I have been a member of the Grange for almost half a century and I think I understand the difficulties now facing the farmers as a result of policies of this administration. There is one thing certain, the farmers are too wise to be deceived by the propaganda that is being sent out over the radio, in the press, the magazines, and movies by the 45,000 New Deal publicity agents on the Federal pay roll with a budget of $74,000,000 annually with which to deceive the country people. There is an upsurge against the administration, and rightfully so, which this brief resolution from the Pomona Grange of Cattaraugus County is indicative.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert the following resolution:

OLEAN, *April 6, 1946.*

"Whereas industry and labor have recently had about a 30 percent raise in wages and prices: Be it

"*Resolved*, That our Worthy Master Goss ask Congress for a 30 percent raise for milk, eggs, and other farm products; be it

"*Resolved, also*, That a copy of this be sent to the State executive committee."

Fraternally submitted by Howard Morris, member of Cattaraugus County Pomona Executive Committee.

Resolution amended that copies be sent to President Truman, Representative Daniel A. Reed, Senator James Mead, and National Master Goss.

ROY BABCOCK,
KENNETH BABCOCK,
HERBERT REYNOLDS,
Resolution Committee.

Copied by Nellie Schuppenhauer, secretary, Cattaraugus County Pomona Grange.

United States Maritime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article appearing in the New York Forwarder, dated April 29, 1946. The article follows:

In the months to come, the Maritime Commission will meet its first full-powered peacetime test as the greatest merchant marine enterprise the world has ever known. For the period between its inception and the outbreak of war, the sturdy and devoted executives who then guided the Commission's progress, well earned the Nation's applause for meritorious production and organizational performance. And as for its war record, it may be said without fear of contradiction that no single group of the Allied Nations excelled the Commission's contributions toward winning the victory. History will note that but for the genius that produced the vast armada of ships—and in record-breaking time, to move an army of millions together with its requisite maintenance and fighting equipment and supplies to the battle fronts, the war might have been lengthened years and probably lost. Mere words cannot adequately express the deep debt the world owes this courageous and indefatigable group for its unmatchable contribution to preserve democracy.

To the present, the Commission has more than met the Nation's hope and aim to build and encourage the operation of a merchant marine which would insure the safe and free movement of our rapidly expanding foreign commerce. Our concern at this moment, however, is for the future. In the months ahead, two-way United States traffic will assume porportions never before approached and rivalry and competition is certain to be keener than ever. Our current advantages in blue water tonnage, improved design, and accelerated speed notwithstanding, other maritime nations have already developed shipbuilding plans that promise to meet and surpass the best we now have to offer.

Our best interests considered, the question arises at this time, "Is the Maritime Commission, as it is now constituted and organized, fully capable of meeting and discharging its myriad responsibilities satisfactorily?"

With all due respect for its past splendid record we believe that the advisory and administrative departments of the Commission should now be augmented with practical talent, especially in the operational fields. A consultative body of experts drawn from the various operating and traffic fields such as ship operators, exporters, importers, stevedores, forwarders, etc., should prove extremely helpful when the inevitable avalanche of seaborne traffic strikes us.

The United States Maritime Commission, representing an investment of almost $20,000,000,000, is one of the world's most highly capitalized enterprises. Briefly defined, its purpose is to aid United States industry and commerce in the distribution of its products to the four corners of the world and transport foreign products to our shores needed for industrial and other purposes. It competes solely with the merchant marines of lower-standard-living nations. Thus far the Commission has out-paced the world in quantity and quality ship production. Our weak point is comparative economical operation. Hence, our suggestion that the Commission be bolstered with an advisory staff comprising active experts in the ship operating and related fields. It is in these departments that our real competition rests. It is this phase of our merchant marine that presents our most bothersome problems. It is here that the Maritime Commission needs the aid and guidance of well-seasoned specialists and craftsmen.

Education for World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on the subject, Education for World Peace, in the Benjamin I. Wheeler Hall at the University of California, Berkeley, Calif., May 3, 1946, at the Institute of Labor Education and World Peace. The institute was sponsored by the extension division of the University of California and the California Labor School of San Francisco.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION FOR WORLD PEACE

Ladies and gentlemen, it is good to be back in these halls. This institution means much to me and my life. I congratulate the University of California and the California Labor School on accepting the theory that, if we know what we are doing, we may get farther in this world than if we just blaze away. I congratulate the entire West in the leadership it is displaying by the establishment of this school. I read, just before leaving Washington, an editorial written in a great paper of the East about the University of California's appropriation and its building

program, and they went so far as to say that the inhabitants of the western part of the United States, now, did not have to seek entrance in eastern universities. Just when did we of the West have to seek entrance into eastern universities to be properly trained? The second act of the Utah Territorial Legislature was an act creating the university and the school system. In the West the schools and the States have grown up together, and that is as it should be. Education apart from the problems of the people and their governments is superfluous, indeed. All education, as all institutional life, should be based upon its social significance. The theory that the public be damned while it is still extant is archaic in the minds of thoughtful persons. The thought that free enterprize exists for me and not for you is egotism, which only the weak can chuckle over.

Our people having traditionally accepted the thesis that "a government of law and not of men" is the proper form, causes us to think in terms of rights. And an attempt to solve problems dealing with the relationship of human beings or of governments, based primarily upon rights, is an invitation to continual clash and not to peace. The right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is not a right in the strictly legal meaning. It is in reality the echoing of the strivings of the human heart to live in ordinary, everyday life the ultimate potentiality of man. It is the reechoing of an ideal. We may, before we get through with these remarks, talk about man's right to a job; man's right to have a decent home; man's right to go and to come as he wishes: man's right to all of the freedoms, not only the four basic ones; but we do not mean it in a sense of statutory right. We want something more. We want the fullness of democratic life, based upon the theory of common consent and the notion that liberty comes from respect of others, not as a result of a basis of demand on our part. These are the ideals which the average man strives for, prays for, and believes attainable. They are the ideals based primarily upon the simple theory of treating others as you would like others to treat you and the basic notion that all social life must have its culmination in mutality.

Are these the dreams of a hermit isolated on the top of a high mountain overlooking the expanses of the universe, or are they based upon a practicality which faces us every minute of the day? I accept the latter thesis, and I shall tell you why. I came to this meeting in an airplane. I do not believe that my pilot flew me safely here just to save his own skin. I came immediately to this meeting over a great bridge. I do not believe that the architects of that bridge made it strong just because they thought that one day they themselves might cross the bridge. I paid for my last meal with a bill that no one questioned. I do not know whether there is enough silver in the Treasury to redeem my silver certificate or not. In fact, like the other 140,000,000 people in America, I have not read the Government's promise on that bill. I live by faith, you see, and so do you. We have put our savings in Government bonds without ever thinking about reading them. No one worries about his bank deposits any more; even those who have bank deposits have ceased to worry. Few workers in America go to work feeling that their job will end tomorrow. In fact, they plan and get credit and the doctors accept their promises on the theory that they will be working tomorrow. In law, has every man a right to his job? Then do you not see that life of faith and trust in finer and fuller than a life of rights? Still, I have carried through the Senate the Wage and Hour Act; still, I have had much to do with the labor laws in the last 13 or 14 years; still, I advocated the full-employment resolution at the Philadelphia meeting of the International Labor Organization in 1944 and the Paris meeting in 1945; still, I was one of the first to propose a world-wide bill of rights; and still, I am plugging for continued legislation making the rights of all more certain. But still, I know that the better life is not based upon rights, but upon faith and trust, and that good peace at home and abroad, in the family, in the Nation, and in the world can only come because men want peace.

Are we going to have an everlasting continuation of strikes, lock-outs, atomic bombs, suspicion, distrust, advantage-taking, and general bedevilment? We can have all those things if we want them and if we are willing to pay for them; pay not only for those who like these everlasting clashes, but pay finally in forced sacrifices of those who give their all in war and social unrest.

The world has known the idea of progress for a century and three quarters. We have had the concept of evolution for nearly 100 years. We have had the dreams of our founding fathers built upon the notion that America is a promised land and dedicated to the concept of freedom for more than 150 years. We have had Jefferson's great letter to Adams written just before he died wherein he said that he and Adams would yet look down from heaven with joy at the fulfillment of their great dream. For over a century, America has learned that the four freedoms pay. Even religions thrive better here under the philosophy of freedom of religions and for religion than they do in those lands where particular religions are protected by law. American life is built upon the right to come and go; the right to have and to hold; the right to think, to aspire, and to achieve. These rights are attainable only and are worth while only when they rest upon faith and trust. The institutions which make us great are the individual savings accounts of our kiddies, the insurance of our parents. Thus it is to say, my great idealism is based upon the practical, everyday economics of bread and butter and a place to lay my head.

That is prologue. Your task is to achieve such a prologue, but knowing at the beginning you can do so only through understanding, and understanding of the practical sort comes only through education. A society based upon a well-trained citizenry is still America's best dream. It should be the world's dream. There can be no peace until there is some contentment, until living standards are such that men and women can produce not only enough to live on, but a surplus to keep that living bigger, better, and more complete. I shall take my illustration for the accomplishment of this from two pieces of legislation, both of which were deemed very impractical. First, the soldier education bill and, second, the full employment act. I believe that for the first time that a nation has attempted to express itself with thankfulness to those who have served it well, by offering educational advantages to the individuals who have come out of that service, placed the philosophy of education where it should be put. The soldier education bill is not a bill primarily for the benefit of the soldier boys and girls, it is for the benefit of the Nation and the American people. Realizing what happened to France and what happened to England as a result of the last war, we recognized the loss of a whole generation of leadership and the American Government was determined that a generation of leadership should not be lost to us as a result of this war. The soldier education act is based upon that theory. Build us a better nation is its slogan. No one knows that better than I do because I, myself, wrote that theory into the bill.

The full employment act is not a pitiful piece of fragmentary mutterings based upon a flimsy interpretation of the slogan "the right to work." The full employment idea had its concept in the notion that it was Government's duty to see that its people are well fed, well housed, and well schooled. The Government is not entirely unselfish in this. We have, you know, the Federal income tax system and the more you earn the more all of the people get through a distribution of taxes collected. At one time, when governments belonged to kings, taxation was a burden for the benefit of the few. I know of no privileged class under the theory of our tax system. But 10 years ago there were many groups of overly privileged. The strange thing is, hard as it was to bring about these simple reforms, no one complains over their accomplishment today.

I like our dollar economy as it works today. Some make greater profits than others, but the theory of the leveling remains. There will always be those who are ahead, who are brighter, who live better by their wits, who gain more than others. That is America. I have no objection to it as long as it is not done by advantage-taking, and there will be no advantage-taking that will last very long if the problems of our economics are made part of our educational scheme. That is what you are doing. But you must go further than the lawyer-minded among us are willing to go at present. You must see basic causes and basic effects. In the individual you will note that the cure for many a clash in our economic life is attained through the simple device of equal opportunity, a real life of interdependence, a spirit of mutuality.

War anywhere is of concern to all everywhere. Poverty anywhere reduces wealth and living standards everywhere. You have a notion that starvation in the middle of Asia does not affect life in prosperous America. Look around you and see what is happening today. Accept the basic fact of life that while men kill each other in hideous war they are thoughtful of each other's welfare, nevertheless.

It is true that great suffering almost invariably brings forth at least little gains. In our own national life we know the cost of the formation of the Union, the freeing of the slaves, and the repulsion of the threats of Wilhelm II and Adolf Hitler of Germany. Why men have to suffer to see is the cause of faulty education. Surely the lessons of the First World War should have been sufficient to have lasted the people of Europe and Asia at least a generation, but they were not. Do we have to have the law of suffering and sacrifice always functioning in order to learn anything? Did it take the depression to give us the philosophy we have now of attempting to make life more abundant and fuller? Evidently it did. Moreover, through the depression only were we able to achieve a measure of social security and set up our first fair-labor standards. Perhaps in comparison the suffering of the depression era was not sufficient to bring about even the crude beginnings of a basic right to work. I mean a single clear-cut, complete right to have a job for the asking, a job compatible with one's capacities and attainments.

It is wrong, at this late date, when soldiers are sent overseas in the first phases of a war, and during the long hours when all that men may do is think things out, that their thoughts should be resolved largely into fears that, should they be so fortunate as to return, they might not have a job to return to. The fear might not have been, and I hope was not, founded on anything stronger than generations of habit. Even so, the fact of their worry, of your worry, and of my worry, over security based upon gainful employment is sufficient to suggest the disease and the cure.

In spite of our gains, we missed one opportunity when we builded upon the ashes of the late twenties and early thirties. Widespread misery should have brought forth guaranteed employment in such force as to have amounted to an iron-clad contract between this Government and its people that any man, any woman, however aged or other-

wise disqualified under the old standards, could confidently expect to earn money simply through his own election and volition, and that the truth be recognized, once and for all, that in a properly organized society, alive to its responsibilities and opportunities, there can be no such thing as a labor surplus. With so much to be done, and so little time in which to do it, how can anyone speak of surpluses. The only surpluses we want are surpluses from honest labor.

The time should have come when an individual, wishing to work part time or full time, according to his own best interests and to fit his own ambitions, should be able to have what he wants, and another, gainfully employed, who because of his ability is offered a better job, should be able to take it with confidence, losing nothing and risking nothing.

Where is all this made-work to come from? Look at poor leveled cities of Europe. See the ravages of bombs and booby traps everywhere. It took us all, working 16 hours a day, on call 24 hours, every day, to do these little destructive jobs. How much would it take to construct a great, beautiful world community? Moreover, job guarantee is something like insurance. By simply having it handy, the working man loses his fear psychology. He knows that he may earn, and may spend or save according to his habits. He need not be subservient. It will avail him nothing to be arrogant. He cannot fail to get some kind of job; yet he easily may fail through lack of industry, for only through industry can he rise, and failing this he is a failure and knows it. No child in America who reaches the third grade is incapable of distinguishing the difference between a successful man and a failure. You get that lesson even in Sunday School.

We had statistics about illiteracy as a result of the last war and we learned that the one privileged group under the Selective Service Act were those who were deferred because they were not able to understand a simple written order. We should have learned that illiteracy did not pay, that poverty produces illiteracy, and that many a fine boy lost his life because he had taken a place ahead of his time because so many others were proved unfit.

If demagogs come into being because of slogans based upon assumed or actual injustices, is it not better to have a just peace and make the demagogue impossible than to spend all of our energies knocking out his contrivances and overcoming his ambitions? Cure the ills of inequality throughout the world and the type of peace we have in America will become possible. This does not mean a time of bliss, a world of inaction, nor a world without strife. But the strife can be of a different type; contest, competition for constructive purposes instead of destructive purposes might pay if we would only get the idea.

If I should try to analyze what I have been saying I would do it in this way. We have spent our energies trying to overcome inequalities in our economic life by guaranteeing certain techniques; the right to strike, the right to organize, the right to assemble, the right to free speech. These result in laws dealing with the techniques of our economic life. The cure for those who demand these rights can be made only by higher wages, decent savings, better environment, and proper training. Those present might say to themselves after hearing my stressing of training, "This fellow Thomas, still remains a Confucionist." I do. I do not believe that man should ever live on the level of an earthworm. Such a statement is no longer the dream of the idealist. It is a fact which is recognized by anyone with a memory that goes back a single generation. In the last war, through lack of preparation and training, boys died getting them into the service. In this war there has been less of that. In the last war boys died of lockjaw and other preventive diseases. In this war there has been less of that. Look to your community health standards, your educational standards. Has it paid to have them a little better? That is my point; simple, so simple that you will say that everyone knows that. But does everyone? The next time a great problem faces you try to settle it on the basis of fundamental understanding of that problem instead of a basis of force. It is only through the schools that such an understanding can come. It is those who know the history of mankind and the advancing march of civilization who do not lose the faith in the great fundamentals of America and her mission.

From your deliberations here will come new aspirations, new studies. Not for this institute but for sometime in the future, may I suggest two great historical events that should form the basis of a new educational approach to better industrial labor relations at home and the advancement of peace throughout the earth. First is the establishment of the International Labor Organization, based upon the simple theory that the raising of the standards of the people of the world is the only sure way to the peace of the world. In the wake of such philosophy has come all of the aspirations of the common people of the earth. Never has the world seen that which has taken place today among the common people of the whole world. World War II was called the people's war in more places than in America. Study contemporary art, drama, and literature, and see how simple concepts, laid down in the basic theory behind the International Labor Organization, have become the aspiration of literally millions of people in the earth.

As a result of intolerable conditions in those nations ruled by single-will tyrants, thousands of refugees, dubbed intellectuals, have come to America. The effect of the thinking and working of these men is not yet apparent. I predict a greater intellectual renaissance in this glorious land of ours, a renaissance which will affect the whole world, a renaissance of scientific thinking and political idealism which will be pointed out by future generations and which will make the last half of the twentieth century a century of inspiration such as the world had in the sixth century B. C. and the first century A. D. We are living in mighty times; times which will result in universal acceptance as significant in the history of ideas as were the democratic ideals of the gospel of Buddha and the antiaristocratic ideals of the Confucian philosophy based upon the training of man whose nature is good; as great even in its lasting significance as was the greatest of all contributions in the development of democracy, the discovery by Jesus of the individual and of that individual's worth in the eternal scheme of things. There will be no single concept quite as great as that given the world by Jesus. But in the renaissance every idea developed will be complementary to those of the sixth century B. C. and the first century A. D. And that the ideas will be lasting is assured because they will be devoloped under the auspices of that government which has evolved upon the theories of our founding fathers.

The next historic event which I say marks the very acme of decent industry-labor relations in the United States and the one on which we should have based all of our industry-labor actions since its inception was the industry-labor conference held in Washington in 1941. A new thing happened in industry-labor relations at that time when the representatives of industry and of labor unanimously accepted by motion that there should be no strikes and no lock-outs but that all disputes should be settled by peaceful means. That is the foundation upon which to build. Make your industry-labor techniques rest upon that constitution and you will have industry-labor peace in America. Whoever was responsible for a different approach and for the belittling of the great action taken in 1941 is responsible for much of the industry-labor suffering we have had in the last few years. Whoever is responsible for not living up to the principles of that great promise made is responsible for keeping back the peaceful evolution of our industry-labor relations for a whole generation.

We missed an opportunity when the going was hard and men crusaded. Gains are more difficult to achieve now that we have war prosperity. Who cares about labor, except to resent the newest strike? Who cares about employment so long as most people can get some kind of job in at least a few weeks of mild effort? Our muscles relaxed after a hard war, we are soft as putty. There will be strikes; there will be clashes; there will be contests; there will be resorts to courts, mediation boards, and conciliation, but you cannot do away with the evils incident to the stoppage of pay, the idleness of strikes, the slipping back into poverty and debt, the keeping of kiddies from schools and the actual killings which have sometimes resulted by law. This is the lesson of our times. I repeat, a guaranty of labor technique in law will not make for peace. A recognition of the broad objectives for which all should strive in our society is the key to final labor peace, higher standards, decent schools, honest hours, protected savings, and equal opportunity; for each to move into the field of his great aspiration and into the sphere of his potential capacity.

What is the great fear in America today that underlies the threatening industry-labor unrest? Despite our full-employment act and despite our prayers, the unconscious juggling for position in our present-time industry-labor strife is a fear of future unemployment. We may be in for it, I do not know. But when we again come face to face with this problem, let us recognize it. It is a religious undertaking and will be attained only through zeal amounting to a religion. Who today in the United States will defend some of the practices we proved right here in San Francisco in our civil liberties investigation?

We have come a long way, but not far enough. The constitution of decent industry-labor relations is the motion accepted by industry and labor in 1941. That did not destroy any rights. That merely said that we will turn to the techniques of peace rather than the technique of war for the settlement of our disputes and for the attainments of our objectives. That should be fundamental in America. Our courts do not always pronounce absolute justice, but no one would like to see disputes between Americans or between Americans and their Government settled by direct action.

I am a product of the American public school system. I went to kindergarten and I finished with a Ph. D. It took a long time, and I did other things, but during every minute of my education I was exposed to American ideals. If there is a rule of history to which I can turn now as a guide, it would be the 150 years struggle in our own country to make a political concept work and become universally accepted. The founding fathers worked out the Federal system on the simple idea of allowing those things which are of purely local concern to be settled locally, but those which are of common concern to be handled by representatives delegated to speak for all. We builded bigger than we thought. That governmental technique is the basis of our political liberty. It is the key not only to national peace in a nation made up of 48 states, but also it is a key to a theory which can become world-wide. Thus we have created, as a result of American experience, a conception of government which can produce world organization and give us world unity. As a result

of the creation of the Russian Soviet system, Russia furnishes a technique which can expand into a world organization. And the British Commonwealth of Nations idea gives us another pattern.

While men have dreamed of peace since the beginning of time, they did not invent a form of government which might become world-wide and, therefore, insure the peace. No longer is the concept of world government merely theory. No longer is it based upon prayer and aspiration. The way of peace is in the world. Whether the world treads the path of peace remains to be seen. It can only do so if it understands where it is going. Education is a process of leading. The new world needs leadership. We shall succeed or we shall fail, therefore, on the basis of the character of that leadership. Is it to be a leadership based upon the single will with the followers forced to go where they are told? If so, now is the best time to accept fascism as a universal ideal because the world knows its technique better than ever before. Or will it be a leadership growing out of deliberations of trained deliberators, using as a basis for argument the knowledge of history, the facts of society, the understanding of man and his nature. That is the democratic way and by no means the easy way as is the technique of the single will. That, ladies and gentlemen, is for you to answer here in this institute. Will you deal with fundamentals, or will you be satisfied with biased partisan strife, or an unquestioned acceptance of the will of the leader? Your children and your children's children are interested in the answer which you will give to that question.

My prayer is that you will all say that American democracy, American freedom, and American liberty all center in a single concept: individualism with a social conscience and a sense of responsibility; and, when American democracy works and reaches its conclusions, it is understood by all that that which it does, it does by common consent.

American democracy is preserved for us in a Constitution which becomes a guide for our political habits. Thus, the American Constitution is, in very deed, the companion of the American people in the accomplishment of their political, economic, and social aims. Make it your companion in your studies.

The Issue of OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Issue of OPA," from the Long Beach (Calif.) Independent of Friday, April 26, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISSUE OF OPA

There is more misinformation being given the public on the issue of OPA than on any issue in many years. Mr. Bowles would have us believe OPA is perfect, and any changes in the policies he has followed would destroy our entire economy. The Merchants and Manufacturers Association representatives would have us believe all restrictions on prices should be removed. In between these two extreme positions there must be a solution of the present turmoil, or we are in for serious trouble.

We listened to Mr. Bowles on the radio and also his stooges of the CIO, Walter Winchell, and others. From them one would think rentals will go sky high if OPA is restricted. And yet every measure we have heard seriously debated provides for the retention of ceilings on rents until the housing shortage is corrected. In placing emphasis on rents Mr. Bowles and his followers are deliberately misleading the people as to what is being asked for by those who know the present system is wrong.

Sound price control is essential to holding down prices during the period of shortages. But unsound controls have caused most of the shortages we are now suffering. The greatest danger of inflation is from a shortage of goods. When the OPA insists upon policies that make it impossible to produce products at a profit it can only result in further shortages.

We find men who should know better blaming business for not producing for resale at old prices while their labor costs have increased 20 percent. They criticize dairies for not making butter at a loss when the OPA makes it profitable for the dairies to make ice cream. They insist that meat be sold at a loss by legitimate packers to compete with black markets caused by OPA unrealistic rules. Black-market operators have become the greatest benefactors from OPA rule.

OPA head Porter and his chief Mr. Bowles never operated a factory or retail store. They are advertising men who made fortunes creating public demands for products created by skillful management. They advocated and encouraged the CIO demands of a 30-percent increase in wages without an increase in the selling prices of products made by workers. They are now backed by the CIO and other groups which go on the theory that business can absorb any increase in cost without increasing selling prices.

The answer is not the complete elimination of OPA price controls. The answer is to give the controls into the hands of men of experience and character. A gradual increase in prices must be given business if it is to operate at a profit. Without this there will be lowered production and more shortages. With assurance of a profit on what industry sells prices will find lower levels because competition will force them to do so.

Present policies have speeded inflation. Published prices mean little because most products are sold at black-market prices. It is not a nice situation. But when theorists insist upon tinkering with the law of supply and demand or expect anyone to operate without a profit the production machine is certain to come to a stop. OPA should be continued as long as shortages prevail. But it needs to be entirely reorganized and its powers restricted to make it workable.

L. A. C.

Food for the Children of Europe and the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which recently was issued by the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. In my judgment, this statement is an important one. It presents a very wholesome question, as compared to the question of the British treatment of the Jewish people which I have previously discussed today. Instead of the matter of forcing people to make further sacrifices and forcing people to die, this statement refers to action to help people to live. The statement was issued by the archbishops and bishops constituting the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, at the close of their meeting held in Washington, D. C., just a few days ago. In the statement they call upon the people they represent to exert every effort to make real sacrifices to the end that the famine and disease which are sweeping the whole world may be reduced and corrected by the generosity and goodness of our people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The archbishops and bishops constituting the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, at the close of their meeting just held here, issued the following statement. The members of the administrative board are: Samuel Cardinal Stritch, archbishop of Chicago; Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York; John Gregory Murray, archbishop of St. Paul; Joseph F. Rummel, archbishop of New Orleans; John J. Mitty, archbishop of San Francisco; James H. Ryan, archbishop of Omaha; Richard J. Cushing, archbishop of Boston; John Mark Gannon, bishop of Erie; John F. Noll, bishop of Fort Wayne; Karl J. Alter, bishop of Toledo. Cardinal Stritch is chairman of the administrative board, Archbishop Murray is vice chairman, Cardinal Spellman is secretary and bishop Gannon is treasurer.

"Famine is killing millions of people. Its victims, weakened in body and in spirit, increase in number each day. We who know not the pangs of hunger must hearken to the pitiful cries of our brothers in Christ. Self-discipline and self-denial on our part will save countless lives. From our overflowing granaries, yea from what we wantonly waste, we can do much to relieve their utter destitution. Bread must become for us a holy thing; for it means life to a multitude of God's children.

"Mindful of this dire need, the bishops of our country are appealing to the faithful to give unstintingly in the campaign for food for the children of Europe and the Far East during the week, beginning on Mother's Day, May 12. We are confident that the response will be a fitting testimony of Christlike love for our neighbors in need. Moreover, we earnestly urge our fellow Americans to heed the plea of our Government to release their reserve stores of wheat that the hungry may eat.

"Relief of hunger is indeed the pressing need of the moment. We know that the shortage of food is due in large measure to the terrible devastation wrought by war. Yet, thinking men will not limit their vision to this fact. They will look down beyond to find deeper causes for the chaos that now afflicts suffering humanity.

"Europe's misery has been aggravated by moral and economic disorders that could have been prevented. Undue delay in reaching peace settlements has fostered instability and paralyzed reconstruction. Eastern or "bread" Europe has been artificially

walled off from western Europe. Multitudes of civilians and prisoners of war have been deported and degraded into forced labor unworthy of human beings. Occupying soldiery, living off the land, are consuming already depleted food stores. Great masses of unfortunate people have been stripped of their goods and then driven like cattle from their native soil into strange areas where they are homeless, helpless and friendless. Inevitably, famine breeds fear and unrest; and unrest jeopardizes the hope of peace for which mankind is longing.

"Justice cries out against these violations of the moral order. There can be no peace while they endure. Injustice is the helpmate of famine and their offspring is chaos. Order among men and nations can come only from the practice of justice and mercy in human relations. The moral order set down by the Maker of the Universe is the only charter given to men whereby they may find peace and security."

The Alcatraz Riot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Alcatraz Riot" published in the Washington Evening Star of May 4, 1946. In my opinion this editorial well vindicates the wisdom and judgment of the Attorney General of the United States in establishing this kind of a prison for our more dangerous criminals. Last week's events justify the wisdom of those who founded that penitentiary.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ALCATRAZ RIOT

The latest ill-fated attempt of some of the Nation's most notorious desperadoes to escape from Alcatraz Prison provides additional evidence of the soundness of the Government's decision in 1933 to use "The Rock" as an isolation center for hardened convicts of the "public enemy" type. The original plan for a sort of American "Devil's Island" in San Francisco Bay was adopted by the Department of Justice over the protests of some well-intentioned sociologists, to say nothing of alarmed residents of San Francisco. The attitude of a few of the critics was similar to that taken by former Attorney General Frank Murphy, who felt that the atmosphere at Alcatraz was too stern. However, Attorney General Cummings, in advancing the project, declared that some isolated penitentiary was needed to safeguard the public from the scandalous series of prison breaks which marked the gangster era of the late twenties and early thirties.

There is no doubt as to the sternness of Alcatraz, but, as Mr. Cummings pointed out in advocating the prison, the incorrigible convicts confined there are of a kind that understand and respect only the sternest of penal measures. They are killers, kidnapers, and other criminals whose records are such as to give little or no hope of reformation. Most of them have escaped from other Federal or State prisons one or more times. In Alcatraz they find virtually all reasonable hope of escape gone. That does not mean that these desperate men ever completely give up hope of making a break, however. Warden James E. Johnston, a successful banker who became a penologist because he was interested in the subject of criminal detention and reform, has never claimed that Alcatraz is escape-proof. "We only hoped it was," he said after the frustrated break of 1939 in which Arthur "Doc" Barker of the Karpis-Barker kidnaping gang was shot to death as he and four other convicts reached the water's edge. Only two prisoners ever succeeded in leaving the island and officials are convinced both of them drowned in the swirling currents which sweep around "The Rock."

Only a careful investigation will determine whether the latest attempt, which already has cost the lives of two guards, was due to any relaxation of vigilance on the part of the prison staff or to other preventable causes. Whatever the origin of the break, Warden Johnston and his staff deserve commendation for the courage with which they met the vicious challenge of the embattled convicts. And the country may well be glad that this battle took place in so remote a spot as Alcatraz—not in some community where innocent citizens would have been imperiled.

Which Has More Vitality—John L. Lewis or the American Constitution?

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of this day contains an editorial which correctly sets forth the causes of the industrial strife which this Nation now witnesses. The Washington Post says that—

It is useless to berate Mr. Lewis for his callousness toward American and world need. However, reprehensible it may be, what Mr. Lewis has done is entirely legal. That is the crux. In the absence of any law clearly recognizing and safeguarding the public interest, there is an invitation for economic pressure blocs to prostrate the Nation for their own advantage, whether their leaders be Lewis, Petrillo, or anybody else. * * * There is no cure for the tactic of well-organized minorities in penalizing the people as a whole in order to force attainment of their ends except in legislation—broad and not particular legislation which states the supremacy of the public interest and defines the legitimate realm of union activity beyond which that activity infringes on public right and becomes a crime.

On yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] stated that there are two sides to the controversy between the coal operators and the coal miners. I do not believe that Mr. SABATH went far enough. In my judgment, there are three sides to the controversy resulting in the present coal strike. One side is that of the coal operators. Another side is that of the coal miners. The third side is that of the American people, and the interests of the American people should be paramount to those of either the coal operators or those of the coal miners.

The industrial unrest which afflicts the public at this moment is the inevitable result of forces which have been operating in this Nation for sometime. As a people, we have permitted the Government to ignore the political philosophy that the Government should extend equal rights to all men, but grant special privileges to none. This wise principle has been flouted by men in executive, legislative, and judicial positions in the Nation and in the several States for some years. Government has either expressly or impliedly granted special privileges to organized minorities at the expense of the American people. This is especially true in respect to certain bodies of organized labor. The extension of these special privileges to particular bodies of organized labor has resulted from the joint action of two diverse groups of public officials. One of these groups has been composed of sincere men who believed that such special privileges were necessary to counterbalance the actual or supposed economic weakness of labor. The other group has consisted of officeholders who have paid more heed to the political power of organized labor than they have to the general welfare of the American people.

Special privileges granted to organized minorities have often been extended through policies practiced by public officials. Sometimes such special privileges have been expressly extended through legislative enactments. Perhaps the most glaring instance of the extension of special privileges to organized minorities is to be found in the National Labor Relations Act, which is generally known by the name of its author, Senator WAGNER, of New York. The Wagner Act was an innovation in the field of American law. It prohibits certain unfair labor practices on the part of employers, but, ostrich-like, ignores the fact that unfair labor practices are sometimes perpetrated by employees. It requires employers to bargain with employees, but it does not impose upon employees any corresponding obligation to bargain with employers. The mistake arising out of this omission in the Wagner Act is illustrated forcefully by the attitude of John L. Lewis in the present coal strike. John L. Lewis steadfastly proclaims to the coal operators and to the general public and to the Government that he will not even advise anybody of the bargain the miners desire until he is first assured that a royalty will be paid to the United Mine Workers upon each ton of coal mined.

The Wagner Act is an unwise piece of legislation because it grants rights to labor without imposing upon labor corresponding duties. It is also unwise because it constitutes a rank perversion and prostitution of the judicial processes. The most fundamental principle of any system of justice worthy of the name is that every person who brings a controversy to a tribunal for judgment shall have that controversy determined by an impartial judge. The Wagner Act expressly prevents the application of this fundamental principle to controversies falling within the purview of the act. It insures its purpose that controversies covered by it shall not be determined with the cold neutrality of the

impartial judge by providing, in substance, that the National Labor Relations Board shall institute and prosecute all prosecutions under the act and shall also be the judge of whether such prosecutions be well or ill founded. Justice cannot live under law which undertakes to unite the impartiality of the judge with the partisanship of the prosecutor.

The only long-range solution of industrial unrest, such as the paralyzing coal strike, is to be found in a comprehensive labor code granting to employers their proper rights and imposing upon employers their proper duties, and granting to labor, both organized and unorganized, its proper rights and imposing upon labor, both organized and unorganized, its proper duties, and recognizing that there is a third party to all labor controversies, namely, the American public, and safeguarding the rights of such public. The enforcement of such comprehensive labor code should be committed to an impartial labor court composed of judges who represent the public and are special pleaders for neither the cause of capital nor the cause of labor.

Of course, such a labor code cannot be enacted and such a labor court cannot be set up in time to settle the present coal strike. When the Members of the House of Representatives visited their homes during the Christmas vacation, they evidently learned that the American people are demanding some relief from the injuries which they constantly suffer as innocent bystanders at the constant fights between capital on the one hand and labor on the other.

A substantial majority of the Members of the House of Representatives voted in favor of the Case bill during the month of February and sent it to the Senate, where it now rests in the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. This bill represented a sincere effort on the part of sincere men to afford the public some protection against the injuries suffered by it as a result of the constant labor strife. Many people criticized this bill, but none of such critics have proposed any other remedy for the economic ills resulting from boycotts and strikes.

I have conceded that a comprehensive labor code cannot be enacted by Congress in time to stop the current coal strike. I am not one, however, who believes that this is a sufficient reason for the President and the Congress to assume the position that nothing can be done to avert the national disaster incident to the coal strike. The mining of coal for use in interstate commerce and the use of coal in interstate commerce is absolutely essential to the preservation of the public health and the public safety and the public economy.

It is my understanding that under existing law the President has the power to seize and operate the coal mines. It is said that the coal miners would not obey any request on the part of the Government that they return to work in the mines. This may be true. Nevertheless, it seems to me that the Government should seize the mines and take such steps as may be necessary to insure proper living and working conditions for the miners while such mines remain in Government control and at least give the miners an opportunity to return to work and thereby avert the impending national disaster. If this action proved futile, then the Government should resort to other measures. The Federal Constitution expressly provides that the Congress has the power to regulate commerce "with foreign nations and among the several States."

There is no natural or constitutional right for any group of men to strike in cases where the public safety and the public health and the public economy are involved. Such a legal right exists now merely because the Congress has been reluctant to exercise the constitutional powers given it for the protection of the welfare of the Nation. It is true that no man can be compelled to work against his will. It is not true that any group of men has a right to strike when it knows that such strike will endager the public health and the public safety and the public economy. Congress undoubtedly has constitutional authority under the Interstate Commerce clause to enact legislation prohibiting strikes endangering the public health and the public safety and the public economy. Some persons in high places assert that such a law cannot be enforced. This may be true.

However, it is high time for the American people to learn which has more vitality—John L. Lewis or the American Constitution.

Wheat and Bread in Kansas

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD a telegram that I received from the mayor of Salina, Kans. This city is located in the heart of the Wheat Belt, which is the largest milling center in the United States. Flour mills are closing and bakeries unable to get needed flour. Some grocery stores are selling only one loaf of bread to a housewife. Many people are thrown out of employment. It seems almost unbelievable that such a thing could happen in the Wheat Belt of the United States. The above-mentioned conditions are the result of ill-advised and ill-conceived regulations. How long must our people put up with this mismanagement and maladministration of our economy?

The telegram referred to follows:

SALINA, KANS., *May 5, 1946.*

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Today in Salina, Kans., in the center of the greatest wheat-growing section and the fifth milling center in the United States, we are witnessing the strange spectacle of bakeries and grocery stores limiting housewives to one loaf of bread if they have any at all. Flour mills are closing and flour getting scarce—all on account of OPA paying 30 cents per bushel over ceiling price for wheat which is similar to the black market on livestock which prohibits the packers from paying more than ceiling prices while others pay over-ceiling prices and get the livestock. News reports say that the OPA have also reduced the size of the loaf and increased the price. What better proof is necessary to show OPA control raises prices and creates scarcities.

If they are sincere in their efforts to quickly feed the hungry why not ship the flour instead of the wheat—all reports say that 80 percent of the mills were destroyed by war. It would at least keep our flour mills running.

It looks like a concerted effort to strip this Nation of huge amounts of grain and livestock that could easily get out of hand and cause a famine here in America. Are our so-called humanitarians getting out of hand and running wild?

I trust you will use your best efforts to curb the OPA and do away with many of their ceilings, especially on livestock and grain products.

J. H. MOORE, Jr.,
Mayor, City of Salina.

Report on the Serious Shortage of Feed by the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say that there is a shortage of feed in practically every part of the country. The situation is terrible in the Eastern and Northeastern States.

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee has made a survey of this problem and has made a report, a copy of which we have sent to the membership. I think this report would be enlightening to the membership and the public, and having gotten permission to have it printed in the RECORD, I hereby offer it as a part of my remarks:

A REPORT ON THE FEED SITUATION

DISTRIBUTION

The shortage which has now reached critical proportions is the result of maldistribution rather than actual undersupply. Administration fumbling and uncertainty have retarded the normal movement of feed grains and in addition have resulted in heavier than normal use of food grains for feed in producing areas. Wheat is badly needed for human food and with proper Government direction of other feed commodities, additional wheat could have been used for food and, at the same time, there would have been a better supply of animal feed. Poor judgment in fixing price ceilings by the administration, and their hasty efforts to circumvent these ceilings when they discovered that they were unworkable have contributed to the present crisis.

THIRTY-CENT BONUS

The recent decision of the administration to permit the Commodity Credit Corporation

to pay a 30-cent bounty on corn and wheat has precipitated the current feed crisis. While this move had the approval of some wise food authorities, it was in practice an implied approval of the huge black market which has been in operation. It is a case of the Government going into the black market to buy supplies it could not obtain at ceiling prices. The black-market price of corn has for some time been about 30 cents a bushel above the ceiling. The Government is now paying this black-market price—but farmers, feed manufacturers, and all other private citizens must pay only OPA ceiling prices or subject themselves to criminal action.

EFFECT

The effect of this move is exactly what might have been anticipated. The Department of Agriculture reports that there is no wheat or corn moving in the market whatever except to the Commodity Credit Corporation. Grain dealers have canceled contracts with feed manufacturers and many feed manufacturers have been forced to quit. Farmers and private citizens are unable to buy even a bushel of wheat or corn through legitimate channels.

AREAS AFFECTED

From reports reaching this committee it is indicated that the areas worst affected by this artificial feed shortage are the areas on which the large cities of the eastern seaboard depend for their dairy and poultry products: The poultry-raising section of New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, and the dairy and poultry section of New England. The situation in these areas is very critical.

FEED ON HAND

Reports indicate that the supplies of feed manufacturers and dealers in the affected areas are fast running out. Some have a maximum supply of approximately 2 weeks. Feed in farmers' bins is also almost exhausted.

RESULTS

The immediate results will be (1) destruction of poultry flocks and curtailment, even involving liquidation, of many dairy herds; (2) a shortage of milk and fresh eggs in many eastern metropolitan areas in about 3 weeks. Unless the situation is remedied immediately it will be too late. Long-range results will be a general reduction of dairy production capacity in the feed shortage areas, drastic curtailment of poultry production, with the possibility of a resulting serious shortage of dairy and poultry products in the affected areas next fall and winter. As an indication, orders for baby chicks placed with hatcheries in the East have declined approximately 50 percent in the past week.

REMEDY

Department of Agriculture officials with whom this situation has been discussed appear to be seriously disorganized because of the succession of wild orders affecting grain that have been thrown at them in the past few weeks by top-level administration officials. They admit the situation is bad, but have no remedy to propose. Said one of them pathetically, "We can't live with this situation very long. Not a bushel of grain is moving to feed manufacturers in the shortage areas. Something will have to be done—I wish I knew what."

RECOMMENDATIONS

Since this situation is the result of top-level efforts to correct what is essentially an unbalanced price situation, there is little the operating staff of the Department of Agriculture can do about it. Complaints from your constituents should be referred to Mr. Chester Bowles.

Reclamation Program

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind but that the items deleted from the Bureau of Reclamation appropriation will seriously handicap the reclamation program, and adversely affect the Western States.

The success for the full development of irrigation in the West is contingent upon the public power aspects of the reclamation program. The full conservation and utilization of the water of the western rivers depend upon the development and marketing of the potential hydropower. There is a definite ceiling on the price a farmer can pay for irrigation water, and make ends meet. The development of the multiple-purpose project, under which the sale of power must return not only the costs allocated to power, but also part of the costs of the irrigation developments, brings within the scope of economic feasibility the development of thousands of acres of land which otherwise would be impossible.

To make this possible, widespread markets must be found for power, and this can be done only if the driving purpose behind power marketing is to make new farms and homes and jobs available for the people, rather than to yield dividends to shareholders in power companies.

If the Bureau of Reclamation is deprived of funds to build Government transmission lines, the outlet for the power generated at reclamation dams would be limited to those consumers who are served through the transmission lines of private power companies. The effect of this would be to give the power companies control over the extent of the power market, the availability of power to the people, and the rates to be charged.

We all know that the objective of a private company is to earn dividends. Thus, in the marketing of power, the emphasis would be placed on making profits, rather than on finding ways to enhance the feasibility of irrigation projects. Furthermore, the incentive to give better and lower cost service, which is born of competition, would be lost. And, not of least importance, the Bureau of Reclamation would be deprived of the means of carrying out the requirement of Congress that governmental agencies and cooperatives be given preference in the marketing of hydropower.

The power companies have not demonstrated that they will be hurt in the least by the construction of Government power transmission lines. In fact, they should be helped, since the result of the successful application of the Government's program will be to create a market for power that will challenge the ability of both the Government and private enterprise to serve.

Everyone should be fully aware of the importance of irrigation to the West, where rainfall is insufficient to sustain successful farming over great areas. The preponderance of agriculture must look to irrigation works by the Bureau of Reclamation for the moisture with which to grow crops, and industry based on agriculture, too, is dependent upon reclamation's program.

The rapid growth of the West already has overstrained the available water supply, and the reclamation program must be pushed forward with utmost energy if the development of agriculture and industry is to keep up with the needs of the West.

Therefore, it is imperative that this Congress support the people of the West, and help the entire United States, by appropriating to the Bureau of Reclamation the full amount requested for its program. This is a wise investment that will accrue to the benefit of everybody, and harm nobody. These projects are not only self-liquidating but the power itself pays thousands of dollars in taxes and creates many new industries and incomes which also pay taxes to the States and Federal Government.

John L. Lewis

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that I am a believer and a follower in the doctrine that the resources of this country belong to the people—in other words, in taxation of land values. I am not going to put myself down as believing in each statement that Mr. Ramage makes. In the case of John L. Lewis, with reference to this poem by Mr. Baker, of the Fifty-eighth Congress, I do not want to say that I believe in his statement as it stands. But it shows how people are thinking, and it shows the seriousness of this case. The poem is entitled "By Sufferance."

The matter referred to is as follows:

WHAT EVERY STATESMAN SHOULD KNOW

(By Matthew Ramage)

That the Creator gave the land to all the people.

That at least 60 percent of mankind in the United States are robbed of their birthright.

That these landless people are paying the landowners for the right to live on the land.

That the rental value of all land is created by the growth of population in this or any country.

That this land rental should be taken by the Nation, the States, and municipalities to pay the expenses of government.

That if this were done we could remit all other taxes.

It has been estimated that the rents collected now amount to $9,704,000,000 annually. This does not include land owned by individuals and corporations, and held for speculation on which no rent is shown, which would in all probability amount to $10,000,000,000 more if collected by the Nation, States, and municipalities. The land-rent tax could be collected for about 10 percent of the present cost of collecting taxes.

Whatever public improvement is made in any community increases the rent the landless people must pay.

That this increase goes on and becomes more acute as advancing civilization goes on.

All improvements reflect higher and higher rent.

Statesmen should know the disastrous results of taxes on production, how such taxes retard the building of homes, manufactures, and everything the people need for their comfort and use.

That there is a law of economics as surely as there is a law of gravitation.

That the value which attaches to land is unearned increment.

Do statesmen want to see our civilization go down in blood—as every great civilization has gone down in the past?

Away down the centuries dead empires testify that this will happen to us unless we conform to justice in reference to the Creator's bounty.

Civilization in most European and Asiatic countries are on the downward trend. Poverty, despair, and crime everywhere, where land is monopolized. Every statesman should know that wars cannot be stopped until we conform to the eternal principles of justice, which are clearly obvious in nature.

Abraham Lincoln said: "The land, the earth, God gave to man for his home, sustenance, and support, and should never be the possession of any man or corporation or unfriendly Government any more than air or water, if as much."

Jefferson, Paine, Winston Churchill, and many great statesmen have declared that land should not be property or treated as such.

We pray for the coming of the Kingdom, but it can never come as long as we ignore this injustice.

Henry George, the greatest political economist of all time, has been on the other side of life for 48 years. He has written most eloquently many books, and in them has shown statesmen how to establish real democracy and bring peace and plenty to America. Every statesman should read and understand Henry George's Land Question, Protection or Free Trade, Social Problems, Progress and Poverty, etc.

Land reform is a true reform for it will make all other reforms easier.

BY SUFFERANCE

(By Robert Baker, Member, Fifty-eighth Congress)

In the "ukase" of John L. L—
That which ne'er before befell,
Has it alone by tyrannic power,
Peculiar to this day or hour!

Is he a recent excrescence,
A modern or a new offence,
Is economic tyranny,
Something new, men bowing the knee!

Though vigorous men now lambaste,
We should beware of sudden haste,
Maybe we thus might open wide,
The door behind which many hide;

Aye, "land"-lordism! Did Lewis create?
He's a mere pivot of its estate,
A limitless realm, vast taxing power,
Operating in every hour.

The Lewis blatant arrogance,
To government shows defiance,
Those who role of teachers take,
To what's basic must needs awake.

These are world's most portentous times,
For basic rights ring freedom's chimes,
No power could a Lewis reveal
When we end the land-values steal.

Its annual increment assess,
E'en the newborn babe greatly bless,
Lewis should be an education,
Aye, to men of every station.

Let's get to the root of this thing,
Join our voices, the welkin ring,
Land is man's common heritage,
Then wipe out cruel "land"-lord page.

Open land now to widespread use,
End the age-old "land"-lord abuse,
Its tyranny forever laid,
Of millennium who's afraid?

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *May 24, 1943.*

Brooklyn Leads Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pleasure that I inform the House of a most constructive and original experiment that was recently conducted in the schools of the borough of Brooklyn under the sponsorship and leadership of Edward J. Quigley, acting postmaster. The Brooklyn post office promoted on April 15, 1946, a postal zone day designed to make the children of the schools of Brooklyn, and through them the residents of Brooklyn, more conscious of the benefits to be derived from including the postal zone in addressing letters and other mailing matter. The day was sponsored in conjunction with the officials of the board of education of the city and the heads of the parochial schools in the borough. It was submitted as a civic lesson for the day and already has had gratifying results. The use of the postal zone has increased from about 20 percent to almost 40 percent and is gradually rising. To further the campaign Acting Postmaster Quigley is arranging for providing the zone number on pass books, deposit slips and even check books, and he has been informed that the motor vehicle bureau of the State will provide especially for the zone number on all application forms for driver's and chauffeur's licenses. Assistance is also being rendered by the major business houses of Brooklyn. The acting postmaster is, indeed, to be congratulated on the fine work that he has been doing not only in this particular regard but in the general maintenance of the high standards of the Brooklyn post office.

I have received a letter from the acting postmaster which I take the liberty of including in these remarks.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES POST OFFICE,
BROOKLYN, N. Y., *May 2, 1946.*

Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENE: The Brooklyn Post Office promotion of Postal Zone Day on April 15, 1946, was a startling success.

In conjunction with officials of the board of education of the city and heads of parochial schools, who developed districts, precincts, and zones into an agreeable program of educational schedules wherein each pupil in school would write a card or envelope indicating their home address including the proper zone number. Submitted as classroom routine, or a civic lesson for the day, each pupil would take the card home for parent's signature, thereby planting the knowledge in the parent's mind, as well as in the mind of the pupil. The teacher on receiving the acknowledged cards then returned them to the pupils for retention and reference at home.

The immediate results are most gratifying. From a series of spot checks running from 18.6 to 21.4 percent, we have jumped to 38.4 and this is rising rapidly.

To further our campaign all banks, savings and State, are providing for zone numbers inclusion in pass books, deposit slips and even check books. The Motor Vehicle Bureau at Albany assures us all application forms for new automobile and driver's licenses will provide space for the zone number.

The major business houses are helping tremendously. It is the individual we must reach and teach. If the optimum is reached of say 80 percent, we'll be very happy. Naturally it will speed the mails, and to that end Brooklyn aspires.

Cordially,

EDWARD J. QUIGLEY.

While Paralysis Creeps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the Appendix of the RECORD some remarks I submitted to the Judiciary Subcommittee upon the subject of royalties to unions. I wish to also include an editorial from the Omaha Evening World-Herald, of May 3, 1946, entitled "While Paralysis Creeps."

The matter referred to follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. A. L. MILLER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FOURTH DISTRICT, NEBRASKA, BEFORE THE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 1946

Mr. Chairman, I appear in support of H. R. 6230 and H. R. 6259. These bills are designed to make unlawful the levying of royalties by unions. The demand of royalties by any union is but another form of taxation. It is wrong in principle. The Congress and the legal political subdivisions are the only bodies that have the right to levy taxes.

There is a growing tendency in this country for racketeering labor leaders to throw their strength and power around much to the detriment of the public. It is time that this Congress and strong individuals take the leadership and represent the American people. We should have foremost in our minds the public interest.

When I was in Detroit 2 weeks ago, I found the teamsters' union demanding that all merchants, large and small, belong to their union before any meat or food would be delivered to their stores. The next step would be to require that every individual purchasing this food belong to the unions. The CIO farm-machinery workers have already demanded that all dealers, large and small, belong to their CIO union before farm ma-

chinery will be delivered to them. The next step would be to require all farmers to pay a tribute, and belong to the union before they could purchase farm machinery.

I introduced H. R. 2818, on March 28, 1945, which was a bill to make unlawful contracts and practices in connection with labor unions. The bill, being referred to the Committee on Labor, took its place with a score of other bills designed to protect the public interest.

The President has referred to the present coal strike as a national disaster. The Administration seems to be impotent and does not act. It seems that John L. Lewis is doing nothing illegal. He is entirely within the law. All strikes are within the law. The administration supported the steel, the auto, and other strikes. They have been encouraging the unions to seek higher wages. How else can they get higher wages without striking and making demands upon industry? The collecting of a tax from labor was established by Petrillo. He has been collecting royalties on electrical recordings for a long time. He is still collecting royalties. There seems to be nothing in the Wagner Act which would prohibit Lewis, Petrillo, or any other labor union leader from these outrageous actions. Unless Congress does something to stop individuals like Lewis, Petrillo, Tobin, and others from enforcing their outrageous demands, at the point of strikes, picket lines, and violence, America will soon become some kind of a Hitler's gangster land. If we permit them the power to tax by royalty or any other kind of a tax, we give them the power to enthrone fascist tyranny upon this country.

Our Government must be a government of law and not of men. The Congress and the administration must not abandon principle and substitute expediency for the impartial administration of law

John L. Lewis and other labor union leaders have it within their power to tie up the entire country worse than any Hitler, Mussolini, or Stalin has even been able to do. We should not tolerate an entire nation being clubbed into submission by Hitler, Lewis, Tobin, or any other individual. To be clubbed into submission means tyranny. Small tyrannies soon grow so large that they cannot be handled by the legal, constituted machinery of the Nation.

The miners, even though they wanted to go back to work, do not dare to work. They would be kicked out of their union, lose their jobs, and their families would be in want.

The bill which I introduced would also outlaw the closed shop, because I believe it is a weapon of coercion. The administration is to blame for the closed shop. They are to blame for permitting foremen to organize. It is the action of the administration, in the past and present, which is slowly paralyzing industry, and putting, not only the coal miners, but American industry and its people in the wringer. The Government has encouraged the placing of public power in private hands.

Mr. Chairman, it is the responsibility of Congress to immediately reestablish government by law and not by men. We must face this problem with courage. The responsibility is ours, and the hour is late.

[From the Omaha Evening World-Herald of May 3, 1946]

WHILE PARALYSIS CREEPS

"John L. Lewis and his coal strike have the Truman administration buffaloed. While paralysis creeps through the basic industries of the Nation, the President and his advisers are deep in gloom and irresolution. * * * If the President decided to make Lewis behave, he would have behind him all the power of the Government and the wholehearted support of the people. * * *

"A British official has said that 'a democratic government must be careful not to expose its own impotence.' Now, the country is treated to just such an exposure in the face of a possible economic disaster. The administration's fretfulness will not pass for authority, much less action. The Nation has reached a point where the only answer to the anarchy of Lewis is determination in the White House."

The foregoing acrid comment comes from no hostile quarter but from one of the ablest and most devoted newspaper friends of Mr. Truman and his administration—the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

That newspaper speaks, with a harshness it regrets is necessary, because it is alarmed over a condition of "creeping paralysis" threatening "economic disaster," while the administration "exposes its own impotence" in an atmosphere of "fretfulness, gloom, and irresolution."

Alarm is by no means confined to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. It is infecting the entire people regardless of political complexion. Nor is it occasioned solely by the administration exhibition of impotence faced with the "anarchy of Lewis" and his attempted sabotaging of American industry.

Lewis' is not the only anarchy, his not the only sabotage. It is only a continuation, on a somewhat more defiant scale, of what has been going on in the Nation for many months, retarding reconversion and production, introducing misunderstanding and ill-will between management and labor, weakening the entire economic fabric, while Washington has remained irresolute and helpless. In fact it has poured fuel on the flames of unrest and dissension.

Nor has the weakness been confined to the White House. It has been equally in evidence in the Congress, where the Members play politics with a grave situation, too many of them regarding their own reelection, however gained, as the objective of first consequence.

One of the leaders of the Democratic side of Congress, Representative RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, acting chairman of the Labor Committee, warned the country Wednesday that if the existing demoralization continues "we might as well recognize that we face nationalization of industry as a possible alternative."

Meanwhile the administration, in both the executive and legislative branches, remains irresolute and "exposes its own impotence."

Those are the words of a good friend. They are not inaccurately chosen.

American Members of Executive Committee of Jewish Agency for Palestine Thank President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to put in the RECORD the statement appearing in the Boston Daily Globe of Monday, May 6, 1946, containing a letter of thanks addressed to the President by the American members of the executive committee of the Jewish Agency for Palestine.

I join with the signers of this letter in expressing gratitude to the President for his efforts to get immediate issuance of 100,000 certificates of immigration for homeless Jews to settle in Palestine. The President carefully read the report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine, and very properly approved the recommendations of that committee that 100,000 Jews be admitted into Palestine at once, and that the restrictions of land ownership and land purchases as embodied in the so-called white paper of 1939, be abrogated.

On all other provisions of the report, the President has reserved comment. He makes these reservations very properly.

Frankly, in my humble opinion, the balance of the report and the balance of the recommendations are ill advised and contrary to the terms of the mandate which set up Palestine as a Jewish national homeland.

The article appearing in the Boston Daily Globe is as follows:

WASHINGTON, May 6.—The White House today made public the following letter from the Jewish Agency for Palestine, expressing gratitude for the work of the Anglo-American committee which recommended the return of 100,000 displaced persons to Palestine:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned American members of the executive committee of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, deem it our duty to address to you our profoundest satisfaction with the adoption by the Anglo-American committee of your proposal with respect to the 100,000 displaced persons. We believe, as you do, that it is of the first importance to proceed without delay with the implementation of the program in relation to the actual transfer of the 100,000 to Palestine.

"We desire to take this means, Mr. President, to pledge to you our fullest cooperation in this great task, not only on behalf of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, but also on behalf of the great number of American Zionists whom we have the honor to represent. Our organization here on the continent and in Palestine is at your disposal in the execution of any part of the program that may be assigned to us.

"With deepest appreciation of the statesmanlike and humane spirit which prompted you to take the initiative in this historic move, and with renewed assurance of our abiding gratitude, we have the honor to remain,

"Respectfully yours,

"ABBA HILLEL SILVER,
"NAHUM GOLDMAN,
"ELIAHU EPSTEIN,
"Washington Representative,
"STEPHEN S. WISE,
"LOUIS LIPSKY,
"MEYER W. WEISGAL,
"Secretary."

The Public Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there has just been submitted to me from the Citizens Public Expenditure Survey of New York State a resolution. This is a timely presentation of facts relating to our public debt, except that there could have been added to the resolution the fact that, if contingent liabilities and obligations of the United States were to be included, the total amount would be not less than $650,000,000,000.

With the national wealth estimated at probably three hundred and fifty billions the picture is not very reassuring especially when under the President's proposed budget expenditures the deficit financing program is to continue.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a resolution adopted by the board of trustees of the Citizens Public Expenditure Survey of New York State:

Whereas it is estimated that the national debt as of June 30, 1946, will be $275,000,000,000; and

Whereas this debt represents directly or indirectly that amount of savings by citizens of the United States; and

Whereas the future welfare of this Nation and its citizens will depend on the orderly payment of that debt largely, but by no means entirely, due to war; and

Whereas retirement of this debt can only be effectively begun by putting the Federal Government once more on a balanced-budget basis; and

Whereas certain Members of Congress from both Houses have declared themselves in favor of balancing the Federal Budget for the year beginning July 1, 1946: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of trustees of the Citizens Public Expenditure Survey of New York State hereby commends the position taken by this bipartisan group in Congress and recommends, in the interest of the future welfare of the Nation and its citizens, that Federal budgets after July 1, 1946, be balanced and that this be accomplished by reduction of expenditures, not by increased taxation.

The Retiring British Ambassador and the Countess of Halifax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial by Mr. Arthur Krock, of the New York Times, of Friday, May 3, 1946, on the retiring British Ambassador, Lord Halifax, and also an editorial from the New York Times entitled "Lord Halifax Goes Home":

TRIUMPH OF A MISSION AND A MISSIONARY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—One week from today the British Ambassador to Washington is going home to stay. The Earl of Halifax is retiring from public life after a career in politics, statesmanship, and diplomacy which few of his own nation have excelled in scope or quality. He has been Foreign Minister and War Minister and Minister of Agriculture. He has been Viceroy of India and leader of the House of Lords. But in his final post Halifax has achieved his greatest triumph, for as Britain's wartime envoy to the United States he was subjected to his most severe test.

The Ambassador came to Washington while confident critics of the Munich settlement, in his country and this, were still assailing all members of the Chamberlain government for making it. In this government Lord Halifax had been foreign minister. They were assailing it on the very assumption that Hjalmar Schacht today, trying to save his neck in Nuremberg, sought to establish as an historical truth: that Hitler never dreamed the French and British would hand over the Sudetenland and was ready to settle for the autonomy of the Germans in Czechoslovakia. These critics waved aside the fact that, if the British had proceeded on this theory and war had been the consequence, they were defenseless from air attack. They also ignored the telegram which President Roosevelt sent to Hitler before Munich, and after the French and British at Berchtesgaden had agreed to recommend the cession of the Sudetenland, urging the dictator to continue peaceful negotiation on that basis.

Nevertheless, this critical chorus gave an encore in full voice when it was announced that a man of Munich was to be the British Ambassador to Washington. His situation was not eased by the circumstance that his predecessor, the Marquis of Lothian, in his brief period of service before his sudden death, had attained very great popularity in this country.

CRITICS WON OVER

Now, at the end of 5 years, the dissenters are silent, or join the overwhelming tributes to Halifax. The contrast with Lothian, which at the time was mentioned unfavorably by many, has been forgotten. It would not be responsibly questioned in Washington that the retiring Ambassador will leave the United States with the respect and admiration of all in Government here and with the record of a hard task brilliantly performed for his own people.

Long public experience explains in part this official and personal triumph. House of Commons training is a good school for Britons who must deal with American politicians. Terms as Foreign Minister and as Viceroy teach an intelligent public servant where pitfalls lie and how to avoid them. But Halifax was born with the gifts of compassion and humor, too, and all his life he has held a simple faith that cherishes the equality of all in the sight of Providence as well as as in the concept of western democracy. This he unaffectedly reveals in every association, which includes all kinds of people.

But even these gifts and acquirements do not entirely explain the unusual place the Ambassador has made for himself in the United States, while always keeping foremost the interests of his nation. Personal charm, natural preference for country life and field sports, and ready humor that Americans like to think "is not British at all" help to account for it. His predecessors—Sir Ronald Lindsay and Lord Lothian in particular—had many of the same attributes. Yet popular appreciation of them was much more limited.

Sir Ronald showed himself a master diplomat during a mission that could not have been exceeded for difficulty—the period in which American neutrality moved to the repeal of the embargo on arms. But because he had no relish for crowds, dining about, and the questionings of the press, his friendly personality and hearty humor were not widely known.

Lothian's tenure was all too brief. Halifax is free of Lindsay's inhibitions, and destiny granted him the time to carry out his errand that it denied to Lothian. In this time also he has visited the 48 States, which is another record for any foreign envoy.

BY WAY OF ANECDOTE

There are many examples of his wit and humor. Just before the Presidential election of 1944 the Ambassador was in the State of Washington, and Republicans were watching hopefully for any chance remark by a British spokesman that was favorable to the reelection of President Roosevelt, certain it would swing many votes to their ticket. A reporter asked Halifax whom he would vote for if he had a vote. "Make me a citizen," he answered, "and I'll tell you."

Of the question of India he once remarked, "The charm of the problem is that the further you get away from it the easier it seems."

At St. Louis on one occasion he and Lady Halifax were taken to the zoo, where a band of gifted monkeys performed for them. After the act the star of the troupe was introduced to their excellencies, and Lady Halifax took him in her arms. A junior became agitated and asked the Ambassador what they would think of this in England if a photograph of the Countess and the ape were published there, "Oh, that will be all right," said he. "The women will all wish they were Lady Halifax, and the men will all wish they were the monkey." And there is, of course, his famous comment when some one in Detroit slung an egg: "What a fortunate country where people can throw food at one another."

LORD HALIFAX GOES HOME

Within the next few days Edward Frederick Lindley Wood, first Earl of Halifax, retiring British Ambasador to the United States, will sail for England, after 5 years in Washington. He was a remote figure to most Americans when he steamed up Chesapeake Bay on H. M. S. *King George V,* Britain's newest battleship, in the menacing spring of 1941. The American people know him now. They know that in him there is a deep sincerity, a prodigious knowledge and ability for work and that he is as sincere a friend of us and of our way of life as Britain ever sent to our country to represent her interests here. He probably knows more about us than many of us know about ourselves. How many Americans, for instance, have visited all 48 States, or even studied them seriously? Lord Halifax has. How many United States ambassadors, we wonder, would lay aside diplomatic affairs to talk an hour and a half with a group of demonstrators protesting this country's policy toward, say, Argentina? Lord Halifax did this to an American group protesting Britain's actions in Greece.

The British Ambassador has served his country well, as a reporter to Downing Street about our affairs and as an interpreter of his own land to Americans. He has shown us that the typical Englishman is not too dissimilar from the typical American, holding the same fears, the same high hopes, basically the same loyalties to the same principles and standards. This kinship he never expressed better than in his farewell address before the Pilgrims. He saw in the chapel of St. Paul's in London, dedicated to those Americans who died defending England, and their own land, a symbol of the basic understanding that exists, and must exist, between our two great English-speaking countries, "Let us then go forward," he said, "into the years of peace in that same comradeship which it was our salvation to find in war."

Continuing, he expressed, perhaps, his own philosophy of life when he closed with the quotation from Lincoln: "With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in." He conducted himself to that rule while he was among us. He leaves with our respect, affection, and best wishes.

We shall miss, too, Lady Halifax, who has made as many friends as her husband. She, too, was a symbol in a way, a symbol of the indomitable England that could lose its sons and still face the world bravely and even serenely. Hers was no easy task, with one son killed and another desperately crippled by the war. She never shirked it. She, too, was a good soldier and a good ambassador to us and for her own people.

Eisenhower and ROTC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. R. E. THOMASON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I was recently the guest of General Eisenhower and Speaker RAYBURN on a visit to Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College at College Station. That is probably the greatest school of its kind in America. In addition to being an outstanding agricultural college, it furnished 7,000 officers to the Army in the recent war, far more than West Point or any other college. It has proved the value of ROTC training. I shall urge Congress to provide funds for the installation of this type of military training in every high school, college, and university in the land that will meet the requirements.

I am sure that the people of Texas and all the Nation rejoice in the fine work and great accomplishment of this outstanding institution. The contribution of its sons in both war and peace has been very large. I predict for it a still greater future.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address of General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, Chief of Staff, United States Army, at the Texas Agricultural and Mechanical sunrise muster service, College Station, Tex., Sunday, April 21, 1946:

This visit to Texas A. & M. allows me to pay at least a first installment on two debts, both of them long overdue. One is to acknowledge, in this Easter morning ceremony, the magnificent contribution made by your college in the gaining of the Allied Victory of 1945. The other is to pay tribute, through this largest of all ROTC units, to the outstanding, even vital, role played by the entire ROTC system in that bitter contest.

Through the lean years following 1918, at a time when possibility of another war seemed, to the public mind, so remote as to challenge the sanity of any individual of contrary view, the nation-wide ROTC system steadily turned out Reserve officers. Between 1919 and our entry into World War II, it produced 112,000, of whom 58,000 were still on the rolls in 1941. In the early days of mobilization, when officer procurement was one of our most critical problems, we had this substantial body to employ. General Marshall called it at the time, "our principal available asset." As the war developed, this asset grew, rather than diminished, in importance. In all, more than 200,000 Reserve officers served on active duty in World War II, and the ROTC was their greatest single source.

Reserve officers from Texas A. & M. served on many fronts in our successful struggle against Germany and Japan. The ROTC of this one institution furnished the Army 7,000 officers—far more than any other college. Figures—and I have already submitted you several—are sometimes more eloquent than words. No more convincing testimony could be given to the manner in which the men of Texas A & M lived up to the ideals and principles inculcated in them during their days on this campus than the simple statement that the Congressional Medal of Honor has been awarded to six former students, that 46 took part in the heroic defense of Bataan and Corregidor, and that nearly 700 are on the list of our battle dead. As one of the field commanders with whom served many of the veterans in this home-coming gathering, I can feel only a lasting admiration for the ROTC of Texas A. & M. This admiration extends to the individual as well as to the institution that produced you.

You met the sternest of all tests. No matter how deep and instinctive our hatred of war, we still are quick to recognize that the weakling cannot measure up to the standard it sets.

Even people who have been so fortunate as to remain strangers to the terror of the diving plane and the nerve-shattering thump of bursting shells, who have not known the sickening smells, the dust, the mud, the stifling heat, the freezing cold of the battlefield, or the bone-deep weariness of marching and firing and digging and crawling, who have not felt the sadness of blank files in the ranks—even these can sense that respect is won in combat only by manifestation of virtues we most admire in men: courage, devotion, endurance, discipline, optimism, mutual help, loyalty.

To these qualities there must be added, for success, still another and vital ingredient.

It is leadership.

Let me say first, and emphatically, that I have nothing but profound admiration for the 800,000 Americans who became officers of the Ground and Air Forces during this last war. They provided the leadership that saved our freedom, our way of life, from powerful enemies. No one can ever deny that accomplishment.

You veterans here know, better than others, that the highest commander cannot, by himself, provide the leadership necessary to tactical victory. He must be supported by a great organization of devoted assistants, the base of which must be the captains, the lieutenants, the sergeants, and corporals—every man that has a position of responsibility over another in the battle. The issue of victory or defeat lies, finally, in their hands.

Through days and months of experience where real leadership was essential to success, you veterans learned to distinguish between the true and the false, between the man who leads and the one who seeks under the cloak of undeserved authority to escape his own proper share of the costs that must be paid to achieve any positive and worthwhile purpose.

You well know that the officer who pretends to a position of human rather than of mere official superiority, who dares not test himself to the fullest before the eyes of his followers, who deliberately thrusts upon his men added danger, suffering, or exhausting work in order that he may himself escape their full impact, is not, in the eyes of his men, an officer and a leader, regardless of the weight of the insignia he carries upon his shoulder.

During the war a broad survey was made to determine what qualities enlisted men considered most important in a good officer. Our soldiers thought the two prime requisites were, first, his ability or competence; second, they named his interest in the welfare of his men. As to his personal attitude, Maj. Gen. John M. Schofield described it well to the cadets at West Point in 1887. He said: "The discipline which makes the soldiers of a free country reliable in battle is not to be gained by harsh or tyrannical treatment. On the contrary, such treatment is far more likely to destroy than to make an army. It is possible to give commands in such manner as to inspire an intense desire to obey, while the opposite manner cannot fail to excite strong resentment and a desire to disobey. The one mode or the other springs from a corresponding spirit in the breast of the commander. He who feels the respect which is due to others cannot fail to inspire in them regard for himself; while he who feels disrespect toward others * * * cannot fail to inspire hatred against himself."

It is the commander who shares, naturally and unpretentiously, in every problem of the group, whether in bivouac or on the battlefield; who gains the confidence of his men and gives to them his own; who shares with them every vicissitude of fortune; who takes no thought of himself until every need of all of his men has been accommodated; who learns from them as much as he can teach them; and who expresses in every word and deed his pride of belonging to the whole, who invariably gains for himself the greatest reward that can come to any man.

This reward is the respect, esteem, and love of his associates. Moreover, his is an elite unit. Such a man is a stranger to resentment from his men. They accord—they demand for him—a position before the world that comes only to those who have rendered honest service to their fellows.

It is this type of officer and leader that the ROTC must develop. It cannot be done in days or weeks—it requires months and years of training, of study, of reflection. The Nation's war needs in officers, if war should again come to us, cannot possibly be met without the ROTC. No Regular Establishment can meet the requirements in numbers, while shorter emergency periods of training, although effective in the rapid selection and specialized combat training of promising material, cannot possibly provide the opportunity for full development of the promise into rounded, understanding leadership.

For it is not true that "leaders are born—never made." That notion is a tattered remnant of a system that went out with the bow and arrow. It is true that a real leader must be inherently endowed with certain essentials, among which are personal integrity, intelligence, common sense, and stability under pressure. But this is only the raw material that reaches its ultimate effectiveness under wise and persistent development. Given the rich stock of American manhood to draw upon, selection and training will continue to produce an even more magnificent body of unit leaders than those who in the late war led 8,000,000 other Americans to the most decisive and the greatest victory with the lowest losses, that the world has known.

The ROTC accomplishes, to a remarkable degree, both this selection and this training. A college course is by its nature a selective and screening process. By and large, those who graduate are tested risks for carrying through to a successful conclusion the diverse enterprises of modern military science. The ROTC man receives much more than military training. He has been subjected to an increasingly difficult series of mental challenges. He gains information and, more important, he gains tolerance, appreciation, and understanding of the problems of mankind. He grows, matures, broadens in interests. His training is calculated to give him a feeling of confidence and sureness, but not an attitude of superiority and snobbishness toward his fellow men. It should go far toward building within him the essentials for assuming the responsibilities for leadership.

In our country, we hold that every man should have the opportunity to rise to any station in his chosen profession commensurate with his ability. This is not merely a pretty theory in the Army. It is the guiding principle upon which we act. We provided the Military Academy, to which entrance lies in the hands of our elected representatives of the people; we established the CMTC before the war and the officer candidate schools during the war; we commissioned specialists directly from civil life; and, finally, gave battlefield commissions to men who displayed the ultimate requirements of an officer in being able to lead troops successfully in the face of the enemy. The war-time Officer Corps of the

American Army was the best the American Nation could provide. It had no artificial limitations due to race, color, or creed. Its record is one to thrill every true American with pride. Its splendid leadership enabled our army to defeat two of the most powerful military machines the world has ever seen. To say that some officers might have done more or done better should not be allowed to obscure the main issue.

The soldier of our citizen army recognizes his commander as one of his fellow men. He has no fear and must not be allowed to have any fear of that officer as a man, no feeling of inferiority toward him as a citizen of this Republic. The American way of life has taught each to think for himself, to be an individual, to be self-reliant. It has taught him that he is in every respect a free man, and it has engendered within him the desire for success and achievement.

At the same time he has learned, from his daily contacts, to recognize intelligence and integrity and the qualities of leadership in others. He is not a follower by nature but will extend himself to the utmost for those in whom he feels he can place his trust.

It is out of such stuff that American armies have always been made. It is those qualities and characteristics that have contributed so much to our victories. To the American military leader, this truth offers an opportunity and a challenge. An opportunity in that these men can, by proper leadership, be welded into an unbeatable army. A challenge in that it calls for the exercise of the highest degree of justice, imagination, and initiative to explore and develop the potentialities of the young Americans in their charge.

The education of the officer never ends. The global nature of the recent war, with its close relationships to the political, industrial, and economic life of the Nation, has made plain the need for more than purely military skills and knowledge, particularly in those who are to bear responsibilities in the higher staffs, or with other Government agencies, with the Navy, and in foreign assignments. Here, again, the educational practices absorbed in the ROTC are certain to assist in the continuous broadening and growth of the individual. Although physically separated from the battle line, he must possess an instinctive grasp of its problems and requirements so that full articulation with the moral and material forces of the whole Nation may be assured.

I cannot close without suggesting to you a more human and more profitable employment of the qualities developed in the ROTC than mere success in battle.

We have briefly surveyed the soldierly virtues that are essential to victory in war.

But not yet has been solved the problem of employing these virtues, which sustain the truth that man was created in the image of God, to serve as effectively the cause of peace as the demands of war. Must we admit that only the compulsion of a common, deadly fear can produce the teamwork that is as necessary to the peaceful concert of peoples as it is to batter and crush a stubborn foe? Why is it that the demonstrated abilities of a great Nation and her allies to produce the mightiest force of righteous destruction yet seen upon the earth, cannot produce an equal progress toward the heart's desire of every individual on that earth—the assurance that he may pursue his peaceful desires in tranquillity and absence of fear?

The answer again is leadership, and again the answer must comprehend leadership in all walks of life, in all spheres of influence. Knowledge of the world—of other countries and peoples as well as our own, understanding of the need of strength to support good intent, and of the need for organization for the constructive work of peace, as well as the destructive processes of war—is required. This supported by energetic, tireless leadership, is the greatest need of a near-chaotic world.

The graduate of ROTC must be able to lead his platoon or fight in war. But more important, he must acquire in his makeup the elements of mental and moral fitness, the desire to help and inspire his fellows, that will mark him for leadership in any community in this land. If he is truly trained, he will be the man to rely on—the one to respect—in danger or in calm.

He is one of the great hopes of this Nation—of civilization itself.

All-Out Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose herewith, by request, an article written by the Honorable B. M. Baruch and appearing in the Rotarian magazine, issue of December 1941, which coupled with events transpiring since that time, demonstrates the wisdom of the views held by this distinguished American at that time:

ALL-OUT PRICE CONTROL

Price control standing by itself has no value. It is essential to the mobilization of the whole of the Nation's resources for war and defense and this mobilization is equally necessary for successful control of prices. The heart of industrial mobilization lies in the system of priorities by which the flow of materials is directed so that the most essential uses take precedence over those less essential. Priority is invoked only because of a shortage. Automatically steps should be taken to increase production and to search for new sources of supply: demand should be cut through taxation, by using substitutes, conserving materials, eliminating waste. Plants should be converted from civilian to defense production, particularly those businesses which might be curtailed by labor or material shortages; prices should be controlled so that what we have goes not to the fattest purse, but to the most necessitous use—no profiteering, no inflation.

All these things go together like the fingers of one hand. Because priorities were put into effect without realizing what would follow, critical shortages have developed, serious temporary unemployment is threatened, businesses may have to shut down. It has cost the country time, production, hardship, and money.

As I write this, the newspapers are headlining that SPAB (Supply Priorities and Allocations Board) has imposed drastic restrictions on nondefense building. Many landlords will seize upon this curtailment to raise rents. Since rents are not under control the public will be unprotected against such profiteering. That is happening all around us. Everywhere the demands of total defense have suspended the normal workings of our free competitive economy. Because we have not brought prices and profits under control, the country is left at the mercies of runaway markets, speculators, hoarders, and profiteers.

NEED FOR IMMEDIATE CONTROL

Because of delay in coming to grips with the price problem, prices have advanced and inflation looms before us. Here and there leaks already have developed in the dike. If the flood breaks loose and prices get out of hand, inflation may descend upon us—an inflation which can be prevented. Prompt enactment of a price-control law is the greatest single necessity of the current crisis.

Next to slaughter and maiming and all that goes with them, inflation is the most destructive of the consequences of war. It means ruin for thousands of small businessmen who, unlike the big fellows, cannot adjust themselves to wildly fluctuating costs.

It undermines the morale of soldiers and civilians. How will the million and more young men who were drafted into our Army at great sacrifices feel if others are permitted to make fat profits and if their own families have their budgets slashed by rising living costs? We must take the profits out of war through taxation and by controlling those profits at their source, which is runaway prices.

Inflation strikes most cruelly at those with fixed incomes, hundreds of thousands of Government workers, teachers, firemen, policemen, war veterans, social-security and insurance beneficiaries. If living costs rise much more, these workers will be entitled to higher wages and every governmental unit in the country will have to increase salaries.

As prices skyrocket, Congress will have to appropriate more and more money to get the same number of guns, tanks, and airplanes. Preventing inflation would save us billions—20 percent and more of all defense appropriations.

The sapping of economic vitality that comes with inflation might so impair our industrial mobilization that we might lose the war or drag it out several extra years. And if we win, if ours is a high price structure after the war, we will face being undersold by the defeated nations. We will lose our export markets. Our living standards will be under constant attack. We will have to take refuge behind artificially high trade barriers. We will be unable to provide full employment for all our workers. We may win the war, only to lose the peace.

With so much at stake, nothing should be allowed to stand in the way of drafting the most effective program of price control that is possible.

THE GORE BILL

The piecemeal bill leaves uncontrolled whole segments of our economy. It undertakes to do only part of the job. It promises favors which cannot be delivered. It will not prevent inflation. The very best that can be hoped for is that it will lessen the degree of inflation that we will have.

What I have propcsed has been embodied generally but not entirely in a bill submitted by Representative ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, that a ceiling be put over all prices, rents, wages, commission fees, interest rates—in short, the price of every item of commerce or service—as of some date. Prices would not be frozen, but would fluctuate freely below this ceiling, although not above it. There would be ample provision for adjusting any of these ceilings, upward or downward, for whatever reason is deemed just and necessary.

Labor's right to strike or to bargain collectively would not be infringed, nor would labor sacrifice any of the gains made in recent years. One provision in Mr. GORE's bill specifically provides that no ceiling shall apply to wages below the standards of the wage-and-hour laws in the States. This probably will mean that wages of our lowest-paid workers will rise, which is as it should be.

The Gore bill also guarantees agriculture a ceiling at parity prices—no higher. For more than 20 years, as farmers know, I have been one of the leaders in the struggle for parity for agriculture. To attempt to take advantage of the emergency to obtain more than parity prices now may result in agriculture's losing the parity status for which it has fought so long. I would take parity prices now and keep that parity relationship after the war. In that way agriculture can

shift from war to peace with minimum dislocations.

Let me be frank in saying that the ideal time for imposing such an over-all ceiling would have been, as I advocated, before the inflationary process had begun—say, at the outbreak of the war or even as late as last January before the present price rise began. Some prices have been permitted to go through the roof. That is the fault of not taking proper measures in time. The ceiling has become more difficult, but that holds true of any price-control scheme. Procrastination has made the task of preventing inflation more difficult. I still believe that an over-all ceiling treating all prices alike is the best plan that has been brought forward to meet current conditions.

PIECEMEAL CONTROL MUST FAIL

The piecemeal bill proposes to control prices by adjusting a number of "key" commodities individually, leaving all other prices free to rise at will. The over-all ceiling calls for a definite halt to rising prices, bringing the entire price level under control, then making what individual adjustments are necessary.

Under the piecemeal plan, while individual commodities are dealt with, the general price level remains free to rise. Inflation is not halted. It is merely slowed in the hope that the degree of inflation that results will not prove ruinous. It submits to the runaway and tries to keep some horses from running faster than others. With the over-all ceiling the team—the general price level—is always under rein and runaways can be brought into line swiftly.

Psychologically, piecemeal control encourages prices to rise. Under the piecemeal bill, the outlook for the future would be a steady rise in prices, slow perhaps but sure, with no upper limit ever in sight. All business would be done in anticipation that prices a few months from now will be higher than today. The ceiling plan, however, puts the entire country on notice that prices will not be allowed to rise above a certain level. The hand of every buyer is strengthened; speculation, hoarding, and anticipatory buying is curbed.

If only for these reasons, the over-all ceiling is more likely to hold prices. Under piecemeal control a further inflationary rise in prices is inevitable. That rise may cost the country tens of billions of dollars.

Another difference between the piecemeal bill and the Gore bill is that the piecemeal bill attempts to do only part of the job. Relatively few commodities are supposed to be regulated; wages are omitted; at 110 percent of parity, farm prices, too, are virtually exempt. Since every price is a resultant of the combination of all other prices, it is both unjust and impractical to regulate one part of the industrial fabric while expecting or providing special concessions for other parts. In recent months you have been paying more for things. If you have asked why, the storekeeper or businessman you deal with has replied, "My costs have gone up, materials are higher, labor has risen, taxes are up," and so on. If we are to stop prices from rising we must plug these excuses all along the line.

Some claim that an over-all ceiling means you have to regulate the price of every item, including hairpins, and are staggered at the administrative difficulties. Their imaginations do not grasp how simple it is. Some years ago when I was lecturing before the Army War College, an officer asked me how I would regulate the price of a certain tooth wash in Utah.

I replied, "There are two persons who know the price of the tooth wash in Utah, the buyer and the seller. You set the ceiling and the price will enforce itself with a watchful local committee."

I have long urged the establishment of committees of industry in every industry and local councils of national defense. The Government would give these committees of industry the price and the competitors would watch themselves. The local defense councils would know the prices prevailing in their community. Complaints would be brought to them; after investigation the complaints would be passed on to central authorities for action. No great bureaucracy is necessary.

RETAIL PRICES MUST BE CONTROLLED

The problem of controlling retail prices can not be escaped. Only a few weeks ago the excise taxes went in effect. As you know, many retailers marked up their prices more than was justified by the taxes. Some verbal warnings were issued to those retailers through the press. Were they effective? If retailers are permitted to profiteer, living costs will rise sharply; we will get demands for wage increases, and rightly so; prices will bound further and the vicious inflationary race will be on.

It is no solution of a problem to ignore it and it is no argument against doing a thing to say that it is administratively difficult. Nothing about war is easy.

We must face the fact that we cannot defeat any powerful enemy with halfway measures. We have to stop backing into things, to stop postponing unpleasant decisions and trying to do things and not to do things at the same time. Let us tackle the job that has to be done and get it over with.

If inflation is to be prevented, we must have an all-out price-control law, as we must have an all-out industrial effort. American labor and management are the best in the world and can make more war machines than all the rest of the world put together. Let them go to it.

It has been argued that control over wages is not necessary, that if the prices of other things are controlled, then labor will not seek wage increases. If that argument is sound, why not include a ceiling on wages? It cannot do any harm, since, as the argument goes, it will not be necessary and it would be there in case of "unreasonable" exceptions.

Also, there are millions of unorganized workers and Government employees who cannot demand that their salaries be increased as living costs rise. If wages are to be controlled through so-called "stabilization agreements," these millions will be forgotten.

I do not object to higher wages. If the real incomes of workers are slashed by rising prices, they are entitled to increases—for some workers such increases are already overdue. What the ceiling plan does is to tie wages and prices together so they can move together as the cost of living changes. That is the just way. It asks no special sacrifices of any group; it grants no special privileges.

I cannot believe that the farmers and workers in this country want more than this—to be treated equally and not profit at the expense of the rest of the country.

DANGER OF PRESSURE GROUPS

In effect, the over-all ceiling applies the principle of the Selective Service Act to price control. The obviously fair way to conscript the youth of our country was to bring everyone in the designated age groups under the draft and then make exceptions. That is what the ceiling does; it brings all prices under control and then allows whatever individual adjustments are necessary. It keeps the entire business on the highest possible plane.

In contrast, piecemeal, partial price controls invite every pressure group, politician, lobbyist, trade association, and interest to descend upon Washington and seek exemption. Since the general price level will continue to rise, the price administrator will have to make adjustments and inevitably he will yield where the pressure—not necessarily justice—is greatest. The little fellows who cannot make themselves felt will be forgotten.

Few laws would contain so much power over the Nation's economic life as would a price-control law. I am all in favor of giving the President those great powers in war or threat of war—they are as necessary as is his control of our Army and our Navy. I do not believe that in any such grant of power there should be a compromise with that basic principle of democratic rule, that all persons be treated alike, as part of one Nation joined in a common emergency.

Some persons have said that while everything I say is true the people are not ready for anything but a piecemeal, stop-gap price-control bill. To such men of little faith in the American people I recommend the words of George Washington to the members of the constitutional convention.

"It is too probable," he told them, "that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be maintained. If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God."

P. S.—As I complete this, I notice that the Canadian Government, after trying piecemeal control, has announced that it is putting a ceiling on all prices, rents, and wages as the only way to prevent inflation.

OPA Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include herewith a resolution adopted by the Collinsville (Ill.) Local Union No. 41 of the Progressive Mine Workers of America to continue the Office of Price Administration:

Whereas the Office of Price Administration has successfully held back inflation during the war, and since VJ-day the OPA did a marvelous job of preventing run-away prices; and

Whereas immediately following the First World War when Government control of prices was removed a wave of speculative buying was created which forced prices and operating costs up rapidly, carrying with it a false picture of prosperity which very soon caused prices and costs to run far ahead of the buying power. Then orders and production dropped and prices crashed, more than 100,000 firms went bankrupt; inventory losses rose to $16,000,000,000. Five and one-half million workers lost their jobs, and by 1922 weekly factory pay rolls dropped $110,000,000, or more than 44 percent; and

Whereas during World War II we have learned what tremendous quantities of goods America can produce, and this quantity production will steadily increase as new production methods are installed; and

Whereas in order to prevent inflation which is always followed by depression, and in order to protect the worker, farmer, merchant, and industry, America must plan for the steady sale of as much as peacetime America can produce. We must establish a price and income base that will keep a balance between the buying and producing power; and

Whereas in recent months we have witnessed the effect on prices of goods released from OPA restrictions. Prices on goods released from OPA restrictions rose rapidly,

and some rose 50 or 100 percent in a few days and the OPA was compelled to again put them back on price restrictions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Local Union No. 41, Progressive Mine Workers of America, go on record as realizing the importance of continuing the Office of Price Administration and therefore cause to create a program to acquaint all of our members as well as other local unions with the results of the OPA and to stand firm for legislation to continue the Office of Price Administration as long as it is needed; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our Representatives in Congress and urging them to support legislation to continue the Office of Price Administration.

B. J. LAURENTI,
President.
ROBERT W. GRIEVE,
Recording Secretary.

State Department Film Agency Switch Called Boost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to an article from Box Office magazine of May 4, 1946, entitled "State Department Film Agency Switch Called Boost." This article appears in the widely read Washington Report column, written by Al Sherman, whose reportorial skill and insight gives due recognition to the immense importance of harmonious relations between Government agencies and our great industries. In this instance, State Department policy relating to our motion picture industry has been clarified and properly publicized in the following article:

STATE DEPARTMENT FILM AGENCY SWITCH CALLED BOOST

Little attention has been given to the fact that the State Department recently decided to move its Commercial Motion Picture Section, headed by George Canty, out of the Telecommunications Division over to the Division of Commercial Policy. When Congressman ELLIS PATTERSON, whose bailiwick is Hollywood, wrote to Assistant Secretary of State Will Clayton for an explanation of the move, the State Department official replied, in part:

"Decision to transfer the Motion Picture Section was based entirely on a desire to bring the Section more into conformity with the organization of the Department of State, in order to make effective our efforts to safeguard the interests of the motion picture industry in its foreign operations. We fully appreciate the value of the industry to America, which you have pointed out more effectively, and the great role the industry is playing in carrying this country's message to the other countries of the world. I can assure you this change in no way reflects a lessening of our interest in commercial motion pictures nor does it lower the status of the Section in the Department.

"Since no change of personnel within the Section is involved in this transfer, I feel certain that the Section will in its new Division function as effectively in the Department and with the industry as in the past. You can be assured that the heads of the new Division and the office in which the Section finds itself will be just as cooperative with the industry and understanding of its problems as the officials associated with the Section in the past, and will continue to do everything possible to promote the interest of the motion picture industry in its operations abroad."

Plight of the Dairymen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the dairy industry is an important segment of the economy of the Forty-fifth Congressional District which I have the honor to represent. The fine, blooded, tested herds constitute a source of great revenue to the farmers and to the communities in the counties of Chautauqua, Cattaraugus, and Allegany. I can say without hesitation that the OPA regulations have been devastating to the dairy industry. Apparently the disastrous effects of OPA regulations to the dairy industry is Nation-wide as is shown by facts submitted to the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting excerpts from the testimony submitted to the committee:

THE PLIGHT OF THE DAIRYMEN—THE WAR IS OVER—AMERICANS CANNOT SPREAD A REGULATION ON BREAD—PRODUCTION WILL PREVENT HUNGER AND INFLATION

In a brief submitted by the American Butter Institute, represented by D. K. Howe, president, before the Banking and Currency Committee, House of Representatives, March 19, 1946, the following excerpts make clear the dairyman's plight under OPA:

With the price of butter held down as compared with other dairy products and farm products, with labor scarce and costs rising, there could be only one result. In spite of an increase in milk production from 1941 to 1945 of about 7 percent, the production of creamery butter declined 28 percent, or 501,000,000 pounds. Nothing like that has ever happened before in the history of the butter industry. The greatest decline in butter-make previous to this was from 1933 to 1937 when the decline was about 139,000,000 pounds.

The creamery industry is the only dairy products industry which was forced by Government controls to go through the war with less than normal volume. During this same period, other major branches of the dairy industry have operated with substantially higher volumes. Butter production declined to the lowest figure since 1920. Instead of using 33 percent of the Nation's total milk production as in 1940, butter took only 21½ percent of the milk production in 1945.

Due to the decrease in volume of butterfat available and the diversion of butterfat from churning to fluid milk and other dairy products, almost 20 percent of the creameries operating in 1941 have ceased to operate. Many of them were forced to close in order to avoid financial disaster due to the fact that when volume decreased, costs mounted rapidly. Aside from those plants which closed, others are faced with increasing costs due to the lower volume, so that all are operating under a heavy financial burden.

The trend toward lower production and closing of creameries has been accelerated since the removal of controls on cream, ice cream, and fluid milk in the fall of 1945. Many creameries have been offered for sale or for lease. In some States the butter manufacture has practically ceased. The cream is going to other products, not butter.

Information from the National Stockyards in East St. Louis reveals that during 1945 the percentages of milk cows being sold as beef was approximately 40 percent of the total number sold. This is the highest ratio of milk cows to beef that has been reported marketed through the East St. Louis yards. The number of cows in the country in 1946 is estimated by the Department of Agriculture to be from 3 to 4 percent under last year. Heifers, potential milk producers, were down to 6 percent. The greatest decrease in milk cows has occurred in the States which normally produce farm-separated cream for butter manufacture: Minnesota and Iowa, 4 percent; Missouri, 6 percent; the Dakotas and Kansas, 9 percent; and Nebraska, 10 percent.

Due to the low ceiling on butter, creameries cannot compete for raw material against other manufactured dairy products and farmers producing churning cream cannot afford to maintain production in the face of rising costs for farm labor, feeds, etc.

In recent months the situation has become progressively worse. This may be seen from the following tabulation showing the percentage by which the butter manufactured has declined in the months indicated below the same month 1 year previous:

	Percent
November 1945	20
December 1945	23
January 1946	30
February 1946 (estimated)	30

As a result, the supply is far below the demand. Added to that is the poor distribution that has developed since elimination of rationing and various controls. Consequently, we have black markets, tie-in sales, and diversion through price evasion practices, which result in severe hardships in some districts. Consumers in metropolitan areas have only one-third the butter supply that was available in 1941.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith, by request, a letter written to me on November 18, 1941, by the Honorable B. M. Baruch which, coupled with events transpiring since that time, demonstrates the wisdom of the views held by this distinguished American at that time.

NOVEMBER 18, 1941.

Hon. ALBERT GORE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GORE: Your telegram of November 17 puzzles me. I cannot understand how anyone can think I do not favor your price-control bill. In an article soon to appear in the Rotarian I support it strongly over the House bill. The only objection I have to your bill is that it does not go far

enough. Chairman Steagall certainly has been misinformed.

Let me make these points:

Mounting prices for the necessities of life make action by your committee imperative. Price rises affect in greater degree those of low incomes than those in the higher brackets. More of the little fellows' income has to be used for barest necessities. That class has little for comforts and none for luxuries.

Unless action is taken immediately, Congress will have to institute proceedings to raise the scale of payments of all Government employees and veterans. Simultaneously, there would have to be an increase in the pay of teachers, policemen, firemen, and all State, city, and county employees, at least to the extent of the increased cost of housing, clothing, and food. All workers will have to be paid more money unless a halt is immediately made in the increasing cost of living—a halt already too long delayed.

It is a great responsibility that rests upon your committee. But price control is only one part of inflation control. It must be accompanied by taxation, profit and money control, and an over-all industrial mobilization which endeavors to increase productivity; find substitutes, allocate short supplies, utilize small business, and standardize and simplify production.

WAGES AND FARM PRICES

I repeat, for it cannot be said too often, that I do not see how control of prices can be effective without taking into consideration wage levels and agricultural schedules. I do not advocate a fixed ceiling on wages that shall be immovable. We face a condition and not a theory. We must be realistic, not political. Wages form the biggest component of all price structures. To attempt to fix levels without thorough consideration of this element would be as abortive as to try to cure a sick man of all his ailments except the one that is most dangerous—the one that is likely to be fatal to him. A ceiling over wages can be adjustable so as to give consideration to increases in the cost of living. In that way the real wage would be in the forefront of all consideration.

But wages do not form the only choke points. The agricultural price is another moot point. In fact, too much latitude toward the schedule of farm prices would distort the picture. This becomes particularly true since today the raises granted the workers have been caught up with by the cost of living.

As one of those who fought for many years for farm parity, I do not want to jeopardize it by demanding too much now. To do so might weaken the present acceptance of that objective—parity—toward which we are now well on the way. Each segment of our society should become a participant in the national program and sacrifice should be the rule rather than the advantage.

ESSENTIALS FOR CIVILIANS

Above all, we must see that the civilian population is protected always in the three essentials of life: (1) Food, (2) shelter, (3) apparel. We should be able to answer the demand for actual needs—not fancied wants.

The morale of our home front is as important—perhaps even more so—than the morale of our fighting forces. We best can protect the men and women who are the country's producers by providing for their necessities at fair prices. At the same time we will be able greatly to reduce costs of the defense program to the Treasury if we do the pricing and supply job well.

In this connection Congress is voting astronomical sums of money for defense, the expenditure of which will further increase the cost of living.

Each dollar and each day make more essential an over-all control. Food costs will increase if agriculture is allowed too much. Rent control now being established in the District of Columbia, should spread throughout the country.

STANDARDIZED PRODUCTION

Apropos of creating and maintaining an adequate supply of one of the commodities required by all the people at low cost, think this over:

Let the proper board (in this case probably the Office of Civilian Supply) select a typical product—shoes, for example. The effort would be to produce standardized, serviceable, good-looking shoes at prices lower than prevail now. During the World War this system was arranged. These shoes could be classed as A, B, C, and D with the notation of the class and price stamped on them. After a certain date no shoe, other than these, should be sold. Being made in mass production, with limited styles and colors, the cost would be low. The present supply of shoes can be sold for another 6 months. After that only the standardized shoes made on Government specifications should be sold. This step should be taken now in order to break the continuity of rising prices for the bare necessities.

The same thing would be done with men's and women's clothing. And with housing.

Let's get action. Delay is dangerous. Our enemies press forward, and we bicker. Let all questions be resolved by one test: Does it advance and strengthen the national defense?

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD M. BARUCH.

Coal Development and Mineral Research Programs Are Unnecessarily Cut by Appropriations Committee—Facts Are Presented for Information of the Members

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, although I can understand and join with the desire of the subcommittee on the Interior Department appropriation bill to curtail Government expenditures and to effect maximum economies, the action that has been taken on the forthcoming year's appropriations is so severe as to create considerable doubt, in at least some instances, whether more harm than good will be done to the American public. I am constrained, especially by that part of the report dealing with the Bureau of Mines, to speak in the hope that the House will take a broader and more foresighted view of the situation.

The total amount of funds recommended by the Budget Bureau for operation of the Bureau of Mines for the fiscal year 1947 was $20,231,400. The committee has slashed this request to $11,298,439, a cut of approximately $9,000,000, or 45 percent. The funds recommended are $6,440,051 below the amount appropriated to the Bureau for the current fiscal year.

This drastic cut in funds is a blow to the mineral industries of the Nation which have contributed so much to the winning of the war and to the peacetime economy of this country. The production of minerals during the war involved considerable sacrifice on the part of the raw-materials producers. The pressure for maximum output, combined with the shortage of manpower, compelled most operators of mines to concentrate on current production at the expense of normal exploration and development work. Mine operators, in order to attain production goals, also were required to forego normal upkeep and replacements of worn-out facilities and equipment, even though wear and tear were excessive. Operators of small and marginal mines were able to maintain themselves only with the aid of price premiums or other subsidies. Altogether, the mining industry, by the very nature of the business, depleted its assets and has found itself the forgotten industry. The industry needs and merits better recognition than is accorded it by the Appropriations Committee.

The Bureau of Mines is the only regularly established agency of the Government which is concerned primarily with minerals and the mineral industries. Since its establishment 36 years ago the Bureau has done a great deal and can do more to assist the producers of metals, nonmetalics, and fuels, if it is given sufficient opportunity. We should not and must not allow the relatively small amount of technologic and statistical assistance which the Bureau is now permitted to give the industry to be reduced further.

Because West Virginia produces almost one-fourth of the bituminous coal in the United States and is the leading bituminous-producing State, I am especially and deeply concerned about the future of coal. I know that coal is the lifeblood of my State, and a great majority of our people and our industries, and I realize how much coal means to our State and to the Nation. For many years I have been closely associated with the problems of the industry. My knowledge of the splendid work the Bureau of Mines has done in coal research and utilization over the years prompts me to ask for further consideration for that agency in these deliberations.

In the committee's report funds for coal-mine safety work have not been decreased seriously. My concern springs from the knowledge that Congress, in the urgency of cutting Government expenses, is asked by our committee on appropriations to cut the relatively small estimates which provide funds for exploring sources of coking coals in the United States, for investigating special methods of preparing coal which is required to improve the quality before it is used, for conducting basic essential research on explosives, the greater part of which is used by the coal-mining industry, and for conducting research on the utilization of all kinds of coal for domestic use and for generating power and providing steam essential to the manufacturers of the United States.

The funds recommended by the committee—$709,748—for expenditure on research relating to testing coal and explosives amounts to approximately three one-hundredths of 1 percent of the value of the coal mined annually in the United

States. This research is important to the industry. For example, the permissible charge limit for explosives was previously 1½ pounds in coal mining. There are now indications that this limit might be increased to as much as 3 pounds. This investigation and basic fundamental explosives research will be seriously handicapped by a decrease of appropriations under that allowed by the Bureau of the Budget.

Progress was made during the war through the establishment of additional coal-preparation plants. Now, about one-fourth of the Nation's coal is mechanically cleaned to remove refuse. Additional research will result in further improvements. These and many other types of coal research are carried on by the Bureau of Mines to the everlasting benefit of the industry and the Nation.

Of national importance is the speedy development of methods of making gasoline and oil from coal, oil shale, and other raw materials. Two years ago Congress instructed the Bureau of Mines to begin a 5-year program in this field and authorized the agency to spend up to $30,000,000. The work is now in its third year, with much construction and development under way, and yet our committee refuses to grant sufficient funds for carrying it forward. We tell, as a Congress, the Bureau to do a vital job in 5 years, yet we are asked to hold back the funds to do the task.

The country's position with regard to petroleum reserves has become more critical in recent years. Heavy demand has continued in spite of the end of the war. Exploration has increased to fourfold the normal effort, and discoveries of oil are less than half the annual demand. Not only is the total quantity of oil discovered each year decreasing, but the size of the new fields is small when compared to the strikes found in earlier years.

To supplement the supply of petroleum in this country, we are now considering exploitation of foreign fields. Oil concessions to be divided between the nations in some of the world areas are major sources of international contention and bickering. While this is going on, it is folly not to prepare to utilize our vast reserves of oil shale or other solid fuels which furnish an almost limitless source of the liquid products so essention to our normal economy and indispensible in time of war.

The work under the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act, of which I am cosponsor, not only insures the petroleum needed to defend the country but prevents foreign countries from applying exorbitant taxes or prices for the petroleum we secure from them. The progress already made on one of the processes studied by the Bureau of Mines indicates that gasoline can be produced synthetically in certain sections of the United States at costs not more than 2 to 4 cents per gallon more than the cost from petroleum. This progress has resulted from the work of only a few years and more is certain to follow.

The program that the Bureau of Mines has planned and on which it has operated for 2 years is based on the $30,000,000 authorized by Public Law 290. The staff and research organization already has been developed to carry the work forward. The first oil-shale demonstration plant will be finished about the end of this year. Construction of a hydrogenation demonstration plant will be started within 6 months. Research laboratories to work on coal and oil shale are in advanced stages of construction.

The Bureau of the Budget has recommended appropriations of $7,000,000 for this work for next year. This is the minimum that will allow the work to be carried forward on an adequate scale. If these funds are not provided, much of the work that has been started will have to be discontinued, especially the demonstration plants. The carefully selected and trained scientific staffs will be lost, and the equipment now ready for operation will stand idle. This is a waste of Government funds, and it will delay or stop projects whose essentiality to our Nation, as well as possibilities for a new future domestic industry are unquestioned. For the good of the Nation, we cannot afford to let this happen. I cannot see how the Congress can direct a program to be undertaken and then deny the necessary funds to carry out its directions.

One of the most severe blows to the mineral industries and the postwar economy of the Nation would be the curtailment of funds for the collection and analysis of facts about the production, distribution, and consumption of mineral commodities, a valuable service performed by the Bureau of Mines for many years and one of utmost importance during the war. The subcommittee approved an amount which is $690,000 less than the Budget estimate, and $55,000 less than the 1946 appropriation.

Reliable facts and figures on the status of the mineral industries of this and foreign countries provide the basis for operations and for planning in our industries and in Government. Without this information, it would be difficult to carry on the business of industry and Government in an intelligent manner.

Statistics collected by the Bureau prior to the war were invaluable in planning wartime production programs, yet we found that there were many strategic minerals on which we had little or no production and consumption data. During the war, the Bureau of Mines was called upon to expand its service in this field, both in gathering information about new commodities and increasing the number and scope of its statistical and economic surveys of the more common minerals. Hundreds of special surveys were made on short notice at the request of the War Production Board, the Army, the Navy, and other war agencies. A vast amount of information was assembled and tabulated.

This wartime experience emphasized the necessity for having facts of this type at hand in peacetime, and before a war starts. Remembering the great depletion of our mineral resources during the war, and the uncertainty of the future in the mineral industries, I know that a broad program to provide reliable, factual information on minerals in this and foreign countries is essential, and the Bureau of Mines is equipped to handle this job.

In cutting down the appropriation for economics of the mineral industries, the Congress would in effect wipe out the gains made in this field during the war and tell the minerals industries that they could get this much-needed information as best they could, or operate without it. If another emergency arose, again we would find ourselves severely handicapped because of the absence of adequate records on mineral production and consumption.

The funds requested by the Bureau of Mines this year included money for bituminous coal economics. If this money is denied, it means that we are ignoring the economics of perhaps the most important raw material used by American industry today—bituminous coal. The current situation in coal certainly demonstrates forcibly that adequate facts on supply and demand are necessary to prevent shortages and other crises in this commodity. The annual production of bituminous coal—about 600,000,000 tons—is valued at nearly $2,000,000,000 at the mine. Compared to this vast sum, the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget to operate a statistical service represents a relatively small amount. It would be a tragedy to curtail this service to the industry and add to its troubles—especially when the Government is obligated to help an industry that gave so much during the war.

Not only coal, but other minerals of a strategic nature, need to be included in a broad statistical service such as the Bureau of Mines proposes. The funds allowed by the committee are barely sufficient to permit the Bureau to carry on the program that it did before the war—a program proven to be entirely inadequate when the war came upon us.

As I stated before, the normal rate of depletion of our irreplaceable mineral resources was greatly accelerated during World War II. The grade of ores being mined and smelted are constantly becoming lower and lower, and the problems of mining and treating them are therefore more and more difficult. Intensive study and ingenuity are required to solve them.

There are many today who say that we have become a "have-not nation" in the mineral field. They maintain that our only chance of competition with other nations industrially is to import our mineral raw materials. I do not agree with this view. I believe that we have in this country untapped resources that can be utilized to maintain our position of world leadership, but we cannot sit back and wait for another crop of high-grade minerals to grow. We shall have to develop new technologies in mining and metallurgy for the use of industry so that the vast deposits of low-grade ores which we have may be used in the most effective way for the welfare of the Nation. An active solvent domestic mineral industry is absolutely essential both to the national security and to the national economy.

In 1939, when war clouds were looming on the horizon, Congress realized that in case of a serious national emergency, we would be short of certain strategic metals and minerals. At that time they called on the Bureau of Mines to explore domestic deposits of these min-

erals and to devise ways and means of using them. All during the war, as new mineral shortages developed, we called upon the Bureau of Mines again and again to redouble its efforts, and it always responded magnificently to these calls. During the last 6 years, it has examined thousands of mineral properties and has developed hundreds of them into producing properties.

By reducing the funds for this type of work to a mere pittance, the Appropriations Committee has said, in effect: "This work is no longer important. There will no longer be shortages of minerals." The actual fact is, however, that many of the minerals are now in such scarcer supply than they were during the war.

Only 2 weeks ago, Mr. Snyder, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, pointed out that our supply of lead is exceedingly low. He again called upon the Bureau of Mines to intensify its development of domestic sources of lead. I am sure the Bureau is willing to do everything that it can in this situation, but if, at this critical time, the funds for exploratory work and for pilot-plant development of new metallurgical processes are so drastically cut as proposed by the committee, it will not be able to do more than a fraction of what is necessary.

I refer particularly to two items in the appropriation: "Investigation and development of domestic mineral deposits" and "Metallurgical research in pilot plants." The President's budget called for $2,400,000 and $2,000,000 respectively for these items. I note that the committee report contains only $1,000,000 for the first and $500,000 for the second. This cut of 66 percent below the figure recommended in the budget, and if approved by the House and Senate, will put an end to much of the Bureau's Nation-wide mineral exploratory work and force the Bureau to abandon most of the pilot-plant work under way and to reduce substantially the experimental and test work carried on at several stations.

There is no question of the national need for a broad program of exploration of new deposits of domestic minerals. Our high standards of living and our national security demand it. But such a program cannot and will not be undertaken, except on a very limited scale, by private industry, for it is obvious that most of the discoveries that will be made will not be immediately economic to exploit. Only a Federally sponsored program can carry out the necessary objective. It is important, particularly in view of the unsettled condition of the world, that we permit the Bureau of Mines to continue the exploratory work on metals, minerals, and fuels which it had so ably begun.

The Bureau of Mines has demonstrated conclusively the great value of pilot plant work. It is only in this way that new metallurgical processes developed in the Bureau laboratories can be put into shape for adoption by industry in any reasonable period of time. The committee report would require the Bureau to return in a very large degree to the practice of carrying its work only to the point where it could be utilized by large corporations equipped and staffed to do pilot plant work. If the Bureau is permitted to continue pilot-plant work, then the processes can be taken up by small decentralized groups and provide employment under a system of free enterprise.

Several processes demonstrated in Bureau pilot plants have already been put into such commercial use. Examples are the electrolytic manganese process and a number of processes for the beneficiation of minerals. Many processes developed during the war are now about ready to be put to industrial use. These include electrolytic chromium and cobalt, titanium, zirconium, natural gas reduction of zinc ores and many beneficiation processes. If the Bureau's pilot plant work on these activities is discontinued, the possibility of commercial uses of these processes will be set back many years.

The cuts made by the Appropriations Committee will not only require the elimination of most of the pilot-plant work of the Bureau but will require a greatly decreased amount of basic research and testing work which is carried on for the direct assistance of the mining industry.

The committee also has recommended a number of decreases in small items in the bill which in their effect may be very serious.

Further, I am disappointed at not being able to find in the committee bill any funds for investigation of the health conditions in underground mines. With occupational disease and workmen's compensation now taking a heavy toll on the health of the miner and on the operating cost of mining properties, the Bureau should do its part by making studies of health and sanitary conditions in and around mines. The Bureau has authority to investigate health hazards and to recommend corrective measures both under its organic act and under the Federal Coal-Mine Inspection Act. I assume that the Bureau did not request funds for such a program and should be censored on that account.

I hope that the House will not permit the Bureau's long-standing program of technologic research and economic assistance to the mineral industries and the people engaged in working in them and operating them to be crippled at this time by these severe reductions in its operating funds. I, too, am opposed to reckless spending, but I do think it is false economy to save a few thousands of dollars here and there which may result in the ultimate loss of millions, endanger our high standard of living and imperil our national security.

Flight Pay in the Army Air Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: A recent issue of the Army-Navy Journal carried a statement by you which I wish to applaud heartily, with respect to flight pay in the Army Air Forces. I note you have spent 3 years with the AAF—I have spent 6; so perhaps I feel twice as strongly about this thing which should be eliminated, or at least overhauled. May I give you a few suggestions which may be of use to you in future discussions of this question?

I should like to see the AAF required to furnish facts, not just garbled statistics, as to the number of hours flown by officers in each grade. This should be broken down to show the maximum hours flown by any officer in each grade, and the minimum. Then there should be a weighted average (not a simple arithmetical one), showing average hours per year flown by all officers of each grade. I am sure that this will show that the flying is being done by the company-grade officers and not by the brass hats who are collecting the major portion of flying pay.

Further, it would be interesting to have the actual data as to the type of airplane flown by the officers of each grade. I contend that the brass hats are not flying combat types; but puddle jumpers such as the AT–6, the C–47, the C–45, and occasionally B–25's, all of which cannot be classified as combat ships, and the flying of which do not give the pilots the familiarity with aerial combat which they claim is necessary for the exercise of command. To fly a B–17 or a B–25 today is definitely not combat flying in any sense of the word. You and I know it, but do other Congressmen know it? I am sure that if they did they wouldn't be fooled by this kind of argument which the flying fraternity is putting up.

Then there is the matter of the command pilot, which is the rating held by a great many brass hats (and by brass hats I include most of the Regular Army full colonels as well as general officers). I think you will recall that a command pilot does not have actually to fly the airplane to get his flying time. He just has to ride. For a full colonel, flying pay is something in excess of $250 a month, $67 an hour, just for riding. It's nice work if you can get it.

What I'm getting to is this: Flying pay, I think every sensible person will agree, should be an extra compensation for extra risk which is taken over and above the risks taken by the remainder of the service as a whole. If we pay flying pay in wartime, we should also set up a similar combat pay for others who are taking risks on the ground. There is justification for flying pay in peacetime, when ground soldiers do not take risks but airmen do. That, I think, we can all go along with.

But any extra form of compensation for extra risk should be paid only when the recipient is subjecting himself to that risk. An airman takes the flying risk only when he is flying or taxiing his airplane, and not while he is sitting at a desk or lying in his bunk.

Likewise an infantryman should receive combat pay when he is in combat, but not while he is in a rear rest area.

I maintain that flying officers in the senior grades are being paid all out of proportion to the risk they are taking, and not in relationship to the risks taken by the remainder of the service as a whole. This should be corrected, and I am pleased to see that you are aware of it and are trying to do something about it.

The pilots complain that they have a lesser life expectancy than officers of the other services—they show that a man has a career-earning expectancy of something like $33,000 less than a career man in the other services. They claim, and perhaps rightly, that men will not go into the Air Forces unless they feel that this difference is made up to them.

But, wouldn't it be more economical, and far more democratic, to set up a suitable sum to be paid to the estate of officers who lose their lives in aerial flight, regardless of branch of the service? The miserable $10,000

suggested by the Air Corps brass hats, to be paid to officers of other services who lose their lives while riding as passengers, is inadequate, as is proved by the Air Corps figures.

On top of this, to reward the Air Force officer for the frequency with which he accepts his risks, I suggest that flight pay be paid for the hours actually spent in the air and taxiing on the ground, at a rate greater than that now paid—instead of 1½ times the base rate, let it be 2 or 3 times that rate. It might be that such an inducement would get some of these chair-borne pilots into the air more frequently. I would suggest, further, that there be a different rate between puddle jumpers and aircraft which are currently in a combat status.

These rates should be extended to any officer or civilian employee who is ordered to fly as a passenger in a Government airplane—the risk is the same, as the Air Forces admit when they defend flying pay for the command pilot.

The argument has been raised that it will be much more difficult to account for flying pay in any way except the present one, of simply adding 50 percent to the officer's base pay. That is pure "bushwa!" I think you will agree that it would be relatively simple, when making out his monthly pay voucher, for each officer to enter in the proper place the number of hours of flying time he has had that month and whether or not it has been in puddle jumper or combat aircraft. I see no more complicated procedure in calculating such a voucher than the one which is now followed. To a Congressman who doesn't know how these things are done, the brass hats' argument might carry a little weight; but you are in position, I believe, to kick this piece of prize applesauce right out of the picture.

Another point for our argument—isn't it a peculiar thing that, as a man gets promoted, and gets more and more flying pay, he does less and less flying and takes less and less risk? This is answered, by the brass hats, with the argument that this increased flying pay is a reward for the technical knowledge which the flyer has gained by experience—who rewards the engineer officer for the technical knowledge he gains by experience—which is just as technical or more so than that of the flying officer? It seems to me that if we're going to have to pay a bonus to broken-down pilots, we should call it a bonus, or a pension, or anything you choose; but for heaven's sake let's not call it pay—pay is something you earn.

Then there is the question of physical fitness. It is simply amazing these days, to see a brass hat pass a form 64 examination, which is probably the most rigorous of the entire military service, in order to qualify for his flying pay, and then turn around a month or two later, go before a retiring board and be retired for (of all things) complete physical disability! If you look in the columns of the Army-Navy Journal for the past few months, you will see dozens of flying generals checking out in this manner. Somewhere here there is something cockeyed as hell. A medical officer who will pass some of these old dodos on a form 64 and put them behind the stick of an airplane, should not only be discharged from the service, but they should be fired right out of the medical profession—that's malpractice! Of course, they know damned well, if they don't, something very unpleasant is likely to happen to them, and right soon.

It all comes down to this—flying pay has been the lifeblood of as vicious a thing as we have in the service. It has resulted in their being of a race of supermen, better paid and more favored than their fellows, who have become arrogant, smug, overbearing, and who have built themselves into an impregnable position where they dominate one of the important branches of our service. I have seen, in a theater of war, preference given to rated officers, not only in pay, but in discipline, quarters, equipment, assignment, food, and medical care—preferences which should not exist in our Army. It all goes back to flying pay, which creates a preferred class or "caste" in the most democratic organization in America—the Army. Flying pay, in its present form at least, and special privilege must go if our Air Forces are to have the strength we expect and need.

Anything you can do to destroy this evil thing will be a service to the Nation, to the military service, and to you and me as citizens of a country which is the prize piece of booty for the aggressors.

I wish I could sign this letter—I wish I could come to see you and talk it over—as soon as I am out from under the control of this gang of airplane jockeys I intend to do so. Meanwhile, please don't consider it a "crank" letter, but as an airing of some views which you might be able to use when the time comes to argue this thing out.

Sincerely yours,

FIELD OFFICER (NONRATED),
AIR CORPS.

Wet Streets Don't Cause the Rain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, properly meeting and solving the challenge of inflation in this country is one of America's No. 1 problems. It is a problem which cannot be solved by radio ballyhoo or frantic propaganda; it is a problem which is likely to grow worse before it gets better; it is a problem to which this Government should give immediate, intense, and intelligent consideration.

The prices paid by consumers on delivered merchandise indicate the degree of inflation from which the country is now suffering. These prices are the effect rather than the cause of inflation. Men's shorts selling at from $1 to $1.50 per pair when normal prewar prices were 40 cents or 50 cents for the same article demonstrate that on that item, inflation is here and the OPA has even failed to control the symptoms of that inflation so that the pocketbook of the average purchaser can be protected. Likewise, the scarcity of white shirts for men and boys while fancy, sport shirts at exhorbitant prices, are available in abundance, demonstrate an instance of where OPA has established regulations which actually have resulted in increased, rather than decreased, prices for the consumer. Similar items can be singled out as examples of consumers' costs which have been increased rather than "held in line" by the OPA through improper regulations and unwise edicts which have curtailed production, increased labor costs beyond reason, or driven materials out of the ordinary channels of trade and into "uncontrolled" or black-market operations.

On the other hand, OPA has in other instances helped hold the line by controlling the symptoms of inflation and preventing extraordinary price increases. Wherever OPA has operated to expand production and to increase the supply of merchandise, it has been able to set price schedules which have helped protect the consumer. Wherever OPA has operated to curtail production, to divert raw materials from established producers to newly created enterprises enjoying political favoritism, and to stimulate black-market transactions in competition with the normal channels of trade, it has actually increased prices, expanded living costs, and deprived entire communities of the necessities of life to which they are entitled.

Thus, OPA is neither all good nor all bad. It has admittedly suffered from maladministration and from too great a tendency to substitute ballyhoo for business-like practices in its operation. I think OPA should be continued into 1947, Mr. Speaker, in spite of its mistakes. I believe we should retain and reform OPA. It should be continued under a "legislative directive" that Congress expects it to help hold prices in line while at the same time so administering its affairs that it will encourage rather than discourage the expanded production which alone—in the long run—can bring supply into line with demand so that the inflationary movement can be stopped effectively.

In extending the life of OPA—and I voted for its extension—I feel Congress should endeavor to amend OPA so that some of its past and current practices which are discouraging and delaying production can be corrected. We should do what we can by legislation to set up guide lines for OPA which will stimulate production and which will wipe out the obnoxious and distasteful black market which is today getting so much of our existence. This black market, Mr. Speaker, should be driven out of existence. To that end I was one of those a few weeks ago who in a close roll call vote went on record in a successful effort to get OPA additional funds for enforcement.

However, in this whole attack upon inflation, Mr. Speaker, we must keep in mind that OPA alone and by itself cannot control or stop inflation. For OPA to present itself as being able to eliminate inflation is like trying to cure a patient of fever by the crude device of changing the degree markings which record the fever's progress. What we need to do is to correct this inflationary fever and to do this we must go beyond and above and around OPA to stimulate production and to stop deficit spending. Let us retain OPA to do what it can to help cushion the symptoms of inflation but let us also insist that this Administration correct its current policies insofar as they are definitely tending to stimulate the inflationary evil which OPA prices tend to measure for the public.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House I desire to call attention to a short item on this subject contained in my weekly news letter to South Dakota papers—Your Washington and You—which was prepared for release in the papers of May 8.

WET STREETS DON'T CAUSE RAIN

Washington is still wrestling with the problems of price control and averting inflation as

this is written. The OPA is to be continued into 1947. What Congress is trying to find is a directive formula which will prevent maladministration of the Office of Price Administration, discourage black marketeering, and stimulate production, so that needed products now in short supply will again become available through the normal channels of trade.

One witness before a congressional price-control committee put it neatly when he said, "Wet streets do not cause rain; high prices are not the cause but they are the measure of inflation." Price controls help hold inflation in check temporarily, but the basic causes of inflation are found deeper than price tags and sales slips.

Two of these causes of inflation are (1) the decreased ratio of consumers' goods to consumers' dollars, and (2) continued deficit spending by the Federal Government which by creating unbalanced budgets inevitably tends to cheapen the dollar.

What is needed to avert dangerous inflation is increased production to bring supply up to demand and decreased Federal extravagance to bring income up to tax revenue. If these results can be achieved while OPA helps hold the line, we can control inflation.

Unless the Government takes effective steps—soon and now—to eliminate the causes of inflation, however, it will be impossible for OPA, with or without amendments, to eliminate the results of inflation by the easy expedient of fixing prices for products which are not available, for homes which have not been built, and on supplies which have never been shipped from farm or factory. We need an improved OPA for a while longer, but even more we need a Government attack on the real causes of inflation.

Why Sympathy for Britain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of April 26, 1946:

WHY SYMPATHY FOR BRITAIN?

What does Britain propose to do with the $4,400,000,000 which she wants from us? Why does she not adopt the Keynes theory and go in for deficit spending like we do? We read about the sympathy angle, but the fact of the matter is that right now Britain comparatively is beating the United States in production.

Britain has not had our strikes. Her labor set-up is much better. She has no Wagner Act, no John L. Lewis, no Phil Murray, no Walter Reuther, and no William Green. Britain is not hamstrung by unions. It looks now as if our unions will keep our production from ever catching up with the demand. Next year promises to be worse than this. In the meantime Britain will be forging ahead.

We have before us a weekly digest taken from the London Daily Mail. It is dated April 17. It should make good reading to any Britisher. There is the Piccadilly spring song of fashion which vies successfully with that of Fifth Avenue, New York. There is an item about Britain's ideal car which will be built cheap enough for workers to buy and run and good enough to capture the vast world market, while our production is throttled by strikes.

Britain also bans all air lines which are not British. Another headline reads: "Exports leap again to target level." Britain is now concentrating on the export of heavier goods, such as machinery, iron and steel, chemicals, vehicles, and aircraft. The Chancelor of the Exchequer says that a balanced budget is in sight. Another headline reads: "Government will hold down cost of living." Our cost of living is getting away from us. Price control works over there and in Canada.

Television in Britain by June is another item and sets are already in production. Interesting in this issue of the Daily Mail is the picture of J. A. Rank, British film magnate, with 11 of his stars. The girls are lovely and the men look competent. Hollywood will soon experience competition from this quarter.

There are also some interesting pictures of the Grand National at Aintree. A record crowd of 400,000 saw a rank outsider snatch victory from one of the hottest favorites ever to run the race. That saved the bookmakers something like $20,000,000. When did we have a horse race that attracted 400,000 people?

Then there is an item headed: "Budget Sent All Shares Well Ahead." The excess-profits taxes have been wiped out and the earnings outlook for many companies is greatly improved. We, too, have wiped out excess-profits taxes, but when a great property like the Pennsylvania Railroad suffers a loss of $5,000,000 in the first quarter of this year we can see that we are taking a back seat to Britain in the matter of profits.

Another item is headed, "Big Speed-Up on British Trains." Another is that "glamorous underwear and nightgowns bedecked with frills and bows will soon be on sale in Britain." But the story that made the greatest impression on us is that Britain will have a "Universal International Exhibition" to be held in the heart of London in 1951. "It should surpass the New York World's Fair of 1939 in scale and technical achievement and the Paris exhibition of 1937 in esthetic excellence and personal appeal," says the Daily Mail.

Britain is developing a boom. We are cursed with politics and strikes. The executive and legislative branches of our Government are at loggerheads. Britain's miners are holding down her coal production, but one man can shut off ours completely.

Let Congress do what it pleases with the so-called British loan, which is not a loan at all but a gift. If sympathy has anything to do with it, we need it more than Britain does. Had we not better keep our $4,400,000,000?

Settlement of Management-Labor Disputes

REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the opportunity for management and labor to settle their disputes by collective bargaining is a precious right. However, the continuance of that right depends upon the exercise of it in a sincere purpose to reach a settlement as rapidly as possible. I do not believe that such efforts are being made in the case of the coal strike. Right after the House voted on the Case bill I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Washington Daily News and a short speech by myself in which I urged at that time that Congress should sit down and consider in a dispassionate manner what kind of a long-run answer to these problems was going to be developed. The present circumstances are not likely to bring that kind of answer.

OPA Persecution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, there are many good people in this country who feel that price control should be continued until supply and demand are more nearly in balance. They fear that a sudden termination of controls would resulting in skyrocketing prices. On the other hand there are many equally good people who while willing to accept the principle of price control until conditions become more nearly normal are not satisfied to continue with price control as it has been handled by the OPA. Every Member of Congress is constantly having called to his attention instances which clearly show that while tremendous black markets flourish under the very nose of the OPA, that its enforcement officials are putting in their time in harassing small businessmen for minor technical violations which cannot be avoided by any businessman under present OPA policies.

I am just in receipt of a letter from my friend, Mr. R. L. Goforth, president of the chamber of commerce at Kiowa, Kans., calling my attention to a typical instance of the way OPA does business. Pursuant to permission heretofore given by the House I submit Mr. Goforth's letter herewith:

THE KIOWA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Kiowa, Kans., May 1, 1946.
The Honorable CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOPE: We are writing you this letter to make a protest against the OPA's small, chiseling way of doing business, and we do mean chiseling. For example, we have one of our grocerymen, who is an honest and reliable citizen, who started in the grocery business 2 years ago, and to get started has held down his expenses and salaries by he and his wife and three children working before and after school. In this manner he has been able to build up a business to where they are making a nice living.

As I said before, they are law-abiding citizens, but on April 2, 1946, the OPA came in and invoiced his stock, and they found 10 articles that were over the ceiling price 1 to 2 cents, which would happen in any store where there are hundreds of different articles. But a few days ago he received a summons from them to appear in Pratt, Kans., which is 65 miles from Kiowa, and to be told that he had been fined $50, but by protesting he got them to cut this down from $50 to $37.50. Mr. Wade, the groceryman of whom I am speaking, lost one full day from his business and the expense of making this trip. The explanation of this is that he had his wife and children marking up the merchandise on the shelves, and it is very easy, with hundreds of articles, to make this small

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

mistake. Although he had hundreds of articles which were under the ceiling, he received no credit for this whatever.

Mr. Wade, while in Pratt, visited several stores selling groceries and found that there were many articles on their shelves that he knew to be over the ceiling. This was in their own city where they were located, and we know that this happens every day in practically every store in the United States, but if the customer should find that he is being charged an extra penny and would mention it to the groceryman, he would be glad to correct it. We also wonder why, if he was charged with this and his fine was $50, they would settle for $37.50. If this is a democracy, we would not want any of it, but it is not, and we just wanted to let you know what we think of these little low-down tricks.

We hope that the amendment to the OPA extension bill will stick, although some prices will rise a little, but competition and the law of supply and demand will soon take care of a few high prices. We hope that your vote will be able to help some on this OPA bill.

Very truly yours,

R. L. GOFORTH,
President.

Farmers Indignant and Deeply Alarmed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, with the coal strike paralyzing the industries of the Nation and causing deep concern on the part of every single individual, it must be self-evident now that this Government ought to be a Government of law and not of men. The trouble is that this administration has abandoned principle and substituted expediency for the impartial administration of law. Votes have been the consideration.

The Government policy that has brought about this bad condition in the country is causing alarm among the farmers of the Nation, especially in the wheat belt. There is a feeling of apprehension as farmers review the whole blundering mismanagement of the Nation's welfare. Whatever bad legislation has been stopped by this Congress, much of the power that has blocked it has come from the farm areas of the Nation. Farmers are hard-headed, practical, far-sighted folks. They have to be. They are alarmed for the future of their industry, lest they, too, find themselves involved in a condition where their industry suffers from governmental mismanagement.

Under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the Fargo Forum, Fargo, N. Dak., under date of May 5, entitled "Farmers Indignant and Deeply Alarmed":

FARMERS INDIGNANT AND DEEPLY ALARMED

Little wonder that North Dakota farmers are confused, indignant, and not a little alarmed at the actions of their Government with respect to the world food supply and mishandling of the control measures over supplies of basic foods, such as wheat and potatoes.

This indignation and alarm, bordering closely on consternation, was expressed by many speakers at the recent Farm Bureau conference in Fargo.

Farmers are indignant because, after the Government had given assurances, not once but many times, that the ceiling prices on wheat would not be raised—the ceilings were raised. Many farmers had sold their wheat at lower figures because they took the Government at its word.

Then, on top of this raise in ceiling prices, the Government announced its 30-cent-a-bushel premium if farmers would rush what wheat they had left into the market before May 25.

While the farmer realizes full well that this is being done in a last desperate effort to get wheat for delivery on commitments which the Government has made to help feed starving people—the thought of the farmer is that it was a piece of stupid folly, an almost unbelievable lack of foresight, which placed the Government in this predicament in the first place.

As one speaker at the recent conference put it, the Government is in a jam, because of this lack of foresight, this failure to realize the need to conserve wheat, and to provide the means for the farmer to get it to market.

It was pointed out that all last fall and through the early winter—when farmers had plenty of time and were in the mood to deliver their wheat promptly—they pleaded for boxcars to move this grain. Then the Government apparently was indifferent to the plight of the starving people abroad.

They point out that this lack of foresight also was responsible for the loss of millions of bushels of potatoes, which were left to rot in the bins, because freight cars were not provided in time.

Representatives of the farmers who pleaded with the Office of Defense Transportation for cars to get wheat and potatoes to the markets were termed "alarmists." Knowing all this, the farmer's sense of justice and fair play is outraged when he learns that in a desperate effort to correct this result of "blundering ineptitude," as F. J. Taintor, of Grand Forks, put it, the Government is now willing to pay, out of Government funds, a 30-cent bonus to the man who either could not or would not deliver his wheat earlier.

That is the background of the movement now sweeping the farm lands, a demand that if the Government, out of public funds, is to pay the farmer who withheld his wheat 30 cents a bushel premium, then in all fairness, the 30 cents should be paid also to the farmers who delivered their wheat earlier.

There is something much deeper and more significant here than a mere scramble to get a 30-cent bonus on wheat previously sold.

There is a feeling of apprehension, almost of consternation, as farmers review this whole blundering mismanagement.

Farmers are hard-headed, practical, foresighted folks. They have to be. They cannot understand how such stupidity, as has been demonstrated here, is tolerated. They are alarmed for the future of their industry, if their affairs are to be left in such hands.

The First Break

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News:

THE FIRST BREAK

From Secretary of Agriculture Anderson comes the first hint that the administration may be losing confidence in its managed economy program.

Mr. Anderson stated in an interview the other day that if the meat situation does not improve in the next 90 days he would advocate dropping of price controls.

That's a lot for the planned economists to admit. Heretofore they had presented a solid front on the price-control question—unanimous insistence that price controls could accomplish reconversion without the threat of inflation.

That Mr. Anderson's admission of possible failure was made grudgingly is evident.

He wants 90 days more, whereas controls have been in effect for several times 90 days and the situation has been steadily going from bad to worse with the prospect that the meat shortage will be the worst in history about mid-summer.

And, then, Mr. Anderson doesn't favor discarding of controls. He would merely suspend them, with the power to clamp them on again should the bureaucrats deem such action wise.

And he doesn't say how much time he would favor granting a free system to repair the damage that has been done, and will be done within the next few months.

Probabilities are, however, that the bureaucrats, if they did consent to suspension of controls, would give the free enterprise system a few scant weeks and if the meat shortage was not instantly converted into great plenty, they would start hollering for restoration of controls.

Given a reasonable time to correct conditions that now exist, a system of free enterprise could in time repair the damage that has been done.

But, the meat situation is far worse than it was when the control system was placed in effect. It will be still worse 90 days hence, according to all indications.

The machinery for the raising, slaughtering, and distribution of meat had been just about wrecked by managed-economy restrictions.

That's what would be handed over to the free enterprise system next summer, if the planned economists should relinquish control.

And that's what the free enterprise system would be expected to perform miracles with.

So, after an unfair trial, the bureaucrats would again revert to a policy which has proven a failure, and which Mr. Anderson has admitted is failing to produce the desired results.

Central Valley Misrepresented

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times:

CENTRAL VALLEY MISREPRESENTED

Some eastern papers—particularly the Washington Post—are misrepresenting as a land grab efforts to get lifted the 160-acre limitation covering Federal reclamation projects. This stand shows a total ignorance of the Central Valley situation, which is entirely different from the general run of irrigation and reclamation projects.

In this general run it is Government-owned land that is mainly being reclaimed and irrigated, and there may be some reason for preventing large areas from falling into the hands of speculators.

In the Central Valley the land is almost 100 percent in private ownership, and is already considerably developed by irrigation projects, which landowners and communities have undertaken at their own considerable expense.

To break up these developments for the mere purpose of satisfying a law passed to fit areas where different conditions obtain would not be useful. On the contrary, it would be likely to result in a disastrous, if temporary, slump in agricultural production from this heavily producing area.

In at least four other cases Congress has suspended the 160-acre limitation. And in this case the Reclamation Bureau itself is proposing to suspend it by ruling that because of California's community-property law a man and his wife shall each be entitled to hold 160 acres of irrigated land. Bureau officials have even suggested that an additional 160 acres be allowed water service for each child in the family—a situation which amounts to an admission that the limitation does not properly apply to Central California conditions.

Prof. B. H. Crocheron, Agricultural Extension Service director for the University of California, fears that the real danger in California is not that farms will be too large, but that they will be too small for economical operation. There seems a tendency to subdivide acreage on the theory that present high prices for land will continue, he says, and, in case of a slump, there is considerable danger that owners of small acreages will be unable to maintain a decent standard of living.

But in any case, there is in the California picture no possibility of anything resembling a land grab since the land is already in private hands; and not in the hands of speculators, but of develcpers.

The Des Moines Register, discussing the project, passes on this piece of misinformation: "The dams to be built in California are paid for by money collected generally over the country." The fact is they will be paid for (and more) by money collected in California. California is one of the few States where Federal tax collections considerably exceed Federal expenditures, so it would be truer to say that "the dams to be built generally over the country are to be paid for by money from California."

Why the well-developed, integrated farms of the Central Valley should be broken up and disintegrated merely to satisfy a pet theory of former Secretary of the Interior Ickes that everything California wants is wrong and that this State needs the guidance and direction of a strong hand in Washington is not at all apparent. The public interest would not be served by insistence upon the 160-acre limitation.

Amvets Proposals Adopted by War Assets Administration and Confirmed by the Attorney General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, 1946, the Attorney General of the United States issued a public statement lauding Amvets'—American Veterans of World War II—proposals to bring about a fairer and more equitable distribution of surplus property. It is gratifying to read that the recommendations made by his young veterans' organization will soon be put into effect by the War Assets Administration. Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the following document:

Attorney General Tom C. Clark announced today the successful outcome of a 2-day conference held in the Department of Justice on May 6 and 7 with representatives of veterans' organizations and of War Assets Administration, resulting in the adoption of plans to expedite the handling of veterans' priorities to United States Government property declared surplus. Delegates from the American Veterans of World War II (Amvets) submitted recommendations on behalf of Michigan representatives of the American Legion, the Allied Veterans Council, the American Veterans of World War II (Amvets) and Veterans of Foreign Wars which were considered at this conference.

Following the recent institution of a suit in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan by the American Veterans of World War II (Amvets) and the individual veterans Monte M. Korn, Thomas J. Barrett, Fred A. Beger, and Samuel Kaplan against War Assets Administration, in which complaint was made of the handling of veterans priorities in the Detroit area, Assistant Attorney General John F. Sonnett, at the direction of the Attorney General, arranged conferences with the National Commander of Amvets, Jack Hardy, with other representatives of Amvets as follows: Frank Schwartz (chief counsel for Amvets surplus property section), Upton Shreve (attorney, Michigan Post No. 67), Monte M. Korn (attorney, Commander Post No. 1, Detroit), H. E. McLaughlin, Samuel Kaplan (investigating committee), James W. Brooks (investigator, post No. 16) and J. H. Leib (national legislative director), and Chat Patterson, of the American Veterans Committee.

The conferences were also attended by E. A. Stansfield, general counsel of War Assets Administration, and by Scott W. Donaldson, Director of the Veterans Division of War Assets Administration, along with the following representatives of War Assets Administration: John G. Alexander, Patrick M. Kildea, Harry B. Rottiers, attorneys, and E. J. Gebben and Mark H. Cornell.

Attorney General Clark stated: "I am happy to announce that after discussion of the administration of veterans' priorities in regard to surplus property in the Detroit area and consideration of various suggestions regarding disposal of surplus war goods submitted on behalf of Michigan representatives of the American Legion, the Allied Veterans Council of Amvets and Veterans of Foreign Wars, a number of important steps will be taken.

"These should improve the disposal of surplus property to veterans and will implement the legislation improving veterans' priorities, recently signed by President Truman. This should be of distinct benefit not only to Michigan veterans by to all other veterans as well. However, it should be noted that General Gregory has advised me that the supply of certain types of surplus property is limited and some veterans may therefore be disappointed."

As a result of the conferences the Veterans Policy Committee of the War Assets Administration will be enlarged. The chairman of the committee is Scott W. Donaldson, Director of the Veterans' Division of War Assets Administration and the membership, which includes representatives of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans, will include representatives of Amvets and of American Veterans Committee. The Veterans Policy Committee of War Assets Administration will act in an advisory capacity to the War Assets Administration in order to assist, through such information as the members may provide, the administration by Lt. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory, Administrator of War Assets, of surplus property in which veterans are interested.

The committee will hold regular meetings at least once a month at the headquarters of War Assets Administration in Washington, D. C., and minutes of those meetings will be prepared for distribution to the committee and to the 33 regional offices of the War Assets Administration. The committee will also receive monthly reports of the amount of surplus consumer goods sold and the dollar sales or percentages of the total sold to veterans.

Consideration is to be given to the early appointment, in each of the 33 regional offices maintained by War Assets Administration, of a veterans policy committee to consult with the regional director.

All participating in the conferences have recognized the need for full publicity as to items of surplus property available. It was emphasized that veterans may upon request to the Regional Office of the War Assets Administration be placed on a mailing list and will receive notices of items to be sold in which they may have an interest. In addition to the distribution heretofore given by War Assets Administration of information concerning such items, War Assets Administration has agreed to furnish to each veterans' organization which may request it full information as to items of property to be sold. Additional methods with respect to further publicizing material for sale are being studied by War Assets Administration.

In view of the complaints as to the administration of surplus property in the Detroit area, Scott W. Donaldson, Director of the Veterans' Division of War Assets Administration, will make a special study of existing facilities in the Detroit area and will explore the suggestion made by Amvets that a veteran's complaint officer be appointed to receive all complaints.

Jack Hardy, National Commander Amvets and Frank Schwartz, Chief Counsel for Amvet Surplus Property Section, stated that, "In view of the splendid ccoperation received in Washington and the changes contemplated by War Assets Administration we are of the view that no benefit to veterans would be accomplished by continuation of the suit filed in Detroit seeking to enjoin further disposal of surplus property by the War Assets Administration's office there and, accordingly, the suit is to be discontinued."

North Carolina's Grand Old Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials which appeared recently in the News and Observer, Raleigh, N. C., relating to our distinguished colleague the gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON:

GRAND OLD MAN

A third of a century ago, when the Congressman from his district was a Republican and that party had great strength, ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON, farmer and cattle raiser, was nominated by his party to redeem the district. He had seen public service as State

senator and member of the board of agriculture, and his record had been approved. In the election he won by a substantial majority and in every election for a longer tenure than any other Congressman of North Carolina he has been unanimously renominated and reelected with steadily increased majorities.

He was in the House of Representatives during the Wilson administration and upheld the policies known as the New Freedom. In the lean years of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover resulting in the national lapse from frenzied finance to depression, DOUGHTON "kept the rudder true," grew in stature and in the esteem of his fellow Members so that when the Democrats returned to power he was, as head of the powerful Ways and Means Committee, one of the group of leaders who carried through the main Rooseveltian policies known as the New Deal.

Mr. DOUGHTON, wearing his honors with modesty, comes to Raleigh today to sound the keynote of the important campaign of 1946, a campaign which may determine which party will guide the destinies of the Republic for the quadrennial beginning in 1948. For four times in succession the Democratic Party has been successful since the days of the depression because it has blazed new trails and served to strengthen the policies to secure freedom from want as well as uphold the "four freedoms" guaranteed in the Bill of Rights. Today, thanks to Roosevelt and the Congress in sympathy with forward-looking policies, every branch of the Federal Government is controlled by Democrats.

In all these years Mr. DOUGHTON has served so satisfactorily that today by his constituents, by his State, and by the Republic he is called "the grand old man"—though the toll of years has robbed him of none of his zeal for causes that he believes will benefit his countrymen.

The delegates to the convention and the people look to Mr. DOUGHTON today to preach the gospel incarnated in Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, and Roosevelt, and to sound the note of going forward along the lines which have won the approval of the people in the Republic and in the State. As his towering figure rises in the convention to give the keynote, all North Carolina Democrats will affectionately hail Farmer BOB DOUGHTON as "the grand old man" of North Carolina democracy.

RECORD IS PLATFORM

In his keynote speech at the Democratic State Convention yesterday, Chairman ROBERT L. DOUGHTON gave utterance to a truth that in politics is as true as anything in Holy Writ. He declared and emphasized the truth—"The record is the platform of the Democratic Party."

The voters are tired of excuses, they are sick of explanations that do not explain, they are fed up on honeyed promises of what is to be achieved. They judge a party as they do a man on performance. In power by four votes of confidence in the Federal Government and 12 votes of confidence in the State government, covering 16 years at Washington and 46 years at Raleigh, Mr. DOUGHTON wisely and succinctly told the voters: "Judge our party by its record of achievement," and he graphically gave the picture of near bankruptcy which was dissipated by the New Deal legislation and administration. People have such good forgetteries it was wise in Mr. DOUGHTON to describe the terrible conditions that cursed the country on the day Roosevelt was inaugurated. Let us never forget from what the Democratic Party saved our country as compressed by Mr. DOUGHTON after saying the "Nation's economy was on its last legs," he added:

"Millions were facing starvation—but nothing had been done by the Federal Government in response to the plea of humanity. Other millions were being evicted from their homes, and agriculture was in a state of complete collapse. Upwards of 30,000,000 farming people had, through no fault of their own, been dropped from the purchasing class—but nothing had been done to help them. More than 5,000 banks had failed during that one Republican administration but the man in the White House insisted that "prosperity was just around the corner." Factories were closing their doors by literal thousands—merchants were beating a trail to the courts of bankruptcy—and the army of the unemployed in swelling ranks was tramping the streets of every city, town, and hamlet, and the highways and byways of every countryside in the Nation."

Mr. DOUGHTON then graphically told the story of the change after Roosevelt and the Congress enacted legislation which lifted the country out of the slough of despond upon the high ground of employment, good wages, and prosperity. He showed that the income of the farmers increased from four and one-half billion to twenty billion and the national income from thirty-eight billion to seventy-six billion with most of the 10,000,000 men jobless in 1932 finding employment at good wages. High tribute was paid to President Roosevelt, and "the greatness and immortality of his unconquerable spirit." He expressed admiration for and faith in Truman, "an honest, capable, and fearless champion of the American way."

Mr. DOUGHTON followed the story of national development and prosperity with a recounting of construction record of the State administration from Aycock to Cherry. He closed with declaring: "We must continue to pilot our ship of state away from the stagnating shoals of reactionism and also away from the equally dangerous quicksand of radicalism."

Mr. DOUGHTON, beyond expressing faith that peace will be attained and progress in domestic affairs, did not touch upon the big problems which this Congress and the Executive must solve. Evidently he feels that it is too soon to assess the record of the post-war period because most of the legislation is in the making. Victory demands that the differences of opinion by members of the dominant party must be ironed out in the same way that the party acted when its representatives carried through the New Deal legislation when Republican reaction then as now wished to cry "Halt" to liberal and helpful policies. Perhaps the best sentence in the keynote address was the approval of policies of the party which since Jefferson "has held for constructive deeds for humanity."

This fall the voters should not forget that Mr. Roosevelt lifted the country out of depression but they will vote in November on the record of advance for "constructive deeds for humanity" made by this Congress and the Truman administration. The past is deserving of all that Mr. DOUGHTON recalled. The future victories of the Democratic Party in 1946 and 1948 depend on united action by the party in power for measures that mark a steady advance "for humanity." So far it has not measured up to expectations and some pledges have not been fulfilled by this Congress. There is need for united party settling its differences and presenting an unbroken front in Congress on important policies just as there was when Claude Kitchin declared that "all important policies will be determined by the Democratic caucus." Voting with Republicans for Republican measures invites a destruction of Government by parties and a repudiation of Democratic pledges made to win elections.

Victory will call for Democratic solidarity in assuming and carrying out the platform pledges so that in 1946 and 1948 we may command victory by showing that "the record is the platform."

Resolution of North Dakota Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the American farmer, wherever he may be located in the 48 States of the Union, is today the greatest influence in the direction of a well-balanced national economy.

He has willingly gone along with the administration as it has parceled out millions here and there to one group and another, but the day is at hand when the American farmer will demand his place in the sun, and his voice will be heard in the Congress of the United States. He has a good case.

Under unanimous consent, I include resolutions adopted by the members of the North Dakota Farm Bureau at a meeting held in Fargo, N. Dak., May 1, 1946:

At a special meeting of representative members of the North Dakota Farm Bureau held at Fargo, N. Dak., May 1, 1946, the following resolutions were adopted:

"Whereas ill-advised leadership has been followed by the Department of Agriculture in the payment of a bonus of 30 cents a bushel on only the wheat and corn marketed between the dates of April 21 and May 25, 1946; and

"Whereas parties responsible for the present marketing and price program should have known long before this of the need for food supplies for relief purposes abroad, and should have provided the necessary transportation, purchasing arrangements and other handling facilities without waiting until this late date to put into effect a plan which belatedly recognizes the unfair price situation which has prevailed for the grain farmer for the past several years. Much of the failure to place wheat in channels of trade has been due to inept handling of available transportation ever since the 1945 grain harvest. The same situation has been characteristic of the handling of other food products, particularly potatoes in which case hundreds of carloads of this cheap nourishing food have been allowed to rot in storage for lack of a fair proportion of the available cars suitable for moving this crop. Much of the potato crop thus lost was stored under Government loans; and

"Whereas farmers were given to understand as long ago as the fall of 1945 that the ceiling price on wheat and corn then prevailing would remain in effect for the entire crop of that year, with the result farmers generally marketed their grain as rapidly as their old farm trucks and shortage of labor on the farms permitted; that when the need for wheat to prevent famine abroad became apparent, they patriotically sold their wheat then stored in local warehouses, and would for the most part have marketed the remainder of their crops left on farms prior to April 1 if roads, labor, and weather had permitted. Most of the available wheat about to be marketed would have been delivered in April if farmers had not been occupied exclusively in seeding or planting the 1946 crop. Because of all these facts and what to the farmer appears to be a grossly unfair method of handling the entire food supply and food price program have all caused the farmer to lose faith in the present and any future program; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the bonus of 30 cents a bushel on wheat should be made applicable

to the entire 1945 wheat crop; and further be it

"*Resolved*, That the parity price of the 1946 crop be set sufficiently early in the marketing season and that the price determined then should apply to the entire 1946 crop; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That such parity prices should reflect added farm expenses because of higher expenses due to increase in the cost of all items that enter into the production of marketing the crop; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the cost of farm labor be figured in the parity price formula.

"The American farmer has throughout the war earnestly participated in the war effort, despite shortage of labor, both hired and family, shortage of equipment, and shortage of all other items entering into crop production. He feels that he has on many occasions been alone in this wholehearted effort, as indicated by labor stoppages and strikes in the industries from which he draws his own supplies, including farm machinery, coal, steel, transportation, and many others, and asks only the wholehearted cooperation of labor and industry with agriculture in supplying hungry and destitute nations of the world which are dependent upon a bounteous America in maintaining their more meager standard of living."

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to extend in the RECORD a copy of a speech which I delivered over Station WWDC, Washington, Monday night, April 29, as follows:

I wish to speak tonight about national defense.

When national defense is mentioned, most Americans instinctively think of the armed services.

In these days, following the close of the shooting period of war, we look hopefully toward a just and a lasting peace. The whole world does. Many of us want peace the easy way. We want to shun self-denial and to run away from the hardships incident to obtaining peace. In our urge to forget the blood and tears of war and to return to the pursuits of peace which we followed before the war, we lose sight of the fact that we have $275,000,000,000 invested in this war and the peace which we hope will follow it. A considerable sum of money to say the least. This vast sum of money is a minor item, however, when compared to the thousands of our finest young men and young women who sleep tonight beneath white crosses in graves upon a thousand islands in the Pacific, in North Africa, in Europe, in Alaska, and in our own land. Many also sleep beneath the ever-changing waves of the sea. There are also the countless thousands returned to us broken in body and mind who are in our hospitals all over the world, victims of the struggle to bring peace to the world.

America must be strong physically and spiritually to be able to help finish the work which these, our gallant sons and brave daughters have begun at so great a sacrifice. We cannot do it by running from the issues. We cannot do it by dodging the responsibility.

We are not a warlike people. This fact makes it harder for us to keep prepared for peace. The realization that we must be strong for peace as well as for war is hard for the average American. The one necessity tends to confuse the other necessity in our concept of duty.

During these unsettled days before the treaties of peace are signed, before the United Nations, now in its infancy, has grown strong enough to keep the peace, it is necessary that we remain strong. We are a friendly nation and a generous people. We desire no advantage. Our hope is that the nations of the world will learn to live together as good neighbors. Nothing, therefore, can be a greater force for peace than a strong America, spiritually sensitive to justice.

My belief is that the first line of defense for peace in America is the composite will of the American people to see the United Nations succeed. To do that with the same unselfish spirit which we manifested during the war, it is essential that we have unity at home; that we be determined that all the suffering and heartache of this war were not endured in vain; that we have faith in each other; that we have faith in our gallant allies; that we have faith in God.

The second line of defense is our armed services. We must have an Army, Navy, and an Air Force strong enough to make our presence felt wherever our word is given in a world struggling for peace. Our armed services must be arms of justice and decency and freedom for all peoples and not for conquest. They have never been arms of conquest.

Our third line of national defense is a strong domestic economy. Right now we are having difficulty with that, what with strife between labor and managements, and, what with the various other problems of reconversion, including price control, minimum wages and all the myriad problems of our daily living.

Fourth in our line of defense is rarely mentioned in that connection, and is the one I desire to stress tonight.

I refer to legislation now pending in Congress to permit the State Department to engage in selling America to the world in those places where our privately owned press, publications, and radio cannot go.

All over this land, chambers of commerce are busy day and night selling to their neighboring communities and to the world those things which set these particular communities apart as special attractions to the home seeker, the industries seeking locations for plants, and as places of rest and recreation for people on tour. Millions of dollars are spent this way each year in the United States selling good will.

The United States today is the leading country in the world in its freedom, its culture, its industry, and its religion. Developments in radio and air transportation have made us next door neighbors to every other place on earth. We are only 60 hours away from the farthest part of the globe in travel, and, only an instant away by radio.

It is not enough that we be strong physically. As I have said, we must be strong spiritually. We must have an abiding belief in the concept of the brotherhood of all mankind; to be aware of the hunger and heartache of our brothers in all places. If we have that spirit, then we will want to tell our story to the world and we will tell it with our heart in it.

Unfortunately, selfishness still plays a big role in world affairs. We, ourselves, do not have entirely clean hands on that score. As a result, misunderstandings and jealousies have arisen between neighbors, and in some places, our story is not told nor is it received. America must accept that challenge in its true sense of good will and tell her story in its full light wherever there are people to receive it; by press, by radio, by messenger. When people know all the facts, they can be trusted to solve the most difficult problems. Let us give the State Department the funds needed to carry on this work in conjunction with the press and radio of our country. The State Department must go where private means of communication cannot go because of the cost involved and consequent loss to private enterprise in the effort. No greater defense from war nor a greater force for peace can be developed than a complete understanding of one another's problems—and that understanding can never be had without the people of the world having the full and complete truth.

If we can get our story told, the most doubting neighbors will completely understand that we, in America, long for peace above everything in the world; that we have neither the desire nor the intent to try to impose our ideology of government upon anyone on this earth; that it is our ideal of government that the lowliest citizen has the same right as the most powerful; that a man can worship God in the manner which pleases him; that he can get up anywhere at any time and criticize his public officials from the President of the United States down to a constable in the smallest township. He can do this and have no fear that he will be stood up against a wall and shot for doing it, or of even being punished at all; that his son or daughter, born and reared in the most humble of circumstances, can become the President of a great university, the head of a great hospital, the pastor of the greatest church, or even the President of his country. Yes; when people all over the world understand what our heart is and what our soul is, then we will be far closer to a just and lasting peace.

Often the news from this country is distorted as it reaches other lands. Where nations are in strife economically or in war, the news is often colored to fit the pleasure of the one sending it or disseminating it. It is not at all unlike a political campaign in our own country. The opposition pounces upon the mistakes which have been made and magnifies them and never mentions the good which may have been done. Statements are studied and selections from the statements are taken which are least favorable. They are pulled from the context and told as the truth. This happens, unfortunately, among nations and is not conducive to better understanding.

What we are endeavoring to do is to get the truth across firmly but in a gracious and friendly manner.

When some other nation misunderstands an act of one of our citizens and erroneously jumps to the conclusion that his acts and statements represent the thought and will of America, we must combat that with the most powerful weapon we have—the truth.

What we want the world to know is that here in America we are a country of divergent interest yet withal we are one of the other. The mills of the North and the East, the grain of the great Midwest, the cotton of the South, the cattle ranges of the West and Southwest, the booming new industry of the Pacific coast are all part of this great land; labor and management and agriculture, dependent upon each other to such a degree that the economic illness of one affects vitally the other two. Our churches, our schools, our hospitals are all monuments to the free expression given to the everyday, average American. It is America.

We are coming to the place in America where there is no section "across the tracks"—and it must be. This one ideal must exist in the world. Otherwise, from generation to generation, the youth of our country will be called upon to go forth to fight to preserve this democracy. And that because those of us before them failed in our duty and ran from our responsibility.

In Defense of the Right to Own Private Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Roy C. McKenna, of Latrobe, Pa.:

IN DEFENSE OF THE RIGHT TO OWN PRIVATE PROPERTY

(By Roy C. McKenna)

In selecting the topic "Private property" to discuss this evening, some of my audience may think it is not an issue in the United States, as all Americans agree that the ownership of private property is the most fundamental of all human rights.

Private property was the original source of freedom, and it is still the main defense of liberty. Where men have yielded without serious resistance to the tyranny of new dictators, it was because they lacked property. If a dictatorship comes to America, it will be under the leadership of brilliant individuals advocating some sharing-the-wealth plan, not recognizing that the Government cannot make a gift to one citizen without taking it from another.

Is there not in Washington a powerful clique working incessantly to undermine our established institutions? Do you believe that Isadore Lubin, Mordecai Ezekiel, Tommy Corcoran, Benjamin Cohen, Rex Tugwell, and Henry Wallace, really believe in free enterprise? Or that the politicians recently appointed to our Supreme Court really do? That wing of the Democratic Party which claims to be "liberal" and the "defender of the common man" has always been influenced by European innovations. Economically they have been followers of Lord Keynes, outdoing him, however, in the advocacy of deficiency spending.

Sir William H. Beveridge, author of the Beveridge Plan in England, has been their authority upon social legislation—so we may be alarmed when in his book, Full Employment in a Free Society (written before the English elections), he states that "The list of essential liberties does not include the liberty of a private citizen to own means of production and to employ other citizens in operating them at a wage."

The right of the individual to save and to use his savings in acquiring the tools of his own business, is the lifeblood of America; and the Government has a deep obligation to encourage and protect the exercise of this right.

Liberals speak of the conflict between human rights and property rights, attacking great impersonal corporate properties, and obscuring the truth that the only dependable foundation of personal liberty is the personal economic security of private property. Anything used by men to aid production is a tool. Not only the plow is a tool, but the horse and the barn and the land itself.

An individual has the right to become a tool owner as a stockholder in any productive enterprise, a holder of a bond or a mortgage, a depositor in a bank, or through life insurance.

That there is an antagonism between tool owners and tool users is admitted. This should not be, for fundamentally the interests of tool owners and tool users are corelated and not conflicting. The objective of both is increased production with less labor and more leisure. In America, there are probably as many persons receiving a part of their income from ownership of production tools as there are those whose income is exclusively from the use of tools. Tools without workers produce nothing, and workers without tools produce little.

Admitting the ingenuity and exceptional skill of the American mechanic, yet his higher wage is due entirely to increased production by the use of more and better tools. A recent study has shown that the standard of living in any country is directly proportionate to the investment in tool money per job. A statistician named Pareto many years ago proved that the economic reward of individuals seemed to have always been divided among groups in some proportioned relation to service rendered.

Judged only by comparative standards, one-third ill-housed, ill-fed, ill-clothed, seems always throughout history to have given political demagogs the opportunity to take advantage of an economic law to create class hatreds. The same law which has been proven by so many studies is our assurance that all social and cultural advances will be shared equitably by all segments of our society.

Is not the standard of living of the lower third of a high-standard-of-living country, many times greater than that of the lower third of a low-standard-of-living country? Even a study by our biased Government economists, the same group that is advocating the adoption by America of European ideologies and economics, showed that the lower third in America consume approximately four times the meat, milk, and other essential food products than the average of Russia—and even lower standards exist in India and China.

Is it not queer that in a world that is drifting toward socialism everywhere, that America alone is able to supply the food, clothing, and absolute essentials necessary for survival of former allies and former enemies?

You may be sure that a continued betterment of living standards will come only through more and better tools. Under the factory system in industry, tools have become too expensive for the workers to own. Under any form of government, tools wear out and must be replaced. Advancement of civilization is dependent upon the supply of tool money. Whether this is supplied individually or collectively, an incentive must be given to reward the self-denial of putting part of earnings into tools. Under Government ownership, the reward would be the payment of interest on Government securities, and under private enterprise the ownership of an equity in a corporation.

The question is, Where is the money to come from? Certainly not from the wealthy under present taxation. In agriculture, the farmer very largely provides his own tools, which actually represent an investment, including land, home, barns, stock, and machinery, of about $6,000 for each farmer. Does not the corporation present a way for workers through savings to supply a large part of their own tools?

The part that the corporation has played in the development of America has never been appraised. It has done more to increase wages and output and to provide more jobs, than any other institution. The modern corporation is an American institution. In the year 1811, the laws of New York State first gave to the citizenry the right to create a corporation without a special act of a legislative body. It was in America that the corporation grew and prospered. Every State in the Union followed the lead of New York; special privilege and monopoly were legally done away with. Collectively citizens could own tools of production.

As a group, tool owners are politically weak and today have to fight for a very minimum payment; the tool owner has no standing in a court compared to the standing of a man who uses the tool, and he has been fighting a rear-guard action ever since the Wagner Labor Act became a law.

Tool owners must hire management; workers have to be supervised by foremen and superintendents; inspectors have to see that specifications are met; chemists, metallurgists, engineers, lawyers, personnel men, salesmen, and advertising men, all play their part in coordinating their own industry.

Management's place is to see that increased production by technological advancement, invention, new ideas, better marketing, and greater volume, and the use of more and better tools, is divided fairly among all groups—workers, customers, and owners—each in accordance to his desserts.

Management's place in the division of labor is definite; it can see that a plant is operated efficienty, waste avoided, that worker-management relations are good, and that better and new products are planned; and by salesmanship and advertising, create a desire for customers to buy.

But management cannot guarantee employment to anyone. Management is just a go-between; a group of men who arrange for other men to exchange their labor. Jobs are supplied by customers, and only by a willingness of customers to trade one with another can there be economic stability.

A government favorable to free competitive enterprise and that recognizes that tool owners—those thrifty citizens who through self-denial by savings supply the funds—are entitled to a fair return for their services—many influence tool users to become tool owners.

Under impartial government, industrial strife may be avoided by better understanding which can be reached by the use of plain common-sense language in place of the highly involved and misleading terms and slogans now in current use.

America, with free enterprise, in peace or war can and has out-produced any dictatorship. By cooperation between tool owners and tool users, under management freed from arbitrary government controls, we can produce plentifully and divide the product equitably among all segments of our people.

Is is not a travesty upon democracy that for almost a generation there has been a drift toward statism without the issue being faced fairly as such and decided upon its merit?

The founders of our Republic gave us a constitutional Government, with far more emphasis upon opportunity than upon security. Americans today are sons of pioneers and basically themselves pioneers at heart. In the long run the infiltration of foreign ideologies which has been going on will probably not change their nature.

Planned economy cannot change human nature—it only changes bosses.

Wheat Premium Unfair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced a bill providing that all farmers who marketed wheat and corn under persuasion by the Government after January 1, 1946, should be paid the 30-cent-per-bushel premium which is in effect as to all sales made after April 18. The purpose of the legislation is to remedy the unfairness which exists in the treatment of those who sold their

corn and wheat before April 18 as compared with those who sold it afterward. The following editorial from the Syracuse Journal, Syracuse, Kans., points out this discrimination very clearly:

WHEAT PREMIUM NOT FAIR TO ALL

Hi, Sucker! You, we mean, who heard and believed your Government a few weeks ago when the "experts" begged you to market your wheat to save the starving and destitute people of Europe. No reason for not doing it, they assured you, for the price would not go up, nor costs go down. Yes; you are the sucker all right. You softened, you took pity on the starving, had confidence in your Government, you marketed your wheat. That 30 cents a bushel raise that your more hard-hearted and hard-headed fellows will receive will almost pay their share of the salaries of the experts who gave you the bum advice a few weeks earlier.

We don't blame you a bit, whether you sold your wheat a month ago when the need became apparent or sat tight waiting for the raise. The fault lies in a situation which should not have existed, a political as well as commercial hazard in the marketing of a crop. If the men who had charge of wheat marketing want to do what is right, they will see that those who heeded them the first time get that extra 30 cents, too. It is a fine, noble gesture to assist in the lessening of hunger in the world, and those who listened to the plea of the starving should not suffer financially in comparison to those who kept their wheat in the bins. Let's make the price increase retroactive to take care of these more gullible though warm-hearted producers.

Cars for Amputee Veterans

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a booklet which was gotten out by the War Amputees Car Committee. It contains a list of veterans, veterans' organizations, student-veterans' organizations, labor organizations, and miscellaneous organizations and individuals supporting the war amputee car program.

Mr. Speaker, fortunately, there are only 25,000 veterans, though that is far too many, who would come under the benefits of bills which I introduced to give a car to men who cannot get about, men who have lost an arm or a leg, or arms or legs, or the use of them through war injuries. There are some men who have lost both arms and both legs. Some have lost three limbs, or even four limbs, or the use thereof.

A paraplegic or spinal-cord injury case said to me yesterday: "When I am driving an automobile, that is the only time I feel I can compete on equal terms with those who have not lost a limb."

This bill should be passed immediately. It is an emergency. These men need a car immediately. They cannot get about without one.

A year ago today peace was declared with Germany. We remember, to bring about that peace everything was done as an emergency. Let us help the men who secured that peace for us and paid so dear a price to become rehabilitated, and to compete with civilians. Without transportation they cannot do so. A car for these men is an absolute necessity.

(The booklet referred to follows:)

WAR AMPUTEES CAR COMMITTEE—LIST OF VETERANS, VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS, STUDENTS VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS, LABOR ORGANIZATIONS, AND MISCELLANEOUS ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS SUPPORTING THE WAR AMPUTEE CAR PROGRAM

The Army has given us a prosthesis to prepare us for civilian life. We, however, feel that this hasn't proven adequate to place us on an equal basis with the able-bodied.

We, the undersigned, are therefore resolved that every veteran, who, because of war-inflicted injuries, is seriously hampered in walking, in order that he may compete on a basis relatively equal to those who are not so handicapped, be supplied an automobile by the Government.

Lee Harrell, ward 67; Charles Worrilow, ward 68; Charles H. Rossmann, ward 64, New Jersey; Sam T. Pico, ward 51; Larry Bauchard, ward 68 A; Earl V. Walls, Jr., ward 53; Harry Ward Hinebaugh, Jr., ward 53; Charles C. Bochanis, ward 52; Joseph E. Kuspiel, ward 50, Elizabeth, N. J.; John J. Kelley, ward 50, Everett, Mass.; George Skalski, ward 50, Meadowbrook, W. Va.; Warren Huffman, ward 54, Dott, W. Va.; Grant G. Sullivan, ward 54 J, Williamsburg, Ky.; Cecil P. Gough, Jr., ward 50, Calora, Md.; James W. Brown, ward 51; Kettler, ward 64, New Bremen, Ohio; O. F. Thompson, ward 68 A; Pfc David Leuxner, ward 50; Joseph F. Stoak, ward 64, Pennsylvania; Angas W. Rose, ward 64; Virginia; Odis L. Warren, ward 64, Oklahoma; Harry W. Wilt, ward 68 A.

Pfc Clifford Smith, ward 53; T/5 Robert T. Lock, ward 51; Staff Sgt. John D. Stone, ward 51; William F. Wooten, ward 53; Pfc Alex Levi, ward 52; Pfc Elmer Siple, ward 68 A; Pvt. Raymond O. Goins, ward 53; Pfc Wonser, New York, ward 67; Pfc James B. Davis, ward 53, Pennsylvania; Pfc Lemuel S. Evans, ward 53; Pfc Norris A. White, ward 52; Pfc Donald J. Murray; Paul L. Sims, Cu.; Pfc Edgar F. Edwards; Sgt. Charles W. Coe; Pfc Anthony R. Cancemi, New York; Corp. John Milone, New York; Pfc David Leuxner.

Paul Bodner, ward 53, New York; Tadao Ona, ward 53; John Georgopulos, ward 64, New York; J. S. Adamson, ward 51; John W. Gilmartin, ward 51; Lionel Anger, ward 64; James J. Podany, ward 51; Emmor E. Gordon, ward 51; Alfred M. Schubert, ward 51; James Cannon, ward 53; Edmund Fannon, ward 52; Vernon J. Price, ward 51; Daniel R. Puma, ward 67; Harry M. Siber, ward 51; David Hess, ward 54; Joseph Lawrence, ward 51; Louis Agosto, ward 50; Bernard Seeley, ward 68A; Edward H. Georgens, ward 68A; Albert P. Beloamino, ward 52; Alex Harrison, ward 67, District of Columbia; Richard Netatte, ward 53; Brunda John, ward 68A; Moran Michael, ward 53.

Francis W. Momeo, ward 53, New York; Henry G. Deske, ward 53; Joseph C. Megatis, ward 53, Pennsylvania; Jacob Davis, ward 53, Massachusetts; Louis G. Hall, ward 53, New York; Nicholos J. Larusso, ward 53, New Jerser; Stanley E. Swizenski, ward 53, New York; Clois E. Laner, ward 53; William F. Collum, ward 53; Vito Romeo, ward 53, New York; William J. Stacco, ward 54; Leo L. Melio, ward 64; Ralph Knauf, ward 64; George Everett, ward 52, Pennsylvania; John Humphreys, ward 53, New Jersey; Francis Clark, ward 51; Richard Lowe, ward 51; Walter E. Dillon, Jr., ward 53, New York; Wallace P. Oring, ward 53, New York; Joseph Postorino, ward 50, New Jersey; Peter Decenare, ward 51.

Richard G. Corbin, Christy J. Proferes, Robert E. Gross, Charles N. Lapinsky, Ralph A. Brown, Peter J. Feyar, Earl M. Wright, William A. Ricci, Frank W. Morris, Carroll Stubblefield, Robert J. Mellon, Virgil L. Leuis, Stanley A. Nelson, John P. Henderson, Felix M. Bedwell, Ernest H. Ratter, Robert Watson, John Ruggiere, Pete Del Valle, Leland Wenger, David Snyder, all of ward 36.

Clarence O. Smith, North Carolina; James W. Bishop, Arkansas; William L. Smith; John D. Neavor, Illinois; Frank J. Sieminski, Pennsylvania; Edwin F. Anderson, Pennsylvania; Robert R. Nelson, New Jersey; Richard C. Woolson, Pennsylvania; Francis J. Jumper, New Jersey; Horace Veal, Georgia; Walter Wood, Lexington, Ky.; Walter Slav, Missouri; Jamies Jeffers, Ohio; John Matton, Baltimore, Md.; Gerald Wallace, Tennessee; Robert Knabbe, N. Y.; James W. Hudson, Virginia; John F. Hoffman, Philadelphia, Pa.; Kenneth H. Schneider, New York, N. Y.; Herman H. Wallace, New Mexico; David Hess, Baltimore, Md.

Robert Beigarten, ward 67; Frank J. Sieminski, ward 53, Pennsylvania; William G. Palmer, ward 67, New York; David Leusuer, ward 50; Albo Angelo, ward 50; Charles English, ward 67, Georgia; Paul A. Heaster, ward 50; James Curry, ward 50; Pasquale D. Chiacchia, ward 68-B, Massachusetts; Richard L. Palneri, ward 51; Edward F. Le Grand, ward 68–B; Charles W. Pelechaty, ward 68–A; Clifford H. Ferris, ward 68–A.

Thomas W. McKenna, New York; Kenneth L. Colbert, Fort Wayne, Ind.; Thomas Allison, Olyphant, Pa.; John H. Zundel, East Palestine, Ohio; Edmund C. Anschutz, Long Island, N. Y.; Harold L. Frank, New Holland. Penn.; James Mulberry, New York, N. Y.; John D. Hull, Baltimore, Md.;Sidney Schuman, Washington, D. C.; Patrick T. Byrne, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Joseph F. Susman, Staten Island, N. Y.; James J. Burke, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Roy F. Ruzzo, Cincinnati, Ohio; Howard E. Bland, Merimoc, Ky.

Edward F. Zarachawiz, ward 52; Robert B. Chapman, Massachusetts, James R. Stout, Flora, Ind.; Fletcher Gainey, Indiana; Joseph E. Mueller, Maryland; Robert T. Bland, Jr., Virginia; Clifford C. Smith, Jr., Ohio; Thomas F. Babchalk, Pennsylvania; Ernie Agatucci, Pennsylvania; John F. Jones, Pennsylvania; Daniel Cooper, New York; Everett Bengtson, Rhode Island; Tiber Tonishow, New York; Ralph Forman III, New York.

Milton Kornfeld, ward 53, New York; Albert Belanger, ward 51; Walter Lesyczynsky, ward 51; J. B. Herson, ward 51; M. W. Kitchen, ward 51; Byron B. Rife, ward 51; Louis A. Walter, ward 51; James T. Allmon, Jr., ward 51; Bernard Yamphy, ward 51; Charles H. Kubach, ward 50; C. J. Burns, ward 52; C. L. Lipish, ward 51; L. J. Gillespie, ward 51; Wm. J. Grant, ward 51; R. St. Jean, ward 50; Alfred Koval, ward 68A; Florentino Casile, ward 68A; Edward G. Fayert, ward 54; Joseph R. Mirabella, ward 67; Joseph Jennings, ward 68A; Ignace Faucheux, ward 53; Norwood S. Moore, ward 68A; Louis J. Catizone, ward 50; Archie Dennis, ward 53, New York City.

Pfc Joseph S. Brofman, Pfc Robert Bradt, Pfc Frederick W. Harris, Pfc Jerry E. Trotter, Corp. James F. Blanton, Corp. James W. Christy, First Sgt. Anthony P. Albrecht, Corp. Vivian S. Ewell, Pfc Eugene Newman, Staff Sgt. Otis Denny, Pfc Charles C. Eill, Jr., T5g Fred M. Raby, Pfc Alden T. Mott, Pfc Richard Elzey, Pfc Thomas L. Mann, Charles Jackson, Pfc Chester M. Burdinski, Pfc Rocco Cuteri, Pfc James H. Rice, Pfc Anthony R. Cancemi, all of ward 36.

Ralph Braitman, New York, N. Y.; Mathias Offerman, New Jersey; Frank R. Miseyka, Pennsylvania, Joseph C. Kopchinski, Pennsylvania; Andrew F. Haas, Charles Leeper, George Maguir, New York; Stanley A. Baryza, John M. Thornton, Richard F. Hinkle.

Michael S. MacDonogh, New York City; Joseph Barbaccio, Haledon, N. J.; Chas. Burns, Kansas City, Mo.; Hubert Durbin, Louisville, Ky.; Walter P. Fyalkomits, Patchogue, Long Island, N. Y.; Colvin M. Maynard, Branchland, W. Va.; James P. Rafferty, Cherry Tree, Pa., R. F. D.; Philippe P. Doucet, Nashua, N. H.; Manuel P. Castro, Fall River,

Mass.; Chester F. Hudson, Jermyn, Pa.; Clyde M. Bruck, R. D. 1, Fairhope, Pa.; Robert J. Boucher, Hamden, Conn.; Hugh D. McCambridge, Akron, Ohio; Wallace J. Newman, Marion, Va.; George Van Guilder, Lynbrook, N. Y.; Edward J. McEvoy, Bronx, N. Y.; Robert T. Lock, Springfield, Ohio; Brent C. Oxley, Ferriday, La.

Sgt. Edward James Volp, Cpl. Charles F. Adkins, Pvt. Donald J. Flynn, T/Sgt. Michael Romanick, Sgt. Robert F. Hemmer, Pfc. John H. Drawbaugh, Pvt. Ralph W. Pennington, Pfc. J. J. Koposak, Pfc. Peter W. White, Cpl. Alfonse J. Swider, Pfc. Robert W. Smith, T/5 William J. Tilisco, Sgt. John J. Testa, Cpl. John T. Griffin, T/4 Horace A. Mauney, Pfc. Ward B. Smith, S/Sgt. John E. Dizeo, Pfc. Edward S. Lach, Pvt. Alford Kidd, T/5 Forrest W. Honeycutt, Paul F. Ziegelhofer, Edward J. Porter, James T. King, all of Ward 34.

William H. Wagner, T/4 Joseph J. Stasrak, Gerald Gillerman, Pfc. Worth Stancil, T/Sgt. Harry V. Loosemore, Clifford E. Weakley, William H. Morgan, Joseph Mocken, Paul J. Wiedorfer, William A. Harris, Herbert P. Baumert, Fredrick H. Schultz, Pfc. Eugene Bassett, Pvt. Lewis Gruber, Clarence E. Wallace, T/4 Howard R. Scott, all of Ward 36.

Charles B. Sandford, Ward 55, Paterson, N. J.; John G. Rooney, Ward 50, Boston, Mass.; Charles B. McAneeney, Ward 50, Medford, Mass.; Robert R. Bell, Ward 55, North Tonawanda, N. Y.; William C. Levy, Ward 51, New York City, N. Y.; William G. Biddulph, Ward 9A, Trenton, N. J.; David Pogoloff, former patient, Brooklyn, N. Y.; John Meehan, Ward 52, Erie, Pa.; Nathan Early, Ward 71, Fort Myers, Fla.; Larry A. Bauchard, Ward 68A, Bangor, Maine; Ternis Kats, Ward 53, Honolulu, T. H.; Aaron Koslow, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Joseph Marcellino, Ward 54, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Angus N. MacLeod, Ward 53, Boston, Mass.; Alex Szymines, Ward 52, Simpson, Pa.; Arthur Hutchinson, Ward 52, Portsmouth, Ohio; Harry Ellett, Jr., Ward 68A, Bloomfield, Ind.

David A. Kent, New Jersey; George E. Hayden, Illinois; Howard L. Schauf, New York; John Wagner, Pennsylvania; Edward H. Patterson, Alexandria Bay, N. Y.; John A. Milone, New York, N. Y.

Pvt. Norman Raines, Ward 53; Pvt. Jerry J. De Leno, Ward 54; Staff Sgt. Leonard McCarthy, Ward 54; Pfc. Frank C. Kolb, Ward 54; First Sgt. John Gamber, Ward 54; Leroy Baxter; Pfc. Griffith C. Blair, Ward 54; Pfc. Bert B. Ross, Ward 54; Tech. 5 Hilbert J. Henry, Ward 54; Theodore Zolniez, Ward 54; Pvt. Andrew Owens, Ward 54; Pvt. Milton Varney, Ward 54; Pfc. Donald Price, Ward 54; Pfc. Ray Sekinger, Ward 54; Staff Sgt. Frank J. Randolph, Ward 54; Pvt. Nicholas J. Ratkovich, Ward 54; Pfc. Paul S. Gallo, Ward 67.

Pfc. Leo J. Marsalek; Corp. Hyatt Shackleford; Pfc. Arthur Hook; Chas. M. Falk; Wilson Makabe; Ralph Holmes; Stanley Gottfried; Charles S. Tobias; Gene D. Hinkle; William L. Haltiwanger; Ezio Martin; Joseph Bianco; Emil Szewczyk; Santo J. Imbesi; Joseph B. Rouert; Thomas E. Burke; Leonard Krupczinski; Robert M. Hugill; Ralph B. Goughnour; Charlie C. Candy; Victor Fogelquist; Edwin Breece; John W. Breen; Anthony Curren; Julius Wagman.

Pfc. Lee Miller; Staff Sgt. George Murphy; Tech. 3 Jack Vanderpol; John P. Grimes; Staff Sgt. Ramon Edwards, all of Ward 33.

(England General Hospital)

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., *March 20, 1946.*

Staff Sgt. MILTON KORNFELD,
Care War Amputees Car Committee,
Walter Reed General Hospital,
Forest Glen Station:

Have discussed your car bill throughout hospital. Full endorsement of all amputee patients goes with this wire. Keep us informed. Good luck.

WALTER BERNSTEIN and DON MURRAY.

FEBRUARY 27, 1946.

Mr. NORMAN RAINES,
Walter Reed General Hospital,
Army Medical Center,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAINES: This answers your letter of February 24 in which you inquired concerning the possibility of enrollment in our professional curriculum here at Washington University. It is a little difficult for us to give you advice without a bit more of specific information. You do indicate that you can walk, but you do not state to what extent you can walk. After you have had your training I think that it might be quite possible to get a job that would fit your situation, but the conditions of training, particularly the supervised field work, are such as to require considerable mobility. However, the loss of one leg need be no hindrance whatsoever, so any advice that we might give would depend to a considerable extent on the condition of your other leg. In other words, if you could do only a very minimum amount of walking, perhaps you might want to consider the possibility of some other field, but I shouldn't rule out social work until you get a more definite statement about this based upon more specific information.

If we can be helpful in any other way, please feel free to write again.

Very sincerely yours,

BENJ. E. YOUNGDAHL,
Dean.

The condition of my leg—which will never change—necessitates my securing a car if I hope to salvage my college degree. Without a car, forced to use public transportation, I could not successfully continue this career. I have no illusions about this. The need is absolute.

NORMAN RAINES.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS,
Boston, April 15, 1946.

Pfc. MURRAY FREED, 42006390,
War Amputees Car Committee, Walter Reed General Hospital, Forest Glen Section, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The registrar of motor vehicles, Rudolph F. King, has directed me to reply to your letter of April 1, in which you inquire for information and statistics concerning amputees as motor-vehicle operators.

The Massachusetts Registry of Motor Vehicles has at its Boston office a special section whose primary function is the licensing and relicensing of the handicapped veteran.

We have been in close touch with the motor-vehicle departments of other States and with Army and Navy amputee centers for about 1½ years on the subject mentioned.

Although I am unable to give you concrete figures as to the amputee drivers at this time, I can say that the amputees who have been licensed in Massachusetts during the past 2 years can be counted in the hundreds. To date, we have no record of any amputee driver having been involved in any automobile accidents resulting in personal injury.

Our experience with amputees coming to us from the various Army and Navy amputee centers has been entirely satisfactory. My personal experience with the amputee driver who has presented himself to this office for a license can be stated briefly as follows:

I have found that in practically every case the amputee recognizes his responsibility to himself and to the motoring public. He realizes his physical handicap and it is my opinion that the handicap is compensated for by an additional alertness to his responsibilities. We find the same thing to be true in the case of a paralytic who has lost the use of his legs.

We anticipate a total of close to 1,000 cases involving major amputations as a result of the late war, and we are prepared to handle them as we have in the past. In view of the record already established, we anticipate no increase in the highway accident rate as a result of the licensing of the war-damaged veteran.

Very truly yours,

A. JOSEPH RODIER,
Supervising Inspector.

STATEMENT

It has been demonstrated through the results of driving instructions, tests, etc., conducted at Forest Glen section, Walter Reed General Hospital, and other such installations that amputees are capable of driving automobiles suitably modified for them with perfectly adequate safety. Moreover, amputees are at a far greater disadvantage than people realize for ordinary tasks such as walking any considerable distance or handling themselves in public conveyances.

JAMES A. GANNON, Jr., M. D.

THE AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE, INC.,
New York, N. Y., April 22, 1946.

Staff Sgt. MILTON KORNFELD,
Chairman, Cars for Amputees Committee,
Unit 1, Ward 53, Walter Reed General Hospital, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KORNFELD: As a result of the meeting of your group on Wednesday, April 10, concerning cars for amputees, in the House appropriations room I sent a recommendation to Charles Bolte and the National Planning Committee of AVC that AVC take a national stand on the matter. The National Planning Committee of the AVC has now gone on record as endorsing the proposal to give veterans lower-limb amputees and paraplegics who have lost their mobility a specially designed automobile.

Our organization is giving full support to the bill of Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts, to provide such an automobile for amputees and has written her to that effect.

The American Veterans Committee feels, however, that grants for this purpose should not interfere with adequate appropriations for the development of more effective prosthetic appliances. We feel that if adequate funds are made available for research a tremendous improvement in the quality of artificial limbs should be possible. We are therefore urging that the grant of an automobile to amputees must in no way interfere with an all-out effort to develop artificial limbs which will afford a maximum of mobility and comfort.

Yours very truly,

CHAT PATERSON,
National Legislative Representative,
American Veterans Committee, Inc.

LAST WEEK THE UNITED AUTOMOBILE WORKERS PASSED THIS RESOLUTION AT ITS CONVENTION

Whereas the last war has left some of its soldier-veterans severely disabled—to such an extent that they require a vehicle as an essential piece of equipment in their rehabilitation and resumption of a normal civilian life;

Whereas these disabled veterans include:

1. Paraplegics who suffer from a severed spinal cord with resultant permanent paralysis of both legs and loss of anal and bladder sphincter control.

2. Amputees who suffer from a loss of one or both lower extremities:

Whereas these men are confined to wheel chairs and cannot travel on public conveyances alone, but they can travel alone in an automobile equipped with hand control attachments;

Whereas these men encounter serious difficulty in walking due to weather hazards

such as snow, ice and mud; public crowds with accompanying pushing and shoving; prosthesis break down; irregularities in terrain (hill climbing); and walking in the dark;

Whereas amputees have also proven that they can successfully operate automobiles with attachments, if necessary;

Whereas there is a scarcity of motor vehicles available for these servicemen and veterans; and

Whereas the Government has the responsibility for giving its servicemen every necessary facility to restore the men as far as possible to a normal way of living: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this tenth annual convention of the UAW-CIO with present and former servicemen numbering approximately 350,000 go on record—

1. As in favor of immediate action by the War Department, Navy Department and Veterans' Administration whereby these agencies make available such specially made cars to those veterans in need of such cars;

2. That if these executive agencies do not now have the authority or funds to supply these vehicles, that we pledge our support of any legislation introduced to meet the problem; be it further

3. *Resolved*, That this convention instruct its veterans' department and legislative department to immediately at the conclusion of this convention start action to get administrative and legislative implementation to this program; and

4. *Be it further resolved*, That we call upon the Government and the automobile industry to give top priority to the production of the specially built automobiles; and

5. *Be it finally resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, the Civilian Production Administration and the major veterans' organizations and the Patients Committee at the Thomas M. England General Hospital, Atlantic City, and to Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS of the House Veterans' Committee and to the press.

REGULAR VETERANS' ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., April 22, 1946.

Staff Sgt. MILTON KORNFELD,
Chairman, War Amputees Car Committee, Unit 1, Ward 53, Walter Reed General Hospital, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SERGEANT KORNFELD: This is to inform you and your committee that the Regular Veterans Association was, I believe, the first organization to whom you spoke in reference to a bill to be introduced at this session of Congress, regarding the issuance of cars for amputees. At the time we discussed the matter, I was accompanied by Hon. HAROLD HAGEN, of Minnesota.

Both Congressman HAGEN and I spoke before your veterans' group and assured you we would work to introduce a bill to provide any veteran who had lost a limb, or use of a limb, in line of duty, with a Government-furnished automobile.

I wish to advise you that the Regular Veterans Association is still behind this measure 100 percent and hope that you or any serviceman or veteran, will feel free to call on us at any time we can be of service.

Yours in comradeship,
WM. FLOYD, D. S. C.,
National Commander,
Regular Veterans Association.

MINUTES OF A MEETING HELD ON APRIL 10, 1946, IN THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE ROOM, CAPITOL BUILDING, BETWEEN THE PROSTHETIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND WAR AMPUTEES CAR COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully move that the committee endorse in principle the campaign now being conducted by War Amputees Car Committee to buy automobiles for veterans, either lower limb amputees or paraplegics who have suffered substantial loss of mobility as a result of injuries incurred during the war.

Colonel ALLEN. Those in favor say "Aye," or better still raise your hands. (All committee members raise hands.) Colonel Haskell and Captain Pratt are for you in principle, so that means a unanimous vote of the committee in favor and in support of the drive that you men will sponsor.

AMVETS—TRUMAN AID SOUGHT ON CARS FOR AMPUTEES

Already assured the active support of Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Republican, Massachusetts, ranking minority member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Amvets today were preparing to ask President Truman to spearhead their Government-cars-for-amputees campaign.

The drive for free automobiles for disabled veterans—originating among leg amputees at Walter Reed Hospital—gathered momentum quickly yesterday with these developments:

WILL PUSH LEGISLATION

Congresswoman ROGERS, describing the proposal as a "magnificent way in which to rehabilitate disabled veterans," inserted in the RECORD a Daily News account of the handicaps that beset amputees, also a petition from 350 hospitalized veterans asking Government automobiles. Then, after lunching with a half-dozen enthusiastic amputees, she promised to introduce legislation carrying out the program.

Ford promised to provide specially adapted cars at cost.

Advised that White House support for the car scheme may be forthcoming, Amvets also began dickering for an interview with President Truman, to press their case that free automobiles would allow them to meet civilian life "on a basis relatively equal to those who are not so handicapped."

BRADLEY'S AID SOUGHT

Endorsing the amputees' contention that they are not asking for charity, Mrs. ROGERS said that an automobile is just as important an aid to them in civilian life as an artificial limb.

Meanwhile, Amvet representatives were asking the Veterans' Administration to endorse an automobile as a necessary prosthesis.

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
DISTRICT 34, LOCAL UNION NO. 1022,
Granite City, Ill., April 18, 1946.

Mr. FRANK W. MONICO,
Walter Reed General Hospital,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Whereas local 1022, USA-CIO, 3,000 members, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

Whereas Congress to enact legislation for the Government to supply an automobile to all World War II veterans who are amputees, and for every veteran, who, because of war-inflicted injuries, are seriously hampered in walking.

JESSE RAINWATER,
President.
FRED TOLLESON,
Recording Secretary.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS,
ADIRONDACK LODGE, NO. 1585,
Plattsburg, N. Y., April 26, 1946.

Staff Sgt. MILTON KORNFELD,
Chairman, War Amputee Car Committee, Forest Glen Section, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It has been called to our attention that a bill has been presented to provide cars for all veteran amputees. Therefore, the 700 members of Lodge 1585, International Association of Machinists, Plattsburg, N. Y., wish to go on record as definitely approving this measure, and hope for its speedy passage.

Yours truly,
FRANCIS G. PROULX,
President.

LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY,
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES,
Brooklyn, N. Y., March 22, 1946.

WAR AMPUTEES COMMITTEE,
Care of Mr. Emanuel Gelbund,
Bronx, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, who are veterans attending Long Island University, in Brooklyn, N. Y., pledge our wholehearted support to you and the War Amputees Car Committee in your fight for congressional legislation to provide an automobile be given to each amputee of World War II. We are fully cognizant of the great sacrifices you and your fellow committeemen have made for our country. Count on us for further support in your program.

Dorothy Libert, Alfred Ranie, Bernard Gross, Isidor Rosen, Samuel J. Mul, Erwin Jockman, Charles Belows, Kenneth R. Gross, Edmond Forden, Richard S. Topp, Allan J. Knoph, George J. Bolotnick, M. I. Mazur, R. R. Perrone, H. Stevens, A. B. Schneck, Jonah Binder, E. Schwartz, Bernard Kon, William King, John A. Pearson, Nathan Bowman, Paul W. Berger, Samuel Sayer, Abraham Sherman, Norman Kass, Robert Culp, Richard Shingles, Fred Patella, Martin Nelson, F. Reha, Walter Halpin, Ephraim Weiss, Nicholas J. Coggiano, Robert D. Spector, Joseph Junkam.

Bert Klein, Rubin G. Druskin, Bernard Murphy, Angelo Coggsarelli, Martin Brandeis, George Lieberman, Rubin Herngass, Matthew Anselmo, Robert M. Juby, Emanuel Rosen, Seymour Koontz, Jack Nord, Philip Goldman, Seymour Goldberg, Stanley Gluckmon, Harvey C. Gallub, Bernard Eddlesen, Harry Cooper, Alfred Baurer, Wilbur Haemash, Arthur Vladem, Sidney P. Shemel, David I. Sherman, Edward Rashkovsky, Howard R. Turkell, Len Karlin, Dante B. Catalano, James J. Verdone, Leonard Barban, Joseph Simone, Sebastian J. Vacchio, Joel Coman, Jackie Goldsmith, Stan Waxman, Paul Guglielmo, I. Clemmons, Daniel S. Lefbrow, Arthur Padbersky, Harry L. Stokowitz, Peronietti Stich, John P. Dolan, Maurice Gerstein, Milton Lerner, Harvey Konig, Gary Lyons, Peter Larofolo, Jr., Stanley B. Ledesco, Victor Kaufman, Stanley Schulman, Stanley Misky, Bernard Silverman, Edward Bejan, Ray Baurduss, H. Mullin, Theodore Skolits, Nathaniel Apchkyney, Robert Macri, George Field, Herman Cohn, John Slagg, Aubrey E. Nicholsen Leonard Meyerson, Vincent J. Nolan, Adrian Wayer, Jay W. Reber, Stanley Brumer, Lee R. Aks, Norman M. Welle, Allen Gross.

Joseph Hecht, Stanley Bird, Marvin Goldstein, Philip Siegel, Morton Siegenfeld, Victor Lavan, Seymore T. Wilk, George Henderson, Nat Deluisaw, C. Manuel Smith, Norman Brachfield, Isidore S. Eichenbaum, Edward Schwartz, Bernard Kasmir, Henrie W. Thomas, Martin S. Rose, Harold Tabacoff, Seymour Tabacoff, Harold R. Marks, Sidney Goldstein, Arnold Gruddinsky, Philip Graiff, Frank P. Brancato, Irvin Seidman, Edward Simoneti, Charles Erne, Morton Parker, E. Rosenblaz, Stanley Levitt, Sandy Leiter, Sol Reiter, O. E. Partilina, M. J. Kilcommons, Sy Brin, Paul Gunsluzer, R. Belleiu, Jerome Huberman, Mortimer I. Silvey, Eric A. Nylund, Joseph J. Guamer, Albert Kelvin, Walter Kelly, Harry Eigenberg, Irving H. Hain, George J. Lichner, Harry Goffe, Morris Cohen, Norman Turk, Lye Messler, Morton L. Haupt, Margie M. Weisburd, Irving H. Schutzman, David Horsink, Harold Taubler, Ralph Holibsky, Stanley Rosenbaum, Albert Foute, Morris Steinberg, Albert S. Hoffman, M. Jerome

Fraden, I. F. Scammacca, Bill Arnelt, William W. Capehart, Aaron A. Rauch, Norman Wenker, Marvin P. Riskin, Sanford Sacks, Abraham J. Eismann, M. Spiegel, Victor Lapidus, Herman Horowitz, Marvin Cohen.

Irve Brown, Jerome Duman, Philip H. Orshansky, Morris Katz, Irving Berman, Martin Jacobs, Charles H. Siegel, Bernard L. Moses, Achille A. Buouagaro, Reuben O. Portland, David E. Buxdaum, Rita Dimesa, Eleanor Zuboff, Milton Paul, Sidney Brown, Jack Gorenstein, Leon Margolis, Irving Dallek, Joseph J. Robb, Newton Taylor, Harold Silverman, Irving Propper, Edwin Bobrow, John J. Vinnes, Abe Weimanich, Louis Powsner, Bernard Geller, Fountain Meadows, Ira Schwein, William Donimsky, Milton Hirschfield, Elmer Cohn, Julian Kirschenbaum, Jean Rystauer, Lou Steinberg, Donald Newberg, B. Bienbaum, Jack Meller, Gerard M. Grosso, Gerald Weisberg, Robert Henderson, Martin Boch, Jacob Brooks, Stephen Dahl, Benjamin S. Rosenblatt, Munez Rozovis, Rosario Filipazzo, Thomas Berger, Artie Greenpan, Herman Leifer, Milton Silverman, Irving Markowitz, Alfred J. Moses, Jack J. Schack, Stanley R. Schmalbach, Sydney G. Siegel, Seyman Zoehlman, Steve Jaibman, Daniel Kirshoff, Emanuel Herbstman, Erwin Jackman, Paul M. Greery, Irving I. Cohen, Herbert M. Freudal, Albert Fradkin, Jerome Flannery, Ralph Edwards, George Koss, Sam Karson, Cy Getzoff, Harry H. Rosenfeld, John Holmes, Jay Gordon, Leonard C. Watson.

We, students and veterans, of the City College of New York, hereby formally support the War Amputees Car Committee and urge the United States Government to supply cars as appliances to World War II amputees.

Gerald Yam; Sidney Stern, Bronx, N. Y.; Harold Keitelman; Sol Feingold; Marcel Weil, New York City; Allen K. Needleman, New York City; James King, New York City; Hubert Guggenheim; Harry Ungar, New York City.

Howard Isaacs, Bronx, N. Y.; Walter Jaatinen, New York, N. Y.; Gilbert Kaplan, Bronx, N. Y.; Ed Plahouski, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Leslie Gardener, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Joseph Rante, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Lawrence Feber, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Benjamin M. Kalish, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Robert Langfelder, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Seymour Furst, Bronx, N. Y.; Leo Adelson, Bronx, N. Y.; Leo Horovitz, Bronx, N. Y.; Murry Ginsberg, Bronx, N. Y.; H. J. Huthwaite, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Helen Wenzler, Long Island City, N. Y.; Stanley Storper, New York City; Norman Malkin, Queens, N. Y.; Richard Horowitz, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Louis Chaipen, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Reuben Klugman, Bronx, N. Y.; Frank Ferris, Manhattan, N. Y.; Carl Lussman, Manhattan, N. Y.; Herbert Horn, Manhattan, N. Y.; Jerry Garfinkle, Bronx, N. Y.; Al Gorman, Manhattan, N. Y.; Marvin Stern, Bronx, N. Y.; Jerome Rolnik, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Saul Rosenberg, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Alfred Poe, New York, N. Y.; Arnold Shickman, Flushing, N. Y.; Albert Goldman, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Seymour Rosumoff, Bronx, N. Y.; Marvin D. Strauss, New York, N. Y.; Israel Gerber, Forest Hills, N. Y.; Thomas Paley, New York City; Ralph L. Munro, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Louis Koshar, Bronx, N. Y.; Tobias Schwartz, Bronx, N. Y.; Harold Pollack; Frank Antonozzi; Leonard Strumpf, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Gerald Kerner, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Melvin Weiner, New York, N. Y.; Toy Eig, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Morton Litvak, Bronx, N. Y.; Julius Sherman, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Herbert Katzenstein, New York, N. Y.; V. Ervian; Rebecca Krugman, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Ronald Hershel, Brooklyn, N. Y.

House of Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER K. GRANGER
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a very thought-provoking discourse that was recently made by Mr. Gustive O. Larson, of Cedar City, Utah. Mr. Larson is an educator in his own right, traveled widely, and I am sure his views as expressed in this speech, House of Brotherhood, are worthy of careful consideration.

HOUSE OF BROTHERHOOD

(By Gustive O. Larson)

Nations churning toward solidification in a shrinking world have experienced repeated periods of dead center immobility. Westphalia, Utrecht, Vienna, and Versailles represent such pauses. Each reshuffle in the balance of power sought to achieve a lasting status quo. Each gave the temporary illusion of stability in international relations.

Behind these shifting scenes men have sought the principles of more permanent and satisfactory social construction. Blueprints for the ideal state appeared along the political highway from Plato's Republic to More's Utopia. The search for some formula of harmonious relationship in a world family of nations produced varied proposals ranging from the Eight Principles of Confucius to Wilson's Fourteen Points.

DEVELOPMENT OF GOVERNMENT FOR THE INDIVIDUAL

The theory of rule by divine right served the Pharaohs of Egypt, Alexander, and the Holy Roman emperors in their control of men and nations. The same was appealed to in justification of the nationalist revolt against the crumbling Christian commonwealth of the Middle Ages. The Machiavellian school urged strong national governments with unrestrained rulers as the only source of peace and political stability. In all this the individual man, the human personality, was ignored. He existed only for the state. But his champions soon appeared in such men as Montesquieu, Rousseau, and John Locke, who held governments to be merely instruments of the people created to protect man's inalienable right to life, liberty, and property. From their ranks came humanity's cry of liberty, equality, and fraternity.

These all represented the host of God's engineers searching for principles of lasting construction and probing for solid foundations on which to build. One among them left no specifications for a particular construction. But He pointed out certain fundamental values which demand recognition and certain attitudes which must prevail in any social structure if it would be permanent and conducive to human well-being. Chief among these contributions of Jesus was the recognition of man's inherent worth in a universe of moral law and the unity of mankind in the Fatherhood of God. Irrelevant as these have been made to appear in most political adjustments of the past there is something so fundamentally vital about them that they refuse to be ignored.

So-called realists at the world peace tables have rejected these basic realities. Disregarding general human welfare, they have built on the sand. Imperialistic policies which starved millions to enrich those in positions of power violated the moral law of the universe; sacrifice of weak nations to economic or political advantage ignored the unity of mankind in God. Such self-defeating expedients have strewn the world battlefields with millions of dying men and reminded repentant humanity that "except the Lord shall build the house they labor in vain who build it."

THE BUILDING SITE IS CLEARED

The Second World War served to clear the ground for a more durable world social structure. Remains of the old order, at home as well as in the stronghold of the enemy, must be removed from the building site. Only those materials which are free from disintegrating elements can be preserved. This done, the world awaits construction of the new house of brotherhood.

THE FOUNDATION

The foundation of the new structure, to be sound and permanent, must include recognition of a moral order in the world issuing from the Creator of the universe. That order, which represents divine will, is just as real and inescapable as the physical order around us. All laws of human manufacture and all man-made decisions must represent the authority which emerges from that moral law. The foundation must embody divine concern for the human personality reflected through human administrative agency. It must represent the unity of mankind in God—that God is above all races, colors, and creeds. It must affirm that men are in truth a brotherhood not only as of one blood, but as increasingly bound together by common interests.

If the foundation is to be kept intact political commitments and practices must take into consideration the welfare of all human beings everywhere. Race hatred and persecution will crack the foundation wide open; discrimination in rights as between race, color, or creed, will strain its cohesive substance, while prejudice and suspicion will corrode and weaken its materials. Nations which defied the assumption of superiority by dictatorial groups abroad cannot now afford to weaken their position by similar practices within their own borders.

THE PILLARS

Solidly upon the foundation of social unity rise the pillars of freedom, to find their completion in a dome of responsibility. These pillars are inseparable from the base upon which they rest, for men find their freedom in the brotherhood of life. Human freedom has its source in the divine personality. Freedom from want, from fear, of worship, and of expression—all of these are man's inalienable rights because God wills it so.

But the pillars of freedom to be solid must conform to the architectural unity of the building. Freedom from want which violates the principle of equal opportunity for others represents lack of balance. The pillars can only remain strong as the substance out of which they exist is properly distributed throughout. Areas of exclusion are areas of weakness, and the pillar of freedom is no stronger than its weakest point. If one man can be denied freedom of expression, if one people can be excluded from free distribution of goods, if one creed can be refused freedom of worship, or if one race is left subject to fear, then all are in danger, for the pillar has a weak spot of denial of human brotherhood; the whole structure is in danger of collapse. The supreme test of the strength of democracy is its protection of minority groups. Recent experience teaches what happens when that protection is withdrawn. The cries of the scapegoat of nazism and Haile Selassie's vain appeal to his "tardy allies" still ring in

the ears of self-interested nations which failed to support the pillars of freedom in the "last citadel of cooperative security." The ruins of the old order are a reminder that there could be no promise of safety in a structure which defied the moral laws of the universe and refused to recognize the unity of mankind in God.

THE DOME

Resting firmly upon the pillars of freedom and inseparable from them is the dome of responsibility. Just as the foundation of human brotherhood gives rise to pillars of freedom, so the dome of responsible power clamps them from above in a vise of human interdependence. Power carries the responsibility of trusteeship. Because men are of one blood, underprivileged people constitute a special trust of those who are in positions of power. Enlightened and more powerful states are charged with responsibility for the welfare, and disciplining, if need be, of more backward nations. Administration of trusteeship in justice will keep the pillars of freedom solidly upright. But if power is exercised in the form of exploitation the supporting pillars become unstable. Centuries of exploitation of the weak by great powers have shown the failure of so-called realists to grasp this principle of social responsibility in the building of a permanent social structure.

THE COMPLETE STRUCTURE

This house with its foundation of human brotherhod, its pillars of freedom, and its dome of responsibility, is what we've been fighting for. Victory over those who would deny these principles has cleared the way for its construction. We are selecting the materials now and cannot afford to allow disintegrating elements to accumulate to destroy our work. Every racial or creedal prejudice will be a tiny fissure in the foundation of the house of brotherhood; every legislative act which promotes hatred and racial discrimination an entering wedge; and every sponsor of such legislation will drive that wedge deeper and deeper into the widening break.

PRINCIPLES OF JUSTICE MUST CONTROL

International relations during the reconstruction years ahead must proceed on principles of justice. Exacting and retributive as necessity shall dictate, they must not be exploitive or retaliatory. Every exploitive act will be a sledge-hammer blow to the pillars of freedom and every act of retaliation a damaging strain upon the superstructure of responsibility.

The task ahead is not for shortsighted men who would build for temporary advantage. It calls for the services of bigger men who understand the fundamental principles of permanent construction; who do not confuse realism with expediency. Such men will gather around the reconstruction tables equipped not only with statistical materials, but with a burning consciousness of the unity of mankind in God and a conviction that the house of brotherhood can be realized when men will to make their ideals come true.

Proceedings at Dinner in Honor of Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a manuscript containing several addresses delivered at a dinner given by the Women's Joint Congressional Committee of Washington, D. C., in honor of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, on Thursday, March 14, 1946. I am advised that the estimated cost of printing the manuscript is $240.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DINNER IN HONOR OF MRS. FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT, UNITED STATES DELEGATE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, SPONSORED BY THE WOMEN'S JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE, OF WASHINGTON, D. C., THURSDAY EVENING, MARCH 14, 1946, GRAND BALLROOM OF THE MAYFLOWER HOTEL

THE WOMEN'S JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

Organized in 1920 after the ratification of the woman's suffrage amendment to the Federal Constitution the Women's Joint Congressional Committee is a clearing house for the congressional legislative work of the following 22 national organizations whose membership totals approximately 10,000,000: American Association of University Women; American Dietetic Association; American Federation of Teachers; American Home Economics Association; American Medical Women's Association; American Nurses' Association, Inc.; American Physiotherapy Association; Association for Childhood Education; General Federation of Women's Clubs; Girls' Friendly Society of the United States of America; National Association of Nursery Education; National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association; National Congress of Parents and Teachers; National Consumers' League; National Council of Jewish Women; National Education Association; National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.; National League of Women Voters; National Women's Trade Union League of America; Service Star Legion, Inc.; United Council of Church Women; Women's National Homeopathic Medical Fraternity.

DINNER COMMITTEE

Miss Emma Carr Bivins, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.; Mrs. O. G. Hankins, National Congress of Parents and Teachers; Mrs. James W. Irwin, National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association; Miss Mary E. Leeper, Association for Childhood Education; Mrs. Joseph Low, National Council of Jewish Women; Mrs. R. Hewitt Nichols, American Dietetic Association; Mrs. Louis Ottenberg, National Council of Jewish Women; Mrs. Glen L. Swiggett, National Congress of Parents and Teachers; Miss Charl Ormond Williams, chairman, National Education Association.

The presiding officer of the dinner for Mrs. Roosevelt was Mrs. Louis Ottenberg, vice chairman of the Women's Joint Congressional Committee, representing the National Council of Jewish Women. Miss Charl Ormond Williams, representing the National Education Association, was chairman of the dinner committee.

The presiding officer called upon the audience of 1,300 men and women to stand and sing the Star Spangled Banner, accompanied by the orchestra of the United States Marine Band under the leadership of Capt. William F. Santelmann.

INVOCATION

Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, chaplain, United States Senate, and minister, Foundry Methodist Church:

God of our fathers, to whose kingdom of justice and love the future belongs, it is Thy might which has made and preserved us a nation; in Thee we trust.

We thank Thee for towering personalities raised up in every crisis—beacons of hope who move up and down the dispirited ranks, not to curse the darkness but to light candles of faith. In this crucial and creative day forbid that professions of brotherhood should be on our lips while hatred and prejudice possess our hearts and poison our minds. Make us builders of the road of world concord which shall make the rough places smooth and the deep ruts level, and which shall span the chasms which separate man from man with bridges of understanding over which the glad and eager feet of brothers shall pass to and fro in the richness of diversity, in a peaceful world dedicated to progress and freedom for all peoples. Amen.

During the dinner, the orchestra of the United States Marine Band played a program of delightful music under the leadership of Captain Santelmann.

Chairman OTTENBERG. Mrs. Roosevelt, honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I regret exceedingly that our chairman, Mrs. James W. Irwin, who was to have presided at this meeting, is unable to be with us tonight. As vice chairman of the women's joint congressional committee, it becomes my very pleasant duty to welcome you to this historic gathering in honor of the appointment of the first woman delegate from the United States to the General Assembly of the United Nations—Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt. [Applause.]

We had expected to have with us tonight Mrs. Truman and her daughter, Miss Margaret Truman, but owing to severe colds, both ladies are detained at home and send their regrets.

The appointment of Mrs. Roosevelt to the General Assembly has been hailed by men and women everywhere. Thus she, whom we have known for over a decade as the First Lady of the Land, becomes the First Lady of the World. [Applause.]

Already we have applauded her valiant services at the meeting of the assembly in London, at which she pleaded in behalf of the unfortunate displaced peoples of devastated Europe and succeeded in saving them from being penalized because they refused to return to the land of their origin.

We feel that her vast experience, her broad sympathies and her ability to work with, and for, human beings will serve her well in this, her most important assignment. She merits the support of citizens everywhere.

We are mindful of the thought that the late President left with us in his last public utterance, that "the structure of world peace cannot be the work of one person, one party, or one nation; it must be a peace which rests upon the cooperative effort of the whole world. Peace can endure only," he said, "so long as humanity really insists upon it and is willing to work for it."

Upon all of us has fallen the responsibility of making a working reality of the ideal for which two great war Presidents gave their lives—the formation and maintenance of an international organization for the preservation of the peace.

Ever since the Women's Joint Congressional Committee was organized, in 1920, the year the woman suffrage amendment was ratified, its international relations committee has had the active support of practically all of the constituent groups. Through the combined efforts of these organizations, nearly 10,000,000 women have been kept informed on world affairs. Many have responded to the frequent calls for action. I dare say that at times Senator CONNALLY has been the most written-to man in America [laughter] and most of the letters came from the women. [Laughter.]

Reciprocal trade agreements and their renewal, Dumbarton Oaks, lend-lease, Bretton Woods, the Atlantic Charter, the Moscow

Pact, the United Nations Charter, support for UNRRA, atomic energy and its control, and so forth, have been some of the widely publicized subjects discussed at study groups. Tons of literature have been distributed by the various organizations, reaching women living in the smallest towns as well as the largest cities.

Our efforts have been stimulated by the appointment of women as ministers to foreign countries, as well as delegates to international conferences. New horizons are constantly opening to women in world affairs. Besides Mrs. Roosevelt, there are a number of other women serving as delegates from their respective nations to the General Assembly of the United Nations. Other women throughout the world are with us in spirit tonight. Some have just been granted the franchise and are eager to learn its best use. Only the other day the State Department referred a request to us made by the women of Italy for information pertaining to the functioning of nonpartisan women's organizations. We were pleased to tell them of the work of the WJCC, as it is more commonly known.

For the sake of brevity I have touched lightly on the international relations committee and have not mentioned at all the work of the other legislative committees of the WJCC. There is no limit set to the number of working legislative committees that may function in the WJCC. That is controlled entirely by the amount of legislation the 22 organizations desire to combine on, and work for, in the field of human welfare. At present there are 15 such legislative committees.

We are honored to have with us tonight, sitting in the audience, a number of Members of Congress and representative Washington citizens, many from Government departments and bureaus. In the name of the Women's Joint Congressional Committee, I want to thank you for joining with us in paying this tribute to Mrs. Roosevelt, our honored guest.

The genius and guiding spirit in arranging the dinner is our dinner chairman, Miss Charl Ormond Williams. [Applause.]

I know that I am speaking for all of the 22 organizations when I say to Miss Williams and the dinner committee, we thank you. We are also very grateful to Captain Santelmann and the Marine Band Orchestra for furnishing us with inspirational music.

And now it is my very pleasant duty to present to you our distinguished guests at the head table.

(The following guests were introduced:)

Mrs. William A. Hastings, president of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Mrs. Frederick Brown Harris, wife of the Chaplain of the United States Senate.

Mrs. Dora S. Lewis, president of the American Home Economics Association.

Miss Anna Lord Strauss, president of the National League of Women Voters.

Dr. Mary E. Coffin, president of the Women's National Homeopathic Medical Fraternity.

Miss Rose Schneiderman, president of the National Women's Trade Union League of America.

Miss Freida Miller, director of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor and adviser to the United States delegation of the United Nations.

Miss Minerva Bernardino, chairman of the Inter-American Commission of Women and delegate of the Dominican Republic to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mrs. LaFell Dickinson, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mrs. R. Hewitt Nichols, secretary of the Women's Joint Congressional Committee, representing the American Dietetic Association.

The Honorable TOM CONNALLY, Senator from Texas; chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee; and United States delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mrs. Alexander A. Vandegrift, wife of the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Mrs. Ingraham Stainback, wife of the Governor of Hawaii.

Mrs. Henry Agard Wallace, wife of the Secretary of Commerce.

Mrs. Tom C. Clark, wife of the Attorney General of the United States.

The Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Honorable Tom C. Clark, Attorney General of the United States.

Mrs. Woodrow Wilson, wife and coworker extraordinary of our great President of the First World War.

Mrs. Clinton P. Anderson, wife of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Honorable Henry Agard Wallace, Secretary of Commerce and former Vice President of the United States.

Miss Frances Perkins, former Secretary of Labor, who has served as Government delegate to several international conferences.

Mrs. Tom Connally, wife of the senior Senator from Texas.

His Excellency the Governor of Hawaii.

General Alexander A. Vandegrift, Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Mrs. O. G. Hankins, treasurer of the Women's Joint Congressional Committee, representing the National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Dr. Lise Meitner, the world's most noted scientist.

Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, United States Senate, and minister, Foundry Methodist Church.

Miss Dorothy Fosdick, adviser to the United States Delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mrs. Ana Maria Borrero, writer, lecturer, artist, traveler, linguist, sent especially to this dinner by the Good Neighbor Foundation of Cuba.

Miss Margaret A. Hickey, president of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

Princess Safiyeh Firouz, wife of a member of the Iranian Cabinet, on a visit to the United States observing child welfare work.

Dr. Maycie Southall, president of the Association for Childhood Education.

Dr. Kate Savage Zerfoss, president of the American Medical Women's Association.

Miss Katherine Densford, president of the American Nurses Association. [Applause.]

Chairman OTTENBERG. And now it is my pleasure to present to you Senator TOM CONNALLY, who became chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1941. In 1945 he was special congressional adviser to the United States delegation attending the International Conference on Problems of War and Peace held in Mexico City. Later that year he was the United States delegate to the United Nations Conference on International Relations held in San Francisco.

He has recently returned from attending the Assembly of the United Nations held in London, where he was a delegate.

Senator CONNALLY has been in the United States Senate continually since 1929. Senator CONNALLY. [Applause.]

The Honorable TOM CONNALLY. Madam Chairwoman, I am indeed flattered by the opportunity to appear before this magnificent assemblage of representatives of 22 Nation-wide organizations, representing 10,000,000 people. Some of them don't happen to be here tonight. [Laughter.]

I have been given the task—one of supererogation—to present the distinguished guest of this evening. That is a duty that transcends words and finds no adequate expression in the poor vocabulary of a Senator. [Laughter.]

It was my pleasant duty to be associated with this distinguished woman in London at the United Nations Organization Conference. She devoted herself to the great work of that Organization, but she did not forget her women friends and associates. She had a part in presenting to the United Nations an appeal for a larger participation of women in the activities of the Organization and in promoting the sublime cause of world peace.

I read from a petition in which she joined: "Open letter to the women of the world from the women delegates and advisers at the first assembly of the United Nations: This first assembly of the United Nations marks the second attempt of the peoples of the world to live peacefully in a democratic world community. This new chance for peace was won through the joint efforts of men and women working for common ideals of human freedom at a time when need for united effort broke down barriers of race, creed, and sex.

"In view of the variety of tasks which women performed so notably and valiantly during the war, we are gratified that 17 women delegates and advisers, representing 11 member states, are taking part in the beginning of this new phase of international effort. We hope participation in the work of the United Nations Organization may grow and may increase in insight and in skill. To this end we call on the governments of the world to encourage women everywhere to take a more active part in national and international affairs and on women who are conscious of their opportunities to come forward and share in the work of peace and reconstruction, as they did in war and resistance."

Mrs. Roosevelt shared in the presentation of that eloquent appeal to the United Nations Organization conference.

I desire to read a very brief report of the general committee to the General Assembly: "Declaration of the participation of the women in work of the United Nations Organization: The general committee at its meeting held on February 11, 1946, considered the request for inclusion on the agenda of the proposal on the participation of women in United Nations Organization conferences submitted by the delegation of France."

The concluding paragraphs of the General Assembly report read as follows: "The great value of the contribution which has been made by women representatives on delegations, both in the present Assembly and in past conferences, was, however, fully recognized.

"The general committee, therefore, recommends that the item be placed on the agenda of the General Assembly, so that a declaration on the subject may be made."

The President of the General Assembly, Mr. Spaak, of Belgium, in commenting on the matter before the General Assembly, said: "The general discussion is closed. There is no formal proposal to submit to vote, but I think I can safely tell Mrs. Roosevelt, who presented this matter, and those who supported her intervention, that the manner in which it was received by the General Assembly leads us to hope that it will be taken into very serious consideration."

Allow me to say that the work of Mrs. Roosevelt at London was outstanding. [Applause.] She did not shirk responsibility. She toiled tirelessly on the committees to which she was assigned with splendid tact, with her great ability, and with force and persuasion she took part in debates, both in the committees and on the floor of the Assembly, where she received a tremendous ovation. [Applause.]

I shall not consume your time here in paying tributes to her which all the world has paid in the years that are gone. I shall not dwell upon her great personality, upon the activities which she has performed in varied fields of humanitarian and civil affairs because they are known to every citizen of this Republic.

I take great pleasure in presenting to you a gallant woman, a great woman, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt. [Prolonged applause.]

Mrs. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT. Madam Chairman, Senator CONNALLY, distinguished guests, Mrs. Wilson, ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply touched by the honor which the organizations represented here have paid to me tonight and I am deeply touched by the Senator's introduction. I think that what really was accomplished in London was accomplished by our delegation working together. None of us did any better work than all the members of the delegation. We met and talked our problems over. We were given information by our advisers. I am glad that Miss Fosdick is here this evening and I hope she will take back to the numerous people from the State Department who worked with us my feeling of gratitude for the wonderful help which was given to all of us who were delegates, or alternates, and who needed help to do a good job.

I like the feeling that every one of us went to London with; we had just one main objective: We wanted to set in motion an organization for which the Charter had been written, but which as yet was not actually functioning, and we wanted to set it in motion so that the world might hope for world peace in the future. We knew that setting up the organization wasn't going to give us world peace, but we knew that it was the machinery through which we could or would have world peace in the future.

I never forgot in those days in London the gratitude which we owe to President Woodrow Wilson and the people who had worked with him to set up the League of Nations because, over and over again, the work which had been done made it possible to do what we hope will prove to be more effective work this time. However, it cannot be more effective unless the peoples of the world state that it shall be effective.

I sometimes wonder if we in this country realize what our responsibility is. I have had people say to me in the course of the last few days, "Well, why should we give up food? Why should we be uncomfortable? Europe brought this situation on herself. What difference does it make to us?" Sometimes, as I look at our domestic scene, I wonder if that is a widespread idea, if really we are thinking throughout this country that our domestic affairs can be isolated from world affairs. If we still think that, then I am afraid the future is a very, very dark future and I am afraid that our vision is a very narrow vision, because during the war we have developed in this country the greatest production capacity in the world. Now, if you produce very successfully, you produce for a purpose. You produce so that others may have what you produce, and they must be in a position so that they can have desires and the wherewithal to achieve their desires. Therefore, if we are chiefly concerned today with what happens to us in the next year or two and forget, because of that concern, what is happening to the rest of the world, then we are endangering the rest of the world surely, but ourselves just as surely in the course of the next few years. That is one of the lessons which I hope we are going to face and to learn fairly quickly. If we don't do it, I don't know just what is going to bring us to a realization of what another war would mean.

We are such a fortunate Nation. No bombs have dropped on us; no bombs have destroyed our homes and our factories. We have lost loved ones, but they fought in far away places and in many cases we cannot even imagine what they went through. We have been spared a good deal and I don't think we were spared because of some particular value in us as human beings which sets us apart from other human beings in the world. I think we were spared for a purpose which we can justify or we can find that there is nothing in us that arises to the challenge of the opportunity that is offered us. And if we cannot rise to that challenge, then perhaps we will not be spared again.

Several people have said to me in the course of the last few days, "Well, things look very bad." One young reporter said to me in New York the other night, "I wonder whether you share our pessimism. We on the newspapers think that the United Nations is going to have its last meeting. We don't see any real hope of success."

That can only happen if the peoples of the world abdicate actually saying what they feel. I don't believe our people or the people of Russia or the people of Great Britain want another war, but I do believe that we have to say how we feel. We have to say that force has been used for a long time in the world and it does not seem as though one could do away with it immediately; therefore, one must build collective force, which can be used by all the nations, or one cannot cut down on individual force. You have to build a strong United Nations and gradually you have to build the confidence of people in each other and in the ability to work together in order to hope for world peace.

When I went to London I thought that I really knew what war was like and that I knew why I never wanted to see my country subjected to war upon its own doorstep, but I don't think I ever realized what war today, without the atomic bomb, could actually accomplish, perhaps because I am a very old lady. [Laughter.] I look back over a long period on Europe and Great Britain. I can remember Europe very well because some 47 years ago I went to school in England and I lived with families in many of the countries where war has been on their doorstep, and I knew those cities and those countrysides before two World Wars had been fought. Then at the end of the last war, within the 6 weeks after the armistice, I went over the front where we had fought, and 10 years later I went back and saw how quickly nature helps us to forget. I realize, however, that there were many things that even nature couldn't wipe out.

Then, in the Assembly, my first real thought that covered those periods was brought very sharply before me when we were looking for candidates for Secretary-General. The Senator will remember that we wanted candidates who had had experience in their own countries, who had made some name as executives and statesmen, but we wanted them to be fairly young, and as we talked something suddenly clicked in my mind. I remembered in '28 motoring through little villages in England, stopping in the evening and looking at the monument in the middle of the town, with its sides covered with names, and saying to the boys, "Those are the names of men who went from this little village, all of whom were killed in the war." And then going to the little church. In nearly all those towns there is an old family tradition which prompts some member of each generation to go into politics in Great Britain. There were always these monuments. I remember one in particular on which were recorded the names of every young member of a certain family, the last of that family, all of whom had been killed, perhaps in the retreat from the Marne.

Then we drove over the battlefield and suddenly the older of my boys said to me, "This is a funny country, Mommy. Out of the fields there are only coming boys our age and old men. Where are the men in between whom we have coming out of the fields at home?" Dead, crippled, hospitalized! So, a whole generation practically was taken out of the leadership of Europe. That is something to remember.

We looked and we didn't find very many people in that age bracket, and that was a loss, a great loss to the whole of European civilization.

After I was through with my part of the work in London I went over for 2½ days only to our zone in Germany. It is foolish to talk of really getting much information in 2½ days, but if you have a background of knowing a countryside and a country well—different countries well—and you have talked with many people, I think you may gain impressions even in 2½ days. If I needed an added reason for knowing why I wanted world peace and why I didn't want war on our doorstep, I gained it in 2½ days in our zone in Germany.

I wish everyone in this country could know what was accomplished without the atomic bomb in destruction. Remember that I saw destruction within 6 weeks at the end of the last war. So, I know what we did in the last war, too. However, the comparison is rather terrific. Berlin is a city of 5,000,000 or so inhabitants. Today they told me some 3,500,000 people still live there. The streets don't seem to have that number of people around. A good many of them, I believe, don't feel much like moving around, but those who are cold have to go and get their wood. They are on a ration; it is like this. You only get enough to cook your soup, which is your main meal for the day—and it is potato soup, with which you get a hunk of bread. That is your main meal. One thousand five hundred calories are not a very great amount of food and you have none of the other foods to compensate. So you get a cup of coffee with a little teaspoon of sugar and a little condensed milk in it and a hunk of bread for breakfast and the same for supper, or a little leftover soup. That is not a very satisfactory diet. It will keep you alive, but you don't have very much energy. You only do the things that you have to do.

The curious thing about war is that it is no respecter of persons. General Clay lives in the one house which just happened to be spared in an area where everything else went. The windows were all out, but they could be replaced, and it was a very comfortable house. A German industrialist lived in it who thought that he could be safe regardless of what happened to other people and although Berlin had by that time begun to be hungry, he was not hungry. He had barrels of food stored. When General Clay went in he found them. You see, in the end the industrialist who thought he could be selfish had exactly the same fate that all the other people have when war takes its toll on your doorstep.

Today the people of Berlin live in cellars or, if they can find a room which is watertight, they may live in that room.

The people of many other places in Europe have lived for many years not only in devastated cities but under the heel of a conqueror, and the result is a very terrifying thing in its effect on people. You may ask me why I think in 2½ days I can sense what happened to people. Well, it is a curious thing, but there is a feeling that spreads over a land and I don't think any one of you could spend time anywhere on the continent of Europe or talk long to any people who had been through the last 5 or 6 years and not get the feel of a civilization that of itself is going to have a very hard time coming back.

They require goods from us. There is not much use in giving them loans if we don't give them things to build up their country, machinery, to modernize their various necessary activities. They must have that from us because nobody else in the world can provide it today. They must have food because no one can starve and rehabilitate a country. They must have leadership, people who know how to do things and who have the energy to do them.

I kept trying to compare the people I was seeing with our people in the worst period that I remember in this country, the days of

the depression in '33, in the worst sections that I could remember in this country. You may have forgotten, but I remember that it took some of our people 3 to 5 years, while they were out of work for that length of time, to get back their initiative and their confidence in themselves. Well, remember that those people, many of them young people, have been in concentration camps and labor camps for 4 or 5 years. One Frenchwoman said to me something that I felt and thought about as I went into Germany. She had said to me in London, "Aye, Madam, it is not just the physical rehabilitation that people go through. When people have suffered so much, they either go crazy or they die or something happens to their personality so that they cannot feel any more. When they come back now and go to a sanatorium, physically they may come back, but it varies how that sense of numbness goes. Sometimes it takes a long time; sometimes it never goes."

While that is happening that person does not provide leadership, that person is almost like a living dead person. Europe has many of those people.

There is another thing that we must remember. There were young people in the resistance movements all over Europe. They were brave, and for 4, 5, or 6 years they fought in the resistance movements. I think I should add this: That sometimes, we forget the range of age in the resistance movements. There were little children engaged in this dangerous work, and it went right up to the older people. The people we need today first of all are the young people from 15 to 25. Well, that age would ordinarily have been in school learning their skills, learning to earn a living, learning whatever they wished to do in life. They have not been to that kind of school; they have been to another kind, though, which matures one very rapidly. That is the school where every time you open a door death may wait just outside. That is a maturing school, but, you see, the things that were virtues in the resistance—lying, cheating, stealing, killing—are no longer virtues after the resistance is over. Now you say to your people, "Go back to school and learn how to live in a peaceful society. Go and keep your house, young ladies; it is time you were making a home. The things which you have done in the last few years are now criminal offenses, so don't do them any more."

That is rather a rapid change, isn't it? That is something hard to learn overnight. If you had to live with death as a possibility day in and day out, you were certain of a lot of excitement. It is not quite so easy to go back and keep your house and get an education and start out on peaceful living.

That is what I want you to think of when you say, as I hope you will every day of your lives, "We want to build for world peace. We want to use this machinery. We in this country are willing to pay the price for world peace."

It is a heavy price. It means education of a nation that has always been isolationist at heart. We love our own country. We have felt that our salvation lay in living within ourselves. Now suddenly we say to our people, "You cannot live for yourselves alone. You depend on the rest of the world and the rest of the world depends on you." That is a very hard lesson to learn. You haven't had any of these things happen to you that I have been telling you about. Yet interdependence is what we have to learn if we are going to be willing to pay the price for peace. We are today the strongest nation on earth, even though we have disarmed to an extent; that is to say, we have a smaller army and our people don't want to go to war, and we don't want to stay prepared for war, and we don't want to think of production as a world need. Nevertheless, the United States and Russia are the two nations, which, being the youngest, have the greatest vitality. I am not minimizing Great Britain's strength. I am not minimizing what Great Britain did for us when she stood alone for a whole year. We can never forget what Mr. Churchill's leadership meant in winning the war, but we should not have our vision clouded by thinking that the English-speaking people of the world, despite their strength, can get along without the far greater number of people that are not English-speaking. [Prolonged applause.]

It is going to take much patience for us to learn about other people. We haven't been interested very much, and we have a lot to learn. They have a lot to learn about us. I know only too well some of the things that I consider fundamental that other nations don't consider quite so fundamental. There is one thing that I think we have to realize, however, and that is that we have taken for granted too much the fact that saying, "We are a republic and our way of life is democratic" does not teach people what we mean, nor is it telling them what the things are that we believe in and are willing to die for. It is much easier if you can just tell people a few things that they must believe and put it in very simple words and have them repeat it parrot fashion. Unfortunately, you cannot do that with democracy. Democracy is something you really have to understand and live. It is a little hard for people in other parts of the world not to find us at times a little inconsistent in our democracy. [Laughter.] They sometimes wonder whether some of the things which we say are really things we believe in, or whether they are just words that sound pretty.

Someone said to me in the Press Club, "Well, we are not living up to the Atlantic Charter." No, perhaps not; neither do we live up to everything in our Constitution [laughter], but I think it is good for us to have the Constitution and the Bill of Rights [applause] and I think it is a good thing for us to have the Atlantic Charter. I think it is a good thing to realize that 51 nations agreed to the Atlantic Charter. There will be things that all of us don't live up to right along and it would be well for us to remember that there are nations that have a great deal to learn and that are still young and are growing nations.

We have to have our own convictions and our faith so clear that we can state them and live by them and prove that what we say we actually mean, so we can say quite plainly that "we are not afraid of your beliefs; we can live in the same world with you, though you differ from us, because we can meet the needs of our people; and 20 years from now our people will have more of what they want than your people will have, and therein lies the proof that our beliefs are the best beliefs in the world." Just saying that you don't believe in certain things is all right, but you have to be able to prove what you say and the proof is the real achievement, over the years, of happiness for your people. No happiness can come to any people if we allow another world war.

I cannot tell you what destruction is. No one can. I think I will tell you one story which filled me with horror. In Great Britain today they have a little more than they have in Holland. Actually they have a great deal more, although we wouldn't think it much. Holland is hard hit. So, Great Britain takes several hundred children and keeps them 3 or 4 months and they go back much better in body than when they came. These children had to be outfitted in England. I suppose you wonder why it was necessary to outfit them there; the reason is you cannot buy anything in Holland today. You cannot buy a sheet of paper or a pen or a pencil. There are no consumer goods. You cannot buy anything in Russia. You cannot buy anything in any of these countries.

The children come over and they are given a set of clothes and a pair of shoes. The women who were doing the outfitting in England found that the children required shoes that were two sizes larger than the clothes they wore. That seemed odd. They pass two medical examinations, one in Holland and one in England. The medical examiners are careful because when people have been hungry (and some of them under the German occupation have starved because the calories were between 800 and 1,000) their resistance becomes pretty badly depleted and they are therefore prone to carry diseases and start them. So they have two examinations; yet no one had any explanation as to why they take shoes that are two sizes larger than the clothes they need and why they wear them out twice as quickly as the British children do. So, an orthopedic surgeon and an X-ray machine were brought to the camp where they were and they X-rayed the feet of those children and watched them walk. The feet spread out, heels going down first and then the toes and a shuffle. The X-rays showed that there were no bones in their feet; there was just gristle. That was the result of lack of food, of hunger. They were given calcium and they went back much better, but that is just one more tragic thing that war brings in its wake. There are many, many more stories I could tell. I could go on for a long time trying to tell you what this means to people, physically, mentally, and spiritually.

Somehow we have to understand, because unless we do, the leadership that we can take will slip out of our hands and the results will not just be bad for Europe, they will be equally bad for us in 2 or 3 or 5 years. We are a great production nation and we need people to buy from us. Economic questions are tied up with political questions the world over today. Don't ever look at anything that happens anywhere without trying to see it from all sides.

The fear of war (because most of these people know what war is and fear it), the fear of not being secure, of being invaded, and the fear of the economic situation affect the poltical situation also. We have to understand things that we have never understood or really cared about before, things that we were glad to turn our backs on, things that we hoped profoundly would never be our business. Today it is our business, if we don't want war.

Everyone of us hopes in our hearts that if war comes again it will not be in our country any more than it was this time. I wonder how many of you read Goering's testimony today, that he had asked before the war in Germany came for the building of planes that would carry destruction to our production cities and get back to Germany, and he had asked for that before the war started.

Don't let's fool ourselves that another war will see us come away scot free again. Let us know what has happened to the nations where war has been on their doorstep. Let's face what has happened to people and let's make up our minds whether we are ready to pay the price of peace. If we are, we are not going to be afraid to stand up for the things that we believe in in the world; oh, no, but we are going to examine what we do believe in and why, and we are going to look at the rest of the world, at least we are going to try to look at what other people need and what they believe in and what their fears and desires are, and see whether 51 nations meeting together can face those problems and deal with them collectively.

Let's stop counting entirely on individual strength and try to build up collective strength, not just collective military strength but collective moral and spiritual and eco-

nomic strength, so that the world may be able to live in the future. Hunger, lack of opportunity, poverty, unhappy people—they make war; they make revolutions, and there are no more unreachable places. An epidemic today can reach us just as easily from Europe or from the Far East as if it started right in our midst.

Every morning remember that the thing we should pray for first is: God, give us understanding of what we have been spared and make us truly grateful, but in addition give us the strength to see that the sacrifices of those we loved have not been made in vain and to remember day in and day out that there is a price for peace, that we work for it just as we work in war, and that only through our work together can the world have hope in the future. [Prolonged applause.]

Chairman OTTENBERG. Thank you, Mrs. Roosevelt, for this wonderful, soul-stirring message.

Now we shall listen to a tribute to be paid by one who served us as Vice President and is now serving in the Cabinet as Secretary of Commerce, an outstanding liberal, the Honorable Henry A. Wallace.

The Honorable HENRY AGARD WALLACE. This is a most significant occasion tonight, at a most unusual time in the world's history. You will never forget it; you will speak of it to your children and your grandchildren. You will remember that here tonight were together Mrs. Woodrow Wilson and Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt, representing in a most unique and unusual way the cause of world peace. You will remember that here tonight Mrs. Roosevelt was introduced by Senator CONNALLY, who has battled with all that is in him in the United States Senate to see that the Senate did not repeat in the forties the tragedy of the twenties. [Applause.]

We are so proud here tonight to honor Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. More than the wife of a President of the United States, more than the widow of a great man, yes, even more than being a person in her own right, she is a symbol of so much that is dear to the womanhood of the entire world. She has always had a big heart, an inquiring mind, a sound mind, and an undying faith in the people of the world. She has served nobly and well the underprivileged in these United States. She has fought fearlessly and intelligently for righteous causes all over America in conferences, on the platform, over the radio, and in her newspaper column. She has gained and deserved the admiration and love of the American people. [Applause.] And, as she has gone about doing good, she has made some enemies. [Laughter.] Because of those enemies we love her the more. [Applause.]

Henceforth, as one of the delegates to the United Nations Organization Assembly, she will stand more resolutely and continuously for peace than any man could possibly stand. No woman with four sons in one war can bear the thought of another war. No woman knows better than Eleanor Roosevelt that another war is unnecessary. She knows the Russians; she knows the British; she knows the Americans. She will use all her influence to see that the United States mediates justly between the British and the Russians instead of ganging up with the British against the Russians or with the Russians against the British.

The only hope of civilization is a just and enduring peace. The only nation in a position to lead the world effectively toward such a peace is the United States. It is time for the mobilized public opinion of the womanhood of the United States to make itself felt.

Women of America do not want to see their sons and their husbands fighting a third world war, nor do they want their daughters going through life single because their destined mates were killed in World War III.

With all our hearts we must pray and prepare for peace. In this crusade for a peaceful world no figure is more important than that of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. She will not let us down. She will stand for justice to the plain folks everywhere in the world, no matter who their oppressors may be. She stands and will continue to stand for the conscience of an awakened world womanhood which sees through the diplomatic wiles and military maneuvers of small boys grown into little men playing with dangerous toys. [Applause.] It takes a woman to do that. [Laughter.] Above all, she will stand for peace.

Yes, Eleanor Roosevelt was not only the First Lady of the Land, is not only the First Lady of the World, as was suggested earlier, but she demonstrated herself to be at the United Nations Organization Assembly (and I am sure that Senator CONNALLY will agree with this and I have heard it stated many times from different sources, from people of differing shades of political opinion) the person who more than any other, because of her charm, because of her prestige, because of her justness, and for many other reasons besides, stood out beyond all other persons and who could in case of need meet any diplomat there on his own terms and prove herself more than a match. [Applause].

And so, Mrs. Roosevelt, your past accomplishments do mean much to us, but your future means even more. We have confidence in your great heart and your clear head, and we wish you Godspeed as you fittingly represent America and the men and women everywhere who are committed to the cause of peace. [Applause.]

Chairman OTTENBERG. Thank you, Mr. Wallace.

Now, at the close of an eventful evening we are ready to say good-night to everyone, and we suggest that you take with you this beautiful menu-program as a memento of the historic occasion sponsored by the Women's Joint Congressional Committee.

(The meeting adjourned at 10:30 o'clock.)

Miners' Viewpoint on Wages, Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article entitled "Reporter Presents Miners' Viewpoint on Wages, Welfare," by Mrs. Eugene Meyer, from the Washington Post of May 9, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 9, 1946]

REPORTER PRESENTS MINERS' VIEWPOINT ON WAGES, WELFARE

(By Agnes E. Meyer)

HARLAN, KY., May 8.—The country at large must try to understand the slowly mounting tension of the striking miners in the Appalachian area and the reasons behind this smoldering impatience. At first they enjoyed a chance to rest. These men had been working 9 hours a day, 6 days a week to meet the increased demands of war production. Through sheer patriotism the Big Sandy area, with less men, doubled the output of the mines. The miners were tired and took to fishing and hunting at the beginning of the strike. But their mood is changing. They cannot understand why their demands for a living wage and a minimum of safety provisions should not receive immediate recognition. Public opinion and popular indignation over the gradual stoppage of the wheels of production throughout the Nation scarcely reaches them in their incredible isolation. They want to go back to work. But said they: "We have already used up the funds of the local union and we will use up every cent of our accumulated war bonds, before we will accept defeat of what seems to us the most elementary justice."

At a camp near Harlan I asked the miners and a group of local labor leaders what they expected to get out of the strike. "We want a living wage," they said, "enforcement of adequate safety provisions, and a welfare fund to take care of the families of the boys who get killed or disabled. During the war," they explained to me, "we got $10 per day for 9 hours' work, 6 days a week, portal to portal—or $63.50 for 54 hours. Now that the war is over we are afraid the 7-hour day and the 5-day week will be restored, which means a basic salary of $35 a week under the 1941 contract, or a substandard wage for the hardest, dirtiest work in all industry. In most of the mines about 40 percent of the men are on this daily rate of $1 per hour, and 60 percent are on the tonnage rate of 65 cents per ton. These skilled men used to get higher wages than the men on the day rate and some still do if they work in a high-grade mine. If the tonnage men have a poor streak of coal they often get less than the men on daily rates."

They then showed me the company's pay sheet at the Black Mountain Coal Co. for the last 2 weeks before the strike. For 10 working days the tonnage men of equal skills ranged from $41.91 to $123 because of the different physical conditions they happened to encounter. "On the average throughout the year," they continued, "the tonnage men make about what the men on daily rates are getting but the tonnage men hate the big variations in their pay. If they go back to the 7-hour day and 5-day week they will also make only about $35 a week plus travel time.

"We were having a hard time feeding our children on $35 a week before the war. With the high cost of living the men and their big families can't possibly exist on that kind of a wage scale. As our industry is the lowest paid and one that is indispensable to the country's welfare, we think we are entitled at the very least to a 20-percent increase for the day-rate and the tonnage men. That will give us take-home pay equivalent to the increased cost of living as recognized by governmental agencies. It would only give us the same purchasing power we had in 1941.

"Every bit as important to us," continued the men, "is the enforcement of safety laws with teeth in them. The department of mines and minerals in Kentucky is run by the operators to suit themselves. There is no union deputy among the nine mine inspectors. Our union inspectors pass the examinations but they never get appointed to the board. Our mining laws are bad, with plenty of loopholes. The law says that the mines should be inspected four times a year. This is not being lived up to. Our union investigator reported to the committee on mines and mining, which was considering recodifying the safety laws, that the mines have been inspected once every 8 years instead of four times a year.

"The Federal reports of the Bureau of Mines showed that 99 percent of the mines of the east Kentucky area are not rock dusted, which is an elementary protection against coal dust. Eighty-two percent of them are dangerous because they have bad air. Permissible or sealed machinery, which

is the only safe kind, does not exist in our mines. The operators defeated a bill which made this safe kind of machinery compulsory. In addition the electric wires are not protected. It wears a man out just to dodge the live wires all day.

"We asked for 30 inches of clearance between the mine walls and the cars. It was refused by the operators, although extra room in the mine actually adds to its efficiency. The men are always in danger and always have to be on the alert. Yet the mines down here could provide the best working conditions because the coal in our area is the finest in the whole country. It is premium coal which commands the highest price. We are sure that the public, if it knew what was going on, would rather have a slight increase in the price of coal than the wholesale murder of miners that now goes on in this State."

CALLS OPERATORS GREEDY

"What the country doesn't realize," said one miner with livid indignation, "is that the greed of the coal operators exploits not only the workers but the natural coal resources of Kentucky. Anybody can start a mine here on a shoe string. The operations are inefficient and wasteful, skimming the cream from the coal mines for a quick monetary return, then abandoning them for other veins. These operators are using up the Nation's substance. As the Kentucky Legislature has always been dominated by the operators, there has never been a tax on coal and all our State gets for its natural wealth is a lot of holes in the ground.

"Yet people are blaming John Lewis for asking for a 10-cent tax on every ton of coal for the welfare fund. If it had not been for the war, we workers would have insisted upon this welfare fund long ago. Without it we live at the mercy of a bunch of operators who are the worst in the whole country. A fairly decent compulsory compensation law was actually passed by the legislature several years ago, but the State supreme court at the behest of the operators declared it unconstitutional. The last legislature has passed another compensation law. It isn't enough, but it is better than nothing. This will become the law on June 1 next unless the Supreme Court of Kentucky throws it out again.

"We think that the miner and his family should be covered by a national insurance policy. We should have a medical and hospital system that will be recognized as sufficient by outstanding medical authorities. At present we pay $2 for hospitalization and $2 for medical care for a man and his family. But what do we get for it?"

I had discovered at Middlesboro what a racket the operators have made of the medical fund. There are two hospitals in this city of 40,000 people, one of them so atrocious that the miners avoid it. It has over a hundred beds and not a single registered nurse. The others one of 50 beds has just been taken over and renovated by 6 doctors. It has good facilities and an adequate nursing staff, five of whom are graduate nurses. But these two hospitals also take care of the general public. At the good hospital I was told the care of the miners was so expensive that the doctors would demand a raise in the insurance rate. Yet the 20,000 mining families in this one area pay $80,000 a month in health insurance.

The company doctors are also unpopular with the workers. At one mine the doctor was a dope addict. Yet the company would not dismiss him until the miners broke their contract, went on strike, and defied the international rather than go back to work before this doctor was removed.

BAD SITUATION

"The worst part about the check-off system for medical care is that the doctors in all of these hospitals are practically in the pay of the operators," said the miners. "These medical men determine how much compensation a man should get when he is injured and whether he is fit to go back to work or not. This is a bad situation. There are many cases when these doctors minimize the compensation; or they say a man is fit to go back to work although he cannot stand the strain of his old job. When he fails to make good, he is simply thrown out as useless.

"With a welfare fund and the $4 that we pay monthly for medical care, our unions could operate first-class hospitals and engage their own doctors.

"We also want to use this welfare fund for a rehabilitation program for the thousands of injured miners. With retraining most of these men could be restored to useful occupations. The permanently disabled, who now receive a compensation of $15 a week, would get supplementary aid through a welfare fund."

Another way by which the miners could be assured of a welfare program would be through a State tax of 10 cents on every ton of coal mined in Kentucky. Yet the politicians of these mining areas have been so completely under the domination of the operators that the miners, with good reason, do not trust them. They are convinced that a State welfare tax on coal would never reach their families.

The miners are thinking only in terms of their acute needs. Yet nobody who realizes the power this welfare fund would give the United Mine Workers Union over its membership can be reconciled to its complete control of these funds. Perhaps the solution is a Federal bureau similar to the Railroad Retirement Fund with advisory representation from the unions and management.

The welfare program which the miners outlined is the barest minimum of what they need. Where does one start welfare work for people who have nothing—no decent homes, no sanitary facilities, no chance for cleaniness and no possibility of escape from the most appalling of the many appalling social situations I have seen in this democracy of ours?

Just the amount of maternal and child care needed in these mining towns staggers the imagination. I could get no figures on maternal deaths, but the infant mortality rate is 100 or more out of every 1,000 live births. And what have the children that live and grow up in these surroundings to look forward to? A life so barren, so devoid of opportunity for health, for education, for recreation, for ordinary human happiness—yes, so devoid of hope that it is heart-breaking.

Resolutions of Manchester Dairy System, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein resolutions which were unanimously adopted at the annual stockholders meeting of the Manchester Dairy System, Inc., Manchester, N. H.:

Whereas farmers cannot now compete with the wage scale of organized labor; and

Whereas governmental controls and the need for exportation of grains necessary to the production of milk have so increased the problems of securing proper and adequate feed supplies; and

Whereas such confusion exists in the minds of farmers concerning price policies for the immediate future that to continue would be financially disastrous: Be it

Resolved, That public declarations should be made at once by Government officials and; furthermore, be it

Resolved, That—

1. The proposed increase of 20 cents per hundredweight in subsidies will not arrest the downward trend in production; that such payments are too low and will come too late;

2. Our constituency is agreed that a net increase of at least 20 percent in the net returns to the farmer is required to save our supply and provide for the public an essential food product.

Whereas the Manchester dairy system has gone on record in favor of higher price returns to the producer; and

Whereas the decision to impose wartime regulations in the sale of whipping cream, ice cream, and other high-fat products, in an effort to divert fat to butter channels, will in our minds result in a lower class II price at present levels of butter prices; and

Whereas the above-mentioned decision is extremely untimely, as we face our problem of handling spring surpluses; and

Whereas there appears to be increasing public resentment against continuance of wartime regulations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That consideration of a gradual return to free enterprise, is the logical answer to this problem. Artificial manipulation of restraints is both backward and unsatisfactory. Adequate returns to producers will more certainly bring once more, adequate supplies.

Whereas it is apparent from the activities of all Federal agencies that it is a declared national policy to assure city labor groups a high degree of purchasing power;

Whereas this purchasing power is predicated on a relatively high return per hour of labor expended;

Whereas the occupants, the owners, and the hired men on our farms are laborers; and

Whereas no balance or equality does now or can ever prevail between city laborers and the farm laborers under the present existing relatively low and fixed milk prices: Therefore be it

Resolved, That all Federal agencies now in control of milk and dairy products prices be petitioned to immediately declare an upward adjustment of prices so as to remove this glaring disparity.

Traffic at the Washington National Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter which I have received from Mr. T. P. Wright, Administrator of Civil Aeronautics. Mr. Wright enclosed a statement containing the statistics of traffic at the Washington National Airport.

It is interesting to note that this steadily increasing traffic came to a peak of one arrival or departure a minute during the crowded hours of some days.

Mr. Wright's letter and the statistics follow:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, May 6, 1946.

The Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN RABAUT: I have just received a report from the Assistant Administrator for the Washington National Airport showing the traffic for March and April. This traffic has been steadily mounting as we forecast during discussions before your committee and it occurred to me that you would be interested in the statistics.

You will note that in April we averaged 546 arrivals and departures a day. Actually, on 2 days of the month we had over 700 arrivals and departures, which means that on those days, averaging over the 24 hours, there were 29 arrival or departures per hour. This is one every 2 minutes, which again means that at the crowded hours of the day there were on these days over one arrival or departure a minute.

On the attached sheet showing the statistics on air-line passengers you will note the average passengers per day enplaning or deplaning was 3,441.

Sincerely yours,

T. P. WRIGHT,
Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

Air-line passengers enplaning and deplaning at the Washington National Airport during the months of March and April 1946

	March		April	
	Enplaning	Deplaning	Enplaning	Deplaning
American	8,405	7,783	15,964	14,963
Colonial	(1)	(1)	500	409
Eastern	10,967	10,103	12,395	12,197
PCA	17,699	16,049	20,741	17,043
TWA	2,011	1,819	2,610	2,284
United	1,829	1,735	2,200	1,939
Total	40,911	37,489	54,410	48,835
	78,400		103,245	

[1] From Apr. 15 to May 1.

Air traffic at the Washington National Airport during the months of March and April 1946

	March arrivals and departures	April arrivals and departures
Air carrier	8,107	8,946
Military	2,842	3,358
Itinerant	1,541	1,779
Local	2,142	2,306
Total	14,632	16,389

The Shades of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson Meet at Monticello

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial by Carlos W. Huntington, published in the Portland Homebildor in Portland, Oreg., under date of May 4, 1946:

PAST AND PRESENT—THE SHADES OF THOMAS JEFFERSON AND ANDREW JACKSON MEET AT MONTICELLO

JEFFERSON. Welcome, Andy. I planned on inviting General Washington and Abe Lincoln over today; but in view of recent events, I thought we two Democrats ought to have a special conference. I was astounded when I noted that members of the "high command" are advocating a purge of good Democrats from the party simply because they were exercising independence of thought and action.

JACKSON. Tom, we have gone a long way on the road to political and economic serfdom when party bigwigs condemn a man for following the dictates of his own conscience. When party leaders attempt to make rubber stamps or ventriloquist dummies out of able statesmen, they are following the line that caused the fall of Rome in Caesar's time, the fall of Germany, Italy, and Japan in modern times. Americans will never stand for that. With your permission, I'd like to summon Julius Caesar right now and illustrate my point.

JEFFERSON. By all means, do, Tom; we've got to impress our people with facts, vivid and compelling facts.

(Caesar enters.)

CAESAR. You called me, sire.

JACKSON. Julius, I want you to briefly tell us what brought on your downfall and the collapse of Rome.

CAESAR. When I entered political life I had some of the theories that I note are practiced in your country today. We had a senate in Rome and it was an august body devoted to developing commerce and increasing the productivity of the country. We had an additional adjunct of consuls, of which I was one. I thought I saw a chance to increase my power so I broke all agreements and precedents, crossed the Rubicon and entrenched myself in authority. I played on the susceptibilities of the people, gave them largesse in the form of subsidies, provided circuses, spectacles and entertainment to make them think that I was devoted to them and to increase my popularity. I disparaged the senate, built up my following, all at the public expense, mind you, and encroached more and more upon the rights and duties of the senate. The senators who did not do as I commanded were purged and in a short time I declared myself dictator, got a scepter and a throne but did not take the title of king because I wanted to continue to fool the people, I had all the powers of a king and more, however, and my word and wish were law, I arrived at the mental conclusion that I was indispensable and that everything centered on me. You know what followed; the rapid decline and fall of the old Roman Empire, and today nothing remains but a few tottering columns, some broken aqueducts and shattered buildings as a memory of the once greatest nation on earth.

The present regimentation of your country, the control of all business and activities by edicts of bureaucrats seem to be leading you along the same path. Your people must be made to realize that a government by law, not by edicts or directives of one man or a group of men, is the only way to avert disaster. Your people must not allow themselves to be misled by patronage, subsidies, gifts or honey-coated propaganda if they wish their government to remain strong and enduring.

JACKSON. Julius, you have recalled history to us and, in the light of experience as shown throughout the ages, government by the people, as Abe Lincoln said, not by individuals, groups or cliques, is the only government that will survive. Tom, we must keep everlasting and emphatically calling the attention of America to this main theme—government by the people.

JEFFERSON. Yes, Andrew, we must drive that thought home with all the force and vigor at our command. Next week, I am going to call in General Washington and Abe Lincoln for our conference. Let's go out and view the beauty of Virginia in springtime.

Manuel A. Roxas, Man of Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. Diosdado M. Yap, editor and publisher of Bataan magazine:

MANUEL A. ROXAS, MAN OF ACTION

(By Diosdado M. Yap, editor and publisher of Bataan magazine)

"You were, in effect, the underground President of the Philippines—the true leader of your country."

Thus did Maj. Robert E. Lapham, the beloved American guerrilla leader in Nueva Ecija and Pangasinan in the days of the hated Jap occupation, write to a slim, wiry, black-eyed man late in 1945, as Major Lapham was about to depart for America.

What was true in actuality, although not in formality, became a fact in April 1946, when Manuel Acuna Roxas was elected president of the soon-to-be-born Republic of the Philippines. For the words of Major Lapham calling Roxas the "underground president" became symbolic.

Roxas—man of action! How often those words have been written. Now, it is unfolded. His destiny has become known. He is to lead 18,000,000 Filipinos on the greatest political adventure in their nation's long history.

By the overwhelming vote of his people, Roxas became the spiritual heir of Jose Rizal, Emilio Aguinaldo, Manuel Quezon. He becomes the successor to the grand old man of Philippine politics—Sergio Osmeña, whose fate seems to have been to be always of the stars that revolve around a planet.

Roxas' overwhelming victory in the late election makes him undisputed political ruler of the Philippines in a crucial period. Although his victory was no walk-away, by any means, and the vote for his opponents was appreciable, the time for recriminations is past. What is past is past. Filipinos in the Philippines and in every part of the world will unite behind the new leader for the good of the nation. Only in such unity can there be strength as the Philippine Commonwealth dies and the Republic of the Philippines is born.

To Americans, the Philippines for more than 30 years was synonomous with the name of Manuel Quezon. Then, for 2 years, the publicists and leaders of the nation learned of quiet, patient Sergio Osmeña, who always had been in power, but always in the shadows near the limelight—seldom in the center of the stage.

And now comes Roxas. Americans in places of leadership in government, business, and education are asking: Who is Roxas? What is his background? What does he believe? What kind of leader will he be?

Not all Americans who are familiar in one way or another with the Philippines are asking such questions, for many Americans, like

Major Lapham, know Roxas. They know him better than many of his own people know him. They lived under the same heavy Japanese heel as he did. They suffered the same hopes and fears as he did. They tread the same dangerous paths in the midst of snakes and vipers as he did. They know Roxas—and they are rejoicing with him today.

Still other Americans knew him before the war. Even then a leader in the islands, Roxas made the acquaintance of hundreds of American officials who went to the Philippines on business through the years. He met hundreds and thousands of American businessmen who had interests in the islands. He met many educators, writers, publicists, and just plain American tourists who were attracted to the Philippines. They know Roxas—and they are proud that he has achieved his destiny.

But the vast majority of Americans do not know him, and it is they who are anxious to know about him. They know that on July 4, 1946, for the first time in recorded history, a colony becomes a free and independent republic without either bloodshed or threat of violence. They—the American people—are responsible for this, insofar as any people is responsible for the destiny of another, and they are interested in the leader of the new republic.

Manuel Roxas was born on January 1, 1892, in the small town of Capiz, Capiz, the third of three boys born to moderately well-to-do parents. His father was a planter. This was at the very time a then little-known ophthalmologist named José Rizal was reentering Manila only to be tricked by the Spaniards and exiled to Dapitan. Five years from the date of Roxas' birth—missing the exact date by only 2 days—Dr. Rizal was led out on the Luneta in Manila and shot to death. Roxas was learning of the travail of his countrymen. He was learning the hard way, for his own father was being persecuted by the tyrants of Spain. The days of the Spaniards were definitely numbered, but like all other tyrants of history, they became more wicked and bloodthirsty as the day of reckoning approached. Thousands of Filipinos were slain, among them the father of Manuel Roxas.

Early in his boyhood Roxas went to Hong Kong, where Rizal had taken refuge more than once and where the Filipino colony was large, to live. He studied at St. Joseph's College there. He returned to the Philippines in 1906, being then 14 years old, enrolling in the Manila High School. He graduated from that institution in 1910, immediately matriculating at the University of the Philippines, where he studied law. He won the highest scholastic honors of his class at the latter institution, graduating in 1913. In 1914 he passed the bar examinations at the top of the list.

The late Cayetano Arellano, chief justice of the supreme court, was attracted by the youth's qualifications—Roxas then being only 22 years old—and engaged him as his secretary and as a law clerk in the supreme court justice's office.

After 5 years of hard work, constant observations, and invaluable legal experience, Roxas went back to his native province. In 1919 he launched his candidacy for governor of Capiz, becoming, at 27, the youngest provincial governor in the islands and likely the youngest man ever to be governor of his province.

Only a year later he won further fame, becoming known at that early date as "a man of destiny." There is reason to believe that Roxas early recognized the political importance of having others refer to him as "a man of destiny," and while he did not coin the appellation, he certainly never discouraged his friends from applying it to him.

His knowledge of parliamentary practice, the fluency of his Spanish and English, and his ability to dramatize his personality and language are the qualities which early catapulted him into the public eye. At the first annual convention of the governors he ever attended, in Manila in 1920, he was elected presiding officer.

Until then, he had been noted only casually by the major politicos of the islands, but after showing his mettle at that meeting, Roxas was watched from then on by the master political leader of the islands—Quezon.

Manuel Quezon and Manuel Roxas were political friends and political enemies for long stretches of time after 1920, depending upon the period and the occasion, but always they were personal friends.

At various times, the late, great President of the Philippine Commonwealth indicated beyond a peradventure that he held Roxas in the highest personal esteem. As a matter of fact, Quezon himself seemed to have held a rather respectful attitude toward the younger and, at the time, immature Roxas.

"Perhaps Speaker Roxas differs with my views," Quezon told CARLOS P. ROMULO, then managing editor of a Manila newspaper, in 1931, when Quezon was still climbing toward the zenith of his power.

"That is his right and his privilege. I have a very high opinion of him. He is a very able man—I am interested in seeing him rise, because I see in him possibilities for leadership—I tell you that I have watched Roxas closely enough to know that he is a coming leader. Even if it is true that that he is trying to take the leadership away from us, which I do not believe, I shall continue giving him my support, because I believe in his honesty of purpose, his integrity, and his ability. It is my duty to support him."

Eleven years later, in the early days of 1942 when the Japanese were overrunning the Philippines, Quezon, now a man sick unto death, revealed to Roxas personally the high esteem in which the elder held his mentor.

"I need you in Washington, Manoling," the President told Roxas, then a colonel on Gen. Douglas MacArthur's staff. "I am old and ill; I am afraid I won't last long. Osmeña is old, too; one cannot foretell what will happen. We need you there."

That time, Roxas made a decision that, at the moment, the older leader did not like, perhaps. Or perhaps deep in his heart, the once-flashing Quezon admired the young Manuel for choosing to stay in the islands. At any rate, Roxas made the decision—and it was to remain with his people.

From the day he was elected Governor of Capiz until 1933, when he was deposed as speaker of the lower house, Roxas' star was in the ascendancy. In 1922, he was elected representative from the first district of Capiz. He himself did not even dream of becoming speaker upon being seated in the house of representatives. There were many men in the chamber—men older and more tried. But they were men schooled under the Osmeña leadership and Quezon, like the master political strategist that he was, saw the situation in a nutshell.

Sizing up the many young men in the legislature and looking them over for likely prospects, Quezon saw that the time was ripe to launch the issue of youth versus old age. Quezon then was a junior partner under Osmeña, but Quezon saw that with Roxas, Camilio Osias, and other youthful, vibrant, more daring men, he could seize control.

As part of his strategy, he worked to win a substantial following in the legislature by invoking the principle of collective leadership in a democracy as opposed to Osmeña's unipersonalist leadership. Quezon would flatter many of them with the title of "fellow leaders"—and this would give every legislator an opportunity to feel that he was important.

Quezon organized the Colectivista Party and labeled Osmeña's group Unipersonalista. Rafael Palma, then one of the top men near Osmeña, was rendered harmless politically by an appointment as president of the University of the Philippines, an academic ambition which would have given him repose in his senescence but for his Quixotic ideas and practices.

Quezon saw that the only danger in the way of complete control was the Visayan legislators, who were loyal to Osmeña. Spotting young Roxas, eager and ambitious and able in parliamentary jousting, Quezon put him up for speaker. After a deadlock lasting 4 days, Roxas was elected speaker at the age of 30, and, for the space of a decade, was the trusted lieutenant and understudy of Quezon, then president of the senate.

When the smoke of the Colectivista-Unipersonalista battle had vanished, Roxas found himself a political leader, a man of great influence at an age when most young men are just beginning to make connections. His youth did not agree very well with his elevated position. Impulsive and impatient at times, he showed lack of tact, and committed what could have been some grievous political blunders.

Yet, he was like the character in the familiar American comic strip who used to say, "I bruise easy, but I heal quick." No matter how many small mistakes Roxas made, he learned from his mistakes and proved the judgment of Quezon and other leaders that he was capable of growing instead of swelling. Roxas grew so fast, as a matter of fact, that his presence on the national scene became a source of discomfort to none other than Quezon.

At first, Quezon did not see any reason to be alarmed at Roxas' steadily growing stature. He was agreeable to giving Roxas as much rope as the young man wanted during days of political peace. There came a long lull in local politics. Even the independence campaign was very discouraging. Quezon more or less retired to Monrovia and left the government in the hands of Osmeña and Roxas. Osmeña himself, noticing the trend of things and in his astuteness not wanting to have his name connected too intimately with many happings, left much of the work to Roxas.

1931 found Roxas in Washington, working on the economic provisions of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Independence Act. When it became known in the islands that Congress was in a mood to pass the bill, Quezon hurriedly sent Benigno S. Aquino to Washington to obtain even more concessions. Aquino, persuaded by the Filipinos already in Washington, joined forces with them, and in 1933 the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act was passed. Quezon immediately organized his own mission, went to see the Pope, received Osmeña in fond embrace in Paris, and reconnoitered in both Washington and New York to see if more legislation, for which he could claim credit, were not possible.

Roxas, Osmeña, and the others had won a victory, but when they arrived back in the Philippines they discovered it was an empty one. Shrewd propaganda had been used against their efforts in Washington—and it worked. Instead of being heroes, they were temporarily heels. Roxas lost his speaker's position. He departed from that post amidst the cheering of the gallery. He was still the people's choice—although the politicians had cut the ground from under him.

For a while Roxas contented himself with being merely another member of the house of representatives and practicing law, which he had long abandoned, on the side.

As a member of the constitutional convention which drafted the fundamental law of the Commonwealth, he distinguished himself as chairman of the committee of seven which is credited with having drawn up the main context of the constitution. Subsequently, he was a member of the mission that took the original copy of the constitution to the United States for the signature of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

With the inauguration of the Commonwealth, Roxas was appointed by President Quezon as secretary of finance. In addition, he also was elected chairman of the boards of directors of the National Development Co. and the Naric, and chairman of the National Economic Council. Moreover, he was a member of the boards of the Philippine National Bank and the Agricultural and Industrial Bank.

When war broke out in 1941, Roxas was definitely one of the big three in the Philippines—he, Osmeña, and Quezon being the three recognized political leaders of the islands.

Roxas' story of what happened in that hectic period between December 8, 1941, when Jap military planes first appeared over the archipelago and that fateful day 5 months later when the Japs overran Corregidor is borne out by all the facts that can be gathered by all the important men in America and in the Philippines who were in a position to know. He worked with Quezon and with General MacArthur tirelessly. He fought and spoke and inspired and led. He chose to remain behind.

The New York Sun, when Roxas announced his candidacy for the Presidency of the new Republic, carries this revealing insight into how Roxas came to stay in the Philippines. Whether it is true or not has never been verified, but here's the story:

"He (Roxas) could have gone. There was one seat in the last plane. But just as he and another fellow were tossing for it, Roxas pushed the other fellow aboard, pocketed the coin, and went underground.

"That left him two-bits ahead, but in considerable peril. In peril he remained, leading guerrillas and unsalvaged Americans until MacArthur waded Gable-ishly ashore on Leyte. * * *"

All during the Japanese occupation, Roxas' status was anomalous, except to those liberty-loving Filipinos who remained true to America and to ideas of freedom and to their compatriots in the guerrilla forces. They always knew where Roxas stood. That is why, when MacArthur came back, although Roxas had actually held position in the puppet government, Roxas could go out to greet the American with clean hands and a pure heart. And because he knew of Roxas' record, MacArthur could (and did) sincerely embrace the little, wiry, half-starved Filipino.

From that day, it was in the cards that Roxas should be the first president of the new republic. Of course there was opposition. There were those who hated to think that any man who could have even spoken to the Japs could be elected to any office in the new republic. But they were the diehards, the incorrigibles, the least understanding. Roxas, all intelligent people now believe, chose the only path open to him to save his life and to serve his people. If he had been slain by the Japs, he might have been a greater hero—but he would have been a dead hero and of no possible service.

As it was he was of great service to the millions of Filipinos in their hour of greatest peril. He helped to obtain rice for them that would have not been had otherwise. He was able to obtain military and economic information that proved useful both to the guerrillas and the reinvading Americans. He was able to hold high the ideals of freedom at the very depth of despair among the people.

When the election campaign began, Roxas went into action like the dynamo he is. He had the support of the army, he had the support of the youth, he had the support of many who, like himself, had been tagged "collaborators" without cause.

Almost to a man, soldiers of the Philippine Army (which meant not only ex-USAFFE personnel but inducted guerrillas as well) hitched their wagons to Roxas' star—his long brigadier-general's epaulet. He defined clearly what he believed, what he wanted to do in office, in his campaign speeches. Already elected president of the senate he spoke from an official position and had a record—a postwar record as well as a prewar record. He used a derivative of the words Americans had heard from Elder Statesman Bernard Baruch—"Hurry, hurry, hurry." Roxas went about preaching action and more action. He declared that when and if he was elected and seated in office he would do away with those who refused to accede to the authority of the government in 30 days.

Political observers will remember now—and watch—his prediction that he also would form a new political party to oppose the Nationalist Party (which he and Osmeña had split wide open in the campaign) whether he won or lost. Many observers believe that a strong clearly-defined two-party system in the Philippines would help make the new Republic work better than the amalgamations and alliances which have characterized political activity in the archipelago for the past 50 years.

The times call for vital economic leadership. Roxas has demonstrated his ability in finance and economics. Even his opponents do not deny this. Also, with the army loyal to him, it is not inconceivable that he can make good his promises about restoring law and order.

Roxas oratory is already legendary in the Philippines. He is a man of "color"—whether native color or artificial color is hard to tell. At any rate, there is little doubt but that he is the most flamboyant political figure in the islands since the heyday of Manuel Quezon.

Alice Roosevelt Longworth once said that he was "the most eloquent speaker" she had ever heard—and she had heard many.

At one time, during a Senate hearing in Washington, one of the members of the committee asked Roxas after one of his turbulent outflows of ardor:

"Just what part of your speech is fact and what part rhetoric?"

When Roxas was forced out of the speaker's chair in the house of representatives, he said characteristically as he listened to the applause of the people in the gallery:

"I have fallen from the speaker's chair into the hearts of the people."

The people, after many years, have shown that he spoke the truth.

Long live Manuel Roxas! Long live the Republic!

The Country Can Afford To Pay a Housing Subsidy Better Than the Veteran Can Pay Inflated Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, though I felt and still feel that the full program of housing recommendations made by the President's Housing Expediter, Mr. Wilson Wyatt, should have received favorable consideration by the Congress, nevertheless I must concede I am pleased by the vote of the House authorizing and directing the House conferees to agree to a $400,000,000 housing subsidy.

CIRCUMSTANCES JUSTIFY SUBSIDIES

I have never been keen on subsidies, however disguised, unless they are clearly in public interest. In this instance, when the use of a Federal subsidy means making possible the construction of homes for veterans who deserve the best from a grateful Nation I feel the subsidy is not only needed but justified and demanded by the circumstances.

Reports that have come to us from every part of the country show that building costs have gone up from 30 to 60 percent. Buildings that normally would sell for $6,000 now are $8,000; and speculators are using every dodge to avoid existing regulations and charge all the traffic will bear. Without the subsidy, and at the present honest cost of new houses, the sale price of a new house of the same type, honestly priced by an honest builder, might be nine or ten thousand dollars. That would simply preclude veterans and other citizens of meager or limited means from buying a house.

RESALE CEILINGS NEEDED

After all, I think the country can better afford a subsidy to meet the difference than can veterans just out of service.

My present regret is that the House has not altered its original decision to refuse to put ceilings on the resale of occupied houses. All over the United States speculators are buying up old homes and reselling them two or three times, adding one or two thousand dollars' profit on each sale.

I feel that it is unwarranted, unfair, unjust, and unjustifiable that these real estate manipulators should thus take advantage of homeless veterans. Under present conditions, many of the men and women who served our country faithfully and uncomplainingly are constrained to live in old and dilapidated shacks, or crowded with two or three families into quarters never intended for so many people, when they are entitled to have decent homes at prices they can afford to pay in which to live and bring up their families.

Once more I am obliged to repeat that I regret many Members were led astray by the million-dollar lobby and propaganda campaign. I am satisfied that if the same vote on the same bill could be taken today the House would approve resale ceilings on old homes. Consequently, I hope in the future the membership will not so easily be led astray by the glib propaganda of highly paid lobbyists. I hope that Members will follow their own judgment and their own conscience, and not yield to the pressure of profiteers and get-rich-quick manipulators.

Extension of Selective Service for 1 Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement

made by me over the National Broadcasting Co.'s network from Newark, in reply to an address by Secretary of War Patterson in which he advocated extension of selective service for 1 year.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We won the war. But we are losing the peace. We are losing the peace because we are doing all kinds of double-talk about supporting the United Nations to restore and keep world order and at the same time calling for vast armed might of our own by which to threaten the rest of the world. We are losing the peace because we are telling ourselves that everybody trusts us and believes in our peaceful intentions while announcing the the world by our actions that we are not going to trust anybody. We are losing the peace because we are trying to substitute power politics supported by B-29's and atomic bombs for constructive statesmanship. We are losing the peace because we keep asserting that the war is not over and that we must maintain further into peacetime all our war-inspired restrictions and regimentations, including military conscription.

The war is over. The sooner we recognize that fact and set ourselves to rebuild democracy and justice at home and help inspire and maintain them abroad, the better promise we will have of winning the peace. This false alarm, "The war is not over" is being used by Secretary Patterson and General Eisenhower as official spokesmen for the War Department to foist upon America military conscription in peacetime. After having failed to pressure Congress and the American people into the acceptance of peacetime conscription for military training, they now come before us and declare that the war is not over.

That this effort to extend selective service now is part of a long-range plan to fasten conscription on America as a permanent policy is quite clear when one puts all the pieces of the puzzle together. Even before the war had ended powerful forces in the Government had launched a drive to get a universal military training law on the books. When the religious and educational forces of the Nation, the laborers and the farmers, and many of its wisest statesmen repudiated this move, the War Department went before the Committees on Military Affairs of the Congress and requested that the wartime draft be extended indefinitely. When they were assured that Congress would not write them this blank check they agreed to take a 1-year extension. But they required that it still apply to all citizens from 18 to 45 years. Since the House has passed a bill exempting the 18- and 19-year-old boys in response to public opinion outraged at the prospect of using these boys for police in Europe and Asia, the Secretary of War now states for publication that if Congress will let them keep drafting these youths they won't send them abroad. First they tell us they can't get along without these boys and keep the necessary forces overseas. And then the Secretary of War tells us they don't need them for foreign occupation troops at all. They will just keep them at home—in the Army, of course. Well, I say let's keep them at home—on the farms and in the factories, in school and college, and give them a chance to become decent and useful American citizens.

Two months ago I introduced a bill in the Senate to declare that the war is terminated so far as war legislation is concerned. I had already introduced a bill last September to stop the involuntary induction of men into land and naval forces of the United States under the Selective Service Act. I introduced these bills in the confident belief that we are impeding the recovery of our liberties at home and the reestablishment of freedom elsewhere by the hypocritical pretense that we are still at war. To be sure, we do have great problems before us. But we shall not settle them by maintaining wartime controls and a wartime military draft.

Again we are told by these advocates from the Pentagon Building that we must have a continuation of the draft in order to meet our foreign commitments. Now just what commitments are these gentlemen talking about? There are insinuations that our signature to the Charter of the United Nations has obligated us to occupy the rest of the world, to maintain armed garrisons all around the globe. We have agreed to help occupy Japan and Korea and Germany. But why do we need troops in Iceland and Egypt and Canada and China and some 50 other parts of the world? Secretary Patterson, under cross-examination before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, admitted that if we did away with guarding surplus supplies abroad no further conscription of troops would be necessary.

What a travesty on common sense and honesty, that we are being cajoled and frightened and threatened into extension of conscription to provide men who can watch our tractors rust away on Pacific islands, to stand guard over beer going stale—500,000 cases of it in Guam alone, according to Time magazine—to keep naked natives in India from taking blankets that will be burned in the end anyway. Why do we keep these surplus supplies all over the world at enormous expense? Is it in order to make a case for an army to guard them? And how much longer are we going to permit this thing?

Now here is another picture for intelligent Americans: We are asked to maintain troops in Germany. And recently in Paris Secretary Byrnes proposed a treaty to bind us to continue occupation of Germany for a quarter of a century. One of the reasons why this is regarded as necessary is to put down disorder among a people that are actually starving to death. Yet we are asked to keep on conscripting men to guard supplies much of which could be used to create the food and clothing and other necessities to relieve this need. But because we have no statesmanship adequate for this, we are further asked to conscript men to stand ready to shoot down hungry Germans who may grow too impatient with our blundering.

If we want to talk seriously about our commitments to create world order, to establish democracy and to preserve peace, we must abandon this illusion of peace by threat, of democracy by compulsion, and of order by deploying military power all over the globe. In place of these purely negative and repressive measures we must turn to positive and constructive ones.

Let us look a little further at the case of the War Department for extension of the draft beyond its expiration date of May 15. We must not gamble with national security, we are told. But it is not our national security that is in danger. We have and are able to maintain by voluntary enlistment a Navy bigger and more powerful than all the rest of the navies of the world. We have air forces, well equipped and well based, which excell the air power of any other nation and are more powerful than all the others combined. We can maintain these forces without further drafting men for their ranks. And we alone possess the atomic bomb, which dwarfs all the military power of the rest of the world. For the first time in the history of the world, one nation—ourselves—could annihilate the military establishments and the centers of population of the rest of the world. It is is defense that we seek, there has never been a nation more secure from defeat than the United States is today.

But the suspicion grows here—as it certainly has already grown abroad—that it is not national security that is sought by this new policy of conscription in peacetime, for our tremendous naval and air power and the atomic bomb cannot be used for policing and dominating other peoples. And even if we blasted the rest of the world to ruins, we would still have to have ground forces to retain control over the ruins. In short, the kind of overwhelming military and naval power we possess is really not sufficient to establish nor maintain empires. For this a nation must have armed garrisons. Are we being asked to stand ready to stand guard over the remnants of Britain's disintegrating empire? Or are we getting ready to launch an empire-building program of our own? Are we getting ready to pull British chestnuts out of the Near East fire where Russia is bidding for the oil of Iran and Iraq and Arabia by the very same methods that have given Britain a practical monopoly over the oil of these countries? Are we ready to guarantee that the Mediterranean is to remain a British lake, denying to Russia at the Dardanelles what we are protecting for Britain at Gibraltar and Suez? Must we conscript our boys to keep British troops in Indonesia and India where they shoot down the colonists for seeking the freedom we fought Britain for a century and three-quarters ago?

Reduced to its final analysis, extension of the draft is demanded as a countermeasure against fear of Russia.

More British Discrimination Against American Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

APRIL 2, 1946.

The AMERICAN COMMERCIAL ATTACHÉ,
American Legation, Cairo.

Re American goods for Egyptian Government departments.

DEAR SIR: As agent in Egypt for the Armco International Corp., Middletown, Ohio; the American Chain & Cable Co., Inc., New York; the Woodhouse Chain Works, Trenton, N. J.; the Wagner Electric Corp., St. Louis, Mo.; the Lincoln Electric Co., Cleveland, Ohio.; the Municipal Supply Co., South Bend, Ind.; and others, and in my capacity of contractor to the Egyptian Government since 1928, I take the liberty of advising that, as you are undoubtedly aware, the Egyptian State Railways have recently placed orders in Great Britain amounting to several million Egyptian pounds for locomotives, wagons, rails, machine tools, electrical equipment, etc., without giving a chance to American manufacturers of similar material which, in the majority of cases is lower priced than British goods and with quicker deliveries.

Of course, the E. S. R. may argue that, owing to the present scarcity of dollar exchange, it would be impossible for them to place orders in the United States of America, but it is my belief that it would still be feasible for them to favor American manufacturers with at least part of their orders, as a matter of fairness.

This state of affairs obtains, unfortunately, also to a great extent in other Government administrations, and my associate, Mr. Mohamed Farahat, Cairo, had last week an interview with His Excellency, Abdel Khawi Bacha, Minister of Public works, on the subject, putting to His Excellency the question whether or not the Egyptian Government policy was to entertain friendly commercial relations with the United States of America. His Excellency replied in the affirmative and

promised to bring the matter before the Council of Ministers and the Prime Minister for consideration and necessary action.

My associate and myself are striving hard to promote the American interests which we represent in this country, in connection with Egyptian Government business, and we feel that, laboring as we do, under very difficult and unfavorable conditions, we must appeal to your kind support and cooperation, in order to overcome the policy of discrimination that seems to prevail in Egyptian Government administrations.

Trusting that this matter will be given your kind attention, and thanking you for your cooperation,

Yours very truly,

L. R. BALLIS.

ALEXANDRIA, EGYPT.

Another Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, farmers should remember that in other sections of the country—notably in California—efforts are being made to force them and their hired men into the union. The procedure employed was pointed out by me way back in 1937.

As election time rolls around, the unions will again attempt to defeat at the primary and, if they win there, at the general election in November, all who refuse to follow their orders, all who oppose their actions.

Employees, working men and women, who are members of the industrial unions, should remember that, if the farmer, the small merchant, and his clerk, even though they be a member of the family, are forced to kick in $2 per month, that sum, paid each month by each employee of the independent merchant or farmer, will be added to the grocery bill.

If, in addition to all township, school, county, city, State, and Federal taxes, everyone is to be forced to pay $2 a month additional tax to the Teamsters' Union, we might just as well know it now as later. And, if the present fee is $2 per month, how long will it be before the Teamsters' Union will be asking for $3, $4, or $5 per month? Is not opposition to that demand justified?

The Conference of American Small Business Organizations—Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS EXPRESSES THE DELIBERATED OPINION OF THE DELEGATES FROM BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTING AN AFFILIATED MEMBERSHIP OF OVER 600,000 SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS

To the Congress of the United States:

Following is a tabulation of the answers received to date to a quarter of a million OPA questionnaires distributed to trade and industry associations, chambers of commerce, and other small business organizations, and to individual businessmen throughout the 48 States.

The percentages speak for themselves. They express the opinions of businessmen in virtually every line of manufacturing, wholesaling, jobbing, retailing, and the service trades located in 48 States.

Extension of OPA	Yes	No	No vote
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
1. Extend the Price Stabilization Act to Mar. 31, 1947	63.4	30.8	5.8
GRADUAL LIQUIDATION OF OPA			
2. Congress should provide for gradual liquidation of OPA so that the agency will be only a shell on Mar. 31, 1947	90.0	6.6	3.4
RELIEF FROM COST-ABSORPTION			
3. Congress should provide for (1) historic percentage mark-up over total present costs, or (2) an arbitrary 10-percent mark-up over August 1945 ceilings, or (3) unit-wise percentage mark-up over total present costs, plus (4) the base period to determine these mark-ups to be the years 1936–41	90.0	2.5	7.5
IMMEDIATE EXEMPTION FROM CONTROL			
4. (*a*) The products of all manufacturers (as defined by the Census Bureau) whose total sales in the latest 12 months' period were less than $100,000 should be exempt from price control through all levels of distribution (wholesalers, distributors, jobbers, and retailers). (*b*) All goods and services not specifically related to the cost of living should be immediately exempted	91.0	8.9	.1
EXEMPTION BASED ON PRODUCTION			
5. All control should be terminated when production reaches a certain dollar volume of sales (in the case of manufacturers), or unit volume (in the case of raw commodities)	86.0	6.5	7.5
ELIMINATE PRETICKETING			
6. Preticketing should be eliminated on any product not normally priced by the manufacturer for sale at retail	86.0	4.5	9.5
AUTHORITY TO DISTRICT AND REGIONAL OFFICES			
7. (*a*) Authority should be delegated to regional and district OPA offices to accept for filing and have final jurisdiction over all price matters. (*b*) District and State offices should have final jurisdiction over all matters relating to distributors, wholesalers, jobbers, retailers, and all service trades. The decisions should be final, subject only to appeal by the applicant and review by the national office. All matters appealed and for review should go directly to the national office without being examined or reviewed by regional offices. (*c*) Regional offices should have final jurisdiction over all manufacturers, subject to appeal to, or review by, the national office	86.9	4.1	9.0
DEFINITE TIME LIMITS			
8. All branches of OPA must act within a certain specified time, failing which the price schedules filed become valid	91.0	1.6	7.4
NO NATIONAL AVERAGE COST FACTORS			
9. National average cost factors should not be the basis when determining adjustments of filed prices	80.9	8.0	11.1
NO RETROACTIVE PENALTIES			
10. No ceiling prices determined after a review by the national office should be retroactive to the date of filing at the local offices, therefore should not make the applicant liable for retroactive penalty	88.2	3.5	8.3
ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURE			
11. The act should direct that noncompliance with regulations of a nonwillful nature be dealt with by private interview with reasonable time for correction; tolerance for margin of error should be allowed, enabling those subject to control to correct mistakes or to make refunds without legal procedure and before OPA institutes formal enforcement action or publicizes the proceedings	90.1	2.2	7.7
RENT CONTROL			
12. Rent control should be transferred to the National Housing Authority with provisions for adequate returns from rental on real-estate investments	90.0	3.5	6.5

Economy With an Ax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me by the House, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Thursday, May 9, 1946, with regard to the pending appropriation bill for the Interior Department. Yesterday on the floor of this House I pointed out that I was not in favor of cutting this bill as much as it was cut. I stated that I disagreed vigorously, particularly with reference to the item of $23,330,000 for the Southwestern Power Administration. I was and am in favor of granting the full amount requested. I felt the same way with regard to the Bureau of Reclamation, particularly the Central Valley project in California, and the Bonneville Power Administration in the Northwest.

The editorial, with which I do not fully agree, follows:

ECONOMY WITH AN AX

Economy in Washington is long overdue, but a cut of 50 percent in one department, while others are barely touched, is scarcely the best way to go about it. In reducing the Interior Department's budget from $346,765,579 to $174,652,579, the House Appropriations Committee expressed the hope that "under the dynamic leadership of Secretary Krug the department will be placed on a more efficient basis." Its own conception of efficiency leaves a good deal to be desired. The Southwestern Power Administration, whose three dams in Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Texas furnish much-needed power, was cut down from $23,323,000 to $3,632,715. The Bonneville Power Administration, which brought $43,216,192 into the Federal Treasury from sale of power during the first 3½ years of the war, was slashed from $19,791,000 to $9,000,000. The committee chose this psychological moment to reduce the Bureau of Mines, one of whose most important activities is the study of ways to prevent accidents and occupational diseases, from $20,231,400 to $11,298,439. With renewed travel now possible the funds asked for the National Park Service were almost cut in two. With a world food crisis upon us and a world food shortage probable for years to come this committee, in its wisdom, chopped down the Bureau of Reclamation from $166,894,055 to $72,271,475.

These are samples of the way the committee operated. There is no indication that it thought of the true nature of economy, which is to cut out useless activities and retain those which bring in more than they cost. There is every indication that it was thinking politically, and especially that it desired to take a final wallop at the figure of former Secretary Ickes. Of course there could be more economy and more efficiency in the Interior Department. This newspaper has long argued for a balanced peacetime budget, which can only be had by efficiency and economy in the public business. But efficiency isn't the sacrifice of profitable enterprises, and economy ought to go beyond the walls of one department.

Threat From Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, time after time after time I have said on this floor and elsewhere that the real danger to America's future and to America's democratic way of living comes, not from those progressive thinkers and liberals who are our itching conscience, nor even from the tiny Communist Party, embracing one-tenth of 1 percent of the people of America, but from the entrenched greed and concentrations of economic wealth of the reactionaries.

Repeatedly I have inveighed against the heavy pressures of the business and financial and industrial lobbies which infest Capitol Hill with their heavy-handed importuning—against the lobbies which misled many Members into cutting the very vitals out of President Truman's housing bill, out of the price control extension bill, out of the full employment bill, and the minimum wage bill.

When, therefore, I find that a fair-minded, accurate, and experienced writer like Thomas L. Stokes, who certainly has never been known for pulling his punches when he felt that even his best friends needed lambasting, says in his own terse way the same thing I have been telling the country for many years, I am very happy. I know that I make no blanket defense of the liberals nor any blanket indictment of big money; I do not believe Mr. Stokes does. Each individual must stand on his own merits. What we do say is that the real and present danger to responsible popular government is from the pressure of vast financial powers too great to be countered by any ordinary citizen or group of ordinary citizens.

It gives me pleasure to insert in the RECORD, Tom Stokes' column of May 8 from the Washington Daily News, which he titled "Threat From Right":

THREAT FROM RIGHT

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

It is the fashion nowadays to say that the threat to our freedom and democracy is from the left.

The proof lies in the facts. An examination of the record would seem to disprove this theory and show, instead, that, amid all the howling about the danger from the left, forces on the other side have been moving in quietly to consolidate themselves.

Since before the war Congress has enacted no new law of the New Deal stripe, or "leftish," if that designation is preferred, with a single exception. That was the watered-down version of the so-called full employment bill. In its final form, it won approval of even stanch conservatives. It has started no revolutions.

But there has been movement in Congress from the right, easily overlooked because it involved seemingly complicated matters, or at least made to look complicated. Their purpose, however, is simple, that is, to protect and strengthen entrenched economic interests to the detriment of the rank and file. Monopoly, or private government by private interests, is what it all spells out.

The irony is that this threat to our competitive, free enterprise society comes from those who are so blatant about free enterprise. But they know what they are up to.

Reference has been made here before to the attempt of the great insurance industry, in the middle of the war, to exempt itself from our antitrust laws and thus deprive the public of its champion against extortionate rates and charges. They won out in the House but were checked in the Senate—and through a compromise—by the alertness of Senator O'MAHONEY (Democrat, Wyoming).

Another campaign to break down the antitrust laws is now on, even more far-reaching in its effects on all of us.

This is the attempt of the railroads to get out from under the antitrust laws through the so-called Bulwinkle bill. It, too, passed the House, often a most undiscerning body. But the Justice Department's Antitrust Division, and such others as Gov. Ellis Arnall, of Georgia, laid before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee a factual record of monopolistic rate-fixing by railroads and allied transportation agencies drawn within their orbit, which this bill would perpetuate and strengthen. So the committee has had its eyes opened.

The bill would exempt from antitrust action agreements on rates among railroads through rate bureaus or conferences that were approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The point about such rate agreements, which the Justice Department has demonstrated in actual cases, is that they are controlled from the top by one organization, the American Association of Railroads, which itself, in turn, has tie-ups with great New York banking houses. It is a private empire above the Government and people.

This top stratum has tremendous power because the banks, in turn, are affiliated with the Nation's great industries. By the way it fixes railroad and allied transportation rates, for example, it not only raises the cost of living for you and me, for freight rates are an important item; but it also can hold back development of certain sections, such as, for example, the South and West. This it has done. Its interests lie with vested industrial enterprises in the East.

So powerful was this hierarchy that it refused reductions in rates to the Government during the war in many cases, and those excessive charges all come out of our pocketbooks as taxpayers. New freight classifications were devised in some cases to get a higher rate. During the war and before, this railroad hierarchy stretched its influence, through its banking and other connections, into other forms of transportation in the effort to get them to raise their rates to the railroad level, thus leaving the hapless shipper, in many cases, no competitive recourse.

Price Control Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include at this point in the RECORD a part of a broadcast by Fulton Lewis, Jr., over the Mutual Broadcasting

System on May 3, 1946, reading as follows:

As you may remember, when the OPA continuation bill was up for consideration in the House of Representatives about 3 weeks ago, an amendment was offered by Representative JIM WADSWORTH, of New York, one of the most highly regarded figures in the House, for the immediate and complete termination of all price and other controls on livestock and the meat picture generally.

He contended that the black market in meat has now become so widespread that there no longer is any hope at all of repairing and patching up the mess, and the only thing left to do is to give it up completely.

On the original tentative vote, that amendment was carried by a fairly strong margin; but when the final confirmation vote came, it was defeated by a rather close margin, so in the form in which the OPA extension bill went to the Senate, the amendment was not included.

This afternoon, Representative WADSWORTH took the floor for 5 minutes, and he told the House that he spent 3 days of this week in Chicago, at the Chicago Stockyards, and that everything he told his colleagues, everything he predicted about what would happen if controls were not taken off meat, were confirmed and more than confirmed by what he saw there. He said that he found the entire slaughtering industry, and the entire cattle industry in general, in a state of total demoralization. And I might add that I personally have contacted certain of the larger livestock markets of the Nation myself today, and I find that the quota buying orders, which Secretary of Agriculture Anderson put into effect on Monday of this week in an effort to curb the flow of cattle into black-market channels and get some animals into the hands of legitimate packers, has failed to show the slightest discernible results.

After Representative WADSWORTH got through today, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, much to the astonishment of the assembled Representatives, he very, very rarely does anything of this kind, took the floor and himself made a brief speech. He said that some Members of the House may have noticed that when the vote on the Wadsworth amendment was taken about 3 weeks ago, he was not recorded as having voted one way or the other. He said he wanted to inform the House of Representatives this afternoon, that if he had voted on that previous occasion, he would have voted in favor of the amendment, that is, he would have voted in favor of removing all controls on meat.

He said the Nation has the largest supply of cattle in its entire history, but because of the OPA and its bungled system of controls, the animals are not getting to the dinner tables of the Nation. And that is from the Democratic Speaker of the House of Representatives—the second highest figure in the administration, second only to the President himself.

To thoroughly complete the fiasco on the meat situation, the White House this afternoon put out a statement that President Truman's remarks of yesterday, and Secretary Anderson's remarks of the day before, about ending controls on meat if the present experiments with the quota system fail to work, had been misinterpreted in most quarters, and that they had been referring to these new quota controls only, and not to price controls.

I can't say, first hand, anything about what the President was referring to yesterday, because it so happens that I was unable to attend his press and radio conference in person. But regardless of what the White House may say, I do know what Secretary Anderson meant the day before, because I talked to him personally, and he told me exactly what he meant. And 50 statements by the White House can't change that.

Now for the last 2 nights, ladies and gentlemen, I've tried to give you some factual information about the inspired mail that is pouring into Congress, particularly into the offices of Senators, demanding the continuation of OPA for a full year, without restrictions or limitations or qualifications or instructions of any kind, just a blank check of authority for OPA to continue as it has been operating, for another 12 months. I've tried to give you some idea of how that mail has been inspired, and who it comes from, and what the forces are that are behind it.

The form post cards, on which an individual merely signs his name, and drops it in the mail box, have been distributed in subways and on street corners and through factories and business establishments, by the CIO, by the Political Action Committee, by the Communist Party, and by a few other groups which they have persuaded to go along with them.

The OPA's own propaganda machinery, notably the so-called Community Services Branch of the OPA Information Division, has been beating the drums with local groups of one kind and another, trying to drum up sentiment wherever possible. It's easy for anyone to scribble a name at the bottom of a card, and drop it in a mail box, particularly if they don't read it carefully, and consider carefully what the card says. They are all worded in such a way as to elicit the momentary reaction, well, yes, I want price control continued wherever necessary, as long as necessary—and that seems to be what this means.

But, in addition to the forces that I have already mentioned, promoting this high-pressure mail drive on Congress, there is another very important force too. Mr. Walter Winchell, in his Sunday night broadcasts, has openly and frankly urged his listeners to write to their Congressmen and Senators and insist that OPA be continued, without restrictions or limitations or qualifications of any kind. Mr. Drew Pearson, in his Sunday night broadcasts, has joined the team, also; he has openly and unblushingly urged his listeners to write to their Senators and Congressmen, demanding that OPA be continued without restrictions or qualifications of any kind. Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, in her newspaper column, My Day, has urged her readers to write their Congressmen and Senators, demanding the same thing, except that she rather let the cat out of the bag by making it perfectly clear that the plan is to keep OPA and government control as a permanent fixture in the American Government. And other lesser figures on the radio and in the press are doing the same thing.

In 9 years before this microphone, I have never done that. I've wanted to, sometimes, but I've always refrained. But inasmuch as I seem to be the only person on the air who believes that the OPA should be forced to clean its own house, and inasmuch as they have done what they have, I'm going to do the same thing, for the first time. We'll let them see what some letter writing is * * * not phony form post cards, but letters.

Don't be fooled by this stuff and nonsense, that this is a question of whether price control is to be continued or not. It is no such thing. It's a question of whether the slide-rule quiz kids in OPA are going to be permitted to continue to run things just as they jolly well please, without any restraints, without any requirements that they straighten out the mess they've made, or whether the Congress of the United States—which is you, is going to make them behave themselves, and make them stop playing politics with the economic welfare of the Nation, and correct their idiotic scramble of controls and price ceilings so that that part of America that wants to go back to work and do a job—which is most of America—can go back to work.

If you want the OPA continued exactly as it has been, with no butter although we have plenty of butterfat, no GI homes, although we have untold quantities of lumber and untold mills standing idle, with no cheap shirts—only $4 shirts—because price ceilings make it impossible for the manufacturer to produce cheap shirts; if you want OPA continued with you paying 20 percent more than you would be paying for meat, because virtually all of the meat is in the black market, when we have more meat than ever before in history; if you want the pushing around, and the persecution of innocent little people, if you want the corner grocer fined $50 for making a mistake of 1 cent on a pound of hamburger, if you're in favor of the way the three little Swiss guys were treated, if you like being propagandized with phoney statistics and untruths, with your own tax money paying for it, if you want Mr. Chester Bowles and his OPA crowd, with the open and organized backing of the Communist Party and the Political Action Committee, to get an absolutely free ticket for another 12 months, write and tell your Congressman and your two Senators to extend OPA without any restrictions.

I don't believe you do. I believe you want the mess cleaned up. And if you do want that, write and tell your Senators and your Congressman that you want OPA cleaned up, and made to behave itself, and to take whatever steps are necessary to let America go to work. This is a question of whether OPA is working for us, or whether it rules us.

Now, they've organized this high-pressure mail campaign. Let's show them, once and for all, what letter writing is. Don't send any printed form postcards. Members of Congress are not impressed by that. If the National Association of Manufacturers or any body else gives you a card to sign, tear it up and throw it away. First of all, find out from your local newspaper or elsewhere the exact names of your Representative and your two Senators. Then sit down and write them, briefly, exactly how you feel. If you think OPA ought to be cleaned up, say so. Get you neighbors to write too. Get the members of your family to write. And we'll show them what some letter writing is.

Don't delay this, many of you have written in, and asked me what you can do. Well, this is it. You've got to show Congress what America really thinks and wants; now, let's see what happens.

Appalachian Mining Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Reporter Finds Appalachian Mining Conditions Appalling," by Mrs. Eugene Meyer, a very able and conscientious lady, the wife of the publisher of the Washington Post. Mrs. Meyer has

made a personal investigation of the situation in the Appalachian mining region, from an unbiased, nonpartisan point of view. She substantiates some of the matters called to the attention of the Senate by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and myself a few days ago.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 8, 1946]

REPORTER FINDS APPALACHIAN MINING CONDITIONS APPALLING

(By Agnes E. Meyer)

HARLAN, KY., May 7.—I have just been through the bituminous coal areas of the Appalachian Mountains, where the fatalities read like battle reports from Iwo Jima.

Since the Christmas disaster at Fourmile, where 20 miners were buried alive, 27 miners have been killed by other accidents in this area. From 146 to 180 miners are killed in Kentucky every year. In 1944, 10,000 out of 67,000 coal miners were injured in major industrial accidents in Kentucky; only 6,338 received compensation, usually inadequate. According to the Federal Bureau of Mines, in the last 35 years, 66,140 men were killed in the anthracite and bituminous fields, an average of 1,889 men per year. Why does the Nation countenance such wholesale slaughter in one of its most essential industries?

These miners need a welfare fund, though it is a question who should control it. They need much more than that. They need a chance to live like human beings. They need a chance to escape from the pigsties they are forced to inhabit. They need health instead of filthy water supplies, insanitary toilets, bad odors, flies, mosquitoes, and the diseases that result from them. They must be assured a living wage. They are entitled to safe working conditions instead of being forced to walk daily into a death trap. Above all things, they need to be freed from some of the most vicious operators and politicians that have ever turned American citizens into slaves.

Before I describe the horrors, the injustices and the terrorism I have witnessed in the Tennessee-east Kentucky area, it is only fair to say that I know the conditions in the Pennsylvania bituminous regions. Conditions there are a veritable heaven in comparison with the hell in which I spent last week.

This Appalachian area is notoriously the worst mining district in the country. In the whole region there is but one first-rate operation. It is Lynch, Ky., run by the United States Steel Co. There are 5, possibly 6, others that are fairly good. The rest in varying degrees are a disgrace to the industry and to the Nation. Daily they threaten the well-being of some 70,000 men and their families in Kentucky and Tennessee, or, given the high birth rate, nearly 400,000 people.

I began my tour of the bituminous coal region at Fourmile, near Middlesboro, Ky., where the explosion occurred last Christmas that shook the whole country. Twenty heads of families are still entombed. The mine has been sealed to extinguish the flames and cannot be reopened as yet. Five men escaped, one of whom died subsequently.

I interviewed three of them, one in the hospital. None of these men will ever work again as miners. Their hearts are bad; their bodies poisoned by coal gases. Neither they nor the families of the dead have ever received a cent of compensation from the mine owner. They had all signed the usual compensation contract, which had been presented by the mine company as though it was providing compensation. It was a fake. Actually no compensation was in force at the time of the accident.

SUPPORTED BY CHARITY

The mine workers are now pressing State officials to start criminal action against the mine owner. The 25 families are being supported by charity. A fund of $120,000 raised by popular subscription and distributed at the average rate of $120 a month per family will last them a little more than 3 years. After that, the widows, wives, and numerous children will have to depend on the charity of the United Mine Workers.

The UMW tried to pass the same safety laws in Kentucky that exist in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois, but the operators defeated the bill. The coal-company lawyers have drafted all the Kentucky mining laws until the last legislature passed a slight modification of the compensation act. Heretofore all compensation for death or injury has been left to the good or bad will of the operators.

Why did the accident at Fourmile occur? Because the operator, to save a few dollars, shut off the fan that forces oxygen into the mine on the Saturday before Christmas. On Christmas night 4 days later, the fan was turned on again. When the men went in the following morning, the accumulated coal gas ignited. Had it not been the Christmas season, about 100 more men would have been trapped. Mine operators such as this one, and they are plentiful in this area, daily risk the lives of their workers to get all the money they can in a short period. They are taking it out of the lives of the men, instead of thinking about good ventilation and general efficiency.

UNFIT FOR HUMANS

At Fourmile I began my study of the miners' living conditions. The company houses are hovels so abominable that no human being should live in them. The roofs leak, the wind blows through crevices in walls and floors, the destruction and filth of generations are everywhere evident. Two families had lived for 30 years right at the mouth of the mine. These shacks with a local lumber supply had cost less than $50 to $75 to build originally. Yet these families, for 30 years, had paid first $6 then $9 a month, or some $3,000 in all, for this abomination of a house and for the privilege of working from father to son in daily risk of their lives when they entered this mine.

There is no running water in such camps. One family uses a dirty trickle of a stream that comes from the hill where pigs run and cattle graze. Others use moldy, polluted old wells. Many walk blocks to the nearest source of water, which may be a clean spring in the higher locations or a dirty one if it is in the valley. The open outdoor toilets are often near the water supply. Refuse lies in the streams and in the all-pervasive mud.

The small children in these families are undernourished and scabby faced, either with skin diseases or filth. The miserable commissary in this mine has an inadequate variety of foods. Other stores are miles away. From 5 to a top of 22 children are crowded into these houses.

NO SIGN OF DISCIPLINE

The four-room school is battered and pitiful, but far better than it used to be. Two young teachers do their best to instruct about 150 children, of whom some 30 were in school. The others were playing hookey, as they usually do. Most of them drop out at the fifth or sixth grade. No vestige of discipline is discernible in the children nor the adults. Women in filthy clothes were rocking on the porch while the ragged, half naked little ones played in the mud puddles that filled every depression after a rain.

These families were poor illiterate mountain folk when they left the isolated hills for the insulated mining camps. There they have lived as virtual slaves before the union fought its bloody battles with the operators' sheriffs, gunmen, and gangsters, to ultimate victory and an organization which has been strong only the last 2 or 3 years. These mining families have never known what it means to have possessions, freedom, decency, and dignity even in better camps than Fourmile. The young men who grew up in the years of depression, want, and idleness, and then went to war, have never had a life.

Unlike the miners and mining families whom I interviewed in Pennsylvania, these folk have lived so long in isolation, fear, and suspicion that they are defensive, if not hostile, with a stranger. If my sympathy pierced their unresponsiveness, the more intelligent ones would show me their houses with a fierce indignation. But the groups of men idling about here and there, playing cards on the commissary steps, would never so much as look up at me when I began talking to them. They would answer my questions warily and distrustfully, out of one corner of the mouth, while they continued their games of penny ante.

THEY HAVE NEVER LEARNED

What a newcomer feels at once is that these people have never learned to be responsible for their own lives. Most of them never handled money before the union invasion, because they were permanently in debt to the company store. Now that they get more money, they spend it often before pay day. The management of money, of a budget, a desire for cleanliness, health, order, and self-development cannot be learned overnight. Most of the miners were induced to buy bonds during the war. Usually their wages are frittered away.

John Lewis has raised the pay of these miners only to have most of it funneled into the company stores. In spite of the fact that some of the mines have paid better wages for 6 or 7 years and most of them for 3 years, there is no discernible improvement in the general standard of living. Oh, yes; these people need welfare work in the profoundest, most far-reaching sense of the word. To put the welfare fund in the hands of the UMW gives the union too much power over its members.

But John Lewis is forced to seek protection for mining families because public justice and private charity alike have failed to come to their rescue. What these dispirited, oppressed, and exploited people need most is an opportunity to escape both company and union domination, to live in an incorporated township and learn slowly what it means to belong to a self-respecting, self-governing, free American community.

Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM A. BARDEN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to insert in the RECORD an article appearing in the April 1946 issue of Hollands magazine by Wellington Brink, on Hon. Lindsay Carter Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States and the agent of the Congress. Prior to his appointment as Comptroller General in 1940, Mr. Warren was a Member of the House of Representatives for 16 years from the First North Carolina Congressional District. He is one of the Nation's finest public servants.

LINDSAY CARTER WARREN

WHIP OVER PUBLIC SPENDING

(By Wellington Brink)

Lindsay Carter Warren, who carries 200 well-packed pounds, bosses the vast, sprawling General Accounting Office. He is the Nation's fiscal enforcement officer, the No. 1 critic of mismanagement in Government, and the chief barrier against illegal spending of Uncle Sam's mickles and muckles.

As Comptroller General of the United States, one of his many duties is to run the biggest auditing house in the world. Warren is tough. His brows beetle. His speech smarts. Spray salts his face. Memories of Blackbeard the Pirate light his eyes. He's a lusty skipper straight from the stormy banks of North Carolina.

Warren battled bareknuckle through county courtrooms and the bruising free-for-all of politics. He's maybe even better as a trial lawyer than at trial balances—and best of all, to hear him talk, at snagging channel bass.

General Accounting has a decimal-chasing population of some 15,000—almost triple the prewar number. In 12 months it handles 50 million vouchers covering Government expenditures of around 100 billion dollars. Mountains of miscellany, your tax money and mine, here pass in review; pay rolls, pencil sharpeners, war contracts, telephone calls, pensions, travel items—just about everything it takes to run the Federal business.

Much of Warren's reputation rests on two monosyllabic words: a thunderous "No" and a decisive "Yes." His decisions are stout and, when necessary, vehement. They stand. Thus, he distinguishes himself in our yes-and-no bureaucracy.

Warren says "No," to every inching from the law's letter. He cracks down when expenditures deviate from the terms of Congressional appropriations. It is not his concern whether Congress is wise or otherwise, or whether an agency is well-intentioned or city-slickerish. He's a stickler for order and integrity in handling the American dollar.

Before the purposeful Tarheel took over in 1940, General Accounting was lackluster and regarded as an encumbrance to progress. By tradition the Comptroller was hard boiled, autocratic, unimaginative—a devilish annoyance to be sidestepped when possible. The Office kept neat books but steadily deteriorated in power and prestige.

GAO's weakness was well known on Capitol Hill. When Franklin Roosevelt sent over his reorganization bill, a bill authored originally by Warren himself, it had been changed so that GAO was all lathered up for the razor. Lindsay would not stand for the throat cutting. He told the President, "If GAO is cut out, the bill will never become law."

Warren was no man to buck on such an issue. He was then veteran chairman of the House Accounts Committee. He was serving his eighth consecutive term from North Carolina's First District. He was hard in the running for the majority leadership. But, although Warren contrived to stay the sentence, GAO continued to flounder. It kept right on moving ineptly, alternately brusque and timid.

Only when he could refuse no longer did Lindsay Warren himself become Comptroller General. He turned down the job in 1936. Again in 1938. Four times in 1940. Thus, he got in some very good early practice saying "No" to the Chief Executive. "I'm not an auditor, nor an accountant. In fact, I'm utterly unqualified," he muttered.

But there was no escape. By then GAO was an habitual stumblebum. Late in 1940 a fifth urgent invitation brought a guttural assent. Warren's nomination rushed through unanimous senatorial approval, and immediately the pressures were on—conspicuously so from some of his former buddies in Congress. Six of them wanted to be Assistant Comptroller, a choice job in itself.

But Warren grinned and bore down, "feeling his oats," conscious of his independence under a 15-year, single-term appointment from which he could be removed only by impeachment or joint resolution. He was affable. He talked as one politician to another. But he said No, just the same. "I'm going to recommend Frank Yates. Yates was practically born in General Accounting—started as a $75 clerk. He's a World War veteran. He knows this place inside and out. He and I hit it off together, and we'll run GAO as a partnership."

Of no avail were threats to "see the President." "I'll see him myself," said Warren pleasantly. "I want Yates."

He got Yates.

That was the beginning of a major revolution. He and Yates divided the areas of responsibility—set up that "partnership." Warren opened windows, swept out dust, introduced incentive. He delighted in his discoveries. He found a lot of latent brains lying around in obscure corners, and promptly put them to use. Warren lighted a warm, imaginative fire. The massive red brick sepulchre at Fifth and F Streets began to glow as it hadn't since the old gay days before Taft, when it had been the regular scene of inaugural balls. Warren began to note happily, "There's right much humanity in this office."

There's also right much efficiency. But Warren does not share the smugness of certain predecessors. "Before I took over, I was told that GAO was 100 percent right," he recalls. "That was somewhat frightening, if true. I didn't feel like joining up with such a high state of perfection. But the actuality proved not quite as bad as the rumor. After 5 years of improvement, I'm now inclined to think that maybe we're right about 75 percent of the time."

Using GAO's intimate knowledge of migrating moneys as leverage, the shrewd Lindsay bit by bit manages to inject sound business practices in Government. Theoretically, the Comptroller has always rated as an adviser to Congress, whose agent he is. Warren takes this part of his job seriously. He goes into frequent huddles with Appropriations, Expenditures and other committees of both Houses, pounding ceaselessly for streamlining bureau affairs and reorganization of the whole executive department.

Last winter the move to separate Federal Loan Agency from Commerce Department afforded an opportunity to bring Government corporations under GAO audit, a measure long advocated by Warren. As a result of Public Law No. 4, approximately 100 such corporations must now answer to Congress, through GAO, the same as other Federal establishments. That was a real victory. Now he backs with equal vigor such legislation as the Byrd-Butler and the Whittington bills which would bring the financial affairs of Government corporations under Budget Bureau and Treasury controls also, without intering with needed flexibility of operations.

Warren deliberately strengthens the hand of the President by stressing his freedom from White House strings. He reports directly to Congress. His annual summary is formal, concise, factual, without trimmings. But when he appears as a witness before bodies of inquiry, he reverts to the picturesque, no-holds-barred language he formerly employed in the well of the House. On these occasions, there is always a full gallery.

War spending, which so expanded the work of GAO, had Warren yelling to high heaven—and saving taxpayers' money with every crescendo. He told a House committee: "Under the cost-plus-fixed-fee contract the money and property of the United States are being dished out and given away with reckless abandon.

"If the Congress does nothing about this situation, let no one in the future point an accusing finger at either the Comptroller General or the General Accounting Office. I have warned and today I again warn the Congress, and you now have sufficient time to protect the public's interest. * * * Believe me when I say that after this war is over, it is not inconceivable that we may be required to have another great bond issue to take care of the unjust enrichment of some war contractors and war profiteers."

Months later Old Eagle Eye was still viewing this sort of contract with alarm: "The General Accounting Office cannot challenge a contract unless it is illegal. It is a rare exception that we ever find what might be termed an illegal one. * * * There is no alternative on our part but to approve. * * * I am not a reformer nor a crusader, but I have insisted that we use just a little ordinary common decency in the expenditure of these vast sums of money.

"The tragic thing about the whole situation is that there does not seem to be anyone who cares or gives a hang about the reckless, improvident, and shocking extravagances in the expenditures of public funds made under the guise of war."

But Warren himself cared. He kept snapping at the heels of disbursing officers from one end of the land to the other. He did away with the controversial "preauditing" to concentrate on and speed up the final accounting. He decentralized whenever practicable, moving his men out within elbow-bumping distance of large spenders away from Washington. Four large branches he planted in proximity to field offices of the Army, another in Cleveland close to a Navy accounting center. He moved to standardize Government reporting systems. He simplified forms and cut red tape. He made it easier for establishments to get GAO rulings in advance on touch-and-go matters, often rushing through in a few hours decisions involving millions in war expenditures. He invoked a variety of devices to facilitate the work of honest, capable administrators. But the Blackstone in his blood kept him strongly allergic to fraud, carelessness, and plain bungling.

In the last fiscal year nearly $9,000,000 was collected and turned over to the Treasury as a result of inspectional and investigational work. The occasional fraud that was uncovered was referred for further attention to the FBI. But much of the money was from overpayments.

Of $86,000,000 recaptured otherwise, $44,000,000 pertained to the distasteful cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts and $24,000,000 represented overpayments to common carriers.

One of the Comptroller's duties is to countersign warrants. Lowest has been for 1 cent, highest for $50,000,000,000.

Another task is to settle all claims brought by, or against, the United States. More than half a million claims were satisfied in the last fiscal year. They ranged from a few pennies to the half billion dollars paid to the Republic of China under a special act by Congress aimed at doctoring a disordered exchange. Other settlements, in large numbers, were of claims by members of the armed forces or their families.

No one knows better than Warren that "There are many very able and efficient administrators in the various Government establishments, but there are some who don't know the value of a dollar and who spend a portion of their time trying to circumvent the appropriation language of the Congress and the General Accounting Office."

Warren has become the veritable oracle of all who would tighten up and modernize the machinery of Government. Better than anyone else he knows the danger areas, the soft spots. He knows where Congress itself bogs down, where losses occur because of duplication or overlapping of agency activities. He knows who are the sound administrators and who are the spendthrifts. He knows that he is in a position to speak out and conceives it his oath-bound duty to do so.

We hear him boldly suggest the use of "a bush-axe or a meat cleaver" to cut down "this thing we call 'government'" which so arrogantly snaps its fingers at Congress, its creator! We hear him cite savings of "untold millions" which could be effected. Admittedly, he expects "loud yelps and snarls, but that is always true when powers are curbed and consolidations made, or appropriations reduced or discontinued."

Warren, who goes counter to pattern, is anything but arrogant himself. He listens patiently, keeps himself accessible. While he bases conclusions on hard facts and the law, he realizes that he must deal amiably with people if he would deal effectively. His No's are said with finality but finesse. He will grab a disappointed pleader with one hand and his 12-year-old fishin' hat with the other, and make a dash for the open sea and a bout with amber jack or dolphin or sailfish.

The old waterpup never stays at his desk long enough to dehydrate. He keeps his outlook moist. The river Pamlico is a mile wide where it passes in front of his home at Washington, N. C., where he was born 56 years ago. That is still his main anchorage. As a small lad he learned from the river as city youngsters learn from the streets. He lived with boats and tackle and the melody of waves. He learned to take care of himself in angry weather.

At the age of 13 he shoved off for military academy, the Bingham School at Asheville, where half the boys were Texans. But he did not graduate. Lindsay's father died, the money gave out, and young Warren took a job in a bank.

But law—and the hustings—called. Barrister corpuscles crowded his blueblood veins. One of Warren's great granduncles signed the Constitution. Another uncle was an early Governor of Tennessee. A forebear of 1776 was a great judge. A grandfather was an outstanding jurist. Lindsay's father, a distinguished lawyer, helped to organize the North Carolina Bar Association and became its second president. Inevitably, therefore, the young Warren used his job in the bank to finance his way through a law course at the University of North Carolina.

Law opened up politics, and as a comparative youngster, Warren was elected county attorney at Beaufort County. His career moved swiftly thereafter. He served as president pro tempore of the State Senate, keynoter of a Democratic State Convention, delegate to a Democratic National Convention, trustee of the university, member of the constitutional commission. Then followed 8 successive terms in Congress, culminating in resignation on November 1, 1940, to be Comptroller General.

Now, more than ever, Lindsay Warren fights the battle of the people. All the people. He buffs the brakes with the sands of Cape Hatteras. He applies frosty sobriety to the brow of fevered spending. He stands sentinel not only over coin and currency, but also over the land's tradition of sweated thrift. He garbs himself in homspun Americana. Congressman Warren sponsored the Roanoke Colony memorial coin, the Virgian Dare postage stamp, the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Park, the Wright Memorial at Kitty Hawk, and so much seagoing legislation as to win the sobriquet, "Admiral of the Coast Guard."

Amidst the clatter of GAO's regimented adding machines, Warren is the epitome of rugged individualism. During his forced retreats from modern business gadgets, he saturates himself in sea and soil and honorable antiquities. He holes up frequently at Nags Head. Every lighthouse keeper is his crony.

Down North Carolina way there's a ceaseless beating of drums for Warren for governor, Warren for senator, Warren for anything, and rebel yells greet the successive homecomings of the handsome and eloquent Baron of Beaufort. On Ocracoke Island, where once dwelt the pirate Teach, the clans all gathered several years ago for a whoop-de-do Warren week sparked by boat races, fishing contests, beauty parades, Coast Guard drills, old fiddlers, and forensics. And just across Pamlico Sound, the Hyde County Chamber of Commerce staged an annual convention " in honor of that prince of good fellows." It used to be a rarity for Warren to have an opponent in his biennial race for Congress. He is forever being offered Federal judgeships.

By all the rules, Warren ought to be as unpopular in Washington as he is popular back home. Precedent holds that the Comptroller should be the most forlorn and lonely of men. The role calls for an aloof and dull and sometimes irritating technician. At best, the Comptroller—old style—used to be tabbed a harumphing stuffed-shirt administrator willing to accept his $12,000 yearly as proper compensation for being poison ivy.

But Warren fooled 'em. He refused to put into port. He kept himself free to maneuver. He remained merry, mellow and gregarious—but with his old salt's eye sharp-whetted for detection of misconduct, his foghorn voice ever ready to let out great blasts of warning. Thanks to Lindsay Carter Warren, GAO rode out the hurricane of war. Because of him, this so-called last bulwark of democracy today fights for all of us the tough, vital, mounting battle of the Potomac.

Some Facts in Support of Retirement Legislation for Civilian Component Officers

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following statement by the Civilian Component Veterans' Association entitled, "Some Facts in Support of Retirement Legislation for Civilian Component Officers":

The famous phrase of Mr. Churchill's may appropriately be applied to the officers and men of the National Guard and the officers of the Reserve Corps prior to Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941.

Under no other possible plan could there have been available and assembled in time of peace, in the then existing state of public opinion in this country, 18 formed divisions than by utilizing the organized National Guard divisions and the calling to active duty of the Reserve officers necessary to fill existing vacancies. But for the periods of "inactive duty" of the civilian component officers, who struggled in times of peace, amid the isolationists, to maintain, train, and administer those organizations, the country would have been in a desperate situation. General Eisenhower himself had his first experience in handling large units, thanks solely to this mobilization and the availability of the National Guard divisions for training. Practically the same thing may be said of every officer who has reached a high command position during World War II. Indeed the Supply System, which plays so important a part, was developed, and officers, both regular and civilian, received their practical training in supply at the summer maneuvers of National Guard divisions prior to 1941.

These statements are of particular interest in view of the fact that a subcommittee of the Army and Navy Joint Board, having before it various legislative proposals, have recognized and fully accepted the principle that the National Guard and Reserve officer who has 7 years of active service to his credit is entitled to equal retirement privileges with the Regular officer on that basis but the committee reported, with specious and perfectly illogical arguments and discussions, that so-called "inactive duty" should not be given credit in determining retirement time.

Prompt passage of fair and equitable legislation is vital to the future economic security of many officers of the Reserve components. To all Reserve component officers the passage of such legislation means a proper recognition by a grateful country of services performed, involving hardships, sacrifices, interrupted and broken careers, as well as of the fundamental dignity of their service. Is it fair that the citizen soldier should not be entitled to retirement for the same service on the same basis as the Regular officer, while the Regular officer is permitted to retire and, though receiving retirement pay, compete with the civilian officer in civil life? The Regular officer, receiving a monthly check from the Government, obviously can accept the same position at less compensation than can the civilian officer.

And, over and above all other considerations, fair and just retirement legislation is vitally essential if we are to be able to secure the Reserve component officers necessary for the Army and Navy of the future.

A comparison of the situation with reference to the two groups of officers from other standpoints, such as education, training, type of service, wartime activities and privileges, is interesting:

1. Education: The Regulars, except for those commissioned direct from civil life, are educated at the expense of the Government. The civilian component officer pays his own expenses. The Regular is educated by the taxpayers and until very recently paid no part of that tax, while the civilian officer not only paid the taxes for the upkeep of the Government, but contributed also to the cost of the education of the Regular officer. Until a few years ago the Regular's pay was not subject to Federal taxation and during a part of the depression it was cut 10 percent, while the civilian officer was subject to economic laws, many of them losing their jobs as various businesses went under.

2. Training: The training of the Regular officer was wholly at the expense of the Government, and all material and supplies were furnished him, while the National Guard and Reserve officer had to receive his military training on his own time, except for periods of summer training or while at service schools, and usually had to furnish the training supplies and equipment.

3. Type of service: The type of service in peacetime rendered by the Regular officer was:

(a) With troops. (However, so few troops were available for training that it may be said without fear of contradiction that perhaps not as much as 20 percent of the Regular colonels, for example, ever exercised their appropriate command in time of peace.)

(b) As instructors with National Guard and Reserve units.

(c) As instructors at ROTC schools and colleges.

(d) As military attachés.

(e) With Reserve Divisional Headquarters or at Corps Area Headquarters.

(f) With the War Department General Staff, the War Department, and as instructors or students at Army schools.

Generally speaking, the peacetime duties of the average Regular officer were more or less nominal and were fully ended, except for details such as officer of the day, etc., say, by noon each day on Army posts, and, say, by 1 o'clock in civilian communities. The officers on duty with Reserve units had office

hours ending usually at 1 o'clock, and the most continuous period of application demanded of any Regular officer was when attending Army service schools.

On the other hand, the National Guard officers served with troops or company tactical units. The company officers had weekly contact with their appropriate command; the field officers commanded their appropriate units at summer training camps and in civil disturbances (which, incidentally, was the only peacetime active field duty, other than for training, performed by any component), while the officers of the brigade and divisional headquarters not only attended summer camp, but pursued a course of instruction throughout the year. The Reserve officers without even the armory drill pay of the National Guard attended troop and unit schools entirely on their own time, and camps in the summer, either with Reserve units or with National Guard units. This preparation, on the officers' own time, was sufficient to keep up the interest required to bring into the field in the most critical period of our national life 18 organized divisions and a great mass of trained Reserve officers, ready to take their places in the National Guard and Regular divisions then formed and to fill other necessary military assignments. It would seem an untenable position for the War Department to take, that this inactive duty had no value as compared with the peacetime duties performed by the Regulars when the results of this activity were so vitally and impressively demonstrated.

In war the type of service is identical, except for the fact that almost without exception all higher command assignments go to the Regulars as well as all first-line staff assignments, and they control absolutely all assignments, promotions, and rewards. Naturally, at the outbreak of war, with a list of colonels, say of approximately 600, and all available places in the Army with troops for officers of that grade being not more than 10 percent, it can readily be seen that the senior National Guard officers in command of battalions, regiments, and higher units had a tough fight to hold their jobs, while the young Regular acquired his promotion, high assignments, and honors with the graceful facility of the famous gentleman on the flying trapeze. Incidentally, these command and staff assignments for the Regular Army would not have been available at the time they were except for the presence of the 18 divisions.

It is believed that a study of the combat losses among officers of the same grade (at the beginning of hostilities) based on proportionate strength will show that service in the civilian component is, apparently, many times as hazardous as is a career in the Regular Army, despite the fact that the preparation of the civilian component officer is gotten principally while on inactive duty. It might be asserted further, that the number of senior regular officers who are retired during the closing months of war for physical disability as compared with the negligible number of civilian component officers retired for physical disability—and this is especially true of retired officers called back to active duty and then retired in a higher grade—raises the question as to the relative physical fitness of the two classes of officers. Retirement pay for physical disability is tax exempt. Regular officers also are retired, sometimes, at a permanent rank much higher than their normal grade.

4. Privileges: The Regular officer has many privileges not enjoyed by the civilian, such as the use of clubs, golf, riding, and other athletic facilities at a nominal cost. He is enabled to purchase supplies, etc., through post exchanges at greatly reduced prices. He has 30 days' annual leave which is cumulative, and in taking his leave he suffers no loss whatever and can take it practically when he chooses and in as many consecutive or separate days as he pleases. The National Guard and Reserve officer when on active duty shares on some basis the privileges of the Army club, though the intensive training schedule in which they are employed when on such duty makes this use negligible. On active duty in time of war he leaves his business entirely. If in a competitive business, this loss readily may be the difference between providing for himself a competence or being dependent in his later years. He takes the same risks and usually a greater risk because of his junior assignments than the Regular Army officers, goes to the same fronts, fights the same enemies, and is not always accorded a gracious reception and treated as generously as might be expected by brothers in arms. The Regular officer, furthermore, is promoted automatically until he has reached the rank of colonel; he has no competition.

On active duty training in peacetime he gives up his leave which he has from his civilian occupation—generally 2 weeks—serves entirely on his own time, and not at the time set by him, nor with his family, but at a place and at a time set by military authorities. In the case of a professional man, and a great many of the civilian officers are professional men, there is always the loss sustained by being away from his profession, and furthermore, he acquires a reputation in the community of one who has other interests than those of his own profession, which naturally militates against him.

It is just as fair to consider all Army officers as having the qualifications of a Marshall, an Eisenhower, a Bradley, and others, who are the counterpart of the great surgeons, lawyers, business executives, etc., in civilian life, as it is to consider every Reserve component officer as being in no respect superior to the most incapable Regular officer.

In conclusion, every business of any size now provides for the retirement of its personnel, either with or without Government assistance. It is a recognized principle of good business. The Army of the future has got to be made up largely of civilian officers. Hundreds of civilian officers must be retained in the armies of occupation. Must they make further sacrifices without some assurance of a reasonable retirement plan? In fact, it may well be that future legislation may put primary emphasis on the National Guard and Reserves, inasmuch as the former is a State force, ready and prepared for local disturbances, while the development of the atomic bomb may change entirely the conception of the duties of the Regular Army.

It is maintained that the Nation owes a peculiar debt of gratitude to those older officers who, having given their spare time and having offered their lives in one, and in some cases two wars, should be given the satisfaction of treatment similar to that of the Regular officer of the same grade and length of service; and while it may be conceded with some degree of fairness that the inactive time of both groups, Regular and civilian, is not properly entitled to be given the same value, certainly it is true that the periods of so-called inactive duty of National Guard or Reserve officers should count at least half as much as the peacetime duty of the Regular officer. It is difficult to accept the idea that a Regular officer who may never have heard a gun fired in anger is an Army officer, entitled to special retirement privileges, while a civilian officer who, say, has served in two wars and been wounded in combat is not an Army officer, but is just a civilian who enjoyed playing soldier as a hobby.

The necessity for some form of retirement privileges must be apparent. It is necessary obviously for enlisting the continuing interest of the younger men of the country in service in the Reserve components.

Time is of the essence: Prompt action should be taken by the Congress in order that these officers who, having served their country in two wars and who are now retired for age, may have this retirement pay in their declining years and that adequate inducement be offered to those younger officers vitally needed in connection with our plans for national defense.

The Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the April issue of Marine Progress with reference to the Panama Canal:

THE PANAMA CANAL MODERNIZATION

The Panama Canal problem is once again up for solution with advocates of the so-called sea-level canal pitting their arguments against the third locks advocates. Public Law 280, approved last December, authorizes a restudy of the entire problem.

There has been lately a vigorous campaign in favor of the sea-level type of canal with one of the main protagonists being J. C. Claybourn, superintendent of the dredging division of the Canal Zone Administration. Mr. Claybourn estimates that 325,000,000 cubic yards of earth and 165,000,000 cubic yards of rock will have to be removed from the waterway area if the Canal will ever attain its sea-level characteristics. Notably missing from discussions on the building of a canal of this type is the fact that there is a tide range of 20 feet on the Pacific side of the waterway and a range of but 1 foot on the Atlantic side. This variation in tides would naturally create high-speed currents in the Canal at every change of tide, a navigational hazard any ship operator would shun.

THREE LOCKS ARRANGEMENT

Another project which has been started is the construction of additional locks at each of the lock areas, not only to increase the normal capacity of the Canal but to accommodate the wide-beam warships that have been built during the war. This plan was adopted and some money appropriated for the work, but with the waging of the war being the prime requisite of the country, the work on the extra locks was halted. Before it is to be started the restudy, authorized in December, will explore the advisability of continuing along this line.

The importance of modernizing the Panama Canal cannot be minimized and no matter what plan is adopted the expense is going to be great.

SOUND ENGINEERING AT GATUN

The existing arrangement at Gatun is sound. The reasons why this arrangement is sound are that the locks are concentrated in continuous structures and that there is a summit level anchorage at Gatun. The duplication of this arrangement in the 1939 third locks project at Gatun is also sound.

But on the Pacific side the canal plan is different. There is no summit level anchorage. There are two sets of locks separated by a small lake. The proposed new channels would have contained large turns, which the transit of thousands of merchant vessels have indicated would be extremely hazardous.

A careful examination of the Pacific section of the 1939 third locks project shows that this part of the project would not have been an operating improvement, but would have aggravated the present navigational problems of the canal tremendously.

NAVIGATIONAL HAZARDS

Hundreds of transits of the canal, and hundreds of marine accidents have thoroughly established that the most dangerous and most feared part of the canal is the southern half, which has the narrow Gaillard cut and two separated locks with one of these locks located directly at the end of the cut where it causes a bottleneck.

The main problems of the Panama Canal are the Pedro Miguel bottleneck, the double handling at the Pacific locks caused by the separation of the locks into two sections, night fogs in Gaillard cut, and lockage surges in Gaillard cut. The complexities of operating the Pacific end of the canal are in direct contrast with the simplicity of the Atlantic end where the same problems do not exist.

SEA LEVEL?

There has been so much mention of the streamlined lockless sea-level canal equipped with tidal gates that some exact information should be supplied to avoid confusion.

The first point is that there must be tidal locks because the tidal range on the Pacific of 20 feet and on Atlantic of 1 foot would cause currents too swift for safe navigation without tidal locks. These locks would be near the Pacific. The term "sea level" canal is therefore confusing. The term should be the "alternating tidal level single locks canal."

The most dangerous area in the present canal is Gaillard Cut, whose rocky sides have gouged holes in the shell plating of many ships that have struck and which have at times even sunk. In the present lock canal this cut is only about 8 miles long. In the alternating tidal level single locks canal, Gatun Lake would not exist and instead of a dangerous length of only 8 miles as it is now there would be a narrow, dangerous section about 35 miles long.

Those who have studied the relative navigational merits of the two types of canals generally agree that the high level lock canal is the best for navigation. This cannot be refuted.

The engineering problems of the Panama Canal have long since been solved, but the operating problems have not been. Now that the plan for the future canal has become a national issue it should be decided on the basis of operational merits so as to get the best canal.

THE DU VAL PLAN

A plan for the modernization of the Panama Canal has been developed, after years of study and observation, by Capt. Miles Du Val, United States Navy, who was captain of the port at Balboa from 1941 to 1944. That plan has been widely discussed at Panama ever since he presented it in a lecture before the American Society of Civil Engineers in 1943.

The Du Val plan for modernizing the Panama Canal retains the high-level lock canal and the present lay-out on the Atlantic. On the Pacific it utilizes the hills surrounding the Pacific end of the Canal to form a summit-level anchorage. The plan calls for the entire removal of the bottleneck locks at Pedro Miguel, the location of all Pacific locks near Miraflores, and the formation of a large summit-level anchorage lake on the Pacific to match the anchorage at Gatun. This plan will eliminate the intermediate level lake at Miraflores by elevating it to the Gatun Lake level. With the removal of the Pedro Miguel locks this Miraflores Lake would be joined to Gatun Lake by an open channel.

Thus, this plan will produce a future Panama Canal with one group of locks on the Atlantic at Gatun and one group of locks on the Pacific at Miraflores. Gatun Lake, extending from Gatun to Miraflores, will enable uninterrupted navigation between the two sets of locks. This plan will remove the dangerous bottleneck at Pedro Miguel, save time in transiting the Canal, eliminate surges in Gaillard cut, provide safe anchorage in Miraflores Lake during fog in the cut, and reduce the number of marine accidents in the Panama Canal.

SHIP-OPERATING VIEWPOINT

The justification of the suspended 1939 third locks project was based mainly on defense, and on the assumption that the Panama Canal would be dug down to sea level. The justification for the "alternating tidal level single locks canal" is being built around the same ideas. In his discussion before the American Society of Civil Engineers on January 16, 1946, of an article on streamlining the Panama Canal, Brig. Gen. Hans Kramer, United States Army, retired, former head of the 1939 third locks project on the Panama Canal stated that "whereas a sea-level canal at Panama has been heretofore a second choice, and rightly so, changed conditions have placed the burden of proof upon those who would advocate against conversion to a sea level." This statement can have only one meaning—that the decision for digging an alternating tidal level single locks canal has already been made by certain engineers without consideration of the operating problem and the needs of the merchant marine.

TREND OF THOUGHT

The Nation has before it a choice of one of three plans for the modernization of the Canal. There is the sea-level plan; the third locks plan; and the Du Val plan. There are also numerous considerations which must be borne in mind in making a determination of which is the best plan. Those charged with the defense of the Canal want a canal least liable to damage from aerial bombardment. Those charged with the maintenance of waterway naturally look toward the elimination of costly slides and equally costly blocking of channels through silting, while those who must, year in and year out, use the waterway, the operators of merchant shipping, look toward fast transit time, reduction of hazards that create delay and damage, and economy in toll charges. Each viewpoint demands certain structural requirements.

The nub seems to lie with the determination of whether defense or commerce is the premier function of the Canal. From the beginning defense has been the most mentioned requisite, but the recent war, and every war that has preceded it has shown that the Nation with the merchant fleet is the nation that surges ahead toward victory and with commerce impossible without ships the trend of thought in relation to the physical characteristics of the Panama Canal must inevitably give equal consideration to commerce and defense in the plan for modernization of the waterway.

Letter From Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, just 1 month ago I received a most enlightening and courageous letter from a constituent of mine, enclosing an open letter to President Truman.

At the time of its receipt I wanted to insert it in the RECORD because it is a message full of sound sense and irrefutable argument which the American people as a whole and most of all our columnists and commentators need to hear. However, I have waited until now to make it a part of the printed record because I think it is very timely and will adequately answer much of the silly sentimental slush, the pious and puny propaganda that is being cooked up and dished out to the American public by irresponsible agents.

My wish, if possible of fulfillment, would be that every American could read the following note by Mr. DeArmond to me, and especially his open letter addressed to President Truman:

SEYMOUR, MO., *April 2, 1946.*

Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I find an increasing constraint on dissenting political and economic views in the press. Any controversial article—if it challenges the current phobias—has slim chance of seeing the light of print. This has happened to me repeatedly, and other writers tell me they have ceased trying to write anything beyond purely expository stuff or Pollyana patter.

Perhaps you might find the enclosed outburst worthy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix. I won't quarrel with your judgment if it isn't. Let conscience be your guide.

Cordially,

FRED DEARMOND.

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN

APRIL 2, 1946.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It hasn't been long since economists and reformers were exclaiming about a "paradox of plenty." Rightly or wrongly, responsibility for that condition of want in the midst of plenty was placed at the door of the Hoover administration.

Unless something is done very quickly your administration will take its place in history as the author of another even more illogical anomaly—the paradox of scarcity. In the thirties we had an abundance of goods but a shortage of buying power. Now we have an abundance of buying power, an ability and an eagerness to produce, but no production to speak of and no goods on the market to buy. Of the two, the present paradox is the worse because it can be corrected. The way to correct it is well known. Why isn't it done?

Most of us out here in the Midwest wish you well. All of us, regardless of party labels, wish the country well. We know you inherited an appalling situation. You began by showing a proper concern about postwar employment. But the acts of your administration have retarded employment as surely as one thing can lead to another.

Only a few days ago I opened my newspaper and read the astounding announcement from Washington that building materials for construction are again to be strictly rationed. What folly is this? You ask for jobs and then you destroy the very forces that would make jobs. To meet the housing shortage you first called for a subsidy, at a time when private capital by the billions is idle, when enterprisers are begging for the "go" sign. Then you move to deny us farmers the materials for barns and chicken houses and granaries after we have worried along with bits of scrap lumber and second-hand roofing for four long years.

No electrical appliances are yet for sale nearly a year after the end of the German war. We are in rags and can't buy clothing. Millions are living on Government dole. We are spending public money as wildly in peace as in war, hastening the coming of wild inflation.

Was there ever a more insane course pursued by a Nation that can outproduce the rest of the civilized world put together, if only the brakes are taken off? There is no possible cure for inflation to be compared with high production. Conversely, everything that depresses production makes directly for higher and higher prices.

More than one thing contributes to this crazy impasse. Ahead of all else comes price control. Mr. President, if you don't get OPA and Chester Bowles and Paul Porter and their breed off your back, your administration will be sunk—and I greatly fear the rest of us will go down with you.

Take off the strait-jacket from enterprise. Put incentive to work for you. No man of sense will risk his capital except on the prospect of substantial profits. Why should he, when labor won't even risk its time? Let prices go up. Give free competition a chance to do its stuff and they will come down quickly. In 3 months you can end this needless "made" scarcity of the things for which people work and sweat.

Get out in the country, Mr. President, and see for yourself that no stigma any longer attaches to black markets. If they are "intransigeants," so are the waves of the ocean. It's no use to damn black marketers over the air waves. Their tribe grows every day. People are buying from them without any qualms. They have the money. You can't prevent them.

One thing more, Mr. President—and this is said most respectfully. Isn't this a time to forget about the political consequences of official actions? You can never reach a higher post than you now hold. A President's greatness doesn't depend on the number of terms he serves. Then there is no reason to fear political reprisals by the union leaders, the bleeding-heart liberals, and the levelers. Do the thing that is sound, politically and economically, no matter how many of these fellows you offend, and your place in the long-time affections of the people will be secure.

Respectfully,

FRED DEARMOND,

SEYMOUR, MO.

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, former Representative from Indiana:

COAL STRIKE

John Lewis is not doing anything illegal. He is entirely within the law. To make this a contest of who scowls the hardest doesn't stoke the boiler.

Lewis demands that foremen be unionized. But NLRB has just decided that is O. K. by them. So why jump on John?

Lewis is on strike. But strikes are within the law. And didn't the administration support steel and auto and other strikes that lasted much longer than the coal strike has so far?

Lewis wants to levy a tax on coal to build up a huge welfare fund under his absolute control. But this precedent was established long ago, and the administration did nothing about it except to scold mildly when a campaign was on. Petrillo has been collecting a royalty on electrical recordings for a long time and still does. By implication, the Petrillo bill, recently enacted, gives it the blessing of Congress. The bill simply forbids a second tax every time the recording is played.

Lewis and the operators can lawfully agree to levy a private tax of 10 cents or $10 on every ton of coal, and give the money to John. The operators have refused to do this (although permitted to Petrillo). They are right and should be supported.

Nevertheless, if Lewis can get away with his demands, as Petrillo did, there is nothing in the Wagner Act or antitrust laws to stop him. Labor unions have been "exempted out" by the administration, Congress, and various outrageous decisions of the Supreme Court, which the United States Senate has so far refused to do anything to correct.

So, if you go without heat, or electricity, or have to shut down the factory, or are thrown out of work by the coal strike, be sure to hurl your dead cats at the right parties.

"Please, John, be a good fellow, won't you?" is not the formula. The American people ought not to have to live by the grace of John L. Lewis or James Caesar Petrillo, or any Democratic or Republican politician, whosoever.

This ought to be a government of law, and not of men.

The trouble is that we have abandoned principle and substituted expediency for the impartial administration of law.

It is inconvenient for the administration right now, and makes us look like fools before the entire world to show that Lewis can tie this Nation up worse than Hitler could. But, if this were a government of law and not of politicians kept in power by a lazy public, we would no more tolerate a little man-and-wife grocery store being clubbed into paying tribute to a teamster's union under threat that no merchandise will be delivered, than we would tolerate a whole Nation being clubbed into submission by Hitlers, foreign or domestic. Little Hitlers grow into big Hitlers. Small tyrannies grow into huge tyrannies.

Mr. Truman is appealing to the miners to please dig us some coal. No doubt many would do so. But how can they? If they do, they can be kicked out of the union, and that would cost them their jobs and their wives and kids the chance to eat. So, I am not blaming the miners. I am blaming the administration which for years has been building up industry-wide collective bargaining, with the closed shop as its weapon of coercion. It is this which has put "we, the people," including thousands of coal miners, in the wringer.

Congressman ROBERTSON, of Virginia, and others, propose to make private tax levies unlawful. This is all to the good. But when and if this is done, the main trouble will remain. It is that Government has put public power in private hands. This is another name for anarchy. If you have condoned it, and not voted for Congressmen who tried to correct it, don't holler for coal.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

Feed Price Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, finally the Department of Agriculture has announced a change in pricing of grains and feed which should help move feed into the northeastern section of the country. No relief has come as a result of the subsidies which were evidently put out by Mr. Bowles for the purpose of procrastinating rather than trying to get feed to the cattle.

The following price increases are allowed, effective 12:01 a. m., May 13, 1946, in the market price of definite articles: Corn, 25 cents per bushel; wheat, 15 cents per bushel; oats, 5 cents per bushel; barley, 9 cents per bushel, rye, 10 cents per bushel; sorghum, 18 cents; fish meal, $10 per ton; fish scrap, $7.50 per ton; tankage, $7.50 per ton; meat scrap, $10 per ton; corn-germ meal, $14 per ton; corn gluten feed and meal, $14 per ton; mill feed, soybean feed, cottonseed meal, $14 per ton; hominy feed and brewers dried meal, $10 per ton; minor items, $10.

These increases may be paid above the ceilings presently in effect to anybody by anyone else, and are designed to permit feed dealers and feed processors to obtain these items direct from elevators and warehouses regardless of where they are. Purchases may also be made from farmers at these advanced prices.

It is hoped that this increase in price, even though it comes as late as it does, will provide some feed for our farmers.

All subsidies on all these items are off as of Saturday night, May 11. The subsidies, of course, were only payable on sales to the Government and not to feed processors.

I am sorry that I was not able to announce this a month ago but I am glad that it has come at last.

Poland and Soviet Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at exercises of the Polish-American Congress, Connecticut chapter, commemorating the anniversary of the Polish constitution, May 5, 1946, at New Britain, Conn.:

May 3, 1946, marks the one hundred and fifty-fifth anniversary of the first written constitution which gave democratic rights to a European nation.

The Polish constitution of 1791 was democratic as we here in America understand democracy: it proclaimed the rule of the majority, while guaranteeing to protect dissenting minorities. Pressed as the Polish people were then between two powerful imperialistic aggressors, Prussia and Russia, it was one of the most courageous political acts in history when the Polish Diet solemnly adopted as the basic law the historic sentence that "All power in civil society is derived from the will of the people."

This courage is still the hallmark of Polish character. Time and again in this war, which began in Poland and has not yet ended for Polish men and women, the Poles on land, sea, and in the air have proven their ancient fearlessness in the face of almost certain defeat.

Only real faith can produce courage of that kind; faith in certain moral principles, faith in the eternal justice of God.

Certainly no people, except perhaps the Jews, have ever needed faith so much. Today that faith is needed more than ever. It is needed, not alone in Poland, ravaged by two marauding armies; not alone in

Scotland, where 40,000 Polish veterans ponder in exile their fruitless victory; not alone in Italy, where the men and women of General Anders' Second Polish Corps think bitterly on Monte Cassino and wonder whether the Poles who died there may not, after all, have been the luckier ones. Here, too, in America, Americans of Polish ancestry still need faith. They need it to sustain their belief that in the long run God's justice will prevail among men; and that courage and sacrifice for conscience's sake will not go unrewarded.

America's task is to translate this faith into works. First, we must use every political pressure possible to restore self-government in Poland, and we must enable the Polish people to feed and house and clothe themselves. Partly this will have to be done through UNRRA, but it can be greatly aided by full restoration of uncensored parcel mail deliveries so that clothes and food from North and South America can be sent direct to relatives and friends in Poland.

The present government in Poland, like other governments in other European countries, has finally promised to call a general election. We all know that the promise of such an election was the basic incentive to unquestioned American acceptance of the Yalta agreement. We also know, from results of elections held under American and British protection in Austria, and even under Soviet occupation in Hungary, that a truly representative election in Poland is bound to change the complexion of the present regime to one more representative of the desires of its people.

But we dare not hope that such an election will change the basic situation in Poland, which is that of a puppet and not a free state. Elections have changed little in Hungary, where the Soviet occupation forces have just been increased, resulting in a further loss of food and of freedom to the Hungarian people.

Most of us must realize by now that real change for the better in Europe, as in the Middle and the Far East, can be brought about only through over-all diplomatic action, which will deal with the European problem as a whole. It is such action that Secretary of State Byrnes is attempting to initiate at Paris now. With all our hearts we wish him well and applaud his efforts. But the trouble is that the men of Washington have begun late for such an attempt to be easily successful. Our efforts, not only in behalf of Poland, but of all other oppressed European nations, are too often hampered at the source—in America itself—by individuals and groups whose main interest is in promoting the extension of Soviet spheres of influence, in the false name of Soviet-American friendship. We must rid our own national—and local—administration of those who want to see the plunder and subjugation of Europe, instead of its restoration to health and real freedom, before we can hope to solve the Polish question.

What to do for Poland comes right down to this: What are we going to do in Connecticut, and New York, and every other State in the Nation? Until we have answered this, the big question—propounded by President Roosevelt at the time of Russia's invasion of Finland, "Shall the world endure, can it endure, half slave and half free?" will remain unanswered. Until we accept the fact that political freedom everywhere is essential to world peace, and without it economic freedom is pure poppycock, since any political dictator can always sweep away economic freedom with firing squads, we shall never understand either the nature of political or economic freedom or the organization of world peace.

The battle for world political freedom begins right at home. It must start with our determination that the majority will not tolerate dictation from any group, or any person who asks them—for any reason whatsoever—to act, or to permit acts, against our conscience and against the interests of world peace, and we must impress this view upon those who represent us in UN.

During the past 3 years all of us can recall a number of such actions. Nowadays, whenever we complain that American power is being used in Europe to do something at which we instinctively revolt, the excuse usually is given that: "It was agreed to at the Yalta, or the Tehran, or Potsdam Conference."

Such an excuse, posing as it does acceptance of secret agreements which have never been either seen or agreed to by our Senate, has no validity to a self-governing people. It is a specious reason, given to conceal facts which those who committed them are afraid to reveal. We still do not know what was promised at Yalta, or Tehran, or Potsdam.

But we have all seen the results of those agreements. Some of them are tragic, and we know now that in most cases they were neither inevitable nor necessary.

One specific case is the question of the heroic Polish Army, which is today a homeless and bewildered band of heroes. The records of the First and Second Polish Corps are known to every American and British soldier and airman who served in the ETO. Many hundreds of Anglo-Americans owe their lives to the sacrifice of their Polish companions-in-arms. Our GI's are well aware of this. They see neither sense nor justice in any political chicanery or cowardice that deprives such men of the basic freedom they fought for. It was as spokesman for such American combat veterans that Gen. John C. H. Lee, commander of our forces in the Mediterranean, recently demanded a haven be given General Anders' veterans in the United States. But General Lee was not the first American to make this demand.

You may remember that a year ago last February, when the results of the Yalta Conference on Poland were first revealed, I introduced in Congress House Joint Resolution 110, a resolution to admit, without quota, Poles who had served with Polish armed forces under Allied command outside of Poland, if they objected to forcible repatriation in Soviet-controlled Poland—a repatriation which would constitute for most of them death warrants.

Since then I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 109, a resolution asking that stateless persons be granted cards of identity by the United Nations, permitting them to live and to work abroad as self-respecting human beings during the reconstruction period while their natural homelands are under alien and hostile political control.

Most of you know that these efforts have so far been without tangible result. That does not mean they have failed. It means only that there has not been enough publicity given to the evils they are designed to overcome.

Publicity, in the sense of the unhampered flow of factual news, is our greatest political weapon. It was no accident that censorship has been clamped down in Iran.

Nor was it an accident that almost at the same time Professor Lange was picked to accuse Spain in the name of Poland.

Diversion, confusion, and censorship, these are the tried and true weapons of dictatorship. We witnessed these techniques during a quarter century of Mussolini and a decade and a half of Hitler.

The iron curtain falls over Iran, Poland, eastern Europe, and to divert the critics their attention is called to another area of the world—and Poland accuses Spain. The people of Spain and Poland are two of the most devoutly religious peoples in the world. Likewise, in both of them individualism has been a characteristic carried almost to extremes. No peoples have, of their own initiative, shown less interest in atheistic, communistic forms of government and life than have these two.

Yet, here we have Professor Lange using the name of Poland to indict the Spanish people. Not just their temporary dictator, Franco, and his Fascist system, which all of us dislike intensely and would willingly have exchanged for true democracy. Professor Lange was not voicing the convictions of men and women he personally heard talking of Spain on the rubble heaps of heroic Warsaw, or in the cathedral of Cracow, or Czestochowa, for he was not there. Professor Lange has only spent a few hours in Poland during the past 7 years. No, what Professor Lange mouthed were words taught him by men who are not Poles, do not think like Poles, and who God knows, do not pray like Poles for Poland. His purpose and his mission from Moscow was to confuse the issue, not only in Spain and in Poland, but in the mind of every citizen of every freedom-loving nation which demands the right to worship God, and to choose its own form of government, without meddling, interference, and cruel pressure from other unfriendly nations.

It is this technique of confusing the issue which most greatly concerns us, because every such attempt, by just so much, beclouds our recognition of our true responsibilities and interests. None of us alone has power to undo all the wrong that has been done by various dictators and leaders, during the past 20 years. But all of us have it in our power to try to sift out truth from falsehood; to support those men and women in office who tell the truth, without subterfuge or doubletalk, and who are not afraid to tell it, though it may cost them votes, and submit them to violent abuses.

Having the power, it is our duty to our conscience, to our country, and the world, to speak out ourselves on every possible occasion, challenging those who want us to believe their lies; applauding those who try to point out the truth.

Never in one generation has the human race lost so much of the stored-up results of human effort.

The destruction which covers most of Europe and great areas of Asia is an inducement to many to appeasement at any price. But that is exactly what it should not be. It should be viewed for what it is: a terrible lesson to nations strong and weak, of the cruel evils that come of appeasing evil, until it is too late.

Here in America, where up to now we have no ruined cities, we may do well to recall the ancient warning: "Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God."

The problem of world peace under liberty is largely America's problem. Its solution must be found here first. So it is not as people of Polish descent only that I speak to you, but as Americans.

Poland's freedom depends upon the establishment of freedom throughout the world. We all know that only by American help can such universal freedom be established. We should have learned that fact by now. Certainly the lessons taught us by the threat of Nazi tyranny should not so soon have been forgotten here.

They have not been forgotten in Poland. Indeed, all Europe has finally begun to realize, in a way we here can only perceive dimly, that freedom is indivisible. Over there they know, as we should know, that tyranny was not a Nazi invention, nor has it vanished with the destruction of the Axis.

Freedom's greatest ally is the truth. Men who dare to speak the truth take the first and longest step toward freedom. That is why we should welcome every effort to obtain the truth about conditions under which our fellowmen live in every country. That is why we will welcome from the UN a true report on Franco's Spain. It will inform us whether the Spanish people have the strength or the desire after their ordeal of civil devastation, to mount an assault against any other nation in the world. We would

welcome like reports on what is really going on in Poland, in the Balkans, in Hungary, in Yugoslavia, in Latvia, Estonia, Lithuanian—indeed, and how greatly we would welcome a true report of what is going on behind that iron curtain in all the Soviet Russias. Only when we know and accept the truth about conditions in all these places shall we be able to take striding steps toward peace and security. On that day we will find the answer to the ancient prayer carved into the pedestal of Lwow's patron saint:

"Cause it to come to pass that our towns and villages and homes shall not go up in flames, that our churches shall not be destroyed, nor the fruits of our hands ravaged, that no one shall drive us out into foreign and unknown lands."

It is for that day Poles work and hope in Poland, in Italy, in Scotland; it is for that day we must work here. It will come.

It will come, for the world must have peace, if civilization is not to be destroyed in a rain of atomic bombs.

But I have just said that the price of peace is first the willingness to face the facts, and the courage to state the truth. What is the central truth of the world situation today? It is this, that peace for the world depends primarily on American-Anglo-Russian relations. And the Russians themselves tirelessly assert the fact that unless we can win their friendship, war, revolution, and all the spiritual and material miseries of widespread political disorder throughout the world will be inevitable.

What then do the Russians expect us to do to gain their friendship? This is certainly the most important question in the world today.

The New York Times of yesterday carried an interview with Jan Stanczyk, Minister of Labor of the present Polish Government. Said Mr. Stanczyk, "It would be better for Poland and the world if Russia were not so suspicious of the western powers." The price of Russia's friendship was, he said that "The western powers have to make every effort to remove Soviet suspicions. * * *"

Everyone who realizes the danger of the growing tension between the Soviet Union and the western powers must be eager to remove Soviet suspicions.

Can this be done? Of course, it can.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you the policy that this Nation could adopt which would beyond any shadow of doubt remove all Russian suspicions and guarantee Russian friendship to us for 50 or a hundred years.

If we will recall all our occupation armies from Europe and Asia, and if we will cease, at the same time, to take any note of the fact that Russia, however, is maintaining vast armies in central Europe, grazing them like hordes of ravenous cattle on the lands of the peasants, so that they munch, munch, munch their way across half of Europe; we would then be taking one step toward lulling Russian suspicions. A number of others would still be necessary: If we will cease to press for fair and open elections anywhere; if we will agree to the forcible repatriation of any of the nationals of Russian-dominated areas; if we will agree at the peace table to the demands of Stalin's puppet, Tito, for Trieste, and aid Russia in the despoilation of Italy, forcing Italy, which was a cobelligerent of ours, to pay huge reparations to Russia; if we will give Russia part of Italy's fleet; if we will make the Baltic and the Black Sea Russian lakes, and thus place the Rumanians and Greeks and Turks under the comradely protection of the Soviets; if we will drop forever the Iranian question and allow the Russians to fortify the Dardenelles, and give them a mandate over Tripolitania; if we will gracefully accept every territorial change already accomplished by Soviet arms around the world, and accept all further changes suggested by them, while making no mention ever again of the Atlantic Charter which swore that no such changes could be accepted that were not in accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned—why then, ladies and gentlemen, we will have taken many forward steps in removing Russian suspicions.

But candor requires me to state, still not enough completely to win Soviet friendship. There are many more things we would still have to do before Russian suspicion—which is really very deep rooted, could be extirpated. But if we use sanctions, and arms if necessary to overthrow Franco, and encourage the substitution of a Communist regime in Spain, if we applaud in our press and in our Congress the rise of every Communist government in Europe, making no rude or uncomradely mention of the shooting, purges, torture, and deportations into Siberia of all those who resist such rising governments; if after encouraging the looting of German industry in Soviet areas, while we feed and supply the people, if we then aid and abet the rise of a strong, armed Communist Germany subservient to Moscow—I feel, I can assure you that we would then almost have won Soviet Russia's friendship. Almost, but not entirely. For, after all, Russia is suspicious of us in the Orient as well: There, if only we will accept the pillaging of Manchuria as an accomplished fact, and withdraw our support from Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, and extend it to the Chinese Communists, of whom Moscow is not at all suspicious—we will be nearing our goal. But I fear Russia's increased liking for us would not really mellow into trust with General MacArthur on the scene in Tokyo. But if we would only recall General MacArthur from Tokyo, and let "natural democratic forces," that is to say, Communist forces, rise—as no doubt they would in Japan and Korea—after the usual period of bloodshed and confusion—we would at long last be on the threshold of a real friendship with our gallant Soviet allies. But still only the threshold, mind you. For Soviet Russia is suspicious of us right here in America! But if we will condemn publicly, and defeat at the polls, every American candidate for office who disputes the wisdom of any of these reasonable gestures of friendship; if we will call a reactionary or a Fascist anyone in American public life, who talks of the rights of the little nations, or speaks up for free Baltic states, for a free Central Europe, for a liberal Germany and Italy and Japan, for a free world press or world communications, we will have all but clinched our friendship. All but. For mind you, ladies and gentlemen, the Soviets are really very, very, very suspicious. There are in addition to the above, several other important things which would be required of us before we can bask in the full light of Soviet affections: We must hasten to give Russia large sums of money in order that she may consolidate this position of domination over all of Asia and three-fourths of Europe; and above all, we must give Russia the atomic bomb, and then lest we sow new seeds of suspicion in this fresh plowed soil of friendship, we must hasten to show them how to manufacture and if necessary, use it.

For this is the price of Soviet friendship; the complete abandonment of all our other allies in Europe and Asia, above all the Poles and the British; and our swift return to isolation. But not, mind you, armed isolation, for who shall deny that Russia might still continue to be suspicious if we keep a large army, navy, and air force? No, in order that Russia may feel quite secure, we would be expected to disarm completely. American isolation and pacifism—complete and abject—that is the real recipe for American-Soviet friendship.

But the finest recipe may fall flat unless it is in the end seasoned to taste. Perhaps more than all these things put together there remains one circumstance of our American way of life which makes our Communist comrades suspicious of us. That is, my friends, our adherence to a belief in God. Karl Marx, the great founder of communism, called religion the opiate of the people. And he wrote, "For liberal democracy, that illusion, that dream of Christianity, which says that man has a sovereign soul" and "holds that not one man alone, but each man has a value as a sovereign being" is utterly and pitilessly opposed by communism, which is antireligious, anti-Christ and anti-God.

In order to remove that most deep rooted of Soviet suspicions in the end we must show a reasonable willingness to desert our altars, our churches, our God.

And when we have adopted all the policies I have outlined above, then, my friends, the Soviets will love us well, and draw very close to us. Oh, very, very, very close! Some Communists go so far as to say that they would even draw so close in the course of time thereafter that their love for us would make them yearn to be, in the end, one with us, so that we might all live in a comradely fashion under the one Red flag of the world of Soviet Republics.

And yet, I think that you will agree with me here today that such a program is somehow inconsistent with American ideals, and American self-interest. There must be some other answer. I believe that there is some other answer. The answer is for this Nation, and all the other nations of the world who signed the Atlantic Charter to begin now to live up to the promises of that Charter to the peoples of Europe and Asia and to do what is necessary to implement those promises. The answer is to begin now to put an end to the appeasement of economic and ideological aggression now proceeding around the whole globe which can only wind up in another terrible war. This would be as ruinous for the enslaved and unhappy Russian people as it is for us. In my opinion, the way to win the friendship of Russia is to show that we mean liberty when we say it. For respect is the foundation of friendship.

Firmness, vigilance, patience, candor, and preparedness now, coupled with a vigorous program for the physical and economic rehabilitation of Europe and Asia will win the day.

We want only men of vision, courage, determination. Perhaps what we want most in high places in Washington is a mere handful of such men as defended Warsaw. We will find them. For the world is hungry for courageous leadership. You will help—you are helping here today, in dedicating this Polish-American Congress to those cherished principles of liberty for which Poland fought longest and hardest, and suffered most.

We shall, we Americans, stand by those who believe as we do—in the cause of liberty under law—in the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God!

LaGuardia Demands Swift Passage of Housing Legislation—Says One Building Season Already Lost—Cites Need for Premium Payments as Production Stimulus

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Fiorello H. LaGuardia, former mayor of New York and now Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation

Administration, has long been known for his plain-spoken comments on public issues. As mayor of America's greatest city, he has dealt first hand with the problems of the public, such as finding adequate housing. Therefore, when he talks about our housing problem he speaks with the voice of considerable authority.

Last Sunday night, on his weekly radio broadcast, he forthrightly discussed the housing legislation now pending before Congress. He pointed out that the building industry said a few months ago, "Now leave us alone and we will build," and commented that several months have passed since that promise was made, the building season is on, and still houses are not being produced.

He urged swift action by the Congress in passing the necessary legislation so that the President's program to provide additional shelter for veterans could get under way without any further delay. His statements dug so deeply into the fundamental facts of the housing crisis that, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include excerpts from that broadcast for the benefit of the other Members:

I have been talking to you about the housing situation, remember? I stated several weeks ago the contention of those who were opposing the Patman bill—the bill that would provide building materials—when they said: "Now, leave us alone and we will build." I said the building season was now on. Have they built anything? Have they built any homes? Not a one. That is the proof absolute that all the American people need, that the bill is absolutely necessary. The housing situation is exactly as predicted if Congress fails to pass proper, constructive, helpful legislation.

Congress did pass the emergency veterans' temporary housing bill, providing units for veterans—temporary. Mr. Wilson Wyatt informs me that all the beneficial provisions of this bill are well in operation.

One hundred thousand temporary housing units for veterans have been allocated to educational institutions, for colleges and universities. Some have already been constructed; others are in the course of completion, and the rest ready to start in a very short time. The remaining 100,000 temporary housing units for veterans will be spread around the country.

Now, the bill providing a real stimulant and encouragement for increasing the production of building materials for permanent homes is now in conference between the House and the Senate. That is the Patman bill. This is the bill from which the House of Representatives struck out every necessary and helpful provision, such as a subsidy to expand the production of building materials, the ceiling prices on existing homes. The Senate restored these beneficial provisions. If the conferees agree, Mr. Wilson Wyatt says we will start construction of the homes in this country as quickly as building materials are available.

It is now impossible to get any building materials above or beyond those now being used for veterans' temporary houses. The bill now in conference will provide a $600,000,000 subsidy for expanding production of building materials. The plans are all ready to put construction into operation. The first preference for these homes will be given to veterans' families, and the second to hardship cases.

This is what Mr. Wilson Wyatt told me yesterday. Said Mr. Wyatt: "I believe we have demonstrated that without stimulation and expanding building materials, such are now not available. We must have this bill and this money. Regarding Emergency Veterans' Temporary Housing, I have been able to get well on with that program. As soon as Congress passes the Patman bill, which will really produce building materials, the first will go to veterans and their families, the second to hardship cases and after that, in a matter of months, building materials will then be available and we can really start on a housing program which this country needs so badly and to which every American family is entitled." This is hopeful but, as I told you several weeks ago, this year's building season has been lost.

Food Shipments and Famine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, our record in food shipments in the first week of May, after all the campaign to get food to the starving, was the worst yet. We fell behind our commitments on wheat by 150,000 tons, or three-fifths. In fats the shortage was even greater. Thus, we even surpassed our low record of April.

We have been told continuously that if we need to, we would not hesitate to resume rationing on world-short items, but this was not necessary. Our policy of voluntary self-restraint and purchase of foods at the source was sufficient. On the other hand, we also know that starvation is already upon China and that it will shortly sweep India and unless new supplies are found, many areas of Europe. Just what is the measure of the crisis which is needed to speed effective action in our country? Must we wait until tens of millions have actually died before we move?

The most recent Gallup poll showed that only 60 percent of American families were, on April 20, actually economizing in the use of food. Furthermore, very few of these knew how much food they were supposed to save. For example, whereas the Government has asked us to cut down 40 percent of our consumption of bread, only 27 percent had any idea how much bread they should save and most believed that a 25 percent reduction would be enough. Even assuming that each of the 60 percent who did actually cut their consumption by this one-quarter—which is most optimistic—we would have a net saving of only 15 percent instead of the 40 percent required. Is it any wonder that we are falling farther and farther behind on wheat?

Our families know even less about the economies needed in fats and oils since only one person out of eight could give any kind of estimate of what they should save of these items.

The one bright spot in the food situation is sugar. By the close of the first half of 1946 we shall have fulfilled our commitments on this one commodity to UNRRA, but it is doubtful that we can possibly meet the deficits in any other major commodity, such as wheat, fats, meats, fish, and dairy products. Can it be a coincidence that sugar is the one article which we continue to ration?

On the first of last month, fearing that the voluntary campaign would not be sufficient, I introduced a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 140, asking for the resumption of rationing on world short-food items. I pointed out that No. 4 ration book, which we still use, had ample blank stamps to be utilized tomorrow for other items. For this reason, the argument that launching the new machinery for further rationing would take weeks, seems not valid. Moreover, we were told a month back that the crisis was merely a temporary one, and hence rationing was not the answer. Now it is generally conceded that it may take 5 years before we can hope that harvests in the devastated regions of Europe and Asia will be back to normal.

There is one final argument which is made against rationing and that is that increasing the purchases at the source will make it unnecessary. Now of course I want increased purchases at the source. But if these are enough, why did the Government recommend voluntary savings by the consumers? The authorities must have thought that if the consumers cut down on their purchases, more food could be directed to relief and the pressure of the black markets eased. If this is so, and there is every evidence that it is, then this is an argument for replacing a relatively ineffective system of saving by a more effective one. I submit that to do the job properly, some form of compulsory rationing should be introduced. Too much time has already been wasted. We cannot waste any more.

If, however, the responsible authorities still oppose rationing, then at the least, they should set up definite standards of consumption on the scarce foods. Perhaps there should be two standards, one for manual workers and another for the rest of us. Then we would know how many slices of bread, how much meat and fats we are entitled to. Americans are generous and humane people. They want to do their part, but by and large they are not sure yet what that part is. If we had a voluntary standard of self-restraint, tens of millions of Americans would be ready to pledge themselves to abide by that standard. Then the Government would have some assurance about how much surplus they could channelize elsewhere.

Indirect Aid to Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, clear thinking is necessary for those charged with the responsibility of dealing with price control and threats of inflation. There is considerable sound thought on this subject outside of Washington bureaucracy, and I believe it will

do the country good to have the opportunity of reading the following editorial from the pen of the editor of my hometown paper at Red Wing, Minn.:

[From the Red Wing (Minn.) Daily Republican Eagle]

INDIRECT AID TO INFLATION

Holding down inflation is a job that is too big for any one agency to accomplish all by itself. Granting that public pressure will be strong enough to keep wild-eyed Congressmen from scuttling the whole price-control structure as constituted around OPA, the danger of inflation will still hang over us as long as certain inflationary factors exist.

It should be apparent to all that the present mania on the part of organized labor to ask for big wage increases cannot help but advance the cost of living and lead the way to continual upward price surges. In most cases, labor leaders are seeking bigger advances in wages than can be justified by increased costs of essentials. Relatively slight wage increases can be met out of profits. But when the demands run up to over a 10 percent raise, the consumer—meaning all of us—has to pay more for the goods produced. And, of course, when the price line gives away—as in the recent grant of $5 a ton to the steel industry to meet higher wage costs—those higher costs are passed right on down the line.

The individual farmer, too, has his part to play in combating inflation. When North Dakota farmers recently asked for a retroactive payment of 30 cents a bushel for all wheat sold in 1945, they weren't helping the Nation's long-range economy in the least. When cattle are sold to black-market operators instead of being shipped to legitimate processors, the seller is actively conspiring to wreck the orderly processes of the marketplace that are essential to a sound, low-cost distribution system.

The fellow with some money in the bank and the men who own and operate businesses are certainly not doing their share in fighting inflation if at the same time they howl for tax reductions. Merely memorializing Congress to reduce the national debt is no substitute for a serious attempt to put the Nation on a sound financial footing. Of course, governmental organizations should be pruned to eliminate waste and inefficiency and savings can be made along that line. But the best way to preserve our vitality is to take a big chunk cut of our national debt now. Increased personal and corporate income taxes at present levels of prosperity would not be hard to meet. Furthermore the withdrawal of funds for tax purposes would reduce our swollen buying power and relieve, to some extent, the pressure for goods.

To combat inflation successfully, citizens and civic groups will have to display a higher type of statesmanship than has been exhibited heretofore. The National Treasury, like the old cash register in the back of Uncle John's general store, can be the cornerstone of a continuing program to support its owners or the subject of petty raids wherein its contents are dissipated without noticeable benefit to any.

Effective national leadership is also sadly lacking. President Truman, well-intentioned and amiable man that he is, seems to want the forcefulness to put over a constructive program. He allows himself to be hamstrung by old political friends. His passion to remain on friendly terms with all the diverse elements in his own party has contributed to his ineffectiveness as Chief Executive.

In the face of these circumstances, the average citizen may become unduly discouraged. There are a few far-sighted stouthearted fellows in our legislative halls. There is a growing consciousness on the part of our people that we must seek constructive solutions to the economic and industrial problems that face us rather than let the ship of state drift aimlessly. Every ounce of support thrown behind these forces will count heavily in achieving a national economy on which prosperity and security can be built.

Oil Prices Should Be Decontrolled Immediately—19,000 Small Producers Have Made Their Patriotic Contribution at Phenomenally Low Ceiling Prices During Wartime While Major Companies Have Waxed Fat on Profitable Side-line Operations—Immediate Decontrol Seen Necessary if Growth of Monopoly in Oil Industry Is To Be Checked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the subject of price decontrol is one of great current interest, not only to industry but to the Congress. I have opposed and will continue to oppose any amendments to the Price Control Act which purport to spell out in general language a decontrol policy which could not be applied in a practical fashion to certain products because of changed production and marketing conditions.

In the case of certain staple products not affected by new inventions and for which both production and demand can be forecast with exactitude, I share Economic Stabilizer Bowles' view that price controls may properly be lifted when production and demand come into balance and we have every assurance that they will remain in that balance.

Crude oil and refined petroleum products are the output of an industry which, in my opinion, is now entitled to be relieved of all price controls.

The oil business is big business, but, contrary to the general public impression, a minimum of 40 percent of the crude oil of the Nation is produced by approximately 19,000 relatively small producers who do not possess the integrated and profitable sideline operations possessed by the few major oil companies who account for the balance of our crude oil production. These small producers have been placed in jeopardy during the price-control period because of their dependence upon the major companies to take their output. Low ceiling prices for crude petroleum during the war period have encouraged the growth of monopoly in the oil business by forcing many small, independent producers into the hands of the major concerns. This trend towards monopoly must be stopped and the small producers must be allowed a free market in which to move their products at prices controlled by present and future demand.

Lifting price controls on crude oil and refined products should not cause an undue rise in prices at the consumer level at this time or in the future. An examination of the reports of the major concerns to their stockholders is the best evidence that these major firms are making tremendous profits out of their refining, pipe-line, and marketing operations even while crude prices remain at an exceptionally low level. Any slight increases in crude prices should not and need not be reflected in advances to the consumer. With the cessation of the wartime demand which has been a heavy drain on our petroleum supplies during the last 5 years, we now have a guaranty of adequate supplies to protect our present consumer price position.

The State of Texas guaranteed the Nation's oil demands in wartime because Texas was the only State in the Nation then, as now, capable of expanding its production through its having used an oil-conservation program for many years. The State of Texas can guarantee sufficient supplies to meet the national demand in peacetime and, in fact, has already made this guaranty in the form of a commitment from the State railroad commission, the regulatory agency which has the production responsibility for that State. This guaranty was made to President Truman on April 15, in a telegram signed by the three members of said commission.

For the past several weeks, I have been insisting that the time has now come to lift price control on crude oil and refined products. My recent pleas have been directed to Mr. Snyder, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and I have repeatedly stressed to Mr. Snyder the importance of any position taken by the State Railroad Commission of Texas in the matter of oil production.

Rather than repeat the arguments I have given to Mr. Snyder and others as to why oil prices should be immediately decontrolled, I am taking the liberty of appending herewith copies of three letters I have recently sent to Mr. Snyder on this subject. I especially call your attention to the copy of the telegram from the Texas State Railroad Commission to President Truman which is attached to my letter of April 16 to Mr. Snyder. This telegram gives the present picture on oil production and demand far better than I could put it in words myself.

My correspondence with Mr. Snyder, including said telegram, is as follows:

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., April 10, 1946.

Hon. JOHN W. SNYDER,
Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR SNYDER: I enclose for your information a copy of a telegram I have just received from Col. Ernest O. Thompson, member of the Texas State Railroad Commission. As you will note, the telegram confirms the fact that the Texas Railroad Commission is authorizing an increase in that State's oil production of 200,000 barrels per day.

It occurs to me that this action removes the last possible argument against the immediate lifting of price controls on crude oil and refined products and I sincerely hope that your Office will agree with me in this respect.

As I wrote to Price Administrator Porter on March 30, a minimum of 40 percent of the crude oil of this Nation is produced by approximately 19,000 relatively small producers who do not possess the integrated and profitable side-line operations possessed by the relatively few major companies. As a result, these small producers have been placed in jeopardy during the price-control period, and, as our Small Business Committee pointed out in its interim report of December 1944, low ceiling prices for crude oil have encouraged the growth of monopoly in the oil business by forcing many small, independent producers into the hands of the major concerns.

I feel that this action now assures us ample supplies of crude oil. I further feel that any partial decontrol action which would not cover the entire field of oil and oil products would not provide a satisfactory solution. Immediate and total decontrol seems to me to be the only answer in this connection. I sincerely hope that you will give this matter your early favorable consideration.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building:

The Railroad Commission of Texas yesterday unanimously and unconditionally increased the oil production of Texas oil wells by 200,000 barrels per day for the month of April. This news is telegraphed to you so you may assure the OPA that every requirement that has been made upon the Railroad Commission of Texas has been fully and completely met.

ERNEST O. THOMPSON.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1946.

Hon. JOHN W. SNYDER,
Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, the White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SNYDER: I have communicated with you frequently during the past few days on the subject of complete price decontrol of oil and all petroleum products. My letter of April 10 requested immediate lifting of price controls on crude oil and refined products because I felt that the recent action of the Texas Railroad Commission in authorizing an increase in that State's oil production of 200,000 barrels per day removed the last possible argument against further delay in authorization of this recommended action.

However, it has come to my attention that certain of your advisers on this important question have expressed a fear that, upon lifting of controls, the Texas Railroad Commission would use its regulatory powers in such a manner as to influence price without reference to its paramount duty to provide adequately for the nation's oil needs. I consider this fear totally unfounded and so regarded it at the time I addressed my previous communication to you.

That this fear is totally unjustified has now been conclusively established by the telegram just sent to the President by the full membership of the Texas Railroad Commission. That telegram, a copy of which has been supplied to Speaker RAYBURN and myself, constitutes a clear-cut, unequivocal, and binding pledge to the President, the administration, and the Congress, that the Commission will use its powers to insure ample production to supply the national demand; thus meeting the test for decontrol through "expanding production" pledged by Mr. Bowles as his yardstick in his recent testimony before the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

In view of the cold fact that Texas alone of all the States can supply any additional quantities of oil that the Nation might require, the Commission's guaranty is a national guaranty. No further assurances should be required from any source to justify immediate decontrol.

For your convenience I enclose herewith a copy of the Commission's telegram to the President. If the administration is to keep faith with its pledge to industry to decontrol prices when supply and demand are in balance, I feel that this telegram constitutes the last evidence which this industry should be called upon to furnish. A complete decontrol order should issue immediately.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

COPY OF A TELEGRAM TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN, DATED APRIL 15, 1946, FROM OLIN CULBERSON, CHAIRMAN, ERNEST O. THOMPSON, BUFORD H. JESTER, MEMBERS, RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The three undersigned regularly elected commissioners, composing the entire railroad commission of Texas, which is the oil and gas conservation and proration regulatory body of the sovereign State of Texas, wish to assure you and all the administration and the Congress that petroleum production is presently in balance with consumptive demand. We respectfully submit that OPA controls should be decontrolled on petroleum and all its products immediately in order that further wasteful overproduction of gasoline may be avoided.

In normal peacetime before Pearl Harbor 95,000,000 barrels of gasoline stocks were always ample for all needs but today there is on hand 105,000,000 barrels of gasoline in the trade not counting Government gasoline stocks of aviation gasoline.

During wartime peak demand crude stocks were 211,000,000 barrels while today crude stocks are in excess of 220,000,000 barrels.

The Navy's fuel oil shortage was brought on by OPA restrictions.

Refiners lost money on manufacturing fuel oil at rate of about 1 cent a gallon so therefore they manufactured as much gasoline as they could out of a barrel of crude and correspondingly just as little fuel oil as possible.

Then besides preference in price was given to export fuel oil. The Navy's shortage of fuel oil was not caused by any shortage of production of crude. However, when the Navy brought their shortage of fuel oil to our attention the railroad commission of Texas promptly authorized the increase of crude oil production from Texas wells of 200,000 barrels per day bringing our State's authorized permissive crude production up to 2,160,000 barrels per day for the month of April.

Texas is proud to have been physically able, by reason of 10 long years of strict conservation and waste prevention and restriction of oil production to market demand before Pearl Harbor, to fill every request of oil requirements certified to us for every month and every day of the war.

The record will show that Texas produced and delivered about 80 percent of all the additional oil required by the war effort.

We never failed to meet all requests for oil in full. As a matter of fact, we consistently allowed a safety factor of an amount larger than requested so it might never be said that Texas was holding back in any way and that might be doubly sure that there was always plenty of oil for our armed forces everywhere.

Further than that we wanted, also, always to be sure that there could never be a scintilla of evidence or even color of claim by any Federal authority that there was ever any need for any Federal control of oil or gasoline production within the sovereign State of Texas.

The record eloquently shows there was no need of Federal oil control. We furnished the oil when and as needed, and a little extra for safety.

We pledge to you, sir, and to the administration, and to the Congress of the United States that there shall never be a shortage of crude oil from Texas if it can be produced without causing physical waste and harm to the producing reservoirs.

Our Texas conservation statutes authorize us only to prevent avoidable physical waste in oil production. Production of oil in excess of market demand or transportation facilities is defined by our statute as waste.

Naturally, we are going to work within the limits of our Texas conservation statutes. We were doing this successfully 10 years before the war. Our long record of performance is evidence of what we will do in the future.

We feel, sir, that we are being fully cooperative and have always been proud to do our part, and we therefore respectfully request that you call attention to the proper authorities that there should be no further hesitation in the prompt and immediate decontrol of petroleum and all of its products.

We make this plea in the interests of supplying the Navy's fuel-oil requirements and in freeing independent operators and independent refiners from the shackles of control that is resulting in the oil industry fast coming into the hands of a few majors and driving the independent operators and refiners out of the field.

It is the independent who generally goes out and finds the oil. He is the venturesome wildcatter who has found fields like east Texas.

When any commodity is in production balance with consumption there is no need for further artificial controls. We believe that fundamental.

Here is a specific case where OPA artificial control too long continued in force is actually working against our national security in making unavailable fuel oil for the Navy.

If decontrol is effected the Navy can readvertise for bids on its fuel-oil needs and award the contracts to the lowest bidders as was the custom before controls.

Respectfully.

RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS,
OLIN CULBERSON, *Chairman.*
ERNEST O. THOMPSON.
BUFORD H. JESTER.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1946.

Hon. JOHN W. SNYDER,
Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SNYDER: I refer you to my previous letters of April 10 and 16 in which I urged that the administration take the necessary steps to immediately remove crude petroleum and refined products from price control. In both cases I was prompted to write you because of actions taken by the Railroad Commission of Texas which I felt offered what constitutes a national guaranty of adequate oil supplies because Texas and Texas alone can make the pledge which guarantees sufficient oil for the Nation because of that State's prudent oil-conservation policy.

On April 15 the members of the Texas Railroad Commission in a unanimous action pledged the President, the administration, and the Congress that the commission's powers would be used to assure a sufficient national supply, thus furnishing more than adequate rebuttal to those sceptics who thought that this regulatory body would

stoop to use its powers to tamper with a national supply situation in order to assure excessive prices in the event that price controls should be removed. On behalf of my State I resented those insinuations then and I am still more than irked at the suggestion of them.

I am now advised that the railroad commission has gone beyond its pledge and has supported its words by an action of good faith that should immediately and permanently dispel any further arguments against immediate decontrol.

In setting the Texas allowables for May, the commission has exceeded the Bureau of Mines estimate of market demand for Texas-produced oil by nearly 200,000 barrels daily production. The Bureau of Mines estimate—which now that we have an interdepartmental committee on petroleum requirements should constitute the last word in official computations—indicates that there should be a market demand for May produced Texas crude oil of 2,050,000 barrels daily. The commission set the May allowables at 2,244,193 barrels per day divided up among approximately 104,000 producing wells.

We all recognize that operations of marginal wells, work-overs, and less than authorized production may come through unavoidable causes as has always been the case historically in the oil business. However, it is a safe assumption in my view that Texas will produce in May between 50,000 and 70,000 barrels daily more than the Bureau of Mines estimate.

The Bureau of Mines estimate of total national market demand is 4,620,000 barrels daily. It calculates that Texas can be counted on for approximately 44.5 percent of the national figure. Actually, the railroad commission is authorizing production at the rate of 48.5 percent of the estimated national demand. Making allowances for any less production due to unavoidable causes, we can still be assured that the State will produce between 45.5 percent and 46 percent of the national demand.

It has come to my attention that certain minor officials in the Office of Price Administration are opposed to oil decontrol at this time, holding that, in any event, certain of OPA's oil industry advisory committees should be called to meet in Chicago next month with representatives of the pricing agency, who would then inquire in substance what the industry proposes to do in case oil prices should be decontrolled.

I view this reported proposed meeting as totally unnecessary in view of the steps taken by the Texas regulatory body.

If it has been correctly reported to me, I view this attitude as symptomatic solely of the point of view of those who prefer permanent Government intervention in business dealings to a return to free trading as soon as supply conditions permit. It is that reported point of view which has already done loyal Government servants a disservice and has tarred others of us with an alleged attitude toward Government controls which we do not truly hold. I sincerely trust that no such petty lecturer's arguments will be permitted in your final discussion on this matter.

Businessmen deal in appraisable facts. You are a businessman with long experience at analyzing balance sheets. The Government's claim to continue controls over oil prices has been liquidated by the Texas commissioners' latest action. The balance sheet shows that the industry is entitled to immediate release from the wartime trusteeship. An order authorizing immediate decontrol is the only answer you can give the industry. I urge you once again to bring about its immediate issuance.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

OPA Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this House, under date of April 18, passed legislation to extend the Office of Price Administration with carefully thought-out effective amendments. If the other branch of the Congress sees fit to back up the House and support this very intelligently designed bill, we will have made a long step in the direction of progress both in the distribution of needed commodities and in the stimulation of their production, and we will have returned to the business people of the Nation, who are compelled to carry out these drastic orders of the Administrator, an intelligent and fair basis of operation.

Inasmuch as we cannot be assured that the other body will pass this legislation as it left this House, there is probability that there will be need for further debate and discussion.

I include here two important letters, one from the Midwest Lumber Co., owners and operators of an extensive line of lumberyards in farm areas, and the other from the Honorable C. W. Buttz, one of the circuit judges of the State of North Dakota:

MIDWEST LUMBER CO.,
Minot, N. Dak., May 2, 1946.

Hon. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON, M. C.
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROBERTSON: Mr. Arthur Clifford, lumber dealer, of Bridgeport, Conn., is today testifying before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in connection with the extension of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942. We hope that you will have the opportunity of reading or hearing his entire testimony. It contains some very interesting information including the following:

The lumber industry is made up of small companies. Of the 25,000 building and supply dealers in the United States according to the 1940 census, the break-down is as follows:

In communities with a population of less than 2,500	12,700
In communities with a population of from 2,500 to 5,000	2,358
In communities with a population from 5,000 to 10,000	2,181
In communities with a population from 10,000 to 20,000	1,805
Dealers in communities of not over 20,000	19,044

The average sales in 1939 of the 12,700 dealers amount to $32,756 per year. Average profit on sales during 1936–39 according to OPA amounted to 2.7 percent profit on sales or $884.41 or $52.41 over the amount an unskilled laborer would earn under the minimum wage law.

An OPA survey showed in 1944 that the operating costs of small yards was 17.8 percent of sales. This percentage is steadily increasing. Comparing our Midwest Lumber Co. sales for the first 3 months of 1946 with the corresponding period of 1944, we find the volume is the same but our expenses increased from 18.5 percent in 1944 to 22.7 percent in 1946.

Due to the volume of business done by the average retail yard, the small profits and increased expenses, the average dealer is not in a position to absorb price increases which OPA has insisted upon. In addition to increased mill prices, many dealers are absorbing other costs such as mill-in-transit charges which in our case amount to an average of $10 to $15 per thousand.

If you have the opportunity of studying Mr. Clifford's testimony, we will appreciate receiving your comments.

Yours very truly,

L. H. PIPER,
President.

DISTRICT COURT CHAMBERS,
Devils Lake, N. Dak., May 4, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG,
Hon. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
Hon. WILLIAM LEMKE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES: Newspaper reports indicate that Senators and Congressmen are being flooded with propaganda favorable to the continuation of OPA. From appearances locally I imagine that is very true and all over this State wherever I have gone, as well as my observations during a 2 months' trip in the South this past winter indicate that this is purely propaganda originating in Washington and through certain organized sources down East that are inspired by the Washington effort. It has even gone so far right here at home as to have the school children voting on the subject, and when one youngster is of a mind to vote against OPA he is ridiculed and bedeviled by his schoolmates to such an extent that he feels it is impossible for him to vote as he desires. I do not know just where this school stuff originates, but I noticed recently at a State meeting of parent-teachers' association the convention was addressed by some eastern woman who spent much of her time and emphasis in an argument in favor of the absolute necessity of continuing OPA; just what that had to do with good schools, the work of teachers, and the cooperation of parents in the education of their children is a little difficult to understand.

Because of ceiling prices and various regulations the great mass of our farmers have dried up their cows and dairy herds are being dispersed and marketed right out here. Producers cannot increase their meat animal output or anywhere nearly maintain a normal production in the present circumstances. Last year, to avoid the serious losses that I had encountered the year prior, my hog output was reduced from approximately 125 animals to 1 brood sow to provide the farm family with meat. I am recently informed that a creamery at Rugby, N. Dak., was forced to ship milk in from Hillsboro, 200 miles away, to be retailed at Rugby because price regulations locally were such as to make it impossible to handle or obtain the product locally.

Radio broadcasters such as Walter Winchell and Mrs. Roosevelt in her column are outstandingly active in peddling propaganda for the continuance of OPA. Most people I talk to out here are strongly against most of OPA activities, but I assume that those of us who believe OPA should be either wiped out or else severely regulated are sititng back and saying nothing while the propagandists are busy in every way making themselves felt. I am sure more of us out here are entirely content to leave the whole matter to your good judgment as representing the best interests of the country, and I am writing this in that thought and to suggest to each of you gentlemen that the great majority of our people feel likewise and hope that the Congress may be able before long to get us back on a normal basis of free competition and eliminating the present intolerable regulations and consequent black markets.

Kind personal regards.

Very respectfully,

C. W. BUTTZ.

An Ex-GI Condemns Present Political Strangle Hold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, it is most refreshing to observe the views of a number of the veterans who have just returned from their military duties. The older and the more seasoned and experienced veterans of World War II have been very quick to sense the maladjustments and the unfortunate directions in which our political leaders and the New Deal crowd in control of our national and many of our State governments are leading this country.

These boys have seen with their own eyes and heard with their own ears what has taken place in the other countries. They know that a lot of the so-called New Deal program was not new in any sense of the word, except for Americans. They have seen it tried in other countries. They have seen it fail utterly. They thought they were fighting against the very things that in many instances are sought to be incorporated in our laws and made a part of the way in which we transact business. They resent this. They know full well that the New Deal program leads to communism, nazism, or some form of statism that is contrary to our American thinking, our American concept of government, and our American system of free enterprise. They know it will destroy initiative and that it has stifled production. They know it means regimentation and virtual enslavement of the people. They want to see us freed of such contamination, and I believe that they will assert themselves along this line to the complete dismay of our New Deal advocates.

Therefore, I invite your attention to a letter which I have just received from a veteran of World War II. This ex-GI condemns the present political strangle hold and reasons very clearly why we should avoid the pitfalls into which other countries and peoples have been led by false prophets and unscrupulous political leaders. His letter of April 30, 1946, addressed to me, reads:

I am just an ordinary, average American ex-GI sergeant, who spent 2 years overseas in the European theater.

I, like millions of others, am now faced with the problem of trying to conscientiously and intelligently become rehabilitated to some degree of normalcy as an American citizen, a status, which, from what I have witnessed since my return 3 months ago, is considerably unappreciated by most Americans today.

It is difficult for us who have spent so much time in other countries, where we could see first-hand the result of European political miscarriage, caused by selfish greed of politicians, to understand how our great and wonderful country could succumb to the influences of communism, nazism, and all the other "isms" to bring it to the state of chaos which exists today in our United States of America.

It seems our Representatives of Government believe the greatest expedient to accomplishment is to keep their constituents in a state of turmoil at all times.

On one hand labor strikes, with three or four men dictating to the Government—our Government—as to what will be done, when it will be done and how much will be done—a dictatorship which has forced production costs sky high. Then, on the other hand, we have some other energetic alphabetical organizations which tell industry what they may receive for their products which usually is abnormally low, and certainly not commensurate with rising production costs, preventing any incentive in industry to all-out production.

Then, to try to cover up the existing chaos from Mr. Average America, the Government starts subsidizing. Subsidy: The politician's stand-by—something the average American doesn't even know the meaning of. All this is contrary to the simple, actual, age-old and proven law of "supply and demand" and most certainly a one-way ticket to that dreaded condition inflation.

Now most recently, overnight practically, the populace is in another turmoil because of a suddenly discovered acute food shortage in foreign countries. Of course, those people have been in war for 5 or 6 years and the problem did not present itself until 2 years after something should have been done about it. Naturally the needy countries would not think seriously of it, for "good old bountiful Santa Claus America will take care of us, so why should we worry." They didn't worry. So now it is our worry. But that is where we are wrong, very wrong. It is their worry but only when we make them understand it so.

Why should anyone or any country knuckle down to hard work to solve this problem as long as someone else like us will do it for them? "Universal suckers," that's what they call us, and rightfully so, too. So long as we play nursemaid to these countries, feed them and clothe them, then so long will the problem remain unsolved.

In my 2 years overseas, working with the operation of gasoline supplies for all armies, I was privileged to travel some 85,000 miles by jeep in France, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, Germany, Austria, and England, and by train in Switzerland—an opportunity to see much, and I did.

My observation was that there is now, as always, plenty of labor in these countries, plenty of soil for cultivation, but because of our continuous charity (at the expense of the American taxpayer) little is being done by them to rectify this so-called "acute situation."

True, there is a shortage of food in certain areas and with certain classes of people in some of the countries, but most assuredly it can be remedied by them if we force them to remedy it.

The several years of war have brought on these people the usual black market. The average man, drawing an honest wage in these countries, cannot feed his family at the black-market prices. The farmers who remain to grow food naturally will only distribute that food through the black-market channels. Consequently, the actual acute situation is with those people who are of the lower class, making a small wage, insufficient to pay the black-market prices. From this, therefore, has developed that the greater portion of the populace is dealing in some type of black market in order to feed their families. This means fewer farmers, making less food production, causing increased prices on black market for an endless cycle of starvation in some classes. This, in itself, is sufficient proof that no systemized method is being used for proper distribution to the actual needy of the food they now have. Why then would the situation be altered by our furnishing several million addition tons? Or how could we be assured that the actual needy situation will be rectified by our supplying additional food? Unless we directly supervise our food distribution to these countries (which is impossible) it is highly probable that we would merely find ourselves the suppliers of a gigantic black market in these countries operating under the guise of some Government department. Only through forcing the people of those countries to work to solve their own problem will they ever be self-sustaining. Unless we, as the universal Santa Claus, realize this, we will be assuming support of the entire world from now on, and, looking at the chaotic condition which is evident at home, it seems we have forgotten that old reliable adage "charity begins at home."

With all of these things existing, it is no wonder that the returning veteran, who is the young man of today but the businessman of tomorrow, would lack any incentive whatsoever for a business venture, which is the foundation of our Nation. Continued alphabetical monstrosities in our Government keep taxation so high and restrictions so tight on industry that they consider it unwise to commence a business venture.

Just how long returning veterans and other thinking people of the American Nation will permit this political stranglehold is questionable. My belief is, not for much longer. The millions of men who have seen the fate of other nations by their people sitting around on their hands and letting the political nincompoops ruin their country are going to insist on a complete house cleaning in our own Government to prevent our Nation from descending to the condition of the other countries which they have been observing at first-hand.

Exemption of Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by H. J. Bernard which appeared in the Civil Service Leader of Tuesday, May 7, 1946:

EXEMPTION OF PENSIONS

When a bill before Congress is so obviously just and necessary that it is impossible to present any logical argument against it, and still it doesn't mature into law, there is ample reason to feel aggrieved. Such a situation obtains regarding efforts to have public employees' pensions exempted from Federal income taxation, as social security and railroad retirement law pensions are exempted.

Public employees are a small percentage of the 65,000,000 persons gainfully employed in this country. It is to be feared that perhaps this relative smallness is responsible, more than anything else, for the slowness of both Houses of Congress to recognize a meritorious objective.

The immediate beneficiaries would be the former public employees now pensioned, a still far smaller number, so that there is even less political need to worry about the strength of their vote. But basic justice should be strong enough in this country to overcome the selfishness of political motivation, otherwise we are setting a sorry example to the rest of the world.

If present public employees who themselves look forward to retirement on a pension would realize that they, in even greater numbers, will be affected, they would join with the pensioned groups in insisting that an

exemption law be enacted. Telegrams are being sent to Representatives in hundred lots by pensioned groups, asking for favorable action on the bill newly introduced by Representative WILLIAM T. BYRNE, Democrat, Albany, for a $2,000 exemption. This bill is H. R. 6140. The Association of State Civil Service Employees is lending every possible aid to Mr. BYRNE in his earnest effort to get it adopted. More organizations of presently-employed public workers should follow suit, in cities, towns, and villages of the State. And, since this is a national project, public employees in other States, and in civil divisions of such States should do likewise. Then impetus would be given to a bill otherwise possibly destined to languish.

Short-sightedness by public employees should not be added to political chicanery in legislative halls. Organizations of public employees must realize that there are common objectives on which it is not only their right but their duty to unite.

Another bill, introduced by Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH, Democrat, Brooklyn, would match for public employees the $1,440 pension exemption under the railroad retirement law. Pensioners would perhaps prefer the higher exemption, but all present and prospective ones should unit solidly on the principle of exemption, and could not be much offended whether Congress passes the one bill or the other. The battle is won the moment that a mere minority, though not particularly vocative, sweeps past the barricades of the reactionaries who put political cunning ahead of American justice.

Milling of Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from one of the many flour-milling companies in Minnesota. It portrays the difficulties under which they are trying to operate under the present program for collecting grain for relief purposes. I have not heard a person or a firm in my State object to making whatever sacrifices are necessary to feed the starving. They do wonder if it would not be better both for the hungry abroad and for our economy and our workers in this country to have our mills grind as much as possible of the wheat here so it can be shipped abroad as flour ready for immediate distribution.

If it is necessary to send it abroad as wheat, then those responsible should make the reasons clear to all concerned:

BAY STATE MILLING CO.,
Winona, Minn., May 6, 1946.

The Honorable WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JUDD: Our large wheat mill, 8,000—100 hundredweight bags daily—was forced down for 10 days last month, not because we do not have wheat with which to run, but because of a Government ruling that we could not operate more than 75 percent as compared to last year. The financial loss to us was large because we kept all of our mill hands on the pay roll, grooming the tulips, raking lawns, and making repairs in general. Next week, we will shut down again, and there are at this time no prospects for running at all in June because we cannot pay 1 penny per bushel for wheat over the ceiling while our Government is paying a bonus of 30 cents per bushel. Operation of our plant for the next few months is very uncertain. In fact, it is hopeless.

It is impossible to understand why our Government ships raw wheat by the millions of bushels to Europe and Asia to be ground into flour over there, when that wheat could just as well be ground into flour in the United States, keeping our laboring employed and keeping the resultant mill feeds in this country for producers to feed to their cattle, hogs, and poultry. I cannot conceive of there being enough flour mills in Europe and Asia to mill this wheat into flour. Transportation media of Europe is in relatively poor condition. Their flour mills must be in bad condition also. Their railroads are in bad shape. Flour milled in this country could be consumed by the starving people of Europe and Asia the very day it arrived, while it must take second rate mills in those countries a month or more to receive the wheat from seaboard, mill it into flour, and then load the flour back into freight cars to be shipped to the starving areas. It looks stupid.

We are told that millions of people in Europe will die and the health of other millions permanently impaired if they are not provided with food at once. The only way to get food to those poor people at once is to have the "mercy wheat" ground into flour immediately in this country for immediate consumption. Making flour mills idle, throwing hundreds and thousands of people out of work subject to unemployment insurance is not common sense.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. ALLEN,
Vice President.

Housing Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN J. RABIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Speaker, I am rather discouraged about the prospect of housing relief for the veteran, the homeless war worker, and the public in general. This bill we are now discussing was introduced before the Christmas recess last year. Here it is May and we are still talking about it. When it was introduced we were told it was a bill to take care of an emergency. We are certainly not giving it emergency treatment.

When we wanted to put a gun on the shoulder of a soldier during the war, we did not debate subsidies, costs, method or manner. We made that gun fast and put it on his shoulder with all speed. Why do we not use the same method to put a roof over his head now that he has returned and needs that roof? Why all this talk about cost, subsidies, and Government control? Why all this debate? Why this delay? Why not do it with the same speed with which we put that gun on his shoulder? Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for these funds to encourage the production of raw materials necessary for housing construction. And I shall likewise vote for any measure to expedite housing construction. I shall vote for anything that is needed to speed up the housing program. I shall vote to use the same methods to give our returning veterans a home as was used to prepare for war. They are entitled to at least that and no less. This is an emergency. Let us treat it as one. Let us get on with building.

Treatment of Armenia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Armenian National Council of America, at Carnegie Hall, April 28, 1946:

One of the blackest blotches on the conscience of a civilized world is the way the cultured people of Armenia have been treated for more than a thousand years. She is a small country, but in advancements for her people, she has always been ahead of the larger powers along her borders and therefore envied by her neighbors. More powerful countries have trampled back and forth across her soil, but not without meeting great armies of valiant fighters. The Armenians have been a fearless people. They have been defeated but have never been conquered and, furthermore, never will be conquered. Armenians everywhere are still fighting for the restoration of their mother country.

President Roosevelt became known as a great internationally minded world leader. The United States Congress backed him up in order to make international cooperation work. The foundation for world cooperation was laid by another great American President, Woodrow Wilson. It was no discredit to President Wilson that the United States Senate did not see fit to support his ideas for a world power to prevent a second world war. That failure was the responsibility of the Senate. The new Senate of the Seventy-ninth Congress has seen fit to reverse the position of the old World War I Senate and put into effect machinery that will help to maintain world peace.

I mention President Wilson because he was called upon by the League of Nations in 1920 to help settle the dispute over the boundary line between Armenia and Turkey. In fact, it was left up to President Wilson to describe a fair and equitable place to establish the boundary.

Turkey, during World War I, as a satelite of Germany and at the instigation of Germany, carried on a systematic campaign of extermination of the Armenian people by merciless slaughter very similar to Germany's program of extermination of the Jewish people. A generation ago the Americans showed great sympathy for the Armenians in their plight, but with the rush of world affairs we seem to have forgotten all too soon. Until justice is restored, we must remember their starvation, poverty, disease, extortion, robbery, and massacre. Nearly every church in the United States collected money, food and clothing for the victims of Turkish aggression.

More than a million Armenians are refugees scattered in many lands, waiting for an opportunity to return to their own country.

President Wilson finally recommended that four provinces be taken away from Turkey

and given back to the Armenian people. The provinces were Trebizond, Erzerum, Bitlis, and Van, an area of 40,000 square miles. The population of this area, commonly referred to as Wilson Armenia, and still in the hands of the Turks, was 1,800,000 prewar, but by 1920 there were only 200,000 or one-ninth of the prewar population and one-third of them were Turks. There were more than 300,000 Armenian refugees from that area alone and more than 1,000,000 had been slaughtered. No wonder the Armenians called them the terrible Turks.

The only part of Armenia remaining intact by this time was the Armenian Republic (formerly Russian Armenia) which had declared independence in 1918. It had a population of over two million people crowded into an area of 26,000 square miles. That amount of space squared up would be about 163 miles square, or about one-fourth of the size of the State of Washington. Had the Armenian boundary been extended according to the Sevres Treaty as recommended by President Wilson, the additional 40,000 square miles would have more than doubled the size of the Republic. However, this still would be only about half of old Armenia, which I might add is approximately the size of the State of Washington. This was the area claimed by the Armenian delegation to the peace conference in February 1919 which would have established the boundary between Armenia and Turkey on an irregular line beginning just west of Ordu on the Black Sea and going across to just west of Mersin on the Mediterranean Sea. This would have included Armenia Minor and Cilicia. I grant that part of this area was quite heavily populated with Turks but they did not originally belong there and I believe in all fairness that anyone would have to come to the conclusion that President Wilson in his proposal for a boundary was plenty generous with Turkey and especially when we take into consideration the fact that she had just been an ally of Germany.

Apropos to what I have been saying, perhaps I should have brought into the picture something about the treaties dividing Armenia between Old Czarist Russia and Turkey, but I was quite sure that someone else on the program would cover that more fully than I could with the time available. Had the Russian Revolution not taken place, which reversed Russia's policy toward Armenia, no doubt Czarist Russia and Turkey would have completely eliminated Armenia.

I would like to say, perhaps at the risk of some repetition, that I cannot help but marvel at the modernization, progress, and educational advancement made by Armenia in the short term of peace between the two great wars. Neither can I avoid trying to visualize how much greater advancement Armenia would have made had the treaty of Sevres been fulfilled. What a glorious nation Armenia would be today. What a glory it would be for her people, scattered throughout the world, for those who wish to do so, to return to their mother country.

Great injustices have been perpetrated upon Armenia already for too many years. If peace is to reign throughout the world, consideration should be given to Armenia's case now. This case is of sufficient importance that it should be considered by the United Nations Organization. The United Nations should reverse the do-nothing-about-it policy of the old League of Nations and see that the treaty of Sevres is fulfilled, that the recommendation of President Wilson is carried out, just as the United States Senate has reversed its former position of isolation and is now carrying out the general principles that were advocated by President Wilson for world cooperation.

Freed Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the membership of the House will receive considerable assistance in their thinking on the subject of price control if they will read the following editorial which appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune on April 19, 1946.

The editorial was written by Mr. Kieckhefer of the editorial staff of the Tribune:

FREED ENTERPRISE

The House of Representatives has called for demobilization of the Nation's wartime controls on prices. Its action requires confirmation by the Senate before it becomes final.

The action by the House in itself is a legislative hot-foot for the planners in the national administration who have been attempting to use their wartime powers to impose regimentation upon the people in peacetime. It is a warning that the time has come to start unsnarling the wasteful tangle of regulations and to end the Federal pap which has been restraining completion of the transition of our economy from war to peace.

Even though the action was taken in a heated session, it came out reasonably considerate of the administrators of this managed economy. It gives these economic overlords 9 months in which to loosen their grip on price controls. It gives them until January 1 to pull out the uneconomic subsidy plugs which they have been employing in a vain attempt to hold back the forces of inflation which the Government has created.

HIGHER PRICES BUT MORE GOODS

The result of the House action if it is approved by the Senate will be higher legal prices on the market places. Let us not fool ourselves into thinking prices will be held to prewar levels. But this action also will result in production of more goods for the legal market places. The greater the volume of goods which appears on the legal markets the less demand there will be for higher prices.

We must bear in mind in accepting higher legal prices that it has not always been the legal—the ceiling—price which has reflected the price the consumer has had to pay even under the OPA. When packers are not producing enough fresh meat to supply the market places consumers turn to black markets for their supply. And the prices on the black market must be higher than the prices will be in a free market even when all subsidies and ceilings are removed.

As for subsidies, the collapse of this bottle-feeding program has been clearly indicated in the order, issued this week by Stabilization Director Chester Bowles, increasing the dairy subsidy. To cling to this stopgap measure any longer will mean greater and greater public expenditure from the Treasury in order that the public expenditures from the pay check will continue small, without regard for the fact that the wallet which pays for the butter also pays the taxes which provide the subsidy.

If the House action becomes final, a great responsibility will fall upon the shoulders of private business. This will be the responsibility for increasing production rapidly to meet the demand for goods of all sorts so that prices will not spiral upward more than is necessary to meet real costs and produce reasonable profits. Neither businessmen who produce or process the goods nor the consumers want a whirlwind rise in prices which can lead only to a severe economic collapse again.

It will be incumbent upon producers and processors to keep their business affairs strictly up to par and to exercise every possible means to bring about price reductions rapidly.

COOPERATION ESSENTIAL

If business is to achieve this end, however, it must have the cooperation of the farmers and of organized labor. If the cost of raw materials or of labor is pushed forward rapidly, the manufacturer or processor cannot help but increase his prices.

We are on the verge of a great opportunity to prove the effectiveness of the free enterprise system.

Open Letter to Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, because I believe it to be one of the most valuable and timely contributions to a calm consideration of the crisis in which every American finds himself and the country today, I submit the following editorial from the Boston Herald of May 8, 1946:

OPEN LETTER TO LABOR

To America's 14,000,000 Organized Workers:

Are you satisfied with the trend of the trade-union movement in America? Do you believe that our Reuthers, Thomases, Petrillos, Murrays, and Lewises are giving you a richer life in a stronger nation? Or are you beginning to wonder whether your own prosperity is not one with the prosperity of all, whether collaboration is not better than conflict at home as well as abroad, whether you have not exchanged the domination of vested wealth for the domination of union bosses?

Since the war ended and the Nation began its prayerful march toward recovery, you have lost something like 100,000,000 man-days of labor through industrial warfare. That means $800,000,000 in direct cash alone. But consider also what it means in automobiles that never came off the assembly lines, in radios that never reached a store shelf, in farm machinery that will never help to stay the world famine. Think, also, what it has meant in the frustration of national development or in the loss of the imponderables of national prestige.

Today you and your fellow Americans are watching the Nation slipping to its knees under the irresponsible and despotic exercise of authority by John L. Lewis. Slowly industry is stagnating. The fine new products you have waited to buy are being taken from you, and your increased incomes will soon buy nothing but the same old trash or a little flurry on the daily Treasury balance. By the thousands you are being thrown out of work, victims of the demented grasp for power of one man, the greatest tyrant this once free land has ever known.

You and your fathers before you fought valiantly for the right to strike. Is it not time to consider whether your preoccupation with the right to strike is losing you the right to work?

No one wants to turn the clock back. No one wants to revive the 75-hour week and

dollar-a-day pay. No one wants to give management again the right to tell you where you shall live or how many children you may have. But a 30-hour week and $2-an-hour pay will avail you nothing if to attain it you thrust the Nation into mass unemployment and uncontrollable inflation.

Do you want your leaders to take you further along this road of destruction? Do you want to stir up a violent antilabor reaction with unforeseeable consequences? Or do you want labor disputes to be settled by pacific means, even if that entails a surrender of the unrestricted right to strike? Ultimately the choice is yours.

Democracy at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein the speech of Col. H. C. Marden, of Waterville, Maine, recently delivered at the Republican State Convention, Bangor:

One feature of my appearance on this program which is of distinct advantage to me, and I hope no disadvantage to the convention, is the fact that I am not currently a candidate for any political office and to that extent may feel entitled to speak more freely than might otherwise be the case. It is quite possible that the good of the cause would in any case be increased if all speakers on such occasions as this had no particular current interest in the action of the convention.

It should also be noted and understood that the views that the speaker may present are not to be understood as the views of our party or any of its leaders. They are the views only of the speaker.

Any comment which it is my privilege to make is aimed at partisanship only insofar as such thoughts may seem applicable to our party. I believe them equally applicable to any party.

Were I pressed for a title to these remarks, it might be one, or all, of three: "Democracy at Work," "Democracy at Play," or, with apologies to certain radio acts, "People Are Funny."

If I appear as a representative of the veterans of the current war, it must be stated in fairness to that vast group of great American citizens, the service men and women, that service in the European theater and service in the Pacific theater have been as unlike as black and white and it is quite possible that the convictions, with respect to the United States and its future role in world affairs, of those who have seen the heartland of the British Empire, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and, finally Germany and Austria, and the convictions of those who have been exposed to the vast reaches af the Pacific where in the nethermost parts of the British Commonwealth of Nations and in island dependencies of France and the Dutch only the shadow of the Central Government may be cast, may be as divergent as the poles. To each of those veterans he has "seen it." To each of the veterans of the China-Burma-India theater, the Carribean Defence Command, Alaska, Greenland, Panama, and the many other stations incident to a literally global war, his voice is the voice of experience and a true picture must be the composite of many artists with as many perspectives. We should urge ourselves to remember that, in recording the voices of the returned service people. The speaker served in the Pacific area. He must be accepted with knowledge of that limitation.

I am certain that in any of the combat areas between periods of intense activity during which one's primary mission was to stay alive and in all operational areas there were longer periods of boredom during which the veteran had too much time to think; during which the values of life were reappraised; things which had seemed very important became worthless and the values of other things heretofore unimportant became immeasurably increased.

Were the speaker to be very formal, he might now say that his remarks have been divided into three phases which seem very formidable.

While I dislike to present the obvious as a conclusion to which the veterans came, certain it is that they are convinced of the futility of war as a means of national preservation. In spite of ourselves, we have managed to prevail in those skirmishes in which we stood alone on one side of the issue. In spite of ourselves we have contributed to an untold degree to the victory in two so-called world wars where our geographical isolation served not to keep us out of them but only to give us time to prepare for them, while the bodies of our fellow world citizens were damming temporarily the relentless tide of aggression.

The part which America played in defeating the Axis powers was based upon our power to produce and reproduce the materials of war, not while the enemy was landing upon our beaches, terrestrial or aerial, but while that enemy was assaulting some other land and air boundaries and attacking some other people by its long-range artillery and air strikes. The United States as a political entity has been struck by the current war only by a false prosperity and a bloodless attack on our natural resources. That may seem to be a brutal statement, but please bear in mind that I am speaking of the United States as a civil entity. Thousands of our fellow citizens have understood the grief of the loss of a soldier son or daughter, but the homes from which those humans came stand inviolate, the soil upon which those homes stand has never been trod by an invader and, while the next of kin can never be told that they do not know what war is, it is nevertheless true they do not know what the people on the continent of Europe know. They do not know what the Filipinos know. They do not know what the Chinese know. They do not know total war.

Science tells us that the atomic age has come and gone, that the creation of the atomic bomb is the beginning of a nuclear age and that, while the significance of that age remains to be realized, the power to produce and reproduce the sinews of war in emergency which up to VJ-day had been the determining factor in defeating the Axis may have overnight lost its significance, for the primary target of an atomic bomb manufactured, airborne and released in surprise attack is the industrial heart of that sleeping giant. Industrial paralysis is instantaneous. If this be true, and it may well be so accepted, the United States has a greater interest than ever before in being a member in good standing of a peaceful world neighborhood.

I believe that the veterans of World War II would say, "The United Nations' Organization must persist" and I suspect that they may not be articulate on that subject because to them it is so obviously self-evident. Whether that conclusion is reached by the psychology of the GI who, in landing on the beach at Lingayen Gulf on the island of Luzon in the Philippines on January 9, 1945, and while pulling splinters out of his clothing and hair from a coconut tree which had been spattered over his head by a Jap artillery shell said, "Ain't this a hell of a way to earn a living!" or the soldier beside him who had long since reached the same conclusion by the study of history, does not matter.

I believe that the veteran of World War II favors compulsory military training which in the minds of some may be the antithesis of the alleged insistence for world peace which I have just indicated. On the contrary to its being antithetical, it is, I believe, a necessary feature of a lasting world peace.

Up to this point we have discussed "Democracy at work." We now pass to the phase of "Democracy at play," and please be assured that the title is used in irony.

Reference has been made countless times to the ill-fated League of Nations, to the ill fate of which the United States contributed largely, and for which we should be profoundly ashamed. We have on countless occasions been reminded of the successive incidents of Manchukuo, Ethiopia, the occupation of the Rhineland, Munich. The veteran of this war is powerless to hope with any greater sincerity than he now does that 25 years from now his son will not be recalling the ill-fated United Nations, and the Iran and the Dutch East Indies as the first step of another series of incidents. With which we come to the point that some veterans want to make—why a retention of military, naval, and air preparedness is considered consistent only with an orderly world organization, and not inimical to it.

You will recall that Sumner Wells in the Time for Decision gave as one of the pertinent reasons why the position of America in the council, from which came the Treaty of Versailles, and, in fact, why the prestige of all the allies, decreased with the passing of time, was an ungovernable popular demand on the allied countries for immediate demobilization which impeded the framers of the treaty in their efforts to maintain a semblance of order in the countries where radical territorial or political adjustments had to be made.

Ladies and gentlemen, not only since VE-day and VJ-day, but before those days, there was developing in the United States an ungovernable popular demand to get the boys home, which ungovernable popular demand seems to have been on such increase, that our military commitments in the necessary control of occupied areas have been jeopardized and the retention of sufficient military prestige to make secure to ourselves the costly victory we helped to win has been a matter of serious concern.

At the same time and over the same critical period extends the formative life of an organization which is the hope for the future. Over the same period is being determined the obligations—and rights and privileges of the United States in that world organization. The standing of our country in the world community is now being determined. The home team is playing in the professional league and in a game such as has never been played before. The home team applied for membership in the league at a time when the home team was supported by the armed might which won the war. Its requests could be treated only with respect. Its demands could be treated only with deference. At this most critical of all times, that magnificent Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force with its incomparable power and organization and material has by popular demand been dissipated. Its numbers—of the Army alone—have been decreased on January 31, 1946, to 3,469,272. The home team is rapidly becoming one of rookies. The boxer is standing on marbles. The bridge player is having his honors converted to two's and three's and, to use an illustration which may be more apt, our poker team has been deprived of its blue chips.

Lest this veteran be misunderstood, he is critical not of his War and Navy Departments, not of the Congress which perhaps has to be sensitive to this popular demand,

but of the people who collectively compose this popular demand and the system which permits it. In that and similar situations, democracy is no longer at work: It is at play in the most ridiculous sense.

It is democracy at play when a popular demand requires that trained soldiers be withdrawn from their organizations and returned 7,000 miles to the United States at a time when their experience would have been invaluable in pending operations. It is democracy at play which establishes a policy which permits 800 men to be taken home from one division within 3 months of its embarking on a major operation and sends them 800 artillerymen to replace 800 infantrymen. It is democracy at play which permits soldiers to be returned from overseas duty whether or not suitable replacements are available. It is democracy at play which permits popular demand to determine the military needs of a nation at war. The service people who were in the South and Southwest Pacific 24, 30, 36, and 42 months beginning in the days of Guadalcanal and southern New Guinea, have little difficulty in stifling their sympathy for their comrades on whose behalf it is now contended that 18 months overseas in an occupation force should be the extent of duty on foreign soil. It is democracy at play which permits minority groups to override the needs of the Nation. It is democracy at play when a system requires the Congress to be answerable to the whim of partisan expediency and sectionalism.

The illustrations which I have drawn are from experience. The principles, this veteran asks you to apply to the ever-increasing domestic problems connected with the return to an alleged normal United States. You and I as individuals are responsible for the developing of this system. We are responsible for its correction if it be in error. Our Congress has a dueyt to perform to its constituents, but the veteran considers it has a more special duty to its country. If you have confidence in the integrity and ability of your Congress, permit it to devote its time and energy and attention to supplying your country's needs, not your personal needs.

This veteran's third thought has to do with the future of the party system. Permit me to remaind you that at one time—VE-day, May 8, 1945—the combined armed forces totaled more than 11,000,000; that the period during which the national emergency took our young people from normal pursuits has been substantially 5 years and that only during perhaps the last year have those men and women been released to civilian life in any great numbers. We are to be reminded, too, that the great portion of these millions went into service at 18 years of age and now for the first time are being exposed to the rights and privileges of adult citizenship, that legal metamorphosis experienced at the age of 21. These potential votes will be exposed to the local political atmosphere from which they will absorb political ideas; their interest will be solicited by various groups, the tents of many of which are less acceptable than those of the two major political parties and, we hope, by some well organized program of civic education.

One interesting illustration is to be found in the experience of one division which was in New Guinea in the fall of 1944 when the voting privilege was extended to troops overseas. I probably would be misunderstood if I were to say that there was a tinge of the impractical to set up a rather elaborate system whereby soldiers overseas would be given an opportunity to vote whether he were in a rest camp, training area, or in a bayonet fight with the enemy. In the division in question, a group of officers were withdrawn from other duties and the procedure carried out. Of the division of approximately 13,000, my recollection is that about 150 voted.

To be fair it must be admitted that there were many factors contributing to this result, but we rather felt that the number which voted, or the comparatively large number which did not vote, was due to the facts just indicated: That the great majority of men in that division had been called into service prior to the voting age, and that during service there was no occasion to think particularly of civic rights and duties. Until they were or shall have been returned to civilian life their voting franchise has been or will be of no practical significance. Until that time and until their attention is invited or induced or directed to their voting privilege they will not become contributors to the result of referendum or to representative government. Between June 30, 1945, and January 31, 1946, the United States Army alone will have returned nearly 5,000,000 persons to civilian pursuits.

This presents an opportunity of which some party will take advantage. It represents an opportunity to minority groups whose tenets may be considered generally less desirable than those of either of the large parties. It indicates action by G. O. P. It indicates a progressive, well-organized, vigorously executed program to interest these veterans now available in numbers far greater than would be the normal annual increment. The future of party politics as we have known it may well be with that very group of young men and women. Again I have emphasized the obvious.

I do not know whether the adage, "Strike while the iron is hot," or "Make hay while the sun shines," or a few lines by Bill Shakespeare who has said the same thing in his inimitable way will most appeal to you.

Certainly to the future of the world organization the time has come. As this is being prepared incidents are taking place in the Council of the United Nations which may well cause the success or failure of that organization and the one world of one of our greatest Americans, Wendell L. Willkie.

As we meet here today incidents are taking place which will mark for all time the place which the United States is to occupy in this postwar world. The United Nations must survive. Our country must assume and maintain her rightful place. The people of this Nation must permit its strong right arm—a sufficient, virile, growing force which will constantly mirror the armed might of which we are capable in a period of emergency, to suffer no atrophy. The Republican Party as a major force is responsible for a major contribution—not one to be deposited in the high councils of this land where it will draw the greatest partisan return, but one to be deposited to the credit of a greater United States of America and a greater united world community.

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. EARTHMAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. EARTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, if we knew that on June 1 some foreign government could by means of sabotage close up all American factories, schools, hospitals, public utilities, institutions of every type and nature, as well as bring to a complete stop agricultural activities and farmers, I am certain that our President, his Cabinet, and every Member of Congress of both Houses would spend every minute, night and day, in declaring war on that nation and would direct every legal authority toward preventing such an occasion.

This seems to be the case today but instead of a foreign government threatening us we thus far are sitting in apparent complacency while one man is proving to be bigger and more powerful than the greatest nation on earth. We stand today as a nation officially at war, with powers delegated to our President as though actually fighting. In our efforts to reconvert our country from war to peace I feel that it is just as essential for our Chief Executive to exert the powers given to him by Congress in behalf of preventing a national disaster such as threatens us now as he did when we were in actual war.

I further feel that if this is not done, we as Members of Congress, should from this minute on cease deliberation on other matters and pursue an effective course of legislation that will be fair and sane in effect upon the miners, who should have adequate compensation and good working conditions but should not be allowed to bring about and cause a national disaster, much suffering, and complete destruction of our national economy and at the same time absolutely annihilate all benefits that are being sought by previous legislation. To let this go further unchecked would bring about the most chaotic and desperate conditions of inflation ever known in this country. John L. Lewis is not more powerful than 140,000,000 people and now is the time that we, the Congress and the President, should make it known to him and all others who in the future may attempt to do likewise. The people shall rule this country.

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, according to the newspapers, President Truman and his administration have in abject helplessness abdicated to John L. Lewis. Lewis has usurped the powers of Government, even the power of taxation by levying a tax of perhaps 10 cents a ton on all coal consumed by the public. He has decreed that the people of the United States shall have no coal unless they pay tribute to him and do what he tells them to do. The strong man dictator has come; and for the first time in our national history constitutional government admits inability to preserve itself and the general welfare of its people. We have sown the wind and are reaping the whirlwind.

When did we sow the wind? Outstandingly in 1937, when this same John L. Lewis, together with the then Governor of Michigan, Frank Murphy, under the leadership of a person now dead, refused to uphold the Constitution, refused to uphold and obey the courts, treacherously failed and refused to call out the State police or the militia to protect the public and private property from the hold-up and highway robbery in the

Flint automobile factory sit-down strike. The evil men do lives after them.

That wind, sown by that administration, developed into the whirlwind now descending on the present administration, causing its abject helplessness.

The question is, Shall Congress also abdicate? There is legislation in committee designed to preserve the Union, to eliminate the scourge that threatens it. Unless Congress ratifies the abdication of the administration and wishes to follow in its wake, this legislation should be given the green light over all other legislation and brought to the floor and passed immediately. It may be a matter of life or death for the Republic.

Mrs. Roosevelt Lets Cat Out of Bag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, we are asked every day what the future holds in store for this country and its citizens. Where are we headed? Have we gone so far afield from the American traditions that we will not be able to retrieve our losses? Is there still a chance to restore American ideals and ways of life, or shall we be forced to accept the ideology of some form of government where the people have lost their individual freedoms and privileges?

We know from history that some of these orders, edicts and rules regulating our businesses and our private lives, are as arbitrary, unreasonable and un-American as the edicts and orders of the kings of old. Then, the king spoke the law. His word was law. Our forefathers preferred to be ruled and governed by laws enacted by their representatives. They established a form of government by which they could govern themselves through their own representatives, where the law would come from the people up and not from a king or dictator down.

Whenever any man or set of men can tell the people what and how much they can eat, wear, and have for shelter they can enslave that people. That is the danger we face in America today. If the bureaucrats are allowed to continue to spend the people's money to propagandize them as they have been doing for the past 13 years, some morning we are likely to awaken and find a dictator in charge, or a communistic regime in control of our Government and our production and distribution systems. Free enterprise will be gone. Government by the consent of the governed through their representatives will fade from the picture. We will have a form of stateism comparable to the system inaugurated by Hitler or by the Russians, if that happens. It is a serious matter.

A man recently passed from the scene of action at the White House who frequently reminded us that "it was planned that way." His widow, in her syndicated column, My Day, appearing in the newspapers April 30, 1946, in condemning Congress for trying to lift the heavy burden of OPA from the backs of the people, among other things, said:

> It has been a long fight to put the control of our economic system in the hands of the Government, where it can be administered in the interests of the people as a whole.

That is communism.

She talks about Chester Bowles, Stabilization Director, and Paul Porter, Price Administrator, "doing their best," and says that:

> Without the support of the people * * * these two men will be defeated by the Representatives of the people.

For one, I am ready, as one of the Representatives of the people, to defeat these two gentlemen. Under our Constitution, the Representatives of the people are supposed to make the laws, not these two appointees of the President. It is apparent that the cat came out of the bag when Mrs. Roosevelt said, "It has been a long fight to put the control of our economic system in the hands of the Government." That is the un-American part of it all. That shows plainly that it was planned that way all along. It was planned "to put the control of our economic system in the hands of the Government," instead of allowing our people to operate under the system of free enterprise which made this country great. It was apparently a part of this scheme to have bureaucrats, according to the New Dealirium, control the people, and the hue and cry has gone up from Mrs. Roosevelt that these bureaucrats "will be defeated by the Representatives of the people," unless the people support the bureaucrats. Which do you prefer to have make your laws and direct your living—the bureaucrats, or your own Representatives? Do you prefer stabilizers, administrators, dictators, coordinators, directors, and so forth, to govern you? Or do you prefer to have laws enacted in the American way by your Representatives in Congress, to determine your rights? Remember, all the bureaucrats are appointed directly or indirectly by the President, while you elect your own Representatives. Any 10-year-old child knows the difference. It is the difference between constitutional Americanism and some form of foreign stateism.

The methods of enforcing the edicts, directives, and regulations issued by these bureaucrats are always arbitrary. They act as prosecutor, judge, and jury all at the same time. Under this New Deal system you do not have the constitutional American right of trial by your peers or fellow citizens. They have a rule of thumb which, in effect, requires so many prosecutions, or shall I say persecutions, to be brought in by each snooper periodically, or he does not earn his money. If this continues, we will have the Gestapo of the Hitler days right here in America.

But they howl that they are trying to prevent inflation, while at the same time and in truth and in fact they are promoting inflation. They are stifling reconversion and putting many concerns out of business. This again is characteristic of the New Deal scheme of things. The New Deal is based upon a philosophy of scarcity. All this red tape slows down production. What we need is abundant production, and we can have it if all of these bureaucrats are sent home and the people are permitted, through their representatives, to enact laws to govern themselves and their transactions with their fellow citizens.

The Greatest Show on Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my attention was recently called to a speech of Frederick C. Crawford delivered before the bureau of advertising of the American Newspaper Publishers Association in New York on April 25, 1946. Mr. Crawford has put into words a graphic picture which every American should see. It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I ask it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> It is a great honor to address the newspapermen of America. It is a double honor to appear between two such distinguished Americans—although I must confess I'm as scared as the Japs when they found themselves caught between the atom bomb and the American Army. I speak as one of the forgotten men of 1946, a manager of American industry, one of three million trying to operate business, big and small. Perhaps my position on the program is not inappropriate, however, the business manager is usually in the middle nowadays.
>
> Eight months ago the war ended, leaving a world of wreckage, hunger, suffering, and shortages. Tremendous production was needed to rebuild our war-torn economy. Production alone can make up the shortages, control inflation, service our debt, and give us strength to aid other nations.
>
> We knew all this. We had planned postwar production for a year before VJ-day. We had the know-how and the means and the manpower. We had learned our war production lesson well.
>
> Let's look at the postwar record. It is 8 months since VJ-day. What a record. No shirts, drawers, autos, lawn mowers, butter, or houses. Meat, lumber, and many other necessities in a disgraceful black market. Strikes and political fights and red ink. Production 6 months behind schedule and shelves bare. All we seem to have accomplished has been to increase the cost of living.
>
> Americans can be ashamed of this record. Unfortunately, people are so pulled and pushed by pressure groups, economic cure-alls, and bureaucratic ballyhoo that they don't have a chance to think of production, to say nothing of understanding what is hamstringing it.
>
> Tonight I call on all newspapermen to find the answer to the question of what is holding production back; to ferret out news stories of production sabotage that can be spread across our front pages, driving home the facts until angry Americans rise in their might and again free the latent forces of American industry.
>
> You fear that these stories won't be news. Whether they are or not, they must be told. In no other way can Americans grasp the

truth about our wrecked production. However, I can assure you that you will be amazed by the stories if you dig them out. We managers live them—stories of production interference, of bureaucratic stupidities, bad leadership, plain dumbness, and real persecution—stories that are as thrilling as murder trials and Reno scandals.

Shakespeare wrote: "All the world's a stage, and all the men and women merely players." I want to add, "all except the newspapermen." The rest of us put on the daily show. You fellows sit in the audience and watch the show. You are the critics. Your job is to report the show to the American people. What a responsibility this imposes on you. You must report accurately, give the more important subjects their proper place, expose the phonies, spread the facts so that the public may have the truth.

Today, life has become more complex. Shakespeare's stage is now a whole circus—side shows, confusion, and all.

Come along with me to the circus and see if we can discover answers to our questions.

We're off. There you see the tents in the distance. That big tent is for the main show. The entrance is over there, and in between is a long street of sideshows. During the war, our armed forces ran the main show. What a performance they gave us. Then on VJ-day the big tent was cleared and in moved American industry for the great job of postwar production—our great American productive system, unique in the world—over a hundred years old, with ingenuity, inventiveness, labor-saving acts never before dreamed of, wages and living standards unequaled.

Here we are inside the entrance, crowds, steam calliopes, noise, confusion. No; this is not the main show. This is the street of side shows, filled with barkers, medicine men, freaks, card sharks, snake charmers, crap shooters, all ready to sell the suckers, and how the crowd loves to be fooled. Unfortunately, there is no other way to get to the main tent.

Here is a show that is quiet. But they have had a big crowd. Look; there are Ickes and Pauley. Both knocked out. And each one has a horseshoe hidden in his glove. They must have had them, as the old boxer once said, "Just for good luck."

And here's one we sure want to visit, the genuine opium den. Look at all the security boys dressed up like Chinamen, playing soft music to the crowd. "Down with opportunity, up with security—from the cradle to the grave. Freedom from work, freedom from worry, freedom from old age, freedom from everything. Freedom from freedom. Put your vote in the box, come in and buy a pipe, and smoke your worries away. Let the taxpayer support you." It does look pretty attractive. Look at the crowd flocking in. Crowds that ought to be at work in the big tent. They know it's a phony, but they want to give it a try.

Look over across the way. There is a real old-fashioned medicine show, snake oil, and all. Why, those are the full-employment boys, handing out bottles marked "full-employment bill." "Cures all economic ills. The Government owes you a living. Why work? Everything planned for you once a year. Jobs made to order. Drop your vote in the box and the bottle is yours."

Look at that side show. It is a boxing match. Walter Reuther and R. J. Thomas slug it out for the UAW belt. Hear the crowd yell! Exciting? I am told 175,000 GM workers quit their jobs in the big tent to watch that scrap and just about closed up all automobile production in the big show.

There is a sword swallower and fire eater—John Lewis spits fire. Same old show every year, with minor variations. "How to quit without striking. Beat Murray or bust."

Look at the crowd around this one, one of the biggest in the street, with a whopping sign which reads, "Crystal gazer. Soothsayer. Fortune teller. Yogi. Also Secretary of Commerce in spare time. Sees all, knows all." Boy, has he a following!

Hear the barker yell. "Drop your vote in the box and see the great side show. 'Alice in Wallace Land.' Prophecies on all subjects." They tell me he prophesied 8,000,000 unemployed by April 1946. But the last prophecy took the prize: 25 percent wage increase and no price rise."

On beyond, the next booth is empty. Ah, they were the fact-finders. You don't hear any more about them. Their slogan, "We fit facts to any conclusion—tell us your conclusion and we'll manufacture the facts to fit." Step up and drop your vote in the box. They fooled millions, including many good reporters. They got headlines and columns until they were found out to be phonies. Even the other sideshow boys couldn't stomach them, and chased them out.

There on the end of the line is the noisiest barker of all. He has just about drowned out the calliope. All dressed up like Sir Galahad on a white horse and a sign reading, "Barker Bowles. Sleight of hand, tricks done with mirrors." His show is entitled: "Things ain't what they seem to be: or The Battle of the Bulge." "The only magician who can inflate a balloon without its going up." He has a balloon all blown up and nearly ready to burst. He juggles 8,000,000 prices till the shelves are bare. The trumpets blare—an important announcement is made: "OPA ceilings removed on shoe horns, glass balls, cat's beds, artificial grass, manhole covers, and moose calls."

On it goes, show after show, in this street of American side shows. Excitement. Fun. Most people know in their hearts that these side shows are phonies, but all love to take a gamble. And the newspaperman finds the shows a reporter's heaven. Side shows always make news—always supply headlines that sell papers. Is it any wonder that people are confused and production neglected? What a tragedy that America and all the world desperately awaits production while we monkey around with side shows.

Finally we enter the big tent where American industry struggles to get going.

We see the best management know-how in the world, and the best workmen of any country or time. Lines of machinery are moving into place. Blueprints and plans were long ago complete. All that is needed is a cleared ring and a free go-ahead to break all records. Yet somehow production is at a standstill. Why?

Let us look back to VJ-day. We all knew production was the great need of postwar. Hopes were high. Postwar plans were a dime a dozen. We even talked of a half million automobiles by Christmas.

At that time, a great fear took hold of many in high office. They foresaw terrible spiraling inflation ahead, the cashing of war bonds, billions in savings to be spent, purchasing power at an all-time high, and shortages in every line. A terrific demand that was certain to bid up prices. They must call out the OPA, strengthen its war powers and hold the line, perhaps push it back. So our Government forged one arm of a great pincer movement.

At just about the same time, many in high office was seized with another fear and behold, it was a fear of drastic deflation. They foresaw 8,000,000 unemployed by April of 1946. Millions of returning servicemen whose only opportunity would be apple selling. No more overtime pay and a reduction in take-home pay of 30 percent. Surely purchasing power would collapse; deflation was ahead. Specter of 1933. What to do? Of course, maintain purchasing power; wages must go up.

Then just at the right moment, a great discovery was made. This was revealed in the now famous report. Wages could rise 25 percent with no increase in price.

The news of this miracle spread like wildfire. Then came the famous fact-finders and went into secret session with the phony report. They labored mightily and brought forth the magic word—18½ cents. Why not 17½ cents? Why not 19 cents? No one knows. It was probably a divine inspiration. Eighteen and one-half cents will save America! Again the news spread like wildfire. Reason and economics went out the window. That thousands and thousands of industries had no wage problem, that thousands had already adjusted wages and entered into solemn contracts was all ignored. All over the land men cried "18½ cents or bust!" All collective bargaining ended; labor contracts became scraps of paper. Great industries shut down in strikes. Even today 900 new strikes are listed for the immediate future—an all-time high, and all over the magic phrase "18½ cents or bust!"

Thus the second arm of a great pincer movement came into being. Think of it, gentlemen! An administration determined to fight inflation and deflation at exactly the same time. And fight them with all their bureaucratic war powers. A pincer movement has terrific crushing power. In war, whole armies are destroyed by it. Just so, industry found itself crushed between the arm of OPA frozen prices rigidly held above—and the steadily rising wage cost down below.

Let me give this pincer movement a more fitting name and call it "The great nutcracker of 1946."

All management knows that by and large, wage is cost and cost is price. They move together like the stars in the heavens. Business lives on the narrow margin between cost and price. Now business finds itself in the jaws of the great nutcracker and the jaws begin to move! Bones crush—and the blood runs. When management cries for help—the nutcracker boys yell "Irresponsible profiteers—see their tongues hanging out for profits." God knows, our tongues were hanging out all right! I speak feelingly, because I have been in the nutcracker's jaws—I have felt the bones crush—and seen the red juices run down the ledger pages. Tough old industry has stood many a kicking around and still managed to keep us in food, clothing, and shelter. But never before has it faced a squeeze-play like this one. Quit or die or black market were the only choices of many.

In a summary of 700 companies, 400 had been forced to quit making some important article. In a Washington survey, 8 out of 10 items had disappeared from the shelves or been forced up substantially in price. Whole industries have been squeezed out by the black market!

Gentlemen, that is the story of the postwar production flop! You just can't put industry in a nutcracker and still have the overwhelming out-flow of low cost goods that is the key to our problems. And just as long as the side-show boys steal the show, production will go from one flop to another.

Can we do anything about it? You bet we can, and much of the job is yours. Get stirred up. Dig out the stories of the nutcracker of 1946. Dramatize them. Spread them across your pages until all good Americans rise in anger and again free the great latent productive powers of American industry.

Evanston Receives First Prize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, as a resident of Evanston, Ill., I am proud to rise on the floor of the House of Repre-

sentatives at this time to announce that another great honor goes to my city.

At the President's Highway Safety Conference today, Lt. Frank M. Andrews, director of the bureau of accident prevention of the Evanston, Ill., Police Department, received for Evanston the first prize in the National Traffic Safety Contest for 1945 in cities of 50,000 to 100,000 population. My city of Evanston went 13 months and 18 days without a single traffic death—throughout 1945 to February 19, 1946.

Evanston is the well spring of the traffic safety movement and the only three-time winner of the grand prize for traffic safety in cities of all sizes.

Has Uncle Sam Entered the Black Market?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, in these days when we hear so much about black marketing, one sometimes wonders how many of our citizens are free from black-market taint. The people have been driven to desperation. They have been pushed around and kicked around by the New Dealocrats until they have become desperate. They are mad—fighting mad, in some instances—and they cannot be blamed for it. Their activities have been so hedged about and proscribed by directives, orders, and regulations of the various bureaus, that they find it difficult to know what to do, or which way to turn. They are exasperated.

The great Apostle Paul, in his letter to the Romans, chapter IV, verse 15, wisely said, "Because the law worketh wrath; for where no law is, there is no transgression." A freer interpretation is sometimes used to simplify and clarify the meaning of this sound philosophical statement of the wise man of the First Century, A. D. Before the law there was no sin.

Let us apply this to black marketing. Before there were OPA regulations and other bureaucratic controls, there was no black marketing. Before the bureaucrats arbitrarily rationed our food, clothing, and shelter, we were all free American citizens, and acted on our own judgment as to what we would eat, wear, and have for shelter. We would be doing so today, if it were not for OPA restrictions and regulations.

We have heard a lot recently about the pressure groups, and their attempts to influence Congressmen and legislation. Be not mistaken—pressure groups are at work here in Washington. The greatest propaganda agency and pressure groups ever known are in evidence here. They were most prominent during the consideration by the House of the bill to continue the life of the OPA. These pressure groups were OPA employees from the great army which OPA employs here in Washington. The bureaucrats generally stick together, and they consolidated and threw a barrage down upon the Members of Congress in a desperate attempt to get the House to give the OPA longer life and unrestricted control of the activities of our people. They have attempted to poison the minds of various groups of our citizens. OPA is directly responsible for a lot of our housing shortage for the veterans, our production shortages and limitations, and our black marketing. They would not exist if we did not have OPA regulations, restrictions, and controls.

Millions upon millions of dollars of taxpayers' money are spent by the bureaucrats, including OPA, every year, to propagandize the public. Every pay envelope suffers deductions from the salary of the employee, a part of which goes to pay the salaries of the bureaucrats to tell the people what they must and must not do. A part of each deduction goes to pay the grocery bills of every other citizen in the country. They call this subsidy, and they make the poor man pay part of his salary for subsidies, which is nothing but a bureaucratic scheme to fool the people in a pretense of holding the line on prices under the guise of preventing inflation.

Mrs. Roosevelt, in condemning Congress for wanting to curb the autocratic rule of OPA, recently said in her daily syndicated article that she is receiving letters from "veterans and people who have to live on fixed incomes, complaining about the high cost of living and the difficulty of finding inexpensive clothes. The manufacturers make more profit these days if they make expensive clothes, so people who can only afford the less expensive variety are having a hard time. In the old days, a man's suit could be bought for $35, but now it costs at least $50; and a woman's dress which could be bought for $15 now costs at least $30." This is a frank admission that prices have already skyrocketed, that women's dresses have gone up at least 100 percent under the rule of the OPA, which was supposed to hold the line on prices. There are many items on which OPA has authorized price ceilings, which have advanced as much as Mrs. Roosevelt says women's dresses have advanced. Who is holding the price line? Is it the OPA?

OPA comes out occasionally with glaring headlines that they have released price controls on snowshoes, cow bells, bull rings, and unglazed flowerpots. That is the way they have of telling you what they are accomplishing, and how fast they are progressing in their decontrol program.

After studying the MAP, Maximum Average Price Control order of OPA, you will know why the manufacturers are making medium-priced clothing and selling it at the top prices. This is all according to OPA decisions and plans. It is planned economy for you. It is bureaucracy in action.

By the time you add the black-market premium to the inflated OPA ceiling prices and get an inferior item of merchandise, do you think OPA has stung you? That is inflation of the worst sort. We have it, and we all know it.

The peculiar thing about OPA is that nearly everybody wants it applied to the other fellow, but nobody wants it applied to his own line of endeavor. The farmers do not want it applied to them. In a recent survey which I made by sending out questionnaires to every boxholder on rural and star routes and in small towns without free city delivery of mail in my district, the farmers, or those who designated themselves as farmers, signed the answers, indicating that 20.61 percent of those farmers are in favor of an extension of OPA, while 79.39 percent are opposed to extension of OPA.

The Governor of Oklahoma, an ardent New Deal advocate, recently testified before the House Banking and Currency Committee and gave figures to show that the production of crude oil is far in excess of the demand. We have been told that when supply catches up with demand, the controls will be released. The Governor insisted upon release of controls on oil. Incidentally, he has made his fortune in oil.

The manufacturers want price controls released on their production. Who would not? There is something wrong with any system where everybody whom it affects wants it removed from their respective lines of endeavor.

Secretary of Agriculture Clinton Anderson, recently testifying before the Senate Banking Committee, stated that legitimate packers were unable to get cattle for slaughter, and intimated that black markets were getting plenty of cattle. Apparently, he is willing to give OPA 90 days to make a further trial of its powers to right the grievous wrongs that have developed. No one can read his testimony and believe that the Secretary considers the OPA a success in controlling meat prices. The housewives would be able to corroborate his statement.

On May 3, 1946, after Representative WADSWORTH, of New York, had told of his having spent 3 days last week at the Chicago Stockyards, where he had an opportunity to observe first-hand the "utter demoralization" of the livestock market with respect to slaughter cattle (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 4418), Speaker RAYBURN stated:

> I think the membership of the House in general should understand that I was not enamored of all the amendments offered to the OPA bill * * * but if I had my way I would have joined the gentleman from New York in passing his amendment insofar as it related to cattle, because I feel that I know that with 80,000,000 cattle in the United States there is a number and production that is sufficient.
>
> I may say to the gentleman from New York and to others that I have spoken to people in high places and told them that I think that cattle ought to be removed from control.

Speaker RAYBURN and others in the cattle business naturally and properly feel the effect of OPA price regulations on cattle and want them removed substantially as provided by the amendment of Representative WADSWORTH, which passed in the Committee of the Whole House but was defeated on a roll call by those who favored continuation of OPA price control on meat.

But Uncle Sam has entered the black market. On April 19, 1946, Mr. Chester Bowles, Economic Stabilization Director, issued a directive, ordering:

The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, to purchase approximately 50,000,000 bushels of corn at prices 30 cents above the applicable maximum prices under the regulations of the Office of Price Administration and to resell such corn for export, for the manufacture of corn products as specified by the Secretary of Agriculture, and for such other purposes as will be effective in directly alleviating the famine emergency. Such purchases shall be made only from producers eligible for loans under the 1945 corn loan program.

It is obvious that a farmer cannot sell his neighbor a bushel of corn for more than the ceiling price fixed by OPA. But Uncle Sam can pay 30 cents a bushel more for that same corn and "resell such corn for export, for the manufacture of corn products as specified by the Secretary of Agriculture, and for such other purposes as will be effective in directly alleviating the famine emergency." Again the long arm of the bureaucrats reaches further than that of the farmer. The taxpayers are paying the bill. The taxpayers are paying this 30 cents per bushel premium. Is it any worse for an individual citizen to buy from his neighbor who produces corn and pay 30 cents per bushel above the OPA ceiling price than it is for one of the bureaus to do so and pay for it out of the taxpayer's money and ship it abroad or sell it locally? Has not Uncle Sam entered the black market? Is not Uncle Sam the greatest black-market purchaser known today? This black-market price of 30 cents per bushel on 50,000,000 bushels means the taxpayers will have to pay black-market prices on this one item alone in the sum of a million five hundred thousand dollars.

But this is not all. On the same day, April 19, 1946, the same Chester Bowles, as Economic Stabilization Director, issued another order authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to pay a bonus of 30 cents per bushel on all wheat delivered to Commodity Credit Corporation on or before May 25, 1946. Again, is Uncle Sam in the black market? No one knows how much wheat will be bought at this black-market price, but it is morally certain that the amount will be tremendous. Then the wheat and the corn that is bought with the taxpayers' money at black-market premiums will be given away. At the same time, we are asked to reduce our consumption of bread and of wheat and corn products.

Naturally, the producers of wheat and corn are up in arms. This situation curtails freedom of buying and selling unless they sell at black-market rates to Uncle Sam and receive the taxpayers' money in payment for their product.

A lot of consumers do not like this. The following letter from a prominent Democrat, who is a county judge of one of the counties of my district, has just written me as follows:

This is a voice crying in the wilderness. This morning the Prim bread truck left out of Nowata with less than half a load. The driver stated that he had nothing at all for Lenapah and South Coffeyville. I realize that you are annoyed by a lot of complaints. I don't expect you to do anything about the present complaint, except in a general way. The voice of the people has been stilled. They have been taught that the famine in Europe is a terrible specter in the form of suffering and emaciated children. This may be a selfish attitude, but I have in mind throwing a plate at the first waitress that rations bread to me. Perhaps we should go back to 1934. I recall selling some wheat at 25 cents per bushel.

I am also in receipt of the following letter from a prominent Democrat of Oklahoma, who is a member of the house of representatives of the State legislature:

MAY 3, 1946.

Hon. GEORGE SCHWABE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: On behalf of myself and hundreds of my friends and business associates here in Ada and Pontotoc County, I want to register my protest against the present plans for the marketing and sale of wheat whereby the Federal Government can go into the wheat market and pay 30 cents above the ceiling price on wheat and thus deprive the flour mills of our country of sufficient quantity of wheat to keep in operation. Today our local Ada Milling Co. will have to shut down because of its inability to buy wheat. They formerly had a pay roll of $18,000 per month but from today they will only have a few men to maintain their plant.

Now I realize our Government is extremely anxious to feed the starving millions of the world, and there isn't a single American but who is willing to help, but I for one am not in favor of starving Americans who have, since the beginning of our country, attended to their own affairs—have never waged a war of aggression—just in order to feed the millions of Europe, except those who are the victims of Nazi aggression.

Surely there must be some way of handling this matter without choking up the life springs of our national existence.

Please do something about this and thus aid the citizens and industries of your State.

Very truly yours,
THOMAS P. HOLT,
State Representative,
Pontotoc County.

The millers, the bakers, and the suppliers of food, the housewives, the restaurant operators, are all up in arms, and they all express about the same type of resentment.

Who is to blame? There is but one answer. Bureaucracy in this country has deprived the people of their liberties. We have inflation, and we have arbitrary and unreasonable controls. We have scarcity and high prices. Production is so hamstrung that the people are threatened with dire want while we attempt to feed whole nations abroad. Uncle Sam is in the black market to get what we need here at home for our own people, the administration is curtailing and stifling production, throwing people out of employment, resulting in strikes and shutdowns and business failures, while tax money is being spent riotously and our substance given to other people.

Let us take Uncle Sam out of the black market, out of competition with our citizens, and get back on the even keel of American principles in business.

Trends in Federal Law and Procedure—An Article by Hon. Grover M. Moscowitz, United States District Judge, Eastern District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 8, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. Grover M. Moscowitz, United States district judge, eastern district of New York. This article appeared in the New York University Law Quarterly Review of January 1946 and is one of a series of constructive and helpful addresses and articles made by this distinguished judge, who has served creditably in the eastern district of New York for upward of 20 years.

TRENDS IN FEDERAL LAW AND PROCEDURE
(Hon. Grover M. Moscowitz)

The last 15 years have been epochal in the judicial field as well as elsewhere. First a major depression and then a catastrophic war have revolutionized traditional concepts of well-being and the most efficacious methods of attaining the ultimate good for all. National legislation and its interpretation by the Federal judiciary have responded to these stimuli by concentrating in the central government an ever-tightening control over the activities of the individual. Perhaps it may be said that these changes represent trends[1] but exhaustively to relate the precrisis history of Federal law and to appraise the extent and permanency of these recent changes would require many volumes. The trends to be encompassed within the scope of this article shall be those which have manifested themselves in the general course of the judicial process in the Federal courts without reference to unorthodox disruptions.

Improvement in Federal administration of justice, which has acquired the proportions of a full-scale trend, received its most poignant impetus with the establishment of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.[2] Ably piloted by Hon. Henry P. Chandler, as director, the office serves as a focal point in the Federal system for gathering, compilation, analysis, and dissemination of extensive statistical data and beneficial information amongst all United States courts.[3] Of the many advantageous measures supported by Mr. Chandler and his staff, those recently adopted by the Congress include the provisions for official court reporters,[4] for an increased number and reclassification of law clerks to judges,[5] and

[1] Henry S. Fraser, editor of the Lawyer Service Letter of the N. Y. S. B. Ass'n. Letter 105, p. 435, Oct. 31, 1945, reflected: "The treading upon the individual by the masses, and the acquiescence of courts and legislatures in the clamant demands of the crowd, bespeak a portent of disturbing significance."

[2] 53 Stat. 1223 (1939), 28 U. S. C. A. § 444–450. Several States have adopted administrative organizations patterned after the Federal office, e. g., West Virginia, 29 J. Am. Jud. Soc. 27.

[3] Dockets are noticeably less laggard since periodic reports of pending cases are required to be made to the Administrative Office.

[4] 58 Stat. 5, 28 U. S. C. A. § 9a.

[5] The Judiciary Appropriations Act, Pub. L. No. 61, 79th Cong., 1st sess. (1945).

for court criers on a salary basis.[6] The Administrative Office merits commendation for its sponsorship of these advancements.[7]

The amount and character of litigation in the Federal courts follow no prescribed trend or cycle. While recent congressional legislation has vested the Federal courts with continually expanding jurisdiction over new fields, decline of volume in other spheres of Federal control has acted as an offset. For instance, while Government civil suits during the last fiscal year doubled in number those of the previous year (20,895 to 43,110), largely due to the enforcement of price and rationing regulations, the number of bankruptcy cases filed was one-third less than the year before and the lowest since the enactment of the present Bankruptcy Act in 1898.[8]

While it is doubtful if any statement may be made in absolute assurance that it will not be disputed, I have no hesitancy in asserting it as my view that the trend which most significantly evidences a closer approach to moral justice under the law is in the transfer from the legislature to the courts of the power to prescribe their rules of procedure. This development received its greatest stimulus from the successful experience of the Federal rules of civil procedure, which became effective September 16, 1938.[9] By the act of June 19, 1934,[10] Congress lodged in the Supreme Court of the United States the rule making power in civil matters. The yeoman work of formulating rules befell a committee under the very able guidance of Hon. William D. Mitchell but the most remarkable observation to be made regarding the result is that it represented the combined thoughts and efforts of every informed segment of the profession, the suggestions of any interested party having been considered and drafts of the proposed rules having been submitted for discussion to various bar groups and members of the judiciary. A like practice was followed by the committee under the eminent and competent chairmanship of Arthur T. Vanderbilt,[11] appointed by the Supreme Court on February 3, 1941, to formulate rules of criminal procedure.[12] That task has been completed and the rules which the Supreme Court has adopted will become effective on March 21, 1946.[13] This method has been aptly characterized as "another triumph of the democratic process."[14]

Under the Conformity Act,[15] the Federal courts had long been required to ascertain and apply the procedure of the courts of the State in which they were sitting. Uniformity was nonexistent and cumbersome State codes were often antiquated and difficult to decipher. The simplicity of the new Federal rules alone would amply justify their adoption[16] but they offer many additional advantages, not the least being the facility with which they may be amended should the need arise.[17] The spirit in which the civil rules are to be administered is manifest in their own provisions. By rule 1, they "shall be construed to secure the just, speedy and inexpensive determination of every action." Rule 8 (f) directs that "all pleadings shall be so construed as to do substantial justice." The courts have been inculcated with this spirit[18] and the elimination of technical niceties from Federal practice has materially aided the attainment of moral justice.

Perhaps the most salutary of the new Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is rule 16, which provides that the court may in its discretion, in any action, direct the attorneys for the parties to appear before it for a conference to consider any matter which may aid in the disposition of the case.[19] "Pretrial," as it has come to be known, had a history of successful experience in England (there called "summons for direction"), Scotland, Detroit and Boston[20] but its advocacy for the Federal courts was nevertheless subjected to the reactionary opposition which meets any innovation. As a result, rule 16 leaves the employment of pretrial entirely to the discretion of the court, both in the fact and manner of its use. However, it has been my experience after 7 years since its adoption—and my conclusion is evidently shared by many of the district judges[21]—that pretrial has produced, and is capable of producing, excellent results, contingent largely upon the spirit in which it is employed.

Originally conceived to be a device for relieving congested calendars, the merits of pretrial far exceed the accomplishment of this purpose. Even in courts where the calendars are up to date and congestion is not a problem, the advantage to litigants of reducing the time and consequently the expense of trial is welcome. Opposing counsel are seldom sufficiently known to each other to permit out-of-court admissions of authenticity of documents or other proof or of numerous facts upon which the parties may be in actual agreement but which appear to be in dispute under the pleadings. Such time-saving concessions may be readily made under the surveillance of a judge at a pretrial conference if he has engendered the confidence that no prejudice will result. It may also develop that the parties had merely misinterpreted each other's claims and that the only question upon which they are not in agreement is one of law alone, obviating the necessity of a jury trial entirely. Sometimes settlement of the litigation is the consequence of the unveiling at pretrial of unanticipated weak points in one side or the other. However, judges conducting pretrial conferences should be careful not to give the impression of advocating that the attorneys settle the matter; the failure to observe this precaution accounts for what disfavor exists with pretrial on the part of attorneys who feel that they are badgered into yielding their clients' interests rather than to affront a judge by refusing the proposed offer. Adjustment by litigants of their disputes, with the consequent saving of time and expense to themselves and the court is desirable, but a suggestion to the attorneys that they discuss the possibilities of settlement should be the limit of impetus from the court.

Some districts have adopted the practice of requiring all civil cases to be pretried and a regular pretrial calendar is employed, a practice which I heartily favor. When the court has determined to hold a pretrial conference, appearance by the attorneys is mandatory and defaults or nonsuits may be entered upon their unexplained absence,[22] but even in the southern district of New York where a pretrial calendar is used, cases appear thereon only upon the initiative of the judge or by request to the judge by the attorney for one of the parties. Many lawyers are as yet unaware of the advantages of pretrial and go to trial even though they would have been in favor of a conference if it had been required. It is a rare case in which nothing can be accomplished on pretrial and the duplication which a compulsory docket

[6] 58 Stat. 796, 28 U. S. C. A. § 9.

[7] Despite the additions just mentioned, total judicial and administrative personnel has been decreased some 17 percent during the past five years. Report of the Director of the Administrative Office to the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges on Sept. 25, 1945, 4 F. R. D. 488.

[8] Statistics from the Report of the Director, op. cit. supra, and the Report of the Judicial Conference, Sept. 1945.

[9] Many of the States are showing interest in judicial rule making (S. A. Harris, The Rule-Making Power, Judicial Administration Monographs, Series A, No. 1, prepared under the auspices of the A. B. A. Special Committee on Improving the Administration of Justice) and it is hoped that all will eventually adopt this worthwhile reform.

[10] 48 Stat. 1064 (1934), 28 U. S. C. A. § 723.

[11] Former president of the A. B. A., presently Dean of New York University School of Law.

[12] 54 Stat. 688 (1940), 18 U. S. C. A. § 687, which provides in part: "Such rules shall not take effect until they shall have been reported to Congress by the Attorney General at the beginning of a regular session thereof and until after the close of such session."

[13] Already intensive study is under way to determine to what extent the Federal rules can be utilized for improvement of criminal procedure in the States. Reports of Committees of the Section of Judicial Administration to be presented at the annual meeting of the A. B. A. on Dec. 13, 1945.

[14] Hon. Homer S. Cummings, former Attorney General of the United States, in a scholarly consideration of the rule-making power, in 31 A. B. A. J. 236.

[15] 17 Stat. 197 (1872), 28 U. S. C. A. § 724, 6, 7.

[16] For instance, compare the 86 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, 28 U. S. C. A., following 723 (c), with the 2,198 provisions of the Civil Practice Act, Rules of Civil Practice, and Surrogate's Court Act of N. Y.

[17] In a report to the Supreme Court, pursuant to order of Nov. 6, 1939, the Advisory Committee was of the opinion that no need for amendments to the rules existed at that time. 1 F. R. D. 79. A second preliminary draft of proposed amendments under date of May 1945 has now been circulated by the committee for the purpose of receiving comments and suggestions from anyone interested in contributing them by Dec. 1, 1945.

[18] *Engl* v. *Aetna Life Ins. Co.* (139 F. (2d) 469 (C. C. A. 2d, 1943); *Barter* v. *Eastern S. S. Lines* (1 F. R. D. 65) (S. D. N. Y. 1939); *Spaeth* v. *Warner Bros. Pictures* (1 F. R. D. 729) (S. D. N. Y. 1941); *Clark* v. *Chase Nat'l Bank* (2 F. R. D. 94) (S. D. N. Y. 1941); petition of Ernst (2 F. R. D. 447) (S. D. Cal. 1942); *United States ex rel. Edelstein* v. *Brussell Sewing Mach. Co.* (3 F. R. D. 87) (S. D. N. Y. 1943).

[19] Rule 16 specifies five matters to be considered, namely: (1) the simplification of the issues, (2) the necessity or desirability of amendments to the pleadings, (3) the possibility of obtaining admissions of fact and of documents which will avoid unnecessary proof, (4) the limitation of the number of expert witnesses, (5) the advisability of a preliminary reference of issues to a master for findings to be used as evidence when the trial is to be by jury, but then adds an omnibus subdivision which eliminates all restriction upon the scope of the discussion, i. e., "such other matters as may aid in the disposition of the action."

[20] Shafroth, Pre-Trial Techniques of Federal Judges (4 F. R. D. 183 (1945), 28 J. Am. Jud. Soc. 39); Notes of Advisory Committee on Rules (28 U. S. C. A., § 723c, following rule 16); Sunderland, the Function of Pre-Trial Procedure (6 U. of Pitt. L. Rev. 1 (1939)).

[21] Mr. Shafroth, in his article summarizes the opinions of some thirty district judges who responded to Judge Parker's invitation to comment on pretrial in their courts (ibid., 4 F. R. D. at 184, 28 J. Am. Jud. Soc., at 40). See also Bull. No. 5, A. B. A., Oct. 20, 1945, item X.

[22] Holtzoff, New Federal Procedure and the Courts (1940) 115; *Wisdom* v. *Texas Co.* (27 F. Supp. 992 (N. D. Ala. 1939)). It is to be noted that there is no specific authority for sanctions with reference to pretrial but Rule 41 (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure authorizes dismissal of an action for failure to comply with the rules or any order of the court; obviously, this would be effective only against plaintiffs who did not appear at a pretrial conference.

would entail in those few cases would be insignificant when compared with the time saved as a whole. Another very helpful benefit to attorneys is that the length of the trial may be estimated fairly accurately after pretrial and a day certain may be assigned to the case, eliminating the inconvenience of counsel holding themselves and witnesses in readiness for an indefinite period.

As a practical matter, pretrial before me operates something like this. I think the best time for the conference is from 2 to 6 weeks prior to the regular trial date, at which stage the nature of the proof to be offered is known to the attorneys but the expense of obtaining witnesses and the time consumed in preparing them has not yet been incurred. I read the pleadings in advance of the hearing to get an idea of what the real issues are. I hold the conference in chambers and try to create an informal atmosphere, although I do have a stenographer present to report the proceedings. While it is the view of some persons that the formality of a record discourages frankness on the part of the attorneys, in a metropolitan area such as ours with its diversity of cases, perhaps coming before a number of judges, it is a practical necessity; it is also very helpful toward drawing an order which accurately embodies the action taken at the conference. I have each attorney state his position and then permit them to ask each other questions concerning concessions which may be made or on any matter directed toward narrowing the issues and obviating the necessity of formal proof upon the trial. I also ask any questions which suggest themselves as aiding these purposes. After the conference is over, I direct that an order be entered in accordance with rule 16, its recital being binding upon the parties at the trial.[23] It has been held that where an order after pretrial is definitive in its terms and is acquiesced in by able attorneys for both sides, admissions may not be repudiated by new attorneys for one of the parties.[24] It stands to reason that if admissions of counsel on the record at a pretrial conference cannot be relied upon by the court to the same extent as those made on the record at a trial, the proceeding would have no force or validity and the advantage I have been discussing would be illusory. I had occasion only recently to hold that the Government, participating in a pretrial of a suit under the Tucker Act, is bound by the admissions made on the record by the assistant United States attorney just as would be an attorney for a private litigant and that such admissions cannot later be repudiated by a special representative from Washington who takes over the conduct of the litigation.[25]

One of the most ambitious and commendable efforts in behalf of making more widely known and appreciated the merits of pretrial procedure was the clinic held under the joint auspices of the Special Committee on Improving the Administration of Justice and the Section of Judicial Administration of the American Bar Association on September 12, 1944 as a part of the program of the annual meeting of the association. The entire proceedings have been published and are available for study by the profession.[26] Consideration is currently being given in many States to the extension of this meritorious practice to State court procedure.[27]

It will suffice briefly to mention a few of the other rules which have materially aided in freeing civil litigation in the Federal courts from the harshness of technical niceties. No longer must the pleader face the penalty of having his complaint dismissed for want of allegations which satisfy the relatively precise requirements of a "cause of action," under rule 12 (b), he need only set forth a "claim upon which relief can be granted," a provision which has been liberally construed in favor of the pleader.[28] By rule 54 (c), the court is required to grant the relief to which the prevailing party is entitled regardless of the prayer made or the particular legal theory of counsel.[29] A motion under rule 12 (e) to make the complaint more definite and certain or for a bill of particulars has been held to be for the accomplishment of the same purpose [30] and will be granted only to the extent that the information sought is essential to responsive pleading; [31] these motions should not be employed to unduly expand the pleadings, discovery and depositions being the proper methods for obtaining all information outside the category of ultimate facts.[32] The argument has been made that the virtual elimination from Federal practice of bills of particulars [33] prevents the limitation of proof sometimes accomplished thereby but this contention ignores the pretrial procedure by which the same end is much more expeditiously accomplished. Rules 26 through 37 provide the methods of deposition, discovery and interrogatories by which one side may become apprised of any information or proof available to the adversary unless it be privileged or is obviously not relevant; since the examining party need not have the burden of proof upon issues concerning which information is sought,[34] the scope of examination permitted is very broad and rests wholly within the court's discretion.[35]

At least one of the new criminal rules marks the achievement of a long disputed objective which I have often advocated for civil cases as well. I refer to rule 30, which authorizes the court to appoint upon its own initiative expert witnesses from an available panel when the occasion arises. Too often the disagreement among experts is not an honest one and bears a direct relationship to the source of their compensation. Perhaps successful experience in the criminal field will result in the practice being extended to civil litigation, where I believe it is more urgently needed.[36]

I have felt for some time that the traditional rules of evidence are fast becoming obsolete in the Federal courts due to the improvement in the standard of our juries. Reforms in these two fields are closely integrated and I believe that they should proceed apace. It is in the interest of true justice that a witness be permitted to disclose all information, relevant to the matter at issue, unhampered by exclusion of this as "hearsay" and that as a "conclusion," provided the triers of the facts are able properly to evaluate what they hear. Constant interruption by counsel only serves to confuse the witness and cause him to lose the sequence of his thoughts, often the purpose of the objectant.

There is a noticeable recent trend toward liberalizing evidence rules.[37] The Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit has gone so far as to state for the guidance of trial courts that "there is more danger in refusing than admitting testimony." [38] Perhaps this discarding of blind adherence to historic restrictions has been encouraged by the agitation for standardizing the qualifications of jurors in the Federal courts [39] and

---

[23] Rule 16 provides in this respect: "The court shall make an order which recites the action taken at the conference, the amendments allowed to the pleadings, and the agreements made by the parties as to any of the matters considered, and which limits the issues for trial to those not disposed of by admissions or agreements of counsel; and such order when entered controls the subsequent course of the action, unless modified at the trial to prevent manifest injustice."

[24] *King* v. *Edward Hines Lumber Co.* (62 F. Supp. — — (D. Ore. 1945)).

[25] *Daitz Flying Corp.* v. *United States* (4 F. R. D. 372 (E. D. N. Y. 1945)).

[26] 4 F. R. D. 35—103.

[27] From a visual portrayal published in the February 1945 issue of the Journal of the American Judicature Society (28 J. Am. Jud. Soc. 157), the use of pretrial procedure in State courts as of that time may be tabulated as follows: in only 4 States is pretrial procedure in regular use throughout the State, but in 10 more it is used in the courts of the larger cities and in some small communities or is authorized by court rules which show prospects of probable extensive use; in only 10 States is it not used at all, in the balance being used occasionally by individual judges without authorization by statute or rule or seldom used though authorized. In New York, where its advantages would appear to be greatest, it apparently is rarely, if ever used. In 4 F. R. D. 100, it is reported, regarding the use of pretrial in New York: "Calendar judge in some places asks counsel if they desire to talk settlement in advance of trial and if the answer is affirmative, he will hold the case and endeavor to bring the parties together. However, the pretrial conference, in the usual sense of the term, is not being used in New York, although it was tried for a time on a voluntary basis in the Supreme Court for Kings County."

[28] *Dioguardi* v. *Durning* (139 F. (2d) 774 (C. C. A. 2d, 1944)); *Gins* v. *Mauser Plumbing Supply Co.* (148 F. (2d) 974 (C. C. A. 2d, 1945)).

[29] *United States* v. *Zara Contracting Co.* (146 F. (2d) 606 (C. C. A. 2d, 1944)); *Ring* v. *Spira* (148 F. (2d) 647 (C. C. A. 2d, 1945)).

[30] *Sharp* v. *Pennsylvania-Reading Seashore Lines* (1 F. R. D. 16 (N. J. 1939)).

[31] *Tully* v. *Howard* (27 F. Supp. 6 (S. D. N. Y. 1939)); *Fischback* v. *Solvay Process Co.* (29 F. Supp. 583 (N. D. N. Y. 1939)); *Goldwyn* v. *United States* (35 F. Supp. 633 (S. D. N. Y. 1940)); 1 Moore's Federal Practice (1938) n. 654; Holtzoff, *op. cit. supra*, note 22, at 35–40.

[32] *Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation* v. *Vitamin Technologists* (1 F. R. D. 8 (S. D. Cal. 1939)).

[33] One of the amendments to the civil rules suggested by the Advisory Committee (*supra*, note 17) would actually delete the provision for a bill of particulars.

[34] I discussed this in greater detail in *Laverett* v. *Continental Briar Pipe Co.*, 25 F. Supp. 80 (E. D. N. Y. 1938).

[35] *Hickman* v. *Taylor*, 4 F. R. D. 479 (E. D. Pa. 1945), 45 A. M. C. 1055; *Pueblo Trading Co.* v. *Reclamation District No. 1500*, 4 F. R. D. 471 (N. D. Cal. 1945).

[36] Under the criminal rules, the cost of the experts will be borne by the Government; some provision would have to be made for indigent litigants in civil cases.

[37] See Model Code of Evidence, as adopted and promulgated by the American Law Institute in 1942, a study of which the American Bar Association at its sixty-seventh convention recommended to the Supreme Court Advisory Committee on Civil and Criminal Procedure "with a view to determining how far its provisions should be adopted as rules of procedure for the district courts of the United States" (13 L W 2143).

[38] *Dundom* v. *New York Central Railroad*, 145 F. (2d) 711, 713 (C. C. A. 2d, 1944); *Balchunas* v. *Palmer*, 151 F. (2d) 842 (C. C. A. (2d) 1945 — F. (2d) —. In the latter case, the Court indicates that evidence as to other accidents at the crossing, known to the engineer, might well have been accepted as evidence of the dangerous nature of the crossing and of notice of danger to the railroad.

[39] See Report to the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges of the Committee on Selection of Jurors, September 1942, pp. 6, 31–45; a bill to establish uniform qualifications of jurors in the Federal courts was introduced in the Senate on January 11, 1944 (S. 1623, 78th Cong., 2d sess.) and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

the efforts constantly being made further to enlighten them as to their duties.[40] The very multiplication of exceptions to the hearsay rule which the courts now recognize attest the general belief in the probative value of hearsay evidence, which is further corroborated by its admissibility before most administrative tribunals. The liberality accorded the admission of evidence offered under the Federal shop-book rule [41] is another example. I am of the opinion that the ordinary hospital records are made in the regular course of a business in which it is customary to make such records and that their entire contents should be admitted under the statute.[42] Upon a recent appeal, my admission in evidence of a memorandum of a telephone conversation made by an employee of a bank was sustained,[43] the court again interpreting the Supreme Court decision in *Palmer* v. *Hoffman* as requiring confinement to its own facts, upon the basis of which an engineer's report of a railroad accident was held to be not admissible under the shop-book rule on the ground that "its primary utility is in litigating, not in railroading." [44]

One matter concerning which there has been unusually extensive litigation in the past 3 years is the validity of a conviction where a confession, claimed to have been procured by coercion, is introduced at the trial. What constitutes an unlawful, involuntary confession and the appellate power of the Supreme Court to review a conviction where such a confession was introduced at the trial, are two questions which have perplexed the courts.

The principle is long established that to be admissible in evidence a confession must have been freely and voluntarily made.[45] The voluntary or involuntary character of a confession is determined by a conclusion as to whether the accused, at the time he makes the confession which is introduced in evidence against him, is in possession of "mental freedom" to confess or deny a suspected participation in a crime.[46] The most common form of coercion, where no actual physical abuse is employed, is persistent questioning over long periods of time, often by relays of officers. The Report of the United States National Committee on Law Enforcement states that "it has been known since 1500, at least, that deprivation of sleep is the most effective torture and certain to produce any confession desired." [47] Convictions have recently been reversed by the Supreme Court which were based upon confessions "secured by protracted and repeated questioning of ignorant and untutored persons, in whose minds the power of officers was greatly magnified" [48] or "who have been unlawfully held incommunicado without advice of friends or counsel." [49]

In the now famous McNabb case,[50] the Supreme Court cited the Federal Statutes, which require the arresting officer immediately to take the accused before a committing official [51] and held that a statement elicited from a defendant under circumstances violating these Congressional enactments is not admissible in evidence and a conviction based thereon must be reversed.[52] Similarly, in the companion case of *Anderson* v. *United States*,[53] convictions were reversed even though the Federal officials had the defendants arraigned immediately after arrest by them but where the confessions were procured through cooperation with the State authorities, who had held the defendants some 6 days before the formal Federal arrest. Some courts felt constrained by their construction of these decisions to hold that any statement made by an accused after arrest and before arraignment was inadmissible.[54] Others could not be convinced that these decisions were intended to be revolutionary precedents beyond their own peculiar facts.[55] The Supreme Court has since explained that it had not meant by its decision in the McNabb case to denounce all confessions obtained during a period of illegal detention before arraignment but only those which were coerced by false promises or real threats, illegal detention being one means of possible coercion.[56]

How far the Supreme Court may go in its surveillance of trial procedure to guarantee to the accused a fair trial in accordance with due process of law is the other aspect of this question upon which there is much difference of opinion. It would appear to be the consensus of the more recent decisions that the Supreme Court may make an independent determination of this question upon undisputed facts and reverse the triers of fact if coercion is indicated; [57] however, where there is a dispute as to whether the facts which are charged to be coercive actually occurred, or where different inferences may be drawn from the admitted facts, the appellate tribunal is not to interfere with the determination below even though it might on an original appraisal have come to a contrary conclusion.[58] The McNabb appeal was from a Federal conviction, and the Supreme Court held that it is not confined in such cases to safeguarding constitutional liberties, but that, in its supervisory authority over the administration of justice in the Federal courts, it may cast a vigilant eye over the accused from the time he is apprehended and may formulate and apply rules of evidence which will best shield him from the viciousness of law-enforcement agencies. While it is generally recognized that each State has the right to prescribe the test governing the admission of a confession and that ordinarily the sufficiency in State prosecutions of an instruction on the voluntary character of confessions is held to be a matter of procedure for the State courts alone, the liberal sentiment of the Supreme Court is markedly shown in the recent holding that where the question is properly raised as to whether a defendant has been denied the due process of law guaranteed by the Federal Constitution, that court should not be precluded by the verdict of the jury from determining whether the circumstances under which the confession was made were such that its admission in evidence amounted to a denial of due process.[59]

In *Lyons* v. *Oklahoma*,[60] a conviction was affirmed which was based on a confession found to be voluntary and admissible by the majority even though another confession, not offered in evidence, made but 12 hours earlier, had been coerced.[61] As subsequently interpreted by the Supreme Court, this result may follow only if the contents of the prior confession are submitted to the jury for the single purpose of determining the voluntary character of the later confession introduced in evidence. The Malinski case [62] also involved two confessions given a few days apart, the accused being held in custody during the

---

[40] The Administrative Office of the United States Courts has prepared and made available to the courts a valuable guide entitled "Handbook for Petit Jurors," of which I make extensive use at each trial term. The Women's Federal Jurors Association (E. D. N. Y.) deserves commendation for its splendid accomplishments in better educating its members to their civic responsibilities.

[41] 49 Stat. 1561 (1936), 28 U. S. C. A. § 695.

[42] Accord, *Buckminster's Estate* v. *Commissioner of Int. Rev.*, 147 F. (2d) 331 (C. C. A. 2d, 1944); *Hoffman* v. *Palmer*, 129 F. (2d) 976 (C. C. A. 2d, 1942), rev'd on distinguishable ground, 318 U. S. 109 (1943); *Reed* v. *Order of United Commercial Travelers*, 123 F. (2d) 252 (C. C. A. 2d, 1941); *Ulm* v. *Moore-McCormack Lines*, 115 F. (2d) 492 (C. C. A., 2d, 1940, rehearing denied, 117 F. (2d) 222 (C. C. A. 2d, 1941), cert. denied, 313 U. S. 567; cf. *New York Life Ins. Co.* v. *Taylor*, 147 F. (2d) 297 (App. D. C. 1944). In a recent New York case, the report of a medical examiner containing his findings which he dictated while performing an autopsy, was held to be a record admissible under the equivalent State statute. *People* v. *Nisonoff*, 293 N. Y. 597, 59 N. E. (2d) 420 (1944).

[43] *United States* v. *Moran*, — F. (2d) — (C. C. A. 2d, 1945)

[44] *Palmer* v. *Hoffman*, 318 U. S. 109, 114 (1943) cited supra note 42.

[45] *Bram* v. *United States*, 168 U. S. 532 (1897); *Wan* v. *United States*, 266 U. S. 1 (1924). The general principle was established in the 1700's that a confession forced from the mind by the flattery of hope or the torture of fear was inadmissible. WIGMORE, EVIDENCE (Student's Text Book, 1935) 210.

[46] *Lyons* v. *Oklahoma*, 322 U. S. 596, 602 (1944); *Ashcraft* v. *Tennessee*, 322 U. S. 143, 154 (1944); *Hyler* v. *Florida*, 315 U. S. 411, 413 (1941).

[47] Cited in *The Unconstitutionality of Coerced Confessions*, reprinted in the N. Y. L. J. Oct. 5, 1945, p. 774, col. 2, from an article in the OHIO LAW REVIEW.

[48] *Lisenba* v. *California* (314 U. S. 219, 239–241 (1941)).

[49] *Ward* v. *Texas* (316 U. S. 547 (1942)). In *Wan* v. *United States* (266 U. S. 1 (1924)) the accused was held incommunicado for a week in a hotel room without medical care although he was extremely sick and in need of a doctor.

[50] *McNabb* v. *United States* (318 U. S. 332 (1943)).

[51] 31 Stat. 958 (1901), 18 U. S. C. A. § 595; 49 Stat. 77 (1935), 5 U. S. C. A. § 300 (a).

[52] After the Supreme Court's reversal of the conviction of murder in the second degree (45-year sentence), upon a new trial the defendants were convicted for voluntary manslaughter (9 years, 3 months sentence). This conviction has been sustained, 142 F. (2d) 904 (C. C. A. 6th, 1944) it now appearing from additional evidence of circumstances surrounding the giving of the confessions, that accused actually were arraigned before and committed by a United States commissioner shortly after apprehension.

[53] 318 U. S. 350 (1943).

[54] *E. g., United States* v. *Haupt* (136 F. (2d) 661 (C. C. A. 7th, 1943)).

[55] *E. g., United States* v. *Grote* (140 F. (2d) 413 (C. C. A. 2d, 1944)); *United States* v. *Keegan* (141 F. (2d) 248 (C. C. A. 2d, 1944) rev'd on other grounds, — U. S. — (1945)).

[56] *United States* v. *Mitchell* (322 U. S. 65 (1944)); see also *Sykes* v. *United States* (143 F. (2d) 140, App. D. C. (1944)); *Ruhl* v. *United States* (148 F. (2d) 173 (C. C. A. 10th, 1945)).

[57] *Malinski* v. *People* (324 U. S. 401, 404 (1945)); *Ashcraft* v. *Tennessee* (322 U. S. 143 (1944)); *Lisenba* v. *California* (314 U. S. 219 (1941)); *Chambers* v. *Florida* (309 U. S. 227 (1940)).

[58] *Lyons* v. *Oklahoma* (322 U. S. 596, 602 (1944)); *Lisenba* v. *California*, 314 U. S. 219, 238 (1941)).

[59] *Ward* v. *Texas* (316 U. S. 547, 550 (1942)); *Lyons* v. *Oklahoma* (314 U. S. 219 (1941)).

[60] 314 U. S. 219 (1941).

[61] Black and Murphy, JJ., dissenting, felt that it was inconceivable that this uneducated accused could be possessed of mental freedom only 12 hours after an earlier confession had been elicited in an admittedly coercive atmosphere, including such gruesome practices as brutality and the placing on his lap of a pan of the victim's bones.

[62] 324 U. S. 401 (1945).

interim. The contention of the prosecution that the first confession, clearly coerced, had been submitted to the jury merely to demonstrate the voluntary character of the second, sanctioned by the Lyons case, was rejected by the Supreme Court upon its findings that reference had been made in the presence of the jury to the first confession, by witnesses for the prosecution, and by the district attorney in summation.[63] The 4 to 3 affirmance by the Court of Appeals of the State of New York of the conviction was reversed without reaching the question of whether the second confession, introduced in evidence, was voluntary or not.

Another principle which the Supreme Court apparently has established in the Malinski case is that a judgment of conviction must be reversed where an involuntary confession has been improperly introduced at the trial, even though evidence apart from the confession might have been sufficient to sustain the jury's verdict.[64] The questions concerning involuntary confessions are far from settled, as evidenced by the difference of judicial opinion in most of the recent Supreme Court decisions, not to mention the variances on the way up the appellate ladder. But the trend toward an ever-increasing vigilance on the part of the Federal court to protect the rights of a defendant in a criminal case is apparent. It has recently been reaffirmed by the Supreme Court that perjury committed before a grand jury or upon a trial does not justify exertion by a Federal court of its statutory contempt power[65] and that evidence of an obstruction to the judicial process must be clearly shown before it may be lawfully invoked.[66]

The writ of habeas corpus has for many centuries been regarded as a palladium of liberty and it is to be hoped that it will always so remain. Although almost from its inception, as is so often the case with privileges coveted by the majority, the writ has been employed by some persons for purposes foreign to the intendment of the protection it affords, since about 1940 a marked trend appears to have developed toward the growth of this abuse in the increasing number of meritless petitions for writs of habeas corpus seeking to have tried anew every conceivable form of "gripe" with the proceedings which resulted in the petitioner's confinement.[67] Judge Arnold, of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, in a recent decision appropriately and amusingly described this trend as follows:

"It is well known that the drafting of petitions for habeas corpus has become a game in many penal institutions. Convicts are not subject to the deterrents of prosecution for perjury and contempt of court which affect ordinary litigants. The opportunity to try his former lawyer has an undoubted attraction to a disappointed prisoner. In many cases there is no written transcript and so he has a clear field for the exercise of his imagination. He may realize that his allegations will not be believed but the relief from monotony offered by a hearing in court is well worth the trouble of writing them down. To allow a prisoner to try the issue of the effectiveness of his counsel under a liberal definition of that phrase is to give every convict the privilege of opening a Pandora's box of accusations which trial courts near large penal institutions would be compelled to hear." [68]

Perhaps it was the decision of the Supreme Court in Ex parte Hull [69] that started the ball rolling, although another Supreme Court case decided at about the same time is sometimes accredited with having done so.[70] In the Hull case it was decided that neither a State nor its officers may in any way abridge or impair the right to apply to a Federal court for a writ of habeas corpus. Although recognizing the merit of the considerations which prompted a prison regulation requiring examination by the legal investigator to the parole board of all legal papers including petitions for habeas corpus to ascertain if they were properly drawn, it was held that this was a matter to be passed upon solely by the court to which the application for the writ was made and the regulation was declared to be invalid. Thus any attempt to limit applications by preliminary control would meet the disapproval of our highest tribunal.

I am in complete accord with the practice in the Federal courts to ignore failures to comply with precise niceties of technical procedure and to treat petitions for habeas corpus with tolerant liberality.[71] But it does seem as though some reform is needed directed toward the reduction in number of baseless applications and the time consumed in hearing the merits.[72] In the Walker case, denial of the writ upon affidavits was condemned; it was held that when any substantial issue of fact is presented by the petition and traverse on one hand and the return on the other, the prisoner must be produced for a hearing based upon evidence and argument. This is the usual practice in many districts, the court being authorized to refuse the issuance of the writ only where the facts alleged in the petition, if true, would not warrant the discharge of the petitioner.[73] The suggestion has been made that it might prove effective to require the application to be made to the sentencing court, where retained familiarity with the case could be refreshed by the records and the report of the probation department, thereby saving the time required to relate the whole trial procedure de novo to a judge to whom the matter is all new. In opposition it is argued that the advantages to be gained by this suggestion would be far outweighed by the cost of transferring the applicants over long distances from the institutions where they are confined to the courts in which they were originally sentenced. The problem is largely one of expediency in judicial administration rather than of fairness of the ultimate dispositions as the courts seem to indulge in a presumption of regularity in the original trial proceedings.[74]

One limitation to which the Federal courts seem consistently to have adhered is that an application to them for habeas corpus by a person detained under a State court judgment of conviction will be entertained only after all State remedies have been exhausted, including all steps available under the State appellate procedure and in the Supreme Court of the United States by appeal or certiorari.[75] However, in *White* v. *Ragen*,[76] it was held that where the decision of the State court is that the remedy of habeas corpus is not available under the State practice, or its decision is based upon some other nonfederal ground, it is unnecessary for the petitioners to ask the Supreme Court for certiorari in order to exhaust their State remedies, since that tribunal would lack jurisdiction to review the decision of the State court. In this case, one of the petitioners alleged that the sentence of life imprisonment for conviction of murder had been secured by the false testimony of two witnesses bribed by the prosecuting attorney with knowledge of the falsity, the affidavits of both witnesses admitting the bribery and perjury being annexed to the petition. If law enforcement were often tainted by episodes such as this and that described as "shocking and revolting" in the case of *Screws* v.

---

[63] Some of the prosecutor's statements in summation, which the Court of Appeals characterized as "indefensible" (292 N. Y. 360, 373, 55 N. E. (2d) 353, 358 (1944)) and the Supreme Court as "shocking" (324 U. S. at 405) are as follows: "They hold men for several days. Are you satisfied with that? They are not going to let him go home, or let him get hold of a smart mouthpiece to preach about his rights and sue out writs. You want a district attorney in this county that is worth his salt, not a powder-puff district attorney. When you are trying a case of murder, especially murder of a police officer, you don't go over and give him a pat on the back and say, 'Do you want anything? Do you want to have your lawyer or your wife or somebody else?' In fact, after that they would not even let him see Mr. Math, an assistant in our office; they would not even let him talk to a rabbi. Do you think McNally, 17 years in the Police Department, is going to let this jerk from the East Side tell him his business?"

[64] See *Bayless* v. *United States*, 150 F. (2d) 236 (C. C. A. 8th, 1945); cf. *Lisenba* v. *California*, supra note 58. Here the prisoner had no sleep for some 42 hours of custody, during which time he was constantly questioned by different persons and on several occasions was "slapped," but the coerced confession was held to be merely one item of proof and the conviction was affirmed where other evidence clearly sustained the guilt of the defendant without relying upon the confession.

[65] Section 268 of the Judicial Code, 28 U. S. C. A. 385.

[66] In re *Michael*, — U. S. —, 66 S. Ct. 73 (1945).

[67] See *Dorsey* v. *Gill*, 148 F. (2d) 857 App. D. C. (1945) for a detailed review of the history of the writ and for recognition of this trend in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the example is cited of a person who during a period of 5 years presented in the district court 50 petitions for certiorari were filed to review the denial for writs of habeas corpus. In two terms of the Supreme Court to April 21, 1945, 225 petitions by the Illinois supreme court alone of leave to file petitions for habeas corpus. See footnote in *White* v. *Ragen*, 324 U. S. 760, 762 (1945).

[68] *Diggs* v. *Welch*, 148 F. (2d) 667, 669 (App. D. C., 1945).

[69] 312 U. S. 546 (1940).

[70] *Walker* v. *Johnston*, 312 U. S. 275 (1940). See *Dorsey* v. *Gill*, supra note 67.

[71] *Rice* v. *Olsen*, 324 U. S. 786, 791 (1945); *Holiday* v. *Johnston*, 313 U. S. 342, 350 (1941).

[72] The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia has made some recommendations; see *Dorsey* v. *Gill*, supra note 66. Reform may be all the more necessary in view of the likelihood of a great many petitions emanating from veterans in mental institutions who prematurely think the continuance of their confinement is unwarranted.

[73] *Ex parte Quirin*, 317 U. S. 1, 24 (1942).

[74] In *Crum* v. *Hunter*, 150 F. (2d) 986, 10 Cir., 1945, it was held that the defendant had not been denied any constitutional rights because counsel assigned to him by the court, after an investigation of the facts, had advised or even urged him to plead guilty to the charge, upon which he was given a sentence of 25 years; it was also held that an accused has no right to more than one counsel, except such as the statute confers upon him (18 U. S. C. A. 563) and that he must comply with the statute by requesting the court to assign two counsels to him in order to be entitled thereto. In *Rice* v. *Olsen*, supra, three justices dissented from the reversal of the denial of the writ in the State court upon the ground that the meager allegations of the petition should preclude attributing to the State courts a disregard of constitutional rights to petitioner. See also *Diggs* v. *Welch*, supra note 68.

[75] *Ex parte Hawk*, 321 U. S. 114 (1944); *Mooney* v. *Holohan*, 294 U. S. 103 (1935); *U. S. ex rel. Foley* v. *Ragen*, 143 F. (2d) 774, C. C. A. 7th, 1944.

[76] *Foley* v. *Ragen*, supra, note 75, at p. 765.

United States,[77] it would indeed be time for courts to become apprehensive of the rights of those accused of crime, but happily I do not think these instances are frequent.

The wide divergence of views among the justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, evidenced by 236 dissents voiced in the 154 opinion-decisions handed down during the 1944 term,[78] brings into focus a trend which has become increasingly marked during the last few years[79] toward the gradual modification of the doctrine of stare decisis.[80] Perhaps the most significant development of the change is the freedom which has permeated the lower courts, denominated by one writer as "anticipatory reversals",[81] whereby a lower court, in the face of precedent against it, reaches a decision on the assumption that the higher tribunal would reverse itself if the precedent again came before it for decision.[82] No one with intelligence would advocate the complete immobility of constitutional law. Undoubtedly the Constitution should be accorded as elasticity which will permit its being adapted to changing conditions of a dynamic society. Justice Cardozo has advanced the aphorism, "Law must be stable and yet it cannot stand still,"[83] which succinctly states the proper modicum of change desirable in basic constitutional principles.[84]

My associate, Judge Clarence G. Galston, in a well-considered address entitled "The Imperiled Position of Our Patent System",[85] focused attention upon a development in Federal law, the significance of which extends far beyond the particular litigation in which it has become noticeable. I refer to the trend toward invalidating patents. Our industrialization has progressed rapidly under a system which encourages competitive research and invention by affording relative assurance of compensation for successful creative effort. Those who argue that invention would continue although the reward be removed are overlooking human experience; the greater the protection afforded an inventor, the greater will be his endeavors.[86]

The Constitution of the United States confers upon the Congress the power "to promote the Progress of Science and Useful Arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries."[87] The patent law passed pursuant to this authority, provides: "Any person who has invented or discovered any new and useful art, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvements thereon, * * * not known or used by others in this country," may obtain a patent therefor.[88] Of course, mechanical skill must be distinguished from invention; there are many who possess mechanical skill but there are few inventors. But many patent lawyers and research engineers have become apprehensive that the Supreme Court has pronounced an entirely new concept of invention, whereby a new device "however useful it may be, must reveal the flash of creative genius, not merely the skill of the calling" to be patentable.[89] The Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit noted this fear of the bar and engineers but interpreted the Cuno case as requiring only that the invention be "something more" than expected mechanical skill.[90] In a very recent decision by the Supreme Court, it was held that finding "latent qualities in an old discovery and (adapting) it to a useful end * * * did not advance the frontiers of science in this narrow field so as to satisfy the exacting standards of our patent system. * * * It is not invention to perceive that the product which others have discovered had qualities which they failed to detect."[91]

The patent bar seems to be very much aroused at the dearth of adjudications decreeing the validity of patents.[92] On the trial of my first patent case as a judge, I became convinced—and the years have fortified my stand—that it would be desirable to establish a patent court as such, which would not only bring about uniformity in decisions but would materially aid in the proper disposition of patent cases. Most judges, who are but lawyers on the bench, have not had the specialized training which would seem desirable for the task of deciding the novelty of difficult technical inventions. If district judges are to continue to try patent cases, they should be provided with a panel of experts from which they could select one to aid in understanding the technical aspects of the matter.[93] It would also seem preferable that there be one appellate court to pass upon patents, subject to an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. Such appellate tribunal could be in the nature of a roving court, so to speak, and sit in the principal cities of the United States, as does the United States Emergency Court of Appeals, which has functioned well. The greatest advantage to be procured from this procedure would be in the uniformity of decisions throughout the country upon patents, the absence of which causes the loss of confidence in the courts on the part of laymen, seriously affecting business relations and inventions. It would seem desirable that the whole subject of patents should be re-examined by the Congress so that the lawmakers could determine the scope of patents and whether the trend to invalidate them is or is not for the best interest of the people of the United States.[94]

Though there hardly can be a trend in the interpretation of anything as new as the reemployment provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended,[95] we may appropriately terminate our discussion by noting the tendencies which the courts have evidenced in the litigation which has thus far come before them concerning this timely subject of vital importance to so many returning servicemen. Section 8 of the act[96] provides in part that any person inducted into the land or naval forces who, in order to perform such training and service, has left a position with a private employer, other than a temporary position, and who (1) received a certificate of discharge other than dishonorable, (2) is still qualified to perform the duties of such position, and (3) makes application for reemployment within 90 days after he is relieved from such training and service, must be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay unless the employer's circumstances have so changed as to make it impossible or unreasonable to do so.[97] It would seem to be only just and proper that these provisions should be construed as applicable to persons who left their

---

[77] 325 U. S. 91 (1945). In this atrocious incident in Georgia, three law enforcement officers beat to death while he was handcuffed a young Negro accused of stealing a tire.

[78] N. Y. Times, June 24, 1945. In more than thirty cases, the splits were 5 to 4 or 5 to 3 with one justice not participating; in only 63 cases were the members in complete agreement.

[79] In 1939 there were 85 dissents in 141 opinion-decisions; in 1940 the number rose to 117 in 169; in 1941, to 160 in 162, and in 1942 to 176 in 171 opinion-decisions. See Kennedy, Portrait of the New Supreme Court, II, XIV, Fordham Law Review 8, 9.

[80] *U. S.* v. *Southeastern Underwriters Assn.* (322 U. S. 533 (1944)); *Mahnich* v. *Southern Steamship Co.* (321 U. S. 96 (1944)); *Mercoid Corporation* v. *Mid-Continental Investment Company* (320 U. S. 661 (1944)).

[81] Kennedy, Portrait of the New Supreme Court, II, supra, note 79, at 33.

[82] As examples of this practice, see *Perkins* v. *Endicott Johnson Corp.* (128 F. (2d) 208 (C. C. A. (2d) 1942)); *Spector Motor Service* v. *Walsh* (139 F. (2d) 808 (C. C. A. (2d) 1944)); *Barnette* v. *West Virginia State Board of Ed.* (47 F. Supp. 251 (D. C., W. Va., 1942)); cf. *United States* v. *City of Milwaukee* (49 F. Supp. 436 (D. C., Wis. 1943)).

[83] (1924) The Growth of the Law, pp. 2, 143.

[84] Hunter L. Delatour, president of the Brooklyn Bar Association, in an address delivered at a session of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court, Second Judicial Department to newly admitted attorneys on June 27, 1945, stated: "The law is not a static thing, even though its fundamentals change but little. It is a fickle thing at times, subject to the whims and notions of every changing Legislature, State and National. Lower courts are overruled by the higher tribunals, and these higher courts often overrule themselves, and so the law, constantly changing, yet basically the same, attempts to keep abreast of what colloquially we call the 'times.' It is good that this is so, for our people would lose faith in a brand of justice which continued applying itself to modern events in the light of what happened in the time of our forefathers."

[85] Delivered at the Association of the Bar of the City of New York on May 14, 1945, printed in 149 F. (2d) XXIII. Judge Galston observed: "In recent years the owners of patents have found it increasingly difficult to obtain relief in the courts against infringers. The purpose of this article is to show that to a marked degree the condition has arisen because of certain failures in the patent statute itself, and because of abuses of the patent grant by owners of patents. Thus the courts from time to time have been compelled to resolve some of the issues involved by judicial legislation. Indeed in no statutory field is the judge-made law more plainly revealed than in judicial decisions of the nature, extent, and validity of letters patent."

[86] Frederic B. Schramm, The General Lawyer's Stake in our Patent Laws, 31 A. B. A. J., 463, 493.

[87] Article 1, sec. 8, cl. 8.

[88] R. S. § 4886, 35 U. S. C. A. 31.

[89] *Cuno Engineering Corp.* v. *Automatic Devices Corp.* (314 U. S. 84, 91 (1941)).

[90] *Trabon Engineering Corporation* (136 F. (2d) 24, 27 (C. C. A. 6th, 1943)).

[91] *General Electric Company* v. *Jewel Incandescent Lamp Company* (— U. S. —, 66 S. Ct. 81 (1945)).

[92] In a letter dated April 25, 1945, from the Patent Law Association of Chicago to myself, and presumably to other judges, it was announced that a subcommittee had been appointed "to consider the trend in some court decisions to extend the misuse of patents doctrine and to limit more and more the rights of patentees and their assignees. We are endeavoring to find out the basic cause for this trend to determine if some revision of the patent laws is necessary or other remedial legislation is indicated."

[93] See the interesting and instructive opinion of Judge Learned Hand to this effect, stated in *Parke-Davis & Co.* v. *H. K. Mulford Co.* (189 Fed. 95, 115 (C. C. S. D. N. Y. 1911)).

[94] Progress in this direction was evidenced by the appointment in 1941 by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt of the National Patent Planning Commission. President Truman on April 20, 1945, authorized the Secretary of Commerce to form a committee to conduct a study of the operation and effectiveness of the existing patent laws and to offer recommendations respecting legislative proposals for the President to lay before Congress. The Commission rendered its third and final report of September 6, 1945. 31 A. B. A. J. 602.

[95] 50 U. S. C. A., Appendix, 301 et seq.

[96] 50 U. S. C. A. Appendix, 308.

[97] The constitutionality of this section of the Act was upheld against the challenge that its applicability was too vague and uncertain in view of the exception provided if the employer's circumstances are such as to make restoration "impossible or unreasonable." *Hall* v. *Union Light, Heat and Power Co.* (53 F. Supp. 817 (E. D. Ky. 1944)).

positions to voluntarily enlist in the land or naval forces as well as to those who were inducted.

It has generally been held that the veteran has the burden of showing compliance with the three enumerated conditions to the right granted him by the Act and that, upon doing so, he is entitled to reemployment unless the employer affirmatively shows that the circumstances of the particular case come within one of the exceptions to the right.[98] A request for a leave of absence was held not to be a request for reemployment and thus not a compliance with the three conditions.[99] But the more liberal view is that an alleged waiver of the statutory right must be shown by positive evidence. Thus, a former railroad worker who had been released from the Army to accept essential navy-yard employment was held to be entitled to reinstatement when he applied for his old railroad job within 90 days after the termination of the navy-yard work.[100]

The extent of the veteran's rights and the employer's obligation in circumstances which do not clearly come within the express provisions of the Act have given rise to varying interpretations of what Congress intended in its legislation to aid returning veterans and the legality of the law which it passed. On one hand it is contended that if a returning veteran's job has been discontinued, he shall merely be reemployed by the company for the first vacant job which he or she is qualified to perform.[101] One court has said that a veteran is entitled to be placed "in status quo ante".[102] The Director of Selective Service, on the other hand, advances the view that if there is another job of like status and pay as the veteran's former job, it must be given to him even though it is held by another employee of greater seniority.[103] Although the Director denied in a statement that this view recognized any "superseniority" in the right of a veteran to job restoration, it has been so characterized.[104] The Director does not believe that so to override the seniority rights of nonveterans who may have held the position long before the veteran was employed is beyond the powers granted to Congress by the Constitution,[105] a point not yet passed upon by the courts. In the case of *Fishgold* v. *Sullivan Drydock & Repair Corp.*, my associate, Judge Matthew T. Abruzzo, held that the veteran was "entitled to come back to work in preference to anybody else who might be working on any of the days that he applied for work, except a veteran in his own category",[106] thereby giving effect to the interpretation advocated by the Director of Selective Service. The court refused to consider the equities of the situation and whom the veteran might be displacing. This case involved a veteran's protection against discharge after he had been reinstated, but the principle is the same.

Subdivision (e) of section 8 provides for the procedure to be followed by the veteran in securing the rights accorded to him by the Act.[107] It would appear that these provisions are being given a rather strict interpretation by the courts. In *Kay* v. *General Cable Corp.*,[108] even though the employer had refused restoration of the veteran, it was held that he was not liable for compensation during a 6 months' period in which the veteran delayed bringing suit since the machinery is provided by the Act for a speedy trial and quick disposition of the veteran's right if he wishes to take advantage of it. In another case it was held that since the Act makes available to veterans the United States attorney's office for the purpose of procuring reinstatement by court action, a veteran who does not avail himself of this procedure cannot avoid the payment of court costs if the suit results in judgment for the employer.[109] In an earlier case it had been held that where the employee made prompt application for reinstatement but was not reemployed until some 16 weeks later, he could bring an action to recover the amount which he would have earned had he been promptly reemployed, even though the Act seems to provide that the right to recover lost wages is an "incident" to an action to compel reinstatement.[110]

A Selective Service announcement of September 24, 1945,[111] advanced a number of interpretations which at the time of this writing have not yet been construed by the courts. It is therein provided that the wage rate to which a veteran is entitled is that received by him when he entered the armed forces, if such rate was fixed on an individual basis for him, and to the present wage of the position if it was fixed on a collective basis. It is also stated that membership in a union may not be required of a veteran as a prerequisite to his reinstatement. It is the Director's view that "position other than temporary," as used in the act, may embrace a concept broader than "permanent" and thus may cover a number of successive incumbents who held the same position. In *Salzman* v. *London Coat of Boston, Inc.*,[112] a veteran sought reinstatement to a position which he had acquired when a predecessor entered the service and to which the predecessor had now returned. There was but one job and a contest between two veterans for it but the necessity for legal construction was eliminated when the court found that the second veteran had been employed merely in a temporary capacity and thus could not comply with one of the three conditions to his right of reinstatement.

It would thus appear that the courts are disposed toward liberality in favor of veterans, for whose specific aid the Congress enacted these provisions of the Selective Training the Service Act. This is as it should be; the commendable and needed protection which is intended should not be fettered by needlessly technical confinements. On the other hand, the realities of the situations which must result from the conflict between veteran and nonveteran for a limited number of positions should not be overlooked. The Congress did not intend to inflict penalties upon persons who have not been in military service but rather to guarantee and assure to veterans restoration to a position which in every realizable respect is equivalent to that which he would now be occupying had military demands not interfered.

In concluding this article within prescribed limits of length, it must suffice merely to mention without discussion a number of recent adjudications which inaugurate or manifest trends in Federal law and procedure. In *Kirschbaum* v. *Walling*,[113] the Supreme Court held that the Fair Labor Standards Act,[114] the validity of which had been sustained previously as an exercise of the commerce power,[115] covered service and maintenance employees in a loft building in which the tenants were principally engaged in the production of goods for interstate commerce. The Act and the Kirschbaum decision have been construed many times.[116] In *Tennessee Coal Co.* v. *Muscoda Local* [117] and *Jewell Ridge Coal Co.* v. *Local No. 6167*,[118] iron and bituminous coal miners were held to be entitled to compensation under the act for portal-to-work travel time and return.

In *Williams* v. *State of North Carolina*, it was decided that the bona fide domicile of the plaintiff within a State granting a divorce is sufficient to entitle the decree to full faith and credit even in the State of matrimonial domicile [119] but that each State may determine for itself the factual question of bona fides, which will not be disturbed upon review by the Supreme Court if due regard has been accorded the judicial process of the rendering State.[120]

In *Smith* v. *Allwright*,[121] the Texas primary system was found to be part of the electoral process and a Negro's right to vote in the Democratic primary was held to be within the protection of the fifteenth amendment against discrimination by the State for race, color, or previous servitude. In *Thomas* v. *Collins*,[122] a State requirement that labor union organizers register before soliciting membership was held unlawfully to abridge constitutional rights of free speech and free assembly.

In *United States* v *Southeastern Underwriters Assn.*,[123] the Supreme Court held that the business of insurance is subject to regulation by Congress under the commerce clause and that a conspiracy to fix noncom-

---

[98] *Fishgold* v. *Sullivan Drydock & Repair Corp.* (62 F. Supp. 25 (E. D. N. Y. 1945)).

[99] *Grasso* v *Crowhurst* (— F. Supp. — (D. C. N. J. 1945)).

[100] *Tipper* v. *Northern Pacific Rwy. Co.* (62 F. Supp. 853 (D. C. Wash. 1945)).

[101] *E. g.*, Order of The Third Regional Labor Board, 13 L W 2615.

[102] *Grasso* v. *Crowhurst*, supra, note 99.

[103] Local Board Memorandum 190 (a), 12 L W 2645, 13 L W 2615.

[104] *E. g.*, 14 L W 1033, 14 L W 1041.

[105] The British practice to the contrary is not deemed significant by the Director because of the specific provision in the English statute covering the point. 13 L W 2616.

[106] *Supra* note 97 at p. 29.

[107] Subdivision (e) reads in part: "In case any private employer fails or refuses to comply * * * the district court * * * shall have power * * * to specifically require such employer to comply * * * and, as an incident thereto, to compensate such person for any loss of wages or benefits suffered by reason of such employer's unlawful action. The court shall order a speedy hearing in any such case and shall advance it on the calendar. Upon application to the United States district attorney * * * if reasonably satisfied that the person so applying is entitled to such benefits, (he) shall appear and act as attorney for such person * * * *provided*, that no fees or court costs shall be taxed against the person so applying for such benefits."

[108] 59 F. Supp. 358 (D. C. N. J., 1945).

[109] *Salzman* v. *London Coat of Boston, Inc.*, 62 F. Supp. 371 (D. C. Mass. 1945).

[110] *Hall* v. *Union Light, Heat and Power Co.*, supra, note 96.

[111] 14 L. W. 2188.

[112] Supra, note 108.

[113] 316 U. S. 517 (1942).

[114] 52 Stat. 1060, 29 U. S. C. A. 20, et seq.

[115] *United States* v. *Darby* (312 U. S. 100 (1941)); *Opp Cotton Mills* v. *Administrator* (312 U. S. 126 (1941)).

[116] E. g., *10 East 40th Street* v. *Callus* (325 U. S. 578, 65 S. Ct. 1227 (1945)); *Borden* v. *Borella* (325 U. S. 679, 65 S. St. 1223 (1945)); *Brooklyn Savings Bank* v. *O'Neill* (324 U. S. 697 (1945)); *Walling* v. *Jacksonville Paper Company* (317 U. S. 564 (1943)); *Philipps* v. *Star Overall Laundry Co.* (149 F. (2d) 416 (C. C. A. 2d Circ. 1945)); *Walling* v. *The Connecticut Co* (62 F. Supp. 733 (D. C. Conn. 1945)); *Frank* v. *McMeekan* (56 F. Supp. 369 (E. D. N. Y. 1944)); *Berry* v. *34 Irving Place Corp.* (52 F. Supp. 875 (S. D. N. Y. 1943)).

[117] 321 U. S. 590 (1944).

[118] 325 U. S. 161 (1945).

[119] 317 U. S. 287 (1942).

[120] 325 U. S. 226, 65 S. Ct. 1092 (1945).

[121] 321 U. S. 649 (1944).

[122] 323 U. S. 516 (1945).

[123] 322 U. S. 533 (1944).

petitive premium rates violated the Sherman Antitrust Act.[124]

These remarks can do little more than indicate the direction of current trends in Federal law and procedure. Expressing an objective view, I believe that the Federal courts by and large have made greater strides than most of the State courts in withdrawing from bonds of tradition and antiquated practices. The Federal rules of civil and criminal procedure are udoubtedly the most notable of these advances, although I have adverted to others, and all States would do well to study them with a view toward incorporating as part of their procedure the most beneficial provisions. The increasing liberality of the Federal courts toward disregarding technicalities and the growing tendency to secure to individuals the privileges which are inalienable under our system of government are trends which portend fuller realization of moral justice under the law; an objective which we of the legal profession should all pursue with untiring effort.

Purchase and Sale of Corn and Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am including a petition received from a large number of citizens of Cloud County, Kans., protesting the action of the Department of Agriculture restricting the purchase and sale of corn and wheat. This order has been especially confusing to the millers, feed mixers, and farmers who have livestock and poultry on hand.

There have been so many conflicting regulations and restrictions on the production of food issued by the Government during the past few years that the farmers are bewildered. I have had several contacts with the OPA and other Federal agencies, urging a clarification of this order, and am insisting that our farmers be given a free rein in the sale of grains and the handling of livestock.

It is imperative that we have a change in the present order.

MILTONVALE, KANS., *April 27, 1946.*
Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We protest action of Department of Agriculture, Emergency Corn Purchase Bulletin No. 1, restricting purchase and sale of corn on the grounds that many feeders of poultry and livestock are unable to obtain grain for feeding and farming operations resulting in early and drastic reduction of poultry, dairy, beef, and pork products. This restriction on free movement of grain must be removed and part of this grain allocated for local use on a free market.

We also protest restrictions of purchase and sale of wheat on same grounds and for the further reason that such restrictions discourage and prevent the production and distribution of human food.

Kenneth Trickle, P. J. Hart, Carl C. McGavran, Georgia Gray, A. B. Fry, Jocie Erhart, J. W. Fury, H. C. Thorpe, Martin Begnock, L. E. Shepard, Earl Fry, Wm. Skinner, Dick Speely, Edyth Thorpe, Albert Adam, Leonard L. Melton, Francis Oulabery, Ralph Miller, Wm. Parker, Catherine Coleman, Albert Chayer, Geo. E. Crave, Neal Lyne, Geo. M. Koster, Rex M. Koster, M. H. Thompson, Leo Hauck, Emery Dallen, Geo. Haist, H. C. Betters, Miltonvale; Frank Walker, Aurora; Lloyd Cyr, Henry Dallen, Miltonvale, Clementine Dallen, Vern Dallen, Aurora; Frank Chayer, Lawrence Dallen, Victor Dallen, Fred Bennet, G. G. Stiverson, Ray Catlin, Keith Catlin, Robert Frybarger, Lillian Gastore, Otis R. Cabler, Aubrey E. Davidson, P. S. Hart, G. M. Pilcher, A. Laplant, Miltonvale; Andrew Purvis, Oak Hill; Walter C. Lyne, A. L. Hauck, Miltonvale; John Rothfuss, Clifton; Hardie Emig, Oak Hill; Floyd Woodworth, Marvin Stevenson, Miltonvale; Raymond Baker, Oak Hill; Walter Louthan, Glasco; Ernest R. Phelps, Henry L. Blocklinger, Chas. A. Merrill, Miltonvale; Edward P. Briggs, Delehos; J. Jensen, Lee Fuller, Miltonvale; Rex Riley, Oak Hill; Walter J. Hadorn, Clyde M. Palmer, Harold D. Jensen, Geo. Young, H. E. Catlin, Clay Torney, Arthur Guy, Jacob J. Stoner, B. W. Gilger, Leo Fiyf, James Hart, Paul Walker, Paul Crane, Albert Chayer, A. Buckley, Arthur Lavore, Miltonvale.

[124] After this decision, Public Law No. 15, 79th Cong., 1st sess., c. 20, was approved March 9, 1945, providing that the business of insurance and every person engaged therein shall be subject to the laws of the several States which relate to the regulation of taxation of such business, and that the Sherman and Clayton Acts shall be inapplicable until 1948.

Veteran Says You Cannot Regiment America in Time of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a most interesting and informative letter from a veteran in my district with whom I am not personally acquainted. However, this young man expresses substantially the same views that many others have expressed in writing me recently.

For the most part, the veterans are convinced that "you can't regiment America in time of peace." They understand that the present chaotic conditions are largely the result of the surrender to the Executive by Congress, the people's representatives, of its rights, duties, and prerogatives. They understand that Congress, under the New Deal leadership and plan, surrendered a substantial portion of its functions to the bureaus and that Congress and the President set up so-called emergency bureaus with power to write directives, orders, and edicts to regulate and govern the activities of our people. Now that the shooting is over, these veterans know that these emergency bureaus should be abolished. They know that the longer they are continued the more difficult it will be to get rid of them. They also realize that these bureaus have hindered production and stifled reconversion. They have followed the New Deal philosophy of scarcity and have created inflation and black marketing.

This veteran cites some worth-while information in his letter. He gives facts and figures which he says he is able to prove. You can't fool these boys; and woe be it unto the New Dealocrats who persist in an effort to befuddle them.

I am pleased to quote the letter to which I have above referred, as follows:

The Navy saw fit last month to release me to inactive duty. I immediately returned to Tulsa and resumed my former position in the lumber business. I find conditions in the civilian world chaotic, and it seems the only relief we can get is for the Congress to repeal the laws in which they established so many agencies delegating their powers for emergencies existing during wartime, but which now seem to be so completely disintegrated that coordination is an impossibility. Price control holding down inflation is one thing, while maximum production is another. At the moment we need maximum production. We don't seem to be able to get it with governmental controls. I believe it is high time that the Congress take back the powers they have delegated to these inefficient agencies and let us unhampered win the peace. Full production is the answer and we don't need governmental controls for industry to accomplish this. Please get small business out of OPA's cost absorption squeeze and let us roll up our production sleeves and give America the goods and services it needs. Thirty-four percent of vital productive small business enterprises have been unable to put new products on the market. Forty-four percent have had to stop marketing certain lines. Forty percent are being forced to curtail or eliminate specific products and 36 percent are confronted with shut-downs completely. These are figures that are at your disposal and any others interested and can be verified and proven as facts. If conditions continue as they are at the moment these percentages will even be greater.

Why have OPA with its dismal failure to get ceiling prices which return the cost of production? It seems to me and thousands of other Americans that it is your duty to either end the whole mess or support the proposals of small business for drastic reforms and complete repeal of present laws or a definite curtailment of those not needed in peacetime, keeping only those that the Congress in their intelligence may deem necessary for the protection of the masses of the people. Food, clothing, and shelter are the three basic necessities of mankind. We have food, we have clothing, but we are in a critical condition on shelter. The only possible way for us to build the required housing units necessary to house the people today is with maximum production from all the building trades. This can be achieved only by releasing American industrial might and free them of the Government controls now holding up production.

It doesn't stand to reason that American industry could supply the materials needed to win a 4-year war and not be in a position to supply the materials needed to win the peace. You can't regiment America in time of peace. There is no use postponing the action necessary by the Congress, for the answer will be the same a year from now. I will, with millions of other Americans, appreciate your taking the action necessary to get immediate results.

Catholic Mother of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include therein an article from the Washington Times-Herald announcing an honor bestowed upon Mrs. Joy Hurd, of Cleveland, by the National Catholic Conference in naming her "the Catholic mother of the year":

CATHOLICS HONOR MOTHER OF FIVE VETS

Mrs. Joy Seth Hurd, of Lakewood, Ohio, mother of 15 children, 5 of whom have just been discharged from the armed forces, was named "The Catholic Mother of the United States" by the National Catholic Conference on Family Life, the Rev. Dr. Edgar Schmiedeler O. S. B., director, N. C. W. C. Family Life Bureau, announced yesterday.

Mrs. Hurd, a convert to the Catholic faith, is the wife of Judge Hurd, of common pleas court, Cleveland. Born Frances E. Stimmel in Cleveland in 1893, she was educated in public schools and Notre Dame Academy.

She is president of the Cleveland Diocesan Council of Catholic Women, member of the board of trustees, Motion Picture Council of Greater Cleveland; the Cleveland Round Table Conference of Christians and Jews, the Catherine Horstman Training Home for Girls, and the Women's Board of St. John's Hospital.

For her war activities, Mrs. Hurd was awarded the Certificate of Gratitude by the Navy. She also organized the Cleveland chapter of Gold Star Mothers of World War II.

Coast Guard Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement on Coast Guard problems submitted to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries this morning and include an article taken from the Rockland Courier Gazette:

Citizens of Maine, especially along the coast and on the many islands, are greatly concerned over the decommissioning of vessels and the curtailing of Coast Guard activities due, we are told, to shortage of personnel.

In filing statement asking for your consideration of H. R. 6219, or some measure that will extend Coast Guard protection along our coast, I want to include a report of a recent emergency near Isle au Haut. This report explains how serious the situation can be for fishermen who earn their living in the waters along the coast, also the island folk who are so isolated and dependent upon this service.

Everybody is willing to cooperate during this period of transition. We do not expect wartime service but we are asking for adequate protection, and appeal to you to anticipate the needs and be prepared—not permit this matter to drift along and then find ourselves helpless in a real emergency.

I truly hope you will find a way either through the proposal before you or some other means to help in this serious situation.

[From the Courier-Gazette, Rockland, Maine, of April 30, 1946]

OUR COAST GUARD IMPOTENT IN THE CASE OF AN EMERGENCY

The case of the steamer *Horace H. Watson*, reported aground on Isle au Hout last Friday, brought home forcibly the immediate need for rescue cutters and tugs of the Coast Guard at the Rockland base.

The call caused a turmoil in official circles that spread to the War Shipping Administration and the Navy. The Coast Guard found itself in the ridiculous situation of being within 20 miles of a ship in distress and nothing with which to go to their aid but an 80-foot cable and utility boat ill-fitted for the rescue of any craft.

War Shipping had no tugs available. Navy had a tug, but it was busy as the proverbial bee, keeping the destroyers at the Portland anchorage from going adrift in the blow that was then in full force.

Coast Guard had an ancient buoy tender at Rockland, but she was on the marine railway at General Seafoods. The *Cowslip*, another tender, but of recent vintage, was in Portland and 8 hours away at the best. Another, the *Hibiscus*, was in Boston and could not reach the scene until late the next morning.

At the base, one coast guardsman, when asked what the base could send, pointed forlornly to a rather decrepit dory on the dock and announced, "There she be."

That is the condition of Coast Guard, Rockland today—absolutely unable to answer a rescue call for anything much larger than a skiff adrift.

The men stationed here are not to blame; they were ready and willing to go, but there just wasn't much of anything to go in—anything that could do any good when it got there.

Rumor now has it that the rescue tug *Snohomish* is to be assigned duty in Boston when she comes out of drydock. Certainly Rockland with no rescue ships at all should be assigned this craft.

The Coast Guard's sole reason for existence is the preservation of life and property at sea. That it cannot do with the cutters on boarding duty in Boston or tied to Constitution Base or in Chelsea Creek.

One Government agency blames the other for the lack of ships and crews to man them. When the merry-go-round slows down and there is a real loss of life and property at sea off this coast, someone will have to accept the blame, or it may start another round of accusations from department to department.

Meantime the Coast Guard has good men and good ships but lacks the authority to put them to sea or on stations where they will be of some use.

The Program of the Geological Survey Is of Vital Importance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS RIZLEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district in Oklahoma is rich in the production of oil and gas. In fact, my home town is in the center of the largest known natural gas field in the world. New discoveries are being made. Only recently in Cimarron County, Okla., oil was discovered in commercial quantities. This field is many miles distant from the nearest producing oil field.

The program of the Geological Survey during the war and the early postwar period has been primarily focused on regional geologic investigations which are the inevitable preliminary to the discovery of new sources of oil supply. The program has been directed to prompt publication of results, principally in the form of maps and charts released for sale by the Geological Survey. I have seen some of these chart publications, which have elicited widespread oral and written approval from numerous responsible sources in and outside the petroleum industry. The Survey has been urged to continue and increase both the volume and the scope of such investigations. Owing to considerable reduction of funds during the current year this work has now been considerably curtailed, which has aroused substantial protest from the industry. Such work needs to be expanded in view of the increasing difficulty in locating new reserves.

An Answer to Some Questions About the Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House today, I place in the Appendix the following letter written to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] commenting upon some fears about the so-called Case bill expressed by one of his constituents:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1946.

The Honorable C. W. VURSELL,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHARLEY: I greatly appreciate the opportunity you have given me to read the 5-page letter (undated) addressed to you by Mr. L. A. Meissner, secretary of the Central Trades and Labor Union of Clinton County, Ill., and the invitation to comment thereon.

First of all, let me say that your correspondent has made an effort to base his criticism on the contents of the mediation or labor disputes bill which I introduced, rather than upon general statements about the bill, and in that respect his letter offers a basis for an intelligent and understanding discussion. I have found that much of the criticism of the bill or of me has been general in character and does not reveal any acquaintance with the bill at all.

At the same time, I find that some of Mr. Meissner's fears are based upon the reading of single sentences in portions of the bill and not taking into account their limited application within the bill, or the full text of the other legislation to which reference is made. May I point this out and also take

up his fears, one by one, as expressed in his letter?

SCOPE OF THE BILL

Page 1 is largely devoted to asserting that the bill is national in scope and that it will apply to the entire United States. That, of course, is correct.

It might be pointed out, however, that the first 9 sections of the bill deal with the establishment of the mediation board and the establishment of a 30-day period for a mediation board to attempt to achieve a voluntary settlement of issues in an industrial dispute without resort to strike or lockout, and that these 9 of the 13 substantive sections in the bill are applicable only where an employer regularly employs 250 people.

It may be that this would substantially limit the application of provisions of the bill in southern Illinois. You would know about this better than I.

In addition, if you have many railroad workers, it should be pointed out that section 12 relating to supervisory employees "does not include any employee within the purview of the Railway Labor Act," and further that section 5, which defines the jurisdiction of the Mediation Board which operates under the provisions of the first 9 sections of the bill, specifically "excludes any matter coming within the purview of the Railway Labor Act."

In this way, also, the scope of the bill is limited and that limitation is Nation-wide.

The positive features of the bill, apart from these exceptions, are, generally speaking, national in scope and the virtue of so being will be obvious as we consider the other points which Mr. Meissner raises.

In fact, it would be interesting to you, I feel sure, sometime to drop in my office and read some of the letters from rank-and-file members of various labor organizations who have written in favor of the proposed legislation.

NO INTENT TO SMASH UNIONS

Page 2 of Mr. Meissner's letter starts off with an assertion which I must challenge.

He says: "The measure is an out-and-out attempt to smash unions and deprive the American working man of the rights and benefits of collective bargaining." That is not correct.

With equal emphasis I assert that the bill is not an attempt to smash unions or destroy collective bargaining, but on the contrary to strengthen collective bargaining.

To support his assertion he further asserts:

"If passed it would:

"1. Create a tripartite mediation board patterned after the defunct War Labor Board."

I would say that 't is more patterned after the National Railway Labor procedure, and for the life of me, I am unable to see how it hurts collective bargaining to create a board to offer its assistance when collective bargaining has broken down or failed to reach an agreement. The Board has no power to enforce any findings or recommendations.

Most people have criticised the bill for not giving more power to the Board. All it can do under the bill is to ask both sides to refrain from work stoppage for 30 days while they try to help iron out the points at issue, and achieve or complete the collective bargaining. How does that destroy it?

"2. Provide a cooling-off period when no strikes could be called and this would be enforceable in the courts."

That period is 30 days. As a matter of experience, such a waiting period has not ruined collective bargaining in Minnesota nor in the railroad industry where it has been tried. The purpose of court protection is merely to preserve "the status quo" so that neither side shall get any advantage over the other during the period that mediation is tried.

It would be unfair, in my opinion, to ask either party to a dispute to withhold its action of stopping work for 30 days unless you did try to preserve the position of each at the end of the time, if mediation fails.

"3. Outlaw boycotts, sympathy and jurisdictional strikes."

Unbiased observers of the industrial situation in the country, today, I think, are generally agreed that these things have done more to hurt organized labor than anything else. I believe it was President Truman who pointed out that the contests between rival labor unions with the innocent public the victim is injuring organized labor. Even the Senate Labor Committee, which has been heralded as "emasculating" the Case bill put in a provision to protect farmers in the delivery of their products from the effects of boycotts.

In fact, the Senate bill makes such interference a misdemeanor punishable by a fine up to $2,000 and imprisonment up to 1 year.

The original Case bill, as passed by the House, did not go that far, merely revoking the benefits of the Wagner Act which the Government had conferred in certain sections, the effect of which would merely relieve the employer of an obligation to reemploy the persons who violated the law or of recognizing a certain union as the exclusive bargaining agent for a period of 6 months. The employer could reemploy everyone involved, if he desired, or any other employer could and would be bound to do so, and the particular union could be negotiated with before the 6 months expired.

The penalty in the House bill simply relieved the employer of the requirement to reemploy or to recognize a given union as the exclusive union (within the 6 months) if either violated the law. That certainly does not destroy bargaining.

"4. Deprive individuals guilty of 'violence or threats' of their rights under the Wagner Act."

Mr. Meissner nowhere in his letter undertakes to defend the use of force, violence, and intimidation, and I do not believe that the average union member does. In fact, to guarantee reemployment rights to the individual who engages in force and violence was not intended in the original Wagner Act nor in the Norris-LaGuardia Act in my opinion. And surely organized labor in America is stronger when it does not defend such practices. I know of no better way to strengthen the position of labor than for it to disown and disavow them.

"5. Exclude supervisory employees, including timekeepers, from the right to be represented by a union of their choice."

This fear rests upon a misunderstanding of the language used in section 12 and since it is again taken up on page 4 of Mr. Meissner's letter, I will take it up in detail when I reach that point.

NORRIS-LAGUARDIA ACT

"6. Amend the Norris-LaGuardia Act to permit courts to issue injunctions in labor disputes."

This fear is expanded by Mr. Meissner in the balance of page 2 by quoting a portion of the bill and by saying:

"Any amendment of the Norris-LaGuardia Act is a critical threat to the freedom of organized labor in America."

And—

"The Case bill would strip labor of its freedom and legalistic dictatorship by providing that—

" 'When granting temporary relief or restraining order, or making or entering a decree enforcing an order of the chairman, as provided in this section, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the act entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code, to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes," approved March 23, 1932.' "

Then Mr. Meissner says: "That means the teeth of the Norris-LaGuardia Act are pulled if the Case bill becomes law."

This, I think, is Mr. Meissner's greatest fear. He overlooks, however, that the language which he quotes, and which I have copied from his letter, applies to and is found in the section which deals with preserving the status quo during the 30-day waiting period for the attempted mediation.

Would he favor letting the employer fortify himself during the waiting period by negotiating with another rival union, or employing personnel without regard to provisions in the prior contract?

The restraining orders permitted during the 30-day period are only for the purpose of preserving the status quo during the period of attempted mediation and completion of collective bargaining negotiations.

Moreover, when Mr. Meissner says that "any amendment of the Norris-LaGuardia Act is a critical threat to the freedom of organized labor in America" and after citing the language above quoted from the bill then says "That means the teeth of the Norris-LaGuardia Act are pulled" by such limited use of that language, he takes in too much territory. For, permit me to point out, that the language he objects to in my bill is identical, practically, with paragraph (h) of section 10 of the Wagner National Labor Relations Act, and I quote:

"(h) When granting appropriate temporary relief or a restraining order, or making and entering a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part an order of the Board, as provided in this section, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the act entitled 'An act to amend the judicial code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes,' approved March 23, 1932."

What I have just copied is not from the Case bill; it is from the Wagner Act. Is it not an amendment proposed to the Norris-LaGuardia Act; it is the law, and has been the law since the Wagner Act became law. It is not limited in its application to the preservation of status quo for 30 days; it is applicable generally as a part of section 10 of the act which grants the National Labor Relations Board broad powers to "prevent unfair labor practices."

Mr. Meissner, apparently, has overlooked the fact that the Norris-LaGuardia Act had previously been modified by that very language in the Wagner Act and for a much broader purpose.

Further, he overlooks the fact that the Case bill specifically says: "No order of the chairman or process of any court under this act shall require an individual employee to render labor or services without his consent nor shall any provision of such order or process be construed to make the refusal to work of an individual employee a violation of such order or process or otherwise an illegal act."

When these things are brought to Mr. Meissner's attention, I feel sure that his obvious desire to get the facts and his sense of fairness and understanding will remove his fears on this score.

THIRTY-DAY MEDIATION PERIOD

Page 3 of Mr. Meissner's letter is largely devoted to his objections to the 30-day waiting period, a power given to the Board to maintain while it seeks to extend and complete the collective bargaining to achieve a contract without stoppage of work. He thinks this means a return "to un-American open-shop working conditions" if the strike is postponed for 30 days.

I know a lot of people who would argue with him about the "un-American open shop" phrase because many people feel the basic American right is for a man to work who

wants to work, but I will not go into that here. Rather, let me point out the idea of a waiting period has not destroyed collective bargaining or established open-shop working conditions in Minnesota where they have such a law, nor in the railroad industry where not 30 but 90 days of postponement can be required.

RAILWAY ACT HAS HELPED

You will recall that under the Railway Labor Act, 30 days' notice of intent to strike must be given; then, if the President decides to appoint a board to investigate the situation, another 30 days can be taken by them; and finally, if the board makes recommendations, 30 days additional can be taken for consideration and action upon them—a total of 90 days. The record does not indicate that this practice has either destroyed unions in the railroad industry or collective bargaining.

On the contrary, I venture the assertion that these provisions of the National Railway Labor Act have made it possible for railway employees to net greater earnings because they have been able to continue on the pay roll while their grievances have been ironed out. And I believe that the blessings to the laborers of America generally, as well as to the public as a whole would be almost incalculable if we could solve our industrial disputes without stopping production and distribution while we do so.

Again, on page 3 of his letter, Mr. Meissner says: "The act throws a monkey wrench into the whole collective-bargaining machinery of the United States as worked out by unions and management by giving the courts the final say in contractual relations." Thereupon he quotes the section making contracts mutually enforceable.

A BARGAIN IS A CONTRACT

I am a little surprised at his making this argument. I have always supposed that the aim in collective bargaining was a contract. If a question arises as to interpretation of some provision, who can interpret it but a judicial body? Long before any issue would go to the courts the parties would talk over their difference in interpretation. If they could not agree upon it, to whom should they turn if not to the courts? There is nothing in the bill which would prevent them from submitting the matter to an arbitration panel if they preferred.

As the Senate minority report points out: "The courts have held that the purpose of the Wagner Act was 'to compel employers to bargain collectively with their employees to the end that an employment contract, binding on both parties, should be made' (H. J. Heinz & Co. (311 U. S. 514–1941))."

And President Truman said to the labor-management conference last fall, "We shall have to find methods not only of peaceful negotiation of labor contracts but also of insuring industrial peace for the lifetime of such contracts. Contracts once made must be lived up to and should be changed only in the manner agreed upon by the parties. If we expect confidence in agreements made, there must be responsibility and integrity on both sides in carrying them out."

Thus, I would think that when Mr. Meissner reflects upon this point more carefully, he would agree that instead of weakening collective bargaining, a provision which makes the collective-bargaining contract mutually enforceable greatly strengthens the process. Otherwise, what is a contract?

Most of page 5 of Mr. Meissner's letter is devoted to quoting the section 12 of the bill on supervisory employees and objecting to its wording as "too inclusive." I am not satisfied, myself, with the wording which the bill carried as it left the House, in this respect, and I hope that the Senate will improve it.

SUPERVISORY EMPLOYEES

At the same time, I should point out that the language, even as passed by the House, does not forbid membership of supervisory employees in unions. It simply denies to supervisory employees as defined, the right to be included among the employees for whom a given "representative" or bargaining agent is recognized as the "exclusive" bargaining power, under sections 7, 8, and 9 of the Wagner Act. In other words, it means that foremen cannot represent both employer and employee at the bargaining table.

Employees who come under the Railway Labor Act are exempted from the limitation because they have a special act which handles their situation.

I wish Mr. Meissner would suggest such improvements in the definition of supervisory employees as he thinks would be appropriate. I know he could help, and I feel sure he would want to, for Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, when he testified before the Senate committee, February 23, 1946, said that "a line of distinction should be drawn" between the supervisory employees who would represent management and those employees who would represent labor at the collective-bargaining table.

"No man can serve two masters" and "no lawyer can serve both parties" and no man can sit on both sides of the table if he is to give full representation.

This matter of defining where the line should be drawn is of equal concern to labor and management, it seems to me. As Gerald Reilly of the NLRB has said: "How can a man be honest with himself and honest with his union, if he is forced, as a condition of unionism, to play both ends against the middle. And this is exactly what he must do as a unionized foreman."

Our definition of supervisory employees in the House verson can be improved upon, and if Mr. Meissner submits some suggestions on this point, I will greatly appreciate your passing them on to me and I will see that they get to some of the Senators who are working on this problem.

In conclusion, Charley, I want to thank you, and through you, Mr. Meissner for this opportunity to bring out some of the intent and purposes of the Case bill and hope I may have cleared up some points for him. Your characteristic effort to accomplish constructive results in legislation should be appreciated by your constituents and I hope it is known to them as it is to us here.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CASE.

Free Enterprise and Peacetime Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Mr. Henry J. Kaiser before the Spokane Chamber of Commerce, May 3, 1946.

Forty years ago Mr. Kaiser first came to Spokane, Wash., and since that time he has played an instrumental role in the industrial development of my State and of the whole Pacific Northwest.

In this address Mr. Kaiser states his philosophy of free enterprise and peacetime production. He reviews particularly his role in the postwar operation of aluminum plants originally built for war needs. Aluminum production will have vital importance to the economic future of the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the well-earned praise which Mr. Kaiser confers in his address upon my colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL]. Mr. Kaiser commends him for his vision and for his perseverance in assuring another great step in America's industrial progress.

The efforts of my colleague in getting the aluminum industry started again in the Pacific Northwest are a matter of record, and with the commendation of Mr. Kaiser I heartily concur.

Mr. President, I have received from the Public Printer a statement that the material which I have requested to have printed in the RECORD will cover approximately three and two-thirds pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $220.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am deeply grateful for the confidence and encouragement you have given us during the past weeks. From the very earliest reports of our interest in the aluminum plants at Spokane, you have made it clear that you really wanted us to come here.

There is so much of importance to talk about today that I hesitate to take time out for the memories of the past which are now so vividly renewed. Nevertheless, I know you will pardon me for mentioning that this is an anniversary.

It will be just 40 years next July since I first came to Spokane. Those were the days of the Golden West—a land of fabulous opportunities. There was still the glamour of the frontier and men still worked and ventured in the spirit of the pioneers.

It is my belief that there are even greater opportunities today, and that the spirit of the pioneers still prevails.

I am grateful that Mrs. Kaiser could be with me today. Spokane was our first home. It gave us not only shelter, but the chance to venture and to build. Both our sons are natives of the State of Washington; Edgar, the older, was born here in Spokane. They would have been with us were they not fully occupied with the task of making automobiles. There are many old friends in memory today. I wish there were time to name them all. The finest tribute we can pay to those who inspired us here in our youth is to work today and now for the fulfillment of their dreams.

Whatever disagreements there may be among men throughout the world at this moment, there are some fundamentals on which all seem to be in accord. One of the most important is that we can have neither peace nor security without the abundant production of goods and services.

Here in America, experts express this truth in technical terms such as "National income" and "National product." They say we must have a $200,000,000,000 economy. I am sure that none of us want to waste time in discussing what these terms mean, nor the past, present, or future value of the dollars in which they are written. In plain language, it is clear that if we are to have the comforts, conveniences, and opportuni-

ties which science and invention now offer, we must double the volume of prewar production. If the expression "a $200,000,000,000 economy" describes the situation, I am content to use it.

The key to this goal is an immediate and vast increase in the supply of basic materials.

Aluminum is now recognized as one of industry's basic materials. Measured by prewar standards and uses the wartime expanded aluminum capacity was greater than any anticipated need. But from what is now known about this metal and its potential uses, we have today an unparalleled opportunity to employ these so-called excess capacity and surplus plants.

This means that Spokane now has the chance to make a superb contribution to the Nation's new economic objective. I am confident that together and with courage we can succeed in this venture and create a national asset of immeasurable value.

A few years ago, before the war, we took a similar step when we built a cement plant near San Francisco. At first the project called for the production of 2,500,000 barrels of cement a year; sufficient to supply more than half the then existing market in that area. The venture was dubbed, "A rash and useless undertaking."

Two years later the capacity of the plant was doubled to 5,000,000 barrels a year. The trade journals classify this as the largest cement plant in the world, and it is operating at full capacity. Nevertheless, the demand still exceeds the supply.

Four years ago we built our own steel mill in southern California to supply steel for the western shipyards where there was a critical shortage in time of war. Today that plant, even though undergoing conversion to peacetime uses, is operating at full capacity producing steel for peacetime products. The demand for steel greatly exceeds the supply. I wish it were possible to double the output.

A dynamic economy like ours must not stand still when the supply side of the market breaks down.

Fear is the great destroyer—fear of competition; fear of overproduction; fear of inflation; fear of a buyers' strike; fear of the new discoveries in science and invention.

What the country needs most is industrial leadership that is afraid of nothing except the false theory that the country can grow great by standing still.

But this is your meeting and today—here in Spokane—aluminum is the top topic.

The war did three things for aluminum:

(1) It paved the way for new competition.

(2) It increased the capacity so that the metal can be profitably employed in new uses, hundreds of which have been explored and proven.

(3) It increased the number of trained personnel so that there are skilled craftsmen available for the expansion which has now begun.

In 1938 there was only one American producer of primary aluminum and this company was also the major fabricator. Four reduction plants produced about 300,000,000 pounds annually; only 80,000,000 pounds more than can now be produced right here at the Spokane Mead plant.

Under the impetus of war requirements, principally for aircraft, private and Government aluminum ingot capacity increased to 2,300,000,000 pounds. However, about 800,000,000 pounds of the capacity is not economic under peacetime conditions because of high power costs. However, the remainder of 1,500,000,000 pounds (five times prewar capacity) will all be in production in the near future. In my opinion it is even possible that additional aluminum facilities may be needed.

Intensive research and experimentation have already converted some of the following prospects into active demand and brought others into potential promise:

Aluminum for housing—for roofing, for siding, for doors and window frames, for baseboards, for plumbing and electrical fixtures, for radiators, for hardware, for gutters and drainpipes.

Aluminum for household equipment and appliances—for refrigerators, radios, stoves, washing machines, furniture, and bookcases.

Aluminum for ships—for canoes and other pleasure craft, cargo and passenger vessels, and even warships.

Dr. Engle of your own State university has enlarged upon this list until it covers many pages.

Any basic material which comes so suddenly into its own is certain to excite extravagant projections. Perhaps these begin to be evident in the current forecasts about the supplies of the raw materials from which aluminum is made.

For the moment bauxite is, without doubt, the prime element. It has been estimated that alumina-bearing clays will provide another source; but until that field has been fully explored and rendered economically sound, we have a heavy obligation to supplement our meager domestic resources by stock-piling imported bauxite against any and all emergencies. Never again should there be a critical shortage of this essential mineral. In the meanwhile, we can diligently exploit all supplies, including scrap, and we must continue the research for supplementary sources.

It is earnestly to be hoped that an additional supply of alumina will be developed in the Northwest either from nearby alumina-bearing clays or from Pacific-island bauxite. Fortunately, however, an independent source of low-cost alumina for the Spokane reduction plant is available through the lease of the Government-owned alumina plant at Baton Rouge, La.

We have also recently acquired rights to 125,000 acres of high-grade bauxite in Dutch Surinam, South America, as our own supply for the Baton Rouge plant. Long-range plans have been developed which will assist the Baton Rouge unit in feeding additional aluminum plants in the South wherever cheap electric power is then available.

I have no corner on imagination nor on faith. I will go all the way with the prophecy that the aluminum business in the Northwest can be a $1,000,000,000 industry and can take the lead in the economic prospects of this area.

I now come to a moment which I have eagerly awaited. I knew there would be a public occasion when there could be an expression of appreciation to your own Senator HUGH MITCHELL for his vision and for his perseverance in assuring another great step in America's industrial progress.

This is the time and the place to briefly review a little current history. The disposition of war plants is not a new subject. It was under discussion long before the war ended. At least three congressional committees have had it under review and analysis.

There is a marked evolution in thinking on this matter which is about as follows:

1. A year ago there was the fear that these plants would compete with and possibly ruin private enterprise.

2. Nine months ago the war came suddenly to a close and there was the shock of realizing that little had been done on the subject of disposal.

3. Then came the period of watchful waiting. Industry wasn't sure whether or not it wanted the plants. There was some vague discussion about terms and subsidies.

4. Then suddenly came the awakening to the fact that instead of a surplus of plants there was going to be a shortage.

5. Today there is active bidding for war facilities. They are actually in demand.

I want Senator MITCHELL to have full credit for his foresight, but I cannot help being glad that early in his fight for full utilization, I was actively on his side.

On March 6, 1945, I answered a request to appear before the Senate's Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of American Small Business. In a plea for the light metals, I outlined five major industrial projects in which we were employing aluminum in quantities in addition to magnesium. I also stated that during the war our people attained a high standard of living; that they are hoping to maintain it, but they all know that they cannot have it on prewar production schedules. Our hope is in the full utilization of the immense productive capacity we now enjoy, and adding to it.

Our further interest in aluminum and the Government-owned plants, particularly the Spokane plants, was presented here at a special Senate hearing last August. This Senate committee, under the chairmanship of your Senator MITCHELL, had requested a statement from us. This was done for me by Mr. Chad Calhoun, vice president of our company. Just prior to the Spokane hearings, I had on August 10 addressed a letter to Mr. W. Stuart Symington, then Chairman of Surplus Property, in which I said that we were actively making a study and analysis upon which to base our proposal. I declared our interest in the Government-owned aluminum ingot plants in Oregon, Washington, and California, the alumina plants at Hurricane Creek, Ark., and Baton Rouge, La., the rolling mill at Spokane, extrusion, forging, and sand-casting equipment at various locations.

Mr. Calhoun read this entire letter to the committee.

At that time, apparently there had been no forecast of a need or demand in peacetime for the great aluminum capacities of this country, especially for the product of the two Spokane plants. Private capital appeared to be wary of taking on the risks.

Let me repeat that aluminum capacity in wartime had increased nearly eight times over the prewar capacities. The Spokane plants alone were capable of producing 70 percent of the entire United States prewar aluminum capacity.

That the risks involved were recognized is evident in a proposal made August 2, 1945, by Mr. Sam Husbands, then in charge of Surplus Plant Disposal for the RFC, which said in part:

"The facts are, the Government has the plants; knowledge of operation is restricted to Alcoa and Reynolds; the Government wants to realize on these plants; therefore, the Government will have to take the risk incident to the education of new operators."

Mr. Husbands then offered a possible basis for leasing to new operators which was in effect a subsidy. His plan, he stated, was that under which the plants were operated during the war—at no financial risk but with profits distributed 85 percent to the Government and 15 percent to the operator.

I do not want to burden you, particularly at a luncheon meeting, with long quotations from Government documents. But the record of these events is of sufficient importance that I have given the citations to the press in the hope that many readers will inform themselves fully.

Another report of the Senate Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business held on September 10, 1945, further indicates the prevailing doubt and uncertainty in these words:

"The location of many of the Government-owned light metals plants is poor from the standpoint of peacetime survival. • • •

"A Government disposal policy of 'come and get it,' and 'take it as it is' would be improper and out of accord with the responsibilities of the Surplus Property Board and the RFC."

On September 11, 1945, the Attorney General issued a lengthy analysis on aluminum which is of historic interest to all of us in this room. It not only makes a plea for competition in the industry, but it forecasts many new uses for the metal including a vast increase in aluminum used in automobile manufacture.

On September 21, 1945, Mr. W. Stuart Symington reported to Congress for the Surplus Property Board on aluminum plants and facilities, two items of which are relevant:

(1) The lack of competition is presented as a critical problem.

(2) "Little interest has thus far been shown in major fabricating plants."

He said in part:

"To date only a few candidates have shown substantial interest.

"The problems before the Board are difficult with respect to bringing them into the industry on terms that will permit successful survival."

By October, the pot had really begun to boil. Guarded proposals were offered with suggestions that the Government share the risk or grant assurances on power rates and bauxite prices.

The Attorney General's office came in with a forceful statement that no deal which did not assure competition would be approved.

Hearings began to bristle with talk about Government in business, monopoly, subsidies, and similar subjects.

During all these months your own Senator MITCHELL was battling heroically for the only major issue, namely, the utilization of the war capacities to assure an expanded peacetime economy.

In all frankness, I want to say that until our bid was made known there was no firm declaration of interest by others in the Spokane plants. But when serious written proposals were submitted last January by us, active bidding began.

Finally the Spokane plants were leased to us on a straight rental basis without any subsidy. I want you to know that these leases are financed with our own funds and commercial bank loans.

We are now committed to a total fixed rental for the three plants, two at Spokane and one at Baton Rouge, ranging from $978,700 for the first year, up to $4,252,000 per year the fifth year. In addition to these rentals, we pay all taxes, insurance, and maintenance whether we produce aluminum or not. We have gladly assumed these private risks without Government subsidy.

In accordance with the terms of the lease we have requested the War Assets Administration to place five of the six pot lines at the Mead plant into operating condition at once. Notice for the sixth line will no doubt be given soon.

In order to bring the Trentwood Rolling Mill into early operation we are endeavoring to purchase 15,000,000 pounds of aluminum from Government stock pile. Otherwise, rolling-mill operations might be delayed until we could produce ingot at the Mead plant.

All indications point to early full capacity operations at both plants. For the moment, we are impatiently waiting for War Assets Administration to place the plants in operating condition.

It is now my pleasure to announce that all three of the aluminum plants which we have leased will be operated by our Permanent Metals Corp. All leases have been assigned to that company which has justifiable pride in the awards of the Army and Navy for records established in the field of light metals.

I fully expect to celebrate the fortieth anniversary of my coming to Spokane by knowing that this great industry is under way as a vital unit in America's bid for peace and security.

But you have the right to know that our entrance into the aluminum field as a third producer, even though it assures a broadening of competition, has not gone unchallenged. I must, therefore, touch briefly on a reaction which concerns us all.

On April 11, 1946, just 2 weeks ago, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, launched an attack on the floor of the Senate which has been widely publicized. It is hard to tell just what Senator BRIDGES was out to destroy. The speech had a political flavor which was offensive to both national political parties. He made it appear that he was striking at me, but actually he struck at a whole army, including many of his own colleagues:

1. He struck at the late President Roosevelt, whose memory is held by our people above partisan slander.

2. He struck at his colleagues in the Senate, Republicans and Democrats alike who supported our war efforts with confidence and encouragement. He struck at Secretaries of War and Navy, at generals, admirals, and department heads who entrusted us with terrifying responsibilities and with major military secrets.

3. His most vicious blow was at the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. He forgot that this institution was created by a Republican administration and was recognized and entrusted with high responsibility by a Democratic administration. Apparently, he forgot the invaluable and nonpartisan service which it rendered to the Nation and to industry throughout the depression and the war. No one will challenge its usefulness today when certain phases of reconversion call for credit beyond the capacity of private lending.

4. He struck at 500,000 workers, a whole host of whom worked 7 days a week without vacations to set many records in shipbuilding, steel manufacture, the production of artillery shells, incendiary materials, magnesium, and aircraft.

5. He struck at more than a thousand supervisors and foremen who carried the load in these industries and at the 50 executives who worked day and night for more than 4 years.

The BRIDGES' attack was a pitiful performance, lacking in every courtesy which respectable criticism requires. In a mass of erroneous, incomplete, and misleading statements there is the charge that we were awarded the leases on the Spokane plants when another competitor had placed a higher bid.

Before Senator BRIDGES indulged in indiscriminate indignation he should have gone over the hearings on the disposal of Government-owned plants. He should have familiarized himself with the provisions of the Surplus Property Act. He should have looked at the war-production records and checked the awards given by his colleagues for meritorious service. With a little fair analysis he could have avoided misinterpreting RFC figures and reports—and, finally, he could have gotten up to date on the projected uses of aluminum in the automobile business.

As to the reasons for the acceptance of our proposals on the Spokane aluminum plants, the War Assets Administration and the Attorney General were clear and explicit. According to their statements, they sought to promote greater competition in the aluminum industry in accordance with the declared will of Congress as set forth in the Surplus Property Act.

On February 21 the Spokane Chronicle told this story in detail. Commenting on another bid, it quoted General Gregory, of War Assets Administration, as saying that the Kaiser offer was in greater conformity with the Surplus Property Act.

Finally, I want you to know about some very promising prospects for aluminum in automobile manufacture which Senator BRIDGES ignored. In his Senate harangue he said:

"Except at a few points on automobiles, steel can take the place of aluminum at about one-third the cost. The total amount of aluminum required for the average car is 6 pounds."

Apparently the Senator from New Hampshire chose to omit the reason why the automobile industry hasn't used more aluminum. He may have forgotten or maybe doesn't know that the heads of General Motors, Ford, and others had long since decided they could not safely use aluminum in automobiles as long as they would be at the price and delivery mercy of only one producer. This is all set forth in the Surplus Property report to Congress, and also in the records of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Stuart Symington, then Chairman of Surplus Property Administration, before Senator O'MAHONEY's Surplus Property Committee last October gave it as his opinion that the automobile industry was the only one capable of replacing wartime aircraft demands for aluminum.

Mr. Symington made it clear to the Senate committee and in his official report to Congress that the automobile industry will not adopt aluminum in a major fashion until it has an assured price based upon competition and until it has more than one source of supply.

If Senator BRIDGES had seen the all-aluminum bodies designed and built for new models which I have seen; if he had driven an automobile, as I have, which is 70 percent aluminum and only 30 percent steel, he would not have cynically condemned the automobile to a mere 6 pounds of aluminum per car.

It would be interesting to know how many million pounds of this metal are now on order for automobile production. It will be interesting to hear that a nationally-known truck-making company alone has offered to buy the full 3 months' capacity output of the Spokane plant. Naturally, we could not accept such an order, but it is nevertheless an index of tremendous importance.

For the few minutes that remain, shall we turn our thoughts to the West, for most of us in this room today like to be classified as westerners.

Nearly a century and a half have gone by since the historical expedition of Lewis and Clark. Notwithstanding the courage of the empire builders, the Northwest has waited long for the economic development which its resources have always justified. Agriculture and lumbering and mining came into their own; but the manufacturing arts awaited the supply of fuel on which they depend.

Perhaps the greatest chapter in the drama of the Northwest were the developments at Bonneville and Grand Coulee. Electric power is the cornerstone of your future and it has been laid. From here on we can rear an industrial structure of almost unparalleled grandeur.

But even as we contemplate this fabulous prospect, it will be well to remember that no section of America can enjoy prosperity at the expense of some other section. Industrial health must be a state of well-being throughout the Nation as a whole, "One Nation indivisible." The West is entitled to an industrial growth which has been too long delayed. But unhappily there are those who seem to feel that this can be accomplished only at the expense of eastern interests. This assumption I wish to deny with all the emphasis I can command.

The answer to the problem—if there is a problem—is inherent in the fact that we are committed to a national economy of $200,000,000,000, which means quite literally that our prewar capacities will be doubled. This is the factor of safety that gives all America its opportunity. We ought to stop thinking in terms of regional interests. The East will benefit as much, if not more, from the development of western industry than it could possibly hope to gain from regional monopoly.

Sectionalism flourishes only among unequals, never among equals.

An industrial West and an industrial South might well be the touchstone to a strong, progressive, and confident industrial America. Old-line and established industries would flourish beyond the most extravagant forecasts.

It would be difficult to say whether Senator BRIDGES holds principally to a regional point of view or whether he represents interests that do not wish to be disturbed.

Some years ago a distinguished group of economists published two studies entitled "America's Capacity to Produce" and "America's Capacity to Consume." Despite skillful research and extensive documentation, this forecast fell far short in its estimate of our industrial power. It took a war to convince us of our productive capacity, and it took the terrifying consuming power of a war to measure the demand which that production could satisfy.

Is there any basic reason why we cannot do as well in peace?

It will be argued that war production was financed by the Nation's credit. But it will be well to remember that the instruments of financing the war are now in the hands of the people and of our financial institutions as investments, purchasing power, and potential credit. It will be argued that, in war, waste and extravagance can be ignored. Peacetime production, based on efficiency and oriented on cost consciousness, can make capital of that which war wasted and destroyed.

The outstanding fact is this: Never in the history of the world has there been such productive capacity and never has there been so great an unsatisfied demand. This demand is born not only of years of waiting, but of the tastes and desires cultivated by science and invention. This is, therefore, the peak of economic opportunity in the curve that runs from the dawn of civilization. It is ours to seize or to throw away. What we do here today is truly a part of that decision.

Copy of a letter and a memorandum from Mr. Sam H. Husbands, Director of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, addressed to Mr. W. Stuart Symington, Chairman of the Surplus Property Board, dated August 2, 1945, which appears as exhibit 1504 in part 31 of the hearings before a Special Committee of the Senate to Investigate the National Defense Program:

"Mr. W. STUART SYMINGTON,
"Chairman, Surplus Property Board,
"Washington, D. C.

"DEAR STU: I am enclosing a memorandum for your personal information. To embark on this program would be quite a departure for peacetime operations, and there might be a howl that the Government's guaranteeing an operator against loss would be construed as a subsidy.

"However, the plan, under the circumstances, is common sense, if we can secure efficient and sensible operators with some background experience in metallurgy.

"The facts are, the Government has the plants; knowledge of operation is restricted to Alcoa and Reynolds; the Government wants to realize on these plants; therefore, the Government will have to take the risk incident to the education of new operators.

"Would like to talk with you sometime about this.

"Sincerely,

"SAM H. HUSBANDS,
"Director."

"MEMORANDUM RE LEASING OF ALUMINUM METAL PLANTS

"1. Alcoa has definitely stated that they will not impart their know-how to any other lessees or purchasers of Government-owned plants. Thus, any such lessee will have to acquire the know-how from experience, and it will probably be costly.

"2. Under the circumstances, I am doubtful that we will be able to get any responsible concern to undertake the operation of aluminum plants on a straight lease basis and lay ourselves liable to losses of operating capital.

"3. Assuming it is in the public interest to create new factors in the aluminum metal manufacturing field, the lease plan now in effect with Alcoa might solve the problem. That plan would be as follows:

"(a) Lease only those plants which give promise of being economically sound, namely, Troutdale, Oreg., Spokane, Wash., Jones Mill, Ark., and possibly Los Angeles, Calif. (if in the latter location a favorable power rate can be obtained).

"(b) The lease to run for 3, 4, or 5 years (length of time to be determined).

"(c) Lease to provide that lessee operate the plants with its own operating capital.

"(d) Out of operating profits, lessee to pay taxes, insurance, etc., on the plant. Next, the Government to be paid cash representing normal depreciation on the plant, the remainder of the profits (before income taxes) to be split 85 percent to the Government and 15 percent to the lessee, the Government to stand all losses from operation (thus the Government would take the lion's share of the earnings, if any, against its guaranty to lessee that there will be no loss).

"4. It would be necessary that the Government exercise control over the amount of money paid to top-flight management, fees, commissions, and other extraordinary expenses, to prevent exploitation of such a contract as mentioned above.

"5. Under such an arrangement, it would be necessary that the cooperation of power companies be obtained in securing a power contract at reasonable rates without demand charges. Otherwise, should the experiment fail after a year or two, the Government would be saddled with a heavy cancellation charge that would run into millions of dollars."

Copy of a statement by Mr. W. Stuart Symington in a report to Congress for the Surplus Property Board on aluminum plants and facilities:

"The key plants to be disposed of produce alumina and aluminum. All but one have been under lease to Alcoa. Their disposal is complicated by large capacities, in some cases by disadvantageous locations, by inflexible power contracts, and by the problems of reopening shut-down plants.

"An especially difficult problem is assurance for any new producers of a permanent supply of the raw material, bauxite. Disposal of the fabricating plants presents other problems but will be partly influenced by disposal of the basic plants.

"Furthermore, the powerful position of Alcoa is a factor recognized by others interested in entering the aluminum industry by taking over Government plants. To date only a few candidates have shown substantial interest. The problems before the board are difficult with respect to bringing them into the industry on terms that will permit successful survival.

"This report outlines three courses of action that have been considered by the Surplus Property Board. Under the first course the best plants would be turned over to Alcoa in accordance with a plan that the chairman of the board of Alcoa has indicated would be acceptable in his discussions with a representative of the Surplus Property Board. This plan would not be consistent with the objectives of the Surplus Property Act. The second course is a program that would require some years to demonstrate the survival ability of any new operators. It might or might not succeed in carrying out the objectives of the act. If it failed, the key plants would revert to the Government, creating a disposal problem once again. The third course of action, therefore, is a comprehensive program which, it is hoped, will succeed in permanent disposal to new operators.

"The Surplus Property Board recommends the third course of action to the Congress and will follow it unless the Congress directs otherwise under section 19 (c) of the act."

Extract from the testimony of Henry J. Kaiser before the Senate Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of American Small Business.

"I come now to the second question on which you asked me to comment, namely, the disposition of Government-owned plants.

"The American people, by their own energies and efforts, created the weapons, the plants, and the facilities which are now being used by our armed forces to fight this war. All that remains of these facilities is the property of the American people. The trustee for these war plants, machines, and tools is the Congress of the United States. That trusteeship exists now, and consequently plans should be worked out now which can be executed as soon as the plants are no longer needed for war purposes.

"During the war, our people have attained a high standard of living. They are hoping to maintain it, but they all know that they cannot have it on prewar production schedules. Our hope is in the full utilization of the immense productive capacity we now enjoy, and adding to it.

"Obviously, such a prospect involves the utilization of the Government-owned war plants."

Copy of a letter from Henry J. Kaiser to Mr. W. Stuart Symington, then Surplus Property Administrator, dated August 10, 1945, which was was read into the minutes of a special session of the United States Senate's Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program:

"GENTLEMEN: This is to advise you that this company requests the opportunity to negotiate for the leasing of certain Government-owned alumina, aluminum ingot, and aluminum rolling mills, forging and extrusion facilities, and other aluminum and magnesium processing plants.

"We are actively making a study and analysis upon which to base our proposal. Our interest is in the Government-owned aluminum ingot plants in Oregon, Washington, and California, the alumina plants at Hurricane Creek, Ark., and Baton Rouge, La., the rolling mill at Spokane, extrusion, forging, and sand casting equipment at various locations.

"We have verbally advised Mr. S. H. Husbands, Director of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, of our interest in these plants. We would appreciate your advising us of the time when negotiations for these plants should commence and with whom. Also, if there is any time limit set for the filing of proposals.

"Very truly yours,

"PERMANENTE METALS CORP.,
"HENRY J. KAISER,
"President."

Why Miners Are Bitter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the third

and final article by Mrs. Eugene Meyer on conditions in the coal-mining fields. This article, entitled "Why Miners Are Bitter," appeared in the Washington Post this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY MINERS ARE BITTER

(By Agnes E. Meyer)

EAST KENTUCKY COAL SLUMS DESCRIBED

HARLAN, KY., May 9.—The leaders of the United Mine Workers and the coal operators in the Appalachian area are so embittered against each other that anyone who has felt the impact from both sides realizes they will never be able to get together without the mediation of the Federal Government. The miners make a strong differentiation in their feeling toward the northern operators and toward the companies in the Southern Coal Operators Association, of which Mr. E. R. Burke is chairman. The latter group is described by the men as die-hard reactionaries who are to blame for all their hardships and for the principal opposition to the welfare fund. The northern operators are actually introducing higher standards of management of the east Kentucky fields, but said one miner: "The southern operators largely think that God by some miracle will still remove the union overnight."

"What holds back the coal industry in this area," said a local union leader, "is its obstinate adherence to the company house, the company store, and the company police force."

The use of company sheriffs is temporarily restricted to the protection of property. But the long history of police intimidation, the bloody and murderous battles that had to be fought with them before the union could gain a toehold, plus the fact that the company police can still be legally restored with the consent of the Governor, hangs like a black, threatening cloud over the miners' outlook on life.

As far as housing is concerned, in order that my description of Fourmile may be balanced by what is considered one of the better camps, let us take a look at the Black Mountain Coal Co.'s properties, 14 miles out of Harlan, run and operated by the Peabody Coal Co., one of the largest producers in the country.

The four-room houses that rent at $10 a month also leak but not invariably as at Fourmile and similar low-grade camps. Mostly they are in poor condition because the leases make the tenant responsible for upkeep. The families, however, have no incentive to do any but the most necessary repairs because any improvements they make immediately become the property of the company. None of these houses, when leased, contains the most elementary facilities such as stoves, sinks, to say nothing of toilets. The 87 houses at Black Mountain stand on level, badly drained ground in rows of 8 or 10 with a 15-foot space between each house. In the narrow, dirty road between the houses stands an array of privies—87 in all. Each family has the toilet of the man across the street, so to speak, in his front yard. In warm weather the odor and the flies are atrocious.

This camp, like every other one except the few high-grade operations which I mentioned, have refuse dumps mixed with the all-prevailing mud. There is no running water except at a hydrant in the middle of the row of toilets. As the water comes from a tank on the hill it is no doubt cleaner than the water from the haphazard springs and streams used in other camps. One man who had piped the water into his house had the pipes torn out by the camp manager but put them back again. Sewers, as usual, are nonexistent here but the tenants have electric light for which they pay by meter. On a lovely grassy slope, just above the slum, stand the fine dwellings of the operators and foremen.

Some of the families in this camp are fairly well off. The 20,000 miners in this area together have about $15,000,000 worth of bonds. They assured me that there are as many class conflicts in a mining camp as in the average American town. But the close proximity of the families and the feeling of being imprisoned make for greater tension, jealousy, and hostility.

The feeling of imprisonment in the mining camps is not imaginary. The whip hand of job security forces the miners to accept this bondage. "The men who dare to live in a nearby town are always the first to be fired when a slack period sets in," they explained. "The leases which we have signed are based on the old master-and-servant law. The union cannot break them. They keep us in slavery almost as tight as the preunion days."

This seemed unbelievable in the year 1946, so I checked some of the leases. "It is expressly agreed and understood," one reads, "that this agreement shall not operate or be construed to create the relation of landlord and tenant between the parties hereto under any circumstances whatsoever." * * * "The employee ceasing to work in the employ of the company, the company may without further notice demand and reenter upon the property above described and take full and complete possession thereof, and remove the employee and the goods and effects of the employee therefrom forcibly, if necessary."

The lease also forbids the tenant even to invite a member of his family to come to see him without permission, although this of course cannot be enforced today. "The lessee shall not harbor upon nor permit the use or occupancy of the premises by any person or persons objectionable to the said lessor."

This clause was used as a club, especially against union organization. If the miners invited anyone suspected of union affiliation, they were immediately thrown off the premises as the lease states that "the lessor has the right to remove the lessee, his family, and any objectionable persons who may be at the time on the premises without any liability thereafter."

The company store with all its vices still reigns supreme. At Black Mountain the commissary is excellent, with a good variety of foods, an important item since it determines the diet of the families. It is also exceptional in that it gives no credit. "This is a good thing for us when the men are working," said one miner, "because people waste their money if credit comes easy. The credit system gives the commissary a chance to cheat on the accounts. The crooked companies can put anything on the bill because so many of the miners can neither read nor write. Practically all the other commissaries except ours use script, which is illegal in Kentucky, but nobody pays any attention to that. The Harlan shops take script at a 20 percent reduction. In many towns the merchants won't accept it at all.

"But now that we are on strike," the miner continued, "it is hard on us not to be able to get credit at our commissary. Yesterday the local union divided up the last of its funds and we shall be cashing our war bonds until the international helps the local union. During the strike, lack of credit is especially tough on the many poor families with large numbers of children, who were never able to do better than just keep up with their expenses. There are, as well, over 20 families in this camp where the father had not been working because of sickness or disability. We have to chip in and help them all out as best we can."

Although the company stores now observe OPA prices, the miners assured me that before OPA most of the commissaries robbed the men and will rob them again as soon as OPA disappears. Before the union gave the miners a modicum of freedom, the big majority of them were in debt to the company store from the time they started to work until they died.

In this tragic situation of mass enslavement, the underlying poverty of this whole east Kentucky mountain area is involved. When coal was first discovered here about 60 or 70 years ago, the operators dealt with an agricultural people so isolated, poor, ignorant and unprotected that it was easy to subject them to wages as low as a dollar and a half a day and to a tyranny of which remnants still persist now that good roads and radios are a commonplace. The pressure of population—Leslie, Ky., has the highest birthrate in the whole country—kept feeding more than enough fresh victims into the maw of unsafe mines. Life was cheap. The company police beat up any union organizer who dared get off the train at Ashland. They resorted to such desperado methods as machine guns to keep out the UMW, because surrender to the union meant the end of their stranglehold on the cheap labor supply of the east Kentucky mountains.

But things are different now. Army training has brokne the habits of life all over the country, even in east Kentucky The veterans are not going back to the mines. Nor are the mountain veterans willing to scratch away at their over-worked mountain farms, 38,000 of which in 1940 averaged an income of $144 total production per year.

During the war 8,000 miners out of every 40,000 in the Appalachian area left the mines and have not returned. The veterans from the mines and the hills are largely going back into the Army, not because they like it but because they will not accept the old miserable lives they used to lead. "There is nothing to do in east Kentucky and too many people to do it," some of them put it. Yet there is not a mine in this region which is not suffering from labor shortage.

The poverty of this whole area has also set in motion a new stream of migratory agricultural workers. Last year 30,000 migrants left east Kentucky to work in the potato crops in Maine or in the Blue Grass section of the State. Some of them did not return. This year the migrants will be more numerous than ever. This is a recent development in east Kentucky and illustrates the way more and more agricultural areas that do not afford a subsistence basis are swelling the migratory agricultural stream all over our country. If the mining industry were safer, afforded more freedom and better wages, these mountain families could keep their farms and would continue to supplement their incomes with work at the mines. If the desertions continue, the future labor supply of this mining area will disappear. The whole mining industry in the Appalachian area is in danger of drifting into the desperate plight of the British mines, unless the local operators see the light and consent to progress not only in the wage scale but in the working and living conditions of the miners.

OPA and Maple Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Bridgeport (Conn.)

Post entitled "OPA and Maple Sugar." This helps explain why pure Vermont maple sirup is not obtainable today:

OPA AND MAPLE SUGAR

We read in an OPA announcement the other day that some Vermont farmers a year ago had sold their maple sugar or maple sirup for more than OPA ceilings, but that a watchful eye was to be kept on them this year to see that this black-market practice was not followed.

That made us wonder a little bit. What is the Vermont farmer selling when he sells maple sugar or maple sirup? Really he is selling nothing else than his own initiative and labor.

And if we tell him that he must not sell his labor in the highest market, is not that a form of peonage? Labor orators for centuries have told us so. What is there about maple sugar or any other farm product that makes it public property when the OPA takes hold?

Most of the maple trees in this country are probably never tapped at all. It takes a great deal of courage, hardihood, and hard work to get out on those bitter winter mornings, tap the trees and collect the thin sap day after day until enough of it has been accumulated for a "boiling." Then it is still more work to boil the sirup down to usable thickness and to make sugar out of it. We suppose that anybody who wants to make maple suger may do so for there are plenty of trees and most of them are untapped.

It is all a question of long hours of labor, exposure to the elements, and patient work—this business of collecting maple sap and boiling it down to sirup or sugar.

And then we say to the man who has made it and whose product has become valuable because the world needs it, "You are a black marketer. You are trying to get the highest price for your product."

And the OPA solemnly warns him, "if you were such a complete fool as to go out and make maple sugar on those freezing mornings when all of us Government pay-rollers were asleep in our warm beds, don't be a big enough dope to think that we will let you sell it for a rewarding price. Oh no! The public must be protected!"

What if the maple sugar maker simply refuses to sell it at these terms? Or keeps it and eats it himself? Who could blame him?

This whole OPA debate is shot through with fraud but the most arrant, hypocritical fraud is the pious chant that only the "selfish" interests are trying to maintain a free market and that only the "pure in heart and unselfish," namely the politicians, those who have lived at the public crib, are fighting to protect the people.

Highway Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 10, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Highway Safety Conference, Departmental Auditorium, Washington, D. C., Thursday, May 9, 1946:

For many reasons I am very glad to have this opportunity to take part in this conference, and to speak to you as a member of the Committee on Enforcement of Traffic Regulations.

Surely we all know that our highway traffic accident total is a major problem of our American scene. Our purpose here in seeking a solution is both humanitarian and highly selfish. It is humanitarian because we want to save lives; other people's lives. It is selfish because each of us is, or should be, quite interested in saving his own life—and no one can know who the next accident victim may be; it might be you or I—today, tomorrow, next week, death always lurks on the highways. Because this problem is personal to all of us, it suggests the solution must be partly personal, too. Fundamentally, it is a personal and local problem.

That fact is proved by the existence of the contests for which prizes are to be awarded today. The National Safety Council, and the American Automobile Association, as sponsors of the contests, decide these awards on the basis of State and municipal records.

Naturally, I am very proud of the fact that today my own State of Connecticut takes first place among the other States in its region in the National Traffic Safety Contest, and that it also wins citation for excellence of program in the National Pedestrian Protection Contest. I want to add my congratulations to the Connecticut cities of Hartford, New London, and Rockville, each of which has been given individual recognition by the board of awards. I particularly want to compliment Mr. William M. Greene. As director of Connecticut's Highway Safety Commission, Mr. Greene has contributed very substantially to the winning of these honors. I am very happy that he is one of the seven State contact men to be given special commendation for leadership in pedestrian protection.

The most significant fact about today's awards to Connecticut, however, is that our State has continually held a high position in these safety contests. Maintenance of a low traffic-casualty rate is of more importance than the occasional winning of first place.

Ladies and gentlemen, too often, I'm afraid, the human factor in traffic accidents is obscured under a mass of statistical data.

The sheer heartbreak of needless and useless traffic deaths is known to many American families. Twice it has been known to me. I am only one of many who could stand here to tell you that there is no possible compensation for such tragedies. There is not even the melancholy satisfaction of knowing that the victim died to maintain a noble principle, or to widen the area of human liberty or understanding. A boy or girl killed in an automobile wreck is just as irrevocably dead and lost and gone as one killed by a bullet, a shell, or an atomic bomb. And remember—there are more boys and girls, men and women, killed on our highways than were killed on the battlefields over which our armies so recently fought.

There is a great deal of informed and misinformed discussion about the necessity for peace—that is security; and we all know that if all the people of the world were free to vote they would vote overwhelmingly for peace and security. But here in the United States in so-called normal, peacetime years our highway casualties, year after year, are two-thirds as high as the military losses of any average war year.

A record of this kind is not a good advertisement for the happiness to be brought to human beings by our so-called industrial civilization. The death record by traffic accidents makes our civilization seem only a little more civilized than actual war. One-third more civilized, for those who like statistics.

The purpose of this conference is to condemn this condition as intolerable in a civilized community and to point out that it can be very greatly improved. In fact, it is not unreasonable to say that any locality can attain almost any traffic safety goal it sets. All that is needed is a determination on the part of a majority of the citizens of the city, county, or State that within its limits traffic regulations will be observed and violators will be severely punished. There is ample evidence to support this statement. Had the record of Connecticut alone been equaled by all the other States of the Union in 1945, there would have been a reduction of traffic deaths throughout the country of more than one-third. Actually, in that year there were 28,500 persons killed on American streets and highways. According to the rate in Connecticut, this total would have been some 18,000; that is, over 10,000 lives could have been saved.

The importance of these figures is not so much in themselves as in the conditions under which they were achieved. Many of you undoubtedly know that Connecticut is next to the smallest State in the Union and that it is heavily populated, with a close network of well-paved highways and a number of industrial cities. Also, it is crossed by motor trunk lines trucking between New York and Boston along the old Boston Post Road, U. S. No. 1, notorious for two decades as a dangerous stretch of highway to travel. These factors could easily combine to make Connecticut a State for timid motorists to avoid. It would be very easy for us to have one of the very worst accident rates in the Nation instead of one of the best.

That we have succeeded as well as we have is simply an indication of what any other State and community can do. We all know that some of the highest accident rates prevail in localities where it should be fairly easy to control traffic—given the public will to do it. If a low accident rate can be established, and maintained, under quite difficult conditions, there is no reason for less thickly populated and less heavily traversed regions to tolerate dangerous traffic practices.

This problem is as critical as any social problem we have to solve today. As automotive production resumes and the highways and streets become jammed with a flood of new vehicles competing with the old ones already in use, only determined action in every locality can prevent a disastrous rise in the total of deaths and serious injuries. Already it is estimated that for this year, if the present rate continues, deaths will amount to over 40,000—the highest figure in our history.

The law of averages, ladies and gentleman, indicates that among them may be one of your loved ones, unless the total comes down. Compare this with the fact that during the past 15 years total deaths from highway accidents mounted to over 480,000—nearly a half million. In the 4 years of war just ended, less than 300,000 were actually killed in battle. And this does not include the maimed, crippled, and disfigured in traffic accidents who survived.

The moral of those figures hardly needs pointing out. But it may be remarked that security, like charity, ought to begin at home, and an unnecessary death toll of 40,000 good citizens a year is not a very profitable way to make progress towards the security and happiness of a nation.

Recently I read a very interesting and provocative book on comparative police powers of governments under totalitarian and free systems. Called Government Against the People, it deals with the difference between laws made and enforced by the people themselves, beginning with small groups of people in villages and little towns; and, the laws that are promulgated by a central authority and thrust upon the people by coercion. Here, in this country, we have had very little experience with coercive laws. When, on

occasion, they have been thrust upon us our reaction has been to set up speak-easies, black markets, and other illegal devices to evade them.

Now, we all know that America travels fast. That means, of course, that practically every one of us likes to drive our vehicle at top speed. The only times we slow down are when there's a funny sound in the motor, and we're afraid of doing some permanent damage to the machinery. That time has come in our national traffic machinery. It can't be cured by any national law, because a national motor law—for highway vehicles—is a coercive law which ignores local conditions. It can be cured by communities which recognize the alarming sound and slow down their local traffic motor.

The slowing-down process does not necessarily mean an actual reduction in the speed of vehicles. There are localities where it is helpful to safety for speed limits to be increased. What it does mean is that the community itself determines that the conditions causing accidents in that locality must and will be changed. Determination is the essential step in bringing about safe traffic conditions.

Back in medieval England the highways were exceedingly unsafe for ordinary travelers who did not have power or money enough to hire armed bodyguards. The danger, of course, was not from traffic, but from highwaymen—the romantic forerunners of hijackers. Certain localities were so infested with these pests that the more prudent and wealthier merchants avoided them, to the great damage of local trade. The Royal Government was practically powerless. It had no policemen, nor would the men of town and countryside permit any London tipstaffs to exercise authority in what was regarded as a strictly local affair. Yet something had to be done, or everyone in the community would go short of clothes and salt and spices and all the other goods and necessities that were brought by traveling merchants.

The cure found by these medieval Britons was in community action. Every citizen became a member of the enforcement squad for the elimination of the brigands. It was a necessity for self-protection. It was a matter for civic pride. The system spread, and in time was replaced by a paid body of men trained and paid as agents of the community, which was the original form of our present police force.

Today we leave the enforcement of traffic rules entirely too much up to our delegated agents. We are too apt to regard traffic violations by ourselves, and by others, as rather amusing achievements—so long as we get away with them, and so long as the other violator doesn't dent our fenders, or smash into our car, or actually run over us.

This is exactly where our greatest danger lies. This is where enforcement must begin; with each of us, from our own self-restraint. Too many of us are, in traffic matters, like the medieval highwayman. We are too much the violator to be the policemen, until we first regulate our own actions. When we have done that each of us can, and should, insist that all others in his community observe the rules. That is the foundation of law in a free community. That is the only road for men of self-respect and common sense to take.

I believe we have begun to take it here. And as one whose life has been irrevocably saddened by our failure to take it years ago, I wish you Godspeed in slowing our motors down.

This conference can and will save many useful lives of which our beloved country has much need.

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by Albert L. Warner on May 9, 1946, and an article by Ernest Lindley published in the Washington Post of May 10, 1946, both dealing with the current crisis.

There being no objection, the address and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Here is a proposal, which has support from within the administration, to end the coal strike.

Give the miners a pay rise of 18½ cents an hour.

Set up a health and welfare fund financed by a small percentage or fractional percentage charge on pay rolls. Each mine would make this contribution in addition to the wages paid the miners. Such payments would go into a fund of a trusteeship nature, in which the miners, management, and the public would be represented among the trustees.

The propcsed wage increase would give to the United Mine Workers the equal of the best wage rise given in any basic industry. The payments to the health and welfare fund would be in addition, but they would be in line with the payments made, and the funds established for pensions and welfare programs in a number of other industries.

Only yesterday the National Wage Stabilization Board upheld the creation of a pension fund for the Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in the case of the National Electrical Contractors Association. That asscciation is to pay 1 percent of its gross pay rolls into a pension fund for the workers. The Stabilization Board upheld the plan on the basis that the payments were reasonable in amount, were earmarked for specific pension benefits and were governed by a trusteeship in which the public interest was represented.

This proposal for the settlement of the coal strike is advanced unofficially, but with backing from within the administration.

It comes as the Nation's economic activity continues to recede. Now all the States in the East are to be requested to dim their lights and to have a brownout to conserve what fuel there is. The Civilian Production Administration has requested utility companies in coal-burning areas east of the Mississippi and in Minnesota, Missouri and Iowa to cut down on the use of coal. This will require brownouts to begin with and then blackouts of unessential services.

Two thousand train runs have already been canceled and the required 25 percent cut in railway passenger service goes into effect at midnight tonight. Also all railroad shipments will be prohibited then, except for food, fuel, and medicines.

Special truck service may have to be organized to aid in the movement of food.

The natural result of all this is to destroy a large part of the Nation's production, create unemployment and the loss of saving, if not worse.

President Truman is having a White House news conference here shortly in which he may have something to say on this situation.

But a lot of questions may well be asked of all parties here in Washington. Why has not John L. Lewis, the head of the mine workers, made definite proposals as to just what he wants in the way of wages and a health and welfare fund? In the absence of definite proposals from him, why have not the mine owners made definite proposals? It may not be industrial custom in this mass bargaining process, but why should it not be just as incumbent upon management to make a proposal of what it will pay to have men work for it as it is considered incumbent upon an employee organization to make a request?

And why has not the Government—a Government with great powers representing 140,000,000 people in this country—made no definite proposal for a settlement when nothing comes from either party in the dispute? The public may well consider it astonishing that the Government has allowed railroads to be curbed, industries to stop running, people to lose their jobs, without making one serious, insistent proposal for a settlement of this coal strike, so far as the public or reporters in Washington know.

The parties to this coal dispute including the representatives of the public, as represented in their Government in Washington are piddling around. To this observer, it seems that the Government has nothing better to do than to see that the path to economic destruction is so eased that we pass by easy gradations and over a longer period of time on a smooth progression from economic brown-out to black-out.

[From the Washington Post of May 10, 1946]

HEALTH AND WELFARE FUND

(By Ernest Lindley)

ELECTRICIAN PLAN

Two serious objections have been raised to John L. Lewis' demand for a health and welfare fund for the soft coal miners. The first is that, under his plan, the union—which means Lewis—would use the fund as it sees fit. The second is that the money would come from a tax on output—10 cents per ton of coal mined.

Both of these objections are obviated in the plan agreed upon by the National Electrical Contractors Association and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (AFL). The funds are to be collected by a board of trustees, consisting of 15 members: seven selected by the employers, seven by the union, and one by the Secretary of Labor. And the money is to be raised by a 1 percent tax on gross pay rolls, instead of by a levy on output. The fund in this case is to be used for pensions, not for general health and welfare, but the same devices would be applicable to a fund for the broader purposes demanded by Lewis.

The National Wage Stabilization Board has ruled that the electricians' plan does not constitute an increase in wages and therefore does not require specific approval under the wage stabilization policy. This ruling, in effect, removes another potential barrier to a health and welfare fund for the mineworkers.

In approving the electricians' plan, the Wage Stabilization Board notes that the money is to be collected, rather than administered, by a board of trustees. The money is to be used to augment the pension fund administered by the union itself. But the board notes that since the agreement is in such form as to preclude any change in the use of the fund or its diversion to nonexempt purposes, the importance of independent administration is of lesser importance.

The example set in this instance is receiving merited attention from administration officials and advisers who are groping for a way to settle the differences between Lewis and the soft-coal operators. Another precedent may be found in the health and welfare funds set up in the coal industry in

Great Britain but administered by an agency in which the operators, the union, and the Government are represented equally.

The American coal miners unquestionably need better provision for their health and general welfare. If Lewis' sole objective is the improvement of the lot of the miners, a fund provided by a levy on pay rolls and administered through a trusteeship in which the Government, as well as the operators and miners, would have a voice, an arrangement similar to the electricians', would fill the bill. His own plan, in addition to the serious objections sketched above, has the additional defect, according to the prevailing legal view, of contravening the National Labor Relations Act. This is the view which President Truman accepted as his own at his press conference Thursday.

Agreement on a health and welfare fund fed by a levy on pay rolls and administered by a trustee, instead of by the union, would not necessarily mean the settlement of the coal strike. At this writing no one knows what Lewis' straight wage demands will be. Some of the administration's labor advisers have been predicting privately that if Lewis got his welfare fund he would settle for a wage increase of 18½ cents, in line with the increase granted to the steelworkers. But some of these advisers have been wrongly optimistic about Mr. Lewis in the past and during the current negotiations up to the present point. Experience and what is known about Lewis' traits and position in the labor movement indicate that he will try to win a bigger wage increase than Phil Murray could get.

The general air of futility in the administration's public attitude toward the coal strike up to the present has been puzzling. The pattern suggested by the electricians' agreement may not solve the dilemma, but the fact that it is engaging the attention of the administration is one small hopeful sign in the rather dismal foreground.

Loan To Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram from I. B. Catz, president of Catz American Co., Inc., on the subject of the British loan.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 6, 1946.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Having just returned European business trip permit me advise you that my definite impressions are as confirmed by today's French vote that people generally are not Communist, however they are driven that direction by chaotic conditions which Russia seems to try creating. If United States succeeds in creating better economic conditions as our State Department is trying Europe can be rebuilt and will be a good credit risk. We have to try this, it is worth the gamble, it will restore free enterprise, therefore a loan like the British is a permissible but necessary risk. May I advise you to have this loan approved by Government at earliest date. Isolationism in 1920 led to Second World War, economic isolationism today will lead to a communistic Europe. This is no scaring with red flag it is our profound opinion after seeing conditions out there.

CATZ AMERICAN CO., INC.,
I. B. CATZ, *President.*

A Plea for the Starving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, on May 3 last this House unanimously, on the motion of the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, passed S. 2101. The bill received little public notice, but to my mind it was one of the most important bills that the Judiciary Committee has reported out during the many years the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] has been chairman of that committee. The bill, which had previously passed the Senate by a unanimous vote, will permit the sending of relief packages by individuals and organizations to our vanquished foes, thus supplementing the relief work of UNRRA.

It was, therefore, most appropriate that 2 days later and at a time when Americans of all faiths were mobilizing their forces in aid of the Emergency Food Collection drive which opens on Mother's Day, May 12, His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, should issue a pastoral letter to the Catholics of the archdiocese of New York, appealing for aid for the starving millions of Europe and Asia. I believe the words of this distinguished prelate will strike a responsive chord in the hearts of his fellow Americans, regardless of their religious beliefs.

The letter of Cardinal Spellman follows:

CARDINAL'S RESIDENCE,
New York, N. Y.

DEARLY BELOVED IN CHRIST: Less than a year ago we celebrated the end of the war, the dawn of victory and peace. But today many millions know only the terrors of peace: Disease, suffering, famine, and death. The horror of hunger, which haunts every corner of the globe, is one terror of this peace that we, Americans and Christians, can and must wipe from the face of helpless humanity—else we are not Christians.

I do not believe that any true, normal American would, if he could prevent it, permit the murder of an aged woman, nor condone the killing of an innocent child. Yet each of us is forced to face this guilt while we allow millions of people to die of starvation in nearly every country of Europe, in China, in India, in nearly every country of the Near and Far East.

Generously you have responded to our appeal for canned goods for these starving peoples, and less than 6 months ago nearly 25,000,000 cans were collected from the parishes throughout the country. But we must collect many hundredfold more, otherwise we are saying to a hunger-mad father: "Here, we give you a can of soup for your starving children. Next year we shall give you another." For there are 500,000,000 starving people being driven from the valley of hunger into the valley of death. If we do not feed these people it will not be the atomic bomb of science which will demolish civilization, but the lack of active charity.

Most Americans have given some share of their moneys, clothes, foods to help save their starving, dying fellowmen. Many Americans have given more than their share. But the hunger-bitten bodies of death-ridden millions will survive and grow strong again only when every one of us gives more than his share today and every day, for death does not wait the convenience of man.

Have hundreds of thousands of our sons given themselves in death to make nations free and men safe from the tortures and bondage of body and soul, only to have them subjected to the savagery and slavery of hunger and disease? Have millions of our sons fought and bled to free men and nations from one set of dictators only to see those they freed become pawns for new dictators? Have we merely changed the names of the tyrants and the type of the tyrannies? Do we not know that starving men are the first and sharpest tools for the dictator who feeds them? Do we not know that a desperate mother will caress the hand that feeds her starving baby; that a helpless boy will follow the hand that feeds his hungry mother? And in the hands of new dictators bread may become the weapon of a new war.

Count then not who is worthy and who is not. Count only the cringing, crawling, crushed legions whose swollen tongues and lips are purple and parched, whose dulled eyes are sunken in their skulls, whose bodies are shocking shrunken skeletons. I have heard the pleas of men whose wives carry new lives cradled beneath their hearts, fathers who know that both the mother and precious unborn child will die for want of milk and food to feed the flame of life within the mother's body thus to enkindle life within her babe. These are not idle, sentimental exaggerations. These are bare, brutal facts. For I have seen starvelings in Europe, China, and India, in all the countries of the Far East. They are our harvest of living dead reaped by war's hangman—Hunger.

Will we help engrave upon the tombs of babies and children: "The little ones have asked for bread, and there was none to break it unto them." It is not only the earth's hungry who hold out to us their bony, begging hands. Christ Himself asks us for bread for His poor. Every mouthful of food which we give to them is given to Him. Every mouthful which we refuse them is refused to Him. The day will come when it will be made crystal clear before the eyes of all who today will not see, when our Supreme Judge in the majesty of His justice will pronounce His terrible condemnation: "Depart from Me * * * For I was hungry and you gave Me not to eat." Let not this sentence be upon our souls for the murder of millions of Christ's poor. Feed them. Feed them today.

Devotedly yours in Christ,
FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN,
Archbishop of New York.

United States in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert an

article by Walter Lippmann concerning the decentralization of Germany:

UNITED STATES IN GERMANY

(By Walter Lippmann)

In my preceding article I pointed out that Prussia, which for 80 years has dominated Germany, is divided between the Russians and the British, and that, in and from their respective zones, they are carrying on a contest for the control of a reunited Germany. Seen from Moscow this Anglo-Soviet duel is portrayed as a conflict between facism and antifascism; seen from London, as a conflict between democracy and communism. But seen from within Germany it is an auction in which the two rivals bid for German support, offering the Germans the very things they lost by losing the war—namely a united and centralized Reich, its territorial integrity, and finally its position as the greatest power of continental Europe.

The Americans have been relegated to southern Germany, where none of the great issues can be dealt with. We do not have the initiative or direct responsibility. We are on the side lines of the main contest. We can, for example, talk to the Russians about food supplies from the Soviet zone and to the British about coal from the Ruhr. But the first and the last word remains Russian or British, and the American participation is advisory and consultative, dealing with the accomplished facts that result from British or Russian activity in their respective zones. Since we are on the outside looking in, even our information is filtered, and our grasp of the general situation is indirect and uncertain. Though we belong to the board of directors, we do not have the kind of knowledge which only the management can possess.

It is necessary to dwell on this point because we cannot hope to work out a constructive settlement unless we can find a way to become in fact, not merely nominally as now, a principal power in Germany. I have already pointed out that our zone in southern Germany gives us no leverage in the predominant region, which is Prussia. I should now add that at Potsdam we made the enormous error of allowing the Soviets to fix the eastern boundaries of Germany without insisting simultaneously upon determining the status of western Germany. The Potsdam agreement left the Russians masters of eastern Germany; the nonagreement about the west left the British the masters of most of western Germany. The effect of this error has been to partition Prussia between the Soviets and Britain, excluding the United States and France from direct participation in those German affairs which really count.

It follows, so it seems to me, that for us the right way back to influence is to repair the Potsdam error by intervening for a settlement in western Germany. If Secretary Byrnes and the State Department could be induced to invest in this vital region even a fraction of the brain power, nervous energy, and moral passion which they have expended on Bulgarian elections, Iran, and other secondary issues, they would begin to get some sort of grip upon the realities of war and peace. Twelve months after the great war which Germany started, they are discussing, and quarreling about, everything on God's green earth except Germany.

This default in Washington—the failure and refusal to take an active interest in a settlement of western Germany—has had a confusing effect upon the American authorities in Germany.

In our own zone we are conducting a most promising experiment with the political decentralization of Germany. If the pattern which we have applied to Bavaria and to two other south German states were generally adopted, it would cause Germany to become a confederation of some 10 or 11 self-governing states. No one has ever suggested any other constitutional structure within which the Germans could be free without being a menace to their neighbors. And only by developing such a confederation can the four separate military governments be dissolved and replaced eventually by a united Allied military supervision and control.

This is the American conception of how to deal with Germany. It is a good conception, and no one else has suggested a better one. But, outside our own zone, we not only do not promote our own demonstrated principle, but in fact use our influence against it. For, harassed by the practical difficulties of feeding and supplying Germany across the military zones, we have become the insistent advocates of reestablishing a central German administration—we do not admit that it would be a central government—in Berlin.

Now it would be one thing to reestablish such a central government of limited powers—though it ought not to be in Berlin—if Prussia, like south Germany, had already been decentralized into a number of separate states. But Prussia has not been decentralized; on the contrary, as I have already reported, the British and the Russians are more and more committed to promising the Germans a unified and centralized Prussia, dominating a unified and centralized Reich.

For us to promote a central government in Berlin under these conditions is to defeat in Germany as a whole our best contribution to the solution of the German problem.

The French vetoed the central administration which General Clay demands. They will not agree even to the rudimentary beginnings of a central German government in Berlin until the Ruhr and the Rhineland have been politically separated from Prussia, of which they are now an integral part. This is regarded as stubborn obstruction. But, in truth, the French have been defending our own principle, and protecting us against sacrificing to immediate expediency our best contribution to a lasting solution of the German question.

The French demand that the Ruhr be politically autonomous and not administered from Berlin, is not opposed to the American conception of Germany as a loose confederation. On the contrary, France and the United States have the same basic principle. They could with great advantage work together toward a general German settlement which would differ radically from the kind of reunited, centralized Reich which the British and the Russians, in their terrible blindness, are offering the Germans.

Our economic policy for Germany is all snarled up, because, in spite of the decentralization we are applying in our own zone, we have acquiesced in, and are indeed promoting, a unitary Germany. This has compelled us to be quite irrational about the economic future of Germany. We are driven to emasculate the productive power of the German Nation, because we do not really expect, nor for reasons of immediate expediency do we really want, to decentralize the political power of Germany.

Thus we find ourselves sponsoring inherently ludicrous plans to make the Germans produce less wealth than they are capable of producing. We are, therefore, encouraging what is worst and most dangerous in the Germans and are discouraging what is best and most admirable. Except in our own unimportant zone, where we follow a diametrically opposite line, we are encouraging their political vices, which are associated with centralized power, and are discouraging their virtues, which are bound up with their capacity and their passion for productive labor.

The makings of a constructive policy exist. But if there is to be such a policy, there will have to be a deep reorientation of opinion at the White House and in the State Department. It will have to begin with a realization that in the making of peace the German problem is paramount. Somehow that elementary but enormous idea has eluded the State Department. At Potsdam, at London in September, at London in January, in New York, and now again in Paris, we have been diverted and distracted, embroiled, and excited, over relatively small questions—which have become magnified and rendered insoluble—because we are not at grips with the great questions.

I hope that another diplomatic failure will not be necessary in order to carry home the conviction to our authorities that they are not making peace, and cannot make peace, around the fringes of Europe—and that being breathless, eloquent, and even tough is no substitute for lucidity and the determination to put first things first.

The Lights Will Not Go Out in the Tennessee Valley

REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. EARTHMAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. EARTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, in that I represent the Fifth District of Tennessee, which is in the area now served so adequately with cheap electric power made possible by the Tennessee Valley Authority through many miles of lines facilitated by the Rural Electrification Administration and municipally owned light systems, I stand with pride today and am most proud of the achievements of the Tennessee Valley Authority and my long advocacy of this worthwhile project.

As we all know, America stands at the threshold of a tragic and disastrous era apparently caused by the stubborn will and selfishness of one man, John L. Lewis, who would, it seems, demand certain benefits for the miners, whether reasonable or not, at the cost of critical paralyzation of American life in every realm.

If John L. Lewis continues to hold out for his selfish demands, there is little hope in the hearts of most Americans for anything but disaster. I am delighted to say, however, that because of the hydroelectric plants that our Government has enabled to be built on the Tennessee River and her tributaries the lights will not go out in the Tennessee Valley, and John L. Lewis nor no other selfish czar can dim the hopes of the great citizenship so served by TVA. Our factories, mills, railroads, homes, hospitals, churches, schools, milk plants, dairy barns, flour and feed mills, and all other institutions that are served with electric power from TVA can continue, and private enterprise can now enjoy its fruits and benefits without the dictates of a czar.

May I now insert an article which was published in the Nashville Tennessean on May 8:

TVA DAMS PRECLUDE POWER SHORTAGE HERE

As railroad service curtailment continued in the face of the coal strike it appeared unlikely that the electricity famine would hit this area because the Tennessee Valley Authority current is generated by hydroelectric dams.

Other sections of the country have been severely hit because power is generated by steam plants. TVA is now selling surplus

power to industries outside the valley area, but TVA officials were silent yesterday on whether or not additional current would be supplied the stricken areas.

This, it was pointed out, might necessitate curtailment of electrical usage in this area.

With the strike negotiations still deadlocked yesterday, there remained a distinct possibility that a gas shortage would be created here since the gas is manufactured from soft coal.

I want to take this occasion to thank our Government and the Members of both Houses of Congress for your farsightedness and wisdom in enacting the laws that today enable my section of Tennessee as well as other localities over the United States to have the advantage of being at least in part beyond the shackles and domination of John L. Lewis.

A Call for Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and pleasure to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3, 1946, an address made in New York City recently by Hon. Edward J. Flynn at a dinner of the Democratic Committee of Bronx County. It might well have been summarized as a call for unity under the aegis of the Democratic Party of the various progressive and liberal elements of our community. The political soundness of Mr. Flynn's speech is reflected in an editorial which appeared in the issue of April 26 last of the Home News, the leading newspaper in Bronx County. I have asked for unanimous consent to include the Home News editorial in my extension of remarks, so as to give to progressives and liberals the country over the benefit of the lesson of unity so clearly and succinctly set forth. The editorial follows:

FOR A BETTER BRONX—WHEN SPEAKING FOR PROGRESS, FLYNN SPEAKS FOR BRONX

The Bronx, alone of the city's 5 boroughs and the State's 62 counties, went 2-to-1 for Roosevelt in 1940 and 1944. The late President had overwhelming pluralities elsewhere within the metropolitan district and carried a few up-State constituencies, but it was only in the Bronx that twice as many citizens voted for him as for Willkie or for Dewey.

Roosevelt stood for a better life and a better country in a better world. He was the great promoter of true progress. The Bronx perceived that from the outset, and was for him from start to finish.

A JOB TO FINISH

But his work was left unfinished. On the domestic scene, the war-interrupted program of socio-economic reform and the promised postwar movement for mass prosperity are now threatened by stalemate or even retrogression as a well-intentioned White House successor encounters rising reactionary forces in Congress and out. The Bronx is anxious for resumption of Roosevelt progress under Truman.

Edward J. Flynn is leader of the Bronx Democratic organization. He is his party's national committeeman from this State, and was formerly its national chairman.

But when Flynn speaks for nonpartisan liberalism and for the arousing of public sentiment in behalf of legislation that would seek to carry out President Roosevelt's ideas, then he talks the language of many more Bronxites than are enrolled in the Democratic Party.

THE FLYNN THEME

That was part of his theme the other night at the Bronx Democratic Committee's annual dinner—and it had a richer meaning than the concomitant drumbeating for Democratic triumph in next fall's gubernatorial and congressional elections and the 1948 Presidential election.

The Democrats, as a party, are no dearer to this borough than the extent of their devotion to the people's cause. If their candidates are generally victorious here, it is partly because of the Flynn organization's effectiveness but mainly because in office they tend to vote the people's way.

On OPA, full employment, housing, minimum wages, on all that the Truman administration proposes in the genuine Roosevelt tradition, the four Bronx Congressmen never falter, never stray toward the benighted standard around which a standpat GOP increasingly mobilizes along with arch-conservative non-Roosevelt Democrats from the South. In Albany, dominant Dewey conservatism is battled by Bronx Democratic legislators. Whatever may be the allegiance to Flynn, it is clearly not merely compatible with but conducive to allegiance to the Rooseveltian legacy.

THE BRONX LINE-UP

Bronx representation in the legislature, as in the city council, is predominantly Democratic, but in the former body we have Republicans and a Laborite, and in the latter a Liberal and a Laborite. All may serve their borough well, in local, municipal, or State issues, with no bearing on the national struggle between progress and reaction.

Liberals and Laborites, each in their own degree and fashion, can also assert adherence to Roosevelt principles, despite Flynn's admonition that on the path of advance, "the medium for accomplishment always was and still is the Democratic Party."

But the Bronx Democratic chieftain did sound one warning which all progressive groups and individuals should take to heart amid the multiparty preliminary maneuvers for November. He fears wrecking of "the coalition of liberals that President Roosevelt so carefully built up."

Deep and widespread disunity in the choice of candidates for Albany and Washington office might indeed spell defeat for men of the people.

The Bronx voted 450,000 to 211,000 for Roosevelt in 1944, under three party emblems. It was 418,000 for Roosevelt in 1940. The Bronx in 1946, with a view to 1948, wants the opportunity again to present a strong front for progress. Its liberal voters demand that they shall not be baffled by failure of forward-looking political parties to select and agree upon candidates worthy of the Roosevelt heritage.

Illinois State Mother of 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVAN HOWELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the people of Springfield, Ill., are all proud of the honor which has been accorded Mrs. Herbert Hines in her selection as the Illinois State mother of 1946 by the American mothers committee of the Golden Rule Foundation of New York.

Certainly, I share with all of them this pride and satisfaction in this selection and want to extend my congratulations at this time not only to Mrs. Hines, but to the Golden Rule Foundation for its wise choice.

The fact that the selection was popularly received was evidenced by the editorial comment of the leading newspapers of Springfield, Ill., which editorials I include herewith as part of my remarks:

[From the Illinois State Journal of May 3, 1946]

MRS. HELEN HINES

Long recognized by Springfield citizens for her contributions to civic welfare and the dignity and solidarity of the home, Mrs. Helen Hines is eminently qualified for the distinction she now holds as Illinois' State mother for 1946.

The mother of 10 children, 9 of whom served America during World War II, Mrs. Hines has found time all of her enviable lifetime to add to the intellectual, esthetic, and moral strength of those who have come in contact with her.

Widely traveled, well educated, and socially conscious, she has proven that marriage and a career are not necessarily divergent pathways for a woman with a well-integrated personality.

Her interest in the schools of Springfield, activity in church circles, and association with various clubs and community groups, have added to rather than detracted from her ability to administrate a home from which 10 children have gone forth into the world with an inspiration mirrored in their own achievements.

Springfield basks in the reflected glory of this New England woman who has made her home with us for 21 years. We feel certain that her election will stir many introspective thoughts among other mothers of Springfield, and will engender a new appreciation of their own stature as well as the importance of the home.

[From the Illinois State Register of May 3, 1946]

AN HONOR WELL DESERVED

In designating Mrs. Herbert Hines, of Springfield, as the Illinois State mother of 1946, the American mothers committee of the Golden Rule Foundation of New York has honored itself and the inspired purposes to which it is dedicated.

Without being familiar with the exact requirements for inclusion in the famous Who's Who in America, we should judge that this typically fine American mother could qualify several times over on the score of her splendid achievements in the community life and the great contribution she has made to the fine young citizenship of our times.

Dr. and Mrs. Hines have 10 children, most of whom already have commendable records to their credit. It is a family of which this community may well be proud. In the rearing of this family, of course, Mrs. Hines—like any real mother—has played the major part, and Dr. Hines would be the first to pay that tribute. There is no finer achievement.

That 9 of the 10 children in this family were enlisted in their Nation's service during the recent World War, presents a record with few parallels in any Nation.

The many friends of this estimable family as well as the citizenry at large are delighted that this extraordinary honor and recognition have been so worthily bestowed. Felicitations are extended to Mrs. Hines with the fervent wish that her happy record as an ideal mother may be enhanced by the further

worth-while accomplishments of her children, reflecting her excellent example and precept as they travel their several pathways, all down the years.

Terminal Leave Pay for Enlisted Personnel of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MALCOLM C. TARVER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an address which Hon. DWIGHT L. ROGERS, of Florida, made over radio station WWDC on last night, May 9, 1946, regarding his bill, H. R. 4051, granting terminal leave pay for enlisted personnel of the armed forces:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, I have been afforded the privilege to speak over this station and am taking the liberty to deliver my message to the listeners in an endeavor to explain my bill, H. R. 4051, granting terminal leave pay for enlisted personnel of the armed forces. Radio station WWDC, in my opinion, is pioneering the field of public service with this program Congress Reports—for it allows Members of Congress to report directly to the people—Congress being the voice of the people—on issues of national interest. And the reaction of our citizens from these reports is one method which Congress can use as a barometer of public opinion—which is most important—for in the final analysis it is the will of the people which makes our laws. And so it will be again—the will of the people which, I believe, will result in the passage of my bill, H. R. 4051, known as the Rogers bill, entitled "Terminal leave pay for enlisted personnel of the armed forces."

The purpose of my bill is to provide for enlisted men, and by that I mean privates and noncommissioned officers, furlough or leave time equal to 2½ days per month or 30 days per year. The Rogers bill further provides that when a GI Joe is discharged he shall be entitled to receive reimbursement for full pay and allowance of accrued leave he has not used—at the rate of pay for the rank held at the time of discharge. In other words, the bill provides for the same equality of treatment and payment to the enlisted man as is now exclusively enjoyed by commissioned officers.

I know of no one thing that has caused as much dissatisfaction among the members of our armed forces as this rank discrimination against the enlisted men.

H. R. 4051, known as the Rogers bill, contains a retroactive clause wherein and whereby all enlisted men who have already received their discharge may file an application and be reimbursed for all unused terminal leave pay to which they are entitled. Both the War and Navy Departments provide for annual leave for both officers and enlisted men—and for years officers and enlisted men have been granted leave for which they were paid—so long as they remained in the service. Therefore, as long as a man remains in the service the departments have the legal authority to provide this annual leave, but this become a different story when the discharge papers are handed out. A dual system is used—officers leaving the service receive their full pay and allowances for all accumulated leave—but no matter how long an enlisted man may have served, or how much leave he may have accumulated, upon discharge he is immediately taken off the pay roll and is deprived of what is justly his.

As a result, this system has given rise to an almost universal feeling among enlisted men that they are unfairly discriminated against, that they are victims of unwarranted class distinction or a caste system, and creates a lack of respect on the part of veterans and the general public for those in authority who are responsible for such undemocratic treatment of men and women who served their country so well. I want to emphasize that this practice is not only condemned by enlisted men, but by most men who served as officers, as well as the general public.

Let us for a moment examine the policies of the Federal, State, and even local governments with respect to their employees leaving their jobs. We find that with the exception of enlisted men in the armed forces, they all receive full compensation for all leave earned at the time of separation from their positions. Even employees of private institutions receive these benefits. Hundreds of thousands of employees of Federal agencies during the war have been and will be paid for all unused leave. Yet the enlisted personnel of our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard have been completely ignored in this regard. The time has come to remedy this situation. Take the case of a corporal who served overseas—in the Pacific—along with his lieutenant. Both men served about 2 years overseas—fought a number of battles, hard, bloody battles, neither had time for leave or furlough, yet when the lieutenant was discharged some months ago he was paid for his accumulated leave, and rightly so, but the corporal merely received a handshake for a job well done, and was told there was no provision by which he could be paid for his accumulated leave. To an enlisted man at present there is no such thing as accumulated leave. That is why I introduced H. R. 4051—to provide for terminal leave pay to the men and women of our armed forces who have so conclusively earned it.

H. R. 4051 was introduced on September 13, 1945. As you know, a bill once introduced is referred to a committee, in this instance the Military Affairs Committee. After 30 days, having no report from the committee, I did, on February 28, 1946, pursuant to clause 4 of rule 27 of the House Rules, file a motion to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from further consideration of said bill, and by obtaining 218 signatures of the Members of the House it was made possible for this bill to be brought before the House for consideration and passage.

I am glad to state that since this discharge petition was filed and placed on the Calendar of Motions to Discharge the Committee, that the Military Affairs Committee, did on yesterday, recommend the passage of my bill with committee amendments. I am hoping for an early passage of this bill granting terminal leave pay for all enlisted personnel.

The American Legion, by resolution of its national convention, unanimously endorsed this proposed legislation and directed its national legislative committtee to advocate prompt action by Congress. The Veterans of Foreign Wars also have aided in the fight as well as the American Veterans Committee, and many other worthy organizations too numerous to mention at this time. All of these organizations agree that this legislation is just, fair, and equitable and is long overdue—since officers have been drawing pay and allowances for terminal leave since 1876. I am persuaded to believe that this legislation will remove the cancer of discrimination that is eating at the heart of the morale of our servicemen and women.

It has been surprising to me the number of letters I have received endorsing the Rogers' bill, H. R. 4051, from men who are even now overseas, and from enlisted men in every part of these United States. I would like to just read you from a few of the letters I have received from enlisted men and what they have to say about H. R. 4051. "We feel it is just and fair insofar as it partially compensates for the loss of money and opportunity during our period of service. The necessary heavy expenditure for reestablishment to a civilian status in the face of extremely high prices has caused an unusual hardship"—and another writes: "Just arrived home—have read the Rogers bill, H. R. 4051, and want to tell you we are proud to know there is somebody pulling for us." Another, "I wish to say that the purpose of your bill, H. R. 4051, is only fair and just for the enlisted man. If you and your associates can put this bill through you can consider it 'a job well done.'" Another writes, "I would like to offer you my full cooperation and to thank you for your interest in us who were fortunate enough to return to civilian life"—and one from an officer reads as follows: "In regard to H. R. 4051, I wish to state that it is the only just course. I was a lieutenant colonel and received my terminal leave, but at the same time, I felt that it was unfair. The normal situation is, that the enlisted man that was overseas doing the real dirty work was the one that was unable to take a furlough, while the one that did duty in the States was able to take his furloughs. Too, our civil service provides a vacation or pay therefor. I will certainly go on record as favoring the bill."

The American Legion, which represents many of our veterans, has very ably summed up the feeling of the enlisted man in its letter to Members of Congress on March 19, 1946, concerning the Rogers' bill, H. R. 4051, and I quote you from this letter as follows: "Nothing has caused more dissent and dissatisfaction among veterans in and out of the armed forces than the condition whereby enlisted men are discriminated against to the extent that they are deprived of compensation for earned leave when they are discharged, while commissioned officers are given full pay and allowances for such leave as they earn."

One man serving in the Navy wrote me from Naples, Italy, on March 3, 1946, as follows: "I've been in the Navy over 3 years and my total days on leave is 16. My uniform means as much to the United States taxpayer as an officer's uniform, and if they can get paid for their terminal leave not taken, I believe that we should have that same right."

Friends, we can never repay some of our men for the sacrifice they have made for you and for me—for their's was the supreme sacrifice—but I dare say there does not now lie in Flander's field—in foreign soil in all parts of the world, a single man, who, if he could but speak to us, would say—"H. R. 4051 is only just and deserving and is long overdue my buddies, the GI Joe's, who have sacrificed so much that we might continue to enjoy democracy and our American way of life."

No Clothing in London, Even Though the OPA Has No Controls There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. THOM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, the Browning King Co., of New York City, estab-

lished since 1822 as outfitters to men and boys, recently published the observations of one of their representatives who went to England and found that the stores of that country are bare of all kinds of wearing garments, even though the OPA does not operate in that country.

The statement headed "An American retailer went to London," follows:

The head of our business has just come back from London.

He went over to reopen Browning King's buying offices there, and to reestablish merchandise contacts in England and on the Continent.

As a result, before long, Browning King will again have some imported merchandise that has been unobtainable for years.

But regarding conditions as they exist today.

He thought the shelves and racks in America were bare—until he went to London.

He thought we were suffering from shortages—until he went to London.

In London today, 8 months after VJ-day, he found rationing of all commodities more widespread than anything Americans experienced even during the war.

For instance, clothing rations are not sufficient to outfit a man even once a year.

Thus, if you use coupons to get a couple of sets of underwear, a shirt, and a few pairs of socks, there are not enough left for a suit the same year.

If you buy a suit, there are not enough for an overcoat. And so on.

As a result, in London—normally the very center of men's fashions—no man there can dress the way he would like to.

Here in America, scarcity of clothing and furnishings has taxed the patience of many a man.

It is difficult to find a suit. Choices of patterns and materials leave so much to be desired. Shirts are far from plentiful. Underwear is sometimes unobtainable for days at a time.

But in America, men still look as well dressed as ever. There may be shortages, but there is still enough merchandise for every man to keep up his usual well-groomed appearance.

Here at Browning King we have known more bountiful Easters in our 124 years' experience. Yet look in our windows—shop our stores and you are likely to find men's apparel to enable you to walk out "dressed your best" in the Easter parade.

Justice to the Virgin Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in the report of the Committee on Appropriations on the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1947, the committee has disallowed funds in the amount of $23,360 for salaries for the positions of executive assistant to the Governor of the Virgin Islands, assistant government secretary, and commissioner of finance, and legal counsel to the Governor. It has also disapproved the item of $142,400 for defraying the deficit of the municipal government of St. Croix.

The elimination of the positions on the Governor's staff will seriously handicap the efficient operation of his office. The denial of a deficit appropriation will create irreparable hardship on a group of American citizens whose governmental services are already far below the minimum standards of decency.

In hearings before the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House on appropriations for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1945, the Governor of the Virgin Islands explained the need for an executive assistant and a legal counsel to the Governor. This need was recognized by Congress and funds were appropriated for these two positions. There has been no change since that time and the governor will be greatly handicapped because of inadequate personnel if these funds are not restored.

Until July 1, 1945, it had been the practice for the district attorney to act as legal adviser to the Governor. This arrangement was not satisfactory, as brought out in the Governor's testimony at the hearings. The district attorney is responsible to the department of justice and it was impossible for him satisfactorily to serve two masters. There were occasions when there were conflicts between the interests of the municipalities and the United States Government. There are also numerous demands for legal assistance on purely local matters, problems concerning relationships between the Governor and the municipal councils and relationships between local and Federal agencies, in which it would be highly inappropriate for the district attorney to participate.

The position of executive assistant was not filled primarily because of the impending change in governors, but the need is still acute and the new Governor, in all fairness, should not be deprived of personnel whose need has heretofore been recognized by Congress.

With reference to denying appropriations for the employment of an assistant government secretary and commissioner of finance, it should be pointed out that if the committee's recommendation is followed, no officer will be available to handle the finance functions and treasurer's functions of the islands. The department recommended in its budget estimate that the position of commissioner of finance be eliminated in 1947 and that a new position be established not only to assume the finance functions but to undertake additional over-all duties.

The Congress should either restore the position of assistant government secretary and commissioner of finance, or reinstate the position of commissioner of finance. Otherwise the Virgin Islands will be without anyone to head this department.

In its report the Committee on Appropriations commented on a letter from the Comptroller General concerning the disbursements of the deficit appropriations made to the municipal government of St. Croix. It appears likely that the committee was not aware of the subsequent disposition of this matter. It appears that this was merely a question as to when unexpended balances remaining in deficit appropriations should be returned to the Federal Treasury. It had been the custom of the insular government to retain the balance of a deficit appropriation into the subsequent fiscal year to cover outstanding obligations which had not been settled at the close of the fiscal period. The Comptroller General requested that any unobligated portion of deficiency appropriation should be deposited to the general account of the Treasurer of the United States where it would be available for subsequent withdrawal within statutory limitation, when needed, rather than be deposited in a bank pending final settlement of the accounts.

In his letter of November 19, 1945, on this subject, the Comptroller General inquired as to whether funds of the municipal governments from either their normal sources or deficit appropriations, were invested in war savings bonds. The Acting Governor pointed out that the purchase of bonds in the fiscal year 1944 was not made by the municipality of St. Croix nor from the municipal treasury. These bonds were purchased from trust funds of the municipality as follows:

Immigration fund	$38,000
Reserve fund	6,000
McDermott's legacy	7,000
Oxholm's legacy	3,400
Merchant Schmidt's legacy	1,600
Prince Valdemar's fund	300
Total	56,300

These trust funds were established under Danish rule and are not available for municipal expenditures except in the form of loans authorized by ordinance or for special emergency or charitable purposes. No money derived from municipal taxes or Federal funds has ever been paid into these trust funds. For example, the reserve fund was established in 1913 by transfer from the colonial treasury of Danish Credit Association bonds in order that St. Croix might have such a fund to fall back on when unusual calamities occurred, as for example hurricanes, earthquakes, crop failures, and the like. The immigration fund was established in 1845 and was maintained by a special levy on cultivable acres. It was originally established to finance importation of labor needed in the heyday of St. Croix' agricultural development, and since 1917 has been available only for municipal expenditure in the form of loans authorized by special ordinance.

We purchased the Virgin Islands in 1917 for $25,000,000. They were purchased on the eve of the First World War as an essential part of the defense of our country. In the Second World War they played an even more vital role in the defense of our life line through the Panama Canal. It has become the unfortunate custom to consider the Virgin Islands as a continual drain upon our Treasury, and yet it is a fact that the returns received from taxes in this country upon products produced in the Virgin Islands have, in the 29 years of our ownership, returned more to the

United States Treasury than the original cost of the islands plus all regular Federal appropriations and relief funds sent into the Virgin Islands.

The municipality of St. Thomas and St. John, because of somewhat better economic conditions, has generally been able to operate its essential government services without relying on the gratuity of Congress each fiscal year. St. Thomas is a commercial and industrial community depending primarily upon its port facilities, which have provided a fairly stable economy even though it has been hard hit in recent years. However, the Island of St. Croix is primarily agricultural, dependent largely on a marginal sugar industry and a small cattle-raising business. Because of its more difficult economic circumstances, the municipality of St. Croix has had to appear each year before this body, hat in hand, begging for a deficiency to operate, even at a substandard scale.

There are many benefits which the Federal Government provides as grants-in-aid to the various States but which are not available to the Virgin Islands, such as social security benefits, vocational education, and others. The Virgin Islands have had to carry the full burden of any such beneficial programs. There are no localities under the American flag where they are more urgently needed.

Unfortunately, because of the extreme poverty of the great majority of the inhabitants, the muncipalities have to provide a higher percentage of the population with health and medical care than is customary in the continental United States. The municipalities have been able to accomplish this only on a substandard scale. How substandard this is, is demonstrated by the fact that grants-in-aid to the aged and the blind of the Island of St. Croix are $2.50 per month; that the salaries of all employees—excluding doctors—of the two small hospitals average less than $40 a month; that less than $2.50 per patient-day is provided for the operation of the hospitals; that the subsistence cost for patients and personnel is less than 30 cents each per day; and that only $1.18 per day is available for the care and maintenance of each of the 50 inmates of the leper colony. All of these are now far below the minimum standards of decency, and to suggest that the municipality of St. Croix reduce its essential services of education, health, and other governmental activities by one-third is something that no Member of Congress would wish to be responsible for. It is inconceivable that the United States Government would suddenly discontinue a deficit appropriation, paid since the transfer of these islands to the United States in 1917, when such an act would reduce by one-third a standard of living already far below accepted American standards.

The municipality of St. Croix has made every effort to increase its revenues through all possible taxes and to reduce expenses to the minimum. Any further reduction will actually endanger health, education, sanitation, and police and fire protection.

McGregor Will Hold Conferences in District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it has always been my policy to keep in constant contact with the people of the Seventeenth Ohio District, whom I represent in Congress. I am anxious to learn what the folks back home are thinking about. In order to follow this policy, I have attempted to make myself available to my constituents so they might discuss with me their views relative to national issues and also to give me the opportunity to be of service to them as their Congressman.

In accordance with my annual procedure during the period of the congressional recess, I plan to visit the six counties of the district. I have made arrangements to be at the court room of the county court houses from 9 a. m. to 6 p. m. and have set forth the following schedule:

Monday and Tuesday, July 29 and 30, Ashland, Ashland County.

Wednesday and Thursday, July 31 and August 1, Mansfield, Richland County.

Friday and Saturday, August 2 and 3, Mount Vernon, Knox County.

Monday and Tuesday, August 5 and 6, Delaware, Delaware County.

Wednesday and Thursday, August 7 and 8, Newark, Licking County.

Friday and Saturday, August 9 and 10, Coshocton, Coshocton County.

I have been most gratified with the results obtained in the past and the interest shown by the number of constituents who have availed themselves of our conference plan.

No appointments are necessary and I look forward to meeting a greater number this year, as I am certain we all have problems of personal and national interest to discuss, which will be of mutual benefit. I urge my constituents to confer with me on the date most convenient to them so that I may have their views, which will aid me in representing them in Congress.

What Shall Be United States Policy With Regard to Palestine Report?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me yesterday over the Columbia Broadcasting System:

I read the report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine with a feeling of distress coupled with a sense of relief for those in the DP camps in Germany to whom emigration to Palestine is a matter of life and death. The report brings a message of rescue to 100,000 individual Jews, but deals a heavy blow to the Jewish people and its aspirations. It recognizes the distress of a mere fraction of the uprooted and homeless Jews, but ignores the central problem of a homeless, stateless people, the solution of which can be secured in no other way save by the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth.

In President Truman's statement accompanying the publication of the report, he set forth American policy with reference to it. Mr. Truman judicially singled out for praise those features of the report that will receive general commendation, while reserving judgment on those sections that are apt to arouse controversy and should properly become the object of further consideration. President Truman said: "I am very happy that the request which I made for the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine has been unanimously endorsed by the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry. The transference of these unfortunate people should now be accomplished with the greatest dispatch." This is a most significant addition since the speedy transfer of the Jewish DP's to Palestine is of the essence, if the recommendation is to be of real help in relieving the situation. The President also made this important observation: "I am also pleased that the Committee recommends in effect the abrogation of the white paper of 1939 including existing restrictions on immigration and land acquisition to permit the further development of the Jewish national home. It is also gratifying that the report envisages the carrying out of large-scale economic development projects in Palestine which would facilitate further immigration and be of benefit to the entire population."

The President is completely right in his statement of American policy on the Palestine report. With the President's interpretation so definitely set forth, the white paper loses the last shred of validity. In the place of the white paper, the chief purpose of which was to freeze Jewish development in Palestine, the President proposes implementation of the report aiming to promote the expansion and the strengthening of the Jewish national home.

President Truman was careful not to embrace the long-range political policies embodied in the recommendations. These, he said, "require careful study," which he would "take under advisement." In other words, the President is in no hurry to accept the Committee's recommendations against a Jewish state while he is most enthusiastic for the Committee's short-term proposals for the admission of 100,000 Jews and the abrogation of the white paper of 1939.

President Truman has spoken out of the heart of all Americans in his statement.

As I have stated, the report brings a welcome message to 100,000 individual Jews. But there are approximately 1,000,000 Jews for whom continued existence in Europe is intolerable. The Committee concedes that there are a large number of Jews in Europe who must emigrate somewhere, but it makes provision for only 100,000, leaving the rest at the mercy of "humanitarianism." What is to become of these other hundreds of thousands of Jews who have expressed a desire to go to Palestine?

I think American policy with respect to the report should be to continue pressing for the immediate transfer of 100,000 Jews to Palestine unconditionally—rejecting any conditions of delay.

Shortly after the publication of the report, Prime Minister Attlee attached strings to its acceptance by the British Government. Mr. Attlee formulated two British conditions to the granting of the 100,000 immigration certificates. First, that the Jewish agency

bring about the voluntary disarmament of the Jewish armed units in Palestine; second, that America share in the responsibility for bringing the 100,000 Jews into Palestine. For years now, Britain has played a delaying action game in Palestine, and this is just another example of their insincerity.

I believe Great Britain to be completely unjustified in demanding the voluntary disarmament of the Jewish armed units in Palestine. The committee's report stipulates no such conditions. Surely, the Jewish self-defense organization will not attack their brethren coming to Palestine. To regard the existence of a Jewish armed force as an obstacle to the admission of large bodies of Jews to Palestine would be laughable, were it not so obviously a strategem to delay this very urgent action.

The second condition of the British Prime Minister smacks of bad faith. What responsibility does Britain want us to share? Do they want us to share in the moral responsibility, or in the financial, political, and military responsibilities? What share of the benefits is Britain willing to offer us?

If Mr. Atlee wants us to share in the moral and political responsibilities, he has it. The mere fact that we joined in the formation of this committee committed us to some share of the responsibility for the implementation of the report.

Is it to share in the financial responsibilities? The United States has given more than its full share to the war effort of the Allies, to international financial agencies, to UNRRA, to world food supplies, and we would be the last to refuse help to the martyred Jews of Europe.

Is it military responsibility? The British Army in Palestine today is very strong. One fraction of Britain's military force now in Palestine could handle speedily and effectively any Arab revolt. Any military expert will confirm this view. If Britain is perturbed over the possibility of Arab unrest, it is up to her to reduce the likelihood of such unrest, by ceasing to favor the resumption of political activity, giving immunity for past acts of treason, of such Fascists as Jamal Husseini and the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem.

American policy with reference to the report should be in accord with the recent congressional resolution on Palestine. We are determined to see to it that justice is done to the Jewish people fully and speedily. We do not shirk from accepting responsibilities but we should get the authority that goes with it. Sharing responsibility in Palestine does not mean however giving the British Government a blank check to continue British imperialism at the expense of the American and Jewish people. Mr. Atlee, stop stalling and making up excuses for an immoral and unfair policy. The plight of the Jews in Europe cannot brook further delay.

Georgia's Industrial Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the annual meeting of Georgia Cotton Manufacturers' Association at Savannah, Ga., May 2, 1946:

Mr. President and fellow Georgians, I am grateful indeed for the kind words spoken of me in introduction, and I hasten to express my very great appreciation of your invitation to speak to you on this occasion. When I received the letter from Mr. Forbes extending me the invitation, I was surprised and first thought that some mistake had been made. I thought surely you Georgia cotton-manufacturers would want to hear from some eminently successful manufacturer or textile expert who could tell you the proper solution of labor problems, export questions, the latest technique of manufacturing or the future trend in rayon versus cotton. I cannot qualify in the least degree in any technical field. All the experience I have had in a cotton mill has been in the picker room, the cardroom, and with the drawing frames. I never advanced to the spinning frames, and my familiarity with cards and slubbers would hardly be of interest to you.

I thought perhaps you would want to hear from some of our distinguished Americans who have traveled lately to Europe and Asia; who have visited the war-ravaged countries; and who could report to you on the number of textile mills left standing to compete with you for the world's postwar textile markets here and abroad. I could not qualify for that, for I am one Congressman who has not made any trips during this war. I have had to stay at home and, save for the trips from Washington, through Virginia and the Carolinas, to my district, I have remained at my post on the Ways and Means Committee under the orders of our chairman, Mr. DOUGHTON, who still thinks a man ought to do a full day's work every day except Sunday.

I thought perhaps you would want to hear from some head of one of our great bureaus of government—some economist from one of the great universities of America or Europe—one of those men who can translate the great war powers given to our President by simple formulas and clever directive into a smooth-running governmental machinery that will insure top-speed production, high wages, high prices to producers of raw materials, and low prices to consumers, with normal profits for all. Again, I cannot qualify, for my views and thinking are rather old-fashioned and, not having had modern university training, my family tree on both sides running back to the Revolution, I suppose I am still, so to speak, "in the mental rut."

Finally, I reasoned that if Mr. Forbes had made a mistake it was too late for him to find another speaker, and, after all, they tell me that they have conquered the sand flies on Wilmington Island, so why should not I avail myself of this opportunity to enjoy your fellowship at this magnificent place, even though my address may not be orthodox?

Mr. Forbes did not assign to me any subject, but gave to me free rein to graze in all pastures. This is a fine opportunity for me to make a political speech, for the district I represent in Congress has more textile mills than any in the State, and I think ranks second only to Major BULWINKLE'S district in North Carolina in the whole United States, and I have probably more constituents at this conference than does any Georgia Congressman. But I am going to sacrifice this great political opportunity.

Speaking of political speeches, several years ago in my district the Ladies' Missionary Society at one county seat seized upon a novel idea to raise money. They invited all the candidates for Governor, for the Senate, for Congress, and for the State legislature—to come to a big all-day rally with music and a barbecue dinner. They charged all the candidates $25.00 for the privilege of speaking, and they charged everybody $1.00 for the barbecue dinner. Several negroes were at work over the barbecue pits while the speaking was going on, and one negro boy said to another, "Sam, what's that gentleman speaking about?" Sam replied, "Rastus, don't you know nothin'. These men are showing off how well they can speak so as to get these folks to vote for them for some big-paying job." Rastus said, "I thought it was something like that for that man speaking now sure do recommend hisself."

I am an enthusiast for the good old American way of life—some people call it the capitalistic system. The greatness of the American people, their vast wealth and power is in my opinion due entirely to the opportunity afforded our youth under our system of Government to acquire position, power and property by their own individual efforts. In the pioneer days of our country's history this system furnished the incentive needed to challenge the best efforts of our citizens. There has been no limit to the height any man may reach and the reward of success and security awaits all who apply themselves diligently. The records show that during the past century, more than 75 percent of the great inventions of the world that have benefited mankind most have been the product of American genius. This was because our system guarantees to each inventor a profit for his toil and genius.

Pioneers with nothing but brain and brawn have cleared the wilderness and built up here under our system the world's mightiest empire. All of these accomplishments are the result of the incentives to achievement afforded by the American way of life. Therefore, I think that any development of any trend that endangers this system, or infringes upon it in the least, is a challenge to us all.

But that challenge concerns the textile manufacturers of this nation more than any group, for that great industry is now holding the last line against such encroachments. Most of the other big industries have closed the door to the struggling beginner. There was a time when there were dozens of steel companies, a hundred or more glass manufacturers, dozens of automobile companies, hundreds of tobacco factories, and these fields offered opportunity to small investors who would succeed. However, by combinations and consolidations, competition has been reduced until most of these fields are now controlled by a few concerns—at most three or four steel companies, the same number of automobile concerns, a dozen glass manufacturers, and three or four great tobacco corporations. If not monopolies, they are just as near monopolies as the anti-trust laws will allow.

Only the cotton textile field remains. This open field has blessed the Southland, and our great State of Georgia particularly. Small cotton mills, large cotton mills, and middle sized ones have been erected on almost every hilltop. Family owned or community owned, they have furnished employment to our people, they have given opportunity to thousands of young men and thousands of small investors, and they have furnished the incentive and the wealth that has made our State what it is. Anything that affects the cotton textile industry of Georgia affects the interest of every person within its borders, so I am going to talk to you today about your responsibility as leaders in this the greatest industry in Georgia.

When Henry Grady was giving his very life in an effort to awaken the people of the South to the realization that we should turn our efforts to industrial expansion, he often related the story told by Bill Arp about the man who died in Pickens County, who was buried in a suit of clothes ordered from Cincinnati, shoes from Boston, coffin from New York, in a grave dug down to solid marble. After they buried him, they placed a small stone of Vermont marble at the head of his grave. Bill Arp said that of all the outlay at the funeral, the only thing Georgia furnished was the corpse and the hole in the ground. Grady lived to see the beginning of the greatest marble works in America opened up near that fellow's grave, but he did not live to see the industrial expansion he dreamed of. His rosiest dreams are in

the process of fulfillment if we can hold our lines against the encroachments upon the American way of life that threaten us.

My friends, this meeting here not only represents a gathering of Georgia businessmen interested in cotton manufacturing—it represents practically every person in our State, for every city and town, every church and school, every farm and fireside has a beneficial interest in Georgia's cotton-manufacturing industry, and its progress and prosperity affects all of us, for you represent our principal industry.

An industrial revolution is taking place today in Georgia, similar to that which occurred in Great Britain a century ago and in New England about the time of the Civil War. Georgia is changing from an agricultural to an industrial economy. The change started about 25 years ago. From 1870 up to 1920, Georgia's economy was chiefly predicated upon cotton, its largest single source of cash income. Production of cotton in our State reached its peak in 1911, when 2,769,000 bales were produced on about 5,000,000 acres. In recent years production of this item has decreased until today it averages about 1,000,000 bales per year. This decrease was brought about by erosion, impoverishment of the land, the decline in cotton prices following World War I, and the invasion of the State by the boll weevil.

The loss in cotton has been replaced by new and expanding industries and by other farm crops. Beginning about 1910, groups of Georgia leaders began to see in the cotton-textile industry the medium for the reconstruction of Georgia's industries. We had at hand the supply of raw cotton and a vast amount of labor which could be drawn from the farms and villages and put to work in the cotton mills, and this labor, native-born, loyal, and patriotic, could be easily trained.

So the cotton-textile industry has grown until today we have more than 200 plants located in 59 counties. Georgia ranks third among the States in textile manufacturing with over 3,000,000 active spindles, and during World War II these mills have consumed more than 2,000,000 bales of cotton per year. This quantity is more than twice the amount of cotton grown in Georgia.

At present there are more than 100,000 people employed in cotton-textile plants in Georgia. It is estimated that one-sixth of the State's white population is directly supported by the textile industry. The present textile pay roll of Georgia amounts to about $125,000,000 a year. These pay rolls from the textile mills, no doubt, have played a major role in placing Georgia once more upon that sound economic basis which the State is now enjoying.

We hear frequently the expression, "Georgia should be industralized." The fact is the industrialization of the State is already under way and has made much headway, as the following facts show.

The estimated invested capital in Georgia industries in 1945 was over $900,000,000. This contrasts with $448,000,00 in 1919 and $202,000,000 in 1909, an increase of over 100 percent now as compared with the years immediately following World War I. The estimated number of wage earners in 1945 in Georgia industries was 318,000, as compared with 123,000 in 1919—an increase of 150 percent. The estimated wages paid workers in Georgia in 1945 were $390,000,000 as compared with $101,000,000 in 1919—an increase of more than 280 percent. The number and types of industries in Georgia have increased until we now have 3,625 industries of all types. From September 1944 to September 1945 there were more than 300 new industries started in Georgia, and hundreds of various manufacturing concerns are seeking locations in Georgia.

Previous to the year 1916, farm income in Georgia exceeded income in industry, but by 1929 the income from industry in Georgia was more than twice that from agriculture. It appears that the total agricultural income for Georgia for 1945 was a little more than $387,000,000, while that estimated from industry exceeds a billion dollars. Some have estimated that we can easily double our present industrial output without importing labor, capital, or raw materials to any large extent.

In addition to this bright outlook for industrial expansion in Georgia, the cotton manufacturers face the largest demand for manufactured goods that has ever existed in history. Every mill can run day and night for months and months before this demand is satisfied.

So I take it that you gentlemen are not greatly worried with problems of sales and distribution. I do not believe you face many technical problems that may prove difficult of solution, and if you had such problems, I would not presume to discuss them.

But there are some problems that confront the cotton manufacturing industry, and every other industry in Georgia, that challenge the best thought and most solemn consideration of us all. These problems affect our established economy, our long-proved customs, our American competitive way.

I speak of the socialistic trend in Government—governmental control and interference in industry; the trend to organize all labor, and the high cost of government.

I think the latter is most alarming, for as each new social ideal is developed, it involves new costs and expenditures. I think the most important duty of Congress is to balance the budget, and to do this it will be imperative that most of the new programs be postponed, if not abandoned.

Of all the industries in this country, the cotton-textile industry is the most competitive and its average percentage of profits less. Because of this, it is a nervous and sensitive industry and taxes are more important to it. We face gloomy prospects in tax reduction, and yet we must have it if our industry remains healthy. I wish to quote in part from a speech by Representative CANNON, of Missouri, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, recently delivered in the House:

For the fiscal year 1945, during 10 months of which we were at war on two fronts, expenditures exceeded the $100,000,000,000 mark. The round-figure total was about $100,031,000,000. It was not until August 10, 1945, of the new fiscal year—which is the present fiscal year—that the Japanese sued for peace on the general terms which had been prescribed by the Allied Powers. Therefore, this also being a war fiscal year, expenditures necessarily will run large. August 1945—the month in which the Japanese capitulated—was the first month over a long period in which a definite downward trend commenced.

The total expenditures for this fiscal year are estimated to aggregate $64,654,000,000. The 1946 Budget message, dated January 3, 1945, prophesied expenditures aggregating $83,000,000,000. The war's end, therefore, will lessen cash outgo during the present fiscal year—partly a war year and the year in which demobilization largely will be accomplished—in the tidy sum of $18,500,000,000.

For the fiscal year 1947, commencing July 1, 1946, expenditures were estimated in the January 1946 Budget message to total $35,800,000,000. At the same time 1947 tax income was estimated at $31,500,000,000. The excess of outgo over income of approximately $4,300,000,000, it was indicated, would be met, not by adding to the public debt, but by drawing upon an excess of cash in the Treasury for paying maturing obligations. Such excess is in consequence of cash withdrawals falling below the amount of financial provision made to meet expenditures of the current fiscal year predicated upon the assumption that the Japanese war would continue well beyond the time it actually ended.

Since VJ-day in August 1945, we have been bending all energies to get disbursements down to levels looking to a balanced Budget in the fiscal year commencing less than 3 months hence.

It is more of an undertaking than is generally understood. In the first place, we must get current fiscal year operations so ordered and contracted as to avoid entering the new fiscal year either with large unliquidated commitments or with carry-over programs growing out of the war. Secondly, new appropriations for the new fiscal year, now being processed, must be limited as closely as may be practicable to essentials. And, thirdly, we must resist to the utmost all legislation not essential to the postwar economy, to effectuate which would occasion further Treasury demands.

I shall speak of the first two "musts" in a moment. Let me first emphasize the importance of the third—legislation calling for new appropriations. We are in a situation where we cannot have budget balancing, and sooner or later further tax reduction, if we indulge in new programs or projects which mean additional dollars out of the Treasury for the very sufficient reason that such dollars would not be there without further borrowing. A great many of the propositions submitted to this Congress, bills now pending in the committees, are propositions for deficit spending, propositions to borrow money and increase the public debt, when the imperative need is reduction of the Federal debt.

I need not amplify that statement; figures already made available speak for themselves. The semaphore shows red. We can close our eyes to it and continue to operate on borrowed money to the extent that borrowing may be practicable—and there is a limit, for we all recognize with the war over the patrictic impetus to buy Government bonds is largely gone. On the other hand, we can pursue, with determination, the hard road of denial and try to get our financial house in order. It is a question of whether the Congress can practice denial when constituents ask for appropriations and contributions to the States, in cooperation with State activities, when the States are in much better financial position to carry those burdens than the Federal Government.

Not only are these high costs of Government holding back industrial development, but the very things for which this money is being spent are in themselves imponderable. To give you some idea of the cost of demands made upon Congress by organized pressure groups, I remind you of the full employment bill whereby it was a part of the President's program to guarantee to demobilized war workers $25 per week for a maximum of 26 weeks or until employment could be secured. This program, which I fought in the Ways and Means Committee, along with 3 other Democrats and 10 Republicans, and for which I have been severely censured by some in the Democratic Party organization, would have cost the taxpayers of this country $2,000,000,000—this in excess of the amount already paid into the State unemployment funds.

The FEPC, or Fair Employment Practice Act, which, if passed, would seriously cripple the textile industry of our State, because of the severe upheaval among our workers which would result in its enforcement, would in itself cost millions to enforce.

The subsidies now being paid on food and other necessities under the price-control law amount to another $2,000,000,000 annually. Another vote cast by me, for which I was criticized, was in voting to gradually reduce these subsidies so that at the end of 9 months the whole program would be discontinued.

Amendments proposed to the Social Security Act under the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill involve an expenditure of another $2,500,000,000.

A bill recently voted by the House of Representatives and now pending in the Senate sought to provide for a veterans' housing program and to expend $600,000,000 in subsidies for part of the cost of the houses.

Then there is the British loan. I am not opposed to lending a helping hand to our English-speaking cousins and allies. They have twice held the line until we could train an army and build a navy to win the battle for democracy. They have suffered greatly and their economy is seriously disturbed. Unquestionably we should help them and everyone here knows we will. But they are asking for nearly $4,000,000,000. They cannot spend that much, for the goods, materials, and services are not available to that extent. With Britain in the markets to that extent, would not our economy be sorely disturbed? While I have complete confidence in Mr. Will Clayton, and am proud that he is in his present position, I feel that the figures he endorses for the British loan are too high. We do not have that much money on hand. We would have to borrow it from our people, thereby increasing the national debt. The interest on this debt now is appalling—even at the very low rate of about .02 percent it amounts to more than four billions annually.

I think we should let them try to get along with one billion for a while and see how they come out, for we have other allies who will want help also.

All of these proposals, some more socialistic in nature than others, pile additional cost on Government and represent more than the entire annual expenditure of our Government in any 1 year prior to this war. This heavy expense not only threatens business, but the objects of some of the proposed legislation also interfere seriously.

Many southern Members of Congress, notably Congressman BROWN of Georgia, and Senator BANKHEAD, of Alabama, have cooperated with the Cotton Council, and other organizations, in their efforts to protect both cotton growers and manufacturers from harsh and unreasonable regulatory directives in connection with price control. I have worked with them, and the Bankhead-Brown amendment to the price control was of real benefit to the industry. Many times we found ourselves voting with the minority party in our efforts to obtain justice for our people.

The other day I picked up a paper in the House reading room that had just been laid down by one of my Texas friends. It was the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, issue of April 17, 1946, and it contained an editorial which presents my views of the present situation in better words than I can command, and I want to quote from it:

"Labor, already the highest paid in the world, demands more and is abetted by crackpot economists who preach the 'bunk' that wages can be raised and prices held stationary or lowered. Management resists and production halts. Meanwhile, the people cry out for goods they need that are not being made.

"But industrial strife cannot be blamed solely on labor. Some of labor's grievances are just and can be traced to the greed and shortsightedness of management's policies in the past. Management, therefore, bears its share of responsibility for today's disturbed conditions."

To quote Mr. Baruch again, "The whole world is watching us, amazed at the exhibition of a giant who cannot pull himself together even to take care of his own needs."

We should commence trying to live with each other. There is a vast difference between living off of a community and in living in it on a live-and-let-live basis. Industry should pay labor a fair wage. And labor in return should deliver a full, honest day's work as it used to do.

There is much that Congress and our Federal officials can and should do that would be helpful. Congress should see to it that OPA is reorganized on a horse sense basis, and pass whatever laws may be necessary to prevent it from wrecking the Nation's business with its silly, uneconomic theories and formulas.

The Government should get out of business and stay out, particularly the business of trying to conduct the collective-bargaining negotiations of both labor and management. Government-fixed wages and Government-fixed prices are not in accord with the American way of life and will not work in a free economy. If let alone, labor and management could solve their problems as they did for years before the Government took a hand. Whatever labor relations laws there must be should be fair and applicable to both.

It also would be enormously helpful if the Government would stop trying to regiment people. Efforts to enact such legislation as the FEPC bill and the anti-poll-tax measure and all other proposals which invade the rights of the States should be dropped. Officials should cease catering to minority groups and fostering racial discord for the selfish purpose of trying to garner a few more votes.

The overburdened Federal pay roll should be relieved of every employee not essential to the proper functioning of the Government. Nonessential bureaus should be liquidated and the National Budget should be balanced.

It is my belief that governmental interference in established and orderly business practices constitutes the most serious threat to industry to date. The experience of business with wartime emergency restrictions, and the administration of all the Presidential powers through bureaus during the war just passed, although unquestionably necessary in the emergency, prove that American industry cannot thrive under governmental or bureaucratic directives.

The labor problem is less serious in Georgia than in most of the States in the Union. I thank God for the character of the working people of our State—sturdy, Anglo-Saxon native Americans who have mostly lived in the State for generations; people who have come from the farms where they were independent in thought and habits, and who believe in giving a day's work for a day's pay. It is my belief that if a maximum wage is maintained by industry, we will be saved from the labor problems that afflict other sections of our country. For that reason I have thought and do honestly believe that the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act is one of the many so-called reform measures that offers a ray of hope. If the textile industry can be assured that all competitors are paying the same price for labor and that their labor is satisfied, it may be one of the greatest blessings in a legislative way that has come to us. Labor unions are powerful, but my experience on the committees in Congress proves to me that they are not always making our laboring people happy, and in many instances the acts of their leaders do not reflect the will of the membership.

These national unions often propose and press legislation for passage that large groups of their membership oppose, and for which very few are anxious. Recently a group from organized labor called on me to ask my support of several bills on their program. Among these were the Full Employment Act, the Fair Practices Act, and the minimum wage amendment. After explaining the $2,000,000,000 cost of the $25 per week for 26 weeks, and the fact that the State law gave them $18 per week for 16 weeks, and that the unemployed could collect only half of their average wage, they saw that most of them were fully protected under the State law with funds already in hand without additional taxation, and they said they were not particularly interested.

None of them favored the FEPC.

All were interested in the minimum wage amendment.

Our industrial workers in Georgia want sufficient wages to live in dignity and decency—they want to be able to go to church in proper clothes, to be able to drop a contribution in the collection plate, to have a doctor when there is sickness in the family, to patronize the dentist, to keep the children in school, and to save at least a little for the rainy days. I believe each and every one of you want them to have all this and more.

I do not fear labor problems in Georgia as do some people.

It is the opinion of all thoughtful people that we are facing an era of great prosperity. It is believed that cotton textile manufacturers face their busiest years, with a greater demand for manufactured goods than any within the sound of my voice have ever known. If in the years ahead we may pursue the even tenor of our ways without oppressive taxes, without Government interference or directive, leaving it to the sagacity and judgment of our leaders to work out the destiny of Georgia's industrial future, I predict happiness, prosperity, and industrial expansion. The incentive that encourages us to work is profit, and profit is measured in dollars. If our Georgia textile industry can be allowed to earn money, it can expand, it can pay higher wages, and Henry Grady's dream will come to pass.

Years and years ago a rugged Scottish poet expressed the essence of the reason and philosophy of our free and competitive business economy in a little verse, and I will close with these words of Robert Burns—

"To catch Dame Fortune's golden smile
Assiduous wait upon her
And gather gear by every wile
That's justified by honor.
Not for to hide it in a hedge,
Nor for a train attendant,
But for the glorious privilege
Of being independent."

Injustice to Farmers on Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to call your attention to the starry-eyed proposals of the Internal Revenue Department as relating to the tax angles of the wheat-certificate plan. A regulation is in the making by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, covering the tax aspects of income under the wheat-certificate plan, and in substance it will provide that if a farmer contracts to collect his money at some time in 1947, then he will be permitted to have it taxed as 1947 income, but if the Government gives him an option to get it sometime during this year, or next year, it will be regarded as taxable income this year. The weird conclusion rests on the proposition that if the farmer can get payment this year, if he wants it, then he has constructive receipt of his money.

This, obviously, again is a punishment for doing the right thing. Many farmers

will realize too late that if they deliver their grain under the wheat-certificate plan, that it will become taxable income for this year, even though they might not sell it until next year. If they keep it in the granary, or haul it to the elevator and take a storage ticket, until next year, there is no question, but if they haul it out and do not collect for it until next year, the Bureau will tax the proceeds because long-haired thinking will come up with the conclusion that there was constructive receipt this year. The fact that the farmer received only a certificate, which in effect is similar to a storage ticket, is immaterial.

Discontinuance of Pension Deductions of Veterans While in Government Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. STARKEY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert in the RECORD a statement sent to me by members of the American Veterans of World War II wherein they desire to call to the attention of Congress and the citizens as a whole facts which appear to be somewhat unfair in the treatment of veterans when it becomes necessary for them to be hospitalized:

AMVETS URGES DISCONTINUANCE OF PENSION DEDUCTIONS OF VETERANS WHILE IN GOVERNMENT HOSPITALS

(By J. H. Leib, national legislative director)

The policy dictating that hospitalized veterans receiving a pension, or compensation shall be forced to pay their own way through service-incurred illness is a strange tribute to America's soldiers.

Amvets, American Veterans of World War II, wonders if the Congress and the citizens of the nation are fully cognizant of the fact the veterans without dependents who have been granted pensions have their pay reduced to $20 per month while undergoing hospitalization for service-connected disabilities * * * and in cases where a veteran applies for medical care for a non-service-incurred illness, his benefit is reduced to $8 a month.

In some cases these pensions run up to $300 per month. For instance, a single veteran who is totally disabled having lost two or more limbs, finds himself in need of professional care, his pension is drastically reduced to $20 per month. In other words, during the time that such a veteran spends in a hospital he is required to pay the government $28 out of his $300 benefit. It is conceivable that such a veteran could secure private hospitalization for much less than the Government deducts from his pension checks.

It is as difficult to comprehend circumstances which would necessitate the Government to force truly disabled veterans to pay for hospitalization, as it would be to imagine a government which would require its fighting forces to pay their own way to and from the battlefield. Yet, such is the case.

The average veteran admitted to a veterans' hospital does not come from a rich family or from Park Avenue. He seeks the aid of a veterans' hospital because he is an average citizen.

Amvets, therefore, would like to see a hospitalized veteran given the benefit of the doubt and the practice now adhered to be discontinued by an act of Congress.

It is a common practice for veterans to leave government hospitals long before their illnesses have been cured simply because they are in dire need of their full pension checks. Some of these boys are amputees, others are TB cases, etc. If a veteran is really sick, beyond all question of doubt, and needs medical aid from his government because of an illness caused by war service, then he should be assisted without hesitation and without being forced to pay his own doctor bills.

Amendments to Public Assistance Sections, Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a statement made by Mr. J. Milton Patterson, director of the Maryland State Department of Public Welfare, on May 7, 1946, before the House Committee on Ways and Means in regard to amendments to public assistance sections of the Social Security Act:

It would be almost impossible to enlarge upon the facts that were presented to your committee by its technical staff.

It must be acknowledged that welfare programs in the country have been built very largely around the pattern set by Federal leadership, which, however, came about on account of the insistent demands from local communities and their awareness of the need for such a program.

One of the fundamental weaknesses, as pointed out by your committee, is the lack of financial assistance to all people in need. For a good many years, changes have been recommended by such organizations as the Council of State Governments, the American Public Welfare Association, and by many private agencies and other individuals who recognized the defects in the original act, which excluded such persons as (1) the physically or mentally handicapped or chronically ill below the age of 65; (2) those who are unable to obtain employment because of age, or other reasons that make them unsuitable for such employment; and (3) those in need because of temporary illness, temporary unemployment, or their inability to obtain employment.

It is further acknowledged that provision should be made for the person who is shut off from employment because of having to give care to children in the home. It is generally believed that children are much better served, and that society eventually profits, from giving them good care in their homes.

Therefore, as director of a State program, I heartily recommend the extension of the act to provide Federal financial participation for those persons in need who are not now covered.

A good many States have made provision in their laws for reciprocal agreements with other States, enabling them to waive residence and settlement requirements. Therefore, it is sound that restrictions as to residnce, settlement, and citizenship requirements be removed because it is believed that such restrictions are antisocial, costly to administer, and antiquated.

In the administration of the program it was early discovered that the maximum limitations or ceilings in the Federal law, which were worked into State laws, have been found to be very inadequate to provide the mere necessities of life, such as food, clothing, shelter, fuel, etc. Therefore, the maximums in the Federal act should be removed, and the States should assume the responsibility for setting standards to meet the actual need of their people.

Because of broken homes and the complexity of our way of life, many children must be cared for away from their own homes. It is sound to provide for the care of these children just as much as it is to provide for children in their own homes or in the homes of relatives. Therefore, provision should be made for Federal matching.

While it is recognized that the money payment to individuals is sound, it is now recognized in the administration of the program that provision should be made for direct payments to provide medical care, because it is impossible to predict the extent to which medical care will be needed. Therefore, provision should be made to permit such expenditures to be matched by the Federal agency, in order to insure proper medical care for needy people.

For a good many years, State administrators have felt the need for unification at the Federal level of all welfare programs, and the same need for such unification and integration at the State level. Therefore, it is recommended that plans of the States should provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to administer the plan, or a single State agency to supervise the local administration of the plan.

Public-welfare officials recognize the soundness of an insurance program that will cover all people, but for many years there will be a residual group of people that will require care. Therefore, these amendments to the act will make it possible to provide that care in the most efficient and humanitarian way.

I am including copy of a resolution adopted by both Houses of the Maryland Legislature at its 1945 session, recommending changes in the Social Security Act.

H. R. 5686, introduced by Representative AIME FORAND, of Rhode Island, incorporates all of the recommendations which are included in this statement.

Joint Resolution of Maryland Legislature at 1945 Session

Joint resolution requesting the representatives from Maryland in Congress to urge that certain amendments be made to titles I, IV, and X of the Federal Social Security Act, dealing with public assistance to the needy

Whereas the purpose of public assistance is to provide a reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health; and

Whereas the Social Security Board, State departments of welfare, and many other agencies have pointed out the need for amendments to the present Social Security Act so that States can more adequately provide at least a minimum of economic security by supplying basic maintenance to needy persons who are not otherwise provided for: Therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Representatives from Maryland in both the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, be, and they are hereby, requested to take whatever steps are possible to have the following amendments made to the Social Security Act:

1. To include a fourth category of general assistance so as to provide for those in need but who, under the act, are not eligible for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, or aid to dependent children.

2. To remove completely from the aid-to-dependent-children law the maximum of $18 for the first child and $12 for other eligible children.

3. To provide for uniform residence requirements with 100-percent reimbursement from Federal funds for persons who do not meet the minimum requirements.

4. To provide that reimbursement be made to the States for direct payments to doctors or hospitals for medical care.

5. To make uniform Federal matching of administrative costs by providing 50 percent of the cost of administration to the States for all of the programs administered under titles I, IV, and X of the act; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of Maryland be, and he is hereby, requested to send a copy of this resolution, under the great seal of the State of Maryland, to each of the Representatives from Maryland in the United States Congress, and a copy to the Honorable Arthur J. Altmeyer, Chairman of the Social Security Board.

Managed Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, planned emergencies, planned economy, planned regimentation, planned scarcity, planned deficits, planned inflation have been the chief activities of the New Deal. In the presence of a great national peril is there to be a planned disregard of Executive responsibility for law enforcement to add further to the suffering of 140,000,000 citizens?

The planned shortage of food is only one segment of our economy that the New Deal has ruined, but it is one that is tragic and ghastly in its consequences.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial which appears in the May 10 issue of the Wall Street Journal, as follows:

MANAGED CONFUSION

Some 3 years ago Professors Pearson and Paarlberg, of Cornell University, wrote for this page an article on long-range food prospects.

One of the main points in that article was that if the United States hoped to redeem its promises to feed or to substantially supplement the diet of a considerable portion of the world, it would be necessary to use our grain for human consumption instead of feeding it to livestock.

The basis for this conclusion was the showing that it takes 7 pounds of dry matter in the form of grain, forage and hay to produce 1 pound of livestock products; roughly, grain fed directly to humans will sustain seven times as many lives as grain converted into livestock. Even at the best levels of production, the supplies of grain would be far from sufficient to furnish an adequate production of the highly prized foods and it was essential, therefore, that grain be kept for human consumption.

In face of this inescapable conclusion, the Government of the United States has pursued a directly opposite policy; by its control of marketing and prices it has encouraged the production of livestock.

During the war shipping was tight and there was that reason for emphasis on the production of concentrated foods rather than the bulk foods. Also during the war our commitment to feed other peoples was limited; it did not include the enemy nations or those occupied by the enemy.

When the war ended the problem changed. However, the Government policy did not change. The artificial price arrangements whereby it was more profitable to feed grain to livestock than it was to sell grain into the market were maintained.

Now the policy has been changed. The ceiling prices for grain have been raised with no comparable rises in prices of livestock products. In the meantime millions of bushels have been fed and it will be necessary to wait for some time to see if the policy change has not been so tardy as to be largely ineffective.

We have here an instance which displays practically all the faults of economic planning by political agencies.

A program is put under way to meet a definite set of conditions. Those in charge of the program have a vested interest in it. More vested interests are created by operation of the program. All of these make themselves felt politically. The program gathers a momentum that carries it on regardless of the changed conditions.

We see the effects of politics. It was clear last January at least that a shortage of grain threatened and that the formula suggested by Professors Pearson and Paarlberg was the correct one. But to have told the country as much would have been a suggestion that it must reduce its standard of diet. Far from being willing to do any such thing, Washington was telling us of better standard.

Then the Government works at cross purposes with itself. There are fixed prices for grains. If those prices are raised the essentials of diet must be raised or subsidized. So someone charged with "holding the line" resists any rises. Meantime another branch of Government wants to buy wheat. It can't because owners of wheat can more profitably feed it to livestock. One Government policy thwarts another and for the sake of the appearance of maintaining a fixed-price policy, the Government must struggle unsuccessfully to meet its solemn international commitments.

The great need is for grain to ship abroad. Instead grain is fed to cattle and chickens. One set of Government officials say that it is wicked. Another set maintains a price relationship which encourages it. The Government pleads with the owners of grain. The owners of grain reply that the Government has been encouraging them to raise livestock.

The Government says that it is wrong to sell grain for higher than the ceiling prices. But by maintaining livestock prices that make it profitable to buy grain for feed at far above ceilings, the Government encourages the sales in the black market. Finally the Government itself is forced to match the black market prices by offering to pay for wheat a price 30 cents a bushel above its own ceilings.

Encouraged by the Government the livestock population has increased to very high levels. Then the Government is forced to reverse its policy and raise the price of grain but not livestock prices. Consider the poor livestock producer. He has accumulated a large supply. Now he is suddenly told that it is unpatriotic to have it. What will he do? Much of it is not ready for market. The marketing facilities cannot suddenly handle all that is ready. The owner cannot let it starve. What he very likely will do is to continue to pay the price he must pay to get grain and to collect a price which will show him a profit, regardless of what the Government says about prices.

The advocates of Government planning have told us a great deal about the disorders, the cruelties, and the uncertainties of a free market. Could anything be more ridiculous, more ineffectual, a source of greater uncertainties and cruelties than this instance of the attempt to substitute a controlled for a free market?

Interior Department Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, cuts in the appropriation for construction of transmission lines in the State of Washington and in the appropriation for the Columbia Basin project which have been proposed by my distinguished colleagues on the Appropriations Committee have already caused great concern throughout the State. I would like to bring to the attention of the House the following telegrams which I received today protesting these cuts:

MAY 10, 1946.

Hon. HUGH DE LACY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand from newspaper accounts that appropriations for Bonneville administration have been greatly reduced. I most respectfully urge that adequate appropriations for construction of transmission lines to carry energy from Bonneville and Grand Coulee to various parts of the State are essential for the development of this region. The city of Seattle is particularly interested in at least one of the proposed transmission lines. Adequate transmission lines are essential if the power from these great Columbia River projects is to be made available to all of the people and not captured by the private power companies.

E. R. HOFFMAN,
Superintendent of Lighting,
City of Seattle.

MAY 10, 1946.

Hon. HUGH DE LACY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Construction of Olympia-Cosmopolis transmission line and two substations from Bonneville essential to proposed industrial expansion of existing plants. Lumber production would be imperiled if cut allowed. Additional power badly needed if this area expected to produce full lumber requirements. Present line through wooded areas subject to continual break-downs from storms. Loop connection essential to maintain continuous service.

DON H. ARTHAUD,
President, Hoquiam, Wash.,
Chamber of Commerce.

The committee has recommended a cut of approximately $17,000,000 from the thirty millions allotted to the Columbia Basin project by the Bureau of the Budget. Work on this project, which is to supply farm homes for our war veterans through irrigation of vast desert lands with the waters of Grand Coulee Dam, will be virtually halted if this money is not restored.

Housing is the bottleneck at Grand Coulee. The old contractors camp, constructed when the work first began on the dam, is no longer usable. Few towns

exist in this desert area, and what temporary housing as is available has proved totally inadequate. Yet the committee has removed from the bill the entire two and one-half million dollars proposed for construction of housing at Coulee Dam, in spite of the warning that this action may delay the whole program for establishing war veterans on farms.

This warning is sounded in the following telegram:

QUINCY, WASH., *May 9, 1946.*

HUGH DE LACY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Proposed appropriation cut for Columbia Basin project will seriously impede program, for development, including reemployment and farm homes. Your efforts to restore necessary funds will be greatly appreciated.

QUINCY COLUMBIA BASIN
IRRIGATION DISTRICT,
J. A. WEBBER, *President.*

Our obligations to the returning veterans who need both jobs and the farm homes which were promised to them in the new frontier land of the Columbia Basin call for restoration of the funds cut by the committee.

Appeal of Lithuanian Political Prisoners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an appeal received by the Minister of Lithuania:

AN APPEAL BY LITHUANIAN POLITICAL PRISONERS, VICTIMS OF NAZI TERROR

We, Lithuanian political prisoners, liberated from Nazi concentration camps and prisons, appeal to you who have shared a common fate with us and who have gone through the same ordeal in the same houses of torture and extermination. The confinement of so many months and years has created a feeling of solidarity among us, and pain and suffering have knitted us closely together. We have come to know one another and we understand clearly the wherefore of our struggle and suffering.

Norwegian colleagues and you, picked men of Finland and leaders of Danish working masses, and you Polish brothers and sisters, from whom the heaviest toll of sacrifice has been exacted, and you, children of long-suffering Israel, and you Latvian, Estonian, Dutch, and Belgian brothers with whom we shared our miserable crumbs and in whom we mutually sought comfort for the cruel wrongs done to our little countries, and you, our unforgettable Czech friends, and you, French martyrs, and you American children of the flourishing freedoms, and you, English sons of the land of classic democracy, and you Ukrainians, White Russians, and Russians, who often comforted us with your plaintive songs, and you Rumanians, Hungarians, Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Italians, who have made such sacrifices for your countries, and finally you who suffered at the hands of your own fellow-countrymen, you, Germans, who were grieved to see the noblest sons of Europe dying only because they wished to preserve their loyalty to their peoples—to all of you companions of our sufferings, greetings.

We stretch our free, unfettered hands, unconfined by barbed-wire enclosures, to you. We greet you upon your return to your native countries, to your families, parents, brothers, and friends, and to the work of your predilection. You have returned not to bury in silence and oblivion your dearly bought knowledge of how heavily weigh the bonds of servitude on all alike, no matter what their position in the world may be.

Freedom! Freedom! Freedom! We clamored in our spirits during the long days of heart-breaking toil. Of freedom we dreamed in the dreary nights, which were never long enough to give us the rest our poor racked bodies so sorely needed. Justice, demanded our dying comrades. And a just punishment for those who had created that horrible system of slavery and boundless injustice. And guarantees for all nations, big and small, that the tyrannical hand of oppression will be laid no more on them. For this we suffered and for this our comrades died. The chief aim of those who have been restored to the enjoyment of liberty is to fight for the freedom of every decent human being. We will not allow anyone to forge new fetters for our bruised hands or to hold in bondage masses of innocent people.

Comrades! The Association of Lithuanian Political Prisoners, victims of Nazi terror, who remain even now, for easily intelligible reasons in exile, hereby propose the establishment of an international political prisoners bureau to provide aid to the still very numerous political prisoners in exile and in distress, to fight for a better future for suffering humanity in general, and to serve as a standing reminder to political leaders that the work of peace will not be completed as long as those whose sufferings far exceeded those of front-line soldiers have not been given the reward due to them—as long as they have not been returned to their free homelands.

We appeal to the International Red Cross to take under its protection the victims of Nazi persecution with impaired health of those nations which are not yet in a position to care for them themselves, and to you comrades, you who are now back in your free homelands, for support in this matter.

We appeal to the Governments of the United States of America, Great Britain, France, and China; we appeal to all the civilized world, we whose families have remained in Lithuania or have been deported to Siberia for help in bringing them to us or providing relief for them, for they are suffering hunger and are exposed to terror of the most ruthless kind. Help us!

Comrades, we appeal to your feeling of solidarity born of our common sufferings.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF LITHUANIAN
POLITICAL PRISONERS,
V. SIDZIKAUSKAS.
STASYS YLA.
B. BUDGINAS.
J. KATILIUS.
J. BUTĖNAS.

Urges Diversion of Lake Water To Increase Power Output in Chicago Area During Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following telegram sent to me by Mr. James M. Whalen, president of the Sanitary District of Chicago, Ill.:

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 9, 1946.*

Hon. WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
Washington, D. C.

Request you take action to have Congress grant authority to the sanitary district of Chicago temporarily to increase lake diversion to make possible the creation by hydropower considerable additional electric current to become available to this community particularly for street lighting during coal shortage. Lake level is now higher than in many years even to the extent of damaging shore property and the district has available adequate machinery at its Lockport powerhouse that can immediately be used to provide double the power now being developed there and such power can be made use of by the people of this area during present emergency and dim-out. Such increased diversion of lake water would not at this time inconvenience or cause damage to anyone.

JAMES M. WHALEN, *President, the Sanitary District of Chicago.*

Unification of the Armed Services Is Debated by Two House Members in Nation-Wide Radio Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statements presented on the Columbia Broadcasting System Open Hearing program originating over WTOP May 7. It is my understanding that 97 stations carried this radio debate. Both Mr. DE LACY and myself hope that our discussion will be helpful in the further crystallization of American public opinion on this important proposal to unify the armed services:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE JENNINGS RANDOLPH

The tumult and the shouting dies, but the captains and the kings have not departed. The end of this war finds the Nation, for the first time, not slipping back into a selfish shell of indifference, but keenly cognizant that to guarantee our survival in an uncertain world we must provide now for our common defense by the most effective means this great country can devise.

Heretofore our country has been isolated in time of peace from threats of war to such an extent that we think little about national defense. The isolation from danger which we have enjoyed heretofore no longer exists. Therefore, we must act now to protect our very existence.

The important question is the nature of our national defense. It is argued that with our separate War and Navy Departments we won the war, so why change? I shall tell you why. The brilliant record of our armed forces is all the more amazing when we consider how long after Pearl Harbor it took to get into full military and industrial operation. Such a period of grace cannot be counted on again.

Two important lessons have been conclusively learned from World War II. They are: (a) The absolute need of teamwork to fight triphibious land, sea, and air wars; (b) conflicts no longer can be characterized solely as land wars or sea wars.

Experience makes us realize that unification of our Army, Navy, and Air Forces under a single and, of course, civilian executive department, is the safest and surest guarantee of security. Now we must profit from our shortcomings in the war—consider the innumerable delays, duplications, disputes, and wastages, not only in the top-level strategy in Washington, but in uneconomical use of our limited manpower, raw materials, production, and transportation—all because no single agency other than the President himself could direct, reconcile, and balance the numerous and complicated requirements and plans of the War and Navy Departments.

Such successful cooperation as was achieved between the armed forces—under pressure of national emergency by patriotic military and civilian leaders—serves to emphasize the urgency of instituting by law a system of defense with the greatest likelihood of success.

Obviously then it makes sense to have in peacetime a single department to administer and train land, sea, and air power for emergencies.

We can place air power in its proper position either by the establishment of a new department of air or giving air power a proper place in our national defense plan. Creating another department for air would probably multiply the difficulties which we already have of obtaining teamwork between our two existing major components of the armed forces, the Army and the Navy.

The conclusion is that the best method by which we can eliminate duplications, overlaps disputes, wastage, conflicts, and lack of teamwork is to have all of the members of our security forces on the same team, which means a single Department of Common Defense.

A single department proposed in H. R. 6066, pending in the House of Representatives, provides not only for the most efficient and effective military structure but for a Director of Common Supply to eliminate administrative duplications and differences among the services and serve them all on the same basis—with a very considerable saving to the taxpayer.

My bill, for which I urge the support of every American who wants to survive a future war, establishes a single Department of Common Defense to replace the outmoded War and Navy Departments. Under the single Secretary will be additional secretaries to administer as separate and distinct arms the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. Assistant Secretaries are provided for the important security factors of scientific research and development, intelligence, supply and hospitalization, and education and training. A Chief of Staff of Common Defense acts as chief military adviser to the President and the Secretary. A Joint Staff representing the Army, Navy, and Air Force will give additional advice and coordination. In addition to integrating the three armed forces into one executive department, the legislation includes important measures to coordinate national defense with the State Department and other executive agencies, all to the end that maximum defense is provided with minimum expense.

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE HUGH DE LACY

In any discussion of the merger of our armed services, we must not confuse different things. It is one thing to favor, as we all do, a unified command of actual military operations against an enemy. It is another to want to reduce or to abolish the democratic process of discussion, deliberation, and conference between equal spokesmen in the determination of policy and strategy in the seat of government at home. It most certainly does not follow from the acknowledge need for combined military operations in a given theater that we ought to reduce the present War and Navy Departments to the status of Government agencies in one large Department of Defense, in which the civilian secretary can only be a rubber stamp for the real power, the single, military chief of staff.

Those who think that the cure for needless duplication and inefficiency in the armed services is putting both of them into one should weigh part of General Kenny's testimony before the Senate Military Affairs Committee. Citing an action on Okinawa where the marines and the Army were fighting side by side, the general drove home the point that a merger of Army and Navy would have avoided the shocking situation which arose during that fighting when the marines, though using the same caliber field guns as the Army, ran out of ammunition, but found the Army's ammunition did not fit their guns. The marines just had to stop their artillery fire.

Now there is no excuse for a mix-up like that. But what General Kenny did not tell the Senate committee is that the marines buy much of their artillery from the Army and that the marines in that engagement on Okinawa were using Army manufactured field pieces. The real shocking part of that story is that two Army field guns of the same caliber, one used by the marines and the other by the Army, could not interchange ammunition.

When we speak of merging the Army and the Navy to cure the evils of lack of standardization and duplication, therefore, we might first suggest that the Army put through a merger within its own ranks, if that is the infallible cure for those evils.

There are advantages, incidentally, which come from what is called duplication, particularly in specialized research and development. The much cited instance of the 4½" rockets developed by the Navy and the 5" rocket developed by the Army are good illustrations. By agreement, the Navy undertook to make a rocket with a dry propellant. The Army undertook to make a rocket with a wet propellant. The dry propellant required a slightly smaller space; the wet, a slightly larger space, which explains why the Navy started with one size and the Army with another.

The Army reached success first with its 5" type. Navy research experts, not content to be outdone, stuck to their job and produced theirs using the other type of propellant and the smaller container. Both are highly effective weapons, and both can be shot from the same holders.

Was this wasteful duplication? Or was it a good example of how two competing research organizations worked together to guarantee that our country would get quick and effective results?

Of course we could have one military research bureau in a merged department and still stimulate competition between research teams, but where would the boasted savings come in then?

We would still need the same number of men and the same amount of equipment, and the danger would be ever present that some one at the top, not knowing about or not favoring a particular specialty, would discourage or stop the experiment he did not favor.

That is one of the most important objections which the atomic scientists are raising to continued, air-tight control by the War Department of further atomic research.

Merging the War and Navy Departments, as proposed in S. 2044, and H. R. 6066 would set up a military colossus, tending to give the military too great a preponderance in decisions outside of their province, and within their own proper field would stiffle fruitful interchanges of thought within the military organization, prevent differences of military opinion from rising to top civilian levels for review and final decision, and create the greatest opportunity for the single military chief of staff to make the same kind of fatal, one-man decisions as those by which Hitler doomed his magnificent army, or as those by which Tojo made the Japanese Navy much less effective against us than its striking force could otherwise have made it.

While I support closer coordination and more effective integration of parts of our military activities, the merger of the two Departments under one chief of staff and one overworked Secretary of Common Defense might well prove disastrous.

What Power!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of May 6, 1946:

WHAT POWER!

Oh, no, Government does not lack power. Sovereignty, working through the Illinois Commerce Commission, the Office of Defense Transportation, and the like is putting on a show of power such as we have rarely seen.

Government is shutting down theaters and movies. It is telling sick people and pregnant mothers to climb long flights of stairs to see their doctors—or do without seeing them.

It is telling wage earners to take 3 days for a working week—and 3 days' wages for a week's wages.

It is stopping passengers trains. It is preventing the shipment of freight. It is closing stores.

And the people who get the orders are obeying them. The orders are brusque. You comply or else—you don't get any electricity, and without electricity you can't operate at all.

It is a vast and magnificent display of authority. Seldom have the common people been so thoroughly kicked around.

But as the people watch this demonstration of their sovereign's authority awe-struck and numb, they wonder why the Government totally lacks another kind of power—the power to see that enough coal is mined to make these other measures needless.

We have been through a great war against what, before we armed ourselves, were the most powerful military states the world has even seen.

But these mighty enemies could not stop our factories. They could not put our trains out of running. They could not reach us by bomb or shell; their saboteurs were shadowed and caught before they could do any serious harm.

But what our enemies could not do to us, our fellow citizen, John L. Lewis, the boss of the coal miners, can do to us all by himself. And the Government either has no power to protect us, or is unwilling to use it.

O, mighty Lewis, how contemptible the Government of this great Nation must be in thy sight! And if this goes on much longer, how contemptible in everybody's.

Tribute to the Memory of the Honorable James W. Mott at the Dedication of Mott Basin, Tongue Point Naval Base, Astoria, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on April 24, a ship mooring basin at the Tongue Point Naval Base near Astoria, Oreg., was officially dedicated to the memory of our late colleague, the Honorable James W. Mott. This great Navy facility will henceforth be known as the Mott Basin.

The dedication ceremony, which was held at the Tongue Point Naval Base, was attended by members of the House Naval Affairs Committee, and by all of the Representatives in Congress from Oregon. The ceremony was a splendid tribute to a great man and a great statesman, our late colleague, the Honorable James W. Mott.

Addresses in connection with this ceremony were given by the Honorable W. STERLING COLE, Representative in Congress from New York, ranking minority member of the House Naval Affairs Committee, and by the Honorable Earl Snell, Governor of Oregon. I include as a part of my remarks the address by the Honorable W. STERLING COLE, as follows:

Only a few months ago our country and the people of Oregon mourned the loss of our friend and colleague the Honorable James W. Mott, the Representative from this congressional district. Today we meet to perpetuate his memory by giving his name to a haven for the ships of the Navy he loved.

Seldom in the annals of our military history has any civilian been thus signally honored by having a military base or activity designated as a memorial to his name and fame. To my knowledge this is but the second instance during the period of World War II. That fact alone is striking testimony of the great contribution which Mr. Mott made to naval history. This ceremony today gives voice to the genuine appreciation which all of us and the Nation have for his outstanding zeal, leadership, and ability.

But Jim Mott requires no memorial in order that his name may remain fresh and alive in the minds of his countrymen. Those of us who knew him and worked with him will always remember his unfailing comradeship, his unstinting devotion to duty and the high principles which were as much a part of him as was his name. We shall remember his loyalty to his country in its time of greatest trial. We shall remember his foresight, his vision, and his wisdom. We shall remember that he gave lavishly of that wisdom in the defense of his native land; for Jim Mott lived at a time when his country needed the type of leadership which he was eminently fitted to give and which he displayed in great abundance.

His career from first to last brought him into close association with naval matters. He served in the Navy during the First World War. During his many years in Congress he was a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. When he passed away he was the leader of the minority members of that Committee. No man has contributed more to the preparation of our Navy for war, and to the maintenance of our Navy in war, than has Jim Mott. It is fitting that his name shall live for all time to come, thus, in close association with the Navy.

It is particularly fitting that the naval activity which is to bear his name should be at Tongue Point. It was he who first realized the strategic potentialities of Tongue Point as a naval base. It was he who steadfastly insisted upon the use of this vicinity for a naval activity. His efforts were notably crowned with success. Tongue Point and Astoria have been of great service to the Nation in this greatest of all wars, and will continue to be so during the peace. I am particularly pleased that the most important portion of this base will bear the name of the great leader of this community who founded and fostered the naval station at Tongue Point.

Jim Mott, although he is no longer with us, is not entirely lost to us. As the poet has said "Gone, gone are the slow slumbering moonlit nights of May. Gone, gone are they. Yet not gone, for I have them in my soul." So it is with Jim, though gone he is not gone, for we have him in our soul.

He was an American of the rugged and courageous type. He led an unceasing fight for those things which he believed to be right. We can draw much of value from him if we only follow his example. When problems confront us, particularly those which involve the Naval Establishment, we can find the correct solution of them if we can visualize what Jim Mott would have advised.

Many of his doctrines remain crystal clear in our minds. Jim Mott loved the Navy. He realized the great value of the Navy as an arm for the defense of our country. He fought for a strong Navy; strong in ships, planes, men, and supporting shore bases; strong in spirit, tradition, and in an uncompromising "will to win." He regarded the Navy as our country's long-range weapon, able to reach out thousands of miles from our shores to roll back an invader; able to carry an attack thousands of miles into enemy territory; able to win and hold bases near an enemy from which air and ground assaults could be launched against the enemy homeland.

Jim Mott envisaged a fleet able to take and keep to the sea for indefinite periods of time; a fleet logistically self-supporting and able to beat off attacks upon itself made by means of whatever weapons a fanatical enemy could devise. His vision was realized when, during the campaign for Okinawa, the Fifth Fleet remained staunchly in the Japanese front yard and continued to give support to landings there through 83 days of suicidal kamikaze and submarine attack.

Jim Mott knew, as we know, that sea power is not obsolete. He knew that so long as persons and things are transported upon or in the sea, there must be ships. So long as there are ships there must be a navy to keep the avenues of trade open. So long as it is possible for an enemy to approach our shores on or over the sea, there must be a navy to meet his advances and turn him back.

The advent of the atomic age held no terrors for Jim Mott, nor did it alter his inflexible belief in the importance of sea power. It is not the fact that a new weapon may destroy an old weapon that makes the old weapon obsolete. A weapon becomes obsolete only when a new weapon is devised which will replace the old.

Aircraft are rather easily destroyed but we shall not cease to build aircraft for that reason. We shall continue to erect buildings although they may be destroyed by the atomic bomb. We shall continue to build ships and we shall continue to need a navy even though we have weapons which will destroy ships. Soldiers will continue to fight our enemies and to occupy their lands, and the great bulk of our soldiers will be transported to their objectives on the surface of the sea. Their attack will be spearheaded by our Navy and the path ahead of their advance will be cleared by our Marine Corps.

Mr. Mott had the same dread of war and its awful consequences as we do, yet he believed that preparedness for it is the best preventive of it.

Although we may take counsel and inspiration from his achievements, we shall miss his ready judgment and his fighting heart. We are beset by many problems, many of which are of vital importance to our Navy. The very existence of the Navy, in the form in which it functioned so well during the war, is threatened by a proposal to merge the armed forces. The inevitable result of this proposal would be to relegate our Navy, with its air arm and its Marine Corps, to a position secondary to that of the Army ground and air forces. Those who advocate a merger tell us that the Navy's separate identity would be maintained. This cannot be. The Navy would be deprived of separate representation in the Cabinet of the President. The operational, as well as the administrative, functions of the Navy and Marine Corps would be presided over and controlled by a Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces. This chief military officer of our Government would hold vast and concentrated power. He would almost of necessity, be an officer of the Army. The Joint Chiefs of Staff who conducted the strategic aspects of the most complicated global war of all history, would, by the latest merger proposal, be relegated to a mere supervision of the joint armed forces annual budget. It was in the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the best minds of our ground, naval, and air forces met to plan and direct our combined forces toward the total victory we have just achieved. It is my opinion, and I think it would be Jim Mott's opinion as well, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have amply demonstrated their strategic competence and that such competence should be preserved.

Those of us who love the Navy and are appreciative of the large contribution it made to the winning of World War II are fearful that an application of the merger as proposed by those who support that plan would, within the space of a few short years, give us a Navy similar to that of Germany or of Russia. The German Navy, dominated as it was by the Germany Army, consisted of a submarine service and of an assorted group of commerce raiders. The Russian Navy was occupied with little more than transport duties and was properly equipped for nothing more. The Japanese Navy was likewise dominated by their army.

Our country is bordered on the east and west by vast seas. We must strike across the sea if we are unhappily called upon to strike in the future. In defense, we must meet attacks which will be launched against us over the sea. It is prudent that we meet our enemies far from our shores. Our far-flung arm of both offense and defense lies in powerful naval striking forces in which we will be able, as we were in the last war, to concentrate great gun power and great air power on the fast moving bases which only ships can supply. Let us not endanger the proven value of our naval striking forces by subordinating them to any other weapon or to any other branch of the military service.

I mention these things to you because I believe Jim Mott would do so if he were present. His passing has deprived his country of one of its most able advisers in matters of national defense.

From this day henceforth the ship basin at Tongue Point, in which will rest vessels of the Navy that James W. Mott loved so well, will bear his name. If the ravages of war beset us again, his spirit and his courage will go forth with the ships which are to be sheltered here, and the qualities of James Wheaton Mott, the fighter, the patriot, and the statesman, will render fresh vigor, inspiration, and service to his country for all time to come.

Also, as a part of my remarks at this time, I include the address made at the dedication ceremonies of the Mott Basin by the Honorable Earl Snell, Governor of Oregon, as follows:

The Navy Department, in designating this installation with the name of the late Congressman James W. Mott, has appropriately recognized the continuous efforts of that statesman to provide this Nation of ours with the greatest and best Navy in the world.

Congressman Mott—affectionately remembered as Jim by his many, many friends—played an important role in the history of this State.

He first began the practice of law here in Astoria; became city attorney and served 6 years as its representative in the Oregon Legislature. From the legislature he became the State corporation commissioner and then was elected to the 73rd Congress and served continuously until the 79th.

During the first World War, Jim Mott enlisted in the Navy and this experience proved invaluable when, as a Member of the Congress, he was appointed on the House Committee on Naval Affairs. During his long career as a national legislator, Congressman Mott was constantly striving for the establishment of a naval station at Tongue Point, and when once established, then for its expansion and greater development.

Congressman Mott first convinced the House Committee on Naval Affairs of the wisdom of the installation. Members flew to Oregon from the National Capital, inspected the site and gave the project their approval. The wisdom of Jim Mott was fully justified for came the war and Tongue Point became an essential link in the coast defense of the Pacific Northwest.

On the national scene, Congressman Mott urged and advocated the building of a great Navy long before the World War and became more insistent as the war clouds were gathering over the skies of Europe.

A loyal, patriotic American, this former resident of Astoria was a strong advocate of national defense and more particularly a strong Navy.

With Jim Mott, the defense of the United States was not a subject for politics. The protection of our country transcended partisanship. It crossed party lines. It represented Americanism in the highest degree. A staunch member of the Republican Party, Jim Mott did not snipe, did not undertake to hamstring nor place obstacles in plans for defense because the administration was of the opposite political faith. In such matters and measures to safeguard our ramparts, Jim Mott placed first the welfare and general good of these United States and subordinated all else.

Congressman Mott lived to see the advance in preparations in which he so firmly believed. He lived to see the Tongue Point Naval Station developed into a powerful unit in the coastal defense. He lived to see the high seas fleet conquer all opponents. And having seen these things—and of which he was a part—Jim Mott passed on.

The United States Navy never had a stronger advocate, a stronger friend or supporter than this Oregon Congressman—this statesman from the golden West, the Honorable James W. Mott.

Save Ourselves First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, through propaganda costing billions of dollars, many of our people have been convinced that our first and most important duty is to solve the problem, settle the troubles, of other nations and their peoples. Hence, we neglect our own.

Our young men fought the First World War to end all war. Twenty-five years later some of them, their sons and daughters, were winning another war to carry the "four freedoms" to all the world. The fighting just over, we now know that many of the smaller nations have no freedom of choice as to the form of government under which they shall live, not even one of the "four freedoms."

Britain and Russia are sparring for position, each attempting to protect its own interest, extend its power and territory throughout the world in anticipation of a third world war. We are trying to feed the hungry, lessen the famine and disease which follow war. Our thoughts are so occupied with world troubles that we have failed to set our own house in order. Historians of the future will wonder as to why we were so stupid, so foolish as to have neglected to protect our present welfare—our future security.

Ever since the communistic sit-down strikes of 1937, when the goon squads of John L. Lewis took possession of our factories, and our Governor, Frank Murphy (now sitting on the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States), with the approval of President Roosevelt, called out the National Guard to protect the violators of the law who were defying the courts and the peace officers, this country has been troubled by a succession of strikes.

Labor unions are necessary—when rightly administered, serve a worthy purpose. Misused by racketeers, ambitious politicians, influenced by Communists who would destroy our Government, they became the unwilling, unknowing instruments which may ultimately destroy us.

Many an honest workingman, joining in the strikes against General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, Steel, General Electric, Westinghouse, and thousands of other employers, failed to recognize the fact that higher prices always follow wage increases. Hundreds of thousands of patriotic, sincere workers swallowed the sophistry of Reuther and Wallace who insisted that wages should be increased while prices were held down. We now know better.

No one criticizes the workers for striking for a higher wage, better working conditions or shorter hours. They were motivated by the same desire which influences us all—to improve our condition, provide for the future. But there is a limit to what each of us can receive in payment for his effort. Usually it is the value of what we each give in return.

Strikers in Steel, General Motors, Westinghouse, in the other industries where strikes were called, forgot that while they were on strike they were not only losing their own wages, but hundreds of thousands of other workers were injuriously affected.

The strike of the United Mine Workers under John L. Lewis threatens the economic life of our Nation, yesterday causing 106,000 Ford employees to lose, temporarily we hope, their jobs; brings home to each and every one of us the hard, cold fact that it is time to devote our attention to our home problems; to first set our own house in order; to recognize the fact that the public welfare comes first, before the interest of any individual or group.

It is time that the Congress enact, the Executive put into effect, legislation proposed by me, which, while it would not prevent labor disputes, would not end strikes, would make it not only possible but imperative that the services of public utilities, of industries affecting the public health and welfare, be continued; that men having the right to strike should not be permitted to prevent other men from digging coal, pouring steel, making automobiles, or doing any work necessary to protect the public health or welfare.

No individual or group has the right to follow a course of action which endangers the safety, the health, or the life of the people as a whole.

John L. Lewis has but followed in the footsteps of Reuther, Phil Murray, and a host of other labor leaders. Lewis is doing it in a bigger, more effective way. The issue should be settled now. It can be by the enactment of H. R. 5571.

The Stake in Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Samuel Crowther:

THE STAKE IN PRICE CONTROL
(By Samuel Crowther)

(This is the seventh of a series of articles on price control by Samuel Crowther, author and economist, written expressly for the Hearst newspapers.)

ARTICLE VII. THE OPA AND THE STRIKE WAVE

The Office of Price Administration is indirectly responsible for the wave of strikes from which the country has suffered since VJ-day. It is directly responsible for the length and severity of the strikes and for the industrial chaos which has followed in their wake.

The record shows that the power to fix prices can be used as a power to destroy.

The policies followed have, by coincidence or otherwise, been exactly the policies of Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee,

and the spearheads of the movement have been the darlings of the Communist Party—the unions in steel, automobiles, and electrical manufacturing.

The OPA has cooperated in a supreme direct drive against private ownership.

The course of events has been confusing. That is because the chief actors have themselves been confused.

The administration started off in one direction. Then, without warning, it started off in the opposite direction.

And now it is running around in circles.

Here is the background.

The Roosevelt administration, before the war, largely financed what the New Dealers called reforms by printing and distributing money. It financed the war largely by printing money.

The Truman administration seems determined to continue these policies and to finance the world by printing money.

Our Nation's big job after VJ-day was to turn productive capacity from making war goods into making peace goods. That would not and could not prevent inflation.

But if goods had been forthcoming in large quantities, with the promise of more, there would have been no incentive to rush for goods at any price—especially if Government spending were at once cut down so that the Budget could be balanced and the money-printing presses junked.

But the picture was so plain that the crystal-ball boys in Washington would not see it.

The President was induced to plug for raising the unemployment allowance to $20 a week and the minimum wage from 40 cents to 65 cents an hour, for the increasing of Government salaries and for the full-employment bill to create employment by subsidy.

If this new purchasing power were to be effective, prices had to be held at the old figures. That was the OPA job.

To carry out the program, controls were removed from wages and the information was allowed to trickle out from Washington that industry could raise wages by at least 10 to 20 percent without needing increased prices.

By what does not seem to have been a coincidence, the automobile union, the steel union, and the electrical workers' union made practically identical demands for large wage advances—larger than had ever before been asked. Then, with all possible speed, the unions went on strike.

By the end of 1945 and the early part of 1946, the Nation's industry, which should have been running full strength on peacetime goods, was tied up tighter than a drum.

As industrial concerns shifted from war to peace—and they did so with astounding rapidity—they found that their costs, due to higher wages granted during the war and the higher costs of materials they were forced to buy, had greatly increased. Some went right ahead with manufacturing, applying to the OPA for new ceiling prices, while others waited for new ceiling prices before they began operations.

The OPA in many cases took no action, leaving the manufacturer in the air.

Where it did act, it mostly denied increases or made very slight increases, taking 1942 prices as a base but also projecting the future of each concern and relating that future back to show that, at the price granted, the company would earn as much profit as during the 1936–39 period.

The OPA fortune-telling division found no difficulty in charting futures for businessmen. The trouble was in getting the businessmen to take their words as inspired.

Of course, if one had not been in business in 1942, one could usually get a good fat ceiling price.

This created, as has been set out in previous articles, a new vested interest. But these interests knocked out only the small people whose affairs required little capital.

The big, basic industries required more money than the fly-by-nighter could raise.

Most reputable manufacturers found themselves with a few lines where the prices gave them a chance for a profit and many lines where they had no profit.

A survey of the Bridgeport, Conn., area disclosed that 48 percent of the concerns had to sell one or more items at less than cost to maintain trade positions; 72 percent had items on which they just broke even; and 68 percent had items on which they did a little better than break even.

Since finished products of any complexity are assembled from a considerable number of items made by different manufacturers, the OPA policy created bottlenecks in assembly and so finished goods did not reach the people.

On top of this condition came the demands for higher wages—which would further increase costs.

The OPA refused to promise higher price ceilings to cover the new wage demands.

The officials maintained, by their Washington formulas, that the companies would have profit enough to pay the wages. The employers knew otherwise. Hence the strikes could not be settled.

In January, 1946, only one and a half million workers were unemployed instead of the lowest Washington prophecy of 6,000,000.

Then the administration shifted from fear of deflation to fear of inflation. But in the meantime the strike wave had been started and the OPA was holding its line by refusing to grant higher prices to cover higher wages.

The shift in policy came with the settlement of the steel strike.

This was directed by Washington and involved an 18½-cent rise in wages per hour, a $5 a ton increase in price and a new wage-price policy—which no one as yet understands—by which certain wage rises will be compensated by increased prices.

Whatever the policy may be, it is exactly the reverse of the purchasing power policy by which wages were to be forced up and prices kept down. But also it moves in a circle—like a merry-go-round.

The manufacturers who were losing money under the old OPA policy are, with still higher wage and material costs, losing more money—or waiting for decisions from the OPA statisticians and fortune tellers.

That is why the hardware stores are so bare, that is why so many common metal articles are either off the market or hard to buy.

That is why so many men are wondering if it is worth while to try to stay in business.

It all strips down to this. The OPA and the other planned economy boys in and out of the Government believed that the dumb public had to be protected from the dumb but greedy business men.

As a result, the public is not even getting what it needs—much less what it wants.

And neither the public nor industry knows where it is at.

Year of Failures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of May 8, 1946:

YEAR OF FAILURES

Twelve months ago the armed forces of Nazi Germany surrendered; 3 months later the Pacific phase of World War II ended.

The rejoicing with which the American people hailed VE-day and VJ-day, and the prospect of speedy return to a civilian economy and reconversion to peacetime pursuits has given way to bitter frustration.

Why? Largely because the Truman administration has played politics instead of devoting its full energy to promoting national recovery and reconversion.

Mr. Truman, following the lead of his predecessor, decided that if his administration were to remain in office, it must continue to court the supposedly deliverable votes represented by organized labor.

To court these votes Mr. Truman adopted a policy of encouraging substantial wage increases while attempting to "hold the line" on consumer prices of commodities produced by labor.

To court the votes of the rural population, he adopted a policy of high prices for farm products, while attempting to hold the line of the prices paid by consumers of those products.

The device adopted was the thoroughly dishonest device of paying Federal subsidies to the farmers. Thus the cost of farm produce was controlled as far as the consumer was concerned; but as a taxpayer the consumer paid the farmer the difference in the form of a subsidy.

As a result of these politically motivated maneuvers, the country has been thrown into chaos. Strikes, food and commodity shortages, black markets, and virtual stagnation of industry have been the bitter fruits.

Instead of being well on the road toward reconversion, the Nation is worse off in many respects a year after VE-day than it was during the war.

It was not even smart politics judged by the most cynical standards. The net effect has been to arouse the people of the Nation to the point where—could they go to the polls today—they would throw out every Federal officeholder they could vote against.

Responsibilities Versus Salaries of Federal Judges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, before the best attended meeting in years of the Louisiana Bar Association at Shreveport on April 27 appeared the Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Tom C. Clark. His speech on the subject of Responsibilities Versus Salaries of Federal Judges drew much attention from lawyers and other public-minded citizens of not only Louisiana but of all parts of the Nation. It is replete with facts not before presented in a speech to the people of the United States and contains powerful arguments for proper treatment of our Federal judges upon whom 130,000,000 people depend for justice and a continuation of our democratic processes of government.

In this speech, the Attorney General was at his best. I was seated in the audience and heard the remarks from others in the audience, as well as the applause which punctuated the address when points were forcefully driven home. At times the Attorney General departed from the manuscript record of his address illustrating statistics presented with most appropriate anecdotes and flashing allegories. In my judgment, the effect of the address on those who heard and subsequently read it has been most magnetic.

But, Mr. Speaker, the address speaks for itself and I am pleased to have unanimous consent to include the entire speech by Attorney General Tom Clark entitled "Responsibilities Versus Salaries of Federal Judges" in full herein:

Thoughtful men, seeking a solution to the world's ills, have reached the conclusion that a durable peace can be achieved for all mankind only if some system can be devised whereby justice will be universally administered according to law. The deeds of valor of those who have just engaged in the most stupendous struggle the world has ever experienced were performed to insure the existence of a world where justice and freedom will be guaranteed and protected by law. The salvation of our civilization can only be achieved by justice—equal justice under the law. History has vindicated Plato's thesis that "Justice is not the right of the stronger, but the effective harmony of the whole."

As President Truman said a year ago to the delegates to the United Nations Conference, at San Francisco, "Justice remains the greatest power on earth." Earlier, he stated to the Congress, "Past experience surely indicates that without justice, an enduring peace is impossible."

What is the reason for this present universal belief? What is it that has convinced all mankind of the desirability of a world where justice under the law prevails? The answer is as simple as it is obvious. It is the example of the American way of life. Our Government operates under a written Constitution, which not only provides a framework of government, but is, as well, a legal document which proclaims itself as the supreme law of the land. The world has come to appreciate the stability and adequacy, the potency and efficiency of a government of laws rather than a government of men.

The world has come to regard this country not only as the arsenal of democracy in time of war, but also as the asylum of liberty and the sanctuary of justice in time of peace. It is, therefore, incumbent upon us to retain and maintain that asylum and sanctuary. The future welfare of ourselves, our children and generations to come, depends entirely on the fate that befalls the rest of this ever-contracting universe. We must continue to set an example for the rest of the world. We can do so only if our officials continue to maintain the high standards we have achieved in the past.

The courts necessarily play a major part in our Government, since it is the courts that declare and apply the law. As a consequence, the personnel of the courts is a matter of the first magnitude. As the eminent jurist and legal scholar Dean Emeritus Roscoe Pound has observed, "Law, as distinguished from laws, calls for judges."

The relative importance of the judiciary in our system of government was noted and realized at its very inception. Even before the adoption of our Constitution by the States, Alexander Hamilton wrote in the Federalist of December 14, 1787, that, "Laws are a dead letter without courts to expound and define their true meaning and operation"; and Mr. Jackson, a Member of the First Congress during deliberations on the bill establishing our judicial structure, aptly and prophetically remarked that "the preservation of the Constitution of the United States and the individual States depends, in a great measure, on the wisdom, impartiality and independence of the judges."

James Madison, one of the greatest architects of the Constitution, in debating the question of the amount of salaries to be paid Federal judges, told Members of the First Congress that "When we consider the duties that will devolve upon them, they strike the mind as being of the greatest magnitude; they are the guardians of the laws and of the Constitution of the United States, and, I trust, of the individual States also." It is obvious that from the moment the delegates of the Thirteen Original States gathered at Philadelphia in that hot summer of 1787 to frame what has been described as the most remarkable scheme of government ever conceived by men, most of them acknowledged that the judiciary was to be one of the three major branches of the new government, and since the very birth of our Nation our judiciary has continued to be one of the most powerful factors in our daily life. One can only speculate as to what the fate of our Nation would have been without a Marshall and a Story, a Kent and a Cardozo, a Holmes and a Brandeis. How true are these often quoted words of the late Justice Sutherland, "If the political structure erected by the fathers rests upon any one pillar more securely than upon another, it is upon that which upholds the right of the individual to invoke the judgment of the civil courts of the land upon his conduct," and those of Chief Justice Marshal: "The judicial department comes home in its effects to every man's fireside; it passes on his property, his reputation, his life, his all."

We need only pause for a moment to consider the variety, complexity, and type of work performed by our courts to be absolutely convinced of the truth of these sentiments. It is not an exaggeration to assert that no factor in the preservation of the integrity of our Government is more important than the judiciary.

The preservation of our constitutional system depends on the maintenance of courts on the highest possible level. Manifestly, the prestige and effectiveness of the courts is determined by the character of the men who serve on them. It is clear that we need the most capable judges obtainable, judges who will be independent, men who are well trained in our tradition, strong men, experienced lawyers, honest and intelligent. In fact, the efficient, honest and effective administration of justice depends solely on the caliber of the judges who administer it.

To assure the selection and maintenance of judges qualified to uphold our constitutional system, the adequacy of the salaries paid to these men is a factor of no small importance. Indeed, it is a most significant and material factor. The truth of Daniel Webster's observation that "Justice is the greatest interest of man on earth and * * * that those who administer justice should be adequately compensated" cannot be denied. During the debates in the Convention at which our Constitution was framed, General Pinckney, of South Carolina, aptly noted that, "The importance of the judiciary will require men of the first talents; large salaries will therefore be necessary, larger than the United States can allow in the first instance." Because of circumstances and conditions brought about by world events, today as in 1787 and in 1926, when the salaries of Federal judges were last fixed, the question of their inadequacy is one of prime importance for all Americans. We hear much these days of the term "prevailing wage." It is high time that we examine carefully this term as it applies to the salaries of our Federal judges. Such an investigation will disclose a disgraceful situation; the salaries of our Federal judges will be found to be grossly inadequate, even niggardly, and certainly unbecoming to a country of wealth and power such as the United States of America.

The existing salaries are a deterrent in obtaining outstanding men for our judiciary. During my short tenure as Attorney General several men have turned down a lifetime position on the bench because of the inadequacy of the salary. We pay the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court $20,500, the Associate Justices $20,000; the judges of the circuit courts of appeals, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, the Court of Claims, $12,500; and district judges, $10,000. These salaries were fixed, it should be observed, in 1926, just 20 years ago. Viewed in the light of economic and social conditions of today as contrasted with those prevailing in 1926, one can hardly blame the lawyer of high caliber for refusing to accept a Federal judicial appointment. According to a reliable statistical study of professional earnings made recently, the upper 10 percent of lawyers earned in 1941, the last full year of peace, $9,000 to $150,000 per annum, and the average earning of a lawyer in that group must certainly exceed the level of the existing salaries now paid to Federal judges.

As a matter of fact, Federal judicial salaries have never been truly adequate. I can well sympathize with the statement of Congressman Jackson who, on September 18, 1789, told his fellow Members of the First Congress, "I have received some accounts * * * by which I find that gentlemen are declining public appointment, on account of smallness of salaries. We ought to consider the great importance of this office; that the lives, the properties, the rights of citizens are to depend on his decision; that the preservation of the Constitution of the United States and the individual States depends, in a great measure, on the wisdom, impartiality, and independence of that officer."

Judicial salaries should be such as would attract lawyers of long experience, of high professional standing, of unquestionable integrity. The members of our First Congress who molded the framework of our judicial structure knew this. Mr. Ames, a member of that historic body, in discussing proposed salaries for our first judiciary, emphasized that the only pertinent inquiry in that respect was what sum would be adequate to command men of first ability. It has remained so ever since. The dignity and esteem of the judicial office is not sufficient to make up for low salaries.

Of course, there are to be found among the able members of the bar some men of independent means who, for patriotic reasons and for the honor and dignity of the office, are willing to accept such an appointment. Most of the members of the present judiciary, however, are making a heavy financial sacrifice. We have no right to ask these men to make that sacrifice. It is our duty to see in return for their relinquishing lucrative practices that there is established for the judiciary, to use the words of a committee of the American Bar Association, "a scale of salaries which will reasonably attract lawyers of first-class competency to accept judicial appointment and to remain on the bench."

Consider for a moment the variety, the complexity, the far-reaching effect of the questions passed upon by our Federal judges. Ponder if you will the vast and intricate number of matters that are presented to them. What a responsibility rests upon the wisdom and competence of these men! They are accountable for the preservation of sacred rights of the people, as well as for the maintenance of the constitutional structure of our Government; they are burdened with the

duty of protecting society against the individual who attempts to interfere with its peace and order, and at the same time they must protect the individual against possible unjust demands of society.

As important and considerable as the work of Federal judges was when their present salaries were fixed by law, think of the momentous and burdensome functions that have been added since 1926. One need only mention the impact on our individual lives resulting from such legislation as the Public Utility Holding Company Act, the Social Security Act, the Securities and Exchange Act, and the Fair Labor Standards Act. These are in addition to matters arising out of the Sherman Antitrust Law Act; criminal cases, patent cases, admiralty cases, tax cases, and so many others. Litigation arising out of the prosecution of World War II, involving such complicated matters as war frauds and renegotiation of war contracts, will be on the dockets for many years to come. It is almost impossible to conceive of the constantly increasing importance and variety of subjects which will devolve upon these judges in the future by reason of the phenomenal technological progress made by science, especially in aviation, radio, and atomic energy. The judges of today have had thrust upon them ever-increasing burdens by the legislation of the past decade. They are required to decide matters that transcend in importance and in effect anything that courts were called upon to determine in 1926.

Have you ever stopped to consider the far-reaching effects of many of these decisions of these courts? Reflect, if you will, on the importance of the Federal judge whose decisions affect people in every walk of life and play a major role in shaping and interpreting the complex economic conditions of the urban and industrial society of this day. The Federal judge's decision in the case of *United States* v. *The Aluminum Co. of New York* affects thousands and thousands of men and women. Is there an inhabitant of our country who is not affected by the decision of a Federal district judge in the antitrust proceedings against the Diamond Match Co.?

In this vast country of ours, where transportation systems are the very arteries of our existence, on December 31, 1943, 78 railway companies were administered by trustees appointed by and acting under the supervision of Federal district court judges. Among such companies are the Chicago & North Western Railway Co. and the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., supervised by a Federal district judge in Chicago; and the New York, New Haven & Hartford Co. by a Federal district judge in Connecticut.

How can we justify the insignificant salaries we pay these men who pass upon such important matters when we compare these salaries with the ones paid by private industry to men whose responsibilities may not be deemed any greater. For example, in 1944 Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corp. paid a salary of $137,500 to T. N. Girdler; Donald W. Douglas, of Douglas Aircraft, Inc., received $120,000; Charles J. Gibson, of Gibson Refrigerator Co., received $100,000; George W. Mason, of Nash-Kelvinator, was paid $125,000; Charles E. Wilson, of General Motors, during the year 1944, received $151,000 in salary, a cash bonus of $71,769, and a stock bonus of 1,210 shares of General Motors common stock, which, during that year, had an average selling price of about $60 a share; and his namesake, Charles E. Wilson, of General Electric, received a salary of $30,181 for the period from August 24, 1944, to December 31 of that year. I could cite hundreds of other instances in which salaries of over $100,000 were paid.

While the burdens on the Federal courts have grown considerably greater, the salaries of judges have actually been lowered. Since 1926, the increased cost of living and the heavy impact of taxes on judges appointed since 1932, which includes almost all of them, have reduced very substantially the actual worth of judges' salaries. For it must be remembered that in 1926 Federal judicial salaries were not subject to income taxes and it was not then believed that salaries of judges would ever be taxed. In 1932, however, Congress provided in the revenue act that salaries of judges taking office after the passage of the act must be included in gross income for Federal-tax purposes, and the Supreme Court in *O'Malley* v. *Woodrough* (307 U. S. 277 (1939)) upheld the constitutionality of this provision. In addition, Congress by the Public Salary Tax Act of 1939 permitted local taxing authorities to subject these same salaries to State-income taxation. Today, assuming that he is married, has no dependent children, no outside income, and no unusual deductions, an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court would pay a Federal-income tax of $7,035, leaving him a net salary of $12,965; similarly, a circuit judge would pay $3,365, leaving a balance of $9,135; and a district judge $2,400 out of his $10,000, leaving a balance of $7,600. Add to that, in many instances, the additional State-income-tax reduction and the net salary received is a miserable one. For example, in the State of New York the net salary of a Federal district judge is about $6,500, a shameful amount for such an official.

In addition, the decline of the purchasing power of the dollar in recent years makes the gross insufficiency of a Federal judge's salary more marked. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the index of retail prices and rents paid by families of moderate income has risen about 30 percent since 1939. As a consequence, present judicial salaries in truth are lower in terms of purchasing power than they have been at any time since the beginning of this century. In 1913, for example, a district judge was paid $7,500. The consumer's price index for moderate income families in large cities, according to Bureau of Labor Statistics (1935–39=100), in 1913 was 70.7 for all items; in January 1945 it was 129.9, an increase of 59.2, or over 83 percent. Yet the net salary is practically the same.

Such a disgraceful state of affairs must be remedied. Increases in judicial salaries are necessary to offset these actual and substantial reductions in compensation. Such an increase would coincide with the desires of our founding fathers. In 1787, when it was urged at the Federal Constitutional Convention that a constitutional provision prohibiting increase in judges' salaries be adopted as a part of our Constitution, delegate Gouverneur Morris stressed that "the amount of salaries must always be regulated by the manner and style of living in a country." Alexander Hamilton, later in the Federalist, wrote that "it will readily be understood that the fluctuation in the value of money and in the state of society rendered a fixed rate of compensation in the Constitution inadvisable. What might be extravagant today, might in a half century become penurious and inadequate." We know now that such a result can occur in less than 15 years. As a matter of fact, even in 1926 the present salary levels were considered inadequate. The bill for increased judicial salaries reported and recommended by the House Judiciary Committee on February 9, 1926, provided that the salaries of circuit court judges be increased from then then $8,500 to $15,000, and that of district judges from $7,500 to $12,000; and this, it should be noted again, was at a time when judges were not subject to any income-tax laws.

The absurdity of this critical situation in our administration of justice can best be demonstrated by a comparison with salaries paid to judges in other jurisdictions. There is a well-known cliché that comparisons are odious. Here, this is a truism and not a cliche, for a comparison of judicial salaries of Federal judges with those paid to men holding comparable positions in England, Ireland, India, and many of the States of the Union makes crystal clear the inadequacy of the present judicial salary scale. As I told the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Civil Service at hearings held last November, "from a comparative standpoint, the salaries are miserable"; I am still of the same opinion.

In England, the Lord Chancelor receives £10,000 or about $40,000 at present rates of exchange. This amount should be contrasted with the $20,500 received by our Chief Justice of the United States. The seven Lords of Appeal in Ordinary, corresponding to the Associate Justices of our Supreme Court, receive £6,000, or about $24,000 each. The Lord Justices of Appeal, who correspond to our circuit judges, receive an annual salary of £5,000 or $20,000 each. Compare that with $12,500 paid our judges. The Lord Chief Justice of England and his associates, and the Judge of the High Court of Justice, who correspond to our district judges, each receive a salary of £8,000 and £5,000 ($32,000 and $20,000), respectively, as compared with the $10,000 we pay our district judges. Think of it, in England, the lowest paid of all judges, the 56 county judges who can only hear cases involving up to £100, or $400, receive annually £2,000, or $8,000. The Chief Judge in Ireland (Eire) receives $25,000, and judges in India, corresponding to our district judges, receive $24,000 each.

When you compare Federal judicial salaries with those paid by most of the States the contrast is equally striking. New York pays the chief justice of its court of appeals $25,500, and the associate judges $25,000. This is $5,000 a year more than is paid to the Justices of the highest court in our country. There are four States which pay the intermediate appellate judges more than we pay circuit judges. For example, New York pays the two presiding heads of its appellate divisions a total of $29,500 each and $25,000 to each of the associates. And there are seven States which pay trial judges more than we pay our district judges. In New York City alone more than 80 judges each receives a salary of $25,000. An associate justice of the City Court of New York, with its limited jurisdiction, receives $17,500 per annum; in Massachusetts, a trial judge gets $12,000 ($13,000 for chief justice); in New Jersey $15,000, etc.

In 1944, the State of New York alone paid out in judicial salaries over a million and a half dollars more than did the Federal Government. Is it just to ask men of high order and talent to serve as our judges for the beggarly stipend now allowed to them? Is it fair to ask such men to undertake the difficult labors imposed upon them, when their salaries will not enable them to maintain themselves and their families in reasonable comfort in the manner and station of life to which they became accustomed while they were practicing lawyers? I am sure the American people do not wish such sacrifices from their public servants. A Federal judge is a leading citizen in his community and the judicial position is one of great honor and dignity. The one who occupies it should have sufficient means to maintain that position with propriety, independence, and dignity. It should be sufficient to free him from mental worry over finances.

Present judicial salaries result in actual hardships. A judge, like everyone else, has a family to support, children to educate, medical bills to pay, and other obligations which are incidental to modern existence. A judge's salary terminates on his death, and there is no protection for those who survive him unless he was able during his life to accumulate savings or to carry insurance, which under the present salary scale is most difficult

in many instances. Moreover, a judge, in common with others, must make his share of charitable contributions.

It should be remembered that Federal judges are deprived of the right to engage in any way in the practice of their own profession. Consequently many able judges have resigned in order to earn an adequate income.

Relieving Federal judges from financial worries will inure to the benefit of our people. A mind free of pressing financial worries will render better judicial service. Abler lawyers will be attracted to the bench and a more talented judiciary will result in the greatly improved administration of justice.

An increase in salaries has been indorsed by all who have a sincere regard for the public good. President Truman, in his message to Congress on September 6, 1945, urging increase in pay to all Federal workers, had this to say, "In most of the various classifications of Federal employees, the wage scales, with few exceptions, are obsolete and inadequate. This is particularly true of the Federal judiciary."

The American Judicature Society, organized to promote the efficient administration of justice, has spoken eloquently for such an increase. The bar, as expressed by the views of many committees of the American Bar Association, has spoken emphatically and unequivocally in favor of such increases. Those not of the legal profession are also in accord. Dr. Vannevar Bush, the famed and eminent scientist who rendered such valuable service as Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development during the war, stated on November 9, 1945, to the Senate Civil Service Committee, "I should like to endorse the general objects of other amendments which provide for substantial increases in the salaries of Members of Congress and the judiciary. The business of Government is the most important of all business and we need to attract and to hold in Government service the best talent among our citizens. An important step in this direction is to increase salaries so that they are more nearly commensurate with the importance and responsibility of public office." William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, as long ago as 1926 when there was agitation for the adoption of the salary scale now in effect, advised the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee that labor was tremendously interested in an impartial, orderly and speedy administration of justice. Speaking of the attitude of members of labor groups, he said, "This they realize cannot be accomplished except through service of judges of the highest character and ability." Further: "Manifestly, the salary of the Federal judges in this democratic country must be large enough in the interest of equal justice for all our people to enable the lawyer of commanding ability but of modest financial means to enter cheerfully upon a lifetime service on the Federal bench." The trend for general increase in judges' salaries is unmistakable. Witness the pendency of legislation in about 29 States to provide for such increases.

It may be contended by some that a substantial increase in Federal judicial salaries will be too costly. Economy in government is a virtue to be sought as eagerly and constantly as in private life. A government, like an individual, must ask itself whether it can afford an additional expenditure. Can we afford to increase judicial salaries? As I see it the real issue is not whether we can afford to increase them, but whether we can afford not to increase them. There is but one unequivocal answer to this query: We cannot afford not to provide a substantial increase.

A government like an individual should have the best it can afford. We are the wealthiest Nation in the world; our ideals are devoted and dedicated to justice. Certainly we should not be paying to those who administer such justice salaries so beggarly that they are obliged in many instances to live under financial strain. Cannot we afford to pay the salaries England, Ireland, and India, and many of the States pay their judges?

Statistics and students of government finances have shown that in each of the States as well as in the Federal Government, the cost of maintaining judiciary is almost infinitesimal in comparison with general expenses of government. Take the case of the Federal Government. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, the last full year of peace, $3,629,308 was paid out in judicial salaries. For that same fiscal year the Government spent $6,473,847,156.08. In other words, less than one-fifth of 1 percent of the cost of government was paid out in judicial salaries. In this connection, it might be parenthetically added that during the same year the sum of $3,710,338.80 in fees, fines, and penalties was collected in the Federal courts. Indeed, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, over $6,500,000 were collected in fines, forfeitures, and penalties—a sum almost double the estimated amount for judicial salaries for the 1947 fiscal year. In addition, a comparable amount is collected annually from fees received in naturalization proceedings. Thus the courts cost the Government little, if anything. Since the courts as an integral and important part of our Government must be supported at any cost, the amounts collected in fines, forfeitures, penalties, and fees are irrelevant to the subject of judicial salaries. However, these figures do effectively demonstrate the relatively slight cost of supporting the judicial branch of our system.

It has aptly been said that, "It is an admirable commentary upon the prestige of our Federal courts that jurists of high character have been willing to serve faithfully for compensation much below their worth as members of their profession." A better judiciary and the better administration of justice await the day when judges are paid what they deserve. The worst economy that could ever be practiced would be to pay judicial salaries so low that in the end they will result in an inefficient judiciary.

To deny an immediate increase of $5,000 to all Federal judges would seem to be, in my opinion, a dangerous and short-sighted policy. To adhere to an inadequate judicial salary would be to jeopardize our judicial structure. The good common sense of the American people will not countenance such a policy. Congress, as spokesman of the American people, must and will translate the people's will into an actual fact. My faith in our Congress leaves no doubt in my mind as to what will be done. The somber robe of the Federal judge must continue to symbolize the dignity, the prestige, the integrity, the impartiality, the inviolability of the custodian of that great attribute of a free and powerful Government: The guaranty of the right of every man to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Equal Job Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on Equal Job Opportunities, at the Tindley Temple Methodist Church, Philadelphia, Pa., on May 10.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am against economic injustice.

I believe implicitly in equal job rights and opportunities, under law, for every American, man or woman, Catholic or Protestant, Jew or Gentile, colored or white. That is the American way, the cornerstone upon which this democracy was founded, the secret of the progress of our great Nation.

The bill to establish a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission is consistent with my beliefs and activities in all of my political as well as my private life. Each time, in 1944 and 1945, when the appropriation for the wartime FEPC came before the Senate, I supported it. As a member of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, I voted for it. When a vicious filibuster developed to defeat the bill by preventing the opportunity for a vote, I signed the cloture petition to cut off the endless talk and get to a vote on the bill. I voted for cloture. That move was defeated by the minority of the Senate—48 in favor of cloture and 36 against—and the cloture motion lost by a bare 8 votes.

But this vote has only increased my determination to see this bill through to enactment. I stand shoulder to shoulder with my Democratic colleague and the great leader of this fight in the Senate, Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, who, in his address to the Senate after the vote was recorded, said:

"Mr. President, it took the crucifixion of Christ to redeem the world. It took intestinal fortitude to bring about the Declaration of Independence. It took ordinary American decency to bring about the Constitution of the United States. It took the death of Americans during the Civil War to find out that this was one country. It took this vote today to find out that a majority cannot have its will. * * * This is only the beginning. * * * This is one country, as Lincoln said. We cannot have it divided. We cannot have one country for the South and another country for the other States of the United States."

This country and its people will not continue divided if we continue our fight. We have made progress. The cloture vote itself was a goalstone in the history of this country. It was the first time since the Civil War that a major issue affecting minorities in this country received a majority vote on cloture in the United States Senate. I am encouraged. The cloture vote was just the beginning and the best start we have ever made on an issue so vital to individual human rights in this country.

Ladies and gentlemen, I speak to you as a fellow citizen and as a Democrat. I am proud of my party. For the past many years it has defended the rights and the interests of all of the people in this country—yes, and provided the leadership in the defense of human justice everywhere. Yet I hold no brief and make no defense of the Bilbos and the Rankins and others of their kind who subvert the principles of our great party to foist the principles of feudalism on our country. I said on the floor of the Senate and I say to you now again:

"There was in no part of our country the slightest doubt of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's attitude toward our minority groups. It is one of the certainties that he will go down in history as their best-beloved President since Lincoln. Yet he was elected and the South voted solidly for President Roosevelt while they knew that his administration, according to his own words, would seek enactment of legislation to create a permanent

Fair Employment Practice Commission, because—and I quote the President's Chicago speech:

"'Our economic bill of rights, like the sacred Bill of Rights of our Constitution itself, must be applied to all our citizens, irrespective of race, creed, or color.'

"The President's running mate in that election, Senator Harry S. Truman, had long ago pledged himself to the enactment of the bill to create a permanent FEPC. He reiterated that pledge during the campaign.

"When the tragedy of President Roosevelt's untimely death overtook us, it was fortunate for our country that Vice President Truman's record in the Senate and in the campaign had revealed him as a protector of all our people, Protestant, Catholic, and Jew, colored and white. That record was the reassuring symbol in a moment of vast uncertainty and distress. Since that time President Truman's forthright declarations on behalf of a permanent FEPC have been unhesitating."

Even after the cloture vote, when the President was harshly attacked on the Senate floor by members of his own party for his unwavering support of the FEPC issue, President Truman has announced not once but several times his continuing determination to see the FEPC bill through to enactment. When Secretary of Labor Lewis B. Schwellenbach addressed a huge demonstration in Madison Square Garden on February 28, he said:

"I come here tonight clothed with full authority to speak on behalf of President Truman. I come with authority to tell you that he is just as determined as was his predecessor that this fair-employment-practice principle be enacted into law by the Congress of the United States.

"I bring this assurance in what I know is your hour of disappointment. I know how disappointed you and all of your supporters must have been when you had to abandon temporarily the struggle in the Senate. But you must realize that you did not lose the battle. You were not permitted to have a decision or you would have won * * *. You lost a minor skirmish but you won a victory in the approval of the majority of the American people of the cause you so ably presented. I ask you to recall the dark days of Bataan and Corregidor. It would have been easy then to have lost heart and faith, but the American people never faltered. They were firm in their determination to proceed to victory. That firmness stemmed from the knowledge of the rightness of their cause. We, too, must be firm in our determination to proceed with this righteous cause."

You want to know—what now? You want more than words. You want action. So do I. I could go on and discuss the merits of the legislation. But I do not believe I need to convince you any more than I need to be convinced of the need for the bill, of its wisdom, of its essential rightness, or of its constitutionality.

This FEPC bill is scarcely no further from enactment than every one of the people's issues before the Congress today: minimum wages and hours, public housing, public health, and OPA. What is the force that keeps such legislation from favorable congressional action. It is the infamous southern Democratic-Republican coalition that makes a mockery of party pledges.

That coalition prevented the chairman of the House Rules Committee, Representative ADOLPH J. SABATH, of Illinois, from bringing the FEPC bill to the floor of the House last spring. Let me quote from the speech Mr. SABATH made on the floor of the House of Representatives after the rule was denied:

"I have endeavored to effect a vote on the application for a rule. However, due to the absence of some of the members of the committee from time to time it was the consensus among the members of the committee that all of the members of the Committee on Rules should be present when a final vote was taken. * * * Those who are responsible for the delay and dilatory tactics against the measure in the Rules Committee should not now charge those who in good faith have been, and still are, trying to obtain a vote on the matter in the House."

You all know what happened—the vote was held up by this infamous coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats, despite Mr. SABATH'S efforts, until every southerner could be present and defeat the rule by a tie vote.

Now that same coalition is acting as a drag on the discharge petition—the petition that would bring the bill to the floor of the House despite the Rules Committee. Practically every northern Member of my party has signed that petition. Why have not the other northern Members of Congress signed in enough number to bring the FEPC bill to a vote?

In the Senate, we watched the minority leader, Senator WALLACE WHITE, Republican of Maine, rise to his feet to denounce the bill and cloture and defend the southern filibusterers. This was after our majority leader, Senator ALBEN BARKLEY, Democrat, of Kentucky, had ably defended the bill and announced to the Senate that if permitted it would have his vote as well as his vote on cloture.

That coalition must be broken before this country can again resume its march of progress in peace, in justice, and in economic security. Only the voting citizenry of this country can accomplish that task. And I say to you that its accomplishment is as essential to your welfare as the three meals you eat each day, the roof over your head, and the clothing you wear. That is the fundamental political task which now lies before you.

Your first opportunity can be grasped this year. Elections for the entire House and one-third of the Senate will take place in November. Where do the candidates stand on the issues which concern you? What have they done about them up to the present time? How have they stood on fair-employment practice legislation, whether they have occupied the governorship of the State of Pennsylvania, or the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States? You have the right to ask and you have the right to have an answer. How will they vote if the issue is placed before them? Will they straddle the issue by saying that they are for FEPC, in principle? Do they say, "Let's have more education," and hand you more words again? The question is: How will they vote on S. 101 and its companion bill in the House, H. R. 2232? And will they honestly commit themselves to voting for cloture in the Senate and signing the petition in the House so that a vote may be had in both Houses of Congress? The answers to these questions are your index to intelligent voting. Don't be fooled or led astray by blind devotion to party label. If a candidate's record indicates that he is for FEPC, let him have your vote. If he has been against FEPC or evasive in any way concerning the issue, he should not have your vote.

I am happy to have had the opportunity of appearing before you tonight. I want to make my position crystal clear, and that I think I have done. I stand before you on my record. It is for you to examine that record and the record of all candidates before you go to the polls. Democrat that I am, I say to vote for the man who will truly represent your interests and your wishes, be he Democrat or Republican. It is their performance which counts.

This much is certain: If the men who have upheld the great ideal of people's rights irrespective of race, creed, and color are given a vote of confidence at the polls, then those northerns who are linked arm-in-arm with the southern bloc will be renounced and a great lesson will have been learned. The ballot is the weapon in your hands with which you must rip asunder this unholy alliance of reactionary Republicans and southern Democrats. Thus, you may serve your country.

Life Magazine Libels Wheat Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the least we can expect of magazines of national importance is that their statements be honest. Recently in Life magazine a picture was shown, apparently taken from the air. The picture represents a number of grain tanks that have been used in the past by the Government for storage of wheat during the period of surpluses. The indications are, by this story, that these bins or tanks are filled with wheat and are represented by the magazine to be the hoarding place for stored wheat, being held by unworthy farmers from the starving peoples of Europe.

The title is "Greed on the Farm," and it charges that American wheat producers are hoarding wheat to get famine prices.

Most of the wheat remaining on North Dakota farms that is salable is there because farmers could not get cars to haul it, because the Government agencies failed to recognize the extent of this most terrible food-shortage tragedy that was developing through the fall and winter. Mr. Plath, president of the North Dakota Farm Bureau, says he feels that the editor of the magazine should choke on his own words.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article from the Fargo Forum, Fargo, N. Dak., under date of May 8, entitled "Life Magazine Libels Wheat Farmers":

LIFE MAGAZINE LIBELS WHEAT FARMERS

If it were possible to sue a magazine for libeling a large and vital segment of America's productive population, then unquestionably, Life magazine would be in for a whale of a damage suit for its charges that wheat producers are hoarding their wheat.

That is the opinion of William Plath, president of the North Dakota Farm Bureau, after looking over an editorial and a picture in the current issue of Life.

"In view of the facts, this is one of the most uncalled for and most insulting pieces of misrepresentation I have ever seen in print," said Mr. Plath.

That sentiment is echoed by John W. Haw, agricultural development director of the Northern Pacific, and by many North Dakota farm leaders.

The editorial—the only one in the magazine and occupying almost an entire page—is captioned: "Greed on the farm," and it charges that American wheat producers are hoarding wheat "to get famine prices."

The whole tenor of the editorial is that the farmers of the United States are so greedy they would willingly let people starve to make a few extra pennies.

Saying there were 200,000,000 bushels of wheat left on the farms last week, the editorial makes this comment:

"It is not enough to save the world, or even to fulfill our promises, but it is enough to choke the farmers who are hoarding it."

This is typical of comment which was coming from some of the country's editorial writers and radio commentators early in the campaign to get the wheat off the farms, evidence of woeful ignorance of the situation, and scotched in his public address at Climax, Minn., by Clinton Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture.

"In view of the fact that most of this wheat is on the farms because farmers couldn't get cars to haul it, because the Government agencies failed to recognize the extent of this most terrible food-shortage tragedy that was developing through the fall and winter, I should think this editor would choke on his own words," said Mr. Plath.

"It is deplorable that one ignorant man, sitting in some eastern editorial office, can blast away the good repute of thousands of farmers who are eager to get this wheat to the starving people, who did not need any 30-cent bonus to get their grain in.

"Can't these eastern people understand that the farmers didn't haul this grain—for the most part—because it was a physical impossibility to get it off their farms, unless they took it to town and dumped it on the ground? The cars were not moved in fast enough to the elevators, hundreds of which were blocked for months last year.

"Secretary Anderson has explained to all the press associations and made the statement over a Nation-wide hook-up, that there is no evidence that farmers hoarded their wheat. He said that, as a matter of fact, despite the car shortages the railroads and the farmers through heroic efforts were able to and did move vast quantities of wheat into the terminal markets last week."

Checking back in its files to get the picture of last year's troubles during the normal wheat-marketing time, the Fargo Forum finds Mr. Plath's statement fully justified?

In August last year the Fargo Forum began carrying stories about the huge grain movement and the fact that cars were not being received by the northern lines fast enough to meet the demands rolling in from the country elevators.

The huge movement was hampered by an ICC ruling which prohibited, for a time, the stopping of grain cars at sampling points, according to protests filed by C. H. Conaway of the North Dakota Farmers Grain Dealers Association, and by the traffic committee of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce. That led to a blockade at the terminals which resulted in an embargo on grain shipments for a time. It was reported in the Fargo Forum, September 8, 1945.

Also early in September the Fargo Forum carried a headline "Boxcar bottleneck blocks 461 elevators." The shortage continued all through September and October and into November. On November 1, the Forum reported 293 North Dakota blocked elevators.

By then winter conditions, blocking country highways with snow, began to slow the movement, and all through the winter and into the spring, that situation prevailed, as the Fargo Forum has explained on several occasions.

Then it was time for seeding—and up to the first of this week, farmers have been hard pressed to get their wheat and feed crops planted. They are just now beginning to get in position to move a large tonnage of wheat, and it is beginning to roll into the elevators, as late dispatches from country points indicate, in great quantities.

The editor of Life owes the wheat producers of the Nation an apology and should publish a refutation of these baseless charges.

Attention Chester Bowles and John L. Lewis et al.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I do not know about other Members of Congress, but there has never been a time during the almost 20 years that I have been a Member of this body when my mail has reflected the dissatisfaction and even despair that it does today. It is apparently a helpless feeling and one which indicates that people are rapidly losing confidence in their Government. This lack of confidence is brought about by the belief that forces outside of the Government are determining governmental policies. People feel that the President and Congress have either abdicated or have been completely overwhelmed by these strong outside forces. They are disturbed about the strike situation, which is represented by the ruthlessness of John L. Lewis, although concededly, he is no worse in this respect than many other labor leaders. They are concerned over the shortages of many things which are not only desired, but which are actually needed if the productive capacity of this country is to be continued. By this I mean such things as housing, farm machinery, coal, and transportation.

They hold the OPA responsible for these shortages because they know that many of the OPA price regulations have been so framed as to discourage production. They very largely associate the OPA with the CIO because they feel that the CIO has used the OPA as an instrument for holding down prices and price ceilings, while increases in industrial wages for CIO members are being demanded and secured with the approval, if not upon the instigation, of the administration. Whether intended or not, they see in the combination of strikes and OPA restrictions on production the answer to the question of why goods are not available. They are very doubtful as to whether OPA is contributing much to holding down inflation because they see a larger proportion of goods going into the black market every day. I think that some form of price control must be continued. I can think of no worse calamity which could befall this country than inflation. However, I have no hesitancy whatever in saying that unless this unholy alliance between the administration and organized labor, whereby wages and costs are increased on the one hand and arbitrary price ceilings are attempted to be maintained on the other, will in the end result in an utter break-down of price control irrespective of what legislation may be passed by Congress.

In my mail today are two letters—one from a returned veteran in Great Bend, Kans., and the other from a returned veteran now living at Norman, Okla. These letters reflect the feelings, not only of veterans, but of millions and millions of other honest, substantial, God-fearing people in this country. The letters referred to are as follows:

As a returned veteran, I must say that it is a shock to find the country for which we fought, as a Government of the people with two Houses of Congress and one President, suddenly taking on the appearance of a Government headed by several self-styled dictators, numerous political committees and two labor unions.

I'm not antilabor and believe they have their rightful place in our way of life, but I certainly think the people should again have a few rights. There should be some control over the unions. After all, they should not be more powerful than our Congress.

I think the OPA should be limited in its powers or eliminated completely. The age-old law of supply and demand still pretty well takes care of situations that the OPA has been unable to solve. Reconversion should not be hampered by one man's opinion. Too much time is spent brow-beating small business over a mistake of a few cents, while the black market in clothing, food, housing, cars, and household commodities goes on unmolested.

Every day we hear announcements over the radio and see bulletins urging us to conserve food so that the world's hungry may not starve, but along with these pleas we hear of a 38-day-old coal strike, a strike by pilots of the air lines, a strike of water-front workers, a strike among the textile workers, and others which I won't bother to name. Do we feed any of Europe's starving people by conserving our food if we have no means of sending it to them, if we have no coal to power our trains and ships, no one to load the cargo at the docks, if we have no engineers to run our trains, or pilots to fly our planes?

As I have said, we are patient people—as long as there are some signs of progress. But I have failed to detect any of those signs. Instead, we seem to be moving backward. Our national welfare seems to be in a worse state than it was a year ago.

When I returned from overseas almost a year ago I promised myself that Congress would eventually set up labor legislation to deal effectively and fairly between labor and management. I thought that in due time a system could be worked out to settle strikes without causing irreparable damage to our national economy. But it appears that little has been done. We are still in the same rut. I'm tired of forcing myself to say that everything will turn out all right. I'm ready for some action.

As a veteran I don't mind too much living in a room in someone else's home. I can wear my Army clothes a while longer. I can do without a new car for some time to come. My wife doesn't have to have nylons or a new washing machine. Of course, we would like to have these things—a home, a car, nylons, etc.—but we can do without them. But there is one thing that we must have—we must have some evidence that progress is being made toward reconversion and supplying these things. We must know that our Government is strong enough and wise enough to deal with the small groups that are destroying our American way of life. We are tired of watching the wheels of the congressional buggy spin in this well-worn rut, and we think that it is time for someone to get out and push.

American Care of World Art Treasures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from today's Washington Post and statements upon the subject referred to therein:

[From the Washington Post of May 13, 1946]

RETURN URGED—UNITED STATES "LOOTED" NAZI ART, EXPERTS SAY

Uncle Sam has followed the "brazen looting" methods of the Nazis in shipping 200 world-famous masterpieces here from Germany, a group of American art authorities charged yesterday.

In an "urgent request" to the President, some 95 art authorities asked that the collection—containing 15 Rembrandts, 3 Raphaels, 5 Titians, and 6 Rubenses—be removed from the National Gallery vaults here, and returned immediately to Germany.

The resolution sent to the White House said, "This action cannot be justified on technical, political or moral grounds, and many, including the Germans themselves, may find it hard to distinguish between the resultant situation and the 'protective custody' used by the Nazis as a camouflage for the sequestration of the artistic treasures of other countries."

Asking that the President order the "immediate safe return" of the paintings to Germany, the art authorities also requested the "cancellation of any plans that may have been made to exhibit them in this country and the countermanding without delay of any further such shipments."

Signers of the resolution include George H. Myers, president of the District Textile Museum, and Thomas C. Parker, director of the American Federation of Arts here.

WASHINGTON, December 14, 1945.—The Honorable Harlan Fiske Stone, Chief Justice of the United States and chairman of the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art, announced today that, at the request of the Secretary of State, the trustees of the National Gallery had agreed to accept custody of the paintings from German museums which might be brought to this country for safekeeping until conditions in Germany insuring their proper care have been reestablished.

He stated that about 200 paintings had arrived at the Gallery, having been safely transported to this country by the United States Army, and that arrangements are now being made to store these paintings in the Gallery's air-conditioned storage rooms. The Chief Justice added that he felt the United States Army deserved the highest praise for the care exercised in salvaging these great works of art and in making provision for their safety until they can be returned to Germany.

A list of the paintings which are now stored at the Gallery is appended hereto.

The attached statements were released to the press by the White House on September 26, 1945, and by the War Department on December 6, 1945.

SEPTEMBER 26, 1945.—The United States Government is removing from Germany to the continental United States certain perishable German art objects not readily identifiable as looted property, with the sole intention of keeping such treasures safe and in trust for the people of Germany or the other rightful owners. The United States Government will retain these objects of art in its possession only as long as necessary to insure their physical safety or until such time as it may be possible to return them to their rightful owners. The return of readily identifiable looted art objects to the liberated countries from the American zone in Germany is already under way.

When the appropriate Allied bodies determine the rightful owners or the return of conditions in Germany whereby the safety of the objects to be stored in the United States can be definitely assured, they will be distributed according to the directives of such Allied groups. When objects of art are definitely established as being of bona fide German ownership, they will be returned to Germany when conditions there warrant.

The reason for bringing these perishable art objects to the United States is that expert personnel is not available within the American zone to assure their safety. At present these perishable objects are being stored under conditions which would bring about their deterioration. For many of these art objects there are not adequate housing facilities in Germany.

The National Gallery of Art, through the chairman of its Board of Trustees, the Honorable Harlan Fiske Stone, Chief Justice of the United States, has been requested, on behalf of the Government, to arrange for the storage and protection of these works of art while in this country.

MASTERPIECES ARRIVE IN UNITED STATES

DECEMBER 6, 1945.—Approximately 200 masterpieces of painting from Germany now rest in the National Gallery of Art at Washington. The shipment, which includes works by such artists as Botticelli, Van Eyck, Memling, Dürer, Raphael, Titian, Giorgione, Rembrandt, and Rubens arrived in New York Friday aboard the steamship *James Parker* and were transported to the Nation's capital in Army vehicles yesterday.

The paintings, which formerly had been in German museums damaged or destroyed by the war, were brought to this country in accordance with the plan outlined in a White House statement of last September 26 which announced that the War Department would transport certain perishable art treasures to this country for safekeeping and in trust for the German people.

These works of art will be returned to the museums when conditions in Europe warrant. In the meantime, the National Gallery of Art, through the chairman of its Board of trustees, Harlan Fiske Stone, Chief Justice of the United States, has arranged for the storage and protection of the masterpieces while they are in this country.

It is not contemplated that any of these works of art will be exhibited to the public until, perhaps, before the time arrives for their return to Germany.

LIST OF PAINTINGS BY ARTIST AND TITLE

Albrecht Altdorfer: Rest on the Flight, Landscape With Satyr Family, Nativity, Christ's Farewell to His Apostle.

Christoph Amberger: Cosmographer Sebastian Münster.

Jacopo Amigione: Lady as Diana.

Fra Angelico: Last Judgment.

Austrian Master (circa 1400): Christ, Madonna, and St. John.

Austrian Master (circa 1410): Crucifixion.

Hans Baldung-Grien: Altar of Halle, Graf Löwenstein, Lamentation for Christ, Pyramus and Thisbe.

Giovanni Bellini: The Resurrection.

Bohemian (circa 1350): Glatyer Madonna.

Hieronymus Bosch: St. John on Patmos.

Botticelli: Giuliano de Medici and frame; Madonna of the Lilies, St. Sebastian, Simonette Vespucci, Venus.

Dirk Bouts: Madonna and Child, Virgin in Adoration.

Peter Breughel: Dutch Proverbs, Two Monkeys.

Angelo Bronzino: Portrait of a Young Man, Portrait of a Young Man, Ugolino Martelli.

Hans Burgkmair: Holy Family.

Giovanni Battista Caracciolo: Cosmas and Damian.

Caravaggio: Amor.

Vittore Carpaccio: Entombment of Christ.

Andrea del Castagno: Assumption of the Virgin.

Chardin: The Draughtsman, Still Life.

Petrus Christus: Portrait of a Girl, St. Barbara and a Carthusian Monk.

Joos van Cleve: Young Man.

Cologne Master (circa 1400): Life of Christ.

Cologne Master (circa 1350): Madonna Enthroned, Crucifixion.

Corregio: Leda and the Swan.

Francesco Cossa: Allegory of Autumn.

Lucas Cranach: Frau Reuss, "Lucretia," Rest on the Flight.

Daumier: Don Quixote.

Piero di Cosimo: Mars, Venus, and Amor.

Lorenzo di Credi: Young Girl.

Albrecht Dürer: Madonna, Madonna With the Goldfinch, Young Woman, Hieronymus Holzschuher, Cover for Portrait of Hieronymus Holzschuher.

Adem Elsheimer: The Drunkenness of Noah, Holy Family, Landscape With Weeping Magdalene, St. Christopher.

Jean Fouquet: Etienne Chevalier With St. Stephen.

French (circa 1400): Coronation of the Virgin.

French Master (circa 1400): Triptych.

Geertgen tot Sint Jans: John the Baptist, Madonna.

Giorgione: Portrait of a Young Man.

Giotto: Death of the Virgin.

Jan Gossaert: Baudouin de Bourbon, Christ on the Mountain.

Francesco Guardi: The Balloon Ascension, St. Mark's Plaza in Venice, Piazzetta in Venice.

Frans Hals: Hille Bobbe, Nurse and Child, Portrait of a Young Man, Portrait of a Young Woman, Singing Boy, Tyman Oosdorp.

Meindert Hobbema: Landscape.

Hans Holbein: George Giesze, Old Man, Portrait of a Man.

Pieter de Hooch: The Mother, Party of Officers and Ladies.

Willem Kalf: Still Life, Still Life.

Philips Konninck: Dutch Landscape.

Georges de La Tour: St. Sebastian.

Filippino Lippi: Allegory of Music.

Fra Filippo Lippi: Adoration of the Child.

Pietro Lorenzetti: St. Humilitas Raises a Nun, Death of St. Humilitas.

Claude Lorrain: Italian Coast Landscape.

Lorenzo Lotto: Christ's Farewell to His Mother.

Bastiano Mainardi: Portrait of a Man.

Manet: In the Wintergarden.

Andrea Mantegna: Cardinal Mezzarota, Presentation in the Temple.

Simon Marmion: Altar of St. Omer (two panels).

Simone Martini: Burial of Christ.

Masaccio: Birth Platter, Three Predellae, Four Saints.

Quinten Massys: Magdalene.

Master of Darmstadt Passion: Altar Wings.

Master of Flemalle: Crucifixion, Portrait of a Man.

Master of Virgin Among Virgins: Adoration of the Kings.

Hans Memling: Madonna Enthroned With Angels, Madonna Enthroned, Madonna and Child.

Lippo Memmi: Madonna and Child.
Antonello da Messina: Portrait of a Man.
Jan Mostaert: Portrait of a Man.
Aelbert Ouwater: Raising of Lazarus.
Palma Vecchio: Portrait of a Man, Young Woman.
Giovanni Paolo Pannini: Colosseum.
Giovanni di Paolo: Christ on the Cross, Legend of St. Clara.
Joachim Patinir: Rest on the Flight.
Sebastiano del Piombo: Roman Matron, San Dago Knight.
Antonio Pollaiuolo: David.
Nicolas Poussin: St. Matthaus, Amaltea.
Raphael: Madonna Diotalevi, Madonna Terranova, Solly Madonna.
Rembrandt: Landscape With Bridge, John the Baptist, Joseph and Potiphar's Wife, Vision of Daniel, Moses Breaking Law Tablets, Susanna and the Elders, Tobias and the Angel, Minerva, Rape of Proserpina, Self Portrait, Hendricke Stoeffels, Man With Gold Helmet, Old Man With Red Hat, Rabbi, Saskia.
Rubens: Landscape (Shipwreck of *Aeneas*), St. Cecilia, Madonna Enthroned With Saints, Andromeda, Perseus and Andromeda, Isabella Brandt.
Jacob van Ruisdael: Haarlem View.
Sassetta: Legend of St. Francis, Mass of St. Francis.
Martin Schongauer: Nativity.
Seghers: Landscape.
Luca Signorelli: Three Saints (Altar Wing) (2), Portrait of a Man.
Francesco Squarcione: Madonna and Child.
Jan Steen: Inn Garden, The Christening.
Bernardo Strozzi: Judith.
Gerard Terborch: The Concert, Fatherly Advice.
Giovanni Battista Tiepolo: Carrying of the Cross, St. Agatha, Rinaldo and Armida.
Tintoretto: Doge Mocenigo, Old Man.
Titian: Venus with Organ Player, Self Portrait, Lavinia, Portrait of a Young Man, Strozzi Child.
Cosma Tura: St. Christopher, St. Sebastian.
Adriaen van der Velde: The Farm.
Roger van der Weyden: Marienaltar, Johannesaltar, Bladelin Altar, Portrait of a Woman, Charles the Bold.
Jan Van Eyck: Crucifixion, Madonna in the Church, Giovanni Arnolfina, Man With a Pink, Knight of the Golden Fleece.
Lucas van Leyden: Chess Players, Madonna and Child.
Velasquez: Alessandro del Borro, Countess Olivares.
Domenico Veneziano: Adoration of the Kings, Martyrdom of St. Lucy, Portrait of a Young Woman.
Vermeer: Young Woman With a Pearl Necklace, Man and Woman Drinking Wine.
Andrea del Verrocchio: Madonna and Child (2).
Watteau: Fete Champetre, French Comedians, Italian Comedians.
Westphalian Master (ca. 1250): Triptych.
Konrad Witz: Crucifixion, Decision of Redemption.

Discharge Emblem Postage Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include a press release from the information service of the Post Office Department describing the ceremony at the White House, Thursday, May 9, 1946, when President Truman, in his capacity as Commander in Chief of all the armed forces of the nation, was presented with the first sheet of the honorable discharge emblem postage stamp.

It follows:

In a ceremony without precedent in philatelic history, President Harry S. Truman, at the White House today, in his capacity as Commander in Chief of all the armed forces of the Nation, was presented with the first sheet of the honorable-discharge emblem postage stamp.

Postmaster General Robert E. Hannegan made the presentation in the historic East Room, as ranking officers of the armed services and distinguished Government officials looked on. Specially chosen enlisted men from each branch of the combat services—Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard—occupied places of honor flanking the President and the Postmaster General. They were: Sgt. Michael Pulice, Army; Chief Electrican's Mate Charles Claybourn, Navy; Sgt. Douglas T. Jacobson, Marine Corps, and Machinist's Mate, First-Class, Paul Leaman Clark, Coast Guard. Representatives of veterans' organizations were among the 300 who attended the ceremonies.

The President entered the East Room accompanied by his Chief of Staff, Admiral William D. Leahy, and his military and naval aides.

Postmaster General Hannegan opened the ceremonies by stating that it was the Post Office Department people themselves who were responsible for the issuance of this new stamp honoring the heroes of World War II.

"The Post Office Department receives requests each week from all parts of the country," Mr. Hannegan pointed out, "for the issuance of commemorative postage stamps. We are proud to issue this one and proud that our President and Commander in Chief invited us to the White House where this ceremony could take place."

Then Mr. Hannegan said:

"In the course of this Nation's last armed conflict 12,000,000 Americans were called into the victorious services of which you, Mr. President, are Commander in Chief.

"Three hundred thousand of those Americans will not return. Nearly 700,000 have come back bearing the bodily hurt of steel and blast. All went into an ordeal more terrible than any that the massed forces of this Nation's defenders ever faced before.

"But for the courage and stamina of these young men and women and the skill of their commanders, America would present a different scene today, a spectacle of the overlordship of Nazism, the end of all that freemen hold dear.

"It is our purpose, Mr. President, to commemorate the sacrifices and the heroism of both the living and the dead—of all men and women in our Army, our Navy, our Marine Corps, our Coast Guard, and our Merchant Marine—who served in the forces that brought victory under your command.

"That victory attained, the great majority who made it possible, on the battlefield, on the high seas, or in the air, have now resumed their places in civilian life. They have gone back to their homes, to their jobs, and to the ways of peace. They wear the uniform no more.

"But to signify past membership in the armed service, each of these defenders of America is now entitled to wear a discharge button. And whether a man wore four stars on the shoulder of his military blouse yesterday, or whether he had not even so much as a single chevron on his sleeve, the button he wears today is the same.

"In that sense, Mr. President, the discharge button is an insigne of the heroism of a whole people. In that sense it is quite as meaningful as all the special awards, the medals, the stars, the oak leaf clusters, that are made for individual heroism. And in that sense, too, this modest discharge button is strictly in character with the democracy which has conferred upon you its highest office.

"The people of our democracy live in the hope that this award will be the last America shall ever have to make for service in armed combat. They share with you, Mr. President, the certain knowledge that if this hope dies, the world dies with it.

"From time to time while nations and their governments grope and stumble on the hard path to peace, there come to us voices of discouragement, counsels of despair. We hear that there can be no peace. We hear that governments and the leaders of governments are conducting themselves as if they had relinquished the hope of peace. We are told that an unregenerate world cannot rise to the fulfillment of the highest goal ever set for itself by mankind—the goal that was set by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt and faithfully pursued, Mr. President, by yourself as his successor.

"But a nation is precipitated into war only after the will to war has been instilled in its people. Today, Mr. President, there exists no nation on earth whose people have it in their hearts to make war upon another people. And whether it be in the practice of selfless statesmanship or in the fear of consequences, the leaders of governments must, in the end, respect the hunger for peace that lives in the peoples of the world.

"To the whispers of defeat, we shall not yield. Our very love of country forbids this; for if we surrender peace, we surrender America—not to any people or any nation or group of nations, but to the destruction that must descend upon victor and vanquished alike in conflict of nations from this time forward.

"We cannot offer recompense to the living, we cannot honor the dead, save by reaffirming the promise that war shall not come to the Nation of their sons and their daughters.

"In commemoration of the sacrifices and the heroism of 12,000,000 Americans, the United States post office has issued a new stamp, Mr. President, which bears the design of the discharge button and the wording, 'Honoring those who have served.'

"I have the privilege of handing you the first sheet of this stamp."

In response, President Truman said:

"Mr. Postmaster General and all of you who are gathered here for this ceremony, I appreciate very much the thoughtfulness of the Postmaster General in giving me the first sheet of these stamps. Incidentally, it will probably cost me $2.50.

"But that honorable discharge, in my opinion, is one of the greatest documents that can come into the hands of a man who has served his country.

"I have one. I am very proud of it. I have it framed so that both sides are visible—glass on each side. I wanted the side to show which said that I had an excellent character, that I was capable of filling the next higher grade to the rank which I held when I was discharged, and that said that I had done the country good and faithful service. I wanted the people to be sure and see that when they looked at that discharge.

"Nothing could be finer in a man's career than to have an excellent discharge from the service of his country. That is what this stamp commemorates—an excellent discharge from service to country, in a war that was fought to create in this world an enduring peace.

"The Atlantic Charter, the Charter of the United Nations, and all the other great documents which President Roosevelt implemented, must be carried through to their logical conclusion; and I am sure that these 12,000,000 men who wear or will wear this

beautiful discharge button for World War II will be the first to help us realize the ideals which were set up by my predecessor.

"Bob, I want to thank you for this, and I'll see you about the compensation after this is over."

At Postmaster General Hannegan's suggestion, the President made the presentation of sheets of the new stamp to the Cabinet officers who are the civilian heads of the military establishments and to the service commanders. The stamp sheets were enclosed in souvenir albums.

Recipients were Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson; Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal; Admirals Leahy, Chester W. Nimitz, and Ernest J. King; Gen. Carl Spaatz, Commanding General, Army Air Forces; Gen. Alexander A. Vandegrift, Commandant of the Marine Corps; and Admiral Joseph F. Farley, Commandant of the Coast Guard.

Albums were mailed to Gen. George C. Marshall, Gen. Henry H. Arnold, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, and former Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson.

Explaining that Secretary of the Navy Forrestal was testifying before a congressional committee and could not attend, the Postmaster General remarked:

"I am sorry for that because I can see an example of unification here."

When the President presented an album to General Vandegrift, he said:

"I can assure you that the Marines aren't going to be abolished."

After presenting the albums to the four decorated veterans, the President said:

"It is a pleasure to me to take part in ceremonies of this sort. I have so many other duties that are not so pleasant that when one such as this comes along, I take a great deal of pride in having a part in it. And I want to thank the Postmaster General, and I will be glad to meet each one of you as you go out, if you like."

A statement of the records of the four veterans is attached.

Records of the enlisted men of the four combat services who received albums each containing a sheet of the new discharge emblem stamp, presented to them by President Harry S. Truman in the East Room of the White House this afternoon.

ARMY

Sgt. Michael Pulice enlisted in the Army on July 29, 1939, in the One Hundred and Eleventh Cavalry National Guard unit at Carlsbad, N. Mex., and remained with that unit until August 1, 1940. This unit was converted to an antiaircraft organization known as the Two Hundredth Coast Artillery. On January 6, 1941, the unit was inducted into the Regular Army service and moved to Fort Bliss, Tex. Sergeant Pulice was in Battery F of the unit and left from San Francisco for overseas on September 8, 1941. He arrived at Manila September 26, 1941 and was stationed at Fort Stotsenberg near Clark Field, Luzon. Sergeant Pulice was assigned to the Five Hundred and Fifteenth Coast Artillery Regiment and sent to Manila to guard General MacArthur's headquarters. He remained there until December 24, at which time Manila was declared an open city. The unit moved December 24 to Culumpit to protect the only bridge leading into Manila from the north while American troops evacuated from Manila. The unit guarded the bridge until December 25 when it moved to Pilar Field, there to set up gun positions. Pulice returned to Manila with his squadron on January 1, 1942, where he secured supplies on the day before the Japs took Manila. On January 5 he moved with the unit to Cabeabon Field, Bataan. He remained there until April 1, 1942, when he was moved to the front lines and on April 2 was blown from a fox hole by a bomb. On April 6, he was sent to an Army hospital. April 9 Bataan fell and Pulice, with his unit, was taken prisoner by the Japs.

However, he remained in the same hospital until the fall of Corregidor on May 6, 1942. Then Japs evacuated the prisoners to Manila, where Pulice was held prisoner in Bilibid prison until July 4, 1942. He was then moved to Cabanuatan in northern Luzon in October 1942, at which time he was evacuated to Divoa penal colony on Mindanao. He remained there until Febuary 1944 when he was moved to an airfield outside of Divoa City to work until August 20, 1944, which was the first day the city was bombed by American forces. On that day Pulice together with other American prisoners, was put on a boat for Japan. September 7 the boat was torpedoed by an American submarine and Sergeant Pulice escaped with approximately 83 other American prisoners to a small island where they remained with guerrillas from September 8 until 29. Then an American submarine picked up approximately 83 prisoners and took them to New Guinea and then evacuated them to the Forty-second General Hospital in Brisbane, Australia. From there they came to the United States, arriving December 1, 1944.

Pulice holds the Purple Heart with one oak leaf cluster, unit citation with three clusters, Pacific theater ribbon with two stars, Philippine liberation ribbon, Philippine defense ribbon with one star, American defense ribbon with one star, Good Conduct Medal, American theater ribbon, victory ribbon.

Sergeant Pulice was born in Morenci, Ariz., on February 10, 1919.

NAVY

Charles V. Claybourn, chief electrician's mate, United States Navy, is a veteran of Bataan, and later Corregidor, where he was captured and spent 2½ years as a Jap prisoner in five different Japanese military prison camps. He made five attempts to escape. On the last of these, he was caught and sentenced to be shot. Together with eight other men, who were in the escape group, they were forced to dig their own graves and then lined up before a firing squad. Fate, in the form of a Japanese officer, stopped the execution. To date, no one knows why this stay-of-execution order was given. Following this, he was beaten and tortured for 30 days in a Jap guardhouse.

Claybourn is 1 of 82 survivors from the Jap prison ship torpedoing and massacre of September 1944, in which 668 American prisoners lost their lives. He was responsible for bringing a group ashore, where they were assisted by Philippine guerrillas and ultimately returned to our forces.

For heroism and intrepidity of action, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross by the Army. He also holds the Army's Presidential citation with two oak leaf clusters, the Purple Heart, Good Conduct Medal, the American defense ribbon with one star, indicating service in the Asiatic Fleet with Sub Squadron 20 prior to and at the time of Pearl Harbor; the Pacific-Asiatic ribbon with three battle stars; the American theater ribbon; the Victory Medal; the Philippine liberation ribbon with one battle star; and the Philippine defense ribbon with one battle star.

Claybourn was born November 10, 1921, at Chatham, Ill.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Sgt. Douglas T. Jacobson received his basic training at the Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S. C., and soon thereafter joined the Fourth Marine Division.

Hs is a veteran of Saipan, Tinian, and Iwo Jima campaigns. He was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for services at Iwo Jima and the medal was presented by President Truman on Nimitz Day, October 5, 1945.

He has the Presidential unit citation, the Asiatic-Pacific area campaign medal and World War II Victory Medal.

He was honorably discharged from the Marine Corps as a sergeant on December 17, 1945, and on April 22, 1946, he reenlisted in the Marine Corps as a sergeant and is now on duty at the Recruiting Station, 1400 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C.

Sergeant Jacobson was born at Port Washington, Long Island, N. Y. on November 25, 1925.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Paul Leamen Clark, machinist's mate first class was awarded the Navy Cross for extraordinary heroism while serving as engineer of a landing boat attached to the U. S. S. *Joseph T. Dickman* during the assault on and occupation of French Morocco from November 8 to 11, 1942. When a hostile plane strafed his boat with machine-gun fire, mortally wounding the bowman and severely injuring the coxswain, Clark, with quick initiative, immediately withdrew from the beach. Speeding toward the U. S. S. *Palmer*, he placed the wounded men aboard and, although his craft was riddled by enemy bullets, courageously returned to his station at the beach. His outstanding skill, resourcefulness, and unselfish devotion to duty were in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States naval service.

Clark's home is in Jersey City, N. J.

The Coal Strike

REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the devastating coal strike has emphasized the stalemate which exists in Government today and has given rise to the belief in many quarters that there is a growing impotence in Government in dealing with such important problems. This in turn points to the necessity for early action on the recommendations made by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress which includes, among other things, a suggestion for the creation of legislative policy committees for the better coordination of national policy between the executive and the legislative branches of Government.

On Friday, May 10, the Senate passed Senate Resolution 260 which was unanimously reported by the Senate Rules Committee and which would establish a special committee consisting of the six Senators who are members of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress with power to consider and report legislation which embodies the recommendations of the joint committee.

Legislation is now in process of preparation to carry out the recommendations made in the joint committee report on Mareh 4, 1946, and includes: First, reduction in the number of standing committees; second, the creation of policy committees; third, expansion of research and

staff facilities; fourth, better fiscal control; fifth, the registration of lobbyists; sixth, congressional pay and retirement, and a number of other items. There is reason to believe, therefore, that the Senate may act on this highly important matter at an early date.

The creation of such a committee will avert the separation and dismemberment of the various recommendations made by the joint committee and the distribution of the various legislative proposals to many standing committees that now have jurisdiction under existing rules of the House and Senate. I, therefore, urge that the House take similar steps in creating a special committee so that the legislation to give effect to the joint committee's recommendations may be handled as a single piece of legislation. This should be done at a very early date.

The Stake in Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 10, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Journal-American of April 28, 1946:

THE STAKE IN PRICE CONTROL

(By Samuel Crowther)

ARTICLE VIII. THE PROPAGANDA OF FEAR

The support for continuing the Office of Price Administration has been gained by the most reckless misrepresentation of the facts of our economy and by playing on the fear of inflation.

Men in responsible positions have not hesitated to play with fire and it is of no consequence that some of them do not know they are playing with fire.

Another part of the support comes from the Communists. They clearly see that price fixing in peacetime is bound to lead to the regimented state.

The Communists are interested only in breaking down; and Lenin long ago advocated inflation and price fixing as the surest and quickest method of breaking down a capitalist state.

Sidney Hillman's PAC-CIO follows the Communist line.

Behind these groups, as has been previously brought out, are the great and growing number of people who are cashing in on price control.

Business fears reprisals

The opposition to price control by businessmen has not until lately had much expression. During the war they were afraid of being accused of putting dollars above patriotism.

Since then many have been afraid of reprisals—for it is practically impossible to conduct business today without violating some OPA regulation.

That is changing; men are beginning to speak out.

More than a few politicians, however, who know thoroughly well what price control means and know something about inflation, are playing politics with the country's destiny.

They want to keep the New Dealers in office long enough to reap what they have sown and so they are willing to keep the OPA in some modified form where it can do a minimum of harm but still be in a position to get the brickbats of inflation.

The favorite propaganda device of the OPA is to magnify the 1919–20 boom after World War I and to represent the 1921 depression as colossal.

They do not hesitate to mix up 1919–20 in the minds of younger people with the 1929 stock-market crash and the great depression of the thirties which reached its depth in 1932.

Questionnaire withdrawn

For instance, in a questionnaire circulated among Los Angeles school children are these questions:

"Did you know there were more than 11,000,000 men unemployed during the depression after World War I?"

"If all price control were discontinued now, as it was after World War I, do you believe we could avoid another depression?"

Those questions mix the two periods. There were never 11,000,000 men unemployed in this country, even at the depths of 1932–33, and we have no reliable figures for 1920–21.

That questionnaire was withdrawn as soon as it was objected to and it was put down as the work of an overenthusiastic employee.

But variations of that sort of thing have been going on all over the country in many forms. It always happens that the most barefaced propaganda turns out, on investigation, to be unofficial.

The chief officers, however, do not hesitate to emit prophecies as to what would happen if price controls and subsidies were removed. Price Administrator Paul Porter told the House Banking and Currency Committee:

"If we are careless or if we lack the courage of our convictions and understanding, we can very easily cast aside our economic future into a wasteland of business failure, farm foreclosure, unemployment, poverty, bitter dissension among groups, intense social unrest and international insecurity."

Without OPA, he predicted, inflation would drive up prices from 30 percent to 50 percent within a year.

Secretary of the Treasury Vinson went so far as to tell the same committee that if price controls were continued for at least a year the $300,000,000,000 of savings "can be the flywheel for our economy for a long time to come. This can give us the future that all Americans want. It can be the pleasant aftermath of war."

The several administrators of reconversion, including Messrs. Bowles and Porter, reported on April 8, 1946, that "the danger of a severe inflation will have passed by the middle of 1947."

The statements of these men have not the slightest foundation in fact or in theory.

The Communists have a higher grade of showmanship.

They accuse big business of being against the OPA as part of a plot to rob the American wage earner. The Worker—which is the official organ of the Communist Party—quotes one Joe Kuzma as telling the mass meeting on the ending of the steel strike:

"This is the rehearsal for the coming battle. Tomorrow we go after Congress and the White House to see that we are not robbed of our victory by high prices and inflation."

But neither the personality of the OPA nor its methods are the main points in issue.

Results of price fixing

The only vital point is that the device of price fixing is being used to cover up the cancer of inflation that is eating the vitality out of the American system of free enterprise and therefore out of the whole system of American freedom.

Nothing whatsoever is being done to stop inflation, but a great deal is being done to stop production.

It needs ever to be borne in mind—and this has been reiterated through this series—that the OPA issue of inflation is a false issue. A perfect holding down of prices would not hold down inflation. It would merely repudiate the money.

Production will not itself avoid inflation. The process of producing generates its own purchasing power and that will be added to the money already extant. But production, to repeat, will bring confidence.

The threat of inflation will remain as long as the commercial banks hold Government bonds, for these bonds are the source of our inflation.

The larger issue is this:

The delicate mechanism of free prices freely arrived at by buyer and seller is fundamental to our freedom.

If a man cannot buy and sell as he pleases, he can work or not work as he pleases, and once that great sector of freedom be withdrawn, little is left but an empty shell.

Free bargaining needed

But, cry the proponents of price control, we admit all that. We want to use price control as a method of gaining freedom by holding back the forces of inflation until supply catches up with demand.

The time when supply catches up with demand under price control is never.

Supply and demand can meet by free bargaining. They can never meet by direction.

On July 1, 1947, even if all our present prophets assemble in white robes on the White House lawn to greet the new era, there will be another gang at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue imploring the Congress to continue price control and giving exactly the same reasons as are given today.

The only way to end price control is to end it.

The Coal Strike

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the people of my district as well as those living elsewhere are gravely concerned about the plight of our country by reason of the coal strike.

Without regard as to the merits of the particular controversy between the miners and mine owners something should and must be done to prevent the recurrence of instances imperiling our very lives.

Of course, the House has already passed many measures for which I voted which, if enacted into law, would prevent unjustified strikes.

There is something eating away the foundations of our Government and that is the tendency of groups to organize and

contend for their rights without any regard for the rights of others. I believe in organization and feel that organizations serve a useful and necessary purpose. We must have them in our democracy but let every organized group take heed of their actions lest in the zealous prosecution of their own case they destroy the whole structure of Government which protects them.

I do not believe that any sizable portion of the American people desire to weld themselves into a group which functions to the exclusion and detriment of the interest of the majority of the people. Too often it is not the membership, that is, the rank and file members, of an organization, but the leadership, the few on the top, who play politics and unhesitatingly use political pressure to have their own way. The average citizen, who is the backbone of all organizations, is more willing to have his case decided along democratic lines in fairness and justice to others.

Lately, we have seen the example of one man being able to stop production in a number of essential industries and defy every authority and appeal to patriotism. It was never intended for any one man to have so much power in America. The Constitution of the United States does not even grant that much power to the President of the United States. Regardless of what the issue might be in disputes which arise between employees and employers, there is no room for an employer or employee to view the situation from a purely personal standpoint and say in effect "the public be damned." That is not the spirit of working together but rather the spirit of working for one's own self without any consideration for the interests and rights of others.

Political Action Committee

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, once again the CIO's Political Action Committee, headed by Sidney Hillman, which recently announced that it had between five and six million dollars to be used to defeat Members of Congress who would not follow its orders, has called for the defeat at the primary—and if he wins there, at the election in November—of our colleague from Michigan, Mr. HOFFMAN, together with many other worthy Members of this House.

The experience is nothing new to the gentleman from Michigan, for the CIO together with powerful leaders of the Political Action Committee, as well as the New Deal and the Communists, have been after his political scalp for, lo, these many years.

This year, however, the CIO-PAC has adopted a new strategy. Through its stooges, and through some who honestly have been deceived, it is attempting to convince our colleague's constituents that he is opposed to legislation designed to benefit the veterans. That, as the Members of this House well know, is completely false.

Our colleague voted for the bonus for the veterans of the First World War. He supported the GI bill of rights, and he has voted for and actively supported every other worth-while bill designed to aid veterans. The Members of this House know that, and many of us are amazed at the boldness of those who attempt to deceive the voters in the districts where the PAC are carrying on the fights against sitting Members.

Our colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], not only has a son who enlisted and served 2 years and 8 months in the Navy, but he has, on many occasions long before the Second World War, championed the cause of Veterans of Foreign Wars and of World War I.

Mr. Speaker, I have served in this House for 28 years, during the last 12 of which our colleague has been a Member of the House. I know the needs of the veterans. I should, at least, as I served in the Spanish-American War; I served through World War I, coming out of that war with the rank of major of Infantry. I was with the expeditionary forces in both instances. My son enlisted in this war, and is being retired a lieutenant colonel, after 4 years' and 4 months' service, the last 16 months of which was in the Philippines. I think I know a little more about the veterans' needs, not only for favorable legislation, but protection against those who would exploit them, protection from the PAC, and similar organizations, and about the ability of my colleague from Michigan, Mr. HOFFMAN, to aid the veterans here in Congress, than do some of those who have no knowledge of the facts, who are seeking only financial or political advantage for themselves or their organizations.

Our colleague from Michigan has supported, and I have not the slightest doubt but that he will continue to support, so long as he is a Member of the House, every worth-while bill introduced to further the interests of the veterans. He not only has the will to do so, he has the ability and the opportunity. No matter what others outside of this Chamber may say, I know there is not a Member of Congress who does not acknowledge his sincerity, his ability, and his patriotism.

His political opponents speak well of the service he has rendered, and of the patriotism of our colleague from Michigan, let me quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a comment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the leader of the Democratic Party in the House [Mr. MCCORMACK], who on April 14, 1944, stated as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, just before the recess a number of gentlemen on the majority side felt the House was wasting its time. Can the gentleman assure us that no legislation will be brought up tomorrow?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And we would not be wasting our time if we adjourned over tomorrow?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I am sure the gentleman will be in his office working very hard. I know I will. * * * I am sure that the Members on both sides are working very hard. They have plenty of office work, and also the study of bills and other matters. I can vouch for the fact that the gentleman from Michigan works hard.

Again the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], referring to our Michigan colleague, said on April 25, 1944:

I have disagreed with the gentleman from Michigan on many occasions, and I expect the gentleman from Michigan and I will disagree in the future, but under no condition at any time have I felt, nor do I think anyone else is justified in impugning the patriotism of the gentleman from Michigan or the patriotism of any other Member of this House.

Again on February 7, 1946, the Democratic leader made the following statement:

Mr. MCCORMACK. The gentleman from Michigan and I voted the same way on that today. * * * The gentleman from Michigan and I were on the same side.

* * * * *

I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Michigan. I want him to know that even in disagreement I know the gentleman is sincere in his motives, and I want the gentleman to understand that no matter how much we may disagree I profoundly respect him.

In the Congress, perhaps to a greater degree than in any other legislative body, experience adds to a man's ability to serve his constituents. Over the years, we learn to accurately evaluate our colleagues' ability, sincerity, and willingness to work.

Our colleague from Michigan, Mr. HOFFMAN, has earned and won, by the service which he has rendered, a position in the House where none ever questions his sincerity, his intentions; where all rely upon his promises.

Because of his service here, he is now ranking minority member on the very important Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; of the Committee on War Claims, which, when the war is officially declared to be over, may become one of the most important committees of the House. If the Republicans win control of the House, our colleague will have the choice of the chairmanship of either one of these committees.

In addition, he is a member of the important special committee charged with the investigation of executive agencies, a committee which has made many investigations, rendered invaluable service to small business as well as to the public welfare.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is an exceedingly valuable Member of this House. His retirement from Congress for any reason would be a distinct loss to the great State he represents, and to the country at large.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the time has come when Members of Congress who are sworn to preserve, protect, and defend this country against all others will have to stand up and be counted when the proposed gift to Great Britain which, in fact, amounts to $4,400,000,000 as distinguished from $3,750,000,000, comes up in the House of Representatives for a vote.

This donation, without even interest, to an empire on whose possessions the sun never sets, and a country which has defaulted on its previous loans, shows an absolute disregard on her part so far as meeting her obligations is concerned. Those who vote for this gift, without interest or strings, will show an equal disregard for the rights of the American citizens. Furthermore, it will show a discrimination against our veterans who fought, bled, and died to help Great Britain win the war, because any loan that a veteran obtains from the Federal Government will bear 4 percent interest.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of May 12, 1946:

THE LOAN

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

So the Senate, after days of debate, has finally passed the $4,400,000,000 "loan" to Great Britain.

You will note that the amount of the "loan" here given is $4,400,000,000 as distinguished from the figure $3,750,000,000 usually mentioned. That is to emphasize the seldom mentioned fact that as a part of the "loan" transaction the United States is canceling a British lend-lease debt of roughly $650,000,000 and to boot is handing out $3,750,000,000 of fresh money.

And as to the reason why the transaction is called a "loan" in quotes, signifying skepticism, the best explanation is in a table of figures furnished by the United States Treasury Department and appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 9. It is found here at the end of this article.

You may draw what conclusions you wish from the fact that only Liberia and Cuba, two countries literally founded by the Government of the United States, troubled to pay back their borrowings. Or that Finland, which got its breath of life from our money at the end of the last war, is the high scorer among the other nations.

Finland has struggled to pay from the beginning in spite of all its troubles, and still does.

You also cannot help but note that Britain, now pounding at our doors for more money, only paid back 47.3 percent before defaulting, and that the rest of the borrowers followed the British cue.

What now happens to those World War I "loans"? You realize, of course, that the "loans" will be paid. They will be paid off not by the people who borrowed the money but by those who "loaned" it.

Our Government let out the money to the foreigners on the basis of its own credit. Our Government had to borrow from whoever cared to invest in its bonds—banks, insurance companies, etc., mainly—to put up that capital abroad.

And who is to pay off the bonds? You, gentle reader. You with your taxes. You pay off the bonds. What have you got back?

Britain, which is now huffily saying that it is an insult to suggest she will not pay back the $3,750,000,000 of fresh money she asks, was the leader of the defaulters and acted as if she were the injured party in doing it.

You've got to hand it to the British. They are smart. They know a rich sucker when they see one.

They are smart in more ways than one. And it is to be hoped that the House of Representatives, which has now to consider the British loan, will take a look into the facts of the British situation in Italy today.

Italy collapsed as a war making power in 1944. It is now ruled by an Allied military commission. And how is the commission made up and how does it work?

For instance, the United States has 12,000 troops in Italy. Britain has 300,000. All living off the Italians. British officials control Italian communications, transportation, shipping, and raw materials.

Members of the House of Representatives should take a look at the balance sheet in Italy since 1944. They will find on it that the United States is exporting heavily to Italy. And Italy is exporting heavily to Britain.

They will find that the control commission is selling off war supplies to strange new companies at very low figures, which companies, in turn, are selling to the Italians at very high figures.

For example, tires sold to the strange new companies at $2 and $3 each go to the Italians at $300 and $400 each.

The profits? It would be revealing to examine the ancestry, membership, and assets of the strange new companies now buying up Italian real estate, factories, and farm land.

Members of the House, what happened last year to the Italian grain, citrus and other crops? Here is one example. The United States had a large pool of trucks in the Italian grain area earmarked to distribute wheat under strict control, to combat the black market and save Italian lives.

When the United States officers in charge of those trucks refused to let them be diverted, the officers were transferred, and trucks immediately were moved to haul lumber for making cases in which the Italian citrus crop was boxed for shipment to England.

And what happened to the wheat those trucks were supposed to haul? It stayed on the farm and was peddled off in the local black markets. So the United States, to make up the loss, shipped wheat from the United States of America.

Now what kind of a deal is that?

Never mind the Italians. They picked the wrong side in this war, and if the British give them a rooking, who cares?

But why a rooking at the United States taxpayers' expense?

Those little items in wheat, tires, the 1945 Italian exports to England and the 1945 United States exports to Italy all cost the United States taxpayer. In total, they run into big money.

They are concealed profits the British are already working out of victory.

As Europe settles down, those profits will grow—for Britain.

What about us? That question, too, has its place in the debate on this so-called loan which you know very well is a gift this time as it was the last. Don't kid yourself about that.

Status of indebtedness of foreign governments to the United States arising out of World War I

Country	Principal of obligations originally acquired	Total payments received to date (principal and interest)	Percent of payments received to original debt
Armenia	$11,959,917.49		
Austria	24,055,708.92	$862,668.00	3.6
Belgium	379,087,200.43	52,191,273.24	13.8
Cuba	10,000,000.00	12,286,751.58	122.9
Czechoslovakia	91,879,671.03	20,134,092.26	21.9
Estonia	13,999,145.60	1,248,432.07	8.9
Finland	8,281,926.17	7,263,549.99	87.7
France	3,404,818,945.01	486,075,891.00	14.3
Great Britain	4,277,000,000.00	2,024,848,817.09	47.3
Greece	27,167,000.00	4,127,056.01	15.2
Hungary	1,685,835.61	556,919.76	33.0
Italy	1,648,034,050.90	100,829,880.16	6.1
Latvia	5,132,287.14	761,549.07	14.8
Liberia	26,000.00	36,471.56	140.3
Lithuania	4,981,628.03	1,237,956.58	24.9
Nicaragua	431,849.14	168,575.84	39.0
Poland	159,666,972.39	22,646,297.55	14.2
Rumania	37,911,152.92	4,791,007.22	12.6
Russia	192,601,297.37	8,750,311.88	4.5
Yugoslavia	51,758,486.55	2,588,771.69	5.0
Total	10,350,479,074.70	2,751,406,272.55	26.6

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. H. MOORE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "It Is a Strike Against the Government," published in the Washington Daily News on May 11, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT IS A STRIKE AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT

Never in history have we had such a demonstration of official impotence as is being shown in this coal strike.

The American people have been pushed around by an insolent, power-mad egocentric—John L. Lewis—whose determination to defy the Government and impose his will on a whole people now threatens to destroy the national economy and the public security.

It would seem a situation to stir a storm of wrath that would blow this strutting, beetle-browed tyrant forever into oblivion.

Yet the President of the United States, in whose opinion the strike was a national calamity 6 days ago, now says coolly that it has not yet become a strike against the Government; that if and when it does he, the President, will do something about it.

And the President's party leader in the Senate urges Congress to wait for calmer times before acting to correct the biased laws and Government policies which have given Lewis his power and made this situation possible.

Meanwhile, the arrogant Lewis isn't even attending strike conferences.

And what happens while we wait?

Two million people already are jobless or working only part time because of the strike. Their number swells by many thousands daily as steel plants close in Pennsylvania, auto plants in Michigan, factories of all kinds in Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, and other States. Seventy-five percent of rail freight is embargoed. Two thousand passenger trains go out of service today; two thousand more next Wednesday. Use of electric power is drastically restricted over a wide area. Streets of scores of cities are darkened. Their food supplies are dwindling. Their hospitals and schools are running out of fuel. Their water and sewage systems are endangered. And much, much worse is still to come as paralysis gallops across the land.

This Lewis coal strike is, and has been from its start, a strike against the Government.

It is a strike against that domestic tranquillity and general welfare which the Constitution says it shall be the purpose of Government to insure and promote.

It is a strike to destroy the price and wage controls by which the Government is attempting to protect the people from calamitous inflation.

It is even a strike against the National Labor Relations Act, which law, President Truman says, forbids payment of the coal-tonnage royalty that Lewis insists must be granted before he will even discuss other demands.

The issue has gone beyond the merits of an employer-employee relationship. It has become the simple issue of whether one man shall be allowed to wreck our society.

This is a strike against the Government. If the President and Congress ever intend to do anything about it, the time is now.

Livestock Feed Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the livestock feed situation is of great importance to the people of the Nation, particularly to the dairymen of the dairy sections of the several states. An up-to-date survey has been made by the Cooperative GLF Exchange, which survey covers the deficit feed areas of the United States. The information will be of interest, I am sure, to the dairymen and poultrymen; therefore, under unanimous consent, I insert a letter received by me from Mr. C. N. Silcox, secretary-treasurer of the Cooperative GLF Holding Corp., Terrace Hill, Ithaca, N. Y.; also I ask consent to insert "Feed Report" sent to 200,000 farmers in the GLF territory:

COOPERATIVE GLF HOLDING CORP.,
Ithaca, N. Y., May 9, 1946.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: Because you are going to hear more and more from farmers about their livestock feed shortage as it comes closer to their farms, I am sending you a brief up-to-the-minute statement on the feed situation, which has just been mailed out to over 200,000 farmers in GLF territory.

This is a factual statement which is representative of the feed situation in the deficit areas of the United States. This situation has been brought on by the unrealistic attitude of the OPA in continuing price relations between livestock and grain, which have encouraged heavy feeding of livestock in the Middle West, because it was more profitable to feed grain to livestock than to sell it for cash.

The result is that today our Nation cannot meet its commitments to feed the starving people of foreign countries, and the northeastern farmers are facing a situation where, unless some help is forthcoming, they must liquidate dairy cows and poultry—the most efficient livestock users of grain.

The only answer is the removal of all price ceilings on grain, grain byproducts, and feed ingredients so that eastern farmers can compete with midwestern farmers for an equitable distribution of supplies after the needs of foreign countries have been met.

Sincerely yours,

C. N. SILCOX.

FEED REPORT

(A message to GLF patrons from General Manager J. McConnell)

THE FEED SITUATION

To GLF Patrons:

Out of every 10 bags of feed used by farmers in GLF territory, 7 to 8 must be brought to the farm from outside the area. This means that, outside of hay and pasture, shipped-in feed is the most important supply item in the livestock industry of the Northeast.

Feed for May

At present rates of feeding, GLF patrons will want to use in May about 150,000 tons of feed. Of this, GLF feed mills can furnish only 50,000 tons, that's all they can make from ingredients now on hand plus ingredients promised for May delivery. Inventories in local agencies can supply another 30,000 tons. Shipments of all sorts of materials, ground grains, supplements, and ingredients of various character, coming in from other sources will be about 30,000, making a total of 110,000 tons. It thus appears that for every 15 bags of feed that farmers want, 11 will be available.

Government buying for famine areas

The Government has found it necessary to pay 30 cents per bushel over ceilings to get grain for export to famine countries. In order to get grain for northeastern cows and hens after the Government gets what it can for export, it would be necessary to pay much higher prices than are permitted under present ceilings. Unless the OPA changes the feeding ratio between meat animals and grain, by raising the price of corn, so as to make it possible for the eastern farmer to buy more grain, there will be even less feed available in June than in May.

Closing the gap

The gap between supply and present use of feed will, of course, be closed by farmers themselves in various ways.

1. Hens will be sold for meat in increasing numbers, as long as good prices prevail.

2. Fewer broilers will be raised than would be the case if there were plenty of feed available. Only pullets will be started for next fall's layers.

3. Cows will soon be turned to grass, allowing dairymen to cut down the rate of feeding per cow during the summer months.

4. Some liquidation of the poorer dairy animals for meat purposes is likely to take place.

In this way, the shortage during the summer will gradually be worked out. Farmers do not like this kind of situation, but it is an aftermath of war controls which all hope will soon pass.

Symptoms of a shortage

Adjusting the demand downward to the amount of feed available is easy enough to talk about, but it will create many individual hardships. After dealing with feed shortages during the entire war period, we have as yet found no way to distribute a shortage with justice to all. Actually, the effect of the shortage has been apparent for many months in the following ways:

1. The quality of feed mixtures for dairy cattle is not what dairymen would feed if they had a free choice. Much material is now being shipped into this territory which in normal times would have difficulty finding a place in the northeastern feed ration.

2. Farmers are very short of whole grains for poultry scratch and other livestock purposes.

3. Western grain handlers are not generally selling whole grains any more. They grind them or process them in some other way in order to build up a higher price base, allowable under OPA ceilings. Thus a legal "black market."

4. Many communities find themselves out of certain kinds of feed for a day or for several days.

5. Some farmers, becoming discouraged, are selling off flocks of hens they would otherwise keep.

All the above things are evidence of a creeping paralysis resulting in general feed shortages, due to price control.

Fall plans

Under such conditions, no one is competent to offer sound advice on what to do, because from day to day no one knows what the Government rules and regulations will be tomorrow. We must bear in mind that we are still in the transition period from war to peace, that our economic machinery is still badly out of kilter.

However, farmers in their planning should keep in mind that beginning in late June, this country will start to harvest, weather being favorable, a crop of wheat, oats, milo, barley, and corn, amounting to around 6,000,000,000 bushels. Between now and next November there will be put into inventory approximately 100,000,000 tons of hay and 150,000,000 tons of grain, plus several million tons of oil meal.

Regardless of whether this will be enough to feed the livestock population then on hand, it is an indication that a man should not go out of business. It seems to me, therefore, that GLF farmers should plan to manage their farm business in such a way that they feed a minimum amount during the summer but have sufficient livestock and poultry on hand next fall to conduct their normal livestock business.

Negro Editor Answers Solon's Go North Plea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Alonzo B. Willis, who is editor of the Negro South, published at New Orleans, La. The article is entitled "Negro Editor Answers Solon's Go North Plea—Solve Your Problems Where You Are, Is Challenge."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEGRO EDITOR ANSWERS SOLON'S GO NORTH PLEA—SOLVE YOUR PROBLEMS WHERE YOU ARE, IS CHALLENGE

The South can get along without the Negro far easier than the Negro can get along without the South, Alcnzo B. Willis, Jr., editor of the New Orleans-published magazine, the Negro South, said in the publication's April issue.

Attacking Harlem Congressman A. CLAYTON POWELL's advocacy of an immediate migration to the North, he said, "Don't you know that the South is presently by far the richer in opportunity for the Negro? And that sage Booker Washington advised right when he said, 'Let down your buckets where you are.'

"It is true that the South has many needs; the Negro South has many, many more. That, precisely, is where opportunity begins; acceptance of the challenge to meet these needs.

"Don't you know, Congressman POWELL, that the Negro must solve his own problems with his own initiative? That he can't escape his problem by running away. The South is not so poor or wouldn't be, if one-third of its population, the Negro, wasn't a liability in many ways. Southerners are the same people as the Northerners, coming over here from the same oppressed European countries. Transport Negroes en masse to the North and you'll see pretty quick their common stripe."

Speaking editorially, the Negro editor questioned the Congressman's seriousness in "trying to coddle the Negro into thinking that blissful security awaits him beyond the Mason and Dixon's line, where he can pose * * * dapper and superiorly indifferent to the industry, the pioneering, the blood, the sweat, the sleepless nights, the brain, the skill, the initiative and toil that makes the wheels of southern industry and agriculture turn—that makes America the richest and most productive country in the world."

"WELL TO STICK AROUND"

Editor Willis condoned good Negro musicians, potential Joe Louis' or writing Richard Wrights going to the North to make money.

"But if the Negro presently in the South (with his average third-grade intelligence) hasn't got those special talents, then he'd do well to stick around * * * where he can laze away in a solacing southern sun if he doesn't want to work," said the editor.

"Where he can ever merely exist (but never progress) if he's unwilling to think, to plan, to work and sacrifice in order to achieve his ambitions, for himself—on his own merit and by his own skill; where he can still feed on good southern hospitality, even though he continues his shiftlessness and irresponsibility.

"The southern white man will put up with the Negro because after all these years he knows him, is patient with him, likes him. (In queer ways that run the gamut from tenderness to violence.) But he'll feed him some crumbs, ever and anon, call him 'boy,' and occasionally lynch him, as any Negro employer of Negroes is himself tempted to do. Incidentally, more Negroes killed Negroes in New Orleans since Christmas than were lynched in the entire South in the past decade. Why not work on that a little?"

LACK INITIATIVE

The Constitution has guaranteed most freedoms to the Negro for nearly a hundred years, he pointed out, and current passing of anti-poll-tax, antilynch, and similar bills "is no panacea for all the ills that the Negro is heir to. Legislation won't solve the race problem."

Most Negroes who have gone north recently "are those who lack initiative, ability, and willingness to work and save and own, which disparity has made them the cast-offs of the South," he said.

He pointed out that "many of the 10,000,000 Negroes down here own part of this economy, are in truth a substantial part of it and consequently are so respected. In New Orleans alone there are more than 10 Negro-owned insurance companies, domiciled for the most part in Negro-owned brick buildings, some with a million dollars worth of assets. Here also are 500 Negro-owned cabs, operating 100,000 passenger-paying miles per day."

Many southern Negroes "who are working and progressing and accomplishing, slowly perhaps, but surely," prefer to "take their chances" in the South rather than seek Congressman POWELL's Harlem "with all of its dandies and petty pickpockets, its vote-baiting politicians, and Communist propagandists."

Editor Willis said: "And, finally, we don't want to be white. We think the Negro generally should quit trying to force himself on white man's society. The very act of throwing yourself on another is a confession of inferiority." He quoted Booker Washington's statement, "Merit, no matter under what skin found, will in the long run be recognized and rewarded."

SOLD SHORT

He urged Negro women to work, and questioned, Where has industry and initiative and ambition and plain womanly decency gone? Disinterested in school, unable to marry, they seem to have resolved on prostitution before they'll hit a lick. All during the busy war years, by the thousands, one could see both young and old setting heavily and cheerily on their rickety, dirty, front porches at 10 o'clock in the morning fanning their faces.

"In conclusion, we know that there are deep and sinister reasons for many of these shortcomings. Originally a great race with a wonderful heritage and many virtues, we have been sold a little short somewhere down the line, many times by our own leaders.

"Our greatest present needs, other than economics, are health and educational ones. The South realizes this, and in fairness, is presently essaying to do something about both.

"Our educational systems must be directed away from the formal, the classic, and the fictitious, toward the productive, the creative, and the actual. Agriculture and industry, buying and selling, manufacturing and marketing, the great resources of the South and the Nation—the backbone and substance of any economy—must slant and dominate the educational curricula and pattern of our high schools, colleges, and universities. We must, in fact, be a part and parcel of a nation's production to be indispensable."

And in closing, Editor Willis advised, "Stay South, young man, and work. Because at any time, as you've done many times before, you may have to send your northern brother a one-way ticket home."

Food Plank for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Pillsbury Institute of Flour Milling History conducted an essay contest for high-school children of this country, the subject being Food Plank for Peace. One of the winners in the contest was Miss Miriam Thelma Peterson, of Northfield High School, Northfield, Vt. It is a very fine essay and shows that considerable thought was applied to its writing. I ask unanimous consent that the short essay may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today in Europe, Asia, in every country ravaged by war, there is a growing and urgent need for food. We, the people of the United States, must provide this food which will serve as the main plank of a bridge between war and permanent peace. There are three excellent reasons why we must provide this food. First, no Christian people can stand and watch tens of thousands of people die daily without doing their utmost to help. Secondly, people without food become disorderly. They are desperate and, when democracy fails to feed them, they will go to any extreme, even to supporting a dictator if they think he will bring them food. If this happens we will be plunged into a third world war. Lastly, until the other nations are again prospering we will have no foreign trade, and therefore we won't prosper either.

The question is this, how are we going to feed these people? Already we have shortages in our country. The first step is to immediately appropriate to UNRRA all the money it requests—this money, of course, to be considered charity. To help such countries as Norway, Netherlands, France, and Belgium, who refuse charity, we might agree to send food as a loan which may be repaid without interest when the country has again reached economic stability.

The next question is how are we to produce the food for these starving nations, since it is evident that most of the food itself, as well as the money, must come from the United States. If the Federal Government would agree to finance a scientific farming project by which the Government would buy up large farming sections, dividing them into different and equal farms, an expert on agriculture as well as modern machines might be assigned to each one section to be used on a cooperative basis. Each farm would be run by one family which would pay for the farm on an installment plan. Many former war workers, now out of jobs, might be induced to become farmers. The Government would agree to purchase all crops and livestock at ceiling prices and the farmers would in turn sell only to the Government so long as there is a need to ship food to Europe. By the time there is no longer a need for food from the United States these farmers will have become well established and the United States will have begun a much needed scientific project and will have provided steady jobs for many of the Nation's unemployed.

At the same time victory gardens and home-canning projects should continue to be encouraged, as they were during the war. Our war against black market practices should be continued. As a last resort, we might return to rationing. If such should be the case the restrictions might be less severe than in the wartime program.

One more problem must be met: that is transportation. All available ships should be put into use. In many cases UNRRA has trouble getting shipping space. With the cooperation of the United States this should be overcome easily. Once the food is shipped, trucks are needed to transport it. These could easily be supplied by the United States Army if we were only willing. We must realize it is our duty to do this.

Many people of the United States will complain they are always being imposed upon by foreign nations, but at the same time we must realize that we can afford to be since

our action in these matters will do much to determine the future of the world.

If we want peace, we must be willing to work for it. We must provide the last and strongest plank—food—in the great bridge between war and peace immediately.

Public Service Responsibility of Broadcast Licensees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very intelligent discussion of the public service responsibilities of broadcast licensees, which appeared in the New York Times of May 12.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FCC'S CRITICS—ARGUMENTS ON FREEDOM OF SPEECH OVERLOOK CONDITIONS PECULIAR TO RADIO

(By Jack Gould)

In the broadening controversy over the Federal Communications Commission's report on the public service responsibility of broadcasters, critics of the Commission's action have concentrated their fire on two major points. The first is that in establishing over-all program standards the FCC is encroaching on freedom of speech. The second is that intellectuals are trying to impose their own tastes in programs on the radio industry to the exclusion of the preferences of the majority of listeners.

The proponents of these theories would seem to have overlooked, however, the fundamental and unique conditions of American radio which inevitably are a part of any consideration of freedom of speech on the air as opposed, for example, to freedom of speech in the press.

In an article on these pages on April 21, Justin Miller, the NAB president, dealt at length with what he regarded as the Government's impingement on radio's freedom but he did not mention once what is the cornerstone of broadcasting's operation. It is that the wave lengths belong to the people and that there are not enough of these wave lengths to go around among all who would like to be broadcasters. A choice between competing applicants for a given wave length had to be made and it was for this reason that the Federal Communications Commission was formed.

It is difficult indeed to see how the FCC can properly discharge this function in granting a license without inquiring as to what the broadcaster proposed to provide the public. If character, financial, and technical references of two applicants for one channel are of equal merit, what else is left but to evaluate on the basis of some general standards how each intends to serve his community on the air?

PROMISES FOR LICENSES

In point of actual fact, stations themselves have accepted this premise over the years without protest. When applying for licenses they have made specific promises to the FCC as to their plans for over-all programing. All that the FCC now proposes to do is to see whether these promises are carried out in performance. As reason for this decision, it cites in its report instances where these promises have not been fulfilled.

Surely, it cannot be construed as a challenge to freedom of speech to insist that a person using a public property treat that property as he himself said he would. The real significance of the FCC's action lies in the commission's own tacit admission that in the past it had not discharged what was an essential part of its public duty. For that dereliction the FCC must bear with the industry the responsibility for the widespread imbalance in programing of which it now complains. That it should not again default in its responsibility to the broadcaster and listener alike is the FCC's major assignment for the future.

In avoiding the basic issue underlying the need for licensing radio stations, the NAB necessarily has gone far afield to buttress its latest campaign for freedom of speech. At the dinner in New York of the William Allen White Foundation on April 25, A. D. Willard, Jr., executive vice president of the NAB, chose to lump together again the freedom of press, radio, and films. This would seem to be a false tack, since it is based on the premise that all three media function under the same standard.

The radio station must obtain a license from the Federal Government. The motion picture must submit to censorship in several States and cities. The newspaper, on the other hand, operates without a Federal license or State censorship. The NAB ill serves radio's own freedom by such careless assertions as Mr. Willard's that "preserving freedom of speech is dependent upon an identical factor in all fields."

ISSUES NOT SO SIMPLE

It is this same tendency in radio and advertising toward oversimplification of the issue of freedom of speech on the air that underscores the validity of the FCC's insistence on balance in programing. In a speech at the recent radio conference of the College of the City of New York, Robert F. Elder, assistant to the president of Lever Brothers, one of the two largest radio sponsors, said that an advertiser has only "goods and services to sell, not ideologies."

"We want to attract the biggest audience we can," he added. "The way to do that is to find out what people want to hear and give it to them. That, I submit, is the essence of democratic radio."

APPLICATION

Where the value of Mr. Elder's thesis is to be questioned is not in its context but in its application. As the philosophy of advertising for a major national concern in a highly competitive field, it is both understandable and defensible. The danger comes if it is accepted as an absolute criterion for a radio station. It is in this distinction between the function of the commercial sponsor and that of the radio station where lies the crux of the FCC case.

By Mr. Elder's own explanation as to why the advertiser wants to attract the biggest audiences, it becomes clear what happens when the station becomes overburdened with advertising. The majority of the station's programs are bent on pleasing most of the people most of the time and inevitably there comes a standardization in program formats in order to reach the greatest number. Concurrently, the programs directed to the minority tastes are crowded off the schedules, as has happened in the last few years.

The FCC agrees that the choice of the majority should continue to prevail; what it also asks is that the substantial minority groups be accorded recognition. If the majority of listeners find the hours between 6 and 11 p. m. the most convenient for radio listening, is it any less true of the minority? It is not a case of the exclusion of one or the other; it is a case of both having a place on the dial. To take refuge in rule by the majority as a means of avoiding one's responsibilities to the minority, as many broadcasters have done, is to distort the full meaning of a democratic radio.

The inclination of the National Association of Broadcasters to shrug off this problem of program balance constitutes perhaps the weakest point in its crusade for freedom of speech. The best criterion of a broadcaster's devotion to that cause is not what he says he will do at some future date in court, but what he himself does now on the air. Freedom of speech is not something that can only be preached; it is something that also must be practiced.

Mother's Day Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Mother's Day address delivered by me at Gunton's Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington D. C., on Sunday, May 12, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOTHER'S DAY—1946

There is an old proverb which states:

"God could not be everywhere;
So He made mothers."

Were I a maker of proverbs, I might add:

"God is everywhere in mothers."

How appropriate it is, therefore, that wherever Americans are today—in this land, on foreign seas, and in foreign lands, the flag of our country is unfurled to the breeze in honor of all mothers. It is a day set apart by congressional resolution and by Presidential proclamation for reverence and honor of mother.

Yes; wherever Americans are, in cities like Washington, in small and big towns, in country hamlets, and on the farms, they pause and pay homage to the woman who brought them into the world and gave them the priceless love and direction which has shaped their course.

THE MEANING OF "MOTHER"

But, my friends, there is an even broader meaning to the beautiful word "Mother" than I have indicated above.

Mothers of men are not simply those who bring the mortal being into this world. In fact, motherhood really begins after the child is born. It is then that the real influence of mother love makes its impact upon the little being.

The noblest work of a mother is to mold the bit of animate clay into soul stuff. We know that there are countless mothers who never gave birth to a child in the flesh but who by their lives and actions are mothers of the race.

The other evening I saw and heard here in Washington a choir of 50 boys from a junior grade school—boys ranging from ages 7 to 14. One could see the impact of a mother love upon them, the mother love of their teacher, a little wisp of a girl, who got that group of youngsters to sing in wonderful harmony. Yes; there are mothers of men who have never borne children. I have seen the mother light of selfless women in schools, in Sunday

schools, in hospitals, in orphanages, and on the battlefield. Clara Barton, Florence Nightingale, and countless others are in that group.

Someday I may write a book that needs to be written, and it is of this that I will write:

Do you remember that at the cross, Jesus said to his beloved disciple, "This is your mother," and to Mary, "This is your son." And it is recorded that thereafter Mary lived in the home of the beloved disciple.

Back of every good man is a good woman, we are told. A Wisconsin philosopher puts it this way: "Every good wife is a mother to her man."

And so the story I would write is the story of John's mother, Mary, his second mother—not a mother of the flesh, but one who made for the rebirth of his spirit. I would write of the influence of Mary on his life. Perhaps that is why he has been called the most spiritual disciple. What she told him, the truths she taught him, undoubtedly illumined his consciousness. A great story could, indeed, be written about the inspiring relationship of these two—mother and son.

There are truly mothers of the flesh and of the spirit and mothers who nourish the body as well as the soul of their young.

MOTHERHOOD ETERNAL

For many of us whose mother has stepped into the beyond, ahead of us in the great journey, there is still her guiding hand and presence. We know she is not dead. Her influence is ever with us. She has simply shed the mortal garment.

On this day we turn the hands of the clock back and remember our youth in the tender care and the love and the sacrifice of her whom we call "mother." We remember her precepts, how she related to us the Biblical tales and implanted in us the seeds for right living, the seeds of courage and consideration for others, the seeds of love of country and love of God. Yes; she was everywhere, serving her family, her country, and her God.

Today, also, our hearts go out, particularly to the mothers of this and other lands who sent their loved ones—their husbands, their sons, their brothers—forth to battle, but are never to see them return. We would have them know that we in America stand at attention, honoring these departed and the courage and the faith of their mothers.

THE IMPORTANCE OF MOTHER

As the mother is, so is the home. She is the keystone of the home, and as the homes of America are, so will the Nation be. Behind every great and good man stands his mother. Abraham Lincoln said:

"All that I am or hope to be, I owe to my angel mother."

We know that mother love is sacred and eternal, enduring through time, stronger than catastrophe, deeper than the deepest sea, and as imperishable as the stars—for it is God-made.

Wordsworth said:

"Years to a mother may bring distress
But do not make her love the less."

In II Timothy, chapter 1, when Paul, writing to Timothy, says:

"For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind."

He prefaced that statement with:

"When I call to remembrance the unfeigned faith that is in thee which dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois and thy mother Eunice, and I am persuaded that in thee also."

Here Paul stated the law of spiritual heredity. The faith of the mothers through their understanding that "God hath not given us a spirit of fear, but of power, of love, and of sound mind," is the inheritance incorruptible.

The tenderest and sweetest recollections are those which are connected with the dearest word, "Mother." There is no human name so enshrined in humanity's affection as the name of Mother. The term "Mother" speaks of home, of the Bible, of brothers and sisters and other kinfolk. Always when our boys in the service were thousands of miles away from home and thought of mother, they were fed courage and strength and purity, for in her the value of religion, pure and undefiled, was always enshrined.

Mother and home—these two go together. They constitute the first influence in every life. It is well indeed that "the hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rules the world."

Mother's thoughts are not for self, but for the welfare, the comfort, the good name of her loved ones. So, through the pages of history from the beginning of time and down through the glorious pages of our own Republic, the story of Christian motherhood has been the greatest factor in shaping the upward march of humanity.

Henry Ward Beecher, whose mother died when he was 3 years old, said:

"No devout Roman Catholic ever saw so much in the Virgin Mary as I beheld in the childhood vision and memory's dream of my mother."

MOTHERS THROUGH THE GENERATIONS

Many of us were more fortunate than Beecher. Our mothers remained with us through the years of our adolescence. She was with us when our children came along and she lived through the joys of parenthood again in her grandchildren.

In the Halls of Memory the sound of Mother's voice comes time and time again. Because of her selfless living, her hopes and her faith, the Halls of Memory are lighted with a thousand beautiful and refreshing thoughts and experiences of home. In Memory Lane she stands smiling through the years. Her spirit was always brighter than the burning Yuletide log at Christmas.

Yes, what would Memory Lane be without a mother! We who have children of our own and have seen the mothers of our children bring them into this life have been privileged to live over again our own childhood in them. And we who have children who have children of their own, seeing this new generation of mothers carry on with unselfish God-like love, know that God is love and, to mortal sense, there is no finer expression of that love than that shown in mother love.

MOTHER'S DAY 365 DAYS A YEAR

It is altogether fitting therefore that every year the second Sunday in May should be set aside in honor of Mother. But, in a larger sense, it is more fitting that each of us informally observe Mother's Day 365 days a year.

Yes, what a wonderful world this would be if every mother's son and daughter lived and thought each day of the year in the spirit of motherhood—in the spirit of devotion, of selflessness, of vision and of understanding.

This would be the greatest tribute which you and I could pay to our own mother and to all other mothers. We know, of course, that no tribute is too great to the woman who bore us, no honor is too high for her; no compensation can ever repay her for all that she did for us, for all the blessings she conferred on us.

A MOTHER'S WORLD

My good friends, I said at the beginning that this year we would particularly honor the mothers whose lads made the supreme sacrifice during the war. We will specially honor, too, all the mothers who experienced the pain of separation from their husbands, sons, and daughters in the armed services.

We will strive to make a better world for the mothers of the world.

But we want more than a world at peace. We want a world that will be in keeping with the spirit of motherhood. That spirit accepts with joy the humblest, most menial task on behalf of a loved one—be it the task of cooking, of sewing, of scrubbing, of teaching, of tending in sickness and in health.

"In sickness and in health"—these are the words of the marriage vow taken by man and woman alike. How fortunate it is that man grows up under the loving care of a mother, and that after he has reached maturity, he takes unto himself a wife who is mother to him, too, and mother to his children.

Yes; we who are blessed with a wife, who is second mother to us, who solaces our worries, shares our joys and successes, overlooks our faults, serves us through the years, as servant, cook, companion, and wife, and on top of all that loves us—we know that God's greatest creation is Mother.

With Stevenson we say:

"Teacher, tender, comrade, wife,
A fellow farer, true through life,
Heart whole and soul free
The august Father gave to me."

Through all womanhood there pulsates the instinct of motherhood. It is an instinct of creation, of sustenance. It is the divine spark, making fruitful the earth. It manifests itself in all of life—from the lowest to the highest—in the wonderful creature known as woman.

CONCLUSIONS

And so, my friends, in view of all this, let it be our aim to make ours a mother's world, a world where all men and women alike, young and old, display that joy in service, that beauty in devotion, that understanding in healing, that patience in tribulation, that selflessness in toil, that godliness in action, which characterized your mother and mine.

There was a mother in Israel who, looking past the mist of death, said, "All is well." There are mothers in Israel today who are carrying on with faith and labor and understanding. Last evening when I got home from the Senate, I received a note from one such mother—I say it with pride—a daughter of mine. She has three small children and a husband to look after. Yet she could think of her father, and she wrote:

"DEAR DAD: Last Sunday our Dr. Kearns used in his sermon a beautiful poem, which I am enclosing."

We have heard the saying, "The son is father of the man," but here again is another manifestation, and we might say, "The daughter is mother of the father."

The poem reads:

"THE PRAYER OF THE QUEST

"Take us on the quest of beauty,
Poet Seer of Galilee,
Making all our deams creative,
Through their fellowship with Thee.

"Take us on the quest of knowledge,
Clearest Thinker man has known!
Make our minds sincere and patient,
Satisfied by truth alone.

"Take us on the quest of service,
Kingly Servant of man's need,
Let us work with Thee for others,
Anywhere Thy purpose leads.

"All along our quest's far pathway,
Christ our Leader and our guide,
Make us conscious of Thy presence,
Walking always at our side."

And so let us each—you and I—go forth from this House of Worship resolved unto this mission: Of making every day Mother's Day, every scene a Godly scene, and this world a mother's world.

Governmental Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon before the Nebraska State Convention of Young Republican Clubs at Grand Island, Nebr., on May 11, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We Republicans are facing great opportunities and heavy responsibilities.

America is confronted with decisions, fraught with much more danger to the Republic's existence, than the normal, economic, and social aftermath of a great war. Facing a foreign situation, growing more dangerous every day, we are joined in the struggle at home over vital principles of government.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to present certain tried and familiar, but fundamental, truths which the Republican Party today alone stands for in soul-stirring terms and high-sounding promises.

For instance, food, housing, jobs, wages, civil liberties, social security, and national security are definitely tied up in the same package with a sound national fiscal policy and efficient national administration.

The differences between the Republican Party and the Democratic coalition are humanitarian and ideological. An unsound fiscal policy is inhumanitarian. Inflation is as brutal as deflation. The first is as hard to control as the second is to stop. Therefore, no other policy of government means as much to the welfare of every individual and the safety of the Nation as a sound fiscal policy.

The issue between the Republican Party and the Democratic coalition is not the old State rights against the Federal Government question. It has to do with the proper principles of a republic and the place of the individual in that government.

I hope that you young Republicans will not approach every domestic problem from the party line, as do the Communists and the corrupt Democratic city machines.

I have never believed that the grand principle of "my country right or wrong" applies to political parties.

It is highly significant that a great Senator from Wisconsin, who personifies today liberal, progressive, and independent leadership, recently deliberately chose to return to the Republican Party because of its broad philosophy of national interest.

Of course, the Republican Party is divided, as it frequently has been, by the diverse economic interests of the different sections of our great country. Basically, however, it is the very breadth of that diversity that has always made us capable as a party of developing a continuity of policy based on unity of principles.

The Democrats, today, are really a coalition that is going to pieces—instead of a strong and well-unified political party.

The coalition in power doesn't bear the slightest resemblance to the historic Democratic Party of Woodrow Wilson. It is made up of an unblendable mixture of the most radical political elements (always at war among themselves) thrown temporarily cheek-by-jowl, with the solid South, the most conservative group in the Nation. That sort of combustible mix may win several elections—anyway it did—but it lacks staying qualities. It is an impossible base for a permanent party. The proud representatives of the solid South are not cooperating with the new day dreamers of the left, with their totalitarianism, in support of an ersatz Roosevelt. They just won't jell.

Every political party is subject to pressure groups and political expediency. Our party is no better nor worse in that respect. However, it can offer our Nation better administration than a coalition, for the simple reason that a well-organized, active, and united party is not as susceptible to pressure groups.

I am not pretending to say that under a Republican administration we will not have a political approach to our national problems. But I do say we will have less—much less—of a political approach than under the present administration, because we are a reasonably united party and not a coalition masquerading as a party.

Furthermore, the Republican Party, in developing its policies, is not hampered by a solid South voting every 2 years on ancient issues—or by corrupt city machines with a philosophy of "government by crony," interested only in jobs.

Such a philosophy is the natural and inevitable consequence of a party in power for too long a consecutive period. A party in power too long goes to seed. That has been true in the past of the Republican Party as it is today of the heterogeneous group now masquerading as a political party.

This is what Senator Bob La Follette referred to when he said:

"In my opinion, the Democratic Party is now stalled on dead center. Although it is the party in power, with a clear majority in both Houses of Congress, it has been unable to act with sufficient unity of purpose to meet the urgent problems of today. The Democratic Party has become so enmeshed in bureaucratic control and intraparty wrangling that some of its leaders are resigning in disgust.

"The political genius of President Roosevelt welded together a coalition of many diverse elements, every shade of political opinion from out-and-out Communists to reactionary political bosses. His emphasis was on issues and principles, but the party emphasis today is more concerned with maintaining political control than with fighting for liberal legislation and progressive principles. The unmistakable signs of dissolution and disintegration are evident."

I welcome Bob and Phil La Follette and their fellow progressives back into the Republican Party, not only because their return focuses attention on our party as the sane, sober, liberal party of today, but because of their healthy influence and vigorous championship of a practical progressive program.

As far as me and mine are concerned it will be a great satisfaction to see a La Follette back on the resolutions committee of the next Republican National Convention—where father and son have rendered such valuable service to the Republican Party and to Uncle Sam for 30 years. I may not always agree with them—as when they supported Mr. Roosevelt. But they are an influence for farseeing legislation and against the reactionaries who exist in both major parties.

While the La Follette proposals might be, and frequently were, rejected by one Republican convention, subsequent ones accepted most of them and Republican administrations substantially wrote them into law.

The American people are worried and disappointed. Our national difficulties are mounting all the time under the well-meaning but groggy Truman administration.

There is increasing public fear that the Truman administration does not have the power that comes from a unity of purpose and a clear pattern of action to firmly direct its legislative and executive policies in domestic internal affairs.

There is a growing belief that the only way to stop the borrowing and borrowing and spending and spending that is forcing up the cost of living—the only way to get rid of the give-away boys—to get away from the greatest emphasis on a political approach to national problems we have witnessed in Washington since the Republican administrations of post-Civil War days—is to elect a Republican Congress and a Republican President.

There is increasing belief that the machinery of our Federal Government has grown too big and cumbersome for an efficient organization and honest management.

The charge that the Truman administration is partly to blame for the food shortage, both at home and abroad, comes not from partisan sources—but from stanch New Deal Democrats.

The flood of erroneous statistics on probable unemployment, on the possibility of a general rise in wages without a rise in prices, and misleading statements by top administration officials are also cases in point.

Prior to the coalition administration, Government statistics were accepted as reliable. But they have been slanted so many times for political purposes that that is no longer true.

Our Government bureaus have grown so big and so unscrupulous in their propaganda that there is not only the question of efficiency, but there is some question of Congress being able to control the agencies that it created. And now the Federal Government is trying to establish the opening wedge of permanent peacetime influence over the news, so that these Government bureaus can reign supreme.

Under the guise of a continuous and unending depression emergency, plus the stress of war, bureaucratic power increased its authority over all economic life.

The Republican Party has resisted vigorously the menace to our political system of these agencies that have become governments within our Government itself.

The Republican Party has always been for a strongly organized Federal Government. It believes the challenge is to organize a country of the size of ours so as to have the proper kind of Federal system in which the States maintain their proper functions.

We are no longer in a position where we need to fear for the weakness of our Federal Government, properly administered, in dealing with foreign powers or in dealings with the domestic problems of a complex industrial civilization.

But we are in a position where we must be alarmed and concerned at the necessity of properly organizing our Federal Government—after our experiences with the present Democratic coalition—where we will not be handicaping ourselves in our individual activities or ultimately destroying State governments, and the Congress. Most people will agree that the closer government is kept to the governed the better it is. The Republican Party believes that fundamental old principle of a Republic is vital today. The Democratic coalition does not.

The question at issue is the retention of an autocratic bureaucracy too big and too unscrupulous to handle. The Republican Party faces the issue on the basis of modern facts and conditions.

The Democratic coalition has steadily developed the reactionary principle of arbitrary-executive law without adequate hearings essential to our American belief in justice. The Republican Party is opposed to such reactionary star-chamber proceedings that have

reached alarming proportions and are of threatening significance. Especially is it opposed to the sweeping assumptions by Washington bureaus of legislative and administrative powers which have repeatedly gone far beyond the clear intent of the Congress. It is further opposed to the amazing and shocking hostility of so many of those bureaucrats to private initiative and the profit motive in business and agriculture and labor.

The Republican Party has a long record of legislative and executive acts to control and restrain monopoly. And they have worked better than we have realized. There was more competition in America than in any other country. That is, there was more competition before the New Deal started strangling small business. Labor also finds itself—like Gulliver—bound a little bit at a time by small-people bureaucrats—until at last farsighted and unselfish labor leaders have become alarmed at the growing threat of Government interference in a manner which prevents labor and management from getting together in the traditional American way of free collective bargaining.

The Republican Party, by a long series of legislative acts both State and Federal, has proved that it believes in creating conditions favorable to the interests of the common man.

When the great weight of monopolistic capital is counterbalanced by Government action in favor of the average American, the Republican Party believes he is perfectly able to take care of himself.

But the Democratic coalition of recent years does not believe that. Its legislative philosophy is based on contempt for the intelligence and abilities of the common man. Its approach to all our domestic problems has been that of bureaucratic social control forever from Washington, D. C. The individual is reduced to a case number—a mere classification in a maze of categories. The New Dealers would institutionalize American life. That means all the deadly routine, inflexibility, and injustice of mass regulation, and the resulting eliminating of individual initiative and competition.

The Democratic coalition has the unenviable distinction of the longest record of the greatest unemployment of any administration in the history of our country. I do not believe any of us wish to return to the sad and dreary leaf-raking 6 years that preceded the outbreak of the European war.

Unless we stabilize prices, labor will gain nothing in recent wage increases. Prices can be stabilized in only two ways—a balanced budget and production. Of these two, the first is the most important, for it paves the way for the second. The OPA and its methods of attempting to handle inflation is only aspirin. That may temporarily relieve a symptom. But it does not deal with the causes.

Neither labor nor business nor agriculture will settle down into a stable condition of prosperity until our national budget is balanced.

Now we have heard the same old promise from the Democratic coalition to balance the budget. But there is a tremendous conflict between Mr. Truman's budget-balancing promises and his other recommendations to Congress, calling for an enormous increase in appropriations. If he can do both—make good on his promises and balance the budget—he will work a miracle—and Mr. Truman does not claim supernatural powers.

The basic difference between us and other parties is that the Republican Party is the only sound money party in the country today. I say therein we are the greatest friend of the average man. Year by year the cost of living has mounted because we have for 14 years taken out of the till more than we have put in.

All social—political—as well as economic questions hinge on a sound national fiscal policy. The purchasing power of take-home pay is actually determined not by OPA but by whether the national budget is balanced or not balanced.

The substance of all which the common man has gained in several hundred years is threatened by the reckless spending and borrowing money policy of the Democratic coalition. Continuation of that policy will automatically paralyze all progress and wipe out all but the nimble speculator.

The happiness and the dignity of the individual depend not only on civil liberty but on a balanced national budget. We are the strongest nation in the world today. But we will not remain so under the fiscal policy practiced by the Democratic coalition for 13 years. As I have often said:

"If the United States is not a sound financial mooring post for the world to tie to in the postwar years, then we along with other nations will travel a merry gait to hell, regardless of the form of international organizations for peace."

We hear repeatedly that this is no time to play politics. I agree as to "play" and as to "politics" too, in purely partisan sense. But if we use the word "politics" in its primary meaning—the science and art of government—there never was a time in the history of our country that called so insistently for politics. The mess the whole world is in, I think most men will agree, comes from the failure of the governments of the world, our own included, to recognize and adjust themselves rapidly enough to changed conditions induced by a wholly new industrial system. That was the job of politics; and politics is not an exact science. The wisest and the best of men disagree in theory and as to practice. Hence political parties in all representative governments. I think the most normal and most healthful condition is when the two major parties correspond roughly to the designation—progressive and conservative—no matter what their camouflage. But whenever the conservative party becomes reactionary or the progressive party fails to go forward fast enough, discontent and impatience arises among those who would make over the world tomorrow morning before breakfast, and we have a radical party or faction which draws into its ranks the visionaries, the reckless, and crackpots of all sorts. Sometimes with a rabble-rousing leader at their head they create great havoc. Sometimes they serve as a needed warning, frightening the conservative from stupid reaction, and encouraging the progressive or liberal to greater progress. But it is a sad state of affairs for the American people when any major party in this country is captured by a minority made up of the reckless ultra radicals, or the fat boys of special privilege.

Where then does that put the Republicans? It makes a "natural" for us from both a patriotic and a party viewpoint. The Republican Party in its origin, in its tradition, and in its record is the progressive, liberal party of the country. In its internal functioning it is more democratic than the Democratic Party, because it is not hampered by the powerful conservative minority representing electoral votes which must be considered en bloc. It can more readily and easily adapt itself to changing conditions. That's what progressivism is. It is true that there are men in its ranks of ultra-conservative temperament and philosophy, but they are far from predominating in numbers or dominating in power. The same myth-makers who have attempted to create the only genuine blown-in-the-bottle brand of liberalism in the Democratic coalition attempt to keep alive the myth that the Republican Party is composed of 25,000,000 nincompoops tyrannically bossed by the Old Guard, a gang of greedy and self-seeking reactionaries who lie awake nights devising means of blocking all progress that interferes with special privilege and the vested interests. But the whole myth, both as to hero and villain, misrepresents the present position of both parties.

There is always difference of opinion in a healthy political party, just as there is in any group of persons having a common objective. One wing may exert greater influence at one time and another wing at another time. Party success, as well as good administration, depends upon both wings finally flapping in unison.

Don't forget that in our party system of government, party discipline is of as vital practical importance as party principles. Factional discord is harder to cope with than partisan opposition, as several Presidents have discovered.

If an "Old Guard" ever controlled the Republican Party, it has long ago gone the way of the dodo. The 22,000,000 Republicans who voted for Governor Dewey and against the coalition party were not herded by bosses of the Kelley-Hague-Pendergast-Hannegan type. They knew what they were doing and why.

As a matter of fact, throughout the Democratic coalition, Republicans in Congress have consistently cooperated in trying to perfect and enact much of the administration's legislation. Such liberalism is inherent in the Republican leadership. Those who taunted it with the charge of being merely a "me too" party are simply ignorant of the record. We are not. Our course has been determined by our historic rational liberalism, the very basis of our party.

Let us look at the record.

As a matter of unquestionable historical facts, the first New Deal from 1933 to 1937 was by and large a "me too" affair. Preceding 1933—President Hoover didn't start leaf-raking—but he called upon Congress to make provision for large-scale public construction; he established the RFC and the HOLC; he was responsible for the Employment Stabilization Act of 1931; the agricultural credit banks and strengthening of the Federal land banks; he extended Federal credit to States and municipalties; he urged the governors of the States to take immediate relief action. True, he moved with caution, but the program he devised was new to him and to the country. It was especially new and obnoxious to the Democratic majority of the House of Representatives, who could think of nothing to do other than to harass and block President Hoover's efforts to secure banking reforms, reforms in security issues, and regulation of power companies.

President Roosevelt, being more politically minded, seized upon what Mr. Hoover had started, enlarged and expanded it, and exploited it with much beating of tom-toms as a special creation of his own. He stole our thunder and we Republicans let him get away with it.

The sad fact that he handled it ineffectually, making it into a thing of shreds and patches, without consistency or a basic philosophy, held together solely by the sky-the-limit spending of billions from the national Treasury, does not argue that the desperate emergency did not call for desperate remedy. But while the means employed, paternalistically relieved the most immediate human distress, it utterly failed to solve our basic economic problems. Again we find the Democratic coalition dealing with symptoms and not with fundamental causes. The artificial structure broke down in 1937, and unemployment was greater in 1938 than it was in 1931. And as everyone knows, these domestic problems are still with us, obscured now only by postwar activities.

Despite the Republican Party's record of cooperation—or, in fact, possibly because of misunderstanding it—the charge is frequently made that the Republican Party is leaderless and opportunistic.

For 4 years the Nation was fighting a war involving its life. During that time we had to present a united front to the enemy, which

required acquiescence as far as possible in the program of the administration in power.

I believe that if the Democrats had been in the minority they would have been equally patriotic.

Constructive opposition under such circumstances had to be restricted to reiteration of fundamental principles of a Republican government and assistance in making as efficient as possible the administration.

The demands of the immediate postwar period and the critical state of international affairs continued to require patriotic caution and judgment on the part of the minority.

Such a record is of itself evidence of reasoned judgment and sound leadership in the Republican Party.

In international affairs the Truman administration is still carrying the ball. Conditions are so critical that the Republican Party, in the interests of the country, may still have to run interference, even though it regrets the existing circumstances and feels confident that they would have been different had the Republican Party been in power.

As I have often said, we must take the leadership in world affairs that our strength warrants, our interests demand, and our humanitarian instincts prompt. That has been the policy of our party under every Republican administration.

Under the Democratic coalition we find the same instability in our foreign policy that exists in our domestic policies.

We see the same fatal quarterback theory of Government handicapping international agreement that handicapped our domestic recovery from the depression.

American business could not plan, with any certainty, its future under such an opportunistic administrative policy. Foreign nations find the same difficulty in shaping their policies in relation to America.

We find ourselves blocked in reaching satisfactory international agreements. Before blaming other countries we should ask ourselves how much of the blame for this situation rests on the vacillating opportunism of that quarterback theory of the Democratic coalition in foreign affairs.

We have swung in 13 years from the peak of the isolationism to the peak of internationalism without any consistent basic pattern. The Republican basic pattern of administration after administration is:

1. Organized international cooperation.
2. Mutual international understanding.
3. Progressive international disarmament.

Those are not my words. That is the New York Times summary of General Eisenhower's speech of April 26, but it so well expresses the Repubjlican position, past and present, that I use them.

Months ago the Republican minority leader of the National House of Representatives, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, offered a resolution that was a step in the direction of encouraging progressive international disarmament—the possibilities of which the administration, at least, should have explored before starting on an international armament race.

If someone asks what about the Republican opposition to the ratification of the League of Nations in 1919, the facts are that the United Nations is no stronger than the League of Nations would have been with the amendments which Senator Lodge offered, in the famous fight in the United States Senate to ratify the League, and which Woodrow Wilson would not accept. We would have been in the League if Wilson had accepted the Lodge amendments.

It will be the tragedy of the ages, if through national jealousies, stupidity, or for any other reason, the United Nations fail to perfect a practical world organization for the establishment and preservation of lasting peace.

Mr. Chamberlain desired peace, and thought he had achieved "peace in our time" by appeasement at Munich. But his wishful thinking and America's foreign policy, beginning with the wrecking of the world economics conference in London in 1933, only made more certain the most devastating war in human history. He was, to say the least, overly optimistic. He did not face realities.

We can easily make the same mistake. Our hope of establishing lasting peace through international organization is in perilous danger today and for the very same reason, namely, an overly optimistic appraisal of the realities of conditions in the rest of the world, and the surrender of our basic principles to the theory that "might makes right."

Too much has been said to create the impression that the United Nations was a practically finished international peace structure. It is not. Much remains to be done, and quickly, to give it the vitality to accomplish its purpose.

In the face of that crucial situation, America's greatest contribution would be a clear, definite, foreign policy on which we could build sincere unity and harmonious cooperation.

We welcome you veterans of the battlefields to the political arena. You come to us with the high ideal of service to your country that the sacrifice of service under arms imparts. Ideals activated by hard work and guided by hard common sense, your most valued heritage, can accomplish much. The Republican Party offers the means by which these ideals may achieve fruition.

The Republican Party is and must always be the party of what I like to call rational liberalism. It was founded to save the Republic, and it is still fighting to save the Republic. It has thoughtfully followed the golden mean between reaction and that radicalism which just naturally flowers into totalitarianism. That is not a straddle. It is the policy of wisdom. It antagonizes the extremes of both sides, because it rebukes the stupidity of the one and the folly of the other.

The Medal for Merit to William Rufus Boyd, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, in our praise of those in the armed forces for winning World War II, we sometimes forget the part played by civilians in winning the war.

In all fields of endeavor—in industry, labor, agriculture, and every other form of activity—civilians wrought nobly, and it was by their concerted efforts, together with the heroic and courageous action of those in the armed forces, that victory was made possible.

The oil industry in the United States is worthy of special mention for the magnificent part it played in producing oil, without which victory would have been impossible.

President Truman has recognized the part civilians and industry have played in winning the war, and has awarded the Medal for Merit to Mr. William Rufus Boyd, Jr., who comes from Freestone County, Tex., in my congressional district; and accompanying this award was a citation telling of the splendid record made by Mr. Boyd, and which fully justified the Medal for Merit which the President bestowed upon him; and under leave granted, I submit herewith the citation so issued by the President:

CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE AWARD OF THE MEDAL FOR MERIT TO WILLIAM RUFUS BOYD, JR.

William Rufus Boyd, Jr., for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services to the United States. Mr. Boyd was elected Chairman of the Petroleum Industry Council for National Defense, now the Petroleum Industry War Council, at its first meeting, held the day following Pearl Harbor. As Chairman of the Council, which was created by the Petroleum Administrator as a functional and advisory body, Mr. Boyd directed the industry's participation in the greatest Government-industry partnership in the history of the United States. Through his indefatigable efforts, his organizational genius, and his singular ability to harmonize differences and coordinate activities, Mr. Boyd contributed materially to one of the outstanding victories of the war—the assurance of petroleum for every military and essential civilian need of the United Nations.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Article by Hon. Alexander Wiley on Business Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article on Business Education which I wrote for the April-May 1946 issue of the magazine, Dictaphone Educational Forum. I believe that this article points out a very important educational area which is worthy of our most serious consideration in preparing our youth for the needs of tomorrow.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS EDUCATION—A NEW FRONTIER

(By ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

America has always been a land of new frontiers. Since the early days of its founding, on through its development and expansion, the ingenuity and creativity of the American people have satisfied the needs and desires of our citizens and country. Today they are ready to meet new challenges.

The extension of business education on a broad front is a vital new frontier today.

In the atomic age, the office—which is the brains of both modern industry and agriculture—must play a more crucial role than ever before. And to staff each office adequately, business-education courses must supply carefully trained and skilled personnel.

But educational teamwork is required on the part of many groups—the businessman (alone and through his association activities), the educator, the vocational counselor, the parent, and the representatives of the Government. Each of these must bend every effort to provide the finest, most appropriate clerical and office skills to prepare the youth

of America to assume his or her eventual role as a self-supporting citizen.

The homemaker, with her family budget, and the farmer in his record keeping, will require training, even as will the typist, the dictating-machine transcriber, the calculating-machine operator, the stenographer, and the file clerk in the industrial world. Indubitably, almost every student will benefit from a sound business education.

In 1940, the Nation's office and clerical force constituted 11 percent of the total of 45,000,000 working men and women. During the war, our total civilian working force increased by approximately 8,000,000, plus 12,000,000 service men and women at the peak of our effort.

During the war, business offices, which act as the nervous system of American industry, sped their impulses through every fiber of our national being to produce almost 300,000 military aircraft, 2,500,000 motortrucks, 64,000 landing craft, 12,000 naval and cargo vessels. For the postwar era, it is almost impossible to contemplate the gigantic supply of peacetime goods which will be generated by the offices of America, in view of the eventual revolutionary changes in our technology.

It has been estimated that 25 years ago the ratio of office to factory workers was 1 to 30. Today it is 1 to 10, and soon will be 1 to 5. That ratio requires thousands of efficient office workers; and to produce such workers, business-education curricula must be improved and developed.

In view of these facts, I am most enthusiastic in my desire to see that America is as adequately prepared to meet the inspiring challenges of business education as of all other phases of education. My enthusiasm may be traced to three sources—one personal, one broadly politico-economic, and one definitely administrative.

First, I am enthusiastic because I come from a family of teachers. My wife and three daughters, as well as my four sisters, have all taught.

One of my treasured childhood memories is of a beloved teacher whose fine character and inspiring personality imbued me with a thirst for knowledge, which I humbly believe has greatly influenced my life through the years.

Certainly, the improved business education of tomorrow will require just as much, indeed far more, inspirational effort and understanding on the part of its instructors. Business educators must join with their colleagues in all phases of education to fulfill four general goals:

1. To help develop and unfold the unique potentialities of the individual student.
2. To implant ideals of service, industry, responsibility, accuracy, and cooperation.
3. To encourage efficient living in the home, in the office, and in the community.
4. To help develop a healthy, growing body to be the fitting counterpart of a healthy, growing mind.

Second, there are today insistent and unfulfilled demands on our own country, and most other countries, for products and services, to a degree hitherto unknown.

The speed and efficiency with which American business will be able to satisfy this demand and help to stimulate its steady growth will depend, in large measure, upon the quality of our business-education courses and their product. Therefore, it is good business for every community to have teachers trained, chosen, equipped, paid and respected in a manner commensurate with their outstanding importance in our society, for in their hands lies the skillful development of America's future businessmen and women.

As an adjunct to business-education courses in the schoolroom, there is a growing trend toward work-experience programs. This enables students to gain practical experience in business offices. It acquaints them with actual office procedures; the necessity for skillful performance in any task to which they are assigned; and the value of ability to work congenially with other people. They also learn to accept responsibility.

Such programs, developed because of the urgent need for workers during the war years, could well continue, under careful supervision, as a very practical method of increasing the students' interest and instigating eagerness to perfect the skills which will best fit them for the work in which they want to engage.

Third, from an administrative standpoint, I am enthusiastic about developing the finest business-education training in America because I, like my 95 Senatorial and 435 Representative colleagues, run an essential public-service office of my own.

In my office, I receive and I trust satisfactorily process, 300 pieces of correspondence a day, together with innumerable telephone calls and telegrams on a vast variety of topics.

I greet countless visitors and delegates from my State and discuss various subjects with them; prepare for and participate in a half dozen committee meetings a week. In addition to the Senate sessions; read and assimilate hundreds of newspapers, magazines, committee hearings and reports, CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, bills, and legislative documents; speak to press and radio representatives; and prepare radio talks, addresses, and articles.

In the light of this, and more, every member of my small staff, including myself, must know and perform his job with the speed and quality required to meet the responsibilities entrusted to me by my 3,000,000 constituents.

But this is only part of the administrative aspect. Each individual office in our Federal, State, and local governments must operate with the greatest time-, money-, material-, and energy-saving procedures if it is to render faithful service.

Modern management—with all it entails in the way of streamlined personnel, budgeting, planning, reporting, and operating practices—is essential to a sound public service for a sound, prosperous America.

Frontier, then, is a word—and a challenge—well befitting business education as a whole and office training in particular. Let us determine to develop and streamline that frontier and be ready to meet the challenge implicit within it.

Portland and Vancouver Led the Way in Shipbuilding for World War II in Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Portland-Vancouver area, which includes my congressional district, made a remarkable record in the construction of ships for the prosecution of World War II. A recent article in the Portland Oregonian, April 24, 1946, states that shipyards in the Portland-Vancouver area out-produced both the Seattle-Tacoma and the San Francisco-Oakland areas from January 1, 1941, to December 31, 1945, according to a report by the Portland Council of Shipbuilders. The Portland-Vancouver area not only built more ships than the San Francisco-Oakland yards, but did so with about half as many workers, the report stated. According to the council's report, the local area produced 1,209 ships during the period while San Francisco turned out 1,167, and Seattle-Tacoma, 816. During the period Portland's maximum employment was 134,777 while San Francisco's was 269,375 and Seattle-Tacoma's, 108,003. The Portland-Vancouver area produced an additional 52 fair-sized landing ships and several hundred lifeboats and rafts. The Portland record was attributable to fine relationship between labor and management.

It is worthy of considerable note.

The report stated—

that there was not a work stoppage in any of the Portland-Vancouver yards due to labor-management difficulties.

Globe Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, because of its public interest, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum entitled "Globe Time," prepared by Count Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, now of New York University, and submitted to the United Nations Organization.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Standard time was introduced in the nineteenth century as a consequence of railway traffic, to avoid chaos resulting from diverse local timetables.

Now a new time reform has become necessary, as a consequence of radio, aviation, and long-distance telephoning.

As the local times have been coordinated by the introduction of standard-zone times, these standard-zone times must now be coordinated to an international system of globe time.

Global time has become necessary for listeners of world-wide broadcasts; for travelers on intercontinental flying boats and liners and on transcontinental railroads; and for people seeking intercontinental telephone connections. Globe time has also become necessary for air forces and navies.

Theoretically, Greenwich time is international time, since International Date Line was universally accepted in 1884 and the Greenwich Meridian recognized as the prime meridian.

But practically this international time has never become popular. It matches standard time only partially. When all the clocks of Florida, for instance, mark noon eastern standard time, it is not 17, but about 17:30 Greenwich time.

Besides, a number of time zones have not yet been coordinated with Greenwich hours. The standard time of the Netherlands differs, for instance, by 19 minutes from Greenwich time.

An international time-reform demands: First, the streamlining and coordination of all zone times of the world with Greenwich

hours; and, second, the identification of the 24 global hours with the 24 letters of the Latin alphabet (thus omitting the two letters of the English alphabet, K and W).

The coordination of the standard times of regions such as India, the Netherlands, Iran, and Uruguay with Greenwich hours has become easy from a technical and psychological point of view since the adoption of light-saving time shifts during the war. All these changes will amount to less than one hour and will cause neither trouble nor difficulties.

The introduction of the alphabet to mark global time would bring great advantages without any handicaps. It would make globe time quickly popular and bar confusion between local time and globe time.

As the globe is divided into 360 degrees of longitude, every fifteenth meridian marks a globe hour and, consequently, a specific time zone.

The world day starts at Z (24) o'clock when the sun stands above the international date line and there is noon on the Fiji Islands.

One hour later, when it is noon in New Caledonia and the sun has moved 15 degrees westward, it is A (1) o'clock globe time.

When the sun stands above Sydney, it is B (2) o'clock, and so on.

Ten hours later, when it is noon in Greenwich-London, there is world midday, M (12) o'clock.

Five hours later, when the sun stands over New York, it is R (17) o'clock, and so on.

Every letter indicates three corresponding things:

1. A specific global hour;
2. A specific meridian;
3. A specific time zone.

The letter R, for instance, indicates: 17 o'clock (or 5 p. m.) Greenwich time, 75 degrees west of Greenwich, eastern standard time.

Globe time follows the following schedule:

Globe time	Greenwich time		Meridian	Zone
A	1		165 E.	New Caledonia.
B	2		150 E.	Sydney.
C	3		135 E.	Japan.
D	4		120 E.	Shanghai.
E	5		102 E.	Chungking.
F	6		90 E.	Calcutta.
G	7		75 E.	Bombay.
H	8		60 E.	Ural Mountains.
I	9		45 E.	Bagdad.
J	10		30 E.	Leningrad (E. E. T.).
L	11		15 E.	Vienna (C. E. T.).
M	12	p. m.	0	Greenwich (W. E. T.)
N	13	1	15 W.	Iceland.
O	14	2	30 W.	Azore Islands.
P	15	3	45 W.	Rio de Janeiro.
Q	16	4	60 W.	Buenos Aires.
R	17	5	75 W.	New York (E. S. T.).
S	18	6	90 W.	Chicago (C. S. T.).
T	19	7	105 W.	Rocky Mountains (M. T.).
U	20	8	120 W.	California (P. T.).
V	21	9	135 W.	Yukon.
X	22	10	150 W.	Alaska.
Y	23	11	165 W.	Hawaiian Islands.
Z	24	12	180 —	International date line.

Soon after the introduction of this schedule the significance of the time letters and their corresponding regions would become popular all over the world, just as familiar as are now the names of the 12 months.

People would be accustomed to following in their minds the course of the sun around the world and to realize the beginning and the end of every world day.

The introduction of globe time would also serve to mark the fact that we are all living in one world of mutual interdependence.

This time reform would have important practical consequences.

If today somebody wishes to telephone from New York to Calcutta, he must investigate the corresponding zone hours to assure the day or night hour his partner would be called.

With the introduction of an international time measure, all this would be greatly simplified. This simplification would also apply to international broadcasting. A speech announced, for instance, from Paris, for R 20, would be identified throughout the globe, without any calculation, even, for listeners traveling on Atlantic Clippers, on ships in the mid-Pacific, or on the trans-Siberian Express.

Nobody would be confused about the meaning of R 20. It would be translated in New York as 12:20 p. m.; in Chicago as 11:20 a. m.; in San Francisco as 9:20 a. m.; in Vienna as 6:20 p. m.; in London as 5:20 p. m.; in Chunking as 12:20 a. m.

Global hours would be marked on the dials of clocks and watches, coordinated with the respective local times.

Once introduced and generally applied, globe time will be considered an indispensable instrument of international cooperation.

Economic Anarchy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. H. MOORE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by George E. Sokolsky, which discusses the responsibility for our present economic anarchy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

I can only hope that when this article is published, it will be out-dated; yet, the political and even moral implications will remain to plague us. As I write it, a brown-out, perhaps soon to be followed by a black-out, faces this Nation. Industries are closing; railroads are short rationed; public services are curtailed.

Why? You say John L. Lewis. You say Petrillo. You blame the Communists—perhaps even Stalin, as once Hitler was blamed for everything. None of these men are responsible to the American people.

None of them hold public office. None have been chosen President, None are in Congress. They cannot be blamed for the errors of planning and performance which produced the economic anarchy in which we live.

They have not substituted private cowardice for public duties and responsibilities.

The blame must be laid upon Harry Truman, President of the United States. His is the responsibility, set upon him by the Constitution, to execute the laws of this country. His is the duty of reporting the State of the Nation to Congress and theirs is the duty of enacting legislation for the welfare of the people.

Responsibility, in this county, is fixed. It cannot be shifted. We face disaster, and all that has come from our Government are counsels of perfection while the laws, already existent, are not used to maintain the productivity of the Nation.

It certainly must give Americans cause for consternation that we have passed a year since VE-day and we are still in the talking stages of peacetime production.

The other night I heard Leon Henderson, on the radio, praise the OPA and tell of the wonders it has performed. And he gave some fancy statistics of production.

But I say to you, Go out and buy a car! Go out and buy a radio or a refrigerator! Go out and buy meat or butter or household appliances!

The test of production is the availability of goods in the market. The test of successful planning is the maintenance of both quantity and quality of goods, purchasable by earnings.

Talk and propaganda will not solve our problems; production will. The Government has not, in a year, done one right thing to increase the velocity of production.

And should the coal strike be settled in some manner short of bankrupting that industry, we face the threat and possibly the ordeal of a railroad strike.

Mr. Roosevelt never tolerated either a railroad strike or Government ownership of the railroads, he having a technique for holding in check the wild boys of the New Deal, no matter how much he loved their trickeries.

Mr. Truman does not possess that technique. He is lost in the mazes of a planner's nightmare. He is bogged down in a swamp of preelection politics.

The real trouble that we face is not economic; it is political. Those whom we choose for office represent not the majority of Americans, but all sorts of groups and blocs banded into voting units.

The politicians calculate closely that they have us in their pockets; that most of us are bound by traditional political prejudices, by party labels, by long associations.

If, they reason, they can hold us and add to us these specialized groups and blocs, reelection will be certain.

They therefore sell the American heritage of liberty, of a high standard of living, of production in a free economic system for this specially organized support. Cowards, they cringe for votes. Poltroons, they live only from election to election.

These are such times as require the greatest statesmanship and the deepest patriotism. What value is it to a man if he wins an election and loses his country?

Yet, every disaster that befalls us is the product of calculations for vote getting. Every deceit which has been practiced upon us is the result of political deals to hold the PAC-CIO support.

The master mind of our failure, Sidney Hillman, plays tiddlywink with the engineer of our confusion, Robert Hannegan.

And the President, according to his physician, sleeps well, as befits a man with an easy conscience. Or is it that not understanding what it is all about, he sleeps well?

Announcement Regarding Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, as a sample of the way OPA's refusal to adjust policies to realities leads to reduction rather than to increase of production of scarce commodities badly needed by consumers, I include the following advertisement in Minneapolis paper by leading dairies and creameries in that city:

IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING BUTTER

Since last fall, we have waged a losing fight in our efforts to supply butter to our customers.

In September 1945, Government controls which had set quotas and regulated the

butterfat content of various dairy products were removed. Since then the general use of dairy products has enormously increased.

Butter prices have been held at about the 1942 levels of 55 cents retail by Government regulations, but the cost of cream from which it is churned is unregulated and has already sky-rocketed to 76 cents here today—much higher in the east. Country creameries, therefore, ship cream at the higher prices to other parts of the Nation, and Minnesota's butter production has nearly disappeared.

We are finding it almost impossible to obtain even enough cream for your table—to say nothing of the larger amount required to produce butter.

Nor can we buy enough butter already churned to meet your reasonable minimum needs. Even small creameries in remote districts find it impossible to sell butter to milk companies, since our legal allowable buying price is as much as 6 cents less than other buyers can legally pay.

For the above reasons, we reluctantly announce that after May 14, 1946, and until conditions are corrected, the undersigned companies will be unable to supply any butter to their trade.

Clover Leaf Creamery Co.; Engell Dairy Co.; Delano Dairy Co.; Ewald Bros. Sanitary Dairy; Franklin Co-Operative Creamery Association, Isles Dairy; Norris Creameries, Inc.; Northland Milk and Ice Cream Co.; Ohleen Dairy; Superior Dairies, Inc.

OPA Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include another concrete example of the way OPA policies are leading to reduced production, reduced employment, aggravated shortage of commodities, and increased inflationary threats, all of which are the opposite of what it is supposed to accomplish:

LULL MANUFACTURING CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn., May 10, 1946.

Hon. WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JUDD: On May 18, 1946, Lull Manufacturing Co., manufacturers of construction and maintenance highway and industrial equipment will close its factory upon which 314 people are directly dependent for their livelihood.

Closing is necessitated because the Office of Price Administration has refused to give the company sufficient increase in its present list price to enable it to continue in business. Their refusal to grant these increases as they have to others is because the company's present list prices are based on those in effect on October 1, 1942, rather than on October 1, 1941, which is the base date defined by revised maximum price regulation 136 and subsequent amendments.

The company moved to its present location during October 1942, where its facilities were devoted largely to the production of war material. After completion of its war orders, the company actively engaged in manufacturing its peacetime items that were developed prior to the war.

Application was made on April 5, 1946, for an increase of 15 percent above approved list prices. No approval to apply this increase or any part of it has been received to date.

Shortly prior to January 1, 1946, the entire construction-machinery industry was granted a 5-percent increase in their list prices. Later this was increased to 10 percent. Lull Manufacturing Co. is not allowed to apply these increases which were granted to the entire construction-machinery industry by the Office of Price Administration because prices were established as of October 1, 1942, rather than the base date of October 1, 1941.

We consider these restrictions to be unjust because:

First. Even though our prices were established from prices in effect October 1, 1942, price increases in the materials and supplies we purchase and use advanced the greatest amount since January 1, 1946.

Second. Our competitors have been granted increases of from 20 to 33⅓ percent so that orders are being received by us at such an increased rate that we cannot meet production demands and if the orders were filled, they would be filled at a considerable loss. Therefore, orders are a liability to the company rather than an asset.

Third. We are not allowed to increase our prices in line with those of our competitors.

We are writing this letter to you in the hope that changes can be made in the Office of Price Administration so that we can again resume our manufacturing of peacetime items and also to save others from the necessity of closing their factories as it has become necessary for us to do.

Very truly yours,

LULL MANUFACTURING CO.,
L. H. LULL, *President.*

Gabrielson Won Fame by Befriending Birds and Beasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, a resident of my congressional district, has attained great fame in his life work, the conservation of our wildlife resources. I am including herewith an article by Richard L. Neuberger, which recently appeared in the Portland Oregonian, commenting upon the achievements of this great friend of birds and beasts. The article is as follows:

GABRIELSON WON FAME BY BEFRIENDING BIRDS AND BEASTS—PORTLAND MAN RETURNS AS WILDLIFE DIRECTOR AFTER ESTABLISHING WORLD-WIDE REPUTATION—REFUGES HE FOUNDED SHIELD DUCKS AND GEESE

(By Richard L. Neuberger, special writer, the Oregonian)

On the pollbook of registered voters for precinct 27 in Multnomah County, for many years, there has been an illustrious name.

Ira Noel Gabrielson, Imperial Hotel, Portland, Oreg.

It is a name which naturalists and lovers of wildlife everywhere in the world would recognize. Ira N. Gabrielson is America's most celebrated authority on the beasts of the field and the birds of the air. Wherever men study the habits of wildfowl he is regarded as the founder of the refuges which protect the millions of ducks and geese that travel the flyways between the Arctic and the Tropics.

Although a distinguished career has taken him thousands of miles from Oregon, Ira Gabrielson has always remained a citizen and registered voter of the community which he considers home. Now, at last, he has the opportunity to return to Oregon. Last week Gabe, as he is known to countless fishermen and hunters in the Pacific Northwest, retired as the first director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

The resignation took effect April 1. Gabe had headed the great animal, fish, and bird protective agency ever since its creation by Congress.

GABE SHOWED ALASKANS ALL ABOUT HIKES

As Director of the vast agency which manages the Nation's animal life, Gabe has lived in the National Capital, where his address is 3525 Valley Drive, Alexandria, Va. But although his house has necessarily been in this suburb of Washington, he has considered that his home was in Oregon. Gabe has never voted in the Old Dominion State, but always in Oregon. Although Gabe has invariably remained aloof from partisan politics, Jimmie Gleason, Multnomah County registrar of elections, reports that the famous wildlife expert is registered as a Republican.

No one who meets Ira Noel Gabrielson ever forgets him. He is chubby with a round face in which blue eyes twinkle. The eyes belie his girth, for they are the bright, far-seeing eyes of a man whose life has been dedicated to the outdoors. They light up with enthusiasm when Gabe spies a winter wren on a birch branch or talks about the heroic flights of Canadian geese.

Gabe has big hands, broad shoulders and short legs. On his first voyage to Alaska, some field men planned to "stretch the director's short legs a bit." A hiking trip was arranged into the towering mountains back of Juneau. As they wound up the steep ramparts of the Coast range, the Alaskans waited for their fat superior to tire.

The going got tougher. Finally one of the Alaskans dropped beside the trail and lay gasping on the ground. "What's the trouble?" Gabe inquired innocently. "Sick?" The played-out Alaskan shook his head. "Well, I'll go on ahead then," said Gabe, "I don't want to waste any time."

The Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service moved on up the mountainside. "He must have an electric motor in him," one Alaskan said. "I didn't think anyone, fat or thin, could climb those slopes like that." When finally the exhausted Alaskans struggled up to the first night's camp, they found a roaring fire built, spruce boughs laid cut for beds and their chief talking enthusiastically about a "dickie bird" he had been photographing on a nearby crag.

RANCHERS DISCOVER GABE KNEW HIS COYOTE

Later, one of the fish and wildlife men at Juneau said that Gabe was "a sort of cross-breed between Noah and Daniel Boone."

By education and training Ira Gabrielson is a biologist. Yet only part of his work is done at a desk or in a laboratory. Much of the time he is in field. In hip-length rubber boots and an old, faded mackinaw he is a familiar sight in every State of the Union. With a camera slung over one shoulder and a pair of high-powered binoculars on a leather thong around his neck, Gabe has tracked and observed wild creatures in all the counties in the land.

Yet despite these far-flung travels Oregon occupies the niche closest to his heart. He insists that the most magnificent view in the United States, bar none, is that from Buckhorn ranger station in the Wallowa Mountains. The station looks down on the great mile-deep canyons where the Snake and Salmon Rivers have their confluence. It is located near the Oregon-Idaho boundary.

"Sometimes on hot, muggy days in Washington," says Gabe, "and I glance out at the sticky pavement, I think of the panorama from Buckhorn ranger station and a terrific

nostalgia clutches at my soul. I don't think I was born to be cooped in an office."

All the creatures of the wilderness fascinate Ira Noel Gabrielson. He knows the gravel pools where rainbow trout will lurk. He can pick out the pebbly river bottoms where chinook salmon will spawn. Claw marks on a tree tell him the size of the bear which gouges them. A trampled meadow conveys to him the full story of the elk or deer herd which grazed there the night before.

No question on wildlife ever stumps Gabe. On a field trip to Wyoming with a group of stockmen, he looked at a paw mark in the snow. "Timber wolf," one grizzled rancher ventured. The others agreed. Gabe shook his head. "Coyote," he insisted.

"Betcha," said the rancher.

"Betcha," said Gabe.

Dogs tracked the maker of the mark to earth. "Gabe," said the grizzled rancher apologetically. "I oughta known better than to argue with you."

BRITANNICA CALLED ON HIM FOR WILDLIFE SECTION

But Gabe's principal preoccupation is with birds. His Birds of Oregon, written in collaboration with Stanley G. Jewett, of Portland, 6 years ago, will probably always be standard in the field. One of his earliest essays was a pamphlet on the bird life of the Wallowa Mountains. When Justice William O. Douglas, of the United States Supreme Court, built a summer cabin in the Wallowas, he took along a copy of Gabe's pamphlet.

"Best key to nature I ever read," he later told Gabe. "I knew every species of bird on the Lostine River just from reading what you wrote."

Gabe himself is an expert mounter and stuffer of bird skins. In his Alexandria residence, bird skins hang everywhere. They are part of a collection of 5,000, all treated by Gabe personally. Etchings of birds cover the walls. Men in every land write Gabe for information on birds in general and bird migrations in particular. Above the davenport in the Gabrielson house is a painting of antlered elk in the Jackson Hole country of Wyoming. Books on wildlife weigh down the tables.

Gabe is the ultimate authority on practically all wildlife problems and questions. The Encyclopedia Britannica turned to him for its section on wildlife refuges and nature reserves. This was highly appropriate, for Gabe has been a leader in the movement to have refuges set aside for the protection of American wildlife. Today, the American system of wildlife refuges embraces 17,628,122 acres.

Gabe himself knows practically all this vast domain from personal experience. He has banded birds on the Malheur refuge in southeastern Oregon. He has lain in the sagebrush watching antelope coming down to the waterholes on the Hart Mountain refuge near the Oregon-Nevada line. He has counted shaggy-coated buffalo feeding on the rolling plains of the national bison range in western Montana.

OUTDOORS CALLED HIM FROM ACADEMIC ROLE

Gabe is especially proud that now there are more than 5,000 buffalo in the United States. Although 100,000,000 bison roamed the prairie when Lewis and Clark went West, a reckless slaughter during the nineteenth century reduced the number to a few hundred. Painfully and slowly the old biological survey with which Gabe was associated in the days before the Fish and Wildlife Service, built back this pitiful remnant. Gifford Pinchot and Teddy Roosevelt led the movement. Biologists like Gabe picked out grassy ranges where the bison survivors could forage and breed.

"The buffalo is deep in our consciousness," remarks Gabe. "It is on our nickel coins. It is on the great seal of the Department of the Interior. It is on the official crest of Canada's famous force of mounted police. The bison we have been able to save are part of the heritage of the next generation of Americans."

But the refuges which stir Ira Gabrielson most of all are the unbelievable bird colonies off Alaska's forbidding coast. These islands are literally covered with birds. Bogoslof Island, not far east of Dutch Harbor, is alive with murres, puffins, terns and carmorants. The birds nest on the rocks above the dashing sea. Along the shore, thousands of sea lions cover the sand.

It is a fantastic scene. The rocks are splattered with guano. When some strange noise makes the birds lift their wings, it seems as if the whole island were alive with an ominous volcanic activity. The birds squawk and cry continually. On the beach below, the sea lions grunt and roar. Mingled with all this is the eternal boom of the surf. On days when the Aleutian williwa drives in from the west, heavy coatings of spray pelt the island's millions of inhabitans.

Not many men have ventured ashore on such an island. Most American soldiers on duty in the far north hesitated to brave Bogoslof's population. But a day or so on Bogoslof Island is a rich experience to Gabe. He likes nothing better than to be put ashore from the wildlife service boat or perhaps its sister ship, the *Penguin*, and trudge across the beaches and up into the bird-covered rocks. Puffins and terns will light on him as if he were a part of the upthrown lava itself.

"Gabe is so engrossed in wildlife that he never knows he is tired," comments Charley Jackson, his assistant. "When we visited the great seal rookeries of the Pribilof Islands in the Bering Sea, Gabe didn't close his eyes for nearly 60 hours. He roved all around the island with a lantern studying the habits of the fur seals. He sat up another full night writing down his notes on the birds which live among the seal herds."

Ira Noel Gabrielson was born in September of 1889, at Sioux Rapids, Iowa. He is 56 years old. Of Scandinavian descent, he had parents who were devoted to the outdoors, too. As early as his tenth birthday, Ira was taking pictures of his mother's flower garden with a box camera his father had given him. He can still remember the yellow currants and jacks-in-the-box which blossomed behind the house where he was brought up.

He graduated from Morningside College at Sioux City in 1912, the same year he married his campus sweetheart, Clara Speer. Gabe did graduate research work in biology at the Lake Okoboji laboratory of the University of Iowa, and he taught biology at the high school in Marshalltown. For 3 years he stayed in a classroom, but he was restless. He wanted to walk hip deep through marsh grass and climb mountains to the bighorn's home. Academic life strapped him down.

OREGON DESTINED TO BE PART OF CAREER

In 1915 Gabe went to work for the United States Biological Survey. This was to be his career. He knew this when he was sent westward to Oregon, the State with which his destiny was to be most closely linked. In Oregon he studied rodent control, he investigated the elimination of animal predators such as cougars and coyotes, he traced the treks of deer and antelope herds, he followed the Columbia River to its distant sources and clipped the fins of fingerling salmon.

Gradually, Gabe rose in the Biological Survay. From 1918 to 1930, he was Pacific coast regional supervisor in charge of rodent and predator control. In 1930 he became game management director for the coast, and from there he moved on to the top of the Biological Survey. He headed the agency for 5 years.

HIS BOOKS WERE TRANSLATED TO OTHER TONGUES

In 1940 Congress established the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Into this huge bureau went the Biological Survey, the old Bureau of Fisheries, and all other Federal Government branches concerned with wild animals, birds, and fish. Ira Gabrielson was appointed first Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service. He retired from the position last week, after 31 years of duty with the agencies in charge of the Nation's animal life. He did so as a doctor of science, for he never ceased his research, and in 1936 got his doctorate at Oregon State College.

Gabe and his wife have four daughters. One of them, June, is secretary to Gov. Ernest H. Gruening, of Alaska. Mrs. Gabrielson and the girls are wildlife fans, too. Gabe often takes them for walks through the parks and meadows near Washington. No bird, tree, leaf, flower, or insect is a mystery to him. "He's the best biology teacher I ever saw," says one of the daughters. Gabe, now a grandfather, hopes to take his grandchildren on similar expeditions in Oregon some day.

The years exact their toll. In recent years Gabe has not been in the best of health. Doctors have told both him and his old associate in Portland, Stanley G. Jewett, that they must take things easier. Gabe hopes to have time for writing. He is the author of two outstanding books on American wildlife, Wildlife Refuges and Wildlife Conservation, both published by the Macmillan Co., of New York. They have been translated into other languages, for Gabe's comments on beasts and birds are axioms in other nations, too.

BIRDS HAVE BEEN HIS GREAT INTEREST

A multitude of Americans who love the outdoors hope that if Gabe settles down in Oregon to take it easy, that his next book will be his autobiography. That, they agree, will be a volume well worth waiting for. "It will be the real story of the American conservation movement," comments Justice Douglas.

But Gabe will always be mainly interested in birds. He helped the Pacific, Central, Mississippi, and Atlantic flyways, those legendary routes by which ducks and geese fly between their summer breeding grounds in the Arctic and their winter homes in Central and South America. Along the routes, Gabe brought about the establishment of countless refuges and sanctuaries.

On the stormiest afternoon, the sound of geese passing overhead in an inverted V will bring him out of the house to watch the mysterious procession pass. As Gabe stands there, a rotund figure of strength and interest, one senses that perhaps he feels a strange proprietory kinship with these winged creatures flapping inexorably by.

Arab Office Linked With Fascist Jew Baiters—President Truman Is Asked To Investigate Arab Propaganda in the United States

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I herewith insert a copy of the communication addressed to President Truman by the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League To Champion Human Rights, wherein very grave charges are made against the Arab

League for its contemptible propaganda activities in the United States.

The Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League, under the guidance of its administrative chairman, Prof. James H. Sheldon, and chairman, Herman Hoffman, has done a splendid job in championing human rights. It has rendered yoeman service in protecting all minorities against the slurs and barbs of hate mongers and disciples of Hitler's doctrine of racism.

What the Anti-Nazi League has uncovered with reference to Arab propaganda in this country merits close inquiry and I intend to offer a resolution to investigate these propaganda activities.

The Anti-Nazi League submits documentary evidence that the Arab office in Washington is closely allied with native Fascist individuals and groups seeking to stir up hatred against the Jews. This is the Arab League method whereby it seeks to gain American sympathy for Arab demands in Palestine. The letter to the President, together with the memorandum follow:

NONSECTARIAN ANTI-NAZI LEAGUE
TO CHAMPION HUMAN RIGHTS,
New York, N. Y., May 7, 1946.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We believe that the attached memorandum indicates the existence of a well-planned effort, of Nazi or Fascist background, to use the evil weapons of organized propagandistic appeal to religious and racial bias and bigotry, for the advancement of political purposes on an international scale, through activities of the so-called Arab League, its Washington agency the Arab office, and a network of more-or-less affiliated agencies.

There are definite indications of the cooperation of these agencies with domestic propagandist forces of the most dangerous character, in such manner as to use the creation of tensions between Americans of differing religious and racial backgrounds, for the advancement of foreign political purposes in the Near East and elsewhere.

We therefore recommend to you the immediate institution of investigations to determine whether any of these propagandistic activities may have been in any part financed by funds made available to countries of the Arab League through credits extended in connection with operations of the United States Government, either directly or through the treasury of a third power, and whether the activities of these agencies in any way violate the requirements of the Foreign Agents Registration Act, or of other statutes of the United States.

We further respectfully suggest the special propriety of such lines of inquiry before final disposition of pending issues having to do with American policy in the Near East, including questions affecting the recognition of the Transjordan state (one of the constituent parts of the Arab League), or affecting the continued use of American credits for public enterprises in the Near East.

Very respectfully yours,
NONSECTARIAN ANTI-NAZI LEAGUE,
JAMES H. SHELDON,
Administrative Chairman.
HERMAN HOFFMAN,
Chairman, Board of Directors.

MEMORANDUM CONCERNING PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES OF THE ARAB OFFICE IN THE UNITED STATES

(Submitted by the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League, New York, N. Y.)

I

It is the purpose of this memorandum to present in summary form evidence indicating that the Arab office, quasi-diplomatic Washington agency representing the seven near eastern countries which together constitute the Arab League, is engaged in conducting, along with more-or-less affiliated pan-Arabic agencies in the United States, a widespread subversive propaganda campaign, involving the incitement of religious and racial strife and the dissemination of propaganda of totalitarian bias, as part of an effort to achieve in the near eastern area certain foreign political objectives bearing no relationship to the best interests of the American people.

It is the recommendation of the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League that appropriate official investigations be instituted to discover whether these activities do not constitute flagrant violations of the laws of the United States, in that they involve the conduct of extensive foreign propaganda activities under circumstances not within the terms of the Foreign Agents Registration Act; and further, to determine whether these activities have been financed through credits originally secured for wartime purposes under lend-lease or similar arrangements, either directly from the American Government or indirectly through the treasury of a third country.

An extended brief on this subject, with full documentation attached, is being prepared for submission within a few days. It is the purpose of the present memorandum only to outline our findings or allegations, and to call attention to a few typical items, selected from a much larger volume of available evidence.

II

Specifically, the anti-Nazi league charges that a high Arab official, Anwar Bekir Nashashibi, has on occasion joined forces with groups associated with Gerald L. K. Smith and with so-called National Blue Star Mothers of Pennsylvania, in the promotion of anti-Semitic, antidemocratic and other inflammatory propaganda, at Philadelphia, New York City, and elsewhere. Also involved in these activities were Khloussy Khairy, officially registered Secretary-Director of the Arab Office, and other members of the executive staff of the Arab Office. Nashashibi, who came here from London at the beginning of March, bears one of the oldest and most influential titles of the Arabian nobility.

The Anti-Nazi League also charges that leaders of the old Nazi-supported Arab National League, including a former associate of the German Bund leader Fritz Kuhn, are currently active in the promotion of un-American propaganda being disseminated through various Arabian or pan-Arabian agencies situated in this country.

III

The Arab office, located in the Wardman Park Hotel at Washington, D. C., is registered with the Justice Department as the American agency for the seven Arabian countries viz, the Syrian Republic, Trans-Jordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, the Lebanese Republic, Egypt, and Yemen, which, together with representatives of Arab organizations in Palestine, make up the Arab League.

Closely associated with the Arab office is a New York agency known as the Institute for Arab American Affairs, Inc. Both the Arab office and the institute have recently purchased large quantities of newspaper advertising space, mostly devoted to anti-Zionist propaganda.

In characterizing these propaganda activities, the Anti-Nazi League has analyzed a quantity of documentary exhibits, including an invitation issued to the Arab office by H. L. Smith, wealthy Philadelphia agitator and financial supporter of Gerald L. K. Smith. The Philadelphia invitation said:

"Democracy is nothing but Jewocracy and it is about time the American public got wise to this fact and got over being a lot of suckers for both Bloody Joe and Churchill."

In another paragraph, Jews were referred to as "Kikes." The proposed meeting was to be arranged as a semisecret gathering of persons who "know who are the troublemakers." After this invitation had passed through Khairy's hands, Nashashibi replied, "It would give me very great pleasure to come and address [your] group * * * and to have dinner with you before joining the meeting."

In view of the lurid language of this particular invitation, it is impossible for the Arab office officials to have been under any misapprehension as to the kind of organizations with whom they were working. (See photostatic copies of this entire series of correspondence, attached hereto.)

IV

Outstanding publicist for the various Arab groups involved is H. I. Katibah, editor of the monthly Bulletin, and of other publications of the Institute for Arab-American Affairs, Inc. Katibah, the Anti-Nazi League charges, was one of the original incorporators and most active workers in the notorious Arab National League, founded shortly after Hitler seized the German chancellorship and incorporated at New York in 1938, and used to disseminate totalitarian propaganda among Americans of Near Eastern antecedents. The Arab National League operated in close association with the German-American Bund, then under the leadership of Fritz Kuhn, and its activities were regularly reported in the Nazi newspaper, Deutscher Weckruf und Beobachter, until that publication was sealed up by the FBI after the attack on Pearl Harbor. In addition to Katibah, whose name appears near the top of the institute's letterhead, it is significant that both the original bund-associated body and the present institute were formed under New York corporate charters containing much identical language and written by the same lawyers. Furthermore, the names of several of the other top officers of the institute, including the present chairman of its executive committee, are to be found among the names of the eight original incorporators of the old bund-associated Arab National League.

This same H. I. Katibah, on May 2, 1946, and again on May 9, 1946, was the signer of full-page paid advertisement appearing in a number of principal newspapers, advancing the propaganda cause of the Arab League, and attributed to a high nebulous source called the League for peace with justice in Palestine. The original announcement address of the latter organization is merely the address of an advertising agency located at 345 Madison Avenue, New York City.

The president of the Arab National League, the late Dr. F. I. Shatara, according to Deutscher Weckruf und Beobachter articles and other published reports, addressed many pro-Nazi groups, including meetings of Fritz Kuhn's German-American Bund and of the German Citizens Protective League. (The head of the latter organization, Kurt Mertig, was recently sentenced to jail for inciting to riot at a Queens County, N. Y., Christian Front meeting). George Kheiralla, another Arab National League incorporator, is the editor of the Arab World, slick-paper publication of the pan-Arabic agencies in America.

V

The Anti-Nazi League charges that these various Arab organizations, under the general dominance of the Arab office and Institute for Arab-American Affairs, are presently conducting a Nation-wide campaign of propaganda, with centers of activity in New York, Washington, and various Middle Western points (including specifically Chicago, Detroit, Toledo, and Flint, Mich.). The league also has evidence of specific instances of such propaganda activities in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and California. This whole wide-spread campaign has received the vigorous support of the so-called

subversive press in America, including such publications as the Broom, California weekly whose editor is still awaiting trial on a sedition charge, and Women's Voice, official publication of the violently isolationist group, we, the mothers at whose "peace conference" last June, Salem Bader, west-coast pan-Arabic propagandist, spoke on "The Jewish threat." Bader, in association with the president of the Institute for Arab-American Affairs, Inc., had earlier arranged a coast-to-coast radio network for a pan-Arabic program, during the San Francisco Conference.

Expenditures involved in this propaganda campaign have already run well above a million dollars, and include substantial payments made by the governments of Arab countries now or until very recently under British jurisdiction and financial tutelage.

In addition to these indications of subterranean cooperation with indigenous Fascist-like groups of exceedingly questionable Americanism, it may be very conservatively added that the official propaganda line openly pursued by the Arab office, the Institute for Arab-American Affairs, and related agencies, bears many of the most obvious ideological criteria of fascism or nazism—for example, in its insistance on an ultra-nationalism based on religious and racial lines, and in its demand for a total Arab hegemony even in areas such as the Lebanese Republic where the Christian population constitutes a definite numerical majority. This Nazi-Fascist line is further borne out in a constant reference to pseudo-scientific anthropological or historical arguments—for example, the argument that Palestine belongs exclusively to Arabs because the ancestors of the Arabs were there (which is historically doubtful) before Moses led the Israelites thence out of Egypt! Throughout all of this propaganda is to be found a basic support for a totalitarian type of state, and a recurrent and virulent anti-semitism (extending, in some instances, to the reprinting in various languages of excerpts from much well-worn Hitlerian propaganda pieces as the fictitious Protocols of the Elders of Zion).

This pattern of secret cooperation by official or quasi-official Arab agencies with native groups of Nazi-Fascist leanings is by no means confined to the United States, but extends also to many other countries in North and South America, and on both sides of the Atlantic.

The recent official vote of the Arab league's governing body, appropriating funds to promote an international boycott against the products of Jewish industry, is further evidence of the political use of anti-semitism, in a manner almost identical with that of the Nazi Deutscher Konsum-Verband and similar anti-Semitic boycott agencies.

If there should remain any doubt as to the essentially antidemocratic and totalitarian outlook of the Arab League, such doubt would appear to have been entirely resolved by the vote of the Governors of the Arab League to support the return to Palestine of the exiled Mufti, Amin-El-Husseini, a political and pseudoreligious leader of the most evil repute denounced as a war criminal by various of the Allied Powers, widely known as Hitler's Arab Quisling, and as the man whom Himmler and Goebbels retained to consult in their anti-Semitic policy and to broadcast radio appeals to American soldiers of near-eastern extraction, urging them to desert the flag of their country.

On the basis of this vote of the Arab League, to reestablish the personal power of the Mufti, it would seem almost axiomatic that the purposes of the highly paid propagandists at the Arab office in Washington could not be regarded as in accord with the best interests of democratic America.

The Anti-Nazi League's investigation of the subject of Arab propaganda in America and in other parts of the world has been conducted in an intensive and thus far strictly secret manner since the end of last November, when the Council of the Arab League, following a meeting in Cairo, Egypt, announced plans for promoting a Hitlerlike anti-Jewish boycott in the Middle East, and inadvertently indicated that this anti-Jewish boycott might be accompanied by a subterranean propaganda campaign in other parts of the world. Since that time, observers for the Anti-Nazi League have been engaged in a careful watch on the activities of Arab agents in America, accumulating evidence of such activities stretching all the way from Argentina to Canada, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Address of President Truman at Fordham University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following speech made by President Truman at Fordham University last Saturday:

Your Eminences, President Gannon, fellow alumni, and friends, it is very gratifying to be here at Fordham University in New York on the one hundredth anniversary of the granting of the charter to this great institution of higher learning. I am very grateful for this degree of doctor of laws from Fordham. I am happy to become a fellow alumnus of the men who have gone out from Fordham and who are making such a substantial contribution to the Government and to their communities. One of my able secretaries is a graduate of this great institution, Mr. Matthew Connelly.

I should like in these few minutes to talk especially of the veterans who have enrolled in this university. For I think that there is great significance in the very fact of their being here—and of veterans being in thousands of other universities, colleges, and schools throughout the land.

This Nation has a comprehensive program to return its veterans to civil life. That program is being carried out. The Federal Government, with the wholehearted cooperation of the various States, has provided many things for veterans—medical care, rehabilitation, loans for homes and farms and businesses; it has provided life insurance, and soon it will provide adequate housing. All these benefits are given not as a matter of favor but as a matter of right. Veterans must not be penalized for their war service.

POINTS TO EDUCATION PROGRAM

Programs of this nature, though less comprehensive, were established for veterans of past wars. But today we find the beginning of a new and important concept—one which is given concrete evidence by the presence of veterans here today. That concept is that the Nation must provide for its veterans something more than pensions, something more than insurance, loans, and rehabilitation. For those who wish it, the Nation must also provide education.

An enormous and tragic deficit was accumulated during the war—a deficit in education—as millions of young men and women left behind them their books and their schools and colleges to go to war. Not only gratitude, but our national self-preservation as well, require that this educational deficit be diminished or wiped out. By providing educational benefits for our veterans, the Congress has started us on the way to our goal.

Some doubt was expressed a few years ago as to whether there would be any interest among the veterans in these educational aids. There were those—I call them skeptics or call them men without faith in the youth of our Nation—who thought that only a handful of veterans would choose to come back to the quiet halls of learning. These men were wrong. The problem is not in the lack of veterans seeking education. The problem is to provide accommodations for those who seek it. Even some colleges which had been exclusively for women have had to open their doors to men students. The response of the colleges and schools to this thirst for knowledge of our veterans has been magnificent.

This desire for further schooling which has been evidenced by our veterans—men and women who will be our leaders of tomorrow—is full of healthy promise for the future. And may God give us those leaders, so that we may continue to assume that leadership which God had always intended us to take in this world.

A NEW CHALLENGE CITED

The fact that so many veterans have taken advantage of these educational opportunities increases the heavy responsibility which rests upon our schools and colleges. In preparing our veterans and other young men and women to live in the new atomic age, education faces the greatest challenge in history.

There is profound truth in the first line of the new charter of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. The charter declares: "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed."

I fear we are too much concerned with material things to remember that our real strength lies in spiritual values. I doubt whether there is in this troubled world today, when nations are divided by jealousy and suspicion, a single problem that could not be solved if approached in the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount.

The new age of atomic energy presses upon us. Mark that well! What may have been sufficient yesterday is not sufficient today. New and terrible urgencies, new and terrible responsibilities, have been placed upon education.

Ignorance and its handmaidens, prejudice, intolerance, suspicion of our fellowmen, breed dictators. And they breed wars. Civilization cannot survive an atomic war. Nothing would be left but a world reduced to rubble. Gone would be man's hope for decency. Gone would be our hope for the greatest age in the history of mankind—an age which you and I know can harness atomic energy for the welfare of man and not for his destruction.

SEES NEED FOR FELLOWSHIP

And so we must look to education in the long run to wipe out that ignorance which threatens catastrophe. Intelligent men do not hate other men just because their religion may be different, or because their habits and language may be different, or because their national origin or color may be different. It is up to education to bring about that deeper international understanding which is so vital to world peace.

Intelligent Americans no longer think that merely because a man is born outside the boundaries of the United States, he is no concern of ours. They know that in such thinking lie the seeds of dictatorship and tyranny. And they know from sad experience that dictatorship and tyranny are too ruthless to stop at the borders of the United States and conveniently leave us alone. They know what World War II and the atomic bomb have taught them—that we must work and live with all our fellowmen if we are to

work and live at all. They know that those without economic hope, and those to whom education has been forcibly denied, willingly turn to dictators. They know that in a Nation where teachers are free to teach, and young men and women are free to learn, there is a strong bulwark against dictatorship.

That was the last message from President Roosevelt. In a speech which he wrote just before he died, but which he never delivered, he said:

"We are faced with the preeminent fact that, if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live and work together, in the same world, at peace."

Until citizens of America and citizens of the other nations of the world learn this "science of human relationships" of which President Roosevelt spoke, the atomic bomb will remain a frightful weapon which threatens to destroy all of us.

But there is at least one defense against this bomb. That defense lies in our mastering this science of human relationships all over the world. It is the defense of tolerance and of understanding, of intelligence and thoughtfulness.

When we have learned these things, we shall be able to prove that Hiroshima was not the end of civilization, but the beginning of a new and better world.

That is the task which confronts education. The veterans who attend the colleges and schools of today, and the children of the veterans who will go to school tomorrow, have a right to expect that the training offered to them will fulfill that task. It is not an easy task. It is a most difficult one. It is one which places burdens without precedent, both upon those who teach and upon those who come to be taught. There must be new inspiration, new meaning, new energies. There must be a rebirth of education if this new and urgent task is to be met.

I know that education will meet that challenge. If our civilization is to survive, it must meet it. All of our educational resources must be pledged to that end. The road is hard, but the reward is great.

I am confident that this splendid institution, with its educational system founded upon Christian principles, will play a full and noble part in the great adventure ahead of us. We can and we must make the atomic age an age of peace for the glory of God and the welfare of mankind.

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Westbrook Pegler from the Washington Times-Herald:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

The case of Tom Dewey is an example of the strange moral intimidation of the American people that has taken place since 1933 which saw the beginning of a sustained campaign of nasty belittlement of every dignified and decent trait in public men.

IT TAKES COURAGE TO PRAISE HIM

There is no governor today whose record may be seriously compared with Dewey's. To find his equal in Albany it is necessary to go back beyond Lehman and Roosevelt to Al Smith, whose like is not around today because he was Al Smith.

But because he is efficient without the leering flippancy which in others has passed for human understanding, because he has eschewed such comedian props as the Ed Wynn fedora and the gas-pipe cigarette holder, because he treats other politicians with more dignity than most of them deserve, Mr. Dewey has been ridiculed and suffers in the public mind.

He is unreasoningly regarded as a seriocomic little fellow whose very aspiration to the Presidency in 1944 was, of itself, an absurd effrontery.

First, he was too young. That objection faded when it was noted that the Roosevelt who ran for Vice President in 1920 and might have become President, were the ticket elected, had been even younger.

Then his stature, something between that of Tom Thumb and Jess Willard, was offered against him until comparisons tended to embarrass LaGuardia, Stalin, and Winston Churchill, when the subject was quietly dropped.

During the brief run of that ill-advised venture to smear, a New Deal propagandist sent along on Dewey's train to heckle him hailed one of Dewey's friends one evening with the news that a New York custom shoemaker claimed to have made high heels for the governor to make him seem taller.

"Yes," Dewey's friend answered, "and I understand your fellow buys those iron legs of his from the Fuller Construction Co."

That, of course, was a vicious reference to the sad infirmity of a great and noble friend of man and in no way comparable to Harold Ickes' sneering jibe at the wheel chair in which the afflicted Lionel Barrymore attended a Dewey rally in Hollywood about the same time. That was humor.

What is the charge against Dewey, anyway?

He has been a student of government and has made government a serious profession. He has refused to frequent night clubs and cultivate the politico-theatrical underworld where brawling mountebanks of the ruling party have made their social headquarters more often than not under the possessive auspices of converted bootleggers and gamblers.

Just over the hills from the inherited barony where Roosevelt took homage from the "simple folk" and paid them coolie wages, Dewey bought a farm on borrowed money and has lived modestly among his peers, attended by one State trooper, by contrast with the Presidential household garrison of 300 selected M. P.'s who joined the Army as American soldiers and became an honor guard of flunkeys.

No kin of his have been found on the public pay rolls nor has he ever used the power of his office to swindle trusting lenders reliant on his honor.

Yet, even Republican politicians begrudge him honor, not for sensible objections to his record or ability, but because they have been put under the spell.

The same reticence is observed toward Herbert Hoover, certainly one of the greatest patriots of his time, who, far from sweating the Presidential office for the last mean and doubtful dollar of personal profit, actually served without pay because he didn't need the money and felt honored in the position. In 1944 Hoover deliberately kept away from Dewey because the propaganda ran that he was the real candidate and Dewey his Charlie McCarthy.

Jim Farley, honest and courageous despite his years in Tammany and the New Deal, recently exhorted the Democrats to beat Dewey for the governorship next fall.

He gave no reason why Dewey should be beaten because his only reason was that Dewey has been altogether too good a governor.

That might mean President Dewey in 1948 and better the poor, bewildered County Commissioner Harry Truman or the Stalinesque Henry Wallace than a good Republican President.

Instead, Farley asked the Democrats to nominate a man in the tradition of Smith, Roosevelt, and Lehman when every reporter knew he had only contempt for Roosevelt. As for the others, no candidate could be found for governor more in the tradition of Al Smith's honesty and worth than Dewey himself, while Lehman was inferior to both.

Notwithstanding his fine record, Dewey often is subordinated to Stassen, of Minnesota, a New Dealer in a Republican wrapper, whose latest record in office is some years old and never was remotely comparable to Dewey's if only because Dewey's problems and responsibilities were so much greater. His war service as an admiral's aide will be urged in his favor, but his was, after all, a political job in the war, and no intelligent man could argue that such service called for statesmanship.

My issue here is not Dewey's political future, however, but an intellectual stupor, the effect of propaganda and regimented prejudices, which gives some Americans thought to dismiss him as a silly little man who makes himself the sillier by living decently in well-behaved company, taking life and his responsibilities earnestly, and even saying grace before meals, and damn the mockers of his piety.

He has no Ickes in his circle, no Leon Henderson, Tommy the Cork, Harry the Hop, or Sammy the Rose. No Alexander Woollcott has come for dinner to the mansion in Albany to amuse a tired ruler with premeditated rudeness nor riff-raff from the big saloons to make publicity at the expense of his office.

He has been, in short, a gentleman in his personal life and bearing, and his wife a modest, honest lady, and so he is inadequate, no man of the people, and, in a word, preposterous. Most men will remember, from their school days, boys who had the courage to be decent and suffered for it socially.

UN Can and Must Work—Keep America Strong and Prepared

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the next few years will largely determine the future destiny of our Nation and the world. Though the war has been won, there still exists a real emergency and a crisis that must be met.

KEEP AMERICA STRONG AND PREPARED

The many difficult problems of today are as important to our future security as were the problems of winning the war. The problems are even more difficult to determine because we were united as never before in winning the war, and there are many grave differences on winning the peace.

It is imperative if we are going to have a just and durable peace for America to continue to assume her position of world leadership and responsibility. The alternative is another world catastrophe that will probably destroy civilization.

Under the direction of our leadership the United Nations was established for

the maintenance of peace and security among all peace-loving nations. Congress has provided the machinery for this organization and augmented it by the Bretton Woods Agreement establishing an international monetary policy and financial structure not only to maintain the peace and security but to bring about conditions of stability and well-being necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations. It can and must be successful.

However, America must grow stronger morally, economically, and politically if our objectives are to be accomplished. We must be prepared and maintain sufficient power as well as leadership, and continue an attitude of trust and frankness in our relationship with other nations, instead of cynicism and suspicion. We must be realistic in carrying out our ideas. It is a practical and common sense problem to be honestly met.

We cannot afford to again sink our Navy and completely disintegrate our Army. By preparedness and remaining a strong Nation in every way does not mean we are to become a militaristic Nation. God forbid. We must face the cold facts for our own national safety and world peace that people may remain free.

The isolationist, pacifist, and cynic are endangering our future peace and security. These groups which took to cover only with Pearl Harbor are coming to the forefront again. They would pave the way for communism which is stalking the world today and endanger the principles of freedom and democracy.

It is not necessary to have peacetime conscription or so-called compulsory military training, as understood, to maintain preparedness. Under democratic processes we should keep strong and ready by, first, voluntary enlistments for our regular standing Army; second, an expanded ROTC program in connection with our educational institutions, colleges, and universities; and, third, an expanded National Guard program. Furthermore, we should streamline the activities of our forces to conform with the progress of time and the atomic age.

Following World War I world leadership collapsed. We refused to recognize a realistic problem. There followed a break-down in our world economy which threw us into the depth of the greatest depression in all history, then came a reign of terror that has brought tragedy, death, and destruction unsurpassed in all history. It will take all of our experience and ingenuity to prevent another occurrence.

Our Nation is a peace-loving nation. We want other nations to live in peace, progress, and enjoy freedom of opportunity. We want to prevent famine, starvation, and privation. Congress provided the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration to aid these overrun countries. We are rushing food and the necessities of life to these famine-stricken countries. We are at the same time transplanting democracy, demonstrating that our system is the best.

These policies will promote free trade throughout the world, which we must have. That will make our domestic problems much lighter and give us greater security and prosperity.

These are critical moments in the life of our Nation, which require the straightest, the plainest, and the most courageous thinking of which we are capable. It is desperately important to America and the world. It is important to future generations that they shall live in peace.

Prayer for Our Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem written by Francis Cardinal Spellman and read by him at the Fordham ceremony yesterday, dedicated to the President and the American people:

PRAYER FOR OUR TIMES

At night, beneath a canopy of stars,
Through lonely canyons honeycombed with light,
I walk the strangely vacant avenues.
Of this great city that I love—New York.
The past and present mingle in my thoughts,
For, having viewed on battlefields abroad
War's fodder in the cemeteries piled
Like old coats left discarded by a road,
And having mused the lessons there revealed
Where sleep the trampled glories of man's past—
The broken swords, the tarnished pomp of power,
Abortive dreams of dynasties, and all
The madness that is spawned from human hearts—
I sense with surety that even here,
Within the confines of our mighty state,
Enduring life may not by us be planned
Or plotted, sciencewise, on measured chart,
Or builded from cement or carven stone.
If dust would live, it must with spirit wed,
And man, vested with vital grace, through work
Must, selfless, serve his God and fellow man!

This is eternal life—to feed the poor,
To suffer little ones to come to Him
Who, for their sake, Himself, became a child.
Would we America immortal make,
Then must we learn to live in unity—
Neighbor with neighbor—State with State—be strong
In charity, and generous with strength
To open wide our hearts in friendly aid
And feed and clothe the hungry and the cold.
Thus may our land achieve enduring life!
Only in God may mankind hope to rise
Above the Stygian levels of his hate,
Only in God may mankind hope to build
A city and a state that shall endure.

As eagle poised on wings are we, above
The Great Divide: Upon the left, revealed
In blood and sweat and tears, are man-made gods,
Ruling a brotherhood of serfs and slaves;
Upon the right, behold a God-made man,
The flowing mercies of His love flung wide
To cloak our nakedness, to heal our wounds,
No weapons in His hands save such as pierce
His innocence redemptive of our guilt,
No malice in His heart toward race or class,
For all are His, and He to all is all.
It is His arms alone that disarm man,
His wounds alone that close the festering sores;
His grace alone saves nations from decay,
His way alone guides men to live in peace.

Father, a thousand tiny lights break through
The great grey darkness of a city night
And are as candles lit before Thy shrine,
Each speaking to Thee of a special need,
And all these needs are one—and Thou that one!

Father, grant us the blessing of Thy peace!
Good men have sacrificed, brave men have died
That we and other nations might have peace.
Yet now, triumphant over all our foes,
We find ourselves without the peace we willed,
Without the wit to bind up our own wounds,
Without the courage, here at home, to share
The very gifts we carried overseas
In the one home brothers are strangers now,
Hatreds gnaw deep, idle our workers stand,
And all our genius, power, and resource
Are sabotaged by stubbornness and greed.

Father, within our time grant us Thy peace,
Not peace conceived in tyranny and lust
Where Thou are not, where men are pawns, and words,
Many as desert sands, are meaningless.
Father, break down the barriers men have built
Against themselves; remove the barnacles
That slow man's moral progress; guide aright
The steersman at the helm of human fate.

Father, within our time grant us Thy peace.

Strikes and the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOREST A. HARNESS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues to the following feature editorial, Strikes and the Law, which appeared in the Marion Chronicle, Marion, Ind., issue of May 8.

This editorial correctly emphasizes the fact that this body has time after time indicated a willingness to write the kind of remedial legislation which might have averted the series of labor crises which this country has suffered in recent months. It makes perfectly clear the fact that full responsibility for the present inadequacies of Federal labor laws rests with the Senate, which has so far failed to cooperate with this body in writing the obviously necessary new legislation.

I am confident that a large majority of my colleagues here remain willing and eager to correct the deficiencies on existing Federal labor laws; and that we will promptly take any further necessary action any time the Senate and the White House indicate a willingness to cooperate with us to that end.

STRIKES AND THE LAW

As the wheels of industry grind to a stop and the crisis produced by John L. Lewis and his coal strike snowballs in the proportions of a national catastrophe, many Senators are rushing into print with immoderate statements promising vengeance against the UMWA leader. One said, "Lewis should be jailed and the key thrown away." Others were working on legislation designed to punish Lewis. "Make a law against Lewis" is the cry.

The concern being thus so belatedly expressed by the Senators was, in part, a smokescreen sent up against their own failures sooner to have recognized that at long last some labor leader, lacking conscience and any vestige of concern for the common obligations of citizenship, would lay the Nation's economy low. Lewis is an extreme example of that sort of thing, but he is not the only such labor leader. Others have transgressed against the public welfare with impunity. It has been done repeatedly on a scale so great that no Senator could have failed to know that what now is happening was forecast by events that have preceded the coal strike. While the war was on and the men of our Nation were fighting, bleeding, and dying all over the world, Lewis called a coal strike, and was bribed by concessions beyond the war regulations to call it off. Lewis is nothing new, even to the Senators. If they possess the reason and logic which is supposed to emanate from their positions, they could have forecast what now is happening. Some did. Perhaps a majority did. But the Senate rules and regulations are of such a nature that a minor number of Senators in the Senate Education and Labor Committee bottled up legislation designed, in part, to have prevented just what now has occurred. And some of the Senators who are screaming most loudly now are on that committee.

We refer, of course, to the Case bill, which was passed by the House of Representatives months ago. It was not a perfect bill; it did not entirely meet the conditions that Lewis has now imposed on the Nation. But it was a start in regulation which, if taken up, debated and perfected, now would have been a law of the land, when the Nation needs it so sorely.

But did the Senate do these things? It did not. It lacked the intestinal fortitude. It lacked the virility. It bogged down in the red tape of its own making. It completely failed to do its duty. And so now we have what we have, and nobody knows where it may lead.

Now the Senators promise dire things, directed against John L. Lewis, who has become the scapegoat for their own derelictions. They promise. But they do not take up the Case bill for consideration. They orate, they brandish their arms; they issue fiery statements. But they do not do the obvious. They allow the Senate Education and Labor Committee to throttle deliberation of legislation which already passed the House of Representatives to languish in the interminable red tape of which they themselves are the authors.

It should be recalled that, no matter how lacking in patriotism, no matter how callous, no matter how devoid of the common concern for a nation which already has endured too much of bull-headed and dull-headed selfishness, John L. Lewis is not doing any more than other labor leaders have done in other industries to enforce their arbitrary wills upon the Nation. The difference is not in method or design, but in effect. Lewis is buttressed by Federal laws that have whatever authenticity a debased Supreme Court can place upon them for what he is doing. He is within the law. But he is wrong. And so the laws are wrong. The way to change Lewis is to change the laws. The way for the Senators to meet this situation is to undo legally what has been done. For as this is not the first threat that has been made against the welfare, health, and security of the Nation, it will not be the last. If we are to have any government at all, not merely a government of law rather than that of men, we shall have to meet with constructive action this and other such potential and real calamities.

If the Senators mean what they say, let them take up the Case bill, redraft it, make it conform to the national situation and necessities. That would be the quickest way to alleviate by legislation a wrong that has been done the country by legislation.

Individualism Has Made United States Great

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks an article on individualism by Mr. William C. Ross, a successful and able businessman of the city of Knoxville. This article forcibly sets out the fact that under our system of free enterprise by free men and women in a free country, the United States has surpassed all other nations in the production, distribution, ownership, and enjoyment of the good things of life. Our people have enjoyed a higher standard of living than that attained by any other people in the world.

This article is a convincing answer to those who would scuttle the American system for the communistic despotism of Russia, where no man owns a home, a farm, a business, or even his own soul. It follows:

INDIVIDUALISM HAS MADE UNITED STATES GREAT

(By William C. Ross)

In these days and times when individualism is being denounced from the housetops and collectivism praised to the skies, it would seem time for us all to consider what all the talk is about.

The definition of individualism is "a tendency to favor the liberty of the individual as to his own conduct," or it might be defined as allowing every man to use the qualities nature gave him to the best of his ability without interference as long as his acts do not injure others. That seems to be what our forefathers intended to allow us when they adopted the American Constitution.

We know this country was built up by the determination of each individual striving, by his own efforts, to build up the best that was within him. Every man working with the incentive to better himself, thereby benefiting society as a whole, whether he intended it or not, for no man living in modern society can succeed unless he renders a service for which someone is willing to pay.

The organization of production and distribution is what it is, not because it was planned so by any one man, but by many individuals striving to better themselves and is, therefore, the result of natural evolution. It is subject to change by the same forces, and it is changing all the time. If not interfered with, it will surely take the form best suited to serve the community as the community changes and develops. It is proper that evolutionary change in business shall take place gradually and in an orderly manner, as it always has done, through the competitive efforts of the millions of intelligent individuals trying to find the best method of rendering the most satisfactory service to society.

Every known method of production and distribution, or method of rendering service, is open to criticism and competition by any individual in the world who can discover something better. The most economical and serviceable method will always be adopted.

When left alone to do that in the business world, the more intelligent individuals are constantly looking for improved methods of production and distribution that will give them an advantage over their competitors. If a man finds something he thinks will do that, he tries it out. He must run the risk of failure, and if it succeeds he should have the rewards. If it fails he must suffer the loss. These things are always tried out on a relatively small scale so that if they are a failure the whole apple cart has not been upset. If they are really good, one competitor after another adopts them until eventually they become the accepted practice. No better method of making progress has been discovered in all history. That is nothing more than a natural type of evolution to which many millions of the best minds of the world are contributing.

Even if the impossible could be achieved, and if some superman could be found who is better able to plan our affairs than the millions of intelligent individuals who are working to speed the business evolution, all incentive for these millions to go out and do things would be destroyed and very few Americans would follow such a man for long, as most of them want to be free to try out their own ideas.

So why should we consider giving up our time-tested principles which have produced, compared to other countries, such fine results for our people in every walk of life?

Secretary, Greater South Dakota Association Replies to Life Magazine's Editorial Indicting America's Farmers for Exemplifying "Greed on the Farm"—Defends America's Producers for Their Patriotic Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of America in general and of South Dakota in particular are not a greedy clan. Too often and too long they have faithfully produced foodstuffs for this Republic and this world at less than parity prices and below the cost of production to ever merit the slander of being dubbed as greedy men.

Life magazine is usually a temperate and tolerant publication but in its editorial entitled "Greed on the Farm" it appears that its enthusiasm for the noble purpose of supplying additional food for hungry people in Asia, Africa, and Europe caused it to err in its indictment of the farmers of America as being the reason why this country cannot do more in a program on which we all recognize that this country must do most.

Having a great respect for the accuracy and ethics of Life magazine, I am herewith calling the attention of the Congress and the country to the reply which George A. Starring, manager of the Greater South Dakota Association, sent to Life magazine under date of May 8 with the hope and belief that Life will desire to modify its position in view of the facts presented so that it will not be party to doing an injustice to American farmers whom I am sure Life recognizes as among the most patriotic, the most hard-working, the most freedom-loving, the most independent, and the most generous citizens of this Republic.

Mr. Starring's letter to Editor Longwell, of Life magazine, follows:

GREATER SOUTH DAKOTA ASSOCIATION,
Huron, S. Dak., May 8, 1946.

MR. DANIEL LONGWELL,
Managing Editor, Life,
Time and Life Building,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. LONGWELL: I do not think your editorial in last week's Life entitled, "Greed On the Farm", is entirely fair to the farmers of this country. Also, it does not seem to be based entirely upon facts.

Your editorial accuses farmers of hoarding to obtain famine prices; that "farmers as a class are high among the beneficiaries of this war, if not its chief profiteers"; that "farmers went on feeding our dwindling grain supplies to their cows, chickens, and pigs"; that "when LaGuardia began to breathe life into the UNRRA and Hoover took over the Famine Emergency Committee, fires were started both to the left and to the right of farm politicians, leaving them nowhere to hide their naked greed"; that "at last week's official count there was twice as much wheat on the farms (some 200,000,000 bushels) as the United States really needs for reserves. It is not enough to save the world, or even to fulfill our promises, but it is enough to choke the farmers who are hoarding it and damage their reputation for a long time to come."

Please do not understand from this letter that I am belittling the fact that everything possible should be done for the relief of needy peoples in foreign lands. I am sure the farmers of this country are as tenderhearted in that respect as any other class of people. I do think this editorial is too harsh and would like to call attention to the following facts:

According to the April 10 report of the United States Livestock Crop Reporting Board: "Wheat has moved from farms since January 1 at a record rate. Over a billion bushels have been moved from farms since the new crop was harvested, a quantity that has never before been approached. Current farm stocks of 204,000,000 bushels are the lowest for April 1 since 1941. Because of difficulty of moving wheat over winter-bound roads, farm stocks are relatively largest in the Dakotas-Montana area."

The figures show that stocks of wheat on farms on January 1, 1946, relative to production, were 5 percent less than average. That is, January 1, 1946, stocks of wheat on farms were 368,820,000 bushels or 32.8 percent of the 1945 production at 1,123,143,000 bushels. Ten-year stocks of wheat on January 1, 1936–45 averaged 291,980,000 bushels or 34.6 percent of average production in the year previous at 843,192,000 bushels, or 1.8 percent more than on January 1, 1946.

Disappearance of wheat on farms between January 1, 1946, and April 1, 1946, is shown by the fact that stocks of wheat on farms of the Nation April 1, 1946, relative to production, were 18 percent below the previous 10-year average. That is, April 1, 1946, stocks (203,991,000 bushels) were 18.2 percent of the 1945 crop (of 1,123,143,000 bushels) compared with the 1936–45 average April 1 stocks of 187,260,000 bushels at 22.2 percent of the previous year's crop averaging 843,192,000 bushels.

Stocks of feed grains on January 1, 1946, were discussed as follows in the livestock release as of February 15, 1946, by the United States Crop Reporting Board: "Compared with a year earlier, the supply of feed grains on January 1 per animal unit of livestock, including chickens, was about 5 percent smaller than a year earlier, but much larger than 2 years ago."

The following is another quotation from the April 10, 1946, report of the United States Crop Reporting Board:

"Consumption of feed grains by livestock and poultry has continued at a relative high level. The tonnage of feed grains remaining on farms, though bolstered by the largest stocks of oats on record, has been severely reduced from the near record level of last fall. The current total, as well as the average per animal unit, is the lowest for the date since 1938, with the exception of April 1, 1944. Disappearance of 32,000,000 tons since January 1, 1946, compares with about 30,000,000 in the same periods of 1945 and 1944. Farm stocks of corn are lower than on April 1 of any year since 1938, partly because of the necessity of using up 'soft' or 'wet' corn in some areas before warm weather."

The quantity of wheat fed to livestock in South Dakota and the United States is given below for several years:

	United States			South Dakota		
	Production (thousand bushels)	Thousand bushels	Percent of production	Production (thousand bushels)	Thousand bushels	Percent of production
Crop of—						
1944	1,072,177	116,211	10.8	38,847	3,108	8
1943	841,023	90,087	10.7	31,595	3,160	10
1942	974,176	92,002	9.4	45,274	3,622	8
1941	943,127	99,162	10.5	35,358	2,121	6

It should be generally known that farm feeding of wheat to livestock is a nominal affair, a practice often followed to feed that grown for the purpose in some areas and to dispose of damaged and inferior grain in surplus areas.

What the feeding of livestock to heavier weights may mean is inconclusive. The statement quoted above may have some bearing on the subject: "Farm stocks of corn are lower than on April 1 of any year since 1938, partly because of the necessity of using up soft or wet corn in some areas before warm weather." Apparently, farmers considered it more advisable to feed this corn than to let it rot.

Further, your editorial goes on to say, "But under all these luxuriant varieties of American greed is a common soil of fear. It is a fear which the farmer has in a special degree; the fear of plenty, of overproduction."

The American farmer inherently is a producer. The overproduction bogey was introduced to the American farmer in recent years by the scarcity theorists of the Government who taught the heretofore independent American farmer to look to the Federal Government for an annual check in payment for not marketing hogs that he did not raise on corn that he did not grow on land that he was paid to keep idle. The natural urge of the American farmer is to produce—and to produce at a maximum! Did anyone ever hear a farmer boast about the crop failures or short crops he has had?

Your editorial states, "At last week's official count there was twice as much wheat on the farms (some 200,000,000 bushels) as the United States really needs for reserves." You have evidently made no inquiry as to what the need for reserves are. On another page in the same issue of Life you state that, the "The Poles were eating their seed grain—which is agricultural suicide." Agricultural suicide is just as imminent for the Americans as for the Poles if the American farmers are high-pressured into selling their seed grain.

For seed grain alone, American farmers in 1943, a typical year of wheat seeding, used 79,000,000 bushels of wheat. In addition, they fed 100,000,000 bushels to livestock, and used another 10,000,000 bushels in their homes for flour. This adds up to 189,000,000 bushels. You can see that 200,000,000 bushels, far from being twice as much as needed for reserves, is really only a prudent amount necessary to protect supplies of seed and feed. The reason that farmers feed as much as 10 percent of the wheat crop to livestock is that there is usually about that much that is soft, moldy, or otherwise unfit to ship or store. A small amount of wheat is planted on some farms every year for the express purpose of harvesting it for livestock, especially poultry.

I think it would be well for your research department to check over the statistics with the idea of publishing a modified statement that will be less rough on the farmers of this country who did a magnificent and heroic job of production during the war years with insufficient help and with insufficient machinery.

With best wishes I am,

Sincerely yours,

GEO. A. STARRING,
Treasurer-Consultant, Manager.

The American People Have Asked for It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the May 10, 1946, issue of the Marinette Eagle Star should make every American stop, look, and listen. Every Member of this House would do well to take to heart the thoughts and advice here expressed:

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE HAVE ASKED FOR IT

American industry is paralyzed. Commerce is practically at a standstill. Cities are browned out. Furnaces are cold and transportation is drastically curtailed. The 40-day strike of the Nation's soft-coal miners seems likely to be paralleled by a general railroad strike within a few days. This is where the Nation stands 1 year after Germany's surrender. Why? Because the American people have asked for it.

For months and years the majority of our people have turned a deaf ear to the obvious—they have closed their eyes to the truths told them by honest public officials, courageous newspapers, and thinking leaders of labor and industry. They have preferred to accept the fallacious philosophies of the entrenched politicians, the power-seeking labor racketeers, and the Communists who have spread the un-American doctrine of more and more pay for less and less work over the broad expanse of this Nation. The most popular refrain has become "the Government will take care of me." But who will take care of the Government?

It has become akin to national treachery for one to oppose these false doctrines of "soft living." Individuals, newspapers, and organizations which have dared take issue with the "do-gooders," the Commies, the labor racketeers, and the bureaucrats have been branded and slandered as Red baiters, labor haters and reactionaries. Yet any intelligent, thinking person—whether he be a holder of public office, an employer of labor, or an employee—knows that industry and commerce prosper only when labor is paid a high but fair wage which enables people to buy the products which industry and commerce produce and distribute.

But through the past decade the American people have assigned their individual liberties and securities to a so-called benevolent Government on one hand and to a ruthless, power-mad group of labor racketeers who try to outdo each other in their ridiculous demands. For months Government bureaucrats have screamed "hold the line," or else—inflation is just around the corner. Mr. and Mrs. United States, inflation is not just around the corner—it is here and has been here for months. What can you buy for your money—our easy dollar which your Government rolls off its printing presses? Can you buy coal? Can you buy stockings? Can you buy automobiles? Can you buy meat? Can you buy half the things you and your family need?

Well, this is the kind of America which planned economy has brought you. This is the condition of affairs you have asked for. The Government bureaus regiment and restrict; the fact finders meet and bring in phony reports; the administration from the President down mollycoddles and appeases the labor racketeers and the Communists; the working men and women of this Nation go on one continuous mad swirl of walk-outs and strikes, as the Reuthers and Lewises play the tune; wages are forced up and prices naturally go up with them; Congress twiddles its thumbs and engages in oratorical contests; and the great majority of us Americans look blank and say, "What the hell can we do about it?"

These are the things which have happened in every great nation which has reached a zenith in civilization and then plummeted to ignominious disaster—ancient Greece, magnificent and pleasure-seeking Rome, modern and licentious France, and fanatic, nazified Germany. Dictatorships rise under these conditions, and bureaucracies flourish. The people surrender their liberty to the smooth talker who promises them utopia without work. Is this what the American people wanted when they handed their individual liberties to a paternalistic form of government and to labor leaders of the likes of John Lewis and Walter Reuther? Who is the stronger today—the American public or John Lewis? You ask yourself the question.

Do you want your paper mills to be shut down and your schools and churches to be without heat or light? Do you want a never-ending spiral of higher prices and scarcer goods? Do you want a government subvervient to the whims of labor racketeers or to the will of the American public? Do you want a pocket full of money and nothing to buy with it except what can be found on the black market? Well, this is what you asked for—and now you are about to have it unless conditions change suddenly.

Economics do not mix with wishful thinking, regardless of how magnetic the personality of the thinker or how trusting the nature of the listener. The world revolves and rotates by the God-given laws of nature—and the laws of economics are just as unchangeable. Sooner or later the pendulum must swing back or else describe a complete arc, in which event the whole mechanism becomes completely wrecked. We are bold enough to say that our economic ills cannot be cured by laziness and the equal distribution of wealth—but only by industry and the creation of more wealth which abounds in this land of ours. Only so can we achieve the "domestic tranquillity" so dear to our founding fathers. And a people made idle by strikes and walk-outs cannot possibly produce wealth. Perhaps even the Secretary of Commerce might agree.

The American people alone can undo the things they have allowed to be done. Who is government? Is it not the people of the United States? Or is it Harry Truman or John L. Lewis or Walter Reuther? Is it not time to replace wishful thinking with reason, experiments with proven procedure, government with people, edicts with law, license with liberty, slothfulness with industry, racketeering with honesty? If these are the things you want, then tell your Senator and Congressman today.

We can insist on order—just as we have asked for and gotten confusion.

Congress Dodging Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is a significant situation when Mr. Jesse H. Jones, in his paper the Houston Chronicle, in an editorial, charges that Congress is dodging its responsibilities in connection with the British loan.

I suggest that those who favor a gift of $4,400,000,000 to Great Britain read carefully the editorial which appeared in the Houston Chronicle of Tuesday, May 7, 1946, which, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

CONGRESS DODGING RESPONSIBILITIES

Two functions specifically reserved to Congress under the Constitution of the United States are the power to appropriate money, and the advice and consent which the Senate exercises in the conduct of the Nation's foreign affairs.

Proponents of the British loan both in and out of Congress are suggesting that the legislative branch of the Government be abandoned with respect to these two functions. Advocates of the loan to the United Kingdom insist that not an "i" can be dotted or a "t" crossed in the loan agreement submitted by the State Department after negotiations with British financial representatives, negotiations at which the Congress was not represented. An effort is being made to present this agreement as a sacred document which should not be altered, notwithstanding the fact that the Congress had nothing to do with the making of it.

When Congress was given the exclusive power to appropriate Federal funds, it was not intended that it should delegate that authority to appointed officials in the executive branch of the Government and serve merely as a "rubber stamp" for such officials. Nor was it intended by the framers of the Constitution that the "advice and consent" of the Senate in foreign affairs should be a mere echo of what any administrative executive might propose, be he the President of the United States or any of his appointees.

Congress has a very real duty under both responsibilities, responsibilities which it cannot ignore. It should have ample time to consider and discuss the loan so that the people can be informed, for it is the taxpayers' money that will be spent. The Members of Congress should assert their authority to make appropriations and not delegate that authority to any other branch of the Government. They should make certain that their "advice and consent" is not a mere perfunctory act which will return to plague them. For the ultimate consequences of a loan, such as the one which it is proposed to grant to the British, will eventually return to adversely affect our own economy.

There is another surrender involved in the arguments which are being made by those who advocate the British loan to which the Congress appears to be oblivious. It is argued that the loan to the British is unique, that there will be no other like it, and that future extensions of credit will be made through the Export-Import Bank.

What happens then to congressional supervision, advice, and consent?

There will be none, if Congress agrees to any such surrender of its responsibilities. The Export-Import Bank will go on its merry way, hampered only by the over-all limitations which Congress may from time to time place upon the total amount of money it can lend, which already amounts to as much as, or more than, the proposed British loan.

Congress cannot and should not abandon supervision of our foreign loans in any such careless fashion. For as surely as we continue to toss billions of the taxpayers' money about in other lands, just so certainly will we lose those billions, seriously damage our own financial structure, and in all probability lose the friendship of those to whom we lend the money.

Address of Hon. John W. McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from an address delivered by JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, House majority leader, speaking at the annual communion breakfast of the Police and Fire Departments in Washington, D. C., at the Willard Hotel, on May 12, 1944:

A little over 1 year has passed since VE-day, and later followed by VJ-day.

The termination of the hostilities in Europe on VE-day defeated the satanic efforts of Hitler and his ilk to dominate the world through a vicious war of destruction.

On VE-day the hopes of the peoples of the world were high. They hoped that sound action and international cooperation would result in permanent peace among all nations.

The people of the United States realized, as never before, the wisdom of such a course of action. Public opinion was and is wholeheartedly in support of our Government in its efforts to achieve a permanent peace, as our entry and active participation in the United Nations Organization clearly evidences.

A year has gone by, and while our hopes and willingness to cooperate still exist, they have become somewhat dimmed as a result of the actions of the Soviet Union. The time has arrived for a frank expression of views. It is only through plain talking and an honest exchange of views that understanding and progress will result.

In Europe as the result of Soviet influence, instability in government exists in practically all of the nations on that continent. Throughout Europe, as a result of this same influence, fear and uncertainty prevails.

In practically all of the countries overrun by the Nazis, and elsewhere in Europe, no properly constituted or legitimate government is in existence today.

No legitimate or sound government can exist where the people are denied the medium of free expression, or are compelled to vote

for the candidate of only one party, popular front, or otherwise. No legitimate government can exist where the dignity and the personality of the individual is submerged or lost.

No legitimate government can exist unless all political parties have the right and the opportunity without fear to present their party policies to the people. All the people must have the opportunity to vote in a free and secret election.

A legitimate government must spring from the people; it must represent their will; it must be a government they respect and obey. The evidence of the past year clearly shows that the Soviet Union has prevented in some countries, and is hindering in others, the establishment of legitimate government. Due to the policies and actions of the Soviet Union the efforts for achieving a permanent peace through international cooperation have been deterred.

The United States and Great Britain among the Big Three have gone to every extent possible to lay the foundations for permanent peace. It seems that the only time the Soviet Union agrees to anything is when a question is decided in its favor. We have reached the limits that we can go in this respect. There are many who feel that the United States and Great Britain have gone too far. Whether or not that is so, our national interests do not permit us to go any further. Permanent peace is just as vital and important to the Soviet Union and its people as it is to the United States, Great Britain, France, China, or even little Liberia. It is just as much for the national interests of the Soviet Union to have future peace as it is for any other country, large or small.

Peace, however, is not a one-way proposition. Peace cannot be brought about when any one country insists on always having its own way. The Soviet Union has committed this offense. If the Soviet Union really wants peace in the world—if it is sincere—it will have to cooperate with the other nations, with understanding. Any one of the large and powerful countries, if stubborn or dictatorically inclined, can prevent future peace.

If the Soviet Union persists in its present policies of stepping on the toes of other nations, of being suspicious and impugning the motives of other nations, of injecting fear and causing uncertainty among smaller nations in violation of the spirit of its agreements; and of injecting itself directly or indirectly into the domestic affairs of other nations, the chances of building a foundation for permanent peace will disappear.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, while Chicago was in the throes of the dim-out during the coal strike, the city of Chicago had a splendid source of cheap power available but was denied its use because of a Supreme Court decision prohibiting Chicago from having additional diversion from Lake Michigan. Several of the Lake States, now advocating the St. Lawrence seaway, are appealing to Chicago and Illinois Representatives to aid them in their efforts to bring this great project into being. Perhaps some of these Lake States' advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway will see the light now and may do as the Chicago Sun suggested in a timely editorial printed in its issue of Saturday, May 11, 1946, which follows:

UTILIZE LOCKPORT

Despite the critical shortages of electricity, one source of power for Chicago has not been fully utilized—the hydroelectric generating plant at Lockport, now operating at only 20 percent efficiency. At capacity it could produce enough current to light all of Chicago's streets.

Operations at Lockport have been curtailed as a result of a United States Supreme Court order prohibiting increased diversion of Lake Michigan. Mayor Kelly went to Washington and got President Truman's informal approval of a plan for more power from Lockport. In addition, why should the city not appeal to the governors and attorneys general of other Lake States, who brought the Supreme Court suit, and secure their permission for an emergency increase of lake diversion? The emergency is not ended by the truce in the coal strike. It is difficult to believe that the Lake States would fail to agree to this temporary relief measure.

Food Plan for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an essay written by a high-school girl in my district. The title of the essay is Food Plan for Peace. I have asked permission to insert this in the RECORD since I feel that the Members of this body will welcome the opportunity to read and to know of the serious thought being given by our young men and women to the problems which face the entire world. I feel very sincerely that this essay will indicate to each and every one of us that the younger people of our Nation, who will in the not-too-distant future inherit our responsibilities, will come to this task armed with sound and logical thinking and preparation. This is indeed heartening to me as I know it is to each of you.

The following essay has been chosen as one of two winning compositions by high-school students in the entire State of Illinois and will be entered in a Nation-wide contest:

FOOD PLAN FOR PEACE

(By Donna Beryl Gates, Apple River High School, Apple River, Ill.)

Today, at the close of the greatest war in history, the problem of feeding the world seems to rest to a great extent, on the shoulders of the American people. How these destitute nations are to be fed is the question of the hour.

The American tradition—it's American to share—is very fine in sentiment. But how to share and with whom to share are realistic problems, not traditions.

There is no question in my mind as to those who are to share our food resources. The whole world must be fed, and America with its vast natural resources and abundant food crops is the logical one to do it.

If we are to live in peace and harmony with former enemies, as well as present allies, we must as quickly as possible find the most sensible way to feed these countries.

Each and every country's need should be charted and figured according to climate population, and the amount of undamaged farm land in the country. If a country still has a reasonable amount of farmable land left, the quantity of food shipped to that country should be determined so as to provide for its people until that country is once more raising at least a part of its own food.

Not only should we send food to that country, but also, seeds, farm machinery, and all else that will insure substantial crops. Furthermore, farm animals should be included to supply needed dairy products, meat, and eggs. Agriculture experts should also be hired to help plan the most economical way of producing crops. That country's people should, in return, cooperate to the utmost with the experts in planning and raising needed food.

America's people will not be put on a starvation diet as a result of this plan. It seems to be a common opinion that we, as a result of sending food overseas, will suffer a food shortage. This need not be nor will it be. Americans will be fed on the same healthful diet which we have eaten during the war.

To carry out this work, there must be special committees who will see that all available food is properly distributed. Each country's need should be studied by a special Food Control Committee. This committee shall determine the kinds of foods to be shipped to each country and the amount needed. In addition, they shall be responsible for seeing that the food is deposited at points throughout the country so that it is available to all people. This work should be performed by honest, capable, intelligent men, who will seek no gain for themselves.

There must be a fair price set for every food that is raised and exported. The price shall be one that will allow the American producer a fair profit for his labor, but at the same time, one that the importing people can afford.

This work must be carried on in a friendly, helpful, democratic way. If done properly, the work may be the basis of a lasting peace. These countries are going to be much easier to negotiate with, once they are back on a smooth peacetime basis. If cooperation on both sides is forthcoming, there should be no bitterness nor hard feelings. They shall have gained the benefit of our help, while we shall be strengthening friendly relations and our position in the world.

"A hungry man is a desperate man." The same rule applies to a hungry nation. A world of well-fed, contented people may well be a world of peace and brotherly love. Thus, may food be the foundation of a lasting peace.

Retail-Store Manager Pleads for OPA Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter recently received from one of my constituents, who manages a retail store located in the district which I represent:

CHICAGO, *April 7, 1946.*

The Honorable Congressman ROWAN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Never before have I written to a Member of Congress trying to in-

fluence legislation. However, the pending bill to extend price and rent control seems so important to me that I feel it my duty as an American citizen to do everything in my power to further enactment of this bill in order to prevent inflation.

I have seen and lived through the terrible hardships, misery, hunger, and the pauperization of the entire middle class which the inflation of the early 1920's brought to the peoples of western Europe, and I am sure that the men who are trying to abolish OPA now do not realize the consequences this step might ultimately have for every group or class in this country.

I believe from your past record that you yourself will vote for the best interests of all the people in our district, to protect their savings and their war bonds, and of our returning veterans, who cannot have postwar security if we do not defeat inflation. But please tell me how I, as a father of two boys, can protect them from the terrible consequences of inflation. More specifically:

I want speedy enactment of the bill to extend price and rent controls without crippling amendments, extension of food subsidies for the present time, until production is sufficient to prevent prices from going up, and passage of Mr. Wyatt's housing program to secure adequate housing for our people. Whom should I write to?

Thank you,

MARTIN MARX.

P. S.—I am manager of a retail store and realize short-range advantages and long-range disadvantages of inflation to business.

The Biggest Black Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Clarion (Pa.) Republican of May 2, 1946:

THE BIGGEST BLACK MARKET

When the Federal Government recently announced its intention of offering the American farmer 30 cents more per bushel for wheat than he—the farmer—can obtain in open market, it was the most shocking statement yet made by a Government dealing in a long line of breath-taking pronouncements.

With this avowed intention the Government legalizes all black markets. For where is the difference between an individual going to the farmer and saying, "I will pay you 30 cents more per bushel of wheat if you will sell it to me," and a government which does exactly the same thing?

Of course, the logical retort is "but the individual is going to sell it to the consumer and the Government is going to give it away to starving countries." True, but is money from heaven about to rain on Washington so that such debts may be paid? In effect, you and I and our neighbor are the customers buying this grain, for you and I and our neighbor are the citizens who will pay for it in taxes.

How can a government rail, with any dignity, against the black markets of any type and how can it plead with the populace for a continuation of the OPA to prevent inflation when its very self is giving a tremendous impetus to both illegal markets and inflation?

There is no argument with the idea that the starving peoples of the world must and shall be fed. To fail this responsibility would be a personal disgrace to each American forever. But how much better if our Government were, in the light of the emergency, to requisition a certain percent of each farmer's wheat, the total amount to equal the number of bushels necessary, and pay the regular market price for this wheat. As an emergency measure it would not only be tolerated by the people, it would be applauded.

And while we are considering this step, let us go into its third serious ramification. It is inevitable that all farmers will rush to sell all wheat to the Government at the 30 cents above market rate per bushel. They would be more than human if they did not. So what happens to the grain dealers, the flour mills, and grain and flour products industries of this country. At best, paralysis of a tremendous industry—temporary in some cases but bringing business failure in its wake to many of the smaller millers and dealers.

This medium has criticized many of the policies of the administration in the past as criminally stupid, but this is the first time it has felt forced to condemn a governmental policy as criminal period.

By the Grace of God, Geography, and Lots of Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the Dallas Chamber of Commerce published in the Washington Post of May 12, 1946:

BY THE GRACE OF GOD, GEOGRAPHY, AND LOTS OF NATURAL GAS

No brown-out or black-out darkens the Dallas Southwest!

Our personal affairs and economic welfare are not dependent upon recurring coal strikes.

Our oil-fired locomotives maintain uninterrupted rail service.

Our factories have plenty of fuel, plenty of electric energy.

We have watched the recurring crises which have confronted the congested industrial areas of the North, East and Midwest, and thank our lucky stars we've never had to go through these experiences.

The Dallas Southwest has no spirit of gloating or feeling of superiority in this situation. Our sincere sympathy goes to the North, the East, the Midwest and the other regions now experiencing the desperate problems born of the coal strike. We can appreciate their plight, though we've never had such an experience.

We're lucky, and we know it. We acknowledge that our good fortune comes from the grace of God, geography, and lots of natural gas.

With sincere thankfulness for our good fortune, the Dallas Southwest wants to remind American industry that this situation does point up one of the great advantages which this region offers:

The Dallas Southwest's almost inexhaustible supply of natural gas provides the best and cheapest fuel for industrial as well as domestic uses.

America's storehouse of oil—the Mid-Continent fields—guarantees another boundless source of fuel and energy.

Natural gas for steam-generating plants of Southwestern power companies insures uninterrupted electrical power for the general public as well as industry.

These resources are so diversified, their sources so dispersed, and their transmission to the consumer so well integrated that the Dallas Southwest cannot be dominated by the will of any one man nor any group of men.

Natural gas and electrical energy in the Dallas Southwest are so abundant, so cheap, and so diversified in geography and control that this region has never experienced the privations and economic distresses which occur so frequently in the regions where industry and the public are dependent upon coal. This is one of the big reasons why industry's thoughts and plans are focussed on Dallas and the Southwest—the great industrial frontier and America's No. 1 region of opportunity.

Regional market. Dallas is the geographic center, the center of density of population and the center, the center of density of population and the center of buying power in the Dallas southwest—Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi, plus 26 western counties of Tennessee. Here are 17,000,000 consumers, with $13,000,000,000 annual buying power. Here is a region which is consistently above the national average in population growth and business activity.

Here's what is happening in Dallas now:

Construction contract awards totaled $23,485,000 during the first quarter of 1946. Five hundred and seventy-six new business enterprises were established. Dallas County's population (in an area of 893 square miles) passed the 520,000 mark. During the first quarter of 1946, Dallas bank debits increased 8.4 percent over the total for the same period of 1945; bank clearings gained 19.8 percent; postal receipts, 6.1 percent; and street railway revenue passengers, 2.8 percent. Dallas telephone subscribers reached 136,811, an increase of 9.4 percent, with 1,717 active applications for telephone service pending as of April 25, 1946.

Learn more about the advantages this bright spot in the Nation has for your business. Write for a copy of the 64-page booklet, The Dallas Southwest. Available to executives requesting it on their business letterhead. Address department G, Dallas Chamber of Commerce, Dallas 2, Tex.

Abundance of low-cost fuel and power is just one of the many reasons industry is coming to the Dallas southwest. Other reasons are:

Labor: The finest industrial labor in America is available. Official war production records show Dallas workers were America's most efficient producers of aircraft (trainers, fighters, and bombers), aircraft components, B–24 gun turrets, and many ordnance items.

Climate: Facts show a factory of 200,000 square feet, for example, can be air conditioned the year-round in Dallas for less than it costs to heat a plant of similar size and more costly construction during the winter months alone in Ohio.

Geography: Dallas is centrally located midway between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, in excellent position for industry which wants to take full advantage of the rapid shift in population to the Southwest and West. It is superbly located for maximum returns in Latin American trade.

Communications: Dallas is one of the eight Bell system telephone toll centers, one of the six division headquarters of the Western Union Telegraph Co. and the crossroads of transcontinental and region air lines.

Distribution: Dallas has superior transportation and other distribution facilities for serving regional, national and international markets.

Youth and vitality: The Dallas southwest is young in spirit, in ambition, in energy. It is proud of what it is today, confident that its superior living conditions, climate and type of development make if possible for democracy and competitive enterprise to find their finest expressions here.

DALLAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Dallas, Tex.

Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson Comments on War Problems and the Thirty-Second Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by the Honorable Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War, before the Detroit Bar Association on May 8, 1946. Mr. Patterson makes especial reference to the Thirty-second Division—the Michigan-Wisconsin division which made such an outstanding record in two wars:

I am glad to take my part in welcoming back the members of your association who dropped their pleadings, briefs, and legal documents and took up the weapons of war. Training as lawyers in the decision of disputes by rule of reason was broken off and it became a matter of training as soldiers and sailors for the decision of their country's fate by rule of force. They fought the fight. We mourn those who lost their lives in their country's cause. We honor those who have returned to their peaceful pursuits.

War is a fatal business, even for those who win, and no one knows it as well as the fighting men who bear the brunt of it. But those who have been through the ordeal and are fortunate enough to come out unimpaired in body have a firmer grip on the realities, a grip that will stay with them all their lives. When I think of the lawyer-soldier, I think of John Marshall, captain in the Revolutionary Army.

His life as a soldier played its part in making him the great Chief Justice that he was. Brandywine, Valley Forge, Monmouth, and Stony Point—these were the sources of his opinions that were so important a factor in making our country what it is today.

Wars are won by men with courage, but the men must have the weapons. When the fire delivered is four times the fire received, the end is not far off. And that was the way things stood at the beginning of last year.

Detroit was the greatest source of weapons the world ever witnessed. I made that statement many times in the war, and I am glad to repeat it now. This city represents, in all corners of the earth, the productive power that armed our fighting men. Without this mighty industrial area and its amazing record of mass production of war supplies, our victory would have been long in coming and the cost in lives would have been doubled. The munitions that poured out of Detroit gave point to what General Patton said, "A pint of American sweat can save a gallon of American blood."

Supplies, the best in the world and plenty of them, were decisive. They were decisive in every campaign. How decisive they were can be shown by the record of the Thirty-second Division in the Pacific, a division that came from Michigan and Wisconsin. I am not overlooking, for a moment, the bravery and skill of the men who used the supplies and equipment in the Pacific. Certainly we could never have won the war without the men who planned the campaigns, the flyers who hit the target in spite of flak and Zeros, and the men who had to crawl through jungle mud and slime—the unbeatable infantrymen—who had to fight it out with the enemy with rifle, bayonet, and grenade, at arms length and face to face.

As anyone who has been battle in the Pacific will testify, the Japanese soldier was daring to the point of madness. He feared death so little that he would sacrifice himself when caution would have been better for his cause. But all Japanese bravery was not of the hysterical type that was exhibited in the suicidal banzai charges.

Japanese soldiers would carry out individual missions to set up a machine gun on a trail behind our lines, to damage a field gun, to blow up a tank, when no other Japanese would be there to spur him on or even see him die. The courage of the suicide pilots cannot be denied. We called the planes specially designed for suicide missions "Baka" planes, since Baka is Japanese for "fool." But their pilots were as brave as they were foolhardy.

What the Japanese did not have was the excellent equipment which enabled the American soldier and sailor to win without suicidal sacrifice. What the Japanese did not have was the unending stream of supply to back up their fighting men. Tokyo was not in a class with Detroit.

Now that the victory has been won, we are inclined to forget that at the beginning of the war the problem of supply was formidable, so formidable that it was seriously believed it could not be solved in time to defeat the Axis before the Axis defeated us.

The effect of supply, for worse or for better, is seen in the experience of the Thirty-second Infantry Division. The first Army division to start on the road to Tokyo and the first division to conduct an air-borne movement, the Thirty-second, you will remember, flew part of the troops over the Owen Stanley Mountains of New Guinea, while the rest made on foot the incredible march that took 49 days. The planes covered the same distance in 40 minutes. That movement opened the Buna campaign in 1942, a campaign fought in swamp and jungle. It was won on a shoestring of supply.

Supply by trail over the lofty mountains was out of the question. The naval situation made it impossible to bring transports along around the New Guinea coast. So the men of the Thirty-second had to improvise.

One year to the day after Pearl Harbor, most of their supplies were being smuggled up the coast in fishing boats and native outrigger dugouts, totally unfitted for the work. Even captured Japanese barges were used. It was a dark day when a Japanese plane hit one of those barges carrying madly needed guns. Other material came in air drops from planes flying over the mountains from Moresby, a run that was as dangerous as the Hump to China.

What the men received, when they got anything at all, was ill-adapted for the steaming jungle in which they had to fight. So slim was the supply that infantrymen in the fever-ridden jungle, crawling out of waterlogged foxholes through murderous fire toward enemy positions they could not see, fought for days on a thousand calories a day, less than one square meal.

There were no bazookas, no flamethrowers, almost no artillery, no rockets, not enough ammunition, no tanks until the last stages of the battle and then only seven light tanks with 37-millimeter guns. Fighting as they were in a rank jungle without the equipment they needed, sickness took far more men out of action than the Japanese did.

If we follow the same division to the Battle of Leyte in the Philippines 2 years later, the contrast is striking. The men have plenty of the best equipment in the world. When the roads became too muddy even for powerful tractors, the Thirty-second Division, fighting its way in northern Leyte, was supplied over water by amphibian tractors, by amphibian trucks, by landing craft, each one specially adapted for its task and all of them available in adequate numbers. For a time a shuttle service of cub planes was set up to supply the division in areas far from the coast, where lack of open spaces or nearness of the Japanese made air drops from cargo planes impractical.

When the supplies and equipment came to the infantryman facing the Japanese, he had what he needed for jungle warfare. There was K-ration, a full meal in pocket-sized package, or the 10-in-1 ration, good, nourishing food for 10 men packed in a wooden box. There were bazookas, flamethrowers, and many other weapons specially built for jungle fighting. There was all the ammunition needed, and in the rear the artillery was firing Long Toms, 155-millimeter guns, with an ample supply of the big shells the Japanese feared.

The Leyte campaign was not an easy campaign from any point of view. It was a tense time when the Japanese Fleet tried to destroy the Third and Seventh Fleets a few days after the Sixth Army landed on Leyte. There were only four American divisions ashore and only the supplies that had been taken along for the initial assault. Over the next 2 months the Japanese were able to put four divisions on Leyte, in addition to the one already there when we landed, and this was in spite of our air and sea attacks against their reinforcements.

Right behind the Japanese Fleet that tried to run through Surigao Strait between Leyte and Mindanao there was a force of transports full of eager Japanese infantrymen who were ready to make a counterlanding on Leyte as soon as the American Fleet had been defeated. It is hard to realize now how close we came to what would have been a second Bataan, if the Navy had not beaten the Japanese Fleet in the three battles for Leyte Gulf.

The Thirty-second Division won the battle they fought in New Guinea, and they took their objectives in the Leyte campaign. The difference between the two lies in the cost of lives. Out of 10,000 men who went into action at Buna in the New Guinea campaign, 9,956, almost every man, became a casualty from death, wounds, or disease. On Leyte, against a Japanese force three times as large as the one they destroyed at Buna, only a quarter of the men in the division were casualties from all causes. That is what the success of the American production and supply program meant to the men in the foxholes.

The Thirty-second Division has a record in the Second World War that spans the long hard road back to the Philippines. I like to think that one of its many distinguished members, Col. Merle Howe, epitomizes the history of the whole division. Colonel Howe was from Grand Rapids and joined the Thirty-second while it was still in training in the States. In the division's first New Guinea battle, he served as staff officer for operations. That was no rear job. On December 5, 1942, when our men drove a wedge through the Japanese to the sea and every able-bodied man from the commanding general down was on the firing line, Colonel Howe was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross. He fought at Saidor and Aitape when the Thirty-second and New England's Forty-third smashed the entire Japanese Eighteenth Army. He was with the division on Leyte and in the last battle on Luzon along the Villa Verde Trail, some of the roughest and wildest country in the world.

At one time or another, Colonel Howe commanded each of the three regiments in the division. He lost his life after the final vic-

tory, when his liaison plane crashed while he was arranging for the surrender of General Yamashita. Colonel Howe in his long service saw the men of the Thirty-second fight through more than 600 days of combat, almost half the time the Nation was at war, one of the longest combat records of any division. He also saw American production grow from a trickle arriving at the combat front to a mighty flood. Many times during the terrible days before Buna, he must have wondered if adequate supplies would ever arrive. Many times on Luzon when supplies were plentiful, he must have looked back on the barren days, regretting the men who died short of arms and ammunition and food.

That must never happen again. American lives must not be wasted, nor must our fighting men struggle to win us a respite in which our production plant can get started. We plan no war. We are working for a lasting peace. But a realistic regard for our own security requires that we be prepared for aggression. Temporary extension of selective service, unity of the armed forces, universal military training, these are important measures, but they are not enough unless we are assured the supplies necessary to equip our forces. In addition to a plan for the mobilization of manpower, we must have a plan for the mobilization of industry. The firing line starts in Detroit.

Twice in world wars, we gained the time to prepare from the fighting of our allies. Almost certainly we will never again get the same chance.

No system as intricate as the American production structure can be shifted overnight from a peacetime to a wartime basis, unless in advance there has been an exhaustive survey of all the facilities that will be needed, as well as a sound plan for their integration into a wartime economy. By planning now, we can assure ourselves against a repetition of the shortages and lacks that cost the Thirty-second Division so dearly.

Last week I announced the creation of a Research and Developments Division as a top level General Staff organization to coordinate Army research with the activities of industry and educational institutions. Plans for operation of this Division were completed by General Eisenhower shortly before his departure for the Pacific. The Division will be primarily interested in the application of national scientific resources to the solution of military problems. Its director will act as liaison by the Army planning chiefs on one hand and industry and the universities and research laboratories on the other. Through it the ablest civilian research groups in industry and science will work on the broad problems in their fields affecting national security.

Should war again come to us, Detroit and all industrial America must be able to exploit fully scientific developments and mobilize quickly to save American lives.

In the meantime we face a critical manpower situation in the Army which I feel it incumbent on me to discuss in some detail.

The Selective Service Act will expire on May 15, Wednesday of next week, unless Congress takes action on or before that day to extend its operation. The time is short. The issue is urgent. I wish to set forth, as plainly and simply as I can, the reasons why I believe that the safety of the country, and of every man, woman, and child in it, requires that Selective Service should be extended.

We won the war last year. The great task now is to make certain that it stays won. It will not stay won if we pull out of Germany and Japan. If we pull out, the chances are that we will be fighting a third World War in the near future.

But we will be obliged to pull out of Germany and Japan, if we allow our Army to dwindle away until it is too weak to occupy them. We would then be in the position of asking for another war. The maintenance of peace comes down to the point, therefore, of Army strength.

The Army's requirements in manpower, if it is to do what the country expects of it by way of preventing another war, is a force of 1,550,000 men by July 1 of this year. The requirement is estimated to drop to 1,070,000 by July 1 of 1947. These estimated requirements represent the best judgment of General Eisenhower, and they are the minimum requirements. Not even the most severe critic claims that they are too high.

Unless selective service is extended beyond the dead line of May 15, we run a grave risk that these minimum requirements will not be met. I say this because the results of our recruiting drive do not show any likelihood that we will have anything like 1,550,000 volunteers by July 1 of this year, or 1,070,000 by July 1 of next year. I will give the facts as to the recruiting campaign, so that you may judge for yourselves.

The campaign for enlistments, in the 7 months it has been under way, has brought in 730,000 volunteers. That is a good figure on the face of it, but it is nothing like the number needed. There are two factors in connection with recruiting that should be brought out, if the entire picture is to be understood.

The first is that the rate is dropping. The biggest month was last November, when 185,000 volunteered. There has been a steady decline ever since. In March we obtained 72,000. The results in April, partly estimated, were in the neighborhood of 60,000. The other factor is that 46 percent of the enlistments are for the short terms, 18 months and 12 months. It is fairly certain that the greater part of these short-term enlistments would not have been obtained if the Selective Service Act had not been on the books. There was the liability for military service in any event, and that fact was a strong incentive for volunteering. It is also certain that these short-term enlistments will begin to expire soon, and the problem of recruiting others to fill their places will be presented.

It is fairly plain, therefore, that if Selective Service is permitted to expire by inaction, the number of volunteers will be far short of requirements. There will be a sharp drop in recruiting after May 15. There is one other resource, the nonvolunteers already in the service. But we are committed to release them on completion of 2 years' service, and we would prefer to release them on completion of 18 months' service, if that course is in any manner possible. It surely is fairer to induct men who have never served at all than to retain men in the service who have already put in a substantial period of time. The load is not heavy if it is spread among the many rather than confined to the few.

That is the case for extension of Selective Service prior to next week Wednesday. It is a case for preventing the horrors and sorrows of another war.

I have heard no logical argument on the other side. Some say, "War is terrible, let's have no Army." That is the quickest way to have a war, if experience counts for anything. Some tell us simply to go out and get the necessary number of volunteers. We are doing our best to get the greatest number possible, but we have no Aladdin's lamp to rub. Some say that the Army is trying to bring in a permanent system of military conscription, under guise of a temporary extension of Selective Service; in other words, that the Army is acting in bad faith. I know of no responsible Army officer, from General Eisenhower and General MacArthur down, who would not prefer to have an Army made up solely of volunteers. Possibly there are still other arguments, but I have heard none that does not represent wishful thinking, none that faces up to the facts of the world we live in.

If an extension of Selective Service is passed by Congress, an extension in substance and not merely in form, there is the assurance—no gambling—that we will have the necessary resources in manpower. I believe that the extension should be for 1 year. The legislation might provide that no one inducted should be obliged to serve beyond 18 months, and it might provide for the discharge of all fathers. These provisions would not weaken the security of the country. But it would be definitely hazardous to couple with the extension, as the House has done, a condition for a 5-months holiday from selective service and a condition exempting all 18- and 19-year olds. The fact is that if these ages are excluded there will be only a handful subject to induction. The men in the twenties have already served or have been deferred for sound reasons.

This Nation, I firmly believe, has a great destiny. We must do all in our power to make sure that it is a destiny free from the curse of war, free from the fear of war. That will not be our destiny in case we should be the only country to disarm in these fateful and unsettled times.

The decision whether or not to disarm will be made within the coming week. Peace has never yet been won through weakness.

Because French OPA Created Tyranny and Drove Out du Pont, America Has Nylons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the scene is France. Headed for the guillotine was Pierre Samuel du Pont de Nemours. For du Pont had persistently exposed the swindle of the OPA.

Robespierre, director of the OPA, had issued the executive order sending du Pont to the gallows.

But Robespierre died; the order was canceled, and du Pont's life was saved.

Because of these dramatic events in France—

Milady today has nylons.

Your bread and many foods come wrapped in protective cellophane.

Lovely rayon yarns abound in the textile industry.

Plastics, Duco paints, and countless other chemical miracles come out of du Pont laboratories, bringing comfort and pleasure to millions of American households, including yours and mine.

"Wait a minute," you interrupt, "there is some mistake here. No fellow named Robespierre has ever been head of OPA. And besides the OPA is an American idea, started in 1942. Where do you get this stuff about OPA way back in 1795? What have du Pont and nylons got to do with France in 1795?"

The connection is exciting. It is a 150-year-old story behind today's events that illustrates "truth is stranger than fiction."

FRENCH OPA STARTED BY POLITICIANS

In 1790 the French Government launched on a spree of reckless spending. Dupont and other members of their legislature opposed this spending. But they were outnumbered, and so the New Deal of 1790 got under way.

Soon the cost of living began to rise. It became hard to get various necessities, especially food. So in 1793 the ruling politicians created an OPA called the Law of the Maximum. What for? To conceal from the common people the inflation created by their reckless spending since 1790.

This French OPA, like our own, fixed all prices. For a while it seemed to work fine and almost everybody was happy. Men like Dupont, who had opposed it, looked foolish, because the evil results they had predicted did not appear immediately.

But before long factories began to close down. They could not operate profitably. Then farmers stopped bringing their produce to town, because they could not exchange the money received for manufactured goods. Many storekeepers, their shelves empty, went out of business. Others went into the black market to keep from going broke.

CRACK DOWN ON BLACK MARKETS

As black markets spread, the Government passed new laws with stiff fines, imprisonment, and even the death penalty for OPA violations. They cracked down on black markets. As people in the cities got hungry, the products of the farmers were often seized.

The tougher the OPA got, the worse became the shortages. To share the misery, ration books were issued entitling each citizen to certain amounts of food. They persecuted, fined, imprisoned, and/or cut off the heads of those who opposed OPA.

DUPONT FOUGHT FOR THE PEOPLE

But Pierre Dupont refused to be terrorized by governmental threats. He made speeches in the legislature, and with his own print shop he issued pamphlets pointing out the deception of the OPA.

The promoters of the French OPA had no radio or movie to propagandize with. So they did not fool the people very long. Started in 1793, the French OPA blew up in 1795. The tyrant Napoleon took over France.

But in that short time OPA had ruined the working classes and thrifty people generally. Speculators and unscrupulous people had enriched themselves.

From 1790–95 Pierre Samuel du Pont was a member of the French Assembly. When the promoters of OPA became desperate, they determined to get rid of du Pont. He was succeeding too well in his efforts to show up the trickery of OPA. du Pont was listed for the guillotine.

Because of the death of OPA director Robespierre, du Pont's death sentence was commuted. But he was imprisoned. His pamphlets were suppressed. And he narrowly escaped brutal exile to a penal colony.

DU PONT FLEES TO AMERICA

The years of persecution and the tyranny of Napoleon, that followed OPA in France, worried du Pont. So, like many other patriots, he felt compelled to leave his native land. He cast longing eyes toward America, a land of freedom and opportunity.

The year 1799 saw du Pont start to America with his family. They arrived on our shores on New Year's Day, January 1, 1800. Promptly du Pont, his sons, and associates looked for a place to start a factory.

After some search, a farm owned by Jacob Broom near Wilmington, Del., was selected. Broom charged the DuPonts $6,740 for his farm of 95 acres, which became their first factory site.

After early struggles and some changes, the name of the firm became E. I. du Pont de Nemours. E. I. were the initials of Eleuthere Irénée du Pont, the younger son of Pierre Samuel.

OPA REWARDS CROOKS—ELIMINATES HONEST MEN

If Pierre du Pont were alive today, he would find Director Bowles threatening and terrifying OPA opponents almost like Robespierre did in France.

Of course, no one is actually marked for the gallows here—at least not yet. But the tactics of terrorism are in full swing.

Here are some little-publicized facts. Four thousand four hundred and fifty-four small businessmen recently answered a confidential questionnaire. Because they did not have to sign the questionnaire, they felt free to speak their minds.

Over 75 percent, or three out of four, reported they were afraid to approach OPA. They feared a "crack down" for even asking questions. Seventy-five and eight-tenths percent felt that Government agency practices limit their freedom of speech. Does that sound like America—or like Germany or Russia?

Well, France tried the OPA and drove out the du Ponts. Hitler tried OPA and drove out the scientists that helped make the atom bomb.

Now comes our 1946 Robespierre, Mr. Bowles. He threatens and smears all Americans who do not agree that Mr. Bowles can change God's law of supply and demand.

Equally important are the ugly OPA consequences that do not get into the papers—the black-market fortunes—the moral corruption—and the profiteering by those having the right underground connections.

In Germany, Rauschnigg called it the "planned corruption" by the Nazis. You can put your own label on it here.

WILL WE REPEAT EUROPE'S BLUNDERS?

Students say that history always repeats itself—will that happen now? France was crucified by the OPA its politicians foisted on it. Germany met the same fate from the same economic regimentation and OPA. Will America be enticed into that same trap?

Will the Communists, the CIO, and the cunning New Dealers who would claim OPA is only temporary have their way? Then that terror and totalitarianism would be ahead—riding the wind of a "phony" war against inflation—inflation created by those who pretend to fight it.

Suppose Pierre Samuel du Pont were to rise out of his grave today. Probably he would wonder if he had only been asleep—that the OPA terror of his legislative days was still going on.

Then, as he thoroughly awakened, he might prefer his grave again, muttering to himself, like the movie-goer, "This is where I came in."

The Present-Day Labor Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, every congressional office these days is flooded with letters and telegrams protesting against the coal strike, and asking why Congress does not do something about it. Because the following letter from the Chamber of Commerce of Rockford, Ill., outlines the situation confronting the Nation so well, and because it also offers constructive suggestions for possible legislative action to correct the situation, I extend the same as a part of my remarks on this subject for the consideration of my colleagues:

ROCKFORD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Rockford, Ill., May 11, 1946.

Hon. NOAH M. MASON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MASON: The following statement and resolution was approved at a special meeting of the board of directors held at 11:30 a. m. May 10, 1946:

"Continued industrial strife is jeopardizing the security of Rockford family life and is having disastrous effects upon our national economy. The causes and effects of this strife can no longer be ignored by any citizen.

"Intelligent legislative actions must and can be designed to eliminate most of the causes of industrial strife.

"We are no longer interested in economic theories—we are interested in earning a living.

"We now have two simple facts with which to deal—whether or not production can be maintained long enough in any one year for any man, laborer or manager, to earn sufficient money to support his family; and whether or not corporations, large or small, can produce a sufficient amount of salable products to stay in business or continue to provide job opportunities.

"Management and labor in one plant or one industry in the past usually have been able to weather the storm of their own difficulties, but no family unit or organization can exist when constantly forced into continued idleness due to the acts of others beyond their control.

"Today one major strike after another is wiping out the cash reserves of employees and employers and official notice of over 1,000 more strikes have been given to the Government.

"We believe that management, labor, and the public are interested above all else in family security, food, and clothing.

"We know this security cannot be obtained if major strikes are to be continued in the future as in the past.

"We all know that plants closed or operating part time cannot produce the needs of this Nation or make any contribution to the needs of a hungry world.

"We also know that one cannot 'legislate' industrial peace any more than human behavior, nor can we have permanent security by curing the effects of strikes rather than the causes.

"Most of the causes can be cured.

"It is Government's function to clearly define the rules of good conduct in any labor dispute, and Government's function is limited to that.

"Congress can write the rules that would be fair to both management and to labor.

They must be enforced and administered impartially through judicial court procedures.

"The board of directors of the Rockford Chamber of Commerce, therefore, recommends the following labor policy to our elective Representatives in Congress:

"We urge all citizens to endorse this action by letter or wire to their Senators and Representatives.

"In making our recommendations, every effort has been made to consider the public welfare first, and to suggest only those things which may be achieved through amendment to existing laws. Enactment of new laws and the creation of new bureaus and governmental services, particularly at this time, will only further confuse an already confused citizenry and weaken our basic labor legislative structure.

"LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

"The repeal of the following clauses in section 17 of the antitrust law, which exempts labor unions from the application of that law, would correct most of our fundamental labor abuses:

" 'Nor shall such organizations, or the members thereof, be held or construed to be illegal combinations or conspiracies in restraints of trade, under the antitrust laws.

" 'Repeal the Norris-LaGuardia Act—which is a law providing immunity to labor union leaders from the authority of the Courts of Equity—authority to which all other people are subject.'

"Only by making possible through existing court procedures the legal prosecution of all individuals and corporations whose conduct is injurious to the public welfare can we hope to protect the general public from such abuses.

"The National Labor Relations Act, which states the principles, methods, and rules under which collective bargaining shall be carried on, should be amended to include the following general principles:

"1. Employees shall have the right to organize and bargain collectively with employers.

"2. The rights of management to manage and operate the business without interference on the part of the employee shall be clearly recognized, and no assumption by the union of the functions of management or its interference in the field of management shall be permitted.

"3. Both employers and employees shall have equal rights and responsibilities under the law.

"4. The Constitution of the United States guarantees the right to work, and that right shall not be conditioned upon membership or nonmembership in any organization.

"5. It is injurious to the public welfare to permit corporations or labor unions to directly or indirectly contribute to the campaign funds of any party or to utilize any of their funds directly or indirectly for political or campaign purposes.

"6. Prohibit payment of any money or royalties by employers to any employee representatives and prohibit receipt of any money by employee representatives from employers, except union dues.

"7. Any violation of these practices shall deprive the guilty party of all benefits of the National Labor Relations Act.

"The Ball-Burton-Hatch bill now pending in the Senate might be utilized as a vehicle for these amendments.

"The immediate and apparently pressing need for the establishment of arbitration procedures has resulted largely from the causes outlined above. If we can correct existing labor abuses and establish and enforce equitable rules for true collective bargaining, there will be little if any need for establishing compulsory procedures of arbitration. We recommend that legislative action be deferred on this subject until such time as the effect of the above changes can be determined, and the whole subject appraised from a more realistic and objective point of view. Meanwhile, we suggest:

"1. The mediation and conciliation services of the Department of Labor be strengthened.

"2. Careful inquiry be made into arbitration procedures in the field of governmental units and services affecting public health and safety.

"3. Provisions for arbitration procedures at this time be left to the discretion of labor and management in making individual contracts."

Yours very truly,

FRANCIS C. SPENCE,
Secretary.

Disaster at Leonardo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, a week or so ago a serious explosion occured in the unloading of a warship at the Leonardo Pier of the naval ammunition depot at Earle, N. J. Seven men were reported missing, and many were injured while property suffered damages as far away as 15 miles from the point of the explosion.

The cause of the explosion has not yet been determined, although the Navy and others are conducting investigations but it seems quite clear that no carelessness was involved. The handling of modern ammunition at all times is dangerous and requires experience and discipline. That the loss of life was not greater and that the fire resulting from the explosion did not do more damage was due to the prompt and efficient work of the enlisted men and officers under the command of Capt. Gilbert C. Hoover. In spite of the imminent danger of additional explosions, these men went to work to conquer and control the spread of the flames. They deserve a great deal of credit for their bravery, their fearlessness and their efficiency.

This is recognized in a recent editorial of the Newark Evening News of May 2, 1946, which I include herewith in my remarks:

DISASTER AT LEONARDO

Courage, discipline, and swift resort to disaster controls combined to avert at the Earle Naval Ammunition Depot pier what we are told could have been one of the world's worst explosions. As it was, seven men were reported missing and many injured in blasts that rent the U. S. S. *Solar*. But considering the huge stores of ammunition awaiting disposal on railroad sidings and aboard ships at the Leonardo piers, the toll of dead and injured was relatively light. This must be attributed not only to brave and quick response to the emergency by the *Solar's* crew, but also by the personnel of the depot, Navy and civilian.

In a matter of minutes, all injured were removed from the wrecked and burning ship. Fire boats and trucks attacked the blaze aboard the *Solar*, still stocked with quantities of unexploded ammunition. From the *Solar's* and an adjacent pier, tugs towed to safe anchorages in the bay four ships loaded with explosives. Railroad crews, ignoring danger, hauled inland strings of ammunition cars after one of them had blown up. Red Cross units, first aid squads and ambulances from shore hospitals within a radius of 20 miles were swiftly mobilized.

In the light of this demonstration of coolness and efficiency, it is regrettable that so many exaggerated and false reports of the number of dead were permitted to gain circulation. This unhappy circumstance, calculated to spread anguish among many of the families of naval and civilian personnel, could have been avoided. It would have been, too, had Navy public relations policy been allowed to function as effectively as other controls.

The Flint Journal Bedtime Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Flint Journal of May 7, 1946. The author of this editorial is Robert C. Herrick, an ex-GI and a former reporter of the Flint Journal where he is now employed. This editorial is well worth reading and I recommend its perusal by all those interested in fundamental American principles.

BEDTIME STORY

The following story is to be told only to very young children, preferably under the age of 5, for a cursory reading will reveal it would test the credulity of children over that tender age.

Once upon a time in the not-too-long ago, there was a fair land blessed by Mother Nature with bountiful gifts. It was a beautiful land and a big land that stretched for miles and miles in all directions. It was so big, in fact, that even a giant wearing seven-league boots would require days and days to cross it.

And this land was covered with great forests and waving fields of wheat and corn and oats and rye, and under the ground were vast supplies of oil and coal and precious minerals. And all over the land were great sprawling factories belching forth smoke and producing automobiles and electric refrigerators and vacuum cleaners and washing machines and innumerable other things which made life much easier in this land than in any other land on the face of the earth.

At night electric lights flashed on all over this enormous land, making the cities as bright as day, and if you were riding in an airplane or were up high in a very tall building and looked down, the twinkling lights of the cities would make you think of flashing diamonds and rubies or perhaps the Milky Way.

And the people who lived in this land were the happiest people in the world. They were happy not only because they had so many more material things like autos and radios than other people had, but because they had a thing called Liberty, which permitted them more freedom than any other people in the world enjoyed.

This Liberty, however, had not been a gift of Mother Nature. The people had conceived it and had fought and died for it and had maintained it only by jealously guarding it.

And as a symbol of their liberty there stood in one of the great harbors of this marvelous land a tremendous statue, arm raised high

with a torch in which burned the Light of Freedom.

It was a beautiful sight, this statue with its torch of Freedom pointing toward the heavens, and many strong men returning to this land after having had to defend their freedom and liberty, wept to behold it, so glad were they to see the light still burning brightly.

And this land was ruled over by a kindly man elected to his high position by the people. It was a position of great importance, because, you see, the people depended to a great extent on his leadership for their welfare. They trusted him.

When he took office many of the men were away fighting to protect their freedom and liberty, and it was not long before the enemy had been defeated, and all the people thought they would return soon to the happy days they had known before.

But in this land there dwelt an ogre with big black bushy eyebrows who smoked big black expensive cigars and who thought he was greater and stronger than any other man. He was the leader of a band of gnomes whose job it was to dig out of the earth the coal which provided the power for the factories and the trains and which furnished the electricity used to make the cities as bright as day.

One day the ogre called all of the gnomes out of the mines and told them to go fishing. Many of them would rather have stayed in the mines, but, so great was his power over them that they dared not disobey. So they went fishing.

And soon the factories had used up all the coal they had piled up in reserve. And the trains stopped running. And the big factory smokestacks, one by one, stopped belching smoke, and the workers went home because there was no more power to run the machines they worked on. And the lights became dimmer and dimmer and no longer looked like diamonds and rubies or the Milky Way.

And the ruler of this great land said the situation was alarming and ordered the lights turned off in the dome of the big Capitol Building and in the big White House in which he lived with the plaintive plea that he hoped other folks in the land would do the same thing to conserve the coal.

And the ogre with the big black bushy eyebrows laughed and laughed because he was proving he was the strongest man in the land and he lit another big black expensive cigar.

What's that, children You want to know if the light in the big statue went out too?

That will have to be another story because, you see, the light here has grown so dim it's impossible to read any more tonight.

Political Repercussions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF ICWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, many people not acquainted with the true facts are constantly blaming the Congress for failure to take some definite action in the coal-strike situation. Certainly such criticism cannot fairly be made of the House of Representatives which has consistently taken the initiative in passing legislation which might at least partially solve some of our labor-management problems.

The following editorial taken from the Sioux City Journal of May 9, 1946, clearly points out where the responsibility lies:

POLITICAL REPERCUSSIONS

It is because the party in power in Washington fears political repercussions that it does nothing to rescue the American people from the chaos in which they are floundering as a result of industrial strife. The Truman administration has inherited from the Roosevelt administrations the hands-off labor policy, with the result that minority groups such as the United Mine Workers of America, feel free to go to any lengths to get what they want regardless of the damage to the Nation's economy.

The Democratic Party wishes to stay in power. Its leaders hesitate to take the initiative in legislative treatment of industrial controversies for if organized labor became dissatisfied with measures adopted and employed its might mean a loss of support at the polls when elections were held.

The leaders in the administration still think in terms of "clear everything with Sidney." They don't want to alienate the affections of the Greens, the Murrays, the Reuthers, the Hillmans, the Lewises, hence they permit industrial strife hurtful to the entire population of the country. They decline to assume responsibility for the welfare, happiness and success of the people, all of them, which the Constitution plainly says is theirs.

In failing to take definite steps toward solution of problems that arise from time to time in the industrial field for the reason that they fear political repercussions, the Government officials may have failed to realize that they would invite political repercussions from the majority element of American life. For the aggregate of all the labor unions in the country would be only a fractional part of the voting strength of the Nation. It could happen that the majority would decide that the party in power lacked the courage, the initiative and the ability to take the steps necessary for national well-being. That would be a political repercussion of an entirely different kind from that which the party in power obviously fears.

The Government leaders ought to know that industrial strife such as the country has suffered since early last fall, lowers the national income by billions of dollars. They also ought to know that Federal revenue derived from the earnings of workers and profits of business enterprises declines along with national income. And after that they could not escape the knowledge that as revenue declines it becomes necessary to revies taxes upward to meet budget requirements. How, then, do administration officials think the American people will feel about paying still higher taxes as a direct result of this loss in revenue caused by declining income superinduced by industrial strife? Can't they see that voters in scores of millions will express their disapproval of such loose methods of administering the affairs of the Nation?

As surely as the administration in Washington continues its do-nothing policy and permits this go-as-you-please free-for-all in industry that menaces the well-being of the American people, it will be held responsible. And it ought to be held responsible.

Government exists for the good of the people, all of them. But our Government today is afraid of losing the votes of minority groups in coming elections while apparently ignoring the fact that it stands to lose the political support of the majority. It's almost as bad as if administration officials could not add 2 and 2 together and determine that the result is 4.

Address of the Earl of Halifax, Retiring British Ambassador to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including therein the farewell address of the Earl of Halifax, retiring British Ambassador to the United States, broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Saturday, May 11, 1946:

I have been asked to say a few words to my American friends before I sail for England on Monday night and I am most grateful to those who have given me this opportunity. During the nearly 5½ years that Lady Halifax and I have been here, we have indeed made many very good friends. We have also visited every State in the Union; and that, as British Ambassadors go, is a record—which cannot well be beaten until you add to the number of your States. And wherever our travels took us, we found a warmth and a welcome such as we had hardly a right to expect.

We cannot say goodbye to all those we have met in all the States separately, as we would wish to do, but that they will understand and forgive. So I would like to begin by sending a special message of gratitude and affection to them all from us both, wherever they may be tonight.

May I go on to let you in to a secret? When I came here as Ambassador in January 1941, I felt very much as I did when, as a very small boy, I went to school for the first time. I didn't know if you were going to like me, or, for that matter, I was going to like you. I only knew that I was entering a strange new world, where I was certain to find a great deal of difficult work to do. And now that my time is up, I can tell you quite truthfully that no small boy who ever went to school for the first time met with such kindness as I met with here or had so fine a time as you have given me.

After all, it might not have been like that. We passed through some dark days together. They were times of war, filled every day with the anxiety that war brought; anxiety often about the many problems arising from the collaboration of our two countries; the sort of troubles that are bound to arise in a partnership between two peoples, who had had very little practice in the art of working together and sometimes found each other's ways, and even each other's language, a bit hard to understand. Yet when troubles and misunderstanding arose between your country and mine, I soon found I could talk about them to you with complete frankness—just as if I were talking to my own people; for I knew that at bottom you would feel about them just as I did; that though they might be annoying, they were less than dust in the balance against the great, compelling forces that brought us together in war and will still, please God, keep us together now the war is over. And in our future reckoning there is something we can add to that. For while it has always been true that on the deep issues of human life we thought alike, we have now the memory of those years which we spent together in a comradeship of work and suffering and finally of victory. And that will count for much in the years to come.

Most of us are conscious of living today in an uncomfortable world. It is full of ques-

tions, to which no man at present can return a sure answer, and of problems, for which there is no quick or easy solution. Sometimes we are beset by doubts—of the reality of the victory we have won, of the extent to which we can all work together to insure the world against the scourge and tragedy of war, of our capacity to use aright the new and fearful scientific knowledge we have acquired. But as we pick our way across this boggy and uncertain country, presently we come to a patch of good firm ground on which we can stand and be secure. And that ground, of course, is the friendship and cooperation of the peoples of the United States and the British Commonwealth. It has been said that whenever we are depressed and feel the world is out of joint, the right remedy is to count our advantages. So when we feel that the times in which we live are difficult and uncertain, a good remedy is to remember this one big fact; or better still, to take out a map of the world and look at the United States and the British Commonwealth and Empire; to measure what they add up to in population, in natural resources and in industrial power, and above all, to think what will be the effect if this massive weight is placed solidly behind the United Nations Organization in its work for a peaceful and ordered world. I don't know how you feel when you look at it like that. I know that for myself each time this thought comes into my mind it fills me with new confidence for the future. For we know that the power you and we have will never be abused, that it will never be directed against the rights or liberties of other people, that there is nothing selfish in our friendship, for we are ready to be friends with all who will be friends with us, and that our joint strength may be for the world a strong guarantee of peace and justice. Don't let us ever forget, either, that the strength of the United Nations is the dedicated strength of its members, it can never be more than that, and if we do not place this mighty force behind it, we shall be doing something less than our duty, not only to the idea for which it stands, but to those who have given their lives to win for us this great opportunity.

Here we can well give a lead, which we may pray that all other peoples of good will may be glad to follow. There is a world of difference between leadership of this kind and dictatorship of the kind we saw in Germany, Italy, and Japan. The world does not want dictators; it has had quite enough of them; it rightly lays at their door all the loss and suffering and sorrow of these times. But it does need and will always need the sort of leadership your people and mine can give, the sort of leadership that only people who are free themselves can give to others.

That need has never been so sore as it is today. There are the problems now with us of making peace after the upheaval of a war that has torn whole countries asunder, wiped out their frontiers, and uprooted their populations. There are the problems of keeping the peace when we have made it. And apart from all that, now, at this moment, as I am talking to you, we face the dreadful fact of famine in Europe and Asia. There has not been a catastrophe on such a scale within human memory, probably never in all recorded history. Millions of people are threatened with starvation and death. An overwhelming majority of them are humble folk, who only wanted to be allowed to live their lives in peace, and yet this terrible thing is happening to them. And I do not think that you or I, or any decent-minded person will sleep peacefully or eat happily if we are not able to feel that we are doing all we can to help them. Here is something that calls from both our countries for the same quality of effort and leadership which brought us through in war.

But I didn't really want to say much on these grave matters to you tonight. I meant to say goodbye, and in saying it to try to tell you a little of what I feel for this country, which has been my home for so many years. As I have gone about the United States and talked to all kinds of people, I have often heard forebodings for the future, prophecies of all the troubles that are likely to come crowding in on you now the war is over. Of course, there will be troubles, plenty of them, but if I know anything of this country, they are not going to get you down. The other day I was reading again the great poem which Wordsworth wrote about this country and mine some 130 years ago at the end of another great war, when people were saying much what they are saying now. He was giving them their answer and he ended, you may remember, with those splendid lines—

"Some fears unnamed
I had, my country—am I to be blamed?
Now, when I think of thee, and what thou art,
Verily from the bottom of my heart
Of these unfilial fears I am ashamed.
For dearly must we prize thee; we who find
In thee a bulwark for the cause of men."

And that is what America can be today—a bulwark for the cause of men; and so it will always be as long as you have faith in yourselves and in the greatness and future of your country.

Well, my friends, to say goodby as I am trying to say it to you tonight, from Lady Halifax and myself, is inevitably a sad business. Five years' roots grow deep, and there must be sadness about leaving a land for which we have come to have so deep an affection and parting from so many who have shown us such constant kindness. But we plan to return here before too long, not as an Ambassador and his wife, but as ordinary citizens; and because that is our hope and our purpose, we won't say goodby in English, but in American, We'll be seeing you.

Conditions Facing Drafted Boys Serving Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from a recent article in the Washington Times-Herald by John O'Donnell.

If the facts asserted in this article are true and their authenticity is declared, every Member of this body ought seriously to ask himself whether he is willing to vote to send young American boys of tender age into this atmosphere.

The following account of conditions which face drafted boys appeared in the May 6 Washington Times-Herald, in John O'Donnell's column:

The overseas job of the chaplains, medical men, MP's, the experts on soldier morale, etc., is one long, thankless headache. Without comment, we produce this authentic petition presented to our United States Army provost marshal's headquarters in Tientsin by the ladies of the evening in that Chinese center. It bears the date of March 21, 1946, and is signed by the Tientsin Union of Prostitutes and Professional Entertainers. It reads, in official translation:

"Petition of Union of Prostitutes and Professional Entertainers to the reception committee of the Allied Forces.

"Subject: That the price fixed by the provost marshal of United States for United States enlisted men at 50 cents (United States) is too low to meet the livelihood of the prostitutes.

"Contents: According to the complaints lodged by the prostitutes and professional entertainers to the office of the union prostitutes, it is known that there was no fixed price for enlisted men who visit the Chinese hotels. However, the usual payment for each time was one American dollar.

"Recently, the provost marshal of the United States Marine Corps has notified the managements of the hotels that the prices for the prostitutes would be 50 cents per visit which cannot cover the expenses of the girls; the following is a list of the daily expense of an average girl:

"1. Expenses for the pro-station established by the United States armed forces as per girl CNC (Chinese national currency), $40,000.

"2. Hotel rental as per day, $600.

"3. Tax, $70.

"4. Food and servant, $1,200.

"5. Miscelleanous, $400.

"Total, CNC, $2,310.

"Provided that the marine pays $1 each time, out of which 20 percent will be deducted by the hotel management for necessary soliciting and interpreting fees, the girl will only get 80 cents net. If she entertains two guests per day (health permitting) her net income will be United States, $1.60, which is equivalent to about $2,880.

"With the price fixed at United States, 50 cents per visit, a girl receiving two marines will only have a daily income of CNC $1,440, while her expenses are CNC, $2,310, with a deficit of CNC $870. Even with the price fixed at United States, $1 per visit, there is only a small amount left over to support her family. Moreover, by so doing, the girls have to forsake their Chinese patrons who are paying much higher prices.

"Thus we beg to ask the help of the reception committee to relay the matter to the provost marshal of the United States Marine Corps, so that the fixed price may be raised from 50 cents one United States dollar and that tips might also be allowed.

"Tientsin Union of Prostitutes and Professional Entertainers, 21st March story."

The Government and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from El Mundo, May 8, 1946, regarding conditions in Puerto Rico:

[Translation]

THE GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY

Some statements made by Mr. Muñoz-Marín to the foreign press paint a picture of relations between government and private industry in Puerto Rico in a manner that does not respond to the truth.

While all the Nation is moving toward reconversion to put again in the hands of private enterprise the business and the industries that the government had partially directed because of the war emergency, the president of the senate assumes that in Puerto Rico everything must be to the contrary; that private enterprises here function

in reverse, and for that reason the government has to engage in industries. Mr. Muñoz Marin speaks of obligatory socialism in saying: "In Puerto Rico the government takes the initiative for the industrial and agricultural development. The government of Puerto Rico does not desire to assume this responsibility, or to perpetuate it, but it has to do it in view of the failure of private enterprise to realize its duties to society."

The truth is that private initiative has functioned in every manner it could, and while the majority group directed by the same president of the senate has been in power, the legislature has not approved any law which could be truly said to be a real stimulant for private enterprise in industry. Actually, this group has established a policy of red tape that has discouraged the investment of private capital and the government has on many occasions entered into open competition with private industry which is already established.

The initiative of the insular government has not been used in regard to those enterprises of which private capital is afraid, as indicated by Mr. Muñoz-Marín. The initiative (if it could be called initiative) has been used to take business and industries already established and to establish business in competition with private industries or to start at enormous cost some industrial ventures of doubtful success in spite of the privileges the government enjoys.

Let us look at the general picture of industries and commercial activities engaged in by the insular government.

In regard to transportation, the insular government did not invent the business nor establish it in Puerto Rico. It bought a private bus line, solicited the help of other private bus lines, and now wishes to throw overboard those Puerto Rican private enterprisers who invested their money in busses.

In the same line of activity, the spokesmen of the government have advised that their field will be extended to the purchase of railroad, steamship and airplane lines. In all of these enterprises the government is not going to invent anything nor is it going to risk money because private persons do not dare to do so. It is ridiculous to say that there is no private capital willing to be risked in steamship or airplane lines.

Another industrial activity of the government has been the purchase of suger mills. Already they have purchased three. It is absurd to say that the government has entered into the sugar business because private capital would not assume the risk. What the government has done in this case is to expropriate industries established by private initiative. And it has done it after having regulated and put under its jurisdiction, by means of the public service commission, all of the sugar mills in Puerto Rico.

They are accustomed to show with pride the cement plant that has been successfully operating as a governmental agency. It is well to remember that the plant was a Federal project and not one of the insular government, that the factory has been working unde advantageous conditions, charging excessive prices and benefiting by the scarcity during the war emergency, and that still the business has not shown its competence in a normal period. Still, it is possible to see the difference between government administration and that of private industry, by observing that the Ponce Cement, a private business started much later, is already producing more than the government.

In the electric industry, the only case that we believe government administration is justified in order to establish general distribution of our scarce natural resources, the government is risking the principle that we have defended, by planning an increase in its rates instead of benefiting the public by offering lower rates.

What other enterprises does the insular government maintain? The bottle factory, established at an enormous cost, much more than would have cost to private enterprise, is functioning at a loss and without a very brilliant future. Its contribution to the chronic insular unemployment has been to give employment to some 200 persons by an original investment of $3,500,000.

The ceramic factory is not yet in operation and we do not know what its results will be. We know that it will give employment to an insignificant number of persons. Can this also be called government initiative? The factory has been built, eliminating one that already existed belonging to private enterprise, one which had to be sold, fearing government competition. Is this how the obligatory socialism of Mr. Muñoz-Marin is risked?

The cardboard factory has not begun to function. It has had many difficulties in obtaining sufficient water since all of the original studies were incorrect. A question mark dominates this governmental initiative.

The development company which has pretended to interest private capital in its enterprises has not been able to offer more than an impotent minority intervention. The government wishes private enterprise to help carry the load without having a vote in how the money is spent. They have not had the good faith to amend the law in order that conditions will be equal.

Its sister, the agricultural company, we know how it has been functioning: Doing over in a bad way that which private enterprise has been doing better. Its last initiatives are to pretend to enter into the manufacture of cigars in competition with an old industry, and to establish a candy factory in competition with candy factories established by private capital.

The government now is looking to enter the field of radio and there are seven stations and petitions for a dozen more.

This is an incomplete sketch of the situation that prevails between the government and private industry. In what way does it sustain the thesis of the president of the senate? When private industry receives government help, when it is not punished and does not have to match ruinous governmental competition, when it is not backed into a corner, only then can it be said in justice that it is not complying with its social function.

A Letter to Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter addressed to each Senator and Representative of the Congress of the United States by Bradford W. Thurston, president of the New England Executive Board of the General Welfare Federation of America, West Newton, Mass., on social-security extension.

IS CONGRESS ASLEEP ON SOCIAL SECURITY EXTENSION?

NEW ENGLAND EXECUTIVE BOARD,
GENERAL WELFARE FEDERATION OF AMERICA,
West Newton, Mass.

DEAR SIR: You certainly will want to believe that your constituents think of you as a supporter of all constructive legislation which will produce the greatest good for the greatest number. Both parties, Democrat and Republican, and all deeply thinking citizens, have approved the idea of the Social Security Act, but believe that the benefits should be extended to a greater number of workers. We are urging you, as a forward-looking statesman, to put your shoulder to the wheel and get actively behind this popular demand for a broadened Social Security Act. Permit us to call your attention to the following quotations from the report of the Ways and Means Committee's security technical staff:

Page 10: The present system results in some individual inequities. But far more important, it leaves many in gainful employment entirely unprotected and results in capricious and uncertain protection in an enormous number of cases. The exclusion of about two out of every five jobs is the AOSI coverage. The movement into and out of OASI coverage is such that some 72,000,000 have wage credits but less than half that number have an insured status.

Page 20: Several aspects of OASI are discussed as well as changes * * * extension is the most pressing. The present system so long as it excludes a large part of the jobs however otherwise improved must of necessity possess many very serious limitations and offer unpredictable protection.

Page 34: Conclusions. As long as the coverage of OASI is limited, the eligibility requirements which are necessary will continue to give rise to anomalous and inequitable situations and to interfere with attainment of the fullest social good under such a plan. The staff's study indicates that the only feasible method of elimination such situations is general extension of OASI coverage to employments now excluded, and that delay in this extension will result in greater rather than lesser problems.

Rarely has popular demand been better substantiated by technical investigation. We ask your wholehearted cooperation in enacting these important conclusions into constructive legislation.

Three years ago I was in Washington for 1 week, and in that time I interviewed 85 different Congressmen, Democrat and Republican. Every one of the 85 admitted that they thought that social security should be extended to those not now covered. "What has Congress done? Are they asleep?"

The Ways and Means Committee did appoint a subcommittee to investigate pension bills, also the Social Security Act. They have given their report in over a 700-page book and recommend that the social security should be extended to cover those not now covered. Congress just now, before election, seems to think about the veteran, and justly so, but they seem to forget that the veteran has or did have a father and mother that would like to have some security in their old age, and not have to go to the welfare board in their city or town and say they are paupers to get help.

Wake up, Congress, and do something for these veterans' fathers and mothers. Extend the Social Security Act and let our fathers and mothers live on a pension they have worked for and paid for, so as to save their self-respect.

Sincerely yours,
NEW ENGLAND EXECUTIVE BOARD,
GENERAL WELFARE FEDERATION OF AMERICA,
By BRADFORD W. THURSTON,
President.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

I include the following statement of Bernard M. Baruch before the Rules Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., November 21, 1941:

I am not quite sure I know what my assignment is in appearing before your honorable body. I was flattered by the invitation which I was told was unanimous and I am hopeful my coming may not be without benefit. I am at your disposal to answer any questions within my power after I have made, with your permission, a brief statement.

It seems to me as a layman this powerful committee is as much concerned with the element of timing as it is with substance. I am under the impression that you are to reach a decision as to when legislative consideration should be given to a price-control bill, as well as to what that bill should be.

NEED FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION

On this theory I shall attempt to point out to you the imperative need for action—now. It is unnecessary for me to tell a group so experienced in public affairs, that timing is always as important as content. Action too long delayed is dangerous, whether such a situation arises on the battle front or on the home front.

It may be true that we cannot always achieve the counsel of perfection but it is equally true that we should reach for it. We must always remember that frequently halfway measures are just as dangerous as no measures at all.

Therefore, it becomes relevant for me to say at the outset that I am in favor of the over-all legislation which takes into consideration those control points which my experience and observation have taught me are essential. Essential, not merely for the purpose of preventing run-away prices, with an immediately destructive effect upon our standard of living, but which also have a definite part in the quantity and quality of our military supplies. Their absence might cause us to lose the peace even if we won the war.

I have in mind here the question of a low price structure, the maintenance of which is absolutely essential to our present and our future welfare; the maintenance of which will put us in the position to support life in the American way when peace comes as it will eventually.

Permit me to make these suggestions:

1. That the Congress give immediate consideration to a price-control bill.

2. That such consideration be based upon as wide a front as possible, which means the development of control that shall guarantee a sufficiency, at minimum prices, of the three necessities of life—shelter, food, and clothing.

3. That in setting up price limits, there must be controls established on rents, on agricultural schedules and on wages—on everything.

4. That all segments of society must be treated equally and profiteering eliminated. We must really take the profits out of war as we have promised to do for so long, and as I was among the first to urge.

5. That control of prices must march along with a sound taxation program; profit and money control; increase of production of raw materials and goods; substitution; standardization and simplification; conversion of facilities; subcontracting to use small as well as big establishments.

We should not confuse price inflation with currency inflation. While the ultimate results of both are the same and are equally destructive, they flow from two different sources. The one comes from increased purchasing power but limited supplies due to the inexorable demands of war. The other comes from cheapening the currency through the printing press, regardless of the metallic base. That causes flight from money into things, with a resultant skying of prices and total exhaustion of supplies.

The first is the cause of the present rises, which are being accentuated due to increasing defense requirements, now something like $67,000,000,000 in appropriations granted or asked for.

Protection against both evils lies in the controls I have here outlined.

The longer the delay in coming to grips with the problem, the harsher will be the measures that have to be taken. Inflation proceeds in a spiral. First one price goes up, then another. The worker, his living costs rising, demands higher wages. That jacks prices up some more and so it goes.

Once the race has started one group will go ahead temporarily, another group will be at a disadvantage. Those who are lagging will cry "wait." In an inflationary race, there is always someone who needs "catching up." If inflation is to be prevented a halt must be called to rising prices. It is far easier to do that before the race has begun.

Frankly, the two points that have caused the greatest contention are control of agricultural prices and wages. In my advocacy of over-all control, it follows that I am in favor of setting up limits on these two factors.

PARITY—NO HIGHER

It does not seem to me to be open to discussion that farm prices must be regulated. I have for many years been an advocate of agricultural parity. I was among the first to believe that the farmers for too long a time had been given a rotten deal. However, at this moment I am not considering the good of any single segment of our population but I am setting as my standard the good of all. In so doing, we must realize that this good can best be achieved by common contribution. We have substantially attained agricultural parity; that is, a proper relationship between what the farmer is paid for his product and what he has to pay for the stuff he uses. I do not want to jeopardize this parity by asking too much now—reaction would be bad.

Even more contentious is the control of wages. I think my record clarifies my position on this point. From my earliest years I have always opposed the old idea that labor is a commodity to be bought at the lowest possible price. I believe the worker is entitled to a thoroughly fair share of the wealth he helps to create. Perhaps even a little more, since he has been so long ground down by conditions that are now slowly changing. But I am opposed to an inflationary wage scale, and I agree completely with the President that no advantage should be taken of the present emergency.

There are many fields in which labor is still inadequately paid. These conditions would necessarily play a big part in arriving at proper levels in our control structure. Let it not be forgotten that sometimes a rise in wage would be actually less in real wage because of the increased cost of living.

WAGES WOULD NOT BE FROZEN

In setting up a wage or any other control I do not advocate freezing existing schedules. Adjustments would be made in wages or prices whenever necessity exists. I would have special consideration given to wage rates to see that they are adequate to maintain life in accordance with the American standard. I would have the rates susceptible to increases, and perhaps decreases, upon the establishment of changes in the workers' income and the workers' outgo.

I believe the proper administration of an over-all bill would be able to survey the changing aspects of our economic and social conditions and make adequate provision against inequalities and injustices. I would have the final price schedule submitted directly to the President of the United States for his approval as was done in the last war. I would take this step not because I desire to saddle him with extra responsibilities but, were he to give his official endorsement to the pronouncement, the public would accept it.

Let me interject at this moment, a piece of evidence that I find in the New York Herald Tribune, dated November 19, on the first page. The dispatch, written by a wholly reliable journalist, Allen Raymond, from Somewhere in Europe, after a long stay in Rome whence he recently came so as to escape censorship, reads thus:

"They tell in Rome of a rich Milan industrialist who recently met a farmer in the country who was carrying two pigeons. 'How much?' the industrialist asked. The farmer, who did not want to part with the pigeons, asked the fantastic price of 100 lire. 'Sold', said the rich man. 'You eat the lire and I'll eat the pigeons.'

"That indicates what Italians think of their money today. The country is in the grip of a swift inflation. The government is believed to be spending about 80 percent of the national income for war purposes and collecting about 20 percent of that amount by taxes. Most of the balance rolls from the printing press in what is called money.

"The cost of living has risen about 50 percent since the start of the war, and the government's policy of blocking prices on a few commodities has proved futile. There is a boom in common stock, despite punitive taxation on transfers and increases of value. The rich have been putting their money into rural land, antiques, works of art and jewelry—anything tangible that may be expected to survive the collapse of the currency. The poor have been tightening their belts to buy rationed food.

"When I left Rome most of the stores had been virtually empty for 20 days. The government had commanded them to stay open but had forbidden the sale of anything with textile or metal materials. You could not buy a spool of thread, and practically no household utensils were available. This paralysis of trade was said officially to be indicative of the need to work out a rationing system for all the country's products, so that the people, according to the government, could share equally, as a proletarian people fighting a war under fascism might expect to share. But fascism is a monumental fraud, as far as the proletariat is concerned, and the rationing system is not likely to work.

"The stores in Italy were closed partly to protect the Italian people against their German ally. Germans were pouring through the country by thousands, civilians as well as soldiers. They were armed with plenty of money and were buying up everything they could lay their hands on which was not available in Germany."

The article goes on but the rest is not especially relevant to our theme today—price inflation. That has infinite capacity to disjoint and upset our whole social and economic system. It is that danger that concerns us all and which I presume has caused you gentlemen to ask me to appear before you.

I know nothing of procedural rules. I have not come to give you advice as to how the legislative calendar should be formed, but I repeat again that unless steps are taken and taken now, we shall be in a situation acutely dangerous. In fact, that situation is beginning at this time.

Due to the depth of my conviction that we should protect our people against inflation, a characteristic of all wars, I believe protection should be established, not here and there, but everywhere. To me that means the over-all bill.

WE MAY LOSE THE PEACE

The arguments for action now are well known. I have outlined some of them in my testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee on September 19 of this year. The arguments that have to do with the future are equally important. What is the use of surviving the war, if we cannot survive the peace? We can win the war and

win the peace only if we preserve a low-price structure. That does not mean depression of the wage scale as some pretend. That means a continuous and developing flow of production. The production must be not merely enough to supply our national needs but to supply the great unfilled needs of all the world, dammed up until the war ends. We shall be the arsenal of peace only if our prices are kept low so that our goods may have access to every market, everywhere.

We must always remember that price rises, affect to a far greater degree those of low incomes than those in the higher brackets. The little fellow has to use all his money for the actual necessities of life; he has nothing to spare for luxuries and little for comforts. He is the helpless one whose fate should concern us most.

I have previously indicated the effect of rising prices upon the wages of public employees—teachers, policemen, firemen and others working for the Federal, State, county and city governments. These wages total billions. If they are not to be heavily increased we must see that the earners are given full opportunity to buy the things that preserve life on a reasonable scale. This becomes doubly necessary when we recall that the low-income groups are now subject to inescapable taxes, both direct and indirect, which have the effect of further reducing their buying power. It is all very well to try to effectuate a system whereby purchasing power shall be restricted, but gentlemen, I beg you to remember, this should not, does not, and cannot apply to the purchase of absolute living necessities. And the longer the emergency continues, the greater need for taking positive measures to see that life is made livable through adequate supplies at prices within the pocketbooks of all.

PROTECT THE HOME FRONT

Here is a thought too often lost in the welter of action:

The home front is as important, perhaps even more important, than the battle front. The morale of the civilian population marks our victory or defeat. Let me recall to your mind that the German armies remained in being when the armistice came. As an organization they were undefeated. That is why Foch could not ask the sword of Hindenburg, which Clemenceau asked. It was the collapse of the German morale that forced the peace. That same thing seems to be coming true in Italy today. I am one of those who thinks that, given time, it will come true in Germany too. With you, I am determined that it shall never happen here.

If I were asked the question I should say it was of final importance to preserve the morale of our civilian population. As a matter of fact, there is no such thing any more as a separate body of civilians. We are all part of the defense program. We are a nation in arms. So we must fit ourselves to defend the country on all fronts instead merely of attempting to put a fighting force on the sea and in the field. There is no surer way of destroying civilian morale than to make living too difficult.

This protection must be even-handed: It cannot advance the interests of any one group at the expense of another.

STANDARDIZE ESSENTIALS

I shall not take your time now to talk about standardizing certain essentials such as housing, clothing, food, etc. My intent, when I expressed that thought recently, was not to stereotype or regiment the Nation; not to goose-step the people with everybody having the same food, the same clothing, and the same housing, although that time may come, unless we are careful. My thought was to employ our mass production to turn out in cheapest form those essentials that today are high in cost because of their variety and frills. I made mention of this in my letter of November 18 to Mr. Gore.

One final thought: It is difficult to perceive the whole of the enormous and beneficial effects of a sound price-control measure. It has an effect upon every aspect of our national life, and it will have a direct effect upon the problem of small businesses, too.

We cannot and should not standardize thought unless and until national policy is declared. Then we must all close ranks and act in unison. Through the impact of mind upon mind, we shall be benefited by discussion as to what those policies should be. I believe in the democratic system with full debate. However, I suggest there is one standard that we should raise and support in considering any question: Does it strengthen our national defense and advance the interests of our people. After consideration comes action. With action there must come unity. It is unity or defeat. It is freedom or slavery.

The Housing Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the New Deal majority in the House of Representatives has passed a $400,000,000 housing subsidy which will eventually become known as a political subterfuge, because it has no relation to the problem of home building for veterans. It is not even earmarked for the purchase of building materials. If this political slush fund were to be used to encourage the building of homes, the black market created by OPA regulations would defeat the effectiveness of it as a means of erecting reasonable priced homes for veterans.

The release prepared by Mary Latham clearly states how the black market functions in the lumber market because of OPA regulations, therefore I insert the release in the Appendix of the RECORD as part of my remarks:

(By Mary Latham)

A prominent southern wholesale lumberman recently said that 80 percent of the lumber being produced today is going into the black market rather than into the regular channels of distribution.

One result, he added, is that the purchaser of this lumber is paying $10 a thousand feet more for rough green lumber than he normally would pay for good seasoned lumber.

Many thousands of homes are needed throughout the country and lumber is one of the most critically short materials required for the building of these homes. The lumberman's statement that the buyer is paying a much higher price for rough green lumber than he normally would pay for good seasoned lumber and that 80 percent of the country's production is being sold in this way forms a discouraging picture for the war veteran in search of a home as well as for the everyday American citizen who has no GI rights of any kind but does need a roof over his head.

This businessman said that honest men who obey all Government regulations are being forced out of business by unprincipled persons who would not pay attention to such regulations unless policemen were at their sides. He described such operators as driving their trucks to the little sawmills out in the woods, filling them with raw lumber bought at a high price, and then driving them away—ready for customers who do not mind paying black-market prices for what they want.

To enforce the regulations, he continued, is impossible. It would take a big army of inspectors constantly on the job. The only solution he sees to the problem is for the Government to let the businessmen be free to operate their businesses without strangling regulations which are obeyed only by honest men. This would kill the black market and would give the public a chance to get its building materials from dependable concerns at prices which would be forced to the right level by keen competition, he believes.

A few weeks ago a contractor in a southern city took out permits to build eight homes at a cost of $15,000 each. They were to be built for war veterans. The contractor was asked how much these houses would have cost the purchaser 5 years ago. "About $6,000 or $7,000," was his answer.

The person who tries to buy a house that was built several years ago finds the same problem of high prices. Houses built for $6,500 or $7,500 are bringing $15,000 or more because of the acute shortage. Families are seeing nest eggs saved up for a rainy day going into the purchase of homes at greatly inflated prices.

When the housewife has found a home she may think her troubles are over. But the search for the things she needs for this home will be another sad experience. Recent studies of the rise in prices in food and clothing in a southern city showed that today's dollar is worth about 50 cents in comparison to what it would buy a few years ago. The same holds true for many items of furniture. At this season there is much interest in porch furniture. Lounge chairs, plentiful 5 years ago at $12.95, are bringing $19.95 this year. Metal chairs, which sold at $3.19 5 years ago, are advertised at $6.88 today. Ordinary deck chairs, which brought $1 5 years ago, are selling at $4.95 this year. Glass-top tables are, in many cases, more than doubled in price. Fiber rugs advertised at $14.95 in 1941 are selling for more than twice as much this year. Living-room, bedroom, dining-room, and kitchen furniture prices are up a great deal—as anyone who goes shopping or looks in a display window knows all too well.

While the prices that must be paid are very distressing to the family of low or moderate income, the fact that shortages make it impossible to buy many necessary items is discouraging, too. The retail dealers say they can't get the stock of household furnishings they need for their customers. The buyers of sheets, towels, pillow cases, and other home necessities often have no merchandise—or very little—to offer. Such conditions worry the retail merchants as much as they annoy the housewife. They are looking forward to the time when American homes and the supplies needed for these homes are plentiful once more, and many of them believe this day is being needlessly postponed by unwise Government regulations.

Let's Quit Crabbing and Get Down to Business in United States, Roger Babson Pleads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. THOM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, the following statement from Roger Babson, emi-

nent financial student and writer, calls on the American people to get down to business and forget their worries:

BABSON PARK, MASS., May 10.—Compared with any other land on earth, we, the people of North America, now are sitting on top of the world. Relative to any former period, we today have the greatest opportunity, both as to current conditions and future prospects. When you tune out the radio croaking long enough to attend to solid facts and figures, you sense the speed of recent reconversion. The outlook is much brighter than some of the outlookers.

During the recent big strikes there was an interval when a little grousing by me and others was, perhaps, excusable. It was a kind of low Monday morning, a natural let-down after the victories of 1945. That period of indulgence, however, has gone; and I recommend that the time has come for all of us to cut out the crabbing and resume business. Despite the actions of labor leaders here at home and of Russian leaders abroad, the situation, fundamentally, is cheerful. Today, the chief cause for complaint is the chronic complaining.

The time for growling and grumbling is when the goose hangs high, with everybody feeling smug, self-satisfied, and overcomplacent. Then crepe draping and fault finding may do some good. Crabbing can help to restore balance. Today calls for pressure on the opposite side—for assurance, cheerfulness, good nature. The very disputes we deplore arise in part as a reaction of the widespread mood of dissatisfaction and lament. It is time to reverse these negative trends.

LOOKS TO UNITED STATES

This need for a more constructive spirit is doubly true in view of the new role of the United States in world affairs. UN leadership will not be won by formal diplomacy, but by the daily attitude which our people demonstrate. What would our international status become if measured by today's chorus of self-condemnation? Our global standing will not be helped if the United States becomes known throughout the world as Uncle Squawk instead of Uncle Sam.

NO DEVASTATION HERE

Particularly impressive are the reports of technical observers who have been surveying the economic ruins of Europe. One of these experts set down a cold-blooded appraisal of the wreckage. Then his feelings got the better of him and he summed up his engineering data: "Blessed is the land that has known no bombs, where everyone has plenty to eat and where people are not worn down by years of deprivation."

America took full share of combat, but we led the world in production. We have come to possess industrial facilities beyond anything heretofore imagined. Our research and technique in a few years scored advances that normally might have taken a quarter century. America has cause for great thankfulness. Yes; I am still bullish on the United States.

NEW HIGHS AHEAD

After the V-days Washington prophets forecast dire unemployment. They were wrong. Furthermore, instead of sagging, retail trade has soared, brisk even in strike-bound areas. Overriding the shortage of goods and stoppage of output, business vitality has defied the grief mongers. Ample buying power points to still further expansion.

Besides the stricken nations of the world, there are key groups of our own people right here at home who should let up their gloomy forebodings. A reconversion to confidence will aid wage workers to raise output and aid farmers to raise crops. A holiday on crabbing will put fresh heart into postwar plans of executives and returning veterans, extra pep into campaigns of salesmen.

BLACK-OUT THOSE BLUES

This country has been chosen as the site of the future United Nations world capital. In the light of this honor it is particularly important that America should regain its ancestral fortitude. In some misguided moments it may have appeared that America had switched its national emblem from the eagle to the crab. This dour mood must lift. Instead, we should make the most of the unprecedented opportunities. To capitalize to the full our abounding material and spiritual resources we need the positive formula: Rather than crabbing about yesterday, let us count our manifold blessings for tomorrow.

Visionary World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article entitled "The Visionary World Government," by Ira E. Bennett, former editor-in-chief of the Washington Post, which appeared in the March-April edition of National Defense News, published by the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution:

THE VISIONARY WORLD GOVERNMENT

(By Ira E. Bennett, former editor-in-chief, Washington Post)

The favorite argument of the advocates of a world government is shaped in the form of an analogy:

"The nations should form a world government, just as the American States formed the United States Government. This Government should join others in forming a world government that would be strong enough to prevent war among nations, just as the United States Government prevents war among the States."

That is a plausible analogy—until analyzed.

The statement that the American States formed the United States Government is startling news. It is a discovery worthy of the genius of those who propose, off-hand, that the Government shall make a parricidal end of its creator, the Constitution.

By examining the Constitution, which apparently they have neglected to do, the advocates of world government could make another discovery whose importance might impress them. They could read the first three words, "We the people," and thus identify the power that created both the Union and the Government. In the meantime, not knowing that important fact, the world-government enthusiasts say:

"The United States Government should join others in forming a world government."

So it is proposed that the Government should ignore the people and the Constitution.

It was not always supposed that the servants of the people had been granted such sovereign powers as to enable them to overrule the people. In the horse-and-buggy days when defeatism was unknown, and when men gloried in the American system instead of defaming it, the true nature of American sovereignty was expressed by the Supreme Court without mincing words. Mr. Justice Matthews, for example, delivering the opinion of the court in the case of *Yick Wo* v. *Hopkins* (118 U. S. 356), said:

"Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts."

This opinion was uttered before the discovery of the atom bomb. Therefore, it is obsolete, according to the defeatists and alarmists who now rely upon a streamlined Supreme Court to modernize the Nation. Although panic has almost deprived them of reason, the world-government zealots pin great hopes upon the Supreme Court, in view of recent decisions which seem to concede that the Government possesses unlimited sovereignty. Whatever others may do, it must be admitted that the Supreme Court is not dilatory. It not only keeps pace with the atom bomb, but outdoes it in demolishing ancient landmarks. The court has discovered that truth is transitory and subject to revision. It has not yet expressly declared that the people are not sovereign. When it does so, the court might be asked this respectful question: "By what authority do you act as a court?"

Some very able men have confused the United States with the Government of the United States. They have assumed that the Government itself is sovereign.

If asked how the Government would effect the change whereby the present system would be abolished and the United States placed under a world government, these gentlemen probably would answer, "By treaty."

Is the treaty power so great? Is it not only able to ignore or overrule all other powers delegated by the Constitution, but to exercise all remaining sovereignty which was supposed to be reserved by the people?

Let us see what Justice Story had to say on this point:

"A power given by the Constitution," he says, "cannot supersede or interfere with any other of its fundamental provisions. Each is equally obligatory, and of paramount authority within its scope; and no one embraces a right to annihilate any other. A treaty to change the organization of the Government, to annihilate its sovereignty, to overturn its republican form, or to deprive it of its constitutional powers, would be void; because it would destroy what it was designed merely to fulfill: the will of the people."

This was another preatomic opinion. How could Justice Story be expected to know that a world government is the only means whereby civilization can be prevented from committing suicide? And that the plan must be put into effect immediately, before someone touches a button in Booriboola-gha and obliterates New York City?

Some of the proponents of world government are ready to submit the whole question to the people—not only to the people of the United States, but to the peoples of the world. Their idea is to call a constitutional convention composed of delegates from all nations belonging to the United Nations, for the purpose of amending the Charter that was born just before Hiroshima. Instead of a league of nations, they propose a government deriving its specific powers from the peoples of the world for the prevention of war.

So the idea is that American delegates shall sit in a world convention for the purpose of drafting a world constitution to supersede the present Constitution of the United States. Where is the authority to appoint such delegates? There are only two lawful methods provided for initiating amendments, and neither of these is proposed by the world government antibomb enthusiasts. Do they intend, then, to resort to bloodshed and war in order to amend the Constitution? Let us hope that even in their haste they will not stain their souls with blood.

Old fogy ideas cling to the American Constitution like soil upon a torn-up vine. It is almost impossible to break away from the

ideas of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and John Marshall, notwithstanding the utter ignorance of all those worthies in such matters as nuclear fission and atomic bombs. The world-constitution party must still conform to ancient rules in pushing forward their great project of scrapping the Constitution. They must either persuade two-thirds of Congress to propose an amendment or induce two-thirds of the States to call upon Congress for a convention; and then, after the amendments have been framed, they must induce the people of three-fourths of the States to approve them.

In view of the hair-trigger nature of the atom emergency it is disheartening to contemplate the long delay that must intervene before a world government can grapple with the danger. Possibly some of the enthusiasts may decide to turn from total idealism and inject a little realism into their calculations, just for expediency's sake. Perhaps they may conclude that the United States as it stands, barnacles and all, is as tough as any other nation, and able to take care of itself for the time being, pending the coming of the far-off event toward which the whole creation moves.

UAW-CIO Statement of Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a statement of policy as adopted at Chicago, Ill., on April 19, 1946, by the international executive board of the United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, UAW-CIO:

POLICY STATEMENT

On the basis of the decisions of the Atlantic City Convention and the problems that were referred by the convention, the international executive board hereby adopts the following statement of policy:

1. WAGE POLICY

Higher wages did not result from any so-called partnership of industry and labor. Our big wage victories had to be fought for and won. These wage increases must be obtained from the technological advances in industry and profits and not through higher prices. They must not be sweated from the workers through a speed-up. Hence, we repudiate all plans attempting to link wage increases to increased manual productivity, since such plans encourage the cutting of workers' wages if they fail to reach standards of production arbitrarily set by the company without employee participation.

We further declare that while profits must be considered as a factor in asking for wage increases, they must not be the deciding factor in determining our wage demands. We reaffirm our historic position that capital is entitled to a fair return on its investment, but that the worker must not be penalized because of the technical production inefficiency, faulty merchandising policies, or other short-comings of management.

Within this policy our union decides as follows:

(a) "Industry-wide bargaining and national wage agreements" has far too long remained an empty slogan in our union. This goal can be achieved only by having all wage contracts expire simultaneously industry-wide. The immediate steps toward this goal shall be:

(1) The International Executive Board shall appoint an International Wage and Contract Policy Committee.

(2) This committee shall work with the assistance of the competitive shop department and research department, the wage and hour councils, and other departments of the international union to establish minimum uniform wage and contract standards to cover the main classifications of work in plants under UAW-CIO jurisdiction.

(3) That no agreement on wages or other issues of collective bargaining shall be approved by the international union, its officers or representatives which fails to meet the minimum standards thus established.

(b) The effort to eliminate wage inequities in a single corporation or plant is not a departmental problem but must be the concern of the entire union. This policy must receive the full attention of all officers and regional directors and must be undertaken in the plants of all corporations. The elimination of wage inequities within the plants is an important step toward elimination of wage inequities in the industry.

(c) For the purpose of working toward wage equalization at the higher levels of the skilled workers' rates in captive and jobbing shops and to work out other skilled trades policies, each regional director, in cooperation with the International Wage and Contract Policy Committee and the Skilled Trades Department of the International, shall call regional conferences of skilled workers within 60 days. This shall be followed by a national conference within the following 30 days. On the basis of the decisions of this conference the International Executive Board shall adopt a comprehensive skilled-trades program for our union.

(d) Our union has not yet decisively won the battle for equal pay for equal work for men and women workers. In many plants we are still plagued by the lower-paying "female classification of work." The terms "comparable quantity and quality of work in comparable operations" are narrowly interpreted by management in violation of the equal pay principle. To protect both men and women workers we must break down these narrow interpretations and win equal pay not only in contract words but also in deeds.

(e) Where piecework systems still exist the companies in most cases are proceeding to cut piecework rates in order to take back part of the blanket wage increases which they were forced to give. We must fight these cuts and continue our efforts to eliminate the piecework system entirely. We reaffirm our policy established at the 1943 Buffalo convention that piecework systems of compensation shall not be instituted or extended.

(f) Besides these immediate aims our union must conduct widespread education for our long range goals such as the guaranteed annual wage and the 30-hour work week with 40 hours' pay.

(g) It shall be the policy of the International Executive Board to fight for the establishment of a vacation plan which will provide for time off upward to 30 days after 10 years' service.

(h) It shall be the policy of the International Executive Board to fight for the establishment of old-age retirement plans; funds to be provided for by the employers.

(i) In order to eliminate as much as possible the seasonal rise and fall of production of automobiles due to merchandising and mechanical problems, it shall be the responsibility of the International Wage and Contract Committee to work toward more equalized production thus eliminating the seasonal lay-offs as a result of model changes, etc.

2. CONTRACT POLICY

(a) Because of the concerted drive to break down price control we must oppose long term contracts and long term frozen wage clauses. The Chrysler formula which gives us the right to reopen wages on 60 days' notice is more attuned to the workers' interests under present conditions than closing our contracts for a 2-year period and freezing our wages beyond a 1-year period, such as the union was forced to accept in General Motors.

(b) We believe that wages must be separated from other contract provisions in collective bargaining negotiations. We denounce the efforts of some corporations to use wage issues as a bargaining point in an effort to weaken or destroy union contracts.

(c) We reaffirm our stand in favor of complete union responsibility in the execution of existing contracts and oppose, as detrimental to our union strength and solidarity, all forms of unauthorized or "wildcat" strikes, stoppages, or organized slowdowns. We must win settlement of our just grievances by actions that are in accord with our democratic constitutional procedures.

(d) We affirm that it is in the best interests of orderly collective-bargaining relations between management and labor and in the best interests of the Nation as a whole, that all managements grant union security clauses in contracts in the form of the union shop and the check-off of dues. We must fight to prevent any weakening of our union security. We must regain our lost ground on this issue in General Motors and win such union security for the first time in Chrysler and other corporations which have not yet agreed to this important phase of better labor-management relations.

(e) We stand unalterably opposed to, and will struggle to prevent or eliminate, any and all types of arbitrary penalty systems which the corporations have falsely labeled "company security." Such arbitrary penalty systems undermine normal collective bargaining relations, which are essential to effective and genuine settlement of labor disputes.

(f) The lack of a coordinated CIO strategy within the last wage drive was one of the major shortcomings which must not be repeated in the movement for better contracts next year. Our representatives on the national board of CIO must commence working now for a unified strategy under the leadership of President Phil Murray for the battles that lie ahead of us.

(g) Our opposition to any peacetime no-strike pledge must find its reflection in all contracts signed by the UAW-CIO.

3. PRICE POLICY

(a) We support President Phil Murray in declaring that members of CIO must join with millions of other Americans in repelling attacks on price control. If price and rent ceilings are destroyed and inflation results it is the worker who will suffer first. With the same persistence and energy that has marked our historic fight for wage increases we must resist all attacks upon price control. If the reactionary forces in America succeed in their drive to wreck price control, and prices skyrocket, thus plunging the Nation into inflationary chaos, such a situation will force the opening of the wages which have been frozen by contract provisions.

(b) To succeed in this struggle we must eradicate all illusions that we have already fought and won the price battle; that we prevented a price increase in General Motors products. GM cars already range from $66 to $417 higher than 1942 prices and will go up still higher under the OPA "adjustable price increase" formula for new automobiles. The battle to maintain price and rent controls, far from being won, has just begun.

(c) In our efforts to keep prices down we should not concern ourselves with whether the corporations are protected in maintaining their high-profit levels. The corporations are adequately capable of protecting their own profit levels without any help from labor spokesmen. In this connection we oppose in principle any plan to raise prices for corporation products during certain periods and lowering them during other periods of the year under the false theory that thereby employment will be evenly spread throughout the year, for the reason that this theory must inevitably lead to correlated proposals to reduce wages as prices are cut. We oppose any plan to cut workers' wages if living costs decrease by a certain percentage. Such a wage-cut plan was incorporated in a St. Louis contract signed by the garment workers' union. It must not be incorporated in any UAW-CIO contract.

(d) We stand unalterably opposed to the recent wage-price order of the Truman administration. CIO and all other labor groups opposed to inflation are fully justified in demanding that there be no more freezing of wages such as was imposed under wartime conditions. At the same time labor demands of Government strict and effective rent and price control to keep down living costs.

4. POLITICAL ACTION

Not only the forces of reaction but also certain groupings posing as progressives are striving to undermine the political arm of CIO—the PAC—and to damage the National Citizens PAC. We hereby reaffirm our support of the political action policy of the CIO and decide that through independent political action we shall:

(a) Work for the nomination of and give full support in the 1946 primaries to progressive candidates of either major political party who have pledged themselves to advance the domestic and foreign policies of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt.

(b) That where no candidate supported by a major party is acceptable to labor and the progressive elements in the community, we encourage the entry of independents or third candidates in the race.

(c) That we work toward the eventual formation of a broad third party based on the thinking and interests of millions of the labor, farmer, professional and other progressive people of our Nation. Such a movement can succeed if it is not prematurely launched on a narrow basis.

(d) In our political activities we shall not only expose the Republican and Democratic reactionaries but also shall make clear that President Truman and his administration are yielding and capitulating on issue after issue to the forces of reaction.

5. WAR VETERANS

The veterans of World War II are generally playing a progressive role in our Nation. Their special problems as veterans will continue for years to come, and hence we must favor the continuance and expansion of special organizational forms to care for the needs of our war veteran members. The international executive board hereby decides:

(1) The veterans' department of the international union shall be under the direction of a war veteran.

(2) Each regional director shall appoint a member of his staff who is a war veteran to coordinate under his supervision the handling of veterans' problems in the region.

(3) Periodic UAW-CIO veterans' conferences shall be held within the regions and also on a national scale.

(4) The decisions of the Atlantic City convention on Army hospitals and aid to disabled veterans shall be promptly implemented.

(5) We call upon Congress to amend the CI bill of rights to include:

(a) Unemployment-compensation benefits to veterans wherever a strike is in progress (and we shall work toward amending State laws on similar basis).

(b) Expansion of education and vocational training opportunities so that the veteran shall receive a subsistence allowance of $100 monthly with an additional $25 per month for each dependent.

(6) Adjusted service discharge pay to all veterans based on length and place of service; $3 for each day of domestic service; $4 for each day of overseas service; minimum of $100 and maximum of $3,500 for those performing no overseas service; minimum of $500 and maximum of $4,500 for those who served overseas.

(7) Endorse and promote the passage of Senator Wagner's bill to give all members of the armed forces and the merchant marine credit of $160 to their social security account for each month or fraction thereof spent in such service.

(8) Promote an increase of 30 percent in pensions to all disabled veterans to compensate for the rise in living costs.

6. WOMEN

Besides the struggle for equal pay for equal work, the International Executive Boards decides:

(1) For the inclusion in all UAW-CIO contracts of the model clause against discrimination and the model clause on maternity.

(2) That all regional directors stand instructed to disapprove any contract that discriminates against our women members.

(3) For the protection of seniority rights of women workers and to end unfair bumping and lay-off procedures we shall work toward the elimination of separate seniority lists for women, the final solution of which is to be found in the elimination of job classification based upon sex.

7. ORGANIZE THE UNORGANIZED

The UAW-CIO must undertake the organization of the unorganized together with the steel workers, electrical workers, farm-equipment workers, and the other CIO unions. Hence, we favor the establishment of machinery by the CIO structure of all jurisdictional conflicts.

The convention decisions on organizing the white-collar workers, dealing with the problems of runaway plants, and the assignment of an adequate staff to organize the unorganized workers in our industry, must be speedily carried out.

Each regional director shall lay plans in conjunction with local unions to organize the unorganized workers in the plants now covered by collective-bargaining agreements.

8. EXTEND INTERNAL DEMOCRACY

(a) The full resources of the international union must be extended to the convention committee which is now investigating the reports of gangster coercion against our membership.

(b) The fair-practice and antidiscrimination department of the international shall, with the full backing of the international executive board, undertake to eliminate unfair practices against minority groups and to promote through education the fundamental principle of equal rights, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

(c) The constitutional rights of our membership to belong to our union regardless of religion, race, creed, color, political affiliation, or nationality, shall be fully protected from all forms of Catholic-baiting, Protestant-baiting, Jew-baiting, Negro-baiting, and Red-baiting.

(d) Regional directors shall report to regional conferences of their local unions after each board meeting so that the membership can be mobilized for the execution of decisions.

9. FOREIGN POLICY

The UAW-CIO reaffirms its consistent stand for the defense of our own country. All of contemporary history proves clearly that the defense of our country rests on the solid foundation of collective security by the peace-loving nations. The Winston Churchills and William Randolph Hearsts who are trying to divide the United Nations are thus striving to lead our country to disaster. We favor independence for all colonies, the outlawing of peacetime military conscription and support world-wide economic cooperation. We urge the Big Three—Britain, Soviet Russia, and the United States of America—to iron out their differences and work unitedly inside the United Nations just as they successfully fought unitedly to defeat fascism during the war. On this issue we stand on common ground with international labor organized in the WFTU. We wholeheartedly endorse the WFTU, and shall do all in our power to induce our Government to secure representation of the WFTU on the Economic and Security Council of the United Nations.

10. UNEMPLOYED

While carrying out our other tasks we must not lose sight of the fact that large numbers of our members remain laid-off and thus have special problems.

The UAW-CIO must continue to build its unemployed committees in every local union, call meetings of its unemployed members, handle individual compensation and welfare cases and campaign for favorable State and Federal legislation for the unemployed. We must energetically fight for our just demand for a Federal minimum unemployment compensation standard of $25 for 26 weeks and fight for the federalization of workmen's compensation.

11. INTERNAL UNITY

The UAW-CIO, an industrial union, cannot be united on an orientation toward the AFL, which is based upon craft union theories. The top officers, regional directors, locals, and membership must be united around the policies of the CIO and under the stalwart leadership of President Phil Murray. The opposition to labor unity and to internal unity in our own union stems from the policies and actions of men like Lewis, Dubinsky, Woll, and Hutchinson of the AFL. These men are determined to split and destroy the CIO. They must not succeed. Unity behind the CIO program is the desire of the men and women who work in the plants under our jurisdiction. The international executive board pledges itself to work for the achievement of such a durable unity inside the UAW-CIO.

Upon the adoption of this policy statement the international executive board shall select a committee of seven members, four of whom shall be top officers, to bring in recommendations for the implementation of these policies.

The headquarters of UAW-CIO are at 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit 2, Mich. The officers are listed as follows: Walter P. Reuther, president; R. J. Thomas, vice president; George F. Addes, secretary-treasurer; Richard T. Leonard, vice president.

The international executive board members are Arnold Atwood, George Burt, Kenneth Forbes, Martin Gerber, Richard Gosser, Jack Holt, Charles H. Kerrigan, John W. Livingson, Percy Llewellyn, Joseph Mattson, Norman Matthews, Emil Mazey, William McAulay, Paul E. Miley, Cyril V. O'Halloran, Richard E. Reisinger, Thomas J. Starling, William Stevenson.

An Answer to Life Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Life magazine recently published an article entitled "Greed on the Farm." I wish to include in my extension of remarks a reply thereto made by Mr. Rufus Howard, president of the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture. Mr. Howard is one of Nebraska's outstanding citizens and is director of agriculture for the State of Nebraska.

The reply is as follows:

MAY 8, 1946.

To the EDITORS OF LIFE MAGAZINE.

SIRS: In your editorial of May 6, entitled "Greed on the Farm," you draw upon the legend of Robin Hood to indict the American farmer as a "corn engrosser," who "hoards grain until he can get famine prices." If I recall correctly, Robin Hood, who with his playful associates Little John, Friar Tuck, and Alan-a-Dale, robbed the rich to help the poor, was an enemy of the feudal barons, the king's foresters, and the Sheriff of Nottingham. In other words, he strove against officialdom and bureaucracy, not against the farmer who tilled his fields and tended his flocks.

It is true perhaps that the farmer has shown some desire to participate in the profits of the war period. It is also true that hoarding on the farms, where it exists, may be as reprehensible as the hoarding of clothing and other basic commodities by manufacturers, and the withholding of labor by labor unions, until they, too, can get famine prices. I refer you, however, to the report of the United States Department of Agriculture, released on April 29, which shows that all stocks of wheat are 40 percent below those of April 1, 1945, and that stocks of corn are 19 percent below that of a year ago. The movement of grain from the farms has been and is above average. Large shipments of wheat and corn are being made in compliance with the recommendations of the President's Famine Emergency Committee. These facts, I believe, are evidence that the farmer is not guilty of any general conspiracy in the matter of "hoarding," and that he does join with his urban brethren in the desire to relieve suffering in the famine-stricken areas.

You make comparisons of gross farm income of $10,000,000,000 before the war and $24,000,000,000 for 1945. Figures for cash farm expenses are not available for last year. However, farm expenses ordinarily amount to approximately 60 percent of the gross farm income which lowers the net farm income to less than $10,000,000,000. Since 18 percent of the population of the United States live on the land, the proportionate share of the national income received by farmers can hardly be considered excessive. In fact, farmers received less than 8 percent of the total national net income.

Your accusation that "Farmers went on feeding our dwindling grain supplies to their cows, chickens, and pigs" suggests a failure to understand the basic nature of our farm economy, particularly in the Grain Belt. Not only are these cows, chickens, and pigs an essential part of our own dietary requirements, but a proper balance between the growing of grain and the feeding of livestock is essential to a healthy agricultural economy. If the farmer were to change overnight from a grain-and-livestock farmer to a mere grain-selling farmer, he would suffer an immediate financial loss, would deplete his soil, and do an injury to American agriculture, which would be reflected years hence in a lower standard of living not only for our farm population, but for the American people as a whole, and perhaps those of other lands as well.

In one paragraph of your editorial you apparently attempt to distribute the equities fairly by pointing out that the farmer has been no worse than those engaged in other pursuits. I suggest, however, that one sentence in that paragraph might have been used as the title of your editorial, and should be your guide in future discussions of this question, "Let him who is without greed cast the first rock at the farmer."

Respectfully yours,

RUFUS HOWARD,
President, National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture; Director, Nebraska State Department of Agriculture.

Emergency Food Collection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID I. WALSH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech delivered by me over the radio at Worcester, Mass., Sunday, May 12, in behalf of the emergency food collection now in progress throughout the country.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies, gentlemen, and the radio audience, of all the pains and sufferings which the human family is forced to endure there are two types which are most debilitating and most destructive. Lonesomeness and hunger are the two.

The long absence of loved ones, the deaths of those near and dear to us, the maimed bodies and distraught minds of those we love, all create a feeling of loneliness that tortures the soul as do few other ills. Mothers especially, fathers, wives, sisters, and brothers experience this torture in time of war, but, unfortunately, the end of war does not mean the end of this agonizing feeling. Indeed, after the battles are over and efforts are made to return to normal living, the losses by death and impairment of mind and body may be intensified with the years.

This loneliness is one ill or suffering of the human family which is a consequence of the awful horrors of war. Unfortunately, the limitations of human nature prevent us from offering any definite cure. The only source of comfort that I know for those suffering the dread pangs of loneliness must be found in the spiritual realm.

The other human ill to which I have referred is hunger—the suffering as a result of want—the absence of food and the basic necessities of life. The recent war has accentuated this ill to tremendous proportions. Today, throughout the whole world, the specter of famine stalks—to a degree and extent inconceivable heretofore in the history of the civilized world.

Those of you who have read the appalling reports on the famine-stricken areas throughout the world, written by no less a humanitarian and war-relief expert than ex-President Herbert Hoover, realize the size and scope of the world food problem. We have more than the evidence of written reports. We have seen, and are seeing more frequently each day, photographic evidence of the effects of widespread malnutrition, of starvation, upon men, women, and children throughout the great land masses of Europe and Asia.

We all understand the underlying cause of the famine. The waging of the war made battlefields of wheat fields. In those grain-producing areas not directly within the lines of battle, production was curtailed because of the lack of manpower. The displacement of hundreds of thousands of people meant a further loss in ability to sow and harvest the necessary grain. Drought and the lack of implements added to the loss. Literally, as well as figuratively, the plowshare had been beaten into a sword. Wherever grain reserves were at all available, the reserves were soon depleted, if not destroyed.

No one can accurately predict how long the crisis will last. It will surely last through most of the summer. It may extend well into next year, for this year's promised harvest in Europe and Asia is dismayingly low. Some experts state that the world food situation is likely to remain critical for 4 or 5 years. Whatever the future, something must be done now to alleviate the world-wide suffering.

Horrible to contemplate is the fact that famine wreaks its effects upon children in such a way as to make the damage permanent. Rickets, tuberculosis, organic ills, malformations of the human frame are rampant among the children of Europe and Asia. Even if those millions of children survive, the terrible after-effects of starvation and of malnutrition may well remain with them to the grave. Bear this thought in mind as you watch America's healthy, happy children at play. You will instinctively visualize the picture I have presented. Then you will surely understand your spiritual obligation.

We must remember, too, that hunger causes unrest among all the affected people of all ages. Discontent and, subsequently, violence are often the result of empty stomachs. Unsound and dangerous political ideologies are often embraced because of the hope that such embracement will somehow, in some way, bring relief of hunger. Therefore, not only from charitable and spiritual motives, but for practical reasons, we, who are blessed with at least the frugal comforts of life, must share our bread with the less fortunate.

We, as believers in democracy, must prove that democracy stands for freedom from hunger as well as freedom of speech and freedom of conscience. We realize many of these suffering people are denied the blessings of free institutions that we enjoy, but, at the moment, the guaranty of freedom from hunger is our primary duty. However, I do not hesitate to assert that many of these peoples must also be helped on the road to freedom.

While we know that the war was the cause of most, if not all, of the hunger in the world today, we must remember that famine has struck everywhere, regardless of political faith or of participation in the war, or on which side the famine victims were forced. The famine has struck old and young alike. We cannot, if we possess but a spark of humanity, stand aside and watch the millions starve.

The emergency food collection for which I am appealing was organized to supplement the supplies given to the world's needy by the UNRRA. This type of food collection enables us to make a tangible contribution to the starving. Our donations to the collection may be in the form of money or of

canned goods. Our contributions, of course, are in addition to the food-saving measures that we, as individuals, are taking.

I repeat! Today, the world's newest and most terrible enemy is hunger. Today, the synonym for the most unsurpassed cruelty and misery in life is hunger. We in America really do not appreciate the meaning of the word. To us the word "hunger" denotes merely that mild alimentary itching which indicates the approach of another regular meal hour, but to 500,000,000 of our fellow men, and to every new-born babe in the world, "hunger" means starvation—literally starvation—and starvation that may end in death. To uncounted numbers in Europe and in Asia "hunger" has already meant that very thing—death by starvation. To many, this very day, it is meaning just that. Half the world can die—may die—from starvation unless we of this Heaven-favored Nation respond to the challenge.

Through the emergency food collection, Americans are being invited to meet and defeat the world-wrecking hunger as we met and defeated our enemies in the recent war. Hunger cannot be conquered through huge military forces, through the construction of a great military machine, through sacrifices and death on the part of our sons fighting on land and sea. Hunger of the millions can be conquered only through food.

Daily, hundreds, thousands are dying. Daily, millions are crying for just enough of the staff of life to keep them alive. And if we, a bountifully supplied America, do not hear and heed that call now, unnecessary death will be their fate. Knowing this, knowing all the suffering of body and spirit which is involved, knowing the tremendous effect it can have on the future of the world—can any of us hesitate in responding to the appeal of the emergency food collection?

Let me state the situation in brief. With millions of citizens economically displaced in Europe and Asia, with countless productive areas laid waste, there is no hope of preventing large segments of many populations from perishing of hunger this very summer except the hope that America will act. To contribute to the emergency food collection, fellow citizens, is to assist in conquering destitution, pain, suffering, and death from starvation.

In closing this appeal, I quote a beautiful and touching poem containing thoughts that have always deeply impressed me.

"Be gentle when you touch bread,
Let it not be uncared for, unwanted:
So often bread is taken for granted.
There is such beauty in bread;
Beauty of sun and soil,
Beauty of patient toil,
Wind and rain have caressed it;
Christ often blessed it."

Be gentle when you touch bread.

In conclusion, let us give bread to the starving, let us give now.

Development of the St. Lawrence River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Register, of Mobile, Ala., entitled "The Register Replies to Senator's Challenge on St. Lawrence Seaway." I may add that this editorial is in reply to one in the Detroit News which justifies the St. Lawrence seaway.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REGISTER REPLIES TO SENATOR'S CHALLENGE ON ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota, speaking from the floor of the United States Senate, has challenged the Mobile Register to answer, if it can, an effort of the Detroit News to justify the St. Lawrence seaway.

This we are glad to do.

First, a brief case history of how the Senator's challenge came about is appropriate:

Senator LANGER recently inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Detroit News whooping up the St. Lawrence project. The News argued that "the project's contribution to over-all national welfare would add to the prosperity of the opposing interests at least as much as it could possibly take away."

Observing this, a Register editorial stated that the claim made by the News is roundly disputed, and that the News, in making it, failed to offer substantiating evidence.

Senator LANGER wrote the News of what the Register had said and suggested "if you have any comments * * * that I could publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I would appreciate your sending them to me."

This spurred the News to another editorial. It declared now that as a power project the seaway will "produce more hydroelectric energy than TVA, at a lower cost," and that as a navigation project "it has no parallel." Also, that "the seaway will make a greater and more prosperous United States, of which Mobile and the Register, in case they have forgotten, are still a part."

Thereupon, Senator LANGER hurried this further editorial into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the remark that "I should like to have the Mobile Register answer the argument made by the Detroit News, if it is possible for it to do so."

That sums up the history of it.

We have fine-tooth combed, spyglassed, and otherwise carefully gone over the second editorial of the News. But still we have found neither hide nor hair of the evidence to back up a statement that the St. Lawrence seaway, by virtue of its contributions to "over-all national welfare," would put into the pockets of its opponents at least as much as it could possibly take out.

Our search for this evidence has been futile, even though the News claims to be "stumped * * * not by lack * * * but by the volume of it." We are not discouraged from replying, however, for the St. Lawrence seaway can be justified only if a colossal economic blunder can be justified.

We agree with the News that the St. Lawrence seaway "has no parallel" as a navigation project. It stands unparalleled in this glaring respect: Never before has the United States been asked to pour hundreds of millions of dollars into an international waterway emptying into the ocean through another country, when for 5 months of each year, or about that, it would be frozen over and blocked to navigation by ice, and closed to most American flag ships in world trade for the rest of the year as well, because of its shallow channel—a channel so shallow that most of the American merchant fleet could not traverse it in fair weather or foul.

Is this one of the grounds on which the Detroit News argues that "the seaway will make a greater and more prosperous United States"?

We introduce as a witness the president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, Frank J. Taylor. Members of the American Merchant Marine Institute "own and operate the major portion of the American flag merchant fleet engaged in foreign and domestic deep-sea trade."

Mr. Taylor's testimony as president and on behalf of this association appears in a letter to Senator CARL A. HATCH (Democrat, New Mexico), chairman of a Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee which fell for such bait as that put out by the News and mistakenly approved the St. Lawrence project.

Not as hard up for evidence as the Detroit News, Mr. Taylor cites statistics to show that the seaway would "decidedly favor foreign flag shipping" and be "highly detrimental to the best interests of the American merchant marine," since the "great preponderance" of vessels that would ply it would be foreign flag.

Does the Detroit News ask the United States to sink a tremendous sum of money into the construction, operation, and maintenance of a project that would do continuing gross disservice to its own merchant marine? If not, let the Detroit News offer credible evidence to refute Mr. Taylor's statistics-supported statements.

Owners and operators of American flag ships would not stand alone as losers. Far from it. American merchant seamen would go begging for jobs as foreign tramp vessels thrived on cargo taken from American bottoms. Idle American ships mean idle American crews.

This still does not cover the scope of American economic loss.

Diversion of traffic from established routes would destroy more jobs—jobs of longshoremen and various other workers in a long list of adversely affected port cities on the Gulf and Atlantic. When large numbers of wage-earning workers are thrown idle, the reaction becomes far-reaching. These workers and their families are hit. Stores and assorted service establishments lose patronage, and the Government loses tax revenue.

Does the Detroit News propose that the United States should funnel hundreds of millions of dollars into a project to create unemployment in this country? Does it expect the St. Lawrence seaway to contribute to "over-all national welfare" by depriving American workers of jobs?

And what of the several months of the year when the St. Lawrence seaway would be ice-bound and unable to handle the traffic shoved to it? Other services—other routes and forms of transportation and other docks and warehouses—would be expected to keep enough surplus capacity available to handle the commerce of the St. Lawrence during its closed season. Who would pay for maintaining this stand-by capacity to backstop and pinch-hit for the St. Lawrence?

As a navigation project, the St. Lawrence seaway stands without parallel indeed in threatening to become a blight and leech on the economic body of this Nation.

It would damage American ports which have spent many years, much energy, and untold dollars to build up and serve ocean trade. It would throw a monkey wrench into land transportation, disrupting established routes of traffic and draining off business to a part-time waterway. It would lift cargoes from American ships and deliver them to tramp ship flying foreign flags. It would drive American workers into idleness and upon the relief roll. It would cut down the sale of consumers' goods by cutting down earning power. It would add to the national debt. It would increase the tax load on the people while reducing the ability of many to pay taxes.

It would send American exports to sea, not through American ports, but through a Canadian gateway. It would bring in American imports, not through American ports, but via the Canadian seaboard.

It would stand as a perennial stumbling block to a "greater and more prosperous United States."

Tomorrow we will have more to say about the St. Lawrence seaway, especially as to its hydroelectric aspect, the other angle played up by the Detroit News in trying to justify an unjustifiable project.

Learning To Live Together

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on May 9 I asked and secured unanimous consent, on behalf of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a manuscript containing the proceedings of a recent dinner given in honor of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt by the Women's Joint Congressional Committee of Washington, D. C. I now ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], to have printed in the Appendix a few brief quotations which appeared in the dinner program on that occasion.

There being no objection, the quotations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If we do not want to die together in war, we must learn to live together in peace. (Harry S. Truman, the President of the United States.)

The Charter of the United Nations Conference on International Organization will, I believe, prove itself to be an epoch-making document and will rank in its contribution to international justice and peace with the Magna Carta and the Constitution of the United States in their contribution to political liberty and representative government. (V. K. Wellington Koo, chairman, the Chinese delegation to the United Nations Conference on International Organization.)

Our faith must rest, not on the great or the small nations, but upon the common man of all nations. All peoples, large and small, fully know that the world cannot bear the terrible stress of another total war without turning back to the Dark Ages. (Ezequiel Padilla, chairman, the Mexican delegation to the United Nations Conference on International Organization.)

The Soviet Government is a sincere and firm champion of the establishment of a strong international organization of security. We will fully cooperate in the solution of this great problem with all the other governments which are genuinely devoted to this noble cause. (V. M. Molotov, chairman, the Soviet delegation to the United Nations Conference on International Organization.)

Let us, mindful alike of the world's need and of our own weakness, pray that, under God's guidance, what we have done here in these last weeks will be found worthy of the faith that gave it birth and of the human suffering that has been its price. (The Earl of Halifax, chairman, the United Kingdom delegation to the United Nations Conference on International Organization.)

Peace is one and indivisible. (Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations.)

Today we are faced with the preeminent fact that, if civilization is to survive, we must cultivate the science of human relationships—the ability of all peoples, of all kinds, to live together and work together in the same world, at peace.

And to you, and to all Americans who dedicate themselves with us to the making of an abiding peace, I say:

The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith. (From the undelivered Jefferson Day address of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the late President of the United States, written the day before he died.)

Arguments Before Supreme Court in United States Against Watson, Lovett, and Dodd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. KERR
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, I include in the RECORD a brief synopsis of argument in the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of United States against Watson, Lovett, and Dodd as reported in the United States Law Week of May 7, 1946:

ARGUMENTS BEFORE THE COURT—CONGRESS: APPROPRIATION POWER

(Construction and validity of appropriation act barring salary payments to named individuals is argued before Supreme Court; limitations on appropriation power and constitutional inhibition against bills of attainder discussed.)

The Congress of the United States was represented by special counsel before the Supreme Court last week in a series of cases challenging the right of Congress to bar the use of public funds for the payment of salaries of named Government employees (*United States* v. *Lovett; Same* v. *Watson; Same* v. *Dodd*, Nos. 809–811).

The cases arose out of section 304 of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1943, which provides, in part, as follows: "No part of any appropriation * * * which is made available under * * * this act, or which is now, or * * * hereafter made available, under * * * any other act * * * shall be used, after November 15, 1943, to pay any part of the salary * * * of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett, unless prior to such date such person has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate." The President, although he believed that the rider was unconstitutional, signed the bill "reluctantly" only "because it appropriated funds which were essential to carry on the activities of almost every agency of the Government during the recess of the Congress." The President said in a message to the Congress: "The Senate yielded (to the insistence of the House), as I have been forced to yield, to avoid delaying our conduct of the war. But I cannot so yield without placing on record my view that this provision is not only unwise and discriminatory, but unconstitutional." Accordingly, the President did not comply with the condition of the rider as to reappointing the named individuals. Nevertheless Lovett retained his position as Executive Assistant to the Governor of the Virgin Islands until March 13, 1944; Watson retained his position as Chief of the Analysis Division, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Federal Communications Commission until May 21, 1944, although he ceased active performance of his duties on November 21, 1943; and Dodd remained in the employ of the Federal Communications Commission until November 21, 1943. In all cases payment of the salaries after November 5, 1943, was refused because of section 304, and actions were instituted in the Court of Claims to recover the money allegedly due.

THE COURT OF CLAIMS

That court (14 LW 2284) unanimously awarded judgment to the plaintiffs, but the court was by no means unanimous as to the ground on which the recovery should be allowed. Chief Justice Whaley delivered the opinion of the court in which Judge Littleton concurred. This opinion did not reach any constitutional question. It held that section 304 had not terminated the plaintiffs' employment but had merely prohibited the disbursing agencies from paying their salaries. The opinion went on to rule that the prohibition did not apply to the payment of judgments of the Court of Claims and that, since the rider had not destroyed the obligation to pay for services rendered after November 15, the plaintiffs were entitled to judgment. Three other judges of the Court of Claims, however, deemed the rider unconstitutional. Judges Whitaker and Madden thought it a bill of attainder. Judge Madden also believed that it violated the fifth amendment. Judge Jones wrote that "Section 304, in making a permanent ban on the rights and privileges of the (plaintiffs), exceeds the authority delegated to the Congress by the Constitution."

Both in the Court of Claims and before the Supreme Court the Solicitor General urged that judgment go for the plaintiffs rather than for the Government; and the defendant, in effect, was represented by John C. Gall, special counsel for the Congress of the United States under House Resolution 386 and Public Law 249, Seventy-eighth Congress.

Another unusual factor in the case is that, although the plaintiffs and the Solicitor General urge affirmance, they both seek such affirmance on grounds other than that relied on in the opinion of the court below; that is, they both seek to have the rider declared unconstitutional. It therefore appears that all parties before the Supreme Court are in agreement that Chief Justice Whaley and Judge Littleton were in error.

At the oral argument Mr. Ralph F. Fuchs, Assistant Attorney General, gave the Court the background of the case, but stated that he was not going to argue on the merits. He introduced Mr. John C. Gall, special counsel for the Congress of the United States, who argued for a reversal of the judgment of the Court of Claims.

CONGRESS' POSITION

Mr. Gall contended that the "claim that section 304 is unconstitutional does not present justiciable questions" since such questions are essentially "political in nature." He stated that under article I, section 9, of the Constitution, which provides "no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law," it is clear that "neither the judicial nor executive branches of the Government may withdraw any part of such funds for any purpose except pursuant to an appropriation made by the legislature." From this it follows, he declared, that "the court * * * may not declare inoperative a statute which forbids the executive agencies of Government to withdraw funds" for such a decision would be a clear intrusion upon the exercise of a function committed solely to the legislature and not subject to review or modification by the judiciary." According to Mr. Gall, "An effective judgment that section 304 is unconstitutional would make section 304 inoperative for any purpose from the date of its enactment, and under the prevailing circumstances would amount to a judgment that on and after November 15, 1943, the executive agencies concerned were, by reason

of the earlier legislation, empowered to withdraw funds in order to pay [plaintiffs]. If binding on the Congress, and judgments within the constitutional power of the court to make are binding on the legislature, the judgment would operate to overrule the Congress and countermand the order contained in section 304 prohibiting such disbursements. Thereby the court indirectly would be exercising a control which belongs exclusively to the legislature. * * *

"When Congress exercises its exclusive power over the disbursing process as it did in section 304, its action is not subject to review or revision by other departments of Government, and questions concerning the constitutionality of its action are not justiciable."

The attorney for Congress next contended that the rider prevented the executive agencies from creating any obligation to pay plaintiffs for services performed after November 15, 1943.

REMOVAL POWER

"Mr. Justice RUTLEDGE. Your position is that by this act Congress intended to remove the plaintiffs?

"Mr. GALL. No; we agree with the Court of Claims that there was no removal.

"Mr. Justice RUTLEDGE. A termination of the right to employment?

"Mr. GALL. No.

"Mr. Justice DOUGLAS. Your position is that if they wanted to work for the Government, they had to work for nothing?

"Mr. GALL. That is substantially correct.

"Mr. Justice BLACK. You say they resigned?

"Mr. GALL. They did, after November 15, 1943.

"Mr. Justice RUTLEDGE. Do you concede that Congress could not specifically remove them?

"Mr. GALL. We have not taken that position—merely that there was no removal and therefore the decisions in the Myers and Humphrey's cases (*Myers* v. *U. S.* (272 U. S. 52); *Humphrey's Executor* v. *U. S.* (295 U. S. 602)) are not involved.

"Mr. Justice RUTLEDGE. If it be found that it was a removal in effect, do you concede that Congress does not have that power?

"Mr. GALL. No; I would not make that concession.

"Mr. Justice BLACK. Assuming Congress does not have this power, did not Congress accomplish the same results by cutting off their salaries?

"Mr. GALL. No; there is a difference between office and compensation. A cutting off of a salary is not a removal."

VOLUNTARY SERVICES

"Mr. Justice DOUGLAS. Is there any provision of law which requires a Government employee to get something?

"Mr. GALL. No, sir. It was argued that employment without compensation would violate the voluntary service statute, Revised Statutes 3679, but that act does not bar uncompensated services. The Comptroller General has ruled that there is no need to pay men a dollar a year. Attorney General Wickersham, in 30 Opinions, Attorney General 51, sustains this definition of voluntary service. The purpose of the statute is to prevent claims based on moral obligations.

"Mr. Justice FRANKFURTER. Your position is that Congress could pass an act cutting off appropriations for salaries of Cabinet members or members of this Court, either collectively or by name?

"Mr. GALL. I would make a distinction as to this Court.

"Mr. Justice FRANKFURTER. All right; leave out this Court.

"Mr. GALL. It could.

"Mr. Justice RUTLEDGE. Congress could provide that John Doe could never occupy an office with compensation under the United States?

"Mr. GALL. Congress has a discretion as to when and how money may be withdrawn from the Treasury.

"Mr. Justice RUTLEDGE. You would say Congress could provide that no Negro could be paid a Government salary?

"Mr. GALL. There may be abuses of powers which Congress has, but no other agency of the Government can review such action of Congress.

"Mr. Justice RUTLEDGE. Then your answer is 'Yes'?

"Mr. GALL. Yes; with the qualifications I have stated.

"Mr. Justice RUTLEDGE. I don't understand any qualifications."

JUDICIAL REVIEW

Mr. Gall remarked that he was willing to admit an affirmative appropriation may be reviewed in the courts, under the decision in *Rice* v. *Butler* (297 U. S. 1) (first AAA case) but, he added, "if Congress says that no money shall be taken for a certain purpose, if the courts were to set that aside, they would in effect be saying it could be taken and in effect would be appropriating. Hence, we say the constitutional question is nonjusticiable."

"Mr. Justice RUTLEDGE. Do you concede that Congress could not withdraw an appropriation to pay for salaries already earned?

"Mr. GALL. They can prevent a disbursing officer from paying, but they cannot repudiate the obligation of payment.

"Mr. Justice RUTLEDGE. Suppose Congress did?

"Mr. GALL. This Court has decided that if Congress says the money shall not be paid out that is effective, even if there is a good claim.

"Mr. Justice FRANKFURTER. Do you think that is good even under the fifth amendment?

"Mr. GALL. Yes.

"Mr. Justice FRANKFURTER. The act does not prevent a suit in the Court of Claims and a judgment which must be reported to Congress for an appropriation.

"Mr. GALL. Exactly.

"Mr. Justice BURTON. Congress could say that after November 15, none of the money should be paid to Mr. John Jones?

"Mr. GALL. Yes; the Court cannot take the money out of the Treasury.

"Mr. Justice BURTON. Do you think that the act is an interference with executive authority?

"Mr. GALL. It would be an authorized interference under the appropriation power.

"Mr. Justice FRANKFURTER. Suppose Congress said, 'No salary to the President?'

"Mr. GALL. There the Constitution says he shall receive a salary, but, of course, if Congress doesn't appropriate, he can't get it.

"Mr. Justice FRANKFURTER. We are talking about judicial review of constitutional power.

"Mr. GALL. That's right.

"Mr. Justice RUTLEDGE. Your position is that Congress can't say that John Doe can't occupy an office, but it can say he can't be paid.

"Mr. GALL. That's correct."

FIRST IMPRESSION

The attorney for Congress stated that "the precise question presented here has never before been adjudicated in our courts," but "it may well be supposed that the existence of the power of Congress in its absolute discretion to withhold funds is so clear that heretofore no one has thought to challenge the exercise of the power." Moreover, he continued, "never in the history of the United States have the courts invalidated an act of Congress directing the withholding of public funds, either absolutely or conditionally."

Further discussing the history of the appropriating power, Mr. Gall told the Court that "under immemorial practice, Congress has appropriated to individuals by name." He cited, for example, a statute enacted by the First Congress making an appropriation to one Roger Alden. With respect to statutes barring from the Federal pay roll, he referred to 27 United States Statutes 591, which provides that "no employee of the Pinkerton Detective Agency * * * shall be employed in any Government service." He also called to the Court's attention the Revenue Act of 1924 which provided that the salary of a particular Government official "so long as the position is held by the present incumbent shall be at" a stipulated figure. A similar provision appears, he told the Court, in the act of 1926.

Mr. Gall also argued that section 304 did not terminate the plaintiffs' services, for each of them resigned. Hence, he continued, since they were not removed, the power of removal is not here involved. However, he said, "Assuming that an exclusive power to remove * * * is implied by the general Executive power of the President (under the Myers case), these cases would then present a conflict between the claimed implied Executive power to remove inferior officers, or employees, and the plenary legislative power to control the expenditure of public funds under article I, section 9, and article I, section 8, of the Constitution. This Court is asked to set aside the exercise of an express power in favor of a claimed implied power."

Mr. Gall insisted, though, that he did "not think it necessary in view of the fact that plaintiffs were not removed at all to argue at length the question of where the power of removal resides. We accept for present purposes the complete authority of the Myers case as far as it decided the question therein presented. It is recognized by all who have studied that decision that it leaves unanswered many questions as to the removal of minor employees."

THE MYERS CASE

The Myers case, he continued, has been limited by the Humphrey's case "to removal of 'purely executive officers' and does not deal with those who exercise 'no part of the Executive power vested by the Constitution in the President.'"

With reference to the civil rights problems urged on the Court, Mr. Gall submitted that the rider "did not deprive [plaintiffs] of any constitutional right, either as a bill of attainder or by denial of due process of law." Referring to the cases of *Cummings* v. *Missouri* (4 Wall. 277), and *Ex parte Garland* (4 Wall. 333), upon which the plaintiffs rely, he said: "While the decisions in the Cummings and Garland cases were based squarely upon a finding of intention to punish, there is dictum in each case which might support the proposition that disqualification from office is punishment per se. * * * However, that doctrine subsequently was rejected by the United States Supreme Court [in] *Dent* v. *W. Va.* (129 U. S. 114); *Hawker* v. *New York* (170 U. S. 189); and *Rietz* v. *Michigan* (188 U. S. 505)."

Equally, there is no denial of due process, he urged, because the procedures of the congressional committee out of which came the rider "are immaterial to the constitutionality of the enactment" and "a refusal to appropriate for any specific purpose, including payments of compensation, may not be assailed as a violation of the due process clause of the fifth amendment," under the ruling in *Hart* v. *United States* (118 U. S. 62).

PLAINTIFFS' CONTENTIONS

Mr. Charles A. Horsky, of Washington, who represented the plaintiffs, told the Court that the Solicitor General agreed with his basic contentions that the rider was unconstitutional as an improper interference with the executive department and as a bill of attainder. He said that he went further and contended that the rider was unconstitutional under the due process clause of the fifth amendment.

Before reaching the constitutional question, however, Mr. Horsky attempted to show that the purpose of the rider, and its necessary effect if it were valid, was to remove the

plaintiffs from office. If the act is constitutional, he said, "it destroyed any obligation to pay [plaintiffs] compensation after November 15, 1943, even if it did not operate to remove them from office." Congress, he told the Court, intended to affect the plaintiffs' substantive rights. It was not enacting a bill merely affecting the disbursing routine of the Government, as the opinion of the court below had held. "Congress," he said, "must be assumed to have been familiar with the long line of decisions holding that the mere withholding of an appropriation would not, without more, affect an officer's or employee's legal right to his salary, enforceable by suit in the Court of Claims. *United States* v. *Langston* (118 U. S. 389); *United States* v. *Vulte* (233 U. S. 509)."

"Mr. Justice REED. Did Congress intend to exercise whatever power it does have for the purpose of effecting a removal?

"Mr. HORSKY. That's correct."

RELIEF SOUGHT

The plaintiffs' attorney asserted that he agreed that an appropriation is the only way to get money out of the Treasury. "However," he said, "this is a suit in the Court of Claims, and we seek a judgment only as to the legal obligation. If we prevail, it would then be up to Congress to appropriate to pay the judgment.

"Mr. Justice FRANKFURTER. Without regard to earmarking of funds?

"Mr. HORSKY. That's right; just like any other action in the Court of Claims.

"Mr. Justice REED. Is there a separability clause in the act?

"Mr. HORSKY. There is not.

"Mr. Justice BLACK. As the act now stands, it would apply even if they are subsequently appointed and confirmed by the Senate?

"Mr. HORSKY. Yes.

"Mr. Justice FRANKFURTER. If the purpose to keep them out can be defeated, they're not forced out of office. If we can save the statute, it's our duty to do so.

"Mr. HORSKY. We think you have to face the constitutional question in order to decide this case.

"Mr. Justice FRANKFURTER. For 125 years this Court avoided passing on the removal power, and when it did rule on the question, the result was not very felicitous."

After discussing the removal power, and the authorities denying such power to Congress, Mr. Horsky urged that Congress could not exercise this power of removal which it does not have under the guise of the appropriating power. He said, "The power of Congress to appropriate, like all other of its powers, is subject to constitutional limitations," quoting from the Veazle case (*Veazle Bank* v. *Fenno* (8 Wall. 533)), in support of this proposition.

"Mr. Justice REED. In that case Congress accomplished indirectly what it could not do directly.

"Mr. Justice FRANKFURTER. Congress could reduce salaries and thus coerce officials?

"Mr. HORSKY. It could or it could abolish the job.

"Mr. Justice FRANKFURTER. For 2 days and then recreate it? Are these the questions which can be put to a court?

"Mr. HORSKY. Congress can't go beyond the office to the incumbent.

"Mr. Justice BLACK. Can Congress say the Secretary of the Interior shall receive no salary?

"Mr. HORSKY. Yes.

"Mr. Justice BLACK. Could Congress say, 'Robert Morss Lovett shall receive no salary'?

"Mr. HORSKY. That it can't do. That's this case."

COERCING CONGRESS

"Mr. Justice FRANKFURTER. What do you say to the argument that there is a difference between an exaction, as in *Rice* v. *Butler*, and a withholding by Congress of appropriations? Do you say that what Congress refuses to do, this Court may say it must do?

"Mr. HORSKY. We don't ask the Court to tell Congress it must pay. We merely ask for judgment in the Court of Claims. Furthermore, you can say the appropriation is good, but the limitation is bad—a simple question of severability.

"Mr. Justice REED. Is there any money available to pay this judgment?

"Mr. HORSKY. Oh, no, it would be up to Congress to appropriate to pay the Court of Claims judgment. This case goes back to Congress if you affirm.

"Mr. Justice FRANKFURTER. Doesn't that support the opinion of the Chief Justice below?

"Mr. HORSKY. No.

"Mr. Justice FRANKFURTER. Put it this way: Congress has not terminated their services and therefore it is up to the Court of Claims, and Congress may decide whether to pay the judgment or not."

Mr. Justice Frankfurter continued: "If I can with intellectual integrity avoid the constitutional question, I will do so. My construction says to all the world that they're employed, that Congress has not discharged them, and they're entitled to be paid."

BILL OF ATTAINDER

Further arguing in support of his claim that the rider was unconstitutional Mr. Horsky characterized it as a bill of attainder forbidden by article I, section 9, clause 3, of the Constitution. He said that the act falls squarely within the definition as given in Cummings against Missouri and Ex parte Garland and quoted from the Cummings case: "A bill of attainer is a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial. If the punishment be less than death, the act is termed a bill of pains and penalties. Within the meaning of the Constitution, bills of attainder include bills of pains and penalties." According to him "the substance, not the form, of the statute, controls."

Additional ground of invalidity urged by Mr. Horsky is the conflict with the due process clause of the fifth amendment. He argued: "The objection to section 304 on this ground is on both the substantive and the procedural level. Substantively, the rider is to be condemned for its obvious discrimination in singling out [plaintiffs] by name for permanent disqualification for Federal employment. Procedurally, the absence of the fundamental safeguards which attended * * * the entire congressional proceeding—an absence which is perhaps the inevitable concomitant of any legislative attempt to determine guilt and assess punishment—also condemn the statute."

In rebuttal Mr. Gall told the court that if the statute is held unconstitutional, it would have a more far-reaching effect than merely permitting a judgment in the Court of Claims which would have to go to Congress for appropriation. A decision of unconstitutionality, he declared, would permit disbursing officers to pay out salaries to the plaintiffs in the future.

Women's Army Corps

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, overseas in 1917 I dreamed and hoped that some day American women would have an opportunity to serve with our Army and Navy. I saw what the English Waacs were doing. I saw them at work in our own AEF offices, borrowed from the English. Our women overseas, with the exception of the nurses, served as civilians, with none of the benefits which the Wacs now receive. In 1942 my dream came true, and four services took women into their services. The Wacs have done so well they are asking that they be made a part of their military establishment. They have served magnificently. I had faith in the women of America. They have more than justified my faith.

Today, May 14, 1946, marks the fourth anniversary of the Women's Army Corps. Not only to the 25,000 Wacs still in uniform but to the some 75,000 who have returned to civilian life this day is of particular significance. It represents the first peacetime celebration of the Corps.

Organized during the critical, early months of 1942, the Women's Army Corps has progressed from its original status of an auxiliary to an accepted component of the Army of the United States. The Corps' integration into the Army has been so thorough that in a 3-year period from September 1942 until September 1945, the original four types of jobs planned for the Wacs branched out to include 239 of the Army's 608 jobs, at 400 installations in the United States and in 28 foreign countries. I personally saw them and their splendid service in England, France, Italy, and Belgium. They served also in north Africa, Germany, Scotland, Bermuda, Puerto Rico, Alaska, the Netherlands East Indies, Egypt, India, China, Ceylon, New Guinea, Australia, Hawaii, Labrador, British Columbia and Yukon Territory, Leyte and Luzon in the Philippines, Japan and Korea, New Caledonia, African Gold Coast, New Zealand, and Austria.

Whatever notions they might have had of military life, Wacs soon learned that there was more work than glamor. They were assigned to Army Ground Force installations, to the Army Air Forces, Corps of Engineers, the Ordnance Department, Chemical Warfare Service, the Signal Corps, Military Intelligence, the Provost Marshal General's Office, the Transportation and Quartermaster Corps, the Judge Advocate General's and the Inspector General's Departments, the Surgeon General's Office, Office of the Chief of Finance, The Adjutant General's Office, Civil Affairs, and with the General and Special Staff Corps.

They typed, filed, made maps, operated switchboards and radios, drove trucks and jeeps; they plotted aircraft and V–1's, assessed combat films, cooked, gave inoculations, assembled guns; from air-sea rescue rooms they "brought home" lost planes and pilots, and counted the ships as they returned from bombing runs over enemy territory. These are only a few of the 239 jobs for which the Army trained the Wacs.

Wacs were present at many of the historic moments of the war. Twenty-seven of them operated the switchboard at the Potsdam Conference; 432 worked on the atomic-bomb project; others were present at the meetings of the Big Three at Yalta, in Canada, at Potsdam, at the German surrender in Rheims, and at the Japanese surrender at Baguio, P. I. Some

are now on duty at the war crimes trials in Nuremberg and in Manila.

Admittedly an experiment brought about by the critical need of manpower in 1942, Wacs have moved from the experimental novelty to a vital status that proves the members of the Women's Army Corps have been and are essential to the Army. During the interim, the adjustment period from war emergency to the permanence of peace, Wacs are filling an urgent need in the Army. They are at work in hospitals, separation centers, and Army headquarters. Approximately, 2,000 are still in the European theater helping to shoulder the tasks of occupation, while 112 are in China. Small numbers are in the administrative forces of installations in Japan, Korea, Hawaii, and in the Philippines.

On the fourth anniversary the Women's Army Corps finds itself fully accepted by the Army. In the emergency of war the Army turned to the previously untapped potentiality of womanpower; with the Nation at peace, it has found that women are not only willing but eager to serve in the Army.

The Pace Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. HOOK
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Journal of Commerce of April 11, 1946:

GILDING THE LILY FOR FARMERS

Farmers cash receipts touched a new peak of $22,000,000,000 in 1945. And while farm operating costs have risen, the net income of farm proprietors last year approached $13,000,000,000, or almost three times the 1940 level. On the basis of this record, passage of the pending Pace bill, which would raise agricultural parity prices to reflect higher farm labor costs, only will gild the lily.

The House will doubtless pass the Pace bill, which has been passed by the Senate as a rider to minimum-wage legislation. President Truman has stated that he will veto the parity price boost measure, however. The real fight, therefore, will develop over a drive to pass the bill over the President's veto.

Advocates of the Pace bill claim it need not raise prices of agricultural products, since nothing in the bill requires that these prices be pegged at parity. But the Price Control Act requires that prices of agricultural products be supported for 2 years after the official close of hostilities at 90 percent of parity, and other legislation will doubtless be sought to support farm prices thereafter at similar or higher levels.

Any formula for raising parity prices is a move in the direction of raising the floor under agricultural prices. If this were not so, advocates of higher parities would surely not spend so much time and effort to force such legislation through.

The national economy is threatened seriously with an inflationary rise of commodity prices. The Pace bill, which aims at still higher support prices for farm products, would increase this threat substantially if it is enacted into law.

Statement of Facts About Watches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, advertisements have appeared in the press concerning the claims of the American watch manufacturers' associations. The American watch manufacturers have sought the imposition of a quota against Switzerland on the importation of Swiss watch movements and watches in this country.

Everybody wishes to protect American industry. But the American watch manufacturers are afraid they will not be able to sell all the watches they are making. This I am informed is quite untrue under present conditions. Spot checks made throughout the country indicate the tremendous demand for both domestic and imported watches, and that their fears are entirely ungrounded.

Some consideration should be given to the American watch assemblers and importers. They constitute a valuable contribution to industry in my State. They employ as many workers, if not more, than the watch manufacturers. The American watch assemblers constitute a thoroughgoing American industry as is clearly shown by the statement of facts placed in the press by the American watch assemblers, which I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD in the interest of fairness and in order to present the other side of the controversy. It was published as an advertisement in the New York Times of April 11, 1946.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS A STATEMENT OF FACTS ABOUT WATCHES

A letter in the form of an advertisement appeared in this and other newspapers on Wednesday, April 10, addressed to President Truman, and signed by Walter W. Cenerazzo, president of the American Watch Workers Union, of Boston, Mass., wherein a plea is made for the imposition of a quota upon the importation of Swiss watches and movements into this country. This letter is so replete with statements contrary to the facts that the undersigned, the American Watch Assemblers' Association, deem it incumbent to make its position clear for the American public.

The letter was so adroitly written as to give the impression that the American watch assemblers do not constitute an American industry. The courts of this country have held that a watch assembled with the use of an imported movement is a manufacture of the United States, *United States* v. *Adolphe Schwobe, Inc.* (21 C. C. P. A. 116).

In truth and in fact, in the manufacture of watches in this country with imported movements, commonly called assembling, there are purchased cases, straps, or bracelets, and boxes—all produced in the United States. These assemblers are American companies, operating with American capital, and American labor.

On the retail price level on all so-called Swiss watches sold in this country, 88 percent of a dollar remains in this country and only 12 percent goes abroad. Mr. Cenerazzo seeks to give the erroneous impression that American labor approves of a quota on the importation of Swiss watches and movements.

This is not true.

The American Watch Workers Union belongs neither to the AFL nor the CIO. The public should know that at the hearings conducted, representatives of both the CIO and the AFL vigorously protested against the imposition of any quota on the importation of Swiss watch movements and watches. American labor directly and indirectly concerned in the American industry of watch assembling, number far more than the number employed in the domestic watch manufacturing industry, composed of only three major companies, the Elgin, Waltham, and Hamilton Watch Co.'s.

Moreover, we take grave exception to the imputation of nonpatriotism on the part of the American watch assemblers. The assemblers had converted to war work and participated, too, in the making of precision instruments and timing mechanism, together with other delicate devices used by the Army and Navy. Proof of this lies in the Army-Navy E awards given to many of the assembling firms—Bulova, Gruen, Longines, Benrus, etc.

The public should know that surveys have been made by the Departments of State, Commerce, Treasury, War, and Navy, as well as by the Tariff Commission, bearing out the facts presented here. They indicate clearly that in the calendar year 1946 there will be a demand for 12,000,000 watches. The backlog demand for watches in the postwar period, as revealed in a spot check of retail outlets in New York and department stores in Chicago, will insure at least 2 years of full-capacity production ahead for the domestic watch manufacturers.

Nowhere do the facts reveal that without the imposition of a quota will the workers in a watch-manufacturing industry be forced out of employment. The American watch manufacturers themselves have indicated just that. For example, the Elgin Watch Co. has recently purchased the plant known as the Elastic Equipment Co., Lincoln, Nebr., in order to secure greater plant capacity to supply the greater demand for its watches.

In a recent advertisement, the Hamilton Watch Co., manufacturers of domestic watches, stated: "Although a few of these quality watches are now available, they will hardly meet the great, pent-up demand that has grown during the war, but more and more are coming within the next few months."

That hardly is consistent with the position taken by Mr. Cenerazzo.

The surveys show there will be plenty of opportunity for the entire watch industry—there will be an unprecedented demand for watches, those of Swiss origin and those of American manufacture.

On the other hand, a restriction of importation of Swiss watches would mean that it would be impossible, because of the excessiveness of the demand over the supply, to hold any ceiling on the price of watches. As a matter of fact, the OPA has already lifted the ceiling from domestic watches. The result would be an inflationary skyrocket that would mulct the public out of millions of dollars.

Again, nowhere in the letter of Mr. Cenerazzo are these facts disclosed. The American watch manufacturers cannot possibly supply the pent-up demand with their present productive capacity of about 2,000,000 watches a year, and could not even supply that demand with a tripling of their yearly output.

We cannot see how the worker employed in domestic watch manufacturing can be hurt under the existing circumstances.

The American watch assemblers would be the first to concede the need for import restrictions if such special need existed for a quantitive limitation on imports from any agreement country to protect any United

States manufacturing industry during its reconversion period.

Such is not the case.

All facts point to an expansion of the domestic watch industry. Mr. Cenerazzo, in his letter, speaks with more emotion than candor. The setting of a quota is a monopoly both ways. The division of quota would naturally depend upon favoritism and influence. Moreover, if a quota is placed on Swiss watches and Swiss movements, it will give a great impetus to smuggling and bootlegging of watches into this country.

Mr. Cenerazzo takes the jewelers to task for turning to their representatives in Congress for help. It is the ready heart of the democratic system of government that representatives in our Congress intercede to see that those they represent receive fair and equal attention on their position in an issue of wide importance.

We maintain that to begin our postwar program by imposing a quota on the importation of watches and watch movements from Switzerland would be contrary to the administration's international trade policy. It would be in direct contradiction to the administration's program for freer international trade, freedom from exorbitant rates of duties, and freedom from irritating and vexatious trade restrictions.

We cannot export unless we import.

International trade is no longer a one-way street. A quota on the importation of these watches and movements from Switzerland will force that country to reduce her imports of other products from the United States.

This information has been collated through the various interested governmental agencies. Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State, and his aides scrutinized all testimony placed before them. Mr. Acheson was careful to give all sides opportunity to be heard, and he deserves high commendation for his judicious and objective approach.

The reciprocal trade agreement as it now stands hurts no one.

AMERICAN WATCH ASSEMBLERS' ASSOCIATION,
S. RALPH LAZRUS, *President.*

The Equal Pay Bill and the Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which appeared in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor, from Miss Mary Anderson, former Director of the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor, on the subject of the equal pay bill and the equal rights amendment.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EQUAL PAY BILL AND THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

The Christian Science Monitor, Magazine Section:

I am greatly concerned about the erroneous analysis of the Federal equal pay bill (S. 1178) in relation to the so-called equal rights amendment (S. J. Res. 61) as presented by Alma Lutz in Which Road, Women Workers? in the February 2 issue of your magazine section.

I'm glad to know that Miss Lutz approves of this equal pay bill and considers its adoption would be in line with progress. Also I think she is right in saying that it "has the support of practically all women's organizations" though no representative of the National Woman's Party which has sponsored the equal rights amendment for 23 years appeared at the Senate hearings on the equal pay bill.

I disagree with her statement that "the equal pay bill needs the equal rights amendment to make it effective." If and when enacted, the equal pay law would stand firmly on its own feet. The bill specifically forbids employers engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce to pay "any female employee at a rate less than the rate at which he pays or has paid wages to male employees for work of comparable quality and quantity." (Incidentally Miss Lutz misquoted the bill in substituting "comparative" for comparable.) The equal rights amendment in declaring "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex" could and would affect only inequalities under the law. Thus it would have no effect on an equal pay law which definitely forbids inequalities.

In implying that women workers who support both special labor laws and the equal pay bill want "to eat their cake and have it too," Miss Lutz uses an unsound premise. What these women want—and I know from my many years of close contact with them as a worker in industry myself and as the director of the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor for a quarter of a century—is opportunity to earn their daily bread in accordance with the same wage standards as men. Investigations have definitely proved that special labor laws for women have narrowed the differentials between the sexes. For decades men through the medium of collective bargaining have made greater and more widespread gains in the matter of higher wages and shorter hours than have women.

The term "equal pay for equal work," a popular slogan used to label the bill, is in my opinion misleading. What women workers really want is "the rate for the job" regardless of sex. In many instances women's work is just as skilled as men's even though not equal or identical with men's. Thus the actual wording in the bill "work of comparable quality and quantity" is a much more realistic approach. The large body of women covered by the bill do not want pay differentials in their favor. They do not expect the same pay for shorter hours than men. Women simply want to be paid the same hourly or piece rates—or the same weekly or monthly rates for the same hour schedule—when their work is comparable with men's.

Miss Lutz is on absolutely untenable ground in her sweeping statements: "* * * it is impossible for women to do equal work when they are prohibited by law from working as many hours as men, when by law they are not allowed night work or overtime with extra pay." and "Until these restrictions [referring to the various special labor laws for women] are removed and until labor laws are rewritten to apply to the job instead of the sex of the worker, women cannot possibly achieve equal pay for equal work, no matter how loudly they may clamor for it." Could Miss Lutz have access to the pay rolls of many establishments today she would learn that a sizeable number of women in States with special labor laws are actually getting equal pay with men.

She seems unaware of the fact that many women in States with a maximum-hour law for them receive overtime pay just as men do, when they work in establishments covered by the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act. This requires overtime pay of time and a half for all hours worked in excess of 40 a week—irrespective of sex.

Now that the war emergency is over, there is a definite swinging back to a shorter week for all workers. Bureau of Labor Statistics data for November 1945, showed that the average weekly hours worked, for all manufacturing, were 41.3. In the long list of 154 branches of industry only 7 revealed average weekly hours in excess of 48. In only 12 others was the average as high as 46 hours a week.

Another factor of which Miss Lutz fails to take account is that some States with a maximum hour law for women also have orders to set up under a minimum-wage law requiring increased overtime rates for women who work more than 40 or 48 hours a week.

I am in agreement with Miss Lutz's statement that employers who want to keep cheap labor available "find ways of labeling jobs as women's jobs and men's jobs, implying that men's jobs require more skill or strength and therefore higher wages. In most instances this differentiation is a myth."

However, the prevalence of the false idea about women's work and other discriminatory practices toward them are not a myth. Thus there is still need for State legislation to safeguard women's interests, and also men's interests, by controlling at least to some extent, the exploitation of woman labor in ways not experienced by men to anything like the same degree.

For such reason I want to see the Federal and State equal pay bills passed. For such a reason I oppose the equal-rights amendment as a measure that would jeopardize the special State labor laws for women before we would achieve something better. Millions of women agrees with me. Our belief is bolstered by a practical knowledge of the history of State labor legislation in this country. Therefore, we are not caught by glib slogans or by the bludgeon methods and blanket approach embodied in the equal-rights amendment. Our belief, based on experience, is that it is no paradox to oppose the amendment, and at the same time to support the Federal equal-pay bill.

MARY ANDERSON,
Former Director, Women's Bureau, United States Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

H. R. 6409

REMARKS
OF
HON. ELLSWORTH B. BUCK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, I introduced H. R. 6409, whose sole purpose is to grant authority to the President of the United States to protect the Nation against strikes which imperil the Nation. The President seems to lack that power now.

Obviously, no President would use the powers conferred by the bill until the Government had exhausted every means to settle a dispute by conciliation, mediation or arbitration.

The bill is short. I include its text herewith, and commend it to Members' attention.

Mr. Speaker, in the Committee on Labor this morning, I again moved that the committee set aside current consideration of minimum wage legislation and devote itself to means for settling

the coal strike emergency which has already deprived a million men and women of their livelihood and is bringing industrial chaos to the country. A point of no quorum was raised against my motion and the committee adjourned without action thereon.

Thus the Committee on Labor fails to take cognizance of the most serious labor situation which has ever confronted the country.

H. R. 6409

A bill to authorize the President of the United States to declare certain strikes contrary to the national interest, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That any strike proclaimed by the President of the United States to be contrary to the national public interest is an illegal strike, any other law to the contrary notwithstanding. Commencing 24 hours after such proclamation, and for 6 months thereafter, any person who in concert with another aids or abets the continuance of an illegal strike during that period shall, upon conviction thereof, be guilty of conspiracy against the United States of America, and be subject to the penalty provided by law therefor: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall require an individual to perform service contrary to his own will: *And provided further*, That during said 6 months' period, rates of pay of employees affected by said proclamation shall be no lower than, and the terms and conditions of their employment shall be identical with, those set forth in the last contract to which said employees were party prior to the date of said proclamation.

Discrimination Against Independent Labor Unions Is Crying Injustice of the New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come when the people as a whole want some real reforms in Washington—not the kind of fake reforms of which so many New Dealers preach, but real reform which makes every agency of our Government work as it ought to work for the benefit of all the people.

One particular field of reform right now, of course, lies in the realm of what you might call labor administration. There are more than 40 Federal agencies which, in one way or another, impinge on the field of labor. The activities of some of these agencies have slight effect on the rank and file of labor, but there are many agencies whose actions are felt by millions of laboring men at one time or another.

It is necessary, in discussing this subject, to clear up what is meant by "labor." There are more than 50,000,000 persons in America who work—many more than that right now, but that's a good average. Of this number roughly one-third belong to labor unions. But in thinking of union members it is necessary also to make distinctions.

Less than a half of all union members are members of unions affiliated with either the American Federation of Labor or the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

When we consider that the two numerically most-powerful labor unions in this Nation represent less than half of all union members, and at the same time that all union members represent less than one-third of all working people, we begin to see the union movement in its right perspective.

We can understand why many Congressman feel—as I feel—that the apparent power of the CIO has been exaggerated by shrewd publicity out of all proportions to its real power. I am neither ashamed of my stand against the policies of the CIO nor afraid to continue to take a stand such as I have taken, and will take. I am told I was one of those Members of Congress placed on the "purge" list recently given out by Sidney Hillman—I was happy to learn of it.

This is not to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am antilabor or antiunion. As a matter of fact, I have held membership in a labor union—the A. F. of L.—and once served as a delegate to a national convention. Be that as it may, I shall show before I am through talking that the labor-union movement as a whole is vastly different from one little, voluble segment of that movement—the CIO.

It is well know that millions of labor union members resent the political activities of the CIO and see in these activities a threat to the union movement as a whole.

As one who has observed closely the swift growth both of the A. F. of L. and of the CIO, as well as the whole union movement, I think I reveal no secret when I point out that the A. F. of L. is much more American in its activities, in the caliber of its leaders, and in the type of political activity in which it engages. The CIO is dominated by men who are collectivists at heart. It has a powerful segment of its membership made up of men who have given their allegiance to Moscow, and, in case of war, would fight for the hammer and sickle instead of the stars and stripes. The Communists are getting so powerful in the CIO that many of its own left-wing members are becoming fearful, and we can read every day of how they are claiming to be trying to get rid of this influence. I challenge the CIO to release the names of the Communists in its membership of whom it has either gotten rid or of whom it expects to get rid in the coming days.

Yet, neither the A. F. of L. nor the CIO, numerous though their membership, can speak for the vast body of organized labor in this country. That is a fact which I hope every Member who is fearful about the CIO will remember.

The majority of labor-union members in this country belong to independent unions. Some of these independent unions are rather large organizations in themselves. Others are small, locally controlled organizations. These independent unions have several things in common.

First. They are generally more representative than the larger unions. That is to say, their control is not centralized so much into the hands of one or two leaders as is the case of many of the unions affiliated with the A. F. of L. or the CIO. Therefore, elections mean something in these independent unions and are not mere formalities as is the case with so many unions.

Second. These independent unions do not emphasize political objectives so much as they emphasize economic objectives. Their leaders are not interested as union leaders in who is elected to Congress or who is not, granted that the candidates are all good, American-minded men. By this, I mean that these local unions do not grab a hatchet and go out to cut off some Congressman's political neck in a group if he does something one or the other of the Members does not like. The various Members, Republican or Democrat, vote for candidates of their choice, not candidates designated by someone sitting in an office building thousands of miles away, as pens with the CIO.

A third thing these independent unions have in common—and it represents one of the crying injustices of the present Democratic administration—is that they are all a subject of discrimination by their own Federal Government. The National Labor Relations Board is dominated by men chosen by one or the other of the big unions. The Department of Labor is loaded down with representatives of the CIO or the A. F. of L. All of the 40-odd labor agencies of the Government seem to be weighted in favor of either the A. F. of L. or the CIO, although these two labor groups put together do not represent one-half the labor union members of the Nation.

This situation, which has been building up ever since 1933, represents a distinctly unrepresentative way of operating the Government. I repeat, it also represents a discrimination against the locally-led, independent unions throughout the Nation.

One of the officials of a local, independent union, E. L. Boram, president of the independent union, of Sutherland Paper Co. Employees, Inc., at Kalamazoo, Mich., recently sent me two letters which are so filled both with information of value to Members of Congress and with plain good American sense that I am going to read them at this time.

The first of these letters is as follows:

INDEPENDENT UNION OF SUTHERLAND
PAPER CO. EMPLOYEES, INC.,
Kalamazoo, Mich.

HON. PAUL SHAFER,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

During the past month a series of meetings have been held in Washington between representatives of independent labor in the United States and the various heads of administrative agencies of Government. Approximately 146 delegates, among which was our representative, were in personal attendance at these meetings and numerous other independent labor groups were represented by proxy. We are confident that we have satisfied those with whom we met that independent labor is not only an integral part of the working classes, but actually constitutes the majority group.

The purpose of these meetings was to bring to the attention of the leaders in Government the existing discrimination in labor

agencies of Government in favor of AFL and CIO, which actually are minority groups in labor. Numerous instances were cited of vicious acts of discrimination against independent labor, and the further fact that minority elements were practically in control of all legislation, rules, and regulations affecting the rights of the working classes in America.

An appeal has been made to the President of the United States to eliminate this paradox now existing in our democracy. Suggestions have been made for the appointment of representatives of independent labor in the Department of Labor, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Wage Stabilization Board, and other agencies of Government administering labor laws. Furthermore, we have asked the President to consider the plight of the majority element in labor in all programs of future labor legislation and to immediately end the existing policy which is admittedly being dominated by the minority interests as represented by AFL and CIO.

In the war which we have just won, the records of industry reflect the efforts of all labor in reaching fabulous standards of production. If we are to expect the maintenance of the goal of full production so that all peoples of the world may be fed, clothed, and sheltered properly, due recognition must be given to independent labor as their spirit shows a more democratic and less radical attitude than the international unions.

We sincerely believe that every Member of Congress, in taking the oath of office, pledged themselves to abide by the principles of the Constitution of our great country. Knowing this to be true, we again call upon the Members of Congress to see that everyone in labor is given equal rights and protection under the law, and to discontinue the present favoritism shown members of AFL and CIO affiliates. It is only through such a program that a democratic state can survive.

We do not ask for any special privilege. All we want is the decent treatment we are deserving of under the Constitution. You will not find in our ranks anyone who preaches communism or any other "ism." We have been lost in the wilderness during the last years, but it is high time the Congress of the United States heard our call and sees that we get just treatment in our fight for equal representation. Our Nation must progress if mankind is to survive, but progress can only develop on an aggressive basis if we all work together in harmony and with common principles, common objectives, and the common understanding of the equal rights of all citizens of these United States.

Very sincerely yours,

EDWARD L. BORAM, *President.*

The second of these letters is as follows:

INDEPENDENT UNION OF SUTHERLAND PAPER CO. EMPLOYEES, INC.,
Kalamazoo, Mich.

Hon. PAUL SHAFER,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHAFER: I think the time has finally arrived in this country to enact laws to compel each union to be held responsible for its obligations.

The workers in this country do not want to be thrown out of work due to some unscrupulous labor leader's dictates, who pretends they are doing all this for the rank and file of their union, when it is quite evident that all they seek is personal power and wealth.

If these so-called labor leaders keep getting by with this sort of thing, it will destroy our whole economy, and we, honest labor leaders, who have the worker's interests and their families as well as our obligation to our community and country at heart, will be placed in an embarrassing position, as the general public will condemn any organization having union attached to their title.

We have approximately 1,800 members in our organization, and I can truthfully say that the condemnation of these dictorial labor bosses is the worst I have heard since my association with the union movement in 1939. The criticism is just as great with regard to our Chief Executive and his do-nothing policy.

The people of this country are tired of this wishy-washy policy of the present administration, and we need a return to constitutional government and States' rights, with aggressive leadership, who will have the backbone to say "No" to some of these pressure groups. The honest workers of America are being taken down a blind alley, and I, for one, think it is time to call a halt to all this organized confusion for the good and welfare of our country before it is too late, if it is not already.

Should I, or my organization, be of any help in getting this country back on a firm footing, please feel free to call on us, as the United States of America comes first in our hearts.

Very sincerely yours,

EDWARD L. BORAM, *President.*

Mr. Speaker, as is plainly apparent to anyone who will consult the Congressional Directory, the Republicans are now in the minority in both the House of Representatives and in the Senate. Whatever legislation we introduce must go through committees controlled by the Democrats; whatever suggestions we make must be acted upon, if they are acted upon, by Democratic administrators.

Therefore, I feel it particularly useless to introduce legislation giving independent unions a priority in appointments that would place them on a par in Government bureaus with the A. F. of L. and the CIO. But I can say very definitely to these millions of members of the independent unions that if they will but wait a little while, if they will but vote Republican, they will get the kind of representation they want, they will have the good government they deserve. Not forever will the millions of laborers in America allow the CIO tail to wag the labor union dog. Not forever will the millions of conscientious, hard-working, thoughtful laborers of America—those who are members of unions and those who are not—allow a little group of collectivists, who in turn are controlled by a little group of Communists, to spend millions of dollars illegally trying to influence elections and to pad the Government pay rolls with hundreds of their representatives, pushing out with heavy hands the representatives of independent labor unions. The day of reckoning is bound to come.

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of May 10, 1946:

ATTENTION, MR. PRESIDENT

If enemy bombing planes were making round-the-clock raids over the United States, smashing factories, severing rail lines, and blowing up bridges, the Government would act swiftly to repel the assaults.

If a gang of outlaws suddenly began to prey on the citizens of this country, robbing them of their savings and seizing their household goods, the crime detection agencies of the Federal, State, and local governments would be speedily mobilized to track down the culprits and stop their depredations.

If a band of extortioners threatened the Nation with disaster unless a king's ransom were paid to buy them off, the Government would resist the demands of the blackmailers and take steps to put them behind bars.

All this is happening in the United States today because of the coal strike. Factories are closing, and the forced shut-downs are just as effective as though they had been bombed out of existence. Rail transportation is gradually being strangled, just as it would be if the roadbeds and bridges had been blown up by enemy action.

Factory closings and the freight embargo are forcing workmen into idleness. They must draw on their savings in order to live and thus are being robbed just as surely as though they had been held up at the point of a gun. They are also being deprived of the opportunity to buy new household goods, automobiles, and other articles, first because these commodities cannot be produced or transported, and second, because the savings with which they might have been purchased must be used for living expenses.

Moreover, the entire Nation is being blackmailed. John L. Lewis in effect has told the coal consumers that they must fork over a royalty on all coal mined, amounting to approximately $60,000,000 a year, or else.

So far the Government has done nothing to protect the people from this menace to industry, employment, production, and transportation, and this threat of extortion. Instead, it has told them they must travel less, ship less, burn less coal, and use less electricity.

Why has the Government failed to act? Because the administration is afraid it could not survive without the political support of the labor unions. And because a generation of citizens and politicians has grown up under the New Deal teaching that a labor union can do no wrong.

For 12 years under the late President Roosevelt the Government was busily engaged in conferring special privileges on labor unions and in herding workers into labor unions and compelling them to remain in good standing, under penalty of losing their jobs. Even the Supreme Court held that robbery and extortion were not crimes under Federal statutes when they were committed by a labor union.

This raw deal which the New Deal gave to America has now achieved its ultimate perfection in the form of one labor leader who is demonstrating his power to strangle the entire Nation if his demands are not met.

Mr. President, if you are waiting for public opinion to become thoroughly aroused before exercising strong leadership to put John L. Lewis in his place, you have waited too long.

The public already is thoroughly aroused to the menace which Lewis and other labor barons have become to the welfare of the Nation.

If you, Mr. President, would submit to Congress an honest program to protect the rights of the people and curb the excesses and greed of the labor barons, Congress would not dare to refuse to approve it. Such a program should include the following:

Make strikes involving the suspension of public utilities and the supply of vital material to public utilities illegal.

Either repeal the collective-bargaining provisions of the National Labor Relations Act or make it mandatory for labor unions, as well as employers, to bargain collectively when demand is made upon them to do so.

Give the Government the right to seize labor unions, that is to take possession of their funds and books, under the same circumstances that the Government now has the right to seize corporations.

Make unions and their officers subject to civil suits and prosecutions for engaging in monopolistic practices, just as corporations and their officers are now liable civilly and criminally for such offenses.

Make it illegal for unions to exact royalties or fees on the products their members produce.

Exempt foremen and other supervisory employees from the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

Permit unions to be sued for violation of their contracts, just as corporations can be sued for contract violations.

This program, Mr. President, would not only take care of John L. Lewis. It would also give the long-suffering public a fair deal, by liberating the people from the tyrannical bondage of all ruthless and greedy labor barons.

All States, Especially Louisiana, Need Additional Federal Funds for Welfare Aid—H. R. 5686, Which Is Forand Bill, Should Be Enacted Immediately

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the State of Louisiana is having a very serious problem trying to find enough money to meet the essential needs of our old and infirm people without jeopardizing the other essential State services, such as education, hospitals and institutions.

It has long been advocated that the Federal Government should bear a more equitable portion of this essential governmental cost, particularly in the States having very low per capita incomes. My colleague, Congressman FORAND of Rhode Island has introduced a bill H. R. 5686 which is now being considered by the Committee on Ways and Means. Some very excellent material has been presented to that committee in support of this bill. On May 7, Mr. W. S. Terry, Jr., commissioner of public welfare from the State of Louisiana, testified before the committee. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of Mr. Terry's remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which is a splendid presentation:

My name is W. S. Terry, Jr. I am the commissioner of public welfare for the State of Louisiana and, as such, I am responsible for administering the entire public-welfare program in that State. I represent the Department of Public Welfare of the State of Louisiana. But, most important of all, I desire to speak in behalf of approximately 100,000 needy people of our great State who, because of their age or infirmities, are unable to provide for themselves the minimum necessities for existence.

The Department of Public Welfare of the State of Louisiana is interested in seeing all phases of the social-security program reviewed and modernized, but my testimony here today will be limited to the need for amending the public-assistance and welfare-service provisions of the social-security program.

I have carefully studied the report of the committee's social security technical staff and particularly with reference to part 2 of that report. It contains a very thorough analysis of the real problems involved in the administration of the public-assistance programs, and it is furthermore supported by complete and accurate statistical data. I shall not, therefore, burden the committee by submitting additional statistical data.

We who are administering the State welfare programs are very close to the problems confronting the people that these programs were created to serve. We feel very keenly the heartaches experienced by people who are in need and who are not adequately provided for, as well as for those who are hindered by red tape and relative inefficiency inherent in a categorical program. We, therefore, feel that we have a responsibility to bring our experiences to Congress so that the legislation can be adapted to more specifically meet the needs of the ultimate recipient instead of meeting the needs of a particular administrative agency.

The bill, House Resolution 5686, which was introduced by the Honorable A. J. FORAND, of Rhode Island, accomplishes that particular objective insofar as Federal legislation is concerned. I hereby express my full endorsement of every provision of that bill.

This bill proposes three major changes in public assistance administration which involve increased expenditures at the Federal level. They are variable grants, removal of Federal maxima, on individual grants, and the inclusion of additional groups not presently covered by the Social Security Act.

Coming from a low-income State I have a special obligation to urge the adoption of the variable grant principle in distributing Federal public assistance funds. I feel that I have a special right to speak on this subject because I also have the honor of representing a State that has extended itself beyond the national average in attempting to provide for the needs of its own citizens. By citing the data contained in the Calhoun Report it is shown that in 1942, 6.94 percent of the income payments in the Nation was required to finance State and local governments, whereas in the State of Louisiana for the same period, 8.41 percent of the income payments of the population of our State was required for the cost of our State and local government. For the same period, 0.37 percent of the income payments was required to finance the State and local share of the public-assistance program in the Nation, whereas 0.46 percent of the income payments of Louisianians was required to finance the State and local share of our public assistance program.

In other words, we are assessing our citizens at a greater rate than the national average to provide for the cost of our State and local government, and we are taking a greater percentage than the national average of our State and local tax resources to finance our public-assistance program. In spite of this fact, we are still unable to meet even the minimum essentials of life for those of our citizens who are unable to work and provide for themselves.

This is true because of two factors that are working adversely against us, namely, our low per capita income limits the amount of our tax resources, and because of our low per capita income we have a greater instance of dependency. To support this statement I would like to cite table 15 on page 348 of the Calhoun report, in which you will find that 303 out of every 1,000 of our population over the age of 65 receive old-age assistance as compared with a national average of 207 out of every 1,000 persons over the age of 65, and 27 out of each 1,000 children under the age of 18 receive aid in Louisiana as compared with a national average of 16 children. There is also overwhelming evidence that the funds appropriated for public assistance are being spent conservatively, and, nevertheless, we are still unable to meet the total needs of our people.

In computing our grants we only make allowances for the minimum needs of life based on low-cost purchases. These needs include food, shelter, medical care, clothing, utilities, and personal needs. Nevertheless, we have never been able to make full allowances for the purchase of even these minimum items for our entire case loads. We feel that our old people, our children, and our other incapacitated and infirm people are entitled to receive at least these basic essentials to existence. Fortunately, there are States that do not require additional Federal funds in order to provide such basic essentials for their needy people. However, our State is unable to provide for all of our needy persons, and therefore the variable grant principle will enable Louisiana and other States similarly situated to attain the additional funds to provide for all such needy persons, while at the same time it will not injure these other States who do not need additional funds.

We people in Louisiana are doing everything we can to increase the per capita income of our population and we are looking forward to the day when we will not need special Federal aid, but until that time comes, we must urge you to recognize our need for additional aid.

Insofar as the Federal maxima on individual grants are concerned we would like to see these eliminated. They only serve to prevent us from realistically meeting the needs of the special cases who need assistance most. Many of our old and infirm people do not have relatives with whom they can live and we must find boarding and nursing homes to provide for their needs. Very few boarding and nursing homes can be found for a rate of $40 per month. The Federal maxima on grants for dependent children are so completely inadequate that even food cannot be purchased at the rate provided in the Federal Act.

The proposal in the Forand bill to eliminate categories insofar as the Federal act is concerned will do more to simplify the public-welfare program and to eliminate buck passing and red tape, and to improve administration than any other portion of the bill. If this proposal is enacted into law it will be applauded not only by the agencies administering the program but by the silent and suffering millions of our population who find themselves caught in the maze of red tape involved in a categorical assistance program.

To illustrate the complexity of the problem I will cite a case of a man 65 years of age who has a blind son by an earlier marriage living in the home with him, and his second wife has two children under the age of 16. It would seem logical that in such a case since the father is the normal breadwinner of the family that one check could be issued to provide for the needs of such a household. Under the present social-security program, if we include the needs of the blind son and the younger children in an old-age-assistance grant to the father, we cannot secure Federal matching for their needs. We must take an application from the father for old-age assistance, an application from the mother for aid to dependent children, and an application from the son for aid to needy blind. Furthermore, the worker who carries these three cases must keep a detailed record of the amount of time that she spends on each case so that the administrative cost can be properly apportioned between the several categories. If the older son happens to be feeble-minded instead of blind we must also keep our records in such

a way that the food that he eats and the clothes that he wears and the other costs of his support can be identified, because it has been ruled that Federal matching is not available to meet the needs of such an individual.

Such unconcern for the needs of our fellowman, such foolish expenditure of tax money for administrative costs that serve no useful purpose, can no longer go unheeded.

We cannot escape this issue. We must face it squarely. There is no logical reason why an able-bodied man 65 years of age should be provided for at public expense while a totally paralyzed man at the age of 60 should be excluded from help.

The other proposals contained in the Forand bill do not involve large expenditures of Federal funds but are equally essential from the standpoint of the State welfare administrator. Outstanding among the other proposals is the provision to place the responsibility for the entire administration of the Federal part of the public welfare program in a single Federal agency. It must be remembered that a State welfare department must presently deal with at least two Federal agencies, which means that the State programs must conform to at least two different sets of Federal standards. This involves two sets of personnel standards, two different accounting systems, and many other differences in reporting and supervising, all of which increase the cost of administration at both the Federal and State level and complicate the administration of the programs.

I, for one, do not want to see either the Social Security Board or the Children's Bureau disintegrated by this legislation. It is to be hoped that in the near future these two agencies will be coordinated under a single administrator. I do, however, want to see an elimination of the competition presently existing between these two agencies in the welfare field. We are trying to render a vital service to our needy people and we cannot permit the vested rights of any agency, whether at the Federal, State, or local level, to interfere with the services to be rendered.

The fact that I do not speak on every point contained in the Forand bill should not be interpreted to mean that we are not vitally interested in the entire proposal. We would like to see this bill reported out of this committee in its entirety.

On behalf of the Department of Public Welfare of the State of Louisiana, I respectfully urge that such action be taken by this committee.

Polish Credits Held Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

POLISH CREDITS HELD UP

The decision of the State Department to hold up the $90,000,000 in credits to the Communist puppet regime in Poland, pending fulfillment of United States conditions, corrects what obviously was a serious error in Washington.

Just why America should finance Soviet aggression in Poland was puzzling to many on this side of the Atlantic who had been outraged by what transpired after Yalta.

The Polish Government of National Unity, presently functioning in the Polish capital, consists of a band of usurpers, openly promoted by Soviet Russia and supported by the might of the Red army. The people of Poland are prisoners. It is not their government. They had nothing to do with its selection nor do they have anything to do with its retention.

If, by some modern miracle, free elections can be held in Poland, and it is not clear how they can be with this set-up, the opportunists will be run out of office unquestionably. But the trick is to provide the opportunity for the Poles to express themselves. Under the existing reign of terror, they cannot even voice an opinion, let alone vote.

For the United States to finance this experiment in Communist power politics is the last straw. It is like rubbing salt into the wounds, inflicted on the helpless country when our statesmen stabbed Poland in the back. Let no American dollars go to Warsaw where they will be used for the enslavement of the people they are intended to succor.

Housing Legislation and Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, in February I obtained unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD certain resolutions and recommendations which had been expressed by resolution of the United States Conference of Mayors at their recent meeting in New York City.

Certain of them made reference to housing. Hon. Ivan D. Carson, Deputy Administrator for Rent, of the Office of Price Administration, has written me this letter, and for the further information of the House I am inserting it in the RECORD.

It follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1946.

The Honorable CLIFFORD DAVIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: I note in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that on February 12 you introduced certain resolutions and recommendations for housing legislation and rent control, passed by the United States Conference of Mayors at their meeting in New York several months ago. The resolutions in the main are encouraging to the rent-control program. I should like, however, to discuss the paragraph on housing, which reads:

"Be it resolved by the United States Conference of Mayors, That where a landlord arranges for a room or rooms in the landlord's own living quarters and sharing the home with his own family, to a veteran of World War II for housekeeping, including cooking on the premises, the Office of Price Administration rent regulations as to landlord-tenant relationship governing tenure shall not apply, and: Be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be submitted immediately to the Director of Reconversion and the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration."

I think a quotation from a letter by Mr. Bowles to Mayor Kelly will make clear our policy in this matter:

"I am sure you will be glad to know that the rent regulations do in fact already cover this point. Although it is perhaps not generally known, early in the war when the homes use program of the National Housing Authority was developed, in order to encourage renting of rooms in private houses, we amended our regulations so as to accomplish what it seems to me the mayors' conference had in mind.

"The rent regulations now contain special provisions applying to rooms rented in a landlord's own home. These provisions (sec. 6, chs. 3 and 4) exempt from the eviction regulations a furnished room or rooms not constituting an apartment, in the home of the landlord or his immediate family, where the landlord rents to not more than two occupants or to not more than one family.

"The resolution adopted by the conference also refers to situations where cooking privileges are provided to tenants. To make sure that proper consideration will be given to such cases, I have asked our rent department to instruct our area rent offices that in situations covered by the sections of the regulations I have mentioned, the granting of cooking privileges shall not prevent the exemption of the landlord from the eviction controls of the rent regulations.

"I should appreciate it very much if you would inform the members of the mayors' council about the way in which the rent regulations now meet this problem. I will ask all our area rent offices to cooperate with the mayors of the cities in their areas in giving publicity to these sections of the regulations so that widespread encouragement will be given to the practice of renting as many spare rooms as possible to veterans and others facing hardship resulting from the present acute housing shortage."

Let me say that we appreciate your interest in the resolutions of the conference, especially the recommendation which urges the necessity for continued rent controls until the problem of housing shortage is solved.

Sincerely yours,

IVAN D. CARSON,
Deputy Administrator for Rent.

Appointment of Karl Brandt to Our Military Government in Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 13, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter sent by me to Hon. Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War:

Hon. ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have before me a booklet called, Germany Is Our Problem, by Karl Brandt. It is distributed by Human Events, Inc., of Washington and Chicago.

This pamphlet is a complete defense for and exculpation of the German people. It makes Germans saints and the Allied occupants sinners. It is a shocking attempt to purge the German people of all blame for the war. It bitterly decries what President Roosevelt did at Potsdam with reference to Germany. It wants the German Army to remain intact, German railroads to run as before and Germany to be allowed to develop industrially. It states that the major part of the victims of Buchenwald and other atrocity camps were Germans. Actually, only a small portion was German, most of the victims coming from invaded and satellite ter-

ritory, Poland, Hungary, Rumania (in most instances the Jews), and France. No mention is made of those. It is apparently his aim to depict the Germans as martyrs. He refutes President Truman's statement made in his report to the Nation, which said, "The German people are beginning to atone for the crimes of the gangsters whom they placed in power and whom they wholeheartedly approved and obediently followed."

Certainly the reports of Raymond Daniell in his series in the New York Times do not bear out Mr. Brandt's audacious conclusion that the Germans did not subscribe to the Hitler regime. To this day the Nazis keep their grip in Germany even with the Hitler regime destroyed.

I would pay little attention to this booklet and the author were it not for that fact that I learned he has been appointed one of the advisers to the Office of Military Government in Berlin in the Food and Agriculture Branch. No man who discusses Germany in his terms in contradiction to our established policy and the policy of our allies is fit for a post with our Office of Military Government in Germany.

I am going to ask you to investigate both the background and fitness of this man with reference to the post he now holds. It is one thing for a private citizen to discuss and refute our policy in Germany and another for a pro-German to hold government office in Berlin with views that run counter to established fact and policy.

I protest against his appointment as an adviser in the Office of Military Government in Berlin in the Food and Agriculture Branch.

With assurances of highest esteem, I am

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

CIO-PAC Communists Out To Purge Barry Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hyman Blumberg, State secretary of the American Labor Party, has announced that "Congressman WILLIAM B. BARRY, of Queens County, N. Y., is on the CIO-PAC purge list because of his position on the Spanish question and on other matters of foreign policy."

What he means is that he and his communistic-minded associates would like to purge me because I have been outspoken in my opposition to their drive to embroil the United States in their Moscow-backed efforts to start another bloody revolution in Spain for the purpose of establishing a communistic government in that unfortunate country. Any thoughtful person realizes that a Communist-dominated Spain would place the Mediterranean Sea—the British l'feline—in the hands of Stalin, and would place all of continental Europe under his heel. Stalin would then face America across the Atlantic. No sensible person believes that Stalin is trying to establish a democracy in Spain or anywhere else. During the Spanish Revolution, and against the wishes of the majority on both sides, the Reds murdered in cold blood thousands of innocent and unarmed priests and nuns. Many of the latter were raped and their bodies desecrated before they were shot. Their only crime was that they worshiped and served God according to their religious convictions. A repetition of those horrors is what the great majority of people in Spain fear if another civil war occurs.

My position is that the United States should pursue its traditional policy of noninterference in the internal affairs of any other nation. I personally dislike all dictators whether their names be Franco or Stalin. I hope that some day all peoples of the world will live under a democratic form of government similar to that which we enjoy in the United States—and I believe that Spain will eventually establish a real democracy.

The other so-called reasons which have invited the hatred of the Communists, and I welcome that hatred, is that I have time and time again exposed their activities in labor unions.

In recent years the power of Communists has grown rapidly, especially in the CIO labor unions. Whenever the Reds control a union, they use it as a vehicle to promote communism at home and abroad. Their motto is Russia first. They blindly take their orders from Moscow without regard to the economic welfare of their members, most of whom are usually not Communists. At one time Moscow attacks Colonel Peron as a Fascist. Now, a short time later, Russia has a trade mission in Argentina dealing with him. Communists see nothing inconsistent in that. Last week Soviet Russia promised the Arabs to advocate their cause against the Palestinian Jews before the United Nations. The Communists have made no protest against Moscow's attitude on Palestine. They will betray anyone to serve the Communists' cause.

Even at the CIO Convention in Atlantic City where it was announced that I was to be purged, resolutions approving the Communist foreign policy of Russia and condemning the foreign policy of America and Great Britain were adopted.

The Communists and their stooges at this very moment are bending every effort to prevent the establishing of a just peace. Their only object is to expand Russia's power.

It should always be remembered by Americans that only a small group of Communists took over Russia, which has a population of 180,000,000 people. Even today there are less than 2,000,000 Communists ruling and enslaving that Nation. Let us not delude ourselves as to what might happen here. Every real Communist in this country is a spy and a Russian agent. From my point of view they are definitely traitors, and should be treated as such.

Personally I have no fear of being purged by them. They tried it in 1942 with every smear tactic known to them and it failed then, and I have no doubt that it will fail again.

I am going to run in the primaries on August 20 and in the general election in November. I will run on my record and will continue my fight against communism, fascism, or any other un-Americanism. I will seek only the votes of good Americans.

I am sending this statement throughout my district and will welcome any comments my constituents have to make.

Operation of Air Lines by Overseas Shipping Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, when Congress passed the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 it was never intended to create a government agency that would follow policies destructive to the American merchant marine. I have repeatedly called the attention of the House to the fact that the Civil Aeronautics Board is following such a policy in denying to American overseas shipping companies the right to operate air lines parallel to their surface shipping routes, as an integrated part of the service to be rendered in the international trade of the United States. Every other maritime nation in the world follows a policy which encourages the operation of air routes by surface shipping companies. The American merchant marine cannot successfully compete in international trade if that policy is to remain.

During the war that danger was not so imminent, but now that the war is over it has become a reality by the amazing fact that rights are being given by the Civil Aeronautics Board to foreign airlines, operated as an integral part of their entire ocean transport business, to land at airports in the United States. At the same time they deny the right to American operators of surface ships to operate airlines to any country.

Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent previously granted, I include as a part of my remarks an editorial which recently appeared in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin recording the arrival at the San Francisco municipal airport of a commercially operated foreign plane—operated as an integral part of foreign surface shipping interests—inaugurating such unfair competition between American shipping companies in our trade with Australia. The editorial is as follows:

AN AMAZING FACT—UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT GRANTS RIGHTS TO ALIEN SHIPPING THAT IT DENIES TO AMERICAN MARITIME INTERESTS

The arrival of an Australian National Airways transport at the San Francisco municipal airport, completing the first commercial air passage between Australia and the United States since the war, gives sharp emphasis to a most amazing fact.

The Australian National Airways is a commercial aviation enterprise designed to offer cargo and passenger facilities to overseas shippers and travelers.

It was founded, and has long been principally owned and controlled, by Australian shipping interests—and it supplements the facilities and services of those established interests and is completely integrated with them, and thus the combined air-sea interests of Australia are now able to offer and

are actually conducting a wholly new and vastly significant medium of ocean transport.

The American Government has not only authorized and permitted this Australian enterprise, but has granted the use of American airports, airways, and other essential facilities.

However, our own American shipping interests which desire to supplement their existing facilities and services with air transport have been denied the right to do so by the American Government.

Several American shipping lines have repeatedly petitioned the Civil Aeronautics Board for permission to operate an integrated air-sea ocean transport service, and have been consistently and persistently refused that right.

But strangely and incomprehensibly, the competing Australian shipping interests are freely granted the very thing which the American shipping interests are arbitrarily denied.

And the truly amazing and utterly incredible fact about this situation is that the American Government is pursuing that policy not only with Australia, but with every foreign government which has shipping interests strongly competitive with ours and which desires to operate supplementary aviation services.

It requires no particular gift of prophecy to foresee where the bulk of ocean transport business is going in the future if the American Government persists in this discriminatory policy.

How can the American shipping interests successfully compete with their Australian and other foreign competitors, if they are foreclosed against using the most vital facilities of profitable competition?

How, as a matter of fact, can the American shipping interests operate at all under these conditions?

Why should our foreign competitors be given such a tremendous advantage in the postwar fields of world trade and commerce, with our own American shipping interests being virtually driven from those profitable fields?

If the American Government had the deliberate purpose of completely destroying the American merchant marine, it could not find a better instrument to accomplish that purpose than this absurd and stupid policy of discrimination and foreclosure.

Loan or Gift to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives will soon be asked to approve the action of the Senate in giving away approximately $4,000,000,000, usually referred to as $3,750,000,000, to Great Britain. This effort on the part of this Government to finance a socialistic government is an insult to every American veteran who has fought to destroy, root and branch, state socialism. Is this Government to bleed our taxpayers white in order to make it appear that socialized and nationalized Great Britain is a success? The people of this country are already being insulted by the communistic, socialistic groups in England even before the money is appropriated.

It is now obvious that the socialistic and communistic element in England are already fraternizing with the Germans in the hope of having them on their side in the case of trouble with either Russia or the United States. Even Mr. Walter Lippmann, who has always seemed to me to be a so-called liberal, and who has just returned from abroad, says:

To state the blunt truth, the German problem, as seen in Moscow and in London, is fundamentally whether in the event of war the Germans are to be used by the Russians or by the western powers. This is a terrible fact, but it is the fact. If anything is to be done about it, the United States will have to do it.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Times-Herald of May 14, 1946:

FROM LASKI, WITHOUT LOVE

Yesterday's New York Times reported by wireless from London that Prof. Harold J. Laski, chairman of the British Labor Party, had made the latest of his habitual cracks at the United States in a speech Sunday at Cardiff, Wales.

Professor Laski's newest sneer at us was worded as follows:

"To those who say we have to choose—as I do not believe we have to choose—between the Soviet Union and the United States, with its passion for free enterprise which is not free and is not enterprise, we, the Labor Party, stand four-square behind the Soviet Union."

Laski did add that he thought Russia ought not to take over the whole world in this period of Russian expansion. He felt that Russia should let Britain know "the limits of its demands."

But except for that stipulation Harold's heart's in the Kremlin; his heart is not here. Harold doesn't like us, and never did—though he continually volunteers advice to us to give up our rotten, decadent (as he sees it) capitalist system and go in for either Russian communism or British socialism. Sometimes it's one, sometimes it's the other.

THE INTELLECTUALS—THE RANK AND FILE

Of course, we are familiar with the excuses which other British Labor (Socialist) Party leaders trot out for American consumption whenever Laski shoots off his pretty little mouth at the United States.

We're always told that Harold doesn't count, really; that he represents only a small, superintellectual faction of the British Labor Party membership. Too, he is chairman of the Labor Party for a year only, and merely because his number came up for the chairmanship.

Assuming that all this is true, Harold's latest blast at us nevertheless calls for some consideration on our part.

For one thing, it came just 2 days after the United States Senate had voted for the proposed "loan" to Britain of almost $4,000,000,000. Laski's gratitude apparently comes high—higher than $4,000,000,000, anyway.

For another thing this man may not represent a Labor Party majority, but he at least speaks for the loudest and most energetic minority in the Labor Party. That is the intellectual minority of professors, writers, newspaper people, and unclassified double domes who do the heavy thinking for the Labor Party leadership.

Ideas hatched by the intellectuals frequently percolate to the rank and file, till after a time the rank and file is ballyhooing those ideas, and has the pleased impression that it thought them up itself.

Laski now appears to be trying to condition the Labor Party rank and file mind to a choice of Communist Russia if Britain should ever be forced to choose between Russia and the United States.

NOTICE FROM PROFESSOR LASKI

All of which has an important bearing on the above-mentioned "loan" to Great Britain, now moving toward debate in the House of Representatives.

In discussing the matter the House, we hope, will give due weight to Professor Laski's latest nip at Uncle Sam's neck.

Laski's remark serves notice on us that, if we extend this "loan," we may reasonably expect that (1) the Labor Party will use a good part of it to push Great Britain swiftly into socialism, and (2) the Labor Party, having got our money, will gradually shift around to the side of Communist Russia in international arguments involving Russia and the United States.

This will be a double-barreled joke on us, if nothing worse. The capitalistic United States will thus have helped to finance the coming of socialism to Great Britain, and will have shored up a potential ally for Communist Russia against the United States. The joke will lose a good deal of its humor if we ever get into a war against the British and Russian Empires combined.

The cream of the jest up to now is the fact that Socialist Britain and Communist Russia are coming around to us for loans while calling us rotten, decadent capitalists. We aren't asking Russia or Britain for loans—and we rotten etc.'s furnished the necessary makeweight to win the Allies' recent wars against both the Germans and the Japs.

Altogether it looks to us as if the best use we could make of those billions, if we've got to fling more billions around, would be to give them to our veterans of World War II as bonuses. We'd like to see the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, etc., push this proposition.

OPA Interference With Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DUDLEY G. ROE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement of facts sent out by Peter W. Chichester, manager of Dietrich & Gambrill, Inc., feed mills of Frederick, Md.

This will show how OPA interference with business has practically closed another large plant and deprives our farmers of urgently needed feed for their cows, chickens, and so forth.

The letter follows:

APRIL 29, 1946.

To All D. & G. Salesmen.

GENTLEMEN: This will be the most distressing letter we have been forced to write our salesmen. The truth of the matter is we are just about at the end of the rope until the new crop year, which will be about November 1.

Our company is and has been losing money for quite some time. We simply cannot continue as we have been going since we can see no definite relief until late this fall.

As you know the Government is buying corn and wheat for export and are paying farmers a royalty of 30 cents per bushel above OPA ceiling price. No feed manufacturer will get 1 bushel of these grains unless he pays black-market price or a premium of 30 cents. This is illegal and our company will not subscribe to black-market tactics. There is no barley and will be none offered until

after the new crop. Oats, practically the only grain we have been getting for 6 months, are being purchased under many dubious schemes above OPA price. Now we can purchase only an occasional few cars at regular prices. Mill feeds are practically out of the question. To keep our mill running at all we have purchased imported mill feed at $15 per ton above OPA prices. We are absorbing this difference. Brewers grains and distillers are scarce, and are practically off the market. Our largest and most reliable supplier of soybean meal has informed us we could not expect over one-third of our usual supply until after November of this year. Most any day we are expecting to receive similar news from our other suppliers of soybean meal. Our volume has and will continue to shrink each week. Our labor costs since January 1, 1941, have increased about 138 percent. We have already taken off our night crew at our Lewisburg mill and expect to do the same at Frederick. With this new Government regulation we hardly expect to run either of our mills more than a few days each week. At this rate it will not take many months to lose thousands of dollars each month. The time has about come when we must do something so that we will at least have our mill and a small skeleton of an organization to start over with when we again will have grains and proteins to manufacture with.

To this end we may be forced to ask all of our salesmen to take a leave of absence without pay until we can get enough grain and protein to run our mill at a profit. The next 10 days probably will give us the definite answer. But at this writing it looks as if we may ask our salesmen to take this leave beginning June 1. How long this leave may last we are not in a position to say. It may be for 60 days or it may last until next fall when the new corn and soybean crop is harvested. At any rate we think it only fair that we should give you details of our position so that you may be prepared when this decision is made.

While this leave of absence is going on we can dispose of what little feed we will have to offer by phone from this office and perhaps an occasional visit.

We hate to be forced to write a letter of this kind, but your company has been put on the spot because of no fault of its management. This has been caused by excessive Government orders, and unscrupulous persons who do not hesitate to enter the black market.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

PETER W. CHICHESTER,
Sales Manager.

Food Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Yankee Division Veterans Association, comprising World War I and II veterans, at Worcester, Mass., on May 16, 1946, have gone on record in support of the Government's food conservation program to alleviate a possible famine throughout the world during the coming year.

In a resolution unanimously adopted by the committee headed by Fred A. Jones for the twenty-seventh annual national Yankee Division convention in Worcester, Mass., June 27 through 30, reads:

In World War I, more than 15,000 men of the Yankee Division served in the Army to preserve world peace. After the conflict, many of the men arrived home, conscious of the conditions of the peoples in war-torn countries—they needed food, starvation was inevitable without help of the American people.

We did something at home for them. We will again today—that's democracy, what we fought for.

Today, World War I veterans find themselves with new buddies who fought throughout the world for the same cause. More than 20,000 Yankee Division veterans this time fought for the preservation of democracy.

As one united group of Yankee Division veterans, we realize the necessity of feeding the starving peoples of the world. We will do our part.

Therefor, during the twenty-seventh annual convention of the Yankee Division chapters throughout the country, to be held in Worcester, Mass., June 27 through 30, we will eat bread but once a day during meals. There will be no waste of food. There will be no excessive use of any foodstuffs or beverages with the ingredients of wheat, flour, barley, or rye which might be used to save the life of anyone—man, woman, or child throughout the world.

The Yankee Division veterans, through this resolution, hope that other people in America will follow the food-saving conservation program as a way of saying for the starving peoples of the world—"This is democracy."

Wheat Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, the following is a copy of a letter sent to one of my farmer constituents by the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, advising the farmer of the calling of his wheat loan. I want to call your attention to the specific sentence in the letter which reads:

We feel it is advisable to sell at this time before March 1, 1946.

Is it any wonder that the farmers of our Nation are discouraged, confused, and bewildered? The loan under this contract was based on June 1 termination. Now, let us analyze what has happened since March 1 in regard to wheat prices.

First. Wheat prices were advanced 3 cents per bushel.

Second. The farmers were authorized to sell on a certificate plan accepting any sale date previous to March 31, 1947.

Third. A bonus payment of 30 cents a bushel was made.

Fourth. Wheat prices were advanced 15 cents per bushel.

All of this has occurred within 45 days. I hope the Congress will give consideration to Representative HOPE'S bill for making these payments retroactive to the first of the year. This, of course, is unfair to thousands of wheat growers who would gladly have held their wheat until after the first of the year, but were advised and assured by the Department of Agriculture and the OPA that there would be no wheat price increases. This mishandling of the purchase program is no credit to any Federal agency.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY,
COUNTY AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION,
February 25, 1946.

MR. ——— ———,
———, *Kans.*

DEAR SIR: This is to notify you that the Commodity Credit Corporation is calling all 1945 wheat loans March 1, 1946. All loans held by local lending agencies not repaid by March 2 will be forwarded to the Grain Branch Office of Production and Marketing Administration serving the area. Settlement may be made by repayment of the note and interest to date of payment, or delivery and sale to Commodity Credit Corporation in accordance with the terms of the 1945 parity-purchase program.

The parity-purchase price for farm-stored wheat will be loan value for grade of wheat delivered plus 15 cents minus 3 percent interest from date of disbursement to date delivery is completed. On warehouse wheat it will be applicable loan rate plus 15 cents minus 3 percent interest from date of disbursement to March 1 and accrued unpaid warehouse charges through the storage year under the uniform storage agreement (7 cents storage and 2¼ cents conditioning charges). If the wheat is No. 1 wheat, the parity-purchase program brings you the price you can make now by paying off the note and selling on the market.

The Commodity Credit Corporation will take the wheat March 2 but it may be possible that they would be unable to get cars to move the wheat so as to have space for the next harvest.

We feel it is advisable to sell at this time before March 1, 1946.

Please notify us in the next few days as to your decision as action must be taken and forms made out to deliver your wheat to Commodity Credit Corporation if you did not make settlement before March 1, 1946.

Yours very truly,

———— ————,
Chairman, County Committee.

Veterans Don't Want Wyatt's Houses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS RIZLEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the May 13, 1946, issue of Barron's:

VETERANS DON'T WANT WYATT'S HOUSES—EX-SERVICEMEN ARE SEEKING FLATS, SUBURES COOL TO INRUSH OF GI'S

(By Harold S. Taylor and Ralph Masiello)

Wilson Wyatt, National Housing Expediter, is striving to settle a great many people into homes they don't want, at prices they can't afford, in communities that don't want them.

It sounds silly right now to speak of anyone's not wanting to occupy any shelter that offers a bearable minimum of comfort and privacy, or being unwilling to pay any price demanded of him. And aren't the Federal Government and lending agencies falling over

themselves to get money into the hands of veterans to buy homes? Doesn't every courthouse square in the land blossom with a "Welcome home, well done" sign?

These things are true, and they help explain the tremendous political appeal of a program to build 2,700,000 individual houses in the next 2 years. But the investor or taxpayer who looks beyond those 2 years can easily spot the fatal flaws in the Wyatt proposals.

The history of the United States in the twentieth century is one of increasing tenancy and increasing concentration in multiple housing. Home ownership crossed the 40 percent mark in 1930—going down. The clock won't turn back for any dream regarding a rose-covered cottage on every hill.

Several studies have been made which intentionally or inadvertently point to the fallacy of trying to solve 1946 housing problems with 1925-type suburban developments. It is less widely known that prudent municipalities feel they can very well spare the type of new resident the veterans' housing program promises them.

VETERANS' GROUP FINDS "WELCOME" COOLS FAST

A group of young ex-servicemen in Leonia, a New Jersey suburb right across the Hudson River from upper Manhattan Island, had this brought home to them abruptly a few weeks back. They formed a cooperative group to build themselves a garden apartment house. They got the promise of a borough-owned tract, taken over by foreclosure for delinquent taxes.

The first blow was the loud howl that went up from the neighbors. Leonia is divided rigidly into right and wrong side of the tracks, and the right-side-of-the-tracks Leonians weren't having any garden apartments next door. A meeting organized to defend their one-family-home section from the veterans was kept secret lest too many persons remark the incongruity between wartime service on bond committees, draft and ration boards, and the objection to the veterans as neighbors. The right-side-of-the-tracksters needn't have worried. The veterans found another site, also borough-owned, to escape the terriffic land-value inflation. (A Nation-wide survey in April by the National Housing Agency found a raw-land price index of 160, with spring 1940, as 100; the finished-lot index was 162).

Then they started planning their garden apartments. They discovered that down payments would have to be $600 a man. Several of them dropped out then. That left 20 veterans. They were a little better off than the average veteran; only three of them made less than $40 a week, and their average income was $48.

Their first plan would have worked out to around $7,000 a unit. They chopped off half a room, squeezed the floor area of each unit down to 750 square feet: Living room 11 x 15, one bedroom 9 x 11, the other 9 x 9. That they could get for $6,050 apiece.

Carrying charges on what the veterans would still owe after their $600 down payments, would be $50.50 a month for the next 35 years.

Another New Jersey borough, Cresskill, was approached by a speculative builder who sought to buy all the borough's tax-foreclosed land for $70,000. He meant to build between 50 and 60 houses. Borough officials went into a huddle and came out with a rejection, based on the following reasoning:

The new homes would pay about $100 a year apiece in taxes. The Bergen County Board of Chosen Freeholders (county commissioners), mindful of the years in the 1930's when county and municipal officials all over the land were sneaking down alleys to avoid bondholders, has forbidden assessments based on current sales prices.

Seventy thousand dollars is a nice piece of change, but it would be a one-shot windfall. Seven years from now the children of any veterans who might fill the new homes would start to school, and the borough's tax income of $100 a year a family would turn into a tax deficit of $100 a year for school costs alone. (This was calculated without reference to the fact that costs per child might come down with more children.)

Taking one consideration with another, the Cresskillians concluded that the borough would do better just to go along adding, family by family of the above-average income group that flees to Jersey after it gets up in years and up in the world a little, rather than to grow up all at once with householders who couldn't pull their weight in the taxation boat.

Other communities in New Jersey and New York have raised their minimum-cost restrictions on homes, and set up other barriers to make sure that an influx of veterans doesn't lower the valuation of older homes, or disturb the present ratios of property values to tax costs.

Before reacting to that situation with any violent diatribes against the veterans' intended neighbors, it might be well to reflect that young people in every previous generation have started out in hand-me-down quarters, and that the veteran, when his opinion is asked, distinctly prefers renting to buying.

Veterans, whom the housing program is designed to benefit especially, want to live in flats where their obligations extend no farther than next month's rent, or, at most, no farther than the expiration date of an annual lease. Mr. Wyatt wants to sign them up to long-term level-payment mortgages.

Three-fourths of all veterans who have jobs work for $40 a week or less, says the New York office of the United States Employment Service. At 25 percent of salary for shelter account, as much as a sound budget will allow, this means $53.33 a month for house rent, light, gas, and coal. If the veteran allots much more than this to shelter, he's broke before he even starts shouldering the other expenses of establishing a family.

The veteran realizes this if Mr. Wyatt doesn't. The joint legislative committee on housing and multiple dwellings reported to the New York Legislature March 18 on a survey of veterans' housing needs and wants for the rest of 1946. Of all veterans discharged between VJ-day and March 1, 1946, 71.8 percent wanted to rent quarters; 20.3 percent preferred to buy homes, and 7.2 didn't care as long as they got indoors.

For the whole country, the most significant figure for what these seekers of rental homes expect to pay is found in the War Department's survey at separation centers, undertaken at the request of the National Housing Administration. Of the departing soldiers questioned, 55 percent said they couldn't pay more than $49 a month for rent, 34 percent said less than $30 a month, and only 11 percent said they could go above $50 a month. As for buying homes, percentages naming the corresponding monthly payments were 54, 32 and 13.

Even these guesses aren't as good as the conclusions to be reached from the USES tabulation of veterans' current pay, which shows that it would be dangerous for 75 percent of them to go much above $40 either for rent or for the carrying charge on a mortgage. After they got out and found how rents had changed, 82.8 percent of veterans questioned by the New York legislative joint committee set the top possible rent at $50.

In the face of this mass of evidence that the single cottage on a hill isn't what the veterans want, and that it will be an economic crime to shoe-horn him into one, Mr. Wyatt's program envisions doing just that. Chief concession to the need for rental housing in and around New York, for example, is a recent order that half of the houses built in the region shall sell for $7,500 or less, and that one-fourth of this half shall be rented for $60 a month or less; in other areas this low-cost half is priced as low as $4,500—or less. The more expensive half of the houses must be divided on a three-for-sale, one-for-rent basis, too, but they may cost up to $10,000 in the most expensive area and rent for as much as $80 a month.

We can discount the one-fourth-for-rent proposal as window-dressing. There just isn't enough investment return possible to persuade anyone to accept the onerous role of landlord. The only sanction to enforce renting the houses is the threat to withhold priorities for construction if it isn't done. This merely presents the speculative builder with another hazard and loads the buyer with a little higher charge for "contingencies."

MORTGAGES MADE ON UNSOUND BASIS

The Federal Housing Administration, with its insurance of mortgages for 90 percent of current value, and the Veterans' Administration with its GI loans and payment of the first year's mortgage interest, are crowding veterans who can find houses at all into purchases on a 100 percent loan basis, and, incidentally, fueling the speculative rise in prices of old homes.

Banks generally try to hold their own share in mortgage loans down to two-thirds of the purchase price. Building and loan associations are a little more venturesome. But even if a $40 a week veteran owes $5,000 on his house, he is whipped before he starts. Amortization at a minimum of 0.8 percent a month, with taxes, will bring his rent before gas, light, coal, or insurance to $50 a month.

He would be immensely better off in a flat, not only now but later. Old houses today are worth as much as new houses, but that cannot last. So, when normal relationships return, many a veteran will find that his dismissal pay, any bonus he receives, and all his savings for 4 or 5 years have been dissipated, and that he owes $5,000 on a $4,500 property. That way lie foreclosures, frozen accounts in building and loan associations, another Home Owners Loan Corporation, and another generation of Government dominance of the residential realty market. That dominance, and the over-priced building of which it was the last phase, helped cripple the building industry before the war for the job it faces now.

Obstacles mustn't obscure the fact that the job has to be done. The veteran knows that if someone had merely suspected that it would help to win the war, the America of 2 years ago would have built 2,700,000 marble palaces in the center of the Sahara Desert, with hot and cold whirling dervishes in every room. It would be an atrocious breach of faith simply to take the brakes off the building industry and tell the veteran he must bid against the stay-at-homes now squatting in all the desirable residences.

It will be as bad a breach of faith to proceed with the unrealistic and cumbersome Wyatt program. The answer is a straight subsidy or concession program designed to get veterans into rented quarters. Subsidy is repugnant, especially when the need for it was largely built up by Government irresponsibility that distorted normal price and wage relationships. But one subsidy that will do the job is immeasurably preferable to a host of subsidies that won't.

New York's redevelopment project statutes, which give builders of housing projects substantial tax concessions, and the help of condemnation proceedings to assemble sites, could serve as models. They are effective subsidies which reward performance only, and take no actual money from other taxpayers to help the subsidized.

These concessions will pay off in Greater New York alone, by mid-1947, in some 20,000 apartments renting from $37.50 up.

CONCESSIONS TO MASS LANDLORDS WOULD PAY

With similar concessions from States and municipalities, and with probable cash grants from the Federal Treasury to pay for the water the Federal Government has pumped into wages and costs, housing projects could

be got under way to house the $40-a-week ex-serviceman.

Of course, this would necessitate a slight change in the official attitude toward the man who invests in homes for rent. Many a landlord has seen his tenant's pay grow until three days' wages pay the rent that used to take a whole week's check. If the landlord suggests that he would like to go a few dollars toward restoring the former ratio, the OPA cries "larceny," "chiseler," "swindler," "racketeer."

The fool who invited all tenants in New York City, whose landlords couldn't find painters to redecorate their flats, to come in and see him about having their rents cut, will have to lose his job before investors scurry to build apartments. Maybe Washington, with its addiction to fact finding, could have a board of eminent biologists examine some specimen landlords to see if they are human beings after all, and hence likely to work better for incentives than under coercion.

Crackpots who hasten to add all sorts of social-minded restrictive clauses to any concessionary legislation could be chloroformed. We can put on the trimmings after we get the veterans under roofs.

Along with such a program for low-rent (it would hardly be low-cost) housing should go a drastic loosening of all other housing controls. Veterans are people; if 3,000,000 new houses were bought by blue-eyed people, or Republicans, or any other category, there would be 3,000,000 vacant old houses for veterans. Insisting that the new house actually be sold to a veteran is merely costly demagogy. It's time to cut out the nonsense and build a few $40 flats.

OPA Rules and Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the OPA is still bungling, muddling, fumbling, and stumbling. I include as a part of my remarks a letter written by Mr. D. Morton Rose, vice president of D. Morton Rose & Co., the oldest manufacturers of finished lumber used in building houses and oak flooring in the city of Knoxville.

I especially call attention to the bewildering, inexplicable, unnecessary, and bone-headed rules and regulations—323 in number—under which this company and others engaged in like business are compelled to undertake to carry on their business. They must work all day to produce these materials and sit up all night figuring out the meaning of the senseless rules and regulations promulgated by OPA.

The letter follows:

D. M. ROSE & CO.,
Knoxville, Tenn., May 8, 1946.

Hon. JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE: You voted for the amendment, which we commend you for, and to further back up your action and good judgment, we submit additional OPA evils supplementing our letter to you dated March 18, 1946:

Victory lies not in Mr. Chester Bowles, nor in Mr. Porter, but in unhampered production.

Subsidy will never catch up with the black market as long as there is a scarcity.

A great deal of building materials come from grass roots, not the big guy.

How is it practicable to subsidize.

We have nothing but promises of shortages under the present OPA policies.

See attached 5-page list of some 323 regulations under which we have to operate.

Shall we eliminate or perpetuate the following OPA evils:

1. Creating unemployment.
2. Where is Mr. Wyatt's GI housing program?
3. The destruction of the distribution of building materials.
4. Inability of OPA to supplant the laws of supply and demand.
5. Changing business practices.
6. Do we want to stop inflation?

Something is still wrong.

1. Unemployment is up 26 percent and may go higher as production goes down. D. M. Rose & Co. could give, and wants to, employment to 25 additional men (all could be GI's) by starting up its flooring department of 33 years of manufacturing experience, but our complete flooring equipment lies idle.

We have had the following inquiries, seeking flooring, in the last 4 months, without solicitation of any kind:

Number of orders turned down, 55, footage 3,751,560.

Number of requests, 75, footage 2,118,020.

Number of inquiries (retail), 420, footage 630,000.

The hardwood-flooring situation is getting worse. We have tried to buy standard oak flooring from others, even offered to exchange lumber for flooring, as the flooring grades of lumber are scarce and are disappearing from the market—another problem child of OPA's breeding.

Direction I to P. R. 33, freezing appropriate grades of hardwood lumber for the manufacture of flooring, still will not solve the problem, as it just means that the mill will saw other sizes and thicknesses, wherever possible, in order to realize a better price.

Something is still wrong.

2. Where is Mr. Wyatt's GI housing program? Oh, where, oh, where, can it be? We do not know, but to make it a success and meet the demand it will take the fullest encouragement, production, and distribution of all the building-material facilities, and then some. Sad, but true. We do not have enough pine lumber in our yard today, green or dry, to furnish a Chick Sales outhouse. We have made all the legal effort to maintain our usual inventory of around 1,000,000 feet of pine lumber, without success. Our sales for the first 3 months of 1945 of pine lumber dropped to .476 percent of our sales for the same period of 1942. Where is the volume to do all this absorption OPA talks so glibly about?

Contractors are being forced into opening lumberyards, as the legitimate dealers are unable to furnish their requirements, so the contractors are compelled to do something to meet their needs.

Something is still wrong.

3. The destruction of the building material distribution system is being carried on most effectually by OPA's absorption plan, which makes it a serious loss for the dealer to handle pine lumber—the most used building lumber in the South. It has gotten to such a point that we doubt, seriously, if we even want to replace, if we could, our pine lumber inventory for this reason. Where is the pine lumber to build the GI house coming from?

Something is still wrong.

Oak flooring producers have been granted authority to adjust prices upward on sales made on and after April 4, 1946, on hardwood flooring. It is not legal for the dealer to make sales of this nature; consequently, the dealer runs a good chance of having to absorb this increase, whatever it is. This uncertainty, at least, does not encourage flooring sales.

Something is still wrong.

4. Inability of OPA to supplant the laws of supply and demand in the balancing of prices. In the first place, the so-called published OPA ceiling prices are not the actual prices paid by the public for building materials that are moving on today's markets. Of course OPA never mentions this. In spite of this fact, OPA would lead the public to believe that they are the very necessary, careful watchdog of these United States. How did we ever get along without OPA, lo, these many years?

Price lists are cooked-up somehow; there is no relationship or relativity; no effort to correct or balance prices over long periods of time.

When the laws of supply are allowed to operate, which eventually they will, it is like interest, it works 24 hours a day in adjusting, equalizing, and balancing and establishing a relativity.

Something is still wrong.

Take white oak stumpage—the stave people can and do, pay as high at $50 per thousand for white oak on the stump; with the ceiling price on white oak lumber, $20 is top stumpage a lumberman can pay. Does this give equal distribution of logs?

Something is still wrong.

5. OPA is still at it, regardless. Second revised MPR No. 215, amendment No. 20, distribution yard sales of softwood lumber. We have run a distribution yard and sawmill for 73 years. Now to correct evils they inform us that we cannot do that any more for they have some bad boys that they cannot handle unless they cut our throat and eliminate more of the production of pine for Mr. Wyatt's GI housing program. Yet in the same order, if you are a "little guy" and only sell $120,000 worth of building material, it don't apply. Here is where most of the black market is springing from. They have no records, can and do take a chance. Why the distinction? Why does not OPA enforce and correct evils and abuses in regulations already existing?

Something is still wrong.

6. Do we really want to stop inflation? If so, OPA has and will utterly fail. There is very little respect for OPA and it will continue to decline as people are forced into doing things that they dislike to do in order to stay in business and save their investments.

1. Why not balance the budget?
2. Why not refinance our national debt?
3. Why not eliminate about one-half of the governmental bureaus and its employees?
4. Why not use the Federal Reserve System and its monetary powers?
5. Why not encourage production with a sensible and reasonable incentive to do business?
6. Why not wage stabilization? This will do more than OPA can.
7. Why was not Mr. Henderson of OPA given jurisdiction over prices of the military during the war? The Army and the Navy knew that production was the key to winning the war, and so it is now so necessary to win this reconversion and revolution that is taking place in these United States.

Something is still wrong.

Whether this is good politics, we do not know.

Something is still wrong.

God be with us.

Yours very truly,

D. M. ROSE & CO.,
By D. MORTON ROSE,
Vice President.

NOTE.—We again call your attention to the attached 5-page list of some 323 regulations under which we have to operate.

Simple, ain't it?

REGULATIONS

2d RMPR–215. Distributing yard sales of softwood: Amendments 1–8; amendment 9; amendment 10; amendment 11; amendment

12; amendment 13; amendment 14; amendment 15; amendment 16; amendment 17; amendment 18; amendment 19; amendment 20.

RMPR–19A. Southern pine, small mills: Amendment 1.

2d RMPR–19. Southern pine, large mills: Amendments 1–14; amendment 15.

RMPR–26. Douglas fir and other west coast lumber: Amendments 1–19; amendment 21; amendment 22.

MPR–94. Western pine and associated species: Amendments 1–2. Order 3.

RMPR–164. Red cedar shingles: Amendment 1; amendment 2; amendment 3; amendment 4.

RMPR–219. Northeastern softwood: Amendment 1.

RMPR–222. Northern softwood: Amendment 2; amendment 4; amendment 5; amendment 6.

MPR–253. Redwood lumber and millwork: Amendment 1; amendment 2; amendment 3; amendment 4; amendment 5; amendment 6; amendment 7; amendment 8; amendment 9; amendment 11.

RMPR–290. Sitka spruce: Amendment 1; amendment 2; amendment 3.

MPR–402. Western red cedar lumber: Amendment 2.

MPR–412. Tidewater red cypress lumber: Amendment 1.

MPR–432. Northern hardwood flooring: Amendment 1; amendment 2; amendment 3; amendment 4; amendment 6; amendment 7; amendment 8.

MPR–458. Oak, pecan, and miscellaneous hardwood flooring: Amendment 1; amendment 2; amendment 3; amendment 4; order 3

MPR–513. Yellow cypress lumber (except table I): Amendment 2.

MPR–454. Aromatic red cedar lumber: Amendment 1.

MPR–491. Pressure preservative treatment of forest products and pressure-treated forest products.

RMPR–467. Distribution yard sales of hardwood: Amendment 1; amendment 2; amendment 3; amendment 4.

RMPR–97. Southern hardwood lumber: Amendments 1–19; amendment 20; amendment 22.

MPR–146. Appalachian hardwood: Amendments 1–18; amendment 19; amendment 20; amendment 21; amendment 23.

MPR–155. Central hardwood: Amendments 1–17: amendment 19; amendment 20.

MPR–412. Tidewater red cypress: Tables 1, 3, 5, and 9; amendment 1.

MPR–454. Aromatic red cedar (except closet lining): Amendment 1.

MPR–513. Yellow cypress lumber (table I).

RMPR–217. Walnut lumber and walnut gunstock blanks.

RMPR–223. Northern hardwood lumber.

MPR–368. Northeastern hardwood lumber.

MILLWORK REGULATIONS

3d RMPR–13. Douglas fir plywood: Amendment 1; amendment 2.

MPR–44. Douglas fir doors: Amendment 1.

RMPR–293. Stock millwork: Amendment 1; amendment 2; amendment 4; amendment 5; amendment 6; amendment 8; amendment 9; amendment 10; amendment 11; amendment 12; amendment 13; amendment 15.

MPR–381. Stock screen goods: Amendment 2; amendment 3; amendment 4; amendment 5; order 1; order 2; amendment 6.

MPR–525. Jobber sales of stock millwork: Amendment 4; amendment 5; amendment 6; amendment 8; amendment 10; amendment 11.

RMPR–539B. Custom milling and kiln drying of softwoods and hardwoods in southern area.

MPR–568. Hardwood plywood.

MPR–601. Softwood moldings.

MPR–608. Made-to-order millwork.

MPR–589. Douglas fir millwork.

MPR–118. Small-volume reconversion pricing.

MPR–119. Small-volume reconversion pricing.

RMPR–151. Building material applied.

MPR–159. Concrete reinforcing bars; Amendment 1.

MPR–165. Lumber-inspection services.

MPR–188. Amendment 63, clay building tile: Amendment 83, firebrick; amendment 85, gypsum lath; amendment 93, putty and caulking compounds; order 4875, linoleum.

2d MPR–195. Wooden containers.

RMPR–196. Turned or shaped wood products.

RMPR–206. Clay sewer pipe, etc.

MPR–216. Cross ties and mine material.

MPR–224. Portland cement.

MPR–281. Hardwood lumber, ship timbers.

MPR–313. Hardwood lumber, veneer logs.

MPR–323. Asbestos and asbestos products: Amendment 11; amendment 12; amendment 13.

MPR–324. Eastern fence posts.

MPR–413. Hinges and butt hinges—amendment 5.

MPR–466. Amendment 5—asbestos cement building materials.

MPR–501. Hardwood small dimension.

MPR–536. Western fence posts.

MPR–583. Prefabricated less nondwelling structures.

MPR–591. Building equipment.

MPR–592. Basic order, building materials: Amendment 9 to order 1, brick.

Amendment 17 to order 1, gypsum lath.

Amendment 34 to order 1, ready mixed concrete.

Amendment 35 to order 1, sand lime brick.

Amendment 40 to order 1, asphalt coated insulating sheathing.

MPR–603. Surplus lumber.

MPR 606. Prefabricated dwellings and sections: Amendment 1.

SO–94. Sales by Government agencies: Amendments 1–8.

SO–129. Exemptions from OPA.

SO–145. Salesman's expenses.

SO–150. Wholesale direct mill sales, lumber.

SO–151. Shelf hardware and screen wire.

RPS–49. Wire products.

RPS–76. Amendment 8, glue.

RSP–14. Nails in keg lots, retail.

RSP–6. Nails in keg lots, wholesale.

PR–28. Inventory restrictions: Amendment 1.

RSO–24. Surplus property.

GO–61. Used lumber.

GO–68. Order G6, region 4, area prices of softwood plywood.

VHP–1. Veterans housing program.

PR–33. Basic order:

Direction 1; Direction 1A; Direction 2; Direction 3; Direction 4; Direction 5; Direction 6; Direction 7; Direction 8; List to direction 8; Direction 9; Schedule A.

These regulations do not cover solid fuels, paint, plumbing, heating, and electrical supplies, or any wage and salary stabilization orders under which we must operate.

Address of Hon. Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts, Before Sons of Italy in Lynn, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address delivered at the silver jubilee celebration of the United Lodges 889, Order of Sons of Italy in America, at Lynn, Mass., on May 3, 1946:

Mr. Chairman, invited guests, and members of the Order of the Sons of Italy in America, it is a pleasure to be with you tonight and to share in your celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of United Lodge 889. Not the least of the blessings that followed our victory in the war recently won has been the opportunity now given us to meet together in fraternal celebration, meetings that are not less pleasant because they are reunions. The events of the past 5 years, though they united us in the greatest common and unified effort in history, have conspired to keep old friends apart. This is particularly true of our veterans. And though the familiarity of men who have returned from war with the names of cities and villages all over the world reminds us again that the war was world-wide, the veteran alone knows how completely our men were separated, by recalling the rare occasion and the great pleasure it was to meet someone from Lynn, Boston, Beverly, and Salem in London, Rome, Paris, Manila, and Tokyo. And the many veterans here tonight can also testify that it takes a great celebration such as this to complete the homecoming. And because this is such a fine reunion as well as a splendid celebration, we should extend to the men here who have returned from a successful mission a sincere and happy welcome.

Friends, the lesson of the value of unity among men has been defined so conclusively by statesmen and thinkers and proven so repeatedly by history and our own personal lives that it is almost trite and boring to comment on it. It is not trite and boring because the contrary and conflicting impulses and interests of men have a powerfully disintegrating effect. You, as sons of Italy, know that Italy's emergence as a great nation in the nineteenth century was the result of the unification of the country under its great leaders. As Americans you know that our country's present greatness is due in large measure to Lincoln's insistence on unity, even at the cruel expense of civil war. The patriotic, civic, and charitable accomplishments of your own lodge in its 25 years of life and work must have made you realize that what cannot be done by one person acting alone or many working individually, can be accomplished by many working as one. By joining your talents you have been able to preserve a filial love and fine sympathy for the mother country, to send assistance when it was dolefully needed, and to speak up strongly for her rights when they were misunderstood. In your 25 years of active association you have welded firm friendships, nurtured a sense of civic responsibility, guaranteed the mutual well-being of your members and won the respect of your community.

This needs no proof; it is immediately apparent. But look again at this world we live in. See that unity, which you have achieved, is, in the great family of the world only the infant of the family. Just as in our own family we encourage the infant to take his first uncertain steps and patiently repeat words for him to learn, so too the world encourages the still youthful concept of world unity to grow strong. This effort is centered in the organization of the United Nations whose first steps we watch closely, not blind to the fact that opposing impulses and contrary interests challenge the unity we work for. And now in Paris the Foreign Ministers' Conference is meeting in earnest effort to work out differences and prepare the peace treaties.

It is to the credit of the Foreign Ministers that they agreed to direct their attention first to the treaty with Italy. The country

which for 2 years fought on the side of the Allies with its entire fleet and with its land and air forces, and which previously fought the Germans with the most effective resistance movement in Europe must receive first attention. This is all the more true because Italy has been governed by the armistice terms since 1943. This fact, and the prior failure of the major powers to agree on peace terms in the London meeting, have made political stability all the more impossible in an Italy which has for so long been repressed by a dictator and torn asunder by occupation and war. This uncertainty and the inability of the country to begin to restore her shattered economy have aided the rise of reactionary and neo-Fascist groups.

The democratic future of Italy has been marred by uncertainties concerning her frontiers, final disposition of her colonies, and the extent of reparations. Thus far the peace treaty has been delayed by the opposition of Soviet Russia to American proposals for the alleviation of Italy's economic plight and protection against excessive territorial demands. However, Russian approval of American proposals may be secured because of the Russian desire to gain support for the Italian Communist Party in the general elections.

It is all the more disturbing to note the conflict of interests which is manifest when we are keenly aware of promise for the future that the conflict impedes. There are in Italy today fairer hopes of a genuine revival of freedom and social progress than anywhere in central Europe. The traditional impulse of the Italian people is toward these goals and the progressive spirit, so long retarded, is now prepared to assert itself more vigorously if the opportunity is given.

We know from our own experience that unity cannot be exclusive in character. We are keenly aware of the similarity in name of the United States and the United Nations and that our country fought a civil war to insist, not that the separate States should be separated but that they must be included in the United States. So basic is this conviction to our national tradition that we must insist that a democratic Italy, as a cobelligerent for 2 years, should be brought into the unity of nations. This return should not be based on a long period of trial, during which her very exclusion would tend to delay her ability to meet imposed conditions, but should be encouraged now as a boost to the progressive and democratic resurgence of Italy.

I have said that the power for good of unity of mind and purpose and the goodly benefits that flow from unity of action are so well known to all of us that to remark on them is to burden the obvious. Except that conflicting impulse and interest can disperse seeming unity with all the eruptive power of a bomb. Consider the unanimous sentiment of all men who are not utterly depraved that in this day people cannot, must not, be permitted to starve to death. Outspoken and repeated are the pleas for assistance for the empty stomachs of Europe and Asia, and universal to all our hearts is sympathy and urge to respond. Clearly indicative of America's sympathy for sufferers is the fact that our fighting men, even with the sternness in their hearts made necessary by bitter warfare, refused to permit starvation to the common people even of our enemies.

United in generosity are the hearts of Americans. But it has taken the magnificent spirit and aroused fervor of Fiorello LaGuardia, new Director General of UNRRA to trumpet into action the marching army of relief. Italy, China, Greece, Poland, and other countries suffer now the cruel ravage of famine. Long had we known that famine was imminent. But still the United States, and as the richest and best-fed country in the world we must take this to our consciences, fell behind in meeting its wheat commitments. We learn now after the spirited crusade of LaGuardia and Secretary of Agriculture Anderson through the wheat-producing regions that this country will meet its goal of shipments. In the meantime many private citizens, accepting the challenge as a personal one, are sending parcels of food to the suffering countries, and I know that many of this audience, members of this lodge, are among these benefactors. Your splendid record of local welfare work and manifest devotion of Americans of Italian origin to their mother country make me convinced that your quiet beneficence is active now, in what Wordsworth calls "That best portion of a good man's life, his little, nameless unremembered acts of kindness and of love."

In closing I want to express again my pleasure at being with you this evening. I have had frequent opportunity in the past to enjoy the unrivalled, joyful good cheer of Italian-American gatherings. And how particularly true this is when the gathering is a celebration of 25 years of beneficial fraternity, you are my proof. I can do no less than express the wish that you will celebrate many more anniversaries in the same happy fraternity.

Britain's Withdrawal From Egypt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 14, 1946:

BRITAIN'S WITHDRAWAL FROM EGYPT—POLICY OF THE SOCIALIST GOVERNMENT MOVES TOWARD A DECENTRALIZATION OF EMPIRE

(By John Chabot Smith)

LONDON, May 12.—Few things that Britain's Socialist Government has done prompted such a variety of worried comment as the decision to withdraw from Egypt. The Tory imperialists denounce the government for giving away the empire; the Communists declare cheerfully that this is only the beginning and Britain should get out of the whole Middle East altogether; the Socialist Party's own newspaper, the Daily Herald, unreservedly and uncritically praises the move. Commentators and editorial writers of all other shades of opinion have spent the week weighing it, trying to think of alternatives and hopefully suggesting that Britain can still base the defense of the Middle East on Palestine or Trans-Jordan.

A great deal of the Government's motivation is still unexplained and likely to remain so, because of the fundamental questions of military strategy that are involved. But apart from strategic issues, the withdrawal from Egypt has one spectacular aspect which may, in the long run, be even more far-reaching. It represents the first time Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin has made an open break with Britain's traditional foreign policy.

The break may not be as fundamental as the Tories try to make out. Bevin is most definitely not giving away the British Empire, but he is doing something with it that nobody ever did before.

A few hours before Prime Minister Clement R. Attlee announced the decision in the House of Commons Winston Churchill was making a speech to the mayor and corporation of the city of Westminster, who were conferring on him the peculiarly British honor, the "freedom of the city." It was a tantalizing speech, in which Churchill pointed out, in a series of elaborate puns, that he could not speak as freely as he would like to. In the middle of it he remarked, as if to illustrate the point he was making about India, "It would be a profound shock to the great mass of the British people if they woke up one morning and found that our Empire and position in the East and Middle East had vanished over night."

He then walked down the street from the "freedom ceremony" in Church House to the House of Commons, where he discovered, with suitable expression of surprise that the profound shock had come. The effect was excellent—a gift to empire-conscious editorial writers.

Actually, Churchill knew all about the withdrawal from Egypt before he made his speech to the mayor and corporation of Westminster. Attlee had kept him informed at various stages of the negotiations with Egypt, and Prime Minister Jan Christiaan Smuts, of South Africa had told him the latest details that morning after a somewhat unsatisfactory conference between Attlee and the Dominion ministers, and the announcement was already in the afternoon papers, cabled from Cairo.

However, it was an adroit and effective way of making his position clear. To Churchill and to many here who think like him the withdrawal from Egypt looks very like the beginning of the end of British influence in the Middle East and the East, not alone for its immediate military implications but because of the policy it implies.

This policy cannot be seen yet in all its details, for they will only come to the surface when a settlement with India is announced, the reorganization of the Malayan Government is completed, the long arguments over Palestine, Greece, and the Italian colonies are settled, and the Empire defense talks are finished.

But enough is plain already to show that a radical departure from Churchillian imperialism is in progress and the Socialists are trying to establish a new base for Britain's stand in the world. The new system is made up of elements that are more or less traditional in British foreign policy, but they are mixed according to a new recipe, dictated partly by the atom bomb and partly by Socialist politics.

One element is reliance on the support of the United States. In a sense the evacuation of Egypt tends to turn the Empire inside out and makes Britain more than ever dependent on American help. The Suez Canal can no longer be the life line of the Empire if the Egyptians share the responsibility for defending it. Britain may not actually intend to give up its exclusive hold on the canal in spite of Attlee's statement and the explanations of the best-informed source in London, but it appears that Britain is at least prepared to take that risk for the sake of other objectives.

In any case the atom bomb has demonstrated beyond argument the fact that the canal is more of a liability than an asset to Britain in wartime. The recent war showed that the canal was useless unless the whole Mediterranean was in British or friendly hands, and now that one plane with one atom bomb could put the canal out of action it becomes virtually impossible to defend it adequately, and it may turn out to be a dangerous bottleneck instead of a valuable link.

If the lifeline of the Empire can no longer run through the canal and Mediterranean, it must run either around the cape, through the Panama Canal, or across the United States. Hence, an additional reason why

Britain must have American support in its foreign policy, as well as in any possible war.

To get and keep American support, Britain must satisfy American public opinion, which means, among other things, breaking down the idea that Britain is an oppressor of subject peoples and a supporter of reactionary kings.

By offering to withdraw from Egypt and grant independence to India, Bevin is obviously contributing toward this aim, and the new shift in British policy in Greece is also a help. Instead of supporting the King at every turn, as Churchill did, Bevin is now proposing an early plebiscite under Allied supervision, which, according to people who should know, is planned, among other things, in the hope that it will result in a rejection of the monarchy and the election of a new government reflecting the strength of the left-wing FAM parties.

These moves can be expected to gain friends for Britain, not only in the United States but in Egypt, India, and Greece. They reflect another element in the new Bevin foreign policy: the desire to gain friends in important parts of the world instead of keeping troops there.

Britain's military strength has been spread thin in the last few generations, and the war put an immense strain on it. If the natives can be relied on to fight loyally for Britain, British troops can be concentrated more effectively in other places. On the other hand, if British troops remain in Egypt and India against the will of the natives, the result may be an extensive anti-British fifth column at the service of any future enemy.

This process of making friends by withdrawing troops also helps to build up Britain's moral leadership throughout the world. Moral principles have always played an important part in Britain's claim to world leadership, and they have become increasingly important now that the Security Council has become a forum for asserting them.

By practicing what they preach British Socialists can hope to use moral principles very effectively against any possible enemy, but particularly so against the Soviet Union. The ideological battle between Social Democrats and Communists is an essential part of the rivalry between Britain and Soviet Russia, and must be an important factor in any struggle between them. Britain dares to set the example; it remains to be seen whether Russia will be as ready to withdraw the heavy hand of the Red army from the countries Russia wants to influence.

Palestine is a more complicated problem. To help the Jews helps to win friends in the United States and to build up a good reputation in Europe; but it angers the Arabs. Perhaps a compromise will be reached, or perhaps if the United States backs down Britain can do so too, with a clear conscience. Time will tell.

The last element in the policy is a further decentralization of the Empire and loosening of the ties between the dominions and Great Britain. It looks dangerous, but the British Socialists are in a mood to "live dangerously," and they think the British people will back them up. Moreover, decentralizing the Empire opens up a lot of possibilities. The looser the ties between the dominions and the United Kingdom, the stronger the dominions may grow in their own right, and the stronger bonds they may forge with the United States. Ultimately Britain may represent not one great power but a collection of great powers, tied together by few written agreements but many common interests.

All these are possibilities implicit in Bevin's foreign policy, but the immediate realities of today are not forgotten. There are to be no concessions to Russia anywhere, and if Britain is withdrawing from Egypt it is asserting a claim to the trusteeship of Tobruk and Cyrenaica, a few hours' flying time from the Suez Canal.

Bureaucracy in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Frank H. Gee, president of American Metalcraft Corp., of St. Joseph, Mo., as an example of the maladministration of the OPA:

AMERICAN METALCRAFT CORP.,
St. Joseph, Mo., May 9, 1946.

Representative WILLIAM C. COLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COLE: We would like to take a few minutes of your time to give you some facts which have come to our attention regarding the operation of the OPA. We feel that the country does need an OPA, provided it can be made to function in a more practical manner.

We are manufacturers of several different items. We have had some very disheartening experiences with the OPA since VJ-day when our production of war materials ceased and we began struggling with the reconversion to peacetime products. It has been our desire to abide by all rulings of the OPA and we have put forth every effort to do so, although it has been a tremendous burden on our little company, adding a great deal of extra expense and taking up a lot of our time. The most disheartening thing about the situation has been this: Once an item was ready for production and the cost established we applied for a price only to find that in almost every instance our application bounced around the country from one office to another, when branch offices existed, or, now that the activity has been moved to Washington, shuffled through various departments in Washington while someone tried to determine who should handle it. It is always several months before we get any action whatsoever on an application.

We have a case in Washington at this time that has already been to three different branches of the OPA, and either the regulations were changed while the application was in the department, or it was sent to the wrong department by some other department. Everything that we do that we are told to do by one department seems to be the opposite of what the other department wants when the application arrives there. In this particular instance our attorney made a trip to Washington in order to see that the application did get to the proper branch so that it would be handled promptly. Since that time it has been through three different departments, and they advised us by telephone today that we shall now have to submit another application under a different order of the OPA.

In one instance we had the tooling, that is, the dies, jigs, and fixtures, ready for production of a utility kitchen cabinet. The application for establishment of a price on this cabinet was made last September. The first action taken on it was in February, and the price that was set up for the unit barely covered the cost of steel going into it, to say nothing of the labor, packing, painting, and factory overhead. This item is still out of production, because we have been unable to get the matter straightened out.

In another instance it was necessary for us to shut the entire plant down for 1 week due to an OPA order affecting the unit we were building that week. That was the only item that we had materials on hand to produce. Later, after much controversy by telephone and telegraph, OPA agreed that we could go ahead and run on the price that we had applied for, but our employees had lost that week's wages, and we had lost 1 week's production time.

Another interesting case is that of an application that was filed in May 1945 and approved May 25, 1945. About the first of September, we received notice that the wrong branch of OPA had given us the approval of price on this unit and we were instructed to reapply, which we did promptly. To this date we have not received a final approval and have written several letters concerning this matter and are not able even to get a reply to the letters.

We have cited above only a few cases and our records are open to back them up. We are sure that you, as our representative in Washington, should know the effect that such things have on us and our employees. We certainly do not think that it is the will of the people to allow such bungling to continue.

As for the coal strike, after midnight tonight no materials which we use in production will be able to be shipped to us because of the freight embargo. Since our material inventory is very low due to previous strikes and the inability of our suppliers to produce because they were not granted approved prices in time it will be necessary that we cease operations again within a period from 1 week to 10 days after this source of material is shut off.

Our plant would normally employ 100 production employees. Due to the combined results of the above mentioned conditions, we are only able to employ approximately 20 people and they have not been able to work on a full-time basis. In St. Joseph, the employment situation is such that there are a lot of people that would like very much to have these jobs which we cannot give them for the above reasons.

Thanking you for your time and consideration, we are,

Yours very truly,
AMERICAN METALCRAFT CORP.,
FRANK H. GEE, *President.*

Cable Sent to Prime Minister Attlee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein copy of a cable which was sent to the Honorable Clement R. Attlee, Prime Minister of England:

MAY 3, 1946.

The Honorable CLEMENT R. ATTLEE,
Prime Minister, London:

It appears from your statement, following Anglo-American committee's report on Palestine, that the repatriation of 100,000 Jews as recommended by the committee "entails heavy immediate and long-term commitments" and you inquire "to what extent the Government of the United States will be prepared to share the resultant military and financial responsibilities." You also called upon the Jews of Palestine to disarm as a condition to the implementation of the committee's recommendation.

This is a direct violation of provisions which guided the formation of the committee. The report does not contain such conditions as you now endeavor to invoke. We must then assume that it is your intention to reject the committee's report and that

the motive for your having set up such a committee was purely dilatory: To repudiate the Balfour declaration; to scrap the numerous treaties calling for a Jewish state in Palestine; to gain time for Arab mobilization with United States lend-lease arms; to prolong the duress of European Jews; to tax further the patience of Palestine Jewry and to contribute to depletion of surviving Jews in Europe.

The world at large cannot deem you and your government sincere unless you choose to abide by international agreements and conventions of recent creation.

The only avenue open to you is to recognize the Jewish armed forces in Palestine, who stand ready to assume full responsibility for the purported repercussions that may follow the repatriation of 100,000 Jews to Palestine.

In conclusion, we must add that we are shocked by your callous reaction to a most humane proposal. American public opinion—nay, the opinion of the world at large—will take cognizance of your unwarranted stand.

POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE FOR PALESTINE, INC.,
MURRAY K. JOSEPHSON.
THOMAS J. LANE,
Member of Congress.
JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Member of Congress.
MICHAEL POTTER.
Senator JAMES M. MEAD.
Rabbi BARUCH S. KORFF,
Executive Vice Chairman.

A Mississippi Page Boy Becomes a Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to say a few words about a young lad from my State who came here as a page when he was 13 years old. Because of his fine personal qualities and intelligence, he was chosen 2 years ago to serve as a page by the Committee on Appropriations, where he has won his way into the genuine affection and esteem of the members of the committee and of the staff of the committee. The name of the lad is Jess Taylor. He hails from Clarksdale, Miss.

Jess will not be 18 until June 3, 1946, but he has inveigled his widowed mother into agreeing to his enlistment in the Army. He feels that the Nation still needs the services of young men in the military arm, and I am sure he will render a good account of himself, as he has here.

I append a copy of a letter written to Jess by the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations:

APRIL 19, 1946.

Mr. JESS TAYLOR,
Page, Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR JESS: So you have decided to put on the uniform and help the Army discharge its large postwar responsibility! I do not like the idea of your leaving us, because we have all become attached to you, but you are leaving to aid the Nation at a time when it needs soldiers very badly, and you are to be commended, particularly since you are volunteering and have yet to reach your eighteenth birthday.

You have performed your duties with the committee in a very satisfactory and commendable way, and I am sure you will make a good soldier and win the approval of your superiors in the Army.

You will find military service entirely different from civilian employment, and, while maybe not more demanding in loyalty and performance than we have required, much more restrictive as regards personal liberties. That is essential for many reasons, and one is discipline, which in later life you will find pays dividends.

I hope you will profit by your Army service, as I am sure you will, and when you get your honorable discharge, come back and see us. You will find a welcome.

Good luck and all good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

Progress in Veterans' Hospitalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Comdr. Tyrrell Krum, United States Naval Reserve, retired, veterans' editor for the Washington Times-Herald, is a veteran of World War I and World War II. He has an exceptionally keen understanding of veterans' problems and the laws and regulations relating to their solution.

Hospitalization for mental illness is one of the most serious situations the Veterans' Administration is facing and will continue to face. That progress is being made is clearly shown by the following article by Mr. Krum, which appeared in the Times-Herald of Sunday, May 12:

It was my good fortune during the past few days to have seen at first hand the remarkable progress made in recent months by the Veterans' Administration in providing hospital and medical care for thousands of men and women who helped win America's wars.

There is no gainsaying that until recently veterans' hospitals, by and large, were in a very sorry state of affairs.

There was bad administration, both at the top here in Washington and on the local level throughout the country, the quality of many of the doctors, surgeons, and attendants was inferior, and veterans generally were subjected to a shoving around that left most of them bitter and disillusioned.

I think it can be agreed generally that the greatest break America's war veterans ever got was when Gen. Omar Bradley took over as head of the VA, appointed Maj. Gen. Paul R. Hawley, former chief surgeon of the European theater of operations, as his chief medical officer and gave him complete freedom to clean up the whole mess inherited from the former administration.

Scores of prominent medical schools, colleges, and research institutions voluntarily opened their doors to VA medical staff members to do postgraduate work in the field of medicine peculiar to wartime maladies, diseases, and injuries.

Perhaps the most vivid example of how the topside of the Nation's medical profession turned all-out to help the VA in its struggle is that of the part played by the famous Menninger brothers, Drs. Karl and Will, of Topeka, Kans.

Just as the Mayo clinic at Rochester, Minn., is absolute tops in the study, treatment, and research of bodily ailments, so, since the close of World War I, has the Menninger Foundation dominated the field of mental illness—psychiatry. Like the Mayo clinic, it was formed by the father, Dr. C. F. Menninger, and carried forward by his two sons.

I was in Topeka this past week with General Hawley when the Menninger clan turned over to the State of Kansas as a gift the entire foundation consisting of a 30-acre tract with nine buildings and beautifully landscaped lawns and gardens. Gave it to the people absolutely free.

And why? Because Dr. Karl Menninger had decided to devote the rest of his days to the training of psychiatrists in the VA psychiatric hospital in Topeka so they could go forth to the 21 VA mental hospitals and 6 mental hygiene clinics in which more than 50,000 veterans suffering from psychoneurosis (battle fatigue) are fighting their way back to mental stability.

Dr. Menninger is today the manager of the VA hospital in Topeka, a job which pays him perhaps one-twentieth of what he could earn in private practice. I saw him in action during a 7-hour visit to the hospital and his enthusiasm for the job was remarkable.

But even more striking was the kindly—almost fatherly—manner in which he moved among the hundreds of war-weary veterans in the wards, the workshops, and the gardens, ex-fighting men who are gallantly struggling to tear aside the black-out curtain which has fallen between their minds and the outside world.

Psychoneurosis is a new name for mental illness which emerged from the late war. To speak of it causes one to shudder. But it is rapidly on the way out, being whipped by such men as Dr. Karl Menninger whose knowledge gained during the past quarter century is to be placed at the bedside of hundreds of thousands of American veterans who will be in Veterans' Administration mental hospitals.

It was amazing to me, and should interest all of you. Because, official figures show that 20 out of every 100 persons in America today either have been, are now, or can expect to be in a mental hospital. And particularly is this true of veterans trying to readjust themselves to postwar civilian life.

Patriot's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a radio address delivered by me over radio station WLAW, Lawrence, Mass., on April 19, 1946, Patriot's Day:

We, the people of Massachusetts, take special pride in Patriot's Day. The incident which gave it birth took place here. The

news of it soon spread around the world, stirring the hearts and minds of oppressed peoples with fresh faith and new vision. Ever since that first day, wherever freedom-loving men have lifted their heads to sight new goals of human progress, the example of our Patriot's Day has been with them, giving them courage and inspiration.

It happened many years ago, a few miles northwest of Boston. The colonists were aroused by the British policy of imposing taxation without representation. General Gage was ordered by England to arrest John Hancock, Samuel Adams, and other leaders of the growing public opposition to a government beyond their control. Gage had been informed that the Americans were secretly storing arms at Concord, 18 miles from Boston.

On the night of April 18, he sent out 800 of his soldiers to make the arrests and to seize the hidden supply of lead and powder. As British sentries stood guard at the narrow neck of the peninsula which separated Boston from the mainland, there seemed to be no way of warning the colonists of their danger. However, Dr. Warren, one of the patriots, anticipating such a situation, arranged to send the news in spite of the guards who watched all roads leading from the city. By lantern, from a church steeple, signals were flashed to Paul Revere and William Dawes who were waiting with their horses on the other side of the water barrier. All through the night they rode through the villages, spreading the alarm. Minutemen, so-called because they were prepared to defend their American liberties at a moment's notice, left their farms and homes and gathered to repel the foreign troops.

At daylight, when the 800 British soldiers reached Lexington, they were met by 60 Americans armed with muskets. The British officer shouted to the thin line of colonists, ordering them to disperse. Sixty against 800. The situation was hopeless, but time might be gained for those a few miles away at Concord to save the ammunition stores. And so the American captain said: "Stand your ground. Don't fire unless fired upon. But if they mean to have war, let it begin here." A single shot was fired, then a volley. Eight minutemen went down, the first to die for American independence. The regiment of British troops went on to Concord to destroy what ammunition had not been taken away. In the meantime, however, the whole countryside was springing to arms. From every direction men, and even boys, answered the call. Taking cover behind rocks and trees and fences, fighting in Indian fashion, the Americans drove the redcoats all the way back to Boston. The war for our independence had begun.

One hundred and seventy-one years ago, on April 19, 1775, the struggle for liberty began, and it has been going on ever since. As Patrick Henry said in a debate in the first Continental Congress, "The distinctions between Virginians, Pennsylvanians, New Yorkers, and New Englanders are no more. I am not a Virginian, but an American."

In succeeding wars, we had to fight for further freedoms—the freedoms of the seas, the freeing of the slaves, freedom of our neighboring peoples, and the right of all peoples to be safe from aggression.

The period between the First World War and the Second World War, while apparently one of peace, was in fact an armed truce. Many Americans were unaware of this at the time. They failed to realize that the quest for liberty is an unending one in the development of democracy. Representative government depends upon the intelligence, the character, and the vigilance of its people. As soon as we win liberty on one front we find it challenged on another. Through town meeting, city council, State legislature, the Congress, and now through the Assembly of the United Nations the people must speak in order to establish security with freedom. This is a responsibility which they cannot pass onto others. It is a power which is merely delegated. It can be lost through indifference and neglect. The sovereignty of the people is real only while it is being exercised. We of today must be minute men also, as alert and courageous as our forefathers were, to see that the liberty so dearly won is not surrendered by default. Day in and day out our minds and hearts must be at work running our Government. The problems of peace are no less than those of war. If we win the peace, winning freedom from want and fear, we shall have no war. There is something about war which all people can understand. It stirs their imagination and calls forth a willingness to work and sacrifice for others. The needs of peace are less dramatic. The changing picture of America's foreign policy, full production, full employment, price control, free enterprise—all these seem confusing and somehow remote from the life of the average citizen. After all, these words are not the language spoken at his work or in his home, so why should he worry about it? And so, too many Americans shrug their shoulders and say, "Let the other fellow do it. I'm too busy."

It would be a strange contradiction if the American people should walk out on the victory they and their Allies have won. Yet every nation is watching us to see how we solve or fail to solve our domestic problems, and to what extent we go forward with others to save international problems. They know that whatever happens within these United States will affect them. And they remember after the First World War how we withdrew into the shell of our isolation. The depression and the war which stemmed from it may be traced in part to the average citizen's neglect of his own Government. What happened once can happen again if we sit back and relax.

The health of a democracy depends, at all times, on the active and intelligent interest which a majority of the people take in their government. It is not enough to work and fight for it in war. Peace, too, has victories to be won or lost.

Which brings us to the matter of voting—the cornerstone of representative government. With some people, however, the knowledge that they have the right to vote seems to be enough. They don't appear to realize that the right when it is not followed up by "use" is meaningless. It was precisely by such indifference, that the people of certain countries forfeited the right to govern themselves and became the slaves of dictatorships. The terrible cost of such indifference, not only to themselves but to the world, must be plain to all.

Yet with this warning ever before us we find that in many primaries and elections less than half, to a little more than half of our people, perform their duty and vote. For instance, how many of our people know that the State primaries in Massachusetts will be held not in September but on the 18th day of this coming June? Other States face the same apathy. Come self-governing nations have been forced to impose fines on those who fail to vote without a good and sufficient reason. While we do not advocate such drastic measures, we must, nevertheless, stress the active part which people must play in choosing the men to represent them. On this Patriot's day, we must be reminded that freedom means responsibility. Our forefathers knew this. They did not forget it.

As we think back to the men of Concord and Lexington, we are impressed by the fact that they accomplished so much with so little. Their material means were small, but their determination was great. They believed in the dignity of the individual man and his ability to work fairly with other men, to build a new commonwealth. It was this faith in themselves that overcame every obstacle and, under God, succeeded in building a free Nation. It was this faith that came first. It was there before the colonists knew of the help which nature would give to those who worked with head and hand and heart. It is today the greatest wealth which we possess.

This faith did not come overnight. For centuries the peoples of Europe had suffered from cruel oppressions. There were men and women who would not resign themselves to this hopeless state of affairs. And so they emigrated to a strange land where they would begin life anew. It was not easy for them to journey across an unknown ocean and make a fresh start in the wilderness that was America, but they were sustained by a great hope. And they found that hope answered as, working together in a free society, they discovered in themselves and one another the energy, ability, and imagination which had been kept in bondage to the caste system of the Old World. Here men did not toil their lives away to support any single, special group. They were all sons of God and partners in life. In this stimulating fellowship democracy grew strong.

In the early Colonial days the settlers began to hold meetings to consider the town's business. At these meetings the people elected town officers and told them what to do. They passed ordinances concerning the setting up of fences, the support and management of the town school, the building and repair of the meeting house, and the care of the town poor. Only landowners could then vote; but any townsman could speak his opinions on all matters. From Massachusetts this town-meeting government spread to all the other New England colonies. It gave the people experience in managing their own affairs and made them civic-minded. It became the best school of democracy the world had ever known.

This was the background which prepared the men of Lexington and Concord to take up arms in defense of their civil liberties. At the town meeting, in the general store, and around the blacksmith's forge they discussed the issues of the day. In this great public forum was developed the character and the intelligence which made them ready to govern themselves. They fought and won their independence, but this was only the beginning. Through debate and compromise the Thirteen Colonies must find a way of working together as a Nation. Because of the public interest which the people took in these matters, this was done. The march of democracy went on. The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, the Emancipation Proclamation, the Charter of the United Nations: through all of these the will and intelligence of the people have found expression.

Today we honor the patriots of 1775, not alone for their courage and sacrifice in time of war, but for their loyal service to the peacetime needs of democracy. In their example is a lesson for us. Representative government is your government. It depends upon your opinions. Let them be heard!

The last speech written by Franklin Delano Roosevelt was on the day before he died. It was written, too late for delivery, in honor of one of those early patriots. It concludes with these words:

"And to you, and to all Americans who dedicate themselves with us to the making of an abiding peace, I say: The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith."

Racketeering Must Be Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, racketeering, whether it exists in labor organizations or business, must not be tolerated, and I am again urging the Congress to pass legislation which will stop such practices. On several occasions the House has approved anti-racketeering legislation, but for some reason or other these bills have been pigeonholed in the Senate or stopped by the New Deal administration.

When I was at home over the Easter recess I talked with two farmers who had purchased trucks from their local dealer. The trucks were in Detroit, and the dealer sent the farmers to Detroit to secure delivery of the trucks. These farmers told me that as soon as they had taken possession of the trucks and driven them six blocks there were stopped on the streets of Detroit by men who claimed to be representatives of the teamsters union. These union men asked the farmers to show their union cards, which they were unable to do, because they were not members of a labor organization, which is not required in our section of the country for farmers. Thereupon the spokesman for the teamsters union demanded that the two farmers each take out a union membership in the teamsters union at a cost of $27 each. At first the farmers refused to do so, but the representatives of the union stated that they would destroy the trucks if the money was not paid at once. Finally the two farmers paid $27 each and received a receipt, which I have in my possession. This sort of racketeering has been legalized by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The time has come for Congress to call a halt to coercion and racketeering of this character. It should not be tolerated in the United States. American citizens are entitled to the protection of any law that we can pass to stop such practices, and I therefore urge the Senate of the United States to pass the Hobbs bill before adjournment.

I am including an editorial on the above incident which appeared in the Red Wing Republican Eagle, of Red Wing, Minn., and also an Associated Press dispatch dated May 11, which discloses the type of extortion and racketeering that is going on in Detroit by certain men who call themselves union leaders:

[From the Red Wing (Minn.) Daily Republican Eagle]

UNIONS MUST CLEAN HOUSE

Few right-minded people in this day and age begrudge laboring men the right to organize for betterment of working conditions and to bargain for adequate wages and fair handling. There was a time, not so very long ago, when this was not the case. All efforts of the working classes to better themselves were hooted down or, in far too many cases, thwarted by intimidation and even force.

But now the picture is changed. Labor—organized labor—is having its day in court. The voice of organized labor is certainly being heard all over the land and demands for more pay and shorter hours are pyramiding into a formidable array which threatens to revolutionize national conditions.

And yet the public's voice is not raised against organized labor, as a class, or against the reasonable demands of the working people. But it is being heard in protest to the high-handed tactics used by some of labor's leaders and a great many of the so-called organizers who dot its ranks. Especially is public indignation growing against some of the racketeering methods used to gouge others who, though workers in every sense of the word, are not numbered among those who are organized.

There have been numerous instances in the past, especially during war days, when men who sought work on Government projects were forced to pay exorbitant fees in order to secure the privilege. Workers who responded to the call of their Government for help in war work were amazed to learn that they first had to clear with some union or other in order to qualify.

In some instances this forcing of membership or fee-gouging has approached outright racketeering. There is an instance of this kind affecting two Goodhue County residents which occurred just recently.

Arthur Schober and John Haas, both Goodhue Township residents, went to Detroit in April to pick up two new trucks. Six blocks from the factory, on a public highway, they were halted by two men who said they represented the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers (A. F. of L.) and who demanded of them individual union fees of $27 each. It was either pay up or have their trucks ditched, they were told. No credentials were presented; no interest was evinced in the victims' addresses or that they were American citizens and taxpayers. Permission to return the trucks to the factory and call the whole thing off was denied. It was a pure and simple hold-up.

Schober and Haas did get stubs of paper showing they had paid. But they have no assurance the collectors were even union representatives.

How long will this sort of thing be tolerated by the American public? Isn't it evident to those in authority that crimes such as this are being committed in the name of unionism and that unless something is done from within to cleanse organizations of gangsterism and racketeering, such action will most certainly generate from without? In which case it is quite probable the pendulum will swing too far the other way.

UNION LEADER FACES EXTORTION CHARGE

(By the Associated Press)

DETROIT, May 11.—The A. F. of L. Teamsters Union drive to organize clerks in Detroit's 7,000 butcher shops and grocery stores brought James Hoffa, union business agent, into court on an extortion charge today.

The charge against Mr. Hoffa, 33-year-old veteran of teamsters' battles here, said he "feloniously and maliciously" threatened injury to the property of an independent merchant.

Issuance of the warrant followed orders by the court directing the prosecutor's office to draw it up so that a judicial ruling ultimately could answer a dispute in which merchants and teamsters have wrangled for weeks.

Prosecutor Gerald K. O'Brien originally had declared there was no evidence to support a warrant. Thereupon Mayor Edward J. Jeffries asked the courts to issue one, and Judge Christopher E. Stein directed Mr. O'Brien to draw one up.

Judge Stein issued the warrant today, on complaint of Margin Bonkovich, independent merchant, and Mr. Hoffa was in court to accept immediate service. He stood mute and the court entered a plea of innocent for him.

In the complaint, Mr. Bonkovich, who has opposed the union drive, said Mr. Hoffa had threatened "orally" that either Mr. Bonkovich join the union or he "would be out of business the next time they met."

Letter by Hon. Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, in Response to CIO Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unnaimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have written to Mr. Boyd E. Payton, president of the Virginia CIO Council, at Richmond, Va. My letter is in response to resolutions adopted at a meeting held by the CIO in which I was put on the CIO purge list. I was also 1 of 10 Senators put on the purge list by action taken at a meeting of Sidney Hillman and other leaders of the CIO which was held recently in Atlantic City. Mr. President, I ask that this letter be printed in the RECORD and I further state that I regard it as a badge of honor, under the conditions now existing, to be on the purge list of the Political Action Committee of the CIO.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABUSIVE CIO RESOLUTIONS

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 10, 1946.*

Mr. BOYD E. PAYTON,
President, Virginia CIO Council,
Richmond, Va.

DEAR SIR: Some weeks ago you wrote me a letter enclosing me resolutions adopted by the Political Action Committee of the CIO at a Sunday meeting in Richmond. These resolutions were intemperate, personally abusive, scurrilous, and, in part, were direct lies and false insinuations. This was a very typical performance of the low standard which characterizes the political attacks instituted against any public man the Political Action Committee of the CIO cannot control. Your resolutions placed me on the No. 1 CIO purge list to receive first priority for the allocation of campaign money from the funds your Political Action Committee has set aside to defeat those who have stood firmly against CIO domination.

WILL NOT WEAR LEWIS, HILLMAN, PETRILLO COLLAR

Among other things, you compared me to Hitler and said I was attempting to destroy the democratic and American process of government. Yet, the CIO, in Atlantic City only recently, adopted resolutions approving the communistic foreign policy of Russia and condemning the foreign policy of America and Great Britain. The leaders of the CIO

appear to have confused the Russian form of government with American democracy.

Since your meeting, the campaign for the Democratic nomination to the Senate has begun and it seems appropriate that I make a statement of my position in response to your resolutions. I do not intend to wear the collar of the Political Action Committee of the CIO, or of Sidney Hillman, John L. Lewis, Caesar Petrillo, or any other labor racketeer now or at any other time. Your threats and personal abuse of me will only make me more steadfast in my purpose.

When you met in Richmond the importance of getting my political scalp was emphasized when you imported your outside bigwigs of the CIO to harangue the gathering. Allen S. Harwood, president of the PAC-CIO of Washington, was there. James B. Carey, of Washington, secretary and treasurer of the national CIO, who recently toured Russia, was also there. Mr. Carey was quoted in the Times-Dispatch as saying, "It is high time to make a change in the Virginia representatives in Congress," and urged the group to "get the ball rolling to sweep SMITH and BYRD out of office." Tilford Dudley, of New York, another head official of the PAC, was there. I feel complimented that so many high officials of the CIO considered my defeat of sufficient importance for them to journey to Richmond to tell the Virginia voters how to vote in a Virginia political campaign.

The southern representatives in Congress who have refused to bow to the dictation of the CIO have been notified of impending political slaughter, and newspapers report a large slush fund has been set aside to accomplish this purpose.

In Atlantic City last week George Baldanzi, an assistant director of the southern CIO purge committee, was wildly cheered when he told of his plans to defeat southern representatives, and he stated that "this is the most important undertaking that has ever been made by the CIO."

LABOR LEADERS AND MEMBERS' DUES

I can well understand the anger of you and your associates at my introduction of legislation to compel unions to incorporate and make reports of their financial receipts and disbursements, and likewise to be held financially responsible for their contracts. Your denunciation of me came very shortly after this bill was introduced in the Senate. Only last week, Sidney Hillman, speaking at a meeting in Atlantic City, told of defying a congressional committee and refusing to produce CIO books, because, said Hillman, "it was none of their business." The last thing arrogant labor leaders want is for union members who pay their dues to know how their money is spent. By Federal law, a corporation is prohibited from making political contributions. An individual must report and pay a gift tax on any political contribution he makes above a certain amount. Yet, labor unions, such as the CIO, can and do spend great sums in political campaigns without making either a report or an accounting either to the Government or to their own membership. I predict that labor union leaders will be compelled to disclose what they are doing with the money they collect from their members just as all corporations are required to make an accounting to their stockholders.

FAVOR COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND LABOR UNIONS

I strongly favor collective bargaining and always have. I believe labor unions have a proper and rightful place in the business economy of America, and sooner or later the great rank and file of the working men in America will realize that such leaders as Hillman, Lewis and Petrillo are doing infinitely more harm to them and to the labor union movement than the most violent opponent of labor unions could possibly accomplish.

CHALLENGE ACCEPTED

The challenge has been given, and this challenge I accept. The issue is before the people of Virginia.

When you have your next Sunday afternoon confab of the PAC workers, I want you to read this letter to the gathering. I hope Messrs. Harwood, Carey, and Dudley will be there to hear it.

Very truly yours,

HARRY BYRD.

P. S.—Your letter to me stated you were sending a copy of your resolutions to the Governor, to the Virginia Members of Congress, to all members of the Senate and House of Delegates of Virginia, and that you would distribute copies to all CIO members in Virginia, and to the press. In like manner, I am sending this letter to the Governor, to the Members of the Virginia delegation in Congress, to the members of the State Senate and House of Delegates, and to the press. As I do not have a list of the CIO members in Virginia, I shall have to rely upon you to distribute this letter to them.

Labor Policies Under Roosevelt and Truman Administrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Journal of Commerce of May 9, 1946:

For 14 long years the Government of these great United States—a Government presumably founded upon justice and equality for all—has sown the wind. That same Government now reaps the whirlwind.

For 12 of those 14 years, the executive branch of our Government ridiculed the honest dollar, encouraged class hatreds and created special privileges and exemptions for labor unions. The New Deal was compelled to soft-pedal a bit during the war; it was forced to admit the existence of certain American fundamentals it had previously denied. But even in that crisis, the White House found ways and means to pay off for the political support of radical labor organizations. And when Mr. Truman became President, he embraced all the policies of his predecessor, adding a fillip or two of his own.

As a direct result of these policies—those of Mr. Roosevelt and the present incumbent—John L. Lewis has become so powerful that he can do to this country that which all its wartime enemies together could not do. Neither Hitler nor Mussolini nor Tojo were able to batter us down from without—but Lewis can batter us down from within!

This man Lewis is so powerful today that he can set himself up above the 140,000,000 men, women, and children of this country. He is so powerful that he can stop railroads, put out the Nation's lights, deny it its food. He can threaten our water supply and reduce our hospitals to a strict emergency basis. All this he can do—and no law can touch him.

Many of the boys who died in distant lands, in flaming airplanes and in pigboats under the seas were too young to realize what they were fighting for. Many who were fortunate enough to return still do not know. And many older men who fought shoulder to shoulder with homesick, bewildered youths still do not know. But they will know before John L. Lewis finishes with them. They will know that this shameless man can destroy their American heritage, the heritage of free men.

Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, arises in the Senate and cries, "Throw the man in jail." But when legislation reaches the Senate designed to reduce the power-bloated Lewises, Petrillos, and Reuthers to a level of equality with the rest of America, the Senate Committee on Education and Labor manages to sit on the new bill until the heat is off. And if someone tries to pry the legislation out of committee, the handful of Senators who make the rules (of which Senator LUCAS is one) come to the rescue of the Lewises, the Petrillos, and the Reuthers. It is truly said that the only American statesmen today are dead politicians.

It is now clear that the executive branch of the Government cannot rescue us from this crisis of its own making. Leadership in the White House is dead. It is now up to the people themselves to bring pressure upon Congress to do what needs to be done.

Three steps must be taken immediately. The Wagner Act must be made over into an instrument that will protect the employer as well as the worker. All union immunity from the laws that govern the conduct of the rest of us must be withdrawn. A law must be passed to make it illegal and punishable by fine and imprisonment for any labor leader to levy his own private tax upon production. All these steps can be taken within 48 hours if the will to do it exists. The record is written and there is no need for discussion or debate.

The vicious, irresponsible behavior of John L. Lewis can destroy all the gains intelligent, farsighted men have won for workers over the last century. The thoroughly discredited policies of the last 14 years must be repudiated.

Ex-Doughboy Pays Tribute to Marines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Henry McLemore entitled "Ex-Doughboy Pays Tribute to Marines" may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EX-DOUGHEOY PAYS TRIBUTE TO MARINES

(By Henry McLemore)

FRENCH LICK, IND., May 10.—General Vandegrift, quit your worrying. Fret no more. Perhaps you were right when you said the War Department "is determined to reduce the Marine Corps to a position of studied military ineffectiveness," and that "the Army sought to relegate it to ceremonial functions, small combat formations, and labor troops."

Perhaps the War Department has such notions in its head, but it won't succeed. It hasn't a prayer. The War Department might just as well try to put over a program that calls for the filling-in of the Grand Canyon, the refusal to allow citizens to look at Niagara Falls, or something else that would spoil one of our natural wonders.

The Marine Corps, General, is one of our natural wonders. How well you know that

How well every citizen of the United States knows that. There is nothing more magnificent than courage, and the Marine Corps has courage in abundance. There is nothing more stirring than the sight of a man ready to give his all for his country, and the Marine Corps is made up of such men.

Speaking as an infantryman, nothing was more inspirational to the fighting men of this country in their battle against Japan and Germany than the record, past and present, of the United States Marine Corps. All of us who didn't belong to the Marines—infantrymen, engineers, sailors, Seabees, and what not—drew strength and willingness to do a little better than our best from the men who are called Leathernecks. We wanted to make ourselves just as tough, just as capable, as the marines.

That builds morale, General Vandegrift. It builds it more than all the moving pictures ever shown, all the USO shows that ever danced and pranced, all the free shaving cream and razor blades passed out for free.

What War Department—and you can name your land—would by any action reduce the Marine song from a song of fighting men to a waltz that was played on juke boxes, and danced to by flighty bobby-soxers and their hubba-hubba escorts? Can you imagine the Marine Corps reduced to such a state that when an American heard "From the Halls of Montezuma to the Shores of Tripoli" he thought of a dance hall? Damn it, those are the words of fighting men. Those are words that raise the hackles, and have nothing to do with masters of ceremonies, soft lights, and gentle, love-making speeches.

General, if the War Department should happen to go completely crazy—and, judging by past performances, it is possible—I want to ask the men who make up the War Department to build several monuments which will make their shame last through the ages. I want to ask them to go to Tarawa—on a free air junket, of course, with a steward to serve them wine and food in flight—and make it a sort of Coney Island. I want ferris wheels provided for the fathers and mothers of sweethearts of the marines who came in through the surf and over the coral, with nothing but mortars and machine guns to welcome them.

Finally, I want them to go to Iwo Jima, and, as they fly over the now placid beach, look down and see if they can imagine what it was like when the Marines went in.

It is mighty easy to sit behind a desk in Washington, with nothing to do but push a few buttons and bawl out a few subordinates. It is so easy in fact, that a marine wouldn't have the job.

Automobiles for Practicing Physicians, Dentists, and Veterinary Surgeons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a condition where practicing physicians, having lost their automobiles through accidents or otherwise, are in a position where they have to wait their turn in buying new cars for replacement from dealers. The members of the healing art should be able to get a priority from the manufacturers through the dealer. The State directors of OPA have no authority to give a physician a priority for a car. We hear a great deal about priorities in building and industry: here is a chance to improve the health and comfort of the country by taking care of the doctors with permits to buy new cars for their practice.

Report of Former President Hoover as to the Food Situation in Europe

REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, when President Truman called upon former President Hoover to make a survey of the food situation he recognized that no other American was as well qualified to do this important work as was Mr. Hoover. Immediately upon his appointment Mr. Hoover got together a group of highly trained and experienced men and proceeded to do the job. He visited practically every country in Europe and also carried on surveys in many sections of Asia.

Mr. Hoover has made his report direct to President Truman. I have a copy of that report which I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The report is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 13, 1946.*

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We have completed your instructions to survey the principal nations affected by food shortages which have resulted, or may result, in widespread famine; to evaluate the minimum needs of these areas until the next harvest; and to discover such additional food resources as possible. In accordance with your instructions, we have also presented the American point of view on the food problem to these nations and the interest and understanding of our people in their plight. Finally, we have constantly advised American officials and the American public as to the situation as we found it.

We have traveled some 35,000 miles, visited 22 countries which have a deficiency of food, and informed ourselves of the situation in several others. The only country of large reported deficiency we did not visit was the Union of South Africa. We visited five self-sufficient or surplus countries and informed ourselves of the situation in other consequential surplus nations.

The dominant need of the world in this crisis is cereals, particularly wheat and rice. There is great need of fats and special food for children, but as cereals can furnish 85 percent of an emergency diet, we considered cereal requirements were the first concern, and the best indicator. If a foundation of bread can be assured, and as much fats and children's food as possible, mass starvation can be prevented.

At the time of our departure, the combined food board's estimate of the available cereal supplies from surplus countries showed a deficit as compared with stated requirements of 11,000,000 tons, or 43 percent.

REQUIREMENTS

We attach hereto (table I) a country-by-country, month-by-month minimum program of required cereal imports to the deficit and famine areas from May 1 to September 30.

These programs represent a considerable reduction from the hitherto stated requirements of the various nations. The amounts have in most cases been agreed upon by their governments. In the case of China, we regret to say our program is less than minimum need but is all, or more, than can be transported inland to the famine areas.

The totals are:

	Tons
Europe	8,390,000
Latin America	1,000,000
South Africa and New Zealand	198,000
Middle East	100,000
Indian Ocean area	2,886,000
Pacific Ocean area	1,910,000
Total	14,484,000

Of course, every country would be better off if more could be furnished.

SUPPLIES

We have found some increases in supplies possible during the crisis through development of certain new sources of supply; through additional loans of cereals from early-crop countries which may not themselves have annual surpluses; through substitution of other cereals for wheat and rice; and as a result of conservation up to this time.

Our estimate (table II) of probable supplies as of May 1 to September 30 is:

From:	*Tons*
United States	4,220,000
Canada	2,300,000
Australia	992,000
United Kingdom	200,000
Argentina	2,375,000
Brazil	200,000
Other Western Hemisphere states	40,000
Burma	75,000
Siam	195,000
Russia to France	300,000
Total	10,897,000

Therefore the gap in supplies between May 1 and September 30 can be reduced to about 3,600,000 tons, as against an 11,000,000-ton gap in the earlier appraisals.

In addition to the above supplies there is a "possible" about 1,500,000 tons more, as indicated in table III.

We are confident that if, until the end of August, there can be further vigorous conservation in surplus countries, mainly wheat and fats, and more energetic cooperation between nations, the remaining deficit can be largely overcome. The cooperation of Russia and the Latin-American states would greatly aid in meeting the problem. If mass starvation is to be prevented, it will require constant effort.

It is of interest to note that the quantities which are provided by UNRRA as charity comprise about 20 percent of the world's cereal needs, whereas nations representing 80 percent are being financed by the importing countries themselves. But the need in these latter is no less urgent.

You will recognize that these statements are estimates. They, however, comprise a reasonable basis upon which to formulate policies.

We wish to express our especial appreciation of the unfailing aid and courtesy of the Secretaries of Agriculture, State, and War and the American officials abroad. We are also deeply indebted to Generals George and Saville, of the Air Transport Command, their efficient crews, and for their provisions for our comfort and safety.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.
D. A. FITZGERALD.
HUGH GIBSON.
W. HALLAM TUCK.
PERRIN C. GALPIN.
MAURICE PATE.

TABLE I.—*Cereal requirements (including rice) showing minimum arrivals required during crisis period* [1]

[Loadings at seaboard about 30 days earlier]

Country or province	Population in millions	Thousands of tons					
		May	June	July	August	September	Total
EUROPE							
France [2]*	39.1	350	350	350	350	350	1,750
North Africa*	12.0	100	----	----	----	----	100
Italy*	41.5	225	225	225	100	----	775
Switzerland*	4.2	----	----	30	30	30	90
Czechoslovakia*	13.5	60	60	60	60	50	290
Poland*	23.5	85	85	85	85	----	340
Finland*	3.8	----	----	25	40	40	105
Norway*	3.0	----	----	----	30	30	60
United Kingdom [2]*	47.5	400	400	400	400	400	2,000
Belgium*	8.0	60	60	60	60	60	300
Holland*	9.0	----	----	----	----	80	80
Germany:*							
American zone	18.0	50	50	50	65	60	275
British zone	23.3	180	180	180	180	180	900
French zone	6.0	30	45	45	45	30	195
Russian zone [3]	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Austria*	7.0	30	55	55	55	30	225
Spain	26.0	60	60	60	60	----	240
Portugal	8.0	30	30	30	30	----	120
Albania	1.0	5	5	5	5	----	20
Yugoslavia*	16.0	50	50	50	50	50	250
Greece*	7.5	55	55	55	55	55	275
Europe totals	317.9	1,770	1,710	1,765	1,700	1,445	8,390
LATIN AMERICA							
Latin-America	----	200	200	200	200	200	1,000
NEW ZEALAND AND SOUTH AFRICA							
New Zealand	----	----	9	9	0	0	18
South Africa	----	40	40	40	30	30	180
Total	----	40	49	49	30	30	198
NEAR EAST							
Near East	----	20	20	20	20	20	100
INDIAN OCEAN							
[Loadings from Eastern Hemisphere 1 month and Western Hemisphere 2 months earlier]							
India (Provinces affected):*							
Bombay	22.0	----	55	85	95	95	330
Mysore	7.6	14	25	25	25	25	114
Madras	51.4	210	170	170	170	170	890
Travancore	6.5	18	10	10	10	10	58
Cochin	1.5	8	7	7	7	7	36
Deccan	2.9	43	19	19	19	19	119
Behar	37.9	19	14	20	20	20	93
United Provinces	57.6	24	----	----	60	60	144
Bengal	61.3	----	----	90	106	106	302
Other	----	50	50	50	50	50	250
Ceylon	7.0	60	60	60	60	60	300
Malaya and Straits Settlements	3.6	50	50	50	50	50	250
Total	----	496	460	586	672	672	2,886
PACIFIC OCEAN							
Philippines*	14.0	12	12	12	12	12	60
China [4]*	220.0	120	150	200	200	200	870
Japan*	75.0	50	250	270	200	100	870
Korea [5]*	14.0	15	30	45	10	10	110
Total	----	197	442	527	422	322	1,910
Grand total	----	2,723	2,881	3,147	3,044	2,689	14,484
SURPLUS OF SELF-SUFFICIENT COUNTRIES							
Sweden*	6.2	----	----	----	----	----	----
Denmark*	3.8	----	----	----	----	----	----
Hungary	9.1	----	----	----	----	----	----
Rumania	12.1	----	----	----	----	----	----
Bulgaria	6.5	----	----	----	----	----	----
Egypt*	17.3	----	----	----	----	----	----
Iraq*	4.0	----	----	----	----	----	----
Siam*	14.0	----	----	----	----	----	----
Total	73.0	----	----	----	----	----	----

[1] Based on not to exceed 300 grams of cereals per person per day.
[2] Including indigenous supplies.
[3] Data unknown.
[4] Utmost capacity of inland transportation.
[5] American zone.
*Visited by the mission.

TABLE II.—*Possible world cereal supplies from surplus areas, May 1 to Sept. 30*

[In thousands of tons]

	Second quarter loadings (April, May, June)			Loadings in July and August			Total
	Wheat	Coarse grains	Rice	Wheat	Coarse grains	Rice	
United States	2,200	500	20	1,400	100	----	4,220
Canada	1,650	150	----	400	100	----	2,300
Australia	700	----	17	275	----	----	992
United Kingdom	200	----	----	----	----	----	200
Argentina	500	800	----	275	800	----	2,375
Brazil	----	50	60	----	50	40	200
Other Western Hemisphere states	----	----	40	----	----	----	40
Burma	----	----	40	----	----	35	75
Siam	----	----	75	----	----	120	195
Russia to France	150	----	----	150	----	----	300
Total	5,400	1,500	252	2,500	1,050	195	10,897

Grand total:

Wheat	7,900
Coarse grains	2,550
Rice	447

TABLE III.—*Further supplies possible*

	Second quarter loadings (April-May-June)			Loadings in July and August			Total
	Wheat	Coarse grains	Rice	Wheat	Coarse grains	Rice	
Indochina	----	----	50	----	----	50	50
Iraq	----	125	----	----	100	----	225
India [1]	----	----	----	----	200	----	200
Punjab and Sind [2]	100	----	----	100	----	----	200
Egypt [2]	30	----	10	50	----	25	115
United Kingdom [3]	300	----	----	----	----	----	300
Russia to France	75	----	----	----	----	----	75
Siam	----	----	----	----	----	200	200
Total	505	125	60	150	300	225	1,365
Iraq (dates)	----	----	----	----	----	----	140
Grand total	----	----	----	----	----	----	1,505

[1] Surplus provinces.
[2] Could be borrowed.
[3] Released stocks.

TABLE IV.—*Provisional balance sheet of world requirements and supplies*

In thousands of tons

Minimum cereal requirements:		
Europe	8,390	
Latin-America	1,000	
Southern British Empire	198	
Middle East	100	
Indian Ocean	2,886	
Pacific Ocean	1,910	
		14,484
Cereal supplies probable:		
April-May-June loadings	7,202	
July-August loadings	3,695	
		10,897
Deficit probable (24 percent)		3,587
Further possible cereal supplies		1,505

TABLE V.—*Comparison of the combined food board balance sheet of Mar. 1, 1946 (retrospective to Jan. 1, 1946) and Hoover mission balance sheet as of May 1, 1946*

[In thousands of tons]

	Stated requirements	Estimated supplies	Deficit	Deficit
				Pct
Combined Food Board:				
Jan. 1 to Sept. 1	25,900	14,900	11,000	42.5
Shipments to May 1	7,000	7,000	----	----
Original balance as at May 1	18,900	7,900	11,000	58
As revised by Hoover mission: May 1 to Sept. 1	14,484	10,900	3,587	24
Total	−4,000	+3,000	−7,413	----

	Ton.
Thus, the requirements were revised downward by	4,000,000
Supplies revised upward, through new sources developed, effect of conservation, drafts on earlier crops in some countries, etc	3,000,000
Estimated gap as of May 1	3,600,000

Address by Sumner Welles at Dinner of Maryland Christian Palestine Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered last night at Baltimore, Md., at the inaugural dinner of the Maryland Christian Palestine Committee, by a very able and distinguished Marylander, the Honorable Sumner Welles.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in connection with the action of the Senator from Maryland, I may say that I was privileged to hear the address. I certainly commend it most cordially, not only to the Members of this body, but to the Members of the House of Representatives and to the people of the entire country. I think the Senator from Maryland has done a great service in obtaining consent to have the address printed in the RECORD, because it is a very thoughtful and a very searching appraisal of the whole problem of Palestine, with which this country and the entire world are increasingly concerned.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, several addresses were delivered at the dinner last night, including one by the Honorable OWEN BREWSTER, Senator from Maine. He has promised me that he will give me the manuscript of his address, so that I can request that it also be printed in the RECORD. His address was a very able and very eloquent one, and I think it should appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore I shall hold him to his promise.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the kind and generous suggestion of the Senator from Maryland. I shall be happy to comply with his suggestion as opportunity affords.

There being no objection, the address delivered by Mr. Sumner Welles was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am grateful for the privilege of addressing the Maryland Christian Conference on Palestine tonight.

I accepted the honor of the chairmanship of the Maryland Chapter of the American Christian Palestine Committee some months ago. I accepted this designation because of my belief that every effort should be made impartially and objectively to lay before the people of the United States the basic issues involved in the great problem of Palestine. For this problem has given rise to one of the most dangerous and controversial questions which the world now confronts. Far more than that, in this problem of Palestine we are challenged by the fundamental issues of right, of justice, and of freedom. And our hope of a peaceful world order depends upon the willingness and the ability of the governments of the United Nations now to decide the questions with which they are faced in accordance with these standards of right, justice, and freedom.

We meet together tonight at a time of grave perplexity. The publication of the final recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee on Palestine has created a crisis, the gravity of which could hardly be exaggerated. To all those who, like myself, believe that Palestine must become not only the promised national Jewish homeland, but also an independent commonwealth into which the entrance of the Jewish people who wish to make that Holy Land their permanent home must never be restricted, save insofar as economic limitations may require, the report of the committee represents inevitably a matter for deep disappointment and for even deeper concern.

This, however, is not the moment for recrimination and inflammatory utterances. Nor is it a time for resignation and supine discouragement. It is, on the contrary, a time for renewed faith, for measured judgment, and for constructive action.

I am one of those who are convinced that in this tragically darkening world of the present moment the safety of the United States, and our chance of constructing that kind of a free world order for which we Americans have fought, depend to a very considerable extent upon the willingness and the capacity of the English-speaking democracies to strengthen that cooperative relationship which was forged in the fires of war. I do not hold with those who insist that all that we have in common with the other English-speaking peoples are our language and our traditions. I believe that we also possess a common heritage which is more highly to be prized than any other. That is the heritage of our common conviction that the individual is not born to serve the state, but that the state is created to promote the welfare of the individual. It is the heritage of our common passionate faith in the sanctity of human freedom.

And it is the abiding conviction of all of the peoples of the English-speaking democracies that the world order which today they seek must be founded upon those same principles of liberty which they have so firmly established in their individual forms of government.

But that belief which I and others hold need not blind us, nor does it blind us, to the tragic chapter of history which is represented by the manner in which successive British Governments have dealt with the problem of Palestine during the past 30 years.

The Balfour Declaration of 1917 was a courageous act of enlightened statesmanship. No subsequent attempts to distort or to limit the terms of that Declaration can change the fact, as the testimony of the statesmen responsible for its proclamation has made clear, that that Declaration gave official assurance that the British Government would establish in Palestine a national home for the Jewish people and facilitate the successful achievement of that objective with all that therein was implied.

There has been no sorrier manifestation in recent British history than the Palestine white paper of 1939. As Mr. Winston Churchill then said, that action constituted "an act of repudiation, a plain breach of solemn obligation." To use his words, "an engagement into which Great Britain had entered before the world was set aside for reasons of administrative convenience."

And I regret to say that during the years of the war and even during recent months I cannot find that British policy with regard to Palestine has been any more courageous, any more enlightened, or any more in keeping with the solemn engagements into which Great Britain originally entered in 1917 than it was at the time of the issuance of the white paper of 1939.

Whatever the legal quibbles which are advanced in extenuation may be, and however much we here in the United States believe in the great principle that dependent peoples should be granted their full autonomy or independence as soon as they are able to accept those responsibilities, I cannot regard the recent decision of the British Government to proclaim the independence of Trans-Jordan as other than a breach of the spirit as well as of the letter of the obligations which were assumed when it obtained the Palestine mandate. We need not minimize the pressing difficulties and the grave dangers with which Great Britain is today confronted. But I do not believe that the step so taken will lighten those difficulties.

The appointment of the Anglo-American committee could scarcely have been expected to result in any practical or constructive accomplishment. Commission after commission had already been appointed in the past by British Governments to investigate the situation in Palestine and to recommend policy with regard thereto. There was no farsighted member of the executive or legislative branches of the Government of the United States who had studied the problem of Palestine—and as we all know Members of our Congress have gone to Palestine for that purpose—who had not already reached a conclusion as to the nature of the solution which should be sought. Under such conditions what could the appointment of this new commission really accomplish other than to make it possible to postpone decisions? And these were months, as we so sadly know, when the pitiful survivors of the Nazi massacres, uprooted from their homes in every part of Europe, were still being compelled to live in intolerable conditions, in concentration camps, with no hope left to them except the possibility that they might be permitted to emigrate to Palestine, or to some other distant shores, and thus procure safety and the chance to make a fresh start in life.

There was not the slightest doubt on the part either of the Government of the United States or of the British Government when the Committee was appointed of what conditions in Europe really were. We already knew in horrible detail of the millions of persons of the Jewish faith who had been exterminated by Hitlerism. We know the number who had survived. We knew that the poisons engendered by nazism had made it impossible for an overwhelming majority of these survivors to return to the homes of their origin. We knew that the only possible solution for their plight, under present world conditions, lay in their chance to leave Europe for new places of security and of hope.

We all know what the Committee has now recommended. Has it in reality advanced the basic solution of the great problem which the world confronts? Has it in reality done more than call attention once again to the suffering of the refugees in Europe? Has it in reality done anything other than to confuse public opinion with regard to the real issues involved in the determination of the future of Palestine?

I know many of the American members of the Anglo-American Committee. I know that they are men of the highest character, of truly liberal convictions, who are incapable of framing or of signing a report in which they themselves do not believe. I do not question either their motives or their judgment. What I do question is the wisdom of our own Government in asking them at this time to assume these responsibilities.

And after this tragic loss of time, now that the report of the Committee has been rendered, there is taking place precisely that

phenomenon which could so readily have been anticipated when the Committee was appointed.

The Government of the United States publicly approves that portion of the report which recommends that 100,000 certificates be authorized immediately for the admission into Palestine of Jewish refugees. It refuses to make any comment upon those portions of the report which contain what in my judgment are those tragically mistaken recommendations with regard to the future status of Palestine. In other words, the Government of the United States in May 1946 reiterates its recommendation of August 1945, that 100,000 Jews from among the survivors of the Jewish people of Europe be permitted to enter Palestine.

The British Government officially states that it must obtain American assistance both in armed force as well as in money if this provision of the committee's recommendation is to be carried out. In consequence of the rest of the report, it has, however, obtained moral support for the position which it has recently taken with regard to its authority to continue to restrict immigration into Palestine, and with regard to the future status of Palestine.

While it is true that the Committee includes in its report certain recommendations which are desirable and encouraging, notably those which have to do with the problem of land tenure, can anyone maintain that, insofar as the basic questions are involved, we are not back precisely where we were 8 months ago?

As a result of the Committee's report, new and immediate dangers have also arisen. The report has resulted in a serious outburst of chauvinism throughout the Arab and the Moslem world. Fortunately, this outburst has been met, except in a few extremist quarters, with restraint and true wisdom on the part of the leaders of Zionism, and of those who support the ideal of a true national home for the Jews.

The report has also given rise to a danger of another character. That is the danger which has already made itself evident in many sectors of our own public opinion here in the United States. It is due to the belief of many well-intentioned people that, if a report of this character is assailed by the two parties to the controversy with which it undertakes to deal, such a report must on the whole be sound and wise. We cannot permit public opinion to crystallize its thinking in such a way.

Except for those reasons of domestic politics and of time-serving expedience with which, unfortunately, we are familiar, there was no justification for the appointment of the Committee. Nor is there any justification for assuming the validity of its recommendations.

There was never any justification for believing that a committee representing only two powers could undertake to reach final and definitive conclusions as to a rightful solution for the problem.

Many months ago I made this public statement of my own conviction as to the most practicable method of finding a solution. I said:

"The commonwealth will only come into being when the United Nations organization decides, as it must, that the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine is essential to world peace and to world stability. Unless the International Trusteeship Council to be set up by the United Nations organization is charged with the obligation of carrying out such a decision, a commonwealth of Palestine will continue to be an ideal and not a reality. Only the United Nations organization itself, representing the concerted determination of the free peoples of the world, will possess the necessary authority to achieve a final solution of the Palestine problem.

"The British Government should, under article 77 of the United Nations Charter, transfer its mandate over Palestine to the International Trusteeship Council as soon as the Council is established.

"From the moment the Council assumes jurisdiction, the United Nations organization should make available whatever armed force may be required to give assurance of security to all inhabitants of Palestine.

"The Council should thereupon summon representative Jewish and Arab leaders for consultation as to the most desirable solution.

"Should it prove impossible for the International Trusteeship Council, after full consultation with both Jewish and Arab leaders, to obtain their agreement to whatever solution it considers most equitable and desirable, the United Nations organization should, nevertheless, decree that its decision be carried out. Once this step has been taken, the International Trusteeship Council should set up a broadly representative provisional government in Palestine and entrust it with all necessary authority until such time as free elections can be held and an independent and democratic government can commence to function.

"As soon as the Council is entrusted with a trusteeship over Palestine, unrestricted immigration should be permitted. Immigration should thereafter be interrupted only if the International Trusteeship Council or the future government of Palestine decides that such restriction is temporarily required for economic reasons."

Due in great part to the postponement by the British Government of the submission of its League of Nations mandates to the new International Trusteeship Council, that Council cannot be established in legal form until after the meeting of the United Nations Assembly next September. For that reason, because of the acute danger which has now arisen, the Security Council of the United Nations should at once take cognizance of the situation existing in Palestine, as provided by the terms of the United Nations Charter. It should thereafter take such action as may be required so that the peace of Palestine can be safeguarded while refugees from Europe are being admitted, and until such time as the Trusteeship Council can assume its full responsibility.

It will, of course, be said that the Security Council has as yet no armed force at its disposal. It will also be said that the British Government continues to be the sole recognized authority in Palestine, unless and until it enters into an agreement with the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations by which its relinquishes that authority in whole or in part. But these objections constitute obstacles only if the interested powers are determined to have recourse to technicalities in order further to delay measures which in our judgment here tonight are so urgently necessary. I can well understand the reluctance of our Congress to agree that American military forces be utilized merely to assist the British Government as Major Attlee has suggested. But I cannot believe that that reluctance would persist if our Government were called upon by the Security Council of the United Nations to assist in an endeavor which is obligatory if world peace is to be maintained.

In our thinking upon the problem of Palestine, some of us here in the United States are too apt to be guided by the beliefs and concepts which are inbred in us because of our fortune in being citizens of the United States. We remember that from the earliest days of our independence men and women of the Jewish faith have been fellow citizens. We remember that among them many have been outstanding because of the great contribution which they have made to the building and to the growth of this country. We remember that these fellow citizens of ours are as much a part of the fabric of American life as any other American citizens. We know that our whole manner of being is founded upon a civilization which makes no distinction between individuals because of their race or creed. We know that if we ever depart from that principle, the free institutions of which we are so justly proud will disintegrate.

For these reasons it is difficult for many of us to believe, now that nazism has been overthrown, and now that the United Nations are pledged by their Charter to bring about a universal observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion, that there can exist any reason why the Jewish sufferers in Europe should not freely and willingly return to their former homes.

Yet, repugnant as they are, American public opinion must be compelled to recognize the following facts. That hideous race prejudice, fostered by Hitlerism, has not yet been eradicated from Europe. Tragically enough, it is not only in Germany where it is still extant. It is also to be found in acute form in many of the other countries of Europe. Even at this moment in some of the countries of eastern Europe it is threatening to bring about a new exodus. The United Nations must, and I believe will, eventually bring about the final extirpation of this poisonous relic of Hitler's barbarity. But in the meantime it is too much to ask of these pitiful survivors in the camps of Europe that they be forced not only to return to places which mark the scenes of deepest tragedy, whence their loved ones have gone to a hideous death, where their homes have been destroyed and their possessions stolen, but where they also will find no welcome and no real opportunity to live without discrimination and with assurance of security.

The report of the committee fixes the number of Jewish survivors whose emigration from Europe should be facilitated at half a million. From all of the information in my possession I believe this figure should be set at a far greater amount. One of the great mysteries of the postwar planning of the United Nations lies in the fact that when, by the vision and foresight of President Roosevelt, all of the necessary machinery was installed as far back as 1938 by means of the Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees, not one single constructive plan has so far been carried out in order that this great human problem might now be in process of solution. Yet there are many countries in the world, with vast unpopulated territories and great undeveloped natural resources, where the majority of the men and women now anxious to leave Europe could find a safe home, and where they could contribute greatly to the development of those countries.

But it is precisely because no such plans have been adopted that the refuge which Palestine affords becomes more and more indispensable. The free peoples of the United Nations must accept their joint responsibility for those conditions which have made it possible for a world to exist in which there can be refugees.

We here in the United States have an inescapable moral obligation to contribute to the solution. We have, I think, an equally inescapable moral obligation to lend the full support of our Government within the United Nations for the furtherance of that kind of a solution which will mean that those men and women of the Jewish faith throughout the world who wish to make Palestine their permanent home shall be afforded the opportunity of doing so freely. This Government must at the same time press for the establishment of a free and democratic commonwealth of Palestine, which will afford security and equal rights

to all of its citizens, whatever their faith and whatever their race may be.

If the United Nations assumes its just responsibility, establishes a trusteeship over Palestine, and permits the immigration into that country of those who desire to settle there, Palestine in all probability will in the future possess a majority of citizens of the Jewish faith. I believe that that is its rightful destiny. In that event, I have no fear that the holy places which are sacred to Christians, to Jews, and to Moslems alike will not always be open to all believers. Nor have I any reason to doubt that those who for so many long centuries have suffered persecution and discrimination will not wish to give an example to the world by bestowing equal rights without discrimination upon all citizens of Palestine, of whatever race or creed.

Nor do I fear that the kind of nationalism which is represented by the passionate desire of many millions of Jews in many parts of the world that the land of their forefathers once more become a national home for the Jews can ever permanently prejudice international understanding. Nationalism of the kind which is evidenced by a belief in the superiority of any people, and in the right of that people to dominate and to control other peoples, is the kind of nationalism which makes for war. But the longing of a great people for the reconstruction of their ancient home, so that within it their homeless and suffering brethren can find shelter and a new life is not a kind of nationalism whose fulfillment can do other, when the immediate clouds of the present are dispelled, than further the eventual reign of peace.

I have long believed that the economic federation of the countries of the Near East would advance peace and stability in that distraught region. I have long believed that the eventual inclusion of an independent Palestine in such a federation would make for the prosperity of the entire area, would do much to raise living standards in all of the Near Eastern world, and would greatly help to assuage that bitter feeling of antagonism which now darkens the relations between the Arabs and the Jews. But I have been equally convinced that objective cannot be achieved if the attempt continues to prevent the Jewish people from immigrating into Palestine, and thus artificially and unjustly to perpetuate a Jewish minority in Palestine.

In the annals of our modern civilization no greater wrong has been perpetrated than the attempt of powerful nations to proscribe the Jewish people. We here in the United States must help to find the means of solving the immediate problem now presented. It must be solved in such a way that in the years to come, in the place of the Palestine which today is rent with contention, with disorder, and with misery, we shall see a Palestine which will be a model and an example for the civilized community of nations.

If our Government pursues a policy which will help to bring that to pass, we Americans will have reason to be proud of the part which we shall have played. For what is here at stake is truly the establishment of liberty. It is the grant of liberty to hundreds of thousands of people who have never known its blessings, and whose forefathers in Europe have not known them throughout the centuries which have passed. We Americans can never afford to deny our own heritage by failing to recognize that the growth of liberty throughout the world will redound to the benefit of all humanity. We must not resign ourselves to the disenchantment which grows in the spirit of man when men come to believe that liberty does not matter very much. For I think this war has taught us the stern lesson that the Almighty will deal good or ill fortune to nations in the measure in which they themselves are disposed to sacrifice what may be required of them in the cause of liberty.

How Do You Like It, Americans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of May 10, 1946:

HOW DO YOU LIKE IT, AMERICANS?

The tragic significance of the coal strike, now in a hastily declared 2-week truce, is that a single individual has the power to bring the production facilities of an entire nation to a full stop.

The arrogant, ruthless man who exercises this dictatorial show of strength was born, ironically enough, on Lincoln's birthday and still lists his residence as Springfield, Ill., where a much greater man preached tolerance and practiced humility.

To those who see in John L. Lewis' demand for a $64,000,000 health and welfare fund either a communistically inspired plot or the first step toward nationalization of the coal mines, it should be pointed out that during the twenties Lewis was considered a solid Republican who rated the best drawing room on the Harding and Coolidge Presidential campaign specials.

With the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt to the Presidency, Lewis made his first bigtime bid for power. The United Mine Workers contributed $500,000 to the Roosevelt campaign fund and Lewis greatly strengthened his union when enactment of the Wagner Act and the Guffey Coal Act removed all the restrictions that had retarded unionization of the coal industry.

QUIT CIO

Lewis broke with Roosevelt in 1940 after Roosevelt is said to have laughingly rejected a proposal advanced by Lewis that he (Lewis) be Roosevelt's running mate in the third-term campaign.

After consultation with the Republican strategy committee, which had difficulty deciding whether Lewis' support would be an asset or a liability, the fiery mine workers' leader made a sonorous radio plea for Willkie's election, in which he pledged his resignation as president of the CIO if the members of the union refused to follow his political advice.

Despite everything that Lewis had done to advance the interests of his own union, the mine workers spurned his plea and voted overwhelmingly for Roosevelt. Lewis made good his pledge to resign as president of the CIO, and Phil Murray was elected to succeed him.

Until the day of Roosevelt's death, Lewis hated the late President with an implacable venom, and today he loathes and detests not only the remnants and political carry-overs of the Roosevelt administration but also his own former associates, like Phil Murray, who refused to participate in the personal vendetta against Roosevelt.

POWER

In the present coal strike John L. Lewis is making his second great bid for power. Edwin A. Lahey, of our Washington bureau, a skilled labor analyst, foresees the next phase of the contest between Lewis and his former associates when the present coal crisis is resolved. "Then," says Lahey, "Lewis will be free to take up the cudgels as a leader of the A. F. of L. organizing drive in the South. A spectacular victory for the mine workers is a matter of personal prestige for Lewis in the forthcoming contest with the hated CIO." That is why Lewis is setting his sights high in the coal crisis, and sitting tight, waiting for his opponents to "lose their nerve."

And so the country sits and fumes and frets while a vain and pompous labor leader who quotes Shakespeare, the Bible, and classical poetry, and struts like Mussolini, paralyzes the Nation in order to uphold his personal prestige.

How do you like it, Americans?

Doesn't it stick in your craw to have to admit that any one man is more powerful than your President or the Members of the United States Congress, who are supposed to represent your interests and protect your rights?

How do you like it, veterans?

Did you ever expect to see your country at the mercy of a domestic dictator who could stop reconversion, halt production, throw millions out of work, and make you eat it?

How do you like it, Members of Congress?

You who have stalled month after month on workable labor legislation that abridges no one's rights, but insists upon mutual responsibility and the prevention of strikes that vitally affect the public interest.

How do you like it, Senators and Congressmen?

How does it feel to know that you might have prevented the inevitable suffering and tragedy that has been brought upon hundreds of thousands of American homes—if you had possessed only a semblance of courage and a little more faith in your oath of office?

TRUMAN

How do you like it, Mr. President?

How does it seem to read about General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler closing down their shops just when their employees were beginning to recover from the disastrous economic effects of a 113-day strike?

Can you, in all good conscience, deny that you first failed to call the labor-management conference when it was urgently needed and then permitted it, when later called, to degenerate into little more than a farce?

Can you honestly say that your administration has developed anything that even remotely resembles an intelligent labor policy?

Do you think it is enough to say that the situation is tense or that you have finally called John L. Lewis and the mine operators into a joint conference?

Why couldn't such a conference have been called before the strike started?

The issue is plain and can be stated in a few words:

Shall John L. Lewis be given the power to place a $64,000,000 tax on the production of coal for an unspecified form of health and welfare fund to be administered solely by his union?

The object of Mr. Lewis' move is quite obvious. Such a levy on every ton of coal produced would give the great man a vast fund with which to augment his own political and economic power.

It would, in effect, make his union a private taxing authority, with the bill to be paid by the public.

Once this principle is established, the way is open for similar levies on all businesses and industries. That would mean higher prices for virtually everything we buy.

Since neither Mr. Lewis nor the coal operators show any indication of "losing their nerve," it is up to you, Mr. President, to show the country that you have some.

REMEDIES

At this late stage there are only two courses open:

The first is your firm insistence that some form of arbitrated health protection be given the mine workers.

The second is passage of legislation that will protect the public in the future against power-drunk labor leaders who flout the

public interest in order to gratify their own vanity and egotism.

To do less would be to concede that the United States Government is powerless to safeguard and defend the rights of its own citizens.

The Truman administration has yet to meet a major issue face up or even to succeed in getting its own limited and sketchy program enacted into law.

We are, therefore, not at all certain that the President has any stomach for tackling this disagreeable assignment.

We are sure, however, that as young Harry Truman studied his history books in school he never envisoned the day when the President of the United States would stand by rubbing his hands and hoping that everything would come out all right while the country was being thrown into a state of anarchy.

How do you like it, Americans?

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Curtailment of Beer Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks I have received thousands of postal cards from residents of my district asking my aid in rescinding the order of President Truman of February 6, 1946, to curtail the production of beer.

The last week in February, a few days before this order became effective, I protested to the Secretary of Agriculture, who told me he was duty-bound to carry out the President's order.

On May 2, 1946, I wrote the following letter to the President:

MAY 2, 1946.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On February 6 you issued a directive under which the use of grains and grain products, for making beer, was restricted to 70 percent of the amount used by the brewing industry in 1945. The purpose of this restriction was to make more grain available for the needy peoples of the world.

I have just returned from Cincinnati, where I have been reliably informed by members of the brewing industry there that the amount of grain, fit for use as food, which is saved by this restriction is infinitesimal. Its enforcement, however, is throwing thousands of men out of work and is losing for the Government tremendous sums in tax revenue, at a time when we can ill afford to have men cut of work or to decrease the tax income of the Nation. At the same time that American brewers are thus restricted, foreign brewers are importing beer into this country. Just last week a Washington liquor dealer advertised Mexican beer for sale in case lots.

In view of the fact that no appreciable grain is saved by this directive, many of my constituents fear that this is the first of a series of planned moves to bring back prohibition; whether this is so or not it is certainly resulting in the loss of their home markets by American brewers to foreign competitors—a loss induced and in some cases financed by their own Government. Since I cannot believe that this is what you intended, I respectfully urge you to rescind the directive of February 6, and to permit our own brewers to put their men back to work to supply our citizens with the beer they desire. Many of our returned servicemen are very bitter, both because this order has closed down the jobs to which they had returned and because they have been unable to get the beer for which they had longed during extended and arduous periods of overseas' service.

Respectfully,

WM. E. HESS,
Member of Congress.

On May 6 I received the following reply from one of the Presidential secretaries:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 6, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM E. HESS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HESS: The President has received your letter of May 2. By his direction, it is being referred for the consideration of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Very sincerely yours,

MATTHEW J. CONNELLY,
Secretary to the President.

And on May 14, 1946, I received the following letter and enclosure from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, May 14, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM E. HESS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HESS: This is in reply to your letter of May 2, 1946, addressed to the President, protesting against restrictions upon the use of grain for the production of malt beverages.

Restrictions upon the use of grain have been imposed in view of the serious world food crisis and are designed to make more grain available for use as food. The reason for restricting the use of barley and other grains for brewing is to make grains normally used by brewers available as cattle and poultry feed. This in turn makes more wheat and corn available for food purposes, both domestic and export.

No wheat is allowed to be exported except to countries in desperate need for food, and the amounts sent to such countries are at a level substantially under their screened requirements for human food. No barley is exported except for human food and for seed. Corn and grain sorghums are exported only through emergency authorizations for human food and for seed. Under these conditions, it is not probable that these grains would go into the production of alcoholic beverages.

The only countries from which beer is imported into the United States in any volume are Mexico and Canada, which in 1945 shipped 219,946 barrels and 56,140 barrels, respectively. These are small amounts when compared with the production by American brewers, which in 1945 was 87,928,939 barrels.

We realize the restrictions, which are explained in the enclosed press release, will require some sacrifices, but we believe Americans generally feel that it is more important at this time that these grains be used for food.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Assistant Secretary.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, February 28, 1946.

ORDER RESTRICTS BREWERS' USE OF GRAINS

The United States Department of Agriculture issued today an amendment to War Food Order 66 prohibiting the use of wheat or any product derived from wheat in the production of malt beverages and restricts the aggregate use of all other grains to 70 percent of the amount used by the brewing industry in 1945. The action was taken in accordance with President Truman's directive of February 6 calling for the conservation of grain.

The use of rice by brewers, except screenings and brewers' rice, is also prohibited by the amended order.

In effect, this action, which becomes effective at 12:01 a. m., March 1, will mean a 30-percent reduction in the use of permitted grains for all brewers except the smallest operators for whom minimum quotas of 180,000 pounds of grain are provided for each 3-month period. This group will not be materially affected by the amended order insofar as their total output is concerned.

Restrictions on the use of grain by the brewing industry are necessary in view of the serious world food crisis and are designed to make more grain available for use as food. The demand for all grains exceeds supply, and the situation is more critical this year than in any of the recent war years. Large quantities of wheat are needed for food in Europe and, at the same time, domestic requirements for all grains for food, feed, and industrial uses have expanded. The wheat available during the war years to supplement feed grains made it possible to increase substantially the numbers of livestock and poultry, but that cereal now must be diverted to direct food uses.

Because of the critical grain situation, the President directed the Department on February 6, to prohibit the use of wheat and wheat products for the production of beer and to limit the use of all other grains and grain products, including barley malt, after March 1.

Mother's Day Originated in the State of South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, because the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is and always has been one of the most productive sources of material for historians and recorders of governmental affairs and national progress, I am inserting in the RECORD, herewith, an informative newspaper story revealing the fact that Mother's Day had its origin in the State of South Dakota.

Mother's Day is now quite rightfully a national day of commemoration. However, Gov. Robert S. Vessey, of South Dakota, issued the first Mother's Day proclamation on April 16, 1909, after the idea had been suggested by Mrs. Anna Jarvis, of Philadelphia, Pa. In the intervening years between the present and the time when South Dakota entered the Union, the Sunshine State of South Dakota has been first in many acts and categories, but not the least of these is that this progressive young State of the great Mississippi River Valley was the first State of the Union to give official recognition to the mothers of men.

MOTHER'S DAY STARTED IN SOUTH DAKOTA—VESSEY ISSUED PROCLAMATION

PIERRE, May 8.—When America pays homage to its millions of mothers next Sunday, the nation will follow an example set by a

South Dakota governor 37 years ago, who issued the first Mother's Day proclamation and 4 years later saw the idea become a national day of tribute.

Robert S. Vessey, who served as South Dakota's seventh chief executive from 1909 through 1913, issued the initial Mother's Day proclamation on April 16, 1909, after the idea had been suggested by Mrs. Anna Jarvis, Philadelphia, who wrote to the governors of the 46 States in the Union that year asking that they proclaim the second Sunday in May as a day of tribute to mothers. Although 45 other governors acknowledged the request, Vessey alone issued a proclamation, and South Dakota became the first State to observe the day. Mrs. Jarvis, who still resides in Philadelphia, has credited South Dakota with leading the way toward national observance, which was proclaimed by congressional resolution on May 10, 1913, when the second Sunday in May was made a nation-wide day of tribute.

While Vessey was later surprised to learn that his was the only Mother's Day proclamation issued by a governor that year, South Dakotans deemed the act typical of the governor, who was noted for his personal kindnes and zeal for moral legislation.

Vessey died in October 1929, but he lived long enough to see a suggestion which only he and one other person thought important enough to warrant an official proclamation, become a national holiday—a day in which 130,000,000 people of the world's most powerful nation pause to pay humble and grateful tribute to their mothers.

Relations Between Argentina and Uruguay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Uruguay—Argentina's Victim No. 1," delivered over the radio by Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., former Secretary of the Treasury.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening. As I study the world today, 1 year after the firing ceased in Europe, it seems to me that very little progress has been made toward the achievement of a permanent peace. I doubt very much whether the United States has a single important friend left in the world. This is not an enviable position in which to find ourselves, because the future is going to be difficult, and we cannot face it alone. The United States must have friends.

This was emphasized for me when I saw the Pulitzer prize cartoon in the papers yesterday morning. It was drawn by Bruce Russell, of the Los Angeles Times. It shows a deep canyon, separating a very serious-looking American eagle on one side, and an equally serious Russian bear on the other. The caption says, "Time to bridge that gulch."

That cartoon summarizes the biggest problem in the world today, our relations with Russia. There is little hope for peace in the world unless the United States and Russia are friends. And there is no fundamental reason for our not being friends. As the cartoon so aptly says, "It is time to bridge that gulch."

However, we have lost important friends in other quarters of the globe as well. In the last year, the heritage of good will which accrued to us in Latin America through President Roosevelt's good-neighbor policy has been largely dissipated. One of our greatest setbacks was the election of Colonel Peron in Argentina, and it doesn't give me any pleasure to recall that in a speech last January I predicted this would happen. I would very much have preferred to be proved wrong; but when I reviewed the uninterrupted series of diplomatic disasters which State Department policy had suffered in South America, I could see no other possible outcome.

Tonight I find myself in the unhappy position of having to make another prediction—that unless we achieve a quick transformation of policy with regard to Latin America, we are going to wake up one morning and find that Colonel Peron has organized a whole group of countries against us—an anti-democratic, anti-American, Fascist bloc based on the nations of the River Plate region—Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay, Bolivia, and possibly Chile.

The first victim of these ominous Argentine ambitions has already been chosen. It is the democratic nation of Uruguay, which—in contrast to Argentina—has consistently done her best to promote the interests of Latin-American democracy. As a result, Peron has slated Uruguay to become the Czechoslovakia of Latin America. As far back as last January, posters carrying Peron's picture mysteriously appeared in the Uruguayan capital, and leaflets were distributed warning the Uruguayan public of the dire punishment that would fall upon them for their democratic ideas, just as soon as Peron was elected.

Now Peron's pressure campaign is getting up steam. For two and a half months, Uruguay has been unable to get either wheat or salt from Argentina, although Argentina continues to export wheat to other nations when it serves her political ends to do so. This political embargo was followed up by Argentina's denunciation of her radio agreement with Uruguay * * * the reason given being that the Uruguayan stations have "insulted Argentina's dignity," although they have done nothing but tell the truth about Argentine fascism. And now, Argentina has declared she is going to revise her tourist treaty with Uruguay, thus making it difficult for travelers to cross the border in either direction. On the very same day that this happened, Colonel Peron had a visitor at his country estate—his Argentine Berchtesgaden. The visitor was Edward Victor Haedo, a leader of the totalitarian Herrerista Party in Uruguay. Haedo is out to capture power for the Fascist Herreristas in next November's elections, or probably sooner if he can get away with it.

And Peron, like Hitler, is undoubtedly ready to provide the money, the pressure, the technique of inciting strikes and unrest, and everything else that is necessary to make a Fascist satellite out of Uruguay. The whole situation is tragically similar to that of Czechoslovakia right after Munich. Peron has learned his lessons well—with such instructors at his elbow as Ludwig Freude, wanted by the United States as Argentina's No. 1 Nazi; and Dr. Heinrich Doerge, Hjalmar Schacht's right-hand man and now a financial expert for the Argentine regime. If Peron is successful in this campaign to stifle Uruguayan democracy, he will control both sides of the mouth of the strategic River Plate, and will be well on his way to the Greater Argentine Empire of which he is dreaming.

We must not underestimate the meaning of these developments. Argentina today no longer represents the minor threat to peace which we considered her during the war. She is a big and powerful state, with enormous potentialities. Her growing financial prestige is illustrated by the fact that she just made a loan to Franco Spain, which is referred to in Peron's press as the motherland.

And she recently made a loan to Paraguay, where dictator Higionio Morinigo rules with an iron hand. Peron's success has encouraged pro-Fascist, anti-American groups all over the continent. In Chile, for example, the remnants of two old Nazi organizations are now planning a convention to reconstitute themselves into a Fascist-type party. And while American prestige is approaching a new low in Latin America, other powers are making the most of their opportunities.

The British, who maintained a virtually complete silence all through the anti-Fascist fight against Peron, have concluded an interim trade agreement with Argentina, pending a permanent one, and in April, the famous British appeaser, Sir Samuel Hoare, made an appearance in Buenos Aires, reportedly as representative of British financial interests and with the rumored intention of selling British armaments to the Peron government.

We are now beginning to taste the bitter fruits of State Department bungling in South America. It seems clear to me that men like Spruille Braden, whose opposition to Argentine fascism has been vigorous and outspoken, have not received the support they should have had from Secretary of State Byrnes.

So consistent has top-level State Department blundering been, that one begins to wonder whether the blunders themselves do not add up to a policy, and whether those responsible did not really want exactly the results they got.

The time for change has come, and it is urgent. I have been deeply concerned about our half-hearted fight against Latin-American fascism ever since that day in January 1944 when the State Department, at the very last moment, reversed decision to freeze Argentine assets in this country * * * and again last November, when we failed to put our whole moral weight behind a Uruguayan proposal for collective action against Western Hemisphere states of aggressive character. Our whole policy on fascism has been marked by vacillation, indecision, and outright appeasement. The net effect is visible in the approaching crisis in Uruguay, and in the attitude of the Paraguayan Hitler, Higionio Morinigo, who is reported to have justified his dictatorship in these words:

"The international efforts of the so-called democratic governments of Paraguay have always been a failure. They were never able to get a cent from foreigners. My government is not democratic, therefore the United States is more interested in getting its friendship. During my regime, Paraguay has received greater aid from the United States, proportionately, than any of the democratic nations of the continent."

It is high time to call a halt to a policy which gives aid and comfort of that kind to South American dictatorships. But we still seem to be proceeding along the same fatal road. Yesterday President Truman announced a proposal by which the United States would provide uniform military training to South American nations. Does this mean to all nations, whether they are democratic or not? Is it not possible that the selfsame armies trained by us may one day be turned against the United States itself? And if we are to have an international police force to guard the peace, why must we go out of our way to build up military machines in South America?

There now appears to be an effort in the State Department to make Spruille Braden, whose fight against Argentine fascism has been forthright and courageous, the scapegoat for all our failures. It is true that a thorough housecleaning in the State Department is vitally necessary, but the men

who are really responsible must be the ones to go. We need a State Department that will be willing to take immediate action on the real source of Fascist infection in South America—the Fascist motherland, Franco Spain, whose influence in Latin America cannot be underestimated. It is we, the United States, who must take the leadership in the UN investigation of Franco, instead of dragging our feet. And it is we who must have the courage to rectify our own errors, and initiate the movement to drive Argentina out of the United Nations without delay.

There is still time to retrieve the friendship of democratic forces in South America, but we must make haste. South American fascism is entrenching itself—and fascism inevitably breeds war.

Good night.

Honestly, It's the Best Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, honesty is still the best policy in the United States. Honestly, it is! The enclosed item from the editorial page of the Saturday Evening Post reports how an honest and hard-working South Dakota farm couple repaid a grant given them by the American Red Cross although it took them nearly 20 years to reach a financial position where such repayment was possible.

This South Dakota farm couple—typical of the honest and patriotic farmers of this Republic—owed nothing to the American Red Cross because the aid they had received was an outright grant, but their gratitude and character were such that they could not be content until they returned to the Red Cross every penny of the money which had been advanced.

Mr. Speaker, in this "gimme age," where debts are being repudiated and when so many men and nations are asking for something for nothing it is indeed gratifying to realize that there are still Americans like Mr. and Mrs. Simmonson, of Yankton County, S. Dak.

The editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of May 11, 1946, follows:

NOT NEWS, BUT NICE

There is so much in the current news about nations and groups and individuals trying to grab off all they can that a recent item in the Red Cross Courier is a pleasant counteractant. It told about the grateful act of Mr. and Mrs. Sig Simonson, who live in the northeast part of Yankton County, S. Dak. On the night of December 13, 1928, a tornado struck the Simonson farm. In a matter of seconds it ruined the farm buildings and damaged the farm home and crops, the total loss amounting to more than $20,000. The farm was heavily mortgaged at the time and it seemed that the Simonsons would lose what was left of it.

But kindly neighbors helped out and the American Red Cross gave them a grant of $1,500 from its national disaster fund. With this slender new start, they began the struggle all over again. Drought years added to their difficulties, but they kept the mortgage interest paid. With better crops and prices since 1940, and through hard work and good management, they finally paid off the mortgage. Then, as soon as they could get the amount together, they turned over a check for $1,500 to the Yankton County Red Cross chapter to be returned to the National Disaster Fund. They didn't really owe the $1,500; it had been a grant. But the Simonsons are the kind of people who want to feel right with themselves and the world. The great majority of the American people are that kind of folks. By some queer distortion of values, their acts of character and unselfishness don't rate as news.

Those Who Undersand OPA Best Oppose Its Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have heard much lately about the number of people writing their Congressmen on the subject of OPA extension. We have heard from OPA representatives and propagandists that the mail from the people indicates an overwhelming majority are in favor of the continuation of OPA. That is not what my colleagues in Congress tell me about the mail they are receiving from their constituents. It certainly is not my experience. During the last 2 weeks, only about 1 out of every 35 letters I received from my constituents favors the extension of OPA. The others condemn it and its continuation in most vehement style. Some of them at first were inclined to believe that it might be extended, with its operations restricted to price controls on only a few of the essential items, but the tendency now to express utter lack of confidence in those administering, or who will administer, the functions of OPA, is more marked day by day. The false impressions, misleading figures, and deceptive statistical information which have been given out by those supporting this Bureau and those who have been a part of its manipulations and operations have thoroughly discredited the Bureau, and the people apparently have lost all confidence in them. They no longer are willing to trust the administration of OPA to these bureaucrats. They have gotten on to their racket, and they want OPA to die a natural death June 30, 1946.

As an illustration of the thinking of the people of my district, I am in receipt of a letter from a lifelong Democrat, a man who has held high positions in his party organizations and in his profession, who has held public office and retired with the respect and esteem of his fellow citizens, and has lived a life without blemish. He is considered one of the top men in his profession in the work in which he has specialized. The letter to which I referred is dated May 9, 1946, and reads:

Since the Government at Washington has had to confess its utter incompetency to run the country and keep this, that, and the other industry from being stifled by senseless strikes, and since the Postmaster General has found it necessary to take the radio to explain to our people why they should curtail their mail, I perhaps should not address you at all. I know my letter will cost the Government, and use up a lot of coal, which we do so sorely need.

I just heard Leon Henderson state that the mail of Members of Congress showed about 28 for to 1 against retaining OPA without restrictions. Well, I want to add my voice to those who want something done about these bombastic bureaucrats, who are always right; who can marshal statistics a yard long, to prove their case; and who spend millions of dollars annually to prove their worth and the necessity for their continuation in power. Mark me, if Congress extends OPA another year without putting some kind of curb on their power, if they let Bowles and his left-wing staff muddle up things for another full year, the same gentry will be back a year from now with their false statistics to prove that a permanent OPA headed by a bunch of Communists or near-Communists must be kept in power.

It is passing strange that every Communist in America is shouting loudly for the retention of Bowles, and his unbridled authority. Were these people ever known to support any program which would strengthen this great Republic? My letter will be but one, but you can rest assured that it expresses my own well-considered feelings. I think it a disgrace that we should yet have in power at Washington the riffraff of every pipe dream of the past, lording it over everybody. I would not cry if Congress refused to appropriate a cent to sustain this office, officered and controlled by the type of people found in it.

Mr. Speaker, the above letter is one of many from the best minds of our people. I say that those who understand OPA best oppose its extension. I might say that those who think most clearly for themselves, and are not influenced by propaganda and have no ulterior motives, and are not influenced directly by its operations, except as average citizens are, are apparently opposed to its continuation. The operations of OPA have sickened and disgusted the people. These bureaucrats have destroyed all the confidence the people originally reposed in them, and, in my humble opinion, such confidence cannot be restored. The OPA is doomed to go.

Following is a letter which I received from a businessman in my district who is absolutely not affected by OPA operations any more than the average citizen. His business is one of the few that is not under the control of OPA and its tyrannical edicts. But it shows the present thinking of our citizens. I quote, as follows:

It has been my practice in the past to refrain from annoying our Representatives in Congress with my views concerning the ordinary run of legislation, and it is not my intention to do so from now on. However, in the present matter of extension of the OPA's life, it is quite apparent that it is a subversive element undertaking to influence the Congress for their own special ends and purely for the purpose of gaining influence politically.

I recognize the fact that you have at all times in your vote shown the very best of judgment in trying to regulate this bureau, and I feel sure that these influences that are being brought about through the CIO will not influence you in any way, yet feel that you should know the sentiment in your district.

I am very much against any influence being brought against Congress that tends toward socialism and communism, and apparently the influences that are trying to extend the life of the OPA in its present form

are these particular people. Personally, I have no objection against the extension of this bureau if it was in the hands of people who were trying to serve the interests of the citizenship, but it is more than evident that these men are trying to control the people, rather than trying to serve them.

If the OPA could be extended and their authority reduced for the purposes for which it was intended they were to serve, it would probably be very beneficial, but unless our legislation can be so formed that it will not be in a position to serve as policemen rather than as administrators, then the bureau should be entirely abolished.

I am writing this so that you may have the benefit of my views along with many connected with my organization.

Address to Kansas Cooperative Council by Hon. Jerry Voorhis, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Representative JERRY VOORHIS at the annual meeting of the Kansas Cooperative Council, at Topeka, Kans., on May 10, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It means a very great deal to me to have been invited to address this annual meeting of the Kansas Cooperative Council. First, because I believe the cooperative movement to be the most constructive economic and social movement in the world today. Second, because your cooperative council includes all kinds of cooperatives and thus shows that you recognize the great importance of unity in the cooperative movement. Third, because you have invited me back to my native State of which I am so sincerely proud. Kansas is the heart of America in more ways than one, and what happens here will inevitably have profound effect on our whole country.

I would like to start my speech with a quotation from Tennyson:

"The old order changeth, yielding place to new,
And God fulfills Himself in many ways,
Lest one good custom should corrupt the world."

An old world lies dead all about us. Few men realize this yet, but it is true.

The old laissez faire finance capitalism passed into history as the world-wide economic collapse of 1929 engulfed the nations.

World War II finished the job. As if years of want, disease, terror, death, and destruction were not enough, the very power of the universe in a lethal weapon has been released upon the earth with consequences which even the boldest and most far-sighted will not dare to predict.

A new age is struggling to be born. But no man can dare guess as yet whether it will be the most fearful age in all mankind's long history or one of progress, peace, and hope.

We talk much about keeping faith with returning veterans. But we shall not keep that faith unless we have the courage to live with foresight and understanding in the new world which their weapons have forged.

No good will come of trying to sweep the institutions of the past wholly away. There has been much evil in that past—poverty, unemployment, greed, hatred, war. But that same past has given us, also, a precious heritage which includes the beginnings of true freedom, the foundations of constitutional democratic government, great advances in learning, science, education, and technology, and above all the basic inescapable truths of religion. Our purposes, therefore, must be to preserve and cherish those things which are good and true, even as we cast out those things which are unworthy.

But no good can come of merely clinging to the past, resisting every attempt at progress, hiding our heads in the sands of time, believing a fairy tale about how past ages can be revived in the uncertain and dynamic future that surrounds us now. In this day of stark suffering and dynamic development such attempts spell a gospel of blind despair.

Mankind is plagued by fears. By fears of foreign countries, of continued violence and future war, of violent revolution and civil strife. Depending upon one's position there is fear of the power of private monopolies, or of labor unions, or of government. Millions are haunted by fears of unemployment, hunger, want, and persecution. These ghosts are terribly real. And over and beyond them all towers the all-pervading fear that in unlocking the inherent atomic energy of the universe man may have dared too far, and unless in quick contrition he comes humbly to the throne of God to ask for guidance and to follow it, he cannot but reap in death the harvest of his untempered pride.

It is a principle of psychology that fears are overcome only by constructive action to remove their cause. But what kind of action? The problem is as universal as human life, as broad as the world itself. We want a solution in which we can believe with a whole heart. We want one that contains a secure basis for the new world which will preserve as many as possible of the values of the past. Above all, we know that we shall lose all that is best in life unless the methods which are used are such as will develop the best qualities in human individuals—methods which will help people to grow and to become more self-reliant, more truly hopeful, more deeply religious people.

Some, with blasphemous cynicism, will say there is no such solution. They are wrong. Such a method lies before us waiting for us to grasp it with vigor and enthusiasm, ready to be used for building the new and better world. By this method the voluntary, self-directed efforts of groups of people can build for themselves a real security without either the loss of freedom or undue reliance upon government.

The outstanding fact about the modern economic world is the machine. James Watts' steam engine started a chain of events which in two short centuries has brought us to the atomic bomb and has almost completely changed mankind's way of making a living. These changes have been not only technological but sociological as well, for as a result of the industrial revolution the average man has lost almost completely his chance to own the tools with which he works. Unless this course can somehow be altered it will remain true that only in agriculture, the handicrafts, and a few other occupations will any real opportunity still exist for the worker to be also the owner of the means of production. And so mankind has been threatened—and is more seriously threatened today than ever before—by three kinds of tyranny. All of them imperil his liberty, his self-reliance, his opportunity for development, most of all his hope.

The first of these is the tyranny of private monopoly power, the power that owns or attempts to own all the tools, all the facilities, all the patents, all the technical knowledge in given fields of industry, production, or distribution.

The second tyranny which threatens mankind's freedom is that of a dictatorial state divorced from responsibility to or control by the people's will. It is not true that government services to the people need result in such a tyranny, but it probably is true that governmental control of the entire economic life of a nation must almost inevitably carry with it political dictatorship, and the loss of the people's freedom.

But a dispossessed people can see nowhere to turn except to their government when distress comes upon them. And the third tyranny is the tyranny of fear, fear of unemployment and bankruptcy, and the war and death that follow them. The third tyranny is the worst of all.

Through all their early history, the people of America have stood against tyrannies. Ours was once a continent of vast areas of free, unexploited, and above all unowned land where the average citizen could carve out for himself a farm and with it economic independence. But the face of North America is different today. Her free land is all taken up, her economic life dominated by huge concentrations of capital utterly beyond the reach of the average citizen.

Is the spirit and hope of the old continent to die? Are there but two alternatives to the problems we face? Must we choose between control of the people by private monopoly on the one hand or by governmental power on the other? Surely we will not be so lacking in vision as to say that. For there is a better way, a middle road which can restore reasonable security to the people through the exercise of their own effort, and their loyalty to one another. Yes; even the opportunity to own a share in this great modern industrial machine can be restored to the common citizens of our country. A middle road can be found. It is a way, a method, an organizing principle which has been tested in the fire of human experience in many lands and found to be good. It is the cooperative way of life—the cooperative method of carrying on our business. It is for nations if you will, the cooperative way, the only way of controlling the atomic bomb.

Cooperation is as old as civilization itself, for it is the very root from which human civilization has grown. The outstanding thing that distinguishes humankind from the animal world is the ability of men to cooperate with one another for the attainment of desired goals. Cooperation began when the first group of primitive people made up their minds that it was better to work together to keep their precious fire burning than it was for all to go their individualistic ways, preying upon one another and thus allowing the fire which otherwise might have afforded protection for all, to flicker and sink into cold, dead ashes.

Ever since that earliest day people have been solving problems by means of cooperation. The machine itself is a monument to the principle of cooperation. Civil peace is possible only because law-abiding people cooperate for its maintenance.

And so it is no wonder that, as men and women have faced the sometimes baffling, highly industrialized world of today, they have turned to this age-old tried and trusted method. For cooperation is the application to our problems of the Golden Rule and the principle of human brotherhood.

There are today in the United States and Canada some 4,000,000 people who are members of credit unions. Why? Because they have discovered out of experience that it is possible for many people with small savings to pool together those savings, to borrow money from themselves when necessary, to pay interest to themselves, and thus to escape the necessity of paying exorbitant tribute to loan sharks and other money lenders. The credit union is simply a means of organizing a people's lending institution so

that the people's money may be available to meet the people's needs, and so the people may be free.

In many respects the credit union is the fundamental type of cooperative. It has been in large part through credit unions of fishermen, miners and other people that the great cooperative movement of the Canadian maritime provinces has been built. That movement stands today as one of the outstanding examples of all time of the successful application of basically right principles to extremely difficult and distressing human problems. With the University of St. Francis Xavier as its center and source of inspiration, there has been built in Nova Scotia particularly a pattern of life which could well be copied by the people of many other parts of the world. At the mining town of New Waterford, where miners dig coal 5 miles out under the sea, the credit union owns its own building and constitutes the bank of credit for one of the finest cooperative stores anywhere in the world. This credit union also operates the town's circulating library and is the headquarters for most of the community activities of this entire city. This is one demonstration of what the people can do when they learn to put their own small savings together for the promotion of their common welfare.

There was a time when the fruit farmers of the West along with all other American farmers found themselves at the time of harvest utterly unable to secure a decent price for their crops. Indeed the more abundant their harvest the weaker their bargaining position became and the lower the price they received. No one farmer's fruit mattered very much to those who controlled the market. Nor was the individual farmer in a position to keep his crop from rotting and spoiling if he did not sell it immediately. Those few people who stood in the position of buyers of those farm commodities were able therefore to drive the price received by the farmers to ruinously low levels and then to resell the crop at ample margins of gain for themselves. Unfortunately, this condition still exists as to many agricultural crops today. But there are other cases, notaby that of the fruit growers, many poultrymen, dairymen, and grain farmers, where the method of cooperation has been applied. There the farmers have decided that there is no reason why they should not assemble together the production of the individual farms, sell it cooperatively, cut down unnecessary middlemen's margins, and thus gain for themselves some degree of control over their own economic welfare and destiny. The method of cooperation has proven by far the most effective means of enabling the farmer to secure something like his fair share of the price the consumer ultimately pays for food in the United States.

By means of cooperatives moreover, the farmers have added to the total income of agriculture and kept in the hands of rural producers that portion of the cost of food which was once represented by unnecessary middlemen's margins.

The marketing cooperative is the farmer's sales agency. It belongs to him and represents his interest in the distribution channels of the country as no other type of agency in the world could do. It has meant, where the cooperatives have been strong, the difference between having as much as 60 percent of the consumer's dollar reach the pockets of the actual producers of a food commodity instead of having only 30 percent of the consumer's dollar reach the farmer and the other 30 percent go into the coffers of handlers and middlemen of one kind or another.

When the first cooperative retail store was started in Rochdale, England, in 1844, it was begun by those 28 poverty-stricken Englishmen as a means of raising their standards of living. They had tried without success to get increases in their wages. So they turned to the method of attempting to make those wages go further in the purchase of the food their families needed. Their experiment proved a success—so great a success that as of today one-sixth of the purchases of British consumers are made at their own cooperative stores, one-third of the purchases of Swedish consumers are made at their own cooperative stores, while varying percentage obtain in other countries.

The significance of this does not become clear until we realize that the root cause of unemployment and economic distress in modern nations has been the fact that the people have been chronically unable to purchase with their incomes as much as they could produce with their energy employed on modern methods of production. Therefore any method which makes the consumer's dollar stretch 10 or 15 percent further in the purchase of goods must be a direct contribution to the solution of the basic problem of this modern day, the problem of bringing into balance the people's power to buy and their power to produce. Clearly this is a matter of the greatest importance. But perhaps a still greater value in the little dingy store in Rochdale and all its successors down through the years has been the fact that those stores have given to the people who owned them as cooperators a feeling of possession, of proprietary interest. This little spot in the great complex economic machine has belonged to them. Their feeling toward it has been like that of a farmer toward his farm or a home owner toward his home. Only in some respects it has been even more poignant because this experience of ownership has come to people who in most cases could not know it in any other way. Many of them have been city dwellers renting rooms in apartment houses and working with tools belonging to someone else.

Mr. Howard A. Cowden, the president of the Consumer Cooperative Association of Kansas City, Mo., has pointed out that all the factories in America have actually been paid for by the consumers who bought their products, but that the only factories which the consumers own are the ones which belong to cooperative members. And may I add here and now that this very Consumer Cooperative Association, along with the other cooperatives that form your Kansas Cooperative Council, is one of the best examples I know of true American enterprise being restored to and exercised by the people themselves and one of the best illustrations of this all-important principle of restoring ownership to the people.

Cooperation then is a means of organizing the consumer buying power of the people in such a way that it can be employed by them to acquire an actual ownership stake in the modern industrial system. What the cooperative really does is to transfer what otherwise would be an unnecessary profit-margin into an investment on the part of the members of the cooperative in the ownership of their business.

Another illustration of this is to be found in what the Indiana Farm Bureau cooperatives have done in the field of petroleum and petroleum products. I could just as well—perhaps better—use the example of what you yourselves in Kansas have done in this field. But if I did so you might think I was a politician. So I am going to move over into Indiana. The principles are just the same in both cases. Some years ago the approximately 100,000 Indiana farmers who compose the farm bureau cooperatives in that State purchased a fleet of tank trucks for the delivery of gasoline and other oil products to the farmers of that State. The savings effected—that is, the margin between what the delivery of the gasoline would otherwise have cost if it had been furnished by the big oil companies in the usual way and the amount that it actually did cost when delivered by the cooperative trucks—was devoted to paying for the cost of the trucks. In 11 months all debts had been paid and the fleet of trucks belonged outright to 100,000 Indiana farmers. They then proceeded to purchase some oil wells and some river barges and to lease some pipe lines in order to supply petroleum products from the southern portion of Indiana to other parts of the State. This whole distribution system is now returning to the cooperative members $1 each year for every $1 which they invested in it. These 100,000 Indiana farmers own their local petroleum-marketing associations, and those associations in turn own the pipe lines, the refineries, the oil wells, the barges, the tank trucks.

Now all of the savings effected by this cooperative distribution system are returned at regular intervals to the purchasers of these petroleum products. And when we consider the economic problem as a whole, we can see the contribution which the cooperatives make toward its solution. For like your own cooperative petroleum business here in Kansas this Indiana Farm Bureau Cooperative petroleum system means that instead of these farmers turning their money over to the oil monopoly to swell the surpluses of huge companies in Chicago or New York banks, the savings from the efficient cooperative system increase the purchasing power of every rural community in the State of Indiana, and thus continue to be part of the active demand on the part of rank and file people for the goods and services which they need. Every single person in those Indiana communities—or Kansas communities, or Missouri communities, or Ohio communities—profits by this result and every single manufacturing plant in the country and all the workers employed therein derive some indirect benefit from this improved distribution of the purchasing power generated by American production.

Since cooperatives belong to the people whom they serve, they inevitably bring into the economic life of the Nation a competitive element which is always striving to bring a better quality product to the people than they had before. Again I will take an example from the Indiana Farm Bureau Cooperatives. Dissatisfied with the equality of lubricating oil which was being furnished by the oil companies the Farm Bureau Cooperatives in that State tried to get a law passed by the legislature to compel oil companies to sell lubricating oil on the basis of known and stated specifications. They did not succeed in getting the law passed nor did they succeed in getting any company to make its sales upon that basis. Accordingly the Farm Bureau Cooperatives built their own laboratory and developed their own lubricating oil from their own petroleum produced by their own wells.

They sold this oil at standard going prices for lubricating oil. They devoted the savings, the difference between the actual cost and going market selling price, to paying off the cost of their laboratory so that it might belong debt-free to the people themselves. And this margin, the margin between real costs and inflated selling prices, proved enough to pay the entire cost of the laboratory and all of its equipment in the short space of 9 months. And even more important is the fact that because of this exercise of the basic cooperative principle of furnishing the best possible product to the people, a better oil was made available, one which increased the life of machinery and added to the wealth, therefore, not only of the cooperative members but of all of the other people in these communities.

The economic world in which we live is one dominated by huge aggregations of capital and tremendous concentration of machinery and industrial power. The great need of the people of our time is to feel that some part at least of this huge machine is theirs. True conservatives, in the best sense of that word, will fervently desire that this result be attained. For the man to whom something belongs is the man who best understands the importance of preservation of the

worth-while values of the past. It is not only the progressives, then, but also the conservatives who should hope for a growth of the cooperative movement.

Now, the trouble with the present situation is that as a rule the great aggregations of industrial and financial power which dominate our economic life are often opposed to extending their own businesses or increasing their own production. For such action might mean that the particular commodity or service which they have to sell would become truly plentiful and not only give the degree of benefit to mankind of which it is really capable, but also become cheaper in price.

The cooperative point of view is exactly the opposite.

It was not very many years ago that the power trust told the farmers of the United States of America that it was impossible for electricity to be furnished to the farm homes of our country at less than 72 cents per kilowatt hour. Rural electrification was at a standstill. We were decades behind some of the far poorer countries of Europe in this respect. Then came the rural electrification cooperatives, assisted this time, it is true, by the availability of Government loans, but depending primarily as they must always do if they are sound, upon the readiness of the consumers of that electricity to guarantee the repayment of the loan and to seek ultimate ownership in their own names of the power lines and transmission systems. For the first time the cost of electricity was brought within reach of American farmers. And so because the principle of cooperation was available to be used, millions of American farm homes have been lighted up—millions of farm housewives have had burdens of drudgery lifted from their shoulders—millions of farmers have found their operation tremendously simplified, and millions of farmers' children have been able to read their school books under good electric lights when otherwise these things would have been impossible.

And best of all, the time will come when these rural electric systems will have been paid for, the Government loans liquidated, and when this portion, at least, of one of the most highly integrated businesses, one of the most highly monopolized types of industrial power in all the world, will have had the ownership thereof spread among millions of simple people throughout the length and breadth of the United States.

Are cooperatives enemies of democracy and freedom—are they enemies of private enterprise? No. Quite the contrary is obviously true. The cooperative is the one best hope of true economic freedom, of true private enterprise, if you will, for the millions of common people around the world. It is the only way I know of in which they can own the things they pay for.

Against this background of what cooperatives have meant—against these facts which indicate what they can mean in the future, let us now turn to one of the most discouraging stories of human blindness and lack of vision that has ever splotched the pages of history.

The farmers of America formed their cooperatives largely to deal with one of two problems. The first of these problems was the inability of farmers at the time of harvest to secure a fair and just price for their crops when their only market was controlled by a few powerful middlemen. Before the coming of the cooperatives, the thousands of farmers all of whose crops would ripen at approximately the same time found their bargaining position as sellers so weak that they received for their crops only a tiny percentage of what the consumers finally paid for the food represented thereby. In order to solve this problem, many groups of American farmers formed cooperatives so that in effect one farmer or one farmer's agent could sell the crops of the whole group and thus secure something like a fair price for them.

The other major cause of the formation of farmer cooperatives was the inordinately high price of many staple farm supplies, feed fertilizer and petroleum products for example. Farmers found that by organizing themselves to do business cooperatively they could in effect have one farmer or one farmer's agent make purchases of these supplies in large quantities thus saving a portion of the large margins of profit formerly charged by handlers and producers. Moreover, with a group of loyal cooperative co-owners of such a distribution system to depend upon as regular customers it was possible for these cooperatives to start in to manufacture feed, fertilizer, and petroleum products and thus to establish a yardstick of real costs of production. In this manner monopolistic controls were broken down and the entire community benefited, whether they were members of the cooperative or not.

Now there were some people who did not like this sort of thing. Mainly they were people who had found it highly profitable through the years to exploit American agriculture and American consumers by, on the one hand paying an unjustifiably low price to farmers and then charging high prices to the consumers for their supplies. As the cooperatives began to relieve the farmer's problems it naturally cut into the business of some of these people and so they organized what they called the National Tax Equality Association with Mr. Ben C. McCabe as president. Mr. McCabe, it so happens, is also president of the National Elevator Co. of Minneapolis, Minn., and a large dealer in grain which is one of the farm crops which cooperatives have begun to handle. Moreover, according to the Muskegon Chronicle, Muskegon, Mich., "The Board of Directors of the National Tax Equality Association is made up mostly of representatives of businesses which likewise have come into direct competition with the developing farmer cooperative movement."

The National Tax Equality Association and other big business groups cooperating with it has a far-reaching program which we must not discount. That program in fact calls for nothing less than the attempted destruction of cooperatives. They appeal to all the taxpayers of the Nation on the false ground that cooperatives are unjustly exempt from taxes. The fact is, of course, that cooperatives pay every sort of tax that everybody else pays with one exception, namely that some of the farmer cooperatives enjoy an exemption from Federal corporation income taxes, which was granted not as a concession to cooperatives but as a means of assistance to agriculture.

It must be remembered that neither partnerships, nor individually owned businesses, pay corporation taxes either. The individual owners and the partners in such businesses pay taxes as individuals and it is assumed by the tax laws that since all the income from these businesses goes to the owners, no further taxation is necessary. Exactly the same situation applies to the members of cooperatives. Now there may be an arguable point as to whether or not all cooperatives should be required to pay taxes upon funds set aside as reserves for expansion purposes or used for the payment of dividends on stock ownership. But even if this were done, the additional revenue to the Federal Government would be negligible. And the changes in the situation likewise negligible, for the real question is whether the Federal Government or any other government can tax somebody on income that doesn't belong to him.

If five farmers, each of whom had a hog to sell, asked Farmer Jones, who was going to town, to take their hogs to town for them and sell them, and if he was able to sell the hogs for $2 per head more than it had been expected he would receive for them, and if then Farmer Jones went back and gave to each of his farmer friends the entire amount including the additional $2, would anyone contend that Mr. Jones had received $10 of taxable income? Of course, they wouldn't. But those who contend that farm cooperatives should pay taxes on all their retains or on all moneys received which are temporarily withheld from payment to members in order to meet current operating expenses, what they are really saying is that Mr. Jones should be taxed on the $10. Obviously this is unjust and a violation of the American Constitution.

The question about taxation of cooperatives is summed up in the two words "whose income?" You cannot tax a cooperative on income that never belongs to it but which always belongs legally to the members of the cooperative. Even in the case of reserves there is an essential difference between cooperatives and other types of business organizations, for the reserves of the cooperative, whether invested in new facilities or not, would not belong to the cooperative, in case of liquidation nor be distributed to the stockholders in the event the cooperative was dissolved. It would belong pro rata to the members of the cooperative as producers or consumers, as the case might be, and it would have belonged to them all along.

Under the Constitution of our country and under all of the tax laws of our Nation, that portion of the money which passes through the hands of a cooperative as a trustee for its member owners, and which the cooperative is legally bound by its own charter as well as the laws of the land to pass on to its owner members in full, is not income to the cooperative at all, any more than money received by an employer which he pays out to his workers under a profit-sharing scheme is income to the employer or money received by any other business which it divides with its customers on the basis of the volume of business done by them with that business. Any business in the United States that wants to enjoy the same degree of tax exemption which cooperatives have can do so if it will bind itself legally and by its articles of incorporation to pay back to customers in the form of patronage refunds the profit margin earned upon their business. Except where the member of a consumer cooperative receives what is regarded for tax purposes as a rebate of an overcharge, every member of a cooperative, no matter what kind it is, pays taxes as an individual upon every dime of income he receives as a result of his membership in the cooperative. He does this in exactly the same way that an owner of an individually owned business or partnership pays his taxes. Now there is a certain percentage of farmer cooperatives, perhaps half of them, which does qualify for a special tax exemption provided by Congress as a means of assisting agriculture. These exemptions do not apply to any cooperative excepting farmer cooperatives, and in order to get the exemption the farmer cooperative must measure up to seven rigid standards laid down in the law. Those standards are as follows:

First. Substantially all of the voting membership control, or voting stock, if organized on a stock basis, must be owned by bona fide producers of agricultural products who market their farm products, or purchase their farm supplies, through the association.

Second. Basically, the organization, whether incorporated or unincorporated, must be a farmers', fruit growers', or like association, organized and operated on a competitive basis. As used here, the term "like" means "pertaining to agriculture, in all its branches."

Third. If an association is organized with capital shares, dividends thereon shall not exceed 8 percent per annum, or the legal rate of interest of the State where issued whichever is greater, on the consideration for which the shares were issued.

Fourth. The volume of business done with nonmembers must not exceed the volume of business done with members, and as to purchasing activities, the volume of purchases made for nonmembers who are not farmers shall not exceed 15 percent of the total volume.

Fifth. In the payment and crediting of patronage refunds, all patrons must be treated alike whether they be members or nonmembers. Absolutely no preferential treatment may be afforded member patrons over nonmember patrons in the payment, distribution, or crediting of patronage refunds.

Sixth. Reserves created from patronage retains shall be limited to those required by State law, or such as are reasonable for the transaction of the business of the association. The interest of each patron in retained capital reserves shall be recognized and established by appropriate entries on the association's records. The liability of the association to the patrons for such retained reserves shall be clearly established.

Seventh. Proper records shall always be kept to show the patronage refunds and credits of all patrons, members and nonmembers alike, and also the interest of each patron in retained reserves.

Now, this tax exemption granted to farmer cooperatives amounts to very, very little indeed. About 1 percent of all the business of the United States is handled by all cooperatives put together and of all the corporations and businesses in the Nation about 1½ percent are ccoperatives, 13 percent are corporations, and 86½ percent are individually owned businesses or partnerships. So it is important to get a perspective about this matter.

The real truth is, however, that what the National Tax Equality Association is after is to destroy every cooperative in the United States by compelling the cooperatives to pay taxes not only upon any income that it may have and retain for reserves or that it may use for the payment of return upon capital investment, but also upon money paid out in patronage dividends to cooperative members or passed on to farmers as their share of the proceeds from the sale of a crop. Of course the National Tax Equality Association is trying to do something in this case which simply cannot be done in decency or equity or in accordance with the law of the United States, for none of this money be the members and it is only held in trust for longs to the cooperative at all but rather to them for a brief period by the cooperative.

The National Tax Equality Association and others who work with it know full well that if they could have their way through a constitutional amendment or otherwise about the double taxation of cooperative member's funds, cooperatives could not and would not continue to operate as they do at present. What then would the cooperatives do? This apparently is something that the National Tax Equality Association has never thought of. Because every cooperative has always been in a position to undersell its competitors if it wanted to; and this is precisely what they would do if a tax were levied against patronage dividends. Cooperatives would then simply give their members the financial advantages of cooperation by selling to them at real cost—that is they would pass on to their member owners the benefits of cooperation in lower prices instead of waiting until the end of the year and giving them those benefits by means of patronage dividends. Marketing cooperatives would sell farmers' crops in pools but would have the checks made out to each individual farmer in the first place instead of in businesslike fashion receiving only one check and then dividing the proceeds among the men who had grown the crops.

The principle of cooperation is too strong—too fundamentally right, and too everlastingly necessary as an antidote to our economic and social ills—to be destroycd by a device such as that suggested by the National Tax Equality Association. And if these people really want some competition which they cannot meet and which the cooperatives have refrained from subjecting them to up to date, then all they have to do is to press their present tactics. Then, indeed, the competition of cooperatives would become a thing to be feared by other types of business because the cooperative, after all, is in a far stronger position essentially than any other type of business organization.

As a matter of fact, the whole picture regarding this attack on cooperatives is brighter tonight than it has been for some little time, for the House Committeee on Small Business, after having received all the propaganda barrage which the National Tax Equality Association could muster, has issued its report on cooperative taxation. Not only does this report state clearly what the real facts are in the situation, not only does it make the essential distinction which I have drawn to the effect that the Government cannot tax the cooperative on income which it never owns, but the report goes further and points out the tremendous advantage which cooperatives can be and have been to our country and its people.

Now the National Tax Equality Association is not the only agency that has been attacking cooperatives, but it is probably the best example of the kind of unfair and deceitful tactics which are now being used against cooperatives and which we may expect to be further used in the future. Under the guise of tax equality this National Tax Equality Association has spread propaganda throughout the Nation, and particularly to small businessmen, to the effect that a cooperative was un-American, a danger to private enterprise, and somehow or another all tied up with Government ownership of business and industry. Of course, the facts are exactly the opposite. For if America stands for anything, she stands for opportunity for the common man; and the cooperative offers that common man his best chance to share in the ownership of the highly integrated business and industry of today. Furthermore, cooperatives are the opposite of Government ownership because they offer the one best chance for private individuals in our Nation to solve their economic problems without reliance upon Government. And finally, cooperatives are one of the best defenses of true private enterprise for the reason that they almost alone have proved able to stand across the path of monopolistic control of business and industry and open up once again opportunity for fair competition on the part of all.

Perhaps it is for this reason that monopolistic forces are so hard at work in Washington, as I am sure they are in Kansas. More and more I have noticed that their propaganda is aimed at cooperatives, though in years past this was not so much the case. One of the most powerful lobbies in Washington is the major oil company lobby. Their most recent success has been to bring about the abandonment of what are known as the Big Inch and the Little Big Inch pipe lines running from east Texas to the Atlantic seaboard. These lines were built at the expense of the people of the United States as a means of relieving the east coast petroleum shortage during the war. There was opposition to their construction at the time from the major oil interests and that opposition, as well as their present activity, of course, stems from a great fear that these lines may become common carriers. At persent practically all the pipe lines in the United States are owned by pipe-line companies which in turn belong to the major oil companies. All that needs to be done to freeze out a cooperative or small producer is to make it impossible for them to get their oil into the pipe line. Exorbitant rates have been charged for pipe-line transportation and these in turn have filled the coffers of the major oil companies, giving them a tremendous competitive advantage.

The Cooperative League of the United States and the National Cooperatives have protested vigorously against the abandonment of the Big and Little Big Inch pipe lines for the cooperatives have a natural interest in seeing the consumers' best interests promoted and they also are fighting the battle of the independent oil producers at the same time. What ought to be done, of course, is that the Big Inch and the Little Big Inch ought to be operated either by a Government agency or under lease by a private agency as common carriers for anyone desiring to ship petroleum or petroleum products through them. Were this done, however, it would have substantial effect on the major oil companies' monopoly. It was significant, it seems to me, that the major oil companies seeking abandonment of these two pipe lines, together with the tremendous investment of public money which has been put into them, frequently stated their position that whatever was done with the lines, the cooperatives should have no part in their use or ownership. This is only one example of the way in which the kind of progress which the cooperatives would like to see made for the benefit of all people as well as small-business enterprise, is fought and all too frequently stifled by the hand of the monoply.

I hope, too, that our memories will not be so short as to forget the manner in which international cartels controlled largely from Germany were able to exact exorbitant prices for many necessary commodities in the period before the war. Tungsten carbide, so necessary for high-speed cutting tools, is only one example of this. Neither should we forget the world-wide control of explosives and pharmaceuticals by the chemical cartel headed by I. G. Farben or the manner in which aluminum and magnesium were monopolized and their supply restricted in the prewar period.

And so I come to the conclusion of my speech which is a frank appeal for unity among all cooperators everywhere. We must cease to think of ourselves as members of farm cooperatives or consumer cooperatives or credit unions or electric-service cooperatives or insurance cooperatives, and must learn to regard ourselves simply as members of a great world-wide cooperative movement. More particularly, we must remember the tremendous contribution to the well-being of our own country which a united cooperative movement can make.

But we must recognize that the well-financed and sometimes bitter opposition to this great movement of the common people which has already shown itself will probably be intensified.

Every great movement the world has ever known has passed through three stages. The first of these has been that of ridicule and indifference. Every great religious movement has passed through such a period. The founder of the Christian religion Himself was no exception. The movement for free public education, the labor movement, the anti-child-labor crusade, above all perhaps the movement for world peace—all of these have been in their early stages regarded with indifference if not with ridicule by the majority of human beings. There are those, however, who prefer ridicule and indifference to the even greater difficulties which encounter a great movement when it passes into the second stage of its development. For that second stage is that of opposition and bitter attempts to destroy it.

Christianity passed through this period during the persecution by Roman emperors and others and all the other movements for human betterment which I have mentioned have had to pass through the fire of this second period of their development. The cooperation movement will be no exception. And as we meet here tonight the one thought above all others which should be

uppermost in our minds is this: Either this movement to which we are all so devoted must gird itself for the rigors of the second period of its development or it must give up the hope of making the worth-while contribution to the solution of the human problems of which it is undoubtedly capable.

The third stage in the development of any great movement is that of its successful establishment as an accepted part of the life of society. It may well be that in Scandinavia, in England, in Nova Scotia, and perhaps in one or two other places in the world the cooperatives have already passed into this third stage. In our own country I think we must frankly face the fact that this movement is just coming of age and is only just entering that second period of opposition and well-laid attempt at its destruction of which I have spoken. In some of our States—in Vermont, in Ohio, Minnesota, Wisconsin, here in the Consumer's Cooperative Association territory, and on the producer side at least in my own State of California—there has been developed a pretty thorough understanding and acceptance of the correct role of cooperatives in the world of the future, but I doubt that anywhere in the United States we have passed fully into the third stage of development. Our task is to reach it in time to offer to mankind the fundamental hope which this movement can give. If I were to make one proposal to a great cooperative meeting like this one, it would be that the cooperatives tell their story oftener, more effectively, with greater conviction, and with greater skill than they have done heretofore. We all know that cooperatives fail unless they have good management. We know that the forces opposed to cooperatives always retain the very best talent that money can buy for the carrying on of their propaganda. We can and must match that talent.

Never before have cooperatives been so needed as a means of solution to the problems of American farmers or as a means of restoring opportunity for ownership and hence for a solid stake in the welfare of a free society for all the people. Never before, however, have cooperatives been subjected to so bitter an attack as at the present moment.

Therefore in Canada or the United States, in Britain or China, or the four corners of the world, let every man who cares about the future of this country learn the true facts about what cooperatives really are and about what they really stand for—let him realize that they are not the enemies of small business but are on the other hand the only instrumentality so far devised which can be unquestionably successful in meeting monopoly on its own ground and breaking its power, the only road mankind can in these perilous days travel with genuine hope, the only means that can give him freedom and security at the same time and by his own efforts rather than the paternalism of government, the only power among nations that can prevent the frightfulness of an atomic war.

The Worst Lobby of All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES L. GIFFORD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wareham (Mass.) Courier of May 10, 1946:

THE WORST LOBBY OF ALL

Any investigation of pressure groups now active in Washington should not overlook the most dangerous of all, that group of bureaucrats that is ever importuning Congress to pass legislation in favor of their particular interests.

This group of office holders appears at every hearing in its own behalf, broadcasts to the public and writes articles for the newspapers. It makes broad statements as to what will happen if anything is done to interfere with their activities, and even asserts that dire calamity will befall the country if their advice is not heeded.

It issues more propaganda than all the others combined and does not hesitate to state as facts what is their own personal opinions. They quote figures and statistics colored to uphold their side of the argument and many people take them for facts and are frightened into giving them their support.

They call their opponents harsh names and doubt their good intentions. In other words, they operate just as any other lobby does and use the same methods. The only difference between them is that they spend public funds for their propaganda, which makes them much worse in the eyes of the people who understand it.

Congress votes them into office and appropriates the money with which they operate and then allows them to use their power to keep what they have got and to lobby for more. Men like Chester Bowles appear as dictators and it is hard to get rid of them.

Strikes and the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of May 8, 1946:

STRIKES AND THE LAW

This ought to be the last Nation-wide coal strike and it will be the last if Congress does its duty.

The laws of this country as they now stand permit paralyzing strikes. Mr. Lewis and his followers have already deprived hundreds of thousands of men and women of all or part of their wages. Interstate and local commerce are being strangled. Factories are closing. Stores and offices are operating under heavy handicaps. Immense losses and inconveniences are being incurred. There is danger to life and health in the threatened interruption of water and sewage services. Every day the outlook becomes more menacing, but all of this is lawful.

Far from forbidding a relatively small group of men, acting in concert, to strangle the country, the statutes protect them in doing so. The strike cannot be enjoined by the courts and as the leaders have violated no law they cannot be prosecuted.

It isn't often that the Tribune is found saying there ought to be a law, but this time there is nothing else that can be said or should be said. Even if the demands of the union were wholly just, the means adopted for winning acceptance of them are far outside the pale of civilized conduct.

Nobody's private cause is so just that he is warranted in declaring war on his fellow countrymen to gain his ends. Governments exist primarily to protect society against this kind of willful and destructive selfishness.

What can Congress do about it? One thing Congress can't do is pass a law requiring anybody, acting by himself, to work in a coal mine or anywhere else, against his will. That would be slavery, and slavery is forbidden by the Constitution. One thing that Congress needn't do is forbid all coal strikes. An interruption of operations in a single mine, or in the mines of a single employer, or even in a single coal field will not paralyze the Nation. The strikes that must be forbidden are those which involve so many mines in so many coal fields that the Nation's life is imperiled.

The law ought not to be limited to protecting the coal supply, for Mr. Lewis and his union are not the only potential offenders. A general railroad strike would be as bad, or worse. A strike of Government employees would be paralyzing. So would a strike in major utilities, including principal power companies and telephone and telegraph companies. Whatever doubts may have existed about the power of Congress to regulate labor relations in these industries has been removed by the Supreme Court's decisions under the Wagner Act and the wages-and-hours law. Congress can act, and it should.

Congress will act if the Members have even a faint understanding of the sentiments of their constituents. The people of this country are enraged, and justly so, not only at the callous indifference to their welfare disclosed by the union, but more especially at the unwillingness of their Government to protect them against the outrage. They know in their bones that the administration and Congress have allowed the situation to grow from bad to worse only because of fear of the political strength of organized labor.

It is significant that the House, which is closer to the people than the Senate, has been the less timid. The House approved the moderate Case bill, but the Senate has smothered it. Mr. Truman and his Senators seem to think that there is less to be feared politically from a continuation of the coal strike than from forbidding it and all similar strikes against the Nation. Senator LUCAS is not the smartest man in Washington, but he isn't so dumb that he doesn't know public sentiment in Illinois, one of the Nation's most highly industrialized States and one of its most important coal-producing States. When Mr. LUCAS denounced the strike he knew he wasn't hurting himself politically. The rest will find it out in time, but the awakening may come too late to save them.

Amvets Deplores Misuse of Priority Rights on Surplus Purchases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by the Amvets deploring misuse of priority rights on surplus purchases, together with a news item referring to such charges:

AMVETS DEPLORES MISUSE OF PRIORITY RIGHTS ON SURPLUS PURCHASES

(By J. H. Leib, national legislative director)

Amvets has steadfastly maintained that no veteran should use his honorable discharge as a front for any other individual or group.

The statement released on May 14, 1946, by the War Assets Administration that veterans are using their priorities to put selfish and greedy individuals into business is deplorable.

We believe that the intent of the Congress in passing the surplus bill was to help individual veterans secure surplus property and was not aimed to establish veterans cliques through which commercial interests could profiteer.

During conferences in the Department of Justice with WAA officials last week, Amvets specifically recommended that steps be taken to protect the rank-and-file veteran as well as the Government from any individual who wears the honorable discharge button to secure preferential profits by deliberate misrepresentation of the intent of the law, which was to provide veterans with surplus priorities for the purchase of goods for use in their own homes or businesses. The law, in our opinion, was not intended to use the veteran for black-market purposes or to use him to make a batch of postwar millionaires as was the case after the last war.

Amvets hopes that the Congress will take whatever steps are necessary to see that the WAA and the Department of Justice carry through the prosecution of any veteran who attempts to use hard-won preference for profiteering through the purchase and sale of surplus goods.

The preferences granted by Congress not only on surplus, but on other benefits, have been won at too great a cost to be placed in jeopardy because of greedy activities of a few veterans whose only thought is to reap the harvest for themselves to the disadvantage of all the other veterans.

The following article speaks for itself:

[From the Washington Post of May 14, 1946]

"VETERANS FRONT FOR DEALERS, WAA CHARGES—MISUSE OF PRIORITIES ON SURPLUS GOODS TERMED A 'SCANDAL'

"Misuse of veterans' priorities to buy surplus property has developed into 'almost a scandal' in some areas, War Assets Administration officials asserted last night.

"Increasing evidence that veterans are being used as illegal 'fronts' by which dealers obtain Government surpluses has prompted an accelerated drive against the racket," a WAA spokesman said.

"Such cases bulk large, he reported, on a list of 160 cases of suspected surplus frauds turned over to the Department of Justice.

"Twenty-one persons now are awaiting trial on fraud, collusion and other charges, and hundreds have been investigated.

"WAA confirmed a report in the Surplus War Property Newsletter, a private weekly publication for businessmen, that widespread manipulation of the veterans' priority certificates is 'threatening to endanger orderly and fair disposal.

" 'Reports indicate that some companies and individuals are using veterans to buy surplus; that some veterans are going into the business of acquiring surplus, not for use personally or in their own enterprises, but for the purpose of trading with others,' the news letter said.

" 'Veterans' certificates are getting to have a dollar value, being employed to obtain surplus not for the veterans themselves as Congress intended, but for commercial reasons.'

"Under the new veterans' priority law, veterans no longer need to show that goods they intend to purchase are for their own business use. The only requirement is that they certify the goods will not be used for resale.

"WAA has hesitated to take its problem to Congress, some officials said, because of Congressmen's universal reluctance to crack down on servicemen. The Department of Justice similarly is unwilling to go to court unless a case is flagrant enough to overcome a jury's natural reluctance to send a veteran to prison.

" 'We are laying for the dealers who are in the racket corrupting and hiring veterans to misuse their certificates,' the WAA spokesman said."

Working Conditions of Coal Miners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, this morning at a meeting of the Labor Department—Federal Security Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, before which Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach testified, my distinguished colleague from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] made the statement that every day for the past 40 years, rain or shine, summer or winter, five coal miners have met their deaths from accidents in the mines.

It occurs to me that in the present differences between the coal operators and John L. Lewis the conditions under which these coal miners live and work have entirely been forgotten. I trust that this Congress and the fair-minded American public will not overlook the sorry housing, sanitary and working conditions in this, the most hazardous of all industries.

The following interesting letter appeared in last night's Evening Star, Washington, D. C., May 14, 1946, in which a Pennsylvania coal miner replies to critics of John L. Lewis:

LETTERS TO THE STAR

A MINER REPLIES TO CRITICS OF JOHN L. LEWIS

Representatives and Senators are ranting about John L. Lewis being a dictator and the effect the strike is having on our general economy, but not a word is being said of investigating the conditions under which the miners live and work.

Mr. Lewis is not asking for a thing but what he was directed to at the last international convention and the miners are back of him.

We are not a minority group, but we have been treated as such because of an insane desire to get John L.'s hide hung on the fence regardless of the cost to the miners.

Housing and sanitary conditions are disgraceful in most mining communities. Most of the people who are condemning Mr. Lewis and his miners would not believe that such conditions could exist in our modern, big-hearted country. If such conditions existed in any city, the property owner would be put in jail.

I mention particularly outside toilets and some of them built on hills 15 feet higher than the houses and running over every time it rains and in the summer giving off a stench that pervades the entire community.

Nearly every other industry in the country has a pension plan of some sort but not the mining industry.

The casualty rate in the coal mines of our country exceeded that of World War II for the first 2 years.

Coal mining is conceded to be the most hazardous of all industries. It also is one of the most strenuous and unhealthy, due to the nature of the work and the ventilation problems encountered underground. There are various gases generated and encountered underground which add to normal air needs of the men working, necessitating the forcing of air throughout the mines. The average temperature in a mine is 50° Fahrenheit, and many of the men work where they get wet to the skin from water seeping from the roof; so you can imagine what that would do to the health of the men. Others work in an unbelievable atmosphere of smoke and dust. There is no provision made to take care of these men when they are no longer able to work. They are cast aside like any piece of equipment the operator owns.

Our wage scale in the various classifications of skilled labor is on the average much lower than steel, automotive, and shipyard workers, yet we are tied to a prewar wage scale.

Why in the name of common sense don't some of the people who are so critical of Mr. Lewis investigate the indictment that was presented against the operators? I don't mean some of the model towns and mines nor an operator-conducted investigation. Contact any of us or invite us down there and let us present our case. I will gladly appear anywhere for an impartial investigation.

WM. M. SEELEY,
MARSTELLER, PA.

Appointment of American Ceramic Engineers To Assist Japanese Pottery Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL R. LEWIS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, on the 19th of March, the State Department, through Mr. T. M. Brewer, recruitment officer, Special Recruitment Section, Division of Departmental Personnel, wrote a letter to Mr. Homer Laughlin, care of the American Domestic Pottery Manufacturing Co., at East Liverpool, Ohio, who has been dead for 33 years, seeking his assistance in the selection of two ceramic engineers to serve as advisers to the Chief of Economic and Scientific Section of the Military Government and Control Activities in Japan regarding technical problems of the Japanese ceramic industry. The letter was delivered to Mr. J. M. Wells, secretary-treasurer of the Homer Laughlin China Co., at East Liverpool, Ohio.

Evidently the State Department is disregarding the fact that the Japanese ceramic industry was the chief competitor in American markets for the American pottery industry before the war, and it is utterly unmindful of the best interests of our American pottery workers. Otherwise it would not have asked for American ceramic engineers to help the Japanese ceramic industry regarding its technical problems. It is well known to everyone acquainted with the facts, and should be known to the State Department which under the so-called reciprocal trade-agreements law is vested with authority to make trade agreements with foreign countries, that Japanese pottery drove American pottery off the American market and was the cause of widespread

unemployment in the American pottery industry.

This brazen request by the State Department was answered by Mr. Wells under date of April 1, 1946. A photostatic copy of the State Department letter addressed to Mr. Laughlin and copy of Mr. Wells' letter in reply thereto are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 19, 1946.

Mr. HOMER LAUGHLIN,
American Domestic Pottery Manufacturing Co.,
East Liverpool, Ohio.

DEAR MR. LAUGHLIN: We are seeking your assistance in the selection of two ceramic engineers to serve as advisers to the chief of the economic and scientific section of the military government and control activities in Japan regarding technical problems of the Japanese ceramic industry.

We do not have full details regarding the duties but we understand that these positions require highly qualified technicians with a broad experience in the various fields of ceramics. The salaries will range up to $7,800 per annum.

All positions in the military government activities are, of course, under the jurisdiction of the War Department. In accordance with a cooperative arrangement, however, the Department of State is responsible for recruiting and recommending personnel for certain specialized positions such as these. The minimum period for an assignment of this nature is 9 months, though it is hoped that an appointee may remain for an indefinite period. Transportation is provided at Government expense, and living costs are exceedingly low since the Army provides living quarters and meals similar to those of officers at a nominal charge of approximately $40 per month. Families cannot accompany civilian appointees at present, but there is a fair prospect that they may be able to follow later on in the summer or fall.

We would greatly appreciate any suggestions which you may be in a position to make regarding personnel who may be qualified for and interested in these positions.

Very truly yours,

T. M. BREWER,
Recruitment Officer, Special Recruitment Section, Division of Departmental Personnel.

THE HOMER LAUGHLIN CHINA CO.,
Newell, W. Va., April 1, 1946.

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary, the State Department,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Several days ago I received a letter addressed to Mr. Homer Laughlin, American Domestic Pottery Manufacturing Co., East Liverpool, Ohio, and signed by T. M. Brewer, Recruitment Officer, Special Recruitment Section, Division of Departmental Personnel.

The letter requested that we recommend two experienced and competent ceramic engineers for service in Japan at the expense of the State Department, to teach the Japanese how to improve and increase their production of ceramic products.

This is the most brazen example I have yet encountered of the State Department's consuming desire to spend our people's tax money to take their jobs away. It is particularly galling that the beneficiary of this incredible plan should be the vicious, bloodthirsty Japs who were responsible for the killing and maiming of so many thousands of our fine young men—many of them from our ceramic industry. Just what answer can there be to our question "Why does our Government spend our money to make jobs for the members of this despicable race, which will mean that our men, who fought and suffered in defeating them, will be walking the streets jobless?"

Now please do not insult my intelligence by dragging out the old and absurd bromide that we must buy their competitive merchandise so that our workmen will have employment in making the things they will buy from us in return.

Let us take a single simple example and see how we Americans make out. First of all, as you are well aware, the Department of Commerce, in reporting the balance of trade figures, uses the indefensible and wholly fallacious method of balancing imports at foreign values against exports at American values. So we accept a thousand dollars' worth of china dinnerware (Japanese value) to balance a thousand dollars' worth (American value) of automobiles, business machines, farm machinery, or what have you. In manufacturing the china dinnerware in an American factory, that such an import displaces, there would be paid out in wages to American workmen more than $1,200. The wages paid out for producing the balancing export of automobiles or what not, would be less than $200. And you ask us, as though it was a patriotic duty, to assist you in spending the pottery worker's tax money to improve and increase the dishes made in Japan for export to the United States. Fantastic!

You will admit, I am sure, that it is inconceivable Great Britain or any other of the United Nations would give a moment's consideration to a plan so prejudicial to the welfare of a large number of its nationals as is this. Is our State Department then the only one that is right and all the rest of the world wrong?

Another question. On what information and by what reasoning did the State Department determine that American ceramists could teach anything to the Japanese potters? Before the war they were making and selling in this country just as fine china as any made here and at less than one-half the American cost of production. At that time, according to the Tariff Commission reports, Japan was shipping more than 80 percent of all of the china dinnerware used in the United States. England furnished about 15 percent and, of the balance, only 3 percent was produced in American factories.

If the State Department must spend money on ceramic technicians, would it not be the most ordinary kind of common sense to pay them to work with the American potters in an effort to produce china that could compete in price with the imports? But I presume it would be pure isolationism to suggest that the State Department should show some remote interest in job opportunities for the people who supply the funds to carry on its activities.

It is probably too much to expect that this letter might actually reach your hands, Mr. Byrnes; but, if it should, will you please advise Mr. Brewer that his request is respectfully but very definitely refused.

Very truly yours,

THE HOMER LAUGHLIN CHINA CO.,
J. M. WELLS, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

Mr. Speaker, when this correspondence was called to my attention I immediately joined Mr. Wells in protesting to the State Department against the appointment of American ceramic engineers to help the Japanese pottery industry. Fortunately, that protest was successful, and the State Department now tells me that the request for two American ceramic engineers has been withdrawn.

The magazine Retailing last October printed a copy of a dispatch from Tokyo which is self-explanatory, and is as follows:

TOKYO, September 23.—Col. Raymond Kramer, newly appointed Chief of the Army Economic and Scientific Section in Japan, is on leave as chairman of the board of Belding-Heminway Co., and is a director of Gimbel Bros., Allied Stores Corp., and chairman of the board of Interstate Department Stores.

Reestablishment of Japan's pottery industry will be strongly urged by Colonel Kramer, who stated this should be a comparatively easy task. Yesterday he had one Japanese bring in a plan for the reconstitution of all phases of the ceramic industry to the extent America is interested in procuring such merchandise. It is expected to be available in a relatively short time.

Colonel Kramer emphasized that this industry can be molded along such patterns as importers desire.

It is this sort of thing, and the sort of thing which the State Department recently proposed, that will make it impossible for many American industries to prosper when foreign industries that have been damaged by the war are restored to production and their products begin to flood American markets. It is a part of the same administration policy which was followed by the War Relocation Authority during the war when that Authority announced its intention to employ interned Japanese at Hart Mountain, Wyo., in a modern American pottery built by the War Relocation Authority for the purpose of training the interned Japanese in the most modern American methods of pottery manufacture. At that time I protested the policy of the War Relocation Authority and what they intended to do at Hart Mountain, Wyo., and the project was subsequently entirely abandoned.

I sincerely trust that we who have the welfare of the American working people and American industry at heart will not permit ourselves to be led astray and continue to follow the fallacious policy of promoting foreign imports at the expense of American workers and American industry.

State Regulation of Oil Industry by Anglo-American Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted, I am inserting at this time in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial, which appeared in the May 8, 1946, issue of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, entitled "State Regulation of Oil Industry Threatened by Anglo-American Pact," which favorably discusses a brief on that subject proposed by Mr. Elmer Patman, prominent attorney of Houston, Tex., who was formerly attorney for the oil and gas division of the Texas Railroad Commission. It is as follows:

STATE REGULATION OF OIL INDUSTRY THREATENED BY ANGLO-AMERICAN PACT

Peacetime regulation of the oil industry is an exclusive function of the States, and every effort which has been made to shift the regulatory power to the Federal Government so far has been successfully resisted.

It is a safe assumption that if a proposal to amend the United States Constitution so as to give the Federal Government control of the petroleum industry were submitted to the States it would be overwhelmingly defeated. Having had a taste of Federal control in wartime, the industry wants none of it in peacetime.

Opposition to Federal control of the industry is so widespread and so pronounced that there is no likelihood of such an amendment being submitted. But the Anglo-American petroleum agreement now pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee would, if ratified by the Senate, provide a basis for Federal regulation of the production of oil and gas without the necessity of amending the Constitution.

Since Texas accounts for almost half of the crude oil produced in the United States, this threatened shift of regulatory power from the railroad commission at Austin to some new bureau at Washington is a matter of concern not only to those engaged in the production of oil and gas, but to the citizenship of the State in general. And inasmuch as a considerable portion of the State's available school fund is derived from oil taxes, the threat is a matter of particular concern to school authorities and friends of public education.

The threatened loss of State regulation lies in the fact that the Anglo-American petroleum agreement is a proposed treaty which, if ratified by the Senate, would become, in the language of the Constitution, "the supreme law of the land." It thus would take precedence over both the Federal and all State constitutions and statutes and nullify all court decisions which were in conflict with it.

The result of ratification of this treaty, for which no real need ever has been shown, would be to provide a constitutional basis for Federal regulation of the oil and gas industry which does not now exist.

These points are emphasized in an able brief prepared by Elmer Patman, Houston attorney, for presentation to the Senate foreign relations committee in opposition to the treaty. The Star-Telegram is in full and hearty accord with Mr. Patman's conclusion that this indirect method of amending the Constitution is fundamentally wrong and one which should not be countenanced by the United States Senate.

The pending treaty is a preliminary agreement. If and when it should be ratified by the United States and Great Britain, a multilateral international petroleum agreement, to be entered into between all oil-producing and consuming nations, would be consummated as soon as possible. The agreement provides for the creation of an international petroleum commission. This commission, proponents of the treaty assert, would have only advisory powers. Actually, it would control world production and distribution of all oil and oil products. It would function in the United States through a bureau established by legislation passed in pursuance of the obligations this Nation would assume by ratification of the treaty.

It is noteworthy that the treaty is silent on the question of qualifications of the members of the proposed International Petroleum Commission. There is no requirement that they be practical oil men, or that they have any first-hand knowledge of the petroleum industry. American businessmen, it would seem, have had enough grief in the last few years having their affairs regulated by impractical theorists in Washington.

The proposed treaty does not specifically bestow price-fixing powers on the International Petroleum Commission—nor does it specifically deny it that power. The purpose of the treaty, as stated in the instrument, "is to facilitate the orderly development of the international trade (in oil)." One clause of the text provides "that the exploration for and the development of petroleum resources, the construction and operation of refineries and other facilities, and the distribution of petroleum, shall not be hampered by restrictions inconsistent with the purposes of this agreement."

Since the proposed International Petroleum Commission would have authority to prorate the world's supply of oil on a "competitive and non-discriminatory basis," it would be well for Americans to reflect that the oil reserves of the Middle East are estimated by competent authoritties to exceed those of the United States. Both the British and certain American oil companies own a substantial share of the Middle East reserves.

It doubtless is more than a coincidence that American companies with interest in these Middle East reserves are in the forefront of proponents of ratification of this treaty. Some of these companies also are dolefully predicting that American petroleum reserves are about to become exhausted and that within a few years it will be necessary to import 1,000,000 barrels of crude daily to meet this Nation's requirements of crude oil and its products.

An International Petroleum Commission clothed with power to prorate production could advise that American production be reduced and foreign production be increased to meet the treaty requirement that production be "competitive and nondiscriminatory." It should not be difficult for American producers to foresee what such an allocation would mean to the economy of this country, or what the importation of an additional 1,000,000 barrels of foreign oil, produced by cheap labor, would do to the oil-price structure.

The treaty now being considered by the Senate committee is a revision of a former agreement which was withdrawn by the late President Roosevelt when the storm of opposition which it aroused made it plain that it never would be approved by the Senate. The present treaty, Mr. PATMAN shows in his brief, is effectively the same instrument as the original. It has been revised in form rather than in substance.

By permitting the original treaty to be withdrawn, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee tacitly agreed that it was not for the best interest of the United States or the American people. Since the pending treaty is no different in legal effect from the original, it follows logically that it is not for the best interest of this country. It therefore should neither be approved by the Foreign Relations Committee nor ratified by the Senate.

OPA Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the black-market operators have now joined with Chester Bowles in urging that he be given full and complete dictatorial control of all prices. Why have the black-market operators joined in the drive to extend and make permanent the OPA? The black market has been made possible by the OPA, and the profit to the black-market operators far surpasses any return which legitimate enterprise can earn. Now that these two rackets have combined under the protection of the law, to bleed the people, is it to be wondered that they are conducting a crusade through propaganda to protect their vested interest? I am receiving a deluge of letters from citizens who know how the OPA and the black-market operators are gouging them, and they are asking the complete outlawing of these racketeering agencies.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting a letter which is typical of those coming from intelligent people who are the victims of these legalized pickpockets:

BENEFICIARIES OF OPA SEEN DEFENDING IT

I take exception to Mrs. R. H.'s letter of April 22. I think that News cartoon was true and meant just what it stood for.

We all know, or should know, that the one who is hurt the most yells the loudest and the OPA is doing some yelling since this talk about putting it out of business: And why shouldn't it yell with the prospect of losing a big fat salary for telling the American people what they can do and what they can't do? I had to buy a car some time ago. I got a 1940 car, OPA ceiling $900. I went to another lot of black-market cars and their price for a 1940 was in the neighborhood of $1,400. Now why shouldn't such people want the OPA to stay in power?

I well remember back in prohibition times how the big bootlegger put his money up to prevent the repeal of the prohibition amendment. And, so far as the housewives are concerned, I think if you will canvass the country as a whole you will find a big majority against the OPA. A word about butter. We have a farm and sell cream. The OPA ceiling on butterfat last winter was 52 cents a pound, and ceiling price on butter was 56 cents a pound.

Anyone with an ounce of knowledge knows that no one can pay 52 cents for butterfat and make butter and put it through the retail market and sell it for 56 cents. It doesn't make sense. So let's kill the OPA before it kills the American way of life.

NEWS READER.

EDEN, N. Y.

Show Us a Vision

REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the following is an address delivered by me during the recess of Congress in August 1945, as a guest speaker at the First Christian Church in Pawhuska, Okla.

"Where there is no vision, the people perish." I once heard a heated discussion as to the authorship of this wise utterance. Some contended it was an ancient copy-book line. Some said it was from the Bible. Others thought Shakespeare was the author. Still others were uncertain. It might surprise you to find how many different answers from people above the average in intelligence and scholastic training you will get, if you ask, "Who is the author of that statement and where it can be found?

Positive authorship may be questioned by our scholars. But those words may be found in Proverbs 29:18.

From the earliest appearance of civilization, men have been asking, and are now perhaps more insistent than ever

before, that their leaders show them a vision. They always want to be told of a promised land. During periods of financial depression, economic upheaval, and social and political chaos, the clamor of the populace is the more intensified. At such junctures, the picture must be painted in the most flashy and even gaudy colors, accompanied by unreasonable and extravagant descriptions and statements. The saner, more conservative, and reasonable positions are ignored. Ordinarily, when intelligence goes on such a rampage, mob psychology and frenzy demand the otherwise wholly untenable and unthinkable promises of irresponsible leadership.

The wise author of this proverb must have known human weaknesses. He must have been familiar with the history of man's gullibility, credulity, and disinclination or refusal to think for himself—his mental inertia. But the one who spoke so wisely knew more than that. He realized that, not only in times of unrest was man prone to follow strange gods, but in order to keep the masses quiet, contented, tranquil, docile, submissive, subservient, and obedient, it was necessary to show them a plausible plan of relief from their difficulties; for he said, with all of the wisdom of the ages back of him, "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

The above is from the King James version. A freer and more modern rendition reads: "Where there is no vision, the people break loose." When the old picture fades, when the promised land is not reached within the time or via the route charted for the people to travel, when pledges are violated or promises apparently become impossible of fulfillment, the cohesive bonds of faith are broken, the tie that bound has developed too much slack, and the people perish, or break loose. They again demand a vision—a new vision—from fresh leadership.

All successful leaders in history seem to have been cognizant of this great truth, as well as the peculiar characteristic in humankind, and to have acted according to the principle enunciated. When they deviated from the teaching of this proverb, their popularity waned, they were pronounced failures in their cherished careers, and the causes they espoused ceased to command further widespread attention and respect.

Statesmen and demagogues alike have always realized that their own personal magnetism alone will not be sufficient to hold their adherents together, unless they are shown a vision. Reformers and religionists, insofar as they have been able to obtain a considerable following, have employed such methods. Even the disciples of Jesus, and particularly the crowds that assembled to hear His great appeal, demanded that He show them the Father, perform miracles, and put on demonstrations to prove His messiahship—they demanded a vision, or threatened to "break loose." The potency of Christianity, its continuing power and suasion over millions of people, perhaps may be said to be based primarily upon His claim of Himself to have been the fulfillment of Hebrew prophecy, that He could and did live like a man and die like a God, with His personal assurance of immortality. What a satisfying vision. Its cohesive power in time may be found sufficient to bind all men in a common bond of love. His matchless conception of the fatherhood of God and the universal brotherhood of man is a vision which, when shown to the people, should dispel all fears that there will ever be any danger that His followers will "perish" or "break loose."

As individuals, we must have a vision, if we are to succeed in our endeavors. Without a vision, we lose faith, hope and inspiration to press forward—we lose our initiative and incentive to achieve. Captains of industry, business executives and all who forge ahead, must show those who look to them for guidance a vision of attainment, if they are to prevent a breaking loose, catastrophe and collapse of their venture. If their vision is faulty, not grounded upon principles that have stood the tests of time and experience, the undertaking will be of short duration. If founded upon dire selfishness, it is sure to become as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. It must be demonstrated to have emanated from a proper conception and application of the immutable truths calculated to improve mankind and raise the standard of living and existence.

After all, are we not inclined to take ourselves too seriously, in trying to convince ourselves we are truly realistic? It is well and good to demand that, in the fields of natural science, we call upon scientists to demonstrate their various chemical, physical and other reactions. But, without attempting to get into the depths of philosophy or the realms of metaphysics, why can't we be realistic idealists enough to admit that the leadership of great men and the movements they headed, have abided and have been successfully carried on, because it has been demonstrated, realistically, that the vision of their idealism based upon immutable truth, wisdom, and love, was a common bond of union and strength, from which the people have had no desire to "break loose."

Where there is no vision, the people perish, or break loose . But why not let us emphasize the corollary in our lives and human institutions? Then, we shall say, "Where there is a vision, built upon the foundations of truth, wisdom and love, the people will not perish, or break loose." Humanity's ideals thus envisioned will realistically endure forever and forever.

A New Deal and a Square Deal Needed for Holders of Star-Route Mail Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have on several occasions inserted articles into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD calling attention to the serious plight of the holders of star-route mail contracts.

It seems inconceivable that during this enlightened day and age the present administration should cling so desperately to an antiquated policy and system as that governing the letting and handling of star-route mail.

In order to illustrate what individuals who have star-route contracts think of the present system, I am reprinting in full two letters which I recently received.

They are reprinted herewith:

APRIL 22, 1946.

The honorable HAROLD C. HAGEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAGEN: I am writing to you in regard to H. R. 2000 and S. 635, the two bills which are in committee now on star-route legislation.

I do hope that you will do everything possible to get these bills out of committee so that we can get action on them at this session of Congress. The need is very urgent. A great many of us star-route contractors are worse off now financially than postal employees were before they received their $300-a-year increase. Now the House Post Office Committee has just favorably reported the bill for another $400 raise for all postal employees.

If it is fair for them it surely is fair for us. Some of us are older men, some are handicapped in some way and hard to get anything else to do. We like the work, but it will be impossible for us to continue under present working conditions without relief.

So, I say again, please get behind the two bills and put your shoulder to the wheel and give her one mighty heave. You may rest assured that your efforts will not be forgotten by the star-route carriers of Minnesota.

Yours for better working conditions.

APRIL 17, 1946.

Hon. HAROLD C. HAGEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: I, the undersigned, am one of the forgotten men in the star route service who is compelled to work for a starvation wage just to have a job, a very poor one at that.

We in this service have been working on this 100 years. Old working conditions outmoded many times over and over again without any change or improvement, or seems to be any chance of improvement.

We are handling the same kind of mail as the clerks, letter carriers and RFD carriers and those employees have had several pay increases and improved working conditions with paid vacations and not required to work on holidays as we in the star route set-up are required to do.

We don't get paid vacations and have to work on all holidays like any other workday and if we were given any consideration at all, we could render a lot better service than at the present old-fashioned, outmoded, cutthroat bidding systems on these routes.

If this is a healthy system of handling the mail on these star routes those other employees should be put on the same basis as the star route carriers have to put up with every 4 years, and at each contract award the pay lessened each time and the never-ending changing operating conditions and forever increasing operating expenses without any consideration of experience whatsoever.

These are the conditions that we in the star route service have to put up with. Therefore, I am asking you if you could see fit to support the so-called star route legislation, H. R. 2000 and S. 635, if these bills should come up before you for consideration.

It seems to me now that these bills will never be considered of any importance. I cannot urge you too strongly to support this legislation, and am thanking you beforehand for your support.

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Pathfinder of May 15, 1946:

SORRY—THIS IS ALL THE PATHFINDER WE CAN PRINT THIS WEEK BECAUSE—

There is a coal strike. Printing machines require power. The electric power which runs the machines which set up Pathfinder's type and run the presses has been produced from coal. And in Chicago, where Pathfinder is printed, there is not enough coal.

Only because our resourceful printers have assembled Diesel engines, some of them hurried in by air, are we able to send you these few pages.

We have decided to use the brief space available to describe the background of the situation that has thus made a great Nation helpless to carry on at the daily tasks of making a living.

The coal strike is legal. Neither the miners nor their leaders violate any specific law in refusing to dig coal—no matter how much the Nation needs the coal.

What, then, are the laws, and what are the court decisions, that have produced a result which President Truman has characterized as a "national disaster?"

What principles of the American system are involved? What remedies can be applied? Is something wrong with the laws which can be changed?

A fundamental principle of freedom is that "one man's liberty ends where liberties of another begin."

The time has now come to ask whether, under freedom, one group of men shall follow as a right a course which interferes with the rights of millions of others.

Fair-minded men have long defended the right to strike because it is one of the few weapons which labor was able to use in a contest which might otherwise be unequal over rates of pay or conditions of work.

The right to strike under conditions which affect only a few people for a short time is one thing. Now the Nation is confronted with something quite different.

A Nation-wide strike in a basic industry, such as coal or steel or power production, places almost a whole people at the mercy of a few men.

This modern civilization revolves around mechanical power. When the fires have to go out the wheels slow down or stop. Food may not be transported, or preserved, or even cooked. The lights go out. Workers may not reach their jobs. The sick in the hospitals may be deprived of lifesaving attentions. All the normal proceedings of business are threatened with interruption or stoppage.

At this particular time the people of the United States are struggling to recover from the effects of a long, tragic, and costly war.

They are short of countless necessities and much-desired goods needed for production and for living.

Confronted with inflationary trends, due largely to shortage of goods, the value of their savings and incomes is threatened by every further slowdown in production.

In the midst of a humanitarian effort to produce and convey food to starving millions abroad, from whom death may not be far away, transportation, farm-machinery manufacture, and other vital services are threatened.

Is it, then, consistent that the liberty of any one man or group thus, legally or not, shall invade so far the liberties of all the rest of the people?

The Constitution itself was "ordained and established" among other things, according to the preamble, to "establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

This condition is the direct fruit of legislation which Congress has enacted within the last 15 years, and of decisions by the Supreme Court.

It can be corrected only by Congress. It will be corrected if the public demands correction vigorously enough.

The basic legislation is the Wagner Act of 1935. The Wagner Act was an attempt to increase the bargaining strength of labor organizations. It overshot the mark, because it placed weapons in the hands of labor leaders which they now hold over the Government itself.

As the Wagner Act is written it declares in effect that the policy of Congress is that no restraints can be placed upon the organization of labor; the choice of bargaining agents; the rights to strike, to make demands, or to picket in enforcement of those demands.

A Supreme Court decision, handed down by Justice Byrnes, now Secretary of State, went even further. It upheld the right to use violence in labor dispute.

In the face of these laws and decisions, even the President of the United States is virtually powerless. He can exercise little except moral suasion. Under the Smith-Connally Act he can seize the mines, but it has been pointed out that coal cannot be mined with bayonets.

In plain language, the law of the United States provides that a coal strike, or any other kind of strike, can be called and can be continued indefinitely, regardless of how much it costs the people, regardless of how destructive it may become to the Nation.

Any settlement of the miners' strike will not change this basic situation. It can arise again in the same or another industry.

The people are without protection from the disastrous consequences. More power has been placed in the hands of a few men in private life than the Government itself retains. It has become a power over the right, both of labor-organization members and of millions of others, to make a living.

Certainly now it must be clear to everyone that this great Nation cannot for long prostrate itself before an unchallenged private power.

THE NATION

CRISIS—COAL STRIKE DRAGS ON AS PRODUCTION NOSE-DIVES, RAIL TRANSPORTATION IS CUT, BROWN-OUT RETURNS

The coal strike came home to the people with a sickening thud.

For weeks they had gone along with a false sense of security. The administration hadn't seemed worried. The press had handled the story in a routine way. The voices of warning were small ones, indeed.

Then, suddenly, the coal strike invaded the people's homes, their businesses, their daily mode of life.

In Chicago, not only were Pathfinder's presses shut down, but other business activities felt the paralyzing effects of the strike. Elevators ran only from 9 a. m. to 6 p. m. Stores and theaters were lighted only from 2 to 6 p. m. The people were asked to conserve on light in their homes. In Boston, in Philadelphia, in Washington, citizens walked darkened streets as the wartime brown-out returned.

The Office of Defense Transportation cut railroad passenger traffic 50 percent, virtually banned all freight shipments except food and fuel.

In plants and factories all over the Nation, workers were laid off because there was no coal, no power, no steel. On Sunday, the President issued a worried report. He told the people that the strike was a national disaster; that the damage being done to reconversion will take months to mend.

Why: Soft coal supplies 95 percent of all locomotive power in the United States, 55 percent of the mechanical power, 62 percent of the electric power. By this week railroad coal stocks were cut in half. Steel production in the major Pittsburgh region was at about 54 percent of capacity, with some mills planning to shut down completely this week. Manufacturers with coal enough to run their factories couldn't get raw materials by rail, couldn't ship out what they did produce.

Strike: The soft-coal miners walked out April 1, after duly giving the 30-day notice required by the Smith-Connally Act. In so doing, they proved once again that they don't go to work without a contract.

When the 400,000 United Mine Workers left their jobs, negotiations were already under way between their chief, John L. Lewis, and the soft-coal operators. And they had already reached a deadlock. Government mediators moved in, but nothing budged Lewis from his position. He refused to discuss wages, hours, and other provisions of the contract until he and the operators reached agreement on a welfare fund he sought for the miners.

Lewis wanted a royalty, reportedly 10 cents on every ton of coal mined. This royalty was to be paid by the operators into a fund to be administered solely by the union. Operators, objecting to the proposal, estimated the fund would total $60,000,000 a year; said they wouldn't and couldn't pay it. There was some haggling over safety measures in the mines, but neither side would give in on the major issue.

The voice: So, with the strike two weeks old, Lewis walked out, telling the operators: "We trust that time, as it shrinks your purse, may magnify your niggardly and antisocial propensities."

Both sides marked time for another 2 weeks. Then the Government, in a flurry of action, named a new mediator, Edward F. McGrady, and got the opponents back together at the conference table.

They were still at the table this week, making no apparent progress. If they ever reached a decision on the welfare fund, they would still have to haggle over Lewis' wage demands, expected to be 20 to 25 cents an hour more for a much shorter workweek, and his insistence that the UMW represent mine foremen.

UMW'S STRIKE HISTORY

The current soft-coal strike is the eighth since the First World War.

Founded in January 1890, as a consolidation of a number of smaller, localized union movements, the United Mine Workers of America has been in continuous existence for 56 years.

The first post-World-War strike, in many respects similar to the current one, occurred in 1919, the same year in which John L. Lewis became president of the union. A contract had been signed in 1917, to run until April 1, 1920. During the war the coal mines were Government-controlled, and price controls had been lifted February 1, 1919. The union maintained operators therefore were free to raise prices to meet demands for a 60-percent-wage increase and a 30-hour week.

The operators argued the agreement should continue in effect until 1920. The workers went out on strike November 1, price controls were restored, and the Government obtained an injunction against the strike which was officially called off, but the miners still refused to work.

Success: After more than a month, on December 10, the miners accepted arbitration by a Presidential commission, and returned to work. Three months later, March 10, 1920, the commission awarded a 27-percent pay increase, to apply for 2 years from April 1, 1920, but denied the 30-hour week.

Two years later a strike was called to force renewal of the 1919 wage scales, to which the operators objected because of the pressure of competition from nonunion fields, where prices and wages were slashed during the 1921 depression. The walk-out of 460,000 organized miners lasted 5 months, and President Harding intervened before the old agreement was extended to April 1, 1923. This marked the first time that bituminous and anthracite miners had struck in unison.

That agreement was subsequently extended, first for one additional year, and then, by the so-called Jacksonville agreement, the 1920 scale was renewed for 3 years from April 1, 1924, to April 1, 1927. During this period, however, there were many localized strikes throughout the mine fields when operators cut wages in violation of the contract.

Slack-off: Then in 1927, with the cumulative effect of the depression and the competitive situation, the industry and collective bargaining fell on evil days. A 7-month strike, the longest to date, failed to obtain renewal of the agreement, and the industry became demoralized with the union retaining control only in the anthracite field and, east of the Mississippi, only in the bituminous field in Illinois and part of Indiana. UMW membership dropped.

From 1927 to 1933 there was bitter struggle among the operators to hold and enlarge their markets, marked by severe wage cuts and price wars. The union also was torn by conflict.

Comeback: Then, under the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933, and subsequently under the Guffey Coal Act, UMW launched an energetic comeback campaign, which led to ultimate unionization of the entire bituminous industry. A strike called on April 1, 1939, was chiefly for unionization. After 40 days and administration intervention, the union won organization of most mines in the Appalachian area.

A 22-day strike in 1941 won a $1 increase to $7 a day in the northern mines, and in June the National Defense Mediation board handed down a ruling abolishing the wage differential for southern mines and extending to the southern fields other gains which had been achieved by northern miners.

Two years later, in the midst of World War II, the UMW demanded a $2-a-day wage increase, along with other concessions including "portal to portal" pay, and walked out on four separate occasions during the year as the various issues were debated through several Government agencies, culminating in Government seizure of the mines after the anthracite miners joined in the walkout. Ultimately the miners won substantial wage increases and other benefits.

Foreman issue: The last major walkout occurred in October 1945, when the dispute over organizing foremen and other supervisory employees, a hold-over from the 1943 negotiations, shut down many mines. Although only supervisory employees were striking, most State laws forbid miners to enter a mine before the workings have been inspected, and a stoppage was inevitable even if the miners had been willing to cross the picket lines. But after a short time, that strike was called off, without result.

Big Sandy Valley Canal Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, in opposing the canalization of the Big Sandy River, I want to impress upon the House that I advocate such waterway improvement and development when it promotes the general welfare.

After some study of the question of the development of the Big Sandy River, which is included in a bill reported out of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, I do not find any evidence that the project is essential.

I am informed that at this time there is a backlog of some $2,000,000,000, authorization for which has already been made by the Congress for waterway development.

I question the wisdom of acting upon this problem in such haste and at this time. If the proposal is in any way justified, it would be far better to consider it after we have constructed millions of homes for veterans, repaired and improved our road system, constructed all the required improvements and expansion of our industrial and commercial establishments and at a time, which now appears to be in the far distant future, when labor and material is looking for a market. At this time it will compete with private construction which is so necessary.

I am pleased to remind you that during the emergency just passed our private transportation facilities have met all demands made up them. There was not any serious transportation bottlenecks of long duration. Our railroads moved greater tonnage and a greater number of passengers, including millions of servicemen, all with reduced personnel, replacements not available, and repair material greatly reduced. The railroads of this country, and this includes both management and labor, have done a miraculous job. Few Americans are fully aware of the enormous job their railroads did to help win the war. Railroad labor is the best managed and there has been no labor difficulties such as occurred too frequently in other industries. We Americans should not forget that in successfully handling the war job the railroads gave another fine example of free enterprise, rising to meet a great national emergency in a way to confound the theorists ready to believe that free, private enterprise has had its day.

The railroads are not seasonable. They move 24 hours a day, 365 days in the year, over snowcapped mountains in subzero weather and across scorching deserts. It would be manifestly unfair and inconsistent, as well as economically unsound, to impose further tax burdens upon these facilities and their employees in order to subsidize competition. A large segment of the population of my section, fine families and most of them home owners, are dependent upon the railroad. Any disruption to the orderly operation or lessening of employment by these facilities would have a far-reaching effect.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I extend in the RECORD remarks made by me before the Rivers and Harbors Committee on May 7, 1946, and also a report prepared by the Association Opposed to Big Sandy Valley Canal Project.

Mr. Chairman, in the discussion of the canalization of the Big Sandy River and in order to give a proper background to my interest in the project, I would like to inform the committee that this river borders the congressional district which I have the honor of representing, for approximately 50 miles.

My home town of Huntington, W. Va., a city of 85,000 inhabitants, where I have lived for the past 56 years, is within 5 miles of the confluence of the Big Sandy and the Ohio Rivers. One hundred and fifty thousand of the population of my congressional district live within 25 miles of the river in question. Consequently, my deep interest in that section of the country is well understood.

It is not my purpose today to discuss the physical aspects of the river or the economic value of the project; that will be left to those who are prepared to oppose the project on these grounds. I may say that after some study I find the arguments by the proponents on these two phases of the problem to be unimpressive.

The inaccessibility of coal deposits or the inadequacy of transportation is not one of our problems today and is not likely to be for many years to come. My primary interest in railroads as such is in their economic contribution to the general welfare. However, I am deeply interested in the welfare of the 6,000 railroad employees, men and women, who reside in my district. In projects of this nature—tax free and constructed with public money and of questionable economic value the railroader is placed in the unhappy position of being taxed to assist in paying the bill for a system which will deprive his group of income.

I would like to bring to the attention of the committee a feature which has manifested itself in mail received, evidently from persons primarily interested in the work afforded by public spending. It is a matter of common knowledge that we are in need of 5,000,000 housing units at this time. The need of building construction in commercial and industrial reconversion and expansion is almost beyond calculation; consequently, it is reasonable to assume that labor of all the building trades, and all the building-material manufacturers, will be fully employed in civilian construction for the next 8 or 10 years. In my opinion, it would be very unfortunate if the Government would go into the labor and material markets, where a definite shortage exists in both fields, and compete with private enterprise, except only in cases which are imperative beyond question and necessary to proper functioning of the Federal establishment.

I am in favor of the improvement and development of our waterways when it contributes to the public good and the expenditure is compatible with Federal income.

In opposing projects of this nature at this time, I could well use the words of Bernard Baruch and Jesse H. Jones in their respective statements opposing the British loan. The opinion of these gentlemen on fiscal matters is respected not only in this country but throughout the world. In essence, they have stated that it is time that we halt public spending and take an accounting of ourselves, and that bringing the Federal budget into balance and terminating deficit

spending are absolutely necessary now to preserve the financial integrity of our country.

We cannot afford to continue printing and spending money indiscriminately. Every time we spend an additional billion of borrowed money we reduce the buying power of our dollar, and if we go on spending and lending and giving and losing, without regard to how we are going to pay back the money that we have borrowed from our people, it will not be long until our dollar will be as depreciated as the currency of other countries that have overspent. Deficit spending is a definite contribution to inflationary processes.

Our national debt today is approaching $300,000,000,000 and is in excess of $2,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. It is time that we stop and think where we are going, that we take stock of our resources, of our earning capacity, of how we are going to service our existing debt before we try to increase it by continuing deficit spending.

There is one fact we should constantly keep before us. The major portion, if not the entire burden, of our huge national debt, the burden of all Federal spending, wasteful or otherwise, falls upon the backs of the men and women who work with their hands. All labor in industry—on the farm, in the mines, in the forests—in the final analysis pays the bill. All the debt juggling and all the high-sounding phrases will not change the picture one iota if we are to remain a solvent nation.

The Proposed Canal in Big Sandy River and Its Tug and Levisa Forks

This memorandum has been prepared by the Association Opposed to Big Sandy Valley Canal Project, an organization composed of more than 2,000 businessmen, bankers, railroad and mining employees, railroads, coal producers, farmers, and other citizens in the States of Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia. A number of the coal producers have mines immediately adjacent to the proposed waterway.

I. LOCATION, COST, AND DESCRIPTION

The canal will extend from the Ohio up the Big Sandy 27 miles, thence 60 miles up the Tug Fork, and 100 miles up Levisa Fork—total 190 miles.

The Big Sandy and the Tug constitute the boundary line between West Virginia and Kentucky. The Levisa rises in Virginia and runs in a northerly direction through eastern Kentucky.

The board estimates the initial capital cost at $82,300,000, with annual carrying charges aggregating $4,190,000.

The canal (two dead-ends with 10 locks and dams—minimum channel width 200 feet on the Big Sandy, 150 feet on each of the forks—depth 9 feet) will be alongside of and will compete with the Norfolk & Western Railroad on the Tug and the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway on the Levisa and will serve the coal fields of southern West Virginia and eastern Kentucky—already adequately served by these two railroads.

The two forks are small and excessively crooked. In time of low water (long periods each year) pumping of water to each higher dam will be necessary. Ice, fog, snow, repairs, etc., will suspend navigation from 2 to 3 months each year.

II. THE OPPOSITION TO THE PROJECT

The Board reported to the Chief of Engineers that at the public hearings before it:

"Opposition to the improvement was expressed by the railroads operating in the area and by representatives of some labor organizations" (without mentioning what organizations they were).

Actually, however, the opposition included the following organizations and governmental bodies:

The United Mine Workers of America.

The various railroad brotherhoods (representing employees in all railroads in United States).

The Big Sandy Elkhorn Coal Operators Association (Kentucky), whose members produce in excess of 80 percent of the productive capacity of all existing coal mines in the Elkhorn field of eastern Kentucky.

Coal Trade Association of Indiana.

Illinois Coal Traffic Bureau.

Harlan County Coal Operators Association (Kentucky).

Hazard Coal Operators Association (Kentucky).

Southern Appalachian Coal Operators Association (Kentucky and Tennessee).

Western Kentucky Coal Operators Association (Kentucky).

City Council of Columbus, Ohio.

City Council of Portsmouth, Ohio.

City Council of Ironton, Ohio.

City Council of Williamson, W. Va.

City Council of Huntington, W. Va.

City Council of Ashland, Ky.

City Council of Ceredo, W. Va.

City Council of Kenova, W. Va.

City Council of Grundy, Va.

City Council of Russell, Ky.

City Council of Allen, Ky.

County Court of Wayne County, W. Va.

County Court of Mingo County, W. Va.

Martin County, Ky., Fiscal Court.

Lawrence County, Ky., Fiscal Court.

Martin County, Ky., Board of Education.

West Virginia State Chamber of Commerce.

Williamson, W. Va., Chamber of Commerce.

Roanoke, Va., Chamber of Commerce.

Huntington, W. Va., Chamber of Commerce.

Buchanan County, Va., Chamber of Commerce.

Kenova-Ceredo, W. Va., Chamber of Commerce.

Norfolk, Va., Association of Commerce.

Hampton Roads, Va., Maritime Exchange.

Association Opposed to Big Sandy Valley Canal Project.

In addition to the governmental bodies and organizations, 13 Members of Congress expressed their opposition to the Board. Only one appeared in favor of it.

III. THE BOARD'S THEORY FOR JUSTIFYING THE PROJECT

The Board estimates 8,300,000 tons of coal will move annually over the canal into the Ohio for transportation to destinations on the Ohio and other waterways, at an average saving in freight rates of about 80 cents per ton.

The 8,300,000 tons multiplied by 80 cents per ton produces a gross saving or "benefit" of around $6,700,000. Subtracting the annual carrying charge of $4,190,000, a net saving in freight rates of $2,510,000 results—or, stated otherwise, the economic ratio of cost to benefit would be 1 to 1.6. Thus the project is justified.

To make the project "break even," 5,237,500 ($4,190,000 annual charges divided by 80 cents per ton) tons of coal must move annually over the canal. If less moves, at the 80-cent saving, or if 8,300,000 tons move and the Board is substantially in error in attributing to the canal the 80-cent saving, a deficit will result, i. e., a ratio of 1 to less than 1.

IV. THE FALLACIES IN THE BOARD'S THEORY

From the foregoing it is apparent that justification depends principally upon:

First. The correctness of the Board's attributing to the canal the entire 80 cents per ton saving.

Second. The annual movement of coal being at least 5,237,500 tons.

Third. The correctness of the cost estimates.

Fourth. The benefits being public.

These will be discussed in the above order.

First. The fallacy of attributing to the canal the entire 80-cent saving.

The board admits that coal can be transported by rail to the Ohio and there dumped into barges at a total cost of 62 cents per ton and claims that it can be transported by barge over the canal to the Ohio at a cost of 33 cents per ton. This 33 cents deducted from the 62 cents produces a saving via the canal of 29 cents per ton.[1]

This 29 cents saving is all that can be attributed to the canal, because it is not necessary to build it (i. e., to spend $82,300,000) to obtain that portion (50 to 60 cents per ton) of the saving represented by the distance from the junction of the canal with the Ohio to destination. The only saving the canal effects is the 29 cents for that portion of the journey that takes place thereon. The balance of the 80 cents can be had without building it.

At 29 cents per ton the 8,300,000 tons would produce a gross saving of only $2,407,000, which is less than the annual carrying charge of $4,190,000.

The Government has expended and will continue heavy expenditure on the other waterways to move the coal to destination by water. Obviously part of the saving should be credited to these other waterways.

Second. Actual coal tonnage will be less than the necessary "break-even" 5,237,500 tons.

Experienced railway mining and traffic experts predict that the annual coal traffic will not exceed, and doubt that it will approximate, 3,750,000 tons.

Kanawha River navigation confirms this prediction. The Kanawha is only about 60 river miles north of the canal. Its coals are of substantially the same character and its channel was deepened 9 years ago to 9 feet. Since then the greatest tonnage that has moved out-bound over it into the Ohio was the 3,109,652 tons of 1942—the great bulk of which was "captive" (i. e., produced and consumed by the same companies) and consisted of shipments for only a few companies. And since 1942 the tonnage has declined to considerably below 3,000,000.

If the broad Kanawha has been unable to develop more than 3,000,000 tons, this small crooked, restricted canal cannot develop as much.

Third. Correctness of the cost estimates.

Opponents of the project demonstrated to the board of engineers that cost estimates made by the district engineer are much too low. Unit costs used by him were those in effect in 1940 and in addition many necessary items were omitted. The board has with slight modification adopted the inaccurate and inadequate estimates of the district engineer. Qualified and experienced engineers estimate the initial cost in excess of $100,000,000 with correspondingly larger carrying charges.

Fourth. Benefits will be private, not public.

The savings in freight rates will accrue to only a few large mining companies or to a few of their consignees and would be essentially not public but private.

Coal is usually sold upon the basis of rail rate to destination and there is but little evidence that the ultimate consumer gets the benefit of the water rate or that on account thereof industry reduces the price of its product to the public. Coal will be the only appreciable traffic on the canal.

---

[1] For more than 10 years there has been on the Levisa a coal rail rate of 55 cents per ton from mines to the Ohio River. The cost of transferring coal from cars to barges on the Ohio is 7 cents per ton. This 7 cents plus the 55 cents makes the 62-cent total cost of getting coal by rail from mines to the Ohio.

There is at present no 55-cent rate on the Tug, but the United States district engineer, recommending the project, assumed that such a rate would be available; and opponents conceded that if assurance was given that transfer facilities would be constructed and used, his assumption was correct.

V. RETRENCHMENT, NOT INCREASE, REQUIRED IN PUBLIC EXPENDITURES FOR UNNECESSARY PROJECTS

In view of the enormous public debt and necessity for retrenchment, large expenditure for the project is unjustified. The tributary area is already served by two railroads and the canal would be a mere duplication of adequate transportation facilities.

Furthermore, while no one doubts that, given enough money, the engineers can construct the canal, experienced river pilots from Pittsburgh, Huntington and elsewhere testified at the public hearing (November, 1945) that because of the narrowness and crookedness of the canal, operation with the size of tow required is not practical and that the canal would be a waste of public funds.

VI. DETRIMENTAL ASPECTS OF THE CANAL

By giving advantage to immediately adjacent coal mines, the canal will cause inequalities among shippers, disrupt their market and divert business from the railroads, with resultant heavy losses (estimated over 2,500) in rail and coal employment—railroads being the largest consumers of coal. Public funds should not be used to aid one competitor while injuring another.

The canal would cause tax losses to both State and Federal Governments. The tax loss to the Federal Government (estimated $4,395,000 railroad income taxes on diverted business) added to the $4,190,000 annual carrying charge would wipe out even any gross savings. Contrasted with railroads, barge lines pay negligible taxes.

That the above detriments are serious is reflected by the character and extent of opposition to the project mentioned above.

CONCLUSION

While the foregoing sufficiently shows that the large expenditure for the project is unwarranted, we believe we are also justified in stating that proponents' support of the project is in reality an effort to lower freight rates through legislation rather than through the orderly processes of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

River and Harbor Improvements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the County Judges and Commissioners Association of Texas, at the Buccaneer Hotel, Galveston, Tex., on Friday, May 10, 1946:

Mr. President, members of the County Judges and Commissioners Association, ladies, and gentlemen, I am very thankful for the privilege of being with you today and to discuss matters in which all Texas has an especial interest. Our waterway improvements are of the most vital interest to our prosperity. For many years we lagged behind other sections of the country in securing necessary improvements. In more recent years we have surged to the front. A few years ago figures on expenditures for river and harbor improvements in Texas were compiled by J. H. McGann, who for the past 44 years has been clerk of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The compilation shows that from the admission of Texas into the Union up to the beginning of the late World War, the Federal expenditures for river and harbor improvements in Texas amounted to $167,590,142. Of these expenditures, only $40,011,356 had been made in the 70-year period from 1845 to 1915, while in the 25-year period from 1916 to 1941, $127,578,785 had been expended.

Under these expenditures since 1916 our then existing Texas port facilities were greatly improved and new ports were established at Corpus Christi, Brownsville, and Port Isabel. In 1916 no Texas port had depth of channel in excess of 30 feet, while now Galveston, Houston, Texas City, Beaumont and Port Arthur all have 34 feet, and measures are pending to give to them and also to Corpus Christi and Freeport, a uniform depth of 36 feet. The new ports of Brownsville and Port Isabel will also be considered for additional depth as their commerce develops.

The effect of our port improvements upon our water-borne commerce has been phenominal. In 1916 our total commerce of our Texas ports was only 9,604,811 tons, while under the 25-year period of our more liberal expenditures for improved facilities it had increased each year, reaching the enormous proportions in 1940 of 100,653,597 tons.

While freight rates generally have been materially increased in many places within the past 25 or 30 years, it will be borne in mind that such has not been the case with our Texas cotton, nearly all of which went into the export trade. Our splendid port conditions permitted larger ships, with increased cargoes, to operate, and up to the outbreak of the war cotton could be shipped to leading foreign ports at less cost than that of 40 years ago.

Our country becoming involved in the war in 1941, practically all ship operations on the Gulf were abandoned. The ship lines were taken over by the Government and used for war purposes. Several thousand additional ships had to be built to supply the Army and Navy needs.

Normal Gulf shipping has not yet been restored, and will not be until the provisions of the Surplus Ship Sales Act are more nearly carried out. We now have several thousand dry-cargo ships for sale or charter, and about 450 tankers for sale, but which under the terms of the law are not permitted to be chartered. Many of these ships may never be disposed of, as our ocean commerce in the postwar period can be carried on with less than half the number of ships we have. Many of them will be held in reserve for possible future needs, though that will be quite expensive. It costs approximately $5,000 a year to maintain one of the large Liberty ships for a year. Many will be required for the future Army and Navy use, but no one can yet say what our Army and Navy strength will be in the postwar period.

After World War I, we junked many ships and sold many others for a song. Quite a number of them were of wooden construction, and after salvaging valuable parts, the hulls were covered with oil and burnt to the water line, 175 being destroyed in one fire in the Potomac River. The wreckage of these ships, in a tangled mass, covered an area of 35 acres of water in an estuary of the Potomac River. Our present ships are of steel construction and of course, have a far greater value than the old wooden ships.

In the early days of our history, we carried a very large proportion of our foreign commerce in American bottoms. In later years our merchant marine dwindled almost to the vanishing point. A little over 20 years ago its operation was at such a low ebb that less than 9 percent of our foreign trade was carried in American ships. Other maritime nations were carrying 50 percent of their foreign commerce in their own ships. President Harding recommended ship subsidies, as all other nations were paying such subsidies. The subsidies suggested generally were intended almost exclusively for the large Atlantic passenger ships, which afforded no aid worth while to the freight lines. Mail subsidies were finally established.

In 1936 we enacted a law that has generally been referred to as the Magna Carta of our merchant marine. Instead of mails, it provided subsidies to equalize the cost of construction and operation of ships with the cost in other great competitive nations. Under this law, our foreign trade began to revert to us. Up to the beginning of the late war, we were carrying 34 percent of our foreign trade in American bottoms, and the American flag was to be seen wherever trade was obtainable. We had a fine lot of new ships available when the war broke out, and ready to build many more. Admiral Vickery stated that the act of 1936 shortened the war by several years.

We now hope that our postwar merchant marine will become the pride of the Nation. The Sales Act provides liberal terms to purchasers to trade in their old outmoded vessels for new ones. Many of the ships in private ownership are 25 and 30 years old, while 20 years is considered as the average life. The old dry cargo ships can be traded in for new ships, at 55 percent of prewar cost of the new ships, and tankers at 75 percent of the cost. If junking has to be resorted to, it will be better national policy to let the ax fall on the old and obsolescent types.

The money I have referred to as having been expended on river and harbor improvements in Texas refer to actual appropriations. In addition to those sums, Congress has approved approximately $130,000,000 worth of river and harbor and flood-control works which have not been expended. Appropriations for these have been held up by the war. Money for these works will be appropriated for hereafter, and at such times as may be consistent with budgetary requirements.

We are now carrying out methods in river improvements that were not in practice a few years ago. This is to carry it on in connection with the soil-erosion program of the Department of Agriculture. This program is being applied quite extensively on the Trinity River, and its operation will be watched with interest. Our reservoirs have been silted up with the fertile soils washing from the farm lands, and this method of treatment will serve the double purpose of holding our reservoirs for the purposes intended, while carrying out the program of our soil conservation.

Texas is primarily an agricultural State. Our lands have been burdened with annual crop production without replacement of the lost fertility. In shipping our crops and meat animals abroad, we have annually exported a certain proportion of our soil fertility. But this is small as compared with the waste of fertile soil that has flowed down our rivers, finding lodgment in waste places that cannot be utilized for agricultural purposes or flowing into the Gulf of Mexico, never to be returned.

Careful engineering estimates show that about 400,000,000 tons of silt is annually discharged into the Gulf by the Mississippi River. Dr. William J. Hale, expert consultant of the Dow Chemical Co., tells us that 2½ percent of that silt consists of potash and phosphoric acid. Our Texas rivers are small in comparison with the Mississippi, but their waters have a proportionately much greater soil-pollution content. Our loss of fertile soils annually discharged into the Gulf of Mexico by the Texas rivers cannot even be reasonably estimated.

Dr. Hale, in his book recently published under the auspices of the Chemical Foundation, tells us that prior to the introduction of the steam engine four-fifths of our tonnage production came directly from the farm and forest. It gradually decreased until the close of the nineteenth century, when only one-half came from the farm. Following the automobile, only one-third of our tonnage is

now produced on the farm, the other two-thirds coming principally from the mines and factories.

The Constitution of the United States confers upon Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes, and by this provision there was transferred from the States to the Federal Government the control of all the navigable waters of the Nation for the purpose of navigation. At first it was seriously doubted whether the power to regulate comprehended the right to improve—that is, whether the improvement of rivers and harbors was a subject of national concern and of constitutional appropriation. Mr. Madison as President in 1817 vetoed a bill for internal improvements, including, among other things a waterway improvement. He stated in his message that the Constitution did not vest power in Congress for such purpose.

In May 1824, Congress passed the first distinct act to improve navigation, entitled "An Act to Improve the Navigation of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers." About this time the decision of Chief Justice Marshall in the case of Gibbons versus Ogden, established unquestionably the exclusive power of Congress with respect to the interstate waterways of the country, and removed completely the doubts of earlier years.

Gibbons versus Ogden was one of the most noted cases ever coming before the Supreme Court, not only on account of the great issue involved but also on account of the great prominence of all the persons concerned. Gibbons was ex-mayor of Savannah, Ga., and also maintained residence in New Jersey. He was locally and nationally prominent. Ogden had been Governor of New Jersey and United States Senator from that State, and both Gibbons and Ogden had been prominent in promoting navigation. The attorneys employed in the case were both nationally and internationally known. Gibbons was represented by Daniel Webster, and by William Wirt, then Attorney General of the United States, and famed as the prosecutor of Aaron Burr. Ogden was represented by Pinckney, of Maryland, and Thomas J. Oakley, attorney general of New York. He was also represented by Thomas A. Emmet, the great Irish patriot.

Gibbons and Ogden had been partners, but their partnership had ceased before the beginning of this litigation. Fulton and Livingston, who developed the *Clermont*, the first steamboat to be successfully navigated, had obtained from the State of New York the exclusive privilege of operating boats propelled by steam upon the navigable waters of that State. Ogden became the assignee of those gentlemen for this privilege and under it was operating boats between New York and Elizabethtown, N. J. Gibbons was also operating boats on the same waters under permit of the Federal Government. Ogden enjoined him from navigating his boats across the State line into the State of New York. This injunction was affirmed by the Supreme Court of New York. Gibbons carried the litigation into the Federal courts upon the ground that the law of New York, under which he was excluded, was in violation of the Constitution of the United States, in which the Federal Government was given full power over interstate commerce. Chief Justice Marshall sustained this plea in one of the most noted decisions ever emanating from that Court.

Since the decision in the Gibbons-Ogden case, our river and harbor improvements have generally been carried on under the supervision of the Corps of Army Engineers. They have been men of ability and honor, and as fair and impartial as we believe to be humanly possible. In our past history, George B. McClellan, Phil Sheridan, Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, George W. Goethals, and Douglas MacArthur were members of the Corps. Our present Chief of Engineers, General Wheeler, was in south central Asia during the war and had charge of the reopening of the Burma Road to furnish supplies to the Chinese. General Clay, now in command of the American zone in Germany, was once stationed in Texas, and had charge of the construction of the Denison Dam and Reservoir, that great monument to engineering skill.

During the 15 years I have been chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, no proposed improvement of any project has been reported to Congress unless it first had the approval of the Chief and Board of Engineers, after the most careful investigation and study. As a result, our waterways have become a great national asset, not only for peacetime use, but for defense purposes as well.

In World War I our railroads constituted the only practical method we had of inland transportation. We had no national highways, and no river or canal was in practical use at that time. Air service was in its infancy. The war burden proved too great for the railroads and they broke down under the strain. In the last war, our freight and passenger movement was many times greater than in the First World War, and every line of transportation continued in operation. The rail movement of men and supplies was so enormous that it even surprised the transportation experts. The highway transportation was without precedent, and the waterway movement was never before equaled in this or any other country. The airways and pipe lines also performed their part.

With the aid of other methods of transportation, and particularly of the highways and waterways, the railways were enabled to hold up through all the period of the war, a thing that would have been impossible without such aid. This shows that in both peace and wartime we need all our practical methods of transportation, one of the most important of which is the highways for which you gentlemen of the commissioners' courts have certainly been doing your part.

Bacon said: "There are three things that make a nation great and prosperous: A fertile soil, a busy work-shop, and easy conveyance of men and goods from place to place." We have all that combined in our program and as a result our country has become great and prosperous in far greater proportion than any other country in the world. Let us combine our efforts to maintain that high standard.

As for our waterway improvements, no work was carried out during the war except that which was necessary in the war effort. That was the policy of the President and I fully agreed with him. He told me he would be glad to approve all projects necessary to that end, and requested me to have such matters presented when necessary.

In carrying out that policy, my committee approved 23 projects, involving a cost of $24,823,000, which passed Congress without opposition and was approved by the President. I also introduced a bill to enlarge the Intracoastal Canal from Carabelle, Fla., to Corpus Christi, and for its extension to Brownsville. This cost was estimated at $27,000,000. The bill also provided for extension of the barge channel across Florida to connect the Gulf Intracoastal channel with the Atlantic Channel, extending from Jacksonville to Trenton, N. J. The bill also provided for a pipe-line across Florida to be in operation until the barge channel could be constructed. The President sent me a letter of congratulation on this bill, and Congress, without precedent, made immediate appropriation except for the barge channel across Florida, there being doubt as to whether it could be completed in time to be of use during the war.

Various other war measures were carried out from time to time, and more than 3,000 ships and other craft were constructed on inland waters and towed to the sea, including a large number of submarines. The freight movements on our inland waters were not made public during the war, but I am advised that it was more than 33,000,000,000 ton-miles in 1944. The commerce on our Texas Intracoastal Canal was approximately 25,000,000 tons, largely of oil and gasoline.

Texas, as well as our Federal Government, has promoted every known method of transportation. Waterways, airways, railways, and highways have all received consideration. Without these means of transportation our State would yet have been a veritable wilderness. No one can deny that the expenditures have brought forth good results. From the discovery by La Salle in 1685 to a time almost within the memory of men still living, no practical methods of transportation were placed in operation, and Texas remained undeveloped. Her prosperity has been coeval with her development of transportation.

Texas fills a unique place in history. No other country on the Western Hemisphere has had such a varied political experience. It has several times been under a kingdom, twice an empire, and six times a republic.

From its discovery by La Salle in 1685 it was considered as French territory until ceded to Spain in 1763. Spain ceded it back to France in 1800. It was claimed by the United States under the Louisiana Purchase from France in 1803, but all our right, title, and interest, whatever it may have been, was quitclaimed to Spain in 1819 in part consideration for the purchase of Florida.

Texas became a part of the Mexican Empire under Iturbide in 1821, and of the Mexican Republic in 1824. It became an independent republic in 1836, and a State in the American Union in 1845.

In 1861, Texas, for reasons deemed sufficient by our fathers, seceded from the Union and cast her lot with her sister States of the South under the Stars and Bars of the Southern Confederacy. With a loyalty and devotion never surpassed in the history of mankind, she fought, bled, and went down to defeat at Appomattox. She was then placed under the military rule of the United States until 1870. She bore the hardships, the indignities, and insults of the disgraceful carpetbag rule. She tasted the cup of bitterness to the dregs.

In due time, she arose from her depressed condition as one from the dead. Complying with the requirements of Congress, she reasserted her right to statehood under the Stars and Stripes, to become what we are proud to believe is the brightest star in the new firmament. There, it is our hope, that she will remain and continue to shine with ever-increasing luster, until Gabriel shall come with his trumpet, and with one foot upon the land and one upon the sea, to make the announcement that time shall be no more.

Wear a Poppy for Remembrance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, each year Poppy Day acquires an added importance in the life of the Nation. I have never had the privilege of reading a more careful and dramatic picture of the significance of this day than an article written recently by Dr. Ruth Miller Steese, State president of the American Legion Auxiliary, Department of Pennsylvania.

Everyone who reads this will get a greater understanding of the purposes of this occasion and of the good their own cooperation in this program will do.

The article by Dr. Steese follows:

POPPIES FOR REMEMBRANCE—THE LITTLE RED FLOWER WITH THE LITTLE WHITE STICKER

The little red poppy—the flower that recalls to our minds the sacrifice of America's men and women in two great world wars.

As we wear the little red poppy in this postwar year let us wear it with love and remembrance. Poppy day is not a tag day. Poppy day is as sacred as the day with which it was originally connected—Memorial Day.

The message, the gospel of the little red flower with the little white sticker, is a precious one. Into the hospitals of Aspinwall, Naval, Coatesville, South Mountain, Indiantown Gap, Valley Forge, Erie, and Perry Point the American Legion and its auxiliary of Pennsylvania take the materials for the assembling of the poppy. No other poppies are made in any Government or veterans' hospitals in our great Commonwealth but the poppy of the American Legion and its auxiliary. As the members of these organizations take the poppy-making program into the hospitals they teach the men and women to make the poppies and pay them for every poppy made. This program has a dual purpose—it provides occupational therapy and it supplies money for the use of the veteran or his family.

Then when the poppies are sold the entire proceeds must be used for the welfare program of the American Legion and its auxiliary.

The money is used to care for the personal needs of the veteran and his family and it is also used to give to the hospitalized veteran those comforts which he needs. In four hospitals alone in Pennsylvania 120,000 cigarettes are distributed monthly. In others monthly ward parties are given for the benefit of the men who cannot leave their wards. Games and prizes, athletic, band and orchestral equipment, hospital chapel bulletins, mimeograph machines, printing presses, furniture for sun parlors, bowling alleys, radios, master radio control sets with hundreds of ear phones—these represent but a few of the many articles which a grateful public buying and wearing the flower with the little white sticker make possible.

For over 20 years the only poppies made in Pennsylvania, the poppies of the American Legion and its auxiliary, were made by the hospitalized men and women of World War I. This year, the poppy has an added story to tell. As you, the public, buy this Pennsylvania-made poppy, the poppy of the little white sticker, will you look at it and think of some of these things?

Some of the poppies this year are being made by our blind veterans. Visualize if you can a white hospital bed with its piles of red petals, green stems, and white stickers. See the hands of the blind grope for each article as he assembles his poppies. If the white sticker is on upside down, ask yourself how you would put it on if you were blind. The poppy becomes dearer as we know who made it.

Then another scene—a hospital ward or solarium. Men making poppies in wheel chairs while waiting for their artificial limbs. Men assembling poppies—men who use steel hooks for hands because their hands or arms were left on the various beachheads.

Do you wish another picture? Then visit our mental hospitals and see men, yes and women. Women, nurses in World War I. Women, nurses, Waves, and Wacs of World War II—all patients in our mental hospitals. As we see again nurses from Bataan and Corregidor, making poppies, filling in idle hours which shall know no end, will you look again at the little red flower with the little white sticker.

Surely the poppy of remembrance is a sacred flower for it represents sacrifice, love of country, courage, employment, and rehabilitation.

Let us love the red poppy, let us buy many more poppies and let them tell us again that they are the memorial flowers for those who went forth never to return—the flowers of tribute and reverence for those who gave of their lives and yet live—our Nation's hospitalized veterans.

Let us all wear the only poppies made in hospitals in Pennsylvania—the little red poppy with the little white sticker.

Let not memory dim with time the sacrifice that made and kept us free.

Wear a poppy for remembrance.

Revival and Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by the distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann, appearing in the Washington Post of Tuesday, May 14, under the title "Revival and Revolution":

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

REVIVAL AND REVOLUTION

Looking at Europe from the outside, from Washington, London, and Moscow, it may seem as if the Continent must: First, be brought under Soviet domination; or, second, be rescued from that fate by coming altogether under Anglo-American influence; or, third, be partitioned into two parts at the military dividing line. My impression is that this is a stereotype which, if not already obsolete, is at least obsolescent. It is a picture formed in men's minds before and just after Europe was invaded and liberated by the non-European armies of the Big Three.

At that time all effective power and authority was directed from Moscow, London, and Washington; the Big Three naturally saw Europe as a continent where they did things to the enemy states and for the friendly states. It was easy to forget that the Continent consists of nations which have the will to live, and cannot for long be regarded as clients, wards, or prisoners of war.

If that is so, then the European nations will, as they revive, resist in all its forms the idea that they are the stakes of the diplomacy of non-European powers. Conceivably, though even that is highly improbable, the Big Three could dictate a European settlement if they were united. But they are rivals. The effect of this rivalry is to offer each European nation encouragement, opportunity, and the means of independent action. While the Big Three contest the control of Europe, the nations of Europe are arising to contest the control by the Big Three.

In a recent article I pointed out that the probable result of the Anglo-Soviet duel in Germany would not be that Germany fell under Soviet or British control; it would be the revival of Germany as a centralized state holding the balance of power between them. This would be the malignant consequence of Big Three rivalry. In the liberated countries a benign, and even beneficent, but similar result is strongly indicated. That is to say: they will be actors and not merely objects in the reconstruction of Europe. And in the world-wide conflict of power between the Russians and the Anglo-Americans, the Europeans will not be disposed, as so many think, to provide the battlefields and the mercenary troops. Their national interests and their pride will cause them to resist being alined in the Big Three conflict.

That, rather than lining up as the brilliant second to the foreign office, ought to be the American position. If it were, our European policy would be in harmony with the European future, and the influence of the United States as a peacemaker would be increasing instead of diminishing.

In this connection, a correct estimate of European political developments is necessary. It is not easy to make it, and it is impossible to present the evidence in a short newspaper article. But, for what it may be worth, I would say that for Americans who cannot consider the details and the variations, the first thing to note about European politics is that the pattern is essentially the same in most of the liberated countries, especially the bigger ones. It is that a revolution which displaced the former governing classes has already occurred, and that now there is a political struggle for power as to how the new governing classes are to be recruited and directed.

We may compare Europe to a forest which has been struck by a violent storm. The older and taller trees—the governing, managing, and leading class—have been cut down, withered, bent, twisted, and in large part, though not wholly, uprooted. The new forest is growing up through the debris amidst which contend the saplings, the scrub, and the old roots. We shall misunderstand Europe if we concentrate our whole attention on the new ideologies. What is much more important is the emergence of new men in an old continent where the right, the privilege, and the opportunity to rule and direct has been—by American standards—the prerogative of a relatively small class. This class has been much more exclusive in eastern Europe than in western Europe. But it has not been wide open anywhere, and the directing personnel were recruited—on a basis of unequal opportunity—from a relatively small segment of the people.

This governing class has been so much decimated by death, torture, and exile, and so discredited by defeat, corrupted by appeasement, and compromised by collaboration, that it has ceased to be the governing class. Individuals survive who have proved themselves as patriots. But the class itself could not, did not, and often would not, defend the nation against its enemies: by that it lost its title to rule.

The mass of the little people, deprived of their old leaders and rulers, rallied around three main centers of resistance and hope. There were the faithful, who made out of resistance to Hitler a religion as well as a patriotic duty. They became the nucleus of a popular Catholic party. There were the trades unionists, mainly social democrats, who are the nucleus of the non-Communists, or non-Muscovite, Socialist Parties, and there were the Communist cells, which fought bravely and boldly in the resistance, especially after 1941, and, because they were fiercely persecuted—acquired the legendary prestige of martyrdom.

These three popular parties—Catholic, Socialist, Communist—appear to have at least three-quarters of the people behind them. All of them are by current American or prewar European standards, parties of the left. They are all advanced collectivists, and while the Catholic Party is usually the most moderate of the three, curiously enough the Communist Party is not, perhaps for tactical reasons, invariably the most radical.

While these three parties compete for the support of approximately three-quarters of the people, none of them has as yet had any prospect of obtaining a clear majority

of its own. Thirty percent has been a kind of high-water mark. Unless all expectations are wrong, it is reasonably certain that no one of these parties is likely to rise very much higher than 30 percent.

This means not only that the Communists have no prospect of obtaining a majority of their own but that even a coalition of Communists and Socialists could not count upon more than a slim, wavering, and unreliable majority. Therefore, the probable pattern in Europe will continue to be government by a three-party coalition. The alternative is dictatorship resting on the seizure of the government, either by the Communists or by the extreme right—led by semi-Fascist military men.

These alternatives cannot be excluded as possibilities. But in western Europe a Communist seizure of power would lack the support of the Red Army and would encounter the opposition of the British, the American, and the national armies. A semi-Fascist seizure of power would encounter the resistance of the working class, who undoubtedly have arms.

In eastern Europe, though not in all countries, the seizure of power has been effected with the support of the Red Army. The question there is how long governments which rest on the bayonets of foreign troops can be kept going. I should think they could not be kept going forever if real peace, which has enormous attraction, begins to break out anywhere on the Continent.

World Peace Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include a statement prepared by Lt. Paul F. Moore, commanding officer of the United States naval air station, Beaufort, S. C., who in private life is an attorney at law residing in Kansas City, Mo.

The statement follows:

It has long been a custom at conferences for delegates to support themselves with expert counselors. When the Big Three met to solve war problems they brought with them their best military advisers. Postwar conferences, dealing with legal, economic, and political problems, have been well attended by lawyers, economists, and political scientists. Thus the wisdom of their professions is lent to the authoritative voice of the delegate.

From the quiet reflections of thoughtful men at home, to the pronouncements of the international forum, there is a growing belief that moral principles must be used in deciding issues between nations. History proves that resort to expediencies rather than to ethics results in repeated wars.

Many people in many lands understand the natural law, the dignity of the individual, and the interplay of rights and obligations. The leaders of these people frequently fail to understand the application of these principles.

Last April the conferees who met at San Francisco to prepare the United States Charter were supported by large staffs of experts. Few of our people know that the American delegation was advised by a group of religious experts selected from the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths by their own national bodies. The specific task of this group was to consider each proposal made to the UN assembly in the light of its moral and ethical implications. In this instance our Nation attempted to apply religious principles to great international problems.

Ahead of us are peace treaties and international conferences which will shape the destinies of men. The wise man feels that the laws of God must be considered in weaving the peace from the rags of war. It is not enough to pay lip service to this belief. The practical answer is to emulate San Fransciso: To supply our delegates to the conferences ahead with sound advisers in the moral realm.

The appointment of religious advisers, moreover, can be an important step in securing the success of the conferences. World peace depends upon the trust which national leaders have in each other. The basis of this trust will not be found in the cultures, histories, or the economics of the nations. These are the sources of conflict. The real basis of mutual trust can be found only in the religions of the delegates and the people they represent.

No matter what our private lives or public benefactions, most of the world looks on the United States as a godless nation dedicated to materialism. An atmosphere of religious purpose within the American delegation could lessen this reputation. Consider the awakening confidence in our country among world-wide Catholicism to witness priests associated with the official American group; consider the approval of the Protestant communicants in all lands to see their clergymen advising with our delegates; consider the effect of Judaic recognition that tolerance is our ideal when rabbis are at our side. Religious advisers will win for us the respect and trust of many peoples and the men who speak with authority for them.

The non-Christian nations and the nations which expell all religions will not be awed by religious advisers. They will not be won by sweet words or pious sentiments. They will be won to our way if there is left to them no alternative but to adhere to the majorities positive Christian platform of just and universal peace settlements.

Where systems of law, traditions of conduct, and even language, stop at the border, the ideas of religion are forces which know neither nationality or borders. They find harmonious acceptance in the souls of different races and nations. Let us use this simple fact. Let us add to the force of our science and to the force of our arms the force of our spiritual values. Thus united we shall prevail for just and lasting peace in the council halls.

Dedication of Pfc Edward Pomerleau Square

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address delivered by me at the dedication of the square at the intersection of South Broadway and South Street in the city of Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday, May 12, 1946, in memory of Pfc Edward Pomerleau, a resident of that community who made the supreme sacrifice on January 18, 1945, in Luxemburg while serving as as member of the Medical Corps. During the exercises, the Silver Star Medal was presented by representatives of the War Department to the father, Lewis Pomerleau, of this brave soldier.

On this, the first day of the week, when men pause in their labors to worship the Prince of Peace, it is well for all of us to ask ourselves this question, "What am I doing, in my humble way, to advance the cause for which the Son of God suffered and died?"

On Sunday we commune with divine example. From this lifting of our hearts we draw the strength and the courage to so live our lives that we may be worthy of His sacrifice. Each Sunday we rededicate ourselves to the eternal truths which alone give meaning to our human journey and which guide us toward immortality. Cleansed by His love, we are prepared for the new week in this old world, fearlessly facing the doubts and trials and responsibilities which are waiting to test us.

Sometimes as we look about us the world seems to offer nothing but trouble. The news of the day is full of man's inhumanity to man. Hate and greed and cruelty are found in families, between individuals, among groups and nations. The peoples of the earth are plagued by confusion and insecurity. To date, the outstanding example of man's genius has been the invention of the atomic bomb, before the threat of which the whole world trembles. We have become suddenly conscious that our capacity for evil is more active than our will to do good. To many, the future looks dark and some faint hearts begin to wonder if there is any hope for mankind. And then, in the midst of this despair, we see one of our neighbors stand up. Scorning personal safety, he gives himself in order to save others. Before this supreme unselfishness, our faith returns. For here in one member of our human family is the immortal glow of divinity in man. The spirit which shines through the sacrifices of the few inspires the rest of us to go forward. Those who live and die for goals higher than the isolated needs of the individual are the true leaders in this life. In their debt, we follow them.

Such a man was Pfc. Edward Pomerleau.

At the time of his death he was only 22, yet into those few years he had crammed more real living than many who reach 80 years on the treadmill of routine without having felt the joys and sorrows which complete a man and bring him closer in mind and spirit to his God. Edward was only 22 when he sacrificed his life for us.

We have come together, as friends and neighbors, to humble ourselves before the devotion that was his. We have come to dedicate this square to his memory, lest we forget the supreme example of service to others which he has set before us. As we stand here this day silently comparing our own lives with his, we must be aware how far we have fallen short in the performance of our American citizenship. Dimly we realize that it is not enough for us to do our daily work, to love and care for those who are near to us, to be law-abiding and God-fearing. In this troubled world a more positive effort is required from each and every one of us. Edward Pomerleau knew this. It is up to us to find out how he came to that understanding upon which the future depends. From his life and his death we must learn to measure up to the high responsibilities which face all of us in the days to come.

Edward Pomerleau grew up as a typical American boy. He played sandlot games and carried papers in the hours when he was not busy with his studies at the Sacred Heart School. After graduation he went to work in the mule room of the Shawsheen mills. Anxious to develop himself, he at-

tended the Diesel Engineering School in Boston. Then he went to work as a welder in the shipyards at South Portland, Maine, already helping in the war effort before he was called into service.

In April of 1943 he answered the summons of his country and was assigned to the Infantry, receiving his basic training at a camp in New Jersey. Like many another young American, Edward had met a girl whom he loved, when war came to deny the normal yearning of a man and a woman for mutual affection and understanding, for a home, and for children. And so they married, hoping for a few hours together before the soldier-husband shipped out on the long journey that might lead to final separation. No one knew where the grim lottery of war might strike, as it did so often in the following 2 years, calling the numbers of those who were to give their all.

War is evil because it makes the innocent pay for the mistakes of the guilty. It demands the sacrifice of the best—who are always the young. It exacts its cruel toll, not only in terms of life, but in long-drawn suffering, and the giving up of all that is sweet and heaven-sent in the life of the young.

And thus it came to pass that war bore down with double malice on the life of Edward Pomerleau. He was training in Kentucky at the time. To him came the dread message that his young bride was dangerously ill. Before he could get permission to leave his duties and hurry back to his home his wife was 3 days dead.

The regimentation of military life is hard enough for any young American to endure. It is twice-hard when he brings to it the grief over a marriage so cruelly cut short by death, and the shock of losing one's life partner who was too young to die.

Edward went back to complete his training. Soon he was shipped to England and thence to France. Our armies, at a price, were pushing the Nazis out of the lands they had ravaged and back to the fatherland where they had launched their assault upon Christianity and civilization. Three thousand miles from home, our men were fighting for our homes, our neighborhood, our peaceful, pleasant way of life. They were fighting to keep the bombers out of our skies, the fear out of children's eyes, and the heavy hand of tyranny from the New World which we are building here. It was winter. The fighting was steady and bitter. Our armies had liberated France. They were advancing through Luxembourg. On the 18th of January 1945 Pfc. Edward Pomerleau made the supreme sacrifice. He was doing his job under enemy fire, with no weapon to protect himself, because he was a member of the Medical Corps. He died in the act of bringing mercy to his wounded comrades.

Captain Henderson, chaplain of his regiment, wrote:

"His death was heroic, clean, and Catholic. Shortly before he died I gave him and his companions general absolution and holy communion. We have taken every possible opportunity to administer sacraments to the front-line men and Edward had always taken advantage of this.

"It is a great consolation to know that Edward died not only a hero for his country, but that he also passed on to his home in eternity fully equipped and prepared. Now he is safely out of this vale of tears, and has magnificently accomplished that for which we are all alive; to have a good death, and to arrive safely to the place for which our souls were created.

"Our regimental commander wishes also to take this occasion to express his deepest sympathy and condolences."

Pfc. Edward Pomerleau has received, posthumously, the Purple Heart.

Before the sublime sacrifice of a man in behalf of his fellow men, we bow our heads in reverent awe. And in our hearts we make the solemn pledge that this must not happen again. Human life and all its promise is too great a price to pay for our carelessness and our mistakes. It is justified in part only if we the living resolve to exert every effort of mind and soul to build a better world, blessed by peace among all men. By this—and this alone—can we make up to Edward Pomerleau and his gallant comrades in the great company of the heroic dead for the sacrifices beyond reckoning which they made for us.

Today we have come to dedicate this square to his memory. Here, in the neighborhood so familiar to his boyhood, we want his name to live on, reminding us of our duty toward our fellow men.

We cannot speak to one who is gone, but we can reach out to those—the living—who were very dear to him. And so we extend to his three brothers, Raymond, Leon, and Earl, who also served in the armed forces, the deep respect and humble thanks of our community.

Today is Sunday, and Mother's Day as well. It is a day of special tenderness for all. Throughout the Nation, men, women, and children are paying tribute to the most cherished relationship our humankind can ever know. In honoring her son, we honor Mrs. Louis Pomerleau, who brought him up to be a credit to his home, his Nation, and his God.

The Distinguished Service Cross has been awarded by the Government of the United States to Pfc. Edward Pomerleau for his outstanding devotion to duty. His mortal remains rest in a beautiful grove in the far-off Duchy of Luxemburg. But from the true peace of his eternal home may he know that the distinction which he won is this day placed in the proud care of Mr. Louis Pomerleau—a heritage richly returned from a son to the father who inspired him.

We who are privileged to attend this dedication and witness this award send the homage of our hearts to the spirit of a hero son and to the brave family before us who gave him to our country.

Let us pray that we may be ever worthy of their sacrifice.

Address by Joseph E. Davies at Dinner Honoring the Late President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most illuminating, eloquent, and, in my opinion, far-sighted address made by one of the truly great men of this country, the Honorable Joseph E. Davies, former Ambassador to the Soviet Union, on the occasion of a dinner in honor of the memory of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt and the presentation of the first annual award of the American-Russian Institute for the furtherance of American-Russian understanding, conferred upon the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt posthumously, and delivered to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, at the Hotel Pennsylvania, in New York City, on May 7, 1946.

I shall add merely that I wish it were possible for every American of open and fair mind to read the address or to have had the privilege of hearing it, as I did, and to hear a man who, about as well as anyone I know of, represents the typical American spirit and the still-existent Horatio Alger possibilities in this country. I do not mean to say that Mr. Joseph E. Davies was ever a boy in rags, but I do mean that he is a man who has made a great professional career and a great career in public service and a financial competence by his own efforts in the great American tradition. Mr. Joseph E. Davies is as strong a defender of the capitalistic system as there is in the United States of America, so when he gives his counsel to his fellow citizens about American-Soviet relationships, it does not come from the mouth of anyone who can be denounced as a Communist. It comes from a great American who believes in the capitalistic system and loves his country. I think what he has to say and what he has said upon the occasion to which I have referred are worthy of note by every Member of the Senate and Member of the House of Representatives, and every member of the public who has access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, among the facets of the genius of our immortal President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, was his singular capacity to strike to the heart of a problem, cleave to it, and boldly and skillfully drive to its solution for the common good. In no situation was that more signally demonstrated than in his conduct of the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States

For this great contribution to American-Soviet understanding, we honor his memory in the posthumous award conferred upon him, and delivered to Mrs. Roosevelt this evening.

It was American-Russian understanding and confidence which insured unity, vital to winning the war. That was the distinctive contribution of President Roosevelt, not only to victory, but to any hope for a durable peace. That was the legacy which our President left not only to our country but to humanity.

Unless that inheritance is preserved through continued mutual confidence, both as to purposes and conduct, there will be no peace.

The military alliance of the Soviet Union and the western democracies, in 1941, sprang from pressure of mortal peril and the necessity for self-preservation. It rested, however, on a background of suspicion, distrust, and fear. In many instances over the long past, that was justified on both sides.

In the immediate past, the experience of the young Bolshevik state with the western European democracies and Britain had been a bitter one. The memories of the attack upon their young government and the invasion of their country by the Allied armies of World War I, were still fresh. Nor had they forgotten the bitter hostility of the outside world, thereafter, climaxed by their exclusion from Munich by one of their own allies. Back of this, for 150 years and more, history discloses a long record of military and political conflict between Britain and Russia. The Soviet Foreign Office knew that only 50 years ago, Lord Rosebery, then Foreign Minister of Great Britain, had told the Austrian Ambassador that any attempt to change the Dardanelles agreement to give Russia access to the Mediterranean, would be regarded by Britain as cause for war.

Britain, on the other hand, has historically looked upon Russia as a threat to her empire, and feared the expansion of her power as a threat to world domination.

Thus, while Britain and the Soviets were partners against Hitler, nevertheless, neither fully trusted the other. These old fears and suspicions engrained in the experience and national consciousness of both Britain and Russia were a constant threat to Allied cooperation. Even in the face of great contributions to the common cause and many indications of good faith by both, and despite the Soviet-British treaty providing for 20 years of friendship, these "legacies of suspicion" would not down.

British leaders refused to accept Soviet assurances that Russia had no design against empire interest, in India, the Near East, China, or in the Mediterranean.

Soviet leaders did not entirely accept the professed altruistic purposes of Britain, declared in the Atlantic Charter and otherwise, and feared that Britain aimed to use and exploit Soviet strength for her own uses and purposes. They feared that British foreign policy was directed, even while fighting Hitler, to the building up of a combination of smaller European states friendly to them which could be used as a bloc to serve British interests through a balance of power, directed against Russia. There was constant fear that such a policy was being directed to the creation of a cordon sanitaire in the Baltic states and in the Balkans, to hem Russia in. Their more recent experiences caused them to suspect that Britain's purpose was to quarantine the Bolsheviks as a pariah state, and to wall in this young threat to capitalism and to western political and religious ideology. They feared the doctrine that the Mediterranean was a British lake. They saw in this a purpose to thwart Russia's desire for an outlet to warm waters and the natural ambition that Russia, along with the other Great Powers, might also enjoy the freedoms of the seas, and be afforded the opportunity to take a position, with her allies, commensurate with her contributions to victory, and consistent with her self-respect.

These fears and suspicions plagued Allied relations and were a constant threat to Allied plans.

Up to a few days before his death, Hitler predicted that these fears and rivalries between Russia and Britain in Europe, the Mediterranean, and the East would destroy the unity of the Big Three, and enable him to make peace with either on his own terms.

Said the Prime Minister in the House of Commons:

"It is his (the enemy's) hope that there will be some rift in this alliance; that the Russians may go this way and Britain and America that; that quarrels may arise about the Balkans or about Poland or about Hungary. There is the enemy's great hope."

Unfortunately, in the course of military development of the war, Soviet fears were aggravated.

There is no question but what the Soviets resented the global planning by the Joint British and American Chiefs of Staff, from which the Red Army, which was doing most of the fighting, was then excluded. They feared that the complete agreements as to world strategy, announced from London, Quebec, and Washington involved plans which might not be wholly military, but political as well, directed to preserve or to extend the influence of the British Empire at Soviet expense and without regard to the still greater sacrifices and losses to the Red Army which might be involved. They feared also the possible effect upon their future postwar security, and the possible attitude of their present allies once the danger was over.

There was the long delay in the opening of a second front by a cross-Channel invasion of France. From June to December in 1941 the Red Army and Moscow were in desperate jeopardy. They suspected that back of this delay there was a policy which Stalin, in 1939, had described as Britain's purpose to let Germany and Russia bleed themselves white, in order that Britain might dominate and control postwar Europe. As delay extended through the desperate years of 1942 and 1943 the Soviets suspected a British attempt to divert the cross-channel attack into an attack through the Balkans. They suspected that this was a political offensive to serve British interest by building up a British sphere of influence in that area, which was to be used by Britain in a postwar struggle to control Europe by organizing forces which, because of political, ideological, or religious reasons, were indoctrinated with an implacable hostility against their wartime ally—the Soviet Union.

The frank analysis of Britain's postwar weakness, and her necessity to restore her strength through a working organization of small western European nations, made by the great dominion spokesman, General Smuts, undoubtedly enhanced Soviet suspicion and distrust. It was a restatement of a classic British foreign policy.

These and other military developments and incidents clearly added to the Soviet fears.

In the fall of 1942, and early in 1943, Churchill and Roosevelt were convinced of the necessity of securing a conference with Stalin. The intimate friendship of Churchill and Roosevelt, the common language, the common outlook and political ideologies of Britain and the United States, and the possible fraternal association of the British and American Joint Chiefs of Staff, known to the Soviets, aroused fears and suspicions that the western democracies were ganging up against them. Whatever the reason may have been Stalin avoided that meeting. It was suggested that he hesitated to place himself in the "nutcracker," in a tripartite conference which might affect the security of his frontiers.

It was under such conditions as these that in March 1943 the President, with the characteristic directness and simplicity of his genius, directed his personal effort to securing face-to-face discussions with Marshal Stalin, and a conference of the Big Three, to protect, preserve, and project unity to win the war and to conserve the future peace. His effort was a success. The result was that the Big Three held their first wartime conference at Tehran in November of that year.

That was the beginning of understanding and confidence between Marshal Stalin and President Roosevelt. Stalin's confidence in Roosevelt was strengthened by his knowledge that the President and our military leaders had constantly urged a cross-Channel operation from 1941 until 1944. It was at Tehran, in November 1943, that finally the date for a cross-Channel operation was definitely agreed upon for the first time. As Stalin and Roosevelt came to know each other, that relationship grew constantly stronger. They stripped the political and military world situations down to the elementary conditions vital to themselves and to peace. They found how far each could go.

The President's attitude was typically American and direct. He convinced the Soviet leadership that America's policy was directed solely, first, to defeat Hitler and prevent enslavement of the world by the Nazis; second, to preserve the physical security and the way of life of our people; third, to cooperate to project a durable, just, and practical peace which would prevent aggression and make the world a decent place for human beings to live in; and fourth, that to erect a durable peace structure, it was imperative that it should rest upon continued cooperation and unity of Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States.

The Soviets accepted the United States and its professions that it had no axes to grind; that it had no ulterior purposes or motives; that it had no empire interests to protect or project; that it had no other purpose than to be an impartial friend to both of its wartime allies, and a partisan of neither.

At Tehran the mantle of world leadership and the hope of the world for both victory and peace fell upon the shoulders of the President of the United States. He carried that burden and responsibility through Yalta and up to the date of his death. During that period, in quick succession, there came rapid developments. There was the meeting with Chiang Kai-shek and Stalin with reference to China; the assurances which Stalin gave that the Soviet Union would fight Japan within 3 months after Hitler's defeat. Basic and essential matters, as to which there might be conflict of vital interests and which were threatening unity, were considered as an entire picture directly and simply. Differences were composed and common understandings and solutions arrived at through face-to-face talks and frank discussions.

Thus, had our President achieved the confidence of the leaders and the peoples of the other great land power of the earth. Thus, had he secured their confident cooperation to win the war and to project a practical and just peace.

Despite the dark days through which we are passing, there is still hope for Allied unity for peace in the common acceptance of certain basic facts.

"After all, the future of the world depends upon united action of our three countries. Other countries will be associated, but the future depends upon the union of the three most powerful allies. If that fails, all fails.

"The future of the whole world, perhaps for several generations, depends upon the cordial, trustful, and comprehending association of the British Empire, the United States, and Soviet Russia.

"Another great war, especially an ideological war, fought as it would be not only on frontiers but in the heart of every land, with weapons far more destructive than men have yet wielded, would spell the doom, perhaps for many centuries, of such civilization as we have been able to erect."

These are not my words. These are the words of the greatest Englishman of this or any other time—Prime Minister Churchill. They are as true and wise now as when spoken a few months ago.

Then there are the words of our President, spoken but a few weeks before his death:

"In the field of foreign policy we propose to stand together * * * not for the war alone but for the victory for which the war is fought.

"Wherever men love freedom, the hope and purpose of the people are for peace—peace that is durable and secure.

"It will not be easy to create.

"We must not let * * * differences divide us.

"We must be on our guard not to exploit and exaggerate the differences between us and our allies.

"Peace can be made and kept only by the united determination of peace-loving peoples, who are willing to work together; willing to help one another; willing to respect and tolerate and try to understand one another's opinions and feelings."

This was the contribution of our great President, not only to victory, but to the hope of the world for peace.

Thus, living and dead, does our immortal American President contribute to Allied understanding and unity, without which civilization confronts, first, bankruptcy—then annihilation. Franklin Roosevelt, more than any other man, built that trust and understanding between Russia, England, and ourselves and thus gave to us all the hope of a just and durable peace.

Time To Drop the OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, Chester Bowles, the OPA Director, is attempting by means of propaganda to convince the people that he, as a director, has judgment superior to the thoughtful citizens of our Nation. The line of reasoning with which he is blanketing the Nation leads to but one conclusion—complete dictatorship. There can be no greater danger to a free society and to free enterprise than placing the power of life and death in the hands of one man over the productive forces of our economy. The arbitrary edicts of Chester Bowles has destroyed legitimate business enterprises, established black markets, and he has stimulated the manufacture of shoddy clothing and other inferior necessities of life at prices far above the prices asked by legitimate producers of honest goods and services. The people as a result of OPA have been cheated in price and quality of goods besides being made the victims of an ever-increasing inflation, regimentation, and loss of personal freedom.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an editorial from the Times-Herald of May 15, 1946:

TIME TO DROP THE OPA

The Senate Banking Committee is getting busy writing a Senate version of price-control extension. Prices are supposed to be controlled by the Office of Price Administration, better known as the OPA.

Our notion of a nice thing for the Senate Banking Committee to do would be to write a bill just sentencing this agency to as fast a death as possible. Senate and House could then agree to that bill, and the President could sign it, and we'd be on our way toward recovering from one of the worst of our hang-overs from the war.

The House felt like this about the OPA when it passed its own price-control extension bill several weeks ago. Under that bill, the OPA was granted a little longer life in form but was stripped of most of its powers to mess up our economy.

That it will continue to mess up our economy as long as it has any real powers seems certain, on OPA performance since the war ended.

It may have been necessary to clap strict controls on prices during the war. But the war is long over now, and we are supposed to be getting back to our customary free-enterprise, supply-and-demand way of producing, selling, and buying. Government price controls in peacetime are in direct conflict with system.

If the OPA were as wise and all seeing as it professes to be, it might conceivably not be so serious a drag on reconversion. But it is a habitual wrong guesser and poor prophet, as its record will show.

WRONG GUESS ON FARMERS

Here is one gem from that record. Last February 6, Chester Bowles, then head of the OPA, appeared before the House Appropriations Committee to ask for some money for his agency. Bowles talking:

"Now the food. We have been very hopeful—'hopeful' is the wrong word—hopeful as far as stabilization is concerned—but when I say 'hopeful,' we are hopeful for the relief of pressure; that means, the relief of pressure that had come from unemployment and reduced sales and poorer business. We expected that there would be a drop in farm income quite substantial by January. There was a general belief * * *."

Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, broke into this gas barrage to say: "We have missed our guess in most everything, then?"

Mr. Bowles replied: "Missed our guess in all those basic facts. We had hoped to be out of some 20 percent of all farm price control by January, and then a substantial part by April, and out of practically all by July 1."

Bowles since the above classic was recorded has been glorified into something called Economic Stabilizer, and Paul Porter has succeeded him as head of the OPA.

But Bowles is still fighting fanatically for extension of the OPA with all its wartime powers intact, and has skillfully propagandized a lot of people into bombarding Congress with demands to that effect.

PUBLIC VERSUS OPA

In addition to being out of place in a United States at peace, the OPA is not doing what it is supposed to do; namely, to control prices.

Black market shenanigans are going on all over the country, and in more and more lines of goods. People are gaily patronizing the black marketeers, and feeling pretty smart about knowing the tricks and passwords that will bring forth the butter, bacon or new car prices far above OPA ceilings.

That only means that there is less and less real public support for price control, regardless of the pro-OPA mail flooding Congress. It seems a safe bet that plenty of those letter and postcard writers patronize black markets themselves.

It was lack of public support that killed Federal prohibition—the widespread conviction that here was an asinine and tyrannical law which deserved nobody's respect and ought to be violated on principle. That same conviction is growing up with regard to peacetime price control.

The OPA is fighting back with shrieks about wickedness of the black markets; but the black markets go rolling along, as did the bootleggers during prohibition—with customer approval and applause in both cases.

And while pretending to "hold the line" against inflation, the OPA is quietly granting price increases at numerous points along the line.

That fact reduces the whole set-up to absurdity—meaning the time is ripe to give this outworn Government agency the heave-ho as fast as we can.

Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me at Portland, Maine, on May 11, 1946:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. The House of Representatives was in recess from April 18 to April 30. Since the end of the recess we have been primarily occupied with routine appropriation bills which, though they have been controversial with respect to some details, have not presented any issues of great current interest.

Since we recessed on April 18 widespread interest has been evinced in the action of the House on price-control legislation and every Member of Congress has had a heavy mail about it. In view of the importance of the subject and the widespread interest in it, I shall discuss the matter at considerable length this evening. I think it most important that people should see the OPA in a proper perspective, should know what it is, why it is, what can reasonably be expected of it, and what cannot be expected of it.

Like every other institution, the OPA can be judged only in the light of its history and the circumstances which brought it into being. It was brought into being by the war and only by the war. The theory was that because the war diminished or suspended all production of ordinary consumer goods and superseded this production with war goods, the Government should protect the consumer against the artificial war-torn scarcities. It should prevent profiteering of all kinds and hold down the cost of living. Probably nobody would question the propriety of these objectives in time of war and the OPA during the war achieved a fair success in meeting them.

In order to have a successful price-control program there must also be some control of wages, because labor is an important element in the cost of production of any commodity. During the war wages were subject to the control of the War Labor Board, which adopted a sort of rule of thumb known as the Little Steel Formula that wage increases were permissible up to but not in excess of 15 percent. When the war came to an end it became necessary to change, or reconvert, to use the more pretentious word, from production of munitions and other wartime goods to the production of ordinary peacetime goods. The more rapidly this reconversion takes place the better pleased everyone will be.

Reconversion is hastened by an adequate labor supply and slowed down by an inadequate labor supply. Shortly after the victory over Japan, at the beginning of September, the administration relaxed its controls over wages. The President in a speech as early as October 30 made a public statement to the effect that wages could be raised without any increase in prices. Since that time in most industries, wages have been increased from 15 to 20 percent and Congress has legislated corresponding increases in the wages of Federal employees.

Whether or not it was necessary for the Government to relax the control of wages is arguable. Many people think that this relaxation was inevitable; others that it was unnecessary and unwise. However, wage controls were relaxed and this step had the inevitable effect of increasing costs of production. The relaxation of wage controls was followed, as everybody knows, by a Nation-wide epidemic of strikes. These strikes have delayed or prevented civilian production which was otherwise quite possible. Also it should be recognized that our facilities for peacetime production are greatly increased over what they were before the war.

The word inflation is often used and in many senses. It may be defined in various ways, but in its commonest use it probably means little more than the prevalence of high prices. Various conditions produce high prices. If goods are scarce and money plentiful, prices will rise. Even if goods are plentiful, prices are likely to rise when there is a large amount of currency in circulation. Under a gold standard, prices rise when there are large discoveries of gold. This happened after the '49 gold rush in California. The ruinous inflations in Europe have occurred in defeated countries, often under famine conditions and when confidence in the Government and currency disappeared. Under those conditions people preferred a

bottle of milk to a piece of paper worth technically a billion marks. We could, of course, have just such ruinous inflation in this country, but it would come only when all confidence in Government had vanished. Such currency inflation is almost inevitably accompanied by revolution or by an overturn in government. The stability of our Government and our great hoard of gold make such an inflation here unlikely.

The causes operating to produce higher prices in this country are basic causes. We have not balanced the National Budget since 1929. The Government ran behind or engaged in what is called "deficit financing" from 1929 through 1941. After Pearl Harbor the rate of deficit financing stepped up, so that in the war years we never paid so much as 50 percent of the going expenses of the Government. We now have a national debt of something like $275,000,000,000.

This deficit is represented by Government bonds—money that the Government owes the people. The majority of these Government bonds are held by banks and are the basis of an expanding credit. They are actually a sort of interest-bearing currency.

Before the war there was $7,000,000,000 in people's pockets and cash drawers. Today there are 26 billion. Before the war there was $27,000,000,000 in checking accounts. Today there are 69 billion.

This great supply of currency and the existent scarcity of many goods the people want create the dangers of inflation.

I cannot too strongly emphasize the fact that there is nothing which the Office of Price Administration or any price control organization can do about these fundamental causes of inflation arising from an excess of currency and credit. All that the Office of Price Administration can possibly do is to say to a grocer or a restaurant keeper, "If you charge more than such and such a price for such and such an article of food we will put you in jail." And, of course, it can say the same thing to the man who makes textiles, automobiles, washing machines, houses, or anything else, but the long experience of history shows that the basic causes of high prices which inhere in the supply of currency and in the demand for goods triumph in the long run over the man or men expected by the Government to control prices.

All price-control schemes in time of peace have broken down. There are quite full and authentic records of price-control measures going back to Babylon in the twenty-third century B. C. The Roman emperors unsuccessfully attempted price control. There was a particularly famous experience with it in France in the time of the French Revolution 150 years ago. When people desire a commodity enough they will find ways to get it despite government authority.

The United States saw a good example of this in the days of constitutional prohibition. People who wanted to drink liquor were able by hook or by crook to get it; people who wanted to sell it were able by hook or by crook to manufacture it or purchase it for resale. The black marketeer in liquor was called a bootlegger. But the corruption which surrounded the enforcement of prohibition is already too evident in this country, particularly in industries like the meat industry where the big packers who respect price ceilings are unable to buy cattle on the hoof or buy only a tenth or less of what they have usually bought.

All these considerations were in the minds of House Members in voting on price control on April 17. They thought the greatest antidote to high prices was more goods—more production. The House adopted five important amendments to the extension legislation.

The first made the expiration date of price control March 31, 1947, instead of June 30, 1947. I think this a sensible amendment, because it simply requires that price control be further scrutinized in the first months of the new Congress which convenes next January. If it needs to be extended next March it can readily be extended.

The second amendment required that prices established should reflect to the producers, processors, distributors, and retailers current costs of producing, processing, and distributing plus a reasonable profit. This amendment has been the subject of much criticism by Mr. Bowles, Mr. Porter, and others. But unless private industry can operate at a profit, it will cease to exist. The question arises whether the function of the OPA is to prevent unrighteous profiteering or to create social and economic revolution by undermining private industry. The OPA has been accused of attempting exactly this latter. Many people in the OPA have in fact been unsympathetic with private industry and traditional American economic organization. But the responsible heads of OPA have always denied any revolutionary intent.

The third important amendment supplies a formula for removing price control by requiring the President, an Industry Committee, or the Secretary of Agriculture, to determine at least once each month whether production is normal as compared with a base year, July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941. When it is, normal controls are to be removed.

A fourth amendment provides for progressive reductions of subsidy payments beginning not later than the 1st of next October. The amendment directs a 25 percent reduction in subsidy not later than 45 days after the effective date of the act and a similar reduction at the end of each 45 days thereafter. In this way we get rid of the consumer subsidies.

Let me say a few words about these consumer subsidies because I think that they are a grave abuse of which this country must rid itself. Few people realize that the United States Government is now paying with borrowed money the grocery bills of its citizens at the rate of nearly $2,000,000,000 a year. Seven hundred and fifteen million dollars go for meat, $260,000,000 for flour, $80,000,000 or so for coffee (not an indispensable item in anybody's diet), $515,000,000 for the dairy production program, $160,000,000 for the 1946 crop program and $50,000,000 for other crop programs.

I dare say that all of us would like to have the Government help meet our grocery bills, but, if we do that, we are going to have to pay out in taxes what we would otherwise pay out in grocery bills. I dare say that all of us would like to buy everything we buy at a price below the cost of production, yet if we do, either the producer goes out of business—which must not happen—or the Government, which, of course, means us citizens, pays the difference. Those of us who believe in the doctrine of individual responsibility believe that all citizens from the highest to the lowest should pay for what they consume. It is only when there are unfortunate people who, without any fault of their own, cannot buy their own food that the Government must step in, and the more fortunate and competent people must carry the burden to the less fortunate and competent. Consumer subsidies are highly inflationary in character because, as I have explained, they add to Government debt and consequently to the volume of currency in circulation.

The fifth and last important amendment exempted manufacturers of automobiles and similar industries which were out of production during the war from absorbing the increased price of their production. This overlaps the second amendment on profits generally.

Another amendment on livestock subsidies overlaps the more general subsidy amendment.

No less than 22 amendments were rejected by the House and many other amendments proposed were not even voted on.

There has been a great deal of extravagant and irresponsible writing about the effect of the amendments. It has been said that they "emasculate" price control, "sabotage" price control, "murder" price control and so on. This writing has had the effect of arousing fears which are in my opinion quite unjustifiable.

The amendments had two main purposes. First to stimulate production by assuring the ordinary profit incentives to the producers, and second to taper off price control gradually as goods came into better supply. If they produce this effect they will make price control workable until we can get the production which will make it unnecessary.

The abolition of consumer subsidies will make food bills slightly but probably not very much higher, and other things being equal, tend to make tax bills substantially lower. Most people would rather pay more for butter and get it than to hold the price down and never see it. The same applies to hardwood floors, children's clothing and other things useful if not edible.

We shall still have the law of supply and demand. If prices advance unreasonably people will not buy. A recent survey shows that 25 percent of 58 basic food items can now be bought at less than ceiling prices. Basic food items on which ceiling prices have been removed have not risen. On such common things as potatoes, cabbage, beets, and canned citrus juices now freed from price control, prices are lower than they were a year ago when price ceilings were in effect.

Nothing in the bill affects rent control.

Generally I subscribe to the statements made in a New York Times editorial of April 19, as follows:

"Price control is at best a secondary and transitional weapon against inflation. It has in many cases already outlived its usefulness. It deals with the symptoms and consequences of inflation, not with its causes.

"Those who have been in direct control of OPA have failed to recognize this fact. They have talked and acted as if price control were the central or sole method of combating inflation. They have failed to recognize its obvious effects in intensifying or prolonging shortages. They have failed to see any danger to a free economy in placing the fate of every industry and firm at the mercy of administrative decision.

"They failed utterly to acknowledge that the whole problem they had to solve changed completely last August, when Japan capitulated."

I repeat that I think this estimate of the situation a fair one. My recent mail indicates that this is the sober second thought of large numbers of our people.

Presentation of Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws to Chief Justice Stone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. TORRENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. TORRENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD, I include a communication from Yeshiva University, located in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, enclosing the presentation of an honorary degree of doctor of laws to Chief Justice Stone:

PRESENTATION OF CHIEF JUSTICE STONE FOR THE HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS

The presentation will be made by Prof. Joseph H. Lookstein.

Mr. President, at this holy coronation, and in the midst of this learned and distinguished company, we, of Yeshiva College, are honored by the presence of the Chief Justice of the United States.

Harlan Fiske Stone is a high priest in the temple of justice who wears over his great heart the breastplate of judgment upon which are inscribed the character and destiny of American democracy. Enshrined in the hearts of his countrymen as the symbol of the living law, he is revered as the blessed possessor of the divine gift awarded to Solomon of old, "a wise and understanding heart." Master of legal knowledge, beloved teacher of a generation of students who have themselves attained distinction at the bar, guiding pilot of a great law school at a great university, eminent servant of the state, his varied career was dedicated to the championship of the great ideal "that the supreme law is the law that there shall be law."

In days of shifting standards and moral confusion, America is sustained by the knowledge that a profound intellect, a matchless philosopher of the law and a prophet with social vision, is steering the course of justice in our land, safely and steadily through the shoals of doubt and perplexity. The American tradition and democratic heritage are indeed secure when presiding in the sanctuary of justice is one who conceives the law as a sacrament, its interpretation as a ritual, its origin the creative genius of man, and its inspiration the moral law of God.

Hail, then, to a stalwart son of true democracy who incorporates the threefold prophetic ideal of doing justice, loving mercy, and walking humbly before God. For, transcending the greatness of the scholar and the sagacity of the judge is the touching and impressive humility of the man.

Borrowing a phrase associated with an immortal colleague of our honored guest, may I say, Mr. President, that a giant from Olympus has come to Sinai. I have the honor, sir, to present the Chief Justice of the United States for the degree of doctor of laws, honoris causa.

CITATION OF HARLAN FISKE STONE, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES, BY PRESIDENT SAMUEL BELKIN, IN CONFERRING THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS, ON THE OCCASION OF HIS INAUGURATION AS PRESIDENT OF THE RABBI ISAAC ELCHANAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AND YESHIVA COLLEGE ON TUESDAY, MAY 23, 1944

Harlan Fiske Stone, distinguished scholar, eminent educator, and able administrator; pride and glory of the bar and bench and supreme master of the domain of jurisprudence; chief exponent of our great American democracy; and leading interpreter of the laws of conduct; defender of human rights and champion of freedom of conscience; man of moral integrity and true humility; possessor of an understanding heart and inner spiritual dignity; philosopher and philanthropist in the true Greek sense as lover of wisdom and lover of mankind; the Yeshiva and Yeshiva College, dedicated to the advancement of scholarship and spiritual values, takes pleasure in bestowing upon you the highest honor within its power, the degree of doctor of laws, honoris causa.

In token thereof, I cause to be placed over your shoulders the visible symbol of our high regard for you and I hand you this diploma.

REMARKS OF CHIEF JUSTICE STONE ON RECEIVING AN HONORARY DEGREE FROM YESHIVA COLLEGE, MAY 23, 1944

President Belkin and friends of Yeshiva College, truly, as has been said this afternoon, these are times of shifting standards and moral confusion. That this is true is due, more than all else, to the fact that mankind, despite its long and painful struggle up from barbarism, is not yet ready to accept in its fullness the ultimate truth that there can be no civilized society, there can be no peace or happiness among men, without freedom of the spirit and of the mind for all men—and I may say also, unless we preserve intact the capacity for righteous indignation at every form of cruelty and injustice, and the urge to give vigorous expression to it.

In all humility I accept from your hands the great honor which this seat of an ancient culture and this true exponent of spiritual values in the world of today has conferred upon me. I accept it, as not in any sense a personal compliment, which would be little merited, but as recognition of a spiritual faith and of aspirations which I should like to think I share in common with this college.

The college degree is a symbol—and man lives by symbols. It is the symbol of learning and our respect for learning. But above and beyond that it is the symbol of our hope and faith in man's never-ending search for truth. For it is the truth alone which can make us free.

Freedom of the mind and the spirit has its practical aspects in everyday life. It includes the right of every man to live and work in peace, to earn, to save, and to enjoy the fruits of his labor, so long as their enjoyment does no harm to his neighbor. It embraces the freedom of all men to seek the truth wherever it may lead, to think and speak freely, and to worship God according to the dictates of conscience.

When the epic struggle now going on has been brought to its inevitable end, and the forces of evil have gone down as they must to irretrievable defeat, I look forward with you to a new and better world in which peace and justice shall prevail. But I do not delude myself that they will prevail unless, with our capacity and opportunity for leadership, we seek righteousness and justice for all and set our faces against cruelty and injustice to any.

I share in your hopes that all this may come in fuller measure than ever before. I am confident that it will come, for, after all, man is an intelligent being. He cannot fail to recognize that freedom of the spirit and the mind, with all that it implies, is the ultimate goal of the race, and the only sure guaranty of its peace and happiness. If I were to bring to you any single message, or offer any one admonition to my countrymen, it would be: let us resolve to join hands with all men of goodwill, to achieve that goal and thereby give to a war-torn world its rightful heritage, to the end that justice may triumph over injustice; that man may know the true from the false; and that we may see light rather than darkness.

Our Responsibility in Feeding the Hungry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, anyone who listened to the report submitted by Herbert Hoover over the radio recently will realize and fully understand that the need for food for the starving in Europe and Asia is a grim necessity.

Too many of our citizens have refused to take this crisis seriously. They have resented further Government interference in the matters of allocating food and have had a suspicion that politics was behind the scenes.

Whether or not their suspicions are well-grounded is more or less not at issue at the moment. It is more important that we concentrate on the saving of as many lives as possible in the famine areas. Our success in providing needed food may have a great bearing on the shape of things to come in Europe and Asia.

Our generosity at this time cannot be interpreted by the cynical as another instance of Uncle Sam being played the "sucker."

Recently I listened to an excellent address given by Mr. H. J. Heinz II, president of the H. J. Heinz Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa. He spoke on America's Town Meeting on March 7 on the subject What Must We Do To Help Feed Europe? I am placing his address in the RECORD because of its timeliness. It follows:

With Senator PEPPER's appeal that we must feed Europe, I agree. That it is easy, I disagree. Senator PEPPER certainly does not tell how it can be done. But before suggesting any solutions, I wish to make my own position clear: I speak tonight as an individual, not as a spokesman for the food industry. No one man can speak for the country's largest industry. I sincerely believe—in light of my recent trip to England, Belgium, and Holland—that the United States must act with the speed of a man coming to the aid of a drowning friend. We have just won the first battle of Europe. We are fighting the second, and the enemy is famine.

Now for my suggestions: The President should tell what food is needed, how much, and where. He should make a monthly report on progress made in meeting these requirements. Among the Government's 3,000,000 employees, somebody should have had time to get some right answers.

The President should explain the reasons why we must help feed Europe. The reasons are three:

First. The American tradition of common decency and human kindness demand that we help feed Europe. It is this tradition that has given us one of our greatest assets, a reservoir of goodwill throughout the world.

Second. Our future international trade demands a healthy and productive Europe which only a well-fed and energetic people can create. I thoroughly agree with Secretary Wallace's recent statement that we are part of an "indivisible world economy."

Third. The entire world's future peace and stability demand that we share our food. In the words of Lord Halifax, "Hunger and discontent are a poor foundation for the peaceful and prosperous world we are trying to build." Hunger provokes despair. Despair provokes hate, especially against those who fail to live up to their promises. Hate makes war. In no better way can America's moral, spiritual, and material might be used than to restore peace of mind to a despairing world. It is time to display the strength of democracy in peace.

Explain these three reasons why we should help feed Europe, and Americans will pitch in. They do not have to be led around by the nose, treated as children, or shamed into helping.

The Emergency Famine Committee should determine and announce immediately voluntary conservation steps which the public can take—meatless days, breadless meals, fat conservation, food substitutions, etc. One thing sure, we must eliminate waste. In New York City in 1945 there was 31 percent more food thrown away as garbage than in 1931.

Then let the committee mobilize all means of influencing public opinion. The churches might institute a famine relief service. The food editors of the press did a magnificent job during the war of showing people how to save. They can and will do it again.

The Government should constantly consult with the ablest men in those divisions of the food and other industries which are directly

affected by the European feeding program. These men will be able to help if their advice is heeded. Some of them have already proposed a uniform limitation on the use of wheat for flour and cereals. Their proposal would save far more than the 25,000,000 bushels to be gained from dark bread.

A basic reason for the wheat shortage is the large amount being used for animal feed—three to four hundred percent more than prewar. Let the Government reexamine the present controlled relationship between wheat and meat prices.

It is most important that our relief program bring about the restoration of European agriculture. We should send all we can of seed, fertilizer, farm machinery, locomotives, railroad cars, and trucks. One good crop year will make Europe generally self-sufficient.

Our Government should make every effort to get other food surplus areas back into production. We are still shipping sugar to the Philippines, normally a large exporter.

Let the administration decide on an industrial policy which promotes maximum industrial production instead of strife. This will have two effects. It will help the American as well as the European farmer to get much needed agricultural equipment. It will encourage the American farmer to produce more by assuring him a steady and large domestic market.

My final suggestion concerns the children of Europe. In the name of all that this country stands for, let's provide food for those children. In some parts of Europe, infant mortality is running as high as 50 percent. If necessary, give the food outright. Let's not haggle about methods when children's lives hang in the balance.

Civilian Production Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include, by request, the following statement received from a constituent:

AFFIDAVIT OF MAURICE A. NEGRINI

I, Maurice A. Negrini, being of sound mind, do solemnly swear under oath that the herein-contained facts are true:

I live at 27 Beloit Road, Dedham, Mass. I am 23 years of age and unmarried.

I was, on February 18, 1946, discharged from the Army of the United States after serving honorably and actively for 3 years and 3 months, 2 years of which were with the One Hundred and Second Infantry Division, and 1 year 3 months with the Regional Hospital, Camp Swift, Tex.

Prior to entering the service I was a business partner of my father, who owned a cafe dealing in food and liquor. It was named the Manor Cafe and was located at 427 Sprague Street, Dedham, Mass. The yearly gross receipts were $40,000 to $50,000.

When I and two eligible brothers named Irving and Vincent were called to service, my father, Vincent Negrini, Sr., same address, was compelled to sell the business, because he was unable to handle such a business alone, owing to poor health and inadequate education.

Before I entered the Army I was not of the legally required age to deal in liquor, but had I remained out of the service I could have aided my father in an advisory capacity as well as by handling the victualer's end of the business as I had been doing all along. I had been working beside my father with the mutual understanding that when I became of age he would turn the business, in its entirety, over to me.

While I was in the service my father sold the business named above, the Manor Cafe. Upon receiving the news of my pending discharge my father, in order to substitute for our previously mentioned agreement, purchased a license to deal in food and liquor and to let rooms from one Mr. Paul Fryer, of East Street, Dedham, Mass.

The name of the corporation to whom this license had been issued is Ye Talley Ho Inn, which had its place of business at 4 Orchard Street, Dedham, Mass.

In keeping with the provisions of the original charter, the corporation now has three directors. My father, my first cousin Walter J. Cerri, 49 Curve Street, Dedham, also a veteran of World War I, Army of United States, and myself. Holding all shares and offices are my father and myself.

When my father purchased the shares of this corporation it was with the understanding that the present owners of the building, located at 4 Orchard Street, would not let the building for our purposes beyond the date of the transfer of stock. In consideration of this, my father and I undertook to look for and obtain a suitable piece of land on which to build a suitable building.

I made an agreement with Mr. Lee, of Dedham, to purchase his land located on United States Route No. 1, Providence Turnpike, so-called, Dedham, Mass., for a price of $6,250, and I paid a $300 retainer deposit, the balance to be paid April 28, 1946.

On March 14, 1946, I made application to the selectmen of the town of Dedham for permission to transfer the address of the aforestated license, from 4 Orchard Street to route No. 1. Action and decision on such application is pending the Government's permission to construct a building. Such permission being required by Civilian Production Administration.

I have been assured by a constructor and supplier that the necessary lumber and materials are at my disposal.

After my father purchased the stock of the corporation, after I made a deposit on a piece of land, and after I had contacted a builder, and lumber and building-material dealer, the Government passed the legislation prohibiting the construction of nonessential, nondwelling houses.

I submitted application under CPA regulations to construct a 60- by 45-foot story and a half building and the request was denied.

Through this denial and consequent delay, it is foreseeable that I shall lose a sum of at least $18,000 without considering the loss of profits in years to come, should I lose this privilege to go into business.

At present we have no means of income and not only myself but my family are depending on this business to provide a living.

I am very disappointed to learn that the Government, after taking three and a half the loss of our livelihood, now has passed legislation prohibiting me to readjust myself back again so I will not suffer by my absence. The Government has passed legislation providing housing, jobs, loans, and education for veterans. And the GI bill of rights provides assistance in getting veterans into business and I do not think it fair to us veterans who want help in another capacity, other than housing, to be thrown out and refused what we had or would have had by not entering the service.

I realize that legislation has been passed and that what has been done cannot be undone and it would be absurd to ask the legislation to be revoked, but I am asking some consideration and help by permitting me to help myself and my family, which I do not think is too absurd to ask of some decent and understanding people. Is this my answer for trying to serve my country?

MAURICE A. NEGRINI.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
Norfolk, ss:

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of April 1946.

[SEAL] AUGUSTUS P. VITALI,
Notary Public.

My commission expires October 9, 1947.

We Must Plan Beyond Tomorrow To Have Food This Coming Winter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, unless we take a long-time view of the food-production situation, particularly in the northeastern section of the country, our cities may have to face an unprecedented crisis this coming winter.

This is the reasoned view of a New Jersey agriculturist and economist who knows whereof he speaks. William H. Allen, secretary of the New Jersey State Department of Agriculture, makes his point in the enclosed letter which I am calling to the attention of our Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Anderson, as well as my colleagues of the House:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Trenton, May 14, 1946.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANFIELD: I appreciate, as well as the commissioner of agriculture of the Northeast, I am sure, your taking the interest in the feed situation here in the Northeast to the extent that you have, and particularly by having inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my letter and the statement of the commissioners on the situation.

So far, New Jersey has had sufficient feed to make it unnecessary for flocks and dairy herds to be sacrificed for the lack of feed. However, we continue to be concerned as to just how much longer the situation will be as it is and also when it will be necessary for severe liquidation of flocks to accommodate the shortage of feed reaching this area. No one can give an answer to this question and I imagine that it will have to remain unanswered.

The shortage of feed, as I see it, plus the tendency each week for black-market operators to offer unusually attractive prices for poultry meat are apt to cause a heavy reduction in livestock and poultry numbers in the Northeast during the months ahead. If that should prove true, then this fall and winter I would expect very severe shortage of both dairy and poultry products in our consuming areas. All these factors of discouragement of production are very apt to result this fall and winter in acute food shortages in our cities, which apparently no one has taken the time and thought to discuss or to prevent. The administration in Washington tends to take a very short view on these matters when the long-time view is so necessary to obtain the production of food.

Yours very truly,

W. H. ALLEN.

Putting Surplus Property to Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we hear much of the sale of war surpluses. Lt. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory informs me that so far the War Assets Administration has disposed of over $2,000,000,000 worth of surplus goods. For the greater part of it, WAA has found a ready market. There has not been, in fact, enough to meet civilian demands or needs. Textiles, automotive equipment, clothing, are in such short supply that practically every WAA sale has been oversold to a staggering extent.

But there is a second and large class of surplus goods for which there is no such ready market. These goods, gas masks, ammunition carriers, helmets, and so forth, were made for war. On the surface they appear to have no civilian value. It is relatively simple to turn an Army truck into a civilian vehicle, but the civilian conversion of protective ointment designed for attacks by mustard gas is another matter.

Such items could be listed as scrap and destroyed with only the taxpayers the losers. In other days and in other wars this would have been the answer.

This time, however, General Gregory proposes to salvage as many of these items as possible. He proposes to save the taxpayers a part, at least, of the original cost of these items. Every million saved lightens by just so much the price America must pay for the victory she has won.

Take the protective ointment, for example. Some 29,000,000 tubes of this ointment, originally costing well over $5,000,000, has been declared surplus. It came in metal tubes almost 100 percent lead. The ointment had a grim and real use in the war. The reason for that use no longer exists. Now WAA is making arrangements to recover the metal in the tubes. It will mean a saving of approximately 1,000 tons of this vitally needed metal.

The WAA is devoting thought and energy to scores of these hard-to-sell surplus items. There are literally dozens of them. In WAA they are termed residual products and special attention is being given to their merchandising.

In some cases, residual items are easily recognizable as such. The fact that some property has no apparent civilian use is obvious. This property is there tagged for study immediately upon declaration. Others are first offered for sale through the regular channels. After 60 days and if no sales have been made WAA turns them over to the research division for study. It all depends upon the items.

The Research Division is called in only as a last resort. Obviously, time and effort are both saved if a prime use can be found. Every effort is made to find such a use. It is only when that use has not materialized, after a given period, that the Research Division is given its chance. Gas masks, for example. Many of the masks were sold to be used as such. Fire departments all over the country were glad to get them. The market, however, was limited and millions of gas masks have been declared surplus. The Research Division of WAA was asked to find a use for them. A number of magazine articles have told how these masks were taken apart and used. One enterprising jobber removed the lenses and converted them into children's goggles. The connecting tube from the face piece to the canister was cut into small pieces to make bicycle grips. The canisters themselves were converted into food containers, flower pots, and small garbage cans. The remaining face pieces were sold as false faces. Finally the head harnesses were converted into garters and baby carriage straps.

A second manufacturer converted the canisters into ice-box deodorizers which are selling by the thousands. They have a real and very practical use and housewives have been delighted to get them.

Another story, equally well publicized but worth repeating, is the sale of the surplus red and blue food tokens. OPA had specifically instructed WAA that the tokens could not be used in their original state. They are the exact size for slot machines and OPA foresaw a possible use outside the law. They were too hard to grind into pulp and could not be used for fuel since they left a deposit on boiler tubes. It appeared that the only answer was to destroy them. There were 255 tons of new and unused blue tokens alone scattered in warehouses throughout the country. They were occupying needed warehouse space.

WAA took over the assignment. A manufacturer of plastic novelties was found who offered a fair price. He took the entire lot and planned to convert them into token trays and doilies. The plastic was not available, however, so he is negotiating to sell them abroad as food tokens, their original purpose.

Other items, already sold, include: Remnants of webbing in fly swatters, field alcohol burner sets into candle holders, barometer cases into shoulder purses and fishermen's kits, unused mortuary tables into work tables and benches, mosquito rods into towel racks, bread pans into rustproof parts pans in auto repair shops, leather saber knots into umbrella straps, and so forth.

No item is overlooked. WAA, for example, received 1,500 doors made of a thin plastic sheet perforated for ventilation and used by the Signal Corps in pigeon carriers. These doors are being cut into triangles for drafting sets and there will be only a small piece three-fourths of an inch in length that must go into the scrap heap.

Another project on which the Division is now working is the conversion of steel field helmets. With the top removed and a bracket added the helmets make ideal reflectors for indirect lighting. An engineer in WAA got the idea from a reflector actually in use in the building housing the WAA. He noted the reflector in passing and thought it was a duplicate of the helmet, there on his desk minus the top and with the addition of the bracket. It was an exact duplicate even to the color. There will be millions of these helmets declared surplus before the year is out. Practically every one of them will be used.

The Division was helmet-conscious because it had already successfully handled the ordinary OCD helmets with which all air-raid wardens had been equipped during the war. A number of these helmets were sold to be used as helmets but the market was exhausted early. Those remaining presented a problem at first. However, it was found that with the chin strap and harness removed a helmet made an excellent bird bath or ice bucket. The center of gravity was found to be so low that the receptacle did not easily tip over. Thousands were sold for this purpose.

Another item that had to be dismantled was the field range water heater. These came without the stove or galvanized bucket. As turned over to WAA the stoves consisted merely of a box, 10 by 20 by 23 inches, a metal cylinder 20 inches high and 21 inches in diameter and a folding stand.

There is a round hole in the box where the cylinder was inserted. The stand was attached to the box and had legs on only one side. It looked like a scrap item.

The hole in the boxes, however, is being fitted with a mirror. Enameled, the box with the mirror makes an ideal and attractive clothes hamper or a place to keep valuables. A wire mesh screen is being attached to the bottom of the cylinder. It will be used as a refuse burner. The little folding stand is acquiring another pair of legs. It will be used as an outdoor hot-dog toaster or, merely, as a folding stool. The material in this item was excellent. All three articles produced will stand up under hard wear. They will be useful in a civilian sense. The taxpayers will be spared the cost of scrapping some 12,000 of the original items. General Gregory's organization is, indeed, resourceful.

Few of the residual items had a value, even when new, that sounds impressive when compared to the millions invested in other war goods. The total, however, is impressive. WAA proposes, whenever possible, to keep the number of items or parts of items actually scrapped to a minimum. Its one purpose is to reduce the loss to the taxpayers to the lowest possible point.

Monetary Policy

REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I hope the proposal that is brewing in the other body now to raise the statutory price at which the Treasury purchases

silver will never come to the House. If it does, it ought to be defeated. Silver ought to find its price in world market and not be made by Government edict.

Below is a statement from members of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy in which they indicate their opposition to the pending silver proposal. The names of the members of this committee making the statement are included.

ECONOMISTS' NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON MONETARY POLICY,
New York, N. Y.

SIXTY-SIX MEMBERS URGE CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT TO REJECT THE SILVER-BLOC PROPOSALS AND TO PERMIT FREE-MARKET DETERMINATION OF THE PRICES OF SILVER

We, the undersigned members of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, urge Congress to reject the proposed legislation designed to increase the price at which silver is to be bought and sold by the United States Treasury.

The only price at which the Treasury should purchase silver is that determined in competitive world markets.

There is no valid reason for subsidizing silver producers in this and other countries. Silver is chiefly a byproduct in the mining of copper, lead, zinc, and gold; and this fact makes any subsidization of silver producers doubly inexcusable.

There is no more validity in the argument of the silver bloc that silver should be bought and sold at its nominal monetary valuation of $1.29 per fine ounce, or at any price above the open, competitive market price, than there would be in an argument that the paper used to make paper currency should be bought and sold in the market at the nominal monetary value of the piece of currency manufactured from this paper.

The proposed silver legislation is solely an attempt on the part of an aggressive pro-silver bloc to persuade Congress to levy on the taxpayers, manufacturers, and other users of silver for the purpose of giving an indefensible subsidy to silver producers, domestic and foreign.

Congress and the people of this country might do well to remind themselves that it was this same pro-silver bloc that revealed that it was not only willing but determined, even in time of war, to protect its subsidy regardless of any adverse effects on the general welfare; that it was this bloc that forced the Treasury to withhold much-needed silver from war industries for many months after we entered the war; that because of the obstructions of this bloc, the best that Secretary Morgenthau could do for most of 1942 was to lend Treasury silver to war industries for nonconsumptive purposes; that it was not until the Green silver bill was passed on July 12, 1943—19 months after we entered the war—that the Treasury could sell its free silver to war (and civilian) industries for consumptive purposes; and that even then the silver bloc was able to force Congress to provide that no Treasury silver should be sold for less than 71.11 cents per fine ounce, thus protecting the subsidy which the silver bloc had obtained for itself by passage of the domestic silver purchase law of July 6, 1939. (The Treasury could have sold its free silver without loss to the war industries in 1942 at 50 cents per ounce.)

The silver situation and the attitude of this silver bloc, from the time we entered the war down to August 1942, were described by an editorial writer in the New York Times of August 4, 1942, as follows: "So we arrive at a situation in which the same Government that urges a patriotic public not to hoard sugar, not to hoard rubber, not to hoard gasoline, not to hoard useful goods of any kind, itself hoards a metal which is needed for planes and shells and tanks and ships. It is a fantastic situation. It could exist only in a bloc-dominated capital." Another editorial writer—in the New York Herald Tribune, on the same date—called silver the slacker metal. Henry Wriston, president of Brown University, described the situation in these words in his Challenge to Freedom (1943, p. 173): "It took 2 days of hearings for Congress to prepare a bill to draft 18-year-old boys. It required many days of hearings to prepare (and months to pass) feeble bills looking to the modification of the silver program so as to draft that metal for national service. It appeared that this generation regarded its sons as expendable but not its silver."

The attitude of the silver bloc in respect to the public welfare, where silver is involved, appears to be no better today than it was during the late war, especially in 1942.

It is the duty of Congress and the President to see to it that the general welfare, rather than the desires of the silver bloc, is served when silver legislation is undertaken.

Should Congress pass the proposed legislation before this protest by monetary economists can be made public, or despite this protest, then we urge the President to veto the bill.

Eugene E. Agger, Rutgers University; Benjamin M. Anderson, University of California at Los Angeles; Charles C. Arbuthnot, Western Reserve University; Leonard P. Ayres, The Cleveland Trust Co.; James Washington Bell, Northwestern University; Ernest L. Bogart, New York University; Frederick A. Bradford, Lehigh University; J. Ray Cable, Missouri Valley College; Wilbur P. Calhoun, University of Cincinnati; Neil Carothers, Lehigh University; Edward H. Collins, New York Herald Tribune; Garfield V. Cox, the University of Chicago; William W. Cumberland, Ladenburg, Thalmann & Co., New York City; Rev. B. W. Dempsey, S. J., St. Louis University; Charles A. Dice, the Ohio State University; William E. Dunkman, White Plains, N. Y.; D. W. Ellsworth, E. W. Axe & Co., Inc., Tarrytown, N. Y.; Willam D. Ennis, Stevens Institute of Technology; Fred R. Fairchild, Yale University; Charles C. Fichtner, Wales-Strippit Corp., North Tonawanda, N. Y.; Clyde Olin Fisher, Wesleyan University; J. Anderson Fitzgerald, the University of Texas; Major B. Foster, Alexander Hamilton Institute and New York University; Herbert F. Fraser, Swarthmore College; Roy L. Garis, Vanderbilt University; Arthur D. Gayer, Queens College; Harry D. Gideonse, Brooklyn College; Lewis H. Haney, New York University; E. C. Harwood, American Institute for Economic Research; Hudson B. Hastings, Yale University; Frederick C. Hicks, University of Cincinnati; John Thom Holdsworth, the University of Miami; Montfort Jones, the University of Pittsburgh; Donald L. Kemmerer, University of Illinois; William H. Kiekhofer, University of Wisconsin; William H. Kniffin, Bank of Rockville Centre Trust Co., Long Island, N. Y.; Frederic E. Lee, University of Illinois; J. L. Leonard, University of Southern California; Philipp H. Lohman, University of Vermont; James D. Magee, New York University; A. Wilfred May, the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, New York City; Roy W. McDonald, Donovan, Leisure, Newton & Lumbard, New York City; Mark C. Mills, Indiana University; Margaret G. Myers, Vassar College; Melchior Palyi, Chicago, Ill.; Frank Parker, University of Pennsylvania; Clyde W. Phelps, University of Chattanooga; Charles L. Prather, Syracuse University; Howard H. Preston, University of Washington; Leland Rex Robinson, 2 West 45th Street, New York City; R. G. Rodkey, University of Michigan; Olin Glenn Saxon, Yale University; Joseph A. Schumpeter, Harvard University; Carlton A. Shively, the New York Sun; James G. Smith, Princeton University; Walter E. Spahr, New York University; William H. Steiner, Brooklyn College; Charles S. Tippetts, Mercersburg Academy; Alvin S. Tostlebe, College of Wooster; James B. Trant, Louisiana State University; Rufus S. Tucker, Westfield, N. J.; Russell Weisman, Western Reserve University; William O. Weyforth, Johns Hopkins University; Edward Wiest, University of Kentucky; Max Winkler, College of the City of New York; Ivan Wright, Brooklyn College.

Clyde Doyle, Representative in Congress, Eighteenth District of California, Reports to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, when I was home a few days during the Christmas recess of Congress, I accepted no invitations nor did I ask opportunity to make any "political speeches." I did accept opportunity to speak at the Municipal Auditorium in Long Beach by way of making a "report" to my constituents. In order that it might be clear that it was not a "political" speech, the honorable mayor of the city of Long Beach, Herbert E. Lewis, a registered Republican, was invited to and did introduce me as "Congressman," and the chairman of the meeting was a distinguished educator of the city. I neither mentioned that I was a candidate for reelection nor asked support for reelection. About a thousand citizens of both major political parties were present. My remarks were purely by way of "report," and designed to give a factual statement. This report was received so cordially by those present, regardless of party affiliation, that I have now continued the facts and figures more nearly down-to-date, and intend to send the same to voters in the Eighteenth Congressional District of California, which I have the honor to represent in this Congress. You will observe that I neither attempt to argue, explain, nor reason the whys and wherefores of my votes or conduct as Representative. I merely state the facts for the information of the voters of the district.

Believing, as I do, that the proper place for a Congressman to be when the House is in legislative session is in Washington, D. C., instead of being in the congressional district campaigning

for reelection, I, therefore, make this factual report for the information of the people. Believing, as I do, that the destiny of our beloved Nation depends upon the participation of an informed electorate, I also believe that when the people are fully informed of the material facts they will act intelligently. Only an informed democracy can act intelligently, and only an intelligently acting democracy will endure.

To make it more convenient for the readers, I have indicated by subheadings the subject matter, indicating the work of a Representative in Congress as I have found it to be. Therefore, I take pleasure in addressing this report to the people.

To the Voters of the Eighteenth Congressional District, Los Angeles County, Calif.:

By way of report to you of my representation of you in the Seventy-ninth Congress, I respectfully state:

1. CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE, 144 HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Your congressional office has been open every weekday from not later than 8:30 a. m. until at least 5:30 p. m., excepting Saturday afternoons. It is staffed by four capable secretaries, working full time, and by one who works part time. Frequently extra secretarial help is employed. My wife works with me almost daily, and is not on the Government pay roll. The office work is departmentalized.

2. DAILY MAIL RECEIVED

The daily mail averages from 25 to 75 first-class letters; from 5 to 25 telegrams; from 25 to 50 second-class letters; from 10 to 25 papers and magazines, besides from 5 to 15 mimeographed or printed reports, circulars, and so forth. I personally read every first-class letter received and every letter received has been answered as promptly as time and secretarial help has enabled.

3. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

I serve as a member of the following committees, to wit: Rivers and Harbors, and the Subcommittee on Erosion thereof; Patents, Claims, Invalid Pensions; I have actively functioned as a member of all these committees. I arranged for the Beach Erosion Committee to make its headquarters in the Eighteenth Congressional District at Long Beach last summer on its Pacific coast trip. All claim bills reported by me have been unanimously approved by the House, and I have prepared and filed several private bills for constituents, which bills are pending.

4. PRESIDING AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

I presided as Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives on three occasions for a total of several hours.

5. DAILY DIARY ON FLOOR OF HOUSE KEPT

I have kept a daily diary and record of interesting, unusual House proceedings. Majority Leader MCCORMACK states that I am the only Member of Congress, in his experience, who has done so for so long a time. I have several hundred pages of original notes personally made by me.

6. APPEARANCE BEFORE OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

I have appeared or spoken before the following House committees, to wit: Ways and Means, Rules, Appropriations, Judiciary, Post Office and Roads, Labor Education, Military Affairs, Rivers and Harbors, Agriculture, and Flood Control. I have also appeared before the Senate Committees on Judiciary—re tidelands—and Appropriations.

7. AUTHORED AND FILED 12 BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

I have filed the following bills and resolutions:

H. R. 2941, filed April 18, 1945: To authorize the payment of the entire amount found due in the settlement of accounts of deceased members of the armed forces without the appointment of legal representative of the estate.

H. R. 4202, filed September 27, 1945: To meet the immediate emergency caused by the closing of the wartime child-care service.

H. R. 1894, filed January 31, 1945: To prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

H. R. 5012, filed December 17, 1945: To dispense with the requirement that a veteran be unable to pay hospital expenses, in non-service-connected cases, as a condition to hospitalization and domiciliary care in Veterans' Administration facilities, and for other purposes.

House Joint Resolution 122, filed March 13, 1945: To quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewater and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles.

H. R. 4517, filed October 29, 1945 (this bill was intended to supersede and take the place of H. R. 2941): To authorize the payment of the entire amount found due in the settlement of accounts of deceased personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, without the appointment of a legal representative of the estate.

H. R. 4931, filed December 10, 1945: To facilitate purchases of surplus property by veterans.

H. R. 5308, filed January 31, 1946: To impose a tax on Angora rabbit wool and yarn imported into the United States.

H. R. 4087, filed September 17, 1945: To amend title II of the act entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve," approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1175), in order to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing and equalizing retirement and retainer benefits for enlisted men of the Regular Navy, and thereby encouraging a higher type of young men to make the Regular Navy a career, and for other purposes.

H. Res. 575, submitted March 28, 1946: Resolved that there is created a select committee of the House of Representatives to be composed of seven members to be appointed by the Speaker, to study, survey, and make investigation into the subject of juvenile delinquency, causes and factors contributing to juvenile delinquency, and the effects and results of juvenile delinquency, possible ways and means to deter or prevent juvenile delinquency.

S. 1349, filed April 8, 1946 (coauthor of): To provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. This act may be cited as the fair labor standards amendments of 1946, minimum wage bill.

H. R. 5986, filed March 26, 1946: To extend the term of design patent No. 21,053, dated September 22, 1891, for a badge, granted to George Brown Goode, and assigned to the national society, Daughters of the American Revolution.

Some of the objectives of these bills have been enacted into law, to wit: The objectives of H. R. 4517, and the objectives of H. R. 4202. Relative to H. R. 4202, California State Assemblyman, Gardiner Johnson, chairman of the California State Assembly Educational Committee, and a registered Republican, wrote me on February 23, 1946, as follows:

"There are many thousands of people in California who should be exceedingly grateful to you for the fine service that you rendered in securing adequate Federal funds to carry on the work of these centers until such time as we were able to conceive and enact into law the program embodied in these bills. But for your action the entire program would have closed down before the State of California was able to act. You should be very gratified to know that your energy and persistent efforts made it possible to carry on this needed service."

As to the Doyle bill, House Joint Resolution 122, re tidelands, I was selected as secretary of the steering committee in the House. The bill I authored was prepared by the attorney general of the State of California. I argued for its enactment before the Judiciary Committee of the House, and also on the floor of the House. The Judiciary Committee bill, known as the Sumner bill, passed the House by a vote of 108 to 11, and has since been favorably voted by the Senate Judiciary Committee, and is awaiting action by the Senate. The facts and record reveal that I discovered the jeopardy to the Long Beach tidelands, and forthwith notified the attorney general of California, the Governor of California, the mayor, the city manager, the city attorney, and the board of harbor commissioners of Long Beach.

8. SPEECHES AND REMARKS

I have personally spoken or participated in debates on the floor of the House more than 65 times; and have personally prepared and extended my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD more than 100 times. Each of these occasions has required preparation by me. These speeches and remarks can all be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in your public library on the dates, on the subjects, and at the pages hereinafter set forth, to wit:

Congressional Record—Speeches and extensions of remarks by Clyde Doyle, M. C.

Date	Subject	Congressional Record page
Jan. 31, 1945	Remarks: Hospitalization and Medical Care of Veterans (hospital facilities for veterans in Washington area)	A369
Feb. 16, 1945	Remarks: A Few Remarks by a New Congressman (re Henry Wallace; George bill; lending agencies of the Government)	A665
Do	Remarks: Dairying and Tydings Amendment	A685
Do	Remarks: Appreciation Expressed for Sympathies Extended on Death of First Lt. Clyde Doyle, Jr.	A688

Congressional Record—Speeches and extensions of remarks by Clyde Doyle, M. C.—Continued

Date	Subject	Congressional Record page
Feb. 21, 1945	Remarks: But the President Cannot Do This Alone (editorial, George Rochester, relative to supporting the President—Long Beach Argus)	A747
Do	Remarks: Discard Pauper's Oath (letter from Joseph Leib, American Legion)	A761
Mar. 1, 1945	Speech: Deficiency Appropriation Bill—Lanham Act (maiden speech—housing for defense workers)	1632
Mar. 2, 1945	Remarks: Nation's Children Must Not Be Penalized (community facilities)	A943
Mar. 12, 1945	Remarks: California and United Nations Peace Conference, April 25 (editorial by Elithe C. Brunton)	A1146
Do	Speech: Dairy Industry—Commodity Credit	2065
Mar. 14, 1945	Remarks: Vocational Guidance Clinics for Veterans	A1179
Mar. 22, 1945	Remarks: Federal Government To Claim Tidelands and Submerged Lands (quoted from Attorney Smith's letter)	A1394
Mar. 23, 1945	Speech: Debate on Agriculture Bill in Support of Voorhis Amendment	2695
Mar. 24, 1945	Speech: School Lunches—Appropriation	2723
Mar. 27, 1945	Remarks: Footsteps on the Pathway to Enduring World Peace	A1506
Apr. 2, 1945	Speech: Two Cities in the Eighteenth Congressional District of California First Over Top on Red Cross Funds	3050
Apr. 5, 1945	Speech: United States Census Figures Show East Moving West	3134
Apr. 12, 1945	Speech: World's Fair for Victory, Peace, and Progress, Los Angeles, Calif	3324
Apr. 19, 1945	Speech: Estates of Deceased Veterans (notice of Doyle bill H. R. 2941)	3576
Do	Remarks: Eliminate Need of Administering Estates of Deceased Veterans	A1800
Apr. 23, 1945	Remarks: Prevention of Beach Erosion Essential to Shores of United States	A1856
Do	Remarks: Settlement of Accounts of Deceased Members of the Armed Forces (Doyle bill H. R. 2941)	A1866
Apr. 26, 1945	Speech: Re: Central Valley project	3876
Apr. 27, 1945	....do	3915
Apr. 30, 1945	Speech: Food and Agriculture Organization	3977
Do	Remarks: Justice to Post Office Employees Demands Increase in Pay	A1987
Do	Remarks: Junction of Governments in San Francisco for World Security and Happiness	A1991
May 2, 1945	Speech: Amending U. S. Constitution re Treaty Making	4074
May 4, 1945	Remarks: Service Ribbons for Veterans (resolution, Veterans Association, Post 15—Siminoff)	A2082
May 7, 1945	Remarks: Retail and Small Business in California in Postwar	A2098
May 8, 1945	Speech: VE-day in House	4310
May 9, 1945	Speech: Amending Constitution	4354
May 10, 1945	Remarks: Put the Likeness of the Diamond of Democracy on Every Dime: Franklin Delano Roosevelt	A2207
May 14, 1945	Speech: Extending and Strengthening 4-H and Other Agricultural Programs for Rural Youth is a Sound Investment	4557
May 15, 1945	Speech: Post Office Pay Increase (reclassification of salaries)	4628
May 17, 1945	Speech: Re: Children's Bureau	4738
May 22, 1945	Speech: Re: Growth and development of maritime shipping and Long Beach Harbor	4867
May 30, 1945	Speech: Memorial Day Speech	5297
Do	Remarks: Westerners for Cabinet Posts	A2593
Do	Remarks: Assisting the Returning Vet	A2595
June 6, 1945	Speech: Re: H. R. 3314—Bretton Woods Monetary Fund and Bank	5666
June 8, 1945	Speech: Criticizing Rules Committee Control—FEPC	5828
Do	Remarks: West Point (including letter—Robert V. Young)	A2740
Do	Remarks: Letter from a Soldier—Bob	A2744
June 18, 1945	Remarks: Extending the Termination Date Under the Renegotiation Act	6139
June 26, 1945	Remarks: Discard Pauper's Oath	A3070
Do	Remarks: San Francisco Charter Must Be Ratified for Enduring Peace	A3069
June 28, 1945	Remarks: Postwar Reconversion Employment (article by Darwin L. Boyer, of Long Beach)	A3124
Sept. 5, 1945	Remarks: Peace Legislation	A3773
Sept. 12, 1945	Remarks: Conserve Childhood Values as Well as Property Values	A3868
Sept. 19, 1945	Remarks: Preference for Veterans Must Come First—Time Is of the Essence—Administrative Adjustments and Conflicts Can Be Straightened Out Later—Resolve Questions in Favor of the Veterans	A3966
Sept. 20, 1945	Speech: Tidelands (including part of letter from Harold L. Ickes)	8856
Sept. 24, 1945	Remarks: Conservation of Childhood Not Less Important Than Reconversion of Machinery	A4025
Sept. 27, 1945	Remarks: The Doyle Bill to Meet the Immediate Emergency Caused by the Closing of the Wartime Child-Care Services, H. R. 4202—This Act May Be Cited as the Emergency Child-Care Act of 1945	A4076
Oct. 2, 1945	Remarks: Favoring Granting of Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity to Steamship Companies to Operate Overseas Air Service—Resolution of Board of Harbor Commissioners of Port of Long Beach	A4134
Oct. 3, 1945	Remarks: Emergency Child-Care Act of 1945, H. R. 4202	A4154
Oct. 5, 1945	Remarks: President Truman Urges Opportunity for Reconversion of Wartime Child Care Program to Peacetime Operations, etc	A4194
Oct. 11, 1945	Remarks: Continuation of Federal Funds for Child-Care Centers a Necessity To Give States Time To Enact State Legislation To Protect These Children, etc	A4290
Oct. 15, 1945	Remarks: Democracy is the Golden Rule Applied to Self-Government—Democracy Demands That the Unfortunate Be Built Up	A4312
Do	Remarks: Freedom Works Two Ways—We Are Always Free For Something as Well as From Something	A4332
Oct. 16, 1945	Speech: Palestinian Situation	9696
Oct. 19, 1945	Speech: Challenged Mr. Taber re his statement about inefficiency and confusion in present administration	9850
Oct. 24, 1945	Speech: Brief Biography of Commentators	10032
Oct. 25, 1945	Speech: United Nations Charter—UN Security Organization for World Peace	10043
Oct. 30, 1945	Remarks: Training for Defense	A4578
Do	Remarks: Rehabilitation of Veterans	A4574
Oct. 31, 1945	Remarks: President Truman Clearly and Emphatically States Sound Policy re Wages and Prices; Corporation Net Profits Would Permit Wages Increase Without Commodity Increase; Unemployed Men Who Want Work and Cannot Find It Are Not Normal-Acting Citizens	A4598
Nov. 1, 1945	Speech: UNRRA	10285
Nov. 6, 1945	Remarks: AMVETS—American Veterans of World War II, etc	A4736
Nov. 7, 1945	Remarks: Principles Adopted by AMVETS at National Meeting in Chicago	A4764
Do	Remarks: Veteran at Battle Front Writes Home That GI Bill Is Not Adequate in Education Benefits for Man With Dependents (Bob Wilson, 832 Redondo Ave.)	A4760
Nov. 8, 1945	Speech: Full Employment Bill	10556
Nov. 12, 1945	Remarks: We Must Make This Armistice One From War to Enduring Peace, Not an Armistice Between Wars—Let Us Dedicate Our Hopes, Our Prayers, Our Deeds	A4827
Do	Remarks: Lack of Housing In Long Beach, Calif., Area Means Lack of Job Opportunities for Veterans—50,000 Unfilled Jobs for Veterans But No Place To Live in Southern California	A4841
Do	Remarks: GI Loan Fails to Meet Need, Takes About 45 Days to Consummate Loan—GI Loan Should Be Primarily for GI's, Not for Banks	A4842
Nov. 15, 1945	Speech: During debate of Full Employment Bill	10739
Nov. 16, 1945	Remarks: Veterans Cannot Take Jobs in Long Beach Area Because of Lack of Housing For Selves and Families—U. S. Employment Service Manager, etc	A4937
Nov. 20, 1945	Remarks: Navy's Beneficial-Suggestions System Results in Tangible Saving and Increased Efficiency, etc	A5002
Do	Remarks: United States Navy is Trustee for Morals of American Youth Under Its Control as Well as Physical Well-Being—American People Will Not Tolerate Any Encouragement of Lessening of Emphasis on High Ethical and Moral Conduct of, etc	A5003
Do	Remarks: Navy and War Shipping Administration Using Ships to Bring Boys Home—But Not Enough Ships and Too Many Boys for Ships—Parents Should Know Ships are Being Used	A5009
Nov. 21, 1945	Remarks: Great Daily Newspaper Editorial Charges That Congress Sleeps and Identifies Some Major Problems It Believes Obstructed—Criticizes Congress Re FEPC and Compliments Wendell Willkie	A5041
Do	Remarks: Long Beach, Calif., Labor Market Report; an Indicative Report From Significant and Strategic Industrial Area of Nation—Long Beach and Southern California Testing Ground of Industrial Advancement or Set-Back—USES Renders Great Service	A5048
Do	Remarks: Letters from GI's Still in Uniform to Their Own Mail Bag in Philippines Tell Their Thinking, Hopes, and Objectives—Tell What Congress Should Do	A5050
Nov. 27, 1945	Speech: Replacing in deficiency bill sum of $128,475,000 for rivers and harbors and flood control	11064
Do	Speech: Replacing in deficiency bill $24,500,000 for temporary housing for veterans	11134
Nov. 29, 1945	Speech: In support of Snyder amendment to appropriation bill for replacing rivers and harbors projects in bill	11222
Do	Remarks: Philippines Face Economic Struggle	A5198
Do	Remarks: Sudden War End Brings Sudden Impact to Western States—War Has Brought Basic Change Equalizing Prior Handicaps—West Possesses Natural Assets and Advantages—Amazing Productivity of War Industries in West Proves Reality of Natural Advantages of the West—Distinguished Assistant Attorney General Illuminates	A5199
Dec. 3, 1945	Remarks: History and Program of AMVETS	A5227
Do	Remarks: Housing in Southern California a First Problem—GI Boys Denied Prompt Enough GI Loans To Help—Thousands of Servicemen Being Discharged Daily and No Place To Live	A5253
Dec. 4, 1945	Speech: Congratulations to author of bill and Committee on Naval Affairs	11436
Do	Speech: In support of H. R. 4421—Navy bill	11446
Dec. 5, 1945	Speech: UNRRA	11569
Dec. 7, 1945	Speech: Re: Osteopathic physicians—medical doctors, etc	11660, 11666

Congressional Record—Speeches and extensions of remarks by Clyde Doyle, M. C.—Continued

Date	Subject	Congressional Record page
Dec. 11, 1945	Remarks: H. R. 4931—A Bill to Facilitate Purchases of Surplus Properties by Veterans	54446
Do	Remarks: Secretary of Navy Replies to Inquiry As To Suppression of Prostitution; Orders Compliance with Navy Policy—Japan Situation Cleaned Up—Letter Is Prompt Reply	A5444
Dec. 12, 1945	Speech: Re: Labor Unions	11844
Dec. 14, 1945	Speech: Re: Full Employment	12087
Do	Remarks: Letter from a Soldier (Pfc Joseph L. Jolley)	A5522
Dec. 17, 1945	Speech: Restoring 2-Cent Rate on First-Class Mail	12209, 12213
Dec. 18, 1945	Speech: Re: Housing Appropriation	12295, 12300
Dec. 19, 1945	Speech: In Favor of Resolution (Palestine)	12392
Do	Remarks: Seven Steps by Congressmen To Help Make UNO Succeed—It Depends Upon You and Me To Be Builders of World Peace; Do Not Stir Up Misunderstanding, Ill-Will, Suspicion, With Other Members of UNO	A5682
Jan. 21, 1946	Speech: Re: Industrial Shut-Down Strike Situation	170
Do	Remarks: UNO Pulling Together for Peace—London Meeting Now in Session Augurs Well-Being Through World Comity—World Collaboration Marches On, Despite Cynics	A150
Jan. 23, 1946	Remarks: State Legislature of California Asks Federal Government to Declare Surplus Building Materials, etc	A199
Jan. 24, 1946	Speech: Re: Return of U. S. Employment Service to States	346
Jan. 25, 1946	Speech: Only Decent Income Assures Decent Level of Living	414
Do	Remarks: What Is Your Answer to the Veteran?—He Asks No Special Favors Either	A247
Jan. 28, 1946	Speech: Re: 3 jet-propelled planes crossed United States Jan. 26 in 4 hours 13 minutes; municipal airport in Long Beach	465
Jan. 29, 1946	Speech: Re: Continuation of USES under Federal control	541
Jan. 31, 1946	Speech: Facsimile of Franklin Delano Roosevelt on New Dime	660
Feb. 4, 1946	Remarks: Long Beach City Councilman, City Attorney, Harbor Board Come To Attend Senate Hearings on Tideland Bill—Newspaper Editorial From Long Beach States City Interest at $50,000,000—Long Beach Press Telegram	A472
Feb. 6, 1946	Speech: Criticizing Rules Committee System	1015
Do	Remarks: Profit Urge and Common Good Are Compatible	A535
Feb. 7, 1946	Speech: Re: Whittier Narrows project	1080
Feb. 8, 1946	Remarks: Label Thinking Our Greatest Danger to Democracy—Well-Informed Public Opinion Is Vital	A607
Do	Speech: Birthday greetings to Judge Mansfield	1166
Feb. 12, 1946	Speech: Abraham Lincoln, an Humble American Who Made Destiny	1237
Do	Remarks: GI Writes His Congressman of Ambitions To Help Humanity	A680
Do	Remarks: Appraisement of Abraham Lincoln Makes Him a Man Who Shaped Destiny—Citizens of Other Nations Also Appraise Him Superlatively	A683
Do	Remarks: Lincoln's Last Message to the Thirty-eighth Congress, Dec. 6, 1864	A702
Feb. 18, 1946	Remarks: Mental Demobilization—Revamp Congress?	A811
Do	Remarks: County of Los Angeles County—The East Moves West—Spiritual Growth Linked With Distribution of Economic Health	A816
Feb. 19, 1946	Speech: Re: New York Stock Exchange Says War Bonds World's Best Investment	1444
Do	Speech: Re: School Lunches	1469
Do	Remarks: Los Angeles County Dairy Area Has Greatest Testing Program—Eighteenth Congressional District, California, Is Portion of This National Achievement in Dairy Industry.	A871
Feb. 26, 1946	Remarks: Let's Place Zone Office for Veterans Geographically Where Veterans Will Get the Maximum of Service and the Minimum Waste of Time by Travel and Mail, and the Minimum of Expense—Los Angeles Area Geographically, and According to Population, Center of Zone 12.	A943
Do	Remarks: Child-Care Centers Necessary so States Can Undertake Own Responsibility	A956
Mar. 4, 1946	Speech: Re: Housing Situation—Patman Amendment—Wolcott Substitute	1870
Do	Remarks: Bar Association to Vote on Race, Creed, Ancestry	A1107
Do	Remarks: Los Angeles Daily News Talks Housing	A1115
Mar. 8, 1946	Remarks: Long Beach Editorial Reminds Loan Is Not All (Long Beach Press-Telegram)	A1224
Mar. 12, 1946	Remarks: USES Reports Only 57 Percent Veterans Are Employed Locally—These Figures From Industrial Area	A1311
Do	Remarks: Red Cross Continues Necessary—Facts About Red Cross Services	A1313
Do	Remarks: Inauguration Prayer by George Washington—Behooves Us To Be Humble Today	A1314
Mar. 13, 1946	Remarks: Status of School-Lunch Project in California—California Will Be Short $407,000—1,035 Schools To Stop Lunches	A1318
Mar. 18, 1946	Remarks: Labor Paper Writes Editorial on Capital and Labor—Labor News, Long Beach, Calif.	A1454
Do	Remarks: Long Beach Airport Great Commercial and Military Asset	A1460
Do	Remarks: Long Beach Editor Spells It Out: America's Need—Homes (Long Beach Press-Telegram)	A1461
Mar. 19, 1946	Remarks: Pro and Con Re Loan to England—Congressional Library States Both Sides for Hon. Clyde Doyle, of California	A1470
Do	Remarks: Spoken Words of House Members on Floor Resound Around the World—We Need To Weigh Our Words Carefully	A1507
Mar. 20, 1946	Remarks: Junk or Jobs?—Jobs for Pilots—World War II Pilots Headquarters at Long Beach	A1533
Mar. 25, 1946	Speech: The United Nations Organization Is Our World Emissary For Peace	2583
Mar. 26, 1946	Remarks: Articles of Incorporation of Association of World War II Pilots and Aviation Specialists—"Chick" Logan, Their President, Talks	A1667
Mar. 28, 1946	Speech: Re: Whether all directors of board (subpenaing board) were present at meeting	2749
Do	Remarks: Municipality of Long Beach, Calif., Spends $22,460,360 on Its Harbor Since 1909	A1752
Do	Remarks: Second Battle of the Bulge or Bigger Profits Versus Veterans' Homes	A1756
Do	Remarks: Eighteenth Congressional District, California, Part of Largest Dairy County in United States	A1758
Do	Remarks: Large Wholesale Grocery Firm Asks Continuation of Price Controls	A1760
Mar. 29, 1946	Speech: Copra from Philippines Necessary for California Dairy Herds	2854
Do	Speech: House Resolution 575, a Bill to Make a Study and Survey of Juvenile Delinquency, and to Report Thereon	2859
Apr. 9, 1946	Speech: Request for RECORD to show that Congressman Doyle had returned from trip to see critically ill brother	3388
Apr. 10, 1946	Speech: Calling attention to fact he had previously filed H. Res. 595, calling fo · Nation-wide study and survey of juvenile delinquency	3454
Do	Speech: Juvenile Delinquency—A National Study and Report Is Sound and Appropriate Now	3464
Apr. 11, 1946	Remarks: Eagles Fly to Aid of Children	A2078
Do	Remarks: Preamble to United Nations Charter Timely to Read Again Now—The Hope of This Present-Day World for Enduring Peace to Evolve From—Wars Must Cease	A2079
Apr. 12, 1946	Speech: President Roosevelt Felt the Pulse of Humanity	3578
Apr. 15, 1946	Speech: A Volunteer and Respectably Paid Army Is Basically Sound—Not a Conscripted Army in Peace	3734
Do	Remarks: Letter to Congressman From Pastor on Four Points, John Atwood, Community Methodist-Episcopal Church, Lakewood, Calif.	A2181
Do	Remarks: Compton, Calif., School Plan Copied as Model re Use of Funds	A2187
Apr. 16, 1946	Speech: The FBI is Best Qualified to Do Such Work	3769
Apr. 18, 1946	Speech: Voting is at Grass Roots of Democracy—Easter Recess Significant	4015
Do	Remarks: High-School Students at Long Beach, Calif., Ask Congress How They Can Help Prevent Europe Starving	A2283
Do	Remarks: Long Beach Paper Approves President Truman's Action on Starvation Prevention (Long Beach Press-Telegram)	A2284
Do	Remarks: Long Beach Recognized by Newspaper in Largest City in State (Los Angeles Times)	A2296
Do	Remarks: Long Beach Sets Building Pace for Pacific Coast for March 1946 (Long Beach Press-Telegram)	A2296

9. ATTENDANCE ON LEGISLATION

I have not been absent so as to necessarily pair my vote on bills excepting on few occasions when I went by airplane at night to Cleveland to there address a large mass meeting in support of child-care centers and later attend upon the illness of my own brother in California, and his resulting demise within a few days, and staying at Long Beach for 2 days thereafter to observe the arrival of my first grandchild, and then a few days at Easter recess. On account of heavy work at Washington, I did not return to Long Beach to attend the funeral of my own son, who was first lieutenant in the Army Air Corps; nor the marriage of my own daughter. I have not missed a vote on a bill. I have missed several quorum calls, but not in connection with voting.

10. CONFERENCE WITH CABINET MEMBERS OR DEPARTMENTS

I have personally had conferences with several Cabinet members and with the heads of Navy, Army, OPA, Surplus Property, Veterans Administration, Post Office Department, Federal Works Agency, Treasury, Surgeon General, and so forth.

11. SERVICE TO DISTRICT

Every request for information to my office has been complied with as promptly as possible, and every request for service to be rendered or help extended has also been complied with as fully and promptly as possible. Such information and service has been furnished on request to individuals, to study groups, or other organized groups or committees, and to city, county, regional, or State government departments or agencies. Active cooperation has been extended to literally hundreds of private commercial businesses and enterprises, and chambers of commerce, boards of trade, county flood control, and other similar official governmental units. Also, hundreds of GI's and veterans have been promptly served upon their request or request of their parents or relatives—all over the world. Active, frequent cooperation has been rendered

to many of the departments of municipal government in the various communities of the congressional district, and active, frequent cooperation has been asked for and received by Long Beach Water Commission, Long Beach Harbor Board, Long Beach city attorney's office in re tidelands, Long Beach city manager's office, Long Beach mayor's office, and so forth.

12. COOPERATION WITH THE VETERANS' NEEDS

Active and frequent cooperation has been asked for and received by veterans' groups, such as veterans' posts, veterans' service centers, Veterans' Administration, veterans' committees, servicemen's clubs at Long Beach and other places, relatives of veterans, and so forth, involving such needs as insurance, back pay, estates of deceased veterans, compensation, hardship cases, furloughs in case of family sickness or death, actions on delayed applications for separation or discharge, location of missing GI's, appeal to clemency board, appeal in court-martial cases, application for surplus-property purchase, reemployment rights, housing priorities, GI bill of rights, disabled veterans' rights, invalid-pension rights, and so forth.

13. COOPERATION WITH OFFICIALS AND CITIZENS FROM HOME AT WASHINGTON

I have been pleased to make literally hundreds of appointments for conferences with Government officials and departments with school, city, county, and district officials, or for private individuals who came to Washington on such matters as housing, surplus property, airports, shipping, tidelands, flood control, harbor development, beach erosion, wharves and docks, school facilities, Army and Navy, YMCA, servicemen's recreation center, and so forth. I have gone with them myself whenever occasion required.

14. ESTABLISHING NEW NATIONAL POLICY

When Long Beach City made application to Federal Works Agency to purchase the Federal Recreation Building for a permanent servicemen's club, and was quoted a price on the established Nation-wide basis, I personally prepared and filed a brief presenting for the first time before the Department the meritorious argument that ultimately resulted in Long Beach obtaining this facility for men in the armed forces at a much lower figure.

15. WRITING WEEKLY COLUMN, "YOUR CONGRESSMAN REPORTS"

Beginning about a month after I arrived in Washington as your Representative I have personally prepared and had sent to every daily and weekly newspaper in the Eighteenth Congressional District a nonpolitical news column entitled "Your Congressman Reports." I have done this at my personal expense and have not asked or accepted any compensation therefor. It will continue to be a "nonpolitical" column, and to be mailed weekly. If you do not see it in the newspaper you read and will send me your name and address and request therefor, a copy will be sent you.

16. SEVERAL HUNDRED THOUSAND BOOKLETS MAILED

Several hundred thousand booklets, pamphlets, and official Government documents and papers have been mailed to individuals and organized groups and study classes in the district, including libraries, religious groups, scientific groups, the naval hospital and other naval facilities, servicemen's clubs, veterans' service centers, and so forth. I have as frequently mailed such to the Republican Women's Study Club in Long Beach as I have to the Democratic Women's Study Group in Long Beach. Also, schools, colleges, and public libraries have received many hundreds of these pieces of printed information about their Government. For instance, one booklet entitled "Our American Government: What It Is and How Does It Function," has been purchased and paid for by me personally in quantities of several thousands, and upon application you will be furnished one also. The few copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Congressmen have largely been placed in the public libraries of the district.

17. ANNAPOLIS AND WEST POINT

I announced and have followed the policy of making appointments of cadets for Annapolis and West Point, based upon the United States civil service examination competitive grades. I have not and will not let the matter of political party registration of parents or support, either past or promised, enter into the decision.

18. VOTING RECORD

Following you will find set forth the date, the number and subject of the bills, and my vote thereon. Space does not permit of setting out every bill.

INDIVIDUAL VOTING RECORD

Mr. DOYLE, of California, cast the following votes on roll calls ordered during the first session, Seventy-ninth Congress, convened January 3, 1945:

January 3: House Resolution 5, a resolution adopting rules of the Seventy-ninth Congress. On Rankin amendment. Nay.

January 18: House Resolution 38, a resolution for the continuation of the special committee. Nay.

February 1: H. R. 1752, a bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes. On passage. Nay.

February 6: House Resolution 120, a resolution for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 85, making an additional appropriation for the census of agriculture. On passage. Aye.

February 7: House Joint Resolution 85, on passage. Aye.

February 14: Senate 340, an act to express the intent of the Congress. Nay.

February 15: House Resolution 137, a resolution to consider S. 375, to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government. On passage. Aye.

March 7: House Resolution 168, a resolution providing funds for the committee on Un-American Activities. On passage. Nay.

March 7: H. R. 2277, a bill to insure adequate nursing care for the armed forces. On passage. Aye.

March 8: H. R. 2404, a bill to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes. On passage. Aye.

March 12: H. R. 2023, a bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes. On passage. Aye.

March 13: H. R. 2013, a bill to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended. On passage. Aye.

March 14: House Resolution 183, a resolution for the consideration of a conference report on H. R. 1752, a bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes. On previous question. Nay.

March 19: H. H. 2603, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and the Federal Loan Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946. Aye.

March 24: H. R. 2689, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes. On passage. Aye.

March 27: H. R. 1752, a bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes. On adoption of conference report. Nay.

March 27: House Resolution 195, a resolution to investigate supplies and shortages of food, particularly meat. On passage. Aye.

March 27: House Resolution 52, a resolution to authorize the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to study the basic problems affecting postwar immigration and naturalization. On passage. Aye.

March 27: House Resolution 192, a resolution to direct the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to investigate the Veterans' Administration. On passage. Aye.

April 25: H. R. 2689, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes. Aye.

April 30: House Joint Resolution 145, a joint resolution providing for membership of the United States in the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations. Aye.

May 9: House Joint Resolution 60, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties. On passage. Aye.

May 11: H. R. 2603, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and the Federal Loan Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes. (Conference of Allied Ministers of Education in London.) Aye.

May 14: H. R. 1690, a bill to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work. Aye.

May 15: H. R. 3035, a bill to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation. Aye.

May 26: H. R. 3240, a bill to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes. On passage. Aye.

May 28: S. 502, an act to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments and certain purchase-and-sale operations by corporations created pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes. On passage Aye.

June 4: H. R. 3118, a bill to amend section 100 of Public Law No. 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, June 22, 1944, to grant certain priorities to the Veterans' Administration, to facilitate the employment of personnel by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and passage (two-thirds required). Aye.

June 7: H. R. 3314, a bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. On motion to recommit. Nay.

June 7: H. R. 3314, a bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. On passage. Aye.

June 8: H. R. 3368, a bill making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946. Aye.

June 11: House Resolution 139, a resolution making H. R. 7, a bill making unlawful

the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers, a special order of business. On question, Shall the Committee on Rules be discharged from further consideration of resolution. Aye.

June 11: House Resolution 139, a resolution making H. R. 7, a bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers, a special order of business. On passage. Aye.

June 12: H. R. 7, a bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers. Aye.

June 13: H. R. 3393, a bill to improve salary and wage administration in the Federal service; to bring about a reduction in Federal personnel and to establish personnel ceilings for Federal departments and agencies; to require a quarterly analysis of Federal employment; and for other purposes. On passage. Aye.

June 14: S. 502, an act to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments and certain purchase and sale operations by corporations created pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes. On agreeing to conference report. Aye.

June 14: H. R. 3395, a bill to extend through December 31, 1945, the termination date under the Renegotiation Act. On passage. Aye.

June 19: H. R. 2944, a bill to continue in effect section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, relating to the exportation of certain commodities. On Harness amendment. Nay.

June 23: House Joint Resolution 101, a joint resolution extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended. On Bates of Massachusetts amendment (prices—margin of profit). Nay.

June 23: House Joint Resolution 101, a joint resolution extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended. On Andresen amendment (agricultural commodities—Secretary of Agriculture). Nay.

June 23: House Joint Resolution 101, a joint resolution extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended. On Dirksen amendment (court procedure). Nay.

June 23: House Joint Resolution 101, a joint resolution extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended. On passage. Aye.

June 30: Senate Joint Resolution 30, a joint resolution extending the effective period of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended. On adoption of the conference report. Aye.

July 6: H. R. 3633, a bill to facilitate reconversion and for other purposes. On passage. Nay.

September 11: Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, concurrent resolution to investigate the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and events and circumstances relating thereto. On agreeing to resolution. Aye.

September 18: H. R. 3951, a bill to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular military and naval establishments of the United States. On passage. Aye.

September 24: H. R. 2716, a bill to provide for health programs for Government employees. On passage. Aye.

September 27: H. R. 2948, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation. On passage. Aye.

October 4: H. R. 4129, a bill to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes. On passage. Paired.

October 11: H. R. 4309, a bill to reduce taxation, and for other purposes. On passage. Aye.

October 18: H. R. 3615, a bill to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports and to amend existing law relating to air-navigation facilities. On passage. Aye.

October 25: House Resolution 367, a resolution providing for the consideration of S. 805, a bill to insure further the military security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information secured through official sources. On passage. Aye.

October 30: H. R. 4309, a bill to reduce taxation, and for other purposes. On adoption of conference report. Nay.

October 30: House Concurrent Resolution 80, a concurrent resolution to announce the sense of Congress as to the composition of the postwar Navy. On agreeing to resolution. Aye.

November 1: House Joint Resolution 266, a joint resolution making an appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. On passage. Aye.

December 6: H. R. 4649, a bill to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. On passage. Aye.

December 10: H. R. 2536, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to certain agreements between carriers. On passage. Aye.

December 11: House Resolution 407, a resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3937 to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act and to abolish the National War Labor Board. On agreeing to resolution. Nay.

December 11: House Resolution 406, a resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 32, to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce." On agreeing to resolution. Nay.

December 14: S. 380, an act to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment and full production in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State, and local governments, and the Federal Government. On passage. Aye.

December 18: S. 1580, an act to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provisions with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization. On passage. Aye.

SECOND SESSION

January 24: H. R. 5201, a bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes. On passage. Aye.

January 29: H. R. 4437, a bill to provide for the return of public employment offices to State operation, to amend the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933, and for other purposes. On passage. Nay.

January 31: House Resolution 500, a resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4908, to provide for the appointment of fact-finding boards. Nay.

February 4: H. R. 4908, a bill to provide for the appointment of fact-finding boards to investigate labor disputes seriously affecting the national public interest, and for other purposes. On motion to go into Committee. Aye.

February 6: S. 380, an act to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment and full production in a free competitive economy. Aye.

February 21: H. R. 3370, a bill to provide assistance to the States in the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of school-lunch programs, and for other purposes. On Powell amendment (race discrimination). Aye.

February 21: H. R. 3370, a bill to provide assistance to the States in the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of school-lunch programs, and for other purposes. On passage. Aye.

February 26: H. R. 3603, an act to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes. On adoption of conference report. Aye.

March 6: H. R. 4761, a bill to amend the National Housing Act by adding thereto a new title relating to the prevention of speculation and excessive profits in the sale of housing. On Smith of Ohio amendment (examine records). Nay.

March 6: H. R. 4761, a bill to amend the National Housing Act by adding thereto a new title relating to the prevention of speculation and excessive profits in the sale of housing. (Maximum sales prices for housing accommodations completed after effective date of this title.) Nay.

March 6: H. R. 4761, a bill to amend the National Housing Act by adding thereto a new title relating to the prevention of speculation and excessive profits in the sale of housing. (Exempting housing accommodations in existence prior to passage of this title.) Nay.

March 7: H. R. 4761, a bill to amend the National Housing Act by adding thereto a new title relating to the prevention of speculation and excessive profits in the sale of housing, and to insure the availability of real estate for housing purposes at fair and reasonable prices, and for other purposes. On passage. Aye.

March 12: House Joint Resolution 307, a joint resolution to authorize the use of naval vessels to determine the effect of atomic weapons upon such vessels. On passage. Aye.

March 12: H. R. 5356, a bill to provide assistance to the Republic of China in augmenting and maintaining a naval establishment, and for other purposes. Aye.

March 13: H. R. 5604, a bill reducing or further reducing certain appropriations and contractual authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes. On Taber amendment (Lend-Lease). Nay.

March 14: H. R. 5455, a bill to amend section 502 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing," so as to authorize the appropriation of funds necessary to provide an additional 100,000 temporary housing units for distressed families of servicemen and for veterans and their families. On passage. Aye.

March 19: H. R. 4873, a bill to create an Agricultural Credit Agency, to consolidate therein all Federal agricultural lending agencies, to create a public farm-appraisal system, and for other purposes. On passage. Aye.

March 26: House Joint Resolution 328, a joint resolution making an additional appropriation for veterans' housing and related expenses. On passage. Aye.

March 28: House Resolution 573, a resolution authorizing the Speaker to certify the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia. On passage. Aye.

April 2: H. R. 5059, a bill to provide additional compensation for postmasters and employees of the postal service. On passage. Paired.

April 4: H. R. 5939, a bill to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes. On passage. Paired.

April 15: H. R. 6064, a bill to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes. On passage. Aye.

April 16: House Resolution 601, a resolution authorizing the Speaker to certify the

report of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia. On passage. Aye.

April 17: H. R. 6042, a bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942. On Wolcott amendments (Nos. 1 and 3, change date from June 30, 1947, to March 31, 1947). Nay.

April 17: H. R. 6042, a bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942. On Wolcott amendment (reasonable profits). Nay.

April 17: H. R. 6042, a bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942. On Gossett amendment (remove price controls). Nay.

April 17: H. R. 6042, a bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942. On Wadsworth amendment (livestock). Nay.

19. THE FOLLOWING LIST WILL BE SELF-EXPLANATORY AS TO THE FEDERAL GRANTS OR LOANS TO COMMUNITIES IN THE EIGHTEENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT SINCE JANUARY 4, 1945

Following is a brief outline of the list of approved advance planning allowances to the Eighteenth Congressional District from Federal Works Agency since September 12, 1946. The total advance planning approved for the district is $122,731.

Location	Applicant	Advance planning approved
Compton	School district	$23,831
Bellflower	do	30,000
Long Beach	City	63,400
Lynwood	do	5,500
Total		122,731

Following is a brief statement of Federal grants to communities in the Eighteenth Congressional District from the Federal Works Agency, Bureau of Community Facilities, Lanham Act projects, between January 1, 1945, and April 30, 1946. All have been for school projects.

Location:	*Federal grant*
Lakewood	$72,047
Lynwood	99,289
Downey	13,277
Artesia	17,859
Willowbrook	113,255
Clearwater	51,365
Compton	233,243
Bellflower	99,894
Total	700,229

20. DAIRYING AND SELECTIVE SERVICE

My analysis and report of selective service, as related to the dairying industry, as was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, was extensively used by some Members of Congress, including other California Congressmen.

21. THE EIGHTEENTH DISTRICT IS ONE OF VARIETY AND GREAT IMPORTANCE

The harbor area of Long Beach is not only one of the natural naval locations of our continent, but Long Beach commercial harbor has already attained world significance on account of its location and expansion of necessary harbor facilities, and having the tidelands oil income therefor without recent need of bonding the city for harbor improvements. The value of our harbor for commercial shipping has had my active recognition in all matters wherein my cooperation has been asked. So have the great shipbuilding and maritime interests of the Eighteenth District. So has the great oil and petroleum industry.

Also, the Eighteenth District outside of Long Beach city limits is one of the most strategic and most important of the whole Nation. For instance, it is nationally known for its dairying and milk herd records; the aircraft and automobile industry; truck gardening. Smaller manufacturing plants and business establishments are extensive, and also are of great importance and value to the State and Nation. The milk production from the dairy herds in the Eighteenth Congressional District is top ranking nationally. The nationally known hay and dairy feed markets at Hynes, Clearwater, Downey neighborhood are significant. I have often been privileged to help these important dairy and agricultural interests, and have extensively informed myself.

22. GREAT NAVAL BASE AND COMMERCIAL HARBOR

The Long Beach-Los Angeles-Seal Beach-Huntington Beach waterway are frankly admitted and stated by the top naval and harbor authorities of the Nation to be of the very best on either coast. In April 1946 Long Beach was designated as the home port of the Fifth Fleet of the United States Navy, and was designated as an anchorage pool. Long Beach Chamber of Commerce, in its new booklet recently published, states:

"One of the Nation's major naval bases is permanently located at Long Beach. Included among its some 16 activities are the provision of "home" anchorage for the Pacific Fleet, the United States naval shipyard at Terminal Island, a large net and ammunition depot, a naval supply depot, a modern Navy hospital.

"The United States naval shipyard on Terminal Island is a permanent establishment, furnishing drydock and repair service to a large part of the fleet, which is permanently based in Long Beach Harbor."

Admiral F. C. Sherman, in command of the Terminal Island naval facilities, at a luncheon for him given by the Long Beach Chamber of Commerce on April 23, 1946, is quoted in the Long Beach Press-Telegram as saying:

"Off shore here is the finest training ground in the world. This combination of fine harbor and training ground insures that the Navy will use it to the fullest extent. Your hospitality and cordial treatment of Navy personnel in Long Beach are proverbial. We are most happy to be based here."

He said the Navy shipyards in Long Beach were assured of plenty of work in the future.

23. SOME OF THE MONEYS TO NAVAL INSTALLATIONS IN LONG BEACH AREA SINCE JANUARY 1945

The following figures were furnished me recently through the office of the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee for naval purposes, and represent a close approximation of the amounts that are being expended by the Navy Department for carrying on the activities of the Navy Department and naval establishments in the Long Beach-Los Angeles area:

Bureau of Naval Personnel: Welfare, Naval Reserve, instruction, libraries, pay and subsistence of naval personnel ashore	$66,619,700
Bureau of Aeronautics: Maintenance and operation of shore-based aircraft and air stations	10,481,200
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts: Maintenance and operation of supply depots; supply, accounting, and disbursing activities, and "Fuel, Navy"	16,000,000
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery: Maintenance and operation of hospital facilities	5,725,000
Bureau of Ships: Maintenance, Bureau of Ships, and increase and replacement of naval vessels	54,000,000
Bureau of Yards and Docks: Maintenance and operation of shore activities ($8,600,000) and public works construction ($15,500,000), Federal breakwater and connecting bridge	24,100,000
Bureau of Ordnance: Ordnance activities	26,269,846
Marine Corps: Maintenance and operation of Marine Corps activities and pay and subsistence of Marine Corps personnel	16,745,390
Total	219,941,136

I have not heard of anyone in Washington, D. C., but that frankly states that the naval installations and program in the Long Beach area is a permanently established naval program on account of the location and other clear advantages.

I know you will understand that the foregoing is not intended to nor can it be a complete report, but I trust it will serve to give you some of the information which will add further to your knowledge of what your Representative has done for you. If you have any question or if you seek further information on any point, I will be pleased to have you communicate with me by addressing me at 144 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

I have the honor to be,

Your Representative in Congress,

CLYDE DOYLE,

Member of Congress.

Victory Without Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 1946

Mr KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a thoughtful and well-considered editorial, entitled "Victory Without Peace," which appeared in the Buffalo

Evening News of May 8, 1946. The editorial is as follows:

This is the first anniversary of the proclamation of the German surrender, and it is fitting to take stock of the great expectations that came to the Allies on May 8, 1945, when President Truman and Prime Minister Churchill officially broadcast the glad tidings that at 2:40 the previous morning Col. Gen. Gustav Jodl, chief of staff of the dead Hitler's defeated Wehrmacht, had signed the document of unconditional surrender.

It seems an almost impossible task to recreate the surge of hope that covered the face of Europe, the deep delight that swept over America, upon the news from General Eisenhower's headquarters in the Rheims schoolhouse. It seemed that, at long last, peace had come to the desolated continent of Europe, that peace in Asia could not be too far behind.

Twelve months have passed since those days of rejoicing, and it is tragic to be obliged to record that these great expectations are growing dim. Nothing that has been revealed since then diminishes the glory of the Anglo-American achievement in fighting from the Norman beaches to the banks of the Elbe in 11 heroic, sanguinary months, nor to lessen the achievement of the Red Army in destroying over half Hitler's forces during the unrelenting advance from Stalingrad to Berlin.

These achievements were, and are, deserving of the highest praise and most respectful recollections. They brought victory in Europe, then in Asia. The tragedy of it all is that they have not brought peace, as is pointed by the fact that a full year has passed and not a single peace treaty has been agreed upon among the Allies, a necessary preliminary step to its being presented to the Axis principals or satellites for signature. Woodrow Wilson once called for peace without victory, but he never thought there could be victory without peace.

Why has peace gone into hiding? Why hasn't it been coaxed from the shadows of sacrifice and frustration, to consummate the hopes and rights of the world?

There are no simple answers. Like most of the great questions confronting mankind, it is dangerous to oversimplify the situation. Peace is negative as well as positive, and peace's negative face is all the world has seen so far.

This is because throughout the grand alliance Russia and Britain and America had the same enemies to fight, but not necessarily for the same causes and not for the same ends. It was as though travelers from Buffalo, Pittsburgh, and Detroit rode the same train from Chicago to Salt Lake City, where they went their respective ways to Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Portland. While each had a different point of departure and a different destination, it was convenient and necessary to travel together much of the way.

Russia, Britain, and America began drawing apart on VE-day, the asperities between Britain and America are illustrated by the Senate loan debate and the clash over Palestine; the gap between the Anglo-American world and Red Russia is widening every day primarily because of the differences between these two systems of economics and politics. Russia plays power politics with bare knuckles, says it with fait accomplis. The stark line of the Russian argument doesn't intersect with the line of our thought in America. We do not have the same foundation of ideological dogma the Russians accept as incontrovertible truth. Some way will have to be found to bridge this gap if peace is belatedly to be brought out of a victory already growing cold.

America's propensity since VE-day has been to move the battle from the Rhine and Elbe to the Potomac, Monongahela, and the Great Lakes. We have waged private wars about who gets what in motors, steel, coal, and other essential commodities and services—a warfare that has thrown the economy for a bad loss. We know that food is a weapon for peace, and that world famine was right around the corner. But the first thing we did after the surrenders was to abolish food rationing here at home. The American Government and the American people share in the responsibility for the fact that this first year of victory still hasn't brought peace. This realization should strengthen our determination to get on the right road. It is never too late to mend.

Address of Hon. Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts, Before Amvets of Chelsea, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address delivered by me at the VE memorial services conducted by the Massachusetts department, Amvets, Veterans of World War II, at the Chelsea High School auditorium, Chelsea, Mass., on May 4, 1946:

Mr. Chairman and veterans and friends, it is a pleasure to speak to you today in response to the kind invitation of the American Veterans of World War II on this occasion of memorial of VE-day. It is similar to the many instances of pleasure I have felt ever since the war was won in greeting old friends who have returned from the war and the pleasure seeing the streets of our cities strengthened again by the presence of vigorous young men in civilian clothes. But to greet you in a body and to speak to you as members of a group is a quickening and gratifying increase of pleasure. And finally because, as Amvets, you are men who have returned from fighting side by side in unified action to join together in fraternal union, to work together and thus work out your common problems and to exert your due influence as citizens, I am pleased at this opportunity. This reunion, as it is in a way, is also a memorial of VE-day, and thus we find ourselves today looking at the past, at the present, and, as ever, at the future.

So strikingly have the affairs of man and his common concerns paralleled the affairs of nature and her perennial concerns during this and the two preceding springtimes, that we cannot fail to notice the unusual parallel. As spring is nature's opening of the year, her flourish of activity, her declaration of hope and promise, so, too, in 1944, 2 years ago, the affairs of man were concentrated on the opening of the front door of fortress Europa, on a tremendous flourish of activity driving toward that D-day Normandy opening, spirited by the hope and promise of victory and liberation.

As spring is nature's conquest of the death of winter, her bursting of the bonds of repression and blight, her victory, so, too, in 1945, 1 year ago, man completed the conquest of the deadly and death-dealing reign of Hitler and his Nazi Germany, bursting the bonds that blighted and repressed Europe and the world, and was victorious.

And finally, as spring means the releasing of energies and forces contained in the earth and is the harbinger of the long, midsummer ripening and the fall harvesting, so too this year is there a parallel. There is a great release of energies, for all, or almost all, of the men who fought and served, who opened the door of Europe and of peace have returned to their rightful place in the order of man's affairs. You face now the long, midsummer ripening and the harvesting.

And it is this release of energies and forces that absorbs our attention now, and, expressed on the practical level, in line with our eyes and our hands, it is this: You, and more than ten million other American men, having completed the task of war, have returned to your rightful and proper place in American life, to resume your own individual life without heed to the blare of the trumpet, to direct your energies anew and to participate in the affairs of your community and your country. There are adjustments, there are preliminaries, there are problems.

But, as this occasion is a memorial of victory, I know that you will particularly insist that before we attend to these preliminaries and problems, we remind ourselves if for but a moment of the men who gave the most to this memorial of victory: the men who died. Those 250,000 men died in the struggle and passed out of our lives. They are not with us today except in spirit; they cannot participate in the rewards of victory. No; they are deprived of the right and opportunity you now have to live freely, to marry, to raise a family, to work, even to look for a job. All that we can do for these our heroes, your comrades, is to remember them in our own way, in our prayers perhaps, by caring for their families, by periodic public consecration of their memories, as on Memorial Day. And finally, as I said not long ago in a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives proposing a memorial for the unknown soldier of World War II, "We wish to dedicate ourselves to them and to the cause for which they gave all that life can possibly give by erecting a pure and enduring temple to the unknown soldier of World War II. We wish to bring to it all the reverence and beauty and spirit of a great Nation." They could do no more than fight and die; we can do no less than remember and consecrate.

Following World War I, the veterans of that war were often referred to as "the cream of tomorrow's generation." This phrase is not sufficient to define the veteran of World War II; he is not only that, he is the generation itself. The difference is pointed and pertinent. The last war was neither as long nor as great in demand. We veterans of the previous war were greatly less in numbers and less in proportion to the population of the Nation. If we were possibly more distinct as a group, we were less distinctively an integral and essential part of the Nation and its future.

Significant considerations flood from the reminder that more than 10,000,000 men have been released from the armed forces during and after the war recently won. You were of all racial origins and religions, of all skills and trades, and were from every State in the land. But you constituted the overwhelming percentage of ablebodied men between the ages of 18 and 45. You are the generation to which the future of our country will be hitched.

But this is the long view. Your concern, our concern, is more immediate, it is now, the present that bears on the future. And the problems are multiple now. However, in working out these problems we remember that the veteran is so integral a part of the Nation that he is not to be segregated from the rest of the Nation, the good of the veteran must be the good of the Nation and the good of the Nation must be the good of the veteran.

Essentially, as the Baruch report of 1945 insisted, the ultimate goal of any veterans'

program must be to restore the returned soldier to the community level socially, economically, humanly. It is with emphasis on the community that I speak. The Veterans' Adjustment Act, the GI bill of rights, which Congress created and passed, is a thorough document which offers opportunities for human reconstruction that never before existed. It authorizes the guarantee of loans, pays pensions, certifies and supports veterans for training and education, gives clinical treatment for the disabled and guides them through rehabilitation, administers insurance, pays adjustment compensation. But it is not a cure-all; it is the beginning, not the end.

As Gen. Omar Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, has remarked: "The GI bill of rights does not exempt a community from its tasks, it seeks only to make them simpler. The GI bill of rights is but one part of the national effort which must be fanned if veterans are to get the honest breaks they must have in establishing themselves." He continues, "Where communities permit the GI bill of rights to exclude their local effort, they are fooling themselves and menacing their veterans with a dangerous 'Let-George-do-it' philosophy. This is particularly true when George is conveniently regarded as the Federal Government in Washington."

You men went out of this community to fight; you came back to this community to live. Here you are known; here your interest is closely linked with the interests of your community. Here is your daily associations with your neighbors you rub shoulders with so many of the troublesome problems that cannot be solved in Washington. The Federal Government is far reaching, it has reached far, but it is impersonal, it is not local and personal as your city is.

We in Congress know that the GI bill of rights is not final and all-embracing. We know that further legislation is requisite to restore the veteran to his community as a useful and productive citizen without being bound and hog-tied by innumerable difficulties. Our legislative labors do not cease; nor does our alert regard to see that what has been legislated shall be accomplished. And we want to hear from the Amvets as we seek continually to bolster our laws and insure just treatment for all. The initial impetus given the veteran must be strengthened, the guarantees must be more secure, the administrative functions dealing with and for the vet must be centralized, the national service life insurance must be liberalized in terms of payment.

But the more we study and propose, the deeper we go into pressing needs, the more we realize that Federal action is not sufficient, cannot in fact penetrate to the personal accumulation of the problems of the veterans.

Most communities are conscious that this is their business and have an honest desire to assist. But far too often there is a lack of leadership and a failure to provide a clear statement of the problems together with a workable plan on what the community can do. From many localities veterans have flooded the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Government with requests for assistance far beyond the boundary of Government action. Some communities have examined their resources, mobilized social, civic, and Government with local leadership to achieve the widened task themselves.

This necessity focuses attention on the function of the Amvets in contributing to the solution not only of your common needs but of your individual ones as well. Your organization locally, as part of a great and growing national organization, composed as you are of veterans of this war and of citizens of this community, can define your problems in terms understandable to the community, can direct the intermeshing of your needs with those of the community, and can cooperate with local leadership and local initiative in mutual effort. Family dislocations, legal involvements, financial crises, these are all problems of concern to veterans which can be answered only by hometown action.

I believe that the common thread that links all veterans is the fact that you have given up two, three, and four of the most valuable years of your lives, no matter what your age, and that you face a multiplicity of problems which, though neither unique nor different from the many separate ones that confront a man in his lifetime, have accumulated and fallen on you all at once. When so many problems are involved, it is not only the Nation's business, it is also the community's business.

There is one problem that is probably pretty well licked now. It is the one pointed out in a Bill Mauldin cartoon in which Willie, now a civilian, is represented walking down the local street in the company of his wife and two small children. The wife is saying, "I was hoping that you would wear your uniform. I wanted to be proud of you." Your wives and sweethearts probably know by now that the golden eagle, the ruptured duck, is sufficient uniform to be proud of.

Abolition of Universal Military Training by International Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by me on May 14 in support of my joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 126, seeking an international agreement for abolishing universal military training.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The supreme issue in the world today is peace. We have had several years of war. We know what war means and what it involves in the loss of life, the suffering of casualties, the wreckage of property and the expenditure of the wealth of the world. In our own Nation we suffered the loss of over 200,000 brave soldiers, over 1,000,000 casualties, and expended over $300,000,000,000 which the taxpayers of America will have to pay over a period of the next half century. Our losses in deaths and casualties are small compared to those suffered by our allies. Surely the world has had enough of war.

Before the national emergency had been declared at an end, the military forces began a campaign of propaganda to establish universal military training in the United States and adopt a policy of peacetime conscription which would require every boy reaching 18 years of age to spend 1 year in a military camp and receive military training. This is a revolutionary policy for America. It naturally met strong opposition from a freedom-loving people. The reason assigned for abandoning a lifetime policy of freedom of the citizen from military control in times of peace, was the national defense.

We should be sensible in our approach to this question. Every intelligent person knows that if there ever was a time when we needed universal military training and service, that day has passed. There can be no national security by training a vast army to drill and fire a rifle. If war should come again, we cannot rely upon the infantryman or the artilleryman for our defense. The assembling of a vast army would provide a choice target for enemy bombs. The next war will be fought by mechanized forces. The robot bomb, the long-range radar-guided plane, the newly devised explosive bomb moving by its own power and the terrible atomic bomb. Why convert peaceful America into a military camp and conscript every 18-year-old boy, taking him from the home, the farm, the school or the college and thus disrupt millions of homes and lives every year for the vain purpose of providing for our national defense. You cannot fight bombs with boys. The cost of universal military training would be over $2,000,000,000 a year and this would be in addition to the cost of maintaining our Army, Navy, Air Force and all other military and naval agencies.

America has been able to defeat every nation that had universal military training. We are now outlawing this practice in Germany, Japan, and Italy, and yet it is seriously proposed that free America adopt this discarded system which has been in vogue in the autocracies of the earth.

America has been strong because she has been free. We must keep her so. Nothing could be more destructive to the spirit of freedom and liberty than dominance by the military. It is necessary in wartime and we accept it as a condition incident to war, but God forbid that we shall be saddled with intolerable military control and dominance in peacetime.

It will be a sad day for this Republic when she deserts her democratic heritage and embarks upon a totalitarian military policy which will inevitably lead to economic fascism, Government-controlled business, and the complete regulation of our whole life and activity. It would be the entering wedge to the crushing of the individual and the crowning of national-State-socialism. A republic encourages free thought, free expression and free enterprise. Military despotism does not want the individual to think, and he soon reaches the point where he cannot express his thoughts. The military brooks no opposition and tolerates no criticism. It is the citizens' duty only to obey—which is necessary in war, but is destructive of every impulse of freedom and growth in peace.

I believe in keeping America strong and in providing proper national defense. I think it is essential to maintain an adequate standing Army, a powerful Navy, a mighty air force, a strong national guard, an efficient intelligence service and a superior scientific research agency. If we wish to benefit our youth from a health and discipline standpoint, I would suggest ROTC units in both high schools and colleges throughout the land for both boys and girls.

As long as the world is war-minded, we shall have to keep abreast of the times in experimentation and research in the field of science, but it should be made perfectly clear that all of our war power is maintained solely for the purpose of aiding in preserving a peaceful world for ourselves and all other peace-loving peoples.

I believe that the world should consider disarmament rather than beginning a race for world armament. A good way to begin would be for the United States, instead of adopting peacetime conscription, to seek to obtain an international agreement to abolish universal military training. With this in view I introduced Joint Resolution No. 126 in the Senate last December, and it is now pending before the Foreign Relations Committee.

The preamble to this resolution recited its purpose and reads as follows:

"Whereas the United States and 49 other nations at San Francisco solemnly resolve to combine their efforts to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war and covenanted together to unite their strength and power to preserve peace in the world; and

"Whereas a plan is being considered for establishing a system of universal compulsory peacetime military training in the United States; and

"Whereas such peacetime compulsory military training is contrary to the American plan of government adopted by the founding fathers, and so successfully followed for the 169 years of national existence; and

"Whereas we are requiring the defeated Axis Nations to abandon militarism, including universal military training realizing that this policy has not prevented war but has developed a reliance upon force which has ripened into war; and

Whereas article 2, section 1, of the Charter of the United Nations contemplates disarmament and the regulation of armaments and article 26 requires that plans be formulated for the regulation of armaments and for the maintenance of peace with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources; and

"Whereas Great Britain and the United States attempted to include in the League of Nations covenant a provision abolishing compulsory peacetime military training by international agreement, and Russia strongly urged this action at the disarmament conference in 1926; and

"Whereas, with the defeat of Japan and Germany, there will never be a more auspicious time than now for the United States, Great Britain, and Russia to secure an international agreement abolishing compulsory military training and service; and

"Whereas such an international agreement would strongly undergird the United Nations organization and aid materially in establishing mutual confidence between the nations on which international peace must depend: Therefore be it

"*Resolved, etc.*, That the United States, through the President, the Secretary of State, and the representatives of the United States and of the president of the United Nations organization, be, and they hereby are, authorized and requested to immediately prepare and seek the adoption of an international agreement for the abolition by all nations of compulsory universal peacetime military service, and that the United States further seek the cooperation of Russia and Great Britain in speeding such adoption."

I believe that the adoption of that resolution by the Congress would be a long step in the direction of world peace. There is good basis for the hope that such an undertaking on the part of our Government would meet with success in procuring the approval of the other nations of the world. We can never attain the aims of peace by pursuing the policies of war. Armament building and universal military training are not signboards on the road to world peace.

Ultimately peace must come to the world by virtue of the spirit and will for peace on the part of the people of the world. It never has been maintained by force alone, and it never will be. America must strive for this will for peace, and I covet for our great Nation the leadership of the world, in this hour of her supreme greatness, both by example and precept, to the end that we shall not fail the 50 nations who have joined us in the United Nations Charter in covenanting, to prevent all future wars. We must make it clear that the force and power which we maintain is solely for the preservation of peace, and that it shall be available for the protection of our allies as well as ourselves.

It is definitely not the time to announce to the world that we have decided to reverse the peaceful policy of our whole national existence, adopt universal military conscription and make of every boy a soldier in peacetime. In this connection I admonish the exercise of trust in the good faith of the nations which have covenanted with us for peace and faith in the God of peace.

I believe that the peoples of the war-weary nations of the earth would welcome the opportunity of joining with the United States in the agreement to abolish universal military training, and to devote more fully and completely their energies and activities to the development of the material resources, the education of the youth, the study of the arts and sciences, the broadening of the spiritual visions and concepts, with the view of the establishment and maintenance of peace throughout the long tomorrow. That is a goal worthy of the leadership of America.

"Save the OPA" Campaign

REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a news release from the office of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. I know the Members would be interested in what he says:

I RISE TO REMARK

(By Congressman JOHN PHILLIPS)

Let me revise the figures I gave last week, for the preliminary "save the OPA" campaign.

It was the evening of April 17, while the House of Representatives was still voting on the bill, that the personally ambitious Mr. Bowles demanded time of all four radio networks, in order to attack the Congress. That means, to attack the people themselves, for Congress is the way the people speak, in a free government.

It was curious; that demand. It would be in order for the President to ask for time, that quickly, on the national networks. It might be in order, in some emergency, for a Cabinet member. Mr. Bowles holds no elective office; not even an office created by the Congress. He holds only one of these mushroom, Executive-order offices, created for the war emergency only, and soon happily to go out of existence, when we return again to constitutional and representative government. Three of the four networks evidently realized this, and refused the request, the fourth (NBC) yielded.

The speech was full of the customary inaccuracies, among them the implication that Washington was full of special interest groups and that Congress had yielded to pressure. I haven't seen a lobbyist, and so far as I know, these pressure groups consist of small businessmen and women, and big businessmen and women, and farmers, and all sorts of people, who have come to congressional committees (which the Constitution says is their right) and told how OPA is retarding production and thus keeping prices up, and inviting inflation. The most expensive propaganda, and the greatest quantity, comes to me direct from Mr. Bowles' office.

Let's see what happened: Between April 17 and about May 1, during which time the OPA propaganda poured out, over the air and through the papers, this office (which is a typical office) received 69 letters asking me to save OPA and 40 letters on the other side. On or about May 1, Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., started to give facts and figures, just as this column has been doing, about the OPA. For a week there was a lull, and 12 letters came in favoring OPA with 23 letters against it.

Then the gates opened. May 8, 3 letters for Bowles, 70 supporting the Congress. May 9, 33 for the Congress and none against it. May 10, 56 for sanity, and 2 for Bowles. The peak was the 13th, 161 for the Congress with only 2 for OPA. Total to date, in the battle of Bowles versus the Congress: For Bowles 91, for the Congress 484. It is the same in all districts, to whose Members I have talked. I have not counted hundreds of letters, on other subjects in which the writers mention OPA.

So let us see what Congress (or at least the House of Representatives, where I work) is trying to do:

1. To set a time limit. This is not very important. The OPA wants a guaranteed life until July 1, 1947. The House says to make it April 1, 1947, as Congress will be back in January, and can tell better what to do about the OPA.

2. To say that everyone who grows something on a farm, or makes something in a factory, in America is entitled to the costs of production plus a reasonable profit. That happens to be the basis on which America became great, and on which we won the war. The alternative is national socialism, of which Mr. Bowles is now a minor prophet.

3. To say that when any of the 8,000,000 items on which the OPA set ceilings has reached a point where supply equals demand, the ceiling on the item and the controls come off automatically, not when the OPA decides it is politically good to take them off. That amendment was not well worded in the House, but the intent is only as I state it, nothing more.

4. And last and most important, to get rid over 6 months of the dangerous consumer subsidy program, which was political to start with and historically disastrous. The program benefits no one except for temporary political benefits. It delays production and normal conditions and loads an added expense on the returning veterans and on future generations and invites inflation.

Until I can get to answering the fine letters that have come to this office in the past 3 weeks, this will have to be a blanket thank you. It is great encouragement. It is evidence, as I said last week, that the people have decided to think for themselves. That alone will save representative government, and the time is tragically short.

Our Library of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, rarely has there been a Federal appointment more thoroughly fitting and appropriate than the appointment of our present Librarian of Congress, Dr. Luther H. Evans. His exceptional educational qualifications, combined with a magnetic personality and unusual talents as an administrator are safe guaranty for the advancement and steady growth of the best-loved Library in the world. The men and women who compose his staff include persons of outstanding competence for their assignments, qualified

by training and experience for the special and diverse services they are called upon to render. Indeed, the New York Times, commenting editorially on the Librarian's most recent annual report, on May 5, concluded that:

The Library of Congress * * * is obviously still in good hands.

Today, the Library is the largest in the world. It has attained to that distinction for two paramount reasons: First, because a lesser library would be quite inadequate to the requirements of the Congress of the first power among the nations of the world; second, because it has scrupulously reflected those requirements both in its purposes and in its proposals as to command the unswerving confidence of the body which created it. The representatives of our people take a natural and profound pride in every opportunity to share their Library with the people, and thus its privileges and influence are extended into every community in the land. The privileges are great; the influence is wholly good.

Now, in our willingness to lend millions of American dollars abroad, let us pause to consider that the agencies and institutions of our own Government are entitled to claim first consideration in the allocation of funds for maintenance and progress. They are, after all, our oldest and most steadfast collaborators in the future of a great America. As for the Library of Congress, prudence, wisdom, and foresight impose upon us a solemn and inescapable duty to preserve its strength and uphold its cause.

Effect of Administration Policies on Milling of Wheat and Corn

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, all over this country flour mills are shutting down and thousands of men are being thrown out of work. This deplorable condition is caused by the unwise policy of the administration in shipping wheat instead of flour to foreign countries for relief purposes. By milling the wheat in this country, the mills can be kept running, their employees can be kept at work, and the wheat bran so necessary for dairy feed can be kept at home.

Common sense can and should be used in carrying out our tremendous relief program. If a serious food shortage occurs in this country, I know of no one to whom we can look for help. We can best help others by conserving food for our own people and by keeping our own people at work.

I include as a part of these remarks a telegram, one of many, I have just received from 93 employees of J. Allen Smith & Co., of Knoxville, Tenn., the largest flour mill in the South protesting action of this administration, creating unemployment by shipping wheat instead of flour.

I also include as part of these remarks a letter from Mr. W. E. Peters, president of Peters & Bradley Mill Co., of Knoxville, Tenn. This is the only mill in Knoxville which produces corn meal. Thousands of people in Knoxville and vicinity rely on corn meal for their daily bread. The OPA, by advancing the price of corn 28 cents per bushel without increasing the ceiling price of meal so as to enable this mill to produce meal, has driven meal into the black market in that section of the country. This mill has been driven out of business in the production of meal, and thousands of its customers must now turn to those who bootleg corn meal.

The matter referred to follows:

KNOXVILLE, TENN., *May 14, 1946.*

Hon. JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We desire to enter a strong protest against the present policy of the Government in sending wheat out of this country while flour mills remain idle. We are in sympathy with relief program, but feel it is unfair to workers of this country in creating unemployment by shipping wheat instead of flour. Urgently request you take any action necessary to change present policy so that flour will be milled in this country to prevent widespread unemployment which is now going on.

A. R. Rutherford, Floyd Faulkner, P. A. Couch, Elmer Keelen, George Shular, Guy Finley, Frank Davis, Edward Neilson, J. A. Davis, James Williams, Coye Harrell, E. E. Hendrix, R. A. Collins, Clyde Mellon, W. C. Tyler, Claude Hobby, R. B. Stricklan, Jack Jones, J. H. Skeen, John O. Clevenger, Carl Miller, James Stinnett, Otis Marshall, Jr., Willet Hartgrove, Carl Smith, James Foust, C. E. Morgan, K. D. Hall, Floyd Witt, L. E. Witt, Love Gay, Jerry Davis, Ralph Spears, Dinnis Willis, Frank Caval, Clifford Love, Willie Banks, Elisha Hill, Ossie Gash, James Holmes, Homas Essic, Anderson Taylor, Julyus Garner, Herbert Wyrick, James H. Reed, Clyde Reed, Alum Mount, John E. Schaad, Bill Beeler, Emmet Howerton, Ray Farmer, Herman Anderson, Jim Williams, Ralph Carmichael, Vernon Oglesby, W. E. Sheets, G. P. Green, Alfred Camara, Raymond Stephenson, J. C. Sherfey, W. A. Carter, Joice Warren, Williamson, Willard Manning, H. McDowell, Willie Ray, Robert Smith, Jeff Smith, Charles Howard, Fred M. Howard, Ray Miller, Julian Hood, Roy Curington, Woodrow Smith, James Ford, W. C. Sherrill, William Kooch, Luther Smith, W. T. Smith, Geo. Kelley, Charles Lawson, Jesse Beeler, James G. Covington, Jesse Smith, Earl E. Bowers, Sr., R. W. Watkin, Robert Towns, Sam Wright, Jas. H. Reed, Coy Churchman, T. F. Byrd, Omer Smith, J. R. Ruffner.

PETERS & BRADLEY MILL CO.,
Knoxville, Tenn., May 14, 1946.

Hon. JOHN J. JENNINGS, *Member of Congress,*
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR JUDGE: The OPA has never permitted us to advance meal in line with their 3-cent advance per bushel on corn, in regard to which we wrote you some time ago, but have now put into effect 25 cents per bushel raise on corn, and so far have not increased the ceiling price on meal. Following is a copy of the telegram we sent yesterday, and up to this writing we have had no reply. Might add that before wiring Washington we telephoned the local office, and also the food administrator office in Nashville, and neither of them knew anything at all.

"RALPH H. BROWN, *Price Executive,*
"Cereals, Feed, and Chemical Price Branch, OPA, Federal Office Building No. 1, Washington, D. C.:

"With corn up 28 cents, has meal ceiling been raised? If so, how much?"

This means, of course, that we will not grind any more corn, and all that will be ground will be sold on the black market, as a great deal of it is already. Things have gotten to such a pass here in Knoxville that we have discontinued deliveries of meal, and the grocery men willingly come here and haul away what little we can let them have, because there is a crying demand for meal which cannot be met.

Yours truly,

PETERS & BRADLEY MILL CO.,
W. E. PETERS, *President.*

Discrimination Against Independent Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an open letter to the Congress of the United States from the New Hampshire Shoe Workers' Union. The letter is signed by Francis J. Mara, business agent, and gives the shoe workers' union's views respecting discrimination against independent labor groups.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

THE NEW HAMPSHIRE
SHOE WORKERS' UNION,
Manchester, N. H., May 7, 1946.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES,
Washington, D. C.:

During the past 2 weeks a series of meetings have been held in Washington between representatives of independent labor in the United States and the various heads of administrative agencies of Government. Approximately 146 delegates were in personal attendance at these meetings and numerous other independent labor groups were represented by proxy. We are confident that we have satisfied those with whom we met that independent labor is not only an integral part of the working classes but actually constitutes the majority group.

The purpose of these meetings was to bring to the attention of the leaders in Government the existing discrimination in labor agencies of Government in favor of AFL and CIO, which actually are minority groups in labor. Numerous instances were cited of vicious acts of discrimination against independent labor, and the further fact that minority elements were practically in control of all legislation, rules, and regulations affecting the rights of the working classes in America.

An appeal has been made to the President of the United States to eliminate this paradox now existing in our democracy. Suggestions have been made for the appointment of representatives of independent labor in the Department of Labor, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Wage Stabilization Board; and other agencies of

Government administering labor laws. Furthermore, we have asked the President to consider the plight of the majority element in labor in all programs of future labor legislation and to immediately end the existing policy which is admittedly being dominated by the minority interests as represented by AFL and CIO.

In the war which we have just won, the records of industry reflect the efforts of all labor in reaching fabulous standards of production. If we are to expect the maintenance of the goal of full production so that all peoples of the world may be fed, clothed, and sheltered properly, due recognition must be given to independent labor.

We sincerely believe that every Member of Congress, in taking the oath of office, pledged himself to abide by the principles of the Constitution of our great country. Knowing this to be true, we again call upon the Members of Congress to see that everyone in labor is given equal rights and protection under the law, and to discontinue the present favoritism shown members of AFL and CIO affiliates. It is only through such a program that a democratic state can survive.

The people of these United States are looking to you as their Representatives in Government to formulate a program so that discrimination in any walk of life for any reason, be it race, color, creed, or membership in labor groups will not be tolerated. Our Nation must progress if mankind is to survive, but progress can only develop on an aggressive basis if we all work together in harmony and with common principles, common objectives, and the common understanding of the equal rights of all citizens of these United States.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS J. MARA,
Business Agent.

Fang and Claw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. OVERTON
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and interesting editorial entitled "Fang and Claw," published in a recent issue of the Shreveport (La.) Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FANG AND CLAW

(From Webster's International Unabridged Dictionary: Fang: A long sharp tooth by which the prey of an animal is seized and held or torn; to strike fangs into. Claw: A sharp nail on the toe of an animal; to pull, tear, scratch, scrape, seize, clutch, dig, or make with as with claws or nails.)

In stating to the Louisiana Law Institute here, in his admirable address Friday night, that the American people have abdicated their authority and are content to let labor disputes be settled by "the law of fang and claw," nationally distinguished Federal Judge John C. Knox, of New York, pointed bluntly to a national situation that stems directly from lack of courage in the Washington Government and lack of action among the people to inspire—or compel—courage among their political leaders.

The law of fang and claw is simply the law of the jungle—of snarling wolf packs, destroying each other, of the tiger slaughtering the lamb and of survival not of the fittest but of the most ruthless. That condition rapidly is spreading itself through our national industrial structure in a vicious circle made of Washington willingness to do more and more of whatever a few national labor leaders demand, of labor leadership willingness to take whatever it can get by whatever means are most handy, and public indifference to what is going on.

All of this has brought about what is—to use another of Judge Knox's phrases—"a tortured and troubled nation." As a solution, the Federal jurist suggests that labor disputes involving interstate commerce should be settled, after all other peaceful means have failed, in Federal courts where the viewpoint of the jurists inherently turns to a clear national perspective rather than to the dog-eat-dog view that marks so much of present so-called "negotiations" in labor disputes.

The fact that such a suggestion comes from Judge Knox gives added weight to it. He is not merely "a" Federal judge, but the senior judge of the southern district of New York, one of the most important in the national Federal judicial system. He is respected throughout the Federal bench and in National and State bar associations, a student of authority on all of the fields of jurisprudence. Aside from his standing as a judge, he is well known as an author on legal matters. Among his writings are the books, A Judge Comes of Age and Order in the Court. Just Justice, an article by Judge Knox in the Saturday Evening Post during the war years, attracted much favorable attention.

Judge Knox's proposal for Federal court settlement of labor disputes can become reality only through a far greater display of courage in the Washington Government and action among the public as a whole than has been evident in the past decade, during which the law of fang and claw became so prevalent in labor disputes. The record of the New Deal in constantly yielding to labor is too well known to need repetition. It is being carried on in the present administration. Congress has followed, with very few exceptions, but one course in the past decade in relation to legislation to prevent or control labor disputes and their terribly destructive effect on national economy. The House occasionaly passes a bill really worth while, but the Senate either pigeonholes it in a committee or emasculates it before passage.

What is needed is more men in Congress willing to show the courage shown by Senator JOHN H. OVERTON of Louisiana in his recent sharp rebuke to William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor. Called on to vote as Green demanded, Senator OVERTON stingingly informed Mr. Green that his vote would be cast "as my conscience dictates" and it is being cast that way.

The incident which brought about Senator OVERTON'S sharp statement to Mr. Green forms a part of the general national situation which Judge Knox referred to in his use of the phrase, "the law of fang and claw." Simply because Senator OVERTON dared to refuse to be coerced by the vote demands of labor leaders, an A. F. of L. official from the East came to the Louisiana Federation of Labor convention at Alexandria to unloose oral fangs and claws in an attack of the type that only a professional denouncer could or would make.

Senator OVERTON had the courage to fight back, but too few in Washington are willing to do that. Judge Knox has offered a logical solution—the substitution of Federal law and Federal adjudication as a substitute for the law of the jungle and settlement that comes only in destruction of one or both disputants. Labor itself should support his proposal for the law of fang and claw plays no favorites and in the end those who use it also find themselves facing destruction under it.

The Louisiana Law Institute, under the able leadership of John H. Tucker, Jr., of Shreveport and Monte Lemann of New Orleans, rapidly and rightly is growing in esteem throughout Louisiana, not only in legal circles but in lay circles as well. A typical example of why this is so is illustrated by that fine organization persuading Judge Knox to use its meeting in Shreveport as the time and place to deliver such a magnificent and momentous address, with its national and even international implications.

Vote—It Is Your Patriotic Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, we should make a start in taking an earnest interest in self-rule, and thereby insure for the future generations the implanting of a mighty good habit—that of being a real good citizen. It is a serious responsibility to be a citizen. Your first ethical duty in the field of public service is your duty as a voter. Use, protect, and cherish this right.

If we are to maintain a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, we must vote. Democracy depends upon it. A democracy is a group of people who get together in a common enterprise for the purpose of governing themselves.

Registered adult citizens, regardless of property or poverty, may vote. Our wishes can be best expressed through the ballot. You do not have to be a king or of nobility to have a part in our government.

We, as American voters, should not be derelict in our duty, and we must not be negligent about taking part in our elections. Under a democratic system of government like ours, the character of the government is largely what the voters make it. Every voter is a part of the government. As such, he has a distinct moral duty to exercise his franchise in such a manner as to bring about the best welfare of the Nation as a whole.

As a result of 50 years of agitation by those who felt that the discrimination against women was unjust and unreasonable the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution was adopted, giving women equal suffrage with men. Since then women have taken a deep interest in elections.

You mothers, fathers, wives, sweethearts, and relatives of veterans should remember that the ballot is just as essential to the maintenance of good government in time of war and peace as arms and a willing soldier in time of war, especially when our servicemen have been sacrificing their lives for the freedoms we enjoy.

There should be no indifference on our part. If popular government is to be a success, we must have an electorate, not only intelligent and honest but also wide awake and vigilant at all times.

Among the greatest dangers of popular government are indifference and neglect on the part of voters. We should be greatly concerned about the

failure of our friends to vote. You should contribute your share by going to the polls and voting and urging your neighbors to do likewise.

We have no right to criticize unless we do take part in elections. To fully participate in the official activities of our Government is a patriotic duty, privilege, and opportunity no citizen can afford to shirk because the majority rule is determined by the will of the people.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a radio address by Upton Close, on the subject of socialized medicine.

Mr. Speaker, a committee in the Senate has been having extensive hearings on the national health program. This national health program is nothing more than socialized medicine. Socialized medicine prevails in every country that has regimentation of its people. It is a foreign ideology, and does not spring from the desires of the great mass of people in this country.

If socialized medicine was to be adopted in America, it would mean the end of your family physician. It would mean the end of high quality, personalized medical care. It would require 8 or 10 billion dollars to operate, and an increase of 2 to 3 hundred thousand on our Federal payroll.

I trust that the members of this Congress, when they return home this summer, will make a special effort to inquire of their constituents if they desire socialized medicine.

The address of Upton Close follows:

It is hard to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. It is just as hard to make a decent orderly world out of a mass of compromises, betrayals of principle, and nose-poking into things that are none of our business or too big for us to handle. Out of our inability to handle situations far too big for any one nation comes the statesmanship of the easy way. In the end it turns out to be the hard way.

As an example, you now have the United States asked to take the brunt of the mess over Palestine while the Arabs appeal to Russia. Don't forget the Communists and so-called liberals have been telling us persistently that the Russian dictatorship was the only true friend of the Jews.

Because our leaders took the easy way, as it seemed to them, of making other peoples' wars our wars and yet selling the innocent voter the idea that other people would fight those wars, we are now in unsolvable messes in Europe and Asia. Then we took the easy way in Yugoslavia, and the result is an impossible arrangement or splitting the territory around Trieste which, of course, will make us still more trouble in the long run unless we abandon the whole picture. Now Jimmy Byrnes is unable to get any definite peace treaties out of Russia and Russia's puppet Marxist governments which do not want Europe to settle down until it first turns Marxist. So Secretary Byrnes takes the easy way of proposing a 25-year, joint four-power military occupation of Germany, a thing utterly impossible in the light of history, but good for a lot of hard trouble before we finally get out, or go in for a third European war.

Roosevelt the second took the easy way of winning elections by coddling aggressive labor bosses in order to get labor votes in huge chunks. Harry Truman took the easy way of avoiding offense to labor bosses, however unreasonable, and proposing wage increases under price restraints which squeezed the life out of American production. But what is the result? We now face the very real possibility of not partial but actually complete paralysis of American production, transportation and distribution, and Harry Truman and those who encouraged him are finding out how hard the easy way can become.

There will be a turn against this false statesmanship. The question simply is: How hard do we hit the bumps before the American people turn against this philosophy of the easy way?

We should have some tests this coming week in the Senate on the British loan, and the renewal of OPA authority, and in a Senate committee on one more amazing scheme which I want to analyze, namely, the scheme for state medicine.

Senator WHEELER's remark that if the British loan is voted it will be put over by the Russian scare, seems quite justified. Senator VANDENBERG says he is utterly puzzled as to whether advancing the money will help Britain and the world, or the exact opposite. So he adopts the theory never before heard from the mouth of a banker, "When in doubt, lend the money."

If we are voting $4,000,000,000 to Britain because we are scared of the Russian dictatorship, we ought to stop and think the whole deal over again. The real logic of our scare is that in the course of Russian crackdown on the far-flung British Empire we will appear as protectors of that Empire and be drawn over to Stalin's side of the world to fight for the British Empire. By just what reasoning could $4,000,000,000 advanced to Britain save us from clashing with Russia? It would take a hundred times $4,000,000,000, plus the rest of the men of the white race, to make the British Empire so strong that Russian Imperialists would leave it alone. As the easy way to avoid war with Russia, the loan to Britain will soon turn out to be the hard way.

In the United States we have seen, in the past week something that could mean the end of our Republic. Paid clerks and administrators of a Government bureau, the OPA, took it upon themselves to go over the head of Congress, which is their employer, in an attempt to stampede citizens into reversing a policy voted by one House of Congress. It is the most flagrant thing yet see in this Republic. A glaring example of how bureaucracy wedges itself into free government and turns it into totalitarianism!

I think our people sense that they can't set prices at less than the money is now worth. They know that they can't force house owners and producers and distributors to take losses any longer. They know that if they bluff Congress to continue the old-style OPA it will ruin business and confiscate property and destroy that basic right of ownership which caused men to leave England and found this Nation. Of course, there's logic in it for Marxists who want to turn our Republic into a totalitarian state, but for the rest of us it's just another case of taking the easy way that soon turns out to be the hard way.

The propaganda of the Marxists and the arguments of their fellow-traveling liberals are handed out ready-made for comrades of Communist cells and just frightened good people to mail to Congressmen. If such methods actually stampede Congress, then a formula has been proved for destroying representative government in this country.

Come, now, to another example of a Government bureau stepping out to change one whole free profession—medicine—into a regimented unit which would fit into a totalitarian government. The Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service is a very obscure official. You may not even know that he or his office exists. But you will know if bills now having hearings before the Senate Labor Committee should pass. The Surgeon General will then become the dictator over all public health and hospitals, the physical and mental care of all children to 21, and the medical, nursing, and dental professions. He will receive and disburse somewhere between 5 and 16 percent of all the incomes up to $3,600 earned in the United States .

The name of the present Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service is Dr. Thomas Parran, and those who know say that he is a good man in his place. Undoubtedly there should be more study, under his direction, of the present public health needs in various parts of the United States, and few of us object to more joint Federal and State assistance for those of small means and residents of backward areas, provided who might succeed him is competent to supervise and subsidize $4,000,000,000 worth of medical research, education, and what is called medical insurance, which would take into its pay most of the doctors of the United States or drive them out of practice. As a matter of fact, it is not insurance at all, but an official medical service that we are asked to supply ourselves at the cost of the doctors, medicine, and hospitals plus another million or two social workers added to the Federal pay roll to supervise both us and the doctors.

In truly totalitarian fashion the Surgeon General would have a board of 16 medical advisers picked by himself whom he could change or ignore at will. He and his millions of bureaucrats would pass upon every local contract made with physicians to serve us. The bill provides four different kinds of contracts for doctors and dentists and nurses, from a straight wage-hour basis to a per-capita-run-through-the-mill basis.

New Deal lawyers haven't yet figured out how such contracts could be drawn and kept put, since some doctors in each community would be wanting to change as soon as each contract was drawn. You can see that the Surgeon General would be a very busy man.

On December 10 last, Dr. Parran put the civil servants of our Public Health Service on notice that they were to advocate this amazing totalitarian program in their public statements. When the very cream of our civil service can thus be thrown into controversial propaganda for innovations to our system, the last sanctum of purity in government has indeed been violated. In the face of this Senator MURRAY, backed by Senator PEPPER, had the brazenness to denounce doctors as "prejudiced witnesses" and to ask an investigation of those lobbying against the bill. He dropped it fast enough when Senator TAFT called for investigation of those lobbying for the bill. Now the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons has asked the Senate Committee on Education and Labor to conduct a thorough investigation of the groups lobbying for the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, Senate 1050 and Senate 1606.

It is a long-laid and complicated scheme. Each particular step is phrased in snide language, which refrains from revealing the entire scheme. For instance, in all the 185 pages of printed text of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill the additional 4-percent social security tax out of pay envelopes, plus 4 percent on employer and 5 percent on the man who works for himself, is never mentioned as such. Through this ruse the bill support-

ers managed to evade the congressional committee dealing with taxes and revenues and engineered the bill into the Senate committee on labor relations—a committee notoriously packed with champions of Russia, and persons influenced by Marxist philosophy. Another piece is fitted into the puzzle by the Pepper bill, which would likely give our bureaucrats authority to take away from parents and churches all influence over our children as completely as was done in Russia.

There is in the bill, in language carefully obscure, a provision which goes completely outside of medicine and health and reshapes the whole structure of Government social-security financing. Apparently it throws into one pot the $8,000,000,000 or so per year to be taken for health insurance, so-called, and the several billion dollars already being taken for social security.

Thus the bill seems designed to slip over what Congress and even the President recently refused, in view of present wage and production conditions—namely, the doubling or quadrupling of the social-security funds taken from the earning public and put on the books of the spendthrift United States Treasury. The Treasury spends the money—the people have figures to their credit.

The scheme is very inequable, as are all Marxist schemes, penalizing hard-working families which have more than one wage earner. Yet those who earn more than $3,600 per year pay nothing on income above that amount. The whole financing scheme is full of loopholes which would make endless business for lawyers, just like all New Deal measures. This one, however, takes the cake.

What is this wonderful scheme designed to accomplish? The public-health record of United States citizens is now twice as good as that of British citizens who have state medicine, and three times as good as that of Germans, who had it longer than anybody else. Our rejects for military service, including duplications, was 38 percent—including mental patients and the deformed—against the British record of 50 percent with lower standards. America's medical bill under the patient's free choice of doctor and physician fee system is the lowest per capita in the world, and voluntary insurance plans which now cover about one-third of our population can reduce it still lower if the free choice exists to throw out "gold brickers," which can't be done under state service. New Zealand finds state medicine such a crushing financial burden and such a political football that New Zealand's health minister has asked his country's medical association to figure out a nongovernmental system. Of course, employers simply could not raise salaries 4 percent and workers simply could not have another 4 percent taken out of their pay envelopes under present industrial conditions, or any in sight.

Where was this wonderful scheme born? Well, I guess we can accept its daddy's own boast. The Communist organization known as the International Labor Office claims to have fathered it and fostered it through our Marxist-influenced labor groups. It has been prepared and written by social workers rather than medical men, and its cock-eyed financing is the brainchild of the research department of our social security board—namely, Isadore Falk, Michael Davis, Arthur Altmeyer and comrades.

A doctor in my family, who has worked 25 years in the Veterans Service and hates it for its red tape and low grade medical standards, says that this bill would reduce all medicine and hospitalization to what our most unfortunate veterans are getting. But, he says he'll go along if they'll put doctors on salaries of what they are worth compared to the lawyers and radio commentators and other ballyhooers for state medicine who, he thinks, should also have their professions taken over and their salaries fixed at something like what they are worth.

I hope there will be other opportunities rather than actual necessities for me to describe to you both the destructive and ridiculous angles of this scheme to totalitarianize the most independent and responsible profession in civilized society—our medical profession. But I know you begin to understand what's going on, and you begin to sense what a free society needs to do to save its freedom.

Out of the Dog House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, there is a trend on the part of the public of this country to fully recognize the rightful place in our economic structure of business—large and small.

During the early years of the New Deal, it was a popular indoor sport to attack big business as such regardless of whether or not its practices were ethical.

A few days ago, I read an article on the subject of the record of business which was written by Mr. Dexter T. Duggan, a prominent businessman of Bemidji, Minn., in my own home district. The editorial appeared under the heading "Guest editorial" in the Bemidji Pioneer on April 22, 1946.

It is reprinted herewith:

OUT OF THE DOG HOUSE

We think it high time for business, big and little, to come rushing forth from the dog house of public opinion and claim its rightful place in the sun of approbation of this country of ours.

We anger at the propaganda of the bureaucrats in Washington who ridicule business in general when we think of the manner in which management came to the fore and accomplished such feats of production that has the rest of the world aghast at their magnitude.

We tire of cabinet officers of that type who state publicly that the auto industry can afford 15-percent wage increases in 1946 and 25 percent in 1947 "after careful study" and encourage a long and costly series of strikes, and who later state "the study urging wage boosts without increases in prices was only proposed in a magazine article written by an obscure Federal employee."

We object to the philosophy of centralized Government in Washington which tells us what we can pay for things and creates an unbalanced condition in our economy with resultant confusion and hardship on the people as a whole.

We resent the class feeling stirred up by the labor unions and fostered by the administration wherein the attainment of wealth is held up to scorn and derision.

We believe that the United States has achieved the highest standard of living by production and ingenuity and that the correction of our present national hysteria lies in the abolishment of our present bureau-ridden system and the unfettering of American business.

We believe that the people should take inventory to the end that their community stand on its own two feet and find solutions for their problems in enterprise and work. We cannot continue to look upon the Federal Government as a never-ending source of financial help in all the things we wish to do.

When we speak of American business we mean the newsboy, the peanut vendor, the chimney sweep, the piece cutter in the woods, the small retailer, the large retailer, the wholesaler, the service industries, the large and small corporations.

We should all remember that a large corporation gets large only because it is efficient and does its job well. It probably started out small and couldn't help getting large. Then, too, if a farmer isn't a businessman, I don't know who is. In fact, if he isn't a businessman he won't be a farmer long.

Let us only restrain those things which are un-American and govern only those things which should be governed impartially for the good of all.

Let's assume our full responsibility to the end that reconversion may get under way immediately before we slide into another costly and bitter depression.

America must produce and it can't do it under the direction of the present muddling mob which is now floundering around in Washington.

San Francisco Bay Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the interest demonstrated by the press and people of the San Francisco Bay area with reference to a second crossing of San Francisco Bay from San Francisco to Alameda County, and under the unanimous consent previously granted, I include as a part of my remarks the following editorial which recently appeared in the San Francisco News:

Traditional Navy opposition has been encountered by Congressman RICHARD WELCH in his efforts to secure authorization for a Federal study of a new transbay crossing. In their initial stages, both the San Francisco-Oakland and the Golden Gate Bridges were held to be against Navy policy. Later, of course, this opposition was withdrawn.

The Welch proposal is that studies be made of both a third bridge and the Reber plan for a system of earth-fill embankments; Navy authorities answer that such studies are inadvisable at this time.

It would be hard to imagine a time more advisable than right now to explore the possibilities of relieving dangerous and exasperating congestion on the Bay Bridge by providing another means of crossing from San Francisco to Alameda County. Week-end and holiday traffic on the structure now far surpasses its capacity. Motorists are reminded painfully of the unconscionable delays of the old auto ferry days.

Obviously nothing can be done locally until approval is forthcoming from the Navy and Army. That is why Representative WELCH asks Congress to authorize them to make the initial investigation. Why they should be unwilling or reluctant to do so is not clear. If there are valid reasons of national security why a third bridge or the Reber plan should not cross the bay it seems to the News the fact should be made known as early as possible. If, on the other hand, the armed services just don't want to be bothered to make a study at this time, that is an attitude extremely unfair to San Francisco and the bay area.

Mr. Speaker, at the time this editorial was being written officials of the War and Navy Departments were demonstrating a deeper and more sympathetic interest than at any time in the past in the imperative need for another physical connection between the peninsula of San Francisco and the mainland.

The joint Army-Navy board has been appointed and full and open hearings will take place in San Francisco about August 1, when all interested parties will be given ample opportunity to present their views.

The Injustice of Taxing Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ralph L. Van Name, secretary to the New York City Employees' Retirement System, which appeared in the Civil Service Leader on Tuesday, May 14, 1946:

THE INJUSTICE OF TAXING PENSIONS

The Federal taxation of public employee pensions is so discriminatory as to be punitive, and so violative of the integrity of pensions as to offend the basic principle of full security on which pensions are founded.

The discrimination consists in taxing public employee pensions while full exemption of social security pensions is granted, up to their very ceiling of $1,020 a year for 60,000,000 present or potential pensioners, and exemption up to $1,440 for 700,000 railroad workers under the railroad retirement law.

Excluded public-service employees constitute only 10 percent of the total gainfully employed throughout the Nation. They justly feel that they are being victimized because they are such a meager minority.

The integrity of a pension consists of its guaranteed fixed amount. Under public-employee systems, the total received is generally known as the retirement allowance, composed of the annuity, which the employee finances by his contributions, and the pension, the part which the Government provides. The total benefit is as much entitled to tax exemption as social-security and railroad pensions, which also are based partly on employee contributions.

Under a Treasury Department ruling and theory, the pension is taxed as soon as an amount equal to the employee's own money has been repaid, his annual taxable income meanwhile being rated at 3 percent of that amount. The total allowance is normally scarcely half the average income on which it was based, so he has to live on less than half of former average income and frequently on the third, suffering the whittling away because of taxation of what should be fixed income.

Remember, too, that annuity or pension income is unproductive income.

Both arguments—fixed nature and unproductive nature of pension income—apply as well to insurance-company annuities.

The imposition of income tax on retired public employees' pensions is not the result of any directive of Congress, contrary to what some imagine. Congress simply did not expressly exempt income of public pensioners from taxation, and that inspired the Treasury Department practice of taxing such pensions. Yet Congress expressly exempted inheritances of up to $60,000 from Federal taxation; and when long-lived annuitants, having exhausted their own equities, begin to draw on the forfeitures to the fund by the short-lived, they are drawing inheritances which, to individuals who are not pensioners, are not taxed at all below a value of $60,000.

There is no tenable argument for retaining the present system of taxation of pension and annuity, and Congress should hasten to remedy the Treasury's present injustice to public employees, which infliction has always lacked, and still lacks, direct Congressional sanction.

Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH, of Kings County, introduced a bill, H. R. 456, to give to all retired employees the exemption which 90 percent of all employees now have. The bill provides:

"There shall be excluded from gross income the first $1,440, in the aggregate for each year, of all retirement, pension and annuity payments including, but not limited to, payment under the old-age and survivors insurance law—Social Security Act—received during the taxable year by a retired employee."

Note that this bill does not pick and choose between public and private employee, but applies alike to all.

Representative WILLIAM T. BYRNE, of Albany, more recently introduced a bill to exempt the pensions of State, county and municipal employees up to $2,000.

There is sound principle in support of greater exemption than either bill carries, but since the Federal Government has provided $1,020 and $1,440 exemption for most pensions, a limited amount of exemption of pensions and annuities generally to public employees probably stands a better likelihood of early success.

It behooves public employees to bring quantity and quality support to proposals for no less pension exemption than that carried in the Keogh bill. Much of the $60,000,000 a year which New York City taxpayers are contributing to make possible the retirement of its employees, instead of providing pensions for them, is now siphoned into the Federal Treasury through Federal income taxation of pensions, and the employees who had hoped to retire at the ages of 60 or 65 years find themselves compelled to remain until age 70 in order to build up the additional pension necessary to produce tax income for the Federal Government out of the life savings made by them and on their behalf. Meanwhile, most of the 12,000,000 veterans have returned from the wars. These veterans' prospects of public jobs are dimmed by aged public employees, who are reluctantly compelled by a discriminatory Federal income-tax policy to continue in their positions beyond a useful age.

Rights of Veterans Under Surplus Property Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a release from the War Assets Administration advising veterans how they can best exercise their rights under the recent amendment of the Surplus Property Act, which is designed by Congress to help veterans get some of the vast stores of surplus materials which the Government has for sale.

I sincerely hope that this amendment will accomplish its purpose and really get some material into the hands of veterans who need it and are entitled to it. I think every Member of Congress has been bitterly disappointed in the way this act has been working in the past. I realize that, in many cases, the goods that veterans apply for are not sufficient to go around, but in too many other cases veterans have been run all around the country on promises of obtaining materials only to find that anything worth while has been snapped up by other buyers, who had no right whatever to deprive our servicemen of the things which Congress intended they should have.

I am distributing to servicemen in my district the information contained in this release of the War Assets Administration with the hope that it will be helpful to them. I am going to ask them to advise me in instances where they are not able to obtain available supplies, so that I can report their difficulties to the congressional committees now investigating distribution of materials by War Assets Administration.

I hope we will find no more instances where department stores are buying materials and selling them at a profit, while veterans are begging for them without avail.

The release of the War Assets Administration follows:

HOW VETERAN CAN EXERCISE HIS RIGHTS UNDER SURPLUS PROPERTY ACT, AS AMENDED

Amendment of the Surplus Property Act provides for setting aside for sale to veterans of World War II exclusively, either for personal or for business use, selected items in heaviest demand and in short supply. It also advances to a general priority second only to that of Federal agencies veterans' former preference in the purchase of any goods for use in establishing their own small enterprises.

Existing procedures generally will continue to govern certification. Applicants must furnish proof of honorable release from service and a description of the property sought.

Veterans holding appropriate certificates may purchase items on the set-aside list for their own personal use as well as for use in a small business or agricultural or professional enterprise. Certificates already on file which include items placed on the set-aside list will be honored wherever such items are available. However, since all items on the set-aside list are in critically short supply, applicants will generally be limited to a single unit.

Certification for personal use will be limited to items on the set-aside list. Such certification will not be made for items previously certified for use in a small business, professional or agricultural enterprise. However, the restriction against more than one certification may be modified to permit additional certification for items not previously requested which are on the set-aside list. For example, a veteran already certified for a tractor finds typewriters in the set-aside list, and wants to buy one. He may be certified additionally for a typewriter.

Application for any item on the set-aside list will be accepted, even though the applications already on hand exceed many times

the available supply. Certification offices have been instructed to inform applicants fully regarding the ratio between the approximate number of applicants and remaining stocks of the item requested.

Whenever any item on the set-aside list becomes available, offerings will be made to the holders of personal-use certificates in the same proportion as their total number bears to the total number of certificates on file for small business or agricultural or professional enterprise.

For example: There are 30 trucks available. The regional office has 100 old certificates and 10 personal-use certificates on file, or a proportion of 1 to 10. Notification will be sent to the 3 applicants for personal use whose certificates bear the oldest dates, and the 27 applicants for nonpersonal use whose certificates bear the oldest dates.

If a veteran holding a personal-use certificate does not exercise his priority upon notification that the property requested is available, he does not lose his place in the chronological file, but will be notified a second and third time, after which his certificate will be placed in an inactive file.

Veterans will be notified by mail or by local public notice where and when they can buy items for which they have been certified. Notice will concern availability of the item requested, location, opportunity for inspection, prices, lot sizes, etc. There will be no need for veterans to call in person to check the progress of their applications.

Veterans' interest has been largely confined to a relatively few classes of goods in the consumer category. As supplies of these goods are and will continue to be low, the effect on the volume of flow will be limited. Veterans will get a somewhat larger supply of set-aside items because they will now be able to purchase them to the exclusion of all other buyers. A larger share of items in the general inventory will go to them because their priority will now exceed that of State and local governments and tax-supported institutions, small business, and all other priority or preferred buyers except the Federal Government itself. But it must be borne in mind that this legislation does not increase basic supply and that there will never be enough of some items to fill more than a fraction of demand.

Certification on a new form must be obtained for purchases for personal use. These and all other certifications should be applied for at the nearest of the WAA certifying offices, which in New Jersey is 20 Washington Place, Newark, N. J.

MAY 1946—100-PERCENT SET-ASIDE LIST FOR VETERANS

Automotive vehicles: Passenger cars (used); passenger cars (new); trucks (Jeeps, all types, 2½-ton or less) motorcycles; scooters; trailers (bomb trucks, all trailers).

Tractors: D4 and R4 caterpillar, 36–45 DBHP (or equal); D7 caterpillar, 61–90 DBHP (or equal); D8 caterpillar, 91–140 DBHP (or equal); TD9 International, 36–45 DBHP (or equal); TD14 International, 46–60 DBHP (or equal); TD6 International, 46–60 DBHP (or equal).

Construction, mining, and excavating machinery: Tractor-type scrapers; air compressors; batching plants; crushing and screening plants; ditching machines; cranes, shovels, and draglines.

Agricultural machinery: Land levelers; plows.

Medical, surgical, and dental apparatus and equipment: Major operating tables; operating lamps; field X-ray units; diathermy machines; dental units; dental chairs; dental cabinets.

Typewriters.

(The foregoing list is subject to change by the War Assets Administration as circumstances require.)

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

THE CHAIRMAN'S LETTER

(By CARROLL REECE, chairman, Republican National Committee)

As this letter is written the coal strike is still unsettled, although a temporary truce has been granted.

Regardless of the ultimate outcome of this strike, the result so far has been the greatest humiliation suffered by the Government of the United States since the burning of the White House and the Capitol during the War of 1812.

For that humiliation the administration in power must accept responsibility.

The responsibility rests directly upon the shoulders of the administration for two reasons:

1. Its pitiful inactivity during the period immediately before the strike began, and for more than a month after the men left the mines.

2. The policies of the administration pursued over the past 14 years which have produced the kind of economic chaos of which the coal strike is a shining example.

The miners ceased work in the bituminous fields on April 1. Long before that date every casual reader of the newspapers knew that a strike was inevitable.

It was not until May 10—1 month and 10 days later—that Mr. Truman took any direct action looking toward a settlement of the dispute which had all but destroyed the Nation's industrial system.

Even then, all he did was to summon a representative of the miners and a representative of the operators for a conference. Why such a conference could not have been held at least 1 month earlier is a mystery of the first magnitude.

Did the President have no information previously that a coal strike was threatened, or was in actual operation? Did he not know that a cessation of mining would bring a paralysis of industry, of transportation, and of many other necessities of economic life?

Did he not know that a continuation of the strike for any considerable period would throw hundreds of thousands of workers out of their jobs?

Why did he have to wait until all of these things had become almost accomplished facts before he saw fit to act?

Perhaps the most humiliating aspect of the entire performance was that on the very day when Mr. Truman finally bestirred himself, Mr. John L. Lewis announced his famous truce. Since when has it been customary, or proper, for the Government of the United States to enter into a truce with its own citizens, or any group of its citizens? Such arrangements customarily are made between sovereign powers.

Nevertheless, Mr. Lewis did grant the truce and if our industries are operating today, if our railroads are running today, if our hospitals and public institutions are functioning, it is due to the condescension of Mr. Lewis, and not to any action by Mr. Truman.

The President does not have all of the responsibility, however. The party, of which he is at least the nominal leader, has majorities in both Houses of Congress.

If legislation is needed to prevent such catastrophes as the coal strike, it is the responsibility of the party in power to provide that legislation.

It is no excuse at all for Mr. Truman to say that several months ago he requested legislation designed to prevent Nation-wide strikes. He is the leader of his party, and his party has the votes in Congress to enact whatever legislation it chooses.

If lack of effective legislation is the cause of the disastrous condition in which the Nation finds itself today, the responsibility for such lack is that of the Democratic Party.

Republicans are powerless to provide such laws as may be needed—they do not, for the time being, have enough votes in the Senate and House. The people themselves cannot enact laws—that is the function of Congress, and, specifically, of the party which has a majority in Congress.

So, whether it is lack of action on the part of Congress itself or upon the part of Mr. Truman personally which has brought about the present sad plight of the Nation, the responsibility rests upon the administration in power and Mr. Truman is at the head of that administration.

Once more we have had a demonstration that the Government of the United States cannot be operated efficiently by playing the piano while the fires of industry die down, by attending county fairs, by vacation cruises at the taxpayers' expense, or by seeing what the boys in the back room will have.

There should, however, be no surprise because of the Administration's bungling during the last few weeks.

The Nation is now reaping the harvest of the seeds of economic disaster which have been sown by the Democratic administration over the past 14 years. A policy of seeking continuation in office by playing one group of citizens against another was bound in the end to produce economic chaos.

Such has been the policy of the Administration—a policy pursued so consistently that it could not have been other than designed.

That it was well designed to produce disaster is apparent to everyone today.

From the very inception of the present administration, it has followed the practice of setting class against class in a nation where no classes should exist. If they do exist today, it is because the present administration has created them.

The ridiculous spectacle of a nation threatened with deprivation of even the necessities of life at the very moment when industry has the capacity to produce in greater degree than ever before in history, and when the public has more money than at any previous time with which to purchase the produce of industry, is the net result of this studied divide-and-rule policy of the administration.

Industry suffers from a loss of profits.

Labor suffers from loss of wages.

The public suffers in ways too numerous and too obvious to mention.

The only beneficiaries are the hordes of tax-eating bureaucrats maintained at public expense for the ostensible purpose of preventing just such chaos as their own stupidity has produced today.

This Nation cannot continue to exist as such if it is divided into warring classes or economic groups. That is as true today as it was when Abraham Lincoln proclaimed that the Nation could not continue to exist half slave and half free.

There never was a time when national harmony and national unity were more important than today, and there never was a time when the Nation was governed by an administration more devoted to the production of disunity than today.

Obviously it is hopeless to look to the party which has produced chaos for leadership toward a united and prosperous nation. That

party is itself composed of discordant and mutally antagonistic groups which have been held together for the past decade only by the spoils of office. Now it is destroying the very source which produced these spoils.

The only hope for the Nation is to entrust the management of the Federal Government to a party which is united, and which wishes to make that Government operate efficiently and justly and economically.

In that situation lies the hope, and also the great responsibility of the Republican Party. We must win control of Congress this year for the welfare of the Nation, which is far more important than the welfare of any political party.

To do so we must present a united front. We must avoid all factional dissensions. We must forget anything in the nature of maneuvering in the interests of potential candidates for the Presidency in 1948.

The Republican Presidential nomination in 1948 will be far more valuable to whomever may win it if we elect a Republican Congress in 1946, than it will be if through apathy, through carelessness, through overconfidence, or through family quarrels we miss the golden opportunity presented this year.

Moreover, the election of a Republican Congress this year will enable us to begin next January the process of rescuing the Nation from the dangerous chaos created by 14 years of Democrat misrule.

Next January will be none too soon to begin that process, but it is the earliest opportunity available. It is obvious now, of course, that nothing constructive can be done so long as the present administration controls both Congress and the White House.

Once a Republican majority takes over in Congress we can begin to put into operation the legislative program upon which Republican Members of the present Congress have already reached an announced agreement. That in itself will be of tremendous advantage to the country.

Even the definite prospect of the enactment of such a program will have a stimulating and beneficial effect. Such a prospect would amount to public notice that no longer will this Nation be governed for the benefit of pressure groups or groups unsympathetic, to say the least, with the American form of government. It would amount to public notice that citizens who want to go to work to produce the commodities which this Nation needs could do so without fear of persecution by a meddlesome bureaucracy in Washington.

Furthermore, even though Mr. Truman would still have 2 years to serve in the White House, the election of a Republican Congress would strengthen the administration's hand in dealing with other nations.

Foreign governments would be quick to perceive that the final governmental authority in the United States—the American people—had determined that henceforward the Government of the United States would be administered in the interest of the United States.

That would mean an end to catering to groups, both here and abroad, whose interests are different from, if not antagonistic to, the interests of the American people. In such a situation the executive branch of the Government would have, at least, the opportunity to exert the full influence of the United States in the international field.

In addition, it would mean that with a Republican Congress on guard there would be no more secret diplomacy maneuverings such as those which have disgraced the American Government under the present administration, and have done so much toward destroying our influence abroad.

All of which adds up to the fact that this year a united and aggressive Republican Party has the opportunity to be of great service to the Nation by making sure of substantial Republican majorities in the next Congress.

House Resolution To Investigate Into the Propaganda Activities of the Arab League and Arab Office in This Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, serious charges have been made by Prof. James H. Sheldon, administrative chairman of the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League, against the activities of the Arab League as well as its Washington agency, the Arab Office, and against the Institute for Arab American Affairs. I have offered a resolution today to investigate the organized propaganda of these entities which are stirring up religious bias and bigotry in this country and which propaganda is aimed to influence negatively the attitude of the administration concerning the recommendation of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine which has been accepted by President Truman; to wit, the recommendation that 100,000 Jews be admitted into Palestine as soon as possible.

These foreign entities have gone far beyond their legal and legitimate purpose and are spending vast sums of money to influence American public opinion against the aims and aspirations of the Jews in Palestine. These agencies are using funds to stir up the Arabs in the Levant against the immigration of the 100,000 homeless Jews into Palestine.

Furthermore, the said Arab league and its affiliates are working with United States Fascist trends and tendencies and are seeking to develop in the minds of the American public antipathies repugnant to our democratic institutions.

Proof positive has been given that leaders of the Arab League are cooperating with the most dangerous and subversive elements here and abroad.

It is high time that these activities of the Arab League and the domestic agencies operating in concert with it were investigated.

A copy of the House resolution follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized and directed to investigate into the subject of propaganda initiated by the Arab League, which is a confederation of seven Arab governments, namely, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Egypt, Saudi-Arabia, Trans-Jordan, and Yemen, in this country, and to investigate into the subject of propaganda initiated from foreign or domestic sources for the purpose of undermining or otherwise influencing or directing the policy of the Government of the United States in regard to the execution of the accepted recommendation; to wit, the entrance of 100,000 Jews into Palestine, of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine.

That the said Committee on the Judiciary is further authorized to inquire into the use of funds originating in this country or coming from foreign sources which is used either by said Arab League or its agency in this country, known as the Arab office, as well as the Institute for Arab-American Affairs, and other similar agencies which operate in concert with said Arab office.

That the said Committee on the Judiciary is also authorized to investigate charges made that United States lend-lease funds and/or property are used by one or more countries forming the said Arab league for the purpose of defraying the cost of propaganda in and outside the United States directed against the said recommendation of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry.

That said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States—whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned—to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers and documents, by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpena shall be issued under the signature of the chairman and shall be served by any person designated by him. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refused to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized shall be held to the penalties provided by law.

Lake Diversion to Chicago's Rescue During the Dim-Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following editorial from the May 14, 1946, issue of the Chicago Tribune:

LAKE DIVISION

Diversion of water from Lake Michigan has been increased from 1,500 to 3,000 cubic feet per second in order to save 300 carloads of coal monthly during the power shortage. The extra water will be used to double production at the Chicago sanitary district's power plant at Lockport.

Mr. Truman issued no official order, but let Mayor Kelly know he would not be thrown into a cell on Alcatraz Island if the sanitary district used a little more lake water in violation of the Supreme Court's order limiting diversion to 1,500 cubic second-feet.

Since half a loaf is better than no bread, Chicago can be grateful, and it can be thankful for this evidence that not all reason has fled from Washington. Perhaps we can dare to hope that the whole question of lake diversion will soon be reexamined.

From 1907 to 1937 diversion of lake water at Chicago averaged 8,000 cubic feet per second, making possible the development of the Illinois waterway to the Mississippi. The flow was reduced, by order of the Supreme Court, after suits were filed by other lake States, which argued that the diversion here was lowering the levels of the Great Lakes.

While the case was pending the lake levels happened to be low. Since then studies of the lakes have confirmed Chicago's thesis that the levels rise and fall in cycles and that diversion at Chicago has had little or nothing to do with the cycles. One study placed the period between maximum high levels at 22.75 years. Another study showed the cycle was 22.84 years.

Diversion has been at the rate of 1,500 second feet in recent years as required by the

Supreme Court decree, but even before that high water was causing damage. Lake levels are now the highest since 1930, and waves are causing damage in Evanston and Milwaukee. The theory that diversion at Chicago markedly affected lake levels simply has not been demonstrated by events.

When Chief Justice Taft wrote the decree which almost shut off lake diversion he disregarded the findings of two former Chiefs of Army Engineers that diversion of 5,000 cubic feet per second was necessary for proper sanitation and navigation in the Illinois waterway. These findings are still valid. Since it has been demonstrated that diversion of that amount of water will have no appreciable effect on lake levels, it is time for the Supreme Court's decree to be changed.

McGregor Stanch Veteran Supporter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article appearing in the Regular, a paper printed and edited by the Regular Veterans Association under date of May 1946 relative to my activities in behalf of the veterans:

MCGREGOR, STANCH VETERAN SUPPORTER—TOOK SHARP ISSUE WITH GENERAL BRADLEY FOR HIS STAND ON R. V. A. BILL, H. R. 3908, BEFORE HOUSE INVALID PENSION COMMITTEE

Congressman McGREGOR is the ranking Republican on the House Invalid Pension Committee and rendered distinguished service to his State as a Member of the State legislature and also as majority leader and speaker pro tempore of the Ohio Legislature prior to his election to the United States Congress.

He is a veteran of World War I, having served in the field artillery, and therefore is well qualified to join issue and press for beneficial veterans' legislation.

During the hearings before the Committee on Invalid Pensions on May 7 he took sharp issue with Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, in regard to the unfavorable report that the Veterans' Administration rendered on the Regular Veterans Association bill, H. R. 3908, to increase the pensions of peacetime veterans to within 10 percent of the rates now being paid to war veterans for similar service-connected disabilities.

Congressman McGREGOR during the entire hearing was on his toes and was quick to compliment those who favored our bill and was just as quick to join issue with those who did not wholeheartedly support the bill. When the hearings of the committee are printed and made available for distribution, the national officers of the Regular Veterans Association strongly recommend that you read the hearing and pay particular attention to the fine support that Congressman McGREGOR gave our National Commander William M. Floyd in his fight to secure the additional benefits as set forth in H. R. 3908.

At the conclusion of the hearing, the genial "Buckeye" was numbered among a group whose picture was taken with General Bradley and our good friend and stanch supporter, Congressman BOYKIN of Alabama, shook his hand and was loud in his praise for the fine support and stand that Congressman McGREGOR took on the 90 percent bill.

Congressman McGREGOR is a member of several very important committees of the House of Representatives and since his election has been known as a tireless worker for all legislation beneficial to the common man as well as the veterans. He has been extremely active on the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee in his efforts to secure priorities and the much needed homes for our veterans. The RVA sends orchids to our genial comrade from Ohio and expresses our very best wishes and sincerest appreciation for the fine support he has given the Regular Veterans Association.

Hon. Robert F. Rich, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 13, 1946

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I am including the following address to be delivered over radio station WRAK at Williamsport, Pa., tonight:

Voters of the Fifteenth Congressional District in Pennsylvania, because I have had the pleasure of addressing some of you in the past at Williamsport and at Lock Haven, and meeting others in several different towns, I welcome this opportunity to address the citizens of this beautiful section of your great State in behalf of our good mutual friend, Hon. ROBERT F. RICH.

America emerged victorious from the two most cruel, brutal, and destructive wars in human history. The war in Europe and the war in Asia cost us more than a million casualties and left us with a Federal debt of $275,000,000,000 dollars. Our sacrifices are not ended and many of our problems were not solved by victory in combat.

Every sane person knows that the aftermath or backwash of war is as bad and sometimes even worse than war itself. It is impossible to blow the brains of millions of men into the mud and to blow up hundreds of billions of dollars of the world's wealth in smoke and powder without every nation engaged in the conflict and even those that fortunately maintained neutrality suffering serious political upheaval, social chaos, and economic dislocation.

In the wake of war follow hunger, starvation, pestilence, and often revolution.

Most of the worries of the generals and admirals ended with victory over Italy, Germany, and Japan, but the troubles of statesmen and headaches of Congressmen just began.

Never before in our history were the American people and the American Congress confronted with so many complex, difficult, and baffling problems as they are today. Demobilization, reconversion, management and labor disputes, strikes, revision of taxation, control of the atomic bomb, proposed loans to foreign countries, peacetime military conscription, merger of our armed forces, disposal of surplus property, priorities in the production and distribution of goods, price ceilings on commodities—these are only a few of the myriad complicated problems which have left America confused and bewildered.

If ever we needed men in Congress who possess clear vision, genuine ability, absolute honesty, unflinching courage, and unimpeachable character, we need them now. Fortunate indeed are you people of the Fifteenth Congressional District in Pennsylvania in having such a man in the person of ROBERT F. RICH to represent you in the Congress of the United States.

For the past dozen years I have been closely associated with BOB RICH and have had abundant opportunity to watch both the man and his work in the Congress. There is no Member of the House of Representatives who is more industrious or conscientious, who is more fearless in facing every issue, or more diligent in the performance of his duties than is BOB RICH. He is devoted to the best interests not only of his constituents but to all classes and kinds of people in his State and in the Nation. He is most accommodating and will go out of his way to do a favor for even those who might disagree or oppose him. I have been in his home and am acquainted with his fine Christian family. Religion is alive wherever BOB RICH is, and our country and the world need more men like him.

I cannot overlook the fact that the 330,000 people whom I have the honor to represent in the 15 counties of southwest Missouri are affected as much by the vote of BOB RICH as by my own. Likewise you people of this great district are affected as much by my vote as by that of your own Representative. Naturally, I want BOB RICH returned to Congress because we speak the same language and believe in the same political philosophy.

BOB RICH, like any sane man, knows that a nation is no different from an individual. Neither one can live beyond its means, nor spend more than it makes without getting into serious difficulty. Our country is now bogging down in its reconversion program. Selfishness, greed, and strife are to be seen on every hand. An epidemic of strikes has brought about commercial and industrial paralysis. BOB RICH and I both believe in organized labor and in collective bargaining, but we do not believe that any selfish minority in this country is greater than the American Government or that their interests should be placed above the public welfare.

Our people are being regimented by New Deal politicians in Washington who want to maintain indefinitely wartime controls. They are more interested in retaining their autocratic power than they are in setting the people free. The infinite red tape and voluminous, intricate, and contradictory rules and regulations by an overgrown, arrogant, and arbitrary bureaucracy has stifled initiative and enterprise, cut down effort and production, and retarded reconversion and recovery.

Today in this land of plenty we are faced with scarcity. It is hard to find butter, almost impossible to get meat, the shelves of our drygoods stores are empty. We still have raw materials in this country and the tools and skilled labor to produce goods, but both OPA and CPA, by their artificial controls, have reduced output. By increasing wages and costs and by freezing price ceilings, more than a million small businesses have been liquidated in the past 2 or 3 years.

The other side of the picture is just as bad. In 1940 we had six and one-half billion dollars in circulation—money not in banks. Today we have twenty-six and one-half billion dollars in circulation, or more than four times as much than at the outbreak of the war. Men and nations are not made rich by printing money. We have plenty of money but no goods. In fact, money is about the cheapest thing we have, but unfortunately men can neither eat nor wear it. Our greatest need today is to stop printing money and begin producing goods, because money without goods will drive us to a ruinous inflation. On the one side we need to expand production; on the other to reduce the Federal debt.

By creating scarcity and running our printing presses, the prices of all commodities are increased and black markets everywhere flourish. The Government loses revenue on bootleg transactions and the people pay exorbitant prices for inferior goods.

Future historians will call this the age of "chiselization," and for very good and indisputable reasons. The OPA has made chiselers, cheats, cowards, and crooks out of good, loyal, law-abiding, honest American citizens.

If we are to avoid disaster, there must come an immediate and swift flow of goods which people want and need—houses, automobiles, washing machines, refrigerators, radios, electric irons, men's, women's, and children's clothing—all of good quality to satisfy long-pent-up demands.

Competition in an open and free market will bring about fair prices. Congress cannot repeal the natural economic law of supply and demand.

The meat packers and processors, the dairy farmers—many of whom are selling their herds for slaughter—the sawmill men, the lumber dealers, the automobile salesmen, the strawberry growers, the canning men, the small-town merchants, and nearly everyone else engaged in legitimate private enterprise have spoken or written to me crying for relief from this modern Spanish Inquisition that has exercised tyranny over them and that has destroyed private enterprise, which has made this Nation great.

The strife of war has given way to the strife of peace. Those of us who have faith in economic freedom, in free individual enterprise, must insist that we return to the American way of life. No wonder Bernard Baruch recently said:

"The whole world is watching us, amazed at the exhibition of a giant who cannot pull himself together even to take care of his own needs."

BOB RICH is a successful businessman. He has had years of experience and has had to meet monthly pay rolls. Constantly he has asked the question: "Where are you going to get the money?"

He realizes that monetizing of the Federal debt must stop. He knows that deficit financing cannot forever go on. He is convinced that our gigantic debt must be reduced if taxes are to be lowered, if our country is to prosper, if our people are to be given full employment, and if we are to live in a nation of peace and plenty.

Fellow Americans, I feel confident that the good judgment of you Pennsylvanians in the Fifteenth Congressional District will return BOB RICH to Congress by the largest majority which any good man and able legislator has ever deserved.

Our National Parks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the American people need their great and beautiful national parks and their historic places. These areas which are the rich heritage of every American, need, this coming year more than ever, sufficient funds to provide adequate protection and services. The demand for travel and recreation over our great country, pent up during the harsh war years, is now breaking forth in a flood. The American people want and need to have these places supported by the Congress.

In Chattanooga, we have Lookout Mountain, with its wonderful natural beauty and its historic associations with the Battle Above the Clouds. Nearby is Missionary Ridge and the battlefield of Chickamauga. For the past 6 months, travel to these places was 215 percent above the same period last year—21,741 visitors as compared with 68,541. During March, travel was 301 percent above March of last year. This is only one example of the tremendous influx of visitors to the national parks and historic places, including great numbers of battle-weary veterans enjoying their first vacation with their families since the war.

I have seen many of the national parks of the West—great national playgrounds. Travel is difficult enough already. Are we to make it more difficult by denying this very reasonable sum asked for the administration, protection, and maintenance of these extremely popular and needed parks—parks which strengthen and intensify that love of country which is so much needed in these critical times?

I regret the House has not found it possible to give the National Park Service additional funds for further development of our beautiful parks. I hope the Senate will vote the funds and that the House in conference will agree.

Chicago Advocates the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the May 14, 1946, issue of the Chicago Sun:

SPEED THE SEAWAY PROJECT

Congress should ponder well the words of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee which recently urged approval of the St. Lawrence seaway project. After reviewing opposition arguments, the majority declared: "Of course, here, as in other matters involving the future of the country, the real test is: Do we believe that the country will continue to grow, and that it will need expanding transportation facilities? Or do we believe that the status quo should be maintained, and that we, henceforth, should turn our backs on any further progress?"

Opponents of the St. Lawrence project voice a common theme: Fear of competition. Railroads and their employees are against it because they fear new and cheap water transportation. Private power interests are afraid that hydroelectric energy will hurt their business. Great Lakes shippers fear competition from ocean carriers. Coal mine owners and workers fear reduced markets among steam electric plants.

Yet the lesson of history is plain. Such projects as that now before us have brought prosperity not to one region alone, but to the Nation; they have stimulated not one industry, but industry as a whole.

The St. Lawrence project, which has been before Congress in one form or another for more than 25 years, would benefit the whole continent. It would be of intestimable benefit to Chicago. It would open up to direct world trade the great landlocked area between the Rockies and the Alleghenies—with a population of 50,000,000—which produces 37 percent of the Nation's wheat, 67 percent of its corn, 50 percent of its packed meat, and 75 percent of its steel. It would mean the harnessing of water now wasted to produce 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity annually. The interests of the Nation dictate the earliest possible approval of the St. Lawrence project. Congress should vote accordingly.

United States Scientific Leadership Threatened by Advance of Soviet Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the debate on the extension of selective service Monday, May 13, I included in my statement to the House of Representatives some very important information regarding the greatly reduced enrollment of students in our colleges of engineering and in the science courses. I also called attention to the striking contrast in the tremendous increase in the number of foreign students who are availing themselves of these courses in our colleges and universities and I called attention also to the still greater number of foreign students who are seeking admission to these courses in our colleges and universities. My remarks setting out this important information appear on pages 4949 and 7950 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 13.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am setting forth a further statement of great importance that has been brought to my attention. This statement is by Dr. I. M. Kolthoff of the University of Minnesota and was released today by the American Chemical Society.

The information I included in my own statement to the House on May 13 together with Dr. Kolthoff's statement should cause all Members of Congress to give serious thought to the matter of encouraging our young people who are interested in science and engineering to continue their studies without interruption.

The statement follows:

UNITED STATES SCIENTIFIC LEADERSHIP THREATENED BY SOVIET RESEARCH

NEWARK, DEL., May 15.—America's leadership in science is threatened by the rapid advance of Soviet research, Dr. I. M. Kolthoff, University of Minnesota chemistry professor who visited Russia recently, warned tonight in an address to the Delaware section of the American Chemical Society.

Unless the United States speedily overcomes its current shortage of scientific manpower, and unless much more intensive support of fundamental research is provided by either the Government or private industry, or both, Professor Kilthoff declared, "the time may not be far off when American scientific research, and also its industrial applications, may be lagging behind the U. S. S. R. (and possibly England)."

Citing his observations as one of 16 American scientists who attended the two

hundred and twentieth anniversary celebration of the Russian Academy of Science, Professor Kolthoff stressed the development of Soviet research in both depth and scope, saying it "compares favorably with that carried out in this country and in England, although the general statement may be made that the Soviet Union is not in the lead."

One of the principal reasons for the progress now being made in Russian laboratories, according to Professor Kolthoff, is the fact that they are amply supplied with researchers, as young Russian scientists have not been drafted into the armed services, even during the war.

"The Russians, realists in this respect, know that despite war 'pure' research must continue, since it pays rich dividends in the long run and is the source of 'applied' research," he stated. "Soviet scientists and the members of the British delegation shared the sentiment that we in America will have to pay a high price for the short-sighted policy of drafting our present generation of young scientists into the armed forces."

Most research in the Soviet Union is conducted in special institutes, sponsored by the government, which have no connection with the universities, except that graduate students may do research for the doctor's degree in the laboratories under the supervision of institute personnel, he continued. The laboratories he visited were well equipped, although some used German apparatus which was inferior to American equipment, he said.

The buildings were old and unattractive, but the Soviet Government has made large funds available to the Academy of Sciences for new buildings as well as for new equipment and general expansion, Professor Kolthoff noted.

Russian scientists with whom he talked were interested in developing closer relations with the United States, he said, adding:

"This might be done by exchange of professors and scholars of repute between both countries. In addition, fellowships should be made available to our recent Ph. D.'s and students for study in the Soviet Union, and vice versa. Of course, we in this country should greatly encourage the teaching of Russian, especially in the graduate schools of our universities and colleges."

Professor Kolthoff also urged the translation of Russian technical articles into English, perhaps by a translation service aided by the Government or organized on the Government's initiative.

"The realistic Russians show their appreciation of the value of articles and monographs published in a foreign language by making them available in Russian translations," he pointed out, noting that seven of his own books have been translated into Russian.

Russia's invitation to scientists from all over the world to be guests of its Academy of Sciences was acclaimed by Professor Kolthoff as helping to reestablish international scientific relations after the war, and he suggested that the American Government should consider whether we could not follow Russia's example in organizing scientific meetings, not only as a matter of prestige and good will but also for our own benefit?

Retirement Annuities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the New York Sun of April 19, 1946, as follows:

TO CORRECT AN INJUSTICE

In drafting the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1942, Congress failed to include a section which would have made its provisions applicable to those earlier retired from Government service. It was the first time in the history of amending pension legislation that such a clause had been omitted. It appears not to have been done through intent but as an over-sight incidental to a change of basis on which pensions are calculated. As a result, those who have retired since passage of the act receive as a pension not less than one-half of the highest salary received during five consecutive years of service. Many of those who retired earlier are receiving annuities which represent less than 25 percent of their average salaries during their final 5-year period.

Twice the Senate has acted unanimously to remedy the situation. The first time the House had not acted when the session ended. The second measure, Senate bill 896, now is before the House Committee on Civil Service. It has the indorsement of the United States Civil Service Commission and it is understood that a majority of the committee is favorably disposed toward it. What is required, however, is not favorable sentiment but action. The plight of those whom the bill would aid is rendered more acute by rising living costs. They are men and women who gave long and faithful service to the Government. The fact that their number is not large may explain why there has been no particular effort to speed action, but does not excuse it. An injustice should not be judged primarily on the basis of the numbers involved. Duration is a better measure of its quality and each day of delay is working added hardships on those this bill would aid.

Words of Counsel From Arizona GI's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me I hereby extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter which I have just received from Paul A. McAdam, of Phoenix, Ariz., speaking for himself and other GI's in our State. The letter is as follows:

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *May 12, 1946.*

Congressman MURDOCK,

Washington, D. C.

SIR: "Remember the 1920's." Tell your colleagues, we vets have the most to lose in the removing of price controls. We've given up a great deal already and we realize we're on call for 10 years, whether we joined the Reserves or not and we've had enough of war.

If we remove the controls we're on the easy, but disastrous road, to another man-made depression and war. We have a phony prosperity now—$3,000 homes (we left or sold) selling at $10,000—our $300 cars, we sold, are worn out and they're selling them back to us at $700 or whatever the black marketeers can get. As bad as the controls are, the Lord help us, if you remove them. Removal of controls for business is fine for them, as they raise their prices to suit their cost of living, but what about the great mass of laborers and white-collared workers, you and me, Congressman, who couldn't possibly keep abreast of the rising tide of prices.

It might be well to remind the civilians of this country, that they won't be as fortunate in World War III, as they were in World Wars I and II, because the atom bomb is here. Also remind the members of the National Association of Manufacturers and the realtors, that 5 cents will keep them forever after they're dead. Let's place human rights above property rights for once. Thank you.

Just another discouraged GI.

PAUL A. MCADAM.

P. S.—Regarding that black-marketeer money, there's a simple way to bring that out of hiding, just declare all currency over $20 null and void, as of June 1, 1946, and replace said currency with nice, new crisp bills, as they surrender the loot. We did it with the gold-back bills and we can do it now, sure it's a big job, but it will pay for itself and it isn't nearly as tough a job as the GI's just completed. You owe it to them that not one illegal dollar was made out of World War II. (Too many dollars were made legally to suit us.) If you legislate this plan, you will see some heap, big red faces and the internal-revenue lines will be filled with grafters who forgot to pay Uncle Sam his just dues. Take the profit out of war or put the profiteers in the front lines. As Red Skelton said: "Too many people in this country are saying to the GI's, 'Thanks for winning our battle; now fight your own battle.'"

P. A. MCA.

Letter From Army Dental Officer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter I have received from Capt. John R. McEvoy, Army Dental Corps, who is a constitutent of mine:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LANE: In the midst of postwar confusion confronting our Congress, I should like to call to your attention a matter of paramount importance to thousands of dental officers in the Army who are now serving our country. Most of these men were prompted by a patriotic motive during a national emergency to enlist in the Army, notwithstanding incalculable personal sacrifice. We feel that we have served honorably and well and that the time has now come for many of us to be honorably discharged from the service and resume our rightful place in civilian life.

A few days ago word was received at this station to the effect that all Medical Corps officers except for a few specialists who had served more than 30 months, were to be discharged by June 30, 1946. The Dental Corps was not included in the directive, and 39 months of service is still required before a dental officer is eligible for discharge.

We of the Dental Corps feel that such discrimination is most unfair to those of us who would qualify for release under the new 30-month regulation. It seems that the dental officers are being made to pay for the shortsightedness of the higher-ups in Washington who have failed to provide adequate replacements for those of us who are desirous of being released from the Army.

The Army specialized training program has provided for adequate replacements of Medical Corps officers, but many ASTP dentists

were permitted to return to civilian practice, while older men, with greater responsibilities, are forced to remain in service against their will.

The morale of the Army Dental Corps is at an indescribable low. We can direct attention to our plight, under our democratic system, through our chosen representatives in Congress, with the hope that our situation may command close scrutiny. There must be no discrimination between the Medical and Dental Corps, and the latter group should not be penalized for the mistakes of the high command.

I should greatly appreciate an early reply, so that I may pass this information on to other dental officers who are so vitally concerned.

J. R. MCEVOY,
Captain, Dental Corps,
AAF Station Hospital,
Eglin Field, Fla.

Recommendations for Prevention of Bloat in Cattle and Sheep

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 16 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association entitled "Recommendations for Prevention of Bloat in Cattle and Sheep."

These recommendations were prepared by a subcommittee consisting of H. H. Cole, chairman, R. S. Amadon, R. W. Dougherty, Dwight Espe, Carl G. Huffman, T. M. Olson, and A. F. Schalk. It is the first report of the Committee on Animal Health of the National Research Council.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PREVENTION OF BLOAT IN CATTLE AND SHEEP

Bloating of cattle and sheep pastured on alfalfa or clover has seriously restricted the use of these valuable feeds. This paper is intended to aid livestock men in reducing the hazard of bloat in cattle and sheep pastured on legumes.

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. What is bloat? Bloat is the distention of the first stomach, the rumen, with gas. Large amounts of gas are normally formed in the rumen by fermentation of the feed. These fermentative processes are essential for the proper digestion of feed, especially roughage. Under certain feed conditions, however, this gas is not expelled by belching and, consequently, accumulates.

2. Are all cattle and sheep subject to bloat? Yes, most, if not all, will bloat but some are more susceptible than others. In one experimental trial, 14 of 17 cows bloated. The three which did not bloat had recently freshened and ate very little. A few chronic bloaters will bloat on any feed. These chronic bloaters are abnormal individuals. The suggestions presented here for the prevention of bloat are applicable only to normal animals.

3. What causes bloat? There are many theories to explain bloat. It is generally agreed, however, that in some way belching fails to occur normally on certain feeds such as green, immature legumes.

4. Is not more gas formed from legume pasture than from other feeds? No, actual measurements show that the amount of gas formed in the rumen on hay and grain is just as great as the amount produced on green legumes. Some investigations have indicated that some of the toxic gases always present in the rumen in very small amounts, are increased on legume, pasture. Studies have indicated that far more gas can be expelled by belching than is ever formed, providing the rumen is functioning normally.

5. Then why do cattle, sheep, and other ruminants bloat on legume pasture and seldom on grasses? Experiments have shown that the rumen functions more normally on grasses; rumination and belching occur more regularly, for example. Attempts to explain this difference account for the many theories of bloat. Some believe that the formation of toxic gases interferes with normal activity of the rumen. Others believe that legumes form a more compact mass which prevents belching. Still others believe that gas can only be expelled when there is sufficient coarse material in the rumen to stimulate the reflex act of belching. Grasses have sharp, irritating surfaces which may facilitate belching.

6. Does frost, dew, or rain have any influence on the incidence of bloat? Possibly, but the kind of feed and stage of its growth are more important. Experimentally, bloat has been produced under a wide range of weather conditions.

7. Under what conditions does bloat most frequently occur? Bloat most often occurs on thick, immature stands of alfalfa or clover. In one series of experiments involving 42 cases of bloat, no cow bloated until she had been on pasture for 1½ hours. Of the 42 bloated cows, 27 bloated during the first 3½ hours on pasture. Animals that have had all the hay they want for at least 2 days before being turned out to pasture are less liable to bloat. When the legume pasture contains many weeds or grasses, bloating does not usually occur until these coarser materials are pretty well cleaned up. Cows and sheep apparently prefer to eat considerable amounts of weeds and grasses, if available with legumes. For these reasons, the mere fact that bloat does not occur the first day gives no assurance that the pasture is safe.

Cattle and sheep bloat most readily on legume pasture, but they may bloat on rape, cabbage leaves, and other succulent crops. Furthermore, bloat may occur in dry-lot feeder cattle when the amount of concentrates exceeds the roughage. If this condition becomes chronic in a particular animal, two courses are open: market the animal or reduce the amount of concentrates.

PREVENTIVE MEASURES

1. Mixtures of grasses with legumes cause much less bloat than legumes alone. This method is effective only when the proper proportion of grasses and legumes is maintained by good cultural and pasture management practices. Selective grazing may interfere with the effectiveness of this procedure. Very often, there is a tendency for either the grasses or the legumes to predominate. Practical tests show that bloat rarely occurs if grasses make up at least 50 per cent of the mixture. Severe bloating may occur on blue grass and white clover pastures if the white clover predominates and the pasture is lush.

2. Unless supplemented, pure stands of alfalfa or clover should not be pastured until after they have reached the bloom stage. Mature legumes stimulate belching by which the cow rids herself of the gas as it forms. Because legumes vary in the rapidity of growth and in coarseness, it is difficult to make specific suggestions. A fine leafy growth is the most dangerous. Unless one uses a system of rotational pasturing, utilizing small fields, it may not be economical to pasture mature alfalfa.

3. Supplemental feeding of hay in dry-lot at night will reduce the incidence of bloat on legume pasture. Experiments have been conducted on pastures proven to produce bloat. In one experiment, for example, 10 of 17 cows bloated when no hay was fed. The feeding of Sudan hay in dry-lot at night completely prevented bloat on this pasture the following day. Alfalfa hay was less effective but still of definite value. Other hays and straws will, no doubt, also prove of value. The effectiveness of a hay presumably depends upon two factors: It must be palatable in order that enough is eaten; and it must be fairly coarse in order that normal ruminal activity is produced.

4. Feeding hay in the pasture will also reduce the incidence of bloat. Frequently it may be desirable to keep animals on pasture day and night. They should have a full feed of hay overnight before the first day of pasturing. Experiments have indicated that cows will consume sufficient Sudan hay to protect them from bloat on pastures proven to be of the bloat-producing type. Using this procedure, one is allowing the animals free choice between legume pasture and hay. Sudan hay, being very palatable, may be more effective than most other hays. It may seem extravagant to feed hay in the pasture. Later in the fall, however, it may be impossible to use certain excellent stands of legumes unless some such method is used.

5. Grass pasture at night will largely eliminate bloat on legume pasture the next day. Experiments on this method have been limited to one grass—Sudan. Here again the effectiveness of the procedure will depend upon the type of grass pasture available. The animals must eat a considerable amount of grass to be protected. Therefore, this method should be used only on good grass pastures. Sudan pasture is not widely used. As this feed is so valuable in controlling bloat and because it also produces a large amount of good palatable pasture, livestock men might well consider a program of crop rotation including Sudan pasture. Its chief disadvantage is that it only grows well during hot weather. Furthermore, like other sorghums, it may produce prussic acid poisoning after a long drought or after frost in the fall.

6. Other preventive measures. A host of suggestions, other than those enumerated above, have been made for prevention of bloat. Some may be sound, but the measures given above are the only ones which the committee feels have been adequately proven by experiment or by practice.

Address by Hon. Harold C. Hagen, of Minnesota, Before the Industrial Banking Institute of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by me in Chicago on Thursday,

May 9, before the Industrial Banking Institute of America:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, the privilege and honor of addressing you this morning arises, no doubt, from the expression of my opinion on the subject of consumer credit in the United States Congress at Washington.

In these days a multitude of important and serious problems face the Nation and the world. Many of us become so enmeshed in them that matters very close to the welfare of our own people here at home are unintentionally minimized or neglected.

One of the important problems, one very close to the people, yet not often considered as it should be, is the question of the value of consumer credit to the American home, the business of the country, its factories and its working people, the effect of the use of personal credit on the people themselves; under what governmental regulation and regimentation, if any, they should be allowed or permitted to use it.

My own special interest in this question does not mean that I devote my attention to it to the exclusion of what seems to be more urgent or immediate business of government and society.

I am aware that there are men in public life who have grown to deal almost exclusively with what they presume to be the great fundamentals of human relationships; wars and peace, treaties with other nations, commerce across the seas, and the gigantic problems of labor-management unrest, or the financing of the Federal Government. In the course of time they find themselves up aloft, in the superstructure of national and international affairs, so far removed from the cares and worries and interests of the people, whose servants they are and whom they represent in the Government, so far removed from these people and their problems, as to become virtually strangers to them.

Gentlemen, I myself have no intention of removing my perspective from the everyday problems of living that are experienced by my people back home, and your friends and mine throughout the country, the millions of ordinary good people of the United States for whom this Government, this society, and this economic structure were created and for whom they operate and exist. There is no lofty idealism concerning social progress nor government, nor international affairs which is worth anything to the United States unless it is built solidly upon a foundation that rests with the people; unless its purpose is to improve their lot, to satisfy their minds, to develop their standard of living and the comfort, contentment, and security with which they may live in this great country of ours.

The banks which you represent would not be worth a continental to America if, perchance, they were established purely for profit, or to carry out the whims of men who would manipulate the American people as guinea pigs or the tools of experiments in social and economic trends.

So it is with government. When the people find themselves face to face with a government which attempts to create and mold a so-called new American way of life for them, one which dictates to them how they should live, when they might travel, and with whom they should transact business, and on what terms, that government or its policies, whatever its label, will be changed, eventually, by the people themselves.

The government must serve the people.

For it is our fundamental objective as a democratic republic to create a government to serve us. It was the objective of the men who wrote the Constitution, the aims of those who signed the Declaration of Independence, the objective of every man in the Continental Army—that the break we made with England years ago was predicated upon our intention not to serve a government but to create a government to serve us.

There have been a few men in public life who, by their actions, have attempted to nullify this basic principle, but there never has been one man who has dared to stand on his feet and announce to the people that it is his purpose, as a public official, to take away the reins of self-government from the people, or that it is his intention to change to any degree whatever those original premises and principles upon which the Government was founded.

I cite as an illustration that under no circumstances would the people of the United States agree to take away from the House of Representatives the fundamental, original power to initiate measures of taxation. They gave this power to the House because it was their intent to permit themselves to be taxed but only through tax laws originating in the Lower House of Congress which they deemed to be directly under the public eye and thumb of the people themselves.

In late years we have built up a system of delegating authority, by which the Congress has turned over some of its legislative prerogatives to the administrative branch. We have witnessed in the past few months the unmistakable effect of public opinion in the stiffening attitude of the Congress; in its clearly indicated intention to take back to itself the power to make the laws and regulations which govern the people so as to conform to the people's own intent, as to where these powers should lodge and who should use them in this Government.

One of the important private rights of the citizen is his privilege to barter and trade, buy and sell, and to make contracts generally with his neighbor. It does not make much difference that a complicated, modern system of manufacturing and distribution has developed to take the place of the older direct trade between neighboring farmers and trades people. The underlying principle has not changed. It is considered fundamental that if I own two hogs and you are raising a crop of wheat, that you and I have the right to enter into a contract by which I can turn over my hogs to you and take in turn for them, say, 50 bushels of wheat. But the wheat is still growing in your fields. It has not been harvested. My hogs are ready for the market. You want the hogs now, and I am willing to take the wheat or its equivalent value when it ripens. This is a simple illustration.

Now suppose someone in Washington should get an idea into his head that it is bad for me to give you my hogs today because of the uncertainty as to the ultimate maturity of your wheat crop. Suppose they should say you may find yourself in a bad fix if I own a lien on your wheat crop after you have used up my hogs. They might say that as a matter of social protection you and I should not be allowed to enter into this contract. All that is involved here is that we have made a simple trade. I have extended you a few months credit. You are going to eat my hogs, later when your wheat ripens I am going to eat it, or use it, or sell it. Meanwhile I have extended you credit, although the average farmer in entering into such a commonplace transaction probably does not realize that credit is involved.

I chose this illustration of common barter to point out to you that when we talk of consumer-credit we are talking of something far more fundamental than just the question of transactions, having to do with cash on the one hand and commodities on the other. In our complicated system of modern business it has become our habit to place a dollar value on these hogs of mine and upon your wheat. The result is that we seem to have extended to each other in the course of our contracts, together what is known as credit in dollars and cents. Actually what is involved is a primary contract between two individuals.

When the Federal Government found itself at war, it moved in all directions for the ways and means of marshaling every ounce of our industrial, financial, and social strength to win that war. Evary type of business, every home, every political subdivision in the Nation, every economic and social segment of us, threw into the war its ultimate and fullest resources and power. The people gave up, temporarily, rights that are fundamental.

Americans never had any intention of turning over to the Federal Government, paternalist powers which reach out permanently to alter or curb or affect in any direct way their right to fairly do business with one another as they choose, once the wartime emergency has passed.

This is why I have spoken in the House of Representatives in favor of the earliest possible end of what is known as regulation W.

However, consumer credit is also quite personal and close to me. If regulation W had been in force in 1923, I likely would not have been in Congress today. During the summer of that year I purchased an old Ford car—you may remember the type which had its headlights lit by acetylene gas tanks resting on the running board of the car. At any rate, it was the old style high-wheel open type car which was available to me at a price of $200. I asked a friend for the money to buy it, my debt payable, according to the agreement I had with my financial benefactor, at the rate of $10 per month with no down payment. I made the loan so that I could enter a newspaper subscription contest and travel around the county soliciting subscriptions. By this means, I was able to win this contest and a new Hudson car which I sold. That fall I went to college with the money.

A long chain of circumstances eventually followed which led to my being elected to Congress in 1942, after being a congressional secretary for 8 years. But I won't give you the details of all that. However, you can see how personal this subject of consumer credit is to me and how it can be a part of the everyday lives of Americans.

As you know, regulation W was and is a credit limitation measure drawn up by the Federal Reserve System, under an Executive order of the President, as part of the program to utilize the resources of the Nation in preparation for and prosecution of the war just ended. Its purpose was to cap and shut off, to some extent, the immediate market demand of the people for some of the civilian commodities which it was known would be scarce so long as our factories devoted their attention to producing for war.

In the eyes of the public, to a considerable extent I believe, regulation W was excusable because it naturally applied most directly to the markets for such things as electrical appliances, radios, automobiles, other durable goods whose manufacture had to stop or materially slow down to make way for the war.

It was known from the very beginning that regulation W would curb only the demand of families, who in order to maintain their standard of living and enjoy the use of these durable products, would need to resort to their use of credit. The demand of those, who had cash, was never curbed in any way and to this day the man with cash can purchase as many automobiles as he

can find or as many radios or washing machines or refrigerators. Indeed there are many families who went through this entire war period with five or seven radios in their homes and two or three refrigerators—year, and if you consider other lines of goods, there are many men who never had less than a dozen good substantial, wearable suits, dozens and dozens of shirts and an equally large number of women who never changed their habitual use of dozens of expensive dresses, dozens of pairs of nylon hose, dozens of almost any type of goods except those specifically rationed.

In time of war these inequities were unimportant as national issues for there were far greater problems to engage our time and thought.

Now that peace has come neither the Government nor any citizen, be he bureaucrat, politician, businessman, laborer, farmer, banker, lawyer, teacher or any other, has a right to say that in this new era, even though there are still some shortages of material and goods, one segment of the people of this country should be singled out to do without the things it needs while another segment not only is permitted but encouraged to buy all that it wants of such goods. This is not the American way.

If the matter of shortage is important enough or if shortages are likely to remain long with us or to become more acute, there may be an excuse for rationing. In rationing all Americans share alike and attempt to divide up what things are available. But for the Federal Government in time of peace to divide the people into two groups, those who happen to have plenty of cash on hand or who have high-paying jobs, and those who need to use their credit to one degree or another on the other hand—is a social principle which cannot be defended.

This, as I said to you at the beginning, is just the reverse of what democratic government is supposed to be, the reverse of the purpose the economic system is supposed to serve in America.

Real hardship has been caused by this regulation which curbs the consumers' use of credit and I would not make light of this hardship. There are millions of our families, and the figures of the United States Government bear this out, which have not enjoyed a wartime boom in income, families whose cash position possibly is no better or little better than it was when the war emergency commenced. There are school teachers all around us today who are receiving almost no more than they were in 1939. In fact there are tens of thousands, of the so-called white-collar workers and other people who receive no more. There are families who, right in the midst of the prosperity that we talk so much about, have no more than they had in 1940.

These people are just as fundamentally Americans as you and I. Their failure to profit by this war may indicate, in a few instances, personal failure to take advantage of the times or of their opportunities. It may indicate that they have made money and lost it. It may indicate that they have not learned how to save. Yes, it may even indicate that while others were making a profit and following up their opportunities, these families gave up their sons and daughters to fight our war, gave up the income these young folk would have made.

It may indicate that these families gave up more than others, deliberately contributed more than their neighbors to our national welfare. They may be just the quiet folk who do not seek for gain—ask no favor.

We cannot discuss here the reasons that millions of our families do not have as much as other millions, but I say that it is fundamentally the duty of the United States Government to realize, once and for all, that these people with smaller incomes and smaller cash resources are just as much Americans as the other group better situated financially. I mean to say that the Government of the United States should not single them out as those designated to bear what some planners call the shock of economic reconversion, or as the group to stand and wait until all the rest of the American people are satisfied with all the new postwar products for which they are able to pay cash or to buy on short-term credit arrangements.

Ridiculous it is to assume that a washing machine would go first to the rich woman, and after all, the rich women who desire them have all the washing machines they want, then, by virtue of our Government's policy, the poor woman who does her own washing may perhaps be permitted to have a washing machine—that is, if perchance the Government decides to liberalize the terms of regulation W. My friends, the woman who does her own washing or who hires out her time to do this work for others should have first right to these machines if indeed any priority of possession is to be shown.

The use of credit by the American family is a matter of a confidential nature. This credit is actually a possession—it is not a gift of government or business. It is as much a man's property as his home, his farm. And consumer credit is a tool. It is a device by which the great machinery of distribution in this country is enabled to gear itself so that many millions of American families may be able to acquire the things our factories produce. We learned a long time ago that if we depend in this country upon the purchases of the so-called cash customers the result will be industrial stagnation, depression, unemployment, together with all the evils and ills that accompany these tragic conditions. I point out to you, gentlemen, that it was the creation of the credit customer which made possible the beltline, high-speed, low-cost production for which we are famous. It was the advent of credit customer that made possible to a large degree the development of this country's great industrial machine, not only the factories in which consumer goods are produced but other factories, which produce the machine tools and the mines and the farms which produce the raw materials—this and also the accompanying employment of countless millions of people in all the phases of our economy. These millions had never been employed before and would not be employed today had it not been for the discovery that through the credit of consumers properly applied to the actual needs of individual families, great hitherto unknown markets for new products could be made available.

Along with the employment and industrial activity which the opening up of the credit markets made possible, an even more important development came simultaneously, for through the advent of consumer-credit machinery to fit, one at a time, individually, the requirements of the American people, came the open sesame to what we now complacently talk about as the American standard of living.

With the development of modern consumer credit came the American home with its running water and bathtubs, its mechanical refrigeration that annually saves the lives of thousands of babies and makes the handling of food more economical than ever before, the radio which has united our Nation as never before, developing common understanding, common ideals, community loyalty such as no nation on earth enjoys.

Here in this Nation the poor and the rich enjoy almost alike the mechanical improvements of this age. And this can be attributed largely to the effective, proper use of credit by everyday people. No man has yet devised another mechanism, another economic tool, that can effectively do what credit has demonstrated in action, it can do.

I pause at this point to stress that in perhaps 95 percent of all the so-called consumer credit transactions in this country, consumers do not, as many speakers and writers would have us suppose, get something and use it or consume it today, then pay for it tomorrow.

A friend of mine recently came to my office and told me of an interesting article which he had read which points out the facts of this situation. This article is somewhat more advanced in thinking than anything I have generally heard about. I will give it to you. I will throw it out at you. I now quote him it in part as follows:

"All science and ingenuity of our modern age addressed to the subject of producing electrical refrigerators has resulted in the manufacture of a contrivance said to last 15 years, at a cost, roughly, of from $100 to $300. This box consumers are asked to buy. Ninety-five percent of all housewives have little interest whatever in buying refrigerators for use 6, 8, 10 or 15 years hence, nor as a matter of fact are they interested in buying refrigerators a great big white box to take up floor space in their kitchens unnecessarily. What they want is refrigeration today, tomorrow, next week and in the early future. They often are willing to pay cash for it. The best that science can do through our multimillion dollar corporations and all of our mechanical advancement is to give the housewife a 15-year package of service, which she probably will want each of those 15 years."

But do you suppose she is anxious to pay today in cash for her refrigeration service in 1959? I say to you that when a workingman's family buys a refrigerator and pays one-third down on its price, this family has actually paid in advance for the refrigeration it wants. In true moral perspective these people have really asked no credit advance of anyone. As a matter of fact, when this family pays in full, in 2 years, for a 15-year refrigerator it has advanced credit to America's economic system to an extent equal to more than seven times the speed with which the family uses up what the economic system has provided. The family that pays for a refrigerator in 2 years has advanced 13 years' credit to American business, production, and banking.

This applies to practically every type of durable goods which consumers purchase on so-called credit terms. Make no mistake about it. It is a serious matter for some bankers, industrialists, and Government officials to go about the country asking whether or not it is wise to advance credit to ordinary families for the purchase of radios, refrigerators, and other products. They misrepresent the truth. The public is not asking for credit terms. The public asks for certain services and comforts which science, as yet, has been unable to furnish in the daily size package which people can readily purchase for cash.

I quote further:

"When I purchase an automobile what I want is a good-looking car to give me service this week and next, or perhaps next month. What they sell me is a car that will give me service for several years. I am not kicking about this, but I am definitely opposed to the theory that I am asking a favor, a financial or credit service of the American economy, when I say to the seller of that car, 'I refuse to pay for it all right now when it will take me 5 years to get my use value out of it.' If I pay for it in 12 months, I have paid for it several times as fast as I use it up. I have extended a credit service to the automobile manufacturers, dealers, and bankers of this country; yes, to the workers of our population, because I have made it possible for all of them to work or to make a profit, by advancing my personal cash before I have any possible chance of using up the product that they hand me in return."

Let us stop this wrong thinking about credit as some sort of a favor which either business or Government can decide is good or bad for the American people. The fact is if the people generally cannot be persuaded to offer the use of their sound credit to our economy, the great factories that produce automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines, watches, clothing, and many other products will operate much more slowly, employ less people—and our economic and financial situation will indeed be severe.

Credit has been abused but it has not been abused any more than any other tool or phase of our economy. It was not the use of consumer's credit that closed the banks in the early thirties. It was not the over-expansion of credit that caused the depression, as some people have said. In fact it was the advent of credit on a broad scale which made the expansion of the twenties possible, which made the reconversion from the depths of the depression of the thirties possible. Yes; it was the development of consumer credit machinery which gave to the United States the great motorcar industry, the refrigeration plants, the radio and other technical production facilities and countless more—with which in turn we built our great war machine in the early forties.

And don't forget the sewing machine. It also should be recalled that as far back as 1850 the McCormick reaper was sold to farmers on the installment plan.

These are some of the great far-reaching and beneficial results of consumer credit measured in industrial terms.

The Government puts on a great campaign to urge the American people to hold their bonds. Yet they will set up regulations and rules which force these same people who are the consumers of America, to sell their bonds in order to buy for cash radios, washing machines, heating systems, venetian blinds, cars, and other good things of life.

But I warn you all and the Treasury Department administration in Washington today that this matter of credit still stems from the fundamental right of individual people to do business together. Credit terms are not subject to mass production, like physical products. Credit cannot be extended on like terms from coast to coast to all folk alike. People use credit as they do their cash. First they use it when they want to use it.

The Government learned in the early thirties that while the savings banks were choked with funds, the people would not be induced to spend those funds. No more could they be induced to spend their credit at that time. Our mills shut down and our stores closed their doors by the thousands. There were millions out of work. Credit, like cash, in the hands of the people is a sort of one-way stream. Yes, it can be turned off if the Government sees fit to turn it off and dares to face the social and political consequences of doing it—but neither cash nor credit purchasing can be turned back on by artificial means. Have we forgotten the depression days and the billions we spent trying to turn business "on"? In this lies the great weakness of the thinking of some people and many in official life in Washington. They seem to think that we can shut off the use of credit until such time as we need it most—then turn on the spigot and let the credit purchasers come in and save our business structure from a tailspin into depression. It will not work that way. The people will use their credit when their jobs look secure, when their income seems sure—not at a time when someone in Washington by the stroke of a pen says, "Now is the time for you to buy with your credit! We will now ease the terms."

For that will be a time when, by the reasoning of these very officials, the country stands at a crossroad with credit purchasing frantically needed to stem impending disaster. Do you think for a moment that the enlightened American people will not see the same handwriting on the wall? Does one presume the radio commentators will not have sounded the warning; that the newspapers will have remained silent?

Representing individual people in my Minnesota district as I do and not just an abstract number of voters, reflecting as I do their thinking so far as I can see it, and not assuming to develop a government to govern them as I think they should be governed, I am opposed to the continuation of any artificial control that divides the American people into different categories or classes and says to some "Thou shalt have" and to the others "Thou shalt not have."

I hope that you bankers will so arrange your thinking, management, and banking customs that you may continue to serve the people, not dictate to them. I trust that your banks will further develop their business habits, their way of handling people, their manner of extending loans and of collecting their accounts, in accordance with the public will and needs—not as selfishness led some of the old-time money lenders to do nor now as some Washington dreamers and theorists say should be done.

It is my belief that the segment of private enterprise in this country, in whose hands credit granting lies, will be sensible enough to handle credit so that the people of the United States may not come to Washington at some future day and ask the Government to place consumer credit under stricter regulation for public protection. That is an entirely different subject from the one I came to discuss with you, but I say in closing that the reason I am opposed to Federal regulation of consumer credit in time of peace is that the people of the United States have not asked for it, and, what's more, don't want it. Therefore, Government has no moral right to force it upon them. The people, thus far, value more highly their right to contract as they choose than they do any possible theoretical good effect of regulation.

But it is just as evident that in a democratic nation if private enterprise does not handle the business of credit or any other business as wisely as it should, the people have the right themselves to ask protection—whatever protection they may want and need.

As matters stand today the Government has no further excuse to regulate the credit of my constituents, nor of the American people. When the attitude of the people changes, the attitude of their Representatives must change. That Americans remain satisfied with your service is something entirely in your hands. I am certain that the public of America has confidence in you and your industry. I share that confidence.

Thank you and good-by.

Do Not Forget To Register

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a card showing registration and voting dates:

DO NOT FORGET TO REGISTER

DEAR FRIEND: The registration and voting periods for the coming Democratic primary, run-off, and general elections are as follows:

REGISTRATION PERIODS

Regular primary: June 2 to June 21, inclusive.

Run-off primary: June 23 to July 12, inclusive.

General election: October 6 to October 25, inclusive.

Primary elections: July 2, 1946.

Run-off primary: July 23, 1946.

General election: November 5, 1946.

Your Congressman,

VICTOR WICKERSHAM.

Keep this! Don't fail to vote.

Our Military "Caste System"

REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago—on February 11, to be exact—I had occasion to address the House on the failure of the War Department to develop a sound program for the rapid demobilization of our armed forces. It was, and still is, my contention that such replacements as are necessary for foreign service could, and should be, obtained from recruiting. At that time I pointed out that no real effort had been made to obtain enlistments and suggested that a campaign be inaugurated for volunteers.

The point I wish to make today, Mr. Speaker, is that one of the obstacles to obtaining enlistments in the armed forces is the existing caste system, giving favored treatment of officers over enlisted men. It is significant that the armed forces have more officer volunteers than they can possibly use, but enlisted men are, as a general rule, anxious to terminate their military service now and forever.

Probably the most notable example of favored treatment of officers over enlisted men is in connection with terminal leave pay. When an officer is discharged from the armed forces he is given full pay and allowances for all accumulated leave at the rate of 2½ days per month of service up to a maximum of 120 days. But no matter how long an enlisted man has served or how much leave he may have taken, upon discharge from the service he is immediately taken off the pay roll. Mr. Speaker, there is no justification whatsoever for this discriminatory treatment.

A number of bills for granting terminal leave to enlisted men have been pending with the House Committee on Military Affairs. The distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] has placed on the Speaker's desk a discharge petition to bring the legislation to the floor of the House. I have signed this petition, and I sincerely urge you to do likewise. We should correct this situation at once.

If I may be pardoned a personal reference, my two sons served as officers in the United States Navy. They condemn this preferential treatment of officers over enlisted men, and I think their

view is shared by most of the men who served as officers. I do not know how any one could justly hold a contrary view. As a matter of fact, if one takes into account the rather substantial difference in the pay of officers over enlisted men, terminal leave pay would mean a great deal more to the men in the ranks than to officers who, in a great many cases, received a higher pay as an officer in the armed forces than received in civilian life.

The favored treatment of officers in the matter of terminal leave is only one of the special privileges which officers receive in our military caste system. Having served on the Committee on Naval Affairs and having myself held a commission in the United States Naval Reserve, I have a first-hand appreciation, if you will, of the importance of military discipline. A military organization cannot be run as a democracy, where you debate issues, attend town meetings, and hold elections. There must be those who give orders and those who obey. Without discipline, without distinctions between those in the ranks and those in the echelons of authority, an army would become a mere mob.

Military discipline necessitates distinctions between officers and enlisted men, such as the salute and separate quarters, just as there must be distinctions between officers of different ranks. But, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why officers should have such things as better food or better entertainment or better clothing than the man in the ranks. My boys, as officers, are not the social superiors of my neighbors' boys, as seamen. They all come from American homes and they all took the same risks for their country.

It is the responsibility of the War Department and the Navy Department to correct the abuses of privilege that have developed in our military and naval organizations. It is a matter of administration rather than legislation, but if legislation is necessary in any respect I trust the Committees on Military and Naval Affairs will promptly initiate appropriate action.

I should like to suggest to the Committees on Military and Naval Affairs that detailed studies be made of existing methods of selecting officers, methods of promotions of both officers and enlisted men, and the personnel organization as a whole. For one thing, I believe there should be better opportunities for boys in the service as enlisted men to become officers and perhaps to attend the academies. This in itself would offer inducement for boys to enlist. The method of selecting men to enter West Point and Annapolis can be improved. If it should be decided that the best method is to continue to have some appointments made by Members of Congress, I believe that the Member should be required to make his selection upon a basis of a competitive examination system. In making appointments from the Tenth District of Illinois, I have always used the civil service competitive examination system in order to give all the boys of the district equal opportunity to realize their ambition.

It is my honest conviction that our military system needs to be revised to be in keeping with our principles of democracy. This can be done without loss of military discipline and the effectiveness of our fighting forces. There is no place for the old European "caste system" in an American army. The first step to be taken is the enactment of legislation to eliminate the discrimination against enlisted men in connection with terminal leave pay. That is something we should and can do immediately.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Journal-American of May 13, 1946:

INTERNATIONAL TOTALITARIANISM

(By E. F. Tompkins)

I

When the House of Representatives begins consideration of the British loan agreement bill, it will be the patriotic business of this branch of Congress to take notice of the following neglected points:

1. Should the agreement be approved, this country will—largely by its own misguided initiative and mainly at its own expense—complete its own entrapment in an international supergovernment adverse to our national independence and injurious to the welfare of our citizens.

2. Under the terms and conditions of the agreement, international free enterprise will be destroyed, a form of international collectivism or totalitarianism will take its place, and our domestic system of free enterprise will be undermined.

3. All of this will be carried out at home and abroad by bureaucratic agencies of government without any further reference whatsoever to the constitutional duties and legislative powers of Congress.

To begin with, the British loan agreement is only one part of a complicated international involvement into which we are being decoyed by propaganda, official pressure, and concealment or misrepresentation of essential facts.

The two other parts—contained in the Bretton Woods arrangement—are the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to which we are the largest contributors in the sum of billions of dollars already pledged.

These two financial institutions will exercise complete control over the international exchange of the currencies of the world, and those currencies in turn will be required to conform to rules and standards prescribed by the central international authority—something that can be accomplished, in this country as elsewhere, only by fiat action by the respective governments of the participating nations.

The monetary scheme thus calls for international control of controlled currencies.

The British loan agreement goes much further.

It imposes similar controls, restrictions, and mandates upon the international distribution, and consequently upon the domestic production of all items of merchandise, together with shipping and other forms of international communications.

The name of this third illimitable control will be the International Trade Organization.

Thus, the very commonest articles of commerce, plus all the means of trading in them, are to be completely controlled by an international supergovernment which is being created almost surreptitiously.

It need not be argued that this totalitarian edifice will affect the employment and well-being of workers as well as employers in every country, including the United States.

The planners are actually fabricating a structure of world peonage in the guise of assuring a world-wide regime of free enterprise and free employment; for, of course, the tendency of a world-trade government exercising direction over trade movements will be to open lucrative markets to cheap foreign competition and thereby to force down the higher standards of living.

One of the least creditable phases of the enslaving scheme is the device adopted in this country of concealing or disguising it in a maze of wordage.

Nowhere in the British loan agreement is it plainly and clearly stated that the proposed International Trade Organization is to be set up.

However, a joint statement issued on December 6, 1945, by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain in "explanation" of the British loan agreement said:

"Both sides * * * have from the beginning had continuously in view the common interest of their governments in establishing a world trading and monetary system."

Somewhat more explicit was a propaganda statement, in the form of a unilateral questionnaire, issued in January 1946 by the United States Treasury Department under the heading "Questions and answers on the Anglo-American agreement."

In this document Secretary of the Treasury Fred M. Vinson, said:

"The financial agreement is associated with a far-reaching agreement on commercial policy. * * *

"The commercial policy statement proposes the establishment of an International Trade Organization."

Moreover, this International Trade Organization will undertake to make laws affecting the internal as well as the international economy of the nations—including the United States.

The "joint statement" of December 6, 1945, referred emphatically to the "International Trade Organization" in relation to "international aspects of domestic measures to maintain employment."

Even more revelatory is a statement made by Clair Wilcox, Director of the Office of International Trade Policy of the United States State Department.

First presented on January 19, 1946, as an address before the City Club of Cleveland, Ohio, this statement has since been printed by the State Department as an official paper—"Publication 2468, Commercial Policy Series 82."

It says: "We have proposed:

"1. That a common code be adopted to govern the regulation of commerce by the nations of the world."

The document lists a considerable number of economic and commercial subjects on which the International Trade Organization will exercise supernational authority and says:

"As a means of implementing and supervising all of these undertakings it is proposed:

"9. That an International Trade Organization be created, under the Economic and Social Council, as an integral part of the structure of the United Nations."

Along very similar lines the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has published a bulletin on the British loan agreement setting forth various matters with which the international supergovernment will deal and which are described as "not requiring ratification by Congress."

The items specified include an "understanding" on commercial policies, mentioning tariffs, quotas, and "an International Trade Organization and international aspects of domestic measures to maintain employment."

Obviously the United Nations is not an organization to prevent war but is intended to be a totalitarian world government.

Equally obviously the British loan agreement is positively not merely a simple and generous proposal to lend or to give $3,750,000,000 to a distressed ally.

It is a skillfully devised scheme to carry forward the plan of international state socialism in which this country is being enmeshed.

It is a scheme which Congress can approve only by ignoring its own legitimate powers and abdicating its own authority.

Fire-Fighting Equipment for North Brookfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegrams and letters:

CLINTON, MASS., *April 27, 1946.*
JOHN E. MILLEA,
Regional Director,
War Assets Administration,
Boston, Mass.:

North Brookfield, Mass., without adequate fire-protection equipment because of breakdown fire pumper. Town officials have located surplus pump in Worcester, but were unable to obtain equipment by spot sale. Have advised them to forward certified check your office with formal order and wish you would authorize release of equipment immediately in view present situation. Please advise me at Clinton. Thanks and regards.

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

CLINTON, MASS., *April 27, 1946.*
Attorney RALPH W. IGOE,
North Brookfield, Mass.:

Have interceded with officials War Assets Administration in endeavor to have action expedited on fire pumper sale to North Brookfield. Will advise you when I have further report. Hope for early favorable results. Regards.

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

BOSTON, MASS., *May 3, 1946.*
Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
Washington, D. C.:

Regarding your telegram, fire equipment North Brookfield, Mass., delivery being made today to Linwood Fullam, assistant chief.

JOHN E. MILLEA,
War Assets Administration.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 3, 1946.*
Attorney RALPH W. IGOE,
North Brookfield, Mass.:

Very much pleased to have word, following my recent intercessions, that fire equipment delivery made today by War Assets Administration to Assistant Chief Fullam. Regards.

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

LAW DEPARTMENT,
TOWN OF NORTH BROOKFIELD, MASS.,
May 4, 1946.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This will acknowledge receipt of your Western Union telegram with reference to your intercession in behalf of the fire department of North Brookfield, relative to fire-fighting equipment ordered by the town of North Brookfield from the War Assets Administration.

The War Assets Administration contacted the local fire department and issued the necessary clearance so that this equipment could be purchased, and the town has now received the fire-fighting equipment from the Administration.

This town was in very dire circumstances because of the lack of a fire pump, and the local board of selectmen, finance committee, and officials of the fire department are very pleased to learn that through your intercession it became possible to acquire this equipment immediately, and thereby solve their problem in this respect.

I am equally grateful to you for your prompt and efficient cooperation in this matter, and I know that your assistance to the town officials at this time is deeply appreciated.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

RALPH W. IGOE.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION,
Boston, Mass., May 7, 1946.

The Honorable PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
Member of Congress, Clinton, Mass.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN: In answer to your recent wire relative to fire-fighting equipment for the town of North Brookfield, Mass., may we advise that the following equipment, physically located at Worcester, Mass., was released by this agency to the town of North Brookfield on May 3, 1946:

One trailer pump, auxiliary pump No. 14, Serial No. 25656, OCD.

One skid pump, auxiliary pump No. 8, Serial Nos. SF-2370, S-9721, OCD.

Two fire-fighting accessories, schedule A.

Two fire-fighting accessories, schedule B.

Two ladders, 14-foot roof.

Two ladders, 24-foot extension.

Eight lengths (50 feet per length) 1½-inch hose.

Sixteen lengths (50 feet per length) 2½-inch hose.

Four length (10 feet per length) 4-inch suction.

We trust that this action will place the above town in an adequate condition with regard to fire hazards.

Very truly yours,

JOHN E. MILLEA,
Regional Director.

NORTH BROOKFIELD FIRE DEPARTMENT,
North Brookfield, Mass., May 8, 1946.

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
Clinton, Mass.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: Thank you very much for your cooperation in helping us obtain the pump through the War Assets Administration for the North Brookfield Fire Department.

Because you took the time to intercede for us we now have the pump here in town and in operation.

We certainly appreciate what you have done for us and thanks again.

Cordially yours,

LINWOOD FULLAM,
Assistant Chief.

How Do You Like It, Americans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herein a newspaper article appearing in the Miami Herald, of Miami, Fla., of May 11, 1946, which article is as follows:

HOW DO YOU LIKE IT, AMERICANS?

The tragic significance of the coal strike, now in a hastily declared 2-week truce, is that a single individual has the power to bring the production facilities of an entire nation to a full stop.

The arrogant, ruthless man who exercised this dictatorial show of strength was born, ironically enough, on Lincoln's Birthday and still lists his residence as Springfield, Ill., where a much greater man preached tolerance and practiced humility.

To those who see in John L. Lewis's demand for a $64,000,000 health and welfare fund either a communistically inspired plot or the first step toward nationalization of the coal mines, it should be pointed out that during the twenties Lewis was considered a solid Republican who rated the best drawing room on the Harding and Coolidge Presidential campaign specials.

With the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt to the Presidency, Lewis made his first big-time bid for power. The United Mine Workers contributed $500,000 to the Roosevelt campaign fund and Lewis greatly strengthened his union when enactment of the Wagner Act and the Guffey Coal Act removed all of the restrictions that had retarded unionization of the coal industry.

Lewis broke with Roosevelt in 1940 after Roosevelt is said to have laughingly rejected a proposal advanced by Lewis that he (Lewis) be Roosevelt's running mate in the third-term campaign.

After consultation with the Republican Strategy Committee which had difficulty deciding whether Lewis' support would be an asset or a liability, the fiery Mine Workers' leader made a sonorous radio plea for Willkie's election, in which he pledged his resignation as president of the CIO if the members of the union refused to follow his political advice.

Despite everything that Lewis had done to advance the interests of his own union, the mine workers spurned his plea and voted overwhelmingly for Roosevelt. Lewis made good his pledge to resign as president of the CIO, and Philip Murray was elected to succeed him.

Until the day of Roosevelt's death, Lewis hated the late President with an implacable venom, and today he loathes and detests not only the remnants and political carry-overs of the Roosevelt administration but also his own former associates like Phil Murray, who refused to participate in his personal vendetta against Roosevelt.

In the present coal strike, John L. Lewis is making his second great bid for power. Edwin A. Lahey, of our Washington bureau, a skilled labor analyst, foresees the next phase of the contest between Lewis and his former associates when the present coal crisis is resolved.

"Then," says Lahey, "Lewis will be free to take up the cudgels as a leader of the AFL organizing drive in the South. A spectacular victory for the mine workers is a matter of personal prestige for Lewis in the forthcoming contest with the hated CIO. That is why

Lewis is setting his sights high in the coal crisis and sitting tight, waiting for his opponents to "lose their nerve."

And so the country sits and fumes and frets while a vain and pompous labor leader, who quotes Shakespeare, the Bible, and classical poetry and struts like Mussolini, paralyzes the Nation in order to uphold his personal prestige.

How do you like it, Americans?

Doesn't it stick in your craw to have to admit that any one man is more powerful than your President or the Members of the United States Congress who are supposed to represent your interests and protect your rights?

How do you like it, veterans?

Did you ever expect to see your country at the mercy of a domestic dictator who could stop reconversion, halt production, throw millions out of work and make you eat it?

How do you like it, Members of Congress?

You who have stalled month after month on workable labor legislation that abridges no one's rights but insists upon mutual responsibility and the prevention of strikes that vitally affect the public interest.

How do you like it, Senators and Congressmen?

How does it feel to know that you might have prevented the inevitable suffering and tragedy that has been brought upon hundreds of thousands of American homes—if you had possessed only a semblance of courage and a little more faith in your oath of office?

How do you like it, Mr. President?

How does it seem to read about General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler closing down their shops just when their employees were beginning to recover from the disastrous economic effects of a 113-day strike.

Can you in all good conscience, deny that you first failed to call the labor-management conference when it was urgently needed and then permitted it, when later called, to degenerate into little more than a farce?

Can you honestly say that your administration has developed anything that even remotely resembles an intelligent labor policy?

Do you think it is enough to say that the situation is tense or that you have finally summoned John L. Lewis and the mine operators into a joint conference?

Why couldn't such a conference have been called before the strike started?

The issue is plain and can be stated in a few words.

Shall John L. Lewis be given the power to place a $64,000,000 tax on the production of coal for an unspecified form of health and welfare fund to be administered solely by his union?

The object of Mr. Lewis' move is quite obvious. Such a levy on every ton of coal produced would give the great man a vast fund with which to augment his own political and economic power.

It would, in effect, make his union a private taxing authority, with the bill to be paid by the public.

Once this principle is established, the way is opened for similar levies on all businesses and industries. That would mean higher prices for virtually everything we buy.

Since Mr. Lewis and the coal operators show little indication of "losing their nerve," it is up to you, Mr. President, to show the country that you have some.

At this late stage there are only two courses open:

The first is your firm insistence that some form of arbitrated health protection be given the mine workers.

The second is passage of legislation that will protect the public in the future against power-drunk labor leaders who flout the public interest in order to gratify their own vanity and egotism.

To do less would be to concede that the United States Government is powerless to safeguard and defend the rights of its own citizens.

The Truman administration has yet to meet a majority issue face up or even to succeed in getting its own limited and sketchy program enacted into law.

We are, therefore, not at all certain that the President has any stomach for tackling this disagreeable assignment.

We are sure, however, that as young Harry Truman studied his history books in school, he never envisioned the day when the President of the United States would stand by, rubbing his hands and hoping that everything would come out all right, while the country was being thrown into a state of anarchy.

How do you like it, Americans?

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Yes, Members of Congress Read Their Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, recently the editor of a publication for college students asked me, "Do you read your mail?" My reply follows:

"You remember that matter I wrote you about?" is a common greeting for a Congressman on vacation at home—the word "vacation" is used in its broadest sense for he works as hard in his district as in Washington.

My answer is generally yes-s-s and if a tone of uncertainty is in the voice it should be no offense for I receive a thousand letters a month. To remember every detail would be a greater mental feat than even a Congressman could perform. Still, the letters are my most valuable contact with constituents and the mail is my first, and often my most important, concern of the day.

On the average, 200 items reach us each day, a good part of which is, of course, second-class mail, but even the mimeographs and printed matter receive attention. My take-home basket receives a lot of newspapers and magazines including at least seven regular publications on religion. Incidentally, the material on religion inserted by Members in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the present Congress exceeds any previous session.

Back to the fellow who said, "Do you remember my letter?" The chances are that I will remember his letter and that I will recall its disposition—I may have dictated the reply and in any event I can assure him I saw his letter. I read and sign every letter that goes from my office when I am in Washington and if any letter has not had my attention it bears my secretary's signature in my absence. Some replies are prepared by the secretaries but are laid on my desk for scrutiny and signature. Most Members of Congress follow this practice.

Much of our mail has to do with a personal problem, but the volume devoted to legislative matters is growing and this is a good trend because this is a representative government and if we legislate wisely we must have the facts regarding the application of proposed legislation to local situations. Moreover a letter regarding a pending bill may give us an opportunity to explain its purpose and in some cases to correct misinformation on the subject. A Representative should be a "window as well as a mirror."

In the realm of opinion, letters that are carefully prepared are of great assistance. In most controversies the categorical attitudes of "for" or "against" are not very helpful. We want reasons. This is particularly true where Nation-wide propaganda has been used. I do not object to propaganda as such. It is often good and it is related to the efficient functioning of our Government. It does, however, often create difficulties. For example, Citizen Watkins in my district may be sure that X bill is a good bill so he urges me to vote for it without amendment. Citizen Watkins may not understand when he learns that I voted for amendments that the friends of the bill regarded the proposed changes as meritorious. I can hardly say that the opinion mail which is inspired has no weight, but Congress has had some sad experiences with pressure and is not greatly influenced by such campaigns.

I am always glad to get carefully considered expressions of individual opinion and I believe I reflect the general views of Congress in asserting that such letters are a great asset. There are many instances in which ideas for legislation originate with a constituent. I have introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress at least three public bills because I liked the suggestions contained in letters from home. Some good laws are on the statute books today because somebody wrote his Congressman.

Most of my mail is interesting, even exciting sometimes. Some of it might be regarded as fan mail and is avidly read. A Congressman has to take sides on a number of issues and evidences of approval are always welcome. I do not resent critical letters and, occasionally, I get something like this, "From here it looked like the best of the argument was on the other side—do you mind telling me why you voted as you did?" I not only do not mind, I positively jump at the chance to explain a vote, and, if the writer is unconvinced, he is more often than not satisfied that I made an effort to reach the right conclusion. A Representative is like an umpire—he must call some close plays and there will be a percentage of errors in spite of everything.

Believing as I do in a close relationship between Congress and the people, I always encourage correspondence. Perhaps not more than 1 in 1,000 constituents will visit my office in a year. My chief reliance must be upon mail and upon contacts at home between sessions. I enjoy contacts with student groups. Occasionally political-science students from colleges in and near Washington visit my office, and my staff is always pleased to cooperate with students in a practical study of congressional problems. The examination and classifica-

tion of our mail is the most valuable phase of their study.

I would hesitate to offer advice regarding mail to a Congressman, but on the basis of my experience I believe the following suggestions would be appropriate:

First. Freely express your opinion on pending legislation, but try to avoid too many generalizations—be as specific as possible.

Second. Deal with particular proposals and identify the bills in which you are interested by number and author if known.

Third. Give reasons for your position—you may have some ideas about the application of measures to local and particular situations that have not occurred to others.

Fourth. Feel free to write about problems that have not reached a legislative formulation—maybe "somebody" ought to act.

Fifth. On important national issues get reactions from others and encourage group discussions to aid in ascertainment of public sentiment.

Sixth. Finally, never forget that your Congressman's best contact with his people is his mail.

Good Will Message From Station WLAW Sent on First Commercial Flight From Lawrence, Mass., Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter received from Mr. Irving E. Rogers, general manager of radio station WLAW, located at Lawrence, Mass., which station is now serving industrial New England. This letter was sent to me on the first flight of the United States air-mail service on the inauguration of commercial air travel from the New Municipal Airport of the city of Lawrence, Mass., in the town of North Andover:

WLAW,
Lawrence, Mass., May 10, 1946.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
Representative in Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: Traveling hand in hand along the path of progress with WLAW, soon to speak to all of New England with its 50,000 watt voice, the city of Lawrence, Mass., joined today with the other aggressive communities of the Nation in inaugurating air travel from its own airport.

This message of good will from WLAW and Lawrence was flown to you by the plane which made the first of regularly scheduled flights from "the woolen and worsted center of the world" in whose textile plants more than 25,000 people are engaged daily in making the materials to clothe the universe.

WLAW is proud to mark this epoch in the history of Lawrence, Mass., the community in which it was born in 1937, and which it has served together with other communities in its listening area, first with 1,000 watts, then 5,000 watts, and soon with 50,000 watts whose power will dominate the airways of New England to bring radio's brightest programs to over 3,000,000 listeners from Portland, Maine, to Newport, R. I.

Sincerely,

IRVING E. ROGERS,
General Manager.

Betty Bacharach Home for Afflicted Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Atlantic City Daily World, appearing on Mother's Day, which refers to the Betty Bacharach Home for Afflicted Children, located at Longport, N. J., in my congressional district.

This great institution has for many years done the finest kind of work for children, and has done it modestly and inconspicuously. It is an enduring monument not only to the late Mrs. Bacharach, but to her splendid children who founded the home in her memory.

Mr. Speaker, I rarely, if ever, insert in the RECORD a statement which has no national significance. I take the liberty of doing so in this instance because a prime factor in this institution is former Congressman Isaac Bacharach, my distinguished predecessor, who for many years represented the Second Congressional District of New Jersey with honor and distinction, and who endeared himself, not only to the people of his district, but to the membership of the House of Representatives. Many of his warm friends are sitting in the House today, and they cherish their former association with this great American. I am glad to report to the House that former Congressman Bacharach is hale and hearty, and still active in Atlantic City. Modest in good works, I doubt if he will relish my reference to them; but I nevertheless am impelled to speak.

The editorial follows:

IS THERE A BETTER CAUSE?

On Mother's Day in May of 1924 a small, inconspicuous frame structure was opened in Longport, N. J., for the care of crippled children. Six patients were accommodated. The building was a gift from the five children of Betty Bacharach; namely, Congressman Isaac Bacharach, Mayor Harry Bacharach, Benjamin Bacharach, Mrs. Ray P. Allman and Mrs. Hanstein.

From this little beginning one of the finest homes for crippled children in the entire country has been developed and perpetuated.

More than 3,000 children, many of them sufferers of the dread scourge of infantile paralysis, have been sent back into the everyday world as useful, happy citizens. Many became rehabilitated to an extent that enabled them to take part in World War II as members of the armed forces protecting our country. Others have been married and reared normal families. They became exceedingly useful citizens.

This feat has been such a splendid public service, and grand contribution to the cause of better health, that all concerned have earned the thanks of not only Atlantic City and the State of New Jersey, but of the entire Nation, whose children the home has received.

On every Mother's Day since that memorable opening 22 years ago, a set of exercises has been dedicated to the founders and the many generous citizens who have made this institution possible. These exercises have been addressed by such outstanding personalities as Senator Alben Barkley, Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, Gov. Harold G. Hoffman, Gov. Walter E. Edge, Gov. Harry Moore, and many other distinguished men.

Tomorrow, Sunday, May 12, there will be another Mother's Day ceremonial, dedicated to the memory of Mrs. Ray B. Allman, one of the founders. There will be an address by United States Senator LISTER HILL. An orchestra under direction of Albert Geidt, will be heard. Pleasantville High School Choral Club, under the direction of Benjamin Censullo, and Spar Sue Bennett also will be featured.

You of the public have been invited to attend, not only to hear a splendid program, but also to inspect the Betty Bacharach Home for Afflicted Children.

This program is worthy of your support. We know of no better place to invest your money in a charitable enterprise. Do it now, so that we may be prepared for any distressing eventuality.

Fair Employment Practice Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 15, 1946

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly that the proponents of the FEPC monstrosity and misnomer are again trying to impose such a philosophy on the American people. I am strongly in favor of the minority rights under our democratic process, but, Mr. Speaker, when a minority endeavors to thwart the will of the majority in a matter of so grave concern and importance to the people of this Nation, it is going far afield to the principles of democracy.

The history of FEPC is well known, and I have had occasion to discuss it as many of us have heretofore from time to time. My views in opposition to FEPC by Executive order of the President as it was originally established, and even more so by legislation, are well known. The only time, Mr. Speaker, during the entire war that I voted against what was considered a war measure was in 1944 when we were considering the appropriation for the war agencies. One-half million dollars was provided in that proposed legislation for FEPC. A rule had been granted waiving points of order in the bill. I could not vote for even a bill so important as that when it carried funds for the continuation of FEPC. I expressed my views at

that time and publicly announced the reason that I voted against it. My attention had been called to specific instances where the actions of that committee were tremendously interfering with the war program. It was causing grave concern among many of our people contributing much to the war effort. A year ago when the same problem came before the House an agreement was worked out whereby sufficient funds would be provided for the liquidation of the committee within the fiscal year. The fiscal year will end June 30. This attempt at this late hour can be for only one purpose, though I want it definitely understood that I do not impugn the motives of any Member of this Congress.

In connection with this bill, Mr. Speaker, there is a fundamental principle involved. It is an issue wherein our philosophy of government is to be determined. I do not believe that the people of this country approve any such change in our philosophy of government, or would ever permit such far-reaching authority under the proposed legislation to become effective. We cannot afford or permit such a thwart to our system of free enterprise and the destruction of private business. Our Nation became great under the principles of private control, and business will not have such a yoke placed on its neck, nor will our people ever yield to such rigid control.

Should such an ignominious proposal become law it would mean another step toward the Government's continuance of rigid control of all our economy in the future. If we are going to be successful in this period of reconversion American business must be free to exercise its own good judgment in its operation as well as in the employment of personnel. We cannot and must not permit any such minority group to say to our employers that by a legal mandate they must employ whomever the committee, as a czar, may say.

Perhaps FEPC is a good thing for a favored few. I recall in the consideration of additional appropriation for FEPC last year that it was then employing approximately 115 persons. Is it not rather unusual that 65 of those employees were Negroes?

I have no prejudice, Mr. Speaker, against the Negro. I have the greatest of respect and feeling for the Negro. They have, as all other people, their rights and their place in this democracy. I was born and reared in a State where there were and still are many Negroes. We never had any trouble with them, Mr. Speaker, in our part of the State, and they have progressed continuously for the past quarter of a century.

This proposal is not and cannot be considered merely as a racial issue. It reaches even further, as it would change the philosophy of our American principles and established traditions. It would mean the ending of free enterprise and the complete control and domination of business in our economy by the Government. This will not and cannot ever be permitted. The American people rightfully will not approve such a radical change in our Government and way of life.

Effects of the Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, in this postwar era the people are making a strenuous effort to reconvert from a wartime to a peacetime economy. There is much work to do, and the opportunity to make great progress in the future is before us. However, we are experiencing at the present the greatest unrest that has ever been evidenced in our Nation, and it appears that there are those who for personal greed would prefer to see our country and our economy destroyed rather than to concede any contribution which would assist our program of reconversion. The untold thousands of our veterans who have returned home, and who are returning to their communities, have found this distressing condition. Many of them have become utterly disgusted because of this distressing condition, and they have reenlisted in the Army, and have returned to the service for a career in the future. To those boys—our veterans—who have fought for our country throughout this war just over, it is a sad commentary for them to find our country in such a distressing condition. Things have changed during their absence. They did not return home and find the same economic conditions existing which they enjoyed when they left for the service. They found a great change existing, and they found, when they returned, that our economic condition was such that they despaired of any material improvement in the immediate future, so they returned, many of them, to the service.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this Nation want to get down to business, and our returning veterans want us to get down to business, in order that our Nation may go forward in progress. However, with the present attitude of those in command, and I refer to the heads of the administration now in power, there is very little hope for any improvement. The coal strike must be settled, because industry and the people need coal and steel, and the contemplated railroad strike must be avoided, if possible, in order to aid this Nation, and the people, in going forward in this period of reconversion. Under the present situation our Nation, and all of the people, are in great peril. Practically all industry will be closed, within a very short period of time, if coal is unobtainable, and that will be the direct cause of untold millions of our working men and women losing their jobs and the opportunity to earn and support their families and dependents. The loss in wages, and production, will be far beyond the contemplation of any person. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is my fervent hope that these strikes, now in progress, and all those strikes which are now in contemplation, may be speedily settled and our people thus given the opportunity to return to their jobs, and that our veterans may be given the opportunity to go back to their jobs so they may earn their livelihood and support those dependent upon them. This is the fervent wish of every American, and it is my hope that a solution, which is fair and just, may be reached—that the factories, mills, and mines, may again reflect the spirit of every patriotic American citizen by sending forth the activity of real accomplishment and progress—so our Nation may live and make real progress in the future.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include as a part of my remarks a newspaper article appearing in the Washington Post on Sunday, May 12, which reads as follows:

JOHN L. HAS OPA WEAVING CREPE

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

The immediate effects of the coal strike are uncomfortably obvious. But Government economists are even more alarmed about its long-range effects. The majority of them fear, in fact, that it has delivered the death blow to the effort to maintain price control and halt inflation.

First of all, production, which is the only final check upon inflation, has been severely reduced. But that, unfortunately, is only the surface of the problem.

Most industrial plants lose money on "low-level operation," no matter how rich their normal profits may be. An automobile company, for example, may begin to make money only when its five hundred-thousandth car rolls off the assembly lines. The strike produced a coal shortage which will endure over a long period. The coal shortage will condemn many industries to low-level operations for several months. And this in turn will reduce many of the smaller companies to a desperate situation, and may even put many of the larger companies into the red.

PROFITS BELIE PLAINTS

The fact that American businessmen are now making larger profits than at any time since 1929, has given the friends of OPA their best defensive weapon. Even so the powerful business lobbies have already succeeded in gutting the price-control system. But if profits go down the cries of indignation against OPA will cease to sound hollow.

If many businesses actually begin to lose money, no power on earth can keep OPA in being as an effective price-control mechanism. Because of the current effects of the strike, production is already lagging further and further behind demand. With low-level operations in the future, the lag will continue. And with a break in price control added to intensified demand, a wild price rise will ensue, followed, as night follows day, by a nice, big bust.

Such, in summary, is the analysis of the Government wise men. What they say does not, of course, alarm Lewis. He must suffer an occasional qualm, however, when he turns from the economists to the industrial and governmental scientists, and asks them what they think of the gas-turbine engine.

INGENIOUS INTERLOPER

This new device is related to the coal strike as the coal strike is related to the national economy—and for a very simple reason. The coal strike will make coal a more expensive fuel. And the gas-turbine engine is a power plant which does not use coal; can be substituted wherever coal is now used to produce power, and is already capable of producing power at one-third the unit cost of power produced by coal. Moreover, the basic design, in principle like aero-jet engines, is so simple that maintenance costs would also be reduced almost to the vanishing point.

There are plenty of bugs in the thing yet, and it is not the place of political reporters

to pass upon technical questions. But several of the largest industrial companies in the United States—General Electric, Westinghouse, and General Machinery Co., among them—are working on the new engine, and one leading industrialist, who is certainly not a harebrained visionary, has said that "in a matter of 4 to 5 years it should be in wide use."

When that time comes, he added, "it is likely to usher in a basic industrial revolution." Politics reflects techniques. It does not require a very profound thinker to see that the sudden availability of a power plant two-thirds cheaper than anything now known will influence politics almost as deeply as it will industry.

EVEN HITS PETROLEUM

For Lewis, of course, unless he gets his $60,000,000 welfare fund and uses it to capture the entire labor movement, the success of the gas-turbine engine would mean something like extinction. A complementary problem would be produced in the oil industry. The engine uses straight fuel oil, which is less wasteful than gasoline.

But American oil reserves are already low, from the strategic standpoint, and the effect of greatly increased fuel-oil consumption on the national future would have to be considered. So would the effect of much cheaper industrial power, and resulting higher profits, on the whole economic structure.

Add to the foregoing facts one more item. The immediate response to the coal strike of the congressional conservatives—the very men who cry out against "Government interference"—has been to trot out the Case bill to punish Lewis. The sum of these facts seems to be that the Government is in the business of interfering in the economic process for good, and that the sooner this interference becomes more decisive and more clear-headed than the dealings with the coal strike to date, the better it will be for all.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Role of Social Security in the Future of America," delivered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] at the West Virginia University convocation on May 8, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF SOCIAL SECURITY IN THE FUTURE OF AMERICA

I deeply appreciate the honor of addressing this convocation. And I am very glad that you have asked me to talk about the role of social security in the future of America—a subject that is tremendously important today when we are striving to build a peace that will realize the ideals for which men and women recently fought and died on such an unprecedented scale.

To realize these ideals, we will, of course, need more than a comprehensive social security program. Social security measures important as they are in strengthening and upholding the freedom and dignity of the individual and of the family—are not in themselves sufficient to remove the fear of economic insecurity or to provide assurance of a decent standard of living for all. The extent to which we attain our broad objectives of freedom from want, and freedom from fear, will depend, in large measure, on our ability as a nation to maintain a high and stable level of employment and income.

We need to remind ourselves that the economy of our Nation today differs radically from the economy of former times. That earlier economy was characterized by almost unlimited opportunity for individual and family security, development and advancement, because it was in its beginning mainly agricultural, and it had the outlets of new frontiers. But our country has reached the limit of its geographical frontiers and has undergone an industrial revolution.

We live today in a money economy, an economy which, without proper safeguards, has been characterized by periods of mass depression, and which is constantly harassed by the poverty and insecurity of countless families. The human values of independence and individual opportunity and enterprise, upon which our democracy was built, have suffered greatly as a result of our economic development and expansion. We must, therefore, now revive and reenforce these values through measures for social security that are realistically geared to our present economy, the one in which we live and must live. Without such measures to give people security while at the same time preserving freedom, we face the danger that people may turn away from democracy itself.

By setting our sights for a socially secure America, however, we are aiming also at the broader objective of increasing the basic stability of our economy. Social security payments increase purchasing power and assure a minimum level of demand for the products of farm and industry. Because these payments are used for current maintenance by many families who would otherwise be without income, their effect on consumer demand is immediate and disproportionate to their size.

Even under the most prosperous operation of our economy, the earnings of many families are often cut off at a time when there is the most urgent need for them. Individuals become too old to work. They become unable to work because of injuries or sickness. They die without having been able to make adequate provision for the support of their families. Persons who work for wages and salaries are confronted by the additional risk of involuntary unemployment, not necessarily the widespread, long duration unemployment of an economic depression but, inevitably, the sporadic unemployment resulting from the technological changes and seasonal shifts which are part of a dynamic economy.

If earnings cease, the family needs a substitute form of income out of which to pay the rent and to buy the groceries. Individual savings are too uncertain and too costly a method of providing this substitute. Even during their best earning years, relatively few persons receive incomes large enought to permit the accumulation of savings which will carry them through the years after enforced retirement. If earnings are cut off unexpectedly and prematurely, particularly during the period when family responsibilities are at their peak, there may have been neither time nor opportunity to accumulate savings.

Social insurance provides a method of compensating for loss of earnings which is more democratic and dignified than public or private charity at its best, and which is far more certain and less expensive than any form of private savings. Our country embarked upon its first large-scale experiment in social insurance in 1935 when the Social Security Act was adopted. Because our social insurance system excludes large groups of the working population and yet fails to insure against some of the most common causes of income loss to which working people are subject, it cannot be considered as more than a first step toward America's goal of social security. But it has been a highly successful first step. And 10 years of actual experience has proved that the principle of social insurance is sound when applied to the American system of free enterprise and cooperation.

Now that we are certain that our first step was in the right direction, we should take further steps along the same lines to insure that all American families will have basic protection against the major hazards which constantly threaten their security.

I should like to describe for you the principal features of a comprehensive, unified program for social security, built upon the groundwork of our present limited programs. A more detailed blueprint for such a program has been introduced in the Senate by Senator WAGNER and myself, and in the House by Representative DINGELL.

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

The Federal program of old-age and survivors' insurance now covers only persons who work for wages or salaries in industry and commerce. The main groups exclude are agricultural wage workers, domestic servants, public employees, employees of educational, charitable, and other nonprofit organizations, and self-employed business and professional persons, including operators of small businesses and farmers. All of these groups—which together number perhaps 20,000,000 persons—as well as those covered—are subject to the risks of premature death and dependency in old age. Among the excluded segments of the population we find some of the workers whose employment conditions are the most uncertain, whose pay is the lowest and who, in consequence, are the least able to safeguard themselves and their families through individual effort.

Exclusion of these employments from coverage has left many workers without protection which they badly need. It has caused large numbers of them who occasionally work in occupations now covered by the program to make some contribution to the system without obtaining sufficient credit to enable them to qualify for benefits. Moreover, all of them, as consumers, are undoubtedly carrying a share of the cost of the social-insurance program since at least a substantial part of the contributions paid by employers in industry and commerce is pushed forward into prices which all must pay—the noninsured and the insured alike.

Administrative problems—which were primarily responsible for postponement of the coverage of these groups—have now been solved in the light of 10 years' experience in operating a social-insurance program. There is no justification, therefore, for further delay in extending old-age and survivors' protection to virtually all gainfully employed workers in the Nation.

Extension of coverage would be advantageous, not only to the newly covered groups, but to all workers already included in the present system. We are a Nation with a mobile labor force. Many workers in the course of a working life-time shift back and forth between types of employment now covered and those not now covered. This results in disqualifying many from insurance benefits; it also reduces the earnings which can be credited toward benefits and reduces the average wage that is calculated. It thus lowers the amount of the payment to which the worker is entitled upon retiring, or to which his widow and orphans are entitled upon his death. Only if the coverage of our system is as broad as possible can a worker take advantage of opportunities which enable him to move from job to job without a break in his insurance protection or a reduction in future benefits.

By failing to credit military service toward old-age and survivors' wage-credits, the present social security law has seriously penalized the millions of young men and women who served in our armed forces. Under the provisions of the new bill, servicemen who had never worked in employment covered by the program, as well as those who had built up benefit rights in previous years, would be given retroactive credit for the entire period of their military service. This would be an act of justice to servicemen and the cost would be borne by the Federal Government out of general revenues. Veterans would thus have full and immediate protection against civilian hazards—protection which they could not obtain in any other way.

We propose also a number of changes and liberalizations to make benefits more adequate and to increase the protection of the old-age and survivors' insurance program. With these improvements, old-age and survivors' insurance can realize to the fullest its major role in securing the future of American workers and their families.

EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Our primary emphasis tonight is on social security measures. In turning to the subject of employment security, therefore, let me focus your attention upon the social insurance program of unemployment compensation. But first, I wish to make quite clear that social security—no matter how comprehensive and adequate—cannot substitute for full employment. Jobs for all our workers is the best safeguard of freedom and economic security for the American people. However, when suitable work is lacking, unemployment compensation is a first line of defense. It is therefore important that our program should provide a truly adequate defense.

I have been interested in statements to the effect that the more we strengthen our unemployment-compensation program, the more we encourage workers to draw unemployment benefits instead of taking jobs. I grant that this would be a very sad commentary on social insurance if it were backed up by facts. Let us look at the principal argument used to support the contention that workers would rather receive compensation for loafing than pay for working. This argument usually takes the form of a comparison of the total number of unemployed beneficiaries with the total number of job openings, for the Nation as a whole, for a State or perhaps for a single city. Such a comparison of totals is both meaningless and misleading in that it completely ignores the fact that workers are human beings who differ widely in their personal characteristics, skills and experience. I have seen the results of local labor market studies which go beyond those totals. They show, for instance, that in one city almost four-fifths of the claimants for benefits were women whereas slightly more than four-fifths of the available jobs were open to men only. Further break-down of the characteristics of the jobless and of the job specifications of the employers piles up the evidence to refute the contention that jobs go begging simply because of the worker's preference for compensated idleness.

Placement of a worker in a job which utilizes his highest skills is to the advantage of the employer and to our entire national economy, as well as to the financial and psychological advantage of the individual worker and his family. An adequate system of public-employment offices serves to bring workers and suitable jobs together as rapidly as possible. Obviously this matching process does not always occur instantaneously. And so, in order that a worker will not be forced by dire necessity to take the first job that opens up, regardless of suitability, he needs a benefit sufficient for maintenance during a reasonable period of searching for a job which will match his maximum ability.

We are now in a period of Nation-wide reconversion. Returned servicemen and members of the civilian labor force are matching their job skills to peacetime uses. During this period we need the strongest possible bulwark of protection. And if, thereafter, we reach our goal of full employment, we still will not have eliminated all wage loss from temporary unemployment. It is generally estimated that even in a fully active and smoothly functioning labor market, about 2 to 4 percent of the civilian labor force is unemployed, at any one time. What steps should we take to ensure that our unemployment compensation program is well adapted to the demands of both Nation-wide reconversion and Nation-wide full employment?

Our present unemployment compensation program is divided into 51 separate State and territorial systems which vary widely in their provisions. During the past year or two, a number of States have revised their unemployment compensation laws to make them somewhat more adequate for the tasks ahead. But these changes have been too limited and have not succeeded in eliminating inadequacies in amounts and durations of benefits. I am convinced that if we are to meet adequately the demands of Nation-wide reconversion and of full employment, we must merge our present separate State systems into one national system, providing more adequate protection—and protection equally available—to workers in all parts of the country.

We shall also need, during the reconversion period and thereafter, a well-coordinated national system of employment offices on a permanent basis. The tremendous geographical shifting of workers during the war years, now going on in reverse, strongly accentuated the mobile character of our labor force. At no time in our history have workers been deterred in their search for jobs by the artificial barriers of State lines. In a highly industrialized and widespread economy such as ours, only a national employment service can effectively appraise the entire national labor market and bring workers and jobs together, wherever they exist throughout the Nation.

DISABILITY INSURANCE

We have made a successful beginning toward the goal of providing protection against loss of earnings due to old age, unemployment, or the premature death of the breadwinner. Our efforts in these fields should now be directed toward improving our techniques and extending protection to other groups of workers. But we have not yet begun to provide an adequate solution to our problem of sickness and resultant disability—the major causes, aside from periods of mass unemployment of dependency and poverty among American families.

It is estimated that on an average day, in a prewar year, about 7,000,000 persons in the United States were so disabled by sickness or injury that they could not carry on their usual pursuits. Nearly half of these would have been in paid jobs, or looking for such jobs, except for their incapacity. In ordinary years loss of earnings from temporary disability, including the loss of persons who during the year shift from the labor force to the group of permanently disabled, amounts to some three to four billion dollars.

Of the 7,000,000 persons disabled on an average day, about half have been incapacitated for 6 months or more, the period commonly used in classifying disability as "permanent" or "extended" for social-insurance purposes. In its effect on the earning power of the worker, permanent disability closely resembles old age because it frequently results in permanent retirement from the labor market. In its effect on family security, however, permanent disability may have even more serious consequences than does old age, in that disability may strike during youth or middle age, when family responsibilities are greatest and before there has been opportunity to accumulate savings. A comprehensive social-insurance program should, therefore, provide cash benefits—similar in amount to old-age benefits—to compensate for the earnings loss which results from long-term or permanent disability.

The wage loss which results from the temporary disability of the breadwinner resembles that which results from temporary unemployment. It may, however, work an even greater hardship on the family because of the additional expenses which illness commonly brings. Because both temporary disability and temporary unemployment involve relatively brief periods of wage loss, temporary-disability insurance might be geared into a national program for unemployment insurance, with similar provisions as to workers covered and as to amount and duration of benefits.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITALIZATION INSURANCE

A program of cash benefits to replace earnings lost during a sickness or disability is only part of the solution to the problem of attaining health security. We also need a solution to the problem of paying for medical care—a solution which will remove the financial barrier now standing between families and the medical care they need.

My personal interest in social security began through concern about the problems of health and medical care. In 1939, as chairman of a Senate subcommittee, I had the privilege of presiding at the hearings on the Wagner health bill. In the course of these hearings, I learned of the great need of people in this country for more adequate health facilities and medical care. I was shocked by the evidence of preventable deaths and disabling illnesses, of whole communities without hospitals or even doctors, or people in our richest communities who went without needed medical care because of fear of the cost. I become convinced at that time that a health program which would bring the benefits of modern medical science to all the people was one of the most important goals for this country.

My conviction has been reinforced during these 7 years. In 1943, and again in May 1945, I joined with Senator WAGNER and Representative DINGELL in sponsoring a comprehensive social-security bill which included provisions for health insurance. On November 19, 1945, we introduced our separate bill for a national health program, S. 1606, the provisions of which are designed to implement President Truman's recommendations on health contained in his message to Congress. For the past month, the Senate Committee on Education and Labor has been holding hearings on this national health bill. The members of that Senate committee, over which I preside, are again hearing a volume of convincing evidence on the prevalence of ill health and widespread failure to obtain needed medical care. Despite the progress we have made on other fronts in the last 7 years, and despite spectacular advances of modern medicine, we find that there is a shocking lack of adequate modern medical care for a large section of our people and many persons who receive some care get no better than their grandfathers received at the beginning of the century. Also through records of Selective Service examinations, we now have additional and comprehensive evidence of the serious extent of substandard health among the youth of America due to lack of proper medical care for our families.

A first line of attack in solving our health problems and in assuring adequate medical care to all citizens is through a solution to the problem of medical costs.

The costs of medical care are uneven and unpredictable for the individual and for the family. Sickness and disability also are much more frequent among the poor than among high-income groups. There is no way of predicting which families will have sickness and be compelled to bear the costs of expensive medical care in any given year.

Even if these families could be forewarned, many would be unable to set aside enough out of their own meager current earnings to meet such expenses.

This is no reflection on the medical profession. The doctors in this country have recognized these conditions and have made great sacrifices to relieve the situation. We have a large section of our people who fail to earn enough to be able to meet the cost of modern medical care. We cannot throw this burden on the shoulders of the medical profession. It is a public problem and it must be met by some kind of a public program.

The social-insurance method of spreading costs is an especially good way of meeting costs that are as uneven and unforeseeable as those for medical care. Through this method, workers can, out of their earnings, pay in advance and pay at an average rate. The pooled funds are then available to pay doctors and hospitals and laboratories for all the services which may be needed by insured persons and their families when illness occurs. This is a simple and unquestioned method of meeting the problem.

By wiping out financial barriers to necessary medical care, a health-insurance system also aids in providing better distribution of doctors, hospitals, and medical facilities. In choosing the locations in which they will practice, doctors naturally favor more prosperous communities or areas which will assure them adequate incomes and access to modern facilities. The concentration of medical personnel and facilities in the wealthier and more urban sections of this country has left whole areas without adequate medical attention. This is reflected in higher than average sickness rates, neglected illnesses and impairments, and premature deaths among the poor, in rural areas, and in underprivileged groups. National health insurance, because it provides continuing assurance of adequate incomes for doctors and adequate payments to hospitals, provides an incentive to doctors to settle in rural and less prosperous areas and an incentive to communities to construct necessary hospitals and health centers.

A national system of medical and hospitalization insurance, such as we have proposed in our bill, does not affect—nor does it attempt to affect—the essential professional aspects of the practice of medicine. Every eligible individual is guaranteed the right to choose his own doctor from among all those in the community who participate. Doctors remain free to accept or reject patients. The treatment of the patient is entirely the doctor's responsibility. And doctors can receive payment for their services according to the method they prefer. Where groups of doctors prefer to work together to give more competent and more economical service, they can do so under an insurance system more easily than today. Small groups of doctors are setting up clinics all over the country and are anxious to practice that way.

This application of the principle of insurance to medical care cannot be questioned. Medical and hospitalization insurance would vastly improve the medical care received by the American people. People who now receive no care or who postpone timely care because of the cost would, under this arrangement, be entitled to care when they need it because they would have paid premiums in advance. Many others who now get inadequate care would have thrown open to them all the benefits of specialists' services and of modern laboratory techniques. Doctors also would have the satisfaction of practicing better medicine while earning, at the same time, more adequate and more assured incomes than most of them ever earned in peacetime.

The question facing us today is not whether we should have a national health program but what kind of program we shall have. It is significant to note that when we were holding health hearings in 1939 some professional associations testified that there were no major unmet needs; this year no one who has appeared before us has denied that we have important unmet needs and no one has denied the importance of increased medical care for the people of this country.

Some of the opponents of compulsory health insurance use as a first line of attack such labels as "socialist" and "communistic." This strikes me as insulting to our intelligence and to the very nature of our democracy. Such name-calling won't do any permanent harm, because the American people will look beyond such false labels and will see the weakness of any case which rests on such arguments. They are aware that every important piece of legislation ever adopted in this country, such as public education, and public post offices, income tax, old-age and survivors' insurance, and workmens' compensation laws was similarly misrepresented and abused before it was adopted.

Since the opponents of national health insurance have had to admit there are large unmet needs, and some way must be found to reduce the costs of medical care to a large section of our people, they have been compelled to offer a substitute program. It consists essentially of three parts, a little more Federal aid for public health services, voluntary health insurance for those who can get it and can afford it, and a little more charity medical care for the indigent and the poor. Let me examine that program with you briefly.

First. As to increased Federal aid for public health, there is little difference of opinion. But I contend it should be not just a little, but—as my bill would provide—as much as is needed to bring the fullest practical program to all parts of our country and to all our people.

Second. It is obvious that voluntary insurance, now or in the foreseeable future, can never adequately solve the health needs of the great bulk of our American families. Voluntary plans, after 30 years, still cover only a negligible portion of our population for medical costs other than hospitalization. Their membership is heavily concentrated in middle-income groups because low-income families, which need protection most, cannot afford the high premiums that are charged. There are no arrangements in many parts of the country and particularly in rural areas for voluntary systems to provide prepaid medical care or hospitalization. Further reliance on voluntary plans will almost surely accentuate rather than correct the unequal distribution of medical personnel and facilities; especially as between urban and rural areas. Voluntary plans which do provide medical care are almost always restricted to surgical or other limited varieties of services, and consequently fall short of meeting the full medical care needs of members.

This leads us to the question: What of the medical-care needs of persons unable to join—for financial and other reasons—voluntary plans? What of the unmet needs of members of voluntary plans? So far as the program of our opponents is concerned, these people can go without needed medical care—as many of them do at present—they can go into debt or ask for charity; or they can ask for a new kind of pauper's aid to be administered by the health departments. I am sure I need only point out that this means charity, public or private, for the great mass of American citizens. That must be recognized for what it is—a degrading program. Those who charge us with socializing medicine themselves now propose to meet the national need by pauperizing medicine.

I am convinced that the American people will never accept this substitute program designed to create a pauper class in the richest democracy in the world. And I am convinced that only a comprehensive national insurance system which covers everyone and to which every worker contributes according to his means, and which can thus provide well-planned comprehensive services at a minimum cost, will solve the Nation's health problems in a democratic way which adequately respects the dignity of our people.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

In talking about the role of social security in America's future, I have concentrated on the insurance aspects of the program because I believe that our American people prefer to earn their own rights to security. But no matter how adequate a social-insurance system may be, there will always be some families with special needs, and some workers because of physical defects or illness who cannot work and cannot qualify for insurance benefits. A comprehensive social-security program, consequently, must include provisions for public assistance which is granted on the basis of individual need.

One of the major requirements in strengthening existing public assistance provisions is to develop a unified assistance program which—in addition to present aid to the blind, the aged and to dependent children—would include provisions for Federal matching of funds for general relief. It is necessary, also, to revise the present equal matching provisions so as to give special Federal aid to States whose economic resources are small in relation to their assistance needs. With the assumption of additional Federal financial responsibility, it would be reasonable to require that States eliminate residence requirements and other unduly restrictive tests which now hinder the payment or assistance to needy persons.

SOCIAL-SECURITY FINANCING

There are some who say we cannot afford as comprehensive a social-security program as I have outlined. That is economic nonsense; and I say that we cannot afford to be without it. We have always met these costs, whether through individual sacrifice to pay large doctor bills or to support dependent relatives, through taxation to finance relief programs, or otherwise. The contributions levied under social security represent, in the main, a method of distributing the burden of these already existing costs among all members of society through relatively small regular payments, rather than permitting the unfortunate families for whom risks actually occur to bear the whole loss.

CONCLUSION

A social-security program which enables all gainfully employed persons to pay for basic security for themselves and their families, purchasing or accumulating privately such additional security as they want or can afford, is a democratic program.

Our democracy can thrive only when it adequately respects and preserves the dignity of the common people. Ours is and will be a democracy of the common people, or it will be hard put to survive. Only by strengthening and upholding the economic freedom, independence and self-respect of the individual and the family, can we strengthen and uphold democracy, against the world-wide challenge of communism and socialism.

I trust that I have made it clear to you tonight that the social-security goals I have described are well worth attaining. To my mind, they will constitute an essential bulwark to our system of capitalist democracy. Although the war has temporarily delayed the march toward these goals, it has also greatly strengthened our desire for real and lasting security. We should move ahead now, without further delay, to attain true social security—social security worthy of the name, worthy of our traditions, and worthy of our American people.

Increase in Veterans' Pensions Needed To Meet Living Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the urgent necessity for an increase in the amount of veterans' pensions in order to enable our handicapped veterans to cope with the mounting cost of living is strikingly illustrated in a statement prepared by J. H. Leib, national legislative director of the American Veterans or World War II.

Mr. Leib's statement follows:

The present low rate of disability compensations forces many handicapped veterans into virtual economic serfdom, with but little hope of alleviation so long as rising prices continue.

Aid from the Government through reasonable increase in veterans' disability compensation would be extremely helpful and would afford a possible escape from their present status as "has beens" in the American society.

As the postwar era sets new wage and price scales that reach to new standard of living heights, the handicapped veteran is forced to shoulder the burden of perpetual poverty, being excluded from the ranks of the middle class by the very nature of his role, as one who gave an arm or a leg so that his country could survive and exist in prosperity.

The Congress should take steps to aid the war handicapped—the forgotten men of this war. The Congress must recognize that the current trend toward higher wages and higher prices is causing hardships for those who have fixed incomes and particularly the disabled and aged veterans and their dependents.

Disabled veterans have been witnessing for months numerous adjustments made in salaries and wages to meet the present economic trend but little consideration has been given to them.

Pension or compensation rates are based on percentage of disability from $11.50 for 10 percent to $115 for 100 percent. Additional statutory allowances are made for loss of limbs which run up to $300. Public Law 312, Seventy-eighth Congress, passed on May 27, 1944, provided for a 15-percent increase on pensions.

The trend today is definitely upward and the Congress should provide a modest adjustment in pension rates to offset the rising tide of living expenses.

In this connection let us bear in mind also that veterans with a 20- or 50-percent disability find themselves unable to obtain employment simply because they come into conflict with the unemployment compensation laws in the various States. Employers are reluctant to hire veterans who are drawing even a slight amount of compensation because it automatically increases their insurance premiums.

The same is true in Government service. The Civil Service Commission has on many occasions actually penalized veterans because they are disabled.

The Government must not leave these men behind. Amvets respectfully asks that the Congress raise disability compensation in accordance with the rising scale of national prices and wages.

For the information of the Congress, Amvets has secured the following information which shows the increase in cost of living since 1944 when the last adjustment of 15 percent was made:

Consumers' price index for moderate-income families

Date	All items	Food	Clothing	Rent	Fuel, electricity, and ice	House furnishings	Miscellaneous
1944							
Jan. 15	124.2	136.1	134.7	108.1	109.5	128.3	118.4
Feb. 15	123.8	134.5	135.2	108.1	110.3	128.7	118.7
Mar. 15	123.8	134.1	136.7	108.1	109.9	129.0	119.1
Apr. 15	124.6	134.6	137.1	108.1	109.9	132.9	120.9
May 15	125.1	135.5	137.4	108.1	109.8	135.0	121.3
June 15	125.4	135.7	138.0	108.1	109.6	138.4	121.7
July 15	126.1	137.4	138.3	108.2	109.7	138.7	122.0
Aug. 15	126.4	137.7	139.4	108.2	109.8	139.3	122.3
Sept. 15	126.5	137.0	141.4	108.2	109.8	140.7	122.4
Oct. 15	126.5	136.4	141.9	------	109.8	141.4	122.8
Nov. 15	126.6	136.5	142.1	------	109.9	141.7	122.9
Dec. 15	127.0	137.4	142.8	108.3	109.4	143.0	123.1
1945							
Jan. 15	127.1	137.3	143.0	------	109.7	143.6	123.3
Feb. 15	126.9	136.5	143.3	------	110.0	144.0	123.4
Mar. 15	126.8	135.9	143.7	108.3	110.0	144.5	123.6
Apr. 15	127.1	136.6	144.1	------	109.8	144.9	123.8
May 15	128.1	138.8	144.6	------	110.0	145.4	123.9
June 15	129.0	141.1	145.4	108.3	110.0	145.8	124.0
July 15	129.4	141.7	145.9	------	111.2	145.6	124.3
Aug. 15	129.3	140.9	146.4	------	111.4	146.0	124.5
Sept. 15	128.9	139.4	148.2	108.3	110.7	146.8	124.6
Oct. 15	128.9	139.3	148.5	------	110.5	146.9	124.7
Nov. 15	129.3	140.1	148.7	------	110.1	147.6	124.6
Dec. 15	129.9	141.4	149.4	108.3	110.3	148.3	124.8
1946							
Jan. 15	129.9	141.0	149.7	------	110.8	148.8	125.4
Feb. 15	129.6	139.6	150.5	------	111.0	149.7	125.6
Mar. 15	130.2	140.1	153.1	108.4	110.5	150.2	125.9

The Hoover Dam Controversy Will Not Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTUS W. BENNET
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Los Angeles Times of May 10, 1946, commenting upon House Joint Resolution 346 introduced by me in the House of Representatives on May 6, 1946, as follows:

THE HOOVER DAM CONTROVERSY WILL NOT DIE

Representative BENNET of New York has introduced a bill in Congress to restore the name of Hoover Dam to the structure in Black Canyon which was miscalled Boulder Dam through the pettiness of former Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes. The bill should pass. The dam was officially named Hoover Dam by Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur as Secretary of the Interior, and the name was accepted by Congress. The action should not have been disturbed.

The Interior Department, under the headship of Secretary Krug, recently explained to a correspondent that it is not the policy of the Interior Department to name public works for persons. This may be the policy now, but if so it is of very recent origin. Coolidge Dam and Roosevelt Dam are examples of a contrary policy. And behind Hoover Dam is an example of a contrary policy by Mr. Ickes' administration—Lake Mead was certainly named for a person. Several of the TVA dams are named for persons.

The great public services of Herbert Hoover are now being recognized again, and President Truman has called upon him for a mission of great importance to the American people and the world. The administration could give no better evidence of putting aside unworthy grudges than to urge this legislation. Mr. Hoover, as chairman of the interstate gathering which drew the Colorado River Compact and thus made the dam possible, as well as President when it was started, is entitled to the recognition.

Problems of Retail Merchants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, as an aid in promoting the national defense and protecting the national economy, President Roosevelt, on October 9, 1941, issued Executive Order No. 8843, under which regulation W was adopted by the Board of Governors for the Federal Reserve System. Regulation W has been successful as an aid in combatting inflation and rendering more liquid assets of merchants and national banks, but business has been concerned as to what may take the place of regulation W when it is terminated. It wishes to retain its good features, but with a minimum of Government regulation. To this end the National Retail Credit Association has been suggesting the advisability of communities throughout the country adopting community credit policies. The legal aspects of a community credit policy, especially in relation to the antitrust laws, was discussed by the Washington counsel, Mr. R. Preston Shealey, of the National Retail Credit Association, at its annual convention, May 15, 1946, at Cleveland.

I ask unanimous consent that the address of Mr. Shealey be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is short and to the point. The address is as follows:

Regulation W of the Federal Reserve Board will terminate at the end of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on April 27, 1941. It has had some beneficial effects, so R. Preston Shealey, Washington counsel for the National Retail Credit Association, told the annual convention of that organization at Cleveland this morning, but business and much of the consuming public as well desire to retain the benefits with a minimum of Government regulation. A number of programs to standardize or control terms of consumer credit have been under discussion in various sections of the country for several years but most of these revolved around the adoption of a consumer credit policy in the various localities of the country at the end of regulation W. "The legal aspects of a consumer credit policy" was the subject of Attorney Shealey's address. He explained that abuse of terms, which it is the object of a consumer credit policy to prevent, may, in its ultimate effect, deal a serious blow to the national economy. However, said Mr. Shealey, no matter how innocent the intent or objective, if the final effect is to violate the Sherman

Antitrust, Federal Trade Commission, or Clayton Acts, such activities if in restraint of trade or detrimental to free competition would place a community credit policy within the ban of the law. If merchant members of the National Retail Credit Association and their credit managers determine that the adoption of a consumer credit policy would not lead to a conflict with the law as respects restraint of trade or free competition, then adoption of such a policy to correct abuses of credit mentioned would be in order.

Recent and proposed legislation dealing with the effects of the insurance and of the Associated Press Supreme Court decisions were likewise featured in the address.

To do justice to the subject assigned to the speaker today, The Legal Aspects of a Consumer Credit Policy, is a large order, especially in the time allotted, 15 minutes, but we will do our best to present at least the high lights. What is meant by the words, "consumer credit policy," and what do these words cover. In simple language it is a code of business ethics to govern the retail merchant in his sales to consumers. It has far-reaching implications because it not only includes the merchant, the wholesaler, the manufacturer, and the banker, but also, though not least, the consuming public. If such codes are universally adopted a nation of 130,000,000 people will be affected. The magnitude of the problem should not, however, daunt you because its objective, if successfully solved, will not only benefit the retail merchant but also the entire national economy.

Granting its widespread ramifications we next should consider why it is that such a policy has been, and is advocated by the National Retail Credit Association. This brings us to regulation W—the reason for its adoption and its value to the national economy. It was adopted as a war measure as an aid in combating inflation and to prevent the consumer from overbuying and thereby becoming bogged down with indebtedness. It has served its purpose along these lines and thereby rendered more liquid the assets of the retailer and of our financial institution. However, it is undeniably Government interposition in business and in this respect is distasteful to business, and in fact, to much of the public. To preserve the good features of regulation W with a minimum of Government regulation is most desirable according to surveys and questionnaires circulated by the NRCA and by other trade organizations, but this must be done within the law and that is the reason for the question—the legal aspects of a community credit policy.

To supply the answers to the questions involved it will not do to give undue weight to the opinions or views of the heads of executive departments or of independent Government agencies, because of the frequency of changes in rulings or decisions of not only such officers or agencies but also because of the shifting personnel of such executive heads or agencies. For this reason it is the purpose of the speaker to limit discussion to decisions of the courts bearing on the subject of a community credit policy. Even here we sometimes find a reversal of former decisions, as recently in *United States* v. *Southeastern Underwriters' Association*, a decision of the Supreme Court of June 5, 1944, in which that Court brought within the jurisdiction of the Sherman Antitrust Act the business of writing fire insurance. Prior to this decision it had been held in several leading Supreme Court cases, notably *Paul* v. *Virginia*, 8 Wallace 168, that insurance was not within the Sherman Act, this notwithstanding the fact that the business of members of the Southeastern Underwriters' Association, which membership covered six States, appeared to be largely local in character. This defense was, however, brushed aside by the Supreme Court in a majority opinion upon the ground that the insurance business is so interlocked, interrelated, interdependent, and integrated that interstate commerce is involved.

Therefore, the Court having held that insurance is interstate commerce, it followed that the various acts—the subject of the indictments upon which the decision was based—fixing of permanent rates and agents and commissions, employment of boycotts, cutting off companies not members of the association from the opportunity to reinsure their risk, disparaging the services and facilities of such nonmember, punishment by withdrawal of the right to represent members of the association, and threatening persons needing insurance and who wished to patronize nonassociation companies with boycotts and with withdrawal of patronage, were illegal. By these means the Court held that the free play of competitive forces within trade or commerce among several States was restrained and, therefore, the activities of the Southeastern Underwriters' Association and its members were in conflict with the Sherman Antitrust Act. Prior to this insurance case the same Court, on December 11, 1942, brought the American Medical Association and member physicians within the purview of the Sherman Antitrust Act upon the ground that the association and member physicians had conspired to restrain trade by their organized opposition to a group-health plan. See *American Medical Association* v. *United States*, 317 U. S. 547. On June 18, 1945, in *Associated Press* v. *United States*, the same Court brought within the Sherman Act the Associated Press and its members, saying that member publishers of the Associated Press are engaged in business for profit exactly as are other businessmen who sell food, steel, aluminum, or anything else people need or want.

From these three decisions we learn that the transmission of credit reports upon a concerted basis, as tabooed by the antitrust consent decree of 1933, is within the Sherman Act and disposes of the assertion that because credit reports are a personal service they do not come under the Sherman Act. Perhaps more important still is the fact that these decisions represent what might be termed a change from the former conservative attitude of the Court to that of liberalism. Court decisions change with the times. At one period in our history, since enactment of the Sherman Act, the Supreme Court wrote into its decisions what was termed "the rule of reason," then more recently "unreasonable restraint of trade," and now including within the term "business" such personal services as medical services, insurance, and publication of news. Having disposed of the economic phase of a community credit policy, as well as calling attention to changing trends affecting the Sherman Act in Supreme Court decisions, let us now consider sections not only of this act but of the later Federal Trade Commission and Clayton Acts most directly bearing on the conduct of business.

In general terms section 1 of the Sherman Act prohibits combinations in restraint of trade and provides a fine of not exceeding $5,000 or imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both, for such violations. The initial sentence of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act states "unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive practices in commerce are hereby declared unlawful," while section 3 of the Clayton Act makes it unlawful for persons engaged in commerce to make a sale or lease of goods whether patented or unpatented, for use, consumption, or resale, or fix a price charged therefor on the condition or agreement that the purchaser or lessee shall not use or deal in the goods of competitors of the seller or lessor, where the effect of such sale, lease, or condition, or agreement may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of business.

While express words do not so declare, the Sherman, Federal Trade Commission, and Clayton Acts are, as to jurisdiction and for practical purposes, concurrent. The Department of Justice more recently has been enforcing the Sherman Act by way of criminal indictments, while the Federal Trade Commission proceeds by way of cease-and-desist orders; the former somewhat in the nature of a surgical operation, while the treatment of the latter has been aptly termed by Mr. Justice Black of the Supreme Court "prophylactic." Even though the Department of Justice sometimes wields a legal surgeon's knife, business should cooperate as far as possible with it, and the same holds true in regard to the Federal Trade Commission. However, it is to the decisions of the Court to which we must look as guides or charts, and this is particularly true of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States because they are binding upon all Federal courts. We note in this connection that prosecutions or proceedings under the Sherman Act by the Department of Justice are usually brought in the district court, but as to decisions of the Federal Trade Commission, they are directly appealable to the United States circuit courts of appeals. A review of the decisions of the Supreme Court does not disclose a decision directly bearing upon the validity of what is involved in a community credit policy, this naturally following from the newness of the subject, but we do have decisions of that Court which we may consider as more or less applicable.

A review of all the decisions of the Supreme Court since July 2, 1890, date of enactment of the Sherman Act, having some bearing upon our problem, would require far more time than is allotted this morning. June 22, 1914, in *Eastern States Retail Lumber Dealers Assoc.* v. *United States* (234 U. S. 600), a decision concerning the activities of a trade association, that Court in substance held that if such activities were in the nature of a boycott or resulted in prices being fixed, both in restraint of trade, they were illegal. The same Court, in *United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.* (310 U. S. 150), a decision of May 6, 1940, held that certain industry activities—in this case purchasing distressed oil intended to be thrown upon a depressed market—was likewise within the ban of the act. In other words, while certain acts of such trade associations or industry groups intended for their primary object the elimination of trade abuses, but with the economic effect of more or less uniformity in prices, they were within the inhibition of the act.

However, in considering cases which originated within the Federal Trade Commission, the application of the Lumber Dealers Association case, as well as the Socony-Vacuum case, designed to correct trade abuses, but which in effect might or could result in boycotts or price fixing, it was held that wherever an unlawful combination exists, no matter how pressing may be the evils which it is designed to correct and, indeed, it may, in fact, correct, it violates statutory law, in this case the Clayton Act. See *Wholesale Dry Goods Institute* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (139 Fed. (2d) 230). The Supreme Court of the United States, Feb. 7, 1944, denied a writ of certiorari to the Institute and, therefore, we must conclude that, notwithstanding language used in the earlier Sugar Institute, Maple Flooring, Cement Manufacturers and Appalachian Coal cases, if association activities are designed to correct abuses but result in boycotts or in price fixing, they are under the ban of the law. Other cease-and-desist orders of the Federal Trade Commission having some bearing on our problem, and which finally reached the Supreme Court of the United States, are *Fashion Originators Guild* v. *United States*, a decision of March 3, 1941, reported in 312 U. S. 455, and *Millinery Creators Guild* v. *Federal*

Trade Commission (312 U. S. 469), a decision of the same day. These decisions turned primarily upon a boycott but price fixing in some degree entered into the picture. The defendants in the first-named case had argued that "the practices of FOGA were reasonable and necessary to protect the manufacturer, laborer, retailer, and consumer against the devastating evils growing from the pirating of original designs and that in effect benefited all four." This language could be applied with equal force and more to a community credit policy. Abuse of terms, which it is the object of a consumer credit policy to prevent, may in its ultimate effect deal a serious blow to the entire national economy. It is the objective of a consumer credit policy, and no other, to prevent such disastrous consequences, but intent or objective, no matter how innocent, if the final effect is to violate the provisions of any of the three acts to which we have referred, substantially acts in restraint of trade, or detrimental to free competition, then a community credit policy runs afoul of the law.

It seems to the speaker that whether or not the adoption of a consumer credit policy would lead to a conflict with the law is for the merchants themselves and their counsel, assisted by the ripe and practical experience of their credit executives, to determine. If the answer is that an adoption of a community credit policy would not have the results in the cases mentioned, more particularly in the Wholesale Dry Goods Institute and Fashion Guild cases, then the adoption of a much-desired community credit policy would be in order.

If, on the other hand, another aspect of this general subject is to be considered, we may turn back to results which have flowed from the decisions of the Supreme Court in the insurance and Associated Press cases. The act of Congress of March 9, 1945, Public Law No. 16, Seventy-ninth Congress, provides through the medium of section 2 (a) that the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, and the act of September 26, 1914, as amended, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, shall be applicable to the business of insurance to the extent that such business is not regulated by State law. Up until January 1, 1948, the net effect of the act of March 9, 1945, is to postpone the effective force of the Supreme Court decisions referred to in the matter of the business of insurance, or acts in the conduct thereof, until January 1, 1948. Furthermore, the act provides that nothing in it shall render the Sherman Act "inapplicable to any agreement to boycott, coerce or intimidate, or act of boycott, coercion or intimidation." A somewhat similar legislative situation seems to be in the making in the matter of the Associated Press decision. Representative NOAH MASON, of Illinois, a member of the House Judiciary Committee in the present Congress, has introduced a bill to exempt the Associated Press from the inhibitions of the Supreme Court decision. No hearings have as yet been held upon this bill but it is expected that they will be. This legislation and these hearings should be watched by retail credit grantors for possible reactions in the solution of a community credit policy if it concluded that the adoption of such a policy might bring members in conflict with the law.

It will be noted that the speaker has not heretofore devoted much attention to the anti-trust consent decree. Codes of consumer credit policies include open credit, as well as installment credit, and many of the proposed codes will no doubt contain provisions which must be considered in connection with this consent decree. The speaker addressed the Spokane Convention of 1937 on the subject of the Anti-trust Consent Decree and recommended a movement for modification of the same. This address was published in the Credit World of July 1937 for which reason detailed reference is not included in this talk. The speaker was not of counsel in the modification proceeding but, nevertheless, feels that a modification attempt, or even a court proceeding for vacation of the decree, is in order at this time and should have reasonable prospects for success. A word of caution, however, unless and until the decree is vacated or modified retail grantors should obey it in every respect.

Is the Coal Strike Justified?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in refusing to work without a contract, the United Mine Workers are but exercising a legal right. To contend as a broad, over-all proposition that men shall not be permitted to strike, that is, to quit work individually or collectively, is, in the words of many a labor leader—to cite but three, Philip Murray, William Green, and John L. Lewis—a sentence to involuntary servitude.

As an abstract proposition, no man should be compelled to work against his will. A corollary of that is that no man, by his work or out of his property, should be required to support another in idleness.

Experience has demonstrated that the individual enjoys the greatest and most profitable degree of liberty and freedom of action when the rights of all individuals are circumscribed by regulations, and only those regulations made necessary for the preservation of the health and welfare of the community in which he lives.

Any other concept of liberty or freedom of action enables the strong to profit at the expense of the weak; in the end establish tyranny, a total loss of individual freedom.

Thus it comes about, and in the end the force of circumstances forces us all to agree, that while no man should be forced to work against his will, when the health, the safety or the welfare of the community, the town or the Nation is at stake, individuals must willingly or unwillingly give up a degree of their absolute freedom.

While no man should be compelled to accept or continue in employment, living in communities as we do, we should all realize that each individual is, to a degree, dependent upon others.

From the day when man ceased to roam the countryside alone or with only the members of his family, individuals in tribe or nation have been forced, as a matter of course, to give up some of their desires, some of their freedom of action. Each must, if he would live with others, render some degree of service to his fellow men.

If it be conceded that the coal miners have the right to strike, that they cannot be forced to work, it follows that other individuals have equal rights and, having equal rights, the farmer cannot be forced to grow the food; the transportation worker be forced to move it from the farm to the city; the retailer be forced to sell to the miner.

If the miner, exercising his right to refuse to dig coal, was met by his fellowman with a refusal to produce, transport and sell food, clothing or shelter, he would shortly discover that he, as a member of society, had no right to arbitrarily refuse to make, by his work, his fair share of the contribution to the common good.

The purpose, and the only legitimate purpose, of government is to give to the individual citizen the greatest possible degree of freedom consistent with the welfare of the community, the Nation as a whole.

From the earliest day recorded by history individuals have been conscripted or drafted to fight, and some of them to die, for the safety, the security, the preservation of the governments under which they lived.

In this, the most liberal of all governments, where individuals have exercised the greatest possible degree of freedom of all kinds, it is an established doctrine that, when national need calls, men must yield their freedom of action, join in defense of the Nation.

When conscripted they leave their homes, their families, their loved ones; they go where they are told to go; they work; they fight, and sometimes they die where they are ordered to serve.

That being an established policy of our national life, it seems absurd to argue that, when the health, the welfare, or the security of the Nation calls, the individual may refuse to serve on the plea that the service so rendered is involuntary servitude.

Hunger, the need for protection against the weather, unless we are thieves, the objects of charity, or someone has given us the means of existence, forces us all to work, to serve others in some capacity.

The only room for argument as to the right of the individual or of an organization to refuse to work or to strike would seem to be in that borderland of employment where the national security is not involved.

If the issue is one solely between the employer and the employee, does not involve the national welfare or a violation of the criminal laws of the land, the disputants should be left to settle their controversy by the means at their disposal, under laws which guarantee fair play, equal justice to both employee and employer.

John L. Lewis and his United Mine Workers are not violating any law of the land nor are they following any course, using any methods, which have not for the last 10 years been repeatedly adopted and used by other labor leaders, other labor organizations.

The coal strike differs in no way from thousands of other strikes, from the recent strikes in the steel industry, in the motor industry; the strikes against General Electric, Westinghouse and hundreds of other employers, except in the degree to which it affects the public.

Because United Mine Workers have control of an industry the successful

operation of which is essential if our whole economic system is to function, the United Mine Workers and John L. Lewis find themselves in a position to impress upon all of us the power of a union, given it by the National Labor Relations Act and other laws designed to protect employees.

Lewis and his mine workers are but doing to all of us what Phil Murray and his CIO did to the steel industry and those dependent upon it for their livelihood.

They are only doing what Walter Reuther and his UAW-CIO did to the motor industry and those who sold repairs and used motor vehicles.

The coal strike has brought home to hundreds of thousands of union members the cold, hard fact that they can be thrown out of jobs, their means of livelihood taken from them, by a strike of another union.

The coal strike has brought home to all of us that we are all dependent upon others for the things that we eat, wear, and the homes in which we live, the pleasures and comforts which we enjoy.

When a strike in a public utility or in any industry affects the health, the welfare, the safety, the security, of the people as a whole, the Congress should, and it must, furnish a satisfactory answer.

The coal strike cannot be justified, nor can any strike in any public utility.

The remedy is clear. If workers in public utilities or in an industry, the stoppage of which would injuriously affect the public health or safety, those who desire to strike should give adequate notice, and when they strike they should forfeit their rights as such employees under the National Labor Relations Act. The employer should be required to hire others who are willing to work. The life of our Nation must go on.

Three times the House has passed and sent to the Senate legislation designed to lessen labor disputes and prevent strikes, but the Senate has refused, and still refuses, to act.

The over-all remedy is the rewriting of the National Labor Relations Act so that its provisions will give "equal justice under law" to employees, employers, and the public. Such an effort was made by me in 1939, renewed again early in 1946, but the Congress has lacked either the courage or the inclination to tackle the job, solve the real issue, which is whether under law all shall have opportunity to secure justice.

The law as originally written was designed to freeze out independent unions. When the CIO seceded from the A. F. of L. the law was used by that organization and its political friends to hamstring the A. F. of L. Later it was discovered that it was a fertile soil for jurisdictional and secondary strikes, for boycotts, for injurious, repressive, monopolistic practices carried on sometimes by one union against another.

If the present strikes continue long enough, affect enough people, perhaps they will awaken to the danger, force Congress to act.

The Surplus Property Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Thursday, May 16, issue of the New York Sun carries a comprehensive exposé of the whole surplus property scandal. I have on many occasions previously pointed out elements of this scandal, particularly with regard to:

First. The violation by War Assets Administration of the will and intent of Congress by WAA's failure to respect veterans' and schools' priorities.

Second. The disgraceful abuses in the manufacturer agent system for surplus property disposal.

I have emphasized the particular significance of War Assets Administration's failure to get vital electronics and communications surplus into our colleges and universities, which desperately need such surplus in order to train scientists for the national defense.

Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the afore-mentioned exposé in the New York Sun, written by the able columnist, Phelps Adams, be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS INVESTIGATES SCANDAL IN SALE OF ONE HUNDRED BILLION WAR GOODS—FIVE COMMITTEES SEEK TO LEARN WHO IS GETTING GRAVY THAT SHOULD BE RECEIVED BY TREASURY

(By Phelps Adams)

WASHINGTON, May 16.—Five separate congressional investigating committees were rooting today into what many of their members believe will prove the most malodorous and shocking scandal in modern American history: A scandal involving the ultimate disposition of $100,000,000,000 worth of the Government's surplus property by the War Assets Administration.

Among other things they want to know why the WAA paid one of its agents more than $15,000 in expenses when he sold only $120 worth of surplus property. They want to know why one official of the WAA sold $10,000 radio sets at $45 each after another duly authorized official had arranged the sale of this same equipment at $150 a set.

They want to know why the WAA arranged to sell 30,000,000 feet of wire to a private interest after the United States Army—exercising its top priority on all such property—had demanded that this wire be frozen for Army use in connection with the Mississippi flood-control project.

Chiefly, however, they want to know who is getting the gravy since it is obvious that the Treasury and the taxpayers are not.

SEEK OTHER FACTS

They also want to know who is getting the material—and for a song. Why is it, they ask, that—in defiance of the priorities provisions of the law—American schools, colleges, laboratories, and veterans, in desperate need of electronic and communications equipment for research, experimental, and educational purposes, cannot acquire it; while the once-top-secret radar devices, without which no nation could hope to start another world war successfully, are being placed at the disposal of foreign governments with the open encouragement of the American State Department aided and abetted by Henry Wallace's Department of Commerce.

In short, they want to know why the Government's surplus property disposal program has operated so inefficiently, and has been so shot through with irregularities that Senator BYRD has openly called it a national scandal and Senator STEWART has pronounced it a "situation with possibilities of stinking worse than Teapot Dome."

Investigation by the New York Sun today produced startling evidence both of waste of these huge national assets and of almost wanton disregard for the letter and the spirit of the law, particularly in the vital field of electronic and communications equipment.

WAA HAS CHARGE

The law requires that after property has been declared surplus and turned over to the WAA for disposal, various groups shall have a priority claim to such items as may be needful to them. Government agencies hold the top priority, veterans come next, States, cities, and counties come further down the list, and schools, colleges, experimental laboratories, etc., likewise enjoy priority rights.

Institutions which are tax-supported or tax-exempt are entitled moreover to buy this material at a discount of 40 percent on the fair price. The fair price in most cases is the going price at the lowest commercial level—the manufacturers' price to jobbers, for example.

These priorities are of grave national importance primarily in connection with the disposal of electronic and communications equipment. Electronic devices are the heart and nerve center of the entire security program and, with the possible exception of atomic energy, are the most important single field of national defense development. Rocket bombs, airplanes, antiaircraft batteries and searchlights, submarines and antisubmarine devices are all electronically controlled. Even more important is the fact that the huge industrial machines which turn out both war materials and civilian supplies—with precision parts worked with microscopic accuracy—are often electronically controlled.

BIG DEMAND FOR ELECTRONICS

Quite naturally, therefore, schools and colleges throughout America are swamped with student demands for courses in electronics. Karl T. Compton, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has described it as the current glamor subject in schools particularly among GI students.

America's future progress in this field depends in large measure upon the knowledge gained by such students in the operation, maintenance, repair and improvement of these electronic devices. To give this instruction, schools and colleges must have all kinds and varieties of this equipment in their laboratories. Commercial laboratories, constantly striving for the improvement of these products must likewise be able to buy the machines. Veterans, already familiar with these devices by reason of their war training, seek the equipment necessary to set up in business in this field.

That is why Congress wrote into the law provisions giving these groups a priority right to purchase these supplies from the huge war surplus which the Government has on its hands. But the priorities are worthless. Veterans have no trouble getting certificates entitling them to buy radar and radio sets, but they seldom if ever can find the equipment and complete the purchase of it. Schools and colleges that already had

this equipment as a part of their war training programs have been forced to surrender it and cannot buy replacements at the discount and under the priority provided by Congress. Some of the property thus taken from American schools has gone to foreign nations.

The basic reason for this lies in the system set up under the War Assets Administration for disposing of surplus property, and in the inefficiency which prevails generally within that agency.

WAA ALLOWS COMMISSION

Faced with the almost superhuman task of selling billions of dollars' worth of surplus goods, the WAA decided that the best way to handle it was to put it in the hands of manufacturer-agents who could repair or assemble it, where necessary, and merchandise it on a 10-percent commission basis, plus expenses. Allowable expenses are transportation, cartage, accounting, testing, inspection, warehousing, and overhead, including entertainment.

The big catch in all this is that these manufacturer-agents get no commission whatever on priority sales, and it is therefore to their advantage to find purchasers wherever possible outside the priority group. There are other catches, too:

Indicative of the unbusinesslike practice of WAA is the fact that this agency keeps no inventory of this property but depends on its manufacturer-agents to keep accurate and detailed records. While 200 such agents were officially designated, only 42 of them have ever submitted reports as to the equipment they received, and none apparently makes any report as to whom the property is sold.

Thus when the Sun endeavored to learn today how much electronic equipment had been sold to Russia, France, and China, official spokesmen for the WAA replied that they had no records whatever on that, and would have to poll each of their manufacturer-agents to find out. They thought that a little had been sold to China, very little to France, and practically none to Russia. China, they believed, had received about a million dollars' worth.

SOME CONTRACTS CANCELED

Of the original contracts with manufacturer-agents, 102 have been canceled, and insofar as electronic equipment is concerned, virtually all the large inventories of Government surplus are now in the hands of 10 companies.

One of these companies—encouraged by the State Department—was negotiating a contract under which Russian agents would be permitted inside its factories to watch the manufacturing process from start to finish and gain the complete technical knowledge necessary to duplicate the process. No reciprocal provisions under which American observers could enter Russian factories were provided.

It should be emphasized that none of the electronic equipment involved is now classified as secret but experts declare that this equipment together with the spare parts that accompany it, plus the technical information provided with it, would enable scientists to duplicate some of the vital defense devices which are still classified as top secret and upon which the future safety of America depends at this moment.

Yet, foreign nations are free to buy this material from the 10 companies who now virtually control its sale. The American veterans and educators—with their priorities and discounts—however, are not, save in rare instances.

Here is the record as it stood recently:

More than 6,500 certificates entitling veterans to purchase this material have been issued, and only 200 veterans have yet been able to get any part of the equipment that they seek.

FEW APPLICATIONS FILED

There are more than 100,000 schools and 1,700 colleges and universities in the country which might be interested in purchasing these supplies. Several thousand applications have been received from these schools and colleges and less than a dozen have been filled.

It would be easy, of course, to lay the blame for all this exclusively upon the greed of the manufacturer-agents and upon their desire to make a profit and expenses on the materials they are merchandising for the Government's account. It would not, however, be correct. Much of the blame must be aimed at higher authority within the WAA itself.

Here are some significant facts about a few of WAA's operations which interpret themselves:

A manufacturer-agent of the WAA sold $120 worth of quartz crystals, received the correct commission of $12 on the sale, plus expenses which now amount to $15,761. Further sales of this product have been barred by regulations designed to create stock piles of strategic materials. The agent has therefore asked to be relieved of his contract, but until the Treasury can make arrangements to take over this supply and keep it, the Government must pay the agent's warehousing charges and expenses.

Then there is the matter of 10,000 handy two-way radio sets. These short-wave transmitting and receiving sets were built for lend-lease account to be used on British and Russian tanks. They cost the Federal Government $1,140 apiece. An official in charge of sales for the eastern division of WAA had arranged for their sale to a New York department store at $150 each. The department store had received a sample and was clearing floor space in its store for them, when another WAA official—not in the sales department—turned the sets over to a manufacturer-agent who in turn sold them to a competing New York department store where they were sold to the public at $78.50 each.

UNITED STATES LOST $1,050,000

The Federal Government, instead of receiving $150 apiece for these 10,000 units, actually got $45 apiece for them. The taxpayers lost a total of $1,050,000 on the deal.

One other transaction that should not be overlooked involved the sale of 35,000,000 feet of wire, suitable for use in electronics or communications. This was turned over to the Electronics and Communications Branch of the WAA for disposal. The Army promptly claimed it under the top priority which it holds, and an authorized official thereupon "froze" the entire supply and in accordance with Army instructions, ordered nearly 7,000,000 feet of it to be delivered forthwith.

Thereupon the entire transaction was taken out of the hands of Electronics and Communications Branch of WAA and turned over to the Industrial Branch, where the sale of 30,000,000 feet of this wire to private interests was arranged. This of course did not leave even the original 7,000,000 feet available to the Army.

At this moment an energetic tug of war is still going on inside the organization over this wire; and the outcome is uncertain.

In all, the WAA has disposed of $176,000,000 worth of electronics and communications equipment, from which the cash receipts have been $15,000,000, of which $5,000,000 went to manufacturers' agents for commissions and expenses, leaving a net to the Treasury of only $10,000,000—or less than 6 percent of its original outlay.

Even from this small return must be taken ultimately the total cost of administering and operating the far-flung agencies of the WAA itself. It is doubtful whether, in the end, enough will have been realized in this field to effect a reduction of as much as a thin dime in the total income tax of each individual taxpayer.

SCHOOLS GET NOTHING

In view of the fact that virtually no return is to be expected from the sale of this material, it is interesting to note here that section 13 of the surplus-property law provides that when it is found that surplus equipment has no commercial value, it can be given to educational and public-health institutions free of charge.

It is also interesting to note that no such gifts have been made by the WAA. In this connection there is the case of from 100 to 150 mobile radar units which the WAA now has on its hands.

These cost the Government $100,000 each, and are now priced at $18,000 with no takers—in America at least. Colleges would find them invaluable in connection with electronics courses, but cannot afford such expensive laboratory equipment. Instead of giving them to schools, as it is authorized to do, however, WAA now plans to junk them for their scrap value—estimated at less than $1,000 each.

Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, rising up in his wrath, has formally demanded that the WAA turn these over to American colleges at their scrap value.

TREATED AS INTERLOPER

These select and classic examples of how the WAA operates help to explain why veterans and educators, seeking equipment for experimental and development purposes, are treated as interlopers, and are shunned and despised by WAA officials generally.

In deference to the requirements of the law, it is true, the WAA last fall set up an agency, in its electronics and communications branch which is supposed to aid priority buyers. This agency is authorized to set aside equipment for priority claimants but such is the condition of WAA records generally, that the priority agency is literally unable to find out where the equipment it wants is located.

Hampered from the outset by lack of facilities and personnel, this agency, which has only half a dozen persons to deal with the thousands of applications and communications it receives each week, has turned out to be just another bottleneck through which priority purchasers must somehow squeeze. Its inadequacy typifies perhaps better than anything else in the whole picture the attitude of WAA top officials toward these purchasers.

As matters stand today, therefore, the situation can be fairly summarized as follows:

The taxpayers are saddled with a national debt of $275,000,000,000—largely as the result of war expenditures. The Government has, in the form of surplus property, materials which cost it about $100,000,000,000, and which might go far to offset a part of that debt.

From experience to date it is clear that the amount realized on the sale of this property, after all expenses are paid, will be negligible at best and the taxpayers therefore will get no relief.

It is also apparent, under present management, this equipment will not be used to further national security, public education, or new private enterprises established by veterans.

That is why Members of Congress, like Senator WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, are demanding that all sales of such equipment be halted until all applications from priority claimants can be screened, processed, and filled before the balance is sold commercially.

It is why other Senators like WHERRY and EASTLAND are seeking to prevent the sale of electronic equipment to foreign nations. It is why Senator BYRD has ordered his joint

congressional committee to investigate the entire governmental set-up; and it is why the House of Representatives has voted to establish a special investigating committee of its own.

Throughout both branches of the Congress there is universal surprise that President Truman, who as a Senator established an outstanding reputation as head of the famous Truman Investigating Committee during the war, has uncomplainingly tolerated this pungent situation within his own administration.

Should Price Control Be Continued?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a short debate between Merryle Stanley Rukeyser, lecturer, writer, and nationally syndicated columnist, and Mr. Samuel W. Levitties, former Director of Consumer Goods Division, OPA, on the subject Should Price Control Be Continued?

I am in receipt of a statement from the Government Printing Office which indicates that the manuscript submitted by me will exceed by six-tenths of a page the two pages allowed under the rule without a statement of cost, and that the estimated cost is $156.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. EAMES. In these days of readjustment to a peacetime world there have been few subjects as controversial as price control. The fight both for and against has been bitter, and we think we are fortunate, indeed, to be able to present two distinguished authorities who can throw a good deal of much-needed light on a complicated topic. Let's start it this way. Mr. Rukeyser, you have recently written a series of articles criticizing the continuation of OPA. Would you briefly summarize your criticism?

Mr. RUKEYSER. I object to the ideologies and practices of the official price fixers, first on the ground of word usage. For example, the regimenters overlook the importance of the first word in the title of the act, namely, Emergency Price Control Act of 1942. Second, on cultural grounds. In his inflammatory, unaudited, unilateral radio broadcasts and other public expressions, Mr. Bowles miseducates the American public. He soft pedals the basic causes of inflation. Third, at a time of reconversion, when customer demand for many items is excessive in relation to the available supply, bone-head economic planners further excite demand by arbitrarily insisting on bargain prices and to contract supply, on the other hand, by failing to offer an incentive price. Fourth, through cuckoo policies the administrators tend to decide what should be produced and what should not be produced. Thus, they limit the freedom of choice of the customer. Fifth, confused men, misbranding their meddlesome activities as economic stabilization, are adding to the inflationay fires. The Government intervenes and, in some items, pays part of the cost through subsidies. This means financing part of the exchanges through Federal budgetary deficits, which further expand the already excessively swollen money supply. Similarly, the new February policy of the bulge is inflationary, because it arbitrarily holds down tax receipts from corporations.

Mr. EAMES. Now, Mr. Levitties, how would you like to reply to Mr. Rukeyser?

Mr. LEVITTIES. I'd like to get one thing straight, Mr. Rukeyser, and either agree with you or disagree. The gist of your statement seems to indicate to me that OPA is a meddlesome Government bureaucracy and is interfering with the normal laws of supply and demand. I'd like to state first of all that OPA's object has been precisely to keep the law of supply and demand from operating at the present time. Otherwise, we would have a dizzy rise in prices. This is exactly what we want to avert. How fast and how far would prices have to go before normal competition could adjust them naturally, Mr. Rukeyser?

Mr. RUKEYSER. I'm very glad to find Mr. Levitties in agreement with me. I guess we're fortunate tonight to have as a spokesman for the OPA a man who's been in business and who's had business experience. I understand Mr. Levitties has been in the dress-manufacturing business since he was a young man out of college, way back in the days of the old Lorrette Dress Co. On the question of the law of supply and demand, my criticism of the OPA is that by failing to understand the problem, which is scarcity, they have needlessly stimulated the demand for goods by making prices artificially low in relation (a) to costs, and (b) in relation to consumer or worker incomes, and that they've also interfered on the supply side by not offering an incentive price, which in all cases recoups the cost.

Mr. EAMES. Mr. Levitties.

Mr. LEVITTIES. I disagree entirely with you, Mr. Rukeyser. The OPA has not used incentive pricing in certain areas where incentive pricing does bring about added production in certain commodities where the cost and selling price of the commodity are out of line. The fact of the matter is that production is continuing high and the further fact of the matter is that industry is earning unusual profits today, as well as during the past several years. In the light of the statements where production is high and industry is earning unusually high profits, how can you possibly say that OPA, through not using incentive pricing, is interfering with production in bringing goods to the American people?

Mr. RUKEYSER. In supporting my position, I'd like to quote two witnesses: One, Paul Porter, and, two, John W. Snyder. Paul Porter, in reacting to the attempts of the House of Representatives to bring order out of chaos by amending the Price Control Act, particularly objected to one amendment, the Wolcott amendment, which provided for what the Congressmen called cost plus a reasonable profit. Paul Porter——

Mr. LEVITTIES. On each commodity?

Mr. RUKEYSER. On each commodity.

Mr. LEVITTIES. Item by item.

Mr. RUKEYSER. Paul Porter, in objecting to that, made the most shocking criticism of the OPA that has yet been made by any public man. He said that in order to enforce this provision it would take a staff of cost accountants and price administrators way beyond the possibilities of the OPA, which was an indication or an admission or a subconscious confession that up to now they've been doing it by ear, without a staff of cost accountants.

Mr. LEVITTIES. I'd like to straighten that one point out.

Mr. RUKEYSER. I want to get to the second point before I get through.

Mr. LEVITTIES. I beg your pardon.

Mr. EAMES. Just a moment. Mr. Rukeyser, perhaps it would be more convenient to the audience if Mr. Levitties answered that point at this time.

Mr. LEVITTIES. I'd like to nail that one down. Mr. Porter rightly and properly stated that the Wolcott amendment, requiring a profit on each and every commodity, would present a problem that OPA accounting staffs could not possibly cope with. That is quite true. As a matter of fact, our Accounting Division tells us that 85 percent of the industries, manufacturing industries, do not have cost-accounting systems which would enable the Office of Price Administration to arrive at a price based on cost plus reasonable profit item by item. But OPA does enter into cost on an all-over basis, on a broad basis, industry by industry, or individual by individual, in order to bring about a reasonable normal operating profit for the industry affected, without giving a reflection of all costs and a profit on each item.

Mr. RUKEYSER. Well, those are a lot of words, but they don't seem to come to grips with my point, which is that Mr. Porter's statement, if it means anything, means that OPA up to now has been administering some 8,000,000 prices by ear, without what he calls an adequate staff of cost accountants.

Mr. LEVITTIES. No; let me try to clarify that for you, Mr. Rukeyser. The fact of the matter is that OPA has administered these innumerable commodities and has set prices on them on the basis of what the price was in some base period. Movements upward only come about as a result of an analysis of financial status of an industry or an individual when the industry or the individual finds itself in a loss position or with profits less than base-period earnings.

Mr. RUKEYSER. Base-period earnings and historic profits have nothing to do with the present problem, which is how to bring out supply at the time when shortages exist.

Mr. LEVITTIES. Well, aren't——

Mr. RUKEYSER. The way to bring out supplies is to find out first what has happened to the cost of production since the historic periods. The inflation in the cost of production has already taken place. It has taken place because of Government policy in respect to seeking the votes from pressure groups in regard to wage policy on the one hand, and, secondly, from the fiscal and monetary policies of the Government on the other, in raising the money count from about $55,000,000,000 in 1929 to upward of $175,000,000,000 now.

Mr. LEVITTIES. I'm perfectly willing to agree with you that what this country needs is added production, but I'm sure that you know, as well as I do, that the Federal Reserve Board Bulletin indicates that our current production is at an all peacetime high, running somewheres around 70 percent above the average rate for 1935-39, and it's continually improving. The basic idea is to get increased production, but without price inflation. Otherwise, production would soon drop, just as it dropped after the inflation of the last war ran its course.

Mr. RUKEYSER. Marie Antoinette said of the people of France, "Let 'em eat cake." The bureaucrats from Washington now say, "Let 'em eat statistics." The index of production of the Federal Reserve Board, in the first place, is not a reliable statistical indicator. But even waiving that point, it shows a very substantial falling off in physical production since the high point of 1944 and 1945, despite the claim by Mr. Snyder that employment is now almost up to the wartime peak. What's happened? How do you reconcile those figures?

Mr. LEVITTIES. Well, do you disagree that employment currently is running at the highest rate in the history of the country?

Mr. RUKEYSER. What do you call employment? Are you speaking of man hours?

Mr. LEVITTIES. People working for wages.

Mr. RUKEYSER. No. I call employment man hours. You can't compare a 60-hour week with a 30-hour week and get anything that makes sense.

Mr. LEVITTIES. Well——

Mr. RUKEYSER. To the cost sheet.

Mr. LEVITTIES. According to the Department of Labor's figure in 1940 the total civilian labor force was 54,200,000, of which 46,900,000 were employed, leaving an unemployed force of 7,300,000. Currently, as of January 1946, the total number of employees was 51,400,000, with an unemployed force of 2,300,000. Now, these people are employed and are receiving wages. Don't you think that they are producing? What are they doing? Industry is certainly not paying them wages——

Mr. RUKEYSER. Mr. Snyder says——

Mr. LEVITTIES. Unless they produce.

Mr. RUKEYSER. Mr. Snyder, your chief, said that despite the fact the Federal Reserve index shows a very substantial decline from the wartime peak, we have almost as many people employed as at the wartime peak. What's happened? How do you explain that disparity? How do you reconcile the figures?

Mr. LEVITTIES. Well, the only explanation for that is that during the war people were working overtime, whereas today they're not working overtime, by and large.

Mr. EAMES. Gentlemen, I'd like to interrupt here just a moment. I think we can get ahead a little bit with our topic for the evening if we could ask Mr. Levitties a question at this point? Several critics of the OPA have argued that price control is impractical without wage control. What's your feeling about this?

Mr. LEVITTIES. Well, I agree that price control is impractical without wage control. We do, however, have limits to wage increases. Under the present wage-price policy of the Government, there are two main kinds of wage increases—those which can be used as a basis for price increases and those which cannot. Here, then, is a very real control on the amount of wage increases which industry can grant. Although there were some very spectacular strikes in certain key industries in the first quarter of the year, let us remember that thousands of wage increases were negotiated peaceably between labor and management. These are now being used as a yardstick for present and future wage increases. If wage increases are thus limited, it necessarily follows that any resultant price increases must also be limited. If the industry has a good-sized profit cushion, of course, the wage increases may result in no price increase at all.

Mr. EAMES. Mr. Rukeyser.

Mr. RUKEYSER. The cost sheet doesn't distinguish between whether wage-increased costs resulted from strikes or whether they resulted from peaceable negotiation. The cost sheet only records changes in costs. The Federal stabilization policy adcpted in February after the settlement of the steel strike isn't related at all to the extent of wage increases or increases in wage costs. Instead, in accordance with the general spirit of goofy economics which has been so popular in Washington, it's related to whether or not an industry, a whole industry—not a businessman, not a corporation, but a whole industry—is earning before taxes an amount equal to what it earned before taxes in the period of 1936 to 1939. Nothing to do with present cost increases.

Mr. EAMES. Mr. Levitties.

Mr. LEVITTIES. Mr. Rukeyser, I'm sure you're aware of the fact that industry earnings after taxes are considerably above and are probably the highest in the history of the country, so that I wouldn't bring in the question as to whether or not the wage-price policy requires readjusting prices on a basis of profits before taxes or after taxes. Furthermore, if industry makes less money, they pay less taxes. Consequently, you can't require setting of prices based on prices to reflect taxes. Certainly, you wouldn't advocate the setting of wage rates after taxes, for example.

Mr. EAMES. Have you a comment, Mr. Rukeyser?

Mr. RUKEYSER. The corporate earnings since the cessation of war orders are only beginning to flow out at this very present time and the earnings for the first quarter of 1946 are exceedingly spotty and show no definite trend. They reflect disturbances from strikes; they reflect disturbances from malpractices by price administrators, and various other difficulties. The wartime earnings have no bearing at all on the present problem when we're talking about reconversion into civilian goods. The wartime earnings represented an entirely different problem.

Mr. LEVITTIES. Mr. Rukeyser, would you say that the fourth quarter of 1945 reflects war earnings or civilian earnings?

Mr. RUKEYSER. Chiefly war earnings and the adjustment of cut-backs of war orders.

Mr. LEVITTIES. In the fourth quarter?

Mr. RUKEYSER. That's right.

Mr. LEVITTIES. The war was over in the third quarter.

Mr. RUKEYSER. The war isn't over yet, according to the bureaucrats at Washington. Neither President Truman nor the Congress has signified the end of the war and you and your associates are asking for a renewal after June 30 of the Second War Powers Act.

Mr. LEVITTIES. That is correct.

Mr. RUKEYSER. The war is still officially on.

Mr. LEVITTIES. That is true. But, nonetheless, the reason I asked the question is because my figures seem to indicate—when I say my figures they're Department of Commerce figures—that the fourth quarter profits, corporate profits before taxes, ran $16,800,000,000 and after taxes $6,800,000,000. In 1939, corporate profits after taxes amounted to $4,200,000,000, so the fourth quarter earnings, and I would say that the fourth quarter indicates civilian earnings, are at least 50 percent better than they were in 1939.

Mr. RUKEYSER Why talk about all of that statistical irrelevance? The American businessman has demonstrated that when you upset his cost sheet and when by incompetence at the OPA and elsewhere you prevent him from recouping his costs, that he'll either shift from items in which he can't earn a living into items where he can or he won't produce. He'll either do that or go into the black market and a great many people won't go into the black market. They'd rather starve.

Mr. LEVITTIES. Well, what makes you say if price controls were removed people would concentrate on producing the low-profit items necessarily?

Mr. RUKEYSER. If interference with the businessman were ended, the businessman would do what he always does, namely, try to please his customer by producing items that he wants and will pay for.

Mr. LEVITTIES. I agree with you that that is undoubtedly true in a normal era where competition between sellers is a fact. Certainly there is no competition between sellers currently. The only competition that is prevalent is among buyers. Anybody can sell anything that they produce at any price they set themselves in the absence of price controls.

Mr. EAMES. Now, Mr. Rukeyser, you know, quite a few brick bats have been going in your direction from critics who say that you're, in effect, advocating higher prices and higher living costs. What would be your answer to these critics?

Mr. RUKEYSER. Well, Mr. Eames, in holding a stethoscope up against the heart and lungs of the economic body of the Nation, I am not in favor of the symptoms which I find any more than the physician is gleeful when he finds a heart murmur in a patient. I am not happy about these tendencies. I am in the same position as the doctor who reluctantly reports that he finds the child has measles. You ask what I am advocating. I am advocating a restoration at the earliest possible time of the American competitive economic system, which has produced the highest living standards that the world has ever known. I am in favor of resuming the American adventure of giving the worker more and better things in exchange for a week's work.

Mr. EAMES. Mr. Levitties.

Mr. LEVITTIES. Well, I also would like to advocate the continuance of the American system under free enterprise in a capitalistic system. I think there's nothing under the sun to equal that system for our economy and the welfare of our people. But until factories have time to turn out the millions of automobiles and the washing machines and the garments and so on, there cannot possibly be the competition among sellers which normally controls prices. Yet you, Mr. Rukeyser, constantly trot out the argument: Take off ceilings! Let competition set prices! Will you please explain how competition could set prices now, and will you also please explain what is to keep prices down before supply can catch up with demand if price controls are removed now?

Mr. RUKEYSER. Well, of course, you can't keep prices down and costs up. Only a blue-sky operator would attempt to do that. The great automobile companies would not take advantage of the present unbalanced state of supply and demand, not because of altruism, but because of hard business sense. In the first place, they don't want to hold up the umbrella of unduly large profits and encourage fellows, newcomers, like Henry Kaiser and others, to come in and take their markets. Secondly, they don't want to get unusual and unnecessary mark-ups because they don't want to encourage Walter Reuther to step in and demand commensurate wage increases, which will freeze those costs there forever after demand catches up with what you call supply.

Mr. LEVITTIES. Well, I think we've already had indications from certain labor leaders that if prices continue to rise in the absence of price control, or even with price control, that it is their intention to come and ask for further wage increases. Wouldn't that further increase costs and would that not set off another spiral of price increases?

Mr. RUKEYSER. Of course, if costs go up prices will go up. Your former associates in the administration invited every labor leader in the country to go out and demand wage increases because they publicly stated as an administration policy that you could raise costs, including wage costs, without increasing selling prices. They put the heat on every labor agitator in the country to go out and get something.

Mr. LEVITTIES. Well, isn't it true that when industry or any manufacturer increases his production, that his overhead costs go down, thereby producing a reduction in costs to offset an increase in cost due to increased wages?

Mr. RUKEYSER. Of course not! Unqualified, that's one of the basic fallacies on which the OPA has snarled up the economy of the United States. You get the economies of mass production when you go from low operations, let's say 50 percent of capacity, up toward capacity, up to say 80 or 90 percent of capacity. But once you're up or either near capacity, there's a law of diminishing returns and instead of economies you have cost-raising factors. That's been the major fallacy by which the OPA has tripped up the national economy in this period of reconversion.

Mr. LEVITTIES. Mr. Rukeyser, are you saying, then, that automobile manufacturers, for example, are not going to produce more cars than they produced in the peak of prewar days?

Mr. RUKEYSER. Of course they are! They're going to try to produce, if you don't handicap them with ceilings and with obstacles—they're going to try to produce enough to meet the demands of their customers, and on top of the growth of the country since prewar time, you've had this stupendous accumulated supply, pent-up demand resulting from the wartime shortages when the automobile companies were not making automobiles but were making munitions. Of course they'll produce as many as they can.

Mr. LEVITTIES. Well, if they produce as many as they can, and let us assume they produce many more than they produced, say, in 1941, aren't they going to have certain savings in overhead costs which automatically bring down prices in a normal competitive economy?

Mr. RUKEYSER. We haven't anything like a normal competitive economy. Walter Reuther announced a few days ago that his new agenda was to demand a 30-hour week. What he wants to do is to capture for the workers, the employees, all the economies of increasing production, not sharing them, as before, with the customer.

Mr. EAMES. Mr. Levitties, have you any further comment to that? Then I think we have time for one more question which would certainly be interesting to all of us. Mr. Levitties, what in your opinion is the likely date at which price control will probably no longer be needed?

Mr. LEVITTIES. We cannot speak of a single date for the removal of all price ceilings, for when to take off ceilings depends chiefly on the supply and demand situation and this varies from industry to industry. OPA must retain its controls over rents and building materials, for example, for a much longer time than over those items where supply is coming or will soon come into a reasonable balance with demand. In a general way, however, I would say that OPA's request for a year's extension of its powers is a reasonable one. By that time we should be well over the production hump. Operating conditions and manufacturing will have been stabilized and the steady flow of goods out of our farms and factories and into our stores will do away with the scare buying that has characterized our markets in recent months.

Mr. EAMES. Mr. Rukeyser.

Mr. RUKEYSER. The OPA has a moving target as to when they want us to get rid of it. On February 5, 1944, Chester Bowles told me that the next 8 months were the critical period in the race between wages and prices—the next 8 months after February 1944. At that time he didn't know what his New Deal colleagues contemplated because he said to me that as soon as the fighting phase of the war is over deflationary forces will set in and he had in mind, and mentioned specifically the ending of overtime work and the ending of overtime pay. He said that would be a counter-inflationary influence. He didn't know then, evidently, that Henry Wallace and Mr. Snyder and the other stabilizing gentry were about to invite labor unions to go out and demand higher pay on the ground that you could raise pay, raise take-home pay—bring it to the wartime peak for fewer hours of work, without correspondingly increasing selling prices.

Mr. EAMES. Mr. Levitties.

Mr. LEVITTIES. Well, what is the point that you're making Mr. Rukeyser, if you please?

Mr. RUKEYSER. The point that I'm making is that the moving target which OPA spokesmen give is unreliable. Mr. Bowles said the other day that by January 1 he thought the worst of it would be over. But I'm saying that he's saying now what he was saying in 1944. He's been wrong right up to date and what reason is there to accept his judgment now?

Mr. LEVITTIES. Well, it's to be admitted, and I think it has been admitted time and again throughout Washington and stabilization agencies, that Government economists miscalculated the swing in the economic trend of the country immediately after VJ-day. There were divergent influences. Some said that we're going to get into an era of inflation, where others felt that we were going to get into an era of deflation. That has no bearing, however, on the question as to whether or not OPA should be abolished today or whether or not OPA should decontrol most of the cost-of-living items that are still under control.

Mr. EAMES. Mr. Rukeyser.

Mr. RUKEYSER. I would like to say that the recurrent fallacy of the OPA is the promise that they'll go home when supply catches up with demand. Can they be serious when they say that? Don't they know, aren't they economists enough to know, aren't they businessmen enough to know that production which makes supply also makes demand? We never know when demand has caught up to supply. The businessman himself doesn't know until he's got an excess of supply and then he's in trouble. He knows it! But until then he's got to exercise judgment and it's sheer bunk to say that we'll stop when supply catches up with demand.

Mr. EAMES. A further word from you, Mr. Levitties.

Mr. LEVITTIES. Well, I disagree completely with Mr. Rukeyser that we can leave the entire problem to supply and demand. I think the issues are very clear. On the one hand, we can have increase in production at stable prices and on the other hand wild hysteria or uncontrolled inflation with its inevitable economic collapse and chaos. Most of the people of this country want stability and price control. Nor are the people being lulled into a sense of security by the kind of price control bill——

Mr. EAMES. I'm afraid our time is up and I must interrupt you. Thank you, Mr. Levitties, and you, Mr. Rukeyser, on behalf of the American Economic Foundation and more than a hundred independent radio stations that carry Wake Up, America! from coast to coast.

The Businessman and Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article which I wrote for the May 1946 issue of the Commerce magazine, published by the Chicago Association of Commerce. The title of this article is, "The Businessman and Congress," and it discusses an area which I believe is of particular significance in the present reconversion crisis.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUSINESSMAN AND CONGRESS

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

There is an old saying that "if you don't make government your business, soon you may not have a business of your own." Never have these words had truer meaning than today. Virtually every legislative day in session Congress makes decisions which crucially affect the well-being of American enterprise. Moreover, the countless agencies of the executive branch daily issue orders and regulations determining business profits, taxes, information to be reported to the Government, wage policy, raw materials, and countless other phases of American industry.

In recent years there has been an almost unbroken trend for Congress and the executive branch to stick more and more Federal fingers into private enterprise's pie. The end of the war, to be sure, saw the termination of many wartime controls. But the muddled strike situation and other reconversion bungling, for example, in Government pricing policy, have stimulated the Government's "managed economy" planners to concoct more and more Federal controls to correct their previous errors. Their method of "undoing" error is to pile new error upon old error, to hamstring the genius of American industry more and more.

NEED NEW APPROACH

So what? What is the businessman to do to help make sure that the executive branch's meddling schemers and dreamers do not further mess up private enterprise? How may the businessman help Congress to curb executive excesses and, too, to withdraw some of the National Legislature's own fingers from free enterprise's pie?

The answer to this is that the businessman must have a new approach in his relationships with his Congress and his Government. May I, as both a legislator and a businessman, indicate what I believe might well be some of the elements of that new approach? Most if not all of these suggestions apply to all other segments of our population in addition to the business. But they apply with particular force to businessmen—men who are builders, sustainers, creators of employment, and wealth, who have done so magnificent a job in war and peace for America and who can do a still greater job. Here is what may be considered a new approach to government, or a summation of old elements necessary for a new day in Government-business relationships.

THE CZARS MUST GO

The businessman must recognize the social responsibilities of business. What are a few of these responsibilities? To provide the highest quality goods at the lowest reasonable price, to provide for fair employment policy with maximum opportunities for employee happiness and growth, to provide a basis for all-out, uninterrupted production.

The businessman cannot, of course, fulfill all these responsibilities alone. Labor must do its share. Indeed management and labor must progress to a new day in industrial relations. The old day of the management czar or the labor czar must go. The new day where management is free to run its own enterprise, while fulfilling its social responsibilities, must come. As the businessman fulfills his responsibilities, there will be less and less excuse for statist intervention in business.

The businessman should be keenly informed on government.

This means that he should devote himself to reading and understanding the news of Congress and government as a whole with the same keenness he displays in reading and understanding his profit-and-loss statements.

To be specific, it means that the businessman should know who his Congressmen are and what they stand for. He should be familiar with the issues, confronting them and government as a whole, with the various arguments used on both sides of those issues. He should be familiar with the workings of Congress—the long procedure by which a bill becomes a law, the problems faced by Congressmen, for example.

Obviously, it takes time and effort to acquire all this understanding. It takes still more time for the businessman to understand the scrambled executive branch of government—the respective jurisdictions and policies of the separate agencies, their top personnel, the nature of their administration.

The businessman cannot be a learned student of all these matters. He must catch them as catch can—in reading of newspapers, of general and trade magazines, in his

listening to the radio and so on. But if he wholeheartedly goes about this task of learning what makes his Government tick, he will have taken the first step toward keeping his own business ticking.

The businessman should participate in his business group. I believe in men and women of all economic fields coming together in their respective organizations to pool their understanding, to stimulate their thinking, to advance their collective interests and the interests of America. Always, of course, they must bear in mind the welfare of the Nation as a whole, in addition to the welfare of their own particular segment of society.

ONE FOR ALL, ALL FOR ONE

Making business prosper means making America prosper, and making America prosper means making business prosper. Therefore, the businessman in his separate trade organization or chamber of commerce should participate actively and constructively in forums, in meetings, in publications which help to advance the cause of prosperous business.

"Letting George do it" in advancing business is as bad as "letting George do it" in casting a ballot. It is up to each of us to do our share in this complex, interdependent society.

The businessman should participate in his local community. I mean all businessmen. In every community, large and small, businessmen play an indispensable role in civic achievement. Still the great majority of businessmen are inactive in local public affairs.

Why is this a particularly unfortunate condition? Because every problem which the local community does not solve because of lackadaisical participation of local businessmen, will sooner or later be seized upon by centralization planners at the Federal Government level as a justification for more and more Federal intervention in local affairs.

Local success in handling local problems depends upon all-out businessmen's effort. Local success means the easing of the burden on the Federal Treasury already almost $300,000,000,000 in the red. When that debt burden is eased and reduced, local business throughout the land will have greater chance of prospering. Helping the community to fulfill its responsibilities is aided by the first element which was mentioned, the businessman's fulfilling of the social responsibilities of his own business.

SHOULD VOTE CAREFULLY

The businessman should exercise his suffrage carefully. The crisis of reconversion points up the urgent necessity of wise use of the ballot. The businessman should back candidates of integrity and judgment, men and women with records of civic service, individuals who will work as team mates rather than as prima donnas. These candidates for public office should be supported if they believe in the American way of life, in our system of private profit and free enterprise.

The businessman should develop effective liaison with his Congress. Once the election is over, the businessman should follow up on his efficient suffrage by efficient liaison with his Congressman. This means communicating with the Congressman when the occasion warrants on public issues of the day. The businessman can, by letter, wire, or in person, give the Congressman the benefit of local facts, briefly, clearly, and respectfully presented, which bear on legislative decisions.

And, too, if the occasion arises when the Congressman can be of genuine service to the businessman, in connection with the latter's dealings with Government agencies, the businessman should avail himself of that service. Here again, his communications should be brief, clear, and respectful to the Congressman.

Some few businessmen make pests of themselves in either presuming to give directions to the Congressman on every insignificant public issue which arises or in asking the Congressman to do the impossible in connection with every sort of dealing which the pests have with Government agencies. Fortunately, according to my own experiences and those of my colleagues, the nuisance is only the rare exception.

I can well understand how a businessman pushed and shoved at every turn by Government bureaucrats might impose on an already overburdened Congressman for continuous information and assistance. The businessman's principal redress, however, should be along the first five lines I have indicated: fulfilling of social responsibilities, keenness of personal understanding of government, active participation in business organization, active participation in local affairs, and wise use of suffrage.

When the businessman has fulfilled his responsibilities along these lines, the sixth line, that of effective liaison with his Congressman, will almost take care of itself.

When that happens, the business of Government will be running on a businesslike basis, and private enterprise's well-being will have been insured.

World-Wide Program To Alleviate World Famine by Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein an address by the Honorable James A. Farley, made over radio station WLIB, New York City, on May 5, 1946, entitled "Hunger Challenges":

In this business of fighting the world-wide food shortage, the American people are facing the greatest challenge in our history. We have got to wake up to that fact. We have got to overcome our excess of confidence. It is in the nature of most Americans to assume that a thing will be done if we merely say it will be done. That assumption grows from the belief that America has a surplus of anything the human family requires. That assumption no longer holds. You know it from your experience in these postwar months. Our industrial machine has not yet reached the point where every American consumer can go into a shop and get what he or she asks for. That observation holds for food. The job ahead cannot be solved by having someone in Washington say: "Well, let them have the wheat and the other foodstuffs." It cannot be done that way because the surplus foodstuffs just do not exist in the quantities required to relieve the critical international situation. The farmers are complaining that they have overextended themselves and have released their harvests without keeping enough on hand to meet their usual requirements. They need some of their supplies for next season's planting. They require some of their production for feeding livestock. And they think it is wise to keep something in reserve just in case we suffer a drought. All that adds up to this: The only way we can develop a surplus, in the face of those circumstances, is for you and me to eat less. It is no longer a matter of sharing our surplus. It is the more sacrificial matter of sharing our own daily supply. We have got to lift ourselves out of our habit of eating to our appetite's content. We have got to learn the art of leaving our table slightly hungry. That margin of difference will rescue tens of millions in India, China, and in several European countries, who have been eating so little these several years that your sacrifice offers them the equivalent of a full meal.

There is more to this question than filling hungry stomachs. There is a moral issue involved. The comfortable and well-fed man is always envied by the ragged, hungry man. That goes for nations, as well. The comfortable and well-fed nation is envied by the bruised, hungry nation. Mark well these words, "the bruised nation." Nations overseas are not forgetting that they were badly bruised by the operations of the recent war. Our continental territory suffered no such bruises. Not an airplane tore up a single mile of our magnificent landscape in that period of 1941 to 1945. The bombs fell over there and not over here. Bombs are not helpful to farms and farm machinery.

Bombs do not allow transportation facilities to stand up. The chaos that follows several months and years of bombing, robs millions of their vitality. They no longer have the strength to produce food for themselves even if they had the untorn farm lands and the necessary machinery. These war-scarred peoples do not resent our plenty, but they cannot refrain from becoming bitter toward us if they discover our show of ingratitude. They believe we should display special signs of gratitude for what we escaped. By that they mean that we should be willing to spare an adequate part of the plenty our peaceful farm lands are able to produce. That willingness to sacrifice on our part, impresses the hungry peoples as a sign of our moral strength. By refusing to keep the entire product of our labor for ourselves, we demonstrate that we are not a selfish people. Thereby we acquire a moral rating in the family of the Nations. It is a rating that no people can do without. It is a rating that the United States must desire and prize, in this postwar era. We shall need the good will of the other peoples as we undertake to develop our relationships in the economic field. If the other peoples trust us as a nation, they will trust our representatives, whatever the mission that takes them to the ends of the earth. If our mission be commercial and economic, they will feel confident that we are not self-seeking imperialists; that we are a people who are bent on sharing what we have. The present situation, in which we virtually command customers on every square inch of the earth's surface, will not continue forever. Before many years pass, other nations will be able to get their industrial production into higher gear. They will be our competitors. International industrial compeitition means that workers will find jobs awaiting them in our factories only if we have markets for the products of our factories. If, therefore, we acquire a large fund of good will today throughout the world, we shall not have to worry about customers in the coming era of stiffer international competition. Moral decency in human relationships pays big dividends. That was the important lesson that the Nazis and the Nipponese overlooked. In their mad ambition to dominate spheres of prosperity, they used tactics that debased and destroyed human beings. They ignored the moral aspect of this universe. This fight to save tens of millions of people from starvation is a challenge to prove that we still stand high above the code that made Berlin and Tokyo the centers of an immoral and savage war against humankind. Do not forget that you can be the innocent slayer of innocent human beings simply through your indifference and callousness. No American can afford to claim

exemption in this battle against starvation. You cannot leave your fighting to the rest of the American people. There must be no break in the line of American homes that are lined up in this campaign to rescue men, women and children who do not deserve a sentence of death at the hands of their fellow men.

The great difficulty for millions of Americans today is that they are not free to travel. They are not free to go abroad and discover for themselves, to see with their own eyes, the misery that stalks this earth. To allow Americans that freedom, at this stage of the international recovery effort, would simply increase the world's confusion and suffering. The ships are needed to transport supplies. And the food for feeding passengers is required for the hungry. You must therefore be content to take the word of a few of us who have been privileged to travel abroad in these recent weeks, on special missions. I have only recently returned from Europe. I went through the towns and cities. I saw thousands of individuals who are paying the price of our present international maladjustments. I could move you to tears and perhaps even to pain if I recited just a few of the experiences I had. But I do not think that is necessary. You have heard of human misery before. You understand why there is all this misery in the world today. You are intelligent enough to bring yourself to doing your utmost in this world-wide emergency. Your men who have been overseas know how tragic is the poverty of the peoples among whom they have moved. You do not need me to add my testimony to theirs. Just ask your men to tell you a few of the conditions they had to observe. That observation brings me to this thought: We promised our men to build a civilization that would never again feel the urge to go to war. We can begin to fulfill that pledge by building the bridges of world-wide brotherhood, with our ships moving over every lane of the high seas, ladened with food and all the necessities for rescuing peoples from disease and plague.

You, the individual American, helped convert this country into an arsenal for the democracies, that won the victories over the Fascist aggressors. You, the individual American, can win another unforgettable victory by converting this country into an arsenal for the universal battle against hunger and starvation. You can win, you must win, that war for humanity.

Statement on Public Assistance Provisions of Pending Social Security Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee, May 13, 1946, by Loula Dunn, commissioner, Alabama State Department of Public Welfare, and president American Public Welfare Association:

As commissioner of the Alabama State Department of Public Welfare, the agency which administers the public assistance titles of the Federal Social Security Act and child-welfare services under title V, part 3, of the same law, I should like to submit a statement in regard to proposed changes in these phases of the Federal act. I am happy to have this opportunity, not only as a public welfare official in my native State, but also as a representative of public welfare people throughout the Nation in my capacity as president of the American Public Welfare Association. While we are primarily concerned with the titles you are now considering, we have also followed with interest the hearings regarding the old age and survivors' insurance provisions of the Social Security Act. We in the public-welfare field recognize that a well-rounded social-security program in a balanced economy must include, first, adequate insurances and, second, residual assistance and service programs. We think, of course, that the first step to security is a job for everyone who can work, but we know that even full employment must be underpinned with adequate insurances and supplemented by cash assistance and social service.

Because I represent Alabama, I shall cite specifically problems, needs, and resources within my own State as it is affected by the present and proposed provisions of the Federal Social Security Act. We have had more than 10 years' experience in administering the assistance and child-welfare titles of the act through our department of public welfare, and prior to that time we had a State-county child-welfare program for 16 years. Likewise linked to these activities were the Federal relief programs of the 1930's. Thus, it is out of this broad background of providing services and financial aid to adults and children in distress that I should like to present to you facts which illustrate the effects of present legislation and the urgent need for early revision.

TEN YEARS OF PROGRESS IN ALABAMA

Alabama has made remarkable progress in its public-welfare program during the past 10 years, with total expenditures rising from a little over $3,000,000 the first year of operation to budgeted expenditures of approximately $11,500,000 for the present fiscal year. Throughout this decade State and local taxes have borne 61.08 percent of the total expense, including the entire cost of urgently needed services and financial aid in which there was no Federal participation.

Average payments to recipients and the number receiving financial aid have both increased, but existing need and limited resources have resulted in sharper rises in number of recipients than in size of payments. In fact, Alabama's average assistance payments of approximately $17 per month at present cover only about one-half of each family's minimum budgeted needs. Thus, while Alabama has steadily increased its contributions to the public welfare program, it is clear that present monthly payments to families do not provide a standard of living compatible with decency and health.

This is not surprising, however, because Alabama ranks seventeenth in population but only forty-sixth among the States in per capita income. In 1943 Alabama's per capita income was $603, while the Nation's was $1,031. Despite its rank of forty-sixth in per capita income, Alabama provides assistance payments which rank forty-fifth for the aged, forty-third for the blind, and forty-fourth for dependent children.

NEED FOR FURTHER FEDERAL AID

The problem of unmet need in Alabama, as well as in many other States, is of national concern. In Alabama 41.02 percent of our total population is under 18, yet for the Nation the figure is only 32.55 percent. This means that with our high birth rate we are contributing adult citizens to the rest of the Nation, and are left with a correspondingly fewer number of adults during their productive years. Alabama, therefore, is unable to overcome the effects of its unbalance of population unless Federal aid is made available on a more equitable basis. We have reached this conclusion after marked increases each year in State and local fiscal effort to provide more adequate assistance and child-welfare programs, with present expenditures being approximately four times those of the first year of operation. Even so, we cannot lift our present assistance levels to an adequate standard without a greater measure of Federal aid, and unless these levels are raised our national economy will continue to be off balance. There can be no guaranty of security in any locality or for any group so long as there remains insecurity for certain people in certain areas.

While it is to the national interest that there be adequate security for all Americans, an even more valid reason can be found in the tenets of democracy itself. If we believe truly in the principle that the well-being of the individual comes first, then our planning must insure a minimum of security to every individual regardless of where he lives.

STATE-LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY

In emphasizing that there is need for changes in the Federal Social Security Act in order for States like Alabama to provide more adequately for needy citizens I do not wish to minimize the responsibility which rests upon us within our own States and localities. It is our conviction that administration of human services must be kept close to the people for whom they were established. We in Alabama are proud of our traditional reliance upon State-local administration. Our public-welfare program is highly decentralized in both financing and administration, a pattern which stresses both State and local responsibility. Though we shall continue to increase our efforts to shoulder our responsibilities fully, we know now we are unable to offer to our unfortunate citizens opportunities equal to those for distressed people in the Nation's wealthier States. We believe, therefore, that the program must be a partnership of the Federal, State, and local governments, with administration retained by the States, but Federal grants-in-aid made according to each State's needs and resources.

AID TO ALL NEEDY PEOPLE ON A VARIABLE BASIS

First in importance is Federal participation in financial aid to all needy persons, with this participation on a variable basis which takes into account the economic ability of the States. Present limits on Federal matching for assistance to specified groups not only work hardships on people just as needy who do not fall within these groups but also are reflected in the total economy of the Nation. As long as the full burden of needy people who are not aged, are not blind, and are not dependent children is left to States and localities, there will be inequities in programs for these people. At the same time, even for people now included in the public-assistance provisions of the Social Security Act, the rigid dollar-for-dollar matching formula now requires all States, no matter what their needs and without regard to their economic capacity, to provide matching funds on the same basis. If, on the other hand, grants-in-aid to States are provided under a variable formula, more equitable distribution of Federal funds will result, to the end that a larger number of the Nation's dependent people will receive help when and where they need it. Our democratic precepts demand that an assistance program which is residual in nature and which operates to underpin insurances must serve all the people regardless of where they live.

Does not the Government have just as great an obligation to a totally handicapped ex-war worker of 60, who is indigent, as it does to a man in similar circumstances who happens to have reached the age of 65? At present Federal funds for public assistance to adults are available under the Social Security Act only for the aged and blind. In Alabama it became necessary for us to set up a

category of aid to the handicapped in order to assist persons totally incapacitated who are ineligible for old-age assistance or aid to the blind. Limited State and local moneys are utilized for this purpose. We also provide a small number of payments for brief periods to families facing temporary and critical emergencies. Our inability to serve people in these groups adequately is further demonstration of the importance of Federal participation in aid to all needy people and not just selected groups.

Aid to dependent children should include all needy children, instead of, as the present Social Security Act stipulates, only those children living in the homes of near relatives and deprived of parental support by reason of the death, continued absence from the home, etc., of one or both parents. In Alabama, where we have provided public services for children for more than 25 years, our experiences have given ample evidence that frequently it is as important to serve a child in a foster home as in his own home. The proposed changes in the Federal law would make it possible to utilize Federal funds for children who must be cared for in boarding homes for short or long periods of time, as well as for those in homes of relatives. A child's need should be the guide to his eligibility, rather than the reason for his need which prevails at the present time.

Likewise, child-welfare services as provided under title V, part 3 of the Social Security Act should be available to all children regardless of where they live. Now these services are set up on a demonstration basis in areas predoninantly rural and in areas of special need. Should we wait for augmented problems or specify only dependent, neglected, and delinquent children for service when we know full well that service is perhaps the primary tool in the prevention of child-welfare problems?

ELIMINATION OF CEILINGS

Present ceilings on Federal matching of public-assistance payments clearly have no relation to present living costs nor is there any valid balance among ceilings for the different categories. When need has been determined, there should be sufficient funds and permissive laws to make it possible for that need to be met in full. In fact, it is unrealistic and impossible to set a maximum on need, or for a single fixed ceiling to be sufficiently flexible to fit the range of human problems which assistance programs have been established to meet. Twenty dollars of Federal funds and $20 of State-local funds, or a $40 total, is frequently too little for an adequate livelihood, and certainly this sum cannot cover the cost of nursing care or the many special needs of aged or blind people, such as medical service, special diets, etc.

Likewise, the present limitation on amounts for which Federal matching is available in aid to dependent children payments is far too low. Why should it be arbitrarily set that a single child could be granted no more than $18 per month, including both Federal and State-local funds? If the aid to dependent children program was established to prevent family breakdown and to give children an opportunity to grow up normally, then surely it should recognize that need should be met on an individual basis and might well exceed the present maxima of $18 for one child and $12 for each additional child in the same household. Furthermore, the difference in ceilings for aid to dependent children and for aid to the blind and old-age assistance make it difficult for us to explain to ourselves as well as to needy families living side by side that the maximum available to a mother and two young children (under present Federal ceilings) is $30, whereas two recipients of old-age assistance may have $80 per month.

ELIMINATION OF RESIDENCE AND CITIZENSHIP REQUIREMENTS

Even provisions that Federal participation in assistance payments to needy people on the basis of actual need rather than according to arbitrary ceilings will not effectually assure assistance to all needy people unless present limitations on residence and citizenship are removed. American tradition is steeped in the right of people to move to new frontiers. The war years showed us, too, that it is often to the national interest that there be considerable movement of people from place to place. It hardly seems in keeping with our democratic ideals that a man recruited for a war job in one State should lose his residence at home without gaining it in his new location. Neither should an American in the making be denied the help he needs while he is waiting to take an oath of allegiance to his adopted country. The Federal law, therefore, should insure the removal of residence and citizenship barriers to public assistance as a measure toward guaranteeing security to all needy people.

FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN MEDICAL CARE OF THE NEEDY

Still another barrier to aiding all people in need is the requirement that assistance payments cannot be made to residents of public institutions. We consider this particularly restrictive insofar as chronically ill indigent adults are concerned. We believe a positive means of strengthening and developing public facilities for dependent people who require nursing care would be a change in the Federal law to allow assistance payments to such persons living of their own volition in such institutions. (I refer to persons not subjects for care in mental hospitals or tuberculosis sanatoria.) Along with the granting of assistance to residents of public institutions should come establishment of standards for, and licensing of, these institutions. We believe, too, that Federal sharing in the cost of medical care to the needy will be a strong factor toward improving the Nation's health and toward restoring to independence many needy persons who now have no way to secure the medical care they should have.

FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN COST OF SOCIAL SERVICES

The prevention of need is as much a part of a welfare program under our kind of government as is the alleviation of need after it has been established. In line with the range of recommendations affecting Federal participation in assistance payments, therefore, it is important that the Federal Government share in the cost of social services as well. In Alabama the roots of our present public-welfare program lie in a child-welfare program which primarily was one of social services to needy, dependent, neglected, and delinquent children and their families. We have seen throughout the years how service at the right time has prevented dependency, and although we have continued to carry forward a variety of social services financed out of limited State and local appropriations, we have been forced to focus first attention on meeting existing economic need. This has been true because the overall social-service programs in the past have been inadequate to prevent need, and because there was Federal matching for certain aspects of the assistance program but not for the preventive social services. In the long run, it will be an economy for the Federal Government to enter into a partnership with State and local welfare agencies in developing a broad, inclusive welfare program in which the cost of social services is shared equitably.

UNIFIED ADMINISTRATION

We believe that the greatest efficiency can be achieved in administering this broadened public-welfare program through a single administration at the Federal, State, and local levels. In Alabama we have followed the plan of unified administration of a total welfare program both in the State Department and in the 67 county departments. We have found the plan to be sound, and we believe it makes for economy of administration. Duplication of effort is prevented, clearance between agencies is made necessary, and people are better served. Likewise, single administration at all governmental levels will be a further step toward equalizing opportunities for every citizen within the United States.

PUBLIC WELFARE ACT OF 1946

These recommendations for changes in the Federal Social Security Act are provided in the Public Welfare Act of 1946 (H. R. 5686 by FORAND, of Rhode Island). While the variety of bills now pending include some of these provisions, H. R. 5686 seems the most practical and all-inclusive. As Mr. FORAND, the author of this bill, stated when he introduced the measure, public-welfare administrators see the assistance phases of the social-security program declining in the years to come when more and more persons will have built up an equity for themselves in the insurance program. Again, I think the first requisite to total security is full employment, underpinned by adequate insurance coverage. Nevertheless, there will always be a need for some measure of assistance and service to handicapped and dependent people. For that service and that aid to be adequate when and where it is needed is essential in any functioning democracy. The war showed us that full employment could be a reality, but, at the same time, that there were some people who could not become self-supporting even amidst labor shortages. While we strive to maintain full employment in peace, we must at the same time give full recognition to our obligations to those unable to earn. To do otherwise would be to deny to certain groups their fair share of democracy's benefits.

In conclusion let me reiterate what has been said to you during recent hearings—that the members of the American Public Welfare Association see in H. R. 5686 the most practical and equitable answer to Nation-wide problems of needy people. This bill incorporates the 13 points which have been set forth in the platform of the association as essential to an adequate Nation-wide welfare service. Therefore, I want to restate my conviction both as commissioner of public welfare in Alabama and as president of the American Public Welfare Association that the enactment of H. R. 5686 will be a vital and positive tool in adding strength to our democracy. The need for amendments to the Social Security Act outlined above is both immediate and imperative.

Address by Gen. Jacob L. Devers, Commanding General, Army Ground Forces, to the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Gastonia, N. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a speech by Gen. Jacob L. Devers, commanding gen-

eral, Army Ground Forces, before the junior chamber of commerce at Gastonia, N. C., on last Tuesday night, May 14:

It is a real and genuine pleasure for me to be here tonight. I welcome the opportunity to speak to you about national security because I know that residents of a State which contributed so much to the winning of World War II will understand the importance of maintaining the peace won with such a great expenditure of money, materials and manpower.

I know that I am among friends when I am in North Carolina because of the wholehearted cooperation given me when I commanded the Ninth Division, with Headquarters at Fort Bragg. During those important months when we were beginning to build a fighting machine to cope with the world's aggressors my mission took me into many parts of the state. I learned to know and to appreciate the "Tar Heel" brand of friendliness.

We took over a vast acreage in the State to be used as camp sites, training and manuever areas so that we could develop—by actual and practical application on the ground—the experience needed to engage in combat with the battle-hardened troops of Germany and Japan. I know how quickly the people of North Carolina responded to the need for this additional wartime training area because I was here. How well the people cooperated when we were on training maneuvers I also know because I was here when some of that vital training in the early stages of our preparation for war was under way. I have a warm spot in my heart for North Carolina. It was about ten weeks ago that I spoke in Charlotte on behalf of another worthy cause—the American Red Cross—an organization which rendered invaluable service during the war years and made a noteworthy contribution to the winning of the war.

But North Carolina's contribution to the winning of the war did not end with the furnishing of training and maneuver areas, or in cooperating with military authorities while that training was in progress.

The State furnished the materials of war in great quantities. The products of your soil, your forests, and your industrial establishments helped to place in the hands of our fighting men the tools needed to wage successful warfare against a stubborn foe.

A considerable portion of that contribution came from Gastonia and Gaston County. Your production for war is a monument to the progressiveness of the area. Your pioneers, who in 1880 changed from a purely agricultural economy, laid the foundation for your industrial progress.

It is no accident that Gaston County today stands third among the counties of the State in the number of industrial establishments. Another result of this progressive spirit is Gastonia's place as the leading rolled cotton manufacturing center in the world.

But not content to supply the materials needed to wage war the State of North Carolina gave freely of its sons and daughters to furnish the man and woman power needed to utilize the materials and implements of war in deposing those forces which sought to enslave the world.

A recent report issued by War Department statistics experts show that on June 30, 1945, there were 189,000 men and 2,700 women from North Carolina in the Army. During the peak years of the war the figures were, of course, much greater than those listed for last June 30.

It also is gratifying to know that the State frequently had difficulty meeting its selective-service quotas, because such a high percentage of the manpower already was in the National Guard when the emergency occurred, or were among the ranks of the early volunteers.

The people of Gastonia can view with pride the high percentage of its eligible personnel that served with distinction in the armed forces. The sight of so many honorable discharge buttons in the lapels of people present here tonight is evidence of the contribution made by your citizens in preserving for the world a dignified way of life.

The patriotic spirit displayed by North Carolinians in supporting the armed forces in training and in war indicates that you appreciate the Army and its problems in maintaining national security. It is not difficult for me to talk to you about your responsibility in assisting us to guarantee national security because you already have demonstrated your interest in the subject.

Your sons and daughters fought on the far-flung battlefields of the world to eliminate inhumanity from the face of the globe. They fought and died to establish the right of free peoples to remain free and to choose for themselves the types of government under which they desire to live. Their deeds of valor reaffirmed faith in human dignity.

The tremendous price that they paid, so that the world might have peace, imposes upon the Nation an obligation to conduct its affairs so that the peace so dearly won will not be lost. All the things that our fighting men achieved in their courage and sacrifice must be maintained.

We will not have fulfilled our obligation to those who won the victory until lasting and universal peace has been established.

None of us must ever forget that the need for continued unified effort and personal sacrifice did not end when the guns stopped firing in Europe and in the Pacific. Eternal vigilance is the price of success and we must work as hard to maintain the peace as we did to win the war. We must labor continually to make the priceless commodity of security a living, breathing reality.

It is axiomatic that peace is dependent, first of all, on diplomacy.

But diplomacy, to be effective must be supported by armed forces of sufficient size and strength to guarantee that the voices of mediators will be heard and respected in the council halls of the world.

The men and women who fought the war and the people of the home front who produced the materials of war and made certain sacrifices so that the conflict could be brought to a successful conclusion are tired of war. It is only natural that they should be. None of us—particularly those in the armed forces—like or want war.

But peace is to a great extent dependent on our readiness for war. We can make the transition to the ways of peace and enjoy the fruits of peaceful living only if we have a military potential capable of discouraging the world's war makers.

And that statement does not imply that I am advocating a huge standing or Regular Army. We must have an Army of sufficient size to discharge our military responsibilities and commitments, and one that will guarantee the national security. That force need not rest entirely in a Regular Army. But we must have an adequate National Guard and a Reserve constantly trained in the methods of modern warfare so that it can be called into action on short notice when needed.

The three components of our Army—the Regular Establishment, the National Guard and the Reserve—must be well trained and equipped in readiness for any emergency.

We must never permit our armed forces to reach the impotent status they occupied at the outset of World War II. A publication recently issued by my headquarters called "Report of Activities, Army Ground Forces, World War II," showed that when we started our preparations to meet the Nazi and Japanese threat we had only 28 poorly equipped and partially organized divisions. Ten of these were Regular Army divisions and 18 were National Guard divisions. We were indeed a fourth-rate military power. The richest and most powerful industrial Nation in the world was the least equipped to defend its position of influence in the world.

Three great factors enabled us to arm and train to meet the threat to our very lives and the democratic way of life.

The first was the fact that our allies held the Nazi and Jap hordes at bay until we could get ready. If they hadn't the final outcome might have been quite different.

The second was the remarkable training job that was done in taking men from all civilian walks of life and shaping them into soldiers fully qualified to shoulder their share of the load in bringing the dictators to their knees.

The Army Ground Forces was organized in 1942 to activate, train and put our combat forces on the 10 fronts of the world's first global war. During 1942, our greatest year of expansion, AGF raised 37 divisions. Our total for the war was 89 divisions, all of which went to overseas theaters. Eighty-eight were committed to combat.

The third factor which enabled us to bring the war to a decisive conclusion was the response of American industry. The ingenuity of industrialists and scientists geared the production system so that the materials of war, weapons, ammunition, vehicles and supplies were turned out in unprecedented quantity. A steady stream of things needed to wage the war on a modern scale flowed to our theaters of war. Scientists, military and civilian, worked hand in hand to develop new and more effective implements of war.

We can always rely on the patriotic response of our citizens to any call needed to protect the lifeblood of the Nation. We can be assured that our industrial system will gear itself to produce the materials of war.

But we cannot be sure—if we ever become involved in another war—that we will have allies who can stave off enemies until we are ready to engage in battle. We can no longer rely on the oceans to isolate us from the rest of the world, or to protect us from any future enemy, if there is one.

This is the twentieth century and nineteenth-century thinking, planning and hoping is as extinct as the dodo bird if we are going to keep pace with the world and with scientific developments. We are in a atomic age which even now with all of its revolutionary development is only in its infancy.

Miraculous developments in the field of air transportation have transformed the people of the far-flung corners of the globe from the strangers of a few years ago to our very next door neighbors of today. Points on the earth which previously could be reached only by long ocean voyages are now a few hours away from us by air.

Whether our isolationist thinkers like it or not we must realize that the day is over when we could shut ourselves within our own borders and forget what is going on in the rest of the world.

Aside from the fact that we have moral obligations which require us to be interested in international affairs, there is the inescapable fact that our national security depends on active participation in world affairs. If we ignore events that may lead to war we could be caught unprepared to cope with an emergency thrust upon us by an aggressor force.

We are all familiar with the havoc wrought by the atomic bombs dropped at Nagasaki and Hiroshima. Even though the advent of the atomic bomb as a weapon of war was the most revolutionary creation of the war its development was only in the beginning stages when the war ended. It is only the forerunner of developments that will occur in the future. The age of rockets and atomic power will completely revolutionize our concepts of modern warfare.

I do not pretend that I am able to foresee with accuracy the type of warfare that will be utilized 50 years hence. No man can predict that.

I do know, however, that we must have men of vision in our military forces so that this country always will be equipped with the very latest equipment and weapons required to carry on successful warfare on the twentieth century scale.

We in the Army Ground Forces are attempting to do the most progressive thinking and planning possible so that our forces will be trained and equipped on the most modern scale.

Even though we are visualizing such radical departures from the accepted and conventional idea of weapons as the radio-controlled guided missile with an atomic warhead, we also are not losing sight of the fact that in any future war the ground soldier will be needed to take and occupy enemy territory and to ferret out and capture the troops of our foes.

It is my belief that those who claim that the need for soldiers in an Army will diminish when atomic power is fuly developed are short-sighted. I do not minimize the deadly effect of atomic power but I do maintain that it cannot supplant manpower in the final stages of any war. This fact was clearly illustrated by incidents of World War II.

During the campaigns in Italy the Germans held up our advance at Cassino. The German defenses, situated as they were on the commanding position of the hill on which Cassino stands, held firm. In an effort to blast out the stubborn Kraut the Air Forces staged an aerial bombardment such as had never been seen before. Tons of bombs were dropped until the entire town had been razed. Not a wall was left standing. Yet when our troops attempted to take the hill Germans poured out of the basements of the demolished houses and from hillside caves, ready to do battle.

The same was true at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Many lives were lost, but many persons came out of the bombings without a scratch. Perhaps in the future underground shelters will not protect people from the ravages of an atomic blast. But we do know that this protection did save many in the Japanese bombings. But of this you may be sure. Some type of protection will be devised. No matter how deadly the weapon history shows us that a defense has been devised. When our bombers began dropping block busters on German cities they moved their industrial plants underground.

So we can say with assurance that in any future wars the type of weapons may be revolutionary, but there still will be need for the ground soldier. He must take, hold, and occupy enemy territory. We cannot entertain the idea that atomic power or any other weapon will obviate the necessity for soldiers.

We of the armed forces want the public to realize the need for an adequate force to guarantee our national security and through public support to maintain it.

At the present time we have military commitments which we cannot shirk.

First of all: We see in the United Nations Organization our great hope for the maintenance of world peace. But it cannot be effective unless it has the required force to back up its decisions. As a leading Nation in that organization we are committed to make a sizable contribution to its world police force. It must be strong or the forces which have brought on wars since the dawn of history will ignore it and embark upon paths of conquest once again.

Second, is the necessity for maintaining in conquered countries an army of occupation for some time to come. The forces of fascism are not dead. There is new evidence of this fact every day. If we are to stamp out those philosophies which support dictators and their dreams of ruling the world with an iron hand, we must keep troops in these countries. They must stay until the people are capable of self-government and the youth has been educated to respect the rights of free people and their desires to remain free.

Third, we must have a sufficient force to maintain our overseas garrisons in territories under American jurisdiction, so that our interests can be protected.

Fourth, and equal in importance to all the other listed, is the necessity for maintaining in the continental United States an Army to assure the security of the Nation. This involves the provision of a force to train our reserves and to assist the National Guard in its training program, and the constant training and modernizing of our Regular Army.

This is our task and we are committed to its accomplishment. But we of the Army are only public servants. The Army, like any other instrumentality of the Government, belongs to the people. The Nation belongs to the 142,000,000 people who comprise its population.

Every man, woman, and child who loves this country must be as interested in keeping it free, and in guaranteeing the American way of life, as the soldiers who fight to preserve the priceless heritage of freedom.

History proves that national security is essential in perpetuating the democratic way of life. An armed force adequate to protect us from any aggressor is the only sure way of guaranteeing national security.

In closing I would like to repeat a statement made by Gen. George C. Marshall, our wartime Chief of Staff, on October 29, last year.

He said:

"As late as 1937 we might have convinced the Axis gangsters of the complete futility of their preparations by simply matching our cigarette money—using the term figuratively—with expenditures on national security.

"I sincerely believe that if we had given security its proper attention, the Axis nations would not have started the war. Millions of men and women—Europeans, Asiatics, and Americans—who perished in battle, or by disease, starvation, and brutality in the past 5 years might be alive today had we faced the world in righteous strength instead of careless weakness. The enemy counted on us to go ahead with our pleasures, ignoring the threat to our lives and our very freedom. We proved them wrong but in the end it cost us a million casualties and astronomical sums of money to restore our security and rightful position in the world. Had we not had allies to buy us time, our own efforts, great as they finally were, might easily have been too late."

Whose Coal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Whose Coal?" from the last issue of the United States News by David Lawrence, the editor.

I wish every Member of the House and Senate would read this editorial, and wish further that everyone in this country who is interested in coal and in the struggle between the miners and the operators could read it. No one can say that Mr. David Lawrence is pro this or that. In writing this article, he was not swayed by emotion but recites the facts with the cold logic of one who has studied the problem thoroughly and knows something of its background. How different is Mr. Lawrence's reasonable approach to the problem from that of the editorial writers in the large newspapers and magazines who apparently know nothing about the social and economic aspects of the coal industry.

WHOSE COAL?

(By David Lawrence)

PUBLIC AND MINERS AS WELL AS OWNERS HAVE RIGHT TO FAIR RETURN FROM THE NATION'S COAL MINES—LEWIS CONTINUES FIGHT FOR BETTERMENT OF WORKERS' CONDITIONS WHICH HAS BEEN GOING ON FOR MANY YEARS

America has been in an irritable mood because of the coal strike.

Almost everybody has been blaming one man—John L. Lewis—or else the unions and their power to shut off the Nation's fuel supply.

But is it as simple as that? Is it really a matter of one man's personality or even the bargaining power of a Nation-wide union? We fall easily into the habit of personalizing our public issues and controversies.

Coal strikes have come periodically for many years. Always there is a shut-down or threat of it. Always there is a bitter controversy, and in the end the price of coal is raised, the public pays the bill, the underlying issues are left unsettled, and everybody forgets about them until the next strike is called. Commission after commission is appointed. President after President offers mediation and arbitration, but it is only through economic exhaustion of one side or the other that a compromise settlement is customarily compelled.

Surely this is not the way for an intelligent democracy to deal with the production of one of the most important of all its natural resources.

Whose coal is it that we burn?

The coal comes out of ground that has been bought and sold or inherited over the years. Ownership has been absolute. Until recently, an owner of a natural resource could pay whatever wages he wished and insist on whatever hours of work he pleased. Labor could take it or leave it.

Then came the unions. Their leaders fought an uphill struggle. Unionism has not been enlightened at all times nor has it been free from violence as a means of getting its demands accepted. But gradually over the years the chiefs of the miner's union have forced the pay scale up.

Lewis as a crusader

None of the leaders, however, has succeeded in achieving proper safety laws or a system of compensation for those maimed or killed in mine disasters. John L. Lewis, now at the peak of his career, sees this as his opportunity to do something that will immortalize him in the ranks of the 400,000 miners.

Is this ambition? Yes; perhaps. Is it something from which the leader will profit personally? Not at all. It is, in fact, the same urge that often comes to a crusader to do something lasting and beneficial for his fellow men, to do something lasting and beneficial for his fellow men even at the cost of abuse and ostracism.

But, you will say, Why can't all these things be done by conference or by peaceful negotiation? Why did Lewis refuse to talk about wage demands until the principle of the welfare fund was accepted by the operating managers? Why did he allow the mines to be shut down while the public health and economic life of the Nation are jeopardized through lack of fuel?

Miners' plight old story

These questions have been asked again and again in past years when serious strikes have occurred. There is only one tragic answer. It is the answer that has come through the ages when human beings rebel against their lot. Revolution against tyranny gave birth to this Republic. Stated in terms of the miners' strike, the answer is that by no other means except a strike that arouses and awakens the entire Nation do the miners' union and John L. Lewis get attention for the demands which they feel are necessary to the future welfare of the workers.

It isn't as if the issue were new. It has been up frequently. The plight of the miners didn't arise overnight. Men have gone down into the coal pits day after day for many years in America. They have lived in the darkness of the underground. With flickering lights in their caps, they have groped for hours every day to dig out coal. They have breathed the foul air of the mines. They have crawled in dampness and in dust. And many of them every year are trapped and crushed by a cave-in or by explosion due not always to improper use of explosives but to the unpredictable movements of a shaken earth. It is the most hazardous occupation in the world. Yet what of the families left behind when accidents come? What of the anxiety every day until the worker returns to his home?

All this the miner endures for a dollar an hour. In 1941 he worked a 7-hour day and 5 days a week and made $35 for his family. In wartime he worked 7 days and often as much as 54 hours a week. He got $63, but he worked hard for it.

The miners are tired. They produced in wartime by long hours the coal for the factories that built our armament for victory. Their leader says the strike gives them a needed rest and offers at the same time a chance to get a settlement on the matter of pay as well as a welfare fund.

Let us ask ourselves a question individually. How many of us would do a miner's work for $35 a week or for 54 hours at $63? How many of us would refuse to accept such employment at any price unless we were assured that our families would have adequate compensation if anything happened to us in the mines?

The safety laws of many of our States relating to mining inspection are a scandal. The situation in the awarding of compensation for injuries is no better.

Coal mining has become a national and not a State problem. The miners are organized nationally and so are the owners. The operating managers collect dues by the ton from their members, and by the terms of a special law of Congress they can add to the sales price the expenses of their associations or trade bodies. They can fix prices in peacetime without running up against the Sherman antitrust law. They have certain immunities granted to no other industry.

Whatever these expenses, the owners may add them all to their prices. They, for the most part, are not conducting their businesses at a loss. They are getting in most instances a "fair return." The public pays the bill, and the public must insist on a fair return to the miners, too. It is unfortunate that it takes a strike to bring out the issues.

A fight for welfare fund

Nationalization of the mines would be a confession of defeat on every side. The answer to every difficult problem is not to turn it over to the state. The Government must continue, of course, the intervention it has already begun in the coal industry, but it must see to it, by a system of regulation, that the miners and the owners do not damage the interests of the public.

It was argued by the operating managers that John Lewis had not been willing for weeks even to discuss wages and hours until the welfare fund was disposed of. The impression was broadcast that Lewis wanted a fund which he or the union could alone administer. Lewis took the position that he wouldn't discuss administration of the fund at all or anything else about it until the principle of the fund was accepted by the operators. This is not a desirable use of the collective-bargaining process, because all issues should be discussed from the outset. Yet it does indicate the extreme to which Lewis felt he had to go in order to get recognition of the principle.

Coal belongs to the people

Some solution whereby the Government administers the fund in an advisory capacity, together with operator and union representatives—as is done under the Railroad Retirement Act—could be worked out.

Almost everybody concedes that safety measures and an accident compensation plan are essential. It should not be difficult to reach a settlement provided the mine owners do not come to think that Government seizure wins a strike.

The President has been reluctant to seize the mines because of a brief that this might not persuade the miners to go back to work. He has known for some time that when the mines were seized he would have to assure the workers somehow that the principle they were asking for would be recognized. The Government had to propose a plan that would appeal to the miners as a possible solution. For when they go back to work in seized mines their leverage, of course, is gone. Their trust must be in the good faith of a Government which asked them to go back to work without a contract. The 2-week truce merely postpones but does not settle the issue.

The coal underground is needed by the American people. It belongs to them as much as it does to any group of owners.

Property rights are sacred only when those who hold them do not exploit or unduly burden their fellow men.

With ownership, as well as with labor, there must be a sense of responsibility. With Government there must be a sense of fairness, and always there must be good faith. The Government must act in behalf of the people and with justice and equity to all.

OPA Cannot Stop It—Face the Facts and Act Accordingly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when John Jones wants to build a home for his family he usually gets the materials that go into it regardless of price. When he wants food and clothing for that same family he gets it notwithstanding price. Call it all black-market operations if you will, but the fact remains that John Jones will not deny himself or his family those essentials so long as they are actually available, and they are. This country had a similar experience in the days of prohibition and eventually the situation was so ludicrous that the law was repealed because the cure was worse than the disease. So OPA will go the same way and for the same reasons.

Mr. Speaker, in support of my position, I include herein as part of my remarks a most interesting article, by my friend and able member of the Milwaukee Journal staff, who had occasion to investigate the situation in Wisconsin relating to the building situation. Members will find it an important contribution to the current discussion of OPA and the effort of its policies on the housing problem in my State:

LUMBER COSTS OPA PLUS WHISKY OR CANNED FRUIT

(By Frank Sinclair)

A bottle of whisky will get you a small quantity of lumber in some of the country lumber yards in the counties surrounding Milwaukee.

In addition, you'll have to pay the yard the Milwaukee delivered price for the lumber—paying the trucking fee to Milwaukee—but you'll do the hauling in your truck or hire a truck to do it for you.

These are ways to charge over OPA ceilings. But with lumber so scarce that the inventories in Milwaukee yards are only one-seventh of what they were before the war, the lumber user doesn't care if he pays double for hauling. It's the lumber he wants.

Whisky isn't the only lure. Nylons, crates of canned fruit, most any kind of merchandise, are just as good.

And you're not to ask questions about OPA ceilings. It's cash on the barrel head and don't bat an eye if the invoice is for an amount smaller than you pay. The seller wants his bills to indicate that he stays within OPA.

STARTED ON NEW STORE

A Milwaukee man started to put up a new store building before construction restrictions were tightened. He got the major portion of his lumber before the squeeze, but he still needed plywood and 2 by 4's for the interior. He couldn't get what he wanted in Milwaukee.

He visited seven rural yards looking for 57 sheets of 4 by 8-foot plywood and the 2 by 4's before he got them, some here, some there. In only one place was he charged within ceiling range. When he had gathered all his lumber, he figured he had paid 15 percent over ceiling—10 percent on the wood and $14.80, or another 5 percent, for four bottles of whisky.

"It was just a question of playing the game or getting no plywood or 2 by 4's," he said. "I caught on to the whisky idea as I went around. In one place they said they had nothing to sell. They told me that what was in sight had been sold. So I put a fifth of whisky on the counter when the man's back was turned and said nothing. When he saw the whisky I got some plywood right out of the lot that had been 'sold,' but they charged me the haulage to Milwaukee, although my truck was right outside. They said that their trucks were too busy."

On the 2 by 4's the store builder asked for select dressed (planed down) lumber. He paid for select, but half of what he got was rough and green and should have sold for less.

"I knew I paid over ceiling, but I wasn't quibbling and I didn't care," he said. "I had been delayed so long in opening my store I was desperate."

He said that a friend obtained lumber in the country on similar terms by "depositing" two crates of canned fruit and one of vegetables.

Such practices are black marketing. However, lumber dealers, contractors, carpenters, architects, real estate men, and the OPA say that there is not much black market in lumber in Milwaukee. They also say that regular customers get lumber at ceiling in country yards.

One yard here admitted that it charges for delivery on the job when the buyer hauls the

lumber from the yard. To some degree ceilings are violated by making short deliveries and charging for grades higher than delivered.

Lee K. Beznor, district OPA enforcement officer, said that there is short delivery and upgrading in his area, but how much he does not know. Such transactions are next to impossible to detect, he said.

HARD TO CATCH

"Even if we stationed an investigator at each job to check deliveries, I doubt if we could catch short delivery," Beznor said. "A yard might deliver 1,750 board feet with an invoice charging for 2,000, evading ceiling by charging for 250 feet that were not delivered. Our man could ask the truck driver, 'Where's the other 250 feet?' and he'd be told, 'That's coming with the next delivery.' As for grades of lumber, the lumber business is so technical with so many different grades that even a carpenter doesn't know, that it would be too difficult to prove that the grade delivered was not the grade invoiced."

Such factors make for loopholes in getting around OPA, Benzor admits.

There are rumors of black market transactions in lumber in Milwaukee, but more so in northern Wisconsin. However, the reputable yards that have been in business here for years are given a clean slate by those who should know.

The opportunity is ripe in Milwaukee for the black market to flower, however. The lumber yards have 86 percent less lumber now than at this time in 1941. Deliveries of lumber from the mills are only half of normal and not of the quality of prewar days. At one yard a 700-foot-long shed with a capacity for 1,500,000 board feet of lumber had only 10,000 feet in it on Thursday. That yard is nearly 60 freight carloads short of deliveries ordered from the mills.

The lumber that arrives here is in such demand that it hardly touches the ground to be checked before it is grabbed off and hauled away. Builders, contractors, farmers, line the sidetracks snatching for lumber as soon as a car pulls in. Three cars that came into one yard Tuesday were gone by Thursday.

"With a demand like that," one retailer commented, "every yard in Milwaukee that wanted to take the chance could get $110 for a thousand feet of No. 1 common dimension lumber—$34 over ceiling—but they won't do it."

Opportunity for black marketing here is obvious also because the demand for housing is such that upward of 1,000 more homes could have been built this year were the lumber available. And many of the people who are building are hounding the contractors to get the lumber anywhere "and forget the price."

Such practices as are thought to be going on in Milwaukee and vicinity are only shavings compared to what is happening in the forest country of the North, South and West. The lumber shortages here are the result of black markets at the source, or to OPA regulations that are so complicated that they invite the tricks of evasion, or to refusal of the lumber mills to sell until the Government gives them the price raises that they want. Increases granted last week on hemlock, pine and fir may bring more lumber here.

Dealers are "hopping mad" over their inability to get lumber to fill the greatest demands in the Nation's history for home building, according to Don Montgomery, Milwaukee, secretary of the Wisconsin Retail Lumber Dealers' Association.

Portable mills are operating in northern Wisconsin and Michigan and getting what they want for their lumber, according to Montgomery. Such mills got into black marketing in the South and their scheme is spreading northward and West.

The portable mill operator, according to reputable sources, buys a stand of timber from a farmer or other owner, paying whatever the farmer wants since there is no ceiling on such sales. The operators move a donkey engine in, fell the trees, make boards and two by fours of white pine, hemlock, jack pine and some hardwood. Then they pick up their machinery and move elsewhere.

SALES MADE AT MILL

Sales are reported being made at the portable mill with cash being passed under the table to cover the plus portion of ceiling evasion.

Some of these woodpecker mills claim that they are distibutors entitled to the higher distributor ceilings and collect it. OPA caught up with some of them and put them through the wringer, but lumbermen say the practice continues. Some of these mills are charging $12 a thousand feet over ceiling, it is reported.

Some portable mill operators load trucks with lumber, start them out on the highway and sell the lot wherever a buyer shows up. That's easy, for the lumber towns are overrun with dealers, contractors, and builders ready to pay any price. Even if the load sold for ceiling, cruising with lumber for sale is an OPA violation, although for years it was the practice of the big mills to start a freight car of lumber on the rails, call for bids by telegraph, and divert the car en route to the highest bidder. OPA put a ban on that practice.

Stories of phony deals to buy a mill to obtain its output at above ceiling are common in the trade. You own a mill and I want your production. I offer to buy your $50,000 mill for $75,000 a year from now if you will sell me all your output during the year at ceiling. I put up $5,000 earnest money, agreeing to forfeit it to you if I fail to purchase. At the end of the year, I decide I don't want your mill so you keep my $5,000. Who can say that I paid you $5,000 over ceiling for lumber since we signed papers to show that I was dickering for your mill?

SOLD IN NEW YORK

Another stunt is to pay a $1,000 deposit against future delivery and forget to ask for the return of the $1,000 when delivery is made. The mill thereby receives more than ceiling.

Overpayment on the side was confirmed by a Milwaukee lumber dealer on a trip to Oregon recently. He had heard that a Detroit dealer had rejected a chance to buy 500,000 feet of dressed lumber because the mill wanted $2,000 over ceiling in paper money. The Milwaukeean went to the mill, learned that the story not only was true but that the mill finally got $4,000 over OPA when it sold the lot.

In Arkansas, the Milwaukee dealer said he got the answer to why he has been unable to get oak flooring for houses that have been waiting for it since January and February. Some Arkansas mills are selling oak flooring for $33 a thousand feet over ceiling at the mill to New York State dealers who send trucks for it, he said.

The same dealer said that some Milwaukee contractors are sending trucks 200 to 300 miles north, paying over ceiling for lumber. The lumber then costs them slightly over retail price, but they feel they can afford it because they cannot get enough lumber in Milwaukee to fill their needs.

STARTS AT THE MILL

In Tennessee, it is reported, one way to get oak flooring is to bet $200 or so that the mill won't sell. One mill, so the story goes, turned down a $200 bet, commenting, "Try $400." But, naturally, the $400 had nothing to do with the price of the flooring, for it was billed at true ceiling.

Upgrading of lumber, requiring the consumer to pay more than he should, goes all the way back to the mills. Pacific coast fir has come here stamped by inspectors at grades which a Milwaukee dealer says are too high. The consumer pays the overprice and everybody is in the clear, because it would be difficult to prove misgrading.

Federal Government regulations are so complex that there are 42 pages of prices on one grade of one kind of wood and there are 15 species of wood. Such price lists invite evasion of restrictions, lumbermen say.

Lumber yards are particularly irked by several war-generated Federal rules that are still in existence although the original need for them has expired. During the war, to discourage the milling of lumber for houses, which was usually about 60% of the mill output, and to expand production of sizes for heavy construction needed by the armed forces, the ceilings were raised on timbers and on crating lumber. They remained lower on house lumber. It was recommended a year ago that timber and crating ceilings be lowered and the house-lumber production be encouraged. But today, the mills still get $12 a thousand more for green 2 by 8's, 12 by 12's, and so on, than they do for smaller, kiln-dried 2 by 4's, even though there is more milling and handling to the 2 by 4's and board lumber.

It would be considered logical that if a retail yard received 12 by 12's and made 2 by 4's out of them, it could charge for the ripping and dressing. But that's not always the case. If the yard asks the buyer whether he wants a 12 by 12 cut into 2 by 4's, it cannot charge for the work. But if the buyer asks the yard to cut it, the yard then may charge. And, though no one knows why, the ceiling on 2 by 4's is around 20 percent lower than on 12 by 12's, lumbermen say.

In some few cases, dressed lumber sells for a lower OPA ceiling than rough lumber. The retail yard that is delivered rough, green lumber, must pay more freight than for kiln-dried, dressed lumber because of the difference in weight. But the retailer must absorb the higher freight cost and he does if he is honest. That makes for a price evasion loophole, since business looks for a profit.

The high-class yards observe these quirks, but they then take care only of their long-time, good customers, and have no lumber for strangers. Such a condition makes it next to impossible for new arrivals in the building game to get lumber unless they patronize some form of black market, reputable firms comment.

Human Rights in a World Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very splendid address made by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] on May 10 of this year at the Hotel Commodore, New York, before the Committee of Catholics for Human Rights. The subject of this outstanding address was human rights in a world order.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends and honored guests, I am grateful for the opportunity to be with you today. I am especially glad that I am privileged to

bring you greetings from the President of the United States. Before leaving Washington the President asked me to extend to you in his name his appreciation and cordial good wishes for the contribution you are making to encourage the international development of safeguards and progressive standards for human rights.

It is a cause for deep satisfaction and hope to the members of the Committee of Catholics for Human Rights—and to men of good will throughout the world—and the Commission on Human Rights of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations has set its hand to the task of formulating an international bill of rights. That task, if successfully accomplished, may well prove to be one of the most significant achievements of our times.

Recognition of human rights, of the fundamental dignity and worth of the individual, is, I believe, one of the basic conditions of a world order. And only in a true world order will human rights achieve full recognition and the human spirit reach its full flowering.

The implementation of human rights is a task that will challenge the energies, and the inventive skill, of each new generation, as it has challenged each successive generation that has gone before us. Our judicial norms, our political instrumentalities, our economic organization, our social institutions, all play a part in safeguarding and forwarding or in undermining human rights.

But prior to the method is the goal. The first step in the achievement of human rights is the recognition that such rights exist; the second, a common understanding of what must be the scope and content of human rights in the modern world.

THE BASIC GOAL

Underlying all formulations of specific human rights is a guiding concept of the potentialities and the worth of the human spirit. With varying force this ideal has laid its hold on men in all ages. This ideal is the cornerstone of our Catholic faith. As Catholics, we have, therefore, a special obligation to see that this ideal becomes and remains a true motivating force for social and political action in our day. As Catholics, we have a special responsibility ever to translate and retranslate this guiding concept into broader and deeper understandings, until it infuses our whole outlook and our whole society.

We do not need to urge upon the Commission on Human Rights of the Social and Economic Council of the United Nations that they take a broad view of their tasks and their responsibilities. The composition of the Commission gives full assurance that the problems before it will not be approached narrowly or mechanistically. We do want to assure the members of that committee of our continuing support, and of our deep concern for the success of their efforts.

The Commission already has much to build upon in formulating a complete international bill of rights. The constitutions of most of the countries of the world recognize some of the basic rights of individuals. In the United States, the economic bill of rights proposed by President Roosevelt and President Truman to round out the political bill of rights in our Constitution, has received wide support. The American nations have taken important steps toward the development of a declaration of the international rights and duties of man. In the Atlantic Charter and in the Charter of the United Nations itself, there are guides to the formulation of a bill of rights for all peoples. And in our own country and throughout the world, private groups, of every faith, from every profession and walk of life, have worked and are working and thinking and formulating their own ideas as to the essential human rights. The peoples of the world are ready to welcome and eager to give meaning to a bill of rights that will express their common goals and aspirations.

THE CONTENT OF AN INTERNATIONAL BILL OF RIGHTS

I have no intention, today of setting forth my personal list of essential human rights. I have not yet reached for myself any final conclusions as to what such a list should contain in detail. I am sure what its general scope should be, and on that point, I want to make a few general observations.

Historically, the first rights of the individual to find common recognition and acceptance were what we now generally think of as civil rights. The right to worship according to the dictates of one's conscience, the right to think and speak freely, the right of assembly, the right to be free from arrest without cause, the right to a fair trial—I could expand the list still further, but I think it will be agreed that these are among the basic civil rights. Only through recognition of these rights can men live together in communities without violating the fundamental principle of respect for one another.

There is, of course, no sharp line of distinction between what I have called civil rights and any of the other essential human rights. Civil rights merge imperceptibly into political rights—the right to participate in one's Government, the right of free elections and again the rights of freedom of speech and assembly. With perhaps greater variation in the specific forms and methods by which they are implemented, the political rights provide the basis for men to act together, without undue domination one of another.

Finally, and much more recently, we have come to see that there are certain economic and social rights which must be realized if men are to work together, and together create the kind of community in which human beings can fulfill their maximum potentialities. The right to health and all that is needed for health—food, adequate housing, medical care, the right to employment—to participate in the creative work of the world and to earn a means of support for one's family; the right to an adequate wage and reasonable conditions of work; the right to freedom of enterprise; the right to security against loss of income from old age, sickness and disability, death, or unemployment; the right to an education; the right to pursue scientific truth; the right to enjoy recreation and to participate in the opportunities of the society in which one lives—these also, I believe, must find their place in our international bill of rights.

It is implicit in the concept of human rights that all of the essential rights must apply equally to human beings everywhere, without regard for race or color, sex, language, religion, or nationality.

There can be, however, and there will be endless variations in the way in which any of these rights are organized and implemented in different communities and among different peoples. As we learn to live together in a world order we shall need to sharpen our judgments and clarify our understanding to recognize the achievements and the denials of human rights in the varied patterns of community organization.

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

The implementation of human rights has always involved both negative and positive freedoms—freedom from and freedom for certain actions. On the one hand the state must abstain or see that others abstain from coercion, discrimination, oppression. On the other hand the state must do or see that others do whatever is necessary to effectuate the right to work, to health, to education. I would not press this distinction too far. In order to see that others abstain from coercion, the state must take positive action. Freedom of speech means not only freedom to speak one's opinion without danger of arrest or molestation; it means also, in our day, free access to the means of communication and positive action by government to prevent antisocial monopoly and to assure the availability of media of communication.

Nevertheless, I think it is clear that the implementation of the essential economic and social rights requires in our modern world a more sustained cooperative effort and a more affirmative, far-reaching and flexible use of government than has been necessary for the implementation of the basic civil rights. The great challenge of our times is to find ways of assuring human beings everywhere that freedom and opportunity which modern science and technology have made possible, without jeopardizing those older civil and political freedoms which we have labored and sacrificed so hard to win. Without underestimating the difficulties and obstacles to be overcome, I have faith that mankind can meet that challenge. Of one thing I am increasingly sure—if we do not give reality to the economic and social rights of man, our civil and political freedoms will also be lost.

There is evidence that the people everywhere are ready, increasingly, to use their governments as cooperative undertakings, whose function is to make it possible for the individual members to work together for their mutual good. The ways in which people work together will never be uniform throughout the world, or from one time to another or for all purposes within one country and one decade.

I hope you will pardon me for drawing on my own experience for illustration of some of the issues and problems which are involved. During the past several years, I have had the privilege of working actively for several different measures which I believe are essential to the economic rights of the American people. I have in mind, particularly, the full employment program, the national health program, and the program for regional development through the Missouri Valley Authority. Each of these programs calls for the development of new methods of working together toward a high and expanding level of national well-being. Each has been severely attacked as involving excessive bureaucracy and Government control—attacked by those who do not want to see any change in the existing order of things. To each of these programs has come increasing support from the people when they understood the positive goals and objectives of the measures.

In the Employment Act of 1946 the United States Government for the first time accepted responsibility for the maintenance of a high level of employment and the full utilization of our resources in the interests of all the people. In the annual economic report of the President to Congress, the act sets up a mechanism by which the general goal of full employment can be translated into more specific goals and by which our actual progress toward the general and the specific goals can be evaluated and brought to the attention of the Congress and of the American people. The establishment of a joint committee of Congress to consider this report is a tremendous contribution to the improved organization and operation of Congress. The Employment Act was adopted as the policy of our Government because the people made clear their support for positive and constructive cooperative action for the general welfare.

The national health program set forth by President Truman last November and expressed in legislative form by the National Health Act, S. 1606, which Senator WAGNER and I introduced in the Senate and which Representative DINGELL introduced in the House, rests firmly for its justification on the conviction that the right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and

enjoy good health are among the essential rights which ought to be assured to every American citizen. I am persuaded that the only effective method of assuring such rights is through national action. Our bill proposes all necessary Federal financial aid to the States to strengthen and improve existing community-wide State and local public-health measures, programs for the care of mothers, children, and needy persons, and provision for prepayment of the costs of personal health services through the expansion of our present national old-age and survivors' insurance system.

The nature of the misrepresentations and false statements that have been made about our bill by the most vociferous of its opponents is instructive. They are all designed to play upon the fears—the legitimate fears—of too much Government control, of that kind of governmental interference against which the older Bill of Rights attempts to protect us. Much of the argument rests on nothing more than name calling, labeling the program socialistic or communistic. Much is based on outright misrepresentation and misreading of the bill.

Health insurance is primarily a method of paying for medical care, drawing on the resources of all workers and of the entire community to pay for medical care for those who need it. Under health insurance the responsibility for medical practice continues to remain essentially with the medical profession. The individual doctors will decide whether or not to participate under the insurance system, and if they do participate, what hours they will keep, whether they should work as individuals or in groups, the method by which they want to be paid, and, above all, they will decide the nature of the medical advice and treatment they give their patients.

Health insurance is an excellent example of the freedom that can be achieved only when the people work together through their Government. All too many of our people today go without needed medical care because they do not have the means to pay and will not accept or cannot get charity, or because they live in communities that lack hospitals, and laboratories and doctors. A national health insurance program would, for the first time, bring to millions of people access to adequate modern medical care; it would bring to all our people freedom from the crushing financial burden of medical costs and the fear of such costs.

I would be the first to urge that in setting up a national health insurance system, we incorporate every possible safeguard against arbitrary use of power by the administrators of the program. I think our bill does contain adequate safeguards, principally in the clearly specified guiding principles and policies for administration, and in the provisions for strong advisory councils at every level of administration. Senator WAGNER and I have from the beginning indicated our willingness to consider all constructive suggestions to further improve the program or to safeguard the accomplishment of its purposes. But we stand firm against any proposals that would jeopardize the larger freedom—the freedom of the American people to have access to adequate medical care—through false respect for the outward forms of older freedoms or lip service to shibboleths.

AN INTERNATIONAL BILL OF RIGHTS

Let me come back, now, to the question that immediately concerns us today—an international bill of rights. Why is the development of such a charter so important? Why is it worthy—as I believe it is—of the most careful and earnest attention of the leaders of thought in every country?

If the peoples of the world are to draw closer together and not again be torn apart in suicidal war, they must have a common goal, a common set of basic values. It is not essential that we all move toward that goal in the same way or by the same methods; it is not essential that we all place the same relative weight on particular values. But no community—whether it be local or world-wide—can exist without the binding force of some common understanding of purposes and goals.

An international bill of human rights can state the aspirations of the peoples of the world in a way which makes clear their unity of basic purpose. By including within its scope all the essential human rights, such an international charter can strengthen the resolve of the people of all nations to act affirmatively and constructively to achieve their goals. It would be my further hope that all or parts of such a bill of rights would be incorporated immediately in the constitutions of all the nations, and implemented by national action. Some might be immediately embodied in conventions which would have the force of international law. What further international sanctions should and can now be given to the United Nations to see that the essential rights of man are in fact assured to all men is a question on which we do not need to agree at this time.

I am sure none of us is so complacent as to assume that the mere enunciation of an international bill of rights will bring those rights into effect. Perhaps the ideal toward which such a bill of rights would point can never be perfectly attained. The challenge of the ideal will nevertheless be there to inspire the constant efforts which are necessary even to approach the goal.

We in this country are well aware that our own bill of rights has never been fully applied. Yet I think no one would question that it has been not only a guide, but an effective instrument in our efforts to achieve a society of freemen. I personally hope that an international bill of rights will in time become the basis for international law. Whether or not it can do so—whether or not we can achieve a stable world order—may depend on the brightness and the compelling power of the goals which a bill of human rights sets for mankind.

The Take-It-Easy Program for Accident Prevention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on Monday the 13th of May there was inaugurated a campaign called the take-it-easy campaign, calculated to bring about safety in traffic in the United States. In connection with that program the President received a letter from Mr. Lou E. Holland, chairman of the traffic safety committee of the American Automobile Association, to which the President made a reply. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Mr. Holland to the President and the President's reply, together with a communication by Mr. Russel E. Singer, general manager of the American Automobile Association, on the same subject, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1946.

President Truman heartily endorses Take It Easy program. Copy of his letter enclosed.

With our Take It Easy program scheduled to be launched on Monday, May 13, we are now happy to inform you that President Truman has given his hearty approval to the activity to be jointly sponsored by the American Automobile Association and its affiliated clubs.

Said the President:

"I most heartily commend the objectives of your Take It Easy traffic safety program. It is well designed to focus attention on the importance of the responsibility of the individual. Your organization is setting an example and setting a goal for its members which could be widely followed, and with great profit to the cause of safety with which we are all so gravely concerned at this time."

President Truman's letter endorsing the program will be released for national publicity on Monday, so while we want you to have it, we strongly caution you not to make it public before that time.

The President's letter, under date of May 9, was in answer to one addressed to him by Mr. Lou Holland, chairman of the AAA traffic safety committee. Copies of both letters are enclosed herewith.

RUSSELL E. SINGER,
General Manager.

AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1946.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Ever since traffic accidents began an upward course following removal of driving restrictions several months ago, the American Automobile Association has been studying ways and means of meeting this problem, with particular emphasis on implementing and energizing recommendations and proposals that will result from the President's Highway Safety Conference you have called to meet here in Washington, May 8, 9, and 10.

As chairman of the AAA's Traffic Safety Committee, it gives me pleasure to report to you that on May 13 next, the AAA and its affiliated motor clubs throughout the country will launch a special intensive and coordinated safety effort. This will be over and above the regular traffic and safety activities carried on by this organization.

Using as its theme the parting salutation so popular in the armed services—Take It Easy—the AAA's program is designed to mobilize its one-and-a-half million members under the banner of traffic safety, and to carry a message stressing the need for individual cooperation to every man and woman who drives or walks in the traffic lanes. Without such individual cooperation, no safety program, however soundly conceived, can produce the desired results. Our facilities are such that we can carry this message down to the crossroads and grass roots of America.

As a cooperative enterprise on the part of automobile clubs throughout the land, we are hopeful that it will prove to be an effective implementation of the techniques and procedures to be worked out at the forthcoming conference and that it will be a major contribution toward the great goal of saving lives and property on the Nation's streets and highways.

Yours very sincerely,

LOU E. HOLLAND,
Chairman, Traffic Safety Committee.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
May 9, 1946.

Mr. LOU E. HOLLAND,
Chairman, Traffic Safety Committee,
American Automobile Association,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOLLAND: It is encouraging to have your letter of April 18. The American Automobile Association can have a far-reaching influence in implementing and energizing the recommendations and proposals that will come out of the President's Highway Safety Conference, the sessions of which are being currently held in Washington.

What we must have is Nation-wide cooperation in an intensive and coordinated safety effort. The fact that the American Automobile Association and its affiliated clubs are launching such a campaign immediately following the conference, over and above your regular traffic and safety activities, augurs well for the success of the effort.

I most heartily commend the objectives of your Take It Easy traffic safety program. It is well designed to focus attention on the importance of the responsibility of the individual. Your organization is setting an example and setting a goal for its members which could be widely followed, and with great profit to the cause of safety with which we are all so gravely concerned at this time.

Very sincerly yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 17 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Seaway Opponent Is Far From the Truth," from the Detroit News of May 10, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEAWAY OPPONENT IS FAR FROM THE TRUTH

Tom McGrath, hired spokesman of an organization opposing the St. Lawrence Seaway, said in a debate before the Detroit Engineering Society:

"Advocates of the project paint far too rosy a picture of the good it will do and far too little of the harm."

This of a project that would open the Great Lakes to ocean shipping and make of their shores, in effect, a fourth American seacoast.

The picture is rosy enough, in truth, that seven successive Presidents of the United States have urged the project to Congress, being fully advised by repeated economic surveys of what it means to America.

Mr. McGrath's picturing it as something novel, which has been sprung on an unsuspecting country, is typical of the propaganda technique, throughout, of its opponents. This has been similar to the Hitler technique of the big lie. The interests fighting the seaway have adopted the technique of the many big lies.

He went on to say:

"The channel will be much too narrow for the fleets of merchant ships we are told will sail into the Great Lakes."

The truth is that most of the channel will be open water, no more difficult to navigate than the oceans. The channels nowhere will be narrower than present Great Lakes channels, which carry, year after year, more commerce than the total sea-borne foreign commerce of the whole United States.

Mr. McGrath said:

"We are told about how it will benefit the agricultural interests by furnishing cheap transportation for the export of grains. But actually, in recent years, not more than one-half of 1 percent of American wheat was exported at all."

In picking his recent years, Mr. McGrath, it happens, chose war years, when grain, if shipped at all, was shipped as flour to save cargo space. In the five prewar years exports averaged 8 percent of the American crop, which was enough, apart from Government subsidies, to fix the price of the crop.

The truth about the seaway is wonderful. The lies circulated by the interests that fight it are, in their way, almost more so.

Townsend Plan the Great Emancipator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution which was adopted by the District Townsend Convention held in East St. Louis recently:

TOWNSEND PLAN THE GREAT EMANCIPATOR

District Townsend Convention held in East St. Louis, Sunday, May 12, 1946, Odd Fellows Hall, St. Louis Avenue and Seventh Street; at such meeting the following resolution was presented:

"Whereas our Nation is now undergoing an unprecedented experience, all because—as we believe—the result of a conflict between capital and labor, strikes, lock-outs, ill-will, selfishness, and greed; last but not least, lack of purchasing power by the common people, the Townsend plan will prove the great emancipator; President Abraham Lincoln in September 1862, while the Civil War was on, issued his great Emancipation Proclamation which made free American citizens of 3,000,000 slaves. What rejoicing? When our Congress passes the two Townsend bills (H. R. 2229 and 2230) 1,000,000, approximately, aged men and women who are now in poor houses, Maine to California, will be emancipated, and will be enabled to live in homes of their own. What rejoicing? The millions—aged—now living—trying to live—on the small pension of the social security and State old-age allowance will also be emancipated. The millions who are or will be unemployed—because of machines—will likewise be emancipated from unemployment because the Townsend plan will retire workers at 60, thus enabling workers under 60 to have employment.

"*Resolved*, That the very day that Congress puts the Townsend plan into effect and is approved by the President that Dr. Francis E. Townsend issue his emancipation proclamation and send it broadcast throughout the Nation, and call upon Townsendites everywhere to consider it a day of jubilee and have celebrations, preferably in churches, making it not only a day of jubilation but a Townsend thanksgiving day.

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be spread upon our records and the president-secretary send a copy to President Harry Truman, Senator Scott W. Lucas, Senator C. Wayland Brooks, Congresswoman at Large Emily Taft Douglas, and Congressman Melvin Price, all of Washington, D. C.

"Respectfully submitted.

FRANK C. SMITH."

The foregoing resolution was presented, read, and on motion, duly adopted by a unanimous and rising vote, this 12th day of May, 1946.

J. A. WHITTEN,
President.
E. L. LURTZ,
Vice President.
JAMES W. REDFEARN,
Secretary.
W. C. WITTLICH,
Treasurer.

Floundering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, our citizens have worked hard during the war years. They were willing to deny themselves the luxuries and to skimp and sacrifice. Now it seems times are tighter than ever on the common man. The wealthy can buy in the black market while the average person is forced either to pay excessive black market prices or do without.

While New Dealers expend millions for propaganda telling the people how many more dollars they have in 1946 as compared with some other year, still we are confused and dissatisfied. The farmer protests because he cannot convert money, if he has any, into sorely needed machinery, hire an extra hand at a reasonable price, or buy corn or other feed for poultry, pigs, lambs, calves, and so forth. He is unable to plan ahead because he never knows what new policy the Government may announce. Thus because of uncertainty of future profits, he curtails production.

The wage earner protests the ill effects of unsound economic practices by striking. He is getting more money than ever before, but he, too, cannot convert it into the things he wants and needs. The high wages will not buy the clothing, food, and shelter for self and family. So while he strikes for more money, really this is only his way of remonstrating against the effects of inflation. He has a right so to do either individually or collectively.

The point I am trying to make is that once having issued too much bogus money, as we attempt to do the impossible by trying to borrow and spend our way to prosperity, we must now put the blame where it belongs rather than call each other such bad names as "selfish," "greedy," "royalists," and so forth. Labor legislation regulating strikes is needed and long overdue, but it alone will not prevent strikes. More important is to correct our principal sin, that of continuing to feed inflation by spending more than we take in. The spendthrift administration plus artificially created

shortages and strangulation of production under the guise of price control constitute the real menace and the chief source of trouble. Until we stop these unsound economic practices and adopt an economy of abundance rather than one of scarcity, there will be continued social dissensions. We may expect strikes and more strikes even to the extent of stagnation and paralysis until we return to gold wages instead of watered wages for our workingmen.

Would we not be wise to face the issue frankly and opening, candidly admitting that due to unsound financing over the years we have brought upon ourselves dreaded inflation. Unless we can agree at this point in our thinking, I am afraid the whole affair will have to run its course. To rely upon governmental artificialities and surface remedies may cause us to miss the boat. With such floundering rational solution could be only accidental.

Amendment of the Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERKELEY L. BUNKER
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 1362, amending the Railroad Retirement Act, has been before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for many long months. Several days ago the Members began to get apprehensive about the outcome of this legislation. With this session of Congress drawing to a close, little time was left for action.

My good friend, the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] filed a petition on the Speaker's desk to discharge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from further consideration of the bill. Two hundred and eighteen Members of the House signed the petition.

Last week the committee reported out a much revised and amended version of H. R. 1362. The bill the committee reported out is not satisfactory to railroad labor, nor to many Members of the House of Representatives.

It is reasonable to believe that an attempt will be made to substitute the committee revised bill for H. R. 1362. When this attempt is made on the floor, I hope Members of the House will rally to the support of our distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], who has led the fight for this important legislation, vote down the committee bill and the committee amendments, then pass H. R. 1362 as sponsored by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, and approved by the Railway Labor Executive Association.

This legislation is long overdue. The railroad employees of America are entitled to a liberalization of the Railroad Retirement Act.

The Law and Mr. Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, is any group in this country greater than the Government? We are witnessing strange events these days. When it is possible for groups, singly or in concert, to stop the business life in this country and go unchallenged, it is time that something was done about it. Friends of labor are alarmed about our national situation. We profess that we have the power and ability to save the world, yet we cannot save ourselves. Before we can exercise world leadership it will be necessary to put our own house in order.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I include an editorial that appeared in the Washington Post for May 15:

THE LAW AND MR. LEWIS

It is clear from the examples of Messrs. Lewis and Petrillo, in whose company Mr. Whitney may soon be found, that our union satraps have it in their power to hold the Nation up to ransom and are not above using it. This is a revolutionary development. And the issue must soon be faced by Congress unless it wishes to recognize rival governments by default. In the meantime, the search for powers to check these manifestations of governmental usurpation is engaging men who feel that our basic institutions are imperiled by the new development. A clue may possibly be found in Mr. Lewis' hurried declaration of a 12-day truce on the very heels of Mr. Hannegan's embargo on parcel-post shipments. "No contract, no work," has hitherto been the miners' slogan. Yet Mr. Lewis has sent them back to work while he is negotiating a contract, and the action is so unlike him that one feels justified in thinking that the Hannegan step was responsible for it.

To have been adjudged responsible for the embargo on parcel-post shipments would have brought Mr. Lewis within the pale of the law on the grounds of interference with the mails. We don't know, however, whether any such case could be sustained. But the pertinent statute may be cited. Section 324 of the Criminal Code says that "whoever shall knowingly and willfully obstruct or retard passage of mail" is criminally liable. To be sure, Mr. Lewis could have pleaded that "knowingly or willfully" could not be applied to him. What he had done was within the law, and interference with the mails was only an incidental consequence of it.

"Incidental," however, does not gibe with common sense. Back on April 1 Mr. Lewis knew that interference would be the inevitable consequence of his walk-out, and that, whether or no such an interference was actionable as interference, it must have led to some action against him or his cause by a government which is specifically charged with the duty of keeping the highways of interstate commerce free from obstruction.

Maybe the Government would have chosen the path of injunction in trying to perform this duty. Injunctions in the same cause have been issued before, though they antedate the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which subjected the injunction process in labor disputes to restriction. But the Norris-LaGuardia Act is not a model of explicitness. Accordingly the old cases have an interest which has been revived by the Lewis holdup. In 1919, for instance, there was the case of the United States against Hayes, in which specified officers of the United Mine Workers were ordered not to distribute strike benefits to mine workers in the bituminous coal fields. No opinion was written, but writers on the law have held that the courts were within their power on several grounds, one of which was the need to safeguard Federal property rights in the mails, which had been incidentally interfered with in the situation producing the injunction. Of course, the law itself has been shown to be deficient in coping with the power-drunk dictators in our midst, with their arrogation to themselves of powers of government, including, recently the power to tax. This is an issue that waits at the door of Congress.

Congress and Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an editorial appearing in the New York Times on Friday, April 19, 1946:

CONGRESS AND PRICE CONTROL

It would be naive to suppose that the amendments piled on so lavishly by the House of Representatives in extending price control were all well considered. But most of them, if not right in detail, were right in principle. Price control is at best a secondary and transitional weapon against inflation. It has in many cases already outlived its usefulness. It deals with the symptoms and consequences of inflation, not with its causes.

Those who have been in direct control of OPA have failed to recognize this fact. They have talked and acted as if price control were the central or sole method of combating inflation. They have failed to recognize its obvious effects in intensifying or prolonging shortages. They have failed to see any danger to a free economy in placing the fate of every industry and firm at the mercy of administrative decision.

They failed utterly to acknowledge that the whole problem they had to solve changed completely last August, when Japan capitulated. It was then no longer necessary to restrict and discourage civilian production but, on the contrary, to speed as rapidly as possible a reconversion to civilian output. But the official price controllers continued to put more emphasis on prices than on production. They failed to recognize that the time had come to taper off price control in an orderly manner. They professed, it is true, not to wish to continue price control "a day longer than was necessary." They promised to remove controls "as soon as supply comes into balance with demand." But they forgot that supply comes into balance with demand only at a price, and that it was within the power of OPA under this formula to perpetuate the supposed need for itself.

They failed, in short, to give Congress any clear standards for decontrol. On the contrary, the President and Mr. Bowles asked for the extension of OPA for another year "without amendment." When it became clear that Congress could not in peacetime

reasonably be expected to give the Executive the same blanket powers over prices and wages that were embodied in the wartime stabilization acts, this was changed to a request to extend price control "without crippling amendments." But so far as OPA was concerned this second phrase seemed to mean the same as the first; for that agency objected to every amendment proposed to limit or taper off its purely discretionary powers.

Congress was therefore compelled to draft tapering-off amendments without guidance from OPA. It could hardly be expected to do a perfect job. Indeed, in this particular task, it may be doubted whether any such thing as a perfect job is even theoretically conceivable. But if some of the House's main amendments are dubious in detail, they are nonetheless right in principle. There is a psychological advantage, for example, in extending OPA for only 9 months, instead of for another full year. It puts OPA more clearly on notice that it cannot expect an indefinite series of annual renewals and that it had better prepare this time for its own liquidation.

The House was right, again, in seeking to taper off the subsidy program, beginning immediately. The method it proposes may not be the best one possible, but the House was right in sensing the dangerous and inflationary nature of subsidies, which OPA authorities have been expanding instead of contracting. The House may not have the perfect formula, once more, in requiring OPA to lift price ceilings from a commodity when its annual production rate equals that from July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941. But some definite, reasonably attainable standard for releasing controls automatically from one commodity after another had to be found; experience showed that Congress could not rely on mere administrative discretion. It is not easy to see, finally, how the amendment that OPA must price goods to yield cost plus a reasonable profit will work out; but the OPA's own formula has been in many cases so inflexible and indifferent to producers' problems that some congressional compulsion on OPA to act more liberally was thought necessary.

The Senate, let us hope, will consider these problems more carefully, to see whether better criteria for liberalization and termination of price control can be evolved. But when Congress does this, it must remember that it is more necessary than ever to deal with the real causes of inflation. Its first task in that direction must be to curb expenditures, to bring deficit financing to an end, and to stop the further increase of money and bank credit.

It's Up to the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress we cannot escape our responsibility in the present crisis. The initiative, however, rests with the majority party. The House passed the Case bill in February of this year, but it has been ignored by the other body until this week. It has required a great national emergency to get it to act.

As part of my remarks, I wish to insert an editorial by Mr. Mason Dobson, editor of the Beloit Daily News, which appeared in his paper on May 4, 1946. It is to the point, Mr. Speaker.

One hundred and forty million Americans are having their noses tweaked daily, or oftener, by John Llewellyn Lewis and Caesar James Petrillo and sundry other pompous blatherskites—and nothing gets done about it. Not a thing.

Nothing is done to curb Lewis and Petrillo and their kind because there isn't enough courage in Washington to curb a pipsqueak. No one, apparently, from Truman down to the cringiest Congressman, has the sort of courage that is required.

Washington has been blamed for a lot that is not Washington's fault. But Lewis and Petrillo and their ilk are Washington's fault. They are Washington's creatures and they will continue to degrade the national scene until Washington contrives enough courage and decency to curb their fantastic dictatorships.

It was political greed—the insatiable hunger for votes that writes a lot of Federal legislation—that gave Lewis and Petrillo their power. It is political cowardice that fears to cut their claws.

Under the laws that political greed wrote into the statutes, Lewis and Petrillo have more power than it is safe in a democracy for any man to have. A Lewis can dim the lights of great cities and the broad countryside. He can close factories and stores, stop railroads, endanger the safety of millions of people. His power is the power of a dictator. He can be ruthless. And the people are helpless.

The people are helpless, at least, while we have in Washington, administrators and legislators so spineless and so timid that they let Lewis go his cruel way without hindrance.

Under the laws that political greed wrote, a Petrillo can decree that no musician can work in television—which is the same as saying there can be no television—until Caesar himself gives the word.

It is fanatic power which the Wagner Act has given the labor leader to abuse if he wishes to abuse it. There are enough abuses of this power to alarm the stoutest friend of labor, if only such friends will see the handwriting on the wall. Until more sensible leaders than Lewis and Petrillo themselves demand that the power which a Lewis and a Petrillo abuse is curtailed, responsible labor leaders and responsible labor organizations are in danger.

The whole effort of a great nation to convert its economy to peacetime plenty and peacetime usefulness ought not to be menaced by a John L. Lewis. It is so menaced today. It will be so menaced any time Mr. Lewis takes it into his head to do so.

Petrillo is an even more fantastic figure. This Mussolini of music is simply too fantastic to be understood in a democracy. It has taken a special act of Congress to clip him—but even then Congress had not the courage to change the basic law which tolerates the Lewises and the Petrillos. Congress was even more fantastic clipping Petrillo than Mr. Petrillo is himself.

It is, of course, gluttony for votes—hunger for reelection—that makes Congress such a sorry spectacle. While Congressmen are scared stiff of blustering fellows like Lewis and Petrillo there will be little chance for improvement. The present Congress and the present administration seem to be on the down escalator to a record low of political courage and public service.

And that, in a democracy, is our fault. We sent the Congressmen to Washington. Doing so, we demonstrated the caliber of our selective ability.

Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. GIBSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] has recently attacked the Un-American Activities Committee because the Reverend Harvey Springer, of Englewood, Colo., recently appeared in Washington. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] may not know that the Reverend Springer appeared with some 60,000 letters written in behalf of one of his associates who was forced off the air in Knoxville, Tenn., by a radio station controlled by the Scripps-Howard newspapers. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN], during his attack upon the committee, did not say that the Reverend Springer's church in Englewood, Colo., had been picketed by the Communists in that city and that handbills advocating the abolition of free enterprise were distributed by the Communists after the church services had closed for the evening.

Mr. KLEIN also failed to mention that at a meeting held on the campus of the University of Denver, a foreign-born Communist agitator named Kurt Singer advocated that certain American citizens be hung and that the Reverend Springer should be one of them. Mr. KLEIN did not mention that this Communist agitator also said that the merchants who attended the Reverend Springer's church should be boycotted. Mr. KLEIN did not mention that this agitator told the war veterans attending the meeting that they would not fight in a war against Russia. Mr. KLEIN did not say that some violence resulted because the Communists picketed the Reverend Springer's church and that two Communists were fined by an American court because of the near riot which they tried to bring about.

Mr. KLEIN also failed to say that one of the Reverend Springer's associates in the Baptist church at Gadsden, Ala., was recently fired upon by an unknown assailant while he was reading the Bible in his study.

Mr. KLEIN did not say that his recent opponent for election to this House, Johannes Steele, is writing for a newspaper called Challenge, which is being published in Denver, Colo., near Englewood. Mr. KLEIN in this connection may not know that because the leader of a labor union in Englewood, Colo., refused to recommend this paper to his union followers the Communist Party of Englewood, Colo., picketed a manufacturing plant in that city and distributed pamphlets which advocated that the workers take over the factory and replace the Government of the United States with a communistic government. Some more violence resulted because of this.

This paper, Challenge, has as one of its featured writers, Virginia Gardner of the Daily Worker and the New Masses, both communistic newspapers and admittedly so. Challenge also has William Patterson as one of its featured writers. Patterson has a communistic record a mile long and has been a candidate for public office on the Communist Party ticket. Mr. HUGH DE LACY, who, like Mr. KLEIN, has attacked the Un-American Activities Committee, also writes for this paper.

The Un-American Activities Committee was not merely interested in the case of Reverend Springer and the Communists who picketed his church. It is interested in these attempts of the Communists all over the United States to create violence and terror among the Christian worshipers and workers of America.

It seems that the time for action has come when the American Communists can freely attempt to tell the workers of America what newspapers should be read by them and what church they should or should not attend. In Englewood, Colo., the Communists have picketed a church and advocated that its members be boycotted. In the same town they have picketed a manufacturing plant and advocated that the factory as well as the government be taken over by the workers under communistic influence. In Alabama, they have tried to assassinate a preacher of the gospel. In Tennessee, the right to hear God's word over the air waves has been denied to 60,000 followers of a minister they want to hear mainly because he has courage enough to attack the Communists.

The Un-American Activities Committee feels justified in listening to anyone who has any evidence concerning the Communist conspiracy that is approaching a climax within the borders of the United States. This also applies to any other group advocating a change in our system of government with or without violence.

There are those of you who have said that the Reverend Springer is anti-Semitic. The PM newspaper said he was anti-Semitic and anticommunistic. However, the Reverend Springer could not be very anti-Semitic, because on the night his church was picketed by the Communists the Reverend Jacob Rosenthal delivered the principal sermon in the Englewood Baptist Tabernacle.

This should show you how the opponents of this committee can either get the facts mixed up or purposely leave out enough of the facts to totally distort the truth.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAN R. McGEHEE
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, under the conditions prevailing today throughout the world and especially in this great country of ours, it behooves each and every one to become an emissary and constantly call attention to our citizenry the most important duty which we owe to our country, that is, the living, teaching, and preservation of Americanism.

Too many of our people are falling for other isms—liberalism, New Dealism, and isms which are far afield from Americanism. Many of our citizens, in my opinion, are being swayed by the unsettled conditions which are prevailing.

Mr. Speaker, there is one great American, whether he is devoting his entire time and energy as a good soldier in political affairs or whether he is devoting his time and talent to the strenuous activities of his business career, he accepts every opportunity, regardless of those duties, to travel the length and breadth of this country spreading the good teachings of Americanism. He never fails to accept the call nor does he let an opportunity pass that he does not sound the clarion call for all to gather around the banner of true Americanism.

That man whom I refer to is James A. Farley, former chairman of the National Democratic Committee, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a tribute paid to him by Oscar Vogl which appeared in the March issue of the National Food Distributors Journal.

A FANFARE FOR JAMES A. FARLEY
(By Oscar Vogl)

It has been said that a statesman is a politician who has died. The habit of criticizing men in public life and eulogizing them in their obituary is universal. With a greater appreciation of the American way, brought about through the war, there may also come a finer understanding of the men who sacrifice monetary gains in order to serve their country and their fellow men.

Among the ones thus classified, James A. Farley deserves a high rating. Throughout his career of a self-made business executive, working up the hard way, he never neglected his duties as a citizen. From town clerk of a New York State village to a Cabinet post, he marched step by step up the ladder of business and politics. He has the rare gift of not only training and coaching men for higher posts, but the far more valuable talent of picking the right men for the right places. Thus he became known as the president maker.

Those who worked with him during these trying days of the first F. D. R. campaign for President, remember him as a loyal, straightforward, tireless and encouraging coworker, not a boss. Yes, Jim Farley can call more men by their first names than any other living man of this age. What is more important, however, is that he can count on the support of more loyal friends than any other man. He just has what it takes to shoulder responsibilities, not cave in under them, and keep on smiling and plugging until his team wins.

One of his former superior officers, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, paid him one of the highest compliments when he said: "I have never heard Jim Farley speak derogatory of any man. Even when badly tried, the worst he would say about a mean opponent is: 'Well, his mother couldn't be very proud of him.'"

As head of one of the largest and world-famous corporations, Coca-Cola, he finds time to make speaking tours from coast to coast on his favorite subject, Americanism. Indeed he says: "There is only one ism for America—Americanism." He knows, because he keeps a tight finger on the pulse of American opinion. He knows what intolerance, bigotry and narrow-mindedness can do to a candidate, be he one for political office or a job in factory, store, or office.

We still have too many among us who cannot shake the herd instinct. So Sunny Jim goes on smiling and preaching the advantages of the American way in life and in his heart he hopes and prays that the day will come when the majority in these good old United States will honor and respect a man for what he is—not what lodge, creed, or country club he belongs to, or what side of the track his folks came from.

Yes, Jim Farley personifies and exemplifies the finest type of American citizenship. May he live long and keep strong to accomplish his mission.

Totalitarian World Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by E. F. Tompkins:

TOTALITARIAN WORLD TRADE
(By E. F. Tompkins)
II

Under the terms of the British loan agreement, and the official interpretations that have been put upon it, the "International Trade Organization" that is to be established will, in conjunction with the Bretton Woods monetary institutions, subject all enterprise—commercial as well as financial—to international controls under the United Nations.

Since the United Nations must operate upon and through national governments, the natural effect of this form of supergovernment will be to substitute controlled nationalized trading, or governmental cartelization, for the vast multitude of unrestricted transactions among individuals which is an essential element of free enterprise.

Other nations are already embarked upon that course.

Great Britain is rapidly advancing in that direction and will not be diverted by any example or inducement that we can offer.

This would be its world effect if Great Britain alone were the sole immediate beneficiary of our lending policy.

In fact, however, the British loan is but a single phase of our policy.

Through the Export-Import Bank or other agencies, we contemplate a loan of $1,000,000,000 to Soviet Russia and a loan of $2,500,000 to France.

Russian foreign trade is now a two-way monopoly of the Soviet Government.

It will continue to be so, whether or not Russia participates fully in the Bretton Woods arrangements and the International Trade Organization.

France is following the British precedent of nationalizing or socializing the banking and industrial systems of the country.

In all of these nations, American dollars—or credits—will necessarily fortify socialism.

Supporters of the British loan insist that this will not happen in Britain—that the proceeds of the loan will be spent overseas and will not affect the British socialist economy.

That view is naive if not intentionally disingenuous.

For, of course, the use of American funds will release British funds for British use.

And Great Britain herself has already geared the prospective American loan into the British domestic economy.

In presenting the new budget to the House of Commons, Mr. Hugh Dalton, Chancellor of the British Exchequer, said the "whole budget had been drawn on the assumption that the United States loan would be forthcoming" and

"If it does not go through, we will have to get a new budget."

No matter what concessions these countries may make through the International Trade Organization to obtain American loan—and thus far nothing but the mere promises of concessions have been made—their socialist systems will still control their foreign trade.

This country can meet the challenge which they now present by withholding all further loans, by protecting the American home market against their cartelized inroads, and by otherwise leaving American traders free to deal or to refuse to deal with totalitarian nations in accordance with good business principles and practices.

Free enterprise, being the superior system, will then overwhelmingly prevail.

If, on the other hand, our Government tries to vie with the totalitarian states in an international trade organization, to whose edicts our industries and commerce must conform, it can do so only by permanently imposing equivalent totalitarian compulsions in the United States and dooming free enterprise, along with every other freedom, everywhere.

The Socialist Labor Party is in complete command of the British Government.

Socialism in power is the vestibule to totalitarianism; and it is working out in just that way in England with the nationalization of banking and credit and of the key industries.

In fact, the British "experiment" could move in no other direction, because Socialism can function in but one way.

First. The industries must be owned or controlled by the state.

Second. There must be a bureaucracy to operate the nationalized industries.

Third. The bureaucracy must substitute its decrees for democratic legislation, and must formulate every policy and regulation.

Fourth. The Government can permit neither domestic competition with itself or with its nationalized industries, nor internal competition from abroad by uncontrolled free enterprises.

And fifth, the bureaucracy must compel compliance with all its edicts.

Any world-trade agreement or international trade organization must therefore be fully acceptable to the British Socialist Government, and cannot be accepted if it is inimical to the Socialist theory.

The British Loan Agreement, consequently, will strengthen Socialism, and weaken free enterprise, not only in Great Britain itself but in the world as a whole.

Manchurian Manifesto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the situation in China is rapidly coming to a head. Many of us have with difficulty kept silent with respect to events there during the last 5 months, hoping against hope General Marshall could somehow achieve unity in China without sacrifice of the principles for which we and the Chinese fought the war. We did not want in any way to embarrass his efforts or to give any possible ground for any group of Chinese or for Russia to claim provocation from America as an alibi for refusal to cooperate loyally toward genuine unification in China. But we cannot keep silent longer. To do so would virtually be to accept loss of the war in Asia for both China and ourselves, after our military forces heroically defeated the Japanese at such terrible cost. Therefore the following manifesto on the situation in Manchuria has been prepared and issued by a group of Americans especially interested in events in Asia:

America Must Not Abandon Open Door Policy in China

J. B. Powell, veteran American newspaper editor in China and victim of Japanese persecution, released today the text of a statement on the situation in Manchuria signed by 60 leading Americans, including many authorities on the Far East. The statement, which is called a Manchurian manifesto demands a return to the traditional American policy of the open door in China, which the signers charge has been abandoned in Manchuria. Among the leaders who have joined Mr. Powell in this appeal are Admiral Harry H. Yarnell, retired, former commander of the United States Asiatic Fleet; William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; Bishop John P. Boland, of Buffalo; Maj. Gen. David P. Barrows, retired, president emeritus of the University of California; Dr. Donald D. Van Slyke, president of the American Bureau for Medical Aid to China; Harry Scherman, president of the Book of the Month Club; Congressman WALTER H. JUDD, former medical missionary in China; Congresswoman CLARE BOOTHE LUCE; Julean Arnold, president of the China Council; and Ernest Minor Hopkins, president emeritus of Dartmouth.

The manifesto points out that the Second World War began in Manchuria, the "only territory China has for the migration of her vast surplus population. Politically, economically, and strategically, Manchuria is the key of the future of China and the future peace of the Far East." The statement asserts that the secret agreement at Yalta "promised concessions in Manchuria and Mongolia to Soviet Russia whether the Chinese Government agreed or not. * * * It is now apparent that China wes forced to negotiate the treaty with Russia, which conceded vital rights in Manchuria and which abandoned all China's rights in Mongolia, under duress not only from Russia but from the United States. To add to their disillusionment at these disclosures, the Chinese also discovered that Russia had grossly violated the very treaty which China had been forced to negotiate under such unfavorable terms."

Although the Sino-Russian treaty promised the evacuation of Manchuria by Russian troops within 3 months of the end of the war with Japan, "8 months have now passed. The Soviet troops are just now withdrawing, having completed the looting of Manchuria. The Chinese Communists they armed are taking over in their place."

The statement cites the testimony of American correspondents that Manchuria has been "a victim of the most scientific looting and stripping operations in history" and that Chinese civilians charge that 6 months of Russian occupation was worse than 14 years of Japanese occupation.

The manifesto closes with the warning that "China and America stand today at the parting of the ways. The future of peace in Asia and perhaps of the world depends on the future of Manchuria. * * * We must request Russia to punctiliously live up to the terms of the Sino-Soviet pact we helped to force on China by secret agreement at Yalta. If Russia refuses, we should make replacement in her stead for the sake of our reputation and our conscience."

Manchurian Manifesto

While the crisis over Iran has occupied the center of the world stage, an equally ominous crisis has been unfolding in Manchuria, although it has not yet reached the stage of a diplomatic showdown. The first of the great wars of this century, the Russo-Japanese War, was fought in Manchuria and for Manchuria. The Second World War really began in Manchuria in 1931. Manchuria is the richest area in natural resources and industrial development in China. It is also a great grain and livestock producing country, and the only territory China has for the migration of her vast surplus population. Politically, economically, and strategically Manchuria is the key to the future of China and the future peace of the Far East.

The Manchurian question is also morally important, because China might have obtained temporary peace with Japan at almost any time in the last 15 years had she been willing to grant Japanese demands in Manchuria. Yet China steadfastly refused to become an ally of Japanese aggression in a racial war against the West and became instead the spearhead of freedom against Japan.

China's Faith in America

In opposing Japan and continuing the fight, through a thousand miles of retreat, the Chinese put their faith in America. Despite our early weakness and the pitiful trickle of lend-lease the Chinese held out. Fortitude and faith at last seemed to be rewarded and China's confidence in America's strength proved justified. It is our task now to prove that China's faith in America's honor is equally justified.

Unfortunately, however, China's faith has now been rudely shaken by the sudden revelation of the secret provisions of the Yalta agreement which vitally affect China and the whole Far East.

This agreement was not only made behind China's back, but at Yalta America was pledged to deliver the promised concessions in Manchuria and Mongolia to Soviet Russia, whether the Chinese Government agreed or not. This is clear from the following words of the secret Yalta agreement as reported by Secretary Byrnes:

"The heads of the three governments have agreed that these claims (railroad rights and Port Arthur base) of the Soviet Union shall be unquestionably fulfilled when the war with Japan has been ended."

Cairo and Yalta Inconsistencies

At the Cairo Conference, held prior to Yalta, which was attended by Roosevelt, Churchill and Chiang Kai-shek, it was decided to restore to China all territories which Japan had taken by force, including Manchuria. Despite this promise, however, it is now apparent that China was forced to negotiate the treaty with Russia, which conceded vital rights in Manchuria and which abandoned all China's rights in Mongolia, under duress not only from Russia but from the United States. To add to their disillusionment at these disclosures the Chinese also discovered that Russia had grossly violated the very treaty which China had been forced to negotiate under such unfavorable terms.

To understand China's reaction to this we need only glance at the provisions of the Sino-Russian treaty and contrast them with the present position in Manchuria.

That treaty pledged the withdrawal of all Soviet troops from Manchuria (except Port Arthur) within 3 months of the end of war with Japan. But 8 months have now passed. The Soviet troops are just now withdrawing, having completed the looting of Manchuria. The Chinese Communists they armed are taking over in their place.

The treaty also pledged, among other things, that China should take over the civil administration in Manchuria immediately after fighting had ceased in specific areas. That, too, was 8 months ago. Yet today Chinese officials have only been permitted to take the first tentative steps in setting up an administration in a few parts of central and southern Manchuria.

CHINA REFUSED ENTRY AT DAIREN

When American ships tried to land Chinese Government troops at the port of Dairen 6 months ago, in accordance with the interallied staff agreement, they were refused entry by the Soviet Army. Thus Russia, after a virtually bloodless war with Japan which lasted just 6 days, has flouted both China and America, whose joint sacrifices won the war in the Pacific after years of agony and defeat. This action at Dairen also violated article III of the same agreement on the port of Dairen itself, which provided that the port would only be subject to Soviet military control "in the event of war with Japan"—and at that time, of course, the war was over.

There have been further treaty violations: The railway agreement restricted Russia's participation to two main lines and other facilities which were built by Russia. It specifically excluded Russian participation in the control of other Chinese-built lines. It provided that the railways could not be used for troop movements except during war with Japan; and that the responsibility for guarding the railway was the sole prerogative of the Chinese Government. All of these provisions were to be worked out and put into effect within 3 months of the signing of the treaty. All have been flouted.

For nearly 7 months after the war ended the iron curtain which surrounds Soviet-occupied territory continued the black-out over Manchuria. When the curtain was at last partially lifted the spectacle shocked the world.

The correspondent in Manchuria of the American paper, the Shanghai Post, called Mukden "a victim of the most scientific looting and stripping operations in history," Robert P. Martin, correspondent of the New York Evening Post, quoted Chinese civilians as saying that 6 months of Russian occupation was worse than 14 years of Japanese occupation. Most of these looted factories were built by the Japanese on Chinese soil with Chinese materials and by Chinese labor, but looting also extended to Chinese-owned industrial properties.

STUDENTS PROTEST AGAINST U. S. S. R. AGGRESSION

If Americans were so deeply shocked at these revelations, what must have been the feelings of the Chinese people? No wonder China seethed with student protests against the U. S. S. R. from Peiping to Chengtu and from Shanghai to Kunming. For almost the first time in China's history there was criticism of America because of the ignoble part we played at Yalta.

The Chinese are the most patient and most tolerant of peoples, but even their patience has a limit. Fifty million Chinese lost their homes and an estimated 20,000,000 lost their lives in World War II, fought for the territorial integrity of their nation. They lost all their ports, nearly all of their great cities and most of their industries. Over great areas of China the earth was scorched. Imagine making such sacrifices in order to win the war and then to have the prize snatched from their hands in the hour of victory.

AMERICA'S STAKE IN A FREE CHINA

China's reactions in this crisis are obvious and natural, but what of America? For 50 years our official policy to preserve the open door and the territorial integrity of China has been the keystone of American security in the Pacific. Shall we abandon that policy now when it is more needed than ever, and when victory has given us a chance to achieve it?

Most thinking Americans feel that we owe a special debt to China because China was the victim both of our long appeasement of Japan and of our unpreparedness. After Pearl Harbor we fought our way back to redeem these mistakes in one of the most glorious achievements in our history, but we did this virtually without Russia's help in the Pacific. Will the American people, at the strongest moment in their history, accept a Russian policy in Asia which we rejected in the case of Germany and Japan even when we were weak?

WENDELL WILLKIE'S WARNING

In his book One World, Wendell Willkie warned of the danger to America if China were dominated by a totalitarian power:

"I have unbounded faith in the courage, the enterprise, and the destiny of the American people. But I believe that if Americans were forced to live hereafter face to face with an empire of such dimensions (Japan plus China) our way of life would be little better than an armed camp, and our vaunted freedom would be little more than a fond hope. We should live in continual alarm, in endless war, under crushing armaments which it would be our constant endeavor to increase. Neither peace nor prosperity, neither freedom nor justice, could flourish in such a struggle for existence. And it would not matter in the least how wide or how narrow the Pacific Ocean is."

Every word he said would apply even more to Russian control of China than to that of Japan, since Russia dominates Europe also.

For many years Chinese-American friendship has been a bridge between the East and the West, between the peoples of Asia and America. China's tolerance, her traditional hatred of militarism, her mastery of the arts of peace, her ideas of equality and freedom are similar to ours. But China can neither be friendly nor peaceful if that vast population is robbed of the only territories which can possibly solve their economic problems. Therefore, China and America stand today at the parting of the ways. The future of peace in Asia and perhaps of the world depends on the future of Manchuria.

JUSTICE FOR CHINA

We must stand firm for justice for China. The test for China is Manchuria. We should lend our support to the demands now being voiced by the Chinese people for a complete revision of the Yalta agreements. But certainly the least we can do is to insist on the strict observance of the promises to China contained in the Sino-Russian agreement which we forced on China. For example, Russia agreed in article I:

"In accordance with the spirit of the above treaty and for the implementation of its general ideas and promises the Soviet Government is ready to render China moral support and assistance with military equipment and other material resources, this support and assistance to be given fully to the National Government as the Central Government of China."

The arming of the Chinese Communists and looting of industrial equipment are obviously direct violations of that agreement.

We believe that we have an obligation to China and to our own self-respect. We should request Russia to punctiliously live up to the terms of the Sino-Soviet pact we helped to force on China by secret agreement at Yalta. If Russia refuses, we should make replacement in her stead for the sake of our reputation and our conscience. We stand on the traditional American policy enumerated in the preamble of the Nine-Power Treaty of 1922 signed by all the powers having interests in the Pacific, with the exception of Russia:

"1. To respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China;

"2. To provide the fullest and most unembarrassed opportunity to China to develop and maintain for herself an effective and stable government;

"3. To use their influence for the purpose of effectually establishing and maintaining the principle of equal opportunity for the commerce and industry of all nations throughout the territory of China;

"4. To refrain from taking advantage of conditions in China in order to seek special rights or privileges which would abridge the rights of subjects or citizens of friendly states, and from countenancing action inimical to the security of such states."

Signed by: Dr. Alexander Baird; Maj. Gen. David P. Barrows; William Bohn; the Right Reverend John P. Boland; Donald M. Brodie; Frank T. Cartwright; William Henry Chamberlain; Gardner Cowles, Jr.; Frank R. Crosswaith; Dan E. Douty; Hon. George H. Earle; Max Eastman; Christopher T. Emmet, Jr.; Geraldine T. (Mrs. George A.) Fitch; Miller Freeman; Varian Fry; Esson Gale; William Green; Emily Hahn; Sidney Hook; Dr. Ernest M. Hopkins; William Hunt; Will Irwin; the Reverend J. C. Jensen, D. D.; William R. Johnson; Hon. Orrin G. Judd; Congressman Walter H. Judd; Alexander Kahn; William C. Kernan; Lucian S. Kirtland; Alfred Kohlberg; Alfred A. Knopf; Isaac Don Levine; William Loeb; Congresswoman Clare Boothe Luce; Henry R. Luce; S. Stanwood Menken; Emma deLong Mills; Liston M. Oak; John O'Connor; Gordon O'Neill; the Reverend Wilfrid Parsons, S. J.; Clifford W. Petitt; John B. Powell; Fletcher Pratt; Leland Rex Robinson; Christine Diemer Razlag; Harry Sherman; Mrs. Joseph Schumpeter; William Philip Simms; Edward Skillin; William Sloane; Margaret Proctor Smith; William H. Smyth; Benjamin Stolberg; Norman Thomas; Dr. Donald D. Van Slyke; Oswald Garrison Villard; Louis Waldman; Robert J. Watt; Dr. Jerome P. Webster; Dr. Maurice William; Michael Williams; Mrs. Wendell L. Willkie; Matthew Woll; Admiral Harry H. Yarnell.

There's a Way to Write Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when Mr. John Q. Public rarely wrote to his Congressman. Times have changed. The Congress is now flooded with mail, largely from

pressure groups. For interesting reading to my colleagues, and, I might add, to every citizen in the Nation, I submit a rare gem on this subject, and I heartily commend the reading of it.

Following is an editorial:

THERE'S A WAY TO WRITE CONGRESSMAN

(By Herbert E. Wilson)

Writing to your Congressman is one of your privileges as a citizen and taxpayer, and in the ordinary course of events he is glad to hear from you.

To know what's on your mind is his one best way of determining how to vote on the bills that come to the floor.

But when the people abuse the privilege, it costs the public real money and ties the Congressman and his staff in a knot. It interferes with his own work to the extent that he has little time to tend to his important business of reading up on proposed laws, and putting full effort into important committee work.

The abuses stem principally from pressure groups desiring the death knell of, or immediate passage of, legislation that is strictly of self-interest. These selfish few arrange to swamp a Congressman with mail, much of it mimeographed or otherwise cut to the pattern of saying the same things.

Doubtless lots of people who sign the communications and drop the letters in the mail have not even taken time to get familiar with the legislation about which they are pumping the handle. They go at the pressure stuff blindly, following the lead of a handful of agitators.

WHERE COSTS ENTER IN

Here's how a flood of letters on a single issue costs the taxpayers extra money:

A storm of written protests pours in, demanding production of a certain commodity. The Congressmen contact the Federal agency under whose jurisdiction this commodity comes.

The agency explains the situation to the legislator. But the matter cannot be dropped there. Either the Congressman has to acknowledge the letters from back home, or the people get the impression he's either not on the job or is ignoring them.

Practically every Member of Congress attaches vast importance to handling signed mail promptly, if it bears full return addresses.

So in this case, he persuades the Federal agency to prepare a special bulletin, detailing the same explanation that was given to him personally.

The number of copies necessary in order for each complainant to receive one may vary from 500 to 50,000.

In a recent storm based on the identical question, "When do we get nylons?" the number was 20,000.

Each Congressman gets enough copies to answer the protests, and his staff is set to work addressing the envelopes.

He may have to call in extra help. Most Congressmen have only two secretaries. On this basis, you can see the jam that results from receipt of 750 or 1,000 letters on a single subject.

The secretarial staffs of Senators are considerably larger, four to six, or even eight. But on the other hand, their mail volume is much greater, since their constituents are from entire States where all but the Congressman at large deal only with a few counties.

FRIENDLY LETTERS BEST

As we said at the outset, if you want to write your Congressman, do it. Take the time, however, to familiarize yourself with your subject matter. Do your own thinking, and set down your ideas in a frank yet friendly manner.

Don't be backward about explanations of how the legislation in mind has affected you, in your business or your job. If you want certain legislation enacted, be specific in your views on its benefits to you.

Remember, be concise. He doesn't have the time to read a 10-page communication when you could well have boiled it to a single sheet.

If you adhere to the rules of courtesy and consideration, chances are you will make a friend of the Congressman, in the event you do not know him personally already.

Congressmen are human, and the vast majority are hard workers. They are sensitive to the people's sentiment, regardless of whether they're coming up for reelection this year or next. But they don't like abuse of privilege, anymore than do you or me, and you aren't fooling them.

They recognize very quickly a reasonable kick, or an inspired mass-production sledge.

Resolution on World's Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION ON WORLD'S NEEDS PASSED AT THE 1946 DIOCESAN CONVENTION OF THE DIOCESE OF MASSACHUSETTS, NEW ENGLAND MUTUAL HALL, MAY 8, 1946

Whereas vast numbers of persons throughout the world have already died from starvation, disease, and exposure since the end of the war, and many millions more are now in dire need of food, medicine, and clothing; and

Whereas the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations estimates that the terrible world food crisis will last for three more years; and

Whereas the United States, standing in a position of leadership in the world and possessing a bountiful harvest and the ability to produce vast quantities of medicine and clothing, has not shipped quantities of material proportional to the need or what it could have shipped; and

Whereas Christian charity demands that we, as persons and citizens, do all in our power to meet this tremendous crisis by seeing that necessary lifesaving material is shipped at once to the needy peoples of the world: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this diocesan convention call upon the United States Government to requisition at once all the supplies needed to meet the situation abroad and to take all other steps necessary to assure an adequate flow of goods to the needy countries of the world and to institute rigorous consumer rationing at home to insure fair distribution of foods that will be scarce in this country.

Education 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am very glad to include the following address by Robert M. Hutchins, chancellor of the University of Chicago, before the American Council on Education. Mr. Hutchins gives us a pretty realistic picture of the grim world in which we are living and lays down a challenge that no thoughtful person can ignore:

THE ISSUES IN EDUCATION—1946

The great problems before us are first, can we survive and second, what kind of life are we going to lead if we do?

Our monopoly of the atomic bomb will end within 3 to 5 years. There is no defense against the bomb, and there never will be. It can be brought into this country in any number of different ways. If it is brought into this country in any way it will destroy all our cities, no matter what our superiority in military power, including atomic bombs, may be. The alternatives before us are no longer peace or war, they are peace or the death of civilization.

When other countries have atomic bombs, the isolated, impregnable position in which the United States has luxuriated will be lost forever. This country will be in the geographical, military, and psychological situation of Czechoslavakia before the war. We may survive, but we shall constantly be wondering how long we are going to. Any one false step in foreign policy, a field in which heretofore aimless blundering has been a harmless pastime, may precipitate universal destruction.

If we do survive, our economic and our political systems will undergo terrific strain. Virgil Jordan exaggerates very little when he says, "We can now make anything out of anything or nothing, anywhere in the world, in any amount, almost without measurable cost." When atomic power is available, and it will be any minute, distance and the scarcity of fuel and raw materials will cease to influence the location of industries and communities. New industries and new communities can be created anywhere because the cost of transporting the sources of atomic energy is negligible. These developments will be accompanied by the rapid dissolution of old industries and old communities. The whole economy, which has rested on work and scarcity, may fall to pieces in the new era of leisure and abundance. We may yearn for the depressions and unemployment we have known as though they were the good old days.

If we survive, the leisure which the atomic age will bring may make peace more horrible than war. We face the dreadful prospect of hour after hour, even day after day, with nothing to do. After we have read all the comic books, traveled all the miles, seen all the movies, and drunk all the liquor we can stand, what shall we do then? All of us here are old enough to testify that all forms of recreation eventually lose their charm.

These changes in the economy will be matched by similar strains on our political system. The accelerated rate of technological change will make for great insecurity. Only a powerful central government, it will be supposed, can supply stability. The physical forces with which we are dealing are so tremendous that we shall be unwilling to entrust them to private persons.

Nobody has suggested that atomic energy should not be a governmental monopoly. The only question has been which branch of the Government should monopolize it. Moreover, the duties of citizenship, which we have been able to take very lightly, will now be so complicated and burdensome that many people will feel that they cannot carry them; they will leave government to the Government. We may even hear that we need a leader. The principal problem of

the Government will be security and boredom. And so the world comes back again to bread and circuses.

What has all this to do with American education as we have known it? Very little. These problems are of the utmost seriousness and urgency. American education has been happily free from any sense of either. Apparently our people have wanted it so. I know that education is the American substitute for a national religion; but many countries have been able to reconcile financial support of a religious establishment with complete disregard of its principles. There has been no particular reason why American educators or the American people should regard education as serious or urgent. Our country was rich, secure, and powerful. It was a country which even the grossest immorality and stupidity could not ruin. The American people have therefore been at liberty to devote themselves wholeheartedly to getting ahead. And though it was clearly possible to get ahead very nicely without any education at all, a social prejudice was fortunately established that you could get ahead a little better if you went to school a little longer. The more expensive and famous the school the greater the advantage it conferred. It followed, of course, that what went on in the school was of litle importance to anybody. What was important was not what went on in the school, but the fact that the pupil had been there.

In this atmosphere all of us in American education have grown up. To these purposes our institutions, for the most part unconsciously, have been dedicated. Now we face a new and totally different world, which has come upon us with incredible suddenness. We may not know what will hold this new world together; but we do know what will make it explode, and that is the pursuit of those policies and ideals which have characterized our country, and most others, in the past. Civilization can be saved only by a moral, intellectual, and spiritual revolution to match the scientific, technological, and economic revolution in which we are now living. If American education can contribute to a moral, intellectual, and spiritual revolution, then it offers a real hope of salvation to suffering humanity everywhere. If it cannot or will not contribute to this revolution, then it is irrelevant, and its fate is immaterial.

I believe in world government. I think we must have it, and have it soon. But the most ardent advocate of a world state will not claim that it can be maintained, or perhaps even achieved, without the moral, intellectual, and spiritual revolution to which I have referred. The prospects of World War III are only a little less attractive than those of a world civil war. For a world state to come into being a higher degree of world community must exist than we can see at present, and for it to be maintained a still higher degree must be achieved. Community requires communication, communication requires understanding, and, if understanding is not to lead to hatred and fear, the ambitions of the peoples of the earth must be such as not to arouse hatred and fear.

A world state demands a world community, a world community demands a world revolution, moral, intellectual, and spiritual. World government is not a gadget, which in one easy motion will preserve mankind. It can live and last only as it institutionalizes the brotherhood of man.

You will say that the task before us is impossible, and I admit it looks so. We must try to arrive at our destination in not more than 5 years. We must educate all Americans, for who can tell which Americans will have the decisive voice in the formation of our policies? We must try by example to lead the rest of the world to educate itself; for, if education succeeded in changing the hearts of Americans, and the hearts of other peoples remained unchanged, we should merely have the satisfaction of being blown up with changed hearts rather than unchanged ones. I do not expect an American audience to have enough faith in the immortality of the soul to regard this as more than a dubious consolation.

You may feel that there is a certain disproportion between the means I have chosen and the end I have in view. You may suggest that I have myself pointed out that little in the record of American education indicates that it is interested in or qualified for leadership in a moral, intellectual, and spiritual revolution throughout the world.

My answer to all objections is the same: this revolution is necessary, and therefore possible. We do not know what heights men can achieve if they understand that it is necessary for them to reach them. We do not know what education can accomplish, because we have never tried it. We never had to. Now education is a serious and urgent business.

Consider the question of time. I decline to take advantage of the opportunity for recrimination on the subject of the Chicago bachelor's degree and content myself with asking whether anybody honestly believes that it is impossible to complete a program of liberal education in less than 4 years. Or is there anybody who can prove that Father Gannon of Fordham is wrong in saying that liberal education should and can be completed by the age of 18, that is, 4 years earlier than is normally the case? Under present conditions the burden of proof is on those who would pretend that we have time to waste.

Consider the question of education for all. One of the most amusing features of the educational situation is the outraged cries of educators at the spectacle of the hordes of people clamoring for education. It is as though the bench of bishops should adopt a resolution complaining because too many people wanted to go to church. Isn't this the opportunity we have been waiting for? Don't we believe in education? Don't we agree that in a democracy we must educate everybody or abandon universal suffrage?

If we understood, and could make our people understand, that education is the most serious and urgent business in the world, could we have any doubt that we could find the means to carry on the work? And as for the geographical scale on which education must now operate, we may remind ourselves that the problem before Unesco, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, is not more difficult under modern conditions of transportation and communication than that which Horace Mann faced in Massachusetts 100 years ago. The imaginative use of the instruments which technology has given us, for education rather than destruction, could give education a scope of which our ancestors could not dream.

Think of the chance we have now in adult education, and the responsibility, too. Work is the enemy of education, and we are entering an age in which there will be unprecedented leisure for all. Leisure and recreation are not the same. Leisure has nothing to do with idleness. Leisure is that portion of the individual's time which he devotes to his moral and intellectual development and to participation in the life of the community of which he is a part. The more leisure there is the better for civilization.

If we want to help save the world within the new few years, we must attend to the education of adults, for only they will have the influence within that period to affect the course of events. If we want to save adults in the atomic age from the suicidal tendencies which boredom eventually induces, if we want to build a world community, we must regard the continuing education of our people throughout life as our principal responsibility.

It can no longer be looked upon as a causal activity conducted by a university for the purpose of helping underpaid instructors gain a little extra income, and attended by third-rate bookkeepers who want to learn how to become second-rate bookkeepers.

Think of the time, thought, effort, and money we have wasted on vocational training. Its relevance to a moral, intellectual, and spiritual reformation is certainly remote. And its relevance to the task of earning a living, which was always open to question in view of the obvious superiority of training on the job, will reach the vanishing point in the atomic age. When we can make anything out of anything or nothing, anywhere, in any amount almost without measurable cost, the fraction of our lives that will go into making things will be about the same as that which fortunate savages devote to picking their daily diet off the breadfruit trees, and the training needed for the job will be about the same, too. The vocational education the world needs is education for the common vocation of citizenship. This is liberal education.

In the United States the phrase "college of liberal arts" conveys no meaning to the mind. Certainly it does not mean that here is an institution devoted to liberal education. It usually denotes an institution in which the liberal arts are not taught. The only other definition that would cover almost all, but probably not all, of the enterprises called colleges of liberal arts is that they are institutions which do not award the doctor of philosophy degree. The trouble with this definition is that it does not differentiate these colleges from kindergartens, elementary schools, and high schools. We do not know what these colleges could accomplish if they organized themselves to give a liberal education and then proceed to give it, without regard to the demands of graduate schools, parents, football coaches, and academic-vested interests.

Many colleges boast that they have a highly diversified curriculum, or indeed none at all, in order to develop the special aptitudes of their students. I have the impression that this kind of program results from the special interests of professors rather than the individual interests of students. Students can be interested in anything that is made important to them. A liberal college should have no difficulty, in the present world situation, in making liberal education important to the young people committed to its charge.

If the student-centered college is really a professor-centered college, its curriculum, if any, is unlikely to add up to a liberal education. The graduate schools which prospective professors must pass through to gain entrance to the faculty club are composed of narrow departmental specialists engaged in training narrow departmental specialists. Such narrow specialization is a necessary ingredient of the advancement of knowledge; it must be maintained for the purpose of advancing knowledge. But it has nothing to do with liberal education.

For liberal education we need a new type of teacher, and hence a new type of graduate school. It should be liberal, too. That is, it should be composed of teachers and students who have had a liberal education and who are eager to help others to acquire one. The members of the faculty should not be selected in terms of their competence in specialized fields, but in terms of their capacity to see knowledge as a whole, to engage in candid and intrepid thinking about fundamental problems, and to guide the student

in his efforts to do such thinking for himself. It should be a community devoted to integration, to unification, to synthesis, to bringing order and intelligibility out of the chaos of the modern world.

The colleges and universities today are characterized by the loss of community within them. Since everybody is a specialist, nobody can communicate with anybody else. The conversation among the students is about athletics and among the faculty about the weather. Both students and faculty lose the sense of communal support in their intellectual enterprise, a sense which is of tremendous advantage in a college with a prescribed curriculum. But what is worse, it is impossible to rely on institutions which have no community within them to lay the foundation for a community in this country or a community in the world. The antics of alumni at reunions suggest that no community can be established among the products of the higher learning except by artificial exhilaration, and such community as results can hardly be described as moral, intellectual, or spiritual.

Some of the most venerable of our institutions of learning have now endorsed the movement to restore community in higher education. One of them has actually gone so far as to require the reading of eight of the great books of the Western World. Another suggests that a few of them might be read in the summer. We are getting on. The movement is now respectable, and it is to be hoped that it will gain momentum. But we may hope also that this movement will not fall a prey to the popular tendency to substitute names for things. For many years we have attached the name "education" to anything that went on in an educational institution, and the name "research" to anything that reflected the curiosity, however idle, of those who had found their way into academic life. Now we seem likely to attach the name "liberal" to anything that is not science and technology.

It is true that we do not need to emphasize the importance of science and technology. Now that they have won a war for us, the tendency of American students and American philanthropists to flock into these fields will be accentuated. It is true that our greatest problems are not how to improve the material conditions of existence and how to exploit the forces of nature. Our greatest problems are how to exist at all in the world which science and technology have made, and how to direct the power they have placed in our hands. Upon these problems science and technology shed little light. In the atomic age they cannot even defend us from the atomic bomb.

Nevertheless, natural science is a necessary part of a liberal education, for the citizen must understand the natural environment in which he lives. Though scientific research can contribute little to the moral, intellectual, and spiritual revolution upon which the future of civilization depends, the scientific method and the scientific spirit have a considerable part to play in it. Moreover, to say, "We have had too much natural science; let us have more social science and humanities," is, in the present condition of the higher learning, to substitute names for things.

Does the student in the humanities and the social sciences learn the arts of communication? Does he learn to read and write? Does he master the disciplines which for centuries have been regarded as indispensable to the attack on any intellectual task? Does he come to understand the ideas and ideals which have animated mankind? Does he learn how to tell the good from the bad, the true from the false, the beautiful from the ugly? Does he discover what the ends of life are and what are the purposes of organized society?

Does he understand the tradition in which he lives? Does he learn how to be human, see the connection between man and man, and fit himself to become a member of a community which shall embrace all men? We know that ideas, understanding, criticism, and ethical and political theory have almost vanished from the humanities and the social sciences, to have their places taken by miscellaneous information, tours of the stockyards, and data collecting. We know that the fundamental problems of our time are philosophical. Yet philosophy has disappeared from the social sciences. Instead of underlying all studies in the humanities, philosophy is confined to one department, which is steadily losing influence as language, art, and history vainly try to become scientific.

What the world needs, then, is a liberal education worthy of the name. This would be an education educating a man's humanity, rather than indulging his individuality. It would be an education appropriate to man, offering him the habitual vision of greatness, and dealing primarily, in a world of rapid change, with values independent of time or place. I believe that such an education is supplied by a curriculum consisting of the great works of the mind and the liberal arts. As the Manchester Guardian said editorially the other day, "The more we understand the forces of nature, and so increase human powers, the more important it is that we should understand human character and draw inspiration from the great civilizing writers and thinkers of the past. For the changes that simplify man's relations to nature complicate man's relations to man. Today, when we have achieved intoxicating triumps over nature, the nations of the world are more afraid of each other than at any time in their history."

Still, I do not insist upon the great civilizing writers and thinkers of the past. If anybody can suggest a curriculum that is more likely to achieve the objects I have named than the one I have proposed, I shall gladly embrace him and it.

The new kind of graduate school needed to produce the new kind of teacher which this program requires would not be concerned with the training of departmental specialists in the traditional fields, but with the education of men who were eager to qualify themselves to understand and to help others understand the nature, the works, and the destiny of man.

We must now engage in the liberal education of everybody, of all adolescents and all adults. Of these two, adult education is the more important. In fact, one of the principal purposes of the liberal education of adolescents should be to prepare them to go on with liberal education throughout their lives.

This program requires drastic changes in our educational institutions. But they are not impossible. They are changes which should have been made years ago, for everything that I have suggested is something we should have been doing all along. Until these changes are made, we cannot claim that the task which history has imposed upon us is beyond human achievement. All we can say is that we do not care enough about it to attempt it. By a clear definition of our purpose and a relentless exclusion of the irrelevant, the frivolous, and the trivial we may hope to reach the goal. We may hope to help our fellow men to survive and to lead the good life if they do. It is better to try and fail than to decline the challenge.

Who's Propagandizing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the title of the editorial I am including below really presents the question of exactly who is propagandizing.

One group of administration spokesmen condemn all who try to constructively legislate an OPA. Then again we observe others, like the Speaker of the House the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, who stated on the floor of the House after the OPA bill has passed, that cattle ceilings should be removed. Since there has never been a ceiling on dairy cattle as such, this must mean cattle slaughtered for meat. The effect of removing meat ceilings will result in removing all agricultural ceilings.

Then we note that Secretary of Agriculture Anderson states that ceilings on meat have not worked, and suggests they be tried for 90 more days and if not effective to discard them.

In my humble opinion, the approach to follow is the enactment of a formula which will remove products from OPA control if and when certain production goals are reached. No one but a believer in a permanent economic dictator could oppose this formula and time table.

The following editorial is from the Wisconsin Rapids (Wis.) Daily Tribune:

WHO'S PROPAGANDIZING?

OPA and its defenders are hurling charges of "propaganda" at critics of Government price control, claiming that huge sums are being spent by organizations which have ulterior motives in seeking to terminate the economic powers vested in OPA.

It is true that considerable money has been expended to acquaint the public with the arguments against a continuation of arbitrary political manipulation of the national economy. The National Association of Manufacturers and other organizations which have taken the lead in opposing legislation for the extension of OPA have not denied their part in financing the campaign.

But the OPA has likewise been spending liberally to perpetuate itself in power. Via the printed and spoken word it has deluged the country with dire warnings of the terrible fate in store for America if price control is discontinued or curtailed. Chester Bowles and his fellow economic tinkerers have spared no efforts to defend their theories and damn their critics. And it is the taxpayers' money they are using to convince those same taxpayers the OPA should be kept in the saddle.

OPA is quick to cry "propaganda" against anyone who dares question the logic of the price-control system. As for its own campaign, that of course is dignified by the term "information." The choice of terminology seems to depend on whose ox is gored. The factual merits of the opposing arguments do not appear to be the determining factor for saying what is "propaganada" and what is "information," since Bowles and company have not been averse to distorting the facts to suit their purposes.

Unless a large number of Congressmen and many business, industrial, labor, and agricultural leaders are plain ignoramuses, too dull of wit to understand the Bowlesian intellectuals, there is plenty wrong with OPA. These folks, though they are not in agreement on the extent of the corrective measures to be taken, are pretty strongly convinced that price control, as now administered, is full of inequities and detrimental regulations which are causing some of the woes OPA was allegedly designed to prevent.

Is it in any way undemocratic or reprehensible to bring these faults to the attention of the public, along with recommendations for their correction? Or should the public get only one side of the story—the OPA's side? If the pros and cons of the issue—and a very vital issue it is—are to be fully aired, and OPA is to be permitted to present its case at the taxpayers' expense, why condemn any organization willing to bear a share of the costs necessary in expounding the opposition's views?

This newspaper is under no obligation to defend the actions of the National Association of Manufacturers or any other group or individual in this matter. But a sense of fairness impels us to say that the NAM and other critics of OPA have as much right to disseminate their views as do Mr. Bowles or any other champion of a politically managed economy. And they have this right without having their motives impunged or being condemned for trafficking in unsavory propaganda. If OPA can prove that its opponents have backing as questionable as that which the Communist Party is giving to the present price-control system, let it make the specific accusation and produce the supporting evidence.

We are not impressed by OPA's contention that those who advocate reducing its powers or completely abolishing the agency are guilty of a sinister plot to wreck the country economically. That description certainly doesn't fit the Members of the House of Representatives who voted to sharply curb OPA's powers. Nor does it fit others who do not see eye to eye with Chester Bowles.

Who, may we ask, has a greater stake in America's future prosperity than businessmen and industrialists who have large investments to protect and large payrolls to meet? It is because they want to see the Nation prosper, under the American system of private enterprise, that they oppose a Government-regulated economy in the hands of theorists who produce nothing and employ no one. And lest you conclude that the motives of these businessmen and manufacturers are entirely selfish, remember that upon the success of their enterprises depends the prosperity of their employees and families, whose number is legion. And also upon their success rests the ability of the whole consuming public to obtain needed goods at fair prices.

Country wreckers? The OPA is letting its imagination run rampant.

Memorial Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Memorials Committee I take this time to advise the Members of the House that all necessary arrangements have been made for memorial service to be held on Tuesday, May 28. The families of our deceased Members who died in the past year have been invited and no doubt will be here.

Necessarily some of the Members will be away that week because of the primary elections in their respective districts. But those of us who are here in Washington should make it a point to be present for the services. It is a mark of respect that we owe to our deceased Members.

The memorial addresses will be delivered by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR]. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], accompanied at the piano by his charming daughter, Miss Joan Marie Rabaut, will sing for the memorial services.

Under unanimous consent previously obtained, I insert for the information of the Members a copy of the memorial services program:

MEMORIAL SERVICE PROGRAM, MAY 28, 1946

Prelude, sacred selections (11:30 to 12)—United States Army Band Orchestra
Presiding officer—The Speaker
Hon. SAM RAYBURN
Invocation—The Chaplain
Dr. James Shera Montgomery
Solo—Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT
Representative from the State of Michigan
At the piano—Joan Marie Rabaut
Scripture reading and prayer—The Chaplain
Roll of deceased Members—The Clerk of the House of Representatives
Devotional silence
Address—Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
Representative from the State of Louisiana
Solo—Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT
At the piano—Joan Marie Rabaut
Address—Hon. J. HARRY MCGREGOR
Representative from the State of Ohio
Taps—Charles Barnes
Master sergeant, United States Army
Benediction—The Chaplain

IN MEMORIAM

SENATE

Hon. JAMES GRAVES SCRUGHAM, a Senator from the State of Nevada. Died June 23, 1945.

Hon. HIRAM WARREN JOHNSON, a Senator from the State of California. Died August 6, 1945.

Hon. JOHN THOMAS, a Senator from the State of Idaho. Died November 10, 1945.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Hon. JAMES WHEATON MOTT, First Congressional District of Oregon. Died November 12, 1945.

Hon. JOSEPH WILSON ERVIN, Tenth Congressional District of North Carolina. Died December 25, 1945.

Hon. JOHN BUELL SNYDER, Twenty-third Congressional District of Pennsylvania. Died February 24, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM OLIN BURGIN, Eighth Congressional District of North Carolina. Died April 11, 1946.

A Workable Credit System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following description of the so-called Giro credit system used successfully in several European countries, especially in Norway, in the years before the war. The statement is prepared by Mr. Giov Grell.

GIRO—UNOBSTRUCTED CREDIT—INTERRELATION OF DEFINITE VALUES

Through a widespread use of Giro, we can overcome the obstacles to unlimited work, production, and consumption, because we will then be dealing with things which we can produce and consume through a noncommodity medium of exchange. We would change things into things through the medium of figures, instead of continuing to go the roundabout way of first having to barter things against an artificially established and unstable "legal tender" thing, before we can buy or pay for other things.

Giro starts with a borrower being granted a credit against the usual bankable collateral, but instead of paying back the loan at fixed intervals, and without sufficient consideration for the borrower's ability to pay, Giro credits are reimbursed only as and when the borrower receives something in payment for his work or goods.

In return, the borrower must (1) maintain the usual safety margin in collateral, (2) agree to deposit all his income with a specific account, established when he received the loan, and a small fraction of the income (as agreed in advance with each borrower) is automatically deducted when something is credited on his account—to amortize the loan and pay for the service of the bank. This entails some bookkeeping which—thanks to modern business machinery—will not cost more than a tenth of 1 percent of the turnover (and not paid with an in-between legal tender, but in figures representing things or work).

Banks are thus freed from the necessity of calling loans as long as these are properly secured; the businessmen pay some of their Giro debts when they are paid for the products from their shops, warehouses or stores; and the workers pay off their purchases, houses, or insurance each time they receive wages. The psychological time pressure is relieved by synchronizing reimbursements with the time when a borrower is best able to pay. The Government can also collect taxes in this way, cheaply and painlessly, by having the banks impose a small surcharge upon all account movements.

Giro money (like personal checks) is used but once and cannot be endorsed and transferred to third parties; all transactions must pass through one's account.

Banks can issue individual money in small change and bills, or certified checks. As above said the cost is not over a tenth of one percent.

It is generally agreed that all-over transactions in the United States run well above $4,000,000,000,000 per year and we need not go into details about which percentage could best be painlessly, and incentively, deducted to keep credit circulating, and thereby production and employment at a desired peak by always being capable of implementing desirable transactions.

Giro can operate both with or without the Government, within the present banking system or its own. There are no patents on any part of this—all are free to use it, there is no author to collect royalties, no group taking collections to exploit or to propagandize.

THE GIRO WAY

A Giro bank charges a small fee to cover amortization, stabilization, risks, and handling charges. The handling charge should be less than one-tenth of one percent. The interest charged upon credits is for the approximate expense of conducting the bank, plus a regular banker's commission for handling the transactions.

The farmer finds Giro credits so reasonable that he is induced to purchase up-to-date machinery and efficient means of transportation. There is every inducement for him to do this, since the only way he can improve his personal finances is to produce additional things of value. Thus, adequate production of the essentials of an abundant life is insured, the cost of living is reduced, while at the same time the farmer's income is increased. Indeed, the only way cost of living can be reduced is by increased production. It follows that the only way to prevent inflation is to produce enough of those things that people want and need. Giro gives impetus and insures exactly this kind of production. By the same token, Giro offers the simplest and most practical method for conversion from a war to a peace economy.

By Giro, the farming industry is placed in the same category as the mass manufacturing of machinery, automobiles and other articles of universal desire, where the cost of the product has been reduced concurrently with increased wages and shortened hours, together with increased profit to the manufacturer.

A high degree of civilization without a medium of exchange, that is, a medium which facilitates free and adequate exchange of economic goods and services, is inconceivable. But we have been laboring under the delusion that money is intrinsically something more than a mere medium of exchange. We have permitted money to become our measure of value; indeed, we have permitted that to become its chief function.

We have permitted prices, in the terms of money[1] and not in terms of relative values, to become a real handicap to free exchange. If we were to exchange a peck measure for all objects it measures that would be analogous to the use we make of money. Not only so, but if this measure of value (money) is scarce, it measures more in other commodities. If it is plentiful it measures less. It is a measure which fluctuates erratically.

Value is a relative term. There is no intrinsic value. The value of one thing must be stated in the terms of its relation to other things. There is no other way to measure real value. Were gold as plentiful as iron it would be worth less than iron.

Since the true purpose of money is to avoid the inconvenience of barter, money should not, itself, be an object of barter, since barter is exactly what money is designed to make unnecessary. It is anamalous, therefore, that our money should serve a double purpose, neither of them consistent with the true purpose of money. (1) Our type of money substitutes itself for wealth or real values and, by this substitution and assumption of arbitrary value, it is made payment in full value for all objects of economic desire. (2) Having assumed an arbitrary value, much in excess of its real value, our money is exchanged for merchandise, an exchange of merchandise for merchandise—barter. Thus, our money, by its very nature, defeats the true purpose of money and is not, and never has been, a true medium of exchange.

A $10 Federal Reserve note recites that it is redeemable at the United States Treasury or at a Federal Reserve bank for $10 in lawful money. Now, what does that mean? The $10 note is legal tender for all debts, public and private, so it is lawful money. It follows that, when it is presented at the United States Treasury or a Federal Reserve bank for redemption the holder will simply receive another $10 bill in exchange for the one he has presented for redemption. Intrinsically, neither $10 note is worth more than the paper upon which it is printed. They are objects of general desire only because they can be exchanged for objects and services of real value when and where we require them.

Referring to the National Survey of Potential Production Capacity, Robert R. Doane, writing for New Outlook, August 1934, remarked that "* * * an economy organized on the principle of division of labor can only function, under any system or 'ism,' on an exchange basis. That is, one class or kind of goods is exchanged by the producers for goods of another class. And this exchange is actually effected upon a cost basis. In other words, one set of costs become exchanged for another set of costs. Whether these costs be reckoned in money terms, in labor costs, in drawing-account tickets, or in ergs makes little difference."

It is evident that the modern industrial system requires an improved capital circulation. The common man needs a generally accepted instrument of exchange, eliminating obstructable circulation (of capital), arbitrary credit liquidation, "bilateral clearings," etc. Men need an instrument of (capital) exchange available to every human being in his transactions with other men, operating through their own clearing banks, private institutions, businesses, all existing banks, and all national or State treasuries. People in each country will, of course, continue to use their own designation for their medium of exchange, as heretofore.

Everywhere men need an orderly and agreed method of determining the realtive value of their various units of exchange mediums, so that uncontrollable variations in the medium of exchange are prevented.

We need a medium of exchange, which is determined neither in an unpredictable manner as, for example, by the technical progress of the gold industry, nor subject to large variations depending on the gold-reserve policies of individual groups or governments, but is governed by the actual current requirement for ever-expanding production, to fill increasing requirements of the needs of all men everywhere, and thus to serve to activate commerce in all countries and capable of deliberate expansion and contraction to offset deflationary and inflationary tendencies through a rational amortizing mechanism functioning in every individual circulation account.

Everywhere man needs a system possessed of an internal inherent and automatic stabilizing mechanism by which deflationary or inflationary departure from equilibrium can be controlled and avoid an equal but opposite disturbance elsewhere.

We need a starting-off during the war as well as thereafter permitting the accumulation of stocks of reserves in products which will be available as credits so that we may all live our free and individual lives without undue anxiety during and following the transitional period to full peacetime economy, regardless of what governments may do in stabilizing or failing to stabilize their mediums of exchange.

It is proposed to establish a gyro-account agreement, under whatever designation the people who do the work and use the accounts may elect, to exchange with each other what they have produced for what others have produced, paying always in kind untrammeled by artificial, varying and dangerous currencies which by past performance have proven inadequate and disastrous, regardless of regulation and the chimeric backing of gold or of paper promises.

Individuals, groups of individuals, or companies, who have a favorable balance of payments with other men who have received what they worked for, produced, and sold, will be given a credit account in their own local private bank or institution which may be counterbalanced by debits on the accounts with similar institutions or banks at the point of origin of the demand for the delivery to others of what they have worked for, produced, and sold.

Giro possesses sufficient capacity for self-equilibrium to assure due precaution against the piling up of credit and debit balances without limit. The fundamental principle is the necessary equality of credits and debits, as that principle is relied upon in any closed banking system.

THE PROVISIONS OF GIRO

The provisions proposed (the particular proportions and other details being tentative as a basis of discussion) are the following:

All who work, produce, organize, direct, buy, and sell (all useful men who serve and wish to obtain the services of others) invite each other to become useful members of a great clearing union for all men in which all shall enjoy the basic human right to exchange with others as others exchange with them, without interference by any special groups, cliques, boards, committees, or appointees.

(1) The people's own banks organized in all places where the local people themselves set them up—free and unhindered by centralized authorities. Ex-enemies will be invited to do likewise.

(2) The governing boards of all these banks or giro houses will constitute themselves locally and there will be no need for centralization; everyone will have the incentive to do business with everybody else, the daily business and the technical arrangements being carried out through each bank and through the bank's arrangements with each other.

(3) All who establish accounts will agree among themselves on the initial value of their own accounts, in terms of their domestic units of mediums of exchange (perhaps tied to some index mutually agreed on) or as established by a people's own commodity exchange. There will be no need of compulsory centralized regulation, because there will be no occasion to risk variations in the value of the medium of exchange, each account will express figures representing exclusively available goods and services.

(4) The value of accounts (deposits) shall be fixed in terms of the value of the goods and services they represent. Sales and purchases need not be restricted, for no credit can be created without the presence of purchasing power which is (available, desirable, wanted) goods and services.

(5) Each individual or legal person shall be able to obtain credits according to his established individual responsibility and have the right to enjoy the facilities provided for easy pay-as-you-go amortization with one's own work and products as and when paid for. It is a matter of discussion whether the formula should also take account of other factors—such as imperceptible payments for social security, general insurance, and all taxes in this same simple way.

(6) All depositors shall agree to accept payment of balances due to them from other depositors, by a transfer to their credit in the books of their bank. They shall be entitled, subject to the conditions set forth below, to make transfers from their accounts to other depositors, which may have the effect of overdrawing their own accounts, provided that the maximum debit balances thus created do not exceed their safe margin of collateral or responsible guaranty of purchasing power (see (4) above).

The bank may at its discretion charge a small commission or transfer fee in respect of transactions in its books for the purpose of meeting its current expenses or any other demands upon it, as agreed on with each individual who has an account. This charge will also include the necessary amortization of debts against each account, in such a manner that debts become imperceptibly payable as and when debtors receive something and not, as hitherto, on arbitrarily

[1] Dollars are the units of our money. Alexander Hamilton wanted us to call them "units," and for a time the words "dollars" and "units" were used interchangeably. (The Spirit of Enterprise, by Edgar M. Queeny.)

fixed dates which do not take into consideration the practical ability of men to meet their obligations. These arbitrarily fixed-payment dates not only constantly harasses all men—directly or indirectly—but are the underlying causes of failures, the loss of millions of man-hours in needless paper-rut routines, and finally resulting in crime, craze, and chaos.

(7) Creditors and debtors shall pay 1 percent on the amount of their transactions. As much as 1 percent is not absolutely essential to the scheme. But 1 percent would amply cover all taxes due to any government anywhere as well as all expenditures of all kinds with which men are now burdened through direct taxation. The 1 percent would also amply cover stabilization funds to insure an ever-stable medium of exchange. All other taxes could be abolished.

During the war a 2- or 3-percent increase would pay as we go for the war—no other levy being necessary. We will then be able to steer our economic development instead of being blown like leaves before the wind by chaotic and uncontrollable, unforseeable, and erratic economic whims and fancies which have led us to the brink of fascism and slavery.

(8) (A) Regulation of the values of the figures (numbers) of the medium of exchange can thus take place without injury to anyone and always with the sole end in view of creating more purchasing power, thus making desirable goods and services available to all men who work and produce, sell and buy.

(B) Governing boards of each local institution will require and fix the type and amount of collateral necessary in each individual case. Such collateral shall, at the discretion of the board of each local bank or institution, be maintained with a sufficient margin within the practical capacity (as determined by the board) of the depositor concerned. As a condition, where one is permitted to increase his debit balance the board may require all or any of the following measures:

(I) A stated increase in the rate of amortization on the turn-over on the depositors account if it deems it to be the suitable remedy;

(II) Additional collateral; and

(III) Good and sufficient guaranties from acceptable responsible depositors.

Furthermore a board may recommend to any business enterprise any internal measure affecting its economy which may appear to be appropriate to the restoration of the equilibrium of its balances with other men and enterprises.

(C) If a depositor's debit balance is excessive, the governing board has under this present arrangement at its disposal all necessary means to reduce his debit balance as above indicated. (See (1), (2), and (3).)

(D) Each individual depositor shall agree to undertake all his transactions over the accounts of this "clearing union." A depositor who ceases to use the bank or institutions of this "clearing union" before the expiration of any credit arrangement with the same may be treated as in default, his collateral liquidated or his guarantors called upon to make good the default.

A depositor whose credit balance is excessive and who is unable to make use of accumulated credits may consult with his board for advice as to the most profitable way (for the depositor and for every other depositor) to use such accumulated credits including:

(a) Measures for expanding the depositors activities.

(b) The appreciation of an increase in earnings by engaging in some new and different activity.

(c) Encouragement to lower prices and rendering better services.

(d) Possibility of financing new enterprises in other parts of the world.

Depositors may be entitled to obtain a credit balance by delivering gold, silver, copper, lead, and other metals but no one is entitled to demand gold, silver, copper, lead, etc., from the banks or institutions.

The boards of the banks or institutions shall, however, have the discretion to dispose of any such metals as they see fit.

Balances on accounts can be in any other bank and country at the discretion of the individual depositor, and all countries will agree that any citizen of any country is at all times free to transfer his credits from one country to the other to any banks he sees fit, always, however, using his same name (and if possible the same account number) so that debt deductions with all transactions cannot be avoided through the transfer of accounts to other countries or banks.

One-half of the boards may be elected by the debtors of each bank—the voting power being distributed pro rata according to the amount of one's debt. The other half of the board members to be elected by all the bank's depositors.

The local boards of each bank or institution will be able to reduce or increase the credit quotas to which the depositors are entitled (relative to their respective collateral or guaranty) in case there is need of curtailing or expanding particular productions.

The board shall be entitled to ask and receive from each individual depositor in business, regular statements and balance sheets and the depositors are invited freely to communicate with the board on important matters of policy likely substantially affecting their relations with fellow depositors.

Information offices for all banks and institutions may be located in New York, London, Stockholm, and all larger cities in the world, so that the names and addresses of all such clearing banks can be instantly located anywhere for the good of all people everywhere.

A depositor who gives proof of discharge of all indebtedness to any bank anywhere may withdraw from the banks or institutions.

All existing banks shall be invited to collaborate and continue this new and improved form of banking.

The governing boards shall make annual reports and shall convene in an annual assembly to which every depositor is invited.

Child-Care Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a resolution adopted at the tenth constitutional convention of the UAW-CIO on child care:

CHILD CARE RESOLUTION

Whereas the UAW-CIO has long been concerned with and contributed to the improvement of community services and facilities for the care and development of children; and

Whereas many States and communities are unable to provide adequate services and facilities for children, and must have the assistance of the Federal Government if such services and facilities are to be widely available; and

Whereas with the termination of the Lanham Act aid to the day care of children and the inadequate provisions of child-welfare services now made under the Social Security Act, the Federal Government is not now doing its share in protecting and promoting well-being of our children: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved—

1. That this tenth convention of UAW-CIO support any Federal legislation, such as the Pepper bill (S. 1318), that will put necessary welfare services within reach of all children who need them, including day care for children of working mothers, recreational and other services that will cut down on juvenile delinquency, and care for dependent and neglected children;

2. That we work to make nursery schools a permanent part of our school structure, free to all parents in the community wishing to avail themselves of the opportunity; and

Be it finally resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Harry S. Truman, Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach, Director of the Children's Bureau, Department of Labor, to the Members of Congress, and to the press.

UAW-CIO TENTH CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION.

Adopted March 24, 1946.

World Famine Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Herbert Hoover under auspices of the Famine Emergency Committee, Sherman Hotel, Chicago, Ill., May 17, 1946:

This is my report to the American people upon the world famine situation. Three weeks ago I broadcasted from Cairo our report upon the situation in Europe. Since then we have examined the food problems in Egypt, Iraq, India, Siam, the Philippines, China, Korea, and Japan, thus compassing most of Asia.

I can, therefore, now consolidate our findings in 25 countries which we visited and upon several more upon which we have received competent information.

At the request of President Truman, I have acted as a sort of food ambassador to determine needs; to discover possible further sources of supplies; and to coordinate the world's effort to master this danger to the lives of millions. Beyond this, it has been my duty to represent the solicitude of the American people and their desire to aid.

Along the 35,000 miles we have traveled, I have seen with my own eyes the grimmest specter of famine in all the history of the world.

Of the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, the one named War has gone—at least for a while. But Famine, Pestilense, and Death are still charging over the earth. And the modern world has added four more to this evil brigade. Their names are Destruction, Drought, Fear, and Revolution. This crisis is not alone due to war destruction of agriculture. On the top of that calamity has been piled—drought in the Mediterranean, drought in India, drought in China, and partial drought in South Africa and the Argentine. Never have so many evil horsemen come all at one time.

Hunger hangs over the homes of more than 800,000,000 people—over one-third of the peo-

ple of the earth. Hunger is a silent visitor who comes like a shadow. He sits beside every anxious mother three times each day. He brings not alone suffering and sorrow, but fear and terror. He carries disorder and the paralysis of government, and even its downfall. He is more destructive than armies, not only in human life, but in morals. All of the values of right living melt before his invasions, and every gain of civilization crumbles. But we can save these people from the worst, if we will.

In our mission through Europe I have had the devoted cooperation of my six colleagues, all of them with long experience in famines. We secured independent investigations in advance of coming; we consulted at length with the heads of state and with the food and agricultural experts of each government; we checked and cross-checked all information with American officials in those countries; we have checked it again with the relief organizations of many nationalities who are working closely with the stricken peoples. And above all, my colleagues and I have gone into the byways to see for ourselves. I am confident our conclusions are close to reality.

On this journey I have seen much which I could criticize as to the management of the famine relief. I criticized such matters to many officials in the world frankly. I could criticize them bitterly. But, after every boiling of inward indignation at men and at nations, I come back again and again to the fact that millions are in grave danger of starvation. To explode into public criticism in this crisis would only weaken the amount of support and diminish the food they will receive. Criticism can wait for history. I only want to record that all has not been perfect in the world that I have witnessed. It all adds emphasis to the fact that today the vital need is unity and cooperation now, so that we may master this crisis.

In appraising the world situation, I could give you reams of figures of rations, of calories, of tons of this and that, for every country and each district. I could give you their stocks of food on hand, in transit, and the further need of each famine area. I could give it by the month or for the crisis. I could give the time required for ship transport with details of port, railroad, and truck capacities for distribution. This sort of detailed information would convey little to you, but it is full of meaning in the lives of men, women, and children, to my colleagues and myself. For in these figures lurks the certainty of hunger to hundreds of millions, and even the specter of mass starvation before this crisis is passed. Rather than such details, time requires that I give you a global picture, in the hope that it will convey to you the gravity of the situation, and the need for our utmost further effort.

I have said before that calories are the yardstick of hunger, of starvation, of famine, and finally death. And I may remind you that an average of 2,200 calories per person per day is the minimum in a nation for healthy human beings. And do remember that we Americans, the British, the Canadians, the Australians, the Swedes, the Argentinians, and most of the Western Hemisphere are consuming over 2,900 calories per day right now. If those 800,000,000 people should receive no more relief, and if we assume that their own remaining resources could be evenly distributed, which they could not, the measure of their hunger with the caloric yardstick is about as follows:

About 100,000,000 people would be reduced to the 2,000-calory level.

About 100,000,000 more people would be reduced to a 1,800-calory level.

About 150,000,000 more would be reduced to a 1,500-calory level.

About 150,000,000 more would be reduced to a 1,200-calory level; and

About 300,000,000 more would be reduced to a 900-calory level, or below, and that is slow death.

As we descend this scale, we move step by step from the stage of hunger to the stage of disease and epidemics, to the stage of public disorder, to the stage of starvation of all but the strongest, and, finally, at less than 900 calories we come to mass starvation. The Nazis at Buchenwald and Belsen gave almost that amount to their prisoners. But long before a population is reduced to these lower levels, Government would break down.

All this sounds like an engineering formula. It is; but it is a formula which means life and hope to nations. At the best we can do, it means knawing hunger to millions, but it is not mass starvation.

We must prevent the descent to these lower levels. Reconstruction and peace in the world would go up in the flames of chaos if we fail.

The transcendent question is the available overseas supplies with which to fulfill this formula. And I shall discuss breadstuffs only, for they are the symbols of life and hope. The problem of fats is no less urgent, but I will not burden your memories with more figures than necessary. And in breadstuffs I include all human food cereals that are available.

We have two sources of breadstuffs supply for this crisis—the residues of the 1945 harvest in the surplus countries, and the earlier part of the coming harvests of 1946. The harvests of some countries comes in June, others as late as October, and some supplies from the new harvest can be available to the countries of late harvests. If the present harvest prospects continue favorable, relief will come to the world within a few months. By September new supplies should be available and the immediate crisis will ease.

In March last, the Combined Food Board in Washington made an estimate of the amount of food needed by all the deficit nations for the first 6 months of 1946, and of supplies available from the food-surplus nations. These estimates of need were based upon the requirements as stated by the nations who must have overseas supplies. Adding in estimates of the need between June and the fall harvest, the total requirements of cereals were listed at, roughly, 26,000,000 tons. For the same period supplies were estimated at 15,000,000 tons. Thus, there was an unbridgeable gap of 11,000,000 tons, or nearly 43 percent. And that would be a calorie level below human endurance. That gap of 11,000,000 tons spells death to millions.

During these past months shipments have been moving, and mass starvation has so far been prevented. Our mission examined the stocks now in the hands of each country and the amounts of their own production that could be expected. We measured the needs of each nation on a drastic caloric basis such as would pull them through, would prevent mass starvation, would maintain order and economic life. We kept the 1,500-1,800 calorie bedrock figure always in mind. Most of the nations we visited joined earnestly with us in working out the very minimum they could do with, as they all realize the desperation of other nations.

The net of these drastic revisions was to reduce the total world requirements of breadstuffs by about 4,000,000 tons. By developing some new sources, by substitution of other cereals, by shifting between early and late harvests, by our sacrifices in America, and by spreading sacrifice into other surplus areas, we estimate supplies for the hungry will be increased by a minimum of about 3,000,000 tons. Thus, the gap has been decreased from 11,000,000 tons to 3,600,000 tons. But the gap is still there—and it is a tragic gap.

I can illustrate how tragic that gap still is. It equals the whole amount necessary to save 40,000,000 people. We would, of course, not concentrate the shortage on one nation but if we spread it over all, the results are about the same. There are Americans who believe it right, and a duty, to feed women and children even of a surrendered enemy. No one is the enemy of children. There are others who believe that the only hope of a peaceful world is to save the enemy peoples from starvation and thus start building them into peaceful, cooperative peoples. There are others who, remembering the immeasurable crimes the enemy has committed against all mankind, believe in "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth." To these, let me say that to keep 500,000 American boys in garrison among starving women and children is unthinkable. It is impossible because, being Americans, they will share their own rations with hungry children; it is impossible because hunger brings the total destruction of all morals; it is impossible because of the danger to American boys of sweeping infectious diseases, which rise from famine. It is unthinkable because we do not want our boys machine-gunning famished rioters. It is unthinkable because we do not want the American flag flying over Nation-wide Buchenwalds.

And what of the children in Europe?

This 1,500-calorie bottom level is dreadfully hard on children. It is hard because a larger portion of the average ration must go to heavy workers if essential services be kept going. While this diet, which is as much as 85 percent bread and the balance a little fat, sugar, and vegetables, will pull adults through, it is not adapted to children. Several nations give them priority in what little dairy supplies there are; extra food is given in some schools; and the charitable agencies are doing the best they can. But in all, they are touching only the fringe of the problem. The proof of this is an annual infant mortality rate as high as 200 per 1,000 among children under 1 year in many cities. The further proof is that there are somewhere from twenty to thirty million physically subnormal children on the Continent. After the war in 1919–20, we have a good extra meal a day, of 500 or 600 calories of restorative food, to 10,000,000 children.

I deplore that this special aid for children has had no counterpart through a widespread organization set-up after this war. Civilization marches forward upon the feet of healthy children. It is not too late to stop this most costly retreat and its debacle of endless evil.

Much the same could be said of tens of millions of children in Asia. There many millions of these children have been falling far short of full life since long before this famine. And they are harder to reach and help because of age-old rooted customs.

Our mission has stimulated some action for children both in Europe and Asia. I have already proposed not alone a systematic handling of this problem of subnormal children, but a drastic reorganization of the world's food administration for the next harvest year. It is a primary job for the United Nations Organization if peace and good will are to be reestablished on earth.

UNRRA, with its earnest staff, attends to about 20 percent of the world's food needs. Their supply is by charity, of which the vast majority comes from America. But great as this work is, 80 percent of the problem is not charity; it is the furnishing of supplies which people can buy, yet they are just as hungry as the destitute.

Before closing, I should pay tribute to my colleagues on this journey, and to the great army of men and women in every nation over the world who are working unceasingly to save these millions of lives. The volunteer organizations of the religious bodies, of the Red Cross of many nations, are in the field unceasingly doing their best, but they can remedy only a fraction of the suffering.

There are some hopes of further decreasing this gap of 3,600,000 tons.

First. Still more intensive conservation of breadstuffs and fats in North America. Before I went on this journey we asked the

American people to reduce their consumption of wheat products to 2 pounds per week per person and to cut their purchases of fats by 20 percent. Hundreds of thousands of families have responded by cutting out wheat products altogether. Public eating places in many cities have cooperated. I regret to say there are too many who have not cooperated with some hungry human being. I earnestly hope that every American will remember that an invisible guest sits with him at every meal.

Second. We have need that every farmer bring every grain of cereal to market.

We are seeking for still further cooperation in other nations. The Latin-American States have responded to our appeals and to those of Pope Pius XII for cooperation. At President Truman's request I shall visit these governments to consult with them on measures of coordination of our efforts.

If we can succeed in persuading every man and woman, every nation to do their utmost, we shall master this famine. And we shall save the lives of hundreds of millions from the greatest jeopardy in all the history of mankind. We shall have saved infinite suffering.

I was asked by the President to undertake this work in a purely advisory capacity and with the further journey to the Latin-American States, my service ends. The responsibilities of administration of the programs I have outlined lie with our officials. I bespeak for them the full support of all Americans in their efforts to meet this terrible world crisis.

In conclusion, do I need to reinforce this report with more urging to do your utmost? I may repeat again what I said 3 weeks ago from Cairo: "If every source of supplies will do its utmost, we can pull the world through this most dangerous crisis. The saving of these human lives is far more than an economic necessity to the recovery of the world. It is more than the only path to order, to stability, and to peace. Such action marks the return of the lamp of compassion to the earth. And that is a part of the moral and spiritual reconstruction of the world."

Un-American Activities Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I agree with most of what has been said today about the importance of investigation of the Communist movement in America. I believe the most effective protection a democracy can have against the inroads of such a totalitarian movement is by means of exposing its methods and activities so the people will understand.

In order to be effective, however, such an investigation must be sharp and definite. It is, above all things, important that no distinction be made between the twin dangers from totalitarian forces of the left and similar forces of the right. With equal effort both such groups must be exposed. Especially is this true in the United States, for it is inconceivable that this Nation will ever succumb to a Communist revolution, whereas it is altogether possible that under certain conditions a Fascist revolution might succeed. But the thing that will cause Fascist movements to grow and flourish in America, more than anything else, is the presence in the Nation of a Communist movement. Every Communist will beget two Fascists to counteract him; and every progressive, however devoted to American institutions he may be, who cooperates with Communists, even for the achievement of apparently worthy objectives, helps to bring about the same result.

My concern about the present committee lies not so much in its official acts as in speeches made and purporting to be connected with the work of the committee in which irresponsible accusations of "communism" are made against people of whom such charges are palpably not true. Such occurrences actually strengthen the Communists because they confuse the public mind on the whole issue.

In the course of the debate today a statement was made by a member of this committee about un-American elements in the House. The implication was left that anyone opposing this additional appropriation for the committee fell into the un-American category. That I know is unfair and untrue. I voted "no" primarily because of that accusation. For when the time arrives that there can no longer be disagreement about the work of a committee of this kind without the opponents being accused in that way, then the very right of opposition itself is questioned and it is time for those who believe in democratic institutions to stand up and be counted.

Therefore I voted against the resolution.

I voted to give this committee its original appropriation. For while I believe an investigation of this kind should be conducted by a special committee subject to having its work annually reviewed by the House, I felt that, once the majority of the House had voted to set up the committee, funds should be provided. I also voted to support the committee on its recent contempt citation. And but for the accusation mentioned above I should have voted for this resolution today on the same grounds, despite my concern about some of the mistakes which I believe have been made.

I am in accord with those who have praised the work of the FBI and stated that it is the agency best equipped to carry on the work against subversive elements. I agree, but I think there is also a place in the present condition of things at least for a congressional special committee to investigate totalitarian subversive movements in the United States. The question is not whether that job should be done but rather how and by whom. And certainly Members of the House who are sincerely in opposition to the way a particular committee of this kind carries on its work ought to be given the same right to their opinion as anyone else, without being unfairly accused of unworthy motives. I stood with them today for that reason. Otherwise I should have resolved my doubts in favor of the appropriation to the committee.

Left Wing Versus Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the left wing ultra radical group which now controls the economic structure of our country through the OPA organization is now using its controls to prevent farmers from making a profit on their product. This un-American group, of which the top officials are only "cat's paws" for the invisible force behind the scenes, are even establishing policies to favor the allocation of sugar to beverage products instead of food-producing processors, farmer owned and operated. Millions of pounds of sugar now go to soft-drink establishments, while the plea of farmers to permit them to process fruit juices into jellies and jams with high nutritive food values is denied sugar with the communistic excuse that it would mean higher price to the farmers for their products. Therefore, beverages, so OPA says, should have the preference. The allocation of sugar for nonfood purposes is a national scandal, but it is in accord with the whole program of this group of economic saboteurs. Why should Congress perpetuate the OPA with its widespread black-market lawlessness and its destruction of legitimate business and its eventual ruin of the private enterprise system? Congress, by wiping out the OPA, can bring about full production as a bulwark against inflationary price advances. Every thoughtful citizen knows this to be a fact. Is our standard of living to be lowered to that of Asia, the latter being more than seven times lower than ours? If OPA becomes a permanent totalitarian agency of the Government, the producing concerns, even our farms, can be so utterly crippled and so incapacitated for production that the consequences to our people can be ghastly. Has the time come in the communizing and sovietizing of the United States that the voice of the OPA and its communistic hirelings on the radio are to be heard and followed by the duly elected and sworn representatives of a great nation? I cannot believe such to be the case, yet thus far the crisis has not been met by Congress with that courage and promptness the citizens have had a right to expect.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of May 15, 1946:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK

OPA INTENDS TO STAY

In these columns yesterday we quoted Professors Pearson and Paarlberg's statements on the triple-headed function of prices. Briefly, they showed that prices and the constant changes in prices determine who makes or grows how much of what for whom.

It seems to us that when the automatic decisions of freely determined prices is replaced by an authority which consciously controls prices, the inevitable consequence is that such an authority effectually controls

the entire economy; who makes how much of what for whom depends on the control's judgment.

There are some people, mostly the leftists of the totalitarian school, who believe that this is a very good thing. Those who think in that way can logically support price control and certainly the most vehement support does come from that quarter.

There are a number of other people who are not leftists who do recognize the balancing and directing function of price changes, but who still think that it is possible to continue OPA in some modified form and provide for its gradual withdrawal.

It seems to us that these people who favor a compromise regard price control not as it is, but as they think it might be. It also seems to us that they are reckoning without the repeated illustrations of the philosophy and intent of those who are in charge of OPA, and will very probably remain if the agency's power is renewed.

OPA does not operate in a vacuum where one can disturb one price or set of prices without affecting others. On the contrary, when one price is disturbed, eddies and currents are set up throughout the whole price atmosphere. What is done to copper and steel immediately affects all users of copper and steel and all materials that are in any way competitive with copper and steel. Under such circumstances it becomes a rather fanciful picture to talk of demobilizing price controls. The whole tendency is in the opposite direction.

The difficulty of selective control would be present no matter who might be in charge of OPA. Assume that Senator TAFT, one of the best informed critics of OPA, were made administrator of that agency. He would find, just as the present controllers have found, that when he controlled one price he threw out of adjustment dozens, and in some cases hundreds, of relationships and that he was under the necessity of making readjustments. Each readjustment would have its disturbing effect in places where the original action was felt only slightly.

However, those who have guided the destinies of OPA have not, for the most part, been people who give any appearance of wanting to demobilize their controls. On the contrary, their record is one of finding reasons why the controls should be retained and extended.

On the record are many statements that when the supply of any commodity was sufficient to meet demand, OPA intended to withdraw its controls. However, it retains controls over commodities where supply is unquestionably sufficient to meet demand. One of them is cigarettes. Before both House and Senate committees, Mr. S. Clay Williams, chairman of the board of directors of the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. and a former administrator of NRA, told how he had approached OPA with evidence of the adequacy of the cigarette supply. When he did that, he was confronted with a new ruling and he was told that OPA was holding control because the agency feared that if control were relinquished the price of cigarettes would rise. There was an instance, which could be multiplied, of OPA's intention to continue an emergency power beyond the emergency and of substituting its judgment for the judgment of the market place.

When the House of Representatives in voting to continue OPA amended the act clearly setting a standard by which commodities in supply should be decontrolled, OPA, aided by its leftist allies, immediately set up a cry of crippling amendments. Now, if OPA had any real intention of lifting controls, why does it cripple OPA when Congress writes a law saying that controls should be lifted?

We think that the demobilization of OPA would be hard enough if it wanted to demobilize. It clearly does not. If it is extended it will, on the basis of all experience, try to take a firmer grip on the economy. In another year or 9 months, it will be back again arguing for renewal of its powers.

Speech of Secretary Henry A. Wallace Delivered at Detroit, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address by Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Commerce, delivered before a meeting of the Michigan Citizens' Committee at the Masonic Temple in Detroit, Mich., on Tuesday, May 7, 1946:

Whenever I speak before independent political action groups, such as the Michigan Citizens Committee, I always feel as if I were in the presence of the conscience of the Democratic Party.

Without the independent vote, the Democratic Party, in due course, undoubtedly would become as reactionary as the Republican Party. But it is also true that in the two-party system of our time, the independent voter has been effective on a national basis only through the medium of the Democratic Party.

The underlying spirit of the independent voter is the progressive spirit. And never before in our history did the independent voter receive anywhere near as big a return on his ballot—in terms of real progress for all—as in the Democratic New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt.

I am here tonight still a believer in the greatness and justness of the Roosevelt New Deal. I believe that the New Deal lives on—that the New Deal is still the one sure guidepost to our national security and progress. And without this national security for all and continued progress at home, we cannot hope to fulfill our role in world affairs.

I am here tonight to give my full support to the legislative program that continues to embody the national cause of the New Deal—that legislative program unswervingly advocated by Franklin Roosevelt's successor, Harry S. Truman.

Every member of the Democratic Party worthy of the tradition of Jefferson and Jackson, Wilson, and Roosevelt—every independent voter who cherishes the progressive faith—must stand up and be counted here and now to put this progressive legislative program into action.

I rejoice, as I know you do, in these words of Harry Truman at Hyde Park on the first anniversary of Franklin Roosevelt's death.

"The progressive and humane principles of the New Deal"—Harry Truman said then—"embodied the great hope which in an hour of extreme crisis President Roosevelt gave to the American people. As carried out in practice, the New Deal became the realization of that hope. It was a recognition of the basic truth that this Government exists not for the benefit of a privileged few but for the welfare of all the people."

Yes; this is the message of hope that the New Deal still conveys to the Nation in these critical days of winning the peace. And in these days of decision, the conscience of the independent voter does not whisper for action. It demands action in a loud and earnest voice.

But the time for action is short. In our own country, just as throughout the world, the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse of our day still are riding hard. These are the Horsemen of Greed and Want, Fear and War. Given free rein, they would ride roughshod over the hopes of mankind everywhere.

Let us identify these horsemen in the plain words of what they represent in our national and international life.

First, there is the Horseman of Greed. Throughout the war we came to know well the voice of "me first"—the voice upon which special privilege and black markets thrived. This voice is still with us. And today it clamors for the outright repeal or emasculation of OPA controls.

It is a voice that drips with honeyed words of freedom of initiative and action. But stripped of these overtones, it is the voice of a Pied Piper of Republican normalcy beguiling us to national ruin.

There is no need for me here tonight to enter into any extended academic discussion about inflation and deflation. We all know only too well the road signs on this economic joyride. They read, "Boom, Bust, and Chaos."

A comparatively small handful will profit from this national catastrophe. But they are those long accustomed to fishing in troubled waters. The giants of business, well-fattened on war profits, have no fear of survival—nor do the speculators who profit on the rise as well as the fall.

But the factory worker and white-collar worker in the city know what would happen to their fixed family budgets if the Congress should eliminate price controls on everyday household commodities. They dread the consequences of the crash that would follow the frenzied rise in prices. They fear for their jobs and their children's future. They know they cannot escape the national misery.

These same fears should also exist everywhere on the farm. But unfortunately too many farmers seem to believe that they could ride out this price rise in safety. And thus, too many of them are giving support to the enemies of OPA.

Such farmers are sadly misguided. For all too soon even the wealthiest of them would be trapped as they were in the twenties. They would have to sell their crops at give-away prices—and yet they would have to pay the same price for the things they needed to run their farms.

Up to now, the National Association of Manufacturers admits to having spent around $400,000 in its nefarious fight against OPA. Other national organizations of industry and commerce have also spent large amounts of money in the same destructive purpose. But it is difficult for me to believe that these organizations speak for most of the merchants and manufacturers in the United States. Most of them, I am sure, clearly realize that the business community as a whole—the structure upon which is built what we call the great middle class—will suffer just as much as the farmer, the factory worker, and the white-collar worker.

From personal contact, I know that many businessmen—big, medium, and small—are opposed to the blind opposition of the greedy policy makers in the National Association of Manufacturers. I know that these intelligent businessmen are doing their best to prevent the extremists in the business community from undermining the very foundations of our national safety. And I applaud them for their far-sighted interest in the national welfare.

Also here tonight I want to applaud the actions of the six progressive Democratic Members of the House of Representatives from your State of Michigan—all of whom

stood up and were counted in full support of OPA. Five of them come from the Detroit area—GEORGE SADOWSKI, GEORGE O'BRIEN, LOUIS RABAUT, JOHN DINGELL, and JOHN LESINSKI. The sixth comes from the Upper Peninsula and is the only other Democratic Representative from all the rest of Michigan—FRANK HOOK.

The national interest demands more of these progressive Democrats—not only from your State but from all the country.

These six progressive Democrats from Michigan not only have fought the good fight on OPA: they also have fought consistently and faithfully for the people's progress on every congressional front. These progressive Democrats from Michigan—as do all good Democrats everywhere in the Nation—know that the horseman of want rides alongside the horseman of greed. They know that when these horsemen ride, we must not only stand fast against inflationary disaster while winning the peace but that at the same time we must also build the foundations of a better life for all.

To this end the progressive forces in Congress have won a full employment bill that goes far toward putting into action one of the basic beliefs of the Democratic New Deal, namely, that the Federal Government has the responsibility to use its resources to prevent mass unemployment and national misery; that the Federal Government has the responsibility to use its power to keep the whole Nation a going concern.

But we still have far to go. We have far to go not only in the development of our natural resources, we have even farther to go in protecting and developing our human resources.

To this end every progressive-minded citizen everywhere should give ceaseless support to the national health program that bears the name of one of your Representatives from Detroit—the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. The hearings on this bill are now going on in the Committee on Education and Labor of the United States Senate, so you still have time to make your support known to Congress.

To this end, also, every progressive-minded citizen everywhere should support a realistic program of Federal aid to education. For only if measures such as these are enacted by Congress will we be living up to the American credo of progress.

This credo of progress is made of many parts. And those parts of progress all fit together into the whole of the national welfare. The prevention of a disastrous inflation is a part. The work of the Federal Government in the conservation and development of our natural resources is a part. The guaranty of the Federal Government to provide and maintain full employment is a part. And so, too, is the contribution of all of us—operating through the Federal Government—to better health, better education and social security for all. They all add up to the whole of our national security. They spell out our national progress.

These things are the barriers that can be erected by an alert people against not only the Horsemen of Greed and Want—but also the Horseman of Fear. For this Horseman of Fear feeds upon the left-overs of national disaster.

Fear is a product of boom, bust and chaos. Fear is a substance that grows out of man's failure to achieve the plenty and security that he knows can be his. We all know that from this kind of an economic fear are born the worst hatreds of mankind—one race or creed against another; one people against another; one world against itself.

Something happens to people in time of extreme economic chaos that affects their judgment and their attitudes. They are understandably low in morale. And all too often, they become easy prey for those demagogs of reaction who seize upon this low morale to serve the undemocratic end of wrecking our free way of life.

We have an undeniably great role to play as a people. We are only upon the threshold of demonstrating to the world what we really mean by the American standard of living. We have extensive economic frontiers still to be developed here at home. We are far from being a mature economy.

But we cannot build to our fullest extent here at home unless we are determined to finish the job of writing both a political and an economic bill of rights in this country. This horseman of fear will always be with us in our national life as long as we still must fight to abolish the poll tax and to establish the FEPC on a permanent basis.

This horseman of fear will always be with us as long as it can feed upon the inequities in our political and economic life.

There is no place in the credo of a progressive America for the Ku Klux Klan, the Silver Shirts, or other satellites of an American fascism that use such high-sounding names as the sentinels of democracy.

There is also no place in the credo of a progressive America for those who would put us one against another to achieve the end of an American communism—nor for those who would put us one over the other to achieve the ends of an American fascism.

Anyone who arises in this country to so put us one against another or one over another—anyone who serves these ends of national degradation—is a stableboy for the four horsemen of our national ruin.

The fourth horseman that still rides hard today—at home and abroad—is the horseman of war.

To erect a barrier against this horseman of war we need a healthy national economy so that we can fulfill our role in creating a healthy world—a world of productive peace. So, by building barriers against the horsemen of greed and want and fear here at home, then we also will have built a barrier against the horseman of war.

We here in the United States want no war against anybody. We seek only peace. And I am sure that we seek the kind of a peace that is not dictated by a few against the many. That kind of a peace that is not dictated by nations still with international axes to grind. I firmly believe that, as a people, we want the kind of a peace that belongs to all peoples everywhere on earth.

The war we have won against the forces of Axis aggression was not won by any one nation. It was not won in the Battle of Britain, in the Battle of Stalingrad. It was not won just by the industrial might and the manpower of our own country. It was won by an undeniable love of freedom by peoples, big and small, all over the world, by people in free countries, as well as those who worked underground in enemy and occupied countries.

It is from this human side rather than from the material side that we must approach the world that we live in today.

We have the human resources, and we have the natural resources. We have the greatest industrial machine that the world has ever known. But the answer to what we are going to do with all of these resources is not an answer that belongs just to ourselves alone. World War II demonstrated to us that the answer justifiably belongs to all of the rest of the world as well.

Those who serve the ends of our national disunity will say that we did not seek the role that is ours in world affairs. Just the same, we cannot escape our dominance in world affairs. We can no more deny our greatness in world affairs than we can deny the necessity of proving ourselves the master of our destiny in our own homeland.

In assuming this inevitable role of greatness in world affairs, we must remember that there is no voice that arises from any justifiable position that says we should go to war against any nation.

I am sure we all believe that the historical position of the United Kingdom in world affairs must be changed, just as I am sure that all of us here tonight fervently hope that Clement Attlee's Labor government will bring about this change in a solution that is equitable to all of the peoples that have hitherto been under the domination of the British Government.

We here in the United States, I am sure, want to see an equitable solution of all problems that stand in the way of a lasting and productive peace. I am sure that we want a world peace based upon the end of exploitation everywhere. I am sure we want no exploitation of other peoples by our own Government. And I am sure we do not want the Soviet Union to use its power to exploit its neighbors.

Throughout the world, big peoples and little peoples know that the Four Horsemen are riding. They know, too, that our world should have learned its lesson. They know that they are not going to stop these horsemen of Greed and Want, Fear, and War by quarreling among themselves. They want peace. And they will demand peace from those in governmental positions of authority who hold peace in their hands.

We here in this country, as a people, are as fortunate as we are great. We have the natural resources and the human resources, and we also have the technical know-how to do any kind of a job. Also, I am sure, we have one other thing. We have a conscience that drives us on to political and economic freedom at home—and to a just peace without exploitation abroad.

This is the essence of the American credo of progress. And if we dedicate ourselves to this credo we need not worry about the Four Horsemen of Greed and Want, Fear, and War. We know that our national life does not end on a note of despair. Our national life is so great that, given the will to do so, we can bring about a workable system between the peoples of the world—so that all of mankind can live in a peace of abundance, one with another.

So to live up to this credo of American progress, I make this appeal to intelligent political thought everywhere. Let us equip ourselves now to be a healthy Nation in a healthy world. And that world means your great industrial area of Detroit—just as it means every place else in this land that we love.

The Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION ON HOUSING PASSED AT THE 1946 DIOCESAN CONVENTION OF THE DIOCESE OF MASSACHUSETTS, NEW ENGLAND MUTUAL HALL, MAY 8, 1946

Whereas a serious lack of adequate housing strikes directly at the institution of the Christian family and greatly increases the rates of disease, infant mortality, accidents, fire, crime and delinquency, divorce and alcoholism; and

Whereas the National Housing Agency's statistics show a need for 1,250,000 new nonfarm dwelling units each year for the next 10 years; and

Whereas the National Housing Agency estimates that 6,800,000 families will be forced to "double up" in houses and apartments by the end of 1946; and

Whereas families of the middle and low income groups, who are in the greatest need of decent homes, are in great need of stable but low-cost houses: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention support the Patman housing bill (H. R. 4761) for a program of emergency veterans' housing and the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill (S. 1592) which establishes a long-range housing program for the United States.

A Bankrupt Labor Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the New York Times:

A BANKRUPT LABOR POLICY

Both the operators and John L. Lewis have rejected President Truman's proposal that they submit their dispute to binding arbitration. The operators were willing to arbitrate on wages and hours, but balked at arbitration of Mr. Lewis' private pay-roll tax. Mr. Lewis took the position that his union negotiating committee is not authorized to arbitrate anything.

The President's arbitration proposal was a proper and, under the circumstances, an unavoidable step. There is no satisfactory explanation of why he waited until the strike had been on 42 days, until the country's accumulated stocks of coal had been all but exhausted, until factories were closing everywhere in the Nation, until the crisis had reached the proportions of a national disaster, before taking it. Its proposal earlier, if rejected, would have left more time for taking subsequent measures.

The crisis to which the country has been brought reveals the utter bankruptcy of the labor policy—or perhaps one should say policies—that Mr. Truman has hitherto followed. Even today he is following two separate and irreconcilable policies in dealing with the coal strike and with the railroad strike.

When the Pacific war ended, Mr. Truman declared in a radio address:

"Many people have asked the Government to step in and decide who is to increase wages and by exactly how much. I have, indeed, been criticized because I have not stepped in to law down the law to business and labor. My refusal to do so has been deliberate. * * * I am convinced that we must get away as quickly as possible from Government controls, and that we must get back to the free operation of our competitive system. Where wages are concerned, this means that we must get back to free and fair collective bargaining."

Even at the moment that the President was announcing this policy, however, he was taking measures inconsistent with it. It was obviously impossible to hold the line on prices while letting wages, the chief element both in costs of production and in consumer purchasing power, go wherever competition and collective bargaining might send them. Mr. Truman made the contradiction greater still by declaring that he thought wages could be raised while prices were held down.

Officials of his Administration then began to incite labor unrest by publishing figures purporting to show just how much wages could or should be raised by industry. Then the President intervened in the petroleum and General Motors strikes by appointing "fact-finding" boards. These boards did not confine themselves to finding facts, but made recommendations for wage increases frankly based on what they supposed was the President's own "wage policy." Influenced by Administration fears of "deflation" which events proved to be entirely unwarranted, their recommendations were based on the assumption that weekly wages should not be allowed to decline below peak weekly wages in wartime, even though the length of the working week was decreased. This meant a policy of increasing unit labor costs. The boards recommended increases in the oil and General Motors cases of 18½ and 19½ cents an hour.

This was in effect applying unilateral compulsory arbitration against the employer. Though the boards declared solemnly that their decisions were based purely on the merits of the individual case, their inevitable effect was to lead virtually every powerful union in the country to demand or strike for at least the same increase of 18½ cents, regardless of the productivity of their workers or of the preexisting wage from which the increase started. This expectation became so strong that Mr. Truman, without even waiting for his own fact-finding board in the steel industry "to go into the merits of the case very fully," personally "recommended" and forced a settlement on the companies on the basis of an increase of 18½ cents an hour. When John L. Lewis struck, however, Mr. Truman, perhaps because he feared that Mr. Lewis would not accept an increase of 18½ cents an hour, did not name any fact-finding board at all.

Meanwhile, however, the process of fact finding was steadily going forward in the field of railroad labor relations. Here, in fact, it was already required by a law passed long before Mr. Truman came into office. The Railway Labor Act has in fact been the model for all fact-finding recommendations made since its passage. But here a Presidential board brought in a recommendation for a wage increase of 16 cents an hour for two unions. The two unions have, nonetheless, refused to accept this, and called a strike. In a situation like this, what becomes of the whole elaborate fact-finding machinery of the Railway Labor Act?

Mr. Truman says he will certainly seize the railroads, on which a strike has not yet occurred, but doesn't yet know whether he will seize the mines, on which a strike has been in progress for more than a month. Nor does he make clear whether he intends to support the decision of the Government's railway wage fact-finding board firmly and unequivocally.

It is clear that Mr. Truman's labor policy up to this moment, and, in fact, the Government labor policy of the last dozen years, is now bankrupt. Instead of promoting industrial peace it has promoted industrial strife, and such peace as it has been able to obtain has been bought only at the cost of steadily mounting ransom. An entirely new labor policy has become imperative.

Our State Department Betrays the United States in Its Foreign Policy in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, in the postwar world, we find one startling development after another. In today's newspapers there is an item from China stating without any qualifications that American Army officers are training Chinese communists. The item also indicates that they are being supplied with the latest weapons.

I do not profess to know everything about our foreign policy, if any, but this newspaper item which I am incorporating in my remarks would indicate to me that this new development in our foreign policy in the Far East is consistent with the ideas of some of our internationalists who favor the policies which emanate from Moscow. This new development strikes me as of tremendous significance and importance to the American people.

I am prompted to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Congress should take immediate action to recall the Ambassador to China, Gen. George C. Marshall, and let him explain to Congress the facts about this latest development of having the United States Army collaborate with the Chinese Communist Army.

Further it seems to me that this new development is another instance where the State Department has done everything it could to "sell America down the river," and so far as I am concerned if this is the policy of the State Department, Congress ought to take action to investigate the the same and to define the attitude of Congress in regard thereto. I think the State Department official who is responsible for this sort of foreign policy ought to be impeached. The news item reads as follows:

TRAINING OF CHINA REDS BY UNITED STATES ARMY

(By Ray Richards)

WASHINGTON, May 15.—Puzzlement so extreme that it approached consternation was felt among Members of Congress today when they learned that American Army officers are to train Chinese Communists in modern army operations, including use of the latest weapons.

The drilling and equipping of the Russian puppets for war was seen as an ultimate step in a process which began in the early stages of the world conflict, when aid to the then great enemy of Japan, Chiang Kai-shek, was blocked by leftist influences in the United States because Chiang opposed the North China Communists as well as the Japanese.

An International News Service dispatch from Nanking reported yesterday that 85 army offiers had left that city for Kalgan, in Communist-held Mongolia, to "help the Communists whip their army into modern shape" under an agreement made with Gen. George C. Marshall, United States Ambassador to China.

The War Department started a requested inquiry in Washington to determine the exact circumstances of the step, but Senator HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, Minnesota Republican, member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, charged it was not a War Department matter at all, but one stemming directly from the leftist element of the State Department, now in fairly complete control of Far Eastern matters.

"Our State Department has led us to an astounding situation wherein we are about to train anti-American forces that may fight us in the future," Senator SHIPSTEAD said.

"But my surprise diminishes when I look back on State Department policy in the Far East.

"Although the Chinese Communists were so disloyal to the Allied cause that they never attacked a rail line by which Japan was moving troops and supplies south through Communist territory against

Chiang's positions, we followed a policy during the war which kept adequate supplies from Chiang, and as soon as the war ended, we permitted the Communists to ravish Manchuria and conduct general civil war against the government we officially recognized.

"Our State Department and our White House sent General Marshall to China to demand of Chiang that he admit the Communists into his Government, although the facts are plain that the Communists represent only Russia, that they need only a foothold now to make China eventually one vast Russian puppet.

"Now, as a logical further step in this policy, we are to teach the Communists the profession of modern arms, so they may the more quickly destroy Chiang's anti-Communist Government and deliver China to Russia as a massive Soviet assault base for some future great war."

The nearest approach to an explanation that came from the War or State Departments was the unofficial conjecture that the military training of the Chinese Communists follows naturally in the plan to unify China. The Communists have accused the United States of arming Chiang's forces, and the leftist-fostered idea of fair play, Senator SHIPSTEAD agreed, would be to arm the Communists also.

"Chiang's forces fight for the constituted and recognized government, however," the Senator added. "The arms they possess were not furnished them for civil war but were retained after the war with Japan for which they were intended."

Representative BERTRAND W. GEARHART, California Republican, asserted that each new development bears out the statement at Honolulu last Thursday by Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault that Russia plans to take over the Chinese Government.

General Chennault, commander of the wartime Flying Tigers in China, declared, "It is evident that the Chinese Communists are receiving supplies from Russia."

The Detroit Free Press Says, "Let's Talk Direct to Russia"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who believes that permanent peace with Russia is not only possible but that it is a super-essential "must" if either the United States, the U. S. S. R., or the world at large is to survive and prosper. War mongering against Russia is worse than silly—it can attain suicidal proportions. To have peace with Russia it is neither desirable to coddle nor to challenge the U. S. S. R. in all of its actions or in all of its practices.

Mr. Speaker, peace with Russia can best flow from a realistic exchange of viewpoints and aspirations between the United States of America and the Government of Russia. To deceive ourselves about Russia or to confuse the Russians about the United States is neither statesmanlike nor prudent. It is apparently popular in some high places to engage in such practices, but it is worse than flirting with fate or playing with dynamite. It is, in fact, toying with atomic disaster.

During the past 6 months I have spoken in many communities, in many States, about the factors which I envisage as essential in the composition and implementation of an effective, workable, and peace-preserving policy between the United States of America and the U. S. S. R. Unquestionably and admittedly there is vast room for honest disagreement as to how best to devise and project such a foreign policy. History, however, teaches that appeasement will not do the job. Current confusion indicates that irresolution and ambiguity will not achieve the task. Logic and judgment direct that an early conference between the leaders of the Big Two—the United States and Russia—is essential and that plain talking, friendly frankness, and dignified determination should be the order of the day at such a conference.

THE WORLD NEEDS A CONFERENCE BETWEEN THE BIG TWO

Out of such a conference as I propose can come many dividends to both countries and to the entire world. The first dividend is certain to be a better understanding and appreciation of the motives and men of both countries. And out of such a conference should also come the adoption of procedures and policies which will operate reciprocally in both Washington and Moscow and in effect upon both Americans and Russians. However small the modicum of the area of agreement arrived at, let it be achieved in an atmosphere of reciprocation.

Once the small beginnings of big understandings are determined on a basis of reciprocity so that they operate equally effectively and acceptably in both the American and the Russian spheres of influence, we shall have established the pattern and the platform upon which to build additional and bigger areas of agreement in future negotiations.

Not long ago, Mr. Speaker, I discussed this problem and this approach to its solution before the famed Economic Club of Detroit. For whatever it can contribute to our collective thinking on this important subject, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Detroit Free Press commenting upon the suggestions I made in my address in Detroit. The last half of the editorial discusses my suggestions in some detail:

LET'S TALK DIRECT TO RUSSIA

The Soviet's acceptance of the proposal for a meeting of the Big Four foreign ministers in advance of the "peace conference" scheduled for May is a welcome step in cooperatfon.

At a conference of Big Five foreign ministers in London last September the Soviet representative found the American, British, French, and Chinese out of step with himself. They broke up without even making a start of writing treaties with Italy and other former Nazi satellites. Their deputies have made little progress to date.

Whether this deadlock can be broken by the Big Four foreign ministers remains to be seen. That will be the real test of the ability of the great powers to work together instead of at odds.

The sudden switch from France to Poland to carry the ball against Generalissimo Franco is another matter.

The original proposal that UN oust Franco was made by France under pressure of the Communist members of its government, who work closely with Moscow. Washington and London opposed it on the ground that intervention in Spain would violate the Charter.

The French, who are angling for a $5,000,000,000 line of credit from the United States, are probably glad not to have to buck American policy too obviously. They will run interference, though.

The use of Moscow's hand-picked Warsaw regime to make the plunge is highly revealing. The Soviet Union has three seats of its own in the United Nations Assembly. Also it has two puppets, Yugoslavia and Poland, whose governments are dominated by Soviet-trained Communists. When Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary are admitted to UN, they, too, will sit on Moscow's knee and do what it says. Albania now asks to be added to this rapidly increasing family of political ventriloquists.

The steady expansion of Soviet voting power in the United Nations increases the danger of collapse unless a way is discovered to compose its dynamism with the disposition of other powers to defend the status quo.

The British have quietly withdrawn from first place in opposition to Soviet policies. Secretary Byrnes has stepped into it. That calls for fairness on our part, as well as firmness.

At Monday's Economic Club luncheon, Congressman KARL E. MUNDT suggested three steps for Washington to take:

1. We should drop the policy of appeasement which Mr. Roosevelt introduced.

The little group of men now ruling Russia are both able and ruthless. They have gained confidence from past successes. They feel they have a mission to go forth and preach the gospel according to Karl Marx in every corner of the globe. As long as they are unopposed they will continue to do so.

2. We should use every legal means to penetrate the barriers of secrecy and censorship erected by these leaders around their own people.

About 5,000,000 Communist Party members dominate every phase of Russian life. They in turn are directed absolutely by a politburo of 13 members, at the head of which is Josef Stalin. The other 185,000,000 Russians admire us and want to be friends. The problem is to get to them the idea that we, too, admire and wish to be friends with them.

3. We should cut out Big Three conferences and seek a Big Two conference between the heads of the United States and the Soviet Union.

An Anglo-American bloc against Soviet expansion is one of Moscow's stubbornest fears. All of Secretary Byrnes' declarations that we will not enter an alliance with either Britain or Russia against the other will not remove that apprehension. Acts and not words alone can destroy it.

At such a conference Congressman MUNDT would have Mr. Truman say something like this:

"Joe, we Americans believe in reciprocity. Your officials and newspapermen are free to travel anywhere in our country, see anything they like, say and publish what they will. We expect you to accord our officials and newspapermen the same freedom in your country. There can be no meeting of the minds between the American and Russian peoples until that is done."

The adoption of these suggestions might accomplish, what nothing else to date has, an improvement not only in our relations with Moscow but also in the life expectancy of the United Nations.

OPA and Full Production—"Somebody's Lying"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following two editorials are from the Wisconsin Rapids (Wis.) Daily Tribune, a paper which has always maintained a constructive approach to all questions of public interest:

OPA AND FULL PRODUCTION

Almost everyone agrees that the surest guaranty against inflation is full production. Washington officialdom has repeatedly emphasized this, as have leaders in the fields of industry and merchandising. It would seem that even the dullest intellect could recognize that a plentiful supply of the things which the consuming public wants and needs is the most certain way of assuring fair prices.

What, then, is holding back the production of goods for which there is a ready market? Surely we have the industrial facilities, the skilled labor, and the managerial know-how to do the job. And the Nation has the wholesale and retail establishments necessary for efficient distribution of products to the consumer.

The one thing we do not have is the incentive to set the wheels turning at top speed. The American system of free enterprise has been thrown out of balance by Government manipulation of the national economy to the point where the profit motive—lifeblood of the system—is not encouraged to function.

While giving lip service to the cause of full production, the Federal administration is stubbornly insisting upon blocking the way to that goal by its unrealistic and unworkable price-control policies. It is, in short, denying manufacturers and sellers the right to dispose of their wares at prices which yield a reasonable margin of profit.

With production costs rising, and with OPA blindly clinging to outmoded price ceilings on many commodities, many business concerns are faced with the unpleasant choice of selling their products at a loss or ceasing to accept orders for unprofitable items. Since the first alternative would lead to bankruptcy, common sense dictates that they conserve their resources as best they can and hope the time is not far distant when they may again be permitted to operate at a fair profit. If you consider this attitude unfair, ask yourself what you would do if confronted with a like choice. Would you make and sell shirts, suits, household appliances, building materials, or anything else if you lost money doing it?

How can Government expect to achieve full production by the utterly ridiculous procedure of penalizing, instead of rewarding, the producer? Price control, as it is being practiced by OPA, is limiting production and consequently aggravating the dangers of inflation. It is time for President Truman and Congress to recognize the obvious fact that the venture into a politically managed economy is a tragic failure.

We are told that unless OPA is continued wild inflation will result. But we were also told that OPA would hold prices in line and assure an equitable distribution of essential goods. It has accomplished neither. We are in the midst of inflation now, an inflation resulting from the artificial scarcity of many articles inspired by OPA's folly. The consumer is becoming more convinced by the day that price ceilings mean nothing if goods are not available at those arbitrarily fixed levels.

Full production is the solution to America's economic headache, and the sooner it is achieved the sooner we will be out of the woods. When supply is built up to a parity with demand, prices will adjust themselves without the necessity of any Government dictation. The consumer will be getting the things he needs at prices he can afford to pay. In other words, the American system of free enterprise will work, if given a chance, just as it worked in years past, before political theorists hatched the idea of a controlled economy contradictory to the basic economic laws.

"SOMEBODY'S LYING"

Pity the plight of this local butcher.

He has the choice of buying black-market meat and losing both money and his self-respect or going without and losing both customers and his livelihood.

A local meat dealer this week was virtually cleaned out and faced the prospect of closing his doors. He was approached by a farmer who had five hogs for sale which could not have been a better answer to his prayers. Unless it was six hogs. The farmer, however, wanted 25 cents a pound—take it or leave it. It would have been bad business for the butcher to take it, both because he would come out loser on the deal and because it would violate the OPA price ceiling of 18½ cents a pound. So he sent the farmer on his black-marketeering way.

Asked what he thought of the meat situation, the butcher said, "Somebody's lyin'." He expressed his belief that there is a very real shortage which has been both created and complicated by Government tinkering. "They've got a lot of stuff on paper," he said, "but it just doesn't exist. These 'experts' have got everything fouled up. It began long before the war. They have driven the country into a hole and the results are just now becoming visible."

These were harsh, bitter words. But the butcher said he knew whereof he spoke because that was his business. And if the Government would let those who know their business go ahead, things probably would clear up before long instead of getting progressively worse. "It's just like a plumber trying to produce and sell a suit of clothes," was the meat dealer's way of putting it.

"The answer? Production and competition. If the Government would have cut away all regulations and controls at the end of the war, there would have been some confusion but by now things would be pretty well straightened out. Production would have built up the supply and taken care of the demand with prices being held in line by competition."

Those, too, are the meatman's words. They are simple and logical. But they probably are too simple and too logical for Washington to take notice. For the bureaucratic way is the hard way and it is the only way they know. And whether the meat shortage is real or not, the butcher would be right in either case—"Somebody's lyin'."

Is the Navy Still Fighting Unification Plan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a book called Battle Stations, published by the William Wise Co., Inc., of New York. It is a well-edited and superbly printed volume containing much interesting data regarding the United States Navy during World War II. Much of the material in this book was written by admirals and Marine Corps generals.

What bothers me is who is going to get all of the money from the sale of this book, and what arrangement was made with admirals and generals for their contributions? Or did the real deal behind the publishing of this book involve the taking over by the Wise Co. of the Navy's fight against President Truman's unification plan?

It looks to me like Battle Stations is one of the Navy's biggest guns to sink the unification plan. Certainly it is a powerful argument with the people of America to quote Admiral King's statement in Battle Stations that Japan lost the war because she had a unified command.

Yes, Admiral King writes in this book that the Japanese Navy was defeated because it wasted time in serving as a mere adjunct to the Army in its land conquest, and he closes with:

> It is hoped that every American will exert his effort and influence to see that * * * the United States Navy will always remain, as it is today, the world's greatest sea power.

Admirals Fletcher, Carney, and Halsey also contributed to this book.

I took occasion, Mr. Speaker, to ascertain the date of the first printing of Battle Stations. I learned that it was early this month, which, incidentally, was some time after President Truman had given orders for the admirals to stop opposing his unification plan.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the publishing of Battle Stations is the result of a deal whereby the Navy had the admirals and generals write the material on United States Government time, using United States Government stenographers, in order that the Wise Co. could carry on where the Navy was told to lay off.

Truman's Controlled Scarcity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Wisconsin Rapids, Wisconsin Daily Tribune, calls attention to the fact that "If the Truman administration does not call a halt soon to its tampering with the national economy which has put our production and distribution system in a snarl, Americans are apt to be living on European rations every day of the week rather than two."

TRUMAN'S CONTROLLED SCARCITY

"Expressing belief Americans eat too much, President Truman said today it would be a good idea if they tried getting along on European rations for 2 days a week during the world food crisis.

"They would know then, he said, exactly what it means to go hungry. Most of us, he

added, eat too much and throw too much away."

The above is the gist of an Associated Press dispatch from Washington, appearing in the Tribune one day this week.

If the Truman administration doesn't call a halt soon to its tampering with the national economy, which has put our production and distribution system in a horrible snarl, Americans are apt to be living on "European rations" every day of the week rather than two.

The present meat shortage is a case in point. Why is it that Wisconsin Rapids dealers cannot obtain enough meat to supply the demands of their customers? Why is it that packers cannot get enough cattle for slaughter to keep retail stocks anywhere near normal? Why is it that black markets flourish while legitimate stores are scarcely able to purchase enough meat to justify staying open?

There is only one answer to these questions, and that answer can be found in the price-fixing policy of the Truman administration, a policy which ignores the natural economic law of supply and demand. The deplorable meat situation is but one of many examples of the futile fumbling which is going on in Washington while the public waits in vain for an intelligent solution to the problem.

A medium-sized packing concern, whose customary weekly kill is 2,000 head of cattle, reports that this week it slaughtered but 200 head. The same situation prevails in every legitimate packing plant and slaughterhouse in the country. America's beef is going into the black market while the OPA stubbornly clings to its unrealistic price ceilings. And the consumer, whom OPA piously claims to be protecting, either goes without the meat he wants or pays tribute to some shyster operator of a black market.

Back in prohibition days, there were fortunes made in the bootlegging of liquor. Today the same illicit practice has been extended to cover foods and other essential commodities so necessary to daily living. The liquor bootlegger, at least, dealt in a luxury product and one felt no sympathy for those who paid his outrageous prices. The black market bootlegger, however, is a filthier breed, for he is trafficking in the necessities of life and exacting tribute from people whose only sin is the desire to keep their larders supplied.

The Government, by its blind insistence upon price controls which handicap the law-abiding producer, packer, and merchant, is driving beef cattle and other livestock into the hands of the black market operator, creating an artificial scarcity in the legitimate markets which makes it possible for him to gouge the public.

Of course, the Government deplores the black market. But is it doing anything to correct the fundamental cause of the evil? Instead of recognizing that the fault lies with OPA's dreamy-eyed theory of a controlled economy and ending its artificial restraint on trade, Washington attempts to cope with the problem in typical bureaucratic fashion. It sets up slaughter quotas, creating a lot of new regulatory jobs. If the Government cannot enforce existing laws which make black markets illegal, how does it expect to do any better in making these new quotas stick?

We don't like inflation any better than the next fellow, nor do we think the consumer should be charged unconscionable prices for what he buys. But when it comes to a choice of allowing the OPA to continue crippling the whole machinery of production and distribution by destroying the incentive which keeps this machinery running, or facing an inflationary period until supply can strike a balance with demand, we'll take our chances on the latter.

OPA not only has failed to "hold the line" on prices but has created artificial shortages, which in many cases have reached the stage of near calamity. What is happening in the United States today, as regards meat, clothing, building materials, and many other necessities, is a disgrace, and a discredit to the intelligence of the American people.

If President Truman is worried because Americans eat too much, the controlled scarcity which his administration is fostering seems destined to force upon us the Spartan way of living which he advocates.

Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin Rapids Daily Tribune is located in a county which, with its adjacent counties, has over a quarter of a million cattle, and yet the stores cannot supply meat to their customers. The OPA is in control of the small killers and packers and the Agriculture Department is in control of the larger packers, whose products are shipped interstate.

Food producers need someone to make some machinery and someone to work on the farms if they do not want to be faced with shortages above-mentioned instead of surpluses of food.

It Is Happening Here—Flour Is Being Fed to Livestock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to call attention to a situation that the Department of Agriculture said would not happen because it was against the law. But it is happening, Mr. Speaker, at a time when flour should be going to hungry people and all because the bureaucrats have created the biggest and most scandalous economic snarl in the history of this country. As part of my remarks, I submit the proof in the form of a newspaper article which appeared in the Racine Journal-Times of May 7, 1946:

FLOUR BEING FED TO LIVESTOCK? YES! MORE FEED DEALERS LAMENT

East Troy, Mukwonago, Elkhorn, Elm Grove, and Waukesha today were added to the list of communities in which livestock-feed dealers have confirmed reports that flour is being fed to pigs.

Written exclusively for the Racine Journal-Times and supported by pictorial evidence, the first story, originating in Burlington, revealed that flour—needed in vast quantities for famine relief overseas—is being fed to livestock because of a complicated economic situation.

Feed dealers complained that they were compelled to buy white flour whenever they ordered bran or middlings. Unable to dispose of the flour, forced upon them through the tie-in sales, through ordinary channels, the dealers mixed some of the food product in livestock feed. Rodents, insects and inadequate warehousing exacted a heavy toll.

DENIED IN WASHINGTON

The story was denied in Washington and Chicago by OPA and other Government officials who declared that tie-in sales and other practices responsible for the waste had been abolished and declared illegal.

A few days after the official denial, however, the original report was confirmed in Union Grove, in Kansas, Arkansas, and throughout Illinois.

This week the Equity Cooperative Feed and Fuel Co., of East Troy, produced sales vouchers and bills of lading to indicate that when dealers want high protein bran or middlings, they have to take flour, too.

The East Troy Farm Supply Co. has 7,200 pounds of flour piled high in a warehouse never intended for flour.

"I don't know how much of it can be used for human food," said Emil Swoboda, manager. "A lot of it is buggy and the rodents got at some of it."

Many of the sacks are ripped open, the flour spilled out after the work of the rodents.

WEEVILS WORK FAST

"You know, it does not take long for the weevils to go to work and ruin flour under such conditions," Swoboda said. "We cannot sell it fast enough. What could we do? We never sold much flour, but we had to take it for months and months, for around 2 years, to get the livestock feeds we wanted. Sure, some of it has been used for hog feeds.

"Some feed dealers made farmers take flour to get feed. We didn't. So it piled up."

"Why did you buy flour if you didn't want it?" Swoboda was asked.

Grinning, Swoboda answered, "Evidently you don't know what's been going on in the feed business the better part of last 2 years. If you wanted feeds you bought flour or you didn't get the feeds."

The office clerk of the farmer-owned cooperative added: "Like most others, we couldn't get a bag of bran or a pound of middlings unless we took flour."

PAGES OF RECORDS

And she showed the records, page after page of price quotations, vouchers, and bills of lading in which flour sales were tied up with purchases of bran and middlings.

Dated April 4, 1946, here is the billing from a Milwaukee feed and flour jobber on a mixed car shipped direct from a Twin City flour mill: "200—100 pounds standard middlings at $40.30 a ton; 200—100 pounds pure bran at $40 a ton; 200—100 pounds enriched flour at $4.60 a hundredweight."

"There have been times when you had to take 15 tons of flour to get 15 tons of mill feed, half and half, but most of the time it was a third flour," said Swoboda. "It does not make sense * * * not when we hear so much about so many millions hungry."

At Mukwonago, the farm trading center of a fertile farm area, the feed dealer, trying to keep pace with the run of patrons calling for high protein feeds, said he would not be quoted by name.

"You know, I got to do business with these people. But don't make any mistake about it, there's been a whale of a lot of flour sold and fed to swine and chickens.

"When the millers and jobbers told me I had to take so much flour to get bran and middlings I got disgusted and refused."

DID NOT MAKE SENSE

"This talk of having to put flour in with livestock feed to fill up a car does not make sense to me or any feed dealer," he said. "I would order 10 cars of bran or middlings and maybe get 3 cars. They do not have to mix shipments to sell feeds. Put a hundred cars of mill feeds on those tracks, without a pound of flour, and we will sell it in 48 hours. The farmers would flock in and shovel it right out of the cars. The people in Europe can use the flour and we will still have the livestock feeds from milling for our farmers to produce food."

Sacked flour is piled high in the display window of the Consumers Cooperative of Walworth County in Elkhorn. There's more flour in the farm-feed departments of two well-kept lumber yards in Elkhorn, stored in

much better warehouses than at East Troy, but it's still far from ideal warehousing for flour.

One of the Elkhorn dealers showed an order and bill of lading of recent date for 15 tons of flour—which he tried to refuse to buy—to get 7½ tons of bran and 7½ tons of middlings.

"We had to take the flour and have been selling it at cost to get rid of it," said Harry Frank, manager of the cooperative. "Even this week the salesmen hitched flour to feeds. There doesn't seem to be any coordination and we've all protested having this flour shoved down our throats to get feeds."

A FANTASTIC GAME

At the Elkhorn Lumber Co., Gilbert Church told of a transaction April 16, where he had to take 10 tons of flour to get 10 tons of bran and 5 tons of middlings.

"I didn't want the flour," he said. "Had more than I needed."

The feed dealers say that getting feeds such as soybean meal, linseed and cottonseed meal has become a fantastic game of swapping.

"If you've got, say, a carload of linseed meal or tankage and want a car of soybean meal, you've got to do some tall and fancy swapping," said one Walworth County feed dealer. "Want corn? Then contact the right tavern keepers down in Illinois and Iowa—not the farmers, but the tavern keepers who act as agents of the brewers and distillers and the small-town elevator operators. Sure, the corn moves at ceiling prices, but if you want it, you buy the seller an auto or a case of whisky.

"Some of the people with their hands on the corn and grain learned more tricks from horse trading than David Harum."

WAUKESHA FARES BETTER

In one small Wisconsin rural village, there is better than 2 tons of flour stored in a leaky shed. In Janesville, flour is going begging.

"We had to take 25 barrels of flour to get 5,000 pounds of feed, quite recently," said Hugh C. Hemmingway, of the Rock County Farm Bureau. "For months the feed people have insisted on taking flour. We could sell the livestock feeds in 2 days but not the flour in months. It is all very asinine and farm feed conditions are 10 times worse than any time during the war. There have been times when we had so much flour some of it became infested with insects and it had to be mixed with livestock feeds, but not since the new orders were issued."

READS OF WASTED MEAL

"We get flour, needed in the cities and in Europe which we never wanted. But farmers are clamoring for feeds and must have them if they are to keep up dairy and livestock production. Yet I read of cottonseed meal, a fine feed, and other such livestock feeds being allotted for use as tobacco fertilizer."

Feed dealers in Waukesha, one of the best farm markets in Wisconsin for dairy rations, did not have the high percentage flour tie-in.

"Dealing direct with millers and being old-time patrons, we didn't have to take more flour than we could use," said Emil Marose, of the Waukesha Feed Co.

"When jobbers and salesmen insisted there be flour tied in with an order, we refused," said Alfred Garven.

SOLD FAST NEAR CITY

A third dealer, saying he shunned the flour, declared that he didn't have a bag of middlings or bran in the place and was depending on brewers' grain—the residue after malting—to fill feed orders.

There was not a feed dealer visited in southern Wisconsin who didn't know about the flour-feed sales tie-ups and waste.

In Elm Grove the feed dealer took flour but hustled to sell it.

"Every time there was an announcement of a possible bread shortage, people would rush out from Milwaukee and buy, and what a relief," he said.

Careful Planning and Businesslike Management of Airports Are Necessary for Success of Federal-Aid Program

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, Federal-aid airport legislation has now become law. Congress, and the American people, have wisely supported, at this particular time, the beginning of a comprehensive program of construction and development of the airport facilities within the United States. The building of approximately 3,000 airports and the improving of 1,600 existing facilities will be an important part of our Nation-wide system. We will need to implement the legislation, recently passed, by a continuing development in our expanding aviation future.

An airport is the main street of aviation. It is the symbol of a better tomorrow. To the community possessing an airport it becomes the focus for radiating lines of communication and understanding with other cities, other States, and other countries. Through its use its citizens extend their circumference of living into the far places of the earth. Aviation has shrunk the world to miniature dimensions and has ended former concepts of isolation.

We will have need for clear thinking and sound judgment as the airport development progresses. It is good to have these goals of aviation achievement for which we can strive. It will be necessary, however, if the job is to be done in a manner to reflect credit on its sponsors, that airports pay their way, insofar as possible, in dollars and cents.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of Congress will be interested in reading, and use it for guidance of their constituents, the following helpful editorial by Wayne W. Parrish, publisher of American Aviation, appearing in that magazine in the issue of May 15, 1946:

AIRPORTS THAT PAY

Of all of the problems facing civil aviation today, there are ample arguments that the airport is the most important and the one needing the most thinking and planning.

With Federal aid on a matching basis with municipalities to be available for construction, civil aviation is at the fork of the road with regard to maintenance and upkeep. Either airports are to consist only of runways, taxi strips, aprons, hangars, and modest terminals, to be paid for out of landing fees and gas charges, or they are to be community centers with numerous attractions for the public and with concessions paying a large share of the maintenance bills.

The local airport is a potential revenue producer. It can be the pride of the community and a center of public interest. Or it can be an unsightly or unattractive freight yard with no other source of revenue than its aviation users and considered as a necessary nuisance on the wrong side of town.

Municipalities are becoming more and more reluctant to expend money for airports without seeing long-range revenue results. State governments ended the war in excellent financial condition but municipalities have not—and they are faced with heavy expenditures for street improvements, schools, playgrounds, and other civic items which were shelved during the war.

Yet if full dependence for airport improvements is placed upon the Federal Government, even though municipalities share in the actual cost, the Nation's airport system will be nothing more than operations depots for which the users will have to pay heavily in the years to come.

It is up to the air transport industry, to aircraft manufacturers, to local operators, and to all aviation organizations, to join together in presenting imaginative plans to municipalities whereby the local airports will be equipped as community centers with swimming pools and other recreational facilities, with unusually good restaurants that are worth driving from town to patronize, and with shops of various kinds, depending upon the volume and type of trade available.

Tomorrow's airport should not consist merely of runways and hangars. Tomorrow's airport should be an integral part of decentralized suburban planning in which it becomes a community center in itself, all operated as a self-supporting unit. It should not consist merely of the actual acreage needed for the flying field and the hangar and terminal buildings, but should embrace a wider area in which other attractions are located. Every city in the United States has experienced a growth of outlying shopping centers because of the parking congestion in downtown areas. Future airport planning should take advantage of this trend toward decentralization by becoming part of such a community unit.

There are all-too-few examples of energy and imagination in this direction. Washington National Airport has discovered many ways of increasing revenues. Jim Harrington, the local aircraft operator at Mansfield, Ohio, has invested a large sum in a first-class restaurant as part of his airport center. Able Carl Wootten, the Beechcraft distributor in Florida, is studying and exploring new methods of making airports attractive and useful to local people in that State as a means of developing more personal plane sales.

Air depot—or community center? That's the question today as the Nation faces its postwar airport improvement program. A depot operation with the plane operators and owners paying the bills, or a self-contained and self-maintained community attraction that will help sell more planes and bring more passengers to commercial air services and help the municipal treasury. Air lines should not think only of runway lengths, gliding ratios, and space for ticket counters—they should join with others in planning imaginatively for real civic projects before it is too late. A dollar spent now in helping communities visualize the revenue potential of local airports will mean many dollars saved in years to come from high landing fees and local charges of various types.

The airplane is a symbol of tomorrow's new streamlined world. But airport planning today is in the realm of railroad roundhouses on the wrong side of town. Airports don't have to be unsightly and burdensome. They can be in keeping with the most advanced civic planning of a better day.

WAYNE W. PARRISH.

Labor Senators Again Conduct Delaying Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from the New York Times by Arthur Krock:

LABOR SENATORS AGAIN CONDUCT DELAYING ACTION

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 16.—The records of the House and Senate committees entrusted with labor legislation, and of Senators now calling for an inquiry into the causes and cures of labor disputes, justify the conclusion that their common objective is unchanged. That objective is to maintain in full force the one-sided Wagner Act and the other statutes and administrative rulings on which the dominance of union labor over the public interest was founded and, with the help of the Federal courts, has been maintained.

Only a brief citation of this record is necessary to prove to reasonable persons that any "inquiry" these legislators now propose would be partisan on the side of the status quo and is designed to head off effective legislation at a time when the Senate is more disposed to join the House in passing it than in any period since President Roosevelt began to steer the administration on a prolabor course.

The account begins with amendments to the Wagner Act, designed to restore a balance in the employer-employee relation, which the House passed on June 7, 1940, by a vote of 258 to 129. This was referred to the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, which held hearings from August 13 to September 16, and then killed the measure without making any report at all. A search of the committee folio this week disclosed that even the draft of the House bill has disappeared from the files. It occupies Lot No. 1 in the Senate's populous graveyard.

On December 3, 1941, just before Pearl Harbor, the House passed another set of strong remedies by a vote of 252 to 136. This was a substitute by Representative SMITH of Virginia for a bill "to accelerate production" offered by Chairman CARL VINSON, of the Naval Affairs Committee. It revised the existing labor dispute laws to provide these restraints:

THE SECOND HOUSE BILL

A 30-day breathing spell before a strike could be called, and immediate notice to the Secretary of Labor when one was contemplated. Secret ballots on proposals to strike. No Communists legally eligible to be officers of unions. No violence or intimidation against those desiring to work, and a ban on jurisdictional and sympathy strikes and boycotts. Union liability to suits for civil damage. Unions required to register with the National Labor Relations Board and file periodical financial statements. A system of mediation and voluntary arbitration patterned on the Railway Labor Act. The withdrawal of Wagner Act protections from all violators of these provisions.

The day after this measure was passed it went to the Senate, where it was referred to the same committee that had buried the House bill of 1940. There, without any particular ceremonies, it was smothered to death and interred in lot No. 2.

The House Labor Committee has had fewer opportunities to act as headsman of corrective legislation, but it has served the administration in this capacity whenever it could. Another Smith bill (H. R. 4875) to revise the Wagner Act has languished in its pigeonhole since December 1945. And the unions can rely on this committee, if an effective Senate measure is passed and goes to conference, to join with Speaker RAYBURN in furnishing conferees who will see that all its teeth are extracted, just as the Senate operated on the Smith-Connally bill before it cleared that branch.

THE CASE BILL

The Case bill is marked for the same treatment if the strategic move by the prolabor Senators to supplant it by ordering an "inquiry" is not successful. The House adopted this on February 7, 1946, as a substitute for a milk-and-water measure offered by its Labor Committee. The vote was 258 to 155. A few days later the House draft entered the shadow of the Senate committee's guillotine. But public opinion was rising against strikes once more, and the obedient prolabor majority, not quite daring to cut off its head, eliminated its heart and teeth instead. Even then it was not reported to the Senate until April 16, by which time an impatient minority had forced some kind of action. The amendments offered by this minority, which seek to restore the effectiveness of the House measure, plus amendments proposed by Senators BYRD, LUCAS and others, are those which advocates of the "inquiry" resolution are now seeking to put on a sidetrack.

That resolution was introduced by Senator KILGORE, who competes with Senators GUFFEY, PEPPER, MURRAY and WAGNER in resisting every attempt to restore equity in the labor laws. In a preamble the document asserts that the Nation is "now faced with wide-spread labor-management disputes which vitally affect all aspects of the economy and the vital interests of the general public." This was written by February 8 when the resolution was introduced, and it is no truer currently than it was then. Yet the committee did not act to report it to the Senate until May 15. The sudden awakening, considered with the further fact that the committee reported the resolution to the Senate in the unusually short time of 5 hours after it acted, more precisely identifies the resolution as an effort to prevent new labor legislation.

When a dog which has been troubling sheep comes home with wool on his jaws, that is only circumstantial evidence but enough for the shepherd.

Hail Representative Kelly for Rescuing Man From Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 17, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, Representative EDWARD A. KELLY, of Chicago, yesterday received the congratulations of his colleagues for his heroism in rescuing John A. Roller, a Washington resident, from his burning apartment. Representative KELLY failed to relate the story of the rescue to his associates and it was not until the Chicago Tribune arrived in Washington on Tuesday that they learned of the Congressman's successful efforts in saving the life of Roller, who lives in the same apartment hotel where Representative KELLY makes his home when in Washington.

The son of an old fighting fireman of the Chicago Fire Department who participated in some of the famous conflagrations of that city, including the cold-storage plant fire at the first World's Fair and the stockyards fire, Representative KELLY, a fire fan, used some of his father's tactics in hauling Mr. Roller to safety. His story is related in the Chicago Tribune of May 14, which follows:

HAIL REPRESENTATIVE KELLY FOR RESCUING MAN FROM FIRE

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 13.—Representative KELLY (Democrat, Illinois) today was hailed by fellow Congressmen in the House cloakroom for his rescue of a neighbor from a burning apartment.

KELLY, who lives at the Majestic apartment building here, was awakened at 5:30 a. m. yesterday by the screams of John S. Roller, 37, a businessman, who lives four doors from the Kelly apartment.

Dashing out into the hallway, the Congressman saw smoke pouring out of the louvres of Roller's door. KELLY kicked in the door and dragged Roller, who had collapsed, into the hallway. KELLY smothered the flames on Roller's right shoulder and back with a hand fire extinguisher.

Posthumous Award to the Late Franklin D. Roosevelt for Contribution to American-Soviet Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me in New York May 7, 1946, at a dinner of the American-Russian Institute, at which was bestowed an award posthumously upon the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt for his contribution to American-Soviet friendship.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

'Tis fitting and timely not only that you honor Franklin D. Roosevelt but that you freshen in the minds of the people of the United States and of people everywhere the policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt respecting the Soviet Union and the nations of the world. The people of the Soviet Union forever remember Franklin D. Roosevelt as their friend. For 16 years after the Soviet Government became the established and responsible government of the Soviet Union, the United States refused to recognize that government. Even when aid and assistance to the new Russian Government would have enabled the strength of Russia to be retained in the war against Germany in the First World War, neither recognition, aid, nor assistance was rendered to that government. To the contrary, the United States when the new government was fighting for a new life, allowed herself to send armed strength into Russia against the government and, with other nations who professed to believe in the self-determination of peoples, to employ

other means to destroy the new government and to restore the old.

What was done by the 14 nations which at one time had armed forces in Russia cannot be more eloquently described than by Mr. Winston Churchill, who will never be remembered as prejudiced in Russia's favor, as reported in that book which should be required reading for every citizen in the United States and Great Britain today, and should be memorized by all the members of both governments, the Great Conspiracy. Mr. Churchill said:

"Were they (the Allies) at war with Russia? Certainly not. But they shot Soviet Russians at sight. They stood as invaders on the Russian soil. They armed the enemies of the Soviet Government. They blockaded its ports and sank its battleships. They earnestly desired and schemed its downfall. But war? Shocking. Interference? Shame. It was, they repeated, a matter of indifference to them how Russians settled their own affairs. They were impartial—bang!"

Former Undersecretary of State Sumner Welles, through whom so many years the foreign policies of President Roosevelt found such perfect expression and articulation in the State Department, has recently emphasized the immeasurable mistake made by the United States in the 16 years during which the United States blindly and stubbornly refused to recognize the Soviet Union.

But in 1933 came Franklin D. Roosevelt to the Presidency and to the leadership of democracy in the world. And with him came the recognition of the government of the Soviet Union and the beginning of a Soviet-American friendship and comradeship, the sweet fruit of which 12 years later was to be the salvation of freedom for most men and the hope of freedom for all men everywhere in the world. This was but a governmental recognition of the responsibilities of the Soviet Government which had long been extended by the business community of the United States.

A certain period has been called the "tragic era" in the history of the United States. The tragic era in Europe was not only the war years but the years 1933 to 1938—from Hitler to Munich. Those were the years in which Germany and Japan were permitted membership in the League of Nations and Russia kept out. Those were the years when an unrelenting war against the Soviet Union was carried on by many of the principal chancelleries and foreign offices of Europe. Those were the years when Hitler fattened not only upon the disillusioned German masses and the deceived German magnates but the selfish and short-sighted statesmen of Europe who designedly built him up against Russia. Those were the years in which the cordon sanitaire was forged around Russia and the Soviet Union was never treated as a legitimate member of the family of nations. It was in those years in which occurred this incident recently told to me by a responsible eyewitness. The Russian delegation was finally to be admitted to the League of Nations. They were delayed by the Swiss at the border. The circumstances of their delay were such as to cause the French Government to advise the Swiss Government that it would be held by France responsible for the safety of the Soviet delegation. When finally the delegation reached the League's headquarters, Maxim Litvinoff, obviously wearied and worn, spoke. He not only labored against fatigue but against an imperfect accent in his English. Yet he delivered his address in the best English he could command. When he sat down a representative of a great power arose and sarcastically called out, "Translation, please."

Those were the years in which the Soviet Union saw the inevitable coming of Hitler and his Nazi hordes. And Russia with equal clarity saw that if Hitler struck them they would have to stand against him alone. Those were the years in which the Soviet Government had to abandon plans for a higher standard of living for the Soviet people and prepare with all their might and strength and the substance of the people to defend their land and their lives against the most dominant and devilish military machine which had cursed the earth in modern history.

It was in those years that the Soviet Union pleaded with the powers of the world for disarmament. It was in those years that the Soviet Union pleaded with the powers of the world for collective security and for the preservation of a common front against aggressors and for no appeasement of conquerors. But whether such pleas of the Soviet Union were delivered in the League of Nations respecting disarmament or protective security against Hitler and Mussolini in Eastern Europe or in Spain their pleas went unanswered, their positions were scorned.

When Munich loomed it was Soviet Russia which called upon the nations to make common cause against a common enemy. President Benes, of Czechoslovakia, told me in Prague last year that it was only Russia who gave him assurance of positive support and assistance if he were attacked by Hitler during the Munich discussions when Czechoslovakia was about to be delivered into the greedy mouth of Hitler.

When the history of this tragic era before war is written, if it is written fairly and factually, the onus of failure to achieve disarmament or collective security will not fall upon the Soviet Union.

Yet, at Munich, when the breast of Russia was being bared to Hitler and the circumstances made favorable for his march to the east against Russia, Russia was not permitted to be present. Of course, she was not permitted to be heard and no great power concerned itself with the effect of Munich on Russia or her preservation when Hitler should deliver his inevitable assault.

At Nuremberg last year from the lips of Von Brauschitz, commander of the German armed forces, I heard the German plans for the Russian attack. Talk about it as early as 1936, the first complete military plan in late 1940, the final plan in the spring of 1941, and the first fixed date of May 8. But it was all set out far earlier in Mein Kampf.

President Roosevelt struggled against the selfish force of Hitler and the short-sighted forces of western Europe to prevent the war. He struggled with a selfish or short-sighted group in Congress and in the country which denied him the power to act with the United States force which might have suspended Hitler's blow. But he failed as Russia had failed in her efforts for disarmament and collective security.

But first with the modification of the Neutrality Act and then with lend-lease, President Roosevelt with all possible speed forged the sinews which so much achieved the final victory.

When finally Hitler fell upon Russia to perpetrate the grossest crime of history, lend-lease was already one of the great weapons of the war against Hitler. It was immediately put at the disposal of the Soviet Union and from the first day of its extension until the crowning defeat of Hitler, lend-lease supplies and assistance poured into Russia and played its incalculable part in the victory to which the Soviet Union made a contribution unparalleled in history.

President Roosevelt saw the necessity of restoring collective security and setting up a world organization to keep the peace and to promote the well-being of nations and peoples all over the earth. The Soviet Union, through its great leader and generalissimo, Joseph Stalin, never faltered in its support of this old idea of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

In conference after conference with other United Nations leaders, Roosevelt and Stalin worked intimately and friendly together. Between the two, as between the two countries, there existed inseverable bonds of confidence and friendship. Stalin and the Russians knew that under Roosevelt the United States would never become a party to an anti-Russia cabal. Stalin and the Russians knew that under Roosevelt the United States would never enter the lists against Russia in support of any imperialism. Stalin and the Russians knew that the friendship of Roosevelt for Russia was genuine and firm and that he would countenance no backbiting, no underhanded antisovietism, no discrimination against the Soviet Union. Stalin and the Russians knew that Roosevelt would support in world affairs a single standard for international morality. Stalin and the Russians knew that this Roosevelt, who had recognized their government, who had seen and sympathized with their suffering, who had extended them in their moment of trial lend-lease, would also work with them to rehabilitate their country from the devastation of war, to find their place proportionate to their prestige and power and the contribution they had made to the common victory in the world community. Stalin and the Russians knew that there was every reason why the United States and the Soviet Union should be friends and no reason why they should be enemies; and they knew Roosevelt knew that and that policies consistent with that knowledge would be unmistakably United States policies.

That is the reason that masses of the citizens of Moscow surged into the great square in front of the United States Embassy with tears in their eyes when they learned of the death of President Roosevelt. That's the reason that Generalissimo Stalin with deep emotion spoke to the United States Ambassador his words of condolence when President Roosevelt passed away. That is the reason here tonight this great institution for Soviet-United States friendship bestows its signal honor and award posthumously upon President Roosevelt. Generalissimo Stalin told me in Moscow that Russia would use American credits to rebuild the Russia the Germans despoiled; to replace railroad rolling stock and rails, power plants, mining machinery, oil-drilling machinery, farm machinery, bridges, factories, and other establishments which the Nazis ruthlessly destroyed or carried away. He told me that, if we agreed upon the principle of a loan to Russia, Russia would reward the confidence by showing that it could be repaid. But the generalissimo added: "Six months ago my Government filed an application for a loan with the United States and we have not even had a reply."

Later, Cabinet officers told me in the United States no such application had been made although the Soviet Ambassador here this evening told me in London such an application positively had been made. Later, a billion-dollar application through the Export-Import Bank was lost 6 months in a pigeonhole by official report. Only lately the Secretary of State invited the Soviet Union to apply for an Export-Import loan. But Senators who are regarded as great internationalists have insisted that the conditions to a Soviet loan shall be such as to make the acceptance of funds by the proud Soviet Union difficult, if not impossible.

That would not and could not have happened under Franklin Delano Roosevelt. President Roosevelt extended lend-lease to every nation whose defense was essential to the United States in spite of a considerable portion of the United States Senate, including Senators of great reputation in international affairs today, voting to make it impossible for Russia to have lend-lease. President Roosevelt, of course, extended lend-lease to Russia in the same spirit and with the same fairness as he extended it to other

countries because Russia was making the common fight against the common enemy.

In the same spirit and with the same fairness Franklin Delano Roosevelt would have extended credit to rebuild the despoiled areas of Europe and other parts of the world to those who had borne the brunt of the battle with us.

Under Roosevelt you would have seen Great Britain, France, Russia, and all the other countries who could make a fair showing of need and of repayment and whose economic restoration was essential to the prosperity of the United States, receiving assistance to the limit of our ability in peace as in the war they received lend-lease. That feeling toward Roosevelt makes it possible for any American to point at himself in Russia and say, "Americanski," and bring the smile of friendship to the Russians' face. All one needs to do to make a speech which will set the Russians yelling in approval is for an American to say, "Russky-Americanski."

Russia is concerned today about American policy as we are concerned about Russian policy. Somehow that old unity and intimacy seems to have slipped away and in the place of confidence there is distrust. We have lost the sense of comradeship which we had in the stirring war days. To dispel such distrust, to restore such confidence, we must bring back into our policy and into our relations the spirit of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

As best I could observe last fall in visiting 19 countries, Russia's foreign policy falls into three objectives.

First, to regain the territory which the Germans tore away from the Russians by the Brest-Litovsk Treaty or was aliened by the Government in its early days upon conditions which it regards as broken. Second, to build around its homeland all possible assurance that Russia shall not suffer again the invasions and assaults it has experienced in our own time. Third, to exercise an authority and an influence in world affairs comparable to its contribution to the victory in the war and to its prestige and power as a nation.

I cannot say that these objectives are such that other nations have not or do not pursue them as well.

I believe the Soviet Union wants peace. Generalissimo Stalin told me so, and the faces of every Russian I saw, as well as the living conditions of the people in Russia, told me so. But Russia, like all the rest of us, is keeping her powder dry. She is not going to allow herself to become the victim of another cabal. Yet, in my opinion, if Great Britain and the United States, France and China will approach Russia with a spirit of true confidence and friendship, with a readiness to give Russia equal treatment in the family of nations and aid her to right some of the wrongs of the power politics of the past; if these powers will hold up to Russia that kind of a future and then will propose again disarmament, including disarmament of the atomic bomb, for all of us, the elimination of compulsory military training by us all, and an effective international police force subject only to the United Nations and supported by us all, I believe we will find Russia more than responsive.

But powers might as well recognize that they cannot indefinitely maintain the mastery of the strategic defense areas of the world without Russia striving for a comparable position.

The powers might as well realize that they cannot maintain a monopoly of the world's natural resources in undeveloped lands without Russia striving for a comparable place. The powers might as well recognize that they cannot privately, and often publicly, tell the world that Russia is their enemy and scheme and plan to contain her within the limits of western imperialism and not expect Russia to react accordingly.

Unhappily, there is a different background behind the Russians and the Anglo-Saxon people. We do not always see the same thing the same way. But each in our own way is essentially striving toward the same thing—peace and the well-being of our people. We were able to find a common course in the war against a common enemy. If we can again invoke the spirit of Franklin D. Roosevelt, we can find a common way along which we can all gloriously march against the common enemies—war and poverty.

In my conversation with Generalissimo Stalin, I asked him what he had to say about Soviet-American relations. In his thoughtful way he replied:

"During the war, we have been held together by the ties of war. Now that war is over, we shall have to find another tie to hold us together. That will not always be easy. But as Christ said, 'Seek and ye shall find.'"

Today the hearts of the people of Russia and the United States are going out for the realization of those things for which so many died in the war. We are already tardy in keeping our debt to the dead. Each passing day draws us nearer to the precipice of disunity and war which will postpone for decades, if not centuries, the realization of these old dreams of peace and plenty.

But if tried in the spirit of Christ, tried in the spirit of Franklin D. Roosevelt, laying aside all selfishness, putting by all prejudice, we seek only the right "as God gives us to see the right," we can achieve, as Lincoln said, "a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

The Washington Scene, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject, The Washington Scene, 1946, delivered by me before the Wisconsin Bakers' Association, Inc., at the Milwaukee Auditorium, Milwaukee, Wis., on May 19 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WASHINGTON SCENE, 1946

On this beautiful Sabbath day, it is good to be back in Wisconsin with one's own folk. There is quite a contrast between the Washington and the Wisconsin scene.

I have prepared a manuscript on the subject, The Washington Scene, 1946. It would be easier for me to talk without a manuscript but I want to be sure to submit to you certain ideas.

I recall that years ago, speaking before a school group, I prepared a written speech which I thought was "tops" and I read it to the audience. Afterward, as I walked away with the superintendent of the school, I asked him frankly what he thought of it, since he had made no comment on my talk. His answer came back quick and sharp:

"You made three mistakes. Yes, (1) you read the speech, (2) you read it poorly, and (3) it wasn't worth reading."

Time and experience, I trust, have improved these matters.

THE BAKERY CRISIS

I know how important the agenda of this trade show and convention is to you and how significant the welfare of the whole baking industry is to the American people. I have been following the wheat situation and the crisis in which you find yourselves with the closest of attention in Washington. Countless communications have come to me from members of the bakery and related industries regarding the food crisis. Wherever possible I have taken these communications up with the Department of Agriculture in order to see if some possible relief might be secured for certain cases.

I have on the floor of the Senate and in public releases condemned the Government's wasting of food supplies. I remember only a week or so back that a civilian investigating committee reported to the Secretary of War about the Army's terrible waste of its own food supplies. For example, on one of its spot checks the committee found 500,000 pounds of weevil-infested flour rotting in an Army depot. That is the sort of thing that must end.

I want you to know that whatever I can do to relieve the food situation will be done, although you recognize as well as I do how serious the food outlook is in our own country because of the famine abroad.

Former President Hoover, reporting to the people, among other things stated as follows:

"Of the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, the one named War has gone—at least for a while. But Famine, Pestilence, and Death are still charging over the earth. And the modern world has added four more to this evil brigade. Their names are Destruction, Drought, Fear, and Revolution. This crisis is not alone due to war destruction of agriculture. On the top of that calamity has been piled drought in the Mediterranean, drought in India, drought in China, and partial drought in South Africa and the Argentine. Never have so many evil horsemen come all at one time.

"Hunger hangs over the homes of more than 800,000,000 people—over one-third of the people of the earth. Hunger is a silent visitor who comes like a shadow. He sits beside every anxious mother three times each day. He brings not alone suffering and sorrow, but fear and terror. He carries disorder and the paralysis of government, and even its downfall. He is more destructive than armies, not only in human life but in morals. All of the values of right living melt before his invasions, and every gain of civilization crumbles. But we can save these people from the worst, if we will.

* * * * * *

"I repeat again what I said from Cairo: 'If every source of supplies will do its utmost we can pull the world through this most dangerous crisis. The saving of these human lives is far more than an economic necessity to the recovery of the world. It is more than the only path to order, to stability, and to peace. Such action marks the return of the lamp of compassion to the earth. And that is a part of the moral and spiritual reconstruction of the world.'"

THE WASHINGTON VORTEX

Washington, the capital of your country and mine, is the vortex of all forces, national and international. It has been so since before World War II, and it is more so now because victory has precipitated America—whether we like it or not—to leadership in world affairs.

The atmosphere in Washington, because of these tremendous currents, domestic and foreign, centering therein, becomes pretty charged at times.

I remember one day an Irish cleric friend of mine came bouncing into my office. He had been obliged to remain outside for an hour while I attended to other folks. When he came in he said with his wide Irish brogue: "In Heaven's name, Alex, how can you remain there so calmly?" (I was seated back of my desk and he in front of me.)

Then he continued: "I have been in Washington now about 10 days. I have been getting the push-around, the ring-around, and the run-around, and I have gotten nowhere. And all at once I remembered, Alex, that you were here. But how can you be so calm?"

I replied: "Well, father, you remember Lincoln"—and before I could say a word more, he burst in and said: "No you don't either. Cut out that blarney. You never saw him and neither have I."

LINCOLN'S THREE GREAT RELEASES

I said: "Wait a minute, father, you didn't let me finish my sentence. You remember when Lincoln was in Washington, when everything was pretty dark, he had three safety valves."

"ALEX, what has that got to do with your being so calm?"

"Father," I said, "I am trying to tell you. I have learned a wee bit from Lincoln, and I am trying to get his wisdom across to you."

"Well," he said, "go on—what about Lincoln?"

"Well, when Lincoln lived in this man's town," I continued, "he found that it was all important to utilize humor. You remember on every occasion, among friends, in his Cabinet, he would tell a story. It is said that he would come to his Cabinet meetings and behold nothing but set faces, taut nerves, and fear on the countenances of his Cabinet members.

"They were all university men but not so Lincoln. His was a degree in the university of life which was worth more than their scholastic degrees. He would tell a tale, a story sometimes with a punch in it, get them laughing, get their taut nerves released. Then he would use them for his country.

"He knew that nervous men, as they were when he came into the room, were no good to themselves or to their country. So, he had to release them from their fear. That was so particularly during the time when the war news from the South and the West was defeat, defeat, defeat. But Lincoln knew that in defeat one should keep his head and be able to laugh. So, you see, father, that was Lincoln's first safety valve—a sense of humor."

"Pretty good," my friend said, "and what was the second?"

"Well," I said, "Lincoln had a great faith. He believed, as you know, in prayer. He said that when he had no other place to go he would go to his knees. He reached up and made contact with the Creator. Yes; he didn't hesitate to pray in his Cabinet meetings. He lost himself in contemplating the majesty and the power and the glory of his Maker."

And before I could be interrupted this time, I went on:

"He had a third outlet. He had a great love—the Republic. He understood and saw the majesty and the glory of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, so much so that when men like Horace Greeley said, 'Let the South go,' he said, 'No.' He knew, when to say no, because he was a man of vision. Had he said, 'Yes,' then America would have been another Europe with 48 conflicting countries.

"Now, where did this humble backwoodsman of Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois, get this wisdom? Life taught it to him—to calmly face any problem. He could exercise his reason and judgment in any crisis. He knew one should lubricate his body by utilizing a sense of humor, prayer, and a love of country."

After I had recounted this, I took my cleric friend over to the window of my office—and I should like each of you to see this view when you come to Washington—and I pointed out the window and said: "See, there is the Washington Monument. Beyond that is the Lincoln Memorial, and over beyond on the heights of Arlington is the Lee-Custis Mansion in which Robert E. Lee lived. To the right, upon the hill is the Washington Cathedral."

And my friend said: "What has that got to do with your being so calm?"

"Just this, father," I said; "when pressure gets pretty stiff, the pressure of critical minds, of irritated folks, of folks who are unpoised and folks who are fearful, as indicated by my mail, and by what I see in person, when the problems of my constituents pour in and I have a tendency to be like Lincoln's Cabinet members, then I try to utilize his three outlets or safety valves."

HAVING A SENSE OF PERSPECTIVE

"And when I do that I usually find myself standing at this window, and I look at the monuments that I have pointed out to you. Then, there come to my mind two sayings, one out of the Book of Books, and one from an ancient philosopher."

And then my cleric friend, now more relaxed than when he had come into the room so upset and fearful, showed forth a smile, and he said: "ALEX, be careful. The Devil himself can quote scripture. What is that scripture?"

I quoted in answer: "The battle is not ours, but the Lord's." The philosopher's statement was: "This too will pass."

"These monuments," I continued, "are emblematic of the problems of the past that are gone, and that cathedral, in which lie the bodies of Woodrow Wilson, Admiral Dewey, and others, shows that all things pass." So, it behooves all of us to keep our heads, remain mentally poised, if we expect to be adequate to meet the problems that face our beloved country in our own times.

Now, the sequel to that story is that my good friend returned to his seat, and I said: "Father, what is your problem?" He told me, and in 10 minutes we had contacted the right officials, I had made an appointment for him, and the next night I sat down with my good friend at his "mother house" in Washington and we had dinner. He told me then that he had secured satisfaction from the Government official within an hour after he had left me.

I need not elaborate further on the moral of this story. We all need to be filled with the value of what Lincoln's life teaches us—to develop a sense of humor, to utilize prayer, and to have a great love of country.

We all need a sense of perspective which will make us realize that "the battle is not ours, but the Lord's" and that all things pass in time.

TEN BIG GOVERNMENT BLUNDERS

Isn't this particularly true when we meet the vital domestic issues of today? I am going to name 10 of those issues—calling a spade a spade in them. These are 10 areas in which the people of our country have been distressed by Government reaction, by Government blundering and bungling. These are 10 areas in which the men of the food industry and other industries and agriculture have been hurt in their reconversion program by their own Government. Here they are:

1. The national administration's labor policy, or rather its lack of policy—its favoritism to organized labor, its one-sided attitude against management; the administration's pussy-footing with labor racketeers who have brought on strike after ruinous strike.

2. The administration's pricing policy which has condemned business in instance after instance to produce at a loss. I refer to the muddling of OPA.

3. The administration's octopus bureaucracy—three million strong—with its red tape, its snoopers, and its tremendous overhead.

4. Our national debt of $275,000,000,000, our national yearly spending budget of over $25,000,000,000.

5. Centralization of authority in the Federal Government which deprives State and local authorities of their constitutional rights to solve their own problems by dint of their own efforts.

6. Government's competition with private enterprise, its unfair entry through tax-free Federal organizations into spheres nominally belonging to private enterprise, forcing private companies to the wall.

7. The national administration's bungling of surplus disposition. Its failure to get the vast accumulation of surplus property—electronic supplies, farm machinery, industrial machinery, etc.—speedily into the hands of those who can use it best now.

8. The administration's throttling tax system, which punishes private initiative.

9. The administration's internal dissensions—its chaos of quarreling, jealous agency heads, pulling at cross purposes, confusing business, dismaying the public.

10. Corruption and favoritism by those in Government who have forgotten that "public office is a public trust."

Yes; there are 10 areas of Government blunders. But one who lays out a bill of particulars such as this should also say what ought to be done to correct these conditions. Let me, therefore, submit these proposed remedies to you.

CORRECTING GOVERNMENT BLUNDERS

1. Let Congress enact a labor policy with guts, a policy which will protect the public interest as well as the great rank and file of honest American labor and management. Let us amend the one-sided Wagner Act, provide for democratic union elections. Let us publicize union finances and eliminate coercion in connection with strikes. In Nationwide industries and public utilities, let us outlaw strikes and provide for compulsory arbitration as a last resort.

I would like to read to you now a few excerpts from remarks which I delivered in the Senate during the period from May 2 to May 10.

On May 2, 1946:

"The critical situation due to lack of coal production in this country and the lack of steel is quickly coming to a head, and perhaps only when it does come to a head will the public realize that it has been diverted from the main issue in the case, which is that of telling the Congress to pass a labor bill with guts in it, a pro-American bill, if you please, not antilabor, not antimanagement, but pro-American and protecting the rights of the public.

* * * * *

"Think it over, Senators. Thirty days from now our manufacturing plants will be closing down unless we have or especially unless the Chief Executive has a little iron in his system to see to it that coal goes into production and that the necessities of life go into production. If that will take place, Mr. President, we will be able to meet the humanitarian demands upon us from abroad. If we do not meet that issue head-on soon, we will be falling down all along the line."

On May 3, 1946:

"Yesterday I emphasized that fact in my remarks and placed in the RECORD telegrams from people in my State describing the conditions there. I said that what the Congress and the President needed was guts to do something in this important matter.

"There is no redress, apparently, for the public against strikes that interfere with public health and safety; nor will there be until Congress enacts laws to regulate the rights of so-called minority groups to inflict loss and privation on majority groups. There are times when the responsibility is as much that of the employers as it is that of the employees. The much abused and criticized Connally-Smith Act is still on the books. Why does not the President act? Who runs this country? Whose job is it in a great emergency such as this?

"Yet we sit here fiddling. It is time that something be done. Why is it not done?

"Is it fear that prevents action? Is this great people which pushed back the Hitler horde, the Mussolini cutthroats, and the ruthless fighters of the Orient afraid of labor leaders in this country? Is the public to be continually jeopardized because groups are organized? Is our production to be interfered with? Are we going to fall down on the job of feeding Europe?"

On May 6, 1946:

"We who believe that our Constitution has vitality in its every word, including the preamble, feel that it is time that the Congress of the United States took definite action."

On October 4, 1945, and again on May 6, 1946, I said:

"Labor has an atomic bomb in its hands. It is playing with it recklessly and wildly. That atomic bomb must be controlled by the Government before it blows up labor and America. End strikes or strikes will end America."

On May 8, 1946:

"All America is resolved that this national-strike paralysis shall never again come to pass, that there shall be no more internal Pearl Harbors. We have reached the parting of the ways with our easy-going policies of the past, with our national toleration of New Deal coddling of labor dictators. All America sees that the New Deal chickens have come home to roost and that America has suffered disastrously as a result. Congress' and the President's inaction have resulted in terrific damage to our economy. The President must act now to take over the mines."

On May 10, 1946:

"Right now we see ourselves in a fine how-do-you-do. It has been characterized as a labor-policy depression due to the synthetic, needless, and senseless attitude of the administration now in power. It is a depression because we cannot get consumers' goods—ranging from ordinary socks and stockings and shirts to automobiles and materials with which to build houses. We cannot get these things, though we have more purchasing power than all the rest of the world combined, and only a year has gone by since VE-day, and 8 months since VJ-day.

"All the 'pinks' and Communists and radicals in America are in this picture up to their ears, creating disunity, confusing and poisoning the minds of our people. But we sit back, wondering whether we should pass a law that has some iron in it."

2. Let Government change its pricing policy so as to get full production by encouraging reasonable and normal profits to business. I have introduced an amendment to the OPA Act along this very line. Government's inept pricing has already cost the public dearly.

3. Let Government demobilize its bureaucratic army, particularly those incompetents and menaces who are activated by a "master complex."

4. Let Government balance its budget, live within its means, and begin to reduce the national debt.

5. Let Government simplify its tax structure so that maximum incentive is provided to private enterprise.

6. Let Government decentralize and return to the States and localities powers which were taken over by Uncle Sam during the depression and war emergencies.

7. Let Government get out of those spheres belonging to private enterprise and in the case of Government corporations, like TVA, require them to pay their way in taxes to the people of America as a whole.

8. Let Government streamline its surplus disposition system so as to insure a speedy square deal for our veterans, educational institutions, farmers, and others pleading to use surplus in producing new jobs and wealth.

9. Let Government set its house in order, eliminate duplication and overlapping, ban jurisdictional conflicts between agencies which now result in instability of program.

10. Let Government rid itself of all those lacking in a sense of public responsibility and replace them with men of proven integrity, of proven civic achievement.

Let's get Government out of the red and the Reds out of Government. And let all of us, awake to our personal responsibility in this age, go to work and produce.

It will be noticed that on the Washington scene these 10 issues and their suggested remedies apply to our domestic affairs.

THE WORLD PICTURE

But, as you so well know, Washington is impacted also by terrific currents that relate to our international affairs.

Startling advances and discoveries of physical science in the field of atomic research are of such significance to world relations that no thinking person can afford to ignore them.

The world-wide conflict has been succeeded by revolutions and civil wars throughout the earth. Racial frictions have burst into flame. The industrial strife in our own land is reflected by civil strife abroad. To human sense there is on every hand vast evidence of disunity.

Most important, there are two great age-old ideological forces in conflict. They are in conflict for the mastery of the world. They are (1) the idea of the state as all powerful, and man as its slave; and (2) the idea of the state as the servant of the people.

This critical situation calls for the individual to utilize all the safety valves that Lincoln possessed. We must under no circumstances let a feeling of impotency take possession of us. We must know that if we develop a sense of humor, have faith that God operates in the affairs of men, and have a love for our Republic, then adequacy will be ours to help heal much of the world's economic and political ills. We have got to do more than merely talk of brotherhood. We have to go into action guided by thinking straight. We have to put first things first, refrain from barbing individuals, classes, and other nations, and do the things that are necessary.

OUR AMERICAN SYSTEM

There are at least 2,000,000,000 human souls on this earth. It has been said that there are not more than 200,000,000 (and our race is among them) who believe in a government of checks and balances, deriving its power from the people.

These 200,000,000 have come up through the ages because their ancestors battered their way through oceans of blood to freedom—freedom of the press, of worship, freedom from the tyranny of government. They have come up after waging an interminable conflict against this other idea—the idea that the state is all powerful, and that the individual is of no account.

That government is best in which the individual can best develop and grow. The Magna Carta of England, restricting the arbitrary personal power of the monarch and definitely stating the rights of the people, was a great step upward. When the dictators later sought to abrogate the rights therein stated, the result was a further statement of individual rights through the petition of rights and the Bill of Rights.

The Declaration of Independence, another step forward in the march of the race, set forth rights, privileges, duties, equalities of men. And when the United States Constitution blossomed forth "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity" in order to found this Nation, we know it was but a reflection of the Christian commandment—

"Thou shalt love the Lord with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy mind, and with all thy strength, and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

George Washington, in 1787, writing a letter to James Madison before the Constitutional Convention, said:

"My wish is that the Convention may adopt no temporizing expedient, but probe the defects of the Constitution to the bottom and provide a radical cure whether they are agreed to or not. A conduct of this kind will stamp wisdom and dignity on their proceedings and hold up a light which sooner or later will have its influence."

What a directive this is: That we adopt no temporary expedient and that we hold up a light. It was such a light, too, that came from Benjamin Franklin in the Constitutional Convention, when he suggested that the Convention apply to the Father of Lights "to illuminate our understanding." Then, he continued:

"I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proof I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. I, therefore, beg leave to move that henceforth prayers be held every morning before we proceed to business."

UNITED NATIONS PROBLEMS

The nations have indicated by the United Nations their desire to unite for universal good. The purpose of this organization is not to force nations into human agreements, but rather to provide the means for nations to reason together—each having its full freedom to develop according to its right, and each being guaranteed that this right shall be respected by all.

But the race is on different levels of development and spirituality. Therefore, the problem in Washington in relation to international affairs has to be met on the individual level and on the national level.

As an individual, and as a Senator, I have to square my actions with my faith and keep my thinking straight. I must put first things first, and when I indulge in criticism it must be for a constructive purpose, on a high level, and impersonal as far as possible.

As a Senator, however, I have a separate and distinct responsibility apart from that of an individual citizen. The Congress of the United States has the function of policy making. The world is contracted by modern inventions, as you know, and the decisions made in Washington will have much to do with world conditions, present and future.

I repeat that America is in a position of world leadership. We in Washington, like you, often cry out for direction:

"Watchman, tell us of the night,
What its signs of promise are."

Every part of the world is just around the corner from every other part. A fire anywhere in the house of the world—an economic fire, a political fire, war fire, endangers our part of the house. By preventing economic, political, and war fires elsewhere, this Nation looks after its own interest. In this contracted world, where all nations are neighbors, it is our function to preserve the concepts for which our fathers and sons fought—the right of free men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Russia, a dictator state, has a different concept of government. I believe we must seek to understand Russia, we must make every conceivable effort to help her to understand us, so that as a result peace and cooperation will be achieved. It is important that we get acquainted with each other; that all curtains be torn down—suspicion, fear, distrust, and Russia's iron curtain—barring the press and visitors.

The Second World War didn't make for peace. It produced tremendous problems toward the solution of which we are now aiming. Whether the United Nations will work will depend upon whether the "big boys" have the brains and vision and the understanding to carry through to a just and enduring peace. Any one can wreck it.

America must remain strong militarily, politically, and economically. That means

that she will be adequate to meet any emergency.

We are living in an age that will be full of great new discoveries. I heard some of the Nation's greatest scientists say recently at a little private dinner that the discovery of atomic energy was just the open door to a world of undreamed-of discoveries. These scientists envisioned some of these discoveries as being more revolutionary than the discovery of atomic energy.

CONCLUSIONS

And so, my good friends, we see that the Washington scene is full of action, full of new challenges. Indeed, there are challenges to this Nation such as we have never had before.

The discovery of atomic energy, the jet-propelled plane and kindred inventions have put the nations in "one basket." With God's help we will be adequate, meeting the problems of our domestic and of our foreign affairs, utilizing humor, faith (the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen) and deep and abiding love of the Republic.

We will adopt "no temporary expedient." We will "hold up the light" for all men and all nations to see and follow.

There come to mind the beautiful verses of Julia Ward Howe:

"He has sounded forth the trumpet that shall never call retreat,
He is sifting out the hearts of men before His judgment seat.
O, be swift, my soul, to answer Him; be jubilant, my feet,
Our God is marching on."

World Food Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an able address by former President Hoover before the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, in which he discussed the need for a new world food organization.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have been asked to present to you my views upon world food organization for the next harvest year. There should be drastic reorganization. A new set-up should take over on September 1 next, when this immediate world crisis shall have passed. We can hope for some breathing spell from the tensity of the present situation at that time. What the final authority of such an organization should be and what methods it shall use cannot be determined until we see more clearly the food outlook for the next harvest year. We will know what the situation is for the northern hemisphere by September 1. But the broad lines of such organization can be determined at once.

Up to date the climatic conditions for the next harvest appear fairly favorable. If these conditions continue favorable it should be a more plentiful year than the harvest year through which we are now passing. We have to remember that the present crisis was not all due to the war degeneration of agriculture. It was partially due to the destruction and looting of food, and it was also due to the unprecedented combination of droughts in the Mediterranean, India, China, and a partial drought in the Argentine and South Africa.

It would be fortunate, however, if those states of Europe, torn by major military operations, should in the coming harvest produce a 75-percent ground crop. I need not recite the effect of shortage of fertilizers, farm machinery, and manpower, which will affect the coming harvest. These deficiencies will, except for some unusual climatic blessing, seriously affect the production. In animal products it will be a still slower recovery than cereals because of the war destruction of herds in many countries and a probable continued shortage of feed. But even with a 75-percent ground crop and the absence of droughts, it will be a tight year in world totals of cereals and fats.

For all these reasons it is necessary now to begin some more effective world organization to take the place of present improvisations. I am not here going to criticize the world food policies of the past year. But they must have vigorous reorganization if we would avoid another crisis like that which we are now in. As I have said, how elaborate that organization must be will depend, of course, upon the volume of resources from this coming harvest.

But in any case, certain major suggestions are warranted for immediate consideration:

1. That a new organization be created now under the auspices of the United Nations Security Council, or better still under your committee. For convenience, I will refer to this organization as the United Nations Food Administration.

2. That a single food administrator be appointed with a small advisory committee. That the advisory committee should in majority represent the surplus food producing nations as they will have to furnish the supplies.

3. That under the United Nations Food Administration certain regional organizations be set up, say one for Europe, including north Africa, one for the Far East, one for South America, and one for the Indian Ocean area, which should include Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa.

4. That this agency serve only during the period of food scarcity and agricultural reconstruction from the war.

5. That this agency should absorb, from September 1, the food and agricultural activities of UNRRA, which covers only 20 percent of the present world problems. Director General LaGuardia favors such a course. The new administration should incorporate also the combined food board, and all other international agencies connected with food and agricultural reconstruction.

6. That it be the purpose of the United Nations Food Administration to return to normal commerce the food, fertilizer, and farm-supply business of the world with all speed possible. Commerce will secure more economical distribution; it will serve with far more assurance and efficiency to farmers, merchants, and consumers than governments. Moreover, the world must quit charity as a basis of widespread food distribution. I cannot too strongly emphasize that charitable distribution is hugely wasteful and inefficient. Charity should be organized separately. Nations should from September 1 forward finance their own food purchases by other means than charity.

7. That the United Nations Food Administration should have by agreement among the supply nations the direction of the destination of some marginal quantity of food so that it can fill in any neglected chinks of commerce. What that percentage may be can be estimated when we know the amount of the world's food resources.

8. That this agency should be empowered to advise nations on measures of conservation, on voluntary relief activities, on stimulation of the production of fertilizers, farm machinery and other materials of agricultural reconstruction.

9. Special feeding and medical care of physically subnormal children should be organized systematically and should be the sole charitable contribution of governments. That is the most needed reconstruction effort in the world. It does not call for large figures.

The primary purpose of the United Nations is to give security and peace to the world. Effective distribution of food during scarcity and the reconstruction of agriculture, and above all, the reconstruction of human beings is essential to order and peace of the world. The first voice of war is the guns—but the final voice in making peace is food.

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials respecting the pending coal controversy, one from the News-Leader, of Richmond, Va.; one from the News, of Lynchburg, Va.; and one from the News, of Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond (Va.) News-Leader of May 15, 1946]

THE GREAT ILLUSION

Coal-mine operators today will reject John L. Lewis' demand for a $70,000,000 welfare fund to be spent exclusively by Lewis and his men. When this preposterous demand is met with "No," Lewis may call from the mines those members of the UMW who have returned to their jobs. He certainly will assert, in loudest terms, that the operators are responsible for failure to comply with the President's appeal that a settlement be reached today. Doubtless Lewis would say the same thing if he had sought and owners had refused an inclusive deed to the mine properties. For that matter, if there is a surrender to him now, he will make a rapid approach to the direct expropriation of the mines for the benfit of the union. Make no mistake about that. Do not write it down as exaggeration. Lewis is the most ambitious and the most ruthless labor leader this country has ever produced. He wants the mines for the miners.

The president of the mine workers has his own special complex, but he possesses inordinately the great illusion under which, when they are themselves involved, about four-fifths of the American Nation labors. As that illusion appears in the action of the powerful unions, it amounts to this:

1. We are entitled to more money because (a) we have been underpaid in the past, (b) prices have risen, (c) the bosses have the profits from which to meet our demands, and (d) we are in an era when labor will have a larger and capital a lesser part of the profits of industry.

2. We can get what we demand because (a) the bosses see ahead a great boom and they will pay almost any price to keep the boom from being stalled, (b) we have the tremendous advantage of the New Deal labor laws which make the Government our ally

and leave the employer almost powerless to resist organization and strikes, and (c) our members have savings now which they cannot better invest than in weathering a strike that will make them more prosperous in good times and will give them a high base wage in hard times.

Tactically this is an argument of sufficient validity to set many union committees to work in formulating unreasonable demands. It is an argument so specious, in fact, that it spreads discontent among those workers who want to share in the great drive and yet realize they cannot force surrender by striking.

The illusion that invalidates all the superficial logic of this argument is, first of all, the willingness of tens of millions of Americans to forget a United States debt, direct and indirect, of $300,000,000,000. As a Nation, we are in the plight of a foolish, reckless man who has mortgaged everything he possesses, has a tremendous burden of interest to meet, and yet is spending lavishly and still thinks himself rich because he has not spent quite all the money he got from the mortgage.

The day of reckoning will come. There is no escaping it. When it does arrive, every one of us will find that he has to meet heavy indirect taxes from reduced income. No matter how high a man may boost temporary wages, he must have a job to "cash in" on his high hourly pay. If there is no job, the burden of invisible taxation will be heavier still. John Lewis and all the other bold, short-sighted leaders will be demanding the breast of the chicken in vain when all of us are eating crow. They will find, in spite of every wrathful denial, that we are members of one economic body and that we have ahead of us a long and difficult period of national poverty in a pauperized world. Defiant blindness to this is the second aspect of the great illusion.

The third phase of the great illusion is being disclosed daily. It is the belief that by pressing furiously its demands for a larger part of the profits of industry, a particular element of the American people can gain permanent advantage over any other. It is skill, not pressure, that determines, in the end, the attainment of a higher lever of compensation. Even if there is skill, it must be productive and it must be able to find a market. Where this is not realized, men simply put themselves on a treadmill and think they are climbing higher because they keep using their legs.

Wherein is a man profited if he gets an increase of 20 percent in his wages and forces everyone else to charge 20 percent more for goods because every item of cost is higher? This question does not assume for a moment that low prices and low wages are preferable to higher prices and better compensation. To a certain point, there is economic advantage in the upward trend, so long as (1) production keeps up with demand and (2) the supply of money is not overabundant. If these conditions are not met, the spiral of rising costs mounts more and more steeply. Higher wages mean heavier costs of living; increased living costs prompt new wage demands.

Ignorant and greedy men in every walk of life refuse to admit it, but we in America are close to the point where the spiral suddenly may take a sharper turn upward. Prices mean little. Many buyers are grabbing from counters the goods they want regardless of price. More and more money is being issued to satisfy the needs of those who temporarily are drawing larger wages. For the week of May 8, money in circulation rose $70,000,000. It now is $1,600,000,000 above the volume of currency outstanding on VE-day. Every evil omen of inflation is here—and John L. Lewis is throttling production, the one thing that could absorb the vast amount of money in production.

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News of May 15, 1946]

STOP SCREAMING AND ACT

The country is crying out in a rage against the power wielded by John L. Lewis. The whole industry is in a state of near collapse by the decree of one man, and the people don't like it. So they denounce the man.

Some time ago it was Petrillo. He didn't hurt industry as badly and he didn't inconvenience as many people, but he did his best. He used the power he had to gain his ends regardless of whom he hurt.

Some time later it will be somebody else. Another big strike will cripple the country and the Nation will be in a rage against the individual who leads the strikers.

These men are mere symbols. What they symbolize is the power certain groups have and which they exercise. Names do not matter. The individual doesn't matter.

Whence came that power? It came from the laws of the land, duly enacted by the Congress of the United States, or from executive decrees issued under laws duly enacted. Let's forget Lewis and Petrillo and the rest; if it were not they strangling the country's industry and impoverishing the Nation it would be some others. Open the way to power and a strong man will step in and seize it. The job facing the Nation is to amend and repeal the laws that gave them the opportunity to grab the power and protect them in the exercise of it. It's a job for the Congress. It is time the Congress were getting down to its performance. Congressmen are yelling and screaming. Let them stop it. Let them shut up and put up.

[From the Washington (D. C.) News of May 16, 1946]

DON'T YIELD ON THIS

"No taxation without representation." Once that was an American war cry against tyranny. It needs to sound again.

For a modern tyrant now seeks to impose taxation without representation on the American people. That is the meaning of the John L. Lewis demand for a 7-percent levy on the coal operators' pay rolls.

The public would have to pay this tax in higher prices for coal.

But the Lewis demand would give the public no say about the amount of the tax or the size of the fund it would place in Lewis' hands. There would be no public accounting of the money. The public would have no control over its expenditure.

Lewis says the revenue would be used for miners' health and welfare. But he could use it as he pleased. And beyond doubt he would use it to increase his own power, already far too great for the Nation's safety.

If health and welfare benefits actually were paid, he could withhold them from critical or rebellious union members, and so tighten his iron domination over the union. He could spend millions in politics, on the ground that it would promote welfare to assist the politicians who promised the miners most.

Whether the levy would give Lewis more or less than $70,000,000 a year is not now the vital issue. He wants 7 percent this time, and might settle for 4 or 5. But next year he could ask 10 percent, order another strike, and settle for 7. And the year after that he could demand 15 percent, and perhaps take 10.

And countless other unions—many of them, like the Lewis union, absolutely controlled by one man or a few men—would make similar demands. Billions of dollars a year, taxed from the people in higher prices, would pour into the treasuries of private organizations which acknowledge no public responsibility. It is not too much to say that our system of government could be changed or wrecked.

The coal miners should have a health and welfare fund. But if the public provides the fund the public must retain authority through the Government to say how large it shall be and whether it is proportioned to the actual need, and to know how it is used. The strike negotiations have broken up again because Lewis refuses to discuss other issues until he gets his pay-roll tax demand on his own terms. But, even to end the strike, that demand as Lewis makes it should not be granted. And President Truman should exert no pressure to have it granted.

Address to Illinois Amvet Convention by National Commander Jack W. Hardy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Jack W. Hardy, of Los Angeles, national commander of Amvets, the American Veterans of World War II, at the second annual State convention of the Illinois State department at Chicago, Ill., May 4, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, honored and distinguished guests, and fellow Amvets of the Illinois State department, it is a pleasant experience to return to the city where I was born, and to the scene of our first national Amvet convention, held in this hospitable atmosphere only last October. One may say fairly that while Amvets was organized on a national scale in December 1944, it has been since the convention that we have come into our own as the outstanding, exclusively World War II veterans' organization. We have grown from a youngster of 127 posts in some 20 States, to a lusty lad of over 600 posts in 45 States—and we've only started. We expect to have more than 1,000 posts in the 48 States and Territories by the time the next national convention at St. Louis, Mo., in November.

This remarkable growth has been the result of several factors: First, a foundation of sound principles honestly administered for the benefit of all the American people—as well as for the veteran; secondly, the loyalty and enthusiasm of the countless men and women who believe that Amvets has a real place in the American scene; and whose selfless devotion of time, money, and effort are making articulate a constructive, American program, based upon our high principles and aspirations. We have a strong determination that Amvets shall be exactly what it is—a real veterans' organization of the men and women who served in the armed forces of our country who are determined to help make and keep this a courageous, honest, and progressive America—an America of which all Americans can be proud—an America which will provide badly needed, competent, and intelligent world leadership where there is now fear, want, and distrust.

Amvets are not, and shall not become merely another veterans' "pressure" group for veterans. We shall insist, however, and properly, that those men and women whose minds and bodies have been shattered by the war shall be cared for so long as that care is needed, and that every effort shall be made

to restore them to useful, happy members of our communities. We do not seek nor want charity in any form. We do demand that the veteran shall not suffer prejudice by reason of his wartime service to our Nation, nor shall he be deprived of the essentials of life by greed or selfishness on the part of any individual or group. Amvets intend to help make this, our America—the kind of country we believed we were fighting to preserve—not the one to which we have returned and are returning.

It is approximately a year since VE-day—and high time we took an inventory of what that year has brought.

It is high time too, that we—as veterans and citizens—faced some facts and made those facts known.

We have a proud heritage of competence, courage, vision, initiative, and faith. We are Americans—a blend of the peoples of many races and many nations. We have, over the years, developed a distinctive national character—a new Nation which breeds the kind of men who freely chose death, standing with faces to the sun, to life on their knees, and men and women to whom the wilderness was a challenge and who created with their hands and faith a Nation, a people who loved freedom so fiercely they traveled half way around the world for the right to worship their God in their way. A people who believed in principle so deeply that brother fought brother, and self-preservation was secondary to honest convictions.

From this stock came Benjamin Franklin, Washington, Jefferson, Tom Paine, Robert E. Lee, Lincoln, Edison, George Washington Carver, and Oliver Wendell Holmes. From this stock, too, come the 14,000,000 men and women who bore arms, fought, and died for an American ideal, an ideal which was, and in a larger sense still is, threatened by forces of incredible greed and brutality and the destruction of the right to worship, think, live, and work as free men and women.

Today there is desperate need for truly great political and spiritual leadership. Out of this same stock, our America, this leadership will come. If we are to survive in a world where fear of instant and overwhelming destruction haunts our days and disturbs our nights, we must learn and practice a way of life which will bring peace to our hearts, security for our bodies, and strength for our spirits. Today the world stands in fear of another war, a war so terrible in its implications that it should shock the leaders of the world into a determination that such a catastrophe shall never come to pass. It need not, if in our internal affairs and international relations we evidence the same determination, intelligence, and fearlessness shown by our comrades who died that we might meet here today in peaceful and fearless assembly.

Amvets are determined that the mistakes and blindness of 1919, and the years which followed, shall not be repeated, that we shall not have sacrificed precious years of our lives, and life itself, to win a war and lose the peace through greed, ignorance, or indifference. We are determined also, that those who sleep beneath the sea or under alien soil shall not be betrayed. They will not be, if we, their living representatives, make certain that the principles for which they perished shall not be forgotten or abandoned in a world—even now more concerned with profiteering than reasonable profits, power rather than service, and personal gain rather than high principles.

Examination of all-too-recent history reveals that the once great and proud democracies of Europe were weakened by bickering between labor, management, and government. Labor demanded its "rights" without regard to the equal rights of others, or the duties, and obligations which are always the correlatives of "rights." To much of management and industry demanded fantastic profits instead of a fair and reasonable return; and government listened and yielded to pressure instead of patriotism; and all three—labor, management, and government—found destruction. Let's not forget that lesson.

Today, unless this Nation is led into new paths, we, too, face destruction and loss of the great freedoms and opportunities for which generations of Americans have fought and died. Full production can be achieved only by complete cooperation on the part of both management and labor. This kind of joint action made possible the winning of the war, and is the only way we can win the peace. A Nation which has produced an overwhelming flow of the essential implements of war can also, if it but will, produce today's urgently needed food, clothing, and housing.

Only self-interest and greed delay us; these must be overcome or we, too, shall perish. We Amvets, consisting as we do of both management and labor, let us tell honest labor—and they are in a majority—that they are entitled to and should receive fair and honest wages for an honest day's work; that they should have every opportunity to improve their lot in life, consistent with their own ability to produce. No thinking American wants to, or will, deny labor the right to fair and honest collective bargaining.

Let's also tell management and industry they are entitled to a fair profit—but not to profiteer—that they, too, should have every opportunity to enjoy equality and fairness at the collective-bargaining table.

Let's be blunt and equally frank with both labor and management on some other matters. Let's tell them they both have grievous faults which are hurting our Nation in critical times. Labor has for too long tolerated the abuses of racketeering leadership and in too many instances permitted the unquestioned control of many by a few who have a propensity for calling strikes and work stoppages for their personal profit, and not the welfare of labor.

For too many years, many trades have been guilty of "feather-bedding" and so restricting apprenticeships and membership in their ranks that our entire economy suffers, and costs of their services are now prohibitive. All too frequently, management, too, has been equally guilty of such practices and encouraged them in others for their own profit.

Labor racketeers rob both labor and management of an opportunity to bargain honestly. Management racketeers pay for power, instead of production, and thereby rob both labor and other industrial lists of an opportunity to produce desperately needed consumer goods at reasonable prices. New industries and returning veterans cannot get supplies and raw materials because producers are threatened. New workers cannot learn badly needed trades because labor racketeers want and have maintained a monopoly control over the available sources of labor supply, and are protected by law in so doing.

Let's demand that both industry and labor stop smear tactics, threats, force, and the invasion of private rights—these practices have too recent and too strong a foreign smell.

Too many, who so violently waved their flags and cheered Johnny and Mary while they were in uniform and "carrying the mail," have placed their flags and patriotism in moth balls, while the same Johnny and Mary now search futilely for a house in which to live, for wearable clothes at a price they can afford to pay. They don't understand why they must now pay $10 for a pastel-colored sportshirt, when an ordinary white one at $2 or $3 is what they need—or why the only houses they can build or buy are "Jerry-built"—and cost twice their real value—or why they must shell out several large bills, in addition to the rent, for the privilege of having a roof over their heads—or, buy a houseful of junk furniture as the only means of securing living space of any kind.

They know, too, that a slap on the back, and a doubtful "Glad to see you home" doesn't take the place of a decent job at reasonable wages, or provide a place in which to live while traveling the road back to self-confidence and courage to face what has now become an almost strange, new world, and way of life.

What shall we tell the returned veteran about the "why" of all this? Let's tell him that in too many high places, personal loyalty to old friends has dimmed the duty of a greater loyalty to all the American people—the men and women who elect officials to public office. Let's tell him that public office must be a public stewardship and trust, administered as such for the benefit of all the people and not for the few.

Let's tell him that too many legislators pay more attention to the ballot box than to their conscience—pay more attention to "pressure" than to patriotism.

Let's tell him that too many highly organized minorities make noise like an honest majority, and exert pressures and influences on their own behalf out of all proportion to their size or importance in the American scene, to the detriment of the public welfare.

Let's tell him further that too many industries, already fat on the greatest profits in their history, despite staggering excess-profits taxes, refuse to produce or release already manufactured consumer goods now needed so desperately, because of the bright prospects of still greater profits.

Yes, let's tell him all these things, and let's also suggest the only possible answers: That honesty and integrity must be given and demanded in our individual lives, as well as in our dealings with one another and between nations.

That essential price controls, honestly and intelligently administered, are necessary until such time as our economy becomes stabilized and production and demand are reasonably equalized.

That we must demand of Congress, and our other elected officials, an administration based on the best interests of the common welfare—not the special interest of any group—be it political, economic, or social.

Let us admit that two and two still make four. That there's no substitute for common sense, basic truth, and honesty, and this despite already too many years of indoctrination in a school of thinking which taught the philosophy that an individual or a nation can spend its way to prosperity, or that real money grows on printing presses, or that ever-increasing governmental services can be paid for by consistent deficit spending.

Let us see that only real wages raise our standard of living, not inflation wages which, of necessity, are always behind an ever-increasing cost of living in the upward inflationary spiral. Cheap money must be replaced by sound Government financing, and drained off an already inflated economic structure.

Let us, the veterans of this war see, recognize, and act upon these problems and their answers, and provide the needed material and spiritual leadership to help make this, our country, the kind of a country for which we believed we were fighting, and the one it must be to achieve true greatness in these and the darker days which may lie ahead.

Let us heed the words of a wise American whose leadership and wisdom have been unchallenged for half a century. Let us examine the recent congressional testimony of Bernard Baruch, who said, on March 25:

"Increase production.

"Stop increasing the money supply.

"Stop decreasing taxes until the Budget is balanced.

"Stop bunking the public by saying wage increases can be granted without increase in price levels.

"Do not fear to increase prices or wages where necessary to get and stimulate production.

"Continue price controls, subject to indicated modifications, for a year. Allow profit but no profiteering.

"Avoid favoritism to any particular group.

"Take care of those between the millstones—the clerks, Government employees, pensioners, et al.

"Make surpluses of goods in military hands available to compensate for shortages.

"Stimulate founding and financing small business.

"Take stock before blindly lending—make inventories of our goods, our cash, our credit before we increase the pressure on these.

"Cut government costs, including Federal, State, county, and city. In time of deflation we should spend; in time of inflation we should save.

"Eliminate all strikes and lock-outs for a year, but arrange that hardships are guarded against.

"Set up a high court of commerce—a sort of supreme economic council—which can decide questions involved in the above points and related subjects.

"Avoid an economic dictatorship. We are still a free society, based on the enterprise system. Let us abolish neither without the consent of the people.

"And, above all, we should keep in mind that humanities come before dollars. Our first duty runs to man before business.

"There is a new feeling that comes because the war is over. The race of selfishness is on—each segment of society and each individual seeking an advantage over others. The shooting war may be over but its aftermath—military, economic and spiritual—is still here. Before the peace terms are set we are adopting a "scuttle-and-run" policy on all fronts, eager to get home and back to normal.

"On September 19, 1941, I said, 'Except for human slaughter and maiming and all that goes with them, inflation is the most destructive of the consequences of war.' That can be said again today. Let us stop trying to do a thing but not do it, both at the same time. We either must suffer what inflation brings or prevent it.

"Price control by itself will not be effective. It must go hand in hand with a sharply defined tax program; the siphoning off of excess savings and earnings by selling Government bonds to individuals instead of banks; by controlling all loans; by not favoring any one segment of society over another; by priority, licensing and allocation to the greatest needs and, above all, by increasing production.

"We are being beguiled with more money, with less purchasing power. The gold dust thrown in all our eyes by political abracabra only confuses, with gain to no one except temporary power to the economic magicians. We must mix brains with our brawn if we would keep our world leadership. The whole world is watching us, amazed at the exhibition of a giant who cannot pull himself together—even to take care of his own needs."

Let us, the Amvets, rededicate ourselves to these truths and our declaration of principles. Let us pray to the Almighty God for the wisdom, courage, integrity and vision to serve our comrades, living and dead, and our country, in these trying days of a peace not yet won.

"Caveat Emptor" Essential, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am bringing to your attention a column from the Washington Post by Malvina Lindsay.

I believe in continuous employment, full production, and the most free sort of movement of goods from production to consumption. Ordinarily I do not favor "buyers' strikes." However, at this time our national economy is going through a period of precarious adjustment. No one should waste their money buying unnecessary or inferior goods.

In this light, Miss Lindsay's column is most interesting:

THE GENTLER SEX
(By Malvina Lindsay)
BUYERS' STRIKE

Reports from the feminine underground indicate that another strike may be in the making. A gradually increasing number of women are going on strike against buying any more fantastically styled, impractical shoes, shoddy cotton and rayon dresses, elaborately embroidered pillow slips with coarse machine stitching, $39.50 hats and $10 to $12 a yard fancy fabrics.

As yet the strikers number only a few discriminating consumers. But responsible manufacturers have the good sense to be worried about them, even though the masses of shoppers are still mobbing the stores for whatever they can lay hands on. Repeatedly in trade papers are warnings of "growing consumer resistance" to inferior or too highly priced goods.

Recently, Edward N. Allen, former president of the National Retail Dry Goods Association, told the Chamber of Commerce of the United States that consumers were aware of the deterioration in quality of the goods offered them. He said both trade and industry feared some public reaction similar to the 1920 buyers' strike, overall parades, and other protests against the high cost of living that preceded the price drop and depression after the First World War.

A shoppers' rebellion, in talk at least, against overpriced, shoddy goods is on in bus and streetcar. There are spoken determinations to nave old shoes resoled or to go barefoot until better-made footwear and less preposterous styles are put on the market. There are vows to drag out old clothes or go in rags until better goods than "a fine grade of cornshucks" are offered in dresses.

This deterioration in quality of goods, which caused Mr. Allen to declare, "never have I seen people spend so much money and get so little for it," is blamed largely on the OPA by manufacturers. They say that restrictions, allocations, and rigid ceiling prices have put them in a strait-jacket, also encouraged fly-by-night competitors, unrestrained by basic standards, to come into the market and make inferior goods.

OPA says that manufacturers generally have taken advantage of a sellers' market to produce poorer quality goods in order to swell their profits. Also, it charges many manufacturers have used tricks of ornamentation to conceal poor material, and have changed designs, added buttons, bows, sequins, etc., in order to get higher ceiling prices. And, says OPA, the abolishment of grade labeling by Congress in 1944 has made it difficult for consumers to check on quality. It points out that clothes production standards were maintained by the WPB for clothes of servicemen and women but not for civilians.

But comparatively few consumers have worried about this. Last year civilian goods produced were 69 percent higher than in 1939. Yet public wants were not supplied. People had money to spend and were desperate for goods. They took anything. Today they are not buying quite so blindly, though retailers expect sales to increase for the rest of the year.

Men with their last shirts on their backs and veterans without suits will continue to take what they can get. Women down to their uppers will continue to buy slingbacks on stilts in which to toddle about their daily tasks. In fact, they have no choice for most shoes have graduated into the "dress" type, which carries a higher ceiling price than the simple conservative model of yesteryear. Children who outgrow clothing rapidly will have to be dressed in what is available—especially if the CPA yields (as it is rumored to be on the verge of doing) to pressure to have the program for low-priced children's and work clothing abandoned. Also, easily panicked women are going to buy more than they need—even though those in desperate need go without—to be on the "safe side" should inflation increase.

But many intelligent and conscientious buyers have begun to draw in their horns. Hence, hosiery makers are beginning to wonder whether women will pay $2.50 and $2.75 for silk stockings now that raw silk from Japan is becoming available. Merchants, looking at their left-over $12.50-a-yard silks, are asking manufacturers for a silk fabric that will sell for around $3 a yard.

Barring other upsets, such as a prolonged holding up of production through strikes, or a new sharp inflationary trend with attendant grabbing for goods, some results should be felt from the reaction against being hoodwinked that careful buyers are showing. For manufacturers and merchants realize that in the long run such customers are their best friends.

Consumer and the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include an interesting letter from the New York Herald Tribune of May 17.

We are passing through a terrific period of economic adjustment in this country—one which calls for the fullest sort of broad consideration for every issue.

Certainly there is a great need for a constructive and intelligent minority approach to these problems. In this light I do feel that Mr. Javit's letter is interesting and worthy of study:

CONSUMER AND REPUBLICAN PARTY—SOUND LEADERSHIP AND INDIVIDUAL SELF-RELIANCE BASIS FOR POLITICAL RELATIONSHIP

To the New York Herald Tribune:

It used to be fashionable to picture the consumer clad only in a barrel, thin and worn and with a harassed expression—a companion piece to the political picture of the taxpayer. Viewing the figures alone, this is no longer true. The consumer is richer after World War II and, what is more, he may scatter his money about like a drunken sailor.

It is a political task of the first magnitude to take the country through the dangers of inflation while conserving that demand which alone can bring about maximum employment and full production. The consumer must stoutly maintain a sense of proportion on prices if he wishes to avoid governmental direction of our economy—under the guise of immediately holding the price line—which is likely to perpetuate itself in this and other directions. The fundamental philosophy on the private enterprise system of the Republican side must give the con-

sumer that support and those principles which he will urgently require to attain the needed discipline and understanding.

Recent figures indicate that the nonbanking public holds cash and Government bonds totaling $225,000,000,000, or, roughly, $1,750 per capita—of which cash alone averages $1,000 per capita. This represents about twice the amount of cash held by the public in 1939. Even incomplete estimates fix the backlog of consumer demand at fifty billions. Aggregate disposable civilian income in the year 1947 is estimated at 147 billions, or well over $1,000 per capita. To meet this flood of spendable money we expect to have production in 1947 of, say, 175 billions, or more than $1,200 per capita—40 to 50 percent above what we ever had before. The explosive inflationary character of our enormous liquid assets is apparent, for inflation comes when there is a demand fed by far more money than goods and when prices are bid up on a scarcity basis. The capacity to produce is much below the level of current demand in many lines.

Our enormous liquid assets are explosive inflationary material, but the fuze to set it off is the consumer. If he goes on a buying orgy we are in for grave trouble, but if he keeps his shirt on and uses his liquid assets for prudent long-term investment and as a buffer against depression we are in for a long period of good times.

Consumers—individual buyers and users of things—include all of us who work and many who do not. Those who are gainfully employed outside of Government generally can adjust wages to prices more quickly. This is especially true for organized labor. Millions of workers are unorganized, and for all workers wages have a tendency to lag behind rather than to precede price rises. Government workers, of whom there are around six million, lag even further behind in adjusting wages to prices. But price rises hit most severely those whose incomes are fixed—the millions of pensioners, annuitants from insurance, savings and social security funds, retired people who have earned what they thought was a competence, and now several million veterans and veterans' families collecting death or disability benefits or receiving unemployment or education assistance under the GI bill of rights.

The basic objective of the individual consumer is a fuller life. Before World War II 85 percent of the people lived in families with annual incomes under $2,000 a year, a sum considered at that time to be required for decent housing, food, clothing, recreation, education, and contingencies for a family of four, according to American standards. The consumer has a right to expect that the enhanced productivity engendered by World War II—estimated at 40 to 50 percent—will materially raise the standard of living and bring many more millions of our aggregate 35,000,000 families into the group enjoying such a decent standard of living. The consumers' interest is therefore, in more production and its wider distribution. Henry Ford 2d has put it well in one of his recent expressions of industrial faith when he said:

"The job of American industry, management, and labor is to make at lower and lower cost more and better products to sell for lower and lower prices."

The United States private enterprise economy has been the most fruitful the world has ever seen—as is apparent, for instance, from our ownership of approximately 54 percent of all the world's telephones and approximately 68 percent of all the world's automobiles. Americans have always believed that this enormous productivity and its wide distribution have been attained through the keen competition and through mass distribution induced by high wages, low prices, and vigorous selling and advertising. But the free market alone does not give us this assurance, for an economic power grows, monopolistic and restrictive practices creep in which tend to reverse the whole process and to make goods scarce and high. Or we find that wars or other dislocations make goods scarce while boosting the demand for them enormously—our present situation.

At this point the consumer meets politics. The Government steps in to prevent monopoly or restraint of trade. It steps in to protect small business from being squeezed out of existence. It steps in to preserve truth and honesty in business. Finally—and especially important at this time—it steps in to keep prices from going out of reason and through inflation, or boom and bust, destroying the whole economy.

The consumer, therefore, has a vital political interest. He must see that on the one hand private enterprise gets full play to produce the most for the least, but on the other hand that this process is not reversed and the social and economic fabric of the country is not destroyed by its excesses.

Long-term technological improvement, increased efficiency of management and labor, and expansion of facilities to increase production and raise the standard of living, require a feeling of security in the rules, the system, and the rewards of our private enterprise economy. It is that basic confidence in the fundamentals of the system which cannot be argued away, which finds its home preponderantly on the Republican side.

The current controversy regarding the continuance of the OPA is a case in point. Regardless of what might have happened if other types of price control had been resorted to during the war, direct controls were put into effect as early as 1941. The pressures of our whole economy having been confined within them, we cannot suddenly take off the lid without blowing up the house.

The Republican side must favor an extension of the OPA price and rent controls—until supply can more nearly meet demand. But the Republican side must remain true to its basic philosophy in the imposition of such governmental price controls. This philosophy requires the lifting of such controls on an item-by-item basis as soon as production is reasonably adequate for current demand, the recognition of the fact that the life of private business is profitable operation, and the refusal to use subsidies to mask price increases rather than as a bounty to encourage production, the purpose for which they were designed.

The consumer requires a firm political philosophy on which to premise that self-discipline so urgently necessary to the country's welfare at this time. He must place his main reliance upon himself, and not on an all-potent and paternalistic government. The consumer's political philosophy should charge him with the discretion to keep his own control on prices by refraining from buying what is unreasonable in price. The consumer owes a national duty to conserve his present liquid resources primarily for a rainy day.

But the consumer's political philosophy should give him enough faith in his country and in his fellow citizens to invest in the expansion and improvement of industry and trade, both in the United States and in other countries. He should help government in good times by refraining from pressures for extensive government spending, thus doing his part to help in bringing about a balanced Budget; he should hold for investment his long-term Government bonds and be willing to pay substantial taxes when he can afford them. The consumer, beyond all, must beware of the insidious spirit which still lives in the world, though we have just crushed the Nazi and Fascist bodies which it animated; that totalitarian spirit which, as Governor Dewey said in his recent report to the people of the State of New York, offers "a security no better than that of a State prison in exchange for the risks of life in a free society."

J. K. JAVITS.

NEW YORK, *May 15, 1946.*

The Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLLA C. McMILLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the News-Gazette of Champaign, Ill.:

THE QUESTION

Many thoughtful individuals ponder the question whether capitalism can survive in a rapidly expanding socialistic world. Socialism now has overrun Europe, at one time the most influential of all continents by far, and is threatening to spread. Will it overrun the Western Hemisphere?

On the basis of current events, there can be no doubt about it. Capitalism will survive. The capitalist world centering in the United States is now feeding the Socialist countries and will be expected to continue to supply them indefinitely. Most Socialist governments would collapse in a short time, to be supplanted by other economic and political systems, were capitalist aid withdrawn.

It isn't hard to conjure a picture of what would happen were the United States and Canada to drop the immigration bars. The inhabitants of the Socialist countries would come flocking over here to live. They know that capitalist North America offers them incomparably more in standard living and in individual freedom than does socialism.

Any American dissatisfied with the capitalist form offers an amazing study in psychology. The system under which he is living is the best by test. It has shown the optimism in economic benefits in the history of the world. The citizen privileged to live under it is envied by peoples of all nations.

The question is not, Can capitalism survive; it is, Why shouldn't capitalism survive?

Subsidies, Subterfuge, and Subversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when is the present administration going to deal honestly with the American people? When is the present administration going to stop operating behind smoke screens? When is the administration going to stop putting off until tomorrow what should be done today?

Many frauds have been perpetrated upon the American people by the present administration, but the worst fraud has been the use of deficit spending to pay today's bills. The fanciest scheme that the administration has yet devised to fool the people is the subsidy program. The evil inherent in this scheme is its simplicity. The Government pays part of the consumer's bill. The cost to the Government is added to the national debt. This debt with interest must be paid by present and future taxation. There is no

such thing, Mr. Speaker, as a "free lunch." Someone must pay the bill.

All during the war this Nation was well able to pay its food bill, but the administration insisted upon paying part of the bill and borrowing billions that the future taxpayers of this country will have to pay back. I hope that the veterans who were away fighting the war and who will be the principal taxpayers of the next 30 to 40 years realize that what the Administration has done by its subsidy program is to saddle them with the bill for many of the things that were consumed by those who stayed at home.

There has never been and never will be a satisfactory excuse for the payment of subsidies of any kind. I have always opposed this dishonest practice. I will continue to do so.

I want to call the attention of the House to an article appearing in the April 24 issue of the National Hardwood News, relating to this matter of subsidies. It expresses most forcefully my thinking on this subject:

SUBSIDY, SUBTERFUGE, AND SUBVERSION

The war after the war is developing into a verbal slug fest, as the people clamor for a restoration of their prewar freedoms and the wartime bureaus fight to hold their places on the Federal pay rolls. The radio provides the stage for dramatics as the bureaus on the firing line strive to deceive gullible people into a belief that the country would fast go to the dogs without their watchful care. They point to their record during the war as evidence of their ability to run the country perpetually. They learned a great deal during the war which they are now putting to effective use. They became expert in propaganda and in ways to influence the public through advanced methods of communication. They were thoroughly trained in the Washington school of deception.

One of the most glaring examples of this postwar campaign to capture America was a recent broadcast over Washington Station WTOP in which the principal actors were Messrs. Bowles, Porter, Small, Anderson, and Wirtz, who conducted a round-table panel discussion on the virtues of price control. As an exhibition of mutual admiration, it was a gem, as reported in the Chicago Journal of Commerce. Honey dripped from their lips as they discoursed on the effectiveness of subsidies as the solution of the price-control problems. Nothing but sweetness and light could flow from such winning personalities. The dear housewife was told that prices have not gone up at all because those public protectors are using subsidies to hold them in line. If the housewife is spending more money for food these days, it is simply because she is buying more and not because she pays higher prices for what she gets.

These five saviors of the American home agreed thoroughly among themselves that they are keeping the wolf from the door through the protections offered by their activities in controlling prices, wages, profits, and all the other schemes for economic management. And the successful operation of these controls depends upon subsidies. Keep these five stalwart protectors in office and they will provide the subsidies which will hold prices from jumping to ruinous levels.

These wartime agencies, established for the duration, have discovered that the country cannot survive without them in peacetime. Forgotten is the promise that a free economy would be restored to the people at the end of the war. Who said the war is over? The President says it is not and Congress does not seem to have the courage to overrule him. So the emergency theoretically continues and the agencies which have waited on the sidelines until the military finished its job have now taken over to regiment American industry and to control for their own political ends that vast production machinery which overwhelmed our enemies with the might of America.

These warriors against a free economy have adopted the military strategy of deception to attain their objectives. Subsidies are the very essence of economic deception. They argue that the cost of subsidies is only a fraction of the cost of free prices. How do they know? The argument itself is deceptive and fallacious. In comparing controlled prices with imaginary free prices, they overlook the reality that reduced quality and existing black markets should be included in a weighted average of so-called controlled prices. They use every verbal subterfuge as a smoke screen to hide the fact that controlled prices are not actual prices. And that being the case, the subsidies are a total waste because they do not accomplish the planned results. They also conceal the real object of subsidies; namely, to make necessary the continuation of bureaus to ladle out the money, usually in the direction where it will bring the most votes.

When food subsidies were first adopted to achieve stabilization it was said that only a small expenditure of public funds would be required. In this year 1946 these expenditures are now estimated to run $1,375,000,000, bringing the total addition to the national debt of $6,500,000,000 for food subsidies since the plan was initiated. To that extent the bills for the food consumed in America are passed on to the children and grandchildren, who must pay them in the distant future. Will these descendants be more able to pay than their ancestors who are now consuming the food? Presumably the generations to come will have their hands full to pay their own grocery bills without the additional burden of paying a part of their ancestors' living expenses. Is this subsidy business fair to future generations? We hear much about the enormous savings and tremendous purchasing power of the American people. Then why should they pass on a part of their grocery bills to their descendants? It does not make sense.

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, total Government subsidy payments for all purposes will be more than $2,500,000,000 and estimates for the next fiscal year exceed $3,000,000,000. That is an indication of the rate subsidies grow and these figures do not include the additional cost of bureaus which distribute the money and the annual interest charges on this addition to the national debt. The average American family rises from the breakfast table with a sense of satisfaction that they have paid for their food. They would be indignant to discover that the grocer had charged a part of the cost on his cuff to be presented for payment by future generations. But that is the effect of Government subsidies, which deceive the citizen into thinking that someone else is paying a part of his bills, only to wake up later to the devastating reality that he or his descendants must pay the balance of the bill with interest.

Now the Washington tune is set to the music of housing for veterans and a small subsidy of $600,000,000 is proposed as an entering wedge. Congress itself knows that this figure will grow and grow, once the precedent is established and deficiency appropriations will be needed to carry on the plan. Ex-servicemen will be deluded with the belief that they are getting a gift from taxpayers who are sharing the cost of their homes. Later they will awaken to the realization that they are the taxpayers who will have to settle the bill.

The whole scheme of subsidies is a delusion and a snare, subversive to a free economy and beneficial only to the politicians for vote getting purposes and to the bureaucrats who administer the program. Instead of subtracting from the cost of living, subsidies add a heavy burden upon the people. They are subversive of the very principles of free government and the Constitution of the United States. It is time that all people who want to preserve and continue the American system of free competitive enterprise rise up and demand of Congress that subsidies be discontinued as a pretended stabilization instrumentality.

NEW QUICK-DRYING METHOD

Progress was made during the war in kiln drying hardwoods, but something new has been added to traditional methods of seasoning, as reported in Business Week, April 13 issue. The new process, announced by Taylor-Colquitt Co., Spartanburg, S. C., is known as vapor drying. This wood-preserving establishment has conducted research for more than 6 years, resulting in rapid drying of green or partially seasoned wood by the use of inert organic vapor raised to high temperature, providing a neutral atmosphere which prevents charring. Railroad crossties have been reduced from 80 to 30 percent moisture content in 12 hours. Checking of the wood is reduced and the strength of the dried wood is reduced very little as compared with the green wood. Commercial production has been started in drying poles and ties by the vapor process to 30 or 40 percent moisture content in preparation for preservative treatment. Pilot plant work has been done in drying lumber to 8 or 12 percent moisture content for construction purposes. Further research remains to be done in determining proper time-temperature cycles for various thicknesses and species and in working out cost comparisons, although Taylor-Colquitt are convinced that vapor drying will prove more economical than either air drying or kiln drying. It is said that the cost of plant alteration for application of the vapor-drying process is reasonable. Taylor-Colquitt plans to license others to use the process and apparatus patents and to provide users with engineering service for plant conversion. Interested members desiring full particulars should write direct to Taylor-Colquitt Co., Spartanburg, S. C.

THE FURNITURE INDUSTRY

Statistcs for February have been released by the National Association of Furniture Manufacturers. Against many difficulties, the furniture industry is making strong headway. Production in February was 6 percent above January and 35 percent above February 1945. The increase of 2 percent over January in orders received is significant because January was the month of the winter show when large bookings are made and normally the volume of orders received in February fall off sharply compared with the previous month. Comparison with February last year tells the story of the uptrend when the recorded increase is 36 percent. The furniture people say that the difficulty in finding lumber is the greatest in the history of the industry and they are also having their trouble in securing cover fabrics, but furniture production seems to make steady and substantial progress against all obstacles.

Feed for Livestock and Poultry

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from Niagara County, in New York State, and

am in receipt of a report from the chairman of the Farm Bureau of Niagara County, the livestock-commodity committee and poultry-commodity committee, pointing out the very serious situation that exists today in regard to feed for livestock and poultry which prevails in that county. This I know is true in many other counties of the country, and it is being brought directly to the attention of Mr. Bowles and the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Anderson.

This is as follows:

LOCKPORT, N. Y., *May 18, 1946.*

Congressman WALTER G. ANDREWS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDREWS: Relative to our conversation of yesterday, below is the situation as we now find it in Niagara County relative to feed for livestock and poultry.

Local mixers of feed were contacted, and this is the situation: These dealers supply better than 60 percent of all farmers in Niagara County. Practically no scratch grain available from any dealer. Two of these dealers hope to get by for the next 30 days. One dealer very low on wheat feeds and grains, no gluten feed for dairy mixing, corn very bad. Barley supply very low. Will close down June 1. Another dealer is low on oats, has no corn, is out of bran and middlings, and is attempting to prepare some sort of mixed feed for 2 weeks' time, then the mill will close down. Has no backlog of mixed feeds available. One dealer in the western part of the county is O. K. on dairy feeds until June 1. Poultry feeds very low. Will be absolutely out of wheat and corn in a week's time. One man with 2,500 layers and 5,000 young birds will be forced to close down his entire operation by June 1. Approximately 9,000 bushels of wheat moved out of Niagara County under the Government bonus program.

Let us consider that approximately 70 percent of the feed that a cow utilizes, grass, hay, silage, cannot be used for human use. This cow, if fed a small amount of grain supplement, makes one of the finest foods in the world. Without this small amount of grain, milk production will fall off to a very low level during the summer and this production cannot be brought back in the fall by any amount of grain or other types of feed. We have our milk supply now, short as it is. What are the people of the United States going to do if this supply is shut off? Once a cow stops producing, few farmers will attempt to keep this animal in his herd. Can the people of the United States afford to lose this much food?

Since the instigation of the OPA, feed prices have increased approximately 70 percent. Meat prices on poultry had slight variations, eggs under present pricing regulations are 1 cent lower a dozen. Again we ask the question, can the people of the United States afford to lose this food supply?

Throughout the war farmers in Niagara County and the Northeast have produced an unfailing supply of food. We have not struck, we have not withheld our products, we have not shirked in the number of hours we have had to work. The time has come when an accounting must be made. The manufacturer will not sell his goods at a loss, production will stop. Unless some means is devised with feeds, repair parts for our equipment and things to work with, the people of the United States are going to go hungry. Practically every organization in the country has had a work stop or strike in the last 6 months except the farmers. What does the Congress of the United States want us to do?

Respectfully submitted.

HARRY O. AIKIN,
Chairman, Niagara County Farm Bureau.
EDWARD STAPLES,
Chairman, Livestock Commodity Committee.
ALPHEUS O'NEILL,
Chairman, Poultry Commodity Committee.
J. S. PUTNAM,
Secretary, Poultry Commodity Committee.

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement of George McLain, chairman of the National Pension Committee, Inc., and chairman of the Citizens' Committee for Old-age Pensions, Inc., of California, before the Ways and Means Committee May 3, 1946:

Mr. Chairman and members of the congressional Ways and Means Committee, my name is George H. McLain, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. I am chairman of the National Pension Committee, and chairman of the board of trustees of the Citizens' Committee for Old-Age Pensions of California.

The National Pension Committee was formed for the purpose of coordinating the national activities of various pension groups which have been working independently with their State legislatures to effectuate liberalization of the State laws as they deal with old age, blind assistance, and dependent children. The membership of our groups are primarily made up of recipients and others interested in these categorical aids.

We believe that the National Pension Committee holds the unique position of having actual experience with the recipient end, as well as the State administration part of titles I, IV, and X, of the Social Security Act; therefore, we are in a position to appreciate the action taken by Congress over 10 years ago to make funds available under the Federal Social Security Act for the needy aged, blind, and dependent children. We also wish to express ourselves as being pleased by the manner in which the Federal Social Security Board has administered the act.

The administration of public assistance by the States has been subject to a great deal of criticism by the recipients because of the States' unwillingness to administer the act according to what we believe has been the desire of Congress. This attitude of the States has caused great misery and needless suffering among applicants and recipients of aid. Much of our contention has been confirmed by the Ways and Means Committee's technical staff in their recently completed survey of the social-security subject.

The public assistance part of the Social Security Act is restrictive and is in great need of clarification by liberal amendments and the establishment of minimum standards as to the qualifications of recipients and a standard of minimum payments should be set by Congress before it will do the job for which we believe it is intended.

The average monthly payments for old-age assistance will bear out my contention. In the State of Kentucky * * * the old folks receive $11.58 a month; in Georgia, $11.74, while in the State of Washington the average payments are $50.28, and, in California, $47.42 a month. A survey made in 1944 of cases in California conducted by the State social welfare board disclosed that the average recipient of old-age assistance in that State needed $61.11 a month; yet, regardless of a well-filled State treasury and large surplus, the State was unwilling to meet these needs because there would not be participation upon the part of the Federal Government.

Now, if California's aged needed $61.11 to get by in 1944, surely the old folks in Kentucky receiving only $11.58 a month, must be in most deplorable and desperate circumstances. The needy blind of our Nation are no better treated than the aged, yet their needs are much greater and their cause most worthy.

The national average payments to 2,047,446 recipients of old-age assistance are only $30.60 a month. Seventy-thousand eight hundred and eighty-two needy blind receive an average of only $33.35 a month. These low payments, in view of the increased cost of living demonstrate the need of greater Federal participation in public assistance payments of the States.

Our great and wealthy Nation, for security reasons, has been, and is now pouring, billions of dollars in resources to aid the needy of the world. Surely our own citizens have the right to expect that their Government will not continue to neglect the security and needs of the homefolks.

The National Pension Committee believes that every Member of Congress desires to see a comprehensive and dignified system of old-age, blind, and dependent children assistance given to everyone in the United States who is in need, and that is why I wish to now take up the time of the Ways and Means Committee to discuss H. R. 5116, introduced by Congressman CECIL R. KING, an able member of your distinguished Ways and Means Committee. The amendments proposed in this bill are as follows:

1. Removal of present $40 ceiling and graduated matching from 50 to 75 percent, according to the per capita income of the State. This means that the Federal Government will match any State to whatever amount it may desire to give those receiving old-age and blind assistance, and the States whose per capita income is low will receive three Federal dollars to the State's one dollar.

The result of this amendment will encourage uniform, higher grants for old-age and blind assistance throughout the entire Nation. The absence of a federally imposed ceiling will encourage States to progressively increase their payments from year to year until finally no aged or blind person in our Nation will be able to complain that they lack the money to buy all of the necessities of life.

2. Age lowered to 60 years for both men and women, on old-age assistance. Thousands of persons between 60 and 64 years of age, too old to get jobs—yet too young to get present old-age assistance—must become subjects of direct relief or county charity. This amendment gives these "oldsters" the opportunity to apply for old-age assistance, which should be on a more dignified plane than direct relief. Others in this age bracket would be encouraged to give way in employment to younger persons.

3. Permits income, resources, and earnings up to an annual value of $240. The reason this is considered on an annual basis is to permit seasonal and part-time employment in agricultural pursuits. Figured on a monthly basis, it would average $20, thereby permitting a recipient who has a small outside income or resources, such as

free rent, ownership of home, old-age benefits, or veterans' widow pension, the opportunity of enjoying these privileges up to this amount, without having the entire deductions made from their grant as our Federal laws require today. This amendment will also encourage the recipients to be profitably engaged in minor pursuits such as mowing lawns, washing windows, housework, and taking care of children. This amendment will also tend to take up the slack in the Social Security Act that deals with old-age and survivors' benefits where the monthly payments are insufficient to take care of the needs of the beneficiary.

4. Provide for Federal funds for hospitalization, medical and health services and choice of recognized practitioner retained by the recipient. Under the present law, while medical needs are recognized as essential, communities have had to assume the entire burden of hospitalization and medical expenses to the detriment of both the recipient and community taxpayer. The majority of recipients are deprived of minor health needs under the present lack of Federal participation.

5. Resident requirement reduced to 2 years out of the 5 years preceding the date of application. The present law on both aged and blind categorical aids is 5 years out of 9 years preceding application. A few States have reduced their resident requirement to only 1 year. Some groups advocate abolishment entirely. We do not favor reducing the resident requirement under 2 years until an opportunity has been given to all of the States under these amendments to increase their amount of grants to a greater uniformity among States. We say this, knowing that there is no evidence of migration upon the part of elderly people to the States that have raised their monthly payments. We recognize that, regardless of whether this State or that State pays more to the old folks, there's still "no place like home"; and people who have lived most of their lives in a community are not going to move hundreds of miles to other States and live among strangers because that State pays $10 or $15 more a month old-age or blind assistance.

6. No condition of aid that requires enforced contributions for children. Those who apply for old-age or blind assistance will be able to stand upon their own qualifications; yet there is nothing in this proposal that will prohibit children from contributing to their parents' support if they desire to do so on moral grounds. "Support your relatives" or "responsible relatives" clause is now in vogue in many States, although it is not a Federal requirement. It is in the hypocrisy of the whole matter that the elderly and blind folks are given the run-around because, in most instances, if the applicant has children, this is used as an excuse to deny them aid—where a responsible relative's scale is used the cost of the collections greatly exceed the amount collected. There is considerable resentment upon the part of the needy aged and the blind against this obnoxious law, as it has caused a great deal of misunderstanding and hard feelings among families, in addition to causing many broken homes. To show to what extreme a State will consider a responsible relative, the State of Connecticut stipulates that liability rests on a husband or wife, father or mother, grandfather or grandmother, and children or grandchildren.

7. Uniform administration in all political subdivisions of the States, which means that all counties must administer the laws the same way throughout the entire State. There is not sufficient evidence that the cost of living between counties within the borders of a State is great enough to warrant anything else but uniformity.

8. Prohibit discrimination because of marriage or sex. Some of the States do have this discrimination. In these States where husband and wife are living together and receiving assistance, their monthly payments are less than that paid to single persons. As the monthly payments throughout the Nation for recipients of old-age and blind assistance are below the standard of actual needs, any distinction made between married and unmarried pensioners constitutes a penalty exercised against marriage.

In some practices the husband is considered the head of the family and the grant is given direct to him. In case of his death, it is necessary for his wife to make a new application, and after several months of being destitute, she may be granted aid.

Also in some States, the welfare boards have ruled that the needs of a woman are less than those of a man. Here we find a discrimination because of sex. While it is said that a scientific study has been made by some professors of institutions on this subject, and it was found that the average woman requires less food than the average male, such a finding does not hold water regarding payments to recipients of old-age and blind assistance which are small and inadequate and not based upon the need of the recipient but entirely upon the ability and desire of the State to pay. Statistics of this sort used against needy aged and blind women smacks of chiselling upon the part of State welfare departments and is not in harmony with American reasoning.

9. Prohibits transfer to State of title to any property owned by applicant or recipient as a condition of receiving such aid. Some States require that a recipient turn over his property to the county welfare department before giving him aid. Other States permit recipients to have real property up to an assessed value of $3,000, less encumbrances. The liberalized Federal payments contained in this bill should encourage all of the States to allow their needy, aged, and blind to have a little home of their own without having to deed it over to the county in order to get the bare necessities of life.

10. Recipients shall not be deemed paupers nor shall any warrant be drawn containing references to indigency or pauperism.

Because an American loses his eyesight and becomes blind and can no longer provide for himself, or due to the normal processes of life he becomes aged and in need, he shouldn't be considered a pauper. For an American citizen in this circumstance to be considered an indigent or a pauper under our form of constitutional government, is contrary to our American ideals.

11. This act shall be effective as of January 1, 1946, and mandatory January 30, 1947. Federal moneys will be available under this measure for old-age and blind assistance immediately upon its passage, and the State legislators are given a reasonable time to adjust their laws to conform with these amendments.

The National Pension Committee wishes to make further recommendations for amendments that are not included in H. R. 5116, and they are:

A. No aged or blind person otherwise eligible shall be denied assistance because of a $5,000 equity in property.

B. While we are opposed to the imposition of a Federal ceiling in the grants of aid to the States, a floor would be desirable stipulating a minimum basic grant of $40 per person receiving old-age and blind assistance.

C. No applicants should be denied assistance because they have been receiving aid from a State during the time they are establishing residence in another State.

D. Because of continuous disagreement between local and State welfare agencies over rules and regulations issued by the State welfare boards or commissions, we recommend that where Federal moneys are involved, only the Federal and State agencies be allowed to administer public assistance. Administration by the Federal and State agencies should streamline the Nation's public-assistance programs to a high point of efficiency.

E. Because of erroneous statements made during the time that State legislatures held hearings on bills dealing with the Federal Social Security Act we suggest that an observer from the Federal Social Security Agency be available and in attendance during such hearings.

F. As the States tend to gear their budget of needs according to their basic grant to recipients we suggest that the Federal Social Security Board make a report on the cost of food, clothing, and living incidentals for use by the States for budget purposes in their assistance programs semiannually. This report should be prepared according to the economic areas in which the individual State exists.

DIRECT RELIEF

We recommend a new title to the present public-assistance programs under the Social Security Act to deal with public relief without requiring any residential qualifications for such aid.

As direct relief should be considered as temporary aid to tide persons over during times of destitution, it should be considered separate from titles I, IV, and X.

The State's present program for direct relief, commonly known as "charity," are inadequate because the entire burden is assumed by local communities. Federal participation in direct relief will trend toward the philosophy that no one in need in the United States shall be deprived of the necessities of life.

Liberals Put on Notice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, William Henry Chamberlain, writing in the current issue of the Progressive, calls attention to the crisis of liberalism that prevails at this time. Some of these self-styled "liberals," such as Henry Wallace and his crowd, should read and study this article by Mr. Chamberlain and find out just what they are doing to the cause of real liberalism in this country. Fellow-travelers and Communists are loud in their affirmations to the cause of liberal thinking, but they follow the Russian line and in effect, are enemies to the cause of liberalism.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks, the fine article by Mr. Chamberlain:

THE CRISIS OF LIBERALISM

(By William Henry Chamberlain)

We live in an age of great confusion of tongues. The same words often do not mean the same things, as between citizens of different nations and even as between citizens of the same nation. Sometimes it seems that a new dictionary, specializing in political and moral definitions, might be a useful idea.

The good old word "liberalism" has not escaped this confusion of tongues. A liberal can be almost anyone, from a thinly camouflaged sympathizer with a foreign brand of totalitarianism to a believer in American political and civil liberties who wishes to make these liberties serve good causes.

The ideals of historic liberalism have been betrayed and forgotten (if, indeed, these ideals were ever known) by many professedly liberal individuals and publications. This

has led to a crisis of American liberalism. Many of its leaders have failed to pass the severe test imposed by the spread of competing forms of totalitarianism abroad and by the Second World War. It is high time to take stock, to examine what is the core of the liberal faith and to apply this standard of judgment to men and ideas.

Liberalism, by its very nature, is not a static creed. It grew up in struggle against static conceptions, against the divine right of kings, against the dogmatic assumption of established churches, against the unchanging feudal order. And obviously no static creed would stand a chance of maintaining itself in an age of breathtaking scientific discovery and technological change.

The discovery of atomic energy and the consequent very real possibility that America could be subjected to terrific destruction, if not to actual conquest, by attacks launched from distant bases in Europe and Asia have revolutionized the problem of American defense and American security. It makes certain political and military assumptions which were entirely valid in 1940 and 1941 invalid at the present time.

The economic forms of the nineteenth century are not applicable, in many cases, to the conditions of the twentieth. The genuine liberal will always be in the front ranks of those who are searching for changes which will be generally beneficial.

But at the same time certain conceptions of historic liberalism are eternally valid and can only be abandoned at the price of retrogression and degradation of human personality. The intelligent liberal will not approve an idea or a system merely because it seems new, any more than he will endorse an idea or a system merely because it is old. He will keep a wary and skeptical eye cocked in the direction of any movement that bases its claim to support on the ground that it is inevitable, some kind of wave of the future.

Liberals have often been the martyrs of temporarily lost causes. They should never be confused with opportunists, who will go along with anything that seems to be winning.

Now one of the fundamental liberal values is belief in the dignity and independence of the individual human being, in the right of free thought and free expression. Milton found rugged and eloquent words for this belief in his Areopagitica, one of the few seventeenth century arguments against censorship:

"Give me the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely, according to conscience, above all liberties * * * And though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so truth be in the field, we do injuriously by licensing and prohibiting to misdoubt her strength. Let her and falsehood grapple; who ever knew truth put to the worse, in a free and open encounter?"

Two centuries later John Stuart Mill put forward this ringing vindication of the right of the individual to stand up alone for an unpopular idea. As he wrote in his Essay on Liberty:

"If all mankind, minus one, were of one opinion and only one person were of contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind."

Modern American liberalism has been sadly neglectful of the primary liberal obligation to work for maximum freedom of speech and press and expression, to uphold the rights of unpopular minority spokesmen, to speak out against the prostitution of legal forms to cover acts of arbitrary revenge. The efforts of leading American publishers to obtain world-wide freedom of news reporting have met not enthusiastic support, but carping criticism in supposedly liberal publications. The Nation, for instance, threw over the whole liberal position, lock, stock, and barrel, when it wrote:

"The grant of such privileges implies the assurance of a sense of responsibility in the recipients."

In other words, freedom of the press is a privilege, not a right, and demands a sense of responsibility in the recipient. This presumably means that if a foreign correspondent writes along lines approved by the Nation, he possesses this sense, otherwise he is presumed to be lacking in it.

So one is in the paradoxical position of having to look everywhere, except in liberal organs, for support of such a definitely liberal idea as the abolition of censorship all over the world. One must also look elsewhere for adequate characterization of the preposterous mass sedition trial in Washington. While many of the defendants were crackpots of a more or less unpleasant type, the trial introduced some very disturbing precedents into American jurisprudence.

There was the attempt, for instance, to construe guilt by the strained and artificial method of trying to establish similarity in ideas between Nazi pronouncements in Germany and the writings of the defendants. There was the undesirable "amalgam" technique of trying to establish a conspiracy of individuals who in many cases did not know each other before the trial. There was the obvious injustice of including a serious thinker like Lawrence Dennis with several individuals who were obviously far gone on the psychotic side.

The trial was as stupid as it was unjust, because it gave some obscure fanatics infinitely more publicity than they could ever have obtained from their fly-by-night little sheets. But liberal publications, as a rule, egged on this trial instead of pointing out the undesirable precedents which it might well have created for the future legal lynching of liberals, if it had been pressed to a successful conclusion.

Individual genuine liberals like Justices Murphy and Rutledge have officially or unofficially pointed to the harm which is being done to our conceptions of law and morality by the use of forms of law to effect the killing of so-called war criminals. But one finds no protest on this score in the newspapers and magazines which are often associated with liberalism.

American liberalism is paying a price in moral frustration and logical inconsistency for its willingness to compromise with the Communist form of totalitarianism. Many so-called liberals have made a practice of condoning or justifying acts of cruelty, tyranny, and repression in the Soviet Union and in Soviet satellite states which they would very properly denounce, if committed anywhere else.

A typical example of the curious double standard of morals which prevails in the indictment of the Argentine Government which the Nation recently submitted to the UNO as an argument for suspending Argentina from membership in that organization. Of nine items in the indictment seven, as herewith cited, would apply just as accurately to the Soviet Union:

"The entire country is being mobilized for war.

"Children of both sexes, from the age of 12 on, are subject to military training.

"Civil liberties have been suppressed.

"Education has been regimented.

"The democratic press has been intimidated or destroyed.

"Freedom of labor has been destroyed, and important labor unions have been converted into puppet organizations.

"A police Gestapo * * * now supplements the army. The concentration camp and the torture chamber have become everyday instruments of internal control."

Every count in this indictment could be proved to the hilt against the Soviet Union and against the puppet regimes which the Soviet Union has installed in Poland and Bulgaria and Yugoslavia and other countries. Yet the Nation would doubtless start with horror at the idea of expelling the Soviet Union from the UN, although the threat to the independence and security of neighboring countries represented by the existence in the Soviet Union of a militarized totalitarian set-up is infinitely greater than any threat to world peace which could conceivably exist in an industrially weak country like Argentina.

Far too many self-styled liberals have simply refused to face the facts of life about the Soviet Union. They have declined to accept the evidence which is contained not only in an overwhelming number and variety of authoritative eyewitness stories, but also in official Soviet decrees and statements. They have bartered the liberal heritage of freedom for a mess of totalitarian pottage.

Another test which American liberalism, by and large, has failed to meet is that of working for a just and decent peace which would give humanity and reconstruction a clear priority over hatred and revenge. The monstrous injustices of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, both of which tore the Atlantic Charter into tatters, were accepted with scarcely a peep of protest. Morgenthau's "kampf" encountered some humane and courageous criticism, but not, as a rule, in liberal publications.

Many liberals have tied themselves up in the hopeless contradictory knot of favoring, in theory, the emergence of liberal, democratic regimes in Germany and Japan, while hurrahing lustily for measures of economic ruthlessness which will certainly destroy any possibility of the emergence of such regimes.

The Nation expressed its warm approval of Admiral "Bull" Halsey's desire to kick every member of the Japanese peace delegation in the face. The New Republic speaks with horror of the prospect that Senator KENNETH WHERRY, of Nebraska, might become more influential. Senator WHERRY's crime? Here it is, in the New Republic's own words:

"His present efforts are devoted to getting more food for Germany and Austria."

So it becomes a crime, in the eyes of a liberal magazine, to try to ward off what is at best acute malnutrition, at worst starvation. As for PM, with its loudly professed code of humanitarian ethics, it gives a daily exhibition, in its attitude toward relief for central Europe, of nazism in reverse, of a positively sadistic desire to inflict maximum suffering on all Germans, irrespective of their responsibility for Nazi crimes.

It is high time to cast up some moral and intellectual balance sheets. Labels and professions are sometimes deceptive. The genuine quality of a man's or a publication's liberalism can be gaged by a few simple tests.

How does it stand on totalitarianism of any type?

Does it regard freedom of speech and press as a right or a privilege?

Does it speak out as boldly about the crimes of the peace as about the crimes of the defeated Nazis and Japanese militarists?

Is it against all forms of race and nationality discrimination, or does it cultivate a Nazi attitude toward the defeated peoples?

These are as good tests as any to distinguish the true liberal from the camouflaged totalitarian.

Isn't Freedom Worth Something?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLLA C. McMILLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Clinton, Ill., Daily Journal and Public of May 14, 1946:

ISN'T FREEDOM WORTH SOMETHING?

The annual battle over the future of OPA is in full swing. Since the war ended nearly a year ago, the compelling argument of its necessity to speed the war effort is not involved in the controversy. Judging by the current debate, almost the sole issue is price and production. One side claims that OPA is holding down prices and pushing up production; the other side claims the opposite. In the meantime, production lags. The real issue—the effect of continuing indefinitely autocratic centralized Government control over every detail of American life, receives little emphasis. There is ample evidence that bureaucratic controls have carried us far from the basic principles of representative government. How far is shown by HATTON W. SUMNERS, veteran Congressman from Texas and chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, who has announced he will not seek reelection. Mr. SUMNERS is returning to civilian life with the hope that he may be able to help awaken the people to the menacing political changes that have crept upon the Nation. He says:

"I have had opportunity to study our system of government, to watch its machinery at work. I have run our Constitution back through its history to its source, and then have followed it back through the centuries of its development, observing what policies of government tend to give it strength and those which weaken its vitality. I have learned as much about our system of government as a person of my capacity could learn, perfectly circumstanced to study it, stimulated by an intense interest, and held by a realization of opportunity and of duty as compelling, I believe, as ever caused any person to dedicate his life to anything.

"I have watched what my own generation, under administration of both parties, has been doing to the greatest system of democratic government ever evolved through the processes of the ages. By ignoring principles and the lessons of history, and accepting the theories of men and political expedience for our guidance, we have made vassals of our States and dependents of our people. By concentration of governmental power and drafts upon the Federal Treasury, we have now a financially 'busted,' greatly piled-up mass of governmental confusion beyond human comprehension, impossible of democratic control, extravagant, wasteful, inefficient, and by its nature the instrumentality of favoritism, tyranny, oppression, and corruption, and the destroyer of the self-reliance and self-respect and governmental capacity of the people, qualities without which no people can remain free."

And still we talk of prices as if they were the most important consideration. Is not representative government from which stems the inspiration of life worth something?

Cheer Up, America!—Statistics Show Reconversion Is Going Well, Unexpectedly Well

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by J. P. Wernette, president of University of New Mexico, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of May 18, 1946:

CHEER UP, AMERICA!—STATISTICS SHOW RECONVERSION IS GOING WELL, UNEXPECTEDLY WELL

(By J. P. Wernette, president, University of New Mexico)

The American people today seem to be bewildered and gloomy instead of rejoicing that we have been delivered from the threat of enslavement. Their pessimism is tragic because it is based, not on facts, but on misconceptions, misleading statements, and misunderstandings. The true facts, rightly understood, form a proper basis for optimism rather than pessimism.

The pessimism seems to have two sides—the domestic and the international. The international picture is not always overly reassuring.

On the domestic front, however, the situation, properly understood, is not only reassuring but warrants optimism. If this is so, why are so many Americans discouraged? I think that we can understand this paradox by examining two propositions which, though unfounded, are uttered frequently, and seem to be rather widely believed.

1. The reconversion of America's industrial-military machine to peacetime production is going badly.

2. It is going badly because of strikes, or unsound policies, or "bureaucratic" interference, or other causes.

But are these propositions in fact true?

The first proposition is untrue; and since the second is merely an attempt to explain the cause of the first, it is also untrue.

Let us examine the key facts of the current economic, business, and industrial situation in the United States and see what they tell us. If reconversion were going badly, we would expect to find it indicated in the key data. That is, we would expect to find industrial production at a very low point with employment low, and unemployment high; we would expect to find few articles available, as indicated by a low volume of sales in the Nation's retail stores; we would expect to find business profits low, and many firms losing money and going into bankruptcy.

Let us look at these key factors. First, what about industrial production?

Did not John D. Small, Civilian Production Administrator, state recently that in January the Nation's industrial production was the lowest that it had been since the spring of 1941? He was right. The Federal Reserve Board's index of industrial production stood at 159 in January, having gone as high as 250 in October 1943.

But—we ask—how does 159 compare with other peacetime years? The index for 1929, the year often used as a bench mark of prosperity, was only 110. The figure for June 1940 (when the United States defense program started), was 120. In other words, a production index of 159 is away higher than ever achieved in the prewar, peacetime period.

The amazing thing is that this record-breaking peacetime production is occurring in the very midst of the reconversion. In April 1945, before VE-day, the index stood at 230. Then, naturally, as military orders were canceled, the industrial production index began to decline, since most of industry's output had been going into war goods. As military output declined, civilian output began to rise. Civilian production rose slowly at first, however, held back by WPB controls. By September, after VJ-day, the index had dropped to 167; but then increasing civilian output practically checked the decline in total population. The month-by-month figures thereafter were: October, 162; November, 168; December, 164; January, 159. The relatively small effect of midwinter strikes is shown by the figures. Substantial increases may be expected during the coming months, as reconversion progresses.

And what of employment? Employment has been held up and unemployment held down much better than the experts anticipated. Last summer, anticipating the release of millions of workers from war industries, and the discharge of millions of men from the armed forces, and taking into account the time required to make change-overs in factory assembly lines, the experts' prediction of unemployment 6 months after VJ-day ranged all the way from 5,000,000 to 10,000,000.

What, however, has actually happened? In January 1946, there were only 2,300,000 unemployed, and many of them were vacationing after stints in the armed forces or in war industry. At the same time, 51,000,000 were at work. In other words, prewar, peacetime America never saw so many people at work, and so few unemployed. Even in 1929, only 46,400,000 were employed; and 2,900,000 were unemployed.

The truth, in short, is that on any day when the headlines discouraged the American people with "Wave of strikes sweep Nation," they could instead have featured the cheerful message, "Fifty million Americans at work today."

And what about the sales volume of retail stores? Retail sales in 1929 were $48,600,000,000; in 1945, $74,600,000,000. In the last month of 1945 (December) retail sales were $8,300,000,000—the largest month in the Nation's history; January 1946 was 15 percent higher than January 1945. February continued even higher.

Curiously enough, the huge volume of retail sales is the real explanation (rather than low production) for the scarcity of many kinds of goods on retailers' shelves and counters. The goods are sold as fast as they come into the stores; buyers are snapping them up; they don't get to stay long in the stores. Today's high incomes plus yesterday's pent-up demand insure a continuing high-level market.

The profits of all United States corporations in 1929 amounted to $8,600,000,000 before taxes, $7,400,000,000 after taxes. In 1945, when end-of-war charges against income were large, total profits before taxes were $22,000,000,000; after taxes, $9,000,000,000. I estimate that this year total profits before taxes will be $16,000,000,000; or $10,000,000,000 after taxes.

Business failures (the negative side of the picture) numbered 22,909 in 1929. In 1945 there were fewer than 900 failures.

The story told by these cold statistics is plain and clear, and in sharp contrast to the clamorous and mistaken statements and beliefs which today are discouraging the people. The truth, however, is that reconversion is going well—unexpectedly well—and the domestic business and economic outlook is very bright.

Cheer up, America.

Reuther's CIO and OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Members of this House will be interested in the appeal being made by Walter Reuther to save OPA. As a part of my remarks, I include a copy of a telegram sent out on May 14 by the presi-

dent of the UAW-CIO, to all local unions. This telegram clearly sets forth the reason for the activity of CIO in the continuance of OPA. Here is a copy of the telegram so all Congressmen may be on notice:

DETROIT, MICH., *May 14, 1946.*

To All Local Unions:

Washington office advises mail reaching Congress shows strong majority against price control. Popular support for OPA slacked off. Senate action expected early next week. Demand for total defeat of House amendment and approval of strong law with no jokers must start reaching Senators soon and continue uninterrupted next 10 days. Senators not yet convinced people mean business on this issue. Your members must write and write repeatedly. Demonstration parades this week end recommended. Send pictures of demonstrations to Senators. Time is short for preventing wage cuts through price increases. You can't do too much, too soon. Urge you redouble your efforts to obtain favorable Senate action on OPA.

WALTER P. REUTHER,
President UAW-CIO.

Amvets Urge Correction of Misuse of Honorable Discharge Button

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include letters from the Missouri Department of the Amvets—American Veterans of World War II—addressed to the organization's national legislative director and to the Adjutant General, War Department.

The letters follow:

Mr. JOSEPH LEIB,
National Legislative Director, Amvets, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEIB: I am enclosing a copy of the letter sent by our State department to the Adjutant General on April 11, 1946.

Regarding its contents, we have been assured of cooperation by at least one major 10-cent store here in the city of St. Louis, Mo. However, it is a matter of national importance, and as such may I suggest that your office take the necessary requisite action with the view of correcting the misuse of the honorable service button.

I would appreciate being advised of what action you may take.

Yours very truly,
JOHN THOMAS HUGHES.

APRIL 11, 1946.

The ADJUTANT GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It has been brought to the attention of the Missouri State department of Amvets, American Veterans of World War II, that it is now possible for any individual, veteran or nonveteran, to purchase at public sale from jewelry stores, 10-cent stores, and/or mail-order houses, items such as rings, lockets, bacelets, brooches, tie holders, etc., bearing a replica of the service lapel button emblematic of honorable service in World War II.

Upon inquiry, we have been informed that paragraph 7, Army Regulation 600-90, as amended by Change 2, dated December 10, 1945, has been interpreted to mean that these sales come within the purview of existing law.

Paragraph 7, Army Regulation 600-90, at present reads:

"The Secretary of War hereby authorizes incorporation of the design of the service lapel button in manufacture for public sale of articles which are not intended or suitable for wear as lapel buttons or as lapel buttons with pin attachments."

It is the opinion of the Missouri State department of Amvets that this is an imposition on the veteran who left his home and business to help win this war. We feel that the service lapel button is degraded when it is lawful for a draft dodger or conscientious objector to display this emblem on his or her person, giving the impression to the public at large that they served honorably in the armed forces during this war.

Whether this emblem is worn as a lapel button or as a ring or as a tie holder, the effect on the observer is the same.

Therefore we of the Missouri State department of Amvets hereby suggest that the Adjutant General cause an amendment to be promulgated to paragraph 7, Army Regulation 600-90, requiring proof of honorable service as a prerequisite to purchasing the emblem or its replica, regardless of how it may be displayed.

We would appreciate being advised what action may be taken.

Yours very truly,
JOHN THOMAS HUGHES,
Legislative Director, Missouri Department.

Stassen Explains His Town Meeting Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times Magazine of May 12, 1946:

STASSEN EXPLAINS HIS TOWN MEETING IDEA—HIS REPUBLICAN OPEN FORUMS ARE DESIGNED TO HELP SHAPE PARTY POLICY AND PROGRAMS

(By Harold E. Stassen)

What is the Republican program on labor-management relations? What is the Republican policy toward Russia? What are the principal points of the Republican position?

I have been asked these and similar questions by hundreds of citizens in many States in recent months. Questions of this nature particularly came from young voters and from veterans of the war. Discussion with the questioners quickly brought out the fact that they were disappointed with the present national administration, that they recognized the deep division within the Democratic party and its inability to give effective national leadership. But they also wanted to know the nature of the alternative. They wanted some assurance as to what the Republican program would be if they were actively to join the party and assist in returning it to national authority.

My response to them has been that the Republican policy is in a stage of formation, and that the debate within the party is proceeding. This will lead to decisions at primaries and elections in 1946 and in primaries and conventions resulting in a platform in 1948. I have pointed out that there is a divergence of viewpoint within the Republican Party, but that this is a national development of the two-party system, and is not a bad thing if a frank discussion of issues leads to an informed decision of issues by the voters of the party. In fact, the narrowing of the party to a more confined agreement would result in splitting off third parties and fourth parties, until soon the fragmentation would prevent any political party from giving effective leadership in government. The multi-party weaknesses were apparent in France before the war, in the Weimar Republic in Germany, and are evident now in a number of the European countries.

Therefore, I invite these questioning young voters to participate actively in the Republican Party and to assist in formulating Republican policy and Republican programs.

Their response was to ask for a definite method by which they could best participate. Some of them began to make definite proposals as to means by which they could best participate and how they could best have an influence on the future Republican policy. A suggestion by a student at the University of Indiana was one of the first, recommending discussion groups with definite recording of sentiment. The idea had a number of similarities to some of the methods used by the political parties in England in the preparation of their programs.

This search for methods caused me to encourage Henry McKnight, a Princeton graduate and a 32-year-old veteran of the Pacific war from New Guinea to Okinawa, to prepare a definite, specific program, with the assistance of the best professional advice in the forum and public relations and discussion field that he could get. The result of the intensive and ingenious work of Henry McKnight and his associates is the program that is now under way throughout the Nation. It is the Republican open-forum program, with headquarters at 1638 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washongton, D. C.

The techniques are simple and effective. Each month the Republican open forum headquarters designates a major vital question for discussion by the local Republican open forums throughout the country. This month the subject is What Shall Our National Labor Policy Be? Any Republican organization or precinct worker or club or individual can obtain from the Republican open forum headquarters in Washington complete material for conducting a forum among his or her friends, neighbors, or associates.

The basic piece of literature is a booklet entitled "How To Organize and Run a Republican Open Forum." This booklet gives detailed instructions as to the method of assembling, once a month, a small group of citizens, 25 being recommended as the ideal number, to carry on a discussion of the question of the month.

A small folder of source material as background for the discussion is forwarded as to each question of the month. This source material consists of a few excerpts from printed works or public addresses that have been made on divergent positions on the question.

The third and most important piece of literature is the ballot, which is prepared and forwarded by national headquarters in sufficient quantity so that each participant in the local forum may have a ballot to mark at the conclusion of the evening's discussions. These ballots are prepared with an effort to present all the various alternatives of policy, from the two extremes down through the central positions on the question at issue. At the conclusion of the evening's discussion, each citizen participating in the forum marks his ballot as to the position that most nearly represents his or her view on the subject. [The current month's ballot is printed with the continuation of this article.]

The ballots of the participants in the local forum are then assembled and tallied and the results are announced to the local forum. Then the ballots are forwarded to the Republican open forum national headquarters. The national headquarters then tabulates the ballots throughout the country and at the conclusion of the month announces the results.

The entire procedure can best be illustrated by giving the specific details for April. The question presented for discussion was What Shall Our Policy Toward Russia Be? The basic discussion material included excerpts from the speeches of Winston Churchill, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, and Marshal Stalin, and from editorials of The New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and the Chicago Tribune. The ballot to be filled in at the conclusion of the discussion by each individual is reproduced with this article. The Republican open forum headquarters does not itself advocate any one of the alternative positions set forth in the ballot. It merely provides the techniques and materials by which the participants can record their views.

What, then, have we learned from the forums about our policy toward Russia? Ballots are still coming in and any final conclusions must await a complete return, but a preliminary study reveals a trend, which will be difficult to overcome in later balloting, toward a middle course—reliance on the United Nations, and direct negotiation with Russia.

Early tabulation indicates that there may be vital differences between the United States and Russia. There is, for example, a light vote for agreeing with Russia in her requests, such as those against Turkey, Iran, and Manchuria, and for backing up Russia in her requests from other nations. However, the ballots indicate that the forum participants are not willing to risk the possibility of another war.

Also, there were indications of the kinds of problems to be solved. The greatest problem appeared to be that of access to information—particularly in regard to Russia and the Balkans. Some of the participants felt that we should have access to information about the Balkans in the absence of access to information about Russia. The same trend was indicated in regard to freedom of religion—the second most pressing problem. Direct negotiation was favored as a method of solving these problems.

The early tabulations of these ballots revealed a surprising lack of interest in communism. Actually more people were opposed to communism in the United States than were opposed to it in other countries outside of Russia and the United States. In either case, however, communism was not represented in the tabulation as a burning issue.

The tenor of extra remarks was conciliatory and revealed a desire to see Russia treated as we would treat any other nation. The participants felt that we should respect her right to manage her own internal affairs and demand that she respect the same rights of all other nations.

In these few weeks, since the announcement of the program, forums have sprung up in the 35 States. They have been particularly active on university and college campuses, in veterans clubs, and in Young Republican organizations. But a large number have also developed in the regular Republican precinct organizations, in Republican women's clubs, and among interested Republican women who had not previously taken part in Republican organization activities.

The results of each month's open forums will be made freely available to the Republican leadership, to Republican officials, to the Republican National Committee, and to press and radio. In addition, the entire record of the Republican open forum headquarters, including correspondence and ballots, will be open to inspection at any time by any interested Republican.

The Republican open forums may thus provide benefits to the individual citizen, to the Republican Party and to the Nation as a whole.

There is much evidence today that the shock of war has shaken us from the political apathy of recent decades. Throughout the country the man in the street expresses dissatisfaction with the cure-all platitudes of political demagogues. He is impatient with the type of political leadership which fails to meet the vital problems affecting his life.

"How do you arrive at these conclusions?" he now asks. "How do I know that what you tell me is so? What is your reasoning? On what authority do you speak?" Today's citizen wants to know the facts. He is tired of generalities which fail to solve his problems. Moreover, he wants his voice to be heard—not drowned out by resounding phrases. This curiosity and this demand for a voice give added hope to democracy's future.

But hope is not enough. The citizen must satisfy his curiosity and channelize his urge for action. First, he must investigate the facts. As most of us do not have access to research facilities or time in which to use them, we turn to friends and neighbors for answers to our questions.

Republican open forums serve the citizen's political curiosity by providing opportunity to investigate facts through well-informed discussion. Knowledge gained through discussion at open forums enables the member to draw well-informed conclusions. These are private opinions on what party policy should be. They find expression through open-forum balloting, the results of which are made available to party policy-makers.

Alert Republican leaders will find the ballot tabulations of great value in considering matters of party policy. That this is a benefit to them is clearly evident when one recalls that political parties draw their real strength from rank-and-file membership. It may develop that mass opinion of forum members is not in accord with party leaders on certain subjects. Discovery of this fact opens the way to further discussion and sensible realinement of policy.

Putting this positively, party policy which sincerely considers rank-and-file opinion stands well to retain marginal Republicans and attract independent voters at election time. This increase in the mutual respect between party leadership and party membership is a contribution of open forums to the Republican Party.

Republican open forums give to the Nation its first large-scale opportunity for popular discussion within the Republican Party of matters of public policy. It might be objected that Republican open forums do not represent a cross section of the Nation's political opinion because they are carried on within the framework of the Republican Party. But if our two-party system is to function effectively there is a need of developing and reflecting the opinions of the membership of the Republican Party.

It is my hope that the forums will attract as many new voters, independents, dissatisfied Democrats and other potential converts to the Republican Party as possible. The forums will thereby broaden the scope of the opinion and strengthen the Republican Party until it becomes the majority party based upon specific policies developed by an informed citizenry.

An additional basic merit of Republican open forums is that they seek to present to their members all the possible points of view and promote none of them. Background material is unbiased, discussion free, balloting secret.

This method lies at the heart of American democracy. Any extension of it can only be viewed as a worth-while service to the political life of the Nation.

The Flour-Milling Industry in the United States

REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the flour milling industry in the United States is about to shut down. According to a survey recently made by the Millers National Federation, 8 percent of the total number of mills are shut down now, 35 percent are expected to close by May 22, 81 percent by May 29, and 94 percent by June 4. These mills are closing down because they have no wheat to grind.

Many of these mills can continue, at least on a part-time basis, until the new crop becomes available if the Commodity Credit Corporation will permit them to mill for export a part of the wheat which this Government is committed to send abroad. Other mills in the Southwest can be kept open if the embargo on shipments out of Texas and Oklahoma is modified so as to permit shipments into Kansas. This would require no modification of basic policy, since much of the wheat in the Texas Panhandle normally moved to the Kansas City market and there is no reason for holding that wheat in the areas where grown when it could be used and milled for immediate use in the areas to which it would normally be shipped.

In the interest, therefore, of enabling the milling industry to continue its operations, to keep its labor forces intact, to furnish employment to its employees and to expedite the movement of relief food to starving people, I desire to make the following suggestions:

First. That wherever possible, wheat now owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation and destined for foreign delivery be turned over to United States mills for milling, the distribution of such wheat to be made as equitably as possible.

Second. That the embargo on the shipment of wheat out of Texas and Oklahoma be modified so as to not apply to that wheat which would normally be shipped in or through Kansas or to the Kansas City market.

The milling industry has cooperated in every possible way in the present relief program, notwithstanding the fact that the effect of that program has been to seriously curtail production and result in partial paralysis of the industry. The industry and its employees are deserving of every possible consideration which can be given in the way of keeping these mills in operation.

Medical Department of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to make any broadside allegations against the medical department of our Army. I can say candidly, however, that following VJ-day many reports came to my office, indicating that this department was keeping numerous doctors in service when there was absolutely no need for that procedure.

So far as I know, no explanation has ever been made for such a policy. Now, over 9 months after VJ-day, protests are being made on behalf of dental officers in the United States Army. These protests point out that there is a surplus of dentists and that the demobilization program, so far as the medical department of the Army is concerned, is entirely out of line with the program followed by the Navy Department. Most of these dentists are family men and, if the facts which have been presented to me are correct, the policy of the men in charge of the medical department of our Army ought to have a thorough investigation. We ought to know why they are carrying out this program about which complaints have been made to me. I hope that Congress will do something and do it right away.

Those of us who voted unlimited appropriations for the purpose of winning the war have a right to demand strict economy on the part of War Department officials, now that the war is over. They have no right to waste the money of the American taxpayer. This does not mean that we are opposed to an adequate Army and an adequate Navy, but it does mean that businesslike methods should be followed by high-ranking Army officials. In this connection I would point out that I have a bill pending in Congress which provides that Congress shall appoint the Inspector General of the Army and that he shall be responsible to Congress and not to the War Department. If that bill had been enacted into law, we could refer this complaint to the Inspector General, appointed by Congress, with instructions for him to find out what, if any, mistakes are being made in the medical branch of our armed forces. We are entitled to know the facts. I hope that the Military Affairs Committee will find it possible to conduct speedy hearings on this proposed bill that I have introduced.

Changes in Labor-Disputes Laws

REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that labor's rights may be jeopardized by the passage of the Case and Robertson bills. Labor will have no rights unless the Nation's paramount right to produce, live, and go forward is preserved and recognized.

In an Associated Press article carried in the Washington Post of yesterday, President Truman was represented as "being willing for Congress to make some changes in labor-disputes laws but opposing any drastic restriction of unions." The state of affairs in America demands a general overhauling of the Wagner Act. It would be a restriction on labor unions to amend the Wagner Act, making it a duty of organized labor to bargain collectively as is now imposed upon management by that act. John L. Lewis has refused to even make known his demands until the coal operators had first approved "in principle" his "health and welfare" plan. He has made a mockery out of collective-bargaining provisions as carried in the Wagner Act.

This crisis into which the country has been plunged requires leadership, not milk-and-water acquiescence. A fair and forceful labor policy on management and union alike is long since overdue. When strikes in major industry broke out soon after hostilities ceased in Europe, the time for action was then, and the country would have been spared the dilemma which followed and which has grown continuously worse. The President and Congress both missed a golden opportunity by failing to act at the very beginning. I am reminded that only a few weeks ago Governor Tuck, of Virginia, made a statement in connection with the intended power walk-out, "The lights of Virginia shall not go out," and the lights of Virginia did not go out. That type of leadership is necessary today.

A recurrence of serious work stoppages may be expected in various types of industry and probably in connection with some which have been recently closed and in which work has been resumed and agreements reached, unless a strong, workable labor policy is put into effect. We may expect a continuation of chaos and pandemonium as we have today, and has existed for many months past, if early action is not taken by this Congress. I hope this Congress will stand firm.

I trust that the Case bill as passed by this House and the Robertson bill to outlaw royalty payments will both be passed. If the President, in his wisdom, sees fit to veto this legislation or either of these bills, then it falls our lot to relieve the country from the thralls of catastrophe. As for me, I will vote to override.

France After the Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an illuminating discussion of the situation in France today. It is taken from Human Events—A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen:

FRANCE AFTER THE REFERENDUM
(By Frank C. Hanighen)

"France wears its heart on the left, but its pocketbook on the right," is an old adage that seems to apply to the results of the recent referendum, on adoption of the new constitution proposed on April 19.

Emotionally left, the voters installed a majority of Communists and Socialists in power in the constitutional assembly last fall. This spring those parties tried to put over a leftist constitution, devoid of the checks and balances which formerly kept radicals from tinkering with the shopkeeper's bank account and the peasant's well-known sock. A rather definite majority, obviously including many who voted left 6 months ago, responded on May 5 with a definite "No." This might well be interpreted as an admonitory "Whoa!"

The picture includes a familiar pattern in French politics which the Communists and Socialists ignored, to their misfortune. The latter erroneously thought that the average Frenchman was permanently fed up with the institutions of president and an upper chamber. But the average Frenchman, it turned out, did not want a completely powerless executive, as projected by the proposed constitution. He was old enough to recall gratefully how in years past the senate checked attempts of the lower house to break down sound finance. Nor did he relish the new constitution's airy treatment of the rights of property. "To the left, to the left—but no further!" said a character in a popular French novel, Le Monarque, by Perre Mille.

Yet it would be well to emphasize that about 47 percent of the voters did vote for the proposed organic law. Almost half wanted something new; a new order, new social laws, additional protection for workers, etc. Much in the rejected instrument of government will be retained in the next constitution which the new assembly, to be elected in June, will have to frame.

France, in a supreme effort to resolve its political contradictions, is seeking to arrive at a solution of the basic problem of our times. Last fall France voted against liberty without bread; this spring, against bread without liberty. The quest for liberty and bread will go on. Events in the coming months will express this spiritual travail, and the forces which contend for power will win or lose as they approach or fall far short of the objective—to combine security and freedom.

II

What France needs for its rehabilitation, even more than a political formula, is an intellectual formula. Just as Rousseau, the Encyclopedists, and Voltaire fertilized the eighteenth century French revolution, so new words and ideas are needed to provide the base for the Fourth Republic, successor to the regime which crumbled to pieces during the last war.

But today there are few signs of positive, hopeful, and constructive philosophy. Those who scan the European horizon for signs of a religious revival find little evidence of it in France's intellectual life. Among new writers, such as Sartre, Camus, Magny, the philosophy of existentialism, now to the fore, emerges as an icy atheism (see Partisan Review, spring 1946). In Sartre, the chief of the new left-bank clan, the principal result of this philosophy "seems to be an emphasis upon the impotence, or nonexistence of the will," says Raymond Mortimer in the London New Statesman and Nation. This is hardly an invigorating influence for new political ideas.

However, 4 years of German occupation has given to French thought, even to men like Sartre, a cast which is "résistant" in more senses than one. After liberation, the more

vital spirits found a new enemy—Stalinism—as oppressive as the German and Vichy. A century ago republicans and radicals reacted against the church with its index expurgatorius. Similarly, progressive intellectuals feel now that the gains of the Résistance and Libération must at least equal in freedom of thought, speech and writing the gains of the great French Revolution. In short, they are in revolt against communism.

Thus André Malraux, perhaps the most talented novelist in the last decade, and other former Communists and fellow travelers, have turned against the mother church of Moscow. The Paris journal Combat, marked by a bristling independence, is the most prominent medium of this movement. Combat, launched as a Resistance organ, is carrying on resistance to the great Moloch which threatens to swallow all the riches, material and spiritual, which are the inheritance of France.

III

The Communist Party in France is not only a force, but a superbly supple organization. It exploits the popular taste for left labels; the peasant's and the shopkeeper's opposition to big business; the factory workers' hatred of employers and the bourgeoisie; the feeling of national humiliation and weakness—"We must have the Ruhr and Rhineland."

Thorez and Duclos, the two leading Communists, know all too well that the bulk of the voters cannot be won by an outright plan for communism. By clever manipulation of hatreds and emotions, they hope to win enough votes to demand more and more key portfolios in the cabinet. Their design for the just defeated constitution was aimed at holding certain cabinet posts regardless of governmental changes. With these portfolios—of Interior (police), Propaganda, Foreign Affairs—they could infiltrate and maneuver any French government at will.

In foreign policy, the Communist line would bring Soviet influence and troops to the Atlantic, isolating Britain, the Low Countries and Spain. By dividing and ruling, by stirring disorder, Moscow could prepare for an eventual coup d'état, to be aided by Soviet troops.

As for the Socialist Party, it seems to be settling down to a position as the center between Communists and Rightists. With no protector like the Soviet Union, with no such organization as the Communists and with the looseness of a really democratic party, it faces an uncertain future. The picture of the Socialist Party is that of a Marxist, Second International intellectual appealing to a constituency of well-to-do peasants who are disgruntled over the price of grapes. And these Marxists seem less able than ever to strike the verbal balance between "bread and liberty" necessary to attract wide numbers of voters.

IV

When an old anticlerical and a young Catholic politician join hands, that is news in France. Such was the case when former Premier Herriot, leader of the old church-baiting Radical Socialist Party, supported François de Menthon, one of the leaders of the MRP (Mouvement Republican Populaire), in a strong attack on the projected constitution. This is a typical example of a ferment on the right that may prove as important as the huggermugger of the Communists on the left.

For over a hundred years, important parts of the French population never in their hearts accepted the Republic and continued wistfully to look backward to the Ancien Régime. Today, descendants of the nobility, and members of the upper bourgeoisie, have swallowed the Republic and find time to defent the French Revolution's bill of rights. And little shopkeepers, peasants, petitsrentiers, who for more than a century regarded the priest and the chateau as the principal danger, now look on the Kremlin as a far greater menace.

Is the ancient feud ended, the breach healed? Nobody knows. But all signs indicate a willingness to forget old grudges, fuse and rally to the defense of individual rights against the danger of the left. In France today there has arisen an important defensive reaction, a spontaneous reapprochement throughout the French middle-class, both upper and lower strata. This is a social phenomenon of great significance.

New political forms have been created to express this reaction. The PRL—Parti Republicain dé la Liberté—has taken shape in the past few months, has gathered funds and has enlisted some 30 rightist deputies to fight the Communists. Additionally important is the fact that M. Herriot, who can scarcely be called a Fascist, has led his radical Socialists into a new Republican Union, to protect "individual liberties and the rights of property." Finally, there is the MRP, fundamentally conservative, but with progressive ideas.

In France, as in other countries when a new idea is lacking—obviously the case in France—the people find some man to bridge a dangerous chasm. Thus it was that Clemenceau was chosen to finish the work of the Union Sacrée in World War I; and Poincaré in the late twenties commanded the support of the disparate blocs to save the franc.

A greater and more difficult task awaits some figure—Herriot, or de Gaulle, or another. This task would be not only to unite the anti-totalitarian forces for an assault on the French electoral barricade, but to point the way for a European united front against Communism.

The Meat Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, because of the seriousness of the meat situation, I am inserting in the RECORD a thoughtful and well-considered letter to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and dated May 17, 1946. I have heard from at least a score of small packers in my State about this subject. They are all serious, patriotic, and good citizens and I know the views expressed in this letter are their views also. It is a question so important that the whole Congress should fully understand this matter, especially in view of the present status of our economy.

A LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE POST-DISPATCH

The beef-slaughtering operations of legitimate, long-established meat-packing companies all over the Nation are almost at a standstill. Deliveries of beef to the retail stores in all of the larger cities, particularly in the Middle West, have stopped. This situation is unnecessary because there is a plentiful supply of cattle on farms. It is unfair because small cities and rural communities have plenty of beef, and black marketeers amply provide for their large-city customers.

The reason for it is simple. It is the same reason as that which ultimately required the repeal of the Volstead Act. The people repealed prohibition long before Congress did. The people have also defeated the rules and regulations of the OPA concerning the pricing and distribution of meats. Only those who abide by OPA regulations are without beef or need to be.

DOOR OPEN FOR BLACK MARKET

The answer to the problem is not so simple. There is nothing fundamentally wrong with the rules and regulations of OPA to control the pricing and distribution of meat. But in focusing on profit control for the larger old-established processors, OPA has literally opened the barn door, but this time before the cattle have gone. The door is open to a growing multitude of black-market slaughterers.

All that OPA can do—and the statement is made with sympathy—is to tighten the regulations; but as they tighten, they only grasp less tightly, and it will not be otherwise. Control is out of control.

Before the war there were about 1,492 meat-packing companies engaged in business in the United States, and there are an estimated 26,000 companies or licensed individuals now. It is impossible for OPA to compel compliance from such a number, and at the same time to keep an eye on all the farmers, all the retailers, and all the consumers who are and who are not black-marketing.

The meat-packing industry is not so foolhardy as to welcome inflation. But when, as at present, more than 50 percent of the beef consumed in the country is being purchased in the black market, at prices often twice the legal ceilings, inflation is here. The industry believes that a return, now, to the law of supply and demand and to a normal distribution would tend in time to cure inflation in meat prices and to reduce the unhealthiness of widespread profitable lawlessness.

WHY THE PACKERS CAN'T BUY

At present, most of the packers on the St. Louis market are unable to buy cattle. They cannot buy within OPA regulations in competition with the prices being paid for cattle by speculators and feeders and order-buyers, who ship their purchases out of the St. Louis market.

Why are the established companies restricted from making higher bids? Because violation of OPA regulations subjects a violator to civil and criminal penalties, and also to loss of subsidies which are paid by the Government to meat processors as part of the effort to hold down prices.

The OPA regulation sets different prices for the various grades of beef. To see the principle involved, only the figures for good grade will be used. The regulations for this grade at the St. Louis market provide a minimum price of $14.15 and a maximum price of $15.65 per 100 pounds. To forestall evasion of the regulation, it is further provided that cattle purchased as good grade must yield not less than 58 percent, and that the dressed beef must be acceptable as good grade by inspectors of the United States Meat Grading Service.

Unless all three factors obtain, the packer is out of compliance and subject to the penalties. It was realized, however, when the regulation was written, that buyers and graders are not infallible. So the regulation further provides for what is termed an "overriding ceiling." At St. Louis, it is established at $17.90 per 100 pounds.

SHUT OUT BY PRICE CONTROL

Provision is also made that compliance will not be determined on each individual purchase but on the total slaughter by grades in each monthly reporting period. So long as the average price paid for all good grade cattle purchased during the month is not more than $15.65, and so long as the average yield is not less than 58 percent, the packer is considered to be in compliance, even though occasional purchases might be out of compliance.

It is obvious that as many cattle must be bought below $15.65 as may be bought above $15.65 if an average of not more than $15.65 is to be attained. For many weeks past good grade cattle on the national stockyards market have sold to other than packing company buyers at prices ranging between $16 and $17. With cattle selling at such prices packers cannot obtain cattle on a bid of $15.65.

Packers who are compelled to operate in compliance are simply shut out of the market. They cannot buy cattle and they cannot serve their trade without violating the law. Whether or not a profit could be made is beside the point.

The situation is growing progressively worse. If the OPA controls could be made effective, if all slaughterers could be made to comply, the meat-packing industry would not oppose them. But compliance with OPA, so far as its meat controls are concerned, has reached the same point that in an earlier day required the repeal of the prohibition amendment.

H. VE. HUNTER,
Hunter Packing Co., East St. Louis.

Americans Demand Justice for Draja Mihailovich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, people all over the world are interested in the case of Draja Mihailovich. They want to know what Tito is going to do. It is significant that among the list of Americans who have taken the lead in insisting that Mihailovich be given a fair trial, the name of no Communist appears in his defense.

The enclosed newspaper article appears in the Duluth Herald for May 16, 1946, and is written by George E. Sokolsky, who states the situation clearly and accurately. The article reads as follows:

MIHAILOVICH

A committee of Americans, headed by Dorothy Thompson, has been organized to seek justice for Draja Mihailovich, leader of the Chetniks, ally of the United States in one of the most serious phases of the war. This committee represents many segments of American life, all except the fifth column Communists. The assumption of its leadership by Dorothy Thompson guarantees that it is authentically American, for this much maligned lady is one of our finer and more courageous minds, fighting everlastingly and valiantly for human liberty and justice.

When the Nazis held Yugoslavia and it seemed that his power would overwhelm the whole of Europe, if not all the world, Mihailovich organized the Yugoslavian guerrillas—not unlike Marion's band of our own Revolution—which forced Hitler to keep divisions in the Balkans that he could have employed against Russia. This act of heroism should have brought to Mihailovich and the Chetniks the undying gratitude of the United Nations.

Unfortunately, Mihailovich believed in human liberty and the independence of his own country. He did not believe in the Russian hegemony over the Balkans. He was not a Communist—not a member of the Third International. His precepts of democracy were similar to ours.

When the western countries were being publicized to the acceptance of Tito, it was necessary to justify the desertion of Mihailovich and the Chetniks by our country. It was necessary to explain that the man who had been painted on a canvas of heroism equal to Kossuth and Pulaski no longer was worthy of our respect. So instead of frankly saying that Soviet Russia objected to Mihailovich and demanded Tito, and that Roosevelt and Churchill could not resist the Russian claims—or would not—Roosevelt and Churchill permitted the story to circulate that Mihailovich had collaborated with the Nazis.

Many who knew the man and the situation in the Balkans believed this tale to be a lie—a false piece of wartime propaganda similar to many circulated to confuse us. Governments in this war generally lied.

It is only now that we are becoming conscious of the fact that we did not win the war in Europe and that our sons are still expendable in all parts of the earth. And slowly it is coming to us that at Tehran, Yalta, Moscow, and Potsdam we were betrayed and deceived by our own representatives.

The matter of Mihailovich involves our honor and dignity as a nation. In the horror of the substitution of the despotism of Stalin for the despotism of Hitler many things occurred of which we still know little or nothing. Mihailovich may or may not have communicated with the Germans when he recognized the inevitability of a Soviet conquest of his country.

Why not try him before a tribunal set up by the United Nations here in New York? Why not try him before an international court? Why not try him in the blazing sun of a free press? That is the American way, even for the guilty. Why not for one who may establish his innocence?

Cost of Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, human conflict is extensive for it implies either destruction or the failure to create. Human cooperation adds greatly to the total good of all. I was very much interested in reading Mr. Marquis Childs' column on the cost of strikes. I think that his discussion is worthy of reading by all of us.

WASHINGTON CALLING
(By Marquis Childs)
COST OF STRIKES

As the gears of industry grind to a stop, emotions—fear, anger, hatred—reach the boiling point. It is an atmosphere in which rash and hasty action may produce consequences even more threatening than those confronting us today.

So much heat has been generated by the industrial warfare of the past 6 months and so little light. In his speech before the United States Chamber of Commerce and in an article in the current Atlantic Monthly, Harvard's Prof. Sumner H. Slichter makes more sense than anyone else on the issue of unions, collective bargaining, and wages.

First, Professor Slichter tries to answer the question whether the strikes were worth while from the union standpoint. Certainly, he concludes, they were not worth while on the basis of the wage increases that were won.

Not until early in 1948 will the workers in General Motors be as well off as they would have been had they not struck and had they worked steadily without any wage increase whatsoever. Not until 1953 will they be as well off as they would have been had they accepted the company's compromise offer of 13½ cents, and thus ended the strike earlier.

According to Professor Slichter's calculations, it will be more than 2 years before the employees of the United States Steel Corp. will have made up for their refusal of the company's compromise offer of 15 cents an hour increase. Two and a half years will be required before the employees of General Electric are as well off as they would have been had they accepted the company's compromise offer of 13½ cents.

"Some people argue," says Professor Slichter, "that the time needed for wage increases to compensate for time lost will be diminished by overtime work which will be caused by the strikes: On balance, however, the higher wages forced by strikers will diminish the amount of overtime."

This last has been proved true in industry after industry. It is true, for example, in lumber and woodworking, where the curtailment of overtime has caused a reduction in the amount of lumber available for houses.

The companies also suffered losses from strikes. But their losses were relatively far less than those of the workers. In part this was because of the working of the income tax carry-back provision, which compensates corporations if their profits, under certain circumstances, fall below a level fixed in the law. Under this provision General Motors got from the Federal Treasury $34,415,000.

But these economic losses to workers and to companies might be justified, as Professor Slichter sees it, if the two parties were learning to bargain together. That is, if they were learning to live together in comparative harmony under the American system of free enterprise.

Government intervention is a danger. If it is repeated in strike after strike through the fact-finding technique, or whatever technique, the danger is that the pattern will be set once for all. Wage-fixing by law will be the next step. The straitjacket of Government will close around a large section of our economy.

The coal miners will have to work a long time to make up for their losses in the current strike, even though they get increases above those granted any other union. They have been out for 42 days.

Is it worth while? Are the two parties learning to bargain? No! John L. Lewis, up until the so-called truce, declined to bargain in any real sense. He made demands and he refused to discuss those demands.

In any democratic meaning of the phrase, there has never been collective bargaining in the coal industry. In the past when wage negotiations have been up, Lewis as boss has holed up in a big suite in a luxury hotel in New York. Finally he has made a deal with the boss of the operators.

Such a deal is not collective bargaining. It has no resemblance to the give and take that occurs between two organizations when they really represent the segments of an industry. Through real bargaining comes mutual understanding. Understanding means improvement in profits and wages.

There has been talk of the "case for John L. Lewis." That is untrue. There is a case for the miners—an incontrovertible case on the score of safety, pensions, and so on. But Lewis has not made that case. Lewis is a man of deals. And deals do not mean bargaining for the workers.

Veterans Adopt California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, following is information from Veterans' Service Center of Los Angeles, Calif., just received by me, and, while these figures relate only to this one veterans' service center situated in metropolitan Los Angeles, it apparently is indicative of facts and conditions as they now are. It is dated May 8, 1946:

VETERANS ADOPT CALIFORNIA

The Bear Flag State is fast becoming the veteran State.

So says Arthur H. Tryon, executive director of the Veterans' Service Center, Third and Broadway, Los Angeles, into whose offices troop thousands of veterans monthly with their special problems. From 47 States, veterans are migrating to California to start their postwar plans, says Tryon.

The new Californians account for over half the load at the Center and for four-fifths at the Pershing Square information branch, according to Tryon.

"And they're here to stay," he said. "Practically all of them are making long-range plans for homes and jobs in California." Citing the results of a special study during April when 5,155 veterans were seen in 2 weeks, he pointed out the new trends. Major requests of the ex-G. I.'s and percentages of out-of-Staters show the extent of new developments.

Request:	*Percent*
Employment placement	55
Housing	68
Educational counseling	52
Service claims, pensions, etc	46
Apprentice training	42
Employment counseling	89

"The large proportion of immigrating veterans who appear at the center need not unduly alarm anyone," Tryon commented. "Since the veterans' service center was expressly set up as a clearing house and information agency for veterans, it is quite natural that ex-GI's unfamiliar with the local scene should come to us.

"In fact, we are glad they do come to us, for it helps dispel any rosy picture they may have had about employment and housing and other critical problems. We think it is better that they should come to us and get a true picture than wander the streets."

He pointed out that Los Angeles has a great advantage over many other cities, since through the very complete coordination of 17 diverse community and Government agencies in their veterans' service center, they can keep their finger on the pulse of the veterans' needs. He pointed to the findings of the recent study, where critical problems are being affected by the veteran migration, as an example of the center's informational services.

Commenting on results of the survey, he said:

"As might be expected, the new Californians find their first need in the area of the Nation's outstanding problem—housing—with 68 percent of requests coming from out-of-Staters."

Finding a job is a veteran need slightly dominated by the newcomers with a 55-percent figure. But long-range planning—counseling on work possibilities and requirements of local jobs—is nearly six to one a request of out-of-Staters.

"First things come first" with the incoming veterans, stated Tryon, pointing to requests where the out-of-state ratio was low. Legal aid, insurance, and business counseling requests were made by 27 percent, 38 percent, and 39 percent of in-migrants respectively. Center staff members believe these lower figures reflect the emphasis on more urgent problems.

According to member organizations housed at the center and the center's general counselors, the ex-GI's are seriously attempting to make constructive and contributing citizens of themselves. "We believe their earnest attempts to get oriented show that," Tryon said.

The Los Angeles Veterans' Service Center is a central information, counseling, and referral service for war veterans sponsored by the Los Angeles Community Chest. Seventeen Government, business, labor, social agencies, and veterans' organizations maintain representatives at its Third and Broadway offices.

It began operations January 2, 1945—the first of hundreds of community centers now functioning across the Nation which pool veterans' services in a community way in one location. In its 16 months of operation, it has provided over 120,000 veterans approximately 350,000 individual services—an average of three services per veteran.

These figures cover the Los Angeles Center only. Similar services are provided under local direction in 18 affiliated centers in outlying areas from San Fernando to Wilmington. These are also backed by the Community Chest and coordinated with the Los Angeles Center.

Article by Richard L. Neuberger—Lewis and Clark Expedition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the great historic story of our Pacific Northwest is the tale of the expedition across America by Lewis and Clark. This expedition, sent westward by Thomas Jefferson, established the claim of the United States to the magnificent region of Puget Sound and the Columbia River.

An outstanding account of this exploration was prepared by Richard L. Neuberger, of Portland, Oreg., prior to his entry into military service in 1942. The story appeared in the Reader's Digest in the issue of March 1941. Mr. Neuberger served 3 years in the Army, most of that time in the Alaskan area. He is a well-known Pacific Northwest writer and newspaperman.

Under unanimous consent, I include Captain Neuberger's article on Lewis and Clark in the Appendix of the RECORD.

OUR GREATEST EXPLORATION
(Condensed from the American Legion Magazine)
(By Richard L. Neuberger)

From St. Louis, the edge of American civilization, Sgt. John Ordway, of the United States Army, wrote to his father and mother in New Hampshire: "Honored parents: I am now on an expedition to the westward with Captain Lewis and Lieutenant Clark, who are appointed by President Jefferson to go through the interior of North America. We are to ascend the Missouri River and then go by land to the great western ocean."

A courier went through the camp collecting such messages from men who were not sure they would ever be heard from again. Then late on the rainy afternoon of May 14, 1804, the 29 members of the party embarked in 2 long, trim rowboats and a 55-foot barge-like bateau. They were voyaging into the unknown.

MOUNTAINS AHEAD

At St. Louis geography ended and myth began. The Indians whispered of the Shining or Rocky Mountains that scraped the sky. Was this merely one of their legends? Jefferson, when Minister to France, had heard mariners who sailed with Capain Cook on his Pacific voyages describe evergreen forests as boundless as the oceans and peaks high as the Alps, to be seen on America's western shore. Were their tales true? Jefferson's lively imagination had been fired and thenceforward he dreamed of sending brave men to "explore the great wilderness beyond the Mississippi and form a line of communication from sea to sea."

As soon as his envoys had bought from Napoleon for $15,000,000 the million square miles of territory that France claimed on the sundown side of the Mississippi, Jefferson asked Congress for $2,500 to finance its exploration "And let us search out even that which lies beyond," he urged.

To lead the expedition the President selected his private secretary, 29-year-old Meriwether Lewis, believing that this young Army captain had a determination that nothing could conquer. Such a man was needed; there might be more than dangers of the wilderness to face and temptations to turn back might be many. A race for empire was in prospect, for the British were talking of sending men to hoist the Union Jack at the mouth of the Columbia.

Jefferson suggested that Lewis select an alternative commander and Lewis named his best friend, William Clark, a 34-year-old artillery lieutenant.

They were in strong contrast. Lewis' thin countenance, with defiant jaw and slate-gray eyes, had an eaglelike intensity. He was taciturn, almost gloomy. Clark, redheaded, red-faced, was never stern or silent. His cheerful chatter often had revived the spirits of troops weary on the march. He liked to dodge officers' mess to eat with the men; he hailed colonels and corporals alike by their first names. He got along with Indians better than anyone else in the Army, possibly because he treated them as equals.

Clark went from post to post on the frontier, asking picked men if they wanted to plant their country's flag on the western ocean. Lewis arranged for supplies, which included presents for the Indians—mirrors, red cloth, needles, beads, calico shirts.

SOLDIERS PICKED

Men picked for the journey were enlisted in the Army at $10 a month for privates, $15 for the three sergeants, $80 each for Lewis and Clark, and as a bonus they were promised parcels of land. Whether any of them would survive to enjoy these rewards was doubtful. Their eventual destination was so indefinite that Jefferson gave them papers bespeaking the good offices of "our consuls in Batavia, in Java, and at the Cape of Good Hope."

As they rowed up the sluggish Missouri, under the flag with 15 stars, the party was a cross section of the expanding Nation. The oldest was Patrick Gass, 33; the youngest, John Colter, was 16. Alongside Kentuckians chosen for their woodcraft were hunters from Virginia, farmers from Vermont, carpenters from Pennsylvania. There were Irishmen, Scots, Dutchmen, and Frenchmen. Near Lieutenant Clark in the first boat crouched his brawny Negro servant, York.

The explorers had not gone far before they realized that the map the President had supplied was useless; it did not even indicate the correct direction of the river. All they could do was to follow the Missouri to its source. From there dead reckoning might take them to the sea.

JOURNEY STARTS

For the first few months it was an idyllic journey—comfortable camps at night, days uneventful save for sightseeing. By firelight the two leaders worked painstakingly on their journals, for the President and Congress wanted complete reports on plants, trees, beasts, birds, and Indians. One evening Lewis wrote: "In addition to the common deer, which were in great abundance, we saw goats, elk, buffalo, antelope, black-tailed deer, and large wolves." They counted 52 herds of bison in one day.

Three months out of St. Louis, the adventurers had voyaged 850 miles and were not far from what is now Sioux City in Iowa. The going got harder. The clumsy bateau repeatedly lurched aground on sandbars. One man collapsed from sunstroke. Sgt. Charles Floyd died of colic in the choking heat of an August afternoon. They buried him on a high bluff, the first American soldier to die west of the Mississippi. The boats went on, the men silent, Lewis wrapped in thought. A man dead, many sick, the real perils just begun.

That night, instead of appointing a new sergeant, Lewis told the men themselves to elect a successor to Floyd. Amid much oratory three soldiers were nominated. Grizzled Patrick Gass was chosen. Next morning the party took to the boats with renewed zeal; Lewis had turned the men's minds from brooding over the loss of their companion.

Misadventures multiplied. Nineteen-year-old George Shannon, on scout duty, got lost and almost starved. A riverbank crumbled and nearly destroyed the precious supplies. Lewis, habitually scouting ahead, had several narrow escapes from stampeding buffalo.

Most of the Indians they met were friendly, grunting with pleasure over trinkets and delighted with whisky dealt out in judicious doses. Whenever possible, chiefs of nearby tribes were summoned to pow-wows under a sailcloth canopy, the flag flying, and told about the Great White Father in Washington to whom they now owed loyalty. Council Bluffs takes its name from one of these pow-wows.

A lazy half-breed, Toussaint Charbonneau, interpreted. The party had picked him up along the route. With him was his 19-year-old Indian wife, Sacajawea, slender in figure, with long braids and dark eyes. Six years before, she had been stolen from the Shoshones by marauding braves, and Charbonneau had won her in a gambling bout. A woman on the expedition? Lewis and Clark had hesitated, but they desperately needed Charbonneau. Besides, Sacajawea's tribe was said to dwell beyond the high mountains. Maybe this Indian girl would know the way.

Meadows and prairies gave way to rolling hills, the hills stiffened into plateaus. But the horizons still were land. Where did it end? Where was the Western Ocean?

The first heavy snows fell in November, trapping the party near the site of Bismarck, N. Dak. In the half year they had made 1,600 miles, all up the Missouri. A few traders had been thus far but no white man had ever gone farther. They built a stockade, calling it Fort Mandan for the friendly Mandan Indians, and here during the long dreary winter a baby boy was born to Sacajawea.

April 7, 1805, the last ice having drifted down the river, Fort Mandan was left behind. So was the bateau, too big for the narrowing Missouri and no longer needed for the dwindling supplies. Six canoes made of buffalo hides and willow branches took its place.

The country grew wilder, the landscape less hospitable. Mosquitoes and gnats were a curse. Buffalo were scarce and, without buffalo hide for patching, clothes and moccasins began to shred.

But the ragged frontiersmen now were unlocking the secrets of the continent. They came upon huge, ferocious grizzly bears that it took half a dozen musket balls to kill. They spent weeks of back-breaking toil portaging goods and boats past thundering cataracts which they called the Great Falls of the Missouri. And on May 26, a Sunday, Lewis, who had been scouting ahead as usual, came back to camp excited. He had glimpsed majestic mountains.

Independence Day, 1805, was celebrated at the foot of the Rockies, 2,500 miles and 14 months from St. Louis. Wistfully they drank the last of their brandy. Other supplies, too, were running low. Lewis wrote in his journal: "We all believe that we are about to enter upon the most perilous part of our voyage."

THE INDIAN GIRL

Only the Indian girl, her baby strapped to her back, had the vaguest notion where they were. From out of the memories of her childhood Sacajawea recognized a creek at which her people had collected clay for painting their war parties. When the dwindling Missouri abruptly forked into three branches her memory again helped. She sent them up the swiftest fork, which they named Jefferson River.

The stream twisted through a labyrinth of volcanic walls at which it clawed with white-capped talons. Sometimes the boats upset and their loads were swept downstream. The men waded through the glacier-fed water, pulling their leaky craft on long ropes, for they could not walk on the steep banks. "The men by being constantly wet are becoming more feeble," the captain noted. Sharp stones cut to pieces what remained of their moccasins and drops of blood flecked the stream. They had journeyed as close to the crest of the continent as water would take them. Wherever they looked the skyline was a jagged row of pinnacles, "mountains piled on mountains," such peaks as Americans never had seen. Each ridge surmounted brought a glimpse of ridge higher still. Eventually they reached the region where now Montana joins Idaho, where the Rockies and the Bitter Root Mountains run parallel in a vast maze. Lewis sent scouts scattering to find some way across. They came back baffled, four of them nursing injuries from falls.

DO OR DIE

By now Lewis realized that he must find the Shoshones or give up the expedition. His fatigued men could not drag themselves over those summits, let alone carry burdens; they must have horses. Rations were low and they could not survive a Rocky Mountain winter. Soon the snows would start and it would be too late even to go back. They had not seen an Indian for 4 months though Sacajawea insisted that she twice had seen the smoke signals of her people.

Lewis chose three men and pushed on ahead. Every morning when they broke camp they left beads and mirrors as tokens of friendliness to any Indian who might stumble onto the dead fires. At last, ragged and exhausted, they crawled to the top of a high ridge and looked down the Pacific slope of the Rockies. Here, on the Continental Divide, they unfurled the flag. They had two pounds of flour left.

As Chief Cameahwait and 60 mounted Shoshone braves jogged over the crest of Lemhi Pass late in the afternoon of August 13, they saw tottering toward them a tall, ragged stranger with pale skin. In his right hand he carried a cloth of red, white, and blue. Half a hundred paces to the rear were three other strangers with long black sticks.

"Tabba bone (white man)," the hollow-eyed stranger said.

"Ah hi e! (I am very much pleased!)" the young chief replied gravely. There on the roof of the continent the feathered savage and the Virginia gentleman embraced and slapped each other on the back.

Game had been scarce that year and the Shoshones were hungry, yet they shared with the white men. The captain's pulse quickened when the chief offered him roast salmon. Salmon from the sea.

Lewis bartered ornaments, coats, blankets, and knives for 38 horses, which were sent back to bring up the main party. A dramatic incident marked the reunion of the two parties. Sacajawea, meeting Cameahwait, greeted him with affectionate cries. They were brother and sister! Nevertheless, when the party went on, Sacajawea chose to stick with her husband rather than return to her people.

TOBY HELPS

A withered old Shoshone, whom Clark christened Toby, volunteered to act as guide. He was not much help. They wandered in the Bitter Root range like men in a rock-bound fortress, while snow began to plug the passes. Provisions ran out. They had to kill some of the horses, which were starving, too, with ground bare of fodder. One day there was only a brace of pheasants for 32 mouths to eat. They scraped the bed of Hungry Creek for crawfish; they grubbed for roots. One wretched night they ate a timber wolf Lewis shot. Lewis gave up his mount to one of the men and struggled ahead on foot. A horse loaded with winter coats slipped, screamed in terror, and vanished over a precipice.

Finally they reached open country. They looked like skeletons, and now even the inexorable driver, Lewis, collapsed. While he lay ill beside the Clearwater River, the others trimmed pine logs and burned out the cores to shape rude canoes. The work was hard for exhausted men and it went slowly.

DOWN THE CLEARWATER

In the canoes they floated down the Clearwater and into the Snake, at the spot where Lewiston, Idaho, stands. They paddled down the Snake and about the middle of October came to a mighty river which surged out of the north and bent westward. This was the Columbia, the Great River Oregon, which for two generations adventurous souls had dreamed of exploring.

For 3 weeks more they stroked the bulky canoes between mountains and grassy meadows and fir forests. One quiet night a soldier heard a far-off roar. Soon long swells rolled up the river from downstream. Gulls flew overhead. The water was full of salmon. There was a tang of salt in the air.

Fog cloaked the Columbia on the morning of November 7, 1805, but around noon it cleared and in the distance a wide expanse of tossing breakers was visible. For a moment the men looked out to sea in silence. Then they cheered. In his queerly spelt diary Clark scrawled: "Ocian in view! Oh the joy! We are in view of the ocian, that great ocian which we have been so long anxious to see!"

For the first time Americans had spanned the continent they would one day inhabit from coast to coast. On that lonely shore, the flag flapping at his back, Captain Lewis thanked the soldiers in behalf of President Jefferson. They had reached their goal ahead of any nation with rival ambitions, covering 4,100 adventurous miles in a year and a half. Just 125 years later one could board a plane at St. Louis after daybreak and be in Portland before dark.

Near present-day Astoria the expedition built a stockade, Fort Clatsop, that sheltered them during the second winter, and in the bark of a tall pine that overlooked the sea Lieutenant Clark carved this record:

"Wm. Clark December 3d 1805 by land from the U. States in 1804 & 5."

THE GREAT RETURN

Late in March of 1806 the expedition began the long trek homeward. It required only a third of the time consumed in traveling west, for now they had landmarks. Again Sacajawea was invaluable, riding at the head of the column with Lewis, unerringly pointing the way. "She has equal fortitude and resolution with any member of the party," Lewis wrote. They arrived in St. Louis on September 23, 1806, 6 months to the day after abandoning Fort Clatsop.

The Nation had given them up for dead. They had been gone 2 years and 4 months. Cheering crowds escorted them through St. Louis. Jefferson wrote his congratulations and triumphantly informed Congress of the expedition's success. They had traveled 8,000 miles through wilderness, had reached their objective and returned, had lost only one man. People were amazed by the information brought back: fierce bears which weighed 1,000 pounds, mountain ranges three times as lofty as the Alleghenies, buffalo herds measured by horizons, wild sheep with horns shaped like cornucopias, goats that leaped from crag to crag. The New York Gazette predicted that the region would probably never be traveled through again, but President Jefferson visioned "a great, free, and independent empire on the Columbia River."

The Lewis and Clark Expedition still stands as the most important ever undertaken by the United States, clinching our title not only to the vast Louisiana Territory but later to the Oregon lands as well.

Lewis was appointed Governor of Louisiana and Clark was named Indian agent for the region and promoted to the rank of brigadier general. Lewis, always a lonely man, was unhappy in political office. In the autumn of 1809, on his way to Washington to answer criticism of his administrative methods, he stopped for a night at an inn near Nashville, Tenn. Shortly after midnight a pistol shot waked the household, and the tavern-keeper found the 35-year-old explorer on the floor with a gaping wound in his side. He died at dawn. Jefferson, stunned with grief, always believed the captain had committed suicide. Tennessee folk maintained that he had been murdered. The mystery has never been satisfactorily solved.

Not far from where Lewis died a granite shaft stands, graven with the words of the President who sent him westward:

"His courage was undaunted. His firmness and perseverance yielded to nothing but impossibility."

Trees overhang the grave, and on stormy nights the wind roars through them like breakers crashing on the Pacific's distant shore.

The Father of the American Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include a splendid article written by Thomas J. Breen on Commodore John Barry, entitled "The Father of the American Navy," appearing in the May issue of the Cross and Anchor, the official publication of the College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass., dedicated to the naval ROTC at this college:

THE FATHER OF THE AMERICAN NAVY

There are gallant hearts whose glory Columbia loves to name,
Whose deeds shall live in story and everlasting fame.
But never yet one braver our starry banner bore
Than saucy old John Barry—the Irish Commodore.

Eire has given many of her sons to the cause of American liberty, but there are few that stand out so brightly in the zenith of our patriotic heaven as the burning star of Commodore John Barry, "the Father of the American Navy."

Barry was born in 1745 in County Wexford in Eire. By the time he was 15 years of age he had arrived in Philadelphia, imbued with a love of the sea that found its roots along the rocky coasts of the Irish Sea. With this love of the sea driving him on, he found jobs on the merchant ships of colonial Philadelphia which plied their way through the Atlantic and the Carribbean regions. It is fine testimony to his able seamanship and knowledge that by the time he was 21, he had command of his own ship.

These were not free times, however, when men could be content to follow the paths of financial gain without keeping cognizant of the clouds that were gathering around them. By 1775 the sides were being drawn for the impending crisis that was to come in the following year. Barry did not hesitate in deciding which was to be his side. Immediately on returning from a voyage to England in 1775, he offered his services to Congress which was preparing to finance a Navy.

Thus on December 7, 1775, John Barry was commissioned captain. He thereby became the first commander to be appointed under the direct authority of the Continental Congress and was assigned to the first ship outfitted by Congress—the *Lexington*. Barry soon justified the confidence placed in him by Congress. On April 7, 1776, he captured the British frigate *Edward* which thus became the first British armed vessel to be taken under the authority of the Continental Congress. Barry brought her back to Philadelphia as a prize. It served as a powerful stimulus to Congress which had been debating on the advisability of trying to fight England in her strongest element—the sea.

As the *Lexington* was not now in fit condition to return to sea, Barry assumed command of defense operations in Delaware Bay. Going to sea once again in July 1776, he captured several prizes.

Barry was given command now of the *Effingham*, a vessel of 32 guns. Two months later in December of 1776, when Washington was preparing for the Trenton campaign, it was Barry and a band of volunteers who came to his assistance and transported his Army across the Delaware.

In 1777, when the British occupied Philadelphia, Barry effectively harassed the ships in the port, and succeeded in capturing many supply vessels, the contents of which he sent to Washington at Valley Forge. During these operations, Barry was ordered by Washington to sink the *Effingham* for fear that it would fall into British hands. He did this only after great reluctance and a show of Irish temper. The half-sunken vessel was later completely destroyed by the English.

He was now given command on May 30, 1778, of the frigate *Raleigh*. On September 25, after being bested in a battle with a Britisher, he deliberately ran his ship ashore rather than allow her to fall into English hands. This disaster left Barry without a ship. The loss, though regretable, did not lessen his reputation as a skillful and sagacious commander nor mar the character and reputation that he had won for bravery.

The Marine Committee of Congress, in ordering the Navy Board at Boston to order a court of inquiry on Captain Barry's conduct, said, "The loss of the *Raleigh* is certainly a very great misfortune, but we have a consolation in reflecting that the spirited and gallant behavior of our commander has done honor to our flag."

Captain Barry was now put at the head of an expedition against Florida. Due to British reinforcements there, however, this expedition was called off. Since there was no Continental ship available for him, Barry, rather than remain idle, entered the Navy of Pennsylvania, as commander of the brig *Delaware*.

On November 6, 1779, he was appointed to supervise the construction of the frigate *America*. This shore duty was not congenial to the Gaelic spirit that ruled him and he returned in June 1780, to the State Navy.

The Marine Committee of Congress, knowing well Barry's value to the cause of liberty, appointed him, on September 5, 1780, to the command of the Continental frigate *Alliance*. This was the largest and the finest vessel in the whole of the Continental Navy.

Thus, we see that once again the best available position was always given to Captain Barry. The first armed cruiser under direct Continental authority—the *Lexington*—was given him, then the *Effingham* of 32 guns—the largest armament of any vessel—was assigned him, and he was made senior commander of the port of Philadelphia. On its destruction by the British, while he was operating on the lower Delaware, he was appointed to the *Raleigh*. On its loss, for which Captain Barry suffered no detriment, he was made commander of the projected expedition to Florida. When that enterprise was abandoned, he was given command of a fleet of the Navy of Pennsylvania. At the termination of this cruise, the appointment to construct the best vessel the country had projected, was given him. Then he was commissioned to the *Alliance*, the best and finest vessel the United States ever possessed. In that he remained as commander while the war continued, and at its close, he was Commodore of all the armed vessels remaining in the services of the States, just as Washington was Commander in Chief of all the forces, military and naval, at the end of the war. As commander of the fleet, Barry was second only to Washington.

On board the *Alliance*, Barry remained till the conclusion of the war, making numerous cruises against the enemy. Finally, on March 10, 1783, the *Alliance* and Barry had the honor of engaging in the last battle of the Revolution. With the war past, Congress could not see the sense of maintaining a fleet. Therefore, on August 1, 1785, the *Alliance*, the last and best ship of the Continental Navy, was sold. Captain Barry had commanded the first and the last ships of the Continental Navy.

For the next uneventful years, Barry engaged in merchant trade. But, in 1793, the actions of France, England, and Algiers made the necessity of a navy evident. Therefore, an act was passed establishing a navy, and on June 4, 1794, Barry was appointed Commander of the new Navy. Barry remained a Commander without a fleet till July 1798, when the newly built frigate *The United States* was ready for sea. By this time the quasi war with France was on. As in the past, Barry acquitted himself well in this naval war with our former ally. *The United States* and Barry carried Adams' peace envoys to France in 1800.

With the coming to power of Jefferson and the Republicans, the Navy came into a pitiful period. *The United States* was laid up, and Barry retired to inactive duty. The new Navy had been laid to rest, and its commander soon followed. On September 13, 1803, while preparing to return to active duty in the wars against the Barbary pirates,

Commodore John Barry, father of the American Navy, died at his home in Philadelphia.

In closing I would like to quote in part the inscription from the tomb of John Barry in the cemetery of St. Mary's Church, in Philadelphia:

"Sacred to the memory of Commodore John Barry, father of the American Navy,
Let the Christian patriot and soldier, who visits these mansions of the dead, view this monument with respect and veneration."

THOMAS J. BREEN.

Public Service Responsibility of Broadcast Licensees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the Republican National Committee, on Saturday night, May 18, broadcasting over the CBS network, made certain charges against the Federal Communications Commission. The gentleman charged that the FCC, in issuing a recent report, Public Service Responsibility of Broadcast Licensees, seeks to control the program content of radio broadcasts. The facts do not support the gentleman's insinuations. Responsible newspapers throughout the country have editorially complimented the Commission upon this report, among them being the New York Times, the St. Louis Post Dispatch, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, the New York Post, Milwaukee Journal, Washington Post, Mobile Press, Miami Daily News, Wilmington Journal, the New York Herald Tribune, New Haven Register, and the Hartford Courant. I call attention to a statement issued by the American Civil Liberties Union, an organization which would be the first to assail any move by Government to place a limitation upon freedom of speech. This statement is highly commendatory of the FCC report.

The statement follows:

The radio committee of the American Civil Liberties Union has considered the report on public service responsibility of broadcast licensees issued by the Federal Communications Commission on March 7, 1946, and expresses general agreement with the conclusions and proposals of that report. In taking this stand the committee stresses the point that the right of an individual broadcaster to appeal to the courts for judicial review of any administrative decision of the Commission should, as heretofore, be carefully preserved.

The heart of the FCC report is its emphasis on a broad review of total program service. Everyone agrees that the kind and quality of program service that an applicant proposes to give is a relevant factor to be considered at the time of issuing a license to broadcast—especially if there are two or more applicants for the same wave length. It seems wholly logical that the kind of service actually given should likewise be considered when a license comes up for renewal.

The FCC report spells out some of the standards by which it proposes to judge the quality of program service. The radio committee hopes that improved means will be found to give a clear picture of station performance. This should be done in the interest of the individual broadcaster, as well as the public which wants to know "what radio does." In issuing and renewing the licenses of broadcast stations, the Commission now proposes "to give particular considerations to four program service factors relevant to the public interest." These are (a) the carrying of sustaining programs as part of a well-balanced program structure; (b) the carrying of local live programs; (c) the carrying of programs devoted to the discussion of public issues; and (d) the elimination of advertising excesses.

The committee recognizes, further, the reality of the danger that the proposed regulations might at some future time be used as an excuse or a starting point for imposing some form of censorship on radio. This danger has aroused great controversy and must be taken into account.

The committee believes that the main impact of the present proposals will be to increase freedom of access to the air, to bring about more adequate presentation of public questions and to raise program standards generally. This seems a social gain so desirable as to overbalance the risk of possible misuse of power or possible later drift toward censorship.

As now defined, the proposed FCC program standards are largely quantitative rather than qualitative and make no attempt either to prescribe or to police program content. If the present or any future Commission should ever attempt to step over the bounds toward program control or censorship, the radio committee trusts the vigilance of the American people to resist any such move. If such a need arises, the ACLU will be among the first to aid in upholding our traditional freedom of the air.

In supporting the FCC report the radio committee of the American Civil Liberties Union makes the following points:

1. The Commission asserts no control whatever over the contents of any individual program or the make-up of any program schedule. The Commission proposes simply a broad review of a station's whole program performance, with particular attention to the four factors mentioned.

2. The proposal maintains freedom of speech on the air by preserving the right of broadcasters, now as heretofore, to have complete authority and responsibility for deciding what shall or shall not go into their programs.

3. The Commission adheres to the provision of the Federal Communications Act which says specifically: "Nothing in this act shall be understood or construed to give the Commission the power of censorship over radio communications." The American Civil Liberties Union looks upon this as a basic safeguard against misuse of the Commission's powers.

4. Physical limitations of the radio medium itself make necessary some evaluation of the public service given by broadcasters.

The number of printed publications—in theory, at least—is limited only by the availability of paper and ink. Any given publication is free to express any opinion or editorial policy it chooses. The number of radio channels, on the other hand, is strictly limited. Radio stations, therefore, are licensed in the name of the whole people to serve "public interest, convenience and necessity." It seems just and desirable, both in theory and on the record of past performance, for the people of the United States, acting through their Government, to make some evaluation of whether stations have actually carried out the purposes for which they were licensed.

5. The proposals of the Commission do not place in jeopardy, the time, money and effort that broadcasters have put into the building up of their stations. No general reallocation of existing licensees is mentioned or contemplated. Present moves are designed to strengthen, not to interfere with, the American system of publicly licensed and privately owned and operated broadcasting. The American Civil Liberties Union reaffirms its faith in this structure of broadcasting operated by private initiative as being superior to any form of government operation, ownership, or control.

6. The Commission's report calls attention to the fact that broadcasters are licensed to serve public interest, convenience, and necessity, and leaves them free to decide how these requirements shall be met. As the report itself says: "Primary responsibility for the American system of broadcasting rests with the licensees of broadcast stations, including the network organizations. It is to the stations and networks rather than to Federal regulation that listeners must primarily turn for improved standards of program service. The Commission, as the licensing agency established by Congress, has a responsibility to consider over-all program service in its public-interest determinations, but affirmative improvement of program service must be the result primarily of other forces."

The members of the radio committee of the ACLU are: Thomas Carskadon, chairman, Ruth Brindze, Henry J. Eckstein, Morris L. Ernst, James Lawrence Fly, J. G. Gude, David Halpern, Arthur Garfield Hays, Quincy Howe, H. V. Kaltenborn, Robert J. Landry, Dr. Paul Lazarsfeld, Morris S. Novik, Harriet Pilpel, Elmer Rice, Thomas L. Stix, Norman Thomas.

OPA Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MURRAY TILE CO., INC.,
Cloverport, Ky., April 25, 1946.
WINDSOR MANTLE & TILE CO.,
St. Joseph, Mo.
(Attention Mr. Fred T. Windsor.)

DEAR MR. WINDSOR: We remember talking to you on the phone, but for the life of us we cannot remember any order you gave us. A lot of things have been popping in our industry, and we may be half nuts at times, so write us and give us the quantities of tile you ordered. Also, please forgive our not getting it straight when you called.

The OPA pricing policies have already driven the United States Quarry Tile Co. and the Hanley Co. out of quarry tile production, while at least one other plant we know of has cut production to about 10 percent of former production, and the rest of us are looking around trying to find something we can make at a profit. This is serious, because we are over a year behind, and the other factories are very little better off, while at the same time countless dairies, food-handling plants, hospitals, and other areas are needing and crying for quarry tiles. If the OPA is carried on there will probably be no production of quarry tile after a short while. We want to see six or seven quarry tile plants in production, and the same proportion of wall and ceramic plants, but such cannot be under the totalitarian, communistic rules of the OPA and other Government bureaus.

These bureaus and their personnel, which largely is made up of failures from private industry, have forgotten that they work for the people—they have the idea that we are

working for them—and we are, because they have almost complete control. If you believe with us that production is essential, and if with us you want to stay in the tile business, let's get rid of the OPA quickly. Write your Congressmen and Senators today, letting them know where you stand, and get all your friends to do likewise because you can be sure the CIO and every other Communist front organization will see that thousands and thousands of their followers do write their representatives.

Very truly yours,

J. C. LARRIMORE,
Sales Manager.

OPA Price Ceilings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article:

PRICE CONTROL PANEL QUITS AT BETHANY—ACTION IS IN PROTEST AGAINST OPA RULES

BETHANY, MO., May 15.—Affronted at what they consider to be a rebuke from officials of the OPA office at Kansas City, and also standing in opposition to one present OPA regulation relating to minor violations of price ceilings, members of the Harrison County price-control panel are resigning.

They are Mrs. Z. R. Mills, Troy Hall, Stewart Dunn, and Ernest Noll.

Mr. Hall said that three OPA men came here from Kansas City and complained that not enough violations are being reported from Harrison County.

"These men come out here and tell us that we are not complying with prices here and that we should have more complaints," said Hall. "When we were told this, that was when we threw up our hands. I haven't seen any exorbitant prices about town.

FOLLOWED REGULAR PLAN

"After all, what we have been doing was not a paying proposition, but was done on a patriotic basis. We've gone out voluntarily, taking our own time for it."

The price panel here has functioned on what it believes is a sensible plan. It has sought cooperation from merchants and not punishment for small infractions which it thinks are bound to occur in a maze of regulations. Much of its work has related to food stores with their hundreds of items.

Whenever a grocer was found to be slightly off in some price, his attention was called to that fact and he altered his price tag accordingly, Hall said.

WANT FINES ASSESSED

This was said to be satisfactory with OPA for some time, but now, it was said by Hall and employee of the price and control board, such a course is permissible only in connection with the first violation. On that a fine is held in abeyance; if there is a second violation, however small, it is said that the first fine is collectible and a second one is assessed as well. It was with this regulation that the Harrison County price panel disagreed.

Of two grocers summoned before the OPA men, Hall said that it was his understanding that one of them was off ceiling by 86 cents on a series of sales on one item. He said that he believed the other one had charged about $3 too much on a series of sales, partly because of figuring in freight charges before establishing his mark-up.

There have been no grievous or persistent ceiling price violations in Harrison County as far as known, employees of the price control board said.

Rural Electrification Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, criticism will serve no useful purpose in connection with the long delays in the development of the rural electrification program in the United States. While World War II was in progress, when complaints were made, the Administration officials could say with perfect truth that they could not extend the rural electrification service because of the shortage of labor and materials needed in the war effort.

Now, inquiries are beginning to come to my office from proposed patrons of these rural electrification cooperative groups in my district. They want to know when they will get service from the local cooperatives. They talk about the delays. Just yesterday I had an inquiry which illustrates the inactivity at the present time. I am prompted to place these complaints in the RECORD because if Congress is not appropriating sufficient funds for the program, then we ought to be advised so that our constituents may have the facts. If, on the other hand, the men charged with administering the rural-electrification program are faced with difficulties, those circumstances should be given full publicity in fairness to the officials involved. It was pointed out to me the other day that these delays in extending REA service are now due to inability to get the necessary materials.

I quote from an item by Clyde T. Ellis, executive manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, in the magazine for May 1946. Mr. Ellis says:

A serious, new-construction bottleneck has developed. This time it is line hardware and farm-wiring materials. Superintendent J. R. Chambless, of Little Ocmulgee Co-op (Georgia), writes a typical letter: Trouble is "drop cord sockets and porcelain pull-chain receptacles, etc. * * * I have endeavored to get first-hand information * * * have written several manufacturers," and they reply, "that they cannot continue to produce such items at a loss * * * that OPA prices are not sufficient to cover the cost of production." He reports that contractors are forced to buy in the black market at "50 cents to $1 per outlet."

REA and the National are working with CPA for relief. We hope Civilian Production Administration will place the following 13 articles on the critical list soon: (1) Medium base sockets; (2) toggle-switch plates; (3) toggle switches—single and three-way; (4) conduit lock nut and bushings; (5) ground fittings; (6) service-entrance heads; (7) No. 14 two-wire nonmetallic cable; (8) No. 12 two-wire nonmetallic cable; (9) mobile base sockets; (10) Romex connectors; (11) couplings for thin wall connectors; (12) duplex receptacle plates; and (13) duplex plugs.

CPA states that if these items are placed on the critical list, increased production will follow. We are fearful, however, that the bottleneck is too serious to be overcome by this action alone. We are fearful, too, that remaining warehouse stocks might have to be frozen for veterans' housing.

There is no doubt that the economic fallacy of OPA in carrying out its doctrine of scarcity and making it impossible for productive enterprises to function has almost ruined every part of our free economy in America. As Mr. Ellis points out, OPA does not permit the people who make the materials which are needed in the rural-electrification program to operate at a profit. It is pointed out that OPA ceiling prices are so low that they do not cover the cost of production. This situation means that these articles are not going to be manufactured.

The farmers and other people in the rural sections already know what OPA has done to the dairy business and to the people who own and operate farms. I think the farmer ought to know, when they look for electricity and can't get any, that the delay is due in large part to the customary mistakes of OPA in refusing to permit the productive processes to function.

Air Pilots Going to Seed—Five-Year Plan of Aviation Backward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, having received unanimous consent to do so, I herewith extend the following remarks by Chick Logan, president of the Association of War Pilots at Long Beach, Calif. Heretofore inserted in the Appendix is also carried some important, informative material by this pilot, whose organization is so much interested in having employment in the air or on the ground in connection with flying at the earliest possible date for all the flyers and ground men of World War II.

THE 5-YEAR PLAN OF AVIATION BACKWARD

(By Chick Logan, president, Association of World War II Pilots and Aviation Specialists)

The veteran pilot and aircraft specialist of World War II is unemployed and fast "going to seed." In the many graveyards throughout the United States and abroad, thousands of aircraft which could further serve in peace are slowly being destroyed by the elements of the weather. If 5 years pass, these thousands of aircraft which represent vast sums of the people's money will be irretrievably lost and the skill of the veteran pilots and specialists which represents a great backlog of highly skilled men who could be used in a national emergency will have vanished.

If this situation is allowed to develop and becomes a reality, it will represent a national calamity. Our country will have slipped back to the days of Pearl Harbor when we held our breath and prayed that our country would be given time to create and expand war industries, build primary flying fields, and schools for aviation specialists, time to prepare. We were lucky. For some un-

known reason our prayers were answered and we built the greatest and most powerful Air Force in the world. This great Air Force pounded to hell the war factories of our enemies and contributed to their complete defeat. This accomplishment, borne out of grave and regrettable necessity, is now history.

This proud and powerful Air Force built for war and destruction, can and must be given the opportunity to further serve in peace. It is a must for national security and postwar employment. It is a must for perpetuating our leadership in aviation. It is a must for progressive America.

The mails are begging to be transported by air. The ships are idle and stored for destruction. Thousands of veteran Air Forces personnel are eager, ready, and trained, to participate in this enterprise. Then what in the name of heaven is keeping these factors from getting together for a progressive America in peace? The answer is the 5-year plan of aviation—backward.

The veteran pilot and aircraft specialist of World War II is all out for every vocation to earn as much salary as possible. However, this same group is not for a small minority of any vocation, through their organization's power, to close the door to other people who represent the same skill and keep back the development of one of the greatest industries the world has yet to see, and in which the veteran pilot and specialist of World War II hopes to find permanent postwar employment.

Today we have a great backlog of four-engine veteran pilots who are experienced and qualified to fly passengers, cargo, or mail over any line, any place at any time. They are not asking a salary of $18,000 per year. They humbly desire a job flying at a livable wage so that they may utilize the results of their training and experience and further serve their Nation in peace. They desire and demand the privilege to exercise their faith in our democratic way of life doing the kind of work they desire to do. As long as the thousands of veteran pilots and specialists of World War II are in existence, there will be an abundance of flying talent and aviation personnel. As long as there are war surplus aircraft in existence which could be used to carry the mail, there will be the possibility that they may be put in operation, manned by the veteran of World War II. This condition greatly endangers the exalted position of a small minority of commercial airline pilots who are demanding $18,000 per year for flying four-engine equipment, and through their organization they hope they can stop the expansion of aviation for a period of 5 years.

If the 5-year plan of aviation—backwards—is allowed to develop, it will mean that the aircraft now stored in the many graveyards throughout the United States and abroad will be definitely unsafe for flight. It will mean that the veteran pilot and specialist of World War II who is fresh, eager, and ready to utilize his skill in the expansion of aviation at this time, will have lost all opportunity to participate in commercial aviation. He will be 5 years older, and this lapse of time will kill his skill as dead as a doornail. It will mean that the money spent for both planes and the training of personnel will have been lost. It will mean that throughout the great United States there will be a shortage of skilled personnel to man four-engine aircraft with the result that the personnel who are already protected in the Air Line Pilot's Association will be safe from the encroachment of thousands of veteran pilots and specialists who participated in World War II.

It will require the organized and energetic effort of all people who believe in a progressive America to see that the 5-year plan of aviation—backward does not take place.

During war our Nation was noted as the arsenal of democracy. All subjugated nations throughout the world looked to the shining light of the Statue of Liberty with hope. Our Nation was known as the greatest producer of materials in all the world—producing more goods accidentally than the rest of the world could on purpose—yet, today, we cannot buy a suit of clothes, an automobile, refrigerator, and thousands of other commodities which make for progress, prosperity, and security for not only ourselves but for the people of the world who look to us for these things.

One of the reasons why a condition of this lack of progress exists is represented in the story of the 5-year plan of aviation—backward.

The problems of the Association of World War II Pilots and Aviation Specialists are more far reaching than the establishment of a national airways system in which the members of this association can be employed. Our problems are the problems of all people who believe in our democratic way of life—free enterprise with equal opportunity for all. It will require the support of all people in an endeavor to make true democracy work.

Lincoln once said, "Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and under a just God will not possess it." We believe these words represent truth, and would also apply to those who deny progress and jobs to others, deserve it not for themselves, and under a just God they will not long remain in their positions.

Misrule Exhibit No. I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERKELEY L. BUNKER
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mining Press for May 1946:

MISRULE EXHIBIT NO. I

Among the many persons who in the late twenties deemed and declared hopeless the effort to rescind the pernicious Volstead Act were many who were assumed to be level-headed and possessed of sound judgment on problems of public concern. Revocation of the dry law, with consequent loss of jobs for the agency's multitudinous office and enforcement personnel, with the end of organized crime and corruption incident to enforcement, was brought about, of course, by public pressure on Congress, few, if any, Members of which were unaware of the unanimity of public sentiment for repeal. There's an analogy in this respect between situations arising from public opposition to the Volstead Act and to the Securities and Exchange Act and its malodorous administration.

In Washington, the "man on the street" will assure the inquiring visitor that no one "on the Hill"—in Congress—will question aloud the conduct of any Federal agency or bureau. Why? Simply politics—in another word, votes. As was the legion of Volstead job-holders, so is the army of SEC advisers, investigators, snoopers, and trap-baiters composed of appointees selected wholly for their political value to those commanding the prerogatives of patronage; rarely indeed for efficiency, experience, or knowledge of industries they are employed to probe and harass. A Congressman interfere? Perish the thought. Senator Bohunkus would never be guilty of depriving a constituent or appointee of Senator Bilkenstiff of his livelihood.

Unquestionably the administration of the Securities and Exchange Act has become, as one commentator depicts it, "a stink in the public nostrils." The Commission's multifarious (many more than 200) "releases" and amendments," in effect, new laws that it assumes to enforce, in their application in some instances provide for means of "entrapment," a procedure that is specifically banned in the Bill of Rights, an integral part of our Constitution. The commission has enacted rules and regulations that, despite repeated promises to "liberalize" registration requirements, completely, not partly, preclude all efforts to finance the development of new mines through public particiation or even through small syndicate organizations.

The most glaring exhibit of the Commission's inept and destructive procedure, however, is to be found in its present exercise of supreme control over transactions in mining stocks on the various exchanges of the country. At a time when the American public, pockets abulge with money, is avid to engage in new constructive enterprise or to gamble—witness the scores of millions poured into the pari-mutuel windows—the SEC declares in effect that public offering of a mining issue is prima facie evidence that a crime is about to be perpetrated.

At the same time, the SEC permits and tactitly encourages the most flagrant market-rigging operations on the exchanges that the Nation has witnessed in half a century. It bans the sale of treasury shares of listed companies for development purposes, authorizes the reinstatement and listing of long-defunct wildcats, and unlimited inflation of list quotations without regard to the value of holdings or lack thereof, but it admonishes the American people, in effect: "You may gamble on long-shots all you damn please, but you shall not invest in any constructive undertaking, if it's outside or inside our jurisdiction."

This misbegotten, senseless rule over the mining industry, imposed without constitutional authority by and for the benefit of politicians, can be and will be relegated to the Volstead limbo when mining men and mining associations of the West unite in a demand so insistent that it can no longer be ignored by office-holders possessed of temporary power.

Silver Bill Defeat Asked—Proposed Legislation Described as Levy for Subsidizing Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to submit a letter on silver by the members of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy:

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

We, the undersigned, members of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, urge Congress to reject the proposed legislation designed to increase the price at which silver is to be bought and sold by the United States Treasury. The only price at which the Treasury should purchase silver is that determined in competitive world markets.

There is no real reason for subsidizing silver producers in this and other countries. Silver is chiefly a by-product in the mining of copper, lead, zinc, and gold; and this fact

makes any subsidization of silver producers doubly inexcusable.

There is no more validity in the argument of the silver bloc that silver should be bought and sold at its nominal monetary valuation of $1.29 per fine ounce, or at any price above the open competitive market price, than there would be in an argument that paper used to make paper currency should be bought and sold in the market at the nominal monetary value of the piece of currency manufactured from this paper.

The proposed silver legislation is solely an attempt on the part of an aggressive prosilver bloc to persuade Congress to levy on the taxpayers, manufacturers and other users of silver for the purpose of giving an indefensible subsidy to silver producers, domestic and foreign.

Congress and the people of this country might do well to remind themselves that it was this same prosilver bloc which revealed it was not only willing but determined, even in time of war, to protect its subsidy regardless of any adverse effects on the general welfare. It was this bloc that forced the Treasury to withhold much-needed silver from war industries for many months after we entered the war.

Because of the obstructions of this bloc, the best that Secretary Morgenthau could do for most of 1942 was to lend Treasury silver to war industries for nonconsumptive purposes. It was not until the Green silver bill was passed on July 12, 1943, 19 months after we entered the war, that the Treasury could sell its free silver to war and civilian industries for consumptive purposes, and even then the silver bloc was able to force Congress to provide that no Treasury silver should be sold for less than 71.11 cents per fine ounce, thus protecting the subsidy which it had obtained by passage of the domestic silver purchase law of July 6, 1939. The Treasury could have sold its free silver without loss to the war industries in 1942 at 50 cents per ounce.

The attitude of the silver bloc in respect to the public welfare, where silver is involved, appears to be no better today than it was during the late war, especially in 1942.

It is the duty of Congress and the President to see to it that the general welfare, rather than the desires of the silver bloc, is served when silver legislation is undertaken.

Eugene E. Agger, Benjamin M. Anderson, Charles C. Arbuthnot, Leonard P. Ayres, James Washington Bell, Ernest L. Bogart, Frederick A. Bradford, J. Ray Cable, Wilbur P. Calhoun, Neil Carothers, Edward H. Collins, Garfield V. Cox, William W. Cumberland, Rev. B. W. Dempsey, S. J., Charles A. Dice, William E. Dunkman, D. W. Ellsworth, William D. Ennis, Fred R. Fairchild, Charles C. Fichtner, Clyde Olin Fisher, J. Anderson Fitzgerald, Maj. B. Foster, Herbert F. Fraser, Roy L. Garis, Arthur D. Gayer, Harry D. Gideonse, Lewis H. Haney, E. C. Harwood, Hudson B. Hastings, Frederick C. Hicks, John Thom Holdsworth, Montfort Jones, Donald L. Kemmerer, William H. Kiekhofer, William H. Kniffin, Frederic E. Lee, J. L. Leonard, Philipp H. Lohman, James D. Magee, A. Wilfred May, Roy W. McDonald, Mark C. Mills, Margaret G. Myers, Melchior Palyi, Frank Parker, Clyde W. Phelps, Charles L. Prather, Howard H. Preston, Leland Rex Robinson, R. G. Rodkey, Olin Glenn Saxon, Joseph A. Schumpeter, Carlton A. Shively, James G. Smith, Walter E. Spahr, William H. Steiner, Charles S. Tippetts, Alvin S. Tostlebe, James B. Trant, Rufus S. Tucker, Russell Weisman, William O. Weyforth, Edward Wiest, Max Winkler, Ivan Wright.

NEW YORK, *May 13, 1946.*

Army Dentists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Drew Pearson from the Washington Merry-go-Round in the Philadelphia Record Sunday, May 19, 1946:

ARMY DENTISTS

At long last Maj. Gen. Norman Kirk, who has the reputation for hoarding more medical manpower than any other surgeon general in history, has decided to let a few more doctors slip through his fingers and go back to civilian practice.

He has decreed that all Medical Corps officers who have served 30 months as of May 1 can be released from the Army before June 30.

However, this does not apply to Army dentists, who are now becoming the forgotten men of the United States Army.

For some strange reason best known to General Kirk, general service doctors can get out of the Army after 30 months, but a dentist must remain 39 months. And today, hundreds of patriotic dentists who gave up good practices to join the Army, are marking time at Army posts, unable to get discharged.

Furthermore, the brass hats have permitted the discharge of many younger dentists, while older men have to stay on. Many of the youngsters, educated at Army expense, have been declared "essential to civilian practice" and discharged, while older men with families to support, can't get out. This means that younger dentists get their civilian practice firmly established before older men can even begin to look for scarce office space.

Meanwhile, the proportion of both doctors and dentists is slightly higher in the Army today than it was at the end of the war—1 year ago. In other words, with the size of the Army greatly reduced, the number of doctors and dentists proportionately has gone up.

Who Is at Fault?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I feel certain that no one in America is satisfied with the near-chaotic condition existing today regarding production, unless it be those who seem determined to change our Republic into a totalitarian Nation.

As the Washington News points out, it is Time to Think—Use It:

TIME TO THINK—USE IT

This week of strike truce on the railroads and in the coal fields is a breathing spell. It may be only that. At least, it gives Americans a little time to think about where they are and where they may be going.

Never have this country's people had so much to gain by cooperation. Prosperity, plenty, high real wages, generous profits, all are within grasp—or were. Productive effort, unimpeded, is the key. Nothing but production can halt the destruction of wages, profits, and savings by inflation.

Never have this country's people had so much to lose by fighting over wealth not yet produced; wealth that never will be produced if the fighting persists.

In Congress and the country there are those—a misguided minority, we believe—who actually would destroy labor's hard-won and essential rights.

Among workers and their supporters there are those—also a minority, we believe, despite the union leaders' clamor—who would use all of labor's political and economic strength to prevent any legal regulation of labor's tremendous power.

Neither group speaks for America.

Today, at William Jewell College in Missouri, Mr. Truman is being made a doctor of laws. A timely reminder, to the President and to us all, that ours must be and remain a government by laws and not by men if we are to continue a free people.

The great labor organizations demand that Mr. Truman fire his Civilian Production Administrator, John D. Small, who last week advocated an emergency act to outlaw all strikes for 6 months.

There is no danger that this proposal will be adopted—not this week. The country is not desperate enough for that—not yet. A week or so more of coal strike, a few days of railroad strike, and the country might get desperate enough to try anything.

Even now there is understandable reason why the official responsible for getting civilian goods produced, knowing the situation, might suggest a desperate remedy. Two months ago before the coal strike began Bernard M. Baruch told Congress that a 1-year moratorium on strikes, "preferably by agreement, otherwise by law," was necessary to get the volume of steady production required to beat inflation.

At that time, in the first 3 months of 1946, Labor Department figures show that strikes had caused, directly, 54,700,000 man-days of idleness. That was more productive effort lost by labor strife in one-quarter of this year than in any previous full year on record. And the figures take no account of vast indirect losses in industries that could not operate because others were strike-bound. Since March the situation has grown worse, the outlook blacker.

Our system cannot endure under the rule of men—whether in labor or industry—who say, "We will have our way, free of restraint by law, no matter what it costs the country." Such men invite another system under which, as in Germany under Hitler and in Russia under Stalin, there would be no strikes and there would be no freedom for industry or for labor or for anyone.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the condition existing today offers concrete evidence that the present administration is incapable of leading this Nation into the great new era of peace and prosperity toward which America and the world aspires, and to which they are entitled.

Radio Address of Hon. Fred Bradley, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include my recent

radio broadcast put on the air over radio station WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; WMAM, Marinette, Wis.; and WDBC, Escanaba, Mich.

Early last week the House and Senate both agreed on the conference report settling the differences between the two Houses on the so-called veterans' housing bill which was promptly signed by the President. This law now makes available a subsidy of some $400,000,000 to expedite homes for veterans by providing subsidies for building materials. Just where the subsidies are going to be applied no one seems to know because the statement was made on the floor that none of that money would be used to affect the price or supply of lumber or the wages of labor. Certain it is that these two items are obviously among the most important costs in the construction of any house so it still remains a mystery as to just what is going to happen to this money. Some people feel that there is some scheme afoot whereby some of our more famous war contractors or shipbuilders like Henry Kaiser or perhaps Mr. Higgins down in New Orleans will receive most of the subsidy for the construction of prefabricated houses. We will have to wait and see what happens but personally I doubt very much that the expenditure of this huge sum is going to prove of any tangible benefit to the veterans.

Then the next important matter on the agenda before the House was our approval of the Senate 45-day draft extension bill. Once again the draft extension consideration bordered on absurdity. As I told you some time ago we have all recognized for many months that the selective service act would expire at midnight May 14. Nevertheless, by direction of the White House and under pressure from the White House the House Military Affairs Committee took up first the consideration of universal military training and held weeks and weeks and weeks of hearings on this matter—all the time neglecting the selective service extension. Then, as is customary when they want to cram something down our throats, they hastily reported out a bill April 10, and the administration demanded prompt action before the House took an Easter recess. You will recall that at that time various amendments were offered from the floor; the four principal ones of which were in opposition to the demands of the President. The first amendment reduced the requested 1 year extension to 9 months. The second amendment suspended the operation of selective service for 5 months. The third exempted all fathers from the draft, and the fourth exempted boys 18 and 19 years old. In any event, we sent the bill over to the Senate on April 15.

Now the Senate did not take an Easter recess because they said they had important legislation to take up and presumably, based upon the statements made in the House as to the urgency of the extension of selective service, we assumed this was one of the urgent matters. Later, therefore, it was amazing to have the majority leader of the Senate, Senator EARKLEY, who is regarded as the spokesman of the White House in the Senate, to make the statement that the all-important matter facing the country at this time was the urgency of the British loan and that that must be passed before he would permit any other legislation to be considered. Well, the result was that the debate on the British loan dragged and dragged until it was finally passed on Friday, May 10. However, on Thursday, May 9, the Senate in less than 5 minutes, by unanimous consent, passed and sent to the House a substitute draft extension bill which would simply extend the Selective Service Act 45 days without any of the House amendments whatsoever.

Well, when the matter came up in the House on Monday, great was the beating of the chests and the thunder of drums from the administration supporters who demanded that we adopt the Senate substitute without any amendments whatsoever. Failing to do so they said would mean the death knell for the selective service and great would be the catastrophe to the forces of MacArthur in Asia and in Japan and great would be the disaster to our army of occupation in Europe. We were told the Senate could not possibly pass any bill with any of the House amendments added to it. Despite that fact, however, the House refused to be pushed around and again overwhelmingly wrote into the 45-day extension the elimination of fathers and the elimination of the teen-agers. Faced with that firm stand on the part of the House the Senate finally adopted it and sent it to the President late last Tuesday afternoon in time to extend the act as amended until July 1, 1946. Presumably between now and then the Senate will be forced to accept the House bill as originally passed.

In view of the action of the Senate in approving the British loan by a rather surprising vote of 46 to 34 on May 10, many of us were rather shocked at a statement which appeared in the New York Times on May 13. Personally, I was shocked at the brazen effrontery of it and if I ever had any doubts in my mind heretofore as to how I should vote on the British loan when it comes before us for consideration in the House all of those doubts were definitely and firmly revoked at that time because I would not vote for it now if it were handed to me on a diamond-studded golden platter.

Not so long ago Mr. Winston Churchill his Conservative Party that fought the war and saved Britain in the dark early days of the war was thrown out of power and the British Government taken over lock, stock, and barrel by the Labor Party. The head of the British Labor Party is Prof. Harold J. Laski, who from time to time has come over to these shores and sought to tell us how to run our Government and how to change our economy for the better. He has been among the blatant, most disrespectful and most disgusting of the British propagandists who has sought welcome on these shores and sought to give us advice as to how to run our country. On last Monday Professor Laski made this public statement in London and I quote: "To those who say we have to choose—as I do not believe we have to choose—between the Soviet Union and the United States, with its passion for free enterprise that is not free and is not enterprise, we—the Labor Party—stand foresquare behind the Soviet Union."

Could there be any more clearly forceful statement of the precepts and the beliefs of the present Government of Britain? Note they say we have no such thing as free enterprise in this country. In other words, our capitalistic form of economy is neither free nor is it enterprise. Yet that same bunch of ungrateful scions of communism have the brazen effrontery to come over here and secure from our capitalistic form of economy not only a loan of three and three-quarter billions of American dollars but, on the other hand, have secured from us for $650,000,000 a settlement on a debt of $25,000,000,000 which they owe this Nation for lend-lease for supplies and equipment without which they would have undoubtedly been soundly defeated by the Nazis and probably committed to an indefinite period of serfdom under the iron heel of Hitler and his satellites. And bear this in mind, too, that under the terms of that settlement of $650,000,000 not one red cent of that will return to the shores of these United States. Under the terms of that agreement arrived at by our striped pants boys of the State Department—who like to bask in the sunlight of the British Embassy—we have agreed that every last penny of that shall be spent in or invested in materials and properties within the British Empire. What a disgrace to our amateur bunglers in the State Department who would settle for such an amount. The British Government on the other hand would not permit the United States to sell to the British people direct and as individuals any of our surplus property or equipment in the British Isles but, instead, insisted that the British Government, itself, should in effect buy this surplus for 2½ cents on the dollar so that it could, in turn, profit by selling it to its own people as individuals. What on earth is our State Department running—an international pawn shop for the benefit of the communistic-inclined British labor Government—and yet the Senate of the United States listened to the voices of a bunch of international bankers in our own country, internationally minded manufacturers in our own country—who seek for their own personal gain and their own personal gain only—at the expense of the American taxpayer—the granting of a loan to a government that says if there is any choice between the United States and Soviet Russia—let the whole world know that they stand first, last, and all the time fore-square behind Communist Russia.

I can't understand for the life of me how the Senate of the United States could have been bludgeoned into the approval of such a waste, and it is a waste of the taxpayers' money. When are we going to start thinking of our own citizens first and think of our own welfare first? On February 15, my colleague, ROY WOODRUFF from Bay City said on the floor of the House that out of 75,000 veterans in California, who were asking for loans only 194 got credit from this gracious Government of ours, the others got advice. Think of that. One hundred and ninety-four American soldiers, who faced death or mutilation in a war that they did not seek were given paltry loans out of some 75,000 applications.

Well, of course, you know the answer to the Senate vote. The so-called British loan—and we might just as well admit it is going to be a gift in the long run, found most of its support among those two-thirds of the 96 Senators who will not be up for reelection this fall. I predict over in the House, however, where all of us are up for reelection, we are going to hear such a wave of protest from back home, especially from the returning GI's, that the British loan is going to have very tough sledding. It probably will pass because the White House and our State Department are still just as generous as they ever were in the days of Roosevelt and they are bound to give away our sum and substance to every corner in the globe with an inside priority to Great Britain even though, as proven by the words of Harold Laski, it is no longer loyal to its lush-plush Uncle Sap and his bank roll but prefers instead communistic Russia, who is itself today seeking a $6,000,000,000 loan in this country from the hated and despised American form of capitalistic economy. Now I said a few minutes ago that this loan might just as well be considered a gift—and mark my words that is exactly what it will turn out to be because if a man doesn't pay his debts to me, I know him to be a dead beat regardless of this intentions to the contrary. Britain has not paid her First World War indebtedness to us and when we sought to collect we were called Uncle Shylock. We will doubtless be called a worse name than that this time.

If you question what I am saying, then let me quote from what London correspondents in Washington told their readers back home in London, as recorded in the British News Review—and listen to this carefully.

"Chief negotiator, the late, Lord Keynes told the Yanks bluntly that Britain was entitled to an interest-free grant for the part the country had played in winning the war for America." How do you like that you GI Joes who may be listening in? It must be of interest to you to know that they won the war for you. Now then they go on to say that Lord Keynes agreed with Mr. Truman, "there was a sort of gentlemen's understanding that America would help Britain to pull down the world's tariff walls

and would consider lowering its own tariff obstacles to British products." Now that is fine and goes on to prove what a keen trader this man Keynes was and how stupid our State Department has become under the New Deal. Because the article goes on to say, "Moreover, Keynes avoided giving the Americans a pledge that Dominion preferences would be removed. He merely promised that Britain would consider bargaining on this matter." In other words, we loan Britain the money to buy supplies all over the world in exchange for which we permit her to ship into our markets in competition with the products of the American taxpayer whatever she produces on raw materials purchased all over the world with the American gift dollars at lower cost than we can afford to produce them with our high standard of living in this country and then undersell the American taxpayer who puts up the money for this so-called loan and then they do not guarantee us a reciprocal right to trade in the British Empire but tell us that they will consider the matter for later bargaining. Do you wonder for one moment that the State Department has now advertised to the entire world that Uncle Sam has definitely and without any shadow of doubt become to the world at large a real Uncle Sap—a real Uncle Sap. I repeat, I shall not vote for the British loan if they hand it to me on a diamond-studded, golden platter. I will not sell America out to selfish international interests. I am not going to vote the capitalistic American dollar to foster the government of the British Labor Party that now admits it proves allegiance to the communism of Russia.

Economics and Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Mr. Henry Hazlitt which appeared in the New York Times of May 20, 1946:

ECONOMICS AND FINANCE—THE GOVERNMENT EREEDS ITS OWN CRISES

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The crisis in which the country finds itself today illustrates among other things the present difficulties of business forecasters. Those who are at once clear-headed and honest never pretend to do more than indicate certain probabilities—which, they recognize, may be falsified by events. But even the indication of probabilities becomes increasingly difficult as an economy becomes increasingly subject to governmental controls. For then everything may turn upon the whim of some public official in making a crucial decision. You cannot predict the future of business unless you can predict what this official, and scores of others, are going to decide at certain critical points—something which they may not even know in advance themselves.

This does not necessarily mean that business forecasting is any easier for people inside the Government than for those outside. For a few of the official controllers understand what the business consequences of their decisions will be, and one official does not know what another official is going to decide. During the war administration officials, including those in the Office of Price Administration, simultaneously feared both inflation and deflation immediately after VJ-day—though it ought to have been clear that you cannot have a collapse of prices (particularly when these have already been held down by price controls) when the monetary means of payment for goods has more than tripled.

Last October, to take another illustration, John W. Snyder, as Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, predicted that "by next spring * * * unemployment may rise to about 8,000,000." It was pointed out in this column at the time that Mr. Snyder did not know any better than the rest of us how much unemployment there was going to be this spring, and that that depended mainly on what course the Government followed before then. J. A. Krug, then Chairman of the War Production Board, was realistic in declaring last fall that "it's a little silly to talk about the progress of reconversion with the strike situation being what it is."

But the strike situation was what it was last October in large part because of administration labor policies, just as the strike situation is what it is today in large part because of administration labor, wage, and price policies. "I am convinced," declared the President last fall, "that we must get away as quickly as possible from Government controls, and that we must get back to the free operation of our competitive system." But he nevertheless retained governmental controls and found himself driven back because of them to the resumption of wartime controls that had been abandoned.

He first followed the impossible policy of trying to control prices while leaving wages free. He was then driven to a few half-hearted efforts to hold down wages. These were soon abandoned for the still more impossible policy of trying to boost wages while holding down prices. As OPA over-all price ceilings had been retained on the theory that Government officials were more capable of saying what individual prices ought to be than was the free market, so "fact-finding" boards were set up on the theory that Government appointees were more capable of saying what individual wage rates ought to be than was competition or free collective bargaining.

But once one of these boards had announced an award of an increase of 18½ cents an hour in a particular case, every leading union in the country thought itself entitled by Government policy to at least that amount, regardless of the point at which its wages already stood. That is why the engineers and trainmen have called a strike against a mere 16-cent award by a Government body. That is why John L. Lewis, who could easily get 18½ cents, wants to prove that he is better than any other labor-union leader, and that the A. F. of L. is better than the CIO, by getting more. And previous Government labor policy and legislation has helped to build up the power of both the railroad and coal unions to the point where either of them can bring the entire economy of the country to a halt if its demands are not met.

The present crisis, like all the previous crises that have delayed reconversion, is the product of past and present governmental policy.

Letter From Commerce and Industry Association of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Commerce and Industry Association of New York. I do this because the letter is in reply to certain remarks made by me on January 14. I do not agree with much that is stated in the following letter, but in the interest of fairness am glad to include it with my remarks:

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY
ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK, INC.,
New York, N. Y., May 10, 1946.

HON. JERRY VOORHIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN VOORHIS: In the Appendixes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages A 26 and A27, you answered a previous report issued by this association in opposition to your bill, H. R. 3462.

Your answer has been reviewed by this association and we desire to correct certain erroneous impressions created therein.

You state that—

"Despite this unequivocal statement of purposes, patents frequently have been used to retard the progress of science and useful arts; to prevent the development of technology and the introduction of new processes and new products."

The fact is:

The abuse and misuse of patent rights has not occurred "frequently," but in isolated instances which have received much publicity and notoriety and thus have obscured the multitudes of patent licenses where no abuse or misuse of patent rights exists. The alleged abuses are the exception and not the rule, and have been corrected by the courts.

Broad and drastic legislation, such as H. R. 3462, would do more harm than good by destroying in one fell ill-advised swoop, various rights that are inherent in the rights of a patent owner. The aim of our patent system is to encourage invention by granting an exclusive right to make, use, and sell the invention for the term of 17 years.

Subject to certain considerations in the public interest, the patentee has the right to enjoy the profits from his invention. The rights of the patentee should not be so stripped as to make the patent almost worthless. Abuses have been and are well taken care of by the courts. There is no need for further legislation and administrative policing. Ours is not a planned economy.

You further state that:

"It is the purpose of H. R. 3462 to provide a method for correcting certain patent abuses and by so doing to strengthen the operation of the patent system as a whole."

The fact is:

A reading of the bill clearly indicates that it goes much further than merely correcting certain patent abuses. We fail to see how the bill strengthens the operation of the patent system as a whole. The bill appears to weaken the operation of the patent system in that its effect would limit the incentive to a patentee. This factor alone would work a radical change in our present patent system.

What are the improper uses which you desire to curb? Is it the enumeration in section 29 of the bill? The Supreme Court has not held all the matters enumerated in section 29 to be bad. The language of the bill is more than what the Supreme Court has already declared to be the present law.

Manufacturers and sellers of patented products should have certain rights and benefits which manufacturers and sellers of unpatented products do not have, since the former have expended vast sums of money in research and in the development of new patents. The incentive to advance our Nation's technological progress should not be restricted.

From our report you have quoted out of context, in your statement, the following:

"In all other important respects, as the Commerce and Industry Association of New York points out in its report, the bill is merely 'a codification of existing laws as developed by recent court decisions.' "

The full quotation is:

"To some extent the bill is a codification of existing law as developed by recent court decisions."

You state:

"In other words, the association appears to contend that the bill is wrong because it would condemn patent-license agreements which unjustly restrict production, regulate prices and sales terms, or allocate markets."

The fact is—

No such contention was and is made. The association does point out that the bill lumps together all practices, proper as well as improper, just as well as unjust, and attaches the stigma of illegality to all, both to the good as well as the improper. The association does contend that the bill is too broad and too drastic.

You state:

"* * *, but it is not true, as contended in the report of the Commerce and Industry Association, that the granting of a patent entitles the holder thereof to use his patent monopoly as a means of stifling the trade and commerce of America by taking to himself powers far beyond the scope of the patent as such."

The fact is—

No such contention was made, as a fair reading of the report clearly indicates. It is contended that the rights lawfully granted to a patent owner should not be so stripped as to render the patent and ownership thereof almost worthless. Your philosophy, carried to its logical conclusion, would accomplish just that, and would weaken our present patent system with a resulting brake upon our Nation's technological and industrial progress.

Appreciating your desire to be fair in this matter, we urge you to give similar publicity to this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as given your previous statement so that any erroneous impression may be corrected.

Best personal regards.

THOMAS JEFFERSON MILEY,
Secretary.

Effect of Strikes on Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. GIBSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from E. F. Dean, Jr., Odum, Ga., to the editor of the Savannah (Ga.) Morning News:

ROSCOE DEAN CO., INC.,
Odum, Ga., May 12, 1946.

EDITOR OF SAVANNAH MORNING NEWS,
Savannah, Ga.

GENTLEMEN: Have been reading Mr. Adams' report of what he saw during a trip to south China. It seems that he is secretary of the International Famine Relief Committee. He says that he has seen a million starve; has seen walking skeletons; seen children with eye infection derived from malnutrition—their eyed puffed out to the size of eggs and exuding pus in streams an inch wide down their cheeks. These children were 1 week from total blindness and perhaps 1 month from death; has seen orphanages where the children died at the rate of 20 a day; seen streets so full of dead the authorities were unable to bury them; have watched fathers and mothers slowly die that their children might have a morsel more of food.

If this is not true, Mr. Adams should be hushed up or put where decent people could not hear him. If it is true then these infernal strikers should be made to go to work and it seems to us that our governmental officials should have guts enough to say they must.

I have just driven out through south Georgia and saw thousands of acres of good land lying idle because the farmers could not get equipment—tractors and so forth to tend it. These farms, if they could have been worked, would have produced thousands of bushels of corn and other produce, if the equipment had been available. The farmers are not to blame because they cannot hire labor at price set by our Government and sell their products at price set by OPA

I think it is high time for the farmer to go on a strike; at least as far as furnishing rations for the GMC and Ford employees and coal miners are concerned, because they are the ones who are holding up production of the whole Nation, full of starvation and famine in foreign countries.

This has been going on for nearly 2 years. Almost every paper we pick up tells of starvation and famine, and now we have Mr. Hoover's report, so there must certainly be a serious situation and I can't see how civilized people could hold up production of the whole Nation as it is being done at present by strikes, walk-outs, picketing, and so forth.

I believe our Government should have the same authority to put these strikers to work as they have to put a man in the Army. I may be radical, but when I see and know so many good farmers who have been begging for equipment—something to work with—for so long, and then for a man like John L. Lewis, in the face of all these reports, stopping several million men from work just for personal gain or to show his power, makes me want to fight.

What is our country coming to? I have heard hundreds of men say they joined the union because they absolutely had to, or not get work, rather not be allowed to work. And this on Government jobs where everything was so essential.

Yours very truly,

E. F. DEAN, JR.

Copy to Farm Journal; JOHN GIBSON, Congresssman.

The People Should Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the editor and publisher of the Hartford Day Spring recently editorialized as follows:

One of the advantages enjoyed by a Congressman seeking reelection is the privilege of sending out campaign material free of postage. * * * Receiving those two statements in the mail from the Congressmen prompted the question, "Will their opponents have an equal chance to present their views to voters without postage expense?" The answer is obvious.

Though the editor is a young man, he has the correct answer. Congressmen do have the privilege of franking out, without postage expense, their views on public questions as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They also have the privilege of franking out their answers to individuals, including publishers and editors, when those replies have to do with the public's business. Without that privilege it would be impossible for any Congressman to answer any considerable percentage of his mail.

It is my practice each week to advise the people of the district as to my stand on public issues, and some editors, believing those releases to be of value to their readers, have been kind enough to reprint them.

The fact that a Congressman is a candidate does not deprive him of the privilege of franking official mail or communications. It has been my practice as election day approached to insert in the papers of the district over a period of several weeks paid political ads at an expense to me personally of between $450 and $500 per week.

This young editor ignores the fact that he, in common with all publishers, is enjoying the privilege of circulating his paper with the aid of Government funds. Newspapers, because they are of educational benefit to the people, are carried at a reduced rate of postage. So far as I know, there has been little criticism of that practice.

GOVERNMENT PROPAGANDA

In recent years, the New Deal has spent more than a billion dollars on administration political propaganda designed to convert the people to its policies, continue bureaucrats in office with increased powers and salaries.

Every publisher in the district, at Government expense, receives many a communication from administration agencies and bureaus sent him with the hope that favorable publicity be given.

Recently Bowles, OPA advertiser, spent $2,572,000 in 1 year on publicity. Many statements were inaccurate. Many conclusions were illogical.

Congressmen would be remiss in their duty if they failed to attempt to make answer to propaganda in support of policies which are obviously unsound.

It seems just a little unfair to criticize because a Congressman attempts to answer an overwhelming flood of propaganda. Does not the editor want the answer of his elected Representative upon issues of vital concern?

A Congressman or a candidate for Congress, who has no views, who lacks the courage to state his position, and to give his reasons therefor, is, in my humble judgment, unworthy of the job.

As a servant of the people, it is my purpose to answer to the best of my ability every individual who writes me on a question coming before Congress or which concerns him personally in his relationship with his Government. Through talks in and out of Congress, through news releases, it is my intent to advise all who care to know how I intend to act on proposed legislation.

Many times I have been and will be in error, for no man can serve more than 242,339 people and satisfy each individual. But the people have the right to know the views, the intentions of their Representative. The reason we have a congressional election is to afford the people an opportunity to elect a man who will, in the main, give expression to their convictions.

A difficulty which sometimes arises is that those who are satisified with the over-all conduct of their Representative remain silent, fail to vote, while those who disagree with some one or more of his acts, or who have only their own interests in mind, do their share of the shouting, go to the polls and thus, because it is vocal and active, a minority may appear to be a majority.

To paraphrase a well-known quotation, "You can please some of the people some of the time, you can please some of the people all of the time, but you can't please all of the people all of the time." But the home folks will know any time they wish just what their present representative thinks—how he votes.

OPA

The Senate is joining the House to make OPA's regulations more workable, more satisfactory; less arbitrary, less destructive.

Union members, finding themselves without jobs because OPA's regulation have cut off production in the plants where they work, discovering that OPA has not held down the cost of living, are now asking in ever-increasing numbers for either drastic reform of OPA or its end.

THE DRAFT AND THE LOAN

While the Senate decided to "loan"—give—some $4,000,000,000 to Great Britain, notwithstanding her refusal to make any concessions as to trade or defense bases for this country, the House shows indications of refusing to go along.

The statement of Laski, British Labor Party chairman, to the effect that Britain should side with Russia as against the United States creates resentment. The knowledge that after all this country has done for the British Empire the chairman of a party now directing its policy should gratuitously insult us by declaring that Government's preference for Stalin's empire does not create any enthusiasm for further gifts. It lessened the desire of some internationalists to follow a gift of billions of dollars with a contribution to the international army of 80,000 teen-aged young men who are now in high schools and colleges—hence, the action of the House exempting for the present young men under 20 from the draft.

When the party in power in another government openly condemns what it calls our capitalistic system, our free enterprise, advocates its end, and, in effect, follows a policy which would overthrow our kind of government, it does not seem sensible to aid in that purpose by either a contribution of billions of dollars or thousands or hundreds of thousands of the youth of our country.

Security for Our Elder Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, there is widespread interest in Idaho in proposals to improve the circumstances of our elder citizens. This problem is one of the most urgent confronting our Nation today, and I believe that the Congress should give early consideration to its solution. I am submitting a statement reflecting this viewpoint which I made before the House Ways and Means Committee on April 15, 1946:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee, the welfare of America is closely related to the welfare of any great mass of the American people. With this in mind and with the uncertainties present in our social and economic order, I am appearing before this committee because I believe that by improving the condition of millions of the Nation's aged citizens, we can strengthen our country and safeguard its welfare.

General estimates indicate there are some 16,000,000 Americans aged 60 and over who today, either because their incomes are too low or because they are holding jobs that mean unemployment for younger people, adversely affect our economy. I think we are unwise if we ignore this fact in the consideration of our legislative program. I believe one of the most forward-looking steps Congress could take today would be to enable each American citizen over 60 years of age to retire from the labor market while stabilizing his income at levels adequate to insure his security and comfort.

Unemployment again looms as a threat to our prosperity. There is a glimmer of hope in 1947 after reconversion has been more completely worked out and accumulated demands are met. However, unemployment will grow because of the expanding productivity of each worker and greater use of machinery. Under such conditions unemployment can be resolved only through systematic retirement of older workers who have made their full contribution to the progress of their country. From a moral and humanitarian point of view, there should not be any large segment of our population doomed to live in squalor or on the borderline of starvation. We have millions of people now struggling on $30-a-month pensions who are in that condition.

I am not asking that this committee arrive at legislation on a basis of sentiment. I do believe that this problem can be met in a humane, Christianlike manner, and at the same time work to the advantage of our national economy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge your committee to give consideration to a program that will be Nation-wide in its scope; one that will not be based on need and poverty, but one that will be recognized by your committee as a matter of justice and that might be considered by the public in general as a national insurance program to meet the hazards and conditions of old age.

What Is the Democratic Party Doing for the Unorganized?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I include hereinbelow a national radio address delivered by me before the People's Lobby Luncheon at the YWCA, Washington, D. C., Saturday, May 11, 1946. The speech was carried over the network of NBC, and is as follows:

What has the Democratic Party done for the unorganized, and what does it offer them in the future?

My first answer to those questions is to say that in winning for labor the right to organize and press for realization of its legitimate claims, the Democratic Party has done more for the unorganized than it could have done in any other way.

The welfare of the millions of individuals who have no one appointed to look after their interests as such—who have no one to plead and exert pressure for them—is intimately bound up with the welfare of organized labor.

That is true because what is good for organized labor is good for the vast majority of people in the country.

Labor—both organized and unorganized—is the majority of the people.

When Congress passes a law to improve the lot of organized labor it also improves the lot of the unorganized.

When Congress acts to protect the rights of organized labor it also provides a bulwark of safety for the millions who are unorganized.

The record of Congress during the last 13 years will show that the Democratic Party has led the way in securing the passage of progressive labor and social legislation.

The National Labor Relations Act, passed in 1935, established the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively. By so doing, it placed labor on a more nearly equal footing with industry in determining what wages and working conditions should be. A general upward revision of wages and a steady improvement in the lot of labor resulted. The unorganized shared in these benefits as well as the organized.

To the Democratic Party must go the credit for this achievement. The Senate vote on the measure showed 49 Democrats for it, and only 4 against. Among the Republicans, on the other hand, 12 supported it and 8 voted against it—nearly an even division. There was no record vote on the bill in the House.

In 1938 came another major test of where the parties stood. A wages-and-hours law was passed, putting a floor under wages and a ceiling over hours for all workers engaged in producing goods for interstate commerce. It was primarily a measure designed to better the lot of the unorganized worker, because most workers who belonged to trade unions had already, through collective bargaining, achieved a status better than that guaranteed by the new law.

The Democrats in both the Senate and the House supported the measure by a margin of 3 to 1. The Republicans in the Senate voted overwhelmingly against it, and in the House the GOP vote was almost evenly divided.

Strengthened in both numbers and influence by the labor legislation passed by a Democratic Congress, organized labor was in a better position to press for enactment of progressive social legislation all along the line.

I do not need to enumerate all the far-reaching reforms and improvements achieved under President Roosevelt.

Many of these were not primarily labor measures, but labor supported them. Labor has been the most effective watch dog in seeing that the tremendous gains registered during the last 13 years have been maintained against the onslaught of those who would have us return to the jungle law of the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover era.

It is because of this fact that those who want to return to the ruthless practices of the 1920's make organized labor the main object of their attack.

In doing so they attempt to drive a wedge of antagonism and ill feeling between the organized and the unorganized. They try to delude the latter into thinking that their interests are inimical to those of organized labor.

They pretend to feel a great sympathy for the unorganized. They do, indeed, favor the unorganized. They favor them the way they are—unorganized—for that way they cannot so effectively hold their betrayers to account.

Those who are misled by these splitting tactics into unreasonable animus against organized labor should pause to consider what happened in other parts of the world where labor haters and lovers of the unorganized succeeded in their designs.

The first thing that both Mussolini and Hitler did when they came to power was to turn their gangster squads loose on the trade unions. Within a few days the union halls were smashed to rubble, the union leaders were in jail, and union members were under the surveillance of the police.

Next the attack was launched against other types of organizations—churches, fraternal groups, and cultural societies.

Even that kinship in the realm of ideas which comes from free access to literature came under the ban, and the works of authors respected the world over were tossed to the flames in hundreds of public squares.

Then, having smashed every vestige of organization except their own, the Fascists and Nazis went to work on the unorganized with a vengeance.

The small businessman quickly lost all freedom of action. He was told whom he should hire, from whom he must buy, and to whom he could sell.

Soon big business, too, was "coordinated." Before long, Italy and Germany were seething camps of repressed unrest which could be kept from exploding only by turning the accumulated wrath against the rest of the world.

There is no danger of a similar tragic chain of events taking place in this country as long as the people continue to show the desire and capacity for organization that they have exhibited in recent years.

Trade-unionism has grown by leaps and bounds, and the unions are proving ever more effective in the political arena. That is why the heat is now being turned on by the reactionaries. They would like to impose a strait-jacket like the Case bill on labor before it has a chance to consolidate and extend the gains it has made in recent years.

Now, I do not believe that the welfare of American people—unorganized as well as organized—will be enhanced in the crucial years ahead by turning the control of Congress over to the party responsible for a measure as reactionary and vicious as the Case bill—a bill which would virtually nullify the National Labor Relations Act, hamstring labor as a political force, and thus deprive even the unorganized of their most effective protector and ally.

When the Case bill was introduced and railroaded to the floor of the House by a tricky parliamentary maneuver, the chairman of the Rules Committee referred to it as "this Republican National Committee abomination." So far as I know, his charge that it was hatched in the headquarters of the Republican National Committee has never been refuted.

I know, of course, that not all Republicans are labor baiters and that not all of them take a consistent stand in opposition to progressive social legislation.

My friend and fellow speaker at this luncheon, the distinguished Senator from Vermont, is a Republican liberal. He is a friend of labor and a friend of the common man. He places the welfare of the country as a whole above the selfish interests of the powerful and privileged few.

For those very reasons he finds it impossible to go along with most of the other members of his party on issues involving progressive legislation. When a vote is taken in the Senate on such an issue, Senator AIKEN will be found voting with the Democrats rather than with the majority of the Republicans.

I am also aware of the fact that the Democratic Party has within it a minority of Senators and Representatives who vote with the reactionary Republicans more often than they do with the liberal majority within their own party.

That fact has resulted in a serious setback to some of the legislation proposed by President Truman to carry the country safely over the reconversion period and assure continued prosperity through adherence to the Roosevelt policies.

But the remedy for this situation cannot be the election of more Republican Senators and Congressmen. With the leadership of the Republican Party firmly in the hands of its most reactionary element, such a course could result only in the decisive defeat for all progressive legislation and nullification or repeal of many of the New Deal measures which have meant so much to the people of this country.

No, the remedy lies rather in an alert and articulate public that lets its representatives know—on election days and between elections—what it wants.

We have just witnessed the effectiveness of such action on the part of the public in the mass protests that flooded Congress when the House emasculated the veterans' housing bill and torpedoed the OPA.

Only the other day, in response to this outpouring of public sentiment, the House restored the housing subsidies which President Truman described as the heart of the veterans' housing program. Protest over the crippling amendments to OPA has been even more vigorous, and I can assure you that many House Members who voted for the amendments will do an about-face when the revised bill comes over from the Senate.

The other remedy for the problem of Democrats who vote the Republican way will, I am confident, be taken care of by the people of the South, whence most of the dissident Democrats come. When that area gets rid of the poll tax and the white primaries, and when southern labor organizes, it will be curtains for the Claghorns. There are many signs that the day is not too far off.

The answer to the question of what the major parties offer the people—organized and unorganized—will be plain to anyone who examines the programs of the two parties.

On the one hand is President Truman's program for maximum employment, full production, high wages and high purchasing power, broadened social security, health insurance, price control to protect the consumer as long as danger of inflation exists, and houses for homeless Americans.

On the other hand is the program of the Republican Party, containing nothing specific, and riddled with condemnation and carping criticisms signifying nothing but a desire to return to the so-called normalcy of the pre-Roosevelt era.

The people were given the same alternative in 1936, 1940, and 1944, and knew how to choose for their own advantage. I am confident that history will repeat itself in 1946.

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER J. RESA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. RESA. Mr. Speaker, the strike of the coal miners has brought to the desks of Congressmen floods of letters, telegrams, and postal cards dealing with the subject.

The most disturbing fact concerning these communications is that they clearly indicate a hasty willingness to accept as a remedy for the present economic difficulties of the country a course of action the unavoidable consequences of which have been given no consideration whatsoever.

The substance of the demands now made upon Congress can be stated in the words of an editorial published in the Sunday Star of Washington, D. C., on May 12. Speaking of the need of a remedy for the existing situation that newspaper editorially said:

> It does call, however, for legislation which will balance power with responsibility and which will reaffirm and reestablish the principle that the promotion of the national welfare is the primary concern of Congress and that this national welfare must take precedence over the interests or whims of any individual or minority group.

It is one of the principles of American freedom that if a man has something you want and he will not give it to you, you have to pay him his price or go without it.

What is meant by the doctrine that the national welfare must take precedence over the interests of any individual and any minority group? So far as the statement in the quoted editorial is relevant to the present situation it means that the national welfare must take precedence over the rights of any individual and any minority group, since in striking the coal miners are within their rights. Is this not precisely the basis of communism? Is there any liberty of an American citizen which it does not sweep aside?

The National Association of Manufacturers and many other representatives of industry and business have been telling Congress and the Nation that the only way to escape the national ruin which inflation would bring upon us is to increase production, and that the only way to get increased production is to do away with price controls and let industry and business enjoy higher prices. This means that if industry and business do not get what they want they will refuse to make and sell goods urgently needed by the American people. The vast extent to which goods which the American people urgently need are being withheld from the market until better prices can be obtained is well known. This is the American way. America is free. We have never been told that in the interest of the national welfare the Government has the power to compel industry and business to make and sell goods at a loss. Their right to refuse to make or sell goods at prices they consider too low has always been conceded. It is not relevant that at the present time price control by the Government is in effect. The relevant fact is that the right of industry and business to refuse to make and sell goods is not only insisted upon by industry and business but is conceded by the Government and by the people.

The present demands pouring into Washington are caused by a shortage of coal. This shortage exists because coal miners are refusing to work in the mines. They are refusing to work because they are not satisfied with what they receive

for their labor nor with the conditions under which that labor has to be performed. I think everyone possessed of his senses will concede that it is not in the power of Congress to enact any law to force these miners to work in the mines if they do not choose to do so. The lack of legislative power to outlaw the refusal of the miners to work in the mines is as undeniable the lack of legislative power to compel industry and business to make and sell goods at a loss. This is true under our Constitution even if the exercise of the freedom of refusal causes loss and inconvenience to 140,000,000 people. The hard reality of the situation is that if freedom of refusal is taken from one group of American citizens it will prove to be impossible to permit it to any other.

The coal operators could have ended the strike in five minutes by granting the demands of the miners. This they refused to do. In a free country they had a perfect right to refuse. The miners could have ended the strike in 5 minutes by withdrawing their demands. This they refused to do. In a free country they had a perfect right to refuse. In struggles of this kind we have always relied upon economic factors to force negotiation of a compromise. When a work stoppage reaches a point where the worker cannot afford a further loss of wages and the employer seeks to avoid a further loss of profits, these economic factors produce some kind of agreement. In this case economic factors have not yet produced that result.

We should make no mistake about the ultimate consequences of the kind of governmental interference for which there is at present a widespread demand. It would be utter folly to fail to recognize the fact that this interference would destroy a status in which the problem is governed by economic factors and create a new status in which the factors governing it will be political.

Once this matter has been subjected to control by political factors pressure for further governmental action to deal with the consequences will not be lacking. If the economic power of labor to raise its income up to the level of the cost of living is placed under restraint by the Government there will be a demand that the Government also exercise its power to bring the cost of living down to the level of labor's income. At this point the full impact of the replacement of economic by political factors will be felt. The next step will be the regulation of prices so that the controlled income of regimented labor will provide the things necessary to livelihood. Following the regulation of prices the next step will be the regulation of costs because to a large extent they determine prices. Part of the regulation of costs will be regulation of executive salaries as well as the regulation of wages. Rate of production will be found to have a bearing on prices and it will be regulated. Adequacy of manpower is important to rate of production and in order to obtain it working conditions will be regulated. Having exercised control of the income and working conditions of labor—and we must bear in mind that the problem will have become political rather than economic—the Government will find it necessary to regulate the income and working conditions of everybody else. The rush to state socialism will be rapid if hotheadedness and hysteria drive us to take the first step.

There are other phases also of the present situation which cannot receive proper consideration from people who think about them while they are hitting the ceiling and writing hotheaded letters on the way down.

Under the Constitution of the United States a man may demand as the price of his labor any lawful recompense that he thinks he ought to get. He can insist that his employer present him with a fuchsia fedora every Easter and refuse to work if he doesn't get it. He can also demand for his labor that he be given a certain number of dollars at stipulated intervals. Or he can demand that some of the dollars which pay for his labor be turned over to him by his employer and that the remaining dollars be paid into a welfare fund from which he expects to derive certain benefits. In fact, he can demand the latter even if he doesn't expect to derive any benefits from the fund. To call this portion of the worker's earnings a tax on production, or a sales tax, or any other kind of tax is clear evidence of excited thinking.

There is considerable outcry against what is termed the power of one man to bring our economy to a standstill. Without the backing of more than 400,000 coal miners, John L. Lewis probably would not be able to get his name into the newspapers. We are not confronted by the power of one man. We are confronted by the economic power of more than 400,000 Americans who selected John L. Lewis to be their leader. No one in possession of his senses will say they had no right to choose him.

Even to say that the present economic crisis arises from the exercise of their economic power by more than 400,000 coal miners is not a correct statement. Our difficulties arise in part from the existence of pay and work conditions which these coal miners regard as unendurable, and to some extent from traditional grievances and disagreements which provide the background against which they view their present situation. The idea that our entire economy is brought to a standstill by one man—John L. Lewis—is simply another product of excited thinking.

It is indicative of the excited state of the public mind, and to a large extent of the press, that emphatic demands are being made for legislation which, if enacted, would not have any relation whatsoever to the present difficulty. The coal strike is not in violation of a contract. It does not present the issue of the closed shop. It is not concerned with any jurisdictional dispute or secondary boycott. There is no illegal possession of or interference with an employer's property. There is no violation of any existing law.

In some quarters excitement has reached a pitch which finds its expression in more general demands. Cries of "Curb John L. Lewis," "We demand effective and quick congressional action," "Settle coal strike immediately," "Challenge to American people must not be ignored," "Congress is permitting Lewis to tyrannize our country," "Halt Lewis in his conspiracy," "Who is running America?" "How long will Congress countenance defiance of public welfare?" "End strike of John L. Lewis," "Congress must end the present outrage," are typical expressions on the lips of the public and in the pages of the press.

The coal mines are private property. The operation of them is a private business. They are operated for private profit. If the Government curbs the economic power of the employees of these private enterprises, will the benefits of its action flow to the owners and operators of the mines or to the public? When the present crisis has subsided, the people will want to know. They will then be as much interested in the price of coal as they are now in the mining of it. The same angry pressure for restraints upon the miners now will demand restraints upon the owners and operators then. The public interest having justified interference in the first instance will force it in the second.

If Congress hesitates to respond to hysterical demands that it take a step in the direction of state socialism, its hesitancy is not due to ignorance or indifference. It is not due to fear or political favoritism. It is due to a deep and responsible understanding of what the situation actually involves.

This country cannot cease to be free for any citizen or group of citizens and remain free for any other. There is no escaping the certainty that the question with which the present economic crisis confronts the American people is whether they intend to remain free. Those of us who have been waiting for the day when the end of the war emergency would bring an end of emergency regulations cannot but view with alarm the current impetuous insistence upon what will prove to be eternal regimentation.

Let not the people and let not Congress be blind. Whatever action is taken in this crisis must not be taken in ignorance of its significance or of its consequences.

OPA Starves the Starving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, those who oppose the private enterprise system are violently opposed to profits. Socialists and communists are the enemies of farm profits or industrial profits because profits are the life blood of free enterprise.

The OPA, as operated, is destroying free enterprise; it operates to this end by regulations that destroy all the incentives and inducement to progress and economic growth. The OPA officials, especially those operating behind the scenes, will yield to no argument that seeks to save private enterprise from stagnation and ultimate ruin. The fact

that only through private enterprise, whether it be in industry or in the realm of agriculture, can the starving be fed makes no appeal to the foes of free enterprise wherever the prospect of profits enters the picture. Let me illustrate the extent to which the OPA officials have gone to prevent the processing at a profit of the products of the farm when such products are desperately needed as food in our domestic economy and to meet the requirements of a famine-stricken world.

A large area in the counties I have the honor to represent is devoted to vineyards, where the chief variety of grape raised is the Concord. There is manufactured from this variety of grape either grape juice or jellies and jams. Jellies and jams have a high food value and at the present time should be made available as a substitute for fats of which the Nation and the world are in desperate need. To make 300,000 gallons of raw grape juice, now stored in tanks in my district, immediately available for food I appealed to the OPA for an allocation of sugar to process this juice into 233,000 cases of jelly and jams for emergency food because of its high nutritional value. One pound jar of jam or marmalade contains a food energy of 1,307 calories, a 1-pound jar of jelly has a food energy of 1,184 calories, fresh grapes have a food energy of 325 per pound, soft drinks—145 calories. The food value of 300,000 gallons of Concord grape juice processed into 233,000 cases of jam or marmalade, each containing 24 1-pound jars is equal to 7,308,744,000 calories of food energy. Allowing 2,900 calories per day per person, which is the amount Americans, the British, Canadians, Australians, are now consuming on the average each day, the 233,000 cases of jam or marmalade would feed 2,520,255 persons for 1 day. Every day counts in a starving world, except under OPA regulations and edicts. If the 300,000 gallons of grape juice were to be processed into 233,000 cases of jelly equal to 6,620,928,000 calories, the food energy would feed 5,626,628 persons at the average of 2,200 calories per person a day, which is the minimum for a healthy human being per day.

The contention of the OPA is that it is far better to let people starve than to permit legitimate enterprise to profit. The request for an allocation of sugar sufficient to enable the farmers, through their own cooperative processing plant, to furnish food instead of a beverage is dismissed by the OPA with the subtle sentence:

Although it is probable that the market for jams and jellies is somewhat more profitable than the market for grape juice, we are advised that there exists a ready market for grape juice at the present time.

The possible profits to the farmers is what irks the OPA. We hear much from OPA about the critical shortages of sugar, but those who wish to violate the law can obtain sugar in practically any quantity from the black market. The OPA is not interested in food for the starving people, but it is interested in starving free enterprise by preventing profits upon which it alone can survive. This method of destroying free enterprise leads to only one destination, and that is state socialism. It is the road which other nations have traveled to their destruction.

A great author and student of revolutions reminds those who yield to the propaganda which seeks to destroy free enterprise that while—

Democracy is a clumsy, awkward thing, and capitalism is too often a game of chance in which millions lose and win. Yet, with all this and much more it is strange in the twentieth century the revolution triumphant should not have known that those areas which have permitted democracy and capitalism to bear their fruit have given to the people of high and low degree the highest standard of living ever known to the inhabitants of this earth.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD the memorandum filed April 22, 1946, with George A. Dice, Director, Sugar Rationing Division, OPA; also his reply:

APRIL 22, 1946.

Memorandum to: George A. Dice, Director, Sugar Rationing Division, OPA.

From: Hon. DANIEL A. REED, Representative, New York State.

I wish to bring to your attention a situation in western New York, particularly Chautauqua County, which I have the honor to represent in Congress.

One of the main activities in northern Chautauqua County is the growing of Concord grapes the product of which is made into either grape juice or jellies and jams. The war years have been very difficult ones for the farmers, due to short crops in some instances, and in others a shortage of labor, the high cost of labor, and the increasing cost of producing a ton of grapes. The result of all of these factors over a period of years has caused a deterioration of vineyards because of the lack of attention which ought to be given to the vines if they are to produce at a maximum.

Rather recently the farmers have organized inter-cooperatives with the hope and expectation of getting a better price for grapes through their manufacture into jellies and jams. The investment made by the farmers in the cooperative enterprises has been large, and it is of the utmost importance to the economy of that fruit-growing area that the farmers do not lose their investment in the huge plants now operated by them as cooperatives. Their investment can only be saved by a fair price for the products of their vineyards.

It is utterly impossible to make jellies and jams without an adequate supply of sugar, and without a supply of sugar the jellies and jams now so extensively used to relieve the butter shortage would be lost. This would be most unfortunate now that it is thoroughly established that dairy herds are being slaughtered because of the lack of feed, and the high cost of producing butter.

I wish to call attention to the fact that there are at least 300,000 gallons of grape juice in the processing plants in western New York, all of which grape juice belongs to the growers. This amount of grape juice, when processed, will make 233,000 cases of jelly for emergency food because of its high nutritional value.

I may add that this entire amount of 300,000 gallons of grape juice is stored in tanks, and these tanks have to be emptied and the product processed in order to save the fall crop of 1946. This is a matter that cannot wait, without the present 300,000 gallons of grape juice, as well as the 1946 fall crop, being lost. Grapes are highly perishable, and have to be handled with promptness and dispatch—otherwise the loss to the farmers will be disastrous. Moreover, this amount of food at a time like this must not be sacrificed.

The jellies made from the grape juice are put up in 1-pound jars—also the jams and marmalade. A 1-pound jar of jam or marmalade contains a food energy of 1,307 calories; a 1-pound jar of jelly has a food energy of 1,184 calories; fresh grapes have a food energy of 325 per pound; soft drinks, 145 calories.

When I say that the tanks must be emptied without delay I know from my own experience as a grape grower that this is true, and I also have the word of Mr. Hall Clothier, president of the National Grape Co-op.

I know that 1,500 tons of sugar are desperately needed for the reasons above stated, and I am sure that it is far more important to the farmers and to the consumers of food to have sugar allocated for the preservation of grape juice for food purposes than to allocate large amounts of sugar to soft drink concerns at this time of a great world-wide food famine.

I have no quarrel with any of the soft drink establishments, but really, the allocation of 50,000,000 pounds of sugar for one soft drink company alone could hardly be justified in the light of the plight of the fruit growers who need only a limited amount of sugar in order to place upon the market almost $1,000,000 worth of highly concentrated food. I hope that the OPA will realize the difference between sugar going into soft drinks when compared to the food value of 1 pound of jam or marmalade, which contains a food energy of 1,307 calories.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1946.

The Honorable DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REED: Reference is made to your memoranda of April 22, 1946, regarding the request of grape producers in western New York State for the issuance of sufficient sugar to process existing storage stocks of grape juice into jelly.

This problem has been carefully studied by this office and has been discussed with representatives of the Department of Agriculture. On the basis of the discussions held, it appears that the juice can be prepared for sale as grape juice and that its production into jelly is not necessary as a means of avoiding loss or spoilage. Although it is probable that the market for jams and jellies is somewhat more profitable than the market for grape juice, we are advised that there exists a ready market for grape juice at the present time. In the light of the present and prospective short sugar supply, therefore, it does not appear desirable that additional sugar be provided for the production of this product into jelly.

As I believe I told you on the occasion of our conference in my office, we receive a considerable number of applications for the establishment of new businesses for the production of preserves, as well as many other products. In view of the extent to which established industrial users of sugar are curtailed under the rationing program, it would obviously be unfair to curtail supplies available to such users still further, in order to enable new producers to go into operation. We feel very definitely that we would not be justified in making an exception to our general rule in the case of the New York Cooperative Association, particularly since no question of spoilage on the product involved exists.

In your memorandum you raised the question as to the propriety of issuance of large amounts of sugar for the manufacture of soft drinks, while production of such products as jams and jellies are restricted. In this connection, I believe it is appropriate to point out that total use of sugar for the production of jams and jellies during 1946 will probably exceed 120 percent of the quantity used for that purpose in 1941. On the

other hand, allotments to soft-drink manufacturers are limited to 60 percent of the sugar which they used in 1941. The higher figure for the jam and jelly industry results from a permitted increase in production of these products during 1944 and the subsequent use of the 1944 production level as a base. Therefore, even though present allotments are at 55 percent of the base use of sugar for this industry, actual total use is considerably higher. In the case of the soft-drink industry, although some adjustments have been made in individual cases for the relief of demonstrable hardship, total use of sugar by that industry in relation to 1941 use is not substantially higher than the 60 percent ration level would indicate.

I appreciate very much your interest in this and other rationing matters and regret that we must deny the request for sugar for processing of jams and jellies in this case. I believe, however, that in the interest of fair distribution such denial is proper.

Sincerely,

GEORGE A. DICE,
Director, Sugar Rationing Division.

Industrial War or Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News of May 14, 1946:

INDUSTRIAL WAR OR PEACE?

It is easily foreseeable that if Lewis attains his aim of collecting some $60,000,000 a year by a royalty of 10 cents a ton on coal and of raising miners' wages in accordance with the 18½ cents pattern for other industries—or more than that, and the indications are that he will demand more when he gets around to that little item—then the battle of the bulge which Bowles of OPA has been fighting for the consumer will be lost and inflation will be unleashed upon the consuming public. This is not what other labor leaders say they want and it is not what the public wants, but it is apparently what Lewis wants.

It is furthermore obvious that the economy of the United States can not go on indefinitely taking the punishment from strikes in essential industries and transportation that it has taken since the war ended and still retain anything like its former efficiency in production and distribution.

The industrial disputes which have shaken the country are battles between immense aggregations of capital and labor. These clashes are not governed by law or reasonableness; they are in the realm of power and irresponsibility. Settlement is not made on the basis of right but of force; the side which can muster the preponderance of power wins, usually after a protracted struggle; the loser is the public, of which the workman as consumer is an important part.

Is there any practical way to shift these dangeous disputes from the field of force to that of reasonableness and meantime keep the economy going full speed ahead? If there is we should earnestly seek for it and promptly adopt it. The Daily News has thought for some time that there is such a way and that it lies in compulsory arbitration.

Compulsory arbitration may not be the ideal procedure in a free economy in which the rugged individualism of corporations and unions should theoretically be privileged to fight out their disputes to the bitter end. But where continued intransigence and irresponsibility make it likely that the end is the end of the national economy, then in self-defense that economy must curtail the freedom of its members by resort to expedients to enforce agreement and secure industrial peace. There is nothing novel or frightening in this; it is the way in which law arises and grows.

Compulsory arbitration occurs when both sides agree beforehand to appoint arbitrators and be bound by their decision on disputes which may arise in certain fields. Usually those arbitrators who represent the parties choose one or more disinterested colleagues, the decision being by majority vote. Fairer results can be arrived at in this way than by a long-drawn-out tug of war, and certainly it is to the public interest that this be done. Congress, we believe, has the power to induce unions and corporations to resort to the practice of compulsory arbitration on pain of losing certain statutory privileges if they do not, and we think that it should pass appropriate legislation to achieve that end.

The Strike Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER J. RESA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. RESA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I call attention to an article dealing with the strike problem, written by Mr. Howard Vincent O'Brien and published in a recent issue of the Chicago Daily News. The contrast which it offers to the heated and superficial treatment which the present economic crisis has received at the hands of a large segment of the press should afford welcome relief to those who have not permitted their distress in the existing situation to unsettle their deep concern for the permanence of the institutions of American freedom. The article is as follows:

HAVE WE ALREADY COLLAPSED

(By Howard Vincent O'Brien)

Among the many unpleasant notions swimming around in my cranium, like guppies in a fish bowl, is the remark of somebody that the Roman Empire had fallen 400 years before any Roman knew it.

Is it possible that what we have been taught to call our "civilization" has really burst out at the seams? Has the curtain really been rung down?

The world looks more and more like a lunatic asylum, run by its inmates. And nobody seems to have the slightest idea what to do about it.

Everybody screams for "leadership"; but I am yet to hear anyone who has any clear notion of just what a leader could or ought to do.

Among the fatter witted of the Nation's legislators, there are several enthusiasts who believe that the way to end strikes is to abolish the right to strike. This, of course, is thoroughly sound reasoning. If you jail strikers, or hang them, you certainly reduce the number and violence of strikes. Hitler proved this. There was no "labor trouble" in Germany.

There are still many Americans, however, who believe that the curative powers of Fascism are more to be feared than any disease to which they might be applied.

Much breath is being wasted and much ink spilled in diagnosis of what is wrong with the scheme of things. But they all boil down to the distressing fact that nobody knows.

Our best minds spin like pinwheels, thinking up ingeniously idiotic alternatives for our scrambling in the woods for acorns.

One of the best examples of this grandiose nonsense is the proposal to construe any strike which seriously hampers production as an insurrection against the state, i. e., high treason. This conveniently overlooks the fact that in our complex economy, any strike can be a disaster. Imagine what our common life would be if only the dentists laid down their tools.

Our trouble is that we've split into groups, each trying to get on at the expense of the others. And so, dimly, it appears to me that the problem is really one of morals. It follows that we shall escape from a new dark age only if we can match our skill in organization with a lively sense of spiritual responsibility in its use.

And this leads me to report a coincidence.

In San Francisco I saw an article by Joseph Henry Jackson about a book by Joshua Loth Liebman, Peace of Mind. He ventured the prediction that this would prove to be one of the really important books of our time.

I made a note to get it—but didn't. Then yesterday I was in the shop of Max Siegel, the bookseller. "Here," he said, "is a book that may interest you."

It was Peace of Mind.

Well, I have now read 30 pages of it, and I agree with Mr. Jackson's estimate. It will help many, and be resented by others, for it is a bold effort to reconcile psychology with religion—a service unwelcome to reactionaries of both sides.

The Good Samaritan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the fall of 1917 I had occasion to be in the war zone in Europe. A portion of Belgium was reduced to rubble. Far removed from any cities some of our men one day came to a small dugout serving as the temporary home of an old lady. Our men noticed that there was a picture of Herbert Hoover fastened to one of the walls of this dilapidated hovel. They asked the old lady why she had that picture, and her reply was "I don't know who he is, except his name, but I received word from him that I would get bread every day, and every day I have received the bread. That's why I have his picture on the wall."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article entitled "These Days" by Mr. George E. Sokolsky, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of May 19, 1946:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

It ought to mean something to an American that his country is asking for no booty. Maybe it is sentimentality. Maybe it would be good business to strip the countries we

occupy, to destroy the economy of the people, to move out foodstuffs.

But we do not do that.

The Morgenthau plan proposed that we should, at any rate, for Germany, reduce that country to the lowest standards of living in Europe.

But we have not done that even in our zone in Germany. We have not done it in Japan. We have not done it anywhere.

We fight but we do not steal. Ghengis Khan is not our model. We, the capitalists, continue to give. Maybe it is smarter to take than to give, but it goes against our grain to be that smart.

We cannot pick the bones of starving people, even if those people were our opponents in war. We defeat but we do not conquer; we can deliver a knock-out blow and shake hands afterward.

And it leads to the phenomenon of Herbert Hoover. On August 10 he will be 72 years old. He has just circumnavigated the earth in an Army transport plane.

He was called to serve, and, age notwithstanding, he entered upon a mission of love and service.

He has visited every country in Europe and Asia where children starve and he has brought the hope of a slice of bread and a bowl of soup.

Maybe he only offered a hope—but that is more than these big-eyed hungry infants dared to dream possible.

And having brought back facts and figures, he enters upon another mission and ordeal. He becomes the beggar, the universal beggar. He begs of us a slight forbearance, a slight reduction of waste, a slight sacrifice of a surfeited appetite.

And then again, he will fly through the air to South American countries to beg them to save the descendants of their European forebears from starvation.

He will succeed in South America. He will succeed in the Argentine.

For Hoover employs no authority but pity, no power but charity, no claim but love. And no civilized person can resist pity, charity, and love.

These missions of Herbert Hoover may shorten his days. He comes of a Quaker breed that never believed war right; yet always went to war to serve its victims.

The Quaker could not withhold a bread card from a woman or child who happened to be born in the wrong country at the wrong time, nor could he ask a babe the nature of its political affiliations.

The Quaker gives; he does not mix politics and charity. He does not ask a return.

And so, Herbert Hoover, American, spends his old age fighting death by starvation. What a blessed old age for any man. What a blessing is a country that in a few months forgets hatred and feeds its enemies.

Maybe all this is sentimental emotionalism to the materialistic dialectician who reasons only from scientific facts, but we Americans are not scientific. We are traditionalists—and our traditions are based upon such expressions of the human spirit as the Ten Commandments, the Psalms, the struggles of Job with truth, the Beatitudes of Jesus Christ.

Who can say that we are wrong? Certainly not the little boy who is puzzled by the pangs of a gnawing hunger, by the soft bones of rickets, and by the parched mouth of bitterness.

That child cannot understand that he is a warring power and that the peace-loving nations are taking it out on him. Nor can he understand that democracy demands that he is to live his years with a warped brain and a twisted soul.

Nor can any American, really. If Herbert Hoover has accomplished nothing else that is noteworthy in his long life, this he has done: He has, in the years when his head is gray and the bones grow weary, when most men retire to peace and reminiscence, become to all who are hungry and helpless the American messenger of the God of pity, charity, and love. America's answer to the cry of the hungry is still, Love thy neighbor—even thy enemy—as thyself.

How UNRRA Is Worked in the Balkans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I welcome the opportunity of giving the people of the United States a true picture of how United Nations relief is used to carry out the political and economic plans of totalitarian dictatorship in the Balkans, as demonstrated in the following account of UNRRA manipulations in Yugoslavia under the iron hand of Marshal Tito, titled "This Changing World" by Constantine Brown, recently appearing in the Washington Evening Star:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

The expenditures of UNRRA for Yugoslavia during 1945 and 1946 amount to $450,000,000, a sum representing nearly the entire national income of that country in 1938, the last normal peacetime year. Yugoslavia's import trade in the same year represented only one-sixth the amount which UNRRA is shipping in over a 2-year period.

There would be no criticism of this lavish expenditure if the supplies were distributed fairly and would answer the purpose for which Congress has appropriated large sums for the relief of the suffering people and the rehabilitation of the country's economic life.

But from all accounts, many of which exist in the files of the State Department and are cataloged as "confidential," the Yugoslavian people themselves are deriving little benefit from the Good Samaritan actions of the American people. The vast quantities of food and raw materials are being used by the government, which exercises a complete though indirect control over them. Maj. Gen. M. A. Sergeichik, the former quartermaster general of the Red Army in Iran, is now director of UNRRA in Yugoslavia and as such supervises the sale and distribution of the supplies.

As an example of how it works, 54,000 long tons of sugar have been transported to Yugoslavia. The sugar is being sold on the so-called black market—which is authorized by the Government—at a price equivalent to $1.25 a pound. This figure has been fixed by the Ministry of Supplies, which controls prices in that country.

In the last few weeks six American and three British high-ranking UNRRA officials in Yugoslavia have resigned, despite the alluring pay and other advantages, as a protest against the manner in which supplies are being used.

When it was decided that Yugoslavia would receive assistance from UNRRA its former director, Herbert Lehman, nominated a Britisher as regional director. This nomination was vetoed by Marshal Tito. Mr. Lehman then proposed an American, C. B. Brock, who before the war had large interests in Yugoslavia. He also was rejected. Finally Mr. Lehman agreed to appoint General Sergeichik.

As soon as Marshal Tito gave his unrestricted approval to the appointment of the Red Army officer, a staff of about 550 British and American officials gathered at Bari, Italy, to cross the Adriatic and start their supervisory and control work. The Yugoslav Government decided that the number was too large and refused to grant the necessary visas. Eventually a compromise was reached whereby the total was reduced to 150.

The Americans and the British soon discovered that their job was more difficult than they had anticipated. At first they had difficulty obtaining travel permits within the country. The Yugoslav authorities were courteous whenever an UNRRA official asked for internal passports, but the OZNA (the secret police patterned after the Soviet NKVD) was always slow in granting them.

For instance, the British official in charge of the rehabilitation of the mining industry received requests for the tools and dynamite needed for the mines. He demanded that he be permitted to go and see for himself the quantity required, but he was never allowed to do so. Finally, he resigned in disgust and General Sergeichik immediately named a loyal Soviet citizen to the position.

The sale of UNRRA supplies by the recipient government is not against the provisions of the laws which govern that organization. But they were not supposed to serve as sources of revenue, which according to the reports received by the American Government has been the case in Yugoslavia.

The Yugoslav Government, which had an empty treasury after the collapse of the Nazis, is now trying to refill it in any way possible. Harsh methods have been taken, such as arbitrary taxation and change of the currency whereby all citizens have had to turn in their old money for the new and have received only $98 regardless of their wealth in the past. The balance is deposited in state banks and the citizens are permitted to withdraw only the equivalent of $20 a month.

These devices are not sufficient, because the Yugoslav budget provides no less than 54 percent of the revenue for national defense. In order to replenish the empty treasury much of the salable UNRRA supplies are being sold and the sums realized are credited to the account of the government. Regional Director Sergeichik, who is regarded by all as an able administrator, is cooperating with the Tito government and allows such transactions.

UNRRA's American and British officials are powerless. Some who are sympathetic with the Communist doctrines and Tito's totalitarian regime are not opposed to departing from the spirit of the laws governing UNRRA. Others who take their jobs seriously have already resigned, refusing to be a party to irregularities which have begun to come out in the open.

Long Beach Chamber of Commerce Issues Recent and Significant Booklet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1946

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent having been granted me so to do,

I take pleasure in introducing for the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the significant data hereinafter set forth as published by the Long Beach Chamber of Commerce in my own city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif. This should prove valuable statistical data for readers because of facts and figures set forth therein:

POPULATION AND GROWTH

Long Beach is the second largest city in Los Angeles County, the fifth city in the State of California, and the forty-sixth city in size in the United States. Concentrated within a radius of 200 miles of Long Beach, which area will encompass most of the section generally designated as southern California, 30.2 percent of the population of the 11 Western States is conveniently centralized.

Fifty-five years of population growth

Since 1920, the western market (11 Western States), has increased in population at twice the national rate and 50 percent of this growth has been in southern California.

Year	City of Long Beach	14 southern California counties	State of California	11 Western States
1890	564	257,352	1,213,398	3,102,269
1900	2,252	372,118	1,485,053	4,091,349
1910	18,809	869,094	2,377,549	6,825,821
1920	55,593	1,512,839	3,426,861	8,902,972
1930	142,032	3,155,720	5,677,251	11,896,222
1940	164,271	3,992,997	6,907,387	13,808,803
1946 (special Federal census)	242,081	4,940,188	8,452,000	16,351,595
Percent of growth	42,822	1,819.6	596.6	427.1

Even more significant, however, from the standpoint of economy in marketing is the fact that this city is the natural center of a widely recognized, highly prized trading area, containing over a million persons, within a radius of 15 miles of a point lying midway between the harbor and the airport. Within this compact 15-mile radius 23.7 percent of the total population of southern California resides. By increasing the radius to 30 miles from Long Beach, sales contacts can be made with over 75 percent of the people in southern California.

Population estimates

Incorporated city of Long Beach	242,081
Long Beach metropolitan area (including immediately adjacent sections)	304,322
Long Beach and suburban area (within a radius of 10 miles)	573,847
Long Beach market area (within a radius of 15 miles; comprises 23.7 percent of the population of southern California)	1,160,687
Los Angeles County (comprises 69.7 percent of the population of southern California; Long Beach is about 20 miles from downtown Los Angeles)	3,447,669
Southern California (14 southern counties—almost entirely encompassed within a radius of 200 miles of Long Beach; comprises 58.4 percent of the population of California and 30.2 percent of that in the 11 Western States)	4,940,188
State of California (comprises 51.7 percent of the population in the 11 Western States)	8,452,000
11 Western States (comprises 11.9 percent of the population of the United States)	16,351,595
Total United States	137,308,000

Western buying power[1]

[Estimates are shown in thousands of dollars]

	City of Long Beach	Los Angeles County	Southern California (14 counties)	State of California	11 Western States	Total United States
Estimated retail sales:						
Total dollars	233,504	2,290,441	3,253,387	5,860,485	10,632,070	68,850,695
Percent of southern California	6.963	68.302	100.0			
Percent of California State	3.99	39.08	57.21	100.0		
Percent of 11 Western States	2.196	21.543	31.540	55.121	100.0	
Percent of total United States	.399	3.327	4.871	8.511	15.297	100.0
Principal commodities groups:						
Food	50,281	591,081	883,733	1,580,967	2,763,432	18,742,402
General merchandise	30,515	353,240	472,371	820,310	1,589,268	10,897,690
Lumber—building materials hardware	8,022	97,877	163,923	297,574	543,314	3,566,927
Drug-store sales	8,207	92,507	134,625	231,376	413,208	2,864,412
Estimated wholesale sales	76,518			8,317,153	13,378,451	103,006,846
Estimated effective buying income:						
Total dollars	574,878	5,443,037	7,567,455	13,100,857	22,178,135	148,415,957
Percent of southern California	7.597	71.927	100.0			
Percent of California State	4.39	41.560	57.76	100.0		
Percent of 11 Western States	2.592	24.542	34.121	59.071	100.0	
Percent of total United States	.387	3.667	5.095	8.206	14.944	100.0

[1] Based on calculations derived from estimates appearing in the 1945 Annual Edition of Sales Management.

QUALITY OF MARKET

For every year since 1936 the Pacific States have enjoyed the highest quality market index of any section in the United States. The margin of lead has been both wide and continuous—and, for the past 5 years (except for the year 1941, when it was rated third), Long Beach has been the first city in the United States in per capita effective buying income.

LONG BEACH LEADS THE NATION IN PER CAPITA BUYING POWER

Long Beach has had the highest per capita buying income of any city over 100,000 population in the United States of America for the years 1940, 1942, 1943, and 1944—and was no worse than third in 1941.

1944 effective buying power

Long Beach	$2,555
California	1,662
Nation	1,166

Comparison of per capita effective buying income of 20 top-ranking cities in the United States

[Source of data—1945 Annual Edition of Sales Management]

20 top-ranking cities in the United States	Per capita effective buying income	Ranking
Long Beach, Calif.	$2,555	First.
San Francisco, Calif.	2,333	Second.
Seattle, Wash.	2,282	Third.
Sacramento, Calif.	2,255	Fourth.
Hartford, Conn.	2,235	Fifth.
Pasadena, Calif.	2,222	Sixth.
Spokane, Wash.	2,196	Seventh.
Oakland, Calif.	2,098	Eighth.
Newark, N. J.	2,024	Ninth.
Indianapolis, Ind.	2,015	Tenth.
San Diego, Calif.	2,000	Eleventh.
Tacoma, Wash.	1,960	Twelfth.
Portland, Oreg.	1,950	Thirteenth.
Paterson, N. J.	1,934	Fourteenth.
Omaha, Nebr.	1,923	Fifteenth.
Los Angeles, Calif.	1,922	Sixteenth.
Washington, D. C.	1,899	Seventeenth.
Providence, R. I.	1,898	Eighteenth.
Atlantic City, N. J.	1,892	Nineteenth.
Des Moines, Iowa	1,887	Twentieth.

LABOR SUPPLY IS AMPLE AND DIVERSIFIED

Population classification

(As of 1940 census)

	Percent
White races:	
Native-born	83
Foreign-born	12
Negro	3
Other races	2

Adult education	*Percent*
4 years or less	6
Grade school	33
High school	44
Better	17
Average years schooling	11

EXISTING PORT FACILITIES

Existing port facilities, briefly outlined below, are conservatively evaluated at nearly $20,000,000 exclusive of the value of its some 8,000 acres of land and extensive investments in oil operating and development units.

1. Twenty modern city-owned deep water berths.
2. Eleven privately-owned deep water berths.
3. Sixteen federally-owned deep water berths.
4. Eighty-five thousand two hundred and eighty linear feet of deep water frontage, including municipal, Federal, and private.
5. Fifteen thousand two hundred linear feet of improved private frontage.
6. Twelve thousand linear feet of improved municipal front.
7. Twenty-three miles of proposed waterfront improvements under the port's comprehensive development plan, both public and private.
8. Four modern municipal transit sheds.
9. Foundations in place or under contract for five additional transit sheds.
10. Approximately 325 acres of new land fills developed by the port in the outer harbor area, in water originally varying in depth from 5 feet to 35 feet.
11. Thirty-four thousand linear feet of paved streets.
12. Four new deep water berths now under construction, totaling 2,500 linear feet of frontage.
13. Approximately 13 miles of municipal railroad trackage, with some 7 additional miles under contract and construction. (The total municipal trackage in the comprehensive plan is in excess of 45 miles.)

The industrial significance and growth of the port of Long Beach are forcibly indicated by annual harbor department tonnage records for the 20-year period 1925–1944, inclusive:

Year	Tons	Value
1935	2,886,830	$55,374,620
1936	2,406,671	52,359,979
1937	2,482,529	61,939,574
1938	2,324,817	43,746,739
1939	3,070,016	86,016,245
1940	2,969,712	71,478,129
1941	3,385,000	103,049,337
1942	2,550,000	123,573,899
1943	3,688,800	128,320,000
1944	4,262,933	123,151,722

OVER $15,000,000 TO BE EXPENDED ON NEW HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS

In order of probable consummation, following is a partial list of contemplated major improvements.

1. Completion of steel and reinforced concrete marginal wharf, 2,600 feet long, at berths 4 to 7, inclusive, of pier A, including tracks, pavement, utilities, and a 160-car capacity railroad storage yard at a cost of $2,250,000.

2. A new, ultra-modern, clear span, steel and reinforced concrete transit shed on berths 3 and 4, 120 by 832 feet, at an estimated cost of $450,000.

3. New transit shed of similar construction at berth 5, pier A, 120 feet clear span by 608 feet in length, at an estimated cost of $330,000.

4. Transit shed at berths 6 and 7, pier A, with 200 feet clear span by 1,120 feet long, estimated to cost $1,036,800. This structure will be the first transit shed on the Pacific coast built to dimensions now considered requisite for best handling the capacity of modern ships.

5. Widening of main access highway into port to accommodate six lanes of traffic, at an estimated cost of $90,700.

6. Creation of further land fills at piers A and E at costs estimated up to $7,000,000.

7. A modern warehouse at rear of berth 5, pier A, approximately 90 by 750 feet in area, at a probable cost of $300,000.

8. Completion of the $1,312,000, 140,000 square foot transit shed at pier 2, berths 52 to 54, inclusive, at an estimated cost of $562,000.

9. Preliminary development of victory pier for municipal operation, at an estimated cost of $207,400. This work will be followed by the construction of modern cold storage facilities on victory pier.

UNITED STATES NAVY OPERATIONS

One of the Nation's major naval bases is permanently located at Long Beach. Included among its some 16 activities are the provision of home anchorage for the Pacific Fleet, the United States Naval Shipyard at Terminal Island, a large net and ammunition depot, a naval supply depot, a modern Navy hospital.

Navy facilities at this location represent an investment of about $180,000,000. At the present time the total Navy pay roll is approximately $90,000,000 per year, divided about $40,000,000 to civilian workers and $50,000,000 to service personnel. This does not include the fleet pay roll, which at present varies from about $100,000,000 to as high as $125,000,000 per year, depending upon the number and type of ships based here.

The United States Naval Shipyard on Terminal Island constitutes the largest single industry in this area. This project alone occupies an area of 265 acres. Its facilities include 6 piers, 5 drydocks (2 are floating), and 1,400,000 square feet of space utilized for storage, shops, administration, and recreation. A new mole provides an additional 100 acres for expansion.

PERMANENT ESTABLISHMENT

The United States Naval Shipyard on Terminal Island is a permanent establishment, furnishing drydock and repair service to a large part of the fleet which is permanently based in Long Beach Harbor.

LONG BEACH MUNICIPAL AIRPORT READY FOR INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Strategically located within 15 minutes of Long Beach Harbor and about 30 minutes distant from the Los Angeles industrial district, the ultramodern, municipally owned, Long Beach Airport offers new and unlimited opportunities to firms associated with or requiring service by air transport and air freight facilities.

The airport, known locally as Daugherty Field, is one of the four major air terminals in southern California and is so designed that dual operations of aircraft are practical. It has 5 runways, ranging from 150 by 6,100 to 200 by 7,000 feet, all paved with asphaltic concrete and supplied with connecting taxiways. It has the highest record for open weather of any airport in the State and is used as an alternate bad-weather landing port for all air lines operating in southern California. It is located within 10 minutes by automobile from the business district of Long Beach and less than 45 minutes from downtown Los Angeles.

A few additional highlights of this newest, finest, and most modern airport include an ultramodern administration building and control tower, a ground area of 738 acres (a proposed expansion would increase this to approximately 1,200 acres), modern flush contact runway and range lights, 2,000-foot approach lights for night operation and a modern instrument-landing system.

AVAILABILITY OF RAW MATERIALS

United States Government reports show that the 11 Western States accounted for almost one-fourth of the aggregate value of the Nation's mineral production in 1939.

Of some 100 of the commercially most important metallic and nonmetallic materials produced in this country, one or more of the Western States occupy a leading position in the production of 63 of these, while California leads in the production of 33.

According to prewar estimates by the United States Bureau of Mines, southern California produces one-twelfth of the Nation's crude petroleum. During the war, this area gained prominence as a producer of synthetic rubber. This industry, together with those producing its chemical constituents, such as styrene, offer tremendous advantages from the standpoint of available basic industrial materials.

In 1939 the Western States accounted for 50 percent of the national lumber production and 70 percent of the standing sawtimber reserve. They produce over 40 percent of the hydroelectric power and have 70 percent of the undeveloped potential hydroelectric resources. Over 16 percent of the aggregate value of agricultural products, 50 percent of the domestic wool, and many other materials are produced in the West.

The West possesses large but relatively untapped resources of coal and iron which only recently have become the basis of the first completely integrated steel industry on the Pacific coast. About 850,000 bales of high-grade cotton are grown annually in California, Arizona, and New Mexico, and active steps are being taken toward the establishment of a full-fledged textile industry in southern California.

Supplementing the products of nature available to firms in this area are the manufactured commodities of some 200 southern California industries, 33 of which produced in excess of $5,000,000 each in 1939.

LOCAL POWER RATES ARE AMONG LOWEST IN NATION

The relatively low electric power rates paid by Long Beach manufacturers are best illustrated through comparisons shown in the Federal Power Commission's study of typical electric bills, published in June of 1944, brief excerpts of which follow:

Typical electric bills paid by industrial plants having 500 kilowatt billing demand and 100,000 kilowatt-hours consumption

New York (Manhattan)	$2,346
Detroit, Mich	1,932
Chicago, Ill	1,870
Portland, Maine	1,683
Wilmington, Dela	1,644
New Orleans, La	1,437
Pittsburgh, Pa	1,398
San Francisco, Calif	1,250
Long Beach, Calif	1,018

Estimates, based on the requirements of specific operations, will be provided upon request.

BUILDING CONSTRUCTION

Federal Housing Administration data show all of Los Angeles County construction costs for residential building to be 20 percent lower for the same type of building than in other large centers. Typical factory construction in all of southern California is materially influenced by the equable climate, making possible the building of more plant capacity per dollar of investment than in other sections of the country. For example:

1. Heating systems can be very inexpensive—many plants require no heating—in fact, many industrial operations here are performed wholly out of doors the year around.

2. There is no need for air conditioning except to control delicate processing operations or under conditions where heat and dust are created artificially as the result of methods used in manufacture.

3. Buildings may be designed and built for use of any inexpensive material that will provide protection from wind, sun, and rain. The typical southern California light manufacturing building has light-weight studs, corrugated-iron sides, lots of steel sash windows, and a saw-tooth roof.

4. Office buildings in this area cost 22 percent less to maintain and service in 1944 than the average for all cities in the North Central, New England, and Mid-Atlantic States, according to data compiled by the National Association of Building Owners and Managers.

5. While earthquake design is a factor in all southern California construction, experience indicates that the rigidity which must be engineered into structural members approximates the snow-load and wind-resistance factor used in the East.

A nationally prominent firm of industrial contracting engineers estimates that the increased plant capacity obtained per dollar of investment amounts to 35 percent or more in this area due to the above factors, as compared with other sections of the country.

Another index of significance is the record of general and residential construction activity of the West, which, naturally, has reflected migration to this part of the country.

It is also an interesting fact that there were 60 percent more dwelling units, based on permits issued, built in the State of California during the 4 years 1939 to 1942, inclusive, than in New York State. California was about equal to New York in the prewar year 1939, and exceeded that State in residential construction by 44 percent in 1940.

TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

Adequate and varied transportation facilities available to manufacturers in this area are in keeping with the needs of this rapidly growing marketing center. Transportation service has unquestionably contributed in a large measure to making Los Angeles County the West's largest merchandising center. These facilities include:

1. The combined facilities of the adjoining Long Beach and Los Angeles Harbors connect industry by sea-borne transportation with the domestic and foreign markets of the world. In normal times its commerce is evaluated in excess of a billion dollars annually.

2. The modern, municipally-owned Long Beach Airport, conveniently accessible to the entire Southland, provides transcontinental service by air for both passenger traffic and air cargo; facilities for handling all types of commercial cargo by air are both modern and complete.

3. Three transcontinental railways—the Southern Pacific, Santa Fe, and Union Pacific—connect Long Beach by rail with the East and all parts of the 11 Western States.

4. A scheduled interurban passenger and freight service, between Long Beach and major cities in four counties, is provided by the Pacific Electric Railway.

5. Belt switching service is available in the harbor and industrial areas by the joint facilities of the several line-haul railroads.

6. Bus passenger service to all parts of the city is provided by the Lang Motor Bus Co. Interurban areas are served by the Long Beach Motor Bus Co., Greyhound Lines, and the Pacific Electric Railway.

7. All major transcontinental bus lines operate direct service to and from Long Beach.

8. There are approximately 180 common carrier truck lines serving Los Angeles County and the entire West.

Broadcasting Congressional Proceedings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, in the June 1946 issue of Pic magazine there appears a set of interviews compiled by the well-known magazine writer and newspaper correspondent, Jack H. Pollack, dealing with the subject of my bill to authorize and direct the broadcasting of congressional debates and proceedings. The magazine article contains four statements by well-known citizens. Hon. Nathan Straus, president of radio station WMCA, New York City, and former prominent official of the Roosevelt administration, and myself present our arguments in favor of my bill, whereas Congressman E. C. GATHINGS and Howell G. Evans, prominent furniture manufacturer, of Wisconsin, present arguments against enactment of the bill.

Because I believe the article to be of interest to the Congress and to the country, I am including the same herewith:

SHOULD CONGRESS GO ON THE AIR?

YES

(By Nathan Straus, president of radio station WMCA, New York City)

I have long favored putting Congress on the air. So much so that, while the Pepper-Coffee resolution is pending, we have begun broadcasting over radio station WMCA a weekly Halls of Congress, with actors portraying legislators. Our listeners have enthusiastically praised this program, which proves to me that an even vaster audience would welcome a daily live broadcast of Congress.

I have yet to hear of a valid objection against broadcasting Congress. One common complaint is that privacy of conversation and consultation on the floor of Congress would be impossible. However, a simple switch at each seat would disconnect the microphone of any Member desiring privacy.

Another objection is that only a portion of the session could be broadcast, thereby giving a false impression of the whole. This claim is likewise unsound. The daily newspapers usually print only parts of legislators' speeches. To require that a newspaper print congressional proceedings in their entirety obviously would be absurd. It is equally unreasonable to demand that the value of reporting congressional debate on the airwaves would be impaired because complete sessions could not be broadcast. If transcripts of these proceedings were made, they could be played back at night for those unable to hear them during the day.

Democracy is not strengthened by excluding from the radio legislative debates which affect all our lives. Moreover, why give enemies of the democratic process the chance to shriek that our lawmakers have something to conceal, that they make statements they would prefer not to have us hear? I believe there is no bad thing that is not helped and no good thing that is not improved by letting in the daylight. Public opinion is a great curative force in a democracy.

To broadcast the proceedings of Congress would raise the tone of debate and immeasurably increase public interest in, and understanding of, the processes of government. Radio can perform no greater service than to bring into every American home the deliberations of those who make our laws.

YES

(By Representative JOHN M. COFFEE, Democrat, Congressman from Washington State)

There is no legitimate reason why Congress should not be broadcast. Americans are entitled to a direct pipe line to their lawmakers instead of being compelled to accept the information and interpretation of not always disinterested columnists, commentators, and other self-styled czars of contemporary thought.

I realize a few cynical citizens would choose to put their elected representatives under rather than on the ether. Broadcasting Congress, however, would expose the unfitness of some and strengthen the sincere lawmaker who hides his light under a bushel of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS. I am convinced that if given a chance to listen to their legislators, Congress would soon become the most popular program on the air with housewives following their favorite Senators more closely than their soap operas.

Wide-awake New Zealand has vastly improved the quality of its national legislators since it began broadcasting parliamentary proceedings 10 years ago. The airing of municipal legislative sessions in New York and other American cities put legislators more on their toes and created a large listening public in a very short time.

Together with Senator PEPPER I have introduced a bill to put Congress on the air. The public's reaction to this measure proves that Americans are Congress-conscious today and want to listen to their elected representatives.

The airwaves, after all, are public domain, even though the radio industry sometimes forgets this in its haste to sell its borrowed birthright for a mess of advertising pottage. Of course, there are technical problems in broadcasting Congress. But they are mere details—and often raised by quibblers. Congress and the radio industry have met—and licked—far more difficult problems.

Two centuries ago our forefathers were brought face to face with their public servants in the town meeting. Broadcasting Congress today is merely a logical extension of this democratic idea. A democracy is only effective when all its people participate in it. Putting Congress on the air would give them that opportunity and furnish millions with front-line seats in the critical days ahead.

NO

(By Representative E. C. GATHINGS, Democrat, Congressman from the State of Arkansas)

I do not think it is wise or practical to try and broadcast Congress. It would jeopardize the dignity our National Legislature now possesses. Furthermore, I do not believe the private commercial broadcasting stations are at present equipped to put Congress on the air and I am highly doubtful whether a new Government broadcasting station is the proper answer. This could lead to a vast and pernicious Federal propaganda system which would encroach upon established private enterprise.

As a Member of Congress, I know that many of our legislative labors are exceedingly complex and undramatic. They would not make colorful broadcasting. Much of our important work is done in committees. It would be impossible and downright silly to try and broadcast them. If we were so foolish as to air Congress, many Members who talk a good part of the day now, would tend to monopolize the time on the air while many others who work hard but quietly, would not be known to the radio public at all.

I think the average person would find Congress dull and uninteresting and would not listen. For example, who would want to hear the Clerk calling out the names of 435 Members in the House of Representatives? What's more, since the Senate and House are in session at the same time, which should be broadcast? Who would determine that?

If congressional proceedings were sent over the airwaves, we would be putting on a show instead of attending to the rightful business of Congress which is writing the Nation's laws. Congressmen have an important job to do. They are not sent to Capitol Hill to compete with Frank Sinatra or Bob Hope.

The whole proposal seems unnecessary as the newspapers and radio are doing a good enough job now in telling the people what goes on in Congress today.

NO

(By Howell G. Evans, a furniture manufacturer at Two Rivers, Wis.)

What will broadcasting congressional proceedings do? What effect will it have on the dear people back home and on your humble servant in Congress?

When you select a man to do a job, you do so because you trust him. You have full faith in his ability to carry the responsibility and properly use the power that is a part of the job. You can't afford to have him always looking at you to see whether or not you nod approval or shake your head in dissatisfaction before he uses that power. Nevertheless, if he knows that you are listening to both sides of congressional debate, he will wait for you to decide vital issues for him.

All of us know that most of the important decisions in Congress are the result of hours of careful research and quiet study behind the scenes. Anyone who has held public office realizes that most of the work has already been done before the question is brought up for debate on the floor. The reasons for arriving at a certain decision cannot possibly be explained in a single speech nor by a group of speeches. Much can be covered up or never brought to public attention because of lack of time. Even though we folks at home—through this publicity—might arrive at a decision on any one matter, it must still remain for the Congressman to vote as he thinks right, in the light of his own judgment and conscience.

Publicity and emphasis at the wrong point can only weaken his power and right to decide. It can only serve to destroy the trust the public should hold in him and the faith he must have in his own ability to make decisions for the people he represents. Radio publicity on special events such as an address to the Congress by the President of the United States or by some other outstanding guest is surely in order. But, to broadcast congressional proceedings? Please, no.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of May 18, 1946:

HASTE? WHAT HASTE?

While labor warfare destroys the people's jobs, endangers their health and safety, and threatens the very foundations of their Government, a few time-killing Senators keep saying:

"We should do nothing in haste."

PEPPER of Florida is their leader. PEPPER, who gets red hot in defense of Soviet Russia and stays icy cool about disaster in America. PEPPER, who wants President Truman to settle the coal strike by seizing the mines—as he seized the railroads yesterday—and compelling the mine owners to pay John L. Lewis his price for peace.

The President would multiply his troubles if he bought Lewis off that way. A hundred other union bosses in the fiercely competitive business of labor leading would make Lewis' price their price, and demand that Mr. Truman buy them off, too.

With PEPPER stand others—MURRAY and WHEELER of Montana, GUFFEY of Pennsylvania, WAGNER of New York, KILGORE of West Virginia and a handful more—protesting that the Senate should not legislate in haste.

What haste?

Year after year after year, while labor abuses grew into the present crisis, these same Senators have thwarted attempts to legislate at all.

Eleven years ago the Wagner Labor Relations Act became law. Each year since, this biased law has demonstrated that in its present form it cannot keep its promise to "diminish the causes of labor disputes." But Congress has not changed it.

Five years ago the Supreme Court's Hutcheson decision came down. It held that the trade-restraining power of unions is beyond the reach of the antitrust laws. Each year since, that power has been grossly abused. But Congress has done nothing.

Four years ago the Supreme Court's teamsters decision came down. It held that extortion and robbery by unions are beyond the reach of the Federal antiracketeering law. The Court suggested that Congress should correct the law. But the Senate has done nothing.

The House—give it credit—has tried.

In 1940 the House voted 258 to 129, for amendments intended to balance the one-sided Wagner Act. But these amendments then went to the Senate Labor Committee, where PEPPER, MURRAY, GUFFEY, and other like-minded Members kept them in a pigeonhole until they died.

In 1941—4 days before Pearl Harbor—the House voted, 252 to 136, for a bill meant to protect defense production against strikes. But PEPPER, MURRAY, GUFFEY, and others saw to it that this bill also died in their committee pigeonhole.

In 1943, and again in 1945, the House passed the Hobbs bill to undo the damage done by the Supreme Court's teamsters decision. But the Senate Judiciary Committee—KILGORE and WHEELER are leading members there—twice has pigeonholed that bill.

More than 3 months ago the House voted, 258 to 155, for the Case bill. The Senate Labor Committee then got it, and pulled all its teeth. Now Senate majority sentiment has forced that bill out for debate and amendment, and is seeking to make it a workable measure against national disaster. And the little group of obstructionists is trying to talk it to death.

Remember them—PEPPER, KILGORE, MURRAY, WHEELER, GUFFEY, WAGNER. They say they are defending labor's rights. What they defend are labor wrongs which, if continued, will bring down destructive public wrath on labor's rights.

"We should do nothing in haste," they say. What they mean is, as always, "We should do nothing."

Address by Secretary of State Byrnes on the Paris Meeting of Foreign Ministers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM CONNALLY
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very able and comprehensive address delivered by the Secretary of State, Hon. James F. Byrnes, over the radio last night, dealing with the meeting of the Foreign Ministers in Paris.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I wish to talk with you about the meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers at Paris. On that mission I was accompanied by Senator CONNALLY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Senator VANDENBERG, a Republican member of that committee. I cannot adequately express my appreciation of their wise counsel and loyal cooperation. Senator CONNALLY was exceedingly helpful. Senator VANDENBERG by his wholehearted cooperation let the world know that regardless of how much he and his party may disagree with the administration about domestic issues, in our relations with foreign governments we have but one policy, the policy of the United States.

Building the foundations of a people's peace in a war-shattered world is a long, hard process. A people's peace cannot be won by flashing diplomatic triumphs. It requires patience and firmness, tolerance, and understanding. We must not try to impose our will on others, but we must make sure that others do not get the impression they can impose their will on us.

The progress made toward peace at the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers was disappointingly small in light of the expectations we had when it was agreed at Moscow last December that the Council should resume the work which had been interrupted by our inability to agree at London last September.

But the progress toward peace at Paris was infinitely greater than I expected when I suggested that the Council should meet in Paris preparatory to the prompt calling of a peace conference. The ministers did come to Paris seriously intending to pave the way for a peace conference. We differed considerably on a number of fundamental points; but we did come to know what these fundamental points were and the varying weight the different ministers attached to those points.

We found that there were three basic issues outstanding on the Italian treaty: Reparations, the colonies, and the Italian-Yugoslav boundary, particularly as it concerns the Italian city of Trieste.

In sumarizing the significance of these basic issues, I shall deliberately seek to avoid intensifying the conflict in viewpoints.

Our position on reparations is simple. To enable the Italian Nation to live we have already advanced directly or indirectly $900,000,000. We should prefer in the interest of peace to forget about reparations. But we are willing to agree to limited reparations, provided these do not deprive Italy of resources necessary to enable her to subsist without external assistance.

If Italy requires help from others she will look to us. And we made it clear we are not going to advance millions of dollars to enable Italy to produce goods to be paid as reparations to any of our allies.

The Soviet Government has insisted on reparations for itself of $100,000,000. We have pointed out certain sources from which reparations can be taken which would not seriously affect the Italian economy and which would yield substantially the amount which the Soviets claim. But the Soviet Government is unwilling to count what she will obtain from some of these sources as reparations.

For example, she insists that some of the naval ships surrendered by Italy to the navies of the United States and Britain be shared with her. She declares the ships are war booty. But war booty belongs to the nation capturing it. The Soviet Union has never shared with Allied nations any war booty captured by her. We are willing to give to her in lieu of reparations some of the naval ships surrendered to us. She demands the ships, but refuses to consider them as a substitute for reparations. She insists upon being paid out of current production. We would have to finance the production, and, therefore, I refused to agree to the proposal.

Differences regarding the colonies have been narrowed, but not resolved. The Soviet Government receded from its claim for a trusteeship of Tripolitania, first in favor of a joint Soviet-Italian trusteeship, and later in favor of an Italian trusteeship, as originally proposed by the French.

Our position has always been that the colonies should be placed under United Nations trusteeship, having as its objective the welfare of the inhabitants and their independence at the earliest practicable date. The Trusteeship Council should appoint a neutral administrator responsible to it, thus avoiding all possible rivalry between the powers. Libya and Eritrea should be granted independence in 10 years.

It is open to question whether Italy is in an economic position to assume the responsibility of trusteeship and whether the return of the colonies to Italy as trustee takes sufficiently into account the wishes of the inhabitants. For these reasons it was with considerable reluctance that I indicated my willingness to yield to the French suggestion of an Italian trusteeship if that would bring about an agreement in the Council, and if it were agreed that a definite date would be fixed for the independence of Libya and Eritrea. But the French Government was unwilling to agree to a fixed date for independence.

The British felt that because of their promises during the war they could not agree to an Italian trusteeship for territory occupied by the Senussi Tribes. For security reasons they also proposed a British trusteeship for Cyrenaica.

When no agreement was reached, I again urged the original American proposal for a United Nations trusteeship.

It was my impression that agreement on reparations and the colonies as well as on a host of other questions would not be long delayed if only a solution of the Trieste problem could be founid. The Soviet representative finally indicated that there would be no serious question on the cession of the Dodecanese Islands to Greece but he refused to approve it until the other territorial dispositions could be agreed upon.

The experts appointed to investigate the Italian-Yugoslav frontier did not differ as to the facts. But the Soviet representative differs from the other members of the Council as to the conclusions to be drawn from the facts. It is his position that Venezia Giulia must be treated as an inseparable whole, and that so treated the claim of Yugoslavia to the area is superior to that of Italy. The other representatives believe that wise statesmanship as well as the explicit decision taken by the Council at London requires a boundary line which will in the main be an ethnic line leaving a minimum of people under alien rule.

It was wrong to give Italy the whole of Venezia Giulia after World War I. It would be equally wrong to give Yugoslavia the whole of Venezia Giulia now. It would transfer from Italy to Yugoslavia approximately 500,000 Italians.

The British and French experts proposed ethnic lines more favorable to Yugoslavia than our own. In an effort to reach agreement we stated we were willing to accept the British or French line or any other ethnic line that could be justified upon the basis of the London decision.

The American delegation suggested a plebiscite for the area between the line proposed by the United States and the line proposed by the Soviet Union—but the Soviet delegation would not consider a plebiscite except for the whole Venezia Giulia area. All of us are agreed that Yugoslavia and the countries of central Europe which have for years used the port of Trieste shall have free access to Trieste at which there shall be a free port under international control. But we will continue to appeal to the Soviet Government and the Yugoslav Government not to press for a boundary line which will needlessly violate ethnic principles and will breed trouble in the future.

Agreement on the Balkan treaties is blocked principally by the inability of the Council to agree upon the economic clauses. Agreement on these provisions may have been delayed as part of a bargaining process, although so far the Soviet Government has stood out against the inclusion in the treaties of any provision which would promise freedom of commerce on the Danube, the gateway to central Europe.

If the Soviet Government is opposed, as the United States Government is opposed, to the formation of exclusive political and economic blocs, they will not persist in their refusal to permit the countries of central Europe to open their gates to the commerce of all nations.

It is regrettable that our outstanding differences on the treaties could not have been adjusted at our recent meeting in Paris. A short recess to allow a calm reexamination of our respective positions should expedite agreement when we reconvene. But when a world short of goods and short of food is crying for the return of conditions of peace, we cannot indefinitely delay the making of peace and the withdrawal of troops from occupied areas. The four Allied Governments cannot indefinitely delay the making of peace with countries which they have long ceased to fight, simply because they cannot agree among themselves on peace terms. The Council of Foreign Ministers was formed to facilitate and not obstruct the making of peace.

It was for that reason that the American delegation proposed that the Council at its next meeting on June 15 should conclude as far as possible its work on the proposed drafts, but that the date for the peace conference should be definitely fixed for July 1 or July 15, and invitations should be issued at once.

It was our view that the Council had taken sufficient time to try to narrow their differences, and at this stage, with the principal issues defined, we should not deny to our other war partners their right to participate. The making of peace is not the exclusive prerogative of any four governments.

The Soviet delegation insisted that invitations for the conference could not be sent until we had reconvened and agreed on all fundamental questions. Unanimous agreement was necessary, and we were forced, therefore, to recess without agreement for the actual calling of the peace conference.

While the American delegation will, when the Council reconvenes, make every effort to reach agreement on fundamental questions, it will renew its demand for the calling of a peace conference on July 1 or July 15.

If we cannot have a peace conference until the four nations agree on every subject deemed fundamental by any one of them, that will give to one member of the Council the power to stop all efforts toward peace. It would be better for the Council to submit to the peace conference a single draft of each treaty and to set forth in this draft both the matters on which agreement had been reached and those on which agreement had not been reached. This would permit free discussion in the peace conference by all the nations that did the fighting, and world opinion will then point the way to a final settlement.

If a peace conference is not called this summer, the United States will feel obliged to request the General Assembly of the United Nations under article 14 of the Charter to make recommendations with respect to the peace settlements. But I confidently expect a peace conference to be called this summer.

The situation which we will face in the coming months will be a test not only of others but of ourselves. There are now, and there will be in the future, many occasions which might impel us to say as we did after the last war that, much as we would like to cooperate in the restoration of Europe, cooperation as a practical matter is impossible without the sacrifice of our principles and that we must be content to cultivate and defend our own hemisphere.

But we must not forget that if we fail to cooperate in a peace which is indivisible we may again find that we will have to cooperate in a war which is world-wide. Whether we like it or not, we live in one world.

I am unwilling to admit that we cannot cooperate without sacrifice of our principles. If we are going to play our part we must take the offensive for peace as we took the offensive for war.

But the victories of peace, like those of war, require sacrifice not of principle but for principle. They require faith in ourselves and in our ideals. They require initiative, resourcefulness, and unrelenting effort. There is no iron curtain that the aggregate sentiments of mankind cannot penetrate.

The American delegation at Paris did not hesitate to start the offensive for peace.

Security is the concern of every nation. But the effort of one nation to increase its security may threaten the security of other nations and cause them in turn to try to increase their own security. The quest for security may lead to less rather than more security in the world.

It is in truth extremely difficult to know to what extent the action of any nation may be ascribed to its quest for security or to its desire to expand. But some so-called security moves on the diplomatic checkerboard have not contributed to a general sense of security.

Many of these moves are said to originate in the fear of the revival of German military might.

On our way to Potsdam last summer President Truman and I discussed this situation and agreed that it should be American policy to disarm Germany and keep her disarmed and to do what we can to prevent a struggle between the powers for the control of Germany which might give Germany the chance to divide and conquer.

Those principles were stated in the Potsdam agreement. But President Truman and I thought at that time that the policy of disarming Germany and keeping Germany disarmed for a definite period of years should become a part of a solemn treaty between the principal Allied Powers. Our policy should be to prevent war and not to wait until aggression gets out of hand.

It was not a new thought. It had been foreshadowed in the Moscow Declaration of 1943. Others had discussed it, but no one more forcefully than Senator VANDENBERG in a speech in the Senate in January 1945.

At the London meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers when the Soviet Foreign Secretary seemed greatly concerned about the Soviet security requirements in the Balkans, I suggested a 25-year-old four-power treaty, to keep Germany disarmed as a means of preventing any real threat to Soviet security. I explained that we contemplated a similar joint guaranty of the disarmament of Japan.

I again proposed such a treaty in a talk with Generalissimo Stalin on December 24 while I was in Moscow. The Generalissimo said that if the United States made such a proposal he would wholeheartedly support it.

Later I also spoke to Mr. Bevin, who advised me that he personally was most sympathetic to the suggestion.

In February I sent a working draft of the proposed treaty for German disarmament to the Soviet, British, and the French Governments and the proposed treaty for Japanese disarmament to the Soviet, British, and Chinese Governments. I invited their suggestions as to the draft.

I was informed by Mr. Bevin and M. Bidault that they favored the proposal in principle but would have a few suggestions to make. I did not hear from Mr. Molotov. Just before the Paris meeting I advised the Ministers I would like to discuss the proposal at Paris. The Soviet Minister agreed to discuss it informally but stated without specification that there were serious objections to the draft.

At Paris the Soviet representative stated he first wanted to know if Germany was being disarmed as contemplated by the Potsdam agreement and he feared the treaty might delay immediate disarmament. I pointed out that our proposal could not fairly be so construed; that it did not lessen the obligation to disarm Germany now but provided machinery to keep Germany disarmed.

To remove any question as to our purpose I asked General Clay to request the Allied Control Council to appoint representatives with power to go into every zone and make a report as to the disarmament of Germany.

Later the Soviet representative stated that when Generalissimo Stalin agreed with me to support the treaty I did not have a draft for it. He said that as it could not become effective until after a German treaty was signed, consideration of it could be delayed.

It is our sincere hope that after the Soviet Union studies our proposal and comes to appreciate our earnest desire to see Germany disarmed and kept disarmed, the Soviet Union will support it wholeheartedly.

While the making of the German peace settlement may take some time, we took the initiative at Paris to propose the immediate appointment of special deputies to prepare

a peace settlement which could be considered at a general Allied conference, the date of which should be fixed by the Council at its next session.

While there is no German Government yet which could accept the settlement, agreement among the Allies on the nature of the settlement is necessary to enable the Allies to know the goal toward which the Allied occupation and administration should be directed and the kind of German Government which should be created to accept the settlement.

I also asked that the special deputies on Germany be instructed to report on several pressing problems, including boundary and economic questions. We cannot, for example, continue to carry out the reparation program if Germany is not to be administered as an economic unit as agreed upon at Potsdam. Whatever boundaries are agreed upon for Germany, she must be able to subsist without external assistance. We cannot subsidize Germany to enable her to pay reparations to other nations.

I regret that the Soviet representative was not prepared to act upon my proposal for the appointment of special deputies without further study. I shall renew my proposal when the Council reconvenes.

Important as the German questions are, and eager as we are to press for their speedy solution, we must not and cannot delay the peace settlements with other countries. At Potsdam it was agreed that the start should be made with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, and Finland. While Germany must remain under occupation for some time, we cannot fail to do our part to rid the rest of Europe of the burden of the forces of occupation. There can be no recovery in Europe until we do.

It is particularly important that we press forward vigorously with the Austrian treaty. The Moscow declaration on Austria contemplated that Austria should be regarded more as a liberated than as a satellite country. It was agreed at Potsdam that no reparations would be taken from her. She was one of the first countries in central Europe to have free elections following the liberation. The continuance of foreign troops in Austria is an undue burden on her economy.

In February we asked that the Austrian treaty be prepared along with other treaties for satellite states. At Paris I insisted upon its preparation but the Soviet representative declined to discuss the Austrian treaty or say when he would consider it.

The making of peace with Austria is essential to the restoration of anything like conditions of peace in Europe. As long as there is no peace with Austria and foreign troops remain on her soil, military communication lines will continue to be maintained in Rumania and Hungary and possibly Italy.

If peace could be made with Austria concurrently with the treaties now under consideration, there would be no necessity or excuse for a single soldier on foreign soil in Europe with the exception of Germany and a line of communication through Poland. European states would have a chance to live and breathe.

It is American policy to press unremittingly for the conclusion of peace settlements to make possible the withdrawal of troops from countries where they do not belong and where they impose unjustified economic and social difficulties upon the people. And even without waiting for the conclusion of peace treaties it is American policy to press for the reduction of occupation troops in all countries.

Our policy of continuing to press for the return of conditions of peace, without regard to the making of formal peace treaties, finally yielded some constructive results in the case of Italy. For months we have been urging the revision of the Italian armistice so as to restore virtually complete sovereignty to Italy except in the colonies and in the controversial Venezia Giulia area. At Paris this revision was agreed to.

While the absence of a peace treaty still handicaps Italy in her effort to rebuild her broken economic and political life, the revised armistice gives the Italian Government the largest possible freedom that can be given to it without a formal peace treaty.

Our problems are serious, but I am not discouraged. Our offensive to secure peace has only begun. We are determined to work for political and economic peace in Europe, in the Near East and in the rest of the world. We shall work for it in the peace conferences and in the councils of the United Nations. The objective of our offensive is not territory or reparations for the United States. The objective is peace—not a peace founded upon vengeance or greed, but a just peace, the only peace that can endure.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Our Foreign Policy," delivered by me on Friday evening, May 17, 1946, before a joint meeting of the American Academy of Arts and Letters and the National Institute of Arts, in New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your president has asked that I discuss our foreign policy. With the possible exception of our labor relations, I can think of no subject more difficult to condense into a neat 20-minute package. It is not easy to be positive or dogmatic about anything, but especially about foreign policy under the tense and changing conditions of today. We are in a transitional and fluid state and it is extremely difficult to evaluate events properly and to formulate a definite policy. I don't think I need tell you that there is some confusion in our Capital City.

Last summer, or even 6 months ago, I had little difficulty in discussing what I thought should be our foreign policy. The United Nations was the machinery by use of which well-intentioned and forthright people could discuss and compare their differences. I thought that the major problem was to overcome the traditional isolationism of this country and persuade our people to devote our power and influence to the establishment of law based on justice. After the First World War, practically all other nations joined the League and it seemed probable that if we joined the United Nations the others would, without hesitation, give it their full support. I believed that the Great Powers had endured so much suffering and destruction at the hands of the Fascists that they would be determined to work together for the prevention of war. It seemed unbelievable that, in view of their recent experiences, any of them would run the risk of war either by aggressive action, or by neglecting their international responsibilities. But during the last few months Russia has traveled rather far along the path of aggression and the United States has neglected its responsibilities at home and abroad. Today I confess that I am troubled and I find it exceedingly difficult to arrive at any convictions about the future of our international relations.

A year ago in Washington there was considerable enthusiasm for the United Nations then being created. Today there is a profound sense of frustration and futility about its future. A year ago, we had decisively defeated Germany; we were certain of victory over Japan; we were proud of our achievements during the war and confident of our position in the world. Many of us talked about the leadership we were going to exercise in creating a decent and peaceful world for our children. Today, our domestic economy is virtually paralyzed by the lack of labor policy and our foreign policy is confused and ineffective. We emerged from the war with the greatest industrial capacity the world has ever seen, with mastery of the seas and of the air, the sole possessor of the atomic bomb; and yet today we are quaking in our boots and seriously considering dispersing our cities and going underground like troglodytes. If we are fearful of the future, what must the attitude of other nations be, with one exception? It is hardly a situation that inspires one with confidence in the future.

No single mistake on our part, or any single act on the part of any other nation, has caused our distress. It is the cumulative effect, the pattern of mistakes and acts of aggression that disturbs us. When the United Nations was being created at San Francisco, many of us thought that a democratic system in which all nations might participate was possible. We believed that a system of binding rules of conduct might be developed, at least in the field of armaments, to which all peoples could subscribe. Many of us did not like the veto power of the Big Five, but we believed that it was perhaps a necessary concession to suspicions which we thought time would prove to be unfounded. It did not occur to us that any nation entering the Organization would use the veto indiscriminately to destroy the Organization itself. There are doubts in the minds of many of us today that Russia will ever submit to rules of conduct in any field. There are even some who have concluded that the United Nations, because of the veto power, may become the instrumentality through which positive action by those who believe in its principles is prevented, while the more cynical proceed with unilateral aggrandizement. In a certain sense the veto power in the Security Council is similar to the right of unlimited debate in the Senate of the United States. Properly used with restraint and judgment, it is a justifiable practice, but the right in both instances can be so abused by indiscriminate use that it can render impotent and ridiculous the institution of which it is a part.

I realize that it is extremely difficult to be objective and judicious in one's analysis of the motives and actions of a great power like Russia. There is ever present the danger that one's ignorance of the facts, or prejudices, will distort one's judgment. We all know that Russia was badly treated after the First World War and had some justification for resentment toward the western democracies. We also know that without these same democracies she could not have saved herself from the domination of the Nazis. That old score, it seems to me, has been washed cut with blood and treasure and is no longer a valid reason for suspicion or antagonism.

During the past several months the question which haunts us most persistently is, "Is it the purpose of Russia to dominate the world through a subtle combination of infiltration and force or is she only seeking

security?" She persuaded us that in the dismemberment of Poland she sought only security. But can we believe that her security requires the domination of Trieste, Iran, Tripoli, and Manchuria? Since 1939, according to a recent article by Mr. William Henry Chamberlin, Russia has annexed 273,947 square miles of territory containing more than 24,000,000 people. In addition, he lists 12 other nations and areas with a population of 165,000,000 which she controls. These are facts, not theories, and are persuasive as to the purposes which inspire her policy. Her recent actions in Iran, in which for the first time in a matter of major importance she positively violated a definite, unequivocal agreement, are indicative of her increasing boldness and determination in challenging the United Nations and her former allies. While the Security Council had its say, it is also evident that Russia did not retire from Iran without compensation.

As I said before, it is not that any particular act of Russia has affected our confidence in her purposes, it is the cumulative effect of many acts. Her ruthless stripping of Manchuria, her extravagant demands of reparations from Italy, and for bases in Tripoli and the Dardanelles, the annexation of the Baltic States and Polish territory, the violation of her pledges to establish free governments in the Balkans, and, last but not least, her refusal to permit official representatives or citizens of her former allies to enter any of those territories under her control except under the most stringent restrictions. By imposing communism by force upon such countries as Yugoslavia and Rumania she has gone far beyond her agreements with her allies.

These overt actions of Russia, coupled with the speeches of her leaders, in which they do not deign even to mention the contributions of her former allies, are scarcely designed to inspire confidence in her self-restraint. The recent rejection of Secretary Byrnes' proposal for a 25-year alliance is not consistent with a policy of security only. I recognize that since I have no inside information about the long-range plans of Stalin or the Politburo, my views are necessarily speculative. I am not sure that these conclusions are sound. We are in a transitional stage and conclusions based upon rapidly changing events are necessarily tentative in nature. With the qualifications understood I may venture the opinion that Russia's policy seems to partake of both opportunism and fanaticism. Her traditional and, to a considerable degree, her legitimate desire for warm-water ports may be said to be the objective of her opportunists. They are simply taking advantage of the universal confusion and Anglo-American indecision to advance these ancient interests. On the other hand there are leaders in Russia who apparently believe that they have a sacred mission to save the world from what they assert is the decadence of the capitalist democracies. The opportunists, as such, are not so dangerous, but every success they achieve enhances the fanaticism of the zealots and fortifies their conviction that only communism can bring peace and prosperity to the world. It is characteristic of all authoritarian systems that they identify their regimes with God and the highest moral precepts. The Nazis and the Japanese pursued this course successfully with their own people. Crusading communism appears now to be on the march. As one sage so aptly put it, "The world has suffered more from the errors of the good than from the crimes of the wicked." No wars have been more marked by passionate hatred than the wars between Christian sects, both sides alike proclaiming a mission of righteousness and mercy, and proclaiming it moreover with deep sincerity. It is the religion of the state, or the party; the pagan principle that the individual is nothing and the party everything, that is the real danger to our western Christian civilization. If, as some assert, Russia is interested simply in a higher standard of living and security for her people there is little cause for alarm, but if she is intent upon saving our souls there can be no limit to her aggression or to her ruthlessness.

The crucial question for all of us who have some responsibility in these matters is, what should we do to keep the respect of Russia and at the same time restrain her expansion within the bounds of reason and safety for ourselves and Christendom? That, I submit, is not an easy query to answer. Before venturing an opinion on that question, may I first suggest that we have made some mistakes and neglected some of our responsibilities to the end that, in a negative way, we have contributed to the aggressive forces within Russia. After VJ-day the haste with which we demobilized our army and brought the boys home, canceled lend-lease, and repealed excess-profit taxes and rationing, demonstrated that we little understand our post-war responsibilities. It would not be unreasonable for Russia to conclude that again we were going home to let the world stew in its own juice, in spite of our professions of faith in the United Nations. Then, on top of these unwise and irresponsible actions, our own economy has so bogged down as the result of indecision leading to disastrous strikes that all the world must stand in amazement at the helplessness of the giant that can win a war, but apparently is incapable of organizing itself for peace. What, they must ask, has happened to the champion of democracy who was going to lead the world into the promised land of peace and security? Apparently her own people have rebelled and paralyzed her economic life. With Russia and her satellites preaching, most persuasively, the superiority of communism over capitalism we certainly have contributed little to the success of our cause in recent months. To top off this dismal performance, the House of Representatives, with their ears attuned to the next election, only this week emasculated the Selective Service Act. Is it possible that we are going to disarm even before the first peace treaty is concluded?

The one bright spot in our actions in recent months is the Lilienthal Committee report on the control of atomic energy. This report exemplifies what I believe to be the proper approach for an effective foreign policy. It is well reasoned, clear, and, above all, it presents a positive and definite proposal for action. If the report is accepted by Russia it will be the most important step forward since the end of the war. On the other hand, a rejection of the proposal by Russia will provide a very significant clue as to her future policy and we should shape our own policy accordingly.

It is my own feeling that until the appearance of this report our policy was inclined to be negative and indecisive. I would suggest to our Government that after a thorough study we attempt to formulate equally concrete proposals with regard to the infiltration and expansion of Russia in Europe, the Middle East, and the Far East. We, of course, must be just in our position. I think certainly that we should give recognition to her need for adequate warm-water ports and a fair and equitable share in such essential commodities as the oil of the Middle East. It would be far more sensible if we should, in cooperation with the other nations concerned, make positive, and I might say generous, proposals to Russia than to have her continue to gnaw away at the status quo in defiance of the principles of the United Nations. For example, I think we should lend our influence to the procurement of complete freedom for Russia in the use of the Dardanelles, but that we should oppose exclusive military domination by Russia of that waterway. It seems to me that the United Nations might well be used in this and other instances to guarantee free and equal use by all nations. The process of subjecting other strategic areas should be in accord with the development of confidence in the power of the organization. Like disarmament, it cannot effectively be brought about haphazardly but only in accord with a well-planned agreement and after United Nations organization has warranted the respect of the world.

I need not go into all the specific problems which may be treated in a manner similar to atomic energy, of which I think there are several. The principal point I wish to emphasize is the positive, affirmative character of the proposal. Our Government has so often apparently had no positive program and has been in the position of quibbling and quarreling with, but finally giving in to, the demands of Russia. It does not necessarily mean that we should never compromise our views in any specific instance, but it does mean that we should be contributing direction and leadership rather than merely going along or obstructing.

There is one further observation that I should like to make regarding a common misconception as to our policy. There grew up after the last war, and there is likely to grow up after this war, the belief that our policy is peace at any price. I think Hitler believed this to be our policy and relied upon it when he undertook to overrun all of Europe. Our present reluctance to maintain an Army and Navy, together with the determined and articulate band of irreconcilable isolationists in our midst, may revive this belief. I do not think this country really believes in such a policy and it is highly important that all the world know that while we do not seek war, yet we are willing and able to fight whenever we believe any power threatens the right and opportunity of men to live as free individuals under a Government of their own choice. This does not mean that we intend to concern ourselves with every local quarrel in every part of the world. There is, and can be, no automatic rule of thumb that can tell us when the point is reached where our security and the security of all free peoples is endangered by the persistent expansion of any power. Nevertheless we know that such a point has been reached in the past, and it can be reached in the future, and, if and when, that time arrives this Nation must and will resist with all its power. In any case of difference of opinion as to rights, whether it be in domestic or foreign affairs, if one party to the controversy is committed in advance to the principle of surrender rather than resistance in case of a deadlock, there is little chance of an equitable settlement. I think therefore that a basic principle of our foreign policy must be that there is a point beyond which we cannot, in justice to ourselves and to the civilization of which we are the heir, permit any nation to expand without offering resistance by force.

I realize that these observations may be criticized by some as being alarmist or defeatist on the one hand, or as offensive and warmongering on the other hand. I can only cite the fact that throughout my public career I have promoted to the extent of my ability the creation of an organization among the nations through which I hoped the rule of law and reason could be established for the solution of differences among men, rather than the rule of the tooth and claw. Never before in a public utterance have I questioned the purposes of Russia. It is with profound reluctance that I have concluded that the recent actions of Russia are not consistent with a desire to bring peace to the world under the aegis of the United Nations.

I am not ready to say that she has definitely and finally decided not to cooperate with the United Nations, but her attitude at Paris and at Hunter College point in that direction. Unfortunately, our own country has unwittingly contributed through weakness and vacillation to this result. Regardless of the responsibility for this state of affairs we are confronted with a situation which requires a careful analysis of our future policy. It is still possible that by a wise and forthright course of action, we may reestablish unity and strength in our domestic affairs from which will flow the confidence and the ability to restrain Russia's ambitions within reasonable bounds on the one hand, and on the other hand to reassure her as to the friendly and pacific purposes of the Western World. I think we all agree that none of us want another total war, but we also know that vacillation and weakness, or pacifism, does not inspire confidence in us or bring peace to the world.

The opportunity to lead the world along the path of peace purchased at such a frightful cost in blood and treasure is fast running out. With strength and wisdom we may yet triumphantly play the role which history has imposed upon us.

Congress and Office Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a recent issue of The Office, magazine of office equipment, carried an article by me on the subject of the United States Congress and office management. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS AND THE AMERICAN OFFICE

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

Your Congress knows office management. Your 96 Senators and 435 Representatives in Washington, D. C., know at first hand the diverse problems which you, as office managers, face. Moreover, your legislators know what a crucial role you have played in winning the war and what an equally vital role you are going to play in winning the peace. The office is the brains of modern industry's complex body. On the efficiency of that brain may well depend the peace and prosperity of the globe.

Congress knows therefore that American office management is called unto a high purpose. It is up to the office managers to so streamline organization and operations that their respective companies do the finest possible job in satisfying and in stimulating further product demand in America and throughout the world. Scientific genius in the laboratories and elsewhere produced the atomic bomb. A parallel genius must apply scientific management as never before to our offices, if they are to utilize fully the amazing new technology.

For its own part, Congress has the responsibility of weighing well the innumerable pieces of legislation which affect the American office in such matters as its personnel, their compensation, hours, etc., its tax accounting and reporting to the Government. Right now, too, Congress, through a joint committee, is examining into its own organization and operations in order to insure their adequacy in the new atomic age. The basis for that adequacy is, of course, the adequacy of the individual office of your Senator or Representative. A moment's reflection will tell you that the office problems faced by your elected leaders on Capitol Hill are enough to test the mettle of the ablest of men.

Your own space problems, correspondence, filing, communications, duplicating, budgeting, and other problems are magnified in intensity manyfold in the beehive-busy offices on Capitol Hill. Let me illustrate by taking the example of my own office. I have a staff of little over half-dozen people, a small suite of offices and a very modest office expense appropriation. My crew works with me from 9 to 5:30, 6 days a week, with the exception of one afternoon which each of my subordinates has off on alternate days.

I personally find it necessary to work some 80 hours a week in the office and at home. But, insofar as possible, my work is done in the office. On the basis of the above-listed resources, my office must be adequate to accomplish the following tasks for my 3,000,000 constituents and 140,000,000 fellow Americans.

There are some 8,000 bills now pending before Congress. A significant percentage of those bills will actually be considered by the Senate and by the five active committees of which I am a member. My committee assignments are the Foreign Relations, Judiciary, Commerce, Claims, and Rules Committees. To do justice to pending bills and measures which I, myself, may be considering introducing, I must read and assimilate each week literally hundreds of bills themselves, committee hearings, and reports, CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, and other legislative documents, newspapers, magazines, and speech transcripts. What complicates this task is the fact that much of the time I am away from the office, either in committee or in the Senate itself.

Innumerable statements must be presented on my findings and opinions on bills. This involves preparing and delivering informal remarks and formal addresses at spontaneous gatherings of my colleagues, in committee, on the Senate floor, at public occasions, private dinners and meetings, and over the radio. Moreover, newspaper and magazine releases and articles must be written if I am to fulfill my responsibility to help keep the public informed. The public wants to be informed and wants to advise and inform. Each day, I receive over 300 pieces of correspondence. They must be read, assimilated, acted upon, and answered preferably within the same day. A varying percentage of this correspondence is on legislative matters and contains inquiries, requests, and suggestions on every conceivable public topic under the sun.

Much of that mail consists of appeals from constituents for personal or company aid and service. Innumerable telegrams and long-distance calls also come in along this line, many of them describing desperate emergencies which must be met with my assistance. Visitors and delegates arrive with their particular problems as well as their legislative recommendations to relate. Action—fast and sound—must be taken on the basis of the facts presented. Countless Federal and private officials must be contacted by phone, letter, or wire to assist me in serving my constituents.

In the light of all these responsibilities, it is small wonder that my Congressional colleagues and I take our office management seriously. For my own part, I have formulated a few rules which I believe have served me in good stead in 30 years of private law practice and 7 years of senatorial labors. Many of these rules are undoubtedly observed by my colleagues as well as yourself. Here are the rules:

1. Create teamwork: My office crew must pull together as a team—harmoniously and smoothly. There must be no task so specialized that it cannot be performed, if necessary, by some other member of my staff other than the one who normally does it. Indispensability of any one of my subordinates is out. So is any prima donna. Teamwork alone can do the job entrusted to my office and your office. Delegation of adequate authority and responsibility is therefore in order; as is sufficient training for every crew member.

2. Inspire: Management is really "humanagement" of ourselves and others. It is the science of getting things done through people. And so you and I who would be successful managers must continuously inspire our crews by displaying that zeal for our work, that appreciation for others' efforts, that willingness to pitch in and help in the humblest job if necessary, that confidence, that faith which gives the crews "a lift," a sense of adventure and triumph.

It is almost inevitable that during the workday and workweek, energies will flag and tempers may become frayed. That is why the captain must antidote these reactions, must constantly inspire his crew by radiating sincere enthusiasm and good will. This is truer perhaps in a congressional office, subject as it is to vast urgent pressures from all sides. But I am certain that the need for the captain to inspire is manifest in your own office, too.

3. Master the work: Drive it. Don't let it drive you. It is doubtful whether any of my readers has any greater responsibilities than rest on my colleagues' and my own shoulders. Yet far too many office managers behave as if the world were resting on their personal shoulders, as if the work were breaking their backs. If Congressmen can learn (and they do) that they must master their work lest it master them, surely you, as an office manager, can. It is not how hard you work; it is how you work hard. A sense of perspective, of balance, of humility is necessary in all of us.

4. Plan: Someone has defined planning as organized foresight based on corrective hindsight. But however you may define it, effectiveness of planning is crucial to any successful office. There is no such thing as being too busy to plan; if you took time out for careful planning, you would be more likely to be adequate to your many duties.

Planning demands vision and perspective. It demands an estimate of your tasks up ahead and the resources—men, money, material, and time—with which you can handle these tasks. It demands a certain fixity and yet flexibility in execution. Perhaps my habit of planning may be most simply illustrated by my practice of laying out, each night before my departure from work, the "must" tasks and the "optional" tasks (those to be done if time permits) for tomorrow's work.

5. Evaluate: All work can and must be evaluated; insofar as possible that evaluation must be objective, that is, against objective standards. In my own office, we can gage our effectiveness by, for example, the fact that we have satisfactorily processed (as we usually do) all incoming mail pieces the same day they arrive. We can gage our effectiveness by the number of messages of appreciation from constituents reporting satisfaction with our efforts in their behalf. We can evaluate our effectiveness by the fact, as is fortunately often the case, that constituents will report they differ with us on particular legislation but respect the case which we presented in defense of our beliefs.

Most of our work is, of course, relatively intangible in its nature and its effects. Yet somehow we can, if our eyes are open, always find some criteria to judge how well we are doing the job for the folks back home.

6. Aspire: Life is growth. It is unfoldment, development, improvement. You and I must not be guilty of arrested development either in our personalities or in our work. We must not fall into a rut of outdated procedures and processes in our office labor. False pride manifesting itself in blind stand-pattedness has no place in a good office manager. We must ever seek the better way, the faster way, the more economical way of doing things. We must use our evaluation technique to refine our work standards and devise new methods of beating those standards. We must constantly seek to become better salesmen—of ourselves and our ideas. Progress is the order of this day more than in any previous period in history.

These then are a few simple rules by which you as an office manager and I as a United States Senator may each of us play our respective roles for the welfare of our Nation. And in devotedly serving that larger welfare, each of us will be serving ourselves.

Subsistence Allowances for On-the-Job Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "They Would Cheat the Veteran and Rob the Government," published in the May 1946 bulletin of the Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY WOULD CHEAT THE VETERAN AND ROB THE GOVERNMENT

One of the most reprehensible pieces of knavery in connection with aid to veterans is now coming to light. Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress (GI bill of rights), provided among other benefits, subsistence allowances for on-the-job training. The maximum subsistence being $65 a month for veterans without dependents and $90 a month for those with dependents.

The theory behind this subsistence allowance was sound, provided it was put to the proper use and utilized so as to obtain the greatest benefits for the veterans.

We regret to say that this has not happened. Immediately the money became available, some employers descended like vultures upon the hapless veteran and began using the veterans' subsidy for their own selfish ends. Happily these employers are in the minority. The employer with respect for his fellow competitor, with proper business ethics and with real moral concern for the welfare of the veteran would not stoop to the practices indulged in by the type of employer now taking advantage of the veteran.

In a release date April 8, and signed by General Erskine, Administrator of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, and addressed to the governors of all States and Territories, we find this language:

"Subsistence allowances for on-the-job training have been provided under Public law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress (GI bill of rights), to assure economic security to veterans who want to learn a job which will increase their earning capacity and their opportunity for employment and advancement. Subsistence payments are in addition to the wages paid by the employer during the training period. The maximum subsistence allowance under this training program is $65 a month for veterans without dependents and $90 a month for those with dependents. Combined wages and allowance cannot exceed the wages of the experienced worker in the job for which the veteran is being trained.

"The subsistence allowance is not a dole to the veteran nor is it intended as a subsidy to the employer. The value of the program would be lost and its integrity discredited if it were used as a cheap labor scheme or if the period of subsidized training were prolonged unnecessarily or veterans were trained for nonexistent jobs."

No one can criticize the purpose and intent of this statement. In addition, it has had the full approval of the five major veterans' organizations, of labor, of the National Chamber of Commerce, and the principal educational organizations. The above groups also approve certain criteria which accompanied the general statement and which will be dealt with in more detail.

But what has happened? Is this laudable and commendable program being used in its entirety to aid the veteran? It is not. It is being used to exploit him. It is being used as a means of obtaining cheap labor, yes, in some instances, to obtain free labor, all under the guise of veteran training and subsidized by the Government.

You will note that this subsistence allowance was not supposed to be a form of dole. It was not a subsidy for the employer. It was not to be used as a cheap labor scheme. And more important still, it was never intended to be used for the training of the veteran for a nonexistent job.

We learn of one State, where the Veterans' Administration of the State approved every application on the part of employers, with the result that employers are able to hire veterans at a cost to themselves of only 20 cents an hour or less, for use as filling station attendants, car greasers, variety store employees, newsstand attendants, and so on.

Where, by any stretch of imagination, is on-the-job training subsistence of any benefit, in such instances as the above, to the veteran?

It does, however, permit the Government to pay the employers' wage bill, in addition to destroying the existing wage structures.

Another instance which has come to our attention is the petition to one of the regional wage stabilization boards for approval of veteran trainees on construction work at the rate of $10 per week.

In another section we find that a garage had four journeymen mechanics employed. Under the Federal-State Aprentice Commission standards, these four journeymen could adequately train two apprentices. This company, operators of the garage, obtained 19 on-the-job trainees.

It is obvious with only the limited number of teachers available, that these 19 on-the-job trainees either were placed at sweeping floors, washing cars, or at other duties which would not enable them to obtain the training they were entitled to receive. How could these trainees be properly trained under these conditions? How could they expect to meet the standards of competition with which they will be faced when they are turned loose?

We also learn of countless others who are being used and made to believe they are fitting themselves for their future, only to learn that their time and money have been wasted.

The above abuses present only one part of the problem of on-the-job training. The other is the apprentice mills which are being developed. All will concede the futility of long and arduous training for a job, by a veteran, who upon receiving a diploma, finds that the job which he has sacrificed so much to attain, either does not exist, or if it does, the demand for the job far exceeds the number of jobs available. All will recognize the ludicrousness of training a thousand barbers with only a hundred heads to work upon. Far-fetched, possibly, but it serves to illustrate the extent of the existing evil.

The trade-union movement has a definite and a real responsibility in making true, on-the-job training a success. International and local unions have accepted the principle of apprenticeship for veterans with the fullest sympathy, consideration, and cooperation, even to the extent of waiving, in most instances, standards which many years' experience has proved workable and realistic.

It seems now that the international and local unions have the very definite charge to use all influence to the end that State approving agencies be composed of people with a full and thorough understanding of the problem. They are faced with the additional responsibility of forcefully calling to the attention of veterans and of the approving agencies the evils which are being condoned under the guise of veterans' on-the-job training.

We repeat, that unless unions and responsible employers, alike, interest themselves in this most serious problem, than years of effort to provide adequate, on-the-job training and proper apprenticeship systems and standards will have been wasted.

The standards for approval, provide for a State approving agency. This State approving agency might well be the Federal-State apprentice commissions working in conjunction with the Veterans' Administration. The United States Employment Service could be utilized. The experience of these already established commissions and services would provide, to a large degree, compliance with the criteria which have had the approval of the above-listed groups. Committees representative of the approving groups could render invaluable service. The criteria listed below can be complied with and made to work. However, if they are to work, it must be with the full and complete cooperation of all.

The abuses now prevalent would not, and could not occur with an efficient, experienced State approving agency, neither would they become dupes of schemers through lack of experience.

At any rate, this is a condition which cannot be permitted to expand, if standard wages and proper apprentice training are to be maintained, and veterans are not to be exploited by unscrupulous employers.

If these practices are permitted to continue we can then factually state that they are cheating the veteran and robbing the Government.

The following are the standards for approval of on-the-job training, as released by General Erskine and approved by Federal agencies and by civic, labor, educational, business, and veterans' organizations:

"1. The training content of the program is adequate to qualify the veteran for appointment to the job for which he is to be trained.

"2. There is reasonable certainty that the job for which the veteran is to be trained will be available to him at the end of the training period as is evidenced by such factors as the ratio of trainees, veteran and nonveteran, to trained workers.

"3. The job is not in a standard wage classification, in which progression and appointment to the next higher classification are based upon such factors as length of service and normal turn-over, and not upon skills learned through organized training on the job.

"4. The wages to be paid the veteran for each successive period of training are not less than those customarily paid in the establishment and the community to a learner

in the same job who is not a veteran and are in conformity with State and Federal laws and applicable bargaining agreements.

"5. The job customarily requires a period of training which justifies the setting up of a complete program of not less than 500 hours of training.

"6. The length of the training period is no longer than that customarily required by the establishment and other establishments in the community to provide the trainee with the required skills, arrange for the acquiring of job knowledge, technical information, and other facts which the trainee will need to learn in order to become competent on the job for which he is being trained.

"7. Provision is made for related instruction.

"8. There is in the establishment adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide satisfactory training on the job.

"9. Adequate records are kept to show the progress made by the veteran toward his job objective.

"10. Appropriate credit is given the veteran for previous job experience, whether in military service or elsewhere, his beginning wage adjusted to the level to which such credit advances him, and his training period shortened accordingly.

"11. A copy of the training program as approved by the State agency is provided to the veteran by the employer.

"12. Upon completion of the training the veteran is given a certificate indicating the length and type of traning provided and attesting to his competency in the job for which he was trained.

"13. Employees of the establishment are advised of the training program.

"14. The approving agency should have access to the establishment for the purpose of assisting in the development and improvement of the training program.

"CERTIFICATION PROCEDURE

"1. A certificate should be issued by the approving agency to the establishment indicating approval of the specific on-the-job training course, or courses, the maximum number of trainees for each of the approved on-the-job training courses, and indicating that the Veterans' Administration is being notified of approval.

"2. Copies of such certificate should be transmitted to all agencies involved in the training program."

Fight for Hebrew Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a speech delivered by the able junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] at a dinner in New York on May 14, 1946, at which time he received the national award as one of the outstanding leaders in the fight for Hebrew freedom.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends, still fresh in our minds—and I hope we have learned the lesson so well that we will never forget it—is the nightmare of Hitler's rise to power. The history of Nazi Germany is the history of the destruction of hundreds of billions' worth of property. And the extermination of millions upon millions of innocent men, women, and children is still going on, for the famine, disease, and pestilence which he planted are now exacting their full toll.

Looking back over the nightmare of the last 12 years, each of us, I'm sure, is haunted with the terrible and guilty realization that it did not have to be. Succeeding generations of learned historians will examine and reexamine the events which led to the colossal destruction of human lives and property. They will analyze again and again the causes, and they will note the errors, the stupid and criminal blunders, of which the whole human race was guilty.

But one needn't be a historian to know the answers. It all began when Hitler learned that he could regard solemn treaties as worthless scraps of paper. The Allied countries, France, England, and the United States, were very well aware of what Hitler was doing. But they turned the other way. The net result was that, after a few years, Hitler had a stranglehold on the European Continent, and was strategically situated to begin strangling the rest of the world. And let us remember that he came within an inch of doing just that.

My friends, I thank God that Hitler is dead. But the Hitler spirit lives on. The desire to grasp what belongs to others, the penchant of regarding solemn treaties as worthless scraps of paper, the use of brute force to subdue and subjugate a smaller and defenseless people, the employment of Gestapo tactics and SS methods, all these are obvious factors in the policy of some of the larger and more powerful nations of today. It is tragic, and painful, that we must charge the Government of Great Britain with violating both the spirit and the letter of international law, with breaking sacred treaties, with oppressing a smaller nation and subjugating weaker peoples, with sanctioning drumhead justice, concentration camps, torture and other Gestapo and SS methods. The English people, the staunch and noble fighters who stood alone in the Battle of Britain, must today assume collective responsibility for the acts of their Government and their Prime Minister. And I say that the acts of the British Colonial Office are most unworthy of the British people.

The record of concentration camps and torture chambers in Palestine has been fully documented. Others, persons who themselves have been the beneficiaries of colonial drumhead justice, who have personally gone through the torture chambers and concentration camps in Palestine, have already eloquently testified to brutish methods of the British occupying force. There is, therefore, no need for me to go into that now. I am concerned here with the breaking of treaties and with the conduct of imperialist power politics in the Middle East which endangers the peace of the world today.

The British Government has recently concluded a treaty with the Emir Abdullah of Trans-Jordan, granting independence and full statehood to Trans-Jordan. Superficially, that treaty seems to grant "independence." I say superficially, because anyone who is the least bit acquainted with Trans-Jordan, Palestine, and the rest of the Middle East knows that a treaty concluded between the Emir Abdullah and the British Government purporting to grant independence and statehood to Trans-Jordan is preposterous. It is also illegal and dangerous. Now, let us merely scratch the surface and it will quickly become completely obvious to us why it is preposterous, illegal, and dangerous.

Trans-Jordan is not a separate and distinct country. It never has been. For centuries, from the earliest recorded history right up to the present day, Trans-Jordan has always been an integral part of Palestine. And nobody, scholars, historians, statesmen, politicians, no Arab, and no Jew has ever considered even for one moment that Trans-Jordan was anything but a part of Palestine. The Jordan River flows through Palestine. The area lying on the eastern bank of the river is called Trans-Jordan. The area lying on the western bank of the river is called Cis-Jordan. The Jordan River in Palestine is analogous to the Mississippi River in the United States. Would it not be preposterous to suggest that the United States be divided into two countries, one east of the Mississippi and the other west of it? The River Jordan is a part of the life, the traditions, the whole history of Palestine even more than the Mississippi is a part of the life, the traditions, the history of this country. Other countries have rivers flowing through them, too. Is that any reason to divide and separate those countries? Surely, even the British Government is aware that this arbitrary dismemberment of Palestine into two countries because the Jordan River flows through Palestine is preposterous.

I say that this treaty is illegal. Why? The British Government is in Palestine by the grace of the mandate for Palestine issued by the League of Nations. Under the terms of the mandate Great Britain was given the authority and the responsibility for supervising the reestablishment of the Jewish national home in Palestine. Great Britain was to act only as a provisional administrative body until such time as the Hebrew nation would itself be in a position to assume control and fulfill the function of governing Palestine. The mandate unequivocally recognizes Trans-Jordan as an integral part of Palestine. It is there in black and white, and no amount of diplomati- double-talk can alter that fact. The mandate expressly forbids the separation of any part of Palestine from the rest of the country. The treaty entered into by the Government of Great Britain with the Emir Abdullah "granting independence to Trans-Jordan" is definitely and unequivocally illegal because it separates one part of Palestine, Trans-Jordan, from the rest of Palestine.

Furthermore, in 1924, Great Britain and the United States concluded a treaty known as the Anglo-American Convention of 1924. Under the terms of this treaty, Great Britain could not change the terms of the mandate for Palestine without the express consent and permission of the United States. The United States of America has never given her consent to this arbitrary partition of Palestine. The treaty with the Emir Abdullah is a violation of the agreement with this country and it is a violation of international law. It is illegal.

Last year, at San Francisco, the Charter of the United Nations was adopted. Both Great Britain and the United States signed it. Section 80 of that Charter, subscribed to by both the United States and Great Britain, specifically states that no change in the status of mandated territories may be made without the approval of the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization. That approval was not given. The General Assembly was not even consulted. The treaty with the Emir Abdullah violated the laws as contained in the United Nations Charter and is, therefore, illegal.

Such indiscriminate scrapping of solemn treaties destroys the very foundations of an international society based on justice. Ultimately it threatens the peace of the world. If the Government of Great Britain regards the United Nations Charter with the same reverance as she has the Palestine mandate and the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924, then the whole United Nations fabric becomes utterly ineffective.

Let us now consider this partition in the light of what it will do to Palestine itself. Palestine, both sides of the Jordan, is a very small country. The total population of Palestine is slightly more than 2,000,000. The Trans-Jordan area of Palestine is three times

as large as the rest of Palestine but it supports only 300,000 people or about one-seventh of the total population. What will this do to the Hebrew national home, the Hebrew commonwealth, which the Government of Great Britain was entrusted to establish, and to which we, by the terms of the Anglo-American Convention of 1924, are committed? It will make it virtually impossible for the Hebrew nation to have its home. And it will, at the same time, permanently blight the social, political, and economic development of the whole of Palestine and the rest of the Middle East. Trans-Jordan, as well as the rest of the Middle East, lies now under a horrible blight of unnecessary desert, wilderness, poverty, filth, disease, backwardness unequaled anywhere else in the world. Proposed power projects on the Jordan River, irrigation developments in that area, industrial and commercial growth, will be made virtually impossible if the Jordan River becomes a boundary line between two separate countries.

And what will this partition do to the hopes and aspirations of the million and a half Hebrew people still left in Europe? Everybody who has had an opportunity to come in contact with the Hebrew people now in Europe, every report that has been published, eloquently testifies that these people cannot stay in Europe. They want to go to Palestine. That is all they live for, hope for, and dream of. And morally and legally they have every right to go to Palestine. Let us not forget that.

The Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry has stated that a minimum 500,000 Hebrews must leave Europe. If three-fourths of Palestine is closed to them, where will they go?

By creating the phoney state of Trans-Jordan, Great Britain has made a double play. First, it gave the impression that there is no room in Palestine for any more Hebrews, and, second, it created the opposition of another Arab state. Had the Anglo-American Committee taken into consideration the whole territory of Palestine, including the 35,000 square miles of Trans-Jordan, they could have found room for every Hebrew who wants to go there and still not rate a density of population any greater than one-tenth that of England. Regarding the second argument, that the Arab world is opposed to the repatriation of the Hebrew people to Palestine, I submit that there is no Arab world other than the one created by imperial interests and nourished by British gold.

Curiously enough, while the Anglo-American Committee was supposedly determining the ultimate disposition of the Hebrew people in Europe and the future of the state of Palestine, Great Britain was dismembering Palestine and setting up Trans-Jordan. This, in the face of her own statement that nothing should be changed in the terms of this entire problem until the Committee had finished its report. And with the completion of the report we are faced with the accomplished fact of the so-called independent state of Trans-Jordan, carved out of the side of Palestine. And what kind of benefit will the Arabs derive from this illegal state? Some 300,000 Bedouins are now being placed under the absolute tyranny of a foreign monarch, the Emir Abdullah, who is being crowned King of Trans-Jordan in a few days. Abdullah had been a pensioner of the British Government for years, receiving 5,000 pounds a month pocket money from the High Commissioner of Palestine, money obtained by taxing the Hebrews in Palestine. Under Abdullah the Bedouins of Trans-Jordan are doomed to continue their lives in misery, filth, disease, illiteracy, and appalling backwardness.

A British resident and British troops, supported entirely by revenues taken from the Hebrews of Palestine, police the desert wastes of Trans-Jordan. Trans-Jordan's population is less than that of Louisville, Ky. Half the people are nomads. Its industrial life consists of two factories, 90 employees, and two distilleries. In illiteracy it rates at the top. This is the land that is deemed ready for freedom and independence, while Hebrew Palestine, on the western banks of the Jordan, smarts under military occupation and is told it must remain a subjugated, occupied country. We are told that it is too immature to be granted independence.

Ladies and gentlemen, when I saw what was happening in Palestine and noted the land grab of Trans-Jordan taking place under the very noses of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, I rose before the Senate and introduced this entire matter for debate on the 5th of April. Several Senators, including Senators MAGNUSON, PEPPER, BREWSTER, and JOHNSON, joined with me in raising their voices in protest. I asked the Secretary of State what was being done about this obvious breaking of a treaty with the United States and Mr. Byrnes replied to the effect that this Government can decline to recognize any modification of the mandate for Palestine. I intend to introduce a resolution in the Senate this week calling upon the United States to withhold any recognition of Trans-Jordan. I am confident that more than a dozen Senators of both parties will join with me in sponsoring this resolution.

I believe that the issues involved transcend the matter of treaties and covenants, however sacred these may be. It is my considered opinion that we are dealing here with the question of rights of small nations—with the question of international peace and, above all, with the question of international morality. It does not matter who shall hold the title to a tract of desert land but it does matter what sort of a world we and our children are going to live in. I will submit to the Senate, and I submit to you, that the creation of this state deprives the martyred Hebrew nation of three-fourths of its territory and adds another voice to the noisy chorus of the Arab League in protest against the admission of 100,000 Hebrews to Palestine. All this scimitar rattling that is now going on is part of a strategy of intimidation patterned after the pre-Munich technique.

I believe, Trans-Jordan represents the dismemberment of Palestine physically and the destruction of the hopes and dreams of the Hebrew people spiritually. Can Americans recognize such a state? We cannot.

Trans-Jordan was set up as a platform from which another desert Charlie McCarthy can keep his abuses upon the Hebrew people and his threats against the civilized nations of the world, including the United States. Can Americans recognize such a state? We cannot.

The granting of sovereignty and independence is a sacred and precious rite to be applied in the case of human beings and not an empty tract of land. Can we recognize this cynical application of the word "independence"? We cannot.

The United States is regarded as the uncompromising defender of the rights of all men and as the protector of small nations, however weak, destitute, or decimated they may be. If such is our policy we must be doubly faithful in the case of the Hebrew people and the population of Palestine. We cannot permit their homeland to be mutilated or for an absurd application of the word "independence" to be used to deprive them of three-fourths of their national territory, which is the only area left to them for freedom and survival.

Can America recognize a state which will serve as the instrument of further oppression and persecution of a martyred people? We cannot.

I shall urge the Senate of the United States to withhold recognition of Trans-Jordan and I call upon every citizen to raise his voice against the scrapping of treaties with the United States and against the great affront which the spurious state of Trans-Jordan represents—an insult to the 6,000,000 Hebrews who died in Hitler's furnaces, to the million and a half who survived and are still pitiful objects of charity awaiting a chance to go home; an insult to our own dead in this war and a challenge to our conscience.

Big Sandy River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. MAY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT SHOWING SUPPORT OF THE PROJECT TO CANALIZE THE BIG SANDY RIVER AS REPORTED FAVORABLY BY UNITED STATES BOARD OF ENGINEERS

Immediate territory affected by the improvement: 12 counties in Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia. There are substantially over 10,000,000,000 tons of coal (authority: U. S. Geological Survey) available for river shipment if and when this improvement is completed. The Big Sandy Valley Association has a membership of 54,497 (both individual and corporations).

The following resolutions have been filed with either the United States Board of Engineers or the Rivers and Harbors Committee of Congress:

(1) Resolution of the Pocahontas Operators Association.

(2) Motion supporting the Big Sandy River project by the Williamson Coal Operators Association.

(3) Resolution of the Pike County Truck Miners Association.

(4) Resolutions of the following labor organizations:

1. Building and Construction Trades Council—Huntington, W. Va.
2. West Virginia State Federation of Labor, Charleston, W. Va.
3. Boyd and Greenup Counties Industrial Union Council, CIO.
4. West Virginia State Industrial Union Council representing 25,000 members.
5. Electrical Workers Tri-State Council, Ohio-West Virginia-Kentucky.
6. Forty-six locals of the United Mine Workers of America, representing 22,000 mine workers.

(5) Resolutions of city councils and civic organizations:

1. City Council of Pikeville, Ky.
2. City Council of Prestonsburg, Ky.
3. City Council of Paintsville, Ky.
4. City Council of Louisa, Ky.
5. City Council of Fort Gay, Ky.
6. Chamber of Commerce of Pikeville, Ky.
7. Johnson County Game Protective Association.
8. Dissenting directors of the Williamson Chamber of Commerce disapproving resolution filed by the railways.
9. County Court of Wayne County rescinding previous action is filed by the railways.
10. Kiwanis Club of Prestonsburg, Ky.
11. Junior Chamber of Commerce of Ashland, Ky.
12. Junior Chamber of Commerce of Pikeville, Ky.
13. Board of Trustees of Allen, Floyd County, Ky., rescinding resolution by Allen filed by the railways.

The following associations have filed statements urging the completion of the Big Sandy project:

(1) The National Rivers and Harbors Congress by unanimous vote of their projects committee.

(2) The Mississippi Valley Association, representing all of the 28 States in midcontinent America.

(3) The Ohio Valley Improvement Association, representing the Ohio Valley.

(4) The Upper Mississippi Waterways Association, representing the upper Mississippi Valley.

(5) The Upper Mississippi and St. Croix Rivers Association, representing the upper Mississippi and St. Croix Rivers Valleys.

(6) The Port Authority of St. Paul, representing the city of St. Paul.

(7) The Dubuque Chamber of Commerce.

(8) The Dubuque Dock Board.

These are supplemented by telegrams supporting the project from:

(1) The city of New Orleans, La.

(2) The Department of Public Works of the State of Louisiana.

(3) The Chamber of Commerce of Shreveport, La.

(4) The Red River Improvement Association of Shreveport, La.

(5) The Chamber of Commerce of Greenville, Miss.

(6) The Chamber of Commerce of Vicksburg, Miss.

(7) The Chamber of Commerce of Kansas City, Mo.

(8) The Chamber of Commerce of Omaha, Nebr.

(9) The Chamber of Commerce of Evansville, Ind.

(10) Acme Oil Co., Chicago, Ill.

Cargill, Inc., of Minnesota, states will take 500,000 tons of coal annually and return with 500,000 tons of farm products (see record).

Mead Johnson Terminal Co., of Evansville, Ind. (statement in the record).

Midland Cooperative Wholesale, representing 351 member organizations in Wisconsin and Minnesota (200,000 families).

Table showing the cost and economic justification, as determined by the U. S. Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, of the 59 projects included in the current rivers and harbors bill, H. R. 6407

OCEAN HARBORS, CONNECTING CHANNELS, FLOOD CONTROL, AND MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS

Page No. in bill	Name	Cost	Economic ratio
2	Portland Harbor	$1,271,750	1 to 1.34.
2	Fall River Harbor	1,500,000	1 to 2.1.
2	Wickford Harbor	95,000	1 to 1.1.
2	New Haven Harbor	3,460,000	1 to 3.3.
2	Bridgeport Harbor	955,000	1 to 2.5.
2	Stamford Harbor	45,000	Silent.
2	Barnegat Inlet	None	Do.
2	Absecon Inlet	16,000	1.1 to 37.2.
2	Delaware River	54,000	Silent.
3	New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway.	Silent	Do.
3	Middle River and Dark Head Creek.	None	Do.
3	Mattaponi River, Va.	60,000	1 to 2.5.
3	Newport News Creek, Va.	109,000	1 to 1.22.
3	Norfolk Harbor, Va.	5,100,000	Self-liquidating.
3	Savannah Harbor, Ga.	809,100	1 to 1.36.
4	Hollywood Harbor, Fla.	786,000	Silent.
6	Brazos Island Harbor, Tex.	170,000	Do.
7	Great Lakes connecting channels, Michigan.	28,063,000	Do. Do.
7	Cleveland Harbor, Ohio.	11,677,000	1 to 1.06.
7	Fairport Harbor, Ohio.	14,500	Silent.
7	San Diego and Mission Bay, Calif.	5,858,000	1 to 1.78.
8	Coos Bay, Oreg.	5,689,000	1 to 1.9.
8	Honolulu Harbor	Silent	Silent.
8	Lavon Reservoir, Tex.	....do.....	Do.
8	Port of Siuslaw	....do.....	Do.

Table showing the cost and economic justification, as determined by the U. S. Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, of the 59 projects included in the current rivers and harbors bill, H. R. 6407—Continued

RIVER IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Page No. in bill	Name	Cost	Economic ratio
3	Schuylkill River, Pa.	$12,895,000	Silent.
3	St. Johns River, Fla.	463,000	1 to 7.1.
4	Withlacoochee River Fla.	None.	Silent.
4	Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Ga.	73,361,000	1 to 1.08
4	Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers, Ala. and Miss.	116,941,000	1 to 1.05.
4	Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to Gulf, Louisiana.	2,000,000	1 to 1.03.
4	Plaquemine-Morgan City route, Intracoastal Canal, La.	8,000,000	Silent.
4	Franklin Canal, La.	43,000	Do.
4	Mermentau River, La.	7,500,000	1 to 1.2.
5	Lake Charles deep channel, Louisiana.	2,000,000	1 to 5.5.
5	Red River, La. and Ark.	42,000,000	1 to 1.33.
5	Arkansas River, Ark. and Okla.	435,000,000	1 to 1.08.
5	Sabine River, Adams Bayou, Tex.	73,000	1 to 4.4.
5	Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex.	3,160,000	Silent.
5	Trinity River, Tex.	429,000	Do.
6	Mill Creek, Tex.	250,000	1 to 1.2.
6	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Tex.	1,095,000	1 to 1.27.
6	Mississippi River seepage, Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.	Silent.	Silent.
6	Mississippi River at Lansing, Iowa.	39,000	Do.
6	Mississippi River at Wabasha, Minn.	22,000	Do.
6	Mississippi River at Lake Pepin, Minn.	79,000	Do.
6	Mississippi River at Hastings, Minn.	34,270	1 to 1.3.
6	Big Sioux River, S. Dak.	325,000	1 to 3.6.
6	Cumberland River and tributaries, Tennessee.	230,000,000	1 to 3.
7	Big Sandy River, Ky.	82,300,000	1 to 1.6.
7	Illinois waterway and Grand Calumet River, Ill.	21,000,000	1 to 2.
7	Chicago River, North Branch of Illinois, Ill.	28,000	Silent.
8	Napa River, Calif.	865,000	1 to 1.14.
8	Sacramento River, Calif.	12,742,000	1 to 1.13.
8	Columbia River, Oreg.	1,044,000	1 to 2.22.
8	.....do.....	1,381,500	1 to 4.7.
8	.....do.....	76,000	1 to 1.5.
8	Columbia River, Wash.	104,000,000	Silent.

NOTE.—There are 33 river improvement projects, the 10 largest of which are as follows:

	Cost	Economic ratio
1. Arkansas River	$435,000,000	1 to 1.08.
2. Cumberland River and tributaries	230,000,000	1 to 3.
3. Tombigbee-Tennessee	116,941,000	1 to 1.05.
4. Columbia River	104,000,000	Silent.
5. Big Sandy River	82,300,000	1 to 1.6.
6. Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint	73,361,000	1 to 1.08.
7. Red River	42,000,000	1 to 1.33.
8. Illinois waterway and Calumet	21,000,000	1 to 2.
9. Schuylkill River	12,895,000	Silent.
10. Sacramento River	12,740,000	1 to 1.13.

Why I Opposed the Wyatt Subsidized Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from a veteran with my answer to same:

MAY 15, 1946.

The Honorable BEN F. JENSEN,
United States Representative,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: I am a veteran living in your district and I am wondering why you voted against the veterans' housing bill.

My family has long been a supporter of yours and we feel you must have had good reasons for this and I would like to know what the reasons are.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER E. GILLETEE, Jr.

MISSOURI VALLEY, IOWA.

MAY 21, 1946.

DEAR WALTER: I am pleased to have your letter of May 15 and to have the opportunity of giving you my reasons for opposing the so-called veterans' housing bill.

The records will show that I have supported every bill benefiting veterans, their widows and orphans, and I shall continue to do so; but never will I support a bill which in my opinion is designated to make a political football of the veteran, or to hoodwink him one iota.

Of course, it goes without saying that for anyone in my position to oppose a bill which on its face proposes benefits for our veterans is something out of the ordinary to even think of doing, for fear his actions will not be understood. However, you may be sure that so long as I am in Congress I shall, after thorough study of every issue, say what I think are true facts and vote my honest convictions, regardless of the consequences. I am sure you will agree that that is what you and every American has the right to expect of your public servants.

On February 13, 1946, when the Wyatt housing bill was first proposed, the following is what I said on the floor of the House of Representatives in regard to it:

"Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I can see nothing but confusion and very few houses getting built for veterans if the Wyatt scheme is carried through. I must say it was one of the greatest surprises and shocks I have ever experienced to learn that the House Banking and Currency Committee would agree to such an ill-advised and unnecessarily costly scheme as the Wyatt plan to subsidize this proposed building program to the tune of $850,000,000 out of an already bankrupt Treasury. Surely the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and his followers on that committee should know that the primary factor in getting these houses built is to make it possible for the producers of lumber to get a price for that lumber that will justify paying a good wage to his employees, pay all running expenses, and make a fair profit. If that is done, all the mills will start to hum pronto. Then, within a few months supply will meet demand and then our traditional competitive

system will keep prices down where they belong; but no, that is not the New Deal way.

"When, oh when, I ask, are we going to stop these unnecessary raids on the Federal Treasury? Every dime of which must be paid back after being earned by the sweat of some workingman's brow.

"Mr. Wyatt talks about using surplus war plants in which to build prefabricated houses. I wonder how the bricklayers, carpenters, painters, and other workmen in the trade, many of them veterans, in other sections of the country will feel about that, to say nothing about the building material dealers, too? The facts are that all these needed houses can be built quicker and better by local labor in every community and for far less money if only they could get the material needed. And they could soon get that material by simply adjusting the OPA ceiling prices on certain lumber and building material, as I have stated before; actually it is that simple. And then Mr. Wyatt talks about a one-bedroom prefabricated house to cost around $3,500. My own knowledge and experience in the manufacture of prefabricated houses with the information I have right now from reliable sources and my 24 years of experience in the retail lumber and home-building business makes it my plain duty to speak out now and say that no one, regardless of where he lives, should pay over $2,000 for a good prefabricated house built of regular materials up to a size of 20 by 22 feet, or 18 by 24 feet, with one bedroom, living room, dining nook, small kitchen, and shower bathroom, exclusive of utilities and foundation material.

"Our veterans will surely be taken for a ride if the Wyatt scheme goes through. A few builders of homes would make millions upon millions at the expense of the veterans, who would get it in the neck twice; first, by a needlessly high price for a house, and, secondly, by paying his share of the tax to pay the $850,000,000 subsidy proposed by Wyatt in his bureaucratic plan. This must not happen.

"I do not propose to sit idly by and see it happen to the American veterans. Yes, they must have homes, but they demand and have a right to expect their representatives in Congress to see to it that they are not fooled or cheated. So, for heaven's sake let us use our own heads.

"If there is the slightest question in anybody's mind as to who is holding down production of lumber and other materials needed to build homes for returning veterans and other Americans, all they need to do is to read the facts as set out so clearly in the following editorials and releases by men who know the lumber business and the building business from A to Z.

"President Truman, the OPA, and Housing Director Wyatt can plan and scheme and talk until they are blue in the face, while everyone who knows something about the lumber business and the building industry listen with utter disgust, knowing full well there is but one solution to the problem, and that is an adjustment in the ceiling prices on certain lumber items set by OPA Director Bowles and O. K.'d by President Truman.

"Of course, a better solution would be a complete hands-off by the bungling OPA czars whose primary purpose, it seems, is to force private operators out of business, then declare another emergency exists as an excuse for the Government to take over the mills and lumber yards, or pay a huge subsidy out of an already bankrupt Treasury, which is the New Deal's stock in trade whenever their bungling in business reaches the climax, as it now has in the lumber industry, as well as in most every line of business where they have interfered with their silly regulations. The OPA must be stopped before the OPA stops America.

"If I were in business today, I would keep a good vermin exterminator handy for self-protection against unlawful search and seizure by any scoundrel. Every law-abiding American citizen has that right under our Constitution. I certainly would make at least one OPA "wise guy" cite me the law which gave him the right to nose around in my business. I said the law, not some rule or regulation or edict which possibly he himself had concocted. Then, if I felt myself guilty under the law, I would pay my fine, but if not, I would fight them if it took the last cow in the barn, for surely the time has come to fight tooth and tong for principle, or lose our birthright. What I have just said may sound out of order, but I have lost all patience with this OPA outfit and a lot of other un-American rot emanating from and condoned by the party in power to enslave the American people by the same methods so successfully used to destroy free, private enterprise and to bankrupt many of the other nations on this globe during the past decade. Certainly that is not what our fighting men fought, bled, and died for all over the world in this last war, or any other war.

"The House Banking and Currency Committee are holding hearings right at this time to determine what to do with OPA. Let us hope and pray that that committee will either bring in a bill speaking out in clear, concise, understandable language just what the duties of the OPA shall be, or else a recommendation for an immediate liquidation of the whole outfit.

"Now, why do I say that? Simply because the present operations of the OPA are accomplishing the exact opposite of what it was intended to do, to say nothing about the abuses suffered by millions of law-abiding citizens in their struggle to stay in business. Thousands have already thrown in the sponge, and many more thousands are about ready to give up the fight, close out, shut down, or sell out to some big competitor who has an "in" with the party in power and can get by with most anything and everything, because they have the kind of salve it takes. How, I ask, can prices be kept down when competition and production is kept down to a minimum; and, mark you, that is exactly what OPA is doing today as every fair-minded person must know, and as the following editorials and news releases prove conclusively.

"Mr. Wyatt proposes to build 2,700,000 so-called low-cost homes during 1946 and 1947. How in heaven's name, I ask, does he expect anybody to take him seriously in the light of the conditions the OPA has brought about and seem determined to carry through in the lumber industry, to hold down production. These homes, they say, will be low-cost homes, costing $6,000 or less. But to 75 percent of the American people a $6,000 home is a high-cost home. So, even if lumber is made available by some hook or crook, a $6,000 or even a $5,000 home is more money than 75 percent of the veterans can afford to spend, or will want to go into debt for; or at least should go in debt for, regardless of whose money is used, unless they are settled at sure, permanent employment at a wage or salary that will justify the monthly payments. I speak from experience, for I was one of those many veterans of the World War I who built a better home than my income warranted, and believe me, it was mighty tough going to hold that home for many long years. So, my advice to all prospective home builders with limited means, is, build a home to fit your income, add to it as you can afford, but above all, own your own home, be it ever so humble. First, because you owe it to your family and yourself, and, second, because your America will always live if America has a majority of its people living in their own homes. Property and home owners are capitalists, you know. You will find very few Communists living in homes of their own in the United States of America, and not one person has a home of his own choosing in Russia, remember that. But again, I warn you, build to fit your pocketbook, do not take chances. Even Uncle Sam is a ruthless collector at times, and it must be awful to lose the place you love to call Home Sweet Home. Deal with your home town building-material dealers, carpenters, and contractors. They will give you sound advice and 100 cents worth of house for every dollar you should spend, which is to their advantage as well as yours.

"Mr. Chairman, I have introduced a bill to stop all exportation of lumber until our needs are supplied.

"Now read what others have to say about this most important matter. After you read I am sure you will agree with what I have just said."

[From the Red Oak (Iowa) Express of February 4, 1946]

"'SOMETHING SHOULD BE DONE

"'Not long ago Representative BEN JENSEN was in this town calling on friends. A lumberman, himself, he was naturally interested in the problems of that important business. He told friends of the unhappy feelings of servicemen who came home to find that they could not buy lumber to build a house. Yet, these same servicemen may have passed on the high seas ships loaded with lumber going abroad.

"'In this issue we publish an editorial which is reprinted from the American Lumberman. It shows that lumber manufacturers are allowed to get a higher price for export than permitted by our good friends in the OPA at Washington when the same lumber is sold for home consumption.

"'Oh, yes; the OPA is protecting us on prices, but darned little lumber can we buy. It is obvious that manufacturers cannot continue to sell it at a loss, nor will they do so when any profitable sale presents itself. Lumber companies cannot print money or charge up losses to taxes. This the Government does not seem to understand.

"'We can never straighten out our shortage problems as long as the OPA, with its tangle of red tape, proceeds to cause months or a year of delay in finding out things that other people already know.

"'Farmers, businessmen, prospective home owners in this community know that they cannot get material with which to build. They also probably know that if we continue shipping our lumber abroad they will never get it. It resolves into the question of who's country is this?—ours, the people's—or the OPA's? Apparently, the only answer is to put sufficient pressure on your representatives and to write to the OPA in the hopes of getting a stick of lumber when you need it. We recommend that every interested person read the editorial from the American Lumberman.

"'IMMEDIATE REVISION OF OPA'S PRICE SCHEDULES IMPERATIVE TO GET HOME BUILDING LUMBER IN VOLUMES

"'Five months have elapsed since VJ-day, but the late moves in Washington, supposedly aimed at improving the Nation's critical building material supply situation are not practical, and will not alleviate the housing shortage. Until an all-out program to stimulate production of building materials is launched, home building will be stymied. A review of OPA ceiling price schedules on lumber reveal the reasons why mills are not producing the items needed for home construction.

"'The Nation's lumber industry is capable of producing more lumber than can be consumed in the greatest building boom ever experienced. Lumber production has always

been governed by the volume of construction—home building has never, until now, been dependent on the amount of lumber available. But under a price structure designed to encourage production for war, lumber items needed for home building are not being produced in volume, and many operations in some regions are entirely out of production because of inability to show a profit.

" 'In the southern producing area, OPA's refusal to recognize that private business is different from Government—in that it must operate within its income, has thrown more than 25 percent of that production out of operation and the decline is continuing. F. o. b. mill ceiling prices on southern pine have increased 24 percent since MPR No. 19 was issued in 1941. That looks good until it is learned that direct labor costs have risen 93.3 percent in the same period and the cost of operating materials and supplies have increased 107.5 percent along with a 33-percent increase in living costs. Normally about 65 percent of southern pine lumber goes into building construction.

" 'West coast producers have not been forced to discontinue operation as generally as those in the South, but they have not been able to cut many home building lumber items at a profit because of OPA ceiling maladjustments. For example, rough green vertical grain B and better clear fir 4" x 12"—12' can be sold for $75 per thousand board feet. When the same item, put through many expensive additional operations, comes out as 1" x 4"—12' B and better flat grain flooring, the OPA ceiling price is only $45—the same price that prevailed in 1942. Or, if the firm deals in export trade, the 4 x 12's mentioned can be sold for export at $87 per thousand instead of being cut into $45 flooring—the result, a substantial footage of our lumber is being exported. Even when flat grain cants are cut into 1" x 4"—12' vertical grain B and better fir flooring, it sells at the 1942 price of $60. Fir 6" x 12"—12' rough green B and better vertical grain sell for $74 per thousand, but when run into 1" x 6"—12' B and better flat grain flooring or drop siding, the price is only $50 per thousand—the 1942 price. Framing lumber as compared to plank and timbers must be repriced if mill operators are to be interested in cutting logs to dimension rather than the easily cut less-wanted items. Instead of lumber manufacturers being able to adjust their cutting schedules to satisfy the market, they are forced, under OPA ceilings, to produce items which are not suitable for home construction.

" 'Unless OPA price schedules are revised lumber production will remain down and what production there is will not develop items needed for home building in any quantity. Furthermore, because OPA price schedules on lumber should have been revised last September it is imperative they be changed immediately—and not after the conventional 6 to 9 months of study and research.' "

[Telegram]

" 'NEW ORLEANS, LA., *January 30 1946.*

" 'Hon. JOHN W. SNYDER,

" '*Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion,*

" '*East Wing, The White House,*

" '*Washington, D. C.:*

" 'On September 10, 1945, we advised you fully of the distressing conditions existing in the southern-pine industry and warned you that the responsibility for any shortage in southern pine lies directly upon Government agencies having control of the industry through their actions or through their lack of action. Since that time, on November 29, OPA authorized an increase which was wholly inadequate and too late to meet the situation. At a meeting of southern-pine lumbermen widely representing the industry here today, Judge Collet's directive No. 94 came as a shocking surprise to those present. It was the unanimous opinion of these lumbermen that the directive is utterly unsound, wholly impractical, and will be ineffective. It will not increase production. To the contrary, in the opinion of those present, it will reduce production and certainly, under the conditions set forth in this directive, there will not be any price increase for this distressed industry. The suggested basic goal of 9,000,000,000 feet for 1946 is absolutely impossible of attainment under directive 94, and it will add materially to the chaotic conditions already obtaining in this industry. In fact, we believe this directive will have the effect of destroying any hope for an increase in price to southern-pine producers. Since you are responsible for the reconversion program, we feel that you should have this warning that directive 94 will be disastrous. It gives no relief and will further tend to discourage the present inadequate production of lumber which threatens to become the major bottleneck in the housing and reconversion programs. We strongly urge its immediate withdrawal.

" 'SOUTHERN PINE WAR COMMITTEE,

" 'C. C. SHEPPARD, *Chairman,*

" 'H. C. BERCKES, *Secretary.*' "

" '(The above telegram has also been sent to the following with the explanation that the original was addressed to Hon. John W. Snyder; Judge J. C. Collet, Stabilization Administrator, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Washington, D. C.; Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.; Mr. Wilson Wyatt, Housing Expediter, room 323, Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Mr. M. W. Niewenhaus, Director, Forest Products Division, Civilian Production Administration, Washington, D. C.; Mr. J. D. Small, Administrator, Civilian Production Administration, Washington, D. C.)'

[From Lumber Buyers Weekly Market Letter of January 25, 1946]

" 'MILLS MUST SUPPLY CONSTRUCTION LUMBER

" 'On February 1 the manufacturers of softwood lumber must set aside 40 percent of their output to be applied on HH priority ratings. This 40 percent must be made up of "housing construction lumber," such as flooring, ceiling, siding, partition, casing, base, molding strips, boards, 2-inch dimension, finish, shop lumber, and lath.

" 'Each sawmill must reserve 40 percent of its total production for February and each month thereafter, to be applied on HH orders. In case the lumber reserved is not sold by the twentieth of the month in which production is reserved, the stock may be sold on orders other than those carrying an HH priority.

" 'The above sounds very nice, and if 40 percent of the fir and pine mills' production is diverted to the purpose intended, we will see a lot of lumber moving through dealers' yards, but it may not work out exactly as planned. Already some lumber manufacturers claim they cannot and will not obey the "edict" unless the ceiling prices on construction material are raised. The whole order will be shot full of holes unless the OPA revises the price ceiling so that the lumber manufacturers can make construction material without a heavy loss. If the OPA tries to enforce this ruling without the coopertion of the lumber industry, we can visualize all kinds of evasions and an active black market.

" 'RETAILERS TO FEEL OPA SQUEEZE

" 'The OPA has just issued amendment 15 to Second Revised MPR 215, which has the effect of freezing retail prices on northern hemlock and other softwood from Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan, and western red cedar shingles, on the basis of the prices in effect on December 1, 1945. This means, in the case of western red cedar shingles, the retail dealer must absorb the 20 cents a square advance allowed the shingle manufacturers, effective December 17, 1945.

" 'This ruling is in line with Chester Bowles' idea of holding the line against inflation. Labor may get higher wages, but the extra cost of manufacturing or distribution must be absorbed by the manufacturers or distributors. This is one way to control profits and so away with competition. The next step, no doubt, will be to freeze lumber prices, and then allow labor and increasing manufacturing and distributing costs to squeeze the manufacturers and distributors still further.

" 'In theory, the plan to control prices and, incidentally, profits, appears workable to men who have learned economy out of a book, but in practice it fails to work. If the manufacturing profit on an item is not satisfactory, the manufacturer simply will not make that item, and if the retailer is not allowed a fair profit, he will not stock the item. If you do not believe this is a fact, try to buy a shirt or a pair of shorts.

" 'In our business, we have a good example of how a price squeeze can affect the supply of any commodity. The prices on flooring, drop siding, boards, and 2-inch dimension are out of line, so the lumber manufacturers simply do not make these items, but instead, they make plank, timbers, and rough green clears. In this instance, Mr. Bowles is holding the line, but the supply of necessary items to build homes is about nil.

" 'FIR DIMENSION

" 'Practically all the fir manufacturers out here are taking advantage of the footnote in RMPR 26 applying to 2-inch dimension, which reads as follows: "Odd or fractional widths, add $1 to and compute footage on next wider even width except 2 by 3." In order to comply with this footnote, a manufacturer can cut 2- by 4¼-inch dimension, surface to 1⅝ by 3⅞ inches and charge for 2 by 6 inches, using a price $1 over the ceiling price on 2 by 6 inches. The same rule applies to other widths; that is, stock can be sawn to 2 by 10¼ inches and surfaced to 1⅝ by 9⅝ inches, and the purchaser must pay not only for 2 by 12 inches but $1 over 2 by 12 inches ceiling price. The fir mills are working this to the limit. Buyers are willing to pay the extra in order to get stock. Everyone knows it is only a question of time until OPA stops the practice, but it is a good graft as long as it lasts.

" 'WHY IT IS SO HARD TO BUY LUMBER

" 'We know some of our clients cannot understand why we cannot place mixed-car orders and orders calling for flooring, drop siding, boards, and 2-inch dimension, but when one knows all the circumstances, it is easy to understnad why yard items are practically impossible to buy.

" 'The lumber manufacturer is only human, and he is going to cut the stock that nets the most money, and that means rough plank, timbers, and green clears. This deplorable condition has been brought about by the stupidity of the OPA, and we do not blame the lumber manufacturers too much. We probably would do the same if we were in their place, but it is going to take lumber other than plank, timbers, and green clears if we are to build a million homes this year.

" 'On account of price ceilings being made by edict rather than by the law of supply and demand, it is only natural for the lumber manufacturers to take advantage of every loophole to get more money for their stock, just as we all do when figuring our income tax. If we had a natural market, based on

supply and demand, there would be no reason for manufacturers to resort to the subterfuges they are now using, as each item manufactured would be priced on the basis of supply and demand.

" 'Our clients, of course, would like to buy kiln dried 2-inch dimension, but no manufacturer is going to make 2 by 4—R/L No. 1 Common K. D. S4S at $34.50 f. o. b. mill when he can sell 4 by 12—R/L No. 1 Common Rough Green at $27.50. The OPA will allow reworking plants to rework these 4 by 12's into kiln-dried 2 by 4's, and for doing this the reworking plants can charge $18 or $20 per thousand feet, but the legitimate manufacturer can charge only $7 difference between kiln dried 2 by 4's and the rough green 4 by 12's. No wonder legitimate lumber manufacturers are not making kiln dried dimension. The same discrepancy applies to 1 by 4—R/L B and better F. G. Flooring. The ceiling price on flooring is $45 mill basis, but 4 by 6—R/L B and better rough green clear is priced at $57. No manufacturer, in his right mind, is going to cut 4 by 6 rough green clear into flooring and sell it for $12 less than he can get for 4 by 6's.

" 'We are told there are to be new fir ceiling prices that are more in line with needs and conditions, but we are afraid we will be given another patchwork job that will cure nothing. What we need is a major operation.

" 'HOW OPA WORKS

" 'The ceiling price of fir railroad ties is $28.50 per thousand feet f. o. b. mill. If for export, the mills can charge $32 per thousand feet. This is an example of why the mills like foreign business. Another laugh—a tie measuring 6 by 8—8 feet supposed to weigh 3,500 pounds per thousand feet, but a tie 6 by 8—9 feet is figured at 3,300 pounds. No one knows why.

" 'The Canadian Government does not try to regulate prices on export shipments. The fir mills in British Columbia have just sold 32,000,000 feet of ties to China on the basis of $36 to $47.50 per thousand feet. If our mills could have furnished them the price could not have been over $32.

" 'SALES, PRODUCTION, AND SHIPMENTS

" 'The confidential report of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association for the week ending January 19, which was mailed to the association's member mills today, will show the following:

[In millions]

Week ending	Dec. 22	Dec. 29	Jan. 5	Jan. 12	Jan. 19
Production	76	36	44	78	78
Sales	69	55	60	76	85
Shipments	71	47	46	78	84
Unfilled orders	599	612	618	604	595
Mill inventories	307	298	294	292	284

" 'Sales were divided as follows:

[In millions]

Week ending	Dec. 22	Dec. 29	Jan. 5	Jan. 12	Jan. 19
Rail shipment	52	39	40	54	58
Domestic cargo	5	7	7	8	9
Export	5	2	6	6	9
Local sales	7	6	7	8	8

" 'Unfilled orders:

[In millions]

Week ending	Dec. 22	Dec. 29	Jan. 5	Jan. 12	Jan. 19
Rail shipment	495	501	495	483	476
Domestic cargo	35	37	43	40	40
Export	69	74	81	81	79

" 'The Western Pine Association's report for the week ending January 12 showed the following:

[In millions]

Week ending	Dec. 15	Dec. 22	Dec. 29	Jan. 5	Jan. 12
Production	26	18	12	16	24
Sales	23	20	10	21	45
Shipments	28	19	12	22	33
Unfilled orders	242	208	202	196	246

[From Crow's Pacific Coast Lumber Digest of December 15, 1945]

" 'INDUSTRY IS QUITTING THE UNEQUAL BATTLE

" '(By C. C. Crow)

" 'This week Mr. Frank Ransom, president of the Eastern & Western Lumber Co., of Portland, announced that within the next few days they will close for all time. This is one of the top sawmills of the Northwest that has been in operation for 45 years and at its peak produced over a long period an average of 110,000,000 feet of lumber annually.

" 'Only a comparatively short time ago numerous other well-known sawmill concerns took the same steps as the Eastern & Western Lumber Co. To name a few, there have been the Clark & Wilson Lumber Co. with its three big plants on the Columbia River, Pacific National Lumber Co., Tacoma, Wash.; Silver Falls Timber Co., Silverton, Oreg.; Westport Lumber Co., Westport, Oreg.; and the big Bellingham division of Bloedel-Donovan Lumber Co.

" 'Keep in mind that, with possibly one exception, all of these mills have or had standing timber of their own when they closed. Keep in mind that all of these concerns were in a good financial position and enjoyed the prestige of long-established connections with the very best trade both domestic and foreign who had come to know that they were capably managed and well equipped and their product of dependable, high-class uniformity.

" 'Why have these mills quit? No one who knows the conditions under which they have been operating can criticize them.

" 'Some would have you believe they closed because of the inability to get timber. That has been a small factor only. In former years all of these concerns brought timber from greater distances than they did in the last days of their sawing. During the peak of Columbia River production, logs were being towed at snail's pace up the river against the current from the very mouth of this stream 100 miles from Portland. Plenty of timber is available today in the opposite direction from Portland up the Williamette Valley at shorter distances and it all moves down grade to the mills. True, it is not on the average as good Douglas fir as was harvested on the lower Columbia River, but it does make excellent lumber even though carrying a smaller percentage of clears.

" 'While the managers of these liquidated mills have never openly made such an admission, it has not been the inability to get logs that has been the major reason for their quitting. They have tired of fighting Government bureaus. They have tired of constantly struggling for elbow room from the never-ending stream of red tape turned out and wrapped around them by Government crackpots. They have tired of spending half of each day arguing with Government-backed, red labor racketeers. They have tired of waiting for months for the OPA to make decisions that should not take them more than a few days as that Bureau fails utterly to make urgently needed and clearly deserved adjustments to regulations and prices to meet the changing conditions while production costs mount. They have tired of having the worst radical element in their organizations preach and teach contempt for the employer. They have tired of having these same reds first encouraging and later demanding of loyal employees that they hold to a minimum the personal effort which they expend as they did during the war when lumber was so indispensable, and the output per man per hour dropped to a ruinously low level. They have tired of labor demands for more and more concessions while their efficiency continues to drop. They have tired of having Government-employed labor troublemakers constantly circulating amongst their employees, figuring out ways to make satisfied men dissatisfied. They have tired of the constant threat of unauthorized "quickie" strikes and the progressive infringements upon the authority to direct their own business, a result of the insolent and overbearing Government-schooled policy of organized labor.

" 'The facts are these excellent, well-equipped mills capable of employing thousands of men and turning out millions of feet of lumber each day, which is urgently needed, have sickened of studied dictation imposed upon them by a Government administered by a spineless Congress of self-seeking politicians led by an accidental President, a weakling, the impotent spawn of ward-heeling, gangster politics who is satisfied to do the only thing he is capable of doing and that is to drift along with the New Deal flotsam on which he was born politically.

" 'The liquidation of sawmills has only started. The OPA and numerous other bureaus, with their dilatory tactics and impractical hamstringing of all industry, are making it necessary for a businessman to become a crook if he stays in business and remains solvent. More good mills have been sold for a song during the past year than in any 10 years previously. This has also been liquidation. Sawmill operators, who have put in a lifetime building up such organizations as those already mentioned, have with full justification come to realize that it is futile and certainly not worth while to continue in the one-sided battle against merged subversion of entrenched Federal parlor pinks and the soap-box radicals they are forced to employ.

" 'What is true of the lumber industry in the Northwest is true of other industries in all sections of the United States. Any man who with hard work and close application has built up a business is not going to continue it, lose what he has, and shorten his own life by trying to do the impossible just to keep grasping politicians in office to test out the theories of a lot of academic nit-wits who could not run a peanut stand and come out whole even if furnished free of charge the necessary equipment and materials.

" 'It will take someone bigger than a group of demagogues headed by a necktie salesman to keep this country from losing its indispensable industry leadership, without which it is destined to sacrifice the democracy and free enterprise with which we at one time became the greatest Nation in the world and the hope and ambition of oppressed people the world over.' "

[From Improvement Bulletin of January 3, 1946]

" 'IN PERSPECTIVE

"(By G. L. Anderson)

" 'We enter this, the first new year of peace, with altogether too many difficulties in the way of a prompt and prosperous return to the normal business of the Nation.

" 'It becomes more and more evident that the pains of transition from war to peace do not spring from the defects of capitalism nor the errors of labor but from the exploits of government.

" 'We are reaping, whether we like or not, the harvest of too much governmental control and regimentation of both employer and employee, of too much interference in those functions which are not properly the province of the Government, and of too many ignorant, inefficient and even vicious bureaus and bureaucrats which have become the tares in the wheat of our national industrial economy.

" 'As a consequence even the great construction program which was to be depended on for much of the immediate employment of our returning veterans and displaced war-industry workers, is being slowed to a halting state and may even come to a complete standstill.

" 'At this moment, capital and industry are ready and willing to go forward in the greatest era of productivity this Nation has ever known, bulwarked by a consumer demand which would assure full employment and round-the-clock operation for every major and minor industry in the country. Unemployment, for everyone willing to work, would cease to exist for the next 5 years at least, if it were not for the unfortunate struggle between labor and industry which, basically, stems from Government interference and restrictions.

" 'Industry wants to go ahead and labor wants to be employed and between them, by intelligent consideration of mutual problems, there lies a solution for all difficulties, but from within and without both are plagued by too many committees and agencies who, in the guise of settling, only succeed in widening the breach between the two factions.

" 'The latest suggestion that Government delve into the private records of corporations with fact-finding committees to determine whether or not higher wages can be paid out of capital is probably the most arrogant assumption of any governmental power advanced thus far in a long series of preliminary regimentations. It is a direct reversal of the old economic rule that the selling price is the determining factor in the price of the component parts of any article or service.

" 'Where the serious damage is done, however, is in the relationship between industry and labor. Erroneous premises are set up and equally erroneous conclusions result, which widen the breach between the two factions and lessen the possibility of reasonable conclusions.

" 'Dividends to stockholders are the wages of capital. Investors have as much right to these wages as do the workers, for their money provides the opportunity for employment. Capital is the safeguard of industry. Industry does not have the limitless assets of government on which to draw. When industry needs huge sums of money it comes either from capital or from investors and where there is little of the former, and no reasonable assurance of dividends to the latter * * * no financing is possible.

" 'All of these things are known to reasonable, intelligent men, but for some reason, for the sake of political opportunities, they are ignored by government or bypassed through some wild-eyed theory which is born in the minds of men who wish to control everything.

" 'No government-controlled economy has ever paid workers anything but a bare subsistence. We have had opportunity to see that in the past 5 years. No nation, under any kind of political system, has ever approached the level of living conditions which has been reached in our Nation under private industry and profit system.

" 'Nor is there any better system yet devised which promises so much to the individual who works to produce and may none of us ever forget it.' "

Now, since that time the Wyatt housing bill has been somewhat amended. At first Mr. Wyatt claimed that in order to do the job he must have $850,000,000 for subsidies, as premium payments to give to producers and prefabricators—not to veterans, mind you. This figure was later reduced to $600,000,000, and then to $400,000,000 as the bill finally passed the Congress. Just how many thousand more Government agents and regulators will be put on this pay roll no one knows; but plenty, you may be sure of that. Also, a provision was placed in the bill and adopted to guarantee a profit to prefabricators for 200,000 prefab houses, which in all probability will be given to such concerns as Kaiser and United States Steel for building makeshift houses for veterans at a price very few of you will be anxious or able to pay, but that many veterans will be obliged to pay in order to have a roof over their heads, for the following reasons:

First, it is a known fact that the large concerns have the advantage over the local building-material dealers and small prefabricators in getting priorities for building materials of every kind—maybe it's because they have more folding money to use in black markets than the little fellow.

Second, since Wyatt's plan guarantees the sale of 200,000 prefab houses at a profit, it is natural to expect that the needed materials will be supplied first for these 200,000 houses, or for possibly 500,000, or even more of them, thus taking this material away from legitimate building dealers and home builders in every section of the Nation where it normally would be used to build houses for veterans at half the price.

Third, the building codes of most every city of any size will not permit the erection of small prefab houses within the corporation limits. True, some cities are attempting to revise their codes and regulations, but this will not solve the problem, due to the fact that in most of the larger cities the labor unions do not look with favor on having houses shipped from a far-off factory into their area of operation, because most of the labor has already been expended on them. Hence, the large cities will get most of the regular building materials of every kind, while the millions of veterans living in the smaller nonunion towns, villages, and on farms will be obliged to take the prefabs from Kaiser, United States Steel, etc., and pay two or three times more than such houses are actually worth, or go without for quite sometime. Those veterans will get a good, royal trimming at the hands of their own Government.

They say all this artificial stimulant is necessary to get 2,700,000 homes in 2 years in face of the fact that in the year 1925 our regular American building industry built over 900,000 homes and over 900,000 family living apartments without a lick of Government pressure control or interference subsidies.

At a committee hearing last week I asked Mr. Wyatt if the above analysis of the situation was not a fact. His only answer was that he was urging the larger cities to revise their codes. He knew full well that my analysis of the situation could not be successfully disputed, so he took the only out by saying practically nothing in reply to my question.

Now, I leave it to your good judgment, how could I have voted otherwise, knowing all these things, and representing as I do, veterans living in over 100 small cities, towns, and villages, and a multitude of farm veterans, besides thousands of carpenters, masons, home builders and building material dealers in my district, all of whose interests I am duty bound to protect, especially when I am convinced this program will prove costly and detrimental to a great majority of our veterans and to all the people of America in the final anaylsis?

With kindest good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN,
Member of Congress.

When Will Congress Talk Back?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the following is an address delivered April 5, 1946, by Gov. Ralph F. Gates, of the State of Indiana, before the Hoosier State Press Association.

It is a challenging and thought-provoking appeal that should be read by every American:

WHEN WILL CONGRESS TALK BACK?

Some years ago a great newspaperman, William Allen White, wrote a famous editorial entitled "What's the Matter With Kansas?" If Mr. White were alive today I think he might be tempted to write another such editorial—only this time the title would be "What's the Matter With the United States?"

For this, today, is the $275,000,000,000 question, and it is being asked on every hand by bewildered men and women. Mr. White, were he alive, would know the answer—you as editors know the answer—and the answer is one word—confusion.

Confusion is what is the matter with the United States today, and it is confusion that is centralized, like almost everything else, in Washington. Today I want to talk about that confusion—how it affects me as the Governor of Indiana—how it affects you as editors and as citizens and taxpayers, and what we can do about it. For we must do something about it, if this is to be a healthy and prosperous nation.

There is an old nursery rhyme about the old woman who lived in a shoe and had so many children she didn't know what to do. Her troubles were small, however, compared to the troubles of our national uncle who lives in Washington and has 135,000,000 children scattered from Maine to California. He doesn't know what to do, either—and the reason is the same—he has tried to mother too large a brood.

We might as well face the facts. The confusion in Washington is not accidental—and it is not temporary. The Federal Government, with the best of intentions, has been trying to do too many things. It has assumed jurisdiction and responsibility for individual, corporate, and State problems. It tries to tell me how to run this State—it tries to tell you how to live your life and run your business.

Washington, for many years now, has been like a hysterical mother who sees pneumonia in every case of sniffles. Today the country is suffering from a complication of remedies rather than diseases.

Organically, the Nation is sound. We have everything. There is an abundance of raw materials, tools, shops, skilled labor, management know-how, sales organization, advertising media, communications systems, and transportation facilities. To match this, we have the greatest demand for goods in the history of the world.

Yet in the midst of all this potential prosperity, this great Nation has worked up a critical case of poverty. No longer is one-third of the Nation ill clad, ill fed, and ill housed. Now, thanks to the confusion in Washington, we are almost all in that condition—not because we cannot buy, but because, with all our miraculous productive capacity, there is nothing to buy.

I can't get shirts, my wife can't get stockings, and you can't get paper.

With surplus cotton and idle factories, we have shirtless citizens with bulging pocketbooks.

Truly, our problem is mental and not physical.

Psychiatrists seek to solve a mental ill by probing the past of their patients. So perhaps we, as a nation, can do that and find the thread that will lead us to the national sanity we once had.

There was a time when our people insisted that it was the duty and the privilege of every citizen to stand on his own two feet. In that era a man made honest decisions with the calm assurance that Washington considered him an adult, capable of living his own life and running his own business, and certainly more familiar with the details of its operation than some clerk hired on the basis of a civil-service examination or a political acquaintanceship.

For a long time there has been a trend toward centralization in the political affairs of the Nation. The product of that trend is bureaucracy, which, Lawrence Sullivan says, is "representative government suffering a nervous break-down." How far that trend has gone can be shown by a few comparisons.

During the first 140 years since the Capital was moved to Washington, the machinery of the Federal Government, as measured in administative personnel, expanded, roughly, 700 times faster than the national population. That growth has become an urgent problem. From 1800 to 1940 our population multiplied by 25, but the Federal civil personnel multiplied by 17,950—and that expansion has further tripled in the last 6 years.

In the last quarter of a century we had World War I, a boom, a depression, and World War II. With each major event, Washington became more possessive. In each crisis more of our independence was surrendered. Each time the Government grew larger.

As of the 1st of January, there were 2,946,947 civilian employees of the executive branch of the Federal Government, and that figure increased 30,000 during January 1946—at a time when, supposedly, the vast personnel of the war agencies was being demobilized.

One out of every 37 of our citizens now is working for the Government—and we can see the increasing pressure of Federal encroachment even out here in Indiana. This city of Indianapolis is a long way from Washington, but already the Federal Government occupies 11 percent of all the available office space in downtown Indianapolis—and it is asking for more. Each office it occupies costs you money—each one dispossesses a tenant who might use its facilities to create employment—productive employment—and to produce or distribute goods.

Along with the governors of the other 47 States, I have been greatly concerned about this top-heavy centralization—not alone because it is costly and inefficient but because more and more it is reaching for power, undermining and vitiating our local governments—the very governments which, because they are closest to the people, are most responsive to the people's will—and we know that the cost of maintaining this clumsy machine—this instrument of confusion—is one of the basic reasons why inflation today is squeezing the value out of the savings of our people.

Anyone who has dealt with the Federal Government—and who of us hasn't?—knows that the Washington approach today is that of an all-wise adult dealing with a child. The highly advanced Federal bureaucracy shares at least one viewpoint with the totalitarian governments—a profound contempt for the individual's ability to take care of himself. We have ceased to be citizens and are becoming wards. Our modern bureaucrats would be the last to agree with Woodrow Wilson when he said, "I have never found a man who knew how to take care of me, and reasoning from that point out, I conjecture that there isn't any man who knows how to take care of all the people of the United States."

This is not a political issue. It is a fundamental problem.

Even those who have carried bureaucratic centralization to new and astronomical proportions are beginning to worry about this Frankenstein they have created.

In Missouri, the home State of President Truman, a resolution recently was introduced in the State house of representatives that the State "give notice to the Congress of the United States that Missouri now takes the lead among the States in helping solve the Federal debt crisis and that we will refrain and forbear from demanding further grants from Congress."

And in his inaugural address, the Governor of Virginia, the Honorable William M. Tuck, pointed to the indisputable truth that Federal grants not only destroy State sovereignty, but bring far less return to the taxpayers than when the States raise and spend the sum directly.

Here is what he said—"Money paid by the taxpayer to the Federal Government and then returned by it to the States is burdened with the collection and handling charges incurred by the Government. It is also burdened with the operating costs of the headquarters of the bureau in Washington which passes on the grant and regulates its expenditures. Finally, it is burdened with the salaries and expenses of the Federal agents who are sent into the States to personally regulate the State agencies in their spending of what is left of the money received from the taxpayer. The amount left is about half."

As Governor of Indiana, I know what Governor Tuck was talking about. I have seen it happen many times in our own State. And I have seen the wealth of Indiana siphoned off by the Federal Government to be spent in Mississippi or Arkansas or Georgia, to do things that those States should do for themselves.

This is the situation, and it is a serious one. The question is—what can we do about it—what are we going to do about it?

The answer is to return to the principles of thrift and self-reliance that have built up this State, the most typically American of all the States. And those are typically American principles. One hundred years ago, we here in Indiana learned the folly of reckless spending. We bankrupted the State treasury by squandering tax money and borrowed money on canals, roads, and other so-called public improvements. We learned a hard lesson the hard way—and when our new constitution was written in 1851, it forbade the State to go into debt. Indiana still is a pay-as-you-go State—we have prospered, and our services have suffered in no way.

Hoosiers, too, know the value of self reliance—of doing for yourself and not depending on the bounty of others. During my campaign for governor 2 years ago, I placed particular emphasis on that principle—and I think it is fair to say that in this administration we have developed legislation and policies along that line. We arbitrate and conciliate our own labor disputes—we do not submit them to the interminable delays and vacillations of the National Labor Relations Board. We are solving our own problem of public health. We are promoting forestry, flood control, and soil conservation on a State basis. Our largest city, by State law, has its own program of slum clearance and redevelopment, using local funds and local brains—without asking a penny from Washington. We have our own fair-employment-practices machinery, our own State economic council. We are meeting our problems as Indiana problems. Indiana is no one's stepchild.

We can do the job, and do it better, because we know what needs to be done and how to do it. We are working with people and not formulas. We are doing what needs to be done, and doing it as far as we are permitted, with Indiana funds and Indiana personnel. That is what our State government is for.

I believe, and I think most Americans also believe, that a local problem can best be solved by a local government, a county problem by a county government, a State problem by a State alive to its duties and responsibilities. There are broad Nation-wide questions which require the machinery of the Nation as a whole—but you do not shoot sparrows with a howitzer nor hunt rabbits with a Sherman tank.

And it is only through a broad acceptance of local and State responsibility that the United States can meet the challenge of centralized bureaucracy. It is because States and cities in the past have failed to do their duty to their citizens that the Federal Government has moved in to do the things that should, and must, be done. It is easy to heap all the blame on the bureaucrats, but we must remember that the bureaucrat is only doing what he has been asked to do. We have asked for funds, we have shifted responsibilities, we have opened the door—and who is to blame if the Federal Government has walked in?

It is easy to blame Congress, too—but again, Congress only obeys the popular will. If his constituents want a free ride, a Congressman will whistle for the hack. If we as citizens and you as editors tell Congress that it is time to call a halt, that we are going to stand on our own feet, that we are going to do our own planning and our own improving, look after our own welfare and our own educating, we shall have little to fear from Federal encroachment. Congress will see to it that the Federal Government does fewer jobs better and many useless jobs not at all.

When will some courageous Representatives and Senators stand up and start demanding that the States take back some of their own responsibility and stop "passing the buck" to Washington?

When will some Congressman or Senator stand up and say he is getting tired of being called a moron, crook and incompetent generally, because he doesn't rush in with some new law to cure every pin prick as well as a cancerous growth?

When is some Congressman or Senator going to stand up and ask the States and local units of government why it is that they are not men and women enough to run their own schools, buy their own children's lunches, administer their own welfare program, and settle their own labor-relations problems?

And while we are asking questions, when is the great Conference of Governors, with its powerful organization, the Council of State Governments—going to start shouting, "We are sovereign States. We are not paupers, we are not children, and we can take care of these matters by ourselves. If the Federal Government will confine itself to its specifically designated constitutional powers, we will handle the rest."

Also, when are some of the southern governors going to announce to the Nation, "We of my State are not beggars—we don't need Pennsylvania's or Indiana's or Illinois' money. We are opposed and will fight those who are always wanting to increase Federal control of our schools and welfare programs by pointing to us as horrible examples. Attend to your business in Washington and we will take care of ours. Stop telling us and the world that we are charity seekers."

The answer to all those questions is that these things will happen when the citizens say they must, and that time is now.

There are 48 State governments and thousands of State and local officials. These people need to be put to work to see that de-

mocracy functions. They are close to the people and responsive to their wishes.

Here is the way to end the present confusion—here is the way for the Nation to get out of the red and out of the mess that it has created. It can fight its way out by pushing more and more governmental controls out of Washington and back to the States where they belong. It can insist that from a financial, a political, and a moral standpoint, Washington cannot accept additional responsibility.

To do so will not be popular in some quarters, nor will it be easy. It is hard sometimes to turn down a gift—even though you may know it is being charged to you. It is easier to drift, to take the line of least resistance, to follow the course of political expediency, than it is to stand self-reliantly on your own feet, and face and solve your own problems. It is human to pass the buck, and that is what many of our local governments have been doing.

That is what many such governments will continue to do until their citizens demand that they do the job which is their duty and their obligation.

As editors you must surely realize the dangers inherent in overgrown centralization. You have dealt with bureaucrats and you have seen the fingers of Federal power and domination reaching into your own communities. As informed men you must know that Washington, regardless of what administration is in power, is not all-wise. You know that it is wasteful folly to try to handle local problems on a national scale. You know that Federal money is not free, that it comes from our pockets and our earnings, just as truly and to a greater degree than money spent by the State, the townships and counties, the cities and towns. You know that when money goes to Washington we have a far smaller control over its disbursement than when it is handled by our township trustees, the county commissioners, and the State departments.

The average man, faced with these facts, will say, "But what can I do about it?" As one man, alone, perhaps he can do little. But as one man of many, he can do a great deal—if he only will.

We here in Indiana have great confidence in the grass roots. We believe in what Lincoln called "the ultimate justice of the people." We believe with him that "any policy to be permanent must have public opinion at the bottom—something in accordance with the philosophy of the human mind as it is." And out here in the State where Lincoln grew to manhood we believe in his precept that "in all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, the Government should not interfere." That is plain common sense.

To apply that, however, the people must be willing to do for themselves. And that is where you, as editors, can and must serve. You are leaders of your communities. You do more than report the news—you help to shape the thoughts and policies of the cities and towns where you live. You are a powerful force, and a force for good, in the affairs of the State. You, more than any other group, can awaken the people to their responsibilities and show them how to meet their problems. If you fail, we shall all fail and our individual lives will more and more fall into the shadow of Washington—and that shadow will come to blot out the light of enterprise, freedom, and self-reliance. We must not become a Nation of faceless men.

There is a big job ahead. It will be hard to buck the trend, to turn from wonderful nonsense and alluring theories to Hoosier sense. But it is the only way to end the confusion that besets us—it is the only way to check the creeping paralysis of bureacracy and bring order out of the present chaos. But if we, the people of the United States, do our part—as editors, as governors, as legislators, as county and city officials, and as citizens—it can and will be done, and we shall have an Indiana that is truly a sovereign State, and a Nation both orderly and prosperous.

Discussion of the Aluminum Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, most intelligent Americans are deeply interested in aluminum, its potentialities, its industrial aspects, its history. Recently, as a result of an interview with an eminent writer, my views on that subject were printed in a series of articles, commencing in April, in This Month magazine. I am appending hereunto the first of the three articles, this one having been printed in the April issue of This Month magazine:

ALCOA—PORTRAIT OF A MONOPOLY

(By Representative JOHN M. COFFEE as told to Allen Bernard)

For more than half a century the Aluminum Co. of America has exercised unparalleled influence upon the daily life of every American. The housewife has felt its shadow every time she buys a kitchen utensil, an electric iron, vacuum cleaner, washing machine, or refrigerator. Purchasers of cameras, typewriters, bicycles, modern furniture, all pay tribute to Alcoa. The tinfoil which protects your cigarets, candy, cheese, tooth paste, and scores of other items comes from Alcoa. The automobile you drive isn't lighter and more economical—because of Alcoa., Better housing has been retarded by Alcoa. Have and have not—but courtesy of Alcoa.

Three times in 34 years the Government has brought suit against Alcoa, charging violation of the antitrust laws. Twice, consent decrees were entered, in which the company bound itself to refrain from specific questionable practices. Last year, on March 12, 1945, a Federal court found that the Aluminium Co. of America was guilty of violating the Sherman Antitrust Act. The court decision confirmed officially what every well-informed citizen has long known: for 50 years Alcoa, a super monopoly, has exercised virtually 100 per cent control over the aluminum industry in this country.

Peacetime monopoly is characterized by the ruthless suppression of competition, limited production and employment, high prices, higher profits, and direct disregard or devious evasion of Federal law. In war, monopoly has proven a threat to the very existence of the Nation. It has helped to provide a ruthless enemy with arms for aggression and deprived its own people of the weapons of defense.

So powerful has this hydra become that Attorney General Tom Clark, in an 80-page report to Congress last September, declared that there was little hope in establishing free competition in the aluminum industry unless the vast Alcoa empire was effectively split up.

This, in brief outline, is the picture presented. It provides an outstanding example of the excesses of free enterprise in peace and in war.

Aluminum was first isolated as a metal in 1827. Its only use for more than 60 years was in the fabrication of jewelry and ornaments for royalty; it could not be exploited commercially until a method was developed to eliminate the oxygen from the raw materials. In 1886 an American inventor, Hall, discovered such a process. Two years later the aluminum monopoly in this country began, harmlessly enough, with the organization of the Pittsburgh Reduction Co. as the sole exploiter of the Hall process. Its initial capital was $20,000.

The metal—two-thirds lighter than steel, less than a third as heavy as copper—was still so precious that the entire daily output, 30 pounds a day, was stored in the office safe. It sold for $8 a pound.

Before the new company was 3 years old it ran into opposition—rival interests began production under a new and improved patent to smelt aluminum without the use of external heat. The resulting competition brought a slash in price, from $2 in October 1889 to 50 cents a pound in August 1891. Then 2 years later, Pittsburgh Reduction obtained an injunction halting its rival's production on the ground that the Hall patents were being infringed. Even while the injunction suit was pending, Pittsburgh Reduction raised its price from 50 to 90 cents a pound.

Ten years later, after a long legal battle, the ousted company obtained a final decision declaring Pittsburgh Reduction guilty of infringing the newer patents. Faced with complete shut-down is the result of this decision, Pittsburgh Reduction bought the disputed patent rights from its rival, paying a sum (in cash and credit) almost equivalent to its total paid-in capital at the time, $1,600,000. The Government has charged that Pittsburgh Reduction's method of ending the conflict was a violation of the antitrust laws.

In 1907 the Pittsburgh Reduction Co. changed its name to the more inclusive one of the Aluminum Co. of America. From 1893 to 1941 it was the sole producer of aluminum in this country. Until 1903, when the Hall patents expired, this monopoly was legal. After that, the founders of Alcoa employed other equally effective, if not entirely legal, means of perpetuating the company's position.

The key to the manufacture of aluminum is water power. The process demands an enormous output of electrical energy—10 kilowatt hours per pound produced. Such power must be cheap, approximately one-twentieth the price the average housewife pays; it must be continuous, not dependent on the vagaries of rainfall. Thus only a small percentage of the total water power in the United States is suitable for aluminum production.

From 1893 on, Alcoa succeeded in tying up in restrictive contracts the principal sources and sites of suitable water power in the United States and Canada, including Niagara Falls. In some years the company used as little as 10 percent of the total power capacity that it controlled; it owned power sites for 25 years that it never developed. These were the tactics by which Alcoa managed to keep power out of the hands of potential competition.

In May 1941 an Alcoa official told the Truman committee: "You cannot buy any more water power, that we know of, at a price which permits use for aluminum."

In the consent decree which followed the Government's first suit in 1912, Alcoa promised to discontinue the practice of restrictive contracts. But in the more recent action, filed in 1937, the Department of Justice charged that similar water-power contracts, in a less obvious form, had been consummated even after the decree.

Second only to water power in importance, in the manufacture of aluminum, is a regular source of raw material. While aluminum is the most abundant metal on earth, found in a wide variety of minerals, bauxite has proved to be the only ore from which it can be produced commercially. Domestic deposits of this ore are located almost entirely in a small section of Arkansas. By 1909 Alcoa had preempted almost all the available

bauxite lands in that State; up to 1940 this company produced 85 percent of all the ore mined there. At the same time Alcoa completely controlled bauxite production in British and Dutch Guiana, boasted full or partial ownership in one Italian, three French, and two Yugoslav bauxite companies.

Between 1918 and 1925 four well-financed attempts by American interests to break into the field of aluminum production failed because they were unable to obtain raw materials and/or water power in America, and because their efforts to negotiate foreign sources were effectively anticipated and forestalled by Alcoa.

With full control of power and raw materials, there remained but one source of potential competition: foreign producers. In 1896 Alcoa entered into the first of a series of international cartels with the principal aluminum producers of the world. These agreements divided world markets, fixed prices, and limited production. America was reserved by Alcoa as its private preserve; no trespassing permitted.

So well did these cartels function that from 1899 to 1938 imports of aluminum into the United States averaged only 9 percent annually, with Alcoa supplying the other 91 percent. This over-all average includes certain periods when the break-down of cartel negotiations, or the intervention of the Government, resulted in a sharp increase in aluminum imports.

The price pattern during these years shows that Alcoa consistently reduced prices to meet occasional foreign competition, raised them again as soon as that competition disappeared. The arbitrary fluctuation of prices, from a high of 38 cents to a low of 18 cents a pound, plus the lack of competitive sources of supply, has curtailed the use of aluminum in the manufacture of many popular products. A typical example of this "public be damned" attitude may be found in the automobile industry.

Prior to 1915 most automobile manufacturers used large quantities of aluminum in their cars. The Ford Motor Co. once was the largest user of aluminum in this country. The outbreak of World War I cut off imports and increased the demand for all metals. In 1915 Alcoa advanced its prices from 18 to 32 cents a pound. The automobile manufacturers protested, warning Alcoa that they would be forced to use substitutes, but the company ignored them. After 1915 Ford, General Motors, and all other manufacturers eliminated the use of aluminum in their cars, except for small parts and pistons.

According to Alcoa engineers, about 500 pounds of aluminum could be used to advantage in the average medium-sized passenger car. With less dead weight to pull, redesign of the engine and other parts would reduce the total weight of such a car from the present 3,400 pounds average to about 2,300 pounds, with a consequent saving to the motorist in gasoline and tires. If all the cars produced in 1937 used 500 pounds of aluminum, automobiles alone could consume the entire postwar capacity of the industry.

Naturally the automobile manufacturers sought the facilities to build their own aluminum plants. When a survey in 1920 convinced GM and Ford that all domestic raw materials and water power were tied up by Alcoa, these companies attempted to buy an interest in a Norwegian aluminum plant. Alcoa's agents got wind of the plan, and aborted it by quietly acquiring the controlling interest in the Norwegian company themselves.

That's how Alcoa built up its monopoly in the production of aluminum in this country.

In 1895 Alcoa began fortifying its monopoly in the fabrication of aluminum into many finished and unfinished articles. Four examples will show how this was done:

1. The principal fabricated form of aluminum is sheet; about half the ingot production is rolled in this form. Some 80 percent of all aluminum sheet sold in this country comes from Alcoa's mills. Until the war these also produced 98 percent of all the alloy sheet used for the bodies of aircraft, trains, busses, and trucks.

2. One of the earliest uses of aluminum was in castings. In 1909, when five companies in this field combined to form the Aluminum Castings Co., Alcoa obtained 50 percent of the shares in exchange for cash and credit advances. Today Alcoa is the largest single producer of castings.

3. The Aluminum Goods Manufacturing Co. makes cooking and other utensils. When it was formed in 1909 by consolidating 3 small companies, Alcoa's officers took over 31 percent of the shares. In addition, Alcoa now operates its own utensils plant. Although there are 20 other manufacturers in this field, Alcoa and Aluminum Goods together sell more utensils than all the other companies combined.

4. In 1922 Alcoa formed a pool of 98 patents on the design of automobile pistons and had itself named the exclusive licensee, with full power to license subcontractors. Three companies were licensed by Alcoa, and the number of pistons each could make was rigidly limited by contract. In 1933 the Packard Motor Co. asked Alcoa to grant licenses to two companies not in the pool, so as to assure a multiple source of supply. Existing sources, said Packard, were party to a price-fixing agreement so that pistons could be purchased at only one price. Alcoa refused Packard's request.

Numerous other fabricating fields were similarly dominated. In every case the few independent manufacturers were forced to rely on Alcoa, their chief competitor, for a regular source of raw aluminum—at any price Alcoa chose to fix. Obviously, competition has little opportunity to thrive, especially when Alcoa sells the raw material to its own subsidiaries at below-market prices, permitting them to put the well-known price squeeze on any rivals.

Such a price squeeze was applied to independent sheet rollers after the last war. The differential between the selling price of raw ingot and Alcoa's price of manufactured sheet was cut so drastically that the independents were forced to sell at a loss in order to compete on the "open market" with Alcoa. By this means, before 1931, Alcoa drove four of its eight competitors out of business. When the manufacturers complained that this practice was unfair, an Alcoa official advised them to "get out of the sheet business" and go into the truck-body business.

And that's how the aluminum fabrications field is ruled by Alcoa.

Supertrusts pay superprofits. The Temporary National Economic Committee, created by joint resolution of Congress, in 1941 reported the following profits for Alcoa:

In the 24 years from 1889 through 1912, this company made a net profit of $33,000,000 on average paid-in investment not exceeding $2,000,000.

In the first 50 years after its incorporation (1888 to 1939) its net income after taxes exceeded $335,000,000.

Its net profit after taxes in 1939 was $36,600,000, and in 1940 over $44,000,000, the largest in its history.

How did Alcoa repay the American public for these generous profits? The Department of Justice, in its latest antitrust suit against the company, reveals these shocking details:

Alcoa failed to expand its production to meet growing demand for aluminum, so that from 1925 to 1927 there was an acute aluminum shortage in the United States of from 22,000 to 55,000 tons.

Meanwhile, Germany, which produced only 7 percent of the world supply in 1920, greatly expanded its production as a result of cartel agreements, and in 1938, on the eve of World War II, produced 30 percent more than the United States. Aluminum played an important part in building the Nazi war machine.

The United States, which in 1920 produced more than half the aluminum in the world, in 1938 was producing less than one-fourth the world total.

Despite all assurances of Alcoa officials, during the war a serious aluminum shortage arose in this country, hampering production of vital war materials, accelerating and accentuating the scarcity of copper and steel. The Government was forced to invest more than $700,000,000 in the aluminum industry in order to continue the fight.

That's how twentieth century monopoly works in the United States.

No picture of the aluminum trust can be complete without a thumbnail sketch of the amazing public career of its dominant figure, director and major stockholder for many years, Andrew W. Mellon. Until his appointment to the Cabinet as Secretary of the Treasury by President Harding in 1921, Mellon was virtually unknown to the general public. Yet he was one of the five wealthiest individuals in this country, and through his banks and vast public-utility interests had long ruled the sovereign State of Pennsylvania as a feudal duchy.

Shortly after Mellon took his position in the Government, Congress passed the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act, the highest tariff wall yet devised. Among other provisions, this act increased the tariff on aluminum from 2 to 5 cent a pound. The market price rose from 18 cents (1920) to 29 cents (1926) a pound. In 1921 Alcoa paid a dividend of 1,000 percent on its original investment. Immediately after passage of the new tariff bill, an additional dividend of 500 percent was declared.

In his first 4 years in Government Mellon received a tax refund of $404,000, second only to one of $457,000 for John D. Rockefeller, Jr. During Mellon's rule over the Treasury under two Presidents a total of $1,271,000,000 of tax refunds were made of which $7,000,000 went to Mellon's personal account and $14,000,000 to the account of his corporation.

When Calvin Coolidge became President, Harlan F. Stone, dean of Columbia Law School, was appointed Attorney General. Stone, on complaint of the Federal Trade Commission, prepared to file an antitrust suit against Alcoa; he was abruptly elevated to the Supreme Court. The suit, of course, never materialized under Coolidge, nor under his successor and Mellon's colleague in the Cabinet, Herbert Hoover.

When Mellon died, Arthur V. Davis, president of Alcoa since 1910, became the chairman of the board. Under Davis the aluminum company continued to expand. By the beginning of World War II, Alcoa controlled 23 corporate subsidiaries including mining companies, water power, numerous fabricating plants, etc. In addition the corporation had up to 40 percent voting power in nine other companies.

This is the empire which Attorney General Tom Clark urges Congress to break up, for the future welfare of the people of America.

Rosary for Remembrance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a beautiful and touching tribute paid by my cousin, Mary Scott Hair, to one of my most loyal and ardent friends and sup-

porters, Capt. Robert McHolland, of Hurley, Mo.

Much as I would like to say, I cannot mar this magnificent tribute to one who gave his last full measure of devotion to a great cause. All that I can do is to shed a tear and even he who has the stoniest heart will shed a tear, to read the following tribute:

ROSARY FOR REMEMBRANCE

(By Mary Scott Hair)

"The personal effects of an individual missing in action overseas are held by his unit for a period of time, and then sent to the effects quartermaster, Kansas City, Mo., for disposition as designated by the soldier."

Those words are familiar words in homes all over America. They have been read and read again, so many times it is not necessary to look at the letter, on official War department paper, to read them. You can look at a blank piece of paper and see the words neatly typed thereon.

A telegram arrived, telling the family and friends of Capt. Robert McHolland, Hurley, Mo., that Bob, previously missing, was killed in action on November 24, 1944.

Then the period of waiting began—waiting for details of what happened. Waiting that seemed endless—in which no clue was too small to offer hope. His old letters, carefully kept and treasured, were once more combed for names of men in his company.

Bits of news, interesting because they express Bob's personality so forcefully, began weaving a pattern, in the tapestry of life the Great Weaver finished so suddenly on that November day.

May 9, 1944, Somewhere in England:

"The war cry of this war is 'Any gum, chum?' Every English kid you see has that on his lips soon as he spots a Yank.

"I talked with a 10-year-old boy about school and fighting and life in general. The boy said he would quit school and go to work in a carpet factory when he reached the ripe old age of 13.

"I asked him who he thought the world's best fighter was—and he said he guessed Hitler was. Anyway, it looked that way to him."

June 26, 1944, France, Somewhere:

"I am enclosing some pictures I found on the battlefield. I did not take them from a dead German—the Krauts carry pictures of their loved ones, too. Any personal belongings such as letters and pictures are scattered like leaves, after a battle.

"I studied these pictures carefully. This one of the little boy and his mother—there will be no swastikas for him. He will have a chance to grow up in a free world where he can think for himself, a free man.

"Not only for Jerry, Bobby, Johnny, and Thomas Earl, but for any children and for all people everywhere, will our sacrifices be made—that they may live the 'Abundant Life' due them.

"I firmly believe that peace will triumph over war and that love will rule the world."

"In a V-mail letter dated August 18, we received our first name-clue.

"Our chaplain, Capt. Edgar Stohler, of the Salvation Army, is just about the biggest hero around here. Watch for his story in the paper."

We watched, and sure enough the account written by Edward Ball, of Associated Press, appeared in the daily paper. It told how guns on both sides stopped as three chaplains went out in a strip of marshy no-man's land to bring in the wounded. A German cameraman came out and snapped pictures of them. Within a few minutes after the chaplains reached the aid station the silence was broken by German shell fire. War was resumed once more. One of the chaplains was Capt. Edgar Stohler, of the Salvation Army.

September 27, France:

"These French kids sure are cute. Many of them speak three and four languages. They call me 'Captaine Robaire.' And they make more noise than a full-fledged attack. You can't help loving them."

October 15, France:

"Today is Sunday. If the situation is favorable we may have some kind of service this afternoon.

"I am sending you a pressed flower. I found it in a German officer's medical manual.

"If the Lord is willing, I'll be seeing you all, some day."

That was my last letter from Bob.

The flower was a beautiful pansy, carefully protected by two folds of waxed paper, "Pansies for thoughts"—

Chaplain Stohler's letter came, finally. Just a few sentences but they told how considerate and kind Bob was to his men, how he attended religious services, and ended with this: "Bob was a dear personal friend. Will you please tell his family and friends that their loss is my loss, too."

Other bits of information came—a few letters from relatives of men in Bob's company; clippings from newspapers.

In September 1945, the War Department notified Bob's sister, Mrs. Roxabel Wiley, of Hurley, Mo., that three awards—the Silver Star with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Bronze Star Medal, and the Distinguished Service Cross—would be awarded, posthumously, to her, or members of her family.

In September, too, Bob's personal belongings arrived. First came the Army foot locker containing clothing and some letters. Two other packages of clothing followed and finally his bed roll. There is something personal and final about a bed roll.

One package was socks and small articles of clothing. And packed in among the handkerchiefs and socks was an old French heirloom, a rosary of Lourdes, France. No one will ever know what story the rosary would tell—if it could. But in one of Bob's letters, he wrote about a little French girl 10 years old that he had befriended. The ever-grateful French people were known to give their liberators many prized keepsakes and heirlooms. And, while it is merely a supposition, it seems logical to suppose that little Marie Eugene gave this lovely string of carved wooden beads to her hero, Captaine Robarie.

The beads are large, an inch in diameter, and are made of olive wood carved in a distinct pattern. The chain between the beads is old and worn.

The heart-shaped wooden emblem between the 50 Hail Marys and the 3 Holy Marys says on one side, "Coeur Immacule of Marie protegez nous."

The round wooden disc at the top of the cross has a religious carving on one side of a kneeling girl and the Blessed Virgin. On the other side are these words, "Allez Boire a la Fontaine et vous y laver."

The cross, also of wood, was broken. The mended place is plainly visible in the picture. The image of Christ has been removed from the cross, leaving only the prints of the nails.

When we examined the rosary carefully and realized what a treasure it is, a quotation from the story of Bernadette, the little French peasant girl who saw the Blessed Virgin, came to mind.

"All the women and girls of Lourdes carry a rosary upon their person. It is the authentic tool of their piety. The hands of poor, hard-working women have not the habit of stillness. A prayer with empty hands would be no prayer observance for them. But the prayer of the rosary is to them a sort of heavenly manual toil, an invisible needlework, a knitting or embroidering busily wrought of the 50 Hail Mary's and the 9 other invocations of their string of beads."

Capt. Robert McHolland was a Protestant, a sincere Christian and a man's man in every respect. He was a Mason, a member of Crane Lodge No. 519, and also a member of the Eastern Star. He shared the idealism of Wendell Willkie's One World; he gave his life that those ideals might come into being in actual life, to the great and the small, the rich and the poor alike. His personal creed was big enough to love little children, regardless of race, creed, or social standing. He was an ardent admirer of Abraham Lincoln and Honest Abe's words, "With malice toward none" could easily be said of Captain McHolland.

Bob loved Christmas. I think it must have been his favorite time of year. He always took part in our programs and went with us to sing carols on Christmas eve. All of us received cards, written and mailed a day or so before his death. A hasty note scribbled on the back of one card said, "I'd give anything to be back home and go caroling with you—but those times seem so long ago."

From the grim story told by the War Department, we know that Bob's last days were full of anxiety and despair, for his first consideration, always, was for the safety of his men. He died trying to save two wounded members of his company.

The words from the beautiful song. "The Rosary," come to mind again and again—'O memories that bless and burn—O barren gain, and bitter loss—" That a life so young and so promising should be sacrificed seems, at times, "A bitter loss."

But there was One who died on the Cross of Calvary, that men might live triumphant lives. And the words come again—in the whisper of wind in the leaves, in the voices of happy children at play, in the peace and quiet of the early morning—"Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

The St. Lawrence, the Great American Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "St. Lawrence, the Great American Project," delivered by Dr. N. R. Danielian before the Engineering Society of Detroit on May 6, 1946.

I have secured from the Public Printer an estimate of the cost of printing the address in the Appendix of the RECORD. The Public Printer has estimated that the address will cover four and a half pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $265.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly happy tonight to have the opportunity of addressing the Engineering Society of Detroit on the subject of the St. Lawrence project. I am quite confident that, if we had let the engineers have their way, this epochal undertaking would have been constructed long ago.

There is no other group of men whose unbiased judgment of this project I would rather trust than the engineering profession. You and your colleagues, the scientists, deal

with the facts of nature, undiluted by social and economic theories. And while the scientist reveals the principles, the laws and the countless balances underlying the forces of nature, the engineers are able to harness and channelize those forces into the likeness of human needs and ambitions.

From the seeming chaos of our world in its natural state you have created, through applied science and technology, our modern civilization. From the raw dirt and dust of our mountains and valleys you have fashioned the streamlined trains, the luxurious autos and the swift airplanes. The black coal of the hills and the raw pulp of our fields and forests, your alchemy has transformed into a multitude of useful and colorful products of synthetic manufactures. And the supreme climax of human achievement, you have taken the scientists' equations of the relation of energy and matter, and his theories of the tiniest specks of reality, and you have created, from pitchblend, a duplicate of the solar brilliance and heat in the instantaneous explosion of the atomic bomb.

Ever since the human intellect shed the shackles of medieval mysticism, science and engineering have fashioned the dominant characteristics of western civilization. Not the least important of your contributions has been in the proper utilization of water resources to meet human needs. You will recall that in the ancient world water was considered, along with fire, earth, and air, one of the principal constituent elements. True, this was too simple a concept, but it was a measure of the importance of water to life. From the simple steam engine and the water wheel, your efforts have improved the utilization of water a thousandfold, for navigation by ocean liners, the gigantic hydroelectric projects for power, the water-supply systems that make our large cities possible.

It is well to remember that when we consider the St. Lawrence project, we are dealing with one phase of this ageless problem of utilizing water for human needs, and no amount of dialectics and economic legerdemain can alter that basic fact.

The St. Lawrence projet now before Congress has two purposes—first, it will make it possible for ocean-going, deep-draft vessels to travel directly from the Atlantic Ocean into the Great Lakes. It will make seaports of such cities as Buffalo, Cleveland, Toledo, Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee, and Duluth. It will bring the great agricultural and industrial productive capacity of the Middle West into direct communication by cheap water transportation with the rest of the world and with the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts of the United States.

As a navigation project, it is as important to our country as the Suez Canal is to Europe, as the Dardanelles is to Russia, as the Panama Canal is to the east and west coasts of the Western Hemisphere.

In building the necessary dams and canals on the St. Lawrence River, there will be a large byproduct of cheap hydroelectric power in northern New York. The capacity of this single powerhouse will be 2,200,000 horsepower, the largest power capacity of a single project with the exception of Grand Coulee. This will be three times as large as the Dneiper Dam—the pride of Russia. The annual output of electricity will be larger than all the power produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority in 1944. It is cheap power, too, costing one-tenth of 1 cent a kilowatt-hour at the station, one-quarter as expensive as the cheapest source of steam power in that area.

The power will be divided equally with Canada. The American share will be available for distribution as far south as New York City, and throughout the New England States. Cheap water power in that area of 20,000,000 people means lower monthly electric bills, more industries, more jobs, greater sales of electric appliances, more farms electrified.

This is not a new project, but a bid for final completion of a waterway that has been in process of construction for 40 years. The Great Lakes now provide deep-water navigation throughout their length and breadth. The MacArthur lock at the Soo, built by the Army engineers in 1943 as a war project, connects Lake Superior and Lake Huron. That part of the seaway, as originally proposed, is now completed.

Eight locks of the Welland Canal, completed by Canada in 1932, scale the difference in the levels of Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, 324 feet. That part of the seaway is completed, too, and deep-draft ships can now proceed from Duluth at the head of Lake Superior for 1,200 miles to Ogdensburg, N. Y., on the upper St. Lawrence River.

The eastern end of the St. Lawrence River is navigable for ocean ships for a thousand miles from the Atlantic Ocean to Montreal, Canada. This city, on the St. Lawrence River, is the second largest port in North America, next only to New York City.

We have, therefore, deep-sea navigation for a thousand miles inland from the Atlantic on the lower St. Lawrence River to Montreal. We have deep-sea navigation for 1,200 miles in the Great Lakes and the upper St. Lawrence to Ogdensburg, N. Y.

The only thing that prevents through navigation is the presence of some rapids in the St. Lawrence River between Odgensburg, on the upper St. Lawrence, and Montreal, on the lower St. Lawrence. Over this distance of 119 miles, the water level drops some 223 feet in three series of rapids. The project now before Congress contemplates the construction of the necessary dams, canals, and locks by Canada and the United States to complete this work, with a huge byproduct of cheap water power. We can join the Great Lakes and the Atlantic together for ocean navigation by helping to knock away the rocks in the St. Lawrence rapids through Congressional approval of Senate Joint Resolution 104.

What this will mean to the Middle West is perhaps best exemplified by reference to Detroit. With the opening of the St. Lawrence route to ocean navigation, this city will be nearer in actual mileage to most European ports than the present routes through New York City. To some northern European ports the advantage in favor of the direct St. Lawrence route is several hundred miles. The reason for this is that the St. Lawrence River flows northeast into the Atlantic in direct line of the great circle route, whereas going through New York you cover two sides of a triangle.

Direct water transportation costs will be much less than the combined rail and water costs through New York to Europe. Let me read the conclusion of the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee issued May 2, 1943:

"There is every reason to believe that the seaway will result in considerable savings in transportation costs—amounting to as much as 50 percent of the present land—and water—transportation costs to overseas points for some commodities."

From the international standpoint, the seaway will contribute greatly to this country's program of expanding world trade and friendly commercial relations with other nations of the world. It will also strengthen our relations with Canada, which is this country's second best customer. We are Canada's best customer.

How much will the seaway cost? Here is what the Senate subcommittee says:

"According to Army engineers' estimates, the cost of the seaway part of the project, based on 1941 estimates, will be around $200,000,000, with annual charges of about $10,000,000. Thus, the maintenance cost of the seaway is shown to be less than $1 a ton for prospective United States traffic, whereas the savings would be anywhere from $1.50 to $12 a ton on various types of cargo."

The byproduct of cheap power is an equally vital phase of the project. In the New York-New England area rates for electric power are among the highest in the country. The consumption of electricity in river valleys where water power is available is two to three times greater than in New York State. Why? Because electricity in those areas costs less than half as much as in New York. The St. Lawrence project will bring down the cost of power in the Northeast where the farmer, the factory worker, the housewife, and the storekeeper can afford to buy the electric refrigerator, the freezer, and other modern conveniences that lighten the burden of mankind and make daily living more enjoyable.

This is what Claude Wickard, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, had to say before the Senate subcommittee:

"There is no section in which complete rural electrification would mean more to the agricultural economy than to the diversified farming interests of the Northeast with dairying and poultry raising preeminent. With the completion of the St. Lawrence project farmers in this area will, for the first time, be able to realize the many advantages resulting from the full utilization of low-cost electric power."

For a generation, Presidents of the United States, without regard to party, have urged construction of this unique project. In 1923, in a message to Congress, President Coolidge called it a good investment which will be reproductive. President Hoover in signing the 1932 treaty with Canada called it the greatest project in North America. President Franklin Roosevelt considered it vital in peace and war. President Truman has urged upon Congress speedy approval of this, as he termed it, one of the greatest projects of the world.

Other national leaders have consistently supported the St. Lawrence development. Successive governors of New York State: Alfred Smith, Franklin Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman, Charles Poletti, and Tom Dewey; Secretaries of State Charles Evans Hughes, Frank Kellogg, Henry L. Stimson, Cordell Hull, Edward Stettinius, Jr., and James Byrnes; Captain Harold Stassen, of Minnesota, and Governor Frank Lausche, of Ohio; the governors of Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota; the mayors of New York City, Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee, and Duluth; Secretaries of Commerce Herbert Hoover; Jesse Jones, Henry A. Wallace; Secretaries of the Navy Frank Knox and James Forrestal; Secretaries of War Henry L. Stimson and Robert Patterson.

Leaders in industry favor it; Owen D. Young, Edward J. Noble, Henry Ford II, John Cowles, Julius H. Barnes.

Farm groups are behind it: The National Farmers Union, the National Grange, and the American Farm Bureau Federation. Labor and liberal opinion support it.

Truly, this is the great American project of our generation. The resolutions before Congress are sponsored by a distinguished group: In the Senate: Senators AIKEN, BARKLEY, FERGUSON, HILL, LA FOLLETTE, LANGER, SHIPSTEAD, TAYLOR, VANDENBERG, and WAGNER; in the House: Judge SABATH, Congressmen DINGELL, DONDERO, RABAUT, PITTENGER, ROBERTSON, and WASIELEWSKI.

No other project in the history of our country has had such distinguished sponsorship.

This is not a political question, but a straight business proposition. The first attempt to develop this great natural resource came from some well known business groups.

In 1921 Col. Hugh L. Cooper, the same eminent engineer who later built the Dnieper Dam for the Soviet Government, laid a proposal before the International Joint Commission. He offered, on behalf of his clients, to make a gift of the navigation facilities to the Governments of the United States and Can-

ada, if they would give his clients a franchise to develop the electricity on the St. Lawrence River between Ogdensburg and Montreal.

Who were his clients: The Aluminum Co. of America, the General Electric Co., and the du Pont Co., who evidently considered that the power production alone would be worth the cost of the entire development. These companies are not in the habit of engaging in uneconomic undertakings. And this is what they thought of the project. I quote from Colonel Cooper's report:

"We believe that the greatest single need for the restoration of the public to normal contentment and happiness is cheap power. The construction of the works here proposed will give to the zone east of Niagara Falls, and for a radius of over 400 miles from the Croil Island site, power advantages at least equal to and probably better than those that now exist or can be hereafter created at Niagara Falls."

Colonel Cooper's report was equally enthusiastic about the advantages of navigation, and I quote briefly from that section of the report:

"It will be seen, therefore, that the zone to be supplied with cheap power will also be aided in its commercial development by the coincident creation of new navigation advantages. These navigation advantages properly coordinated with water power and the vast railway system now existing in this territory will give to this zone industral advantages that cannot be otherwise created or found elsewhere on the American continent."

It is generally assumed now that the railroads are opposed to this project. That was not true 15 years ago. Many railroads interests were supporting the seaway then. Almost all of the transcontinental lines west of Chicago favored it: The Great Northern and the Northern Pacific; the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul; the Illinois Central; the Chicago and North Western; the Minneapolis and St. Paul; the Chicago Great Western, and the Quincy lines.

From the point of view of national interest, and as a business proposition, the overwhelming testimony has been in favor of earliest possible construction of this great project.

It is also claimed now that New England is opposed to this project. That attitude again is a synthetic product of recent vintage. One of the leading businessmen of New England, Mr. Henry I. Harriman, made a serious study of this subject and published his findings in 1929 in a book of 152 pages, entitled "New England and the St. Lawrence Seaway."

Mr. Harriman was at that time president of the Boston Chamber of Commerce. As you know, he also has been president of the United States Chamber of Commerce for several terms and a leading figure in the public utility field, being the creator and chief executive of the New England Power Association. I shall only read to you Mr. Harriman's conclusions:

"I am convinced," he wrote, "that the St. Lawrence seaway is of as great importance to New England as to the Middle West, and that New England should unitodly, heartily, and enthusiastically support the project."

The seaway means to New England:

"1. Lower transportation costs on much of its food supply, hence a lower cost of living.

"2. Lower freight rates on many of the raw materials required by its industries.

"3. Lower freight rates to many markets for its finished products.

"4. A supply of export grain and flour at prices as low or lower than can prevail in other North Atlantic ports, hence a revival in the export business of the port of Boston and other New England ports.

"5. The removal of the handicap of rail differentials, due to water competition via the St. Lawrence.

"6. A reasonable supply of cheap power."

There may be those who will try to discount this weighty opinion by saying that this was only one man's view. But that was not an isolated opinion. At one time or another other leaders of New England industry favored this project.

In 1923, at the time President Coolidge recommended the project to the Congress, a New England committee of 30 industrial and public leaders—5 from each State—was established. They devoted a whole year of study to the subject. Some of them are still with us and quite prominent in public and business circles—just to mention at random: John G. Winant, former Governor of New Hampshire and recently our Ambassador to England; and Samuel Ferguson, president of the Hartford Electric Light Co.

I shall only read you the unanimous conclusion of this group of 30 New England leaders:

"The committee looks upon the proposed expenditures for developing the waterway as in the nature of a capital investment of a national character upon which exceptionally liberal dividends will be returned in the form of reduced transportation costs and the general benefit and prosperity of a large and important section of the country which at the present time is laboring under a most serious and difficult economic handicap. It further believes that the net result of the development of such a waterway will incidentally be of considerable advantage to New England and the surrounding community, both from a broad national standpoint as well as that of purely local self-interest."

The impression is being created now that these views are not applicable, and that the men who held these views have changed their position. This assertion is incorrect. I have seen evidence in the past 2 years that those who favored the project 20 years ago after exhaustive study still hold to that view on the basis of the economic merits and engineering feasibility of the project. Some of them are now disinclined to advocate it publicly because as a matter of policy the State of New York and the Federal Government insist upon State ownership of the powerhouse.

I shall not argue here the merits or demerits of the particular form of control proposed for the St. Lawrence power project. That controversy does not touch the fundamental engineering and economic factors upon which an absolute judgment must be based. That controversy has no place in the calculations of engineers or economists.

We may take cognizance of the fact, however, that governmental responsibility for the development of water resources is an accepted national policy, and there is in fact no other way in which a major project of this kind can be undertaken.

On many occasions I have engaged in debate on the economic merits of this question with opponents representing coal interests, or chambers of commerce, only to be confronted with the admission, at the end of a protracted evening that, of course, they would not oppose the project if it did not provide for public ownership of power.

We must be realistic about the current situation. The choice is not between private and public development of this project. The choice is between public development and no project at all.

The issue of public ownership of the powerhouse is now settled beyond any possibility of reconsideration. Even the Association of Electric Operating Companies, in public advertisements, has acceded to this principle. What worries the New York utilities is the possibility of public transmission and distribution. That is not an issue in the present legislation, and the ultimate settlement of that issue will depend upon the attitude of the utilities and their relation to public opinion.

What hurts deeply is the fact that an idealogical controversy which interests principally the State of New York and perhaps New England should stand in the way of utilizing one of the great natural resources in North America, and should deny the 50,000,000 people of the Great Lakes area their rightful heritage of access to the ocean lanes of the world.

The principal opposition to the development of the St. Lawrence centers in the eastern trunk-line railroads and in the eastern power companies. Through their trade associations and holding companies these eastern interests have succeeded in raising a hornet's nest throughout the country. It is a regrettable fact that some labor groups, principally the railroad brotherhoods and the United Mine Workers, have become pawns in this struggle for monopoly control of transportation and power in the East.

Congressional approval of this project has been so long delayed, not because the people do not want it, not because Congress and individual members of the legislature who know about the project are not convinced of its merits. The project has never failed to obtain a majority in congressional committees when hearings have been permitted on the substantive merits of this proposition. In 1933, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee approved the project by an overwhelming majority. In 1941 the House Rivers and Harbors Committee approved it by a vote of 17 to 8; and only recently the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Commitee, which held hearings over a period of 3 weeks, approved it by a vote of 3 to 1.

The approval of the project has been delayed because organized minority interests have been successful in thwarting a congressional vote on the merits of the project. This opposition has been exceedingly well financed, reaching out to every part of the United States with propaganda and misrepresentations which surpass anything I have observed in the recent political history of this country. Sections of the country which by no stretch of the imagination will be affected by this project have been deluged with erroneous propaganda. A few examples will illustrate this point.

It is asserted by the opposition, for instance, that when the St. Lawrence Seaway is open to navigation during 7 months of the year, from spring until late fall, the railroads will lose a large amount of traffic to the seaway. But they have to keep equipment idle during these months in order to meet traffic requirements in the wintertime, when the seaway will be frozen over.

There are two things wrong with this assertion: First, the total capacity of the seaway will probably be around 25,000,000 tons, of which about 16,000,000 tons will be new traffic, deducting 9,000,000 tons which now travel over the 14-foot canals. Of the 16,000,000 tons of new traffic, some will be utilized by Canada. It is likely that in over a decade or two, new American traffic will amount to about 10,000,000 tons. This is less than 1 percent of the total originating tonnage on our class I railroads, and a somewhat larger percentage of the originating tonnage of the railroads serving the northeastern territory. In the perspective of time, over the next generation, it is obvious that increase in population and industrial activity, and the new stimulus to business that this seaway will bring, will create certainly enough new traffic to equal this 10,000,000 tons, so that the railroads would not even feel the impact of the seaway.

There is another thing that's wrong with this assertion of the opposition. The peak of traffic on the railroads comes in the months of September and October, during the open season of navigation, and the railroads now have to maintain their cars in idleness during the winter months when traffic is down. The seaway, therefore, will not increase the number of idle cars in the wintertime. On the contrary, it will diminish the necessity

of maintaining idle cars in the wintertime by leveling off in a small degree the peak in October, thereby improving the average utilization of railroad rolling stock.

Another example of exaggerated propaganda by the opposition is the fear they have been generating among the business people in the eastern sea ports, claiming that the seaway will destroy the foreign-trade activity in these ports.

In the case of Boston, a careful study will show that very little of its foreign trade is transshipment business to and from the Middle West. In the case of Providence there is absolutely no transshipment business at all. In fact, a careful scrutiny of statistics shows that the only export out of Providence before the war was local scrap iron shipped to Japan.

The character of traffic in New York may be somewhat affected. In a study made by the Department of Commerce it was revealed that there might possibly be a diversion of 1,800,000 tons of foreign traffic in comparison with about 30,000,000 tons of foreign commerce and over 100,000,000 tons of harbor activity. The case of New York is special in the sense that the development of the water power project is likely to create so much industrial activity that the net effect upon New York State is likely to be beneficial. But more important than this is the fact that the prosperity of New York is directly connected with the prosperity of the Nation as a whole. With full employment and production in the United States, New York City will not feel the impact of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

In the case of New Orleans, it has been claimed that the seaway will divert 3,000,000 tons of traffic out of 5,500,000 tons of foreign commerce. This is an absurd claim on the face of it because the seaway will be closed during 5 months of the year, which is 42 percent of the time. The 3,000,000 tons of claimed diversion, therefore, is equivalent to the assertion that nearly all of the traffic going through New Orleans during the 7 months of open navigation will be diverted. This is simply impossible because most of the traffic through New Orleans originates or is destined for the area tributary to this great port, consisting of the States of Missouri down to the Gulf and from Kentucky, Tennessee, and Alabama to Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona. This southern tier of States will not be affected by the St. Lawrence project and much of the New Orleans traffic is with these States.

The opposition has gone down to Houston and Brownsville, Tex., claiming that the St. Lawrence seaway will destroy these ports. They claim, for instance, that grain traffic through the port of Houston will be lost. We made a test study of this claim and the conclusion is that grain moving through this port does not come from the territory affected by the St. Lawrence Seaway. It comes mainly from Oklahoma and Texas where traffic could not be diverted north to Chicago.

Such misinformation that is being disseminated on this subject is not unique in the history of industrial and technological progress.

We all glory in the memory of Thomas Edison, who gave light to our civilization. Do not think that his only difficulty was in finding a durable filament for our electric bulb. An even greater handicap was the mental blindness of men who could not see the future light as he saw it.

At the very time that he was experimenting successfully with his carbon filament bulb at Menlo Park, N. J., in 1879, a professor of science at the Stevens Institute, Henry Morton, refused even to visit the laboratory, content with a statement to the press that what Edison aimed to do was scientifically impossible. The gas lighting companies of that day did not like the idea of a new competitor, even as the railroads and power companies now fear the St. Lawrence project.

You all know that Nikola Tesla and George Westinghouse made it possible to transmit alternating-current electricity over long distances. Holders of direct current patents, however, made life miserable for them. Legend has it that in 1886 New York State passed a law providing for the electrocution of murderers, instead of the more traditional method of hanging by the neck. This was done, the story goes, upon the insistence of the patent holders on direct current systems, who hoped thereby to frighten the public and create revulsion against the monstrous and dangerous a. c. system. And yet today practically the whole country is on a. c.—the system that makes it possible to transmit power hundreds of miles.

After Westinghouse proved his system at the Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893, the engineering board then considering different ways of developing Niagara power finally decided on an alternating current system and gave the contracts to George Westinghouse—the first large-scale water-power plant in the world. This was in 1895—50 years ago. It is hard to believe now that the engineers seriously considered mechanical transmission of Niagara power, by belts and pulleys, until Westinghouse convinced them of the feasibility of high voltage a. c. systems.

I mention these things because history gives us the perspective of experience and practical wisdom with which to judge proposals such as the St. Lawrence project. There have always been those who would delay progress; and nearly always they are defeated and refuted by history.

When the first Soo lock was proposed between Lake Superior and Lake Huron, it was called, in the Halls of Congress, just an Indian ditch. In 1944, the American locks at the Soo carried 117,000,000 tons of traffic. Just think what the fate of this Nation would have been in the last war if we had not had the Soo locks disgorging the iron ore of Messabi into the belching furnaces of Chicago, Cleveland, Youngstown, and Pittsburgh—at the rate of 100,000,000 tons a year.

It took 50 years of negotiation with Great Britain, and 25 years of debate in Congress, to get an Isthmian canal approved, joining the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. At the time, James J. Hill of the Northern Pacific Railroad, called it a ditch where water lilies would grow. The canal was approved against stanch railroad opposition. Can you contemplate what the fate of this Nation would have been after the disaster of Pearl Harbor if we had not had the Panama Canal to shift additional naval reinforcements from the Atlantic to the Pacific?

When the debate waxes hot on the St. Lawrence project, I often like to read a historical passage. It was not written recently, and it was not addressed to the St. Lawrence Seaway. It was spoken by Prime Minister Palmerston, of Great Britain, in the year 1856 to castigate that great visionary project of that day, the Suez Canal. Palmerston's hostility to the Suez Canal is historic and the violence of his language almost comical:

"It is an undertaking," he said, "which, I believe, in point of commercial character, may be deemed to rank among the many bubble schemes that from time to time have been palmed upon gullible capitalists. I have been informed, on what I believe to be reliable authority, that it is physically impracticable, except at an expense which would be far too great to warrant any expectation of any return."

You can take your choice between that view of the practical man—the Prime Minister of England—and that great visionary of that day, De Lesseps, who was then wandering all over Europe to sell the Suez Canal to governments and peoples.

To add to the irony of this episode, in 1871, 2 years after the Suez Canal was opened, Disraeli, the new Prime Minister, stepped in and bought a substantial minority interest in the French Suez Co., without even securing parliamentary approval. There was apparently no time to lose in acquiring control of this impractical project.

Incidentally, the Suez has been a profitable investment; whereas it was built with the expectation that it would pay its way with 3,000,000 tons of traffic it has carried, in prosperous years, more than 30,000,000 tons. And neither Europe nor the Orient has been hurt by it.

Men of vision have advocated the St. Lawrence project for a generation. Just as the Suez Canal is the life line of the British Empire, and the Dardanelles of the Russian land mass, so the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence watershed is the life line of continental Canada and the United States.

I have heretofore confined my comments to the economic aspects of navigation and cheap water power. Let me briefly present to you the national-security aspect of this project.

In 1941, during the hearings before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, every spokesman for the national-defense agencies appeared before the committee and urged the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway as an aid to national defense. Lt. Gen. William Knudson, Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, Secretary of State Cordell Hull, Assistant Chief of Engineers, Maj. Gen. Thomas M. Robins, and the United States Maritime Commission all urged the committee that the St. Lawrence project was necessary for national defense, because it would provide additional shipbuilding facilities in the Great Lakes, it would supply large blocks of electric energy urgently needed, and would provide an easier and more protected navigation route.

As a result of the experience of World War II, these views of the agencies entrusted with national security have been strengthened. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, and Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, sent a report to the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee under the signature of Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson and Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal, stating that the completion of the project will strengthen national security. I shall read you from their report, which I consider decisive in judging the necessity for constructing this project:

"The principal factors which influence the consideration of these projects in the interest of the national security are that, in the event of a national emergency, they would provide:

"A. Shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities, located in a relatively secure area, capable of expansion and of conversion for handling deep-sea vessels, which could be used to supplement coastal shipyards.

"B. An additional line of communication, navigable by ocean shipping, which could, by diversion of some cargo for overseas destinations, ease and strain during wartime on rail transportation and port facilities of the East and Gulf coasts. This seaway could also serve as a reserve route to be used in the event of interruption of other routes by enemy action.

"C. A large source of cheap, dependable power, which can be generated without the use of coal or other critical combustibles and without use of crowded rail or highway transportation facilities; this power would be available in an area which, during World War II, was a power deficit area.

"The foregoing factors prompted the Secretaries of War and the Navy to support the projects in 1941 in the interests of national defense. In the light of the experiences of World War II, in which total mobilization became a near actuality, it is evident that the prospective increase in our war potential that would have been contributed by these projects, had they been completed, would have been of material assistance in prosecut-

ing the war. It is probable that attainment of success in any future world conflict would require utilization of the ultimate production and transportation facilities of the United States and possibly Canada. The Joint Chiefs of Staff consider that it would be in the interests of national security to complete projects, such as these, which would have distinct military advantages and would materially increase the industrial and transportation potential of the United States."

This is the view of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the present time. I think it is appropriate here to give you briefly the mature reflexion of the only living former President of the United States. In a statement addressed to Senator CARL HATCH, chairman of the subcommittee considering this project, former President Hoover said this on February 12:

"It was obvious in 1924 that aside from its great peacetime importance the waterway would have been of immense value in prosecuting World War I. Had the treaty of 1932 been ratified at that time, and construction followed, the waterway would have directly or indirectly paid for itself several times over in World War II. There can be no doubt as to its value as a defense measure."

There is another vital national security consideration which I should like to bring to your attention. Under Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman testified before the Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that our high-grade iron ores are being exhausted. The War Production Board made a special report on the subject, and Fortune magazine widely publicized the fact that our remaining high-grade ores amount to little over a billion tons, of which about half is open-pit ore and the rest underground. This ore supply will be exhausted within 20 years at a peacetime rate of consumption of 50,000,000 tons a year. This is within our own lifetime.

During the war we consumed as much as 100,000,000 tons of ore a year. What saved the United Nations a great embarrassment of shortage of iron and steel was the ease with which open-pit excavation could be expanded, and the efficiency with which it could be transported over the Great Lakes and through the Soo Locks to the lower lake ports.

What happens when this rich ore is exhausted? We are told by the opponents of this project not to worry because before long they will find a way of beneficiating low-grade ores, of which we have an abundance. But there is a catch in this. It will take an overhead investment of $800,000,000 to build all the necessary concentrating plants for a capacity of 80,000,000 tons of 50-percent ore a year. It will require four or five times as much labor as it takes now. And it should not be overlooked that the ore will cost two, three, or four dollars more per ton. That would make the price of ore around $7.50—$8 at lower lake ports, as compared with $4 or $4.50 at present. Of course, the price of steel must go up commensurately, and the scale of prices of all products using iron and steel must be raised.

Compare this with the situation on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts. There you can bring, and will continue to bring, Brazilian ore for $4 or $4.50 a ton. The recently discovered Labrador ore will also be available.

Can you hold your iron and steel industries and fabricating facilities in the Great Lakes area with that kind of price disparity? The answer is "No," not without a compensatory tariff against foreign ore. Otherwise, your industries will tend to migrate to the seacoasts.

Permanently higher prices for iron and steel and the products made from them, and the danger of great economic dislocations as a result of industrial migration—these are a high price to pay for the economic comfort of a few leaseholders on the iron ranges who wish to continue to draw their 25- or 50-cents-a-ton royalties per ton of ore.

There is a better, a more rational way to organize our national existence. We should now undertake to conserve our open-pit ores for a future national emergency. It is the most precious stock pile we have, and we should not squander it. At the same time, we should take steps to import as much iron ore as our boats and harbor facilities will accommodate. We should open the St. Lawrence seaway so that the Great Lakes industries can secure this foreign ore as advantageously as the east coast. With the utmost effort, we may not be able to import more than twenty or twenty-five million tons a year. We should, therefore, utilize as much low-grade ore as is necessary, but we should do it now, in the next 10 years, before our high-grade ores are exhausted.

In this way, we would be able to keep the price of ore down at present levels, we would conserve ore stock piles for national security, and we would help open up new trade channels by putting dollars into the hands of ore-producing countries.

Finally, I would like to present a few quotations here from recent publications, which indicate that other countries in the world are not spending time in dialectical exercise and arguing interminably about the economic advantages and disadvantages of a proved natural resource of this kind. Other countries are putting their projects into blueprints and into actual construction.

I have here a brief story from Time magazine of January 28, 1946, indicating a gigantic project in Russia which involves the changing of the courses of rivers now flowing into the Arctic Sea, to flow southward into the Volga River and the Caspian Sea, and in the process they expect to develop millions of kilowatts of electric capacity. Time magazine describes the project in these words:

"The planning Russians, who have already drawn big blueprints for everything from history to human lives, now plan to raise the water level of an ancient sea and make a few north-bound rivers flow south. The staggeringly complex plan is called the greater Volga project. A technically audacious scheme, it was laid aside in 1939 and is now being dusted off and revised by a special commission of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. Through a series of dams, canals, and reservoirs, the greater Volga project would provide an all-water route from Archangel to Batum (which is on the Black Sea). Involving cities, towns, and villages where 50,000,000 Russians live, it would install 14 new hydroelectric power stations. It would add enough water to the Volga to maintain—or lift—the level of the Caspian Sea."

Again, we have recently had pictorial evidence of the work that is being done on the Yangtze River, and in this case the engineers who are planning this enterprise are American engineers of the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation. Interior's Bureau of Reclamation is designing the world's mightiest dam to end the eternal threat of flood to the Yangtze Valley. But ships still must ply China's life line, so the American engineers are considering giant cranes which would simply lift vessels 550 feet through a revolutionary lock.

It is very likely we may be called upon not only to supply the know-how to build these great projects but also to supply some of the financial help and the necessary equipment.

In the February 9, 1946, issue of Foreign Commerce, a weekly of the Department of Commerce, there is a description of the program of development in the Ural Mountains in Russia. I shall read briefly from this:

"The Ural hydroelectric planning organization proposed to build 65 hydroelectric stations on 25 Ural rivers for a total capacity of 2,500,000 kilowatts and an average annual electric output of 9,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours."

Now, these developments are proceeding in other parts of the world, as I said, without dialectical exercise, without waste of 25 years' time in endless argument about the most obvious and elementary truths. Viewing the future of this country in the perspective of the next 20 or 30 or 50 years, in the light of the development of varying ideologies in the rest of the world, and their inevitable application of American technological know-how to strengthening their economic and military potential, I submit that this country cannot afford to sit back and see the rest of the world forge ahead while we let our inexhaustible natural resources such as water power go to waste and allow our exhaustible resources, such as petroleum and iron ore, be used up. That way lies the road to ultimate national suicide.

It seems to me that in the appropriate terms of the strategy of history the one hundred and thirty or one hundred and forty million people in this country, with the sister republics to the north and to the south, cannot afford to let themselves be surrounded by billions of other people with a different outlook on life, potentially, in manpower and resources, stronger than ourselves. We cannot afford to sit by and just talk about projects like the St. Lawrence. We must build them.

Let Us Have a Chain Reaction of Mind to Mind Toward Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the vote on House Joint Resolution 305, which carried a few minutes ago, did not indicate the presence of a quorum. That may necessitate an automatic roll-call vote at a later date. I hope and I have no doubt but that this worthy measure will be passed by the House when that roll-call vote is taken. On the standing vote those favoring the resolution were more than two to one over those who opposed it. I sincerely hope that the roll-call vote, when it comes, will be even more overwhelmingly in favor of the passage of the resolution than was the standing vote today.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] indicated so earnestly, a few moments before this vote was taken, the action of the House today is very significant. While the attendance today has not been large, the serious attitude of the Members present who engaged in the debate shows plainly that those present and participating realized, as did the gentleman from California, that this resolution is one of the most serious steps which Congress has been called upon to take in recent years. Certainly it ran through my mind as I interrupted the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], we are attempting to set up here machinery which will bring about a chain reaction of the human mind which we hope will spread throughout the whole world in an effort toward peace as powerful as the chain reaction generating atomic energy capable of such vast destruction. I am as hopeful of

an intellectual chain reaction in the direction of peace as I am apprehensive of a physical atomic reaction in the direction of annihilation.

In the latter part of 1844, and on several subsequent dates, there have been certain individuals who felt that the world was coming to an end at a given hour. They were serious in that belief and they went about getting ready for the end of all things human. Of course they were laughed at by their neighbors, for in spite of their predictions the hour for the crack of doom came and passed and the world didn't come to an end. No doubt, their failure accurately to predict the end of the world very properly subjected those individuals to laughter and scorn on the part of the unbelieving. Now we come to another dire prediction. Sober-faced scientists tell us that if we do not control this frankenstein which the mind of modern man has invented—the atomic bomb—if we do not control atomic energy which we now know how to call to our use, at least for the purpose of destruction, mankind can destroy itself. Without doubt the human race will destroy itself in the event of an atomic war.

Human life might not be wiped off the earth entirely but the fruits of human civilization, I verily believe, can be so nearly destroyed as to plunge the world back into another Dark Age. I, for one, am not scoffing now at the men of science who tell us that such a catastrophe would not only be possible but probable. As we look about us at the indifference with which our own people and probably the other peoples of the world view the release of atomic energy, it would seem that the most of humanity is about as much inclined to scoff at the prediction of the atomic scientist as the unbelieving were toward those who looked for the end of the world in 1844.

For my own part I have the firm conviction that if civilization is to continue on this planet and the human family is to continue an upward climb, we are going to have to start a "chain reaction" spreading quickly from one human mind to another in the interest of peace, or another kind of chain reaction spreading from one atom to another with untold possibilities of destruction will wipe out all our efforts at peace, even at continued existence.

I have noticed during the course of the debate how often this sentence has been repeated, "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defense of peace must be constructed." This reminds me of the question, "Where were you first prepared to be a man of peace?" The answer is, "In my heart." Now, I think it does not matter so much whether we say, "In my mind," or "in my heart," for I am not quite sure I understand the difference between the terms as used here "in my mind" or "in my heart." But I am sure that for an individual to be a man of peace he has got to be prepared either in his mind or in his heart. It is there that the preparation must first come. And it is to be prepared in each individual's mind or in his heart that this organization is set up in order to generate a great force for peace capable of spreading from mind to mind in a chain reaction, or if you will from heart to heart in a mighty chain reaction which will result in peace. This would be in reverse order from the chain reaction of atomic energy which results in wide destruction.

One Member spoke truly today, when he said the last few years had given a horrible example of the results of wrong education. At least three great nations have gone intellectually mad under the influence of wrong education. The terrible holocaust of war which is not yet ended was the result. He thought, and I think so too, that it would have been just as easy to teach the millions of Europe and Asia that right is might, as it was to teach them the opposite that might makes right. What a sad commentary it is that in central Europe where the gentle Pestalozzi taught of the great regenerative force of education capable of reforming the world and doing away with evil, it was in that same land where the destructive education by Hitler seized hold of the minds of youth and led to the evil which has cost the world so much to overcome.

If we are not to have a recurrence of such Hitlerite evil we must pay attention to the power of education for good. That is in part what I believe House Joint Resolution 305 is intended to do. For that reason, I do hope that we can enact this legislation and start this move before the forces of evil can get ahead of us. Truly this is a race between the forces of good and evil—between the forces of preservation and the forces of destruction.

Secret Pact Imperils United States Atlantic Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I extend an article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of May 13, 1946, entitled "Secret Pact Imperils United States Atlantic Bases":

SECRET PACT IMPERILS UNITED STATES ATLANTIC BASES

OTTAWA, ONTARIO, May 12.—United States-Canadian cooperation in mapping defense of the Northern Hemisphere has received its first sharp jolt since the start of the war, nearly 7 years ago.

The jolt was delivered by an agreement among Canada, Britain, and Newfoundland, signed secretly April 8 and announced last Tuesday, concerning defense of strategic Newfoundland.

The United States has 99-year leases on several defense bases on Newfoundland, with about $200,000,000 invested in them. The United States considers itself a principal defender of this island, which controls the airways and seaways of the North Atlantic and stands as the strategic keystone for defense of North America against attack from Europe.

UNITED STATES SURPRISED

American officials expressed surprise the agreement was made without their knowledge after 7 years of open and frank wartime cooperation in plans for defense of the continent.

The Canadian view is that the agreement does not affect the United States nor require consultation, and that it merely "tidies up" the situation regarding Canadian defense installations in Newfoundland, built during the war under agreements expiring with the end of the war.

The agreement, effective for 3 years, provides for return to Newfoundland of control of air bases which were operated by Canada during the war, and covers future air services. The American officials have no objection to this, but expressed concern at the agreement's article V, which provides:

"The Governments of Canada and Newfoundland and, as necessary, the Government of the United Kingdom, will consult with one another from time to time as occasion may require with a view to coordinating defense requirements in Newfoundland."

IGNORES WASHINGTON

The Americans saw in this the implication that there need be no consultation with the United States.

The agreement was made effective as of March 31 and presented to the public 6 weeks later. American officials had their first news of it when it was presented in the Canadian Parliament. They hurriedly consulted the Canadian Government for details. The combined chiefs of staff during the war placed Newfoundland specifically within the United States area of defense. According to the best available information, the new agreement was negotiated without reference to the permanent Joint Board of Defense, the United States-Canadian civilian and military body which served as a clearing house for such matters through the war. The life of this Board has been specifically lengthened to operate on hemisphere defense problems in this postwar period.

CONSULTATION PROVIDED

The wartime agreements concerning Newfoundland, in which the United States cooperated along with the other three governments concerned, provided for consultation at the end of hostilities.

Canadian and British defense installations on Newfoundland are small compared to the $100,000,000 United States naval base on the island at Argentia, paired with four United States Army bases, including the elaborate and modern Harmon Field, one of the larger American air bases.

Newfoundland is a British colony under a commission of government directed from London, but its defense during the war was given over largely to the United States and Canada.

Unusually frank defense cooperation between Canada and the United States has prevailed until now. This covered projects as varied as the Alaskan highway and defense of Canada's Northwest, the Canadian Arctic "Muskox Exercise" just completed, and defense of the continent's northeast coast and Newfoundland itself.

Reduction of Pension Compensation or Retirement Pay of Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MAY 10, 1946.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Majority Leader,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: Reference is made to your letter of May 1, 1946, enclosing an editorial from the April 29 issue of the Boston Daily Record, Boston, Mass., and requesting my views on the matters mentioned therein.

The present provision of law requiring a reduction in pension, compensation, or retirement pay during the period a disabled veteran is maintained in an institution at Government expense is applicable only to veterans without a wife, children, or dependent parents, and is based upon the thought that while such a veteran is so maintained he is relieved of the expenses of his own support. He is not normally obliged to maintain a home for others during this period and therefore his economic needs are far less than those of his fellow veterans with dependents receiving the same amount for like disabilities.

It is apparent, however, that the uniform application of this provision creates hardships and a morale problem in certain cases affected thereby and it may be that steps can be taken to alleviate the situation. Accordingly, a comprehensive study of all phases of this problem has been in progress in the Veterans' Administration with a view toward the consideration of proposed legislation to liberalize the present law, and I hope to be able to make certain recommendations on the subject to the Congress in the near future.

As indicated in the enclosed editorial, I am keenly interested in this problem, but I desire to point out that certain assertions therein are incorrectly attributed to me. My remarks at the interview referred to were concerned with a recognition of the problem, an expression of my interest therein, and a statement that consideration of the matter was being given by the Veterans' Administration. It appears, however, that numerous interpolations have been made.

Your interest in this matter and your offer to cooperate in the enactment of necessary legislation are appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

OMAR N. BRADLEY,
General, United States Army, Administrator.

British Concessions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by E. F. Tompkins:

BRITISH CONCESSIONS
(By E. F. Tompkins)

Under the Anglo-American loan arrangement, Great Britain will obtain enormously valuable favors and concessions from our Government and at the expense of our people.

By the loan agreement itself, the British Government is to receive a "line of credit" of $3,750,000,000 at nominal interest rates.

An accompanying lend-lease settlement "forgives" $25,000,000,000 of Britain's lend-lease obligation—an obligation corresponding to the First World War debt, of which $2,330,764,782 will never be repaid.

The settlement leaves a lend-lease balance of $650,000,000 due from the British Treasury.

To provide for the liquidation of this balance, Great Britain is to receive a further loan of this amount also at nominal interest rates, making a total advance of $4,400,000,000.

The loan agreement also permits Great Britain to waive—or cancel—the interest on the "line of credit" under certain conditions.

If the interest charge cannot be paid it is not easy to assume that the loan itself can be or will be repaid.

This naturally invites consideration of the good faith of the British Socialist Labor government in accepting the one-sided scheme; and the best way of arriving at a justified conclusion is to examine the Labor government's current record.

The loan agreement is already morally, if not strictly legally, binding upon the British Government.

It was signed at Washington on December 6, 1945, by Secretary of the Treasury Vinson and Lord Halifax, the British Ambassador, and was ratified by both houses of the British Parliament in the same month.

Among the concessions which the Labor government promised to make was an undertaking to abolish the British sterling area controls whereby American trade is excluded from most of the British Empire and from several other countries by preventing the conversion of their currencies, or their credits in British pounds, into American dollar exchange.

This concession was to be completed within 1 year after the effective date of the agreement.

Following upon the British ratification of the agreement, and while the British loan was under consideration in the United States Senate, the Labor government entered into entirely new deals of the same nature as the sterling area system.

These deals have been made unilaterally with all of Great Britain's western European allies except France, and with Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Sweden, and Switzerland; and France and Britain are still operating under a similar lapsed agreement which is expected to be renewed.

By these agreements, Great Britain and the other countries will accept each other's currencies, but the European central banks are not to convert sterling balances into dollars, up to an agreed amount, without the assent of the nationalized Bank of England.

The effect, of course, is to create a preference in European markets for British goods as against American, and to nullify the British loan agreement before it comes into operation.

A London dispatch to the New York Times on March 17, 1946, said the new system "taken as a whole, looks to many observers like a possible alternative to the Bretton Woods system," and it "limits the convertibility of sterling * * * in a manner inconsistent with the Anglo-American loan agreement."

That does not appear to be good faith in accepting the pending loan.

In the matter of tariffs, also, the Labor government is "taking time by the forelock."

Under the loan agreement, Great Britain ostensibly agrees to negotiate further tariff reductions with us.

We are not in a good bargaining position here.

We have already made a reciprocal trade agreement with Great Britain, reducing our statutory tariffs by 50 percent on a long list of specified articles, and have extended these reductions to other countries under the most-favored-nation principle.

With that bargaining power all traded away, President Truman asked and obtained from Congress authority to negotiate additional reductions of 25 percent of the original tariffs.

The British Government is now canvassing British trades and industries to ascertain what tariff reductions, if any, they might approve—an action quite opposite to the doctrinaire methods of our Government.

At a meeting of the commonwealth governments, further, the question of imperial preference, a protective tariff system inside the British Empire, is being discussed.

There is much opposition in England to any weakening of imperial preferences—and it would seem foolish to expect Britain to weaken the Empire by such a procedure.

Finally, there is the matter of state trading as opposed to free enterprise in international commerce.

A New York Times report from London dated April 26 said:

"In Britain this state trading will take two forms.

"Government agencies will buy in bulk raw materials, such as cotton and possibly rubber and metals, for resale to domestic manufacturers.

"The implications of this practice are already causing concern in American business circles.

"In addition, the mammoth state-owned enterprises, such as steel, coal, and electric power, will both buy and sell in the international markets."

Great Britain has already gone very far along this line.

The House of Commons has approved an announcement by Sir Stafford Cripps, chairman of the British Board of Trade, that the wartime policy of bulk purchases of cotton by the British Government would be perpetuated.

This action permanently closes the world free market in cotton at the Liverpool Cotton Exchange and puts the American cotton planter at the mercy of the British Government—loan or no loan.

Likewise, British aviation has been nationalized against foreign competition.

In view of these developments, even before the British loan has been approved, it appears doubtful indeed if the loan—and the proposed International Trade Organization—will have any value at all in accomplishing the declared objective of removing international trade barriers.

Such being the evident case, there seems to be no sensible reason whatsoever why the loan should be made or why legitimate American interests should be sacrificed to totalitarian purposes.

Peacetime Conscription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of misconception prevailing about the present necessity for peacetime conscription, and in the belief that the attached editorial of the Bridgeton Evening News throws some light on the situation, I take the liberty of inserting it. The editorial follows:

AN AROUSED HOUSE

The militant action of the House of Representatives in protecting teen agers from Selective Service must have been based on the protests they received from their constituents.

It certainly came as a painful surprise to the Senate and to President Truman as well. And if it merely put aside the youngsters

at the expense of men 26 to 29, it might not have fulfilled its original purpose.

The main question, of course, is whether the United States must keep on drafting men nearly a year after the end of the war in order to maintain its fighting services, or whether it is safe to rely on enlistments to keep our armed machine intact.

If it is true that we have to draft young men now as a club over the head of unnamed aggressors, it will be true next year and all the years to come. If we aren't secure against some attack by a warring power today, then it is a certainty we will not be immune from the threat of war next year and a decade from now.

If there is one time in a country when selective service seems unnecessary it is directly after a war has been won and the enemy prostrated.

If it is true that we are going to prepare for the next war without any draft holiday at all, then the Government should make the various branches of service an attractive career and match wages of private industry. Conscription has no place in our way of life, except during an emergency or the threat of war.

Our Government deems it advisable to keep selective service alive and to continue compulsory inductions. They evidently have a reason for it. There should be enough men in the service now to police occupied areas, even allowing for replacements of the veterans who have already done more than enough. If we must have a big standing army at home, in event of an attack, it might be well for some official to state whether we ought to be ready to fight the Russians at a moment's notice.

If it isn't Russia, then who can it be? Certainly we are not afraid of aggression from Canada, or Mexico or Spain, or Britain, or Argentina.

If we can't trust the Russians now, we'll never be able to trust them. A man doesn't have to be an isolationist to wonder why conscription must be continued after a war has been won.

McGregor Again Offers Aid to Housing Needs and Introduces Bill Prohibiting Exports of Critical Building Materials

REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on February 14, 1946, I made a speech on the floor of this House, calling to your attention the fact that we exported approximately 423,000,000 feet of lumber for the year 1945. I also called to your attention the fact that plans were in effect which contemplated the export of a billion feet of lumber in 1946. In addition to this, large quantities of other products that are so essential to the building of homes for our veterans, and others, were exported from the United States.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a chart from the Trade Statistics Division of the Office of World Trade Promotion, Department of Commerce, which shows that we are continuing to export from the United States building materials. May I call your attention to a small group of these exports:

To Canada there were exported from the United States in January 1946, 4,376,000 board feet of lumber; February 1946, 4,351,000 board feet of lumber.

To Cuba: January 1946, 2,328,000 board feet of lumber; February 1946, 2,159,000 board feet of lumber.

To Mexico: January 1946, 1,340,000 board feet of lumber; February 1946, 1,392,000 board feet of lumber.

To United Kingdom: January 1946, 25,016,000 board feet of lumber; February 1946, 10,156,000 board feet of lumber.

To Netherlands: January 1946, 554,000 board feet of lumber; February 1946, 6,746,000 board feet of lumber.

To Palestine and Trans-Jordan: January 1946, 2,000 board feet of lumber; February 1946, 410,000 board feet of lumber.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that I have shown only the export of lumber to countries that appeared in my previous report of February 14, 1946. In addition to this, we have exported to countries other than quoted above sufficient amounts to make a grand total—including the above—of lumber exported: January 1946, 77,195,000 board feet of lumber; February 1946, 64,498,000 board feet of lumber.

May I also call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that in January we exported 3,187,002 square feet of plasterboard and wallboard. In February, 1,009,338 square feet of plasterboard and wallboard. In January we exported 814 bathtubs and 909 bathtubs in February.

I think it is unfair to the veterans and to all citizens that we tell them we are going to do everything possible to see that they receive materials with which to build homes and repair homes, and at the same time allow this material to be taken from them in such large quantities and shipped to foreign countries. This policy is being carried out over the protest of many Members of Congress.

Realizing those in power have refused to follow suggestions that this material be retained for our own people, I am today introducing a bill, which reads as follows:

A bill to prohibit, for a period of 9 months, the exportation of building materials from the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That the exportation of building materials from the United States to any foreign country is hereby prohibited for the period of 9 months following the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) the term "building materials" means articles and materials suitable for use in the construction of housing accommodations; and

(b) the term "United States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories and possessions of the United States.

You will note this legislation prohibits the export of building materials for the next 9 months. I am calling upon the membership of this body to give active support to this bill, so that it can be passed immediately, and then we can truly say that we are giving aid to the veterans, and to those who desire to build homes and to repair homes. I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, that we give more consideration to the American people.

How About the Men Behind the Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and a great amount of credit has been given to the radio, stage, and screen actors and entertainers who traveled long distances, under many handicaps, to entertain our armed forces during World War II.

Unfortunately the men behind the scene have been overlooked. I refer to the stage hands, the grippes, the scene shifters, and the whole crew that had to go along to make the show a success. These men did not get the applause, they have not been given citations and little is known of the difficulties they had to overcome to "set the stage" for the star so his show would be a success.

Somebody had to set the lights and control them. Somebody had to put up and take down the scenery. Somebody had to pack and unpack all the gear to make the entertainers more effective. That somebody was the stage hand who was not eligible for military service but nevertheless left his home and family, traveled thousands of miles and met the same hardships cheerfully to see that our boys in the armed forces were properly entertained.

When citations are handed out, they should not be overlooked. They are deserving and have won them just as much as the entertainers.

Poultry Industry Headed for Extermination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the poultry industry is a major industry in my State. It is facing a most critical situation. The present policy of the Federal Government in depriving this industry of the necessary feed, unless modified, will result in the extermination of the industry. The Government has made it impossible for poultry growers to obtain grain in the Northwest States which is necessary to provide needed feed. We in that area do not grow corn in any material amounts and are required by reason thereof to rely largely upon wheat. The Government has now seized, through its operations, all of the excess grain for export, leaving this industry stranded. I am advised that within the next few weeks at least a million laying hens will have to be killed, as there will be no feed for them. By reason of the dearth of cold-storage facilities and the inability of the market to absorb such a large

influx of dressed poultry, the result will be that these growers will suffer an immense loss in their investment. It not only means extermination of the industry but, more important, means that in the months to follow the American people will be deprived of eggs and poultry and we will not have the supplies available for our armed forces and for export.

What I have said with reference to the poultry industry obtains, to some extent, in the dairy industry. The Oregon delegation in the Congress has appealed to the Secretary of Agriculture, urging that modification of existing orders be made at once to provide for the channeling into Oregon and Washington of a sufficient amount of poultry feed to save the destruction of this large industry which has grown up through the fostering care of the Agriculture Department.

A similar condition exists in at least a dozen other States of the Union, particularly in the New England area and it behooves all of us in these districts to insist that measures be taken by the Secretary of Agriculture and other Federal agencies involved to relieve the situation so that these few States will not be penalized. It is not a question of doing our full share in furnishing food for the starving people of the Old World. We are willing to make every sacrifice necessary to that end. It is not required, however, in carrying forward the relief program for the starving that major industries in our own country be struck a death blow so that the very objective we seek to accomplish will be prevented, namely, providing food for our own people as well as those starving overseas.

Mrs. Talmadge Replies to Mrs. Luce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am including an address delivered by Mrs. Julius Y. Talmadge, president general of the Daughters of the American Revolution, before the fifty-fifth continental congress of the DAR in Atlantic City, N. J., on Monday, May 20, 1946.

I need not tell you that the Daughters of the American Revolution is one of the greatest patriotic organizations in the world today, and that Mrs. Talmadge is one of the outstanding women of this Nation.

Her defense of the DAR in this address is simply unanswerable.

The matter referred to follows:

REBUILDING FOR SECURITY

In rebuilding for security we must consider too the affairs of our own Society.

As the sessions of this congress which follow will be crowded to the limit with important business, this is probably the best time to present to you some of the issues which have confronted the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution during the past year.

All of the so-called patriotic societies in this country which base their membership upon hereditary lines, naturally signify American birth. There are hundreds of other organizations which are equally patriotic and whose aims for the betterment of humankind are as worthy as ours and are marked by most notable achievements.

By the same token, there are individuals—Americans by adoption only—without whose patriotism, loyalty, and high order of intelligence, this country could neither have achieved nor maintained its stability and greatness.

To such organizations and citizens we pay a sincere tribute, but the fact remains, that the same sinister forces which have for many years been deliberately seeking to destroy our institutions of government, have also leveled their guns at the Daughters of the American Revolution.

As most of you know, the barrage began 20 years ago, when we took a firm stand for preparedness, for restriction of immigration and for other measures of national defense. Therefore, it has been easy to trace the source of some of the public haranguing against the DAR which has been going on for the past few years.

The issue again presented this fiscal year has been a fruitful one for both enemies and dissidents, though due acknowledgment is made of the sincerity of some of the latter group.

Since last October, when the national board of management reaffirmed the well-known decision regarding use of Constitution Hall—based upon conformity with the prevailing customs in the District of Columbia—it has been accused of being un-Christian and of negligence in adhering to the principles as enunciated in the constitution of the society, drawn up by its founders in 1896.

These accusations the board members have borne with remarkable equanimity and well they might, because Christianity lies within the heart of each individual and the expression thereof is its own sacred privilege—and further, because no one has a right to speak for the dead. It is not within the province of the present living to declare what the attitude of those who have long since gone to their reward would be upon any issue were they here to present their personal viewpoints.

In giving a recital of facts regarding the management of Constitution Hall, I would remind you that in Washington there are separate schools for the white and colored races, separate playgrounds, separate halls and theaters, restaurants, and other meeting places. These customs were carefully worked out as best suited to existing conditions and conducive to the greatest happiness and peace for all. The Congress of the United States can change them at any time it so desires and is the sole body that can do so. Politicians, radicals, publicity seekers, and others gain nothing by attacking Congress. But an attack aimed at the DAR, a patriotic organization—owning Constitution Hall—gets the headlines. Politics and publicity have lurked behind every curtain in every attack on our management of Constitution Hall.

Back in 1923, when the DAR Society realized it had outgrown Memorial Continental Hall, and that a larger auditorium was needed, the members wholeheartedly espoused the cause—raised $2,000,000 and built one. The society has been glad to share their auditorium with the people of Washington, knowing there was no other one in the city of equal beauty, accommodation, and refinement.

Various plans have been announced to build a large auditorium in the District of Columbia. A bill has been introduced in Congress to this effect. I am sure the owners of Constitution Hall, who have served as hostesses to the District throughout these many years, would welcome such a plan.

There is another suggestion, however, and that is—that the backers and sponsors of those artists who have been denied the use of Constitution Hall because of our rules regulating our rental system—and have obtained thereby a million dollars worth of free advertising, more or less, for these artists—could easily build an auditorium of their own. The DAR Society would wish them great success—and Godspeed—in their endeavor. There is room for all, and Constitution Hall would remain as it is today—a cultural center in Washington, D. C.

But we continue to be criticized hypocritically by those who have political ambitions; by various groups who are opposed to us; and honestly by those who, acting with sincere motives, follow the leader.

A certain few, however, have decided to take matters into their own hands, and attack the leadership of this society.

This little band of women, who style themselves as "loyal members of the DAR", formed an unconstitutional committee calling itself a "DAR committee against racial discrimination in Constitution Hall—a voluntary organization of members of the Daughters of the American Revolution" and is, therefore, misrepresenting itself both to the general public and to the membership of the society. The secretary of this committee is not even a DAR member.

IS THIS LOYALTY TO THE DAR?

I have in my possession some of the original letters sent out by this so-called committee, over the personal signature of the leader, bearing at the top the above name, and on the side of the sheet the names of the members of the committee are printed. I quote from one of these letters dated March 27, 1946:

"This fight against racial discrimination is on the move throughout the country and it would be a glorious achievement if from within our own ranks we could accomplish the deletion of the offensive clause. There are several things which each DAR woman can do. She can:

"1. Write to the above committee, offering the use of her name as a protestor.

"2. Write every DAR she knows to urge her chapter to agree to a resolution to be submitted in Atlantic City in May.

"3. Write directly to Mrs. Julius Talmadge, personally protesting.

"4. Write local newspapers and radio stations, expressing how she feels about the matter.

"5. Announce her intention not to resign if her chapter will not act upon the resolution, but to transfer to another chapter or become a member-at-large.

"6. Distribute speeches and literature to interested DAR's.

"7. Send copies to me for insertion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of any resolutions passed in their individual chapters.

"8. Send to the committee yearbooks and names and reports of chapters of other States.

"9. Seek to become a delegate to the May convention or insist that the delegate who is going be prepared to vote against racial discrimination.

"10. Join the above committee which is in the process of formation.

"I shall welcome word from you as to your efforts in this basic factor in our democracy."

This letter was sent even to those who are responsible for the making of the policy of the national society, the members of the executive committee and national board of management—and then to all others whose names they were able to obtain.

DO WE BELIEVE IN RULE BY THE MAJORITY? IS THIS LOYALTY?

Our enemies from within and without have done more than this, however.

The infiltration of propaganda into some of the public schools, which we have for a long time featured to their advantage through our committees, is one evidence of outside and inside unfriendly planning. A class of high-school girls in one State resigned from the Good Citizenship Pilgrimage contest, and their misguided act was praised by members of this rebellious group, seeking to force a change in our rules governing Constitution Hall. Is this loyalty? I would state here that never have I seen more interest shown in the Good Citizenship Pilgrimage than during these last few months—on my long itinerary covering State conferences.

I ask you, Is any person who attempts to wreck one of our important programs worthy to wear the insignia of the DAR?

Our enemies struck at our work in the naturalization courts when a Federal judge declared that he thought the DAR members would be embarrassed to appear in his court with our manuals for citizenship. Let me tell you that our work in the naturalization courts is proceeding in larger measure than ever before. We are not at all embarrassed over our efforts to keep Constitution Hall the cultural center in Washington, in accordance with prevailing customs.

During this turmoil, some members have urged that we take the lead in abolishing the established order of custom in Washington.

In this changing world—for war always brings changes—we, as an organization are in accord with any individual, regardless of birth or color, who wishes to keep step with the march of progress, but we would naturally hesitate to assume the role of dictators to the lawmakers of the land.

Can you imagine a Member of the Congress of the United States trying to saddle upon the DAR a controversial matter which the Senate and House must decide? A few Members in the House of Representatives who have flayed the DAR because of its position have never—publicly at least—taken any steps toward proposing or supporting changes in customs in their own Capitol Building or in the District of Columbia.

Another bill was introduced in the House to penalize this organization by taking away its tax-exemption privileges if it denied Constitutional Hall to any person because of race, color, creed, or national origin. This bill was thrown out, upon recommendation of the District of Columbia Commissioners. They stated that, in the first place, the DAR does pay taxes whenever the hall is used for commercial purposes; and that, in the second place, owners of amusement places or halls may exclude or admit whomever they choose. As a matter of fact, last year we paid many thousands of dollars in taxes into the coffers of the District of Columbia and the United States Treasury.

And there have been personal attacks upon me, the principal reason seemingly being that I am a daughter of the South, and their purpose is to stir up sectional and racial discord. I quote briefly from a radio broadcast delivered on the eve of Washington's birthday, February 21, 1946, by a member of our society, which she later published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"There are ladies on the DAR board who are, as they should be, proud daughters of the South.

"Naturally their racial prejudices die hard, but they must be told that when they allow their racial prejudices to operate in DAR matters they add to the wrong of intolerance, the wrong of disloyalty to the DAR.

"Mrs. Julius Young Talmadge, of Georgia, is today president general of the DAR. Now, I don't know how many more revolutionary ancestors Mrs. Talmadge can boast than you and I, and I don't care. So we are going to step right up to her and say, 'See here, Mrs. Talmadge, of Athens, Ga., you are a fine woman and a gracious lady, but, whether you will admit it or not, in your deep concern for white faces you are, paradoxically enough, giving our DAR a couple of black eyes by insisting on this clause in our Constitution Hall contract."

I did not reply to her then—and am not doing so now, except to make these broad general statements, to a widely publicized but still uninformed citizenry. You have all probably read it, as it was widely distributed. The attack had little, if any, effect upon me, for I do not see, in the first place, what bearing my locale could have on the subject. I had no choice in its selection and we are all presumably human, whether we embarked upon life in the north, the south, the east, or the west; but the sum total demonstrates to what length antagonists will go in order to create division and discord within our ranks.

IS THIS LOYALTY TO THE DAR?

Unconsidered accusations like these are not rebuilding for security, and it is safe to say, that the fair-minded membership of our society will repudiate such tactics.

The national board of management, and I, as president general, are deeply conscious of our responsibility to the Society. Therefore, the opinions of earnest members who have demonstrated their devotion by years of honest effort and cooperation in the many good causes should not only be voiced but should be given respectful attention.

Be it stated here and now, however, that pressure groups and nonactive members, who express themselves through the press, the radio, and other media, are very much mistaken if they think they exert any influence whatsoever upon the members of the national board.

Their deliberations and decisions are based—not upon the threats and insinuations of sporadic groups—but upon wise judgment and plain common sense.

Realizing that they are simple human beings, these women who foregather from all parts of the country three or four times a year—and at their own expense—and sit through long and weary business sessions make no claim to infallibility. Only Caesar's wife could do that. Our women just try to do the very best they can.

That will continue to be the policy, and the Daughters of the American Revolution will function, as it has for 55 years, in the path of good will and good deeds, without dictation from unauthorized sources, either within or without the organization. It stands proudly upon its own fine record, and I know full well that succeeding administrations will brighten and not dim its luster.

You all know, by this time, that the free and unconditional use of Constitution Hall has been granted to Tuskegee Institute and its famous choir for the evening of June 3 for a benefit performance, the entire proceeds of which will go to the United Negro College Fund.

This action did not in any way change our rules governing the rental of Constitution Hall. The executive committee, in 1943, invited Marian Anderson to give a war benefit for Chinese relief in Constitution Hall. The Negro College Fund is to be used for aid to Negro schools, and not for mixed schools, and that sort of education should be encouraged, applauded, and assisted.

The executive committee felt that it was a privilege to honor the request of an institution which, by its dignified conduct of affairs, has proved itself worthy of the admiration and respect of the world. To the executive committee belongs the entire credit for the decision, and any assertions or implications of influence from other quarters are both futile and untrue, as I have already stated to the press.

It seemed fair to you for me to speak plainly and go into detail in all of this: It is right that you should know the truth and the facts. I would ask you this: Are we a free and independent society, perfectly capable of managing our own property in Washington and attending to our own business—or must we hand over the leadership to unauthorized groups and be told how we are to run our affairs?

Daughters of the American Revolution, believe in your society. Believe in its strength—and its power. Believe that nothing in the world can harm it, because it is founded upon a rock. Its roots are too deep—they are as deep as America herself. It is America. Give out a spirit of confidence. Be a positive—not a negative—influence.

OPA Rules and Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DUDLEY G. ROE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very fine letter issued by Hales & Hunter Co. on the present emergency due to the unsound rules and regulations promulgated by the OPA.

The letter follows:

HALES & HUNTER CO.,
Chicago—Wilmington, Del., April 26, 1946.

Subject: Where do we go from here?

To All Dealers:

The Constitution of the United States was developed around the principle that that government is best which governs least. In the last 13 years this basic concept of good government has been reversed. Erroneous laws have been enacted, creating confusion and discrimination foreign to American ways and thinking. In efforts to correct the harmful effect of these laws additional laws are passed which convert confusion into chaos.

Emergency begets emergency, each calling for its bureaucratic edicts. With three bumper crops in the last 3 years, and with hundreds of millions of bushels of grains on the Nation's farms and in elevators, the petty Washington dictators find it necessary to issue distribution and use controls in an attempt to make grains and proteins move to market. And do they move? Yes—but not through conventional channels. They move, largely, through illegitimate channels of trade, out of reach of long-estabished, legitimate business. OPA planned it that way through its irrational pricing of various grains in relation to other products, primarily livestock and poultry.

And now the pay-off! The Government itself, unable to secure wheat and corn, has entered the market with special inducements. In the case of the 50,000,000 bushels of corn, the 30 cents per bushel "bonus" being offered has all the attributes of "black market" dealing—this in the face of the Government's own OPA! Incidentally, it is rumored this corn is ear-marked, like the wheat, for export.

What the feed manufacturer is supposed to make feed from, we have not yet discovered. Barter and wire-pulling are the only instruments left for the organization that continues to play the game legitimately. Money per se, under OPA pricing, means nothing.

There is grain in this country today but it will not flow into legitimate markets freely until laws of supply and demand again become the "economic law of the land."

You can't blame Americans for refusing to do business on any other basis.

With few exceptions, as in cases where there is a definite, known lack of goods, primarily housing, there is no need for OPA. If continued intact this year, some trumped up reason will be found to continue it again in 1947—and so on, infinitum.

Your Congressman and your Senator are the only ones who stand between a free America and ultimately complete regimentation of the only remaining free nation in the world. Write them.

HALES & HUNTER CO.

San Franciscans Parade for OPA Continuance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, 14,000 citizens of San Francisco paraded in protest against the crippling of OPA on May 15. The parade was followed by a monster mass meeting in the civic center where prominent speakers urged that Congress remove from the price control extension bill the amendments which would render OPA impotent.

The following story, published in the San Francisco Labor Herald, gives a graphic account of the parade and mass meeting:

SAN FRANCISCO, May 16.—They extended from the civic center to the Embarcadero Wednesday—the 14,000 workers who paraded to show their determination to keep the OPA alive.

Spectators lined up five deep to watch the march up Market Street.

The marchers and the spectators listened to Attorney General Robert Kenny and others at the Civic Center rally demand that OPA be continued without crippling amendments.

"I think the parade today is the answer to the $300,000 the NAM raised to kill the OPA," Attorney General Kenny, the Democratic candidate for Governor, said.

Ten CIO unions paraded, with 8,000 members of the ILWU Warehousemen's 6 leading off.

Sixteen AFL unions and the independent Marine Firemen, Oilers and Watertenders also marched.

The American Veterans Committee section of the parade featured a soldier wearing a barrel lettered: "A preview! What else can the veteran afford?"

"The average American wants three things," Kenney said, "peace, security, and a decent, democratic way of life."

Kenny, condemning fence straddlers, said, "The politicians who are not active for OPA are against OPA and you and me."

San Francisco CIO Council Secretary Paul Schnur pointed out that the NAM had outflanked the American people on the political front by its pressure for a rising cost of living.

"If OPA is taken off," Ann Boylan, a San Francisco housewife, pointed out, "a housewife will have to choose between spending 65 cents for a loaf of bread or 55 cents for a bottle of milk because that's what bread and milk will cost."

"Are we going to be able to live simply and decently?" demanded Philip I. Deredi, business representative for the AFL Elevator Operators and Starters.

"I am talking about bread and milk and meat and vegetables. OPA not only means Office of Price Administration," he said. "It also means Organization to Protect Americans."

Palestine Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, every Member of Congress who is interested in the Palestine question will be interested in reading a part of a sensible analysis of the committee report, which appeared May 10, 1946, in the Jewish Record, of Atlantic City. It is as follows:

PALESTINE REPORT

Senator BREWSTER scored a bull's-eye when he said that the report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine "represents a naive and unholy alliance of Machiavelli and Pollyanna." Even a cursory analysis of the report fully justified this conclusion, but it is so much truer now, after Prime Minister Attlee has told the House of Commons that the British Government declines to take any steps towards the implementation of the recommendation to permit 100,000 Jewish refugees to enter Palestine, until the United States shares "the resultant financial and military responsibilities" and the "illegal armies" in Palestine are disbanded and disarmed.

WHAT THE INQUIRERS FAILED TO INQUIRE INTO

The very terms of reference of the Inquiry Committee were a victory for British Machiavellianism. Following closely the policy which Mr. Bevin laid down in his famous statement, the immediate refugee problem was separated from the larger Jewish problem. This alone made it impossible for the committee to study the problem with any degree of adequacy and intelligence.

It was not possible for the Inquiry Committee to consider the Jewish and Arab claims in terms of justice. But the requirements of justice are the very basis of the Zionist case. Zionism is grounded in the principle that every people has a right to an equal measure of autonomy and security, to a chance for the free and undisturbed development of its native potentialities. If this premise is accepted, the claim of the Jewish people to Palestine may be denied justly, only if it can be shown that the fulfillment of the claim will rob another people of the opportunity for national survival. But no one yet has claimed that the survival of the Arab nation will in any way be jeopardized if instead of eight Arab states there will be only seven, whereas the last hope for the survival of the Jewish people will be totally lost, if it is not given the opportunity to build its national home.

It should be obvious to every literate person that the Palestine problem cannot be understood except in the context of present-day power politics and particularly the general set-up of the British Empire. Palestine is not a British territory, yet it has been under British control for over a quarter of a century, and Great Britain does not even pretend that it has any intention to evacuate it in the near future.

The Shipping Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Shipping Scandal," from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 18, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SHIPPING SCANDAL

The strong odor of scandal exudes from the wartime administration of our merchant fleet, yet Congress is trying to turn its nose away. As Edward A. Harris reported in this newspaper, demands for a congressional investigation have been ignored.

The evidence of potential scandal is thicker around Washington than masts in a shipyard, so escape from the elementary facts is impossible. Representative WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts, has even put some of the evidence into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in the form of a report by the Comptroller General. This report states flatly that there is a discrepancy of $5,822,498,000 in the records of the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration.

Other scraps of evidence, despite their abundance, and despite the efforts of Congressman WIGGLESWORTH, have not generally reached the public. For instance, the Congressman says that during the war, the WSA allowed 758 ships, more than 20 years old, to earn $200,000,000 in 18 months. Their book investment value was only $38,000,000. The Government, which operated the merchant fleet, paid the difference between reasonable and unreasonable profits, whatever it was.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH also notes that the Government allowed insurance worth $477,000,000 to be written on 690 vessels whose book value was $34,000,000. He says typical ships were insured for 10 to 20 times their prewar book values. When insurance premiums had to be paid, the taxpayers did the paying.

Many a vessel, according to Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, floated throughout the war in milk drawn from the Government. He charges that the Government paid 5 to 10 times what a typical ship was worth, and that profits on voyages often were 6 to 8 times the prewar price of the craft. He further states that the Maritime Commission renegotiated less than 60 percent of the astonishingly profitable war shipping contracts.

Perhaps the Commission and WSA can offer some defense of their record. They did succeed in building a fairly small merchant service up to a point where it had nearly two-thirds of the world's commercial vessels. To do that, the Government had to rely on men from shipping interests for help, and to throw dollars this way and that for incentives. However, many another war agency succeeded against similar problems, without butting its bow into scandal.

Now, Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, says examination of the Maritime Commission's record would reveal the most shocking story of collusion, corruption, and disregard of public interest. Since the Senator is not given to extreme statements, Congress might be expected to take his words as a challenge. Instead of that, as Mr. Harris reported, the challenge is met with notable apathy.

This is the worst possible time for Congress to pass the shipping administration with an

apathetic blessing. For one thing, there is the current dispute over whether a Navy clique should continue to dominate the chairmanship of the Maritime Commission. Certainly, if there was mismanagement or corruption during the war, that is a reflection on naval control, and civilians should be put in charge.

Moreover, Congress has been considering proposals to turn the merchant fleet back to private ownership, under exceedingly liberal terms of sale, and under further subsidies to ship owners. The Shipping Act of 1936 allows subsidies up to 50 percent on both the construction and operating costs of a vessel.

Since the United States is committed to private ownership, return of the ships to their owners requires some subsidization. This protects our merchant marine against cheap foreign competition, and preserves a shipping reserve in case of war. But if shipping firms profiteered at the taxpayers' expense during the past war, Congress owes the public a review of shipping operation in the future. The people are willing to pay to float a merchant marine, but not for a supercargo of profits, and certainly not for the bilge of corruption.

The whole question of the future of our merchant service depends on its operation in the past. If the past represents scandal, then policy and the men in charge must be changed. Congress has a duty to investigate, and make all the facts plain, for the facts already known are enough to make the American people suspect piracy.

Tribute to Hon. James W. Mott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that sweet is the journey on friendship's road, and with this sentiment I fully agree. Hon. James W. Mott and I traveled this road together in the House of Representatives for many years. It was a sad blow to all of us when he passed from among us. Such a man as Jim, as he was affectionately known among his colleagues, was too valuable to the Nation to be spared. Yet, an allwise providence, whose decision can not be questioned, called Jim home. The record he left as a great legislator will ever remain as a monument to his ability, energy, and character.

I sympathize deeply with Mrs. Mott in her great bereavement.

Our Place in Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, this is the air age. Development of direct and competitive routes through and between our industrial and commercial centers, between our great ports and foreign ports, is imperative to our national well-being, to our national economy, to our national defense, and to our world leadership. We must not delay. Civil Aeronautics Board has a definite responsibility to expedite the approval of these additional routes and to see that they are put in operation as soon as possible.

There is no justification for further dilly-dallying. The air lines are anxious and ready to go, the planes are available, and trained pilots and mechanics, veterans who learned to fly and service multimotored planes with the Army Air Transport Command and the Naval Air Transport Service, operating around the world, are capable and anxious to fill the new jobs these extensions would provide. And remember that General George, of the Army Air Forces, has said it will take a minimum backlog or reserve of at least 5,000 transport planes to adequately provide for the national defense. What better way is there to make these planes available than to approve and put into operation these much needed new airline routes?

The New Orleans Item, in the following editorial, has most aptly set forth the case in point. This is 1946, yet some of the applications not yet acted upon—neither denied nor approved—were filed in 1940—six long years ago. But read the editorial:

NOW OR NEVER FOR OUR PLACE IN AVIATION

Unless New Orleans is content to be hopelessly bypassed in the coming age of air transport, steps to get fair consideration of its just claims for action by the Civil Aeronautics Board must be taken—now. Within a year at most, the available routes for continental air travel will be allocated. Thereafter the only additional certificates will be extensions of existing facilities or small and relatively unimportant feeder routes.

Among the 110 applications for permits to establish routes to or through New Orleans still gathering dust in the CAB's files is one by the Waterman Steamship Co. for a direct route to Puerto Rico. It was filed December 19, 1940, almost 6 years ago, but has not yet received action.

Pennsylvania-Central Airlines, an eastern service, would give New Orleans another line to New York, provided the CAB would authorize establishment of one more link between here and Birmingham. Application for this was made by Pennsylvania-Central almost 3 years ago.

One of the conspicuous blanks in our present air-line facilities is communication with the Detroit region about half way between New York and Chicago. This route would include Meridian, Nashville, Louisville, and Cincinnati—with none of which we now have direct connections. American Airlines, one of the Nation's largest and most important, applied for permission to establish flights over this route—in July 1943.

Our principal immediate needs in the way of additional lines are:

First: Direct connection with the west coast, and thus with the Orient. We mean no time-killing stopovers and transfers at Dallas or Tulsa. Eastern Air Lines has had an application for this service in for years. American has been trying a long time for a merger with Mid-Continent in order to begin a one-stop, one-plane direct service. Braniff, National, and Eagle have all been seeking permits to fly to or through El Paso from New Orleans since 1943. All these applications are still pending.

Second: New Orleans to Mexico City direct—not through Merida, Brownsville, Miami, or any other way around Robin Hood's barn. Chicago & Southern, Pan-American Airways, and Eastern Air Lines all applied to give us this in 1943. No action as yet.

Third: A direct air line to Havana. The CAB examiners themselves showed by their investigation of hotel registrations in Havana that much the largest proportion of United States visitors to Cuba's capital would have best been served by flights through or from New Orleans rather than through or from Miami or any other point of origin. National, Pan-American, Delta, and others have had applications for this on file with the CAB for years.

Fourth: For the sake of our own commerce, as principal liaison city and port with Central and South America, we must have direct air communication with the Canal Zone and the east and west coasts of South America. Chicago & Southern applied in 1942 for a route to Rio. Half a dozen applications, including one by United Fruit in 1943, are still on file for flights to Balboa, from which west coast extensions would reach South America.

The New Orleans Airport Commission has done more than its share. Moisant Field is the finest civilian port in the country—the only one where DC-4's and Constellations are permitted to land 24 hours a day with full capacity loads. Callendar Field is an excellent alternative port. Ordinarily, when one of these is closed by local weather conditions, the other is open. There have not been half a dozen times when both have been closed at once. Because of the war, they cost New Orleans comparatively little.

The war is over. By spending huge sums of their own money, rival communities can match our otherwise unmatched airfields—if given enough time. But vigorous action by New Orleans—now, when the facilities which other cities will yet have to provide are already in operation here—can put us almost at once in the position we should properly occupy and from which only our own lethargy can bar us.

Our geographical situation has been as good as the best and better than most. Our airports are literally the best at the moment. Continued delay or obstruction by the CAB on applications that have been pending for years can balk us and nullify these magnificent advantages. But only our own lethargy can let the CAB pass us by until competing communities have attained the position we already enjoy.

If we wait until this occurs and the available lines are fixed and permanent, we will have lost the chance to become one of this hemisphere's—and of this world's—major aerial crossroads. If we bestir ourselves now, our world place in the years to come will be secure.

How Could OPA Possibly Do a Better Job of Stopping Our Building Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include some letters which will give all who read some faint idea of just how the OPA carry on their gestapo snooping and meddling

in the affairs of honest American businessmen:

NORTHWESTERN BUSINESSMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., May 15, 1946.
To Our Senators and Representatives.

GENTLEMEN: Will you take the time to read the enclosed? These letters are typical of many we receive each week from our members.

In Iowa you will note how the OPA is ransacking our dealers' business on a small technicality of having correct information on sales tickets, and if, in the OPA's opinion, not enough information is on the sales ticket, they fine the dealer not for charging over the ceiling but on a small technicality. And then, as they say, use the money collected to get an injunction against the dealer, which gives them the privilege of ransacking the dealer's business any time they see fit. Is this justice?

Also note what the dealer in North Dakota has to say about procuring lumber for GI homes. They can build them and have the labor to do so, but not the material. Two hundred and thirty of our yards have notified Mr. Wyatt that, if they had the material, they could and would build over 1,600 GI homes, and have asked Mr. Wyatt to help them get the material. Philip H. Coombs, Acting Director, Materials Supply Branch, has sent our dealers a letter which doesn't say or mean a thing when it comes to getting materials to build GI homes. The Wyatt program is not getting material into the Northwest to build GI homes. Isn't this letter from Coombs to our dealers a pretty weak approach to the matter of materials?

Thought you would also be interested in the resignation of Mr. R. L. Hudson, Pocahontas County, Iowa, chairman of the OPA price panel for that county. Read what he has to say about the OPA. Pretty bad business, is it not?

Our 2,700 dealers and all connected with the building industry, including the GI's who want homes, the farmer, and the present home owner are in worse shape now than during the war; and if the Northwest is not being discriminated against, abused, accused, and confused, then we have another guess coming.

Sincerely yours,
W. H. BADEAUX, *Secretary.*

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY,
Washington D. C., May 9, 1946.

DEAR SIR: Mr. Wyatt has asked me to reply to your recent communication concerning the lumber shortage. It is regretted that the shortage of stenographic personnel and the volume of correspondence received on this subject necessitate answering your communication in other than on an individual basis.

Since the war, the lumber industry has had to be completely changed from wartime to peacetime operations. The types of lumber produced at the mills had to be changed and the distribution system revitalized. In addition, actions were necessary to expand production.

Considerable progress has been made in all of these fields since VJ-day, but many problems still remain. The manpower situation is improving progressively, partly because of an intensive recruitment campaign. The equipment situation is improving through the extension of equipment priorities to lumber producers. The Office of Price Administration has made broad adjustments for all major species. The Congress has been asked to appropriate sufficient funds for the development of access roads to increase the accessibility of stumpage. In addition, we are working closely with the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, the Civilian Production Administration, and State forest services to give all possible assistance to individual mills in expanding their production.

This year we anticipate a total demand for lumber of at least 36,000,000,000 feet, while the likely production figure is thirty or thirty-one billion. This will result in a shortage of about 5,000,000,000 feet this year. This presents a continuing problem of distributing the available supply of lumber to the most essential users and of shifting the burden of the deficit to less-essential users. The recent limitation order, designed to restrict nonessential and deferrable construction, represents an effort to divert a greater proportion of available materials into housing.

We are aware that HH ratings are not being filled in every case because mills may have obligated their total supply for the period before your order was placed. We feel certain, however, that this situation will become progressively better as the effects of the new limitation order become apparent and the over-all supply of materials increases.

You are assured that we will do our utmost to secure the peak production needed to meet the goals of the veterans' emergency housing program.

Sincerely yours,
PHILIP H. COOMBS,
Acting Director, Materials Supply Branch.

LETTER OF RESIGNATION

POCAHONTAS, IOWA, *May 1, 1946.*
To the People of Pocahontas County, Iowa; and Office of Price Administration, Des Moines, Iowa:

During the long period of war, the members of the war price and rationing board of Pocahontas County, Iowa, carried on the work of the various committees, at personal sacrifice, in order to administer the program for the winning of the war, and for the needs of our people. For many reasons members wanted to resign, but we had no resignations. Among others in this county, I personally appealed to them to stay and finish the job. They did the work, and no board did a finer job.

Since VJ-day and the end of rationing, other than sugar, I have continued on as chairman of the board, with the sole thought in mind that the functioning of the price committee of that board was necessary and required for the benefit and protection of the people of this county.

However, the records of that committee show that it is being required to indulge in a program of persecution of our friends and neighbors. That committee is forced into a penny ante business, its recommendations are ignored, and the apparent sole interest of the representative calling at our office is to at least enforce the so-called administrator's claim. Our businessmen are finding themselves forced to pay claims for alleged violations or resort to expensive litigation.

No useful purpose can be served at this time to refer to the specific cases the committee has had before it, and the action that has been taken by the district office at Des Moines. But suffice it to say that some of our people have been advised by the district office of what a fair profit for the labors and investment of some of our business people is. After long delays, our people are having their applications for relief denied, and are being told they can appeal to Washington—a long, slow, and expensive procedure. There is nothing the price committee of this county can do in these matters.

I cannot subscribe to such a program, nor will I be a party to, nor give my consent to, such a program. I refuse to be a rubber stamp. That is not a principle for which the war was fought and won. Our boys did not fight and die and go through hell for such a principle or such a program.

I have, therefore, as of this 1st day of May 1946, resigned as a member of said board and as chairman of said board, and in so doing it is with a feeling that my resignation is, at least, gratifying to the district office at Des Moines.

Respectfully submitted.

R. L. HUDSON.

(Published in Pocahontas Record-Democrat, May 9, 1946.)

MARSHALL LUMBER AND COAL,
Marshalltown, Iowa, May 2, 1946.
NORTHWESTERN LUMBERMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn.

GENTLEMEN: About 10 days ago a spot checker from the OPA visited us and at the same time visited most of the yards around us. He spot-checked the tickets for the months of January and February and seemed to be more interested in exact descriptions of the items sold more than anything else.

Today we get this letter:

"A recent investigation by this office indicates you have violated the provisions of Second Revised Maximum Price Regulation No. 215 as amended (lumber).

"Prior to instituting any further action in this matter it is our desire to discuss it with you. We, therefore, request that you appear in this office, 7th floor, Liberty Building, Des Moines, Iowa, at 3:30 p. m. on Friday, May 17, 1946."

Signed by Ralph R. Randall.

I have learned that Wilson Lumber & Coal and the Legrand Elevator got the same letter but have to appear on different days.

My thought in writing you was to find out if you knew just exactly what these dudes were trying to hang on us. We have made an honest effort to price the material according to the formulae set up, but probably have not been too careful about the descriptions on the sales tickets.

If you have any information regarding the latest move to get us to fold up (and in a hurry), please advise.

Very truly yours,

C. W. SUNDAY.

WILL LUMBER CO.,
Stanley, N. Dak., May 9, 1946.
NORTHWESTERN LUMBERMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn.

GENTLEMEN: To again call your attention to our earnest belief in regard to forthcoming legislation concerning the OPA, we are again writing you. We are pleased to see that the action of the House called for drastic curtailment in the powers of the OPA.

Our situation remains unchanged. We have the plans drawn for homes for 13 of our local World War II veterans. Further, we have the FHA approval for these homes; the financing has been arranged; the local labor is available. We cannot begin to build these homes because we do not have the necessary materials. Our yard contains sufficient sheathing for the walls and roofs of several of the homes, but we do not have the dimension lumber necessary to support the sheathing. The cement is available for the foundation, but not the lumber for the forms to hold the cement in place while it is setting.

Recently, we received certain publications from CPA. Directive 1 to PR-33, part 944, paragraph (d) states in effect that we may place orders with sawmills for certain amounts of lumber—sufficient to begin construction on the jobs that we have.

The answers that we have received from lumber producers and wholesalers, while varied, point in one direction: elimination of the powers of the OPA.

However, for the past 3 months we have been trying unsuccessfully to place orders with sawmills for housing construction lumber. We have made personal trips to call on the sawmill operators; we have telephoned; we have written. The net result is that we have not placed one car of lumber. What little lumber we have received is from orders placed, but not shipped, last year.

When a sawmill operator says that he cannot produce certain types of lumber because

the ceiling prices in effect allow him no profit, or when an operator says that he cannot take aggressive action in the settlement of his difficulties with labor because he doesn't know that the future ceiling prices will enable him to produce at a profit, can you blame them?

The little lumber that is in our shed has been there for 5 weeks. Each pile has a little white tag which says in effect that the lumber is subject to veteran priority for a period of 60 days. Of the lumber now on hand, we do not have the necessary varieties to construct a home. The farmers are busy in the fields. Their big job now is to get the crop into the ground. Their equipment is old, and it is subject to breakage. The drill needs a new top; the truck box needs new boards to repair the floor.

The farmers' criticism is well founded when he sees a pile of lumber not being used and which he cannot buy. They do not begrudge a veteran a home, but to see needed material laying untouchable in a pile because of an unworkable Washington plan causes violent criticism.

The veteran cannot build because of lack of varieties of lumber; the farmer cannot repair his equipment because of a white tag on a pile of lumber.

Let's face the facts: There are millions of citizens of these United States whose future rests with the future of this country. There are thousands of OPA officials holding a job trying to regulate the daily lives of the millions of citizens. The OPA officials have proved that they do not have the necessary brilliance to regulate the individual lives of the people of this country. Let's curtail the powers of the OPA and give the individual citizen a chance to work for the future of this country.

E. WILL.

WM. A. WIEGERT & SON,
Palmer, Iowa, May 10, 1946.

Mr. W. H. BADEAUX,
Northwestern Lumbermen's Association,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR SIR: Our visit with OPA at Des Moines turned out as you said it would. We violated section 17 of the Second Revised Maximum Price Regulation No. 215.

We discussed it with Mr. Randall and settled it with an injunction. We had to pay the court cost, which was $25. We paid this to the clerk of the United States District Court.

We felt this was the best and cheapest way to settle it. Thanks for your cooperation on this. We remain

Yours truly,

WM. A. WIEGERT & SON.

SCHRADER & ENGEL,
Hawkeye, Iowa, May 6, 1946.

Mr. W. H. BADEAUX,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR BILL: Recently a lumber checker from OPA checked our records and I was asked to appear at Des Moines office last Friday. And Attorney Randall admitted that we were not over price ceiling, but we did not have the tickets marked as he wanted them. One of these tickets was material which went to H. H. Engel, who is one of the firm. The material was used for a truck body. He uses this truck on his farm, and part time we use this same truck here in our own yard. Mr. Randall wants $25. I told him I did not feel that we should be fined $25. He stated it was not a fine nor a penalty. But he said he had to have this for an injunction. He is going to send us some kind of a paper to sign, and also he stated he would tell us where to make the check for. If this is not a hijack deal, what is? What is there to stop them from coming in our yard every week and telling us our records are not right and collect $25?

I imagine we will have to pay the $25, but I will see them in hell before I will sign any statement of any kind. Isn't there any possible way to stop this hijack outfit? Mr. Randall admitted he did not know anything about the lumber business, and as far as grades were concerned they would have to accept the grades of any lumber as we would have them listed on our yard tickets. I am going to write a letter similar to this one to our Senators, and I may also write Fulton Lewis.

Yours truly,

H. W. SCHRADER.

NORTHWESTERN LUMBERMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., May 17, 1946.

To Our Senators and Representatives, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Note the following letter that Mr. Ralph R. Randall, enforcement attorney, OPA office, Des Moines, Iowa, wrote one of our members:

"SCHRADER & ENGEL,
"Hawkeye, Iowa.

"Enclosed you will find your check made payable to me in the amount of $25. We are returning the check because it should have been made payable to the clerk of the United States district court, and additionally because it is acceptable only if you sign the stipulation which was mailed to you. Inasmuch as it is your decision that you do not wish to consent to the entry of the injunction, we have no alternative other than to institute suit in the Federal district court. We will not file our complaint in this case before noon Wednesday, May 29, 1946. If you wish to change your mind before that time please advise us."

This dealer, according to OPA, violated section 17, OPA Act, and did not have full description of material sold on his sales ticket or tickets. A minor violation.

Hundreds of Iowa dealers are being forced to make $25 checks to the United States district court so the OPA can secure an injunction against the dealer, thus giving the OPA full and complete authority to ransack our dealer's business at will.

If the dealer doesn't comply with these gestapo methods, the OPA threatens to take the case to court, so what chance do hundreds of small dealers have in Iowa against the OPA and their damnable methods.

Haven't we Americans any more rights—constitutional rights?

Sincerely yours,

W. H. BADEAUX,
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you, is it any wonder our businessmen and millions of other good Americans are urging Congress to throw the whole OPA outfit in the ash can?

American Mother of 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a thought-provoking article by Clifford B. Ward, editor of the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, concerning the selection of Mrs. Emma Clarissa Clement as the American mother of 1946:

GOOD EVENING

(By Clifford B. Ward)

There should be rejoicing among both white and Negro persons over the selection of the American mother of 1946. It indicates that we are on our way to improvement of the relations between Negroes and whites of this country. One of those who voted for the woman honored was herself a Kentuckian, who honestly said that she never expected that she would vote for a Negro for anything, but who was compelled by evidence in favor of the 1946 nominee to give her the honor.

Mrs. Emma Clarissa Clement, the American mother of 1946, a Negress, is a resident of Louisville, Ky., who was born in Providence, R. I., and is now 71 years of age. She herself is a college graduate, and each of her seven children have university degrees. That should answer a lot of people: Those who say that the Negro hasn't a chance, those who say that higher education isn't available to the poor, and those who say that when parents have large families they can't be properly educated.

Here is a list of the seven children of Mrs. Clement, their ages, and their occupations: Abbie Clement Jackson, 47, executive secretary of the Women's Home and Foreign Mission Society of the African M. E. Zion Church; Rufus E. Clement, 45, Ph. D., president of Atlanta University; Frederick A. Clement, 44, professor of physics, West Virginia State College; Ruth Clement Bond, 42, wife of director of Inter-American Educational Foundation, Port-au-Prince, Haiti; George W. Clement, 40, recreation director of the American Red Cross in Italy; the Reverend James A. Clement, 38, chaplain (major) in the United States Army, served 3 years and 8 months overseas—on leave from Hood Theological Seminary, Livingston College; Emma Clement Walker, A. B., M. A., professor of English, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama.

Mrs. Clement was born shortly after the Civil War and accomplished the education of her children during times much less favorable to her task than now.

It is no wonder that Mrs. Clement was chosen for the honor given her.

Negroes are on the upgrade in the United States and should be. Helping them obtain the status which they deserve is the obligation of all those who really believe in Christian, Jewish, and American principles of man's equality.

Unfortunately many of those who profess tolerance the loudest in beautiful general terms are themselves fourflushing. What Negroes want most are not professions of love, but economic opportunities. They want a chance to compete on even terms with all other Americans. They do not want discrimination of the kind which prevents them from taking their proper place in the sun. They are rapidly getting that chance and they are making the most of it as their presence now in many of the highest professions proves. Employers principally have the greatest opportunity to do a good turn for Negroes by not restricting their opportunities to menial jobs but by opening up the door to any opportunities of which Negroes are capable of taking advantage.

The Negro in this country is among the best of our citizens. With exception of a very few who have listened too attentively to the Communists, the Negroes in America are loyal, God-fearing individuals who love this country passionately. Their patriotism has never been suspected by anyone.

Negroes themselves on their march to a better opportunity in this country need only to remember one thing, namely that respect is something which is obtained by deserving it, not by demanding it. That is something which is true of all groups. You can't make

people respect you, but you can do what you can to make you deserve their respect. Usually if you deserve respect, you will get it.

Mrs. Clement, the American mother of 1946, did not demand respect. She made herself so worthy of it, that no one could deny it to her.

Our Basic Need Is Good Administration Of Our Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a significant address delivered today by Harold E. Stassen before the Inland Press Association meeting in Chicago:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members and guests of the Inland Press Association, more than 8 months ago on the deck of Admiral Halsey's flagship, the U. S. S. *Missouri*, Gen. Douglas MacArthur accepted the surrender of Japan and World War II was officially and victoriously ended.

In responding to your invitation to speak to you this afternoon, I would like to review these 8 months. As I see it, this is a time for plain speaking. It is time—high time—for America to face up to hard facts.

These 8 months have been marked by the greatest need for civilian products of all history. And they have been marked by the greatest stoppages of production of all history.

These 8 months have witnessed the greatest need for food in the world of all history. And they have witnessed the highest consumption and largest waste of food in America of all history.

These 8 months have been characterized by the greatest need of a demonstration of efficiency of Government of freemen in all history. And they have been characterized by the greatest amount of confusion and delay and executive and congressional drifting in all history.

These are the facts. They are hard, startling facts. They can be demonstrated by columns of detailed statistics. They have not been fully recognized, primarily because of the growth of a tendency for inaccurate and distorted official information.

A principal plea today to the press of America is that you not only continue to insist upon access to information around the world, but that you also insist upon accuracy of information at home.

One of the most deceptive releases of public information that this country has ever experienced, and one which has a direct bearing upon the hard facts we have just considered, was the release of the Sixth Report of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Director dated April 1, 1946, in which we find this quotation:

"In the first 3 months of 1946 the Nation met and surmounted many difficult obstacles on its road to full civilian production. The quarter ends with industry producing at a volume unprecedented in our peacetime history.

"Total civilian production now stands at the highest level ever reached by the Nation, in war or in peace; an annual rate of more than $150,000,000,000."

The plain truth of the matter is that in the first quarter of 1946 the real production of goods vitally needed by the people of this country was below the level of even the depressed prewar period.

An analysis of the details of the statistics show that, far from being grounds for the optimistic characterization given to them, they show instead a basis of real concern of the inflationary pressures and of an unhealthy production situation in the country. Specifically, the comparatively frivolous items show a very high dollar index and bring up the dollar statistics used in the bulletin. For example, alcoholic beverages were up to 231 compared to a 100 figure of 1935–39. Cigarettes were up to 205, glass containers to 255. Whereas, the basic production which our economy now needs to get on a healthy economic basis, such as iron and steel and lumber and electrical equipment and heavy capital goods, were down compared even to the repressed years of 1935–39. It is imperative that America recognize that the present situation resulting from stoppages, dislocation, and confusion is definitely unhealthy and dangerous. We must no longer delude ourselves or permit the administration to do so on the basis of distorted statistics.

Once having recognized the gravity of the situation and the implications for the future of America, and of the world, the question is asked, "What shall we do about it?" This answer is frequently given, "We must pass some more laws." While some legislation is desirable, I should like to emphasize that the major cause of this 8-month record has not been a deficiency of laws. The major causes have been the failure of the administration of laws and the politics of favoritism in government.

Specifically underlying to a great degree the industrial strife in America today, has been a major struggle for position between the powerful labor organizations of the country, with the administration playing favorites on a political basis. It is tremendously important that we analyze these factors and move to correct them rather than to compound the mistakes already made by passing anti-labor legislation which seeks to change the basic rights of labor and which will add to the conflict and confusion, rather than correct it.

In reviewing our files since VJ-day, we find that in the first few months a very large number of workers' contracts were renewed and renegotiated without stoppages and with wage raises of from 10 to 15 percent. These were principally A. F. of L. contracts. The CIO drive then began for the 30-percent increase, stimulated by erroneous and unsound statements by administration officials indicating that large wage raises could be had without increases in prices. This drive was highlighted by the strikes in General Motors and in steel, and the settlement of steel at the 18½-cent figure presented by the President.

The inevitable result was to place tremendous pressure on every other union and every other union leader to a least equal the 18½ cents. It became the pattern for turmoil. It contributed directly to the decision of railroad labor that if steel and automobile workers should get 18½ cents, why should they, who had performed one of the most essential services of the entire war—the operation of the rails—carrying extreme individual responsibility, settle for less?

It placed extreme pressure on John L. Lewis, with the background of the pending jurisdictional struggle of labor, to seek more.

Then after establishing the 18½-cent formula, the administration has shown a tragic reluctance to follow throw on the inevitable adjustments of prices and other wages to this new level broadly throughout the economy. Why was there no fact-finding procedure in coal before the strike? Why have essential price adjustments been delayed in many industries while production stalled?

Coupled with these events on the labor-production front, has been an unbelievable clumsiness in the administration of OPA which has driven vital production, processing, and trade, out of its normal channels into abnormal channels which are wasteful, unsound, and demoralizing.

I cite these specific examples:

The failure to increase the ceiling on butter and to clamp the same relative ceiling on cream. The result has been a tremendous shift from the economical churning of butter in efficient, sanitary creameries, to the uneconomic shipping of fresh cream and wasteful churning in hundreds of thousands of hotels and restaurants and homes. The result has been the disruption of a large agricultural industry which has been one of the stable foundations of the country. The result has been ample cream at high prices to the drug stores, the hotels, and the candy factories, instead of butter on the table of the workingman's home for the children of America.

They have also failed to make the essential adjustments in the price and control of meat, and as a consequence the major portion of the meat of the country is no longer processed in the efficient packing plants, but is slaughtered in temporary, unsanitary, wasteful slaughtering houses throughout the land. The result is a tremendous waste in food and dissipation of byproducts at the very time that the world so needs food for survival. The result has been ample meat at high prices for the roadhouses and taverns instead of on the table of the workingman's home.

They have failed to make prompt, essential adjustments for the types of lumber needed for building homes, thus shifting the production of flooring and siding and 2 x 4's to the wasteful and unevenly distributed special fabricators. The result has been a delay in the flow of materials for the urgently needed homes for America.

I therefore strongly urge the necessity of moving upon this confused situation on a bi-partisan basis. I urge the President to promptly call a major economic conference consisting of representatives of the major economic groups of the country, of the best of the Nation's economists, and of the leadership of both political parties. I urge that emergency settlements be worked out in the pending rail and coal disputes, with the recognition that these disputes are partly the result and consequence of the 18½-cent formula. I urge that the Government step in immediately to prevent a shipping strike, and work out an emergency solution of this dispute before it occurs.

I urge that the economic conference recommend the basis on which the entire economy can be promptly adjusted to the new level now irrevocably created by the 18½-cent "steel" formula, and present the plain-spoken basis for holding the line at that new level.

Among other phases, this national economic conference should develop recommendations on which to promptly correct the present "squeeze" of the white-collar workers, including the professional groups, the teachers, and pensioners. It must give careful attention to the possible requirements of rationing, which may become an urgent necessity, especially if there are crop failures in any major world area.

I urge that we begin at once a national information campaign to the workers of America that, once adjusted to this new level, their real hope—and in fact, their only hope—of a genuine increase in wages and standards of living must come from increased productivity throughout our economy.

I urge the prompt development on a high priority basis of legislation to provide a labor court of high standing to settle jurisdictional disputes between unions, to outlaw

jurisdictional strikes between unions, and to emphasize to the workers of America that the greatest tragedy which could befall them would be if the A. F. of L. and the CIO seek to weaken and destroy each other by a Nation-wide program of interunion conflict.

On a long-term basis, legislation should be carefully developed to increase democracy within some unions, to establish more definite methods of conciliation and mediation with a required time for its accomplishment during continued production before stoppages. But legislation should not be enacted which would give new and extreme powers over labor. This would be a move in a totalitarian direction, which would either break down, or would be followed by a similar move to increase power over capital and business, and our free economy would disappear.

I urge that the three administration officials having major responsibility in this failure of administration, to wit:

The Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Stabilization Director be removed and be replaced by three men of high standing and broad knowledge of the field they are to represent, such as Mr. George Harrison, of the railway clerks; Mr. Paul Hoffman, of the Studebaker Co., and the Committee for Economic Development; and Mr. Eric Johnston, recently of the United States Chamber of Commerce—all to be drafted on an emergency basis.

On the basis of this changed type of administration, the OPA legislation should be continued with complete powers for a full year.

We must develop an increased measure of unity in peace in America. To do so, a bipartison approach to these critical economic questions is imperative. We must get our goods and production back in normal channels. Even though the cost of living tables may go up, the actual cost of living will go down.

These immediate postwar years are some of the most critical and formative in the world's history. America must lift her sights and move together to meet the challenge of this day.

Justice for Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID I. WALSH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I request that there be inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article recently published by Dr. W. Elmer Ekblaw, of Clark University, Worcester, Mass., entitled "Justice for Greece."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTICE FOR GREECE

(By Dr. W. Elmer Ekblaw, Clark University)

The time nears for solution of the many problems arising from the Second World War, and final conclusions of the peace. If permanent peace is to be secured, justice must be the essence of the solution of every problem; there can be no peace without justice. Justice must prevail, for its own sake. Justice must be done for those nations, both great and small, that laid their all, like Greece, upon the altar of freedom, not counting the sacrifice, or cost, or hazard, and fought shoulder to shoulder beside the freedom-loving peoples of the world against totalitarianism and tyranny. Justice in the peace can be the only guarantee for safe and prosperous international trade and all international relations.

Already justice has been grievously sacrificed in preliminary settlements of war controversies. The instances are too many to list, the violations too flagrant to tolerate long; but there is no reason, no need for extending the list, continuing the violations. When the final solutions are sought in drafting the peace there should be no temporizing with principle, no compromising with justice. The nations of the world, sincere in their democracy and their assurances of freedom for their individual citizens, must stand fast for the fundamental declarations of the Atlantic Charter, and insist upon justice and honor in all the provisions of the peace.

Of the nations that struggled and sacrificed so devotedly, sacrificially, and triumphantly for liberty and justice, Greece stands among the foremost. Greece dared challenge the Italian invaders, and, despite the vaunted power and superior numbers and equipment of the Latin hordes, stopped them dead in their course, among the rugged mountains and frozen passes of the border lands, and surging forward, wrested from them the key position of Koritza, and drove them back in confusion into the sanctuary of their allies, the Albanians. The boasted invincibility of the Italian legions and their leader, Mussolini, the Greeks proved a myth; there was not a shred of reality behind it.

The Greek resistance to the Italian invasion proved of incalculable value to the democracies by delaying the Axis time table, disrupting Axis plans, disturbing Axis unity. It diverted by months the German forces from their planned and treacherous assault upon Russia; the time the Greeks gained for Russia at Lake Ochrida and on the slopes of Mount Olympus may have saved the day at Moscow and Stalingrad. British and Americans gained time by the desperate Greek resistance, sorely needed for mustering their strength, assembling their forces, building their transport.

And all the time the Greeks kept fighting—on Crete, at El Alamein, in Tunisia, and along the Macedonian border. Their ships carried cargoes for the Allies on the seven seas. Their sons in every land enlisted and fought in Allied armies. Their little wealth they poured freely into the struggle for freedom and victory. On every front, they fought implacably against the forces of evil and tyranny. They died by the tens of thousands and sacrificed of their meager funds in the tens of millions. They lived up to the most glorious traditions of their history.

Now in the forthcoming peace, justice must be done Greece; justice must be done those Greek thousands who died so nobly for their land and liberty; justice must be done the survivors who would restore Greece to peace and comfort and prosperity. If justice is to be done Greece, then northern Epirus must be restored to her to hold within her own sovereignty; the Dodecanese islands must be returned to her in their entirety; and her northern boundary with Bulgaria must be rectified to insure strategic security by control over the mountain passes where Greece could stand advantageously at her very gates to resist invasion.

To do full justice to Greece implies little, if any, significant sacrifice on the part of her enemies, our enemies. Justice for Greece constitutes one of the first obligations of the Allies, and of the United Nations, when peace is planned and achieved. And every American will insist that the gallant little nation receive that justice, that justice which she so well has earned, and deserves.

Is Compulsory Arbitration Needed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter from Mr. J. G. Kelly, a distinguished citizen of my State, publisher of one of the great newspapers in the State, and an editorial from his newspaper entitled "Is Compulsory Arbitration Needed?"

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALLA WALLA UNION-BULLETIN,
Walla Walla, Wash., May 14, 1946.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: President Truman stated publicly a few days ago that our country is facing a national disaster. As yet, he has made no move to change present deplorable conditions. I don't know what is in his mind, but I do know he is very slow to act, if he has any plan on which to act.

I deplore some conditions which made John L. Lewis feel justified in following the plan which he is inaugurating. He appears too ruthless to me in his methods, although I understand the dangerous conditions under which coal miners work, and the miserable conditions under which most of them live. I am not finding any great fault with Mr. Lewis. I believe the employers are at least partly to blame for allowing conditions to go on as they are and have been for many years, without voluntary rectification of the poor situation.

The fact remains that there is a violent controversy on between labor and capital. I need not recall to you the recent labor crisis. In my opinion, nothing definitely has been settled during the recent labor struggle. The same situation will prevail next year and we will likely again go through the same sorry chaotic condition. I believe it is time that somebody does something about rectifying this situation, and the quicker it is done the better off our country will be.

I have had much favorable comment on the attached editorial, which appeared in our last Sunday's issue. I have had a lot of favorable verbal comment and one party has written me as per attached copy of his letter.

If the President and his Cabinet have no solution of the present labor situation, then some sort of a proper remedial labor situation must naturally be inaugurated. Such at this present time may mean further strife and struggle.

I believe that proper legislation should be passed as quickly as it can possibly be done, to bring labor and capital together in the way of some sort of reasonable and equitable compulsory arbitration. As our editorial says, the Interstate Commerce Commission has functioned for more than 60 years. It is a sort of court or tribunal, where both sides to any controversy would have the same right to present their case, have it reviewed by impartial judges or commissioners, and when the resultant decision is rendered, it would bind both parties to the controversy.

I might go into this matter further at great length, but I am a busy man and I know you are just about a dozen times as

busy as I am, so I am making this letter short. I do trust you will have time to at least glance over this suggested plan of compulsory arbitration. It is not a new thought and it has often been talked and discussed at great length, but so far as labor and capital are concerned, nothing has yet been done about it. The time for action has too long been delayed and I trust that this letter with accompanying articles will be helpful. It is not meant to be critical, but you and I know that the coal strike has now been on for 6 weeks and very little has been accomplished.

I am writing you because you are one of the Congress, which shapes all of our Federal legislation. I thank you for any consideration you may feel this suggestion merits.

Very truly yours,

J. G. KELLY,
Publisher.

[From the Walla Walla (Wash.) Union-Bulletin of May 12, 1946]

IS COMPULSORY ARBITRATION NEEDED

The coal strike, which experts now call the most disastrous strike in history, high lights a situation which has gotten so far out of bounds as to threaten the United States with industrial chaos over a period of the next few years.

Force, rather than logic or justice, has become the basis for settlement of the industrial disputes involving labor and management. The group which can produce the greatest political and economic pressure emerges as the winner in a contest in which the stakes are high—power and money. The situation is unthinkable in a civilization which seeks to outlaw war and which demands due process of law in the handling of differences between individuals. It is as though we had reverted to a society in which any dispute between two men were settled on the basis of which carried the larger club. Society decided centuries ago that legal and orderly settlement of disagreements is essential to development of civilization, but the application of the same rules to disputes between workers and employers is still denounced with unreasoning violence and prejudice, by some.

The difficulty is a natural outgrowth of the suddenness with which America came of age industrially, but the historical facts in the case do not excuse the tardiness with which our Government is now coming to grips with the problem. During the last half of the nineteenth century when individualism among industrial and financial giants was running riot, the Government found it necessary to clamp on a series of restraints in order to protect the rights of the public. Employment matters have remained, however, largely a matter of individual negotiation between employer and worker until the sudden tremendous growth of unions as bargaining agents in the past several decades. The record shows clearly that only too often this individual negotiation in the past was to the continuing disadvantage of the employee, although in justice to employers it must also be pointed out that under that system, wages continued to rise to a point where Americans were the best paid in the world and enjoyed working conditions far superior to those in any other country.

Let us look, however, at the situation now. The power of the leaders of organized labor exceeds that of the greatest industrial magnate, and is exercised with the same ruthlessness and disregard of the rights of the public as marked the era of the "robber barons" of the last century. A series of strikes of increasing gravity has stalled the reconversion from wartime to peacetime economy to an extent that is impossible to assess accurately, but which may set the Nation back a year to 18 months in its production of essential items. A railroad strike on top of the others could well throw us into complete confusion, from which it is difficult to see the way out. Yet already labor leaders are looking ahead to starting the entire cycle over again in order to achieve further wage gains next year, or sooner.

Our experiences since the end of the war should make it clear to all who can read that the strike as a means of settling disputes has outlived its usefulness. Our economic system is so highly integrated that the effects of a strike are felt, not only by the immediate disputants but by every other segment of society. Idle coal mines mean unwilling idleness in a hundred other industries. A tie-up of a small supplying plant may close down a tremendous automobile factory employing thousands of men and women who have no knowledge or concern in the dispute involved. The question is no longer that of protecting the laboring man's right to protest against an unscrupulous employer; it is one of protecting society itself against the devastating effects of large-scale economic warfare in which the greatest losers are the vast majority of the citizens who are neither union members nor employees.

It is a simple matter to show that the wage settlements being exacted at present bear no relationship to the profits earned by the companies or the need of the workers, but are dictated by political considerations of a government which faces an election year. Workers generally believe that their wage gains are being paid out of swollen war profits, yet the facts show that the majority of companies are earning less for their stockholders now than in any normal year. A typical example, taken because the figures happen to be available, is Republic Steel Co., which took in $500,000,000 in 1945, but earned only 2.8 cents for each dollar of stockholders' money invested. After deducting cost of materials, wear and tear on equipment, taxes, and similar items, the company had $178,000,000 left, which was distributed 95 percent for pay rolls, 4 percent to stockholders, and 1 percent put back into the business. Despite this division, further wage demands were made, which could come only out of the final 5 percent; the result was a net loss of $350,000 for the first quarter of 1946.

Important as such facts are, it is more important to realize that the underlying problem can never be settled by our present means. Are we doomed to spend at least 6 months of every year undergoing a series of walk-outs, strikes, and shut-downs that have their effect in every area of life, or is the only alternative to be weak submission on the part of the public to the demands of the unions, no matter how outrageous?

Nearly 60 years ago Congress found a pattern for the railroads which may not be perfect but which should be given serious study for its application to the present labor situation. Congress established an Interstate Commerce Commission whose duty it is to fix transportation rates by orderly means on the basis of all the evidence available. Whenever a rate change is under study, a hearing is held at which any interested party may appear to testify as to the effects of such a change on his business. After all the evidence is in, the commission issues a ruling designed to serve the greatest good of the greatest number. No one contends that the results are always 100 percent right, but the percentage of discrimination is far less than if the rates were set on the basis of pressure brought to bear by various interested shippers or districts. And most important, all of this is done on an orderly basis with no interruption of service given by the carriers.

The Union-Bulletin urges that in this period of unparalleled labor problems Congress should give serious thought to the development of a similar pattern for the orderly and legal settlement of questions involving employment. We are fully aware that compulsory arbitration of labor disputes is a concept which now appears unsatisfactory to many businessmen as well as to virtually all labor leaders, but the relentless pressure of events is forcing us to a point where we must adopt some similar program or resign ourselves to increasing disorders which can only end in the collapse of our present economic system. If this conclusion appears to be too pessimistic, one need only look at the history of other nations in which government by law was supplanted by rule by pressure groups and power-hungry individuals.

Legislation to curb or abolish unions, and a return to the period in which workers were at the mercy of arbitrary employers cannot offer any final solution to the problem. But the application of reason and justice, through legal settlement of employment matters, may be the answer and its achievement provides a challenge which the Nation must not and cannot fail to meet.

The Silent Farm Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Bowie News, on May 17, 1946.

This is a small country weekly published in a small country town. As an expression from the grass roots this editorial is worthy of consideration.

THE SILENT FARM STRIKE

Because labor union racketeers, and their crippling of the Nation's industry and transportation, and because of many Government meddlings into private enterprise, such as the man on the soil is accustomed to, there is gradually spreading a shut-down of production on the farm and ranch—a silent, unwilling but necessity sit-down strike if you please.

No, not at all a strike in the sense we commonly understand by the big industrial strikes. But multiplied thousands of farms have had to curtail production, because of the unreasonable impositions and the hurtful restrictions now upon them.

These farmers are not organized, they are not acting in any agreed concerted manner, and they have no dictator leader telling them to strike, but there is in effect a strike just the same, a voluntary stoppage of much production. They are not getting publicity about it—and their forced plight and action will be felt by the Nation and the world, just as much as some other shut-downs, which have been greatly publicised.

One example of the farmer and stockman's condition and attitude and forced shut-down of production of things needed to feed and clothe the world is our fellow citizen and neighbor J. R. Rater, well-known farmer and stockman, who lives not far from Bowie and has traded here for years. Mr. Rater did not inherit the 900 acres of land he owns, clear of debt, but knows how it came, by hard work and sweat and diligence and management. In the past he milked a lot of cows and sold milk and cream to help feed others. In the past he has run large herds of cattle and produced a surplus of beef animals—to help

feed others. In the past he has plowed long days and into the night to produce grain and corn and other crops—to help feed and clothe the world. In the past he has raised several hundred turkeys to market each year. But, in the Bowie News office Saturday, Mr. Rater declared he has quit this diligent, hard work of trying to produce surpluses, because the strikes have made conditions so you cannot secure trucks or parts to enable you to deliver your products—cannot secure machinery or repairs any more for harvest and grain production equipment. He cannot secure protein feeds for livestock.

"And I cannot face the music of the unreasonable, unbusinesslike, unsound, unfair subsidies handed out as a salve to the farmers. If I have to go to the courthouse and get a hand-out in the form of a so-called milk production subsidy, I'll sell no more milk," Rater said. "If John L. Lewis is going to continue running the Government—yes, running it into communism and chaos through an indirect dictatorship—we'll just have to quit trying to farm until conditions permit us to do the job decently and reasonably. We're just butting our brains out against a wall, trying to grow big crops, grow and feed lots of cattle under present restricted conditions, where all the freedom of free enterprise is denied us. So I have decided to quit. I have quit already. I'm selling off nearly all my hundred head of cattle. My 275 acres of cultivated land will lie idle, and my pastures on the balance of the 900 acres will be idle, until I can run my affairs decently, at a reasonable profit and without killing myself and losing confidence in my fellow men with whom I have to deal to keep going under present conditions."

Confusion Reigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Confusion Reigns," published in the May 18, 1946, issue of the Dakota Farmer, a leading farm publication of the Northwest.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFUSION REIGNS

Confusion has taken hold of officials in high places and the sad results are noticeable on every farm in Dakota. We are reminded of the man who described his wife by saying that she was even tempered—and then added that she was mad all the time.

So it is with the people who are directing official agricultural policies of the United States—but they are uniformly wrong in their actions, stupid in their policies, and as changeable as the air in a Dakota whirlwind.

Farmers used to worry about grasshoppers, drought, crop diseases, hail, farm prices, mortgages, duststorms, erosion, harvest weather, and how to get the hay up before the rain. Some of those things are still worries—but they are minor compared to the man-made, Government-manufactured, darn-fool troubles that now beset the farmer.

Machinery shortages, labor shortages, clothing shortages, lack of equipment for modernizing houses, and the inability to buy a new car are all blamed on government and the lack of intelligent and courageous leadership. These are other troubles which the farmers have to put up with but they are still not the worst ones.

CHANGES ALMOST DAILY

The greatest confusion in the minds of farmers is caused by rulings and policies which are made by individuals in high places—and then changed almost daily.

Will parity prices be increased? Will the farmer's labor, and that of his family, be included in any new parity prices? Will ceilings on livestock be raised or eliminated? What will happen to subsidies? What will Congress do with the OPA? These are just a few of the many things that farmers have to think and worry about.

The Government has now gone into the black market—by buying wheat and corn at 30 cents a bushel above ceiling prices. This is making it impossible for feeders to get the feed they need and had planned on, unless they go into the black market, too. Sure, we know the starving world must be fed. However, we visited with one Corn Belt feeder who had 70 brood sows. When the Government started buying corn at 30 cents above ceiling, he took 40 of these sows to market. What else could he do without feed? The same thing is happening to poultry feeders and cattlemen. Where will it lead? How will it end?

Some people are now predicting the greatest meat shortage ever, for this fall. Unless something is done to help the farmers obtain feed, who knows into what derangement the livestock industry will be thrown.

MORE FORTUNATE IN DAKOTA

In Dakota we are more fortunate than farmers in most parts of the United States. We are the truly diversified area of this country. People, who know nothing about Dakota, think that all we grow is wheat. We do grow almost 15,000,000 acres of wheat, but we also grow barley, oats, corn, and other feed crops. We raise hogs, cattle, poultry, and sheep. We have always gotten along—because of a true diversified farming system—buying less feed than most farming areas of the United States. We have learned to put up hay at the right time to conserve the protein content. As a result of all this, Dakota farmers will be able to get along better than many of our neighbors.

In addition, we are going to ship all the wheat and corn that we can spare to feed the starving world. We are not going to let our feeling of disgust, for the mess we are in, interfere with our honest belief that we are our brothers' keepers. We may be mad at the way the 30-cent bonus was handled, we may want it to apply to all the 1945 crop, and we may get sick of the confusion and bickering of officialdom, but we are going to move as much food to starving people as it is feasible for us to move.

PEOPLE LOSE FAITH

When we see the sad picture of two high Government officials fighting publicly over dairy subsidies, then we begin to lose faith in the people who are limping along trying to run the farming business of this great Nation from Washington. As a child, we were always taught—if we had to fight—that we should do our quarreling at home and present a solid front to the world. Not so with Government!

In the meantime, Dakota farmers have to go on producing crops, raising livestock, and doing the best job possible. They must adjust livestock to available feed supplies. However, no one should reduce livestock numbers if he has enough feed—for meat is going to be in greater demand than ever. Every farmer should put into practice as many good feed-saving ideas as possible. Cull, make the best use of pastures, waste nothing, plant feed crops, avoid livestock losses, and follow all the proven practices for efficiency and good management.

THE "GOOD OLD DAYS"

We hear much about the "good old days." People wish that they would come back and that it would happen soon. They don't mean the days of low prices and low farm income. They don't mean the days of high mortgages and low purchasing power. They refer to the happy days when confusion didn't reign over the farms of America.

We have gone through 4 years of war and 9 months of peace—and maybe we have forgotten how things used to be back in 1940. The other day, as we were cleaning out a drawer, we ran across an old publication which was dated May 17, 1940—just 6 years ago. It was really most interesting to look it over and read the advertisements of prewar days.

One company was advertising a 6-cubic-foot refrigerator for only $109.95. And that wasn't all—it could be bought for 99 cents a week, with no interest or carrying charges, and a 5-year warranty.

Strawberries were selling for 23 cents a quart, a fully experienced girl wanted housework, and a man was looking for a job washing windows or doing other odd jobs. You could buy underwear—just like Dad's—for active boys and girls at three for $1. A suggested gift for a graduate was a shirt—guaranteed not to shrink—for $1.35. There was even a pleasant furnished apartment, with a nice location, for rent.

This particular publication didn't carry machinery advertisements, but you could buy tractors, combines, mowers, and any or all new farm equipment you needed. Automobiles and tires were plentiful.

WANT PRODUCTS AVAILABLE

That is what farmers want—not only the ability to buy but also the products available for purchase. It doesn't help that the ceiling has been kept on low-priced house dresses if those dresses can't be found on the shelves of stores. The fact that a farmer can afford a combine won't save a crop if the combines can't be bought. A highline by the front door doesn't help much if appliances and wire can't be found.

Confusion reigns. Where it will end no one knows. In the meantime, Dakota farmers are going to do as they always have—do the best job of farming in the world, produce to the limit of worn-out machinery, and hope for the best. Maybe out of all this official double-talk, jumble, bewilderment, and turmoil some decisions will be forthcoming—by the time we are ready to harvest this year's crop. Let's hope so.

Wiley "Carries the Ball" for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, recently a number of Grange publications have carried an article dealing with the efforts of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] on behalf of American agriculture. The May 16, 1946, issue of the Altoona Tribune, which is published in Altoona in the Senator's own State, has also printed this article, and I ask unan-

imous consent that it be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY "CARRIES THE BALL" FOR FARMERS

It sometimes takes a showdown in the Senate for the farmers to find out who their true friends are and who their fair-weather friends are. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin Republican, never has been considered a member of the so-called farm bloc in Congress, but when the ball was passed to him in an 11-hour effort to prevent farmers being squeezed under the 65-cent an hour minimum wage bill, he carried it for a winning touchdown.

For weeks the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives and the Cooperative Milk Producers Federation had sought to prevent a labor-inspired move from taking away exemptions under the present law.

The labor move would have added millions of dollars a year to the cost of preparing farm produce for market and would have either decreased farm income or added to consumers' food costs. Under OPA there wasn't much doubt as to which it would have been.

A few quotations from WILEY's address to the Senate on behalf of farmers will illustrate the kind of a fight he put up. His address disclosed a deep and sympathetic understanding of the farmer's problems.

"During the past decade," he said, "approximately 6,000,000 people left the farms. If such an exodus continues, there will not be production, and production is vitally needed throughout the country. Perhaps there are persons in this country who wish to see a grand exodus from the farms.

"I know that the farmer is the backbone of the Nation. When I look around this Chamber and see men who were produced by and on the farms, and when I examine the pages of history and consider the character of great statesmen of the past who came from farms, I do not want to see the source of supply of American manpower come to an end. However, Mr. President, that will take place if we do not make life on the farms more interesting.

"Why is it inflationary, as some contend, to allow the farmer to receive higher prices for his products and be enabled to meet the higher expenses which they constantly thrust upon him, and yet it is not inflationary to grant increases in the compensation paid to labor, the manufacturer, and Government employees? Why is the so-called farm bloc criticized for asking that the farmer be allowed to receive his cost of production when no word of criticism along that line is heard with reference to the labor bloc?

"The Government gave labor the green light and the labor bloc started this whole inflationary spiral, especially the PAC, and the Government did nothing to prevent it. Instead, it said in effect, 'Come on boys, we are with you. You can get a 2 percent increase, and the cost of the goods you will buy will not be increased whatever.' Strikes and nonproduction followed and the administration sat by doing nothing. Production ceased and unemployment increased, but labor got its increase and prices went up.

"Mr. President, it is time that we remove the blinders from our eyes and give to the farmers what he is entitled to receive. I repeat that I am not speaking only for farmers, 23,000,000 of them. I am speaking for the millions of persons who reside in cities and depend on a maximum production of food. I speak for the economic and physical health of this Nation. I do not wish to see an exodus from the farms. I want to see an exodus from the cities back to the farms. I want to see farm life made more and more interesting. After all, the farm is the laboratory of life. There we see vegetable life and animal life. There we see, going on and on, a part of the mystery of creation.

"Mr. President, I also stand for the proposition that the farmer is just as worthy of his hire as is the laborer. The farmer must now pay an increased cost for labor and material as well as an increased price for farm machinery. If the farmer wants to obtain help he must meet on the labor market wages which are paid in the city."

The Church and Organized Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GALLAGHER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by John M. Jacobsen, national representative, CIO Political Action Committee, at the regional conference of the National Lutheran Welfare Council, Des Moines, Iowa, April 10, 1946:

The war brought out in sharp relief the basic need for reexamining and reformulating the relationship between the church and organized labor, a relationship which must be faced by all of us and solved if society is to move forward. The nature of the war, which was waged to exterminate fascism, united all groups and forced them to work together. It threw together among others the representatives of the church and labor, and gave each of them a better understanding of what the other was striving for.

Before the war, organized labor and the church followed separate paths which rarely crossed. All too frequently labor was given the impression that the church was being used to oppose its efforts to organize and to achieve its other objectives. This was not the result of any all-embracing official statements, but by the individual acts of individual clergymen and lay leaders of the church.

During the war, in many countries the traditional aloofness and neutrality of the church from politics and the social and economic struggles of the people was severely shaken or broke down completely. Let me illustrate by what happened in Norway where my parents were born, where I received part of my education, where my relatives still live, and for which I still have a genuine attachment. In Norway the two leading organized movements fighting against the Nazi occupation were organized labor and the Norwegian Church. It is now conceded that both contributed tremendously to the defeat of Hitler and his quisling puppets. The fact that neither one weakened or permitted themselves to submit in any degree to the occupation made it impossible for Hitler to use the resources of Norway for his war machine or for Quisling to achieve any kind of ascendancy over the Norwegian people. This was so true that when the time came for the liberation of Norway, no expeditionary force was needed to oust the Nazis and quislings. The Norwegian people simply stepped in and took over. This is the magnificent record of organized labor and the church in one country.

It is inconceivable now that peace has come, and postwar relationships must be established that experiences of this kind will be forgotten. Neither labor nor the church can return to a prewar status. Neither one can afford to face the future alone. Neither one can ignore the realities of political and social and economic life which they faced during the war. The objective of both should be to cement relationships that took shape during the war in the common cause of the struggle for freedom.

Here in the United States organized labor, and especially the CIO, wants to establish such a relationship. No one knows better than labor that labor cannot stand alone. We are fully aware of the artificial barriers that have been set up in the minds of people between labor and the rest of the community by a constant stream of antilabor propaganda. In the organization that I represent there has been a great deal of discussion on the need for establishing a better and more constructive relationship with the various organized church groups. We are committed to doing everything in our power to seeing that such a relationship is established and maintained. It is now up to the church to make a similar decision and, if necessary, to leave behind it once and for all its traditional neutrality on all social and economic issues, to reexamine its mission among the people, and eventually to reorient its social program so as to provide a sound and continuing basis for cooperation with organized labor in achieving the greatest possible benefit to the great mass of people.

The truth is that the church and organized labor have too much in common to remain apart. Both are by definition representatives of the common people. By their very nature both have an immediate and concrete concern for the economic and social welfare of the people. Both are vitally interested in maintaining the welfare and integrity of the family. Both are sworn to fight everlastingly against poverty, disease, and the other social ills that beset us. Both have the mission of improving the living standards of the people and establishing the conditions for a spiritually happy and prosperous people. After all, that is why working men organized themselves in trade unions in the first place, and no one knows better than the church that there can be no thriving spiritual life in the midst of poverty and degradation.

There are substantial areas of agreement in objectives between the church and organized labor. These areas of agreement we must seek out and define. We can then establish procedures and methods which will permit the greatest possible harmony between the church and labor in achieving the objectives outlined in these areas of agreement. Today I wish to mention three such areas of agreement, and to discuss in some detail two of them.

The first of these areas of agreement grows directly out of the cooperation achieved during the war. There can be no serious disagreement between the church and organized labor on the need for maintaining peace and preventing future wars. In this connection labor is committed as it has never been before to a policy of continuing in peace the cooperation among the United Nations established in the war to stop war in the future. I am sure that the vast majority of church leaders and members are similarly committed. Neither labor nor the church can afford to permit a regrowth of isolationism, nor can they permit cooperation among nations to be destroyed by the aggressive imperialism of any group of nations. The church's mission has always been peace, and it is safe to say that no other organized group in society is, by its nature, committed to the same mission in the same degree as is organized labor.

The second area of agreement between church and labor is possibly more controversial and may be more difficult of achievement. This is in the field of positive social

legislation, the objective of which is to improve the living standards of the people and to protect them from the social evils of our society. In this connection I should like to discuss in some detail some of the measures on which in my opinion an agreement can be reached and on which cooperation can be achieved.

These measures group themselves conveniently into natural subheadings, and the first of these is the field of health and social security. Both the church and organized labor are vitally concerned with the health and security of the people. This should be so self-evident as to need no elaboration. At the present time in Congress there is a group of proposals, all of which have for their purpose the improvement of the health of the mass of our citizens. The first and most important of these is the so-called Wagner-Murray-Dingell national health insurance bill. This bill is now before the Senate Education and Labor Committee. It provides, briefly, for a system of compulsory contributory insurance designed to spread the costs of medical care among all the people and to provide adequate medical care without regard to the ability of the individual to pay for it.

It is significant that the United States is the last of the great civilized nations to establish a national health program for its people. It is also significant that although we have the highest living standards in the world, the greatest natural resources, the most highly developed civilization, the greatest scientific and medical resources, we do not rank first among the nations of the world in the health of the people. There are far too many gaps between the resources at our disposal and their application to the people who need them.

The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill is a mild and rather hesitant attempt to correct this situation. It is only the first step in the solution of the problems it seeks to alleviate. Its critics to the contrary, it does not call for a system of socialized medicine; it will not force the physician to become an employee of the Government. The bill emphasizes the insurance principle rather than the taxing principle. Furthermore, all beneficiaries of the act will be required to contribute just as they do now under voluntary prepayment schemes. In the eyes of organized labor, these are some of the deficiencies in the bill which can be corrected only when the people have been sufficiently educated to understand that good health is a right and not a privilege based upon ability to pay.

I doubt that anyone would deny the need for some concerted attack upon the problem of payment for medical care and the provision of adequate medical care and health facilities for all the people who need them. It would be most helpful if organized labor, which has been leading the fight for such measures as the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, would get the cooperation of the churches who are just as vitally concerned with this problem as we are.

In addition to the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill there are other measures before Congress which seek in a more modest way to contribute to the improvement of the people's health. For example, there is a bill introduced by Senator PEPPER which provides Federal aid for the payment of dental care. It is particularly directed at establishing a program of dental care for school children. This bill has the support of the American Dental Association as well as other groups. Its purposes are clear; there should be little controversy among enlightened people about the need for such a program. It, too, should receive the united support of the churches and of labor.

Another bill which has been sponsored by a number of Senators from both parties is the so-called Neuropsychiatric Institute bill. This bill provides funds for the care of persons suffering from mental illnesses, and in addition it provides funds for much-needed research into the nature and causes of mental diseases. Again, the need for such legislation is obvious. More hospital beds are occupied by mental cases than by any other single disease. Scientists admit they know less about mental illnesses than about other diseases. Such a program has been long overdue.

A fourth measure is the so-called Maternal and Child Welfare Act of 1945 which provides for health, medical, and welfare services for mothers and children. It is a comprehensive bill and includes among other things day-care nurseries for working mothers. In my opinion, it would be difficult to find a bill which more closely fits the pattern of welfare work conducted by the churches. The absence of adequate care for mothers and children in the lower income families has resulted in broken homes, delinquency, and disabling diseases among children which have blighted the lives of thousands of our citizens.

A second area of agreement in the field of positive social legislation is one that is particularly acute at the present time. This is the field of housing. Again, it is significant that the United States with all of the resources available to it has been relatively backward in acknowledging its responsibility to provide adequate housing for its people. Organized labor has long been fighting for legislation which will provide eventually for a decent home for every family without regard to the economic status of that family. Here, again, is a subject on which the church and organized labor should be in substantial agreement. Both the church and labor have every reason to know the demoralizing and degrading effects of slums and poor housing generally.

Every student of welfare work who has examined the effects of poor housing is in agreement. Bad housing has contributed more than its share to delinquency and crime, to diseases of the body and the spirit, to broken homes and general demoralization among those who are forced to live in slums. There should be little disagreement therefore on the positive effects of good housing, and studies have been made that show an immediate exhilarating improvement in the social lives of the people who have been transferred from slums to decent, clean, but modest homes.

At the present time there is being debated in Congress measures that provide for improved housing for the people who need homes. Whether the present bills pass or not the problem of housing will not be solved in the near future. The great emphasis in the present Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill is upon providing immediate housing for veterans and others in need of shelter. Buried in the bill is a modest appropriation for publicly financed low-cost housing. Once the present emergency is passed, the issue of low-cost public housing will come to the fore again and when it does organized labor and the church cooperating together can help tremendously to see that the ultimate objective of a decent home for everyone is attained.

Still another issue now before Congress vitally concerns the living standards of the people—the minimum wage bill providing for a 65-cents-per-hour minimum wage. Minimum-wage legislation is necessary not only to raise economic standards, but to protect the family against the worst evils of poverty. Substandard wages produce substandard living standards, and the church as well as organized labor has long recognized the demoralizing effects of grinding poverty upon family life. The churches should be among the foremost in the fight to guarantee at least a minimum standard of decency for all people.

My discussion of these bills has been brief and cursory. Necessarily so. In the future I hope that we will have an opportunity to work over the whole field of social legislation and perhaps reach an agreement on a minimum program that we are both committed to support, and that will by our united efforts be enacted.

The third area of agreement between the church and organized labor is in what I call the protection and extension of our democracy. The issues in this field were sharpened tremendously by the war. Hitler and his satellites were not only antidemocratic in the sense that they represented the totalitarian state but also in their use of false race supremacy theories and in their persecution of minority races and nationalities. Therefore, in fighting the war against Hitler and all that he stood for, both labor and the church committed themselves to a fight against all of the evil doctrines put forward by Hitler to support his aggressive dictatorship.

It is in this field that I see the gravest threat to cooperation between the church and organized labor. I say this deliberately because subversive interests have found too ready an acceptance of subversive race doctrines, of racial and national intolerance and prejudice among a few misguided church groups. We who live in Minneapolis are particularly aware of the evil potentialities of this situation. I have had in the last few months a number of bewildered questions and inquiries from members of our unions on the behavior of certain clergymen, none of whom I am glad to say were Lutherans. The aggressive mouthings of a few irresponsible and semi-illiterate evangelists must not be permitted to threaten the harmony and cooperation between the responsible churches and organized labor. One of our problems has been that up to the present time the responsible church leaders have remained silent. They have not identified themselves sufficiently with the opposition to such doctrines within the church organizations themselves or within the community as a whole. This subject is worthy of the most careful and detailed discussion among the representatives of the church and labor.

Meanwhile, I should like to point to a few issues on which I believe agreement can be reached, and our united efforts pledged. The first of these has to do with overt acts of discrimination based upon race or nationality. It has been said that we cannot legislate tolerance among people. That is true. But we can legislate against the act of discrimination, and such legislation is embodied in the proposed Fair Employment Practice Commission bill which, as all of you know, is now before Congress. We in the organized labor movement feel very keenly that this bill must pass if our democracy is to be preserved against the attacks that are constantly being made against it. We have encouraged our local leaders to propose similar bills to state legislatures and city councils. The bill, as drawn, would simply provide some protection for the individual who is discriminated against in employment and can prove it. But the social and political benefits of the bill are immeasurable. It would go a long way to stop the insidious growth of race-baiting, prejudice and intolerance which has become particularly noticeable since the end of hostilities. In my opinion, race prejudice and intolerance are the rock on which our victory in the war can be destroyed. And I appeal to the churches to take their place shoulder to shoulder with organized labor in fighting these tendencies in a positive, concrete way.

The second of the measures in this field which can contribute to strengthening our democracy here at home is the abolition of the poll tax as a condition for the full par-

ticipation by our citizens in elections. The evils of the poll tax are apparent to everyone. Very few responsible individuals maintain that it should be kept. If the churches along with organized labor and other interested groups were to make their united strength felt, it would not be long before the Congress would abolish the poll tax.

A third group of measures in this field is one to which organized labor is particularly sensitive, because these measures are directed at organized labor and are designed to weaken, cripple, and even destroy organized labor as a force in our society. It may be said that such measures are labor's business alone. Actually they are the business of every citizen in the country. The attacks that have been made upon labor by way of such measures as the Hobbs bill, the Case bill, and others even more destructive come from the same sources that have prevented the passage of a fair employment practices commission, the adoption of adequate social-security legislation, and which manifest the prejudices and intolerances about which I spoke earlier. No free society at the present time can exist without free and powerful trade-unions. The evidence of labor's contribution in the war against Hitler is all that is needed to establish that fact. An attack upon labor, therefore, is merely the first manifestation of an attack upon all of us—upon the democracy by which we live. We most certainly wish to discuss with the churches this problem of the continuing attacks upon labor and what must be done to stop them.

Almost everything that I have said up to the present time has been in terms of a generalized plea for a better understanding between the church and organized labor. I should like to tell you in conclusion that we in organized labor do not intend to stop with a generalized statement. In Minnesota at our next State board meeting of the CIO there will be a thoroughgoing discussion of the problems that I have raised here. Since I have discussed this question with a number of individuals and members of our organization, I am confident that our discussion will result in positive action. Among other things, there will be formulated an invitation to church leaders to come together with us in a discussion of the many problems that face us.

We hope that such a conference between church leaders and organized labor would result first, in a discussion of the social and economic and political issues of the day, second, in the formulation of a positive program on which we can both agree, and finally, in the establishment of some kind of continuing relationship which will have a healthy and invigorating effect on both of us.

I am not asking here for a formal alliance between the organized church and organized labor. Far from it. I recognize that such a formal arrangement is neither practical nor desirable. However it is possible, and I believe absolutely necessary that the church and organized labor join forces on those issues which directly and vitally affect the people whom we both serve. I have tried today to outline some of these issues as we in the organized labor movement see them.

If something like this is not done, the consequences may be disastrous for both of us. The enemy of humanity, of the human spirit, which very nearly succeeded in winning the victory in the last war is not yet dead. It can be revived. Every effort is being made now to revive it. It will benefit from the division in our ranks, and if we remain divided, it may yet succeed in enslaving humanity. This is the threat. I am confident that we will be able to establish a unity between organized labor and the church sufficiently strong to stop that threat.

FEPC—Restrictive Covenants versus Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a moving and telling address delivered by the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, D. D., on May 11, 1946, for the Chicago Council Against Racial Discrimination:

To believe in the intrinsic truth of the brotherhood of man presupposes and admits of a prior belief in the essential truth of the fatherhood of God. For there can be no relationship of brotherhood that does not stem from the mutuality of fatherhood. Men are brothers not because of some mystic unity growing out of emotionalism, but because they proceed from a common origin, God. Strip from the brotherhood of man the doctrine of the fatherhood of God and you leave only a meaningless husk: A set of nice, but acquired mannerisms that may easily be discarded without fear of consequence. Deny the fatherhood of God as the one and only basis for our common brotherhood and you open wide the door to the racial insanity of the superman and all of the hatred, brutality, and violence that follow inevitably in its wake.

We have just finished a horrendous world conflict in which a system of government, predicated upon the denial of the brotherhood of man in the fatherhood of God, came within sight of total victory. All through that portion of the global action in which we, as a Nation participated, we trumpeted forth from many rostrums and on numerous occasions our deep and abiding faith and belief in that great moral principle. We pointed with pardonable pride to our system of government, a great Republic dedicated to the principles of democracy, and boldly enunciated that in the "land of the free and home of the brave," all men were equal.

Even as we proudly announced our virtue, we realized that it was not completely true. But we had our fingers crossed; we shouted it as a tocsin and a rallying cry. Many of us, in our hearts, sensed the hypocrisy inherent in such lip service, but assuaged our conscience by promising ourselves that, when the danger had been averted and the enemy defeated, America would move confidently forward to the fulfillment of the age-old dream. Our enemies knew of the inconsistencies between our brave words and our inocuous actions and utilized these contradictions in their propaganda. Yet, America in the moment of its greatest danger really did believe in the ultimate triumph of what Gunnar Myrdal in his monumental work termed "The American Creed." "For when the devil is sick—the devil a monk would be." With pious thoughts and democratic ejaculations we made mental note of things to be done in the peaceful future when the term "duration" would have been dropped from our national vocabulary.

High on the list of those things awaiting our attention when the war would have ended was the problem of the Negro; or rather, the problem of white America's attitude toward colored America. We felt, and our hearts were warm and a feeling of good will permeated our entire being, that when the fighting was over we would easily move to smash this glaring anomaly in our national life.

The war finally drew to a victorious conclusion—and FEPC went down to inglorious defeat. Our young men ceased to die in the muddy fields of Germany and on the coral beaches of the South Pacific—and the anti-poll-tax bill was allowed to languish and die in the congressional hopper. Young colored Americans no longer had the opportunity to prove their love for their country by winning decorations for gallantry and bravery—and those Americans who continued to plead for the establishment of a fair employment practices act, who begged that colored Americans be given an opportunity to cast their ballot, found themselves stigmatized as "crackpots," or Communists, by United States Senators whose only claim to fame lay in the fact that they had obtained their tattered senatorial togas through State elections in which only a scant percentage of the eligible voters participated. This was the shocking answer of white America to the plea for racial justice.

The time has come to face the facts and face them squarely. Brotherhood is but a shibboleth tossed on the wind if we are not prepared to accept the responsibilities inherent in it. How can we dare hope to establish a world peace and world order based on justice, if we cannot establish internal peace and order based on justice? Furthermore, it is the most stupid kind of hypocrisy to proffer the lily-white hand of friendship to a world predominately colored, and at the very moment that our hand is extended be guilty of the most vicious kind of discrimination against these, our darker brothers. It is high time we cease vitiating our moral principles by dehumanizing actions and move to correct the tragic consequences that have grown out of such actions.

In the hideous question of restrictive covenants we are faced with a problem that far transcends the question of democratic rights. It is one of the most basic factors mitigating against inter-racial harmony. Moreover, and this is the most important element in the entire problem, its solution is essentially a question of simple justice and charity. How we eventually answer this question will plainly reveal whether we really love our neighbor, or merely tolerate his existence. The God-given right of every human being to an existence on a plane equal to his dignity as a child of God must of necessity be our guiding rule. Yet the whole theory of restrictive covenants ruthlessly ignores this divinely ordained principle.

The mere existence of what we have come to term (with an understandable sense of national shame) "Christian ghettoes" is an absolute negation not only of the American creed but of Christianity itself. The defenseless people whom we have caused to be walled in behind the legalistic concentration camps of America are mute witness to how far we have drifted from the original command, "Love one another." The shallow attempts to justify and rationalize such ghetto tactics on the loose and shifting grounds of economic realism and expediency is to stand condemned of the very crimes of which we accused Nazi Germany.

To the weak and futile argument contained in the premise of protecting "neighborhood property values," I can do nothing better than quote from Father George H. Dunne's magnificent article of recent date:

"THE SIN OF SEGREGATION

"It is said that people have the right to protect the value and desirability of their homes by preventing undesirable characters from invading the neighborhood. The tattered shreds of this well-worn argument ill conceal the naked sophistry underneath. Like all the other analogies, it ignores the essential difference between racial segregation and other kinds of segregation. Granting for the sake of argument, the right to keep moral delinquents or slovenly housekeepers

out of the neighborhood, the question is: 'Upon what ground do you refuse admittance to one who is neither a moral delinquent nor a slovenly housekeeper and whose only offense is that he has Negro ancestors?' And the answer is: It is because you falsely and unjustly assume that the fact of Negro ancestry is itself a form of uncleanness. Establish your residential restrictions upon whatever other basis you choose—moral conduct, social grace, physical cleanliness, or domestic propriety. None of these restrictions imply the existence of a people whose nature is itself unclean. * * * The sophistry and hyprocrisy of those who defend residential segregation by appealing to their right to maintain a proper standard of morals, of cleanliness, or of beauty surrounding their homes is made manifest by the undoubted fact that these same people, for the most part, would prefer a white neighbor who violated all of their standards to a Negro neighbor who more than measured up to their most stringent demands." "A white debauchee," Father Dunne concludes, "will be admitted when a Negro saint would never be tolerated."

To list the evils which grow out of restrictive covenants is to enumerate the sins against charity of which we, the white population, have been guilty. Poor health, improper housing, disease, crime, to mention only a few, are the inevitable products of racial segregation. Coupled with the physical maladjustments are the numerous mental conditions imposed on both the white and Negro public by this un-Christian way of life. Racial fear and unrest, bitterness, friction, distrust, these are but a few of the many physical neuroses which stem from restrictive covenants.

It is sickening to realize that, at the base, restrictive covenants and all of the other inhuman recial practices to which we have become inured are diametrically and blatantly opposed to every concept of Christian ethics. It is idle for those who engage in such racial practices to plead ignorance of the Christian teachings. They know, although they would undoubtedly desire to forget, that it was just such actions which Jesus Christ condemned when He warned: "Whatsoever you do unto the least of these, my brethren, you have done unto me." When smug, complacent idolators of the status quo, or so-called defenders of property rights, deny to any human being the opportunity to live on terms of honest, objective equality, they are denying the Son of God. It is disheartening to have to acknowledge that otherwise good Christians completely ignore this stricture when brought face to face with the consequences of racial discrimination and blithely continue to interpose their own petty, unjustifiable prejudices.

I have said before, and I repeat, that the churches of all religious denominations cannot be absolved from blame for the fact that social injustice, racial and economic inequality still remain as entrenched obstacles to the complete development of the American creed. The fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man are the basic dogmas of the Christian faith. Moreover, they are and must be the very source of our entire Christian way of life. Failure to understand this is failure to grasp the very core of Christianity. Nor does this principle offer any room for compromise. Too often in the past religious leaders, under the plea of prudence, have failed to appreciate or to teach fearlessly what the brotherhood of man means in terms of simple justice and charity for the poor, the underprivileged, and the oppressed. Too much respect for the local banker, industrialist, realty operator, or politician has caused them to be silent when the teachings of Christ should have been literally shouted from the housetops. It is true that the Gospel is to be preached to all men of all stations of life, but it must be the same Gospel offered without suspicion of concession or surrender.

There is a time for the exercise of the virtue of prudence. There is also a time for courageous thinking and action, but there is never a time for compromising with fundamental moral principles. Either we believed and meant what we announced to the world concerning the dignity of man and the essential community of his nature or it is a lie. If we meant it, then let us, for the love of God, begin to practice it, honestly and objectively.

Scrapping of Aerial Power Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, war creates great waste. However, there is much of the waste that is entirely needless. Recently it was reported that $150,000,000 in value of good aerial power plants have been scrapped for junk. That is needless waste. That amounts to an act of throwing the taxpayers' money away. The report shows that those engines had been overhauled, and many of them were new engines, but all of them were serviceable and usable, but those good engines are now lying in a junk yard out in the open and subject to the elements of the weather. Those in charge of that portion of the war property, which is ruthlessly turned over to junk yards, should be investigated and they should be required to answer for this great waste. The people demand that this instance be investigated, and the people demand that this conduct be entirely stopped. The people have a direct interest in this item, as well as all other items of waste which have been discovered, and they insist upon action being taken in all such cases—and they demand that such action be taken now.

The article contained in the Cincinnati Enquirer, of date May 14, is very illuminating upon this very subject, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therewith such article appearing in the Cincinnati Enquirer, which I hope all may read. This very illuminating article is as follows:

AIRPLANE ENGINES THAT COST $150,000,000 SOLD AS JUNK BY UNITED STATES—MOST ARE NEW—IN PLASTIC GARB—STOWED FOR BLOCKS IN NORWOOD SCRAP PILE—NONE CAN BE PUT TO AIR USE—MOST DOOMED TO BE MELTED DOWN

(By Joseph Garretson)

One hundred and fifty million dollars' worth of the finest airplane engines in the world—most of them apparently brand new—are lying in a Cincinnati junk yard and on an open railroad siding ready to be melted down and sold as junk.

These engines are the property of the American Compressed Steel Corp., 900 Front Street, scrap dealers. They were purchased from the Army Air Forces.

Abe Byer, president of the company, says he bought more than 10,000 of the engines and that their original cost to the Government was near $15,000 each, or $150,000,000.

REFUSES TO TELL PRICE

Byer declined to say what his company paid for the engines because "it would just aggravate the public some more." He did say that the cost of dismantling the engines and melting them down is going to be a big job and a terrific headache.

Most of the engines are piled on a spur of the Pennsylvania Railroad at Lester Road and Highland Avenue, Norwood. There is a hump along Lester Road that almost blots out the casual passing motorist's view of the pile of engines.

The entrance to the field where the engines are piled is from Highland Avenue and there is a sign there stating that the property is for lease by the railroad and inviting one to drive in. However, an attendant approached our car and told us that he had been instructed not to let anyone in. A press card, apparently, convinced him that we were all right.

PILE TWO BLOCKS LONG

The huge pile of engines extends for the equivalent of two long city blocks and is about 20 feet wide and, perhaps, 15 feet high. The attendant told us that there were 3,000 engines in the pile and that 1,000 of them had been in one shipment from Wright's Lockland plant.

There were Wright Cyclones (the kind that powered B-17's and commercial DC-3's); Allison, liquid-cooled, in-line engines (that were used on P-51's and P-38's); and Pratt & Whitneys (that were used on C-47's). There were also several hundred Holly carburetors.

These engines had been brought to the siding on flatcars, picked up by a crane, and simply dropped on the pile.

Many of them were still in their original pliofilm wrappers (which looked like a heavy celophane). Final inspection approval tags were attached to most of the engines.

RED TAPE ENCOUNTERED

When Byer declined to say what he paid for the engines I tried to find out from the seller—the United States Government—and ran into a fine combination of red tape and passing the buck.

At Wright Field, Dayton, I couldn't get anybody on the telephone who knew anything about it, so I tried the Cincinnati office of the War Assets Administration. They told me it was not their transaction but had been handled by the Cleveland office of the Administration.

In Cleveland I was shunted around from one telephone extension to another until I finally got a man named Boggess on the phone. He said that his office handled the accounting for Army Air Force sales, but that they had no record of this one and that I would have to get the information out of Washington.

That's where I gave up.

However, it is not important, as the fact is well established that the engines are here and are being dismantled for junk, and there seems little doubt but that their original cost was easily $150,000,000.

One hundred and fifty million dollars is a lot of money. It is enough to operate the whole city of Cincinnati for 12 or 15 years. It is nearly four times as much as the $40,000,000 worth of bonds that we voted in Hamilton County in 1944. It is nearly 20 times as much as the big Emery skyscraper on Sixth Street will cost.

Beyer said his contract with the Government specified that none of the engines be sold for use in aircraft. He added that most of them will be melted down and sold for the metal that is in them. However, he said that

part may be sold for other purposes, such as use in boats and power plants and "for folks who may want to put them in their cellars just to tinker with."

Inauguration of Governor of the Virgin Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JESÚS T. PIÑERO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. PIÑERO. Mr. Speaker, the Territory of Puerto Rico was privileged last week to be host to the Secretary of the Interior who was on his way to attend the inauguration of the new Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Honorable William H. Hastie. The leaders of the Puerto Rican Territorial government were unanimously impressed by Mr. Krug's interest and sympathetic attention to the problems of the island. As a representative of that Government I was equally impressed. But as a Member of this House, I wish to call attention to the initiative and sense of responsibility which led Mr. Krug to see and learn at first hand the problems of this important part of our national sovereignty for which he exercises the administrative direction of the Federal Government. The same intelligent interest in the problems of the Virgin Islands was also evidenced. Secretary Krug presented the following letter from the President to the new Governor of those islands:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 11, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM H. HASTIE,
Governor of the Virgin Islands,
Charlotte Amalie,
St. Thomas, Virgin Islands.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR HASTIE: It is with much pleasure that I send you my hearty congratulations and good wishes for a long and successful administration as Governor of the Virgin Islands. Your activities and the progress of the islands under your able and understanding guidance will be watched with interest all over the world. A great responsibility has been entrusted to you, and I am entirely confident of your ability to shoulder it. The loyalty and cooperation pledged to you by the people of the Virgin Islands should do much to lighten your task.

I should like you to tell the people of the islands that I share their hopes for and determination to see achieved a great advance in the status of the islands economically, socially, and politically. I shall do all in my power to have extended to the islands an ever-increasing degree of self-government, as the people demonstrate their capacity to govern themselves. Please extend my greetings to my fellow citizens of the Virgin Islands and express to them my regret that I cannot be with them today.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

He spoke briefly to the large throng attending the inaugural ceremonies, as follows:

Governor Hastie, Governor Decastro, Governor Tugwell, Commissioner Piñero, ladies and gentlemen, it gives me great pleasure on the occasion of my first visit to the Virgin Islands to join with you in inaugurating your new Governor. This is both a festive and a solemn occasion. It is a time for taking stock of our accomplishments and for rechecking our policies in the democratic administration of the Territories under the jurisdiction of the United States.

The Congress of the United States is the policy-making branch of our democratic government. The Department of the Interior and the Governor of the Virgin Islands administer the policies laid down by the Congress. Congressional policy has been to help the people of the Virgin Islands to help themselves. Congress believes that the most effective action to resolve your problems is not that conceived in Washington but that which is inspired and developed within the islands.

The Department of the Interior has the primary responsibility of seeing that the Governor is a man who understands the problems which confront him, a man who can get along with the people he is to govern, a man with the intelligence and imagination to work out with you a constructive program for the advancement of the islands, helping the people most by putting them in a position to help themselves. It is also the policy of the United States Government to consider the aspirations of the people in the Territories themselves in establishing governmental controls. The eventual attainment of self-government for the Territories is the fundamental goal toward which our policy is directed.

The governorship of the Virgin Islands is a challenge to the ability and wisdom of any man. I do not have to catalog for you the number of excellent reasons why William Hastie will make a great Governor. Governor Hastie has what no other Governor before him had as he began his term of office: a thorough knowledge of the social and economic problems of the Territory and an understanding of the people themselves. This knowledge was acquired during his work as Assistant Solicitor of the Interior Department and later during the 25 months he spent as judge here in the Federal district court.

Your affection and enthusiasm for William Hastie, expressed through communications to the Congress and the President and to the Department of the Interior, as well as editorials and news comment in your newspapers have demonstrated your approval of his appointment. This expression has given us the feeling that Governor Hastie's appointment is the next best thing to his having been chosen in a popular election.

In his capacity as Assistant Solicitor of the Interior Department Governor Hastie had much to do with the drafting of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands—legislation which has been tested through use for almost 10 years. Its revision now in the direction of an increased measure of self-government is of paramount interest to you. One of the recommendations made by your Organic Act Reform Committee that the islands be entitled to a Resident Commissioner has been incorporated in a bill which I will soon recommend to the Congress. I know you want the right to elect your own Governor, and I know that that provision too will come with time.

Governor Hastie has a great opportunity. I am sure that he will prepare a practical program to build a firm economy for the future development of the islands. I am sure that under his administration private-capital investments will be encouraged and larger markets will be built up for local products and that the tourist trade will be promoted.

You will always find the Department of the Interior ready to give all the aid it can to practicable projects. But I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance, for your political and economic future, of a demonstration through legislation and administrative programs that you are able to plan and build for yourselves.

We have all come here with high hopes that a new period in the history of the Virgin Islands is about to begin. Certainly we are being given a unique opportunity to test the ability of democracy to solve difficult political and economic problems. The ability of democratic society to correct the inequalities, artificially established, which deny economic or political freedom because of race, color, or creed is a basic test of our governmental system. You here and we in Washington are partners in a program which will bring credit to us all and to the cause of territorial populations the world over. Under Governor Hastie's intelligent guidance and encouraging leadership I am confident that the impetus for a solution of the islands' destiny will come from the islands themselves. I pledge the cooperation of my Department to him and to you in working out that destiny.

Governor Hastie's excellent inaugural speech was:

It is my hope, it is my sincere belief that the Virgin Islands stand today at the beginning of a period of significant progress and achievement.

It would be enough to justify this optimism that guests of such distinction and in such numbers are here assembled with us, showing by their very presence that we have good and powerful friends upon whose continuing interest and support we can rely. The President of the United States, in his January message to Congress and in his message to the recent splendid International Caribbean Conference here in the Virgin Islands, expressed both his interest in this community and his determination to support a constructive program for the benefit of all the people. To me personally, the President has expressed similar interest and determination. I know that the prosperity and happiness of these islands and the well-being of the Caribbean neighborhood are in the mind of the President and close to his heart.

The Secretary of the Interior is here today. Various agencies of the national Government upon which we must rely again and again for cooperative assistance are represented by their chief officers or responsible deputies. Never before have the Virgin Islands experienced such an earnest of good will from the mainland and from our good neighbor, Puerto Rico.

A great American commented a few years ago upon the "reservoir of good will" enjoyed by the United States in the far places of the earth. Today, we in the Virgin Islands are happy and appreciative for an unprecedented demonstration of the reservoir of good will stored up for us in Washington and in this Carribbean neighborhood.

In recent days, the threatened drastic reductions in our appropriation of Federal funds for the next fiscal year may have caused some of you to question the amount of good we will enjoy in Washington. I am confident that we will be granted the funds essential to the maintenance of necessary public services. My only regret is that within a very few days I must leave you temporarily to return to Washington to urge in the Senate the restoration of essential items in our appropriation. Again, I am confident that the ultimate resolution of this issue will further demonstrate the good will and support which we enjoy in the Congress of the United States.

It is also noteworthy that within our own community, in St. Thomas, in St. Croix, in St. John we are beginning to experience and to act with a greater sense of unity, than

ever before. For example, your own local committee, after many months of study of our basic law, the organic act of the Virgin Islands, has very recently recommended, among other things, a single legislative body and a single treasury for this group of islands. Even as the airplane has brought St. Thomas and St. Croix within a few short minutes of each other, your own wisdom and good will are bringing St. Thomians and Cruzians more closely together in thought and action for the common good of the Virgin Islands. There are not very many of us here in these islands, some 30,000 in all. Yet our combined unselfish efforts in any common cause can be effective.

In this connection may I pause for a personal reference. I have already been a beneficiary of your united power. Your united and effective support of my nomination to the office I have this day assumed demonstrated the attention which is commanded by the voice of the people of these islands. You spoke through your local councils and your legislative assembly, you spoke through your distinguished representatives whom you sent to Washington, you spoke through countless individual messages and through large community demonstrations. You used the methods which a united people in a democratic society employ to impress their wishes upon the leaders of government. I know that the United States Senate was deeply impressed by your purposeful, planned, and persistent action. I certainly shall never forget nor cease to be grateful for your demonstration of confidence and friendship. But more than that I hope that you are convinced that the voice of this community will be heard and will have influence when that voice bespeaks internal unity and solemn determination to work without tiring for an agreed common objective. My keenest desire is to work with you, both in determining the objectives upon which we can agree and then in applying our united energies and resources to achieving those objectives, whether they can be accomplished by us here at home or whether we must call upon our friends in Washington and elsewhere to help.

In brief, we have two great sources of power: A reservoir of good will beyond our shores and a reservoir of ability and energy and wisdom among ourselves. I believe we are ready to pool these sources of power and to make these islands hum with constructive activity.

It is customary on such an occasion as this to announce something of a program for the future. I have already been asked in the Senate, by the press, and on numbers of other occasions what my program for these islands is. I have refused to try to answer that question and I still am not ready to do so.

There are two reasons for this. Snap judgment is rarely sound judgment and then only by sheerest luck. We properly mistrust the doctor who takes only one look at the patient, immediately states everything that is wrong with him and prescribes an elaborate cure. The forces at work in human society are even more complex in their functioning and interrelation than are those of the human body. They are not less deserving of our most thorough study before we prescribe for maladjustments.

There is a second reason for deliberation in the matter of a program for our community. Infinite wisdom is not given to any individual. Yet we know that there is great wisdom in the consensus of all those who will think and reason together upon problems of common interest. I have not been in position to share your thinking and planning in recent years. But it is now my privilege and duty to do so. When and only when we have arrived together at decisions which seem to be wise, and have agreed among ourselves upon hopeful courses of action can we be confident that our program is the best we can devise. We should not be satisfied with anything less than that.

In saying these things, I am not unaware that much planning and experimentation and constructive activity has already taken place in these islands. Fortunately, your first civilian governor, Paul M. Pearson, was a distinguished educator whose concern with the development of that aspect of community life was as deep as it was rewarding to these islands. His successor, Gov. Lawrence W. Cramer, equally interested in basic human and community values, worked constantly for the improvement of the status of labor, for higher wages and better living conditions for working people. My immediate predecessor, Governor Harwood, has laid the material foundation for our postwar readjustments by winning congressional approval for a large postwar public-works program. We shall not forget our debt to those who have brought us thus far along our way. I am sure that the highest and most satisfactory reward for their efforts will be the success with which we build upon the foundations they have laid.

I have already indicated my reasons for not speaking in terms of specific programs for the future. Yet, since I am not a stranger in these islands, it seems proper that I express certain fundamental ideas which long have been the subject of discussion and upon which I believe we are essentially in agreement.

Underlying our economic problems is the fact that we send a large amount of money out of the community in payment for food and clothes and other commodities produced beyond our shores, while very little money comes from the outside into these islands for things we produce and work we do here. Thus, every successful effort to reduce our dependence upon goods and services from outside and to increase the consumption of local products at home and their marketing abroad will help our economy. This is a simple fact which we have heard before and will hear again and again, and for the good reason that it is the cornerstone of all planning for a prosperous future.

At the same time, money cannot be our sole consideration. We will not sacrifice the spiritual values of human life, the dignity of the community, the civil rights of every citizen, the good manners and respect for law of which we are justly proud for any number of dollars. We shall welcome whatever helps our economy, with the one limitation that our people must not be demoralized, nor their human rights infringed thereby.

I shall comment very briefly upon the political aspirations of the people of the Virgin Islands. The people of these islands are proud to be an integral part of the United States of America. We are citizens of the United States and we take that citizenship seriously. The aspirations of the Virgin Islands for future political status are in the direction of more complete realization of the privileges of citizenship in our Republic.

Our country has developed and prospered under a system of local self-government, subject to the paramount authority of a National Government over those matters which cannot effectively be controlled by separate local communities. We believe in that system and at the same time we wish to share fully in the privileges and the responsibilities which it presupposes. I know how strong is your desire that this community shall have representation of its own choosing through which its voice can be expressed officially in the National Government in Washington. I have been delighted to find so much cordial support of that aspiration in Washington. I know, too, how keen is your legitimate desire for progressive extension of local control over local affairs. In this connection it seems appropriate to emphasize the responsibilities which go with increasing local autonomy. Not the least of these is the responsibility for finding the money to pay for local governmental activities. At the same time this is not, in my judgment, the most serious responsibility by local self-government. Our most serious responsibility, and it will be an increasing one, is the responsibility for the wise and unselfish use of power. It is true that such responsibility falls most obviously upon the elected representatives of the people. But more fundamentally, it is upon the people themselves. It is a truism, not nonetheless true, that people get just about the kind of government they deserve. If we are to have increasingly good government, all of us must play a more active part in the affairs of government. We must continually discuss among ourselves the ways in which government can serve us better. We must be honestly critical of what our representatives are doing with reference to the public business. What I do as Governor, what the councilmen do as legislators, what your municipal hospital does in protecting your health, what your police force accomplishes in the field of public safety, all these and other matters like them are your business. You represent the power of public opinion. By and large these things will be done by your representatives which you as citizens want and want enough to make your will known and felt.

I sincerely believe that men and women who take no active part in discussions of public matters, men and women who do not avail themselves of the privilege of voting, men and women who do not accept civic and political responsibility have no moral right to complain about their Government. On the other hand, in a community in which all citizens take such responsibility seriously, there is relatively little occasion to complain of the way public officers discharge their public trust.

In broader aspect, we have a great opportunity to demonstrate two very important things to all who may wish to observe. The first is that so-called dependent areas entrusted with self-government will grow in political wisdom and effectiveness as they are given the opportunity to do so. I believe the history of the Virgin Islands in the 10 years since the adoption of the organic act is proof of this fact. It is important that in the next 10 years the ever-increasing effectiveness of local self-government be a further and even more conclusive demonstration of the capacity of the people to conduct their own affairs skillfully and justly and for the benefit of all.

Second, we and our neighbors throughout the Caribbean have an opportunity to demonstrate to the world how peoples can work together constructively and harmoniously, subordinating particular local or national interests to the common good. We are all proud that the Virgin Islands were privileged to entertain the recent Caribbean Conference. But meetings are only the essential preliminary to deeds which shall make this area a functioning neighborhood under several flags. We must continue the friendly interchange of information and ideas with our neighbors. Many of our problems are common to most of us. Something which has worked to improve the economy of Jamaica may be instructive for the Virgin Islands. Public institutions which have proved effective among our French neighbors may give us useful ideas for improving our own organization. The more extensive exchange of commodities throughout the Caribbean will help all of us. And it may be that, more important than

any one project or group of projects, our demonstration of cooperation across international boundaries will give hope and encouragement in a world where mistrust and cynicism are becoming all too prevalent.

We live in important times. We live in a small place, but it can be a very significant place. For our own happiness and satisfaction, for what we can mean to the hopes and aspirations of men for a good life in a free world, let us make this place in these times as good a place to live as we possibly can.

Benefits for Filipino Veterans

REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, there was introduced on the floor of the House yesterday a bill—and I want to thank my good friend, Congressman RANKIN, for sponsoring it—H. R. 6508, to restore to veterans of the armed forces of the Philippines certain benefits of veterans' legislation previously passed by Congress in favor of the armed forces of the United States.

I should like to express once more to the President of the United States the appreciation of the Government of the Philippines for his directive of February 20, 1946, which is the basis for the proposed legislation. In his message of that date, delivered in conjunction with his signing of the First Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act of 1946, he directed the Secretary of War, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and the United States High Commissioner to the Philippines to prepare a plan which would overcome the injustices to Filipino veterans which resulted from the passage of that act.

In his message, the President said:

> The passage and approval of this legislation do not release the United States from its moral obligation to provide for the heroic Philippine veterans who sacrificed so much for the common cause during the war.

In the name of justice to the Filipino veterans, I wish to call to your attention certain features of the Rankin bill introduced yesterday which, although most laudable in its objectives, in its present form, however, falls regrettably short of the goal set by the President.

The First Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act of 1946, at one stroke of the pen, stripped veterans of the Army of the Philippines of almost all rights to which they had been entitled under the veterans' legislation of the United States. All but two of the benefits to which Filipino veterans had theretofore been entitled were summarily taken away by that act.

The two remaining were:

First, National Service Life Insurance under the act of 1940; and

Second, pensions for service-connected disability and death, which are to be paid, however, on the basis of pesos instead of dollars, thus cutting in half the benefits to which they were otherwise entitled.

The Rescission Act deprives Filipino veterans of veterans' benefits, with the proviso that $200,000,000 be appropriated to the Army of the Philippines. These $200,000,000, which are purportedly in lieu of the benefits of which Filipino veterans were thus deprived, are actually not sufficient to cover their back pay. The Philippine Government has chosen not to accept the appropriation.

So patent was the injustice and discrimination against Filipino veterans in the Rescission Act that the President of the United States registered a protest. He called upon the Secretary of War, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and the United States High Commissioner to the Philippines to prepare a program which would rectify the injustice done and conform more closely with the spirit of brotherhood and equality in which American and Filipino soldiers fought and died together in the war against Japan.

The bill which was introduced yesterday proposes to restore certain of the benefits of which Filipino veterans were deprived by the passage of the Rescission Act:

First, hospitalization and medical care for service-connected disability;

Second, appropriate burial and funeral allowances; and

Third, pensions for service-connected disability and death, which are still to be paid, however, on the basis of pesos instead of dollars.

The Members will note, Mr. Speaker, that the third benefit provided by the proposed bill, namely, pensions for service-connected disability and death, is identical with the provision of the First Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act of 1946, and thus is not new.

Filipino veterans, Mr. Speaker, when they look back upon their experiences as members of the armed forces of the United States, all through the hardship and the misery of war, find it hard indeed to understand the proposal to Congress to deprive them of those very benefits which were once conferred upon them by the Congress and which are still enjoyed by their American comrades in arms at whose side they fought.

Let me make it very clear that the Filipino veteran has never requested, and does not now request, any special benefit or recognition. Filipino soldiers flocked to the colors by the thousands, in answer to the proclamation of the President of the United States, long before veterans' legislation had been proposed on the floor of the House. They did not go to war for the sake of the advantages they might enjoy as veterans, any more than did the soldiers and sailors of the continental United States. The Filipino veterans, however, are profoundly disappointed at the suggestion that they should be cut off at this late date from the benefits which Congress granted to them during the war. This is injustice. This is discrimination. It is un-American. The Filipino veterans, their families, and their government cannot believe that this is the treatment which the people of the United States will accord to the Filipino veterans who so valiantly withstood the brutal onslaught of the Japanese. They know America too well to think that this is the American attitude.

Filipino soldiers in the Army of the Philippines served in the armed forces of the United States. As such, they were entitled to the benefits conferred by legislation upon veterans of the armed forces of this country. I need not remind you, I know, that under the Independence Act of 1934 the United States Government specifically reserved the right to call into the service of the armed forces of the United States all the military forces organized by the Philippine Government until the Philippines should finally become completely independent. Pursuant to that provision, the President forces of the United States for the period of the existing emergency all of the organized military and naval forces of the government of the Commonwealth of the United States on July 26, 1941, issued a military order in which he called and ordered into the service of the armed of the Philippines, which were placed under the command of the appropriate Army and Navy theater commanders.

From that day forward, the Army of the Philippines was an integral part of the armed forces of the United States. The veterans who served in that Army were forthwith included within the terms of the legislation passed by Congress providing benefits for any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States.

The United States Government early recognized this position of Filipino veterans. On April 27, 1942, the Attorney General of the United States held that "personnel of the organized military forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines called and ordered into the armed forces of the United States under authority of the President's military order of July 26, 1941, are in active service in the land and naval forces of the United States."

Filipino veterans, therefore, were included within the benefits provided for veterans by numerous acts of Congress. Under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944—GI bill of rights—they were entitled to vocational rehabilitation, to education and training, to loans for the purchase or construction of homes and for other purposes, and to unemployment readjustment allowances. Under the Mustering Out Act of 1944 they were entitled to receive mustering-out pay under the conditions specified in that act. Under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 they were entitled to take out insurance. Under Public Law No. 2 of 1933, as amended, they were entitled to hospital and domiciliary care, artificial limbs and appliances, and other medical attention. Other benefits were provided by various other laws, but those cited above will suffice as examples.

The legislation as now proposed to Congress would exclude Filipino veterans

from benefits under the above legislation in all but four cases. It would exclude them from all the benefits of the GI bill of rights, which in the Philippines, as in the United States, had convinced the veteran that his sacrifice was recognized and that civilian life would really hold out something to him upon his return from military service. It would exclude him from the benefits of the Mustering Out Payment Act of 1944.

These are benefits to which the Filipino soldier was entitled while he was fighting in the common cause. Is he to be told now that he is no longer entitled to them, although the status of his comrades from the American mainland has undergone no change? The wounded Filipino veteran, Mr. Speaker, is as concerned about how he will earn his livelihood for himself and his family as is the wounded veteran in this country. He is just as much in need of vocational rehabilitation which modern science is now in a position to give him, as is his former comrade who is now recuperating in the continental United States.

The physically able veteran in the Philippines is as eager to continue his interrupted education as is his American comrade in arms. He was no less willing to interrupt his studies to fight the common enemy. The prejudice which he has suffered is no less severe.

The problem of readjustment from military to civilian life in the Philippines presents problems no less troublesome to the Filipino veteran than to the veteran on the mainland. Perhaps it presents even more, since many Filipino veterans returned to find their fields or former places of employment mere shambles in the wake of war.

I have said here on this floor when I spoke for the Filipino veteran on February 28 last, and need not again set out at length, the story of heroism in which Filipino and American soldiers shared in the Pacific, to the great credit of both. The bullets they faced, and the shells and bombs, made no distinction between them. The misery of the prison camp felt the same in the Filipino heart as it did in the American heart. The terror, the determination, the courage of battle drew no line of discrimination between Filipino and American.

The bill proposed yesterday, H. R. 6508, goes a small way toward correcting the great injustice to Filipino veterans which was done in the First Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act of 1946. It nevertheless still discriminates against Filipino veterans because it prevents them from enjoying the benefits which have previously been accorded to every veteran who fought under the flag of the United States of America.

President Truman recognized that the earlier injustice has not yet been cured when he said in his letter of May 18 to the House that enactment of the present bill will not cure in toto the present discrimination against the Filipino veteran. The President further states that he has directed the Veterans' Administration, the War Department, and the High Commissioner to the Philippines to give consideration to a practicable method of providing educational opportunities for the Filipino veteran, and to assure, so far as possible, employment for him.

We are told, Mr. Speaker, that to provide to Filipino veterans certain of the benefits established by Congress will entail practical difficulties. I feel certain that Filipino veterans will not insist that they should be entitled to benefits which are impossible of practical administration. At no time, however, have we been told what actual difficulties, if any, exist. We know, from working in the past with the agencies of the Government of the United States, that there are very few problems which cannot be solved in a spirit of harmony and cooperation.

We know that the present bill and the legislation which preceded it would withdraw from Filipino veterans the benefits which had previously been vouchsafed to them under the veterans' legislation passed by the Congress. We know that such action is clearly discriminatory against Filipino veterans. We believe it is unjust. We cannot believe that it represents the true purpose of the Members of the Congress or of the people of the United States in their treatment of the Filipino veterans who fought gallantly side by side with their own sons.

I urge you, on behalf of the Filipino people and of my Government, to correct those inequities now. I urge you to enact legislation which will restore to Filipino veterans the recognition and benefits to which they are entitled and which have previously been accorded them by the solemn acts of Congress.

Alien Seamen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, our present merchant marine is a far cry from the cluster of fleet of clippers and brigantines of a century ago.

Our great merchant marine today—the foremost in the world—rendered invaluable service in the war. The war could not have been so triumphantly waged without our bridge of merchant ships, over which went men and matériel to the nethermost parts and into all theaters of combat operations.

Among those whose names will ever be enshrined in the maritime hall of fame are: Admiral Emory S. Land, Admiral Howard L. Vickery, Capt. Edward Macauley, and John M. Carmody, who guided so eminently the activities of the Maritime Commission.

The members of the American merchant marine, officers and men, served with honor and glory.

They were bombed, torpedoed, wounded. Their ships were sunk under them. Their deeds of heroism are legion.

Among the thousands of brave seamen who were a crucial factor in keeping the American flag vessels sailing during the most dangerous period of the war were some 10,000 alien seamen. Forty-three nationalities were represented. They deserve highest praise for their courageous service.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt said:

They deserve and receive from us our thanks for the job they have done.

They are today men without a country. They were never citizens of the United States. But when merchant seamen were urgently needed during the war, these alien seamen accepted wartime responsibilities. They went into dangerous war zones with the supplies and munitions that helped to defeat the enemy. Today, they are ineligible to residence here. They face deportation.

Many have American wives and children who are dependent upon them. If they are deported, it will mean cruel separation of American families—a shameful reward for their outstanding contribution to our victory.

The service of these alien seamen during the hour of our need demands that special consideration be given them in order that they may secure legal status in this country and become American citizens.

We must grant a legal entry to alien seamen with 1 year's wartime service in the American merchant marine.

Bills have been offered, which provide that alien seamen with 3 years' wartime service in the American merchant marine should be granted American citizenship.

These bills should pass.

OPA Defrauds People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more apparent every day the extent to which the OPA has defrauded the people. I have several times prior to this called attention to the fact that a few large department stores now overstocked with shoddy, inferior goods wish to have OPA extended to enable them to unload their goods upon their customers before legitimate superior goods are made available.

I invite attention to the analysis of the situation by George E. Sokolsky, which, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD as part of my remarks. His analysis appears in the Times-Herald of May 22, 1946:

THESE DAYS
(By George E. Sokolsky)

You must have been surprised, as I was, that some department stores came out for OPA. By all the logic of the situation, one would expect these purveyors of goods to be antagonistic to an agency that has forced them to merchandise wares of depreciated values for higher prices.

So I took a look. I got the reports of the Neiman-Marcus Co., of Dallas, Tex., one of the highest-priced department stores of the country, and the W. T. Grant Co., which operates a number of low-priced department stores.

Nieman-Marcus favors OPA; W. T. Grant has testified in opposition to it. Nieman-Marcus sells principally to the luxury trade; Grant to the worker, housewife, and proletariat.

So these are the figures:

Neiman-Marcus

	1941	1945
Sales	$4,891,449	$16,025,695
Profit before taxes	$293,394	$1,915,883
Net profit	$215,129	$565,883
Sales increase—percent	----------	228
Increase in profit before taxes—percent	----------	554
Portion o consumer's dollar in profits before taxes—cents	6	12
Increase in net profit—percent	----------	163½

W. T. Grant

Sales	$130,555,607	$180,306,612
Profit before taxes	$9,217,393	$12,568,092
Net profit	$4,446,393	$4,210,092
Sales increases—percent	----------	38
Increase in profit before taxes—percent	----------	36
Portion of consumer's dollar in profit before taxes—cents	7	7
Decrease in net profit—percent	----------	(5-2) 10

I worked these figures out from their reports and maybe my arithmetic is not as perfect as Einstein's but the fact is that the high-price luxury outfit cleaned up on the OPA and favors it, while the low-price outfit got struck down by OPA and opposes it.

A Marxian might call this economic motivation, but in simple English what it means is that Neiman-Marcus know where their bread is buttered—while Grant is without any butter.

The answer to Grant's difficulty is that low-priced goods have disappeared from the market. Sure, the OPA statistics quote ceiling prices, but you go out and get the goods at that ceiling price. As long as I am quoting Grant figures, let me use some data offered by Mr. Robert Seidel of that company:

"Our stock of men's shirts in 500 stores as of January 1, and this includes all types of shirts, amounted to $22,000. It would normally approximate $600,000. Our sales of shirts during last fall were not over 25 percent of any prewar year and the sales were very much lower than they were during any prior wartime year.

"Sales of drapery materials declined 80 percent but sales of ready-made draperies increased 170 percent.

"Sales of dresses for 1- to 6-year-old children decreased 50 percent and for schoolgirls from 7 to 16, dress sales declined 72 percent.

"During the same period, total over-all retail sales and profits reached a new high, primarily because of extremely heavy sales of high-priced novelties and gifts and less essential apparel. Novelty jewelry increased 80 percent; luggage, 92 percent; handbags, 60 percent; fountain pens, several hundred per cent; novelty aprons, 6 percent; women's coats, 47 percent; small leather goods, 60 percent; gloves, 50 percent; art goods, 65 percent; novelties in the millinery line, 170 percent."

In other words, essential, reasonably priced goods were unavailable; luxury goods were plentiful and sold high.

Or take the story of men's shirts:

"In March 1942 a white shirt of combed, mercerized broadcloth with a thread count of 144 by 76 per inch cost $12.80 per dozen. The lowest cost price that we have been able to find recently was a shipment made in November 1945 at $21 per dozen. The cloth in this shipment was identical to that used in shirts in 1942, but in many respects the November 1945 shirt does not measure up the February 1942 shirt.

"First, the tail is shorter and the yardage per dozen is approximately 1½ yards less. Second, the collar is inferior.

"It is made with poorer lining materials that are not uniform (manufacturers are compelled to use practically anything they can find for collar lin'ngs) and the collars are soft, whereas in 1942 they were fused. The buttons are plastic and they formerly were ocean pearl. * * *

"Actual increase in price, 64 percent. Estimated deterioration in quality, 15 percent."

Apply this test yourself. You do not need to bother about Chester Bowles or Leon Henderson or me or anyone else. Become an expert yourself. Take 10 essential commodities and check by the above process—that is availability, quality, price—and see what OPA has done.

School of Political Action Techniques

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gould Lincoln in the Washington Star of May 21, 1946:

The School of Political Action Techniques, which is to be launched in Washington, June 26—and run for 4 days—is sponsored by the National Citizens Political Action Committee. If it turns out a success, in all probability there will be other similar schools in other cities.

The political actionists are going in for teaching the intricacies of professional political campaigning in a big way, and have 80 specialists ready to teach 39 courses. They will teach how to build ward and precinct organizations, how to organize women for political action, the use of radio, leaflets, and posters—and a variety of other significant things.

Stressing its nonpartisan complexion, the school prospectus declares that any citizen of the United States is eligible for admission but that registration for the first session is necessarily limited to 500 students. The citizen, however, must hand over $10 as a tuition fee, and an additional $2 for the manual, supplies, literature, and admission to Films for Action and Songs for Action.

The National Citizens' Political Action Committee—which arose as a kind of national extension of the CIO's PAC—went to town for the late President Roosevelt in the 1944 political campaign. Presumably it is going to town for the candidates of New Deal Democrats and the CIO in the coming congressional and State elections.

The school is to have a department of political strategy, a department of political organization and administration, a department of political groups, a department of political research and a department of public relations—each giving several courses. One of the courses of the political strategy department is on the major issues in the 1946 election campaign, with special emphasis on those issues "which will best mobilize masses of voters." Other courses will deal with the raising of money and how to spend it.

Since the CIO and its Political Action Committee have announced a $6,000,000 goal for its campaign funds for this year—just twice the sum allowed a major party's national political committee in a presidential election under the Corrupt Practices Act—it should be important for their friends and allies to know how, not only to raise, but also to spend these funds without running afoul of the law. Indeed, it looks as though the students at the school are to be taught techniques of politics in a thoroughly realistic manner.

The close association of the National Citizens' Political Action Committee, the CIO's PAC and the Democratic National Committee is clear from a perusal of the list of faculty members of the new school. For example, there are included C. B. Baldwin, executive vice chairman of the National Citizens' PAC; a former Farm Security administrator, Harold Buckles, secretary to Representative SABATH, Democrat, of Illinois, chairman of the House Rules Committee; Thomas Burns, assistant chairman of the CIO's PAC; Carl Holderman, State director of New Jersey CIO's PAC; Henry Morgenthau III, New York City Housing Authority, and Sam O'Neal, director of publicity for the Democratic National Committee.

Whether any of the Democratic Members of Congress will take exception to the employment or assignment of an official of their party's national committee by the PAC to this new school of political action remains to be seen. Quite a number of House Democrats—and some in the Senate, too—look upon the PAC as an effort to take over the Democratic Party, certainly in some States. Incidentally, no invitation was extended by the organizers of the new school to the director of publicity of the Republican National Committee, William C. Murphy, Jr. It might be a good idea for the GOP to send a couple of hundred "students" to the new school, however, to learn the technique of the opposition.

Mr. Baldwin, in announcing the opening of the school, remarked that "politics has been too nearly monopolized by political machines; it is time that it becomes the business of every citizen." And then he added, "it is time that politics be raised from the amateur to the professional level." A professional politician, apparently, does not mean to Mr. Baldwin what he means to the ordinary American citizen.

Another of the courses to be given concerns itself with the "techniques of dealing with Congress," i. e., including the history of pressure groups, a discussion of techniques for use at home and in Washington. In other words, how to "lobby." Mr. Buckles, Representative SABATH'S secretary, is part of the faculty which interests itself in this course. Yet, Mr. SABATH'S Rules Committee of the House is considering an investigation of all "lobbying" in Washington.

National Maritime Day

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. HOOK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, today is, by proclamation of the President of the United States, National Maritime Day, set aside to do honor to the men who, in war and peace, man our great merchant fleet. During the war these men contributed heroically to the victory. The

role they play in peacetime is no less important. They are the blood and sinews of the great vessels that link us with the rest of the world. We should honor them. It is appropriate to honor them with words of commendation. We should do more than commend them. We should reward them in a meaningful, material way for their part in making this the greatest commercial Nation in the world.

It is high time our country recognized that its sons who man the ships which form one of our main arteries of commerce are no different from those of us who work at home, and that the benefits which our economy makes available to us at home should in the same degree be granted to our seamen.

An opportunity to extend some of these benefits exists at the present time in the bill before Congress to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act. When this act was originally passed in 1938, seamen were exempted from its wage-and-hour provisions by section 13 (a) (3) without rhyme or reason. It was said at the time that since the Maritime Commission had jurisdiction over seamen, the introduction of another agency which would administer basic wage-and-hour standards would create confusion in the maritime field. Not only was this absurd then, but experience since has shown that unless protection is afforded under the Fair Labor Standards Act seamen will have no protection.

The intervening years have also dispelled the illusion that seamen are a class apart from shore-side workers. They are as typical of American working men as employees of shipyards and steel mills. They come from every State of the Union. The great majority of them now have families who must subsist in communities in which the cost of living, despite all attempts to control it, has steadily been on the upgrade. The present bill acknowledges this rise by proposing to increase the minimum wage for the bulk of the population who reside in these communities. To prevent the families of seamen from enjoying the necessities of life while according them to their neighbors is neither fair nor realistic. The merchant marine is a modern industry. Ships are highly mechanized and require skilled mechanics and craftsmen to man them. If there is any distinction at all between the occupations of seamen and those of other American working men, it may be found in the confinement, loneliness, and hazards of the former. Far from justifying their exemption from the wage-and-hour law, this distinction should serve as a basis for additional compensation to our seamen.

It is not as though the exemption were based on the kind of work that is done. An able seaman who while ashore obtains a temporary job as a rigger or a painter with a shipbuilding company or who does repair work for his own ship operator on the dock can get as much as 120 percent more than for the same kind of work performed aboard ship. Moreover, ashore he will have a 40-hour week and at sea a 56-hour week, although the 40-hour week could easily be introduced at sea simply by increasing the ship's complement by a few men. If the 12-hour daily watch could be reduced to 8 hours, thereby cutting the workweek from 84 to 56 hours, there is no reason why it cannot be further reduced to 40. The Senate has already set the course for the application of the minimum wage provisions to seamen. It remains for the House of Representatives to follow that lead and to extend the protection of the overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act as well.

Subsidies, in recent years particularly, have so increased the profits of shipowners that there can be no question of their ability to absorb comfortably the slight additional cost which would be entailed by eliminating the present exemption entirely from the statute. A representative study of the growth of shipping companies between 1938 and 1944 shows that assets almost doubled despite all losses and damage due to enemy action during the war, net worth increased by 125 percent, and net profits after taxes rose more than 200 percent. Considering that over one-third of the unlicensed shipboard personnel are already receiving at least 65 cents an hour, application of this minimum to the remaining men would raise the weighted average hourly rate about 8½ percent and total labor costs less than 5 percent. Since the labor cost is only 10 to 15 percent of all operating costs, the increase would be one-half to three-fourths of 1 percent of the total cost of operation, and the application of the overtime provisions would raise this to not over 4 percent.

The cries of the operators of their inability to afford the cost are reminiscent of 1915, when the hours of engine-room personnel were cut from 12 to 8 per day, and 1936 when the same thing was done for deck hands. The operators carried on then. They could carry on now. The shipping industry depends for its life on other industries. The most proximate of these are shipbuilding and ship repair. The labor costs of these industries, the labor bill for longshoremen and for harbor workers, all directly affect the cost of water transportation. Yet these workers are paid in accordance with prevailing industrial standards. Even the administrative staffs of the ship operators, their clerks and stenographers, receive a decent living wage. America can and must see to it that her seamen get no less.

Why Should We As A People Destroy Ourselves

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, in the Wagner Act of 1935 we sowed the wind of inevitable and disastrous class and economic conflict.

We are now reaping its whirlwind harvest of moral, economic, and political chaos.

If our American principles of individual freedom and responsibility are to survive, we must without delay substitute for the Wagner Act a comprehensive national labor policy, based upon tested American principles of equal freedom, equal responsibility, and equal justice for all.

This is a job demanding statesmanship of the highest order. It can only be done by the full and free cooperation of all interests involved thinking and acting only for our people as a whole.

When the Wagner Act was before Congress for passage in June 1935, I voted against it for reasons set forth in a brief speech, which by permission of the House I am including herewith, and which supports my unchanged conviction that the relations of employer and employee constitute a national rather than a class issue.

Unless we settle this question on American principles and by the American way, our whole economy will sink into failure and ruin.

Why should we as a people and government destroy ourselves when the most powerful enemies of all time could not destroy us by force of arms?

Under the authority of the Wagner Act, our country is now plunged into what amounts to a civil war as destructive of the property and constitutional rights of the general public as if we were being bombarded by enemy guns. If we cannot have peace at home, we surely would not be able to establish peace abroad.

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATE OF THE SEVENTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, JUNE 19, 1935, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON S. 1958 (WAGNER ACT)

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I was profoundly impressed by the very able argument to which we have just listened, offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

I am not a lawyer; in fact, the number of phases of human existence about which I do not know is very large, but I approach this and every other problem from the point of view of the well-being of man himself, and I find myself deeply disturbed by and strongly opposed both to this rule and to the legislation which it introduces to the House.

Eleven years ago last March I had the honor of addressing this House on the subject of our American economic revolution, and at this time I laid down certain principles by which I interpreted history. To those principles, in which I believe more strongly than ever, I appeal at this time for your consideration.

The end of the social process, as I see it unfolding down through the long weary centuries, is that men may be free. For a thousand years men have fought to be free to think, to be free to worship, to be free to govern themselves. They have won in theory at least those areas of freedom which have to do with intellectual, moral, and political rights.

Today throughout the civilized world the attention of every class in every community is turned to one new objective, namely, that the masses of men shall achieve the same freedom economically that in days gone by they had achieved in the realm of the mind, the spirit, and the political structure. In accomplishing this great objective, which I believe in with all my heart and to which I have devoted the best years of my life, we have a choice between two great instrumentalities. One is the American instrument of private enterprise developed by free American citizens under the Constitution and Government of the United States. The other is the instrumentality adopted in the

various countries of Europe, in which the government is everything. It is the monster of control, and under that control the individual lives his life, whether he is employer or employee, shackled and bound by authority forced upon him from above and not created by his own choice. As between these two principles of life I take my stand on and for the American principle, and I am willing to go down with that principle even if I did not get one vote back home. I will stand for that American concept of life to the last ditch at any cost to myself or to my party.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in organized labor. I have voted and fought for almost every principle and every policy introduced in this House in 10 years that had as its purpose the advancement of the working man, not because I wanted their votes, although sometimes I needed them. I will be honest with myself and my people even if I am in politics. I would rather go down fighting for the principles that have made this Nation great than to be guaranteed a safe election for the rest of my natural life. I believe those American principles are at stake in this legislation today.

The American instrument for the distribution of wealth is not this body and it is not the White House. It is organized industry, composed of the employer and the employee working together as partners in the greatest material social service the world contains.

Mr. WHITE. I think sometimes industry may be overorganized.

Mr. EATON. I think that is a valuable suggestion. In the old days the individual was the chief instrument of industry. You did not need organized labor. But when we created by law a great, impersonal giant, known as a corporation, it became the duty of Government to follow that legislative creation by proper legal regulation. The day that you introduced that powerful impersonal instrument on the side of the employer, it became necessary for the employees to organize in a mass form, otherwise the individual worker would have had about as much weight as a fly on the wheel of a locomotive. So I have been for organized labor, and I want to see it continue, but I want to see organized labor and organized industry work together as a team in social service, not under the whip of bureaucratic control, but under personal responsibility and in accordance with the fundamental ideals of our country.

Can this be done? I may be an old fogy in my views about that matter, but I have been in the industry of this country, and in the closest intimacy with these problems for the past 20 years, and I do not believe that full and free and friendly cooperation between employer and employee is an idle dream. May I give you two illustrations, and I am sorry that they have to do with the dead. When you go to Cleveland, go out to the Lake View Cemetery, and I hope you will not go there as a patron, but rather as a visitor. You will see a monument at the entrance crowned by the magnificent figure of a man, Henry Chisholm. Many years ago a young Scotchman, who was a carpenter, and his wife were put off a sailing vessel on the wharf in Cleveland. They had all their worldly goods in a box and she sat on the box while he went up town to get a room. He came back and both of them took hold of the box and carried it up to their room. When that man died at the end of a wonderful career in Cleveland he was followed to his grave in the cemetery by 6,000 of his employees, and they erected this monument. On it they put this statement:

"Erected by 6,000 employees and friends in memory of Henry Chisholm, Christian, philanthropist, and everybody's friend. Born in Lochgelly, Scotland, April 27, 1822. Died in Cleveland, Ohio, May 9, 1881."

That is the essence of the relationship that I believe should exist between employer and employee in every organized industry. I believe it is possible to achieve that normal human relationship if we may have some kind of moral sense and intellectual understanding of our problems, which problems we can never solve by legislation such as is being proposed here today.

Here is the other instance. The employees of Richman Bros., manufacturers of clothing, have hung in the lobby of their East Fifty-fifth Street factory, Cleveland, Ohio, a life-size portrait of their friend and employer, Henry C. Richman, and a bronze tablet which does not read very much like the legislation which we are considering here today.

The Richman institution is a successful firm of Jewish people who have been for many years in the clothing business. They are not chiselers, they are not doing a sweatshop business. They are fine American citizens who stand for the very best in all their relations with their employees. This is what the employees put on the tablet:

"The memory of the righteous shall be a blessing. This memorial tablet has been erected by the employees of Richman Bros. Co. in loving tribute to Henry C. Richman. June 26, 1876–February 16, 1934. Coworker, friend, benefactor. His interest in the personal welfare of the men and women of 'the Richman family' was constant, devoted, and inspiring. He was a gentleman of spirit, generous of heart, strong in integrity, and a friend of us all. His memory will live forever in the grateful hearts of all who knew him, and, knowing him, loved and respected him."

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman if he thinks there should be any laws against homicide because there are decent people in the country?

Mr. EATON. I would not expect a question of that magnitude to be asked except on that side of the aisle. This resolution describes the legislation under consideration as a bill to promote equality of bargaining power between employers and employees, to diminish the causes of labor disputes, to create a National Labor Relations Board, and for other purposes.

As I read the bill, the exact opposite of this description would be more in accord with the truth. It destroys equality of bargaining power between employer and employee. And it will increase enormously the causes of labor disputes. It will not cure the disease. It will aggravate and perpetuate the disease.

This legislation strikes a fatal blow at organized labor as we have known it in America. For it plucks the labor union out of the plane of free, self-governing American institutions and places it under the supreme control and domination of a political bureaucracy in Washington.

Under this bill the labor union ceases to function as an economic instrumentality and becomes a mere cog in the vast political bureaucracy now being built up in Washington for the purpose of bringing all American life under Government control and management.

It takes from employers and employees alike their constitutional right to develop their mutual relationships under local conditions and free from bureaucratic political dictation. And it denies the great majority of American workers the right to work under conditions and leaderships of their own choosing.

This and all similar legislation rests upon the absurd proposition that all businessmen are dishonest and unfair and all employees are incapable of self-determination or self-government. It places the relation of employer and employee upon a permanent and unalterable war basis. It rests upon the false assumption that the interest of employer and employee are by their intrinsic nature absolutely irreconcilable. And it puts the employer in the criminal class, subject to fine and imprisonment for a list of new crimes fastened upon them under legal processes as unjust and unfair, as they will certainly turn out to be unconstitutional.

Believing as I do that organized industry is now the chief instrument of civilization, I see small hope for our social future unless employer and employee quit fighting each other and join forces to meet the challenge that confronts them. Under our American system there is only one way to justly distribute wealth, and that is by high wages made possible by high production at low unit cost. Wages and profits must be paid out of production. There is no other source from which they can be derived. And high wages cannot come out of an industry conducted by an armed camp with the vultures of bureaucracy darkening the sky.

The problem of human relationships in industry can never be solved by law, and especially by class legislation which seeks to enthrone one class while it enslaves another. The need of the hour is not more law and more bureaucratic dictators. Our need is an awakened sense of moral obligation among employers and employees and the people generally which will make fair industrial cooperation possible and leave us all free to act as self-governing, self-respecting American citizens with faith in ourselves and in each other.

Terminal Leave Pay

REMARKS
OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to urge the speedy passage of H. R. 4051, the bill granting terminal leave pay to enlisted men. When the House recessed at Easter we were advised that this measure would be on the floor of the House for consideration on Monday, May 13. This was due to the fact that petition number 23 on the Speaker's desk had the required 218 signatures and that the Committee on Military Affairs was thus discharged from further consideration of the bill. I am glad to say that my name appeared on that petition as it is my firm opinion that the terminal leave pay bill should be passed.

I flew to Washington from California in order to be here and support the bill, only to learn that in the meantime the Military Affairs Committee had reported a similar measure which voided the action taken by petition. It now becomes necessary for me to return to California as a member of a special Naval Affairs Subcommittee which has been selected by Chairman VINSON to inspect sites for the proposed Navy Postgraduate School for line officers.

Unfortunately, it is impossible for Members of Congress to be in two places at once, especially when these two places are 3,000 miles apart. I am advised that the terminal leave pay bill may be called up in my absence and although it may be impossible for me to be here when the roll is called I wish to state,

as emphatically as possible, that I am positively in favor of its passage.

We do a lot of talking about injecting more democracy into the various branches of the armed forces and about removing discrimination between officers and enlisted men. Here is an opportunity to back up our words with action, the kind of action that the veterans, the men and women presently in the services and those still to be inducted can understand. It is my hope that the bill will pass the House without a dissenting vote. It should in the interest of simple justice and fair play.

Experiment, Yes—Wanton Destruction, No!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received several letters from constituents and others relative to the proposal of the United States Government to destroy dozens of warships in an effort to determine the devastating effects of the atom bomb.

The loss of ships during the war would have been considered a disaster. Surely there must be some way for our scientists to determine the exact effects of the atom bomb without the destruction of so many vessels. A short time ago I witnessed a newsreel in a local theater in which several Japanese ships were taken out to sea and sunk by gunfire. Why were not these vessels used in connection with the atom bomb test?

One of the excellent letters which I received on this subject is reprinted herewith:

MARCH 6, 1946.

Hon. HAROLD C. HAGEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: Atom bomb destruction of 97 warships. Can we justify an operation to destroy 3,000,000 tons of metal?

DEAR SIR: Atom bombs are being prepared to destroy 97 United States Navy and some other, captured, war vessels—to be sunk to the bottom of the Pacific Ocean!

We may not need these warships now nor in the future. We hope not. However, we do not know that. But the cost of the atom bombs to do this devastating act will be a staggering cost. Also the enormous amount of fuel oil to take these doomed ships to their place of destruction in the Pacific is a large item. Then there is the fuel oil and other supplies for an additional large fleet to accompany these vessels to their watery grave and accommodate the 20,000 men, which it is being planned will take part in this affair, then bring them back—we hope—all alive and well. The food and clothes and supplies for this great number of men for, perhaps, several months—all add to an enormous cost to carry out this proposed experiment to destroy 97 ships and millions of tons of valuable metal. Can we afford this gigantic destruction?

In addition to the loss of all the fuel oil (tens of thousands of tons), food, and supplies to operate this great fleet the equivalent of once around the world—there is about 3,000,000 tons of steel metal in this fleet—to be sunk to the bottom of the great Pacific Ocean where there can be no hope of ever recovering any part of it. This is enough steel to build a railroad across America, make a windmill and an engine for every farm, build 4,000,000 automobiles, or the steel bridges for several trans-American "autobahns"—superhighways—which Americans are entitled to have. But we can never make any of these things from materials we destroy or sink to the bottom of the ocean. Our Nation is rich in natural resources—but not rich enough to afford such waste as this.

These materials should not be destroyed! The steel in these warships is valuable metal, if the ships themselves are not required. They can be cut in pieces, then melted and the steel made into other things we need or want. In fact the saving of the metal in obsolete or worn-out ships is a regular practice in this and every industrialized nation. The metal in these doomed ships should be shaped into useful things to add to America's conveniences, comforts, and luxuries to make a better life, a higher standard of living, or it should be held in reserve stock piles for the day when we may need it badly or even possibly have no other source of supply. But the steel is not the only metal in these vessels which it is proposed to destroy. There is a huge amount of copper, brass, and other materials which could contribute to the needs and comforts of human beings.

Proposals have been made and plans are now being developed to destroy 97 ships with the super-expensive atom bombs. This is a waste of material that the people of America should not tolerate. We cannot afford this destruction. The steel industry has to have a great deal of used steel, commonly called scrap, to make steel forgings, shapes, and plates. It is not made directly from iron ore as it is taken from the earth. About half of all the steel produced is scrap steel melted down, and electric furnace steel (about 10 percent of the output) is made entirely of scrap steel. The steel in these doomed ships is a very good grade of steel metal for reworking into useful articles ranging through rails, cars, bridges, and passenger liners, and many things made of steel.

During the war years we needed scrap steel badly. We saved all the pieces we could spare from our kitchens, basements, garages, and farms to provide for the needs of our steel mills to help win the war, which was done at a staggering cost to this Nation. And that cost must be measured in the materials we used up, also the man-hours for producing the things that had to be destroyed to win the war.

The fighting equipment we have made has been largely used up, burned up, worn out, destroyed, and abandoned on the shores of, and inland from, the seven seas, never to be returned to America. We have impoverished ourselves tremendously to win this war. We have worked ourselves into a state of severe fatigue. We have used up a great deal of our natural resources in metals, iron, copper, oil, and coal. We have almost worn out our automobiles, busses, trucks, railroad equipment, and highways, and our houses are in great need of repairs and replacement. We have destroyed much to win this war. We cannot continue in this spirit of destruction without, one day, finding ourselves destitute, living like nomads, foraging for food and shelter.

We need to save and conserve everything we can to repair, rebuild, and replace these worn-out things in America and quickly restore them to the condition they were before the war. Then we must go forward. We must carry on the building of America until it becomes the land of a really great Nation. We need homes, roads, bridges, and we need repairs, on every hand, of what we have left after this devastating conflict. We need to go far beyond where we were in 1940 and have homes—good ones for all our people. We must have autobahns—superhighways—many of them—autobahns on which cars can cross this Nation at speeds of say 150 miles an hour or more and with no crossings. We need to have our forests planted and tended—our land conserved and enriched. We need river and harbor improvements. Many of our rivers should be in concrete banks with flood-control dams and navigation improvements. We need sewage disposal and more machines to do work. We need manual-training schools and a lot of things to make America really great—and we can have them. But not by following pursuits of destruction. To have the things we want requires the materials to work with—the manpower—and the will to work. But when we destroy or dissipate our materials and our manpower we not only prolong the day when these things can be had but we endanger the possibility of their even being acquired by the destruction, beyond hope of recovery, of materials from which they may be fashioned. There is a definite limit to our supply of cheap iron, coal, and oil, and they may, one day, become so expensive in the number of man-hours required to obtain them that we will reflect with great regret the lack of foresight and conservation of materials when there appeared to be plenty, and we wasted—even destroyed them. That sad condition is now being experienced with respect to the lumber industry in the Pacific Northwest.

We must not destroy the metal and all the other materials, supplies, and man-hours of work in the atom bombing of 97 vessels. It must be saved and ultimately used for other things. If another war should come upon this country—which no man can say is impossible—even in the not very distant future—we would need scrap steel, and copper, and brass, lots of it, and quickly.

We all recall how we lamented the fact that Japan bought 7,000,000 tons of scrap steel from the United States—and how we felt the serious need of that metal during the war—and how much we credited Japan's ability to wage war against us because of the scrap steel she got from us—7,000,000 tons of it! Yet there are plans being made to sink about 3,000,000 tons of steel and a great amount of other metal to the bottom of the Pacific Ocean with atom bombs!

The only possible reason for this prodigious act of destruction is to see what would happen—when the atom bomb is exploded—in the vicinity of some war vessels. It is to be expected that some—perhaps all, would be sunk or damaged to some extent—then they would be scuttled to sink where they lay—helpless—wallowing in the sea. It's too far to tow them back to America. They won't be brought back for salvaging, it's too costly and hazardous.

We know that the explosion of the atom bomb liberates an enormous amount of heat. One ounce of uranium 235 will evaporate a million cubic meters (260,000,000 gallons) of water. This would make a volume of steam of one-half cubic mile at atmospheric pressure. The temperature is approximately that of the sun—about two and a half times greater than the hottest fire we can make—nearly twice the heat of an electric arc. The exploding bomb burns everything near by that will burn—even melts some that won't burn. We also know that the explosion destroys structures in the vicinity—and that the electrons from the atoms, which travel at the speed of several thousand miles per second, for short distances, have destroying characteristics. We know that an explosion of even minor violence below the surface of the water and near a vessel will often cause the hull to leak and that the ship will sink if the leak is not stopped or the leakage pumped out. The time required for the ship to sink depends on how big is the leak.

The damage done to a vessel by a blast above or below the surface of the water is

dependent on a number of factors such as the distance of the ship from the blast—whether the ship is pointed toward or broadside to the explosion—the position of the rolling of the vessel in the sea, etc. But of greater importance, there is no possibility of duplicating the results of any atom bomb blast of the type proposed in an attempt to sink 97 ships or even the bombing of 1 vessel. So, no matter what the results might be of the contemplated atom bombing of this large naval fleet of 97 ships, the net practical answer is well known in advance—the atom bomb destroys plenty—but just how much and to what extent could never be determined with any reasonable degree of practical accuracy—particularly if leaks developed in the vessels and they sank, which it is expected they will do—thereafter to be only mute evidence in memory that they were once afloat—now sunk—perhaps only a sea valve jarred off or some shell rivets broke and fell out to admit the sea water—or maybe the sheer strake cracked and the ship's shell plate broke apart to admit the sea and sink the ship. Who would know? and what difference would it make? the results of such tests do not repeat.

No manned vessel—nor person—dares to be near these explosions. However, some doomed ships might perchance live through an explosion—probably will and remain afloat. This would not indicate that the same ship or a similar one would again survive a presumably identical test for, indeed, a duplication of such a test is virtually impossible.

The observers of such a proposed test, both ships and personnel, must be many miles away for safety—how far away, for a submerged blast, is a matter of conjecture. Several hours at best must elapse before an atom-bombed vessel, if still left afloat, could be boarded for examinations. Then there is the problem of lights to get about and through a sinking vessel's hull, in fact the many hours required for examination, if the ship remained afloat that long, the difficulties of finding the leaks and the nature and extent of the damage, perhaps then covered by water, are still problems that just don't get solved under these kinds of conditions, and a reliable report of any practical value is not produced to reveal just what happened. The ship was afloat, was bombed, and sank is the net reliable report of any practical value; and if it did not sink, then it is scuttled, it's too far to be towed home to salvage. It is destroyed, a lot of valuable metal sent to the bottom of the sea to satisfy a desire to make one great explosion and see how much destruction can be wrought therefrom.

Let us turn our materials, our steel, oil, coal, food, clothes, and manpower into the channels of producing American super "autobahns"—river and harbor improvements—sewage disposal—land conservation—reforestation—manual-training schools. Let us make schools and tools for our boys to learn to be better mechanics, better workmen, better neighbors. Let us save and conserve all the materials we can to make America a really great country—a fine place for all its citizens to live in. We can't do that by destroying our resources—our metals, our materials, and spending our time making great big explosions to hear and see what needless destruction we can bring in the excitement of one great big terrifically expensive bang.

Save that 3,000,000 tons of steel metal, save that fuel oil, tens of thousands of tons of it—save the other supplies and materials—save those precious atom bombs for the day when they may be required. Turn that manpower, food, and clothes into useful creation, the repairing of America's worn-out and damaged property, and then direct it toward the new and greater building program, the making of great things for America. We can have the things we want only by working, saving, and conserving and then only if we have the materials to work with. Let us refrain from plans to destroy them in one terrific, big, expensive blast.

The Future Status of the Press

REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to H. R. 6301. That bill is now before the Judiciary Committee and hearings have been called upon it, beginning tomorrow. Because many of the Members have had their attention called to H. R. 6301 by the publishers and editors of the Nation, and because many more will hear from their newspapermen back home, I want today to outline three things: The purposes of the bill; the need for the bill; and reasons why favorable action should be taken upon the bill.

Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1946, I introduced H. R. 6301, a bill to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes. It was introduced to take the place of H. R. 4665, a bill previously introduced by me, which sought to accomplish the same purpose. The difference between the two bills is that the latter is more specific in its provisions and somewhat more limited in its scope.

H. R. 6301 proposes to exempt the activities and operations of mutual news-gathering agencies from the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act. This bill was made necessary by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, handed down on June 18, 1945, in the case of the Associated Press against the United States of America, a decision rendered as a result of the suit brought against the AP by Marshall Field's Chicago Sun. In that decision the Supreme Court declared that the AP comes within the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act, and that the AP must cease and desist from its practices which the Court considers monopolistic.

It is my understanding that Supreme Court decisions on the constitutionality of a law can only be changed by the adoption of a constitutional amendment—and some have been so changed. But decisions involving the interpretation of a statute may be changed by the passage of other statutes—and that is what I propose in H. R. 6301. It is interesting to note that this remedy was suggested or proposed in both the majority and the minority opinions in this case.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of H. R. 6301 will clarify the status of the AP and the mutual news-gathering agencies such as the UP and the INS insofar as the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act are concerned. The bill is designed to carry out the clear intent of Congress when it passed the Sherman Antitrust Act, for neither in the debate on the Sherman antitrust bill, nor in the committee report that accompanied the bill, nor yet even in the printed report of the committee hearings on the bill, can be found even the slightest indication that the Congress intended the act to apply to the AP or any other mutual news-gathering agency. In fact, I go so far as to say that not one Member of Congress who voted for the Sherman Antitrust Act even dreamed that the provisions of that act would someday be applied to our mutual news-gathering agencies.

In this connection it is interesting to note the concluding remarks that Justice Roberts made in his caustic analysis of the majority opinion in the case. He said:

> Suffice it to say that it is a novel application of the Sherman Act to treat it as legislation converting an organization, which neither restrains trade nor monopolizes it, nor holds itself out to serve the public generally, into a public utility because it furnishes a new sort of illumination—literary as contrasted with physical—by pronouncing a fiat that the interest of consumers—the reading public—not that of competing news agencies or newspaper publishers—requires equal service to all newspapers on the part of AP and that a court of equity, in the guise of an injunction, shall write the requisite regulatory statute. This is government by injunction with a vengeance.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction that when Congress passed the Sherman Antitrust Act abolishing monopoly and restraint of trade, it did not intend to include the application of its provisions to our mutual news-gathering agencies. I cannot believe that any Member of Congress who voted for the Sherman Act ever intended to tread upon this fundamental freedom which guarantees to the American people unobstructed channels for gathering and disseminating news.

It would appear, Mr. Speaker, that our Government today deliberately tries to obtain judicial decisions that are without foundation, in order to strengthen its design to harness private enterprise and individual freedom. Sometimes these decisions are based on a distortion of the intent of Congress in passing the legislation, and thus the decision has the effect of statutory law. If this sort of distortion of the law continues, the Congress may well come to a point where, regardless of the clarity with which it expresses its acts and intents, it will not know what the effects of its acts may be until some court tells it what it meant to say.

The case before us shows the dangerous present-day tendency of the Supreme Court to read into an act something clearly not intended by the legislative branch when it passed the act. In fact, the Supreme Court today even goes so far as to state in its decisions what the Congress should have meant. By doing so, the Court assumes the function of the Congress by actually providing, as Justice Roberts puts it, "Government by injunction with a vengeance." This forces Congress to pass legislation which has the effect of correcting or vetoing the strained decisions of the Supreme Court in order to protect its own legislative responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, freedom of the press is a heritage deeply imbedded in our traditions and inseparably linked to our

freedom. Down through the ages people have fought for freedom of expression. It has always been an essential part of man's eternal struggle against ignorance and oppression to criticize freely, to print freely the facts without fear of censorship, and to encourage the free flow of information among readers. Our American concept of free press means freedom of men's minds to seek the truth. So fundamental is this concept that our founding fathers saw fit to safeguard it by inserting in the Constitution itself the restriction against Congress that no law shall be passed "abridging freedom of speech or of the press."

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6301 should be passed by this Congress for the following reasons:

First. To correct the situation our mutual news-gathering agencies face today as a result of the decision of the Supreme Court.

Second. To clarify and settle for all time the future status of all mutual news-gathering agencies.

Third. To serve as a protest against the present-day tendency of the Court to read into an act something clearly not intended by the Congress when it passed that act and, if possible, to discourage future similar actions by the Court.

Mr. Speaker, I invite all Members to appear before the committee and speak either for or against the bill.

Rural America Poisoned by Pews' Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Rural America Poisoned by Pews' Press" from the issue of In Fact for May 20, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RURAL AMERICA POISONED BY PEWS' PRESS

Happy hunting ground of the powerful Pew family of Pennsylvania is rural America—the farmers and their families who comprise the "grass roots" of the United States. Selected by the Pews as their private game, these people have been subjected to an endless barrage of propaganda to turn them against labor, progressive legislation, the industrial workers, and whole areas of the country.

Undaunted by their past failures, the Pews are about to start again. America's ninth ruling family (TNEC Monograph 29) is about to launch a new campaign to win votes for reactionary Republican Congressmen this fall and pave the way for a Republican Presidential victory in 1948.

Reaching these millions is an easy matter for the billionaire Pews. They own the Nation's fourth largest magazine, the Farm Journal (circulation 2,800,000), its companion, the Farmer's Wife, and the rejuvenated Pathfinder, slick weekly rural competitor of Time and Newsweek. The concentrated resources of all three publications, in addition to the Pew trade papers, will be weapons in their new offensive.

PEWS PROMOTE FASCISM IN UNITED STATES

If fascism ever comes to the United States, it will be families like the Pews which are responsible for it. They have subsidized anti-Semitic organizations (Sentinels of the Republic), fought unions, hired thugs to shoot workers, backed native Fascists with money, fooled farmers, corrupted the press; they work behind the scenes of NAM, are chief financial backers of the Republican Party. They have been fined for black marketing, refused to help the war effort until NLRB charges against them were postponed or canceled, fought OPA, drove competitors out of business, are now indicted for antitrust violations. The record is an endless one. It is documented. It shows that, while bleating about the New Deal, Pew's oil holdings under the Roosevelt administration soared from $67,000,000 in 1932 to $147,000,000 in 1940—and have risen even higher during the war years. Most of the Pew income is derived from the Sun Oil Co. (Sunoco), in which they own 69.42 percent of the stock, and the Sun Shipbuilding Co., which they own outright, as well as scores of other holdings.

ANTI-PEW SPEECH IN CONGRESS SUPPRESSED

When J. Howard Pew, Sunoco president, made an anti-OPA speech, it hit the front pages of almost all large papers, was featured in the Pew-owned publications. When Representative MICHAEL J. BRADLEY, of Pennsylvania, answered Pew's falsehoods in Congress 2 days later, his speech was suppressed by virtually the entire United States press. The advertising thousands which Pew spends each year for Sunoco and other products paid off.

Here are some of the high lights from BRADLEY's speech. It appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 21, was available to every newspaper and wire service in the country.

"Pew is the financial whip of the Republican Party. To accomplish his ends, Mr. Pew and his family have made gifts and loans to the Republican Party estimated at $13,000,000. Pew wants what he calls freedom—freedom to exploit labor and to destroy the competitors he cannot draw into his monopoly. A verbal champion of free enterprise, J. Howard Pew is at this moment named as a co-conspirator in an antitrust suit pending before a United States court.

"Pew wants to abolish OPA so that his company can raise the price of gasoline and fuel oil to American consumers * * * It has always been true that the loudest cries of Government encroaching on free enterprise have come from those who seek to perpetuate their private stifling of free enterprise. They recognize the Government's protection of small independent business as a threat to their monopoly advantages. Mr. Pew is a leader in trying to set small business against the Government because without the Government Mr. Pew would be able to exterminate small business * * * The motive behind Pew's rabid attacks on OPA are plain. He wants unrestricted opportunity for big business to get in another boom without concern for the bust that would follow. * * *

"Again and again at the polls the American people have rejected the kind of sinister, back-room government Mr. Pew stands for * * * They will reject his party in November, too, because they know that both free enterprise and the people's welfare would be sacrificed if Pew had his way."

The foregoing items are examples of the vast amount of reactionary propaganda placed in the papers and of the suppressed news items kept out of the papers each day. It is a fact that while 99 percent of the Nation's press gives prominent play to the anti-OPA speeches, antilabor talks, antiliberal activities, only 1 percent of the press gives any space at all to the kind of speech made by Congressman BRADLEY. Nor is the flood of reactionary propaganda confined to the newspapers. Huge quantities of it are mailed into the homes of citizens each week by the same big business organizations whose pocketbooks are always open to defray the expenses of anyone with pro-Fascist poison to peddle.

The Peace Offensive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in today's New York Times, entitled "The 'Peace Offensive.'" It gives merited recognition to the services of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] at the conferences which he has attended at London and Paris and to his activities here in the Senate and elsewhere in behalf of world peace.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE "PEACE OFFENSIVE"

Secretary Byrnes has made a frank report to the American people on the disappointing accomplishments and the even more disappointing failures of the Paris Conference of Foreign Ministers. He has also outlined plans for a new "peace offensive." The wholehearted endorsement of his words by Senator VANDENBERG, the Republican spokesman on foreign affairs, is proof that this is not merely a personal, or even an Administration, policy, but a national policy that will be backed by men of both parties and, we believe, by the great majority of the Nation.

The whole emphasis on the "peace offensive," however, and the whole tenor of both Mr. Byrnes' and Mr. VANDENBERG's speeches demonstrates that we have before us the final result of the frustrations of the past year. This is the necessity of a new program, which Mr. VANDENBERG characterizes as a "positive, constructive, peace-seeking, bipartisan foreign policy for the United States," and which he regards as the most important development of the Paris Conference. The aim of that program remains what the aim of our policy has always been—a peace based upon the moralities of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations Charter which will give the nations of the world a chance to live and breathe, politically and economically. But the methods illustrate the change. For the whole drift of the new program is away from the idea of a "closed corporation" of a few Big Powers settling the world's problems secretly, arbitrarily, and according to their own hearts' desire, and a return to the democratic method of discussion, consultation, and agreement in an assembly of all interested nations, large and small, under that public scrutiny which alone can mobilize the world's conscience—the last restraint on the powerful, short of war.

This shift has been in progress ever since the failure of the Foreign Ministers Council in London last October. It reaches a new climax in Mr. Byrnes' report. For that report, while deliberately seeking to avoid

intensifying the conflict in points of view, is almost without equal in candor and blunt speaking by the head of a Foreign Office. In that respect it is in itself a powerful blow in the "peace offensive," wielding with telling effect democracy's best weapon of publicity. It not only discloses frankly all the differences that prevented agreement in Paris, and our delegation's bold effort to overcome them by entering into formal alliances to prevent a revival of German and Japanese aggression. It just as frankly reveals that agreement at Paris was prevented by one nation, Soviet Russia, which must bear responsibility for the present deadlock.

The report goes still further. It serves notice that at the next meeting of the Foreign Ministers on June 15 the United States will insist on the calling of a general peace conference for July 1 or July 15, whether the ministers reach complete agreement or not, and that if this fails the United States will submit the whole problem to the Assembly of the United Nations, meeting in New York in September, as a kind of substitute peace conference. Under the Moscow agreement of last December and the United Nations Charter, neither the general peace conference nor the United Nations Assembly possesses any power of final decision. But either of them can serve as a forum before which all nations can present their cases for the judgment of the world. Even a big power will defy such judgment only at the risk of a moral isolation.

Above all, however, Mr. Byrnes' report is a last appeal to Russia to reconsider her stand and to cooperate in the making of the peace on the principles to which she freely pledged herself. In an effort to achieve such cooperation the United States, far from trying to impose its own will on others, has already made concessions so sweeping that, in Mr. VANDENBERG'S words, further "compromises" would only multiply our hazards. We are dedicated to a peace based not on power politics, but on justice, Mr. Byrnes declares, because that is the only peace that can endure.

The Late Booth Tarkington

REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, only the other day they were making preparations in Kennebunkport, Maine, for the forty-third annual return of her most distinguished citizen, Booth Tarkington. But fate had it otherwise and our whole country mourns the loss of the leading literary figure of his generation. Maine mourns him especially. He came to us a gentleman from Indiana, but his recipe for the perfect year was "Seven months in Kennebunkport, 4 months in Indiana, and one to come and go in."

Kenneth Roberts, his neighbor who knew him best, said:

He was a great man, a great writer, a great gentleman, the kindest, gentlest, and most helpful man that ever lived.

No one who ever saw Booth Tarkington would forget him. To visit him on his old coasting schooner, the *Regina*, was a memorable experience. He lived in surroundings that evoked the past, but he never tried to escape the contemporary. He was worried about our policy of military training, about world peace, about Russia. He wrote me at length about these things. I tried to reassure him. I kept the War Department busy getting facts for him. He loved his country. He loved the truth. It was as an artist trying to tell the truth about his fellow man that he became immortal.

I know that the Members of this House will mourn with me the man who for nearly 50 years peopled our country with figures that will long outlive our flesh and blood. His creations of youth, Penrod and Willy Baxter, challenged Tom Sawyer and Huck Finn. In all he wrote some 40 novels and about 20 plays. Though he was blind for a good part of his later life, he never relinquished work.

He never followed up the political career that he began in the Indiana Legislature in 1902 and 1903, but no one spoke better than he on public issues, and in the days before Pearl Harbor his vision was as good as his eyesight was bad. Seldom has death dealt with us more harshly.

[From the New York Times of May 21, 1946]

BOOTH TARKINGTON

"Our boy, Newton Booth Tarkington * * * is long boned and needs filling out. * * * He is fine tempered, gay, and good. He is nervous, sympathetic, and affectionate, and without pretense."

With these words Booth Tarkington's father, a judge and lawyer in Indianapolis, recommended his tall, 21-year-old, convivial son to relatives at Princeton, N. J., in the late summer of 1889. Fifty-odd years afterward the son commented that he did not recognize the person referred to, but actually, of course, he had justified the fond description, as all of us know. Ever since that morning near the turn of the century when his sister—made justifiably indignant by the rejection slips that depressed the family mail—determinedly brought the manuscripts of Monsieur Beaucaire and the Gentleman from Indiana to the harassed attention of S. S. McClure, Mr. Tarkington's gaiety has brightened our books and stage and magazines; his sympathy and affection have warmed our responses to a long gallery of American portraits, strong among them the coolly impractical Penrod, William Sylvanus Baxter, Alice Adams, and Georgie Minifer.

Booth Tarkington became delighted with life when he first discovered it, when he was young. Of all the words that this stylist used so well perhaps "pleasant" and "pleasing" were his favorites. His people walked pleasant, lawn-bordered, tree-lined streets, and they were pleasing people who laughed pleased laughter. He liked them as he found them—these Americans of the Middle West—and he did not want them or their world to change. So in his fiction there will live for many fortunate years the pleasing picture of a pleasant land as a "fine-tempered, gay, and good" man enjoyed it.

Gasoline Tax in the District of Columbia

REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that I have introduced today a bill to provide an additional 1 cent tax on gasoline sold in the District of Columbia.

In 1941 I introduced the bill which was enacted into law and became section 47–1901a of the District of Columbia Code. The bill was not finally enacted in the form in which I introduced it, but it was first amended in the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives to provide only a cent increase in the then-existing gasoline tax. Later, on the floor of the House, upon my motion the bill was amended to read as I had formerly introduced it. In this form it was enacted and went to the other body, where it was again reduced to its present figure due to the fact that the war had commenced, and it was felt that no major improvements could be made on the streets of Washington during the war because of the scarcity of necessary materials.

That action has proven to have been poor judgment on the part of the Congress. The sale of gasoline fell off very materially during the war, and the income to the District of Columbia highway fund, maintained largely by this tax, was much reduced.

Now we are faced with a very large program of major street and traffic improvements in the District of Columbia, made necessary in order to handle the increasingly congested traffic conditions, and the District of Columbia does not have a backlog of funds to make it possible to do all the urgently needed work. In addition to this, in order to take advantage of the Federal Aid Act of 1944 it is necessary for the District of Columbia to match available Federal funds, or the District of Columbia does not get the Federal Government assistance. If the Senate had been as farsighted as the House of Representatives, the District of Columbia would now have the necessary funds for this purpose, and at the same time provide the necessary street improvements and traffic-relief structures. Washington, D. C., is growing rapidly and more and more streets must be opened, improved, and maintained each year.

It is evident to every Member of this House of Representatives that the District of Columbia must have more tax money from many sources. The District of Columbia is entitled to help from the Federal Government, but only when the residents of the District do their proper share in bearing the tax burden. This year witnessed the necessity for Congress to pare down the annual budget, simply because there was not sufficient tax funds to meet the needs of the District of Columbia.

This need is as great in the Highway Department as any other phase of the Washington tax problem. It is more pressing now because of the fact that during the war, when the District of Columbia should have been providing a backlog of funds to meet the repair of the District of Columbia highways the District was compelled to neglect during the emergency, we did not provide such funds. The Highway Department advises that they are facing "a great problem of financing from this fund as no other sources are available for this work."

The District of Columbia has no funds available to maintain its streets, bridges,

and other traffic structures, except those paid into the highway fund. Since the establishment of the gasoline tax in 1924, which fixed the tax at 2 cents per gallon, the Federal Government has contributed to the maintenance of streets and highways in the District of Columbia, as shown by the Poage report filed in 1941, amounts totaling $42,035,447. This was not all contributed to the then-described gasoline fund, but was contributed by payment for various improvements, and through the general fund of the District transferring various amounts to the gasoline fund, and the Federal Government in turn paying into the District general fund.

I am not adverse to the Federal Government assisting the District of Columbia in its maintenance problem in the District, but I am interested in the District bearing its fair share of the tax burden. I do not want the taxpayers in my congressional district to have to pay taxes to carry District of Columbia improvements. I want the District of Columbia to assume and carry its proper share of taxation. This 1 cent additional gasoline tax I propose will do just that. During the time when the District road fund was constantly being helped by the Federal Treasury, the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia was 2 cents while the average in the various States of the Nation was 4.4 cents per gallon. The District of Columbia was collecting less than it needed, and taxpayers in my congressional district and your congressional districts were making up the difference.

There is another consideration which enters into a fair discussion of this subject. Thousands upon thousands of people from various parts of the United States visit Washington each year. They drive their automobiles on the streets of the District of Columbia and wear them out, and then contribute less to their upkeep than they pay at home. They are willing to contribute as much to keep the streets of Washington passable as they pay to keep up their own State roads, as they know that unless they pay for such upkeep in the shape of gasoline taxes, they will have to pay it in other Federal taxes diverted to this purpose.

I hope this bill will pass without delay so that the highway officials of the District of Columbia will be supplied with sufficient funds to keep the streets of our Nation's Capital in good repair and to make major highway improvements that they so badly need to solve their urgent traffic problems. Large major improvements will have to be made in this city in the possible form of subway systems or elevated roads, or separated intersection—and where are we going to get the money to make these improvements?

Is it fair to saddle this added tax load on the real-estate property owners of the District of Columbia through increased real-estate taxes, or the Federal Government, and permit those who reap the benefit of these improvements, the automobile drivers, to pay less gasoline tax than is collected in all of the States?

The time has come when it is urgently necessary to provide sufficient money to properly maintain the streets, and erect the structures needed to solve traffic problems in our Nation's Capital, and at the same time stop the District of Columbia from mooching the maintenance of its streets from taxpayers in all of our congressional districts.

I earnestly hope every Member of the Congress will vote for an increase of 1-cent gasoline tax in the District of Columbia. I am sure our taxpaying constituents will approve of our action.

The Real Cause of Inflation Is Underproduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, we have become so accustomed to having our lives regulated by bureaus and departments that we are fearful of walking alone. If a man puts his arm in a cast and hangs it in a sling long enough, he will eventually lose the use of that arm. That is what is happening to the independence and personal initiative of many American citizens.

I believe that our Government should operate and function to protect the weak against the unscrupulous strong; however, in the process we must not permit our democratic way of life to be sold down the river and, of course, it is not necessary to do so. But if the American people are not aroused to the danger we will wake up some day and find a dictatorship in our Nation.

We have been told over and over again by Mr. Chester Bowles and Mr. Paul Porter and their departmental propagandists that the way to prevent inflation is to control prices. This is less than half the story. The real way to control prices and reduce the danger of uncontrolled inflation is to increase production.

An excellent article on this subject appeared under the title of "Inflation" in the Alameda Times-Star, published at Alameda, Calif., on February 25, 1946. It was signed by "The Hired Man," who is a regular contributor to the Times-Star.

The article follows:

In the early days of Alaska a breakfast of ham and eggs cost $25. That was inflation with a vengeance. But why? There is just one answer to this problem. The fact that ham and eggs were very scarce was the cause, and the only cause, for this outlandish price.

Just as soon as this commodity became more plentiful the price went down. It is obvious, therefore, that the only way to avoid inflation is to increase production of goods. The only way to get an increase in the production of goods is to make it worth while to produce—only by making it worth while to produce can you pay good wages.

In the past many attempts have been made to avoid or regulate the law of supply and demand. It can't be done. It is not pleasant for us to look back at the time when our own Government destroyed 6,000,000 pigs because bacon was too cheap. It did not work. While the price of bacon did go up on account of this artificial regulation, bacon was very scarce the next year.

The foundation of our American competitive system is the law of supply and demand. It counterbalances the supply of goods against the supply of buying power. If we encourage production by making it worth while to produce, the unbalance would be corrected.

To prevent inflation we must balance these two important factors. And the only way to attain a balance between these two factors is to increase the supply of goods. This is just what the many Government bureaus and the OPA have not done and refuse to do.

Inflation is buying power competing for the supply of goods—just like the ham and eggs in Alaska. Increase production and you have the supply of goods competing for the buying power.

In the name of common sense, let us increase the supply of goods and avoid inflation forever.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as I view the proposal to extend a line of credit to Great Britain over a period of 5 years with the definite understanding that purchases made by Great Britain in this country shall be so regulated as not to increase inflationary pressure for items in short supply, the three outstanding advantages to us in agreeing to the proposal are:

First. It will make possible the Bretton Woods proposals for the establishment of an international bank and the stabilization of international currencies geared to the American dollar.

Second. It will enable us to gain access to foreign markets for surplus production without engaging in a trade war to do so.

Third. It will mean the survival in Europe of the last substantial bulwark against the spread of communism.

A distinguished newspaper editor who recently visited Germany reports that the destruction in parts of Berlin and other great cities of Germany was so complete that, in his opinion, those sections may never be rebuilt. There can be no political independence here or abroad without financial independence, and in the war-devastated areas there can be no financial independence without the reconstruction of the instrumentalities of production. The establishment of an international bank and the stabilization of international currencies will be the most effective means to accomplish that purpose.

The British Empire and the 18 nations in the sterling payment area control one-half of the world's commerce. In the course of 2 years, and perhaps sooner, we will need foreign markets for surplus cotton, tobacco, wheat, apples, lard, and pork products. We will likewise eventually need foreign markets for the surplus production of machine tools, trucks, and automobiles, electrical equipment of

all kinds, office fixtures, and appliances, and numerous other items of smaller volume. Such markets will mean employment in this country for not less than 3,000,000 workers. The following letter from Hon. William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, indicates the type of cooperation that may be expected from Great Britain in that program and in the more fundamental program of combatting the type of state trading as practiced by totalitarian nations:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 14, 1946.

The Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR WILLIS: I have your letter of May 9 asking for a brief statement indicating exactly what the British have agreed to do in regard to preferences in return for the proposed loan.

To put it as concisely as possible, the British have agreed, in return for the loan, to negotiate with us for the immediate reduction and eventual elimination of their Empire preferences.

For your own information, I might explain the situation a little more fully. You recall that this Government published its "Proposals for Expansion of World Trade and Employment" on the same day that the financial agreements with Britain were signed. At the same time, in a joint statement on commercial policy the British Government expressed its full agreement with all the important points in the proposals, accepted them as a basis of discussion, and agreed to enter into early negotiations for their implementation.

In respect to preferences, the proposals suggest negotiations for the elimination of all tariff preferences. As an initial step, nations would agree that existing commitments would not prevent action on preferences, that any negotiated reductions in most-favored-nation tariffs will automatically reduce or eleminate margins of preferences and that, in any event, no new preferences will be introduced nor existing preferences increased.

Sincerely yours,

WILL CLAYTON,
Assistant Secretary.

Last night I had dinner with a Canadian and when I praised Canada for making a loan to Great Britain, which is more than one-third of the loan we propose to make, although the Canadians do not have one-tenth of our financial ability, the reply was "Well, we feel that it was our war." If the American people do not feel that they had a stake in combating the form of totalitarian government which Hitler sought to impose upon the world they do not understand why the war was fought. What boots it, may I ask, for us to spend billions of dollars and thousands of lives to prevent the world from being engulfed by one form of totalitarianism and then refuse to contribute as much as 2 weeks of the cost of that war to a program to prevent the world from being engulfed by another type of totalitarianism. The consequences of extending the proposed line of credit to Great Britain may be that the loan may never be repaid, although I believe the British people are honest and will repay if they can. The consequences of not making the loan will be the loss of our system of private enterprise through the regimentation of our economy to domestic needs, the maintenance of a huge and costly military establishment because we will be living in one world without one friend and the ultimate possibility of a future atomic war in which there will be no victor.

Newark, Ohio, Newspaperman Wins Award for Year's Best Series of Stories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a newspaper article from the Newark (Ohio) Advocate of May 18, 1946, relative to one of the reporter-photographers of my district, Bill Diehl. Bill, as he is known to all of us, is one of the outstanding reporters of this age. His alertness, integrity, and hard work have brought him this distinguished recognition, which is well deserved.

In addition to his various activities, Bill has been a true friend of the veterans, and his outstanding work in this regard is recognized, not only by the people of his community, but by the entire State of Ohio as well.

Announcement was made today that Bill Diehl, reporter-photographer for the Advocate, has been selected as the winner of one of the 1946 Headliner medals for outstanding achievement in the highly competitive journalism profession during the past year.

Diehl is 1 of 20 chosen for membership in the National Headliners' Club, with headquarters in Atlantic City, N. J., and will be enrolled in that organization at its annual "frolic" June 21-22-23 at which time the award will be formally presented.

The Advocate writer's award is for the "best news story or series among newspapers of from 15,000 to 25,000 circulation."

The 20 winners were chosen from a list of more more than 500 writers by the board of judges headed by Braton Gardner of Pennsylvania State College and including representative editors from newspapers, news syndicates, magazines and newsreels. Purpose of the Headliners is "to dig out new talent and to honor the old."

This is the first year that writers on smaller newspapers were ever considered for one of the awards which are rated as the top prize in the profession.

Diehl's series of stories began early last year when, at the Army's invitation, he visited the German prisoner of war camp at Fletcher Hospital, Cambridge. His story and pictures in the Advocate, telling of finding Nazi flags and pictures of Hitler in the PW barracks, was printed despite vigorous protest by military authorities and resulted in orders to "clean up" such conditions in all such camps in the Nation.

Next in the series came when the Advocate sent Diehl to New York to cover the arrival of the first Newark men to return from Europe after the Nazi surrender. Photos and stories from aboard the incoming troopship, at the demobilization center, and on the platform at home, greeting wives, parents and friends painted a graphic picture for Advocate readers.

Diehl's next major assignment concerned disposition of the body of a World War I veteran who died in Aspinwall Veterans' Administration hospital, Pittsburgh, and which was delivered nude to an Ohio undertaker.

His investigations and revelations resulted in an order going out from VA headquarters, after Gen. Omar Bradley had replaced General Hines, that a complete uniform must be provided whenever a veteran died in such a hospital, and providing for other major reforms.

Only a few weeks ago the Advocate sent Diehl to Washington, where he told VA's top officers of conditions at the big VA hospital at Marion, Ind., resulting in an immediate investigation and correction of these conditions. On this same trip his stories resulted in long-delayed pension payments coming through to local disabled veterans of World War II.

Currently, Diehl is covering the Dillon Dam story—the $10,000,000 "conservation-and-flood-control" project—pet of the Army engineers, which, if built, will result in 750 families losing their farms and homes.

He will accompany Melvin Mayfield, Nashport, winner of the Congressional Medal of Honor, to Washington next week and will report to Advocate readers on Mayfield's conference with President Truman when Mayfield pleads with the President to intercede and save the homes of the Dillon Dam refugees.

Real Security for Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to point out the growing need for considerate attention for a large segment of our American people. I speak of our elder citizens, most of whom have passed the prime productive years of their lives and who are entitled to special consideration for the contribution they have made to our economic and social order. Are they to be ignored when Social Security is extended, when industrial wages are raised, when increased retirement benefits are voted and when taxes are maintained at their present high rate?

Recent estimates indicate that there are some 16,000,000 American citizens aged 60 and over who today, through no particular fault of their own, are in effect adversely affecting our economy. Either because their incomes are too low or because their present meager pensions are not sufficient to meet increased living costs they are forced to hold jobs that would mean employment for younger people.

Are we not being unwise if we ignore this fact in our legislative program? It seems to me that Congress would be taking a progressive step if we passed legislation which would enable each American citizen over 60 years of age to retire from the labor market while stabilizing his income at levels adequate to insure his future security and comfort.

I have the honor to represent a district in a State that pays the highest old age pensions in the country. But even this amount, $50 per month, is not enough to properly feed, clothe and house the average citizen in anything like the comfort

to which he is entitled. In other States, where the monthly pensions are much less, we all know that squalor, human suffering and even near starvation stalks many homes.

The Committee on Ways and Means now has before it many legislative proposals, including H. R. 2230, which seeks to correct some of the evils that now exist. I do not ask this committee to legislate on the basis of sentiment but I do ask that it approach the problem in a humane and Christian-like manner. I ask that the committee give consideration to a program that will be national in scope; one that is not based on need and poverty and one that will be recognized as a matter of justice to our senior citizens and in the interest of the common good.

Tragedy of Liberalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the self-styled liberals in this body would do well to read the challenging article which appears in the current issue of Life magazine, which is included as a part of my remarks:

TRAGEDY OF LIBERALISM—BY IGNORING THE CHALLENGE OF SOVIET IMPERIALISM, UNITED STATES LIBERALS ARE DESTROYING THEIR NATION'S CHANCES OF BUILDING A PEACEFUL WORLD ORDER

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

The American liberal movement is in danger of self-destruction as the result of a bitter internal conflict over the role of the United States in the postwar world. How grave the practical results of this conflict can be is best illustrated by a recent behind-the-scenes episode of our foreign relations.

Long before the war ended the American military authorities had rightly or wrongly concluded that in the present phase of the age of the new weapons, outlying bases in the Atlantic were essential to our security until a working world organization could assure permanent peace. Of these the base most desired was that in Iceland. Accordingly last October we made an offer to the Icelandic Government for a 99-year lease on our wartime base facilities there, with the understanding that the base would be transferred to United Nations control when, in our judgment, fully satisfactory security machinery had been set up by the UN. The Icelanders are a proud and independent people. In the informal talks which followed our offer American Minister Louis G. Dreyfus, Jr. had an uphill task persuading Icelandic Premier Olafur Thors that the proposed lease would not infringe upon Icelandic sovereignty. Nevertheless the diplomatic courtship was well conducted. As a token of our friendship we undertook to support Iceland's application for membership in the UN. And by last March the outlook for an agreement with Iceland was decidedly hopeful.

Then, late in March, Secretary of Commerce Henry A. Wallace blundered onto the stage of this small but significant international drama. He gave a newspaper interview sharply condemning the presence of American troops in Iceland and stating categorically that the Soviets must naturally assume the purpose of the Iceland base was to threaten them. It mattered nothing that the sole purpose of the base was to assure American security. As a member of the Truman Cabinet, speaking presumably from official information, Wallace declared that the Soviets must regard the base as purely aggressive. Premier Thors instantly intimated that, after what Wallace had said, the Icelanders wanted no part of the proposed agreement with us.

Efforts were made to convince the nervous Icelanders that the voice of Wallace was not the voice of America and to restore the favorable atmosphere of the talks. But these efforts were defeated by the remarkable speech in which CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, echoed Wallace on the Senate floor. In April the Win the Peace Conference, held in the Commerce Department auditorium and attended by such notable congressional liberals as Senator HARLEY KILGORE and Representative HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, adopted a resolution again asserting that the American program for overseas bases was aggressive and anti-Soviet and loudly demanding the evacuation of Iceland. Almost simultaneously Premier Thors announced in Reykjavik that the Icelandic Government was no longer considering the American offer for a peacetime lease on the Iceland base.

Possibly the Icelanders will change their minds. But if they remain firm in their resolve and a time ever comes when this country needs outlying Atlantic bases, Wallace, PEPPER, and their associates are not likely to remember with pride this thing they have done. Concerning Wallace at least, one cannot doubt that he acted from the best and highest motives. Nor is it necessary to suppose that the military authorities were right in insisting upon an overseas-bases program. The point is that their plan had been accepted as the agreed policy of the American Government, approved by the President and relevant advisers. By an irresponsible intervention in a matter of great delicacy and seriousness, Wallace defeated his own Government's policy. He had a right to his opinion, but if he could not make his opinion prevail at Cabinet meetings, his only alternatives were to resign or to remain silent. That this man, so obviously patriotic and even painfully virtuous, should have chosen the only course which was plainly indefensible is a symptom of the terrible confusion which now afflicts American liberalism.

What is the nature of this confusion? Its manifestations are simple enough. The majority of liberals are so preoccupied with foreign policy that they have ceased to think constructively about the pressing problems of the domestic economy. The reason for the confusion is also simple. It is the liberal attitude toward the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has deeply stirred the liberal imagination, first by its vast experiments in social and economic planning and then by its magnificent struggle against the Wehrmacht. When the war ended, an idealized picture of the Soviet state had formed in the minds of American liberals.

Unfortunately, the tough, brilliant leaders of the Soviet state are not liberal idealists. They are realists and, unlike most liberals, they fully understand that power is the basic unit of all politics. When the war ended, they embarked upon an experiment in imperialism as bold as it was novel. In blunt truth, all the methods which were condemned most bitterly when employed by the new imperialism of Germany now began to be used to extend the sphere of Soviet domination.

Already Poland, the Baltic States, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania, are behind the iron curtain. Huge armies hold Hungary and half of Germany and Austria. Czechoslovakia and Greece are encircled, and the Soviets are frankly dragging their feet in making the European peace in order to prolong chaos and thus promote the Communist parties in other European nations. In the Middle East the Soviets are driving southward. Iran is in danger of being reduced to puppethood; Turkey and Iraq are threatened. Finally, in the Far East, the Kuriles and half of Korea are occupied, and Manchuria has been stripped and left in condition to be transformed at will into another Azerbaijan. The process still goes on. One can only admire the Soviet leaders' iron nerve and precision of execution, but one must also wonder whether they will ultimately be satisfied with less than dominion over Europe and Asia.

No such critical judgment has been possible for the American liberals, however. They have had to relate the reality of Soviet policy to the ideal picture of the Soviet Union which they cherish in their minds. Some have blamed ourselves (as Henry Wallace did), arguing that Soviet "realpolitik" can be cured by loving kindness. Others irrelevantly declare that the new Soviet imperialism is no worse than the old British imperialism or attribute Soviet foreign policy to the lustiness of a young organism, as fond mammas excuse the doing of their offspring because "boys will be boys." It is painful to hear these laborious apologetics from good men, for one has heard them before—in 1937, 1938, and 1939. Furthermore, it is tragic. For no political movement can retain its strength which fails to respond to the major challenges of its time. The major challenge of our time is the need to organize a stable, prosperous, and, above all, peaceful world. This can hardly be attempted successfully by men who will not or dare not face the facts about one of the world's two great powers. That is the tragedy of American liberalism.

But before continuing this inquiry it will probably be well to define the term "liberalism" as used in the present discussion. Some readers may already share the indignation at the connotations here given to liberalism, which was once expressed to one of your correspondents by the late Ogden L. Mills. He had been called a conservative. He asserted with some heat that he was nothing of the sort—he was a liberal and a better liberal than most, being a stanch believer in the theories of Adam Smith, Jeremy Bentham, and the other thinkers who shaped the beginnings of British nineteenth-century liberalism. But a political grouping is not like a church, with an immutable creed. Jeremy Bentham or no Jeremy Bentham, free enterprise or no free enterprise, Ogden Mills was a conservative of conservatives.

In contrast, one of your correspondents also heard Franklin Delano Roosevelt bitterly complain against the attacks upon him as a "radical." He was not a radical, he said; he was not even a liberal. He conceived of himself, rather, as a "conservative," seeking to "conserve" what was best in American society by making essential concessions to the forces of the time. As Mills harked back to Bentham, so Roosevelt also reached into British history for a comparison, claiming that his New Deal hardly differed from the repeal of the Corn Laws by the great Tory Sir Robert Peel. Peel or no Peel, Roosevelt was also talking nonsense, for he was no more conservative than Mills was liberal.

The difference between Mills and Roosevelt suggests a practical nondoctrinaire definition of liberalism. That difference was a difference in attitude toward social change. Mills thought first of the ramifying vested interests which social change invariably discommodes. He was contented with the world as he found it and, while he realized change was inevitable, he wanted change to be as slow as possible. He was a conservative. Roosevelt, on the other hand, thought first of the large group who are always slighted in any society's distribution of its loaves and fishes. He was discontented with existing order, positively liked social change and wanted it to be rapid. He was a liberal. Healthy conservatism and healthy liberalism

are both essential to the health of a free society, since both are needed to insure that desirable social changes are accomplished in a practical manner and without undue delay.

AMERICAN LIBERALISM IS ALL BUT LEADERLESS

American liberalism has now entered a period of ill health, to which the behavior of the first Truman Congress is testimony enough. What are the reasons for the decline of this movement, which dominated the political scene from 1932 until 1945? One answer was given long ago in a conversation in Tom Corcoran's office, when the New Dealers were trying to build up Robert H. Jackson as Roosevelt's successor. Then the future seemed to glow with a promise of ever-recurrent, ever-novel New Deals. But one cynic remarked, "It's no good, Tom. F. D. R. is like the upas tree in the old travelers' stories. He kills everything that shelters under him."

There was truth in that, for, while he lived, Roosevelt did the thinking for American liberalism; now that he is dead most liberals find it hard to think for themselves. He was the giant, the great figure who both gave strength to and dwarfed everyone on his side. It is now necessary to pay for his way of making his followers seem to be mere pygmies.

Certainly Roosevelt's successor was not designed to be the standard bearer of a faith. Roosevelt's White House was a place of power, where the winds of destiny blew through the corridors and one heard the voice of the future. The White House of Harry S. Truman, for all his modesty, patriotism, and good will, is more like the lounge of the Lions Club of Independence, Mo., where one is conscious chiefly of the odor of 10-cent cigars and the easy laughter evoked by the new smoking-room story. Among the liberal influences which still act upon Truman, the ghost of Roosevelt is by far the strongest; and it is often difficult for a mere shade to carry conviction when George E. Allen is also there in the excessively solid flesh, telling his jokes and knowing precisely what he wants.

To all intents and purposes the American liberal cause is all but leaderless. Its best servants are a handful of courageous administrators—Wilson Wyatt, Paul Porter, Chester Bowles, and Fred Vinson—but they are servants. For the rest there are the labor chieftains like Walter Reuther, Philip Murray, and Sidney Hillman, whose sphere is restricted by their professional attachments. There is Wallace, too otherworldly to lead. And there are the assorted Justices of the Supreme Court, who would have cast off their dark cerements, break forth from their tomb, and rise again as politicians in order to be leaders in a true sense.

As a result, in the past year the seminal center of American liberalism has passed from Washington to New York, where liberal intellectuals congregate, where the liberal press is strongest, and where the most significant organizations of the left of center, such as the CIO-PAC, have their headquarters. The consequences have not been happy, for consciousness of political realities does not flourish in New York.

THE LIBERAL HABIT OF SELF-DELUSION

Not long ago one of your correspondents was present at a discussion in which Secretary of State James F. Byrnes' patience and firmness toward the Soviets were explained away on the facile ground that the State Department was a mere haven of elegant reactionaries. A certain inconsistency between this view and the Department's Argentine policy was humbly suggested. Whereupon an ordinarily intelligent liberal female replied, with something close to a knowing leer, that she had good reason to believe that this policy was a mere mask for a secret understanding between the Department spat wearers and Colonel Peron. No one was coarse enough to mention the ample, irrefutable evidence that an understanding with Peron was in fact, at that very moment, being urgently sought not by our spat wearers but by a Soviet mission in Buenos Aires. This curious habit of self-delusion is not limited to the unappetizing type of liberal who throbs with elevated feelings in the stimulating atmosphere of the Stork Club. Innumerable able editors, publicists, labor leaders, and others of real influence in the liberal movement share it to the full. Consequently, for example, the Soviet objective in Iran was anxiously but misleadingly explained as being no more than oil, although oil had been offered to Molotov by Stettinius and Eden at Yalta more than a year before, and again offered by Bevin to Stalin when the Iran dispute threatened.

The facts and atmosphere of Soviet policy and Soviet-American relations are simply not known in New York. It is only where the business of politics is carried on that one hears of such straws in the wind as the famous conversation between Andrei Vishinsky and an American traveling with him on Mediterranean commission business. It came at the end of a fairly cheerful evening. As though deciding at last to solve a bothersome puzzle, Vishinsky suddenly inquired why the United States did not take South America. The startled American replied that we did not want South America. Vishinsky, in a rather worried way, urged that we must at least desire to establish our empire over Central America. Again the American protested that the occupation even of Central America was not part of our postwar plan. "But I can assure you," said Vishinsky, as though removing the only possible reason for this strange self-denial, "my Government would not have the slightest objection." One can imagine the horror of liberal thinkers who argue that there is no difference between our ownership of the Panama Canal and the Soviet desire for the Dardanelles, if anyone in this country took the Vishinskian view of our national interests.

It must finally be added, with all frankness, that the liberal tendency toward self-delusion is vastly increased by the singular liberal attitude toward the American Communists and fellow travelers. The horror of Red baiting is as natural as it is admirable, for the future will be dark indeed if this country ever indulges in another orgy of violence and suppression of liberties such as we experienced under Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer. The Communists have an entire right to hold and to express any views they choose. But there is all the difference in the world between stoutly defending that right and being so fearful of an honest assessment of the Communist position that mentioning the word "Communist" comes close to being a breach of etiquette.

In truth, self-delusion is at the very heart of the tragedy of American liberalism. One cannot help but wonder whether this self-delusion would have been practiced if Roosevelt, who was both a great leader and a great realist, had kept his life and health. During his last year, for example, Roosevelt let those close to him know that his concessions to the Soviet Union were a wartime expedient which would be abandoned for a firmer policy when the war ended. While he still lived, Roosevelt was following a Polish policy which plainly foreshadowed a change in this direction. Firmness, in short, was one aspect of Roosevelt's postwar plan. Another was indicated by his constant, strong insistence on this country's responsibility to use its great wealth to rebuild the devastated areas and assist the backward nations.

Roosevelt fully understood that both Germany and Russia were ruthless police states but believed you could do business with Russia where you could not with Germany because the basic concept of nazism was barbaric while the basic concept of sovietism is the purpose to improve the lot of all men. But Roosevelt also knew and said what the liberals do not know: that appeasement is always wrong, in whatever connection, since it always eventually results in a situation where you must fight or knuckle under forever. He knew and said that wars were averted not by weakness and conciliation but by firmness and strength. Would this man, who led the United States into the most terrible war in history to prevent the domination of Europe and Asia by two powers, have been complacent before the possibility that one power alone would reach this position of unchallengeable predominance?

A MINIMUM PROGRAM FOR LIBERALS

This does not mean that Roosevelt ever considered war with the Soviet Union or would have done so now. On the contrary, he was convinced to the end of his life that by plain speaking with Stalin and by firmness a sound working relationship with the Soviet Union could be established. It is useless to speculate on what the details of Roosevelt's policy might have been today. One can only say that there is a fine Roosevelt ring to the policy which, it is known, Secretary of State James F. Byrnes would now like to pursue. He is pursuing it only in part because he cannot get the tools for the job—the military strength in being, the relative freedom to use our economic resources as an instrument of policy and the public and congressional support for decisive action. Yet a tentative outline of the ideal policy is certainly worth study. It can be given as follows:

1. All-out support for the United Nations as a working world organization capable of providing practical solutions of world problems.

2. Internationalization of the terrible new weapons under UN control and sponsorship of sound measures of disarmament under UN direction.

3. Greater firmness in all dealings with the Soviet Union in order to bring to a final halt the process of Soviet expansion.

4. The broadest effort of relief and reconstruction all over the world. This both serves humanitarian ends and removes the conditions which now actually tempt the Soviets to imperialist adventures. Famine and poverty, feudalism, and economic chaos create political vacuums. Short of war, no display of American firmness can permanently halt the Soviets' onward march as long as conditions everywhere constitute an open invitation to the masters of the Kremlin. Nor is it enough to offer a few billions in loans to selected good risks. There must be much larger loans. There must be far more generous relief. And there must be many more programs like the Yangtze Dam, which would give 100,000,000 Chinese something like a decent life, or the Jordan Valley Authority, which should end the conflict between Jew and Arab by providing plenty for them both.

Certainly every plan for employment of American economic resources abroad would have to be scrutinized and judged on its merits. But the broad concepts set down above surely constitute the ideal program of the American policymakers. It is worth emphasizing again that the underlying thought is not to risk war with the Soviet Union but to remove the danger of war. The object, in short, is both to deflect Soviet policy and to improve world conditions so that the United States and the Soviet Union can live at peace together without the terrible mutual suspicion, the deepening division between Russia and the West, which now mark all our relations. Confronted with such a program, the astute leaders of the Soviet state would understand their inability to compete and would develop a new policy of progress by internal development and equal partnership in the United Nations. And thus, eventually, time would remove suspicion and division, and peace would be assured at last.

The tragedy of American liberalism may well be the tragedy of the United States for a very simple reason. The foregoing is a

minimum program. And it is essentially a liberal program. American conservatives will not insist upon American acceptance of such huge responsibilities. You do not beat the drum for Yangtze dams and Jordan Valley Authorities if you have only just reconciled yourself to the TVA. It is, therefore, the liberals who must speak out. But nations rarely act from pure humanitarian motives. The American people, suspicious even of the British loan, will never shoulder far greater responsibilities unless they are convinced that the alternatives are deeply dangerous to them. That special conviction of our danger can only be conveyed by men who have faced up realistically to the nature of the Soviet-American competition. The liberals have not taken that plunge and thus the liberals who must speak out, cannot carry conviction. The whole Nation is whipsawed, as it were, by the liberal tragedy.

That is one side of the medal. The other side, on which one may read the future of American conservatism, is no less discouraging. For the attraction of the extremists for the moderates is just as strong on the political right as on the political left. Already one hears more and more good American burghers talking the poisonous drivel of antisemitism. Already one hears more and more discussions of the labor movement by formerly reasonable men who now use the language of Colonel McCormick and Representative JOHN RANKIN. What is stranger still, one also hears, more and more often, the absolute isolationism of the Patterson-McCormick press. What does it mean, coming from these men who can hardly enjoy a Soviet triumph? One cannot avoid the suspicion that it implies subconscious acceptance of the Vishinskian analysis and anticipation of an ultimate deal with Moscow under which each of the two great powers will delineate its area and reduce to enslaved dependency all other, weaker peoples within its imperial sphere.

Let no American liberal deceive himself. It is not the left which will gain strength if the march of Soviet imperialism is not halted. It is not the liberals who will then acquire followers if they continue to publish to all and sundry the extent of their self-delusion. In the spasm of terror which will seize this country, if we awaken one morning with the sudden sensation of encirclement, it is the right—the very extreme right—which is most likely to gain the victory. If that time ever comes it will be as detestable to honest conservatives as to honest liberals. A friend well said to Henry Wallace, after one of his pro-Soviet speeches, "Henry, has it ever occurred to you that you're taking a big risk? You're talking the language of Chamberlain and Simon. If you're wrong about Soviet intentions, won't you and your friends do to American liberalism what Chamberlain and Simon did to the British Conservative Party?" Very briefly, that gave him pause.

War Expenditures for the United States, Great Britain, France, Russia, and China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter and attached memorandum supplying certain data relative to total and per capita war expenditures for the United States and certain of its allies, which I have received from the Treasury Department.

There being no objection, the letter and enclosure were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
FISCAL SERVICE,
Washington, May 1, 1946.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is in further reply to your letter of March 30, 1946, in which you requested data on total and per capita war expenditures for the United States, Great Britain, France, Russia, and China.

The attached table presents the data you requested for all countries except China. Official data available for China are very fragmentary and offer little basis for computing the expenditures which have been made for war purposes.

The table has been computed both in terms of the local currencies of the countries listed and converted into dollars at the official exchange rates which obtained throughout the war.

The figures in the attached table do not present accurate estimates of comparative war expenditure, since the official exchange rates may be far from reflecting the parity of internal purchasing power between the two currencies. It should be noted in addition that a greater proportion of the war effort may be expressed in monetary terms in some countries than in others. For example, the pay of the armed forces of the United States was substantially higher than that of other countries.

It should also be noted that the expenditures for the United Kingdom do not include those for the rest of the British Empire, and that those for France do not include expenditures made by the Free French forces and the territories controlled by them. In addition, the costs of destruction and damages to property (for which the countries concerned will be paying for years to come) are not included.

I am glad to have had this opportunity to be of assistance to you.

Very truly yours,

E. F. BARTELT,
Fiscal Assistant Secretary.

Estimated total and per capita war expenditures of the United States, United Kingdom, France, and Russia

Country	Total war expenditures (billions)		Population (millions)	Per capita war expenditures	
	Local currency	Dollar equivalent		Local currency	Dollar equivalent
United States	$339 [1]	----------	[2] 140	$2,431	----------
United Kingdom	£28 [3]	($113)	[4] 48	£582	($2,351)
France	Francs 1,227 [5]	(25)	[6] 40	Francs 30,446	(613)
Russia	Rubles 676 [7]	(128)	[8] 193	Rubles 3,508	(662)

[1] Fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, to 1946, inclusive. 1946 figures are estimates.
[2] July 1, 1945, estimate.
[3] Fiscal years ending Mar. 31, 1940, to 1946, inclusive. 1946 figures are estimates. Pounds converted at $4.03.
[4] 1941 estimate.
[5] Fiscal years ending Dec. 31, 1939, to 1945, inclusive. The total is based on yearly provisional results or estimates and is composed of (1) national defense expenditures for 1939, the first 6 months of 1940, and the year 1945; and (2) occupation charges for the last 6 months of 1940 and the period 1941 to 1944, inclusive. Francs converted at $0.02.
[6] 1944 estimate; includes 2,560,000 absent mainly as prisoners and deportees.
[7] Fiscal years ending Dec. 31, 1939, to 1945, inclusive. The total is based on yearly provisional results or estimates. In addition to budgeted expenditures for "Defense" additional amounts were expended for "National economy" under which all expenditures were for war purposes during the 5-year period 1940-45. These latter allocations totaled 29.7 billion dollars for the 3 years of this 5-year period for which information is available. Such allocations are in fact reflected in the United States, United Kingdom, and French estimates. Rubles converted at $0.189.
[8] 1939 estimates; includes 1939 estimates of population of territories acquired in 1939 and 1940.

Sources: United States: Population—Bureau of the Census. War expenditures—the Budget of the U. S. Government for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1947. United Kingdom: Population—Whitaker's Almanack, 1945. War expenditures—Finance Accounts of the United Kingdom. France: Population and war expenditures—Statistical Yearbook of the League of Nations, 1942-44, except war expenditures for 1945, which are from the League of Nations Monthly Bulletin of Statistics, September 1945. Russia: Population and war expenditures—Statistical Yearbook of the League of Nations, 1942-44, except war expenditures for 1939, which are from the League of Nations Monthly Bulletin of Statistics, September 1945.

Terminal Leave Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I strongly favor the early enactment of H. R. 4051 which simply extends to enlisted men of the armed services the same rights to annual leave now enjoyed by officers, or pay for accumulated leave not taken at the time of discharge from the service.

Congress has long since recognized the principle of granting annual leave to civilian Federal employees. Industry recognizes the same right to its employees. Certainly the enlisted men of the armed services, millions of whom have faced the stress and strain of armed combat, should be extended the same right.

Every idea of equity and justice demands that this bill be enacted. Millions of the men who have served in the armed services during the past 6 years were forced to leave good-paying positions and accept the low pay of enlisted men regardless of their domestic responsibilities. They spent weeks and months of arduous training and then were shipped overseas to foreign lands to defend the interests of our country. They earned the right to vacations the hard way. If they were honorably discharged from the military service before vacations were granted to them, then the moral obligation rests upon a grateful Nation to pay them the equivalent in cash.

Mr. Speaker, this bill simply gives legal recognition to a moral obligation, and I strongly urge that it be speedily enacted into law.

Importation of Watch Movements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WAGNER. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the memorandum exchanged between Switzerland and the United States Government, concerning the importation of watch movements and the assembling of watches in this country. I feel that the agreement reached is just and fair and equitable to all parties concerned.

Attempts have been made to force the Swiss Government to impose upon itself an uneconomic quota. We have approached the time when, in the interest of international commerce, trade irritations like quotas and embargoes must be eliminated. Recently, the State Department announced the setting up of an international trade association, inviting all nations to join to the end that trade might be made freer and barriers reduced. Any Swiss watch quota would be inconsistent with that policy.

The text of the agreement follows:

LEGATION OF SWITZERLAND,
Washington, D. C.

The Legation of Switzerland wishes to refer to recent conversations which have taken place between officials of the Governments of the United States and Switzerland in regard to a number of problems affecting the importation into the United States of Swiss watches, watch movements and parts, watchmaking machinery, and jewel bearings.

Reference was made in these conversations to the fact that the United States watch manufacturing industry had during the last few years been converted largely to war production, and in contrast to many other industries similarly converted, the absence of American production had been largely compensated by imports of Swiss watches. The fact that as large an accumulated civilian demand did not exist in the case of watches as in other commodities, therefore, appeared likely to create certain difficulties for the American watch manufacturing industry during its period of reconversion to civilian production. It was also recognized that, by the terms of the trade agreement between the United States and Switzerland concluded in 1936, no quantitative limitations were to be placed by the United States on the importation of watches and watch movements into the United States. It was further recognized that this provision of the trade agreement should not be allowed to operate in a manner to interfere with the reconversion of the United States watch manufacturing industry. Taking into account such considerations as the foregoing, the Legation of Switzerland makes the declarations set forth below:

1. The Swiss Government is willing to effect a scheduling of the exports of watches and watch movements during the period of the reconversion of the United States watch manufacturing industry to civilian production (which is estimated for that purpose to end March 31, 1947) so that the volume of watches and watch movements reaching the United States shall not be such as to interfere with the ready marketing in the United States of the products of the American watch industry.

2. In order to facilitate such scheduling described in paragraph 1, above, the Swiss Government further declares itself prepared to:

(a) Initiate immediately such measures as are available to it to channel the shipment of watches and watch movements from Switzerland directly to the United States and to prevent their indirect shipment to the United States.

(b) Initiate immediately such measures as may be necessary to assure that direct shipment of watches and watch movements from Switzerland to the United States during 1946 shall not exceed the amount of direct exports in 1945. The limitation is to become effective retroactively to January 1, 1946. The volume of the direct shipments during the first three months of 1947 shall be calculated pro rata temporis.

3. The two Governments will review the question of the volume of imports of Swiss watches and watch movements from time to time as the Government of the United States or the Swiss Government may deem necessary. If at any time during the reconversion period satisfactory evidence appears that the United States watch industry is finding difficulty in marketing its products, the Government of Switzerland declares itself prepared, in addition to the control of exports contemplated by paragraph 2 above, to effect a further reduction in the volume of exports of watches and watch movements from Switzerland to the United States to an extent to be agreed upon between the two Governments.

Furthermore, the Swiss Government takes cognizance of the opinion expressed by officials of the Government of the United States that a joint review shall be made whenever the imports in any 3-month period during 1946 exceed the average direct imports during a similar period of the years 1942–45, inclusive, or whenever the volume of imports with respect to the several United States import classifications greatly deviates in any such period from the general pattern established during the last decade, and sees no objection to such procedure.

4. The Swiss Government will use its good offices to expedite the issuance of export permits by the Swiss Watch Chamber and other watch associations for watch parts and for jewel bearings to be used in the manufacture of watches in the United States, according to the autonomous internal regulations of the Swiss Government. The Swiss Government also will use its good offices to secure the issuance of export licenses to supply the American watch manufacturing industry with the watchmaking machinery which it is now endeavoring to purchase in Switzerland and will consider sympathetically the granting of export licenses for such further watchmaking machinery as United States watch manufacturers may desire to purchase in Switzerland. The Swiss Legation is looking forward to receiving from the Department of State the list of machines which the American watch manufacturing industry is now desirous of obtaining in Switzerland.

The foregoing declarations will be in effect until March 31, 1947.

AIDE-MEMOIRE

The Government of the United States appreciates the declaration made by the Legation of Switzerland in its aide-memoire of April 22, 1946, concerning the intentions of the Government of Switzerland with respect to the exportation of watches and watch movements, watch parts, watchmaking machinery and jewel bearings to the United States during the period from January 1, 1946, to March 31, 1947.

The Government of the United States believes that the adoption and execution of these measures by the Government of Switzerland will contribute materially to the solution of problems confronting the American watch industry in its period of reconversion to civilian production and will serve, at the same time, to assure the American watch importers and assemblers as well as the retail jewelers and consumers of an adequate supply of watches.

The Department of State, in this connection, will transmit to the Legation of Switzerland in the very near future the lists referred to in paragraph four of the aide-memoire.

Dangerous Technicality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, the ethical aspirations of House Joint Resolution 305 are so high I am reluctant to raise a question as to its method of attempting to carry them out. But I feel it my duty to do so.

The resolution is entitled "Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, and authorizing an appropriation therefor."

The resolution authorizes the President to accept for the United States membership in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, which I will refer to as UNESCO. Upon the passage of the resolution, and the carrying out by the President of the authority given him thereby, the United States of America becomes a member of the Organization above named, and, as such member, is certainly morally and probably legally bound by the provisions of the constitution of UNESCO, which constitution is set forth in detail in the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, report No. 1927. Sections 1 and 2 of article IX of that constitution read as follows:

1. The budget shall be administered by the Organization.

2. The general conference shall approve and give final effect to the budget and to the apportionment of financial responsibility among the states members of the Organization subject to such arrangement with the United Nations as may be provided in the agreement to be entered into pursuant to article X.

Mr. Speaker, that is quite different language than if the section gave only authority to the conference to determine the equitable proportion of the expenses which each member ought to pay and would be asked to pay.

It is perfectly clear that in joining UNESCO this Congress is bound to furnish the funds determined by the General Conference to be our portion, whether that action be through House Joint Resolution 305 or a subsequent appropriation bill, or the two together. If it does not do so, it is not living up to the agreement which it has authorized the President to make, and thereby might be in the position of having cast a serious reflection upon its own sincerity and

the national integrity of the United States. Yet when it does live up to its obligations and makes the appropriations to meet the determination of the General Conference, this Congress has, to every intent and purpose, delegated the authority to control the amount of those appropriations, which can only be extracted from the taxpayers of the United States.

It is no answer to say that we will go through the constitutional motions of passing formal appropriations bills or such other acts as may be necessary to raise the revenue because, as I have said before, if we do not do it we have violated the obligations we assumed as a member of UNESCO, and if we do it we are merely giving effect to a previous surrender of our authority and responsibility to the action of a majority in the General Conference which will not only be composed of persons never elected or selected in any way by the people of the United States but who are not even American citizens or subject to the jurisdiction of this Congress.

Whether such a subterfuge be technically constitutional or not, or whether we have previously resorted to the same tactics, makes no difference. The practice, in my opinion, is dangerous, and I cannot admit that making a mistake once is any sound argument for repeating it over and over again.

This procedure, Mr. Speaker, may, to some, have the sweet aroma of technical adherence to our constitutional power, but to me it has the unpleasant stench of technical violation of our constitutional responsibility.

Uncle Sam seems to have become a "joiner." His intentions are unquestionably good. The purposes of the organizations he is joining may be lofty and worthy, but the methods he is using to fix the financial responsibility for his dues and obligations in those organizations are extremely dubious.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I regret that I feel I must vote against House Joint Resolution 305.

To Right an Injustice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of May 20, 1946:

TO RIGHT AN INJUSTICE

An odd blunder by Congress in passing the 1942 amendment to the Retirement Act has resulted in steadily increasing hardship for several thousand faithful former Government employees. Through an oversight they are not entitled to share in the liberalized benefits provided under the amendment, but must still get along on pensions which in some cases are no more than a small fraction of the salaries they received as active workers.

The 1942 amendment increased retirement annuities and graded them above the minimum figure according to the contributions deducted from annual salaries. Previously employees in the higher brackets, though they made larger payments, received no greater annuity than the $1,200 a year assured to all employees. But in voting the increased benefits Congress forgot to insert the usual retroactive clause. Only those who retired after January 24, 1942, receive any increase. The aging and forgotten group who retired before that date have been striving now to make ends meet through 4 years of rising prices. The Senate has twice voted unanimously to rectify this injustice, but the House so far has done nothing. Now there are assurances that our Representatives, too, are ready and willing to act. They should perform their obvious duty in this matter.

Go for Broke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial in the Delta Democrat-Times, Greenville, Miss., August 27, 1945, written by Maj. Hodding Carter, editor, who was recently awarded the 1945 Pulitzer Prize on said editorial for editorial writing on religious and racial tolerance as exemplified in said editorial, as follows, to wit:

"GO FOR BROKE"

Company D of the One Hundred and Sixty-eighth Regiment which is stationed in Leghorn, Italy, is composed altogether of white troops, some from the East, some from the South, some from the Midwest and the west coast.

Company D made an unusual promise earlier this month. The promise was in the form of a communication to their fellow Americans of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Infantry Regiment and the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion, whose motto is "Go for Broke," and it was subscribed to unanimously by the officers and men of Company D.

In brief, the communication pledged the help of Company D in convincing the folks back home that "you are fully deserving all the privileges with which we ourselves are bestowed."

The soldiers to whom that promise was made are Japanese-Americans. In all of the United States Army, no troops have chalked up a better combat record. Their record is so good that these Nisei were selected by Gen. Francis H. Oxx, commander of the military area in which they are stationed, to lead the final victory parade. So they marched, 3,000 strong, at the head of thousands of other Americans, their battle flag with three Presidential unit-citation streamers floating above them, their commander, a Wisconsin white colonel, leading them.

Some of these Nisei must have been thinking of those soul-shaking days of last October, when they spearheaded the attacks that opened the Vosges Mountain doorway to Strasbourg. Some of them were probably remembering how they, on another bloody day, had snatched the Thirty-sixth Division's lost battalion of Texans from encircling Germans. And many of them were bearing scars from those two engagements which alone had cost the Nisei boys from Hawaii and the west coast 2,300 casualties.

Perhaps these yellow-skinned Americans, to whose Japanese kinsmen we have administered a terrific and long overdue defeat, were holding their heads a little higher because of the pledge of their white fellow-soldiers and fellow-Americans of Company D. Perhaps when they gazed at their combat flag, the motto, "Go for Broke," emblazoned thereon took on a different meaning. "Go for Broke" is the Hawaiian-Japanese slang expression for shooting the works in a dice game.

The loyal Nisei have shot the works. From the beginning of the war, they have been on trial, in and out of uniform, in Army camps and relocation centers, as combat troops in Europe and as front-line interrogators, propagandists, and combat intelligence personnel in the Pacific where their capture meant prolonged and hideous torture. And even yet they have not satisfied their critics.

It is so easy for a dominant race to explain good or evil, patriotism or treachery, courage or cowardice in terms of skin color. So easy and so tragically wrong. Too many have committed that wrong against the loyal Nisei, who by the thousands have proved themselves good Americans, even while others of us, by our actions against them, have shown ourselves to be bad Americans. Nor is the end of this misconception in sight. Those Japanese-American soldiers, who paraded at Leghorn in commemoration of the defeat of the nation from which their fathers came, will meet other enemies, other obstacles as forbidding as those of war. A lot of people will begin saying, as soon as these boys take off their uniforms, that "a Jap is a Jap," and that the Nisei deserve no consideration. A majority won't say or believe this, but an active minority can have its way against an apathetic majority.

It seems to us that the Nisei slogan of "Go for Broke" could be adopted by all Americans of good will in the days ahead. We've got to shoot the works in a fight for tolerance. Those boys of Company D point the way.

Statistical Data for United States and Allied Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter received by me from Brig. Gen. Miles Reber, giving certain information of a statistical nature regarding United States and Allied forces.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 8, 1946.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: This is in further reply to your letter of March 30 asking for statistical data of the United States and Allied forces.

I am very pleased to furnish the following information, which I shall outline as you have presented your questions.

1. The total United States, British, Russian, and Chinese forces mobilized during the war were:

United States	10,900,000
British Empire	8,700,000
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	22,500,000
China	5,900,000

2. The total United States, British, and other Allied forces deployed in Western Europe, the Mediterranean, Southeast Asia, and South Pacific theaters were as follows:

United States:	
Western Europe	3,059,000
Mediterranean	[1] 490,000
Pacific-CBI	[2] 1,691,000
British Empire:	
Western Europe	2,000,000
Mediterranean	1,425,000
Pacific-CBI	2,495,000
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:	
Western Europe	0
Mediterranean	0
Pacific-CBI	0
China:	
Western Europe	0
Mediterranean	0
Pacific-CBI	3,680,000
France:	
Western Europe	3,000,000
Mediterranean	432,000
Pacific-CBI	0

[1] United States also had 32,000 troops in Africa and the Middle East, 18,000 in the Persian Gulf Command, and 22,000 in North Atlantic bases and Canada.

[2] The strength in the Pacific is not broken down into Southeast Asia and South Pacific.

3. The total United States and Allied forces deployed in central and western Pacific campaigns against Japan: See above, Pacific and CBI.

4. The total Russian forces deployed against Germany: 17,500,000.

5. The total Russian forces deployed against Japan: 1,500,000.

6. The total Chinese forces deployed against Japan: 3,750,000.

7. The total United States, British Empire, Russian, French, and Chinese casualties:

United States	948,418
British Empire	475,000
United Soviet Socialist Republic	10,000,000
China	2,200,000
France	450,000

8. Total enemy prisoners captured by the United States, British Empire, Russian, French, and Chinese forces. Also estimates of total casualties inflicted on enemy by United States, British Empire, Russian, French, and Chinese forces:

Total enemy prisoners captured to April 1, 1945.

Germans:	
United States	1,022,000
Britain-Russia-France	1,200,000

Germans captured April 1 to May 10, 1945:

United States	4,269,000
Britain-Russia-France	2,350,000
Total Italians captured:	
United States	44,000
Britain-Russia-France	300,000

Total Japanese captured by all Allied forces: 35,000.

Total enemy battle losses:

Germans	3,350,000
Japanese	1,800,000

9. Total tonnage of bombs dropped on German targets by the AAF and RAF respectively:

AAF	1,554,463
RAF	1,235,609

10. Total tonnage of bombs dropped on Japanese targets by the AAF and RAF:

AAF	502,781
RAF	Figure not available

11. The total aircraft lost and total aircraft destroyed by AAF, RAF, and U. S. S. R.:

AAF losses	41,575
RAF losses	22,010
USSR losses	50,000
Enemy aircraft destroyed (no breakdown)	21,622

NOTE.—75,000 Polish troops, trained and equipped by the western Allies, fought in western European theater; 150,000 Polish troops, also trained and equipped by the western Allies, fought in the Mediterranean theater.

I trust the above data will provide you with the answers you have desired. I realize that some of the material is not in the exact form you requested it, but I have furnished you with the best information in the War Department.

Sincerely yours,

MILES REBER,
Brigadier General, GSC Deputy Chief, Legislative and Liaison Division.

Let's Get the Houses Built

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday afternoon, May 18, in New York City, 3,000 veterans and their friends gathered on the drill floor of the spacious armory of the famous Sixty-ninth Regiment of New York to demonstrate their interest in and espousal of the veterans' housing bill recently passed by the Congress. The gathering sponsored by the American Legion of New York County was participated in by some 50 posts of the American Legion of that county, besides having official representation from the American Legion of the other four counties within New York City.

The guest speaker was the distinguished Member of the House from Texas, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, who was enthusiastically hailed as the father of veterans' housing.

Among those present were Members of Congress from New York City, all of whom had voted for the Patman housing bill.

Under the unanimous consent granted me, I take pleasure in including in my remarks the address made by Representative PATMAN on that occasion:

Mr. Chairman, congressional colleagues, fellow Legionnaires, and guests, when the President signs the administration housing bill next week he will issue the fighting orders for a military operation the like of which the world has never seen. As all of us know, too well, a military order usually means burning and death and destruction. This unique order, though born out of war, calls for the construction of millions of homes in a Nation of peace.

We have on this platform many Members of Congress from New York, all of whom were strong and effective supporters of the veterans' emergency housing program. I am very glad, indeed, to work shoulder or shoulder with them.

In my opinion, no act of the Seventy-ninth Congress will be of more benefit toward the progress of the American people than the President's housing bill.

No better phrase could be chosen to describe this program than your own "Operation Housing," and I, personally, urge its adoption to cover the whole plan of our Nation-wide effort to provide shelter for our returning veterans. With your permission, I will use it in that particular sense today.

During recent months there has been much propaganda and bitter discussion on the question of housing. But in keeping with the finest traditions of our form of government, out of the fire and fury of controversy and debate, the furnace of democracy, a good law has been forged.

It is true that a good deal of time has elapsed since last November 20, the day on which I had the honor to introduce that particular legislation into the House of Representatives, but that time has been well spent. As I said when the bill first came up for consideration, it contained many rough spots which needed ironing out, and I stood completely ready to accept any amendments which might offer a better or more practical way of providing housing for our veterans.

In these ensuing months, the measure has been continually hammered and polished. Defects have been found and torn out. Misunderstandings have been corrected, until now we have a sound, workable legislative foundation for the execution of "operation housing."

The orders which Congress has written provide for a Housing Expediter to be Chief of Staff of "operation housing." He has broad powers to take the necessary steps to gear government and industry into a high-speed machine to produce the greatest possible number of houses in the shortest possible space of time. His powers were designed along the lines of those given to the Rubber Expediter during the war. This authority will permit the Expediter to attack the housing crisis with the same speed and dispatch, with the same methods by which we so successfully met the production problems occasioned by the conflict.

The time limit set for the task under the law is December 31, 1947. Therefore, these extraordinary powers granted to the Expediter will not remain too long in the hands of one man. Yet this time limit should be sufficient to meet the problems involved.

The objective of "operation housing" is to build 2,700,000 houses during these 18 months—more than three times the number of houses this Nation has ever built before in the same period of time. To accomplish this tremendous goal, as we accomplished similar goals in the production of airplanes, tanks, and guns during the war, there can be no little plans—no business-as-usual. Drastic steps must be taken. The law provides for these.

It gives veterans first priority on all new shelter being built. It channels supplies of building materials that are available into the lower cost homes that veterans can afford to buy. It provides for liberalization of loan guarantees so that financing is removed as an obstacle to home construction.

But, even with these steps, the goal cannot be met by conventional methods of building. The know-how of mass production must be utilized. To do this, the bill permits the setting up of a system to protect manufacturers of prefabricated houses from undue loss by guaranteeing them a market. Under this procedure, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will purchase up to 20 percent of the output of a manufacturer if his homes are not sold on the open market. In today's situation, I do not think it will be necessary for the Government to purchase many of these homes. This guaranteed market should provide the necessary incentive to permit establishment of the prefabricated housing industry on a true volume production basis. It should go far in helping introduce new materials into our housing—

towards modernizing our antiquated building codes—toward opening new fields of enterprise for all builders—and, finally, as the fruits of mass production, toward providing more houses at less cost than the Nation has ever had.

The biggest obstacle which "operation housing" must overcome is the question of materials. The normal peacetime productive capacity of the building industry is insufficient to produce the brick and tile and lumber needed to accomplish our housing task, just as, during the war, our production capacities of steel and aluminum and rubber were insufficient to meet the demands of war. So we propose to adopt the same methods used so successfully to increase manufacture of metals, to spur production of building materials now.

It is more costly for a plant to run the three shifts needed to meet these production goals in building materials, and less profitable than a one-shift operation. So the Congress saw fit to provide $400,000,000 to be used as premium payments to increase production. The President has described this provision as the heart of the building program. Unquestionably it will be a major factor in enabling all our productive facilities—little mills as well as big ones—to go into full capacity operation to make the materials that the country so desperately needs.

By the use of these subsidy payments to cover a producer's increased costs, prices of building materials can be kept to a lower level, thus avoiding the inflationary spiral of prices which could so easily bring disaster to the builder, as well as the buyer.

Naturally, I, personally, would have liked to have seen ceiling prices set on existing homes to keep down speculation. Since that provision has not been included, our one hope is that "operation housing" can so increase the production of building materials that new homes will be built rapidly enough and at low enough prices to save the situation before existing houses skyrocket so high in price that the great mass of the people cannot buy them.

This is the bill—the order—which Congress has approved and the President will doubtless sign. As Mr. Wilson Wyatt, the Housing Expediter, said: "This throws the veterans' housing program into high gear." So those are your orders, giving the plan of battle and the objective to be taken in "operation housing."

Your chief of staff, Commander Wyatt, if I may call him that, already is moving swiftly to organize the campaign. This week he has called a staff meeting with the leading producers of brick, cast iron soil pipe, plywood, pig iron, and roofing— the Service of Supply for the operation. Though buffeted and weary from the colossal task of supplying our Armies during the war, these men are being called upon to make an equally great effort of production to put the country on a prosperous peacetime footing. I think we can feel quite confident that these patriots, who contributed so great a share toward victory, will meet this new call of duty and provide the material to build the homes.

The second step Commander Wyatt took this week was to set up a Veterans' Advisory Council composed of representatives of the five veterans' organizations. The Legion has two representatives on that council—National Commander John Stelle and Paul H. Griffith.

Now we come to the heart of the problem—the striking force which is needed to spearhead this attack on a national crisis. I have a plan to offer—a suggestion that through this council you veterans, yourselves, can be the vital spark plug that will make this program a precedent-shattering success.

The American Legion, as the oldest and strongest of all the veterans' organizations, having veterans of World War II as members, has an opportunity and a responsibility in "operation housing"—a responsibility imposed on it by the high ideals and integrity which has made it such a patent force in American life in the years since that first armistice was signed on a chill November day at Campiegne forest. American Legion posts are well established in every hamlet and city and town across the width and breadth of the land. Its members are the leaders of the community. Its forces already are mobilized for an operation of this nature. These far-spread operating units have it within their power to carry out a program which would go far toward guaranteeing the success of the Nation's efforts to provide decent homes for our returning servicemen.

Under the Government's present plans, mayors committees are being set up in each community to handle the housing problem on the local level. As the first attack in "operation housing" you veterans can get behind these local mayors committees. You can make sure that there is adequate veteran representation upon each local committee. Men of leadership and energy.

One of the major problems that will develop as "operation housing" moves into its full program is to find land available on which to erect these homes. The second phase of the attack would be to help procure these home sites. In many instances, municipal authorities can be persuaded to make tax-delinquent land available for construction of veterans' homes. New areas and suburban districts can be developed through cooperation between industry and Government in the installation of water and power facilities.

Veterans can secure the modification of zoning ordinances to make more land available.

The third major attack must be made on the scarcity of manpower to build the homes. Through local organizations, planned efforts can be made to persuade ex-war workers and returning veterans to turn to the building trades for livelihood. Already many building trades unions have indicated that they will cooperate with the housing program by liberalizing apprentice training rules so that more men can be trained more swiftly to increase the size of the building force.

Fourth. Adequate veteran referral services must be set up in local communities. Listing bureaus, whose people will take it upon themselves to search out possible vacancies, and who will endeavor to bring together the home-seeking veteran and a place where he can stay.

Fifth. There is a tremendous need for modernization of building codes to put them in step with modern methods of construction—to enable cities to take advantage of scientific developments in housing which will make for lighter, cleaner, more beautiful homes at lower cost.

Sixth. A program to keep the veteran informed of the steps he should take to buy or build a house under the program. In my opinion, this will be one of the greatest needs during the coming months. As "operation housing" moves at higher and higher speed there will be more and more necessity for seeing to it that the individual veteran has comprehensive, up-to-date, and accurate information on how he can get a home.

Seventh. "Operation housing" should maintain the best possible liaison with the agencies of Government and the men producing the materials. It is only through this coordination that any well-planned attack can be carried to a successful conclusion.

The plan for "operation housing" has been done—well done. The success of the program to build 2,700,000 homes in 18 months now depends on the intelligence, the resourcefulness, and the vigor with which the field forces execute this unprecedented program. I humbly hope that you veterans, who have seen at first hand the war might of this Nation, will see to it that that strength and power is used with the most dynamic force of which we are capable to bring our Nation to a new prosperity.

Strength of the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter and accompanying data relative to the strength of the Army, which I have received from the Office of the Chief of Staff.

There being no objection, the letter and attached data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1946.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: I am now in receipt of the necessary data pertaining to the strength of the Army which you requested in your letter of March 22.

The Secretary of War, together with General Eisenhower and General Spaatz, in discussing the personnel requirements of the Army with members of the Senate Military Affairs Committee stated that, to meet the tasks the Army faces during the occupation period, a strength of 1,070,000 officers and men, of whom 400,000 would be in the Air Forces, will be necessary. It is planned to reach this figure by July 1, 1947, which will require a reduction of approximately 500,000 from the July 1, 1946, Army strength which has been set at 1,550,000.

The War Department records reveal that the present disposition of troops in garrison in the continental limits of the United States as of February 28, 1946, include 373,251 in Air Force commands and installations, 217,264 assigned to the Army Ground Forces, 918,169 officers and enlisted men and women in the Army Service Forces and 13,767 in the War Department groups.

In addition there will be, as of February 28, 1946, a total of 3,809 serving in the Eastern Defense Command and 1,036 in the Western Defense Command; a grand total of 1,527,296 serving in the Army within the continental limits of the United States. A complete analysis of this total is attached for your information. (See exhibit "A".)

In reply to your specific questions as to the strength of our military garrisons in the several areas of the world the following data is provided you:

In the Pacific	400,472
Islands in the Caribbean	19,964
In Europe	531,710
In the United Kingdom	11,352
In India	41,034
In Australia	509
In China	9,165
In north Africa	3,866
In Egypt	2,281
In New Guinea	None
In Denmark	None

The strength of the Army in Iceland was approximately 269 on March 31, 1946, all personnel belonging to the local Army Air Forces Base Unit and was not considered a garrison since it includes no combat soldiers. All combat soldiers were withdrawn shortly after VE-day. The 969 personnel now at Iceland are necessary to provide the facilities for maintaining the regularly scheduled Army Transport Command flights through Iceland keeping our line of communications open to our occupation forces in Europe. The apparently large number is due to the lack of local civilian labor and the almost total lack

of any native facilities. These troops are now in Iceland under the agreement between the United States and Iceland effected July 1, 1941, which states: "Immediately upon the termination of the present international emergency all United States military and naval forces will be at once withdrawn leaving the people of Iceland and their Government in full sovereign control of their own territory."

Some statistics on the redeployment of our Army have been of interest to the people of the country and I am very glad to make these latest figures available to you. As of March 1, 1946, the strength of the Army, less officers on terminal leave, was 2,647,306, or 31.9 percent of the VE-day peak strength of 8,300,000. This strength of 2,647,306 is approximately the same as the strength of the Army, April 30, 1942, less than 5 months after Pearl Harbor. In the 11 months from May 12, 1945, to April 12, 1946, 6,904,000 United States Army personnel were returned to civil life, which number is equivalent to the strength of the Army in June 1943. This indicates that it took the Army 11 months to demobilize a strength equivalent to what required over 2½ years to mobilize.

I trust that the data communicated to you in this letter will be the information you seek, and prove of interest to you.

Sincerely yours,

MILES REBER,
Brigadier General, GSC, Deputy Chief, Legislative and Liaison Division.

EXHIBIT A

Continental, by major echelon of command, February 28, 1946

ARMY AIR FORCES

Command	Officers		Enlisted men	Nurses	Dietitians	Physical therapists	Warrant officers	Flight officers	Women's Army Corps		Total
	Regular Army	Total							Officers	Enlisted	
Commanding General, Army Air Forces	(414)	5,200	8,086	51	1	-------	255	19	41	311	14,064
Continental Air Forces	(692)	23,249	106,318	428	28	8	934	1,427	121	2,647	135,160
Headquarters, Continental Air Forces	(99)	1,696	5,295	31	1	1	63	24	16	460	7,587
First Air Force	(109)	2,782	8,038	86	2	2	149	99	17	510	11,685
Second Air Force	(119)	4,064	9,548	50	4	-------	164	282	20	307	14,439
Third Air Force	(120)	4,367	10,073	55	2	1	145	258	20	561	15,482
Fourth Air Force	(168)	4,471	20,811	114	13	2	218	183	26	624	26,462
IX Troop Carrier Command	(31)	2,007	5,290	25	3	-------	85	330	16	93	7,854
Overseas replacement depots	(46)	3,862	47,263	67	3	2	110	251	6	87	51,651
Air Technical Service Command	(269)	10,296	15,546	108	3	4	396	32	107	684	27,176
Air Transport Command	(76)	9,994	15,464	118	2	-------	160	675	52	856	27,321
Personnel Distribution Command	(41)	2,540	4,027	143	9	5	78	78	19	343	7,242
Army Air Force Tactical Center	(86)	1,453	4,753	31	1	2	50	4	13	211	6,518
Army Air Forces School	(51)	636	3,747	30	3	1	29	124	6	142	4,718
Training Command	(227)	16,798	110,234	386	14	4	395	2,180	111	1,317	131,439
Units at air ports of embarkation	(1)	176	722	1	-------	-------	8	10	1	-------	918
Subtotal	(1,857)	70,342	268,897	1,296	61	24	2,405	4,549	471	6,511	354,556
Army Ground Forces, Army Service Forces, and miscellaneous type units and personnel											
Personnel in process of separation	(66)	14,285	205	99	2	-------	370	437	4	-------	15,402
Recovered American military personnel	(1)	2	5	-------	-------	-------	-------	1	-------	-------	8
Army Ground Forces AAA personnel	(3)	31	271	-------	-------	-------	4	-------	-------	-------	306
Army Ground Forces personnel at air ports of embarkation	-------	20	135	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	4	-------	159
Army Service Forces personnel at air ports of embarkation	(1)	35	234	2	-------	-------	1	-------	1	-------	273
Army Service Forces medical personnel	-------	1	3	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	4
Detachment of patients	(26)	895	1,479	45	2	-------	24	64	7	27	2,543
Subtotal	(96)	15,269	2,332	146	4	-------	399	502	16	27	18,695
Total Army Air Forces	(1,953)	85,611	[1] 271,229	1,442	65	24	[2] 2,804	5,051	487	6,538	373,251

ARMY GROUND FORCES

Headquarters, Army Ground Forces	(225)	495	531	-------	-------	-------	54	-------	4	40	1,034
Headquarters, troops	(128)	497	1,784	-------	-------	-------	29	-------	-------	-------	2,310
First Army	(262)	3,081	25,508	-------	-------	-------	235	-------	-------	-------	28,824
Second Army	(120)	1,269	16,396	-------	-------	-------	115	-------	-------	-------	17,780
Fourth Army	(205)	2,390	23,429	-------	-------	-------	197	-------	-------	-------	26,016
VII Corps	(68)	802	7,600	-------	-------	-------	62	-------	-------	-------	8,464
Replacement and School Command	(699)	11,181	86,568	-------	-------	-------	488	-------	41	333	98,611
Replacement depots	(52)	1,758	32,319	-------	-------	-------	34	-------	4	110	34,225
Total, Army Ground Forces	(1,759)	21,383	194,135	-------	-------	-------	1,214	-------	49	483	217,264

ARMY SERVICE FORCES

Headquarters, Army Service Forces	(73)	267	113	-------	-------	-------	1	-------	3	-------	384
Staff divisions	(520)	3,721	4,659	26	1	1	232	-------	104	90	8,834
(Provost Marshal General)	(9)	(353)	127	-------	-------	-------	(1)	-------	(4)	-------	(485)
(Judge Advocate General)	(13)	(347)	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	(347)
(Adjutant General's Department)	(45)	(653)	(63)	-------	-------	-------	(214)	-------	(67)	-------	(997)
Technical services	(1,337)	22,259	125,941	1,116	84	65	1,147	6	239	2,167	153,024
Quartermaster General	(164)	3,067	32,828	-------	-------	-------	129	-------	37	60	36,121
Chief of Transportation	(131)	6,754	35,264	203	17	6	225	-------	104	1,478	44,151
Surgeon General	(514)	3,043	7,645	813	66	59	43	6	19	247	11,941
Chemical Warfare Service	(46)	1,056	2,346	-------	-------	-------	33	-------	23	102	3,560
Chief of Engineers	(208)	2,774	22,143	-------	-------	-------	190	-------	16	11	25,134
Chief of Ordnance	(181)	3,205	19,454	-------	-------	-------	353	-------	10	9	23,031
Chief Signal Officer	(69)	1,851	2,577	-------	-------	-------	167	-------	23	47	4,665
Manhattan Engineer District [3]	(24)	509	3,684	-------	1	-------	7	-------	7	213	4,421
Service commands	(2,326)	170,690	517,773	18,355	691	752	3,791	2,015	1,914	13,639	729,620
First	(148)	10,101	26,461	887	34	40	277	85	50	747	38,682
Second	(252)	24,867	53,315	4,019	126	152	715	188	502	1,602	85,486
Third	(304)	17,959	51,160	957	41	47	485	260	112	1,340	72,301
Fourth	(328)	21,267	100,499	2,464	95	90	422	170	281	2,482	127,770
Fifth	(141)	15,457	38,035	1,237	46	64	416	171	70	1,179	56,675
Sixth	(164)	17,251	42,474	3,266	97	112	470	230	277	1,164	66,041
Seventh	(217)	14,976	68,467	1,122	57	46	388	217	102	1,349	86,724
Eighth	(346)	19,156	51,021	1,837	89	74	274	225	188	1,304	74,168
Ninth	(403)	28,348	80,859	2,471	100	125	318	529	304	1,919	114,973
Military District of Washington	(23)	608	5,482	95	6	2	26	-------	28	553	6,800
Staging areas	(105)	2,029	23,989	190	-------	2	50	43	2	2	26,307
Total Army Service Forces	(4,361)	198,966	672,475	19,687	776	820	[4] 5,221	2,064	2,262	15,898	[5] 918,169

[1] Includes 112 aviation cadets.
[2] Includes 1 WAC warrant officer.
[3] Previously a part of Chief of Engineers.
[4] Includes 12 Women's Army Corps warrant officers.
[5] Includes 12,775 Army Air Forces, 1,873 Army Ground Forces, and 462,492 miscellaneous personnel not included in Army Service Forces troop basis.

EXHIBIT A—Continued

Continental, by major echelon of command, February 28, 1946—Continued

WAR DEPARTMENT GROUPS

Command	Officers		Enlisted men	Nurses	Dietitians	Physical therapists	Warrant officers	Flight officers	Women's Army Corps		Total
	Regular Army	Total							Officers	Enlisted	
Secretary of War	(66)	355	221	----	----	----	3	----	9	9	597
Joint Chiefs of Staff	(60)	128	68	----	----	----	6	----	3	47	252
Chief of Staff	(600)	2,181	4,966	----	----	----	52	----	65	554	7,818
Miscellaneous War Department	(40)	354	880	----	----	----	14	----	3	48	1,299
Civilian agencies	(27)	2,276	1,513	----	----	----	2	----	9	1	3,801
Veterans' Administration Facilities	(10)	(1,643)	(1,509)	----	----	----	----	----	(1)	(1)	(3,154)
Total War Department	(793)	5,294	7,648	----	----	----	[6] 77	----	89	659	13,767

[6] Includes 8 Women's Army Corps Warrant Officers.

Veterans Given Run-Around by War Assets Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I think it is about time that the Congress took definite and vigorous action against the War Assets Administration. The run-around which this organization is giving to our veterans is a national disgrace. The veterans are fully aware that instead of enjoying the priority which it was intended they should receive to aid them in getting started in business, the so-called priority has proved to be a delusion and a snare. They are chased hither and yon throughout the country in a desperate endeavor to get trucks, jeeps, and other surplus materials which are standing outdoors by the thousands rusting out.

I am not a member of the New Deal Party, which has a majority in the House; therefore I want to emphasize the responsibility of the majority party in relation to this surplus property scandal.

Hundreds of letters are coming to me from veterans, not only from my own District, but from other States, in each of which it is pointed out that they are being deceived and misled as to available surplus property. The one thing that infuriates the veterans is the fact that certain stores and dealers are able to obtain surplus property and resell it at a large profit, while the veteran, who has risked his life, his health, and his time in fighting for his country, gets no consideration except a run-around. I cannot understand why the New Deal Congress does not take this situation in hand and correct it. There is not a Republican who will not join with the New Deal members in the enactment of legislation to correct this gross injustice now being perpetrated upon our fighting men.

I am inserting under unanimous consent an article which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of May 19, 1946:

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

(By Lt. Comdr. Tyrrell Krum, USNR, retired)

The Government's highly touted scheme for channeling a goodly portion of the tremendous inventory of surplus military and naval property into the hands of war veterans started off with high hopes following VJ-day but soon degenerated into one scandalous "sale" after another. Now the story is about to burst wide open.

Within the next 30 to 60 days, unless strong action is taken by the White House, the War Assets Administration is going to stop giving veterans any preference and toss the remaining surplus property out for anybody and everybody to grab.

And what a shame it will be—and disappointment to millions of men who fought and won this war. They will be deprived of a chance to procure the items they need so much to fit themselves back into a postwar profession or business.

But there's no use—at least that's what I was informed by a highly reliable source close to the top of WAA—of further deceiving and deluding war veterans into thinking they have special rights to enter the surplus property market.

It would be better to repeal entirely the law granting their alleged priorities and let the surplus goods go on a catch-as-catch-can basis than to keep them constantly stirred up in confusion and disappointment.

Such is the bitter truth WAA has come to face.

Perhaps no Government activity in recent years has been subjected to so much fruitless experimentation as was the attempted disposal of surplus property to war veterans.

It has been juggled from one agency to another and from one theory of operation to another until more than a half-dozen men who tried to solve the problem gave up in disgust and took jobs elsewhere.

The thing that always has and probably always will put the "hex" on veterans trying to obtain war goods is the plain blunt fact that they are in a hopeless and helpless minority alongside the deeply entrenched and high-powered well-heeled army of speculators who have virtually taken over control of WAA and its operations.

These gents are not inclined to give an inch in a business proposition which involves potential billions of dollars in profits. The surplus-property market is the most stupendous merchandising proposition in our history.

Today some $16,000,000,000 worth of surplus goods are ready for sale, another $20,000,000,000 worth will be ready in months to come.

It is true that war veterans are supposed to get top priority in the purchase of surplus property—at least so far as some certain lines are concerned.

These are known as "set-aside" items and include automotive vehicles, certain construction, mining, and excavating machinery, a limited amount of agricultural machinery, medical and surgical apparatus, and typewriters.

But that's all. On all other items, particularly photographic equipment, which is so avidly sought by hundreds of thousands of men who want to make a career of what they learned while in the Signal Corps, veterans still get the "old one-two" when they try to enter the public sales.

At a recent sale of photographic equipment in Philadelphia, which was highly advertised and touted by the WAA press agents, a number of Washington veterans wrote up asking for a listing of what was to go on sale. Word was sent back saying the items would be on sale between May 5 and 10 and that the bids must be in by the later date at the very latest.

And—here's the pay-off—the letters from Philadelphia were received in Washington May 12, bearing postage cancellation of 6:30 p. m. on May 10, the last day of the sale.

I've talked to hundreds of veterans about their efforts to buy surplus property. Almost to a man they were mad clear through. It's easy to see why the WAA feels it's better to call the whole thing off rather than continue to irritate these ex-fighting men in a field in which the Government has apparently lost entire control to selfish private business interests.

Where Is American Justice Under OPA?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, No. 1 casualty of bureaucracy is American justice.

In the process of trying to enforce unworkable rules and regulations the various agencies of our Government, including the OPA, has resorted to extreme punishments for violations of regulations that are unreasonable and downright unconstitutional.

This situation was very well defined in an article printed in the May issue of the National Grocers Bulletin, published in Chicago, Ill., by the National Association of Retail Grocers.

The article follows:

THE PLIGHT OF THE COURTS

"I accept the contention of defendants as proven that the regulation is unworkable in this area. It has been shown that violations are unavoidable. No evidence was offered to the contrary.

"But the question remains whether I may deny OPA an injunction in any case where a regulation exists and violation of the regu-

lation is shown. All of my instincts say that should not be enough, that the equities should be open to inquiry in every case.

"Hecht Co. v. *Bowles* (321 U. S. 321), ruled that an injunction need not be issued where a defendant was honestly endeavoring to comply and could in time comply. But here the defendants, while honestly endeavoring to comply, cannot at all times and under all conditions be certain that their operations will, at the end of every 30-day reporting period, 'be in compliance' under the formula.

"The regulation itself cannot be assailed in this proceeding. Section 204 (d) of the Price Control Act prohibits that. It compels the courts to treat a regulation as valid, even though they know it to be invalid.

"Assuming therefore, as Congress has commanded, that the regulation is valid, must an equity court issue an injunction, even though it is clear that future violations are bound to occur, regardless of the good faith and earnest efforts of the defendants to avoid violations.

"In other times, I would have thought there could be but one answer to this question, but the decisions in this circuit have so completely shown the District judges of discretion in OPA cases, I must conclude that equity is compeled to act in this field, even though there be not equity—that an injunction must issue, even though it is known at the time of issuance that nonwillful violations are bound to occur.

"This is a strange situation, previously unknown to our law, and it could not arise except for the vise that section 204 (d) puts on the courts, coupled with the appellate decisions referred to, which take away the discretionary powers normally allowable to trial courts.

"Because I have no choice, I will therefore issue the requested injunctions, expressly reserving, however, the question of their enforceability, for I am yet to be persuaded that an equity court can punish conduct that contains no ingredient of evil.

"CLAUDE MCCULLOUGH, *Judge.*"

WHERE IS AMERICAN JUSTICE?

Courts of our land forced to administer injustice under the guise of justice—such is the admission here of Federal District Judge Claude McCulloch, of Portland, Oreg. In this case, the judge granted an injunction at the request of OPA against a Portland slaughterer and packinghouse owner. But read the complete text of his decision. Doesn't sound much like the democratic practices to which Americans so often point with pride, does it?

THE PLIGHT OF A PACKER

My name is William S. Clithero. I am vice president of Armour & Co. in charge of all livestock buying. Perhaps you gentlemen will be interested in knowing who and what Armour & Co. is. Most people, when they think of Armour & Co., think of P. D. Armour the founder or of J. Ogden Armour his son, who were the principal owners of the business at one time. Today, Armour & Co. has 45,000 stockholders. This stock is widely dispersed and no two stockholders own 5 percent of the stock put together. We also have 55,000 employees, so today I am speaking in the interest of 85,000 to 90,000 people who are employed by Armour & Co. or have their money invested in the company's stock. * * * Under me and under my direction, of course, are expert highly trained livestock buyers who handle purchases at the various markets. These men are as competent as any in the business in their ability to judge how the livestock will yield and grade. * * *

Control of live cattle prices through MPR 574, the so-called average compliance calculation rests upon three legs:

1. Uniform Government grading of all beef carcasses.

2. Accurate reporting to the OPA of cattle costs, dressed weights, and carcass grades.

3. Strict enforcement—certain, quick, and appropriate punishment for every violator.

The failure of any one of these three legs results in the collapse of the entire control program. It simply cannot stand on two. Actually, all three legs have broken down. It is no wonder that all semblance of effective control over cattle prices has disappeared. Legitimate slaughterers are being squeezed out of business. Our volume is being taken away from us steadily. Every day and every week is worse than the one before. We know positively that other legitimate packers who are trying to follow the regulations are in the same fix.

There is as much as $20 per head difference from a compliance standpoint between adjacent grades of beef. If you get the liners into the upper grade you are in compliance and if you don't you are in violation. And about 30 percent of the cattle are liners—that is, they could go into either of two grades. Here is an example of why this variation in grading is so serious when because of inadequate enforcement all grades of cattle are selling at or over maximum permissible. Suppose two packers each buy 100 steers of similar quality at the same price. One packer gets A's on his beef and is in compliance; the other gets half B's and is therefore about $1,000 over maximum permissible. The second packer is practically out of business because to offset the amount he is over maximum because of the above transaction, he must buy cattle under maximum permissible and they just don't sell that way because of the pressure from black market slaughterers and the fact that his competitor is in compliance.

You may feel that I am exaggerating minor and insignificant details. But they are sigsificant. They are the difference between staying in business or closing up a packing plant. Our employees are being demoralized and the business built up over a period of 80 years is being destroyed. When this live cattle price control was put into effect it was apparently the OPA's honest belief that cattle prices would average around the midpoint between maximum and minimum prices. Actually, because of the lack of enforcement, cattle are selling at or over maximum permissible 10 months out of the year. Under these conditions grading becomes one of the most significant factors. The Government grader has become the most important individual in the packing plant. He can keep it in business or close it up, and because grading is a matter of judgment no one can prove he is right or wrong.

The extent of the black market in live cattle is difficult to measure. The buyers can see every day what is going on in their particular market but it is impossible to specifically outline and evaluate all of the ramifications of the black market. Diversion of livestock from legitimate prewar slaughterers would probably be the most significant measure but it is not readily available. Some of the new slaughterers may not actually be in violation but they are able to operate and grow because of some loophole in the control regulations.

We cannot measure the diversion accurately but here are a number of different sets of data which give an indication of what is taking place. To the packer buyer on a market, order buyer activity is a good measure of diversion. The order buyer purchases cattle for slaughterers in other parts of the country, usually small operators who cannot afford to employ their own buyers. The order buyer earns a commission and the cost of the cattle is not as important as getting the cattle to fill his orders. Throughout the war period, order buyers have been becoming increasingly important factors on the markets. The packer buyer who in normal times was the principal buyer has been pushed into the background. He can't even look at cattle until the order buyers have been taken care of. Shipments from market for slaughter at other points is a measure of order buyer activity and diversion from normal channels.

The table below shows the proportion of cattle receipts shipped from the principal markets and indicates that in 1941, 22.7 percent of the cattle receipts in Chicago were shipped elsewhere for slaughter; in 1942, 24.9 percent; in 1943, 37.2 percent; in 1944, 33.7 percent; in 1945, 40 percent; and in January 1946, 57 percent. I don't have the February figures but they would show even a greater proportion. The same thing is true at other important markets.

Most specifically we know how Armour & Co. has been affected by the so-called controls on livestock and meat prices and particularly the cattle compliance regulation.

Our cattle slaughter is running about 50 percent less than last year compared to about a 20 percent decrease in Federally inspected slaughter and a 11 percent decrease in cattle receipts at principal markets. The cattle are available but we cannot slaughter them and stay in compliance so some one else kills them.

We are operating at about 30 percent of capacity. Our cattle killing gangs in most cases have been reduced to the lowest possible point and are working 15 to 25 hours per week. We guarantee our employees 36 hours per week and we must pay the difference even though we have no cattle for them to kill. Employees having as much as 15 to 25 years of service have been laid off indefinitely.

Our cattle slaughter as a percentage of the federally inspected slaughter has declined more than 50 percent. The decline compared to total slaughter has been much greater because we know that noninspected slaughter has been growing by leaps and bounds.

We ordinarily watch our purchases on the principal markets as compared to the receipts. Under normal conditions this tells us whether or not we are competitive with the industry. The table below shows the proportion of the receipts on some of the principal markets purchased by Armour & Co. during a 5-week period.

Percent Armour buy of on-sale receipts

Ten markets: 1 day March 16, 1946, 9.28 percent. Five weeks ending March 2, 1946, 11.59 percent; 1945, 18.01 percent; 1942, 23.90 percent; 1940, 21.79 percent.

Furthermore, the situation gets worse each day and each week. On Monday, March 18 we purchased 5.44 percent of the receipts on the 10 markets compared to about 22 percent prior to the war as indicated above. In Chicago we purchased 3.77 percent of the receipts; in St. Louis we could buy only 9 cattle which we had reason to hope would be under maximum; in St. Joseph 89 cattle and in Fort Worth 32 head.

Specific situations would be funny if they were not tragic. At Kansas City on Monday, March 11, the on-sale receipts were 10,000 head and Armour & Co. was not able to buy a single head. On Thursday of that week the receipts were about a thousand head and the four large packers, Armour, Swift, Wilson, and Cudahy combined were able to buy only 112 cattle.

I can summarize the situation very briefly. Armour & Co. is being forced out of the cattle business. Our cattle slaughter is going down steadily and rapidly; if the present rate continues it will be only a matter of weeks until our cattle-slaughtering operations will be closed up at most or all of our plants. We know that every slaughterer who is trying to stay in compliance and who is not getting superspecial grading is also going out of business. There are no secrets

about the reasons. There are no questions of efficiency of operations, location, or size. Compliance depends on cost of cattle, yield, and grading. We know that the slaughterer who reports costs and yields honestly and who is not getting super-special grading cannot operate. The business of the legitimate packer is being taken away from him and being turned over to the dishonest and crooked racketeers just to maintain the hold-the-line fiction.

IS THIS AMERICAN JUSTICE?

"A typographical error," "sorry," "we're undermanned," cries this bureaucratic gestapo when their mistakes are called to their attention. What about the retailer, when a woman takes down a can of beans, changes her mind, inadvertently puts it back on another shelf under a price 1 cent over ceiling? In comes an OPA inspector. Then he, acting as "judge and jury," slaps a $25 fine on the retailer.

THE PLIGHT OF THE RETAILER

I am Harry W. Walker, secretary-manager of the Independent Retail Food Distributors of Maryland, an organization representing 90 percent of the independent food distributors of Maryland and also secretary-manager of the Independent Retail Grocers & Meat Dealers Association of Baltimore, Inc., an organization of 2,000 retail dealers in Baltimore, and distributors of 68 percent of the food consumed in our State. I am here at the direction of our Board, not that I wish to come, since reading the United Press release of March 13 that these hearings were simply to give "everyone a chance to blow off steam."

We object principally to OPA because of its mismanagement. When Chester Bowles can address a group of retailers and state that the over-ceiling charges were $1,000,000,000 and then excuses himself and leaves the meeting to his subordinates, and the subordinates immediately show a chart showing that the overcharges amounted, not to one billion, but to two billion, and when we ask for an explanation of the divergence we are told that it was a typographical error. Now we submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that when an organization is so badly managed that it can make a typographical error of $1,000,000,000 and not have it caught up, something is wrong somewhere.

We are going to give you some examples of the loose method in which OPA is managed. Not from what we tell you, but from documents issued by OPA itself and which, Mr. Chairman, we are going to ask may be filed as part of the records of this committee.

I hold in my hand a price list, effective January 21, 1946, and which it states must be posted near the item listed so that customers can read it. On the reverse side they give the prevailing poultry prices of wholesalers during the week.

Mind, they instruct us that we must pay 33 cents for live chickens and only 27 cents for dressed. When we called about it, we were informed that it was another typographical error. Now, we submit to you that there is nothing more important in OPA than getting the correct ceiling prices; and if the procfreading is so careless that an error of this kind can occur, you surely will admit that an error occurred.

Here is an envelope just as it came from the OPA office in Baltimore. Over 2,000 of our members are in Baltimore, and OPA sends me some extra ceiling prices to give to our members if they haven't secured the ceiling price for the week. * * * Had I given that to the retailer in Baltimore City and he had followed these prices and overcharged due to OPA's mistake, he would have been summoned before the panel board and forced to pay a fine or, as they call it, a settlement of the Administrator's claim.

Over in Baltimore, on East Chase Street, is a little grocery store. It's what we call a mama and papa store, run by a grocer and his wife. He makes a living, but nothing more. He applied for a bail-out on sugar, and the figures showed that he was 300 pounds short of his original allotment of sugar.

We were assured by OPA officials in the presence of Senator WHERRY and of Dewey Anderson, secretary of the Senate Small Business Committee, and representatives of the Federal Trade Commission on January 24 that these bail-out applications would not be used in prosecuting the grocer and that the Enforcement Division would not even see the application. Yet, relying on OPA's promise, this grocer made application and was forbidden to handle sugar for the duration, had to post a sign to that effect in his window, and has virtually been put out of business. If that was good for one grocer it should be good for all, and yet the A & P Co. acknowledged in New York that they are 51,850,251 pounds of sugar short that they cannot account for.

An OPA attorney, Mr. Gottesman, stated that OPA would not seek the customary order which would deprive the right of A & P to deal in sugar because it would cause undue hardship on customers of A & P stores.

THE PERSECUTIONS OF THE RETAILER

Example: "Effective immediately, not one price violation will be tolerated, whether it is a first violation or not. This regulation has come to the Chief Price Clerk and price panel in plain words. * * * Any merchant found in violation, when the surveys are made, if it is only 1 cent over the ceiling, will be summoned before the price panel and the minimum penalty is $25 on each violation found. There will be no further warnings.

"PRICE CONTROL BOARD No. 5122,
"Monticello, Ark."

Example: "My name is R. H. Raibert. I represent the Kentucky Retail Food Dealers' Association, Inc. I am secretary of this organization. Before any of the gentlemen, who are retail grocers, that are with me present any testimony before this committee, I would like to ask this committee if the same thing is going to happen to these men that happened to the grocers that testified before this committee last year.

"The thing that happened that I am referring to is that each and every grocer who testified before this committee last year was hounded and persecuted by the OPA. Many of those grocers have been forced out of business.

"Even though we have come a long way up here from Kentucky to present the factual information on things that we think are unfair in the present Price Control Act, I don't think that it would be fair to ask these gentlemen to testify if they are to be persecuted by OPA for appearing at this hearing. These gentlemen are honest, upright, American citizens, and they deserve fair treatment, because, after all, this is still America, I hope. I ask you gentlemen of this committee to assure the representation from Kentucky that no method of retaliation by OPA will be allowed againt them. We certainly do not want to see these grocers from Kentucky crucified, as the grocers were who testified before this committee last year."

Example: "My name is W. L. Murray, Lexington, Ky., State president of the Kentucky Retail Food Dealers' Association. My one and only purpose in appearing before this important committee is for the interest, protection, and betterment of the retail food dealers not only in Kentucky but all over these United States. May I state first that I own and operate a fair-sized food market in Lexington, Ky. I have spent the past 16 years in the food business and I very much like the business when I can operate on a pure and competitive basis, but I must state that due to complications that have arisen from the unworkable and nonreasoning regulations of the OPA it has especially been very hard to operate efficiently as per OPA checkers' views in the past 6 or 8 months.

"I want to make this statement that it is next to impossible to calculate 2,500 to 4,000 items normally carried in a retail food market without making an error. I contend that there is a big difference between an error and a violation. As I understand a nonintentional error—the OPA asks for a $25 voluntary contribution to the United States Treasury and an intentional error—they ask for $50 plus court costs and an injunction against such food dealer for further violation.

"Now here's the joker—on second offense they are permitted to assess large fines and add long jail sentences. I ask you, gentlemen, if you think in time of peace after the display of all-out cooperation to win the war by contenting ourselves with various regulations, rationing, buying bonds, making contributions to war chests, Red Cross, etc., that this law is fair to the food industry? Do you not think that it is harsh enough in time of war, much less in time of peace?

"We believe that it is the purpose to make laws based on justice, and if such unfair laws as are now being interpreted by OPA enforcing agencies remain in effect, that many, many honest food dealers, some of whom have been in business for many years and are respected in their communities, will throw in the sponge and be forced to quit the type of business they love and resort to some other way of making a living.

"In fact, we have two well-liked food dealers of many years in Lexington, Ky., that have recently gone out of the food business according to their own statements because of unjust regulations and enforcement of the OPA. One of these gentlemen quit before any charge was placed against him and one after an indictment had been made against him of which he pleaded not guilty."

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Excerpts from the two foregoing statements made by Mr. Raibert and Mr. Murray before the House Banking and Currency Committee on March 21, 1946, contain many more constructive specific suggestions for correction of abuses. Space limitations alone prevent entire publication here.

The evidence of injustice

"Thousands of honest, upright, independent grocers will be driven from their businesses by this unnecessary harshness and unjust attitude of OPA." And this makes no mention of the honest grocers who are ill, or already dead by their own hands, in fear of persecution by OPA.

THE PLIGHT OF THE DAIRYMEN

The war is over—Americans cannot spread a regulation on bread—production will prevent hunger and inflation

In a brief submitted by the American Butter Institute, represented by D. K. Howe, president, before the Banking and Currency Committee, House of Representatives, March 19, 1946, the following excerpts make clear the dairyman's plight under OPA.

"With the price of butter held down as compared with other dairy products and farm products, with labor scarce and costs rising, there could be only one result. In spite of an increase in milk production from 1941 to 1945 of about 7 percent, the production of creamery butter declined 28 percent, or 501,000,000 pounds. Nothing like that has ever happened before in the history of the butter industry. The greatest decline in butter made previous to this was from 1933 to 1937

when the decline was about 139,000,000 pounds.

"The creamery industry is the only dairy-products industry which was forced by Government controls to go through the war with less than normal volume. During this same period, other major branches of the dairy industry have operated with substantially higher volumes. Butter production declined to the lowest figure since 1920. Instead of using 33 percent of the Nation's total milk production as in 1940, butter took only 21½ percent of the milk production in 1945.

"Due to the decrease in volume of butterfat available and the diversion of butterfat from churning to fluid milk and other dairy products, almost 20 percent of the creameries operating in 1941 have ceased to operate. Many of them were forced to close in order to avoid financial disaster due to the fact that when volume decreased, costs mounted rapidly. Aside from those plants which closed, others are faced with increasing costs due to the lower volume, so that all are operating under a heavy financial burden.

"The trend toward lower production and closing of creameries has been accelerated since the removal of controls on cream, ice cream, and fluid milk in the fall of 1945. Many creameries have been offered for sale or for lease. In some States the butter manufacture has practically ceased. The cream is going to other products, not butter.

"Information from the National Stockyards in East St. Louis reveals that during 1945 the percentage of milk cows being sold as beef was approximately 40 percent of the total number sold. This is the highest ratio of milk cows to beef that has been reported marketed through the East St. Louis yards. The number of cows in the country in 1946 is estimated by the Department of Agriculture to be from 3 to 4 percent under last year. Heifers, potential milk producers, were down to 6 percent. The greatest decrease in milk cows has occurred in the States which normally produce farm-separated cream for butter manufacture—Minnesota and Iowa, 4 percent; Missouri, 6 percent; the Dakotas and Kansas, 9 percent, and Nebraska, 10 percent.

"Due to the low ceiling on butter, creameries cannot compete for raw material against other manufactured dairy products and farmers producing churning cream cannot afford to maintain production in the face of rising costs for farm labor, feeds, etc.

"In recent months the situation has become progressively worse. This may be seen from the following tabulation showing the percentage by which the butter manufactured has declined in the months indicated below the same month 1 year previous:

	Percent
November 1945	20
December 1945	23
January 1946	30
February 1946 (estimated)	30

"As a result, the supply is far below the demand. Added to that is the poor distribution that has develcped since elimination of rationing and various controls. Consequently, we have black markets, tie-in sales, and diversion through price-evasion practices, which result in severe hardships in some districts. Consumers in metropolitan areas have only one-third the butter supply that was available in 1941.

"The Evidence

"Approximately 1,000 creameries have ceased operation since 1941 due to insufficient volume or heavy financial burden. Milk production continues to decline at an alarming rate and the trend should be reversed immediately. The following facts indicate the diminishing consumer supplies of butter:

1941:	*Pounds*
Creamery butter churned	1,872,000,000
For civilians	1,791,000,000
Per capita	14
1945:	*Pounds*
Creamery butter churned	1,370,000,000
For civilians	1,058,000,000
Per capita	81
1946 (estimated):	
Estimated creamery butter churned	900,000,000
For civilians	840,000,000
Per capita	61

WHY CONTINUE THIS REIGN OF TERROR?

Unfortunately, however, this question of how best to control inflation is not the only issue—or even—as we see it—the most important issue involved in the pending proposal to extend price control for another year. There are two reasons why retail grocers and other small businessmen hate and fear OPA and want it abolished and I now wish to present these to the committee—respectfully, but with complete candor.

In the first place—and this is a condition for which Congress and not OPA is squarely responsible—we do not see why those citizens who are subject to the Emergency Price Control law should be denied recourse to the courts of the land for the adjudication and redress of their grievances. We are aware, of course, of the action of the House in passing the Dirksen amendment last year, and we were and still are grateful for that action. We regret, however, that the House did not insist on the retention of this amendment in conference. And whatever considerations of expediency might have been urged in support of such an extraordinary abrogation of the citizen's rights in time of war, certainly there can be no excuse for the continuance of this injustice, now that the war is over.

In the second place, OPA's enforcement policies have violated and continue to violate every decent concept of what constitutes fairness and justice.

It starts upon the assumption that the citizens—taxpayers and employers—are criminals. In support of this statement I now wish to summarize for the record two of the most revealing documents which have so far come to light.

This document, apparently prepared by one Fred Lewe, an assistant training specialist in the San Francisco regional office of OPA and circulated among all the regional offices, contained instructions—said to be modeled closely after those used by the FBI—on how to interview a witness and break him down. I quote, in part:

"Get him (the witness) to talk about himself. He has likes, dislikes, hobbies, pet ideas. When the facts in the case indicate that another person may be involved with the witness, phrase your questioning to transfer the blame. Make the witness feel that he is not telling you anything that you do not already know. Sometimes the factual situation is such that you can work a good bluff on the witness. Ascertain the status and degree of friendship between the witness and third parties or any degree of animosity. Play this factor up by inference to the witness' mind. Point out that he is possibly being played for a sucker. Each little pinpoint penetration that you make in the witness will make him want to sing to get even. When he sings, you write the music. Play up any reason, alibi, or excuse the witness may have. The use of the double or alternate question is sometimes an effective way. Play upon his connection with his family, his standing in the community, his citizenship, his business associates, his lodge affiliations, his friends, his business, or any other factor that you are able to ascertain. Don't be afraid of a little silence on the part of the witness. It generally indicates that his nervous tension is building up, which is exactly what is desired."

Characteristically, as soon as this document became public (through insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 13 by Representative DIRKSEN, of Illinois), Mr. Bowles sought to disavow it, saying that while it had been prepared by an OPA specialist and circulated among the regional offices, it was not really official.

The second document—a directive ordering a recent enforcement drive in the Chicago area—was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 26 by Senator LUCAS, who described it as "one of the most remarkable and far-reaching directives that has ever been handed down by any agency of Government."

This directive stated, among other things, that "our prime purpose is to file a great number of lawsuits so that the attendant publicity will effectually strengthen future compliance" and that OPA attorneys "should postpone all conferences with violators until suit is filed. Prior notice to retailers of the filing of the suit is not necessary and not recommended," it declared, adding: "The newspapers should be advised daily of the names of the defendants and the nature of the violations.

"In other words"—and I am now quoting Senator LUCAS—"they tell the agents in the field that once they find a violation of the law, whether it be a willful or an innocent violation, they should not talk with the individual who has committed the violation, but should go back to the office, confer with the lawyer, immediately file the suit, and bring the individual into court without notice.

"And remember," said Senator LUCAS, "they are dealing with a citizen who has never violated the law in his life, who has over a period of many years established a reputation for honesty and fair dealing with the public."

In January alone, retailers in the eighth district (west coast) paid more than $51,000 in settlement of the "administrator's claim" provided for in an amendment passed by the Congress last year.

The law authorizes OPA, under certain circumstances, to subpena books and records and require their production at a place other than the defendant's place of business. But without any subpena or court order, OPA investigators go into stores and demand that they be permitted to remove books and records and keep them indefinitely. They have even demanded that merchants supply them with copies of their income-tax returns.

These enforcement policies have driven thousands of our people out of business and other thousands—who are still hanging on, hoping for relief from Congress—to desperation. One highly respected merchant in Ohio, following a typical OPA inquisition, went to the basement of his store and hanged himself.

On behalf of the independent retail grocers of the United States—and on behalf of small business generally—the National Association of Retail Grocers earnestly petitions this committee and the Congress not to perpetuate this reign of terror beyond next June 30.

MANDATE OF BUREAUCRACY—WHAT NEXT?

DEAR MERCHANT: The price panel has just received instructions from the district office on the new price-control program as to handling violations. Under the Price Control Act, from now on, a settlement of no less than $25 must be made for any price violation, even if it is unintentional.

Very truly yours,

W. ROY HASHINGER,
Price Panel Chairman,
War Price and Rationing Board,
Morgantown, W. Va.

IN BEHALF OF AMERICAN JUSTICE

Last month, on behalf of the independent retail grocers of the United States—and on behalf of small business generally, Tyre Taylor, general counsel of the National Association of Retail Grocers, earnestly petitioned the House Committee on Banking and Currency "not to perpetuate the extension of price control beyond June 30."

Space here prevents full publication of Mr. Taylor's sound presentation. However, briefly summed up, first he cited the NARGUS board of directors resolution adopted January 20 and 21, 1946, strongly opposing the further extension of the act.

This was followed by a documented elaboration explaining why the small business people of this country feel that on broad economic grounds, and in the interests of effective inflation control, it would be better to permit price control to expire than to extend it. Examples of how OPA is in fact strangling and distorting production, depreciating quality, promoting hoarding, creating black markets and debasing the American scale of living were cited. A fine example in the case of butter. "In other words, the 'line has been held,' and an inflationary price rise averted. The only catch in it is that you can't get butter except through the black market."

Bill To Relieve Shortage of Rayon Hose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, unquestionably the shortage of women's hose has been one of the most troublesome and irritating of the scarcity problems facing our small wholesalers, our small retailers and the American public in general. This shortage, of course, does not rank in seriousness with the other major problems which have grown out of a bloody war, such as the lack of homes and bread, and steel for our basic industries, but, because it so directly affects individual women of the nation, it has caused an irritation and aggravation all out of proportion to its size. Its effect has been like the constant annoyance of a festering splinter continually pricking our economic body.

For some time the Small Business Committee has felt that it was one problem to which a comparatively simple solution could be found. During the past several weeks the committee has made a thorough study of the causes of the shortage and possible remedies which might be suggested to the executive agencies and to Congress. The investigation developed that in 1939, which might be considered a normal year, 60,192,000 pairs of hose of all types were being produced per month to meet the normal demand for the whole United States.

In 1940 the launching of the defense program had its impact on the manufacture of hosiery, as it did on all civilian business. Nylon and silk, the raw materials used for most of the stockings the American women wore, were diverted to the manufacture of war equipment, such as parachutes, maps, jungle clothing, and tow ropes for gliders. As a consequence of war production, hosiery production during the war dropped steadily until, in 1945, it reached a low of 42,179,000 pairs of stockings a month.

In an effort to insure that some stocking production would be kept up during the war, the War Production Board had issued an order, M-37D, which allocated a certain amount of rayon fiber to hosiery manufactures. This action made some hose available during the entire war, although the supply was at a minimum level.

Since we were able to make some hose available during the war, the question has arisen as to why we should have such a critical shortage since the end of the conflict. Investigation has disclosed that three factors have contributed more than any others to the present situation. First, of course, has been the fact that a certain amount of hoarding has aggravated the real shortage.

Second has been the raw-material supply. Last fall the War Production Board threw out most of its controls, including allocation order M-37D. Since then relatively small amounts of rayon have been going into hosiery manufacture because the dozen or so large rayon producers, who control the rayon output, do not consider women's stockings a large peacetime market. As soon as the order was lifted, these rayon producers diverted their production toward more permanent customers—the makers of other types of wearing apparel—and the hosiery manufacturers were cut off almost entirely from their sources of rayon supply.

At the time this allocation order was lifted it was anticipated that the supply of nylon would increase sufficiently to meet the raw material demands of hosiery mills. However, nylon, upon which the hosiery mills have become principally dependent, did not come into the market in the quantities anticipated when the order was lifted. Today the production of nylon is very substantially below consumers' needs, accounting for only some 30,000,000 pairs of stockings per month.

In March of this year, total production of all types of hosiery, including nylon, rayon, and cotton, reached only 50,000,000 pairs—approximately the same number that were made during 1942 and 1943, when the country was in full war production.

The Small Business Committee has repeatedly urged the Civilian Production Administration within recent weeks to correct its premature action of last fall and restore allocation of rayon to the hosiery mills. It is estimated that if only 3 to 4 percent—at the most not over 5 percent—of the country's rayon production can be given to hosiery manufacturers, stocking production can be stepped up to 58,000,000 pairs a month, including all types, which would be sufficient to relieve the worst of the shortage.

Diversion of this amount of rayon to hosiery mills would create no real hardship on the makers of other rayon items, nor would it cause shortages in consumer supplies of other rayon goods which are now more plentiful than hosiery. To date the executive agencies have declined to take this allocation action. Therefore, one of the major provisions of this bill directs them to allocate only a sufficient percentage of material so that a total monthly production of 58,000,000 pairs of all types of stockings can be obtained.

The third factor that has added to the severity of the hosiery shortage has been the poor distribution of the limited supply of nylon hosiery. The small wholesaler and the small retailer have not been getting even their proportionate share, and the resulting maldistribution has caused a serious competitive hardship to the businesses affected and considerable inconvenience to the customers served by the small retailers.

This has been caused to a considerable degree by the wholesaler percentage limitation in the Office of Price Administration's hosiery regulation, MPR 602. Under this order, manufacturers are prohibited from supply wholesalers as a group with a greater percentage of their production of nylon stockings than they shipped to wholesalers during 1941. Unfortunately, the Nation's wholesaler distribution pattern has shifted considerably since 1941, and the order has created much unnecessary hardship in the hosiery industry.

When the order came out, manufacturers ceased supplying some of their smaller accounts, and greatly restricted shipments to the smaller wholesalers. Instead, they increased the practice of making direct sales to chain organizations and large department stores. One wholesaler association reports that 19 of its members, serving an estimated 26,500 retailers, were cut off completely from supplies by their manufacturers as a result of OPA's regulation. Another 20 wholesalers, serving an estimated 47,000 retail accounts, received only from 2 to 25 percent of their previous allotments.

This condition also was called to the attention of the OPA by the Small Business Committee. To date that agency has declined to consider removal of this wholesale percentage limitation order. Therefore, I am including in the bill a provision that the Office of Price Administration be required to eliminate this limitation and to refrain from issuing any similar provision for channeling nylon hose to certain distributors.

If this measure is adopted, it will simply increase temporarily the supply of raw material for the manufacture of hose, and will provide for equitable distribution of the product, and will go far toward alleviating one of our most exasperating postwar problems.

Statistics Relative to United States and British Naval Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURTON K. WHEELER
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two letters received by me from the Secretary of the Navy, incorporating certain statistics relative to United States and British naval forces.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, April 11, 1946.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: In response to your request of March 30, 1946, for certain information regarding the United States and British Empire Navies, I take pleasure in submitting the following information, arranged in the order given in your letter:

1. The total United States and British naval personnel engaged in World War II:

UNITED STATES

Total United States naval personnel, including the Women's Reserve, enrolled throughout the war was 3,963,000.

Peak enrollment in the United States Navy was 3,408,000.

BRITISH EMPIRE

The total enrollment in the British Empire naval forces throughout the war was not immediately available in the Department, nor from British official sources in Washington. A dispatch has been transmitted to the United States Naval Attaché in London to secure the information.

Peak enrollment is estimated at 1,025,400.

2. The total United States and British combatant ships engaged:

The total number of combatant ships of all types in commission in the United States and British Empire naval forces at the outbreak of the war, December 7, 1941, in the case of the United States. and September 1939 in the case of the British, together with those placed in commission during the war, until the cessation of hostilities, August 15, 1945, is as follows:

United States	3,305
British Empire	1,872
Total	5,177

3. The total United States and British Empire warships lost:

The total number of combatant vessels of all types of the United States and British Empire naval forces lost during the war period, in the case of each nation, from causes incident to the war, is as follows:

United States	703
British Empire	1,031
Total	1,734

4. The total United States and British merchant marine losses:

The total number of United States and British merchant vessels of 1,000 or more gross registered tons lost incident to the war is as follows:

United States	549
British Empire	1,996
Total	2,545

5. Enemy warships, including submarines, destroyed by the United States and British Navies:

The total number of German, Italian, and Japanese naval vessels, including submarines, sunk by naval forces of the United States and British Empire naval forces, including surface craft, submarines, naval aircraft, and combinations of forces, but excluding those sunk by mines, is as follows:

United States	702
British Empire	821
Total	1,523

6. Enemy merchant shipping destroyed by the United States and British naval forces:

The total number of German, Italian, and Japanese merchant vessels of 1,000 or more gross registered tons sunk by naval forces of the United States and the British Empire, including surface craft, naval aircraft, submarines, and combinations of forces, but excluding mines, is shown following. In this connection, there should be added a number of German and Italian merchant ships which were sunk by naval forces, the identity of the attacker not having been reported. The majority of these should probably be credited to the British Empire forces:

United States	1,393
British Empire	57
Not reported	294
Total	1,744

7. The total United States and British naval aircraft lost:

The total number of United States naval aircraft lost by naval and marine squadrons in action or in an operational status in action sorties, or in forward areas, is 8,592.

Similar figures for the aircraft of British Empire naval aircraft are not immediately available, but the United States naval attaché in London has been requested to secure the information from the Admiralty and forward by dispatch.

8. The total destruction of enemy aircraft by the United States and British Empire naval forces:

The total number of enemy aircraft destroyed by United States naval forces in aerial combat, on the ground, by shipboard forces, including armed guard units on merchant vessels, but not including land-based antiaircraft units is 18,560.

The total number of enemy aircraft assessed as destroyed and probably destroyed by British Empire naval forces, including RAF assigned to the fleet, surface craft of the Royal Navy and Netherland, Norwegian, Polish, and other units operating under British control, and merchant fleet units is given as 1,348.

Further reply will be made upon receipt of the information desired from the naval attaché, London.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, April 12, 1946.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: With further reference to your request of March 30, 1946, for certain information regarding the United States and British Empire naval forces, I take pleasure in forwarding the following.

The British Admiralty have informed the Department that the total number of naval personnel engaged in World War II was 1,100,000, of which 851,000 were Royal Navy and 248,085 British Empire.

The Admiralty have also advised that total naval aircraft lost were 11,000 of which 6,500 were operational.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

Prevention of Strikes in Essential Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when every Member of the House is being besieged by requests from his constituents to take specific action with respect to the current strike situation there have been few suggestions for specific legislation as sound as the ones proposed by Prof. Sumner H. Slichter, of Harvard University, and published in the Christian Science Monitor on May 20, 1946. Professor Slichter needs no introduction to anyone who has made a study of labor problems. He is without question one of the best-informed students of the subject and has made many notable contributions toward the working out of labor-management relationships. He is known to be friendly to the labor-union movement, and his writings are characterized by great objectivity and clarity of thought. Professor Slichter's statement follows:

A BILL OF RIGHTS FOR THE PUBLIC PROPOSALS FOR PREVENTING STRIKES IN ESSENTIAL INDUSTRIES

(By Sumner H. Slichter, Lamont University professor, Harvard University, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of May 20)

Two transportation unions have recently threatened to tie up the Nation's railroads because an emergency board appointed by the President awarded them no more than a board of arbitration gave 18 other railroad unions. The Brotherhood of Utility Workers in New England threatens to deprive 80,000 households, schools, hospitals, and plants in New England of gas and electricity over a dispute involving the working hours of 27 employees. Four hundred thousand miners, after rejecting a wage increase of 18½ cents an hour, throw millions of nonminers out of work and inflict what the President has called a national disaster on the Nation in order to win gains for themselves beyond those allowable under the Government's wage-price policy.

Conspicuous in all of these cases is the willingness of certain unions to inflict calamitous losses upon the community either in order to get preferred treatment for their members or in order to win trivial gains. Such reckless and irresponsible use of the strike plainly calls for vigorous action to defend the public interest. The public has been remarkably slow in asserting its rights. It tolerated with little show of anger a strike of elevator operators in New York which threw tens of thousands of nonstrikers out of work. This was a strike against a decision of the regional War Labor Board. An even more serious strike of tugmen in February which stopped most business in New York for a day also aroused little public resentment. The public has endured telephone strikes and threats of strikes, transit strikes in Philadelphia and other places, and an electric light and power strike in Pittsburgh without getting seriously aroused. Mr. Lewis, however, seems to be slowly provoking a demand that something be done to protect the public's interest in the continuous production of essential goods. Quite possibly the popular demand for a law will evaporate as soon as the coal strike is settled. Sooner or later, however, the country will have to develop a well-planned public policy to guard its interest against serious stoppages in certain key industries. Everyone knows that a Nation-wide shutdown of railroad transportation cannot be permitted. Everyone knows that electricity to operate oil burners and refrigerators and to light hospitals, homes, and streets must be available every day of the year. Union leaders and union members, as well as employers and professors, use oil burners. They must have heat in their homes every day in January, and they must have current for refrigerators and lights every day. Obviously, the community cannot put off indefinitely frankly facing the problem of strikes or lock-outs which interrupt essential services. What should be done?

The first essentials are well planned arrangements for keeping the two parties negotiating as long as possible. Until negotiations break off, there is hope for settlement. This

means a strong and well-administered Conciliation Service under the direction of a man of national stature—a man of comparable importance in his sphere to the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Let us assume, however, that the parties have at last broken off negotiations and that a strike has been ordered or even started. The recent orders of the locomotive engineers and the railroad trainmen to strike on May 18 against the findings of the President's emergency board will serve as a good example. These unions have had their day in court and were awarded large increases. Nevertheless, they threaten to halt the railroad transportation of 135,000,000 people. Or Mr. Lewis' strike against the Government's wage-price policy is an example. In order to win concessions for his people beyond those allowed to persons in other industries by the Government's wage-price policy, Mr. Lewis does not hesitate to stop the industries of the Nation.

In cases of this sort, what instruments should the Government have to defend the rights of the community? The Government's policy should be based upon a declaration of rights of the community—a public bill of rights. This declaration should assert the right of the community to an adequate supply of essential services and commodities. It should place upon the President (or in the case of State legislation, the governor) the duty to declare that a public emergency exists when a threatened or an actual interruption to production so seriously limits or threatens to limit the output of essential goods and services as to imperil the public health, the public safety, or the general welfare. The declaration should provide that, after the Executive has found that a public emergency has been created by a strike or threat of strike or by a lock-out, work shall continue under the terms of the previous contract until new conditions of employment have been determined. The union shall be required to rescind any strike orders which it has issued and to order back to work any of its members who fail to live up to their obligations under the extended contract. Union members who fail to obey the return-to-work order or union officials who refuse to rescind strike orders or to order men to resume work shall be disciplined by the union in accordance with its laws—in the same way that the union ordinarily disciplines members who violate its rules. A union which fails to order its members back to work or which fails to discipline the members who violate its orders may be required by the National Labor Relations Board to show cause why it should not be deprived of its bargaining rights in the affected plants until such time as it shows that it has become a responsible organization. Similar obligations shall apply to employers in case the interruption to essential production is caused by lock-out.

The finding that a strike or shut-down would imperil the public health, safety, or general welfare shall make any strike or lock-out illegal. All picketing in support of strikes which imperil the public interest shall be forbidden and likewise all payment of strike benefits, the holding of strike meetings, and other activities designed to promote the continuation of the illegal shut-down. These prohibitions shall be supported with suitable penalties.

The parties shall be given three options for settling the dispute. In the first place, they may agree between themselves to continue negotiations in their own way. In the second place, they may agree to submit the unresolved issues to arbitrators selected by themselves. If they are unwilling or unable to use either of these two procedures, provision should be made to submit the dispute to other arbitrators. The method of selecting the arbitrators is important. The United States Conciliation Service should maintain a permanent panel of arbitrators who are regarded as fair and competent. No person should be a member of this standing panel of arbitrators unless his selection has been approved by a labor-management committee advisory to the Conciliation Service. From this panel of arbitrators the union or unions involved shall be permitted to select one arbitrator and the employees another arbitrator. These two arbitrators shall select the third member of the board. If either party refuses to select its member of the arbitration board, the head of the Conciliation Service shall make a selection from the standing panel of arbitrators. It is important that each party be given an opportunity to select one member of the board and it is important also to keep the selection of the third member out of the hands of politicians.

The findings of the board shall be retroactive to the expiration date of the previous contract between the parties and shall also be binding upon both parties for a period not less or more than 6 months. This period is long enough to enable the two parties to negotiate a lasting settlement which may be more to their liking than the findings of the board.

Would the proposed policy work? Would the union members obey the orders of their officers to refrain from striking or to return to work? These are the $64 questions. No one knows the answers. There is no way of assuring that thousands of men will stay at their jobs or return to their jobs simply because their refusal to do so would be either a national or a local disaster.

The proposed policy, however, has several points of advantage:

1. It is based upon a declaration of rights of the public which virtually no one either in the labor movement or outside it will dispute. This will help the policy command the moral support which any policy needs in order to be successful.

2. It limits the right to strike as narrowly as possible—imposing restrictions only in cases where public interests are seriously threatened. These are situations where there is general agreement today that stoppage of production is intolerable.

3 It is flexible. It gives public officials an opportunity to use their own judgment about declaring an emergency. If an official believes that the public in a given situation is too indifferent to its interests to give proper support to the policy, he is not required to act. Some persons may fear that public officials will abuse their discretion and will declare emergencies where no real disastrous stoppage of essential services is threatened. This danger can be partly averted by limiting the application of the emergency powers to a few industries in which continuous service is peculiarly important. It would not be appropriate, for example, to use the emergency powers in an automobile strike or even in a steel strike. With labor as powerful as it now is, officials will not declare emergencies unless the general welfare is gravely threatened.

4. The policy works through the unions and gives them an opportunity for becoming instruments to protect the community against disastrous interruptions of services. It builds up rather than undermines their prestige.

5. The policy gives each side a quick hearing before nonpolitically appointed neutrals.

In practically every case there will be at least a substantial minority of workers who will heed the orders of their union leaders. If the Government enforces the prohibitions against picketing in support of illegal strikes, these men will return to work and their return will encourage other members of the union to return.

The success of the policy, however, would depend upon the moral force of public opinion. It is important that the general public realize its responsibility. Neither trade unions nor employers will respect rights which the public does not vigorously assert. Hence no policy will work unless the public is vigilant on its own behalf and gives strong support to Government officials, trade-union leaders, and employers who attempt to support the public interest. The public may prefer to be lackadaisical and indifferent, as it has been up until the coal strike. In that event, however, the public should not complain if it finds itself frequently inconvenienced by strikes or lock-outs in public-service industries.

Would it not be preferable to select a few vital services, such as transportation, electric light and power, and hospitals, and simply outlaw all strikes and lock-outs in those services? This procedure has been suggested, but it seems to me to be too broad. There can be strikes among groups of railway employees, truck drivers, hospital employees, and workers in electric light and power plants which threaten no serious stoppage of service. Consequently, the policy which I have outlined is more flexible and more practical than an outright prohibition of all strikes and lock-outs in certain defined areas. If small strikes or lock-outs occurred which produced no public emergency, there would be difficulty in mobilizing public support behind the proper enforcement of a law against all strikes in the industry. That would undermine the policy and bring it into disrepute. Failure to enforce the policy in many small cases where no serious emergency existed would handicap the Government in dealing with real emergencies. Consequently, a policy which becomes operative only when a serious emergency is threatened or exists is best designed to command strong moral support from the public. Without such support the policy will fail.

General Bor Here for Visit With Polish Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, May 22, 1946:

GENERAL BOR HERE FOR VISIT WITH POLISH LEADERS—CHIEF OF THE UNDERGROUND AT BATTLE OF WARSAW IS GUARDED BY CITY POLICE

Carefully guarded by uniformed police and 15 detectives, Lt. Gen. Tadeusz Komorowski, better know as General Bor, leader of the Polish underground forces in the battle of Warsaw, arrived yesterday in New York by plane for a visit of several days.

The slight, balding general, attired in a brown civilian suit and brown slouch hat, was greeted at LaGuardia Field at 12:50 p. m. by officials of the Polish-American Congress, which is sponsoring his trip, and by Councilman Hugh Quinn, Queens Democrat, representing the city government.

Francis J. Wazeter, former assistant State attorney general and president of the downstate division of the Polish-American Congress, told reporters the congress, an anti-Communist organization, had requested ample police protection for General Bor, who came here from Detroit.

"Many Poles," he said, "do not believe that Premier Wladislaw Sikorski's death in a plane crash in the Mediterranean in 1943 was

an accident. We don't want anything like that to happen to the general."

Ten uniformed police and 15 detectives under Capt. James E. Donnelly, of the Special Service Division, were at LaGuardia Field. For security reasons Mr. Quinn banned a press conference with the general at the airport, although he, General Bor and several others posed in front of a newsreel camera for 5 minutes.

General Bor was escorted by motorcycle police to the Waldorf-Astoria, where he will stay. Mr. Wazeter said the Polish-American Congress hoped that at the hotel General Bor would receive as much police protection as was afforded Winston Churchill on the latter's recent visit. Except for the detectives accompanying the Polish underground leader, however, the only police in evidence were a half-dozen patrolmen on duty in the corridor near his seventeenth-floor room.

In a speech in Chicago on May 5 General Bor charged that Russia had double-crossed the Polish armies by not coming to their assistance in Warsaw in 1944. Yesterday, talking to reporters at the Waldorf, he declined to discuss political or international affairs, but said he would do so at a press conference in the Waldorf at 10 a. m. Friday.

He said he was in America as a guest of the American-Polish Congress to tell what had happened in Poland during the war. What has impressed him most on his first visit to America, he said, is the personal freedom of all citizens. General Bor will be received by Mayor William O'Dwyer at city hall, Friday noon.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the two letters below indicate the reaction against OPA policies in the Midwest. For the information of the House I am inserting these letters.

MINNESOTA PEOPLES POLITICAL FEDERATION,
St. Paul, Minn., May 18, 1946.

Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSEN: We are enclosing a copy of a letter sent by A. W. Ricker, retired editor of the Farmer's Union Herald, in resigning from the advisory labor committee to the State OPA in protest against OPA policies.

Mr. Ricker is one of the old-time liberals. Back in the second decade he was on the staff of Pearson's Monthly. Like all of the sincere liberals, Mr. Ricker sees that the greatest danger to true liberalism is the so-called liberalism today which is trying to establish a totalitarian state here and take away the liberties of the people, making them merely serfs of the state.

Yours sincerely,
RICHARD S. WILCOX,
Secretary-Treasurer.

MAY 17, 1946.

Mr. FRANK CLOUGH,
President, Minnesota Farmers Union,
Willmar, Minn.

DEAR MR. CLOUGH: About 3 years ago, Mr. Einer Kuivinen, our then president of the Minnesota Farmers Union, advised me that the board of directors of the Minnesota union had selected me to act as a member of the Minnesota OPA Labor Advisory Committee, subject, of course, to my acceptance. I replied that I would give the matter as much of my attention as possible and thereafter attended such meetings of the committee as I could.

Matters considered at the meetings which I attended consisted mainly of rent ceilings and their enforcement in protecting workers from evictions, bad sanitation, and excessive charges for housing privileges.

With respect to such matters I think the OPA has done a commendable and necessary job at least here in the St. Paul area. With respect to many other things, however, I am entirely at odds with OPA procedure, and so much so that I feel that to longer permit my name to be used as a member of the committee would be a betrayal of the best interests of the average workingman's family in the cities and that great group of farmers who once supplied the American consumer with meat and butter.

The mass of urban consumers are now unable to get butter at all at the stores and only the poorest quality of meats. The best meats are permitted to go to the big hotels and restaurants where the well-to-do get the benefit of ceilings while the common people get little or no benefit from ceilings because the showcases are empty of meats which may be freely purchased at the eating places patronized by the well-to-do. What good is a ceiling price on something which you cannot buy?

One of our employees at the central exchange told me as late as yesterday that the only pork he was able to buy at the butcher shop recently was pig tails. I have yet to see pig tails on the menus of first-class eating places anywhere between here and the Pacific coast from which area I have just returned.

Butter is unavailable now in a very large part of the United States even at the best hotels, but ice cream can be freely purchased even in the most remote sections between St. Paul and Los Angeles, Calif.

It is possible that the OPA has reached a place in its career where it is no longer possible to function as it once did. If so, then that fact should be faced and the work of this Government bureau suspended in favor of letting the law of supply and demand once more operate.

This would bring inflation, it is claimed. The answer is that we have inflation now and it is an open and debatable question whether the kind of inflation we have now is not worse than the one which would make it profitable for creameries to again churn butter and the meat packers to give the consumers an equal chance to buy as good meat through their dealers as they can now buy only in big hotels and other places patronized by those able to pay for, and get juicy steaks, good ham, and bacon.

I am sure the farmers would be glad to produce plenty of meat and butter and would not care to hoard such products if they, the farmers, could buy them at the stores and butcher shops as they once did.

Please accept my resignation as a member of the OPA Labor Advisory Committee of Minnesota.

Yours very truly,
A. W. RICKER.

A Missed Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at its national convention in Atlantic City, the DAR adopted a resolution ordering the immediate dissolution of a voluntary committee of which I am a member. The purpose of this voluntary committee is to seek removal from the contracts governing use of the DAR's Constitution Hall of a clause restricting use of the hall to "white artists only."

In connection with this action of the Daughters of the American Revolution Convention, I ask leave to insert in the RECORD, the following editorial from today's issue of the Washington Post:

DAR OPPORTUNITY

One can react only with dismay to the resolution adopted by the DAR Continental Congress ordering immediate dissolution of the DAR committee against racial discrimination in the use of Constitution Hall. Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE who headed the committee has been endeavoring to mobilize sentiment within the DAR for elimination of the "white artists only" clause in rental contracts for Constitution Hall. We should think, if the organization is at all democratically constituted, that she has every right to do this. Yet Mrs. Talmadge indignantly called her the leader of a "rebellious group seeking to force a change in our rules." "Rebellious" is a strange taunt from a daughter of revolution.

If it be rebellion that Mrs. LUCE is leading, it is rebellion of a very constructive sort. There must have been many in the DAR, as there were many throughout the Nation, who deplored the refusal last fall to permit Miss Hazel Scott to use Constitution Hall for a recital. The refusal, based entirely on Miss Scott's race and color, was an affront to the essential American principles which it is the stated purpose of the DAR to uphold. It did grievous injury to the organization's prestige and called into serious question the tax exemption enjoyed by Constitution Hall.

In seeking to remove this blot from the DAR record, Mrs. LUCE displays a devotion at once to democratic ideals and to the organization of which she is a distinguished member. Only through this kind of rebellion against an ugly and un-American intolerance can the DAR regain public esteem.

Poles Are Slow To Occupy Old German Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Homer Bigart from the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, May 22, 1946:

POLES ARE SLOW TO OCCUPY OLD GERMAN AREAS—WROCLAW STILL RESEMBLES A BATTLEFIELD AFTER A YEAR OF WARSAW ADMINISTRATION

(By Homer Bigart)

WROCLAW (Breslau), Poland, May 18.—Poland is meeting with indifferent success in its efforts to Polonize its new western territories, amputated from Germany as compensation for loss of eastern lands to Russia.

Wroclaw, which had a population of 700,000 Germans, now has fewer than 100,000 Poles, and after a full year of Polish administration this Silesian capital still has the appearance of a battlefield, with miles of uncleared rubble and desolation.

Much of the rich hinterland remains untilled. The broad valley of the Oder was the

scene of savage fighting, and in many farm settlements nothing remains but blackened chimneys and crumbling walls. Finding homes for settlers is one of the chief problems, along with acute shortages of seed, fertilizer. horses, and farm implements.

Thus, Wroclaw, even with its present small population, gets less than 40 percent of its food from the surrounding countryside. Mayor Alexander Wachniewski, admitting that even A-category ration cards are not being completely fulfilled, hopes that the district will be 70 percent self-supporting next year.

LITTLE PIONEERING SPIRIT

Wroclaw is a depressing ruin, and the visitors fail to sense any of the elation one expects in pioneer settlers fired with dreams of national destiny. For one thing, reconstruction is drearily slow. Mayor Wachniewski told us that removal of rubble was being effected by "ultramodern" methods, but apart from two conveyor belts lifting debris into carts, we saw nothing more advanced than picks and shovels. There are few lights to assist pedestrians groping by night along rutted streets, the restaurants are poor and expensive, and what few shops there are display shoddy goods at prices far beyond the reach of workers.

But the Government is making brave efforts to stimulate Polish culture in this uncompromisingly German scene. It has a philharmonic orchestra and an opera, three newspapers, and a university recruited mainly from transplanted faculties and students of Lwow and Wilno.

Efforts to stamp out Germanic vestiges sometimes are carried to ridiculous extremes. For example, all street names have been Polandized, and while one can applaud the changing of Adolf Hitler Strasse to Ulica Adama Michiewicza (for the nineteenth-century Polish poet) and of Matthias Ulica Marshala Stalina, one questions the replacing of Bethoven Strass by Ulica Mieczysl Arlowicza (late Polish poet and composer).

NO ETHNOGRAPHICAL BASIS

On the ground of ethnography the Poles have no claim to this region, and while at Potsdam President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee acceded to Polish "administration" of former German territories east of the Oder and the Neisse, the permanent severance of so deep a slice of Germany may become one of the most hotly contested issues facing the peace conference.

Knowing this, Poland is bending every effort to settle the western territories as quickly as possible. Settlers are arriving in Silesia at the rate of 60,000 monthly, and by April 1 the Polish population, according to government estimates, slightly exceeded 1,000,000. Some 40,000 Poles have been hurriedly planted in disputed Glatz, which Czechoslovakia claims, and hardly a week passes without anti-Czech demonstrations, at which representatives of the Red Army sometimes are present. At Bystrzyca, for example, the commander of the local Russian garrison listened attentively to denunciations of Czechs for "disrupting Slav unity," and later joined the Poles at a celebration.

Neither the settlement of Poles nor the expulsion of Germans is moving as quickly as the government, gravely worried over the attitude of the western powers, would wish. There are still more than 80,000 Germans in Wroclaw and more than 1,000,000 in Lower Silesia. Up to May 15 only 269,000 had been repatriated. According to Governor Stanislaw Plaskowski, the British will accept only two trains daily, carrying a total of 3,000.

NO EVIDENCE OF BRUTALITY

I saw absolutely no evidence to support the tales of Polish brutality one hears in Germany. I saw a trainload of Germans leaving Wroclaw, carrying great bundles of personal property they had taken to the train in carts. Although forbidden to take furniture, many had brought chairs and cots which they set up inside freight cars to make the long journey easier. They seemed well fed and the children had rosy cheeks.

Searchers for cruel injustices are on firmer ground when they dispute the uprooting of such huge segments of humanity. But the justice of the Polish frontiers must be viewed in the light of German outrages during the 5 years of occupation. Only then can one understand the apocalyptic hatred of the Pole for the German and the absolute impossibility of their living together for at least another generation.

But while Silesia contains wealth that can make Poland the dominant power in east-central Europe, Polish settlers seem strangely lacking in patriotic fervor. There has been too little psychological preparation for the enormous tasks ahead.

Instead of emphasizing the vast wealth of Silesia—Poland's export capacity is at least doubled by territorial acquisitions—government propagandists have sounded too many alarms, painted too many clouds on the Western horizon. This defensive attitude, "We stake our life on the Oder and Neisse," is hardly calculated to instill confidence among settlers, with the result that little is being invested in private enterprise, and everything has a superficial and very temporary look.

Meanwhile, evaluation of the government's achievements is hardly possible within the present limited perspective, and this correspondent's views may be clouded by the belief that Germany cannot possibly achieve a tolerable existence within its new compressed frontiers.

The brighter aspects of the somber picture cannot be overlooked, however. The Polish Government can take justifiable pride in the Silesian coal production. Already the output is 30 percent above prewar production. Nearly 1,000,000 tons were mined during the first 10 days of May, a 15-percent increase over a similar period in April. Since coal is Poland's wealth, the importance of this achievement can hardly be overestimated.

The efficient rehabilitation of Wroclaw's enormous railroad shops, among the largest in Europe, is another point in the Government's favor. These shops already are turning out seven railway cars daily. Ambitious plans are under way to shift the metallurgical industry from Warsaw to Wroclaw, which eventually may become Poland's biggest industrial center. But success of the venture may finally depend on foreign capital.

Poland desperately needs foreign loans, and it is for America to decide whether the present government, which is trying to remain in power through repressions which often seem ugly to western eyes, is deserving of help.

How To Reduce Mine Accidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the last weeks as trouble in the coal industry has grown, I have of course been following closely and have come to a few conclusions. Whatever our views on the present dispute, we must correct certain abuses under which most coal miners work. Regardless of action about wages or the prevention of industrial war, we must take effective steps about this other matter. If we do so, we shall remove some of the real grievances which cause discord and so we shall help toward peace and cooperation in the industry.

In the last 40 years nearly 80,000 coal miners have lost their lives while at work. This is about one and a half times the number of our men killed during the first World War and nearly a quarter of those killed during the second. Since the average number of workers in the mines during these years was some 650,000 and since the average working life of a miner is of about this duration, it follows that one out of every eight of those who worked steadily in the mines was killed while earning his living.

But even this does not tell the story. We must also consider the nonfatal injuries. The number of these is shocking. During the 10 years 1931–1940, according to the United States Bureau of Mines, there were 637,180 of these accidents or on the average some 64,000 a year. Even this may be an understatement since the unions claim that the Bureau of Mines is not able to get a record of all the accidents that occur. During this decade the average number employed in the coal mines was 555,000 so that at least one out of every nine miners was injured each year. The record during the first 4 years of this decade from 1940 through 1943 was not a happy one since a total of 5,576 miners were killed during this period or an average of 1,394 per year. Not less than 258,000 miners were injured during these 4 years, of which 8,755 were injuries of a permanent nature.

All this makes coal mining rank with war as a dangerous trade. I do not believe that as a nation we can, with good conscience, neglect this subject any longer. There is lots of blood mixed with the coal we burn to heat our homes and run our industries. We owe a debt to those who shed this blood for us, to see to it that these deaths and injuries are reduced to the lowest possible figure.

We can make a beginning at this job if we see (a) what the main causes of the accidents are, (b) how they might be prevented, and (c) what the role of operators, the unions, and the State and Federal Governments might be.

The main types of accidents in relative importance are:

First. Accidents caused by falls of roof and coal which so frequently bury or crush the miners. In 1942 these caused 49 percent of the fatalities and 23 percent of the nonfatalities.

Second. Haulage accidents, when the miners are struck, run over, or squeezed in moving the coal out. These accounted for about one-fourth of the accidents in 1942.

Third. Explosions of gas or coal dust. Every year several terrible accidents of this nature occur which almost wipe out the men of some mining communities. Such were the tragedies of Cherry Hill, Ill.; Monongah, W. Va.; Mather, Pa.; and that of a few months ago near Pineville, Ky. The growing practice of rock dusting has reduced these catastrophes but they are still too frequent and too costly.

Fourth. Accidents caused by explosives.

Fifth. Accidents resulting from the use of machinery and electricity.

There are certain precautions which can and should be taken.

(a) There should be much more careful timbering of the roofs of the shafts, particularly near the face where coal is being removed. The haste to get out coal frequently leads to neglecting this precaution and greatly swells the accident rate.

(b) A much wider use should be made of rock dusting. This is now practiced in mines employing about 55 percent of the miners, but if it were always carried out, mine explosions would be cut to a low figure.

(c) The use by the mines of only permissible explosives and the barring from use of the more dangerous explosives.

(d) A wider use of either electric cap lamps or other safe lamps by the miners.

But important as such precautions are, perhaps even more important is the education of management, the miners, and the State and Federal authorities with the vital necessity for observing safety rules. This is especially needed to prevent haulage accidents and those caused by the fall of roofs and coal which, as we have seen, are the two most important sources of accidents. It is always hard to develop such a safety spirit and particularly so in an industry where piecework is largely used and where the emphasis is upon hurry and speed. But the human losses are so great that it must be fostered at all costs.

By the Federal Mine Inspection Law of 1941—Public No. 49, Seventy-seventh Congress—the Bureau of Mines was given the power to inspect all mines in the country and to make recommendations for improved safety and sanitation. A staff of 157 inspectors and 10 engineers has been built up under a Mine Inspection branch. Several thousand mines are thoroughly inspected each year and recommendations are given to the operators and the unions. While the Bureau has no power of enforcement, it can and does report its findings to local papers near the respective mines. By persuasion and by the pressure of public opinion however, it has been able to make some progress. Perhaps because of this work and that of the Safety Branch within the Bureau of Mines, the accident rates for 1944 and 1945 have been lowered. According to unpublished figures of the Bureau there were 2,492 miners killed in these 2 years, as compared with 2,922 miners in the 2 preceding years and the fatality rate per 1,000,000 manhours fell from 1.62 in 1942 and 1.56 in 1943 to 1.30 in 1944 and 1.21 in 1945. These figures do indicate some progress and show that the present work should be supported. But it is only a beginning and much more needs to be done.

One proposal is to require the operators to put into effect the safety recommendations of the United States Bureau of Mines. This could either be done by a Federal law or by operators and miners reaching an agreement to this effect. It is understood that many leaders prefer the second to the first method. If it were adopted, we would need to give proper support to the inspection and safety work of the Bureau of Mines. If the operators and miners, however, do not reach such an agreement, the question will arise as to whether Congress should not try to reduce mine accidents. I personally believe we should.

There are two major arguments for requiring the safety rules of the Bureau of Mines to be followed by the coal operators.

First. It is charged that State enforcement has been ineffective. Not only are some State laws weak, but the enforcement of State rules is often lax.

Second. It is claimed that the Bureau of Mines, on the other hand, is very competent and that since the staff is under civil service it is less subject to political pressure.

Those who are opposed to the compulsory system advance the three following objections:

First. That conditions of mining differ so widely between States that it would be hard to frame rules, especially in the fields of timbering and haulage, which could be applied to the country as a whole. Instead they urge that we get flexibility by requiring the States, which are closer to local situations, to make the local rules. Those who believe in compulsory action reply to this argument that they are not proposing that Congress pass a law which will prescribe in detail all the safety rules which should be followed. They say instead that any law or collective agreement should merely lay down broad principles and that the Bureau of Mines should then, as now, make safety recommendations for each separate mine. The only difference would be that the operators would then have to put the rules into effect and could not, as now, disregard them. In this way, it is urged, we could get both national protection and local flexibility.

Second. That we should try to develop greater State responsibility for such matters and should not weaken them by running to the Federal Government every time the States do not function properly. If the State governments, which are closely responsible to the people affected, do a poor job, how, it is asked, can we expect Federal officials, who are far less responsible to the people, to do better? This group says therefore that we should improve the State mine safety laws and their administration instead of trying to centralize all responsibility. One reply to this is that the Federal Government need not enforce the rules, but rather that this job might be given to boards set up by collective bargaining. If this were done, we would have industrial rather than political decentralization. The Bureau of Mines would lay down the rules. The industry would enforce them. The more this could be done by joint action, the greater would be the harmony.

Third. That since there has been such an improvement in the last 2 years, the voluntary system has earned the right for more time in which to prove its worth. The reply is that what has succeeded is in fact Federal inspection rather than the voluntary system and that accidents would be still further reduced if the Federal rules were binding.

Such are the arguments. I ask that the public and the Congress seriously consider them and the situation with which they deal. If this is done, an adequate solution can be found.

In the meantime, there are at least two steps upon which all men of good will can agree.

First. Mine fires and deaths from explosives can be almost abolished by the use of rock dusting, proper safety lamps, and only permissible explosives. I urge the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Mines to get the operators and the unions together and see if they cannot agree upon such a measure. If this is impossible, I believe a simple law to this effect should be drafted and passed by Congress at this session.

Second. Since safety is caused not merely by rules but even more by the spirit with which it is sought, cannot the Bureau of Mines still further promote it by getting operators and unions to compete vigorously in reducing accidents? It can do this by both "experience" and "merit" rating. If you can get men and organizations to compete for excellency, much good can be accomplished. Andrew Carnegie was, for example, able to spur his steel mills on to break production records by having the mill which turned out the most steel in a month hoist a broomstick. Many of our combat divisions were able to improve camp sanitation by staging competitions between their regiments and separate battalions. There is no reason why this cannot also be done in safety work. Experience rating consists in computing both the fatality and the injury rate per million hours worked and million tons mined. This permits a comparison between mines and districts. Each mine would then be required to post its rates for the preceding year in comparison with the average for the district and the country. This would exert a mighty pressure within every mine and community to improve their showing.

The use of merit-rating would throw added weight behind such a movement. Numerical weights would then be given to the main safety precautions and rules and each mine rated on a percentage basis. These percentage ratings in turn could then be posted and published. Even though the Bureau did not have the power to enforce compliance, the mere publication of such ratings would be a powerful force toward compliance in order to improve the standing next year. Prizes and medals, which would not cost much, could be given as tangible rewards for good service to extend the already excellent work done in this connection by the safety association named after the late Dr. Joseph A. Holmes.

Coal miners not only endure industrial dangers, but they and their families also suffer from excessive sickness. Mine and camp sanitation both need to be improved and more adequate medical and hospital facilities provided. The housing in many mine villages is bad and the general surroundings depressing. There is a big job to be done in all these directions. We should roll up our sleeves and make a start.

To Prevent Price Inflation, Give Production Its Head

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Saturday Evening Post of May 4, entitled "To Prevent Price Inflation, Give Production Its Head."

This article bears out the arguments set forth in my remarks in the March 5 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD entitled "The Housing Bill," that we are not going to witness the extensive and greatly publicized building program held out to our veterans, until private industry is taken in on the program and given an opportunity to secure the necessary materials through the lifting of OPA restrictions.

TO PREVENT PRICE INFLATION, GIVE PRODUCTION ITS HEAD

Among our recent callers was an unregenerate individualist who announced straight out of the box that there isn't going to be any inflation unless the Government insists on printing money while preventing people from producing goods. In his opinion, the inflation faction is ignoring the rapidity with which the American productive system can turn things out, once officialdom takes off the wraps.

"Someday," he told us, "you'll say to the man, 'How about a refrigerator?' and he'll say, 'Sure, take it home.' Then the boom will be over and it'll be too late to get out. It's getting that way with tires already. And nylons. Hasn't your wife got a post card from half a dozen department stores telling her she can have a pair of nylons? It's only the beginning. I've been buying nylons here and there, all through the war. Sending a pair to a politician's wife eases a lot of situations. I've paid as high as $18. Last week I bought a dozen pairs, and the top price I had to pay was $3.

"Of course," continued our unregenerate individualist, "the boys at the Federal desks can show things up a lot. In housing they're doing a wonderful job already, because they won't let anybody build houses until they can decide on the price the last veteran to come out of New Guinea wants to pay, granted that he wants a house at all. It doesn't occur to them that when a man who is now paying $150 a month for an apartment builds a house, even if he gets gypped on the price, a unit of housing has been created which takes the heat off housing all down the line. You've got to keep ceilings on rent for a while, just as you have to keep ceilings on certain scarce and necessary articles that can't be quickly produced. But the bureaucrats look more interested in preventing profits than in boosting production. If building is encouraged on almost any terms, it won't be long before that apartment-house owner will have a tough time getting $100 for his $150 flat. The other way to go at it is the way the Government wants to go at it—that is, decide in advance how many $6,000 houses the building industry must build for veterans. Nobody knows how many veterans want houses or where they want 'em, but when you have a housing program, you have to look as if you are going to pass a miracle.

"So, of course, nobody builds any houses, and probably won't until the Government puts up the money to turn them out like Liberty ships. I often wonder what would have happened if somebody had told Henry Ford about 1902 that justice demanded that nobody should pay more than $600 for an automobile. The result would have been that everybody would have had justice, but nobody would have had a car."

Nevertheless we go along with our individualist friend in believing that it takes more than an office full of economists to keep the American productive machine in the barn. But why try so hard?

Nashville Tennesseean Endorses Rural Industrialization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, recently Senator JOSIAH W. BAILEY, of North Carolina, and I introduced bills—S. 1385 and H. R. 4068—which are designed to promote the industrialization of underdeveloped areas of the United States through cooperation with agencies of the State and municipal governments. The measure is sometimes referred to as "the rural industrialization bill" and is receiving endorsements throughout the country.

It is not our purpose to encourage the removal from any city or region of established industries but rather to encourage rural communities in all areas of the country to develop appropriate industries in aid of a balanced economic life.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Nashville Tennesseean of May 20, 1946:

The implications of the Bailey-Hays bill to promote industrialization in the more underdeveloped and overpopulous areas of the South and Southwest stand out strongly in the floodlight of information brought to bear on this region by Dr. Vance's monumental new work, All These People. The bill itself is an important piece of legislation and Dr. Vance's book should be required reading for every Southern Congressman who is inclined to look down his nose at this Wallace-supported measure.

Mr. Wallace introduced testimony in support of the bill that should shock the South into alertness. The region, he said, may have a total of 7,000,000 unemployed people in 5 or 10 years unless steps are taken to develop capital and technical resources and protect the vast human resources which we have.

Mr. Wallace was not talking through his hat. The cotton picker is here. It is certain to upset the fairly stable population of the rich cotton areas, eliminate the cotton-patch farmer, and create an unemployed army of 1,000,000. Wartime emigration took 6 to 11 percent of the population of Southern States to industrial regions northward and westward. Some are already back. The first slowing of machines will send hundreds of thousands southward again.

Add to these the rapid increase of the region's population (it produced 30 percent of the Nation's increase in the decade 1930–40 as against 15 percent for the preceding decade), particularly in the underdeveloped areas, and there is created a potentially tremendous jobless pool.

The Secretary of Commerce very soundly pointed out that now is the time for underdeveloped regions to industrialize because the "next few years will see a great expansion of facilities, employment, and production in most peacetime industries." But he added, "Once the great expansion period is over further increase in these regions can be made only in severe competition with industries already established in other portions of the country. This is, therefore, a very strategic time to launch the program which the bill proposed."

The bill looks in the direction of that national-regional planning which Dr. Vance sees as imperative if the South is to realize its legitimate place in the Nation and the Nation benefit by the proper development of the South. It authorizes the Department of Commerce to gather data for private enterprise seeking opportunities for expansion and encourage industrialization in the areas where population is already far beyond the point of efficient employment in agriculture.

Heretofore population has followed industrialization. This bill would reverse the process.

United States Navy Underwater Sound Laboratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, during the war little could be said about the remarkable work being done by this laboratory to facilitate the fine work of our submarines. Now we may lift the curtain. Recently I was privileged to spend a day with the staff and I give here a very scant outline of the work which this important but little known section of our Navy did to help win the war and is doing today for our protection.

The United States Navy Underwater Sound Laboratory is one of several scientific development organizations under the control of the Navy Bureau of Ships. This laboratory, located at Fort Trumbull, New London, Conn., is engaged primarily in the development of underwater sound equipment and other special devices used in submarine and antisubmarine warfare.

The present staff of the laboratory numbers about 365, of whom about 20 percent are professional scientists and engineers. The remaining 80 percent are subprofessional engineering aides and technicians, radio mechanics, machinists, supporting clerical and administrative personnel, guards, chauffeurs, and other unclassified employees. The technical direction of the program is in the hands of Dr. John M. Ide, who before coming to this laboratory held positions on the Harvard University faculty; in the Shell Development Co.'s geophysical laboratory; and at the Naval Research Laboratory in Washington, D. C.

The Underwater Sound Laboratory started in 1941 as a Navy establishment to provide facilities—buildings, ships, and liaison—for a Columbia University scientific project under NDRC contract. During the war the combined Navy and

Columbia Laboratory in this location doubled and redoubled in size, sending its field engineers into the areas of conflict wherever sonar equipment was in use, taking a major part in the pro- and anti-submarine training program, and completing a number of important technical developments which contributed to the final victory.

In March 1945, with the beginning of the liquidation of the NDRC, the laboratory was reorganized and put on a permanent peacetime basis as an important unit of the Navy Department's long-range program of research and development. The development and research program of the United States Navy Underwater Sound Laboratory is coordinated closely with the related programs being carried out by the Naval Research Laboratory in Washington and by other naval activities. Maximum benefit is thus gained for the Navy from limited funds, equipment, and personnel, and the particular advantages of the New London laboratory—fleet contacts, especially with the submarine forces, seagoing test facilities, and nearness to ocean test conditions, excellent shops, and so forth, are used most effectively.

CONTENT OF THE TECHNICAL WORK

While the dramatic developments in atomic energy and radar have been given a great deal of recent publicity, considerably less emphasis has been put on the importance of underwater sound. This field of physics is particularly recondite. Relatively few commercial applications for underwater sound can be visualized, and therefore few men are experts in the field. The sonic fathometer is about the only piece of underwater sound equipment which has any extensive peacetime use; and its development was virtually complete nearly 25 years ago.

Yet, sound is literally the only means by which a submerged submarine can be located, and the only means available to a submerged submarine for obtaining intelligence as to what is going on around it. Light waves and electromagnetic radiation—radio waves—are, of course, so severely obstructed and attenuated by water that a submarine is absolutely invisible and absolutely radar-proof when submerged to only a relatively shallow depth. Conversely, the submerged submarine is blind and his radar is impotent. He must rely on his underwater ears.

The problems of listening and of echo-ranging are still further complicated by the vagaries of sound transmission in water. Just as sound in air is affected by atmospheric conditions or by the characteristics of the walls and other objects in a room—in fact, just as sound echoes up and down a canyon—sound in water is subject to all sorts of echoing and bending effects, channeling and scattering. Corrections can be made for many of these effects by scientists who have made detailed studies of sound transmission.

The scientists' part in the sound phases of subsurface warfare has consisted of both the development of specific equipment and the study of the physical properties exhibited by sound in water. These studies were actually started during the First World War. In fact, there was a small experimental station run by the Navy in New London during the latter part of that war. After the armistice, these activities gradually dwindled away, although the Naval Research Laboratory in Washington, D. C., maintained a Sound Division, in which a small group of devoted scientists, working with very limited facilities, continued to study the properties of sound in water, and to work on developments of interest to the Navy. The sonar equipment with which our Navy entered World War II was in large part the result of these efforts carried on in peacetime.

In 1941, however, the likelihood that the United States would soon be at war made it necessary to expand all the Navy's existing research facilities. Under the OSRD, Division 6, Section 6.1 of the NDRC set up underwater sound laboratories in New London, Cambridge, and San Diego, run respectively by Columbia University, Harvard University, and the University of California. These were the most important of several organizations whose principal business was the study of underwater sound phenomena and the development of equipment. Each laboratory had its special assignment in the general field of subsurface warfare. The New London laboratory developed the famous JP listening gear, which became standard equipment in our submarines. The war patrol reports are studded with enthusiastic references to this equipment, by submarine skippers. Another highly successful project was the expendable radio sonic buoy, a device dropped from planes to enable them to locate submarines by underwater listening. Many other devices which are still confidential or secret were conceived, developed, subjected to operational evaluation, and finally turned over to manufacturers for mass production from the laboratory's prototype design.

In 1945, the NDRC terminated the activities of its underwater sound laboratories. The Navy, anxious to see that the most important of this work was continued after NDRC's termination, and already having possession of the buildings, took over the scientific equipment from OSRD, hired a considerable number of both the Harvard and Columbia scientists and continued the prosecution of the long-range development program. March 1, 1945, was the official date of the transfer of management.

Like other service laboratories, the Underwater Sound Laboratory now operates as a civilian organization under the administrative military control of a commanding officer. The engineering personnel are civilians and the technical cognizance of the scientific program is in civilian hands, guided by the service requirements as outlined by the Chief of Naval Operations and interpreted by the Chief of the Bureau of Ships, in the Navy Department.

The physical principles and the engineering developments which underly the operation of any sonar equipment are no less dramatic than those on which radar is based. Echo-ranging, the process by which a submarine is detected by a destroyer's sound gear, is in many respects analogous to radar. Some scientists believe echo-ranging suggested radar to the radio physicists. As its name implies, echo-ranging consists of sending a pulse of sound energy into the water, noting the direction from which an echo comes back and measuring the time interval between pulse and echo. Range and bearing are thus determined.

Echo-ranging was an outgrowth of echo-sounding, the process by which a vessel determines the depth of water in which it is operating. In a primitive form, echo-ranging was developed in the 1920's. But the necessary improvement of echo-ranging devices has been a major concern of all laboratories engaged during the war in underwater sound.

Echo-ranging and listening are the two basic methods of obtaining information under water. Listening has the advantage of being a passive method which does not signal one's presence to the enemy. Obviously, echo-ranging (if the enemy himself is equipped with listening equipment) is about like turning a searchlight on a thief in the middle of the night. Whether you see him or not, you tell him where to shoot.

Echo-ranging and listening are, in a sense, analogous to radar and to radio receiving, although the technical problems are very different in detail. One system or the other is the basis of practically every underwater sound development, and the heart of either is naturally the element which sends out sound and/or picks it up. This is called the transducer. The transducer used for listening is an underwater microphone, of which all kinds of applications have been and are being developed. The present-day sound equipment is as much better than the equipment of only a few years ago as your present-day home radio receiver is better than the crystal receiver and headphones of 1920. Still better equipment is now on the drawing boards and undergoing sea tests.

Among the accomplishments of the Underwater Sound Laboratory in New London, the radio sonic buoy has probably been most widely publicized. This is an expendable device consisting of a hydrophone and a radio transmitter, built into a buoy which is dropped, with a parachute, from an airplane. The buoys broadcast sounds picked up by their hydrophones to planes flying overhead. They could hear German U-boats, effectively report their positions to the aircraft, and verify their sinking after depth bombs had been dropped in the right location. With this equipment it has actually been possible, while flying over the location of a submarine, to hear the U-boat breaking to pieces under water.

To a layman the most amazing underwater sound phenomenon discovered during the war is probably the sound channel transmission effect which is the basis of the SOFAR air-sea rescue system. This came as the result of theoretical studies conducted by the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution in Woods Hole, Mass. Scientists found that, at a depth of about 4,000 feet in the ocean, there exists what is practically a horizontal sound channel. Sounds originating at this depth, instead of spreading out in all directions,

spread only horizontally. The energy is therefore conserved and transmitted to tremendous ranges. A 1-pound bomb exploded in the sound channel off Dakar can be heard an hour or so later—sound travels at about 5,000 feet per second in sea water—in the Bahamas.

This discovery suggested the possibility of using underwater sound as a means for locating castaways at sea. Theoretically, it is perfectly possible to locate the latitude and longitude of an underwater explosion if the time of arrival of the sound wave at each of three receiving stations can be determined. The Underwater Sound Laboratory has developed the necessary hydrophone, receiving, recording, and timing equipment and the Bureau of Ships has assigned a project officer to coordinate the establishment of operating stations in the Pacific.

With properly located listening stations monitoring 24 hours a day, an airplane in distress halfway across the Pacific or a survivor on a life raft will be able to signal his location merely by dropping a 1-pound TNT bomb with the proper hydrostatic fuse. Within 45 minutes, his latitude and longitude can be determined by the listeners a thousand miles or more away. This system is, incidentally, far better than radio for the purpose, because even if it were possible to set up a high-power radio station on a life raft, this station could not send a direct transmission farther than the horizon.

Unfortunately, the most important of the laboratories' projects must necessarily be in the confidential or secret category, and cannot be described at the present time. The air-sea rescue, radio sonic buoy, and JP sonic listening projects, briefly described above, illustrate the kind of developments on which the laboratory is or has been engaged.

The principal mission of the Underwater Sound Laboratory, as described in its administrative directive, is "the development and testing of sonar and submarine equipments under the cognizance of the Bureau of Ships." At present, the laboratory is working on problems ranging from special new sonar developments of a confidential or secret classification, to short-range equipment developments, sea trials and evaluations, which all involve subsurface warfare but are not exclusively sonar in nature. During the war, most of the laboratory's activity was short-range and time was of the essence. In many cases, decisions emphasized speed rather than cost or technical adequacy. With the coming of peace, the Underwater Sound Laboratory is reevaluating its program and turning toward longer-range projects, with the engineering development of reliable and well-integrated equipment as the primary purpose.

With the advent, at the very end of the war, of new types of submarines—German—having extraordinary range and speed submerged, the antisubmarine problem must be considered to be still unsolved. In the war just finished we were able, with radar and with the improved sonar equipment, to win the war against the U-boats by a narrow margin. In another war, greatly improved submarines may operate from the beginning with schnorchel—breathing tubes—giving no perceptible radar indication. They may submerge quickly to depths much deeper than existing sonar equipment was designed to penetrate, and they may operate at higher speeds than present Navy escort vessels can make in the chase.

These are problems for the scientists in the Navy laboratories to solve between now and the next war. When war starts it may be too late because of the ever-increasing pace of offensive strategy. The consequences of failure will be more serious than the loss of shipping alone, because the future submarines may carry guided missiles with atomic war heads, with which to bombard our coastal cities from positions safely out at sea. The Nation's first line of defense against such assaults must be the technical proficiency of the scientists in the service laboratories. Their business is to maintain indefinitely the technical excellence of the United States Navy and to keep this country in the forefront of technical proficiency in all matters affecting the national security. Subsurface warfare and underwater sound are fields which may be just as vital to that security as guided missiles or atomic bombs.

ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL

The New London laboratory is organized in six operating sections, with a large staff of administrative and supporting and service groups. The operation sections consist of:

First. A submarine sonar section, concentrating its activities on the development of equipment for use in submarines.

Second. A scanning sonar section, working on radically new types of sonar for both submarines and surface craft.

Third. A section studying submarine radio-antenna systems.

Fourth. A scientific service group, which includes mechanical design facilities for the entire laboratory, a sound recording department, a group of electronic experts, and a group of data analysts and theoretical physicists.

Fifth. A transducer development section.

Sixth. A production department, which contains complete drafting facilities, electronic shops, carpentry and machine shops, for the construction of prototype models to be turned over to commercial concerns for large-scale manufacture.

The supporting services and administrative sections contain the technical library and records department, the supply offices, transportation and shipping facilities, and the other groups which are a part of any business organization.

Attached to the laboratory, and under the administration of the naval command are several vessels, including both an experimental submarine and numerous small craft used for sea trials of new equipments. A barge, located in a freshwater pond 7 miles from the laboratory, has been completely equipped with the apparatus necessary for the scientific evaluation of the transducers and other components of underwater sound equipment. This is a sort of underwater sound studio.

The laboratory is essentially an industrial rather than an academic research organization. Its business, like that of other Army and Navy laboratories, consists of applied research and engineering development. The staff works, for the Navy, on those scientific problems which are vital to the submarine service and to submarine and antisubmarine warfare.

As is the case in practically all Government laboratories, there is no problem more fundamental to the continued activity of the Underwater Sound Laboratory at the present time than that of acquiring and retaining highly qualified scientists and engineers. The competition for the services of such men has never been stiffer than it is today. As a result of wartime experience—and partly as accumulated results from prewar experience which did not give rise to effective action—it is now generally recognized that the Government service must be made more attractive to scientists if the competent staffs which have been assembled during the exigencies of the war are to be retained.

The plant and the equipment assembled at the Underwater Sound Laboratory, mostly by inheritance from the OSRD, will probably serve peacetime needs without major additions. Efforts to recruit capable scientists since the termination of hostilities have been only moderately successful. Many of the younger men are interested in returning to school to complete the requirements for advanced degrees. Private industry has drawn off at the top many of the most competent scientific personnel on the management and administrative levels. Those of us who recognize this vital work of the present staff at the Underwater Sound Laboratory are, for these reasons, particularly interested in the suggested improvements in the operation of the Civil Service Commission which are being studied and recommended by such groups as the Advisory Committee on Scientific Personnel (National Research Council), the auxiliary committee on civil-service regulations, and the Committee on Scientific and Professional Personnel—appointed by Secretary Forrestal via Admiral Crisp, chief of OIR.

Improving the Public-Assistance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement presented to the House Ways and Means Committee of the Federal Congress at hearings held May 3, 1946, on proposed amendments to the Social Security Act by Robert P. Wray, acting secretary of public assistance, Pennsylvania Department of Public Assistance:

During the recent years of low public dependency we have been taking stock of our

experiences in developing a public assistance program in Pennsylvania following the mass unemployment of the early thirties. Our conclusions are in agreement with the principles recommended by the American Public Welfare Association and incorporated in H. R. 5686, introduced in the House of Representatives by the Honorable Aime J. Forand, of Rhode Island.

After witnessing the inability of private charities and local government to finance the heavy cost of what was generally called unemployment relief and the various temporary ventures by the State and Federal Governments to cope with the problem, Pennsylvania has settled down to a uniform program of public assistance administration with the four categories of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, general assistance and blind pensions administered by a single State department and, in each county, by one board of assistance.

I believe it might interest this committee to have me indicate the advantages of integrated assistance administration under which Pennsylvania, in contrast with most other States, has been operating for the past 8 years.

In Pennsylvania a needy person goes to only one office where his eligibility for an assistance grant is determined. Only as a secondary operation is he assigned to a particular category, depending primarily on age. Let me illustrate the advantages to the applicant by recounting a recent experience with an adjacent State where the several assistance programs have not been integrated administratively.

Some time ago we received a letter from a city welfare office requesting permission to return a mother and her children to Pennsylvania so that they might receive aid to dependent children. We inquired why aid could not be received in the present State of residence since the record indicated that the family had been living there long enough to be eligible for aid to dependent children. After further correspondence it developed that this mother had committed the unpardonable sin of going first to a municipal welfare agency to seek financial help for her destitute children. Because this agency had certain residence requirements of its own, the family was ineligible; but if this mother had gone through a different door and made application for aid to dependent children, she could have received help. A letter from the head of the State agency explains: "As it now appears, Mrs. G. having made application for (municipal) aid, the case is within the purview of the statutes dealing with (municipal) aid. It appears that the above subject is entitled to categorical assistance * * * (but) we are hesitant to intervene * * *." One of the points, therefore, toward which we should strive in public assistance administration is that of integrated administration under a single agency at the local, State, and Federal levels.

A further refinement in administrative integration is that of noncategorical administration. Although in Pennsylvania all four categories of assistance are under the administration of single State and local agencies, we grant old-age assistance if the applicant is aged 65 or more; but if he is only 64, he receives general assistance. Similarly a needy child in school receives aid to dependent children until he reaches the age of 18 and thereafter receives general assistance for which we must prepare a new record. There are those who argue that under a categorical program, the needs of special groups are better met. Personally, I cannot agree that this must necessarily be so; but in order that there be provision to meet differences of opinion among the States, it would be helpful if the law permitted Federal financial participation in grants-in-aid for assistance to all needy persons, leaving the decision as to categorical or noncategorical administration to the States.

In further support of a uniform concept of an assistance program it is interesting to note that since 1939, 63,000 cases, representing 40 percent of all cases opened for old-age assistance in Pennsylvania, were transfers from the general-assistance category. These persons and their needs were no different because a birthday had occurred; but as an agency we made them "categorically different." Also, 10 percent of all assistance cases are part of a household receiving two or more categories of assistance; 25 percent of general-assistance cases are in households where there is either an aid-to-dependent-children or old-age-assistance case; and 15 percent of aid-to-dependent-children cases are in households where there is either a general-assistance or old-age-assistance case. The one thing that all of these people have in common is financial need; categories are a designation by the agency and are costly and cumbersome in administration.

It is proposed that Federal participation in payments to needy persons be on a uniform basis without respect to arbitrary ceiling or assistance category. There should be Federal participation in financing a general-assistance program, just as is now done for the other assistance programs. In fact, since the general-assistance rolls fluctuate in relation to unemployment—a factor usually beyond the control of the State—Federal sharing in the financing of this program is even more logical than sharing in the other assistance programs with their relatively more stable characteristics. Arbitrary ceilings governing Federal matching in the specific categories should be removed in order to eliminate accounting and statistical red tape and place full responsibility on the States for developing adequate assistance standards so that there is no discrimination for or against a person because of the accident of age that places him in a particular assistance category.

The lack of uniformity that develops under differently financed categorical programs is illustrated in the various ways States have tried to meet the medical needs of assistance recipients. It is generally admitted that medical expenses do not lend themselves to advance budgeting for assistance grants. However, in order to secure the financial advantages of Federal participation, many States have tried to include the cost of medical care in regular assistance payments to individuals. Such a device is administratively difficult; and fixed allowances for medical care are too low in some instances and too high in others. In the further interest of economy and adequacy, provision should be made for Federal participation when payments are made directly to physicians or institutions providing medical care to assistance recipients.

Pennsylvania has already indicated through legislation enacted at the 1945 session of the General Assembly, in a bill sponsored by Representative Lichtenwalter, that it is willing to abolish residence requirements in determining eligibility for assistance. What the attitude of our Pennsylvania Legislature will be on the elimination of citizenship requirements as a condition of eligibility for general assistance, I am unable to say. Judging, however, from the conditions of extreme hardship that come to my attention where a noncitizen spouse or mother must manage to live with her husband or child on an assistance grant determined with respect to only the citizen members of the household, I hazard the guess that Pennsylvania will not long continue the requirement of citizenship in determining eligibility for general assistance.

There is one further question to which H. R. 5686 suggests an answer. The question is, Should the assistance program include financial support for indigent persons who choose to reside in infirmaries, convalescent homes, and public institutions for the physically infirm? Under H. R. 5686, this question would be answered in the affirmative. An assistance grant to a particular person could be made to cover the cost of necessary care without the State and local agencies feeling that they have been penalized by the refusal of the Federal Government to participate in such grants. This permissive feature is further in line with simplicity in administration and the encouragement of State responsibility in developing an adequate assistance program to meet the particular needs of the community and its needy citizens.

There are three general features of H. R. 5686 that cannot be stressed too much. The first is that the proposed amendments to the Social Security Act are permissive with the States. In other words, States may continue the present categorical programs, or they may take certain steps to integrate the categories into a comprehensive program.

The second feature is that of planning. Mistakes are more likely to be avoided when there has been advance planning. The basic question is whether the Federal, State, and local governments will plan in advance for developing and financing a sound public assistance program or whether we drift with the tide and, in time of emergency, look to the highest level of government for help which could be offered only on a hastily conceived basis.

The third feature is the element of adequacy, simplicity, uniformity, and efficiency in the public asistance program.

In brief, H. R. 5686 represents Federal leadership in permissive planning on the part of the States for an improved public assistance program.

Control of Food Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, much has been said by the supporters of price control about the iniquitous amendments passed by the House of Representatives when we considered the OPA Extension Act. In my personal judgment there have been few occasions when the Members of Congress have been the victims of more unjust criticism at the hands of the Administration and its officials, particularly those who were given permission to talk over the national hook-ups.

The mere application of common sense should indicate to these officials of the Office of Price Administration that there does exist general disapproval of its management and its policies in many sections of the country.

Under unanimous consent, I include an editorial taken from the Sunday edition of the Fargo Forum of May 19 dealing with the question of milk and food in the cities of Fargo, N. Dak., and Moorhead, Minn. It is such conditions as these that justify the vote of the House when it passed the important amendments to the Price Control Act:

GROSS STUPIDITY DEPRIVING AMERICA OF FOOD AND MILK

How long are the people of the United States going to tolerate the grossly stupid—or is it deliberate and culpable—mismanagement of the controls over the Nation's food

supplies by the Office of Price Administration?

Here in Fargo and Moorhead, in the heart of one of the richest, most prolific food-producing areas on earth—in a land where there is a superabundance of milk- and meat-producing animals, where there is no lack of feed for these animals, we are facing the possibility of a complete cut-off from our milk supplies Monday, and we cannot buy fresh meats.

There is no real shortage of milk or meat in America.

In fact, there is, according to the records of the Government itself, a greater supply of milk and of meat than we had in normal times.

This is purely and wholly a man-made shortage.

It is begining to take on a bad odor. It is beginning to smell of deliberate manipulation on the part of the control agencies, the creation of such situations as this threatened milk famine in Fargo and Moorhead for example, a result of deliberate stalling tactics on the part of OPA over a period of months.

It was obvious when OPA took the ceiling prices off the cream that went into processed products—and left it on butter and milk for human consumption in the cities—that this would be certain to switch such a volume of milk away from the products on which the ceilings were maintained as to create artificial shortages in those controlled products.

Apparently that is what these bureaucrats, afraid of their jobs and willing to gamble with the Nation's precious food supplies to maintain themselves in office, are after. They have fought off every effort to have this ridiculous situation corrected.

They have brought Fargo and Moorhead to the shivery edge of a milk famine. They have forced a butter famine on millions of Americans.

High-up officials of OPA have had this critical Fargo-Moorhead situation before them for 77 days, during which they have dawdled and stalled, keeping the entire community on the tenterhooks of anxiety as to their milk supply.

It is monstrous that we in America are under the thumb of a dictatorial bureaucracy so callous and indifferent.

This mismanagement of the price controls is a national catastrophe.

The Fargo Forum has gone on record time and again as being in favor of controls. But it believes they should be administered with some semblance of sanity and judgment.

The people who are in control of OPA have proven they are not capable of providing that kind of administration. They should be removed from office, or the Office of Price Administration should be abolished, or controls placed with some other agency.

The Council of State Governments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, by Franklin H. Lichtenwalter:

The States of the northeast and middle Atlantic region have for many years held conferences on the general subject of social welfare. These meetings have been planned under the sponsorship of the States' joint agency, the Council of State Governments, and they have, through the years, resulted in practical and specific accomplishment.

In 1941 the conference adopted a series of resolutions recommending the abolition of State settlement and residence laws as affecting social welfare and relief needs; urging State reciprocity in residence requirements for the recipients of public assistance under the old-age, dependent-children, and aid-to-the-blind categories; requesting State legislation to authorize administrative agreements among the States with respect to foster care of children; opposing the federalization of the unemployment-compensation program; urging the return of the employment services to the States as soon as practicable; and suggesting, finally, a review and analysis of the Federal Social Security Act with a view to its refinement and possible extension.

To undertake a follow-up work program on these matters of legislation and to provide a continuing means for consultation among the States on related items of interest in this field, a continuing committee of State legislators and administrators was formed and has since served the States in this region.

The committee membership is selected by each of the States' commissions on interstate cooperation and is thus an officially representative body.

I ask leave now to read and to submit for your records a resolution of the Council of State Governments Regional Continuing Committee on Social Welfare and Relief Problems, adopted at its most recent meeting, held in the State capitol at Harrisburg, Pa., on March 12, 1946.

I should like also to submit for your record a copy of the résumé of the discussions held on that day.

"THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS REGIONAL CONTINUING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL WELFARE AND RELIEF PROBLEMS, RESOLUTION, MEETING OF MARCH 12, 1946, HARRISBURG, PA.

"Whereas the Regional Continuing Committee on Social Welfare and Relief Problems of the Council of State Governments representing thirteen (13) States of the northeastern region has for several years been discussing changes in social security and related legislation that would enable the Federal Government to deal with the States on a more equitable and uniform basis and thereby enable the States to meet actual need wherever it exists, and to administer their programs in an efficient and effective manner; and

"Whereas, this committee held its most recent meeting in the State Capitol at Harrisburg, Pa., on Tuesday, March 12, 1946, at which time it reviewed its position on the following specific proposals relating to the Federal Social Security Act:

"1. Federal financial participation in general assistance;

"2. Removal of restrictions as to residence, settlement, and citizenship;

"3. Removal of maximum limitation on Federal matching (with State responsibility for setting standards);

"4. Variable grants (as related to 2 and 3 above);

"5. Assistance to needy children receiving foster care;

"6. Assistance to persons in public institutions; and

"7. Administration by a single agency:

"(a) At the State level; (b) at the local level;

"Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the committee to be recorded as unanimously approving the principles set forth in those proposals, while indicating a difference of opinion as to methods for arriving at a formula by which Federal participation may be varied according to State financial ability and as to methods for providing administration by a single agency at the local level; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the delegates here assembled (and who are named below) indicate their endorsement of these principles by directing a special committee, consisting of the chairman and two other representatives, to appear before the Ways and Means Committee of the United States House of Representatives and present this resolution together with such additional facts as may support this resolution.

"Unanimously adopted March 12, 1946."

"THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS REGIONAL CONTINUING COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL WELFARE AND RELIEF PROBLEMS, MEETING OF MARCH 12, 1946, HARRISBURG, PA.

"Attendance

"Connecticut: Mrs. Carolyn L. Cone, State representative.

"Delaware: R. C. Beckett, secretary, Commission on Interstate Cooperation; Miss A. Bernice Quimby, executive secretary, State children's aid commission.

"Illinois: Raymond M. Hilliard, public aid director, Illinois Public Aid Commission.

"Maine: Senator Lee C. Good; Frank W. Haines, director, bureau of social welfare.

"Maryland: J. Milton Patterson, director, department of public welfare; Clarence C. Tyler, house of delegates; Albert W. Woodfield, house of delegates.

"Massachusetts: Patrick A. Tompkins, commissioner, department of public welfare; John Plaisted, secretary, Commission on Interstate Cooperation.

"New Jersey: Sanford Bates, commissioner of institutions and agencies; Marc P. Dowdell, director of old-age assistance.

"New York: Harry Page, deputy commissioner, department of social welfare.

"Pennsylvania: Franklin H. Litchenwalter, house of representatives; Robert W. Wray, acting secretary, department of public assistance; Miss Sophia M. R. O'Hara, secretary of welfare; Miss M. Louise Rutherford, deputy attorney general; James Brindle, director, bureau of assistance; Mrs. Mary L. Moore, bureau of assistance; Floyd Chalfant, secretary of commerce; F. A. Pitkin, director, State planning board.

"Rhode Island: Miss Elizabeth M. Smith, acting administrator, division of public assistance.

"Virginia: James W. Phillips, director, county and city organization, department of public welfare.

"American Public Welfare Association, Howard L. Russell.

"Council of State Governments, Hubert R. Gallagher, David W. Robinson."

Oregon's Poultry and Turkey Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, the current Government policy which results in an extreme limitation of feeds available for the poultry and turkey industries is having disastrous effects in the State of Oregon, and I wish to herewith present to the House some pertinent data and information on this subject.

Oregon's 1946 turkey production goal established by the United States Department of Agriculture is 2,221,000 birds, or 85 percent of 1945 production. Actual numbers being raised, according to care-

ful surveys of the Oregon State Department of Agriculture, approximate 50 percent of the 1945 production of 2,605,000 birds, or 1,302,500, a reduction below the requested amount of 918,500.

To feed 1,502,500 birds through the period May 20 to July 20, 1946, figuring 75 pounds of grain to raise one bird maturing at 7 months and without making allowance for heavier consumption as the bird matures requires of wheat, or its equivalent, in bushels, 442,206.

Basing Oregon's requirements for poultry feed other than for turkeys upon the goal established by the United States Department of Agriculture for hens and pullets to be upon farms as of January 1, 1946, of 3,206,000, reduced by 20 percent, as a result of United States Department of Agriculture orders limiting the use of grain to 80 percent by months of that used during 1945, gives 2,564,800 birds, which equals a reduction from 1945 of 901,200.

We find there will be needed during the period May 20 to July 20, 1946, on the basis of an annual use of 75 pounds of grain per bird, wheat or its grain equivalent to the extent of 528,990 bushels.

The above figures exclude any consideration of chickens raised for meat purposes.

The total grain requirements, therefore, for Oregon turkey and poultry industries during the period May 30 to July 20, 1945, reduced 50 percent and 20 percent, respectively, over comparable 1945 figures equals 977,196 bushels of wheat or its grain equivalent. Pounds of grain required per bird are furnished by Oregon State College, Division of Animal Industries.

SOURCE OF GRAIN SUPPLIES

There are few individually large growers of either turkeys or chickens in Oregon. Particularly is this true with respect to chickens. Nearly all are small commercial growers raising no products other than chickens for eggs or turkeys for meat. Hatcherymen depend on small breeder flocks for their supplies of hatching eggs. There are a few large growers numbering less than a hundred for the entire State. As a result the local feed dealer, a small businessman, is the source of feed supplies purchased usually in small lots of a ton or two, as needed. The country feed dealer secures his supplies from the terminal feed manufacturers or from wholesale jobbers. Feed manufacturers depend upon the commercial grain trade for feed grains. Country feed mixers depend on the commercial grain trade as well. Normally all grains used other than corn are raised either within the State or within the Northwest area.

During recent years, including most of 1945, the Government's feed-wheat program accounted for an average of 6,611,000 bushels of wheat per year for the years 1943–45 being sold in the area. The withdrawal of this source, just prior to the time when feed supplies began to tighten and become difficult to obtain, resulted in a gap the feed trade supplying turkey and poultry raisers found it impossible to bridge. Neither did usual quantities of 1945 crop corn move westward to Oregon. Shortages of railroad cars prevented feed manufacturers from accumulating wheat inventories from local producing areas prior to a set-up in the Government's export program. Then the Government itself used the cars and moved wheat at a time feed manufacturers and dealers were trying desperately to accumulate inventories. When the car situation cleared from westward rail movement from our production area, the wheat was gone. Oregon depends on the Midwest and South for the bulk of its vegetable oilseed meals—the predominent source of proteins for livestock and poultry feedings. As a result of the failure of the Government to effectuate distribution of short supplies through its 5 and later 10 percent set-aside order to processors, Oregon during December 1945 and January, February, and March 1946 was compelled to use more grains than would have been necessary had proteins been available even in somewhat reduced amounts to permit more efficient utilization of those grains.

Government exports from the Northwest to March 9, 1946, were 23,000,000 bushels of wheat. Private exports were 8,000,000 bushels. Exports in the form of flour were estimated at 10,000,000 bushels, or a total of 41,000,000 bushels, nearly half of the area's total production. In the face of this movement and an extremely tight food situation, the Government stepped in when feed manufacturers were trying to buy stocks at legally established ceiling prices and offered 30 cents a bushel premium, thus estopping the feed manufacturers from further purchases. The situation was so acute by April 19, 1946, that the chairman of the Oregon State United States Department of Agriculture Council wired Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson as follows:

Information available to Oregon USDA Council leaves no doubt that April 1 wheat stocks in all positions in three Northwest States are seriously short and at least 10,000,000 bushels below requirements until new crop is available. To meet situation and bring about equitable distribution of remaining stocks, Council recommends immediate stoppage of exports of wheat from three Northwest States, and that such wheat as is obtained under purchase certificate program be diverted by CCC for feed. That milling be reduced at least 25 percent. That bread loaf be cut 10 percent and the President be requested to instruct Food and Drug Administration to relinquish labeling requirements during emergency. Stress more active participation of hotels, restaurants, and public generally in reducing the use of wheat.

Even if the above recommendations are carried out, Northwest will need to import at least 6,000,000 bushels, and it is suggested that steps be taken promptly by the appropriate Government agency to bring that amount into this area.

Nothing was done. Again on May 10 the chairman of the council wrote Secretary Anderson as follows:

The Oregon USDA Council is gravely concerned with the feed-supply situation in the State resulting from the heavy wheat exports to famine areas. On April 19 I wired you the council's report that remaining wheat supplies in the Northwest were about 10,000,000 bushels short of requirements. In view of this shortage and its effect on the livestock and poultry industries, the council asked for an immediate stoppage of exports of Northwest wheat. At its meeting today, the council again considered the situation, and from the information presented, it is apparent that wholesale liquidation of laying flocks is in prospect.

The council recognizes that heavy reduction in both poultry and livestock is necessary to do our share of feeding the starving abroad. But the council believes that the Pacific Northwest has been doing much more than its share in sending wheat to the famine areas. It now has reached the point where emergency action must be taken to prevent wrecking of the poultry industry far beyond the point of individual hardship. Accordingly, the members of the council agreed unanimously on the following:

1. That immediate steps be taken by the Department to ship in corn from Commodity Credit stocks.

2. That Oregon poultry producers be urged to immediately increase the rate of liquidation of flocks.

3. That we again urge you to halt exports of Northwest wheat.

4. That the corn and wheat made available through imports of corn and cessation of wheat exports be used exclusively for feed, and that the distribution be controlled so as to make certain that none is used as food.

We have vigorously promoted the food conservation program and will continue to do so. Indications are that widespread public cooperation is being achieved. We would strongly oppose making one single bushel of additional grain available for milling for domestic consumption.

Still nothing has been done. Oregon faces not reduction of its poultry flocks but liquidation. There are not enough slaughtering facilities or storage facilities either so that much of such poultry as must be slaughtered will be a complete loss. Growers were given goals by the United States Department of Agriculture in the fall of 1945 for 1946 production and encouraged to meet them. Their only offense is having done too well. In February 1946 after having set this production pattern to meet the goals established the same Government through its Department of Agriculture limited the amount of grain which might be used for feed purposes automatically reducing production by the extent of the limitation or 20 percent. Then the Government competed for grains to ship abroad and used up a major portion of what otherwise would have been available for domestic uses including feed. That same Government now says it has no facilities for making feed grains available in areas of acute feed shortage except through persuasion of handlers. It admits the gravity of the situation and then claims to be powerless to act. We are told that because we did not reduce our flocks as much as we were requested to, they are now to be exterminated. It seems the Government is more concerned with the welfare of citizens of other nations than of its own. Oregon's livestock raisers including its poultrymen are ready and willing to make their production available for relief purposes but object to being exterminated as producers as a result of Government action. The food supplies of all America's citizens are threatened as extermination of American food producers cannot do other than reduce our own food supplies.

South Dakota Farmers Are Not Greedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Congress and the country, an editorial appearing in the Aberdeen American-News, published in Aberdeen, S. Dak. The editor of this paper, Henry J. Schmitt, has recently returned to his desk after several years of service in the uniform of his country. His reactions to the insinuations that the farmers of America are a "greedy group" are therefore doubly interesting.

Incidentally as additional evidence that this editorial is eternally correct in its findings, it might be pertinent to observe that only yesterday I received a letter from a farmers' elevator in South Dakota—bulging with wheat—and asking me to help get additional railroad cars routed to its community so that the wheat could be shipped to the areas needing it and so that neighboring farmers could bring additional wheat to market. In other words, farmers were bringing wheat to market faster than the railroads of this country have been able to carry it away!

The editorial follows:

DAKOTA FARMERS NOT GREEDY

After several years of getting pretty fair breaks in national publicity the Dakotas once again are moved to anger over the interpretation an editorial in Life magazine gives to the wheat-shipping situation.

Entitled "Greed on the Farm," the Life editorial accuses farmers of hoarding to obtain famine prices, and asserts that "farmers as a class are high among the beneficiaries of this war, if not its chief profiteers"; that "farmers went on feeding our dwindling grain supplies to their cows, chickens, and pigs"; that "when LaGuardia began to breathe life into the UNRRA and Hoover took over the Famine Emergency Committee, fires were started both to the left and to the right of farm politicians, leaving them nowhere to hide their naked greed"; and that "at last week's official count there was twice as much wheat on the farms—some 200,000,000 bushels—as the United States really needs for reserves.

The offensive editorial further observes: "It is not enough (wheat) to save the world, or even to fulfill our promises, but it is enough to choke the farmers who are hoarding it and damage their reputation for a long time to come."

Like the article in the Saturday Evening Post during the dark days of the dust storms, which described extremes and gave the impression that all of Dakotaland was doomed to become a desert, the Life editorial does the Dakotas an injustice. And like that article, it has created a wave of righteous indignation and a flood of protests to the magazine publishers.

George A. Starring, manager of the Greater South Dakota Association, has written Life's editor information that should absolve Dakota farmers of the serious charge made against them. He elaborates upon such pertinent facts as these: Wheat has moved from farms since January 1 at a record rate. Current farm stocks are the lowest for April 1 since 1941. Stocks of wheat on farms on January 1, 1946, Nation-wide, relative to production were 5 percent less than average. Compared with a year earlier, the supply of feed grains on January 1, per animal unit of livestock, including chickens, was about 5 percent smaller than a year earlier.

William Plath, president of the North Dakota Farm Bureau, said the editorial libeled a large and vital segment of America's productive population and declared:

"In view of the facts, this is one of the most uncalled-for and most insulting pieces of misrepresentation I have ever seen in print."

What wheat is on the farms, Mr. Plath said, is there "because farmers couldn't get cars to haul it, and because the Government agencies failed to recognize the extent of this most terrible food shortage tragedy that was developing."

"Can't these eastern people understand," he asked, "that the farmers didn't haul this grain—for the most part—because it was a physical impossibility to get it off their farms unless they took it to town and dumped it on the ground? The cars were not moved in fast enough to the elevators, hundreds of which were blocked for months last year."

As a matter of fact, Dakota farmers have made a great contribution to the war effort and they responded in their characteristic unselfish manner when they were advised of the famine emergency.

Dakotans know that to be the truth and they would appreciate more understanding treatment of their activities by national disseminators of opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I further desire to call attention to another editorial appearing in the Aberdeen America-News on the same theme. This editorial again demonstrates that South Dakota farmers and townspeople alike not only are not greedy but actually that they are vigorously conducting campaigns to share their traditional abundance with the starving people of other lands. I hope people will read the answer-in-action which Selby, S. Dak., is making to the Life magazine editorial and I also hope writers, hereafter, will be more careful in their search for facts before they engage in name-calling against a great class of most patriotic and productive American citizens:

SELBY'S ANSWER TO LIFE

Who said South Dakota farmers are greedy?

Following our defense of wheat-raising farmers against the charges of profiteering made by Life magazine we have observed several examples that further justify our faith in the generosity of the farmers and their city neighbors in the bread-basket section of the Nation.

Citizens in the vicinity of Selby, Walworth county seat, for instance, have donated—not sold, but donated—one whole car of wheat and have a good start on a second car to be processed and sent to help relieve famine conditions abroad.

The Selby contribution, and a mighty fine one, is part of a State-wide effort launched at the State conference of the Congregational churches at Redfield a couple of weeks ago.

If other parts of the State respond as the Selby area has there should be hundreds of cars of wheat moving from South Dakota to the famine victims. And it is not being sold for fancy prices. It is being given free in a good Christian spirit.

A similar effort being made by Catholic churches in Aberdeen and Ipswich is meeting encouraging results. Nearly a carload of wheat had been donated by members of the Ipswich parish; and members of Sacred Heart and St. Mary's churches in Aberdeen had contributed 1,800 bushels during the opening days of the drive.

These humanitarian moves, started before Life's charges of greed were expressed, indicate the character of Dakota farmers.

Puerto Rico and Her Language

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a letter I personally gave to the President this morning at an interview during which I also pleaded for the independence of Puerto Rico:

MAY 22, 1946.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I hereby respectfully urge the approval of Senate bill 51 passed by the Legislature of Puerto Rico at its last session, over the veto of the Governor of the island, providing for the use of the Spanish language as the means of instruction in the public schools of Puerto Rico.

Spanish is the vernacular language of the 2,100,000 inhabitants of Puerto Rico. They possess a rich literature of their own, and Spanish is their intellectual vehicle of expression. They have made substantial contributions to the literature of Spain and Spanish-America.

In Puerto Rico, Spanish is the language of the home, the courts, the legislature, the churches, the government offices, and everyday life. Nevertheless, and contrary to established pedagogical principles, teaching is conducted in English in the public schools of the island.

By so doing, the fundamental educational principle that instruction should be transmitted in the vernacular language of the students has been violated.

The language question has been a burning issue in Puerto Rico ever since the occupation of the island by the United States forces in 1898. At the time of the invasion, our soldiers found in Puerto Rico a Spanish-speaking community of nearly 1,000,000 people, endowed with a common Spanish heritage and homogeneous in character as far as language, customs, and traditions are concerned, more so than a large number of the old Spanish provinces. Spanish was, of course, at that time the means of instruction in all levels of education. Foreign languages were taught as special subjects at the Provincial Institute and in some of the then existing private secondary schools.

Let me say right now that the situation was quite different from the one prevailing in the Philippine Islands. These had 87 dialects, none of which was spoken by even one-tenth of the population. On the other hand, as I have heretofore said, Puerto Ricans had a common language, spoken by 100 percent of the population, perfectly suitable as a means of social intercourse, not only among the inhabitants of the island but between these and the inhabitants of Spain and all the Latin-American Republics, with the exception of Brazil and Haiti. Puerto Rico had its own literature and also the rich heritage of the literature of all Spanish-speaking countries.

Since 1898 to date, Puerto Rico has unfortunately been taken as a field of experimentation in the language realm. In 1899,

Dr. John Eaton and Dr. Victor S. Clark were entrusted with the mission of organizing the educational system of Puerto Rico, but they were unable to understand the language situation.

In 1900, Dr. Martin G. Brumbaugh was appointed Commissioner of Education by the President of the United States. May I say, in passing, that up to the present date the Puerto Rico commissioner of education is appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the United States Senate. Dr. Brumbaugh provided for the use of Spanish in the elementary grades and English in the other levels of education. He returned to the United States in 1902 and was succeeded by Dr. Samuel McCune Lindsay.

Dr. Lindsay changed Commissioner Brumbaugh's policy and provided for the teaching in English from the first grade on. This policy was continued by Commissioners Roland Falkner, Edwin G. Dexter, W. A. Barlow, and Edward N. Bainter from 1905 to 1916.

In 1916, Commissioner Paul G. Miller established a middle-of-the-road policy instituting the use of Spanish in the first four grades of the elementary school; of English and Spanish in the fifth grade, and of English in the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades, as well as in the secondary school. This policy was continued by Commissioner John B. Huyke up to 1930, when Dr. Jose Padin became head of the Department of Education.

Dr. Padin ordered at once a detailed study of the language question, and in the year 1934 instituted the use of Spanish in the eight grades of the elementary school, and of English in the secondary school. He based, in part, his policy on the conclusions of a committee of educators from the International Institute of Teachers College, Columbia University, which made a survey in 1925 at the request of the Legislature of Puerto Rico.

Commissioner Padin's policy was abruptly changed in 1937 by Dr. Jose M. Gallardo, who succeeded him. During the tenure of office of Dr. Gallardo, who resigned a short time ago creating a vacancy not as yet filled, and ever since his resignation, the most contradictory language policies have been in effect in the Island.

The result has been confusion, misuse of the monies appropriated for education, suffering on the part of the student, excessive time given to language study, and inability to master either Spanish or the English language.

But these policies of confusion have not been pursued without the utmost protest on the part of the Puerto Rican people. Every civic association, including the powerful and influential Puerto Rico Teachers' Association, have repudiated the prevailing language educational policies and have advocated the teaching in Spanish in all levels of education.

In 1945, the Puerto Rico Teachers' Asscciation, in a statement of principle on the teaching of English in the Island, said the following:

"Without entering into a discussion of the pernicious effects of this practice upon the general learning processes and the cultural development of the pupils, we believe that, from the point of view of English itself, other subjects should be taught in the vernacular."

Copy of the above mentioned statement of principles, which contains fundamental and persuasive reasons in support of the asociation's position, is enclosed herewith.

May I add that the problem here involved is a pedagogical, and not a political one, and that it should be solved according to the historic experience of all peoples throughout the world, that is, by the use of the vernacular.

There are very few exceptions the world over to the established practice of teaching in the vernacular. The only exceptions known to me are to be found in Egypt and in the African French Colonies. In Egypt, an effort is being made to popularize the classical Arabic language, and it is used in place of the vernacular. France insists in the use of the French language in her colonial schools, yet this policy is now being changed.

The use of a foreign language as the means of instruction is justified only in cases like that of the Philippines, or when the vernacular cannot be used as an effective means of social communication.

Law 51 passed by the Legislature of Puerto Rico over the veto of the Governor, and which provides for the use of Spanish as the means of instruction in the public schools of the island, is now before you for consideration.

In the name of the children of Puerto Rico who are being tortured by the prevailing system; in the name of the people of Puerto Rico, who have spoken through their elected representatives and their civic and professional organizations, and in the name of an enlightened educational policy at a time when we are trying to fight cultural chauvinism and to correct past errors, I respectully urge you, Mr. President, to sign the abovementioned bill of the Puerto Rican Legislature.

Respectfully yours,

VITO MARCANTONIO.

The Crosser Bill, H. R. 1362, as Introduced, and the Committee Substitute Therefor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, the following are the points of greatest interest to railroad employees, railroad companies, and Members of Congress:

First. Coverage: The committee substitute does not change the coverage of the present law.

The Crosser bill seeks to expand the coverage of the present law and include persons such as freight forwarders, ice companies, warehouse companies, longshoremen, and others, not now covered who do not want to come within the scope of the law. Substantially all the classes of persons affected by the proposed new coverage of the Crosser bill appeared at the hearings in objection thereto. Furthermore, the coverage language of the present law has been the subject of judicial construction, and the Crosser proposal, by introducing new and difficult questions of interpretation, would involve further litigation.

Second. Annuities for women: The present law grants retirement annuities to women employees on the same basis as to men employees.

The committee substitute proposes full annuities for women employees after reaching age 60, with 30 years of service, exactly as proposed in the Crosser bill—Bill, page 67, line 6.

Third. Total and permanent disability: The present law provides annuities for total and permanent disability after 30 years of service.

The Crosser bill proposes to reduce the 30-year requirement to 10 years. The committee amendment leaves the 30-year requirement of present law, but provides for a new type of annuity for those with 10 years of service if the permanent and total disability results from injury or disease arising out of railroad employment—Bill, page 67, line 21.

Fourth. Disability from performing usual occupation: The present law makes no provision for annuities for individuals who, by reason of disability, are unable to engage in their regular railroad work.

The Crosser bill proposes the payment of such annuities for those with 20 years of service or being 60 or over, and having a current connection with the railroad industry. The committee substitute adopts the Crosser proposal, but with the limitation that the disability must result from injury or disease arising out of railroad employment—Bill, page 68, line 1.

Fifth. Minimum annuities: The committee substitute and the Crosser bill are alike in liberalizing the minimum annuity benefits of the present law; except that the committee substitute continues eligibility for minimum annuity benefits in the case of an annuitant who was an employee when he attained age 65 and has completed 20 years of service. Bill page 71, line 18.

Sixth. Survivor benefits: The present law provides a surviving widow with an annuity only in the event her spouse had elected to take a smaller annuity for himself during his lifetime than he otherwise would have been entitled to.

Present law also provides for payment of a death benefit equal to 4 percent of the employee's taxable compensation less the total of annuities paid.

Both the Crosser bill and the committee substitute strike out the provisions of law above referred to, and substitute therefor benefits to survivors (widows, children, and parents) patterned on the Social Security survivor insurance provisions, and payable as a matter of right without any reduction being made in the annuity of the retired employee. The committee substitute, however, preserves the death benefit so far as it has accrued to an individual up to January 1, 1947, reduced by such amounts as may be paid under the new survivor benefit provisions.

The principal differences between the survivor benefit provisions of the Crosser bill and the Committee substitute are as follows:

First, under the committee substitute the survivor benefits are of the same size as under Social Security, whereas the Crosser bill provides for benefits averaging about 25 percent higher.

Second, the committee substitute grants benefits only with respect to deaths occurring after 1946 where the decedent has an insured status, while the Crosser bill, in addition, would be applicable with respect to deaths occurring before 1947, and would presume an insured status in the case of all pensioners and in the case of any annuitant receiving an annuity which began to accrue before 1947 and was based on service of not less than 10 years.

Seventh. Making solvent the present retirement fund: Under the committee substitute there is included in the new tax a total of 3 percent of pay roll to make solvent the present fund. The

Crosser bill proposed 1.5 percent for this purpose. The amount included in the committee substitute follows the recommendation of the actuary employed by the committee. This amount of 3 percent is included in the total increased tax of 5 percent, which added to the present tax rate of 7 percent makes the new total 12 percent, of which 6 percent is borne by the employees and 6 percent by the employers. Bill, page 98, line 16, to page 99, line 10.

Eighth. Unemployment insurance benfits: The present law grants maximum unemployment-insurance benefits of $20 for 20 weeks. The Crosser bill proposes to increase this to $25 for 26 weeks. The Crosser bill also proposes to create new benefits, with maximum payments of $25 for 26 weeks, on account of employment due to sickness, including maternity, or accident from whatever cause. This letter proposal would inject a new and novel theory into unemployment insurance legislation.

The committee substitute does not change the benefit scale under the present law and does not provide for unemployment benefits in case of sickness, maternity, or accident.

Ninth. Railroad unemployment insurance tax: The entire cost of unemployment insurance benefits is borne by the railroad companies. The tax rate at present is 3 percent. The Crosser bill proposes no change in the tax rate. The committee substitute provides for a periodical adjustment of the tax rate on the basis of the amount in the railroad unemployment insurance account as of September 30 of each year—page 101, table after line 6.

Practically every employer in the United States is granted a merit or experience rating which provides a sliding scale of taxation for this purpose which, in most cases, is more liberal than that proposed to be accorded the railroad companies by the committee substitute.

No other employer pays a tax on more than $3,000 of annual compensation to any one employee. The railroad pays on all wages under $3,600.

In 45 of the 51 State and Territorial systems the tax basis is graduated on a merit or experience-rating provision. Under this provision the tax liability of the employer decreases as his reserve account for payment of unemployment benefits increases. In the other six State and Territorial funds, where no merit or experience-rating provision is accorded the employer, provision is made for the study of the establishment of such merit rating.

In only 13 of the 45 jurisdictions which provide a specific minimum tax is the minimum rate as much as 1 percent or more, while some States completely forgive the tax when a sufficient balance is maintained in the reserve account. The minimum rate of taxation most generally used in the State system is one-half of 1 percent. In the two instances where a merit rating has already been granted by the Congress, viz, Hawaii and the District of Columbia, it is interesting to note that complete relief from unemployment taxes is possible under the experience or merit rating for the Territory of Hawaii, and for the District of Columbia there is a possible minimum of one-tenth of 1 percent.

Tenth. Tax-collecting functions: Under present law the railroad retirement taxes are collected by the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the unemployment insurance taxes are collected by the Railroad Retirement Board.

The Crosser bill proposes to transfer to the Railroad Retirement Board the function of collecting the retirement taxes.

The committee substitute leaves the function of collecting the retirement taxes in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, where it now is, and transfers to the Bureau of Internal Revenue the function of collecting the unemployment insurance tax. In order to accomplish this appropriate amendments are made to the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act and the Internal Revenue Code—page 91, line 3, to page 110, line 19.

It is important that the railroad unemployment insurance tax be collected by the governmental agency which collects all other Federal taxes.

OPA Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting herewith as part of my remarks a radio speech by Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., wherein he points out the type of personnel now employed by the OPA:

Now, tonight ladies and gentlemen, I want to present to you some facts which Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi, introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in connection with the recent order by Economic Stabilization Director Chester Bowles, which created the terrific Senate revolt against Mr. Bowles and the OPA. This is the now famous order which Mr. Bowles ordered Secretary of Agriculture Clinton Anderson to approve, so that Mr. Bowles could issue it, and it's the one that increased the margin requirements on cotton futures.

You know these things by Government don't just happen; they are done by people, people in Government jobs. You frequently hear charges that the OPA rulings and regulations are all out of line, but a great many people take all that with a grain of salt, on the assumption that those who are making the charges probably have some selfish motive in the background, and after all, some of the Government employees probably are out of line, but undoubtedly a lot of them must know what they're doing and be pretty familiar with the industries they're dealing with or they wouldn't be in their jobs.

Senator EASTLAND, coming from Mississippi, was intensely interested in this cotton order by Mr. Bowles, because, on investigation, it developed that Mr. Bowles, as Economic Stabilization Director, got the OPA cotton textiles section to draft the order for him, and it came all the way up through the OPA ranks on cotton questions before it reached Mr. Bowles. Senator EASTLAND wanted to find out just who the people were, who originally wrote this order, and who the people, the experts, were, through whose hands it went from there on up and what their experience has been in the cotton textile industry.

But it's equally interesting to every ordinary citizen, because cotton textiles are one of the knotty problems of the present clothing shortage. The clothing industry complains bitterly that the OPA ceilings and regulations are stifling production of cotton textiles, and the clothing manufacturers cannot get the materials with which to make the clothing, so it ought to be interesting to know who these experts are, specifically, as individuals, from that standpoint too.

Well, here's the story from the official records of the OPA: This isn't hearsay; this is cold, hard fact, and it is complete fact and you can make of it what you will.

First of all, let me explain that the price division of OPA has under it various general subdivisions, one of which is the Consumer Goods Division, and the Consumer Goods Division in turn is subdivided, into various branches, one of which is the Textiles Branch, and that Textiles Branch in turn is subdivided into various sections, one for each of the several kinds of textiles, one of which is the cotton textiles section. That is the line of procedure on all price control matters, concerning cotton or cotton goods and it's important to keep a picture of that in your mind.

Now, leaving out stenographers and file clerks and such personnel, there are in each of these offices two specific men and only two—six in all—and it is the personnel records of those six men, who between them determine the entire fate of the whole cotton textile industry of the United States, and who between them, wrote and perfected this cotton margin order which Mr. Chester Bowles issued, that Senator EASTLAND introduced into the RECORD, and which I now want to present to you.

At the bottom, in the cotton textile section, where the price orders and where this Bowles order began, is a man by the name of Henry Wohl, of New York City, who is listed as business economist and he has with him as a private analyst, Mr. Max L. Levinson, also of New York City. It happens that Mr. Levinson actually is the individual who made the original draft of the order which Mr. Chester Bowles ultimately issued, but from him it went on up the line to be perfected and inspected and approved by the other five of these experts.

So, let's have the personnel record on Mr. Levinson.

It shows that he has lived in New York City all of his life, is a graduate of New York University, was a reporter on the college newspaper, studied for a while at the Stock Exchange Institute. In 1935 he was employed by the Kinsler Distilling Corp., and was supervisor in the bottling plant at $1,300 a year. He then went to Stern Brothers Department Store as an extra sales clerk for a holiday season at $21.50 a week. He then was employed by Rhoades and Co., in New York City at $1,800 a year (that's $150 a month as an associate commodities economist), and he is now price analyst in this cotton section of the textile branch of OPA.

His boss, in that section is Mr. Henry Wohl. Mr. Wohl is 33 years old, born in New York City and has lived there ever since. In 1935-36 he was a mirror salesman for the Globe Mirror & Glass Corp., of Brooklyn, N. Y., at a salary of $1,300 a year. He also worked for the firm of Cohen, Wachsman, and Wassall, in New York City, as a market technician, making stock and bond analysis, also at a salary of $1,300 a year. Then, for a few months he had a job with a soft drink concern at the same figure of $1,200 a year. Then he came to Washington to the Census Bureau as a clerk at $1,800, and was transferred from there to his present job in OPA, in which he gets $4,600 a year.

Now let's get up to the next rank and see what there is there in the way of cotton or cotton textile experts.

At this next level working up from the bottom, the Textiles Branch of the Consumer Goods Division, there is Gardner Ackley, who has the title of price executive and he has as his assistant a man named William Stix.

Mr. Ackley is 30 years old, born in Indianapolis, he has a master's degree from a college in Kalamazoo, Mich., and a degree of doctor of philosophy from Michigan University. From there until the time he went into the Government, he taught school at a salary of $2,700. His present salary in OPA is $7,175 a year.

Mr. Stix, who has the title of counsel under Mr. Ackley, is 33 years old and comes from St. Louis. He holds the degree of bachelor of arts at Harvard University, is a protégé of Justice Felix Frankfurter, has a degree of bachelor of law from Harvard, and was admitted to the Missouri State bar in 1936. During that and the following year he was employed by a law firm in St. Louis at a top salary of $150 a month. He worked on memoranda and research. He then engaged in private law practice as a specialist in labor relations. In 1937 and 1938 he was employed by the Senate Civil Liberties Committee as an investigator at $2,100 a year. He then went to the National Labor Relations Board at $2,600 a year and was increased to the top salary there of $3,200 a year. At the present time his salary is $6,500 a year.

Now, finally, let's get up to the top level, the actual Consumer Goods Division of the OPA, and see what we have there in the way of cotton experts. In that office there is an Assistant Director of the Consumer Goods Division, and he has a so-called economic consultant. There is no Director of that Division, strangely enough, so the Assistant Director is really in charge.

That Assistant Director is Mr. Saul B. Sells, of New York City. Mr. Sells is 33 years old and got a doctor of philosophy degree from Columbia University in New York after getting a bachelor-of-arts degree from Brooklyn College in Brooklyn. His major studies in college were social science, psychology, education, economic history, and anthropology. In 1934 to 1936 he drew $1,500 a year as research assistant at the Institute of Educational Research at Columbia University Teachers' College, New York City. He became a WPA employee in New York City, starting at $1,860 a year, and increasing to $3,000 a year when he quit. In WPA he was a program-planning analyst, for the preparation and development of detailed plans in economic statistics, government, education, and various scientific fields. Then he became director of education and research for WPA in New York City at $3,000 a year. Then he was employed by the Board of Education of New York City at $3,600 a year.

On December 22, 1942, the OPA Director of Personnel requested Mr. Sells' local draft board in New York City to reclassify him into III–B, due to the essential nature of the activities in which he was engaged in OPA in connection with the textile industry. Mr. Sells' salary now is $8,750 a year in OPA.

As for his consultant, that gentleman's name is Benjamin Caplan. He is 36 years old, born in Toronto, Canada, became a naturalized citizen of the United States in 1938. He was educated at McGill University in Toronto, received degrees of bachelor of arts and master of arts. He got a Ph. D. later from the University of Chicago majoring in economics and political science. From February 1934 to June 1934, he was employed at People's Junior College in Chicago at $2 an hour teaching economics. At the same time he was a clerk in the Civil Works Administration in Chicago at $35 a week.

He came to Washington in 1934, and went to the Treasury Department at $4,000 a year, to make a special study of branch banking in the United States and Canada. In 1935, he went to the National Labor Relations Board in Washingotn at $4,000 a year and then went to Brookings Institution in Washington for a while, after which he taught economics in Ohio State University, earning $2,000 to $2,500 a year. He was later transferred to OPA, and on March 8, 1943, he was deferred from the draft, on the grounds that he was indispensable to the Government in his OPA job. His present salary is $6,500 a year.

There is the story of the cotton experts, who are in control of the cotton industry of the Nation and through whom the cotton-margin order issued by Mr. Chester Bowles was handled.

United Nations Permanent Headquarters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, 1946, under leave I inserted in the RECORD a letter from Col. Truman Smith, United States Army, retired, pointing out certain military questions regarding the establishing of an extraterritorial enclave in the strategic area of Connecticut. This letter will be found on page A2091 of that date.

Subsequently, Mr. Marion Potter, of Bellehaven, Greenwich, Conn., issued a circular letter protesting the insertion of this query which was sent to a large number of newspapers and individuals in Connecticut.

As this question concerns the public security, and is one which should be fully recorded as to all points of view on it, I include Mrs. Potter's letter and a reply which I sent to all Connecticut newspapers on May 20:

From the moment when local newspapers prominently carried the report of Mrs. LUCE'S insistence on inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a letter from Col. Truman Smith, warning her that the United Nations would be a menace to the community harboring its personnel and facilities, I have waited in vain for someone in an official position to indicate to the public the sort of political and social thinking that is employed by the writer of the letter, and the amount of importance one should grant to his opinions. Have we, who believe that the United Nations offers the best existing hope for peace in the world today, been merely the dupes of our own foolish optimism, or can it be that this vigilant warrior who appeals to his Congresswoman as his natural protector, is not an unbiased reporter?

Well, it is interesting to note that when Col. Truman Smith was stationed in Germany from 1934 to 1939 (for the second time) he was considered by some serious and conscientious men to be dangerously pro-Nazi. And it was thought by many that this friendship with Goering and other top-ranking Nazis, went above and beyond that call of duty and indicated a degree of authentic affection demanded neither by his work nor by the ordinary exercise of tact. During Charles Lindbergh's celebrated stay in Hitler's Reich, Smith introduced him to his German friends and the chaperonage he undertook at that time developed into a lasting association which was believed to have been the inspiration for some of Lindbergh's finest flights of isolationist oratory, not to mention some of his articles which asserted that the United States has made an irreparable blunder in its choice of sides in the war. In fact, Father Coughlin's Social Justice stated on page 5, September 16, 1940, that Major (as he was then) Smith was Colonel Lindbergh's chief advisor and friend. Social Justice on page 18, October 20, 1941, was grieved at the sudden retirement of Colonel Smith and it attributed this calamity to orders from President Roosevelt. Another friendly publication, Charles Hudson's American in Danger, on page 4, October 7, 1940, speaks most sympathetically of Smith. It may profitably be recalled that this same Hudson was not only a defendant in the recent (interrupted) sedition trial and is still under indictment, but was twice before indicted on the same charge. This is strange support for someone who is now attempting to protect Connecticut from the menace of the United Nations! And I may add that in an article contributed to the New York Staats Zeitung, Colonel Smith defended the conduct of the German Army in occupied Poland.

In the light of later disclosures of extermination camps and other horrors, it can only be said that Colonel Smith was either a peculiarly unsuccessful observer or that what he saw he considered to be correct behavior. Neither recommends him seriously as a mentor in the present situation.

It is, of course, Mrs. LUCE'S privilege to choose her friends and advisors, and equally is it her right to ask to have their opinions inscribed forever in the archives of the United States Government. But I believe that the citizens of Fairfield County and those people interested in building confidence in the United Nations should know the background against which to evaluate the judgment of those whose advice is taken by this Representative in Washington.

This letter is being distributed, I hope, in time to illuminate the situation while the site commission is in conference. It seems to me a dreadful thing for people to be influenced unwittingly by opinions of men like Truman Smith, and I shall do what I can to see that the residents of Fairfield County know the affiliations behind his judgment.

MARION POTTER.
BELLEHAVEN, GREENWICH, CONN.

MAY 20, 1946.

Mr. GEORGE C. WALDO,
Editor, the Bridgeport Post,
Bridgeport, Conn.

DEAR SIR: Mrs. Marion Potter, of Bellehaven, Greenwich, has been circulating a letter through the State and to the Connecticut papers condemning my insertion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of a statement from Col. Truman Smith, United States Army, retired, in which, as a constituent and as an authority on military intelligence, he drew attention to the fact that the establishing of a United Nations headquarters extraterritorial enclave in Connecticut might create a grave danger to the security of the United States due to the great strategic importance of the area.

In view of the publicity given Mrs. Potter's letter, I feel that in the public interest it is necessary to point out certain facts not included in her statement.

The question Colonel Smith asks: Would the establishing of United Nations headquarters in Connecticut create a potential danger to the security of the United States in an area of great strategic importance; has nothing whatsoever to do with anyone's opinion of him in any capacity other than as an expertly trained authority on military intelligence.

It was Colonel Smith's background as an intelligence officer which made the insertion of his letter into the RECORD a duty required of me, both as his representative and as an official sworn to defend the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic.

Colonel Smith's knowledge of his profession is attested by the citation awarding him the Distinguished Service Medal in January 1946, which was presented to him by General of the Army George C. Marshall, Chief of

Staff, in the presence of Secretary of War Stimson and other top-ranking officials. The citation follows:

"Col. Truman Smith, GSC, United States Army, rendered distinguished service to the United States Government. As military attaché to Germany during the fateful period from August 1935 to March 1939, Colonel Smith accurately reported Nazi Germany's rapidly growing military strength and intentions and greatly facilitated the efforts of the United States Army to keep abreast of German organization, tactics, and equipment. His reports stimulated action and were, in a measure, responsible for the manner in which the Army developed its plans to build up the military strength of this country.

"Upon return of Colonel Smith to the United States his intimate and expert knowledge of the enemy was of importance in the formulation of Allied strategic plans. Although suffering a severe physical limitation, he continued to render important service on the War Department General Staff from February 23, 1942, to date. His contribution to the war effort of the Nation has been of major significance."

Does Mrs. Potter suggest that General Marshall and these other men directly charged with responsibility for repressing our foreign and domestic enemies are guilty of gross misjudgment? Her letter, which accuses Colonel Smith of dangerously pro-Nazi ideas, indirectly accuses General Marshall either of gross misjudgment or of conspiring in these ideas for the services for which General Marshall decorated Colonel Smith are the very services she condemns Colonel Smith for performing.

A second point not clearly brought out in Mrs. Potter's letter is the relationship between Representatives and constituents. One of the primary duties and obligations of a Congressman is to bring to the attention of the public and the proper authorities any questions and problems intelligently and well presented by a constituent, regardless of the constituent's political affiliations, or of his social or economic status or background.

It is one of the basic purposes of congressional representation to give any citizen a voice to urge or protest any measure which affects the welfare and safety of the community and Nation. I am surprised, not that Mrs. Potter and others differ with Colonel Smith but that some of them seem to favor depriving him of his constitutional right to express his opinion through his Representative in Congress—a right which we all cherish and do well to exercise.

Sincerely,

CLARE BOOTHE LUCE.

United States, British, and Russian War Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 22 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter and attached tables and text received by me from Mr. John W. Snyder, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, relative to total United States, British, and Russian war production in major categories.

There being no objection, the letter and attached material were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1946.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: This is in response to your letter requesting "the following facts as near as possible: the total United States, British and Russian war production in major categories—aircraft, tanks, guns, small arms, warships, merchant ships, etc."

Attached are tables and text presenting data which are available at this time. If I can be of further service to you, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. SNYDER,
Director.

PRODUCTION OF MAJOR TYPES OF MUNITIONS, UNITED STATES, UNITED KINGDOM, AND UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

The first tabulation attached presents data for production of major categories of munitions in the United States during the period July 1, 1940, to July 31, 1945. The concluding date is the end of the last full month before VJ-day.

The second table presents data for production of major types of munitions in the United Kingdom. Data are now available only through June 30, 1944. Production in the United Kingdom of munitions as a whole, though not necessarily of each major type, reached a peak during the year July 1, 1944–June 30, 1945. Included in the table is data for production of each major category during the 6 months, January 1, 1944–June 30, 1944. Doubling these figures and adding them to total production up to June 30, 1944, will give a rough estimate for production through June 30, 1945. On the average the estimate will understate output somewhat, but for some types, it may overstate output slightly. Accurate data through the later date await the release of the final report of the Combined Production and Resources Board, or the release of data by the British Government.

For the USSR, the only information available is that contained in the speech by Premier Stalin from which an excerpt is attached.

Production of major types of munitions, United States, July 1, 1940, to July 31, 1945

Aircraft:	
Bombers	96,847
Fighters	98,703
Trainers	57,573
Reconnaissance, transport, other	43,478
Total	296,601
Naval ship construction:	
Major combatant warships	1,201
Patrol, landing, auxiliary, other	69,859
Total	71,060
Naval guns (20 mm. and larger)	165,525
Army guns and equipment:	
Artillery pieces	204,965
Mortars	110,348
Machine guns and submachine guns	4,808,403
Rifles and carbines	12,599,312
Combat and motor vehicles:	
Tanks	86,388
Armored cars, carriers, etc	120,588
Trucks—all types	2,434,553
Heavy	1,001,293
Medium, light, other	1,433,260

Production of major types of munitions, United States, July 1, 1940, to July 31, 1945—Continued.

Total Maritime Commission ships:	
Number	5,425
Tonnage (thousand deadweight tons)	53,239

Source: WPB, Document No. 334, report to Production Board, Oct. 9, 1945, by J. D. Krug.

Production of major types of munitions, United Kingdom, September 1939 to June 1944

	Sept. 1939–June 1944	Jan.–June 1944
Aircraft:		
Bombers	27,720	4,280
Fighters	38,025	5,655
Trainers	25,346	2,070
Reconnaissance, transport, naval, other	11,518	2,604
Total	102,609	14,609
Naval ship construction:		
Major combatant warships	722	88
Patrol, landing, auxiliary, other	38,022	1,033
Total	38,744	1,121
Naval guns (20 millimeters and larger)	49,865	10,489
Army guns and equipment:		
Artillery pieces	64,012	4,586
Mortars	48,300	6,300
Machine guns and submachine guns	3,729,819	433,063
Rifles	2,175,000	328,500
Combat and motor vehicles:		
Tanks	25,116	2,474
Armored cars, carriers, etc	74,802	13,957
Trucks—all types	919,100	94,100
Heavy	493,700	47,200
Medium, light, other	425,400	46,900
	Sept. 1939 through 1943	*1943*
New merchant vessels completed:		
Total (thousands of gross tons)	4,717	1,204

Source: Statistics Relating to the War Effort of United Kingdom, November 1944. (Report of Prime Minister to Parliament.)

[Excerpt from speech by Premier Stalin, the New York Times, February 10, 1946, p. 30–L, column 6]

RUSSIAN PRODUCTION OF MAJOR TYPES OF MUNITIONS

"Our tank industry in the last 3 years at least produced on the average over 30,000 tanks, self-propelled guns, and armored cars per year. It is also known that our aircraft industry produced in the same period about 40,000 planes per year. It is also known that our artillery industry produced annually in the same period about 120,000 guns of all calibers, about 450,000 light and heavy machine guns, over 3,000,000 rifles and about 2,000,000 automatic rifles."

Huge munitions production

"It is also known that our mortar industry in the period 1942–44 produced on the average about 100,000 mortars per year. It is obvious that in the same time a corresponding quantity of artillery shells, various kinds of mines, air bombs, and rifle and machine-gun ammunition was also produced.

"It is known that in 1944 alone more than 240,000,000 shells, bombs, and mines were produced and more than 7,400,000,000 cartridges."

Roosevelt Memorial Dinner Address by Justice Hugo L. Black

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. Hugo L. Black, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, before the National Citizens Political Action Committee Roosevelt memorial dinner, held at the Hotel Commodore, New York, on Friday, April 12, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We who are gathered here tonight come from many different places and environments. We are of diverse faiths, beliefs, occupations, and races. But we are together because we are united by a common bond. That bond is the love all of us have felt for Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and our common devotion to the principles of genuine democracy to which he gave his service and his life.

It is a cherished honor, Mr. Chairman, to have been selected as one of those privileged to speak his sentiments to such a gathering upon such an occasion as this. For this reason I accepted your gracious invitation.

A year ago today Franklin Delano Roosevelt left us. When that news flashed around the world, all of the people—those who agreed with his policies and those who violently disagreed with him—recognized that a great leader had passed away. He had passed away in the midst of terrible times, when great leaders were rare and very much needed. This Nation was engaged in a bitter life-and-death struggle. The failure of economic systems and the consequent disintegration of moral values, together with selfish ambitions, greed, intolerance, and disillusion, had brought about that struggle. Only those on the side of the United Nations, only those who still clung to a faith in their ideals of good government of decent values, could hope to restore peace and the good life to a warring world. Over two decades before we had been engaged in a similar struggle for similar purposes. The war was won, but victory did not bring tranquillity to the people in this troubled world. Instead, disillusion and desperate cynicism followed. That disillusion and cynicism still embittered and blinded people when the second struggle began. The forces of disillusion capitalized on that fact. Yet Franklin Delano Roosevelt was able to provide the leadership that restored faith to the American people in the possibility of a better world to come. Our people sacrificed security. We sacrificed the comforts of immediate peace. Some gave their best, many gave their all, to win this battle that had engulfed the rest of the world. All the world recognized Franklin Delano Roosevelt as the natural leader of this new humanitarian restoration. The confidence of people in his leadership led them to regain their faith in the possibility of democracy all over the world.

We all remember how magnificently this country became transformed into an arsenal of democracy. This was not merely an arsenal of weapons and of the machinery of war. It was an arsenal of ideas and of a burning democratic faith. All this was done by people who for many years during this century had come to take democracy for granted. All this was done by a people that for many years had feared extensive participation in international affairs. No one can tell nor will anyone ever be able to tell whether events would have happened as they did had Franklin Delano Roosevelt not been the leader of his country during its most trying times. One thing is clear. Everyone—friend and enemy—recognized that he had a great deal to do with our transformation, with our awakening to new responsibilities. Roosevelt was the man of the hour. He was the kind of democratic leader a democratic people wanted and needed during trying times. His charming smile, his genuine love for the people, his ability to compromise, his ability to take a strong stand and stick by it when the times required it, and his ability to plan ahead, all meant that he personified democratic ideals.

There was no magic to his leadership. There was no sinister Machiavelian scheme to it either. Roosevent was a successful, a loved, and a true leader, and the people followed him because they trusted him. His formula for leadership was a simple democratic one. When the times called for it, he educated the people. When the people demanded action, he acted. Above all, while cherishing sound traditions, he was not afraid of the new and unexplored. He restored power to the sinews of democracy by ruthlessly exterminating debilitating dogmas disguised as honored traditions. His career which culminated with his great commandership during the second bitter war, is and will remain a model for democratic leadership.

But it is a mistake to think of Roosevelt only as a wartime commander. His great ability as a democratic leader was demonstrated during his many years as President before we were forced to go to war. As a peacetime leader he also brought renewed democratic faith to a people that had become cynical and disillusioned. It is not necessary to describe at length the economic crisis that faced this country and the world in 1932. We all remember the farmers whose lands were sold for taxes and the many idle industrial workers, desperately looking for jobs. We all remember the financial ruin, general chaos, despair and apathy that paralyzed our economy. But Franklin Delano Roosevelt did not despair. He had faith in democracy and faith in our people and faith in our country. Even before he became President in 1932 he felt deeply the seriousness of the times and the need for calling on the people to regain its democratic strength and to work cooperatively for a better America. He addressed the following important words to all of us: "These unhappy times call for the building of plans that rest upon the forgotten, the unorganized, but the indispensable units of economic power, for plans like those of 1917 that build from the bottom up and not from the top down, that put their faith once more in the forgotten men at the bottom of the economic pyramid."

Later events proved that these words were not mere empty phrases. For when Roosevelt became President, reform followed with the speed of lightning. The natural resources of our richly endowed country which had been slowly but surely turning into a wasteland were made to serve the people. Many of the people who had been forced into idleness against their wishes, but who were capable of doing useful work, were employed at a living wage to save our forests, to improve our parks, to build roads and streets, and to make available much needed recreation centers. Great dams were built to harness the power of our streams. New industries and thousands of new homes sprang into being. Parts of our country that for a long time had known nothing but want and degradation were thus transformed into healthy and happy communities. Roosevelt's vision to build from the bottom up was becoming a reality.

His administration made the people's bank savings secure. New laws were enacted to curb business practices that had resulted in fleecing many for the advantage of a few. The distressed owners of mortgaged farms and city dwellings were given a chance to keep their homes. These things, too, are what Roosevelt meant when he had spoken about the "forgotten man" and about building from the bottom up.

Roosevelt and his administration worked for and made substantial progress toward social security for all the people. Not only did unemployment actually diminish, but a higher standard of living for the many was provided, and unemployment compensation and old-age pensions became a reality, not merely a bait for use by unscrupulous demagogues. Roosevelt sought to strengthen business by protecting it against speculation, monopoly, and fraud, and by increasing consumer purchasing power. He worked, campaigned, and fought so that farmers and workers in industry might get a fair share of the gains of strengthened business. That, also, is what Roosevelt meant by building from the bottom up.

Of course, a good deal of the legislation he recommended was experimentation. For, while the Government had been used before to help some people, it had never before been used to such an extent as an instrument of economic control for the benefit of so many people. And of course, as with all experimentation, there were mistakes. But even the mistakes that were made taught lessons for the future, and provided an intelligent and workable approach toward achievement of a better society. For the proof of this, one need only study the later Presidential campaigns and see that even those political parties that opposed Roosevelt began to accept many of the innovations that were once called radical and revolutionary. And today most of those innovations are accepted as essential parts of our governmental program.

All these changes did not come about without vigorous opposition. The opposition was composed in part of those who were seeking selfishly to maintain unfair practices under which they had greatly prospered and by those who innocently clung blindly to old ways merely because they were old. That opposition was fierce indeed. But Roosevelt was willing to face that opposition because he believed his program was right and his faith in the people led him to believe that they too believed in building this Nation's prosperity from the bottom up. In this struggle he proved a skillful political craftsman. He has been frequently attacked for that, but those who believe in democracy must accept as a part of it, in a Nation such as ours, all the fair political activities essential to the achievement of concrete and constructive action. Roosevelt's great political craftsmanship simply meant that he used the instruments of democracy for the purposes of democracy—the good of all.

The internal and international problems of today are of a kind that can be far more serious than the difficult problems that existed in 1932. For these problems are not only world-wide in scope but there is also an air of finality about them because of the pervading threat of the atomic bomb. Today Roosevelt would probably have faced these problems as he did all others, with the idea and purpose of building anew in the midst of chaos, and building as always from the bottom up. But Roosevelt is no longer

with us. He is no longer here to gather together all of those who are devoted to the ideal of a government that works directly for the benefit of all, rather than a government that bestows special favors on a few in the hope that the few will then divide their favors with the many. Yet you believed and still believe in his philosophy are still among the living. That philosophy cannot remain a living force unless you people who believe in it fight for it. What does it mean to build anew today? Roosevelt showed that building anew means experimentation. His philosophy in this respect was one which many great men have believed in throughout the ages: The old should not be abandoned merely because it is old, but age alone should not bar the adoption of new and better methods. Roosevelt deplored the state of mind that refuses to face the possibility of new devices, of different ways of doing things, that refuses to discuss them, that refuses to think in their terms. Our people have had the great privilege of living in a democracy for over a hundred and fifty years. Democracy and government by and for the people means immediate and quick response to the people's needs, means expression and communication of new ideas and new thoughts, means experimentation in carrying out, in putting into effect, many new ideas and new thoughts. Roosevelt believed in that kind of democracy. He would believe in that kind of democracy today. He believed in the democratic method of bringing people of like minds together to accomplish common objectives. You who are heirs of Roosevelt's philosophy, and on whose shoulders it has fallen to face the serious times ahead without his leadership in person, can follow his spirit.

To bring about peace and cooperation among the nations Roosevelt proposed that we abandon our old policy of isolation and adopt the United Nations organization. Today there are already many who say that we should not advance one step beyond the United Nations organization as it now stands. Even if that were true, I am sure Roosevelt did not think of it as being the last possible word. He proposed the United Nations organization as something we must try to make work. If it should not work, or if there is a sign that it might not work, we must help to change it or change the organization of nations.

In other words, when we face the task of building anew, we must not fear the possibility of making the United Nations organization strong enough to preserve the peace of the world.

Too many of us who comment today on world affairs are tempted to comment on them in terms of the old traditional logic of international relations. This leads to analyzing everything in terms of power politics. All problems are thus seen in terms of problems of the interest of Russia, as against the interests of Great Britain and the United States; the interests of the United States as against those of Russia and Britain; or the interests of Britain against those of the United States and Russia. World peace is envisioned as wholly dependent on some compromise of these various power interests. That may be the road toward world peace, but it has not led there in the past. You who want to follow Roosevelt's aims must consider possible alternatives. You must consider the possibility of building economies for the benefit of the starving people of the world. It becomes important for you to ask yourselves the question whether building anew from the bottom up means building the economy of India for the Indian people, the economy of China for the Chinese, the economy of Iran for the Iranians, of Poland for the Poles, and integrating the economies of all countries for the good of all the people of all the countries of the world. Perhaps we should discuss as a real possibility the giving up of power politics on the part of all nations.

Those who follow Roosevelt's policies must remember that with reference to international affairs his underlying philosophy was hatred of war and love of peace. In domestic affairs Roosevelt carried out his belief in the fullest governmental protection of the weak from exploitation by the strong and powerful. As he put it: "America calls for government with a soul." Roosevelt became a war leader not because he liked it but because it was the only chance, indeed it was the last possible chance, of saving our democratic way of life. His own words were: "The true goal we seek is far above and beyond the ugly field of battle. When we resort to force, as now we must, we are determined that this force shall be directed toward ultimate good as well as against immediate evil. We Americans are not destroyers; we are builders * * *." This was his good-neighbor policy which he hoped would replace the old power-politics big-bully policy. This policy means extension of a friendly hand to all people and all nations that love and want peace. And real friendship means that we can live together and face common problems together with those whose economic systems differ from ours. Roosevelt discarded and disavowed the dangerous belief that all nations that produce and distribute goods in ways different from ours are our natural enemies. To promote peace, he recognized Russia despite the outraged clamor of a vociferous minority. The friendship that thus began proved to be the key to our victory over Nazi greed and cruelty which threatened the peace of mankind. Continuation of this policy of friendship for Russia and all other peace-loving nations, should, and I am sure will, turn out to be the key to lasting peace. Again a vociferous minority is opposed. We must not let it succeed.

All of those, however, who believe that Roosevelt's humanitarian philosophy would make the United States a better Nation, and the world a better world, the small group gathered here and all forward-thinking people everywhere, would do well to reflect very often on what Roosevelt himself once said: "For all these things we have just begun to fight."

Coercion in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of May 22, 1946:

VISITOR IN POLAND REPORTS COERCION—UNBELIEVABLE CONDITIONS SAID TO STEM FROM SUPPRESSION OF WILL OF MAJORITY

(By Pauline Frederick)

NUREMBERG, GERMANY, May 21.—"What's the use of telling the American people the truth about Poland—they won't believe it anyway."

This is how those in close touch with conditions in Poland greet Americans who are able to get into the country. I have just returned from an 8-day stay in Poland and I could scarcely believe, either, what I saw and heard.

To begin with, I could not have cabled any true stories out of Poland. Press messages that the government does not like are stopped dead in Warsaw. Larry Allen of the Associated Press, who has been waging a discouraging battle to get the news out, has been told anonymously at least three times lately that he should leave the country.

I was in Poland on 2 days—May 1 and 3—that came near to lighting the fuse of the civil war that even a member of the Polish Parliament admitted is threatening.

CELEBRATION CALLED FORCED

On May 1 participation in the workers' holiday was compulsory. All places of business in Cracow were closed. As I entered the Magistrature for the official opening of the ceremonies, at which Dr. Boleslaw Drobner, cousin of Premier Stalin and leader of the Socialist Party, was the principal speaker, the Soviet hymn was being played.

The main square was jammed with 100,000 persons, waving banners—of the PPR (Communist Workers' Party, which dominates the government although it is estimated to have only 2 or 3 percent of the people behind it), and the PPS (Socialist Party, which works close to the PPR), the hammer and sickle and an occasional red and white Polish flag.

There was no sign of the flag of the Peasant Party of the former head of the London government, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, who is estimated by impartial observers to have the sympathy of at least 60 percent of the people.

For 2 hours there moved in parade thousands of persons, from workers to Boy and Girl Scouts to orphans who were hauled in trucks. There was more than one reason for the turn-out. For instance, many Government employees and other workers (the majority PPR) who rate UNRRA rations under the Government's system of distribution, were threatened with loss of this ration if they did not show up.

That night, at the dinner given by the Cracow district military officers, where meat was plentiful although Wednesday is a meatless day, three out of four toasts were drunk to Russian-Polish relations. One was a courtesy toast to the Americans present.

CIVIL WAR THREAT CITED

Even so, the Government was displeased over the May Day celebrations. The administration was also displeased by a recent speech in Parliament by Peasant Party member Benezyk.

"We even hear warnings from some leaders that the Polish Peasant Party will not be allowed to win the elections at any price," he charged. Many Poles were being forced into an underground organization, he declared.

Therefore, the Government ordered that the people of Poland were not to celebrate their "Fourth of July" on May 3. Meanwhile, M. Mikolajcyk, whose life is admittedly in jeopardy, went into hiding over the holiday to prevent any demonstrations by his followers that might result in bloodshed. But this is what happened in Cracow:

The Poles of Cracow gathered for mass in the Church of Our Lady, to which the Wit Stowosz altar had just been returned. As the service broke up the people poured out into the market place and a small parade began.

As they reached the building that houses Red Army headquarters, shots were fired into the crowd. Then shots were fired into the crowd from the building housing the Communist Party.

They cried, "Mikolajczyk!" "Down with Communism!" "Give us back Vilna and Lwow!" There was more shooting into the crowd as two Russian armored vehicles rushed up, manned by security police.

People began running into the side streets, some heading for a dormitory occupied by students from the University of Cracow. One of the armored cars followed and sprayed the front of the dormitory with machine-gun fire. The students were ordered out with their hands in the air. They were loaded into trucks and cars and taken away.

Keynes Discovered Economic Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. HOCH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, at the request of one of my constituents, I ask unanimous consent that the following article by Ralph W. Page be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

KEYNES DISCOVERED ECONOMIC LAW
(By Ralph W. Page)

WASHINGTON, April 26.—Lord Keynes, who died recently, will be rated as one of the foremost men living in this terrible era. He challenged the accepted and established dogmas of political economy and dispelled the myths of immutable economic laws that the interests and practices of the industrial and commercial ruling classes had built up on the theories of John Stuart Mill and Herbert Spencer. And he made the diagnosis of the mortal sickness of the laissez-faire doctrine and the free-enterprise capitalist system manifest by recurring and aggravated depressions.

His revolutionary proposition was that periodic collapse is inevitable unless all the money realized in payment for production and distribution—wages, rents, interests, dividends—is spent either for consumption or in new enterprise; in other words that savings not utilized in creative investment serve only to dry up purchasing power and bring on stagnation in employment and production.

The remedy he advocated was a commensurate spending by Government—public works and social service programs equal in volume to the personal hoarding.

Long before the idea was accepted, people everywhere adopted the remedy simply because they had to. In spite of any theories, convictions or lamentations, they were faced with the choice of Government spending or complete ruin.

This doctrine—or discovery—resulted in a political and economic upheaval throughout the world. It compelled and sustained the New Deal in America and a parallel phenomenon everywhere else on earth.

His exposition, however, did not end with perpetual Government spending. With the exception of continued Government contribution to really essential public works and social betterments for their own sake, he contended that this unbalance could be corrected by distributing more of the income to the poorer groups who are compelled to spend for necessities, and simultaneous penalties upon unproductive savings of the rich.

His other main contribution was that capitalism can thrive only on free trade, and that the prevailing attempt of countries to sell but prevent buying by trade barriers is suicidal.

These propositions of Keynes are logically and mathematically irrefutable. But they do violence to long-established customs and convictions, and jeopardize the tenure of the ruling classes, who deny and combat them with the utmost vigor.

The political and economic battles that have now produced a deadlock between the administration and Congress and threaten to paralyze the ability of the Government to adopt any policy or program, are the fruits of controversy over the effects and validity of Keynes' expositions.

Regardless of theory, the well-to-do and those now in command of enterprise perceive that both of Keynes' remedies reduce their wealth and their influence. So they conclude that they are un-American and communistic. Workmen, share croppers, submerged minorities—all those in the lower brackets—naturally flock to the support of a creed that spreads the income and disseminates health, education, free lunches, and general betterment.

The ultimate long-run result is not in doubt. Keynes did not invent a doctrine that can be accepted or rejected at will. He discovered a natural law that will operate regardless of desires and opinions.

Amendment of Internal Revenue Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call to the attention of the House, my bill, H. R. 6487, which I introduced on May 20, 1946, and which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. The bill in its entirety reads as follows:

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939

Be it enacted, etc., That section 22 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 10), is amended by adding the following provision: "*Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection, all amounts up to $2,000 per annum as annuities, pensions, or retirement benefits for past services as an employee of the Government of the United States, as an employee of any State, Territory, or possession, or any political subdivision thereof, as an employee of any corporation owned directly or indirectly by any of the foregoing governmental units, or as an employee of any corporation exempt from income tax under the provisions of section 101 (6) of this chapter, shall be excluded from gross income and shall be exempt from taxation under this chapter."

The whole theory of this municipal pension system, as I understand it, is that as a reward for long and essential service, usually at fairly low salaries, the beneficiary or his widow and dependents is entitled to at least a minimum amount of money on which they can live in reasonable security. Years ago when most of these pensions were established, the cost of living was very much less than it is now and the rate of income tax was very moderate. Now with the cost of living high and growing higher and with income-tax rates at a staggering level, these fixed funds are just not sufficient to allow their recipients to live. In order to afford some measure of relief, it is necessary that the funds be exempt from income tax.

I am aware of the argument that we should not create classes of exemptions in this general tax law of ours, but that argument does not answer the practical problem of how these people are going to live. Moreover, let me call your attention to the fact that for many years it was considered illegal and unconstitutional for the Federal Government to impose a tax on the receipts of municipal salaries or funds, a proceeding which is still of doubtful propriety.

This bill I have introduced is not original. The subject has been repeatedly debated in Congress, but I hope the time has at last come when the Ways and Means Committee and Congress itself will act to alleviate many cases of very real distress among these pensioners, who were promised and who deserve at least a minimum security.

Government of Spain Under General Franco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the United Nations are conducting an investigation relative to charges that the Spanish Government is a threat to international peace and security; and

Whereas the United States of America is vitally interested in the matter to the end that the fullest authentic information may be obtained as a result of such investigation; and

Whereas the Spanish Government is entitled to have such an investigation conducted in a fair and impartial manner; and

Whereas the Government of Spain rescued the people of that country from the intolerable tyranny of atheistic communism which drenched the land in blood, caused the murder of thousands of its noblest citizens with inconceivable brutality, and ruined the patrimony of the Spanish people; and

Whereas a new campaign of lies and propaganda has been commenced with the object of forcing the Spanish Government to withdraw its garrisons along the French frontiers so that the forces of disorder—bands of terrorists, guerillas, and saboteurs now being trained in the school of terrorism in Toulouse, France—may be enabled to invade Spain and cause a fresh outbreak of bloody disorders in that country which is now at peace with its neighbors and all of the world; and

Whereas an Asiatic power desires a foothold on the Atlantic Ocean in its campaign of imperial expansion into the Iberian Peninsula and as one more step toward its boasted destruction of the British Empire and after that the extinction of the liberties of the Republics of North and South America, and to this end hopes to work through its tools, the Spanish Communists, who will inevitably

rise to power in Spain if the present progressive government of that country is overthrown; and

Whereas the government of General Franco has earned the undying hatred of the Communists because it is the only government that successfully blocked the design of communism of overruning all Europe by force; and

Whereas the Government of Spain since the end of the civil war in 1939 has established law and order, embarked on a campaign of social and personal justice, and has ended long-standing abuses and inequalities in that country, and has thereby gained the good will of a large majority of the Spanish people; and

Whereas the program of social reforms in Spain during the period from 1939 onward presents a record of accomplishment without parallel in history in that opportunities were afforded to hundreds of workers in all branches of production in Spain to broaden their social outlook on the basis of Christian principles of social justice through intensive courses of study, the Government strengthened existing laws relative to accident compensation for workers, the obligatory old-age retirement law, maternity insurance, statutes relative to the length of the working day, recognition of Sunday as a legal day of rest, and introduced reforms relating to the protection of laborers and agricultural workers, the broadening of social-security legislation, unemployment compensation, housing, the fostering of settlement projects, professional training, the protection of the family and family life, insurance for widows, orphans and schooling, loans for marriages, social aid, and the promotion of educational opportunities as well as many other matters relating to the welfare of the worker and every other class in the community; and

Whereas the Knights of Columbus, an American fraternal and patriotic order, with its roots deep in the great contribution that Spain has made to Christian civilization and the development of the New World, views with concern the efforts being made on the soil of the United States to interfere with the internal affairs of a nation which is at peace with us and every other nation of good will, and are mindful of the assurance of the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt to General Franco, when Spain's power to injure the Allied forces invading north Africa was at its highest, that "Spain has nothing to fear from the United Nations."

Now, therefore, the Rhode Island State Council of the Knights of Columbus hereby recommends to the national officers of this order that the sum of $100,000 be raised and appropriated to be expended under the direction of Supreme Knight, Hon. John E. Swift, for the purpose of engaging and paying for the services of attorneys, historians, geographers, publicists, researchers, translators, interpreters, and others, and also for the purpose of paying traveling and other necessary expenses of every kind and description in and about presenting to the United Nations or any committee thereof full, fair, accurate, and impartial information about the achievements of the Spanish Government under the leadership of General Franco in restoring peace and order in that country after the defeat of the Anarchist and Communist hordes during the civil war of 1936–39, as well as full information in regard to the hideous conditions that existed in Spain in 1936 and for which many of the enemies of the present Spanish Government who are now urging the United Nations to take action against Spain are largely responsible, not forgetting to present evidence of the looting under the direction of those same forces of $700,000,000 in gold from the vaults of the Bank of Spain as well as the looting of every strongbox in every bank in the country, and the widespread robberies, assaults on women and children, and murder of thousands of innocent religious—bishops, priests, and nuns—whose lives were devoted to the service of their fellow men, and similar acts of barbarism which will be duplicated if the existing Spanish Government is overthrown; and be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States, the Department of State, the Congress of the United States, and the United Nations are hereby urged to follow a policy of not interfering with the internal affairs of the Spanish people and to preserve friendly relations with the Spanish Government; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Hon. Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, Hon. James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State, Hon. Edward R. Stettinius, Permanent Chairman of the United States Delegation to the United Nations, Hon. Tom Connally, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Hon. Sol Bloom, chairman of the House Foreign Relations Committee, Hon. Theodore Francis Green and Hon. Peter G. Gerry, Senators from the State of Rhode Island, and Hon. Aime J. Forand and Hon. John E. Fogarty, Members of Congress from the State of Rhode Island.

RHODE ISLAND STATE COUNCIL,
KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS,
THOMAS J. CURLEY,
State Deputy.
DONALD J. MURRAY,
State Secretary.

WARREN, R. I., *May 14, 1946.*

Importation of Watches and Watch Movements From Switzerland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PEHR G. HOLMES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from the President of the United States and my reply thereto:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 15, 1946.

Hon. PEHR G. HOLMES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HOLMES: I have received the letter of April 6, from yourself and other Members of the Massachusetts delegation in the House of Representatives, concerning the importation of watches and watch movements from Switzerland and requesting that the problem be reviewed to the end that the Department of State continue its efforts in obtaining a limitation on the volume of these imports.

During the war the American watch industry did a splendid job in manufacturing time fuses, marine chronometers, watches, and all types of time precision instruments. We, as Americans, should be proud and grateful that the industry was able to produce these instruments vital to the national security and defense in a volume and quality which met the essential needs of our armed forces and of those of our allies. It is true that many watches and watch movements were imported from Switzerland, directly and indirectly, during those years but in no manner can it be said that these watches were dumped upon the American market. The Army and Navy Departments as well as the War Production Board encouraged these imports and, at times requisitioned up to 50 percent of them to meet the requirements of the armed services.

Last June I wrote to Speaker RAYBURN, as you have mentioned in your letter, that the increased authority sought under the Trade Agreements Act would not be used to endanger segments of American industry. It has not been, and will not be, so used. You seem to be under the fundamental misapprehension that under the act the President has the power unilaterally to limit or stop imports. No such authority is granted by the act.

The only recourse open to the Department of State is to obtain by agreement through negotiation with the Government of Switzerland some limitation to be imposed by that government upon exports to this country.

In view of the problems facing the American watch industry during its period of reconversion to civilian production, the Department of State requested the Government of Switzerland to place a limitation upon the export of watches and watch movements to the United States. It pressed upon that government the need of reaching some understanding with respect to the position of the American watch industry during its period of reconversion. The Department of State has no power by which it could compel the Government of Switzerland to comply. The Department of State is doing its utmost to convince the Government of Switzerland of the need of limiting and reducing the volume of watches and movements being exported to the United States and of recognizing the special position of the American watch industry in its reconversion to civilian production. It is hoped that a public announcement by the two governments can be made with respect to this matter in the very near future.

In addition to this expected solution for this emergency period immediately confronting the American watch industry, it is the intention of the interested departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government to make a detailed study of the American watch industry and associated industries with a view of establishing a long-range policy which will meet fully the requirements of our national defense and security.

Very sincerely yours,
HARRY S. TRUMAN.

MAY 22, 1946.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your letter of April 15, 1946, in response to the complaint registered by me and other Members of the Massachusetts delegation in the House of Representatives in the matter of imported Swiss watches and watch movements, came as somewhat of a shock. We had hoped you would be more keenly aware of the disruptive influences of the continued flood of imported watches from Switzerland, and express a willingness to prevent further damage from this source. It is clearly apparent, however, that you are closing your eyes to the evils of the situation and to its remedy as well.

The record is clear, Mr. President. Importation of jeweled watches and watch movements from Switzerland has increased in recent years, out of all proportion to the normal growth in demand for these imported articles. While the sales of American watches increased by 150 percent in the years leading up to the war, imports of Swiss watches and movements in the same period increased by 400 percent, and in 1945 reached the staggering total of approximately 9,000,000. All this time American manufacturers have been denied access to the American market. They are now confronted with a market saturated by Swiss importations, with no relief in sight.

Notwithstanding these facts, Mr. President, you deny in your letter that Swiss watches have been dumped upon the American market. In the same breath, however, you offer a half-hearted apology for them on the ground of military necessity. Again, the record will not bear you out. According to my information, the War Production Board reports that not one imported Swiss watch was used for military purposes. On the contrary, imported units were allocated to Army post exchanges and Navy ship stores for resale purposes only. Timepieces required for actual military operations were, on the other hand, supplied by American watchmakers and issued without charge to military personnel.

Your disregard of these facts, Mr. President, is disturbing. Even more shocking is your denial of authority under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to limit or stop such imports. You have either been grossly misinformed or are begging a way out when you say:

"You seem to be under the fundamental misapprehension that under the act the President has the power unilaterally to limit or stop imports. No such authority is granted by the act."

It is not I, Mr. President, who labors under a misapprehension, but yourself. Permit me to refer to the act (section 350 of the Tariff Act as amended) and in particular to the proviso at the end of section 350 (a) (2):

"*Provided*, That the President may suspend the application to articles * * * of any country because of its discriminatory treatment of American commerce or because of other acts (including the operations of international cartels) or policies which in his opinion tend to defeat the purposes set forth in this section."

The purpose of the act is, of course, the expansion of our foreign trade but this is expressly a subsidiary purpose only—a means to an end, the end being, as stated in section 350 (a):

"Restoring the American standard of living, in overcoming unemployment * * * in increasing the purchasing power of the American public, and in establishing and maintaining a better relationship among various branches of American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce."

The authority conferred in section 350 of the act is, of course, conditioned both upon the fact of discriminatory treatment of American commerce, and upon commission of "other acts" and the existence of "policies" which merely tend to defeat the purposes of the Trade Agreements Act. Similar authority exercisable under similar conditions, is likewise found in sections 337 and 338 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

In determining whether the President has authority on his own initiative to restrict or stop imports, the question of whether current excessive imports of Swiss watches constitute discriminatory treatment, or is one of the "other acts" or the result of a "policy" is not as important as the question of the effect of these imports on the American watch industry. It is the effect which counts in determining whether the purposes of the act are, or will likely be defeated by their continuance. They do constitute an act. The Swiss Government encourages such imports. The excessive imports do tend to defeat the purposes of the Trade Agreements Act, by encouraging unemployment in the United States and otherwise in the curtailment of American watch production.

Furthermore, it is well known that Switzerland subjects imports of American goods to certain quotas and other import restrictions, in addition to regular duties. It is equally well known that, notwithstanding the concesssions we have extended to the Swiss they have not reciprocated to the extent of any appreciable modification in their quota system. And in the recent import-limitation agreement with the Swiss they apparently refused to restrict shipments to less than 90 percent of the record-breaking total of 9,000,000 units shipped here in 1945. Altogether it is abundantly clear that we are the victims of unwarranted discrimination.

It is equally plain that the Trade Agreements Act is designed to help, not hinder, American interests. It is true also, according to the law, that where the President finds any act of a foreign government which in his opinion tends to defeat the purposes set forth in the act, he may impose higher rates of tariff duties, special classifications of articles and, to quote section 350 (c) (2):

"(2) Limitations, prohibitions, charges, and exactions other than duties, imposed on importations or imposed for the regulation of imports."

I do not desire to prolong my remarks, Mr. President, but on this question of your authority it is important that you weigh carefully these words of the Committee on Ways and Means in its report on the 1945 extension of the act:

"Pursuant to the wise authority conferred by the original act not only to proclaim changes in duties, but also impose 'additional import restrictions,' concessions have been circumscribed, wherever necessary, by reclassifications, changes in form of duties, tariff quotas, and absolute quotas. It is the intent of the law, and also that of the committee, that these same protective measures shall be used in connection with future agreements whenever circumstances require them."

Finally, permit me to refer to the testimony of your own Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. William Clayton, given in his testimony before the Finance Committee of the Senate, May 30, 1945:

"Senator BAILEY, if we were to take any drastic action in respect of any commodity which would bring in a flood of imports of that commodity and seriously threaten the stability of any industry, you would throw us out."

No, Mr. President, the weight of authority is all on the side of Presidential power to limit or stop imports of any commodity when the volume of such imports injures, or even tends to injure any industry, or tends to create unemployment in the United States, or tends to lower the purchasing power of the American public.

If you were wholeheartedly determined to protect the stability of any industry, it is my honest opinion that ample legal authority can be found to justify any appropriate action you might wish to take in this direction. By your failure to act, and by your denial of such authority, you simply nullify the purposes of the Trade Agreements Act.

In behalf of myself and my colleagues, and with all due respect, I am compelled again to request that Swiss imports of jeweled watches and watch movements be substantially reduced by whatever means you choose to adopt under the law, to the end that thousands of American working men and women in this industry may be removed from the international auction block.

Respectfully yours,

PEHR G. HOLMES.

What of the Atomic Bomb?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address delivered before the annual communion breakfast of the Valladolid Council of the Knights of Columbus, Lynn, Mass., on April 7, 1946, by Rev. M. J. Ahern, S. J.:

Before the outbreak of the war that is just closing we discussed, in answer to many requests, the moral conditions of a just war, in the light of the teachings of the theologians of the Catholic Church, especially since the time of St. Thomas Aquinas—the thirteenth century. I do not intend to repeat that discussion at this time. However, I may be allowed to recall to your memories one condition that must be fulfilled in a just war. This condition is admirably explained by Philip Hughes in an article in the London Tablet for September 2, 1939, which was widely reprinted in the Catholic press all over the world. Father Hughes said:

"War is a relation of nation to nation, and not of the citizens of one nation as individuals to the citizens of the other nation. It is not lawful, therefore, in time of war, for individual citizens to kill, maim, and plunder the subjects of another power. The enemy, whom it is lawful to attack with arms, and therefore to kill if necessary, comprises only those taking an active part in the hostilities. All others, not only the civilian who continues in his civil occupations, his womenfolk, his children, but all those who accompany the actual fighting men, such as doctors, nurses, chaplains—all these, from the point of view of the right to make a directly intended assault, are neutrals. And this, not as a matter of favor, or chivalry, or sentiment, but in justice. Directly to attack them is grievously wrong."

These words take on new significance since the advent of the atomic bomb. What are we to judge of the morality of the use of this bomb—by all odds the most terrible weapon in the history of warfare?

Quite recently President Truman proposed that the secret of the manufacture of the atomic bomb be held inviolate by the nations whose scientists developed the weapon, that is, by the United States, Great Britain, and Canada, so that this mighty force might be safeguarded for the uses of peace, and that the secret might not fall into the hands of those who might use it for purposes of war at some time in the future. But the question at once arises, Can this secret be held thus inviolate? There are those who doubt that this secret can be hidden from other nations indefinitely. In fact, it has been reported that a high official in our military command has stated that within 3 years the method of manufacture of the atomic bomb will be known to all nations in the world. Perhaps the particular technique, which the three nations concerned use in the production of the present bomb, may be kept secret. But it would be a rash prediction to state that no scientist or group of scientists will ever develop another technique for the manufacture of an atomic bomb. In fact, we are told that the scientists of Germany were within a year of manufacturing an atomic bomb. If this is true, then we cannot suppose that no one in Germany is in possession of at least part of the method of preparing an atomic bomb. Was it not a woman scientist in Germany who had a lot to do with the research that resulted in the atomic bomb as it is now known? There are a great many men of science in the world outside of the three countries at present involved in the making of the atomic bomb. I cannot conceive that a pooling of the knowledge of these extraneous men of science would not result in a similar weapon. The three nations in question do not seem to be completely at ease about the ultimate consequences of the use of the bomb last month. Is it not an open question whether or not Japan was very near surrender before the dropping of the bomb?

Now let us get down to the pertinent question about the use of the atomic bomb, Was its use morally justifiable, or better? Was the way in which it was used in the case of the two Japanese cities morally justifiable? Before we address ourselves directly to this question, let us ask a question about bombing in general. Is there no limit to the use of bombing from the air? Most people would answer, I surmise, by saying that such bombing should be confined to military objectives; if in such bombings civilians are killed, this is to be regretted; but as long as such accidental killings were not intended, it would be a legitimate practice of warfare. At least this answer, or an answer tantamount to this answer, had been given quite frequently in the course of this war. It has been given by authorities on both sides of the struggle both in Europe and in the Pacific.

This answer leads directly to another question: What is a military objective? In many cases it is not difficult to decide this question. Thus a fort, a battleship, or other ship of war, an airplane, and an airplane factory, a hangar, an ammunition dump, a railroad used for military purposes, etc. Such bombing would be justified in the following statement: "It is morally lawful to bombard a military objective of the kinds enumerated, even though in the course of the bombing some civilians are lost, which loss of civilian life the bomber did not intend."

But in the course of this war, as in the last war to some extent, the meaning of "military objective" became extended, until now it means all or almost all enemy railroads and railroad stations because such were used to transport troops and munitions. It means as well all enemy means of communications, such as telegraph lines, radio stations, and all other forms of communication that could be used by the enemy for military information. Then all factories in which munitions or other war material were made came to be considered military objectives. And it was taken for granted that they too could be bombed, especially, when the enemy was warned beforehand, even if civilian lives were lost.

But—as my fellow Jesuit Father Wilfrid Parsons points out in an article widely syndicated in the Catholic press, and of which I have made free use in this broadcast—factories can and have been repaired, even after repeated bombings. Hence it was concluded that, since workers' houses were of necessity connected with such factories and with their repair, then these houses, too, were military objectives. Finally, apparently at the end of the war with Germany, the cities themselves, with their water and electric and other supplies, were considered legitimate military objectives; for without water and electricity and other similar materials and commodities, munitions could not be made. In addition, it was argued, as a justification for indiscriminate bombing of cties, that such bombing terrorized the inhabitants of these cities, would break the morale of the people at home, and thus indirectly ruin the morale of the armed forces of the enemy nations, so that surrender was inevitable.

With his permission, since Father Parsons has done such an excellent job in this discussion, I quote the following paragraphs from his article. You will find the whole article in the Pilot for August 18, 1945.

Incidentally, just after I had completed this portion of the broadcast, I read the letter of Monsignor Wright in the Boston Herald of last Friday. I endorse wholeheartedly his clear presentation of the moral issues of the atomic bombing.

In the present war there has been no use of poison gas. Nor has there been any attempt to inoculate the water supplies of the belligerents on both sides with the germs of disease. Such weapons have been outlawed by the moral conscience of the world. Let us suppose that one of our enemies had used one of these means against the civil populations of the United Nations, on the plea that nowadays every citizen of warring nations is fighting in some form or other, and hence these barbarous weapons would be justified against the whole civil population of the enemy in order to break their morale by terrorizing all enemy civilians. It would be impossible to justify such a claim on moral grounds. When the German air force bombed Coventry and other English cities in order to terrorize the British into surrender, such bombing was universally condemned as immoral. So was the indiscriminate use of the robot bomb. It seems to me that the same condemnation can be aimed at the indiscriminate use of the atomic bomb against whole cities.

Father John Ford, who has just been appointed professor of moral theology at the Gregorian University, in Rome, after a distinguished service in the chair of that subject at Weston College, published last September an exhaustive study of The Morality of Obliteration Bombing, of which atomic bombing is the supreme example. Father Ford in this study made a calculation of the number of citizens of the United States who could not by any sense be said to be combatants, or guilty of aggression, or deserving of violent repression; that is of death and injury because they are living in areas that are said to be military objectives, in the widest sense in which that term is used. Father Ford's estimate, after a thorough study of the figures, is that three-fourths of the population of the United States have the right, under the natural law, to be immune from the attacks of indiscriminate bombing because they cannot in any sense be considered belligerents. In the Boston market area, for instance, where the population was roughly, in June 1944, 1,800,000, the War Manpower Commission estimates that 800,000 are gainfully employed. Of these, 300,000 are classed as essential war workers, and 500,000 as less essential because their connection with the war is more remote. That leaves 1,000,000 people in this area, who cannot be considered belligerents; this is more than half of the total population. And many more of the 500,000 less essential workers could not be justly classified as belligerents. When you remember that half the population of the area is female and about 15 percent is children—at least these are the percentages of the whole country—then it seems to be clear that such persons could not be bombed for the purpose of terrorizing the population, until the morale of the armed forces of that nation would be broken and they were thereby forced to surrender. It should not take much deep reasoning to conclude that atomic bombing of whole cities with the aim of terrorizing and breaking the morale of the nonbelligerents of an enemy nation, cannot be morally justified.

Prevention and Cure of Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission duly granted, I extend my remarks for the purpose of having printed in the RECORD the following timely and impressive address concerning the prevention and cure of cancer which was delivered on May 7 over radio station WOR, New York, by the Honorable James A. Farley, formerly Postmaster General and now the chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp.:

Although I am speaking for the adoption by Congress of a bill which this body has under consideration, this is not a political speech.

Please bear with me if I tell you a fact with which you must be familiar and that is that good government is concerned with the greatest good for the greatest number of people. I have always fought for the highest precepts of government which consider the welfare of all the people. I am now concerned with the tragic fate of 17,000,000 of my fellow citizens who are doomed to die during your lifetime and mine.

It is not especially to my credit that I am worried about this. I may be one of these 17,000,000 people—or one who is dear to me may be one of them; or you who are listening to me at this moment, or someone dear to you may die before the year is out.

With all the tragedy and the heartache and all the devastation and ruin which has come out of this war, there has come out of it, I am glad to be able to say, some good things and one is the proof of what we can do in this country when there is necessity for doing it.

When we mobilize our might and our money behind a worthy cause nothing can stop us. We declared war against the mightiest military machine the world has ever known. We determined to destroy it and we did. We did it by mobilizing the money, the industry and the people of this country, and all the resources and all of our facilities behind the common war effort. Once we willed to destroy Hitler and Hitlerism and Japanese imperialism we did it and we revealed the remarkable, miraculous capacity this country has if it simply mobilizes its might against a common enemy.

It was not thought possible that, in a short time, we could get together scientists from every corner of the world who would be able to fathom the mysteries of the atom and harness them into machinery of war, and yet we did, because we had the courage and the vision to use the money and to mobilize the might to make that great feat possible.

Congress was wise enough to appropriate expenditures for the organization of facilities that made possible the bringing together of knowledge from all corners of the world and this resulted in the perfection of the atomic bomb.

Certainly the war created great desolation over vast areas of the world; millions of people died; some unmercifully, under torture and in gas chambers. Millions have suffered the slow creeping death of starvation and inconceivable human brutality in concentration camps, yet, add together the lists of all the deaths in this horrible war and, while the total is staggering it does not compare with the greater total of deaths from a disease which has been the mortal enemy of manknd from the beginning of time, a disease that grows annually in power to take life. The upward spiral of this disease is of such proportions as to cover every human being in our country and throughout the world. Every time 3 minutes pass a life is taken by this disease and always it is a terrifying, agonizing death.

More than 170,000 persons, men, women, and children were the victims of this disease last year; and a cancer specialist, who has been fighting this disease for many years, warns the American people that during our lifetime 17,000,000 people will die unless a means is found to combat the ravages of this

unspeakable scourge. I submit that any time 17,000,000 of our people are confronted by death, this Nation is in a state of emergency.

Having to look back on 170,000 deaths last year and having to look forward to more than that number this year, gives me the conviction that we face an emergency that menaces all of our people and that the Government must do something about it.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER of Florida and Congressman MATTHEW M. NEELY, former governor of West Virginia, have presented to the House of Representatives and the Senate a bill asking that $100,000,000 be appropriated for the purpose of mobilizing the world's knowledge and every facility in an effort to wipe out this disease. Senator PEPPER and Congressman NEELY envision an action to be taken against this threat to so many human lives similar to the effort that produced the atomic bomb. Now $100,000,000 is a lot of money, but just think of it in comparison to the cost of the war.

Every day that our men were fighting overseas it cost the taxpayers of this country $221,000,000.

The number of Americans who died as a direct result of the war was 273,000. Senator PEPPER and Congressman NEELY ask that less than one-half day's cost of the war be used to save the lives of 17,000,000.

I am sure you will agree that any government concerned with conserving the lives of it's citizens would not hesitate to spend such a relatively small sum for the benefit of so many.

The disease about which I am speaking is cancer.

Many of us know of cancer as a disease that attacks older people and yet more little children are attacked by cancer every year than by infantile paralysis.

Let me read you a statement by Dr. R. R. Spencer, chief of the National Cancer Institute:

"A cure for cancer would be the greatest medical news in all history. What are the chances of winning the battle against this master killer? If you had asked a research man that question 5 years ago he would have been pessimistic. Not today. One leader in the field states, 'Given time and money, any scientific problem can be solved.' And he adds, 'Cancer is no exception.' Think for a moment of the stake involved. Each year cancer kills more than two million people throughout the world. At the time of Pearl Harbor, cancer was taking more American lives every 24 months than bullets had taken in all the wars in United States history. Cancer is chiefly a disease of the aged, yet it kills more children than infantile paralysis. Every three minutes, day and night, it ticks off a life in the United States."

Do not confuse the Pepper-Neely bills with the drive now going on to raise money for cancer research. That drive is conducted by a private agency, the American Cancer Society. It is a worthy effort. I am associated with it. Everybody should make a contribution to any cause that is devoted to research and prevention.

The $100,000,000 asked for in the Pepper-Neely bills is for the purpose of finding a cure for cancer. There is nothing impossible about it. No one in his right mind would say that anything is impossible in this age. Think of the sulfa drugs, the penicillin and the other drugs that came recently into general use and the great good they have done for humanity. I do not say that any particular drug will be found to cure cancer but I do say that enough money should be set aside by this Government in an all-out effort to find some way to stop the ravages of this disease.

What these bills propose is that the Government of the United States throw its full weight, might, and power behind an organized, determined, resolute assault upon this killer—this greater enemy than Hitler was, insofar as destruction to life is concerned.

I hope we can bring enough public opinion to bear upon the Congress to get them to respond to the challenging appeal initiated by Senator PEPPER and Congressman NEELY. I hope that we will not let a stone remain unturned, a dollar unspent, a facility unused—nothing undone to retard this curse. Surely everyone wants to spare the human race the horror of this unspeakable recurring scourge. Everyone wants to hold out hope of the joy of life to those doomed to death by cancer, unless a discovery is made that will kill this No. 1 killer. The decision which will be made in this Congress with reference to these bills ranks in importance with anything with which the world is faced. There were no more important decisions at any of the conferences by the great powers during this war. Even the tremendous problems of peace are not any more compelling than that of our worst enemy—cancer.

For more than 2,000 years the world has been trying to solve this problem, and yet, with all of the skill and with the use of X-ray and radium, we are still working largely in the dark. We are still employing the same methods as the early Egyptians who used fire to burn out the cancerous flesh as the only way of stopping its progress.

If the $100,000,000 called for in this bill is provided, I believe that we will find the cause and cure for cancer. If it is not provided, then I believe that, though the problem may eventually be solved, it will only be after many wasted years and at unthinkable cost of life and untold misery.

I have seldom talked on this subject of cancer with anyone who has not had a relative, a friend, or someone close to him die in cancer's agonizing way.

How do you think the American public would vote on this subject if it came to a vote?

It is not hard to believe that if a national referendum of an initiative measure could be put before the voters of this Nation there would be a flood of approval such as has never before been recorded in favor of man or project.

What does $100,000,000 mean spread among our population? It means 70 cents for every individual—every man, woman, and child in America. If you confine the $100,000,000 to the seventeen million now living who are doomed to die of cancer unless something is done about it, it would mean about $6 for every one of them. What it really adds up to is the best form of insurance imaginable; a few cents for each of us who face the odds of one to eight in this unequal fight to the death with cancer.

And now, what can you and I do about it?

I want to call your attention to the work of a new organization known as Sponsors of Government Action Against Cancer. I am a member of this organization and as a member I have pledged myself to do everything I can in this fight for the adoption of the Pepper-Neely bills. It does not cost anything to join the Sponsors of Government Action Against Cancer. You merely have to be concerned about your own protection against cancer and the protection of everyone you know.

The Sponsors of Government Action Against Cancer are rallying the force of public opinion behind these bills. Hearings are being held in Washington today and tomorrow before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. Representative SOL BLOOM of New York is chairman of that committee. Wire the committee or Representative BLOOM at once and thus add your voice to those of the great army of public-spirited men and women who are urging the adoption of these bills.

A great national debt of gratitude is due and owing to our friend and farsighted leader, Julius Jay Perlmutter, chairman of this organization, who was catapulted after personal experiences, into the war against cancer; who, after 9 years as a contributor, worker, and observer, came to the conclusion which resulted in the organizing of this great national group. Sponsors of Government Action Against Cancer, which is dedicated to sponsoring Government action againset cancer along the lines proposed in the Pepper-Neely bills. Join the Sponsors of Government Action Against Cancer. Wire Congress today.

GI Morals in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interesting article entitled, "GI Morals in Germany," written by Walter J. Slatoff and printed in a recent issue of the New Republic. Mr. Slatoff was editor of the Lightening Bug, the Three Hundred and Tenth Regiment newspaper, for 2 years, and served a year and a half in Europe. He graduated from Columbia University in 1942.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GI MORALS IN GERMANY

(By Walter J. Slatoff)

One of my best pals came through six months of combat without a scratch only to become a casualty in Berlin nearly a year after the war's end. He, along with many hundreds of other young American soldiers, is the victim of a city in which vice, corruption and callousness have reached a point that defies description.

Imagine your own 18- or 19-year-old son removed entirely from your supervision, given an almost unlimited supply of money, granted a power over women equal to that of Van Johnson or Clark Gable, fed a steady diet of lies and stories calculated to inspire suspicion, hate and cynicism, and placed among a people who had lost all moral standards. The American soldiers occupying Berlin today are in exactly that position. A great number of them are recently drafted 18- and 19-year-olds, and as redeployment continues, the percentage increases.

The situation is particularly dangerous because its true aspect does not become apparent until one gets away from the city. Several days after we left Berlin one GI compared it to an insane asylum, within whose limits the abnormal becomes the normal, and whose inmates, lacking any sane measuring rod, lose all realization of their own peculiarity.

Thus in Berlin, the black market has become the accepted way of doing business. Sexual promiscuity and prostitution have become the normal pattern of boy-and-girl relationships. And the inhabitants, just as the asylum inmates believe the rest of the world crazy, spend a great portion of their time building and circulating stories designed to show that it is the French, Poles, Russians and others, not they, who are vicious, immoral and without civilized standards.

Great numbers of GI's and officers fall into this Berlin pattern very quickly and easily.

From July through November 1945, my regiment was stationed in various small towns near Kassel, Germany. During that 5-month period, out of the approximately 1,000 men who became eligible for redeployment and were shipped to home-bound outfits, not more than 10 elected to remain in Germany. Estimates of the number of men seriously fraternizing during that period ranged from 3 to 10 percent. The regiment moved to Berlin the end of November. The venereal-disease rate rose sharply; the number of men seriously fraternizing jumped to between 80 to 95 percent; and between November and the middle of January, when I left Berlin, well over a hundred men eligible for redeployment chose to remain in Berlin for further duty.

My friend was among these, and his case is not unusual. Throughout the war we thought of him as a typical American kid—proud of his country, his folks, his home town, the pictures of his fiancée, and particularly proud of the fact that he didn't fraternize. He hoped to be married as soon as he was discharged and intended to go back to college under the GI bill of rights. When I last saw him he had become an active black marketeer, spent all his evenings drinking with one German girl or another, had ceased to write home and, despite continued pleas from his parents and fiancée to return, was determined to remain in Berlin as long as possible. When speaking of the German Nation or the war his arguments might have come from Goebbels.

The great majority of the men in my regiment were combat infantrymen who had been well conditioned to distrust and hate the Germans, and most of them were at least 21 years old. If they become diseased, what can be expected to happen to the teen-age recruits? Easy money and easy women are the lures. The sum of money a Berlin soldier can make is limited only by the amount of cigarettes, watches, food, or other scarce commodities he can obtain from home. On the black market—which is every street, hallway, and house in the city—he can receive $150 a carton for his cigarettes, between $100 and $300 for watches, $5 for a 5-cent bar of candy or cake of soap, and comparable prices for coffee, canned goods, and similar items.

An idea of the extent of GI black-market activities is given by the fact that when flower-wiring services were set up throughout Berlin, our soldiers sent home $500,000 worth in less than a month. GI's are considered poverty-stricken if they have less than $500 in their pockets. They pay $1,000 for $50 cameras, and Leicas and Contaxes are eagerly purchased for $3,000 or more. A bottle of vile cognac costs between $60 and $80. Many soldiers spend most of their spare time in black-market transactions, and during my stay in the city I encountered only two who did not admit to having sold at least one carton of cigarettes.

The situation became so bad that in November the Army found it necessary to issue currency-control books which listed the legally acquired money of each soldier, and to rule that no other money could be sent home. This, however, did almost nothing to curb the black market, but merely forced the GI's to search for mailable commodities—camera equipment, jewelry, china—into which to translate their money.

The women of Berlin are hungry, cold, and lonesome. The GI's have cigarettes, which will buy food and coal. The GI's have food—chocolate, doughnuts (taken in large quantities from the Red Cross clubs) and canned goods from home. The GI's have warm night clubs. And the GI's provide a kind of security and meaning in an otherwise meaningless city. The result is an aggressive and wholesale manhunt by the women. From the ages of 15 to 50, they seek GI protectors. They stand in front of the GI night clubs, parade up and down the streets in front of the Red Cross clubs and even accost GI's in trolleys, subways, and on the street. "Ich liebe dich," normally the German equivalent of "I love you," has become no more meaningful than "How do you do" or "I'm pleased to make your acquaintance."

It is very hard for a GI, lonesome and thousands of miles from home, to resist the onslaught, and very easy for him to forget that he is paying for the "love" he receives. When, after a few weeks, the sweet "fraülein," like as not the wife of an SS man, weeps that she has no money for coal, or that the "barbaric Russkis" killed her mother and father, took all her possessions, or attacked her, it is almost impossible for her GI sweetheart not to help out or not to feel embittered at his former allies.

It is important to remember that I am describing not the exception but the norm for Berlin, and that 90 percent of the soldiers there are affected. Again and again one hears such remarks as: "I couldn't make this kind of money at home." "The girls back home never treated me like this." "I'd be a sucker to go home now. I'll wait till the scramble for jobs is over and then go home." "These Germans aren't so bad. They're the same kind of people we are." "Hell, back home I'd have to work." "I'd go back if I could take the black market with me." Surprising comments when one considers the overwhelming desire of most overseas soldiers to get home as quickly as possible!

The situation would not be so serious were it merely a case of young men sowing a few wild oats. But the picture is one of large numbers of men accepting crooked dealing, dishonesty, and promiscuity as a way of life—and apparently liking it. It is also a picture of large numbers of men falling for an insidious line of propaganda calculated to win the peace for the Germans. A survey conducted in August by the European Theater Service Forces' Information and Education Division showed that among men who had spent no time in Germany, only 34 percent expressed any favorable feeling toward the Germans. This percentage rose to 42 percent among men who had spent less than 4 weeks in Germany, to 54 percent among those who had been there between 1 and 2 months, and reached 59 percent among troops who had been in Germany more than 2 months. I estimate that in my outfit in Berlin the percentage would be in the vicinity of 75. And in direct ratio with increased affection toward the Germans run hate and suspicion of other peoples. The Germans make sure of that.

For most areas of Germany the problem can be met by an active and intelligent information and education program, provided it is fully supported by unit commanders. But in Berlin the situation will grow steadily worse unless a minimum age and maximum tour of duty is set for our forces there and a strong effort is made to garrison the city with only our best and most mature troops—those who will be least likely to succumb to the Berlin pattern of life and Berlin propaganda, and who will best represent America, to the other occupying powers and the German people.

World Literacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask to include a letter written to me by former Senator Robert L. Owen, president of the World Language Foundation of Washington, together with a passage from a book entitled "The Silent Billion Speak," which is referred to in Senator Owen's letter to me.

It is most heartening to find that so much constructive work is being done toward the time when all the people of the world will be able to communicate with one another freely and when illiteracy will have been overcome wherever it now exists.

Especially should note be taken of the fact that people of all religions, Catholic and Protestant alike, are working together to that end.

WORLD LANGUAGE FOUNDATION,
Washington, D. C. May 16, 1946.

Hon. JERRY VOORHIS, *Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR JERRY: Enclosed find chapter 8 of the last edition of The Silent Billion Speak, published by the Friendship Press for the Committee on World Literacy, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York. This chapter describes three campaigns of three successive years removing illiteracy in the Republics of the Western Hemisphere. It is an astounding story which ought to be known by every Member of the House and Senate. It is a sound revolution demonstrating, however, the eagerness with which illiterate people welcomed the knowledge of reading and writing their own language and the cordial support given to this movement by the governmental and educational authorities of the different communities.

The "each one teach one" plan is now being employed to teach hundreds of languages and dialects covering the face of the globe—the Pacific Islands, Asia, Africa, the islands of the sea in the Caribbean and the Western Hemisphere.

The magnificent campaign of Mexico is an example. I, therefore, venture to suggest to you that you call attention to this important record of the work done by the Committee on World Literacy, of which Rev. Frank C. Laubach, PhD., is director, and by the American foreign missionaries by thousands who are silently and unselfishly serving the fundamental principles upon which the United Nations are now being founded in a new world of peace, justice, and human brotherhood.

The happiness of the new world will be found not by seeking happiness but by unselfishly giving happiness to others through justice and service.

Yours faithfully,

ROBERT L. OWEN.

LITERACY IN LATIN AMERICA

When the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor in 1941, I happened to be in the United States on furlough. Many invitations to visit Latin America had come to me, and among these was a request to speak at the Congress of the World's Sunday School Association in Mexico City, which was to take the place of the one originally planned for Durban. The delegates were to come largely from Latin America, and they felt that the time was ripe for an effort on behalf of literacy in their countries. So in June of 1941 I went to Mexico City for the conference, and the following year I started out on the first of three tours of the republics to the south.

Most of Latin America has made rapid progress during recent years in the fields of education, health, agriculture, and industry, but there are still great numbers of underprivileged people. Three-quarters of the population depend on agriculture for their livelihood. The trouble is that at least two-thirds of the farmer class do not own any land, but are mere laborers, many of them serfs. Two-thirds of the agricultural land and livestock

are owned by a comparatively few native landlords or foreign corporations. Two-thirds of the population are physically undernourished, and half of these are diseased as a result of diet deficiencies. Poverty and extremely low incomes among many millions of people retard the economic progress of nearly all countries, while the public revenues in all but a few countries are insufficient to provide educational and public-health facilities.

In nearly all Latin-American countries these economic and health problems are tied up with illiteracy, the condition of over half of the population. In general, the Spanish, Portuguese, and other peoples of European origin have a fairly high rate of literacy, while among the Indians and Negroes illiteracy percentages are usually high. The future of the Latin-American countries depends very greatly upon the conquest of this enemy to progress.

In some countries men of large vision have toiled with tireless zeal to stir their countrymen. A Brazilian Presbyterian elder named Dr. Gustavo Armbrust started a literacy campaign a decade or more ago in his country, and there are now literacy committees in every town of any size in Brazil. The funds for this campaign are provided from the small contributions of many thousands of people.

The Government of Mexico was the first to wage a real war on a large scale against illiteracy. This campaign was clearly seen to be necessary for any real agrarian improvement. The Government was trying to give the land back to the masses, but saw that this was not enough. If the masses were illiterate they could not rise above their present level. "We have not helped people until we help them to help themselves." A series of very good citizenship books were printed and widely used.

It happened that Dr. Gonzalo Baez-Camargo of Mexico had been with a team of us on a speaking tour in Florida in 1936, where he began to build "key word" lessons that he later printed and distributed in Mexico and Central America. During the meeting of the World's Sunday School Association at Mexico City, Dr. Camargo's lessons were revised.

As in all these literacy tours, God opened the doors of Latin America in a surprising manner. A self-effacing woman who does not wish her name mentioned, asked for the "joy" of paying for the travel expenses. Mr. Sumner Welles, then Under Secretary of State, at the suggestion of Mr. Francis Sayre (who had seen our Lanao Moro work) wrote a lovely letter that served as an introduction to all our embassies, and every embassy did all it could to assist. Dr. Stanley Rycroft, of the Committee on Cooperation in Latin America, arranged all contacts with the Evangelical churches.

The literacy tours in Latin-America have followed the same general pattern as the campaigns in other parts of the world. In most of the countries missionaries, some church people, and a few other far-visioned men and women were ready to begin at once. Everybody else was in doubt or despair. These few courageous souls proved that by phonetic lessons people could be taught quickly, that illiterates were eager to learn, and that the "each one teach one" method is practical and is very inexpensive. Government officials became interested, and upon our visits a year later many were eager to begin campaigns.

Colombia was the first South American country visited. The missionary statesman, Dr. Edward G. Seel, met me at the airport and took me to confer with the director of education. A literacy council was formed, consisting of the director, the cultural attaché of the American Embassy, Dr. Seel, and the principal of every school in Bogotá. The coordinator's office of the United States paid for the first edition of lessons. In the following year literacy efforts seemed to lapse. However, Mr. Richard Shaull, an energetic young missionary serving on the comité central in Barranquilla, specialized in literacy, and he did so well that the Government began to catch his fire. When I visited Colombia a year later I was accompanied by Theodore P. Fricke, of the American Lutheran Board of Foreign Missions, and Sherwood Reisner, a missionary candidate then preparing for work in Latin-America.

Every director and inspector of schools in Colombia was called by the Minister of Education to Ebague for a 3-day conference on literacy while we were there, and soon the northern coast of Colombia had a literacy campaign in full swing. Mr. Rafael Borrelly, mayor of Barranquilla and a stanch Evangelical, has cooperated with all his power, and through him Richard Shaull has become practically the director of literacy for northern Colombia.

Ecuador also illustrates how an able missionary can inspire a country. The first year I visited Ecuador there was considerable interest, but Alan Reed, the son of the pioneer Evangelical missionary to Ecuador, was the first to do anything about it. He was head pastor of the great Community Church at Guayaquil, which his father had founded; and in addition he conducted, along with his brother, a successful stationery store and printing establishment. The Reed brothers printed lessons with beautifully colored pictured and gave them away throughout the country. This demonstration of public spirit caught the imagination of newspapers, which published lessons and gave wide publicity to the movement.

Alan Reed also enlisted the cooperation of leading manufacturers in the campaign. A cracker company placed an illustrated leaflet in some 25,000 boxes, which were shipped all over the country. The leaflet bore this slogan: "No man can be a citizen who cannot read."

The Ecuadorean Newspapermen's Union of Quito has tackled the job of teaching the Indians to read and write, and they like it. The law says that "every new reader becomes a citizen and can then vote." They have a plan with which they hope to eliminate illiteracy from Ecuador in 5 years.

When Fricke, Reisner, and I visited Ecuador the following year, the Government was thoroughly aroused. A bill has been introduced into their congress requiring every citizen of Ecuador to learn or to teach—it was to be universal conscription against enemy No. 1.

The first year I visited Peru, missionaries and the churches welcomed the campaign with great eagerness. John Ritchie, representing the American Bible Society, gave generously of his time and money to promote the cause. He printed lessons and the churches started teaching. The Government appointed a commission of three to study the lessons and observe results.

On the coast of Peru we found a few enemies of literacy. They told us of their opposition frankly. But high up in the Andes, the people who worked with the Indians were zealous in their concern for literacy. When Reisner and Fricke visited Jauja in the mountains the officials came to the Evangelical church and became positively excited about literacy.

Missionaries, teachers, and the president of the university at Cuzco did everything they could to cooperate. "This," said the president of the university, "is the dream of a lifetime come true. It is the dawn of a new day for the descendants of the Incas, whom my ancestors brought to ruin. If we can make amends in some small way, I shall die happy." All the Quechua lessons were mimeographed by the university offices, at their expense.

In Bolivia about 90 percent of the people are Indians, and 95 percent of the Indians are illiterate. These, like the Indians in the Peruvian Andes, are in sickening poverty, and are the victims of liquor and the opium-like drug named "coca." They speak either the Aymará or Quechua language. The Oregon Quakers have an interesting church for the Aymarás in La Paz, where the lessons were prepared by Juan Ayllon, a leading scholar among the Aymará people. He was pastor of the church and translator of the Bible. Our American Ambassador, Mr. Boal, urged me not to go any farther but to stay in Bolivia for 2 or 3 years. "You will not find greater need," he told me, "in all Latin America."

In Brazil we found the Director of the National Institute of Pedagogics, Dr. Lourenço Filho, eager to cooperate. He set aside his best teachers to assist in preparing a set of lessons for the government. The publication of these was postponed for 15 months while the government completed a Portuguese word count to make sure that all the words were basic. The next time I visited Brazil, the word count had only just been finished, and Dr. Lourenço Filho said he was about to print 70,000 copies that would be used for experimental purposes in all parts of that vast country. But the missionaries did not wait. In São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Salvador, Recife, and Pará, they prepared lessons that were printed in Recife.

When I arrived in Venezuela the avidity with which the young, progressive council of education seized upon literacy and helped prepare lessons made me tingle. These they printed within 3 months, thus breaking all records for Government action on lessons in Latin America.

In western Guatemala we visited five Indian tribes and prepared lessons in their dialects—Quiché, Kekchi, Cakchiquel, Conob, and Mam. Mam looks like an easy word, but one great linquist, Prof. Manuel J. Andrade, of the University of Chicago, declared Mam to be the world's most difficult language. From the point of view of spelling, at least, he is right. I have never heard a language with so many glottal stops—instantaneous stops and starts made in the throat after nearly every syllable. These glottal stops are characteristic of the languages of the Central American and Andean Indian languages. Missionaries have been nearly driven mad over the baffling problem of spelling them. Some missionaries have used double letters to indicate these stops. The Reverend and Mrs. H. Dudley Peck, after many years of studying Mam for the Carnegie Foundation, reached the conclusion that an apostrophe is the best mark to indicate this sound. So pronounce this if you can—ts'u'uts'. Just choke at each apostrophe. If you doubled the letters as they do in Peru, that word would be spelled tstsuuuutsts.

On the last night of our campaign in Guatemala there was a big literacy meeting in the Presbyterian Church. When the meeting was over and I was shaking hands with everyone, 10 new literates stood in a row by my side, the women weeping and the men blowing their noses. I understood, for I had seen many other new literates weep. Those 10 "blind" were beginning to see, and they were as happy as starved prisoners just freed from an internment camp.

The missionaries kept on teaching in five languages for the next 2 years, and they demonstrated the value of the lessons so well that in 1945 the new Government took up the campaigns with enthusiasm, and asked the missionaries to continue in places of leadership.

Now the whole country is excited about literacy. A New York Times dispatch of March 4, 1945, says: "The Guatemalan Government has started a campaign to reduce illiteracy, which it charges has been used by dictators to control the masses with greater ease. Only 30 percent of the 3,000,000 population can read and write. Radio, press, and volunteer teachers will be used to carry on the campaign."

"Hundreds of illiterates have been enrolled," writes Mr. Peck. "One hundred and

fourteen prisoners in the Chiquimula Penitentiary are being taught. The directors are finding it difficult to keep up with the campaign in their zones."

Meanwhile the literacy thermometer in Mexico was constantly rising. Better lessons were made in Spanish, and new lessons were prepared in four of the Azetc languages. Mexico and Central America have 40 important Indian dialects—there are 600 in all Latin America! Mr. William C. Townsend and the other members of the Wycliffe Bible Translators were working on Bible translations in the 40 dialects, and were especially helpful in the building of lessons. As a missionary enterprise, the Townsend group is unique. When I was there, Townsend was studying the Bible every week with ex-President Cárdenas, then minister of war. When Fricke and Reisner visited Mexico in 1944, they found more interest than ever before.

My most recent visit to Mexico, in February 1945, was a thrilling experience. The government had printed 10,000,000 sets of lessons. These lessons had been distributed in every town of Mexico. A law had been passed requiring every man and woman in Mexico to teach or to learn to read. It was in March 1945, during the Pan-American Conference that the campaign began. In some of the newspapers it had more editorial space than the conference itself. President Avila Camacho and his wife are both teaching.

At first the Government insisted on every Indian's learning to read in Spanish even though he could not speak Spanish. This is a mistake, as they are discovering. One vital principle should be to teach people to read first in the language they speak, and then they can step over into another language with the same spelling, for they can pronounce the syllables.

Governments and missionaries nearly always part company over this question. Missionaries are convinced that only the words of a person's childhood can plumb the depths of his soul and make him laugh and cry. So they prefer the Bible read in the native tongue. We have sought a compromise by insisting that it is sound pedagogy for people to learn to read in their own dialects, and sound statesmanship for them to step over into the lingua franca as soon as they can read their own tongue. The Mexican government has come around to this position, and is now printing lessons in a few Indian dialects.

Yucatan, the scene of the famous Maya ruins, is one of the most illiterate sections of Mexico. It was cut off from the outside world during the war excepting by airplane. At Xocempich, 8 miles from Chichenitza, the most famous ruins in America, Mr. Brainard Legters, of the Wycliffe Bible Translators, and the Reverend Theodore Finley, of the Presbyterian mission, cooperated in preparing Maya lessons. One Sunday we started a Sunday school class for men and women who could not read. I taught a woman of about 60 in front of the class. She learned rapidly. When I told her that she was so bright she ought to be a teacher, she started to cry. I asked her what she was crying about, and she said:

"I don't see why you, an educated man, should pay any attention to me. I'm nobody."

Then she cried harder than ever. It is a wonderful thing to see a woman weep for joy, as women often do while the scales of illiteracy are falling from their eyes.

During our second tour, Fricke and I visited the Dominican Republic and prepared lessons in the office of the Minister of Education with George Greco, an educational genius lent by the United States Government to the Dominicans. These lessons had advantages over any made before because they contained 50 pages of the second-stage reading material. Fortunately a refugee from the Nazis named Scott, who was a swift free-hand artist, was at hand. He drew a thousand pictures—one picture for every sentence.

In Puerto Rico the Commissioner of Education, who is a Presbyterian layman, welcomed us into his offices to prepare the newest type lessons. The commissioner sent us all the way around the island. At Castaner there is a civilian public service camp in which some 20 young Americans are helping the impoverished people of the mountains. Here Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Harbison and their associates had been hard at work preparing the ground and had made a complete census of the illiterates in their district.

Jamaica opened a new page for me in literacy adventures. On the first trip to South America our plane was overtaken by darkness at Jamaica, and a British official, having seen my name and occupation on the list of passengers, inviting me to spend the evening with him. He said that an urgent cable had just come from England asking them to open a literary campaign as soon as possible. They did not know how, and wanted help. I had repeatedly said that I would never touch English, for it is the world's worst spelled language, but I promised to help on some future occasion.

Upon returning to the United States I told Dean Russell of Teachers College about this invitation in Jamaica, and he kindy offered me an office in the college for undertaking a new approach in English. Professors Gates, Zimmerman, Lorge, Hollenbeck, and Cartwright were all helpful in their suggestions, and several graduate students cooperated with fine zeal in this my first experiment in teaching English phonetically.

These lessons we took with us when Mr. Fricke, Miss Maria Dayoan of the Philippines, and I visited Jamaica in 1943. Missionaries, Jamaicans, and government officials helped us adapt these lessons to Jamaica. The lesson preparation was done chiefly in a Quaker school at Highgate in the mountains. There we had over 50 teachers making lessons and experimenting on about 100 illiterates in nearby villages. The Jamaica people organized 4 committees made up of government officials and private citizens. The Committee on Finance raised several thousand pounds for the publication of the lessons. The Propaganda Committee, including all newspapers, gave magnificent support. The churches gave a fine demonstration of friendship, for the leading Roman Catholic priest and the Anglican bishop were cochairmen of the Committee on Church Cooperation.

Three of most interesting experiences in Latin America have been left to the last. The first was in Paraguay, the second in Haiti, and the third in Mexico.

The missionaries of the Disciples of Christ and their International College are highly regarded by the Paraguayan people and the government. This school is admittedly the best educational institution in the country, and its director, Mr. R. B. Lemmon, has served as secretary of the American Coordinator's Committee. He took us to the minister of education, who was an army physician.

The minister of education went after literacy with all the efficiency for which the Paraguayan Army is famous. Classes were held several times a week to train the literate soldiers to teach, while the illiterate new soldiers were used as guinea pigs for demonstrations. At the same time classes were held every weekday for 2 weeks in the government normal school.

The President of Paraguay was delighted. He said to us as we left: "This literacy campaign is the hope of my country."

Mr. Reisner and I did not visit Argentina, but our colleague, Mr. Fricke, visited Buenos Aires while we were in Paraguay. He told the church leaders and government officials that we all realized how progressive Argentina is in education and that he had come to Buenos Aires in order to plead with the Argentinian Christians to cooperate in the preparation of the supplementary literature so badly needed all over Latin America. "After the new literate has completed the first seven lessons," Fricke told them, "he is unable to read the standard books, magazines, and newspapers; and almost nothing exists that is adult in content but with a simple vocabulary." Buenos Aires gave him an enthusiastic hearing. Fricke came back to Paraguay jubilant.

In Haiti the government for many decades had been trying to teach French, but with small success. The great majority of the people speak Creole, which is only partly French. The spelling of French is very difficult—almost as bad as English. The result was that less than 5 percent were literate. The Reverend H. O. McConnell of the British Methodist Church had studied our experiments in Asia, had prepared lessons with Creole spelled phonetically, and had made a fine success of teaching several hundred people to read. Our American ambassador had become convinced that the only way to make Haiti literate was to change from French to Creole. So the day I reached Haiti, Ambassador White took Pastor McConnell and me to see President Lescot. The President was impressed by our proposal to adopt a new alphabet and teach adults to read in Creole istead of French. Here was the beginning of an educational revolution. As we left the president's palace, Mr. McConnell was beaming. The director of education and other splendid educators helped prepare the new lessons in McConnell's home.

The President, the American ambassador, the Minister of Education, and all the politicians and social leaders of Haiti attended a meeting of 1,200 of the elite of Haiti in the Rex Theater, where the President announced the tremendous experiment he was undertaking in their country. The excitement in Haiti ran high. Every day a thousand people or more would gather in churches and theaters to promote this cause. For 3 years Mr. McConnell had toiled to persuade the country to adopt Creole, and now his dream was realized.

On my second visit to Haiti with Theodore Fricke, there was nothing to do but visit one city after another, and give away diplomas to learners, and certificates of patriotic service to those who had taught them, and listen to enthusiastic speeches. The cooperation of churches, Protestant and Roman Catholic alike, as well as all government officials, was exciting. In Cap Haitien the Roman Catholic bishop sat on the platform and prayed for the campaign, and in Aux Cayes the archbishop made a powerful speech advocating literacy.

This literary campaign is in process of transforming Haiti. A little newspaper in Creole published by the Haiti Literary Committee has a larger circulation than any French newspaper. The American Bible Society has furnished 20,000 copies of the Gospel of Mark in Creole, and has been asked to provide a second edition of 70,000 copies. Mr. McConnell has been decorated by the President with the Order of Honor and Merit and the title of commander for his literacy services. The President offered $200 in prizes for the best folklore stories in Creole. One of the prize winners was a young man who had been illiterate just 3 months before.

During our second tour we visited Cuba. Four missionaries came down from the United States to help us, and together with the Cubans we revised the literacy lessons in Spanish and introduced some new ideas suggested by our experienec in all the other countries. One advantage of making experiments in so many countries is that we can profit by mistakes and successes alike.

All during this tour it grew clearer that we could start campaigns and teach people to read but that there was nothing easy

enough for them to read after our first phonetic lessons. They needed a vast deal of simple transition literature. I appealed to the University of Havana to help prepare this literature. Mr. J. P. McEvoy of the Reader's Digest, who has a home in Havana, was greatly impressed by this need.

"We must also get Dr. Wharton in this," said Mr. McEvoy, "for he is the best loved foreigner in all Cuba."

Then I recalled those other magnificent missionaries I had visited only a few months before, all of them named as "the most beloved foreigners" in their countries—McConnell in Haiti, Morgan in Santo Domingo, Tucker in Brazil, McClean in Chile, Norment in Paraguay, Alan Reed in Ecuador, Seel in Colombia, Auler in Honduras, Wyse in Nicaragua, Townsend in Mexico, and Miss Blackburn, the uncrowned queen of Yucatan. Many other names might be added to this partial list.

The Committee on World Literacy and Christian Literature sees that while adult literacy campaigns are already making great headway, Christian literature must be produced and distributed in ever larger volume to meet the rising tide. The committee is hard at work trying to determine what people want to read, discovering writers, studying word counts, experimenting in simple style, and investigating how to get books sold in the remote areas of the world where literacy is making rapid progress. Here is perhaps the most stupendous frontier of useful service in the whole world. It is the channel through which we can pour into the minds of three-fifths of the human race the rich ideals that have come down to us from Christ. Few things, therefore, are so vitally necessary as devoted leadership and adequate resources to make the whole world literate and to give men literature that will bless and not curse our race.

Don't Yield on Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. H. MOORE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Don't Yield on Principles," published in the Washington News of Wednesday, May 22, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T YIELD ON PRINCIPLES

This country desperately needs to have the railroads running and the coal mines operating.

Under Government seizure of the roads and mines, these ends may be accomplished for a while. It will be only for a while if they are accomplished by appeasement.

If any lesson of history is clear, it is that temporary peace can be bought at too dear a price—that surrender of principle to expediency leads to worse consequences than it avoids.

We have just had to fight the costliest war in history because peace-loving nations did not stand against aggression when it first appeared.

Vital principles are at stake in the rail strike and in the coal strike.

In the rail strike, it is the principle of fact finding embodied in a law which for many years kept peace on the railroads. That fine law's usefulness will be destroyed if now, under Government seizure, President Truman uses his influence to get the unions more than his own fact-finding board recommended. The present strike threat might be bought off that way, but endless future rail strike threats would be invited.

In the coal strike, it is the principle of taxation without representation. The question is not whether the miners should have a health and welfare fund. Certainly they should. The question is whether unions dominated by one man or a few men—and there are many such unions—shall have power to tax the public and use the proceeds as they please, free from public control or supervision.

Mr. Truman's mine-seizure order authorizes Interior Secretary Krug to negotiate a strike settlement with the John L. Lewis union; a settlement conforming to the Government's wage-price stabilization policy. If Lewis is willing to keep the miners working, and to agree to such a settlement, good. The mine owners have already stated their willingness to go that far, and Mr. Krug's task should be easy.

But, if Lewis holds out for a settlement that would wreck the stabilization policy, there should be no yielding by Government. If he insists—as he has from the first—that he will not discuss wages and hours until he is given a health and welfare fund on his own terms, there should be no yielding.

Whether the pay-roll tax to raise the fund is 7 percent, or 3 percent, or 1 percent, the principle is the same. The money will have to come from the public, in higher prices for coal. Even Senator PEPPER admits that. And so the public must have the right to make certain the money is put to proper use.

If Government helps Lewis gain power to levy such a tax and spend the revenue as he will, all union bosses will demand the same power, brandish the strike weapon until Government helps them to get it, and, in many cases, use money thus taken from the public to oppose the public interest.

Significance of the Postwar Labor Problem in Relation to Global War Reconstruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 23 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very moving and laudatory letter from Mr. Roscoe Lewis Ashley, of Pasadena, Calif., I believe of the social-science department of the Pasadena Junior College, to the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, together with a brief by him entitled "Significance of the Postwar Labor Problem in Relation to Global War Reconstruction." I am informed by the Public Printer that it will cost $420 to print the matter.

There being no objection, the letter and brief were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PASADENA, CALIF., *May 14, 1946.*

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: In addition to all the very valuable services you have rendered the American people, we wish to thank you for your comments in the Senate yesterday re the action of Congress and the strike situation. As the newspapers usually refrain from carrying news in the public interest, we do not know the exact comment, but hope we may have it. I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of an article written for our teachers, but completed nearly 3 months ago. You see I am a very earnest advocate of the right of the American people to manage all their own public affairs.

We are hoping that the Senate will take action in line with the needs of the American people re OPA. The House bill leaves so much to be desired that, if the Senate lets us down, where can we look for help? We realize that no economy can continue half price-controlled and half price-exploited; but price exploitation caused most of the grief after the last war—and that must not occur again.

Thanks again for all that you have done and are doing.

Sincerely yours,

ROSCOE LEWIS ASHLEY.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE POSTWAR LABOR PROBLEM IN RELATION TO GLOBAL WAR RECONSTRUCTION

(By Roscoe Lewis Ashley)

Most prominent of American public problems is that of labor in the postwar period. Most acute is the danger that our economic system will fail to develop an economy of abundance. The changing world, changed vitally in the United States of America as well as outside, does not change essentially for the better unless the heart of modern civilization, the economic part, is both developed and modernized. The derivative parts, political and social, will be modified more or less in accordance with the reorganization of the dominant, the industrial-technological. In the matrix of this economic reorganization from war to peace, especially in this country, relationships of capital, labor, the consumer, and the general public must somehow be worked out to be far more fairly and successfully established than in any previous period.

By the standards of a modern, progressive economy of abundance must we judge the need, the desirability and the wisdom of any agreement, readaptation or innovation.

CRITERIA OF JUDGMENT—HISTORICAL

Prominent among criteria to be used in forming judgment are two outstanding historical experiences: that of the recent war and that of the period following World War I. The critical, costly and stupid mistakes of the transition and reconstruction periods following the woefully misnamed "last" war are far too numerous for listing and cannot be considered except possibly for the critical subjects of strikes and inflation. The reader is referred to two excellent, fairly recent books devoted somewhat to that earlier transition from war to peace.[1] Watch particularly the conditions which seem somewhat analogous to those of the present and those which were, or might easily have been, preventable. It is too early to expect a full and careful analysis of the American economy in the recent conflict; but a few statistics and other items will be mentioned because indispensable for consideration in determining the wisdom and the success of any action taken since VJ-day.

The outstanding phenomenon (economic) of the war was the tremendous expansion of American industry. The fact destroyed practically all arguments theretofore advanced on what industry could not produce.

[1] Howenstine, E. Jay, Jr., the Economics of Demobilization (1944), especially chs. V, X, XIII, and part III: Conclusions; Clark, J. M., Demobilization of Wartime Economic Controls (1944), particularly chs. II, III, and X.

The total, even allowing for higher prices, exceeded the 1935 estimates of Loeb and associates[2] and the later congressional proposal of Maverick, Voorhis, et al. The organized governmental public as chief consumer, faced with vast military needs, and supported by greatly increased tax income and almost unlimited public credit, ended the former slowdown of production, geared to the limited purchasing power of the consumer, and determined by the illiberal ideas of the producer.

One need not inquire whether industry or the Government deserves the chief credit for this expansion—or labor, though it was painfully evident who was shortsighted and who was not. To the actual accomplishment all three contributed to an unbelievable degree; but a few facts should be mentioned.

First, without the vision and the leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt the goals and the achievement would have been much lower. Remember the skepticism about "50,000 planes a year"?

Second, in 1940, when anyone who had followed the course of events knew what we probably were in for, American industry refused either to convert its existing plants to defense uses or to expand plant facilities for new war production. Further, in spite of the fact that the Government spent huge sums for new war plants, American industry refused to use them unless it had the lion's share in control of the whole program to make the United States the "arsenal of democracy."

Third, price controls and the Little Steel formula apparently kept down prices and wages; but even a superficial examination shows that both rose to unprecedented levels and uncontrolled prices in war and after represented almost a runaway inflation. These figures must be examined in some detail to judge the merits of many present arguments on both sides.

Fourth, to what extent was our truly remarkable war production chiefly quantitative rather than qualitative, falling far behind in the manufacture of the latest and best? And if that happened often, whose fault was it, especially if that situation affects the postwar muddle?

Fifth, what do the balance sheets of 1940–41 and 1945–46 show regarding (a) the financial status of capital and labor; (b) development of organization, strength and power in actual operation of the American economic system; (c) relative contributions toward those accomplishments which are highly in the public interest; and (d) attitudes toward the public and the American people along the line of necessary economic action?

Sixth, what has been done with, or is being planned for, public property used for the larger part of the war production?

Seventh, during the war how did business other than "production" fare? Did the general consuming public lose or gain? What would be shown by the balance sheets of business not distinctively war business, for workers not classed as war workers, and for other people, from the economic standpoint? We need these facts—who has them?

Other criteria of judgment appear later, especially in the next section.

ARE VITAL PRINCIPLES AT STAKE?

Several months ago the writer was asked by a businessman whether the labor controversies after this war were likely to be worse than those after World War I, when the strike situation was very bad indeed. His reply was "no," though he does not recall now the reasons he gave. Recently he has been wondering whether he not only was wrong but critically wrong, although the two situations are not exactly comparable.

[2] Loeb, Harold, and associates, Chart of Plenty, 1935.

He was wrong if management is correct in its contention that labor insists on deciding who shall be employed and now demands an active part in phases of management. He was wrong if Marquis Childs was correct (Pasadena Post, January 6, 1946) and Drew Pearson (January 13, 1946) that the corporations are out to break the labor unions, although that was done 1919. He was wrong if the New Republic was correct (December 17, 1945) in calling the program of management at both the beginning and end of this war "Plotting a New Depression." Be sure to read that editorial. He was wrong if our newspapers are correct in considering almost any sharp action of labor as racketeering, especially if labor seeks a closed shop or follows the economic tactics of economic piracy.

Almost daily the press or radio has mentioned the fact that the action least desired by management and labor is that by government. In the opinion of this writer, a political scientist, that, if true, is the most unfortunate situation we could encounter. No conclusion drawn is good; for either any present or potential actual Government action is poor or both capital and labor prefer not to take a chance on Government adjustment, choosing instead to fight the controversy out to the bitter end. Of course those who do not like a modern, sensible procedure or who look upon the third party, the public (really more vitally interested than the other two) as interfering when it acts or to be damned whether it acts or not, have more antiquated views than either labor or capital. Moreover, they fail of their first obligation, the protection of their own interests, tolerating instead anti-social or crminal private acts contrary to the public nterest. The wrter realizes that his own position is not that of the frontier or of "self-help" or of enemies of government, also alas, enemies of a modern democratic society and civilization! To all these groups, however, he offers no apology. If Adam Smith 170 years ago insisted that the sole purpose of production is consumption, surely the consumer public, and with it the general public, has interests superior to those of any other economic group. In more than one sense, the most important principle involved in the present crisis is the protection of the public interest. The most important problems are two: First, to ascertain how apparently private economic claims, plans and actions are, or are not, in the public interest. Second, to determine when, how, and to what extent the Government and the American people should and must act, temporarily, but also as part of a more permanent American public pattern, both to safeguard that interest and to promote American democratic civilization.

Even more than World War I this war was fought, presumably, to promote democracy and human welfare. Old-time political democracy was inadequate, even as political democracy but especially as real democracy. Add the concept of economic democracy to a truer concept of political democracy, and we are getting somewhere. Call democracy perfected and effective group organization and, to attain that, we must have proper and better uses of an economic system which provides an economy of plenty. Even a superficial survey of the present scene shows that those who stand for modern democracy and an improved general standard of living, and the promotion of the welfare of the public, stand on one side; the advocates of a narrow and outworn political democracy and an equally outworn anti-democratic economics of scarcity, on the other. "Full employment"—not yet a subject of the semantic misrepresentations of the terms "liberty" and "free, competitive enterprise"—represents rather well, for a crude phrase, the idea and ideal of the new order. It stands for regular employment, a decent wage, regularized not spasmodic, for permanent purchasing power and consequently for a continuing and improving standard of living.

The transition from war to peace could have meant a transition from an obsolescent, halting economic system to one more efficient and prosperous as well as a transition from full war production to only slightly smaller peacetime production.[3] The crux of the difficulty lies in the substitution of an unorganized consuming public for the organized public (government) which bought more than half the goods created in wartime. Temporarily the equivalent demand is being supplied by abundant war savings, coupled with pent-up desire for civilian goods not available in war. But the continuance of civilian demand is another story. Several things are needed—quantity production of low-priced, socially valuable goods, continuing income of consumers, constant increase of output per worker, willingness of business to accept small unit profits, made large by a vast volume of business, favorable promotive action by Government which will encourage investment, savings in moderation, and high wages. The wages must be high enough to make spending continuous but not high enough to discourage or block the continuing process. Above all, there is needed the maintenance of optima relations between the public, labor, and management (please note the order). If there is one thing which, in the past, has been proved incontestably it is capital's absolute failure to safeguard the public interest. An examination of the whole subject shows, therefore, the need of a partial, in many instances an almost complete, reversal of the prewar economic set-up which was based on an economy of scarcity.[4]

WHAT THE WAR DID TO BUSINESS AND LABOR

The replacement of civilian production by goods created for war needs in the early forties was fairly rapid and relatively simple due to the major part of purchases by a single agency, the National Government. The reverse process in the middle forties—remobilization for peace—would seem even simpler if we go back to where we left off in 1940. But in 1940 we had barely emerged from a long depression—and therefore conditions then could not be considered normal.

[3] More than 2 years ago the writer examined this problem as follows: Any better America calls for real economic reconstruction, including mass employment, which will not be obtained directly. The lessons of war, depression, and boom, in reverse time order, point the way rather clearly. If we can maintain an economy of plenty in production, and also attain fair distribution and mass consumption as corollaries, we shall solve a main problem. In war we have had an expanded war consumption, chiefly by a politically organized public. Can peace bring a comparable civilian consumption when the civilian public is completely unorganized? We have achieved superproduction with resources (natural and human) not too well utilized in a hastily set up military industrialized system. If these resources can be utilized as well in reconversion, which probably will be even more hasty, or if they can be used better in a carefully planned civilian economy, for long-range purposes, we may get what we want. * * * The free enterprise which prewar business demanded will be sorely taxed to give enterprise enough to produce and sell maxima quantities of low-priced socially valuable goods and services.

[4] Before the war a minimum of at least 8,000,000 was unemployed. The national income had never exceeded $86,000,000,000 a year. Output never averaged 75 percent of capacity, and sometimes dropped to 40 percent. When the 40-cent hour was mentioned as a minimum there were only six States which paid their women workers in industry, usually the highest-paid field, more than 40 cents per hour. I will not give detailed figures for the real depression after 1929.

If the global war has left us no advance due to the tremendously increased industrial capacity or if it brought in its wake a new war, one between management and labor, we have certainly not yet won either peace or relief from scarcity. If the increased economic monopoly of the war years perpetuates itself, that spells the death of the already decadent, but grossly misrepresented and overadvertised system of old free American enterprise. If any other economic group, for example, a huge labor union or combination of labor unions, uses the exploitative tactics of great combinations of corporations to which we were subjected in the twenties,[5] the war for democracy and civilization certainly has not been won.

Probably it is too early to learn the extent to which the conduct (industrial) of the war injured many but benefited even more. Government reports, usually only through 1944, show that during the years from 1939 more than half of all American corporations lost money or broke only even,[6] although the net profits of the other 40 percent, including the larger corporations, increased so greatly that all corporations gained nearly 400 percent[7] during the war period. A comparison of 1939 and 1943 balances showed for all corporations (more detailed statistics of income, etc., later):

	1939	1943
Total current assets	$54,600,000	$94,100,000
Cash	2,200,000	22,600,000
Current liabilities	30,000,000	52,500,000
Net working capital	24,600,000	[1] 41,600,000

[1] On financial performance of United States 1,000 largest corporations, see Survey of Current Business, August 1945, pp. 4–9.

The figures for labor are impressive but far less startling. The total civilian labor force increased, naturally. It rose from 47,600,000 in 1940 to 55,000,000 plus in 1944 but decreased to less than 50,000,000 in 1945. The number of workers in war industries rose meanwhile from 4,100,000 to 9,600,000 in July 1943; in fact, nearly double that number were probably to be classed as war workers. In durable goods wages increased in 1 year (19432–43) an average of 9.7 cents per hour to a level of 108.8 cents per hour. The following year the increase was only a little more than 1 cent; and by September 1945, most of the war increase had been lost. (By October 1945, the hourly wage in manufacturing had dropped to 98.5 cents, in nondurable goods to 90.9 cents. The weekly wage in steel dropped from $50 plus to $43, later $41.)[8] In the war overtime averaged about 6 hours weekly, at time and one-half pay. In nondurable goods the increase was almost the same, both years, to a level of 82.4 cents per hour in 1943; but outside manufacturing wages rose much less and averaged at the peak less than 70 cents per hour, possibly in part because the workweek was shorter.[9]

WHERE THE WAR LEFT THE TWO PARTIES

Aside from the economic desirables, what are the possibles—and probables? A comparison of reconversion in 1918–19 and in the last year shows many similarities, too few differences. Then the strike picture was bad, very bad. In war, labor had been asked not to strike and to be content with gentle pay rises. In some cases the demand for labor was far in excess of the supply and wages then rose considerably. Occasionally, as in steel, the need was met by abolishing the shorter hours and other prewar gains of labor.[10] After war, though longer after than this time, labor demanded that it should be compensated for its sacrifices. In the last half of 1919 strikes were rampant and President Wilson called a second industrial conference, with results which remind us of the 1945 fall management-labor conference called by President Truman. Wilson's intervention was less extensive than Truman's and, then, capital showed less regard for public authority than labor. Mr. Baruch, personal representative of the President, reported back that the steel magnates knew they were wrong but did not wish to act differently. In fact, after 62 days the steel strike, called for much more just reasons than the present, failed utterly as only a fifth of the steel workers were unionized—and the power of the unions was rather badly broken. The strike, however, lasted in part into January 1920 for some plants.

How much of the failure of that reconversion and the reconstruction period which followed was due to the failure of the workers to protect themselves better, and, in the process, make gains for the American people? Certain it is, as the historian looks back on that period of disaster, almost every opportunity was neglected to improve and modernize the American economy. But those Americans did not have two advantages we enjoy: The lesson of that period of exploitation, with the subsequent one of depression, and the opportunity that exists today to start a quarter century farther along in the struggle for the modernization of civilization. They had excuses we cannot offer. And do not imagine that the dear public stood impartially by, any more then than now. "How much can we make?" was and is the unexpressed will of the majority as well as those involved directly in the strike situation.

The war has shown not only that vast production is possible but also that this achievement benefits big-business management far more than any other group. Wages have never been so high as they were in 1944–45 for 30,000,000 workers, including gardeners and boys, but Government research workers estimated that in 1944 unmarried men took home only 6 percent more than before the war and married men only about 20 percent. Of course more people were working, including more members of very many families.[11] Yet even in the well-paid steel industry the total average saved through bonds was only $300. The SEC estimated that only 1 percent of the twenty-five billion in war savings, to the middle of 1943, belongd to industrial war workers. The average savings account of $632 is misleading, for most workers did not have a savings account. One reason for that misfortune was the increase in the cost of living, computed as only 23 (now 29) percent by the Bureau of Statistics (chiefly on price-controlled articles) but estimated more than a year ago at 44 percent for the families of workers, who bought chiefly necessaries. Then there have been about twenty million people on fixed income, only the income has not been "fixed," for it dropped as taxes and the cost of living rose. In spite of all general prosperity, 4.2 of the city population in the year of the highest average income (1944) enjoyed less than $500 per family and 12 percent less than $1,000. Those families of income of $3,000 or more numbered two-fifths of the population in 1944 against one-fifth in the last prewar year. At war-end prices it was estimated that a family of four could not enjoy a decent "American standard of living" on less than $2,000 annually, after taxes.

As stated above, in the early years of the war only 40 percent of all corporations made a net profit, but that 40 percent did marvelously well. In 1944, not so good a net-profits year probably as 1945 or as 1946 is likely to be, the gross profits of all corporations were about twenty-five billion and about ten billion after the payment of all taxes, including excess-profits taxes. The "concealed" profits were often higher than those reported as profits. In the steel industry, for example, annual dividends amounted to only one hundred and fifty million; but two hundred and fifty-seven million was allocated to undistributed profits, reserves, amortization, etc. Undistributed profits for steel are estimated to the end of the European war at one thousand and sixty-one million. During the war General Motors increased its business about threefold but operated on a smaller profit margin than in peace; its profits mounted greatly but not in proportion.[12] Not included in profits of any kind are the enormous salaries and bonuses of high officials and unearned salaries of supernumeraries. As a quarter century ago, Congress has exhibited a pronounced bias in favor of business, particularly big business. Its generosity was expressed in many laws in the fall of 1945, including the repeal of the excess-profits tax, with its resulting sit-down strike against consumers in order not to pay any more of that odious tax. In the 1942 and 1944 tax laws the corporations were protected against threat of loss in the transition. If a company's profit for the year after war was less than it had been in the years 1936–39, it could collect from the United States Treasury, from excess profits paid, an amount equal to that difference. One should recall also that the early war or defense plant expansion was financed almost solely by Government, with liberal terms for acquisition by the company operating, if it wished. If the company financed its own new plants, that cost could be amortized, at the expense of the taxpayers, in 5 years. Remember also that all President Truman's recommendations in favor of either labor or the general public are still held in committee by overage chairmen or have been changed beyond recognition by the National Legislature. A repetition of 1918–19.

In the transition to peace we are rejoiced that the change has been made rapidly, more rapidly than we had dared expect. Although stormy, this period was inevitably one of serious difficulty in readjustment. The very high wages of war years could probably not be continued, because extra time was no longer necessary, if for no other reason. But the volume of business and the volume of employment has not slackened as much as we feared, possibly for the reason that reconversion in some fields started back in August 1944.[13] We are glad that management

[5] Consult any good history but study facts mentioned in Brady, *Business as a System of Power*. See also Senator O'Mahoney's famous T. N. E. C., *Summary Report*.

[6] Cf. the work of Senator Murray's Small Business Committee.

[7] Publicized figures show increase of net income after taxes only from about 4 billion to 10 billion; but the addition of "concealed profits" gives 400 percent or more.

[8] Phil Murray (radio) and the *New Republic* (January 28, 1946) give weekly pay of steel workers as $56.32 at highest and $43.48 in October 1945.

[9] Practically all figures cited here and later were furnished to the Government by management; but were not compiled by it.

[10] Many steel companies had before 1917 abandoned the terrible 12-hour day, 84-hour week. Many of these made war excuse to restore that schedule.

[11] Two members in half the families with $2,500 or more; two (on the average) in every family which earned $4,000 or more. (*M. Labor Review*, January 1946).

[12] Note the fine articles by George Soule in the *New Republic*, January 1946.

[13] At New Year the number of workers was still computed at nearly 50,000,000. Our two largest southern California industries, the Douglas and Lockhead airplane factories, before VJ-day had reduced their rolls from nearly 200,000 employees to about 50,000. At this writing (February 1, 1946) it is estimated that there are 200,000 unemployed in Los Angeles, with almost as many more outside. But the southern California situation is not typical, because immigration continues and the expected exodus failed. Statistics of production are not available for recent months but the fall retail business was heavier than in 1944, estimated 10–15 percent, though that difference might be in prices, not in quantity.

has been more generous and broad-minded than it was in 1919, when it seemed to feel that others had no economic rights. Since the consumers are not organized and are almost unrecognized in Congress, it is fortunate, perhaps, that the largest single group of consumers—labor—keeps the consumers' problem in mind, even if working rather distinctively for its own interests. We were gratified when President Truman acted by urging fact-finding boards, in some cases appointing them, which would help determine how much hourly increase of pay was both fair and possible, though Congress plans to substitute something wholly different instead of enacting a fact-finding panel law. (Note provisions of the Case bill already passed by the House.)

We are disappointed that all prices except controlled prices have risen, often unreasonably, that supply shortage is almost greater than in war years, sometimes greater. We are displeased that labor feels entitled to make up for what could be made to appear sacrifices, by striking, often in essential industries, which threaten to disrupt the entire economy; that management has frequently reclassified labor, always downward, and reduced hours so that take-home pay sometimes has fallen as much as 40 percent. We are chagrined that in this enlightened day, Government either feels that it must stand aside and watch actions from both parties which are against the public interest or that when it does act it cannot or will not support the public or those who misrepresent the public least. We are disappointed when high officials appease those who should not be appeased any more than Hitler was at Munich; and we are chagrined when our body of representatives helps those who should not be helped, to the disadvantage of those whom they are supposed to represent. Even President Truman, who has offered a large number of suggestions to improve and modernize our present welfare laws, makes no distinction between public utilities, in which strikes should be forbidden because a substitute should be offered,[14] and other business, in which work stoppages are inconvenient but not deadly. Unfortunately, regular peacetime practices for settling labor disputes have been neglected, even collective bargaining being refused by one party, usually capital but for other legal processes by labor. Why multiply the list further except to express fear of inflation, very much of which is due to greed that has nothing to do with labor controversies; but is, from the public's viewpoint, the most dangerous element of high profits and too high wages.

THE PRESENT OR RECENT STRIKE SITUATION

The present epidemic of strikes involves more workers than have ever before been out on strike.[15] A large number of small strikes have been settled, usually with a slight increase in hourly rates but with a smaller take-home pay than the war years provided. It is said that neither labor nor capital likes strikes, but some of these have been provoked by management as well as started by labor. Certainly the general public dislikes strikes and unions to an unreasonable degree and certainly it has excellent reason when the supply of necessities or near necessities is curtailed or destroyed.

Important controversy arose first in the auto industry. Ford, whose prewar wage policy had been changed most, was the first to be affected but took the initiative by closing several plants as in the change-over from model T to model A.

The real controversy started, therefore, with General Motors, November 21, after several weeks in which the union tried to get the use of conciliation or collective bargaining. The UAW-CIO demanded a 30-percent hourly increase to offset loss of overtime and reduction of classification. This, it maintained would give about the same take-home pay as before; but the demand gave rise to the slogan "52 hours pay for 40 hours work." The union cited General Motors' ability to pay, which General Motors retorted was none of labor's, later also the public's, business. It contended that the worker now turns out in 40 hours as much as before the war in 48. One United States Senator, rather sympathetic with the union, states it is estimated that 83 percent of the cost of the strike is being financed by the Government, that is, the public.[16]

General Motors countered with an offer of a 10-percent increase per hour, an offer it did not increase until mid-January. It progressively has protested any attempt of the workers to share in management or question profits. Finally, President Truman suggested a fact-finding board for each controversy and appointed one, considered excellent, for the General Motors dispute; but the company refused to cooperate if the panel included or considered profits.

Rather than alienate public opinion, General Motors did sit in with Walter Reuther[17] before the board and presented its case. Reuther is the man who in 1941 urged the conversion of unused auto plants to airplane production, a year before that was started. He claimed the UAW was conducting a crusade to establish the right of workers to get pay high enough to maintain the purchasing power which is the sine qua non of full employment and continued large production.[18] General Motors replied, as it had argued all along: "Workers and Government keep hands off."[19] When the board reported in favor of an increase of 19½ cents per hour,[20] the UAW accepted, the company refused. Soon after, Kaiser agreed upon 18 cents with his workers, first in his auto plants, then in his steel mills. Before February 1, 1946, both Chrysler and Ford had come to terms with their workers on about the same terms. On February 12 General Motors offered 18½ cents per hour but with very many strings attached. The union would have accepted but for the conditions. To a skilled, experienced worker, years on a job, many conditions are more important than the pay. In addition, note suggestions for worker aid in improving the business given in W. L. Blair's column February 17, 1946. Under the Government's wage-price arrangement, a Government conciliator finally helped workers and management to iron out their differences and to accept 18½ cents per hour, with new annual additions (March 13, 1946).

General Motors may have been the key strike but that conducted by nearly 800,000 steel men was much larger and affected quickly a very much more numerous galaxy of dependent industries. At the same time a quarter million telephone operators threatened to strike and 263,000 meat packers asked for an increase of 25 cents per hour (temporarily 17½ cents) from their quite low war-wage level. The steel strike was postponed a week at the request of the President, and the operators waited 30 days in the hope of a satisfactory settlement. The meat packers went on strike—and then the Government took over the plants (January 26, 1946) but the packers returned to work, although on strike against their employers.

The 7-day postponement of the steel strike did not prevent what is undoubtedly the largest single strike on record. In contrast to General Motors, to whom the OPA had not only denied a rise of prices but had actually reduced prices except for additional improvements since the 1941 models, a price rise had been promised to steel, half of which is produced on a narrow margin of profit. The combined companies asked for an increase of $7.50 per ton. Chester Bowles agreed to $2.50 and the administration suggested $4. Steel later reduced its demand to $6.25 as an irreducible minimum. On the quantity of steel recently produced, probably greater than continued peace demand, the OPA's first suggestion would add to the steel coffers more than $15,000,000, a $4 rise add $260,000,000. With the Government repealing the excess-profits tax and agreeing to carry many millions in carry-back tax reductions; with the hours cut 5 or 6, all overtime, and the weekly wage cut nearly, or more than, $10 per worker, it would seem as though steel could have managed with an increase of $2.50 per ton, for the whole output. In view of the vast quantities of "water" which most, if not all, steel capitalization carries,[21] and in view of the record of strikebreaking, from Homestead in 1892 to the postwar strike in 1919, it would seem rather nervy of steel to expect the public to finance both its present strike against

---

[14] More than a decade ago the writer suggested: "If public utilities must give continuous satisfactory service, at rates prescribed by administrative boards, the service must not be interrupted by either employed or employers. Adjudication of their labor problems should be part of the task of public utility commissions." That is, in public utilities strikes and lock-outs should be forbidden, on condition that labor problems in these businesses be settled by Government satisfactorily.

[15] The total number during 1919 was 4,160,348. Final figures for 1945 not available, but the year 1945–46 will undoubtedly be highest.

[16] On who pays strikers' bills see e. g., the United States News, January 18, 1946, pp. 13–14.

[17] Walter Reuther, vice president of the UAW-CIO, but in charge of the General Motors union, discussed this controversy in the Nation, January 12, 1946.

[18] Labor has contended also that management is now saving 30 percent above war costs chiefly by action of Government in repealing the excess-profits tax and guaranteeing losses represented by profits below the net profits of 1936–39.

[19] General Motors claims are presented in a letter of November 19, 1945, to President Truman: "It is our view that labor troubles in our industry result primarily from the following causes:

"(1) Our country's outdated national labor policy and the partisanship of Government agencies and officials in matters where unions are involved.

"(2) Misuse of its excessive monopolistic power by the auto union.

"(3) The substitution by the auto union of revolutionary economic and political objectives for the legitimate objectives of collective bargaining.

"(4) The auto union's use of false ideas in organizing workers, such as that loafing will increase purchasing power.

"(5) Because control of the auto union is the biggest prize in unionism, and the intraunion factional fights are intense, bitter, and perpetual.

"(6) Because almost every strike has meant a gain by the union and even children multiply their tantrums if by so doing they can rule the roost.

"(7) Because the auto industry is the national proving ground for CIO unions."

(These points are explained in a pamphlet entitled, "Why Does the Auto Union Cause so Much Trouble in the Automotive Industry?")

[20] The panels report on General Motors' finances should be read, if published. (Try New York Times.)

[21] Andrew Carnegie estimated cost of his holdings at eighty-five million, sold to United States Steel for three hundred million. Much more "water" in some other transactions, and later.

USWA [22] and the postwar costs, additional, if any, of making steel, now a public necessity which makes it almost a public utility. Consider also what steel did not lose during the war.[23] The steelworkers agreed, moreover, to accept President Truman's proposal of 18½ cents per hour; but President Fairless and his associates are at this writing (February 4, 1946) clinging stubbornly to a 15-cent increase.[24]

At long last President Truman announced, February 14, 1946, his wage-price stabilization policy. He urged avoidance at all costs of the misery and disaster of inflation. He asked Congress to extend the stabilization law to continue the Second War Powers Act and to extend Federal subsidies for a year. The Wage Stabilization Board was authorized to grant wage increases in line with those already granted or proposed, 16 cents in meat packing but 18 to 19½ cents in other industry, though a lower percentage increase than for the packers. Business which feels that such increases to organized workers work a hardship on it, may apply at once to the price board for such increase of prices as will leave its profits at not lower than those of the base prewar period—1936-39. Chester Bowles, with his fine record against price advances, becomes Economic Stabilizer and Paul Porter is OPA chief. No direct provision, apparently, is made for unorganized workers who are supposed, however, to get some advance.

Almost immediately, United States Steel agreed to the President's proposal of 18½ cents per hour, most other smaller steel corporations following suit. It was agreed that the price of carbon and alloy steel should be increased $5 per ton.

Some other strikes have been more important, intrinsically, or to the public affected, than these major strikes, especially those which affected only 3,500 tugboat workers but shut down New York City's supply of fuel oil for several days, transportation workers in several cities, telephone operators in New York and elsewhere and numerous others. Most of these have been settled but no principle has been established for preventing or for handling controveries in these and many other fields.

One of the very interesting and revealing features of the whole situation has been the effect of strikes on the stock market. If they were counted by the buyers of stocks as really a menace to business prosperity, one would have expected the prices of stocks, especially industrials, to go down. Exactly the opposite has happened. Prices have risen sharply since strikes began—and, when the steel situation seemed to be very bad, the steel stocks rose more than the others. The steel strike was called originally for January 13, 1946. In the preceding week, the Stock Exchange closing before the strike was postponed 7 days, Bethlehem Steel rose 5⅞ points, United States Steel 6⅜, and Republic, a leader in Little Steel, from 30⅜ to 34 in the 5½ days. Queer? What did it signify?

CONCLUSIONS—GENERAL

If, now, we were to apply, or could apply, each of the criteria of judgment, and were to examine the changes which rejoiced or disappointed us, revaluing each as part of the larger scene and comparing the responsibility of capital and labor for each, what would we learn? If, further, we could measure the real success or failure of the conditions involved in the transition by discovering the principles underlying the demands made by each side or involved in the changes actually occurring, the writer wonders how many credits, and how many discredits, should be given to labor, to capital and to the public, for its part in the development of this postwar reconstruction.

From the standpoint of the larger issue and opportunity, the modernization of our economic system in the creation of an economy of plenty, a critic might be rather optimistic. The abundance of the war period has not disappeared as it might easily have done. The small number of unemployed among regular workers, the relatively high pay for peace times, the willingness of almost all employers of large-scale organized industrial workers to consider some hourly pay increases, should be placed on the credit side of the civilization ledger. Many of our standards should be improved but have not been. We think too much in terms of hourly pay, and we call an increase in that field a means of judging concessions made, when the yearly income is monetarily the chief thing which matters, from the standpoint of an advancing society. We are asked to leave out of the question whether management can afford to pay when that is the chief problem of the smaler employer—and that does not matter in the least to corporations which are paying full regular dividends and so forth on stock chiefly "water." When we realize that the rise of wages in the past has come first to organized labor, usually through the strike route, that it has then spread, slowly, to other organized workers, to large-scale unorganized, and only then, perhaps very slowly, to others including the "white-collar" employees, we can see the whole picture involves very many angles not to be determined by the justice or fairness of the demands of actual parties to huge labor controversy.

In this crisis voluntary cooperation by management, a sine qua non of a better system, is distinctly lacking. The willingness of management to permit strikes, sometimes to encourage strikes (which none, even labor, wants—they cost too much) shows a poor attitude toward the vital problem. If the comments of observers of great perspicacity and opportunity to know are true—that management insists on its right to keep its great war profits as a springboard from which to leap into exploitative profits, regardless of the public interest, and to dominate labor and government, it can then justly be accused of "plotting a new depression" and sabotaging the best in the present economic set-up.

In comparison with 1919, management seems at first sight to have gained greatly in stature and in realization of public purpose. It does not appear that a repetition of the overwhelming 1919 success and crudity of capital is a possibility. In fact, concessions already made (February 6, 1946), or offered, exceed anything proposed or granted then. Management has scorned the report to President Truman, October 25, based on careful studies by economic experts, that management can afford to pay 24 cents more in hourly pay, with overtime discontinued, without any increase whatever in prices, just as steel ignored the President's recommendation of an 18½-cent increase, hourly pay, and General Motors turned down the 19½-cent increase thought fair by the General Motors Presidential panel. More serious than anything which threatens big business is the problem of the ordinary employer, who may be faced with a strike to get somewhat corresponding gains, especially if the addition to his present pay roll turns a marginal business into one submarginal. We think too much in terms of the 40 percent which made 400 percent more profit than before war: too little in terms of the 60 percent that lost or broke even.

How does labor shape up? We know less of both motive and procedure. Labor is urging some changes exceedingly necessary—more continuous employment, a higher hourly wage so that the yearly income may maintain an American standard of living and insure continuous purchasing power, more attention to low-priced, socially valuable goods, and labor-management cooperation (usually spurned by capital). The CIO is undoubtedly right that big business, almost or completely remobilized for peace, can afford to pay more than labor is now asking in hourly wage increase without raising prices at all to their consumers. But—labor, like capital, often prefers to fight rather than take advantage of public protection and regulation. Some unions are controlled less by members than by others, much as most corporations are no longer controlled by the stockholders. Some unions favor the close corporation form of organization, with excessive dues, etc., for themselves and demand union control of the whole employee situation, in relation to their employers. Sometimes unions have indulged in sabotage and racketeering as objectionable as the management tactics used in strike breaking and prevention which were brought to light a few years ago by the La Follette Civil Liberties Committee.[25] Occasionally we have a coalition of employers and employees working for themselves regardless of the interests of the public.[26] Two cases sometimes cited as being in this classification are construction and coal, the latter classified by Theodore Roosevelt as almost a public utility. Here the workers have been accused of conspiring to profiteer at the expense of the consumer, on condition that their wages be raised substantially. The charge that either organized labor or unorganized workers strike recklessly, in spite of occasional inexcusable outlaw and jurisdictional strikes, probably has its own answer in the time needed to replace lost pay, when a strike is prolonged. If labor feels, however, that its day has come, it may strive to show its not inconsiderable power, thinking turn-about is fair play.

What showing has the public made in this atmosphere of industrial strife and greed? Unfortunately, it can express itself little on an effective scale except through the Chief Executive, Congress, administrative agencies, and the press. Whose fault is it, if a recent writer on international affairs is correct in stating that we are more than a decade behind peoples of western Europe in our economic and social thinking? Wish he were wrong. But he includes consciousness of public responsibility, which makes his charge worse. He believes that the average Conservative M. P. would have difficulty in securing election to our Congress—too liberal, the M. P., he means. For several years Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the New Deal helped to close part of our lag; but after 1938 the forces of reaction, and with 1939, the war, blocked further advance in overcoming that lag. But—unfortunately, many of the progressive laws and some of the administrative agencies, even if staffed by the same bureaucrats, no longer operate adequately or meet the need. President Roosevelt promised that

[22] President Fairless of United States Steel maintains that, in striking, the steel workers have broken their contracts, which called for "no strikes" and which did not expire until fall, 1946. The CIO contends that Steel, not the workers, failed to live up to that contract, which was broken before the strike was called.

[23] See p. 7.

[24] At first, public sentiment was with the workers and against the operators. It was believed, as those who knew did in 1919, that labor had a better case than management. When Mr. Fairless refused to consider President Truman's compromise of 18½ cents per hour, he was criticized severely. Although he has denied Mr. Murray's contention that he was ready to sign January 11, Fairless probably would have reached an agreement with the workers if his reactionary advisors had agreed. Were any of those the men who broke the 1919 strike at such cost to the United States of America?

[25] See Senate documents under Senate Resolution No. 266 (Seventy-fourth Congress).

[26] Are any of the recent post-strike decisions in this class?

none should make unfair profit out of the war but that promise he could not keep, although almost single handed he checked the forces of inflation within the fields most vital to the common man. This takes no credit from the grand work of Chester Bowles, himself selected by Roosevelt.

If the labor-management controversy depends upon what happened to both parties during the war, it is equally involved in the whole politico-economic policy of the U. S. A. in reconstruction. And it may well be questioned whether our Government has any reconstruction policy, even if labor and capital may have for themselves. But their policies, covering but a small part of the whole and from biased viewpoints, must be subordinated to the needs of the American people, which in turn should be represented by the general national policy of the Government at Washington. The one thing which has become clearest in recent months, although it should have been perfectly clear years ago, is the fact that in addition to public utilities, businesses like steel, which affect most other industry, are sharply affected with a public interest—they are almost quasi-public utilities—and cannot conduct their own affairs as they please if, in doing that, they affect the interest of the public adversely. As this is being typed the Cabinet is meeting in Washington to consider, possibly to determine, a wage-price policy which will meet general needs. Whatever it does, and it did nothing then, that will be completely inadequate, of course, to bridge the gap between the price-controlled part of our economy and the price-exploited part. But even that house divided against itself is far better than one again wholly exploited.

President Truman suffered several serious handicaps in succeeding to high office just as the war was ending, in addition to trying to fill Franklin Delano Roosevelt's shoes. As a Senator, he had never needed to view the whole scene and to "see it whole." He wanted to follow the Roosevelt policies, but the conditions were changing rapidly and he wanted also to follow party guidance and especially to unite the irreconcilable elements among the Democrats. He probably has always overlooked the fact that the non-Democratic supporters of Franklin Delano Roosevelt equaled half the Democratic vote out of Congress. Problems rushed upon him in overwhelming number and of overpowering magnitude. Offhand he made a decision regarding each, when some issues required prolonged study and optimum advice. Breaking precedent, he changed his predecessor's Cabinet (in which a few changes were overdue), something no other succession President has ever done. When he made a liberal appointment, that is, Schwellenbach, he tied his Secretary's hands by taking the advice of others, not liberal. Controls which should have been kept were abandoned. War plants that had been financed by the Government, which now in Government hands might have solved the worst part of the strike problem, were soon lost to the Government. Truman is not to blame that all his suggestions to help business in the transition were enacted quickly by Congress and that his more numerous reform proposals have been killed in committee, at least now when needed. But he is at fault that his administration suggested changes, for example, the repeal of the excess-profits war tax, which were responsible for the late 1945 sit-down strike of capital against the public.

If you want to know how Congress has helped in general, read the congeries of appeals by the President to the public January 3, 1946. Of course Congress, and many agencies, have been subjected to terrific pressures. Three major pressure lobbies in 3 months are at least two too many. But that does not excuse Congress for many actions, including the recent proposals to balance the Budget by cutting or destroying appropriations to OPA and other anti-inflation agencies[27] and similar antisocial activities. The aid given indirectly as well as directly to big business, incidentally at the expense of labor and the public, amounts, or might amount, to the increase of hourly pay first asked by the UAW-CIO 30 percent, and more than the USWA's 25 cents and the packers 17½ cents. The press, checked by some frank radio commentators, has been more fair and honest in its reports on labor than formerly. Our local daily paper gave a 6- by 6-inch cartoon on he swollen pay of workers. It would have taken at least one whole page for a corresponding cartoon on the much-worse-swollen profits of corporations. In many ways the affairs of the public are more publicized than those of the other groups. That does not necessarily mean that they are better understood.

In the war, the Government, though engrossed with fighting, never before had done so good a job of checking inflation (though outside of the field of price control many prices soared) and kept an eye on war profits as never before. Roosevelt in the White House, Truman in the Senate, and Leon Henderson (with other chiefs of the OPA) are only the big three of those public services; the helpers were legion. With the war over, the real problem needed to be faced. If business could not reconvert successfully, nothing was right; and, if business reconverted as it did in 1919, everything was wrong. Here is where Government stepped in. From the first whatever business asked was granted, whenever possible, as he guaranties against "loss" after war, in the carry back arrangements in the 1942 tax measure and provisions re the war plants, etc. After war ended the fear that business might not be able to manage led Congress to lean over backward to help. But in the transition what has the Government done to make that difficult period easier for labor and through labor for full employment? I ask you, what has it done? The Government has proposed a number of things and it has started several others, including fact-finding boards.[28] Perhaps these proposals and these starts may eventually produce a lot of gains for labor and the public.

What the Government did for business it did because full production, and with it full employment, is the direct responsibility of the economic leaders, who alone can control the product and its potential uses. If they are prosperous and successful, they can pass on to the consumer and to labor the benefits of that prosperity. The present proposals in Congress to restrict not only the right to strike but also other rights of labor, by legislation and injunction, put a premium on industry's indifference to its obligations. Anyone who knows the history of the last war reconstruction knows that help to management coupled with restrictions upon labor made about the worst combination which America has ever experienced. When the 1945 strikes occurred, therefore, why did not Congress at once withdraw from business the differential advantages given to it by law?

In the midst of strikes and strife it is difficult to show what is really happening, what the conclusions reached really signify and to what those decisions will lead. Only the future can tell whether we are headed for a more sensible economy and whether, not the strikes, but the outcome of the strikes, will promote or retard our progress toward that goal. Most of all, we must try to discover whether we are inflation-bound, whether management can, or will, work for and on an economics of abundance and whether the public does understand, and gets, that coordination of government and business which alone will give a better America.

In the light of these facts, conditions, and comments, what do you conclude, first, about the rightness and success of the position and the plans of the public, of management, and labor and, second, about the proposals each should make and the policies each should adopt?

CONCLUSION FOR THE FUTURE

Labor controversies can be understood only in the light of history and the future. Only the past and the present can explain whether a claim or demand is just, inherently and in the prospect of success, not for the parties but for all of us. Comparing the analogous situation, that after November 11, 1918, we find then as now that in the war itself capital made far more gains than labor.[29] After war, then, wages rose considerably, except in the white-collar occupations, although the most important strikes were lost and the power of labor unions was diminished greatly. The income of those, not employers, who shared in the inflation, through commissions or service to the profiteers, was vastly larger than that of those who worked for a living. Yet, temporarily, until unemployment became great (1920-22) there was constant complaint that it was not easy to "get your money's worth" from labor or in the purchase of goods.[30] Yet the apparent gainer was neither labor, even if better paid, nor the consumer, always the goat in misfortune, but the profiteer. Never has there been more propaganda than there was for the hundred-percent Americans, meaning those who did not see and criticize; but they were too modest, for as often as not they were thousand-percenters — profiteers of great magnitude.

For a reasonably fortunate ending of this early controversial stage of global postwar reconstruction, we must consider less the actual results of labor-management struggle than the larger aspects of the unfolding drama, hoping that it may not again be dire tragedy. From the angle of economic advance, inseparable from political progress, for the politico-economic system is really one, development in three fields is essential: mass production, no inflation of consequence, Government adequate to handle the public affairs of the American people.

With large-scale economic activity, production, and exchange, it is possible for management to continue the mass production of war, by creating, instead, huge quantities of civilian goods of high social value. The task is quite definitely more varied and difficult, calling for vision and understanding as well as initiative, courage, and genuine enterprise of no mean proportions. But, if management will and can do that, like gaining true religion (which it is socially), "all these shall be added to you"—and, through management, to everybody else. The mass of goods created assures ample profits for (large-scale) business, especially in industry. Its large net profits give ample funds for the latest and best equipment and for constant replacement and improvement. Its constant income provides a share for workers larger than any yet demanded—without increasing prices. And quantity production of low-priced socially needed goods spells higher standards of living for all and other desirable articles in abundance—a consumers' paradise. But—and there are several but's.

---

[27] This argument reminds us of the patriotic appeals of statesmen 60 years ago to economize by abolishing the Civil Service Commission.

[28] Since that was written, the new wage-price formula has been announced. Is this unwise because retaining earmarks of its origin?

[29] The writer refers again, as he has many times, to the excellent study on profits of war by Lewisohn, on war profiteers, pp. 221–228.

[30] See tables.

Business will need to have the initiative and enthusiasm of Henry Ford in the early twenties and Henry Kaiser in the early forties. But, what the Henrys have done, let the Georges at least attempt, for the economic Georges must or let others do it. Large business will need to be encouraged without discouraging that small business which is one of our greatest needs and which still seems to stand for what we shall always think is the true American idea and ideal (economic). If you know your American history, you know what we are facing when we tackle either part of that dual Herculean task. And if we tackle both parts together, as we must, the good Lord help us (I say it reverently and earnestly), for we shall need His help to the uttermost. And (another "but"), when the forward-movers step on the gas, please don't let capital, or labor, or the Government (must we add the American people?) push down on the brake.

Labor's problem is partly to help prevent inflation, even if that too is management's distinctive responsibility, for whatever happens that must be avoided. Again and again and again we must insist that inflation must not come again and lead to all the other evils of the interwar period. Labor's chief problem may be to envision its share of the task which lies ahead, but is confronting America right now. What many labor leaders are attempting to do is to arouse capital to the opportunity, which lost now is gone forever, and the advantage of a saner economy. Labor puts less stress than management on the failure which awaits that plan if the workers are half-hearted or indolent, one means of insuring nonprosperity; because the only way to get mass employment at maximum wages is maximum creation of goods—and even modern science and technology cannot assure that, by themselves. If labor policies measure up to the ideals and plans of its best leaders, its contribution, through cooperation with management and the public, will repay manyfold for any sacrifice it may seem to make.

The public is the center, the mainspring, the deus ex machina of the desired economy of abundance. That system is not solely economic, for we passed out of an age of separated systems, as we passed out of one of separation of political departments, with World War I, if not before. The writer realizes that the vast majority of political "leaders" lag in their thinking and planning toward these goals at least as much as most captains of industry, except the reactionaries. Twenty years ago Franklin Delano Roosevelt inquired "Is there a new Jefferson on the horizon?"[31] He came near answering that vital question in a period far too complicated for the distinguished father of democracy. We have an American Constitution both stable and flexible; let's get a government that is better organized,[32] more serviceable and efficient because it is adapted to the greatly expanded public needs of a modern, democratic society. What government has not done in the recent months, or what it has done which should have been left undone, is less material than its almost total failure to develop any proper and adequate policy of reconstruction, of which the wage-price policy is a very small part.

Without better organization of, first, the American people; second, the unorganized body of consumers; and, third, American government, especially our National Government, it is impossible to modernize and develop the politico-economic system—that is, the public system—of the United States of America. For an improved and modernized American system we need both an improved government and much better correlation of government and business.[33] But we need even more a greatly developed American democracy, newly reintegrated and capable of controlling its own public affairs, including management-labor relations to make them more fair, and others of more general scope, to give us the kind of America to which we are entitled, if we can deserve it. Business never has denied its dependence on the public as buyers. Let it learn its dependence on the public as directors of public policy, an over-all, forward-looking, generous, modern policy, in which free-lance, exploitative business has no place. If this is regimentation, let the economic regimenters try it for a change. If it is big government, what else will help big business and big labor help themselves by serving the American people?

The pattern of the immediate future is beginning to emerge. Organized labor is getting a money increase, from war-end levels; unorganized may be able to follow suit, a little. Industry is having somewhat corresponding raises of prices if those are Government controlled, and a great deal higher if they are administered by business. These changes spell a slightly higher standard of living and will assure greater purchasing power if whoever controls production will produce on a vast scale. Government has not sunk to the level of that in the period following World War I, but it is yielding far too much to pressures, usually from money, sometimes from worker organizations, but seldom from the American people. This statement, unfortunately, applies not alone to Congress but to too much administration. The menace of inflation is considerable, in spite of partial controls—remember, no society can continue half price-controlled and half price-exploited. And if it becomes all price-exploited, even an economy relatively of abundance will not save us from inflation. Again we say the United States of America must not repeat the costly, stupid mistakes and dire tragedy that followed World War I.

Cost of living

I. 1915–21

[1926=100]

	All commodities	Food	Textiles	Metals	House furnishings
1915	69.5	65.4	54.1	86.3	56.0
1916	85.5	75.7	70.4	116.5	61.4
1917	117.5	104.5	98.7	156.5	74.2
1918	131.3	119.1	137.2	136.5	93.3
1919	138.6	129.5	135.3	130.9	105.9
1920	154.4	137.4	164.8	149.4	141.8
1921	97.6	90.6	94.5	117.5	113.0

II. 1915–21

	Annual earnings of workers	Cost of living	Index	Purchasing value of earnings in 1913 dollars
1915	582	69.5	(101)	564
1916	679	85.5	(114)	610
1917	771	117.5	(146)	594
1918	940	131.3	(167)	601
1919	1,029	138.6	(186)	563
1920	1,273	154.4	*(219)	612
1921	983	97.6	(153)	550

King, W. I., National Income and Its Purchasing Power, No. 1, p. 146, No. 4, 152.

No. 3, in parentheses, National Industrial Conference Board, Cost of Living in the United States, 22 weighted articles, average for year, maximum*, pp. 161–165.

III. 1939–45

[1935–39=100]

	All commodities	Food	Clothing	House furnishings
1939 (August)	98.6	93.5	100.3	100.6
1941 (January)	100.8	97.8	100.7	100.1
1942 (August)	117.5	126.1	125.2	123.0
1943 (August)	123.2	137.2	128.9	125.5
1944 (August)	126.4	137.7	139.4	139.3
1945 (July)	129.4	141.7	145.7	145.3

Bureau of Labor Statistics, for large cities, no consideration of quality.

"These figures are misleading.". R. W. G.

IV. EARNINGS OF WORKERS IN MANUFACTURING

[1939=100]

	Weekly earnings	Hourly earnings	Balanced hourly earnings
1939 (January)	100.0	100.0	100.0
1940 (January)	106.1	103.8	102.1
1941 (January)	113.6	106.9	102.9
1942 (January)	128.2	112.8	104.7
1942 (October)	140.5	118.3	105.1
1943 (July)	148.5	122.7	106.4
1945 (June)	$47.1	$1.044	(?)
1945 (September)	40.5	.987	(?)

Material from Departments of Commerce and of Labor.

NOTE.—The writer wishes to thank all who helped with this article. He is particularly indebted to Mr. R. W. Grinstead and to Dr. William B. Langsdorf and the Social Science Department. It is regrettable that the article is limited solely to domestic conditions and that the impact of the outside world is not included, for we live in an age when America and the rest of the world cannot be separated. The important money-credit angle of potential inflation also is omitted.

[31] Reprinted in the American Mercury for September 1945.

[32] If you have not read Paul H. Appleby's Big Democracy, do so now.

[33] For example, see the writer's American Government, ch. XXI.

In Defense of the Corporation-Employer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the May issue of the Washington News Digest:

IN DEFENSE OF THE CORPORATION-EMPLOYER

(By Roy C. McKenna, chairman of the board, Vanadium-Alloys Steel Co.)

How much the general welfare of America is due to the development of the corporation has never been appraised. Yet it has done more to increase output, wages, and jobs than any other social or economic institution.

In our present complex society, no individual worker can provide himself with the services and costly equipment needed to produce efficiently and sell in a wide market the goods he makes. Nor can the wealthiest individual or family provide the capital or tool money in the quantity necessary for mass production. The corporation alone, by public subscription presents hope that sufficient tool money can be obtained to provide a high level of employment without a decline in our living standards.

Even though we recognize the extraordinary ingenuity and skill of the American worker, we must still admit that he would have little competitive advantage over other nationalities except for the larger investment in tool money per worker here than elsewhere. For, ever since the invention of the steam engine, it is a recognized fact that the standard of living in each country has been directly proportionate to the investment in tool money per worker. This is as true of agriculture as of industry. In America the industries with the largest investment per worker pay the highest wages. Wages are paid by production. The benefits of technological improvements have always been divided with the worker and the customer but the machine tools must also be compensated. Often a skilled craftsman, after a long apprenticeship at minimum pay, at the height of his earning power earns less than the man on mass production who is aided by machine tools.

Unemployment is a disease of civilization, and unknown in primitive societies. Even admitted that more jobs would be available with the lowering of our living standards, this need not be inevitable. Subsistence farming quite naturally reduces unemployment. Substituting manual labor for machine work may lessen unemployment at the expense of living standards.

Plainly, our only hope of a high level of employment with a rising standard of living, is more tool money. There is no other source for this tool money than the savings of the wage earner. To induce the wage earner to forego present enjoyment by saving now, an incentive must be given; namely an average return upon investment in compensation for his sacrifice. The individual wage earner must choose whether to place his savings in risk capital, or more conservatively in insurance, bonds, or bank deposits. The investment per job in industry and in agriculture, necessary to provide present standards, is $6,000. Therefore, for each new job to be provided, we need $6,000 in savings.

OUR SAVINGS ARE VOLUNTARY

Economic laws do not change with forms of government. In Russia, the people undergo hardship now to provide tool money to implement their five-year plan. For only by savings can living standards be raised. The difference is that here, in a constitutional republic, the individual saves voluntarily; whereas under socialism, he is compelled to save. Human nature does not change materially with government policy. Some hope of future reward for present sacrifice must be given even by a dictator. In America the failure to offer the average wage earner sufficient inducement to save is due to the present administration's long-range plan of securing socialism by indirection, without facing a mandate at the polls upon the real issue.

Only sabotage will cause capitalism to fail. For, under capitalism, voluntary savings can provide sufficient tool money to increase our standard of living continuously. However, a change from the present set-up to an administration sympathetic to free, competitive enterprise, and one willing to face economic facts, is necessary. It is vital to have an administration which recognizes that only through increased production can we satisfy our needs if the drift toward socialism is to be stopped.

With the memory of our splendid production under wartime stress, no American could doubt that freemen who voluntarily provide their own tool money can outproduce man for man labor even with high incentive payments under socialism.

The corporation is a vital part of our capitalistic society. It is an American institution. In England some companies received royal charters; others became joint stock companies by act of Parliament; and partnerships had transferable shares. But it was in New York in 1811 that corporations first were allowed to be created without special act of legislature. This is the modern corporation as we know it. Every State in the Union quickly followed the lead of New York in this matter.

SAVINGS ARE STORED LABOR

In the United States there are as many persons receiving part of their incomes from ownership of tools as from the operation of tools. Capitalism can provide a wider distribution of goods than is practical under any less efficient regime such as socialism. Economic principles remain unchanged by the form of government; human nature changes little; tools wear out and must be replaced; incentives must be provided for savings. The average return on savings, which is stored labor, would be the same in the long run whether it became interest on Government bonds under socialism or free-will investment under capitalism.

We have the choice between socialism and capitalism. The quicker a positive mandate is had from the voter, the better. To permit for a whole generation a positive drift into socialism without the issue being faced fairly as such, and decided upon its merits, is a sad commentary upon a democratic form of government.

The founders of our Republic gave us a constitutional representative government with far more emphasis upon opportunity than upon security. Americans today are sons of pioneers, and basically are themselves pioneers at heart. In the long run, the infiltration of foreign ideologies which has been going on for a generation, will probably not change their nature.

Reactionaries Bore From Within Also

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, day in and day out we hear criticism in the unfriendly press, representing the reactionary forces and interests, against any activities or actions on the part of progressives who, unlike the others, do not seek any personal benefits or special favors, but have at heart only the welfare and best interests of all the people.

In the eyes of the reactionaries in this House, and in the eyes of reactionary columnists and radio commentators, any positive action by progressives should not be tolerated, and it is manifestly wrong, and in fact should not be permitted. Meanwhile, there is not a day I do not receive a large number of pamphlets, articles, booklets, and other expensive mailing pieces; while on the floor I hear statements in the interest or in behalf of rich and powerful groups who feel that no law should be applicable to them; that they should be completely freed from any restraints or regulations on the part of their government.

MUM ON INFILTRATION BY RIGHTISTS

A few days ago there were two or three articles in a certain paper criticising an organization being formed for the purpose of enlightening the masses on their rights and privileges under the Constitution, and this is strenuously resented by the representatives of the vested interests and monopoly finance of Wall Street, by the leaders of the cartels, and by others, who, through the benefits of special-interest legislation, have grown rich and powerful at the expense of the masses, and who today are not satisfied with the tremendous wealth they have accumulated, but clamor for more, and for more and greater profits, and for accumulation of still greater wealth.

That element charges that the leftists, so-called, are infiltrating themselves into the Democratic Party; but they are mum and silent as to the reactionaries infiltrating themselves into every possible organization they can penetrate or buy into, or where they can use the wealth accumulated under a Democratic administration for that purpose.

Under unanimous consent granted me, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent column written by the Honorable Harold L. Ickes and published in the Washington Evening Star, the Chicago Sun, and other newspapers in which the former Secretary of the Interior makes some pointed remarks about infiltration of reactionary elements into progressive organizations.

MAN TO MAN—COLUMNIST ASSERTS RIGHT WING INFILTRATES ITSELF INTO POLITICS

(By Harold L. Ickes)

Contrary to the general impression, the left wingers in this country do not have a monopoly on the tactic or infiltrating into an organization in order to use it for their own purposes. Other kinds of wingers, and some without even hope of wings, are also adept at this practice.

The most determined and most successful example of right-wing infiltration in recent years concerns the National Reclamation Association, a nongovernmental organization which sprang from the great progressive movement during the early part of the century, and which was originally dedicated to furthering the reclamation program of the Government.

The goals of the Government's reclamation program have been three: (1) The irrigation of arid lands; (2) cheap electric power to pump water onto these lands; (3) a limitation to 160 acres one person may own of such reclaimed land.

For years the Government, through the Bureau of Reclamation, supported by the Reclamation Association, marched toward these goals. In this fight the association was to the Bureau what the Navy League is to the Navy Department.

HELD AID TO NATION

The benefits which have accrued to the Nation through this cooperation of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Reclamation Association have been incalculable. Monuments to their activity include the Salt River Valley in Arizona and the Yakima Valley in Washington, both desert wastes before water was brought to the land, and now flourishing gardens supplying fruits and vegetables to the great cities of the Nation.

Almost from the beginning the reclamation program has been fought by two groups—the big landowners and the private power companies. The 160-acre limitation aroused the opposition of the baronic landowners, although they were delighted at the prospect of the Government irrigating the thousands of acres which they held, thus enhancing their value a hundredfold. The private power companies opposed the program because they considered cheap Gov-

ernment power as a threat to the excessive charges that their monopolistic practices made possible.

After losing battle after battle down the years, these two groups—the private power companies and the great landowners—have finally learned that the march of democracy is too relentless to divert by a frontal attack, so they have finally adopted that time-honored maxim: "If you can't lick 'em, jine 'em, and use 'em."

Utility jobholders have joined the Reclamation Association in droves and they have become an influence so great that this once great progressive body is now denouncing as communistic cheap public power and the 160-acre land limitation law—two of its three original goals.

CITES SLUR AT BASHORE

The epithet "fellow traveler" was hurled at Harry Bashore, then Commissioner of the Federal Bureau of Reclamation, at the last meeting of the association when he urged a continuance of the association's original policies. Mr Bashore was taken aback by such a classification. He had been an original Bull Mooser, but not even a New Dealer.

And last month Floyd O. Hagie, secretary-manager of the association which is supposed to be fighting for the water users of the West, had the effrontery to urge higher rates for power from reclamation dams. Mr. Hagie has since announced his resignation, for which the water users of the West may be thankful.

His successor should be chosen with care, for the private utilities, by trying to take over the Reclamation Association completely, would be in a fine position to play Grandmother Wolf to Little Red Riding Hood public. They could push their reactionary schemes under cover of a name which, before the infiltration of the private-power troopers, had won a reputation for liberal and popular policies.

The aims of the utilities and those of the founders of the association will always be diametrically opposed. The association, if it is to maintain its reputation unsullied and its strength unimpaired, must rid itself of the incubus of electric power and the incorporate firm.

H. R. 2788, A Bill To Penalize the Workers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House, H. R. 2788, will have extremely unfortunate effects under the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act. Workers have unlawfully been deprived of money owing them under the extremely modest requirements of a minimum wage of 40 cents an hour and overtime pay for hours over 40 per week. Those workers are not in the position constantly to bring suits to protect their rights. They do not have the resources to undertake the hazards of litigation for the $50 or $100 which would be the most that employers would likely be liable for under a 1-year statute of limitations. The Gwynne bill either would force them into unions as the only means by which their rights can be secured, or else, in effect, make the present 40-cent minimum a mockery.

When Congress in 1938 passed the Fair Labor Standards Act it did not give the Wage and Hour Division the power to collect back wages due the employees. Instead the Congress provided in section 16 (b) of the act that employees could themselves sue for the back wages and obtain additional amounts as liquidated damages. Since the Wage and Hour Division has not been given the right to sue to collect back wages illegally kept back by occasional employers, it is necessary that the workers have reasonable time.

A worker will find 1 year all too small, not only because of the very small amount he could collect during 1 year. The average worker is in no position constantly to employ legal aid to inform him of his rights. Many of them are in fear of losing their jobs if they antagonize the employer and they do not run that risk for a few dollars. For these reasons a substantially longer period is needed for workers under the Fair Labor Standards Act, at least 3 years, and better 5 years.

Although the worker would be limited to 1 year under this unjust proposal, you may be sure his creditors will not be, since almost every single one of the debts the average worker might acquire would be outside the scope of the Gwynne bill. State laws providing in almost every case for much longer periods would be applicable. We would be in effect saying to John Jones: You must sue within 1 year to collect the $25 or $50 your boss owes you, but anybody to whom you owe money can sue within 3 or 5 or 6 or more years, as the case may be in your particular State. That is not justice.

Disabled War Veterans' Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

QUAKERTOWN, PA., *May 11, 1946.*

Hon. CHARLES L. GERLACH,
House of Representatives,
Washington D. C.

DEAR MR. GERLACH: I am an enlisted veteran of World War 1. Seven years ago I lost both legs as the result of an accident. After spending eight months in a hospital and six months at home recuperating, I was finally able to get around with the aid of crutches and one artificial leg. I soon found that I was unable to secure a job because of my condition. I wanted no charity, either private or Government, although as a veteran I would be entitled to a monthly payment from the Government, which I have never claimed. With my life's savings rapidly vanishing, I gambled all and purchased a small farm, believing that if I and my family were not afraid to work we could at least produce enough food to feed ourselves.

For five years, by working 10 to 16 hours a day, 6 and often 7 days a week, we have managed to produce enough meat, poultry, vegetables and fruit, to feed ourselves, with sufficient over to pay our taxes and buy the other necessities of life.

Our whole year's supply of food is preserved in a large freezer cabinet. The preservation of this food depends on a continuous supply of electric power Failure of such power supply for 24 hours or longer means not only loss of all our labor but lacking cash income, means we would be faced with near starvation. There are thousands of farm families throughout the country in exactly the same position.

According to newspaper and radio reports, if the present coal strike continues, the country will be faced with a partial or even total shut-down of electric power.

I may concede the right of any person or persons to stop work or strike to enforce demands, reasonable or unreasonable. I cannot concede the right of any group of persons to organize to prevent others who may wish to work from working Neither can I concede the right of any group, whether labor or industry, either by strike or lock-out, to jeopardize the safety, health and welfare of the entire Nation. I believe that the conceded rights of any group, particularly a small minority, ceases when the unreasonable exercise of those rights jeopardize the safety, health, and welfare of th vast majority.

I can get along for some time without transportation, without new clothes, without most of the common necessities and conveniences of our complex civilization except food. I must have food to live. Any strike or lock-out affecting the ordinary routine of life may impose inconvenience or even hardship but may be accepted with only the usual amount of complaint. When, however, my ability to live is placed in jeopardy by the actions of any person or group of persons, particularly when I have produced by my own labor the food by which I live, then I believe that I have the right to demand protection.

It is reported that the Government has no power to enforce the continued production of such a necessity as coal which is so vital to the health and safety of the Nation. If the basic articles of our Constitution do not grant such power, then it is high time that the men who have been elected by the people and who have sworn to protect the best interests of all the people, not just a few minority groups, take immediate action to see that the defect is remedied at once.

If any person or group of persons entered my home with the purpose of jeopardizing my ability to live and no police protection was available, I would be justified in shooting if necessary to protect myself.

Any group which by concerted action cause the shut-down of electric service is jeopardizing my ability to live. If, as is stated, the Government has no power to give protection against such action, then I assume that I would be justified in taking any means to defend myself or exact penalty for any loss I may suffer.

If the coal strike is permitted to continue to the point where electric power is shut off, the moment that occurs I shall most certainly start to fight in a most drastic way, irrespective of consequences.

I trust that you will be good enough to draw to the attention of your colleagues in the Congress this side of the picture I have presented above, which many of them seem to have overlooked.

Very truly yours,

R. E. FREDERICK.

QUAKERTOWN, PA., *May 20, 1946.*

Hon. CHARLES L. GERLACH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GERLACH: Your letters of May 14 and May 16 have been received. May I express my thanks for your courtesy in answering my letter to you.

I am not in the habit of writing to my representatives in government and telling them what they should do. I felt, however, that the present situation had reached a point where it was time for some of us citizens who are taking a beating from the unreasonable attitude of some labor organizations, to stand up and express our opinions.

May I thank you most sincerely for your offer to attempt to take care of my food supply should the coal strike reach the point where electric power should be curtailed or shut off completely. I am afraid, however, that if that point was reached, we would all be in the same position. Whether the ice plants purchased their current from a public utility or generated their own, no coal means no current. And no current means no refrigeration and no refrigeration means spoiled food.

I, too, am not against labor organizations. I feel that they have a just place in our economy. When, however, any such organization reaches the point where it can defy the Government, disrupt the national economy, and jeopardize the safety, health, and welfare of the entire country, then it is time to curb or regulate such organizations. And the same thing holds true whether the organization is of labor or of industry.

I am not in favor of Government control of vital industries. I do believe, however, that laws with teeth should be set up to compel arbitration in the case of industrial disputes in such vital industries as coal mining, the steel industry, public utilities, and transportation. If labor or management in such industries could not or would not arbitrate their differences, then the Government should have a fact-finding board or commission and the findings and recommendations of that board should be enforced on either or both parties, by force, if necessary.

I do not hold too much with the much-talked-about theory that a man cannot be compelled to work against his will. If he cannot be compelled to work, why should he be paid relief if he refuses to work. I am indirectly paying to support him because the cost of that relief is included in the cost of everything I buy. I expect no support for myself and I object to supporting others who refuse to work, particularly when their refusal to work makes it harder for me to make a living.

If the Government has the power to put men in the Army to be shot at—my own son is there now—then I fail to see why that same power cannot be used to compel men to work when their refusal to work jeopardizes the health, welfare, and safety of the entire Nation.

No man is compelled to choose any particular occupation in this country. If however, having chosen an occupation which is vital to the well-being of the country, he should be compelled to recognize the obligation he has assumed in making his free choice.

It is well to talk about the rights of individuals, but when the so-called rights of a fraction of 1 percent of the population work hardship and even suffering on the remaining 99 percent, then it is time to redefine "rights." Certainly we have reached a very sad state when an infinitesimal minority can upset the national economy and endanger the welfare of the entire country.

If I remember my history correctly, we have had officials in government who had guts enough to do something when such a condition threatened.

In reply to your last paragraph of your letter of May 16, I know that according to law I am entitled to payment for my disability. However, the Government had nothing to do with my accident and, therefore, I do not want or expect the Government to give me something for nothing. I will earn my own living, but I do not want it taken away from me after I have worked for it.

You have my full permission to print this and my previous letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In fact I hope that it can be done, as it may be a means of enlightening some of the other Members of the Congress regarding the feelings of the vast unorganized but all too often inarticulate mass of citizens.

Thanking you most sincerely, I am,

Very truly yours,

R. E. FREDERICK.

The Penalties of Indifference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on June 27, 1942, I called to the attention of the New Deal Members of the House of Representatives, who, of course, were then in the majority as they now are, the futility of paying out huge sums of the taxpayers' money to corporations for not producing sugar. Here is what I said at that time:

WHY SUBSIDIZE TO CREATE SUGAR FAMINE?

Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent a congressional district, a portion of which is one of the finest fruit-producing sections in the United States. Thus, canning both in the factory and in the home is of great importance. This is especially true now when the administration seeks to fulfill its lend-lease obligations to supply foreign countries with canned products for the duration of the war.

Sugar is a necessary ingredient of canned fruits to be sent abroad. Foreign tastes and habits, so it is claimed, require sugar to maintain health, vigor, and the morale of our allies. Why, under these circumstances when sugar is so essential for home canning and commercial canning, should the administration reduce the acreage of sugar beets and also make a drastic cut in the sugarcane area?

Moreover, I do not believe it is in the public interest to pay huge Government subsidies to induce corporations not to produce sugar and at the same time severely limit the amount the housewife may use for preserving purposes.

I note that the Department of Agriculture, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 20, 1942, has paid benefits to the following corporations for not producing sugar:

Luce & Co., Puerto Rico	$614,643.01
Fajardo Growers, Puerto Rico	528,839.15
Oahu Sugar Co., Hawaii	510,062.64
United States Sugar Corp., Florida	470,007.51
Eastern Associates, Puerto Rico	447,959.73
Waialua Agriculture Co., Hawaii	444,225.97
Ewa Plantation Co., Hawaii	443,021.49

This is New Deal scarcity gone mad. It it a senseless program when it is known by every well-informed person that the removal of the New Deal bureaucratic stranglehold on the throat of beet-sugar and sugarcane growers would quickly replace scarcity with plenty.

Mr. Speaker, how much longer must the people be made to suffer from the stupidity of the totalitarian bureaucrats? Has Congress no responsibility when such a group first creates a shortage of an essential food such as sugar by means of subsidies paid from the pockets of the American taxpayers for not producing it, then turns what is left of the sugar shortage over to the black-market operators to enable them to gouge the people with prices that are prohibitive to all except the very rich. This un-American system of exploitation of free people has gone far enough, unless the disease has become so malignant that it has destroyed the strength and will of a sovereign people to fight for their rights. The people must become aroused to the dangers of all totalitarian approaches to our economic problems, because the penalties of indifference are severe, as Herbert Spencer has pointed out:

THE PENALTIES OF INDIFFERENCE

The man who, expending his energies wholly on private affairs, refuses to take trouble about public affairs, pluming himself on his wisdom in minding his own business, is blind to the fact that his own business is made possible only by maintenance of a healthy social state, and that he loses all around by defective governmental arrangements. Where there are many like-minded with himself—where, as a consequence, offices come to be filled by political adventurers and opinion is swayed by demagogs—where bribery vitiates the administration of law and makes fraudulent State transactions habitual, heavy penalties fall on the community at large, and among others, on those who have thus done everything for self and nothing for society. Their investments are insecure; recovery of their debts is difficult, and even their lives are less safe than they could otherwise have been.

Omaha Council of American War Dads Asks for Official Termination of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following letter which I received this morning:

AMERICAN WAR DADS,
Omaha, Nebr., May 15, 1946.

Hon. HOWARD H. BUFFETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BUFFETT: The Greater Omaha Council of American War Dads, at its regular meeting, held April 16, 1946, directed me on their behalf, to earnestly urge that you, as our Representative, take necessary action to officially terminate World War II immediately. This must be done as a step toward balancing the Budget and stabilizing the economy of our Nation.

Our sons and daughters, who so valiantly fought and sacrificed, will be the taxpayers of the future and they, as well as we, should be relieved of the unnecessary burden of retaining and paying for the more than 3,500,000 civil employees, about 75 percent of whom are needless and the hundreds of useless wartime bureaus. Considering that all of these are continued on the pay roll because of the pretense that the war is not over and that this useless burden will have to be carried for an additional 6 months after the war is officially declared over, is it not time to consider the American people?

Regardless of the fact that the war is ended, we are needlessly subjected to regi-

mentation, bureaucratic rules, harmful propaganda and deficit spending, retarding recovery. In view of the fact that it is now more than 8 months since VJ-day, is it not time that you eliminate this injustice to a long-suffering public?

Our Constitution guarantees a representative form of government and we stand for its maintenance against encroachment by existing emergency powers and we demand that these powers now be returned to the people from whom they came.

Sincerely,

GREATER OMAHA COUNCIL
OF AMERICAN WAR DADS.
J. A. YOUNGSTROM,
Vice President.

Crisis In Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of May 22, 1946:

CRISIS IN POLAND

Despite the best efforts of the present Polish Government to minimize or conceal the true situation, available evidence points with increasing clarity to a major political crisis in that distressed country, already suffering so acutely from the legacy of war. And it appears equally clear that responsibility for this crisis rests mainly upon the Polish Government itself.

The nub of the difficulty lies in the refusal of the Polish Peasant Party, headed by Deputy Premier Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, to join in a single-slate ticket with the Communist and Socialist Parties which are the political expressions of the present Government, which, in turn, was originally the creation of Moscow and has remainded its obvious satellite in both foreign and domestic policies.

The single-slate ticket is a device employed by Communists everywhere to gain or maintain a degree of political control not warranted by their separate voting strength. In Soviet-dominated countries like Bulgaria it has been imposed on the opposition either by browbeating them into line or outlawing them for alleged antidemocratic and Fascist tendencies. The elections are then held and the world is informed that the people have unitedly supported the single-slate ticket, thereby confirming the Communist-dominated regime in its tenure of power.

This transparent fraud has not been swallowed, however, by the American and British Governments. Even when, for diplomatic reasons, they have reluctantly recognized a regime like that of Tito in Yugoslavia, they have called attention to its failure to live up to the Big Three agreements at Yalta, Moscow, and elsewhere, providing for free elections in liberated European lands, and in other cases, such as Bulgaria, they have withheld recognition for this reason.

Everything indicates that the Moscow-dominated Polish regime headed by Premier Osubka-Morawski is cracking down hard on the Peasant Party for its obduracy. Wholesale arrests and outlawing of certain elements of the party as "Fascist" have not only evoked strong protests from Mr. Mikolajczyk and his colleagues but also resistance on the part of the persecuted elements to an extent that amounts almost to civil war in certain areas. The evidence is that, outside the cities, the Peasant Party is favored by a majority of the population.

Against all this, both London and Washington are evincing their stern disapproval. Our Government coupled strong notes of protest with a suspension of deliveries on a $50,000,000 loan recently negotiated under conditions, one of which was the assurance of free elections this year.

Unless the Warsaw government modifies its present tactics and permits free elections, a show-down both within the country itself and with the western powers appears to be inevitable.

Something To Think About

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, everyone who loves liberty under the law rather than compulsion by men, should inquire into the extent to which he must sacrifice individual liberties in order to obtain an all-abundant life by "compulsion." The forces of compulsion are on the march. The armies of totalitarianism are advancing. By deceitful and cunning methods they aim to overthrow in the United States, the doctrine of ordered liberty and to substitute a slave system of government by compulsion. Is it not pertinent to inquire whether the defenders of constitutional government and the true American way of life are mobilizing to meet the attack?

Under leave to extend my remarks I ask to have inserted the following recent editorial appearing in the April issue of American Affairs, a quarterly journal published by the National Industrial Conference Board, which I earnestly commend to the thoughtful attention of every Member of Congress:

COMPULSION

Not long ago there would have been no point in a man's saying, "What I earn is mine and what I do with it is nobody's business." Why should he assert what was taken to be one of the absolute rights of a free individual? He is the same individual still and has yet more enumerated freedoms than individuals possess anywhere else in the world, but in the change he received for his one gold coin of indivisible freedom there is something missing. That absolute right to do as he would with his own no longer exists. What is done with part of it now is the Government's business. On the face of his pay envelope he may read how much the Government has taken out and what it is for. It is for his own good, of course, but he himself has nothing to say about it.

This is compulsory thrift, called social security. When the first social-security law was being passed the word "compulsion" was forbidden. The idea was that the Government, knowing how anxious you were to provide for your old age and the welfare of your dependents, had thought of a way to enable you to do it almost without feeling it, and you would never have to worry about it again. The way was to let the Government do it for you. It was, of course, something you wanted very much to do and really meant to do, and if that were so, how could anyone say that you were being compelled?

So the law was enacted; and the enactment of the first law is like the winning of a beachhead. After that it is no longer necessary to cover the attack with verbal disguise. In a little while the word "compulsion" quietly took its place in our political language. Over the President's message to Congress on the subject of a national health program the New York Times set the following headline: "Text of the President's health message calling for compulsory medical insurance." The President said in that message: "I recommend solving the basic problem by distributing the costs through expansion of our existing compulsory social insurance system." And then Senator WAGNER, on introducing the national health bill, said: "Without exception voluntary plans are too expensive for the lower-income groups—the people who are most in need of medical care—and there are too many illnesses for which care is not given under these plans."

Thus is indicated another entry on the face of the pay envelope showing what the Government has taken out just in case you get sick and might have to worry about the doctor's bill. Under a system of compulsory social insurance the Government is saying simply this: "Hitherto the young have supported the old, the well have supported the sick, the employed have supported the unemployed, but they have done it badly, either by voluntary insurance plans which were inadequate or by no plan at all. Hereafter the Government will do it for you in a systematic manner and take each week out of your pay envelope the money you ought to have saved for old age and sickness and bad times but didn't—not always and never enough."

If it is good why should it stop at this point? One cause of ill health in the Nation is faulty nutrition. People know too little about scientific nutrition, especially people in the lower brackets. Even when they have plenty of money for food they buy and eat the wrong things and suffer from an unbalanced diet. On a big cotton plantation in the South the company maintains both a hospital and a commissariat where only the staples of food are sold. When cotton is high the sharecroppers go to town and buy their food, and then the company's commissariat shuts up and the hospital opens. When cotton is low the commissariat opens and the hospital is empty.

Now, if the Government is going to mind the health of the people how can it fail to consider the matter of proper diet? Why shouldn't it say: "It is true you have been feeding yourselves, but how? Hereafter the Government will take from your pay envelope the amount of money you ought to spend for food and put in place of it an order slip on your grocer and baker and butcher calling for just the right quantities of proper food."

Next, clothing. It is well known that people spend money foolishly for clothes. Why not a tax on the pay envelope for a proper clothes budget? Then at last housing and recreation, so that we shall be a people altogether insured against the distress of poverty in old age and the hazards of illness, all of us well fed, well clothed, and well housed, with a maximum of planned leisure as we go along, and then, of course, guaranteed jobs to provide the pay envelopes in which the Government will find the money. The good life by compulsion.

Once it has been accepted that compulsion may be laid upon the individual to improve his life, on the ground that his voluntary efforts to improve it himself are unsatisfactory, there is no logical place to stop short of minding his life from birth to death. And the principle of it has already been accepted

with the utmost complacency. The American Life Convention, the Life Insurance Association of America, and the National Association of Life Underwriters jointly appointed two committees on social security to explore and develop the best present-day thought on this most important subject. The committees have reported and their report has been accepted. The report says:

"There should be neither conflict nor confusion between social security, properly defined, and that type of security which comes from the exercise of personal industry and thrift. While the one represents the basic protection which can safely be provided through Government programs set up by society at large, the other gives the individual the right and the opportunity to raise himself and his family to such level of security as his industry and thrift dictate. They complement each other rather than conflict with each other."

Then follows this curious exercise in sublimation—sublimation meaning the process of converting solids into vapor:

"In current discussions one often receives the impression that the philosophy of social security is basically opposed to our fundamental ideas of individual enterprise and self-reliance; that it means the replacing of our traditional democracy by a form of socialism or totalitarianism; or that it necessarily implies that the world owes everyone a living. While certain proposals for social security do raise such issues, it does not follow that we must abandon our way of life in order to have effective social security plans. Nevertheless, a social security program must be carefully designed lest it afford a basis for these criticisms. Since such a program leaves the individual no choice as to whether he should come in or stay out, it must justify, economically and socially, the distribution of both its costs and benefits.

So the conclusion is that if costs and benefits are properly balanced the fact that it is compulsory—that it leaves the individual no choice as to whether he should come in or stay out—is really of no importance. When the drive begins to socialize all insurance the unanswerable argument may be like this: "Why not? A good deal of it has already been socialized by compulsory law with the blessing of the private life insurance companies, who have said that while voluntary thrift plans are good for the individual, compulsory thrift is good for society."

G. G.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the House Ways and Means Committee in connection with general hearing on social security:

Mr. Chairman, in this Nation today there is a group comprised of literally hundreds of thousands of citizens that has been bypassed and ignored for years while this Congress and those that have preceded it were making concessions and granting special favors to dozens of other groups, many less strong in numbers, none more deserving. I am talking about the aged people, the elders of our country, those who in the declining years of their life need help and assistance. These people patiently suffered through the depression, suffered through the war, and now, today, when the Nation is prosperous are still forced to endure deprivations because we have failed to provide for them.

Certainly if we will but pause for a moment and consider on a sound, moral basis, the distress of our aged, we will recognize the injustice of the treatment these aged folks are now receiving. They were, you will remember, to have been adequately cared for by the provisions of the Social Security Act passed in 1935, and amended in 1939. They have not been. They have received in benefits from old-age and survivors insurance barely enough money to buy their food. Surely they are entitled to more than mere existence. They have been humiliated time and time again by the indignities of poor-law-old age assistance restrictions. They appeal to us for help. They have never had enough money to keep themselves other than just bare subsistence.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is high time they do have enough; I believe we cannot ignore them, cannot bypass their needs any longer. I believe this Congress must act now to raise old-age benefits to a level that will reflect at least some measure of humanitarian consideration for the hardships and sufferings these aged people have been forced to endure so long.

National Maritime Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 22, 1946

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I think it timely on this day that the American public be reminded of the vital part which our maritime activity has played in peace and in war.

Every American knows that World War II could not have been won without the great merchant fleet built in our country and manned by American seamen. The men and materials carried by these vessels to every fighting front were decisive factors in bringing complete victory.

A small craft, the *Virginia*, was the precursor of the immense ocean fleet of America today, having been built in 1607. The early colonists were, in fact, inheritors of a bold seafaring tradition, and Americans of the Colonial era had two frontiers: One of the forest, the other of the sea.

Before the eighteenth century was far advanced American ships had no superiors—and they were the most smartly handled craft on the globe. Indeed, at the outbreak of the Revolution, Americans held nearly a monopoly of the world's whaling.

The era of the American fast clippers, greyhounds of the sea, so-called, was one memorable in the glorious history of our seafaring people.

The merchant marine gave the country a group of naval commanders more than able to match the British in skill and daring, and John Paul Jones gained part of his seafaring experience on American ships in American lines of trade.

Entering the war as a third-rate maritime power, the United States emerged from it with the greatest merchant fleet in the history of mankind—a great fleet of the best shipping ever built.

Building upon the experienced furnished by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, it was possible to make a sound approach to the rehabilitation of our merchant marine—the primary instrument for promoting world trade and friendly world contacts.

Our Nation has learned the lesson by experience that it must turn its face toward the sea. Our maritime people are worthy of just plaudits, especially upon this day. May we ever keep in mind the activities and vital need of this great body of seamen who have done so much in building our America.

The members of the American Merchant Marine served with honor and glory during the war against the Axis. They were bombed, torpedoed, wounded; their ships were sunk under them. Their deeds of heroism are legion. It is fitting that we give proper tribute to the heroic sacrifices of the American seamen, among whom are many who, though alien seamen, served capably and well. Today they are ineligible to residence and face deportation—a shameful reward for their outstanding contribution to our victory. Forty-three nationalities were represented by these men, approximately 10,000 in number, from countries overrun by the enemy, who have lost family and friends and yet have found it possible to contribute to victory as members of the American Merchant Marine.

As said by the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt: "They deserve, and receive from all of us, our thanks for the job they have done."

Now that hostilities have ceased, these seamen are entitled to special consideration by our Government and by the American people in their efforts to become American citizens.

Amendment of Antitrust Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED. V. IZAC
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to my request for permission to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include two editorials recently appearing in the San Diego Union and the Tribune Sun. I ask this in response to a request by Mr. Lester G. Bradley, publisher, who I understand represents the absentee owner of these newspapers, Col. Ira C. Copley, of Aurora, Ill.

In spite of the fact that I am in hearty accord with the decision of the Supreme Court against the monopolistic practices

of the Associated Press, I am glad to permit the opposing views of Colonel Copley and his friends to be brought to the attention of the American people through the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I do this in full realization that this same policy of fair play has never been demonstrated as being a part of the reportorial or editorial policy of the two papers mentioned above.

The editorials follow:

[From the San Diego Union of May 18, 1946]

NOT A PUBLIC UTILITY

Congressman NOAH MASON, of Illinois, has introduced in Congress a bill amending the antitrust law to exclude its application to associations engaged in the gathering and dissemination of news. The bill is aimed to meet the situation created by the decision of a bare majority of the United States Supreme Court, ordering the Associated Press to sell its services to all petitioners, regardless of existing commitments to previous subscribers.

The high court's decision was characterized by dissenting Justice Roberts as "rendering the Associated Press a public utility," and equivalent to making a new statute by court decision. Justice Roberts adds:

"Suffice it to say that it is a novel application of the Sherman Act to treat it as legislation converting an organization, which neither restrains trade nor monopolizes it, nor holds itself out to serve the public generally, into a public utility because it furnishes a new sort of illumination, literary as contrasted with physical, by pronouncing a fiat that the interest of consumers (the reading public, not that of competing news agencies or newspaper publishers) requires equal news service on the part of Associated Press and that a court of equity, in the guise of an injunction, shall write the requisite regulatory statute."

The Associated Press is not a private merchandising institution, but a mutual organization composed of members in individual cities, who not only receive news gathered by the association, but who contribute the news from each member's field. There is no sale of a commodity involved, no restraint against any other news service or any newspaper. There is not and cannot be any such thing as a monopoly in news; news, like gold, is where you find it.

The conception of a news disseminating service, or a newspaper, as a public utility is incongruous, so far as any relation to monopoly or government control is concerned. Readers are not compelled to rely on the news reports of any particular agency nor to read only newspapers supplying the reports of these agencies. The element of choice, not present in a public utility, always is present.

Congress should correct an unjust situation and move to protect a free press by passing the Mason bill.

[From the San Diego Tribune-Sun of May 16, 1946]

TASK FOR CONGRESS

Awaiting action in Congress is H. R. 6301, a bill designed to give news-gathering organizations freedom from restrictions of the antitrust laws. The measure has the support of 814 publishers, and only 36 of those polled voted against the move.

Until recently the gathering and distribution of news was not looked upon as activities needing such controls as those imposed by the Sherman Antitrust Act. But the Supreme Court changed all this last year when it ruled that the Associated Press had no right to refuse sale of service to an applicant, even though a contract of long standing between the Associated Press and a member expressly forbade the service.

While seeking no special privileges for themselves or their businesses, publishers generally feel that this ruling, which was by a bare majority of the Supreme Court, impinges upon freedom of the press. They feel that it well might be the opening for some such regulations as those imposed upon public utilities. In this they see a grave threat to one of the great cornerstones of democracy, the free press.

The pending bill proposes nothing that could do violence to public interest, unless it is to be construed that the whole business program of press associations in the past has betrayed that interest. What is proposed is that a press association shall have the right to select its customers.

This proposal has a parallel in numerous types of businesses which reserve the right to refuse service to anyone. Many restaurants post signs stating this right; theaters often are similarly placarded.

Specialists in the publishing field feel that the Supreme Court ruling establishes a policy and a threat which are against the traditions and the essentials of democracy. Despite this, the Associated Press has amended its bylaws to comply with the decision. The restraint should be removed before it leads to evils menacing to gathering and distribution of news, and the way to do this has been indicated in H. R. 6301.

Pending Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELLIS E. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, Congress has before it now the Kilgore resolution to investigate industrial disputes. It has legislation to set a minimum wage standard; to strengthen mine safety laws; it has legislation for health and accident insurance. It could extend OPA to prevent prices—and therefore wages—from spiralling upward. If it would act courageously and quickly on such constructive legislation, we would soon see an end of strikes. Ill-advised and anti-labor legislation right now would create nothing but tension and ill will among 14,000,000 union members and it is for this reason that I heartily endorse the following statement of the National Lawyers Guild, which I include in my remarks:

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON LABOR LAW OF THE NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD ON PENDING LABOR LEGISLATION IN THE CONGRESS.

The labor-law committee of the National Lawyers Guild respectfully requests that this statement of its position on pending labor legislation be made part of the record of the current debate in the Senate.

We are fearful that hysteria will animate any legislation which the Senate may now adopt. Hysteria is not too strong a characterization of current moods in Washington, in much of the Nation's press, and in the Senate itself. What but hysteria could account for the suggestion made by Civilian Production Administrator Small that strikes be outlawed for 6 months? We believe that a suggestion so violative of fundamental American liberties demands Mr. Small's immediate removal.

Hysteria also is behind the proposal that health and welfare funds administered by unions be outlawed. Millions of American workers now receive the protection of such funds in a large number of diversified industries, to the satisfaction of themselves and to their employers. Such funds contribute to high morale, productive efficiency, and to the public welfare by removing heavy charges on the community at large. There is no more justification for removing this subject from collective bargaining than there would be in removing the subject of wages. We also doubt the constitutionality of any such step.

The Case bill as passed by the House also betrays lack of a reasoned approach. It would do violence to basic legislation like the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act which were based on 50 years of profoundly bitter experience with labor disputes and which were passed only after decades of wide public debate of their fundamental premises. Those who believe they can safely recreate legal principles which failed to prevent the use of troops, of militia, of police forces, and which encouraged contempt of legislatures and courts, are living in a fool's paradise. If they do so with their eyes open, they will be guilty of deliberately flouting history and the public welfare.

The Senate should act on facts and not on headlines. The Kilgore resolution to set up an investigating committee gives it an opportunity to do so in harmony with the great traditions of senatorial investigating committees. We respectfully urge the Senate to adopt the resolution and get to work uncovering the basic causes of industrial disputes.

Salaries of the Federal Judiciary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Attorney General Tom C. Clark before the Westchester County Bar Association on May 11, 1946, at the Hotel Biltmore, New York City:

Gentlemen of the Westchester bar, for the past several months there has been tremendous interest on the part of the Congress and the people regarding the salaries paid our brethren of the bench and bar in the Federal service.

I recently testified before the congressional committee on the salaries of the Federal judiciary and my remarks elicited interest in many sources.

We lawyers all like to talk shop and one of the principal features of shop talk is fees.

The courts necessarily play a major part in our Government because it is there that the laws are declared and applied.

It is axiomatic of the law that it soon gathers dust in the archives unless it is invoked.

While we have thousands of laws, public interest is generally centered in a veritable handful which are the most commonly discussed in open court.

That famous legal scholar, Roscoe Pound, dean emeritus, Harvard Law School, once remarked, "Law, as distinguished from laws, calls for judges."

The relative importance of the judiciary in our system of government was noted and realized in its very inception, even before the adoption of our Constitution by the States.

At that time, Alexander Hamilton wrote "Laws are a dead letter without courts to expound and define their true meaning and operation."

During the deliberations on the bill in the first Congress establishing our judicial structures, it was remarked that the preservation of a constitution of the United States and the individual States depends, in a great measure, on the wisdom, impartiality, and independence of the judges.

I bring these examples before you merely to refreshen your minds because all lawyers know and appreciate the responsibility of the judiciary, not alone in hearing cases and pronouncing sentences, but in preserving the respect for law without which no government can long operate.

This country has witnessed in the past and, I am sorry to say, is witnessing now, a general disrespect for law, and I, as your Attorney General, and the lawyer, it has been said, for the people, have a growing consciousness of the importance the Federal judiciary plays in maintaining traditional respect for law.

Manifestly, the prestige and the effect of these courts is determined by the character of the men who serve on them.

It is clear that we need the most capable judges obtainable—judges who will be independent, men who are well trained in our tradition, strong men, experienced lawyers, honest and intelligent.

The adequacy of the salaries paid to these men is a major factor to assure the selection and maintenance of judges qualified to uphold our constitutional system.

Daniel Webster once said, "Justice is the greatest interest of man on earth and * * * that those who administer justice should be adequately compensated."

Salaries that now exist are not only a deterent in obtaining outstanding men for our Federal judiciary, but they are a scandal.

During my short tenure as Attorney General several men have turned down these lifetime positions on the bench because of the inadequacy of the salaries.

We pay the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court $20,500; the Associate Justices, $20,000; the judges of the circuit courts of appeal, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and the Court of Claims, $12,500.

The district judges receive $10,000.

This sounds fairly adequate on paper, but, actually, it must be observed that these salaries were fixed about 20 years ago, and economic and social conditions have changed in this period.

According to a reliable study of professional earnings made recently, the upper 10 percent of American lawyers earn from $9,000 to $150,000 per annum.

Surely we must consider the Federal courts as representative of this class of lawyers.

These judges have seen since 1926 the increased cost of living, and taxes have reduced very substantially the true worth of their salaries.

In 1926 Federal judiciary salaries were not subject to income taxes and, further, it was not then believed that salaries of judges would ever be taxed.

Subsequently, however, Congress provided in the Revenue Act that salaries of judges must be included in gross income for Federal tax purposes.

In addition, in 1939, Congress permitted local taxing authorities to subject those same salaries to State income taxation.

Today, assuming that he is married, has no dependent children, no outside income, and no unusual deductions, an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court would pay a Federal income tax of $7,035, leaving him a net salary of $12,965; similarly, a circuit court judge would pay $3,365, leaving a balance of $9,135, and a district judge $2,400 out of his $10,000, leaving a balance of $7,600.

If we count the additional State income tax, the net salary received might well be considered a miserable one.

For example:

In the State of New York, the net salary of a Federal district judge is about $7,000—a shameful amount for such an official.

In the meantime, prices have risen, and while a district judge in 1913 received $7,500 here in New York, in that year he could buy a dollar's worth of living for 70 cents. Now it costs him $1.29—a sharp reduction in his standard of living.

In other countries the value of the judiciary is recognized more strongly.

In England, the Lord Chancellor receives £10,000, or about $40,000 at the present rate of exchange.

This amount should be contrasted with the $20,500 received by our Chief Justices of the United States.

The salaries all through the British judiciary are much higher than ours and, actually, even in these times their income taxes are not too disproportionate.

In England the lowest paid county judge with a jurisdiction limited to $400, receives approximately $8,000 a year.

The chief judge in Eire receives $25,000, and judges in India, corresponding to our district judges, receive $24,000 each.

In your own State of New York, you pay the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals $25,500, and the associate judges $25,000, to which has now been added a $1,000 cost-of-living bonus. This is $6,000 a year more than is paid to the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

In 1944 the State of New York alone paid out in judicial salaries over $1,500,000 more than did the Federal Government.

I am sure the American people do not wish such sacrifies from their public servants.

The district judge is a leading citizen in his community and the judicial position is one of great honor and dignity. The one who occupies it should have sufficient means to maintain that position with propriety, independence, and dignity.

Also in the category of underpaid public servants are the lawyers for the Federal Government. Their salaries run from $2,100 to $15,000 a year. There is only one $15,000 job. That is mine.

But, of course, you may say that the lawyer for the Federal Government does not have the office rent and clerical expenses incident upon private practice.

This is true—and the average Federal lawyer is grateful for the prestige of his job and for the opportunity in doing big things for the people of the United States and for the facilities afforded him. But the disparity between what is paid some of our lawyers in our big cases and those received by lawyers in private practice on the other side of those cases is, indeed, a marvel.

Let me enumerate some of the amounts paid to our legal staff and those that we estimate private firms collected in outstanding cases. In a big case involving a motion picture firm, we paid out a total of $80,000 in salaries, and the movie firm paid a million dollars in fees.

We won the case.

In another case, an antitrust matter, we paid $60,000 to our Government lawyers, and the opposing counsel received $700,000.

We won that case, too.

Invariably, counsel fees for the defense run about 10 times what our lawyers get.

Some years ago at a hearing before a Senate investigating committee, Mr. J. P. Morgan had occasion to correct an offhand statement by one of the participants who ventured to quote the Bible to the effect that money is the source of evil. "It is not money the Bible refers to" Mr. Morgan was careful to point out, "it is the love of money."

To those who crave money, employment as Government lawyers can afford little satisfaction.

The motives that bring lawyers into the service of their Government are of a different character.

True, there are tremendous satisfactions in Government service.

There are thrills and joys that come from public service that transcend material values measured in money's worth.

This is abundantly true of those Government lawyers whose role and function is advocacy.

What advocate could want a worthier client than the United States of America?

For what cause can a lawyer plead with greater sincerity and devotion of purpose than the public interest of all the people of the United States?

But what client and what cause is deserving of better representatives at the bar?

What client and what cause is more entitled to command the best in skill and ability that the bar can muster?

This is a practical world.

And while idealism plays a very practical part in bringing to the Government service lawyers of ability and distinction, idealism cannot do the whole job.

The lawyer who, through idealism and patriotism, is moved to enter the Government service may have to make real sacrifices, both in immediate income and in giving up or delaying the development of his long-term private practice.

Some sacrifices, perhaps, we have a right to expect of lawyers who enter public service.

The distinction, the honor, and the satisfaction that come from public service are themselves compensation of a rewarding kind.

But have we not gone too far in expecting sacrifices, both as a matter of fairness and from the sound business point of view that to attract able lawyers to Government service the compensations, both professional and financial, must be attractive in competition with what is available in the field of private practice?

Even in private practice all lawyers are not rich and successful.

But all lawyers are not in the class of ability, training, or experience to warrant their employment by the client which is deserving of the finest in ability, training, and experience.

The fair basis of comparison is not the annual salary of the Government lawyer as compared to the yearly income of the private practitioner, but what the actual earnings of each are in a particular litigation.

Generally speaking, exactly the same kind of skill and ability are required on both sides of the same case. If dollars or property are involved, both the Government and the private litigant opposed to it have an equal stake in the outcome of the litigation. If, for example, the Government is being sued for the recovery of $35,000,000 worth of property taken over by the Alien Property Custodian as enemy property, the Government's stake in the case is $35,000,000 in as real a sense as that of the private party.

And because the Government is involved in such large affairs—in transactions of such gigantic importance—contracts, lands, taxes, antitrust matters—its lawsuits, both as plaintiff and defendant, commonly do involve staggering millions of dollars. The total stake of the Government in pending litigation easily exceeds a billion dollars.

And many, many individual cases in themselves each involve several million dollars. Sometimes the amount involved cannot be measured in dollars. Take, for example, injunction suits where a private litigant is seeking to enjoin a whole program of the Government of enormous significance. The consequences of losing such a case might be disastrous from the Government's point of view.

In these cases need I ask how the Government lawyers' compensation compares with the fees gladly paid by the private litigants to their lawyers? What the Government lawyer is paid is a matter of public record.

The most he can be paid is $10,000 a year.

Typically, a very first rate government lawyer is paid from $5,000 to $6,000 per year.

Many Government lawyers of very real ability are paid much less than that.

Salaries paid to Assistant United States Attorneys, many of whom handle a tremendous number of cases involving very large amounts, are shockingly low.

No statistics are available on the fees paid by private litigants to private lawyers in cases of litigation with the Government.

But, just as a matter of clinical observation, we know that the fees paid the private lawyers are many, many times those paid Government lawyers, sometimes 100 times the amount.

The 100-to-1 ratio, it must be said, may be exceptional.

But ratios of 10 to 1 are the everyday experience.

Even higher ratios are common.

My thesis is not that the salaries of Government lawyers should be raised to equal those paid to their opponents in private practice.

That is an impractical objective.

Such a solution would be neither feasible legislatively nor would it take into account the philosophic implications of a career of public service according to our best traditions.

My thesis is that something should be done about the gross disproportion between Government salaries and private fees; that a more balanced relationship should be sought and achieved; that the ratio be brought a little closer to what common sense calls for.

Only in this way can we assure that the very real need of the Government for the finest in legal services will be met.

Only in this way can our best traditions of public service be maintained and developed.

The objective, moreover, is an economical one.

The returns to the Government from the added cost, measured in dollars and cents, would, I am sure, far exceed the cost.

The penny-wise practice we have been following is dollar-foolish, and it is time we put a halt to it, if only for financial reasons.

A National Insurance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony given by myself before the Ways and Means Committee on March 11 of this year:

AMENDMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEES ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, D. C., March 11, 1946.

The committee reconvened at 10:30 a. m., the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please be in order.

The first witness on the calendar this morning is the Honorable JERRY VOORHIS, Representative in Congress from California.

Mr. VOORHIS, we are happy to have you appear before the committee this morning.

STATEMENT OF JERRY VOORHIS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to divide my testimony into two parts, if I may. The first part will deal with suggested specific amendments to the old-age and survivors' insurance title of the act as it now stands. The second portion will contain what I believe to be a constructive proposal for certain fundamental changes in the Social Security System.

I will go rather fast, Mr. Chairman, with the understanding that the committee will stop me if they want to ask me any questions. I do not want to take any more of your time than I can help, because I know how long and hard this committee has worked.

In the first place, I think it is quite evident that all military service should be counted as covered employment toward old-age and survivors' insurance. I believe the way to handle it is for the Government to pay into the fund the necessary contribution so the time spent in military service will count as covered employment for the men who have been gone in the Army and who should have been building up their entitlements just the same as if they had stayed at home and worked in covered employment.

I put in a bill for that purpose, and I believe several other Members did the same thing.

Mr. GEARHART. May I inquire as to what amount per month would be considered a fair basis?

Mr. VOORHIS. My bill is based upon the calculation that the minimum earnings to be calculated would be $100 a month. That is, if a man's pay was less than $100 a month he would be covered in the system as if he had earned $100 a month; and if he earned more than $100 a month he should get the monthly average up to a maximum of $250.

Mr. GEARHART. I think the Social Security Board have recommended that we arbitrarily select a figure and they suggested a figure of $160 a month.

Mr. VOORHIS. That would be quite all right with me. You mean assume that the earnings had been that?

Mr. GEARHART. Just fix an arbitrary figure that would be a fair average.

Mr. VOORHIS. I imagine that would be a fair average.

The second point is to suggest that some plan be worked out so that temporary Government employees, that is, people who worked less than 5 years for the Government on temporary war-service appointments, should be allowed to contribute their refunds from civil-service retirement fund to social security and obtain credit for a proper number of quarters of covered employment.

The third suggestion I want to make is a provision for a change in the law so that if a person works less than the required number of quarters and either dies, or, as in the case of some of our fruit packing house workers, is removed from protection of this act, or becomes 65 without dependents, he should be entitled to a refund of the amount of taxes actually paid in by him.

I think there is a lot of misunderstanding about that, Mr. Chairman. I have received explanations from the Board, but those explanations are hardly convincing to the person who pays into the system but never receives anything in return. In other words, it seemed to me it ought to be possible for the amount of his own tax to be refunded to him.

Then the fourth suggestion is that if a person has worked in covered employment for the required number of quarters, and has become entitled to OASI, then either retires or goes out of covered employment, and later comes back into covered employment, whether he is 65 or not, he should be entitled to have his entitlement recomputed and the months he did not work in covered employment ought not to count in determining the divisor. I do not think I need to explain that further.

This is my fifth point. I believe I am correct in this, and if I am not, I want to be corrected and I will not say any more about it. A woman, let us say, has a crippled husband. Maybe she is married to a disabled veteran, or somebody like that. Unlike a man, if that woman earns retirement she does not receive anything for the support of her crippled husband. If a man has a crippled wife, then he would get it. That does not seem fair to me. It seems to me it ought to work both ways.

Then, in the next place, I think it is important that some dignified provision be made for the people who were too old in the very beginning to have any chance to build up an entitlement to title II annuity. I believe there have been bills introduced to do that. The people I am talking about are those that were too old when the act first began to have any chance to work in covered employment. I think there should be some way that they could be covered, maybe by some nominal contribution being made on their part, or in some way, so that they could, if they wanted to, come in under the act.

Finally, on this part of my testimony, I believe there should be provision to allow anyone to purchase annuities with Government bonds they hold.

I have two or three reasons for this. In the first place, it would give certain added security to those people who have those Government bonds for the future. In the second place, it would be one of the best ways that I know of to prevent the time coming when a whole lot of people would attempt to cash in those bonds all at once, when you would get, in effect, a run on the Treasury. It would also prevent additional inflation.

If a fair, reasonable plan could be worked out so people could exchange those bonds for a future entitlement to annuity payments, bonds in effect being canceled in consideration of that future annuity payment to the individual, it seems to me we would be taking a very sound step.

I have written the Treasury about this and the reply I got to it was that they did not know how many people would do it. I admit that, but it does not seem to me that is much of an argument against the plan.

Now, Mr. Chairman, those are the specific proposals that I wanted to make to the committee.

Now, I would like, if I may, to proceed to certain considerations about the whole Social Security System, which seem to me to be very important at this particular time.

The core of America's economic problem is the necessity of adjusting active demand for goods to our ever-increasing capacity to produce. No industrial nation has ever done this effectively yet, which is the fundamental reason every industrial nation has thought it had to export an over-all surplus of goods.

Our choice is between, on the one hand, high level of national income and production—an economy of genuine abundance—resting upon a base of ample, maintained, and well-distributed mass buying power, with freedom; and, on the other hand, a periodic failure of demand, continuous effort by governmental control and monopoly restrictions to reduce supply, low production, low national income, and artificial scarcity with ever-growing regimentation.

We cannot achieve the first alternative unless we raise our sights and broaden our vision. But we must achieve it, if, in world-wide competition for the allegiance of millions of people, we are to justify our free economic and political system as against totalitarian ones.

But we desire to achieve this goal of a high-level economy without deficit financing, without WPA's, without Government direction of the citizens' economic life.

What I am trying to say is that in these critical years if the United States can demonstrate that we can have sustained prosperity, a rising level of production, and national well-being, with our free system, we will in the long run win the allegiance of all the wavering people of this world and we will be able to win the race against totalitarian systems. But we desire to achieve this goal of a high-level economy without resorting to continuing increase in our national debt.

We can do so by using effective monetary and fiscal policies. They must be dynamic policies, but they need not add at all to the power of government. They must induce full employment, not give it. They must bring about a high sustained level of demand by the people which is the one sane way to secure continuously increasing production and continuously vital expansion of the economic system as a whole.

The principal tool we can use for this purpose is a broadened, dynamic Social Security Act.

Basically, three categories of our people should be covered: One, those beyond a reasonable retirement age; two, the disabled; and, three, dependent children. Unemployment insurance is important at present but only because the fundamental job of economic adjustment has not been well enough done. The major purpose of unemployment insurance is to get to the place where it will be unnecessary. It is not an aim in itself.

I am not arguing against unemployment insurance at all, but I am saying that we have unemployment insurance because people who ought to have jobs and want to have jobs have not gotten them.

All people in the population who fall in the three categories mentioned above should be covered by the act.

At present those not covered are paying in higher prices, at least the major portion of the employer's contribution to the OASI of those that are covered. I do not think I need to explain that. Those people in the population who are not covered by the act pay the same prices as those that are and those prices reflect at least a part of the employers' contribution to the taxes that support those who are covered. A man gets old even if he is a farmer or farm worker or self-employed. A woman gets old even if she is a domestic worker or a stenographer for a nonprofit institution.

There is, furthermore, no reason to provide for the blind alone and leave out the handicapped and disabled people. I understand the committee is not hearing testimony on the title that has to do with the blind and I will not burden you with it now. However, I would like to say I have a bill, H. R. 2020, which has been referred to this committee, the purpose of which is to allow additional earnings to be made by blind people over and beyond their pension payments without reducing the pension, because of the psychological benefits that I think that gives.

Above all, our provision for dependent children is pitifully inadequate. My conception of the objective of aid to dependent children is to make it possible for all America's children to be cared for by their own mothers when the bread winner of the family is taken away.

Personally, I would add one more title to the act at least. This would be a title making provision for Federal grants to States for children's school-lunch programs. This would be preventive health insurance and a great step toward the solution of our agricultural as well as some of our worst social problems.

Deeply interested as I am in the individual and collective welfare of the groups I have mentioned, I am even more deeply concerned about the welfare of the Nation as a whole. I want the Social Security Act to become an economic stabilization and security act for the whole country. That is why I want it to be made a big enough program to do that job. Maybe it needs health insurance as well to accomplish this purpose. But I want most of all right now to make my central purpose clear. I believe, properly set up, the Social Security System can provide the major portion of the answer we have sought so long to booms and depressions, inflation and deflation, and the burden of debt.

Difficulties of covering new groups into the act are admitted. But this could be easily done by levying a broad general tax like the wartime victory tax for example. I would oppose this for other purposes, incidentally. But for this purpose I think it is different. This tax providing reasonable but not very large exemptions and then making every one eligible to a basic old-age annuity.

The CHAIRMAN. Regardless of their financial condition?

Mr. VOORHIS. I am coming to that.

Present pay-roll taxes could be continued or not. If they were continued to preserve the incentives of possibility of higher annuities by specific contributions, then they should be the means of entitling pay-roll taxpayers to additional annuities above the basic one. Or those paying pay-roll taxes could go ahead as they now are and be excused from payment of the other tax. Or pay-roll taxes could be discontinued and those who have built up special entitlements under the present system could be fairly compensated. This problem, however, is a detail.

But answering the chairman's question, what I would do, Mr. Chairman, to avoid investigations of people to find out whether they have cousins some place that could be called upon to support them, considerations of little homes, and things like that, I would simply say that if the income was below a certain amount, as determined by their income-tax returns, they should be eligible for enough to bring them up to that certain amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The temptation there would be to get rid of the low income.

Mr. VOORHIS. That could be avoided, of course, by making everybody eligible, which does not seem to me to be particularly objectionable. In other words, everybody would be paying the tax. The amount that you would pay to well-to-do people would be a drop in the bucket so far as they were concerned. You would avoid all the expenses of administration under those circumstances. Above all, you would have the orderly means of purchasing power distribution, which is the main thing I am after. But it seems to me that the basing of the entitlement on the income-tax returns could be rather readily worked out if you wanted to do that.

Mr. CURTIS. Are you talking about the OASI?

Mr. VOORHIS. I am talking about the Social Security System as a whole. I am proposing a broad tax similar to the Victory tax as a contribution the people would make.

Mr. CURTIS. What would be wrong if you made it universal?

Mr. VOORHIS. I was not arguing about making the benefits taxable. But I think we have got to make up our minds whether we are going to exempt all such payments or none of them. I think we are going to have to make that fundamental decision. We have already exempted a number of similar benefits from taxation. We ought to exempt them all or else we ought not to exempt any of them, and we ought to fix the rates in accordance therewith.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to get you clear. I have great respect for your opinion. What is the fundamental difference between your plan and that of Dr. Townsend?

Mr. VOORHIS. I do not believe that there is a fundamental difference, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. It looks like you ought to get on his bandwagon, then.

Mr. VOORHIS. I have no quarrel with him certainly. The contrary is rather the case.

The CHAIRMAN. Why should you fight with different armies?

Mr. VOORHIS. I am not.

The CHAIRMAN. I am trying to get you clear. Are you here approving the Townsend plan?

Mr. VOORHIS. I am here speaking for myself.

The CHAIRMAN. What plan? I know you are speaking for yourself. Are you behind the Townsend plan or behind a separate plan, or do you want to weld the two plans together? What is your plan?

Mr. VOORHIS. I would support and have supported the basic Townsend proposal, Mr. Chairman, since it was revised in recent years. I am trying to lay down some fundamental principles on which all these proposals could be welded together, as the chairman puts it. When I first ran for Congress I was asked by the Townsend organization in my district if I was for $200 a month. I said, "I do not think it is possible, and I will not tell you I do think so, because I do not." I lost the endorsement, and my opponent received the endorsement.

The CHAIRMAN. How much a month are you for?

Mr. VOORHIS. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that under the proposal that I have here, it probably would be possible for us to provide $60 a month.

The CHAIRMAN. How much would that cost the Treasury, and how would you secure the funds?

Mr. VOORHIS. I told you how I would secure the funds.

The CHAIRMAN. You said a broad tax. You did not say how much.

Mr. VOORHIS. I think my point will be clear as I go along.

The CHAIRMAN. Will it be a sales tax or an income tax?

Mr. VOORHIS. It would be an income tax with hardly any deductions except a basic exemption of a certain amount.

The CHAIRMAN. Special income tax or an addition to present income tax?

Mr. VOORHIS. It would be a special tax similar to the wartime victory tax.

The CHAIRMAN. Not a gross income?

Mr. VOORHIS. It would be similar to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give us an estimate of the cost on your $60 a month for everybody that has passed a certain age?

Mr. VOORHIS. It would depend upon whether you continued to have the States pay a portion or not, and whether you used Federal funds to supplement State payments, which could be done if you change the formula somewhat. I have not calculated that cost, Mr. Chairman, in connection with this

testimony. I will be glad to do it and insert it in my remarks, if you would like to have me do it.

Frankly, I am primarily concerned with the matter of having means of maintaining buying power continuously through the years more than I am with any other consideration in this.

If I can just go on a little bit further, I think I can show you how I want the tax to tie in with the out-payments.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, it is also very important, is it not, not only to maintain buying power but to maintain earning power?

Mr. VOORHIS. It certainly is.

The CHAIRMAN. When a man is able to earn money and earn a living you think he should be then made a public charge on the Treasury?

Mr. VOORHIS. No, I do not; not at all. I would like to point out that the only three groups of people that I am proposing that should be included in this are people beyond an age of retirement, disabled people and dependent children. I think it most important that the Social Security System should not get involved with maintenance of people in the prime of life who want to and ought to be at work supporting their families. I do not want that to be involved in the act.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you foresee any great difficulty in the administration of your plan with justice to the Government and justice to the individuals that claim benefits under the system?

Mr. VOORHIS. No, sir; I think it would be much simpler than the present plan.

The CHAIRMAN. How much of the present plan would you abandon?

Mr. VOORHIS. I have already explained that I think it is necessary to tie my proposal in with the present system in some way. You could let the present system go on for the people that are now covered and apply this new system only for the ones that are not now covered. I think it is going to be rather hard, for example, to include some of the groups that are not now under the act in the same way that you have got the people that are now covered by pay-roll tax. I have what I think is a pretty simple proposal whereby you could cover the whole balance of the population under it.

The CHAIRMAN. If they are all covered under one plan do you propose covering some of them by additional plans?

Mr. VOORHIS. You could do that. I left it open for the committee to decide what they would want to do about that. I said either you could cover the people that are not now covered by the plan I am proposing and let the people that are now covered by title II go ahead as they are now or that you could repeal the pay-roll tax and put everybody under the proposal I made, making some kind of a fair settlement with the ones who have built up entitlement under title II, which I think you would have to do. Or you could let both systems work at once and people paying pay-roll taxes in addition to the basic tax would do so for the purpose of getting additional payments over and beyond the basic pension, the basic annuity, whatever you want to call it.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not answered my question as to how much it would cost.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Chairman, I did not. If you want me to take 3 or 4 minutes to calculate about what it would be, I will do it, or I will put in my remarks at this point as best I can figure it.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

(The calculation mentioned above is as follows:)

"I believe we can assume a figure of 10,000,000 as about the number of people who would be eligible for old-age annuities under this proposal. Therefore if the Federal Government paid the whole amount and if everyone came completely under some such program as I am here proposing, the annual cost to the Federal Government would be 12 times $60 equals $720 times 10,000,000 or $7,200,000,000. However, the extra burden would not be that much even if the Federal Government paid the whole cost, because either we could count the major portion of present pay-roll taxes as a deduction from needed new revenue or else we could repeal those taxes, thus reducing the net tax burden on the country.

"Then there is the question whether the States should participate in the system. Supposing that the Wickersham bill, H. R. 4747, for which there is strong support, were to pass, the Federal Government would pay a flat $40 a month with the States supplementing as they saw fit. Under such a plan, the cost would be two thirds of $7,200,000,000 or $4,800,000,000.

"But the essential point is that since all of the money collected in taxes under this plan would be promptly returned to the people of the entire country and kept in constant circulation, the net burden on the economy as a whole would really be nil. Everyone, sooner or later, would share the benefits directly. Everyone would immediately share the benefits indirectly from a substantial stabilization of our economic system.

Mr. VOORHIS. The major considerations, it seems to me, are these:

The Social Security Act is at present only a partial and inadequate measure. It covers only a portion of the population and provides only meagerly for some of them. The first step should be to greatly broaden the social-security system so that it will include old-age retirement pensions for all older people in the Nation who have reached the age where their employment in industry becomes generally difficult and at times virtually impossible. Just what this age should be ought to be determined by general economic conditions, but it is probable that it should not be older than 60 years in normal times. Coverage should be universal as to all persons in receipt of incomes less than a certain amount who have attained the stipulated retirement age.

In addition, the act should be broadened to include reasonable provision for all disabled persons and should not be limited as at present to the blind.

In the third place, the aid to dependent children ought to be broadened and increased so that it would be true that a mother deprived of a breadwinner in the family could devote herself to the care of the children without being compelled to support them economically at the same time.

The volume of production of food by American farmers is abundant, both in good times and bad. In the name of justice, therefore, action must be taken to maintain a market for agricultural commodities which will be somewhere near commensurate with the supply of food. We must never again permit hunger and farm surpluses to exist side by side. There should be provisions for financing the purchase of what otherwise would become surplus food commodities and making them available to local school districts for school lunches and undernourished children.

Under these circumstances, the Social Security Act would really constitute what the name implies—a thing it does not do at present. It would provide protection against dependence in old age; it would provide aid to the disabled among the population; it would protect the American home; it would protect the health of children. From an economic point of view, however, a broadened national insurance program of this sort would constitute a means of maintaining the general buying power of the Nation through the years and would become not only a social security system but an economic social-security system for the entire country. Furthermore, this plan would not interfere in the slightest degree with the self-dependence of any able-bodied American citizen in the productive years of life. It would not increase the power of the Government by one iota but would be a means of passing economic power on to millions of citizens in the purchasing power that they would consistently receive.

The crucial point in this proposal, however, is found in a method of financing the system which will make it possible to use it as a means of regulating and evening out the flow of demand in the country. Since this program would be of benefit to the entire population, it should be basically financed by a broad, general tax similar to the so-called victory tax levied during the war. There should be reasonable exemptions, high enough to cover the minimum amount necessary for a basic standard of living, but no other substantial deductions from gross income should be allowed, excepting this basic exemption. The rate of tax should be fixed so as to finance the entire system in times of prosperity and reasonably full employment and to provide some surplus in addition at such times. Then it should be provided in the act that the tax would be lowered or eliminated entirely, if necessary, in times of threatening deflation, falling prices, and unemployment. Thus, with the out-payments continuing at a time like that, we would be equipped with an automatic device for increasing the purchasing power of the country in an orderly fashion at a time when such action was needed to assure continuing employment."

The question arises as to how the necessary funds would be provided for out-payments under these circumstances. The first part of that answer is that any surplus accumulated in the fund would be used first. But the second part of the answer is that since the economic problem of the Nation would be one of matching potential production with equivalent buying power in the hands of the people, the Congress itself would be entirely justified and correct in authorizing the creation of a sufficient volume of new money or national credit to maintain the out-payments of the national insurance or social-security system in lieu of tax revenues. Instead of permitting the private banks to create new money needed to expand purchasing power at a time of threatening deflation and then compelling the Government of the Nation to borrow that new money back from the private banks at interest, it is here proposed that the Government create the new money itself in the first place. This would not be inflation because the money would be used by the recipients of social-security benefits for the purchase of goods in process of production, which goods would otherwise go without a market. The new money would only be the means of warding off deflation and depression and of maintaining the price level at a reasonably stable average. Thus the national debt need not be increased by a single dollar under this proposal.

If we are sincere in wanting to maintain freedom in our economic system, we have to have the means of preventing mass unemployment in the future. The program here proposed would go a major distance in accomplishing that purpose by itself. It does not rest upon any further increases in the national debt, nor upon any unwarranted invasion of the realm of private enterprise by Government. Neither does it involve discretionary decisions by Government agencies nor an increase in Government power. The only place where governmental decisions would be made would be in the reduction of the tax rate and certainly this is a measure to which no one will object.

Action to curb monopoly power, to develop the natural resources of the Nation for the common welfare, to maintain a decent basic

level of minimum wage in the country, to prevent precipitous declines in farm prices—all these would be required in addition. But the basic problem of maintaining an adequate flow of buying power in the markets of the country at all times would have been largely answered. And that is the one basic necessity if there are to be good jobs and steady ones for the veterans of America's wars as well as others in the population.

That is all of my statement, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You have said a good deal that does not come under the head of title II. You being a Member of Congress, of course, we let you present your views. Some of that comes under title I. Some of it does not come under any title. It is entirely a new proposal.

Anyhow, we are glad to have your views.

Mr. VOORHIS. I think you are quite right that probably I have gotten over into title I. But my purpose is to render it unnecessary to have more than one title so far as old age is concerned.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Voorhis, you have raised some points that cause all of us some concern, especially if we are going to have full coverage. If we take in the self-employed and the low-income farmers and great groups of domestics and farm laborers, the most they can ever expect to draw is $10 a month.

Mr. VOORHIS. That is right.

Mr. CARLSON. At the present time I am told that 10 percent of our people who draw OASI payments are getting additional benefits from the old-age-benefit section. If they draw additional and then they draw only a maximum of $10, we will have to greatly supplement it. I think you have something.

Mr. VOORHIS. The whole purpose of title II, as I get it, was to try to get these payments completely out of the realm of social welfare and charity payments, and everything else, to put it on a basis of contributory entitlement. What I am trying to do is suggest a means whereby those other people could be put more or less on the same basis, and whereby from a financial point of view they actually would be on that basis.

Mr. CARLSON. I think everyone must agree that if we are to have a national social-security program it ought to include everyone, but when you analyze it you will find that millions of our people will never draw over $10 a month unless we change the law.

Mr. VOORHIS. Exactly, so the system falls short of its intended purpose. You could do it by the means I have proposed.

Mr. CARLSON. I think it is a very interesting suggestion.

Mr. VOORHIS. Thank you very much. You would have to calculate first of all what methods you would provide. If you had this system broadened as much as I have proposed here it would be a very important economic factor. I think the system has got to be broad enough so as to have real impact on the economy in order for that to be true.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Voorhis, I was very much interested in your suggestion of a new system to be supported by a tax in the nature of a wartime victory tax. That is in the nature of a gross income tax, isn't it?

Mr. VOORHIS. That is correct.

Mr. GEARHART. If we levied a tax of that type would you have it collected with the general income-tax collections?

Mr. VOORHIS. You mean would I have it collected at the same time?

Mr. GEARHART. Yes; as part of the tax shown on the returns.

Mr. VOORHIS. Well, in some instances it might be difficult to do it quite that way, but I think that a very simple return could be used for it.

Mr. GEARHART. I was just thinking that in time of peace, there will be millions of people not on the income-tax rolls at all.

Mr. VOORHIS. Yes; that is true.

Mr. GEARHART. So the social security tax system would have to be independent in order to cover everybody and reach into everybody's pocket for support of everybody's program. It would have to be separately handled.

Mr. VOORHIS. Yes; under those circumstances it certainly would. The only thing would be that if a person did file an income tax it would seem to me there should be a place provided for him to fill it in.

Mr. GEARHART. When the tax is collected from all the people for the benefit of a program for all the people, do you, in viewing your system, contemplate the paying of equal pensions to all of the oldsters as they reach the maturity date?

Mr. VOORHIS. That is what I contemplated; yes.

Mr. GEARHART. Supposing we had the victory tax system. If a man earned a little bit, paid very little tax, and another man who earned great sums, lived proportionately well, paid very much in taxes, you believe that when they reach the retirement age the system should be equalized so they would all draw the same amount?

Mr. VOORHIS. I would say to my colleague from California that I think there would be certain inequities in there, but I think there is also inequity in a situation where the fellow who has the greatest need gets the least.

Mr. GEARHART. I am assuming that both individuals at age 65 will need assistance. One has contributed tremendously to the payment of pensions to other people during his productive days, while the other has contributed very little. I am not criticizing the man that has contributed little, and I am not praising the man that has contributed much. But it seems to me it will be a bitter pill for the man who has contributed much to the support of his Government, and has lived well at the same time, to be forced to cut his standard of living down to the level of the other man.

Mr. VOORHIS. Of course, the Government is not telling him he has to do it. But in your example, it seems to me quite clear that if this fellow who had this big income really squandered it all——

Mr. GEARHART (interposing). It is it not squandering; 1929's come around once in a while and wipe a man out and all the ingenuity in the world cannot foresee or prevent such consequences.

Mr. VOORHIS. That is true.

Mr. GEARHART. Nobody is going to ask a pension from the Government of the United States who is able to take care of himself. I am thinking of the poor fellow who has all of his life helped this system, paid liberally, and thereby benefited other people less fortunate. Are we going to say to him that he should not draw benefits proportionate to his contribution?

Mr. VOORHIS. Let me answer it this way. I think you could work out an actuarily sound scheme like you have under title II of keeping track of tax payments made by the people and over a period of years try to graduate those payments in accordance with those tax payments. But I think you are going to have a terribly complex system if you are going to try to do it that way.

Mr. GEARHART. I was thinking how difficult that would be for the people in the lower-income bracket. They do not keep records of the taxes they pay. The only thing I am thinking about is justice based upon sacrifice. I think a man should draw in accordance with the sacrifice he makes during his productive years.

Mr. VOORHIS. As a matter of principle. I would agree with you that the principle of sacrifice should be included. You would run into all kinds of gradations in that, because you are going to have some men who never had a chance to contribute as much as your man did, but the reason they did not get a chance to contribute was because they happened to have a lot of people to take care of and their living expenses were so great. You get in all kinds of complications like that. We have got to do one thing or another. We either have to keep individual records or we do not.

Mr. GEARHART. Under title II we do.

Mr. VOORHIS. Under title II we do.

Mr. GEARHART. A man gets exactly what he purchases with his pay-roll taxes.

Mr. VOORHIS. Roughly.

Mr. GEARHART. He comes in under the formula and gets what he is entitled to.

Mr. VOORHIS. Yes. The object I am trying to accomplish by my proposal is to get the rest of the population covered.

Mr. GEARHART. Your testimony has been very helpful and has stimulated my thinking. I do not have any definite views. You have certainly helped me on my way of developing views.

Mr. VOORHIS. Thank you. I would like to say that what I have proposed is not anything particularly new, except for my proposal as to financial methods whereby you would use the system to regulate the flow of buying power, not on the out-payment side, but on the side where you raised the money.

Mr. CURTIS. You referred to the contest between our system and the totalitarian system. How old is totalitarianism?

Mr. VOORHIS. It is a lot older than any other system of government. It is the simplest form of government. It is one that can be applied where people have no particular will to freedom or no particular ability to conduct their own affairs. I mean it goes back to the earliest tribes and clans and cities and states.

Mr. CURTIS. No individual or group of individuals who have had any enlightenment at all have deliberately chosen the totalitarian system?

Mr. VOORHIS. Only in times when there was great economic distress, Mr. CURTIS, in a country when the anticipation of a good worth-while, fruitful life was very small, particularly for young people, and when you have some demagogic appeal being made to those fellows to the effect that if you will just follow me I will fix everything up for you and I will put you to work, and while I will be boss, nonetheless you will be better off.

Under those circumstances what you really have is the people making a bargaining where they will sell the birthright of their freedom.

Mr. CURTIS. It is because of false leadership?

Mr. VOORHIS. I believe so.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have watched you over the years.

Mr. VOORHIS. Yes, sir; and I appreciate it.

Mr. GIFFORD. When you first came to Congress did you ever talk favorably toward a $200-a-month pension?

Mr. VOORHIS. No, sir; I never did. You have always had it in the back of your head that I did, but I can show you the documentary records in my first campaign for Congress, and that was the place where I fell down in some folks' views. My opponent said, "Sure, I think we can pay $200 a month." I said to the pension people then, "With your fundamental economic approach to the problem of a great industrial nation in this kind of an age I have no quarrel at all; I think you are correct that along this line of a better means of distributing mass buying power we must go," but I said, "I do not believe that everybody is going to get $200 a month of pension."

Mr. GIFFORD. I have always felt that you were very liberal. I was shocked when you were satisfied with $60 a month.

I want to make this observation. Social security could have no better champion than

you are. I have heard you before committees talking about purchasing power in the hands of the people. You have not given up that idea, have you?

Mr. VOORHIS. Hardly. I think I have been talking about it all morning.

Mr. GIFFORD. You want a broad general tax in prosperous years. Do you mean income tax?

Mr. VOORHIS. In effect an income tax.

Mr. GIFFORD. Do you mean a gross-income tax?

Mr. VOORHIS. Yes; I do in practical effect.

Mr. GIFFORD. Give me a definition of gross-income tax.

Mr. VOORHIS. I gave you the example of the victory tax that we had during the war as something approximating a gross-income tax. It would be a tax on all receipts minus certain necessary deductions. You would have to have some deductions and exemptions, basic exemptions. There are some kinds of receipts that you could not consider to be real income.

Mr. GIFFORD. You say gross income must have some exemptions. Name one.

Mr. VOORHIS. An individual would have to have some exemption, a basic exemption.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have always wondered about a gross-income tax that falls upon the people which might remove entirely any net income.

Mr. VOORHIS. You mean on a business, don't you? In that case it would be calculated as part of business costs, I suppose.

Mr. GIFFORD. Gross income. You say there should be exemptions. I would like for a specialist to take me aside and explain it.

Mr. VOORHIS. Taxes of that character have been levied already in some places. Indiana has one; Hawaii has had one. As I say, our wartime victory tax was something of an approach in that direction.

Now, I am not enough of a tax expert, Mr. Gifford, to tell you exactly how that tax should be set up.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have not found anybody yet that could tell me.

Mr. VOORHIS. I am trying to say—all I am trying to say is really that I am willing to support a tax that would fall rather broadly on practically all of us and would leave us very slight means of escape from it.

Mr. GIFFORD. You want a broad general tax in order to support that $60?

Mr. VOORHIS. I think it is that important. If the system were geared to benefit all the people of the Nation, then I think it would not be socially wrong to levy a tax like that.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to say this much to the committee. He is always so stimulating. I fear him greatly.

Mr. GREGORY. Any further questions? If not, I want to thank you for your testimony.

Mr. VOORHIS. I appreciate the committee hearing me.

Amending the Clayton Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 20, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an address delivered by me on the danger of the monopolistic trend in this country and the need of amending the Clayton Act to prevent monopolistic combinations. The address was delivered the early part of April before a rally of the Community Progress Foundation in Cincinnati, Ohio, with more than a thousand people attending—representatives of various business and professional groups from many cities in the Middle West. The address is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, it is encouraging to come here and visit with this splendid group of independent businessmen. It is good to find that you are so vitally interested in the preservation of our free-enterprise system and that you know of the danger to your own businesses and to the Nation as a whole as a result of the unchecked creation of monopolies in this country. It is good to see the representatives of so many business association groups from the Middle West present here today. I want to pay my respect to Ed. Wimmer, editor of Forward America. Mr. Wimmer has gained many friends in Washington, and attention is paid to what he has to say.

PLUGGING THE LOOPHOLE IN THE CLAYTON ACT

The Clayton Act as a preventative of the formation of monopolies is now a dead letter. The hands of the Federal Trade Commission are tied. No real effort is being made under the Clayton Act to prevent mergers which restrain trade. An effective effort is not possible until Congress amends the law. The "loophole" in section 7 is well known and is usually availed of when a monopolistic acquisition is being accomplished.

Section 7 of the Clayton Act now provides that no corporation engaged in commerce shall acquire the whole or any part of the stock or other share capital of another corporation likewise engaged in commerce where the effect of such acquisition would substantially lessen competition between the corporations or where the result would be to restrain commerce in any section or community, or tend to create a monopoly.

The evil the Congress was trying to wipe out in 1914 when section 7 was written was to prevent corporate mergers which would result in monopolies. This is amply and conclusively shown from the committee reports and debates in the House and Senate on the measure. The Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, in a report dated July 22, 1914, stated as follows:

"Broadly stated, the bill, in its treatment of unlawful restraints and monopolies, seeks to prohibit and make unlawful certain trade practices which, as a rule, singly and in themselves, are not covered by the act of July 2, 1890, or other existing antitrust acts and thus, by making these practices illegal, to arrest the creation of trusts, conspiracies, and monopolies in their incipiency and before consummation."

Normally one corporation buys or controls another by purchasing controlling interest of its capital stock. Stock purchase was the acquisition method in 1914. Congress then expected this customary means of consolidation would continue. Congress intended to stop the creation of trusts and thought a prohibition against stock purchases would do the job.

Smart lawyers conceived a device of avoiding the penalty of the Clayton Act by having the acquiring corporation purchase, not the capital stock, but the physical properties and assets of the corporation to be acquired. The scheme worked. The Supreme Court in 1926 in the case of *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Western Meat Co., et al.* (272 U. S. 554), declared that if the acquiring corporation had so used its stock purchases as to secure title to physical assets of the corporation acquired before the Federal Trade Commission issued its complaint, an order by the Commission was improvident. In 1934 the interpretation of the law respecting acquisitions of stock control, which were subsequently converted into outright purchase of assets, was extended by the Supreme Court, which held that if an acquiring corporation secured title to the physical assets of a corporation whose stock it had asquired before the Federal Trade Commission issues its final order, the Commission lacks power to direct divestiture of the physical assets, even though the acquisition of stock control may have fallen within the prohibitions of section 7 of the Clayton Act. This was the decision in the case of *Arrow-Hart & Hegeman Electric Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (291 U. S. 587-598). The holding of the Court was by a bare majority of 5 to 4.

A recent case on the docket of the Federal Trade Commission illustrates the dilemma of the Commission in trying to prevent consolidation under the act as it now stands.

P. Ballantine & Sons operates one of the largest breweries in the United States at Newark, N. J. This brewery has been operating for a number of years and sells both ale and beer primarily in the Atlantic Coast States and in New England, although it makes substantial sales in other States in the Middle West and in the far West.

In July 1943, it acquired the capital stock of the Christian Feigenspan Brewing Co., also located in Newark, N. J., which, at that time, was selling substantial quantities of ale and beer in New England and New Jersey and New York. As a result of this acquisition, P. Ballantine & Sons increased its annual capacity from approximately 2,200,000 barrels per year to nearly 3,000,000 barrels per year, and the competition which had theretofore existed between the two corporations was eliminated.

The Federal Trade Commission issued a complaint against P. Ballantine & Sons in July 1944, charging it with violation of section 7 of the Clayton Act by acquisition of the capital stock of the Christian Feigenspan Brewing Co. Testimony was taken in support of the allegations of the complaint in the fall of 1944, and the Commission closed its case in chief in January 1945. Respondent, P. Ballantine & Sons, introduced testimony in opposition to the allegations of the Commission's complaint in the fall of 1945.

At a hearing held in the latter part of November 1945, the announcement was made that the respondent had acquired, on November 15, 1945, the assets of the Christian Feigenspan Brewing Co., the corporate name of which had been changed to Ballantine Brewing Co., and, on January 24, 1946, filed a motion with the Commission to dismiss the proceedings on the ground that the Commission was without jurisdiction to issue any order under the provisions of section 7 of the Clayton Act, for the reason that the respondent no longer held the stock of the acquired corporation and that the assets of the corporation had been transferred to the respondent and the acquired corporation had been dissolved.

The matter was set down for hearing before the Commission on March 19, 1946, at which time respondent was represented by counsel in oral argument.

In the oral argument before the Commission, counsel for the respondent relied upon the decisions of the United States Supreme Court in the Arrow-Hart & Heteman Electric Co. and the Thatcher Mfg. Co. cases.

This case is an illustration of the difficulty under which the Commission is laboring at the present time in its attempts to enforce the provisions of section 7 of the Clayton Act. Counsel for the Commission proceeded with all due diligence and speed to present evidence in support of the allegations of the Commission's complaint. However, counsel for respondent was able to bring about the purchase of the assets by the respondent before the case was closed, so that it was impossible for the Commission to issue an effective order of divestiture.

Thus the effect of the loophole has been to make section 7 of the Clayton Act completely ineffectual so far as preventing monopolistic consolidations is concerned. Where the object and effect of an acquisition is restraining of competition or monopoly, the law as it now stands is easily evaded by purchasing the assets. Even though unlawful acquisition of stock may be the preliminary step in consolidations resulting in restraining of competition or monopoly, the law may be evaded by the two-step process of first acquiring stock control and then, through that stock control, bringing about outright transfer of assets, provided the acquiring corporation can act fast enough to complete both steps before an order requiring divestiture of stock is issued.

It is now proposed in H. R. 5535 to close this wide-open loophole by making the acquisition of capital stock or assets, or both, by corporations under the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission subject to the divestiture provisions of section 11 of the Clayton Act as it now stands. The bill proposes to make such proceedings by the Commission effective regardless of whether the Commission acts in the matter before or after the acquisition of either stock or assets is completed. Any divestiture order of the Commission made after formal proceedings, as outlined in section 11, is subject to review by any circuit court of appeals of the United States having jurisdiction as now provided in the act.

It is difficult to understand how anyone who thought the purpose of the act of 1914 was in the public interest could oppose H. R. 5535. This amendment would do exactly what Congress intended and thought it was accomplishing in 1914. The language in the Senate report is pertinent, "to arrest the creation of trusts, conspiracies, and monopolies in their incipiency."

The ineffectiveness of controls in the past few years is indicated by the growth of concentrations and monopolies and, of course, there is a corresponding lessening of competition. The recent merger record is alarming. In copper mining, three companies controlled 78 percent of United States production in 1937. In lead mining, four companies controlled 87 percent in 1941. In farm implements, six companies controlled 80 percent in 1940. In dry ice, two companies controlled 70 percent in 1941. In rubber tires and tubes, four companies sold nearly 93 percent of all tires sold by the 17 important tire companies in 1943. In fluid milk and cream, one company, in 1937, sold 56 percent of the total consumed in the District of Columbia, 55 percent in Baltimore, 42½ percent in Pittsburgh, and 32 percent in Philadelphia. In the ice cream business, the same dairy company, in 1937, sold 52 percent of the total in Connecticut, 51 percent in Vermont, 49 percent in New Jersey, and 47 percent in both North Carolina and the District of Columbia.

That evasion of the intent of the Clayton Act by acquisition of assets has figures largely in the growth of concentrated control in American industry is indicated by a general survey of 832 corporate acquisitions during the period 1939 to 1944. This survey showed that 479 acquisitions, or 57.6 percent of the total, were accomplished by purchase of assets, 345, or 41.5 percent, were by acquisition of stock control, and 8, representing less than 1 percent, were by undetermined method. American Home Products Corp. led with a total of 33 acquisitions, of which 25 were by acquisitions of assets. National Distillers Products Co. acquired 14 other companies, 10 of which were by acquisition of assets. Borden Co. acquired 9 companies, 8 by purchase of assets. General Foods Corp. acquired 8 companies, all by purchase of assets. General Mills acquired 3 companies, all by purchasing assets. Jones & Laughlin acquired 5 companies, 4 by purchase of assets. United States Rubber Co., acquired 3 companies, 2 by buying assets; and United States Steel Corp. acquired 4 companies, 3 by acquiring assets.

The list could be considerably extended with similar showing. Whenever the proposed merger would be in the teeth of the Clayton Act it has been accomplished by acquiring the assets. This is a clumsy unnatural procedure for corporations to pursue and it would never be resorted to except for the purpose of evasion.

This is not a partisan issue. President Hoover and the late President Roosevelt both recommended a tightening up of the Sherman and Clayton Acts. The Federal Trade Commission has informed Congress from year to year of the tremendous number of unhealthy monopolistic mergers which have been made possible by the existence of this loophole. The temporary National Economic Committee studied the defects in Section 7 of the Clayton Act and strongly recommended an amendment to remove the present loophole.

We must decide very quickly what sort of country we want to live in. This Nation was founded and built by men who believed in individualism. It has grown under a system carried on largely by individual capital. The increased concentration of economic power is dooming free enterprise. The present trend of great corporations to increase their economic power is the antithesis of meritorious competitive development. It is no accident that we now have big Government, big labor unions, and big business. The concentration of great economic power in a few corporations necessarily lends to the formation of large Nation-wide unions. The development of the two necessarily lends to big bureaus in the Government to deal with them. Local economic independence cannot be preserved in the face of consolidations such as we have had during the past few years. The control of American business is steadily being transferred from local communities to a few large cities in which central managers decide the policies and the fate of the far-flung enterprises they control. Millions of people depend helplessly on their the people are losing power to direct their judgment. Through monopolistic mergers own economic welfare . When they lose the power to direct their economic welfare they also lose the means to direct their political future.

If we are going to maintain the competitive system, H. R. 5535 should be passed quickly. If the present tendency toward mergers continues, we will be confronted soon without choice of having the economic life of the country managed by private groups or by public groups. In my judgment the people will turn to public groups because that is what they have been doing in every other nation when confronted with these alternatives.

America is a middle-class country. The economic welfare of our country depends upon the maintenance of strong independent firms. What chance does a small business have in competition with monopolies which exist in certain segments of our industry which have been described above? Poor indeed, unless the trend is checked. The adoption of this amendment is definitely in the interest of small business. Prevention of monopolies is actually in the interest of big business, too. Big business is now confronted with all sorts of governmental rules and regulations. As a concentration of economic power continues, Government regulation and interference will increase. The Government inevitably will get further and further into the regulation of business which create monopolies and this will be done upon the demand of the people. We want to maintain our traditional system of free competitive enterprise. Big business should realize that we cannot do that unless we stop the trend toward the creation of monopolies and a concentration of great economic power in a few. Amending the Clayton Act is an urgent and necessary step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, under the present situation management is rapidly being transferred from local communities to a few big cities, in which central managers decide the policies and the fate of the enterprise they control, while the people in the local communities depend helplessly upon their judgment. It is unfortunate, but it is true that, unless the trend toward big corporations is checked, the American people will rapidly lose the power to direct their economic welfare. With the loss of economic independence, the people will also lose their political independence. This is an inevitable consequence.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES L. GERLACH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ALLENTOWN, PA., *May 14, 1946.*

Hon. CHARLES L. GERLACH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GERLACH: It is high time that we begin to do some real thinking and stop mushing around in our emotions if we expect ever to solve our economic problems and get back our liberty. Ever since the beginning of the war we have been telling ourselves that, come what may, we must and we will avoid inflation. Yet this talk is the sheerest of sheer emotional nonsense, because we already have inflation.

What is inflation?

The dictionaries say it is an unusually rapid and excessive rise in the money supply which a people has to use in its economy.

If that is what inflation is—and it is—then do we or do we not already have inflation? Let's take a look at the behavior of our money supply.

In 1939 the total of all the coins, paper currency, and bank accounts, the money which our people owned, was $64,000,000,000. Today it is something like $170,000,000,000. In six short years we have almost trebled it. But that is not the whole of the story. In 1929 this money supply was only $55,000,000,000. During the depression, from 1929 to 1939, it rose nine billions, startling as that may seem. Nor does that complete the story, either, because in 1929, as a result of the First World War, our money supply had already been boosted by $41,000,000,000. It had increased from its prewar normal of about fourteen billions in 1914 to fifty-five billions in 1929. Thus, as the cumulative result of World War I, the great depression, and World War II, our money stock has been increased from $14,000,000,000 to $170,000,000,000—about 12 times what it had been as a normal condition before two world cataclysms set everything at sixes and sevens.

Now, the price level which we talk of holding is virtually the depression level. And that depression level was not very much higher than that obtaining back in 1914 before the First World War. In fact, so far as real estate is concerned, it is quite truthful to say that it is no higher at all. Therefore, broadly speaking, we are in the position of trying to hold a price level which came into

existence when 120,000,000 people had $14,000,000 to use in the settlement of their daily business score, but attempting to do this in a time when 140,000,000 people have $170,000,000,000 to use for the same purpose. Is it not perfectly obvious that each individual worker's share today of the money in use must just naturally be much, much greater than was his daily share under the previous circumstances? Why, it is not fantastic to say that when the inflation will have completely expressed itself, we can conceivably have a wage level under which a building mechanic, for instance, will receive $50 a day and the general price level will be in consonance with it. We have enough money, if used, to support such a price plane.

The great trouble is that our American public is not aware of this condition, and also that it knows next to nothing about the real nature and working of its money system. Poor, deluded fools that we are, we seem to think that God has endowed us with a certain amount of money and that He established the value of the dollars; that during the 1920's a few rich malefactors, assisted by the devil and the Republican Party, acquired most of this money, and that now, under the beneficence of the New Deal, the war and the grace of God, it has been taken from them and more generally and equitably distributed. And we drool about having lent the Government our money when, as a matter of fact, the Government created most of its borrowed money out of a little paper and printer's ink and a lot of thin air.

That is the literal truth. How was it done?

The simple answer is that the greater part of the 275 billions of bonds which the Government is said to have sold was not sold at all, in the sense that it was bought and paid for with money which the people owned. The bonds were simply taken by the banking system and a bookkeeping entry made debiting "United States Government Securities" and crediting "United States Treasury" on the depositors' ledger with the amount. Immediately the Treasury drew checks on its newly created balance, and out over the land billowed the billions which had not existed before. All of us shared in this flood of new money, and we busily carried it back again to the banks and deposited it in our own accounts. That's how it became ours.

And that's how this swollen money supply has come about. It's very simple, but, as I have said, our people do not know this condition, and, not knowing it, they certainly can't be expected to understand it. And the sad part of the thing is that they are not told about it and no attempt is made to explain it to them. Instead, they are given an incessant line of ballyhoo about avoiding inflation—avoiding inflation which already exists! And we set up a confusion of elaborate and clumsy machinery, with armies of employees to man it, and try to prevent the inflation from expressing itself!

We ought to know, but seemingly we don't, that the OPA has not thus far prevented wages from rising above their depression low to heights which they never attained during the wild and wicked inflation of the twenties; and that the cost of building a house today is already higher than it ever was in that crazy era. And the inflation of the cost-and-price plane is just beginning to express itself.

We simply do not look the real condition in the face. We just can't avoid the consequences of our financial legerdemain. We chose to finance two wars and a depression by converting Government debt into bank deposits, thus flooding the country with fiat money. The inexorable result is a depreciated dollar, which is the counterpart of an inflated price plane. To try to avoid this consequence is like trying to keep the sun from shining or the wind from blowing. It is as foolish as was the old woman's attempt to sweep back the ocean tide with a broom.

The tide, by the way, can be used as a good illustration of how the money supply influences the price level. During the last 3 years, I have asked a good many people, among them plenty of college men, too, what it is that makes a price level, and their answer, without exception, has always been: supply and demand. The National Association of Manufacturers gives the same answer. It is telling us in full-page newspaper advertisements that, if we will only free the markets from price restraints, the supply of goods will speedily equal demand and that then competition will keep prices down and inflation will not take place. Yet the truth is that the supply of and demand for commodities does not create the price level at all. The thing that creates it is the cost of production. And the cost of production is the cost of labor, which is wages. But what makes wages, or the wage level? Why did the carpenters whom we house builders employed in Allentown in 1914 get 22 cents an hour, a pick-and-shovel laborer 12 to 15 cents, a bricklayer 40 cents, etc.? What made that wage level? Why wasn't it only one-half or one-quarter as high as that? Or why wasn't it 2, or 4, or 10 times as high? The answer is, of course, that it was the quantity of money which we had to use in our economy at that time that established the level. Through employment and business, the money supply circulated, and each performer's share of it each day became, all circumstances governing, what it was. That share was the daily wage, or the daily income of the worker—laborer, mechanic, businessman, professional man, whatever he may have been. In 1926, after the war had inflated the money supply until it was four or five times what it normally had been, wages were also four or five times higher. The same carpenters then received $1.15 an hour, the laborer 60 cents, and the bricklayer $1.50 per hour. And with this increase in wages, costs, of course, were also correspondingly higher. And so were prices.

You see, the price level literally floats upon the surface of the money supply, just as the ship floats upon the surface of the ocean. When the money supply rises, up goes the price level exactly as the ship goes up with the swelling tide. But as the ship is borne up upon the long swell of the rising tide, it bobs up and down on the short waves caused by the wind. Just so does the price level, acted upon by the winds of supply and demand, also bob up and down in short, choppy fluctuations. Bringing production into balance with demand will not avoid inflation. It will only still the storm that temporarily causes abnormal waves. The sustaining tide of the big money volume will still be there when the storm is over, and the price level will continue to ride high until that time recedes. And, Mr. GERLACH, that will be a long, long, time.

Now, some of our economists and bankers and Government officials are so naive as to hope that, while this enormously increased money supply exists, it will not be used; consequently it will not circulate and divide itself into inflated wages and incomes among the people, and thus it will not tend to raise the price level. Conceivably, this could happen. It would mean that the money would be kept idle in inactive bank balances, in safe-deposit boxes, and in holes in the ground, as has been the case since 1929. It could not be invested, because then it would circulate. But when people hoard money in this manner it is an indication that they have no confidence in other values. And when confidence in values is lacking, depression prevails. Do we want the great depression, then, to be resumed where it was interrupted by the pseudo prosperity of the war?

No, Mr. GERLACH, if confidence should by any chance fail to assert itself, then it is going to be just too, too, bad. But if confidence will prevail, then this swollen money supply of ours will circulate, and the inflation which we have created will express itself. Let's get that proposition into our consciousness.

Now then, the circumstances being what they are, what should be our attitude in the matter? It should be that of willingness to look the facts in the face and to be reasonable. If we really meant to avoid inflation, we should have financed the war entirely with taxes, plus only such borrowed money as already existed; we would not have dared to exchange bonds for mere bank credit. But we have done what we did. It is water over the dam. It is spilt milk, and it will do us no good to keep crying over it. We have made our bed; now we've got to lie in it, too. We have inflated, now let's make up our minds to accept the consequences.

The OPA, as we are seeing, cannot undo the damage. It can only slow up the completion of the inflation process and in so doing continue its interference in the reconversion effort, thus prolonging the agony of injustices, annoyances and hardship which we are suffering. So let's do away with OPA. Let's restore their liberty to our people and—I pause to summon courage—let the inflation proceed.

And how it will proceed! the belief of the NAM to the contrary notwithstanding. Yet it will not be nearly so painful as the calamity howlers are painting it. As a matter of fact it can be expected to be quite exhilarating, as was the inflation of the 1920's. We didn't hear any groaning then. Indeed, while we were going through it we were constantly telling ourselves that we were experiencing the most golden of all golden ages. Like then, our new condition will simply be a case of much larger dollar incomes, with correspondingly larger living costs. After all, a man is no worse off when he gets a hundred dollars a day and it costs him a hundred dollars to live, than he is when he gets one dollar a day and it costs him a dollar to live. What does hurt is premature, abortive deflation. That is what we tried to bring about in 1929. But that attempt was an entirely mistaken idea which should never have entered our heads. If we had had even a modicum of real intelligence it never would have become the obsession that it did. Although we believed that we were going to deflate, we did exactly the opposite—we inflated still more. Oh yes, we did bring wages and prices down considerably, and we really did reduce real-estate values to their prewar level, in spite of the fact that at no time during the depression was it possible to build a house at less than at least double the prewar cost. But we started anew to inflate the already abnormally swollen money supply. We had the Government support a big section of our population, and to pay for this floated additional billions of bonds by palming them off upon the banks in the same manner I have described above. The result was, as I have indicated before, that our money supply rose from 55 billions in 1929 to 64 billions in 1939, when the Second World War broke out in Europe. Just one of the three chapters of the story of our present inflated state.

I say we should not have gotten the idea of deflating into our minds in 1929. Instead, we should have kept our heads; we should have looked the facts in the face at that time. We should have realized that since we were blessed—or, rather, cursed—with an enormously inflated money supply which could not all at once be gotten rid of, we would also naturally have a continuation of its rightful concomitant—the inflated price level. Instead of going off into hysterics as we did, we should have kept right on going as before, which, under the circumstances, had been really a most wonderful state of affairs. Think of it! For practically a decade we had been enjoying unheard of incomes. And while our expenses were also correspondingly

high, so were our savings. And so were taxes, too. But out of those high taxes, and with its sensibly reduced expenditures, lo, behold! the Government was paying off its debt at a remarkably smart rate. Why, almost unbelievable as it seems, in the 10 years from 1919 to 1929, we reduced the debt an average of a billion dollars a year—from 26 billions to 16 billions. And, marvel of marvels! with it all the tax rate was also being lowered!

I say to you, Mr. GERLACH, that was a magnificent performance, and we should have kept it up in spite of the disturbance which the bursting stock market made upon the surface of the economic waters. If we had continued in that fashion, another 10 or 15 years would have seen the end of the debt, and then the inflation would have been gone also, because the inflated money supply would have been gone. It would have been wiped out in the smooth, gradual, orderly manner which we have a right to expect from a really enlightened nation.

The real answer to our present problem therefore is that, since we cannot avoid an inflation which already exists, we must avoid a new 1929 if we want to entertain even the faintest hope of preserving our American way of life—that liberty and freedom which until 1929 had made us the greatest and the grandest and the most blessed nation of all history.

How can we avoid such a new catastrophe? Only by being reasonable. And we can only be reasonable if we are educated enough to be so. Our people must be given the truth. They must become acquainted with the vital facts of economic life and realize and understand the conditions that confront them. Our task is to teach them.

We have gotten ourselves into a horrible financial mess. We have a debt of almost $300,000,000,000. And, what with all the subsidies and bonuses and gifts disguised as loans that are proposed, it threatens to keep on forever mounting. Yet we can extricate ourselves if only we will behave as reasonable beings. We can pay off the inflated debt. But we can only do it on an inflated basis. We can't pay off this mountainous obligation of cheap, inflated dollars with dear, deflated ones. In other words, we can do it like we were doing the same thing in the previous similar case.

Therefore, let the inflation complete itself. Let men be free. Let natural forces have their way. Let wages rise and prices rise until the money supply is absorbed and stops the flight. Of course they will soar to vastly greater heights than they did after World War I, because the money stuff is here to support that higher level. But, so what? Under the conditions, it will be all right. It will simply be a new normal level which to all intents and purposes will be a permanent one, not a mere, temporary condition. Then, on the new plane of incomes and of living costs, we can go ahead, year after year, gradually, systematically, orderly reducing the debt. And possibly 50 years from now it may be gone. And with it also will be gone the inflation.

That, Mr. GERLACH, is the way to do this job that lies before us. Get up on your hind legs and stand and fight for a realistic way of tackling it.

I repeat: We are not now preventing inflation, and we cannot and we will not avoid a fuller expression of it in the immediate future. But if a free America is to live, we absolutely must avoid another 1929.

There is one way in which we can avoid the full effects of the inflation. It is also another way by which we can get rid of our debt; that is, to declare ourselves bankrupt, repudiate the obligation and wipe it out. Indeed, this might be a very sensible procedure. But our people would no more understand the loss of their cherished money hoards and the annihilation of their stock and bond and insurance assets that would result from the ensuing liquidation than they understand their present situation, and they would surely and speedily conclude that the free, capitalistic system is a failure and would demand something else. That something else would be communism and the dictatorship that goes with it.

If that should happen, and sometime it may, it will be ascribable to nothing other than sheer, dense ignorance. Yet in that eventuality, I can vision the history books of the future saying that liberty and freedom died because successfully greedy few tried to prevent the masses from living—the most damnable lie ever to be fastened upon a deluded humanity.

I am awfully sorry to burden you with such a long letter, one that has turned out to be a lecture, perhaps even something of a tirade. But mere dogmatic assertion and opinion are ineffective; they must be supported by a line of logical argument if they are to be worth anything. I know I am a fanatic on liberty, but, Mr. GERLACH, fanatical devotion to liberty is needed to save it. Step by step we have been sacrificing our liberty. We have even voluntarily surrendered it—only as a war expedient, we told ourselves. Now, unless we resolutely about face and get back to genuine first principles, we are going to lose it altogether.

God forbid that that shall happen.

Yours most sincerely,

HERBERT J. KLEPPRUGER.

All-American Motion Picture Academy Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, notwithstanding the strike crisis which has paralyzed our Nation, none of us forgets the underlying blessings enjoyed by the American people and the great ideals for which this Nation stands.

In order that the American motion picture industry may be encouraged to produce films best representing American life and American hopes, I am submitting a suggestion today for a new film award to be given each year. I ask that a statement by me presenting this suggestion be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUGGESTIONS TO THE MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY—NO. 1, AN ALL-AMERICAN ACADEMY AWARD

This is the first of a series of suggestions which I intend to submit, particularly through the motion picture press, to the motion picture industry. These suggestions will be respectfully offered in the hope that they may be of some use in focusing the attention of Congress, the public, and the cinema industry itself on some areas in this field which I believe are vitally important to the future of America.

IMPORTANCE OF CINEMA

By no means do I presume to be anything of an expert in this highly complex and developed field of American enterprise. I do, however, humbly feel that:

First. Legislators have too long overlooked the importance of the cinematic arts in the new scientific age.

Second. Too little Government encouragement has been given to the motion-picture industry in helping the industry to realize the great patriotic possibilities for formal and informal education of our own and other peoples on the blessings of our free way of life.

Third. Too little public credit has been given to the industry for the mighty strides it has made in so short a time; for its vital role in the American economy; for its patriotic efforts, much of which are overlooked in the rush to point out the industry's shortcomings. Collectivist influences at work in the industry, itself, must not however be ignored and must be combated.

Fourth. Motion pictures have long ago graduated from the level of mere entertainment to the level of being an important weapon in the world-wide battle of ideas raging between the forces of individualism and the forces of collectivism as represented by the United States and Russia.

SUGGESTION FOR AWARD

On the basis of these introductory facts and opinions, I want now to respectfully suggest that each year a special "All-American Award" be given by the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences.

This award should be given to the picture which best represents the highest ideals of American life to our own and other peoples.

The purpose of the award is obvious; to stimulate all motion picture companies to an all-out effort to produce inspiring fims which would (1) correct the misleading notions about America deliberately fostered abroad by other powers; (2) to encourage patriotism and a deep and abiding understanding of America in our own people.

I want to make it clear that this must be an all-industry affair with no interference by government. I want no Goebbels-type propaganda orders going out from Washington, D. C., to Hollywood or any orders whatever. The motion picture industry must be kept free and independent.

Nor should this award result in producing hokum files about America, full of phoney notions such as, for example, would characterize propaganda films produced by a dictator State. The motion picture which should win this award should, I humbly believe, represent a human, warm, true account of the American scene.

The present series of academy awards for the best picture, the best acting, the best script, etc., may be well and good for encouraging technical excellence in the industry, but I believe the all-American award which I have recommended would lend a certain purpose and higher value to this series of awards.

Let's have an "All-American Film Award" for 1946 and 1947 and for future years.

Failure of Government Agencies To Cooperate To Secure Increased Food Production

REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, day by day and hour by hour, agencies of our Government urge us through the columns of our newspapers and over the radio to cooperate in the effort to minimize the starvation and

misery threatening millions of peoples throughout the world.

I am sure no decent American will turn a deaf ear to those humanitarian appeals, and I am sure this country in this crisis will be worthy of the reputation it has richly won for generosity and sympathy toward suffering peoples everywhere.

But it must occur to millions of our folks here at home that we might expect at least as much intelligent cooperation from the agencies of Government as they ask from our people. And it should be perfectly obvious to any casual observer that many Government agencies are not doing the job they could to help in this crisis.

As evidence I offer here an article entitled "Uncle Sam Lets His Rich Farm Land Lie Idle," appearing in the May 15 issue of the Indiana Farmers Guide, which specifically points out the tremendous potential loss occurring at the Bunker Hill Naval Air Station in my State of Indiana. Here are 2,370 acres of farm land as rich as any in our great Midwest Farm Belt, long since abandoned as a naval activity, and now growing weeds. Within my own State alone there are no less than 10,000 acres of fine land similarly lying idle; and the same thing is true in probably every State of the Nation. Our Government grows weeds while its official spokesmen harangue a willing and generous people to redouble their own productive efforts.

Our administration bureaucrats fail to show enough interest or energy to cut their way out of their own red tape while they exhort the people to greater and greater sacrifices.

There never was a more opportune time for an administration to lead by precept and example, but the evidence is plain that this type of leadership is woefully lacking now. There probably was never a time when real businesslike efficiency and planning could have paid such rich dividends. Instead we have bungling, waste, delay, and confusion as usual. And the irony of it is that those who are chiefly responsible for the administrative shortcomings which burden and limit America's productive efforts are the first to accuse the American people of indifference to world suffering.

The article follows:

UNCLE SAM LETS HIS RICH FARM LAND LIE IDLE

(By J. P. Hoekzema)

Some of the finest land in the United States was used for the Bunker Hill naval air base, located in Miami County, Ind. Back in 1942, 2,370 acres of this fertile soil were purchased from prosperous farmers who wanted to stay on their own farms.

Food was important, even at that time. This land was producing an average of 75 to 85 bushels of corn per acre, and many gold medals (over a hundred bushels per acre) had been won by farmers in this area. Soybeans yielded from 30 to 35 bushels per acre while some of the land had been producing tomatoes at the rate of 15 to 20 tons per acre. Other yields were in the same ratio.

The Federal Government came in and purchased this land. The payments came through very slowly (typical of Federal agencies) and by the time some of the farmers received their money, the prices of the farms that they had purchased had raised so that they had a loss of money—as well as a loss of their own farms. The farmers who were on this land were scattered into adjacent counties though they hated to lose their farms, some of which had been in the family for many years.

Miami County took a loss in taxes. For 1945 this loss was figured at $3,458.23 as the assessed valuation of the property was used with the 1942 rate of taxation. This is low because all valuations have raised since 1942, and the tax rate is lower (due to higher valuations). It is difficult to state how much more this amount would be, but it is likely that $5,000 would be a fair figure.

In other words, since the Federal Government has taken over this project, Miami County has lost between fifteen and twenty thousand dollars, and the end is not in sight. What the total loss will be, no one can estimate.

Now that the war is over what will happen to this project? Rumors are rampant, but no one knows. The buildings may be used as a housing project. Sewers, electricity, water, etc., are all available.

In case this is revamped for housing it will still be federally owned and the local and State governments will receive no taxes. In fact, as in all Federal projects local folks will have to pay for it in different kinds of taxes.

How can income taxes be lowered when more ways are being devised to spend Federal funds? As one said: "Hogs used to be considered mortgage lifters, from now on they will have to be considered as income-tax payers."

There are still 15 or 18 hundred acres of land that were not used, and are not being used. Grasses were planted on part of it, and one year this was cut for hay.

Last year it was cut and the hay was baled. In April 1946, the bales are still lying in the field. Work was done in cutting and baling it but the bales are still lying out.

It has been said that some of the returned veterans have requested that they be permitted to farm some of this land. To date no reply has been received.

Hundreds of acres of land growing up to weeds and some grass, with a Nation asking for more food to feed not only the United States but the entire world, and this most productive soil lies idle.

Most economical production of food and fiber is obtained from the most productive soil. This Nation needs to be very efficient this year as there is a shortage of labor and of machinery, but the Federal Government asks for more production on one hand, and prohibits it on the other.

Farmers in the area are interested in the productivity of this land. One said that he was getting along in years, but felt that as long as the Government needed food that they should use this fertile land for food production. Even though the buildings were in the north area, there were hundreds of acres that were not injured in any way.

Another suggestion was that the runways would make excellent feeding floors for hogs. These might be rather large, or one would need large numbers of hogs.

STATE ROAD REBUILT

One of the State roads had to be rebuilt around the airfield and this makes extra driving for the folks west of the field. If they do not go around the field it is possible to use a gravel road, but this is not always in the best condition.

Road building, miles of the most expensive fence, all added to the cost and the south part of the field was not used. Some of those who are acquainted with the conditions cannot understand any reasons for this.

The Navy has 250 acres of land in Jackson Township which were assessed for taxation at $15,570 at the time of purchase. At the 1946 tax rate of $1.74 in Jackson Township this represent a loss of $274.05 in taxes.

In Deer Creek Township the Navy owns 459.66 acres. This was assessed for taxation at $29,020 on real estate and $6,010 on improvements, or a total assessment of $35,030. At the 1946 tax rate of $1.90 in Deer Creek Township this represents a loss of $665.57 in taxes.

The Navy also has 1,660.46 acres in Pike Township. This was assessed for taxation at $102,864 on real estate and $17,070 on improvements. This represents a tax loss in 1946 of $2,518.61.

These tax losses are small when one remembers that if the land was in control of farmers there would be personal property taxes totaling hundreds of dollars.

Last word was that the Navy land and buildings have been turned over to the War Assets Corporation, a subsidiary of the RFC, for disposal.

No one has given out any information on how the property is to be liquidated. It is definitely sure, however, that nothing will be done in time to use the acreage in full for the production of food this year.

One report has it that the Federal Housing Administration has made a request for 15 and 21 buildings at the base. Nothing is known about the plans of the FHA.

TOWNSHIP PROGRAMS UPSET

These tax losses have upset business programs of the townships. Schools have been carried on, children have been transported, but many sacrifices have been necessary. The citizenry of Miami County took it all in patriotic stride in the war.

This field is now closed. There is no activity around the base. It would seem the Navy and the Agriculture Department could get together in 9 months and decide what to do with some of the best land in this area. Asking for more food, needing more land, wanting to give discharged veterans a chance, and yet almost 2,000 acres of land is laying idle.

O Ship of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a copy of the speech which won the Arizona High School State oratorical contest sponsored by the American Legion. Each of the orators spoke on the Constitution of the United States. This oration was delivered by Mr. Jerry Joachim, a senior at Union High School in Phoenix, Ariz. I recommend the oration as excellent reading material and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the oration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

O SHIP OF STATE

Because we are human beings, all of us have definite individual wants to be satisfied and needs to be met. We cannot live without food, clothing, or shelter. We must live with other human beings; we have wants in common with them, and we must also give help to them. One for all and all for one.

Prehistoric man, ignorant though he was, realized that certain things were necessary in order to live properly. He obtained these needs as best he could, even by killing his

fellow man * * * the only way his undeveloped mind would permit him to do. However, man developed rapidly, and it was not long before he began to see the need of sharing things with people. He realized, also, that he did not have to kill his comrades to obtain necessities.

Man also learned that when people live together in a communal life, they must, to preserve good will, behave in such a manner as not to arouse ill feelings between themselves.

Immediately man knew that some form of governing authority was needed. This was the first sign of the need for some basic law. They needed a government. But what is government? Government is a contrivance of human wisdom, to provide for human wants. Men have a right that these wants shall be provided for, by this wisdom.

Various forms of government developed in the progression of man's ingenuity; and as man progressed, so did his government. As the first step toward the ideal form of government, King John signed the Magna Carta; the great charter proclaiming the rights of the common man.

The discovery of the unknown lands of the Americas by Christopher Columbus in 1492 brought colonization to a new world. Men were on their way to a new and unheard of freedom. As America grew, so did the English control over her; until at last the young country reached the point of saturation; and the American people revolted to recover the freedom they so ardently desired.

In 1776 America was born with the Declaration of Independence. She cried out * * * for all the world to hear * * * "When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation." America declared her cause * * * and upheld it. In 1781 they secured their freedom with the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown. The grip of the mother country was broken, shaken off, and America was free.

The European countries refused full recognition of the new country because of the lack of unity in this loosely organized Nation. The American people asked, "Where is this life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, for which we fought?"

In May 1787, in answer to these queries, a group of Representatives from the States of the newly won America met in Philadelphia to devise such further provisions as appeared to them necessary to render the Constitution of the Federal Government adequate to the urgencies of the Union. The States had been invited to send Delegates to the Congress, for the sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation. Finally, out of the welter of governmental ideas and ideals, inspired by the guidance of divine power, came this immortal document of their creation, the Constitution of the United States of America.

Many times, since the days of the Egyptians and the Greeks, men have drawn up schemes for more perfect unions, which excelled in theory, but failed in fact. The greatest achievement of the Constitutional Convention was the formation of this plan of union and government that was theoretically sound and eminently practical. The framers were students of history; and profiting by the mistakes of mankind, they selected the great and workable principles of government from the beginning of written history and incorporated them into this marvelously simple and concise document, the Constitution of the United States.

The history of America has been a series of great events—1492, 1776, 1868, 1917, 1941, flow smoothly from the lips of a definitely marked time. Likewise, the course of human events emerging from history is a multiple and turbulent affair. America's history is a catalog of motives, good and bad, aimed at one goal—democracy.

In the following 159 years after the ratification of the Constitution, the United States and her people have made every effort to remain in the spirit of democracy. She has retarded governmental regimentation as much as possible. She has been wary of all political trends not in keeping with the American tradition. She has tried to maintain a balanced government; a free government; with the idea that America's walls will resound with the deep, sweet tones of her freedom.

Unfortunately, some of mankind's ancient and inherent weaknesses, from which he will never fully recover, rise, time and again, to hamper his progress. As a result, we have had wars; political and economic upheavals.

Capital and labor—never the twain shall meet amicably, it seems—have clashed and are now clashing with intense fury. Usually capital is on the offensive, attacking a defenseless labor. But the situation is now almost the reverse. Labor is launching a full-scale attack against the efforts of capital, who is extremely adept in her own defense. Both are powerful; both are backed by constitutional rights. At this time socialization seems to be in the public mind. What will be best for the American people must be tested by time. The disputes of capital and labor must be cured by time—time in which to coordinate their differences in backgrounds and opinions.

Tolerance and understanding, such as that shown by those far-seeing men who drew up our Constitution, must be given to all classes and all races of people who make up our great Nation of today. For this is the real path of true democracy.

But whatever the outcome, we may rely on the assurance that, in the spirit of '76, the Constitution will prove to be a workable basis for solving the problems of all our people, for in its wider interpretations it is as applicable today as it was in the period for which it was written.

"Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!"

Franco-Fascist Spain and Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, because of the wide interest, internationally, in the subject of the United Nations and Franco-Fascist Spain, I am inserting herein editorial expressions with regard to the subject matter.

The first one is an editorial from an interesting weekly publication from my Congressional district, the Peninsula Gateway, of Gig Harbor, edited by a community builder and thinker, the Honorable C. E. Trombley, former member of the State legislature. This newspaper is published at a very picturesque and scenic community known as Gig Harbor on Puget Sound. The editorial is as follows:

FRANCO APPROACHES THE SHOWDOWN

"Franco," a name that has become associated with everything that is brutal, treacherous, and horrifying in the international political world, yes, Franco of Spain, is fast approaching a showdown.

The possibility that Franco and his dirty gang could keep their grip upon the governmental affairs of Spain in a world that is supposed to have been freed of nazism and fascism, through the blood and sufferings of millions of the world's finest young men, and the sacrifice of untold billions in wealth, is beyond belief and understanding. However, such has been the case.

It is a generally known fact that fully 75 percent of the Spanish people were in favor of their Republican government. However, Franco, with the aid of Hitler, Mussolini, and north African troops, descendants of the Moors, literally overpowered the Republican armies and peoples of Spain, beating them to the earth, executing thousands of the best blood of the country, torturing thousands more, and placing hundreds of thousands in prison whose only crime was to disagree with the Franco regime politically.

That such a state of affairs could have existed in our so-called civilized Christian world is beyond comprehension, but nevertheless such was the case.

However, the Spanish situation as just narrated was only the first chapter in Franco's bloody and diabolical career. When Hitler had brought Europe to its knees, it was found beyond a doubt that Franco was one of his most ardent sympathizers and collaborators, giving every aid possible to the Nazi-Fascist cause, even to the extent of sending troops into the field for the purpose of crushing one of our allies. The evidence against Franco and his whole tribe is positive and complete, and they should be placed in the same category as Hitler, Goering, Mussolini, and the rest of them, and be placed on trial for their red-handed deeds.

Poland, Russia, France, Mexico, and Australia are loud in their demands, before the United Nations Council now in session, that Franco be brought to justice and his gang kicked out of Spain on the charges that they are a menace to the peace of the world. These charges are well-founded and well-grounded.

It is well known that thousands of German men of influence in the late Nazi regime, together with scores of highly trained scientists, are now being protected by Franco in Spain, and that there is a possibility that Hitler himself may be there, and it is suspected, for very good reasons, that experiments in the realm of atomic energy are now under way in Spain, which if allowed to run their natural course will result in disastrous consequences. For you can safely bet your last dollar that as soon as this nest of international rattlesnakes get a thorough understanding of up-to-date atomic power secrets, they will use them with great disaster to all who oppose them.

France is greatly concerned in regard to this matter. She lives next door to this problem and has a better first-hand knowledge of the dangers than any other nation has and should Spain start anything, France would be the first to get hurt. The possibilities of a sudden atomic attack by self-propelled contrivances, against great world centers, carried out simultaneously, is no idle dream, but rather a real threat.

The threat which Franco Spain offers to the world is so understandable and evident, one is prone to wonder why England and the United States do not step in and with the other nations cooperate in cleaning up the dirty mess. The world will not be safe until the allies occupy Spain as they have Ger-

many, and proceed to clean out the Nazis, police the country for a time at least, and supervise elections that will give the Spanish people an opportunity to select the kind of government they desire. As it is the Spanish people are almost helpless because of the fact that Franco has exterminated so many able and efficient citizens.

The attitude of our own State Department as regards to Franco's Spain, over a long period of years, has been most deplorable, and beyond understanding. In 1936 when the Republic of Spain, which had been duly recognized by us, was fighting for its life, we treated that nation most shamefully. At that time the Spanish Government had in the banks of the United States $200,000,000 which it desired to use for the purchase of war supplies, but our Government refused to allow the needed supplies to be shipped to Spain, and now after all the undeniable evidence has been presented against Franco, we are still playing Franco's game, in complete harmony with his desires.

The man on the street and the American people in general feel that there is certainly something putrid securely intrenched in our State Department. We are inclined to be patient with President Truman in regard to this matter because it is one of those objectionable things which he inherited when he became President. But we feel that he had better get the Spanish situation cleaned up, and soon at that, or he will be hearing from the liberty-loving people of America in tones that to say the least, will be very embarrassing to him.

We wish to congratulate three of Washington's Congressmen on the work and influence they have exerted in Congress in regard to the Spanish situation, namely, Congressmen COFFEE, SAVAGE, and HUGH DE LACY.

The Citizen-Times, of Asheville, N. C., likewise recently spoke on the subject editorially as follows:

ANOTHER CHAPTER

Franco Spain's active cooperation with Germany during the war has been denied with such vehemence by persons with excessively short memories that it is useful to examine some of the new evidence that has come in advance of, and outside of, the current investigation by the United Nations Security Council.

One likely witness is Sir Samuel Hoare, now Lord Templewood, who served as special British envoy to Spain from 1940 through 1944. It was Sir Samuel who negotiated the notorious Hoare-Laval agreement, which hardly stamps him as a wild-eyed radical. Under copyright of the Overseas News Agency, the former British diplomat has been publishing extracts from his Spanish experience in the New York Times. The series casts an interesting light on Franco's intrigue with Germany almost until the time of Hitler's collapse.

When Sir Samuel first arrived in Madrid, for instance, he found the British Embassy under virtual siege. "Gestapo agents listened to our conversations and hung around us at every turn." In June, 1940, he wrote Lord Halifax, then Foreign Secretary: "The country is in a state of suppressed excitement, and the Germans and Italians are deeply entrenched in every department of government and in every walk of life."

All during the period Generalissimo Franco loudly proclaimed the imminent defeat of the allies. He urged a negotiated peace on the British envoy, saying, "Why do you not end the war now? You can never win it." This was in 1940, and even then it was a bad guess. But in mid-1941 Franco was glorifying the "German arms that were leading the battle for which Europe and Christianity had so long waited." As if to emphasize this, Franco's brother-in-law and hetman of the Falange, Serrano Suner, inspired a demonstration against the British Embassy, "a carefully staged riot," which led to the breaking of windows and the tearing down of the Embassy's flag.

Spain was also a fertile field for Japanese espionage both before and after Pearl Harbor The Japanese Minister "made Madrid the European center of the Japanese secret service. He had on his pay roll senior members of the Spanish diplomatic service, and one at least of Serrano Suner's official entourage."

This sort of activity in a neutral country, and especially the circulation of foreign propaganda, supposedly was illegal. The Franco government in fact passed a decree prohibiting all foreign propaganda. "Although never carried into effect against the Germans," says Sir Samuel, "it was vigorously enforced against us." Thus, "under the influence of German successes, the Spanish Government seemed to be moving from non-belligerency into the pre-belligerency that had been Mussolini's last stage before entering the war."

In late 1943 the British envoy wrote to London: "The present Spanish Government with General Franco at its head is fundamentally hostile to the Allies and the aims for which we are fighting." Into the following year there occurred many events which confirmed this impression—the export of war materials to Germany despite Allied protests, the dispatch of the Blue Division to the Russian front, and continued espionage and sabotage. Of the latter, Sir Samuel told Franco in 1944: "Although I have made repeated representations on the subject, these activities, so far from having been checked, are continuing as aggressively as ever."

All these facts and observations speak for themselves. They add another chapter to the damning indictment of Franco Spain, friend and ally of the Axis as long as there was a breath remaining in the body to which Franco owed filial devotion.

The famous News and Observer of Raleigh, N. C., editorially expressed itself as follows:

FRANCO PROPAGANDA

How long will Americans permit themselves to be duped by foreign propaganda? During the war every European and Asiatic ally set up a costly propaganda shop in New York or Washington and flooded the mails with literature to make favorable sentiment. They got all the paper they wanted when American papers were so severely rationed their circulation was frozen. But war excused many things.

However, there is no excuse for the propaganda by European countries now, particularly that which is being sent out by Fascist governments. The Office of Cultural Relations of the Spanish Consulate is sending out tons of propaganda favorable to Franco. In addition to other bunk the literature urges support of Hitlerized Franco in the name of "Christian Spain" and claims that the government ousted by Hitler and Franco was seeking to "destroy religion and substitute communism."

In the light of Franco's subserviency to both fascism and nazism any American who swallows this propaganda bunk is a Fascist or a dupe.

OPA Price Increases

REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the footnotes to history are just as beguiling and just as important as history itself. I submit for the edification of the membership and of the country a list of 132 price increases that I received from OPA this morning for the month of April 1946. It includes bolts, veal, firebrick, pulpwood, retail meat, rubber footwear, home laundry machines, blankets, yarn, doors, auto radios, hardwood lumber, metals, stampings, work clothing, pepper, automobiles, photographic equipment, preserves, textiles, wool floor coverings, bedspreads, castings, cigarettes, clay tile, metal furniture, maple sirup, cast-iron radiation and other items as seen from the list which follows:

Price increases, April 1946

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
Apr. 1, 1946	Bolts, nuts, screws, and rivets	Producer	7 percent.
Do	Brass mill products	do	Average 1½ cents per pound.
Do	do	Warehouse distributors	Average 1.5 cents per pound.
Do	Carcass veal (freezing and storage allowance on Government sales).	Packer	15 cents per hundredweight.
Do	Chestnut corrugating medium paperboard	Producer	8 cents per M square feet.
Do	Clay glass melting pots, tank blocks, accessories	do	16 percent.
Do	Crude oil	do	10 cents per barrel.
Do	Fireclay and silica refractory brick (Missouri and east of the Mississippi).	All	11 percent rounded to the nearest 5 cents.
Do	Fourdrinier Kraft containerboard	Producer	$8 per ton.
Do	Imported Hawaiian molasses (f. o. b. west coast tank stations)	Importer	$2.78 a ton.
Do	Paperboard	Producer	Varied.
Do	Railroad parts and assemblies (90-percent steel castings)	do	15½ percent (over October 1941).
Do	Retail meat and variety items	Retailer	Beef and veal, average ⅜ cent per pound; lamb and mutton, ½ cent.
Do	Retail pork items	do	Average, ¾ cent per pound; 1½ cents per pound on 80 percent of all sausage products.
Do	Waterproof rubber footwear	Producer	10 percent.
Do	West coast ethyl alcohol (from imported Hawaiian molasses)	Distiller	About 5 cents per wine gallon.
Do	Wire-tied cushion-spring units (with sisal pads)	Producer	11.2 percent on base models.

Price increases, April 1946—Continued

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
Apr. 2, 1946	Cast-iron gas-fired heating boilers	All	10½ percent.
Do	Dried fruits	do	Processor: 0.8 to 1.6 percent
Do	Hog pancreas glands	Slaughterer	4 cents per pound.
Do	Home laundry machines	Producer and wholesaler	Producer: 9.5 percent (over 1941).[1]
Apr. 3, 1946	Blankets (cotton-wool and cotton-wool-rayon mixtures made by Chathan and Pepperell).	Wholesaler and retailer	Wholesaler: 16 to 25½ cents. Retailer: Indeterminate.
Apr. 4, 1946	Carded cotton yarns	Producer	¾ to 1½ cents per pound.
Do	Douglas fir doors	All	Producer: Average 28 percent.
Do	Ford auto radios (2 models, uninstalled)	do	Producer: 56.6 percent (above 1941); wholesaler: 28 percent; retailer: 14 percent.
Do	Special cherry boxes and display lugs (Yakima and Wenatchee, Wash., area).	Producer	About 2 cents per box.
Apr. 5, 1946	Plug fuses	do	21.4 percent over 1941.
Do	Southern hardwood lumber (all species, except yellow cypress and all grades except construction).	Mill	8½ percent.
Do	Western pine and associate species	All	Average $4.60 per M board measure.
Apr. 6, 1946	Douglas fir and western hemlock lumber	Mill	About $4 per M board measure for Douglas fir and hemlock boards; about $2 per M board measure for western hemlock.
Do	Sand-lime building brick	All	$2 per M.
Apr. 7, 1946	Wooden beverage cases (painting charge—east of and including Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas).	Producer	$1 per 100 cases, half-depth cases; $2, full-depth.
Apr. 8, 1946	Awning cloth	Converter and jobber	Indeterminate.
Do	Berry cup and dividers (sold separately)	Producer	10 percent.
Do	Electrical wire and cable (containing silver)	All	Varied.[2]
Do	Friction tape and splicing compound	Producer	10 percent (over October 1941).
Do	Hard rubber SLI battery containers, covers, and vents, and standard items of molded, extruded, lathe cut, and chemically blown sponge rubber.	do	15 percent (over January 1942).
Do	Maraschino, glacé, and brine cherries	Processor	½ to 1 percent.
Do	Metal stampings	Producer	19 percent.
Do	Nonneoprene rubber hose, belting, and packing	do	12 to 26 percent.
Do	Red sour pitted cherries (packed in Utah and Colorado)	Processor	13 cents per dozen No. 2 cans, 43 cents No. 10 cans.
Do	Retail meat and variety items (Kosher)	Retailer	Beef and veal, 1½ cent per pound; lamb and mutton, ⅜ cent.
Do	Rubber braid building wires (low-end items)	Producer and wholesaler	Indeterminate.
Do	Specified medium and low-capacity tanks and vessels, 585 gallons or less (except tanks designed for use with industrial equipment).	All	Producer: 17 percent (over July 1941).
Apr. 9, 1946	Barrels, nail kegs, and slack (except west coast)	Producer	10 percent for staves, hoops, and headliners; 5 percent for all headings, 2 cents per finished keg; 5 cents per barrel.
Do	Canned slab bacon (sold to Government)	All except retailers	$1.70 per hundredweight in 14-pound tins
Do	Pine nail keg stave and heading bolts (truck deliveries in 11 Virginia counties).	Producer	11 percent.
Do	Pork chops (sold to purveyors of meals)	All except retailers	25 cents per hundredweight.
Do	Smoked hams	do	$1 per hundredweight for smoked, skinless, boneless, and fatted hams weighing over 12 pounds.
Do	Work clothing (jean, drill, twill, and poplin)	Producer	Varied.
Apr. 10, 1946	Basic construction machinery, equipment, and parts	All	4.8 percent.[3]
Do	Glazed sash, windows, and garage doors	do	Producer: Approximately 1 percent.
Do	Ground black pepper	do	Processor: About 8¾ cents a pound for bulk; 9 cents a pound for 3 pounds or less. Retailer: 2 cents for 1½-ounce tins, 3 to 4 cents for 4-ounce tins.
Do	Ground white pepper	do	Processor: About 13 cents a pound for bulk; 12 cents a pound for 3 pounds or less. Retailer: 2 cents for 1½-ounce tins, 3 to 4 cents for 4-ounce tins.
Do	Men's waterproofed garments (low-end items)	Producer	10 percent.
Apr. 11, 1946	General Motors, 50 models (Pontiac, Buick, Oldsmobile, and Cadillac).	All	Producer: 8.3 to 17.5 percent over 1942. Retailer: 5 to 15.9 percent.
Do	Appalachian hardwood (except timbers and dimensions)	do	10 percent.
Do	Carded cotton contils (grey goods)	Producer	35.2 percent and 26.5 percent.[4]
Do	Photographic equipment (except commercial 35 millimeter motion-picture cameras, and items already released from control).	All	Producer: 14 percent over October 1941, or 7 percent over March 1942. Retailer: About 9 percent over 1941.
Apr. 12, 1946	Western agricultural shook	Producer	$7.50 per M board measure.[5]
Apr. 13, 1946	Ceylon No. 2 cinnamon	Importer	5 cents per pound.
Apr. 15, 1946	Defluorinated phosphate (100-pound paper bags)	Processor	$1.48 per ton.
Do	Distribution transformers (industrial transformers 500 kilovolt-amperes and under, and parts and accessories with specified exceptions).	Producer and reseller	5.4 percent.
Apr. 16, 1946	Chrysler auto radios (2 models, uninstalled)	All	Producer: 49.7 and 34.7 percent; special brand purchaser: 23.6 and 17 percent; distributor: 22 and 15.6 percent; retailer: 10.3 and 10.6 percent, respectively.
Do	Fruit preserves, jams, jellies, and apple butter	do	Retail: About 1 cent per pound jar.[6]
Do	Southern pine grain doors (for freight cars)	Producer	11 percent.
Do	Women's, girls', children's, and toddlers' outerwear	Retailer	Indeterminate.
Apr. 17, 1946	Cotton textiles (2 combed broadcloths for men's shirts)	All	5 percent.
Do	Little cigars	do	$1 per M.
Do	Oranges, lemons, and tangerines	do	Country shipper: Oranges, 20 cents in California and Arizona, 15 cents in Florida and Texas; lemons, 28 cents; tangarines, 22 cents in California and Arizona, 14 cents in Florida and Texas. Retailer: About 1 cent per pound.
Do	Overwrapping packaged rice (heat-sealed, moisture-proof cellophane).	Distributor	30 cents per hundred 12- or 16-ounce packages.
Do	Peeled pine and hardwood insulation bolts (Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana east of Mississippi River).	Producer	$1.10 per cord for pine and 5 cents for hardwood.
Do	Primary slab zinc (packing and loading charges)	Supplier	10 cents per ton for wiring and strapping in bundles, and 50 and 70 cents, respectively, on wooden and steel pallets.
Do	Staple work clothing (men's and boys'—made of chambrays, coverts, denims, drills, jeans, and whipcords).	All	Producer: 12 to 15 percent. Retailer: About 22½ to 29 cents per garment.
Do	Wool floor coverings	do	Producer: 4½ percent.
Apr. 18, 1946	Dyed carded and combed cotton yarns	do	Producer: 5½ to 6¾ cents per pound by type and ply.[7]
Do	Household mechanical refrigerators	do	Producer: 8 percent. Retailer: About 4 percent.
Do	Packard (10 new models)	do	Producer: 14.1 to 19.7 percent. Retailer: 10.8 to 15.4 percent.

[1] Instead of 7.7 percent granted in October 1945.
[2] To reflect higher cost of foreign silver content.
[3] Until June 15.
[4] For mills paying and not paying, respectively, WLB wage increases.
[5] Increase effective until May 31, 1946.
[6] Reflects rise in sugar costs. Only processors with a no-balance inventory processed from sugar purchased before Feb. 10, 1946, may take the increase.
[7] Distributed in 2 bands for producers paying and not paying WLB wage rises.

Price increases, April 1946—Continued

Effective date	Commodity	Level of action	Amount of increase
Apr. 19, 1946	Industrial power transmission equipment	All	7.8 percent.
Do	Machine tools (including hand and foot powered immobile machine tools).	Producer and reseller	Producer: 20 percent over October 1941.
Do	Screw machine products	All	Producer: 5.2 percent.
Do	Screw machine services (except bolts, nuts, screws, and rivets, and automotive parts).	do	Supplier: 10 percent over 1942.
Do	Snap beans	do	Country shipper: 50 cents per bushel.[8] Retailer: About 2 cents per pound.[8]
Apr. 20, 1946	Cotton bedspreads and table napery	Wholesaler and retailer	Wholesalers: 14 to 34 percent. Retailers: 1 to 20 percent.
Apr. 22, 1946	Cement—except white (southern California, Arizona, and southeastern Nevada).	All	10 cents per barrel.
Do	Cotton gray rope, yarn, twine, and cord	Producer and jobber	5 percent per pound of cotton content.
Do	Cotton rope, twine, yarn, and cord	Producer	¾ cent per pound of contained cotton.
Do	Ford (new model)	All	Producer: 48.8 percent above most comparable 1942 car. Retailer: 43 percent.
Do	Gummed cloth tape (sheetings and osnaburgs)	Producer	35 cents per M 1-inch yards.
Do	Manganese steel castings and castings products	do	9.6 percent.
Do	Mercury (new model)	All	Producer: 51.6 percent over most comparable 1942 car. Retailer: 45.2 percent.
Do	Special American and Asiatic cotton blankets and wool blankets.	Producer	About 14 percent on cotton and 5 percent on wool.
Do	Tidewater red cypress lumber	All	Mill: 10 percent over 1942.
Do	Western red cedar lumber (bevel, bungalow, and special sidings)	do	Average 7½ percent.
Do	White cedar shingles (Lake States)	Mill	About 23 percent.
Apr. 23, 1946	Preservative treatment of lumber by nonpressure methods	Supplier	Indeterminate.
Do	Steel ducts for electric wires (except tubing, fittings, flexible conduit, and raceways, including fittings).	All	Producer: 13 percent over Oct. 1, 1941.
Apr. 24, 1946	Chrysler, 4 models (Dodge, De Soto, Chrysler)	do	Producer: 8 to 16.4 percent over 1942. Retailer: 2.3 to 11 percent.
Do	Industrial casein (inedible)	Producer	9 cents per pound.
Do	Northeastern hardwood lumber (except timber and dimension items).	All	Producer: From 3 percent to 7½ percent according to grade.
Apr. 25, 1946	Cigarettes	do	Producer: 25 cents per M. Retailer: 1 cent on 2 packs; vending machine sales, except "economy," 1 cent per pack.
Apr. 26, 1946	Malleable iron castings	Producer	Average 7 percent.
Apr. 25, 1946	Metal upholstery springs, construction, and accessories	All	Producer and wholesaler: 8 to 10 percent.
Apr. 26, 1946	Tools, dies, jigs, fixtures, molds, and patterns (sold with machines, parts, and industrial equipment).	Producer	Varied.[8]
Apr. 29, 1946	Caskets and shells and shooks (low-end)	do	15 percent and 25 percent, respectively.
Do	Clay drain tile (Ohio and Michigan)	All	$1.20 per ton.
Do	Lamb and mutton wholesale cuts	All, except retailer	10 cents per hundredweight for kosher foresaddle, forequarter, bracelet, and all whole or half chuck; 25 cents per hundredweight for fabricated cuts (WSA specifications) sold to specified buyers.
Do	Lead—special packing and loading (at buyer's request)	Supplier	20 and 40 cents per ton.
Do	Spectacle frames (low-end)	Producer	25 percent.
Apr. 30, 1946	Rye bread (not less than 1 part rye to 4 parts wheat flour)	All	Producer: 2 cents per pound.[10] Wholesaler: Maximum limited to 12 cents per pound.[10]
Do	Waterproof rubber footwear	Wholesaler	10 percent.
Apr. 19, 1946	Metal nonhousehold furniture	All	Producer: 10.5 percent over October 1941 to resellers.
Do	Warm-air furnaces, subassemblies, and repair parts	do	Average 12.3 percent.[11]
Apr. 20, 1946	Metal cots, beds, and springs	Producer and jobber	Producer: 5 to 35 cents per item as listed.
Apr. 22, 1946	Market wood pulp (on listed grades)	Producer	Average 10 percent.
Do	Vitrified clay sewer pipe and allied products (Eastern and East Central States).	All	Producer: 15 percent.
Apr. 23, 1946	Pole line hardware and line construction specialties (except for overhead trolley lines).	do	Producer: 15 percent.
Do	Levers, raschel, and barmen laces (82 low-priced laces)	Producer and jobber	½ cent to 22 cents per yard, depending on width.[12]
Apr. 24, 1946	Cutting tools and machinery attachments and accessories	All	Producer: 17.3 percent over March 1942.
Apr. 25, 1946	Milk bottle stock paperboard (2 major manufacturers [13])	Producer	$10 and $26 per ton, respectively.
Do	Fluorescent and specialty transformers	All	Producer: 11 percent on fluorescent; 19 percent on specialty over October 1941.[14]
Do	Maple sirup and sugar (bulk sirup, and block sugar, containers of 24 ounces or less).	Packer, wholesaler, retailer	Packer: About 3 cents per pound.
Do	Mufflers, tail pipes, and exhaust pipes (replacement)	Producer [15] and wholesaler	Producer: 12 percent above March 1942.
Apr. 26, 1946	Pontiac auto radios (2 models, uninstalled)	All	Producer: 45.5 and 46.3 percent. Pontiac to distributor: 25 and 27.1 percent. Wholesaler: 21.3 and 23.3 percent. Retailer: 8.8 and 10.2 percent. All over 1941 prices.
Do	Pennsylvania anthracite (group 1 mines, when shipped via the Great Lakes and sold on dock on the United States bank of Lake Superior or the west bank of Lake Michigan, north of and including Waukegan, Ill.).	Dealer	5 to 15 cents per net ton.
Do	Linoleum and felt-base floor and wall covering (except carpets)	All	Producer: About 15.5 percent over March 1942.[16] Retailer: 6 percent.
Do	Steel shovels, spades, and scoops	do	Producer: 9 percent. Retailer: About 7 to 10 cents each.
Apr. 29, 1946	Metal household furniture	Producer	7 percent above 1941.[17]
Apr. 30, 1946	Home washing and ironing machines	All	Producer: 6.8 percent over current ceilings.[18]
Do	Cast-iron radiation and accessories (convectors, convector, baseboard, and bathroom radiators, radiators for blower and ventilator systems, and radiator bushings, plugs, nipples, brackets, pedestals, and chaplets, including steel chaplets).	do	Producer: 37 percent over October 1941.
Do	Nonmetallic sheathed cable (type R, insulated with synthetic rubber).	do	11 percent over October 1941.
Do	Repair and replacement parts under GMPR (for domestic cooking and heating stoves, washing and ironing machines, mechanical refrigerators, vacuum cleaners and attachments, business and office machines).	do	5, 9.5, 16.5, 6, and 12 percent, respectively.

NOTE.—Excludes price increases allowed under individual company adjustment provisions.

[8] Increases effective until April 30.
[9] New ceilings may reflect current instead of base-period costs.
[10] Until June 30.
[11] Replaces reconversion factors for furnaces of 9 percent for oil burners and 12.5 percent for gas.
[12] Ceilings may not exceed established cut-off prices.
[13] Producing 60 percent of output.
[14] Replaces increase factors of 6.3 and 14.4 percent issued in January.
[15] Except automotive producers.
[16] Replaces 9-percent rise granted in February.
[17] Replaces reconversion increase factor of 5 percent issued in February.
[18] Total 17 percent over 1941.

The St. Lawrence Waterway and the Utility Investor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the coal-power crisis has brought the matter of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway development to the attention of a goodly share of the population of the United States. It is generally supposed that the investors and the banking interests of New York are opposed to the seaway. However, that is not altogether the case. I have in my hand a report made by Eastman, Dillon & Co., members of the New York Stock Exchange. They have made a serious study of the St. Lawrence seaway development and its probable effect upon the private investor, and find that the value of the interests of investors in private utilities in the Northeastern United States might well be enhanced rather than decreased by its construction. They have given me permission to insert this report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. So, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD this report made by Eastman, Dillon & Co., members of the New York Stock Exchange.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY AND THE UTILITY INVESTOR

Considerable interest has been evidenced by holders of securities of public-utility companies in New York and New England in the proposal to develop the St. Lawrence waterway and to establish hydroelectric generating facilities in connection with this project. Some investors have feared that such a development might be detrimental to the values of their interests in established utility companies.

We have been interested to review the terms of the Power Authority Act passed by the New York State Legislature in 1931 to establish just what plans were made at that time for the marketing of power. In general, the law authorizes the Power Authority to negotiate contracts for the sale, transmission, and distribution of the power generated under the project.

The act does not specifically mention contracts with private utilities, but it does provide that sale be by contract. There is the further protection that in the event of disagreement upon contract terms, the Authority shall report an alternate plan for the disposal of power to the Governor and legislature, but shall take no action on building or developing the project until the Governor and legislature approve the plan. The Authority also is directed to see that municipalities engaged in the distribution of electric energy may secure a reasonable share of the power generated with provision for connecting lines to the municipalities from the main line of the contractors.

Since the Power Authority Act would seem to assume that private utility companies would have every reasonable opportunity to make contracts for this power, before any other means of distributing it would be considered, the question then arises as to whether power from St. Lawrence would be economically and efficiently used by established companies. In this connection, very helpful material has been presented to a subcommittee of the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee within the recent past by the Bureau of Power of the Federal Power Commission. This report was not prepared for general distribution so has not attracted the attention which it deserves. We have been provided with a copy, and as it is a lengthy document, we have attempted to digest and summarize some of the outstanding points. We hope, in so doing, to indicate how this project might fit in with the operations of the privately owned utility companies in this general area.

The Federal Power Commission report first outlines the general nature of the project. It would consist of a navigation and hydroelectric development in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, comprising approximately 46 miles of river between Chimney Point (near Ogdensburg) and St. Regis, N. Y. The project contemplates construction of regulatory works, a dam, and a powerhouse for the development of approximately 2,200,000 horsepower of hydroelectric power and a navigation channel having a minimum depth of 27 feet. The power project itself would consist of two dams and a power house at Barnhart Island. The total cost of the development for navigation and power is estimated on 1941 construction costs by the War Department at $260,000,000.

Half of the power generated in the Barnhart powerhouse would go to the United States and the balance to Canada. An agreement is proposed between the United States and the State of New York whereby the New York State Power Authority would pay the United States $98,057,250, the cost of the United States share of power, and the power authority would get the right to occupy and operate the United States powerhouse and distribute and sell the energy. New York would thus get 1,100,000 horsepower, or an installed generator capacity of 940,500 kilowatts. The energy output in an average year is estimated by the United States Corps of Engineers as six and three-tenths billion kilowatt-hours. The report points out one of the outstanding characteristics of this St. Lawrence power. The river drains an area of 303,000 square miles, nearly one-third of which is in lake surface. As a result, the flows in the St. Lawrence River are remarkably constant, having a ratio of maximum to minimum flow of only 2.2 as compared with the normal ratio of 40 to 50 for most rivers of comparable size. This makes possible the generation of a fairly uniform amount of high-load factor energy year after year and does not necessitate the provision of steam-electric generating facilities to supplement the project output. Such high-load factor power is of distinct value in connection with transmission to distant markets. To quote the Commission, "St. Lawrence power could be integrated readily with existing steam-electric plants in upper New York and New York City and with the steam-electric plants and storage hydroelectric plants in New England by serving the upper base portion of the lead with the rest of the base and variable portions of the loads being served by local steam-electric plants or hydroelectric plants."

The report then goes into a discussion of the cost of St. Lawrence power, for "the potential value of power that may be developed at a new hydroelectric project is fixed by the cost of obtaining equivalent power from alternative sources." For this purpose, the Commission presents data comparing the estimated total energy costs at seven of the more efficient steam-electric plants throughout the region under consideration with the estimated cost of St. Lawrence power delivered to the same general locations. The table below, adapted from the report, clearly shows the difference in costs:

Cost of power at distribution centers from steam plants and from St Lawrence, at 80 percent load factor

	Total energy costs, in mills per kilowatt-hour [1]				
	1941	1942	1943	1944	St. Lawrence power
Steam plants:					
Waterside, New York City	6.44	6.15	6.53	7.35	2.51
Huntley No. 2, Tonawanda, N. Y.	4.46	4.67	4.85	5.09	2.46
Oswego, Oswego, N. Y.	4.39	4.54	4.58	4.71	1.66
Greenridge, Dresden, N. Y.	5.04	4.90	5.33	5.53	1.91
Manchester St., Providence, R. I.	5.48	5.97	6.26	6.52	2.61
Somerset, Somerset, Mass.		6.13	5.94	6.58	2.61
Edgar, North Weymouth, Mass.	5.85	6.24	6.35	7.04	2.61

[1] For steam plants, fixed costs assumed at 2.2 mills per kilowatt-hour; for St. Lawrence power, includes operating and maintenance costs plus payments in lieu of taxes and fixed charges.

The Commission calls attention to the fact that the St. Lawrence cost estimates include fixed charges while the steam-generating costs do not. Mention is also made of the fact that the cost of St. Lawrence energy delivered at the load centers would, in most cases, be less than the fuel costs alone at the most efficient existing steam-electric plants. Referring again to the last column in the table above, there is contained in the report one other estimate that might be interesting. Based on the 1941 average cost of producing equivalent output at alternative steam-electric plants and including fixed charges on investment based on private financing, the indicated value of St. Lawrence power delivered at load centers is about 5.16 mills per kilowatt-hour. The Commission concludes, "The economic soundness of the St. Lawrence power development has been amply demonstrated herein. A comparison of the foregoing figures on the cost of St. Lawrence power and its value in the region as determined from a consideration of alternative sources of power supply, shows that steam-electric power cannot compete with St. Lawrence power." The desirability of obtaining this power thus would seem to be a foregone conclusion.

Having examined the economic soundness of the project the report next turns to a consideration of the market for this power, to determine whether its availability will make it a glut on the existing power market or whether it will be readily absorbed by the current and expected demand.

The region within the economic transmission distance of the power is the industrial area of New England (less Maine), all of New York State, northeastern Pennsylvania, and portions of New Jersey. The question raised is whether there is a possibility of utilizing such a block of power in this area within a reasonable period after the war emergency without destroying investment in present electric generating facilities. This leads to the question whether the wartime expansion of generating facilities will create surplus generating capacity when the war loads drop off. Data in the report support the contention that no undue vol-

ume of new capacity was added during the war period in this region. In fact, wartime capacity additions did not keep pace with normal peacetime requirements. In December 1945 the assured capacity that could be depended upon to carry load, after reserve allowances to maintain service, equalled 6,363,077 kilowatts. The estimated peak demand for the period was 6,461,020 kilowatts, leaving an indicated deficit of 97,943 kilowatts.

In view of this, the report continues, it might be well to ask how war loads were met in this region. This is explained by a number of factors. Emergency additional diversions of water were authorized at Niagara Falls. Power imports were increased from Canada. Large prewar surplus of power in New York City was made available to a larger market region. Reserve capacity was used to serve loads. More complete utilization was made of generating equipment, old and new, with minimum outages for inspection, maintenance, and repairs. War time, dim-outs, and multiple-shift operations and other factors changed the load shape to such an extent that peak demands were reduced about 400,000 kilowats below what it would have been with normal load characteristics. A return to a more normal load shape reasonably to be expected in the immediate postwar period is expected to offset nearly 75 percent of all new generating capacity added since 1941.

It is also stated in the report that reconversion in the region should not affect wartime demands to any great extent for throughout the region war production consisted largely of an expansion and intensification of prewar activities rather than a widespread establishment of new facilities. In large measure, peacetime products had been laid aside for the war period to produce the same, or not too dissimilar, items for war.

Having shown that wartime capacity did not equal wartime needs and that postwar demand is not expected to be appreciably less than wartime demand, the report undertakes an estimate of probable future power requirements. Generally speaking, the Commission feels that "estimated loads which may reasonably be expected in the postwar years are higher than those indicated by the normal trend which might have been expected if prewar trends and factors had prevailed unchanged. These load estimates are not as great, however, as may be experienced if abundant low-cost power is made available through the area at reasonable rates."

Based on Commission estimates of future loads, and the existing net assured capacity plus presently planned additions in the area (exclusive of the emergency diversions and the importations from Canada) additional generating capacity would be needed in the area as follows:

	Kilowatts
1950	1,149,000
1960	3,499,000

The report considers the industrial power demands of the area, and points out that all of the principal industries (except pulp and paper, which generates a considerable portion of its power requirements) purchased a substantially larger portion of their energy requirements from utilities in 1943 than in 1939. This trend is expected to continue, and may become more pronounced by the availability of low-cost power.

Domestic usage in the region is then examined and is found low compared with the national average and much lower than in areas such as Tennessee, Washington, and Oregon, where ample low-cost power is available. The report states that "normal trends in residential use, without taking into account stimulation resulting from new uses of electricity, indicate a yearly increase of about 500,000,000 kilowatt-hours in residential consumption for the New York and New England areas combined. If low-cost power becomes available, allowing for nearly complete customer saturation with a usage per domestic customer about equal to that of the State of Washington, an increase of approximately 7,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year would be obtained in New York and New England alone. Such an increase would represent more energy than would be available from the United States portion of the St. Lawrence development."

Thus, concludes the Commission, St. Lawrence power can be readily absorbed. Since 1945 peak load exceeded net assured capacity for the region, load growth beyond 1945 will require additional capacity. Based on estimated growth in the region, the United States portion of the St. Lawrence power would be absorbed within a relatively short time after it becomes available. Delay in retirement of old plants and development of new industrial load in anticipation of the availability of St. Lawrence power might well absorb all the capacity, within a year or so after its completion. The excess St. Lawrence energy, if any, could be immediately absorbed as steam-electric replacement. Moreover, lower rates and a promotional sales policy might increase loads beyond the ability of the St. Lawrence projects to supply it, and redevelopment of Niagara Falls might be necessary.

It would seem from the summary above presented that if the St. Lawrence project becomes a reality, an opportunity will be offered for the privately owned electric utilities to obtain low-cost power. This power should have a ready market in the region to satisfy postwar demands of industrial and domestic consumers. Should the privately owned utilities obtain this St. Lawrence power, the value of the interests of investors in private utilities in the northeastern United States might well be enhanced rather than decreased.

EASTMAN, DILLON & CO.

Why Don't You Write To Your Senator?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of May 25, 1946, entitled, "Why Don't You Write To Your Senator?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY DON'T YOU WRITE TO YOUR SENATOR?

In the midst of the world-shaking effort to build up Bowles as the Nation's sole bulwark against inflation, we ran into a young man who informed us that he had just sent telegrams to both his Senators and the Representative from his district, urging them to pass the OPA renewal act without crippling amendments. It turned out that our earnest friend had few definite ideas on what "crippling amendments" were. Was an amendment crippling if it insisted that OPA permit dealers to make a profit on what they sold? Were we not still ostensibly a profit economy? Who would be maimed if OPA were compelled to modify its policy of stifling the incentive to produce more goods? Our Western Union statesman didn't undertake to reply in detail. He had heard from Mr. Bowles that any curtailment of OPA's powers would be crippling. That was good enough for him.

Later on, thinking all this over, we asked ourself, "Why haven't you sent a telegram to your Senator?" Like most American citizens in the middle, we had never, in a fairly long life, sent such a message. We favored measures to amend certain OPA administrative practices which are rapidly crippling American production and threatening famine and scarcity everywhere. But our Senator had not heard from us or, we imagined, from millions of other citizens who felt the same way. Instead, he is left to thumb over a thick sheaf of telegrams sent in by people who are soft touches for stimulation by the CIO's Political Action Committee, the League of Women Shoppers, and other organizations of similar lineage. Therefore, what complaint had we if the Senator found himself unable to vote his principles?

For our part, we decry this kind of pressure on politicians. It seems to us that a man worth electing to the Senate should be trusted to make up his mind on the issues we delegate him to decide. But if that's the way the organized propagandists for regimentation want to play it, the thing for the great unorganized to do is get in there and telegraph. When that happens, your Senator will find that common sense has outwired the crackpots by at least 3 to 1.

Magazine Libels Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Daily Republic, of Mitchell, S. Dak., entitled "Magazine Libels Farmers of the United States."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAGAZINE LIBELS FARMERS OF UNITED STATES

Life magazine tears into the farmers of the country with a screed entitled "Greed on the Farm." The theme is that hoarding farmers had to be paid bonuses to induce them to sell grain needed for starving people.

Life says, in attempting to support its idea that the farmers have been profiteering:

"Gross farm income, which ran around $10,000,000,000 before the war, rose steadily to almost $24,000,000,000 last year. On a per capita basis, the farmers' income has increased during the war half again as much as other people's income. According to the magic formula called 'parity' (a pre-World War I relation between his costs and prices) the farmer is now 16 percent ahead of his own idea of justice."

As Al Smith was wont to say: "Let's look at the record."

In the first place the parity formula, sneeringly called "magic," is the very simple one of purchasing power. It shows the price the farmer must get if his products are to be secure for him, in things he buys, as much as they did in the base period, 1910–14.

WHAT FARMERS RECEIVED

And this is what the farmers actually received, in percentage of parity, for the 25 years from 1921 to 1945, inclusive:

	Percent
1921	75
1922	80

	Percent
1923	86
1924	86
1925	92
1926	87
1927	86
1928	90
1929	89
1930	80
1931	64
1932	55
1933	60
1934	70
1935	84
1936	90
1937	92
1938	77
1939	77
1940	80
1941	94
1942	106
1943	119
1944	115
1945	116

So the farmers went along for 21 years, between the wars, with an average of only 80.7 of parity prices. In other words, his products purchased 20 percent less in things he bought than in 1910–14.

Including the 4 last years, when prices were over parity, the average from 1921 was only 82.2 percent of parity.

If the farmers had been paid enough during the war to bring their average price from 1921 up to parity, they would have received 200 percent of parity or two-thirds more than they did receive.

20 PERCENT BELOW COST

But, by all the records, the 1910–14 purchasing power of farm products did not give the farmer enough to pay even his costs of production. And for 21 years after World War I, he got one-fifth less than that amount.

This is proved conclusively by the USDA report on the average farmer's 1944 balance, over cash expenses and allowed depreciation. It was just over $2,000 per farmer. But this included no wage at all for the farmer or members of his family. With a workweek of around 60 hours, this means he received, on a 40-hour-week basis, only 27 cents an hour. And over that he received no profit at all on an average investment of $15,000. And that was in 1944. Wonder if the greed of Life's advertisers would be satisfied with a return like that.

NINETY-BILLION-DOLLAR INVESTMENT

And there is $90,000,000,000 invested in agriculture, 15 times as much as in the steel industry and with only $55,000,000,000 invested in all corporations of every kind.

There are 6,000,000 business units in agriculture and 3,000,000 in all other kinds of business.

Why should this biggest industry be forced to operate on more than 20 percent less than cost for two decades, and then receive what no labor union man would accept as a wage, and no profit in his business? It happens because farming is the only business in which the seller has nothing to say about the price he receives.

How would Life magazine like to operate, with subscribers and advertisers telling it how much they will pay for what they receive?

As for farmers holding their grain, Life ignores the fact that millions of them have living things on their farms. The USDA recognized this by encouraging them to sell their livestock and poultry. The farmers can't sell feed and still keep animals and poultry that must be fed.

AN APOLOGY IS IN ORDER

Life magazine owes agriculture a sincere apology, because, even in the worst years, the farmers have kept on producing. In the 1932–33 bottom, farm implement manufacturers cut production 90 percent and prices about 10 percent. Farmers reduced output about 10 percent, and took prices reduced 90 percent.

Agriculture is the one and only business in which it has not been necessary to provide price incentive for production. With that record, to call the farmers greedy is to libel them. It is adding falsehood to ingratitude for the finest producing job done by any industry, in peace or war.

Booker T. Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an address which I delivered last night on Booker T. Washington.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOOKER T. WASHINGTON

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, today, in an American shrine, a Hall of Fame, the statue of a man was unveiled. That statue has a deep significance in our lives. We revere the power of a man to overcome the obstacles of birth and origin; to rise to great heights despite the handicaps of prejudice and intolerance. We dream of an America in which such obstacles and handicaps will no longer exist. Because we have that reverence and work to bring our dreams to the world of reality we have gathered tonight to pay tribute to Booker T. Washington.

The American people have always had great faith in education. Early in the history of our country we set aside a portion of our greatest asset, the land, for the development of schools. The plan by which this development came about was worked out by one of our greatest Americans, a man who knew that democracy and education go hand-in-hand—Thomas Jefferson. Like us, he had a dream. Jefferson dreamed of an America in which every man, woman and child would have a complete education at public expense. In the 150 years since Jefferson planned a public school system, we have brought that dream a long way toward reality, and we are making further progress every day. Let those who believe that intolerance and prejudice are here to stay remember that free public education was once a dream.

At the time Booker T. Washington was born, about 1859, the system of slavery had so taken hold of the minds of men, that the benefits of education were withheld from Negroes, except in a few institutions. Not all of these were in the North; some were in the South. Among them are certain of the colleges which have united in the Negro college fund. The nature of their origin is important to that faith in democracy which has brought us together tonight. Many of these colleges had their beginnings in the activities of religious institutions and missionary associations who did not accept the belief that some men were fit for education and others were not. These churches and missionary associations boldly set out to prove their faith in man. They went down into the slave States and created schools for Negroes. Their faith was upheld. Some of those schools are still in existence, and from them have come through the years an unending procession of craftsmen, teachers and ministers.

I say that this faith in man is important to what we are doing tonight. We, too, have this faith in man, and we, too, believe that further progress will come through the joint efforts of the masses of people in both races and in all parts of the country.

One of the mission schools I was talking about was located in the Tidewater of Virginia. From its missionary beginnings it had been expanded by the Freedmen's Bureau in the Civil War and postwar years. Toward it, one day, trudged a boy. He had had a little schooling up in the highlands and had heard of Hampton Institute. He didn't know for sure where it was, but he set out to find it, working his way, walking, and getting rides where he could.

The boy, of course, was Booker T. Washington. The New England teacher who met him gave him, he said, his entrance examination—not with books or paper and pencil, but with a broom and dustcloth. She took him to a classroom and told him to clean it up. The boy knew this was his test. Three times he swept the room, then with his dustcloth he poked into every corner again and again. He passed the test and was admitted to Hampton.

Booker T. Washington completed his course in June 1875. To Hampton he always gave credit for his training and for the ideas to which his career was devoted. At the ceremony in New York this afternoon the role of Hampton in Booker T. Washington's life was signalized by the presence at the unveiling ceremony of the present president of Hampton Institute.

After teaching for a few years in schools near his old home, Booker T. Washington was called back to Hampton to take charge of a group of Indians who had just been admitted, and to serve as a night-school teacher.

How prophetic was that first teaching assignment of Booker T. Washington. Today we have learned the hard lesson that Hitler taught us. The fate of one minority people is the fate of all. Whoever attacks freedom in one place attacks it everywhere. The picture is one for us all to remember. Booker T. Washington, who, a few short years before, had set out for Hampton without a clear idea of where it was, was now teaching and serving as guide and counselor to 75 Indian youths, and this is what he said about them:

"At first I had a good deal of doubt about my ability to succeed * * *. It was not long before I had the complete confidence of the Indians, and not only this. I think I am safe in saying that I had their love and respect. I found they were like other human beings; that they responded to kind treatment and resented ill treatment. When the difficulty of learning the English language was subtracted, I found that in the matter of learning trades and mastering academic studies there was little difference between the colored and Indian students."

Booker T. Washington spent about a year at Hampton. About this time the Alabama Legislature voted $2,000 to start a normal school in the little town of Tuskegee. General Armstrong, then the head of Hampton Institute, was asked to recommend someone. He named Booker T. Washington, although the sponsor had assumed the general would choose a white man. The sponsor thought it over a few days and sent a telegram, which said, in effect, "Booker T. Washington will suit us. Send him at once."

This was the beginning of a great American story. It is the story of the growth of an American institution that rose by its own bootstraps as surely as Booker T. Washington himself rose by his own efforts. Two thousand dollars was supplied for a staff. There was no provision for land, building, or equipment. The first building was a kind of shanty, near the church. Booker T. Washington said, "I recall that during the first months of school I taught in this building it was in such poor repair that, whenever it rained, one of the older students would very kindly leave his lessons and hold an

umbrella over me while I heard the recitations of the others."

In this building Tuskogee opened its doors with 30 students. During the first year a farm with a large house was put up for sale for $500. Booker T. Washington borrowed $250 for a down payment and moved his school, now grown to 50, to its new home. Land was cleared, the buildings were repaired, crops were planted; and always money was raised, in small amounts, but continuously. In 3 months the loan was repaid, and in another 2 months the balance was paid and Tuskegee received a deed to 100 acres of land.

The work went forward. A boarding school was established. New buildings were planned and erected by the students. Finally came a time when a substantial sum was needed. I tell this part of the story because of its similarity to the drive now going on. General Armstrong called Booker T. Washington to Hampton, and told him he had arranged for a quartette of singers to make a concert tour through a number of northern cities at which the General and Booker T. Washington would speak. The proceeds were to go to Tuskegee. In this manner Alabama Hall was paid for, and it proved the first of a long series of such musical events, of which the coming concert by the Tuskegee Choir in Constitution Hall is a fitting successor.

Tuskegee grew, and, in its growing, launched Booker T. Washington into public life. In the early 1890's he was asked by the National Education Association to speak to a large audience at a national meeting. There, Booker T. Washington stated fully, for the first time, the philosophy which has since become identified with his name.

He said that the whole future of the Negro rested largely on the question as to whether or not he should make himself, through his skill, intelligence, and character, of such undeniable value to the community in which he lived, that the community could not dispense with his presence. He used the famous phrase, "Any individual who learns to do a common thing in an uncommon manner has solved his problem, regardless of the color of his skin."

We have come a long way since then. We have all been shown some hard truths. We have learned, for example, that totalitarian powers may grow in the world which will not leave us alone; who are jealous of the common things we do well, and would take them away from us by force. We have also learned that even at home there are a few who are jealous of success, and will fan the flames of hatred and intolerance. No, it is not enough to do things well as individuals. We must work actively and together to maintain the precious right to do the common things Booker T. Washington spoke of, without interference from outside or from within.

Following this speech and other similar ones, particularly a very famous speech at the Atlanta Exposition in 1895, Booker T. Washington wrote, spoke, and traveled widely. He was honored by degrees from major universities. He was the confidant of Presidents. His influence on that period in our national life was very great indeed. And now we have placed him among our immortal Americans—in the Hall of Fame.

I have told his story in some detail because it is an American story. Many schools have been started from nothing. Many Americans have struggled for an education. Booker T. Washington's story is the story of Lincoln and Jackson. Tuskegee's story is the story of Harvard and Dartmouth. These and all other stories like them are the story of America, with its boundless faith in the future, its bounless self-confidence, and its supreme reliance on education for everyone as the ultimate solution to all our problems.

It is fitting that the Negro college fund drive this year should be built around Booker T. Washington. The cause of Negro education is one of the earliest and oldest forms of racial cooperation. The more we work together for common goals the better we understand one another; and the better we understand one another the less we will listen to the voices of division. I wish you all success in your drive, for your cause is America's cause.

Shall We Follow France? Russia?—Or Do We Have the Courage to Preserve America?

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that certain of the big-shot heads of organized labor have compiled the records of the various Members of this body and propose to do some purging of the Members of the Congress who do not see eye to eye with them on what legislation is beneficial to the country and to labor. I am reliably informed that in some instances where they deem it expedient they will publicly endorse the opponents of the sitting Members whom they wish to defeat, and in other instances they will send these records into the local labor groups in an effort to poison the minds of the honest, God-fearing wage earners against those Members who do not vote according to their wishes and dictates.

It has further been called to my attention that because of my activities during the year immediately proceding the declaration of war and during the war as a member of the Rules Committee of the House, and in my own responsibility as a Member of this body in voting to curb strikes in our effort to prepare for and carry on the war, that I am among those who have been marked for political slaughter. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, an article has been called to my attention which recently appeared in the New York Journal-American, which is as follows:

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

The Political Action Committee's drive to purge Southern conservative Democratic Members of Congress—"Operation Dixie," the Communist Daily Worker calls it—is not only heavily financed with northern left-wing money, but it is being carried out with the precision of a military offensive.

Its objective is not merely the conquest of the Southern Democratic political machines, with a view to ultimate control of the next Presidential national convention, but the domination of legislation in the House of Representatives through control of the powerful Rules Committee.

Conservative Americans in this country probably do not realize by what a slender margin of safety they have been protected by this all-important committee from a devastating riot of left-wing legislation by the present Congress.

The Rules Committee is composed of eight Democrats and four Republicans.

For example, the coalition has prevented the permanent fair employment practices bill—most extreme of all pending left-wing proposals—from coming to a vote on the floor of the House by a majority in the committee of only one.

There are four determined conservative Democrats on this committee, all of whom are marked for political slaughter, but so close is the division within the Rules Committee that the defeat of any one of the four would transfer control of the committee, if the House should remain Democratic in the next Congress, from conservatism to extreme radicalism.

If this bulwark of old-fashioned Americanism should be captured by the left wing, radicalism would then run floodtide in the new Congress to be elected in November.

These four Conservative Democrats are E. E. COX, of Georgia; HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia; WILLIAM M. COLMER, of Mississippi; and ROGER C. SLAUGHTER, of Missouri. All are on the CIO-PAC purge list.

CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio, a Republican Member of the committee, is on the list marked for defeat by the PAC at its Atlantic City meeting last week.

When it is realized that by driving any one of the five from Congress the way would be open for the seizure of control of the Rules Committee by the Political Action Committee and its Communist allies, the significance of the effort to defeat them becomes as clear as crystal.

The force, skill, and money of the Political Action Committee is being hurled against this group, whose crime is steadfast adherence to the ancient American tradition against the alien ideology of an arrogant and subversive radical labor dictatorship.

Every good American should stand by these members of the House Rules Committee in this year's primaries and at the polls in November.

The Rules Committee is the key to the House itself. From the origin of the Congress under the Constitution it has been given the power to determine which bills shall be given the preference of consideration from among the many thousands of measures introduced at each session.

The Rules Committee stands for orderly government. It protects the House against pressure groups that might otherwise prove to be too strong to be resisted.

Today it is the wise and prudent servant of the House.

Once captured by left-wing radicalism, it would become the master of the House and the dictator of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, so far as I am personally concerned I am willing to meet the issue. My political fortunes are insignificant compared with the future of this country. But if this left-wing radicalism is to prevail, it means government by minority and the destruction of the American system of Government.

I want the people of my congressional district to know the facts, and I welcome an opportunity for them to pass judgment in the coming primary election on whether my activities in attempting to curb strikes in wartime was the proper conduct or not. Especially am I pleased that the issue has been made and that the veterans returning from waging the country's battles will have an opportunity to pass upon my conduct in this matter during their absence.

Mr. Speaker, during the late and unfortunate war I used one yardstick in dealing with this question of wartime strikes which I often quoted on the floor of the House. It was to the effect that the average American laborer wanted to be just as patriotic as the American soldier; and that his contribution to the

winning of the war in the building of the ships, guns, planes, and other sinews of war was just as essential as the services of the men and women who wore the uniform and sailed the ships and fired the guns and flew the planes. But by the same token I have always contended that the responsibility of the laboring man to his Government under those circumstances was just as binding as the duty of the men who wore the uniform, and that the one had no more right to strike against his Government than the other had to desert the colors in time of battle.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, as one who started laboring at 50 cents a day at a very early age, and who worked his way through high school and college, my sympathies have always been with the laboring man. And in my own heart I know that I am a truer friend to labor than many of these so-called labor leaders who set themselves up in judgment about who is friendly and who is unfriendly to labor. I have repeatedly pointed out on the floor of the House and to many of these leaders personally that if they continued their reckless and unjustifiable actions, they were going to pull the temple down upon the heads of labor; that such actions as the present coal strike would result in the loss to labor of many of the just gains they had made.

It is interesting to note from the records compiled by the labor big-shots here in Washington just what they constitute as votes unfriendly to labor. For instance, in my own case I am charged with being unfriendly to labor because on several occasions I voted against the anti-poll tax bill, the FEPC, and other similar bills which were aimed at my own section of this great country. As a matter of fact, if 99 percent of the wage earners of my district had been in my shoes they would have voted just as I did.

Again, I am charged with being unfriendly to labor because I voted on two or more occasions for the so-called anti-racketeering bill. This bill, as every Member of this House knows, simply provided that anyone guilty of extortion or robbery in interstate commerce would be punished therefor. The real purpose of this bill, of course, was to prevent a practice which had grown up around many of our larger cities whereby a farmer could not drive his own vehicle, carrying the produce from his own farm, into one of these cities without first joining the teamsters union or paying $10 to $15 to a representative of that union who held him up at the city's outskirts. Mr. Speaker, I do not think there are any laboring men in my district who would condone such a procedure or who would consider me as against labor because I opposed such a practice.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I am ready to accept the challenge. My actions as the representative of my people were motivated by what I regarded as my patriotic duty in those tragic days of our country. I felt then and I feel now that to have done otherwise would have subjected me to the grossest kind of condemnation by patriotic Americans everywhere. I could not have faced my three sons who were engaged in that conflict on their return, nor the millions of other patriotic young Americans who endured the hardship of the foxholes, the wintry blasts of the seas, and bared their breasts to the ruthless enemies who sought to destroy them and this great country. I have no apology to make. I would follow no other course if it were to be done over again. In fact, Mr. Speaker, in addressing the House on this subject in 1941 I concluded my remarks with this statement:

As for me, my own policy from here on out will continue as in the past. My policy in this crisis of my Nation will continue to be such that should my own precious son or that of any other American father and mother be brought back from the firing line in a flag-draped casket that I can look courageously into his pallid face and say, "Ole fellow, I have been honest with you."

For the benefit of those interested, Mr. Speaker, I should like to include some of my other utterances on the floor of this House in the debates which took place during the tragic war period and which further reflect my convictions then as well as now.

On August 13, 1941—Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A3929—I said, in part:

Mr. Speaker, the situation is serious; the hour is grave. Franklin Roosevelt today could with propriety repeat what Woodrow Wilson, the great wartime President of yesterday, said: "We know not what a day may bring forth." The time has come for a full realization of the American people of the gravity of the hour. The time has come for sacrifice. The time has come for all Americans—young men who must fight the country's battles, industrialists who must prepare the sinews of war, and laborers who must build the guns, planes, and boats—to throw off their lethargy and indifference and awaken to the full realization of the fact that if we, too, would not become the victims of Hitler like the other democracies of the world we must as a united people make sacrifice the watchword of the future. Profiteering in industry and strikes in defense construction during a national emergency should no more be tolerated than desertion in the Army.

Mr. Speaker, I have supported the foreign policy of this administration. I have voted for the expenditure of billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money with which to build up this national defense and with which to combat Hitlerism. I voted for the original Draft Act because I thought it was the democratic and equitable way to secure an Army. I shall vote for this legislation, not because I want to but because I refuse to take the responsibility for the tragedy that might occur should I do otherwise. As one who for years earned his keep by the sweat of his brow, I have voted for all legislation aimed at the betterment of the laboring man since I have been a Member of this House. I am ready to compare my labor record with that of any Member of Congress. I have always been fair and just in my legislative attitude toward capital. But I must confess that within the last few months, when I have beheld the sorry spectacle of capital profiteering in the ventures growing out of the threat to this country and have witnessed the unconscionable, and in many instances communistic, labor leaders bringing about a cessation of work on defense projects vital to the country's defense, I have been astonished and dismayed. This condition cannot prevail. An outraged public opinion will not much longer tolerate it.

Again, Mr. Speaker, on November 24, 1941—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 9062–9063—I said:

Personally and frankly, Mr. Speaker, if I have a well-founded conviction on this highly controversial and far-reaching subject, it is that no legislation which attempts to cover one or more phases of the subject of price control without covering them all will solve the problem. I cannot for the life of me see how we are going to say to one group of American citizens that you can make a profit not exceeding a certain amount without making that yardstick apply to all groups alike. How are we going to say to the farmer that he can only receive a certain price for the commodities produced by him and at the same time say to the laborer that his wages will go unrestrained? Or, again, how can we in fairness say to labor that wages not exceed a certain amount without saying to industry that beyond a certain point he cannot profit out of this great national emergency?

On October 27, 1941, in addressing the House on the first coal strike called by John L. Lewis, I said—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 8265:

Mr. Speaker, the entire country is alarmed and amazed at the prospect of an extended strike of several hundred thousand coal miners, which is now being engineered by John L. Lewis and his corps of henchmen. America has embarked upon a most gigantic program of aid to the democracies who are fighting Hitlerism. The President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretaries of War and Navy, as well as the leaders of the country generally, are daily emphasizing the fact that this country faces the greatest crisis in its history. The very future and stability of this country is involved. The future of labor and of other American citizens is at stake. This crisis in which the Nation finds itself will determine whether American labor will continue to enjoy the freedom and progress and high standards of living or become virtual slaves under Hitlerism in this country as in the other countries which Mr. Hitler has overcome. Our American youth are being called upon to leave the comforts of their homes and the peaceful pursuit of life and happiness in order to combat Hitlerism. And yet in this appalling situation Mr. Lewis, apparently indifferent to the future of labor and the freedom of this country, has openly defied the President of the United States and imperiled this country's future.

Mr. Speaker, the mining of coal is the basis of our whole defense program. It takes so many tons of coal to manufacture so many tons of coke. It takes a given quantity of coke to manufacture a given quantity of steel. Steel is required to manufacture guns, ammunition, ships, tanks, and planes. Therefore, the whole defense program threatens to be stopped dead in its tracks because Mr. Lewis and his henchmen have arbitrarily declared that arbitration and reason shall be ruthlessly laid aside in order that their point might be carried. It appears that the Rubicon has been reached; that a showdown is imminent. It is to be hoped that the President and the Congress of the United States will meet the issue squarely.

In the name of God, in the name of freedom, in the name of the men of our Army and Navy who today are preparing to offer themselves as living sacrifices upon the altar of the country, how long—oh, how long—will this condition continue?

On December 3, 1941—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 9373–9374—4 days before the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor, and when we were feverishly trying to prepare the country for its defense, I addressed the House, then considering an antistrike bill, in part, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, all eyes in this country today are directed at the Capitol of the United States. The people of the country are alarmed, they are amazed, they are dumfounded that their will has been so long thwarted upon this question of strikes in defense industries * * *.

My distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. MCKEOUGH] on yesterday made a most impassioned appeal against any legislation. Today he took the floor again. I listened to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] and others who represent that school of thought talking about crucifying labor. Nobody is trying to crucify labor * * *.

The gentleman from Illinois says that those who advocate this legislation have voted against all labor legislation. I challenge that statement. I say to the gentleman from Illinois that there is no man on the floor of this House, not excepting him, who has a better labor record than I have. I have never voted against a piece of legislation, the wage-hour law not excluded, that was for the benefit of labor since I have been on the floor of this House. When I listen to these gentlemen talk, I can almost see in my mind's eye the delegates in the House of Deputies of France and I can hear them making the same kind of appeal the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MCKEOUGH) made.

Mr. MCKEOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I cannot yield, my time is so limited. I would like to debate this matter with the gentleman if I had the time

Mr. MCKEOUGH. I would like to also.

Mr. COLMER. I have not the time. I know that the delegates in France, in all the crises of that country made the same kind of an impassioned appeal that the gentleman from Illinois made, and today, where is France? Where are the gentlemen who made those appeals * * *?

Mr. Chairman, today we are face to face with the fact that this Nation, its institutions, and the heritage left us by the founding fathers is at the greatest crisis that it has ever witnessed. It will either survive and flourish as a result of this world struggle, or it too will fall prey to the scourge of Hitlerism, and its peoples will be added to Hitler's slaves. The legislation which we are considering here today seeks to make the disgrace of strikes in defense industries either no longer possible or negligible. So, Mr. Chairman, this legislation is in no sense antilabor legislation. This legislation is prompted by an effort to help the rank and file of labor to help themselves and to give them a full opportunity to contribute their full patriotic measure toward the winning of the war against Hitlerism. This legislation is necessary and essential, therefore, not only to see that the wheels of industry in our defense program are kept rolling, but it is necessary to protect that great mass of workers, who are just as patriotic as any other class of American people, against a small group of labor racketeers who place their own selfish gains and advancement above their duty to the masses of labor and their country. * * *

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, to you and my colleagues in the House on both sides of the aisle, that such legislation is essential. The American people, including the hordes of the rank and file of labor, are looking to you as their representatives to enact legislation that will stop this unwarranted and inexcusable system of strikes in defense industries. Moreover, they have a right to expect such action on your part. I can conceive of nothing that would afford the common enemy greater satisfaction than for you to fail the country in this hour of crisis. The splendid young men who have been forced by the draft law, enacted by you, as well as the hundreds of thousands of young patriots who have volunteered into the country's Army and Navy for a mere pittance in the form of a wage, are looking to you. The mothers and fathers of those young men, and the millions of patriotic laborers themselves have turned their eyes toward the Nation's Capital today, and they all together with the patriotic Americans everywhere, expect every Member of this Congress to do his duty faithfully, patriotically, and without fear.

Mr. Speaker, 2 days after Pearl Harbor, on December 9, 1941—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 9578—when most of our Navy had been destroyed and Japan was in almost sole control of the Pacific, I again addressed the House as follows:

I wonder if the American people yet appreciate the fact that we are engaged in a death struggle for the survival of this Nation and its institutions. As far as I am concerned, I have taken the position ever since the repeal of the neutrality law that we are in a state of war * * *.

We are in a war unto the death and the sooner the American people realize this, the sooner the American laborers, the sooner the American Congress, the sooner the American capitalists realize this the sooner we will be able to achieve that ultimate victory that we all hope for. I hope the American people will no longer be deluded. Mr. Speaker, I apprehend that when the facts are made public, it will be disclosed that we suffered a major tragedy on Sunday and that the casualty list is going to be great indeed, and that our material losses were greater than we now suspect; but it is up to us to relegate everything else to the background and prepare for a long, drawn out war and make whatever sacrifice is necessary.

I hope I will never again hear from this floor or from any other Government official the thought advocated that we can go on and win this war and at the same time carry on with the social progress we have made. We have got to do one of two things. We have either got to make up our minds that we are going to make whatever sacrifice is necessary or else play the role in this great tragedy of World War II that was played by France.

Mr. Speaker, only a few days ago, on May 17, 1946—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 5214–5215—in addressing this body I again pointed out the direction in which we are traveling in this labor-management crisis. I called to the attention of the membership of this House, as well as the labor leaders of this country, dangers of that trend in part, as follows:

As chairman of the Postwar Economic Policy Committee, I, with six other members of that committee, visited the Soviet Republic last year. We saw, first hand, how labor was treated in that country. We saw those people working in those factories and we saw them working on those farms, and I say to you that they are virtually frozen to their jobs, and do not enjoy the right to strike. They do not enjoy the right, in most instances, of even the freedom of electing their own form of employment. I asked the superintendent of one of the large factories there, a pride of the Soviet Republic, if they had any strikes in that country. The gentlemen here who were with me will bear me out on what his reply was. No; they do not have any strikes in that country. He indicated that that was an American institution. I said, "What happens when the workers are dissatisfied?" He said that they were not dissatisfied. But I pressed the question about what would happen if they became dissatisfied.

"Well, in that case a representative of the trade-union and a representative of the factory just get together and everybody is satisfied," the superintendent replied. But he neglected to say that the representative of the trade-union and the representative of the factory were both key figures in the Communist government, and that the trade union was also a part of the government.

I asked the same question at the collective farm and I got the same answer. Nobody is dissatisfied, nobody strikes, and nobody changes his employment. Is that the form of government we want in this country? If that form of government threatens this country, then are we justified in investigating the activities of that form of government in this country? They have a right to their form of government there, but they have no right to force their form of government on us.

I say to you that we left the distinct impression from those with whom we discussed this matter there, both the Russians and our American representatives, that if a worker complained about either the working conditions or the pay for the fruits of his labor he was waited upon, usually at night, by a representative of the secret Russian police. He was then either glad to remain satisfied thereafter or was sent to the frozen regions of Siberia.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, I read recently where a group of vice presidents and representatives of the CIO visited Russia and came back and recommended closer cooperation between the Soviet trade-unions and the American labor unions. God forbid that the independent American workingmen and farmers will ever be forced to work under such a system.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, today our whole economic system, already staggering from the blow dealt it by John L. Lewis' coal strike, was dealt still another and final blow by other dictatorial labor leaders. Today our whole transportation system—the arteries which furnish the lifeblood to our economy—is blocked. A mere handful of willful men have stopped the wheels of industry and have caused a complete cessation of the production and transportation of the farm and industrial products so essential to life in this modern civilization.

Has not the time come when the President and the Congress of these United States, the only Representatives whom 135,000,000 Americans have to look to for leadership and guidance, must decide—and decide now by appropriate action—whether this great country is to be conducted for the benefit of all of the people or whether it is to be dictated to by a small minority? Ours is the only surviving republican form of government which engaged in the last two world wars. We must decide now whether we are going to follow in the footsteps of France, or Russia, or whether we have the intestinal fortitude to save this glorious Republic—the most perfect embodiment of human liberty and freedom.

River and Harbor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED. V. IZAC
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my statement made before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House, May 3, 1946, in connection with San Diego and Mission Bay, Calif., which is of great importance and benefit to the citizens of San Diego:

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I would like to develop the benefits regarding this project a little bit further than the colonel has.

I think he has covered the main essentials of the Government expenditure.

Now, about 1870 we had a flood problem in San Diego, small as the city was, because the waters of the San Diego were flowing down into San Diego Bay, not Mission Bay.

In order to save the valuable lands there at the mouth of the river, the Government built this jetty, as you can see here (pointing to chart), to shunt the waters away from San Diego Bay and run them off into the ocean here at Mission Bay. That held for quite some time, although it had to be amplified and augmented and strengthened, and as late as the 1920's I saw a flood that I was sure was going to take out that dike, but by the help of Marines and Navy personnel, we managed to get sandbags sufficient to withstand that flood.

Immediately thereafter a study was made to see what had to be done to avoid this danger in the future. Now, the danger is, not to just the sand in the mouth of the old river. In the meantime, we have built the Marine Corps base, the naval training station, and the Consolidated Vultee plant, employing 44,000 people during the war building aircraft for the Army and Navy, and all of those, in addition to the municipal airfield, lie athwart the old mouth of the river.

So it is very essential that we do not have any floods from now on.

It is for that reason that a study was made, as I say, to see if we could not have a real flood-control channel out to Mission Bay instead of into San Diego Bay, and as has just been stated, this $2,000,000 project, mostly at the expense of the Federal Government, and correctly so, because it is strictly a flood-control project, is to be used to build a jetty here, a jetty there, and then dredge out this channel between.

The San Diego River coming down from the gorge as it does will flow through this and go out unobstructed to the ocean.

Here is one reason why it costs the local interests so much money. When we build anything of this kind it means the relocation of bridges and boulevards, and in this case the main highway to Los Angeles has to be moved. All of the bridges will have to be moved, and that will be at the expense of the local people.

They have assumed that already in their appearance before the Army engineers. So much for that.

Now, we come to what I consider one of the great assets to the country that we will have if this river-and-harbor feature is carried to completion.

As you know, we have a high coast line on the west coast. In the East it is low. We have many indentations from the Rio Grande up to Canada.

The type of coast line is such that it permits of harbors being built every few miles. You know if you have ever been fishing along the east coast, you can put in out of danger of storms every few miles because there is always a little harbor close by.

On the west coast it is entirely different. On the west coast, we have, starting at the Mexican line, only three or four natural harbors, the first one being San Diego Bay.

This committee made it possible for San Diego Bay to serve to such a great capacity in this war by authorizing the dredging program that I had the honor to present to the committee in 1937, my first appearance before any congressional committee.

That dredging program made it possible to use San Diego as a real harbor for our men-of-war during this war.

After you leave San Diego, the next harbor is Los Angeles, Long Beach, and that is a made harbor; it is not a natural harbor. In between, there is only one little port, you may call it, which was likewise developed by the Army engineers, Balboa, where you can put a few small vessels.

Next comes one or two little made harbors again like Huenemo, which we built in the war, and practically nothing of any account until you get to San Francisco Bay, and then all the way up to the Columb a River, and then to Puget Sound, practically nothing else on the west coast.

So it is very necessary for national-defense purposes, and for normal peacetime purposes, for our patrol craft and for Coast Guard operations, to have all along the west coast sufficient harbors of the type that this project will provide.

You see, there will be nothing from Point Loma up to Balboa, 70 miles away, unless we open up the entrance to Mission Bay by putting two jetties here. One of the two jetties will be common with the jetty for the flood-control channel.

Those jetties, incidently, cost about a million and a half dollars. That is strictly, of course, a Government charge.

As we come in on the ocean side, the plan is to dredge an cntrance channel to 20 feet which will make it possible to take practically all smaller vessels. Adjacent to this main channel there will be a boat basin on the right for repair and overhaul, a boat basin to the left for smaller craft, and by having 20 feet as far as this bridge shown here, it will be possible to place a great number of vessels there out of the storms as well as for laying up for repairs and for the ordinary uses of patrol craft.

Now, just a word about San Diego's end of this. Already we have spent over $4,000,000. It has not all been spent, perhaps, but it is on the way and obligated. We have a dredge working there now. The city of San Diego is going to develop this into a very fine recreational area.

At the present time those are mud flats covering that great expansion there. Right in practically the heart of the city of San Diego.

By dredging we will deepen this to 8, 10, and 12 feet, and up to 20 feet, for various purposes. A power-boat course, yachting all through, and a rowing course; it even provides an airfield and a seaplane base.

At the present time there is a development here in Mission Beach of an amusement center. That, naturally, vastly enlarged by this project, we think will bring great numbers of tourists to our area. That might not seem of such great importance to you gentlemen, were it not for the fact that when the war ended 52,000 of our people lost their jobs as a result of cancellation of contracts. In a town of our size, 52,000 jobs is a lot of jobs.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the size of the city?

Mr. IZAC. Two hundred and two thousand in the 1940 census. Three hundred sixty-three thousand the other day, when they finished the next census. You see, we had a census paid for by the city, and it was just completed a few days ago—363,000, quite an increase from 202,000.

Now, with that great number of unemployed, the mayor and the city officials have plans for putting great numbers of people to work on this project. As I say, they have issued bonds, $2,000,000 in one lump sum. They have spent or obligated all told about $4,500,000 on getting their end done, or at least the preliminary work. They were unable to have the State take care of the bridges and boulevards, but they are going to use the gas-tax fund for that purpose. So all of their part is taken care of. All we need now is to have a favorable report from you gentlemen, with the Government providing its logical share of the cost, and developing for the use of the Nation this harbor that is so badly needed, as are all harbors on the west coast.

The flood control, of course, you can see from this chart. That is a necessary thing to safeguard the Government capital investments that have already been made in the great establishments we have in the mouth of the San Diego River. We must have that flood control regardless of anything else; and with that going hand in hand with this other development, as you can see, it will redound to the benefit, not only of the city of San Diego, but to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Congressman, is there any opposition to this project?

Mr. IZAC. As far as I know, there has not been a word said against it. I understood from the mayor that the bird refuge—this has always been a great bird refuge—that the Wildlife Service was a little worried about it at first, so our people agreed to set aside this whole area, and another section here, for bird refuge—a real wildlife refuge. I understand that that meets with the approval of the Wildlife Service.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I would like to state, Congressman IZAC, that the subcommittee of this committee dealing primarily with beach-erosion matters had the pleasure of visiting your fair city last summer, and we were very graciously and very royally entertained, and in addition, we had an opportunity to go over your water front and see your problems there.

We think you are fortunate in having a number of this committee who were able to get first-hand information on what you are attempting to do.

Mr. IZAC. I am sorry I was not able to be there at the time. I was on an investigation in the Pacific. I had heard that the Members had been there and made the studies, and incidentally made a very fine impression on our people.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. We were delighted to see that the distinguished gentleman was held in high esteem by his constituents, and I assure you that your constituents are fortunate in having you here to promote this project and look after their interests in this Rivers and Harbors Committee, as well as the other committees of Congress.

Mr. IZAC. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Locust Years End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include part of an editorial

from the Alliance Times Herald of Tuesday, May 21, 1946. This paper is owned and edited by Ben Sallows. His editorial reflects the thinking of the people in the Panhandle of Nebraska.

Mr. Speaker, this Government has been issuing more directives by bureaucrats, which have the full force and effect of law, than laws actually passed by Congress. The condition has gone on so long that many people have a feeling that perhaps constitutional government is breaking down and they want big government which will direct all of the activities in the country.

This Government, for 14 years, has so coddled labor that it has become larger than Government itself. Much of this has been due to the administration giving in to labor on ever point.

This House passed labor legislation more than 2 months ago. The Senate is now working far into the night to get labor legislation which will prevent some of the chickens from coming home to roost. These eggs were laid by the administration in the past 13 years. The time is long past due for legislation which will protect the interests of the public. I recommend the reading of this editorial by the Members of the Congress.

LOCUST YEARS END

Government by mimeograph and Government by directives has become the way of American economic life. We have gone so far from the rocklike principles of the Bill of Rights and article I of the Constitution that students of government can find no comparison between the written law and the way which it is now interpreted.

In case you may not remember article I, the first part of our Constitution, that section of our Federal law details the law-giving powers of the Congress, including the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The article says "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States."

What is the current picture that has become so increasingly perilous to the ideas of that Constitution?

We have been subjected to the imperious rulings of the executive department which has mushroomed into a myriad "boards" and "administrations" and "authorities."

Article I says that the laws shall be made by the Congress. But the bright-eyed and starry "thinkers" of the Government in the last "14 long years" have sat at desks and dictated directives that have carried as much power over our economic life as any bill ever passed by the two Houses of Congress and signed by the President into law.

The landslides which swept the Democratic Party into power in 1932 and continued them in that power for three more elections were partly a result of a public impatience against the die-hards of the Republican Party. Some of the New Deal ideas were good; they've been proven of benefit to the general public.

But their method of administration has been bad. These hot-heads and dreamers haven't been content to let our natural constitutional processes bring about the ends they wished to accomplish. They've sat at desks in a fine fever and written directives. Then they sent investigators into the field, and when they found what they considered to be a violation of their beautiful ideas they socked the hell out of the supposed violator.

This boils down to a few simple facts. The best way to see what the trend has been is to get a copy of your Constitution. First, the bureaucrats made the laws through directives; that is an assumption of the powers granted by the Constitution only to the Congress.

Second, they have put those laws into execution; they have determined where and when their directives shall apply; that is an assumption of the powers granted in article II to the executive branch of our democracy.

Third, and most vicious of all, they have proceeded to levy fines and assessments against persons whom they consider have violated the provisions of their own directives.

That is the final assumption of our third and most important division of government—enforcement of the laws.

We have seen a trend in the past few years where people are rising in righteous indignation against this complete assumption of government bureaucracy. And we have seen young able men of purpose, filled with a natural respect toward the written law, come forward and denounce this Government by mimeograph.

Feed for Livestock in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, on May 11, the New England delegation conferred with Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson with reference to the situation existing in New England as to livestock feedings. Because this situation has become increasingly critical, a conference was arranged yesterday morning with Undersecretary of Agriculture Norris E. Dodd, Mr. Carl C. Farrington, Assistant Administrator of Production and Marketing Administration, and Mr. Leroy K. Smith, Director of the Grain Branch of the Department. Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN of Vermont, Senator THOMAS C. HART of Connecticut, Representative SHERMAN ADAMS of New Hampshire, and I met with these representatives of the Department.

After this conference, we were convinced that further action was imperative and, consequently, last night we four sent the following telegram to the President:

Shortage of stock and poultry feed in New England is now past the stage of crisis and is actually approaching a calamity. The destruction of poultry flocks is already widespread and increasing daily. Great numbers of valuable dairy cows are being slaughtered, and underfeeding of remaining herds is aggravating the already drastic shrinkage of milk and other vitally needed dairy products. The withholding of grain for essential feed of draft animals engaged in lumbering operations is curtailing production of lumber indispensable to the progress of the national housing program. These are the stark facts in the face of an abundant supply of oats and a sufficient corn inventory to tide over feeders until the incoming new crop. The failure of the Government to take immediate and effective action in this emergency means the destruction of food-producing flocks and herds, seriously threatening not only our own food supply but also our ability to fulfill our commitments to famine-stricken people abroad. Our producers are faced, in addition, with forced liquidation and bankruptcy of small businesses built up with years of hard work. This is an unfair, unreasonable, and unnecessary hardship upon them. We have used every effort to have the Department of Agriculture provide some solution in this crisis. The Department now offers no hope of any relief. This relief must not be delayed any longer. Therefore, we ask that you proclaim a state of emergency and make urgent recommendations that holders of feed grain ship to New England a supply sufficient to prevent this catastrophe.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Senator from Vermont.
THOMAS C. HART,
Senator from Connecticut.
SHERMAN ADAMS,
Representative from New Hampshire.
JOHN W. HESELTON,
Representative from Massachusetts.

We are reporting this action to the New England delegation. We will continue to make every effort, consistent with our recognition of the solemn obligation of this country in the present world-famine crisis, to develop constructive and immediate action by the Government to prevent further suffering in New England and the destruction of our invaluable food-producing units.

Save America—That's the Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for the information of my colleagues and all those who may read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial by Mr. Richard Lloyd Jones, of the Tulsa Daily Tribune, on the subject, Save America—That's the Issue:

SAVE AMERICA—THAT'S THE ISSUE
(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

At Oklahoma City, the other day, a young man just out of uniform rose before a State convention of Republicans to defiantly serve notice that he was going to be a delegate to the next National Republican Convention and he was going to drive the "Old Guard" right out of the party. He had a lot of things he was going to do. He was very interesting.

He thought the Republican Party had no issue. This week Mr. Kiplinger, the confidential wiser-upper at Washington, said the same thing. Kiplinger knows better. Young Stassen is out on the pay platform peddling the same falsehood. It is time to scotch these lies.

For a dozen years the Democratic Party paid a high salary to one Charles Michelson to manufacture lies about honest men. Repeating lies cause them to stick. Not a high-class business, but it was the Democratic business.

This "Old Guard" slur at the Republican Party sets up a big, bad bogie. It is the alias for "Wall Street," wicked Wall Street where Franklin Roosevelt was most at home. Is Stassen getting any money today from a Wall Street stock broker by the name of Hanes? Wall Street is Democratic and Wall Street is New Deal.

J. Pierpont Morgan, Sr., and J. P., Jr., and the majority of the partners in the Morgan House, including the late Mr. Roosevelt's playmate Stettinius, his adviser. Barney Baruch, Thomas J. Watson, and a catalogue

of Wall Street operators that compiled, would compare with the Tulsa telephone directory, are registered and participating Democrats. Wall Street is, and always has been, a Democratic stronghold.

The Charley McCarthy, sitting on the Democratic Party's knee, lies when he indicts the Republican Party of being antilabor in any sense. It is the party that put labor into the Cabinet. And it designed that Cabinet position for an actual laboring man to occupy. It was Franklin Roosevelt who overthrew that plan.

Unlike the record of the Democratic Party the Republican Party is so progressive, so just, and so American, that it does not believe the American people should be made the victims of the avaricious performances of labor racketeers who have the full support of the New Dealers in blocking production and halting progress.

The Republican Party believes that under our Constitution and Bill of Rights, every American has the right to work and the right to earn the worth of his labor. Does the young ex-officer want to go to the next national convention to protest that right?

This "old guard" stuff needs a little notice. Youth is not measured by arteries. Youth is vision. Forward moving. If that young man doesn't know that simple physical truth, it's time he learn it. Chaucer wrote the Canterbury Tales when past 60, and Goethe finished Faust when past 80. And today the most aggressively progressive Governor of any State in the country is Republican Walter Goodland, of Wisconsin, who is now canditating for his third term in his eighty-third year. "Old guard"? Who are you talking about, boy?

A lot of these misguided youths, like Stassen, have the idea that no one past 35 is fit to vote.

Deliberate and wilful lies accuse the Republican Party of being a collection of isolationists. By its own national action, the Republican Party pledged itself to everything that the UNO hopes to be. It is time some of these young fellows read the last Republican platform. The Republican Party is opposed to any commitments not sanctioned by the Senate. That is the constitutional way. Under the secrecies of Roosevelt, the Democrats have repudiated this Republic. Under Roosevelt the Democrats returned this country to monarchy from which our forefathers freed us.

The Republican Party is pledged to old-age pensions; to child health and welfare; to low-cost housing; to crop insurance; high farm prices and Government farm credit. A long program of specifically progressive performances, the like of which the Pendergast machine, Tammany Hall, the corrupt Boston gang, the Hague, Crump, and Kelly machines that are the sinews of the Democratic Party, know nothing and care less.

The young man down in Oklahoma City the other day put up bogies to knock down. He didn't tell anybody anything when he said we must feed the hungry and clothe the naked of all the peoples who were injured by wars and who themselves made wars.

He can't find an American in any party who isn't willing to work and to share, to feed and clothe people who are in distress. But the Republican Party never plowed under food, nor killed pigs to create a scarcity.

And the Democratic President, Mr. Truman, had to turn to a Republican, our former President, Mr. Hoover, to find out how best to use America's gifts to relieve the suffering.

The Republican Party is the only party today that stands for the return to free enterprise, that will house our own homeless, that will make work for everyone who wants to work and wages that are the worth of work. Out of producing only can we feed and clothe the misguided and mistreated peoples of the earth.

But they have a need for something greater than bread and fabric. From the strong sustaining neighbor they need a plan, a pattern to emulate, that they can enjoy the productive powers of free peoples. And only the Republican Party can make that pattern because the Democratic Party has destroyed the form.

The falsehood factory has long toyed with the name "Harding" with diabolical dishonesty. It has been implied, and broadcast, that Harding was a grafter. Harding never grafted a thin dime. He was a kindly, genial, gullible, weak, affable chap, a county politician as unqualified to be President as the graduate of the Pendergast school that we have now. The Teapot Dome boys ran circles around Harding but he did not know what was going on. But that infamy was a thimbleful of betrayal compared to the oil operations which Franklin Roosevelt engineered for the Rockefellers and other political playmates of the New Deal. The only President who ever put a Standard Oil officer in a Cabinet post was a Democrat.

The falsehood factory has circulated sneers and contempt for Herbert Hoover, than whom the people never had a more honorable servant. So keen was his sense of public duty that he never drew a dime of salary from his Government while he served as President. In contrast to which the Democratic family that occupied the White House for 12 years made more than a million dollars in just the White House business.

It is high time responsible writers and self-respecting broadcasters began to speak the truth.

Who says the Republican Party lacks a positive program belies his own devotion to this Republic. The Republican Party was born to champion just one cause—to save the Republic of the United States of America. Today that is the real issue. And had the Republican Party no other it would outweigh all other parties in their hypocritical professions of platform. As it began, so the Republican Party today is going to save America. And that is the real issue.

OPA Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting article appeared in the Indianapolis Star of recent date as a reprint from the Chicago Tribune, relating to the misinformation given by the OPA to the people of this country. Quite well do we recall the material misinformation given to the people and to the country by Mr. Chester Bowles, and others, by radio and through the press, following the action taken in the House of Representatives on the extension of the OPA. Of course, the people knew that those who gave that misinformation were trying to perpetuate the OPA as an agency of Government, and to likewise perpetuate the fat jobs those in that agency are now holding. The people know that fact. The people are not being fooled by the Washington bureaucrats, and least of all by those in the OPA.

Abraham Lincoln said: "Let the people know the facts and the country will be saved." But, with men who would mislead and try to fool the people, for their own selfish purposes, deliberately misstating the facts, and trying to mislead the people, there will be a great uprising in the future and those very men will be the recipients of the wrath of the people—who, in the end, are our own Government. The people are opposed to control and domination by some agency of Government. They have experienced too much of it already. If there is need for regulation, the people will regulate themselves—or that regulation can be properly handled in the counties—there is no earthly need of maintaining a huge agency of government, in Washington, with thousands of people upon the payroll, telling the people just what they must do, or what they must not do, at a tremendous cost and expense to the taxpayers of the Nation. And, too, we do not approve the methods used by those in the OPA—and the people do not approve of those methods. Let the OPA be honest, and let them tell the truth, while they are yet in existence.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include the newspaper article to which I have referred, which is as follows:

HOW THE OPA LIES TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Garritt Roelofs, regional agricultural adviser of the OPA, went down to Peoria in February and made a speech in the name of Rae Walters, the OPA Administrator in Chicago. He spoke before a meeting of grain dealers. He quoted what he claimed was history in an argument that the OPA was needed to prevent a wild price inflation.

"Our Nation was spreading westward when Lincoln took office in 1861," said Roelofs. "Great barge loads of wheat were drifting down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers to New Orleans. Top price for wheat at the farms that year was $1.46 per bushel. But in 1862 it was up to $4.10 per bushel. In 1863 it hit $15 a bushel, and in '64 it was sold at the farm for as high as $65 a bushel. As the year 1865 opened the price had jumped to $80. By February of that year wheat was selling for $110 a bushel. From a top price of $110 a bushel it fell to a low of $2.25. It was boom and bust again."

An OPA press release quoting Roelofs came to the desk of T. C. Tisler of the Daily Republican-Times at Ottawa, in La Salle County. Mr. Tisler spotted it for a piece of fakery and went to work to prove that it was a fake. He checked the Civil War files of an old Ottawa newspaper. He wrote to the United States Department of Agriculture, which informed him that the price range of wheat during the Civil War was only from 80 cents to $1.45 a bushel. He inquired at the University of Illinois and of the Chicago Board of Trade. He summarized his findings in a column in the Republican-Times.

The next thing that happened was that Mr. Tisler got an indignant letter from Clifford Blackburn, the OPA press agent in Peoria, defending Roelof's alleged statistics. Blackburn let the cat out of the bag. Roelofs had got his price figures from a study of farm prices published by the Virginia agriculture experiment station and the Federal Department of Agriculture in 1929. Wheat had sold for $110 a bushel, but it was not the wheat that Roelofs spoke of as floating down the Mississippi on barges, nor were the prices he quoted paid on the farms, as he said they were. Wheat sold in February and March, in the beleaguered city of Richmond, for $110 a bushel—$110 in Confederate money. The same report from which Roelofs extracted his "phony" figures warned:

"These prices are given in Confederate currency and reflect the rate and extent of cur-

rency inflation in the Confederate capital during the Civil War years. These prices must not be taken as representative of prices in the South during the Civil War, or even for the State of Virginia, for they represent strictly local conditions."

The statement was as artful an example of a liar figuring as any New Deal agency has produced in months. When it was challenged the OPA tried to brazen it out.

We may yet see $110 wheat in the United States, but, if so, it won't be because the OPA is abolished, but rather because the masters of the New Deal have rendered our currency as worthless as Confederate paper was in the month before Appomattox.

Paul A. Porter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the permission granted me I submit for printing a letter to the President demanding the removal of Hon. Paul A. Porter, the Price Administrator, and another letter to Hon. Tom Clark, Attorney General, demanding the prosecution of said Porter for violation of section 201 of title 18 of the United States Code:

MAY 23, 1946.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I enclose a copy of a letter which I am today sending to Hon. Tom C. Clark, requesting the prosecution of Hon. Paul A. Porter, Price Administrator, for violation of section 201 of title 18 of the Code.

This section provides not only for fine and imprisonment but it also provides for removal from office as a penalty by his superior officer.

I ask that this be done immediately.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN TABER.

MAY 23, 1946.

Hon. TOM C. CLARK,
The Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CLARK: I enclose herewith a Price Control Board News Letter, No. 162, OPA Region No. 2, dated April 29, 1946, which includes a lot of propaganda designed directly and indirectly to influence Members of Congress to favor the continuation, without amendments, of the price-control law.

This is a direct and deliberate violation by Price Administrator Paul A. Porter of section 201 of title 18 of the Code. The penalty provided is removal from office and that he be guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

It is about time that the waste of appropriations on illegitimate propaganda was stopped.

Until this matter is laid before a grand jury I shall be obliged to keep calling attention to this violation and to the failure, if such shall exist, on the part of the Department of Justice to do its duty.

I regret that a situation has arisen where it is necessary to call attention to such criminal operations on the part of public officers.

I am sending a copy of this letter to the President with the request that he proceed with the removal required by the statute.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN TABER.

Labor Disturbances and Price-Ceiling Adjustments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include two statements on current issues, recently adopted by the board of directors of the Illinois Agricultural Association.

These two statements, Mr. Speaker, are sound approaches to the problems of labor disturbances and price-ceiling adjustments.

As my record of the past few years will disclose, I have tried as best I could to help write and vote through the House constructive labor legislation which, if enacted into law, could easily have helped this Nation avert the drastic labor disturbances now abroad in the land. Mr. Speaker, in all fairness, no minority group in this land, be it industry or labor, is entitled to preferred treatment at the expense of and against the public interest. I trust this great democracy will not permit itself to be completely destroyed through any inaction on the part of those presently in control of our national affairs.

Last week I took up with the Department of Agriculture the wisdom of their recent grain-ceiling-price increases without their putting into effect a corresponding price increase on soybeans. I emphasized that more consideration be given this matter and expressed the need for soybean price ceilings to be increased in order to obtain for the future a better balance not only in price but likewise in production.

STATEMENTS ON CURRENT ISSUES ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE ILLINOIS AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION, IN SESSION AT CHICAGO, MAY 17

LABOR DISTURBANCES

The American Government and way of life are founded on full production. If these are to continue, the production of goods must be on an ever-increasing scale.

Since VJ-day a long series of strikes and labor disturbances in basic and major industries has hindered reconversion, paralyzed our economic system, and undermined the very foundations of our Government. The attitude and actions of certain labor groups and leaders has cost billions of dollars in loss of production, wages of workers, and markets for farm products.

Our modern economy is highly specialized, and economic groups are necessarily dependent upon one another. Under these conditions a few individuals must not be allowed to throttle the Nation's economic processes.

After many years of struggle organized labor has gained, largely through national legislation, a tremendous power. Some labor leaders seem not to recognize that the possession of this great power properly carries with it corresponding responsibilities. National legislation should be enacted placing responsibilities on labor unions comparable to those which have been placed by law on management. Such legislation is essential to curb abuses by labor leaders and to check the loss of production and waste of resources we are now experiencing.

Legislation as reported by the Senate Labor Committee is entirely inadequate. We urge that Congress adopt the Ball-Taft amendment and other appropriate legislation to protect the people, the Government, and the workers themselves from irresponsible labor leaders.

PRICE CEILING ADJUSTMENTS

As an aftermath of history's most frightful war, famine rages in many lands. Food from America is the only hope of life for millions of people. Fats, oils, and protein are especially needed.

Although soybeans can produce more oils and protein than any other crop, recent actions of the Government threaten to greatly reduce the acreage to be planted to soybeans. According to a Government report issued in March, United States farmers expected to plant about one and one-half million acres less soybeans in 1946 than in 1945. The recent increase of 25 cents per bushel in the ceiling price of corn will cause a marked increase in corn acreage and a further reduction in soybean acreage, unless soybean prices are increased in proportion to the increase in corn price ceilings. If fats, oils, and proteins are needed as critically as we have been led to believe, it is essential that the price for 1946 soybean crop immediately be increased in proportion to the increase in the ceiling price of corn.

Another very important effect of the higher price ceiling for corn is to increase feeding costs and force heavy marketings of livestock. Although this brings about a temporary increase in meat production, after a few months the marketing of hogs and other livestock will be greatly reduced, and supplies of meat will be even less than the small amounts available in recent weeks. At the same time unused corn may accumulate to form a surplus which would depress prices later. In order to prevent the accumulation of such a surplus, an unnecessarily severe liquidation of livestock and a critical reduction in meat supplies, livestock price ceilings, especially those on hogs, must be increased to reflect at least part of the large increase in food costs.

Futile Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an editorial which appeared in the Journal News, a newspaper published in Nyack, N. Y., under date of May 22, 1946, as follows:

FUTILE OPPOSITION

Hell hath no fury like a woman scorned, but comparable is the fury of the political organization which has had its wishes flouted by the voters. That is perhaps the only explanation that can be found for the stubborn refusal of Orange County Republicans to accept Congressman AUGUSTUS W. BENNET as the party standard-bearer in the 29th District. There is neither rhyme nor reason in the steadfast refusal because every claim

alleged against Mr. BENNET'S party regularity can be and has been satisfactorily answered.

The trouble arose 2 years ago when three of the four counties in the newly established district let it be known plainly that they would have no part of representation by Hamilton Fish. That went counter to Orange County Republican wishes for there Mr. Fish had built up a machine of long standing. The three counties now feel that Mr. BENNET has given an excellent account of himself and are quite willing that he should continue for the next term. But Orange County feels it is an orphan child in the district, in spite of the fact it is the largest of the four and refuses to listen to the majority. It is not a healthy situation but it's one of Orange making and the best solution would be for that big county to yield gracefully. That it hasn't thus far is due to the fact that the committee and its leaders refuse to admit that they can be wrong.

Child Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this occasion to commend President Truman for the progressive move he has made in Reorganization Plan No. 2 and its accompanying message to Congress to advance the cause of human welfare on the home front. Leaders in welfare and related fields have long been urging the strengthening of our administrative machinery in this area in order that the Federal Government might exert forward-looking leadership on a unified basis. President Truman's reorganization plan to bring together in the Federal Security Agency all Federal agencies concerned with human welfare, and his accompanying recommendation that Congress give the agency Cabinet status deserves the strongest support. This move has long been advocated by organizations and individuals concerned with the protection of our human resources and was last year strongly recommended by a committee on reorganization of community services for which Mrs. Agnes Meyer served as chairman and Leonard Mayo, dean of the Western Reserve School of Applied Social Sciences, president of the Child Welfare League of America, and chairman of the Commission on Children in Wartime, served as vice chairman. Other members of the committee were as follows: Mrs. Winthrop W. Aldrich, vice chairman, Civilian Defense Volunteer Office of New York City; Mr. Joseph P. Anderson, executive secretary, American Association of Social Workers; Mr. Frank Bane, executive director, the Council of State Governments; Mr. Paul V. Betters, executive director, the United States Conference of Mayors; Mr. Ralph H. Blanchard, executive director, Community Chests and Councils, Inc.; Mr. Bradley Buell, executive editor, Survey Associates, Inc.; Dr. Eveline M. Burns, formerly of National Planning Association; Dr. Louis I. Dublin, assistant to the chairman, American Red Cross: Miss Catharine M. Dunn, New York School of Social Work; Mr. Martin P. Durkin, general president, United Association of Journeymen Plumbers and Steam Fitters of the United States and Canada; and Mr. J. W. Edgar, superintendent of Schools, Orange, Tex.

The President's proposals closely follow the recommendations of this group of experts.

I personally am particularly gratified by the provisions of this plan because they complement my own proposal for a unified welfare program as incorporated in H. R. 5686, the Public Welfare Act of 1946. Welfare leaders have long pointed out, and recently reiterated before the Ways and Means Committee hearings on social security, the necessity for bringing all social welfare programs into closer relationship. Transfer of the Children's Bureau to the Federal Security Agency, as provided in the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2, and enactment of my bill for a comprehensive welfare program would mean the greatest forward step in the welfare field since the Social Security Act itself was enacted.

OPA Seeks the Help of Panic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Sun, published in New York City, titled "OPA Seeks the Help of Panic":

OPA SEEKS THE HELP OF PANIC

In a fight for support of public opinion, phrases are often more effective than facts. OPA, fighting for an extension of its lif without change, has hit upon the phrase "without crippling amendments." It thus substitutes a label for an argument and seeks to create the presumption that all the amendments to the bill for continuing its existence as adopted by the House of Representatives are a spiteful attempt to cripple a noble and unselfish agency. As a result of a propaganda campaign that might have been outlined by Dickens' Fat Boy, this agency and some of its friends have oversimplified the issue and have succeeding in frightening many Americans.

Senator BOURKE R. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, a Republican, and a frequent critic of some OPA policies, supplies a note of needed common sense. He is for continuation of OPA, but "in reasonable form." Doubtless he will be attacked for this conditional support; he will be accused of being one of the cripplers. Those who insist that OPA must be continued without the change of a single clause in the law choose to ignore the record of OPA. Some of the so-called crippling amendments adopted by the House were meant to assure its continuance as an agency to control prices and were equally meant to prevent continuation of it as an agency to make over the American economic system in accordance with the opinions and whims of those in OPA.

The crowded file of OPA blunders explains the action of the House. If the House went too far, it lies within the power of the Senate to correct the excesses. But it is misrepresentation of the worst character for those in OPA who wish to keep it intact, as an agency for remolding America, to contend that the slightest correction of its ways is a proposal to bring down upon the United States the worst inflation of history. The trouble with the attorneys for OPA is that, in their alarm over the possible loss of unparalleled power, they have begun to prove too much.

Food Plank for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include therein an essay which was submitted in the Nation-wide Food Plank for Peace essay contest sponsored by the Pillsbury Institute of Flour Milling History at Minneapolis, Minn. I am happy to state that the writer of this essay, one of the Maryland winners of the contest, is David Shafferman, of Coral Hills, Md., a student at the Maryland Park High School at Seat Pleasant, Md., in my congressional district. This essay is exceptionally good and it is timely. It typifies how young Americans are seriously thinking about ways to solve the acute problem of world hunger so that tomorrow's peace may be lasting.

FOOD PLANK FOR PEACE

It is an old tradition of the United States to follow the saying, "It's American to share." I think that since this war many of the other nations of the world have learned to depend on and follow the United States. Certainly as a Nation that has become a leader we should share our food with the other starving countries. However, I don't think that we should allow ourselves to be imposed upon. It is our duty to help feed them, but we shouldn't be expected to contribute all of the food.

America and Britain have trained observers abroad whose job is to report to their countries the conditions existing in Europe. They say that the starving people of Europe are ripe for a revolution. There is general discontent in occupied areas. Armed bands are reported to be roaming the western Allied zones of occupation in search of food and clothing. These bands are made up of from 15 to 50 men, and in some cases women, who raid stores of food as well as stores in private homes. Former German soldiers and persons of varied nationalities make up these bands.

Other examples of discontent are to be found in Poland. Because of the total lack of fuel, food, clothing, and shelter, the underground forces have increased and become a real problem to the Warsaw government and the Red Armies of occupation. Politics enter in a little in the reason behind Polish discontent. In Yugoslavia the people are complaining that the supplies obtained in limited quantities from abroad are being distributed only to those who have proved themselves 100 percent behind Tito. In Rumania the situation is better. Their supply of food is better and there has been less devastation of homes and farms than in any other Balkan areas. However, American and British observers feel that the country is seething with discontent and violent outbursts may be expected at any time.

These examples firmly impress upon our minds the things that are happening and

are likely to happen if the food situation in Europe is not relieved. The solution probably lies in a well-organized group to administer relief to the starving millions.

The problems of transporting and distributing the food to the starving nations of Europe has been left up, thus far, to UNRRA. It has done a great deal to eliminate the suffering of European people. It would seem logical for us to let UNRRA continue this work. Of course, to do this they will need more money. They have asked Congress for an additional appropriation, but Congress wants to investigate the inner working of this organization before granting this request. It wants to know what every dollar is spent for and who receives the benefit of it. In the past Russia hasn't allowed American or English reporters to go into the areas where the food and clothing were being distributed to observe just what was going on there. It is only natural that we want to know if our money, food, and clothing are getting into the hands of the starving and needy people of Europe.

If Congress, through this investigation, can iron out all of the difficulties in the administration of this relief, I strongly advocate the continuation of the UNRRA.

The next big problem is whether the European nations should have to pay for this relief. These countries have very little, if any, money. I can't see the point of running up a large bill which would take them many, many years to pay. The chances are it wouldn't get paid, anyway, as there is always something interfering. If we did charge them for this relief, it would only make them have a little hatred for us, which might in several years turn out to be a cause of another war.

This war has lead to a lot of research on food. Various ways of concentrating food, such as K rations, and ways of sending more food without fear of spoilage (dehydrated) have been used. Although our Army didn't think much of K rations or dehydrated food, they might mean the difference between life and death to many a starving nation. A great deal of research has been done on deep-freeze technique. This would enable many fresh vegetables and meats to be kept for an almost indefinite period. All of these inventions would help us to have the food to spare and facilities for sending this food to other countries.

Experts agree that by 1950 we shall have a large food surplus. Since this will be the case, we might just as well help those have-not nations. This in turn might lead to better international relations and make for a more lasting peace. If this would enable us to avert another world war, we could truly say that food was a plank for peace.

UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, since the early days when it was only a hopeful plan I have followed the development of UNESCO. I believe that finally it is only through the cooperation of the teachers, scholars, scientists, and artists of the world that we can achieve real understanding and peace and the one world which will be our sole security. A matter of the greatest urgency kept me from the floor when the vote on funds for it was taken; had I been there I certainly should have supported it as I have supported and shall continue to support all measures which will implement the Charter of the United Nations.

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, a very enlightening editorial appeared in the Indianapolis Star, of recent date, on the subject of the pending coal strike. This situation has been augmented by the present railroad strike, and with these two major strikes in progress the question of progress in our country presents a very dismal picture to the people. I am confident the coal miners are highly patriotic, in every respect, and I hope they will measure up to that high standard by following their own Government. It is hoped that both of these strikes will be settled very promptly, in the interest of their Government, the people, and all future progress. We cannot even contemplate any progress in our Nation as long as we have these two major strikes in progress, and the job of every laboring man and woman in our Nation is threatened by these two major stoppages.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the editorial to which I have referred, which is as follows:

UNCLE SAM OR JOHN LEWIS?

President Truman has directed Secretary Krug of the Interior Department to seize and "operate the mines in such way as to preserve the national economic structure in the present emergency." That is a beginning. It puts the issue right up to the miners as being between their country and John L. Lewis. Will they be for Uncle Sam or Lewis?

Uncle Sam is not asking anything for himself, but is acting for the millions of Americans who are employed in steel mills, automobile factories, and other activities that will be halted by a fuel shortage. Is Lewis to be permitted to paralyze American industry? He cannot do it without the cooperation of the miners.

Secretary Krug may take over the mines. It is up to the miners to say whether, as American citizens, they will cooperate to preserve the national economic structure in the present emergency, or, as pawns of John Lewis in the game of dictatorship he is playing, they will bring hardship and suffering to millions of helpless citizens. It is hoped that good sense may prevail. The Government, and even American industry, may be defied for a time, but not permanently.

If and when the head of the miners' union consents to a conference, it would be well if Attorney General Clark would call attention to article 1, section 8, of the United States Constitution, "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes." There is not a word about John Lewis, or even Caesar Petrillo, just Congress.

And taxes can be collected only "to pay debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States"—all the United States, not merely the miners or musicians.

International Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include a splendid address delivered recently in the city of Shreveport, La., before the Kiwanis Club by Dr. R. O. Cawker, of the Highland Baptist Church of Shreveport. The address should be read by every Member of Congress:

INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL

In a world that is full of international suspicion, hunger, and suffering, and so far removed from the spirit of brotherhood manifested between our two nations, we should be thankful to Almighty God that we have been permitted to live together side by side as good neighbors for over a century. Our feet have trodden the pathway of peace together; our national lives have developed, each in its own individual sphere. We have both been building mightily in those everlasting forces which make for a great people. This has been done without jealousy, envy, or strife; without covetousness or greed—with a sense of fair play and justice, and with a respect for the rights of others to live their own lives. We spring from a common heritage; we speak a common language; we are actuated with the same impulses and desires. We love our own countries with an unswerving loyalty and devotion and yet we meet as brothers; brothers in that larger sense, which means a recognition of the Divine Supremacy which created all men and gave to all men the power to create and destroy.

Between our two nations there stretches for over 3,000 miles an unseen line of good will. These borders have now been dotted with bronze tablets testifying to this era of peace that has so greatly blessed us. We have no death-dealing armaments guarding our frontiers. In fact, the very thought of such things would be as repellent and inhuman to us as having to take up arms against those of our own kith and kin. Years of peace and friendship together have taught us to love peace and to hate war with its agony which at best can be summed up in five points: filth, degradation, tears, wooden crosses, despair.

If only the spirit of good will existing between us could be interpreted to the nations of the world, peace would be universal and enduring. We should be deeply grateful that our two nations have responsible governments; that we are not under the grinding heel of dictators; that we are not bereft of those attributes which make not only for national but also for personal happiness and contentment, such as freedom of speech, freedom to regulate our lives as we see fit with due regard for the rights of others. Under dictatorships these things are crushed out and cruelty and ruthlessness take control.

We in the United States live with Canadians. We associate with them daily in business and Kiwanis activities. It would be very foolish to say there are not frequent differences of opinion between us, these differences arising out of economic and diplomatic conditions, but we have learned that by the exercising of common sense and tolerance these differences can be adjusted without detriment to either side or either country.

The great force of public opinion demands that there shall be a most friendly relationship and spirit of good will between the

United States and Canada. These questions of tariff frequently irritate the citizens of both countries, but economic matters such as these can be adjusted so that no permanent harm shall come to either country. No one can seriously doubt that the relationship between the United States and Canada is based on sincere and abiding friendship. Public opinion on both sides of the line would damn forever any man, or set of men, who would do anything which would in any way injure permanently that friendly relationship.

International good will has for its very foundation a continued fair dealing between citizens of two countries. Without fair dealing there can be no permanent and enduring international good will. It is fundamental that good will cannot exist between countries where one country is dominated by another, or where all the benefits are derived by one country to the detriment of the other. It would be equally foolish to imagine that international good will could be brought about by force of arms, and so long as propagandists are permitted to pour out on an unsuspecting public propaganda which leads to misunderstanding between nations, the day of international peace is long deferred.

Sacred covenants, which can be broken by any man or group of men who see that in the breaking of these covenants power or profit shall accrue to them, must be supported by a public opinion which is strong enough to effectively stop either commercial or military conquests. Wars are not caused by nations. International misunderstandings are not caused by a whole people; these things are caused by individuals or small groups of men who see the possibility of power or profit accruing to them by bringing about misunderstandings which lead to wars between different nations.

International good will is not something which just happens. It is brought about by the studied determination on the part of men and women who work unceasingly to maintain a relationship between nations which enables them to remain on a friendly basis. Perhaps the Harding International Good Will Memorial in Vancouver, British Columbia, is one of the best examples of an attempt on the part of an enlightened people to set up a shrine which will exemplify good will. An enlightened public opinion is the strongest weapon for the maintenance of international good will between nations, and the example that has been set by Canada and the United States is the most effective answer to those who say that continued international good will is impossible. To educate that public opinion international good will should be a topic of all our Kiwanis Clubs. As Kiwanians it is our duty and our responsibility to exemplify in our daily lives, by precept and example, that last objective of our constitution, to cooperate in creating and maintaining that sound public opinion and high idealism which makes possible the increase of righteousness, justice, patriotism, and good will.

We, as Kiwanians, glory in the fact that we are freemen. We, on this continent, are freemen. We can, to paraphrase Kipling, rise to our feet as God passes by, gentlemen unafraid. Democracy has made us so; no other social order has brought to man such abundance of material things, such stimulus to creative progress, such freedom of spirit. What then is democracy? It is primarily a spiritual force and, as such, transcends definition. The nearest we can come to it is to list its attributes. They are freedom of conscience, freedom of spirit, equality before the law; and beneath these three and holding all three on its shoulders is freedom of enterprise.

It is freedom of enterprise I would emphasize this noonday. When this value is lost democracy is gone. It is now in danger from Utopian suggestions and loose talk about economic bliss. What is freedom of enterprise? Its essence is the right of every man, so far as he can bend circumstances to his will, and so long as he does not transgress the rights of his neighbors, to choose his own calling, to devote to it such diligence as he desires, to engage in such enterprises as to him seem promising, to incur such hazards therein as he cares to risk, and to reap such rewards and suffer such consequences as might result from his election. Its antithesis is regimentation. Note well the limit here set. This is no law of the jungle. Unrestricted freedom of action is anarchy, and none but totalitarian states proclaim that might is right. But within the limits of the rights of others, man should have the right to order his life as he thinks best for himself and society.

History is not wanting in example. Man has tried to improve his economic conditions by restricting his economic activity. It looks like such an easy way. The oldest code promulgated by Hammurabi more than 4,000 years ago took a whirl at fixing prices and wages. The story of Rome shows the inevitable consequences. In the early days of the Republic, the Roman citizen enjoyed economic political rights unprecedented in the ancient world. Except when he was called to bear arms for his country, he was free to follow whatever calling he chose, and he had a voice in the affairs of the state. Then hard times came and the price of wheat went up. To relieve distress in the cities the government bought wheat and sold it to the poor below the market price. Because this curtailed the free market for wheat the farmers were in distress and many flocked to the cities. There they enlarged the pressure groups demanding lower prices for wheat until at last the price was removed. The result was that large numbers of the people were forced to live on relief. The ascending scale of relief threw all other businesses into disaster. New laws, new credits grew, currency was depreciated, enormous sums were spent for public works to provide employment and all of this in the ancient Roman Empire sounds up-to-date.

Finally there came the famous decrees of Diocletian that fixed a maximum price on practically every article known to commerce, including labor and services. Nothing was omitted. The results were as one would expect. Initiative was killed and enterprise was in a strait-jacket. The Empire's defenses were left to mercenaries soon conquered by the barbarians. What happened during this period to politician rights? Step by step, as economic rights were restricted, political liberties were lost. The once independent Roman farmer was bound to the soil and became a serf. The emperor assumed the powers of an oriental despot and the state became totalitarian. Roman liberty died. It could not survive freedom of enterprise. It is not always safe to draw an analogy between ancient and modern times. It is hard to say how much the results were affected by factors that are not present today, such, for example, as slavery. Nothing is more certain, however, than that like causes produce like effects and nearly all the causes that operated in Rome would operate with equal effectiveness in Ottawa or Washington.

One thing, however, is crystal clear—economic liberty and civil liberty stand or fall together. Freedom of enterprise has not come to the common man as a gift. He has won it through centuries of struggle and winning it he has won democracy. Most great social movements have been born in desire for economic betterment; man has learned by experience that he cannot have economic liberty without political liberty. Unless we are watchful we shall sacrifice our birthright of freedom for a mess of utopian pottage. If you think there is no danger read your daily papers, listen to the radio. Freedom of enterprise is democracy. It is not perfect, nor is it above reproach; it is the best offered man today. He, however, is no friend of man who would cure the economic ills of today by bleeding her economic freedom or by dosing her with poisons of restriction and regimentation. We must never again fail to feed the hungry, to bind up the broken hearted, to proclaim freedom to the economic captives, but these are only palliatives. There is a remedy that in time will cure the ills themselves, and that remedy, the only remedy, is greater production. Greater production has an ingredient often overlooked. Man must be encouraged to take risks, else progress will cease for want of enterprise, and for increased risk there must be increased reward. On the other hand, there must be a loss for guessing wrong, else society would be impoverished by recklessness. This means there must not be complete social security. There should be a measure of security for the aged, the infirm, the unfit; but man must not be made so secure that he will not take risks to gain greater security or will not suffer if he takes them unwisely.

We have just won a ghastly war to protect our liberties. To preserve them we must make their objectives our own. These things are the things for which men have died for which we must live—freedom to believe what we hold to be true; freedom to advocate what we hold to be right; freedom to choose each man for himself the manner in which he will serve society and to abide the consequences of his choice; freedom to do and to dare, to strive for gain and to risk loss. For these things we must work and pray—until we have won them all victory is incomplete. Only through constant vigil can we have total victory. This, then, is the glorious task that faces two peace-loving countries, Canada and the United States, who for more than 100 years have depicted to the world how nations can live together without conflict.

As an American citizen I ask you to join in the exultation of a great Englishman, who, knowing America, reverently thanked God that freedom is still an eagle whose glory is gazing at the sun.

OPA Fights Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial which appeared in the Daily Times published in Mamaroneck, N. Y., entitled, "OPA Fights Back":

OPA FIGHTS BACK

With the opening of the case for the defense by the Office of Price Administration before a Senate committee, it is reasonable to predict that the harsher features of the House bill will be softened. For the House bill, in effect, would kill OPA and there are substantial business organizations which fear, along with many individuals, that this would be going entirely too far at this time. Certainly we would face, should the House bill become law, a considerable advance for the remainder of 1946 in food prices and to a smaller degree in clothing and other necessities.

In all likelihood the Senate will leave more price control, and the joint committee may be expected to take more of the Senate than the House viewpoint. In any event, we are of the opinion that the House bill would meet a sharp veto by the President, and that

the Senate would not muster sufficient votes to override.

What has developed, as we see it here in Westchester, is a combination among Southern Democrats who want higher cotton prices, western Democrats who want higher meat and farm prices, and eastern Republicans who want some sort of guarantee that the profits necessary to adequate production will be assured. What we must hope for is a compromise wherein manufacturers can be certain of enough profits to allow uninterrupted production and consumers can be guarded against any inflationary rise in the cost of any necessary commodity. That is, we admit, a tough nut to crack—but if we didn't have tough problems we wouldn't need government.

In whatever form OPA is to be allowed to continue, we hope there will develop in that office a greater responsibility for reasonableness and understanding of human psychology. Some of the rulings from OPA have been alarming in their stupidity. For example, within the week the OPA has permitted an increase of 1 cent on two packs of cigarettes, while holding the price on one pack to the present level.

In other words, when you buy one pack of cigarettes, you pay 17 cents, when you buy two packs you pay 35 cents, which, we suppose is some kind of expert logic even though to us ordinary mortals, it looks like plain damfoolishness.

DAR

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I wish to insert the following editorial from the Connecticut Danbury News Times of May 22, 1946, on the subject of the rebellion in the DAR, which reports the attempt of the Committee Against Racial Discrimination in Constitution Hall, a voluntary group of DAR's, to eliminate the "white artists only" clause from the Constitution Hall lease:

"REBELLIOUS"

This is a free country and each of us is entitled to his own opinion, and to a great deal of leeway in stating his opinions. The ladies of the Daughters of the American Revolution most assuredly have all the rights and privileges for which their ancestors fought so hard, and which these ladies have themselves endeavored to preserve.

In the larger sense, it is solely the business of the members of the Daughters of the American Revolution what rules and orders they make to govern their own proceedings. Constitution Hall, in Washington, is their property, and if, in the best judgment of the governing body of the DAR it is deemed wise to restrict the use of that hall to members of the white race, why that still is not the business of anyone except members of the organization. The Daughters assert, in their own defense, that they have simply conformed to the customs of Washington which decree that the races shall be segregated.

But there is within the organization itself a goodly body of opinion which dissents from this ruling and our distinguished Representative in Congress, Mrs. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, has led this opposition. And thereby has brought down upon her beautiful and sturdy shoulders the wrath of the ladies who hold the southern viewpoint concerning segregation of the races. In her latest manifesto to the dissent elements of DAR the DAR president general, Mrs. Julius Y. Talmadge, of Athens, Ga., asserts that Mrs. LUCE is "the leader of a rebellius group seeking to force a change in our rules."

Well, Mrs. LUCE is perhaps exactly that. But she had distinguished precedent for leading a rebellious group, seeking change. If we learned our history correctly, there was a famous leader, back in 1776, who also was a leader of a rebellious group which sought change. Moreover, he succeeded in his mission.

And if that leader of that rebellious group hadn't succeeded in bringing about the changes he championed, Constitution Hall wouldn't be standing today in the city named after him, and there would be no such society as the Daughters of the American Revolution.

I should also like to include the following editorial from the Herald Tribune of May 24, 1946:

PEACE IN OUR TIME?

The Daughters of the American Revolution, assembled in their fifty-fifth continental congress, were in a spot. Advance publicity and the activities of some younger and, therefore, upstart members had centered attention on an unwelcome resolution to delete the "white artists" clause from leases of Constitution Hall in Washington. The way the congress wriggled off the spot is reminiscent of the more adroit maneuverings of United Nations conclaves. A special committee to study rental contracts was appointed. Whereupon Mrs. E. C. Denny Vann, whose New Jersey chapter had entered the resolution, announced its withdrawal.

Mrs. Vann's sponsorship of the resolution had been spirited. The ladies were, indeed, disinclined to hear her speak. But hisses, we are told, turned to cheers when they understood that she was offering sugar instead of vinegar. Meantime, the issue of the committee against racial discrimination in Constitution Hall, spearheaded by CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, is not so neatly disposed. Despite the congress' prompt move to dissolve it, the committee refuses to be dissolved.

A feeling that the DAR had backed, or been backed into an untenable position troubled the meeting. Without interjection of the maverick committee, and of Mrs. LUCE in particular, Mrs. Grace L. H. Brosseau, chairman of resolutions, held that the deletion would have gone through—in fact, would have gone through long ago—had a state regent or some older woman who had been in the organization for years brought up the subject. Mrs. Vann boasts a mere 62 years and evidently does not yet rank as an older woman. She points out that the white-artists clause bars Indians, Filipinos, some South Americans and, presumably, Madam Chiang Kai-shek. Since Constitution Hall is, in one sense, Washington's most available concert hall, the issue may come up again, even without upstart intervention.

But, of course, it is distressing to have youthful daughters needling the more stalwart. The distress would be eased were the appointed study committee to drop the clause, thereby dissolving the Luce committee quite decisively.

Also included is an editorial from the New York Times of May 24, 1946:

"WE HOLD THESE TRUTHS"

If the Daughters of the American Revolution did not lay claim to an uncommon devotion to the Nation's traditions and if they did not call their edifice in Washington Constitution Hall, they would face much less criticism for their reluctance to permit concerts by Negro musicians in the said hall. Segregation in Washington is a fact, though the only phase of it for which the Federal Government is responsible is the maintenance of separate schools. Hotels, restaurants, theaters, and concert halls customarily discriminate. It may be, as Mrs. Julius Young Talmadge, the DAR's president-general, said the other day at the Atlantic City convention, that "these customs were carefully worked out as best suited for existing conditions and conducive to the greatest happiness and peace for all." But it was not the Negroes who worked them out.

The DAR is not called upon to reform the customs of Washington or of the Nation. It does seem, though, that it would be truer to the American ideals it purports to represent—and often does represent—if it would hold out the same welcome to gifted Negroes that it does to gifted persons of other races. Negroes have fought as valiantly as whites in all our wars. One of them, Crispus Attucks, fell in the Boston Massacre. His feminine descendants, if he had any, would be literally daughters of the Revolution. We think those Daughters, including Mrs. CLARE BOOTH LUCE, who have protested against "racial discrimination in Constitution Hall" are the ones who are loyal to the spirit of the Declaration of Independence. We hope they win out. We think many of the signers, slaveholders though they were in their time, would stand with Mrs. LUCE. The best of them never believed that progress in human relations would end in 1776 or 1787.

Speaking of Lobbies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, permission has been granted me by the House to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the New York World-Telegram entitled "Speaking of Lobbies":

SPEAKING OF LOBBIES

Philip Murray and other CIO officials have called on their unions throughout the country to rally the people of all communities behind a demand that Congress undo what the House has done to cripple price controls.

They have every right to engage in this form of lobbying. We agree with them that many of the House amendments are bad and should be removed from the Price Control bill. We share their fear of dangerous inflation. But we ask one question:

Is this big labor lobby really any nobler or more unselfish than the big-business lobbies which, according to CIO leaders have formed an "unholy alliance" to scuttle the OPA and "sacrifice the American people on the altar of greed?"

We believe that no organization or group has done more than the CIO to create and intensify the present danger of inflation. True, in all it has done, it has professed the loftiest of motives. Always it was "protecting the living standards of American workers." Always it has charged bad faith against anyone who dared to challenge the CIO's tactics.

But it was primarily the CIO, through its organized political power, that induced the Government to adopt the unsound, unworkable and now thoroughly discredited theory that wage rates could be forced up without affecting prices.

The CIO insisted that its members must get theirs first. It enforced its wage demands by great strikes that delayed reconversion and stifled production. Its victories caused

industrial wage costs to rise until OPA's efforts to maintain rigid ceilings further discouraged production. That's why many price ceilings had to give. That's why many Congressmen became convinced that OPA's power must be restricted if ever production was to reach the full essential volume.

We hope that the value of wage increases won by CIO members will not be destroyed by inflation. We hope that American living standards will be protected. But no law Congress can pass will protect them if labor leaders continue to mislead their followers and use their influence on Government to compel adoption of phony economic policies.

The Arkansas Democrat Asserts Loan to Britain Urgent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most influential newspapers in Arkansas—the Arkansas Democrat—published in Little Rock, urges favorable action upon the proposed British loan agreement. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the issue of May 2, 1946:

LOAN TO BRITAIN URGENT

Why snarl up and further delay our proposed loan to Britain with the question of getting military bases from her? That attempt is being made in Congress, which has already dallied around with the loan too long.

Putting first things first is a sound rule. The loan is of immediate importance. It is sorely needed to help Britain over the hump of recovery, and as a necessity to freeing foreign trade from the shackles which Britain had to impose on her huge share of it, so she could live and fight the war.

More than that, the loan is needed to strengthen Britain as a democratic power, whose interests identify closely with our own in keeping world peace.

There's no rush about those Atlantic bases, on which we have a 99-year lease. Nor is there any call for demanding other bases from Britain forthwith, as a condition for granting the loan. Who are we going to fight right away? Congress, in its leisurely consideration of our military problems, has certainly given no indication that it sees any war at hand.

And if we should be on the verge of war—which Heaven forbid—it certainly isn't with Britain. She is our natural ally. We would better be guided by that fact, and help her back on her feet with this loan, so she can speak with some authority again, instead of bickering over bases that represent no urgency at the moment. That problem can be worked out later.

The pressing matter right now is to restore world trade. This will take time, at the best, and the key to the whole structure of world trade is a prosperous Britain. She's the greatest market for our own goods, including cotton, as well as for the products of many other nations. The loan is necessary to hasten her recovery, and get the whole intricate process of world trade to functioning again.

We're going to need that foreign market. It will be vital to our welfare as soon as our production has caught up with the shortages created by the war. It involves millions of jobs for our people. It means the difference, in normal times, between our having employment enough, and lacking jobs—maybe tumbling into another depression.

That last could easily cost us far more in political relief, vast spending by Washington, than the amount of this $3,750,000,000 loan. And figure the military cost to us, if we have to stand alone in the world, as the one strong democracy.

Our best interests argue for granting this credit to Britain. We may not get it back. No man can say whether it is possible to restore normal conditions of peace. But, at least, we can try. We're prize "saps" if we don't. And the prospects will be far brighter if we now risk on peace a small fraction of what we spent for the war. Plain good sense dictates that Congress give the loan its prompt O. K.

Civilian Production Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. JONES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

LIMA, OHIO, *April 20, 1946.*
CIVILIAN PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION,
Columbus, Ohio.

SIRS: It is with considerable reluctance and timidity that I must explain my tale of woe, but it is necessary that I, practicing medicine for a living, have an office in which to see patients.

I was released from active military service December 4, 1945, on the basis of points, after starting my fourth year of service.

Soon thereafter I obtained office space, later engaged a carpenter, and a local lumber dealer (Lewis Bros.) agreed to furnish the material. Things moved slowly, then one day I called the lumber dealer to inquire about the delay (this must be done tactfully, for both dealer and carpenter are quickly offended if you imply that you are even anxious to get the job done). The lumber dealer said, "You have no priority; I can sell you boards but no doors, and you want four inside doors. I have the doors but you're not taking a single door out of here without a Government permit." I asked, "Where do I get the permit, priority, or whatever else is needed?" He answered, "I don't know; that is your lookout." Stunned, I answered, "Well, you are selling doors, what do you suggest"? Answer was, "Try OPA." So I did.

They told me to wait, young lady said she would see, and after considerable delay informed that I must go to the Veterans' Administration.

I went to the Veterans' Administration. They said, "I think we can handle it. I will let you know." On not hearing, I called again, and was told, "Yes; we did handle such things in Cleveland, but we don't do that any more. You must write to FHA in Columbus."

Having more courage then, I promptly wrote, and after several days received a letter stating that inasmuch as the doors are for an office this cannot be handled by FHA, as they are only interested in housing. He did suggest that I write to the Civilian Production Administration, Washington, D. C.

Not dismayed I wrote to Washington and received a large package of forms, directions, copy of laws, a form letter, and apology for not answering promptly.

I spent one evening to digest it, filled out four copies of the form CPA-4423 and sent them to the nearest Civilian Production Office, Toledo, Ohio.

Some time later under date of April 16, 1946, I received a letter from Mr. V. H. Pfaender of the Civilian Production Administration in Toledo stating "you are not in the territory served by Toledo office, you are requested to contact the District Construction Manager in Columbus, Ohio." Continuing in good bureaucratic style "we suggest you have a conference with the above party in Columbus to discuss the possibility of the use of CPA form 541A."

Since so much time has elapsed, I would be glad for just one door on an examination room to give some privacy, but I have neither the time nor the money to drive to Columbus to consult you about changing forms for an application. However, if you feel the request is unreasonable, and you cannot grant me a permit to allow me to purchase one door, can you direct me to an agency granting permission to remove a door from my home and take it to the office?

Respectfully.

DEAR BOB: Thought you might like to know how things are working out in the home town. Everyone you talk with has had enough. Just too bad it isn't election day.

Sincerely.

DAVE STEINER.

Industrial War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Vineland Times-Journal, Vineland, N. J., entitled "Industrial War," which is a clear-headed statement of the problem that I think will be helpful:

INDUSTRIAL WAR

The nearest approach the administration has to a labor-industry policy has been one of "let's wait and see." The general idea has been to be mild, to keep one's shirt on. Then as strikes affecting the basic necessities arise and continue, and are not resolved before becoming acute, it would be up to the people to protest loudly. On the basis of that protest, as in one of those noise-meter contests, the winner would be decided.

The idea of waiting for public opinion to crack the whip does not constitute sound leadership. Deluging Congress with letters and telegrams, requesting action, does not constitute a sound approach to any problem.

On the surface at least, it appears that our top leaders in the Democratic Party are at least as much concerned with their political future as they are with the welfare of the country.

A feeble effort was made some months ago to attack the problem of postwar industrial relations on a higher plane than politics, when President Truman called for a labor-management conference. The conference got exactly nowhere because there was little or no zip put into its sessions. But the failure of that effort foreshadowed a period of unsettled industrial relations. Neither the White House or Congress did more than talk about it now and then until the House of Representatives got hot under the collar and approved the Case labor disputes bill. For a time it appeared that the Case bill's restrictions on labor union funds and responsibilities would be watered down consider-

ably in the Senate. The soft coal strike and the impending railway strike have served to strengthen the hand of the more conservative Members of the Senate, who are now pressing for action on the Case bill as approved by the House.

Legislation considered with more heat than light is one of the basic faults of this administration. It results from failure to resolutely tackle a job at the very beginning, instead of drifting and hoping that public opinion will in some manner right everything. Resentment against strikes may bring legislative curbs, but it also results in fanning industrial war as the result of such legislation.

No plan whatever has been advanced by the Truman administration that will give a basis for avoiding strikes affecting the entire Nation. And if and when these Nation-wide strikes have been settled, there still remains a scheduled battle between the AFL and the CIO for dominance of organized labor. It has been freely predicted that John L. Lewis will supplant William Green as president of the American Federation of Labor, and when that comes about, Lewis is to go after the scalp of Philip Murray. If that is true, the labor turmoil will heighten rather than subside.

Thus far, the White House has side-stepped the problem of avoiding industrial war. It has shadow-boxed and for the most part remained silent. A trial balloon was sent up when John D. Small, Civilian Production Administrator, suggested that Congress outlaw strikes for 6 months. Congress didn't fall for that one, which would have directed all the lightning to Capitol Hill and away from the White House.

Just how Mr. Truman and his congressional leaders plan to improvise to meet the serious condition now confronting the Nation is as much a mystery as how high is high. But it is plain that lack of aggressiveness in leadership has brought on the industrial war that is crippling reconversion, and which threatens to topple over price controls by making even scarcer than before the essential goods not now being produced.

MAX LEUCHTER.

Merely an Armistice?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I submit, under permission granted by the House, an editorial which was published in the New Rochelle (N. Y.) Standard-Star entitled: "Merely an Armistice?":

MERELY AN ARMISTICE?

We are firmly convinced that at least half of our difficulty in securing an orderly and a prompt reconversion from wartime to peacetime industry and employment lies in the insecurity of bureaucratic policies in Washington. The policy of today may change tomorrow, and without assurances of continuity no businessman is going to take any great risk or make any substantial venture.

The shooting has stopped but have we won the peace? What is to be our long-term policy in international relations? Can we be assured that the Truman administration will adopt a definite program and stick to it?

W. Kingsland Macy, of Suffolk County, reelected as president of the National Republican Club in New York City, and one well qualified to act as spokesman for his party, concluded his acceptance speech last evening with these words:

"The close of World War II brought us surcease from fighting but no peace. There is not one of us who feels the issues have been determined. The thing we fought for was a settled future for ourselves and our sons. Today the future seems less certain than ever and it is a grave and terrible indictment of our elected representatives and the men who operate the political mechanics of the world that so many honorably discharged fighters feel that they are merely enjoying an armistice.

"We have won the war but we bargain with the vanquished; victory is dissipated in deals. We grow stridently vocative with our wartime allies without making it clear that the end of battle terminated what were temporary alliances. We are incapable of acting with dispatch and while we vacillate about the proper way to attack the hydra, another head grows and current complexities complicate last year's problems."

That, we submit, is a depressing and pessimistic viewpoint. But there are many factors which indicate the attitude is justified.

Is this in reality "merely an armistice?" What can we do about it?

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my message to the chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee in behalf of old-assistance legislation:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 21, 1946.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives.

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE: The welfare of America is closely related, perhaps oven identical with the welfare of any great mass of the American people. I am appearing before this committee in behalf of our senior citizens. I believe that by improving the lot of millions of the Nation's aged we can strengthen the economy of this country as perhaps in no other way.

Mr. Chairman, when you have a great portion of the Nation's population living on substandard incomes, you have a definite drag on our entire economy. There are more than 14,000,000 good substantial Americans, aged 60 and over, who today, either because their incomes are low, or because they are forced to hold jobs that mean unemployment for young people, are a drag on our economy.

I do not think we are wise if we ignore this fact in this changing social and economic order through which we are passing. I believe the most forward-looking step Congress could take would be to enable every American citizen over 60 to retire, if they so desire, from the labor market and at the same time stabilize his income in the form of pensions at levels adequate to insure expansion of the consumer goods market.

There are, of course, moral arguments in favor of this proposal. In a land blessed with all the material resources we have there should not be any large segment of our population doomed to live in squalor or forever on the border line of starvation, but we have millions of people now struggling on $30 or less pension, who are in just that position.

If we are in a position to lend or give gratuitously to foreign nations we certainly are able to provide for our own. I am a firm believer in the old adage, charity begins at home, but I would not have this committee look upon our senior citizens who are destitude pityingly.

Aside from the moral arguments involved, we can develop a purchasing power and improve our economic condition by the proper allocation of adequate old-age assistance. This group of people can serve in the distribution of purchasing power and thus contribute to a greater volume of business and at the same time meet a humanitarian need. This, in my opinion, is one method of meeting the ever recurring depressions and booms, and making our economy stable, year in and year out.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that for the benefit of all the people, for the purpose of taking the brakes off of production and on a sound basis accelerating consumption, for the purpose of meeting both our economic and social obligations, this committee should recommend the establishment of a Nation-wide old-age assistance program which might be construed as a national insurance annuity program.

I can think of no better way to serve our country, at this time, to improve our woefully inadequate social-security laws, particularly the old-age assistance features of it, than to establish pensions as a matter of right, rather than on a basis of abject needs.

Respectfully,

WAT ARNOLD.

World Food Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted on May 13, 1946, by the Richmond (Va.) Ministerial Union on the subject of the food situation in the world:

RESOLUTION ON FOOD SITUATION IN THE WORLD

In view of the unparalleled and appalling famine that is sweeping Europe, Asia, and other parts of the globe, where men are seeking to keep alive on from one-half to one-third of the daily calorie content necessary to preserve life, the Richmond Ministerial Union affirms its conviction that the people of America are now ready to support any drastic action, even including rationing, our Government may take to avert the starvation of millions of people abroad.

Furthermore, we call upon the members of our churches to practice rigid self-denial in the consumption of food, particularly wheat, cereals, and fats which are most needed abroad, and of which there will not be enough to prevent starvation unless the American people reduce their consumption of such foods. We commend President Truman for announcing that the White House will go on a European diet of 1,500 calories twice a week, and urge our people out of sympathy for the needy to follow his wholesome example.

Finally, we ask that each minister in Richmond read this resolution from his pulpit next Sunday, May 19, and ask his people for immediate cooperation inasmuch as the crucial period for relief lies within the next 3 months.

At the Garden Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of today:

AT THE GARDEN PARTY

While the President of the United States went out to a garden party Thursday afternoon the members of the railroad trainmen and engineer unions went out on strike, thus presenting America with its worst peace-time disaster of modern times.

WORST DISASTER OF THE PEACE

As to how long the strike could last there was no telling as this was written. At the worst, the disaster could run on for weeks and bring all American agriculture, industry, business, and even effective Government, to a dead halt. At best, the strike may be settled by the time you read these words. We hope for the best.

But any way you look at it, the railroad strike is a disaster that should sober the minds of any who may still try to believe that the power of the labor unions over our Nation's life is being sensibly used.

BIG STRIKES OF 1946

Look at the broad picture of the year to date. A long and brutally crippling steel strike that slowed down the production of durable goods, from freight cars to refrigerators so that the whole year's industrial planning has been thrown off. A long and brutally crippling strike in the automobile business so that the shortage of cars will run well into 1947, at least. Another long and crippling strike in the production of electrical equipment.

A throttling, pinching strike in the meat-packing industry that surely ought to be clear in anybody's recollection. Numerous crippling telephone strikes.

As of yesterday, more than a third of the Nation's miners of soft coal were still out on the also long and brutally crippling strike called by John L. Lewis and now supposed to be graciously in a state of truce while the Government holds title to the mines and talks back and forth between union and operators.

And finally, the rail strike.

Look them over: Steel, automobiles, meat, electrical equipment, telephone communication, railroad transportation—and scheduled for June a wholesale strike by the waterfront shipping workers under command of Messrs. Harry Bridges and Joe Curran, who need no introduction.

These are just the biggest ones. Add to them thousands upon thousands of minor industrial shut-downs, slow-downs, chock-downs, and lag-downs.

Mr. Truman's labor policy has hardly been a success, and though he may have had a good time at the garden party we doubt if anybody else feels very cheerful.

Well, it does no good to get excited and call a lot of names at this critical stage, so let's keep cool and try to identify some of the facts concerning these paralyzing strike waves.

COMMUNISTS USE TRUMAN'S BLUNDERS

First, there are the Communists. These babies work for Russia, hate America, and spend their every waking hour trying to wreck this Republic built on capitalism and private enterprise. Communists use a lot of language about their noble aims and ideals, but it all comes down to the same thing: They are all agents of Soviet Russia and their publicly stated purpose is to produce bloody, violent overthrow of our constitutional Government.

They are down there making trouble in the rank and file of all the unions. In some of them, such as the auto, electrical, and maritime workers, they are also right at the top. The Communists needle rank-and-file union members to expect the moon with the morning milk, and then needle union officers to go after same.

They have been given many powerful weapons by Mr. Truman's addlepated—and only fair to say—inherited, staff of economic advisers.

The long-range view of the Roosevelt crowd was that at the war's end money wages would slump and goods in volume hit the market with a crash that would cause deflation, a political and economic embarrassment.

So Mr. Roosevelt began in 1943 to let slip his never very firm control of wages. Mr. Truman has followed the same course. B. M. Baruch, testifying before the House committee on OPA early this year, issued a blunt warning to "stop kidding the public that you can keep raising wages and not raise prices."

Baruch also called for a year's moratorium on strikes so that production could get up to real working levels. But his words of wisdom were wasted.

KIDDING DAYS ARE OVER

Well, the kidding days have now ended. Nobody can fool himself any longer about the facts. Mr. Truman's idea—that industry could raise wages and hold down prices has flopped. The only cure now is to junk the OPA and let the law of supply and demand take its course until prices, wages, and production find a balance again as they always have and as they always must in spite of all Government decrees.

Finally, it seems to us that the time has come to amend the laws which give labor unions so much power.

Labor is not the only group in this country's history to abuse its privileges. Bankers, businessmen, and industrialists have all had their days of rough stuff.

But those days are now well past and banking, business, and industry are all pretty tame specimens.

As of today, it is the union bosses who are overplaying their hand. It is time to whittle these characters down to reasonable size. And the job of whittling is up to Mr. Truman, Congress, and the Democratic Party which has dominated the Federal Government for 14 years.

A Reprieve From John L.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 26, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the New York Sun entitled: "A Reprieve From John L."

A REPRIEVE FROM JOHN L.

By the grace of His Imperious Majesty, John L. Lewis, the United States of America has received a reprieve for 2 weeks from its sentence to the gas chamber of industrial suffocation. H. I. M. does not say what promises, express or implied, may have won him over to this act of mercy. It is indicated in other quarters, however, not only that there will be substantial and retroactive increases in pay for the coal miners but also that John L. may get his health and welfare fund"—to be made up out of royalties on production of coal. At any rate, the mines are to be reopened for 2 weeks and in the meantime, the President of the United States pursues the hope that settlement of the strike may be brought about sooner than that. Until it finds out upon what terms the surrender is to be made, a disillusioned public naturally restrains its inclination to throw up its hat and burst into cheers.

Prophecies In Retrospect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald-Tribune of May 22, 1946:

PROPHECIES IN RETROSPECT

It is not necessarily always true that a prophet is without honor in his own country. So long as we have access to the records of congressional debates we can at least turn back and see who, in the light of experience, judged a piece of legislation most accurately. A typical example of this are reports of debates on the first income-tax law. Asked why, if a tax of 1 or 2 percent could be levied, it wouldn't be possible to impose one of 10 percent, or even 25 percent, outraged sponsors of this bill demanded to know who would dare pass such a measure. History has answered that question decisively enough, just as it has demonstrated the fallaciousness of the argument put forward at the same time that the income tax would assure "economy in Government."

The evolution of the income tax was a comparatively slow process. Such has not been the case, however, with the National Labor Relations Act. Although this measure was passed only in 1935, the claims of its sponsors for it already have proved to have been little more than empty rhetoric, while its opponents' criticism have been vindicated, perhaps to an extent that even they scarcely foresaw. Writing in American Affairs, L. Lamprey give us some of the high lights of the debates on this controversial measure. Introducing the bill in the upper house, Senator WAGNER pointed out that it "specifically prevents discrimination against any one for belong to a union," and described it as a measure "designed to promote industrial peace." Nothing in the bill, said he, "promotes union monopoly, places the stamp of Government favor on any type of union, or outlaws the so-called company unions."

When Senator TYDINGS proposed an amendment which would free employees from "coercion or intimidation from any source," instead of simply from employers, it was denounced as an effort to "hamstring" the legislation. In vain did Senator Couzens protest against protecting the worker against his employer, but not against being coerced into joining an organization which he did not choose to join. The reply was that "only the employer" could coerce the worker.

Representative Connery, who moved the act in the House, was asked about "the 49 percent who might not want to strike." What

protection would they receive from the act? Said Mr. Connery: "You are not discussing strikes. You are discussing an act to prevent strikes!"

Mr. Ekwall said, according to Mr. Lamprey: "Most of the letters I receive from employers claim that it will make more strikes." Mr. Connery disposed of this protest with equal ease. "They are crying before they are hurt," was his tart comment. "I believe they will find that the best thing that ever happened to them was the passage of this bill."

The predictions of two Representatives on that occasion are worth recalling at this time. Said Representative RICH: "What are unfair labor practices? Five are listed. They can be committed only by employers. If I am not a student of law, I at least have some common sense. This act will cause us to see more strikes than we have ever seen in the history of the country." Statistical note: In 1934, the last year before the Wagner Act, there were 1,856 strikes. In 1937 there were 4,740; in 1941 there were 4,288; and in 1944, with the country at war, there were 5,005. In the entire year 1934 man-days lost through labor disputes totaled 19,600,000. In the month of February 1946, alone, the figure was 21,500,000.

Mr. COX, of Georgia, made an even more important prophecy. "The bill," said he, "raises an issue that must at some time be fought out It must be apparent to every one who has read it that it carries on its face the most terrible threat—I speak deliberately and advisedly—to our dual form of government that has thus far risen. It is not what is on the face of the bill that disturbs me; it is the intent and purpose which the language used is intended to conceal."

Few will deny that this was a profoundly prophetic observation. But at the time Mr. Connery was to have the last word. Said he: "What this bill means to do, and what the members of the Committee on Labor believe it will do, will be to stop strikes. It will stop unrest; it will stop labor disputes in the United States."

The Labor Trusts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of May 23, 1946:

THE LABOR TRUSTS

Suppose one man set out to corner ownership of all the coal mines and refuse coal to all consumers except at his own price.

The Government would smash that man in a hurry. The antitrust laws give it power to prevent or break up business or industrial monopolies.

Suppose two financiers undertook to control all the railroads and fix their own rates for service.

The Government would smash them. The antitrust and interstate commerce laws give it power to protect the public against such a monopoly.

But one man having dictatorial control of a big union can close down all the coal mines and keep them closed until he gets his price. The Government is not equal in power to John L. Lewis. Its own laws and policies have made the power of Lewis so great.

And two men at the heads of big railway unions can halt the railroads until they get their price. The Government has made A. F. Whitney and Alvanley Johnston more powerful than itself.

The President of the United States can seize the mines and roads, but he cannot be sure the miners and railway men will work for the Government. He can beg Lewis, Whitney, and Johnston to tell the men to work, but they are free to ignore such a request. And the power of other union leaders differ only in degree, not in kind, from that of Lewis, Whitney, and Johnston.

So here are the new monopolies—the monopolies of labor—fostered by Government and capable of doing swifter, far more serious injury to the public than any of the financial and industrial trusts that the Government has armed itself to destroy.

Congress, for reasons that seemed sound and compelling, undertook to exempt legitimate labor union activities from antitrust law prosecutions. Supreme Court decisions have placed practically all union activities, however harmful to society, beyond the reach of the law. Congress, intending to "diminish the causes of labor disputes," tied the hands of management and encouraged the organization of more and bigger unions. The administration ranged itself completely on the side of labor. The results are what we now see.

Great unions, many of them dominated by one man or a small group, control essential commodities and services more tightly than the most ruthless Wall Street monopolies ever did. Unions have power to deprive the Nation of coal or steel or oil or rubber or food or rail transportation, and when they use that power the Government can only plead with them to be reasonable.

And the Peppers, Guffeys, and Murrays stand in the United States Senate, saying that in such a situation Congress should not act hastily—meaning that Congress should not act.

President Truman Grins While Lewis Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 12, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in The Sun of New York City, entitled: "President Truman Grins While Lewis Strikes."

PRESIDENT TRUMAN GRINS WHILE LEWIS STRIKES

The time has come for the Nation to talk turkey to President Truman, the national administration, the Congress of the United States.

The President has dodged and hedged and shilly-shallied with the problem of industrial unrest. What he has actually done about it can be summed up in a single word—Nothing.

The national administration talks out of one side of its mouth about price control and out of the other side about inflation, but what it has actually accomplished in respect of either can be summed up in a single word—Nothing.

The Congress has played ring-around-the-rosie with the Case bill and other proposals for remedial legislation, but what it has accomplished can be summed up in a single word—Nothing.

Today the country is all but paralyzed as a result of the stoppage in the coal mines. Great industrial plants have been forced to close down. Cities have gone into brown-outs, if not black-outs. Public utilities everywhere are crippled. Railroads are taking many of their chief passenger trains out of service. Manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers can make no plans for the day after tomorrow because they have no way of knowing what goods they can produce or distribute tomorrow.

No enemy action in the years of war caused anything like the dislocation in American business which now exists. Our people have plenty of money to spend. They need innumerable things which they are eager to buy. Never before in the history of the United States has the average worker earned higher pay in cash than he is earning at this very moment. But if he wishes meat or butter or salad oil or wearing apparel or nylon hosiery his only safe dependence is upon the black market.

This is not a sudden development. The malady now afflicting our country is no swift assault of locomotor ataxia, but a creeping paralysis which has been coming on for weeks and month—even for years.

Neither the President nor his administration nor Congress has ever made a single move to curb the rapacity of selfish labor leaders who have taught their followers that this is the time to grab while the grabbing is still good.

The man in the street knows well enough what the great question of the hour happens to be. The man in the street knows that Petrillo "got away with it." All he asks himself is whether John L. Lewis and Philip Murray will "get away with it" also. Being a realist, the man in the street sniggers even as he answers his own question by saying, "Sure they will. Wanna bet?"

In this answer the man in the street may be wrong.

But who can blame him for his attitude? He knows, for example, that although the war could not stop the circus from moving to city after city, John L. Lewis and the ODT belatedly permit it to travel to Boston. He remembers the Westinghouse strike, when the forces of law and order were deployed, not to keep streets open to traffic, but to keep them closed in front of picket lines.

And now, in the face of the gravest crisis which has yet confronted the administration, the Nation beholds its President halting, hesitating, shuffling, postponing until the last possible moment anything resembling the kind of forceful action which the situation demands. Yet Congress, as well as the country, has been waiting for him to demonstrate effective leadership.

There is a good, old-fashioned word for all this. It is cowardice.

Useless cowardice, silly cowardice, unfruitful cowardice.

The President doesn't have to take our word for it. He will get the correct answer in the congressional elections of next fall. If Mr. Truman maintains his present course for another month or so, his party will be lucky if it succeeds in marshalling, outside the Solid South, much more than a corporal's guard in the House of Representatives.

Government Employment Has No Room For Those Opposed To Our Form of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday I called attention to the fact

that our Government should be the last employer to consider the employment of or to tolerate, any group who supports communism or any "ism" not in accord with representative government. I mentioned a statement issued by Mr. Mitchell, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission directed to the organization described as the Public Workers of America. The statement is forthright. I deem it of sufficient importance to place it in the RECORD.

I also have, what I regard as a very splendid statement from the Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor together with a resolution dealing directly with the same subject matter that I am also extending with these remarks. I commend the careful reading of these documents:

MAY 21, 1946.

The United States Civil Service Commission today sent the following letter to Mr. Arthur Stein, international vice president of the United Public Workers of America, in response to a letter which he had addressed to the Commission on May 9:

Mr. ARTHUR STEIN,
International Vice President,
United Public Workers of America,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEIN: Your letter of May 9, 1946, refers to several newspaper stories which have appeared in recent days indicating that officials of the Commission are planning to investigate the United Public Workers of America.

One of these stories refers to an investigation in connection with collections for the educational work of the Political Action Committee of the CIO. The other newspaper story relates to a reported inquiry by the Commission's legal division on the question of the loyalty of your organization to the United States of America.

The information concerning the alleged collection of funds for a political organization has been obtained so far from the newspaper article to which you refer. However, whenever information of that sort comes to the Commission, it becomes the duty of the Commission to investigate and endeavor to learn whether there has been a violation of the Hatch Act or the civil service regulations as promulgated under the Civil Service Act and Rules, or if one is contemplated. If a violation has actually occurred, it is the duty, as the law now stands, of the Commission to remove the violator from office, no matter how slight the violation may be. If a violation is contemplated, the Commission believes that it is only fair to advise Federal employees that what is contemplated probably would lead to violations on the part of individuals who, otherwise, might not know what is proposed is a violation, and might lead to removal no matter how innocent the individual may be of any intent to violate.

While it is true that a Federal employee may make a contribution for political purposes, the law provides that he may not solicit, collect or otherwise handle contributions made for political purposes. Further, it is unlawful for an employee to solicit "in any manner whatever" or receive any contribution of money or other thing of value for "any political purpose whatever."

The law also provides that "no person shall in any room or building occupied in the discharge of official duties by any officer or employee of the United States * * * solicit in any manner whatever or receive any contribution of money or other thing of value for any political purpose."

It is the real purpose for which the money is being raised that counts; not what the process of raising it is named. It may be for a worthy political purpose, in one's viewpoint, or it may be for a bad political purpose in one's viewpoint; the effect of the law is just the same.

So far as the story about a loyalty investigation of the United Public Workers of America by the Commission is concerned, there is no basis for it at all. Before the article to which you referred apeared, no one in the Commission having authority had even thought of such an investigation, so far as the Commissioners have been able to learn.

Having answered the two questions asked in your letter, let me go a little further in the way of suggestion. The right of a Federal employee to his own opinion regarding the affairs of the United States cannot be questioned: nor can his right to express that opinion. Neither is he prohibited from expressing his personal opinion on international affairs. There is no law which forbids a body of Federal employees from expressing its opinion on either domestic or international problems.

The law on the subject which might affect a Federal employee who expresses an antagonistic opinion towards the United States Government, either as an individual or as a member of a convention, is contained in the Hatch Act and regulation v, section 3, "Disqualifications" of Temporary Civil Service Regulations.

As you are undoubtedly aware, section 9 (a) of the Hatch Act reads as follows:

"It shall be unlawful for any person employed in any capacity by any agency of the Federal Government, whose compensation, or any part thereof, is paid from funds authorized or appropriated by any act of Congress, to have membership in any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States."

The regulations of the Civil Service Commission, referred to above, provide that one basis for disqualifying a person for employment in the Federal service, is "a reasonable doubt as to his loyalty to the Government of the United States."

Admittedly, that provision of law was aimed at members of the Communist, Fascist, or Nazi Parties. Therefore, it is the duty of the Civil Service Commission to prevent members of these parties from getting into the Government service, and to get them out if it has authority in the particular case.

The Commission has done everything possible within the limits of its resources to see to it that both the provisions of the Hatch Act above referred to, as well as the regulations above referred to, are strictly enforced in connection with passing on the qualifications of persons for Federal employment. As you know, the Commission has throughout the war often approved the appointment of persons "subject to the results of an investigation." If these investigations have revealed that persons already on the Federal pay roll fall within the provisions of either the Hatch Act or the Commission's regulations, the Commission has consistently ordered their removal.

Experience has taught the Commission that it is difficult to prove that a person under suspicion is a member of the Communist Party. Very few Communists in the United States will admit that they are Communists. Even when the Commission has definite proof that certain persons are or have been members of the Communist Party, they still dispute the fact. Therefore, the Commission has to rely on cumulative, collateral, or circumstantial evidence.

In evaluating the evidence which has been placed before it in individual cases, the Commission has sought to determine whether the person concerned has been a follower of what has been recognized as a well-established Communist Party line. If it has concluded that a person has followed the Communist Party line, it has either disqualified him for Federal employment or, if he is in the service, it has ordered his removal.

The mere fact that a person attended a convention which declared that the communistic Russian Government was perfect in all that it did, while the Government of the United States was imperialistic in its designs on humanity, would not, standing alone, justify a decision that the person was a Communist, and consequently believed that force to overthrow the Government to which he normally owed allegiance was justified. However, such action is bound to arouse suspicion against the members, as it unquestionably did in the case of your organization. Its purpose in throwing an utterly uncalled-for proverbial red rag in the face of the American public, the employer of its members, is rather difficult to understand.

There is no question but that evidence indicating that individuals participated in the drafting of such resolutions or actively supported the adoption of such resolutions would be considered as relevant evidence in determining whether or not a person was following the Communist Party line.

You have asked for information on these two newspaper reports, and we have endeavored to comply with your request in a manner that will give you an understanding of what the Commission regards as its duty in connection with the subject matter of both reports.

Sincerely yours,

H. B. MITCHELL,
President.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Government Employes Council of the American Federation of Labor today called upon Congress to rid the Federal pay rolls of all persons of doubtful loyalty to this Government. The Council took special note of a practice among some minority groups which call themselves unions to engage in dual allegiance with their sympathies slanted toward governments other than the United States.

The council mentioned no names of organizations or individuals. Nor did it use the term "Communist" to demonstrators seeking to apply mass picketing procedures on Congress and Federal agencies. Allegiance solely to Uncle Sam was the topic of a resolution unanimously approved by the unions affiliated to the council.

A spokesman for the council said, "We fully expect to be targets for the usual epithets and brickbats and cries of Fascists aimed at any who dare protest retention on the public rolls of those who place the interests of foreign powers on a plane higher than that of our own people.

"It also is likely complaint will be made that unless the welfare of other nations is as important, or more so, than that of the United States of America that free speech is being curbed. There is a time and place for everything, including license of speech. There are groups one may join to voice his views on almost any subject. There are civic clubs and foreign policy associations, and for those who want them, marching and chowder clubs. But the Government service is not the place for abuse of free speech and the elevation advancement of other nations above our own.

"In any reduction in force, this council is of the definite belief that those who persist in holding membership in such groups whose leaderships are determined to take them far afield from their supposed purposes should be discharged before any other persons. Thereupon their places should be taken by returning veterans who well understand which Government shall be served first."

Whereas the Government Employes Council of the American Federation of Labor believes the American form of Government is the best ever devised by man; and

Whereas the people of this Nation and their Government are the only parties entitled to be served by those who are on their Federal pay rolls; and

Whereas such service involves the rudimentary and essential requirement of loyalty to the Government of the United States and the best interests of the Government of the United States must be served above all else, first, last, and all the time; and

Whereas the advancement of the interests of any foreign power or powers in preference to that of this Nation, or in competition or conflict with the interests of this Nation can only result in divided allegiance, is not only un-American, but is decidedly anti-American; and

Whereas mass demonstrations and threats to picket Government agencies are not in the slightest conducive to advancing beneficial legislation toward enactment; and

Whereas the vast majority in Federal Government employ definitely and obviously possess all the desired and required traits of decency and loyalty in their dealings and expectations with and of the Government of the United States; and

Whereas this attitude of loyalty is demonstrated by the following section of the Constitution of the Government Employes Council of the American Federation of Labor which reads: "This being a thoroughly American council, fully affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, it shall be definitely stated that no known member of any un-American, pro-communistic, pro-bundist or pro-Fascist organization, or fellow-traveler front organization, shall be admitted as a representative of any union. The known sympathies or demonstrated activities in behalf of any such un-American groups shall be sufficient cause for withholding admittance": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor condemns all provocation toward internal strife as disruptive of the composite efforts of our people to assist in bringing order out of chaos at a time when famine and general emergency still stalk the earth; and be it further

Resolved, That the standard for loyalty to this Government be reenunciated, simply defined, and emphasized as "faithful and true allegiance to the lawful Government of the United States"; that the President of the United States be requested to proclaim active observance of I Am an American Day; that all persons who persist in holding membership in and paying tribute to any organization which continues to temporize on the subject of dual allegiance be served notice that their services shall be terminated and that a complete recitation of the reasons be spread upon the record in each case and that the names be published through as many channels as possible; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be supplied the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Senators, and Members of the House of Representatives, the Governors of the respective States, President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, each member of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, the Attorney General of the United States, President Arnold S. Zander, of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, the press and radio, and all others having concern in a free expression of fundamental amenities and decent human behavior in relations among the citizen, his Government, and those who are employed to carry out the will of the people.

(The above resolution unanimously adopted May 7, 1946.)

Investigation of Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution adopted by the Rhode Island State Council, Knights of Columbus, at its State convention, held in Warren, R. I., on May 14, 1946, with relation to the investigation of the Franco Government of Spain by the United Nations. The resolution follows:

Whereas the United Nations are conducting an investigation relative to charges that the Spanish Government is a threat to international peace and security; and

Whereas the United States of America is vitally interested in the matter to the end that the fullest authentic information may be obained as a result of such investigation; and

Whereas the Spanish Government is entitled to have such an investigation conducted in a fair and impartial manner, and

Whereas the Government of Spain rescued the people of that country from the intolerable tyranny of atheistic Communism which drenched the land in blood, caused the murder of thousands of its noblest citizens with inconceivable brutalty and ruined the patrimony of the Spanish people, and

Whereas a new campaign of lies and propaganda has been commenced with the object of forcing the Spanish Government to withdraw its garrisons along the French frontiers so that the forces of disorder—bands of terrorists, guerillas, and saboteurs now being trained in the school of terrorism in Toulouse, France—may be enabled to invade Spain and cause a fresh outbreak of bloody disorders in that country which is now at peace with its neighbors and all the world, and

Whereas an Asiatic power desires a foothold on the Atlantic Ocean in its campaign of imperial expansion into the Iberian Peninsula and as one more step toward its boasted destruction of the British Empire and after that the extinction of the liberties of the republics of North and South America, and to this end hopes to work through its tools, the Spanish Communists, who will inevitably rise to power in Spain if the present progressive government of that country is overthrown; and

Whereas the government of General Franco has earned the undying hatred of the Communists because it is the only government that successfully blocked the design of communism of overrunning all Europe by force; and

Whereas the Government of Spain since the end of the Civil War in 1939 has established law and order, embarked on a campaign of social and personal justice and has ended long-standing abuses and inequalities in that country and has thereby gained the good will of a large majority of the Spanish people; and

Whereas the program of social reforms in Spain during the period from 1939 onward presents a record of accomplishment without parallel in history in that opportunities were afforded to hundreds of workers in all branches of production in Spain to broaden their social outlook on the basis of Christian principles of social justice through intensive courses of study, the government strengthened existing laws relative to accident compensation for workers, the obligatory old-age retirement law, maternity insurance, statutes relative to the length of the working day, recognition of Sunday as a legal day of rest, and introduced reforms relating to the protection of laborers and agricultural workers, the broadening of social-security legislation, unemployment compensation, housing, the fostering of settlement projects, professional training, the protection of the family and family life, insurance for widows, orphans and schooling, loans for marriages, social aid and the promotion of educational opportunities as well as many other matters relating to the welfare of the worker and every other class in the community, and

Whereas the Knights of Columbus, an American fraternal and patriotic order, with its roots deep in the great contribution that Spain has made to Christian civilization and the development of the New World, views with concern the efforts being made on the soil of the United States to interfere with the internal affairs of a nation which is at peace with us and every other nation of good will, and are mindful of the assurance of the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt to General Franco, when Spain's power to injure the Allied forces invading North Africa was at its highest, that "Spain has nothing to fear from the United Nations:

Now, therefore, the Rhode Island State Council of the Knights of Columbus hereby recommends to the national officers of this order that the sum of $100,000 be raised and appropriated to be expended under the direction of Supreme Knight, Hon. John E. Swift, for the purpose of engaging and paying for the services of attorneys, historians, geographers, publicists, researchers, translators, interpreters, and others, and also for the purpose of paying traveling and other necessary expenses of every kind and description in and about presenting to the United Nations or any committee thereof full, fair, accurate and impartial information about the achievements of the Spanish Government under the leadership of General Franco in restoring peace and order in that country after the defeat of the Anarchist and Communist hordes during the Civil War of 1936-1939, as well as full information in regard to the hideous conditions that existed in Spain in 1936, and for which many of the enemies of the present Spanish Government who are now urging the United Nations to taken action against Spain are largely responsible, not forgetting to present evidence of the looting under the direction of those same forces of $700,000,000 in gold from the vaults of the Bank of Spain as well as the looting of every strong-box in every bank in the country, and the widespread robberies, assaults on women and children, the murder of thousands of innocent religious—bishops, priests, and nuns—whose lives were devoted to the service of their fellow men, and similar acts of barbarism which will be duplicated if the existing Spanish Government is overthrown; and be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States, the Department of State, the Congress of the United States and the United Nations are hereby urged to follow a policy of not interfering with the internal affairs of the Spanish people and to preserve friendly relations with the Spanish Government; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Hon. Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, Hon. James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State, Hon. Edward R. Stettinius, permanent chairman of the United States delegation to the United Nations, Hon. Tom Connally, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Hon. Sol Bloom, chairman of the House Foreign Relations Committee, Hon. Theodore Francis Green, and Hon. Peter G. Gerry, Senators from the State of Rhode Island, and Hon. Aime Forand, and

Hon. John E. Fogarty, Members of Congress from the State of Rhode Island.

RHODE ISLAND STATE COUNCIL,
KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS,
THOMAS J. CURLEY, *State Deputy.*
DONALD J. MURRAY, *State Secretary.*
WARREN, R. I., *May 14, 1946.*

The Governor's Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 16, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House I submit for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the New Rochelle (N. Y.) Standard-Star titled "The Governor's Health Program":

THE GOVERNOR'S HEALTH PROGRAM

Because of the stress and strain of national and international problems, there may be some readers who have not thoroughly familiarized themselves with the new public health program for the State made possible through bills enacted into law last week. These are integral parts of an over-all program initiated by Governor Dewey to better health standards over a period of years.

There were three such units of the program enacted into law last week. Here are their essential contributions.

With the express design of eradicating tuberculosis entirely from the State in the next 20 years, a new hospitalization system for that disease is established. Under this, a patient will no longer be required to pay one cent for treatment, unless he specifically so requests. The care of tuberculosis in public hospitals becomes absolutely free of charge. This should mean that many who hesitated heretofore to apply for treatment in time to check the spread will now be relieved of embarrassment and can enter promptly.

Under this assumption by the State of tuberculosis cure as a State responsibility, the State will reimburse public T. B. hospitals, as Westchester's Grasslands and elsewhere in the county, to the extent of 50 percent of their maintenance and operation costs, such 50 percent reimbursement being limited to $2.50 per patient-day. At Grasslands the charge is now $5 per patient-day but, actually, the cost to the county is greater, so that there will still be a substantial charge upon county taxpayers. But this can be borne in view of the goal.

However, for any county which cannot stand the financial costs under this program, as well as for any city, the State will accept transfer of the T. B. hospital and meet all costs of operation. Further, the law provides for pooling of patients, in that patients will be transferred from crowded hospitals to others where there are vacant beds, the county transferring its patients to another county reimbursing the latter county at the $2.50 rate.

These provisions for treatment of tuberculosis are in two of the three new laws. The third provides that cities and counties will be reimbursed annually by the State to the amount of 75 percent of the first $100,000 they spend on public-health work and 50 percent on such expenditures over and above $100,000. In the case of Westchester, where we spend heavily, this will prove a vital State aid.

Under this expanded public-health program, to be supervised by five physicians who are specialists in diseases of the chest, a long step forward has been taken. It is practical instead of New Deal-theoretical acceptance of a public problem. It is real "socialized" medicine, but without the bureaucratic overlordship proposed by the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill pending at Washington. And, while it will increase State costs in this respect from $3,000,000 to $14,000,000 annually, it is the most economical method which can be expected to prove effective.

There is, we believe, no more sincere approach throughout the entire Nation to the extermination of tuberculosis than will be found in this new public-health program of the Empire State. We have a right to be proud of our progress.

Newport Torpedo Station

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave already granted me I offer for printing in the RECORD the plea I made before the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations on April 13 for fair and just treatment of the employees of the United States Naval Torpedo Station, Newport, R. I. My remarks follow:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I appreciate the courtesy which your committee is extending to me to appear here today to place before you the plea of thousands of displaced civil-service workers who have for many years been employed at the naval torpedo station in Newport, many of whom are now walking the streets because after serving, in many cases, 25 or 30 years in the Government, have reached the age where private employers will not hire them. Yet these men are not old enough to avail themselves of civil service retirement benefits because they have not reached their 55th birthday.

All of us realize that the end of the war brought with it the necessity of curtailing the manufacture of torpedoes and other Navy ordnance and thus the reduction in the work force. The objection we have is to the Navy Department's action in disregarding the human element by abandoning the manufacture at Newport of whatever torpedoes are to be produced, and transferring this work to the naval ordnance plant at Forest Park Ill.

The torpedo station at Newport was established by authority of the Congress 75 years ago. It was at that station that the torpedo was designed, perfected and manufactured. ago It was at that station that the torpedo were invented. It was there that the primer, the igniter, and other ordnance were invented.

The efficiency, intelligence, loyalty, and devotion of the employees at the Newport station have never been questioned. On the other hand they have been many, many times commended.

That the Navy Department recognized during the war that the experienced help, the men who knew how to manufacture torpedoes, the people who could produce most efficiently, by virtue of long experience, was at Newport, is attested to by the fact that the Department brought to Newport for instruction and training mary of the personnel it used to establish and operate Forest Park.

It seems only reasonable, therefore, to conclude that the personnel at Forest Park could not be as efficient as the personnel at Newport. The high efficiency and skill inherent in the men of Newport comes only with years of experience and cannot be developed overnight.

In December 1945 the Navy Department stated: Production of torpedoes has ceased, with certain minor exceptions. The exceptions are: (a) The completion of torpedoes for which parts were already on hand when production ceased (of which there now remain 297), (b) the manufacture of 100 torpedoes to determine whether the tooling provided for this type at Forest Park—in anticipation of large wartime requirements—is adequate, and (c) the manufacture and assembly of small lots of torpedoes, not exceeding 25 at a time, for thorough test of new development of the latter group, such manufacture as is within the capacity of the research shops at Coddington Cove, Newport, will be undertaken there, and the remainder will be accomplished at Forest Park, Ill.

The argument of the Department that it plans to manufacture 100 torpedoes at Forest Park to test the tooling "in anticipation of large wartime requirements," if it became public, would certainly raise the question: Are we anticipating another war in the near future? If the answer to that question is in the affirmative, surely the public is entitled to know it, so that nothing might be done to jeopardize our military and naval preparations.

The plant at Forest Park is a war plant, built to supplement and not to replace the plant at Newport. If the Navy Department desires to keep it, it could be used for the manufacture of other products or could be placed in a maintenance status for future use. Since Newport is fully equipped to provide the needs of the Department, as it did in the prewar period, and since research and development of torpedoes is to continue there, it would seem to be the wiser policy to concentrate in Newport whatever torpedo work will have to be done. Otherwise, torpedoes built 1,000 miles inland will have to be shipped to Newport for testing at increased expense to the Government.

I question the statement made by the Navy Department that there would be economy in the manufacturing of torpedoes as the result of such transfer. For reasons of economy, if for no other reason, I respectfully submit that whatever small amount of torpedoes may be needed, these should be manufactured at Newport, where men of long experience are available and where the finest torpedo testing range in this country is located. Numerous Navy boards who have surveyed and studied testing-range facilities in every section of the country all agree that the Newport range is the best available.

The plant at Forest Park was operated during the war by a subsidiary of the American Can Co., under a contract with the Navy Department. Its employees were noncivil service and were paid higher wages than the civil-service employees at Newport. For example: Machinists at Forest Park received $1.47 per hour while those at Newport received $1.26 per hour. That does not show economy.

The employees at Forest Park, which I understand have now been brought under the civil service, worked for a private employer and thus were eligible for unemployment compensation if their services were terminated. The employees at Newport, either through patriotism, or because they were frozen in their jobs, or because they were building up their retirement benefits, refused to leave the torpedo station during the war to go to privately operated plants at higher wages, and thus are left without the benefit of unemployment compensation.

The Department has also advanced the argument that use of the manufacturing facilities at Forest Park was preferable to Newport because the labor market in that area is such that expansion or contraction of

activities would not have any serious effect upon the unemployment situation.

This argument brings into focus very forcefully the fact that the Department has flagrantly disregarded the effect that its decision has had upon the employees at the Newport Torpedo Station and upon the city of Newport. In that city, of some 35,000 population, the torpedo station is the only industry. By removing the torpedo-manufacturing activities from Newport, several thousand persons have been thrown out of employment. Many of these workers had spent their lifetime in the employ of the station. Many of them, now around 50 years of age, have 25 and 30 years of civil service to their credit. They are still too young to take advantage of the civil-service retirement benefits which they have earned, and yet they are told, when they seek employment elsewhere, that they are too old to be put on the employment rolls because of certain insurance rates which the employer has to pay.

These men have married in Newport, raised families and established themselves in their own homes. They are now forced, because of the Navy Department's utter disregard of them, to pack up their belongings and try, as best they can, to reestablish themselves and their families elsewhere. The city is also to suffer because these taxpayers will have to leave the community and no one can say what the possibilities are that these homes may be sold for nonpayment of taxes. The public-welfare rolls in that city will also increase because many of these employees of the torpedo station, who are now out of work, will not be able to support their aged parents and other dependents who will have to apply to the welfare department for assistance.

The statement of the Navy Department that "in order to take care of a small group of long-service employees in the explosive department, a small torpedo igniter shop is being established on Goat Island which will employ a maximum of five men," is, in my opinion, only a gesture to permit the Department to say that torpedo igniter work is carried on at that station. Newspaper announcement of the opening of this small shop has been misinterpreted in Newport where it is well known that this type of work has been transferred to Macon and Milledgeville, Ga., when the explosive work was transferred from Newport during 1945.

Construction of facilities by the Navy Department during the war did, on many occasions, arouse suspicion of the workers at the torpedo station, Newport, that these facilities might be used in the postwar period to replace those of long standing at Newport. I discussed this subject many times with officials of the Navy Department and always was assured that these suspicions were not well founded. These war facilities were being built, I was told, to supplement the facilities at the permanent shore stations. There was no thought of using them to replace prewar facilities, I was assured. All thoughts were concentrated in providing ordnance to meet the war requirement. I accepted these assurances in good faith.

It was not until early in 1945 that I was told, at a meeting with the then Under Secretary Bard, that the Navy Department had decided that henceforth the explosive ordnance work at Newport would be discontinued completely at the end of the war and that future explosive ordnance work for the Navy would be concentrated at Milledgeville and Macon, Ga.

And it was not until after VJ-day that I was told by the Navy Department that manufacturing of torpedoes at Newport might stop and future manufacturing be carried on at Forest Park. Upon hearing this proposal, I had several meetings with Secretary Forrestal and his naval and civilian subordinates at which I argued against the proposed transfer. Neither Secretary Forrestal nor anyone at these meetings told me that the decision had already been made, and I did not learn of the fact until at a hearing on the subject before the Senate Naval Affairs Committee on December 11, 1945, it was revealed by Admiral Hussey that the Navy Department had taken over Forest Park as a part of the Naval Permanent Establishment at 8 a. m. December 10, 1945. This must have been done under the wartime authority, and I raise the question what right the Navy Department had under that authority to abandon manufacturing of torpedoes at Newport, which had been carried on under authority of Congress for over 75 years.

I claim that whether or not the Navy Department had the right to establish a new torpedo station at Forest Park as a part of the Naval Permanent Establishment, it had no right to abandon the torpedo station at Newport.

It is interesting to note that while the Forest Park plant, representing an investment of $16,600,000 of Government funds, is to continue to operate, the Newport torpedo station, representing an investment of $35,600,000, is going to be restricted to research and development work. The Navy Department, I am told, is requesting $8,306,000 for Forest Park for the next fiscal year and requests only $3,117,000 for Newport, of which $2,057,000 will be for station maintenance and only $1,060,000 for labor and material, while for Forest Park the maintenance figure is $1,710,000, with $6,595,000 for labor and material, thus indicating, despite the Navy Department's arguments, that torpedo production will be carried on on a pretty large scale at Forest Park, while Newport will have to get along, if the Navy Department's idea prevails, on $1,060,000 for labor and material.

I, therefore, respectfully request the serious consideration by your committee of a restriction upon the appropriation for Forest Park and an increase sufficient to permit the torpedo station at Newport to operate with at least a respectably large staff during the coming year.

Democracy on Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Evening Star published in Washington, D. C., entitled "Democracy on Trial":

DEMOCRACY ON TRIAL

The bill to extend the Selective Service Act was cut to pieces on Saturday by a vote-conscious House, a majority of whose Members apparently are more interested in being reelected than in enabling this country to meet its responsibilities in working out and maintaining a lasting peace.

As reported out by the House Military Affairs Committee the legislation was reasonably adequate. But a majority of the House overrode its leadership to adopt amendments which, while leaving the Draft Act on the statute books until February 15, 1947, raise the minimum age for induction from 18 to 20, suspend the operation of the draft between May 15 and October 15, and push off onto the President the obligation of deciding on the latter date whether inductions should be resumed. Furthermore, this mutilation was accomplished without benefit of a record vote, the majority having rejected a proposal for roll calls on the amendments which would have enabled the people to know how their representatives had voted and to hold them accountable.

The direct effect of this depressing political performance will be to cripple the Army and subject the administrators of our postwar international programs to a new and dangerous element of uncertainty. Those sponsoring these amendments are relying on the hope, or taking refuge in the expressed belief, that the number of volunteers will be sufficient to permit the Army to function without the draft. This is no better than a hope, however, and it is a hope which has been so heavily discounted by those in position to know the facts that one is almost driven to the conclusion that the legislators have little faith in it themselves and are merely using this talk of the volunteers to cloak their own dereliction. The plain conclusion is that a majority of the Members of the House, at best, are gambling with the welfare of the country and the future peace of the world for no worthier purpose than the promotion of their own political fortunes.

Such conduct as this, beyond its immediate and direct effects, raises deeply disturbing questions as to the adequacy of our political system in a world which has undergone such profound changes in the course of two great wars. In the period between the wars politically minded Congresses repeatedly failed to keep this country's military forces abreast of world developments. Indeed, as late as the summer of 1941 after the fall of France and just a few months prior to Pearl Harbor, a bill to extend the draft passed the House by a margin of one vote. Had that vote gone the other way this country would have been compelled to scrap its military organization when it stood in the shadow of its greatest war.

At that time, as at present, the problem lay in getting the House to rise above petty politics and meet the urgent need for true statesmanship. Saturday's performance suggests that a majority of the House Members have learned nothing from experience of the past, and it is not an exaggeration to say that our democratic system, with respect to the great issues of the day, is on trial. The House has failed badly in this test. Fortunately, the Senate has yet to act and it may be hoped that there will be found in that body the needed quality of statesmanship so deplorably lacking in the House.

The Need for 65-Cent Minimum-Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, one of the great daily newspapers in my State is the Seattle Daily Star, published by Howard Parish, and edited by Cliff Harrison. It is independent in its thinking. It is everlastingly militant in its crusading for the development of the State of Washington and the Pacific Northwest. Recently there appeared in the Seattle Star an interesting editorial discussing 65 cents an hour as a minimum wage. The editorial is provocative, challenging, thoughtful, and meaty. It is as follows:

SIXTY-FIVE CENTS AN HOUR IS NO INFLATIONARY WAGE

Congress should enact the minimum wage bill now before the Senate.

Justice to the country's low-paid and unorganized workers requires it.

The present minimum wage rate, fixed by the Fair Labor Standards Act, is 40 cents an hour. The pending bill would raise that to 65 cents for 2 years, to 70 cents for the next 2 years, to 75 cents thereafter.

Even most of the bill's opponents admit that the existing "floor under wages" is too low—that $16 for a 40-hour week is not adequate pay for workers.

But they contend that an immediate step to 65 cents an hour—$26 a week, $1,350 a year—would put the floor too high; that unmarried workers don't need that much; that it would ruin some industries; that rising wage costs would force prices up and promote inflation.

We heard the same sort of arguments in 1938 against proposals to put the first Federal floor under wages at 25 cents an hour.

We do not believe that a worker can support a family properly, anywhere in this country in these times, on less than $26 a week. Married workers should not be penalized because unmarried workers may be able to live on less. And unmarried workers should be paid enough so that they will be able to save money, get married and raise families.

A few industries may now be paying some of their workers as little as 40 cents an hour. If so, the fact is disgraceful. But the average wage in most industries is already above 75 cents, and according to Government statistics four out of every five factory workers are already getting more than 65 cents an hour. The effect of the proposed new minimum on industry as a whole would not be severe.

Higher wages in the lowest-pay industries would mean better satisfied and more productive workers. However, we think some of these industries would need price relief. Well, what of it? The Government has encouraged unions to force the wages of organized workers upward. That has meant and will mean higher prices, whatever Mr. Bowles and the OPA may say to the contrary.

We want to see inflation curbed—but not at the expense of unorganized workers who have to pay the higher prices and have been unable to force their wages up to even 65 cents an hour.

The British Collect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the British it seems that they are most active in their endeavor to secure money from the United States without security, and I am including herewith an Associated Press dispatch from London showing how they are collecting from other countries:

FRANCE TO REPAY BRITISH LOAN IN FULL BY APRIL 1949

LONDON, May 2.—A White Paper disclosed today that France had agreed to pay all her $440,000,000 debt to Great Britain by April 1, 1949.

France already has reduced the debt from $600,000,000 by a payment of $160,000,000 in gold.

Under the agreement, France will pay off $220,000,000 by next April 1, paying another $100,000,000 in 1948 and the remaining $120,000,000 the following year.

Payment must be in gold or securities salable on the London Stock Exchange, except for the remaining period of 1946, when France may pay up to $40,000,000 in dollars.

Great Britain lent France $400,000,000 a year ago and added $200,000,000 to the debt in an agreement settling the unpaid balance on a trade pact.

OPA in the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I submit for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune entitled "OPA in the House":

OPA IN THE HOUSE

The House voted yesterday to extend the powers of the Office of Price Administration, but only with a number of important reservations. Price control, under the House measure, would terminate March 31 next; food subsidies would be dropped at the end of the present calendar year; ceilings on individual products would be automatically removed when production reached the 1941 level; and in fixing ceilings the Office of Price Administration would be directed to allow a "reasonable profit" on each item.

Administration supporters are quoted as saying that the amendments proposed would murder the Office of Price Administration. If it be admitted, however, that the changes introduced are a good deal less than subtle, the margin of almost 10 to 1 by which this measure was passed is a striking piece of testimony as to prevailing opinion on the question of price control. One thing would seem to be abundantly clear. That is that if the House is at all representative of general opinion, then the public is distinctly dissatisfied with price control as presently administered.

The House amendment, which would terminate food subsidies at the end of the present year, is an example of legislative reaction to what many regard as an abuse of Government privilege. Rightly or wrongly, the view has gained ground that the OPA has been more concerned over the appearance of inflation than of inflation itself, and that the subsidy has been employed with this in mind.

Opposition to the attitude of the OPA in compelling business to absorb all or most of the increases in costs is widespread, and this is reflected in the amendment which would guarantee a profit on each item produced. As the law now stands, if a company turns out a number of different products the OPA is responsible for showing only that it makes a profit on such products as a whole, even though it may produce some of them at a loss. The results of this policy have been, to put it mildly, unfortunate, for what has happened has been that producers have in many cases switched from the manufacture of the items most urgently needed to those which have been the most profitable. As between that policy and the one proposed by the House, the latter, though heavy-handed, is the more logical for purposes of the transition period.

Whatever may have been said for the philosophy of the OPA 6 months or a year ago, the fact is that it has lost much of its validity since the administration permitted itself to be swept over the dam an the basic question of wages. That, in effect, was what the House was saying yesterday when it voted its amendments to the OPA bill.

Religion and the Criminologist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article on religion and the criminologist by the Reverend John E. Coogan, S. J., of the University of Detroit.

Father Coogan's article originally appeared in the October 1945 issue of the American Catholic Sociological Review which is published at Loyola University in Chicago. It was reprinted in the May 1946 issue of the Catholic Mind.

I know Father Coogan personally and I am familiar with his studies on criminology. I feel that his treatise on the part of religion is worthy of consideration.

RELIGION AND THE CRIMINOLOGIST

(By John E. Coogan, S. J., reprinted from the American Catholic Sociological Review)

Whatever allowances must be made for the unreliability of American crime statistics, our crime problem is undoubtedly tremendous. Thoughtful scholars warn us against taking it for granted that there is somehow or somewhere a solution. Surely none of us feels assured that a solution is possible unless through a combined, all-out effort, using all our resources. In an undertaking of such magnitude criminologists and law-enforcement officers should be grateful for all small favors. The failure to appreciate and use to the utmost any honorable means of crime and delinquency control would itself seem scarcely less than criminal.

Secular participants in the actual work of crime and delinquency control are usually not backward in confessing their indebtedness to the cooperative efforts of religion. Thus the 1943 congress of the American Prison Association expressed its "appreciation to the religious leaders and chaplains who have participated in our meetings and who through the years have given a service of helpful counseling and inspiration not only to the inmates of our institutions but also to the workers in the correctional field."[1]

The testimonials of individual prison administrators to the constructive efforts and example of the chaplains of their own institutions are so customary as to be almost matters of course. Sanford Bates has described the heightened importance of the prison chaplain as a notable advance of the new penology.[2] Warden John Cranor, Penal and Correctional Institutions, Howard, R. I., says that in the new prison the chaplain "has been elevated to the prominence to which his office entitles him. He is one of the most important members of the official staff."[3] And Alexander Paterson, commissioner of prisons for England and Wales, being asked, "What to your mind is the most potent factor in the

[1] Congress Bulletin, December 1943, p. 4.
[2] America, August 14, 1943, p. 513.
[3] Prison World, September-October 1944, p. 21.

betterment of an inmate?" unhesitatingly replied, "A good chaplain." [4]

Although law-enforcement officers and prison administrators have that high appreciation of the contribution of religion to their common task, too many writers of current criminology texts are much less appreciative. It may perhaps be worth while instancing and commenting upon examples of this apparent lack of sympathy in some recent textbooks of criminology.

Crime and Its Treatment [5] does not so much as refer to religion in its index; its only index reference to church is principally concerned with the odium theologicum which we are told "has played an important role in the history of crime wherever a bigoted, ecclesiastical control has been exercised."

CLAIMS OF RELIGION

Dr. Edwin Sutherland gives scarcely more attention to the claims of religion, disposing of them in less than one of the some six hundred pages of his Principles of Criminology.[6] In that scant space, however, he finds room to remark that "There is no specific evidence of the effect of religion as such on crime." Human motivation being so complex, what "specific evidence" is possible? For that matter, what specific evidence is there of the influence of anything on crime? Dr. Sutherland adds, as do other criminologists, that "Persons who have membership in church are committed to prison slightly less than persons who are not members." Surely he knows of how little value such statistics are: a prison clerk commissioned to fill all the blanks in an admittance sheet, for a convict giving such answers as he hopes may secure for him preferred treatment, is not compiling trustworthy information. When it is common knowledge that the introduction of parole boards multiplied the number of church-affiliated convicts overnight, what honest purpose is served by citing without explanation such weird data?

Dr. Sutherland goes on to say that "Compulsory church attendance * * * has produced negativistic reactions as a rule, so that it is presumably not the church attendance as such * * * which is influential." Why should it be thought necessary to remark that lock-step, Oregon-boot religion under the scrutiny of ever-suspicious guards "has produced negativistic reactions"? And who has ever supposed that "church attendance as such" is reformative? Who contends that church attendance is some sort of magic that revolutionizes in spite of inner opposition?

Somewhat more friendly, perhaps, is Dr. Nathaniel Cantor's appraisal of religious influence on crime,[7] but in the main that appraisal seems belittling. Despite, for example, the age-old fight of religion for freedom, he thinks that "to most people it probably means, in a general way, acceptance of the authority of present patterns." How inadequate is that description he might come to see were he to reread Einstein's comment [8] on the relative constancy of the three great German forces, the universities, the press and the church, when faced with the "present patterns" of Nazi tyranny:

"Only the church stood squarely across the path of Hitler's campaign for suppressing truth. I never had any special interest in the church before, but now I felt a great affection and admiration because the church alone has had the courage and persistence to stand for intellectual truth and moral freedom. I am forced thus to confess that what I once despised I now praise unreservedly."

Dr. Cantor informs us also that in the church, feelings of self-esteem are not encouraged. On the contrary, nowhere else is human dignity, human worth, so nobly conceived; man has a value supermundane and eternal as the child of a personal God, and made to His image and likeness. We wonder, too, how Dr. Cantor can say that for those who feel the need to assert themselves the church functions negatively * * * the expression of his own emotional needs is not only discouraged but frowned upon. What secularist has asserted himself more effectively, has expressed his own emotional need more fully than a St. Paul, a Chrysostom, a Bernard of Clairvaux, a Francis of Assisi, an Xavier, an Ignatius of Loyola, or a Teresa of Avila? If personal happiness be accepted as the result of the expression of emotional needs, the most religious people in the church—professed nuns—most completely satisfy that description. As Dr. James J. Walsh, the psychiatrist, says from his own rich experience:

"My duties often bring me into contact with numbers of sisters during their hours of recreation, so-called, and I do not think that I have ever seen a happier, heartier group of people than they make during these periods of relaxation. I have always considered it a privilege to share recreation after dinner or supper with a dozen sisters when I am lecturing in one of the smaller towns, and we have often laughed so heartily together that I have sometimes wondered what the neighbors would think of us." [9]

Passing on now to Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes, in his recent textbook of criminology he no doubt meant to serve some constructive purpose when he characteristically remarked: "But it is obvious that a majority of our criminals—certainly our convicts—are brought up in orthodox religious surroundings." [10] Just what is the meaning of being "brought up in orthodox religious surroundings"? The expression, of course, may mean almost anything, and therefore may in some sense be true. But is it true in any significant and pertinent sense? Is it obvious that the mass of convicts has been brought up in surroundings where orthodox religion had a Chinaman's chance to prove its powers?

A survey of the largest American prison, that of southern Michigan, reveals its average prisoner has had "no connection with the church for the past 20 years. He seldom knows the name of a clergyman, and church members in good standing at time of admission are as scarce as proverbial hens' teeth." [11] Everywhere throughout the country we hear the same story. The Catholic chaplains of the prison of northern Illinois (Joliet-Stateville) report as their experience of many years: "Less than 4 percent of the Catholic registrees had come up to the average Catholic practice of receiving the sacraments several times a year." [12] Of the 1,160 so-called Catholic inmates of the Clinton State Prison at the end of the 1944 fiscal year, "only 59 had ever attended parochial schools." [13] And Professor Taft acknowledges, "Dickson found the average 18-year-old reformatory inmate a nominal member of a church he never attends; * * * the Gluecks found but 8.5 percent of their 500 reformatory men attending church regularly before commitment, 88.5 percent irregular in attendance, and 3 percent not churchgoers." [14]

In further disparagement of the influence of religion, Dr. Barnes adds: "Pending further study, we may accept Dr. Miner's statement that there is little evidence that the churches play any major role in the prevention of crime." This despite the fact that Dr. Barnes acknowledges that "Religion has almost universally been assumed to be the most important influence in checking crime." [15] Has the universal assumption been arrived at so completely without evidence, and is it so very probably wrong? Is this another case of "Everybody's out of step but Jim"? Is it democratic, is it American to be so contemptuous of judgments "almost universally" held with regard to matters of everyday experience?

UNIVERSITY THEORISTS

Even more condemnatory in some sense is Professor Taft, who in his textbook goes so far as to say that "religion or the church are factors in the causation of crime" because of "the resistance of the church to deterministic philosophy." [16] This charge we pass over lightly here, having dealt with the subject elsewhere.[17] Suffice it to say that the opposition to the moderate free-will explanation of human conduct is confined to university theorists, and even these abandon their theory in real life situations, as the determinist psychologist, Max Wertheimer, admits.[18]

Moreover, these theorists caricature the free-will concept beyond all imagining; and this practice is so inveterate as to have drawn the fire of William James already 50 years ago. According to this caricature, the free-will concept implies a will acting absolutely unaffected by any previous experience. Its acts are called so unpredictable that it is called the jack-in-the-box theory. (As though the jack-in-the-box were not purely deterministic.) And we are told that the free will is evidently a delusion because one who drinks enough whisky will get drunk even though he wills to remain sober. From personal experience, one might live a generation among the most convinced voluntarists and yet never meet a solitary soul holding to the concept of free will which such determinists as Dr. Taft seem alone to have heard of or to rebut. But for our present purposes, let it suffice that as competent a psychologist as Dr. Gordon Allport, of Harvard University, has declared that "the pragmatic justification for casting one's lot with the indeterministic hypothesis is that it releases energies and avoids the tempting rationalization in which the determinist can indulge, letting himself slide along the channel of least resistance and regarding the slothful course as the only one possible. Provided it is not indiscriminate or extreme, a belief in freedom has—who can deny it?—benign consequences." [19]

In closing these remarks, let it be recalled that Dr. William McDougall, in what was almost his last will and testament,[20] urged that there be less pontificating, less pretension on the part of scientists, especially biologists. If masters of a science so comparatively mature and reputable as biology need that warning, what is to be said about criminologists? If, as Dr. McDougall added, college students must be taught a healthy skepticism toward "the truths" of science in general, why should not writers of college textbooks on criminology exemplify a modest skepticism as to their own preparedness to sit in ultimate judgment upon so many and such difficult matters quite remote from their special field?

If criminologists would more generally restrict their pronunciamentos to the observed facts in the field of their special competence, they would thus win the more enthusiastic cooperation of respecters of religion in attempting to solve a crime problem that challenges our combined efforts.

[4] America, ibid.

[5] Wood, Arthur E., and L. B. Waite, American Book Co., 1941.

[6] Lippincott, 1939, p. 195.

[7] Crime and Society, Holt, 1939, p. 421 f.

[8] Time, December 23, 1940, p. 38.

[9] Religion and Health, p. 229 f.

[10] Barnes and N. K. Teeters, New Horizons in Criminology, Prentice-Hall, 1943, p. 223.

[11] Treatment of the Criminal, Bureau of Probation, Department of Corrections, Lansing, Mich., p. 52.

[12] Leo Kalmer and Eligius Weir, Crime and Religion, Franciscan Herald Press, 1936, p. 60.

[13] America, December 23, 1944, p. 239.

[14] Taft, Donald, Criminology, Macmillan, 1942, p. 212.

[15] Op. cit., p. 222.

[16] Op. cit., p. 222.

[17] Federal Probation, VII, 4, pp. 12–15, VIII, 4, pp. 40–42; Probation, XXIII, 1, pp. 22–24.

[18] Ruth Anshen, editor, Freedom: Its Meaning, Harcourt Brace, 1940, p. 562.

[19] Psychological Review, January 1943, p. 108.

[20] Riddle of Life, p. 9 ff.

Blank Checks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday this House passed H. R. 6496, a bill making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

On page 7 of the report of the Committee on Appropriations accompanying this bill (Rept. No. 2085) the following appears:

A policy has apparently become ingrained in the administration of certain Navy projects of requesting contract authority which, when given and exercised, obligates the Government to make appropriations in the future to carry out the legal obligations growing out of the commitments made pursuant to the grant of contractual authority. The result of this procedure is to lend complete confusion to Government financing and accounting and to confuse the public mind as to the true fiscal status of the Government. The committee believes that this system of granting contract authority is fundamentally wrong and that the Government should deal on a strictly cash basis.

With that statement, Mr. Speaker, I am in entire accord. According to the policy heretofore followed by the Navy Department somebody other than Congress has been allowed to pledge the credit of the United States and then Congress found itself in a position never contemplated by the Constitution—of having given out blank checks.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, it is astounding that on the same day, yesterday, just before we passed H. R. 6496, this House passed House Joint Resolution 305 providing for membership and participation by the United States in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor of an unknown amount. This was not just an authorization we could exercise or leave hereafter as we choose. By the passage of House Joint Resolution 305 we authorized the President to make us a member of UNESCO, the constitution of which specifically provides that the General Conference, composed of people the overwhelming majority of whom are not citizens of the United States, shall determine the amount which we must pay. So if we are to keep our promises, meet our obligations and maintain our national credit and integrity, which I certainly hope we are, this House has no alternative hereafter but to sign that blank check and pay it with the money of the taxpayers of the United States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the policy objected to by the Committee on Appropriations with reference to the Navy Department at least had the merit of restricting the filling in of our blank checks to responsible American citizens, officials and officers appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. But not so with House Joint Resolution No. 305 and UNESCO. There we have given the blank check with full knowledge that the amount is to be filled in at the will of citizens and subjects of foreign nations.

So, on the same day this House approved a policy of giving a blank check to people not even citizens of the United States it received a report from one of its most important committees repudiating a policy of giving a similar blank check to our own Navy Department.

Mr. Speaker, the sole sad solace I find in this situation is that it ought to be a complete answer to any accusation that this House is "nationalistic," "isolationist" or not "internationally minded."

Strikes Against the Public Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including a telegram from the Associated Industries of Vermont, as follows:

WOODSTOCK, VT., *May 24, 1946.*
Representative CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Whereas actual and threatened work stoppages resulting from disputes between management and labor in essential industries throughout the Nation since VJ-day have materially reduced or stopped production of goods wanted and needed by our people, have caused widespread unemployment, increased public expense, retarded reconversion program, endangered the public health, and in many other ways have been and continue to be so harmful to the general welfare that this Nation has been brought to the brink of economic disaster; and

Whereas the strike weapon has been employed and is threatened to be employed by certain national leaders of organized labor in a manner that has been and is contrary to the best interest of the people of this Nation and contrary to the best long-term interest of the workers themselves and to the cause of organized labor; and

Whereas the executive branch of our National Government has so far been ineffective in bringing to the Nation that degree of industrial peace that is essential for the continued well-being and progress of all the people; and

Whereas to the extent that such ineffectiveness stems from lack of power under existing law to adequately protect the public interest, that lack of power should be remedied: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Associated Industries of Vermont in annual meeting assembled at Woodstock, Vt., this 23d day of May 1946, That, first, the representatives of the people of this Nation in Congress should without delay review existing law and make such changes or enact such new legislation as will provide the curbs necessary on the extravagant exercise of the monopolistic powers of the leaders of existing labor organizations contrary to the best interests of the people at large. Second, Congress should immediately enact into law a "public bill of rights" which will (a) outlaw the use of the strike weapon in labor-management disputes in transportation, public utility, fuel-producing, and other industries affecting the public health and general welfare, when the President of the United States by proclamation declares that a state of emergency exists or will be caused by such actual or threatened work stoppage. (b) Provide that such disputes will be referred to a board of conciliation and arbitration fairly representative of labor, management, and the public, to be chosen from a panel selected by nonpolitical means, and that any decision made by such board, in the absence of agreement by the parties shall be binding for a period not in excess of 6 months and that collective bargaining on disputed points shall be continued by the parties until a settlement is reached. (c) Provide appropriate penalties to be imposed on any or all persons in either management or labor who incite, sanction, order, or permit organized work stoppages in such industries when such a state of emergency has been proclaimed by the President of the United States.

JAMES F. DEWEY,
President.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed program suggested by the Associated Industries of Vermont has my general endorsement.

The House Stampedes Over OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial published in The Sun of New York City, titled: "The House Stampedes Over OPA":

THE HOUSE STAMPEDES OVER OPA

The usually literate Chester Bowles seems to have got his metaphors a little askew. When the House of Representatives trampled all over the Office of Price Administration yesterday, Mr. Bowles tore his hair and uttered lamentations about a "joyride to disaster." But anybody reared on the range could tell him it was not a joyride. It was a stampede. The boys just got to rearing and plunging and, in the excitement, OPA got considerably mussed up. Maybe regrettably mussed up. But if Messrs. Bowles and Porter and the OPA got run over they can't place all the blame upon Members of Congress who this year are up for reelection. They can blame much of it on the popular notion that our national planners have made such a mess of things that it is time for Congress to step in and straighten matters out. In any case OPA, its deeds and misdeeds, are issues in the political campaign that is already taking shape.

This is not an ideal atmosphere for legislation. It is likely that before Congress completes action on the bill to extend the life of OPA some of yesterday's drastic restrictions will be modified or removed. Some of the more sweeping amendments adopted with such a rush could, indeed, as Administrator Porter contends, "make the law completely ineffective and impossible to administer." But if the Representatives acted with more heat than wisdom, one key to their action can be found in the amendments requiring that price-fixing involve a reasonable profit to producers, processors, distributors, and retailers, and calling for removal of controls on any commodity when its production for a 12-month period equals its production in the peak year which ended on June 30, 1941.

From its inception OPA has seemed disposed too often to consider itself an agency with a social mission. This has given rise to perhaps unfair suspicion that in holding the line against inflation it has played favorites. Certainly it has not always been realistic as,

for example, in assigning the drafting of regulations to persons seemingly unfamiliar with the industries they were regulating. Its orders have been confusing and, at times, incomprehensible to practical men expected to abide by them. Under the circumstances, Administrator Porter and Stabilization Director Bowles would be well advised to advance some practical answers to the criticism implicit in the action of the legislators.

Feed Famine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, day by day the OPA is rapidly reducing the food supply of the United States. The subversive groups who plan the destructive policies of the OPA know that revolutions are born on empty stomachs and emanciated bodies. Compulsory starvation has been the technique used by trained revolutionists throughout the ages as the most effective means to overthrow governments. The OPA is stripping the farms of livestock and poultry at a time when food is more precious than gold. Sugar is being denied the processors of fruit by the OPA at a time when every ounce of fruit and its juices should be converted into food. Another effective means to overthrow established government is an excessive issue of money by means of the printing press, whether it be currency or credit money. Can the people escape inflation with the forces which are creating a shortage of food in conjunction with a plethora of cheap money?

I insert, under unanimous consent, an article entitled "Feed Famine," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal under date of May 24, 1946:

SCARCE EATS FOR HENS, HOGS, AND COWS MEANS LESS MEAT, EGGS AHEAD—PIGS SOLD AT HALF NORMAL WEIGHT; 200 CHICKENS IN ONE POULTRY FLOCK STARVE—EGG BLACK MARKET PREDICTED

(By John A. McWethy)

FRENCH LICK, IND.—Dwindling supplies of poultry and livestock feed are beginning to pull down this country's production of chickens, eggs, turkeys, milk, and meat.

Higher prices for corn, wheat, oats, and other ingredients used in feed, without compensating rises in the ceiling on livestock and poultry products, are accentuating the trend. The profits in converting feed into food are shrinking under the new prices.

Feed men, here from all parts of the country to attend the 3-day annual meeting of the American Feed Manufacturers Association ending today, related incident after incident to indicate the effects feed shortages are having on the farm.

Some distress selling of poultry and hogs has started. In the State of Washington, where the feed shortage is probably more severe than in any other part of the country, turkeys are being sold at weights of only 5 or 6 pounds instead of the usual 15 or 20.

HOGS SOLD AT 150 POUNDS

One feed man reports that hogs are coming to market in Bloomington, Ill., at average weights of only 125 to 150 pounds, only a little over half the size at which they are normally sold. This same trend is in evidence in big markets like St. Louis which are in definite grain areas bordering the Corn Belt.

A New Hampshire farmer who has around 15,000 chickens, recently had 200 of his birds starve to death because he had nothing to feed them, a leading eastern feed man said.

A man who has recently been through the section of northern Arkansas where a large volume of broilers are raised, said that fully half the broiler-growing poultry farms had no chickens on them. Indicating that this condition may be partly due to the squeeze on profits resulting from the new price relationships, a representative of a firm in Delaware that not only produces feed but also runs a chick hatchery said orders for thousands of chicks were canceled the day feed prices were raised by the Government, a short time ago.

"Those cancellations and reductions resulting from the feed shortage are going to mean lots fewer broilers for restaurants in New York along in August and September," he said.

MARKET CAN'T ABSORB HENS

A Boston feed man reported that New England farmers want to sell their old hens so fast that the market won't absorb all of them and they are beginning to back up. A similar condition is reported in the Portland, Oreg., area.

Effects of the shortage are beginning to show up, too, in official statistics. The association's new president, Walter C. Berger, who has just resigned as head of the Production and Marketing Administration's feed division, said the number of chicks hatched up to May 1 this year is off only 1 percent from 1945, but emphasized that the number of eggs in incubators on May 1 was 26 percent below last year.

The feed to handle chicks is down sharply. Output of chick starter feed made by the Ralston Purina Co., for example, is 27 percent below 1945. It's next to impossible to get chicks started without special prepared feeds of this type.

DAIRY FARMERS CUTTING DOWN

Dairy farmers are cutting down, too. Mr. Berger said that the number of dairy cattle is off 3 percent and that there are 5 percent fewer dairy heifer calves than there were a year ago. There are 17 percent fewer beef cattle being fattened for markets in feed lots than there were a year ago, he declared. This, of course, will mean fewer top-grade juicy beefsteaks this fall.

While the effects of the feed shortage will be confined largely to food, one manufacturer said that cotton raisers were having a hard time obtaining mule feed. Mules are still used extensively on southern cotton plantations. "If a mule has to live on grass, he can't put out a hard day's work any more than a man can on a salad diet," he said.

There are evidences of the shortage in all parts of the country. In Pine Bluff, Ark., a few days ago, not a dealer in town had a bag of poultry feed. Farmers on Long Island, N. Y., have been giving their ducks hog and dairy feed to keep them going. In California, chicken raisers are feeding their poultry rabbit pellets (a type of feed made largely from alfalfa meal).

MANUFACTURED FEEDS HARDEST HIT

The scarcity of feed, which is getting more acute all the time, is particularly bad in manufactured or commercial types. Last year, about 130,000,000 tons of feed were consumed in this country by livestock and poultry, excluding hay and pasture grass. Of this total, some 30,000,000 tons were manufactured feeds. The balance was grain fed on the farm where it was grown.

Between April 1 and October 1, the country's feed supplies will be about 14 percent below a year ago, according to Dr. L. C. Cunningham, agricultural economist from Cornell University. However, because of the pinch, farmers who have grain are hanging on to it and feeding it to their own livestock rather than selling it to feed manufacturers. As a result, output of feed manufacturers over this period will be off 25 to 50 percent from a year ago, Dr. Cunningham predicts.

About the only bright spots in feeding ingredients are oats and alfalfa meal. Between now and October, Dr. Cunningham says there will be about 200,000,000 more bushels of oats than a year ago. Corn supplies, however, will be off 200,000,000 bushels and wheat will be down about 100,000,000 bushels.

The new crop of alfalfa, now being harvested in the Mississippi Valley and the Southwest, is beginning to move to market. It will help to some extent in tiding feed users through the period of shortage. The supply and the amount that can be used, however, is quite limited.

OTHER INGREDIENTS SHORT

Other key feed ingredients will be in short supply because of restrictions on various industries producing them. Distilleries will produce 350,000 tons less of the byproducts used in livestock feed over the period from March to October. Breweries will turn out about 67,000 tons less of brewers' grain, also used in feed. Because of the shortage of wheat and the order requiring flour to contain 80 percent of the wheat berry, the supply of millfeed, which is what remains after flour has been produced, will be off 500,000 to 600,000 tons during this period.

Aside from alfalfa, it's almost impossible to buy feed ingredients. A Chicago feed manufacturer recently made a 1,000-mile tour covering Minneapolis, Omaha, Kansas City, and St. Louis with one of his buyers in an effort to buy grain.

"We weren't able to obtain enough to run our mill half a day," he said.

In the early part of this year, feed manufacturers were able to operate at or near capacity. Operations have, however, been steadily dropping as the shortage of feed ingredients got tighter. Interviews with a number of manufacturers here indicate that output of various firms in May will range between 45 percent and 65 percent of the like month in 1945. Without exception, feed men said they expected June output will show a further decline. July may be even worse until the new crop of oats and wheat begins to arrive in volume toward the end of the month.

L. S. Riford, who has just been elected chairman of the board of the association, and who is president of the Beacon Milling Co. at Cayuga, N. Y., said he recently attended a meeting where 40 feed mills in the northwestern part of the country were represented. They produce 60 to 70 percent of the manufactured feed sold in the area. This group produced 70 to 75 percent as much in April as last year and will turn out only 55 to 60 percent as much in May, he said. June will be much worse, he added, unless something is done to enable deficit areas to purchase grain.

MIDWESTERN MILLS BETTER OFF

Feed mills in the Midwest are operating, in most cases, at a slightly higher level. A survey of men here from firms in the Midwest indicates that operations range from 55 to 65 percent of capacity at the present time. These companies, too, expect June and July production will be much lower.

Feed men think that poultry and egg supplies will show the effects of what's happening this fall.

"You are going to see one of the worst black markets in eggs in history," one feed company executive predicted.

Another said he thought eggs would go to $1 or $1.50 a dozen if the ceiling is taken off. There will be more chicken for a short time as farmers cull their flocks and reduce poultry numbers, but feed men think that by

this fall both chicken and turkey are going to be in short supply.

The Government has asked farmers to cut hog production 10 percent but feed men think farmers will reduce it by over 25 percent. This will begin to show up in the pork chops, bacon, and ham you won't be able to buy by this fall or early next year. If there's any substantial reduction in cattle, beef production will be very slow coming back because it requires 3 years from the time a cow is bred until a T-bone steak is produced from her calf grown to maturity.

Our Foreign Lending Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith insert an address delivered by Hon. M. S. Szymczak, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, before the annual convention of Ohio Bankers Association in Columbus, Ohio, on May 16:

Most of Europe and important sections of Asia find themselves entering the period of peace with only a fraction of their normal export trade. They have not adequate means of their own to pay for the great volume of imports that they must have if their populations are to be kept alive, the damage of the war repaired, and their industries restocked with raw materials and set functioning again. Once this job is done, the war-stricken countries will be able to look after themselves. They will once again have the exports necessary to pay for the goods they need and to service the debts they have incurred in process of rebuilding. Until this has been achieved, however, the United States, which has built up its productive power during the war, must be prepared to supply the goods and the needed financing on a great scale. Since this is a constructive job—one that strengthens the economies of the countries and expands their output—it is entirely appropriate that most of it should be done through loans rather than by a mechanism such as lend-lease. The countries that receive our aid will by reason of that very fact be placed in position to repay us in the years ahead. We are already engaged upon this lending program and I hope to give you a brief picture of it and the philosophy behind it in my talk today.

First, let me say, however, that we are going into it with our eyes open. We have not forgotten what happened to the investments that we had abroad in the 1920's. Our experience then was bad in many respects though not as bad as is commonly supposed. As a matter of fact on our total foreign investment in the 1920's we have received an aggregate service in dollars, which together with the undefaulted loans and equity holdings, is well in excess of the money we invested. Speaking very broadly, we have received something like the equivalent of 3- or 4-percent return on the whole investment. This is primarily due to our good experience on direct business investments abroad and, in any case, it is far short of the 8 or 9 percent which was charged on many individual loans in the 1920's; but rates of that magnitude give fair warning that the loan that is being made is a pretty poor risk. And such rates constitute a burden on the balance of payments of the debtor country that is almost impossible to carry when a major world depression strikes.

This time the rate of interest we are charging on reconstruction loans is in the neighborhood of 3 percent—a rate which, as I have just remarked, appears to have been actually realized on the investments of the 1920's as a whole. Also, this time foreign loans are being carefully screened to meet only the most urgent and productive needs. They are not being blindly pressed upon countries to finance undertakings that are beyond their means. They are being judged in terms of the effects they will have upon the whole economy of a country and its international position. And notwithstanding the enormous uncertainties of the years ahead, there are new factors in the situation that afford some hope that the problem of transferring service on these loans across the international balance of payments will not prove to be the stumbling block it was in the 1930's.

The chief ground for this hope is that we have probably learned enough in the last 10 or 15 years to prevent the full recurrence of such a depression as then occurred. While we are far from having mastered the problem of how to keep a free economy running smoothly at maximum production—while there are many years of trial and error ahead—we have, I believe, learned enough to prevent the most extreme fluctuations. Steadier economies in the major countries will lessen the disturbances to international trade. In addition, the most upsetting element in the international situation in the 1930's—great capital flights—will be severely under control in most countries in the years ahead. All this will tend to limit the size of the international deficits we must face. And as these deficits occur the International Monetary Fund, an institution which was not available in the 1930's, will swing into action. It will use its position to help assure that adequate corrective measures are taken and taken in time. While they are being taken and until they can bear fruit, the fund will be prepared to assist a country financially by making foreign exchange resources temporarily available to it. Not only will countries have access to the billions of dollars available in the International Monetary Fund, but they already have gold and dollar reserves of their own, which are more than double the reserves that were available to them to meet the crisis of the 1930's. These reserves are not, of course, evenly distributed according to need, and in any case they must largely be used for currency stabilization purposes rather than for the reconstruction job. That job is too big for them. But the loans made for reconstruction will be safer if a larger measure of currency stability and freedom of exchange markets is achieved.

Here then are four major reasons—diminished business fluctuations, control of capital flights, action of the International Monetary Fund, and larger basic reserves abroad of gold and dollar exchange—four major reasons why the international financial breakdown of the 1930's is not likely to be repeated on the same scale again. I might add to this list of economic factors the progress that we hope to make in the forthcoming conferences on commercial policy. If these conferences achieve substantial reductions in the barriers to international trade and open the field more widely to private enterprise and competition, the effectiveness of measures designed to correct balance of payments deficits will be correspondingly enhanced. Even on the political front, although the immediate problems are great, we are better organized than in the anarchic period of the 1930's; for now we have the United Nations embracing all the great powers and with the United States playing a full and purposeful role. The possibility that war will cut across the whole pattern of international investment is materially lessened though, of course, far from eliminated by the United Nations.

All of this may sound a bit optimistic to you bankers. I can sympathize with that feeling. If one looks only at the problems that face us today in the international sphere, there can be few grounds for optimism. The problems themselves are unprecedented, and it would be a bold man who would predict in just what way this war-stricken world will finally settle down. What I have been trying to emphasize, however, is that we are far better organized and equipped to deal with these problems than we were with those which were left behind by the first World War. We should not just sit back and assume that history will repeat itself. The basis of international investment has been strengthened in many important respects and we are taking what the generals call "calculated risks" when we come to the assistance of the war-damaged countries of Europe and Asia. If we can aid these countries to get back on their feet; if we can tide them over these first years when their shortages are temporarily acute and their means of paying for them through exports are not yet restored; if we can help them to obtain the means to help themselves; then we may find not only that they can repay us what we have lent, but that they are strong enough to participate with us in building a world of free enterprise and expanding employment and production. It is in that sort of world that democracy can best thrive.

We have kept these purposes clearly before us in the lending program we have undertaken. The key loan is, of course, that to the British. The United Kingdom is the greatest trading nation in the world, and the pound sterling is the currency in which much of the world's business is carried on. The many countries that export to England more than they buy from here were at one time able to employ the sterling proceeds of their sales to buy outside the sterling area—particularly in the United States. Under war conditions this freedom was lost. England could not possibly restore it again in the difficult transition years without the aid of the American loan. She doesn't have the dollars. Without the loan she would be driven to desperate measures—to a whole series of bilateral deals, every one of which would discriminate against the United States and would draw world trade away from its most productive channels. Although in the end this system would seriously shrink world trade as a whole and work against Britain's own interests, the United Kingdom would be forced to get what she could out of it in the critical transition years. Anything gained in that period, when exports were still insufficient to pay for the most urgent import needs, would be worth considerable sacrifice of future potentialities. Once set on this path it would be hard for her ever to disentangle herself. So many vested interests would grow up around the discriminatory bilateral arrangements that even the Bretton Woods Fund could hardly blast them loose. And with England playing this sort of economic game the chances for cooperation in the political field would be jeopardized.

The loan agreement with the British, therefore, provides specifically that, within 1 year from the date when the agreement becomes effective, sterling due on current transactions with any part of the world shall be made convertible unless the United States consents to an extension of time. This is written into an agreement in which $3,750,000,000 is provided to help England purchase the supplies she will urgently need before her exports and other sources of international income build up sufficiently to enable her to pay her own way. Because the loan deals with a key situation and has larger objectives than a mere financial transaction, it is on a larger scale and on more liberal terms than any other contemplated by the United States. It has been laid before Congress for approval; and the funds, if supplied,

will be voted by Congress for this specific purpose.

The remainder of the United States lending program is largely being carried out by the Export-Import Bank. Substantial credits, to be sure, are being extended by other agencies in connection with the sale of lend-lease inventories and surplus property abroad, and the Maritime Commission has been authorized to sell ships on credit. All this is helping to meet the needs of Europe and Asia on the basis of deferred payments. But the loans of actual money are being made almost entirely by the Export-Import Bank.

Our policy on Export-Import Bank loans has been to meet only the most pressing needs that must be financied before the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is ready for business. The resources of the Export-Import Bank were increased last summer from $700,000,000 to $3,500,000,000 and the President has stated that he will ask Congress for another $1,250,000,000 to enable the Bank to complete its part of the reconstruction job. Substantial loans have already been authorized to France, Belgium, Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, Finland, Poland, and Greece, and still larger loans to these and other countries are now under discussion. The programs have been pared down repeatedly; but the rock-bottom needs that must be met before the International Bank is ready to take over remain on a vast scale.

Reconstruction loans by the Export-Import Bank have been made on a 3 percent 20-year basis except for a few special loans for 30 years at 2⅜ percent. These special loans have been made only to France, Belgium, and the Netherlands and have been for the purpose of financing goods authorized under the lend-lease program but ordered after the end of the war. They amount to about $650,000,000. The remainder of the great Export-Import Bank reconstruction loans, which are on a 3-percent basis with serial maturities, may in the course of time prove salable in some measure to the private market. This is particularly likely in the case of the shorter maturities.

The bank is anxious to sell as much as it can to the market because it is under a legal directive to supplement private investment rather than compete with it and because the more it can sell, the more resources it will have to do those parts of the job which private investors are not yet ready to do. As you know, the $200,000,000 loan recently made to the Netherlands Government was opened to the banks of the country on a participation basis. Since it was an extremely short maturity of from 1 to 2 years and bore an interest rate of 2¼ percent it is not surprising that $100,000,000 of it was in fact taken by the banks. It is not, to be sure, the usual type of loan provided for reconstruction purposes. That would require a much longer term. The $200,000,000 credit is merely in anticipation of other measures that the Dutch will take to borrow here or liquidate their assets. Nevertheless it is cause for considerable satisfaction that a market which is extremely cautious about resuming international lending after the experiences of the 1930's has made on this occasion so substantial an investment.

The chief channel through which private funds will flow abroad in the immediate future, however, is likely to be obligations of the International Bank. The major part of the bank's lending will be financed with funds raised in the market, since the bank can use only 20 percent of its own capital for making loans. The remaining 80 percent can be called up only to the extent it may be needed to meet the obligation of the bank. The bank may raise funds either by issuing its own securities or by guaranteeing the issues of foreign borrowers. In either case private investors will be supplying funds to foreigners while the bank assumes the credit risk.

I should be interested to have your comments on the market prospects for bonds of the International Bank. It is possible that there will be an offering of such bonds before the year is out. As you know, the International Bank came into existence last December, and in March the first meeting of its Board of Governors was held in Savannah. The smaller working group of Executive Directors to whom the board has delegated most of its powers is even now in session in Washington. The president of the bank will have to build up a staff, and this may take some months. Gradually the bank will acquire working funds through calling up a portion of its capital. Under its statutes, however, it can hardly call up much more than $400,000,000 of dollar subscriptions before the fall; and if, as seems likely, the demand of foreign countries is predominantly for dollar resources, it may be necessary for the bank at an early date to offer its bonds for sale in this country.

At the outset insurance companies and savings banks in many States may find that the existing legislation does not provide for purchase of this new type of bond. Until a few months ago this was the case in New York; but through prompt action a law was passed permitting the savings banks of that State to invest in the obligations of the new International Bank when they become available. Commercial banks in general will be free to invest up to 10 percent of their capital and surplus. It will be for them to determine to what extent they wish to purchase securities of the International Bank, taking into account maturity, risk, marketability, etc. The bank will undoubtedly exercise great care to adapt the form of its securities to the potential market which it finds available.

As regards the basic risk involved I might make one comment. The bank cannot lend more than its unimpaired subscribed capital, surplus, and reserves, which today amount to about $7,600,000,000. Hence if it borrows and lends to the maximum possible, both its loans and its obligations will amount to about $7,600,000,000. The obligations will be covered to the extent of about $3,200,000,000 by the United States subscription. The remaining $4,400,000,000 will be covered by claims against foreign governments and central banks amounting to about $12,000,000,000—i. e., $4,400,000,000 of foreign government subscriptions to the capital of the bank plus the $7,600,000,000 of loans, all of which must have behind them the credit of a government, central bank, or similar institution acceptable to the International Bank. This $12,000,000,000 of claims against foreign governments or central banks would have to shrink through defaults to $4,400,000,000 before the bonds of the International Bank would cease to be covered in full. No such shrinkage as this occurred in the servicing of our foreign investment during the ill-fated 1930's and there is little reason to believe that it will occur in the decades ahead—particularly in view of the factors to which I have called your attention earlier in this talk.

If the securities of the International Bank find a ready market in the United States it should be able in 1947 to relieve the Export-Import Bank of most of the burden of making reconstruction or development loans. While the shift from the Export-Import Bank to the International Bank will be from an agency of the United States to an institution representing some 40 nations, the predominant role of the United States in international lending will not be greatly altered by the change. As I have already remarked, the United States investment market will be expected to supply most of the International Bank's funds. Furthermore the American director of the bank wields about 37 percent of the total voting power. Even more important than this, however, are the provisions under which the consent of the United States is required before the Bank can lend the dollars subscribed by the United States or can float or guarantee an issue in the American market.

The power to give or withhold consent in these cases has been assigned by Congress to a new body which already has assumed primary importance in our international lending picture. I refer to the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, commonly known as the NAC. This Council is composed of three Cabinet members—the Secretaries of State, Treasury, and Commerce—and the Chairmen of the Federal Reserve Board and the Export-Import Bank. These five men have been given the task of coordinating the foreign lending policies and financial operations of this Government and of the United States representatives on the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund. It is for them to keep the whole program that I have been discussing in this talk in proper proportion and order. Not only must it be adapted to the needs and capacities of one foreign country as against another but it must be fitted into the position of our domestic economy in such a way as to help preserve its stability. The NAC is taking its task with the utmost seriousness. The Secretary of the Treasury is Chairman and there are regular meetings in his office. The group is constantly shaping and reviewing the lending program of this country, both in detail and as a whole. As the International Fund and Bank come into full operation, the task of the NAC will be increased. But it is already clear that an adequate system has now been devised for bringing together the Government agencies primarily concerned with our foreign financial policy. I believe that you have in this Council the best assurance you could ask that the lending program of the United States will continue to be broadly conceived and well integrated and that it will make the most effective use of our admittedly limited resources. It will be powerfully directed toward rebuilding the kind of international world in which American free enterprise can thrive side by side with foreign enterprise, and the foundations of the peace can be made secure.

The Ku Klux Klan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the resurgence of the Ku Klux Klan in the southland is disturbing to patriotic Americans. Religious bigotry should be stamped out in these United States. One of America's great newspapers, the Post-Dispatch, of St. Louis, Mo., has some pointed observations to make on the subject. I am inserting hereinbelow an editorial of that newspaper from its editions of May 12:

REVIVAL OF THE KU KLUX KLAN

The pattern of reaction that followed World War I is being repeated today on many fronts. One of its most sinister manifestations is seen in the glare of burning crosses in southern fields and on southern mountains, where bands of sheeted figures perform their ceremonial mumbo-jumbo and hear intolerance preached in the guise of patriotism. Again new groups of the gullible are

found to pay $10 a head for admittance to the hooded ranks and to fill the promoters' pockets.

The revival of the Ku Klux Klan, after it was so thoroughly exposed and discredited 20 years ago, is a saddening commentary on our times. In its previous incarnation the Klan was anti-Catholic, anti-Jew, anti-Negro, anti-foreigner, antilabor, antiliberal and there is no reason to assume that its character has changed especially since its present resurgence follows admittance of Negro voters to some southern primaries and the opening of a unionization drive in the South. In the past it was only a step from cow-pasture meetings to the floggings, tar-and-feather parties, abductions, and even murders that made up the Klan's sordid record in the early twenties.

The House of Representatives has a committee on un-Americanism, whose duty it is to investigate such antidemocratic movements as the Klan has typified. Strangely, the committee has concentrated on leftist and liberal groups. Will it now look into the doings of the revived KKK and expose its machinations before the organization again becomes a menace to orderly government?

Report Adopted by Convention of United Textile Workers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a report which was unanimously adopted at the 1946 convention of the United Textile Workers of America in session at the Hotel Roosevelt, Washington, D. C., from April 29 through May 2:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATION

The committee recommends that this convention of the United Textile Workers of America go on record in support of the following legislative measures or demands:

1. That we demand the further extension of the Office of Price Administration into 1947, and that we oppose the adoption of any amendments which would deprive the OPA of its effectiveness in maintaining control on prices;

2. That we press for the immediate placing before the House of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill for its adoption in its present form, with the amendment providing for a reduction in age qualifications for eligibility to old-age benefits of from 65 years to 60 years;

3. That we urge the immediate adoption of the bill now before Congress, which provides for a 65-cent minimum hourly wage;

Further, that we demand legislation which will guarantee equal pay for equal work; and

Finally, that we demand Federal legislation which will provide to raise the level of wages in the South to that of wages in the North;

4. That we demand legislation providing a guaranteed annual wage for all.

The committee further recommends that this convention instruct the officers of the United Textile Workers of America and urge upon all locals to place the above demands before the elected representatives of the country and press for passage of legislation on these matters.

On Historic Ground

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Standard-Star of New Rochelle, N. Y., entitled "On Historic Ground":

ON HISTORIC GROUND

When 7 representatives of 51 United Nations motored last week through northern Westchester they traversed ground dedicated by struggle to the liberty and freedom of this country. It would be, therefore, wholly appropriate historically that the headquarters of an international organization with such aims be established where two centuries and more ago a freedom-loving and pioneering people made their mark.

It was in November 1683 that Westchester was erected, one of the 12 original counties of this Empire State. And during these early years the northern part of Westchester was much more important in its relationship to other sectors than has been true in recent years, when the heavily populated southern half has more or less ruled the roost.

Back after the Revolution, when the county was divided into 20 towns, the county included all that is now the Bronx, Morrisania. West Farms and Kingsbridge went from the county to New Lork City in 1874, and in 1895 there followed Wakefield, Williamsbridge, the town of Westchester, and portions of Eastchester and Pelham.

In earlier days we had other names for some of our upcounty towns. One was Salem, to become South Salem in 1806, in order that it might be distinguished from North Salem, and then later it became Lewisboro. There was, too, Stephentown, changed to Somers in 1808, New Castle was formed from North Castle in 1791. And there were already in existence Bedford and Poundridge and Yorktown.

For a time Westchester had its county courthouse in Bedford, and when that was burned by the British in 1779, courts were held in Upper Salem. County supervisors met for a time in Bedford's Presbyterian Meeting House, and there was much upcounty opposition when White Plains became the permanent county seat. Back in those days it was prety much an all-day trip from Upper Westchester, through Connecticut, by coach and rail and later trolley from Port Chester. For a while, Bedford enjoyed a greater population than had Yonkers.

Those were the days when the De Lancey Manor House in Salem Center was the "Halfway House" for travelers from Norwalk to Peekskill, from the Sound to the Hudson. It was about then, in 1731, when New York and Connecticut decided to settle their quarrels over boundaries, New York giving Connecticut a section of land along Long Island Sound, 12 by 8 miles, accounting for the zigzag bite into Westchester, an area through which the UN delegation traveled last week.

In return, Connecticut gave New York a rectangular strip of almost 2 miles width and 50 miles in length, reaching to the Massachusetts border. So "cantankerously" true to old loyalties were the renounced residents that many refused to vote—or pay taxes—and it was not until 1880 that final joint legislative action confirmed the swap. They are people of firm attachments in northern Westchester. They have Dutch blood.

There we found then trapping and fishing and hunting, early grist and saw mills, a country of hand-made plows and blacksmith's bellows, where everybody worked, even the dog upon his treadmill churning out the butter. There were the toll-turnpikes—great-granddaddy of our modern parkway toll stations—and the spinning wheels, the root cellars, and the flocks of sheep. (The village of Somers once blocked a railroad extension because the farmers feared the engine smoke would blacken the wool.)

That is the territory, as elsewhere in Westchester, through which roamed "Appleseed Johnny" and "The Old Leather Man." Here can be found the fireplaces with the old Dutch ovens, and spit and cauldron, the bedrooms with foot-warmers, and the trundle beds. But not all household equipment was home made. There were in these homes beautiful Hepplewhite mahogany desks and tables of satinwood and polished ebony, sandwich glass lamps, and beautifully designed silverware from the old country. Comfort even called for bed-steps where the four-posters were high. And for prices, board at Bailey's Tavern was only a dollar a week and beef could be purchased for 1 cent a pound.

Yes, those are liberty-loving grounds where the UN delegates from Russia and Iraq, from Uruguay, and China, and France, and the United Kingdom traveled last week.

Too bad, isn't it, that there is little likelihood the home of world liberty is not to rest upon those history-hallowed acres of northern Westchester.

Resolution Adopted by Committee For Armenian Rights and the Armenian National Council of America at Hotel Edison, Lynn, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a resolution in support of the Armenian people's appeal to the United Nations adopted at a rally held by the Lynn Committee for Armenian Rights and the Armenian National Council of America at the Hotel Edison, Lynn, Mass., Sunday, May 19, 1946:

To His Excellency TRYGVE LIE,
Secretary General of the United Nations:

Whereas many thousands of Armenians have suffered under Turkish domination and now live in circumstances of great poverty and destitution in foreign countries, particularly in the Near Eastern and Mediterranean countries; and

Whereas great numbers of Armenians have expressed a desire for repatriation in their homeland; and

Whereas an adequate homeland in Soviet Armenia for the Armenian people is only possible through the restoration of the Armenian territory forcibly taken from them by the Turks; and

Whereas the Government of Turkey has for centuries brutally slaughtered and oppressed the Armenian people; and

Whereas the policy of the Government of the United States has since 1920 been one of extensive friendship to the Armenian people; and

Whereas President Woodrow Wilson in his 1920 arbitration award provided for the restoration of Armenian provinces which had been taken by the Turks; and

Whereas the Armenian people have made great strides during the past 25 years as Soviet Armenia under the U. S. S. R.; and

Whereas more than a quarter of a million Armenian soldiers with great courage and bravery served in the Russian Army in the fight against Nazi Germany, as did American Armenians in the armed forces of the United States during World War II; and

Whereas the United Nations has a grave responsibility and a solemn obligation in the interest of world peace and well-being to correct international injustices: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That this meeting under the auspices of the Lynn Committee for Armenian Rights and the Armenian National Council of America, held at the Hotel Edison, Lynn, Mass., on May 19, 1946, unanimously and earnestly makes its plea to the United Nations to give prompt and sympathetic attention and consideration to the request of the people of Armenia as outlined in this resolution; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the delegations of each of the United Nations; to the Secretary of State of the United States, Hon. James F. Byrnes; to the President of the United States of America, Harry S. Truman; to the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee; and to the United States House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee.

Prosperity for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 21, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the Journal of Commerce recently carried an article which discusses farm income with particular reference to the Pace bill. Because of its interesting approach, information, and conclusions, I am inserting it hereinbelow:

GILDING THE LILY FOR FARMERS

Farmers' cash receipts touched a new peak of $22,000,000,000 in 1945. And while farm-operating costs have risen, the net income of farm proprietors last year approached $13,000,000,000, or almost three times the 1940 level. On the basis of this record, passage of the pending Pace bill, which would raise agricultural parity prices to reflect higher farm-labor costs, only will gild the lily.

The House will doubtless pass the Pace bill, which has been passed by the Senate as a rider to minimum-wage legislation. President Truman has stated that he will veto the parity price boost measure, however. The real fight, therefore, will develop over a drive to pass the bill over the President's veto.

Advocates of the Pace bill claim it need not raise prices of agricultural products, since nothing in the bill requires that these prices be pegged at parity. But the Price Control Act requires that prices of agricultural products be supported for 2 years after the official close of hostilities at 90 percent of parity, and other legislation will doubtless be sought to support farm prices thereafter at similar or higher levels.

Any formula for raising parity prices is a move in the direction of raising the floor under agricultural prices. If this were not so, advocates of higher parities would surely not spend so much time and effort to force such legislation through.

The national economy is threatened seriously with an inflationary rise of commodity prices. The Pace bill, which aims at still higher support prices for farm products, would increase this threat substantially if it is enacted into law.

Silver $1.29 Now or $3 Later; Which Will You Have?—A Timely Warning To Manufacturers of Silver Jewelry and Silver Fabricators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 7, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much misrepresentation on the silver question that I feel I owe it to my colleagues to call their attention to an article by George Stuart Brady, in the bulletin of the National Association of Purchasing Agents, whose business it is to know accurately the demand and supply and probable price of commodities they are expected to purchase.

A GENTLEMEN'S AGREEMENT

Senator GREEN, author of the Green bill and admitted advocate of the silver jewelry manufacturers and fabricators, and Senate Members of the so-called silver bloc reached a gentlemen's agreement in the hearings before the Senate Appropriations Committee setting the price of silver at 90 cents per ounce for the next 2 years and $1.29 per ounce after that date. Despite the fact that silver cannot be produced for 90 cents per ounce (the actual cost of production is well over $1 per ounce) the silver interests made that agreement and they intend to keep their word. But the opposition are trying to hedge: they want to make the price 90 cents with no mention of $1.29 in 2 years.

NAILING A DELIBERATE FALSEHOOD

The charge has been made that the price of 71.11 cents per ounce was a subsidy to the silver producers at the expense of the American taxpayers. That is a deliberate falsehood. The Silver Purchase Act of 1934 and 1939 has never cost the taxpayers one thin dime, but instead has made them a profit of $1,500,000,000 as a reading of the daily Treasury statement will show, and would have made them an additional half billion if the Treasury had not sold and lend-leased almost a billion ounces of the people's silver at much below its monetary value.

WHY MINING INTERESTS AGREED TO COMPROMISE

Why did the silver advocates agree to a price below the cost of production for 2 years? I will tell you why. Mining is not a business that can be turned on or off by an electric switch. It is customary for the mines to have a blocked-out reserve of 3 years or more. During the war, at urgent requests from our Government, and the Army and Navy, they used up those reserves. Instead of recognizing that the depletion of these reserves was an evidence of patriotism by the mining interests, those who would destroy our domestic mining industry and import minerals from foreign sources have used this depletion of reserves as an argument that we are a "have not" nation, when, as a matter of fact, our mineral resources have not even been scratched.

SHALL 3,000 MINES OPEN OR REMAIN CLOSED?

As a result of the antimining policy of our Government, more than 3,000 mineral mines have closed. If assured of a decent price at the end of 2 years, these mines will begin driving tunnels, sinking shafts, making raises on the ore bodies, and be ready to go into full production in 2 years. If not given this assurance, they cannot raise the money for this development. Unless these mines are given the go-ahead signal, there will be such a scarcity of silver in 2 years that the price will be $3 per ounce with little or no silver available even at that price. The following article tells some of the reasons why:

POSTWAR PROBLEMS IN COMMODITIES—SILVER—$1.29 NOW, OR $3 LATER; WHICH WILL YOU HAVE?

Silver is a commodity that at one time rocked the political life of this country. No basic economic problems were settled by political slogans and torchlight parades, and now the subject is up again for solution, with the added new complication that the metal has, in the meantime, become a highly important industrial material.

In the days when William Jennings Bryan high-lighted the silver question, we were producing an annual average of 160,000,000 ounces of silver and exporting nearly all we produced at around 50 cents an ounce. Today the situation is drastically changed. In the 5-year period, 1940 to 1944, we produced an average of only 55,000,000 ounces annually and consumed 90,000,000 ounces annually for industrial purposes alone. We are now a heavy importer of silver metal, and our industrial consumption has been steadily increasing, until it has reached 120,000,000 ounces, equal to almost half the total world production in the year before the war.

The proposed increase in the price of silver from 71.11 cents an ounce to 90 cents an ounce was labeled by one economist as an extension of the sordid tale of subsidies. But silver is no ordinary raw material. Its price has never been subject to the ordinary law of supply and demand. It is a basic metal of coinage, and its value is so entangled with the financial economy of all civilized countries that it would be a grave error if it were again made the subject of domestic bipartisan politics.

INDUSTRIAL USE

The largest industrial use of silver is in the production of motion picture and photographic film, which requires about 20,000,000 ounces. Some of this silver can be recovered from old film and from the chemicals, but much is lost. The importance of silver brazing metals and hard silver solders has been increasing, and the silver used for these purposes is largely unrecoverable. Another increasing use is in electrical contacts for electronic and electrical apparatus. Engine bearings have also been taking an increasing amount, and there has been a growing use of silver-clad metals for chemical equipment and of fine sheet and wire for electrical instruments.

But, in the face of a growing industrial use of silver, the metal still remains distinctive in that it is a "precious" metal highly valued in the arts for jewelry and plate. As a coinage metal, silver today is exactly what it

was 1,900 years ago when Pliny wrote: "We are about to speak of the metals which are the standards of value of things." Only two metals meet the three requirements of "intrinsic value" as mediums of price exchange for setting the "standards of value of things." These two are gold and silver. First, any metal used for standard coinage must have a real asset value such as for valued jewelry and ornamentation. Second, it must be a highly resistant metal capable of lasting through the ages. Third, it must be universally obtainable but universally scarce. Platinum fills the first two requirements but not the third. Silver is regularly mined in more than 70 countries and is available in practically every area of the world. It is universally obtainable but universally scarce. As nearly as can be estimated the ratio of silver mined to gold mined has remained constant for 25 centuries at about 20 to 1.

Five centuries before the Christian Era, the Greeks set the value of silver as one-sixteenth that of gold, and that value remained practically unchanged until the 19th century when the actual financial standing of the then four great nations, Britain, Germany, France, and the United States made their paper money unquestionably redeemable without the necessity for the second coinage metal standard. But, since the 19th century, two of those countries have lost their financial standing and the world has become flooded with paper money. The recent pitiable attempts to stabilize, by agreement, the French franc at 119 to the dollar when 300 could be bought for a dollar is an indication of the futility of the regulation of money by law when not backed by the metals of intrinsic value.

MEDIUM OF EXCHANGE

The greatest use for silver throughout the ages has been as a metal for the arts. But, in this generation, much of the plate and jewelry of Europe and Asia has been melted down and the silver sold. The argument of economists that we collected most of the silver of the world and caused a chaotic depression in India and China because of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 is merely diagnosing a disease by viewing the pimples on the face. Actually, the tide turned during World War I, and our net exports of silver began to drop precipitately until we had already become increasingly, a silver-importing nation by 1931. The fact is that the silver standard countries of Asia needed food and goods desperately, and the United States became the only great country where they could exchange their silver for goods.

India, which Devadas Gandhi, the editor of the Hindustan Times, has called "one vast slum," has had to sell off its silver on the same terms that any slum dweller sells off his assets when he is in dire need. But it was not because our Government raised the price; it was because no other nation had the moral courage to raise the price and maintain it. Had the price of silver been maintained on an international basis, India and China would have been able to get more food and goods for their silver. During 1932 and 1933, before the passage of the Silver Purchase Act, poverty-ridden India was selling its silver in New York as low as 24.3 cents an ounce. After the passage of the act the price averaged 47.9 cents in 1934 and 64.3 cents in 1935. That our Government created the depression seems without foundation. What is more to the point is that, when the governments of India and China did not join in the monetary stabilization process, their own governments and their own bankers collected the silver from their own slum-dwelling people at the current low sacrifice price and sold it to us at a 50-percent profit. In those countries the rich became richer and the poor became poorer. The workers of those countries were ignorant of the advanced value of silver and they were not in a position to hold out for high prices.

The involved and clouded statements given out from the Bretton Woods Conference could only indicate that there was little understanding of the technical changes in the position of silver since the nineteenth century. On the other hand, industrial buyers of silver seem to overlook the fact that silver is not a material subject to ordinary competitive buying. When a manufacturer buys silver, he does not own the metal in the same sense that he owns other industrial materials, and when he sells it to another, it can only be on the understanding that it is on lease-tenure only and must be delivered over to the Government if called for. Under the law of June 19, 1934, the President is empowered, when necessary, to "require the delivery to the United States mints of any or of all silver by whomever owned or possessed." This act was merely setting to statutory law in the United States a principle of common law of all western nations. On many occasions, in times of war, this right of governments had been invoked in Europe and in several Latin-American countries.

WHAT IS TRUE PRICE?

What is the true price of silver? Under the law of November 1, 1893, the Government is ordered "to coin both gold and silver into money of intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement." The Government is also ordered to "maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States." While the production ratio of silver to gold is about 20 to 1, there has always been a heavy loss ratio of silver, and the 16 to 1 valuation has been considered as more realistic than 20 to 1. If we are now to consider a greater industrial use loss, which did not occur in the nineteenth century, a truer present value ratio might be 12 to 1. Thus, we have the basis for the argument of those who felt that the price of silver should have been raised in 1934 instead of raising the price of gold. The difficulty at that time was that no other nation would join in the price stabilization, and we were nearer to monopoly in gold than in silver. With gold at $20 an ounce there are those who believe that the true value of silver is $1.66 an ounce. If gold is maintained at $35, the ration of 12 to 1 would mean a price of $2.91 an ounce.

The weight of the dollar is set by law of February 28, 1878, and equals 412.5 grains of standard silver, or 371.25 grains of fine silver. The present Treasury price of silver is 71.11 cents an ounce of 480 grains. That means that the present intrinsic value of the dollar is about 55 cents, and its credit, or paper, value is 45 cents higher than its intrinsic value. To give an intrinsic value of $1 to the silver dollar would require that the price of silver be raised to $1.2929 per ounce. But it is not as simple as that, because the Government is not buying all the silver, and the open-market price has usually been below 50 cents an ounce. Up to the time of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars, international trading was done on a weight basis, and the silver coins of all nations were taken indiscriminately and their value set by weighing. The American dollar was based on the famous Spanish "piece of eight," or 8 reales, and was later given 8 grains less weight than the piece of eight to compensate for the then increasing value of silver.

By laws of February 12, 1873, and March 14, 1900, the standard unit of value in the United States is the dollar of 23.22 grains of fine gold. Gold was then worth $20 an ounce, but today it is worth $35 an ounce. The minted eagles thus now have an intrinsic value of $17.50 instead of the stamped face value of $10, and consequently the Government will not permit them to be issued. Therefore, the silver coins constitute the only real money at the present time (nickels, cents, pennies, etc., are "tokens" of little more than credit value). Under the law of 1893 we are supposed to have coin of both gold and silver "of intrinsic and exchangeable value," but, with gold at $35 and silver at $1.29 an ounce, the ratio would be 25 to 1, and, at the present legal price of silver, the ratio is 49 to 1. At the open-market world price of silver, the ratio is about 70 to 1 and the dollar has an intrinsic value of about 38 cents.

METAL COINAGE STANDARDS

Prosperity and stabilized trade can never be reestablished in the world until we return to international units of real value. There never was sufficient gold in the world to serve as a single monetary standard. Today, with an international trade vastly greater than it was in medieval times, the amount of gold is even less adequate. The price system completely depends upon metallic coinage standards. No nation in the history of the world has ever been able to abolish the price system for long. Even the Communists know that. Hitting at the ideas of the Fabians and the Technocrats to abolish the legally fixed metallic price units, Paul Blanchard, the Socialist writer said, "It would require such an alteration in the habits and thought of the common workers that no Socialist movement would think of it as a practical possibility."

Yet what has happened on an increasing scale since World War I is that many countries of the world have abandoned all metallic units of value. As few as 10 countries of the world, controlling the production of at least 90 percent of the silver, could correct the deplorable situation immediately, but the leadership seems to be lacking. These countries are: United States, Canada, Mexico, Bolivia, Peru, Argentina, South Africa, Australia, Spain, and Belgium (Belgian Congo). Congress has commanded by law that our Government take such leadership "through international agreement," but there has been no indication that our representatives on international councils have fully understood the problem.

We and Canada have been the most generous nations in history in giving goods to needy nations, but we have never seemed to sense that while we have been feeding and clothing these international slum dwellers gratuitously we have been taking away from them at poverty sell-out prices the only real thing of intrinsic value that they have. Bolivia, for example, a great producer of silver, is a desperately poor country. Cicero, one of the greatest of lawyers, wrote this principle of trade, "No one should act so as to take advantage of lack of knowledge of another." Cicero was a pagan. He would not be in accord with the present international silver dealings of the above-named great Christian nations.

PRICE PROBLEMS AHEAD

While it appears to the casual thinker that raising the price of silver constitutes a subsidy to the western miners, the more realistic viewpoint is that keeping the world price down is merely subsidizing the buyers of luxury plate and the industrial users, enabling the latter to use this valuable material at low prices in applications where it is permanently lost and unrecoverable. When the industrial countries again resume high production of manufactured goods it is not unlikely that the demand for silver for industrial uses will exceed total world production, and by that time, if not corrected sooner, the world coinage problem will be so acute that all governments will be obliged to conscript silver. If this happens, we can look for more drastic laws and higher prices than any ever before dreamed of.

GEORGE STUART BRADY.

Shipping Heifers to Europe Is Practical Method of Aiding Starving Peoples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Dr. Oscar F. Blackwelder, of the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, Washington, D. C., I was privileged to address a large gathering assembled at New Windsor, Md., to dedicate a shipment of cows and heifers to starvation areas in Europe.

This recent dedication was conducted under the auspices of the heifer project committee sponsored and started by the Church of the Brethren. This committee has among its membership representatives from the Evangelical and Reformed Church, Northern Baptists, Friends, Mennonites, Catholic Rural Life Association, and Fellowship of Reconciliation.

According to a pictorial folder published by the heifer project committee, the heifer project had one of its beginnings in a city in southern Spain. The blight of war, the Spanish Civil War, was upon the country. Farmers had been conscripted, farm equipment was scarce, dairy cattle numbers had been reduced, and fields lay uncultivated. The blockade and military demands made food and clothing for women and children hard to get. Thus, the war's burden fell on the children, whose weakened bodies were made susceptible to disease by undernourishment.

Dan West, Brethren relief worker, who was visiting the city of Murcia, knew that the small amount of food and clothing the relief committee had to give out would bring only temporary and inadequate relief. The children he met could not know normal family life and permanently improved diets until their family farms and gardens would once more be in production. And the food these undernourished children needed most was milk. Out of the conversation with his fellow workers came the idea that postwar relief plans should include the gift of a family cow to those families who needed one and could properly care for it. Relief would then help people to help themselves.

When he returned to this country he was determined to do something more for those hungry children. But the Spanish war soon became a world war, France fell and before heifers were ready to be sent abroad, all Europe was blockaded. The tragedy of Spain's children became the tragedy of Europe's children and the passing years spread this tragedy through the world. As more and more children suffered in Europe, more and more people in the United States became interested in reconstruction — especially through the heifer project, a plan to send cows to Europe after the war.

Many millions abroad are trying to live on less than half of the food Americans get. Anything under 1,800 calories is a starvation or semistarvation ration; 2,400 calories are needed for good health. In the autumn of 1945 the people of the United States were consuming 3,500 calories per day. The figure for the people of France was 2,000; for Russia, 1,600; Italy, 1,500; Japan, 1,500; and Germany, 1,300. The calory consumption of Greece, Czechoslovakia, and Poland was even lower than the figure quoted for Germany.

Not only is the diet in many countries on a starvation level but it is poorly balanced. Since thousands of dairy cattle were war victims, protein food, including milk, is almost entirely lacking.

Because milk is one of the best sources of protein, the heifer project can offer hope and future security to thousands of hungry, discouraged people. Those who have given the many fine heifers have done so because as followers of Christ they felt called upon to feed their hungry brethren. They believed that people must be healthy to be good neighbors and that we cannot achieve international security with anything less than that.

By January 1946, 939 heifers were sent to four European countries. Hundreds more have been shipped since that date. People in France, Belgium, Poland, and Czechoslovakia received these animals.

Many thousands more are needed. The surface has barely been touched. Following are three plans suggested by the Brethren Service Committee:

PLAN 1. START A CALF

Dedicate a heifer calf for relief. Many farmers have set apart and raised calves from their own herds, thus bringing to the Brethren Service Committee many high-quality heifers.

Urban churches and groups by the dozens have purchased calves and placed them with their rural neighbors, contributing to the expense of raising them. Sunday-school classes and children's groups have been thrilled to see their small contributions grow into a means of health and hope for many.

This plan stimulates interest in your group.

PLAN 2. GIVE A HEIFER READY TO SHIP

Donate cattle ready to ship now. This plan appeals especially to men's groups and civic organizations. Farmers have chosen from their herds high-quality heifers and have given them freely to the sufferers of war's aftermath, even though they could have realized an income from the animals very soon. Sunday-school classes and church groups have raised money on short notice, purchased heifers in their own communities, and made them available to the heifer project for immediate shipment.

PLAN 3. RAISE MONEY AND LET THE HEIFER PROJECT COMMITTEE BUY THE HEIFER

Groups located at a distance from collection centers, as well as churches in urban areas and people living in areas where transportation is difficult, have chosen to raise the money for heifer purchase by the project committee.

We are prepared to receive cash contributions of any amount. Our qualified buyers will invest your money to the best possible advantage.

Send your cash donations to the Heifer Project Committee, New Windsor, Md., and you will receive a receipt from this office and be credited with the heifers that are purchased and shipped.

Let us reclaim some of the damage that was done by war.

Because so many people have indicated a real interest in this splendid project, I am reprinting a series of questions and answers relative to the plan. The following appeared in the printed folder circulated by the Heifer Project Committee:

1. What will a heifer cost?

Answer. We have found the average price to be about $125.

2. Whom do I notify if I have a heifer to donate or money to contribute?

Answer. The Heifer Project Committee, at New Windsor, Md.

3. How can I be sure that the heifer is given to the person in need?

Answer. Our own representatives help to distribute them.

4. What if the heifer is slaughtered?

Answer. Some risk, but not as great as that taken in war. The chances of doing good are better.

5. Will there be feed for the heifers?

Answer. We ship only after investigating and finding feed possibilities.

6. Are heifers contributed by church people given free of charge to those in need?

Answer. Yes, they are, but the recipient is expected to share the gift by passing along new heifer calves and any extra milk.

7. Are heifers being given to countries suffering military defeat?

Answer. Not yet. The War Emergency Act makes it impossible, but we hope to very soon. Hungry women and children everywhere must be fed.

"You, too, may have the privilege of putting a cup, not of cold water, but of warm, life-giving milk, to the lips of our Lord, who suffers again in these little ones."

Reports have come back to the Heifer Project Committee from individuals in Poland and Czechoslovakia who have seen the great benefits derived from the shipment of heifers to starving nations.

In a letter to Mr. M. R. Zigler, executive secretary of the Brethren Service Committee, 22 South State Street, Elgin, Ill., Mr. Vlasta A. Vrazova, public relations director of American Relief for Czechoslovakia, Inc., has the following to say:

The 171 cattle donated by Church of the Brethren arrived in Czechoslovakia February 4 after a week's journey from Bremen, attended by experts sent by the Ministry of Agriculture. All arrived in good condition with a shipment of UNRRA cows totaling 328; 30 cows had calves en route.

On February 12, Mr. John Nevin Sayre, Waitstill H. Sharp, with members of the Ministry of Agriculture and Social Welfare traveled to Frydek in Silesia and nearby Nerad, the quarantine station and state farm. The Minister of Agriculture Duris had issued an executive order to cover your stipulations; your wishes will be respected in all details. Cows will be given free to farmers with large families, who are poor but have the means of taking good care of the animal; to children's sanatoriums and orphanages. The cows will not be sold and will not be used for work on the farm. Newspapers will make known these terms to applicants. Every case, whether of individuals or children's institutions, will be studied by a committee of experts, the Joint Association of Farmers and the Ministry of Social Welfare.

It has been decided also that all cows are to remain in Silesia, one of the regions which suffered most during the war. Nearby is the coal mining and industrial zone of Moravska Ostrava, Opave, Trinec, which is vitally important to Czechoslovak economy. A year ago war raged through this part of the country for many weeks. For instance, in the Opava area 28,000 families were completely

bombed out, another 20,000 families lost almost everything. Even in peacetime the children of these mining towns and industrial centers were under fed. This part of the country is not very prosperous agriculturally, but has meadows and is good cattle land. The farmers understand livestock and have reared a very hardy "Moravian" breed. All these conditions were taken into consideration and you will, we hope, agree that this choice of Silesia has been wise.

One of the institutions which bid for cows is Jablunkov, a tuberculosis sanatorium near the Slovak and Polish frontier. Mr. Sayre drove with us and Director K. Kotek of Child Welfare Headquarters to inspect the sanatorium which had enjoyed the best reputation in the republic. It was built 10 years ago; its farm is most modern, a palace in tiles, with moving belts, conveyors of fodder, blue colored glass windows, and so forth. It can well compare with the best in the United States. Mr. Sayre will, no doubt, tell you how impressed he was with what he saw.

In the last 2 years tuberculosis has doubled. Minister of Health Prochazka reported before Parliament that children are in grave danger. In first grade grammar school in the city of Praha 25 percent have tuberculosis and another 50 percent are on the danger line. The chief reason is malnutrition for 5 years. It must be remembered that Czechoslovakia was occupied by Germany in 1938–39 and that the Germans openly admitted their program of extermination of the Czech nation.

What the Czechs have suffered, with what fortitude, is a story of unbelievable heroism and faith. Although the country is recuperating and many American observers credit Czechoslovakia with the best internal political stability, it cannot solve some of its problems without assistance. Its problem No. 1 is the health of the undernourished children whose unbalanced diet of 1,700 calories, mostly starches, is far below normal. The crying need is milk. All relief organizations now see the necessity of child feeding. It is to the everlasting credit of the Church of the Brethren that it has foreseen this situation and sent such valuable assistance.

Many children will be benefited. As soon as the cows are distributed, Church of the Brethren will receive a full report, addresses, and letters from the fortunate new owners. I am enclosing an editorial from the leading Farmer's Daily by editor Slapanek. I have also written an account of your contribution for the Czech and Slovak press in the United States. Your example will serve as an inspiration of good will and constructive realism in world cooperation.

This worthy project and method of helping the starving people of Europe should be supported by all Americans.

When Truman Broke the Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Standard-Star published in New Rochelle, N. Y., entitled "When Truman Broke the Line":

WHEN TRUMAN BROKE THE LINE

We had not expected that support for our thesis that Harry S. Truman had violated FDR's famous "Hold the Line" order would come from any element of organized labor. But now when the American Federation of Labor takes exactly the same viewpoint it makes us all the more certain we were accurate in our original thought.

It had been our contention, readers may recall, that when President Truman directly and indirectly recommended increases to specified CIO labor unions, he has broken the line which Mr. Roosevelt had ordered held. This was true in the General Motors case, where Truman's fact-finding committee recommended 19½ cents increase, and even more significant in the steelworkers strike, where he settled for 18½ cents. Mr. Truman began to call these bulges but there were so many of them in time that where the line held was the exception rather than the case.

Now comes the A. F. of L. in its official organ and makes the identical point we raised in this column at that time.

"This order," says the A. F. of L., referring to the steel-strike settlement and increase of price of steel by $5 a ton, "increased pay for 2 percent of all workers; but the resulting break in price ceilings will raise everyone's living cost 10 cents on the dollar by the year-end.

"So the Government in effect gave every worker a 10 percent wage cut to benefit a small minority who used their right to strike as a political weapon."

The A. F. of L. might well have carried on with the assertion that the surrender of the Truman administration to the CIO was equally politically motivated.

But what is vitally important is the realization that the A. F. of L., oldest of our labor organizations and to many far more intelligent in its policies, recognizes clearly that any wage increase which pushes up living costs as much or more is likely to prove of questionable benefit.

Is there any change for the better if wages go up 25 percent and living costs go up 25 percent or even more? Thank fortune, there is at least one major labor organization with brains enough to grasp the picture.

Office of Price Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter I have received from the city clerk of Lawrence, Mass., with reference to the extension of the Emergency Price Control Act:

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE,
Lawrence, Mass., May 22, 1946.

Hon. THOMAS C. LANE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: At a regular meeting of the City Council of Lawrence, Mass., on May 20, 1946 a communication was received from the Greater Lawrence CIO Industrial Union Council urging that the city council go on record in favor of the retention of price control under the Office of Price Administration without any weakening amendments or reduction of present powers of the agency, for an additional period of one full year.

The resolution of the CIO Industrial Union Council was supported before the city council by representatives of the Lawrence Textile Workers Council which is affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

Following discussion, the city council voted unanimously to go on record in favor of retention of price control as now vested in the Office of Price Administration and to respectfully urge the Senators from Massachusetts and Congressmen from the district to vote in favor of extending the present powers of the OPA, for an additional period of 1 year, without any amendments which would lessen its control over prices.

I was instructed to communicate this vote of the city council to you.

Very sincerely yours,

GORDON E. GAFFNEY,
City Clerk.

Let's Give Justice and Help to Our Pioneers Now!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the hearings recently held on the Townsend old-age pension and prosperity bills—H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230—have created a lot of interest in social-security problems in general.

Congress and the people of this Nation generally have been too complacent in their attitude toward the older people who find themselves unable to earn a livelihood during this age of modern high speed mechanized industry and increasing higher prices for almost everything.

The result is that a great many of our older people are living on a dole or pittance which is not enough to keep body and soul together—let alone to permit them to retain a degree of self-respect to which they are entiled as pioneers who built this great country of ours.

I ask that before this Nation dissipate its finances in loans to foreign countries that we should first make good our obligation to the people who have built this country and made it the most powerful and strongest in the world.

We all know that after the present industrial boom, we will be confronted with a period of recession. What better way could Congress guarantee a continual flow of legitimate consumer business in our Nation, than by passing legislation granting reasonable and adequate pensions to the aged of this Nation.

Following is a statement which I presented to the Committee on Ways and Means in support of H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230 when hearings were held on April 15:

I am vitally interested in legislation now being considered by the Committee on Ways and Means, namely, H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230, which are better known as the Townsend bills.

Almost every day I receive letters from aged constituents who are actually suffering for want of proper food, shelter, and clothing. Spiraling prices have accentuated their deplorable condition. It is about time that the Congress of the United States recognizes its moral obligation to the aged pioneers of this

country and takes the necessary steps to rectify this serious situation.

Many of our leading citizens talk glibly of loaning billions of dollars to Great Britain and other countries but when mention is made of adequately caring for the aged, they throw their hands up in horror and say that it cannot be done because we have to balance our Budget.

I am firmly convinced that the needy elder citizens of our Nation are the real casualties of World War II. I have fought vigorously in their behalf and I intend to continue my efforts to see that they get a square deal.

I sincerely hope and ask that the committee take prompt and favorable action on the measures under consideration.

National Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "National Disaster":

NATIONAL DISASTER

The coal strike, says a statement issued by President Truman, has become a national "disaster."

No question of that. Evidence of disaster piles up on every hand. Even if John L. Lewis were to use tomorrow's meeting of his dummy policy committee to order the miners back to work right then, damage already done by the strike would blight the Nation's economy for months.

And what do we do about this national disaster?

Senators rise to demand that the President act promptly, firmly.

Act how? With what? Lewis is breaking no law.

Lewis is doing only what present lopsided law permits and encourages every labor leader to do. It is mere accident if no other labor leader has quite Lewis's guts, his ruthlessness, his ability to dictate the policies of a big union, his monopolistic control over a life-blood commodity.

The President could seize the mines and ask the miners to return to work. He could have Lewis jailed if Lewis then told them not to work. But he has no authority to punish the miners or Lewis if the miners, without instructions from Lewis, should simply refuse to work for the Government.

The President could recruit strikebreakers, order the Army to the mines, and try to mine coal with bayonets. It has never been done successfully. The possible if not certain result would be rebellion, bloodshed—and little coal.

The President can do one other thing. And should. Now.

He can ask the United States Senate to give him a law to use.

The Senate is the place. The House passed a labor bill last February. We have thought it too drastic. Now we are not so sure. But the Senate could take up that bill, amend it, make it a strong weapon against national disaster, and it could become law quickly. Except that the Senate's Labor Committee and the administration's influence are keeping it from consideration by the Senate.

It is said that labor's rights might be endangered. We want labor's rights protected. But labor will have no rights unless the Nation's paramount right to live, produce, and go forward is recognized and preserved.

"Everybody for Himself and—"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, one of the best appraisals of the present situation of the Nation I have read is in the editorial from a recent edition of the United States News by Mr. David Lawrence. He has made a keen analysis of what people are thinking and doing and what they should be thinking and doing. His recommendations in the last paragraph are well worth reading and remembering by all Members of the House. Read what Mr. Lawrence says:

"EVERYBODY FOR HIMSELF AND—"

SELFLESSNESS AND SACRIFICE OF A YEAR AGO HAVE GIVEN WAY TO UNIVERSAL SELFISHNESS AND MATERIALISM—RETURN TO NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL MORALITY WILL COME WITH INDIVIDUAL REGENERATION

(By David Lawrence)

Less than a year ago men were giving their lives for a cause. There was no thought of self. Sacrifice after sacrifice was being made.

Today the whole world seems to have been transformed. There's a scramble for power, for position, for material things. Governments which practiced self-denial against a common enemy now reach out for territory and more power. Governments which professed adherence to broad ideals are going the way of all flesh. The surrender to materialism is universal.

Individuals, too, everywhere have succumbed. Labor controversies are sweeping the world. Producers and sellers are resisting controls and, whether it be under the aegis of capitalism or communism, the waves of unrest are spreading.

Here in America the tide of selfishness rises every day. Leaders who manipulate large organizations of people apply their political pressures to gain selfish ends. The Congress listens to the imagined threats of voters who have 18- and 19-year-old sons for the draft pool, while the parents of those aged 20 to 30 wonder why their sons must now face the draft. No longer is there a spirit of service—of devotion to the cause of all of us, the simple cause of national obligation.

Our economic system is paralyzed by strikes. The pursuit of profit, whether it be by employer or employee, has checkmated reconversion. Price ceilings are denounced. Black markets are thriving. Wage increases are demanded. Risk capital stands in awe of the passing scene. Goods are scarce. Inflation is here.

Voice of reason

In all this, the calm, mediating voice of reason is absent. Some say it would be ineffective and unpersuasive even if the call to reason were articulated. There is a tendency to despair, to throw one's self to the let-nature-take-its-course school of thought. We are, in fact, in an era of cynicism which in effect calls out to everybody to look out for himself and let the devil take the hindmost.

It is a short road from the selflessness of the battlefield to the selfishness of peacetime.

It is a longer road back to that exalted mood when men gave their lives for a principle—the emancipation of mankind.

What then, you will ask, is the answer? Isn't all this human nature in the raw? Hasn't it always been that way after wars? Aren't people instinctively selfish and individualistic, and isn't it better to recognize the inevitable and apply the totalitarian controls of man-made law and coercive regulation of the mass by the few? Russia handles the problem by one form of collectivism and calls it democracy. We in America and in the British Commonwealth are urged to do it by socialism or liberalism and to call it democracy, too. Shall we forsake voluntarism and endorse coercionism?

Where is spiritual instinct?

The real answer lies today as always in the power of the individual to rise above self. That power can sometimes be stimulated by the organized rituals of the church and sometimes by the eloquence and exhortations of pastors. But more often it is stimulated by the sudden realization by the individual that he stands on the brink of disaster and that his only hope lies in a release of the spiritual instinct which has been intermittently within him.

Just a year ago this instinct was neither abstract nor dormant. The aviator who came in on a wing and a prayer, the soldier who thought little of creed or sect the night before the battle as he grasped the hand of the nearest chaplain and both strove for a split second to find communion with God and to understand His purposes, and the rest of us who on bended knee offered almost any sacrifice if we could but see again the children of our yesterday—all this was concrete enough only a few short months ago.

Has God changed in the interim? Is He more remote from the conscience within us? Has materialism suddenly become more attractive than it was a year ago? Is the mad chase for creature comforts and the satisfactions of the ego more alluring than it was before? Or is the simple truth that we have forgotten to be humble, forgotten to keep the faith because all around us people are not keeping the faith?

It is easy enough to say that man will find his refuge in an obedience to the commandments of Moses or the teachings of Jesus. It is easy to prate of the need for a spiritual renaissance and to argue that it will come by looking to the pulpits alone for inspiration. The preachers will preach to deaf ears, their words will sound hollow against the stubborn substance of a closed mind, unless we concede that there must be change within us. Then only will the words or ideas of our fellow men reach us.

Individual regeneration will come in time, though it may take more months and perhaps years of suffering to awaken us to the folly of the present-day quest for happiness through the acquisitive side of our natures.

Millions of persons are already suffering. To these we must add the millions who have been suffering through the war. The helpless persons driven from their homes by the bombs of warfare, the broken-down human beings who wander aimlessly now in Europe and Asia searching for food and shelter—these are not the only unhappy mortals of our times.

Let us look around us inside the United States. Have we achieved either contentment or happiness? Who is satisfied with the economic outlook and who sees an opportunity for his children to grow up in an atmosphere of mutual trust or helpfulness to one another? Where is the "freedom from fear"? Do we hear talk of another war abroad? And do we see in the rivalry of groups in this country or in the leadership that worships materialism, anything that remotely resembles that word "security" which we were all so anxious to glorify in our politics just a few short years ago?

Individual responsibility

There's no use blaming anybody else. We shall not make progress by selecting scapegoats. Each of us must accept responsibility for what has happened and for what is yet to happen. Reform and change will not come overnight. At best it will be a slow process of evolution. But it must follow the

inexorable law of human experience which tells us that governments are no better than the men who compose them and democracies are no better than the peoples who make up the electorates or constituencies.

Character and morality in a people must come from modest beginnings. Usually there has to be a minority before a majority is attained for any worthy cause. That minority may be small, but a lot of minorities eventually make an overwhelming majority.

The responsibility for what is happening throughout the world is mine and yours. It involves an abandonment of indifference. It means a return to the spirit of Divine Providence which bids us be humble and unselfish and to seek the greatest of all compensations—the satisfactions that flow from service to our fellow men.

What to do?

Concretely, it means a response to the call for saving of food that others may live.

It means a contribution of self to the solution of the many ills that surround us in Federal, State, and city communities.

It means a subordination of the censure that we heap on others and a readiness instead in all controversies to examine ourselves honestly and without prejudice.

It means a willingness to recognize that if everybody demands the maximum there will be no minimum for anybody.

It means that the voice of reason, coming from men of character and honesty, must be raised higher and higher and that we must all listen.

It means, too, that we must listen every hour of the day for the voice of God, who can tell us what is really worth while in this brief span of life and what is the real purpose of the few years vouchsafed us.

These years and this life are not meant to be exploited by self for self. They are meant for the highest purpose that human imagination can conceive—to give of ourselves that others, too, may eat and live.

Thou shalt not kill thy brother, whether he be black or white or yellow or red, and whether he worships God in your way or his. Thou shalt not kill him by famine or by degradation, by enslavement or by exploitation.

We can destroy civilization by man-made bombs or we can rescue it by the God-given strength of cooperation and human comradeship. To find that strength, we must recognize the divine spark of goodness which reposes within us and give the spark a chance to glow in the darkness of human friction, misunderstanding, and irresponsible individualism.

Senator Vandenberg's Argument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Sun published in New York City entitled: "Senator VANDENBERG'S Argument":

SENATOR VANDENBERG'S ARGUMENT

The speech which Senator VANDENBERG delivered in support of the loan of $3,750,000,000 to Great Britain may very well turn out to have been the decisive factor in obtaining its approval. The Senate had been waiting to hear what position would be taken by the man who has done so much to shape the Republican Party's position on foreign affairs. It heard him confess that he had made what he considered one of the most difficult decisions in his 18 years as Senator. He summed up with the observation: "To pass the bill is a gigantic speculation. Not to pass the bill may be an even greater speculation." Elaborating on this thought he said:

"This bill may prove to be a decisive factor in determining whether we are to live in a world of decent commercial opportunity or whether we are to attempt survival in a world of bitter strife and in a world of government cartels which might make any kind of peace impossible."

Far from aiding British socialism, Senator VANDENBERG argued, failure to obtain the loan would force Great Britain to expand its socialistic program at emergency speed; without the loan the Bretton Woods arrangements would collapse; without orderly international trade the American way of life cannot survive and, most important of all, "if we do not lead, some other great and powerful nation will capitalize on our failure and we shall pay the price of our default." A possibly reluctant advocate, Senator VANDENBERG nevertheless was a forceful one. His views are entitled to the earnest consideration of all his fellow countrymen.

Revival of a Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial out of the St. Louis Star-Times, May 18, 1946:

REVIVAL OF A LOBBY

House approval for restoration of $4,202,000 cut out of a requested appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration gives a slight rebuff to the power lobby. Yet the full appropriation of this important project will still be only $7,500,000 as against the $23,323,000 requested for a full program of expansion. And the subterfuges of the lobby revealed in a Star-Times story of the fight against SPA will still be untounched.

Contributions to schools "to maintain the good graces of the people" (and, incidentally, to try to insure teaching of utility propaganda), company payments to chambers of commerce and to country clubs "to keep our men acquainted with the people"—these are in the pattern of the old utility lobbying against public interest.

George A. Davis, president of the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., who admitted these practices, departed from pattern in only one particular. He did not even pretend the lobbying largess was for the benefit of the utility's customers, but said flatly it was for the benefit of stockholders—that is, for higher profit.

Activities of the Oklahoma utility are not isolated; they are part of a revival of the old power lobby. The National Association of Electric Companies, with Purcell L. Smith as $65,000-a-year director, is the coordinating organization for the lobby, which includes the National Resources Department of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Mississippi Valley Association, the National Reclamation Association, and, to a degree, the United Mine Workers and the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Strangely, Congress so far has done little about this pressure group. Congressional memories must be short, indeed, to have let slip already the recollections of Insull empire lobbying. Congressional temerity must be great, indeed, if it dares let this new pressure group twist the power policy of the Nation.

Los Angeles Needs Housing Badly—Situation Serious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, here is a report of the tragic and serious situation due to inadequate housing facilities in Los Angeles. This summary is the result of a number of responsible agencies and organizations that took part in bringing these facts to the attention of the public.

I doubt that a more serious situation exists in any other large metropolitan city in the Nation. I think the Members of the House should know what we from Los Angeles are fighting for when we speak out vigorously, and support and vote for appropriations for housing. We are trying to relieve suffering of returning veterans and their families and others who are living under severe handicaps and trying hard to reestablish themselves.

In Los Angeles, the people and organizations interested in the human needs of the community during this reconversion period, gathered under the sponsorship of the Welfare Council of Metropolitan Los Angeles to scan the record and learn the facts. What they learned was not encouraging.

A partial list of representation included University of Southern California, American Federation of Labor, Los Angeles City Housing Authority, Y. W. C. A., Haynes Foundation, American Legion, Catholic Welfare Bureau, Los Angeles County School Department, Los Angeles County Tuberculosis and Health Association, Veterans' Administration Facility, Los Angeles County General Hospital, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles City Schools, Los Angeles County Medical Association, Los Angeles County Dental Association, Downtown Business Men's Association, CIO, Travelers' Aid Society, Office of Price Administration, and many others. More than 500 representative and interested citizens attended the three sessions.

Prior to the conference, reports had been received from field workers and after analysis it was found the three major subjects covered Housing, Health, and Economic Problems, which formed the basis for panel sessions. All other questions channeled in these three main topics.

HOUSING

While an equal amount of interest was created by all three panels, housing was the most immediate and reports of this meeting will be described first. Well supplied with facts, the members plunged into analytical discussion of the problems confronting the Los Angeles metropolitan area. A swollen population has overtaxed the facilities of the Nation's fourth largest city and little help is in sight, it was pointed out by the experts.

Although rent control is in effect, devious means have been found by landlords for avoiding controls. Among the choice methods in use are the bonus system for the privilege of gaining a roof overhead; bribes and even wagers are taken on the availability of space. Particularly hard hit were those on relief. They are the last to get housing. Recipients of old-age pensions cannot juggle their incomes with higher rents, costs of living and general upkeep.

Because there is a lack of housing, families are forced to double up and even triple up. Large families of 10 or 12 are living in one or two rooms, condemned shacks, garages, chicken coops; a majority of these inadequate facilities are without sanitary fixtures or heat.

Many difficulties are related to the housing situation. Race relations have become intensified. The prewar tendency of minority groups to escape from restricted areas is now heightened by the necessity for expansion. The inadequacy of housing facilities for the general population further accentuates the problem for minority groups due to discrimination against these groups and to restrictive covenants.

Veterans are having housing difficulties. The Pomona Chamber of Commerce reports 1,100 requests for housing in 3 months, largely by returning veterans who want to set up their own households. There are veterans with good job opportunities who can't take them because they are unable to find housing. That is true of the war worker also.

Doctors, nurses, social workers, and other technicians are not able to pursue their practice because of inability to find houses.

The lack of housing is leading to broken homes and general family discord.

"Jungle towns" are being erected from packing boxes and scraps.

Apartment house owners have taken hotel licenses and are charging weekly and daily rates.

Rooming houses have been sold two and three times and new landlords do not feel obliged to supply the necessary utilities, such as linen and laundry. They are cutting down on expenses to get as quick a return on the investment as possible. Tenants dare not make an issue of this, fearing eviction.

Families are being split up due to the lack of housing. Emotional situations are being created under crowded conditions and health problems for the family have been intensified. When parents are not able to pay the rent, it becomes necessary to place the children in boarding homes or institutions.

The present housing situation has made the finding of foster homes even more difficult than previously. With evictions, high costs, return of servicemen and doubling of families, foster mothers have had to close their homes and ask agencies to remove placed children.

Patients discharged from hospitals cannot find houses and have had to return to the hospitals.

Transients cannot be housed as hotel facilities are crowded.

There is an inequitable distribution of building materials and consequently not enough of it is going into housing.

There is a lack of housing for single men and women.

The problems reported above by the field workers are based on the stories and examples of which the following are good examples.

SPECIFIC CASES REVEAL REAL HARDSHIP

A father has been in the service for 2 years. The mother and two children, 4 and 2 years of age, have been forced to live with parental relatives due to the housing shortage. Now there is a total of five adults and five children living in four small rooms. The young mother has suffered a complete break-down and doctors have diagnosed it as being caused largely by worry. The children have had to be placed in a boarding home until the mother is able to look after them and the father can secure his discharge and return to his family.

A Mexican-American family with three children is living with in-laws in a family group of nine. X-rays of the in-law family detect active tuberculosis. The couple with the three children had cash to buy a house, found the house, but were advised by the agent that although he would like to serve them, the district was restricted and he could not do business with Mexicans, Negroes, Jews, or Orientals.

A mother and her three children slept in the union station and all-night movie theaters for 3 days and nights.

A mother, father, and four children slept in their car for more than a month. One of the children, aged 16 years, developed pneumonia.

Two middle-aged women are caring for a serviceman's motherless year-old baby. They live in two rooms infested with mice, roaches, and bedbugs. There is no running water. The bathroom and kitchen are shared with seven other people. The toilet is broken and paper is disposed of in an open box.

A mother and two children live in one room. There is a kitchenette. They use the public bath and the rent is $75 per month, payable in 5-day installments.

A family of nine was evicted from a housing project on the basis that the wage earner was no longer employed in an essential industry. The father is the wage earner and he gave up his job as a painter to look for housing. This led to irregular work on his part, and the family is now under the care of the bureau of public assistance. No attempt can be made to reestablish the family on a sound basis until adequate housing is assured.

A serviceman's wife and four children are occupying a former chicken house. The property was condemned by city health authorities several months ago, but the family has been unable to vacate. Medical problems for all family members have resulted.

A veteran came home from the war and found his wife and two children living with her six relatives in a three-room apartment. The extreme overcrowding forced the veteran and his family to move into a hotel room costing $4 a day. This expense, plus the cost of eating out, resulted in a financial burden greater than the husband's income. The wife had to go to work, which necessitated placing the two children in a foster home. The net result is that the home has been broken up and both the veteran and his wife are forced to work to support a hotel.

Grasping at a Straw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Sun published in New York City entitled "Grasping at a Straw":

GRASPING AT A STRAW

The National Labor Relations Act has been law for more than 10 years, but not until Thursday last had anybody in a position of responsibility seriously suggested that any of its provisions prohibited the creation of such a health and welfare fund as John L. Lewis seeks for the coal miners. President Truman's citation of a few words from the law may persuade some persons that what Lewis seeks is clearly prohibited by the law.

One of the main purposes of the Wagner Act was to put company unions out of business. The law accordingly defined various unfair labor practices on the part of the employer. The second in order of these declares that it shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer "to dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any labor organization or contribute financial or other support to it." At his press conference on Thursday, President Truman referred to only the last part of the clause, without giving the context.

In seeking to discover the meaning of statutes judges commonly explore the legislative background, to clarify intent. Such an exploration of the debate that preceded enactment of the National Labor Relations Act will show that the intention of the majority of both Houses of Congress at that time was to outlaw company unions and that the prohibition of financial contributions to a union was merely an incidental qualification of this main purpose. Otherwise it would have been unnecessary for Congress to enact a special law intended to prevent James Caesar Petrillo from collecting a welfare fund from the broadcasting companies.

It is true that the legal point raised by President Truman has never been tested, but the National Labor Relations Board has been in existence for more than 10 years and it has never been asked to rule on this section of the law. The absence of this demand is a pretty good indication that lawyers who have studied the clause have come to the commonsense conclusion that the words cited by the President were inserted by Congress to keep employers from establishing and supporting company unions and for no other purpose. It is a strain on the law of probabilities to suppose that what the smartest lawyers have missed for 10 years a layman discovered in an offhand fashion. It would be comforting to many persons to think that a dozen words in the National Labor Relations Act disarm Lewis completely, but unfortunately this just does not happen to be true.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, during my service in the House of Representatives from Minnesota, I have been a consistent advocate for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway, which would make Duluth and other cities located on the Great Lakes, first-class ocean ports. I have felt, and still believe, that the construction of this seaway from the interior of our country, which significantly is the bread basket of the world, to the seaboard, will provide a vital and necessary link in our transportation system to facilitate and increase world commerce for products produced in the United States.

Many people from the central West were greatly disappointed in the middle thirties, when the late President failed to put his full force back of the project. He was then in complete control over the majority of both Houses of Congress

and at the height of his Executive power. He had promised the seaway to the people in 1932 and again in 1936, and 1940, but promises and results failed to synchronize and the oceangoing waterway still remains a dream.

While the Democratic leadership, which has been in full control of Congress for nearly 16 years, has virtually abandoned further legislative action on the waterway project, there is one man in the House of Representatives, a colleague if you please from Minnesota, who has and is vigorously and consistently keeping the flame alive in daily demanding action by Congress for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. This colleague is our able and persistent, as well as congenial friend, the Honorable WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, affectionately known to all Members as just plain "BILL." BILL is a fighter, and one of the hardest working Members in the House for his district and country. He will never give up, when he knows he is in the right. His following in Congress as a colleague and as a ranking member of the important Committee on Rivers and Harbors, is providing the leadership which will result in favorable action by Congress and the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. When the project is completed, it will be a monument to the perseverance and energy of BILL PITTENGER.

I am commending my friend, PITTENGER, from Duluth, for his diligence and application to duty, and I am handing him this bouquet because he is worthy of it. He is a valuable Member of the House of Representatives. He has done outstanding work as a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee in the development of the Nation's waterways and, knowing him as I do, I am satisfied that he will leave no stone unturned until the St. Lawrence seaway becomes a reality.

H. R. 6541

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing H. R. 6541, a bill to grant certain servicemen and veterans the benefits of section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code. Under the law as it now stands, servicemen captured in the Philippines, Guam, and other American possessions, were exempted from the payment of an income tax as long as they remained prisoners of war in an American possession. However, if they were removed to other than American possessions such as Japan, Formosa, Manchuria, or elsewhere, the exemption ceased. Some of these prisoners spent more than 3 years as prisoners of war outside the Philippines. Had they been allowed to remain in the Philippines they would, of course, have incurred no income-tax liability.

In view of this obvious discrimination, I have introduced H. R. 6541 which will, if enacted, bring about a degree of fairness in payment of income taxes on the part of servicemen who were prisoners of war outside the Philippines and other American possessions under Japanese control. The only place where this discriminatory situation can be corrected is in the Congress of the United States, and I urge all Members to give this measure their most earnest and serious consideration.

Home To Roost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I submit for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune titled "Home to Roost":

HOME TO ROOST

The House of Representatives within recent weeks has taken on all the fearful and wonderful characteristics of a river when the ice goes out in the spring. It has been just as chaotic, just as violent, just as impatient of controls—and just as responsive to the primal urges of a changing climate. Unfortunately, these urges—however natural, however healthy at bottom—are blind and reckless. They thrust aside constructive considerations and are the very negation of leadership and intelligent direction.

It would be folly to assume that the swift rush of House action is the result of a deep-laid plot by the "interests" to thwart the will of the sovereign people, just as it would be far too complimentary to the House to give it credit for adopting a well thought out program to liquidate unnecessary wartime controls and restore a free economy and free government. Undoubtedly there are motives operating among the Representatives which are not pretty to contemplate, just as there are among the citizenry at large. There is weariness with the restrictions imposed by war, there is greed, there is personal ambition and partisan jealousy. But there is also a profound and justifiable mistrust of the leadership which the administration has sought to supply, and deep concern over the state to which that leadership is reducing the country.

During his year in office Mr. Truman has been forced to wrestle with many grave problems. He has inherited conditions and trends for which he was not responsible. He has also been confronted by a postwar restlessness and contempt of all restraints which would have tested the ablest of Presidents. But he has compromised—perhaps fatally—his power to cope with these problems by fundamental errors of policy and execution.

The administration was wholly wrong in its estimate of the postwar domestic situation. It looked for a glutted labor market and rapidly shrinking purchasing power. Consequently, it sought to cushion unemployment with Federal money, to boost wages, to hold down prices. The swift adaptation of the Nation's industrial plant to peacetime uses, the enormous backlog of consumer demand, and accumulated purchasing power completely falsified the administration's assumptions, while the administration's policy, leading to increased public demand for goods and services through the disbursement of Government money, coupled with the disruption of production and distribution through unsound labor and price policies, sent inflationary pressures soaring.

Such errors, when taken with the fumbling over the food situation and the President's shotgun tactics of firing a vast and complicated program of social welfare and other long-term projects into a Congress distracted by an unending series of emergency situations, have confused and weakened Mr. Truman's supporters, brought to the surface all the latent divisions within his party and led to a rejection of his leadership by Congress. It is extremely doubtful whether that leadership can be regained. The Democratic split is too wide, and the President has the choice of submitting to such inchoate leadership as has been developed in the Legislature or continuing the battle until the results of the congressional elections in November are known.

In either case, it is fairly clear that the Republicans, even if they do not win outright control, will soon alone be in a position to provide direction for national legislation. They are hampered by the fact that it is almost impossible to govern administrative measures and personnel from Congress. That is perhaps the gravest difficulty in dealing with the Office of Price Administration in the present crisis and explains many of the weaknesses of the House OPA bill. It is, moreover, a difficulty that will recur constantly during the remainder of Mr. Truman's term, unless he can resolve his own political dilemmas in a manner satisfactory to a majority in Congress. But this does not absolve the Republican Party of the imperative duty of creating a constructive program of legislation, of using the power it has gained by alliance with dissident Democrats with discretion and a steady eye to the true interests of the country. The errors of the Truman administration have come home to roost; the Republicans must not allow satisfaction at the discomforture of the opposition to lead them to believe that mere opposition, mere negation, can save them from a similar fate.

Economic Problems in Overcrowded Postwar Los Angeles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, further evidence of the difficult problems in postwar Los Angeles were the subject of study by the Welfare Council of Metropolitan Los Angeles. These problems are the result of inadequate housing, improper sanitary conditions, and lack of hospital space to take care of the rapid increase in population following the war, also the slow reconversion of industry due to lack of materials to reconvert, thereby causing unemployment for thousands of returning veterans and others who were employed in war plants.

Following is the report of the council on economic conditions:

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

Many of the economic problems interrelate with housing and health, but the fact remains that if a person hasn't enough money, he may have to live in substandard or totally inadequate housing; he can't buy enough of proper food, and, as a result, his health is endangered; his family usually gets sick;

and he finds himself sinking deeper into the morass of despair and confusion.

Citing a number of examples, the field workers reported on the reduction of working hours which has led to lower take-home pay. While factories have been reconverting, there has been unemployment.

Medical, dental, hospital, and other professional services are too costly for many persons who need such aid.

When a mother was included in a reduction of employees, the take-home pay for the family was reduced. The mother has been forced to seek other work and place her children in a boarding home.

Serious economic problems confront women workers who are unemployed, the aged, minority group representatives and the handicapped. They are among the first to be let out.

The unskilled worker, who could formerly get a job during the war years, cannot find a job today.

Present relief budgets per capita are now inadequate and not in line with the high cost of living.

The youth worker who was formerly employed during the war years has been displaced and now constitutes a problem in his field.

Welfare and health personnel salaries have not been adjusted to the rising cost of living. Sufficient trained workers are not attracted here. Potential trainees are not interested in the field.

Foster parents and boarding-home operators, nursing and convalescent-home operators are forced to raise their rates. It is impossible for low-income groups to avail themselves of such facilities, as a result. Many of the homes have been forced to close because of financial problems.

The low tax rate does not supply enough funds for the city administration to provide more health service, sanitary inspection, educational and police service.

Aged people living on fixed outside incomes cannot meet the rising costs of living. They were formerly self-sufficient but are not today.

The Army allotment made by the serviceman for his family is not sufficient. When the serviceman is mustered out delay in receiving his check forces him on relief.

Relatives who were contributing to members of the family in need of financial assistance have been forced to discontinue their help.

A couple with two small children had a happy family life. After the husband entered the service his wife secured an excellent job, at a rate of pay far above that which he had received in civilian life. On his return from the service the husband insisted that his wife leave her job. The family allowance stopped, and the husband was unable to secure work which provide sufficient income. He has become jealous of his wife's success and is becoming suspicious of her conduct out of the home.

One worker reports that it is now necessary for agencies to supplement incomes of families that were recently self-sufficient.

A brief and pointed story about a serviceman's wife with a preschool child is revealed in the following family notebook:

Rent	$37.50
Utilities	8.00
Food—milk	35.00
Wife's insurance	6.22
Incidentals	10.00
Total family expense	96.72
Total family income	80.00

The employment of a war worker terminated on VJ day. He immediately looked for employment in order to support his wife and five children. The wage offered him was not sufficient to support his family, so he decided to join the merchant marine. This was an undesirable solution for the large family needed the father's presence at home.

The father of a family, employed as a commission merchant for a wholesale goods firm, has had adequate earnings in the past. However, for the past 6 months his income has been practically nothing because of the shortage of merchandise. The family has exhausted its savings and is now applying for relief.

Mr. K is a clerical worker who has just taken a $40 cut in pay and now takes home $180 per month. He has to support himself, his sick wife and the child, who is in a boarding home. The agency must supplement board payments for the child.

A man who was employed as a tool crib attendant in the shipyards during the war, has now exhausted his unemployment insurance. Because he is 63 years old he is unable to find another job.

A 58-year-old man, who has held responsible positions in the past, has been having difficulty finding suitable employment. His savings have been dissipated due to family illness. Although he has good references, private industry regards him as too old and he is beyond the age for civil service.

One worker reports five families in which the children are badly undernourished due to present-day rise in food prices and scarcity of many items.

HEALTH

Health agencies, both public and private, are badly understaffed in relation to the great population increase which has taken place in the Los Angeles area. These doctors, nurses and technicians have been able to hold epidemic possibilities in check through their vigilance, but break-downs occur that affect many individuals. There are gaps in the services that should be filled to build up community health.

Medical and dental needs have been aggravated because they were neglected during the war period, due largely to a lack of doctors and dentists. In the shortage of physicians, workers say there is an inequitable geographic distribution of doctors.

The reports from field workers decry the lack of dental appliances and glasses and the lack of neighborhood clinics offering free dispensaries.

There is a need for more city and county health nursing service.

The Visiting Nurse Association should be enlarged, for the chronically ill who can remain at home must have service.

There is a need for housekeeping services for those physically or mentally unable to care for themselves. Post-operation cases need home service.

There is a need for sex education for youth, martial education and planned parenthood education.

Regarding the attitude of patients toward the Los Angeles General Hospital, a number of points were brought out. These include:

1. Long distances required to travel.
2. Long waits at clinics.
3. Personnel shortages and tension of the staff.
4. Fear engendered by recent reports as a result of the legislative hearing on the hospital.
5. Need for decentralization of these facilities and more individualized service.

There is great difficulty experienced today in getting medical, dental, and related services to low and border-line income groups.

Among the shortages noted by the workers are hospital beds, school nurses, and school doctors, mental hygiene clinics for adults and youths.

There is a reluctance on the part of private dentists to deal with children's dental problems.

There is a lack of rest homes and boarding homes for those chronically ill.

The aged have special medical problems which are not being solved.

There is a great need for health education on a community-wide basis, with special reference to Spanish speaking groups, Negroes, etc.

Maternity costs for discharged veterans' families are almost prohibitive.

Child guidance facilities and well-baby clinics should be increased.

There should be a greater development of institutions for epileptics and mental defectives with good programs of training during rehabilitation.

Prompting these problems are a wealth of actual, drab, every-day stories heard by the workers.

A child was brought to a hospital after the parents had been unable to find a private doctor to attend her. As the child's temperature was 104 degrees, the hospital could not refuse care, although the parents were able to pay for a private doctor.

A child needed a tonsillectomy but the clinic the parents applied to could not give them an appointment within 3 months. The operation was performed by a private surgeon. The cost was more than the family could afford to pay on their $80 a month allotment.

A child of 6 years had several cavities and a bad toothache, but the mother could not get an appointment with the dentist for several weeks.

A 15-year-old boy is in need of dentures. Many of his teeth have been neglected for the past 3 years because of difficulty in obtaining a dentist. Now these teeth will have to be extracted.

A child of 9 years is reported suffering from a toothache. The mother finally obtained an appointment with the dentist 1 month hence. When the dentist learned the patient was a child, he refused to take the case.

Men who are employed and are supposed to report to a VD clinic cannot get away long enough from their work to wait their turn or they cannot get off at all.

A woman of 48 years is suffering from advanced tuberculosis and heart trouble. She has to have a check-up at the Los Angeles Health Center in Tujunga every 3 months and at the Temple Street Health Chest Clinic every six months. She is located 2 miles from the Tujunga health center and no public transportation is available.

Because of the shortage of doctors and the increased number of births, the health department child hygiene conference in Inglewood health district has been obliged to limit attendance to infants not exceeding 1 year old. Before the war, children were admitted up to 6 years of age.

An elderly woman recently returned from the hospital after a serious operation. She is not a rest-home case but will need housekeeping assistance for 30 days. She is unable to get this assistance.

IN CONCLUSION

In summing up, three expert commentators added to the case stories as follows:

That at the time of the conference only 35 percent of building material was available for residential housing. There is reason to believe that the housing problem has hit Los Angeles harder than any other section of the country because of a greatly increased population, marriage, birth rate, and low maintenance standards during the war.

Inadequate housing has a deleterious effect on children who must live in crowded homes and attend crowded schools. Minorities are crowded into small areas and racial tensions have increased. If the share-the-house plan were instituted in Los Angeles, 100,000 people could be accommodated, but minority members would not be included.

Support for the Lanham Act and the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill was urged, and the housing panel concluded with a call to revive genuine social planning in Los Angeles.

In health, experts pointed out that great sums are expended on cure, but a comparatively small amount of money is made available for prevention. At the present time more than one-half of the hospital beds in

the State of California are used by the mentally ill. In this connection it was pointed out that recently $15,000,000 was appropriated to care for the mentally ill for 1 year, while only $135,000 was appropriated to establish 4 mental hygiene prevention clinics.

Los Angeles needs approximately 6,000 more hospital beds to meet minimum requirements.

Members of the panel on economic problems showed that they had their fingers on the pulse of the community with an apt knowledge of the rising cost of living. Wages are lower; unemployment is evident; women workers are unemployed; and when they have to work to supplement family income children—again bearing the brunt—are placed in homes because of the curtailment of child-care centers.

Health and welfare agencies dealing with people in need have their special problems because they are understaffed and underfinanced.

Working girls who want to go to school for retraining or more education cannot be admitted because of a lack of facilities and housing accommodations.

The three groups hardest hit are, first, the working women; second, the minority groups; and third, the aged and youth. Old age has a particularly hard problem trying to adjust fixed income to a higher cost of living.

Although veterans may not want to be classified outside the rest of the population, their special problems do require special attention. Thousands of veterans are coming to Los Angeles to work. They have a right to come here if they wish, to establish and build homes. While some student veterans are relatively better off, there is a feeling that the large group is not satisfied with the emergency efforts to help meet their needs.

Living costs have risen 33 percent, compared to the last World War I period, when they rose 208 percent. Control of prices and rent ceilings have held the line in cost of living to some measure.

Social security benefits must be extended to those groups not now covered, including a fourth category of general relief for unemployment supported by Federal, State, and local funds.

The experts stressed the following over-all imperative needs:

1. Need for more aggressive public and private leadership to stimulate the community and its elected officials to their responsibilities.
2. Need for a coordinated community program to develop better housing.
3. Need for realistic provisions for financing home-building, particularly for veterans.
4. Need for legislation to insure medical care for all who need it.
5. Need for coordinated planning for geographic distribution of services, closing gaps in areas where no service is available or where there is poor coverage.
6. Need for State programs for the subnormal or abnormal child and adult.
7. Need for funds for agency services which are growing without compensatory increase.
8. Need for initiative by public and private planning groups to engage in political action in order to secure better programs for social welfare.

Dig Down, Brother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Standard-Star, published at New Rochelle, N. Y., entitled "Dig Down, Brother":

DIG DOWN, BROTHER

Whenever Washington bureaucrats begin to shove out to the press and radio intimations that the OPA is prepared to "integrate" strikers' demands into a higher price ceiling on the commodity in question, you can be pretty sure that the strike is nearing its end. For those intimations are the feelers put out for a negotiated peace just before the surrender.

It was that way in the automobile strike—and prices went up. It was that way in the steel strike—and prices went up. It is now that way in the coal strike—and prices will go up.

Don't let there be any misunderstanding about who pays higher wages after any strike. It's you, the consumer, and so you might as well get ready to dig down into your pockets to pay more for coal and for everything in whose production coal plays a part.

A Professional Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New Rochelle (N. Y.) Standard-Star entitled "A Professional Army":

A PROFESSIONAL ARMY

When the United States of America entered World War II we left, for all time we trust, the position of isolationism. Never again can we take the attitude that we will go our way and the rest of the world can go hang for all we care. This is, indeed, whether we like it or not, one world, and the atom bomb has in all probability made it one world or none.

Further, our entrance into World War II brought us postwar commitments which we cannot evade if we are to win the peace as well. There are wartime agreements entered into at Yalta and Tehran, there are definite commitments which we have accepted as to the policing of conquered areas, and, above all, there is the essential need for providing a large portion of the force which United Nations will need if it is to survive.

All of which means that we must have an effective, efficient armed force upon land and sea and in the air. We must continue to be militarily strong, and this means a substantial-sized Army and Navy. Where, then, are we to get the men? Shall we continue the selective-service draft indefinitely?

Our carefully considered opinion is that the answer lies in a professional Army and Navy, sufficient in size to guarantee the commitments we have accepted, and highly specialized to accord with use of modern weapons of mass slaughter. Such an Army and Navy, we believe, could be secured without the draft of our youth if the pay be made sufficiently attractive to bring voluntary long-term enlistments. There is no reason whatever why our Army and our Navy cannot provide careers as do other professions. The Navy in the past has done this to a large degree; the Army must learn how it can be accomplished.

We do not believe it is either economical or fair to continue conscription one day longer than our military safety requires, with interruption to schooling of youth. Certainly youths of 18 and 19 should not be exposed to depraved conditions which have risen in foreign countries where the veneer of morality has worn thin. Adults can perhaps withstand the temptations of such sudden transition; youngsters cannot be expected to do so and should not be risked.

Rather, let us make enlistments sufficiently stable and lucrative to attract the hundreds of thousands who would welcome long-term service at pay, with clothing, lodging, food and the like, equivalent to, let us say, $250 monthly. With a smaller Army, as can be assumed where long service and experience makes each man more valuable and frequent turn-overs would reduce efficiency, this might prove far more economical in the long run than selective service training of our youths. There would be, too, a greater pride and morale among the members of a professional army.

Admittedly, we cannot safely permit our security to hinge upon a fluctuating policy of manpower. If war comes, we must have at hand a highly trained Army capable of quick, decisive action and, if time proves the need, able to furnish instructors for a quickly expanded force of millions. But this latter may well never prove again to be the case. It may be proven in years ahead that the atom bomb and its successors have driven large masses of infantry to the same low level of effectiveness to which gunpowder brought the mounted knight and to which the modern high-powered rifle reduced the blunderbuss.

We must have an Army and Navy. But we believe their effectiveness will not hereafter be found in large numbers. Rather, we should seek for efficiency in modernization, in specialization, and in quick utilization of every forthcoming military invention. The answer lies in a professional Army and Navy composed of well-paid experts.

False, Dangerous, Insulting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I submit for presentation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York World-Telegram titled "False, Dangerous, Insulting":

FALSE, DANGEROUS, INSULTING

The John L. Lewis strike against the Government is still on. The Lewis rope is still around the country's neck.

The truce is a mere reprieve. For 2 weeks Lewis will consent to let the American people stand on his gallows, meanwhile permitting them a little nourishment, while he decides whether to spring the trap. That's all it means.

Lewis has surrendered none of his power to strangle the national economy.

He has made no promise to bargain in good faith with the coal operators.

He has not abandoned his illegal demand for a self-administered coal royalty.

What he calls "the United Mine Workers' contribution to our Nation's economy" is an impudent insult to public intelligence.

Such coal as may be mined in the next 2 weeks—actually only 12 working days—will be inadequate even to safeguard "the Nation's health and security," about which Lewis pretends concern.

Twelve days of coal production after 6 weeks of strike, with no certainty as to what will happen then, cannot reopen strike-closed plants or keep all industries from staggering to a halt.

Two weeks of mining cannot restore jobs to the 2,000,000 people who have lost them because of the strike; or prevent the further spread of unemployment; or end the necessity for railroad freight and passenger embargoes; or turn on the lights in browned-out cities; or give the country any but the falsest, most dangerous sense of future security.

One thing only Lewis has given up—his hypocritical arguments always before paraded, that no matter what the emergency the miners could never, never trespass on the owners' property by working without a contract. He has now ordered them to work 2 weeks without a contract.

And why, even to that extent, has he confessed weakness?

Because, we believe, Lewis finally has outsmarted and overreached himself.

He thought he could bluff an easy-going President, bamboozle a Senate fearful of the labor vote, and force the Government to help him win the strike on his own terms.

But his bluff was called. Called not by the President, not by the Senate, but by the American people who woke up at long last and saw how nearly this one man's uncontrolled power had come to pushing them over the precipice.

It was the people who began to demand, in tones the Senate and the White House dared not ignore, correction of the lopsided labor laws and administration policies that created the uncontrolled power.

God help America if the people now let this 2-weeks reprieve lull them back to sleep, while the Senate relapses into inaction and ways are found to appease Lewis and help him save face.

If that happens, Lewis will go on to other outrages against the public, and a host of pettier labor tyrants will be emboldened to follow his example.

America's Responsibility Toward Armenia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. LANE. I am enclosing a speech delivered by me at a mass meeting held at the Hotel Edison, Lynn, Mass., on Sunday, May 19, 1946, sponsored by the Lynn Committee for Armenian Rights, working under the Armenian National Council of America.

The chairlady of this get together was Mary Finn Berlyn, who has taken a very active interest in assisting and helping minority groups in that part of Essex County, and who annually conducts the "I Am An American Day" program in the city of Lynn. The chairlady was very conversant with the subject matter under consideration, and together with Rev. Charles A. Vertanes presented very able remarks on the Armenian situation.

The program was as follows:

Flag salute.
United States and Armenian National Anthems----------Mme. Rose Zulalian
Accompanist----------Miss Helen O'Connor
Director, instrumental music, Revere public schools
Introduction of chairman---John A. Zakian
Recording secretary, Armenian National Council (Lynn branch)
Our concern for minority peoples----------Mrs. Mary Finn Berlyn
Chairman, Lynn Committee for Armenian Rights
Songs----------Mme. Rose Zulalian
The Armenian point of view----------Rev. Charles A. Vertanes
Director, Armenian National Council
America's responsibility toward Armenia----Congressman THOMAS J. LANE
Resolution for presentation to the United Nations----------Mrs. Mary Finn Berlyn

Madam Chairlady, invited guests, and ladies and gentlemen, the histories of the growth of the American Nation narrate with justifiable pride that the early founding and first growth of this Nation was the result of the courageous action of peoples who so desired independence that they sought and suffered much to gain it. Our early history is the impelling story of minority groups who suffered under oppression and restraint, who wanted freedom and struck through the darkness of the unknown, the turbulence of varied hopes and fortune and privations of the new life to gain freedom. This the histories record proudly, and this we remember abidingly, conscious that this quest for liberty is the essence of our inheritance, the essence of the American life.

But the histories, having accomplished this early chapter, and brought us through the American Revolution, change their stride and turn to emphasize the subsequent growth of our Nation in terms of the "land of opportunity." This is true; the emphasis is understandable; America has been and is "the land of opportunity."

However, I am convinced that in this emphasis our historians are guilty of an error of omission, and one that omits an integral and continuously vital factor of this land. You people know, as I do, that the initial impulse of the Pilgrims and Puritans, though firm in faith and prophetic, has not been sufficient in itself to explain the sustained and glorious growth of America. You know, as I do, that the early impulse of colonization and independence has been constantly restored, strengthened and vitalized by successive immigrations of European and Asiatic peoples. It is right, I believe, to term these successive immigrations of peoples as America's true Fountain of Youth.

Yet what I wish to establish is that the succeeding waves of peoples who come to these shores were all impelled by the same basic force that brought our original settlers, the zest for freedom which has the strength to defy tyranny and the vision to seek freedom in defiance of the unknown. Our people did not come to this country simply because America was "the land of opportunity." They came too because the land they left, and, remember, the land they loved, was the land of denial. The Irish in the last century were a deprived people, and people without right in their own land and when in 1845 in the famine they had not even food, they came to America in increased numbers, impelled by persecution and the denial of basic freedoms. The Polish, the Italian, the Greek, the Armenian, and all others sought America because in their own land they suffered at the time denial and death. Your fathers and mine loved their land and their home, they would not have left their land if persecution and denial had not been incompatible with the spirit of freedom that was in them.

It is this essential spirit which is behind our unflagging effort to secure freedom of religion and speech, fair employment practices, equal opportunity for our youth, elimination of racial discrimination, the right of the worker to a living wage. And it must be the same essential spirit which guides our relations with the other nations of the world.

We are familiar with America's sympathy for the underdog; then we must remind ourselves of the underdogs we have not helped. If we recognize Woodrow Wilson's plea for justice for small nations and minorities as characteristically American, then we had better remind ourselves of the Lausanne Treaty, which, in effect, endorsed the butchery of Armenians and the expulsion of the remnants of the Armenian race from their ancestral lands. If we think of America, true to her tradition, intervening internationally in the cause of justice, let us not forget that we stayed out of the League of Nations and isolated ourselves from the rest of the world in the period between the wars. The spirit of America is in us and guides us, but not always alone—and the spirit flags. I believe that the epic spirit of America is kept alive by those who have not escaped from privation and restraint without leaving at least their sympathy behind, and in whom the spirit of freedom burns and is found by the continuance of the persecution and deprivation in the land they left.

That is why I am particularly pleased to speak today to you, members and friends of the Lynn Committee for Armenian Rights, associated with the American Committee for Armenian Rights. I want to encourage you in the purpose you have set for yourself. I have spoken of the essential spirit of America and recalled that this spirit has often faltered, often defaulted. But it will not vanish when your committee and other committees similarly organized and working, repeat and renew the fight for the basic rights, the very fundamental fact of freedom from wrong.

But though your presence here is an assertion that you know the cause for which you are working, I will take the opportunity to remind you and myself of some of the basic factors in what has been called the Armenian question, though this term is recent and the problems it suggests are ancient.

Deep in the recesses of history is the first growth of the Armenian people in the land that was there and is now the open doorway between the east and west in the valleys that connect the Iranian plateau with the harbors of Asia Minor. Through these valleys, armies have marched and nations have ever contended. The empires and conquesting warriors of Persia, Greece, Byzantium, and Constantinope flowed and ebbed; flanked by mountains where lived hardy mountaineers jealous of their independence. Armenian history rings with familiar names of all history, but is proud of Vigranes the Great who united the country in the century before Christ, and King Tirdat brought to his country, now a political entity, the Christianity which is still cherished.

But most important to my mind as a historical fact which sheds light on today's concern are three events, which in the space of a century or so, stamped an indelible, national individuality on the Armenian people that has stood the test of centuries. The establishment of a national church in 303 A. D., the invention of a national alphabet by St. Mesrop, and the Holy War against Persia in 451 combined to affix an indelible character on the Armenian people, a character that defies boundaries and which proclaims an essential undeniable union. It is this that should be the beginning of every attempt to secure justice for the Armenian Nation. Despite centuries of oppression, despite Turkish depredations and enforced immigration from the home, and, despite an overlord strip as cruel as any people have ever been afflicted with, the stamp of Armenian character, of an ancient and modern nation, has not been altered.

It is not possible for me to summarize here successive trials and tribulations of Armenia in current times, which you are all too familiar with, since the Armenian question, as it is called, officially entered European diplomacy as an international issue with the treaty of San Stafano in 1878. You know too well that the modern history of Armenia is

black with the neglected promises and utter disregard of rights of her supposed friends among nations, and red with the terrible massacres of 1895 and 1909, and the inhuman attempt of the Turks, during World War I to carry into execution the total extermination of the Armenian people. The consequences of this work with its deportations, starvations, disease, and deliberate slaughter, were the reduction by one-half of the native peoples in the Armenian provinces and the involuntary exile of more than a million people. To these brutally oppressive blows was added territorial aggrandizement which deprived and has continued to deprive Armenia of provinces rightfully native and her own for centuries back. These wrongs have never been rectified despite the stalwart defense Armenia made against the Turks in the crucial struggle of the Caucasus, despite the expressed resolutions of the leaders of the allied cause, and the principles for peace which were proclaimed.

I do not intend to disparage those friends of Armenia who, in the past have insisted, though in vain, on justice. You know of the conscientious and repeated efforts of Woodrow Wilson, whose championship of small nations rings like a clear bell through our days, to secure justice for Armenia. He recommended boundaries which would include substantial portions of territory historically Armenian, but which have remained in Turkish hands. The League of Nations never implemented his decisions. His was not the only voice, the only hand raised to help. But here I would like to remind you that the zest for freedom for all, characteristic of America and exemplified in Wilson, has been forced to default again and again to the counterimpulses which proclaim power politics, the bartering of principles for concessions.

However, the growth of Soviet Armenia with its local self-government, political responsibility, and material prosperity points clearly to what can be accomplished. Here, security and progress, so often denied Armenia, are being gained.

Yet, Soviet Armenia is but the nucleus. Two major and imperative restorations must be accomplished: First, Wars, Ardahan, and the provinces awarded by President Wilson to Armenia as rightfully hers must be restored. Second, the multitude of refugee Armenians forcibly driven from their homes years ago must be enabled to return to their homeland.

In the words of Mr. Black, of the American Ethical Union: "Surely it is the responsibility of the United Nations to consider whether this people may not have some spot on earth which is hallowed by its past, made meaningful by its history and achievement, a place where whatever is real in its spiritual and cultural life can enjoy natural growth and expression." In the United Nations we have the authority, the opportunity, and the obligation to accomplish and perpetuate the principles of justice which are not only the law in the hearts of all people, but the steel structure of the hope and future of this world.

And as peace in our time so depends on the mutual understanding and sympathetic agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union, an understanding and agreement which must be ceaselessly sought after. I feel that the Armenian Nation can serve again as a bridge between the East and West. The universal sympathy of Americans for the deprived, the essential character of America in its devotion to the cause of freedom can meet with the apparent sympathy, and manifest assistance given to the Armenian people by Russia. Here the two nations should meet in concord, in working agreement.

That is part of the reason why your work is so important and praiseworthy today, why your revived efforts to remedy the gross injustices of the past has added meaning. Not only do you soothe the crying out in your own hearts, for the nation of your origin, not only can you awaken the zest for freedom native to your countrymen here, essential to the American character if it defaults, the nation must inevitably default. But the drawing the nations of the world, particularly America and Russia, closer together for common understanding of a cause they cannot fail to sympathize with, you can strengthen the United Nations on whom we so depend.

Polish Police Hold Yanks as Terror Grips Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Milwaukee Journal of May 22, 1946:

POLISH POLICE HOLD YANKS AS TERROR GRIPS COUNTRY—UNITED STATES EYEWITNESS DEPICTS ARRESTS BY NEW TYPE GESTAPO, REDS—NATIVES CHEER AMERICANS

(The writer was the only American correspondent to accompany the special American mission returning to Poland her greatest art treasure—the Wit Stwosz altar, which the Germans stole from Cracow in 1939. She had to wait until she got out of Poland before writing this.)

(By Pauline Frederick)

NUREMBERG, GERMANY.—One year after the end of a war fought for the "four freedoms," Poland knows nothing about freedom from fear. The terror in this tragic land is such today that Poles risk arrest and imprisonment for showing enthusiasm for Americans and for democracy.

I have just come from Poland. I spent 8 days there, 24 hours of which our entire party of 21 Americans was held under arrest in a train in the freight yards at Cracow. The 1946 version of the Gestapo, the security police, sat on watch outside in an American made UNRRA truck. The guards wore GI clothing except for their Polish caps.

I was in Poland on two fateful holidays—May 1, when the workers and students marched under threat, and May 3, when the Polish people tried to celebrate their national constitution day against the wishes of the government, with the result that there were shooting and mass arrests.

It is heartbreaking to witness as I have—the way the people cling to the sight of an American as a sort of sign that in some way they will be delivered from their bondage. They stop you on the street and after making sure that no one is in earshot, plead: "Send us help for the June 30 referendum or there will be slaughter."

NO WORD ABOUT ELECTION

On that day the Communist-dominated government, which is estimated to have the support of not more than 3 percent of the people, will ask for a vote of approval on a one-house parliament, nationalization of industries, and land reforms and Poland's western boundaries. Nothing is said of the eastern boundaries; nor, more than a year after VE-day, is anything said about a popular election.

One of the GI's with our party came out of the Cracow YMCA on May 3 after lunch. People were marching with tiny Polish flags, despite the government prohibition against celebrating their traditional Fourth of July. When the people saw the Yank they broke ranks and surrounded him. They shook his hand, cheered him, began covering him with lilacs. Then they boosted him to their shoulders and started carrying him down the street. They had gone about two blocks when an American-made half-track appeared. It mounted four machine guns manned by soldiers in Russian uniforms. These soldiers fired four bursts over the head of the GI. The crowd slowly dispersed with hisses and cries against communism.

The following Sunday as our party left church to walk to the hotel a crowd gathered about us. Under the very barrels of the guns of the security police and armed guards who were everywhere, they began to cheer, "Long live the Americans." They handed us armfuls of flowers and from the windows all along the way branches of lilacs were tossed down to us. The crowd grew and so did the cheering. Finally, some of the men were boosted to the shoulders of the people and carried the rest of the way.

Standing outside the doorway to the hotel were four young Polish girls, laughing and applauding the performance. Before we were in the hotel, two Russian soldiers had stepped up and led them away. As the young prisoners were taken off the angry crowd burst into cries of "We want Mikolajczyk!" (the leader of the Polish Peasant Party who would probably pull at least 60 percent of the votes if a free election were held), "Down with communism!" "Give us back Wilno and Lwow!"

[Wilno and Lwow are the two chief cities in the eastern part of Poland annexed by Russia.]

Our party was forcibly detained at Cracow because a civilian member of the security police charged that a GI of our party had shot him in the arm. The incident was alleged to have occurred around 1 a. m. A security officer told an officer of our party that "no one saw the shooting but it was believed to be an American."

Two days later the security police started to arrest the whole GI detail of 13 on a Cracow street. But when a crowd began to gather they didn't dare. They waited until the men boarded the train, and without looking over all of them, pointed to one and said he was guilty. The GI pointed out had four witnesses to prove that he was not anywhere near the scene of the alleged incident. No American saw the alleged gunshot wound under a bandage around the arm of the alleged victim.

ALL PLACED UNDER ARREST

When the accused GI was not given into their custody immediately, the security police put all members of the party under arrest and posted guards to see that none of us left the train and that the train did not leave Cracow. Thirty-six hours of negotiation between the American Embassy, the Polish Foreign Office, and the security police resulted in releasing the train and the rest of the passengers—but the GI was left behind.

As our train prepared to move out of Cracow, another train pulled in. Out of the filthy straw in the boxcars in which they were living poured filthy, ragged, hungry men, women, and children. These are the people who are being moved from east of the Curzon line to west of it. They are packed in these boxcars with their cattle and farm implements, but without food and clothing. They eat what they are able to scrounge along the way. They are not told their destination.

There are at least 80 American citizens in jail in Poland today on charges ranging from manslaughter (one case) to relatively minor matters such as not having the proper papers. In each case negotiations are painfully slow, dragging over months while these Americans remain in prison. In some cases representatives of the Embassy have not even been permitted to see the prisoners.

Shipment of Edible Nuts From Europe to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

CALIFORNIA ALMOND
GROWERS EXCHANGE,
Sacramento, Calif., May 21, 1946.

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: We know that, regardless of party affiliations, your primary interest is in the welfare of the American people. With this in mind, we urge your consideration of the situation outlined in the enclosed resolution, which is endorsed by the farm organizations marketing the major portion of America's edible nut production.

As we see it, the question is basically a matter of principle.

America has given freely of blood and treasure in winning the war; her citizens are fully conscious of their responsibility to the famine-stricken people of Europe; they surely have the right to expect that their own Government will not allow them to be "played for suckers" by foreign interests which are exporting desperately needed foodstuffs from the famine areas and, at the same time, crying for the gift of American wheat.

We believe that it is time to be realistic. Public opinion surveys have confirmed this fact, and the farm organizations whose names appear on the enclosed resolution are asking the President for direct action by the United States representatives on UNRRA.

We ask that you use your influence in every way possible in support of this eminently reasonable request. It is not our intention to embarrass the work of UNRRA in any way, yet we feel that the basic matter of principle involved here demands immediate and realistic action.

Yours very truly,

D. R. BAILEY,
General Manager.

Whereas the war-torn and famine-stricken countries of Europe look primarily to the United States for the gift of food in this critical period; and

Whereas both the individual United States citizen and the various agencies of the Government are making an all-out effort to supply the necessary food to maintain a minimum diet of 1,400 calories per day in the famine areas; and

Whereas in many of these areas millions of pounds of edible nuts, declared by nutritionists to be high-energy foods, supplying in excess of 2,900 calories per pound, are being withheld from the starving population and prepared for shipment to the United States; and

Whereas these shipments of edible nuts to the United States not only deprive the producing countries of vitally needed foodstuffs, but have reached such volume as to jeopardize the stability of the United States market, already amply supplied with domestically produced almonds, pecans, walnuts, and filberts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Government of the United States, acting through its representatives on the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, demand immediately that foodstuffs produced in famine-stricken areas be retained in those areas, and that European exporting interests be prohibited from shipping food to the United States so long as these famine conditions prevail in the producing countries, and so long as these countries are receiving the gift of American foodstuffs.

CALIFORNIA ALMOND GROWERS EXCHANGE.
CALIFORNIA WALNUT GROWERS ASSOCIATION.
NORTH PACIFIC NUT GROWERS COOPERATIVE.
OREGON NUT GROWERS, INC.
NATIONAL PECAN SHELLERS AND
PROCESSORS ASSOCIATION.

MAY 17, 1946.

Importations to the United States of foreign-produced edible tree nuts

	12-month period beginning Sept. 1—										Sept. 1, 1945, to Feb. 1, 1946 [1]
	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	Average, 1935-39	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	
Almonds:	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*
Shelled	5,506	5,175	1,289	704	654	2,678	1,290	1,543	616	8,254	9,147	[2] 6,029
Unshelled	1,365	286	1	2	0	331	[3]	4	0	439	175	82
Brazil or cream:												
Shelled	5,130	4,075	3,256	4,507	5,721	4,538	8,150	4,368	1,745	[3]	-------	1,587
Unshelled	12,303	9,763	6,952	9,517	11,605	10,028	13,705	8,501	3,583	-------	[3]	396
Filberts:												
Shelled	1,076	1,131	1,030	819	1,369	1,085	561	27	27	576	3,902	3,611
Unshelled	1,737	2,098	115	219	750	984	34	0	0	6	34	200
Walnuts:												
Shelled	2,004	2,565	2,162	2,001	2,277	2,202	2,337	1,114	82	6	6	13
Unshelled	158	37	127	68	11	80	8	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Cashews	10,230	13,373	13,063	14,513	13,302	12,896	18,463	12,068	3,806	4,037	10,892	9,290

[1] General imports.
[2] Includes 32½ tons blanched.
[3] Less than 1 ton.

Source of data: 1935-40, Almond Market Information Bulletin No. 231, U. S. Department of Agriculture, and California Department of Agriculture; 1941-44, reports prepared by Walter Schreiber U. S. Department of Agriculture; Sept. 1, 1945, to Feb. 1, 1946, Report No. Fi 110, Bureau of Census Reports.

[From the Pacific Rural Press of May 11, 1946]

WHILE THEIR CHILDREN STARVE

In the matter of feeding her starving peoples Europe, as ever, carries a prayer book in one hand and a cash book in the other.

The same is true of the politicians in starving India.

Let's set out the facts and look at them.

Europe had a big yield of almonds last year—81,000 tons shelled basis.

Those almonds are good food. They contain about 2,800 calories per pound, which is twice as many calories as the charity leaders say is necessary to save European lives.

Is Europe using those almonds to save the lives of her hungry people?

Indeed not. She is shipping them to us by the boatload. On the docks of Italy starving children watch them being loaded out for the United States. Our own 1945 crop of almonds was large, and we had no need for imports, but they want our dollars, and they undersell us in our home market to get our dollars.

And we give them food.

Up to the 1st of February, India had dumped in the United States cashew nuts equal in tonnage to our entire 1945 almond crop. The tariff is negligible.

And we will give India free food to replace the cashew nuts sold to us.

This is not by way of criticizing our charity. To feed these hungry people is our duty and our privilege.

But criticism is due the greedy folk abroad, and Uncle Sap who lets them get away with it and who gives away our home market to these greedy foreigners to the detriment of our producers at home who carry the load of feeding the world.

The flood of foreign nuts into our market is already big and getting bigger. India dumps most of her cashews into this country. Europe dumps almonds and filberts in the good old easy United States. This hurts the walnut and almond crops of California, the walnut and filbert crops of the Northwest, and the pecan crop of Dixie.

We have a law against dumping in this country, but the State Department has never enforced it.

It is apparent the prayer book is to be used only on Sunday.

Welfare of America Takes Second Place in Palace Guard Advice to President—They Show Him How To Save Himself and the New Deal Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include an article from the Times-Herald, Washington, D. C., of May 24, yesterday.

How this article ever got out of the hands of those who run the big show from behind the scenes is a mystery to most of us.

WHITE HOUSE PUTS POLITICS ABOVE WELFARE—SECRET DOCUMENT REVEALS POLICIES

The political crisis is put before the economic crisis in the administration's plan for handling the strike paralysis, it was disclosed last night in a confidential White House document outlining the plan for a "National Industrial Peace Board."

This paper, on the basis of which Mr. Truman was scheduled to go on the air last night for his fireside chat and plans to address Congress today, was drawn up May 22. It tells not only what the President should do, but why.

POLITICS ABOVE ECONOMICS

The "why" is revealed in the first paragraph and reads as follows:

"The current strike situation is grave on both economic and political grounds. Momentarily, the political crisis is the most urgent."

It then proceeds to warn that Congress is "virtually certain" to enact something approximating the Case bill, which has already passed the House and which will put a severe restraint upon union power. If that law is

passed, the paper declares, Mr. Truman will be "on the spot."

From there follows a detailed analysis of strikes and how to handle them, each studied under the headings: "Substantive (meaning 'real') argument" and "political argument."

MEDIATION BOARD BEST

The main substantive argument is that a national mediation board is the best machine for labor peace.

The political arguments include such items as how to smash John L. Lewis (told in so many words); how to keep the union members pacified; and how to smother the drive in Congress for the Case bill.

This program, the Times-Herald has learned, has circulated since May 22 among such top administration officials as Reconversion Director Snyder, Commerce Secretary Wallace, Labor Secretary Schwellenbach, Senate majority leader Barkley, and all the principal White House secretariat, and now is in the President's hands. Following is its text:

"PROPOSALS FOR A LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM IN STRIKE SITUATION

"I. BACKGROUND

"These proposals are based upon the following considerations:

"1. The current strike situation is grave on both economic and political grounds. Momentarily, the political crisis is most urgent.

"2. This crisis will not end with a solution to the coal and rail strikes. The longshoremen and maritime workers' strike in June may be less economically disastrous than either of the present disputes, but will be political dynamite because of interference with the food and relief programs.

"3. Congressional adoption of antilabor legislation is virtually certain. The legislation will approximate the House version of the Case bill.

"4. Under present circumstances, adoption of the Case bill will put the President on the spot. He cannot afford to veto it in the absence of a more concrete program of his own. Yet, legislation will do more harm than good and his approval of it will cost a large part of the labor vote."

CASE BILL TOO SWEEPING

"(a) The Case bill is both too sweeping and too restrictive to be desirable. It would turn back the clock so far as all union bargaining is concerned and revive the hated injunction process in labor disputes. At the same time, it contains nothing which would help in dealing with a major strike like coal. Both statesmanship and politics require that it be headed off, if possible.

"(b) The bill has become a symbol of infamy to the labor movement. Its approval might be politically disastrous to the administration.

"5. The congressional situation accurately reflects the present temper of the country. Positive administration action is therefore required for political reasons, if for no other.

"6. There are no simple solutions to the substantive problems involved and the climate of opinion is not favorable to an objective review of national labor policy at this time. Such a review will have to be made in the future. Meantime, some useful steps can be taken which, combined, would meet the political problem.

"II. SUGGESTED PROGRAM

"The following elements could comprise an immediate administration labor program:

"1. Create within the Department of Labor a national industrial peace board. This should have semi-independent status, like the Wage Stabilization Board, and its members should be appointed by the President. The board should serve as a national mediation board and should administer, through the chairman, a strengthened conciliation and mediation service. It should also contain a well-staffed fact-finding unit, which would anticipate important disputes and assemble all relevant facts pertaining to them.

"(a) Substantive argument for this: Strengthening of our conciliation and mediation machinery is the most fruitful approach to industrial peace. The lack of a national mediation board is particularly serious and has turned the Secretary of Labor and even the President into a mediator."

REQUIRE UNIONS TO REGISTER

"(b) Political argument: Creation of such an agency would dramatize administration action in the crisis and would meet some of the criticism of a weak Department of Labor.

"2. Require all unions to register and file their constitutions with the National Labor Relations Board and require certification by the board before a union can claim the privileges and protections of the Wagner Act. Such certification should be based on clear standards related to internal union organization and procedure; free elections, ordinary civil rights, nondiscrimination because of race, creed, or color. The following are indicative of such standards:

"Labor organizations must have their constitutions adopted by the membership by secret ballot; must hold regularly stated meetings and conventions; must elect their officers at fixed dates by secret ballot supervised by election boards supervised by the membership; must distribute detailed and properly certified financial statements to the membership."

REASONABLE RULES

"Unions must agree to admit new members without discrimination on the same basis as was established by the existing fellowship; there must be no discrimination based on race, color, or religion.

"Unions must have adopted clear and reasonable rules with regard to good standing and the conditions for resignation from the union and have impartial machinery to protect employees against unreasonable demand or suspension of union membership when loss of membership involves loss of employment, and from the imposition of unreasonable fines or penalties.

"a. Substantive argument: Such requirements would be good for the labor movement and would establish norms by which to judge these free associations. They would help to break up undemocratic practices and concentrations of power in the hands of individual labor dictators. To the extent that mass unions become truly democratic, they will behave much like the rest of the population and will be confronted with fewer situations like the coal strike."

AIMED AT JOHN L. LEWIS

"(b) Political argument: No one can legitimately object to this if standards are reasonable and many liberal groups will welcome it. Moreover, it can be aimed directly at John L. Lewis and thus appear to be specific for the country's present sickness. It is a step to meet the increasing public criticism of the personal power of labor leaders without harming the union movement.

"3. Request the Congress to enact a permanent seizure law of limited scope. Such an act should be applicable only to dispute situations threatening the national economy or the health and safety and should become applicable only after a Presidential proclamation to this effect. It should clearly authorize the Government to put into operation, during the period of seizure, changed conditions of an employment and should include criminal penalties similar to those in the Smith-Connally Act."

LIMITED ARBITRATION

"(a) Substantive argument: Free and unlimited collective bargaining is in the public interest in most instances and the overwhelming majority of strikes do not seriously affect the national economy. In a limited number of instances like coal, however, we cannot, in fact, permit collective bargaining to run its full course. The only realistic alternative is a limited form of compulsory arbitration. This is achieved when the Government takes over the facility and puts into effect new conditions of work.

"Seizure on a status quo basis is virtually useless in peacetime. At best it is only a delaying tactic and it invariably raises the question of whether the workers will actually return to work. That problem can be handled by authority to make wage and other adjustments during the period of nationalization.

"(b) Political argument: The public now generally recognizes seizure as the ultimate step in disputes affecting the national economy. Request for this power on a permanent basis will symbolize the determination of the administration that our basic economy and services be protected from disruption by any private power. Its application would not affect most industries or unions and it should be emphasized as an extreme power used only in extreme cases."

APPOINT COMMISSION

"4. Appoint an expert commission to undertake a comprehensive review of national labor policy and agencies and to report to the President.

"(a) Substantive argument: Such a review is urgently required if we are to avoid a hodgepodge of conflicting measures and policies and to develop an adequate national labor policy. No official body has yet undertaken such a comprehensive review and analysis. Major changes in labor policy should await such a study.

"(b) Political argument: The chief political advantage of such action—aside from indicating a determination to get at root causes of our present difficulties—would be to provide a sound basis for a "cooling off" period for Congress and the country. We should not tinker with our fundamental labor policies in our present national mood.

"III. SUGGESTED TACTICS

"The tactical question involved relates to two areas: (1) The Congress; and (2) the general public. Decisions in both areas will necessarily be governed in large part by the legislative situation at the given moment.

"To the extent possible at this late date, the Administration should attempt to recover the offensive. This is admittedly difficult so far as Congress is concerned. It is less so from the standpoint of the country as a whole.

"The objectives of any tactics adopted are: (1) To convince Congress and the Nation that the Administration is really on top of the situation and not merely muddling through; (2) to forestall or provide a basis for vetoing any ill-advised legislation which might make the situation worse."

CONGRESSIONAL TACTICS

"1. Congressional tactics: These are the most difficult to devise in the present situation. Opportunity may be presented by a congressional deadlock (a filibuster in the Senate) for the President to outline the above program in a special message. It would probably be more desirable, however, to use informal methods, in terms of amendments offered in the Senate to the Case bill, or of compromise proposals presented to the conference. There is danger that a public recommendation of an administration labor program which should be the maximum program at this time would merely add fuel to the antilabor flames and be used by Congress as a starting point, rather than a finishing one. However, someone with judgment, like Senator BARKLEY, might be prepared to present the program at the appropriate time.

"2. Relations with the public: Whatever approach is made to the legislative problem, the President should certainly make a fire-

side report to the Nation on the labor situation. The content of such a report would vary somewhat in terms of the situation existing at the time in the coal and rail disputes and in Congress."

What Is Needed in the White House Is New Courage, a New Program, or a New Occupant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in his syndicated newspaper column of this morning one of America's most widely read and influential columnists, George E. Sokolsky, states some blunt truths in some blunt language which all Americans should read and heed.

With this in mind, I am inserting Mr. Sokolsky's straight-from-the-shoulder column in the RECORD at this point:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The President seems to be a leisurely gentleman who takes his time about things. He waited 40 days to become cognizant of John L. Lewis' coal strike. He took at least a month to acknowledge the perils of the railroad strike.

A maritime strike has been announced for the middle of June by Harry Bridges and Joe Curran. I wonder if Mr. Truman has heard about it yet?

Mr. Truman is one for taking advice from carefully selected advisers. For instance, his economists advised him that following VJ-day this country would suffer from deflation, that some 8,000,000 would be out of work and that prices would collapse.

Why Mr. Truman should have accepted the advice of these great minds whose opinions ran counter to all knowledge, wisdom, and human experience, is beyond understanding. But he did.

A formula was worked out by these pedants to raise wages without increasing prices on the supposition that industry could operate for 6 months at a loss.

Every idea in this formula turned out to be wrong. Instead of deflation, came inflation. Instead of prices falling, they rose.

Instead of wages rising without prices rising, came a series of Government-inspired and fomented strikes which threw this country into a spiral inflation, the end of which is not yet on the horizon.

Every advice given the President by Chester Bowles, Henry Wallace, Leon Henderson, Robert Nathan and the rest of the smart products of book-worn wisdom worked exactly in reverse.

Now, on the matter of the coal strike, his wisdom came, according to reports, from Dr. John R. Steelman and George Allen. The theory was to let John L. Lewis and the coal operators "sweat it out."

John L. Lewis is a good sweater. And the coal operators have nothing to lose but their mines. So they can sweat.

Actually the "sweating out" was by the American people. Every business, every home, every individual is affected. The President himself had to sit in a brownout.

Yet for some reason the President sat around and waited while the advisers advised. No issue arose in the coal strike after the fortieth day which was not on the cards all the time.

The welfare fund was first projected by David Dubinsky and was picked up by James Caesar Petrillo.

Obviously, if they got away with it, every labor leader will try to get away with it. Should Lewis get a welfare fund, every union will try for one. Why not?

The function of officialdom is to know what is happening in the country and to anticipate trouble. So far as the American people are concerned, it is the President and not his advisers who are responsible for whatever occurs.

He can, if he chooses, advise with Popeye or Superman or Dick Tracy—and I fear some of his advisers are of that ilk.

But when a President sits around for 40 days, sweating it out, while the productivity of his country is tobogganing, he cannot be regarded as a serious-minded person who knows what he is doing.

It is impossible for the economy of this country to mark time until after the 1946 congressional elections. Mr. Truman apparently prefers not to make decisions that endanger his majority in Congress.

Mr. Hannegan would prefer him not to antagonize the CIO and the PAC. Mr. Allen and Mr. Snyder want him to hold business and the farmers in line.

Mr. Bowles wants to be elected Governor of Connecticut. Paul Porter wants to go back to the FCC where he can continue his program of limiting freedom of the radio. Everybody wants something and gives advice.

But the American people also want something and they want it now. Now and not in November. Now and not after election day.

Mr. Truman has to make up his mind whether he is managing a congressional election or whether he is President of the United States.

It may be a difficult decision to make; yet he cannot avoid making it and hold his job. The course of events brooks no delay—and he cannot change that course by gazing at the heavens through Henry Wallace's astrological devices. It is a time to swim or sink.

Shortage of Stock and Poultry Feed in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD yesterday, I included a telegram sent to the President Thursday evening with reference to the critical shortage of stock and poultry feed in New England. This will be found at page A2943 of the Appendix. That telegram was signed by Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont; Senator THOMAS C. HART, of Connecticut; Representative SHERMAN ADAMS, of New Hampshire; and myself, and was reported to the New England delegation in Congress.

Last night the following telegram was sent to the President:

The undersigned Members of Congress from New England wish to endorse the request contained in the telegram last night signed by Senators AIKEN and HART and Representatives ADAMS and HESELTON that you proclaim a state of emergency and make urgent recommendations that holders of grain ship to New England from their supply of feed grain sufficient to meet the immediate crisis.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Representative from Massachusetts; JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Representative from Massachusetts; WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr., Senator from Maine; DAVID I. WALSH, Senator from Massachusetts; WARREN R. AUSTIN, Senator from Vermont; PETER G. GERRY, Senator from Rhode Island; STYLES BRIDGES, Senator from New Hampshire; THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Senator from Rhode Island; CHARLES W. TOBEY, Senator from New Hampshire; OWEN BREWSTER, Senator from Maine; BRIEN MCMAHON, Senator from Connecticut; LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Senator from Massachusetts; CHARLES L. GIFFORD, Representative from Massachusetts; EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Representative from Massachusetts; RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Representative from Massachusetts; PEHR G. HOLMES, Representative from Massachusetts; CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, Representative from Vermont; GEORGE J. BATES, Representative from Massachusetts; CHARLES R CLASON, Representative from Massachusetts; HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN, Representative from Connecticut; MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Representative from Maine; AIME J. FORAND, Representative from Rhode Island; FRANK FELLOWS, Representative from Maine; THOMAS J. LANE, Representative from Massachusetts; JOSEPH E. TALBOT, Representative from Connecticut; JOHN E. FOGARTY, Representative from Rhode Island; ANGIER L. GOODWIN, Representative from Massachusetts; ROBERT HALE, Representative from Maine; CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, Representative from Massachusetts; CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, Representative from Connecticut; CHESTER E. MERROW, Representative from New Hampshire; PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Representative from Massachusetts; JAMES P. GEELAN, Representative from Connecticut; JOSEPH F. RYTER, Representative from Connecticut; CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE, Representative from Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, we have reported to the President that this shortage is now past the stage of crisis and is actually approaching a calamity. The condition is so widespread that it is impossible to report current figures. But I want to give the following which I received by telephone yesterday afternoon.

Last week the milk receipts of 20 large distributors in the Boston market were 10.7 percent below the receipts of that week in 1944. Those receipts were approximately 16 percent below the receipts in that period in 1945. This is a stark fact in terms of the drastic shrinkage of milk we have reported to the President.

Between January 1 and May 1 of this year 83 percent more live poultry went into the Boston market than during that period last year. During the last 6 weeks 164 percent more live poultry went into that market than in the like period in 1945. Compared to the average rate for the last 5 years, between January 1 and

May 1, approximately 1,200,000 hens more than the normal slaughter from our poultry flocks is recorded. These are other stark facts in terms of the widespread and daily increasing destruction of New England's poultry flocks.

I repeat that New England fully recognizes this Nation's solemn obligation in the present world-famine crisis. I think it will not be denied that our dairy farmers and our poultry raisers have accepted the request to reduce their herds and flocks to provide grain for shipment to famine areas. But is it sound to continue that reduction to the point of destruction of food-producing flocks and herds when we have the means here of preventing that calamity without interfering with our commitments to the starving? Will not the threatened extermination of these food producers soon reflect itself in our ability to help the famine-stricken people of the world? Is it not already affecting the food available here which would release other food?

We desperately need immediate and constructive action. We hope and believe that the President will take that action.

The Railroad Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's New York Herald Tribune:

HOW SACRED?

As these lines are written there has been no settlement of the railroad strike that has paralyzed the country. But even if a so-called settlement should arrive and provide the relief we all crave, it can have no basic significance. The fact that we Americans must face is that two men, both labor leaders in key public services, have been in a position to dictate, temporarily though it may be, the fortunes, health, and national honor of 140,000,000 people—to say nothing of lives around the world.

It would be easy to become hysterical on the subject of such tyranny, exercised by officials privately clothed with power by a minority even of railway workers. Mr. Alvanley Johnston and Mr. A. F. Whitney represent only 2 of the 20 brotherhoods in the railway labor field. The 18 others, as well as the operators, agreed Thursday to abide by the formula for settlement presented at the President's conference. These two held out.

The most discouraging feature has to do with the unions involved (among the most conservative and responsible in the country) and the law under which they operate. That law—the Railway Labor Act—has for the 20 years since its enactment been considered a model of labor legislation for the simple reason that until Thursday it has saved us from the suffering we have just experienced. It is a law which the railway unions themselves promoted. Now it has failed of its purpose and the country gropes in the dark for anything better that will hold labor in check while preserving its right to strike.

But how sacred is this right to strike? Here is the fundamental question which requires reexamination. Does the right to strike come before the right to live or to work, or the right of a great nation to play its part in the world? According to New Deal philosophy the answer is "Yes." But common sense surely suggests a different answer. We urge that henceforward in this land of the free and the brave the right to strike be reconsidered in the light of its relative importance and placed in its proper perspective among the essential rights of man.

Northwest Industry Revival Erasing Power Surplus; Recognized Impetus Given Campaign for New Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Oregonian of May 21, 1946:

NORTHWEST INDUSTRY REVIVAL ERASING POWER SURPLUS; RECOGNIZED IMPETUS GIVEN CAMPAIGN FOR NEW DAMS

The Pacific Northwest, a region which a heavyweight national magazine predicted only a few years ago had "power to burn," may be shy of kilowatts during the next 5 years and until the first generators of McNary and Foster Creek Dams are hooked onto the great Northwest power grid, if preliminary estimates of Bonneville Power Administration experts are correct.

Those Bonneville engineers and statisticians whose particular field is attempting to look far enough into the future so that generating and transmission facilities may be built and ready by the time a demand for power comes have recently made a preliminary revision of their estimates on the comparatively immediate future.

Where it has been thought that a war-end slump in power requirement would extend over a period of at least a full year, it now appears that the slump—which left the Bonneville Administration with a 500,000-kilowatt surplus—will be little more than momentary.

What are the bases upon which these forecasters predict, as shown in the accompanying graph, that the power supply for Oregon, Washington and northern Idaho will drop below total power requirements between 1948 and 1952?

One principal factor, of course, is the unexpectedly early return as major power consumers of the aluminum plants at Spokane and Troutdale. They are expected to be in partial operation by the end of this year.

That, coupled with general industrial increases and a demand for power by the general public even heavier than had been anticipated, is expected to place requirements by the end of this year at a point above the wartime peak reached in December 1943.

Before the war ended the power requirement forecasters had figured that there would be an increased demand from the public, which had not been able to increase its requirements at a normal rate because of inability to obtain electrical appliances and equipment.

This demand, partially because of unanticipated population increase, is proving to be greater than had been expected. Bonneville now figures an annual increase of 6½ percent in general public use of electric power in the northwest is conservative. Some large distributors are showing an increase as high as 10 percent, and the average increase for small distributors is a phenomenal 25 percent.

INDUSTRY LOAD HIGHER

Increasingly industrial loads, which account for the comparable climb of the lightly shaded area of the graph indicating Bonneville's direct industrial load, served from Bonneville transmission lines, are based on studies of northwest industrial prospects and efforts to attract such large users of power by the BPA industrial and resources development division. The industrial load increase is about the same as the general use increase after a sharp rise in 1946 and 1947, reflecting return of aluminum plants to lines.

The aluminum plants alone, when in full operation, use 650,000 kilowatts of power—more than the total output of Bonneville Dam's 10 generators. Other electrometallurgical plants built in this area during the war are expected to be converted eventually to peacetime use.

Studies of electrometallurgical and electrochemical industries not presently represented in the northwest indicate that the electric power on which they depend is becoming scarcer in regions where they are now located. Availability of low-cost power here is expected to bring many of them here. The total load of those which have already expressed interest in the northwest would exceed 1,000,000 kilowatts.

SUPPLY INCREASES DEMAND

Industrial demand depends to a great extent upon availability of power. If there were serious doubts that the Northwest's hydro plants could not supply the energy for a specific industry, it would locate elsewhere, or at least delay its location here until a steady supply of power could be assured.

Wide and insistent public demand for electrical house heating is another factor which can be expected to heavily increase the drain upon Bonneville and Grand Coulee in the future. Bonneville estimates that even without promotion a load of at least 100,000 kilowatts for this purpose by 1953 is a reasonable expectation. No effort is being made to increase use of electricity for house heating until technical problems are solved.

Irrigation pumping load and railroad electrification are small but important factors.

Now where is the power coming from?

The broken line on the accompanying graph indicates the total developed and proposed power supply. It includes both the power developed and to be developed by the big Federal generators and by non-Federal utilities. The latter, including both private companies and municipal operations, is represented in the cross-hatched area at the bottom of the graph and in steam generating plants.

1948 CRISIS PREDICTED

The broken line, which shows Bonneville's preliminary estimate of what the Northwest's total power supply will be, begins dropping below the solid line, which indicates estimated power requirements in December 1948.

This does not necessarily mean that there will be an extreme power shortage, but it means that there very easily could be. Estimates of how much power can be developed in a hydroelectric system must necessarily be based on the least that can be expected. That is, on the lowest water year for the Columbia River. The lower the water, the less power can be generated, and no sensible business can contract to sell what it may not produce.

Should the years between 1948 and the jump in power supply which will come when the first three generators of McNary Dam start whirring be reasonably high-water years the broken line would probably be above the solid one.

EXPANSION TRACED

The broken line starts climbing in 1947 to keep within range of the increasing power requirements. This increase in power supply is expected as new generators are installed at Grand Coulee Dam. The first is to be installed in 1947. Two go in in 1948, two more in 1949, and three in 1950.

That will make Grand Coulee Dam's generators number 15. But even those installations will not be sufficient, providing Bonneville's estimates of the Northwest's growing thirst for energy are reasonably accurate.

Expected also to be activated in 1950 are the first two generators from Hungry Horse Dam, to be built on upper Flathead Lake in Montana and connected with the Bonneville transmission system, and the one generator of Detroit Dam on the North Santiam River.

Still the power demand and power supply will be uncomfortably close until the first 3 of McNary Dam's ultimate 10 generators go into service in December 1951—if dam construction keeps pace with schedule and that projected date can be met.

CONGRESS ACTION NEEDED

The pressure will be off and a comfortable margain between supply and demand existing as three more generators go into service at McNary Dam during 1952 and the first three of the generators at Foster Creek Dam, proposed for construction downstream from Grand Coulee, are activated. Again there is a big "if," however, for Foster Creek Dam has not yet been authorized by Congress, let alone provided for in congressional appropriations.

All in all, the Northwest's power problem appears, at least from the Bonneville standpoint, to be a race between thirsting power users of the Northwest on one hand and the dam builders, the generator builders, and the Rivers and Harbors and Appropriations Committees of the National Congress.

Preliminary generator installation schedule

Date	Dam	Kilowatts
November 1947	Grand Coulee 7	108,000
February 1948	Grand Coulee 8	108,000
May 1948	Grand Coulee 9	108,000
April 1949	Grand Coulee 10	[1] 120,000
July 1949	Grand Coulee 11	120,000
October 1949	Grand Coulee 12	120,000
April 1950	Grand Coulee 13	120,000
July 1950	Grand Coulee 14	120,000
	Hungry Horse 1	47,000
	Detroit 1	45,000
October 1950	Grand Coulee 15	120,000
	Hungry Horse 2	47,000
October 1951	Hungry Horse 3	47,000
December 1951	McNary 1	[1] 69,000
	McNary 2	69,000
	McNary 3	69,000
April 1952	McNary 4	69,000
August 1952	McNary 5	69,000
October 1952	Foster Creek 1	[1] 64,000
	Foster Creek 2	64,000
	Foster Creek 3	64,000
December 1952	McNary 6	69,000
July 1953	McNary 7	69,000
October 1953	Foster Creek 4	64,000
	Foster Creek 5	64,000
December 1953	McNary 8	69,000
July 1954	McNary 9	69,000
October 1954	Foster Creek 6	64,000
	Foster Creek 7	64,000
July 1955	McNary 10	69,000
October 1955	Foster Creek 8	64,000
	Foster Creek 9	64,000

[1] Bids for new generators to be built for Grand Coulee will call for nameplate ratings of 120,000 kilowatts. Originally 108,000-kilowatt generators had been planned. Overload performance of installed generators indicates feasibility of the larger units.

[2] Original estimate. Installation of units of either 58,000 or 62,000 kilowatts is now being considered.

[3] Tentative estimate of rating of units.

Chester Bowles and Paul Porter Are Shoving the American People Down the Road to Famine and Black Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, that OPA is continuing to deprive the people of this country of meat, bread, flour, meal, poultry and dairy feed, and that the senseless orders, rules, and regulations promulgated by this agency, Mr. Paul Porter and Mr. Chester Bowles are driving these necessities of life into the black market is shown by the editorial from New York Times of May 20, the letter of Mr. Horace H. Justus, of Knoxville, Tenn., and the letter of Mr. Clifford Marcum, secretary of the Progressive League of the First District of Scott County.

This editorial from the Times, and these letters from these fine and representative citizens of my district are but three of the daily protests coming to my office that condemn the OPA and the two men who are daily and stubbornly bringing the law-abiding people of this country face to face with famine.

[From the New York Times of May 20, 1946]

CRISIS IN BEEF

With about 75 percent of the Nation's beef at retail levels having passed to the control of black marketers, the time is at hand when definite steps should be taken to restore that essential product to legitimate channels of trade if one of the world's finest food distributing systems is not to be damaged irreparably. To supply the country with adequate supplies of fresh beef a vast and complicated system has evolved. It includes the range where the cattle are bred, the feed-lot operator who produces about two-thirds of the meat sold by the retail butcher, and the packer with his fleet of refrigerator cars and numerous branches through which the beef is distributed to retail outlets.

Now under the impact of rulings by the Office of Price Administration this system is being shattered. The range still is operating at capacity. But the feed-lot operator cannot operate profitably at the ceiling price. He is either out of business or selling the cattle he feeds above the ceiling in the black market. The old-line packer is able to buy only a fraction of the cattle needed at the ceiling and is processing only about 25 percent of the former quantity of beef. This 25 percent is the only beef over which OPA now has any control.

When controls were first being considered, the meat industry was fearful of just such developments. There was no shortage at that time. In fact, an artificial shortage through legitimate channels was created by the initial restrictive measures that OPA put into effect. Moreover, immediately OPA assumed control over meat, the black market started to function. Since then it has expanded steadily. Today OPA has control of no more than 25 percent of the beef reaching retail outlets.

It is improbable that OPA ever will be able to recover the control it has already lost. From past experience with prohibition, it is doubtful if control could be recovered even with the establishment of a huge policing force costing millions of dollars. It is problematical, in fact, with black marketers now so well entrenched, whether OPA will be able to retain even the slight hold it now has. Meanwhile the Nation's health is being imperiled by the increasing quantities of insanitary beef from black markets.

This is why many of those who have studied the meat problem now believe that the only solution lies in eliminating meat controls so that free competitive forces can again assert themselves. In that way, they argue, the makeshift operators soon would be eliminated and meat returned to normal distributing channels. Since operations through legitimate channels would be more efficient, they believe that prices would adjust themselves at lower levels than those now being paid for the greater part of the meat that is available.

JUSTUS & CO.,
May 15, 1946.

Hon. JOHN W. JENNINGS,
Member Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You no doubt are aware of the serious food situation which exists throughout this section, but you could not appreciate the feeling of our customers who come to our store to purchase feed for chickens and cows. We have had an order placed with the Ubiko Milling Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, for feed for 30 days. They advise us they cannot fill this order because they cannot buy corn to make livestock or poultry feed. As I understand it the Government is paying 30 cents per bushel more for corn than this feed mill is allowed to pay under OPA. It is quite natural no one will sell them anything at 30 cents less than the Government pays.

We have had a dozen people in our store today that tell us they cannot buy a pound of starting feed for baby chicks in the city of Knoxville. We operate a hatchery in connection with our business and at present have about 10,000 eggs in our incubator. In normal times we sell from 800 to 1,000 chicks per day at this season of the year. I am writing this letter about 3 p. m. and we have sold exactly 31 chicks today. We have approximately 3,000 in our battery for sale and had to go 60 miles from Knoxville or to Rogersville yesterday to find enough feed to keep these chicks alive. We have had any number of people who tell us they are going to sell off all their poultry—some of them will never be raised large enough for human consumption.

Sincerely yours,

JUSTUS & CO.,
HORACE N. JUSTUS,
President.

THE PROGRESSIVE LEAGUE,
FIRST CIVIL DISTRICT,
SCOTT COUNTY, TENN.,
Pioneer, Tenn., May 21, 1946.

Hon. JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As secretary of the Progressive League of the First District of Scott County, Tenn., I am writing you regarding the flour and feed situation. According to reports our Government is paying 30 cents more per bushel for grain than they will allow the flour and feed milling companies to pay, and sending all this to foreign countries, causing our mills to shut down, and we cannot buy bread and feed. We ask you as our Representative to protest this action.

We are willing to divide, but we are not willing to give all. We cannot work without bread, meat, and other food we are hardly able to get.

Respectfully yours,

THE PROGRESSIVE LEAGUE OF THE
FIRST DISTRICT OF SCOTT COUNTY,
CLIFFORD MARCUM, *Secretary.*

Administrative Procedure Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM HOBBS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the leadership of the great chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, Hon. HATTON W. SUMNERS, has again been demonstrated in the history of the pending measure. He has worked with every one of those who have been interested for the last 10 years. Several of the bills that have been precursors of the present one have been introduced by him. His sage advice and his encouraging example have been helpful throughout the long fight.

The letter from Attorney General Clark, of October 19, 1945, while referring specifically to one of Judge SUMNERS' bills, needs only one slight change to make it apply perfectly to the bill of the moment. That change is: the reference to section 3 (a) (4) should read 3 (a) (3), since the latest amendments of the House committee.

With such change in mind the letter speaks as of today, and it is so helpful that I take pleasure in including it as the major part of these remarks:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., October 19, 1945.

Hon. HATTON SUMNERS,
Chairman, House Judiciary Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You have asked me to comment on the substitute draft of H. R. 1203, a bill to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure, in the form in which it appears in the revised committee print issued October 5, 1945, and referred to in your recent letter.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on this proposed legislation.

For more than a decade there has been pending in the Congress legislation in one form or another designed to deal horizontally with the subject of administrative procedure, so as to overcome the confusion which inevitably has resulted from leaving to basic agency statutes the prescription of the procedures to be followed or, in many instances, the delegation of authority to agencies to prescribe their own procedure. Previous attempts to enact general procedural legislation have been unsuccessful generally because they failed to recognize the significant and inherent differences between the tasks of courts and those of administrative agencies or because, in their zeal for simplicity and uniformity, they proposed too narrow and rigid a mold.

Nevertheless, the goal toward which these efforts have been directed is, in my opinion, worth while. Despite difficulties of draftsmanship, I believe that over-all procedural legislation is possible and desirable. The administrative process is now well developed. It has been subject in recent years to the most intensive and informed study—by various congressional committees, by the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, by organizations such as the American Bar Association, and by many individual practitioners and legal scholars. We have in general—as we did not have until fairly recently—the materials and facts at hand. I think the time is ripe for some measure of control and prescription by legislation. I cannot agree that there is anything inherent in the subject of administrative procedures, however complex it may be, which defies workable codification.

Since the original introduction of H. R. 1203, I understand that opportunity has been afforded to public and private interests to study its provisions and to suggest amendments. The agencies of the Government primarily concerned have been consulted and their views considered. In particular, I am happy to note that your committee and the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, in an effort to reconcile the views of the interested parties, have consulted officers of this Department and experts in administrative law made available by this Department.

The revised committee print issued October 5, 1945, seems to me to achieve a considerable degree of reconciliation between the views expressed by the various Government agencies and the views of the proponents of the legislation. The bill in its present form requires administrative agencies to publish or make available to the public an increased measure of information concerning their organization, functions and procedures. It gives to that portion of the public which is to be affected by administrative regulations an opportunity to express its views before the regulations become effective. It prescribes, in instances in which existing statutes afford opportunity for hearing in connection with the formulation and issuance of administrative rules and orders, the procedures which shall govern such hearings. It provides for the selection of hearing officers on a basis designed to obtain highly qualified and impartial personnel and to insure their security of tenure. It also restates the law governing judicial review of administrative action.

The bill appears to offer a hopeful prospect of achieving reasonable uniformity and fairness in administrative procedures without at the same time interfering unduly with the efficient and economical operation of the Government. Insofar as possible, the bill recognizes the needs of individual agencies by appropriate exemption of certain of their functions.

After reviewing the committee print, therefore, I have concluded that this Department should recommend its enactment.

My conclusion as to the workability of the proposed legislation rests on my belief that the provisions of the bill can and should be construed reasonably and in a sense which will fairly balance the requirements and interests of private persons and governmental agencies. I think it may be advisable for me to attach to this report an appendix discussing the principal provisions of the bill. This may serve to clarify some of the essential issues, and may assist the committee in evaluating the impact of the bill on public and private interests.

I am advised by the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget that while there would be no objection to the submission of this report, he questions the appropriateness of the inclusion of the words "independently of agency recommendations or ratings," appearing after the word "Examiners shall receive compensation prescribed by the [Civil Service] Commission" in section 11 of the bill, inasmuch as he deems it highly desirable that agency recommendations and ratings be fully considered by the Commission.

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

TOM CLARK,
Attorney General.

APPENDIX TO ATTORNEY GENERAL'S STATEMENT REGARDING REVISED COMMITTEE PRINT OF OCTOBER 5, 1945

Section 2. The definitions given in section 2 are of very broad character. It is believed, however, that this scope of definition will not be found to have any unexpected or unfortunate consequences in particular cases, inasmuch as the operative sections of the act are themselves carefully limited.

"Courts" includes the Tax Court, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, the Court of Claims and similar courts. This act does not apply to their procedure nor affect the requirement of resort thereto.

In section 2 (a) the words "agencies composed of representatives of the parties or of representatives of organizations of the parties to the disputes determined by them" are intended to refer to the following, among others: National War Labor Board and the National Railroad Adjustment Board.

In section 2 (c) the phrase "the approval or prescription for the future of rates, wages, corporate or financial structures or reorganizations thereof, prices, facilities, appliances," etc., is not, of course, intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the types of subject matter of rule making. Specification of these particular subjects is deemed desirable, however, because there is no unanimity of recognition that they are, in fact, rule making. The phrase "for the future" is designed to differentiate, for example, between the process of prescribing rates for the future and the process of determining the lawfulness of rates charged in the past. The latter, of course, is "adjudication" and not "rule making." (*Arizona Grocery Co.* v. *Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railway Co.* (284 U. S. 379).)

The definitions of "rule making" and "adjudication," set forth in subsections (c) and (d) of section 2, are especially significant. The basic scheme underlying this legislation is to classify all administrative proceedings into these two categories. The pattern is familiar to those who have examined the various proposals for administrative procedure legislation which have been introduced during the past few years; it appears also in the recommendations of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure. Proceedings are classed as rule making under this act not merely because, like the legislative process, they result in regulations of general applicability but also because they involve subject matter demanding judgments based on technical knowledge and experience. As defined in subsection (c), for example, rule making includes not only the formulation of rules of general applicability, but also the formulation of agency action whether of general or particular applicability, relating to the types of subject matter enumerated in subsection (c). In many instances of adjudication, on the other hand, the accusatory element is strong, and individual compliance or behavior is challenged; in such cases, special procedural safeguards should be provided to insure fair judgments on the facts as they may properly appear of record. The statute carefully differentiates between these two basically different classes of proceedings so as to avoid, on the one hand, too cumbersome a procedure and to require, on the other hand, an adequate procedure.

Section 3: This section applies to all agencies covered by the act, including war agencies and war functions. The exception of any function of the United States requiring secrecy in the public interest is intended to cover (in addition to military, naval, and foreign-affairs functions) the confidential operations of the Secret Service, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States attorneys, and other prosecuting agencies, as well as the confidential functions of any other agency.

Section 3 (a), by requiring publication of certain classes of information in the Federal Register, is not intended to repeal the Federal Register Act (44 U. S. C. 301, et seq.) but simply to require the publication of certain additional material.

Section 3 (a) (4) is intended to include (in addition to substantive rules) only such statements of general policy or interpretations as the agency believes may be formulated with a sufficient degree of definiteness and completeness to warrant their publication for the guidance of the public.

Section 3 (b) is designed to make available all final opinions or orders in the adjudication of cases. Even here material may be held confidential if the agency finds good cause. This confidential material, however, should not be cited as a precedent. If it is desired to rely upon the citation of confidential material, the agency should first make available some abstract of the confidential material in such form as will show the principles relied upon without revealing the confidential facts.

Section 3 (c) is not intended to open up Government files for general inspection. What is intended is that the agencies, to the degree of specificity practicable, shall classify its material in terms of whether or not it is confidential in character and shall set forth in published rules the information or type of material which is confidential and that which is not.

Section 4: The term "naval" in the first exception clause is intended to include the defense functions of the Coast Guard and the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation.

Section 4 (b), in requiring the publication of a concise general statement of the basis and purpose of rules made without formal hearing, is not intended to require an elaborate analysis of rules or of the detailed considerations upon which they are based but is designed to enable the public to obtain a general idea of the purpose of, and a statement of the basic justification for, the rules. The requirement would also service much the same function as the whereas clauses which are now customarily found in the preambles of Executive orders.

Section 4 (c): This subsection is not intended to hamper the agencies in cases in which there is good cause for putting a rule into effect immediately, or at some time earlier than 30 days. The section requires, however, that where an earlier effective date is desired the agency should make a finding of good cause therefor and publish its finding along with the rule.

Section 4 (d) simply permits any interested person to petition an agency for the issuance, amendment, or repeal of a rule. It requires the reception and consideration of petitions, but does not compel an agency to undertake any rule-making procedure merely because a petition is filed.

SEC. 5. Subject to the six exceptions set forth at the commencement of the section, section 5 applies to administrative adjudications "required by statute to be determined on the record after opportunity for an agency hearing." It is thus limited to cases in which the Congress has specifically required a certain type of hearing. The section has no application to rule making, as defined in section 2 (c). The section does apply, however, to licensing with the exception that section 5 (c), relating to the separation of functions, does not apply in determining applications for initial licenses, i. e., original licenses as contradistinguished from renewals or amendments of existing licenses.

If a case falls within one of the six exceptions listed at the opening of section 5, no provision of section 5 has any application to that case; such a case would be governed by the requirements of other existing statutes.

The first exception is intended to exempt, among other matters, certain types of reparation orders assessing damages, such as are issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Secretary of Agriculture, since such orders are admissible only as prima facie evidence in court upon attempted enforcement proceedings or (at least in the case of reparation orders issued by the Secretary of Agriculture under the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act) on the appeal of the losing party. Reparation orders involving in part an administrative determination of the reasonableness of rates in the past so far as they are not subject to trial de novo would be subject to the provisions of section 5 generally but they have been specifically exempted from the segregation provisions of section 5 (c). In the fourth exception the term "naval" is intended to include adjudicative defense functions of the Coast Guard and the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, where such functions pertain to national defense.

Section 5 (a) is intended to state minimum requirements for the giving of notice to persons who under existing law are entitled to notice of an agency hearing in a statutory adjudication. While in most types of proceedings all of the information required to be given in clauses (1), (2), and (3) may be included in the "notice of hearing" or other moving paper, in many instances the agency or other moving party may not be in position to set forth all of such information in the moving paper, or perhaps not even in advance of the hearing, especially the "matters of fact and law asserted." The first sentence of this subsection merely requires that the information specified should be given as soon as it can be set forth and, in any event, in a sufficiently timely manner as to afford those entitled to the information an adequate opportunity to meet it. The second sentence complements the first and requires agencies and other parties promptly to reply to moving papers of private persons or permits agencies to require responsive pleading in any proceedings.

Section 5 (c) applies only to the class of adjudicatory proceedings included within the scope of section 5, i. e., cases of adjudication required by statute to be determined after opportunity for an agency hearing, and then not falling within one of the six excepted situations listed at the opening of section 5. As explained in the comments with respect to section 5 generally, this subsection does not apply either in proceedings to determine applications for initial licenses or in those to determine the reasonableness of rates in the past.

In the cases to which this subsection is applicable, if the informal procedures described in section 5 (b) (1) are not appropriate or have failed, a hearing is to be held as provided in sections 7 and 8. At such hearing the same officers who preside at the reception of evidence pursuant to section 7 shall make the recommended decision or initial decision "required by section 8" except where such officers become unavailable to the agency. The reference to section 8 is significant. Section 8 (a) provides that, in cases in which the agency has not presided at the reception of the evidence, the officer who presided (or, in cases not subject to subsec. (c) of sec. 5, an officer or officers' qualified to preside at hearings pursuant to sec. 7) shall make the initial or recommended decision, as the case may be. It is plain, therefore, that, in cases subject to section 5 (c), only the officer who presided at the hearing (unless he is unavailable for reasons beyond the agency's control) is eligible to make the initial or recommended decision, as the case may be.

This subsection further provides that in the adjudicatory hearings covered by it no presiding officer shall consult any person or party on any fact in issue unless upon notice and opportunity for all parties to participate (except to the extent required for the disposition of ex parte matters as authorized by law). The term "fact in issue" is used in its technical, litigious sense.

In most of the agencies which conduct adjudicative proceedings of the types subject to this subsection, the examiners are placed in organizational units apart from those to which the investigative or prosecuting personnel are assigned. Under this subsection such an arrangement will become operative in all such agencies. Further, in the adjudicatory cases covered by section 5 (c), no officer, employee, or agent engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions for any agency in any case shall, in that or a factually related case, participate or advise in the decision, recommended decision or agency review pursuant to section 8 except as witness or counsel in public proceedings. However, section 5 (c) does not apply to the agency itself or, in the case of a multi-headed agency, any member thereof. It would not preclude, for example, a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission personally conducting or supervising an investigation and subsequently participating in the determination of the agency action arising out of such investigation.

Section 5 (c), applying as it does only to casts of adjudication (except determining applications for initial licenses or determining reasonableness of rates in the past) within the scope of section 5 generally, has no application whatever to rule making, as defined in section 2 (c). As explained in the comment on section 2 (c), rule making includes a wide variety of subject matters, and within the scope of those matters it is not limited to the formulation of rules of general applicability but includes also the formulation of agency action whether of general or particular application, for example, the reorganization of a particular company.

Section 5 (d): Within the scope of section 5 (i. e., in cases of adjudication required by statute to be determined on the record after opportunity for an agency hearing, subject to certain exceptions) the agency is authorized to issue a declaratory order to terminate a controversy or remove uncertainty. Where declaratory orders are found inappropriate to the subject matter, no agency is required to issue them.

Section 6: Subsection (a), in stating a right of appearance for the purpose of settling or informally determining the matter in controversy, would not obtain if the agency properly determines that the responsible conduct of public business does not permit. It may be necessary, for example, to set the matter down for public hearing without preliminary discussion because a statute or the subject matter or the special circumstances so require.

It is not intended by this provision to require the agency to give notice to all interested persons, unless such notice is otherwise required by law.

This subsection does not deal with, or in any way qualify, the present power of an agency to regulate practice at its bar. It expressly provides, moreover, that nothing in the act shall be construed either to grant or to deny the right of nonlawyers to appear before agencies in a representative capacity. Control over this matter remains in the respective agencies.

Section 6 (b): The first sentence states existing law. The second sentence is new.

Section 6 (c): The first sentence entitles a party to a subpena upon a statement or showing of general relevance and reasonable scope of the evidence sought. The second sentence is intended to state the existing law with respect to the judicial enforcement of subpenas.

Section 6 (d): The statement of grounds required herein will be very simple, as contrasted with the more elaborate findings which are customarily issued to support an order.

Section 7: This section applies in those cases on statutory hearing which are required by sections 4 and 5 to be conducted pursuant to section 7. Subject to the numerous exceptions contained in sections 4 and 5, they are cases in which an order or rule is to be made upon the basis of the record in a statutory hearing.

Section 7 (a): The subsection is not intended to disturb presently existing statutory provisions which explicitly provide for certain types of hearing officers. Among such are (1) joint hearings before officers of the Federal agencies and persons designated by one or more States, (2) where officers of more than one agency sit, (3) quota allotment cases under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, (4) Marine Casualty Investigation Boards, (5) registers of the General Land Office, (6) special boards set up to review the rights of disconnected servicemen (38 U. S. C. 693h) and the rights of veterans to special unemployment compensation (38 U. S. C. 69h), and (7) boards of employees authorized under the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U. S. C. 17 (2)).

Subject to this qualification, section 7 (a) requires that there shall preside at the taking of evidence one or more examiners appointed as provided in this act, unless the agency itself or one or more of its members presides. This provision is one of the most important provisions in the act. In many agencies of the Government this provision may mean the appointment of a substantial number of hearing officers having no other duties. The resulting expense to the Government may be increased, particularly in agencies where hearings are now conducted by employees of a subordinate status or by employees having duties in addition to presiding at hearings. On the other hand, it is contemplated that the Civil Service Commission, which is empowered under the provisions of section 11 to prescribe salaries for hearing officers, will establish various salary grades in accordance with the nature and importance of the duties performed, and will assign those in the lower grades to duties now performed by employees in the lower brackets. It may also be possible for the agencies to reorganize their staffs so as to permit the appointment of full-time hearing officers by reducing the number of employees engaged on other duties.

This subsection further provides for withdrawal or removal of examiners disqualified in a particular proceeding. Some of the agencies have voiced concern that this provision would permit undue delay in the conduct of their proceedings because of unnecessary hearings or other procedure to determine whether affidavits of bias are well founded. The provision does not require hearings in every instance but simply requires such procedure, formal or otherwise, as would be necessary to establish the merits of the allegations of bias. If it is manifest that the charge is groundless, there may be prompt disposition of the matter. On the other hand, if the affidavit appears to have substance, it should be inquired into. In any event, whatever procedure the agency deems appropriate must be made a part of the record in the proceeding in which the affidavit is filed.

Section 7 (b): The agency may delegate to a hearing officer any of the enumerated powers with which it is vested. The enumeration of the powers of hearing officers is not intended to be exclusive.

Section 7 (c): The first sentence states the customary rule that the proponent of a rule or order shall have the burden of proof. Statutory exceptions to the rule are preserved. Parties shall have the right to conduct such cross-examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts. This is not intended to disturb the existing practice of submitting technical written reports, summaries, and analyses of material gathered in field surveys, and other devices appropriately adapted to the particular issues involved in specialized proceedings. Whether the agency must in such cases produce the maker of the report depends, as it does under the present law, on what is reasonable in all the circumstances.

It may be noted that agencies are empowered, in this subsection, to dispense with oral evidence only in the types of proceedings enumerated, that is, in instances in which normally it is not necessary to see and hear the witnesses in order properly to appraise the evidence. While there may be types of proceedings other than those enumerated in which the oral testimony of the witnesses is not essential, in such instances the parties generally consent to submission of the evidence in written form so that the inability of the agency to compel submission of written evidence would not be burdensome.

The provision regarding evidence in written form does not limit the generality of the prevailing principle that any evidence may be received, that is, that the rules of evidence as such are not applicable in administrative proceedings, and that all types of pertinent evidentiary material may be considered. It is assumed, of course, that agencies will, in the words of the Attorney General's committee on administrative procedure, rely only on such evidence (whether written or oral) as is relevant, reliable, and probative. This is meant as a guide, but the courts in reviewing an order are governed by the provisions of section 10 (e), which states the substantial evidence rule.

Section 7 (d): The transcript of testimony and exhibits, together with all papers and requests filed in the proceeding, shall constitute the exclusive record for decision, in the cases covered by section 7. This follows from the proposition that sections 7 and 8 deal only with cases where by statute the decision is to be based on the record of hearing. Further, section 7 is limited by the exceptions contained in the opening sentences of sections 4 and 5; accordingly, certain special classes of cases, such as those where decisions rest solely on inspections, tests, or elections, are not covered. The second sentence of the subsection enables the agency to take official notice of material facts which do not appear in the record, provided the taking of such notice is stated in the record or decision, but in such cases any party affected shall on timely request be afforded an opportunity to show the contrary.

Section 8: This section applies to all hearings held under section 7.

Section 8 (a): Under this subsection either the agency or a subordinate hearing officer may make the initial decision. As previously observed with respect to subsection (c) of section 5, in cases to which that subsection is applicable the same officer who personally presided over the hearing shall make such decision if it is to be made by a subordinate hearing officer. The agency may provide that in all cases the agency itself is to make the initial decision, or after the hearing it may remove a particular case from a subordinate hearing officer and thereupon make the initial decision. The initial decision of the hearing officer, in the absence of appeal to or review by the agency, is (or becomes) the decision of the agency. Upon review the agency may restrict its decision to questions of law, or to the question of whether the findings are supported by substantial evidence or the weight of evidence, as the nature of the case may be. On the other hand, it may make entirely new findings either upon the record or upon new evidence which it takes. It may remand the matter to the hearing officer for any appropriate further proceedings.

The intention underlying the last sentence of this subsection is to require the adoption of a procedure which will give the parties an opportunity to make their contentions to the agency before the issuance of a final agency decision. This sentence states as a general requirement that, whenever the agency makes the initial decision without having presided at the reception of the evidence, a recommended decision shall be filed by the officer who presided at the hearing (or, in cases not subject to section 5 (c), by any other officer qualified to preside at section 7 hearings). However, this procedure need not be followed in rule making or in determining applications for initial licenses—(1) if, in lieu of a recommended decision by such hearing officer, the agency issues a tentative decision; (2) if, in lieu of a recommended decision by such hearing officer, a recommended decision is submitted by any of the agency's responsible officers; or (3) if, in any event, the agency makes a record finding that "due and timely execution of its function imperatively and unavoidably so requires."

Subsection (c) of section 5, as explained in the comments on that subsection, does not apply to rule making. The broad scope of rule making is explained in the notes to subsection (c) of section 2.

The second exception permits, in proceedings to make rules and to determine applications for initial licenses, the continuation of the widespread agency practice of serving upon the parties, as a substitute for either an examiner's report or a tentative agency report, a report prepared by the staff of specialists and technicians normally engaged in that portion of the agency's operations to which the proceeding in question relates. The third exception permits, in lieu of any sort of preliminary report, the agency to issue forthwith its final rule or its order granting or denying an initial license in the emergent instances indicated. The subsection, however, requires that an examiner issue either an initial or a recommended decision, as the case may be, in all cases subject to section 7 except rule making and determining applications for initial licenses. The act permits no deviation from this requirement, unless, of course, the parties waive such procedure.

Section 8 (b): Prior to each recommended, initial, or tentative decision, parties shall have a timely opportunity to submit proposed findings and conclusions, and, prior to each decision upon agency review of either the decision of subordinate officers or of the agency's tentative decision, to submit exceptions to the initial, recommended, or tentative decision, as the case may be. Subject to the agency's rules, either the proposed findings or the exceptions may be oral in form where such mode of presentation is adequate.

Section 9: Subsection (a) is intended to declare the existing law. Subsection (b) is intended to codify the best existing law and practice. The second sentence of subsection (b) is not intended to apply to temporary licenses which may be issued pending the determination of applications for licenses.

Section 10: This section, in general, declares the existing law concerning judicial review. It provides for judicial review except insofar as statutes preclude it, or insofar as agency action is by law committed to agency discretion. A statute may in terms preclude judicial review or be interpreted as manifesting a congressional intention to preclude judicial review. Examples of such interpretation are: *Switchmen's Union of North America* v. *National Mediation Board* (320 U. S. 297); *American Federation of Labor* v. *National Labor Relations Board* (308 U. S. 401); *Butte, Anaconda & Pacific Railway Co.* v. *United States* (290 U. S. 127). Many matters are committed partly or wholly to agency discretion. Thus, the courts have held that the refusal by the National Labor Relations Board to issue a complaint is an exercise of discretion unreviewable by the courts. *Jacobsen* v. *National Labor Relations Board* (120 F. (2d) 96 (C. C. A. 3d); *Marine Engineers' Beneficial Assn.* v. *National Labor Relations Board*, decided April 8, 1943 (C. C. A. 2d), certiorari denied (320 U. S. 777). In this act, for example, the failure to grant a petition filed under section 4 (d) would be similarly unreviewable.

Section 10 (a): Any person suffering legal wrong because of any agency action, or adversely affected or aggrieved by such action within the meaning of any relevant statute,

shall be entitled to judicial review of such action. This reflects existing law. In *Alabama Power Co.* v. *Ickes* (302 U. S. 464), the Supreme Court stated the rule concerning persons entitled to judicial review. Other cases having an important bearing on this subject are *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon* (262 U. S. 447), *The Chicago Junction Case* (264 U. S. 258), *Sprunt & Son* v. *United States* (281 U. S. 249), and *Perkins* v. *Lukens Steel Co.* (310 U. S. 113). An important decision interpreting the meaning of the terms "aggrieved" and "adversely affected" is *Federal Communications Commission* v. *Sanders Bros. Radio Station* (309 U. S. 470).

Section 10 (b): The subsection requires that, where a specific statutory method is provided for reviewing a given type of case in the courts, that procedure shall be used. If there is no such procedure, or if the procedure is inadequate (i. e., where under existing law a court would regard the special statutory procedure as inadequate and would grant another form of relief), then any applicable procedure, such as prohibitory or mandatory injunction, declaratory judgment, or habeas corpus, is available. The final sentence of the subsection indicates that the question of the validity of an agency action may arise in a court proceeding to enforce the agency action. The statutes presently provide various procedures for judicial enforcement of agency action, and nothing in this act is intended to disturb those procedures. In such a proceeding the defendant may contest the validity of the agency action unless a prior, adequate, and exclusive opportunity to contest or review validity has been provided by law.

Section 10 (c): This subsection states (subject to the provisions of section 10 (a) the acts which are reviewable under section 10. It is intended to state existing law. The last sentence makes it clear that the doctrine of exhaustion of administrative remedies with respect to finalty of agency action is intended to be applicable only (1) where expressly required by statute (as, for example, is provided in 49 U. S. C. 17 (9)) or (2) where the agency's rules require that decisions by subordinate officers must be appealed to superior agency authority before the decision may be regarded as final for purposes of judicial review.

Section 10 (d): The first sentence states existing law. The second sentence may be said to change existing law only to the extent that the language of the opinion in *Scripps-Howard Radio, Inc.*, v. *Federal Communications Commission* (316 U. S 4, 14), may be interpreted to deny to reviewing courts the power to permit an applicant for a renewal of a license to continue to operate as if the original license had not expired, pending conclusion of the judicial review proceedings. In any event, the court must find, of course, that granting of interim relief is necessary to prevent irreparable injury.

Section 10 (e): This declares the existing law concerning the scope of judicial review. The power of the court to direct or compel agency action unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed is not intended to confer any nonjudicial functions or to narrow the principle of continuous administrative control enunciated by the Supreme Court in *Federal Communications Commission* v. *Pottsville Broadcasting Co.* (309 U. S. 134). Clause (5) is intended to embody the law as declared, for example, in *Consolidated Edison Co.* v. *National Labor Relations Board* (305 U. S. 197). There the Chief Justice said "Substantial evidence is more than a mere scintilla. It means such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion (p. 229) * * * assurance of a desirable flexibility in administrative procedure does not go so far as to justify orders without a basis in evidence having rational probative force." (P. 230.)

The last sentence of this section makes it clear that not every failure to observe the requirements of this statute or of the law is ipso facto fatal to the validity of an order. The statute adopts the rule now well established as a matter of common law in all jurisdictions that error is not fatal unless prejudicial.

Section 11. This section provides for the appointment, compensation, and tenure of examiners who will preside over hearings and render decisions pursuant to sections 7 and 8. The section provides that appointments shall be made "subject to the civil service and other laws to the extent not inconsistent with this act". Appointments are to be made by the respective employing agencies of personnel determined by the Civil Service Commission to be qualified and competent examiners. The examiners appointed are to serve only as examiners except that, in particular instances (especially where the volume of hearings under a given statute or in a given agency is not very great), examiners may be assigned additional duties which are not inconsistent with or which do do not interfere with their duties as examiners. To insure equality of participation among examiners in the hearing and decision of cases, the agencies are required to use them in rotation so far as may be practicable.

Examiners are subject to removal only for good cause "established and determined" by the Commission. The Commission must afford the examiner a hearing, if requested, and must rest its decision solely upon the basis of the record of such hearing. It should be noted that the hearing and the decision are to be conducted and made pursuant to the provisions of sections 7 and 8.

Section 11 provides further that the Commission shall prescribe the compensation of examiners, in accordance with the compensation schedules provided in the Classification Act, except that the efficiency rating system set forth in that act shall not be applicable to examiners.

Section 12. The first sentence of section 12 is intended simply to indicate that the act will be interpreted as supplementing constitutional and legal requirements imposed by existing law.

The section further provides that "no subsequent legislation shall be held to supersede or modify the provisions of this act except to the extent that such legislation shall do so expressly." It is recognized that no congressional legislation can bind subsequent sessions of the Congress. The present act can be repealed in whole or in part at any time after its passage. However, the act is intended to express general standards of wide applicability. It is believed that the courts should as a rule of construction interpret the act as applicable on a broad basis, unless some subsequent act clearly provides to the contrary.

Coal Miners Present Their Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include a letter from the Progressive Mine Workers of America, Local Union No. 3, Collinsville, Ill., together with a resolution adopted by that organization at a recent meeting.

The resolution will give much food for thought to those who will take the time to read it:

PROGRESSIVE MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA, LOCAL UNION NO. 3,
Collinsville, Ill., May 21, 1946.

MELVIN PRICE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are enclosing herewith a copy of a resolution as adopted by our local union and sent to our State senators.

We note from your record that you are not only following a progressive attitude but taking an active part to stem inroads of reaction and also forwarding progressive measures.

Thanking you for your kind response to our mail, we remain,

Yours very truly,

FRANK HOFFMANN, Jr.,
Recording Secretary, Local Union No. 3, P. M. W. of A.

MINERS WILL FIGHT FOR CAUSE

Many lawmakers in Washington are breaking their necks trying to find ways and means and reasons to pass laws to check labor and their unions, or we might say to put labor in its place, and if it were not for the popular vote on election day, and of which labor holds a deciding influence in the number of votes cast, as well as the open vote on bills in Congress, labor would have been chained long ago.

These reactionary and progress suffocators should examine their own actions. Of the many must bills recommended by our former President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and President Harry S. Truman, backed by labor, how many were passed? We can safely say none because the one or two that were passed were crippled so badly that they are maimed for life.

Some of these bills that were backed by labor and are gathering dust on the shelves of Congress have much to do with health and welfare, the main cause of the miners' strike. Labor has not forgotten their importance, and not being able to get them through legislation, which is the proper way, must resort to other methods.

There has been much talk about the coal miners' strike and the retarding of industrial activities caused by the coal strike. To all of this the coal miners admit and also realize the importance of an uninterrupted supply of coal. But can any group of workers make their demands, which are necessary to a proper living, known effectively without draining the markets of their product when it becomes necessary to strike to gain their needs.

Every person, and also recently the coal barons, have come out with open statements admitting the necessity of a health and welfare fund for the miners, but it became necessary to bring about the present scarcity of coal so that the miners may at last be lifted from their plight.

This is no different than World War II. It became necessary to fight a World War II because the people did not have the forethought to kill fascism in time to avert a war. And also it seems necessary to let a number of people be killed in order to eliminate a dangerous railroad crossing.

We deplore strikes as much as any labor hater. A strike, if you have been in one you should know, is not a picnic any more than World War II was an excursion.

Many unions in their contracts have established welfare funds such as medical care, hospitalization, unemployment benefits, old-age assistance, etc.

In order to be fair to the consumer, we hold that such welfare funds should be established by law. If handled by law it will

cover all industries and also spread the cost to all industrial products.

Why should a consumer of a given product pay the cost of a fund to the people who make that product that he must buy while he himself does not receive such benefits because the industry in which he works may not carry such a fund?

While labor continuously rallies support for essential labor laws, we insist that such legislation be adequate for the purpose for which it is intended. And until such laws are passed, we shall continue to fight to have such benefits inserted in our contracts.

Resolution of Arlington (Mass.) Machine Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

ARLINGTON MACHINE WORKS,
Arlington, Mass., May 10, 1946.

Hon. EDITH N. ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM: We, the undersigned, employees of the Arlington Machine Works, of Arlington, Mass., do hereby demand that immediate appropriate congressional action be taken which will stop John L. Lewis and provide for limiting his power.

As matters stand, we are faced with lay-off from work due to material shortage. This will cause our families to endure hardship which we will not accept without vigorous protest.

Very truly yours,

Employees of Arlington Machine Works, Arlington, Mass.: Alvar V. Melin, Joseph L. Lupien, George A. Lupien, Art Bell, E. Bowman, H. M. Macfarlane, Raymond H. Stearns, F. Snow, George F. Reid, William Bell, Sherman Forbes, Geo. H. Bell, Sherman Forbes, Geo. H. W. Karlson, John M. Stearnes.

Reorganization Plans 1, 2, and 3 Should Be Investigated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on May 22 I called to the attention of the House Reorganization Plans No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3 which were transmitted to the House by President Truman on May 16 and which are labeled as House Documents 594, 595, and 596, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, and are now before Congress. These plans were submitted pursuant to Public Law No. 263, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved December 20, 1945.

It is important that Members of the House familiarize themselves with the details of this law. It provides that unless both branches of Congress take an affirmative action to disapprove any reorganization plan, then that plan goes into effect the same as though it were a law by Congress. The disapproval of Congress must be voted within 60 days after the reorganization plan is submitted to Congress.

There may or may not be a coincidence in the fact that party leaders have indicated that they expect a recess or adjournment of Congress around July 8, and in the fact that these reorganization plans were submitted May 16. If plans of party leaders are carried out Congress will not be in session when the 60-day time limit expires.

I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 151 on May 23 for the purpose of getting a vote on Reorganization Plan No. 2, which some think ought to be disapproved. In my remarks I indicated that that plan, along with other things, abolished the United States Employees Compensation Commission. I pointed out that no other Government agency was duplicating the work of the Commission, and that therefore no saving would result to the taxpayers because some other Government agency would have to employ additional help to carry out the purpose of that law. Anyhow, those of us who supported the law giving the President power to consolidate Government bureaus and agencies did so with the understanding that he would abolish agencies which were duplicating the work of other Government departments.

I am today introducing two more House concurrent resolutions, one of them to prevent Reorganization Plan No. 1 from becoming effective and the other to prevent Reorganization Plan No. 3 from becoming effective. I am doing so because information comes to me that indicates some very startling plans on foot as a result of this reorganization legislation. If I am correctly advised, a lot of New Deal and wartime emergency agencies created by the late President are being perpetuated and continued in these reorganization plans. I only mention this fact because I have not had time to study these reorganization plans and if these charges are true, the appropriate committee of the House of Representatives should make a study of the reorganization plans and report the results obtained by it to this Congress. Otherwise, we will get legislation by Presidential message and we have had too much of that already.

Apparently under this legislation the President can submit as many reorganization plans as he sees fit. I am one Member of this House who would not trust the New Dealers or the "brain trusters" to prepare a reorganization plan. I would know in advance that they were concerned more with politics and perpetuating their own jobs than they were concerned with the welfare of the American people or the American taxpayer or anything else American. I earnestly hope that the Members of this House will get copies of these documents and cooperate with me in getting quick action and hearings before the proper committee. If the Bureau of the Budget has prepared these plans, we ought to have that agency before Congress immediately.

I supported legislation for reorganization and consolidation of these Government agencies because I felt that Congress could not or would not do the job by reason of certain outstanding difficulties. I felt we had to entrust the work to one man. I am still hopeful that the man to whom we gave that power will exercise that power wisely and to the best interest of the American people.

Prompt Action Will End Strikes Against the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the ugly spectacle of defiance of the Government has raised its head in the railroad and the coal strikes. There is no right to strike against the Government, Continuing a strike that paralyzes the transportation, industrial, and agricultural life of the United States in such a strike.

Collective bargaining presupposes self-control and consideration of the consequences of continuing a strike because one party cannot get all that is demanded. Two out of twenty railroad unions decided that they would tie up the railroad system to get their demands. They were willing to punish 140,000,000 people and cause much suffering in order to compel acceptance of what they thought they should get. It is plain that this is the application of force to compel a surrender to demands at the expense of the public welfare. The Railway Mediation Act, which up to now has been successful in such situations, has failed and new legislation must be enacted.

In the case of the coal strike there is a law that applies. It is the Smith-Connally Act. If its provisions are followed by the Secretary of Interior there can be no strike after the Government takes over. Recently at some hearings on the proposed repeal of this act the Under Secretary of Labor recommended that the section providing for seizure of industries on strike be retained. He stated that this provision would be useful in the event of a strike against a public utility. Apparently the administration was thinking of situations such as are now upon us or they would not have recommended the retention of the seizure provisions of this law.

The Smith-Connally Act could also have been used in the case of the cannery labor dispute. But the President would not give the California Congressmen an interview to discuss the matter, although importuned twice by Mr. LEA, the dean of our delegation, to do so.

Strikes of this type were tried in 1919 in Boston and Seattle. Calvin Coolidge and Ole Hansen met the challenge promptly and the strikes dissipated. This will occur today if prompt and vigorous action is taken.

Time for Restraint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of today:

TIME FOR RESTRAINT

Washingtonians, like other Americans, are inclined to pride themselves on their ability to exercise self-restraint and preserve a calm demeanor in the face of national calamities. But, as wartime experience has demonstrated, many people who display magnificent courage and willingness to make great personal sacrifices in the fight against an alien enemy show an appalling lack of self-control in the day-to-day struggle to get more than a fair share of goods in short supply.

During the war rationing protected the public from the inroads of hoarders insofar as basic necessities were concerned. Since the war these marauders (some of whom have an almost pathological yearning to buy up anything hard to get) have caused a certain amount of inconvenience. Fortunately, they have not been in a position to do much direct damage, although their temperamental susceptibility to rumors of shortages undoubtedly has encouraged the spread of black-market operations. Owing to the rail strike, however, the people of this and other cities are now wide open to attack from the host of guerrilla shoppers, mostly women, who maintain vigils in the stores, prepared to pounce on any article that takes their fancy, regardless of their need for it. We do not doubt that these selfish individuals, if left to their own devices, will make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to effect an equitable apportionment of limited food supplies. What is worse, they are likely to spread panic among the decent people who want to share with others.

From all accounts, Washington is fortunate in having access to food supplies sufficient to provide for essential needs for some time. The thing we have chiefly to fear is that hoarders will nullify the efforts of the authorities to direct supplies where they are most needed, with the result that some people will have more than they need while others will get too little. The only way to prevent such maldistribution is to bring pressure to bear upon the undisciplined elements. The more thin-skinned among them may be induced to mend their ways by the force of good example or by a few well-directed open rebukes. A good deal more could be done, however, by informal rationing of scarce foods by store managers. If the strike should continue for any length of time, some program of voluntary rationing by sellers will probably become essential to prevent real hardship.

Attacks Against Representative Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, like many other Members of Congress my opposition vote at election time has in more recent years come from a small group of voters who have been deceived and misled by a few radical Communists. It is not the home folks who furnish the subversive leadership and spread communistic propaganda throughout our districts, but rather the Russian-trained agents from Communist headquarters who invade our respective districts to spread their poison. These lawless enemies of God and freedom are trained in the technique of revolution. Chaos, confusion, distress, and hunger are the troubled waters in which the communistic crusaders fish for converts to their Communist godless cause. The Communists' political organizers and propagandists in our respective congressional districts carry on their subversive work under the semblance of patriotic organizations.

One of the most dramatic and far-reaching fights in the cause of religious freedom to be found in recorded history was the one carried on in the early days of our own country, yet there is no organized Christian and Jewish resistance to the active enemies of God, Church, and our Republic. Thoughtful people, who believe in our form of government, ought to realize that the violent attacks against representative government now being carried on, do not originate in this country. The attacks stem from Moscow. The Soviet agents are now operating in our respective districts preparatory to their fight against us at election time. Their propaganda is subtle, adroit and when it is supplemented by the bureaucrats of our own Government, it is effective in influencing credulous citizens who are unaware that their Government is filled with Communists holding key positions.

Let us take an example in a foreign government which shows what happens to Christian and Jew alike when the Communists take over:

The inhabitants of the provinces of east Poland are a believing people. Christian or Jew they are men and women of faith. The numerous houses of worship were always crowded during hours of services. Christmas and Easter are days of immense significance in Polish life. They are not just holidays; they are holy days. For a nation that has in the course of its history lived through martyrdom, death, and resurrection, Easter has a poignancy, a promise, and a reality unknown to people who have never been nailed to the cross. National tragedy and the suffering this has implied have never destroyed Polish faith in God. Therefore Communist doctrine, Soviet doctrine in regard to religion and the negation of God not only win few followers among the Poles but are repellent to them. They want no authority over them that would eliminate religious faith and its practice. They are a people noted throughout their history for their tolerance. They have permitted persons of all faiths to live among them and practice those faiths. They demand religious liberty.

Liberty has been lost in the Polish eastern provinces under Soviet administration. Among Polish citizens deported to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics all religious activities of every kind were forbidden and a close watch was kept in the effort to prevent them.

Yet there were many instances of outwitting the guards. In prisoner-of-war and labor camps there were a comparatively large number of priests in the garb of civilians or common soldiers, and these men whispered rather than said the mass at night in a corner of a barrack for a little handful of men while others stood guard, past whom none could get without having given the password—the old Christian password of the catacombs—Ichthus. If such services were discovered, those taking part spent days in the dark cell, while priests were removed and disappeared altogether.

Let every patriotic American, in these days when enemies from within and from without are seeking to weaken and destroy this Republic, give heed to the prophetic words of Daniel Webster:

Other misfortunes may be borne or their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again and ripen to future harvests.

It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt.

But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government?

Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty?

Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with States' rights, individual security, and public prosperity?

No; if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful and a melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty.

Questions and Answers Re S. 7

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum of the Department of Justice:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS RE S. 7

Section 3 (a) provides that there shall be publication in the Federal Register of the rules of the various agencies of the Government. The last sentence of section 3 (a) states: "No person shall in any manner be

required to resort to organization or procedure not so published." But this does not mean that a person who has actual notice is not required to resort to agency organization or procedure if it has not been published in the Federal Register. If a person has actual notice of a rule, he is bound by it. The only purpose of the requirement for publication in the Federal Register is to make sure that persons may find the necessary rules as to organization and procedure if they seek them. It goes without saying that actual notice is the best of all notices. At most, the Federal Register gives constructive notice. See 44 U. S. C. Sec. 307.

Section 3 (a) requires that rules to be published in the Federal Register shall be separately stated in three categories. This does not require every agency to comb through all its rules and separate procedural aspects from substantive aspects of all of its rules. This provision has application only in futuro. As to rules which have been heretofore published by the agency, there is no requirement that they separately state them into the three categories required by section 3 (a). Such as task would be wellnigh impossible since agencies have adopted rules for many years prior to this act and these rules in many cases have been codified into the Code of Federal Regulations. It is not intended that the Code of Federal Regulations be rewritten at this time.

Under section 6 (c) it is provided that "upon contest the court shall sustain any such subpena or similar process or demand to the extent that is found it is in accordance with law." This provision is not intended to change the law as expounded in *Endicott Johnson* v. *Perkins* (317 U. S. 501 1943)) in which the Supreme Court held that subpenas issued by an agency will be accorded due respect by the Court if they are within the agency's power and that there would be no independent inquiry as to whether the particular person subpenaed comes within the coverage of the act enforced by the agency. The law, as expounded in *Endicott Johnson* v. *Perkins* is still applicable. All that this section requires is that the court determine whether the subpena issued comes within the general power of that agency. There need be no in limine inquiries as to whether the person subpenaed is or is not covered by the act.

Section 10 as to judicial review does not, in my view, make any real changes in existing law. This section in general declares the existing law concerning judicial review. It is an attempt to restate in exact statutory language the doctrine of judicial review as expounded in various statutes and as interpreted by the Supreme Court. I know that some agencies are quite concerned about the phraseology used in section 10 for fear that it will change the existing doctrine of judicial review which has been settled for the particular agency concerned. I feel sure that should this section be given the interpretation which is intended, namely, that it is merely a restatement of existing law, there should be no difficulty for any agency. We may in a sense look at section 10 as an attempt by Congress to place into statutory language existing methods of review.

Student Body of Williams College Commemorates Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I received yesterday the following telegram:

WILLIAMSTOWN, MASS., *May 23, 1946.*
Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Student body of Williams College intends to commemorate Memorial Day by reducing food consumption for all day's meals to 1,200 calories and content similar to average in starving nations overseas with savings contributed to world relief. We feel this small sacrifice is in the spirit of consecration in which this Memorial Day will be celebrated, and by emphasizing to each person the seriousness of food situation will discourage food wastage. We urge you to use your influence to secure cooperation of Nation to show rest of world that America is aware of the desperate conditions and is willing to take measures to aid starving peoples. Done on a Nation-wide basis, savings of both money and food would be material. Would appreciate reply regarding action you are taking. Similar messages are being forwarded to others of the Nation's leaders, State and Government officials, and to the Nation's colleges.

UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL
OF WILLIAMS COLLEGE.

The telegram speaks for itself. The student body at Williams College has made a constructive suggestion to the Nation. These men, many of them veterans of this war, are determined to do everything possible to help this Nation meet its great and solemn obligation to the starving millions of human beings all over the world. They have proven the complete truth of President Truman's statement to the world that—

The warm heart of America will respond to the greatest threat of mass starvation in the history of the world.

It is a privilege to endorse this suggestion. As they have so well stated:

This small sacrifice is in the spirit of consecration in which this Memorial Day will be celebrated.

What Do We Get From the British Loan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, opponents of the British agreement, which has passed the Senate and is now pending in the House and is commonly referred to as the British loan, all assume that Great Britain alone receives benefits therefrom.

Secretary Byrnes, Assistant Secretary of State Will Clayton, and others both in and out of the Government have pointed out the many benefits and advantages to be derived by the United States which makes the loan desirable from our standpoint.

Recently Mr. Clair Wilcox, Director of the Office of International Trade Policy of the Department of State, delivered an address in Philadelphia, Pa., upon this subject, and under leave granted I submit same herewith:

WHAT DO WE GET?

As you all know, a bill now before Congress would authorize the Treasury to extend to the British Government a line of credit of $3,750,000,000. This credit would be available until the end of 1951. Then, beginning in 1952, the amounts actually borrowed would be repaid in 50 annual installments with interest at 2 percent.

This is the British loan. There is no question that England needs it. But its advantages to the United States are less well known. It is about these advantages that I want to speak. Some people seem to think that this is a mere hand-out; that we are getting nothing in the way of a quid pro quo. This is not the case. We are getting a great deal.

First, we get back the principal and up to $2,000,000,000 in interest. But this, I may say, is not why we propose to make the loan. Even if little or nothing were to be repaid, there would still be advantages for us.

Second, the loan will enable England to buy goods in the United States. And if she spends her dollars in other countries, it will enable them to buy here. This will provide employment and income to our people. And it will be particularly important in those war-expanded industries where capacity now exceeds peacetime domestic demand.

But if this were the only advantage to us, the loan might not be justified. There are others. During the war Great Britain, of necessity, adopted policies that restrict trade. American businessmen believe that these policies, if continued, will be harmful to this country. They have asked our Government to get these policies reversed. This is what we have sought to do. And this is what we have accomplished in connection with the loan.

The third advantage of the loan, then, is the removal of exchange control on current transactions between England and the United States. During the war, England bought more here than she sold here. She was therefore short of dollars. So she limited the freedom of her people to use dollars. This meant that an American exporter who sold in England for pounds could not change these pounds into dollars. He could not get his money out. Now American businessmen want to be paid in money that they can use where and when they please. This is what we asked the British to agree to. And this is what we got. Britain agrees, as soon as the loan is available, to remove all exchange controls on day-to-day transactions between the two countries. Then anyone in this country who earns pounds can walk into a bank and come out with dollars. This is a great gain for American trade.

The fourth advantage of the loan, for us, is Britain's agreement, within a year, to remove exchange controls on trade with other countries. Countries that sell in England for pounds cannot now change these pounds into dollars to buy American goods. But they can use them to buy British goods. This puts the American exporter at a disadvantage. Naturally he wants this disadvantage removed. This is what we asked the British to do. This is what they agreed to do. Within a year, anyone, anywhere, who earns pounds can walk into a bank and turn them into dollars and use his dollars to buy in the United States. This concession is of the greatest importance to us. It will open up markets for us all over the world.

The fifth advantage of the loan is the early abolition of the dollar pool. During the war, all of the dollars that were earned by any of the countries in the empire were pooled in London and rationed so that they would be used only to pay for essential imports. This meant that empire countries that sold in the United States for dollars could not use these dollars to buy our goods. American businessmen feel that the dollar pool has been used—or could be used—to give British exporters an advantage by keeping American exporters out of empire markets. They want the dollar pool abolished. This is what we asked for. This is what we got. Within a year from the date of the loan the pool will be dissolved. Empire countries earning dollars can then use them to buy in the United States and our sellers

can get into Egypt, India, the Near East and other markets from which they might otherwise be barred.

The sixth advantage of the loan, for us, is in the way that England will settle the external debt that she has accumulated during the war. Her creditors can now get pounds to buy British goods. They cannot get dollars to buy American goods. This gives British exporters an advantage over American exporters. American business wants this advantage removed. This is what we asked for. This is what we got. England will ask her creditors to scale down part of the debt. She will pay off another part at once. She will fund the rest and pay it over time. But the important fact for us is that all of these payments will be convertible into dollars. This means that England's creditors will be paid in money they can spend in the United States.

A seventh advantage: England protects her money by a system of import quotas. Because dollars are scarce in England, this system is so administered as to discriminate against imports from the United States. As a result, it is easier for our competitors to sell in England than it is for us. American business demands that this discrimination be removed. This is what we asked for. This is what we got. The British have agreed, by the end of 1946, so to administer their import quotas as not to discriminate against our goods.

Advantage number eight is the elimination or reduction of preferences. Under the system of imperial preference, countries within the Empire sell to each other at low rates of duty. But when Americans sell to any one of them, we have to pay high rates of duty. This makes Empire goods cheaper and American goods dearer in Empire markets. American business wants to have this handicap reduced or removed. This is what we asked for. This is what we got. Britain has pledged herself to work with us toward the reduction of tariffs and the elimination of preferences. She will not permit her existing commitments to stand in the way of this program. And she agrees that every reduction in Empire tariffs will reduce preferences by the same amount. This will enable American business to enter Empire markets more nearly on a basis of competitive equality.

A ninth advantage is Britain's participation in the International Monetary Fund set up at Bretton Woods. England, in her desperate need for imports, might well be forced to adopt heroic measures to promote exports. One way of doing this would be to devalue the pound. This would make British goods cheaper in world markets than American goods. American exporters would therefore lose sales to their British competitors. They want to be protected against competitive depreciation of currencies. This protection is afforded by the Monetary Fund. The British Parliament, on the same day on which it agreed to the terms of the American credit, voted to assume membership in the fund. This was not laid down as a condition of the loan, but England's ability to join the fund may well depend upon the financial security that is afforded by the loan. Her participation means that she will not act independently to put our exporters at a disadvantage by depreciating the pound.

Tenth, and last, we get British support for the American trade program. This program is set forth in the proposals for the expansion of world trade and employment which our Government published on December 6. These proposals are based upon the conviction that human energies can best be directed toward the improvement of standards of living, if the world, instead of regimenting its trade, will seek to restore the greatest possible measure of economic freedom. They are designed to reverse the prewar trend toward economic isolationism and to resist the present tendency to fasten the pattern of wartime controls upon a world at peace. Their provisions may be outlined in a few words.

We have proposed:

1. That a common code be adopted to govern the regulation of commerce by the nations of the world.

2. That tariffs be substantially reduced and that preferences be eliminated.

3. That quotas and embargoes be limited to a few really necessary cases and that they be administered without discrimination.

4. That subsidies, in general, should be the subject of international discussion, and that subsidies on exports should be confined to exceptional cases, under general rules.

5. That governments conducting public enterprises to buy and sell abroad should agree to give fair treatment to the commerce of all friendly states, that they should make their purchases and sales on purely economic grounds, and that governments whose enterprises are completely socialized should commit themselves as to the quantities of goods which they propose to import.

6. That private cartels and combines should be prevented by national and international action, from restricting the commerce of the world.

7. That action to protect the many small producers of the great primary commodities against sudden and violent changes in world markets be international rather than national; that the solution of this problem be sought by measures that would remove the basic causes of the difficulty, not by measures that would perpetuate it; that the solution be sought, in particular, by methods that would expand consumption, and that measures restricting exports or fixing prices, where they are necessary, be limited in duration; that they be attended at every stage by full publicity, and that consuming countries be given an equal voice with producing countries in their formulation and administration.

8. In order to carry out these undertakings it is proposed that an International Trade Organization be created, under the Economic and Social Council, as an integral part of the structure of the United Nations.

These are the proposals that relate to trade. If they are to gain acceptance, assurance must also be given that the nations of the world will seek, through measures that are not inconsistent with them, to achieve and maintain high and stable levels of employment. For this reason, it is proposed, finally, that each nation should agree, individually, to take action designed to provide full and regular employment; that no country should attempt to solve its domestic problems by measures that would prevent the expansion of world trade; that no country, in short, should be free to export its unemployment.

These proposals are not utopian or visionary, they have been hammered out in great detail to meet the actual situation that exists in the world today. They are distinctively American—in substance, if not in detail—they embody the recommendations that have been made by groups representing American business, labor, and agriculture, the women's organizations, and the churches. The world that is pictured in these proposals is the kind of a world that Americans want.

As a part of the understandings connected with the loan, we have sought and obtained the full agreement of the British Government to the American program. And this is highly significant. For it means that we have obtained Britain's pledge that her foreign economic policy will henceforth be devoted to restoring an international order that is favorable to the preservation and expansion of private enterprise.

All of these matters are directly related to the loan. They are commitments that Britain is enabled to make by virtue of the loan. They are commitments that she could not make if she didn't get the loan. Our negotiators did not seek concessions that would have been extraneous to the loan. It would have been unwise for us to attempt to push our bargaining power farther than it would go. It cannot be said with sufficient emphasis that the American people want the economic freedom and the trade expansion that are involved in this loan fully as much as the British people want them. In short, we are getting plenty.

Our Military Strength in Relation to World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, recently I had a letter from one of my constituents, urging the abolition of the Selective Service Act upon its expiration next month. His view was predicated on the ground that the extension of the draft was advocated by the so-called brass hats of the Army, in order that some of them could keep their commissions as high-ranking officers, and that politics alone dominated the desire of the administration to regiment the youth of the Nation, and that no reason existed for the continuance of the draft.

Such a view is wholly unjustified and without foundation and displays an ignorance on the part of the people with reference to the necessity for a strong Army at this time. So many of them look at the question of military strength, or, rather, the lack of it, from a selfish standpoint with reference to keeping their boys at home, and fail to grasp the fact that the extension of the draft and the maintenance at this time of a strong Army is necessary, not only for our defense, but in the preservation of world peace and in carrying out our commitments and relations in preserving world peace.

This latter view is so well presented in an article written by our Secretary of State, Hon. James F. Byrnes, on the subject, United States Military Strength—Its Relation to the United Nations and World Peace, and under leave granted same is submitted herewith:

UNITED STATES MILITARY STRENGTH—ITS RELATION TO THE UNITED NATIONS AND WORLD PEACE

(By the Secretary of State)

We Americans realize that the victory over the Axis was not an American victory alone. The victory was won by the peoples of many countries welded together in a powerful alliance. But as Americans we are proud that we contributed mightily to the defeat of the Fascists and Nazis in Europe and that we played the major part in the defeat of Japan.

Irish-Americans in turn are aware that the blows struck by America were struck by Americans of every race and faith. But we of Irish blood take honest pride in the number of Kellys and Burkes and Sheas whose names appear in the war's roll of honor.

These Irish lads came from the cities and the farms, from the factories and the fields. They came to the decks of our ships, to the cockpits of our planes, and to the turrets of

our tanks. They came to the landing barges and to the foxholes. And when their guns and the guns of their comrades began to sound, it became certain that victory would be ours.

Tonight time does not permit me to recite to you Friendly Sons of St. Patrick the names and deeds of these Irish heroes. But their names and deeds will not soon be forgotten, and there will be many an opportunity for more gifted Irish tongues to tell the tales of their gallantry.

I know that in these troubled days you are more anxious to look to the future than to the past—to consider what we must do now in order to insure that the sacrifices of these men have not been in vain.

Consequently, I desire to return to a subject to which I referred 2 weeks ago, the military strength of the United States.

We Americans love peace. We are a nation of civilians, not soldiers. It is fundamental to our system of government that military authority be subordinate to civilian authority.

Even in the midst of total war, we have maintained this principle. The American soldiers and sailors who made military history from New Caledonia to Tokyo and from North Africa to Berlin were not professional soldiers and sailors. They were civilians in uniform.

This is a fine tradition. Having preserved it in war, we should not relinquish it in peace.

The problem is how to reconcile our civilian traditions with the necessity to maintain our military strength at a level to match our responsibilities in the world.

No nation is more willing than the United States to participate in any reasonable plan for the general reduction of armaments. But while other nations remain armed, the United States, in the interest of world peace, cannot disarm.

Between 1918 and 1941 there grew up in this country an important body of pacifist sentiment. The dominant theme of this movement was that the way to end war was not to prepare for war. It was argued that plain men the world over hated war and that there would be no more war if all these plain men simply refused ever to fight again.

If the United States were to scrap all its armaments and completely demobilize its Army and Navy, it was said, the force of its example would compel the rest of the world to follow suit. The peaceful instinct which underlay this point of view is an admirable one. The trouble with the idea is that it does not work.

Without consciously deciding to do so, we actually tried it. By the time the Nazis attacked Poland in 1939 we had permitted our armed strength to dwindle to token proportions. When the war came and the realization slowly grew upon us that we would not be spared, we regretted that we were not prepared. The political parties then indicted each other for the lack of preparedness. The argument was no substitute for weapons.

We learned that the example of weakness set by the United States did not compel Italy and Japan and Germany to follow suit. On the contrary, our weakness incited them to ever bolder aggressions. Only the accidents of history gave us 2 years in which to prepare before the blow fell at Pearl Harbor.

Those 2 years were not enough to repair the damage. We were not ready on December 7, 1941, and the consequence was that brave men died to regain the ground we could not hold in the first weeks of war.

This tragic experience makes us realize that weakness invites aggression. Weakness causes others to act as they would not act if they thought that our words were backed by strength.

Today there is grave danger that the sense of relief which accompanies the end of the war may cause us once again to do unwittingly what we would never do consciously.

No one in or out of Government desires to extend for a single day more than is necessary the enforced separation of men from their families and from their peacetime business or employment.

But those who bear the responsibility for the security and welfare of the Nation are alarmed at the possibility that sufficient numbers of physically fit men will not be available to replace those who have earned the right to return to their homes.

This is true now while the Selective Service Act is still in effect. If the act is permitted to expire on May 15 of this year, the situation will become critical. It is imperative that the act be extended at least for the period in which the Army and the Navy have the multiple responsibility for the occupation of Germany and Japan, for the protection of our surpluses overseas, for the continuing defense of the United States, and for the fulfillment of our commitments under the Charter.

It is even more important in the long run that we have at all times a reserve of trained men who can be called upon in case of need.

A number of methods have been proposed for obtaining this trained reserve. As Secretary of State, I desire to emphasize my wholehearted and unequivocal endorsement of the proposal for universal military training.

It may be that the system proposed can be improved upon with experience in its administration. It is probable that as the years go by the system can be adapted to the demands of education and civilian employment in ways which will minimize friction and disruption in private lives. The important thing, however, is to get started with the plan, and to get started now.

An intelligently organized and administered system of universal military training will not undermine the American tradition of the subordination of military authority to civilian authority.

As for the effect of the training upon the boys, I can see no cause for alarm. It is not realistic to say, as some do, that a period of military training will turn our spirited and independent young men into unthinking brutes.

If we are to take the word of the old-timers among the master sergeants and chief petty officers, American recruits have always displayed a phenomenal capacity to withstand education in the military way of doing things.

If we need fear anything about the effects upon our boys of a brief period of military training, it is that they will learn too little about being soldiers and sailors rather than too much.

If we are agreed that it is necessary for the United States to preserve an adequate degree of strength, it is well to remember that the only real alternative to universal military training is the maintenance of a large professional standing Army and Navy. This is an alternative which experience has shown to be a threat to civilian government. It is an alternative which we should accept only as a last resort.

A system of universal training will keep our armed forces from becoming fixed in their ways and habits. Teachers frequently learn from their pupils. Youngsters will not readily respond to training in methods which they know to be outmoded. Our defense in the modern world depends upon the mobility and flexibility of our armed forces and their ability to make use of and keep up with the advance of science.

It must be acknowledged that universal military training involves a major change in our society. Consequently, the people of the United States have a right to know the purposes to which this reserve military strength might some day be put. This is a fair question. It deserves a fair answer.

The answer is simple. The United States is committed to the support of the Charter of the United Nations. Should the occasion arise, our military strength will be used to support the purposes and principles of the Charter.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that the United States looks to the United Nations as the path to enduring peace.

We do not propose to seek security in an alliance with the Soviet Union against Great Britain, or in an alliance with Great Britain against the Soviet Union.

We propose to stand with the United Nations in our efforts to secure equal justice for all nations and special privilege for no nation.

We must maintain our strength, therefore, for the primary purpose of preserving and using our influence in support of the Charter of the United Nations. We will not use our strength for aggressive purposes. Neither will we use it to support tyranny or special privilege.

I do not desire to conclude on a somber note. I firmly believe that the difficulties confronting the world, although they are serious, can be solved if all of us approach those difficulties in a spirit of conciliation and good will.

There are powerful currents loose in the world today. But the currents of life cannot be stopped in their courses. We live in a moving and changing world.

There is no reason to fear an open and vigorous contest between our conception of democracy and other political faiths. The voice of democracy is as thrilling today as it was yesterday. In a conflict of ideas we can be supremely confident of victory.

The important thing to remember is that a war of ideas is not won by armies. In international life there can be progress without war if reason and not force is recognized as the test of progress.

The basic purpose of the United Nations is to make force the servant and not the master of reason, and to reject the ancient and discredited doctrine that might makes right.

After every great war there comes a period of anticlimax and disillusionment. Those who fight together expect, when the fighting is over, too much from one another and are inclined to give too little to one another.

Those who have won the victory expect the millennium and feel that they should have the fruits of victory without further effort.

They forget that victory in war can only give the opportunity that would otherwise be denied: to live and work for the fruits of peace and freedom.

Having been forced to fight for military victory, they sometimes think that whatever they want should be taken by force instead of making their claims the basis for peaceful negotiation.

It takes time to pass from the psychology of war to the psychology of peace. We must have patience as well as firmness. We must keep our feet on the ground. We cannot afford to lose our tempers.

I am deeply convinced that the peoples who fought together for freedom want to live together in peace. I am deeply convinced that the peoples of the United Nations are sincerely committed to the Charter.

There are always some of little faith; some who still believe that they cannot get their due except by force. There are others who still believe that ancient privilege will yield to nothing but force of arms.

But with firmness in the right not as we alone see it, but as the aggregate sentiments of mankind see it, and with patience and understanding, we must and shall achieve a just and enduring peace for ourselves and all nations.

The Strike Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a copy of a letter I have received from one of my constituents, Mr. A. D. Rooke, of Woodsboro, Tex.:

No real American can read, without a deep feeling of just pride the preamble to the Constitution of the United States, the Declaration of Independence, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, or any of several other documents written or spoken by the great and courageous men who were our forefathers, who were the real authors of Americanism.

Neither can any real American read, without a deep sense of shame and resentment, news of the rough-shod riding of our labor racketeers selfishly disregarding the welfare and safety of our Nation and foolishly playing directly into the hands of our enemies—enemies who are carefully and cunningly planning the destruction of our national economy, our American ideals, our American way of life.

I have every sympathy for the workingman. I believe he should be protected from the selfishness and greed and lust for power of both management and labor. I also believe in the American system of free enterprise—the system that has brought, in the past 170 years, these United States of ours from an infant among nations to the very top—the greatest nation on earth.

On that climb to the top our statesmen and our people were ever vigilant, ever watchful to see that our American ideals and individual liberties were not encroached upon and that our shores were adequately protected against any foreign aggressor. Of late we have relaxed that vigilance, that watchfulness, to the extent that we now find ourselves in the grip of unscrupulous and lustful racketeers—headmen of the most powerful monopoly the world has ever seen, headmen who are really but dupes of a foreign aggressor—specifically, dupes of those who would see Moscow the capital of America.

I believe it is high time when Congress—the bulwark of the people—should step in and pass adequate laws to assure the following:

That every American citizen shall have the right to work for whomsoever he chooses who would employ him, without paying dues or tribute in any manner to any individual, group, society, or union.

That any individual, group, society, or union who calls or incites a strike or work stoppage wherein the safety or welfare of our people or the defense of our Nation is endangered shall be punished by adequate fine or imprisonment or both.

A law that will adequately protect America and American ideals from communism or any other foreign ideology that would destroy Americanism.

I have talked with many people throughout this section of Texas and have not yet found one who did not agree with and believe in the above principles. I sincerely believe that fully 90 percent of all our people would be wholeheartedly in favor of such legislation.

I am a ranchman. I have no iron in the fire, no bill of goods to sell. I truly believe in my heart the things advocated above to be for the good of our Nation, the welfare of our people.

California Unemployment Increases—Veteran Population Grows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the problem of finding employment for returning veterans in California is becoming increasingly difficult because of the large number of out-of-State veterans who are moving into California plus the number of former citizens returning home from the armed forces.

According to figures compiled by the Selective Service System office for California, all but about 140,000 of the men and women who entered the service from California have returned. Up to March 30, out of 780,000 total enlistments and inductions from California, 639,140 had been reported back.

At first glance this might indicate that soon the need for special veteran services would begin to level off, but that thought overlooks the ever-rising tide of in-migrant veterans who are flocking into California from every point of the compass. One State agency estimated that of March 30, the in-migrant veterans in the State numbered 210,000.

Recent reports received, based on calls at USES offices, veteran service centers, Veterans' Administration, Selective Service, and other sources, indicates this is a very conservative figure.

As an indication of the influx of out-of-State veterans, a report issued by the Los Angeles Veterans' Service Center on May 8 states that 57 percent of 5,155 veterans contacting the center office in a 2-week period were from out of the State. Their requests and needs were: First, housing; second, financial assistance; third, employment. Reports from other centers as well as from United States Employment Service offices indicate that the above reflects the average picture throughout the State.

The fact that housing is practically nonexistent everywhere adds a secondary migration problem. Faced by lack of both housing and jobs in the home town, or where they first land in California, veterans are moving up and down the State, only to find the same conditions.

No doubt most of them will not take advice, preferring to look for greener pastures themselves, but anyone dealing with veterans, especially outside of California, veterans here writing to their former buddies out of State, and others writing to eastern friends, will be doing the veteran a kindness by advising them not to come to California now.

Advise them not to leave the place where they are known, where people are friendly, where housing is now provided, where they know economic conditions, rather than migrate to strange surroundings where everything is taxed to capacity, and the community finds it impossible to provide sufficient shelter or jobs for those already in the community.

Some day, when the chaos of postwar dislocations, labor unrest, material shortages is over, and the full stride of reconversion is reached, California may be able to accommodate and provide for the newcomers, but that time has not yet arrived.

What Kind of Education Shall We Buy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, May 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Glenn D. Everett entitled "What Kind of Education Shall We Buy?" published in the March 1946 issue of the Utah Educational Review.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT KIND OF EDUCATION SHALL WE BUY?
(By Glenn D. Everett)

The United States Congress is currently considering legislation which would double the educational bill of the Nation. The measure is endorsed by the President and by many military and naval leaders, but it is opposed by a majority of educators. The legislation in question is the May-Gurney bill for a year's compulsory military training.

It is proper to call this an education bill, for the year's training is really an educational process. The trainees will be educated in the art of killing men. This may seem harsh, but training for war is the only real purpose of the program—and war in the atomic age threatens to become a matter of wholesale human butchery.

THE COST IS HIGH

The expense of such a program is unquestionably high. At least $1,900,000,000 in direct Federal appropriations will be required each year, according to Secretaries Patterson's and Forrestal's estimates. This is only part of the cost, however. Indirect costs, in terms of the resources withdrawn from the productive economy, and the loss of 1 year's productive work from the life of the trainees, will amount to more than $2,000,000,000 additional. Further, the Nation will not be able to mobilize its projected 5,000,000-man reserve quickly unless a huge stock pile of arms and equipment is kept in readiness. Maintenance of such an arsenal alone would cost at least an additional $1,000,000,000 a year, and, in any event, might be obsolete in the event of war.

Under any circumstances the total bill for a year's military training is certain to exceed the $3,200,000,000, which represents the largest sum ever spent on education, both public and private, from kindergarten to college (1941).

Were any legislation offered to double, at Federal expense, the cost of all civilian education, it would be subject to close scrutiny to determine if it would achieve the goal claimed for it. The May-Gurney bill for compulsory, universal military education ought to be subjected to similar scrutiny.

ATOMIC THINKING

This is the atomic age and political thinking must be done in terms of the atomic age.

"Whenever mankind makes a significant technical advance," declares one west coast Congressman, "he must make an equal advance in his social thinking and social processess or face grave difficulties."

Realization is beginning to dawn on Congress that the atomic bomb represents one of mankind's most astounding technical advances and that it requires a sharp overhauling in traditional ways of thinking. That is what lies behind the cautious study currently being given the President's proposal. Congress is demanding to know whether this program will actually achieve its aim. Will it give this country security? Will it help to keep world peace?

In the atomic age the world will either stay at peace or face virtual suicide. This is becoming clear from the testimony that scientists are presenting to Congress. The fission of uranium and plutonium, spectacular though it is in producing an explosive 20,000 times more powerful than anything heretofore known, represents only the beginning of the development of atomic weapons. Radioactive poison gases, so powerful that they could kill any living organism within miles and render an area uninhabitable for years, are a development not far distant, according to G. L. E. Oliphant, the British physicist. Space ships capable of delivering such weapons at the supersonic speed from outside the earths' atmosphere are definitely predicted by General Arnold in his last Army Air Force report.

CAN WE ADEQUATELY PREPARE?

It is a foolhardy world that would go to war again. Yet with the world crying for peace, the leaders of the United States are debating preparation for the next war. The question has been raised, indeed, as to whether there is any preparation that can render the Nation secure from atomic war. Certainly, serious question can be raised on that score with regard to the projected program of military education.

If the United States is ever attacked, the aggressor will undoubtedly come from either Europe or Asia. While our two great oceans no longer offer us security from attack with atomic weapons, they do, nonetheless, continue to offer a formidable barrier to the movement of land armies. America's peacetime reserves would be scattered and demobilized. General Marshall, in his most optimistic estimate, admits that it would require 12 months to assemble these men into effective fighting units. They must then be armed, supplied, transported across the ocean, and put into the field against the enemy. It is only when America's force is on the field ready to go into action against an aggressor, and begin doing him some damage, that the latter need take our trained reserve into consideration at all.

At Nagasaki, a steel mill three-quarters of a mile long, located 2 miles from the site of the atomic bomb, was reduced to a mass of twisted girders and crumbled wreckage. When 20 pounds of uranium and plutonium can do that to an enemy's war-making potential, aggressors of the future have an attractive picture before them. They have the picture of the Nagasaki steel mill—and the enticing picture of America's concentrated industry, and large, peaceful cities. The crafty aggressor may well contemplate that with one sudden blow this Nation's entire military force could be rendered impotent.

Aggressor nations, in fact, may have three excellent chances of defeating the United States, even if this country is armed to the teeth with peacetime conscripts.

(1) The aggressor could reasonably gamble on so destroying this Nation's centers of population and industrial manufacture in one sudden blow that we would never be able to recover and wage successful war.

(2) This failing, the aggressor could still bank on "atomizing" our slow-moving transports, either on water or air, as they cross the ocean carrying our troops to fight on another continent, and on so reducing our supply lines that we could not maintain these troops abroad.

(3) Or, with even that failing, the aggressor might still have a good chance of stalemating the American attack on the actual battle front, forcing it to an inconclusive draw which would compel us, in the end, to negotiate and return to the Western Hemisphere.

DOES CONSCRIPTION PROVIDE SECURITY?

Peacetime conscription, thus, will neither deter an atomic age aggressor nor guarantee this Nation success in war if it is attacked.

On the contrary, the program may be an actual detriment to the Nation's security. The possession of a large reserve may breed a false sense of security. Peacetime conscription could become America's Maginot Line, an imaginary line of defense, blinding this Nation to reality. Eagerly, we would seek security by racing other nations to attain the largest volume of armaments, until no one in the world would have any security.

The truth is that there is no longer any security for peace-loving, democratic people until the world organizes itself so that nations can live together without the possibility of large-scale warfare breaking out among them. Scientists who developed the atomic bomb are urgent in warning that real world government can no longer be delayed, that international control of atomic energy is essential to keep it from falling into hands that will use it for evil purpose.

EDUCATE FOR PEACE

The establishment of such a world government, however, requires a higher level of education on the part of the people of the world than has yet been attained. The eradication of nationalistic prejudices and petty provincialism is not impossible—but it requires education. Education, indeed, holds the key to the future, though it is not education for war, but education in the art of living together that will save the day for the world.

The practical test of whether the United States is giving the world good leadership in this first decade of the atomic age may well come from our choice as to what sort of educational program we are going to follow. The amounts spent on all education in the United States during the last prewar year (1941) were as follows:

Primary	$1,623,862,628
Secondary	934,735,060
College and professional	622,667,188

If the Government were to spend $3,000,000,000 a year, in addition to the above figures, in raising civilian education standards, see what a difference it would make. Thousands more would graduate from colleges, with a real awareness of the world in which they live, and scores of worthwhile courses in political science, international relations, economics, and sociology could be added to the present curriculum. If, at the same time, the United States were to spend millions of dollars a year on student exchanges and cultural cooperation with other nations, and take the leadership in providing the new United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) with a generous budget of a billion dollars or more a year with which to accomplish its program on an international scale, real hope could be held for the solution of the world's educational problem.

The program of military education being studied by Congress is a flight from reality; man's only security can come from working together cooperatively to eliminate the threat of atomic conflict. Military education, as represented by peacetime conscription, is widely hailed as a practical policy; education in international relations and cultural exchanges with foreign nations are often dubbed "visionary." It is for educators to questions the wisdom of such a choice in educational programs, and to point out the type of education which will best bring peace and security to this Nation. If the Nation's education bill is to be doubled, care should be exercised in the expenditure of the funds.

Mustering-Out Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include a statement with reference to veterans' legislation, issued by Amvets.

It follows:

AMVETS SUGGEST AMENDMENT TO THE MUSTERING-OUT PAY

(By J. H. Leib, national legislative director)

On February 3, 1946, mustering-out pay to veterans of this war who were discharged prior to the enactment of Public Law 225, Seventy-eighth Congress, and who did not make application for such benefits within the time limits of the act are no longer eligible for such remuneration.

Section 3 of the act reads as follows:

"Any member of the armed forces entitled to mustering-out payment who shall have been discharged or relieved from active service under honorable conditions before the effective date of this act shall, if application therefor is made within 2 years after date of enactment of this act, be paid mustering-out payment."

This legislation was approved on February 3, 1944, and was made retroactive to the date of Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941.

Amvets believes that the specific-time clause ought to be removed from the act simply because it is now becoming evident that many veterans were and are still unaware of the existence of such legislation. It may be well to call attention to the fact that War Department officials advise that veterans of the last war were given 22 years to make application for their discharge pay of $60.

Of course, such pay is now given automatically upon release from duty.

There is another problem now baffling Amvets and that is in connection with those veterans who were discharged from the armed forces prior to Pearl Harbor. We have numerous instances where men were operating under hazardous conditions in the Atlantic before our official entrance into the war and who were injured in maneuvers and subsequently honorably discharged. Amvets has a case where a man was called to active duty on October 24, 1940 (under selective service which started on September 16, 1940) and was granted a medical discharge on December 6, 1941, after serving in foreign waters aboard a destroyer operating out of Panama. Under the provisions of this act this man never was entitled to mustering-out pay. Yet, nearly all benefits, including the GI bill of rights, date back to selective service, September 16, 1940.

Amvets believes that this type of legislation is discriminatory and we are asking that the Congress undertake to correct this unfortunate situation.

Chamberlin and Luce Versus Foster and Ward—Radio Debate on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a report of a radio debate on the American Forum of the Air, broadcast from the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., on May 21.

A careful reading of this debate will convince any thoughtful American that the Communist Party of America is loyal first, last, and only to the Kremlin, and that in all its utterances and propaganda it is following the Moscow line in trying to pin now on the United States the sole guilt for our past, present, and future failures to secure the cooperation of Soviet Russia in the rehabilitation of a peaceful world.

ARE COMMUNISM AND DEMOCRACY MUTUALLY ANTAGONISTIC?

(Speakers: Representative Clare Boothe Luce, Connecticut; William Henry Chamberlin, noted author and lecturer; William Z. Foster, chairman, Communist Party, U. S. A.; Dr. Harry F. Ward, professor emeritus of Christian ethics Union. Chairman: Theodore Granik)

Chairman GRANIK. Perhaps the most basic and vital issue confronting our country and the world today is the solution of the problem: How can we live on peaceful terms with the Soviet Union?

Before the war, the western democratic nations mistrusted Russia in varying degrees. During the war against fascism and nazism, Russia was our ally. Cooperation between our armed forces and our governments reached a high state of perfection. Since the war, relations have gradually come to such a point that the Peace Conference in Paris has just ended with little accomplished.

It is important that every American, for the future security of the Nation, understand what the issues are. The Russian form of government is Communist. There has been considerable argument in this country as to the merits and demerits of communism. This evening we hope to clarify some of the definitions. In a much smaller world than our ancestors dreamed possible, for mutual security we must understand our neighbors.

There are many in this country and elsewhere who maintain that communism and democracy are mutually antagonistic, that the two forms of government and, in fact, the two governments, cannot live peacefully in the world until one or both changes its philosophy of operation. Those who believe that communism and democracy are not antagonistic to each other argue that communism is the only true form of democracy and what we call democracy in the United States is actually unequal capitalism.

This evening we have invited four of the leading authorities on this subject to debate the question: Are communism and democracy mutually antagonistic?

And now here are the authorities.

First, the distinguished Congresswoman from Connecticut, Mrs. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE. Mrs. LUCE.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Moderator, I believe that communism and our American form of democracy are mutually antagonistic for the reasons that Mr. William Z. Foster himself, who sits opposite me, gave when he testified before a congressional committee investigating Communist propaganda in the third session of the Seventy-first Congress. The average American believes in God and is loyal to his country, but Mr. Foster believes that a belief in God and loyalty to the American flag are wholly opposed to communism.

May I read Mr. Foster's sworn testimony before this congressional committee?

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Foster, does your party advocate the destruction of religious belief?

"Mr. FOSTER. Our party considers religion to be the opiate of the people, as Karl Marx has stated, and we carry on propaganda for the liquidation of these prejudices among the workers.

"The CHAIRMAN. To be a member of the Communist Party, do you have to be an atheist?

"Mr. FOSTER. Many workers join the Communist Party who still have some religious scruples, but a worker who understands the elementary principles of the Communist Party must necessarily be in the process of liquidating his religious beliefs, and when he joins the party he will soon get rid of them.

"The CHAIRMAN. Well, can members of the Communist Party in Russia be married in the church and maintain religious belief?

"Mr. FOSTER. My opinion is that a member of the party of the Soviet Union who would be married in the church wouldn't be of any value to the Communist Party.

"The CHAIRMAN. Would he be put out of the party?

"Mr. FOSTER. Eventually.

"The CHAIRMAN. Would it not be the same in this country?

"Mr. FOSTER. As I have stated before, workers who would be so imbued with religious superstitution that they would be married in a church would be of no value to the Communist Party."

And now for loyalty to our country.

"The CHAIRMAN. If I understand you, Mr. Foster, the workers of America look on the Soviet flag as their flag.

"Mr. FOSTER. The workers of this country and the workers of every country have only one flag. That's the Red flag.

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Foster, do you owe allegiance to the American flag? Does the Communist Party owe allegiance to the American flag?

"Mr. FOSTER. I stated very clearly that the Red flag is the flag of the revolutionary class, and we are part of the revolutionary class, and all capitalist flags are flags of the capitalist class, and we owe no allegiance to them.

"The CHAIRMAN. Well, that answers the question."

So far as I am concerned, Mr. Moderator, Mr. Foster has also answered the question as to whether our democracy and communism are mutually antagonistic.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mrs. LUCE.

Next, the recently elected chairman of the Communist Party, United States of America, William Z. Foster. Mr. Foster.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Moderator, communism, far from being antagonistic to democracy, is the most profoundly democratic social movement in the world. This is proved by the basic principles of communism, by the progressive, anti-Fascist programs and struggles of the Communist Parties in all countries. Above all, it is proved by the Socialist democracy and the anti-Fascist foreign policies of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The Communist movement and the trade unions and other popular forces working with it are the major bulwark of world democracy. The danger to world democracy and peace comes primarily from the monopolies in the United States. The economic royalists, with their predominant influence in shaping American foreign policy and their imperialist determination to rule the world, are, together with their British junior partners, a malignant threat to democracy in the United States and throughout the world. American monopolistic forces are the basic cause of the present highly dangerous tension in the United Nations, and they must be curbed by the American people.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. Foster.

Next, the well-known lecturer and author, William Henry Chamberlin. Mr. Chamberlin.

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. I understand by communism, not some abstract theoretical idea, but the political, economic, and social system that is actually functioning in the Soviet Union today. Communism, thus defined, and democracy are entirely incompatible. Democracy is based on the free man and the moral order. Communism is based on the supposedly infallible leader and one-party dictatorship and recognizes no morality but expediency. In a democratic society people work as they please, vote as they please, speak as they please, write as they please. Invariable features of the totalitarian state, whether of the communist or fascist type, are: so-called elections with only one list of candidates to vote for; a regimented and gagged press and radio; executions and arrests without trial; and slave-labor concentration camps. Democracy stands for habeas corpus; communism for habeas cadaver.

Democracy recognizes the eternal truth of Lord Acton's statement: "Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely." It surrounds the exercise of government power with proper checks, balances, and safeguards. In such acts of Soviet communism as the man-made famine of 1932–33, which doomed millions of peasants to death, the liquidation of the kulaks as a class, the mass deportations to slave labor from Poland, the Baltic States, and other countries which the Red Army occupied in this war, you see the fearful moral corruption which absolute power of communism inevitably brings. Communism, if one can believe the writings of its acknowledged leaders, Lenin and Stalin, is out for world domination, to be achieved by a mixture of subversive propaganda and military force. Democracy is content to work by example and persuasion. The difference between democracy and communism is the difference between day and night, between civilization and barbarism.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. Chamberlin.

And now the professor emeritus of Christian ethics, Union Theological Seminary, Dr. Harry F. Ward. Dr. Ward.

Dr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, in principle there is no antagonism between communism and democracy. Communism regards democracy as an historic process which moves through three stages—capitalist, socialist, Communist. It sees each as a higher form than the other, bringing more freedom and more equality to more people. In practice, Mr. Chamberlin, what we are now dealing with in the Soviet Union is not communism, but socialist democracy under Communist leadership. The Soviet founders held that political guaranties of freedom and equal rights were ineffective as long as economic power was in the hands of the few. So they got the people first to lay the foundations of economic democracy as the sure basis of more freedom and more equality. After the people had learned to share in the making and execution of the economic plans on which their lives and future depend, then came the Constitution of 1936, with its unlimited democratic guaranties, and now the further decentralization of control through the "party and nonparty bloc" in the recent election.

In this general course there is agreement with, not antagonism to, the equal, inalienable rights of the Declaration of Independence and Lincoln's "government of the people, by the people, for the people." It was this basic agreement, not merely the need for national

preservation, which bound together the peoples of the United States and the Soviet Union in the war. If the further development of the democratic way of life is now our aim, the unfolding of the century of the common man can also become a joint enterprise. If our objective is to be the American century, antagonism is bound to grow.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mrs. LUCE and gentlemen. There we have the issues, and the sides are clearly drawn. Now, to start our discussion, which is the danger to democracy, communism, or monopoly capitalism, Mr. Chamberlin?

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. I think that term "monopoly capitalism" is very misleading, if it is applied to the system that prevails in America at the present time. In America one has a free play of economic forces—free enterprise, free trade-unions, free farm organizations, and so on. Power, economic as well as political, under democracy, is widely diffused, whereas under communism there is a terrific concentration of power in the hands of a few men. I would defy either Mr. Foster or Dr. Ward to show that any man or group of men in the United States could doom millions to starvation as Stalin did by his agrarian policies in 1932 and 1933.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to reply to Mrs. LUCE's quotations. These were delivered many years ago, of course, and represented a sectarian period of development of our party.

Mrs. LUCE. Of course, everybody knows that a Communist changes his mind according to the party line as handed out from Moscow.

Chairman GRANIK. Will you let him finish, please? Go ahead, Mr. Foster.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to state that Communists learn as they go along.

I would like to ask Mrs. LUCE whether she believes in this statement, which she wrote in 1930:

"Lying increases the creative faculties, expands the ego, lessens the friction of social contacts. It is only in lies, wholeheartedly and bravely told, that human nature attains, through words and speech and forebearance, the nobility, the romance, the idealism that, being what it is, it falls so short of in fact and in deed."

Chairman GRANIK. Do you want to let her answer, Mr. Foster? Go ahead, Mrs. LUCE.

Mrs. LUCE. The article of which you speak was a parody—a Society satire—clearly so marked, for Vanity Fair magazine, written in the year 1931, in a series of other Café Society satires; and if Communists had a sense of humor—which they obviously haven't, or they would laugh themselves to death at themselves—they would have seen that it was a piece of humorous satirical writing.

When it comes to a belief in bigger and better lying, stated with no humorous intention, you have got to go to the head of the communist state for that. I will give you the quote that Stalin made to Hitler when he signed the Hitler-Stalin pact. He said, "Fascism is a matter of taste, Mr. Hitler, but our pact is signed in blood." Or, for that matter, Mr. Foster, for a belief in lying as a high art, for subterfuge, and all sorts of evasion, I will be very happy to supply you with a quotation from your own left wing Communist magazine, quoting Lenin on the subject.

"It is necessary," says Mr. Lenin, "to be able to agree to any and every sacrifice and even, if need be, to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion and subterfuge, in order to penetrate the trade unions, to remain in them, and to carry on communistic work in them."

By the way, Mr. Foster, how are you doing in your performance of this Mission From Moscow?

Chairman GRANIK. I think Dr. Ward wants a word.

Dr. WARD. Regarding the first point that we are supposed to be discussing now, the test of any understanding of communism is whether democracy is regarded as a developing process. I would like to ask you whether you regard our capitalist democracy as the perfect, final form of the democratic way of life.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Ward, our capitalist economy has many faults, many grave faults. I am the first to acknowledge them, and the first to say that we must improve them. But the fact that capitalism has faults does not prove that communism is virtuous; nor does it prove that communism is a cure, except as a guillotine might be called a cure for a case of dandruff.

Dr. WARD. The point is, what do you regard as the next historic stage in the development of democracy?

Mrs. LUCE. As the next historic stage in the development of democracy?

Dr. WARD. That is it, the next historic stage.

Mrs. LUCE. I am not talking of economic systems.

Dr. WARD. But we are, you see. We are talking about——

Mrs. LUCE. You can talk about anything you want, but——

Dr. WARD. So can Hitler——

Mrs. LUCE. But I am talking ethical and moral fundamentals——

Chairman GRANIK. I am sorry, Mr. Chamberlin wants a word.

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. As a more or less prominent Christian, Dr. Ward, do you see any inconsistency between the ethical ideas of Christianity and such Soviet practices as executing people without trial and keeping millions of human beings in slavery in concentration camps?

Dr. WARD. Mr. Chamberlin, I should think those extravagant statements of yours by this time had become too hoary for any respectable man to use. Let's have some proofs, if you can give them. Now I will answer your question, sir. If you will read a little history, you will find that from the days of Roman Christianity, it has always been agreed that the ethical base of the Communist ideal and the ethical base of early Christianity were the same.

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. The actual answer——

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to reply. Mr. Chamberlin asked me a question, and I would like to reply to it, but before that, a word in answer to Mrs. Luce. Mrs. Luce may creep out of these statements that she made years ago——

Mrs. LUCE. I have not crept out of them——

Mr. FOSTER. —but the Communists believed the statements they made years ago and have changed their minds about them.

Mrs. LUCE. O. K., if you have changed your mind about some things, what have you disagreed with Stalin about for the last 5 years, Mr. Foster?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't think Mrs. Luce is entitled to the floor the whole time, even if she is a woman. I should like to answer. Mr. Chamberlin asked a question, and I want to answer it. He says there is no monopoly capitalism in the United States.

Mrs. LUCE. What would you do without monopoly capitalism in these arguments if you had to stick with arguing moral and ethical principles of government?

Mr. FOSTER. We would do very nicely without monopoly capitalism in these arguments, and that is what we are going to do eventually in the United States as well. This is the leading country of monopoly capitalism of the world. Not only that, but these economic royalists, whom President Roosevelt identified during the course of many years, are now dictating our foreign policy and are threatening to plunge the world into a new world war.

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. I would merely like to say that anybody who, like Dr. Ward, implies that there have not been wholesale executions in Russia or that there is not slave labor on a gigantic scale must be a total ignoramus or a completely irresponsible falsifier of facts. You can read the Soviet papers, read Izvestia for 1933, and you will find there a statement in the Soviet press that 67,000 slave laborers were amnestied on just one project, the Baltic-White Sea Canal.

Very sympathetic visitors, like Wendell Willkie and Quentin Reynolds—everybody who has been in Russia and who isn't deaf, dumb, and blind, especially dumb—knows that Russia rests on slave labor of a type more inhumane than Negro slavery was in many parts of the South before the Emancipation Proclamation.

Dr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, I may be ignorant, but I am not so ignorant as not to know that neither you nor anybody else has any accurate facts about the number of people in the labor camps in the Soviet Union and you ought to know in the beginning that the labor camps that you are talking about are constructive rehabilitation programs. [Laughter.] You people can laugh, but if you had talked, as I have, with people who come from those camps and whose whole lives have been reconstructed, you would know that Soviet penology is not the way you described it.

Now I want to ask Mr. Chamberlin——

Chairman GRANIK. I have a question directed to you, Dr. Ward. It is claimed that every American Communist invariably sides with Russia against America on every disputed issue. Does this fact not indicate that they are not an independent party of the American working class, but the organized fifth column of a foreign power?

Dr. WARD. I am not concerned with what Communists in this country do. I am discussing the relationship between democracy and communism on principle, and I want to ask Mr. Chamberlin a question. Mr. Chamberlin, why do those who call for a crusade against communism, from Hitler to Dies and Rankin, make their immediate objective the destruction of democracy or the prevention of its development, and why do you, if you believe in democracy, help these people by your writings, thus to carry on a campaign not against communism but against democracy?

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. Because I think that Soviet totalitarian communism is the greatest threat to human liberty, democracy, and civilization today. [Applause.]

Dr. WARD. You want democracy destroyed here to save it over there?

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. No.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, may I now address a question to the rather optimistic Dr. Ward. Dr. Ward, Lenin, in his pamphlet, entitled "Lenin Speaks to Youth," said, "Our morality is entirely subordinated to the interests of the class struggle. We don't believe in eternal morality, and we expose all fables about morality."

Now, Dr. Ward, do you think that this belief, which you have referred to as a high ethical principle, explains why, after 25 years of Communist education, the thing that the Soviet armies will be remembered for best by the women of Europe is rape?

Dr. WARD. You have not a shred of proof. Not one shred of proof. Not one shred of proof can anybody produce that there has been any more rape by the Soviet armies than by the capitalist armies. So, where does your ethical principle go to then, including, Mrs. LUCE, your Catholic armies?

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to answer about Communists thinking the same as the Soviet Union. Capitalists all over the world react the same to political and economic questions; Catholics react the same; Fascists react the same; Communists react the same, naturally, because they have the same underlying basic principles.

I would like, Mr. Moderator, to call our discussion here back to some more important things that are happening in the world today. One of them is that American imperialism, with British imperialism as its junior partner, is now carrying on an imperialist campaign designed to dominate the world, and that this is the greatest menace there is confronting world democracy and that Communists all over the world are the most——

Mrs. LUCE. Let's see who it is that believes——

Mr. FOSTER. I have something to say to Mrs. LUCE on this, and that is that it was precisely Mr. Henry R. Luce who enunciated a call for world domination by the United States several years ago with his American Century. That is precisely what the American economic royalists are now trying to put into effect, and that is why we have the world tension at the present time.

Mrs. LUCE. When it comes to who is seeking world domination, let us refer to Stalin's own book, his own Mein Kampf. That, incidentally, is being shipped from Russia in great packages and is being sold in an excellent 25-cent edition, and you can buy it in practically any book shop in the United States. It is called "Problems of Leninism". In it, Stalin says, and I quote: "It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with the imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer."

That "imperialist states" means us. Now, Mr. Foster, I consider it nonsense of the most egregious sort for anyone to try to pretend as you do, that the United States is out to start a war with anybody. We don't want a war. We want to do everything we can to avoid one. We have not asked for a dime of reparations. We have not asked for a foot of territory in Europe or Asia. We have not taken a piece of loot. To call this an imperialist, aggressive country is just shabby nonsense. [Applause.]

Chairman GRANIK. Please hold the applause. You are taking the time of the speakers.

I want to ask a question, directed to Mrs. LUCE, which was sent to us. The Communists in every country gave all-out support to the war against fascism. Isn't this a basic proof of their democratic objectives?

Mrs. LUCE. This is definitely no proof of their basic objectives. The Soviet Union went to war with the Fascists only because the Germans attacked them. Before the Fascists attacked them, they had, according to Stalin, a blood bond with the Germans. I would like to read you, if I can find it here, some of Stalin's pronunciamentos on the subject of his democratic objectives. He said, at the beginning of the war, "It is our purpose to see imperialist Great Britain and Germany bleed themselves white while we stand by and wait for the world revolution."

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. Might I put in a word about proof? It seems to me Mr. Foster and Dr. Ward are strong on generalities but very weak on concrete proof. About the behavior of the Russian troops, Congressman GORDON, of Illinois, went to Poland and here is what he reported:

"Pillaging of the shops in the streets was going on most freely, and the snatching of purses from Polish women is a daily occurrence. There also exists a wholesale raping of Polish women. When resistance would be given, the Russian soldier would use his weapons of war and kill. There is no freedom of press in Poland."

John Dos Passos, writing in Life, tells of the savagery of the Russian armies. The people in the working class districts felt that when the Russians came, they at least would be spared, but not at all. In the working class districts the troops were allowed to rape and loot and murder at will.

Mr. FOSTER. It is ridiculous to infer, as Mrs. LUCE does, that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is organizing a world revolution. Capitalism in each country, by its own bankruptcy, gives birth to socialism. By World War I capitalism lost one-sixth of the world to socialism, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. As a result of World War II, already several European countries, including Great Britain and France, have Socialist-Communist majorities, and the great colonial peoples, especially India and China, are on the march against imperialism. Let the American monopolists succeed in organizing World War III, and that will just about finish capitalism altogether.

Chairman GRANIK. I have a question here for Mr. Chamberlin. If there is mutual antagonism between communism and democracy, on what basis do you expect to organize peace and security?

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. I think through a firm American policy in close understanding and agreement with other freedom-loving peoples. I would say that, with the best will in the world, it is very difficult to reach a cordial understanding with a government which practices such persistent and consistent bad faith as the Soviet Union has shown in violating its nonaggression treaties with Poland, Finland, and the Baltic States, in disregarding its pledged dates of evacuation in Iran and Manchuria, in ignoring the promise in the Yalta Agreement assuring free, unfettered elections in Poland. An experienced diplomat recently said that while in the Nuremberg trial Hitler was accused of violating 26 treaties, Stalin already has violated 29 and he is still going strong.

Dr. WARD. I have a question, but before that I want to point out that Mr. Chamberlin's stuff does not give a shred of proof of any sort, except the statements of descriptive writers, but he has trials enough in the American zone and the British zone and other zones of cases where you can get some facts to show what happens.

My question to him is this: Why do the people of the Soviet Union have and exercise the unrestricted right of recall of their elected representatives?

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. I think that shows again the completely utopian nature of your whole view of the Soviet system. Actually, I would challenge you to show——

Dr. WARD. I will, Mr. Chamberlin, and then you will stop talking generalities here. In the recent war, five members of the municipal government of Leningrad were recalled by the people under their Soviet rights. I have also another quotation here from a country district where two representatives were recalled for the same reason. Lenin, you may remember, said that the base of democracy was that the people shall have the unrestricted right to recall their representatives.

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. If you can show five people from Leningrad and two from some other place, I am sure you would find 5,000 peoples' representatives arrested and shot by the Ogpu, the secret police.

Dr. WARD. The Ogpu doesn't exist, and you know it, Mr. Chamberlin.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Ward, don't you agree—I think all of us would agree—that the best way to settle this bitter controversy about what goes on inside Soviet Russia would be for Uncle Joe to let down the iron curtain and let us all go in and have one good, big look at it? The fact that he does not do so puts the burden of proof on him. What goes on there that he is so ashamed of, that he is so afraid of a free press visiting his country?

Dr. WARD. Mrs. LUCE, I have lived enough in the Soviet Union to know that that iron curtain is in part a figment of Mr. Churchill's rhetoric and imagination and in part a necessity of the situation. It varies according to the outside world and what is happening. Mr. Duranty and Louis Fisher, in the time that I was there, and other people who were not propagandist reporters——

Mrs. LUCE. You should hear Louis Fisher now!

Dr. WARD. I know Louis Fisher now, and I also know that he happened to be the man that I consulted because he had been so much around the Soviet Union and particular places of my study. He wasn't shut up in Moscow; nor was——

Mrs. LUCE. Earl Browder wrote a book called——

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman——

Chairman GRANIK. Just a moment. I want to ask a question which is directed to you, Mr. Foster. In 1919, it is claimed, there were less than 5,000 political prisoners in all the Russias. Today, Soviet writers are said to admit there are a minimum of 10,000,000 political prisoners. What other government has ever imprisoned 5 to 10 percent of its whole population because they longed for freedom?

That is a question directed to you.

Mr. FOSTER. Just a lot of nonsense, and this is the kind of talk that promotes——

Mrs. LUCE. Let's go in and have a look——

Mr. FOSTER. War between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Mrs. LUCE. Let's go in and have a look at it!

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to reply to a misstatement of Mrs. LUCE to the effect that we are not showing any imperialist tendencies. First of all, with our gigantic Navy——

Mrs. LUCE. Whom do you mean by "our"?

Mr. FOSTER. The United States.

Mrs. LUCE. Are you talking about Russia or the United States of America? I am just asking for clarification.

Dr. WARD. That is clear enough, Mrs. LUCE.

Mr. FOSTER. We have a Navy twice as big as all the rest of the navies of the world put together, and an Air Force beyond comparison. We are dominating the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean, and with air bases scattered all over the world we are in a position to bomb any nation in the world with atomic bombs, and our reactionaries are just trigger-happy enough with the atomic bomb to want to do it at the first occasion.

Mrs. LUCE. Oh, Oh! [Cries of No! No!]

Chairman GRANIK. (Addressing the audience). Hold your demonstration.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a lesson that the American people have to learn. I would like to read what Mr. Morgenthau has to say about American policy, the former Secretary of the Treasury.

"Two paths are open to us. One is the path of moral leadership. This path leads to peace and prosperity for all peoples. The other is the path of commercial advantage, business as usual."

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Foster, I have a question to ask you that you can take all the time you want to answer.

Mr. FOSTER. Please let me finish.

Chairman GRANIK. If you will make it brief.

Mr. FOSTER. I have two lines. "This path leads——" You don't want to hear this?

Mrs. LUCE. We know that Victrola record about capitalistic imperialism——

Chairman GRANIK. Go ahead, Mr. Foster. Complete your sentence.

Mr. FOSTER. "This path leads to struggles for markets, imperialism, and war."

I submit that, on the basis of our actions to date, it looks as if we are following the second path, which is the path to war.

Chairman GRANIK. I have to give the mike to Mrs. Luce.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Foster, are we the ones who have marched into Poland and took half of it over? Did this country start the fighting in Europe? And now, Mr. Foster, I have a question to ask you, and you can take all the time you want for it. Have you ever at any time publicly before, during, or since the war, condemned, criticized, or found fault with anything that Stalin has ever enunciated

from Moscow? If so, what? Take all the time you want.

Mr. FOSTER. The Soviet policy is the correct policy, and why should I criticize it?

Mrs. LUCE. Oh, dear! I wouldn't if I were you. Remember what happened to Trotsky. [Laughter.]

Mr. FOSTER. It is a socialist country following a correct policy.

Mrs. LUCE. Incidentally, speaking of Trotsky, do you approve of murder as an instrument of national policy?

Mr. FOSTER. First of all, I want to say that the way you put that question is a slander against the Soviet Union. It constitutes war mongering, and it is one of the most menacing manifestations in our country at the present time, the systematic slandering of an ally that gave 30 times as much in dead as we did in the war.

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. I would like to put a question to Mr. Foster. Mr. Foster has doubtless seen the statement by Carlos Prestes, the Brazilian communist leader, that he would fight for Russia if Brazil and Russia came into conflict. Are we to draw from Mr. Foster's assumption that Russia is always right and America is always wrong, that he would be fighting on the Russian side if America and Russia ever came into conflict?

Mr. FOSTER. Whenever the policy of the United States is correct, the Communists give it 100 percent support, and there is nobody in the United States who were more loyal supporters of the war than the Communists.

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. Because they believed it to be Stalin's war.

Chairman GRANIK. I think Dr. Ward wants a word.

Dr. WARD. Mr. Chamberlin, why do the people of the Soviet Union have and exercise the unrestricted right of recall of their elected representatives?

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. All political and civil liberties in the Soviet Union are a complete hoax and sham.

Dr. WARD. Is that so, now, Mr. Chamberlin——

Chairman GRANIK. Please, Dr. Ward. Let him answer the question.

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. In the assembly of trained seals called the Supreme Soviet they have never had a single vote that was not unanimous. There never has been one word in the whole length and breadth of the Soviet Union published which was critical of Stalin. In the very minor cases where they have recalled people, it was usually someone whom Stalin wanted to get rid of, and there have been far more recalls, I assure you, Dr. Ward, by secret arrests. Whether you want to call it OGPU or Narkomindel or NKVD, it is the same terrorist gang. Whatever name it may give itself, there have been far more recalls by its method than by any other process.

Dr. WARD. That is a typical reply, Mr. Chamberlin, typical of your writings and typical of your speeches. It is an evasion and a distortion, and there is not a shred of fact. Now I will give you some facts. The war municipal government of Leningrad during the war recalled by public election, recalled by an election demanded by the people, five members of the municipal government. I have a letter here from a country school teacher explaining the situation in her village soviet and telling how the people themselves, when they found that some of their representatives, were, as the old Russian proverb has it, "neither a candle for God nor a poker for the devil," recalled them by popular election.

Mrs. LUCE. May I ask——

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. Let me come back here. I have a question I have long been pining to ask Dr. Ward. I get the impression from Dr. Ward's writings that he thinks Russia, with its mass slave labor, its whole executions——

Dr. WARD. More distortion.

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. Is morally superior to America. How do you explain, Dr. Ward, that Americans had virtually 100 percent loyalty to their Government during the war while hundreds of thousands of Russians fought with the German army during the war, and there are hundreds of thousands or millions of refugees from Soviet soil in Europe now who fear death rather than be repatriated to their country.

Mrs. LUCE. They just do not like it there.

Dr. WARD. None of your figures correspond, any more than your writings, to the facts, Mr. Chamberlin.

Mr. CHAMBERLIN. Will you believe Gen. Omar Bradley, who said 150,000 Russians were captured on the western front?

Dr. WARD. He has never let me answer the first one yet. I have the answer for the first one. He charges me with believing that the Soviet Union is morally superior to the United States. He charged the Dean of Canterbury similarly, and although the Dean of Canterbury twice disavowed this position in his book, he and the Times both refused to correct the error. Now, Mr. Chamberlin, that is the kind of thing you have been putting over on the people of this country for a long time, distorting other people's views.

Mrs. LUCE. May I ask you a very simple question? In a congressional committee hearing a few weeks ago, a month or so ago, a misguided congressman called Wendell Willkie a Communist, and Mr. Foster jumped to his feet and said at the top of his lungs that this was a smear. (Apparently Mr. Foster, himself, thinks it is a disgrace for an American citizen to be a Communist. But you are here defending communism.) I want to ask you, would you call it a smear, too, if I called you a Communist?

Chairman GRANIK. We pause——

Dr. WARD. I would call it a falsehood——

Mrs. LUCE. But if you would be angry at being called a Communist, why are you defending communism——

Chairman GRANIK. We must pause now for a summation of the arguments advanced this evening. Mrs. LUCE, will you sum up, please?

Mrs. LUCE. This has been a very turgid argument. The position of Mr. Foster and Dr. Ward seems to be that communism is a system that will bring us all paradise on earth. Mr. Foster has just claimed more than one-sixth of the world for communism since 1917. And yet never in the world's history have there been so many homeless and hungry and terror-stricken and enslaved people. Mr. Foster, I am afraid that your earthly paradise is receding faster and faster. If only you and all your Communists had not deserted your Christian faith, you would at least have one consolation, which would be that your heavenly paradise is growing substantially closer.

But as I said, that there is one way to settle all the disputes of the evening about how communism is really working, and that is for Stalin to lift the iron curtain and let us all go and look at it and report our findings. The fact that he doesn't, puts the burden of proof upon him, and it puts the burden of proof on you and Mr. Foster.

The charge that Mr. Chamberlain and I have made tonight is that you and the American Communist Party are not loyal to the United States, but that you are loyal to an antireligious foreign system and government which has been characterized by torture to obtain confessions, executions without trial, falsification of the record, floggings, beatings, shootings, slave labor, and the suppression of all minority and individual opinion. I would rather die than live under such a system and, incidentally, I think Dr. Ward would, too, though I am not sure. In any case, like many liberals of his ilk, Dr. Ward is a self-deluded man. He is fighting against our system of Christian democracy, a system which he does not in his heart wish to destroy, and defending a system that he could not bear to live under.

Chairman GRANIK. I am sorry, Mrs. LUCE, your time has expired. Dr. Ward, will you sum up?

Dr. WARD, Yes; I will.

The difference between us is the difference between facts and distortions in viewing democracy as a historic process which has its imperfect stages. I have never found anybody in authority in the Soviet Union who did not ask me to see their bad things as well as their good things and to tell them honestly where they were wrong as well as where they were right. I have never held a utopian viewpoint. It is a developing proposition. It has its defects, but it is on the way to correction.

We have shown here from different approaches that, both in theory and in practice, communism is democratic, a process of democratic development, that the Soviet Union has a basically democratic regime. Its postwar foreign policy makes for democracy and peace.

Our opponents have indulged in reckless distortions and misrepresentations of communist policy. The logic of this position is war, a war which General Eisenhower has warned would be long and ruinous.

We have shown also that the danger to world democracy comes not from communism, but from American economic royalists and their British friends. It is American imperlialist monopolies that today are a menace to everything democratic in our country and in the world. With their imperialist aggression and their control of our foreign policy, they become the mainstay of world reaction. To avoid a disastrous atomic war costing millions of American lives, the American people need to take their foreign policy away from the monoplists and——

Mrs. LUCE. And give it to Mr. Foster?

Dr. WARD. Not place their whole reliance on Republicans and Southern poll-tax Democrats. Give it to the American people, Mrs. LUCE, not the Republicans and southern poll-tax Democrats who destroy democracy in the South and what they do to the Negro people—who refuse to enact Roosevelt's economic bill of rights. We need to return to Roosevelt's policy of world collaboration.

Mrs. LUCE. Roosevelt said that we must never forget that Soviet Russia was a dictatorship as absolute and bloody as any other.

Dr. WARD. Mrs. LUCE, if your manners are no better——

Mrs. LUCE. A touch of communistic tactics seems to have seized me.

Dr. WARD. We must compel the Truman administration to restore Big Three unity, to drop the warlike gestapo policy. World peace and democracy depend upon the American people getting control of their foreign policy.

Chairman GRANIK. I am sorry, our time is up. [Applause.]

Pacific Southwest Manpower Review Indicates Postwar Recovery Slow

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the utilization of manpower in the Pacific

southwest territory is becoming a serious problem in our economy. Behind this problem are factors such as availability of materials, price controls, disposal of governmental wartime surpluses, and housing.

In order to understand the manpower picture throughout this region, the CED office has visited key communities, has checked Government statistics, and has talked with business leaders about the story behind the figures.

Here are some of the figures:

First. Los Angeles County: March unemployment is estimated at 218,000. This is 10,000 more than in February and February was 10 percent greater than January.

Second. San Diego: Unemployment during March had increased to 29,400. This is over 11,000 more than 2 months ago.

Third. San Bernardino-Riverside: March unemployment is estimated at 13,700. This is a 13 percent increase over February.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE CLAIMS

First. Veterans: Week ending March 28—61,214 veterans claims were paid in southern California. This is over 30,000 more payments than were made in January.

Second. Civilians: In southern California during the week ending March 28, 115,570 idle people drew unemployment checks. This figure has been increased each week.

In actual dollars this means that the unemployment insurance pay roll in southern California was $3,536,000 for 1 week.

About 6½ percent of the claims on our State funds are made from outside of the State. This is interesting because it gives some indication of the number of our wartime workers that have left the State.

Here are some general statements:

First. Heavy immigration continues particularly among veterans. There are still over 50 percent of the veterans seeking jobs in this territory who have neither lived nor worked here previously.

Second. The job opportunities now being listed through the USES are declining seriously both in number and quality. For example, one community had over 22,500 requests for placements and less than 1,300 job openings. Another community had over 3,700 people applying for work and about 614 job openings. If job openings listed through USES are going down, they should be going up in business associations that are doing a placement job. However, this has not been generally true.

There are large numbers of well qualified veterans who are becoming extremely discouraged over the lack of any type of suitable opening.

EXPLANATION

First. Job openings: Business is very cautious about increasing employment. This is due to lack of certainty about flow of materials, and lack of confidence in pricing policies. There is a hesitancy to make commitments on jobs before assurance that materials will come and pricing policies will be fair.

Second. Many organizations faced with commitments to men in service have not taken action regarding some of their "temporary" wartime employees. This has caused an extreme shortage of white-collar jobs.

There is still a very strong tendency on the part of unemployed individuals, both veterans and civilians, to be very choosey about the type of work which they will enter. This is all part of a national downgrading problem.

SUGGESTED ACTION

First. That increased emphasis must be given to problems of materials, pricing, and housing.

Second. That the employers throughout southern California consider giving preference to veterans who have worked and lived here previously.

Third. That employers attempt some commitment with well-qualified individuals as to the time when they will employ and will expand. Employers can then recommend temporary training or experience which will prepare the individual for the job in question.

Fourth. That employers make greater use of apprenticeship programs.

Fifth. That employers be stimulated to list any information about job opportunities with central sources which are now interviewing very-well-qualified personnel, whether these central sources be business groups, business associations or governmental agencies.

Sixth. That a publicity program be originated throughout Southern California to stimulate the listing of job opportunities, at the same time that business organizations are working to correct evils of black market, surplus disposal and unrealistic pricing policies.

Seventh. That a manpower story be submitted to Congressmen to show them the alarming nature of our material supply problems.

Eighth. That community business organizations take a strong stand on the return of the employment functions to the State.

Ninth. That representatives from CED and the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce investigate the State's proposed program for handling the unemployment problem, if and when USES is returned to them. We should then develop business recommendations for Jim Bryant who is in charge of the California Employment Stabilization program.

Who Are the UPWA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, following my statement on the floor of the House yesterday concerning a letter from Mr. Mitchell, President of the Civil Service Commission, I believe the membership of this House will be interested in reading an informative article by Mr. Jerry Kluttz in the last Sunday's issue of the Washington Post. I am including it herewith:

Federal workers not only have a new union, CIO's United Public Workers of America, but they also have a new leader, Abram Flaxer, of New York, the union president.

Flaxer is relatively unknown here. He made his first public speech to UPWA members here Friday night in the Commerce Auditorium. Those who attended saw and heard a persuasive speaker, an able organizer, and a vigorous individual.

The union leader has a pleasant personality. He appears to take things easy. He is short, has a mop of black hair, and a straight-stemmed pipe is seldom from his mouth.

Though only 41, Flaxer is an old hand in union affairs. He was an official of the AFL's public worker union in 1937 when John L. Lewis, then the CIO boss, appointed him to form the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America. He did, and he built it up to an organization of 331 locals and 50,000 members.

UNION HAS $70,000 IN BANK

Flaxer today is more powerful than ever. His SCMWA was merged with CIO's United Federal Workers, and he emerged as the dominant leader of the new union, UPWA. Two of the three top UPWA offices are held by former SCMWA officials, Flaxer and Bob Weinstein, director of organization. Eleanor Nelson, former UFWA president, is secretary-treasurer of UPWA.

Another important point: Flaxer's old union had a $70,000 bank account while UFWA found it most difficult to balance its books and for years it was given grants by the CIO. Further, SCMWA had twice as many members as UFWA.

So there is no question that Flaxer is the No. 1 person in the UPWA and what he says and does must be reckoned with by Federal, State, county, and municipal governments.

HE CALLS SOURCES DOUBTFUL

[A preliminary draft of this article was made available to Flaxer for comment. Flaxer contented himself with charging that the article was part of a campaign of "misrepresentation and vilification" by the Post, passing up the opportunity to rebut specific passages. Flaxer asserted that Kluttz used sources which Kluttz "would not consider reliable." He added that Kluttz distorted "the views which I expressed several years ago in a magazine article by quoting the article out of context." He said the true program and purposes of the Government employes union were outlined in an advertisement in the May 15 Post.—Editor's Note.]

ACTIONS HE DEFENDS

Since UPWA was created a couple of weeks ago at Atlantic City, Flaxer has had his hands full defending a couple of actions of that convention. They are:

1. The provision in the UPWA constitution that leaves the way open to strikes against Federal, State, county, and municipal governments.

2. The Communist line foreign policy resolution which demanded the removal of American and British troops from friendly nations and refusing to demand the same of Russia.

The Congress is threatening to enact legislation which would bar from Federal employment any member of any organization that "asserts" the right to strike against the Government.

RANK AND FILE BALK

Many union rank and filers are revolting against the pro-Russian foreign policy resolution. They are supporting a substitute which supports the official CIO-PAC position which isn't Communist-biased.

And now, it is a proper question to ask—were these two actions of the UPWA convention accidents, or were they by design?

The official UPWA line, as set forth by Flaxer, Nelson, and other paid officers, is now to flatly oppose strikes in the public service, and (2) to kiss off the Communist line foreign policy resolution as a convention act made solely by the delegates themselves.

Maybe so.

But since Flaxer and his old SCMWA are so little known here, and in view of the intense controversy of the two convention actions, it is certainly in order to go back a bit to see how Flaxer and his union have behaved in the past. Doing so, will give us a better perspective of what happened at the Atlantic City convention.

DAILY WORKER CITED

First, the strike controversy.

In September 1941 SCMWA held its second biennial convention. The Daily Worker, official Communist Party organ, had an article on September 27 of that year in which it said Flaxer supported a proposed constitutional provision which declared:

"There is no law or any legal precedent denying us the right to strike and we will fight any abridgment of this right."

Several months later, in the April 1942 edition of Survey magazine, Flaxer wrote:

"The Government employer asserts that a strike against the Government is akin to insurrection. Therefore, if the Government employee strikes he is subject to penalties. But if the Government employee refrains from striking he is barred from the collective-bargaining rights to which other citizens are entitled. Can a more effective trap be devised for trade-union men and women?"

And this added bit of evidence—Flaxer's SCMWA has engaged in several strikes in the public service. A SCMWA official told me in Atlantic City that he thought the number was eight. He wasn't sure.

I also talked to Flaxer about the strike provision. The UPWA president told me in Atlantic City that it would be possible to have a strike under the Constitution, but he offered the opinion that it would rarely, if ever, occur.

Now, let's take up the Communist line foreign-policy resolution. Was it really the will of the 600 delegates—an accident—or was it by design?

In 1938, the Communist line was anti-Hitler. In March of that year Flaxer had his name on a statement issued by the American League for Peace and Democracy, cited as a Communist front by the Attorney General, which demanded cooperation of the United States, Soviet Russia, and other peace-loving nations to prevent the Fascist Powers from obtaining the means to carry on war.

On March 25, 1939, SCMWA members participated in a stop-Hitler parade in New York City.

IN THE LIFE OF THE PACT

Then the Stalin-Hitler pact was signed, and let's see how Flaxer and his union behaved.

The Daily Worker of September 12, 1940, quotes Flaxer as denouncing compulsory military service, declaring it "could knock into a cocked hat" civil-service tenure, seniority rights, and income levels.

Earlier, on April 6, SCMWA members staged a demonstration in New York's Madison Square Park to show "how much they hate war and want the United States to stay out." Members were urged to write the President to tell him the "Yanks are not coming." Peace committees were formed in many SCMWA locals and a weekly score sheet for peace was published by the union.

Flaxer was a leader in the American Peace Mobilization which threw a picket line about the White House, and which, oddly enough, was withdrawn the day before Hitler invaded the Soviet Union. The peace outfit was against lend-lease, convoys, conscription, and the imperialist war.

ANOTHER SOMERSAULT

But Flaxer and his group flopped again when the Nazis invaded Russia. At the 1941 CIO convention, Flaxer said in part:

"The object of our foreign policy is the defeat of fascism and we are going to take every step that is necessary to bring about this defeat * * * it is a policy that requires the revision of our Neutrality Act * * * and requires that our seamen stand ready to their stations and be ready to shoot at sight * * * it is a policy that recognizes that this war is our war."

With the war won, the Communist line has changed again. The line is to charge the United States and the British with imperialistic ambitions; to demand the withdrawal of all United States and British troops from friendly nations, and to charge the United States and Britain are ganging up to isolate and destroy Russia.

This is the line indorsed by the UPWA convention.

So again, I ask in all sincerity: Was the convention action an accident, or by design?

Now, here are other straws in the wind which may, or may not, be a clue as to the character of the new union.

A good many people here—including many UPWA members—were horrified when a motion was voted down in a caucus of some New Jersey delegates at Atlantic City to amend the constitution to bar Communists, Nazis, and Fascists from membership in the union.

Well, the SCMWA convention held in Lansing, Mich., in September 1941, according to the New York Times, rejected a proposal to outlaw Communists, Nazis, and Fascists from union office.

And again the New York Times, the February 3, 1938, edition, quoted Flaxer on the issue of barring Communists from membership in CIO unions to this effect:

"We do not inquire as to the political affiliations of our members. We have no specific way of knowing or any specific interest in the way our members exercise their political franchise."

A FEW MORE INCIDENTS

So is it by design or accident that the UPWA constitution permits Communists, Fascists, and Nazis to be members and officers of the union?

Other straws:

The October 28, 1940, edition of the Daily Worker reveals that Flaxer was a delegate on the committee of election rights to protest to the then Governor Lehman against attempts by pressure and coercion to keep the Communist Party off the ballot in the November 5 New York election.

The New York World-Telegram on March 25, 1943, said that Flaxer was one of three CIO national presidents who signed a protest attacking their own leaders and others who protested the executions of Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter, Polish laborites, by the Soviet Government.

And there are other straws. Add them up and make up your own mind. I happen to believe it is most important for Government employees generally, and UPWA members in particular, to know something of the records of their leaders.

And these are the vital statistics: Flaxer was born in Vilna, Russia, on September 12, 1904. He claims citizenship through his father, who was naturalized in Brooklyn in 1917. He holds a bachelor of science degree in philosophy which he received from City College of New York in 1932. He married Charlotte Rosswaag in 1941.

Whither the Strike?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, May 25 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, yesterday Palmer Hoyt, the new publisher and editor of the Denver Post, wrote a most significant editorial on the current tragic railroad and coal industry strikes, I especially call the attention of my colleagues to his insistence that Congress meet its full responsibility which is tremendous in the greatest crisis since Ft. Sumter was fired upon. Editor Hoyt was speaking for every American when he wrote that editorial; he was pleading the cause of millions of starving women and children in Europe and Asia when he made his stirring plea.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

WHITHER THE STRIKE?

At the present moment the United States is locked in its most serious strike since this Republic opened its doors for business. By and large, the vast network of United States railroads is inoperative.

Few have realized how dependent is our economy on rail transportation. In Chicago and the East, millions of city workers depend on trains to get them to and from their employment.

The whole Nation is generally dependent on the railroads for its food and this dependence is a very vital thing indeed as far as the larger cities of the United States are concerned.

In fact, our present economy for peace and for war is built upon steel rails. It is now apparent, and has been for some time, that this foundation of prosperity and, in fact, our very existence has not been properly safeguarded.

There is little point now in name calling, in recrimination, or second guessing, but there is great point in suggesting some of the inevitable results that will come about as the strike goes on.

There are facts that all American people must face in this crisis. There are facts labor must face and facts that management must face. There are facts the White House must face and facts the Congress must face.

First. While there is scant possibility that there will be many Americans who will actually starve to death there is not the slightest doubt that there will be millions who will starve to death overseas because the American railroads are on strike.

At this certain and grim specter of death to millions not only the striking trainmen and their leaders, Johnson and Whitney of the brotherhoods, but President Truman, a surprisingly politically minded Congress and all the rest of us must direct our unhappy gaze.

Second, and this is something for labor to study long and thoughtfully. Government ownership and operation of the railroads (and of the coal mines, too) well may come

about. This could be an eventually unhappy situation for both the workers and public.

Third. The ultimate projection of this strike could well mean the overthrow of our economy and in this grim eventuality labor would stand the greatest loss for nowhere in the world has labor reached as high a social place or economic reward as in these United States.

Fourth. This strike deals a deadly blow at reconversion, at our hopes to control inflation and at our world position. The effects of the rail strike will be felt for months and they will constitute a deadly blow at the prosperity we need and can have.

Columns might and will be written on the certain change that the railroad crisis will have on public groups and private lives but such writings will not alter the fact that our President and our Congress face the gravest time for decision since the Civil War rent the States.

This crisis brings particular responsibility for wise action to certain Members of the Congress who have been friends of labor and who are recognized as national leaders. Special reference is made to Senators MORSE of Oregon, MURRAY of Montana and WAGNER of New York and in the House to HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, ADOLPH J. SABATH, MIKE MANSFIELD, and MARY MORTON.

Our labor relations now rest on such shifting sands as the Wagner Act, the Smith-Connally bill and the proposed Case legislation. Collective bargaining has become a joke in too many instances, as witness, John L. Lewis' refusal to even reveal the demands of the coal miners as to hours, wages and working conditions.

Solid, basic legislation must be passed by the Congress which will recognize the right of labor, management, and the public and which will prevent such high-handed and unreasonable performances as have been staged by John L. Lewis, A. F. Whitney and Alvanley Johnston of the brotherhoods.

Solid, basic legislation that takes full cognizance of the rights, privileges, and freedom of the individual worker is desperately indicated, but law that also completely concedes that the basic principle of our Constitution and Bill of Rights provides that no one can have freedom or rights or privileges without accompanying responsibility. Freedom without responsibility can have no part in a democracy.

It should be thoughtfully recognized by management associations and labor unions alike that there can be no National Association of Manufacturers, for example, no Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers in total government. Labor unions today are a necessary part of our democracy, but no union member or union leader should ever forget what Robert Ley, head of labor in Hitler's government, said to a congress of German workers some 10 years ago, "I am your labor union."

Scant applause will come to the railroad brotherhoods for striking or to our national leaders for permitting the strike because the whole world will cruelly feel its effects. However, an Associated Press dispatch of today sets forth the probability of a new propaganda drive by Russia. The dispatch points out that one of the major themes of the Soviet propagandists has been the inability of the capitalistic system to cope with postwar crises. The dispatch points out that the industrial disputes in the United States have been held up to the people of Russia and Europe as evidences of weakness, and it relates that a Soviet Embassy bulletin issued in Washington asserted that while billions of workers in capitalistic society were fearful of their jobs, Soviet workers were assured of steady employment. Russia is a bad place for endorsement of the railroad strike to come from.

PALMER HOYT,
Editor and Publisher, the Denver Post.

Higher Ceilings on Wheat Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

HIGHER CEILINGS ON WHEAT URGED

WASHINGTON, May 15. —Representative WICKERSHAM, Democrat, Oklahoma, suggested today that the Government halt wheat buying May 25 and raise ceiling prices on wheat 45 cents a bushel for the next 120 days, so the increase will apply to the new crop.

Payment of a 30-cent-a-bushel bonus to obtain wheat for famine relief is scheduled to end May 25. Ceiling prices on wheat were raised 15 cents a bushel effective last Monday.

WICKERSHAM contended that if the ceilings on the new wheat crop were increased 45 cents a bushel, the grain would move promptly from harvest field to elevators, terminals, and mills.

Otherwise, he said, farmers will withhold their grain expecting higher prices or Government bonuses later.

WICKERSHAM also recommended that if farmers sold both the old and the new crops during the emergency period that they be allowed to charge the income of half of it this year and choose any one of the next 3 years in which to list the other half as income for income-tax purposes.

A Record of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1946.

Mr. DANIEL C. BIGBEE,
Arlington, Va.

MY DEAR COMRADE BIGBEE: As a discharged veteran of World War II, whose legal residence is in Granite, Okla., you inquire concerning the record of Congressman VICTOR WICKERSHAM. Please be advised that I have known him for more than 5 years, since shortly after he was elected as a United State Representative from Oklahoma. He is congenial, courteous and cooperative.

I have had many conversations with Congressman WICKERSHAM, relative to various bills affecting veterans, disabled veterans and their dependents, and have been impressed with the fact that he is sincerely interested in their welfare, and in constructive legislation in their behalf. As a matter of fact, he has introduced a couple of bills at my request.

So far as I know, he has not voted against any bills favorably to affect veterans, disabled veterans and the dependents of our war dead, but has been cooperative as to all such proposed legislation under consideration.

I trust that this furnishes you with the desired information.

Very sincerely yours,

M. W. RICE,
National Director of Public Relations, Disabled American Veterans.

The Present Labor Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 27 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me at Duke University commencement exercises on Saturday morning, May 25, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is a transition period in world history. Old values have been discounted. The world has been changed overnight. Different theories of Government and varying philosophies of life are being presented to us. There is much confusion in our thinking and many people are groping helplessly in an effort to find a balance and to chart their life course on some dependable basis. It is a time for profound thinking, rather than a period for seizing the surface plans of the theorists who would save the world en masse.

Today the challenging task confronting America is to show the world how to maintain the supremacy of man. It is the old issue of democracy versus dictatorship and it arises in both the political and the economic field. There is widespread socialistic and communistic movements in Europe and Asia and throughout the world. There is much infiltration in America.

One group, led by W. Z. Foster, are boldly and openly communistic, and in a recent meeting in Madison Square Garden urged their fellow-travelers to encourage all the strikes possible in the United States and seek in every way to disrupt our economy and to try to prevent amicable adjustments of labor disputes. Another group, denying the communistic label, work under cover and are more subtle. Many of these are in the Government service. This month employees of municipal, State and Federal Governments met in Atlantic City and organized a radical union and proceeded to pass resolutions denouncing the United States and Great Britain for not removing troops from various war sectors, and when one delegate offered a motion to include a denunciation of Russia, for the same reason, he was howled down, and the original resolution was adopted. We have the spectacle of Government employees evidencing their allegiance to a foreign nation while on the pay roll of our Government. It is a well known fact that many Socialists are employed in practically every branch of our Government. I make bold to declare that only loyal Americans who believe in a democratic form of government ought to be placed on guard.

Dictators have arisen in the field of economics and they have accumulated power over business, industry, and the very life of the Nation. We have permitted many of these organizations to grow powerful by governmental permission, if not sponsorship, and the question is going to have to be definitely determined as to whether the free

government of the people is sovereign and can protect the American people, or whether we are going to permit any labor or capitalistic dictatorship to take charge of our Nation and visit disaster upon the people at will. I am in favor of the assertion of the sovereign power of this Nation in unmistakable fashion—so that even a John L. Lewis can understand it.

What do we most desire today? Is it wealth, power, health, learning, happiness, peace, or security? And do we still desire liberty and freedom? Many well-meaning people are very busy trying to solve all the problems of life for us and insist that it will be easy of accomplishment if we follow their lead and adopt a planned economy for the whole human race, with all on the same basis, and all reduced to the level of mass mediocrity. Their purpose is to provide security for all.

Amid all the confusion of voices and the din of strife, we can hear the voice of experience admonishing us that there is no panacea for the solution of the varied problem of the individual—that we cannot provide any universal system banishing poverty and want and inaugurating prosperity and plenty. The equation of the individual must be taken into account. God created men and women with different abilities and capacities: to some He gave five talents; to others, two talents; and still to others, one talent; but the same fidelity and diligence was expected and required of each. The human race has progressed and advanced after that pattern through the centuries. God has not changed His plan.

The philosophy which would have the Government provide everything for the people is both false and destructive of the highest human values. America has achieved its greatness and surpassed every nation of the earth because it has been free and the individual has had an opportunity. The initiative and genius of a free people knows no bounds or limitations. Sometimes it becomes necessary to choose between freedom and security. There should never be any hesitation in making that choice. Likewise there should be no hesitation in deciding between a government which offers you security and a government which guarantees to you liberty. One represents the socialistic concept and the other the democratic process. Today the socialistic planners are assiduously advancing their sugar-coated theories to deceive the unsuspecting into an acceptance of this deadly line which can only result in sacrificing the higher values of liberty and freedom for the individual. The slave has security. The man in prison has security. Both will be provided with food, raiment, and shelter, but who wants to be a slave or a prisoner? The citizen cannot afford to trade his birthright of liberty and freedom for a mess of pottage in the form of paternalistic governmental bounty and accompanied by governmental control and regimentation.

There comes a genuine thrill to the individual who lives and breathes in a free land and looks out upon life as a high adventure. It will be filled with struggles, it will be a difficult road to travel, there will be much to overcome and much to achieve, but it will be worth the struggle all along the way. Even the defeats and failures will contribute to the successes and triumphs and there will come real satisfaction in showing the quality of our metal and demonstrating the character of our faith. Be not deceived by the spurious claims or theories which ignore the basis of all true greatness and all worth-while achievements. These fundamental things have not changed. The attributes and virtues which merited and won success in other years are still the standard by which our lives will be measured and appraised. Courage and character, determination and dependability, industry and intelligence, loyalty and leadership—these qualities and characteristics will always win and deserve superior recognition and reward.

We hear much discussion of liberalism and there is a widespread misapprehension of the term. It is sometimes used to denote the opposite of conservatism, which is wholly erroneous. A radical is the opposite of a conservative, but each may be a liberal. My observation is that you will find more real liberals among conservatives than among radicals, for ordinarily you will find radicals are more intolerant and less disposed to admit the possibility of any good coming out of a conservative or any one else who differs with them. The trouble is that many people who call themselves liberals are only new-born radicals. Even Communists class themselves as liberals, when in reality they are Fascists by another name, but just as undesirable and autocratic as any totalitarian group. Under the cloak of highly vaunted liberalism these dangerous radical groups are making insidious attacks upon our democratic way of life.

If it be true that the rugged individualist is rapidly passing, we ought to be very sure that we do not lose the rugged American. Not the narrow nationalist who styles himself an American Firster, but the real American, who believes with all of his heart and soul, in American ideals and the right of freemen to govern themselves and remain free in an America that shall still belong to Americans.

The colleges and universities and their graduates have a great opportunity in this chaotic period of our history to lead us away from the road to serfdom and into a broader, higher, and finer highway of liberty and freedom, where opportunities shall be greater for the youth of the land, and where democratic processes shall be available for all—and where genuine service shall be the test of real greatness. The full measure of our duty will not be realized until we recognize and discharge our responsibilities of leadership and helpfulness at home and abroad in the one world of tomorrow.

The present is a most dramatic hour in the history of the American Nation. The coal miners and the railway trainmen have been engaged in a strike and the situation had become so desperate that the whole transportation system of the country was tied up. The President of the United States, under the War Powers Act, seized both the mines and the railroads and proceeded to operate them by the Government for the purpose of averting a major disaster to the health, safety, and security, of the whole people.

Notwithstanding this action on the part of the Chief Executive, the union leaders, President Alvanley Johnston of the engineers, and President A. F. Whitney of the trainmen, ordered their men out on strike against the Government and succeeded in paralyzing all rail transportation. President Truman made a fighting speech to the American people last night and placed the blame squarely upon the shoulders of these two union heads, where it justly belonged. He gave notice that the Army would take charge and operate the railroads unless the engineers and trainmen returned to work by 4 o'clock Saturday afternoon, at which time he will address a joint session of the House and Senate to ask for the passage of drastic legislation to adequately deal with all rail or coal-mine workers who strike against the Government.

I heartily endorse this action on the part of the President. We cannot afford to let any union, organization, or group of any kind defy the authority and power of the Government and wreck the whole national economy. The time has come when there will have to be a show-down. We shall know who places loyalty to a union above loyalty to his country, and we shall demonstrate the capacity of a free people to deal with that situation adequately and effectively. America is still sound at heart and labor dictators must be made to understand that they cannot strike against the public interest and in defiance of the Government of the United States and get away with it. We are not yet ready to turn this country over to them. I call upon the American people, including the railway-union workers, who are among our best citizens, to respond to the call of the President of the United States and to rally to the flag in peace as they did in war and to demonstrate that their first allegiance is to their country.

(NOTE.—The union leaders accepted the terms of settlement proposed by President Truman and the rail strike was called off at 4 o'clock Saturday afternoon, May 25, 1946.)

Senator Pepper's Attitude on Labor Legislation and Child Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 27 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Pepper to the Rescue," and another editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Child Care Program."

I am pleased to say that in the latter editorial I have received the commendation of the Washington Post, for which I am especially gratified. I ask to have the two editorials appear in the RECORD in juxtaposition to each other.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEPPER TO THE RESCUE

After several days of speech making of an exceedingly intemperate character, Senator PEPPER, in his self-appointed role as defender of organized labor, climaxed his indiscretions by a midnight call upon the heads of the two striking railway brotherhoods. We strongly suspect that the true friends of organized labor deplore the officious zeal displayed by the Senator from Florida at a time of national crisis when calm objective judgment is so imperatively needed. Certainly, Mr. PEPPER's inopportune appeal to Messrs. Whitney and Johnston to resume negotiations with the Government will not endear him to the administration. Indeed, the suggestion was in the nature of an affront to the President, since it assumed a willingness on his part to negotiate a more favorable contract on behalf of the Government than the one endorsed by the President and accepted by 18 unions and the operators.

To encourage the practice of bribing strikers into returning to work after Government seizure would, in our opinion, lead ultimately to the establishment of an intolerable labor dictatorship. But however short-sighted the advocates of such weak-kneed yielding under pressure may be, they are entitled, like Senator PEPPER, to voice their views with perfect freedom. His chief offense in the present instance lies in his failure to realize the futility and the impropriety of setting himself up masked as an intermediary in a dispute that is the concern of the President as representative of the Nation.

The Senator from Florida has also muddied the waters of debate by rash insinuations concerning the character and motives of

those opposing his labor program and by intimating that the coal and rail strikes were welcomed, if not actually fomented, by management. "There is evidence," he asserted, "that the mine owners have deliberately let this strike occur in order to break the power of the mine workers of the Nation. There is evidence that the railroad management is willing to let the country go through the emergency of a transportation stoppage, if, Mr. President, they can keep unimpaired their great wartime profits, or if public animosity toward the workers, or legislation that Congress might enact, would weaken the collective-bargaining power of the railway employees." Such unverified assertions, so obviously in conflict with the facts concerning the causes of conflict, distract attention from the real issues and raise a serious question as to what the Senator is driving at.

CHILD-CARE PROGRAM

The hearings which Representative KELLEY has scheduled for tomorrow and Wednesday on the maternal and child-welfare bill seem of dubious utility at present. For the intent of the bill and for its substantive provisions, we have, as we said when it was first introduced by Senator PEPPER, the keenest enthusiasm. It would make available through Federal grants-in-aid to the States, $100,000,000 for the purpose of providing medical care and health services for mothers and children and child-welfare services for emotionally sick and insecure children and for children without parental care or supervision. These services are genuinely needed. We have neglected the health of our children, the Nation's most precious resource.

But the child is a member of the family. Therefore maternal and child care should be treated as an integral part of a national health program. Senator PEPPER's proposal, as originally drafted, would assign administrative responsibility for maternal and child care to the Children's Bureau, which admirably administered a wartime emergency program in this field. Whatever the merits of this assignment a year ago, it seems incongruous now in the light of the President's reorganization plan. The plan proposes that the Children's Bureau be taken from the Labor Department and put into the Federal Security Agency, with the hope that Congress will provide for the elevation of this agency to departmental status.

The reorganization plan calls also for an integration of all the grants-in-aid programs in the health and welfare field. This is of prime importance in promoting Federal-State cooperation. And it is for this reason especially that we feel it would be unwise now to establish a new and independent grant-in-aid program in the Children's Bureau. The funds to be appropriated for maternal and child care should be entrusted without strings to the Federal Security Administrator (or, as we hope, to the Secretary of Welfare who will succeed him) and administrative responsibility should be in the United States Public Health Service under his supervision in conformity with an over-all Federal-State health and welfare program.

A Historic Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 27 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able editorial appearing in the Lynchburg News, owned by my colleague [Mr. GLASS] entitled, "A Historic Day."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HISTORIC DAY

The right to strike is not an absolute right.

That is what has been decided by the events of the last few days. It was the recognition of this fact by the President, by the Congress, by the American people, that ended the strike on the railways that threatened the very lives of the people.

The right to strike is not an absolute right.

That is what is recognized now by the leaders of the railway brotherhoods who presumed to act as if it were. To their sorrow they have found their error. It is what the leaders of the mine workers must find. It is what they must act upon.

It is not necessary now to inquire too closely into the terms on which the railway brotherhood leaders finally bowed to public opinion, reluctantly and whiningly, but bowing nevertheless. It is not necessary to inquire too closely into the legislation President Truman has recommended for dealing with the coal strike. We can appraise later the extent of the gains made by the railway brotherhoods, if any, by striking against the Government, against the public safety. We can appraise later the full virtues of the legislation, the President recommended, the House promptly passed by a whopping majority and the Senate surely will pass without undue delay. What stands out is that when men employed in an essential public-service industry dare to strike and deprive the public of the services of that essential industry they will be guilty of violation of statute laws as they have been guilty in the past of violation of moral law.

The right to strike is not an absolute right.

That decision made by the public when faced with suffering, even starvation, by a strike, will soon be embodied in the law of the land. That is what the Whitneys, the Johnstons, the Lewises have accomplished. For that involuntary contribution to the Nation's good, a contribution these leaders in their arrogance did not even know they were making, they get no thanks from the American people.

The Whitneys, the Johnstons, the Lewises, will get no satisfaction out of that contribution to the public good. They should not be permitted to escape the contribution they made to the ill repute into which organized labor has been brought these last few weeks and months. They have given organized labor a black eye. It will be only by the restraint the public places upon itself that the black eye is not a fatal wound. They have been false to their trust as labor leaders, false to their trust as American citizens. They have betrayed both the whole people to whom by the fact of citizenship they owed allegiance, and they have betrayed the small group of the people to whom they, by accepting office and emolument, owed allegiance. They should be done away with as leaders. Organized labor deserves better and more faithful servants than they, must get itself better and more faithful servants, or they will suffer in prestige, will suffer in privileges, may suffer loss of rights. One hundred and forty million people are not going to be subservient to a few hundred thousand blind led by blind, or incompetent, or corrupt leaders. President Truman's belated rise to the occasion, the cheers with which he was received, the promptness with which his recommendations were started on the road to becoming legislation gives evidence of that, if any were fools enough to doubt it at any time.

The right to strike is not an absolute right.

Whitney, Johnston, Lewis, and a few others by their arrogance, their insolence, their stupidity, and their consciencelessness in dealing with the American people have made that a truth in fact, as well as in theory, in statute as well as in moral law. Saturday was a great day for the American people. It can be made a great day for labor.

Emergency Strike Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for and support this emergency strike legislation although there are provisions in it which I do not like. The President of the United States has just announced that a state of emergency exits in the economic life of the Nation, a fact which anyone of average intelligence has known for some time, and he demands extraordinary powers to cope with it. It is the President's decision, as well as his responsibility, and I would not deny him what he asks.

I want to make a few remarks, Mr. Speaker, about the rule under which the House is operating in this matter and also make some observations on the bill itself.

We are acting under a suspension of the rules which limits debate to 40 minutes equally divided between the pros and the cons and which prohibits the consideration of any amendments to the bill. The Members, at the close of the 40 minutes of debate, have no choice but to vote yea or nay or refrain from voting at all. The legislation under consideration is important, far reaching, and will have a lasting effect on our whole national economy, and although the present serious emergency may demand prompt action, I do not like gag rule and the lack of time and opportunity for ample discussion and amendment. It savors too much of the legislative practices in vogue in Russia and is not the way of a free republican form of government. Furthermore, no Member of the House was given an opportunity to see a copy of the bill, let alone study it, before it was introduced. We have to take it or leave it and as I have already stated, I will take it because the administration states it cannot settle the paralyzing industrial strife without it, and this strife must be settled. I repeat, I do not like that way of legislating.

I would like to say a few things about the bill itself and point out briefly what I object to after a very cursory study of it. The measure is drastic, far more drastic than anything ever suggested by the Republicans, who are often called the enemies of labor. If this bill sets forth the labor policy of labor's "friends," labor certainly has odd friends. In addition, the bill is indefinite and in some places ambiguous; whoever drafted it for the President obviously did a rush job. The measure provides that a man who strikes against the Government without good cause will lose his seniority rights and yet it is claimed that no one has any right,

whether the cause is good or bad, to strike against the Government. Provision is also made that any man who refuses to work for the Government may be drafted into the Army. Will such an individual be required to work at his job in a seized plant, mine, or facility or become a soldier? If he is a soldier, I presume he would receive a soldier's pay, as now provided by law, no matter what he may be ordered to do. Then again, a seized plant cannot make any profits under the bill, even if the management is not to blame for the strike, and although the plant might have been taken over by the strikers. Apparently the owners of property in a labor-management dispute have no rights under this provision and the owners in the case of the railroads represent great numbers of the public. Is that fair, indeed, is it constitutional? I can subscribe wholeheartedly to the provision for a joint committee to study the labor-management problem and submit a report in 6 months' time. Something constructive should come out of that proposal, provided such a committee ignores politics and does a sincere and honest job for the Republic.

There is grave doubt in my mind that the President needs this legislation he seeks to bring order out of the scrambled economic condition the country is in. The War Labor Disputes Act of 1943, generally known as the Smith-Connally bill, gives the Chief Executive extensive powers and they would have been most effective if they had been used firmly and fearlessly. Some of the Members of the House addressed a letter to the President under date of yesterday, May 24, on this subject and I will include it at the end of my remarks. The truth of the matter is that during the past few years, and especially since VJ-day, the Nation's economic problems have been so completely mishandled by the administration and so permeated by political considerations that both management and labor have become arrogant and defiant of the public welfare. Such a state of affairs requires strong medicine for its cure, and this bill is strong medicine.

Just a word about the members of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen and the Brotherhood of Engineers. I believe them to be as fine and intelligent a group of workingmen as there is in our Nation today. Their loyalty to their country is unquestioned; they have served faithfully and well during the war years and their fellow countrymen are grateful. Their grievances should have prompt and sympathetic consideration and I feel sure their Government will see to that. But these men have been badly led; their cause has been hurt by their representatives. Their leaders defied the Government of the United States and gave little consideration to the security of the Nation. Such an attitude is a betrayal of trust and I hope that these intelligent and patriotic brotherhoods will purge themselves of all such influences in a constitutional and proper manner. Only by such action can they restore their own self-respect and prestige among their countrymen.

MAY 24, 1946.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Congress is now working on a number of legislative measures which have a direct bearing on the present strike situation. However, in the crisis facing the Nation we are at a complete loss to understand why you are not availing yourself of all the powers you possess under existing legislation.

Let us be specific. You have, on behalf of the Government, seized the mines and the railroads under authority of the War Labor Disputes Act of 1943 (generally known as the Smith-Connally Act), an act vetoed by your predecessor and passed over his veto by both branches of the Congress. As far as we can see, however, you have taken no action to make effective your seizure. Section 6 of the War Labor Disputes Act makes it unlawful for any person under specified penalties to "coerce, instigate, induce, conspire with, or encourage any person to interfere by —strike—or other interruption with the operation" of any "plant, mine, or facility" in the possession of the United States or to aid any such strike by giving "direction or guidance" in its conduct, or by providing funds for its conduct or direction, or for the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits. Can anyone doubt but that such unlawful acts have been and are being perpetrated? Is anything whatsoever being done to stop these willful violations?

It has been suggested that no conspiracy existed because the strikes were initiated prior to Government seizure. We cannot agree. Section 4 of the War Labor Disputes Act provides that a plant, mine, or facility in the possession of the Government "shall be operated under the terms and conditions of employment in effect at the time possession" was taken.

May we respectfully point out, Mr. President, that yours is the responsibility to stop at once the destructive forces which, growing from month to month, now paralyze our country. You have the authority to act. You have the prestige of office to effectuate a policy which would place the welfare of the country ahead of that of any small group. The Nation expects action.

Should you feel that you require legislative authority greater than you now have we stand ready to support whatever is requisite.

Respectfully yours,

AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Minnesota; JOHN W. HESELTON, Massachusetts; CLIFFORD P. CASE, New Jersey; WALTER H. JUDD, Minnesota; GEORGE A. DONDERO, Michigan; BARTEL J. JONKMAN, Michigan; HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Oregon; JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, New Jersey; ROBERT HALE, Maine; CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, Massachusetts; ELLSWORTH B. BUCK, New York; ANGIER L. GOODWIN, Massachusetts; RALPH W. GWINN, New York; JOHN PHILLIPS, California.

Presidential Inauguration Day in the Philippines

REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, today is inauguration day in the Philippines. President Sergio Osmeña is retiring from his high office, and his place is to be taken by the new President, Gen. Manuel Roxas.

This may be my last opportunity on this floor to express publicly as Resident Commissioner of the Philippines my admiration for our retiring President.

President Osmeña shall always live in the hearts of his countrymen as the very model of the public servant. Throughout his adult life he has lived only to promote the highest interests in the Filipino people. From his early days on Cebu, where he rapidly became the youngest provincial governor in our history, through the stormy days of political leadership in our struggle for national independence, and right on to the pinnacle of political success in our country, his honor has been undefiled, his devotion to duty unrivaled, his sincerity of purpose unmatched.

I do not think it is possible to find, in any nation of this earth, a man whose public record is so clear in integrity, probity, unselfishness, human understanding, and unflinching devotion to his duty, as is the record of Sergio Osmeña. Indeed, the story of his life is little more than the story of the Philippines for the past generation. The impact of his personality on our people has been felt from Manila to the remotest village of our archipelago. The wisdom of his decisions has speeded our development toward the independence which shall so soon be ours.

Today he relinquishes his office. He deserves a long rest, for his task as President has been a grueling one. He landed with the liberation troops on Leyte, and there began the difficult job of bringing order out of chaos, of reorganizing a disrupted government, of slowly bringing the country into a state approaching normality. There are few jobs, anywhere in the world, that have been harder than his. Yes; he deserves his well-earned rest. But I know that all of his countrymen now look upon him, not as a man retired, but as a man entering into a new and useful phase of his career. Henceforth Sergio Osmeña becomes the elder statesman of the Philippines. We shall continue to look to him for wise and dispassionate counsel during the difficult transition days that lie ahead for us.

It is a privilege for me to be able to stand before you now and speak my words of tribute to Sergio Osmeña.

Of Gen. Manuel Roxas, who today is inaugurated as the last President of the Philippine Commonwealth, I will have many occasions to speak in the future. Suffice it to say for the present that General Roxas opens a new chapter in the history of the Philippines. Heretofore our national leaders, the late President Manuel L. Quezon and the retiring President Sergio Osmeña, have been products of the Spanish system of private education. For the first time in our history a man whose thought patterns were molded entirely in the public schools of the Philippines is called by popular vote to lead our people. Manuel Roxas is the first of a generation of Filipinos who learned their A B C's from American teachers and who are imbued

with the democratic ideals of true Americanism to rise to power and to be given by the people's will the privilege and the responsibility of guiding the destiny of the Filipino Nation.

President Roxas is a symbol of our historic development. With his assumption of the presidential duties, a new generation of Filipinos comes into its own. This is the generation of younger men, reared in an American atmosphere, educated in American schools, taught to think in the American idiom and the American philosophy.

Soon, Mr. Speaker, the Philippines shall be an independent republic. But we reach our maturity at a time when those who are in power are closer to the American spirit than ever before. This is the very essence of the fraternal association that will continue to exist between our two peoples—an association that cannot be broken by the mere political act of establishment of our independent republic. It cannot be broken because it is a thing of the spirit and not of the law.

It is fortunate that this should be so, for in a country with a feudalistic economy such as we have there is need of a leader with the basic democratic background of General Roxas. The Filipino soldiers who fought in Bataan, Leyte, Panay, Mindanao, Cebu, and all over the Philippines and the rank and file of the Filipino people who resisted the invaders with courage, fortitude, and heroism for more than 3 years look up to him now as the man who will translate into reality their dreams of the better world for which they suffered and sacrificed.

Former Governor of his Province of Capiz, former speaker of the house of representatives, former cochairman of the Philippine Independence Mission that succeeded in getting the enactment of the Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act, former secretary of finance, brigadier general on General MacArthur's staff in Bataan and Corregidor, president of the Philippine Senate, and now President of the Philippine Commonwealth—this is the man who has won the support of his people because of his dynamic leadership, his matchless eloquence, his unquestioned understanding of economics, and his proven ability as legislator, executive, and far-seeing statesman. This is the new leader who will carry on his shoulders the tremendous responsibilities of a new nation just emerging from a terrible war—responsibilities such as very few of the world's elect are called upon to bear.

I bespeak for him, who by training and education is America's own, your support and cooperation.

Statue to the Late General Mitchell

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would provide that a statue be erected in Statuary Hall to the late General Mitchell. Certainly no man ever suffered more or was more severely crucified for the cause in which he believed so completely. The contribution which aviation made to the war proved conclusively that he was right. It is only justice to so recognize General Mitchell.

The bill I am introducing is as follows:

A bill to authorize the erection in the United States Capitol of a monument in memory of Brig. Gen. William Mitchell

Be it enacted, etc., That the Fine Arts Commission is authorized and directed to erect in the United States Capitol a statue in memory of Brig Gen William Mitchell.

There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of $25,000 to carry out the purposes of this act.

[From the American Weekly magazine]

BILL MITCHELL, PROPHET WITH HONOR; TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO THE GREAT, FARSEEING AMERICAN ASSERTED THE SUPERIORITY OF AIR POWER OVER SEA POWER, BUT THE BRASS HATS BUSTED HIM; NOW THE ATOMIC BOMB IS PUTTING AMERICA'S MILITARY AND NAVAL COMMANDERS TO A SIMILAR AND MUCH GREATER TEST

(Maj. R. W. (Shorty) Schroeder, like the late Maj. Gen. William (Billy) Mitchell, was a combat pilot in World War I, and was one of the earliest associates of America's first great apostle—and martyr—to air power. Last year Major Schroeder was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross in belated recognition of a heroic experimental high-altitude flight he undertook at Mitchell's behest in 1920. On that flight he nearly lost his life when he "blacked out" in a power dive and his plane plunged nearly 7 miles toward the ground before he recovered control and pulled the plane out of the dive to land safely.)

(By Maj. R. W. (Shorty) Schroeder)

If God would grant me one last request, it would be a simple one to make.

I'd ask Him to let Billy Mitchell live again for just one day—the day that the Navy finally tries out an atomic bomb on a bunch of battleships and seagoing warcraft.

I imagine I can hear the general say right now: "Well, boys, this is where I came in 25 years ago. But I hope they give the atomic bomb a better hearing than they gave me. Not for any vindication on my part. I don't need it now. The men who flew the planes in this war are vindication enough. But God knows this Nation of ours is at stake in this question of atomic- and air-power effectiveness against surface craft."

I've got a hunch that if my last request isn't granted—and I doubt that it will be—old Billy's spirit will be watching if and whenever they put on the show.

The big question today is, What will this new danger from the skies do to American sea power? The same question was being asked more than two decades ago when Billy Mitchell tried to shake the brass hats out of their lethargy and make them see the menace that budding air power held for the battleship.

This time the men to whom we entrust our command of the seas seem alive to the new danger. In the plans tentatively made this last winter for an experiment in the lagoon of Bikini Atoll in the Pacific, it was provided that all types of warcraft would be subjected to the destructive power of the atom bomb. What a show that would be. Battleships, cruisers, destroyers. The whole works. Such planning certainly indicates a lively curiosity and we can be thankful for at least that much.

All this assembled for another chapter in a serial Billy Mitchell started 25 years ago.

Everyone is worried this time. Even some of the brass hats who knocked Mitchell down, ripped the buttons from his tunic and broke his heart.

As I indicated, this is not the first time that sea power has been put on trial by air power. They've merely got a new and more deadly bomb than they had before to let fly at the warhips.

It's the climax round of Mitchell's original fight. He started right after the last war to prove that an airplane, carrying bombs, could sink a battleship. He sank three.

The brass hats wouldn't accept his results and when he refused to give up his fight, they persecuted him and the Nation almost lost a war.

This time there's even more at stake. They're dealing with some stuff which only the scientists know much about. The scientists and the military brains want to see if this new and horrible bomb can sink a modern battleship. They also would like to know what the release of this atomic energy does to the sea itself.

Certainly, no one has forgotten that a few Jap fliers broke the British resistance around Singapore and with them the British Navy's slowness in accepting air power. Several airborne missiles ripped His Majesty's battleships *Repulse* and *Prince of Wales* and they went down like rocks when we needed them most.

The experts say that the atom bomb may make the Navy of the future turn almost completely to air power. But let's look a little to the past.

Back in those days after we'd flown "flaming coffins" all over the place trying to combat superior German planes, Billy Mitchell started a crusade and a campaign similar to this one coming up for the atomic bomb.

He dedicated his life to prove the value of aircraft in wartime as well as peacetime. But he fought a losing battle even when his experiments sank battleships and proved that the next war would be fought a whole lot of the time 25,000 to 30,000 feet above the ground.

Mossbacks, skeptics, and bureaucrats, handcuffed by tradition, sneered at him. Then they went after him. He was demoted, then stripped of the uniform he loved and fought for so much.

Had those brass hats not kicked him around, the *Repulse* and the *Prince of Wales* might now be riding at anchor in Singapore Bay. Pearl Harbor might—yes, probably would have been—averted. A lot of good American boys might be walking around today instead of being buried in graves in some desolate spot of a forlorn land.

It wasn't until September 1, 1939—the day the Nazis hit Poland with the then mighty Luftwaffe—that official stupidity was shaken and we awoke one morning to find war around the corner and we had just 20 heavy bombers. None of those was in first-line condition.

Billy, who died in 1936, had a few disciples. We can thank God for men like Gens. Douglas MacArthur, H. H. "Hap" Arnold, and Carl Spaatz, who finally won support for Billy's theories and built us an air force that slaughtered the Nazis and sank the Japs.

"Once upon a time, but not so long ago," said a commentator on a recent radio program, "there lived a man who saw eagles in the sky. And that man's name, written eternally among the ever-shining stars, was Billy Mitchell."

On the same program was Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, who told of long association with Billy, beginning when he drove Mitchell's staff car in France. Maybe you'd be interested in knowing what "Rick" had to say about this great man: "Under his driving bluster, he was human and warm. On our whirlwind cross-country drives, rank was forgotten. He would discuss his troubles with me. As a storm center, Mitchell rushed into places where even cyclones feared to howl. When the dirigible *Shenandoah* crashed in 1925, Mitchell attributed it to

'incompetency, criminal negligence and almost treasonable administration of the national defense by the War and Navy Departments.' After the court martial, Billy Mitchell led a more or less retired life on his farm in Virginia. But he continued to fight with a tireless and eloquent pen, and as the years went on, time took up the cudgel for air expansion where Billy Mitchell left off."

For the record, members of the court martial which was convened October 28, 1925, to hear charges against Mitchell were Maj. Gens. Charles P. Summerall, Robert L. Howze, who served as president of the court; Fred W. Sladen, Douglas MacArthur and William S. Graves; Brig. Gens. Benjamin A. Poore, Albert J. Bowley, Edward L. King, Frank R. McCoy, Edwin Winans, George L. Erwin and Ewing E. Booth. Col. Blanton Winship served as the judge advocate general, Col. Sherman Moreland as the trial judge advocate general, and Lt. Col. W. I. McMullen as the assistant trial judge advocate general.

Under his rights as defendant, Mitchell challenged three members of the court and they were excused from service: Summerall, Sladen and Bowley. On November 17, Majs. Francis B. Wildy and Allen W. Gullion were added to the court staff as assistant judges advocate general.

The lone vote for acquittal of Billy Mitchell was cast by Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

I've been asked a lot of times just what manner of man was Mitchell.

Well, I suppose he was some sort of a prophet. He preached and pleaded for a big air force.

He stepped on a lot of official toes all over the place to tell his countrymen the truth which he believed they should and had a right to know.

He was a fighting man in and out of battle.

I remember one time, shortly after the First World War, when Billy had asked me to get busy and develop a plane that would fly higher than any known to man.

I had been thinking along these lines myself, and I had found a turbocharger in a junk pile near Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio.

I mentioned this to Bully, and he asked me why I didn't get some new material. I told him that it required money, which we didn't have. Billy snorted:

"Get busy. I'll get you the dough if I have to beat some armchair brass hat over the head for it."

He got the money.

Another time Billy called me to Washington, where some War Department brass was sold on either an English or French type of plane. I had told Billy that the German Fokker could outfly and outfight either of them and that we should develop our own type of plane.

Billy agreed, but he needed to prove it.

Mitchell, ostensibly showing off the flying prowess of the English and French planes, ordered me to race a Fokker against them. I won easily. Again we had our way.

Billy never was a stuffed shirt. He was equally popular with enlisted men and officers.

Now, I may be a skeptic, but I keep thinking

"Just what's going to happen if and when they try out the new atom bomb on battleships? I mean, what's going to happen to the findings?"

I keep telling myself that this time the Nation is going to be the benefactor. This time the results are going to be studied and not pigeonholed like they pigeonholed Billy, and then, even after his death, pigeonholed three times the move to grant him posthumously the rank of major general on the Army's records.

Almost unbelievable is the fact that there are still some brass hats in Washington who fight even this honor for one of the greatest heroes the Nation ever had. All three times the resolution has passed the Senate without dissent—and each time it has been pigeonholed by the House Military Affairs Committee.

I burn up even when I think of the chance that they might treat atomic-bomb findings like they treated Billy's results and the moves to grant him the medal which he so richly earned.

It won't happen if the press and the people of this country keep their eyes open.

We can't afford to have hide-bound brass hats, fearful of their jobs, pigeon-holing atomic findings. They must not be allowed to do that.

There's a great advantage now that Billy didn't have in his days.

We've still got General MacArthur, who was a member of the military court which tried Billy and alone voted for his acquittal.

We've got air-minded Eisenhower, and Spaatz, and Arnold, and Kenney, and other courageous men who saw what air power did in this war.

We've got Nagasaki and Hiroshima to remind us what the atomic bomb can do.

We've also got Cologne, Berlin, and a hundred other cities to show what air power can do even without the atom bomb.

If we could dive deeep enough we could find a lot of Jap and German battleships that confirmed truths Billy Mitchell established 25 years ago.

We just can't be pigeonholed again.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

The President's Strike Record

REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a telegram from manufacturers in a great industrial city in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent stating:

All manufacturers in Jamestown completely shut down due to coal emergency.

I am inserting under unanimous consent an article by George E. Sokolsky which appeared in the Times-Herald of May 25, 1946, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The President seems to be a leisure gentleman who takes his time about things. He waited 40 days to become cognizant of John L. Lewis' coal strike. He took at least a month to acknowledge the perils of the railroad strike.

A maritime strike has been announced for the middle of June by Harry Bridges and Joe Curran. I wonder if Mr. Truman has heard about it yet?

Mr. Truman is one for taking advice from carefully selected advisers. For instance, his economists advised him that following VJ-day this country would suffer from deflation, that some 8,000,000 would be out of work, and that prices would collapse.

Why Mr. Truman should have accepted the advice of these great minds, whose opinions ran counter to all knowledge, wisdom, and human experience, is beyond understanding. But he did.

A formula was worked out by these pedants to raise wages without increasing prices on the supposition that industry could operate for 6 months at a loss.

Every idea in this formula turned out to be wrong. Instead of deflation came inflation. Instead of prices falling they rose.

Instead of wages rising without prices rising came a series of Government-inspired and fomented strikes which threw this country into a spiral inflation, the end of which is not yet on the horizon.

Every advice given the President by Chester Bowles, Henry Wallace, Leon Henderson, Robert Nathan, and the rest of the smart products of bookworm wisdom worked exactly in reverse.

Now, on the matter of the coal strike, his wisdom came, according to reports, from Dr. John R. Steelman and George Allen. The theory was to let John L. Lewis and the coal operators "sweat it out."

John L. Lewis is a good sweater, and the coal operators have nothing to lose but their mines. So they can sweat.

Actually the "sweating out" was by the American people. Every business, every home, every individual is affected. The President himself had to sit in a brown-out.

Yet for some reason the President sat around and waited while the advisers advised. No issue arose in the coal strike after the fortieth day which was not on the cards all the time.

The welfare fund was first projected by David Dubinsky and was picked up by James Caesar Petrillo.

Obviously, if they got away with it, every labor leader will try to get away with it. Should Lewis get a welfare fund, every union will try for one. Why not?

The function of officialdom is to know what is happening in the country and to anticipate trouble. So far as the American people are concerned, it is the President and not his advisers who are responsible for whatever occurs.

He can, if he chooses, advise with Popeye or Superman or Dick Tracy—and I fear some of his advisers are of that ilk.

But when a President sits around for 40 days, sweating it out, while the productivity of his country is tobogganing, he cannot be regarded as a serious-minded person who knows what he is doing.

It is impossible for the economy of this country to mark time until after the 1946 congressional elections. Mr. Truman apparently prefers not to make decisions that endanger his majority in Congress.

Mr. Hannegan would prefer him not to antagonize the CIO and the PAC. Mr. Allen and Mr. Snyder want him to hold business and the farmers in line.

Mr. Bowles wants to be elected Governor of Connecticut. Paul Porter wants to go back to the FCC, where he can continue his program of limiting freedom of the radio. Everybody wants something and gives advice.

But the American people also want something, and they want it now. Now and not in November. Now and not after election day.

Mr. Truman has to make up his mind whether he is managing a congressional election or whether he is President of the United States.

It may be a difficult decision to make; yet he cannot avoid making it and hold his job. The course of events brooks no delay—and he cannot change that course by gazing at the heavens through Henry Wallace's astrological devices. It is time to swim or sink.

President-Elect Roxas Visits the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARLOS P. ROMULO

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. ROMULO. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, upon the invitation of the United States Government, President-elect Manuel Roxas came to Washington accompanied by the Honorable Paul V. McNutt, United States High Commissioner to the Philippines.

During his stay in this city, he made certain press statements and delivered speeches which I ask the unanimous consent of the House to insert in the RECORD today, together with the press releases and addresses made by High Commissioner McNutt. They are state papers that are of great value in fostering mutuality and understanding between the American and Filipino people.

Following is a press release issued from the office of the commanding general, Army forces of the Pacific:

MAY 9, 1946.—President-elect Manuel Roxas, accompanied by United States High Commissioner Paul V. McNutt, conferred with General MacArthur last night on his way to the United States.

The subject matter of the conference was not revealed. In response to a question as to his views on the attacks which have been made in the United States against Roxas as a collaborationist, General MacArthur replied:

"Roxas is no collaborationist. I have known him intimately for a quarter of a century, and his views have been consistently anti-Japanese. During the Bataan-Corregidor campaign, he was one of my most trusted and devoted officers and conducted himself with utmost gallantry.

"When Quezon left the Philippines, Roxas was purposely left behind as his representative to conduct matters of civil government and to further the continued resistance of the Filipino people. After General Wainwright's surrender, I eventually established contact with Roxas from Australia, and thereafter he not only was instrumental in providing me with vital intelligence of the enemy but was one of the prime factors in the guerrilla movement. When he came into our lines in North Luzon early in 1945, in answer to an accusation of collaboration, his case, like that of any other soldier of the Philippine Army, was referred to the Loyalty Board which completely exonerated him.

"The handling of the collaborationist problem in the Philippines has been in the hands of the Philippine government almost from the beginning of the liberation of the Philippine Islands. Original arrests for security reasons were made by the Army but the prosecution of the cases was completely turned over to the Philippine government in August 1945. That government has acted positively and decisively on the problem. Under the leadership of Roxas, then senate president, legislation was passed setting up a people's court for such purpose. It is reported that between five and six thousand alleged collaborationists are now awaiting trial. The first recently completed was that of Sison, a member of Laurel's 'cabinet,' who was convicted of treason and sentenced to life imprisonment. Laurel, the puppet president, and three members of his 'cabinet' together with Vargas, the puppet 'ambassador' to Tokyo, were arrested by our occupation forces in Japan and are now being held in custody until called for by the Philippine government for trial.

"The recent election which selected Roxas for the presidency reflected the repudiation by the Filipino people of irresponsible charges of collaboration made in foreign countries by those who lack an adequate knowledge of the circumstances.

"Roxas is now on his way to the United States and I bespeak for him a most cordial welcome by all Americans. He is a stanch patriot, and a most fitting representative of a people whose loyalty to our cause, under one of history's most exacting tests, has earned for them our undying honor and affection and our unending concern for their future welfare."

The following is a press statement that was issued by the President-elect of the Philippines upon his arrival in Washington on May 9:

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Brig. Gen. Manuel Roxas, newly elected chief executive of what will be on July 4 the Philippine Republic, arrived at Bolling Field today, accompanied by High Commissioner Paul V. McNutt, to be the guest of the United States for a 7-day series of conferences with President Truman and other United States officials on Philippine-American problems.

President-elect Roxas, who will assume office as head of the Philippine Commonwealth on May 28, flew here with McNutt in the High Commissioner's plane by way of Tokyo, Adak, and Seattle. He will stay at the Blair-Lee House, residence of official guests of the United States.

General Roxas, on arrival, said he was "delighted and deeply affected by the prospect of meeting President Truman who has shown such deep sympathy and understanding of our problems.

"Independence will be granted us in little more than 1 month. We have mountains to move before then. The Philippine people have given me a mandate and a heavy responsibility to lead them forward to nationhood.

"On this particular mission we carry the hopes of the entire Philippine people. I have the endorsement of President Osmeña for this mission.

"Although we have already been given concrete evidence of American good will and willingness to help us recover from the ravages of war, we are still the possessors of a devastated land. We need financial assistance to meet emergency needs. We face the immediate future without governmental funds. We face the great adventure of independence with a destroyed and broken economy. We are beset with grave social and economic maladjustments which must be corrected.

"I am sure the United States will not let us down. The people of the Philippines in electing me asked for action. I shall try to give it to them."

High Commissioner McNutt said, "I am proud of the opportunity to present to President Truman the choice of the Philippine people for their next president who will soon be president of the Philippine Republic. The Philippines are America's experiment in offshoot democracy. We are going to discuss with officials here what the United States can do to support and maintain that democracy in the immediate months and years ahead."

The following are the introductory remarks of Hon. Paul V. McNutt, United States High Commissioner to the Philippines, on a broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System, on May 10, 1946:

I have just come from seeing democracy, in its raw and elemental phase, justify itself as a political system of government. I have seen it take hold among a people but lately snatched from the iron jaws of dictatorship.

I returned to Manila from the United States on April 20, just 3 days before the holding of a national election.

That election occurred only 8 months after the complete liberation of the Philippines. In those islands today, the frightful imprint of war is everywhere. The physical destruction of an entire nation is epitomized in the ghastly ruins of Manila. The imprint of war, the impact of unequalled brutality and savagery is stamped indelibly in the minds of the Philippine people. Yet, in spite of this, a national election had to be held to choose a president, a vice president, and members of a congress.

We had reason to be concerned over this election.

The axioms and rules of democracy can easily be forgotten in the holocaust of war. Japanese propaganda to which the Philippine people were exposed for 3½ years might have had an insidious effect. The habits of violence and disregard for law and authority—prevalent throughout the Japanese occupation—are dangerous stimulants whose effect might not have worn off even after liberation.

There were and are thousands of guns in the hands of civilian groups in the Philippines. Some of these groups are organized along military lines. During the election campaign much bitterness developed. There was talk of large-scale violence and even of revolution. The people were arrayed in two grimly hostile camps. Tempers mounted to the straining point as election day approached. There were those who advised martial law, there were those who predicted that if one or the other of the two major candidates for the presidency won, the streets and countryside would run red with fratricidal blood. It was said that there were desperate groups on both sides who would not accept the victory of the other. I cannot say that I was not deeply disturbed. Yet I had faith, at times it was only a hope, that the reasonableness of democratic procedures, for which these same people had fought and bled during 4 years of war, would prevail.

On the day before the elections, I issued an appeal to the Philippine people to accept the decision of the ballot box. I said in part, "Once the choice of the people of the Philippines has been determined, the ranks of Filipinos must close for the all-important struggle ahead. This is an obligation which the people and their leaders of the Philippines owe to their own country, to the United States, and to the watching people of the Orient.

"The fundamental obligation of all free men is to recognize the will of the majority as the law of the land, but the law of the land and the conscience of the people must protect the rights of the minority as zealously as those of the majority."

Still there were many anxious hours, dramatic and exciting hours, as we waited through a day and a night and a succeeding day not so much for election results as for reports from the so-called unrest provinces in central Luzon and in Mindanao, far to the south of us.

The hours rolled by and the anticipated reports of large-scale disorders failed to materialize. There was some violence, yes; but nothing on the scale which had been feared. On the whole, order prevailed. The people in magnificent numbers went to the polls and voted their convictions. Of the 2,800,000 voters who registered, approximately 93

percent voted, despite the unimaginable difficulties of transportation, in traveling to the polling in the isolated villages of the remote Philippine hillside.

The outcome of the elections was decisive. Before the actual voting took place, the guesses were divided * * * and they were only guesses * * * as to who would win. Most of the guessers were entirely wrong in detail, even if not as to the gross outcome. It was a people's rather than a politicians' election. Manuel Roxas, candidate of the opposition, was swept into office by a resounding majority.

And then came the major miracle of democracy. There were tense moments when wild rumors filled the Manila air that the election commission would declare all ballots invalid, that the incumbent administration would refuse to abide by the election results, that revolt was about to explode.

But first imperceptibly, then swiftly the air cleared. President Sergio Osmeña, the magnificent old man of Philippine politics, gracefully conceded and urged his followers to observe the rules of democracy and rally round the new leader of the Philippine Nation.

Newspapers and politicians vied with each other in editorial and news columns in accepting the verdict of the people and in acknowledging the choice of the majority. Within a few days, election bitterness had largely disappeared, and this people, trained in American political ways, turned their faces to the future, their future as an independent nation, under the de facto leadership of their new President.

Actually General Roxas has not yet been inaugurated. But incumbent President Osmeña generously accepted the good offices of the United States High Commissioner in effecting an informal agreement with General Roxas for joint consultations on all matters of policy during the remaining days of the Osmeña administration.

The United States Government, during this election, took the greatest pains to avoid any semblance of partisanship. Federal Government employees were directed to maintain in official act and word the most scrupulous neutrality. More than once during the campaign I told the Philippine people that the United States had no candidate in this election, neither Sergio Osmeña nor Manuel Roxas. On the day before the elections, my office found it necessary to issue a statement denying a politically inspired report that General Roxas was the candidate favored by the High Commissioner.

But the day that the election results became clear, the day President Osmeña conceded, our attitude was galvanized. Manuel Roxas became the leader of the Philippine people. And as such I felt it my duty to begin working with him immediately, with the assent of President Osmeña, to carry on the great unfinished tasks—indeed tasks scarcely begun—for the liquidation of commonwealth status and the inauguration of the new Republic of the Philippines.

Although I had just returned to Manila from a prolonged mission to the United States, I agreed to a proposal by President-elect Roxas that I accompany him on a brief trip here for a series of conferences with United States officials.

In the midst of our planning, there arrived in Manila an invitation from President Truman to President-elect Roxas to come to the United States as the guest of this country. And so we came.

Gen. Manuel Roxas is a brilliant and dynamic leader. Bearing the fresh mandate of electoral victory, he is here to discuss the vital needs of the democratic experiment which the United States is sponsoring in the Pacific. We stand to gain greatly if this experiment succeeds. We stand to lose irretrievably if it fails. As the chosen leader of the heroic people involved in that experiment, Manuel Roxas is destined to be an important figure in our times. We depend heavily upon him and his people, as they depend heavily on us. It gives me great pleasure and deep satisfaction to introduce to the radio audience President-elect Manuel Roxas of the Philippines.

Following is the text of the speech of President-elect Roxas over the Columbia Broadcasting System on May 10:

I am not a stranger in America. My first visit here was in 1923, when I was a member of one of the early independence missions which came to ask that our deep yearning for political independence be satisfied. I have been here many times since.

But America is much more to me than a country I have come to know by travel and residence. America is, in a sense, my country, and will be until July 4 of this year. Since 1898, when I was 6 years old, I have been a national of the United States, owing allegiance to your flag and to your Constitution, subject to your laws and the provisions of your Congress. In the 47 years that I have been an American national I have learned to know and to admire and to believe wholeheartedly in the philosophy of life which you exemplify and have taught us. Your system of government by law rather than by men is our system. Your system of a tripod-type government—of executive, legislative, and judicial branches, with coordinate powers and responsibilities—is our system of government. Your institutions are our institutions. Your political and moral principles are our political and moral principles. Although the color of our skin is brown, the temper of our minds and our beliefs is almost identical with yours. The Philippines, in governmental system and tradition, is a replica in miniature of the United States. There has been transplanted to a land 10,000 miles across the seas the seed of American democracy. We hold as firm a devotion to the institutions of democracy as you have here. I think our people have proved their devotion to those institutions beyond all question or doubt.

Yet we must begin our national existence on July 4 with grim and tragic obstacles confronting us. We begin our national existence in a land torn and shattered by war. The wheels of industrial and agricultural production are in large measure idle. We have almost no transport to link our 7,000 islands. Our communications are broken down. World food shortages, combined with the ravages of war, face us with a severe food crisis. The stark spectre of hunger looms over the land. Our capital goods, our machinery, our factories and homes are in ruins. Our export trade, beginning only now to be restored, is but a modest fraction of what it was before the war. We are in the grip of a ghastly inflation. Mass unemployment is increasing daily.

Many people of my country have been seized with a deep sense of unrest. Some of them anxiously and hopefully inspect foreign ideologies, and look for new panaceas. In some few parts of the country, law and order has broken down. Yet the goal of economic plenty has been glimpsed by many in the midst of the swift rush of events of recent history. In the Philippines today we are faced both with the problem of binding up the wounds inflicted by war and at the same time bringing a new era of plenty to the large underprivileged sectors of the population. I have pledged my earnest efforts to advance this development.

We are not deceiving ourselves. We must travel a long and difficult road. It cannot be brought about by a mere laying on of hands. It can be accomplished only by hard, patient and persistent toil over a long period of time. The Philippine people are ready and willing to undertake such a task.

But the United States to whom we gave all our devotion during the recent world conflict is necessarily a major factor in all our plans for future development. Our prospects for national existence would be bleak if we could not hold to the hope that the United States will stand firmly by our side with assistance and counsel during the difficult months and years ahead. We have not asked and are not asking for a gratuity. We have asked and are asking only for the opportunity to help ourselves. Give us a chance to make democracy in the Pacific succeed. Give us a chance to secure and maintain the independence you are about to grant us.

The United States Congress has already taken steps to assist us to recover from the ravages of war. The Congress has granted us 8 years of free trade and 20 years of gradually decreasing tariff preferences following the free-trade period. The Congress has authorized to be appropriated the sum of $520,000,000 for the payment of war damages to private and public property.

For this we are grateful. One of the purposes of my coming here on the eve of my inauguration as President of the Philippine Commonwealth is to express as fervently and as often as I can to as many people as I can the heartfelt gratitude of the people of the Philippines for your understanding and assistance. I must make plain, however, that the trade concessions granted us do not represent an outright grant on your part. We are called upon to give your products and your exports the same concessions in our markets as you give ours. And for the next several years, at least, your exports to the Philippines will far exceed in value our exports to the United States. The balance of trade will be overwhelmingly favorable to you. But I do not wish to speak in terms of dollar benefits. I do not wish to weigh in the balance the dollars that will be earned by your exporters against the dollars that will be received by our producers. I realize that the measures which have been enacted by the United States Congress provide a feasible formula, which together with other steps which must be taken by both the United States and the Philippines, will permit the gradual rehabilitation of our economy. Meanwhile we have made plans for an over-all reconstruction of our economy so that eventually—and the sooner the better—we will not be dependent upon trade preferences in the United States; so that eventually we will not be solely dependent upon the United States market for our national existence. We hope to industrialize and to diversify and to construct an economy capable of sustaining an increasingly high standard of living, to achieve full employment and profitable employment.

The measures which have been provided for the rehabilitation of our economic life and for the repayment of our war damages will not in themselves produce an immediate reconstruction of our economy. Meanwhile the needs of the Philippine people are immediate. We must have food, we must have funds with which to finance the activities of government, to provide for the restoration of law and order, the encouragement of production and the beginning of a program of social reform.

I am sure that our needs will not fall on deaf ears in Washington. The American people who have watched over our welfare for so many years, who liberated us from the enemy and who have indicated their desire to see our Nation thrive and our people prosper, will be willing, I think, to give us the immediate assistance we require. Remember that today you have in the Philippines not only an ally but a protagonist of your own way of life. It is for the advancement of that way of life, as well as for the welfare of my people, that I have come to the United States to discuss our problems with your leaders. I was in the Philippines during 3½ years of tragic Japanese occupation. I have seen with my own eyes and felt

in my own person the tremendous pressures exerted to win us over to the designs of the so-called greater east Asia coprosperity sphere. United States High Commissioner Paul V. McNutt has given eloquent testimony to the American people that this attempt did not succeed. I can tell you without qualm or qualification that not for one moment during the occupation did the Philippine people waver in their complete devotion to the American cause and to our common ideals. The Philippine people resisted the enemy, but at what great cost. They resisted passively with the weapons of indifference, of disobedience and of scorn. They resisted actively with guns, bolo knives, and with grim courage. Many of those who resisted are no longer here to bear witness to the fact. They were victims of a violent Japanese vengeance which knew no bounds of humanity in the grim retribution for pro-American acts and pro-American thoughts. Hundreds and thousands of my countrymen died in this cause. Though we mourn them, their deaths were not in vain. I think we have proved to the people of the world the validity and the strength of the ideals of freedom and human dignity. Violence and cruelty cannot destroy those ideals. Brute force cannot drive the love of democracy and liberty from men's minds.

During the Japanese occupation there was little that could be done to alleviate the sufferings and humiliations of the people. The enemy was the more savage against us because he could not sway the loyalty of our hearts. Appeal as he would and did to the false doctrine of race, he could never understand our rejection of that doctrine. In his impotent fury, he committed against us unbelievable acts of cruelty, as the shadow of defeat came closer. Liberation, though it brought with it the destruction of much of our land, was the happiest day in our history. It is soon now to be followed by the grant of independence.

In preparing to assume our future role as an independent nation, we are showing no ingratitude to the United States. We are showing no forgetfulness of the great gifts which American sovereignty brought us; rather we are reflecting the teachings of American patriots and heroes whom we revere as much as you do. We are following the path toward independence charted for us by your leaders during 47 years of political association. We have taken to heart the lessons of liberty you taught us. We hope to practice them, to advance them, to maintain them. We are not cutting our ties with the United States, we are merely terminating the period of political dependence. What we propose to substitute instead is interdependence, a mutually beneficial relationship based on two great foundation stones; first, a mutually beneficial trade and a community of economic interests; and second, a steadfast mutual allegiance to identical political principle and to the maintenance of peace and security throughout the world.

We invite American capital and American businessmen to help us develop our homeland. There are vast opportunities in the Philippines for enterprise, for ingenuity, and for technical know-how. The Philippines are rich in resources, resources which have scarcely been touched. We have no prejudices against profits legitimately gained by a positive contribution to the economic life of our nation. But we expect that whatever development of our resources takes place shall take place under conditions which will be both profitable to enterprise and capable of contributing to the social and economic welfare of the great masses of the people. Not only must the damages of war be repaired, but the economic status of the Philippine people must be raised, the purchasing power of the people increased, and the stability of democracy made secure.

The United States can earn for itself in the Orient a national profit that will be beyond value and calculation. If a prosperous and free democracy can be built in the Philippines upon the ruins of war, the prestige of America and the American way of life will be raised to towering heights and the millions of people of the Far East will look to us and to you as their models.

On our side we are conscious of an obligation to you and to the world to promote this development. Our obligation is to represent political stability in the unstable Orient. Economically we of the Philippines need assistance, but politically we are secure in a chosen way of life, your way of life. We are the only people in the many-peopled Orient who understand their own destiny. We alone in the Far East bear aloft the banner of democracy without internal dissent. We carry that banner through convictions. We know that the eyes of the oriental world are upon us. We will not falter or fail.

Following are the remarks of Hon. Paul V. McNutt, United States High Commissioner to the Philippines, at a joint press conference with President-elect Roxas on Friday, May 11:

I did not think, when I arrived in Manila, less than 3 weeks ago, that I would be crossing the Pacific again so soon. I arrived in Manila on the eve of the national election. I made a quick survey of the local press predictions. They were very revealing and very interesting. Incidentally they happened to be completely wrong. Most of the Manila press and American press correspondents, too, reported that General Roxas didn't have much of a chance, that he was going to lose the business vote because he was too radical, the labor vote because he wasn't radical enough, the club vote because he had joined the wrong clubs, the farmer vote because he wasn't a farmer, and the Government worker's vote because he didn't control the Government. I have a dim recollection of reading similar predictions in the United States over the past 13 years.

During this election the United States took the greatest pains to avoid any semblance of partisanship. Federal Government employees were directed to maintain the most scrupulous neutrality. More than once during the campaign I told the Philippine people that the United States had no candidate in this election, neither Sergio Osmeña nor Manuel Roxas. On the day before the elections, my office found it necessary to issue a statement denying a politically inspired report that General Roxas was the candidate favored by the High Commissioner.

Election day passed. It took a week for the results to become absolutely decisive, to the satisfaction of the political managers of the administration party. Then, although great bitterness had characterized the election, President Osmeña gracefully conceded and the United States Government was able to take cognizance of the fact of the election of a new President.

We determined immediately to swing into action with the new leader of the Philippine people, and to begin working with him to carry on the great unfinished tasks—indeed tasks scarcely begun—for the liquidation of the Commonwealth and the inauguration of the Republic of the Philippines. When President-elect Roxas suggested a quick trip to the United States for the conduct of negotiations essential for the transition of Commonwealth to Republic, I easily assented. That is why we are here. We are in the process of carrying on those negotiations and those deliberations. I think General Roxas will tell you a little about them this afternoon.

But on the part of the United States Government, it was desirable that there be a signification of assent from the incumbent Philippine Administration that this mission be undertaken. President Sergio Osmeña gladly gave that assent and gave General Roxas his unlimited blessing. I have here a statement which President Osmeña gave me in Manila to be read in the United States concerning this mission. I read it to indicate the unity of over-all purposes which characterizes the Philippines today, in the general Filipino attitude toward the United States.

"President-elect Manuel A. Roxas is departing for the United States on a mission of great importance to the Philippines. He has the best wishes of my administration in his efforts to obtain decisions on questions that vitally affect the future welfare of the Filipino people.

'He is making the trip quickly—and before the inauguration—because of the urgent need for consultation with President Truman and other high American officials on the problems of Philippine rehabilitation and reconstruction and those connected with the establishment of the Philippine Republic.

"My administration has been informed in general terms of the scope and purpose of Mr. Roxas' mission to the United States.

"I bespeak for my successor-elect during his stay in America the same cooperation and understanding which I have always been accorded by the American Government and people.

"Mr. Roxas will need the help of all of us—Filipinos and Americans—in the great task that faces us before and after independence."

That is the statement of a great leader of his people, passing on the torch to his successor. Personally I have only one interest in my assignment as High Commissioner which will end not long after I return to Manila next week, following the fastest trip I have ever taken over the thousands of miles of separating distance. That interest is to see a free, democratic, liberal, and prosperous Philippines, a perpetual monument to American pioneering and American policy in the Orient.

That is why I am here today. That is why I am going back to Manila for a short period to see the Republic inaugurated and to speed it on its way. That is why I am glad to introduce to you today my friend and a true friend of America, President-elect Manuel Roxas, of the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

Following are the remarks of President-elect Roxas at the press conference held May 11, 1946:

This is my fifth official visit to the United States in the last 23 years. On my previous missions here I have come with other of my countrymen either to speed the grant of political independence or to urge measures that would make independence economically supportable.

Since my last visit here, in 1939, a great world conflict has convulsed civilization. We have emerged from that war, your country and mine, victorious; somehow through this war over-all world issues and purposes have become much clearer.

On this occasion it is my proud privilege to be the spokesman of my country in deliberations being held here to advance those purposes and those issues insofar as they affect the relations between the Philippines and the United States.

Philippine independence is no longer an issue. In a few weeks it will be a fact. The broad outlines of Philippine-American trade relations after independence have been laid down by the United States Congress and I must say, although we have not yet had occasion to act officially upon that trade formula, it is, in general, acceptable to us. Indeed we are grateful for the wisdom and the generosity you have shown in providing trade relations which are, as President Truman said, alien to the over-all international trade policy of the United States. You have provided preferential trade relations with the Philippines, although elsewhere in the world

you are trying to break down the system of trade preference.

We recognize, and recognize clearly, that your Congress approved such a formula precisely because it was the only feasible formula for the earliest possible revival of a skeleton economy in the Philippines whereas today we have virtually no productive economy, except for local consumption.

We recognize that your Congress took this action despite the danger that some might point out the anomaly of your seeking to eliminate trade preferences as a world system while you, yourself, established trade preferences with the Philippines. We recognize this act for what it is, a generous recognition of our historical association and of the services we performed for freedom and democracy during the war.

I believe, too, theoretically, in the lowering of trade barriers on a most-favored-nation basis throughout the world. But the Philippines are entering upon a national existence without means of economic sustenance other than an immediate market in the United States. There is no other substantial and permanent market in the world for our coconut products, our sugar, our cigars and tobacco. On the other hand the Philippines are a prime market for your products, too, as a matter of fact, your exports to the Philippines will far exceed in value Philippine exports to the United States for a good number of years. We hope, and I think you hope, too, that this trend will be arrested and reversed. High Commissioner McNutt, speaking on behalf of the United States Government, said in a speech only the other day in Manila—it seems strange to say only the other day in Manila—that the United States would rather see the Philippines develop industrially and prosper than to sell the Philippines all the goods we need to consume. That, incidentally, is typical of the enlightened attitude on the part of the United States which today is, and will be for generations, the wonder and marvel of the Orient.

One of the purposes which brought me here in the company of High Commissioner McNutt is the implementation of the legislation passed by your Congress. That implementation must be effected through an executive agreement between myself, when I become President of the Philippine Republic, and President Truman. But we are not waiting for July 4 to make these arrangements. We are already negotiating. There are other treaties and agreements which must be negotiated. We are working on all of them, and it is a long and almost tedious job. But it must be done. It is not as if there were any outstanding differences between the United States and the Philippines. Thank God the discussions here bear no resemblance to other treaty conferences which are taking place in other parts of the world today. We are all agreed on the general purposes and principles we want to see included in those treaties. There are some specific provisions which will require some discussion. We are starting those discussions here. We will carry them on in Manila, when Commissioner McNutt and I go back there.

You must realize the importance which my countrymen attach to this visit, which was approved by President Osmeña and the nation, generally, despite the fact that my inauguration as Commonwealth President is only 2 weeks distant and I haven't even organized my cabinet yet, not to speak of the other great concerns which attend the beginning of a new administration. But for us relations with the United States are and will always be, I hope, the keystone of our foreign policy and of our national and political economy. That is why I am here and why Commissioner McNutt is here.

There are other arrangements which must be made—financial arrangements rearranging the intimate connections between our currency and yours, and our financial structure and yours—and, of course, the immediate financial needs of our Government, which will have to be taken care of in the form of a loan. I am not as yet prepared to discuss details. We are still discussing policy.

Then there is the matter of military and naval bases, to which we are committed as far as the United States is concerned. But we want to know the details of American plans in that respect. There are other problems which I cannot discuss in detail as yet. But it is rather a full week's work.

Following is the text of a press statement issued on May 10, 1946:

President-elect Manuel Roxas of the Philippines today placed a simple wreath at the crypt in which lie the remains of Manuel L. Quezon, the late great leader of the Filipino people.

In a short, moving ceremony General Roxas, accompanied by United States High Commissioner Paul V. McNutt, and Resident Commissioner Carlos P. Romulo, and flanked by military aides and other officials of the Philippine Government, silently paid his tribute to his long-time friend and mentor who had selected Roxas as his heir and successor.

After the ceremony, President-elect Roxas said he planned to arrange for the early transfer of President Quezon's remains from Arlington Memorial Cemetery to a suitable depository in the Philippines. The arrangements for the ceremony were made by the Philippine Resident Commissioner's office.

The tribute was given after Mr. Roxas had spent the day in a round of official conferences beginning with President Truman and including Interior Secretary Julius Krug and Acting Secretary of State Dean Acheson. Roxas and McNutt also made a broadcast over a Nation-wide radio hook-up this afternoon.

The wreath laying was more than an official gesture from the first president of the soon-to-be Philippine Republic.

Quezon had been Roxas' old chief. They had been close personal friends. They were together at Corregidor.

It was President Quezon who first recognized Roxas' abilities as a leader. Quezon saw Roxas preside over a governors' convention and was so impressed by his skill that he urged him to run for a seat in the Philippine Legislature.

Roxas was speaker of the house of representatives for 11 years while Quezon was president of the senate. When Quezon was inaugurated president of the Philippine Commonwealth in 1935, he named Roxas secretary of finance.

Much of Roxas' popularity among Filipinos arises from the fact he exemplifies many of Quezon's qualities. And Quezon long ago referred to Roxas as his logical successor.

Following is the text of a press statement issued on May 13, 1946:

President-elect Manuel Roxas has designated Mr. J. H. Foley, manager of the Philippine National Bank in New York, as personal representative of President-elect Roxas for the coordination of efforts to secure for the Philippines surplus property available in the United States. Mr. Foley will report to Commissioner ROMULO.

General Roxas, who had an early breakfast conference with Mr. Foley this morning, said he had authorized Foley to acquire whatever technical assistance was necessary in order to keep in touch with all declarations of surplus property.

General Roxas said he was especially interested in rolling stock for the rehabilitation of Philippine railroads. Some rolling stock is available and has already been declared surplus that would be suitable for Philippine lines, General Roxas said. Foley was instructed to take immediate steps to ascertain the whereabouts of freight and passenger cars, some of which it was understood were manufactured in the United States for use on Japanese rails in the invasion, which are useless for United States rail lines because of the wider gage of United States railroads.

High Commissioner McNutt pointed out that under the provisions of the Tydings War Damage Act, the President of the United States is authorized to arrange for the transfer of surplus property from the United States to the Philippines under such conditions as he determines for the rehabilitation of the Philippines.

High Commissioner McNutt, General Roxas, and General Romulo called on Secretary of the Navy Forrestal and Admiral Nimitz of the Navy Department later this morning and upon Secretary of War Patterson at noon. A general discussion of matters of mutual concern was held with the War and Navy officials, the spokesman for the Roxas-McNutt mission said. No details are as yet available.

A group of more than 50 Senate and House leaders were scheduled to be guests of High Commissioner McNutt at a luncheon in the Senate dining room today with General Roxas as honor guest.

Following is the text of a press statement issued on May 14, 1946:

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Philippine President-elect Manuel Roxas told an informal gathering of congressional leaders today that a "business loan" of approximately $400,000,000 extended to the Philippine Government over a 5-year period would be required to support the costs of government through the early stages of the reconstruction period of the infant republic beginning July 4.

Describing the "dollar-poor" condition of the Philippine government as it approached its "great adventure in Pacific democracy," the newly-elected chief executive said his government would need a loan of $100,000,000 in its first year of existence to "support the bare essentials of rehabilitation and social reconstruction."

A total of 270,000,000 pesos ($135,000,000) will be required to meet government needs in the first year of independence Roxas said, whereas expectable income during the next year will be approximately 40,000,000 pesos ($20,000,000).

The President-elect who was guest of honor at a luncheon given by High Commissioner McNutt in the Senate dining room told Senate and House leaders that his Government would undertake to repay the loan with interest within a reasonable period of time. He said he would not ask for remission of interest rates or other concessions but asked merely for what Representative JED JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Appropriations Committee leader, defined as a "loan of convenience."

McNutt commenting on the Roxas proposal said it was "one loan which I am sure will be repaid."

Roxas in his first meeting with congressional leaders described himself as a fellow Congressman, recalling his long years of service as speaker of the Philippine Assembly and more recently as president of the Philippine Senate. He said he understood "the problems of the legislators in appropriating as well as the problems of the Executive in requesting."

Referring to the terms of the proposed loan, Roxas said the Philippines expected to pay interest as on any commercial loan. He recalled the fact that the Philippine Government had always met its external obligations. Roxas said the loan was required to pay salaries, to operate hospitals, maintain schools, and pay for the cost of essential public services, pending an expected growth in government revenues as a result of the economic reconstruction of the nation within the next 10 years.

Roxas said that after the first loan installment of $100,000,000 in the first year, the

second installment would be reduced by 12 to 15 percent, and the third, fourth, and fifth installments would be reduced by similar amounts. This would be a "Government loan," Roxas emphasized, distinct from an economic rehabilitation loan which might be requested to support a specific investment and development program.

The President-elect pointed out that recent congressional enactments providing for the rehabilitation of Philippine trade and the payment of war damages in the Philippines could not begin to be reflected in an increased national and governmental revenue for several years.

He said, due to the lack of funds, the Philippine Government plans a standing army of only between 12,000 to 15,000 men in addition to an insular police force of about 22,000. One of the pressing problems of his administration, Roxas said, would be the firm reestablishment of law and order simultaneous with a program of social reform "calculated to cure the economic ills which lie at the root of the economic unrest in my country."

"It is as much to the eventual interest of the United States as it is to the immediate interest of the Philippines to make our independence succeed," the President-elect said. "If we succeed, it is your form of government which will have overcome the tremendous obstacles which today confront us as a result of our participation in the war."

Roxas said that due to American Army expenditures in the Philippines, the islands were suffering from an enormous inflation, as a result of which the cost of living had increased to 12 times its prewar level. Roxas estimated it would take from 8 to 10 years for the Philippines to reach its prewar national income of $1,000,000,000.

The Philippine leader said that the heroism showed by his countrymen during the war and the loyalty displayed to the United States was a direct result of the farsighted statesmanship of the United States in its treatment of the Philippines since 1898.

Following is the text of a press statement issued May 14, 1946:

President-elect Manuel Roxas today submitted to Fiorello LaGuardia, director of UNRRA, a complete statement of Philippine needs from UNRRA, and with High Commissioner McNutt prepared to coordinate Philippine relief and food requirements in a separate conference with former President Herbert Hoover and Secretary of Agriculture Clinton Anderson tomorrow.

President-elect Roxas said through his spokesman today that among the requests made of UNRRA was one for both food supplies and agricultural equipment to be delivered to the Philippines as soon as possible. General Roxas requested also that machinery be provided for the establishment of factories in the Philippines for the manufacture of small farm equipment items for speedy distribution to Philippine farmers.

Roxas cited the precedent of UNRRA activities in China where similar factories have been established.

LaGuardia conferred with High Commissioner McNutt and President-elect Roxas at the Blair House at a luncheon meeting. Resident Commissioner Romulo also participated in the conference. Meanwhile an appointment was arranged for a meeting with former President Hoover sometime tomorrow. Secretary of Agriculture Anderson was invited to participate in the meeting in order to "tie up all angles on the food and relief needs of the Philippines for the next critical period," the McNutt-Roxas spokesman said.

The President-elect said no details could be made available on the financial requests made of UNRRA because they are still in a "fluid status" pending the gathering of facts to be brought out in investigations and discussions "now under way".

Mr. McNutt, President-elect Roxas, and General Romulo conferred with officials of the Export-Import Bank this morning and discussed in general terms a request for a rehabilitation and development loan. No amount was specified but High Commissioner McNutt indicated that the bank officials were "favorably impressed" although they indicated it would require a very specific description of the purposes and projects for which the loan would be intended.

Mr. McNutt told the bank officials that he had the impression that President Truman would favor the policy of a loan to the Philippines from the Export-Import Bank. No further details were made public although the spokesman for the mission said that both Commissioner McNutt and President-elect Roxas had "made out a strong case in their presentation to the Export-Import Bank." Further conferences are scheduled to follow.

It was disclosed that Mr. McNutt and Mr. Roxas had held an hour-long conference with Secretary of the Treasury Fred Vinson late yesterday afternoon, discussing the same proposition and also other aspects of the Philippine financial structure in its relations with the United States. General Romulo was present during the conference.

Earlier this morning, the Chinese Ambassador paid a courtesy call on President-elect Roxas at the Blair House, where he was received by Mr. Roxas, High Commissioner McNutt, and General Romulo. General Roxas said it was a "short but very friendly and satisfactory meeting during which a number of problems of mutual interest were discussed."

This afternoon Mr. McNutt, General Roxas, and General Romulo conferred with State Department officials and with War and Navy Department representatives regarding post-independence treaties covering military and naval bases No comment was available on these conferences which are merely in a "continuing status," the spokesman said.

Following is the text of a press statement issued May 15, 1946:

Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, chairman of the Senate Territories Committee, and Representative JASPER BELL, chairman of the House Insular Affairs Committee, in a breakfast conference with High Commissioner Paul V. McNutt, President-elect Roxas, and General Romulo today pledged sympathetic consideration of a proposal for a Philippine Government loan, the spokesman for the McNutt-Roxas mission said today.

The two congressional leaders, who discussed Philippine problems with the High Commissioner, General Roxas, and General Romulo for over an hour beginning at 8 o'clock this morning, indicated that they fully understood the predicament of the Philippine Government as it approached independence and would go along with a reasonable proposition. The spokesman emphasized, however, that neither leader had definitely committed himself on any specific program.

"Nor was there any effort on either Mr. McNutt's or General Roxas' part to so commit them," the spokesman said.

"It was a cordial and thoroughly useful meeting in which many of the problems of the Philippines were thrashed out and during which, among other things, the need of attracting American capital to the Philippines by an assured policy of nondiscrimination was emphasized by both Senator TYDINGS and Representative BELL," the spokesman declared.

Following the breakfast the President-elect had a full morning of conferences with business leaders and administrative officials of the United States Government, and also worked on an address which he was scheduled to deliver to the National Press Club this noon.

Following is the text of the remarks made by Hon. Paul V. McNutt, United States High Commissioner to the Philippines, introducing President-elect Roxas at the National Press Club on May 15, 1946:

Since coming to the United States on this trip, I have had the pleasure on several occasions of sharing public appearances with President-elect Manuel Roxas. That was, in fact, one of the purposes of our coming. I know of no audience to which I would more gladly introduce our guest today than to this one. I say "our guest" because I feel almost like a member myself, I have been here so often. And since most of you came here to listen to President Roxas rather than to me, I will be as brief as I can.

As High Commissioner to the Philippine Commonwealth I have had recently to maintain the interests of the United States on an even keel in the Philippines through the storms and buffets of a national election. It was not an easy job. Tempers ran high. Angry words were said on both sides. Irresponsible statements were made from both political camps.

The incumbent President of the Philippines, Sergio Osmeña, is a good friend. He was and is a good friend of the United States. So was and is Manuel Roxas. The United States had no choice in this election. It could not have had. We maintained a scrupulous neutrality.

The office of the High Commissioner was charged by Congress, when it voted in 1934 to set up the Commonwealth government as a transitional stage on the way to independence, with the representation of America's interests in the Philippines. Up to July 4 the United States has the ultimate responsibility for the welfare of these islands. Whatever authority has been delegated to the Philippine people themselves is a grant of authority by the sovereign power, the United States. Yet, since we were about to launch these people on the sea of nationhood, we were bound to respect the decisions and actions of the popular will in the Philippines. We were bound by them morally.

The Filipino people have in no way resented the exercise of legitimate American authority. They have observed, by and large, the compact of independence contained in the Tydings-McDuffie Act, to the letter. They have never taken advantage of our position of holding responsibility while yet progressively withdrawing authority.

My task has not been an easy one in the Philippines. The islands presented and still present today a heartbreaking picture of devastation and economic confusion. Some steps have been taken to bring order out of that confusion. But the chaos and confusion still exist. Yet my job could have been made much more difficult than it has been, if we had had to deal with a restive, resentful people anxious to mock us in our power before the eyes of the world, desirous of taking mischievous advantage of the interim period approaching independence.

For this forbearance, which is an innate and perfectly natural one in the Philippines, I must thank the leaders of all groups in the Philippines. They deserve the thanks and the gratitude of the United States, if for this alone.

I cannot but recall to this audience that at one time I opposed the grant of independence to the Philippines for the sake of the Filipinos. I did not think, at that time, which was in 1938, that the Filipinos could possibly survive economically under the conditions which were then laid out for their independence. Had there been no war, I think my fears would have been well-grounded. I think that most Filipino leaders at the time agreed with me.

But there was a war. The Filipinos proved their mettle as no other colonial people in

the world have. The resistance of the Filipino people to the ideology of Japan, and the armed might which the Filipino people provided from their rude and native arsenal against Japan, will go down in history with Thermopylae and Marathon. They did more than their part to save civilization for the world.

By the political maturity they showed during the war, the Filipino people earned for themselves the respect of the freedom-loving areas of the earth. They demonstrated an intrinsic right to independence and nationhood. Franklin D. Roosevelt understood that. He pledged them the resurrection of their independence and the guaranty of economic rehabilitation.

So today we are committed to economic measures which will assure the Filipino people of economic survival. The experience through which they passed demonstrated to them the benefits of democracy and the falsity of totalitarian doctrines. They are today alerted to the dangers of dictatorship ideologies.

For this reason and because we in the United States have been shown by dramatic example the advantages of close association with the Philippines, I no longer deem independence a casualty for the Philippine people, but rather a great opportunity for world service. But independence for the Philippines is an even greater opportunity for the United States. We have here the chance to demonstrate that our way of life and our system of government, as exemplified and transplanted to the Philippines, has the qualities of survival value in whatever difficult circumstances.

Never has a nation started out its beginnings with bleaker prospects. The land is laid waste. The cities are leveled. In an age of jet-propelled travel, when this very mission could sweep 10,000 miles across the sea in 40 hours, communications in the Philippines are still elemental. Hunger stalks the land. Thousands have died of hunger. The maimed and the injured remain yet to be tended. Veterans brood over their injustices. Armed bands of tenant farmers defy law and order in some areas. The school system is a shambles. All this is the result of war—of Philippine participation in our war.

We are not going to tell the Filipinos that they must solve unaided all their problems. We are going to help them in every way we can. Theirs is the primary responsibility, but their needs will not fall on deaf ears. We will give them a market for their primary agricultural products. We will provide part of the funds to repay their war damages. We will, I hope, extend them a loan for the support of their Government through its first revenue-poor years. We will extend them another loan, I hope, to help them reconstruct their economy along broader and more democratic lines.

It is all to our interest to do all this. For the salvation of the Philippines is the glory of democracy. Should independent, free, and American democracy survive and flourish in this oriental land, we will have transplanted our own ideology across 10,000 miles and placed it in the immediate view of two-thirds of the population of the earth. All our propaganda broadcasts, all our pamphlets, all our efforts to tell the world the story of America will not be one-quarter as convincing as a demonstration of democracy in action in the Philippines.

There is no substitute for example. We have a ready-made example of our form of government, our institutions, and our political traditions in the Pacific. It would be wasteful not to do our utmost, everything within our power, to encourage its growth and development in the Philippine Republic.

Manuel Roxas is the newly elected leader of that experiment in the Pacific. He was chosen by his people in a free, unfettered election in which the United States, true to its doctrine of nonintervention, allowed the people to vote without hint or prejudice. Such elections are rare outside of the United States today.

There have been many things said about General Roxas. None has denied his courage, his brilliance, his intellectual grasp and ability. He is superbly equipped for the high responsibility he is so soon to assume. A product of the American school system instituted by the United States in the Philippines, he is, along with others of the younger leadership in the Philippines, a man trained to think in the American mold, in the American idiom. He is just as American in thought and intellectual habit as any university graduate from Texas or Wyoming. He is a brigadier general in the United States Armed Forces of the Pacific, Philippine Army Division, commissioned on the field of battle by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who had this to say about General Roxas the other day—and I quote:

"The recent election which selected Roxas for the presidency reflected the repudiation by the Filipino people of irresponsible charges of collaboration made in foreign countries by those who lack an adequate knowledge of the circumstances.

"Roxas is now on his way to the United States and I bespeak for him a most cordial welcome by all Americans. He is a staunch patriot and a most fitting representative of a people whose loyalty to our cause, under one of history's most exacting tests, has earned for them our undying honor and affection and our unending concern for their future welfare."

General MacArthur issued this statement on the day after our party left Tokyo. General MacArthur, under whose orders Roxas served during the war, has vouched for his military record.

As far as his civilian record is concerned, it shines with a great brillance through the pages of Philippine history. He was elected speaker of the house of representatives of his country during the first year of his membership in that body in 1924. He served 11 years in that capacity. When the Philippine senate was reconstituted in 1945, Roxas, elected to the upper house in 1941, was chosen senate president.

And finally, on April 23, he was elected to the highest office in his country's gift, the presidency of the Philippine Commonwealth. On May 28 he will take the oath of office. And on July 4 he will swear to uphold the constitution and defend the honor of the Republic of the Philippines as its first president.

It gives me pleasure and I deem it a privilege to introduce to this group today my old friend, the leader of the Filipino people, Manuel Roxas.

Following is the text of the speech made by President-elect Roxas at the National Press Club on May 15, 1946:

I have been looking forward to this occasion. On my several visits to the United States in the past, I have had the privilege of being in the audience here and of listening to some of the distinguished speakers that you have had here through the years. I have always felt that given the occasion, I might improve upon some of the presentations here. But that was before I had the chance. At this particular moment, I would rather be just sitting and listening.

Nevertheless, I have wanted this chance. And now I have it. I will say my nickel's worth, as you call it, and then you will write yours. You will have the last word in any event. I have learned sometimes to my sorrow that it is always so with newspapermen.

In speaking to you today, I do not feel that I need sketch in much background regarding the Philippines. It is not as if I were from a foreign country. Although the Philippines are 10,000 miles distant from here, most of you have as good an understanding of our problems and of our politics as you have of the problems and politics of Oregon or New Jersey. We must thank High Commissioner McNutt and my friend, General ROMULO, for their remarkable work in that connection. And speaking of Governor McNutt, I would like to say that he is a brilliant example of the kind of men America has sent us over the years to lead, to advise, and to inspire us toward our common goals. The men who have been sent to the Philippines as governors general and as high commissioners have added stature and luster to America. They have been great colonial administrators and almost without exception have been men of such outstanding quality that they have returned to grow still further in the American scene, and have contributed to the greatness of America at home as well as abroad. I need only mention such names as Gen. Leonard Wood, William Howard Taft, Henry L. Stimson, Young Teddy Roosevelt, Frank Murphy, and Paul McNutt, to recall just a few. Perhaps it was the richness of their experiences in the Philippines; perhaps it was their own outstanding qualities; in any event, all of these men, after serving in the Philippines, have come back to bigger and better things. All of them, greatly beloved and revered by the Filipino people, have greatly loved the Filipino people in turn. One of them, Governor McNutt, came back to the United States to take over one of the most difficult jobs in the war effort; and when that job was done, he agreed to return to the Philipipnes for a second term as High Commissioner for our critical period between liberation and independence. In that service, which is soon to end, High Commissioner McNutt has shown an energy and a devotion to the interests of my people, and to the interests of his own country—in this case the two are identical—which has been in the finest tradition of American leadership and idealism in the Orient.

I have been told of the job which Governor McNutt did here to get the Trade Act and the War Damage Act through Congress. We have every reason to be deeply grateful to him. As far as I know, Governor McNutt, who is soon to leave public life—and only temporarily, I hope—had no personal or political interest to support his efforts on our behalf. Yet he spared neither his energies nor his time to help accomplish what had to be accomplished in our cause. No other man could have done what he has done for us in the last six months.

And now I would like to say—and I haven't discussed this with Governor McNutt at all, nor with anyone, for that matter, and I recognize that under ordinary conditions this would be a most improper statement to make—that if President Truman were to name Governor McNutt as the first American Ambassador to the Philippines, and if Governor McNutt were willing, the Philippine people would welcome that choice. I personally would be overjoyed.

I have departed from the general theme I had in mind for today's remarks to praise Governor McNutt, not because he is present and was good enough to make immediately possible this trip of mine to the United States, but because his service has been typical of that rendered us by his predecessors, a great line of great men. I do not think America has ever sent us a second-rater. We have battled with some of your governors-general. I remember in particular some of the knock-down-and-drag-out fights we had with that pugnacious old gentleman, Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood. The late President Quezon and General Wood had some of the grandest fights, I can say in retrospect, that have ever taken place on any continent. They fought about appointments, about policies, about personalities, and precedence. But General Wood, typical of your finest mil-

itary genius, was respected as a man and as an American. We all respected him and today we revere his memory. Among those who respected him the most was Manuel Quezon.

It was this type of man and this type of administration—largely unselfish, of unquestioned integrity, of unassailable honesty, of telescopic vision—that converted this colonial people, burdened for three centuries with the tyranny of Spanish rule, to an understanding of and devotion to American democracy.

Not too many in my homeland have enjoyed the economic fruits of the democratic way of life you exemplify. Ownership of productive enterprise has been far too concentrated. The majority of my countrymen have had only a limited horizon, until fairly recent years, for their poverty-bound existence. But the great miracle of the Pacific was that these people learned to love democracy, to love liberty, to love independence, and to love America. They may not have had true economic democracy, but they saw in political democracy the promise of social justice, that promise which the great President Quezon held out to them. It was that promise which shone like a beacon to light up the dark years of the Japanese occupation. The Filipino people fought and resisted in the cause of the political democracy they knew and had enjoyed as a heritage from America and for the promise of full economic democracy which they expected, by the example of America, to follow.

The Filipino tao, humbled to centuries of bowing in subservience to his master, learned quickly and joyfully the satisfaction of dignity and political equality. His vote, he learned, was equivalent in weight to that of the hacendero or the wealthy money lender, the two magnetic poles of his economic existence. He drank deep the heady wine of free political choice and solicitation, of free expression, and of free thought. He listened to the local radical extol the virtues of expropriation or of socialism, and saw that the radical was protected in his right to express himself, even if his views were in violent disagreement with the facts of life. This was good, he thought. This is democracy. My son, too, can be a political leader and make fine speeches and help rule my people, even though he is the son of a poor tao or cochero.

In some Provinces of the Philippines the average farm under cultivation is 3 acres, supporting an average family of 10. In these provinces, well over 50 percent of the land is tenant-farmed. In some of these areas, before the war, the average annual income of the farm family was 30 gold dollars.

I am not exhibiting the old sores of economic maladjustment in the Philippines as an exercise in self-flagellation. The conditions I have described stem from the feudal regime before 1898. We have tried to alleviate these conditions in recent years.

As chairman of the National Development Corp. before the war, I proposed and saw to completion a project for the purchase of a few large estates and their resale to the tenants. But the land problem of the Philippines is deep and difficult. It is not to be solved merely by the purchase and division of lands already under cultivation. A broad-scale program of dividing up the large estates must be coupled with resettlement of our great undeveloped areas, coincident with electrification and community planning, with modernization of agricultural methods, with education and public health. The attachment of the Filipino farmer to his little 3-acre plot of rice land is deep and elemental. He gathers round him his entire family. Together they till and re-till the land until it is exhausted, until hunger drives them apart. The Filipino must be educated in the spirit of the pioneer, of the mover across seas and across mountains. I have merely mentioned these things, in digressing again from my general theme, to indicate the monumental problems facing us as we begin our independent existence. I mention them to indicate the great distance we still have to travel on the road to economic democracy. I mention them to show how deep must have been the appeals of political democracy to cause this people to resist the alien ideologies of Japan, with their bland and superficial plausibility, and to sacrifice life and treasure in the cause which you in America understand more by its fruits than by its definitions.

Of course, loyalty to America on the part of the Filipinos should not have been such a surprise as it seemed to many elsewhere in the world. From the days of William McKinley, we have been given a progressively greater and greater measure of self-government. We resisted the American conqueror in 1898. But after the pacification, the United States sent us not troops but school teachers; not colonists but doctors and road builders. Cholera was stamped out; typhus was eradicated. Roads took the place of trails. School buildings and post offices took the place of forts and barricades.

William Howard Taft and Francis Burton Harrison both preached and practiced the doctrine of "Filipinization," encouraging us to take over more and more of the responsibilities of government and leadership.

Under the Wilson administration we were given a congressional pledge of eventual independence. Under the Roosevelt administration we were given a definite date of independence.

The tidal wave of war washed over our islands, leaving in its wake such a flotsam of destruction as has many times been described but which actually defies description. I was in the Philippines all during the war. I saw with my own eyes the brutal savagery of the enemy. Life was cheap and death was common. Torture was ordinary. But in my recent campaign tour throughout most of the Philippines I was continuously shocked and horrified to see more and more of the evidence of barbarism practiced by the enemy on persons and on things. It was unbelievable. This alone has scarred the existence of my people beyond all reparations and repayment.

The damage to the national economy was incalculable and cannot be estimated in dollars alone. It must be thought of in three dimensions—in dimensions of dollar-men-years. It will take years, dollars, and the unstinted energies and sacrifices of all Filipinos to restore what has been damaged, destroyed, and stolen. We can import carabaos from Indochina, rice from Siam, and building materials from the United States. But who can estimate the damage when an entire economy is blasted and disrupted, when an inflation has increased the cost of living 12 times, when communications and public health have been set back half a century; when the morals and morale of an entire people have been hideously affected by exposure to the evil climate of Japanese casuistry.

I have spoken of Filipino loyalty to America. These are words which you might think are polite compliments to your hospitality. I could recite to you at whatever length you wish incident after incident of my personal experience to illustrate and point up this loyalty. Let me recall one such incident, one of many, and less heroic than most.

It was after the surrender of American forces in Mindanao. The year was 1942. As a brigadier general, although a prisoner, I was in internal command of a prison camp at Malaybalay. A Filipino soldier, 18 years old, was among those huddled in the bare stockade.

He was like a hundred others and I never noticed him, until 1 day he escaped to join the guerrillas. Somewhere in the jungles the Japanese overtook him and brought him back for punishment by death. He was young and his eyes sparked with fire. I pleaded for his life and asked for the privilege of meting out internal punishment.

The Japanese, as always, weighed coldly the advantages of mercy in terms of prisoner morale against the delights of revenge. My entreaties were heard and he was given to me for punishment. I confined him in a cell. One day he sent for me.

"General," he said, his eyes pleading, "would it make you much trouble if I escaped again?"

"Jose," I said. "Perhaps there would be trouble for all of us if you escaped. And as for you, it would be certain death if you were caught. And perhaps torture, too. Your mother and your father, they too might suffer."

His eyes were eloquent with reproach. I was silent a minute and then went on.

"Anyway it is impossible for you to escape. You are guarded from within and without. Why should you want to escape anyway? Where would you go? What could you do? You are so young and inexperienced."

"General," he answered, "I can escape if I make up my mind to it. They cannot keep me here if I do not wish to stay. And I do not really care what happens to me if they catch me. What is happening to our people is more important than what might happen to me. But if I could hurry the liberation just one moment, I will have earned my life. The Americans will come back one day soon, and then we will all be free, my mother, my father, you. Maybe, I, too."

It was an eloquent speech. I could not answer him. I could not deny him.

"Good luck," I told him. "Let your conscience guide you."

The next night he was gone from his cell. None knew how he had managed it. He was caught before long, but not until after he had killed some of our enemies. He was brought back to camp and killed before all of us. We were to see the penalty for escape.

The priest with whom he spent his last moments came to me later. He had a letter addressed to me. It told of a tree, and of a package buried under that tree. I would understand what to do with the contents of that package, he said.

I found that tree and the package. The package was carefully tied. I can still see it today. There was only one object in it. A clean, carefully folded, carefully kept American flag.

I had that boy's body dug up from its shallow grave. At night, and with proper ceremony, we reinterred him. Over his body I placed with tender hand that American flag. The good earth of the land he loved covered him up. The flag went with him. He had died for it. He deserved it.

Oh, this boy was not especially a hero. He was not an exceptional case. His number was legion. There were a thousand, a hundred thousand others. General Wainwright told me, while we were in Corregidor, of a Philippine scout of his, a member of the famed Igorot Tribe of the central Luzon Mountains. He had grown old in the service, this Igorot scout, old and tough and irascible. On Bataan he would disappear night after night. None dared to question him. But sooner or later his conduct came to the attention of his commanding officer and Pedro was called to account. General Wainwright happened to be present.

The general, who knew and loved the old veteran, took up the questioning.

"What have you been doing, Pedro?" the general asked.

"General," he said, "I do not lie to you. It is said that we Igorots are head hunters. Many generations ago we were. It was said that our people liked to rob and kill. Perhaps it was so, because I have had that impulse. But I have never done it. Now I am having a chance to justify what is said of my people.

"I rob and kill, but only Japanese. It is very entertaining."

"But Pedro," the general said, "that is disobedience of orders. Besides, it is very dangerous. We cannot afford to lose a man like you."

"General," Pedro said, "it is not dangerous. I merely make a small noise and then I attack. The Japanese do not put up much fight. They are afraid of us Americans. They always think that I outnumber them."

These are the Filipinos who fought for you. These are the Filipinos who struggled through 3½ years of darkness toward the day of liberation. These are the Filipinos to whom you are giving independence and economic assistance. The loyalty of the Filipino is a byword in the Orient. He will not desert you when victory fails you. He will not falter when the odds are against you. He is the Irishman of the Orient. There are 18,000,000 of us 10,000 miles across the Pacific. They are 18,000,000 allies. They are 18,000,000 men, women, and children who love your way of life. You do well to retain their devotion.

I do not draw this word picture idly. I have weighed these words. As I see the future, it belongs to either one of two ways of life. The one way is the way you have developed, the way of economic and political freedom through free choice and free enterprise, guided and governed by such controls as are necessary to protect the public interest, responsive to the will of the majority, but with the fundamental right of opposition, the rights of the minority eternally and zealously protected. The minority may become the majority through the instrument of the ballot box.

Then there is a second way of life, the way which presupposes that one group, economic or political, is ordained by the prerogative of power, however seized, to govern, and all other groups must blindly accept and follow for the sake of the state or of the classless society. This way allows for no discussion, for no freedom to differ and oppose. Perhaps in some circumstances this way may be accepted by some. Some peoples may choose it as their way. Our people reject it. We have learned to love democracy, with all its halting, stumbling, and confusion, with all its weakness and inefficiency, we, like you, prefer it and will fight at your side to protect it.

But democracy presupposes one thing. It presupposes that the direction of movement is progress, and that the purpose of progress is to assure not power or glory but well-being and contentment for an ever-growing number of individuals who make up that democracy. It presupposes that the goal of Government is to assure not only freedom but also economic prosperity and security to its citizens. It is the job of Government to find the means to move in that direction. We in the Philippines have many miles to travel. We have many more than you, especially today that we have been prostrated by war and laid waste by devastation.

We look to the United States, as we are about to enter the era of independence, for the assistance and guidance we require. We are not seeking to collect on an obligation. We ask only such assistance as is indicated by our vital needs, and by the undeniable relationship which has existed, which exists, and which I hope will always exist between our people. We are not of the Orient, except by geography. We are part of the Western World by reason of culture, religion, ideology, and economics. Although the color of our skin is brown, the temper of our minds and hearts is almost identical with yours.

We expect to remain part of the West, possibly as the ideological bridge between the Occident and the Orient.

Economically, our immediate future depends upon the United States. We know no substantial market for the goods we can most easily produce except the American market. You, on your side, need our products. The whole world needs our products today but cannot pay for any substantial share of them.

We do not intend to retain primarily and indefinitely an agricultural economy. Before the war, 85 percent of our national production was agricultural. Much of that agriculture was based on low wages, producing for export—higher, yes, than the general level in the Orient, but still much lower than your wages here.

Since our liberation, we have had a vast inflation. Wages in many areas in the Philippines today are equivalent with yours. It is an artificial condition. We must endure some deflation. But our goal is to industrialize, to diversify, and to broaden out our economy. We hope for financial and technical assistance from the United States to accomplish this. I believe it is to our common interest for you to provide us with that assistance. Your country has now in the Philippines much more than a mere market for your exports. You have in us a protagonist of your political and economic system—a broadcasting station for Americanism.

The more you help us to achieve prosperity, the more you advance the cause of democracy. The Philippine people are not without pride. They have, perhaps, too much of it. They would not be content to play for pay the role of Charlie McCarthy to your Edgar Bergen. They believe in your words and will therefore repeat them. But neither for the sake of subsidy nor economic favor will they play an international role which is not worthy of the dignity of freemen.

In a few weeks we begin our career as an independent nation. We owe our independence, our national existence to you. We are not ungrateful, as I have tried to indicate. But there should be a stronger tie between our two countries than the mere memory of historical association and a sense of economic gratitude. There can be a community of interest to bind the Philippines and America past all power to divide. That community of interest can consist, first, of common economic principles, free, guided enterprise and, second, of a common political system. A mutually advantageous commercial relationship and constant cultural exchanges will furnish the cement for this union. But today it is up to you to determine whether that community of interest is to continue to exist. It will take some trouble and some effort on both our parts. You can decide for yourself whether it is worth while.

Our political independence is a recognition of a geographic fact and also of the circumstances that your Constitution does not provide for coequal political association other than statehood. But our independence does not necessarily mean that we will go our separate ways. I imagine that there are gravitational attractions which would gladly draw the Philippines from her occidental orbit. We intend to resist them. I hope that in the future the natural forces of mutual interest will keep us together in a closer, certainly more conscious relationship than ever before. We will do our part. Will you do yours?

Following is the text of the remarks made by Hon. Paul V. McNutt, United States High Commissioner to the Philippines, introducing President-elect Roxas at the Overseas Writers Club, on May 16, 1946:

I will not keep you long with the remarks I have to offer today. We came over from Manila—breaking a speed record as we came—because we had urgent business with the Government here and with the American people. It was essential that the new president-elect of the Philippine Commonwealth meet and confer with President Truman and with the heads of departments who have been dealing with the Philippines and will continue to handle Philippine affairs after July 4 when these islands become independent. It was also essential that General Roxas be introduced to America as the new leader of the Philippine people, as the freely elected leader of that people. It was necessary that General Roxas meet you gentlemen, who will be writing about and commenting on his activities and on American relations with the Philippines over the next four critical years.

We left business of critical import in the Philippines. During our brief stay here—and it ends tomorrow—we have settled and clarified enough problems and questions to have entirely justified our trip. General Roxas hasn't even formed his cabinet, and he is to be inaugurated on May 28, just 12 days from today. Mr. Roxas is faced with numerous other problems incidental to the start of a new administration in the islands. As for the office of the High Commissioner, we have a hundred pending matters to be liquidated before July 4 when the office, itself, passes out of existence. We face the problem of transition involved in terminating completely American sovereignty in an area where the American flag has flown for 47 years; we shall turn over to an independent Philippine government complete control in fields of jurisdiction which the United States has, up to this point, exercised sole authority.

Nevertheless—and I shall come back to some of these problems in a moment—we decided, General Roxas and I, to leave Manila and to come flying to Washington for this brief 1-week stay for the general purposes I have stated.

Relations with the United States are necessarily, in any coherent scheme, the key to the future of the Philippines. If those relations are correctly established and skillfully managed, they can be the heart not only of a successful foreign policy, but of a successful national economy for the Philippines. Looking at it from the American viewpoint, a successful Philippine-American relationship, integrated with the successful development of the new Philippine republic, can become the keystone of our entire policy in the Pacific, and a major source of American prestige in the Orient.

You must understand that in the unprecedented instance in which two countries, which have been integrally associated in a political way for half a century, decide to sever their political ties, great concerns are involved. The Philippine and the American banking systems are intimately connected. The Philippine currency is tied to the American dollar, with Philippine currency reserves held in the United States Treasury. There are many bonds and miscellaneous accounts which the United States Government holds in the name of the Philippines.

On numerous international boards and committees, the United States has represented Philippine interests for these past five decades. In all the capitals of the world, American embassies, legations, and consulates have represented the Philippines. Filipinos scattered over the face of the globe other than in the Philippines hold passports issued under the seal of the United States Government.

And since 1898 the Philippine national defense system has been a part of the United States national defense. Today what there is of a Philippine army is part of the American Army forces of the western Pacific. With American Army and Navy forces still concentrated heavily in the Philippines, the Philippines are necessarily today, and will continue to be after independence on July 4, an integral part of the defensive security system of the United States.

These are just a few of the over-all connections between the United States and the Philippines which must be drastically rearranged with the advent of independence. The trouble is that there is no precedent for such a disposition. Never before in history has a great and sovereign power willingly and with beneficent intentions provided a grant of political independence to a dependent territory. Without the element of violence to break political connections asunder, a peaceful transition involves the orderly liquidation of all the elements of sovereignty, as well as of sovereignty itself. It requires all the delicacy of a surgical operation separating Siamese twins. A single slip can be fatal to the weaker member of the union.

By the accident—if you can call it an accident—of war, our future policy toward the Philippines has been completely revolutionized from what it had been planned to be under the terms of the original Tydings-McDuffie Act passed in 1934.

Under that act, we had agreed to grant these islands their independence and in so doing to wash our hands of all connections with them, except as would be maintained with any friendly foreign power. Economically and politically there was not to remain even the shadow of an intimate association. The origins of the decision to grant independence to the Philippines were not simple or unalloyed. Basically the Nation had decided to respect the long and often expressed desires of Filipino leaders for political independence. But among the forces which joined with idealistic unselfishness to force through the original Independence Act were selfish commodity interests which desired to dispatch, as soon and as quickly as possible, with all competition in the American market from Philippine export products * * * namely, sugar, cordage, fats, and oils.

As a result of the marriage of forces which brought about Philippine independence, the terms of the freedom grant were cold and chiseled. The Philippines were to get their independence—period. No trade preference, no assistance in transition from economic dependence to economic independence. No assurance of assistance if the Philippines should be attacked by an Asiatic power. No provision for technical assistance to the Philippine Government in setting up the complex machinery of independent government existence—instead, period.

The Filipinos, I must say, were forced into the position of being willing to go it alone. They were told in no uncertain terms they could not have their cake and eat it too. They had asked for independence. They would have to take the bitter with the sweet and either sink or swim. Beginning in 1946, under the plan of 1934, the Philippines were no longer a concern of the United States.

It is true they had a vague promise from President Roosevelt, given at the time he signed the Independence Act, that inequalities would be later adjusted. There was a provision in the Independence Act that a Philippine-American trade conference would be held at least 2 years prior to independence to arrange post-independence trade relations. But there were few political realists on this side of the water who felt that anything would come of these tenuous strands of hope. The Congress was not in a mood to look yonder over the distant waters and see the advantages of a friendly output in the Pacific. Even the matter of post-independence military relations was deemed of such relative unimportance that it was left for negotiation.

I told the Philippine people in a speech just before I came on this trip that the United States has no export psychology. Despite the unquestioned advantages of export trade to the national economy, the United States as a whole is production-for-consumption minded. Appeals for legislation based on the advantages of overseas markets have little chance of success, or had little chance of success before the war, when competition with American products is involved. The United States, despite reciprocal trade agreements legislation, has remained protection-minded. And so the arguments for economic concessions of the Philippines based on the desirability of retaining American markets in the islands never rang very impressively here.

But the war has changed the national psychology in regard to the Philippines as well as in regard to more oblique matters. Gratitude is an inherent American trait and ingratitude is acknowledged a reprehensible trait * * * in our international relations as in our personal conduct.

When the Philippines proved their mettle in war, when the Filipino people fought and died under the American flag, and created a new saga of historic courage, the American people changed their minds about the Philippines.

We were morally and practically obligated, in the eyes of the world, to help the Philippines recover from the utter devastation our war had brought them. We were morally and practically obligated at the same time to redeem our promise of independence.

We were ready to do both. But it was more than the redemption of an obligation. We found, to our satisfaction, that the world, especially the colonial world, looked with envy at the grant of independence we had given the Philippines. Moreover the great powers of both West and East looked curiously, and not without jaundice, at our action in setting free a colonial people. I am not sure that they wish us unmixed success in our experiment.

We found that the entire world had watched the struggle and the resistance of the Filipino people against the enemy with unabashed wonder. It was the first historical instance of a colonial and especially alien people rallying, without reservation, to the side of the sovereign country.

Meanwhile the United States, cast in a new role of world leader, had undertaken the championship of the small nations and the underprivileged. We became a spokesman for the colonial peoples of the earth, for the exploited and the downtrodden. And always from behind the looming figure of our military power there blinked reassuringly our Philippine policy, our beneficent grant of independence to a dependent land, rich in economic potential, but helpless to resist our will.

And so we changed our attitude toward the Philippines. Imperceptibly, but radically our policy changed. We are today ready to give the islands their cake and let them eat it too. They are to get their independence, and they are to have economic concessions as well. We will underwrite their national security, we will provide technical and financial assistance to assure their economic survival, and we will give them their full and unreserved sovereignty at the same time.

A major part of our primary economic concessions, in the form of preferential trade relations, is intended to rehabilitate their war-shattered economy. That is true. But above and beyond that, we have inferentially agreed to support this experiment in Pacific democracy and to help, to our utmost, to insure its success. That is a radical, an almost revolutionary shift in our policy.

It has not gone without notice in the rest of the world. Russia, like Magellan, but four centuries later, has discovered the Philippines. Reference to our policy in the Philippines, is frequently found in the Soviet press. These references are not always laudatory. Soviet readers are told that the United States, while purporting to grant political independence to the Philippines, is actually intending to maintain a new type of economic imperialism there, that we are forcing upon the Filipinos our military, naval, and air bases, and that we intend actually to withhold the realities of sovereignty and give the Philippines only a shadow of control over their own land. These allegations are utterly and completely false. If there is one policy which we have in the world today which is completely without selfish motive, it is our policy in the Philippines.

In a speech before the Philippine Bar Association on May the 8th, speaking on behalf of the United States Government, I told the Philippine people the following:

"The American people and the American Nation are committed to the support and the encouragement of the democratic growth of an independent Philippine Republic. Any measures instituted in the United States which prove to run at cross-purposes with this goal will be willingly corrected. At the present moment I cannot see that there is any such danger.

"The only selfish advantage, if you would call it a selfish advantage, which the United States hopes to derive from its activities in the Philippines is the respect and friendship of the peoples of the Orient. That is the guiding star of our Philippine policy. Nothing which interferes with that basic policy will be tolerated, insofar as we have the power to prevent it."

That is our handiwork in the Philippines today. We have much to do to implement our general policy. What success we will have in the achievement of this goal will depend in large measure on the attitude and the policies of the gentleman who will speak to you in a few moments.

On the shoulders of Manuel Roxas, newly elected President of the Philippine Commonwealth and soon to be the first President of the Republic of the Philippines, will rest the responsibility not only for the salvation of his own people, but for the justification of America's historic pattern in the Philippines. Whether our 47 years of efforts in the islands will bear fruit in the growth and development of a successful and prosperous democracy in the Philippines depends on him, as on no other single individual.

My work in the Philippines is nearly done. His is only beginning. I bespeak for him your interest and your sympathetic support.

Following is the text of the speech of President-elect Roxas at the Overseas Writers Club on May 16, 1946:

This is my second appearance in 2 days before a body of American newspapermen. I am told that I have the privilege of speaking off the record here. It is a privilege I value but which I decline. What I have to say can be said to the world. I am limited only by time and opportunity to say all I wish to say to the American people about the Philippines and about Philippine-American relations.

In my homeland, where an entire people has suddenly developed a tremendous avidity for world news, for information on the trends and currents of affairs beyond their immediate concern, realizing today more than your people how those affairs affect their daily lives, the newspaper profession is a young and vital one. Many of our newspapermen have had little previous training. They have taken to the smell of ink and paper like the proverbial duck to water. They are fearless and crusading. Frequently they are overzealous. They crusade at the drop of a typewriter. It is a good sign, an encouraging sign. But it is often uncomfortable for those who have the responsibility of government.

Where before the war Manila had approximately a dozen periodical publications including daily newspapers, today we have a hundred, and the total circulation is many times that before the war. Almost all these publications are printed in English. They resemble yours in style and make-up. In the

case of some, the resemblance is not close enough to flatter you; but your newspapers and magazines in the United States are the models of ours in the Philippines. We have nothing to approach the New York Times as yet, but we have had several newspapers which bear a striking resemblance to the New York Daily News and the Washington Times-Herald. I mean no disrespect to those two very interesting and enterprising newspapers.

I am about to wind up my official visit to the United States. I have been in Washington 7 days. Into that short time I have tried to compress the activities of a month. I have enough pending business to keep me here 2 months more. But time is always of the essence when you have the least of it. I must go back for my inauguration on May 28. I must organize my Government. Cables reaching me from Manila indicate that the leaders of my party are having trouble sharing the glory of political victory. It is time I was back home.

But I cannot leave without telling you how overwhelmingly gratifying has been this visit to the United States. The last time I was in this country was in 1939 when I was a member of an economic mission seeking some adjustment of our post-independence trade relations. It was a hard, up-hill fight. We accomplished little more than to compile an excellent record, which is still useful today, but is rather more important for historians than for current use.

I have found a completely different atmosphere on this occasion. The leaders of government, and just plain people everywhere in the United States, are as interested in the Philippines as they are in their own affairs. Your President, who is, in a sense, our President, too, exhibited an amazing knowledge of the Philippines, and is showing by deed as well as by word his wholehearted desire to advance in every way possible the cause of Philippine independence and the welfare of my people.

When I mentioned, almost casually, because I was afraid to do it otherwise, my desire for a $400,000,000 loan for the support of my Government on Capitol Hill the other day, I was amazed to find how friendly was my reception. I think we are going to get our loan, although we have only begun the process of applying for it. But you and your leaders have demonstrated a receptiveness to our needs and our interests which assures us of success. For this mere gratitude is a poor and inadequate word.

During the recent election compaign, I spoke early and often regarding the necessity of maintaining on a primary plane the closest possible relations with the United States after independence. I said that America was the hope of the Philippines and that your Government could be depended upon to aid us navigate the desperate waters of economic chaos which now surround us. I said that America had not forgotten and would not forget our loyalty during the war. I said the blood we shed under the American flag, mingled with the blood of American boys who struggled with us shoulder to shoulder, had fertilized the soil of Philippine-American relations and would bring forth a harvest of mutuality to repay our sacrifices and sustain us in common purpose through the years to come.

In my campaign speeches, I invited American businessmen to come to the Philippines and invest and help us develop our underdeveloped land, provided that they came to help and not to exploit, assuring them of profits, but warning them not to seek undue privilege or advantage.

I fought under the American flag during this war. I swore loyalty to your flag. I had been raised and educated to feel that loyalty. During the dismal years of Japanese rule, my heart did not change. Neither did the hearts of my countrymen. Nor can we modify the feeling we have for your country although we are about to get our independence. By associating the United States and the Philippines in a common system of interest, we can retain, and always will retain, I trust, our love of America while maintaining our primary devotion to the interests of the Philippines.

A few of my countrymen are alarmed about your imperialists. I am not alarmed. I think that between the democracy-loving people of both our countries, we heavily outnumber the imperialists. It is my impression that the majority rules in this country as in the Philippines. We are not afraid of imperialist designs on the part of the United States. If imperialism had been a part of American policy toward the Philippines, we would not be on the road to independence today. If imperialism had been the American credo, it would not have had to wait until we were a free land to accomplish its purposes. The Philippines today are a living testimonial and a perpetual monument to the lack of imperialistic pattern in American foreign policy.

There have been imperialist phases to your history. But it is my impression that they have been few. And over the long reach of 47 years of political association your policy toward my people and my country has been a shining instance of unselfish and enlightened conduct toward a dependent territory.

We resisted you in 1898. There were some desperate and heartbreaking moments and months when we thought we had lost our freedom in being liberated by you from Spanish rule.

We were accustomed to promises. And when you promised us self-government and progressive development toward independence, we were sceptical. But then we saw miracles. Instead of sending us soldiers and laborers, exploiters, and overseers, you sent us teachers and roadbuilders, doctors, and engineers. Instead of building barracks, you built post offices; instead of forts you constructed bridges.

In 1912 we were given a definite pledge of independence. In 1934 we were given the charter of independence, itself, to be effective in 1946. So this enlightened attitude on the part of the United States is no novel development in our relations. It is part of a studied pattern. You gave us, you taught us, you trained us in political democracy. You Filipinized our government, our school system, our municipal administrations. You taught us a devotion and a love of your ideals and principles, your heroes, and your pioneers.

Knowing the American people as we do, we are not afraid of your imperialists.

It is my feeling that there is a studied attempt by some forces in the world today to make us and other people believe that American imperialism is on the march. I do not believe it. I reject the notion. If there is such a thing on the horizon as the American century, it will be an American century by example and by emulation rather than by extension of control by either subtle or direct power. We are a living allegation to that effect. I hope we remain so.

I do not doubt that there are forces in the United States, as there are everywhere in the world, which would like to use the power and prestige of the American Government to gain personal profit. I do not believe the American people will ever elect a Government which would so allow itself to be used. There are other countries of whose regimes I am not so confident.

I do not mean to be undiplomatic. I speak with feeling because I feel deeply on this question. Besides I am not yet the President of my country and still have here the status of a national owing allegiance to the American flag. I think we can speak frankly to each other.

But on July 4 my status and that of 18,000,000 of my countrymen will be changed. On that day the American flag will be replaced by the free flag of the Republic of the Philippines. We will be citizens of our own land. We will be masters, within the limits of our capacity, of our own destiny.

We can, if we choose, reject special relations with the United States. We can refuse to approve the formula of trade relations laid down by your Congress recently. We can decline to modify our Constitution as required in the Philippine Trade Rehabilitation Act to grant equal rights to American citizens.

We can orient our foreign relations as we determine best. We can become allied with China, with Siam, with England, or with France. We can become allied with Soviet Russia. We have that full freedom of choice. That is implicit in the grant of sovereignty.

But I assure you that as far as I am concerned, and I think I will have some influence in the matter, we will do none of the things I have just mentioned. The magnetic pole of our foreign-policy gravitation will be the United States. As long as the present foreign policy of the United States is maintained, we will support it with whatever power and authority we have. This, I am certain, represents the overwhelming sentiment and unshakeable determination of the people of the Philippines.

We do not overlook the need of developing a friendly foreign policy toward the other nations of both east and west. Although we are today a part of the western world, other than by geography, I believe we must develop strong commercial ties and cultural understanding with the great oriental nations which surround us. China is a natural market for the industrial goods we hope soon to be producing. Russia may one day buy many of our agricultural products. Australia is within our natural trading area. We must gradually enter and flow with the trade currents dictated by our geographic position and our natural resources. But our ties with the United States will be based on a foundation much stronger than trade.

We will accept the economic assistance you have offered us with deep and dignified gratitude. We will try as best we know how to manage our economy so that it can become independent of your tariff preferences while at the same time we continue to sell and buy preponderantly in your markets. We will welcome the existence of your naval, air, and Army bases on such of our soil as is mutually agreeable for the common protection of the United States and the Philippines, and will cooperate in the defense and security of those bases insofar as it is within our power to do so. I pledge my efforts in support of these policies because we are devoted to the same goals and principles you are. If ever two peoples had a common world policy it is the American and Filipino peoples. Peace, security, and prosperity for all men, the maintenance and advancement of the four freedoms, the espousal of free economic enterprise, the elimination of restrictive trade barriers among all nations, and the promotion of democracy as a way of life—these are the cardinal points of our world idealism as they are of yours. It should be no surprise that this is so. We developed an attachment to those ideals as part of the same body politic. We learned to love them in the same school systems, and out of the same books; we have discussed and spoken of them in the same language.

I have emphasized the over-all pattern of our attitude toward world principles because I thought that to be your main interest today. I have not referred to the internal problems of the Philippines, to the great needs of my people, to the heavy and difficult burdens we assume in a war-shattered land as we become independent. I have spoken of those matters elsewhere during my visit here. I know most of you are acquainted with those problems.

Naturally we can assume our rightful place in world affairs and can exert an influence in

the solution of world problems only if our internal structure is made strong and secure. As we prepare to cut the Gordian knot which connects our two nations, I hope we are doing no more than arranging for another even more intimate association. That association will represent at first a transition stage during which your country has undertaken to help us repair the ravages of war, as we begin the first major test of our existence as a nation. Although economically today the Philippines is a wasteland, I think we have the tools, and we have the promise of more, to repair and refashion in modern design our devastated land. When we have justified your faith in us and our faith in ourselves, we will approach the next phase of our relations more as equals than as benefactor and recipient.

And as we thrive, as we expect to one day, the fame of your system of government, of your institutions, which have been transplanted to the Philippines, will grow.

I hope to live to see the day when in the vocabulary of the world the word "Philippinism" is synonymous with Americanism, and when the peoples of the earth will see in the full grandeur of its world significance the attainment by the Philippine Republic of the same standard of living and the same exemplification of democratic liberalism which the United States stands for today.

Following is the text of an interview of President-elect Roxas by Mr. Richard Harkness broadcast over the National Broadcasting Corp. network May 16, 1946:

Mr. HARKNESS. General Roxas, before we go into these specific problems facing your country as it approaches independence, I think it might be interesting—I know it would be for me—to hear a few basic facts about the Philippines. What, for instance, is the racial relationship of Filipinos to the other peoples of the Orient? What kind of customs do you have in the islands? What is the prevalent language?

General ROXAS. That is a large order, Mr. Harkness. Books have been written on some of the questions you have asked me. However, I will answer as briefly as I can. Filipinos are of Malayan stock and came to the Philippines many, many centuries ago. They are related to the inhabitants of Indochina and Indonesians in general. Together they form the racial group called the Malaysians.

During recent centuries there has been little intercourse between the Filipinos and their racial kin. Since the great Spanish explorer, Magellan, discovered the Philippines in 1521, the islands have been exposed largely to western influences. As you probably know, over 90 percent of our people are Catholics and, although we have many local dialects, the one common language spoken by all Filipinos today is English. Our customs, although they still contain some evidence of Malayan origin, came largely from Spain; in more recent years they have been liberally mixed with American customs and habits. I suppose one of the major cultural influences in the Philippines today is Hollywood and its movies. As I said, English is the prevalent language, although most of the old folks cling to their native dialects, which differ from island to island. The three principal dialects are called Tagalog, Visayan, and Ilocano.

Mr. HARKNESS. What success did the Japanese have, General, in trying to win over the Filipinos to their viewpoint? I assume they did try.

General ROXAS. They tried, and tried hard, for 3 years, but their failure was total. There were a few Filipinos who, even before the war, were pro-Japanese. Some of them had studied in Japan. There were a few others, before the war, who thought that our future lay in an alliance with Japan after we became independent. Those who were pro-Japanese are either dead or in jail. Those who had some idea that we could or should get along with the Japanese have been greatly disillusioned and have changed their viewpoint. The Japanese tried to appeal to us on the basis of race. They said the colored peoples of Asia ought to control Asia and the world, and they invited us to join in that control. They spoke about the so-called greater east Asia coprosperity sphere. It became one of the common jokes in the Philippines, and many of my countrymen were punished just for laughing. But the Japanese coupled their extensive propaganda efforts with terrible and inhuman barbarism practiced against all those whom the Japanese accused of having what they called bad and dangerous thoughts. No; the Filipino people were not deceived by the Japanese propaganda. They could not be. They could not think in the same idiom the Japanese thought in. Of course, they did not speak the same language. The Japanese could no more shake the Filipino belief and faith in democracy than the pagans of Roman days could destroy Christianity by persecution and brutality. And it is exactly the same kind of faith that the early Christians had in their religion that the Filipino had and have in democracy, in liberty, and in America.

Mr. HARKNESS. Well, if the Philippines and the Filipinos are as loyal and devoted to America as you say, I suppose there is little objection to our maintenance of air and naval bases in the Philippines after independence?

General ROXAS. Mr. Harkness, rather than say little objection, I would say no objection. Indeed we welcome the retention by the United States of those bases. It was agreed to back in 1944 and was actually approved both by your Congress and the Philippine Congress a year ago. There is no major group in the Philippines which seriously objects to American bases in the islands. As far as the great majority of the Philippine people is concerned, they welcome the use by the United States of base facilities for the protection and defense of both the Philippines and the United States. In fact, when I become President, I hope to propose to the United States a plan under which Philippine troops would cooperate with American troops in the defense of these bases, so that eventually some of your boys can come home. As I see it, these bases are essential not only for the protection of American interests, and for the protection of Philippine interests, but also for the promotion of the whole system of security by which the peace of the Pacific will be guaranteed. These bases will fit into the general pattern of United Nations security. Filipino and American troops employed in this sector will be, in a sense, functioning as members of the international police force required to secure the peace.

Mr. HARKNESS. Would you feel that these naval and air bases infringe upon your sovereignty, General?

General ROXAS. No; not at all. No more than the presence of the United Nations Council sitting in New York infringes on the sovereignty of the United States. As long as we feel that these forces are situated in the Philippines to help support international policies to which we subscribe, we will feel that the American troops are there in our cause and we will feel the same toward them as we feel toward Filipino troops.

Mr. HARKNESS. I understand that you have informally proposed that the United States Congress vote the Philippines a $400,000,000 loan. What do you propose to do with that money and how would you pay it back?

General ROXAS. The loan we seek and to which you refer, Mr. Harkness, is, what one Congressman with whom I discussed the subject, called a loan of convenience. It will be a loan to enable us to pay for the essential services of government. At the present moment we have no source of government revenue to speak of. Our land is devastated. Our industries are prostrate. We cannot tax properties which are in ruins. We cannot tax land that is not being used. We cannot tax civilians who are barely able to eke out a living. But gradually we expect to rehabilitate our economy. Your Congress has provided measures to assist us in this and from the industries that develop and from the new investments which we hope flow into the Philippines, we hope to obtain sufficient revenue not only to support government but to repay the loan. We will repay that loan with interest. We have never yet failed to meet an external obligation. We have requested a loan of $100,000,000 for the first year of independent existence and decreasing amounts after that for four more years. I might say that the reception given by your officials to our request has been sympathetic. I think we are going to get the loan.

Mr. HARKNESS. What is the most serious problem your country faces on the eve of independence, Mr. President?

General ROXAS. Our most serious problem, Mr. Harkness, is independence. I mean, we are going to be a free nation, yet we are a nation in ruins. That is a general statement, Mr. Harkness. But speaking of our internal problems, there is one which is more serious than all the others and that is the land problem. We have lived for centuries in the shadow of a feudal regime. We have not yet gotten entirely away from that feudalism. There are many tenant farmers, whose average cash income before the war in an entire year was 30 gold dollars. These people are discontented. They have reason to be. Many of them now have arms which are held illegally. There were hundreds and thousands of guns distributed by your armed forces or stolen from the Japanese which are being held by individuals who see in their guns an assurance of economic justice.

Of course, they are completely wrong in that. We cannot discuss economic reforms at gun point. While we are reestablishing law and order in those isolated sections of my homeland we will also be working at economic reforms to bring to these people, many of whom fought bravely for our common cause during the war, a measure of relief and of social justice. Some of the larger estates will be purchased by the government and will be divided up. We plan to initiate resettlement projects in some of our undeveloped areas, to relieve the plight of the tenant farmers. We propose to increase the proportion of the crops that the tenant receives and at the same time to increase the yield by modernization of agricultural methods and by the large-scale building of farm-to-market roads. The landlords have not been without fault in the Philippines. Usury was practiced in many areas. We intend to use to the full the powers of government to protect the underprivileged. That is certainly a major function of government. It will all be done within the framework of free enterprise. It is a direction which you in the United States have followed during the past generation.

There is much more I could say, Mr. Harkness. We have many problems to be solved in the next few years. I am confident that the American people will sympathize with our needs and our requirements and will, when necessary, give us a helping hand along the way.

Following is the text of a press statement issued May 17, 1946:

High Commissioner McNutt and President-elect Manuel Roxas, today paid a final call on President Truman and discussed with him plans for the inauguration of the Philippine Republic on July 4.

President-elect Roxas said he was "satisfied beyond all measure at the degree of cooperation and the complete solicitude which is being shown by the President of the United

States for the welfare of the Philippines. All our needs have been recognized."

"We expressed to him our deep gratitude for his assistance and I told him again of our earnest hope that he will be able to be present in Manila on July 4," Roxas said.

Commissioner McNutt said he had discussed with the President plans for the liquidation of the office of the High Commissioner on July 4 and "an orderly transition of the functions and property of the office to the jurisdiction of the State Department."

Mr. McNutt said he had no official plans beyond the completion of his work in Manila. He said he expected to return to the United States, with his family, shortly after July 4.

Following is the text of the final press statement issued on May 17, 1946, the day of President-elect Roxas' and High Commissioner McNutt's departure for Manila:

High Commissioner Paul V. McNutt and President-elect Manuel Roxas, in a joint statement issued as they prepared to board their plane for their return to Manila after 8 days of official conferences in Washington, said that "the faith of the Philippine people in the United States has been more than justified. All our requests for assistance have either been met or on the way to being met."

"The general outlines of the rehabilitation program and of the scope of Philippine responsibilities are now fairly clear. We have received policy definitions on practically all points. What remains now is to have the policy implemented," the joint statement said.

The High Commissioner and the Philippine President-elect, after a speedy round of discussions with all the ranking officials of the United States Government, and with President Truman, said they expected to be in Manila in 3 days where "we must all roll up our sleeves and attack the concrete problems of rebuilding and refashioning a shattered land."

A brief stop will be made by the C-54 carrying the official party in Martinsville, Ind., to greet the parents of High Commissioner McNutt who will entertain their son and President-elect Roxas at a "family dinner." The plane will leave the same evening nonstop for San Francisco.

In San Francisco, General Roxas and Mr. McNutt will make an appearance at the Commonwealth Club which is giving a luncheon in honor of the new president of the Philippines. General Roxas will speak.

"Our most important work was successfully accomplished * * * an understanding with President Truman, with congressional leaders, and with administrative officials concerning a loan to help us sustain the cost of Government in the first difficult years of the new Republic.

"The specific formula under which the loan will be granted has not been decided, but we are confident that something will be done in the near future. Conferences on this subject have been held with Secretary of the Treasury Fred Vinson. We have his support as well as that of President Truman.

"The matter of emergency food supplies was discussed with every pertinent official, including former President Herbert Hoover and UNRRA Director Fiorello LaGuardia.

"There is a world shortage of food, especially of rice. We are going to get a proportionate share, based on the needs of the Philippines, of what is available for distribution. We discussed with State Department officials the barter of surplus trucks for rice from Siam. State Department officials were sympathetic, but have thus far made no commitment on policy.

"Former President Hoover again urged us to arrange for the barter if at all possible. He said it was our one hope to obtain rice to stave off the dire rice shortage which threatens us wit' in a few weeks. We will continue with ou' efforts. The Interior Department, the Washington Office of the High Commissioner, and Resident Commissioner ROMULO will all continue to work on this essential project.

"UNRRA has under consideration the Philippine application for a greatly increased allocation of funds. Certain legal and technical difficulties remain to be discussed. Commissioner ROMULO has been pressing for action on this application and will continue to do so.

"There are many other matters which were taken up here. We have completed the preliminary conversations on treaties covering commercial relations, diplomatic relations, and other matters. Other discussions must take place in Manila.

"Altogether we have met no major obstacles. There has been agreement between the two heads of the mission on all matters which have been taken up here. Many matters are still pending."

The Welfare of the Country Must Come First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of the American people approved President Truman's radio speech Friday night about the railroad strike, and also his speech to a joint session of Congress on Saturday, on the same subject.

The swift action of the House in passing legislation within 2 hours after President Truman's speech by a vote of 306 to 13 indicates the crystallized sentiment of the American people in support of the President.

The News of Washington, D. C., a Scripps-Howard publication in an editorial Saturday, before the President delivered his speech to a joint session of Congress, commended his Friday night radio speech. The News as a rule is more inclined to criticise than to praise, and its commendation of President Truman is all the more noteworthy, and under leave granted to include same in my remarks, same is included herewith:

"THE WELFARE OF THE COUNTRY MUST COME FIRST"

The American people can be proud of their President and of what he said last night.

Mr. Truman cleared away all doubt of where he stands when Government is challenged by a group.

"The welfare of the country must come first," he said. And he was right.

The vast majority of his fellow citizens will support him loyally in such steps as he may have to take to make certain that operation of the railroads does resume.

He told the Nation plainly how two men—the heads of two great railway unions—undertook to place their will above the welfare of the country; how they rejected his fair proposal for settlement of the strike; how they ignored his warnings of the tragedy they might cause.

We share his doubt that the rank and file among the quarter million engineers and trainmen can have known what fearful consequences their strike could mean, what suffering and peril it could bring upon all the millions here and millions more abroad.

We share his hope that the strikers, now they have been told, will man the trains today and operate the roads.

We applaud his determination, if too few of them do return to work, to use all means within his power to run the trains, calling upon the Army to assist and upon the armed forces to protect every man who heeds the call to duty.

All that Mr. Truman said about Whitney and Johnston, the two misleaders of their unions, was deserved. Yet, when he addresses Congress this afternoon, we trust the President will remember that the same power abused by these two men is possessed by many other union bosses, bestowed upon them by the laws and policies of the Government.

We trust he will remember that legislation designed to curb the actions of two men will not be enough. Legislation to prevent abuse of labor's power by any man or group is what this country needs, and what the labor movement must have if it is not to lose its necessary rights.

And that is what the country can have new hope of getting, now that it has heard the President speak strongly, firmly, bravely as a President should.

Mr. Truman has been called weak, vacillating, indecisive. There was nothing weak or vacillating or indecisive in what he said last night.

Rev. Timothy C. Gleason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a write-up which appeared in the May 25 edition of the Boston Pilot, entitled "Meet Your Pastor," on the personal life and accomplishments of Rev. Timothy C. Gleason, pastor of the Sacred Heart parish, Middleboro, Mass. I have been personally acquainted with Father Gleason during my entire life and, like thousands of others, he is held in the highest respect and admiration by me. There is no doubt that he has been a hard and conscientious worker in his field of religion, and the result of his work as pastor of this church is well known throughout the archdiocese of Boston.

MEET YOUR PASTOR
(By Bill McMorrow)

It has been said, "You can preach a better sermon with your life than with your lips," and in these wise words we discover a most adequate introduction to the subject of today's column, Rev. Timothy C. Gleason, pastor of Sacred Heart Parish, Middleboro, a man accepted by one and all as an inspired pastor, a devoted friend, and a zealous priest whose life has been one of love of God and service to man, an inspiration to all who have been fortunate enough to know him.

Born in Middleboro, he moved to the "Mill City" of Lawrence at an early age, and was educated in the grammar and high schools there, Boston College, and St. John's Seminary in Brighton. Ordained October 20, 1918, his initial assignment was to St. Anthony's in Allston where he remained for 15 years, endearing himself to all who came in contact with him. Transferred to St. John's in

Quincy with Monsignor Owens, his stay in the "City of Presidents" lasted 9 years, at which time he became pastor of St. Joseph's Medway. Two years later he came home to Middleboro as pastor of Sacred Heart Parish in the town of his birth, and here he has discovered complete happiness working with parishioners whom he himself terms, "a perfectly grand group of people."

EXTENSIVE PARISH

Sacred Heart Parish is perhaps the largest in our archdiocese in terms of square miles, 145 square miles to be exact, and embraces the Lakeville Sanitorium and the Bridgewater State Farm. The parish is a beehive of Catholic activity, and under the direction of Father Gleason and his curates, Rev. Thomas A. Navien and Rev. John W. Morrissey, parochial functions, spiritual, social, and athletic, play an important part in the life of this residential town. The Holy Name Society, the Ladies' Sodality, the CYO, the Knights of Columbus represent the strong right arm of the parish, and the very beneficial results of their ground work are best expressed in the number of converts here, with 12 now taking instruction at the Sacred Heart rectory.

The Holy Name Society is well organized, 160 strong. The bowling season just ended represents "only the beginning" of Holy Name activity, and the banquet held at the tail-end of things, is still a topic of conversation, when good times are being discussed. "The Holy Name spirit is a wonderful thing here," Father Gleason said, "and is something of which we are all proud." The Ladies' Sodality is just another topnotch society at Sacred Heart, and their enthusiasm as they point to the parish reunion on May 24, opening their home for socials and similar fundraising activities, has been responsible for the tremendous success of this worthy undertaking. Members of the Sodality also handle the needs of the pastor, taking care of the Sanctuary, and maintaining a spick-and-span church at all times, well worthy of note, in Father Gleason's opinion.

The CYO is one of the foremost parish units, and acted as a "flying squadron" as plans went through for the reunion. The girls handled the correspondence, the filing, and the records, and the boys did yeoman work in the many miscellaneous, yet necessary, details to arrange such a get-together, for which Father Gleason is deeply grateful to each of them. "In the recent drive for canned foods," Father Gleason pointed out, "these boys and girls rounded up a ton and a half of food to aid the archbishop's campaign for the relief of Europe, a grand job—well done."

OUTSTANDING WORK

Outstanding in the life of a priest in Middleboro is the work connected with the sanatorium and the State farm, where the spiritual needs of the patients and inmates are cared for by Sacred Heart Parish. Intensely interested in this phase of his work, Father Gleason and his curates have arranged special programs at each institution, with mass on Sunday, holy days and first Fridays in the sanatorium, as well as special instruction classes for the children. The enthusiasm for this program shown by the child-patients has been a source of encouragement to both pastor and curates, and much headway is being made in this direction.

Father Gleason's interest in the work at the State farm is at an all-time high, and he makes it a point to visit the farm in person every Saturday afternoon for confessions, interviews and chats with the inmates. The depressing side of this work is more than offset by the results obtained, Father Gleason said, and the many little tokens of regard and affection given him by the inmates that adorn his living room mantel, more than attest this fact.

Sacred Heart Parish Sunday School is the pastor's pet, and the children occupy a major portion of Father Gleason's attention. Supervised by two sisters of St. Joseph from the Boston School for the Deaf in Randolph, the children receive the finest in instruction, and Father Gleason pointed out that 50 percent of the lay-teachers were teachers by profession, a group of which he is mighty proud.

A red letter day for the people of Middleboro, Father Gleason said, was during the visit of Archbishop Cushing, last July, at which time His Excellency visited the sanatorium and the farm, confirming many inmates, and sealing a bond of friendship that ripens with age, insofar as the boys and girls here are concerned. The exchange of letters continues even today, and the many little tokens the archbishop sends his young friends here are all proudly displayed during Father Gleason's visits. It was during this visit that Archbishop Cushing dedicated the beautiful memorial to the boys in the service, located on parish property, outside the church, photographs of which Father Gleason prizes highly and retains as treasured memories of this gala occasion.

CHAPLAIN OF KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

Chaplain of the Middleboro Council, Knights of Columbus, Father Gleason is extremely interested in the doings of the Knights, and a recent combination of Knights of Columbus-Holy Name Communion Breakfast, on Passion Sunday, he described as the best demonstration of Catholic action by the men of the parish he has seen. He is equally enthusiastic about the fine work in the juvenile court by Father Navien, and follows this work with active interest.

Still green in his memory is the tribute paid him during his pastorate in Medway, on the occasion of his silver jubilee in the priesthood, when hundreds of former parishioners from St. Anthony's came to do him honor, an affair he will always cherish with heartfelt gratitude and appreciation. Likewise, the memory of Monsignor Riordan, pastor of St. Patrick's, Watertown, and Father Murphy, pastor of Presentation parish, Brighton, continues to blossom in the minds and hearts of the people of Middleboro who well remember the years each spent in their midst. And may the memory of Father Gleason's work at Sacred Heart parish grow mellow with age, in their minds, to join those of his illustrious predecessors.

Let's Do Something To Stop These Strikes

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great men of this Republic is Governor Tuck, of Virginia.

The other day when a strike was threatened to shut off the electricity all over Virginia, regardless of the consequences to the people of Virginia, our disabled servicemen and others in hospitals in this State, Governor Tuck reminded them that there was a law by which he could protect the people of Virginia, and that he would use it, if necessary. The result was, no strike.

The safety and integrity of this entire Nation is being threatened by strikes today. Many are forced to strike who do not want to strike. It is virtually revolution.

I am for the passage of a law now that will put a stop to the paralyzing of our country in this way. If the railroad men do not want to work, then let us take the ex-servicemen and give them the jobs. They can run trains. They have run tanks and planes and submarines, and they can run trains.

It is up to the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, the Members of the House of Representatives, and the Members of the Senate of the United States to protect our country in this crisis.

For my part, I am ready to proceed.

Labor Situation Received Negative Treatment From Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I read with interest the column by Thomas L. Stokes which appeared in the Washington Daily News and many other newspapers throughout the United States Saturday, May 25.

In this column Mr. Stokes clearly and fairly sets forth facts relating to industry and labor which I feel should be read and digested by all Members, and which I am sure will be applauded by fair-minded Americans. I am, therefore, inserting the text of the column in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under leave granted:

BACKSTAGE

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Additional controls being imposed by Congress on labor evolve from a variety of motives and circumstances.

One fact, however, stands out—determination of the Senate to curb the powers of labor. For hitherto nothing has been done by the Senate to revise or modify the Wagner Act since it became a law a decade ago and was hailed as "the Magna Carta" of labor. The only Senate action on basic labor legislation was to approve the Connally-Smith Act, a wartime measure to give the President more power in industrial disputes that threatened war production.

The Senate blockade against basic labor law revision was in its Labor Committee, controlled by New Dealers. It let recurrent measures passed by the House linger and die without reporting them.

The Senate's changed attitude must reflect concern among the people. That is the only way it can be interpreted. This is understandable when the Nation suddenly faced paralysis by strikes in two of its fundamental industries, coal and railroads.

It is unfortunate that these two strikes came together, unfortunate for millions of workers. For that opened the opportunity for those in Congress who wanted to seize this postwar era for crippling labor to move in on the wave of aroused public opinion.

People do not like to see the mechanics of our civilization slowed down and stopped. That is human. Furthermore, they do not like to see their Government virtually powerless.

The workers are like the rest of Americans. They are trying to get a little more in the

pocketbook to meet the increased cost of living to their families.

Their weapon is the strike. And don't believe it is easy to come around to use it. For it means hardships.

What they won in the Wagner Act took a long, hard struggle. The odds were against them for so long. Their new-found power has been abused in some cases, and often they have been misled by their leaders. Now they are paying the price for these mistakes.

The Senate situation may be explained simply. Broadly, the Senate is divided into three groups. There are the strict conservatives who long have been itching for just such an opportunity to restrict labor. Among them are Southerners who are disturbed by the CIO organizing campaign in the South and its eventual political effects.

There are, on the other extreme, the stanch champions of labor who have resisted any change whatever, and refused to recognize abuses of power by labor. Then, between, are the moderates. What has happened is that the conservative antilabor element and the moderates are joined now in common cause, though not for the same reasons.

The unfortunate thing for labor in this whole situation is that it gets wholly negative treatment from Congress. While Congress regulates labor, at the same time it shows little inclination to go forward with a number of long-pending measures to improve the general welfare of labor, or to resist new encroachments by monopolistic enterprises which meanwhile have been entrenching themselves, while attention is diverted.

The American economic machine is so delicately intertwined now, with the opportunity to stall it by pulling out one segment, that it is necessary to find some means to handle strikes in the public-service industries and those which affect public welfare.

This should be coupled, certainly, with fact-finding machinery as advocated by President Truman. For, when public utilities are stopped by strikes, the public is inclined, without thinking, to blame the workers. That gives the owners a psychological advantage. What is needed is some means to bring out the facts, particularly as to wages and working conditions. Some of these workers have been much underpaid.

That is a primary principle.

A. W. Ricker Quits OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I shall include in my extension of remarks a letter written by A. W. Ricker to Frank Clough, president, Minnesota Farmers Union. Mr. Ricker for 25 years has been editor of the Farmers Union Herald, published at St. Paul.

If I recall correctly in the past he has been an ardent supporter of the OPA, but he has now come to the conclusion that it may have reached a place in its career where it is no longer possible to function for our best interest. He suggests that the time has come that this Government bureau be suspended and industry be permitted to function.

I have stated repeatedly that the OPA is the bottleneck that has interfered with, and prevented full production, that it has bungled the GI's out of homes and the farmers out of farm machinery, lumber, and other building material. I feel the time has come to turn on the green light, open the door and ask industry to go ahead and produce at full speed. That will keep and bring the prices down. I agree with the President that the time has come to go to work—to go to work without governmental interference, and hobble-skirts.

I feel that on a whole the OPA has not kept prices down but increased them. It interfered with production and then raised the ceilings. I would like to have the OPA explain to me just how they kept prices down when it costs as much for a lady to buy a hat the size of your hand, as it did during World War I to buy an entire suit. It is time for the American people not to accept all of the false propaganda that is being sent out with the taxpayers' money as to what the OPA accomplished.

I am glad to know that my friend Ricker has finally come to the conclusion that unless the OPA functions with more justice and fairness, it should be suspended. Here is Mr. Ricker's letter:

MAY 17, 1946.

Mr. FRANK CLOUGH,
President Minnesota Farmers Union,
Willmar, Minn.

DEAR MR. CLOUGH: About 3 years ago Mr. Einer Kuivinen, our then president of the Minnesota Farmers Union, advised me that the board of directors of the Minnesota union had selected me to act as a member of the Minnesota OPA Labor Advisory Committee, subject of course to my acceptance. I replied that I would give the matter as much of my attention as possible and thereafter attended such meetings of the Committee as I could.

Matters considered at the meetings which I attended consisted mainly of rent ceilings and their enforcement in protecting workers from evictions, bad sanitation, and excessive charges for housing privileges.

With respect to such matters I think the OPA has done a commendable and necessary job, at least here in the St. Paul area. With respect to many other things, however, I am entirely at odds with OPA procedure, and so much so that I feel that to longer permit my name to be used as a member of the committee would be a betrayal of the best interests of the average workingman's family in the cities and that great group of farmers who once supplied the American consumer with meat and butter.

The mass of urban consumers are now unable to get butter at all at the stores, and only the poorest quality of meats. The best meats are permitted to go to the big hotels and restaurants, where the well-to-do get the benefit of ceilings while the common people get little or no benefit from ceilings because the show cases are empty of meats which may be freely purchased at the eating places patronized by the well-to-do. What good is a ceiling price on something which you cannot buy?

One of our employees at the central exchange told me as late as yesterday that the only pork he was able to buy at the butcher shop recently was pigtails. I have yet to see pigtails on the menus of first-class eating places anywhere between here and the Pacific coast from which area I have just returned.

Butter is unavailable now in a very large part of the United States even at the best hotels, but ice cream can be freely purchased even in the most remote sections between St. Paul and Los Angeles, Calif.

It is possible that the OPA has reached a place in its career where it is no longer possible to function as it once did. If so then that fact should be faced and the work of this Government bureau suspended in favor of letting the law of supply and demand once more operate.

This would bring inflation, it is claimed. The answer is that we have inflation now, and it is an open and debatable question whether the kind of inflation we have now is not worse than the one which would make it profitable for creameries to again churn butter and the meat packers to give the consumers an equal chance to buy as good meat through their dealers as they can now buy only in big hotels and other places patronized by those able to pay for, and get juicy steaks, good ham, and bacon.

I am sure the farmers would be glad to produce plenty of meat and butter and would not care to hoard such products if they, the farmers, could buy them at the stores and butcher shops as they once did.

Please accept my resignation as a member of the OPA Labor Advisory Committee of Minnesota.

Yours very truly,

A. W. RICKER.

Copy to Mr. Carroll Koch, price administrator, St. Paul, Minn.

LaGuardia Says That the Railroad Workers Have No Right To Strike Against Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me upon my unanimous-consent request, I include the following newspaper article written by former Mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia which appeared in yesterday's Sunday issue of PM. It is particularly timely, coming as it does on the heels of our vote taken the evening before on President Truman's temporary public utility strike-curb legislation.

Incidentally, I want to point out that with the passage of the temporary strike-curb bill, there is now no justification for the enactment of the so-called Case bill. I voted against the vicious and unfair Case bill when it was originally before this body, and I shall oppose every phase of it again.

The article referred to follows:

LAGUARDIA SAYS THAT THE RAILROAD WORKERS HAVE NO RIGHT TO STRIKE AGAINST GOVERNMENT

(By Fiorello H. LaGuardia)

Some, not all, of the railroad workers have chosen to go on strike. This is no longer a strike against the railroads. It is a strike against our Government. The railroads have been taken over by the United States Government. This is in accordance with the laws of our country. The Government took over the railroads because of the failure of the railroads and their employees to come to an agreement. The Government took over the railroads in order to carry out the highest functions of government—the protection of life, the public health, and the security and safety of the people of the country.

Perhaps I am old-fashioned, but I am one who is not afraid to say that no one has a right to fight the Government of the United

States except in the manner provided in the Constitution itself. If the Government took over the railroads, it was only because of dire necessity. Our country cannot live without internal transportation. People in the cities cannot get food without transportation. Industry cannot exist without transportation. National life cannot live without railroads. Hence, the Government stepped in to protect the public health because of a deadlock between the railroads and their employees and the stoppage of all rail transportation. What would the unions say if the railroads refused to turn over their property when the Government so ordered? The Government must function. In our country the Government represents the people.

I had an important part in the drafting of the Railroad Labor Act. It was enacted in order to prevent just such a situation. I have had personal dealings with the railroad unions well on to 25 years. I know their leaders. They are fine patriotic and able citizens. I believe that some of them in this instance have been ill-advised. I remember some 3 or 4 years ago, when a railroad strike was threatened. As mayor at the time, I appealed to the executives of the various railway unions on behalf of the people of the city of New York. I explained to them that we could not live without coal and food being brought into our city. They were sympathetic. They were understanding. The story may well be told now that they gave me assurance that one or two or three emergency trains would operate every day to bring in fuel and food to the city. I know they are fine, loyal citizens and intelligent leaders, so I am at a loss to understand their action now. Granted that they have a grievance, assuming that the railroads are wrong, the fact remains that when the Government of the United States—and that means the people of the United States, it doesn't mean a dictator, it doesn't mean a king, it means the people—decides that it is necessary to take over the railroads then it is the duty of the railroad workers, as it is that of every other American to respond to the call of their Government. The rights of the employees would not be impaired one bit.

It is quite right that no one can be forced to work. That is true. But the situation here is that because of the emergency, because of the results, because of the necessity the Government has a right to say: "We must operate the railroads," just as it says: "Come on boys, you have to get into the Army. We must protect our country." This is just as much protection of the country as anything could possibly be. It is also significant that many of the railroad labor organizations are ready now to work for their Government. The American people appeal to all of the railroad labor unions to work for the Government. We ask the railroad workers to enlist temporarily in the service of their country. The people and their Government will protect them in all of their right.

The United States has taken over the railroads as a public necessity, and all Uncle Sam's sons must cooperate.

Rationing Isn't Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 9, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial published in the New Rochelle (N. Y.) Standard-Star entitled "Rationing Isn't Production":

RATIONING ISN'T PRODUCTION

Chester Bowles, contrary to public pronouncements from President Truman, is apparently in favor of a return by this Nation to rationing of foodstuffs. And if the need to provide starving countries of Europe and Asia with sustenance continues much longer, it is quite probable that Mr. Bowles' view will prevail.

But if we go back to wartime rationing we should do so with a clear understanding of the causes and the effects. Production of foodstuffs in sufficient quantities has failed because of unnecessary interference and red tape entanglement by the administration. Congressman THOMAS A. JENKINS, of Ohio, chairman of a food study committee, has asked these questions:

Why has nothing been done to bring about a desperately-needed increase in production of farm machinery?

Why—in the face of a critical shortage of fertilizer—have Government-owned nitrate plants been permitted to stand idle since last summer?

Why is OPA permitted to maintain a price structure that is a detriment to the production of milk, sugar, butter, meat, and other basic foods?

Why are millions of pounds of copra being allowed to rot on the ground in the Philippines, with people starving for fats and oils?

We would like to see those questions answered by authoritative spokesmen in Washington. For if we must ration we should have clear reasons.

And another point should be stressed. Rationing is not going to increase production. It will not add 1 pound of butter or meat or sugar or oil to the world's supply. Rationing merely works toward equitable distribution. Only increased production can increase the supplies which will prevent hunger.

To get that increased production is as much the job of Mr. Bowles and of the OPA as is the task of fair distribution of what we have. And it is, to put it mildly, extremely unfortunate that we must entrust into the same hands whose policies created these shortages the job of increased production and resumed rationing. Their record to date has been by no means convincing of their efficiency.

Dedicatory Exercises in Memory of Pfc Roland H. Vanderkerkove

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address delivered by me at the dedication ceremonies of the bandstand in the Philip J. O'Connel playstead to the memory of Pfc Roland H. Vanderkerkove, of Lawrence, Mass.

The program and address are as follows:

DEDICATION CEREMONIES

1. Address of welcome: Herbert Conroy, chairman.
2. Invocation: Rev. Clinton W. Carvell.
3. Addresses: Mayor James P. Meehan, Alderman Andrew E. Donahue.
4. Introductions: Governor's Councillor Robert V. O'Sullivan (representing Gov. Maurice J. Tobin), State Senator Michael A. Flanagan, Representative William J. Casey, Representative Joseph T. Conley, members of the city council.
5. Introduction: Mr. and Mrs. Henry Vanderkerkove.
6. Eulogy: Congressman THOMAS J. LANE.
7. Dedication of bandstand: Herbert Conroy, representing neighborhood veterans of World War II.
8. Benediction: Rev. Clinton W. Carvell.
9. Star-Spangled Banner: Adolph Florin, soloist.
10. Salute and taps: American Legion Post 15, firing squad bugler, Peter F. Degnan.

We are meeting today, on the green of this common, with all the hopeful signs of nature's rebirth around us, to honor a friend and neighbor who, though he can never come back to us in person, is eternally with us in spirit.

Here, on the very ground where he played as a child, we have come to pay our humble respects to his great sacrifice and to erect a tablet to his memory. Over there is the field where, as a growing boy, he played the games of baseball and football which developed the strength of his body, the courage of his heart, and the fair play of his American spirit. Across the street is the Richwood Bowling Alley, where, as a young man, he engaged in the fraternal sport which taught him the value of teamwork among men.

This playstead and this neighborhood have not changed much since the days when he was growing to manhood. The grass is just as green, the trees look the same, even the men who sit on the benches in the evening to talk over the happenings of the day. The smoke curls lazily from the mill chimneys and we look up in wonder and admiration at the occasional plane which passes overhead. Everything seems to be just as it was, except that some who should be with us are gone.

They sleep in hero's graves far from home.

Before this solemn fact we pause, suddenly aware of the great debt we owe to these men. They left their homes and loved ones and crossed great oceans and landed on strange shores to defeat the evil that was threatening to enslave us. They fought, and many died, to preserve our homes, our churches, our schools, and our American way of life. Not for themselves did they sacrifice, but for you and me and for the children who are laughing and playing today, healthy and happy because they have been saved from fear. They fought for the peace and security of this, our neighborhood, and for the right of all peoples to go forward together to the bright future which we can win, if we will. They won the war believing that we would win the peace. They contributed all; we are asked to give some, so that the scourge of war may never ravage mankind again.

We meet to honor the memory of one of our neighbors who has set before us the highest example of unselfish service, and to pledge ourselves to the task of finishing the job to which he gave the last, full measure of his devotion. We have come to dedicate this bandstand to the undying spirit of Pfc Roland H. Vanderkerkove, who gave up his life that we might live.

It was on December the 30, 1920, that a son was born to Mr. and Mrs. Henry Vanderkerkove, only a short distance away from here, on Springfield Street. The First World War, during which the father saw action in France, as a member of the Twenty-sixth or Yankee Division, had ended just 2 years before. It was, you recall, the war to end wars. A weary world was settling down to a period of peace and prosperity, or so people thought and hoped. Sick and tired of war, they turned their backs on the world at large and every man concentrated on his own personal

future. For a few years, prosperity of a kind, did come; but then it suddenly ended and the world was plunged into the misery of economic depression. Agitators came to power in many countries, fanning the smouldering fires of discontent. World War II had already begun, though few of us knew it at the time. Certainly, the children of the 1920's and the early 1930's had no suspicion that the older people who were supposed to know so much would fail them. The joy of their childhood and adolescence was unclouded by any fear that they, who had no voice in the matter, would have to put aside all the fine promise of their youth, and pay, through suffering and death, for the mistakes of their elders. The tragedy was that even the elders did not know the bloody heritage they were building for these children by their indifference to the kind of world these children would grow up in. Men thought to find safety in money and property alone, ignoring the greater problems of their community which today is the world.

In this uneasy climate, Roland H. Vanderkerkove and his generation came to manhood. There, on the very threshold of life, we presented them with the staggering bill of our follies, which they, and not we, had to pay. And the price was not in terms of money or things, but in the irreplaceable treasure of their life's blood.

We had let the world drift into war and then called upon them to save it. They were "the lost generation," remember? Because of our mistakes at home, denying them regular employment and a decent chance for a start in life, they had become wanderers in the wilderness of our errors. But in 1941, we suddenly discovered that we needed them. And we begged the so-called lost generation to save us. What they did is a tribute to their spirit and a rebuke to our failures.

They, the dispossessed, fought with a faith and a courage so far beyond our comprehension that we shall never really know how much these few did for us, the many. If we could but know, we might become worthy of them.

The rolling hillsides of France are dotted with many white crosses. One of them covers the resting place of our late friend and neighbor, Pfc Roland H. Vanderkerkove.

This boy whom we knew, went to the South Union Street and Packard Schools and later attended Lawrence High. He earned his living at the Wood and later the Shawsheen Mill, before he was called to the service of his country. He was an active and prominent stockholder of L'Union Franco-Belge.

Roland H. Vanderkerkove made the supreme sacrifice in the invasion of France. He lies in the arms of the motherland, whence his forefathers came to find freedom of thought and conscience in America. He returned to France, along with many other splendid young Americans, to fight for economic and social freedom as well, and for the right and need of all people to live as neighbors in one world. And now he sleeps in the silent neighborhood where men of many races and different creeds rest side by side, without fear, or hate, or greed. They have found, in death, the democracy which is absent from the company of the living. The pity of it is that they had to die so young in order that we might learn the great responsibility which now faces us.

The plain fact is there are no more islands left on this globe of ours. No nation and no man can separate from others and live alone. We've got to find new techniques of working out our problems in justice to all.

And yet there are many who have not grown up to recognize this clear and inescapable truth. The first to feel this are the buddies of Roland Vanderkerkove. When we sent them off to save us from our mistakes, we promised that nothing was too good for them. But with the war and its lessons so recently behind us, many who stayed at home are forgetting their duty. They are living as if nothing, and I mean nothing, is too good for the returning veterans. The ex-soldiers are coming home to find that they must struggle for housing, for a chance at a decent job, and for the very clothes with which to seek that job. No wonder that some of them have become bitter as they see the prosperity of those who did not have to fight and discover that the doors to this are presently closed against them. In spite of this, however, they are not organizing to seek out advantages for themselves alone. They have learned, the hard way, that the old dog-eat-dog attitude must go. With a patriotism so much finer than ours, these new veterans are determined to work for improvements that will benefit not any one special group but all in the community. They will carry forward in peace as they did in war that fellowship in a common cause, which is the life-spirit of our democracy. And they will teach us, without charge, what they paid for so dearly to learn. For we are the beneficiaries of their sacrifices.

In behalf of the veterans of this war who wish to honor the memory of one of their buddies who did not return, for the neighbors and friends who remember him with affection, and for the family who, in mourning, take sober pride in the fact that he gave up his life to save others, we gather to dedicate this bandstand to Pfc Roland H. Vanderkerkove.

It is fitting and proper that we do it in this way. No rigid statue or cold monument, but a place of peace and pleasure and recreation, where his name will be enshrined among the living. Here, where his boyhood was lived, graced by the happy voices of children at play, he will be truly at home again with us.

Through the formality of dedicating this bandstand to him, we are coming closer to the great spirit that was his. By this ceremony we are dedicating ourselves; pledging that we who live will not fail the high responsibility which he has handed on to us. Never before, in the long history of man, has any generation been faced with the opportunity and the duty which is ours. For once we, the people of this world, have the chance to make or break ourselves. It is a big job—one that is more important than the personal job at home, in field, or store, or office, or factory—by which we earn our daily bread. It is the job of working together to build a human society that will be free from want and fear. The young man whose memory we honor this day died so that we might wake from our indifference to see the new horizons which challenge us. With the courage and the faith that was his, we must work toward these new goals. Anything less would dishonor his memory.

And so, in naming this public bandstand for one of our hero dead, we offer a silent prayer to his memory. We pray that in some way beyond our understanding he may know that his sacrifice was not in vain. We pray that we may be steadfast in our devotion to the cause of a just and enduring peace among men as among nations, which he fought and died to win. We ask, with Divine help, that this may be uppermost in our minds and hearts, not only for this day but forever.

In time to come, passing this way with those who are too young to know, we shall pause, and, pointing to this name, shall tell them the story. And we shall say to them: "Grow up clean and straight and strong. Be as loyal to the brotherhood of freemen as the young man whose name is held up in honor before you."

With the inspiring example of Roland H. Vanderkerkove, perpetuated for us, we of this neighborhood cannot fail in doing our share to promote the forward march of all the people.

Wheat, Flour, Food Policies of Government Bureaucrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, we have listened this afternoon to a most interesting and informative talk by our distinguished colleague from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], who has told us how the bungling and mistaken policies of administrative officials are about to ruin the poultry business in the far West. Our colleague has given us facts, free from partisanship, and his story is a very sad one. It is sad because numerous American citizens, who are interested in the business of raising poultry, producing eggs, etc., are going to have their business ruined and such a result could be avoided.

It is too bad that the administrative heads refuse to use business methods and common sense in dealing with problems that confront the Government. Some time ago it was learned that our commitments to send food to Europe called for larger exports than were available to the Government agencies. So, steps were taken to increase the amount of available wheat. Regulations were issued on February 15, 1946, which required the flour mills to use 80 percent of the whole-wheat grain in making flour instead of 72 percent. There was a lot of protest and as I recall it, people who were feeding that part of the wheat grain which was not used in flour to chickens and other animals pointed out that it would disrupt the whole production process in the raising of such kind of animals.

The remarks of our colleague from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] this afternoon were very interesting to me because everything that he has said was pointed out as sure to happen some time ago. His remarks just indicate what happens when you try to create an artificial or a planned economy such as we have today. Confusion results. We would be better off if the bureaus and bureaucrats could be chloroformed or asphyxiated, and the old fashioned economic law of supply and demand brought out of prison and granted its freedom. Of course, several million young chickens will have to die, not by the use of chloroform or lethal gas, but because of this planned economy of the bureaucrats who will wind up by shipping statistical wheat to the starving people of Europe while the young chickens at home starve to death.

Now, if we would follow the advice of my distinguished colleague from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], we would be able to help the famine-stricken countries of Europe and we would be able to save the young chickens from an untimely fate. We would, in that way, work injury to neither. Such a procedure, however, is contrary to the planned economy, and the net result will be that there will be less food for the unfortunate people of Europe and less food for the people in America.

The remarks of Congressman ELLSWORTH prompt me to call attention to some developments in connection with the exportation of wheat to other countries. Of course, the bureaus and bureaucrats will alibi. They will make excuses, but the facts are that the Government went into the black market and agreed to pay 30 cents a bushel more for wheat than it would let anybody else pay. This forced all wheat into Government channels and has deprived our flour mills of any wheat at all. The flour mills have either closed down or will close down. The bakers of bread and other bakery products have either quit business or will quit business. People either have used or will have to use oatmeal or rice as bread substitutes, if they are obtainable. Think of it. This is taking place almost 10 months after VJ-day in the land of the free and the home of the brave. The good and noble and well-intentioned people who were going to ship grain to Europe and save humanity are just making a mess of the thing, any way you want to consider it. I only touch on a few of the developments in these brief remarks.

First, the bureaus and bureaucrats ignored entirely the fact that the American people had to have a little consideration and should have a part of our available supply of wheat. They were overcome with generosity as usual and overlooked the fact that they could not ship all the wheat we had because of transportation problems. So, as in the case of the poultry producers, pointed out by Congressman ELLSWORTH, where there is plenty of wheat in reserve to feed the chickens and keep them from starving, in the case of shipping food products to Europe, we can ship our wheat so far as possible and still have some wheat left for Americans.

Then, here is another curious development. In Canada they are grinding their wheat into flour, giving employment to Canadian citizens in the flour mills and exporting flour instead of wheat. We cannot do that in the United States because that would be too sensible for any bureaucrat or administrative officer to comprehend. They have to close the flour mill at Duluth, the only one we have, while every day several hundred car loads of wheat come through Duluth for shipment to foreign countries. This is an outstanding example of ignorance, stupidity, and perhaps a fair degree of incompetence, which you would expect to find in the story books. By the time the bureaus and bureaucrats get their red tape unwound we will find the year 1947 approaching, and by that time they may decide it is a good policy to permit American flour mills to operate instead of closing them down and throwing people out of work. In that respect, we will be acting sensibly and normally like our good neighbors in Canada. Of course, it will be too late but a bureaucrat, like a hog down on an Indiana farm, cares nothing for time. Those animals remind me of the farmer down in Indiana who was interrogated by a city cousin. The city cousin told him that the hogs could masticate the corn much better and quicker if it were ground up into meal instead of being thrown out to the animals to let them devour the kernels of corn from the cob. The farmer gave the matter of fact reply, "After all, what is time to a hog?"

One flour mill official writes me that his company operates a mill and employs 36 employees in one place, a mill with about 130 employees at another place, and a mill with 88 employees at another place. He is compelled to close all of those mills and that results in unemployment. Of course, we can live in the hope that the new crop of wheat will be available some time in August and then he may be able to reopen the mills. Now, all of this is nonsensical, because it is unnecessary and reflects bad management on the part of administration officials. None of us want to hinder or obstruce the efforts to get food to the unfortunate, starving people in war-torn countries. All of us want to give them every measure of relief possible. We have a right, however, to expect that the program will not be bungled up and messed up so that the sum total of all efforts will be less food available than would otherwise be made possible.

Plenty of time has elapsed since we knew that more relief would be needed for the people in Europe and other places. The Department officials had plenty of notice. In my remarks, which appear in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A2378, I pointed out some of the things that are taking place today. Since I made those remarks I have been told that they do not have enough flour mills in European countries to grind the wheat after we get it over there. If that statement is true then the present governmental policy becomes all the more ridiculous.

Is Truman Labor Bill Aiming at State Capitalism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial:

STRIKES INTO REVOLUTION

There were two revealing points in President Truman's radio address to the country last Friday.

Mr. Truman laid particular emphasis on his record of friendship to organized labor; about to take steps designed to preserve law and order in behalf of all the community, the President apparently felt it necessary to imply some apology to the group that threatened law and order.

Also Mr. Truman chose to center his condemnation on two labor leaders. To anyone familiar with the record of industrial disputes over the last dozen years, it is quite clear that Messrs. Johnston and Whitney are neither the most arrogant nor the most extreme of their kind. They were not employing any unprecedented tactics. Quite the contrary, they were following those which had been approved and which had won victory in other strikes.

Now, why did Mr. Truman choose to cite justifications for a performance which was his plain duty? Why did he think it wise to create a couple of scapegoats?

It seems to us that if the President did not actually accept, he at least gave some recognition to, a delusion which certainly possesses most labor leaders, which just as certainly has been a standard of Government policy and which at times has seemed to have public acceptance. This delusion is that men organized into labor unions have not only the right to strike but the right to win a strike; that in the winning they have privileges superior to those of the ordinary citizen; that it is permissible for them to use these privileges and to assert their interest as having precedence over the community interest.

If organized labor can occupy premises and hold them in a state of siege, as in the sit-down strikes; if it can blockade and deny use of the streets in whole sections of the city; if it can organize armies whose intentions are clearly revealed by the presence of elaborate first-aid stations; if unions can do these things without interference, then why should anyone be surprised that Messrs. Johnston and Whitney thought it permissible to inflict privation on a grand scale?

That any such right or privilege existed was, and is, a delusion. It was a thing without any living substance, a puppet which moved only as propaganda and political favor pulled the strings. At the first challenge, even though it was a fearful, halting, apologetic challenge, the thing was revealed for what it is.

We now come to President Truman's speech to Congress, and his recommendations which call for the most drastic emergency powers.

Since last February this threat of a rail strike has existed. In dealing with that threat, Government had an instrument specifically designed for the purpose: the Railway Labor Act, which at various times has been proclaimed as the model for achieving industrial peace. Additionally, the Government possessed, as a hang-over from the war, more statutory powers than any American Government ever possessed. Nevertheless the rail strike took place.

Now see how the strike was ended. Not a single extraordinary power was used. The President merely employed the most fundamental power of the Executive, to protect life and property by an accepted instrument. The immediate moral support that such an announcement called forth doomed the strike which all the intricate arbitration machinery and all the extraordinary powers of the Government had been unable to prevent.

With that example before him, Mr. Truman nevertheless went before Congress and asked more emergency powers.

There never was a time when government with its continuing pretense of an emergency was so intimately concerned with attempting to guide industrial relations. There never has been a time when those relations were in a worse state. Yet here comes Mr. Truman with recommendations which would result in complete Government control and paralysis of all processes of collective bargaining. And this recommendation treads on the heels of Mr. Truman's own demonstration of the correct use of governmental powers.

If the President's recommendations represented mere hasty, illogical mental processes, they would be bad enough. But they are much worse.

The heart of the proposed program is the drafting of workers into the armed services if they persist in refusing to work after the Government has taken over the operation of a property.

Let us see what may be involved. There are 400,000 miners on strike. Suppose they are drafted. Suppose they remain away from the mines. How many soldiers will it take

to round them up? Suppose they resist being rounded up. Suppose they are herded to the mines one day but fail to return the next day. Then, of course they will have to be guarded at all times in some concentration camp. Suppose they are taken to the mines and refuse to work, that is, stage a slow-down. The accepted way to deal with that situation is to take every tenth man and shoot him. Either this proposal to draft men to work is an empty threat or it is something that the Government proposes to attempt. Probably it is the former, which is sufficient condemnation, but if it is the latter it entails consequences which are perfectly horrible to contemplate.

It is politically impossible to propose that some men be drafted to work for other men's profit, so whether the owners are guilty or innocent of wrongdoing the Government proposes to take their property and operate it for the profit of the Federal Treasury. That is certainly grease for the toboggan that would shoot the country into state capitalism.

All in all, it would be hard to think of a formula more ideally suited to the purposes of that little group which is trying to change the character of the American economy and American society.

Mr. Truman has found the way to turn strikes into revolution.

The Truth About Guam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that this country several months ago emerged victoriously from the greatest and most catastrophic war in all times some people, for selfish or political reasons, are still prone to criticize our wartime President, Franklin Roosevelt, the wartime Congress, and the Chiefs of the Army and Navy Staffs for what could have or should have been done in preparing this country for that war. Particularly singled out in political campaigns has been the controversial question of Guam. Some have taken the position that Guam should have been fortified; others have contended that Guam should have been entirely evacuated. There has been a great deal of misinformation and misrepresentation about this tiny little island a few miles off the coast of Japan and nearly 6,000 miles from Washington. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Guam argument, both pro and con, has been the subject of so much comment and misrepresentation that it might be well to see just what the undisputed facts themselves are.

First, the records show undisputably that there never has been before Congress a bill to fortify Guam. They do show that on two occasions, in February of 1939 and in February of 1940, there was a proposal before the House of Representatives to authorize an appropriation of $5,000,000 to "(a) build a breakwater; (b) dredge the harbor, remove coral heads, provide a channel for ships and for seaplane operation; and (c) build seaplane ramps and parking space."

The Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, stated when this bill was being considered:

I can assure you that there is no intention on the part of the Navy Department to fortify Guam or to do anything further than what is included in this bill.

Again, when the matter was before the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, Admiral Leahy, the head of the Navy Board, stated among other things after being asked by Chairman WALSH whether the proposal was one to fortify Guam:

This is not the case. The only improvements contemplated at the present time are the building of a breakwater, dredging to improve the seaplane take-off area, and minor preparations to handle planes.

During the same hearing before the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, Senator JOHNSON of California asked Admiral Leahy:

How much would it take to make Guam safe from assault by any belligerent nation?

Admiral Leahy, in responding, replied:

Something in the neighborhood of $200,000,000. Such a proposition is not in the mind of the Navy Department at the present time. The only improvements contemplated are $5,000,000 for harbor improvements. * * * I must say there is no proposition before the Congress at the present time to establish any kind of a base at Guam, and we are now speaking of things which are not proposed and are not in contemplation by the Navy Department. * * * It is entirely possible, Senator, that in the future it may become necessary, from the point of view of national defense, to fortify the island of Guam. I am unable to say when that will happen, or whether it will ever happen. At the present time there is no proposal to do more than improve the harbor.

Again, in the Senate hearing when Rear Adm. Arthur B. Cook was asked whether it was proposed to fortify Guam his answer was:

The fact that Guam could be fortified, or might in the future, if the Congress so decides, actually be fortified, has nothing to do with the harbor improvement that is now proposed.

From the above quotations it will be seen—

Said Senator WALSH, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate—

that the question of fortifying Guam was never presented and was not voted on by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, when this question of harbor improvements was before the House, bearing in mind that the question of the fortification of Guam has never been before the House, I took a stand against the appropriation of this $5,000,000 for this purpose. I did so on the ground that at that time such an undertaking would be a mistake for two reasons: First, it was evident that our relations with Japan were so strained that such an action on our part would possibly precipitate an attack on us before we were prepared for war; and, second, that if we did expend this money in these harbor improvements it would only serve Japan when they had taken it. I asked this question in the debate:

If you are not going to fortify the island, then why do anything about it? In other words, why go in there and deepen the harbor that would be useful to Japan * * * because we would not be able to protect it if we did not have any fortifications.

Mr. Speaker, I thought then my position was sound, and I have no reason to change my opinion about it in the aftermath of the war. For it so happened that the money was made available and Guam proved to be a death trap. Guam fell to Japan in the first onslaught. The best information I have been able to secure is that our small force of some 50 sailors and marines, along with several hundred civilian workers, were all captured.

In view of the fact that the mighty fortresses of Hong Kong and Singapore—the latter costing a half billion dollars—also fell to Japan, my contention that $5,000,000 would not have saved Guam is proved. As tragic as the capture of these heroic American citizens is, it must be obvious that had we expended even a billion dollars the result would have been the same after the sneak and dastardly attack at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I should like to point out that I not only voted for every authorization and every dollar, both for the preparedness of this country for war and for the waging of that war, but I also advocated the preparedness of this country for the war that I saw was coming as far back as March of 1936. At that time I made a speech on the floor of the House under the caption "American neutrality—an answer to the war lords." After pointing out the unsettled conditions that existed in Europe and in Asia at that time, I said in part on March 19, 1936:

Mr. Chairman, there is an old adage to the effect that in times of peace we should prepare for war. I should like to paraphrase this for the purpose of this discussion and say, "In times of peace, prepare for peace." With Europe a veritable volcano of war at present, with the war clouds of another gigantic war, the like of which possibly the world has never heretofore witnessed, hanging the lowest on the world's horizon, with the diplomatic endeavors of the Old World statesmen daily changing into kaleidoscopic patterns, with the whole of Europe jockeying for position, it must be manifest, even to him who reasons as he runs, that the enemy of civilization and Christianity, the all-powerful god of war, is busy about his task. War is imminent. Just how far distant it is no man can successfully predict. It may be 6 months, it may be 2 years. At the most it cannot be more than 5 years unless something not now apparent develops. * * *

Is it necessary for me to point out to my colleagues here that treaties, pacts, and agreements are worthless in a world of nations who are arming to the limit of their economic ability; when aggression and expansion are the ultimate desires of so many nations of the world? Is it necessary to call your attention to the fact that a peaceful overture of one powerful nation to another today is withdrawn almost before an opportunity for its acceptance has been given? The order of procedure among the nations of the world today is so selfish and so self-centered that one is reminded of a public auction where the highest bidder is the purchaser of the thing sought. A powerful nation through its diplomatic circles issues a strong denunciation today of the encroachment upon the national rights of a weaker nation. A few months later the same powerful nation, when it is either to the economic or strategic interest of that nation to do so, barters or negotiates with the same nation that it has so

recently denounced. We have seen treaties, pacts, and agreements thrown overboard, apparently without rhyme or reason other than that might makes right. Apparently, therefore, we are driven to the conclusion that, however desirable and beautiful are world courts, leagues of nations, and international agreements for disarmament in their theory, we are confronted, as peace loving as we are, with the realization that we are dealing with nations, who, like men, have as their controlling factor a selfish desire to prosper at the other fellow's expense.

In this situation are we not driven, driven reluctantly, but nevertheless driven, to a little selfish consideration of our own national preservation? Because of this unfortunate situation our Navy and our Army, and more especially our Navy, must be built up to the point where it will be excelled by none, not even that of Great Britain. Our vast shore lines and outlying possessions must be protected. American integrity and American nationality must be conserved. The heritage purchased by our glorious ancestry, with its institutions and its ideals, must be maintained. When Europe and the rest of the world has awakened to the truth that peace is precious and that the race in armaments and warfare must end, then—and not until then—can America afford to cease its vigilance.

Mr. Chairman, let us in the present status of world affairs follow the advice of that great patriot and seer who sleeps at Mount Vernon. Let us maintain a policy of strict neutrality; live up to the letter and spirit of the neutrality law so recently enacted, and thereby serve notice upon a warring world that America desires peace; that she maintains a strict neutrality so long as she is allowed to pursue that course; but that by the means and methods of her perfected armed forces she here and now warns those who would break that peace with her that there will inevitably and surely be but one result, the annihilation of that aggressor. Then, and then alone, will we be able to maintain neutrality and enjoy coveted peace.

The Unknown Soldier Speaks Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. P. W. GRIFFITHS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a poem written by a fellow townsman of mine, Mr. William H. H. Gantz, which I believe is most appropriate as we approach Memorial Day:

THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER SPEAKS AGAIN

I died because the world is vain
And hopeless in its greed for gain;
And I died because there is no thought
Of brotherhood which Jesus taught.

I died because the world is cruel,
And sordid, too, with despot's rule;
Where "shalt not kill" and "shalt not steal"
Are virtues each without appeal.

I died because the world goes mad,
And lust and sin becomes a fad;
And I died because it is wrong—not right,
Which rules the world with sheer delight.

I died because of the selfish ways
Which dominate our earthly days;
And wickedness, too, and hate and strife,
A flaming part of each one's life.

I died because we gave no thought
To the creed George Washington taught;
And I died because we gave no heed
To immortal Lincoln's word and deed.

I died because the church has failed,
But, that's your fault and mine!
We made our vows—then broke the pledge
And lived on worldly wine.

We of the dead—so burdened with fame
Care not at all for the name;
But, we of the dead shall ever hope—
That our sacrifice was not in vain.

And so I bring this message to you,
The soldier boys of World War Two;
You are the hope of democracy—
And America's men of destiny.

So much depends on each of you,
And how you think and what you do;
Much more depends on what you learn
And the message you bring when you return.

IN CONCLUSION

You have now returned to your native hearth,
You have won the war and have proved your worth;
Continue the fight—and with all your might
For peace on earth which is yours by right.

—*William H. H. Gantz.*

MARIETTA, OHIO.

Strike-Control Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of May 27, 1946:

STRIKE-CONTROL BILL

President Truman's emergency strike-control bill, which the House passed by 306 to 13 on Saturday, may properly be regarded as insurance against a particular type of man-made economic calamity. It is not an anti-strike bill in the ordinary sense of the word, for it leaves unions free to apply any sort of coercion they can muster against private employers. The severe penalties embodied in the bill are reserved solely for union leaders, workers, and employers who strike against the Government when it is trying to operate great industries that must be kept running in the national interest.

No measure of this sort applying to all strikes could have been pushed through the House, even if the President had recommended it, which, of course, he had no thought of doing. Certainly the Senate would not approve any general strike-breaking device. The President's emergency bill has met with widespread acclaim only because it will enable the Government to halt or prevent strikes against the people and the Nation. In our opinion, labor has no legitimate grievance against a bill limited to this purpose however severe the penalties imposed for strikes against public authority.

It is well to remember, also, that the bill has harsh penalties for employers in industries necessary to the national economy if they do not successfully negotiate agreements with their employees. Plants, mines, or railroads taken over and operated by the Government because of strikes will pay their net profits, if any, into the United States Treasury. The bill proclaims a policy of denying both employers and employees benefits from the seizure of a strike-harassed industry.

Of more immediate interest, however, are the respective predicaments in which both union leaders and workers would find themselves if they should continue a strike when the Government has seized the struck properties. Union leaders would be put under a positive obligation not only to refrain from directing or aiding a strike or slow-down but also "to take appropriate affirmative action to rescind or terminate such strike, lock-out, slow-down or interruption." Failure to do so would render them liable to heavy fines or imprisonment or to punishment for contempt of court if an injunction (also authorized by the bill) had been granted.

Individuals refusing to go back to work in a Government-seized industry would lose their seniority rights and the protection of the National Labor Relations Act. In effect, their jobs would be swept away and the question of rehiring them as new employees would be solely up to the owners or operators of the plants seized. Here is a very drastic penalty which can be justified only because it is reserved for strikers acting against the Government. There is also a proviso that such strikers could be drafted into the Army, but we suspect that this would not prove necessary in view of the other remedies provided.

The bill would put into the hands of the President ample power to deal with any foreseeable national emergency resulting from strikes or lock-outs. That the Government should have this power seems to us no longer open to question. Democracy must save itself from the threat of disintegration that has arisen out of repeated strikes against public authority. The Nation is fortunate indeed that the President and Congress are standing together to buttress our political and economic system for the difficult reconstruction period ahead.

Twentieth Century Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a letter I have received from Mr. O. W. Johnson, one of the oldest and stanchest supporters of the Townsend plan in my congressional district:

I am in my eighty-second year, a born and bred American citizen of old colonial stock. My ancestors have worked, fought, bled, and died in war and peace since Rhode Island was first settled to help make this vast Nation the free land it is.

I am of that generation that inherited this Nation from their fathers at the close of their pioneering efforts. Many of the basic industries of today were then a-borning, or, in their adolescence.

I began my adult industrial struggle at 21. My sole assets were health, a strong body, a bride, $1.50 in cash, and no inheritance or family influence to help us start.

In 1893 I was superintendent in a city manufacturing plant drawing a good salary for that day. Both were wrecked in the panic of that year.

In 1927 I owned stocks, bonds, mortgages, and real estate valued at $27,000. Under the baleful influence of the late thirties, it all

faded away like ice under a summer's sun, and now, at 82, I am an Ohio State pensioner.

I am writing this to ask why, I, and millions more of the generations since the Civil War, still alive, that are just as loyal, just as industrially inclined where strength permits, and have been just as active and responsible for this Nation's greatness as any of those gone before, are not unquestionably worthy of and entitled to a just and fair dividend out of the huge national and personal wealth our generation's basic planning and personal labors made possible for the current and future generations to receive and enjoy? And now, because of natural causes beyond our control, are we to be compelled to turn all of this great national household, this magnificent estate, the sum total of our life's efforts over to our children and their children's children for a pauper's pension, a beggar's dole, a bum's hand-out, or are we to be treated with the honor and respect our achievements are entitled to and receive the dividend asked for in H. R. 2229 and H. R. 2230?

If this is denied us, are we to understand that the pauper's role is what our sons and daughters, and their children think of us and the heritage we are leaving them? Is that their idea of a just and fitting reward, an honest compensation for the genius, the labor and talent expended by us, their parents in producing the most scientific, industrial, and wealthy nation ever recorded in the annals of time? Is that the deal, the kind of feeling they want their children to hand out to them when age bends the back, whitens the locks, and dims their tired old eyes?

God forbid; that flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone, and blood of our blood should ever possess the feeling and spirit of the depraved, ravaging human vultures that live by sucking the financial blood of their helpless victims without conscience, pity, or remorse. We do not want to believe, we cannot believe, that the boys and girls we so fondly loved, fed, clothed, educated, and fashioned this mighty land of the free for them to live in, would, or possibly could have the cold-blooded heart to turn us down when we no longer can stand on the firing line of life's strenuous battle.

We of our generation do not want either a pension, a dole, or a charitable hand-out, as such. What we do want is a clean-cut, regular business deal embodying a legal, lawful transfer of rights for a consideration of an annual sum equal to a 3-percent levy or royalty on the gross income our heirs and successors receive from the estate we, their lawful parents, are now compelled to release, and turn over to them, all our rights, deeds, and claims to some. The receipts of said levy to be distributed how, when, and to the class of recipients named in said bills.

We are not selfish in this matter, our bitter experience has taught us the absolute necessity of providing a Federal guaranteed life insurance against the ravages of depressions and the assurances that the Federal Government is the only known institution that stands a show of weathering the ever-recurring crises and panics that would wreck any private insurance institution regardless of its financial strength, for, if the United States Government cannot survive, no private institution can.

Today, the wealth of the Nation is set at approximately $361,700,000,000 with an annual private income of over $149,000,000,000, and largely the direct result of the ability and labors of the generations active since the Civil War.

To prove this assertion, of their achievement and intrinsic value, let the facts speak for themselves.

We took the wild and woolly West, made peace with the Indians, developed its mines, built great ranches and covered them with cattle, hogs, and sheep, created farms, homes, villages, towns, cities with their giant industries and spanned its broad acres with mile upon mile of railways and telegraph systems from the broad Mississippi to the Pacific's ocean shore.

We took the old four-wheeled, wood-burning locomotive of our father's day and developed it into the modern 10-wheeled goliath and its Diesel counterpart of today and built some 228,000 miles of steel rail beds to run them on.

We took the horse-drawn midget streetcar and cable systems of yesterday and made them into vast electric network of lines servicing the huge area of residential, industrial, and business districts of city, State, and Nation.

We developed the multiple-message system per wire and the teleprinting machine of recent years.

We took the telephone from the experimental laboratory and hung them in the homes, business places, factories, and covered the land with its poles, wires, and cables.

We chained the lightning to a wire and made it produce the arc and incandescent light, and drive the motors in factories, busses, automobiles, and on the farms.

We took the side- and stern-wheel lilliput steamers and converted them into those huge propeller-driven monsters carrying the world's commerce over the seven seas.

We imprisoned the human voice on imperishable records so that countless generations yet unborn, may listen to the golden cadenzas of a Caruso, or a Melba's vocal beauty.

We harnessed the etherial waves, and in the space of a human thought make them carry our voices and music over mountains, rivers, lakes, and plains, even to the uttermost parts of the earth.

Again we robbed the laboratory and took the internal combustion engine and fashioned it to meet the needs of the world in an undreamed of source of light, transportable power to lighten the labors of man and open the industrial dawn of the most wonderful age of human progress.

We abolished the age-old slavery on the farm with a full line of power-driven tools for harvesting, plowing, tilling, and seeding, and gave them the gasoline-driven tractor that powers them all, and found the gas and oil to run it with.

We took the steam-driven monstrosities of Cugnots, Twevithick's, James Churches', and Daimler's gas-driven buggy, and developed them into the streamlined, beautifully upholstered 100-mile-per-hour masterpieces of today's auto world, and built over 1,600,000 miles of surfaced roads to run them on.

We converted the horse-drawn dray and wagons into the motor-driven delivery bus and the huge 10-ton freight trucks now carrying the Nation's commerce from ocean to ocean and Lakes to gulf.

We drove drudgery out of the home with the vacuum sweeper, washing and ironing machines, oil, gas, and electric stoves, gas and electric refrigerators, hot-air, hot-water, and steam-heating systems.

We abolished the old wooden navy of our fathers and built the huge steel-turreted, 16-inch, 20-mile shooting gunned battle wagons that sunk Cervera's Spanish fleet and its armada in Manila Bay.

We created the greatest technological era, the greatest industrial plants and systems, the most versatile and amazing automatic machinery ever known to man.

We not only fed ourselves far better than any other peoples on earth, but in times of great disasters through storms, earthquakes, floods, and fires, we rushed food and other supplies to those stricken peoples with haste, good will, and our heartfelt sympathy.

We created, designed, and built the successful motion-picture industry, turned it into voice and color and now, soon, both voice and actors in distant places will be seen and heard at the fireside of the family home.

We wrenched from the hidden archives of nature the marvelous radar's powerful beam and forced the man in the moon to answer our call.

We captured the illusive atom and unlocked its gigantic forces that may yet be harnessed to power the industrial might of coming years.

We started from scratch in 1914 and raised, trained, officered, and equipped a fighting force that under Pershing helped defeat the highly trained forces of the arrogant Hun.

We again started from scratch, so to speak, raised, trained, and equipped the mightiest fighting force ever let loose in any war and under Eisenhower and MacArthur brought the most devilish hosts of human ghouls ever spawned from the pits of hell to their knees in unconditional surrender.

And so I could go on and on, indefinitely, for the list of our achievements will fill thousands of pages of future encyclopedias in their effort to record the multitude of accomplishments arising out of the activities of the adult millions of American citizens since 1875.

And in closing I ask, how can you, our own flesh and blood, our children, beings we loved, nurtured in illness, fed when hungry, doctored when sick, clothed with the best we could afford, built the finest of schools and colleges to educate: I repeat, how can you before your God tell us, your fathers and mothers, that we are not worthy of a just and fair dividend out of the huge and rich estate we built up for you, and that the inexorable law of nature forces us to turn over to you?

Protection Against Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial and article from today's New York Times of Monday, May 27, 1946:

PROTECTION AGAINST STRIKES

There is only one credible interpretation to be placed on what took place in Washington over the week-end. When a President whose whole record as legislator and Executive has been one of consistent partiality toward organized labor suddenly proposes the enactment of a law under which leaders of strikes against Government-seized properties may be sent to prison for a year and strikers themselves may be drafted into the Army and ordered back to work, and when a House of Representatives whose ear is always particularly close to the ground in an election year proceeds to pass this measure within 2 hours' time, there is no reasonable explanation except an immense pressure of public opinion to achieve some protection against strikes which have threatened the very life of the Nation.

The leaders of organized labor in this country will read the signs of the times very badly if they fail to recognize that the great mass of unorganized Americans have lost patience with successive strikes in basic industries, by means of which powerful trade-unions have attempted and are attempting to force the diversion to themselves, in a time of inflation, of a larger share of a much smaller supply of goods, at the price of a considerably smaller output of effort. It is undeniable, and the action of Mr. Truman and the House of Representatives is proof of the truth of the statement, that there is in this country

at this time a strong and widespread conviction that an earlier monopoly of unregulated capital, placing group interest above national interest, has now been succeeded by a monopoly of industrial labor, which carries similar possibilities of evil and which likewise demands regulation.

The regulatory measure which the House has passed, on the President's initiative, is, by the President's own description, drastic. What should not be overlooked, however, is that it is not only drastic, so far as the rights of organized labor are concerned, but that it is also drastic from the point of view of the employer. For the bill provides that the owners and managers of businesses may also go to prison for willfully violating the measures of the bill and failing to take appropriate affirmative action to end strikes or lockouts. Moreover, whenever an industry has been seized by the Government (which can happen through no fault whatever of the owner, but solely because a strike has been called by his employees), the President shall have power to establish fair and just wages for the period of Government seizure—and we may be sure that such wages, fixed not at all by the process of collective bargaining, but solely by Government order, would remain at that point thereafter. Meantime, all net profits resulting from Government operation would be turned over to the Treasury.

Furthermore, it seems certain that one effect of the bill, if approved without change by the Senate, must be to stimulate greatly the whole practice of Government seizure. For it is to be noted that nothing whatever happens, under the terms of the bill, until a property is seized. It is then and then only that the proposed restraints and penalties would come into being. The result must surely be to promote Government seizure as the most effective method—and in fact, so far as this bill is concerned, the only method—of dealing with a strike. And while the President's message promises to use this power of seizure sparingly, the terms of the bill itself are broad enough to give him power to seize anything and everything, provided only that it is deemed by him to be vitally necessary to the maintenance of the national economy.

What is not vitally necessary to the maintenance of the national economy in this highly mechanized modern age? Certainly the list of vitally necessary things includes railways, coal, and steel. Does it not also include meats and other food products, textiles, automobiles, leather goods, metals, house furnishing, drugs, clothing, machine tools, petroleum, building materials, and a hundred other items? And must not the fact that the present bill proposes no grant whatever of additional authority until a factory or a mine or a mill has been seized promise vastly to accelerate the seizure process, with all of the attendant evils with which we have become familiar—the diversion of attention from the real problem, the fiction of "Government ownership," and the steady erosion of respect for the rights of private property?

These are points for the Senate to consider, along with such points as seem certain to be raised concerning the enforceability of the measure and its effects on the traditional rights of labor, and there is also this further and more fundamental point to be considered: Would it not be more practicable and more profitable to do something to prevent strikes from occurring, or from being prolonged until they create a national crisis, than merely to provide a remedy which begins to work only after they have reached the crisis stage and the country is in a furor?

In our judgment, Congress can both reduce the number of strikes and ameliorate their severity if it will move to restrain the monopoly power which it has given the leaders of the trade-union movement in the basic labor law of the country—the Wagner Labor Relations Act. If it wishes to deal with causes and not merely with consequences, let Congress at once subject that statute to thoroughgoing revision—in order to make certain that it provides at every point equal responsibilities for employee and employer, equal penalties, and the conditions of genuinely fair collective bargaining.

A STRIKE THAT CAST A LONG SHADOW

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

The "Stop, Look, and Listen" sign was out for all Americans last week A Nation-wide railroad strike is like a general strike in that it affects everybody, and affects them directly and immediately, so that even a brief stoppage of the many-spoked wheel on which we all revolve caused the kind of shock that often changes the mind and temper of a nation.

Two days of arrested motion made us realize that life is movement. It demonstrated that industrial war can do to an uninvaded continent what military war did to Europe. A temporary stopping of train service alone gives a very faint idea of the paralysis that results from the smashing of rails, roads, freight yards, locomotives, trucks, busses, bridges, power stations, but at least it gives some conception of the primary problem Europeans faced when the fighting ended. It is a problem they still face, for getting the transport system started over there is not a matter of persuading a couple of unions or a couple of union leaders to permit all the rest to go back to work. It is a matter of starting again from scratch, without raw materials, without tools, with decimated manpower and insufficient food for hard labor. For people camping for hours in makeshift stations waiting for a train, people for whom transport is the blood of life, the sight of railway lines deliberately tied up must be the climactic scene in the American extravaganza.

ONE PHASE OVER

And it was a climatic scene. One phase of the labor struggle is over. The strike was not fruitless if it awakened Americans to the danger to democracy of showdowns between special interests and general interests. It would be too much to say that the political reaction called fascism began because the trains stopped running. Fascism was the symptom of many obscure diseases; it rose out of the backwash of one war and led to another as inevitably as the spring rises to its source. It was a surrender of individual responsibility to an abstraction called the state which soon fattened into a monster on the power the people relinquished. But at first it was just the exploitation by an eloquent demagog of popular weariness of class warfare and weak government.

The strike was not fruitless if it taught Americans that nothing in this country is stronger than public opinion. Democracy weakens only because people falter in their faith in the power of the people to influence government and master events. In his appeal to the striking railwaymen and his recommendation to Congress the President spoke with force because he expressed the will of the people. Whether he should have waited until beyond the last minute to speak is another question; maybe the demonstration has to be complete before democracy can render its slow but massive judgments. At any rate, the strikers yielded to public opinion. At a time when men too often feel helpless, it is worth a crisis to be reassured that this is the ultimate force.

ANGER A POOR FOUNDATION

But anger is a poor foundation for a new policy. Fascism proved that. The fact that public opinion here is largely the opinion of labor is a safeguard against the senseless exasperation that throws out the baby with the bath water. The railroad strike, and the coal strike in somewhat lesser degree, brought out more clearly than before that we are a nation of workers, all so closely tied together in the network of industry that every striker puts a score of other workers out of a job. That is why the strike as a weapon is as archaic as the noncombatant in modern war. The long-term legislation Congress is asked to work out must invent a new system of stage-by-stage arbitration—perhaps on the order of the Toledo plan—which will consolidate and expand the gains labor has achieved by organization and collective bargaining without interfering with the work of others or interrupting the rhythm of production on which the life and prosperity of America depend.

And not only the life of America. No strike in history ever cast such a long shadow as the rail tie-up in the United States. It revealed not only that millions starve when the movement of American supplies is slowed up, but that American production is a life-and-death matter for the whole world. The international effects of a major strike in this country, on American prestige, on the free-enterprise system, on the future course of mankind, are literally without precedent. They place upon American labor, and America itself, a responsibility for which nothing has prepared them.

The American people have seen in the last few days how inextricably all the interests of this country are bound together, and how the movements of the world are geared into our production and transportation system. This is not class conflict, and the employer's answer to it is not fascism; behind its plaster front of "order" both capital and labor died. Nor is communism the worker's answer; the power labor exercises here, not to speak of the right to work or not to work, is impossible under the government of the proletariat.

War, domestic or international, is no longer the answer to any problem. The idea that society is divided into separate classes, like the idea that the world is composed of separate nations, has to give way to modern realities. Every civil war is now a world war and every world war is a civil war. And in these wars there are no winners. Force has become a boomerang, wherefore man has no recourse save the use of reason.

As You Were

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion certain Members of Congress completely missed President Truman's point in section 7 of the emergency legislation which the House passed on Saturday, May 25.

Section 7 provides in part:

That any person subject thereto who has failed or refused to return to work within 24 hours shall be inducted into the Army of the United States.

Now, certain Members of Congress referred to this language as "involuntary servitude" and inferred that the men so inducted under the provision of section 7 were criminals and that their induction would cast reflection upon the honor and dignity of the Army and Navy tradition, as well as upon those now serving or who had previously served in our armed forces.

In my opinion, these Congressmen overlook the words in section 7 of "subject thereto." Now, what does "subject thereto" mean in this instance?

In my opinion it means subject to the terms and conditions as outlined in the Selective Service and Training Act, which would make them subject to the draft as regards age, marital status, and so forth. In other words, if any person subject to induction had been deferred due to occupational reasons, and then deliberately refused to work at the occupation for which he had been deferred, he would then, according to my interpretation of the President's recommendation in section 7, be subject to induction. This in no manner catalogs these men as criminals. It simply means that they had a contract with their Government to work in a given occupation which was considered essential to the health, safety, and interest of the Nation. As a reward for this essential service they were granted deferment from serving in the armed forces. Now if they refuse to fulfill their part of the contract by failure to perform work which has been declared essential, then they forfeit all rights under the contract, and if subject to the provisions of selective service, their further deferment ceases to exist.

The sancity of contract is one of the oldest provisions of English law. Breaking a contract does not necessarily brand a person as a criminal, but it certainly makes null and void any rights and benefits which he might have had under the contract.

If it is involuntary servitude to induct one of these men into the armed forces, then it is also involuntary servitude to induct anyone who is subject to the provisions of the Selective Service and Training Act.

Briefly then, these men are not being penalized by being inducted into the armed forces any more than all men previously inducted were so penalized. They simply lose, by their own voluntary act, their contractual rights and return to the status quo of every other American citizen under the provisions of the Selective Service and Training Act.

This is entirely different from the recommendations made by the late President Roosevelt as a substitute for the Smith-Connally bill. In that recommendation it was proposed that every individual in the United States, both male and female, between the ages of 18 and 65 would be subjected to every whim and fancy of the administration. If my interpretation is correct, this present provision deals only with those who come within the provisions of selective service so far as induction is concerned.

Support for the Fuller Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HADWEN C. FULLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, since I introduced House bill 5893, a bill to prohibit the exportation of American grains to nations which are manufacturing alcoholic beverages from agricultural products while their people are starving, individuals and organizations have written, wired, and telephoned me from all sections of the country telling me of their vigorous support.

There is no Member of the Congress more interested than I in seeing that the people of Europe are kept from starving, but it is not fair to them, nor to the American people, who are going without, that the alcoholic-beverage industry in those nations should continue to use grain during this crucial time.

As many Members of the House and Senate have expressed their interest in this legislation, and the principles underlying it, I would like to read a newspaper article which appeared in the Syracuse Herald-Journal recently on the front page. This article, written by Ben Atlas, a very able newspaperman, summarizes most accurately the picture in regard to the Fuller bill at the present time:

LEADERS BACK FULLER BILL

(By Benjamin Atlas)

WASHINGTON.—Leaders of the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization indicated support here today for a proposal by Representative HADWEN C. FULLER, of Oswego, to ban shipping of American grain to foreign countries that use the grain for alcoholic beverages.

The UNFAO leaders were sounded out on the Fuller proposal incidental to a conference by the UNFAO which is being held here. The Oswego Congressman's proposal, meanwhile, is embodied in a bill now awaiting action of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Fiorello H. LaGuardia, Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, was among conference leaders here who voiced approval of the Fuller proposal. LaGuardia, in a message to FULLER declared: "If any country persists in using grain for alcoholic beverages and attempts to export to the United States, I will come up on the Hill and ask for protective legislation."

Others who registered support included Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson and Secretary of State James F. Byrnes.

FULLER, heartened by responses of these leaders, said today he was determined to press for favorable discharge of his congressional measure which, he said, has the primary objective of "cutting off supplies of American grain to any foreign countries that continue to manufacture alcoholic beverages from agricultural products while their people are starving."

"Once the grain is handed over to the foreign countries," said FULLER, "we lose control of it and there is no guaranty that it goes to the starving.

"A gentleman traveling in Italy recently told me he was present at the auctioning of American grain by Italian authorities, and a large share of it went to the brewers and distillers although the people do not have enough to eat over there.

"Recently France and Denmark exchanged some American grain. France got wheat and Denmark got corn. The corn, I am told, was fed to Danish hogs. This is discouraging to American farmers, who are asked to raise fewer pigs because they cannot get feed which is supposed to go abroad to the starving."

FULLER declared that Secretary of Agriculture Anderson in a letter "admitted that in the last quarter of last year we sent 3,000,000 bushels of malt to Holland for purposes of making beer there."

"The Dutch, with their business sense, attempted to import this beer to the United States," FULLER said, "but I was able to nip this scheme in the bud."

"Reliable sources tell me," said FULLER, "that truckers are picking up corn off farms in the Middle West and taking it to Mexico to be manufactured into alcoholic beverages which are imported into this country. Most liquor stores advertise Mexican beer and liquor.

"While our own breweries are making considerable sacrifice and thousands of people, many of them veterans, are losing their jobs, the import of Mexican beer has increased 50 times and the import of Canadian beer 20 times. In other words, while we are tightening our belts to feed the starving, other countries are taking advantage of this situation.

"Last week I was advised that 1,000 cars of grain from our own Middle West were shipped to Mexico for manufacture of alcoholic beverages. We must make mighty sure that our grain gets to the starving."

Secretary of State Byrnes promised FULLER several weeks ago that he would present the issue formally to the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization Conference in Washington this week. Byrnes made the pledge after FULLER had written to him complaining about the shipment of American grain abroad for nonfood alcoholic purposes.

FULLER told Byrnes that the use of American grain abroad for alcoholic purposes "is decidedly unfair to the American people and to the unfortunates who are starving."

"In view of the deep interest expressed by yourself and the United Nations in worthwhile moves to prevent starvation of millions of people," FULLER told Byrnes, "I believe it would be well in order for this group (UNFAO) to take immediate and concrete action to support the principles of my bill."

LaGuardia in a recent communication to FULLER said he has received assurances from Poland that the use of grain by breweries is now illegal. LaGuardia also informed FULLER that the Government of Czechoslovakia has assured him no beer will be brewed for export "and only a limited quantity will be made for workers in heavy industry whose health requires it."

Anderson, at FULLER's request, has been making a survey of the uses of American grain abroad.

FULLER said he has received more than 1,200 letters from individuals and groups in all parts of the country approving his measure. Five hundred communications have come to him from Onondaga County alone, he said. Support has come from both "wets" and "drys," including several locals of the Women's Christian Temperance Union and a number of brewery workers' organizations.

It is estimated that more than 75,000 communications on the subject have been received on the Hill, with an overwhelming majority favoring the proposal.

The Negro's War Record: or the Negro Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with my unanimous-consent request, which was granted, I am inserting the following remarks which I made at memorial services conducted by the George T. Cornish Post, No. 292, the American Legion, Philadelphia, Pa., on Sunday, May 26, 1946:

Today, my friends, as we gather here to do honor to the Negro soldier, we may all be

proud, and his country as well, of his magnificent contribution to victory.

In this last war, as in all wars in American history, the Negro soldier played a decisive role. His heroic deeds are brilliantly emblazoned on the pages of victory. He stands before history as a real patriot—a true fighting man—a champion of freedom. We do well to recognize and applaud the part the Negro soldier played in all the far-flung theaters of war as the embattled democratic world fought off the savage Axis horde, and then pressed on to crush the ruthless foe and preserve the world of civilization.

Everywhere the battle raged, no matter where the enemy was engaged, the Negro soldier was to be found acquitting himself with high distinction, bringing credit on himself, his people, and his country, fighting with a zeal that was inspirational, winning deserved commendations and citations.

Are these just figures of speech felicitously uttered for the occasion? Indeed, they are not. They are abundantly supported by facts and figures, strongly and vividly affirmed by the official records.

Let me for a moment illustrate what I mean. The following impressive number of coveted awards were made to the Ninety-second Infantry Division, a Negro division, which served in Italy: Seven awards of Legion of Merit, 65 awards of Silver Star, 1,377 awards of Purple Heart.

These official figures from the Library of Congress reveal the valor, the intrepidity, the fighting efficiency of the Negro soldier. And do not for a moment imagine this is just an isolated example. On the contrary, it is but typical of the caliber of service rendered by the Negro soldier wherever he went into action.

The scope and merit of the contributions made by the Negro soldier to the Allied victory has been admirably set forth by that brilliant and charming exponent of liberalism in the House of Representatives, Mrs. HELEN GAGAHAN DOUGLAS. The able and distinguished Representative from California had this to say on this subject:

"I wish to pay the Negro soldier the respect and to express the gratitude of the American people for his contribution in the greatest battle of all time, the battle which decided whether or not we were to remain a free people.

"The service record of the Negro in World War II began with the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, and carried through to the day and hour of the Japanese surrender.

"Whether in the north African, European, or Pacific theater of war, the Negro serviceman responded to the call of duty to the fullest extent of his opportunity and to the very best of his ability—Negro heroes won citations in every combat area on land, on sea, in the air."

The official record of the war is replete with deserved tributes from America's greatest military leaders to the Negro soldier.

From that peerless American general, Dwight D. Eisenhower, we have these valued words: "I do not differentiate among soldiers. I do not say white soldiers or Negro soldiers. I have seen Negro soldiers in this war. They have rendered very valuable contributions and some of them with the greatest enthusiasm. They have done their job and they have done the job given them."

Again, we turn to the testimony of the gallant and colorful leader, the late General Patton, who said: "The Negro tank battalion attached to my command fought bravely in the critical Battle of Bastogne. * * * The Negro soldiers were damn good soldiers, of which the Nation could be mighty proud."

The evidence mounts; General Simpson, whose forces played such an important part in crushing Nazi resistance, has volunteered this statement: "Colored soldiers were magnificent in the historic crossing of the Rhine and the devastation of the Ruhr Valley. The Thirty-fifth Infantry Division and the Seven Hundred and Eighty-fourth Tank Battalion were elements of the Ninth Army, and the teamwork of the Negro and white personnel of the units comprised an unbeatable combination."

To this volume of tribute, I must add one more from Gen. Mark Clark, commander of the United States forces in Italy: "The Ninety-second jumped into Laspezia, and with other Fifth Army units took Bologna. They moved into Genoa and took it, much to the surprise of the enemy and headquarters. I needed the Ninety-second, and if anyone had tried to take it from me, I would have protested loudly. They were glorious."

Similar appreciations were voiced by other high-ranking military authorities.

"I have never seen any soldiers who have performed better in combat than you." This was the great appraisal of Brig. Gen. Charles Trueman Lanham, who spent much time up front watching the campaigns of the famous One Hundred and Fourth Timber Wolf Division in Germany.

There are scores and scores of appreciations and citations of individual Negro soldiers. Their brave deeds illuminate our military annals. In this connection it is worthy of mention that the Negro soldier has distinguished himself by valorous deeds in the field of battle in defense of American freedom across the years.

The Honorable JAMES MEAD, United States Senator from New York, interested in doing justice to the record of the Negro soldier, made a special study of his participation in our wars. He found that between the years 1862 and 1926 soldiers serving in all-Negro outfits were awarded 31 Congressional Medals of Honor. As Senator MEAD pointed out, the Congressional Medal of Honor "is a special honor awarded only after a most thorough search has been made of the records, and an investigation has been made of the incident for which the award is to be made." As the distinguished Senator from New York pointed out, "those medals were awarded for conspicuous gallantry and beyond the call of duty in action with the enemy."

Under all circumstances and conditions of war, the Negro soldier in World War II, met the highest tests. He displayed real courage, initiative, a sense of responsibility, teamwork, and cooperation. His patriotism was beyond question, and in many instances his sacrificial devotion to the cause was such as to greatly inspire his fellows and account for substantial and impressive victories.

Numerically, as well as in quality, the Negro was well represented in the Nation's armed forces. Official figures show that as of March 31, 1945, the number of Negroes in the United States armed forces totaled 865,038. They were comprised of 690,282 in the Army; 160,080 in the Navy; 15,867 in the Marines; and 3,809 in the Coast Guard. These totals, considered in relation to the total Negro population of the United States, show a high ratio of military service by our Negro population. In fact, it is a magnificent showing and something which must not be lost sight of now that the fighting has ceased and the country follows the road back to the pursuits and blessings of peace.

The contributions of the Negro to America's war effort becomes all the greater when it is realized that whereas he gladly bore what we might describe as equality of sacrifice, in all too many instances has he been denied equality of opportunity. Nor should we lose sight of the fact that because of the lack of adequate educational opportunities and technical training the Negro soldier was at a great disadvantage when it came to meeting the stern requirements of the various technical services of the armed forces, yet he overcame those disadvantages by enthusiasm, determination, by sincerity and honesty of purpose. Viewed from this angle, the Negro soldier's war contribution was one of the mightiest and worthiest of the conflict.

Well, there is the record, my friends. It is one of luminous achievement on the field of battle, burning patriotism, of high honor and brave sacrifice.

And in the face of the record, I say to you, my fellow Americans, that such service to democracy must not be permitted to go unrewarded. It has been well said that "republics are not ungrateful," and it must be our common endeavor to see to it the great democratic principles in whose name we fought must become living realities to all our people.

Only too frequently are we inclined to give lip service to what we proclaim as democratic rights. Here and now I say to you and all America that we have the duty to all our honored war dead to see to it that all of our people are accorded their just rights, that no section of our population will have any of their constitutional guaranties delimited through restrictions or discriminations.

America went to war and American blood was shed so that all men everywhere might have the right to live decently, in dignity and security, free to achieve the highest blessings of their God-given gifts. Our servicemen died gladly in the pursuit of this dream. They died that we might live in a better world. We must never play their memory false. We have the solemn duty of bringing to fulfillment in our national life the rich idealism they championed at the cost of their lives.

Every man has certain inalienable rights. Each and every American has the right to earn a livelihood so that he and his loved ones can live in dignity and decency. He has the right to an education that will enable him to bring into fullest play his capacities and talents.

He has the right to worship his God according to his conscience. These are minimum democratic privileges and guaranties we must insist upon. Anyone, anywhere, who either negatively or overtly attempts to deny those rights to any American is betraying the men who died with their eyes fastened on the goal of a free world.

Democracy, in its essence, is not the rule of the majority, but rather the zealous protection of the rights of the minority. Destroy the rights of any one American and the rights of all Americans are jeopardized. Such democratic rights are not divisible in nature. They must be had whole or they wither and die.

The Negro soldier believed in democratic principles and values. He fought for them, sacrificed for them, and died for them. Those who survived the war and who have returned to civilian life as well as all those who were soldiers on the home front must now have the opportunities in our national life that are part and parcel of American citizenship fully exercised. So, too, must all our people without regard to race, creed, or color.

America means unity, not divisionist activity. We are brought together under a grand concept of liberty. We fought shoulder to shoulder against a deadly enemy. That enemy was vicious but visible. We must now be equally concerned with standing shoulder to shoulder in democratic unity to fight an enemy just as deadly but invisible. The enemy who strikes through racial bigotry and hatreds, poisoning the fountain-springs of our democratic life.

Already there are threatening signs that such un-American activities are on the move. First one minority group is singled out for attack, then another, until through fear, ignorance, and falsehoods, neighbor is set against neighbor and the fine spiritual feeling of Americanism is destroyed and a harvest of hate reaps a crop of bitterness and destruction.

Such an eventuality would constitute a desecration of the sacred memories of all

our American war dead, who in their graves on far-flung corners of the earth have realized true equality in their immortality.

Let us remember them, cherish their memories, prize their gallant and sacrificial deeds, and vow that each of us in his and her own life will try in every way to bring to full and fruitful realization the kind of world they saw with the superior and gifted sight of the young and brave in heart.

This is the way to the charitable life of kindness and understanding and appreciation of the worth of the other fellow. This is the real American dream come true, the world of fullness and abundance wherein all men are equal before God. The world in short which the soldier dead are privileged to see in that luminous glimpse beyond the curtain before they are summoned into the presence of their Maker.

Speaking within the shadow of those who died for liberty and equality, I summon all men of good will to the task of building that better world of peace, justice, and order for which the peoples of the earth yearn. That world is within our grasp. Let us realize it and redeem to society the sacrifices of our gallant soldier dead. It is the opportunity of a century. We must not fail.

Sic Utere Tuo—Address of Hon. A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia, Before the State-Wide Safety Conference, Richmond, Va., May 24, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address I made before the Virginia State-wide Safety Conference, in Richmond, Va., on May 24, 1946:

In the midst of strikes and rumors of strikes, it is pleasing to me to visit a seat of government where the chief executive believes and has the courage to say that the right of the people to the necessities of life takes precedence over the right to strike.

In the midst of booms—prices, pleasure seeking, crime, and accidental death and injury, it is a gratifying experience to make contact with this splendid group of able and patriotic men and women who are dedicating their best and most unselfish efforts to the prevention of needless death and needless human suffering.

During World War II we perfected a military organization whose power to destroy both lives and property excelled anything heretofore known in the world. In fact, the destructive power of our culminating war invention, the atomic bomb, is so terrifying in its implications that we are frankly sorry that human ingenuity has solved that secret of atomic chain reaction, because we do not yet know whether that instrumentality of destruction will be used for the preservation of peace or the destruction of civilization as we have known it.

We fought World War II for the preservation of democratic ideals and the preservation of a democratic way of life, in which the rights of the individual are recognized and the fullest measure of personal freedom enjoyed, consistent with equal freedom for all others. For that victory we sacrificed billions of dollars, the lives of nearly 300,000 of the flower of our youth, while approximately 700,000 more were wounded in action. With a spirit reminiscent of the youth of Athens, those boys "gave their bodies to the Commonwealth and received, each for his own memory, praise that will never die, and with it the grandest of all sepulchers, not that in which their mortal bones are laid, but a home in the minds of men, where their glory remains fresh to stir to speech or action as the occasion comes by. For the whole earth is the sepulcher of famous men; and their story is not graven only on stone over their native earth, but lives on far away, without visible symbol, woven into the stuff of other men's lives."

That is what should have been. This is what happened: During the period that those boys were falling on far-flung battle fronts we had at home 89,000 deaths from motor-vehicle accidents and 3,100,000 injuries; 112,000 deaths from home accidents and 17,000,000 injuries; 62,000 deaths from occupational accidents and 62,200,000 injuries; and 88,000 deaths from off-the-job accidents and 8,000,000 injuries; a total, between Pearl Harbor and June 1, 1945, of 351,000 killed and 34,300,000 injured.

And the saddest commentary on the kind of democracy we have been fighting to preserve is the startling fact that thus far in 1946 the accident rate, and especially on highways, has been the highest in our history. Evidently, something must be wrong with our manner of thinking, as well as with our manner of living, when such a terrific and needless expenditure of lives and of dollars as that should be permitted to occur. The dozen or more public-spirited men who organized the National Safety Council in 1913 had a vision of a job to be done, but I doubt if they had a vision of how big and how vital the job would ultimately become.

In choosing for the title of my remarks tonight a familiar maxim of the English common law, "Sic utere tuo ut alienum non laedas (So use your own as not to injure another)" I had in mind what I regarded as being the chief reason for these appalling casualty lists. The prevention of accidents, like all Gaul, may be divided into three parts, namely, what government can do, what the individual can do for himself, and what the individual can and should do for others.

The Government operates in the field of education, in the requirement of safety devices, in the inspection of mines and other dangerous working places, in the field of law enforcement, and in the construction of dual-lane highways with fine alinement and perfect visibility, where one fool is safe until he meets another. Numerous speakers at this conference have discussed the functions of government and I shall not dwell on that phase of the problem.

The individual, of course, by the exercise of reasonable care and prudence, can save himself from many needless and painful accidents. I once heard of a man who got kicked when he tickled the hind leg of a mule. He said that the mule had betrayed his confidence. Most farm boys know how much confidence to place in a mule or in a Jersey bull, but many do not know how much confidence to place in a tractor and many other types of machinery now in general farm use, as evidenced by the fact that even inadequate and incomplete reports to the United States Department of Labor show that last year there were 4,500 fatal accidents and 301,000 disabling injuries in agriculture.

To help those who are willing to help themselves we, of course, need continuous programs of education in accident prevention in homes, in industry, on the streets and highways, in schools, and on the farm, with Government agencies centering their attention on fire prevention and protection, machinery guards, atmospheric contamination, sanitation, first-aid facilities, mining safety, and conservation, such as ventilation, coal-dust hazards, blasting and shot fires, timberage, haulage, and various Federal and State construction and other codes.

Programs of that character will help those who are the innocent victims of self-inflicted accidents, but will not reach death and injury inflicted upon others by those who do not so use their own as not to injure another.

It has been said that truth is eternal, but man's conception of truth varies from time to time and from age to age as he grows in wisdom. Cain was the first man in recorded history to raise the issue of the duty that one man owes to another when he said, "Am I my brother's keeper?" In 2185 B. C. a Babylonian king included in his laws, "If a builder build a house for a man and do not make its construction firm, and the house which he has built collapse and cause the death of the owner of the house, that builder shall be put to death." The Roman emperors applied the same principle to their road contractors. If the road failed the contractor lost his life. That is one reason that the Appian Way, over which the victorious Caesars marched and over which the Apostle Paul was taken a prisoner into Rome, still stands—the builder of that highway used paving blocks one yard thick. He was taking no risk with his neck.

Seven hundred years before the birth of Christ, Moses, in Deuteronomy, laid down this law for the Hebrew children: "When thou buildest a new house, then thou shall make a battlement for thy roof, that thou bring not blood upon thine house, if any man fall from thence."

Such ancient safety programs, involving the duty one man owes to another, rested upon force and punishment penalties.

The new and modern dispensation of the good-neighbor principle was expounded to a group of uneducated fishermen by the greatest of all teachers in what we now refer to as the parable of the good Samaritan. The English common-law maxim of so using your own as not to injure another was a foundation stone in Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence and around that system of law was built the English democracy which our Colonial ancestors brought to this country. It remained for a great political philosopher named Thomas Jefferson to crystallize in terms that the average man could understand, the rights of the individual, which he did in his immortal Declaration of Independence. It is significant that he enumerated only three inalienable rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The first one is well understood. But the second two need to be redefined in terms of a machine age at home and in terms of rocket planes and atom bombs abroad.

In industry, a man reaches his highest productive power and earning capacity when harnessed to electric horsepower and when engaged with thousands of fellow workers in what we are pleased to term "mass production." Motor transport has revolutionized highway travel, but our right to operate a car or a truck must be limited and restricted by the duty we owe to other travelers on the highway.

The more highly organized society becomes, the greater regard there must be for the welfare of others. And the closer science draws the nations of the world together, the greater the necessity for international cooperation.

The subject of accident prevention, discussed at this conference by many experts in their various fields, touches a fundamental problem in the future development of our democratic form of government. As a nation, we hate totalitarianism and the compulsion over the individual which it represents. But a democracy cannot survive if a majority of the individuals that compose it become ruthless and selfish. "The defense of tolerance, understanding, intelligence, and thoughtfulness is necessary for world peace,"

said President Truman in his recent Fordham address. "This science of human relationships is the only defense we have against the atomic bomb which threatens to destroy all of us." But that attitude, like charity, must begin at home.

Many years ago we found it necessary to restrain the ruthless and selfish operations of concentrated wealth by the passage of antitrust laws. Labor unions were exempted from those laws. Corporations, acting in restraint of trade, could hinder and obstruct commerce, but could not destroy it. Now we find one labor union so powerful that it can destroy all commerce and the Congress is wrestling with the question of whether or not a democracy can survive if a limited group of individuals be permitted to exercise that power.

Tomorrow evening at 4 o'clock the President will address a joint session of the Congress. He needs your prayers. Pray that God will touch his lips with a live coal from off the altar that he may tell the men of America, as did Pericles of Athens:

"There no hearts grow faint because they loved riches more than honor; none shirked the issue in the poor man's dreams of wealth. All these they put aside to strike a blow for the city. Counting the quest to avenge her honor as the most glorious of all ventures, and leaving Hope, the uncertain goddess, to send them what she would, they faced the foe, as they drew near him, in the strength of their own manhood; and when the shock of battle came, they chose rather to suffer the uttermost than to win life by weakness * * *."

I do not know what answer the Congress will give to the people in this crisis, but I do know that Virginia is represented in the Senate as well as in the House by men who are not afraid to battle for the principles of democracy and who would sacrifice their political lives before seeking to win life by weakness. Last night the Senate adopted an amendment by Senator BYRD to the pending Case bill, which I had previously introduced in the House. It outlaws the tribute to unions upon the goods they produce, and will eliminate the occasion for the coal strike. In addition to that, I hope and I believe that the Congress will amend the Wagner Labor Relations Act to make it fairer and will withdraw from those who strike against the Government or hold the people as hostages their seniority and reemployment rights.

I believe every worker should be free to choose his own employment and I believe in the right of organized labor to strike when just and legal demands have been denied, but to me it is implicit in a democracy that the rights and welfare of the majority must be the controlling consideration. All safety laws and regulations rest upon that sound foundation.

You can gallop a colt like a house afire on your own farm, but not down Main Street. There you must so use your own as not to injure another. In a comparatively short period our economy has undergone a fundamental change—from that of agriculture to that of industry, and 13 colonies, in which the largest town south of the Potomac River was Williamsburg, have in a century and a half become the most powerful Nation in the world, with a population of 140,000,000 people. A proper adjustment of our conception of personal liberty to that fundamental change in our social order has not yet been made. Progress in material sciences has outstripped progress in social sciences.

We sacrificed to win the war. In that undertaking we were motivated by a spirit of unselfishness and we had strength in unity. Now that the war is over, the spirit of getting while the getting is good is not by any means confined to organized labor. If we can solve the problems of cynicism, of discontent, of unrest, of selfishness, and of disunity, which have supplanted the unselfishness and the unity which characterized our war effort, we can go far toward solving the problems of accident prevention. If we fail to solve them, it may one day be said of us, as it was said in 1918 of the nobility and intelligentsia of Russia:

"Only in after years when their sins have taught them charity and their despair has taught them hope, and their loneliness has led them to faith, they shall listen again to the sound of bells coming across the fields and comprehend and reverence the symbolism of the cross."

Conditions in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Pauline Frederick from the Milwaukee Journal of May 23, 1946:

POLAND FACES CIVIL WAR, CORRESPONDENT DECLARES—WRITER TELLS OF SHOOTINGS, SUDDEN ARRESTS, PLEAS FOR AMERICAN AID; TENSION MOUNTING

(By Pauline Frederick)

NUREMBERG, GERMANY.—"What's the use of telling the American people the truth about Poland—they won't believe it anyway."

That is how those in close touch with conditions in Poland greet Americans who are able to get into the country. I have just returned from an 8-day stay in Poland and I could scarcely believe, either, what I saw and heard.

To begin with, I could not have cabled any true stories out of Poland. Press messages which the Government does not like are stopped dead in Warsaw. Larry Allen, of the Associated Press, who has been waging a discouraging battle to get the news out, has been told anonymously at least three times lately that he should leave the country.

I was in Poland on 2 days—May 1 and 3—that came near to lighting the fuse of the civil war which even a member of the Polish Parliament admitted is threatening.

FOOD USED AS LEVER

On May 1, participation in the workers' holiday was compulsory. All places of business in Cracow were closed. Not even the streetcars were running. As I entered the magistrature for the official opening of the ceremonies at which Dr. Boleslaw Drobner, cousin of Stalin and leader of the Socialist Party, was the principal speaker, the Soviet hymn was being played.

The main square was jammed with 100,000 people, waving banners—of the PPR (Communist Workers' Party which dominates the Government although it is estimated to have only 2 or 3 percent of the people behind it), the PPS (Socialist Party which works close to the PPR), the hammer and sickle, and an occasional red and white Polish flag. There was no sign of the flag of the Peasant Party of the former head of the London government, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, who is estimated by impartial observers to have the sympathy of at least 60 percent of the people.

For 2 hours there moved in parade thousands of people. There was more than one reason for the turnout. For instance, many Government employees and other workers (the majority PPR) who rate UNRRA rations under the Government's system of distribution, were threatened with loss of this ration if they did not show up.

UNRRA FOOD SOLD

UNRRA supplies are not always consumed by the recipients. The packages are frequently broken up and the contents sold for three times their actual value. The seller then buys potatoes or bread or some other commodity he wants more than UNRRA supplies.

That night at the dinner given by the Cracow district military officers, where meat was plentiful although Wednesday is a meatless day, three out of four toasts were drunk to Russian-Polish relations. One was a courtesy toast to the Americans present.

Even so, the government was displeased over the May Day celebrations.

The government ordered that the people of Poland were not to celebrate their "Fourth of July" on May 3. Meanwhile, Mikolajczyk, whose life is admittedly in jeopardy, went into hiding over the holiday in order to prevent any demonstrations by his followers that might result in bloodshed. But this is what happened in Cracow:

PARADERS SHOT AT

On May 3, the Poles of Cracow gathered for mass in the Church of Our Lady to which Poland's greatest art treasure, the Wit Stwosz altar, had just been returned after being looted by the Germans in 1939. As the service broke up the people poured out into the market place and a small parade began.

As they reached the building which houses Red Army headquarters shots were fired into the crowd. Then shots were fired into the crowd from the building housing the Communist Party. At that point there was an angry outburst from the people but at no time did they shoot back. They cried, "Mikolajczyk," "Down with communism," "Give us back Vilna and Lwow." There was more shooting into the crowd as two Russian vehicles rushed up, manned by security police.

People began running into the side streets, some heading for a dormitory occupied by students from the University of Cracow. One of the armored cars followed and sprayed the front of the dormitory with machine-gun fire. The students were ordered out with their hands in the air, were loaded into trucks and cars, and were taken away.

The number of students arrested in Cracow in 3 days was between 2,000 and 3,000. They were taken to an insane asylum 30 kilometers from town. When the student aide organization tried to get packages of food to the prisoners they were refused admittance to the building. Students who were not arrested fled into hiding, and the university had to close temporarily until the situation clarified.

TENSION IS GREAT

Estimates of the number of dead in the shootings in Cracow on May 3 ranged from 6 to 21. There were at least 35 injured. Three days after the killings, the bodies of the victims had not been turned over to their families for burial as the authorities feared new demonstrations at the funerals.

There were shootings in other Polish cities on May 3.

There are between 133,000 and 150,000 security police in Poland today. In addition, a reserve militia, called the Ormo and inspired by the Communists, is being set up. It is composed of men between 18 and 45. They are being trained to shoot to kill. This militia is ostensibly being prepared for duty at the June 30 referendum when the minority government is asking the people to approve Poland's western boundaries, a one-house legislature, nationalization of industries and land reforms the government has put into effect.

Tension was so great when we left Poland that a Pole feared for his life if seen talking to the "wrong" persons. When someone suddenly disappeared it was assumed he had been picked up for "questioning." Strangers

were stopping Americans on the street and whispering with tears in their eyes:

"How much longer? We can't stand much more of this. When will the war begin?"

The OPA Continues To Run Amuck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the OPA and the Department of Agriculture are impartial. They, along with other Government agencies, are treading on the toes and tightening their holds on the necks of all the people. To relieve want abroad it is not necessary to create want and famine at home. If they will mix common sense and a regard for the rights and urgent needs of our own people they can carry out our program of foreign relief without wrecking the home front.

I include as a part of these remarks a letter from Hon. Harry G. Sabine, of Crossville, Tenn.; an editorial from the Knoxville Journal, of Knoxville, Tenn., May 21; a letter from J. S. Greer, a merchant of Burrville, Tenn.; a petition signed by a large number of his patrons who are among the best citizens of Morgan County, Tenn.; and also a letter from Mrs. George M. Keezle, the wife of a minister of the gospel, of Knoxville, Tenn.; and a demand made on her husband for 20 months' refund in rents on an apartment, a porch, and the use of a garage.

CROSSVILLE, TENN., *May 23, 1946.*

DEAR JUDGE JENNINGS: I wish to join in this editorial.

If you don't believe it, try to buy a dime's worth of tenpenny nails.

A country merchant told me this week he bought thirty 50-pound tins of lard from Ohio.

This black market could not go on without the sanction of someone in the administration.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY G. SABINE.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal of May 22, 1946]

OUR WASHWOMAN, ONE OF "LITTLE PEOPLE" BY NEW DEAL STANDARDS, PAYS PENALTY FOR SOLICITUDE OF MILLION BUREAUCRATS

Over the week end our washwoman's house burned. It wasn't a complete loss. It happened that she had a little stack of lumber on her place and, responding to the misfortune with the optimism that is human, she decided yesterday that there was enough to rebuild the structure in such fashion that it could be lived in at least through the summer.

But she had reckoned without the chaos induced by the economic planners in Washington. Even in this modern day of plastics and other new building materials, a few nails are essential in building.

A search for nails developed none from the retail sources where one would have expected to get them. An inquiry at a big wholesale hardware concern provided what seemed to us quite an ironic touch.

"We haven't been able to buy any nails," the president of it told us, "and we don't know when we can get any. As a matter of fact, you know we are trying to build an addition to one of our buildings, and in order to keep the work going I had to arrange with a certain railroad, a customer of ours, to borrow eight kegs of nails from them."

Then he said something else interesting:

"You can probably find them on the black market, but they will cost you about $20 a keg. The regular price, as you may know, would be in the neighborhood of $8 per keg."

Telling this story to an acquaintance yesterday, as an illustration of what paternalism in action is doing for the country, a related item came to light.

"My wife told me on Saturday," he said, "that she had met a Mrs. Jones down on Gay Street. Mrs. Jones is from Chattanooga. She was not in Knoxville to shop at the stores, to buy a new hat, or to make any of the purchases you would ordinarily expect a woman to come more than a hundred miles to make. No; Mrs. Jones and her husband are trying to build a house in Chattanooga and they had been told that there were some black-market nails being offered for sale somewhere here in Knoxville."

We have related the story of our washwoman's misfortune, and its sequel of nails that could not be bought for rebuilding, because her story in its essentials is the story of a nation of 140,000,000 people today.

With the greatest production plant in the history of the world at their disposal, with the greatest natural resources in the world at hand for their use, with a population that always heretofore has been willing to work enough to provide an abundance of needed things, our washwoman can't buy nails any more than the reader can buy butter or automobiles or the thousand other things that he is accustomed to buy if he has the money.

It would doubtless be pointed out by any agency of the present administration that it is not solely responsible for the situation typified by the story of the nails. The OPA would say that there is nothing it can do, for example, about the series of labor disturbances that have disrupted the country since VJ-day.

That part of the public which does any thinking, however, knows that the labor troubles, the scarcities in all commodities, the black markets—all contribute to the rising prices; these are all chargeable to the determination of the Government to plan the Nation's economy—a process undertaken in 1933 under Roosevelt.

The climaxing irony, too, is emphasized in the story of the nails. All this Government meddling with business, coddling of labor, and clutching at economic controls is done in the name of those "little people" who are so close to the heart of every demagog in the country. By their standards our washwoman is one of the "little people." She is colored, she is a widow, she is 60 years old, and has nobody to depend upon but herself, yet she is paying the penalty, in a minuscule degree, for the ambitions of a large group of men, far away in Washington, to control the American economy. We wonder, if she understood the situation, if she and millions of others wouldn't like to have a little less planning and a little more goods, in the form of nails and butter and other things that never before in history have been impossible for Americans to get.

BURRVILLE, TENN., *May 21, 1946.*

Hon. JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed you will find a statement of fact, signed by a few of my customers concerning the unfair and unjust regulation concerning the distribution of grain.

After the actual needs of our own people are met, we believe in cooperating in the fair distribution of food that can be sent away to aid others. We do not think it fair to let our American children and returned veterans go hungry, just to try to feed the rest of the world. We look to you and the other Members of Congress for help.

So we plead and urge that you and your colleagues at once remove the unfair regulation concerning grains, and give the millers an opportunity to serve their regular customers. Please see that the millers have the right to pay as much for grains as the Commodity Credit Corporation does.

Expecting and hoping that you will at once do all you can to relieve this situation, I am

Sincerely yours,

J. S. GREER.

BURRVILLE, TENN., *May 21, 1946.*

Re: Scarcity of flour and meal.

We, patrons of the local merchant, J. S. Greer, urge and implore speedy action by you and your colleagues to prevent acute suffering to us, our families, and our neighbors being brought about by recent orders issued through the Production and Marketing Administration by the United States Department of Agriculture.

We are not in a wheat-producing section, so we need not only flour and meal but also feed for our stock and poultry.

If we cannot secure sufficient supplies for our actual needs, we cannot do our part in production.

Therefore, we plead for immediate action by you, our elected Representatives, for the best interest of us and our people:

Calvin H. Brown, Wayland R. Brown, M. H. Range, Geo. C. Babcock, Jessie Peters, Edith La Rue, Leslie La Rue, W. R. Davidson, James McCampbell, Ernest F. Brown, Tinker D. Hicks, Mr. and Mrs. R. G. Jacks, J. J. McCampbell, James Pickett, Mrs. Annie Pickett, Wiley Duncan, W. E. Cromwell, Wilmoth McGrath, Ottis Davidson, Theodore Dixon, Mr. and Mrs. W. V. Ashton, Mrs. J. E. Chasteen, Mr. and Mrs. Roy Morgan, Mrs. Lillie Dixon, Mrs. Edith Young, Nettie C. Griffith, Johnie La Rue, C. H. Brown, S. C. Brown, Unive Ward, G. H. McGrath, Sr., Charles E. Murray.

KNOXVILLE, TENN., *March 28, 1946.*

Hon. JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
Knoxville, Tenn.

MY DEAR MR. JENNINGS: I am enclosing a letter from the OPA. I trust it will be of some benefit in your fight on that useless organization. In June 1944 a representative of the OPA came out to my house and inspected an apartment and suggested that I increase the rent from $25 to $40 as the new tenant had a grown son and I had to furnish an extra bed, they also had a car and wished a closed garage, and they wanted exclusive use of a porch, I furnished the above-mentioned services and they paid the $40 per month. The OPA man filled out a bunch of papers and left, and I heard nothing more from the OPA until March 1, 1946, 20 months later, accusing me of overcharging my tenants and demanding I reimburse said tenants. How was I to know I was violating any rules. What am I to do? I don't have any money to return. It isn't fair for me to stand in the schoolroom, making less in a week than the folks in my apartment make in a day, and give them a place to live.

We are paying the HOLC $65 monthly and last June, my husband, a minister, collapsed with a serious heart ailment and will never be able to work again. There seems to be no place in these times for a poor honest person.

There are numerous places that could be rented, in fact I have a sleeping room I could rent to someone, but the OPA makes itself such a nuisance that people won't be bothered. The housing situation will ease up in Knoxville when the OPA is gone.

The apartment in question consists of one large room, kitchen, private bath, porch, and

garage. I furnish electric stove, electric refrigerator, heat, water, power, telephone, in fact everything but the food, yet OPA wants me to rent this for $25 monthly while my neighbor gets $40 for a sleeping room.

The OPA is doing more harm than any of the New Dealers.

Please tell me what to do.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Geo. M. Keezel.

Re one room and kitchenette, 2421 Washington Pike, Knoxville, Tenn.

Office of Price Administration,
Knoxville, Tenn., March 1, 1946.

Rev. G. M. Keezel,
Knoxville, Tenn.

Dear Sir: According to your letter of February 6 you are unable to come into our office for a conference. Therefore, we will write you full instructions.

On November 30, 1942, you filed a registration for a one-room-and-kitchenette apartment showing Mrs. Helen Whaley as tenant which, according to your wife's signed statement, is the same apartment as later registered as three rooms showing Sallie Coker as tenant. The registered amount of this apartment is $25 per month and you so rented it until June 9, 1944, when you registered Sallie Coker at $40 per month and after Sallie Coker you rented it to Robert Williams on October 1, 1944, at $40. This rental to Sallie Coker and Mr. Williams is definitely an overcharge, and you are to consider this letter as a formal demand upon you to make a refund to all tenants of record since June 9, 1944, from whom you have collected more than $25 per month and to furnish us receipts from each of them showing that refund has been made within 7 days from date of this letter. We enclose our blank forms (D-406) for your convenience in reporting.

Your failure to comply within the allotted time gives each of your tenants the right to sue you within the next 30 days thereafter for treble damages plus reasonable attorney's fees and court costs. If after 60 days you have not made the refund and neither have the tenants sued you, the case then becomes one for handling by the Administrator according to section 205 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended.

Yours very truly,

Harry S. Hyman,
Area Rent Director.
By Robert P. Mehaffey,
Chief Examiner.

We Must Outlaw the Closed Shop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYLE H. BOREN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, it is evident, as epitomized in the current crisis, that it is contrary to the constitutional provision to promote the general welfare that a willful group of power-mad individuals can advance the self-interest of any minority as paramount to the common good.

In our Nation, as great and good as this Nation is, the history of industrial relations has been one of sorry extremes. There was a period in our history when selfish tyrants of industry used even the bond servant, cousin to slavery, and the sweatshop practice of serfdom to exploit human life to the selfish ends of greed. Our Government, which is the proper arbiter of the human relationships that make up the American way of life, has with wisdom branded the proselyte of child labor an outlaw. Our Government has put also the sweatshop tyrant and other bandits of selfishness and greed within the realm of outlawry, where they belong. Our Government has wisely raised the heavy hand of justice and the sharp sword of the law to cut the bonds of slavery and to release the bond servant and the serf and raise him to the stature of freedom and liberty that is the self-evident right of all mankind. We have in this country enacted laws that place a floor under wages and a ceiling over hours of labor. We have put the power of the Government into the protection of the worker to guarantee the safety of his life and limb and to protect his health and welfare. This Government has evidenced in its policy and action a deep concern and a true sense of justice in its consideration for the rights and welfare of the men of toil.

Today, however, Mr. Speaker, we find excesses from another source which threaten the stability of our national economy and endanger the welfare of labor and the freedom of thousands of Americans as well as endangering the common good.

New tyrants have arisen who wield absolute power over segments of our society. James Caesar Petrillo has assumed the role of dictatorship over the musicians of America and all the commerce and industry related to their endeavor that not only is a power which stands as a constant threat against the Nation subjecting the will of the people to the whim of his fancy, but also with the power of compulsion and coercion he rules with absolute tyranny the thousands of men who have affiliated together as a union of musicians.

John L. Lewis, Alvanley Johnston, Philip Murray, A. F. Whitney, and others have set themselves up within our realms as absolute rulers of hundreds of thousands of subjects. When John L. Lewis commands, hundreds of thousands of coal miners must obey, for his word is their law. Not only is such power used oppressibly and arbitrarily as a whiplash on the back of labor, but it is a usurped power to ration, allocate, or forbid the use of coal to every industry or consumer of coal in America. Similarly we have tyrants ruling the production lines of the auto industry, the electricial industry, controlling farm-machinery production, the telephone and telegraph services, and hundreds of other industries and services so that every individual in America has his life or freedom ruled or affected by that tyranny.

Sidney Hillman has attempted in the form of a Political Action Committee to unite the power that results from the individual becoming a cipher of strength in the hand of a despot into a power that would be superior to the power of the whole people as delegated through constitutional processes to the people's government.

By threat of reprisal at election, such willful power-mad men have attempted to coerce the Congress and the President. In my individual case, the Political Action Committee, testifying before a special House committee of Congress in August 1944, admitted that they had made every possible effort, including the spending of considerable sums of money, in an effort to eliminate me from membership in the Congress because I had refused to yield to their pressure and coercion. Already in this election public announcement has been made that they have accumulated $6,000,000 to direct against the independence of Congress and by influencing the elections to elect a subservient Congress that will acquiesce in their ambitions. That $6,000,000 is as much as the total the law allows for all expenditures for all purposes by both the two major parties combined. This morning my paper advises me that A. F. Whitney has threatened the President of the United States and has openly announced that he will spend $47,000,000, which belongs not to him but to the men who have the unfortunate cross to bear of being under his domination; yes, he has announced as though it were his own personal money, thus admitting his dictatorial power; announced that he will spend it against the President of the United States because the President has refused to sacrifice the general welfare to his selfish ends.

I do not believe that Whitney's threat will frighten anybody, because the American people are not all subject to his dictation, and the American people cannot be bought and sold by the multiplied millions at his command.

We have fought a war to save a world from dictatorship and tyranny. We should now devote ourselves to saving our own country from the same evils. Tyranny exists in America. Where tyranny is and tyrants are, liberty, freedom, and independence are destroyed and banished. In this recent period all Americans have suffered at the hands of despotic, willful men and the greatest sufferer of all has been the laborer who is directly subject to the whim and dictates of such men.

Mr. Speaker, fundamental in the freedoms that are guaranteed to an American is the freedom of opportunity—the freedom of choice. It is the American's inalienable right to be free to choose his own religion, to choose his own political party, and the thousands of other choices that he can make in his religious, political, social, or economic life. Not by any means least among the freedoms that are right and ought to be for Americans is the freedom to choose his own occupation. A child born in America has guaranteed to him in our system of liberty the freedom to become a farmer, doctor, lawyer, or a coal miner, or a mechanic, or a painter, or a welder. That freedom I want to preserve for my child and yours.

Today thousands of occupations are closed to you in America where opportunity is supposed to be equal and free. I am willing for any man in America who wants to join a union to be perfectly free to join it, but I am unwilling to have the hand of compulsion of any man to make him join a union. The closed shop which forbids opportunity in a thousand lines of endeavor to your child and mine, who cannot in good conscience submit to the dictates of union commanders or subscribe to union rules and tenants, is un-American. It closes the gate of opportunity in the face of the individual citizen, who under our Constitution, is guaranteed free and equal opportunity. No

man could compel me to join a church, much less a union. I would resist with my life any usurpation of power that would permit you to compel other free Americans to join the religious organization of your choice and I would reject with horror any offer of power that would grant to me any such control over your freedom of religion. In a like manner I hold that the closed shop governing economic freedom is as alien to the thought of American freedom as is the destruction of the freedom of speech or the other fundamentals that make up the foundation of the American way of life.

The closed shop is un-American. It belongs to the thought that gives birth to nazism and fascism. It is completely contradictory to the tenets of Americanism. The closed shop is un-Christian. It violates all the tenets of freedom of conscience and is a direct contradiction to the Christian faith which stands on the premise that "whosoever will, may come."

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in behalf of all the thousands of men who labor and who seek an equality of opportunity for the use of their labor without arbitrary conditions, or coercion, or compulsion governing their economic freedom, for the millions yet too young to seek employment and for the millions of Americans yet unborn, I introduce today a bill which will outlaw the closed shop and put it where it belongs along with slavery and bond serfs and all the other usurpations of power over the will and the life of free men. Let there be in America a full realization of the freedom that is the heritage of every American. There must be absolute freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom to think, to speak, and to work. Let us guarantee to every American a free opportunity to earn a living with the toil of his hands without subjecting him to the loss of any other American freedom, in order to open the door of opportunity. Again I say, sir, the closed shop is un-American. Let us put it out of America. Let us banish it back to the realm from which it came to invade our shores of freedom. In this period in our history every American must take sides and stand up and be counted. Every American must come to realize that he is on the side of individual liberty and individual freedom, or else he is on the side of abdicating the individual freedom in behalf of the control of the tyrant. The bill I have introduced will give every American the chance to stand up and be counted for individual liberty and freedom, or against it.

Memorial Day Address of Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Memorial Day address delivered by me at Lowell, Mass.:

It is with great pride and a feeling of deep reverence that I stand here today before the people of Lowell, Mass.—at this first Memorial Day service since the end of World War II.

Pride—at the memory that by the August following Pearl Harbor, more men from Lowell had given their lives for their country than from any other city of comparable size in the United States. Pride in the great gallantry of our men and women in every war.

Reverence—for those dead—and a prayer to Almighty God, echoed I know by all of you, that we may prove worthy of their sacrifice—that we may be able to feel in our hearts that they shall not have died in vain.

At a time like this, and on an occasion such as this—we are all searching our souls to find how we can best pay tribute to those who died for us—how we can best show appreciation for those veterans who fought and lived to come back to us.

It is in our appreciation and service to the living—the returned veterans—the families, widows, and orphans of those who have not returned, that we best do honor to those who have died. Earl Wilson said: "Remember! Could buddies forget Memorial Day * * * and they wave their flags and make their speeches—and ask us to remember. Did they think we could forget?" This Memorial Sunday I do not ask them to remember—they know that. On the fields of Flanders, in Belgium, Holland, France, Italy, Africa, and on the islands of the Pacific, fields of white crosses guard the resting places of those who gave their lives doing their job. Their fight is over. Their job is done.

How are we helping to fulfill their last prayers—those who died that this country might be preserved? Are we doing our job? Are we carrying on the torch that fell from their hands?

Are we working with every ounce of our strength so that the ideals and the form of government they fought to save shall not perish? Are we?

In 1944, I toured the battlefields. There I talked with many of our men. Many who came back—many who are still there. But from them, time and time again, I heard this thought expressed:

"When I see what the ideologies of other governments have done—how they have wrecked the countries and destroyed the people, then I know that the American way of life is the right way. That is what I'm fighting for and praying to go back to. That is what we want to keep—our way of living."

How are we helping to preserve that way of living, for those who came back and for those who will not? What more can we do?

First we must see the picture straight and clearly. We must diagnose the condition and then apply the remedy. For that, there is no better time nor place than now, no better way to dedicate ourselves to the dead than by rededicating ourselves to the living.

All right, then. What is the situation as it is today? We, who on the home front—as did those on the battle front—fought for peace, now face a world, not of peace, but of turmoil and unrest.

Why? Why is it, when we fought so long and prayed so hard for a lasting peace, that we now face turbulence that borders on chaos?

When things go wrong we are apt to look for someone to blame. Whom can we blame now? Is it possible that we must look within our own souls for that?

Let us face things very clearly. During the war we fought together, at home or on the battle line. We, all of us, thought more about what would help the country than about what would help each of us individually.

Why? Because we had a war to win, because it was necessary for all of us to work together in order to save this great country of ours.

What makes any of us think the need is less great now? What makes us think we can bicker and quarrel and think only of our own selfish interests and get away with it? For while we bicker the country falls apart. And why not? We, the people of these United States, have made it great, have fought many wars to preserve its greatness. And, if we fail the country, it fails too.

Shakespeare has said, "Tis an unweeded garden that grows to seed; things rank and gross in nature possess it merely." Well—it is an untended country that falls to ruin. And if it falls, we fall with it—and all our selfishness has been in vain—for selfishness is always so.

To fully understand what has happened to us and the country, we must recognize how it happened and why it could. After any strenuous effort there comes a let-down. After any war there is some confusion.

If you will check back through your history you will note that conditions following the Civil War in this country were badly disorganized.

There is a difference now though. This time, we suffer not only from inner chaos and confusion. This time a foreign power, Soviet Russia, by open and subversive means, is making use of our natural exhaustion and confusion, to confound and weaken this Nation.

This is no time for further challenge to conflict. We fought a war to bring a lasting peace to the world. We have helped to set up a United Nations Organization to see to it that peace is maintained. There is no reason why it should not be successful. It can be successful. It must be successful!

But—lasting peace—whether it be within the confines of a family home or a family of nations, is founded on mutual respect. We do not force our form of Government, nor our ideals, upon other nations. And we have the right to demand that they do not force theirs upon us!

But until the pressure of public opinion has ousted these subversive influences from within our borders, they will continue to undermine the structure of the Nation—by hitting us at our vulnerable points—by fomenting strikes and discontent, between labor and management. Never in our history has it been so important for us to be united. The nations of the world are not yet at peace.

When foreign influences within our country and within other countries have been dissolved, then and only then, can the nations of the world honestly and firmly establish peace. Let us hope this will not take long to accomplish.

Meanwhile—what can we do here at home—that is constructive—that can set an example?

There are many things. Lowell has for centuries been an example to this Nation of thrift and industry.

Since 1801, when the first carding mill was built here and 1804—when the completion of the Middlesex Canal at Pawtucket connected Concord and Boston by water passage, Lowell has been a center of thriving textile industries.

Now, with over 400 manufacturing establishments, Lowell runs the industrial gamut from acids and aprons to yarn and zipper products, from big machine products to small. The artist, James McNeil Whistler, and John Lowell, Jr., who founded the Lowell Institute, set the pace for Lowell and the world in art and culture.

With such a background and such a heritage, we can with pride betake ourselves to the task of setting an example for the rest of the country of the way to rebuild our Nation.

And how shall we begin? First, by solemn prayer—and at what place in the United

States are there more opportunities for prayer or finer churches than at Lowell? Then by setting to work to secure proper legislation for the widows and orphans of those veterans who did not return—by giving proper service and rewards to those veterans who did return.

What is proper service to the returned veteran? We might better begin by asking—Who is the returned veteran? He is—We! A member of your family or mine. He is an integral part of our community.

Therefore when we help the veteran we do not dole out charity. We invest in our future, yours and mine.

The veteran is not the man on the other side of the fence—a stranger—he is the man on our side of the fence, our family.

I think it is high time we thought of that angle pretty carefully. For we do not want our Nation, nor our community, to be divided into the veteran versus the nonveteran.

We are a people who fought a war together—we must now work together to rebuild our country.

The veteran is a citizen who went off to war and came back into the community. He does not want to be treated as someone to be set apart. He wants to melt back into the pattern of the town. He wants to be part of the picture, part of the whole.

This is not to say we should brush off the veterans' problems, or let him fend for himself completely. Not at all. You parents know what I mean. If among your children there is one who has been ill or injured, you give him extra attention. You give him a little extra something to put him back on an equal footing with the rest of the family.

That is what we must do for the veteran. Legislation has provided that he be given extra schooling, special medical attention, pensions, and opportunities for training.

But, in the last analysis it is up to us in the individual communities to make sure that the legislative plans can be fulfilled.

What good is it to provide opportunities and financial help for veteran schooling, if there are no schools available? We must see to it that school facilities are enlarged where necessary.

What good is a fine medical plan if there are not sufficient doctors and nurses to make it work?

We must encourage our daughters to train as nurses and our doctors to serve veterans when and where needed.

What good is legislation to provide for rehabilitation and training of our disabled men, if no employers will hire them?

Did you know that only one out of eight disabled veterans who apply for jobs are given them?

That is a shameful record for those whose country was founded on freedom and equality of opportunity.

Employers may not have recognized the tremendous potential value of a trained disabled veteran as an employee. But they can remedy that now.

Disabled veterans have proven that in jobs within their capabilities they are far above the average in ability and reliability. Employers can now be assured that employing a disabled veteran is not an act of charity. It is a good investment.

What good is any legislation for a veteran if he has no home to live in—no place of his own for himself and his family?

Here is where the community can help—where we can all help.

How? By gladly waiting with your plans for building or remodeling until veteran housing has been taken care of. By giving honest value on their investment to those veterans who buy property or materials from your firms.

There was a letter from a veteran's wife in a recent national magazine which illustrates well the returns to a community for helping a veteran. She began by saying that—

"Enough cannot be said to thank those who help returned veterans * * *."

She went on to tell how the real-estate man helped them find a lot they wanted at a price they could afford—how the architect helped them plan within their means—the builder aided them, etc.

The veteran's wife finally closed the letter by saying:

"Mere thanks is not enough for these people. But maybe by helping the community we can show our appreciation."

That is the answer. That is the kind of dividends that come from your investment in the veteran—solid citizens who help build the community.

If we all take a new lease on life, brush the cobwebs of postwar confusion out of our souls, work together to help the veteran to help us build a strong community, we can show that Lowell leads again in the establishment of peace, as she did in the defense of the country.

Then we can say to our living and our dead:

"You have not fought in vain. You have not died in vain. The torch of peace you flung to us, we carry on—to light the path for the world."

We, the People, Fight Tuberculosis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein an address by the Honorable James A. Farley at the forty-seventh anniversary dinner of the National Jewish Hospital, at Denver, Colo., entitled "We, the People, Fight Tuberculosis":

Mr. FARLEY:

I want to express my deep appreciation at having been given the honor of addressing this gathering of distinguished men and women who have come together tonight to pay their respects to our good friend, Leonard Ginsberg, for his tireless work on behalf of the National Jewish Hospital at Denver and other worthy nonsectarian causes.

By his many benefactions and by his efforts in support of humanitarian enterprises, our guest of honor has earned the right to have the spotlight of our action focused on him tonight.

He holds firmly to the noble tradition of celebrated Americans who have always recognized that success in one's personal aspirations obligates one to shoulder added social responsibilities. Leonard Ginsberg has been true to this fine tradition. That is why he is so ready to more than fulfill the civic responsibilities which he, as an esteemed member of the business community, has been called upon to assume.

I think it is most appropriate that this dinner which honors him should at the same time celebrate the forty-seventh anniversary of the National Jewish Hospital of which he is a trustee and which is so close to his heart.

I have had occasion to learn of the splendid work and program of the hospital for some years. But I am now more aware than ever of the tremendous debt of gratitude the people of America owe to this pioneer institution.

Those familiar with the epidemics that followed in the wake of the First World War know that disease and the threat of disease are great postwar dangers.

Recently I had occasion to travel through various parts of the European continent. While abroad I saw at first hand some of the pitiful after-effects of World War II on the minds and bodies of ill-fated children and adults. I spoke to authorities responsible for instituting epidemic control measures and was informed of the obstacles that are making the grave health and welfare problems of the people difficult of solution.

Although disease records show that the people of Europe have withstood the health hazards of war much better than our worst fears led us to believe would be the case, the end of the crisis period cannot be said to be in sight by any stretch of the imagination. Almost everywhere abroad the incidence and death curves of tuberculosis are rising. The only conclusion to be drawn from available reports is that the rise in tuberculosis rates on the European Continent is alarming.

During the first 6 months of 1945 the Netherlands experienced a 300-percent rise in this contagious disease. The number of cases at present is still estimated to be double that of 1940. In varying degrees, the grim story is repeated in Denmark, Italy, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Greece, where tuberculosis is among the chief causes of death. In Greece, for example, published statistics on TB disclose that this affliction took a toll of more than three-quarters of a million lives during the war years. Authorities in that country consider approximately 2,000,000 people to be potential victims of infection.

I am sure that every American who has an inkling of the ravages of illness in general and tuberculosis in particular on the peoples overseas will, without hesitation, pledge complete support to all measures necessary to guard against similar outbreaks in the United States.

One need not necessarily be imbued with the spirit of humanitarianism in order to subscribe to this pledge. All we need do is give ear to the dictates of self-preservation.

We are a nation whose people are gifted with the quality of practical idealism. I am sure that men and women who are sufficiently informed of the role they can play in the campaign to control and prevent tuberculosis will render invaluable assistance toward maintaining and developing still further the gains we have made against this plague in the last half-century.

I believe health authorities would agree that the following points shape up as the Big Five in the fight against TB:

1. Isolation of active cases.
2. Adequate medical care and hospital facilities.
3. Intensified efforts to find early cases by chest X-rays and tuberculin tests.
4. Adequate food, clothing, and shelter.
5. Full citizen support of medical and public-health campaigns undertaken to wipe out TB.

Given the necessary united action on behalf of such a Big Five program, there are those who state with assurance that this blight could be removed from our ranks in 20 years. Well, then, how do we stand at present?

In the next 12 months about 54,000 men, women, and children will succumb to tuberculosis—at a rate of one about every 9½ minutes. There are more than 800,000 persons in the United States estimated to have TB.

Despite the fact that most early cases of tuberculosis can be arrested or improved fairly rapidly, it is unfortunate that 90 percent of the cases discovered at present are already in an advanced stage.

Health authorities estimate that from 50,000 to 100,000 additional beds are needed to take care of the ever-increasing number of tuberculosis patients. This acute shortage is felt by most cities throughout the Nation.

Tuberculosis, still the chief cause of death between the ages of 15 and 45, is so grave a menace that every healthy person is threatened by its continued existence. We must constantly bear in mind the fact that hospitalization—segregation of open cases of tuberculosis—remains one of the most effective protections to the community. Support of institutions like the National Jewish Hospital is therefore but the common-sense form of self-defense for ourselves and our families.

Among the principal factors on the positive side are the breaking down of taboos which at one time made TB a subject to be discussed only in whispers; and the fact that considerable progress has been made since the turn of the century, when TB claimed 200,000 lives each year.

The National Jewish Hospital at Denver has had a prominent part in the progress against tuberculosis in the United States. Opened in 1899, it was the first Nation-wide philanthropic nonsectarian institution for the tuberculosis poor of our country.

Since its inception it has been guided by its motto, which proclaims that none may enter who can pay—none can pay who enter. This principle has been applied to the needy sick without distinction as to religion. By virtue of its laudable interfaith policy, the National Jewish Hospital has been a great symbol of the tolerance and cooperation among peoples of different faiths to which we Americans wholeheartedly subscribe.

It is in the spirit of this principle that the institution has said to those afflicted with the double tragedy of tuberculosis and poverty: "Come to us—if we can help you we will."

The National Jewish Hospital's beneficence reaches into hundreds of communities in every section of the country and offers without charge the best that science has developed against this scourge. Its contributions to public health and public welfare have won it a well-deserved place of honor among medical and professional organizations here and abroad.

Grown over the years to a 16-unit institution occupying 15 acres of ground, the hospital has a bed capacity at present of 250. It dispenses free medical and surgical care each year to approximately 800 men, women, and children through its in-patient and out-patient facilities.

Patients remain as long as necessary for their improvement or recovery. Some stay 5 years or longer. Others a year or less. More than 36,000 unfortunate persons have been cared for—representing different races and religions; including civilians and war veterans; people from north, east, south, and west.

While no known drug is effective against tuberculosis in human beings, new surgical methods have come into practice in comparatively recent years and are applied at the National Jewish Hospital whenever deemed necessary by the staff of specialists in order to hasten recovery and save lives. Thus, in the treatment of this disease, the hospital, with 90 consulting specialists supplementing a highly competent clinical staff, goes beyond the services afforded by sanatoriums and is equipped to accept as patients people with tuberculosis in all its forms and degrees of severity.

The institution's most recent medical report discloses that during the past year 76,707 days of free care were received by 338 in-patients from 129 communities in 34 States. Forty percent of the patients were of the Jewish faith. Sixty percent were Protestants and Catholics.

After an average residence of 18 months at the hospital, 7 out of every 10 patients discharged during the year were improved or recovered, despite the fact that 83 percent of the patients admitted during the year were in the advanced stages of tuberculosis.

Under the guidance of Dr. H. J. Corper, director of the hospital's research department, the lofty tradition of scientific research is perpetuated. The autolytic tuberculin test—a means of determining the presence of tuberculosis—is but one of the many contributions for which this department is world famous. Scientists and physicians who have studied the merits of this new diagnostic weapon state that its general use will afford a swifter, more accurate means of detecting infection and bringing people under treatment in the early stage, when the outlook for recovery is best.

The hospital also renders distinctive service and stands as a model for other institutions through its work in the field of rehabilitation and vocational retraining and through its accredited program of medical education for general physicians and tuberculosis specialists.

Vocational therapy has several vital functions. It not only instills health-building morale by helping the months and years of hospital life pass by less drearily, but kindles the spark of hope for a gainful and socially useful life upon restoration to health and strength. More than 50 courses are offered in the hospital's rehabilitation program, including instruction in watch repairing, homemaking, bookkeeping, radio construction, stenography, and others. Moreover, each youngster in the children's division is given a standard grammar-school education during hospitalization, thereby preserving youth's bright heritage for a future in which dreams—despite present handicaps—can still come true.

The most telltale achievements of the tuberculosis movement are yet to be recorded in the years ahead. Our Nation's fight against tuberculosis is far from won. The support that the general public gives to this campaign in the coming period will determine whether or not the United States succeeds in staving off the threat of a postwar tuberculosis upsurge such as is now causing untold sickness and tragedy in Europe.

The National Jewish Hospital has taken up the challenge. It is now completing well-thought-out plans for a building-expansion and maintenance drive, involving an ultimate expenditure of $2,500,000, and aimed at increasing the hospital's bed capacity to 500 and extending all other vital services, so that it will become the chief arsenal of our Nation in its unrelenting war on tuberculosis—the age-old destroyer of human beings.

Aided by the generous giving of the thousands who in the past have made possible the work of the National Jewish Hospital at Denver—and with thousands of new supporters of all faiths joining their ranks—the hospital will reach its goal and will be able to offer its humane services to many more needy people.

This splendid institution has earned the commendation of Americans in every walk of life. It has been a privilege and an honor to take part in this testimonial to Leonard Ginsberg, one of its outstanding supporters, and to pay tribute to it as we celebrate the forty-seventh anniversary of the National Jewish Hospital's service to our suffering fellow men of all religious affiliations.

The President's Proposed Legislation

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1946

FINISH THE JOB IN THE RIGHT WAY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, driven by public sentiment, the President late Saturday afternoon asked the Congress to immediately pass temporary legislation which would authorize him to draft workers, who for 48 hours after he had declared a national emergency, refused to return to work in industries where a cessation of work injuriously affected the public welfare. Such a strike, the President declared, would be a strike against the Government.

That is the same position taken by President Cleveland in a previous railroad strike; by former President Coolidge, when as Governor of Massachusetts the policemen went on strike. President Theodore Roosevelt followed the same course, insisting that coal be mined.

President Truman but belatedly enunciated a fundamental principle to which we all must subscribe, that is, that the public be protected before the interest of any individual or group. That is the ABC principle underlying our Government.

The drafting of men who refused to work in war industries while the war was on was embodied in H. R. 3705, offered by me on July 6, 1945. It dealt only with workers and war production in wartime. That bill provided that when a worker who was engaged in producing, fabricating, manufacturing, or transporting things for the prosecution of the war, refused to work to supply the food, clothing, munitions of war needed by our men who were doing the fighting, he should be, regardless of his age, drafted into the United States Army and by his commanding officer assigned to whatever task for which he was best qualified, either digging ditches, working on farm, in factory, or on the railroad or fighting. That bill went to the Committee on Military Affairs and was there buried.

The fighting over, men should not be drafted for any purpose in peacetime, but if they refuse to work and such refusal endangers the public health and welfare, they should be deprived of special benefits given them by Congress.

NOT FAR ENOUGH

The President did not go far enough in one respect. His proposal referred only to industries which he had seized. There should be legislation providing that when there is a strike in any public utility which affects the health, welfare, or life of the public, if the strikers remain out for 12 hours they should lose their special privileges heretofore given them by Congress—their exclusive benefits under the NLRA, the Railway Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, which gave them privileges not enjoyed by the average citizen.

H. R. 4612, introduced by me on November 7, 1945, and H. R. 5571, offered in February 1946, would have accomplished the purpose without the drafting of a man had they been enacted into law.

The President went too far when he asked for power to seize profits in Government-seized industries when management was not at fault. Why punish the innocent?

A REMEDY—NOT DELAY

The President also recommended that a committee from Senate and House be appointed to, for a period of 6 months, investigate conditions generally, then

recommend to the Congress such special labor legislation as might aid in lessening the number of labor disputes, the length and the intensity of strikes.

Why investigate for 6 months? Everyone familiar with labor disputes knows that many of them, many of our strikes grow out of the inequities of the Wagner Act. The authors of that law never had in mind the principles of equal justice under law. Their purpose was to protect and advance the interest of organized labor. The rights of the unorganized worker, of the employer, of the general public were completely ignored.

Earnest, sincere leaders now realize that the law has increased jurisdictional disputes and strikes, led to boycotts, to racketeering, now to the threatening of the welfare of our people.

This phase of the President's recommendation was recognized by me in March of 1939, when H. R. 4990 was introduced. Reintroduced in 1941, and again in February of 1946 as H. R. 5334, it was pigeonholed. After weeks of study and research I prepared amendments to the Wagner Act, drafted a bill, had it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in parallel columns with the original act so that anyone who cared could, by comparison, see the effect of the proposed changes. That bill was referred to the Committee on Labor and, notwithstanding all my efforts, was buried.

Today, public sentiment, the disaster threatening the Nation, forced the President to act, but he still ignores the need for more just and equitable, permanent legislation, hence recommended an investigation. Action, not investigation, is what we have long needed. It is my hope that the same aroused public sentiment which forced the President to act, will convince the Congress that it can no longer safely ignore the demand for an amended Wagner Act, for just legislation protecting workers, employers, the public.

I shall continue to do my utmost, as I have ever since the sit-down strikes in 1937, to see that neither branch of Congress forgets the issue, nor without warning, ignores it.

We Deport Some Japs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication published in the Washington Post of March 18, 1946:

WE DEPORT SOME JAPS

A letter written in March, 1945, by a Japanese on behalf of himself and his wife reposes somewhere in the files of the United States Immigration Service. They had been legal residents of this country for many years. He had entered in 1904 as a regular immigrant. Much later, for reasons he sets forth, he went back to his homeland and reentered under the provisions of the trade treaty between the United States and Japan. Only if he came in as a "treaty trader" could his wife be admitted, since our 1924 law prohibited further Japanese immigration.

In January 1940, the treaty was abrogated. Immediately, the right of both of them to remain here could be challenged.

A little over 5 years later they had hearings before an immigration inspector. Under date of March 19, 1945, a crisp Government communication was mailed to each of them. The inspector's report cited the facts of their case and the pertinent provisions of the law. They were declared to be in the United States illegally and subject to deportation.

The wife wept. Her husband a mild little man who had left Nagasaki long ago, was at a loss to know what to do. Maybe, he thought, he could explain things to the Government. So he wrote a letter. After some preliminaries it proceeds:

"I, Masao, came to the United States in 1904. I worked hard. Little by little the opportunities this country afforded made it possible for me to establish a modest economic foundation. In 1914 I went to Japan to obtain a wife. Life was good to me. I prospered and was blessed with four children. In 1929 my wife passed away. When she knew she could not live she was much concerned about the children. She urged me many time until her last moments to marry her younger sister so that, when she was gone the children would have a good mother.

"I did not respond to her request right away. I tried to hire a housekeeper. It did not work. I sent the two daughters to Japan. Still I had trouble trying to maintain a proper home. Finally, in 1931, I went to Japan for my first wife's younger sister.

"The only way I could bring her back with me was to acquire the status of a treaty trader. I did not ever think of this as a subterfuge. I was an importer and was clearly eligible. It was just a way in which I could solve a pressing family problem. Never did I dream that the treaty might be abrogated. It seemed so permanent and dependable.

"My family problem was solved. My present wife accepted her responsibilities as a sacred trust passed on to her by her older sister. She has been a real mother to my boys. She has cared for them and guided them with tireless patience. She wanted, as much as I did, for them to become good men, good Christians and good Americans. When the older boy graduated from the University of California just before evacuation, her pride was as great as mine. And when the younger boy made a brilliant record as a student and went from scholarship to scholarship in college we both felt the same way.

"In recent years I have suffered many financial reverses. Now I am poor and old. All I have in the world that matters to me are my wife and three children. [The third is a daughter by his present marriage.]

"I am not a citizen only because I could not be. I feel deeply that this is my country anyway. Here I have lived and worked and brought up my family. In Japan I have nobody and nothing. I thrill when I see my son in the uniform of a soldier of the United States. That is where he should be when his country needs him. My other son is deferred because of his medical studies. He is ready to serve in any way when he is called and my blessings will go with him.

"My wife has been here less time than I. But she has given so much to the rearing of our American children that her heart is where they are. Her attachment to this country has been thrown into sharp relief by the deportation order. She is worried and full of dread. I have little success in my efforts to comfort her.

"As I said in the beginning, no exception is taken to the findings of the inspector. This is written in the hope that it will call attention to the personal and family predicament that we (and others) find ourselves in as a result of the abrogation of the treaty—an event beyond our control that we had no part in causing. We pray that the Congress may see fit to modify the immigration laws or that our deportation will be stayed until a new treaty has been negotiated after the war so that we may be able to reestablish our status under it or that some other remedy for our tragic situation may be forthcoming. However, it may be done, it is our fervent desire to remain in this, the country of our children, until the end of our days.

"In honesty, we should explain that the foregoing was not written by us. I can write English but I cannot express my deep feelings well. It is the work of an American friend. We told him everything and what we wanted to say. We have studied it carefully and have made a few changes. The words are his, but it is a true account of our actions, our thoughts, and our feelings.

"Respectfully submitted,

"MASAO O. TSUKUO."

Now, the Justice Department is rounding up deportable Japanese aliens in preparation for sending them to Japan at an early date. A ship is planned for May 29. Those who acted in complete good faith in entering the country under the provisions of treaty will be dealt with in the same way as those who crossed the border without authorization. An event in international relations, and no move on their part, suddenly made their presence here illegal. The termination of the treaty was really retroactive in its effect, since it took away a status they had had up until that time.

Masao and Tsuku are among those scheduled to go. Their daughter, an American citizen by birth, will probably have to accompany them. She is just 13. What do their citizen sons think? The soldier-son was top man in his class of 1,500 in the military intelligence language school at Fort Snelling, Minn.

It must not be imagined that this case is unique or even unusual. Hundreds of families will be broken up by these deportations.

One may wonder why officials in the Justice Department do not recognize the situation and make some adjustments. The answer is simple. There is a clause in the immigration law which prohibits officials from exercising any discretion in the cases of aliens ineligible to citizenship. The Attorney General does have the power to stay the deportation of other aliens in the event of undue hardship. But with reference to the Japanese and most other Orientals, the operation of the law is as mechanical as a rock crusher.

There is in Congress a bill, introduced by Representative EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania, to remove this paralyzing racist clause from the immigration law so that all aliens can be treated alike in the matter of deportation. It is in committee. It will likely remain in committee until Masao and Tsuku and many more parents of American soldiers and citizens are back in Japan, scrabbling for life in that defeated land. The only hope is that enough voters may show interest in the Eberharter bill to get it enacted speedily.

ASAEL T. HANSEN,
WASHINGTON.

Americans Returning Art Stolen by Nazis Arrested by Poles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by

Pauline Frederick from the Washington Evening Star of May 25, 1946:

AMERICANS RETURNING ART STOLEN BY NAZIS ARRESTED BY POLES

NUREMBERG, May 25.—One year after the end of a war fought for the four freedoms, Poland knows nothing about freedom from fear. The terror in this tragic land is such today that Poles risk arrest and imprisonment for showing enthusiasm for Americans and for democracy.

I have just come from Poland. I spent 8 days there, 24 hours of which our entire party of 21 Americans was held under arrest in a train in the freight yards at Cracow. The 1946 version of the Gestapo, the security police, sat on watch outside in an American-made UNRRA truck. The guards wore GI clothing except for their Polish caps.

I was in Poland on two fateful holidays—May 1, when the workers and students marched under threat; and May 3, when the Polish people tried to celebrate their national constitution day against the wishes of the government with the result that there were cold-blooded shootings and mass arrests.

PLEAD WITH AMERICANS

It is heartbreaking to witness as I have—and as any American who comes to Poland does—the way the people cling to the sight of an American as a sort of sign that in some way they will be delivered from their bondage. They stop you on the street and after making sure that no one is in earshot, plead: "Send us help for the June 30 referendum or there will be slaughter."

On that day the Communist-dominated government, which is estimated to have the support of not more than 3 percent of the people, will ask for a vote of approval on a one-house parliament, nationalization of industries and land reforms, and Poland's western boundaries. Nothing is said of the eastern boundaries. Nor, more than a year after VE-day, is anything said about a popular election.

One of the GI's with our party came out of the Cracow YMCA on May 3 after lunch. People were marching with tiny Polish flags despite the government prohibition against celebrating their traditional "Fourth of July." When the people saw the Yank they broke ranks and surrounded him.

They shook his hand, cheered him, began covering him with lilacs. Then they boosted him to their shoulders and started carrying him down the street. They had gone about two blocks when an American-made half-track appeared. It mounted four 50-caliber machine guns manned by Russian soldiers. The Russians fired four bursts over the head of the GI. The crowd slowly disbursed with hisses and cries.

CROWD GATHERS

The following Sunday as our party left church to walk to the hotel, a crowd gathered about us. Under the very barrels of the guns of the security police and armed guards, who were everywhere, they began to cheer, "Long Live the Americans." They handed us armfuls of flowers, and from the windows all along the way, branches of lilacs were tossed down to us. The crowd grew, and so did the cheering. Finally, some of the men were boosted to the shoulders of the people and carried the rest of the way.

Standing outside the doorway to the hotel were four young Polish girls, laughing and applauding the performance. Before we were in the hotel two Russian soldiers had stepped up and led them away. As someone who was in Poland during the German occupation observed, "at least the Germans told a person why he was being arrested. Today one can never find out."

As the young prisoners were taken off, the angry crowd burst into cries of, "We want Mikolajczyk!" (the leader of the Peasant party who would probably poll at least 60 percent of the votes if a free election was held), "Down with communism!" "Give us back Vilna and Lwow!"

UNITED STATES PARTY DETAINED

Our party was forcibly detained at Cracow because a civilian member of the security police charged that a GI of our party had shot him in the arm. The incident was alleged to have occurred about 1 o'clock in the morning. At the time a security officer told an officer of our party that "no one saw the shooting, but it was believed to be an American."

Two days later the security police started to arrest the whole GI detail of 13 on a Cracow street. But when a crowd began to gather they didn't dare. They waited until the men boarded the train, and without looking them over, pointed to one and said he was guilty. The GI in question had four witnesses to prove that he was not anywhere near the scene of the alleged incident. No American saw the alleged gunshot wound under a bandage around the arm of the alleged victim.

When the accused GI was not given into their custody immediately, the security police put all members of the party under arrest and posted guards to see that none of us left the train and that the train did not leave Cracow. Thirty-six hours of negotiation between the American Embassy, the Polish Foreign Office, and the security police resulted in releasing the train and the rest of the passengers, but the innocent GI was left behind.

There are at least 80 American citizens in jail in Poland today on charges ranging from manslaughter (one case) to relatively minor matters such as not having the proper papers. In each case, negotiations are painfully slow, dragging over months while these Americans remain in Polish prisons. In some cases representatives of the Embassy have not even been allowed to see the prisoners.

Veterans' Preference in Purchase of Surplus War Materials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana:

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Baton Rouge, May 22, 1946.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Representative, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: Under the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 2, I am enclosing a true copy of the resolution for your information.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Yours very truly,
LEE L. LAYCOCK,
Clerk of the House.

House Concurrent Resolution 2

Whereas the youthful and vigorous manhood and womanhood of our Nation, by their valiant services and sacrifices, have defeated and destroyed those evil forces who sought to deprive us of our American way of life; and

Whereas not the least among their sacrifices was the compelling necessity to abandon their peacetime jobs and businesses to take up arms against our common enemy; and

Whereas upon their discharge from service and return to civilian pursuits they find our economy in a confused state brought about by an unprecedented scarcity of materials and equipment; and

Whereas this unprecedented scarcity, following a period of prosperity for those engaged in business during the emergency, has created an inflationary market for the limited supply of materials and equipment; and

Whereas the Government of the United States, as a result of the termination of the war, has a large quantity of surplus war materials and equipment suitable for civilian pursuits now being sold by the War Assets Corporation; and

Whereas it is the fervent desire of a grateful people to assist and encourage the early readjustment of our returning veterans, a vital and virile part of our population, and,

Whereas under existing legislation no preference in price is given the veteran in the purchase of surplus war material: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That we urge the Louisiana delegation in the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to the end that any honorably discharged veteran of World War II may enjoy a price preference in the purchase of surplus war materials over all competition on a set formula, as follows:

(a) On all purchases up to $5,000 the veteran to pay 50 percent of the marked price.

(b) On all purchases over $5,000 and less than $10,000 the veteran to pay 75 percent of the marked price.

(c) On all purchases over $10,000 and less than $20,000 the veteran to pay 90 percent.

(d) On all purchases over $20,000 the veteran to pay full market price; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Representatives and Senators from Louisiana in the Congress, and to the national patriotic organizations.

The Emergency Strike Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we present a sorry spectacle before the world, a great country brought to the brink of collapse by false and selfish leaders in both camps, by weakness and vacillation on the part of Government, by the confusion in the country at large at a moment when the suffering people everywhere look to us for food and help of every sort, but most of all for assurance that free men can govern themselves with justice, wisdom, and vision.

The practical contribution it was the responsibility of our genius to make at war's end was immediate production. In this we have failed tragically and miserably. Who can tell the results of our failure?

We have listened to an unsmiling President while he presented a grave picture of the situation in which this coun-

try finds itself, and then requested immediate temporary emergency legislation and a study of the problem leading to long range labor policy and legislation. The suggested temporary legislation was brought before us under suspension of the rules which forbids amendment. Twenty minutes was given each side for an expression of views and then the bill H. R. 6578 passed with but 13 dissenting votes. I voted for this bill with utmost reluctance, knowing it contains both injustices and real dangers because the impotence of the Executive, faced with the results of its own inaction, threatened the very life of America. Labor had to be told in no uncertain terms that no group, no matter what its grievances, can be permitted to destroy the whole.

Holding more power than any president has ever held, the President could and should have used those powers effectively. He did not do so. Yet one cannot rest too great blame upon him as he fell heir to a situation built upon the false foundations of those who bought labor's support by appeasement. I would feel greater confidence in him and in his methods had he prefaced his message to the joint session by saying quite simply what we knew to be a fact [inasmuch as Senator BARKLEY had announced at noon to the Senate "that the railroad brotherhoods involved in the pending strike have agreed to go back to work immediately," and the press had carried a similar announcement before 4 o'clock] that though the immediate railroad emergency was over, the coal strike still remained to be dealt with, instead of playing the game of having a pink slip handed to him during his speech in attempted drama.

But even so, a halt had to be called and whether the Senate ever considers the bill or not the House could do no less than support the President in his delayed effort to stop an intolerable situation.

One thing I must protest, Mr. Speaker, and that is the casting of all the blame either upon the workers, or upon industry.

I believe so thorough in organization for the workers that their voice may be heard. I have such certainty that there is no greater loyalty, no deeper desire for America's welfare than in the hearts of the workers of America! That they have let themselves be led to this point of confusion and unwisdom is to me one of the great tragedies of our time. In their hearts they know that unless the Nation prosper they do not prosper, that unless America prosper the world may crash about our ears. They know, if they know anything, that increased wages can be paid only if production is so great that costs to the consumer are attractive. And production does not result from strikes no matter who is to blame. Indeed the matter of fixing the blame is foolish business and gets nowhere. "Let him who is without sin cast the first stone"!

I hold no brief for industry—I see too many places where its lack of vision, of heart, of understanding has bred the very situation these many strikes result from. But neither do I hold with the labor leaders who alibi their own arrogance with charges of industry's mistakes. I know so many workers whose loyalty to the American Way, whose recognition of their own long-range benefits are too keen to make very tolerable the selfish power-seeking of a few men in temporary positions of leadership.

What of Government? Let Government withdraw from business and from the controls of free Americans rather than be used as mediator and advocate! And what of the ordinary run-o'-mine citizen? Surely it is high time that he resume responsibility for his own acts rather than asking Government to take them from his shoulders.

Indeed, it seems so clear to me that blame rests foursquare upon the shoulders of all concerned—labor, industry, Government, and the citizens of this country, that I would have us stop seeking the blameworthy and begin building constructive attitudes that will of themselves lead to solutions of the very difficult but not insoluble problems contained in the relationship between the man who works, the man who hires him, the man in the street, and this Government in Washington. Then such measures as H. R. 6578 will not be brought to this Congress in moments of emergency caused by our fourfold weaknesses.

To my mind it is time we Americans woke up and made ourselves responsible human beings. We believe that the individual has essential values, that he must be protected from the encroachment of others upon him, as well as from overmuch Government interference with and control of his life—his freedom. But we believe also that freedom for the individual goes only to that point where his activities interfere with the activities, the same freedom, of others. At that point we believe restriction by compromise, if possible, by law if impossible of achievement, must take place. But let us not set up these drastic measures as permanent methods. Therein lie the seeds of revolution.

Let me repeat my earlier words:

No one element in all these strike controversies is at fault. The blame lies foursquare upon each—and so upon us all.

We have the most wonderful way of life in all the world—the way of freedom. When we have permitted it to become license we have paid heavy penalties. Our way has carried us far. But we must not forget that any machine will rust and crack and break down if it is not looked after. We have been neglecting ours. The sooner we forget sentiment and face up to the fact that there has been bad leadership, bad policy, and irresponsible activity on the part of all, the sooner shall we be able to clear our difficulties.

So, Mr. Speaker, certain that it is important to my country and to the world as a whole that we stop the tide of strikes, even though it be done by unreasonable and ill-considered measures, as I believe this bill to be, I have voted to give the President the power he considers necessary. But I do so because he has insisted that it be a temporary measure and am less troubled than I might have been had section 10 not had added to it the clause that termination can be had by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses.

Sermon of His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman at the Eighth Annual Memorial Mass for the War Dead in Arlington National Cemetery, Sunday, May 26, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include herein a splendid sermon delivered by His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York and military ordinary at the eighth annual memorial mass for the war dead, which mass was celebrated in the Arlington National Cemetery, Sunday, May 26, 1946, at which mass the Most Reverend William R. Arnold, military delegate and former Chief of Chaplains, United States Army, pontificated; the Most Reverend Peter L. Ireton, bishop of Richmond, presided; Dr. James A. Magner, procurator of Catholic University, Washington, D. C., acted as deacon; Lt. Col. William J. Walsh, Chaplain Corps, United States Army, acted as subdeacon; Rev. Walter J. Schmitz, S. S., master of ceremonies; and Col. Patrick J. Ryan, Deputy Chief of Chaplains, United States Army, and Capt. T. M. Michling, chaplain, United States Marine Corps, the chaplains to Cardinal Spellman.

Thoughts, reverent and profound, dominate the hearts of Americans this day, as, midst the complex labors of the present we pause to commemorate the laborers of the past, the unnumbered millions who, not alone on the field of battle but in the broad plazas of peace, have made America the great and God-blessed Nation that she is today. Memorial Day is our Nation's recognition of immortality and America's expression of gratitude to her mighty dead. I say her "mighty dead" with deliberate purpose, for here at the grave of the Unknown Soldier, America today is re-pledging her plighted word—"that these dead shall not have died in vain"—the sacred promise of the greatest of her martyred sons, that these United States might forever live in unity and peace.

If this pledge we fulfill, then the simple granite block above the Unknown Soldier's grave bespeaks the will of America never to betray the precious blood and priceless sacrifices of the world's first soldier unknown to many, who became its Saviour, Jesus Christ. Thus, upon this Memorial Day and throughout all the days of our years, our belief in God and immortality becomes a common bond, as in united prayer, we give thanks for America's heritage of freedom, justice, and unity, God-given glories saved for us, the living, by our valiant dead. And it is forever our duty and our honor to protect this heritage with dedication and devotion even to the very sacrifice of our own lives.

Material progress, the visible trappings of affluent life, mighty cities, great marts of trade, harbors crowded with the commerce of the far corners of the earth—these never have and never will assure a nation of immortality for the material things of this world are by their very nature subject to decay. It is the spirit that gives eternal life and it is the great and mighty host and heart of America that makes our Nation

consecrate. It is not then the revered dust of this Unknown Soldier here entombed, but his immortal soul that speaks to America and to us his fellow-countrymen, bidding us place our trust not in the material achievements of our country, however great and praiseworthy they may be, but in the preservation of our high and Christ-enlightened program of a Nation dedicated to the perpetuation of untrammeled justice and mutual understanding among our own citizens and classes, and international good will among the great family of nations. This is the immortality which America must achieve if she would endure as a nation, exalted by her own citizenry, respected by other nations and feared only by nations and peoples of ill will.

In the holy sacrifice of the mass offered here today as we pray for the soul of this Unknown Soldier and all our beloved dead, we also pray that the spirit of him whose earthly dust here sleeps, may awaken within us the determination to be true to all our soldier dead who peacefully sleep beneath the flag-draped greensward in the cemeteries of whole wide world. In pledge to them, united we must stand against the savageries, blind furies, deceits, and infidelities of forces who seek to impair, undermine, and destroy the soul of America. For, if in selfishness, weakness, indifference or in fear, we permit disloyalty and disunity to prevail, we are sinning not alone against God, but against these millions of stout-hearted men, who, cloaked in courage down through the years of our Nation's life, have given the last full measure of their devotion to preserve our unity. Our soldier dead now sleep in many lands—in the far isles of the Pacific, in the frozen tundra of lands of perpetual winter, along the shores of Africa, in the Middle and Far East, in green England, and in Ireland's hospitable heart, in the poppy fields of France, the lowlands of Holland and Belgium and on Italy's sun-washed slopes.

Today's salute will fade in echo, the sad-sounding taps will be lost among the hills, the sun will sink low as the cool of the evening comes and the dawning stars blossom in the great-skied canopy of night. But nothing but death will take from me the recollection of the far-flung fields of the embattled world, other morns and other masses, scenes of smiling, eager faces and friendly hands reached out to grasp my own; kneeling throngs in silent adoration, in pledge of faith and hope in love divine. For where'er I go there lives within my soul the message and the memory of our fallen, our sleeping soldiers—the multitude of men who at life's threshold met death with courage, firm and unafraid. Upon their faces fell too soon the shadows, too soon came nightfall and an alien grave:

They were the mighty host whose outward passage
Will never know the gladness of return,
Who only from the ramparts of God's heaven
Will see again the shrines their hearts held dear:
The sleepy main street of New England village,
The busy joyousness of old New York,
The gold-washed cuts of Colorado's canyons,
The breeze-waltzed grain of fertile western farms,
The mystic romance of the old South's rivers,
Her cottonwoods blanched cleanly by the moon,
The brisk, clear breathings of a Northwest morning,
And California's sun and sea-bathed shores.
These were the mystic fabric of their dreamings,
And these the scenes blurred rudely by the pain
Of men who fell asleep that nations might awaken,
That other men may live and work in peace.
Their ears, I pray, now hear a sweeter music;
Their hearts, I trust, now know a happier home;
Their minds have now a fuller understanding
Than is man's lot within this earthly world.
And I presume as priest and loving brother
Upon the tolerance of hearts softened by grief,
To pray above the graves of sleeping soldiers,
Whether in life they shared my faith or not,
And gently whisper through their death-veiled slumber:
"Soldier, I bring your mother's fondest love;
Here on your brow I place your father's blessing,
And here the love of faithful wife and child,
To you a message from your cherished sweetheart,
For ' rs is sacrifice akin to yours.
Be yours the peace God grants the fallen soldier,
Whose courage gave to justice, might and right,
That righteousness, through might of truth prevailing,
Again among the sons of men should dwell."
Their lives they placed upon man's noblest altar,
Entabernacled for the peace of man,
For Christian faith transmutes in man all suffering
Into eternal joys and life's awards.
And thus I feel that far beyond the living
Unto our dead our pilgrimage is made,
And in the oneness of a common sorrow
Born of the Single Fatherhood of God,
We leave in thought the message of each dear one
Upon the altars of our templed dead.
And they in turn, to us, I feel, are speaking
With eloquence which we, the living, hear.
They ask not to have back what they have given;
They seek not praise, nor prize, nor earth's acclaim.
They only ask that we who follow after
May profit by the anguish they have borne.
They ask for men the just peace that they fought for,
The better world that they have died to build.

And, today, standing among these hallowed hills where sleep our war-dead of yesteryears, reflecting on these sacred scenes reproduced in prayerful pattern of Memorial Day remembrance which find our Nation standing in a hundred thousand cemeteries with bowed head and reverent heart, I am possessed of a great confidence that righteousness shall walk again among the sons of men, and that these dead shall not have died in vain; that the world's greatest experiment in self-government can and shall survive amid the changing tides of political policies, domestic differences, internal difficulties and international divergencies; that America and Americans will not follow the will-of-the-wisp theories of modern vagaries and uncrystallized, vagrant, undisciplined thoughts; that under no precocious pretext of class betterment shall America abandon her treasured heritage of balanced, checked and counterchecked democratic political forms; but that we shall achieve the peaceful solution of all our internal and external problems in the light of those ideals of liberty and justice for which the Unknown Soldier, with thousands of his companions, lived, fought, bled, and died!

Along the avenue of my war memories I see again a new American cemetery, stretching across a wide, wind-swept field marked off by sparse hedges and crude fences of field stone. On one side, the terrain sloped gently to the beautiful valley of the Meuse, and opposite there opened a vista of green fields and low rolling hills dotted with old farm buildings and even older churches. At a turn in the road, I lingered at a wayside calvary erected by the pious farmer folk of the region, and said a rosary for all our dead and their bereaved beloved.

Here was a military cemetery in the making, a new sanctuary, where once again, not only the bodies of our soldiers were being buried but, with them, the hearts and hopes of those who loved them. Some day, it, too, will be like this one, trim and well kept, with tall trees restlessly moaning and rustling in the wind. Some day, its serried, white crosses and stars of David will be set off by freshly raked gravel paths and cool green lawns, as in Brookwood outside London, as in the American cemetery by the lake near Oran, or at sun-baked Ponte Olivo looking down across the plain of Gela toward the lapping blue waters of the Mediterranean. But on that day it was a lonely expanse of sticky black mud, with yawning holes of sad familiar shape and depth dug in low rows lined by white tape.

In one corner, the day's harvest of the dead lay piled. Some were just as they had come, fresh-fallen from the field of battle, blood-stained and gory. Some, from the field and evacuation hospitals, still wore their splints and bandages, now sadly soiled, disarranged, and shaken loose, mute, melancholy evidence of the fervent but vain attempts of medical corpsmen to save them. Others lay wrapped in their mud-spattered, soggy, white duck sacks, which serve as mattresses for the living and as burial shrouds for the dead.

Here lay the youth of America, modern youth, capable of going out with an infectious grin and a hasty prayer, and dying for an ideal; dying for the America they knew and loved, dying for lands and peoples unknown to them. Across the swirling, swollen Meuse behind them, were the lands they had liberated, where the streets had been thronged with people who greeted them with wild shouts of acclaim, music, and laughter, with tears, kisses, handclasps, and a torrent of grateful words. They had tasted the brief, exhilarating glory of the liberator and, then, they, too, had been freed from the bondage of war—forever freed.

On the other side of the farthermost hill lay the land those still living would conquer and, in conquering, liberate from thralldom. I thought of Rupert Brooke and his little corner of the earth that would be forever England. I thought of Alan Seeger and his youthful springtime rendezvous at some disputed barricade. I thought of the gentle, kindly Joyce Kilmer and his trumpet-note of young death floating clear in the wood of Rouge Bouquet. I thought of all the others of that great and youthful host who, so little time ago, had also died to make the world safe for democracy—and for us.

The silence was broken only by the mournful sound of picks and shovels hacking at the soft yielding earth—gateway to the only peace thousands of our boys, who fought for peace, would ever know. I looked again upon the stricken, scarred, shocking remains of fun-loving, peace-loving Americans lately turned soldier, who, stout-hearted, strong-limbed, vibrant, and daring, had fallen facing the foe upon the soil to which they had carried the flag of freedom. I stood with them in the dank mud while the chill, gray, dripping fog and marrow-searching cold hugged me, and I prayed then, as today I pray, that love and tolerance may quench the fires of bigotry and hate and in their ashes we may plant the seeds of peace.

Standing here with our hallowed, silent dead, thinking of those newly laid to rest, and all our sleeping soldiers who, throughout the life of our United States, selflessly have spent themselves to make this Nation consecrate, I ponder the great and sacred trust our mighty dead have laid upon us. Sorrow, pity, pride, hope, and faith well high in my heart as I beg you harken to the plea of the Unknown Soldier:

O ye who live and walk the earth today,
Think ye of me, think not I quiet sleep!
I am the witness of your present need.

I am the reason you may not retreat,
I am the trumpet calling you to wake,
Bravely to live, lest all that I have won
Should yet be lost; that painfully beyond
Our triumph dearly bought with blood and tears,
The anguished spending of a million lives
Should be in vain; and end again in war's
Beginning—bitter bartering of blood!
O ye who live, lift up your eyes today!
Though mine are closed on Time, I truly see
The wisdom and the glory of God's plan!
Each man permitted in some little way,
A minor part within one sacrifice—
Of us who died and you who yet must live.
What we did yesterday for you, must you
Now do for us, and bear the burden dropped
From out our dying hands. Lift up the torch
We now must needs put down and trust to you
Through all the years to come. Lift up this host—
America, the hope of all the world!
For all men sense with darkling prophecy
That if America shall fail, true peace
Upon the earth will never come!
Today He comes, the Prince of Peace, when peace
Seems poised for flight. And since He comes
To promise us His grace and bless our souls,
We may take hope for what is yet to be!
We shall not fail who put in God our trust,
We shall not want who generously give,
We shall be fed who feed the hunger-worn,
We shall be healed who bind our neighbor's wounds,
We shall be found acceptable and live
Immortal—immortal make our land, and save
Our Unknown Soldier's sainted sacrifice.

Address of Gen. Clarence H. Kells, Director, Port of Boston Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address delivered by Gen. Clarence H. Kells, director, Port of Boston Authority, at the Maritime Day luncheon held in Boston, Mass., on Wednesday, May 22, 1946. This speech was given by one who is in a position to know personally of the contribution made by the merchant marine during the past years and is a most able, forceful, and constructive speech. Gen. Clarence H. Kells, in his well-prepared address, cited many and various reasons for a better and busier port of Boston. We all congratulate him on his worth-while presentation with the sincere hope that he will obtain the well-needed support of all parties concerned to bring about this reality.

Today the Nation celebrates National Maritime Day—a day set aside by the President of the United States to honor our merchant marine. This day commemorates the anniversary of the departure of the S. S. *Savannah*, from Savannah, Ga., in 1819 on its first transocean crossing using steam propulsion.

In all parts of the continental United States, and in many other places, groups totalling in the hundreds of thousands are this day meeting as we are meeting to reflect upon the past, to attempt to presage the future.

I believe that today is an appropriate one on which to take stock of our present merchant marine and the role which it will play in the economic life of our country in the years ahead.

Every man, woman, and child in America should have a real interest in this day, not because it marks an anniversary, for anniversaries are, after all, only the milestones of a long journey, but because this anniversary may be the beginning of the rise and fall of our American merchant marine. Let us not forget that a merchant marine—strong, loyal, and efficient—is one of the greatest factors of national security.

Without a merchant marine our Nation cannot prosper in peace, nor can it defend itself fully from the perils of war.

It was a Boston man, the Honorable Joseph P. Kennedy, who was the leader in bringing to a reality a strong merchant marine policy in 1936, and the ships, the shipyards, and the spirit of that act became the foundation of our now great merchant marine.

This National Maritime Day of 1946 finds the United States with the largest merchant marine in all history, and yet suffering from a critical shortage of vessels of a suitable type to give immediate stimulus to world trade, which died when war clouds darkened the world.

We find that our merchant marine consists largely of Libertys, Victorys, and transports.

The Libertys are old, slow, and unsuitable for trade competition.

The Victorys—newer in design and faster—are better suited to enter postwar commerce; while the Transports, in the opinion of most experts, are not adaptable for passenger use.

Large and excellent bulk tankers are in excess of postwar needs, but we have practically no special ships.

We face a shortage of special service craft such as: Refrigerated ships, specialized tankers, grain vessels, colliers, lumber ships, sea trains, vehicle carriers, special coastal ships, and passenger ships.

Until these can be built and their trade developed, the Victorys and the few newer cargo ships, and the aging, war-weary passenger ships must go to world ports to compete for the commerce of the seas.

Thus we see that despite our great fleet of war-built vessels, we are not in as good a position as many believe.

We do have, however, excellent personnel to man our ships. The urge of all-out war brought many new faces to our merchant-marine crews. The necessities of war developed instruments and skill in navigation second to none in all the world.

The Navy, and the Army, too, contributed training schools. Intense study, coupled with experience, produced reinforcements to our pre-Pearl Harbor merchant marine that were of great aid during the war, and will remain of utmost value in the postwar era ahead.

We can, and do, have a lot of confidence in the crews of our vessels, and in their future performance.

Some will point out that foreign nations are worse off than we. This is generally true, but it is no reason why we, as a nation, should lose valuable time in creating our own peacetime merchant marine on sound principles—much as we did after World War I, but this time to meet a greater world trade challenge.

The quick-on-the-trigger critic may leap to his feet and say, "Well, why not get going?" That's not too bad a snap edict, either, but first let us take a quick look at the problems which now confront the American merchant marine, before we support a policy of haste.

The outlook for speedy resumption of world trade is not rosy, by any means—for a variety of reasons, which I shall attempt to outline:

(A) There is little or no world business in sight, and it is virtually certain that many months will have elapsed before domestic production of many major items reaches the shipping stage, particularly by water. Even then the best experts will not predict the length of time which must pass before foreign countries will produce sufficient goods for us to import to establish a balance of trade, and give our maritime trade the two-way haul it must have to keep ships operating on an economically sound basis.

(B) New trade routes must be explored and established, and old ones reconstituted, and this despite the fact that maritime red tape is discouraging no end.

(C) Shore establishments, both foreign and domestic, must be set up and placed on a firm business foundation.

(D) Peacetime operating costs before Pearl Harbor are no longer applicable, and wartime costs cannot be used as a yardstick for the immediate future.

These problems and many others must be faced in our postwar operations.

Many fear, also, that the labor unrest prevalent in other industries may spread to the ships, to the water front and to the yards, and disturb the at present fairly certain performance of these hundreds of thousands of skilled and essential workers.

Before we leave the national picture to touch upon our home port and its problems, which naturally affect us personally more than do world problems, it is only fitting that we should pay respectful tribute to the merchant marine and its allied industries for the splendid manner in which it played its part during World War II.

It is true that the shipyard workers—from blueprint room to commissioning berth—worked in comparative safety and under the best attainable working conditions, but we must recognize that they produced the ships—good ships—in quantities and at a speed which astonished our own leaders and brought mortal terror to the leaders of our enemies.

Praise is deserved by our water-front workers who loaded the greatest tonnage of history—wartime or peace.

The water-front workers of this Nation loaded the staggering, unbelievable amount of 268,283,000 tons during the war years, meeting convoy hours night and day, in every kind of weather.

They met the challenge put to them more than halfway.

When we are giving praise for war contributions, we must not forget these water-front workers and their battle cry, "You can't sail them if they are not loaded."

As for the crews, these soldiers of the sea sailed as truly into the unknown as did the first sailors who ventured in flimsy craft into the uncharted Atlantic.

They met the test with the same will and same courage as they faced the same dangers as the soldier going into battle. Torpedo and bomb and mine were waiting for them—perhaps just over the horizon, perhaps a few feet away.

The masters of our vessels will perhaps never receive the credit due them. All but a few of them are unknown to the public which owes them so much, yet theirs were the long days and nights of tension as the mighty bridge of ships was built around the world.

There must always be special mention of the brave men who sailed the tankers and the ammunition ships. The odds were always high against them, yet they never shirked and never failed to sail.

A place high on the honor roll of Maritime Day is due to the Navy and Coast Guard, the brave men who gave convoy protection to our ships and furnishing the fighting gun crews on all our vessels.

And last we come to the masters and crews of the ships which carried the most precious cargo of all, the cargo so highly important that without it—or even with the loss of a part of it—the war could have been lost.

That precious cargo was made up of your sons and daughters—America's mighty Army.

Often far overloaded—vulnerable, especially in the early days, to air and underwater attack—the transport fleet stood always ready to deliver its precious human cargo to all parts of the world.

When we realize that more than 8,000,000 men and women of our services were carried across the seas, with very small—but nonetheless tragic—losses (in fact, less than 2,000), we must acknowledge our debt to the men of the transport fleet, and a very real debt it is.

The War Shipping Administration leaves a great record for history. Experts still ponder its record of doing things that "couldn't be done."

Briefly, here are some of its accomplishments:

Requisitioned from owners and operated all the existing tonnage, large ships and small, home flag and foreign flag.

Built more than 4,000 cargo ships.

Built troop transports and special-type vessels to carry everything from planes to bulldozers to jeeps.

Trained 1,500 officers and 110,000 seamen, and used more than 200,000 men to sail our ships.

Several weeks ago, at a get-together of military and naval personnel—high and low in rank—which, by the way, proved to be the last military round-up for some of us, myself included, the boys got around to the always debatable question that comes up after every war, Who won the war?

Some of the officers suggested that we settle the question once and for all.

A vote was suggested, secret, too, and just to make it a little easier to decide, two questions were asked:

What individual contributed most to winning the war?

What implement actually did win the war?

Well, the voting was slow, as these veterans of organization, selective service, supply, movement, plans, and battle pondered these two questions.

When the votes were in and counted, the results astonished some of the boys who so loved their Sherman and Grant tanks—or who swore than the B-17's did the job all alone.

These and other implements got some votes, but 75 percent of the votes went to one implement of war—and of peace, too, since it serves in that dual capacity.

The winner—ships.

Ships, so vital to any war, did—these veteran leaders decided—play the leading part in the global conflict.

I think I see curiosity registered on some faces as to who came out first in the voting on the other question, "What individual contributed most to winning the war?"

Well, the vote was almost unanimous for the wartime Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. George C. Marshall.

That brings us home to Boston and our own problems, past, present, and future.

What I have to say now is more of a report to you, similar to that of a newspaperman sent to a strange land to report on the habits of the people, man-built structures and nature's bounty.

This report is intended, not as criticism, but to present to you the port of Boston as I see it.

Much has been said about the ills and needs of the port of Boston over the last 40 years.

Our greatest boosters—like the Honorable John F. Fitzgerald, Gov. Maurice Tobin, Senator Leverett Saltonstall, Congressman John McCormack, Mayor Curley, and many other public and private citizens—have pointed out the advantages and disadvantages of the port of Boston time and again, and most of you know what they are, but I want to mention some of them to give you a complete report—and give it to other ports, too, and to anyone, anywhere, who will listen, so that National Maritime Day, 1946, will be recorded not only as the one hundred and twenty-seventh anniversary of a great day in our history, but as a day on which was sounded the keynote of a better and busier port of Boston.

As I go around the port of Boston in a thorough and critical review of this harbor and its water front, I see a lot of things the average citizen of Boston never will see, and I sense deep inside that here, of all the ports of the world, is the one that has the natural advantages to live again as a great port; and I sense also that now is probably the only opportunity the port of Boston will ever have to regain its former importance as a world port.

This, then, is the critical period, and those who say, "Wait until we see if business gets better," or "Wait till next year," will find opportunity gone, never to return.

I see here many advantages and some disadvantages, and I mention some of them so that we may discuss how we expect to exploit our advantages and at the same time overcome the disadvantages; and then, too, I might as well admit that I have an ulterior motive, because we need your support.

Solid, unselfish, far-reaching support of the same caliber you gave the war effort in Boston, and the same kind you gave other successful public projects in Boston, the Commonwealth, and in New England.

The port of Boston was one of the foremost ports of the world less than a century ago. It did not reach this world prominence by accident. It reached that high place through the courage, vision, and will of its citizens, management, and labor.

Those citizens who were willing to give financial support to world shipping and those workers, both shipbuilders and waterfront labor, who put so much pride and skill into their work, brought wealth and fame to our seaport.

No one man can accomplish the task alone—no one group or committee. We must all work together, solidly, and untiringly, for the prominence we deserve again.

Some of the advantages of the port, as I see them, are:

The harbor: A beautiful deep-water harbor, close to the sea, sheltered, and large enough for our use.

Labor: Skilled and plentiful.

Management: Good—better, I would say, than found in many other ports.

Facilities: What few we have are good, and sufficient to start our program.

Rail and highway: Excellent, and fully capable of meeting a peak load.

Planning: Your port authority is composed of the best men in the Commonwealth's industries. It is certainly as good as any other port authority. It has experience and genuine enthusiasm. Men such as Chairman James R. Nolen, John J. DelMonte, L. U. Edgehill, and John F. Fitzgerald, former Chairman Henry J. Nichols, and Commissioner-elect Gerald Henderson are firmly and actively interested in the future of our port.

Legislation: The port of Boston has a good, sound organization, backed solidly by His Excellency the Governor, the members of the executive council, and the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

With these advantages we look squarely at the present and gaze with confidence at the future, not forgetting some of the disadvantages we must overcome.

Let me enumerate some, as I see them:

One disadvantage stands out as important.

It is the same that other ports face, and will be no more difficult to overcome here than in other ports.

We must rebuild our port and at the same time bring to it its rightful share of the world's trade.

To rebuild our port we have planned two modern ocean terminals. These will berth seven modern cargo vessels, with adequate shed space, good rail and highway connections, and with every modern device to expedite the handling of cargo. They will be rivaled by no other ocean terminals in the world. We are doing our utmost to hasten the day on which construction will begin.

To secure our share of the world's trade, our plans include:

Branch offices in three major cities of the United States; also close contact with New England shippers and manufacturers; cooperation with importers and exporters; more coastal and intercoastal trade; standard port costs, including wharfage, tariffs, and freight rates; better working conditions for waterfront labor, so that their results will attract new trade to our port.

Labor should come in for some discussion lest some misunderstand the reason why I mention it as an important item in our plans.

Labor is one of the most important factors of a good port. Upon labor's performance rests a port's reputation, and the reputation of a port is known to the world.

One disadvantage of Boston is that the individual water-front worker does not recognize his proprietary right in the port. This applies not only to Boston but to almost every other port. He has a great interest in the development of the port—but does he know it?

Frankly, I do not believe that our waterfront workers know how much they can contribute to bringing back world trade to Boston.

The workers on the water-front prosper or face depression; undergo greater anxiety and suffer financial gain or loss in greater proportion than many others as the business of the port surges or lags; yet civic groups, committees, planning agencies, and even management too often neglect to inform them of their obligation or insist that they have a part in the great civic project that a port constitutes.

As I stated, the water-front worker probably does not know how much is at stake, and how much and how quickly he is affected. I believe that if he did know, he would give a little more and better work.

We must awaken this often-criticized, usually forgotten, and rarely praised waterfront worker to his responsibility to his port, and ask his support, too, in all programs which affect him most.

During the war I came into intimate contact with labor in seven great American seaports, and surveyed a number of foreign ports. I am firm in my belief that Boston's water-front labor is better by far than its critics rate it, and will meet the challenge of postwar trade with skill and good performance.

This brings us to the question of the day—

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

If you ask it of an individual—independent and free—the answer can be: "Anywhere you choose," but when it is asked of a great port and city composed of citizens, civic and private organizations, shipping and industrial organizations, labor and management, newspapers, and thousands of other interested and disinterested groups, then the answer is not so simple.

In that case, you go where the stronger or more aggressive group takes you, the majority, or one group, does not always lead.

Now, are we to go back to the era of 1921 to 1940, or ahead to a new era of, let us say, 1946 to 1951?

In the period 1926-40, Boston's imports and exports by water amounted to an average of about 3,000,000 tons of general cargo a year, and foreign ocean passengers totalled several hundred thousand a year. Not a bad record, and sizable enough to make those of you who developed this era feel pretty good.

But you cannot measure your future business by the past in this new era. The new

era of 1946–51 will not produce the cargo and passenger business of the 1921–41 period unless there is sound planning, aggressive selling, and modern facilities.

You had your planning of 1921 to 1941, and it was good planning.

Under the mayor, Hon. John F. Fitzgerald, John Levins, James L. Truden, Richard Parkhurst, and David Howie, your port sailed along fairly well until it ran into the 1939 European war storm, and before you could get ready to meet the troubles of those 2 years of our prewar period, we were into the war, and all plans were laid aside to give all to the war effort.

The Department of Commerce recently estimated that if postwar conditions are favorable to the United States in foreign trade, as much as $7,000,000,000 worth of goods will go in each direction per year.

If this estimate of $14,000,000,000 in trade holds true, it means big business. Boston deserves its share, but Boston will not receive its rightful share of this world trade unless we act now.

Labor, management, facilities, building, selling, public spirit, and all the essentials to a successful enterprise must bind together and stay together as we enter the 1946–51 era with determination to make Boston the port which the city, the commonwealth, and New England deserve, a better and busier one.

With this pledge let us thank our God that He gave us Boston harbor, so we can serve the world the products New England makes, and let us give thanks for a merchant marine that will stand fast in peace as it did in war, to carry our goods to those who need them and who will use them for peace and happiness.

Let us also pledge that through our combined efforts a friendly spirit of rivalry will bind us closer to all other world ports.

Labor Code Framework, Ready-Made

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, last February, when this House was considering the Case bill, I introduced H. R. 5367, which would establish a labor code for the settlement of industrial disputes without having to resort to the costly method of strikes.

In view of the present labor crisis I wish to call attention of the House to that bill, now before the Committee on Labor. The measure includes many of the features of the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of May 16, which explains the general purposes of the legislation I propose.

A LABOR-CODE FRAMEWORK, READY-MADE

Under the imminent threat of a Nationwide rail tie-up, and in its hurry to curb John L. Lewis, there is danger that Congress may do no more than turn out a legislative hodgepodge. This might strike sharply at some special situations, but accomplish worse than nothing toward building a legal framework within which American industry and labor can work out their differences without resort to private wars.

What is needed is a comprehensive and consistent code, not merely potshots at union "royalties" or "the fomenters of strikes." It might be argued that the urgency of the situation allows Congress no time to build such a code from scratch. That is possibly true, if such were necessary. But it is not. Something that is very nearly a code already exists and is available in the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill, long sidetracked in a Senate committee because of labor opposition.

Of all the labor bills now before Congress this "B2H2 bill" is the most carefully drawn, comprehensive, and consistent.

A few days ago this newspaper called for a labor code which would—

1. Limit, to near the vanishing point, the right to strike in public utilities and other services vital to public safety and welfare, but at the same time give special protection to the workers against the self-interest of ownership and management.

2. Facilitate the functioning of true collective bargaining and voluntary agreements throughout all industry.

3. Stimulate the resurgence of healthy minorities within the ranks both of all labor and union labor by amending those provisions of the Wagner Act which have aided the growth of labor monopolies and by new legislation which would make democratic control within unions a matter of public concern.

The Ball-Burton-Hatch bill goes a long way toward every one of these objectives save the very last. It requires compulsory arbitration of disputes which directly period the public safety and welfare, at the same time setting up machinery to insure fair treatment of the workers' interests. It would establish and extend to all of industry the services of a strengthened mediation and arbitration service.

It would require both employers and employees to maintain the status quo while exhausting the procedures of peaceful settlement before resorting to strikes or lock-outs, and would enforce this provision by court injunction if necessary (without the indiscriminate resort to injunction which seems a danger in the Case bill).

The Ball-Burton-Hatch bill would amend the Wagner Act to extend the definition of "unfair labor practices" to the acts of employees and unions as well as to employers. It would bar the "closed shop, closed union" situation, and require that closed-shop contracts rest on a much more clearly decisive choice of the employees concerned than the law now provides.

So-called labor racketeering would have to be handled by amendment or by separate legislation, as would safeguarding democratic processes within unions. But, gentlemen of the Congress, why waste time trying to unscramble the Case bill egg or putting together another piece of legislation by the patchwork method when you have an architect's design ready and waiting?

John Buell Snyder

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1946

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN BUELL SNYDER, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, at a time like this when we honor the memory of our departed colleagues, I want to mention the name of J. BUELL SNYDER, who served with me on the Committee on Appropriations.

He was old-fashioned and sincere, and in his death the House and the Nation lost a valuable friend.

His death was one of the greatest shocks we have received, because it came with such suddenness. Truly it recalls the Biblical admonition that death comes as a thief in the night.

William Olin Burgin

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1946

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM OLIN BURGIN, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, of the four colleagues in the House who have passed away since our last memorial service and to whom we pay tribute today, the one whom I knew best and had been most closely associated with was the Honorable WILLIAM OLIN BURGIN of the Eighth Congressional District of North Carolina, whose death occurred on April 11, 1946.

Mr. BURGIN became a Member of the House on January 3, 1939, and was at once made a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House upon which committee he remained a member continuously throughout his service. Because of my membership upon that committee, I therefore became intimately acquainted with him.

When I was active in the practice of law I used to say that the best way to know a man was to practice law with him, and since my service in the House I have found that the best way to know a colleague is to serve with him upon the same committee.

BILL BURGIN, as I affectionately called him, was able, faithful, and devoted to duty, and during his more than 7 years' service upon the Foreign Affairs Committee, during the most critical period of our history, he rendered a real service to his country. He became a member of that committee when the clouds of war were about to break, or just 8 months before Hitler invaded Poland. Our committee at that time had much important legislation referred to it, and many difficult problems of policy had to be determined by the committee in passing upon legislation. Bills concerning neutrality, lend-lease, and other kindred subjects having to do with our relations with other nations, and legislation designed to protect our country and the suppression of the Axis Powers were all considered by our committee, all of which was vitally important to our Nation.

The importance of the work of the Foreign Affairs Committee at that time and since, and during all of Mr. BURGIN'S 7 years' service upon the committee, cannot be overestimated. The majority leader of the House, Mr. MCCORMACK, of

Massachusetts, when the death of Mr. BURGIN was announced in the House, on April 11, in his tribute to Mr. BURGIN, spoke of the importance of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I quote from Mr. MCCORMACK'S speech on that occasion:

I know of no committee which in my time has exceeded the contributions made by the members of that committee during the war-time and during the period preceding the war, when danger was imminent to our country; and in the consideration of the important legislation in those days that meant so much to our country and to our successful contribution to the recent war, our late friend, as a member of that committee and as a Member of the House, played a very important part.

Mr. MCCORMACK was not a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, but his leadership in the House enables him to know and weigh the importance of all committees, and his remarks should carry weight in the tribute he paid, not only to Mr. BURGIN, but to the work of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

During the 2 years prior to Pearl Harbor that Mr. BURGIN was a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the committee was not always unanimous as it was after Pearl Harbor, and frequently there was a close division in the committee upon legislation referred to it, but at no time and on no bill did Mr. BURGIN waver. He stood foursquare for the defense of America and for the foreign policy so ably advocated by our then President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and his able Secretary of State, Cordell Hull.

Mr. BURGIN was a modest man, he did not speak often, but he had firm convictions which he defended. He had character, ability, and a devotion to duty which are essential requisites for service in the House. He was held in the highest esteem by every member of the committee, both of his own party and the Republican Party. Everyone believed in the integrity, loyalty, and devotion to his country of BILL BURGIN of North Carolina. His passing to me is a personal loss, and the Nation and his district have lost an able and faithful Representative.

I sympathize deeply with his lovely and devoted wife in her sorrow at his passing, and also with the people in the Eighth Congressional District of North Carolina whom he had the honor to represent in the Congress of the United States during the most critical period in our history.

John Buell Snyder

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1946

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN BUELL SNYDER, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want to take this brief moment to pay tribute to our late beloved colleague, JOHN BUELL SNYDER. I am sure that any tribute I could pay is inadequate. Mr. SNYDER was a man of high integrity, a man who loved his fellow man and did not hesitate to demonstrate that love. I served on the same committee with Mr. SNYDER and had the pleasure of making a trip around the world with him. I always found him kind, considerate, and very sensitive to the feelings of others. I feel that the greatest tribute I can pay to him is to say that he was an intelligent Christian gentleman.

John Buell Snyder

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1946

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN BUELL SNYDER, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania

The lighted windows dim
Are fading slowly,
The fire that was so trim
Now quivers lowly.
Go to the dreamless bed
Where grief reposes.
Thy book of toil is read,
The long day closes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in all ages and amongst all civilized peoples it has been an honored custom for the living to pay tribute to the dead, and so today we are met here in response to that custom to pay a meed of tribute to three Senators and four Representatives, including the Honorable JOHN BUELL SNYDER, who departed this life within the last year.

It was my good fortune to know Mr. SNYDER from the time he joined us at the beginning of the Seventy-third Congress, and I count fruitful the many hours we conversed about our country's general welfare and the work of the House, in which he was ever intensely interested.

It was easily discernible that our late friend would give a good account of himself here because he had a ripe mind, abundant successful experience, and he was ambitious to achieve.

His innate modesty and gracious manners at once attracted many who became warm friends, and, with an accumulation of legislative experience here, he became the sagacious counselor of men dealing with large affairs, especially concerning our national defense. Under his wise leadership the House voted more appropriations for national defense than were ever provided for any single purpose anywhere before.

Gifted with a mind singularly clear, sagacious, and penetrating, in civil government his decree was justice to men, in war the duty of patriots. From neither did he ever veer. His eyes were fixed to see the great danger that was upon us in a late hour. He did not parley with it; he did not compromise with it, nor smother its expression from fear in any quarter. His was again the lifted ax that he might smite the head of the foe when raised to endanger his country. Truly there was none more patriotic and none more sure nor more uncompromising in his championship than this chairman of the subcommittee on War Department appropriations.

Nor, sir, did the beckon of riches or the opportunity of fortune seduce him from his sense of right. When he began his undertaking for men he remained true to the end. It was because of the confidence of the multitude in such men, in whom they beheld the rock around which the vine must entwine in beauty yet remain fixed in unshaken strength. Truly, sir, his voice and character was largely part of the rock of our salvation. When we reflect upon this we can but slightly measure the service such a man does a country such as ours founded upon the will of the people and only abiding so long as the people have faith in the honesty of men.

Mr. Speaker, the State of Pennsylvania has contributed many great men to the world of circumstance in America. She has inscribed in perpetual history such memorial as time affords to the names of great heroes and wondrous statesmen familiar to us. We recall them easily—Frederick A. C. Muhlenberg, William Bingham, James Ross, Andrew Gregg, Galusha A. Grow, Samuel J. Randall, and Philander C. Knox.

In Mr. SNYDER, too, there was the philosopher of government—that government that meant justice to all men equally, wherever possible, under the law. There was the courtly gentleman who knew not how to swerve from duty, with the courage of the sure-footed statesman; a courage which never shrank in an undertaking that meant the preservation of the country and the maintenance of its honor. He passed through all the stages represented by all others and in himself personified their virtue.

In these days of great victories, where they have been garnered by other men with every opportunity of favor of partiality, Mr. SNYDER leaves in his life and memory a monument of achievement over all obstacles to which after generations of his State will point with pride and glory. His memory will live as an influence that will inspire its citizens to noble efforts, and strike to their lips a chorus of praise in the coming day and in aftertime, when our whole world shall know the new regeneration of this, our Republic.

In the passing of our friend his State and district have lost an outstanding citizen and eminent Representative, the Nation and practical democracy have lost a patriot and exponent who clearly understood and accurately applied the principles of sound government, and I have lost a treasured friend.

By the memory of our deceased friend, let us resolve to cultivate, preserve, and emulate the qualities that made him worthy and useful; let us determine to meet the call of patriotic duty in every time of our country's danger or need.

William Olin Burgin

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1946

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. WILLIAM OLIN BURGIN, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, during the time he served in Congress it was my privilege to know WILLIAM O. BURGIN intimately. He was an able and conscientious Member who served his district, his party, his State, and his Nation faithfully and well. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs he took a great interest in all efforts being made to establish a just and lasting peace among all nations.

By his friends WILLIAM BURGIN will be remembered best for his splendid Christian character. He was kindly and tolerant, always ready to do something for a friend, and gentle and friendly to everyone. My own idea of a world that could really live at peace would be a world in which there were more men such as our departed friend, WILLIAM BURGIN.

John Buell Snyder

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1946

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN BUELL SNYDER, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, few men felt greater loyalty to membership in the House of Representatives than did J. BUELL SNYDER, of Pennsylvania. He was proud of his membership, and never permitted himself to do anything which he thought would dishonor this body. If a course of action was in question for himself or the Committee on Appropriations for the War Department, of which he was chairman, he always gave the benefit of any doubt to the side of the Government's request. He would take no chance where his country might suffer.

How important it was to America and the world that such a man with such a guiding principle was chairman of our committee immediately before and during World War II. Whatever may have been shortcomings in our war effort, there was never a lack of funds. And what that meant to getting ammunition and machines and food and clothing on time only reflection can make clear. And, certainly to no one man is credit due in greater degree than to BUELL SNYDER.

Personally, however, while I shall remember BUELL SNYDER for his pride in his work, I shall remember him equally well for his personal qualities. He was fair. He often said he was a party man—but he insisted upon every courtesy for members of the other party. His innate sense of honesty and integrity was such that if he were convinced of such issues in any situation he promptly took his place in their behalf.

We came to know our chairman intimately on our world trip at the conclusion of the war last year. He was unfailing in his thoughtful concern for our every need. On that trip he displayed the determined, driving purpose which must have carried him through his career. Although he was oldest in years, he was youngest among us in his eagerness to get going every day and make the schedule at every point.

To some of us, his remarks on that trip foreshadowed the retirement from Congress which he later announced, if, indeed, they did not predict the end which came so soon afterward.

He was a man of deep religious faith. Only that equaled his love for his country. Faith in God and faith in country—those virtues in the degree he had them, in my memory, overcome any shortcomings BUELL SNYDER may have had.

Joseph Wilson Ervin

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1946

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOSEPH WILSON ERVIN, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot permit this occasion to pass without paying tribute to the life of the late JOE ERVIN, of North Carolina. I met Mr. ERVIN shortly after I came to Congress. We were mutually interested in a legislative program which was pending at that time. He was very thorough in securing full knowledge of the proposal and all the pros and cons in connection with it. We formed a friendship which grew in value to me and lasted until his untimely passing.

I considered JOE ERVIN a fine public servant. He was conscientious, and he was a loyal and true friend.

JOE ERVIN made his determination on issues after fullest investigation, and he was industrious in presenting his viewpoint, once a determination was made. We miss JOE ERVIN in the Congress. The country during these years needs more men like him.

Commencement Address by Hon. Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, at West Virginia Wesleyan College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on Monday, May 27, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] delivered the commencement address at West Virginia Wesleyan College. I ask that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today marks the beginning of a new era in your lives—an era that will bring a new type of freedom, but, at the same time it will impose great responsibilities.

From here on, at least with respect to education, you will chart your own course, the importance of which cannot be overemphasized.

How, or whether or not, you continue your education from this point, is a decision that you must make, but, bear in mind that its importance reaches far beyond your own personal orbit.

The degree to which you make yourself and keep yourself an educated person is vital to the welfare of our country and the world which is so rapidly shrinking geographically and so rapidly expanding in its potentialities for good or for evil.

Our world stands now on a momentous threshhold.

We have emerged from the concerted fury of war into an after-war that is not peace, but only our chance to make peace. Unfortunately, VJ-day, in many respects, marked the end of national and international unity and the return to unbridled bickering in the pursuit of multiple interests and conflicting goals. In other respects, however, it did not mark return to the status quo. For us there will never be such a return. We are working to build a new order out of new chaos at home and abroad, but it will not be easy.

The tremendous industrial expansion this country achieved has left us with a vastly changed economy at home.

For this new economy the old rules will not suffice.

At the same time, developments in transportation and in the techniques of war have changed our picture of this country's place in the international scene.

We face a new realization that never again can we think or plan in terms of one self-contained nation; that, for better or for worse, it is one world.

Isolationism is out, and its newer, equally dangerous form of neo-isolationism must be rooted out if we and the world are to survive. All this was clear even before the blast at Hiroshima blew our world into the atomic era.

We are barely in the kindergarten stage of this era.

Our country and the world face a new phase that holds no prescribed program.

We have to seek out new answers.

Whether we find the right ones will depend partially on you, and the rest of your lives will be colored by the rightness or wrongness of the answers we evolve.

Your influence on the answers is not a shadowy figure of speech.

It is very direct and immediate.

Never before in the history of our country has there been a time when the enlightenment—the social and political literacy—of the individual citizen was more important to the well-being of all.

This is true, not only because the issues we face are so complicated and critical but also because the voice of the people can be so essential a factor in final decisions.

It is a factor, not only when votes are being cast at the polls but also when the elected representatives of the people are shaping crucial legislation and determining key policies.

A recent example was the Vandenberg amendment to the McMahon bill on control of atomic energy. The letters that poured in from all parts of the country were the deciding element that caused this amendment to be revised so that top control was not vested with the military.

The present version of this amendment may not be ideal, but it is a vast improvement over the original form, and it opens the way for further improvement.

But whatever the issue, the number of those who are able to see into, around, and behind the daily headlines is comparatively small.

The number who can see clearly enough and care deeply enough to want to do something about what they see is still smaller.

I do not for one moment suppose that only college graduates are able or willing to accept the responsibility of active citizenship. Such a notion would be nonsense.

A college graduate can be a civic illiterate, and an unschooled man can be educated in citizenship.

It is true, however, that on the whole, college graduates are the ones most likely to be informed about current events and current affairs—information not acquired in the classroom.

We find again and again in public opinion polls that the college educated are the ones who keep most closely in touch with what is happening in the world; that they are the ones most apt to have an opinion about events and issues; and that their opinions tend to be moderate rather than extreme.

For example, in studies made during the war, many of the uninformed but few of the informed, took an extreme isolationist position.

Again, blanket hostility toward Russia or England is most conspicuous among those with least schooling.

We don't really need slide rules and questionnaires to tell us that lack of information is an invitation to unthinking prejudice and to short-range judgments; but they do tell us so whenever we give them the chance. And they also tell us that the proportion of those who are ready with soundly based judgments on public affairs is much too low.

This means that those who receive a college diploma in the year of 1946 also receive a special responsibility as citizens.

The piece of parchment given you today is not only a token that you have fulfilled certain academic requirements.

It is also a token that you have had training which should equip you to be fully literate as a citizen.

This training is both a privilege and a duty.

How does college training help you to be a better citizen?

Not chiefly by the facts that you have picked up in your years here.

They will help.

But, far more important than any specific body of facts is the ability to know the difference between facts and fiction; to know where to go for facts, and how to recognize rumor, prejudices, and distortion when they parade as fact.

It may not always be possible to find the full facts—they may be too complicated, or they may even not be known.

Then it is important at least to recognize the gaps in the evidence presented, and to be clear about what you do not know.

Whether the public is a tool or a partner in our national policies depends on the ability of the individual citizen to read the score—even through a smoke screen of deceptive claims and catchwords.

Undemocratic groups who seek their own selfish ends at the expense of the national welfare trade on the power of slogans to sway those who do not have enough information and understanding to see through them.

Your training here can become insurance against rubber-stamp mentality that is a boon to antisocial pressure groups and a prime menace to the successful operation of democratic government.

There is another ability that every college graduate should feel bound to acquire if he has not done so already. That is the ability to recognize that most facts are not simple—certainly not the facts about any of the national and international issues which we face today, and which will face us in the years when your generation is steering our country's course. We sometimes forget the truth of the truism that most things are neither clear black nor clear white.

It seldom happens that right is all on one side and all wrong on the other; that one line of action means 100 percent gain and the other 100 percent loss.

It is up to the responsible citizen to weigh the balance of evidence and see what line of action promises the best results, despite its disadvantages; or which side in a dispute holds the preponderance of right, despite its share of wrong.

It is up to the citizen to weigh the separate pros and cons and see how they fit into the whole picture—and not to be thrown off balance by the confusing details which cut across its main outlines.

It is easy to say, for example, that the black market in meat is running riot and that therefore OPA is no good and price control should be abolished.

But before saying that one must make sure to what extent the black market has flourished because OPA was denied means for strong enforcement; to what extent OPA has succeeded in holding the line despite bulges here and errors there; and where we would be without such an agency.

None of us can command all details of all issues.

However, by careful testing, we learn what sources are to be trusted and to what degree.

We learn that no authority is wholly free from bias, but that the degree of bias, and the motive for it, differ widely.

We must learn where to place our trust.

I have mentioned, for example, the complicated issue of atomic energy and its control.

No laymen can hope to master the intricacies of atomic energy itself

But any intelligent citizen can make it his business to find out the few facts and conclusions that are available to all, the various plans proposed for dealing with this new element in our lives.

This matter of atomic energy gives an example of the ostrich-thinking which we must struggle against.

We find in repeated public-opinion polls that a large majority of the public want the United States to keep the secrets of atomic bomb manufacture.

Yet in these same studies, majorities say that the secrets cannot be kept.

The public recognizes, as scientists have assured us again and again, that it is only a matter of time—and a short time at that—before the so-called secrets will be known to others.

Yet the public insists, "Let us keep them as long as we can."

This insistence shows a refusal to recognize that our only hope lies in anticipating the inevitable—it lies not in blindly clinging to what we cannot keep, but in forging now, while there is yet time, an international agency strong enough to prevent future use of this weapon in a war that the public very definitely does not want.

Nothing is more certain than that the American public desires lasting peace; yet not enough of the public has thought enough about the consequences of vain attempts at monopoly of the atomic bomb to see that they would be a menace to peace.

What can the individual citizen do about it?

First of all, he can acquaint himself with what the scientists say on the subject, with what our military leaders say, with what our civilian officials and legislators say.

He can read the Smyth report which gives him a vivid picture of the implications of atomic energy in warfare.

He can read the Acheson report, which sketches a proposal for controlling the military potentialities of atomic energy without clamping down on its development for peacetime uses. And he can follow the leading arguments for and against such a proposal.

On the basis of such evidence as he can muster, he can then decide whether he will blindly say, "Let's keep the little edge we have as long as we can hang onto it, even if it leaves us finally with no advantage in a hostile world"; or whether he will say instead, "Let us use this temporary head start as a means to promote an international organization strong enough to prevent war."

Of course, a prime reason for trying to cling to an unfeasible monopoly of the atomic bombs is the doubt that an effective international organization is possible. Here again we have a challenge to the citizen.

He must realize, first of all, our stake in the success of such an organization.

Without it there is no hope for the period of world peace and world prosperity that should be within our grasp.

But in order to achieve it, each country must relinquish some portion of national sovereignty, just as the separate States did in order to make the United States a working organization.

Again, however, he must become clear about how much—and how little—each country must give up in order to make the world safe for us all. He must understand that actually we should need to sacrifice very little that would matter in the world of the United Nations—that what we might give up would be of value to us chiefly in a world of isolationist nations, which under a working international organization would be as out of date as the armor worn by knights of old. In order to protect ourselves against future war we must resign chiefly the privileges that are significant for purposes of warfare. To say we must sacrifice some of our sovereignty is like saying that a boy sacrifices his knickers when he puts on long pants.

As a rule he is glad to make the change and he can still wear shorts for golf, or even for victory gardening.

Yet, having granted that our stake is great enough and that the rewards would be great enough to outweigh the price of active participation in a world order, there still may be skepticism about our chances of making it a working proposition. That such doubts do exist is clear beyond question.

There is no denying that recent developments make doubt easier than faith. We read about dissension at the United Nations meeting in New York, friction at the conference of foreign ministers in Paris.

Certainly a bland and blind optimism would be fatuous.

Yet here again the individual is under obligation to stop and think.

He is under obligation to remember that we are groping our way along an uncharted course, beset with obstacles and hazards.

Some of these are of our own making, some are the results of carrying old habits and patterns into a new enterprise in which they have no place.

The thinking individual must remember too that most of his information comes through newspapers and newscasts, which habitually play up conflict because of its news value.

The conferences in behalf of peace are described in terms of battle—one side losing out, the other scoring a victory.

The international negotiations are pictured as sharp bargain driving, in which one side is bound to lose exactly as much as the other gains. Granted that elements of conflict and of sharp dealing are strong, we can still remember that there is such a thing as a contract entered for the benefit of all contracting parties.

Moreover, many of these newspapers and radio accounts are in capsule form, giving high lights and conclusions rather than a play-by-play account which would allow the individual to form his own conclusions.

We saw in the case of the San Francisco Conference how each disagreement appeared—or was made to appear—as the final snag on which the whole undertaking might founder.

Yet in the end, despite disagreements, despite the loud moans of those who daily predicted defeat, despite tragic blunders, the United Nations Charter was completed and the way was laid open for the next steps.

Today, as during the San Francisco Conference, much of the fear that the United Nations will fail is centered on doubts about Russian cooperation.

Once more the thinking citizen is duty bound to avoid the rubber stamp that so easily becomes a stampede.

He is bound to remember that in many cases his reports are slanted or incomplete.

He must remember that Russia, too, has a stake in avoiding war—a stake even greater than ours.

He must remember that Russia has good grounds for feeling a need to insure herself against hostility and aggression.

We may have reason to disagree with or to contest certain specific moves or policies that Russia proposes or acts on, just as Russia may disagree with or oppose our own acts or policies. Yet we are guilty of criminal stupidity if we assume that specific points of conflict prove a basic incompatibility; and if we view each successive point of conflict as proof of failure and reason for despair.

Oversimplification is particularly evident, particularly sinister, and particularly silly in connection with Russia. The rubber stamp blankets the whole U. S. S. R. and all its acts with a single cliché: "We must get tough."

It assumes that whatever Russia does in any part of the globe or in any situation—be it Iran, Korea, Trieste, the Balkans, Paris, New York—is to be explained on the basis of a single mechanism.

This mad lumping of all in one is as dangerous and as unsocial as arson.

It is, in fact, a form of arson.

It is dangerous to forget that, although each situation is part of the whole, it also must be seen in its own particular terms and against its own particular background.

In each case there are special and complicated circumstances, and each must be dealt with on its own merits.

If we cannot know all about each case, at least we can get enough light on a few of them to realize the infinite scope for variety; and to realize that what we have to grapple with is not Russia, but the knotty and diverse problems which we and Russia must jointly solve.

We have seen recently a rash of press indignation over criticisms of the United States published in Russia.

The indignation is rather quaint, since these criticisms are slight, in comparison to the flow of anti-Soviet comment issued by our press and radio.

How many of us have asked ourselves about the Russian reactions to this anti-Soviet geyser?

One of the gravest dangers in our world today, one of the chief obstacles to the success of the United Nations, is the unremitting campaign of words against Russia. It is not only the duty, it is the immediate self-interest of every United States citizen to resist being caught up in this rush of words and accusations.

It is so easy to shout with the crowd.

It is much harder to think clearly and objectively.

The parchment given you today is a sign that you can and you must stop and think. You must try to understand what is happening and why. You must try to understand what facts are being oversimplified or misinterpreted and why.

You must remember what our goal is and try to see how we can reach it in spite of towering difficulties.

One way to do this is to get both sides of any story.

Since every newspaper has a bias—even those that agree with you—don't depend on only one.

Read two or three that have conflicting points of view.

If they give contradictory versions of what goes on you may not be certain which is correct, but at least you will know that you can't swallow any one of them whole.

Then it's up to you to get additional insight where you can—from magazines, from books, from people.

It's up to you to learn by experience what the bias of your different sources is; how to discount for that bias in order to arrive at a reliable conclusion; whose word you are best able to trust when your own information fails you.

When issues are many and confusing, ostrich opinions and rubber stamping are both a temptation and a danger.

You will have to fight this danger.

I have said that your training has earned you the duty of avoiding it.

But this is not only a duty.

It is also a right and a challenge.

Our whole world at this moment is in transition, and your own action—or lack of it—can help to determine which way we go.

Our country at this moment is a babel of voices, each crying in the accent of its own special interest or bias.

If you thoughtlessly echo this cry or that cry, if you blindly go your own small way without bothering about the rest, you will be contributing to consequences that may be dire for you and for all.

On the other hand, if you carry your full share, you can help to steer our country in the ways of prosperity and of peace. You can do it at election time by going to the polls and voting for the people whose policies you have reason to trust. You can do it between elections by keeping informed on current issues, reaching the soundest conclusions you can about them, and by making your view felt.

There are, of course, other ways besides voting and writing letters to Congress in which the citizen can put his weight behind his opinions; these ways are multiplying.

Each one will discover them for himself.

The mere act of increasing one's information and understanding is bound to increase his interest.

Never forget that if the people care enough they can get their way ,and when they know enough they care enough.

You are the people. In exercising the citizen's duty to think and to make his will felt you will be fighting for your own right to enjoy the freedoms that belong to us all, in a world which can be made a good world to live in.

Abolish OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the substance of a bill designed to abolish the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are getting very tired of the unnecessary rules and regulations which come from the OPA. This agency has put out so much propaganda and false statements that the people no longer heed their cry of "Wolf! Wolf!"

A recent study by the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee indicates that the housewife must pay at least $18.06 for food that she could buy, in 1939, for $10.94. Many housewives are paying as much as $26.20 for this same food.

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee has made a careful study of 73 basic food items, generally sold at retail grocery stores. This study shows that in April 1939, these 73 items could be purchased for a total of $10.94. In April 1946, the lowest price at which identical quantities of the same food items could be purchased in Washington stores was $18.06. This is the lowest price for the least expensive brand of each food. At the class No. 1 stores, a survey disclosed that these 73 items now cost the housewife a minimum of $26.20. This is an increase of 140 percent over 1939 in the class No. 1 stores, and more than 60 percent at the cheapest prices available in Washington.

In 1939 Washington stores were running full-page ads, begging housewives to buy butter at 23 cents a pound; sliced bacon at 24 cents a pound, and sugar-cured ham at 23 cents a pound. The survey shows that the price of these items has nearly doubled under OPA and some of them are now practically unobtainable, at any price.

I am introducing a bill, Mr. Speaker, which has for its purpose the abolishing of OPA, and the bill will transfer certain of its functions to the Secretary of Agriculture and the National Housing Administrator. The OPA has failed in doing the job for which it was created. It is time to abolish this Frankenstein monstrosity.

The OPA, by trying to control the price on more than 8,000,000 separate items, has kept production down. They have had so many silly rules and regulations that no human being could interpret

them, or stay in business and live under the interpretations. The people of America will welcome the elimination of this agency.

There are a few items such as food, clothing, and rents that may still need some slight control. The food can be controlled by the Department of Agriculture because they understand the problem of supply and demand as it relates to food. Rents properly belong in the National Housing Agency. The bill which I am introducing will accomplish that purpose. It is identical with one introduced in the Senate, by Senator TOM STEWART.

A bill to abolish the Office of Price Administration and to transfer certain of its functions to the Secretary of Agriculture and the National Housing Administrator

Be it enacted, etc., That the Office of Price Administration and all of its functions except those transferred by section 2, are hereby abolished.

SEC. 2. (a) All functions of the Office of Price Administration and the Price Administrator relating to food commodities are hereby transferred to and shall be exercised by the Secretary of Agriculture: *Provided*, That controls shall not be exercised over any food commodity except when such commodity is in short supply as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) All functions of the Office of Price Administration and the Price Administrator relating to rents and building materials are hereby transferred to and shall be exercised by the National Housing Administrator: *Provided*, That controls shall not be exercised over any building materials except when such materials are in short supply as determined by the National Housing Administrator.

SEC. 3. (a) Such of the records, property (including office equipment), and unexpended balances of appropriations as have been used or available for use by the Office of Price Administration and the Price Administrator in the exercise of the functions transferred by this act and as may be determined and specified by the President shall be transferred to and available for use by the Secretary of Agriculture and the National Housing Administrator, respectively, in the exercise of the functions transferred to them by this act.

(b) No person who has been employed (otherwise than as a clerk, stenographer, messenger, or the like) in the principal Office of Price Administration in the District of Columbia during the 24 months immediately preceding the date of enactment of this act shall be eligible for transfer to or for employment in any office or position in the Department of Agriculture or the National Housing Agency.

SEC. 4. All regulations, policies, determinations, authorizations, requirements, designations, and other actions of the Price Administrator (not inconsistent with the provisions of this act), made, prescribed, or performed in the exercise of the functions transferred by this act and before the transfer of such functions under this act shall, except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, or made inapplicable by the Secretary of Agriculture or the National Housing Administrator, have the same effect as if such transfer had not been made; but functions vested in the Price Administrator by any such regulation, policy, determination, authorization, requirement, designation, or other action shall, insofar as they are to be exercised after the transfer, be considered as vested in the Secretary of Agriculture or the National Housing Administrator, as the case may be.

British Loan Faces Defeat in House

REMARKS
OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I still have confidence that the British loan will be defeated in the House, by a narrow margin. I realize it will be difficult to beat the propaganda machine backing the loan to Britain. The proponents of the loan claim 160 Democratic votes and 40 Republican votes. We estimate that at least 150 Republicans and 70 Democrats will oppose the loan.

If Americans take a look at our indebtedness they will understand why the British loan faces defeat. We now have a national debt of $278,000,000,000. This debt is greater than the combined debt of Great Britain and Russia. Where will we get the money? Of course, you know the answer, every American will be called upon to pay his share. The American people should not be required to continually keep their "nose to the grindstone" to aid foreign countries. We will need additional billions to pay the interest on our debt, for foreign relief, veterans' benefits, and reconversion plans.

Why should we make loans to foreign countries at 1.62 percent when we charge our own farmers and veterans an interest rate of 3 and 4 percent? Great Britain has unmined gold reserves, unmined diamond reserves, and foreign investments which will total over $47,000,000,000.

According to the New York Sunday News, February 3, 1946, Lord Beaverbrook, the powerful British newspaper publisher, renewed his attack on the loan. He told the House of Lords they did not need the loan. He also stated, "We have rubber, we have secondary aluminums, 15½ years' supply of wool in hand and large stocks of cotton. There is a vast store of valuable scrap. But these are not our only resources. We have enough solid balances in hand to pay our debts for the next 2 years." Let her use these assets before we borrow money from our taxpayers to make such loans.

The proponents of the British loan contend that money will come back to America in wider markets, if the plan works. What items will we have to export in the next year, when we are not able to supply our own citizens with products? Our critical housing problem is due partly to the exportation of lumber and logs. Too much farm equipment and other items have also been exported. Is this trade argument sound? Why would it not be better to distribute money to our citizens in veterans' benefits, old-age pensions, wages, farm prices, then both the money and goods would remain in the United States.

Everyone knows that we cannot continue to give our money and resources without jeopardizing our own welfare. American taxpayers cannot afford to pay billions in subsidies to industry. The time has come to look after our own people first. The American taxpayers cannot uphold the British Empire forever.

THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

Following are a few excerpts from letters I have received:

First. Texas:

Anyone who tries to tie up this loan with the promotion of future peace has about run out of arguments. If there is anything to that we shouldn't have had this last war.

Second. Indiana:

Great Britain seems to think that they are granting us a favor in allowing us to make them a loan.

Third. Indiana:

Please keep up your fight to defeat the $4,000,000,000 loan. Do we want to keep the United States in economic slavery for a hundred years?

Fourth. Illinois:

The majority of the people are "thumbs down" on making any loan to Great Britain.

Fifth. California:

It is time Great Britain learned to stand on her own feet.

Sixth. Alabama:

Block and defeat the British loan.

Seventh. New York:

Make them put up Bermuda and Trinidad as collateral if they want the loan.

Eighth. Missouri:

You are to be congratulated for taking an interest in American taxpayers, and I trust you will be successful in stopping this steal.

Ninth. Indiana:

That money to be loaned represents about $34 to every man, woman, and child in this country.

Tenth. Ohio:

I am glad we have a few men left that are not willing to give the United States of America back to Great Britain.

Eleventh. Pennsylvania:

Orchids to you for your opposing the loan to Britain—which proves your 100 percent Americanism.

Twelfth. Michigan:

Please go to the limit of your strength to keep all our money here at home. Our New Deal boys make Benedict Arnold look like a piker.

Thirteenth. Texas:

I am a native of the State of Texas and, of course, a Democrat but I am not in favor of giving Britain as much as a thin dime, and all of my ancestors were English.

Fourteenth. New York:

My husband and I hope that you and your colleagues will be able to protect our substance and integrity from wolves, in or out, of sheep's clothing.

Fifteenth. Ohio:

I think that's about the best bit of horse sense coming out of Washington in several moons. Why bankrupt this Nation trying to finance other nations.

Sixteenth. Michigan:

It seems our country today is overrun with foreign "ism" instead of Americanism.

Seventeenth. New Jersey:

Why must this country always be the goat for England?

Eighteenth. North Carolina:

I read with approval your article about the proposed loan to Britain which the hard-hit taxpayers of this country will have to put up if granted.

Nineteenth. Colorado:

Let the people who want to lend to foreign countries buy the bonds to furnish the money.

Twentieth. North Dakota:

Keep up the good work and clean up that foolishness going on down there.

Twenty-first. Illinois:

The salary list you gave the House of the Kings and Queens of Europe has interested me very much. Seems to me with all that annually, they don't need to ask for gifts.

Twenty-second. New York:

With millions of veterans to be taken care of, and the need for more and better schools and hospitals all over the country, it is a shame that even one Member of Congress would add further to our present multi-billion dollar national debt for the benefit of any foreign country.

Wisconsin Implement Dealers Register Their Complaint

REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Representatives from Wisconsin had a conference at 10 a. m. on May 27 with Mr. George A. Martiny, vice president of the Wisconsin Implement Dealers Association, and Mr. Joseph Walsh, representing the members of the association.

Members of the Wisconsin Implement Dealers Association do not feel that the OPA is justified in their "decree" to reduce the dealer margin that has been historically in operation these many years.

The original Price Control Act, approved January 30, 1942, states:

The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices, or methods or means or aids to distribution established in any industry—

And so forth. This is what the Congress voted for. But what do the people get? The Executive orders later issued have given this agency the power or authority, or they have assumed the power or authority, to follow many procedures not in accordance with the law. The principal reason OPA is in legislative difficulties today is because there are too many people in high places that appear to believe in "government by men" instead of "government by law."

The following statement is by the representatives of the Wisconsin Implement Dealers Association:

According to information received, OPA on May 10, 1946, amended MPR 246 and MPR 133, changing the pricing of farm equipment which gives the manufacturer a 10¼-percent increase and increases the selling price 5 percent, thereby reducing the trade discount from manufacturer to dealer from 20 percent to 16 percent, which is actually forcing a dealer to operate on 14.4 percent basis, or an absorption of 5.6 percent on new machines, and reduces the trade discount on extra repair parts from 35 percent to 28 percent, and according to actual figures 16 percent to 22 percent is the dealer's overhead cost on an average, normal volume of business, this depending on the season and efficiency of the individual operation. This figure is based on the fact that most dealers are operating as individuals and not as corporations, so does not include salary of owner operator.

The manufacturer's increase was justified and we feel sure that farmers today are able and willing to pay the extra price if they could get the equipment through legitimate channels. They need this equipment so badly in their short-handed fight to increase the world's food supply.

Most dealers would endeavor to continue as they have done during the war years, if the price increase was a dollar for dollar pass-on, but with this drastic reduction, how can they continue?

We are representing a group of about 975 loyal American implement dealers scattered in every hamlet and town throughout the State of Wisconsin who cannot continue to serve the Nation as law-abiding citizens under the OPA regulated amendment of May 10. This is the group who not only gave their sons and daughters, supported all bond drives, assisted with rationing, served on selective-service boards but took time to call on every farmer during the early days of the war to put the scrap drive across that really brought the scrap into war channels. In general, they promoted all loyal American jobs which might be classed as beyond the line of duty call.

We nobly carried on and supported the Stars and Stripes in the long battle on the home front hand in hand with the farmer in the production of food. Our job has been big brother to him in his mechanical problems. Whether it was the 10-cent spring lost from his corn planter or the broken block in his tractor, his call is for the implement dealer. This dealer by carefully planning and anticipating the parts that might be needed and working early and late has kept this equipment in operating condition. This dealer's mechanical help and personal contact with the farmer has strengthened his morale to work beyond his capacity to produce our ever-increasing food supply with less physically able help on the farm than ever before in history.

It was long hours, short-handed with limited parts and no time and one-half for overtime. According to statistics, more than 20 percent could not get adjusted to the small volume and hard grind with ever-increasing costs and passed out of the picture. Most dealers, however, by long hours and the liquidation of stock of obsolete and used equipment sold on a depleted market, have shown a nominal gain.

Today with the show nearing a close, stock inventories depleted, overhead, that is, labor, rent, taxes, etc., at an all-time high and with less than one-fourth of the new goods nominally available, how can we dealers possibly operate under the new OPA regulation of May 10?

The 20-percent reduction on commissions itself spells only failure for the dealer who would attempt to follow the regulations. Is this the proper reward for services rendered on the home front?

We hard-headed implement dealers of Wisconsin may not be too well versed on political affairs but we do know farm equipment. Being closely associated with the farmer we know his problems and needs and do recognize a solid stone wall which is what we are confronted with under the May 10 OPA amended regulation.

As previously stated, farmers would rather pay the dollar-for-dollar increase that the manufacturer must have and get their equipment through the legitimate channels than patronize the black market.

We are not happy to admit that we now have some black marketeers in our ranks. We are more grieved with regulations that will force good home front fighting loyal American citizens into illegitimate practices if they want to continue in business.

Our problem in the implement line in Wisconsin under the May 10 amendment, is probably more critical than other sections.

First, we are in the hilly rough country with greatly diversified farming. Our unit sales are smaller and dealers' volumes normally smaller than many sections.

Second, the distribution of farm equipment is always started in the South, with deliveries made to the North last as the season progresses. We get what equipment has been left over, if any, each year from the South. Our pattern of distribution for 1941 was therefore not as large. We have paid the penalty all the war years on this score, thereby making our problem to continue, under the May 10 regulation, still more impossible.

This same group of Wisconsin implement dealers probably should have but are not following the well-beaten path of labor and industry, namely, asking for higher pay, shorter hours, or making threats of strikes or suggesting other asinine actions.

After a very courteous hearing with the national department on farm-equipment pricing of the OPA, we are forced to draw the following conclusions.

First from OPA statement, they made a survey of dealers' profits through forms mailed to approximately 17,000 dealers, from which they received only 149 usable returns. Based on the information in 149 returns the regulation was amended affecting all 20,000 dealers throughout the United States. We consider the amendment very unfair, unjust, and if followed will work a definite hardship on all farm-implement dealers. Prior to the amendment the officials of the National Retail Farm Equipment Association conferred with OPA and strenuously opposed it. We are led to believe that the conclusions drawn from this survey are very arbitrary, due to the fact that the reports received were only from dealers who had weathered the storm and due consideration should have been given to the fact that over 20 percent of the dealers had already failed.

Second, due consideration should have been given to the fact that in probably a majority of cases where the dealer's report showed a nominal profit for the war years that it was as above stated, from the liquidation of obsolete machines and the reduction of inventories of used equipment sold on a depleted market. We are led to believe that the dealer was supposed to be able to survive under this drastic amendment from the greatly increased volume of merchandise that he would have to sell. This increase in farm equipment under present conditions, has not materialized and is apparently nil and in all probability is many months away and no more stock piles of used equipment are now available.

Should we, as small business, close our doors? Are we to cut our services accordingly or shall we hide our self respect and join the ever-increasing ranks as black marketeers or shall we openly defy the regulations?

Summarizing, with our volume at less than one-fourth normal and the increased cost of operating, overhead, rent, labor, taxes, etc., and a 20 percent cut in the trade discount,

according to our arithmetic, this cannot be added up to anything but failure.

We have submitted the facts and are not going to operate under this amended regulation because we cannot. We are making this appeal in our own behalf as individual dealers and as representatives of the Wisconsin Implement Dealers Association and must report back to the adjourned meeting of the group we represent. The action of the group we represent will be determined by the relief that we are given.

WISCONSIN IMPLEMENT DEALERS ASSOCIATION.
JOSEPH WALSH.
GEORGE A. MARTINY.
MADISON, WIS., *May 25, 1946.*

Mr. Speaker, it must be borne in mind that these implement dealers have had, and do now have, a very few articles to sell their customers. The decrease in margins, together with the decrease in available implements, makes the net income still lower to the man in the implement business.

It is now up to the Senate to correct this situation. The House corrected it when we adopted the Wolcott amendment to the extension of the Price Control Act.

Morituri Salutamus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Morituri Salutamus" written by Rt. Rev. John J. Nash, pastor of the Holy Family Church of Buffalo, N. Y.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORITURI SALUTAMUS

A little more tired at close of day;
A little less anxious to have our way;
A little less ready to fret and blame;
A little more care for another's name;
And so we are nearing the journey's end,
Where time and eternity meet and blend.

A little less care for earthly gold;
A little more zest in the days of old;
A broader view, a more tolerant mind;
A little more love for all mankind;
A little more careful of what we say;
And so we are far a-down the way.

A little more love for the friends of youth;
A little more zeal for established truth;
A little more charity in our views;
A little more time to pray and peruse;
And so we are folding our tents away
And passing in silence at the close of day.

A little more leisure to sit and dream;
A little more real the things unseen;
A little bit nearer to those ahead,
With visions of those long loved and dead.
And so we are going where all must go,
To the place the living may never know.

American-Type Legislation To Antidote Collectivist Evils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me entitled "American-Type Legislation to Antidote Collectivist Evils."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY CALLS FOR AMERICAN-TYPE LEGISLATION TO ANTIDOTE COLLECTIVIST EVILS

The administration must bear unqualified blame for the strike torment through which America has been going. Let not the American public be fooled by the administration which is posing as the "Savior of the country from the strike evil." Lest we forget, it is important to note that the strike crisis is of the administration's own making in more than one way.

HOW THE ADMINISTRATION CAUSED STRIKES

(a) The strike crisis is due in part to the 13 years of coddling of irresponsible labor leaders, pampering them in the belief that they could do no wrong and that no excess was too great.

(b) It is due to the administration's refusal to recognize that the Wagner Act is, and has been, grossly one-sided, unfair, and discriminatory against employers; and due to the administration's blocking of pro-American labor legislation.

The President has at long last signified he recognizes the truth of the charges made against the Wagner Act all through the years by the Republican minority, including myself.

(c) The strike crisis is due also to the phoney notion foisted on labor principally by Mr. Wallace and applied against industry by Mr. Bowles to the effect that wages could be raised without raising prices and that we could get full production by forcing business to operate at a loss.

It was Mr. Wallace's "green light" which started the entire strike wave.

THE COLLECTIVIST MENACE

(d) It was due to the administration's coddling of collectivist elements in and outside of unions and other high places.

Last August 1, I submitted a resolution to create a Special Senate Committee on Promotion of American Activities. Such a committee could have done yeoman work in combating the Red-Fascist menace in recent months. It could have helped determine what are the alien and subversive influences at home and abroad which have fanned the strike flames.

We know that with the CIO-PAC's tie-up with the Soviet-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions, there is an ominous international angle to the CIO drive. Nowhere is this truer than in the case of the Communist infested and led maritime unions with their world tentacles.

The implications of Communist infiltration in the CIO are particularly grave when we consider the drive to organize the atom scientists in Oak Ridge, Tenn., and elsewhere. What chance have American defense preparations if the CIO should organize the atom workers and then call a prolonged strike?

In spite of all these obvious needs for my resolution to be enacted, Senate Resolution 165 was referred to subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee only on January 21, 1946, and has been sat upon there since then.

The time is, however, not too late for the resolution's enactment during this Congress. It is up to the administration to withdraw its opposition to this resolution and to fill the great need in America for the Special Committee on American Activities.

I cite these proofs of the administration's harmful activities not as a partisan accusation, but as a pro-American approach. Conservative elements in the Democratic Party recognized the New Deal's terrible responsibility for the strike wave just as the Republican Party recognizes the New Deal's responsibility.

The New Deal's chickens have come home to roost, not only in the instances cited above, but in the following case:

UNION SLUSH FUNDS

On October 18, 1945, I introduced the antislush fund bill (S. 1487) to prohibit political expenditures by unions as well as by national banks and corporations. The effect of this bill would have been to plug the loophole in the election law which allows contributions by these sources to elections but not expenditures.

This bill would have preserved union treasuries inviolate from plundering by unscrupulous labor bosses for political purposes. The bill would have left union workers still perfectly free to use their own individual funds for election expenditures in accordance with their American rights, but would have maintained their organization's funds intact for strictly union purposes on which all Members could agree.

My bill, S. 1487, has however been pigeonholed by the administration in a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections.

As a result, within 48 hours after President Truman broke the rail strike, the autocratic trainmen's boss, A. F. Whitney, apparently on his own initiative, said that his union would use the $47,000,000 in its treasury to defeat Mr. Truman in 1948. He also said his union would spend $2,500,000 to defeat every Member of Congress, including, of course, Democrats, who voted for pro-American labor legislation.

Thus, the administration's strategy in stymieing my antislush fund bill has rebounded against itself.

The principle of my bill, S. 1487, is nonpartisan and sound. It, too, should be enacted now—before the November elections.

Grain Shortage

REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I would feel remiss in my duty if I did not warn this country against the pledging of a crop even before it is raised, before we know how much wheat we can spare. I call the attention of the House to the fact that we will have less than three pecks of wheat per capita left in this country from this 1945 crop, and that the crop now growing has already been pledged

before we know its size. With poultry, dairy cows, and livestock being liquidated all over this country, America must look out that she does not face starvation herself.

The Chicago Daily Drovers Journal recently carried the following editorial on this subject:

AMERICA MIGHT GET HUNGRY, TOO

In recent weeks the foundation has been laid for stripping the Nation of a huge amount of grains and livestock, a program that could easily get out of hand and become a great threat to this Nation. There are 140,000,000 people in this country who must be fed, not subsistence rations, but enough to keep an energetic Nation energetic.

The humanitarians must not be permitted to get out of hand. It may seem brutal to admit that there are starving people in this world and yet be reluctant about reducing our stocks of food to a danger point, but there is a huge battle of self-preservation going on in this world, and there are no peoples more worthy of preserving than our own Americans.

We wish to go on record as warning the food planners of Washington to take care in their program of feeding a hungry world not to overlook the possibility of a hungry America. In the rush to strip this country of grain and livestock our food supplies may be reduced to a danger point. But we have a harvest coming up, we are told not by the farmers but by inexperienced planners. Farmers do not count their chickens before they are hatched. We fervently hope we have a bumper harvest of small grain coming up, but there were dust storms in sections of the Southwest a few days ago, a bleak warning that what happened before can happen again.

A major drought either this year or next could become a national tragedy to America. People of this country have almost always been well fed, at least the best fed in the world. There has been starvation in many other countries for centuries; it is not new. Placing a nation accustomed to being well fed on the same food basis as peoples who have been accustomed to hunger would soon bring panic, uprising, food riots, bloodshed, and chaos.

Let us do what we can to help reduce starvation in other countries, but let us use logic and not strip this country to the danger point. It is as simple as adding two and two for anyone who knows production and population to realize that the United States cannot feed the whole world, even if we starved ourselves to do it.

Address by Hon. James M. Mead, of New York, Before Association of Fraternal and Benevolent Organizations of the American Jewish Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at a testimonial dinner tendered to Dr. Stephen S. Wise on his seventy-second birthday by the Association of Fraternal and Benevolent Organizations of the American Jewish Congress at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, on Sunday, May 26, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is with genuine satisfaction that I join you tonight in paying tribute to Dr. Stephen Wise, great American, great Jew, great human being. I say that not because Dr. Wise happens to be one of my favorite constituents. I say it not merely because he has, through 50 years of public activity on behalf of every civilized cause, so richly merited the admiration and affection of his fellow Americans and his fellow Jews the world over. I say it because Dr. Wise so supremely embodies those qualities of democratic leadership the world so sorely needs today.

It is unfortunate that during the past several years we have been far too prone to identify leadership with dictatorship. Democracy, like all systems of government, requires leadership. It requires a different kind of leadership. It requires, in the first place, courage. I mean not the courage which one needs in order to march at the head of ruthless and plundering legions, but the courage that is needed to fight for what is just against the most overwhelming odds. It requires, in the second place, imagination. Here I do not mean the imagination to see one's self astride a world dominated by force and shackled by the bonds of poverty and insecurity. I mean the imagination that one can see a world at peace because men have learned to live with each other, to recognize each other's legitimate aspirations, and to respect each other's fundamental differences. And, it finally requires humility—the humility which recognizes that wisdom is not the monopoly of the privileged elite, but that it is to be found in the ordinary man and woman who make up our society.

These qualities of courage and imagination and of humility have more than anything else marked Dr. Wise's life. Whether it be the courage to fight for the rights of labor and the common man years before those rights were recognized, whether it be the imagination to see 50 years ago the inescapable need for a homeland for the Jewish people, or whether it be the humility which has led him to enlist with his fellow men of good will everywhere in every battle for justice and for freedom—Dr. Wise has given to this country, to the Jewish people, and to the world, an outstanding example of the kind of leadership we need today. It is for that reason that I am so gratified to join with you in earnest tribute to him on this occasion.

I am particularly happy that I have the opportunity of paying that tribute at this dinner of organizations affiliated with the American Jewish Congress to which Dr. Wise has given so much of his abundant energies and his incomparable eloquence. I know something about the work of the movement. I know of the manner in which, at the end of the last war, you worked to assure the security of the Jewish people throughout the world. I know how your voice was among the very first to be raised in warning the world that the rise of nazism meant the death of liberty. And I have been hearing a good deal lately about the manner in which you are meeting the new and challenging tasks of the postwar period—how you are seeking to end the inequalities by which men are divided and to promote freedom for all groups, how you are developing new means of teaching people to live together in friendship and cooperation, how you are working to make possible a decent future for the Jewish people. These are aspirations which are shared by all earnest and honest people everywhere. These are programs which cannot fail to bring enduring benefit to all peoples.

And I must say that the world needs such programs. As I move about talking with people I find two attitudes being expressed about the war we fought and the peace we are trying to win. Many people tell us pessimistically that although we won the war, we have already lost the peace. They argue that we went to war to smash fascism, to rid the world of the evils of tyranny and to build for all a better future. They point to many things in the world around us that make all of us unhappy—suspicion and jealousy, want and poverty, narrow nationalism and aspiring imperialism. These they cite as proof of the fact that we have not won the objectives we set out to conquer.

There are others who sing a different tune. They tell us that we haven't lost the peace because we never set out to win it. We were forced into war because we were attacked. None but the most naive should delude himself into thinking that our motives were anything more noble than self-defense and survival. We turned back the challenge of death. And no one should be surprised or disappointed if we are back where we started from.

I must confess that I find neither of these attitudes at all helpful or realistic. We went to war for many reasons. Of course, we fought because we were attacked. But if we hadn't known the meaning of tyranny and valued the reality of freedom, our defense might not have been so resolute or so determined. And I might add that we were giving aid to the defenders of liberty even before we were actually involved in conflict.

Nor was there ever at any time a single definition of victory. I am certain there were those in our midst who would have been satisfied only with a peace which would leave their personal privileges untouched, their right to exploit their fellow man unchallenged; on the other hand, there were those who would find victory meaningless unless it brought a peace that would completely liquidate empires, that would uproot every vestige of injustice and smash every form of privilege.

Of course, neither of these things have happened. Obviously, we have not yet achieved the social millennium. But it is equally true that we have moved forward from where we were before the war.

That may sound tragic mockery to you, the representatives of a people which has lost 6,000,000 of its brethren and which is still waiting for a word, an act, of hope and encouragement. But I say we have moved ahead because years of blood and death, of gigantic effort and supreme achievement have seared into the minds and hearts of men everywhere lessons that must be deeply prized because they were so dearly purchased. We learned that our capacity for social organization and social achievement—democratic organization and democratic achievement—exceeded even the dreams of our utopians. We learned that the passion for freedom and the will to defend it were shared by people of all lands and faiths and races and colors. We learned a thousand times a day that men whose station had been humble and whose lot bitter, could assume the heaviest of responsibilities. And we learned that we could bring the nations together not only for the waging of war but for the planning of peace—uneasily, it is true, haltingly, to be sure, but together nonetheless.

War is always a tremendous and overwhelming catastrophe. But it is also a great opportunity. Our task is to compensate in some slight measure for the catastrophe by making utmost use of the opportunity—the opportunity to build better and stronger.

I do not agree with those people who insist that some of us are setting our sights too high when we speak of the ending of want, and exploitation, and insincerity, and fear. Our sights cannot be too high because in the atomic age on which we have

entered our social potentialities are limitless. But we must not attempt nor expect too rapid a pace in reaching our goal. It may prove fatal if we attempt to leap over the gap between what we have today and what we want. We must, rather, build slowly and securely, the bridge over which we must pass.

Already we have taken the first step in the formation of the United Nations. I refuse to be dismayed by the frictions and tensions that seem to emerge. Every additional day the nations sit together is additional schooling in world government. We must have a good deal of practice in world government before we can fully develop the habit. Practice at first is bound to be somewhat amateurish and inadequate.

But the mere fact of organization is not enough. That is merely the foundation on which we can build. What shall be the first story in that structure?

The first story, I should like to suggest, must be the immediate acceptance and speedy implementation of a program of basic social principles—a program which all nations can accept and which almost all can fulfill.

We must, for example, firmly establish the principle that there can be no genuine freedom in the world until all nations and all peoples enjoy the status and security at present vouchsafed to some. If we want to keep the nations united, we must not only dissolve the suspicions and jealousies which threaten that unity. We must abolish the inequalities of status and treatment by which they are divided. That is why the homelessness and lack of status of the Jewish people by which they are divided from other people not only constitute the worst and least defensible injustice being perpetuated in this world. It seriously impairs the unity of nations by violating their equality. That is why the displaced persons, as well as those Jews who can find no peace in Europe, must be removed immediately to Palestine—without delay and without excuses. That is why the homelessness of the Jewish people must be ended at once by guaranteeing the future of the Jewish national homeland.

There is a second principle we must proclaim—the principle that there can be no genuine security in the world until men generally enjoy the privileges and standards of living now reserved for some. We cannot achieve a genuine unity of the peoples of the world until all enjoy decent standards of living and social welfare and health. International economic development and reconstruction is not an act of charity toward less fortunate lands. It is an indispensable condition for the forging of a united world.

Finally, we must insist that there can be no genuine justice in the world until all men have access to the opportunities now accorded to some. That is why any attempt to impose barriers of race or color or national ancestry or creed to the access to education or work or social privilege impairs the unity of nations. That is why these barriers must be shattered—everywhere and speedily.

These are principles to which there can be no challenge. This is a program within our power to implement. Certainly, the larger nations—Britain, France, the Soviet Union, ourselves, can begin at once to make it real. And, by the force of our example and prestige, we can secure its adoption everywhere.

There is one further point I must add. If we seek to keep the nations united, we must keep the Nation united. And we can keep the Nation united only by ending those political and economic inequalities by which we are at present divided into the privileged and the under-privileged, into first-class and second-class citizens.

That is why I so warmly commend the program and the activities of the American Jewish Congress. By your efforts to raise and secure the status of the Jewish people throughout the world you are not only bringing the hope of a decent future to a shattered people, you are helping to forge a world united by equality and freedom. Through your magnificent work in fighting for the democratic rights and security of all minority groups in this land, you are not only helping make democracy real for so many people, you are helping to assure the unity of our country. By your application of science to the problems of human relationships you are not only helping local groups of all sorts to live in harmony and brotherhood, you are developing basic principles of human cooperation.

This is a program which meets the challenging realities of a world challenged by the power man has created either to live together as one or to die. I wish you strength in that program. I hope particularly that Dr. Wise, who has been both its inspiration and its most eloquent spokesman, will continue to give it for many years his energy and enthusiasm and his leadership.

Statement of Assistant Commissioner William E. Warne, of the Bureau of Reclamation, Before the Omaha Chamber of Commerce

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by the Assistant Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, William E. Warne, before the Omaha Chamber of Commerce, May 23, 1946.

Mr. Speaker, water, if controlled, can be made to serve mankind. Uncontrolled waters can cause tremendous loss of life, soil, and property.

The people of the United States, and particularly the Missouri River Valley Basin, can be grateful that the United States Government is now proceeding to harness the waters of the Missouri River and make them work for the people of the United States.

The speech follows:

I am honored to respond to your invitation to discuss development of the Missouri River Basin before the Omaha Chamber of Commerce. There is no more important project today than that which has been presented, approved, and authorized for the improvement of the Missouri River Basin.

Before getting into the details of the plan or the schedule of operations, I would like to outline for you some of the physical facts of the basin and some of the problems inherent in it.

The Missouri River Basin covers 525,000 square miles. That represents one-sixth of the land area of the United States. It has within it every problem related to the control and use of water that is found in the world. It extends from the arid to the humid zones. The river rises at elevations reaching 13,000 feet and empties into the Mississippi at an elevation of little more than 500 feet above sea level. The semiarid and subhumid sections of the Missouri Basin are subject to devastating droughts, in accordance with cyclical weather changes. The people of the basin are also the victims of catastrophic floods which, as in 1943, visited the lower areas with destruction three times in a single year. While the Missouri River was the highway that led the fur trappers and explorers into the West; today its silt-laden waters make difficult the maintenance of its navigable channel.

I could go on cataloging the water problems of the basin—stream pollution, especially severe in dry periods of low flow; sinking ground water levels, which threaten to extinguish the domestic water supply in some areas; the need for fish and wildlife conservation, and of making the waters available for recreational enjoyment.

I do not want, however, to overemphasize the formidable characteristics of the Missouri River. This great stream, 2,500 miles long and carrying 65,000,000 acre-feet of water on the average in a year, is in truth one of the major natural resources of its basin. The fact that it presents unsolved problems in its control and utilization should not cause us to lose sight of the tremendous potential benefits that the river embodies.

The truth is that we are 50 years behind the times in the development of the Missouri River and the use of the waters and related resources of its basin. For many long decades we have known in a general way what should be done to solve these problems. Other river basins to the west and some to the east have been developed.

The Colorado River Basin, about half as large an area and with less than half of the water that is available in the Missouri River, is far ahead in the development of control and utilization works. The great Sacramento-San Joaquin Basin in California is developed a generation beyond that of the Missouri River. The Columbia River, principal resource of the Northwest, is also out in front, while the Tennessee and the Delaware in the East are well along toward full utilization.

The reasons are various for the advancement of some of these basins before that of the Missouri. As I see it, the Colorado and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Basins, being semiarid throughout, demanded attention so loudly by their very physical characteristics that their development could not be denied. In the Missouri Basin, only partly arid, the development of the river was not absolutely essential to the first settlement, and so it was postponed.

Great cities grew along the Delaware and turned to it naturally for their water. The river, though an important resource, is not the dominating resource in that entirely humid area. You all know the history of the Tennessee, how it was chosen as a demonstration of the regional value of unified development of a river and its related resources. But the Tennessee Valley is small, by comparison with the Missouri Valley, being only one-thirteenth as large. What has been done there has proved the efficacy of such a program. There is no longer room for doubt concerning the value of unified river development to a region and to the Nation.

The development of the Columbia preceded that of the Missouri largely because it is America's greatest power stream. The hydroelectric energy potential of the Columbia was so great that it was only natural that it should be early among the streams to be harnessed.

The Missouri River is not untouched, but compared with other American rivers its development is in a rudimentary stage. In some respects this is an advantage for those of us who are expected to have a part in carrying out the adopted plan. It will be possible to get a better final result. There will be fewer old patterns that do not fully conform. I offer you this as a doubtful consolation in connection with the fact that the development of the Missouri is now beginning 50 years late.

You may wonder why I have dwelt on the assertion that we are late in the Missouri River Valley. It is because all of the problems that we now seek to solve were present and fully understood in this valley in the 1880's when that great conservationist, Maj. John Wesley Powell, preached the use of the waters of the Missouri River up and down the high plains.

More than 50 years later the Nation has aroused to the unalterable fact that we cannot afford to leave these waters uncontrolled and unused. We have already paid for the Missouri River development program several times over by failing to build it and by permitting nature, through drought and flood, to devastate and ruin the land.

Here are the monetary facts. The 90 reservoirs proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation and the score proposed by the Corps of Engineers for inclusion in the unified plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin would have cost at 1940 prices about $1,500,000,000. The drought of the 1930's, measured alone in terms of Federal relief expenditures in the Missouri River Basin, cost the Government $1,200,000,000, which only alleviated a part of the suffering. During that same period 300,000 rural people left the region in jalopy caravans, driven from their homes, forced to start anew elsewhere. This tragic loss in human resources, in money and in goods, cannot be calculated.

You have heard a great deal about the type of administration which should govern the development of this great basin. I am not here to discuss administrative patterns of one kind or another. I am here to tell you what we are doing to catch up on those 50 wasted years of basin development in the great valley of the Missouri. Whatever administrative device may finally be utilized, not a nickel's worth of work done now on the approved plan will be wasted.

I want to bring you up-to-date on the progress that the Bureau of Reclamation, together with seven other agencies of the Department of the Interior, has made. Our work is in full cooperation with the Corps of Engineers and other Federal agencies under the development plan authorized by the Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1944.

During the extensive hearings held by the Committee of Congress before passage of the Flood Control Act, the basic issue may have seemed to be somewhat clouded. On the surface it may have appeared that the argument was one between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. The issue was far more fundamental than that.

The Corps of Engineers, recognizing the extreme necessity for providing flood control along the lower reaches of the river and the desirability of increasing the navigation facilities, presented its plan to the Congress. This was printed as House Document No. 475. Now the people further upstream realized full well that their present development and any possible future development was dependent upon conserving and using the available water supplies and they became alarmed at the prospect of the water in the river being committed to support navigation.

The Bureau of Reclamation, which had been working in the basin for a considerable period of time, was called upon to accelerate its studies and to present a plan to the Congress which would show the possibilities for utilizing the water in the western part of the basin for irrigation and power development. The Bureau's plan was printed as Senate Document No. 191. The detailed studies behind the document showed clearly that there would not be enough water in the river to provide for irrigation of lands during drought periods, such as existed in the 1930's, and also to provide for a full navigation channel.

Here was the crux of the whole argument that raged around the plans of the Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior. It related directly to the priority of the use of water. There were, of course, some conflicts in the engineering plans that had been presented to the Congress. These existed in that twilight zone between the lower part of the irrigated area and the upper part of the flood-control area. Until the Congress had indicated its policy with respect to the priority of use of water, it was not possible to coordinate the two plans. However, once the Congress had indicated its policy, agreement was quickly reached. Engineers from the Bureau of Reclamation and from the Corps of Engineers met here in Omaha and welded the two plans into one great coordinated plan for the basin. This coordination was printed in Senate Document 247.

The Congress in adopting the coordinated plan, recognized that it was but the broad framework which would govern activities in the basin for a long period to come. It therefore approved the broad plans and authorized construction of the initial stages. Consequently, the job which the Bureau of Reclamation and other agencies in the Department of the Interior are now doing is twofold: We are proceeding with the construction and development of the authorized initial stage, and we are also proceeding with investigations, studies, and mapping activities that will lead to refinements in the ultimate plan, and successive authorizations for additional stages. We have been at this work for a little over a year.

The Congress appropriated $3,200,000 to the Department of the Interior in the Regular Appropriation Act of 1946 and limited the use of these funds specifically to preparing detailed plans preparatory to construction, and carrying on investigations of the general plan. Then after VJ-day, the President indicated that wartime restrictions would be lifted and that he would consider estimates of appropriations from the Department of the Interior for work such as that in the Missouri Basin. He submitted these estimates of appropriations to the Congress which acted upon them and made $10,780,300 additional funds for work in the Missouri Basin available to the Department of the Interior in the First Deficiency Act of 1946.. These funds, in addition to providing for a broadening in the program of detailed planning, also provided money for beginning the construction of three dams in the initial stage.

On May 15, the Bureau of Reclamation began construction of Kortes Dam and Power Plant. This first Reclamation construction project in the Missouri River Basin will be located in a rocky canyon of the North Platte River, 60 miles southwest of Casper, Wyo. Its purpose is the production of power to help relieve a threatened power shortage in that area, and to provide energy to foster the development of coal, oil, mineral, and other resources. The dam will be about 2 miles downstream from the Seminole Dam, which the Bureau of Reclamation completed in 1938 to provide irrigation water for 66,000 acres of lands on the Kendrick project.

The Kortes power plant will be part of an integrated Missouri Basin power network being developed by the Bureau of Reclamation and will increase the firm power output in the immediate area by 120 percent. The Kortes power plant will have a generating capacity of 36,000 kilowatts, provided by three 12,000-kilowatt generators. Contracts for the generators and other electrical equipment, including a switchyard on the roof of the powerhouse, are to be awarded later on. In order to deliver power generated at the Kortes Dam, the Bureau plans to construct a 115-kilovolt transmission line to replace the existing 69-kilovolt line of inadequate capacity. Another 115-kilovolt line is scheduled for construction from Casper to Sidney, Nebr. These are parts of the basic grid that eventually will carry low-cost power for wholesale throughout the basin.

Another structure on which work will be started very soon is the Boysen Dam on the Big Horn River in Wyoming. It will provide irrigation water, flood control, silt control, and power generation. We had hoped to have construction work started on the Boysen Dam by now, but there were intricate legal problems involved with the relocation of a major highway and a railroad around the reservoir site. These negotiations have taken somewhat longer than we anticipated. We are rapidly approaching solution of them.

The third unit upon which construction will soon be started is the Angostura in South Dakota. This unit consists of a dam, a reservoir, and canal-distribution system for some 16,000 acres on the Cheyenne River. The invitation for bids for construction of the dam are now out and will be called for soon.

Another item on which construction will get under way in the near future is the power transmission line from Williston, N. Dak., to the Garrison Dam site. This power transmission line will serve the initial purpose of transporting power generated at the Fort Peck Dam in Montana from Williston, N. Dak., to the Garrison Dam site for use of the Corps of Engineers during the construction period. Ultimately it will be used to take the power generated at the Garrison Dam to the market areas.

One of the most widely prevalent desires throughout the basin is the desire for low-cost electric energy. At the present time the basin's industrial development is far short of what can be done with sufficient hydroelectric power development. It has extensive ore deposits. Development of the ore bodies would be speeded up if low-cost electric energy can be made available for use in processing of the ores within the basin.

We are preparing plans for initiating construction on seven other units in the initial stage this summer, providing that the Congress acts favorably upon our pending appropriation estimate. These plans cannot, of course, go forward without appropriated funds. It is not a case, in my opinion, of "Can we afford to spend Federal funds this way?" I say, "We cannot afford not to build these works." I am pleased to report that stanch support for the Missouri Valley program and appropriations has been given by the Nebraska Congressmen.

An important unit on which we anticipate early construction is the Frenchman-Cambridge unit located on the Republican River in Nebraska. The plan of development includes the Enders Dam and Reservoir on Frenchman Creek near Enders, the Medicine Creek Dam and Reservoir on Medicine Creek near Cambridge, four diversion dams, five main canals, and extension of two canals to serve 53,140 acres of land. The people in the Frenchman-Cambridge area recently voted 10 to 1 in favor of the organization of an irrigation district to participate in the repayment of the construction costs to be borne by the water users.

The Bostwick unit, on the Republican River, also scheduled for early construction, will embrace lands located on both sides of the Republican River from Naponee, Nebr., east and south to Concordia, Kans. There it is proposed to irrigate some 69,000 acres of land. The storage reservoir for the irrigation systems will be the Harlan County Reservoir that will be constructed by the Corps of Engineers. The Bureau of Reclamation is at work preparing construction plans and working out details of irrigation districts, studies relating to repayment ability and other matters which have to be considered before construction can begin. Initiation of work on the Bostwick unit will depend in a large measure on the participation of the local people in perfecting preliminary details relating to organization of districts and repayment contracts. Local participation on the Bostwick unit has not developed to the

degree of that evidenced for the Frenchman-Cambridge.

The North Republican unit will consist of a dam on the North Fork near Wray, Colo. The lands to be serviced extend into Nebraska. Approximately 3,300 acres of land irrigated under private canals will receive supplemental water and canals will be built to irrigate approximately 2,100 acres of land now dry farmed in the vicinity of Haigler, Nebr. Our activities on the North Republican unit will continue to be the perfection of construction plans and organization of irrigation districts looking to starting construction in the spring of 1947, providing sufficient funds are available.

We also expect to continue our studies looking to the development of irrigation units that will be supplied from wells along the South Fork of the Republican River from St. Francis, Kans., to Benkelman, Nebr. No construction is contemplated on these well units before July 1, 1948. In addition to these units I have outlined, we plan early construction on the Canyon Ferry Reservoir in Montana, a regulating reservoir on the upper Missouri that will make irrigation water available and also the development of power; the lower Marias unit in Montana to serve some 120,000 acres of land; the Owl Creek unit in Wyoming; the Heart River unit on the Heart River, N. Dak., and the Kirwin unit in Kansas.

While we will be devoting a large part of our energy to getting this construction program under way, we will not overlook our long range planning toward perfecting the ultimate plan. The water problems of the Platte River will receive a considerable amount of study by the Department of the Interior. The possibilities for irrigational developments around Kearney and Grand Island, Nebr., must be looked into as well as those of the Loup River area. Water supply problems of the Platte River are extremely complicated. As you people of Nebraska know, it is not going to be an easy job to work out these problems concerned with future irrigation development along the lower Platte.

Ultimately, reservoirs in the Missouri River Basin development will provide water to irrigate 4,760,400 acres of new land and to provide supplemental water for over one-half million additional acres.

Now let us consider another important phase of the Missouri River development plan—low-cost power. The present installed capacity of generating plants in the Missouri Basin, exclusive of those portions of the States of Kansas and Missouri lying within its confines, is about 1,100,000 kilowatts. Full development of hydroelectric energy in the basin will yield a total of almost 2,500,000 kilowatts. This includes 84,000 kilowatts in present Federal plants, 433,600 kilowatts of capacity the Government has under construction, and 1,909,000 kilowatts of additional proposed capacity.

The total energy sold within the basin in 1945 was about 5,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. Federal plants under construction and proposed would make available about 11,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours additional, or more than twice the present sales.

This will be low-cost power in comparison with present conditions. Low-cost power attracts industry and stimulates widespread and liberal use of electricity in the home. It is a potent factor affecting the prosperity, health, comfort, and general well-being of the people.

The financial feasibility of the entire Missouri River Basin development largely depends upon anticipated revenues from sale of power. Two-thirds to three-fourths of all reimbursable costs must come from this source. To insure financial success and to expedite the benefits which will accrue to users of power for irrigation, domestic and commercial uses, we propose to push the power phases of the development as fast as market conditions warrant.

I have devoted considerable time to outlining the program of the Bureau of Reclamation. I do not want to give you the impression that the entire program of the Department of the Interior is only that of the Bureau of Reclamation; far from it. The Department's plan for the Missouri Basin is for the comprehensive development of the basin and for the full use of its land and water resources.

To that end, we are working on an integrated program with the National Park Service which is reviewing our plans to determine the possibility of recreational developments at our proposed reservoirs. We are working with the Fish and Wildlife Service which is studying the fish and wildlife problems of the basin with a view to determining if there are desirable modifications to our plans to foster the propagation of fish and wildlife streams, if that is feasible. We are working with the General Land Office in connection with its administration of the public lands of the basin; similarly, with the Grazing Service in its administration of the grazing districts under the Taylor Grazing Act that will be affected by the irrigation developments. We are coordinating our developments with the plans of the Office of Indian Affairs to insure that adequate attention is being paid to possible irrigation developments on Indian reservations, and with the Bureau of Mines in their investigations of mineral resources. Last but not least, we are working hand in hand with the Geological Survey in the gathering of basic data relating to water supplies, both surface and underground, topographic maps, geological data, and other factual material. This information is necessary for the preparation and execution of an adequate plan for the development of the basin's resources.

We have tackled a large job in the Missouri River Basin—one of the biggest resource development programs ever undertaken in the United States.

Through this work we expect to alleviate the disastrous effects of both drought and flood. By controlling and storing, by using the waters, it is possible to prevent a recurrence of the crippling disaster in the plains of the past decade. We cannot prevent droughts. They will come again; do not mistake that. But we can, through the use of stored water, alleviate their effects, stabilize the economy of the high plains to a much higher degree.

To understand what this will mean to Omaha, to all of Nebraska, to the entire Missouri Basin, to the United States itself, just think back a dozen years and remember what 1934 and 1936 meant to you and all of us in terms of dust storms, displaced persons, unpaid taxes, suffering, and relief.

Your State—the whole State of Nebraska—will share in the benefits from this great irrigation and multiple-purpose project. By controlling the Missouri, it will be possible to bring under irrigation almost 1,000,000 new acres of land in Nebraska and to provide supplemental water for almost 20,000 acres now in need.

Diversification of agriculture made possible by irrigation will stabilize the economy of rural areas and have a definite effect on urban development. The city of Omaha will be enriched by increased production on fertile farm lands. Expansion of low-cost power within the area will augment industry and help to keep employment opportunities at a constant level.

It's a big job, this harnessing of a wild river and forcing it to do man's will. I am confident that with all of us pulling together for the common gains of water-resource development, we can get even the Big Muddy under control, and make it take its place with the other great working streams of America.

Palestine: Sole Salvation of 100,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Palestine: Sole Salvation of 100,000," delivered by Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., former Secretary of the Treasury, over radio station WMCA of Wednesday, May 22, 1946, at New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening. I want to talk to you tonight about President Truman's humanitarian recommendation that 100,000 displaced persons of Jewish descent, now confined to camps in Germany and Austria, be moved as soon as possible to Palestine.

This is a problem of enormous moral consequence for the entire American public, and for the allies. We Americans in particular have inherited a long tradition of readiness to extend a brotherly hand to oppressed and homeless peoples. During the nineteenth century, the persecuted German democrats of 1848, the Irish driven by tyranny and famine, and many others found sanctuary here. After the First World War, it was American warships that rescued terrorized Greeks at Smyrna; and the Armenian people will always remember our efforts to save them from extinction by the Turks. And only this week, the first boatload of refugees from postwar Europe docked in New York, a small part of the 39,000 who will be welcomed to our shores this year under the regular prewar quota.

We are now faced with a situation where this humanitarian tradition must again impel the great conscience of America to take positive action. Among the millions of human beings slaughtered by the Nazis in Europe—Poles, Czechs, Ukrainians, and others—there were almost six million Jews. Of the total prewar Jewish population in Europe of almost seven and one-half million, there are now less than one and a half million left. It is difficult for any normal person to conceive of the wanton murder of almost six million human beings. Imagine a factory such as was discovered in the Polish Corridor, where soap was being made from human fat. Imagine a devil's laboratory, where the most horrible and deadly viruses were injected into the veins of innocent human beings to observe the resulting agonies. If you can imagine these things, you will begin to understand a small part of what happened to Hitler's six million Jewish victims. These unspeakable atrocities and a thousand others which once we held up to doubt, are now proven fact.

Out of this inferno, only 1,400,000 were saved. Of these, 100,000 still languish in detention camps in Germany and Austria. They are the survivors of Buchenwald, Dachau, and Bergen-Belsen. They are alive today only because the Allied advance was so swift that the Nazis had no time to finish the job down to the last man.

But even for these survivors, liberation has not meant freedom. They are still detained in camps—one might even call them concentration camps, except that the torture chambers, the crematories, and the gallows no longer operate. And to these people who have suffered so much, anything but a real home only serves to remind them constantly

of their former life under Hitler. The miserable inmates are sick in body and mind; worn out by their past sufferings, many no longer have even the strength to hope. And every day many of them die.

That is the situation in which we now find these remaining hundred thousand Jewish victims of Hitler. They are a byproduct of the most terrible conflict in history; part of the unfinished business of a war which we fought for the salvation of our national existence and for human dignity everywhere. They are a heartbreaking residue of the war for which we are obliged to find an immediate and practicable solution.

Is there such a solution? These people do not want to stay in Europe. For them Europe is a huge cemetery, littered with the bones and blood of their friends and relatives.

A poll was recently taken among them to determine where they would like to settle. Ninety-eight percent gave Palestine as their first choice. When asked for a second choice, many of them replied, "The crematories." As they see it, it is Palestine or death. And this indicates in the sharpest possible form what the solution must be. These people must be allowed to go to Palestine, because the simple truth is that there is no other place for them to go.

I am confident that this fact must have been uppermost in President Truman's mind last August, when he recommended that 100,000 certificates be issued to permit these displaced persons of Jewish origin to go to Palestine. Mr. Truman made this recommendation on the basis of a report by Earl Harrison, dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, who had spent 6 weeks in Europe as the President's personal emissary to investigate the situation in the camps. Mr. Harrison's report urged immediate improvement of conditions in the camps, and some improvements were undertaken. But the report underscored the fact that no improvements could solve the problem. All the hopes of these people for the future, said Mr. Harrison, are concentrated in Palestine, because "they feel that only in Palestine will they be welcome to find peace and quiet and be given an opportunity to live and work." On August 31 of last year Mr. Truman asked that these desires be granted.

That was many months ago, and we have seen no action yet. But we now have further testimony to the fact that removal to Palestine is the only feasible future for these hundred thousand Jewish survivors, still confined to camps in Germany and Austria. Earlier this year, an Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry was appointed by the Governments of the United States and Great Britain, to investigate the whole problem and make definitive recommendations. The Committee had six American and six British members. Their report was made public last month, and was subscribed to unanimously by all 12 members. Its most significant recommendation for immediate action was a reiteration of President Truman's proposal of last August—that the 100,000 Jews now in camps be permitted to emigrate to Palestine without delay.

We have an incontestable blueprint for action—and the great need now is to get that action.

I do not think that it will be possible to get action if we are to rely on routine measures by existing governmental agencies. I say this on the basis of experience. A problem similar to this one existed during and even before the war. There was then an urgent need to take decisive steps to save as many of the persecuted people of Europe as was humanly possible. The intensification of Nazi persecution during the war was endangering the lives of millions of innocent civilians of all faiths. In an effort to cope with the situation, there had been the Conference at Evian, Switzerland, in July 1938, and following that the Bermuda Conference in April 1943. An Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees was established. The problem was surveyed and resurveyed, and then surveyed again. But action was completely lacking. By the end of 1943, with millions already murdered by Hitler, a report by the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs was forced to state, and I quote: "We have talked; we have sympathized; we have expressed our horror; the time to act is long past due."

What happened then is a lesson for us today. President Roosevelt stepped in—and we got action. In January 1944 the President appointed the War Refugee Board, composed of the Secretaries of State, Treasury, and War. It was directly responsible to the President. The Board went to work with vigor and decision, and in the course of the following months literally hundreds of thousands of lives were saved. As Secretary of the Treasury, I was a member of that Board, in collaboration with Mr. Cordell Hull and Mr. Henry L. Stimson. With the full support of President Roosevelt, I can tell you that we got results. And it is my firm conviction that we must have a similar type of agency today, to bring this present problem to a prompt solution.

Mr. Truman has made his position clear. He is backed by the unanimous decision of the joint Anglo-American Board of Inquiry. It now remains only to do something about it. And on the basis of my experience as a member of the War Refugee Board, I suggest that the same pattern be adopted—that President Truman appoint a group selected from the Cabinet, or one man, responsible directly to the President. Whoever is entrusted with this task must be capable of acting with imagination, daring, and decision extending even to the use of Army transport planes to speed the evacuation of these stricken, heartsick people from the camps, which have, in effect, become their prisons. The situation is grave, and half-hearted measures or routine handling in the lower echelons of a governmental department will no longer suffice.

It is my fervent hope that President Truman will act upon this proposal. It would demonstrate in a positive manner that the humanitarian ideals of Franklin D. Roosevelt, to which President Truman has subscribed, are being carried forward by the present administration. And it would illustrate once again to humanity that the American tradition of assistance to the oppressed and homeless—a tradition which illuminates some of the brightest pages of our history—lives and is remembered in the weary and war-sick world of today. I pray that President Truman will seize this opportunity to become the spokesman for the conscience of America, and for the great humanitarian heritage of his predecessor, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Good night.

Settlement of Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, the first entitled "After We Have All Calmed Down," the second entitled "Congress Can't Stop Strikes by Goading Labor Into Them," from the Philadelphia Record of May 27, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Record of May 27, 1946]

AFTER WE HAVE ALL CALMED DOWN

"Never slap a child in anger."

That is a sound adage. But those of us who have reared children know that once in a long while direct action applied with some heat is necessary for the good of the family.

In heat and anger the House slapped down labor Saturday night. We hope the Senate follows suit today, so certain irresponsible labor leaders will realize they have tried the Nation's patience to the breaking point.

But that does not mean we want boiling-point legislation to remain on the statute books beyond the immediate emergency.

Drafting workers into the Army in peacetime is abhorrent to our political system. It is akin to the ancient press-gang system of recruiting seamen, a practice which was second cousin to chattel slavery.

Such temporary legislation must be replaced by well considered permanent laws which will remove the necessity for the drastic act passed by the House.

The Record proposes three divisions of permanent labor legislation.

First, an act to outlaw strikes against the Nation.

A strike against the Nation may be defined as a concerted strike against an essential service or the production of a basic commodity that would disrupt our economy and endanger the public health and welfare.

Such a law would not prevent Mr. Lewis striking one coal field at a time but he could not strike all coal fields at the same time. When he uses a general strike as a weapon he and his fellow union leaders are engaged in a conspiracy against their Government, should be subject to arrest and trial in the United States courts.

Furthermore, the new act should provide that the property and funds of unions involved in a strike against the Nation be subject to seizure by the Department of Justice and, after trial in Federal courts, to confiscation by the Government.

This would apply to trade-unions the same principle which is already in effect against trade monopolies and combinations in restraint of trade. We must guard against the excesses of big labor as we do against the excesses of big business.

The strike against the Nation is not necessary to the preservation of free-trade unionism. The usual tactic is to strike one plant at a time. Then the struck plant is under the double pressure of losing money and losing its customers to its competitors. As far as management is concerned, it would rather have all of an industry shut down than be the sole victim while its competitors profit.

Therefore the general strike which ties up all of an industry is not a strike against management as much as it is against the general public. Such strikes are called in the hope that the Government will intervene to relieve the Nation of further danger.

Too often the general strike is actuated by the egotism and arrogance of union leaders rather than by a desire to improve the lot of the worker.

A strike of the Illinois coal mines alone might not put John on the front page.

The second division of permanent labor legislation should deal with services and supplies essential to the safety and health of a community—such as water, milk, electric power, police, and fire protection. Men who work in such key places should be amply protected by law in job security, in seniority rights, with pensions and retirement funds, and with more than adequate wages. In return for such special protection they should renounce the right to strike.

Third, division of permanent labor legislation should deal with the internal management and conduct of trade-unions.

We call on the Nation's labor leaders to formulate this law themselves.

It should provide for democratic processes within each union and it should protect the rights of the individual union member. He should have the right to a yearly accounting of union funds. He should have the right to vote for the officers of his local. No local union should be held captive, under arbitrary control of national headquarters, for more than a year. The individual member should be protected in his right of free speech at union meetings. He should have the right to a secret ballot in all voting.

The act should protect the public against jurisdictional strikes, featherbedding, exorbitant initiation fees, lack of apprentices.

Decent labor unions already practice such principles and they are in the majority. Let the decent labor leaders protect themselves against the black sheep who besmirch labor's good name.

Let labor leaders avoid the errors of the utility tycoons and the Stock Exchange governors who denounced all regulatory legislation until they brought the Wheeler-Rayburn Act and the SEC down upon their heads.

If legislation were enacted along the lines indicated above, Congress could rescind its emergency act as a signal that the crisis is over, that we start again with a clean slate.

These proposals would not end strikes in private industry, nor bring the millennium. But they would remove the causes for many strikes and adequately protect the public's interest.

Equally important, trade-unionism would emerge stronger and sounder than ever before.

CONGRESS CAN'T STOP STRIKES BY GOADING LABOR INTO THEM

Is the Congress of the United States, which Saturday acclaimed President Truman's request for antistrike legislation, helping to foment strikes itself?

The answer is "Yes."

On Saturday, the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, exceeding in some respects the House's savage butchering, voted to virtually kill off price control and the OPA altogether.

It approved amendments which would scrap controls and make the sky the limit on basic foods—meat, livestock, poultry, milk, and all products derived from them.

That is fomenting strikes.

Too many Members of Congress are eager to crack down on labor while they foster conditions in which strikes flourish.

The House jammed through President Truman's requested antistrike legislation on Saturday evening.

The Senate, late Saturday night, passed its version of the House-approved Case anti-labor law. Today it may push through the specific legislation Truman asked to meet the immediate emergency of the coal strike.

While Congressmen thus shout "Whoa" to labor strife out of one side of their mouths, they are screaming "Giddap" out of the other and applying the goad by attempting to destroy price control.

Of all commodities food should be guarded against runaway prices.

The world hungers. Millions may die for lack of food.

It is in such situations, where the demand outstrips the supply, that price control is particularly urgent.

The people of the United States have told Congress they want efficient price control retained. They don't want economic chaos, widespread industrial strikes.

If Congress would have labor stop its strikes, then Congress must help to create an economy in which there is not an everlasting race between wages and prices.

Increased Efficiency in the Legislative Branch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "S. 2177," published in the Washington Post of May 19, highly and deservedly commending Senate bill 2177, providing for the streamlining of Congress, which bill was introduced by the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2177

We do not expect that a great number of citizens will take the time to read the 88 pages of S. 2177. But it should be required homework for every member of Congress. For this is the bill introduced by Senator LA FOLLETTE "to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government." It puts into legislative form the constructive and forward-looking proposals advanced in the La Follette-Monroney Committee report released a few weeks ago.

Legislators who examine the bill will first be struck by the painstaking section for reorganization of the committee structure in the Senate. All the legislative work of the Senate would be divided among 16 committees. No longer would bills be subject to haphazard placement. The La Follette bill outlines in considerable detail the type of legislation that should go to each committee. Undoubtedly there will have to be subcommittees within these general groups to handle various different types of legislation in the same general field, but it seems to us much better to centralize control over all legislation in the same sphere and then divide the task of giving it specific shape than to leave the existing haphazard committee structure intact. Division of effort in a Congress as busy as ours cannot be avoided. What Senator LA FOLLETTE and his colleagues are trying to accomplish is to secure more responsible and more efficient group action after the details of conducting hearings and preparing bills and reports have been taken care of.

Several devices that will help to avoid the splintering of power that now afflicts Congress are included in the bill. One is the provision for four experts to serve each of the new committees. These men, who would be especially trained in the field in which the committee operates, would doubtless be of great help in keeping the subcommittees working in a harmonious relationship. More important would be the policy committees "for the formulation of over-all legislative policy" which Congress would ask each of the major parties in both houses to set up. Acting with the President through a formal legislative-executive council, the majority policy committees would be in a position to work out a comprehensive legislative program and mobilize party strength to put it into effect.

A similar purpose would be served by lifting burdensome details from the back of Congress. The bill would relieve Congress of its duty as a city council for the District of Columbia; it would cut off the flood of claims bills, by diverting claims against the Government into administrative offices and the courts; it would centralize the hiring and firing of congressional employees in an office of congressional personnel. In each case the effect would be to shift burdensome details out of legislative hands and permit the concentration of our policy-makers on the all-important business of national policy-making.

There are many other provisions of the bill which seem to us excellent. It would raise the salaries of Congressmen to $15,000; bring them into the Federal retirement system; provide definite periods each year for them to renew their contacts with the people; greatly expand the legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress; require the registration of lobbyists and permit publication of their connections and expenditures. Committees would be required to hold regular meetings and to make it possible for the congressional sponsors of bills to appear and present their case. They would also be put under obligation to bring bills before them to a vote and to report the results promptly.

As a means of bringing order and stability into our fiscal system, the Ways and Means and Finance Committees and the Appropriations Committees of both Houses would be directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each session for a careful survey of revenue and prospective expenditures. Should they find that estimated expenditures exceed estimated revenue, they would have so to report to Congress and the business of appropriating funds for the year ahead, except in time of war or national emergency, could not go forward until Congress had authorized a corresponding increase in the public debt.

We do not pretend to pass judgment upon every detail of this bill. But we think that its principles and approach will commend themselves to everyone who sees the necessity of adjusting governmental machinery to the exacting demands of the age in which we live. It does not seem possible that Congress can be indifferent to this thoughtful and progressive buttress to American democracy.

United States Merchant Marine Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following message received by the Superintendent of the United States Merchant Marine Academy from the Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy together with the reply thereto. Such expressions of mutual understanding and cooperation are encouraging.

MAY 22, 1946.

SUPERINTENDENT, UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY,
Kings Point, N. Y.:

No one better appreciates the sacrifices and services rendered their country better than the men of the Navy who at close hand witnessed the magnificent achievements of the United States Merchant Marine in World War II. The brigade of midshipmen joins the superintendent in extending congratulations and best wishes to the officers and cadets of the Merchant Marine Academy on this day dedicated to their heroic service.

SUPERINTENDENT, UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY.

ANNAPOLIS, MD.

MAY 23, 1946.

Vice Adm. AUBREY W. FITCH, USN.,
Superintendent, United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.

MY DEAR ADMIRAL FITCH: On behalf of the regiment of cadet-midshipmen and officers attached to the United States Merchant Marine Academy, I extend sincerest thanks for your most thoughtful despatch of May 22, 1946. It has given the regiment and myself our greatest thrill and stimulation.

Please know that we of the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps will always be in debt to the Navy, and especially the Bureau of Naval Personnel, for its generous cooperation and assistance with regard to personnel and material. When Kings Point reaches the level to which we strive it will be because of our aim to emulate and maintain the high ideals and standards of the United States Naval Academy.

Every effort will be made by us to maintain a very close bond of friendship between Kings Point and Annapolis to the end that our country will be second to none in sea power.

Sincerely,

R. R. MCNULTY,
Commodore, United States Maritime Service, Superintendent.

Drafting Strikers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Drafting Strikers," published in the Washington Post of May 29, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRAFTING STRIKERS

The drastic labor legislation urged upon Congress by President Truman was designed to meet a national emergency. The criterion which must be applied in judging it, therefore, is this: Are the powers requested by the President necessary? Will nothing less serve to overcome the crucial threat to the national economy? No American who cherishes the free traditions of this society can relish the imposition of stringent governmental controls upon labor. Such controls can be justified only by genuine necessity and only to the extent that they are indisputably required for protection of the general welfare. It is in this light, we think, that the proposal to draft into the armed services men who strike against the Government ought to be conscientiously examined. For it is a proposal odious at best and violative of a long-accepted democratic principle.

The coal strike and the railroad strike demonstrated that the self-restraint of men cannot be counted upon to keep them from striking against the authority of their own Government. Since strikes against the Government in an industrial society so integrated as our own are intolerable, the Government must be armed with extraordinary powers to prevent them. The powers which President Truman has requested include the power to seek injunctive relief in the event of strikes conducted against the Government, the power to punish strike leaders by fine or imprisonment and the power to punish the strikers themselves by depriving them of their seniority rights. These are powerful sanctions—powerful enough in themselves to break any attempt at defiance of the Government's authority. We believe, therefore, that it is needless to supplement them with the additional power which the President also requested—the power to induct strikers into the Army of the United States.

If this additional power is needless, then it is certainly altogether undesirable. It would degrade military service by establishing it as a form of punishment. It would be enforceable only through a distasteful, and perhaps brutal, type of coercion; for it does not follow that men can be made to mine coal or run trains against their will merely by inducting them into the Army. It would entail, insofar as the coercion could be made effective, a discriminatory species of involuntary servitude in time of peace and is therefore of doubtful constitutionality. And, finally, it would place in the hands of the President a power over the lives and liberties of American citizens which ought not to be entrusted to any individual. It seems to us idle to defend this power on the ground that it would be merely temporary. The granting of it would constitute a precedent explosive in its implications. And the precedent, once established, would lie at hand like a loaded weapon ready for use whenever a crisis could be cited as a pretext for dictatorial control.

Violent actions beget violent reactions. The power to draft strikers sought by the President is a reaction to extreme provocation and to the helplessness of the Government in the face of the recent railroad strike. The granting of this power by the House of Representatives without debate and almost without consideration, was an expression of extreme anger, not of sober legislative judgment. A great service has been rendered to the Nation in the Senate, we think, by the insistence of Senators PEPPER and MORSE and TAFT and MURRAY that real and serious deliberation precede the enactment of any law so novel and so drastic. Theirs has been a soundly sobering influence. It has afforded opportunity for reflection. And reflection forces a recognition that nothing less is at stake here than a fundamental of our society.

Let us not shatter this fundament recklessly or needlessly. A government made too powerful is at least as perilous as a government not powerful enough. Balance has been always the American watchword. Balance between the powers of the Government and the rights of the people is the key to freedom. Let us preserve that balance now.

Iran Gives Up Opium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to report that the Government of Iran has issued an edict forbidding cultivation of the opium poppy after the harvest of the present year's crop. This action marks a long step forward in the long fight against one of the world's worst destroyers of human life and character.

During the almost 50 years since the United States took over the Philippines and promptly destroyed the opium monopoly there, it has led in a crusade to control world traffic in this deadly drug and its derivatives. It soon became apparent that success would be impossible as long as opium was being freely grown in many parts of the world, because traffic in it is so lucrative, and smuggling is so difficult to discover and eliminate. Therefore, the United States for several decades has consistently maintained that the only way to get on top of this problem is to strike at its source; namely, the growth of the poppy. It was difficult to get cooperation from any countries, especially those with colonies in Asia which maintained opium monopolies as a source of revenue.

During the last war the British and Dutch Governments announced that when they recovered their territories in Asia from Japanese control they would not reestablish the opium monopolies there. Most of the evidence indicates that this new policy has been followed faithfully, except perhaps in the case of Burma, where conditions have not yet been finally determined.

The British and Dutch Governments stated frankly that the success of their new policy would largely depend on the degree of success attained in cutting down world production of opium. Therefore, I introduced a resolution which was enacted and approved on July 1, 1944, asking the President to approach the governments of all countries where opium is grown, urging them to restrict their production to the world's legitimate needs for scientific and medical purposes.

Afghanistan was the first nation to respond. Now Iran has also agreed to go along. It has been the largest source of opium in illicit trade. All who are familiar with the problem recognize that the internal and external troubles of the Iranian Government are so great that it cannot be expected to eliminate cultivation of the drug immediately or entirely, any more than we in America are able to eliminate or even control the black market, for example, in meat. So much of Iran's agriculture has been based on opium that it will be a real problem to get it converted to growing of crops which will be beneficial rather than injurious to the health and vigor of its people. We and other countries should be sympathetic and helpful in assisting this transition.

Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of great satisfaction that the Government of Iran has made this public declaration of its moral responsibility and its determination to eliminate the growth of the opium poppy, which has proved such a curse to its own people and to victims of the terrible habit throughout the world.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a news dispatch from Tehran:

[Translation]

IRAN GIVES UP OPIUM

(By Haig Nicholson)

TEHRAN, May 20, 1946.—Officially this is the last opium-poppy crop which is now growing in Iran. M. Ghavam es Saltaneh decreed on April 10, 1946, that after the harvest of the fruit of the red and white flowers which ripen on all the hillsides of Iran, the cultivation of the opium poppy would cease.

The licensed traders will no longer be able to carry on their work and the large stocks of existing opium will be exported or reserved for medical use. This decision of the government will be difficult to enforce; this is

freely admitted because it will be easy to carry on production in the widely separated regions where supervision is difficult. But, according to an authorized spokesman of the government, the problem is being seriously examined.

Poppy cultivation, which extends over large regions and especially in the provinces of Isphahan, Chiraz, and Kazeroun, forms a picturesque landscape. The plants await the skilled hand which knows how to extract the "tears" of a juice resembling sap which become little balls that give pleasure to those who use it moderately by smoking or eating and forgetfulness to those poisoned.

They say that opium was introduced into Iran by the Chinese who came to Isphahan, a center of manufacture of Persian rugs and jewelry, to teach their art. However that may be, the largest part of the production of opium in Iran in 1937–38 (at the time this product was recognized as one of the major exports of the country and attained a value of £500,000 sterling), was directed to Japan which sent it to the people of Manchuria.

For a number of years opium production in Iran has been a monopoly of the government. But as a result of the mercenary character of the officials charged with estimating the poppy crop, of gathering it, and of levying the taxes, the opium was being sold at 10 times more outside of the government monopoly than by the monopoly. Caravans of camels came from far-off regions, stopped at the farms and collected opium in order to sell it in the cities unknown to the authorities.

It is estimated that in Iran, where statistics shine by their absence, one adult in three or five (men and women) take opium. In certain regions of the country half the adult population is addicted to this drug. Two-thirds of the addicts of the country consider this drug much as an Englishman regards his whisky and soda, one thing which should not be abused. The other third are the ones who are poisoned. One hears it said that servants quiet children in their care by coating their lips with opium.

As compensation for the loss of profits resulting from the prohibition of opium, they are inviting the cultivators to plant other things such as sugar beets. At the same time the medical authorities are taking measures which are sometimes successful to cure the addicts of this habit, recognized as dangerous to the body and to the mind.

Memorial Day, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an editorial from the National Tribune—the Stars and Stripes of May 30, 1946.

It contains the spirit of America and those principles for which men have died throughout the ages. If freedom and self-government is to be preserved then sacrifices and devotion to duty and country of those who have fought the Nation's battles must be kept forever green and fresh in the memory of the American people.

On the 5th of May just 78 years ago, Gen. John A. Logan, hero of the Civil War and Commander in Chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, issued his now famous General Order No. 11. These designated May 30 as Memorial Day, to be observed in every city, village, and hamlet churchyard in the land where lay the remains of those of his comrades who had fought to preserve the Union. The orders paid fond tribute to the gallant dead "who made their breasts a barricade between our country and its foes," and they called upon those who survived to strew upon the hallowed mounds the choicest flowers of springtime, and to keep ever green in memory the sacrifices which had been exacted.

As years have passed and the last bugle call has sounded over all but a few score of the more than 2,000,000 Boys in Blue, the charge to guard with sacred vigilance the last resting places of those who died, and to protect the principles for which they gave their all, has been taken over by younger hands. The day itself has become one devoted to the memory of other valiant dead because, with the passing of time, other wars have entailed further sacrifices and hundreds of thousands more from the youth of America have paid the penalty of armed conflict.

"Let no vandalism of avarice or neglect, no ravages of time, testify to the present or to the coming generations that we have forgotten, as a people, the cost of a free and undivided republic," was penned by General Logan in those orders creating Memorial Day. They were a challenge alike to those who survived the horrors of civil strife and to coming ages that must carry the banner of freedom. Logan's orders were written nearly four-score years ago. They were accepted by men who bared their breasts to a foreign foe in 1898 and through 4 years to follow. They were passed on to another generation in 1917–18 and to their sons who fought during the 4½ years just passed. Those costs of a free and undivided republic took into uniform nearly 20,000,000 patriots and, of them, more than a million and a quarter died or shed their blood. In the light of present-day events, it is, therefore, appropriate to ask ourselves whether or not we as a Nation are keeping faith with the millions who have offered themselves with inspired fervor and whether those who were struck down in battle are remembered as they should be.

This is Memorial Day. The stars look down on myriads of mounds beneath which lie the remains of those who fought wars to end wars. Over countless crosses in faraway lands there hangs a silence that is a deafening cry for justice to those who mourn the loss of them who sleep beneath the warm, brown earth. We lay wreaths. We think back in homage to loved ones who have left our midst. The Nation views with pride and deepest gratitude the victories of these fighting men. It feels humble when it recalls their heroism, their stubborn will to win. Almost unheard-of courage and privations yet to be recorded are not forgotten—these were a down payment in struggles to eliminate inhumanity from the world, to make of it a safe haven in which unborn generations have still to live. The burden to protect and honor the memories of our courageous dead is ours, and today is one in which our souls should be searched to see if we are worthy of the price that has been paid.

America cannot live forever in a structure gilded by the promises of leaders whose capabilities have been tested and are found wanting. To those of us who have worn our country's uniform and have witnessed evil machines of war mastered by alien hands and used to promote the destruction of everything that we have had and every ideal that we cherish dearly, this day calls for action. The awful sacrifices that have been made are due largely to a lack of the vigilance that Logan demanded, to a failure to scrutinize the actions of leaders who have trodden forbidden paths, to a refusal to learn fully the lessons of war, to a neglect to stamp out the causes of war before it reared its ugly head in defiance of mankind. We have ourselves to blame for permitting ourselves to be caught in the trap of war.

The present unsavory conditions abroad are not the fault of the military. A demand from home compelled a faster rate of demobilization than was ever contemplated. The Congress and the homefolk refuse to recognize existing dangers and prevent a muster of strength that is essential to satisfy our commitments in Asia and in Europe. Men in uniform, who never saw a day of military schooling, form "military governments" that speak for the mightiest nation on earth and yet are incapable of enforcing the feeblest of their edicts and are not old enough or sufficiently experienced to know how to justify them. Some such representatives, may it be said, have not one iota of sympathy for the aims and purposes of the country that employs them. Under such conditions the weather centers of world disturbance must remain uncharted. To people who brought on world-wide catastrophe and who can understand rule by might alone, we make ourselves ridiculous. We invite the scorn of former allies who will not collaborate with us in our show of weakness. We invite for ourselves another world war.

As this is written, we permit at home an economic chaos that is due only to a contemptible lack of courage on the part of elected representatives whose personal ambitions are made paramount to the requirements of state. Political considerations are given priority over their country's safety. What we have now at stake is tremendous in its implications. Our liberty, our freedom, our form of government and our very way of life are threatened. Unless we uphold the hands of the military, enhance its strength and put it in absolute charge of occupied territories for years to come, unless we prepare ourselves to speak as equals with those who deplore our weakness, unless our leadership buries its internal differences and exhibits once more those characteristics that have made men fight and die and speak pridefully of the greatness of their homeland, only some power of the Infinite can save us.

We have no choice on this day of consecration except to devote ourselves to courses that we know must lead to the building of a greater and stronger America, and so assure the lasting peace that can be the promise of tomorrow. As our people respond, to pay proper tribute to those who have died that we might live, and as they realize that only the accumulated praise of all time can pay them honest obeisance, they should recall, too, that but a few feet of earth separates the dead from the living. These, our honored dead, have devoted themselves to their country and to their loved ones; they expect no less from us who can build, if we will, upon the foundations they laid so well, so nobly, and with such willing sacrifice. Tomorrow is another day. It is not far distant. It is so near that it is never far away. It is for us, the living, to ponder now what we shall do in memory of the legions that have passed, and in passing have said:

"If I should die, think only this of me:
I kept the faith.
If you, my friend, would follow in my step,
Keep, too, that faith."

Proposed Amendments to the Wage-Hour Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose behind the American Constitu-

tion which, said Gladstone, "was the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man," was to give to the individual citizen and to the States the greatest possible degree of freedom consistent with national existence.

Individual citizens were left free to deal with each other in their social and business activities.

The Federal Government was given authority to protect, but only to protect, the citizen and the state in those fields where it was inexpedient or impossible for the States to effectively act.

The growth in population, the increase and the centralization of industries drew ever-increasing numbers of workers to their doors until finally, to protect the health and welfare of such workers, legislation labeled "fair-labor standards" became necessary to protect the workers from greedy and powerful individuals and corporations.

Unfortunately, the power conferred upon a Federal bureau by the wage-hour law created a desire for greater power until the abuses imposed upon our colonial forefathers by George III, of which they complained so bitterly and which they fought so desperately to end, were mild in comparison to those today imposed upon us by the Washington bureaucrats.

The minimum-wage law affecting private industry, first enacted in June of 1938, was based upon the findings by Congress that the existence in industries engaged in commerce, of labor conditions detrimental to the health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers, rendered wage-hour legislation necessary.

The purpose of the legislation then and subsequently enacted was to correct and to eliminate the conditions then found to exist in such industries, without substantially curtailing employment or earning power.

Unfortunately, Congress, under pressure from labor groups, swung far to the left and enacted legislation which in some fields substantially curtailed employment and earning power in some locations.

This it did by making it impossible for some small employers to compete with large corporations; by denying employment to some workers incapable of earning the minimum wage.

Not every worker is capable of earning either the minimum wage which has heretofore been fixed or the minimum wage which it is now proposed to fix.

It was Henry Wallace who wrote, "Five cents an hour is too high if the worker doesn't earn it."

Many an individual, some Senators and Congressmen, thrown out of his job, dependent upon his daily toil for his livelihood, would find that he could not obtain, was not capable of holding a job in General Electric, in the motor, or the steel industries, where far more than the minimum wage is actually paid. Because he could not earn the minimum wage, the corporation would not want him. Because it could not lawfully pay him less, it could not hire him.

May I ask the proponents of this legislation what that man is to do for a livelihood?

There has been an ever-increasing tendency on the part of pressure groups and the lawmakers to extend wage-hour legislation to additional groups of employees where there is no mass employment; where employees were able, either individually or through their union organizations, to successfully bargain with employers.

In the mass-production industries, where formerly protection from greedy employers who exploited workers was necessary, today the minimum wage paid is much higher than the minimum fixed by law.

The logical effect of wage-hour legislation has been, and will continue to be, to create monopolies, great concentrations of capital and of labor, where capital, ever alert, will because of its almost unlimited resources, be able to devise and obtain labor-saving machinery, the use of which will put both the employee and the employer in outlying districts at a distinct disadvantage.

The war has demonstrated that workers from the rural communities, because of the higher wages, are attracted to the cities, to the large industrial centers.

If the wage-hour law is extended to rural communities, to small industries, small employers will be forced out of existence and with them will go the jobs they create.

If this shift of population is encouraged by the extension of the wage-hour law, we may shortly find ourselves with a scarcity of food because farm workers and workers in smaller cities have left for the higher-paid jobs in industrial centers. We may find ourselves with an ever smaller number of industrial plants scattered throughout the country.

If our people want all industry centralized in a few large cities, where the people live in barracks or in homes, each a replica of the other; if we wish to do away with rural and suburban life, then wage-hour legislation is one way to accomplish that result, one way to create an aristocracy of labor by freezing out small competitors.

It is one way to render it impossible for those incapable of earning the minimum wage fixed by law to find a job; to be self-supporting or to contribute to their own support by their labor.

A Nation-wide minimum wage greater than the employer of small numbers of employees can pay will lessen the number of jobs; deprive those incapable of earning the minimum wage of all opportunity of employment.

Gravest Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an interesting and timely editorial which appeared in the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass, on Friday, May 24, 1946:

GRAVEST CRISIS

As a result of the Nation-wide railroad strike now in effect, the United States stands on the brink of utter chaos, with the American people fearfully facing the future and looking hopefully to Washington, D. C., for quick, decisive Federal Government action to correct the situation and restore order before the results become catastrophic.

There is the possibility that the labor leaders heading the unions which have forced this ruinous strike upon the Nation may realize the enormity of their error in judgment and call it off, but that is remote. They had weeks to consider all angles of the matter before setting last Saturday's 5 p. m. dead line and then five more days to ponder during the period of postponement. When those leaders still chose to initiate a strike against the Government and the public, it seems certain that nothing will bring them to their senses but the drastic action in the National Capital the situation demands.

Nobody has any illusions about the effectiveness of the railroad strike. A prolonged coal strike would cause the same general result by slow strangulation, but the rail strike is comparable to quick paralysis in its results to the entire country. Already there is far-reaching confusion, with consequent unemployment and adverse effect on business and industry. With the wheels of the railroads stopped, the wheels of industry soon must follow. Fortunately mild weather eliminates any problem regarding movements of fuel for heating, but one does exist for fuel for manufacturing. Far more important, though, food stocks in local communities will be exhausted in a matter of days and if the railroad strike prevents securing new supplies, hunger and even starvation will prevail in the land, with the sick, the young, and the old being the worst sufferers.

Short-sighted labor leaders willing to be responsible for such a catastrophe in an endeavor to secure relatively slight benefits in wages and working conditions for their supine followers will have the dubious distinction of doing more disastrous damage to the United States in just a few days than the Axis powers could accomplish in over 3 years of war. As a consequence, their right to be regarded as real Americans can be questioned reasonably.

When a foreign enemy strikes from without Congress and the President act at once dynamically and decisively to combat the threat to the Nation and a comparable move is in order when the crippling blow is hit from within the country. Like ex-President Calvin Coolidge in the 1920 Boston police strike, President Truman and Congress can make history by immediate drastic action against present-day labor leaders imperiling the welfare of the American people and the future of the United States. Such action will convince those leaders that neither they, nor anybody else, have the right to strike against public safety and security any time, any place, or under any conditions. Beyond any question, such steps would receive overwhelming Nation-wide approval.

Resolution on Orphaned European Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, there are now nearly 2,000 orphaned children under the age of 17 interned in camps

within our occupation zone in central Europe.

America does not make war on children, nor is it a proper part of military duty for American occupation troops to run nurseries and kindergartens for homeless orphans whom the backwash of war has left at our mercy.

Yet these young people are our national responsibility. Their future is entirely in our hands. We can neglect them, or we can see they are given a fair chance to become decent, self-respecting, and possibly outstanding citizens of the world. In either case, our action will decide.

Luckily for them, and as an encouraging mark for our national conscience, many American organizations of every creed and kind have expressed an eager willingness to assume financial and educational responsibility for any of these children whom we will permit to enter the United States.

Only one thing stands in the way of fulfilling this humanitarian offer. That is the legal barrier of red tape; a barrier which enactment of this resolution would remove for these specific cases.

I want to point out that this resolution does not seek to impair the regular acts now in force governing immigration to this country. It creates no precedent upon which subsequent applicants can base claims for admission. Its only purpose is to secure for this specific group of infants and children and youths an opportunity for self-development. By accident of war they are at this moment actual wards of our military and civil government overseas. Let us give to the world an example of guardianship which befits the moral stature of our Nation.

Herewith is the text of the resolution introduced by me today on this matter:

Joint resolution authorizing the admission into the United States, as nonquota immigrants, of certain orphan children now interned within the American Zone of occupation in Europe

Whereas there are approximately 1,200 young persons under the age of 17 years now interned in various camps in Europe under the jurisdiction of the American Military Government; and

Whereas these 1,200 young persons are under the age of 17 years, and are without known relatives in the various countries in which they formerly resided and from which they were driven as a result of the recent war; and

Whereas these young persons are unable, in the present unsettled state of Europe, to find sufficient food, clothing, and shelter or adequate means of education or reasonable opportunity to develop their natural talents; and

Whereas numerous organizations such as the Boy Scouts, the American Legion, and nearly all religious groups are on record as advocating that particular care be given, and attention paid to the displaced and dispossessed children who are innocent victims of war: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding any provision of the immigration laws to the contrary, any child, bereaved by loss of both father and mother, who (a) has not attained the age of 17 years, and (b) is interned in any camp under the jurisdiction of the American Military Government in Europe shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence as a nonquota immigrant. No such child shall be admitted unless assurances satisfactory to the Attorney General are given that such child will be supported and properly cared for through the voluntary action of responsible citizens or responsible private organizations of the United States and consequently will not become a public charge. The total number of children who may be admitted to the United States under this act shall not exceed 2,000.

No Right To Strike Against America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the most outstanding and important issue facing our Nation today is whether any group, representative of industry or labor, can strike against the Government. There can be but one answer. There is no right to strike against America. As the President has so well and forcibly said, "The welfare of the country must come first."

The issue in the railroad and coal mining disputes is no longer solely between management and men. Failure of representatives of the railroad and coal mining industries and workers in these industries to agree between themselves required the President in the public interest to take over for Government operation these two great industries.

The operation of these industries is unquestionably vital to the welfare of our people. Without the operation of either the health, progress, and well-being of our people would be seriously threatened. Without both the result would be disastrous. Cessation of operation is unthinkable. It cannot be tolerated.

The bill presented on behalf of the President is the result of an emergency that cannot continue without bringing distress to our people, ruin to industry, and chaos to our economic structure. It would threaten the very structure of Government. The final result could be one that no patriotic American would wish to contemplate.

Maintenance of the sovereignty of our Government is at stake. In such a case can there be any duty we owe to our country of greater magnitude than to preserve, by whatever means necessary, the sovereignty of our Government? It is the source of all the freedoms we hold dear and the means by which they are made secure.

The legislation proposed by the President is more sweeping in its grants of power than Congress would willingly give except in the greatest emergency. Such an emergency does exist.

It may be that some of the powers conferred upon the President by this bill, or the penalties provided, are questionable or inadvisable. It is unfortunate that the bill comes before the House under rules that do not permit any amendments to be offered. It, therefore, leaves no alternative to the membership of the House than to vote for or against the bill as it is. Had the opportunity to amend been possible, I am quite certain amendments would have been made, particularly with reference to the right to draft workers into the Army and confiscate profits of business.

However, regardless of the propriety of possible amendments, the fact remains that the underlying purpose of the bill is to establish in the President of the United States, as representative of all the people, the necessary authority to assert the sovereign power of the Government to protect the welfare of the people and their Government. To the maintenance of this principle I unqualifiedly give my support.

They Have Sown the Wind and They Reap the Whirlwind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregon Daily Journal of May 25, 1946, and also editorials from the Oregonian of May 24 and May 25, 1949:

[From the Oregon Daily Journal, Portland, Oreg., of May 25, 1946]

THEY HAVE SOWN THE WIND AND THEY REAP A WHIRLWIND

At midnight tonight the truce in the coal strike expires. The coal strike had all but been forgotten. The formidable figure of John L. Lewis had been retired to a corner, the place he has held these weeks in the national spotlight taken by two other labor leaders, Alvanley Johnston, president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen. Even if the miners returned to work there would be no cars to haul the fuel until the rail unions permitted.

As the rail strike moves with spectacular swiftness toward decision, as the President, who should have spoken before, speaks boldly and as the dilatory Congress professes readiness to adopt any strike-breaking legislation the President may recommend, this history-making day has demonstrated impressively the interdependence of all American groups, including interdependence of labor unions.

The rail crisis is before the Congress, brought to it by the President. The crisis is before the people of the United States, their activities interrupted by the paralysis of rail transportation. But the crisis is also before the Nation's labor unions who must, by this time, see that the power within a union, or within the boss of that union, has reached a point where it can impose calamity upon all.

The strike as an instrumentality of labor-management adjustment has been repudiated by the havoc it plays upon labor.

The Congress has no choice but to place such walkouts as the rail strike beyond the pale of law.

This is President Truman's demand. This is the demand of the American public.

No matter how legitimate the demands of the rail unions, Whitney and Johnston, on behalf of the trainmen and engineers, went too far. No matter how just may be the answer by some of the striking railroad unions that the President overlooked the fault of railroad operators in his indictment of the union leaders, they had led the Nation to the brink of economic collapse. The peril they created outweighed the gains they sought.

They had thrown millions of their fellow American workers out of their jobs. They had threatened whole segments of the American population with hunger. They had left perishables spoiling beside the tracks. They had blocked the wheels of factories across the land. They had given the emergency housing program a setback. They had accentuated the brownouts of cities where lights already were dim.

But there was no penalty imposed by the strike that was more poignantly felt than the stagnation created in the mercy movement of food relief to the famine-stricken millions in the former war zones of Europe and America. Americans could take a good deal. They have. But the quality of sympathy in the American heart could not look without horror upon withholding of food from famine victims, especially the children.

We know that if politics and pressures had not clouded the realities of national necessity, and if a strong but fair position had been taken earlier, the rail strike could have been averted. It is possible that the coal strike might have been averted, although the irascible personality of John L. Lewis creates a doubt. But if the rail strike has taught a lesson almost equal to that of national and world-wide interdependence, it is that politics has no place in labor controversy.

Economic paralysis knows no politics. The political fortunes of President Truman or of any Member of the Senate or the House do not transcend the interest of the people.

Today the United States deals with a crisis more serious economically than any situation of the war.

But let us not indulge in the folly of recrimination. It will serve no good to say that the traditionally steady, dependable, railroad workers are betraying their country or that railroad ownership is false to the principles of humanity in refusing to pay labor its just hire.

There was no transportation strike in war. There was no stifling production strike. No foreign enemy could compel any American group to do what has now been done within the country. Had the same thing happened after the Axis nations attacked, we would today be a defeated and subject people.

The Government did not take over the railroads during World War II as in World War I. This was a pledge of confidence to private operation—to workers and to managers. It was a pledge fully met.

The fact which labor overlooks, which the President and the Congress overlook and which the public is prone to overlook, is that only the shooting war is over. The war has not been legally ended. The war emergency will not be ended until the Nation has been retooled for peace and until reconversion is an accomplished fact.

What is the basis of the rail strike:

1. A flat 18-percent wage increase was demanded by the brotherhoods of locomotive engineers and trainmen. A fact-finding board recommended 16½ cents an hour increase. President Truman proposed 18½ cents, the equivalent of 16 percent.

2. Changes in basic rules—engineers and firemen shall not throw switches; crews shall be released at terminals without being required to make return trips; extra "pilot crews" would move trains from one line in operations on "foreign rails"; trainmen at court to receive an extra day's pay and expenses; coal to be kept within fireman's reach; engineers must be paid extra for each additional unit of multiple-unit locomotives; watches must be furnished at cost and maintained by the company; uniforms must be furnished, cleaned, and pressed by the company; in locomotives there must be installed drinking water, windshields, seats, and other comforts. It was estimated that the proposed changes in rules would cost about $800,000,000 a year. The fact-finding board threw up its hands, asked that qualified experts serve as arbitrators.

There are 20 railroad unions. The strike was precipitated by two of them—the engineers and the trainmen. It was a case of minority rule in the brotherhoods. Such a strike goes against the American principle of rule by the majority within the railroad workers themselves. It is, of course, against the will of the American majority whose very existence is jeopardized.

The rail leaders know now they sowed the wind and are reaping the whirlwind. The Congress knows it cannot equivocate longer. But the American people want results that are effective, yet equitable. They do not want reprisal legislation angrily drafted and impulsively passed. They want cure and not salve.

The world is watching. May there be from this travail a new concept of democracy. May there be in progress toward one world a unified nation.

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of May 24, 1946]

THE TEST

It seems to us an inescapable conclusion that if the men involved in this railroad strike succeed in winning, at least conclusively, they will have gone a long way toward destroying the Government and the way of life which most of them, in their hearts, love as much as the rest of us.

The tragedy of it is that the implications of such a strike—a strike against the Government in a utility declared to be essential to the whole people—are too intricate for the man who runs to read.

The men are being loyal to their unions. They are being loyal to organizations which have had outstanding success through the years and have contributed much to the betterment of working conditions and wages. It requires concentration and application and almost a legal turn of mind, to see why the present persistence in the railroad strike threatens to bring about a situation under which none of us could strike because none of us would be free. And the men have not given that application. So we are in a crisis which will go far toward determining America's future course in the world.

This is what it boils down to:

If the railroad workers can strike after the roads have been taken over by the Government and declared essential to the life of the whole people, then there is no apparent limit on the right to strike. Dissatisfied soldiers and sailors can leave us without an army and navy. Dissatisfied police can leave society without protection. Dissatisfied unions can cut off our water supply.

So this appears to be the occasion for deciding whether, in the new America, the whole people is to have rights superior to any of its parts. If no such rights are asserted and maintained, then we move into a period of confusion and disintegration, which could only end in the establishment of some new type of power. No nation could endure under the pressure of various unions threatening it with starvation, thirst, and paralysis from all the possible sources.

[From the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of May 25, 1946]

BY 4 P. M.

President Truman's report to the Nation on the strike situation was sadly inadequate in itself, and unless his recommendations to Congress this afternoon go far beyond anything foreshadowed in the report the country can well be in for a most difficult time.

We appreciate that many people, influenced by the President's earnestness and his excellent summary of the hardships imposed by the railroad tie-up, will consider this a harsh judgment.

But what, really, does it matter that Mr. Truman's heart is in the right place? What, really, is the importance of his summary of the difficulties imposed by the strike? We all know those. They are what the fuss is about. The essence of the matter lies in Mr. Truman's program for correcting the situation, and in that particular the President's address was an evasion, when correctly analyzed.

There was just one paragraph in the President's address which had to do with positive action, and we give that paragraph entire:

"If sufficient workers to operate the trains have not returned by 4 p. m. tomorrow, as head of your Government I have no alternative but to operate the trains by using every means within my power. I shall call upon the Army to assist the Office of Defense Transportation in operating the trains and I shall ask our armed forces to furnish protection to every man who heeds the call of his country in this hour of need."

In other words, the President, so far as we can judge, does not intend to use present laws, or ask further laws, for bringing to justice the irresponsible principals in this strike. He does not intend to meet and defeat those who defy the Government and bring upon us, through a small group, the embarrassments of a general strike. His program, so far as one can determine thus far, is not offensive in any particular but entirely defensive. His only definite proposal is the calling in of the Army, and all of us know what a poor job the Army would do for a long time at least, in the highly technical job of running the railroads of the Nation. The flying of the mails is too fresh in our memories, and that was a mere exercise by comparison.

Patently, the answer to the railroad tie-up—and to the coal tie-up if it is reinstituted today—is not to be found in any passive resistance. It is not to be found in any declaration, or any effort, toward operation of the railroads, or possibly the coal mines, by Army personnel or any other untrained personnel.

If, as the President himself has stated, the railroads are essential to the life of the whole people, then the answer to the situation lies in bringing to justice those responsible for the strike, and the return to work of those responsible, by training, for the conduct of the roads. They have a duty to the country. One cannot be in essential work without sharing in that duty. And when Mr. Truman declares that he is calling in the Army, he is begging the whole question. It will do little good to the industry of the country to have the flag raised over the rail lines. And it will not feed Europe's and Asia's starving millions. What we want is not talk but the trains.

Office Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 29 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the May 1946 issue of the magazine Office Management and Equipment carries an article by me which I humbly commend to every one of my fellow Senators. It is on the subject of the morale of office staffs and it is entitled "Is Yours a Happy Office?" I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Is Yours a Happy Office?

(By Hon. Alexander Wiley, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

This is a mighty important question, because a happy office is a productive office. But what do I mean by "happy office"? I mean one in which everyone from the boss down to the charwoman enjoys the work and enjoys the work associates, and gives to the job his or her best.

"An impossibility," you may say, "an impractical dream—no such office exists." Well, perhaps so. Perhaps the nature of men and women is such that an entirely happy office can never be achieved under the stresses and strains of modern business life. But at least this represents an ideal which we, as employers or employees, can aim at.

Of course, by a "happy office" I do not mean a noisy, undisciplined madhouse where the employees have the time of their lives chattering, making personal calls, gold bricking, and so forth. Obviously, such an office is as incompatible with efficiency as is a ball-and-chain office, where terrorized employees sit sullenly at their desks, in mausoleum-like silence, doing their tasks, but anxiously awaiting the 5 o'clock whistle.

The findings of modern personnel management indicate that an office which avoids both of the above extremes and instead practices self-disciplined, spirited democracy with proper respect for authority achieves high output with a minimum of wear and tear on its workers and supervisors.

But perhaps you may be wondering at this point why I am at all interested in submitting this problem to you. There are several reasons.

First, I am interested in the problem of happy offices because I believe in happy people. Happiness is man's birthright. We were made to express joy, to radiate good will. Our constitutional Republic is dedicated to that ideal. Therefore, we should no more have dictatorship in the office than we would have dictatorship in the home or the school or the public forums. Wherever he is, the dignity of the American should be respected, his birthright should not be denied him, he should be treated like a human being.

WE CAN TEACH IT

American offices can teach office happiness to the world just as American Government can teach the way to achieve the people's happiness in governing themselves. We can teach that it is the happy citizen who achieves the greatest good for himself and his brothers, just as it is the happy office worker who is the best worker.

Second, I am interested in submitting this problem to you because the achievement of happiness in the office was my goal throughout my 30 years of running a private law practice. I found that true office happiness paid off in work dividends and spiritual dividends. And I believe that my findings can be duplicated in your own private enterprise.

Third, I have been interested in achieving happiness for the nine or so employees of Uncle Sam working with me in my office throughout my 7 years in the United States Senate. Only a happy senatorial office can possibly handle the 300 or so pieces of correspondence that come to us every day, in addition to the telegrams, the long distance phone calls, the visitors, the delegations, the lobbyists.

Part of that job consists of public relations. We want to make a sincerely good impression on all who come to our office or write to it or call it—a good impression not so much of the Senator but of the State we represent and, indeed, most important, of the United States Senate as a whole and of our form of government.

MEETING THE PROBLEM

This then is the background for my interest in this subject. May I now make a few suggestions on how the problem of achieving happy offices may be met:

1. By fairness and equity and employer-employee relationships: The best atmosphere for office happiness is, of course, that in which fair play prevails. Favoritism, discrimination, broken agreements, arbitrary rulings—all of these prove the bane of over-all employee satisfaction. When, however, the employee feels in his heart that he is getting a fair break and a square deal along with his associates, he has been given the indispensable condition for his contentment in the office.

2. By a personal relationship between the employer and the employee: The position of the United States Senator well deserves the respect of our citizens and of every employee working in a Senator's office. But I have never felt that the position commands abject subservience on the part of employees, that it is necessary to keep an unbridgeable distance between myself and them. Although we are almost continually busy, everyone of the employees in my "shop" has leave to bring to me any personal problems or subject of a personal nature at a convenient time. I, personally, try to work alongside my employees as the occasion warrants.

"HOLY OF HOLIES"

Why should any employer be treated as a "holy of holies" who can neither be seen nor heard by his employees? To treat him as such deprives the employees of knowledge and understanding of their employer and makes them rely on hearsay and gossip. It deprives them of a sense of personally "belonging" in their job.

On the other hand, if the employer were to greet his employees with a warm word in the morning and a kind word of farewell at night, if he were to make a thoughtful remark on the employee's health or that of some member of his family, if he were to graciously remember to mark in some slight way the employee's birthday or to make some appropriate gesture regarding the employee's wedding, surely these can have immeasurable beneficial effects on both the employer and the employee.

3. By encouraging teamwork. Satisfaction in a job well done is increased many-fold when that satisfaction can be shared with others. Teamwork is essential in the modern office. With tasks being specialized more and more, it is important that they be integrated by a spirit of mutual help and hope. Joint production goals must be set, just as individual goals should be devised for each employee. Each person should feel a joy in personal achievement and in helping others to accomplish their own jobs. When a particular employee is hard put to complete his assignment through no fault of his own but because, for example, of an unusually heavy day, he should be able to call upon others to pitch in wholeheartedly and help him. Almost all the advantages of specialization will be nullified if the office becomes a collection of smug, self-satisfied suboffices, each caring little for the other's progress, each interested only in performing its separate function.

4. By encouraging suggestions: If the employee is treated like a robot, he will behave like a robot, doing just so much and nothing more. If, on the other hand, he is encouraged to suggest ways and means for improving his job—saving men, money, materials, and time—then suggestions, often exceedingly profitable to business, will be forthcoming. Every suggestion, if it be sincere and carefully conceived, deserves the praise and gratitude of the employer. It deserves, too, his fair consideration. If it is proved feasible, the employee should be rewarded appropriately in some manner for the suggestion.

5. By encouraging growth: I like to feel that every employee who passes through my shop, spending a long or brief time with us, will have gained something from our company. Perhaps she will have increased her typing speed or her stenographic skill or he will have learned some new method of filing or may have picked up some bit of personal philosophy which may be helpful to him. But, in any case, the employee should be able to grow and should be encouraged to grow in the job—vocationally, emotionally, spiritually. As the employer helps the employee to grow, he, the employer, will find that he is growing, too.

Growth is the law of life. None of us must be guilty of arrested development. The office, to be sure, is not run in order to be a school, but there is no reason why it cannot informally stimulate individual self-development in very effective fashion.

These, then, are the ways in which the employer can help to increase his own happiness and to increase the happiness of those who spend approximately one-third of their daily living with him as he spends one-third of his daily life with them.

The Dead End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Centralia Sentinel of May 27, 1946:

THE DEAD END

The dramatic ending of the railroad strike insurrection by President Truman Saturday afternoon, and the capitulation of the two obstinate railroad organization heads let the Nation's strike-bound transportation system again steam up, and American life lines again function.

Belated though the Presidential action was, it was brave, and it was with a vast sigh of relief that the wheels again began turning.

The people generally, including probably the vast majority of the affected railroad men themselves, will applaud Mr. Truman for even his late action.

If such action is only just what it seems to mean to the people at large—a call for overdue legislation to make an end to the emergency, and not also subtly a cover to politically kill the Case bill for the permanent and long range relief of a suffering nation from dictatorial labor heads the applause will be more sincere.

This wait and see thought it not an unfair response to a patriotic act but the thoughtful public still has grievous memories of the personal bottle feeding of dictatorial labor leaders by Mr. Truman's predecessor and which have continued under Truman to a steady build-up to the inevitable chaos and explosion which logically has followed such selfish policies of the past. By successively created emergencies top labor heads have been taught to lay such purposely into the Presidential lap for grandiose political flourishes, so perhaps they, too, should not be blamed too much.

We wish to believe Mr. Truman has finally seen the dead-end of the road. We will believe that until Presidential acts to the contrary indicate otherwise, as many wise legislators on Capitol hill today say will later be shown.

The retaliatory threats by the labor heads, however, are nonsense, and would much better have been left unsaid.

We again repeat the welfare of all the people comes before the welfare of any group.

The Nation will watch now to see whether John L. Lewis is running the country, or Mr. Truman and his politically minded administration.

The Veteran in Civilian Life: Politics Versus Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Charles G. Bolte in the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday, May 26, 1946:

THE VETERAN IN CIVILIAN LIFE: POLITICS VERSUS JOBS—SNYDER ACCUSED OF SHELVING JUNE IS JOBS MONTH DRIVE BECAUSE, IN ELECTION YEAR, HE DIDN'T WANT TO ADVERTISE WIDESPREAD UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Charles G. Bolte)

Because of the rising tide of unemployment among veterans, it was reported in this space some weeks ago that the Retraining and Reemployment Administration had decided to launch a Nation-wide job-development campaign under the title of "June Is Jobs Month." It must now be revealed that June Is Jobs Month has been canceled, for reasons which are not edifying.

The original prospectus for June Is Jobs Month called for the initiation of comprehensive efforts toward stimulating employment and training opportunities, encouraging effective use of all resources in placing workers in jobs, and focusing public attention on the importance of productive work.

The campaign, involving the cooperation and coordination of Government, business, and trade groups, labor unions, and veterans' organizations, was to have aimed at the fullest development of job-placement, on-the-job-training, labor-market, and rehabilitation programs, to the end that all workers may have maximum opportunity for productive employment.

This prospectus was prepared some 6 weeks ago in the office of Maj. Gen. Graves B. Erskine, Chief of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration. It was, and remains, a valid prospectus, designed to improve the status of a goodly portion of the nearly 2,000,000 veterans who are now drawing unemployment compensation. Nevertheless, it will stand in the files as one proclamation which never saw a Presidential signature—at least, not in the month for which it was originally scheduled. Mr. John Snyder, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, has canceled the project.

Mr. Snyder's reasoning, according to the best available information, was simple. It involved three steps:

1. In an election year it is not wise to advertise widespread unemployment among veterans.

2. In certain skills there will be shortages of labor by next fall, which will take up the slack in these fields (although this will obviously not affect the 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 veterans who lack previous job experience, and for whom June Is Jobs Month was primarily designed).

3. The summer is a bad time to begin a job campaign, since there is usually a seasonal slump in unemployment which is made up after Labor Day.

It seems superfluous to point out that, according to these reliable sources, the political dynamite involved in the first step of Mr. Snyder's reasoning process was the determining factor.

This is not the first time that a politico has sought to evade responsibility for failing to solve a problem by pretending that the problem does not exist. Historians may wonder, however, if it might not have been the better part of valor, in this year of grace 1946, to face up to the complex questions arising out of hasty demobilization and speedy reconversion, to admit that one segment of the population was bound to suffer unduly, and to undertake ambitious enterprises for the alleviation of that suffering.

Certainly the 3,000,000 veterans who will, by best estimates, be drawing unemployment compensation by election day will not go to the polls believing that all's for the best simply because Mr. Snyder does not recognize their plight. And other voters, families and friends of the 3,000,000, may not be inclined to overlook this singularly unappetizing stratagem for avoiding a burning question.

Black Market in Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including herewith an interesting article by Mr. Frank Sinclair, feature staff writer for the Milwaukee Journal, which appeared in the May 27 issue of that paper:

BLACK MART ROLLS BUTTER INTO AMERICA'S DAIRYLAND—TRUCKS CARRY OVER-PRICED PRODUCT HERE FROM MINNESOTA AND IOWA, REPORTER FINDS

(By Frank Sinclair)

Black market butter from Iowa and Minnesota is coming into Wisconsin by freight, express, and motortruck because there is a shortage of butter in America's dairyland.

Motortrucks laden with over 2 tons of Iowa butter are stopping around the corner from groceries and meat markets. The drivers are offering to sell retailers 30 or more pounds of butter at around 65 cents a pound, at least 15 cents a pound over the wholesale ceiling.

Within the last 2 weeks, strangers who say they are from Iowa have been ringing doorbells in Milwaukee offering to sell Iowa, Minnesota, or Wisconsin butter at about 60 cents a pound, 4 to 6 cents over the retail ceiling, depending upon grade.

Tavern keepers in Milwaukee in recent days have been offered Iowa butter at 56 cents a pound in lots of 40 pounds to a ton—6½ cents a pound over wholesale ceiling. Some are reported to have bought and then sold butter to their tavern customers for as high as 75 cents a pound.

The situation in butter is an anomaly in metropolitan Milwaukee. Creameries claim that because there is no price ceiling on cream or manufactured milk, they have to pay so much for cream that they lose money selling butter at OPA ceilings. The big milk distributors say they are losing around $10,000 each a month in selling butter at OPA prices that cost them up to 5 cents a pound more to make. But they must provide butter for the trade to keep their customers from changing to milk companies that provide butter, even on a rationed basis.

YOU NEED A "FRIEND"

Some retailers who pay around 60 cents a pound—or about 8 to 10 cents over ceiling for butter—are selling it at ceiling. They use butter as a loss leader to hold good customers. But when they thus observe Federal price regulations they violate a State law that prohibits the use of loss leaders to attract business. Dairy industry spokesmen say they have definite knowledge that this is going on.

It is easy to buy black-market butter in southern Wisconsin if you have "a friend" to vouch for your "trustworthiness." That is how the writer got butter last week in a Waukesha County store where the retailer disclosed his secrets on the promise of anonymity. The dealer said he gets his butter by train or truck from Iowa, paying 3 cents a pound over wholesale ceiling for it. He sold the writer 2 pounds at 55 cents a pound. That was only 1 cent a pound over ceiling, since the butter was 92 score or lower (93 score is the best). But, regular customers who ask no questions and return for more butter are charged 75 cents a pound. They must, however, buy other items. That violates the OPA prohibition against tie-in sales, but tie-ins are prevalent in Milwaukee and southern Wisconsin, according to Lee K. Beznor, OPA enforcement attorney.

It is next to impossible to get butter if you are not known, even in places that are black marketing. The best the writer could do in such places was a quarter of a pound in a north-side Milwaukee store at 14 cents, which was ceiling. Persons who know, however, say that that store charges trusted customers 65 cents a pound—11 cents over ceiling—but they pay to get butter regularly.

The way the black market operates, plus the fact that folks who otherwise are strong for law enforcement don't blush at paying over ceiling, makes it difficult for OPA to catch violators with its small staff of investigators, and fewer complaints being made than formerly.

However, the OPA shortly will bring a dealer into court who has been buying butter in 50-pound lots from Minnesota and selling it around Wisconsin at 60 to 80 cents a pound—4 to 24 cents over top ceiling. This butter, as does all black-market butter, varies in grade. That dealer buys at 4 cents a pound over wholesale ceiling and makes his shipments by express.

Two employees of a Wisconsin industrial plant soon will be prosecuted for selling butter, imported from Iowa, at 75 cents a pound to friends.

A Milwaukee County filling station operator will be called to account for selling butter at 75 to 85 cents a pound in 1- to 3-pound lots. He buys from a wholesaler, and sells only to those who buy gasoline regularly.

The OPA has a line on a Wisconsin creamery that is shipping butter east at over ceiling. Several other creameries within 50 miles of Milwaukee are selling butter at 60 to 75 cents a pound.

SALES VIA TELEPHONE

Deals for large quantities of butter are made over the telephone or with no witnesses. Yet some take little precaution, as did the man the other night who apparently sold 7,000 pounds in 15 minutes over the telephone from a country tavern between Milwaukee and Pewaukee, while 25 persons listened. He'd put a nickel in the slot, open the conversation by saying, "I've got butter." He went on, "It's 65 cents if you'll take all I got—1,400 pounds. Okay. Deliver it in the morning." Five times he dropped a nickel in the slot and five times he said the same thing.

Butter in this manner, but in smaller quantities, is finding its way into night clubs, resorts, restaurants and similar places, according to the dairy industry. The bill of

sale is at ceiling with the balance handed over in cash.

One deal offered to Milwaukee taverns came by mail, a mimeographed letter from Sheldon, Iowa, signed, "George Bikop." In return for a certified check or a cashier's check, Bikop said he would send 40 to 2,000 pounds at 56 cents a pound. He wrote, "We sell only to tavern keepers in Milwaukee and all transactions are confidential. By getting butter, a scarce article, in Milwaukee, you can keep your customers satisfied. Spread the word around."

A tavern near Cedarburg on a recent Saturday night sold 100 pounds of butter at 75 cents to patrons, according to a man who was there.

The lure of the black market is difficult for some restaurant men to avoid since their supply has been cut to 30 percent of normal within the last week.

"What's a fellow to do when his customers yell if he serves jelly instead of butter and they threaten to go somewhere else to eat?" said a restaurant association leader. "People driving to Iowa and Minnesota bring butter in and offer it to restaurants at about 65 cents a pound. Some restaurants are buying it."

These truckers bring in as much as 5,500 pounds a week, selling it also to filling stations, jobbers, meat markets, grocers, clubs, and night clubs.

One large Milwaukee restaurant is buying 250 pounds at a time direct from a creamery for 5 cents over creamery ceiling. That eliminates the middle man, but the price paid is in violation of OPA.

Violation of ceiling prices is easy to get away with because most persons have no idea what the ceilings are. A Milwaukee west side woman, who paid 60 cents for a pound from a young chap who said he trucked it in from Iowa, was surprised to learn from this reporter that she had paid at least 4 cents over ceiling. She was surprised again when she found that the 58 cents she said a neighbor paid her regular butter dealer was 2 cents or better over ceiling. "But," she said, "we've had no butter in our house for 2 weeks and nowadays you pay what they ask."

BUTTER SOOTHES CUSTOMERS

Some salesmen, railroad men, and others who travel, buy butter in Iowa, Minnesota, and other States at creameries and wholesalers at 55 cents a pound—7 cents over ceiling on such purchases—and sell it at home. Even if they do so at 55 cents, they have violated ceiling. Salesmen, who formerly took a customer out to dinner, now give or sell a customer butter to keep him friendly.

Much of the situation is created by the fact that the farmer is paid from 70 cents to $1.88 more for whole milk delivered to eastern cities than the $3.15 offered in the Milwaukee market, and because cream prices, lacking a ceiling, have soared.

Milwaukee is getting 5 percent less milk than 5 years ago, and much Wisconsin milk and cream is moving eastward. Less butter is made in Wisconsin than formerly even though Wisconsin milk production for January, February, and March was 197,000,000 pounds more than the first quarter of 1945. The State's butter output is 40 percent less than last year. National milk production meantime dropped 833,000,000 pounds the first 3 months of this year. Butter churned nationally last year was only 900,000 pounds, less than half what was made in 1941, and butter production has taken a further drop of more than 25 percent. Twenty percent of the Nation's creameries have closed, pulling Wisconsin butter increasingly into the black market, according to State department of agriculture authorities.

BUTTER PRODUCTION COST

Under these conditions, with cream worth 75 cents a pound for butterfat, and some of it selling at $1, one Milwaukee dairy said that it costs at least 61 cents to make a pound of butter, 5 cents over retail ceiling.

A Milwaukee housewife who thought it might be cheaper to make butter bought whipping cream, got out her mixer and found her costs went over $1 a pound.

Complications have hampered the big milk companies. One firm bought cream and had a creamery churn it, losing 10 cents a pound but taking the loss to keep milk-route customers. The OPA jumped in and said that arrangement was illegal. Now, it is permissible to lease the creamery and take all its output as long as the butter is sold within ceiling range.

Labor Unrest and OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address to be delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] on Sunday next:

Good afternoon, folks. In these times of trouble and confusion, I want to make a report to you people I represent and tell you what I and other Members of the House of Representatives have tried to do about it.

Naturally much criticism over the radio and through the press has been directed at Congress as a whole because its Members did not take action.

I want to give you some facts today and tell you the truth so you will be able to give credit where it is due and place the blame where it belongs.

Congress is made up, as you know, of two branches. If the House of Representatives passes legislation in an effort to prevent strikes or affecting OPA, or any legislation, it cannot become law until it is passed by the Senate and later signed by the President.

Let me explain what the House of Representatives has done to try to prevent these strikes and what the Senate and the President have not done, until Saturday, May 25, when the President and the Senate finally decided to act.

Three years ago when Mr. Lewis called the coal strike during the war, and when over 150,000 people were striking in other plants, the Congress acted courageously and decisively. It passed the War Labor Disputes Act giving the President the power to seize any plant or mine where a strike was called which would slow down production. The late President Roosevelt opposed this bill and vetoed it. The House and Senate passed it over his veto.

This legislation is the law today which gave President Truman the authority under which he seized the railroads and the authority under which he could have seized the mines when the strikes first started.

Six months ago we passed the Hobbs bill to protect the farmers against violence so they could deliver farm products to the cities.

Three months ago when the General Motors strike was on, when other strikes were slowing down the production of refrigerators, washing machines, electrical appliances, and farm machinery, and everything, the House of Representatives, in which I serve, courageously and quickly moved to protect the interest of the general public by passing what was known as the Case bill. Here, again, President Truman opposed this bill, but the House of Representatives passed it by a big majority and sent it over to the Senate. Those representing the administration in the Senate refused and blocked consideration of the Case bill for the past 3 months.

If the President would have supported the Case bill then, the Senate would have passed it promptly and I believe it would have been helpful in effecting an agreement on the issues involved in the coal strike in bringing about a settlement without it paralyzing the Nation as it has done.

The coal strike followed. Then came the railroad strike paralyzing the business of the Nation, the people began to suffer everywhere, then, under the criticism and lash of public sentiment, the President decided to act. He came before the House and Senate May 25 requesting legislation, and within 1 hour the House passed an emergency bill by a tremendous majority going much further than the original Case bill. The Senate the same day passed the Case bill. If the President had given his leadership instead of his opposition for such legislation months ago, the business of the Nation would not have been brought almost to a standstill. Six months ago, in three speeches, I urged that fair and well-thought-out comprehensive labor legislation should be enacted in an effort to prevent the very thing that finally happened.

Three weeks ago in a speech on the floor of the House I said, "I want the American people to know that the House of Representatives has had the courage time and again to pass legislation in an effort to slow down and make strikes unnecessary, which we believe is fair to labor, fair to business, and for the protection of a hundred million people who make up the general public.

"The Members of the House have passed such legislation. It is now up to the President and the Senate to act. If the lights are turned down at the White House for lack of power while industrial chaos envelops this Nation, it is chargeable only to the administration in power and to the policy of this administration which has for the past 12 years traded legislation to special groups for their votes at election time. For 12 years this administration has sown to the wind and is now reaping the whirlwind."

I have tried to point out the facts as they exist here in Washington so you may better understand our and your problems.

THE OPA

Now, I want to discuss with you briefly, the question of the OPA or price control, and point out to you how you are often misled and deceived, how difficult it is for a Member of Congress to get the facts to you.

We have to combat the greatest propaganda machine in our history here in Washington which is made up of big government, bureaucracy, and which is supported by left-wing radio commentators and news writers who pour out criticisms over the air almost constantly against the actions of conservative Members of Congress, the effect of which tends to destroy the confidence of the people in their own elected representatives.

If they can control your thinking by prejudice, by half-truths and at times, falsehoods, they can cause the individual citizens to exert pressure upon the Members of Congress to put over legislation bureaucracy wants, and to prevent legislation being enacted that big government and bureaucracy does not want.

At the expense of you taxpayers there are over 35,000 publicity men on the Federal pay roll, spending millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to keep this propaganda machine going. Nothing like it was ever heard of in the Government of the United States until the New Deal developed this self-serving political publicity machine.

The radical commentators can always be counted upon to join up with big government.

Chester Bowles and Paul Porter have recently given the best example of how such an organization works, and, as you know, they have been supported by these radical commentators referred to.

The OPA, for publicity, is spending of your money for the fiscal year 1946, $2,572,000. They are spending over $150,000,000 in all to administer price control.

Recently Mr. Bowles commandeered all radio networks charging the Members of the House with wrecking price control, which would cause ruinous inflation. In an effort to arouse the people into a lobby in the hope of getting them to put pressure on the Senate by letters and telegrams, he used the threat of fear—fear of ruinous inflation.

The facts are the House did not cripple price control, but attempted to make it more workable to prevent inflation, by writing in amendments the purpose of which was to encourage greater production of goods, knowing that we can never be free of the threat of ruinous inflation until the supply of goods equals the demand.

We conservative Members of the House are the ones who are really trying to prevent inflation. Mr. Bowles and Mr. Porter and the President, 2 months ago, broke the price line Nation-wide when they adopted the policy that wages could be raised 18½ percent Nation-wide without raising the cost of living. Their continuous spending of billions of dollars unnecessarily by borrowing money through the creation of bonded debt has been a constant move toward inflation. They force inflation and blame we Members of Congress who are trying to prevent it. Last month they raised prices on 135 articles, but they don't tell you that they are raising prices.

We Members realized price control, because of the war, was necessary, also that because of bad administration and the unwise rules and regulations in many instances of the OPA, that a great volume of goods have been kept off of the market. We attempted by these amendments to correct these abuses in an effort to get greater production and in an effort to prevent ruinous inflation.

With the OPA here in Washington admitting that over 50 percent of the lumber is going through the black market, with the shortage of lumber for housing for veterans making it necessary for the Congress to pass legislation providing for vast sums of money to encourage the building of houses for our veterans, we Members of Congress have attempted by amendments to compel the OPA to administer the law so as to get a greater production, rather than to continue some regulations that are preventing production.

With 10,000,000 head of cattle more in this country than our normal production, yet we find a shortage of meat, and it is estimated that over 50 percent of the meat of the Nation, largely because of the policies of the OPA, is selling through the black market where the people are compelled to pay more than ceiling prices. I cite only these two of the many reasons why the Members of Congress have attempted to compel better administration of price control.

Most of the criticism by big government, bureaucracy, and radio commentators is directed in opposition to the position we conservative Members of Congress take on all legislation.

What do we conservative Members stand for? Are we right or are we wrong?

We want to deflate bureaucracy and separate from the Federal pay rolls a million and a half employees which cost you taxpayers on an average of over 3 billion dollars a year. That's what you want I am sure.

As a member of the Civil Service Committee, I, with others, have led this fight for the past 2 years.

We are making some progress. Three weeks ago we wrote into the law a provision that will compel the reduction of the Federal pay rolls to the extent of 800,000 employees by July 1, 1947. This is the first break we have been able to make to crack the solid front of bureaucracy in the interest of the taxpayers who pay the bill. I am sure you approve this action.

We conservative Members have voted against subsidies generally in the belief that the Federal Government should not pile up an additional debt in paying a part of the living expenses of people during the past 4 years when wages were the highest in the history of this Nation. We have been defeated every time and some $4,000,000,000 have been added to the Government debt for food, a part of which the soldiers and their families will have to pay, which was charged against them when they were fighting to save this country for $50 a month and up.

We conservative Members are fighting against the continuous trend in government toward state socialism, communism, and corruption. I know you will say amen to this.

We want, as soon as possible, to again return to the people their liberties, many of which have been restricted due to the war effort and are still being restricted in peacetime. I know you endorse our efforts in this direction.

We have voted to cut down expenses and the waste of the people's money on every occasion and will continue to do so. You will say amen to that.

We want to reduce governmental expense, balance the budget, and reduce the Federal debt. That's sound isn't it?

We are not unfriendly to labor. We want labor's rights protected, but we believe the interest of labor will be best served if legislation is effected clearly defining the rights of labor, business, and legislation which will protect the unorganized general public of a hundred million people. We believe that labor's interest will be best served with continued employment at high wages if labor, business, and agriculture, are all fully protected so that the highest possible production and distribution of products may be obtained throughout the Nation. I think you will agree to that.

With a debt of $275,000,000,000 hanging over the American people we believe that conditions must be speedily brought about where the rights of all these parties are protected so that the entire Nation may get back to work pulling together in the best cooperative spirit, where labor may be steadily employed and that the greatest possible production may be had in an effort to keep the national income high enough that the billions of dollars worth of bonds owned by the people may be kept at par; with a volume of business which may be sufficient to bring in an adequate amount of taxes to pay the running expenses of the Government with a few billions left over each year with which we can reduce and eventually retire the national debt. That's only a part of our program.

I think you all know Sidney Hillman and the CIO Political Action Committee has been a potent part of the present New Deal administration. That they have been working together for the past several years pooling their political efforts successfully for victory in every campaign. The final results of this unholy political partnership are now being revealed to the Nation. They have brought a scarcity of goods, Nation-wide strikes, chaos, and confusion. This combination in power has brought the Nation its present distress. You have read in the press that the CIO Political Action Committee, under the leadership of Sidney Hillman, intends to spend many millions of dollars to defeat in the coming campaign this fall 100 conservative Congressmen I have referred to who do not do his bidding. If they can do this they can finish taking over your Government here in Washington. We are opposed to this radical element or any group taking over the Government. You will endorse our stand I am sure.

In these few minutes I have tried to give you a few facts. I think you people know that I would not knowingly do anything against the interest of the people of the Twenty-third Congressional District or against the welfare of our Nation.

If the people cannot trust the conservative Members of this Congress who are not thinking politically, and who are not acting politically, but who realize our serious national situation, frankly I do not know whom they can trust.

We believe the present philosophy of government which is leading this Nation toward state socialism or communism must be reversed if we are to save representative, constitutional government, which guarantees the liberty and freedom of the people. If we should do less we would not be worthy to represent you in Congress. For my part I shall continue to follow such a course believing when the people of my district understand the facts they will back me to the limit with their confidence and moral support.

The President's Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, for the past 12 years, under the present administration, the Congress has been bedeviled by one crisis after another. The President who for months has opposed broad and comprehensive legislation and who has refused to assist the House with his leadership in drafting legislation which would protect the rights of labor, business generally, and which would protect the rights of the great body of people making up the public, has now rushed before the House asking that the House quickly pass, without due consideration, the most drastic legislation ever offered before the Congress of the United States in an effort to settle the railway strike and the coal strike which have brought paralysis to the business of the entire Nation.

If he would have asserted the power of the President, which he already had 30 days ago, these strikes would have been ended before now.

Six months ago or earlier, with his cooperation, legislation fair to labor, and fair to business, and which would have protected the general public, could have been thought through and passed which would have aided reconversion, helped to prevent inflation with greater production, and which would have prevented the chaos we are in today.

The responsibility for this drastic legislation can be attributed solely to the inaction and lack of leadership by the President and to the top labor leaders who have opposed any and every type of legislation which has been suggested to help bring about industrial peace throughout the months past.

The following of such a course by the President and the labor leaders referred to has done great harm to the public and has done great harm to the just and honest rights of the rank and file of labor throughout the Nation. Such action has aroused unfavorable public sentiment generally and in many instances unjustly against the laboring men of this country who have deserved better leadership and better treatment than has been brought upon them by reason of such a course.

I think it is manifestly unfair to the Members of this House to be maneuvered into a position within the past few hours where, because of this crisis, we have been almost compelled to consider and vote for a bill which none of us have had an opportunity to read until it has been read from a manuscript on the Clerk's desk.

Under the extraordinary rule we are permitted but 20 minutes on a side to debate this bill. In all fairness we should not be compelled to vote upon this legislation until it could be thoroughly debated for at least 2 hours.

The business of the Nation is almost at a standstill. The transportation of the Nation is shut down; suffering and almost starvation will be abroad in the land unless something is done within the next 3 or 4 days to get transportation restored. Children and sick people in the hospitals will be without milk and probably without food. The people of the Nation are up in arms and apparently when the President has demanded this legislation, when he says it is absolutely necessary to protect the people of the Nation, there is no course left open to the Members who for months have tried to prevent this crisis, but to vote for it.

Under this extraordinary rule we must take it all or nothing. We are not privileged to amend it. If we were privileged to amend it, this House, in my judgment, would vote to amend the draft section of the bill. I doubt the constitutionality of the draft section. If we were in war, I would be willing to draft men, of draft age, who refused to work and who went out in a strike of this kind which is tying up the Nation. Most of the coal miners are probably between 45 and 65 years of age, and yet we are to pass a bill that would draft men of this age. This, to me, raises a serious question. I hope and believe the Senate which, under its rules, will have the right to amend this act, that it will amend the draft section of this act. Let us hope that the rail strike and the miners' strike may be speedily settled before the extreme penalties of this bill may ever have to be enforced, and in the hope that the administration leadership and the leaders representing organized labor may now see the extreme necessity of getting together and cooperating with the Members of the House and Senate in an effort to work together in bringing about and supporting legislation that will give a fair deal to the laboring men of the Nation, to the business interests of the Nation, which at the same time will protect the rights of the general public.

If we are to keep this Nation solvent so that the bonds the laboring men have bought, the businessmen have bought, and the general public has bought, may be kept at par, so that we can keep this Government sound financially, and in the end save representative constitutional government, and the freedom and liberty which it has preserved for the American people, we must enact legislation fair to all that will bring about continued industrial peace.

Feed Grains for Deficit Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a statement issued yesterday afternoon by the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture with reference to the voluntary program to furnish feed grains to deficit areas, as follows:

In order to furnish feed in areas where foundation livestock will be liquidated unless some assistance is given, to make it possible in extreme cases to furnish stockyards with feed at markets where livestock has been delivered for sale and to furnish grain for extreme emergency food needs, a voluntary program is being put into effect under which feed grains will be shipped by grain dealers who are willing to cooperate in furnishing such gains to deficit areas.

In addition, the Grain Branch will direct wet and dry processors that are processing wheat and corn purchased under the emergency food program to ship the byproducts produced in such processes into designated areas.

PMA State directors in States where feed grains can be obtained will be asked to call a meeting of the State feed advisory committees and any elevatormen who they think will cooperate in the shipping of grain stocks to deficit areas.

Grain and grain products made available under this program will be directed into deficit areas in the Northeast by Mr. J. Ralph Graham, State PMA director, University of New Hampshire, Durham, N. H., and into the Northwest by Mr. Chester P. Downen, State PMA director, 1023 West Riverside, Spokane, Wash., on a sight draft bill of lading basis. These individuals will work closely with the State feed advisory committees in their respective areas and establish priority of shipment on the basis of the emergency needs. State feed advisory committees should determine where the most urgent cases are and direct the movement of the grains to points where the supplies will be distributed over as wide an area as possible.

Shippers will be notified into which deficient area they will be expected to ship. As soon as a shipper has a carload of grain available, such shipper will notify Mr. Graham or Mr. Downen, by wire collect, and the shipper will receive by wire shipping instructions showing name and address of the consignee and name of the bank to which the sight draft bill of lading is to be forwarded.

Mr. Speaker, this is recognition of the critical situation prevailing in New England, which the New England delegation has been presenting consistently and vigorously to the Department and to the President. It is too early to predict whether it will produce sufficient feed to meet the immediate minimum needs in New England, but it is a welcome beginning.

The Importance of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered over Station WWDC on Tuesday, May 28, 1946:

I am grateful to Station WWDC for this opportunity. Radio is taking an increasingly prominent part in determining issues before the country. Its impact on public affairs has been illustrated many times in war and in peace. It will continue to be an important part of our machinery formulating public opinion.

As a Member of Congress serving his first term, I am a bit hesitant to "sound off" in any highly critical or politically partisan manner. But it may be that a newcomer can use a more discerning eye than some of the old-timers merely because he is less affected and controlled by tradition and precedents.

First of all, let me say that I thoroughly believe in our form of representative self-government. Our method of governing ourselves has been proven good by more than a century and a half of experience. It has produced the highest degree of widespread well-being ever known.

I do not think other peoples should necessarily follow our pattern. They have a right to determine their own form of government. But at the same time I insist that foreign ideologies and subversive activities designed to undermine and destroy our form of government be eliminated in our own land. We demand for ourselves freedom to govern ourselves as we choose, without interference from abroad.

The Sixth Iowa District, whose people I have the honor to represent in Congress, is an agricultural district. Most of the people there are farmers or are directly dependent upon the soil for their livelihood. In other words, our merchants and to a great extent our manufacturers, recognize the importance and the necessity of a prosperous agriculture. If the farmer prospers, his prosperity is reflected in the business activity of all the towns and cities. Conversely, if the farmer undergoes hard times, so does the rest of the community.

Accordingly, it is understandable that Members of Congress representing agricultural areas are deeply and necessarily concerned with legislation dealing with agriculture in all its phases.

Some of us hold that the entire economy of the United States is tied to agriculture. That is to say, if by unwise and unfavorable laws, agriculture is depressed, then it inevitably follows that all other parts of our industrial and commercial life will be undermined and will follow agriculture into ultimate collapse. This is true not only on a local scale, but is true on a national scale.

Except for the products of our mines and oil wells—which are irreplaceable—all the new economic goods that come onto the American market year after year, come from the soil. All other types of economic goods are merely a change in the form of the products of the earth. The wonderful part of it

is that these new economic goods will continue to be produced for generations yet to come without any diminution, as long as we conserve the agricultural resources of our country. These new economic goods are the lifeblood of business and commerce and manufacture. The encouragement and maintenance of a prosperous and healthful agriculture is, therefore, the very basis of our continuing civilization.

A study made of the fluctuations of industrial prosperity in the United States over its history since the Civil War, when our major industrial development began, shows those fluctuations follow directly the ups and downs experienced by the farmer. When agriculture slows down, the entire economic machine slows down. Conversely, a prosperous agriculture soon finds a similar condition in business, commerce, and industry. In other words, the engine and balance wheel of our whole economy is agriculture. When that balance wheel ceases to exert its stabilizing force, it seriously affects for the worse our whole industrial scene. When that engine loses its power, then all business and manufacture sooner or later feels its effect, and slows down accordingly.

Since 1938, it has been very apparent that the great Midwest, the heart of the agricultural area of the United States, has turned to the Republican Party for its political leadership. In my own State—Iowa—in 1935 there were but three Republican Congressmen. Today, all the Iowa delegation is Republican—the largest solely Republican delegation in the House of Representatives.

Such a change in political complexion must have some rational explanation. From going rather strongly for the New Deal in its early stages the great agricultural Midwest has now become the center and heart of the Republican Party.

It seems to me the reason for this change is that our farmers and businessmen have become alarmed about a good many policies and tendencies of the present administration, of which I shall mention three.

First, the unlimited deficit spending of the party in power since 1933. Despite promises made by platform and candidates of a reduction in Federal expenditures, the Federal debt has mounted until it is nearly $300,000,000,000, or about $2,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. I quickly recognize that a large proportion of this spending was necessary in the prosecution of the war. But before the war started, our Federal debt had increased every year from 1933 to 1940 until it was ten times more than the original amount.

Since the close of the fighting war last summer, we have seen very little effective effort to decrease this deficit spending. For instance, the Budget message of the President delivered to the Congress last January, showed on its face an overspending in the first peacetime year of $4,000,000,000, and the proposed British loan was on top of that, as well as about a like amount of other unbudgeted spending.

I am not accusing the administration of deliberately and fraudulently plunging this country into a financial disaster by its deficit spending. Rather, its overwhelming desire to maintain its political power has brought about this appalling situation. I do say, however, that the present administration has proven helpless to extricate itself from the ever-increasing demands of growing bureaucracy.

This situation is very apparent to any discerning Member of Congress. When any appropriation comes before the body which might have any bearing or influence on the electorate—with total disregard for the financial stability of this American Government—the appropriation is passed in order to perpetuate the voting power. Examples could be multiplied to illustrate this practice.

Many of our people all over the country who realize the folly of this fiscal policy are deeply concerned. They know that if the disaster of inflation overtakes us, it will be primarily due to the unwillingness or inability of the present administration to measure its expenditures by the yardstick of governmental receipts.

Second, it appears to me that midwesterners are extremely resentful of bureaucratic government from Washington. One of the fundamental principles of our system is that of local self-government. Our people believe in that.

The fact is that gradually the New Deal has choked off and stifled local self-government. It has interfered not only with State functions, but has gone to the county and municipal levels. This has been the unfortunate result of foggy thinking on the part of some of our political and business leaders, who have grasped at the idea that by passing local problems to the Federal Government automatic and uniform solution might be found. But no such solution is found in Washington. The fact is that our country is so large, and its interests so varied, that no uniform policy on all matters can work or be desirable.

A situation has been created by which certain unthinking persons have relieved themselves of their civic responsibilities. This pattern of governing ourselves is wrong. We must return to our States and local communities the right and duty of governing themselves.

Under the present administration farmers and businessmen are constantly harassed by some regulation or regulator emanating from Washington. This excessive Government control has permeated every nook and corner of our country. Scores of Federal agencies and thousands of Federal agents have descended upon our farmers, our business people, and our laboring men to tell them how to run their affairs, until it now appears to be the deliberate effort of the administration to control every detail of the daily lives of 140,000,000 people. It is amazing that Americans have permitted themselves to be so subjected. A free people from the foundation of their Government have not changed over night. They have permitted such controls only because in the beginning there was claimed emergency, which emergency was revived again and again in order to retain these controls. During wartime, of course, a sense of patriotic duty impelled a loyal observance of restrictions.

But now, with the fighting over and many of our men returned from service, the American people would throw off the chains of bureaucracy. The economic life of our country needs to be freed from the restrictions and controls that hamper it. Our people want freedom to produce and to sell their products in the market place. They would throw off the shackles of governmental interference.

This brings me to my third suggestion. For the reasons mentioned, and for other reasons too, Americans are fearful for their freedom. They do not like the tendency to statism. They abhor the doctrine that the citizen is the pawn of the government. They believe in the true American doctrine that the government is the creature and servant of its citizens. The duty of the government is not to dominate and direct the daily lives of its people, but rather to create a social and civic climate wherein men, women, and children may live complete and happy useful lives.

How greatly Americans loathe the unlimited rule of the state is attested by the blood and sacrifice of nearly 15,000,000 young Americans who in these years just past fought to preserve American freedom. Totalitarianism proved the downfall of Italy, Germany, and Japan. We want none of it here. Our Federal Government is subject to our people, not their overbearing master.

The Republican Party, being founded in the first place by lovers of freedom for all men, is now the political haven of those who still believe in freedom. And such believers are legion in our land. They come from all walks of life and from every race, religion, creed. They are in every economic stratum of our society, and in every corner of our country.

I believe that they are sufficient in number, and public spirited enough, to give to the people of the United States a Congress in November 1946 that will stop this deficit spending, cut down this overwhelming bureaucracy, and preserve the blessings of liberty for the American people.

The Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK H. DREWRY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, recently when railroad management and the leaders of certain railroad organizations were unable to reach an agreement as to the future of labor relations between them, the railroad unions called and put into effect a strike which, in the words of the President, threatened "to paralyze all our industrial, agricultural, commercial, and social life." With this emergency confronting him, the President of the United States delivered a message to Congress pointing out conditions and requesting "temporary legislation to take care of this immediate crisis," and permanent legislation "to prevent the recurrence of such crises and generally to reduce stoppages of work in all industries for the future." Such legislation as requested was immediately introduced, taken up, and passed by the House. I wish to put myself on record as concurring wholeheartedly in the request of the Executive and in concurrence with the legislation which followed his request.

It is inconceivable that patriotic Americans, such as I know most of the members of these organizations to be, should act in such a way as to leave the impression that they care more for their unions than they do for their country. No other conclusion could be drawn from their action. It is also inconceivable that 135,000,000 people should have to suffer because of such action in connection with a dispute with which they had nothing to do. Therefore, only one course is open to the Members of the legislative body of this Nation, namely, to provide such legislation as will prevent any such occurrences in the future. It is not necessary to go into the details of such legislation. That can be worked out; but the legislation should be so definite and certain that it will forever prevent such stoppages of transportation in the future, as well as such stoppages of work in other industries. I have no desire for any revenge by reason of the acts of the men who struck, but I am convinced that strikes should not be allowed in essential industries and expect to vote for such legislation.

Are We Qualified To Lead World to Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Minneapolis Sunday Star-Journal-Tribune of May 26, 1946:

ARE WE QUALIFIED TO LEAD WORLD TO PEACE?

(By Carroll Binder)

Axis propagandists used to gloat over what they termed the "egoism" of the American people. They also despised our "egotism." But the Fascists expected our systematic selfishness, as the dictionary defines egoism, rather than our self-conceit (egotism) to be our undoing.

Knowing by personal experience how generously Americans aid the distressed of other lands, the German, Italian, and Japanese deriders of American egoism were not speaking of collective stinginess.

They considered our greatest national weakness to be the excessive preoccupation of Americans with individual, group, class, and sectional benefits and gains at the expense of others and the Nation as a whole.

The Fascists confidently relied on these individual and collective selfishnesses to undermine and eventually destroy free institutions in the United States. They thought that Fascist preoccupation with the whole as distinguished from the individual parts of society would increase Axis strength as American strength waned.

The war proved that the Fascists underestimated the will and capacity of the United States and other non-Fascist peoples to defend their freedom and overestimated the prowess of the Fascist dictatorships.

But Fascist dreams of world dominion were thwarted only by the subordination of the parts to the whole. The democracies had to overcome individual and group egoisms in a supreme effort to remain free. They had to pool their efforts with Communist totalitarianism in order to defeat Fascist totalitarianism.

As soon as fascism was defeated Americans reverted to their unbridled egoisms. Those in the armed forces demanded to be brought home immediately.

Millions of soldiers got back to the United States in record time, but their precipitate redeployment robbed the United States of much of its power to consolidate the military victory and make a just and lasting peace. We may have forfeited much of the permanent security we fought so hard to attain.

WHOLE IS FORGOTTEN

Nearly everybody was so eager to get consumer goods, make huge profits, earn enormous wages, work short hours, stake out monopolistic advantages that the conflicting greeds combined to all but paralyze production and distribution.

The devil-take-the-hindmost state of mind which has prevailed since VJ-day leaves most of us with less than a better ordered reconversion would have provided for everybody. What we obtain costs us more than it would have if individual and group egoisms had not been permitted free play in total disregard of the interests of the whole. We are unable to supply a devastated world with the basic needs for recovery.

It is just as the Fascists predicted it would be, but, fortunately, it came too late for them to profit from it—at least immediately. Had we been as selfish and as stupid during the war, we would be as badly off as the Germans and Japanese are today.

If the effects of this anarchistic egoism were felt only within the United States and limited to the year 1946, they could be dismissed as our just desserts. If the future assuredly belonged to us, we could afford to be foolishly short-sighted.

FAILURES SHAPE FUTURE

But we happen to be the most fortunately situated and influential nation in the world. What we fail to do, as well as what we do, shapes the future of our children and the children of other nations as well as the character of the contemporary world.

It is not inevitable that our well-being and our institutions will survive and prosper. It is not inevitable that we shall always be top dog, or even free and at peace.

We have yet to prove to ourselves and the rest of the world that ours is the best system and we are the best people in the postwar world. The Communist totalitarians look upon us and our institutions as patronizingly as did the Fascist totalitarians.

The Communists are as confident the future belongs to them as were the Fascists. The Communists are as eager to make their kind of peace as we are to make our kind of peace. The weaker we are internally the weaker we are externally.

OUR ACTIONS SPEAK

The Chinese would be more impressed by General Marshall's attempts to reconcile their warring factions if we showed we could reconcile our own warring factions.

The French would be more disposed to vote next month for our kind of institutions and against Communist institutions for France if we proved that we could produce more of the coal and the other things they need so urgently for recovery than communism can produce.

The Communists gleefully diagnose our prolonged industrial warfare and our distributive paralyses as the last convulsions of outmoded and dying capitalistic society. They expect to build their new order on the ruins of the incompetent system of free enterprise.

We will not arrest the Communist tide, we will not create a peace safe for free institutions by making speeches about the virtues of democracy and free enterprise.

We will not preserve American security and influence solely by voting huge sums for national defense. We must prove that we know how to order our individual and collective lives better than other peoples order theirs. We must prove that we are better qualified to lead the rest of the world to peace and prosperity, to get the kind of world we want and fought so hard to obtain.

It is not too late to do these things but there isn't a great deal of time left in which to prove that our peacetime qualities are every bit as good as our wartime qualities.

"He who willeth not the means, willeth not the end."

Restrictions Close Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, in many towns in Nebraska people are having difficulty to purchase meat, even though these towns are in the center of meat-producing areas. With my remarks I include a letter written by the Neligh Chamber of Commerce. This letter is typical of many which I am now receiving from various parts of the Third Congressional District of Nebraska:

MAY 25, 1946.

Mr. H. B. J. MEYER,
District Slaughter Control Officer,
Omaha, Nebr.

DEAR SIR: This letter is written to ask if the regulations concerning the slaughtering of livestock and the sale of other necessary commodities can be lifted, or at least modified so that the people of this area can be supplied with necessary foodstuffs.

We have an excellent meat market which is capable of supplying this community with all of the beef and pork that is needed, if the restrictions can be raised to so permit. We feel that if the proprietor, Mr. Ben Brodersen, were permitted to kill from 6 to 8 beeves a week and 8 to 10 hogs a week, that the meat needs of the community could be taken care of. As the matter now stands, the market is closed 3 afternoons a week and the rest of the days it does not have a sufficient supply of meat on hand to supply the people in this community. Not only are the people of this community deprived of an adequate meat supply, but Mr. Brodersen is compelled to operate at a loss or close his market. This community needs a meat market of the type that Mr. Brodersen maintains.

Our local mill (the Neligh Mills) has also been forced to shut down and if restrictions were lifted, it would be capable of supplying flour for this entire section of the State.

Our bakery (F. Benning, proprietor) has announced that unless restrictions are raised on flour, that it will be obliged to close on June 1.

We believe that the people of this community are entitled to the facilities of a meat market, a flour mill, and a bakery. We have the available raw materials, the desire of our merchants to produce, and the market for the finished product. We respectfully ask that we be permitted to market the produce of our community in a regular and orderly manner.

Yours very truly,
NELIGH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By K. W. MILLER, *Secretary.*

P. S.—This letter was written without the solicitation of the above merchants referred to.

Connecticut's Mental Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a recent editorial from the Bridgeport Post on Connecticut's mental hospitals, as follows:

CONNECTICUT'S MENTAL HOSPITALS

The whole State will welcome Governor Baldwin's decision to give a special message to the general assembly on the condition of Connecticut's insane asylums, a matter brought sharply to public attention by an article in Life magazine which gave the general impression that life in American institutions for the mentally sick is worse than life in the famous German horror camps. A Connecticut hospital was included among those picked out as horrible examples.

Nobody in Connecticut has less to fear from such an investigation than the Governor himself because those who have been

familiar with his schedule during the past year know how much time, anxiety and devotion the Governor has given in the effort to improve conditions in our State hospitals.

Nor is it likely to be found that conditions were as bad as the examples pictured in Life magazine. But the people of this State could not sleep with an easy conscience if they felt they were not giving their best to those unfortunates who, through some accident of fate, are condemned to the horrors of a living death. They want to know that the best is being done that can be done.

When Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE telegraphed to Governor Baldwin asking for a clear statement on the conditions in our institutions she did a service to the Governor and the State by bringing the whole issue to a clear focus. The Representative from the Fourth Congressional District knew that she spoke the mind and heart of the average citizen of Connecticut in desiring to know the truth, good or bad, and to do everything that could be done to improve conditions. We cannot imagine life being completely pleasant and happy for persons who are incarcerated against their will, even mentally deranged persons.

Nor can we imagine any State which prides itself on being civilized and humane, doing less than its very best for the comfort, welfare, and if possible the cure, of all the mentally deranged.

The Straight Way to Industrial Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann from the Washington Post of May 28, 1946:

THE STRAIGHT WAY TO INDUSTRIAL PEACE

(By Walter Lippmann)

At the week end Mr. Lewis, Mr. Whitney, and Mr. Johnston had brought the country to a point where there was no good remedy for an intolerable situation. A general railroad strike on top of a general coal strike, and in the near future a general maritime strike, would be a combination of disasters which the Nation could not sit out patiently and quietly. The Government was compelled to act. It had no choice but to act. Yet there was no way it could act which does not do violence to the principles of liberty which our people cherish.

The dilemma has been imposed upon us because the law of the land on the subject of great general strikes is obsolete. The law does not outlaw these calamitous strikes. But the Government had nevertheless to outlaw them. Lacking sound law to avert an intolerable condition, the President has had to improvise a bad law.

The root of the trouble lies in the fact that Messrs. Lewis, Whitney, and Johnston have failed or refused to recognize that though the law permitting these general strikes has not been formally repealed or amended, it has in fact been radically modified by usage, custom, and the will of the people. The right to strike so as to paralyze the Nation is, no matter what the statutes say, not now a right which the Government could permit Messrs. Whitney and Johnston to exercise. They could have preserved the right to call a general railroad strike only by having the wisdom not to call a general railroad strike. Once they exercised the right, there was no alternative but to take that right away from them.

They will have missed the meaning of what happened on Saturday if they think only about how violently and crudely they were deprived of their right to strike. The fundamental point is that they had to be deprived of the right to conduct a general railroad strike. A wiser, more constitutional measure to achieve this end can undoubtedly be worked out. But it will have to be a wise and constitutional measure which deprives them of the right to conduct such general strikes. It cannot be a measure which does not deprive them of that right. For if it is, and they again exercise the right, they will once again be met by drastic measures.

This is the fixed and fundamental point in the whole business—that the right to conduct general strikes is outlawed, and the real choice of labor leaders is whether they will now recognize this fact or whether they will compel the Government to spell it out in the form of drastic penalties.

This is not an agreeable choice. But they have to face it now because they were too reactionary to see in advance that a free society is governed not by the letter of its laws but by a social compact—a common understanding among the people—of which the laws are at best an imperfect expression. For a generation the railroads of the United States have been governed by a social compact which held that the railroads must run while management and labor argued out their differences, and somehow settled them.

This compact is the real law of the land, as Messrs. Whitney and Johnston learned on Saturday. They violated that compact. In violating it the whole structure of their statutory rights was broken, and even their constitutional rights were impaired. For all the rights of man are bound up together and rest finally on a social compact as to how men will in fact behave toward one another.

The violation of the fundamental understanding about general strikes makes it necessary to write the understanding into statutory law. It would have been better to let the understanding develop by custom. But the big labor leaders have not allowed that to happen. So the Congress will have to legislate.

There are here two main ways it can proceed. The one way which the Congress will be tempted to take, is to avoid the main issue—whether general strikes shall be outlawed—and then to engage in a complicated effort to outlaw them by indirection. This will generate measures which, as a result of the push and pull of politics, are too drastic to be enforceable or too weak to be effective.

The other way is to begin by the direct outlawry of general strikes in specific industries such as the railroads, the coal mines, and primary public utilities. Then on that major premise, which could be declared by Congress immediately, a code for the settlement of disputes could be carefully and patiently worked out.

If the leaders of the big unions are wise in their own interest, they will see that by choosing this second way they will give up nothing they have not already lost. They have already lost the right to conduct general strikes. What happened Saturday would happen even more spectacularly if the same situation arose again. In accepting the principle that general strikes are outlawed, labor will merely be recognizing an accomplished fact. But by accepting this principle they will be preserving much that they may otherwise lose, namely the opportunity to participate in the formulation of an industrial code which will rest not on the brute authority of the Government but on the consent of the governed.

They will in this way, moreover, restore promptly something of great value to them which they have lost—the esteem and confidence which the railroad brotherhoods have long enjoyed and so justly deserved. Let them come forward as the sponsors of the principle of a full industrial peace, and they will yet confound the enemies of labor who are waxing fat and presumptuous on the mistakes which labor is making.

Why I Intend To Vote Against the President's Emergency Strike Control Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against H. R. 6578 for several reasons. The Nation is tense and the pressure upon Congress strong. Action by both the administration and Congress is long overdue. The hour demands coolness and deliberation, but the mood of the House is to rush through whatever the President recommends, which will result in my opinion, in the passage of very bad legislation.

The bill is not presented in printed form. Only mimeographed copies of it are available, of which there are not enough to go around. It was some time after the measure was under consideration before I was able to procure a copy. No committee action was had on the proposal. The Members were not afforded an opportunity to see it until debate had started. It has been precipitately thrust upon the House in what appears to be a dramatized setting of a momentarily impending national catastrophe. It is solemnly urged upon us that the threat can be met only by suspending the rules, prohibiting amendments, and ramming through the President's proposal in the brief space of 40 minutes, which is insufficient time for acquiring a reasonable understanding of its contents and implications.

There is absolutely no valid ground for this unusual and dictatorial act. The President was aware before he had finished his address to the joint session of Congress that the railroad strike had ended, as he interpolated a message from Mr. Whitney to that effect. The acute emergency has passed. There is time for deliberation. At least a few hours might be given the House to study the measure.

This bill gives the President profound and sweeping dictatorial powers. He is authorized to seize any plant, mine, or facility that he considers a vital or substantial part of an essential industry, which is strike bound, or where a strike is threatened, or which is affected by any kind of work stoppage. This, in effect, means that the President could seize almost any plant and he could do this for political as well as economic purposes. We have the Montgomery Ward case.

The measure empowers the President to capture the net profits of corporations which have accrued during the period of seizure. This clearly embraces the principle of confiscation of private property and state socialism. No doubt this will be encouraging to those who believe in

abolishing the Constitution and the American way of life and replacing it with state capitalism.

The President would be empowered to force into the Army at such time, in such manner—with or without oath—and on such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the President, any employee, officer or executive who has failed or refused, without the permission of the President, to return to work within 24 hours after the final effective date of his proclamation of the existence of a national emergency relative to the interruption of operations.

This is the kind of measures Hitler evoked. The President would have the power to induct such persons into the Army and condemn them to the jungles and deserts at the far ends of the earth. What is this but Siberia or a concentration camp by another name?

This bill would vest in the President the dictatorial power to fix the wages of employees of all seized plants. The use of this authority would, in general, affect wages in all other industries.

The claim that this is only temporary legislation should be promptly discounted. It is New Deal "emergency" legislation, which means that it is permanent legislation.

Furthermore, the President's proposal is not something that can be put into operation and later repealed like, say, prohibition. Once this proposal is enacted into law and put into operation, it becomes permanent by virtue of the peculiar forces which brought it into being and by its own momentum. Furthermore, like every other authoritarian machinery, it will progressively acquire more power and extend its operations.

Legislation is indeed needed to cope with the spreading strife between labor and management, but not this kind. There is one basic law that must be placed on the statute books before our Nation can ever hope to put an end to the strife between employers and employees. Pass a Federal act which will guarantee to every person in the United States the right to work wherever he pleases, at whatever wage he can agree upon with his employer, without having to pay tribute to any one. Such a law would have the effect of eliminating both corrupt politics and irresponsible union leadership from the field of enterprise. These forces are accountable for nine-tenths of all the trouble laboring people have with their employers. Until this unholy combination is broken up and destroyed there can be no hope for peaceful relations between labor and management. This would not affect any fair and equitable principle of collective bargaining. It would, however, put unions on their own merits. This would, in the long run, create a much higher type of unionism and provide a finer service to the working people. The passage of such an act would be nothing more than a reaffirmation of one of the basic principles of the Constitution of the United States.

The technique used by the President to force this legislation through Congress is the technique used by all dictatorship builders. In my judgment, the enactment of this proposal into law will mean that the Nation has taken another long step in the direction of dictatorship. Accordingly, I am compelled to cast my vote against it.

Have the Veterans Sacrificed in Vain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion to see many of the fine, clean, young men who have sacrificed their eyes, their limbs, their health for their country in World War I and World War II.

We hear much about justice these days, which let us analyze: "Justice" is a fine word, but it is not the last word between man and man. To so order the world that every man receives his just wage will not bring millennium. Who pays the mother for her long night vigils, the father for his toil, the soldier for his wounds, the hero for giving up his life to rescue another? Who paid William Morris and William Booth for their labors for social betterment? Above all, work done for fair pay towers the work done for no pay at all—just for love.

Such has been the service of our soldiers for no pay at all—just for love of country, because no money can compensate for all that they have sacrificed and suffered. What for? Love of God, and home, and native land. Will not their victory be an empty one if vicious, subversive leaders clothed with dictatorial labor laws can destroy our free economy, our free enterprise, and principles of free government by coercing thousands of men to follow a program which will destroy the only means by which free men and women can sustain their life and health?

I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Dorothy Thompson, which appeared in the Evening Star May 27, 1946:

ON THE RECORD
(By Dorothy Thompson)

God has had mercy on this great land. May we never know His wrath! It is rich in coal; oil gushes from its wells; in its factories stand slaves, ready to work for mere subsistence—machines, capable of turning out for all of us what 100 years ago were the luxuries of kings. On 6,000,000 farms, men plow and sow and reap, in climates and soils that produce the tangy apples flavored by frost, and the juicy oranges sweetened by a subtropical sun; there is hardly a food grown anywhere which is not producible in this country. And no armies have trampled its corn or devastated its groves.

Our sons lie under little crosses, row on row, from Burma to Cologne; their bones dissolve on the floor of the sea; in hospitals from Maine to California, they take first trembling steps on legs of steel; they wear new faces pieced on them in pain; they trail their hands along old words in Braille. Blind boy, can your fingers find the word "sacrifice"? Dead boy, does a whisper pass your skull that the country from which you fended destruction is destroying herself, while her people scream for rights! Rights! Rights! The rights are all mortgaged. The rights of each are mortgaged to the rights of all.

A strike is a simultaneous organized laying down of tools. Through the use of tools we live. Should all American workers lay down their tools, all Americans would die.

Does any conceivable right include the right to kill?

Farmers are workers who own their own tools. Farmers have grievances. Though they and their families are 19 percent of the population, they have only 13 percent of the income. They work a 70-hour week and bear the burdens of capital, labor, and of nature itself. They suffer many casualties from their occupation and have recreational handicaps. They, too, have the right to organize.

Suppose they should propose that the Government create a fund for insurance, pensions, recreation, and the education of their children out of a 7-percent tax on all farm products to be added to their price, and, until their demands were met, should strike, refusing to send a drop of milk, a grain of wheat, a pound of meat, or a basket of fruit to any market.

Then very soon, miners, railroad men, auto workers, and all the population of America except farmers would die of famine. Would that be the exercise of a right?

Has a surgeon the right to lay down his scalpel in the middle of an operation? Has a kindergarten teacher the right to walk out on a brood of babies? May a fireman refuse to rescue people trapped in a burning building?

The whole concept of "rights" presumes the existence of a code relating rights to righteousness. The most sublime concept of righteousness is expressed in a book, which you, John L. Lewis, are accustomed to quote, and which is more familiar to your miners than to most other workers. And if you will listen to the words of the only one whom you call your Master, you will hear:

"He who loveth his life shall lose it, but he who loseth his life for My sake shall gain it," and, "Bear ye one another's burdens and thus fulfill My law."

This country, as a peaceful family, can produce enough for all, including miners and railroad men. But it cannot produce anything as a warring jungle in which each group is reaching into the pocketbook of every other group and yelling about its rights. The right to live is precedent to all others, the duty to contribute to sustaining life is its logical complement and the life of each depends upon the labor of all.

This is true—absolutely.

Resolution of the Hotel Association of Vermont

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a resolution adopted by the Hotel Association of Vermont at a meeting held in Woodstock, on May 25, as follows:

WOODSTOCK, VT., *May 25, 1946.*
Congressman PLUMLEY, of Vermont,
United States Congressman,
Washington, D. C.:

Resolution of the Hotel Association of Vermont, Woodstock, Vt., May 25, 1946:

Whereas the state of the Nation and the general welfare of its people is at low ebb,

the health of its people jeopardized, and patience exhausted; and

Whereas the situation seems to be either too involved or too big for any one man to handle; and

Whereas we believe that it is high time that Congress take over the situation and enact a law immediately to outlaw the use of strikes by anyone at any time affecting the public health of the Nation, or its economic life, or the American way of living and working: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the Vermont Hotel Association, in meeting assembled in Woodstock, Vt., this 24th day of May 1946, call on Congress to:

1. Curb the monopolistic powers of labor leaders and agitators contrary to the best interests of the people at large.

2. That all further disputes during a period when the declared emergency exists should be referred to this board, empowered to make decisions effective for 6 months, so that both collective bargaining and work can continue.

3. This board be nonpolitical and represent labor, management, and the public.

4. Severe penalties to be imposed by this board on persons in either labor or management who permit work stoppages when a state of emergency exists, as proclaimed by the President.

5. That a copy of this resolution be sent to Vermont's congressional delegation.

ALLEN P. BEACH,
President, Vermont Hotel Association.

Tennessee an Eminent State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article in connection with the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Tennessee's admission to the Union:

TENNESSEE AN EMINENT STATE

Rich in tradition, richer in history, and richest of all in the men she has procured, Tennessee points with pardonable pride as she celebrates the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of her admission to the sisterhood of States on the first day of this month. She became the sixteenth State, Vermont and Kentucky having preceded her by 5 years and 4 years, respectively.

On May 31, 1796, Congress had passed the bill admitting Tennessee into the Union but only by agreement of the Senate, which, on account of the opposition of Rufus King, a Senator from Pennsylvania, had been holding the passage of this bill since May 6, on which date it was passed in the House by a comfortable majority. On the last day of May, Rufus King was absent, having accepted the appointment from the President as representative of this Government at the Court of St. James. To his absence more than anything else probably was due the passage of the bill—Mr. King being chairman of the committee to which was referred the President's message dealing with the territory out of which Tennessee was carved.

Aside from her struggle for entrance into the Union as indicated above, there are many remarkable things about Tennessee, both before and after her admission. The unconquerable spirit of her sons and daughters has been manifest in every land and clime known to mankind. But first there are other things.

The great Spaniard, De Soto, was upon Tennessee soil when he crossed the Father of Waters where the city of Memphis now stands, in the fourth decade of the sixteenth century. Indeed he and his adventuresome followers traveled much of the Tennessee territory. Not quite half a century later when Queen Elizabeth by royal grant conferred a great boundary of land upon her favorite, Sir Walter Raleigh, Tennessee was included therein, although it was nearly two centuries until it was settled and a longer period until it was so named.

Her settlers were almost entirely from Virginia and North Carolina, with a small sprinkling from Pennsylvania and farther east. It will be recalled that the Father of his Country declared during the dark days of the Revolution, that as a last resort he would take his little Army far into the Alleghanies where he could forever successfully defy all foes. That would have been into what is now Tennessee.

After the battle of the Alamance, May 1771, in which the Regulators were defeated by the British troops, under Governor Tryon, many of the former were forced to flee for their lives from the colony of North Carolina. They came into the wilderness, then unquestionably a part of Virginia. They entered this region at the Watauga country, a wild mountainous land relieved with fertile valleys along beautiful rivers and creeks. But the Regulator had the spirit of the mountains in his blood, and fitted well into his new environment.

Among the born leaders who came about this time were Daniel Boone and James Robertson, although Boone was here on former visits.

That Boone was greatly impressed with the new country is seen in his own words: "One day I undertook a tour through the country, and the diversity and beauties of nature I met with * * * expelled every gloomy and vexatious thought. Just at the close of the day the gentle gales retired and left the place to the disposal of a profound calm. Not a breeze shook the most tremulous leaf. I had gained the summit of a commanding ridge and looking round with astonishing delight beheld the ample plains, the beauteous tracts below. At a vast distance I beheld the mountains lift their venerable brows and penetrate the clouds."

Virginia did not lack in sending men, for John Sevier came early in his own life. Many others came and penetrated farther until they arrived at the level land and plateaus of the State. So it was Tennessee that received the liberty-loving Regulators when the parent colony would no longer afford them the freedom they desired.

The Watauga Association, with its articles for the management of general affairs adopted in 1772, formed what is believed to be the first written constitution or resolution of rights by American freemen, antedating the famous Mecklenberg declaration by some 4 years. These articles were drawn by the pioneers from North Carolina and Virginia, who believed in the divine right of the people. Moreover they signed their names. Theodore Roosevelt says in his Winning of the West, that the number of early pioneers in this country who could read and write is remarkable. Roosevelt further says: "The Watauga settlers outlined in advance the Nation's work. They turned the rugged and shaggy wilderness, they bid defiance to outside foes and they successfully solved the difficult problem of self-government."

The first territory to be named for George Washington embraced what is now the entire State of Tennessee, and was so designated in 1776 in a petition sent by the members of the Watauga Association to the North Carolina Assembly asking for annexation to that colony. It is supposed that the name was suggested by John Sevier who during his residence at Williamsburg, Va., must have known Colonel Washington. This district embraced not only what is now Tennessee, but all the country west of the Alleghanies, and so remained until 1779, when Sullivan district, now Sullivan County, was created. Washington County continues to exist.

The oldest institutions of learning west of the Alleghenies are in east Tennessee. One known as Tusculum College, founded in 1794, is now a successful college of high rank. The other known as Washington College but now a preparatory school was founded in 1780 as Martin's Academy, named for Governor Martin of North Carolina in which it was then located. These famous schools were founded by Samuel Dock, A. M., D. D., who brought with him on his journey a sheepskin from Princeton which is in a good state of preservation at this time. Dr. Dock, whose descendants still live at Greeneville, was a memorable man.

The ill-starred State of Franklin existed in what is now practically east Tennessee, from 1784 to 1788, comprising all the territory east of Davidson County, that county being the rest of our country westward, so to speak. John Sevier was governor of this new State, during which time he had considerable correspondence with Benjamin Franklin concerning this State and some with Patrick Henry.

When the State of Franklin came to an end in 1788 it had existed because of the independent spirit of the mountaineers—the territory again acknowledged the sovereignty of North Carolina, which State ceded it to the United States and it was made into the Territory of the United States South of the River Ohio, and so remained until admitted into the Union as Tennessee.

This State, after having such a difficult time being admitted to sisterhood because of Rufus King and the Spanish free navigation of the Mississippi River, had for her first governor, John Sevier, formerly of the State of Franklin, who served in that capacity three consecutive terms twice. Sevier died in 1815 while on a mission to Alabama for the United States Government.

She had for her first Congressman, Andrew Jackson, afterward President of the United States. In fact, she has furnished three Presidents, all natives of North Carolina, unless it be Jackson, for the honor of whose birthplace the two Carolinas seem yet to be in contention. I think no other State has a record of three Presidents all born outside the State. The ashes of these men rest in Tennessee. In Tennessee sleeps all that is mortal of Meriwether Lewis, famous as private secretary to President Jefferson, leader of the Lewis-Clark Expedition, governor of the northern part of the territory purchased from France in 1803, and otherwise a famous man who came to an untimely death on the Old Natchez Trail some 60 miles south from Nashville in what is now Lewis County, in 1809, by his own hand, some say, but doubtless murdered—men living in the open seldom commit suicide. In 1848 the Tennessee Legislature erected a small monument to his memory.

The statesmen Tennessee has given to other States are famous the country over. To Missouri and Kentucy she sent Boone on and to the former later gave Benton and Polk; to Alabama and the Nation, John T. Morgan; to Texas, Houston, Reegan, and a hundred thousand others; to Washington, Rodgers and McCrosky; to the Nation at large, Farragut, Maury, and Key, and Samuel P. Carter, the only man in our history who was a general in the Regular Army and an Admiral in the Navy.

Tennessee's high peaks and rich valleys nourished Horace Maynard, and far up among the valleys of her highest mountains the father of Abraham Lincoln once toiled for

a few months as a humble day laborer in the service of his kinsman, Isaac Lincoln. Many of the Great Emancipator's relatives lived in this State and some are here to this good day. The present United States Commissioner of Education was born, bred, and educated in Tennessee; from her State university, where he was giving large service, he went to his present important position.

Three Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the Nation have been Tennesseans.

In war her people have been most glorious. Early Indian encounters made John Sevier, Evan Shelby, William Campbell, and other crafty fighters. They took their little band of followers from the inspiring prayer of President Samuel Doak, at Sycamore Shoals, to the King's Mountain, and with their squirrel rifles won the battle that Thomas Jefferson termed the turning point of the Revolutionary War. Later they and their progeny went with Jackson to New Orleans and were not unknown in the Seminole War, for they smote the false Spaniard at Pensacola. In the Mexican War they furnished their quota and in the Civil War the First and Second Congressional Districts furnished more volunteers to the Union Army than any districts of like population in the United States. Moreover, a goodly number went from these same districts into the army of the Lost Cause. In the Spanish-American War Greene County, in the First Congressional District, is said to have the honor of the largest number of volunteer soldiers of any county of like population in the Nation, and may I add that it would be the same all over the State today should there be war.

This State is a Switzerland and many William Tells have dwelt therein. Those who come this way have often felt the inspiration of the mountains. Daniel Boone, poet and statesman that he was, on one of his memorable and historic trips through this region, standing at Cumberland Gap, gazing at a herd of buffalo grazing below, said: "I am richer than the man mentioned in the Scripture who owned the cattle on a thousand hills. I own the wild beasts of more than a thousand valleys." And on other occasions this great trail blazer spoke in rhapsodies of enthusiasm about this magnificent country. In east Tennessee is located the great Smoky Mountain National Park, which has attracted world-wide attention.

Finally in this Southern Appalacian region, of which Tennesee is a large part, there is the greatest number of pure-blooded Anglo-Saxon people than any place in the entire country, if not in the world, when territory and population are considered. Generation after generation has lived on the same farm, in the same valley, ennobled by the same ideals, worshiped the same God, and above all, nourished and cultivated the same independent spirit of endeavor, enterprise, and advancement.

Responsibility for the Strike Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I submit for the consideration of my colleagues a forthright editorial by Mr. Raymond Brewster, editor of the Herald Dispatch, Huntington, W. Va., which presents a keen analysis of the present chaotic condition existing in the country, and courageously and decisively places the responsibility on the doorstep of the administration, where it rightfully belongs.

I hope the Members of the Hcuse will take the time to read every paragraph of this timely statement.

The editorial follows:

IMPOTENT? WHO?

The rail strike has ended, under circumstances described as "dramatic." Given the perspective of a few weeks, or a few months, and those circumstances are more likely to seem to us ludicrous, not to say unbelievable.

Disregarding President Truman's proposals for legislative remedies, and the wisdom of certain specific suggestions made by him, there are aspects of the situation in this country pointed up by the rail and coal strikes, and the impending maritime union strike, which cannot be dismissed in the wave of relief that the trains are running again.

First of these is the fact that the power and authority of the Federal Government can be—and has been—successfully challenged, and whether all will choose to agree with him or not, the Nation has witnessed the spectacle of a President declaring to Congress and the people that their Government—perhaps he should have used the term "the administration"—is, in his own language, "impotent."

The fact is that never before in our history save in instances of actual armed rebellion has any individual or group challenged the authority, or even so much as questioned, the power of the Federal Government to deal with any situation directly and immediately affecting the public welfare.

Certainly no President has ever so confused personal incapacity to deal effectively with a situation with his own failure to provide the country leadership through his office and his administration until that situation precipitates an admitted national emergency and he is moved to shift responsibility by resting on the unsupported assertion that the Government is "impotent."

There is nothing President Truman said in his two addresses to the Nation on Friday night and Saturday afternoon that he could not have said before the occurrence of any of the industrial crises which have followed one another so swiftly since VJ-day. There is nothing he has proposed—and the House of Representatives has granted and the Senate is today prepared to act upon—that he could not have proposed at any time prior to the actual paralysis of the Nation's railway transportation system. Or, it follows, the shutting down of the coal mines for more than a month, the closing of the great automobile plants and the steel mills, the suspension of such vital public services as the telegraph, the long-distance telephone, business, street railways, electric power, and gas.

There is nothing Congress can do now that it couldn't have done at any time in the past—had the President and his administration had the courage they now find in the Nation's extremity to speak out, to act, and to demand through the instrumentality of the party in power. There can be no political approach to such questions as the railroad and coal strikes present but the very nature of our Government's organization fixes responsibility for executive initiative and leadership with the President in power and for legislative action of the kind now demanded with the party of the majority. Granted that the minority party likewise cannot evade a proportionate measure of responsibility for legislative action, it cannot be denied that the minority party has sought for months to obtain enactment of laws incorporating practically all of President Truman's requests and has been blocked by the administration.

Another aspect of the situation which finally moved President Truman to take a position on strikes which was not patently political is the shattering of the concept that John L. Lewis is something unique in his power to dictate terms to the country in labor matters because of special personal qualities rather than by virtue of powers which are inherent in the structure of unions as they have been permitted to develop. Now we know that Mr. Lewis' powers are vested in any union leader who chooses to ignore reason and defy not only authority but every consideration of public welfare and the national interest. It may be a blow to Mr. Lewis' ego, but the Nation now knows that however finished in effectiveness as a strike leader he is nothing more—or less—than a product of a system the ultimate economic and political implications of which have finally shocked the Nation and moved President Truman belatedly to perform the functions of his office. The Nation—and the rank and file of organized labor—can only hope that the legislation that now is certain to result will not be so restrictive in nature as to destroy many of the American workingman's hard-won gains.

Shall We Make Honesty Illegal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention of the Members of Congress and the people to an indictment of OPA by one of the leading economists of the United States, Samuel Crowther.

Under unanimous consent, I am inserting several pages of a pamphlet recently issued by Mr. Crowther relating to OPA, as follows:

SHALL WE MAKE HONESTY ILLEGAL?

The Office of Price Administration, sprawling over our Nation like a giant squid, has thrown its tentacles around every honest man and woman, in and out of business, and is crushing out of American life the plain and simple virtues which made ours the land of hope and promise.

And, as is the nature of the squid, the OPA is throwing out a black, inky fluid which forms into a mass of words which seek to conceal that the blood stream of our national life is being strangled.

These are not pleasant words, though, as one looks into its workings and matches pretense with performance, it becomes less than a pleasant subject. And the more one investigates, the less pleasant it becomes.

TRICKS WITH MATHEMATICS

No matter how thoroughly one attempts to investigate, the best that one can do is to scratch the surface. But every scratch, no matter where taken, reveals a revolting rottenness.

It is not too much to say that the present campaign to prolong the grip of the bureaucrat on American life through price control is the most blatantly dishonest and recklessly hypocritical in the history of our country and perhaps of any country.

It is peculiarly unfortunate for the faith which citizens should have in government, that the ranking officers of the administration, who must depend for the information upon others, should be turned into propagandists.

It is quite evident that when the President uses dollar figures to prove that production

is high and the OPA just fine he does not realize that a $6 sports shirt counts the same as six $1 work shirts and that he is really saying how much prices have risen and not how much production has risen.

By counting prices instead of goods Germany at the peak of inflation was also at the peak of prosperity.

Of course those who furnished the President with the script knew exactly what they were doing.

They were obeying their masters.

SOMETHING FOR NOTHING

The real backers of price control today are not the simple dupes who hope to get something for nothing—to receive much for their own goods and services but to pay little for the goods and services of others.

It is begining to dawn on them that arithmetic although it has not been used for some years is still lurking about.

Nor are the real backers of price control the mavericks, dead-enders, chronic failures, and adventurers who make up our motley crew of social-reform bureaucrats.

They are only the fronts.

The real backers of price fixing and the real source of the tremendous movement for the retention of the OPA are the vested interests that have grown up under the regulations and methods of administration of the OPA.

Legitimate manufacturers and merchants with standards and reputations to preserve have been so regulated that they can produce only at a loss. They are turning out only token amounts of their standard goods. Many of them are putting up the shutters.

FLY-BY-NIGHTS FAVORED

But manufacturers who were not in business in 1942 and can find favor with the OPA are allowed high ceiling prices.

This is promoting hundreds of thousands—no one knows the exact number—of fly-by-night outfits who turn out any old thing and sell to certain kinds of wholesalers. These foist the stuff on goods-starved retailers as tie-ins with reputable merchandise.

The manufacturer and the wholesaler clean up in a big way. The retailer makes some money—but at the expense of his good will. These manufacturers and merchants are not all racketeers. Some of them are formerly honest men who have had to shift their lines or go bankrupt.

Many of these people are making more money than they ever knew was in the world. They are operating wholly within the law under the special privileges granted them by the OPA. Their existence depends upon continuing the OPA. They are the backbone of its support.

The other great vested interest is the black market. The black market is not a definite form of business on which one can put a finger.

FLASH-BACK TO PROHIBITION

In the struggle for survival against the OPA many merchants who tried to be honest have found that they cannot buy or sell at ceiling prices and also cover expenses. Smarting under injustice, they began to cut corners. Soon that became the regular way of doing business. That is bad for their normal structure. It is worse for the country's.

From the involuntary criminals, step by step one reaches the real black market where no questions are asked or answered.

Only cash talks, and anything may be bought at a price.

And, as in the days of prohibition, the highjackers and "muscle men" are back at trades. But the lawlessness and the money returns of the bootleggers of yesterday are as nothing to the lawlessness and returns of today.

The vested-interest stake in keeping the OPA is thus enormous. Only a part of the black market is hampered in its actions by being beyond the law. The great new lines of establishments privilege to make shoddy goods at high price is entirely within the law.

But since these concerns live on the sufferance of special ceiling prices which may be changed at the will of an OPA officer, most of them think it necessary to be represented by those ex-New Deal lawyers and economists who swarm as lobbyists.

What, if anything, these lobbyists do for their fees, is still a matter of doubt. But there is no doubt of their activity as members of the pressure group that is trying at any cost to fasten price fixing into the scheme of American life.

INFLATION THEIR BOGEYMAN

Whether the OPA, in its frenzied campaign to perpetuate itself, is playing the game of the new vested interests or the vested interests are playing the games of the OPA, does not call for a decision, because the results are the same whichever way one takes it.

But it is difficult to explain the impudence and the recklessness of the OPA campaign.

Take inflation: Nearly every waking hour of the day some OPA employee or some Government officer with an OPA script goes through a bloodcurdling routine to the effect that only the OPA stands between the people and the loss of their money through run-away inflation.

The threats of what will happen to Congress if it lets the OPA out and inflation in are dire and dark.

There is never a hint that monetary inflation can be caused only by the Government printing money and never by the people spending it.

And also there is never a hint that any government which was honestly against inflation would balance the budget so that no more money would be printed.

And no one seems to note that the crowd who want regimentation through price fixing are the same people who are all-out for free spending.

SMALL BUSINESS SUFFERS

The OPA has not, qualities and subsidies considered, kept down prices. That will be brought out. It has aided inflation by hampering first-class production. That will be brought out. But talking of prices and inflation dodges the real issue.

The real issue is whether legitimate, fair-dealing free business in free markets shall be pushed out and in their place be set up congeries of royal favorites, existing at the will of pinchbeck despots.

The ranks of honest small business are thinning. There were 300,000 less such concerns at the end of 1945 than in 1941.

The ranks of hones+ big business are wavering.

For the OPA has made honesty a punishable crime.

That has been its sole contribution to the public.

H. R. 4908—The Federal Mediation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this rule accepting the Senate amendments which amount in reality to a substitute for the Case bill we passed more than 3 months ago. Whether we were justified in going along with the President's bill last Saturday remains to be seen. I thought and think it was doubtful. I myself could not see the propriety or even the wisdom of much of it, especially the authorization to draft into the armed forces men who strike in plants, mines, or facilities which the President has taken over because he finds their continued operation essential to the whole Nation's economy. I am still against any such provision, just as I am against going to war. But when a President of the United States calls a special session to report that there is such a serious assault on the very integrity of this Government that we must go to war—or, in this instance, must authorize drafting men into the Army in certain very special and extreme cases, in order to keep the Government from breaking down—then I felt and feel one must resolve his own doubts in favor of the President's position, and support that position loyally until events prove it unnecessary or unwise or wrong.

Inasmuch as the immediate crisis has eased greatly, I hope the President's hastily drawn bill will be revised rather drastically in the Senate and that we will thus get a chance to vote on its individual provisions instead of having to take it or reject it in toto, which was our sole alternative on Saturday under the parliamentary situation which alone permitted the immediate consideration and action the President so urgently requested.

But whatever the wisdom of the Truman bill, I believe the bill now before us is on the whole a real forward step in the direction of establishing equity and mutual responsibility in our troubled labor-management relations, the first really sound forward step since the Wagner Act in 1935 tried to correct the lopsidedness of our laws in favor of business by making them lopsided in favor of labor. Only as legislation is fair and equitable to all concerned, including first of all the paramount public interest, can it be workable. Otherwise it inevitably promotes industrial strife, not industrial peace.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see how anyone can honestly call this bill "antilabor." If I thought it were anti-labor, I certainly would vote against it. If it is found that any part of it operates in such a way as to be unfair to labor, I shall move or support any move to correct such unfairness.

What actually does it do? It lays equally on employers and on employees and their representatives the obligation to exert every reasonable effort to make and maintain agreements as to pay, hours, and working conditions.

It sets up a Federal mediation board to encourage and assist employers and employees to settle their differences and disputes, if possible, through conferences. If not, then, by conciliation, or by mediation, or by voluntary arbitration.

It requires that whenever the mediation board proffers its services in an unsettled dispute, it shall be the duty of both employers and employees to maintain the status quo for a period up to 60 days before any lock-out or strike.

It provides that any employer who does not perform this duty shall be subject to the penalties prescribed in the

National Labor Relations Act for engaging in an unfair labor practice.

It provides that any employee who does not perform this duty shall lose his status as an employee under the National Labor Relations Act.

It provides, specifically, that nothing in the act shall be construed to require an employee to work without his consent, or construed to make his quitting his job an illegal act.

It authorizes the Mediation Board to request the President to create an emergency commission to investigate and report on any unsettled dispute involving a public utility whose rates are fixed by a governmental agency, if it determines that there is likely to be such interruption of an essential monopolized service as would endanger the public interest. Employers and employees must maintain the status quo during the period of the commission's investigations, not to exceed 60 days.

It decrees that whoever by robbery or extortion obstructs or affects the movement of articles in interstate commerce, is guilty of a felony and it prescribes penalties.

It prohibits payments by an employer to any employee welfare fund unless the employer is represented in the administration of the fund.

It prohibits supervisors from unionizing under the National Labor Relations Act if they have authority in the interest of the employer to hire or fire employees, adjust grievances, determine or recommend wages, and so forth. However, such supervisors may become or remain members of a union.

It provides that labor organizations, as well as employers, may be sued in the United States courts for violations of contracts concluded as a result of collective bargaining.

It provides that any employee who participates in a strike in violation of an existing collective-bargaining agreement, if such strike is not approved by his labor organization, shall lose his status as an employee of that employer, under the National Labor Relations Act.

It outlaws secondary boycotts, such as the use of strikes, violence, or concerted refusal to handle specified articles, in the attempt to force a business concern not to handle the products of another concern, or to force an employer to deal with one labor organization instead of another with which he has an effective collective-bargaining agreement. The present bill does not set aside in certain situations the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act as did the original Case bill.

Mr. Speaker, probably no one is wholly satisfied with all the provisions. For example, I wish that it provided a special labor court to deal judicially with jurisdictional disputes between unions and with grievance disputes arising over the application or interpretation of an existing collective-bargaining agreement. Why should the employer and the public be the bystander victims of these grievance disputes, as contrasted with interest disputes which are the proper subject of collective bargaining?

But on the whole I believe the provisions of the bill under consideration are basically sound and workable. I sincerely believe its enactment and faithful administration will be in the best interests of labor as well as of the country as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, it has seemed to me unfortunate that many labor leaders have been so adamant in their opposition to any legislation at all. Even they would oppose, and properly, the repeal of legislation regulating railroads, banks, utilities, or corporations. When unions become as big as big business then it is inescapable that the Government, as the agency representing all the people, must exercise regulatory functions in both cases in order to protect the public interest against abuse of its power by any business or labor organization which does not conduct itself in a responsible way. Labor would gain enormously in public good will and public confidence if it would take the lead in advocating proper regulatory legislation instead of in opposing any legislation whatsoever that has to do with its activities.

If labor will not help those of us who believe we are true friends get sound and equitable legislation, then it is likely to wind up with far more drastic legislation from its enemies. I realize such a statement will be scoffed at, but I am confident events will prove it accurate.

Therefore, I must vote my conscientious convictions and support this bill as one that will be of benefit to our country and everyone in it during this most critical period in its history, and the history of the world.

While Honoring Heroic Dead Let Us Recall the Meaning of Their Sacrifice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day, which was yesterday, a significant and appealing address was delivered by Gen. Omar M. Bradley at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in the Arlington National Cemetery. Under leave to print, I wish hereby to furnish the text of this memorable address that it may reach a wide audience in a permanent form for reference and rereference. These words of sincerity, coming from the heart of one who bore his part in the decisive military struggle, and is now bearing his part in binding up the wounds of war, should have a special and direct appeal to the minds and hearts of all Americans. I commend the reading of this address, not only by all officials, but by the rank and file of our citizens. The address is as follows:

A wise man has written: "To everything there is a purpose, and a time to every purpose, a time to keep silence, and a time to speak."

Today, on these green hills of Arlington, we know that there is also a time to listen.

For if we listen here with our hearts, we may hear many voices. Many voices, that speak together—and strangely sound as one.

That is the voice of America.

And that is the voice we hear in our hearts. It is greater, and truer, and more compelling in its command, than any we shall hear with our ears.

In looking about these narrow hills, this green grass that we see about us covers the graves in which dead men lie. But we know that if we lift our hearts to their great voice—we shall hear the dreams, the hopes, and the achievements of this mighty Nation.

We know that the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier stands for the good spirit of the American people.

We know that out of the humility with which we approach this tomb, we draw greater faith in that good spirit.

And we know that in the unyielding strength of this Nation's spirit, there lives our best assurance of freedom.

It is not important that we know whose body lies within this marble shrine. It is not important for us to know who he was while he still lived. No, nor what he did before he died.

He is important to us because in giving his life he gave so unselfishly to the spirit of this Nation. He is important because in dying he has given enduring life to that by which we live.

Every soldier, every citizen, buried here is equally fixed in our hearts. So also are those Americans buried under their white markers in fields that bear the names of battles all over the world.

Just as there is a way of living, so also is there a way of dying.

To live by beliefs that give freedom, justice, and dignity to all—we must sometimes be prepared to defend those beliefs with our lives.

On this Memorial Day we shall remember that to live with tolerance and good will in a world sick with hatred, we were forced to fight that hatred.

In dying in the search for peace they left—by their example—a bequest to the Nation. Each has given himself to the greater good of his people.

What more could be asked of any man?

The good spirit for which they died is part of the life we live today.

It is the freedom to think, the freedom to speak, the freedom to pray—without fear or persecution.

It is the right of parents to raise their children in truth.

It is the right of youth to seek jobs of their choosing.

It is the right of all men to be judged by achievement.

It is the right of men to ask justice of other men.

Throughout our long past, wars for survival have ravaged both the youth and the wealth of this Nation. Again and again, arms have been called upon to rescue us from the failures of diplomacy. Again and again it has cost the men who bear those arms their health, their ambitions, their lives.

The span of our Nation's life has become the chain of all their lives.

That chain makes a mighty bond because each link is the life of a man who died that it might hold. The chain is a mighty bond because its strength is the strength of brave young men.

We come today not alone to honor these graves. We come not alone to give solace to those who grieve for their dead.

Instead we come to ask even more of those who have given so much.

We come to take comfort and strength from the men who are buried here.

We come to learn, if we can, how men might live as charitably together in peace as they died for each other in war.

The uneasiness we feel comes from a gnawing fear of failure. Fear that the peace we sought at the end of war will again elude our reach.

The symptoms of fear are all about.

The world that was sick with hatred is now sick with starvation and famine.

Out of the rubble of Axis aggression has emerged the distrust and suspicion of Allies.

Already, people have asked themselves: What has the war accomplished?

Let them remember this:

Wars are not instruments of achievement. They destroy. They do not create.

Wars cannot make peace. They remove the barriers to peace.

Wars cannot outlaw aggression. They banish the threats of aggressors.

This war, just ended, has done just that.

Germany and Japan have been destroyed.

Both are demolished as obstructions to peace.

They have been obliterated as aggressors.

For all that we can be grateful.

It is true we have won a remarkable victory. But there is a difference between victory and peace.

Victory has redeemed the mistakes that led to war. It has cleared the way for the attainment of peace. It has not secured it.

We make a mistake if we believe that with the destruction of our enemies, we have achieved an immutable pattern for peace.

Peace is part of human progress. Like progress it must be pursued. And like progress, it requires work.

There are faint hearts who point to the postwar contest of nations and cry that the peace has already been lost. They delude themselves in thinking the peace was ever won.

Peace is not won by war.

We shall have to see that peace can only be created by intelligence, by realism, by sacrifice, and by the will to see it achieved.

It can be lost by timid world leadership and by the premature abandonment of our armed strength. It can be lost when a nation's self interest is permitted to smother its world role. It can be lost by surrender to doubt. It can be sold out by suspicion.

Above all, the easiest way to lose the peace is to lose it by default, by retreating behind our walls to live in dangerous isolation.

With the defeat of our enemies, with the establishment of United Nations, this is not the time for despair, but a time for hope. Never in all world history have we had a better chance to achieve peace.

Contrasted with the world of imperialist ambition in which we lived only 10 years ago, the world that we find today gropes hopefully for cooperation and holds at least promise for enduring peace.

History has taught us that there is no easy road to peace. Its path is more devious than the well-mapped road to Berlin.

Remembering this, we must remember, too, that peace suffers set-backs. During the war, we clung desperately in the face of early defeats to our insistence on Axis surrender. Now is the time to cling as doggedly—and with continued faith—in the eventual achievement of a pattern for peace.

This is a time for hope, rather than for despair. It is a time for frankness—a time for plain statements of intentions in an open search for amity. It is a time to anticipate the causes of war and expose them to discussion.

Above all, it is clear that unless we are willing to work with all our hearts and with all our minds, we shall not find peace. And unless we are willing to pay the costs of peace, it will continue to escape our reach.

It was less than 100 years ago that Abraham Lincoln, confronted with the terrible agony of war between the States, observed in his great wisdom that "this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free."

Time has made this true of the world as well as a nation.

In struggling to build an arch of peace over the misery that follows war, we need lift our national interests to a new level of world leadership.

In a world that could again divide itself it is a time for nations to remember that peace cannot endure in a world half slave, half free.

It is time for nations to remember that peace cannot endure in a world half gaunt, half fat.

It is a time for nations to remember that peace cannot endure in a world half naked, half clothed.

By this time we should have learned that no one is richer by war. All are the poorer. Including the victors.

But if war is costly, so also is peace. Until nations know that peace demands its price, they shall risk future conflicts.

In shouldering a fair share of this cost we are nonetheless true to ourselves. The lives of our children hang upon our ability to find peace. All that we produce will mean nothing if produced in the shadow of atomic war. These dead have already shown us the cost of war. By their death they have made it possible for us to strive for a peace that may banish war.

To give anything other than our full share in the achievement of this peace is to break the faith we held with them.

Let us this day, under God, dedicate ourselves anew to building a world in which men may live in freedom without fear.

Memorial Oak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday a young white oak tree was planted on the Capitol Grounds in front of the Senate wing of the Capitol by the American Legion Auxiliary and dedicated to our fallen heroes who gave their lives for their country in World War II. Around its roots was placed the soil from each one of the 48 States as well as from the Territories and insular possessions. President Truman was invited to be present and deliver the acceptance speech, but was unable to attend. I was asked to be present and to represent the President and accept this tree on his behalf.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the short address made by me on that occasion.

The address referred to follows:

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the President of the United States I desire to accept this token of your patriotism in the form of this living oak which you have just planted, nurtured by soil from each one of the 48 States as well as from the Territories and insular possessions.

It is an all-American tree, and the soil which you have placed at its roots is all-American soil. It will be a symbol of the love and gratitude of all the American people for this, the greatest Government the world has ever known.

The representative of the American Legion Auxiliary which sponsored this magnanimous gesture has called attention to the fact that it is dedicated to our fallen heroes and watered, as it were, by the tears of their sorrowing loved ones.

In accepting it on the part of the President, as well as on the part of the Congress of the United States, I should like to dedicate it also to the future generations of Americans.

This Government is the hope of civilization today and will be, no doubt, for generations to come. When our children gather beneath the shadow of this umbrageous manifestation of your gratitude, to look upon the dome of yonder Capitol and contemplate the blessings of this great Republic, may they behold a Government more powerful than the Athens of Pericles or the Rome of Augustus, more splendid than the France of Louis, or the England of Queen Elizabeth, more beneficent than anything pictured in the wildest utopian dream, and as enduring as the eternal hills, as she goes down to the future leading the way in the onward march of modern progress toward a greater era of peace, happiness, progress, and prosperity for all mankind.

American institutions can never fail as long as they are supported by the patriotism and devotion of those glorious men who have offered up their lives in her cause, and by the undying devotion of the untold millions of men, women, and children whose love for their country this tree will symbolize.

This Government is here to stay, and, as Chief Justice Marshall once said, to endure throughout the ages. Those alien enemies that now attempt to undermine and destroy it will find their efforts no more effective in the long run than that of the tiny termites that gnaw at the base of Washington's Monument have on the destiny of the Father of our Country.

As this tree grows and spreads its branches and points its towering pinacle heavenward, America will grow in power, in strength, and in influence throughout the world.

If I might borrow from the lips of a great English poet a verse dedicated to the British Empire, revise it and appropriate it to my own country, I would say:

"All our past acclaims our future; Jefferson's voice and Washington's hand,
Marshall's faith and Franklin's trust in this our chosen and chainless land,
Bear us witness: come the world against her, America yet shall stand!"

Alien Wealth Here Over Twenty Billions—Foreign Ownership of American Resources Doubled During War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the ownership of American wealth by foreigners has long since passed $20,000,000,000. With the proposed settlements of lend-lease the United States now owes more abroad than others owe to us.

Stated another way, foreigners today have more assets and more financial power in America than ever before.

The New York Times article, which concludes these remarks, indicates that foreign holdings in the United States have passed $20,000,000,000.

But this total does not include the speculative gains made at the expense of Americans by refugees and aliens during the war.

It is probable that much alien "smart money," cunning and experienced in the art of manipulation during inflationary periods, has multiplied itself by speculation in the stock market, real estate, and other inflation hedges.

These gigantic assets could furnish plenty of dollar credits for necessary export purposes for years.

Instead, the administration demands a gigantic inflationary hand-out to Great Britain at a time when no American can buy the things he needs without the interference of governmental regimentation.

The New York Times article follows:

ALIEN STAKES HERE PUT AT $20,000,000,000—ESTIMATED TO BE TWICE AS BIG AS AT START OF WAR—DATA FROM OFFICIAL SOURCES

(By Kenneth Austin)

Foreigners have increased their stake in the United States to more than $20,000,000,000, without allowing for appreciation in the value of securities held during the last 5 years, it appears from a study of the United States Treasury's census of foreign-owned assets as of June 14, 1941, and of subsequent changes in the position reported by the Treasury and other authorities.

The current total is more than double the foreign holdings at the outbreak of World War II in Europe and nearly one-third greater than mid-1941 total disclosed by the Treasury census. It is more than five times the total at the close of 1919, some months after the end of World War I, and compares with more than $8,900,000,000 at the end of 1929 and some $5,400,000,000 at the close of 1933, the low point of the last depression.

CENSUS BY TREASURY

Undertaken principally to determine the nature and amount of foreign holdings with a view to implementing the freezing controls to safeguard the countries that were victims of Axis aggression, the Treasury's census was the first authentic appraisal of the nature and amount of foreign investments and deposits in this country.

Before the mid-1941 census, we had only data compiled by such organizations as the Department of Commerce, the Federal Reserve Board, and the Treasury Department to gauge foreign holdings and international movements of capital. While the estimates were made carefully, they were subject to continuous revisions as new methods were developed and new sources of information were tapped.

One result was that data compiled by one agency were difficult to reconcile with figures supplied by another. Furthermore, comparisons for more than a few years have been unsatisfactory with respect to the estimates of a single official agency. Even although the estimates do not appear to have got too far off the track at any given time it may be added that they could not reflect adequately the constantly changing market values or other fluctuations in worth of foreign holdings.

The Treasury Department notes that "the conclusion is inescapable * * * that data and estimates currently available (end of 1945) with respect to foreign deposit accounts and security holdings are reasonably accurate for general use and as the basis of policy decisions. More accurate data are needed, however, regarding accounts payable by United States enterprises, interests in estates and trusts, and interests in foreign-controlled United States enterprises."

Likewise, the Treasury notes that there is still an unexplained "residual" in the Commerce Department's records of our balance of international payments. This residual contains such items as the following: Changes of domicile from foreign to domestic by persons with deposits in United States banks, foreign purchases of real estate and other assets not included in the current reporting mechanisms, foreign purchases of securities and holdings of cash balances by agents who are not included among those reporting currently, and deposits held by nonreporting persons in the United States for foreign accounts.

The Treasury not only finds that it cannot assign numerical values to the foregoing items, but also that there are still other elements of the "residual" which are not explained. It is considered probable that many of the items under this general heading come under the loose description of "refugee operations," which experienced financiers assert have attained considerable proportions as to both initial amount and subsequent profits, particularly in the last 4 years.

DIVISION OF HOLDINGS

The census data revealed that more than 132,000 foreign individuals had assets valued at nearly $2,600,000,000 and 23,000 foreign corporations property valued at about $8,000,000,000 in mid-1941. "Thousands of persons held assets amounting to less than $5,000," the Treasury recorded. "While the foreign interests in American corporations were large in value, it can be stated definitely that they did not represent control over any large segments of the industry of this country."

Starting at $12,738,700,000 the aggregate foreign holdings at June 14, 1941, the Treasury did not include therein $1,916,000,000 of gold ear-marked for foreign account, since we were mainly the custodians, nor $890,500,000 of foreign securities held in this country on behalf of foreign owners. Since exclusion of "deposits" might apply quite reasonably also to bank deposits or brokerage balances, the present analysis includes such items in arriving at a total of $15,545,200,000 for the foreign position at mid-1941 and a total of $20,307,000,000 for end-1945.

The latter figure is conservative for many reasons, chief among which are the following: It does not allow for the "residual" items, which the Treasury was unable to evaluate; it does not allow for increases in stock and bond market values during recent years, which have been substantial; it does not appraise the value of patents, trademarks, copyrights, franchises, and concessions. However, the total does allow for foreign assets vested as a war measure in the Alien Property Custodian and for the sale of certain substantial interests by British holders in obtaining dollars in the early war years.

There is no indication of any "flight from the dollar" in the data consulted in making this survey. On the contrary, net inflow of foreign funds from the end of 1944 to November 30, 1945, was $933,000,000.

Cancel Old Feed and Seed Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, during the years from 1931 to 1937 inclusive the Government made feed and seed loans to the drought stricken farmers of the Middle West. It took a lien on the crops and on the cattle.

It was the intention of the Government undoubtedly not to go beyond that lien. But, unfortunately, the Farm Credit Administration has gone far beyond that. It is attempting not only to collect these loans from widows and orphans, whose husbands' and fathers' homes they took by mortgage foreclosure, but is even trying to collect from the returning veterans of World War II, the indebtedness in some cases of the departed father.

During this same period we gave the city people relief but we did not ask any lien on their earnings. During this same period we gave WPA relief. We asked nothing in return, but when it came to the farmer we demanded a lien, and now, not satisfied with that lien, the Farm Credit Administration is attempting to collect these old feed and seed loans with interest at 6 percent. This in spite of the fact that last year we passed a law authorizing them to make compromises and get rid of these old feed and seed loans by charging them off the books. But Shylock never went after his pound of flesh with more vengeance than the Farm Credit Administration with its collection brigade.

These old feed and seed loans should long ago have been canceled, but it is not too late to do justice now. I have a resolution pending to cancel them. I sincerely hope that there are enough Members of Congress, who believe in justice when dealing with agriculture, the same as we Members who represent agriculture, believe in justice when we deal with city, industrial, and labor problems.

Here is a letter from the commissioner of agriculture and labor of my State:

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Bismarck.

Congressman WILLIAM LEMKE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEMKE: I wish to submit to you and Congress a statement with regard to the old feed and seed loans which were made by the Government to the drought-stricken farmers during the period from 1931 on up to 1937.

Some of these loans have already been paid back by the farmers that were best able to pay, but a greater number of them are still delinquent; the reason for this delinquency, through the north-central section of this Nation especially, is the fact that while crops have been generally good and prices fair, nature in the form of hail storms and various insects which damage crops, over which the farmer has had no control, has not been too kind. Therefore, most of the farmers have been unable to pay or at least make any substantial payment on these loans. In all fairness to those people who made these loans and since that time have been unable to make payment on them, it seems to me that it would be a just and fair thing for Congress to now enact some law to settle these feed and seed loans with the farmers on a reasonable basis, or in cases where necessary, cancel them. These loans have run long enough, and those that could pay have done so. Those that have not paid have been financially unable to do so. I will point out again that in many cases the interest on the loan amounts to as much now as the original loan.

I would like to make one point clear to you and Congress, and that is the loyalty of the farmer to the land. When these loans were made, they were entered into in good faith; everyone hoped that a crop could be raised which would be beneficial both to the farmer and to the Government. This failed; the crop failed entirely. The farmer fulfilled his contract by putting in his crop in a good manner, cultivating and taking as good care of it as it was possible for him to do. The Government had first lien on this crop. However, all the security was wiped out year after year. There were absolutely no returns to the farmer. He did not receive anything for his work, to say nothing about having money to pay on a loan. Neverthe-

less, the farmers and their families stayed on their land; in fact, they made a desperate battle to stay there and suffered innumerable hardships. Very few people have any conception as to what these people went through to sustain life when drought and depression struck this country. Due to the heroic effort that was made by the farmers and their families and the deep privation they went through, they were there to fill the place when the climatic conditions changed and Divine Providence again blessed that portion of the Nation that had been a dust bowl for several years. Then the farmers began to produce good crops, and the crops produced added to the wealth of this Nation. There is no question that the farmers of our country have done a most outstanding job in producing food not only for this Nation and our armed forces, but also for our Allies.

In the face of all the hardships and suffering which these farmers and their families have gone through, both financially and otherwise, it certainly can no more than be reasonable to ask that definite action be taken by Congress at this time to make definite provisions that these old feed-and-seed loans be settled up on a percentage basis or by outright cancellations in cases where the farmer is unable to pay without jeopardizing his credit in so doing. Congress has been very generous in helping other nations, and certainly they ought to be willing to give some help when help is needed by citizens of our own country. I do not want to believe that Congress will reject a reasonable proposal to a fair settlement or an outright cancellation of these loans. A bill should be passed by Congress at once to settle this controversy once and for all, thus giving the farmer some consideration for his faithfulness to the land and for the wonderful service each one has given to this Nation.

I trust, Congressman LEMKE, that you will give every effort to see that justice is done in that matter.

Very sincerely yours,

MATH DAHL,
Commissioner, Department of Agriculture and Labor.

Here is one of hundreds of letters I have received:

DEAR MR. LEMKE: Have your letter of April 2, 1945, and accordingly will write you and also send you a letter which the United States attorney sent me before they sued me. You will note that they have pretty near as much interest as principal. I worked with my wife and children day and night to pay for the taxes in those bad years. I ran behind in interest on my Federal loan. They threatened to foreclose. Then the county threatened to foreclose on the taxes. We struggled along and started to pay all we raised from the farm—just scratched out a bare living. We had some fair crops and the taxes are now paid, also the interest on the Federal loan. Never had any crops from the seed that I seeded of those Government seed loans. About 3 years ago I took sick and had two operations in 4 days, and never did get over that, and had to rent the farm and get now half crop share with still the Federal loan on hand.

I send you letter herewith that you may return.

Unable to work any more; I am now 67 years old. Is it possible that such things as this exist where the United States charges full interest to our people, gets judgments, and worry us to death, and Congress would loan billions to foreigners without interest and no security?

I would like to have you get a resolution through that such judgments against our people for these seed loans be canceled. These seed loans were no help to us at all.

Here is another letter:

DEAR MR. LEMKE: Enclosed find a letter from the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Office. Sometime ago I made them an offer of $30 as payment in full on my loan. You can see what he has to say. Admits that they have the power to cancel, but would still like to bleed a turnip.

I have a friend who lost a son in the service, the same as I did. He is going to tell them when the foreigners pay their debts he will try and pay some of his feed loans. I think I will do the same and tell them to return my $30. What is your advice?

Thanking you again for all you have done in trying to cancel these loans, I remain,

Your friend,

J. D. EDWARDS.

FRAZEE, MINN.

Here is the reply of the Farm Credit Administration. If it were not so bureaucratic and ridiculous and at the same time tragic, it might be excusable. Here is a farmer whose gross income for himself and family is $750 a year, farms a little 80-acre farm in Minnesota. He anticipates a gross income of $850 the following year and yet the Farm Credit Administration, which in effect, is the Government of the United States, tries to get some more blood out of a turnip and in the next breath that same Government makes a loan of $1,370,000,000 to France and wants to make a loan of $4,400,000,000 to Great Britain.

May I suggest a trickery in the last paragraph "applied $30.02 on your loan as partial payment" in place of returning it. It is about time that the Government becomes as honest with its people as it expects its people to be with it. These loans should have been canceled long ago. They never were intended to go beyond the lien. Read the Farm Credit Administration's reply:

EMERGENCY CROP AND FEED
LOAN OFFICE, UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION,
St. Paul, Minn., November 5, 1945.

Mr. JOHN D. EDWARDS,
Frazee, Minn.

DEAR MR. EDWARDS: We have given careful and sympathetic consideration to your application for a compromise settlement of your indebtedness, but we are unable to approve your offer of $30.02 as payment in full.

Public Law 518, which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture or his duly appointed representatives to cancel, adjust, or compromise indebtedness arising from loans made pursuant to the several acts of Congress enumerated in section 2 of the law, provides that there must be a showing on the part of the debtor that he is unable to pay his indebtedness in full and has no reasonable prospect of being able to do so.

The application which you submitted and our independent investigation show that you are the owner of 80 acres of land and that you are actively engaged in farming, from which source you have had approximate incomes of $750 the past 2 years and anticipate an income of $850 this year. You show very little indebtedness other than that against your land and to this office. We believe it reasonable to assume that you will be able to continue farming for a number of years and that from future income you have the prospective ability to either pay in full or substantially reduce your indebtedness. In view of this and the provisions of Public Law 518 above referred to, we can find no authority under the law to compromise your indebtedness upon the payment of only $30.02.

It is and always has been the policy of this office to give due consideration to the financial circumstances of each borrower and to regulate our requests for payments in accordance with ability to pay. We appreciate that your income is insufficient for you to arrange for the full payment of your indebtedness at one time. However, in line with our policy, it would be our suggestion that you authorize us to apply the $30.02 which you forwarded as a compromise settlement, upon your account as a partial payment and that you make periodic payments from future income in accordance with your ability.

Very truly yours,

L. C. STREATER,
Regional Manager.

Floor Space Equivalent to 223,000 Five-Room Homes Occupied by Government Agencies

REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting but most disturbing to note how the administration lags in reducing the wartime spending. Six months before Pearl Harbor, the Federal Government occupied 68,277,000 square feet of leased floor space throughout the country. On VJ-day, August 1945, this total had increased to 227,800,000 square feet. Think of it, 227,800,000 square feet occupied by the Government. During the ensuing months from August 1945 to February 20, 1946, the last date for which the figures are obtainable, only 4,000,000 square feet of this tremendous total have been relinquished, according to newspaper reports from the Public Buildings Administration.

In New York City 26 Government agencies and bureaus occupied in excess of 6,000,000 square feet of rented space as late as February this year, which is approximately 10 percent of the total office space in that city, and we are told that as fast as one Government agency releases space another Government agency moved in. Either the New Deal does not want to cut expenses or they do not know how.

We know that at least 50 percent of the 223,000,000 square feet of space could be released almost immediately if a little intelligent action would be taken by the administration, thus making over 100,000,000 square feet of floor space available to relieve the housing shortage for our veterans and other Americans who are so badly in need of a place to live right now. Also, to make room for private business places at a time when the administration has almost brought new commercial construction to a standstill.

There is approximately 1,000 square feet of floor space in a normal 5 room home. So, when we reduce this 223,000,000 square feet to more easily understood figures, or in terms of normal sized dwellings, we find the space occupied by Government agencies is the equivalent of 223,000 homes. That is hard to believe, but it is true.

Now, if half that space were released it could be converted into homes for over 100,000 veterans, that in itself would be a big step in solving the problem and it could be done economically and quickly.

Right here in Washington, D. C., several large apartment houses, such as the Dupont Circle Apartments taken over by the Government during the war, could and should be immediately relinquished, thus making homes for several hundred families. The same is true in almost every large city in the United States.

If Mr. Wilson Wyatt, the boss man of the housing program, is as anxious as he says he is to get homes for veterans, he will do something about this unwarranted space hording by Government and do it now.

Tennessee Celebrates 150 Years of Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, throughout the State of Tennessee, people will celebrate 150 years of statehood of the Volunteer State. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered on the accomplishments of the State of Tennessee by J. Pope Dyer, head of the history department of Central High School, Chattanooga, Tenn. The address is as follows:

We are soon to celebrate the sesquicentennial of Tennessee—in other words 150 years of statehood. It was June 1, 1796, that Tennessee became a State, the sixteenth to be admitted. It had only a few counties then. The population then was only a few thousand. Now we have 95 counties and about 3,000,000 population. I should explain that Tennessee had at one time 96 counties but James County was consolidated with Hamilton (our own county). This was a great event in political history since it was the first example of county consolidation in American history, I am told by historians.

Tennessee is about 550 miles long and about 110 miles wide. It is about 42,000 square miles in area. The geographical center of Tennessee is near Murfreesboro. The first settlement was made in 1769 by William Bean and the first white child to be born in Tennessee was Russell Bean. He was not particularly a great credit in later life to his noble birth. Jonesboro is the oldest town.

East Tennessee was settled first and we all know much about the early settlements around Jonesboro and Watauga, the first in Tennessee. Such men as John Sevier, William Bean, and James Robertson, played a prominent role in our early Tennessee history.

Our forefathers were good fighters and probably that is one explanation why the tradition has been so nobly upheld in all recent wars. Early fighters like Crockett at the Alamo; Sevier as an Indian fighter; Jackson and Houston, Farragut and numerous others could be mentioned as great heroes, as well as Alvin C. York, whom General Pershing called the greatest hero of World War I. Huff, Cooley, McGarity, Coolidge (of our city) and others have made great records in World War II for bravery and heroism.

Our political history is a great chapter. We all know of our Presidents: Jackson the 7th President, Polk the 11th President, and Johnson the 17th President. It has been said that Tennessee ruled the Nation from 1830 to 1850. If it did we must remember that Andrew Jackson was the leader during that period and did as much as any man in American history to help the common man to participate fully in the civic, military, and political affairs, of his community and Nation. We must not overlook the fact that John Bell, the great Whig leader, was a Tennessean of that period.

In modern times such great citizens as Cordell Hull (ex-Secretary of State), James C. McReynolds, and Wiley Rutledge—Supreme Court members—are very well known and bring fame to our State.

As I think of the history of our State, I recall that there was a terrible feud and hatred between John Sevier, our first governor, and Andrew Jackson, which always was a potential duel wherever they met; that Sam Houston left Tennessee a greatly discouraged man, but made his great name for outstanding service to the State of Texas; that David Crockett, one of the heroes of the battle of the Alamo, was one of the bitterest foes of Andrew Jackson, remarking, "I refuse to wear the collar of another man." That Admiral David Farragut demonstrated the highest type of courage when in command of a fleet he refused to be bluffed when told that torpedoes were at the mouth of the Mississippi River—he uttered some very strong language; that one of the most colorful political campaigns in American history was the race for governor between two brothers in 1886, Bob and Alf Taylor. This has been called the War of the Roses; and that General MacArthur came to our fair State to select his wife.

We have always been famous in war as our nickname, "The Volunteer State," indicates. As you know in the Mexican War, Tennesseans far exceeded their quota for volunteers and were given that sobriquet.

In Tennessee we have produced a lot of firsts—but one you know about is Miles Darden, the largest man on record. He weighed over 1,000 pounds at the time of his death in Henderson County in 1857. He was 7 feet 6 inches tall.

Tennessee produced the worst criminals in history—the notorious Harps brothers of Knox County. They killed men, women, and children. A noted criminal, John A. Murrell, lies buried within a short distance of Hamilton County.

Tennessee's mountains, the Appalachians, are rich in beauty and recreational opportunities. Reelfoot Lake is the paradise of hunters and fishermen.

Our educational institutions are growing and some of the finest schools in America can be found in Tennessee. The University of Tennessee, Peabody College, and Vanderbilt are only a few schools for the whites. Maherry, A. & I., and Fisk are well known for Negroes. Three United States Commissioners of Education were Tennesseans—Eaton, Claxton, and Tigrett.

Our industrial opportunities are unlimited. The TVA offers navigation and electrical advantages. Oak Ridge, with the laboratory manufacturing the atomic bomb which destroyed Hiroshima, put our State on the map throughout the world.

Our State has a glorious history in war, politics, industry, and education. We cannot trust the past too much. The opportunities for greatness for Tennesseans have not been reduced; they have been increased. The challenge is to the young people of this school and every like school to carry on in an ever-expanding manner the past achievements. You are equal to the challenge, I am sure. Tennesseans are proud of their achievements. They look forward with renewed vigor and ambition.

In 50 years the two-hundredth anniversary of our State will be celebrated. I can visualize some youth, probably from this very student body, returning to Tennessee from the White House to deliver the main address on that occasion. I hope that that person is in this audience now. That dream is not an impossibility—it can be a reality. I certainly hope so.

Acceptance of Bid of United States Steel Corp. for Geneva Steel Plant

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, today's newspapers inform us that the War Assets Corporation has awarded the Geneva steel plant to the United States Steel Corp., accepting the corporation's bid for this plant.

I am told this gives the corporation a complete monopoly in iron and steel production in the West.

I am also told that the antitrust division of the Department of Justice has for some months carried on a study of the Geneva steel plant from all angles, its construction, costs of raw materials, cost of production, markets, and so forth, and of its relation to the steel industry of the West and that its findings are such that if made public, there would be no possibility of any sort of bid being accepted from the corporation. I hope this report will be published.

There were seven bids in all for the Geneva plant, one withdrawn at inception. Among these bids is one that offers about the same as the Corporation, but adds another offer to the effect that if the Government goes along with them, the entire amount of the people's money here invested—stated in all Government publications that have come to my notice up to this week as $202,493,208. By a private engineering firm the amount is placed at approximately $198,000,000 and now by the Government as "$191,210,307 after deductions for sales and transfers."

The offer to permit the Government to collect the entire amount loaned is quite novel here and a precedent of this kind would of course be bitterly opposed by the eastern bankers that control the Nation's industrial set-up. However, to repay the Government all the money it loans out is practiced in such countries as Holland, Norway, Sweden, and Great Britain—to my knowledge—and no doubt there are other countries equally honest in their transactions between government and industry.

The engineer in charge is one of the Nation's most experienced iron and steel engineers and he will have as consultants two world-famous eastern engineering firms. Under such leadership there can be no loss—the reputations of these men and firms would not permit a loss.

The company to which I am referring is the Pacific American Steel Iron Corp., an organization on the Pacific coast composed of men who have for a period of over 50 years examined, acquired, and developed iron ores, limerock, coal, and alloy minerals—from Alaska to Mexico, and who have financed their enterprises time and again up to an aggregate of $195,000,000—always to find each transaction stopped by the Morgan-United States Steel Corp.

The evidence of this was presented before the Truman committee in 1942 and is recorded in hearing 14 of that committee's work.

They now find this giant eastern monopoly about to be hung over the Pacific coast from Utah—and they are anxious.

I might refer here to the United States Steel Corp.'s bid on Geneva—how they bring in again and again that the Government is responsible for the building of that plant. In the bid it is stated:

> In 1941 the Government decided on its own initiative and in the national interest to construct a steel plant in the far West.

And again:

> United States Steel was requested by the Government to design and construct the plant.

And again:

> United States Steel was later asked by the Government to operate the plant.

I assume that all this about being asked by the Government is injected to show how self-sacrificing these gentlemen were during the war and thus establish a priority of claim on the Geneva Steel plant. And so, let us look at the picture.

"The Government" the United States Steel Corp. refers to was the Steel Division of the War Production Board, manned, staffed almost in its entirety by employees of the corporation who were in a position to protect and advance the corporation's interests. So much for their peculiar claim of being asked by the Government.

Around the year 1923 the United States Steel Corp. purchased the Columbia steel blast furnace unit at Provo, Utah, a 600-ton furnace. Mr. H. A. Brassert built this furnace and before doing so, carried on the required examinations of the ores, coals, and lime rock available for the use in a Utah furnace. He demonstrated for all time that Utah coals are not good enough to produce a coke that will stand up under a furnace charge in a blast furnace designed to produce over 600 tons per day. This information was available to the corporation—the tests had been in their possession for some 23 years, they could not possibly plead ignorance on this so all important point.

The corporation actually built 1,200-ton furnaces, three of them at Geneva and, needless to say, none of the furnaces have produced over 400 to 500 tons per day—an expensive performance.

It is the well-considered judgment of men familiar with the West and the United States Steel Corp.'s performances out there and elsewhere, that the corporation intends to finish its operations by taking over Geneva—make a pretense of altering the set-up to peacetime needs and at a right moment announce that they find it impossible to produce iron and steel in the West and that they regret being compelled to close down the Geneva plants. Then will come a period during which the steel mills will be moved back to their eastern stronghold and letting the rest rust—a performance we saw at the corporation's plants at Ojibway, across from Detroit in Canada—a sabotage performance along their best lines.

This frightful engineering mistake could never have occurred except by design.

How the United States Steel Corp. has for over 50 years destroyed all efforts on the Pacific coast to start iron and steel production is only too well known for me to need dwell upon.

I might say here that there is no question but that the United States Steel Corp. is responsible for forcing Mr. Henry J. Kaiser to build his blast furnace at Fontana—in fact, the Fontana and Geneva plants may be classed as two super mistake performances on our continent.

Fancy building a Pacific coast iron and steel production plant 75 miles inland—yes, I know, they say the Navy did it, but I think that is wrong; the plant was built in the orange groves near Los Angeles, to use water from a drinking water aqueduct—coal from Utah for the 1,200-ton blast furnace—coal transported some 800 miles by rail from Utah—or by rail, and so forth, when all know there are huge deposits of iron ore, coal, limerock, and so forth at any number of harbors along our 3,000 miles of water front on the Pacific coast.

Regardless of the avalanche of telegrams and letters this Wall Street organization pours into the Justice Department, regardless of the wealth of influence these men control, I hope we do not permit them to fasten their eastern steel monopoly upon the West.

The least the Government can do to atone for this awful injury the United States Steel Corp. manned War Production Board inflicted upon the West through the Geneva and Fontana plants will be to hand the Fontana over to Mr. Henry Kaiser without any further payment—I understand he has paid in some $54,000,000 on Fontana—and award the Geneva to western men.

Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, that ancient and honorable country known to us as Hungary holds great interest for us as it lies in the center of middle Europe, where wars have generated for centuries. Middle Europe is the place where the many races and tongues of the Orient and the Occident meet in a great whorl. Middle Europe is the homeland of the Magyar, the Czech, the Slovak, the Serb, the Croat, the Ruthenian, the Rumanian, and a number of lesser tribal units such as the Slovene and Dalmatian. Hungary is the motherland of many distinguished Americans.

Earlier this year I had the pleasure of hearing an address by a great son of Hungary, concerning the recent history of that country. It appealed to me as a matter of wider interest than the small audience present, and I therefore submit it for the RECORD as follows:

I am deeply gratified by your kind invitation, and I hope that I shall not disappoint you, but that you will realize my difficulties. I shall speak about questions which are very familiar to an Hungarian, since they involve his country's past, present, and future, but to you they are obviously strange and confusing and to a certain extent perhaps of indifferent interest. Nevertheless, the area where these problems originate is of vital importance to Europe. Two world wars were begun in this region and were, at least partly, provoked by the conditions prevailing there.

The first important thing to be said about the Danube Basin, which is the center and geographic backbone of the region, is that it is the eastern gateway of Europe. Lying between the east and west, it is a cross road of races and creeds and of ideological and economic trends. It has never belonged completely either to the east or to the west; conditions in this area were always rather a compromise between western intentions and eastern facts. The people, however, have always considered themselves western. The paramount political fact is that this region, inhabited by a host of small nations, lies between two great political entities: Germany and Russia.

The following data indicate the importance of the region and the variety of its inhabitants:

The combined area of Czechoslovakia, Austria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Poland, and Hungary approximated 482,000 square miles in 1938. This is approximately the area of three American States—Texas, California, and Arkansas, which have a combined population of 15,271,000. But the population of the six European nations was almost 98,000,000 in 1938.

The following area and population figures are in round numbers:

	Area (square miles)	Population, 1938	United States State comparable in—	
			Area	Population (millions)
Austria	26,000	7,009,000	Maine	0.84
Czechoslovakia	54,000	14,000,000	Arkansas	1.95
Hungary	35,000	9,635,000	Indiana	3.43
Poland	149,000	34,776,000	Montana	2.68
Rumania	113,000	16,000,000	Arizona	.5
Yugoslavia	95,000	16,200,000	Oregon	1.1
Total	482,000	97,620,000		10.5

For a comparison of the size of the two powerful neighbors of these six European nations, the following figures are given for prewar Germany and Russia:

	Area (square miles)	Population
Germany	183,381	69,622,213
Russia	8,417,118	[1] 192,695,710

[1] 1940 estimate.

Until 1918, a good half of this area was included in and ruled by the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, a supernational state. Economically it was nearly a perfect unit, but politically it was obsolete. Based, as it was, on the domination of the Austrian-Germans in Austria and the Hungarians in Hungary, it was unable to satisfy the aims and desires of the different peoples within its borders for national integration and independence. By the end of World War I, Austria-Hungary collapsed, and was eventually dismembered in accordance with the principle of national self-determination, or rather national determination, since the way in which the people concerned were to decide their future was fixed in advance by secret agreements negotiated during the war. At any rate, the nations or nationalities were not consulted at all as to whether they actually wished to join the new states or preferred to remain within the old boundaries. Perhaps I am biased in this respect, so I prefer to quote a British expert on the peace settlement of 1919:

"Hungary not only found her historic unity destroyed and her territory reduced by 65 percent; she also lost, even on the ethnographical basis, an unduly large number of Magyars, many of them living in compact masses just outside the new frontiers. Bulgaria not only failed to acquire Macedonia, the goal of her dearest ambitions but long disputed between her and Serbia; she also lost purely Bulgar territory in the southern Dobruja and west of Sofia. * * *

"After the Ukrainians, the Germans came off the worst. It had not been doubted up to 1918 that if Austria were dissolved, most if not all of her German-speaking area would return to Germany; and after the non-German populations had seceded, the German deputies of the Austrian Parliament proclaimed without a dissentient voice that German Austria was now a part of the German Federal Republic. The Allies vetoed this, forbade Austria to alienate her 'independence' without the consent of the League Council, and even forced the young republic to drop the word 'German' from its name. Similarly, the Germans of the Sudetenlaender were compelled to belong to Czechoslovakia.

"Thus a group of dissatisfied states was left as counterpart to the satisfied; and even within the latter, the national minorities formed a dangerously high proportion, amounting to nearly 33 percent of the total population of Czechoslovakia, 25 percent of those of Poland and Rumania. However, the frontiers were drawn, they must have included minorities, but the number was needlessly high, and although not all of them were discontented with their fate, so many of them were as to form a factor of real internal instability of many of the states." [1]

The new settlement in the Danube Basin was worked out under unreal premises, because neither Germany nor Russia were at that time considered as political factors. Actually, both were absorbed for several years with their own domestic problems. This situation allowed time for consolidation and for the conclusion of agreements for the maintenance of the status quo, but it also prevented the winners from attempting a more real consolidation which would have required concessions to the dissatisfied. Moreover, all of the newly emerged states began a policy aiming at economic autarchy, and did not even attempt to put into effect those provisions of the peace treaties which empowered the succession states of the Austro-Hungary Monarchy to introduce a preferential tariff system. This meant serious difficulties for trade and the great economic crisis of the early thirties had grave consequences for all of these states.

[1] Pages 18–19 of The Danubian Basin, by C. A. Macartney, Oxford Pamphlets on World Affairs, No. 10, 1939.

When Hitler took over, Germany offered markets to the agricultural countries, and within a relatively short time became the most important customer of Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and Yugoslavia. This was the first important step toward establishing a German hegemony, since trade was used by the Germans as a means toward political influence. Germany was ready to pay prices above the world market level, and also sold her goods at higher prices. As a result, farmers became interested in good relations with Germany, and at the conclusion of each special agreement the Germans had opportunity to exert pressure on their Governments.

A second pressure group which the Germans could use for their purposes were the German minorities scattered throughout this area. Their nationalistic feelings were first awakened after 1918, when the new states, in order to split their own minority groups, everywhere sponsored the birth of German consciousness. Democratic Germany itself was busy to compensate the political losses of the Empire by activating the Germans abroad. The Nazis exploited this situation, and their task was made easier by the phenomenon that since the Reformation no other ideological movement had aroused such a tremendous echo among the Germans as national socialism.

Another important factor in the onward march of nazism was the ideological and social element. There was something in national socialism which appealed to the common man of central and eastern Europe, dissatisfied with his living conditions, and activated by a confused and undefined longing for a better life, but not always inclined toward the Marxist version of socialism, having been educated in the spirit of state idolatry and being opposed to the internationalism of the old socialist school of thought. Antisemitism and antibolshevism were also powerful factors, not to speak of the success which seemed to be the privilege of the Hitlerian policies. As a consequence, the right-wing groups were strengthened in all the countries.

Fourth, there was the obvious attraction of the rapid and prodigious rise of an underdog, which in a few years had become a great power—for central and eastern Europe the great No. 1 power, on which the hopes and fears of all the smaller nations were focused. For the satisfied ones, to be on good terms with Germany meant the chance of safeguarding the gains of peace; for the dissatisfied, it meant the hope of revision. Nazism played with both alternatives, and everybody was promised what he liked.

On the opposite side of the balance sheet, there were, of course, some disturbing items. First was the possibility of German rule—an obvious threat to national independence. Cooperation with Nazi Germany was not on the basis of partnership but on that of subordination. For the smaller partner it did not mean a wise or even clever limitation of its independence, but rather its ultimate surrender. In this respect I have to reproach ourselves.

Nationalism in this part of Europe was born out of a reaction to foreign domination, and was, therefore, conceived more in terms of domination over other people than in terms of independence. The danger of losing some of the independence was thus compensated to some extent by the hope of keeping or gaining some domination over other people. While people definitely disliked the idea of becoming a satellite, they still preferred the status of a satellite to the sad reality of being an underdog. On the other hand, the small states lived under the same illusions as the larger ones: Czechoslovakia could not believe that the same thing could happen to her that had happened to Austria; the Poles could not believe that the same that had happened to Czechoslovakia could happen to them, and so on.

Then some important events occurred: The annexation of Austria to Germany, the journey of Lord Runciman to Czechoslovakia, and most important, Munich. The Munich agreement confirmed our fears that, with the approval of the British and the French, our region was to become a German Lebensraum, in exchange for adequate guaranties to France and Great Britain in western Europe. The smaller states within the Lebensraum had the choice of being a satellite or a victim of Germany.

The rape of what remained of Czechoslovakia put an end to appeasement, but also established an extremely strong initial position for the war, both politically and economically. And when France collapsed, the independence of the small states in continental eastern Europe was gone.

The second great fear was that a totalitarian great power, with indefinite aims for ideological and national expansion, would impose its political system on its junior partners. Actually, the degree of trustworthiness from the Nazi point of view was measured by two standards: the progress of inner nazification and the privileges granted to the German minority. But another—even more detestable proof of loyalty—also had to be furnished; a satellite had to commit a number of Nazi crimes against Jews, Poles, etc., as an act of solidarity and in order to block its way back to the community of decent nations.

Neither could there be true partnership with Germany in the economic field. In the beginning national socialism was helpful to the small states in need of a market, but eventually Germany insisted on exclusiveness. The Germans tried to prevent trade with other countries and wanted to participate in industry, banking, etc. It was always the same experience: Not cooperation but domination. It was extremely difficult to yield to one demand and resist another, since there was rarely an isolated question but always the totality of relations at stake.

The fourth item on the debit side was the fact that close relations with Germany necessarily involved a sharing of all the risks of Germany, its ultimate defeat and destruction included. The satellite states had no claims against the great powers with which they had to be at war, but only against their fellow satellites with which they were allied under the three-power scheme. Their ultimate hope could have been, and actually was, that they might be rewarded by the Germans after the victory for their good behavior.

The transition from peace to war in eastern Europe was not spectacular. Every intelligent man realized that war was unavoidable, but failed to realize the strength of Germany and the initial weakness of her enemies. The admirers of Germany were triumphant, and the lightning successes of the German armies increased their conviction that the German age of history had begun. The opposite camp was convinced that the Germans would ultimately lose the war, but wondered how to survive the period of German successes. The only possibility seemed to be to play for time and to get along with the victorious Germans as smoothly as possible, especially after the defeat of Poland.

As long as Germany was engaged only in the west, this was not a difficult task, in spite of the fact that the military penetration of southeastern Europe began in the fall of 1940, after the Russian ultimatum to Rumania, in the form of German training units sent to the country of the iron guard. However, no active participation in the war had been sought thus far. But politically, the countries were already lined up on the Axis side, since they were signatories of the Tripartite Pact.

The turning point came when the Yugoslavs kicked out Prince Paul and his regime, and refused to adhere to the Tripartite Pact.

Germany, wanting to take revenge, asked for the active participation of Hungary in the war. The then Hungarian Prime Minister committed suicide, rather than break the treaty of eternal friendship with Yugoslavia or assume responsibility for an open conflict with Germany. So the war spread over eastern Europe.

The next step was the German attack on Russia, which after the collapse of Poland had secured for herself the eastern half of that country, and for the first time in history was established on the fringe of the Danube Basin. The war was to be a crusade—a short and lightning one—and the date for the triumphal parade in Moscow was fixed for the middle of August 1941. Rumania, Slovakia, and Hungary joined the Germans in this fateful adventure, for the reason that the risks of being an active ally of Germany seemed to be less then the risks of sharing the fate of the Poles, Greeks, or Yugoslavs, who were crushed after a heroic but lonely fight. In December came Pearl Harbor, and the satellites declared war on the United States, because that country was far away and the Nazis were on the spot.

Even in this there was something of a compliment to the United States; to be conquered by America seemed to be less dangerous than to be punished by the Germans. Believe me, this is not an overstatement nor an attempt to distort the truth. It was the result of a fear, already born, that what had happened to Poland and others could happen to the satellite countries, too. You could not be luke warm with the Nazis; if you were not with them, you were against them. And sad enough, there was one thing that the satellites feared even more than to be punished by the Germans; the possibility of being punished on behalf of Germany by a fellow satellite. Berlin knew this, too.

And here may be added some obvious comments on the mastery of the Third Reich in using, or abusing, the faults of human beings. Cowardice, envy, greed for power, instincts of subservience, these were the basic items for establishing and carrying out policy. In this the Nazis succeeded as well as in the art of warfare. It was a great achievement to release these human forces. As long as they could corrupt people, they could prolong but not win the war. They secured the collaboration of many, but it was seldom wholehearted and enthusiastic. There was resistance. Not everywhere, in exactly the form demanded by Allied broadcasts or agents, or as actually carried out in the forests of Poland, the mountains of Yugoslavia and Greece and in certain factories. While partisans and saboteurs are wonderful people, they are somewhat difficult to handle when the war is over. To exchange a tommy-gun for a ballot is never easy nor obvious. One can get accustomed to methods of settling disputes which are not exactly what is meant by free and unfettered elections.

To many of those in Hungary who tried to reconcile the actual position and the obvious needs of postwar times, the only practical way of resistance seemed to be to try to limit the various forms of Nazi influence, and thus prevent the gap between this part of Europe and the rest of the world from becoming too wide. They realized their inability to decide the main issue, or even the ultimate fate of eastern Europe, which issue has always been decided by forces superior to its own. The fact is that the control of eastern Europe was a very important factor in the undertaking to control the whole of Europe, and in the light of the experiences of the two world wars, even a prerequisite thereto, but this circumstance gave no decisive influence to the inhabitants of eastern Europe. On the contrary, the weakness of its political organization predestined this area to be only in a subordinate position.

What did it actually mean to limit Nazi influence? It mean to maintain insofar as possible the pre-Nazi character of a country, its political institutions, a relative amount of freedom of the press, speech, and political activities; to limit anti-Semitic measures to a bearable minimum, and to limit discrimination on racial grounds so as not to injure human dignity beyond a certain point; to limit the actual participation in the war and to avoid the hideous propaganda of hatred; to be kind to Poles, Jews, and other refugees or prisoners of war; to translate English and American books; to learn English or Russian (the book Brush Up Your English was a best seller in Budapest); to speak more about Goethe than about Hitler; to read Swiss newspapers; to listen to Allied broadcasts, and to hope for a world which was just the opposite of actual conditions. Finally, when the end of the war seemed nearer, there was a constant concern to seek ways leading out of the war.

But everything failed. The German dissatisfaction with Hungary increased; there were leaks in the contacts with the Allies; Hungary insisted on withdrawing her troops from the Russian front; there were no air raids on Hungary, and the situation on the Russian front deteriorated rapidly. The fighting came nearer to the Danube Basin, and the Germans reacted in their characteristic way.

In the early days of March 1944 they began to concentrate troops on the Hungarian border; they summoned Horthy to Germany on March 18 and told him that the Hungarians wanted to quit the war and commit treason against Germany; therefore they were forced to occupy Hungary, and they of course asked for the consent of the Regent. The story was to be presented as if Horthy was only too happy to get rid of his treacherous government, with the help of the Germans. This, too, was typical of Nazi methods; bullied people had to say that they were delighted to be bullied.

After serious blackmail, Horthy gave in, and the Germans occupied Hungary on March 19 without meeting with noticeable resistance. The dangers of the policy of limitation then became manifest. It is much more simple to tell the people plainly that they have to resist or comply than it is to explain to them when they must resist and when they must comply, in order to limit. When there was no possibility left to limit, people still hoped to be able to do so. This recalls the fate of Petain and his regime.

Another inherent weakness of the Hungarian system also became manifest; it lacked sufficient popular support. The majority of the Hungarians were not happy about the occupation of their country, but there was not sufficient contact between the Government and the people. A right-wing government was imposed, and then began one of the saddest periods of Hungarian history. Everything that before was avoided was now done; everything that was to be saved was compromised. We gave more soldiers and more food to Germany; the freedoms were suppressed; the Jews, Poles, and other refugees were picked up and deported; anti-German and anti-Nazi elements were arrested and sent to Germany; hatred was preached, and Allied bombings began.

In October 1944 the Regent, a former fellow-traveler of the right wing, tried to conclude an armistice with the Allies, but failed. He was arrested by the Germans, the country was ruled by criminals, looted by the Germans, and then destroyed by the fighting. It was a battlefield for 6 months, suffering every hardship which that implies. The price for having been a satellite was definitely high.

But the experience has taught us some lessons. The Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" were greeted during the war with tremendous hopes, in spite of the memory of the Fourteen Points of the First World War. We knew what they had to mean for the world, because we had experienced the opposite. We were ready to learn from our own mistakes and to try to improve.

The main lessons taught us by the war were that human dignity is to be the basis of a decent and sound political system; that people are unable to realize their own dignity unless a certain standard of living is secured to them; that we must attain true national independence by getting rid of the ideas of domination, and that some form of collaboration with the other smaller States should be our main contribution to the future of eastern Europe.

These goals could not be attained within a German Lebensraum, because the Third Reich aimed at German domination and was not concerned with a decent and satisfied eastern Europe. The Allies and the Red Army have eliminated Nazi Germany and thus opened a new chapter in the history of eastern Europe.

First Hungary and then Austria have held their elections, which were genuinely free. Both are still living under the armistice regime and hoping that after the conclusion of the peace treaties their Governments will also be genuinely free.

The difficulties in Hungary are now tremendous, but the people realize that they have to pay for their own mistakes. However, they are somewhat afraid that they may have to pay for the mistakes of others also, since they were definitely not responsible for the rise of the Third Reich, for Munich, nor for the imperfect settlement of 1919. So do not blame them, if sometimes when life is too hard they ask, "What have we been beaten for?"

United States, 1946; Italy, 1922!

REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the railroad strike has been suspended and the transportation facilities of the country are again permitted to function. The soft-coal strike has at least temporarily ended. The miners are presumed to go back to work today. The country feels much relieved. It will be a long time, however, before the effects of the railroad strike on reconversion disappear. We are told that, because of the soft-coal strike, in the winter of 1946–47 there will necessarily be fuel rationing throughout the land. Such interference with the public interest must be prevented if humanly possible.

The members of these two great unions have returned to work, but this morning the hard-coal miners are idle. In short, they are on strike, called out by their leaders. I make reference only to the hard-coal miners. We all know that many, many other strikes are in progress throughout the country at the moment and that many, many strike notices have been given, and that, while the strike epidemic is not as virulent as it has been within recent weeks, yet it is still contagious and the public, the innocent and apparently helpless bystander, is the real victim.

On Saturday last, the House passed the President's strike recommendations

within a few minutes after his request. That bill now languishes in the Senate where it is being considered. Months ago the House passed the Case bill and months before that the antiracketeering bill. Responding to an aroused public demand the Senate passed the Case bill and added on the antiracketeering bill. The House accepted the Senate amendment and the Case and the antiracketeering bills are now in the lap of the President. He has 10 days within which to sign or veto. The country expects immediate action because nothing can be gained by delaying his decision. The question is, will he act like he talks?

This strike situation in the country is more serious than many people think. What is happening is symptomatic. It happened in Europe and I hope it is not happening here. In the Jackson Citizen Patriot of Jackson, Mich., appears a very good editorial which is well worth our attention. This is not only the time to stop, look, and listen, this is the hour for decision. Has our Government the vision, the patriotism and courage to do something before it is too late? The editorial reads as follows:

UNITED STATES, 1946; ITALY, 1922!

Strikes had strangled industrial production. Railroad service had broken down.

We speak not of America in 1946 but of Italy in 1920.

Quoting from the Encyclopaedia Britannica:

"The Italian people, he argued, must be made free to recover, to work, and produce undisturbed, to fulfill their higher destinies; the incompetent governing caste, ready to compromise on everything, must be swept away and its place taken by the virile youth of the country who had won the war."

Who argued? Mussolini!

That was the birth of fascism. Dictatorship was approaching.

Strikes continued, promoted by revolutionary Communist agents. And Mussolini struck for power. He was the fabled man on horseback. The Fascists led by Mussolini marched on Rome in 1922. The weak Facta government resigned. The King ultimately turned to Mussolini.

That was the end of Italian democracy.

And that, good friends, is the crystal-clear threat to our America today.

The pattern is almost identical—a breakdown of transportation, a paralyzing of industry by strikes, a weak Government attempting repeated compromises with the striking forces.

America today.

What happens if Mr. Truman and his helpers settle the railroad controversy today or tomorrow and the coal strike before the 25th? The picture will be unchanged. We still will have had compromise and expediency. A minority group still will have pointed a pistol at the Government and gained its aims. Settlements will be mere stop-gaps, bridging the people and industry over to the next crisis which probably will be precipitated by the Communist-controlled marine unions.

Too often these strikes are not in the pattern of the United States labor movement, not efforts to obtain better wages, shorter hours, or improved living conditions. The miners are asking a royalty cut to build up a so-called welfare and health fund to be administered by the union. The marine unions are threatening strike to make known their opposition to American foreign policy.

That is the pattern of disaster. A government that resorts to expediency and compromise only. A labor movement that has wandered into the labyrinthal fields of radical social experimentation and alien-directed political pressure.

Such was the picture which produced a Mussolini and pointed Italy toward disaster.

America wants no Mussolini! It wants no fascism! But the danger is real and present.

The people who want to work and who want to return to decent living are becoming impatient ahd irritated. Too many of them are in the mood to follow a strong man, a war hero, someone who won't let John Lewis or Harry Bridges wreck the country. When an ordinarily level-headed newspaper writer suggests, as one of the leading columnists did only a few days ago, that Truman appoint Eisenhower or Marshall as Secretary of State ahd then let him become President—when that happens the menace is clear.

We haven't yet reached the point where our people will follow a demagogue into dictatorship. But the trend is plain.

It is time that Congress rectified present labor laws and made provision for such ordered democracy as will safeguard the rights and liberties of all of us, else those rights and liberties may be traded away for the mess of pottage which is totalitarianism.

One Congressman's Answer to Sidney Hillman, the CIO-PAC, and Its Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Sidney Hillman, his CIO-Political Action Committee, with its millions of dollars, and some other organizations with dollars to spend—all determined to give us their kind of a government in place of the one for which our forefathers fought, and which has been so successful—are asking for the defeat of all those Senators and Representatives who will not follow their orders.

So that the people of the district which I have the honor to represent may clearly understand the issue, this answer is made:

YOU CHOOSE YOUR REPRESENTATIVE

Fellow Americans, since you sent me to Congress as your hired man, to do a job for you, consistently, vigorously and faithfully have I exposed and opposed the waste, extravagance, inefficiency, the bureaucratic oppression of the New Deal, its pink and its red allies.

Every worth-while, workable piece of legislation designed to aid the veterans has been supported by me.

Much of the labor legislation first proposed by me and designed to protect the men—many of them union men—who work in factory, mine and mill, as well as to protect employers who make the jobs and issue the paychecks; to protect as well the public which purchases the goods, was incorporated in the bill which was just sent to the President.

Servicemen, their relatives and dependents; farmers and businessmen—hundreds of them—know I have served them on every possible occasion by representing them here in Washington before departments with which they had business.

Some say I talk too much. God He knows that someone is needed here in Washington to rip the lid off the New Deal, give the people a look at what is cooking. Sidney Hillman, the Communists and other pressure groups have their stooges here in Washington. You are entitled to a representative who speaks and acts for you, and that I do.

Because my opposition to some of the crooked schemes of those who are creating discord, seeking by legislation to destroy your rights and mine, has been so vigorous and they fear so effective, Sidney and his CIO-PAC, announcing they have millions to spend, are out to get my hide, my political scalp. If you want to kick me out, that is all right. I will have no complaint. But I am not going to quit just because Sidney turns thumbs down.

Thousands of workingmen throughout this country know that, if ever organized labor needed a friend, it is now, when public sentiment has swung against some of their leaders and labor is in danger of losing much of what it gained during the last 20 years.

I will support organized labor in every legitimate demand, but I will not go along with their schemes when some politically ambitious leaders endanger the national welfare: your ability to get food, clothing, and shelter. My sympathies always have been, they are today and they always will be, with the man who must work for a livelihood, for throughout my life that is the way I got my living.

Experience in Congress, where you go up under seniority, a personal acquaintance with—and I am quite sure, the confidence and respect of a majority of the Members of Congress—will enable me, if renominated and elected, to give the people of the district worth-while service, and that without bias or prejudice.

"No man can serve two masters." The CIO-PAC and other organizations ask for my defeat because I will not be their stooge. They never support any candidate unless they think he will do their will. The people of the district know where I stand on every public issue. They know I have been fair, faithful, and industrious.

June 18 is primary day. It is the day the Republican Party of Michigan will name its candidates for Congress. Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee, with headquarters in New York, and millions at its command, has decreed that I cannot be your candidate. But in this country, whose government Sidney does not seem to like, it is your privilege—not his—to make the choice.

Memorial Day Address of Hon. John W. Bricker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Memorial Day address of John W. Bricker, at Gettysburg, Pa., May 30, 1946:

Today we gather at our greatest national shrine. Once more we honor our heroic dead who fell and sleep here. We recall with solemn pride that this, their resting place, was dedicated to the cause of liberty and free representative government. We rejoice that there are no longer any sectional differences that threaten our national unity and our domestic peace. Since the close of the bloody conflict which began here on July 1, 1863, we of the North and the South have marched shoulder to shoulder in three wars against external enemies. In complete na-

tional unity of resolution and effort, we have emerged victorious from them all.

Almost 1 year ago now we ended the most deadly and costly of all our wars. Every segment of our society subordinated personal interest for the common cause. Almost overnight, it seems, we converted this Nation from peacetime pursuits and an incredible military weakness to a nation of invincible military might. History cannot overstate the magnificence of our united effort as a free nation.

The national unity which served us so well in war is equally urgent in peace. We do not have such unity now. We do not have unity of purpose as a nation.

We are confused and bewildered both in domestic and foreign policy. At the very moment when the world is looking to America for leadership in providing political and economic stability, we present a picture of vacillation and indecision.

Our essential difficulty does not lie in the inevitable differences which will arise as to the methods of solving national problems. Rather it arises from a serious conflict in political philosophy and purpose. The great American President who dedicated this shrine expressed the conviction that it is the function of government, not to direct the lives of people, but to provide a fair chance for all in the race of life. That concept of government is challenged today by those who would make this Government supreme over the lives of men. The principle of "government by the consent of the governed" written into our American Declaration of Independence, has been robbed of its vitality. And because there are many in high places who have lost faith in the people, who have lost faith in the capacity of men and women to exercise wise, independent judgment in their economic and social relationships, this Nation now stands on dead center. The conflict about OPA, about labor regulation, about agricultural and industrial policy is essentially a conflict which centers on the issue of planned economy versus economic and political freedom under law.

This is no better illustrated than in the field of labor-management relations. Ever since the surrender of Japan, this Nation has been beset with one strike after another. At the very time when industrial production is more desperately needed than ever before to head off the specter of inflation, the wheels of industry have been slowing down. Last week they came almost to a complete stop. There are those who say this is inevitable after war. That is but a superficial answer. It ignores the basic fact that governmental policy itself is at the root of the problem.

For a long time now, this Nation has been without an effective and just industrial relations policy. Our National Government has improvised from day to day. It has tried one expedient after another to meet constantly arising crises. And it has, through one-sided legislative policies, inequitably administered, actually fanned the flames of industrial discord.

The national calamity which the leaders of the rail strike almost precipitated was the inevitable result of a long-continued pursuit of ulterior political aims combined with ineptitudes of political management of our economic affairs.

The rail strike has been settled and this Nation is greatly relieved. But in our relief there is the danger of a new complacency. The basic causes of industrial unrest have not been removed. Indeed, only another temporary expedient has been offered by the executive branch of Government. And even this expedient involves governmental regimentation in the most hideous form which has yet been proposed.

This is a time for clear thinking and plain speaking. And it is a time when we must consider the labor problem in terms of basic principles. I propose to express my views freely.

First of all, the President of the United States is to be commended for taking a positive, even though belated position. But, the proposal which he has offered is wholly incompatible with the fundamental concepts of a free society.

The suggestion for drafting strikers into the Army is abhorrent to the American way of life. The Army never has been, and it should not be now, used for punitive purposes. Service to one's country under the flag is an honorable status. It should never be degraded from the noble spirit in which those who lie here served. Nor should military service, while the country is considered at war only on the basis of a legal fiction, be used as a guise for that which is essentially involuntary servitude. We adopted a Constitution to avert such ends. The rank and file of labor in America, who have served this Nation well in war and in peace, should not be made to suffer such constitutional infractions because of the unwise judgment of their leaders.

Moreover, the proposal to siphon the profits of seized industries into the United States Treasury is outright confiscation. It was undoubtedly intended to appease labor for the drastic proposal to draft strikers into the Army. But it may well be regarded as the opening wedge for nationalization of industry and the establishment of a socialist state in America.

Second. This Nation needs to examine the basic premises of labor policy. The right to strike is one of those premises. It is recognized by law and I believe it should be safeguarded. But it should not be unlimited when the public interest is at stake. There was a time when combinations of capital in restraint of trade and commerce became prejudicial to the public interest. To protect that public interest, we enacted the Sherman antitrust law. We have reached the time when combinations of labor in Nation-wide industries are engaged in restraint of trade and commerce and are prejudicial to the public interest. We need legislation to prevent this also, and they, too, should provide administrative, not military, methods of enforcement. The right to strike in a particular plant is one thing. The right to strike in a Nation-wide industry involving peril to our national life is something entirely different.

Third. We need to abandon the current policy of governmental management of labor relations. In its place we should restore full and free collective bargaining between management and labor. We do not now have genuine collective bargaining—and we have not had it for a long time. The unbalanced provisions of the Wagner Labor Relations Act are a part of this problem. The act purports to guarantee free bargaining. It protects labor against the abuses of management, but it does not protect management or the public the abuses of labor. It provides privilege for one and responsibility for the other, but it does not provide privileges and responsibilities for both. It must be revised at the earliest possible date and the job must be started now—not 6 months hence. Moreover, the practice of this Government in overriding established labor law must cease. The Railway Labor Act was not sabotaged by labor leaders alone. It was sabotaged by the executive branch of the Federal Government when the unions were given more than the fact-finding boards had recommended. Obedience to and respect for law must begin with the Government itself.

I have referred to our current labor problem only because it is extremely critical and because it illustrates our need for national unity of purpose. Decision and action are imperative. We must decide which way we will go. One way is freedom under law—the other is collectivism. The choice must be made now. We cannot longer continue to keep this Nation free. Let us here solemnly reaffirm our faith in democracy and our republican form of Government.

The heroic dead who lie here and the soldiers of all our wars, both living and dead, have paid a tremendous price to preserve for us a free society, a society which recognizes the worth and sovereignty of the human soul, a society which stresses the rights and responsibilities of the man himself, a society which holds that government is the servant of men and not their master, a society which has faith in itself and its capacity for self-government.

Molotov's Political Fantasy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of May 28, 1946:

MOLOTOV'S POLITICAL FANTASY

Once again, the Russian Government has made use of what appears to be its tactic No. 1 in diplomacy; that is, to charge others with the weaknesses and sins most conspicuous in Soviet policy. By shouting loudly and embarking on the offensive, as Hitler frequently did, the Soviet leaders apparently are trying to convince the people that black is white.

This may work in the Soviet Union; it may work in parts of the world under such firm Soviet control that unbiased news cannot be printed. But it will not work with peoples who have access to all the facts and all the points of view, including, of course, the Russian.

Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov reaches new heights in illustrating Soviet diplomatic tactic No. 1 in his article in the official newspaper Pravda. He charges that the attempts to draw peace treaties by the council of foreign ministers in Paris were defeated because the United States and Britain formed an offensive bloc against the legitimate interests of the Soviet Union. He charges that this bloc was designed to exert "pressure, threats, and intimidation" against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, to impose British-American will on weak nations, and to enslave them economically.

This charge might be funny if it were not so serious. Think of the facts in eastern Europe and then laugh, but be sure it is grimly. Ask Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and Poland who it is that is imposing a will on them and taking economic advantage of them. And, among the defeated nations for whom Mr. Molotov finds a parenthetic crocodile tear, ask Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Germany who imposes and who enslaves. Ask Finland what pressures she fears most.

Equally callous and shocking is Mr. Molotov's attempt to paint Britain and America as willful violators of the Potsdam agreement. It is true that Mr. Brynes' threat, after all else had failed, to ask all the United Nations to make peace is not ideal. At Potsdam it was agreed that the Big Three, and other interested countries in particular cases, would draw up peace treaties to be submitted to the United Nations. That has been tried at several foreign ministers' meetings Russia has blocked all attempts. Mr. Byrnes' view is that peace must be made in Europe and, if Russia chooses to block all council attempts, then the entire United Nations must take up the problem.

The unhappy truth is that the Soviet Union has fundamentally violated the Potsdam and previous agreements by interfering consistently with the holding of unfettered and free elections in Poland. To this the USSR is pledged. Freedom to report conditions in Poland before, during and after the elections is guaranteed by Russia. Yet the secret police, under Soviet control, interfere constantly. Under Potsdam, all democratic anti-Nazi parties in Poland were to have freedom. Actually, the Soviet dominated regime in Poland constantly harasses democratic parties, like the Peasant Party, for instance, indulging in murder and violence.

Mr. Molotov says that the Soviets have demonstrated their "desire for coordinated action" in Europe. They have. But to them coordination means the right of the Soviets to do as they please with as much of Europe as they please, regardless of the wishes of the other great Allies or of the wishes of the peoples concerned.

No amount of smoke screening in Pravda, or from any source, can change the facts, though it may be gradually possible to obscure the facts from millions, in parts of the world where the Soviet Government does not allow the facts to be heard. That is the bad thing about it.

Condemns Short-Sighted VA Hospital Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklohoma. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the House passed another appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, the total of which was $416,656,000. In addition to the $76,000,000, additional funds for new hospitals, the same bill carried an authorization of $41,250,000 for future hospitals for veterans. As a member of the Deficiency Committee that reported the bill, I supported the measure as I have all other bills for our disabled veterans. As Members know, of the $8,000,000,000 this Congress has expended for all purposes, approximately $5,000,000,000 has been for the assistance of our disabled veterans, their widows, and dependents. I recently stated on the floor of the House that if it took $5,000,000,000 more to make certain that our disabled veterans were adequately cared for that this Congress would do so without hesitation.

A few weeks ago when another Veterans' Administration appropriation request was presented to this House carrying $129,000,000 for veterans' hospitals. I also supported that appropriation, but in doing so voiced my disapproval of the Veterans' Administration policy of refusing to utilize the hundred Army hospitals, and about that many Navy hospitals, all equipped with the finest and most modern hospital facilities. At that time I stated as follows:

I want to make it clear that I have not backed up 1 inch from my stand, well known among members of my committee, that the Veterans' Administration should utilize all the Army and Navy hospitals that are safe and suitable for veterans' hospitals. * * *

I know also that General Hines, who served for many years with distinction as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and the Federal Hospitalization Board were consulted when those Army and Navy hospitals were located. In fact, they were not only consulted but the locations of such hospitals received their approval. The record will disclose General Hines and members of the Federal Hospitalization Board repeatedly told the Appropriations Committee that the Army and Navy hospitals were located in areas, after very careful investigation and consideration, where it was felt they would be specially needed for veterans' hospitals after the war.

At the same time I also quoted a statement by Hon. JOE HENDRICKS, chairman of the subcommittee having jurisdiction over the Veterans' Administration, when General Bradley appeared before his committee, as follows:

Mr. HENDRICKS, General, there is one item in regard to hospitals that I would like to bring to your attention. Up to this time there have been constructed by the Army 355 temporary hospitals, most of which are one-story buildings. The cost to the Government for the construction of these Army hospitals exceeded $500,000,000 aside from the sites donated by local communities. Although these Army hospitals are not actually fireproof and are rated temporary and semipermanent, they are equipped with automatic fire extinguishers, fire alarms, and the Army reports that there has been no loss of life. At the time these Army hospitals were constructed, General Hines, in appearing before this committee, I believe advised that his policy and the policy of the Federal Board of Hospitalization was that the hospitals should be utilized as veterans' hospitals. The location for the hospitals was selected with meticulous care and with the definite view that they should be used for veterans' hospitals or for the domiciliary care of veterans upon the cessation of war.

Now, Mr. Speaker, despite this record and despite the fact that there are literally hundreds of war veterans in the State of Oklahoma now in urgent need of hospitalization and according to newspaper reports the halls and corridors of the United States Veterans' Hospital at Muskogee, Okla., are full to overflowing with veterans and not an available bed in the State for them, yet the Borden General Hospital at Chickasha in which the taxpayers have approximately $5,000,000 invested is to be closed June 30. At the same time the Veterans Administration is actually remodeling some old hastily constructed wartime barracks near Oklahoma City that were not constructed for and never intended to be a hospital, and when finished will be virtually a firetrap. Such a short-sighted policy is inexcusable and is an example of waste, and wanton extravagance. It just does not make sense. I am enclosing herewith an editorial from the Chickasha Daily Express that speaks my sentiments as well as that of a vast majority of the citizens whom I represent on this short-sighted policy of the Veterans' Administration. The editorial follows:

The wishy-washy Veterans' Administration is not taking over Borden General Hospital. For 2 or 3 weeks we've had a funny feeling about the VA and Borden General due to rumors from Washington and St. Louis. These rumors, although not definite, just simply didn't jell. Below we carry a letter received by a Chickasha citizen, now employed at Borden General, who applied to the VA's regional office at St. Louis, for a position here. It follows:

"I am sorry to advise you that we have received official word to the effect that the Veterans' Administration is not going to operate Borden General Hospital.

"Your application has been submitted to the branch office for consideration for any openings that may occur in this district."

We can't comprehend the muddled thinking that goes on at VA headquarters in Washington. In the first place, it will take months—and even years—for the VA to build new hospitals in the big cities to take care of the veterans. And in the second place, it's a waste of taxpayers' money to abandon splendid facilities like Borden when veterans are unable to get medical and surgical service.

Over a year ago the VA big shots began throwing the idea around that medical specialists could not be obtained to work in country towns. And at that time about $6,000 was the top that could be paid a specialist under civil-service regulations. Sensing this red herring, we advised Congressman JED JOHNSON—and the local Legion post passed a resolution in agreement—that Congress should hike salaries of specialists. That was done and the VA can now pay up to $11,000 per year for specialists.

The VA can't make us believe there are not plenty of top specialists who would like to live in fine, smaller communities and drag down 11 grand net without any overhead expense.

And, now that we're a little "het up" after all the VA baloney we want to say that we think the VA is being dominated by the big city specialists of the American Medical Association.

Some weeks ago we talked with one of the top VA men who made an "inspection" trip to Chickasha. And who did he have with him as "consultants"? A big shot specialist from Kansas City and another from Oklahoma City—and both very prominent in the American Medical Association by virtue of their official positions.

The VA hasn't played fair with Oklahoma veterans and certainly not with the taxpayers—and the people of Chickasha. Weeks ago a high Army official at Borden General received a letter from the VA saying the hospital would be taken over June 30. That officer read us the letter but said that no official announcement could be made. We carried in this column the information in the letter and credited it to "a reliable source." Later, the regional head of the Public Health Service in Kansas City made the same announcement. At the time we wondered why the word wasn't coming from Washington but we decided it was just due to the fuzzy conditions of affairs in the VA.

Only yesterday, Gen. Omar Bradley, head of VA, told the Governors' Conference in Oklahoma City that the job of finding jobs and training veterans for future jobs was up to the States. That's a fine way to pass the buck. Didn't the VA formulate the rules and regulations? Sure they did. But the barnacles are so thick on the outfit that they can't do an efficient job in the field.

We recall too, that McCloskey General at Temple, Tex., was to be taken over by the VA. It was. And all they did was hire a few guards to watch the property. Glennan General at Okmulgee is empty and a monument to bureaucratic pig-headedness. Because, for months Glennan could have been serving ailing veterans who can't be admitted to the small VA hospital at Muskogee.

Shall Oklahoma veterans who need medical care wait a year or so until General Bradley builds a superduper hospital in Oklahoma City? (Incidentally, we haven't heard a protest from the big Oklahoma City specialists, who, of course, will be called in regularly for consultations at fixed fees.)

There is no question but that General Bradley is a great soldier and one of the best generals who ever served the United States. But being a great general doesn't automatically make him a perfect civilian administrator of a civilian agency. We predict in the months ahead that plenty of former GI's will be hollering about military operation of the VA rather than civilian.

Chickasha is in good shape to stand the loss of Borden General and will weather that event when it happens. But as taxpayers, owing some $300,000,000,000, we shouldn't stand idly by and let a bunch of bureaucrats whoop off seven or eight million dollars—including the finest hard-of-hearing clinic in the world.

Arbitrary Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, May 29, 1946:

ARBITRARY POWER

From left and right and in between, President Truman is getting hell for asking "arbitrary power" to deal with strikes against the Government.

Senator PEPPER and Senator TAFT, the Communist Daily Worker, and the Wall Street Journal join in the chorus of denunciation. It is said that under the law he wants Mr. Truman could seize all strike-bound industries, confiscate all their profits, fix wages at 10 cents or $10 an hour, draft strikers and have them court-martialed and shot if they refused to work.

Perhaps he could. It is unlikely he would go to such extremes, but saying that does not alter the fact that he seeks frightening power which would be dangerous in any hands, though not completely arbitrary. Persons injured by his acts would have the protection of court appeal, and Congress could withdraw the power.

But it is fair to ask why Mr. Truman believes he needs such power. Here, we think, is the answer:

Because totally arbitrary power to injure the whole Nation terribly is being used by private citizens and groups, which accept no public responsibility and from whose acts there is no appeal to any court.

Ending a railroad or a coal strike, preventing a shipping strike, will not make safe this fearful power of labor and its leaders. So long as it is arbitrary it will be abused. Whitney, Johnston, Lewis, Bridges, Curran—they may subside, for a while. But other arrogant men will undertake to have their way, no matter how they hurt the country.

Go back another step, and see why this totally arbitrary power exists and is not safeguarded:

The President who did most to make labor mighty did his utmost to prevent legal regulation of labor's might. Mr. Roosevelt, abetted by "liberals" of the Pepper-Wallace-Ickes stripe, blocked all attempts by Congress to hold labor responsible for proper use of power and to correct one-sided New Deal laws.

One man—the President—was labor's government. Mr. Roosevelt "managed" the labor leaders. So far as they were kept in line, it was by deals he made. When they became too restive, he appeased them for the moment. When they rebelled against so good a law as the Railway Labor Act he undermined that law to satisfy them.

In all this Mr. Roosevelt used arbitrary power not granted by or even asked of Congress. And that was fine with the "liberals," and labor leaders now howling at Mr. Truman, to whom their chickens have come home. That was what they wanted—then.

They would not see where one-man government of labor was taking workers and the country. They would not heed the warnings of those who believed in government by law. They would not stop inviting what is happening now.

Even now they rail as bitterly against any corrective legislation as against the emergency power Mr. Truman asks. Emulating yesteryear's princes of privilege, they proclaim that "to the last breath" they will resist the Senate's sound version of the Case bill. Yet only legislated reforms, toward which that bill is a start, can insure safety for labor's essential rights.

For the American people will not tolerate continued abuse of labor's arbitrary power and what it does to them. Inevitably they will decide it a lesser evil to give an elected president arbitrary power, and insist that, if necessary, he use it to destroy labor's power and save the country.

Reorganization Plans 1, 2, and 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on May 22, and again on May 25, I called to the attention of the House the reorganization plans submitted by the President. I was just advised today by the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. CARTER MANASCO, chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, that hearings will start Tuesday, June 4, at 10 a. m. These hearings will be continued on Wednesday, June 5.

I believe the Members of the House will want to acquaint themselves now with the situation in regard to these reorganization plans:

Congress passed Public Law 263, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved December 20, 1945. This is known as the Reorganization Act of 1945.

On May 16, 1946, President Truman transmitted to Congress three documents:

Reorganization Plan No. 1, House Document 594, Seventy-ninth Congress.

Reorganization Plan No. 2, House Document 595, Seventy-ninth Congress.

Reorganization Plan No. 3, House Document 596, Seventy-ninth Congress.

I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 151 to abolish Plan No. 2, House Concurrent Resolution 155 to abolish Plan No. 1, House Concurrent Resolution 154 to abolish Plan No. 3.

All of these documents can be secured from Elmer Lewis of the House Document Room in the Capitol.

The Reorganization Act of 1945 authorized the President to consolidate various Government agencies for the purpose of reducing the number of agencies and to eliminate duplication of work by Government agencies. Under this act the three reorganization plans above referred to were submitted to the House on May 16 and under the law, both the House and Senate must take affirmative action to disapprove the plans within 60 days from the date when the plan was submitted to Congress. Otherwise, the plan has the effect of law.

It is the purpose of these committee hearings to examine the respective reorganization plans and to have members who are interested appear and give testimony. Likewise, people who are interested in or affected by these reorganization plans will have an opportunity to express their approval or disapproval of the same.

Several objections have already come to my office since I introduced these House concurrent resolutions. It has been pointed out that Plan No. 1 has to do with the housing problem and also other matters which should be carefully considered before there is acquiescence in Plan No. 1. It has been pointed out in connection with Plan No. 2 that it abolishes the Social Security Board and I have received a protest in connection with that intention. I have also received protests against the abolishment of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission. In connection with Plan No. 3 I have received protests in connection with the permanent transfer to the Coast Guard of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation.

I just point out a few of these developments to show the importance of a careful study and a thorough investigation of these proposed reorganization plans. Congress will be glad, I am sure, to have the benefit of testimony of all people who are interested or affected by these developments. Those who are interested should contact Chairman MANASCO, of the Committee on Expenditures.

Commends Doolittle Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JED JOHNSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, with all the industrial strife and unpleasant headlines it is refreshing to read in the papers this week that General Doolittle's committee, appointed by the Secretary of War, after extended hearings during which it heard 42 witnesses ranging from General Eisenhower to Private Hargrove and other privates, has made a constructive report. The purpose of the Doolittle committee was to ascertain, if possible, the basic reasons for the poor relationships between the officers and enlisted men of the armed forces and recommend remedies for same. According to newspaper and radio reports this week it also considered "gripes" collected from more than a

thousand letters from enlisted men. I have not yet seen an official copy of the report but according to the paper the Doolittle committee, a board made up of members, the majority of whom worked up from the ranks, freely admits the poor relationship that everyone else but the Army has known for years has existed between officers and enlisted men, and has made the following recommendations to the War Department:

1. "All" military personnel be provided with a sense of security. Through equitable distribution of allowances for food, clothing, quarters, and travel; pay increases in line with civilian salaries, and assurance of chance for advancement.

2. In administration of military justice, the higher the rank the more severe the punishment; that enlisted personnel be permitted on courts; and that there be a review of all cases where wartime operations necessitated very strict handling.

MERIT PROMOTIONS

3. Selection of officers be based upon 1 year in the enlisted ranks and knowledge of "human relations" under a new system providing for easy dismissal of privilege-abusing officers, promotions on a merit basis, and retirement after shorter periods of service.

4. GI's be enabled to accumulate leave or furlough time and be granted terminal-leave pay on the same basis as commissioned personnel.

5. The use of discriminatory references, such as "officers and their ladies; enlisted men and wives" be eliminated.

6. All military personnel be allowed, when off duty, to pursue normal social patterns comparable to our democratic way of life.

7. The hand salute be abandoned off Army installations and off duty except under specified conditions.

NO "CHEAP" DECORATIONS

8. That a system of decorations and awards be established to provide more equitable distribution and prohibit distribution to a degree tending to cheapen them.

9. The system for registering complaints be improved under a program possibly calling for reorganization of the inspector general's section.

10. All regulations and instructions be so written that they stipulate the limited privileges to officers in performance of duty to prohibit abuses of authority.

11. All statutes and traditions which discourage or forbid social association of soldiers of similar likes and tastes because of military rank be abolished.

12. Close contact and association with civilians be encouraged because the service is a citizen's Army.

13. Further study be made of the caste system to extract additional ideas for improving GI-officer relationships.

I desire to commend the report of the Doolittle committee and to express the hope that the War Department will not ignore its findings. The Congress and the country will be anxiously watching to see if the War Department was serious when this committee was appointed. It should not only give serious consideration to the recommendations made, but it is to be hoped that each of the recommendations will be put into effect at an early date.

Several days ago when I voted to increase the pay of the enlisted military personnel 50 percent, I stated in substance that "now if the Secretary of War, as a result of the Doolittle investigation, will do away with the antiquated caste system and make certain that the enlisted men get a square deal, the Army will have no difficulty in securing all of the men needed to fulfill our commitments, protect the American interest, and preserve the future liberty of the country."

The next move is up to the Department of War.

The Stock-Piling Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, in presenting S. 752, the stock-piling bill, which is in the nature of an amendment to our Strategic and Critical Materials Stock-Piling Act of June 7, 1939, I cannot better describe its purpose than to quote to you the preamble of this valuable and far-sighted measure:

That the natural resources of the United States in certain strategic and critical materials being deficient or insufficiently developed to supply the industrial, military, and naval needs of the country for common defense, it is the policy of the Congress and the purpose and intent of this act to provide for the acquisition and retention of stocks of these materials and to encourage the conservation and development of sources of these materials within the United States, and thereby decrease and prevent wherever possible a dangerous and costly dependence of the United States upon foreign nations for supplies of these materials in times of national emergency.

During the course of the hearings on this bill it was brought out, and it is also a matter of common knowledge, that following the trying experiences of World War I, that great advocate of our national security, Mr. Bernard Baruch, urged in his report to the President dated December 24, 1919, that steps be taken immediately to insure adequate supplies of raw materials for any future emergency. Such a program was repeatedly advocated in the 20 years that followed. The costly lesson had been taken to heart by many individuals and agencies, public and private, including the Secretaries of War and Navy, many Members of Congress, the Bureau of Mines, the Planning Committee for Mineral Policy appointed by President Roosevelt, the Mining and Metallurgical Society of America, the American Mining Congress, and many others.

Not until 1938 was a small appropriation approved in the supply bill for the Navy Department for the purchase of strategic and critical materials. It was too late when in 1939 authorization was given in the original stock-piling bill for appropriation of $100,000,000 to be used by the Procurement Division of the Treasury in the purchase of such materials. Soon thereafter came the war in Europe resulting in the blocking of many sources of supply, shipping became tight and prices of these indispensable materials were soaring. Our desperate efforts to secure these materials met with delay, confusion, and exorbitant costs in acquiring the minerals necessary for our defense program.

Many materials may be taken as illustrations of this situation. For example, let us take tungsten of which we needed but a comparatively small stock pile. We did not get it. In the tremendous effort since made we did acquire the necessary quantity at a cost several times the cost at which it would have been available earlier. Only by the grace of providence were we allowed nearly a year and a half between the time our Council of National Defense began its work and the disaster at Pearl Harbor. This was only a repetition of our experience in the First World War.

Surely the experiences of these two wars should be enough to make us do something to correct this glaring need. Perhaps the fault lies with us in that the problem of raw materials as a basis for real preparedness has never been sufficiently dramatized to draw enough public attention. Next time the problem will be worse—much worse.

It has been aptly said that stock piles mean something more than mere stock piles of strategic and critical materials; they mean a concentrated and canned manpower, and a concentrated and canned transportation, obtained ahead of time.

When the outbreak of a major war in Europe seemed inevitable, we created in this country our National Defense Advisory Committee as a prudent step toward preparation for whatever emergency the future might hold. The committee soon found that with the exception of industry-held stock there was little to be had. We lacked not only supplies of many minerals that had not normally been produced in this country, but the available supply of copper, lead, zinc, and other metals in which our peacetime production had been sufficient, was far below the rapidly pyramiding requirement of a world war.

We came all too close to paying a terrible penalty for our lack of foresight. Strenuous and costly were the measures required to make up for our deficiency. Premium price plans, Government financing, tax-relief provisions, and many other emergency measures were brought into play. Emergency measures were needed to maintain adequate manpower, even to the furloughing of trained soldiers to work in the mines. Only the energy, resourcefulness, and patriotic sacrifices of our domestic mineral producers enabled us to meet the needs. Additions to mill and smelter capacity were provided, new plants built, and treatment processes for low-grade and refractory ores were developed. Production was forced beyond actual consuming requirements to provide munitions plants with working stocks and to fill the whole greatly expanded "pipe line" of metallic products in process of fabrication.

To aid in meeting the enormous needs of military and civilian production in both world wars we were forced to turn to foreign sources. There was much delay. We had to recruit and in fact train engineers and geologists and send them to wild and inaccessible parts of Africa and Latin America and Asia. It was

necessary to obtain for these foreign operations essential mining equipment from domestic factories that were, as we all know, hard pressed to turn out war materials. It meant demands upon sparse manpower in competition with the manufacturer of ships and guns and vehicles. It meant the overseas dispatch of equipment in vessels that were too few in number and which, with their priceless cargoes, were being sent to the bottom by submarines.

If any lesson has been learned from this intensive drive to supply these strategic and critical materials from both domestic and foreign sources under the pressure of war conditions, it is, first, that prewar stock piles would have been vastly more effective and less costly than wartime procurement and transportation; second, that long shipping voyages would have been saved at a time when ships were scarce and when they were urgently needed elsewhere—also there would have been saved much war wastage that took place by the sinking of ships and their mineral cargoes and equipment; third, scarce manpower and materials that had to be allocated to the manufacture of mining equipment and supplies would have been saved at a time when those materials were needed for direct war effort.

A very important point which we should consider in our effort to protect the United States in the future is that physical stock piles, particularly of minerals and metals, are only our first line of defense. Back of them, and of even greater importance to our security must be a sound, healthy and functioning mining industry, equipped and ready to deliver the additional quantities of minerals required for all-out war production. In the past Congress has rightfully retained control over the stock piles. This principle of congressional control bears directly also on the future of the mining industry, upon which we must rely for a major part of our mineral supply in an emergency. Unless Congress maintains its control over release of stock-pile accumulations an unhealthy and repressive effect on our domestic mining industry will result. The conferring of discretionary power upon any administrative agency to liquidate portions of the stock pile would inevitably impair, if not destroy, the necessary confidence on the part of those who are responsible for operating and developing our mines. Even though such power were never exercised, the mere fact that it could be, would serve as a continuing threat, discouraging development, expansion, and long-termed financing in mining. It is essential that the Congress itself retain the key to the stock piles.

Ample provision is made in this bill for the release of stock-piled materials for purposes of rotation, as in the case of rubber, fibers, and drugs, and also where the materials become technologically obsolete for war purposes. Materials may also be released and disposed of when the express approval of Congress is given.

Now as to the specific provisions of the bill. Following the statement of policy presented at the opening of my discussion, section 2 (a) provides that the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Interior acting jointly through the Army and Navy Munitions Board shall determine, from time to time, which materials are strategic and critical and the quality and quantity to be stock-piled. The Secretaries of State, Treasury, and Commerce are to designate representatives to cooperate in carrying out the provisions of the act. Section 2 (b) directs the appointment of industry advisory committees selected from the industries concerned with the materials to be stock-piled. The general function of these committees is to advise with the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Interior and with any agencies through which they may exercise any of their functions with respect to the purchase, sale, care, and handling of materials to be stock-piled.

Under section 3 (a) the Secretaries of War and Navy direct the Secretary of the Treasury, through the medium of the Procurement Division of his Department, to make purchases of strategic and critical materials pursuant to section 2, and insofar as practicable from supplies of materials in excess of the current industrial demands. Purchases are to be made in accordance with the Buy American Act of March 3, 1933. A reasonable time of not to exceed 1 year is to be allowed for production and delivery from domestic sources, and in the case of any such material available in the United States but which has not been developed commercially, the Secretaries of War and Navy, may, if they find that the production of such material is economically feasible, direct the purchase of such material without requiring the vendor to give bond. Section 3 (b) covers the storage of the stock-piled materials on military and naval reservations or other approved locations; section 3 (c) authorizes refining or processing through normal commercial channels of any materials acquired or transferred, into a form best suitable for stock-piling; section 3 (d) provides for rotation of materials where necessary to prevent deterioration; section 3 (e) provides for disposition of any materials no longer needed because of any revised determination made pursuant to section 2. It is specified that no such disposition shall be made until 6 months after publication in the Federal Register and transmission to the Congress and to the Military Affairs Committee of each House of a full report of the proposed disposition. Full data is required and the time and date of disposition is to be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss on the sale or transfer of the material to be released and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual market. At this point the important provision is made that no material constituting a part of the stock pile may be disposed of without the express approval of the Congress except where the revised determination is by reason of obsolescence of that material for use in times of war.

Section 4 requires submission to the Congress every 6 months of a report detailing the activities with respect to stock piling, including a statement of foreign and domestic purchases, and such other pertinent information on the administration of the act as will enable the Congress to evaluate its administration and the need for amendment and related legislation.

Section 5 limits release of stock-piled material other than as specified in section 3, for use, sale, or other disposition to the following: Only (a) on order of the President at any time when in his judgment such release is required for purposes of the common defense, or (b) in time of war or during a national emergency with respect to common defense proclaimed by the President, on order of such agency as may be designated by the President. This is an improvement over section 4 of the original 1939 act, which permitted use of stock-pile materials only "upon the order of the President in time of war, or when he shall find that a national emergency exists with respect to national defense as a consequence of the threat of war."

Section 6 (a) provides for the transfer of strategic and critical materials under War Assets Administration regulations by the owning agencies, when determined to be surplus, so long as the particular material does not exceed in amount the quantity determined therefor pursuant to section 2. Exemption is made from this requirement of such amount of any materials as is necessary to make up any deficiencies of the supply for the current requirements of industry as determined by the Civilian Production Administration or its successor. Also exempted are, first, any material which constitutes contractor inventory if the owning agency shall not have taken possession of such inventory, or second, such amounts of any material as the Army and Navy Munitions Board determines, (i) are held in lots so small as to make the transfer thereof economically impracticable; or (ii) do not meet or cannot economically be converted to meet, stock-pile requirements determined in accordance with section 2. It is also specified that the total materials transferred to the stock piles in accordance with this section during any fiscal year, beginning more than 12 months after this act becomes law, shall not exceed in value an amount to be fixed by the appropriation act or acts relating to the acquisition of materials under this act.

Section 6 (b) provides that transfers made under section 6 shall be made without charge against or reimbursement from the funds available under this act, except that expenses incidental to the transfer may be paid, and except that upon any such transfer from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel RFC notes, and sums due and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the fair market value (as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury) of the materials so transferred. Under section 6 (c) it is provided that the amount of RFC obligations outstanding shall be deemed to be reduced by the amount of the notes so canceled. Section 6 (d) is provided to make the Surplus Property

Act of 1944 conform with this bill, S. 752, and section 6 (e) repeals section 22, which is the stock-piling section of the Surplus Property Act, with the proviso: That any owning agency as defined in that act having control of materials that, when determined to be surplus, are required to be transferred to the stock piles pursuant to subsection (a) hereof, shall make such determination as soon as such materials in fact become surplus to its needs and responsibilities.

Section 7 (a) remains the same as in the original Stock Piling Act, Public Law 117, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 7, 1939. This provides for the Secretary of the Interior, through the Director of the Bureau of Mines and the Director of the Geological Survey, to conduct investigations concerning the extent and mode of occurrence, the development, mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances found in the United States or its Territories or insular possessions, which are essential to the common defense or industrial needs of the United States. Investigations are to take into account the quantities and grades of these essential mineral substances, of which supplies are inadequate, from known domestic sources in order to determine and develop domestic sources of supply and to devise new methods for treatment and utilization of lower-grade reserves; also to develop substitutes. Exploration is authorized to demonstrate extent and quality of deposits of lower-grade reserves, including most suitable methods of mining and beneficiating them, and the cost at which the minerals or metals may be produced. Section 7 (b) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the feasibility of developing domestic sources of supplies of any agricultural material or using agricultural commodities for the manufacture of any materials determined pursuant to section 2 to be strategic and critical.

In section 8 authorization is made for specific amounts to be a propriated for the procurement, transportation, maintenance, rotation, storage, and refining or processing of the materials to be acquired. These amounts cover 5 years' operation of th eproposed act and the funds so appropriated are to remain available to carry out the purposes for which appropriated until expended.

Under section 9 funds received on account of sales or other dispositions of materials are to be deposited to the credit of any appropriation available at the time of such deposits, for carrying out the provisions of purchase under this act.

Your committee has held hearings and given long and careful consideration to the development of this bill which, as I have previously stated, is an amendment to the original Stock-piling Act of 1939. Many of the present members of the Committee on Military Affairs participated in the development of the bill which we presented to the House in 1939. We believe that we are presenting to you a sound measure for the future protection of our country and thus believing, we ask its adoption.

Why Are the Shelves Bare?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, when a leading economist such as Samuel Crowther asks, "Why are the shelves bare?" and presents the answer in a clear, logical, forthright statement, it should be read by those who want to hear the truth, nothing but the truth, about the OPA.

I am inserting, under leave to extend, what Mr. Samuel Crowther has to say as to "Why are the shelves bare?"

WHY ARE THE SHELVES BARE?

Many previously unscented males were surprised last Christmas to receive from loving friends attractive looking bottles of toilet water, usually with a half apology that there seemed nothing else to buy. The brand was usually a new one.

In most cases the contents turned out to be a liquid resembling water that had gone wrong.

Women, according to the purses of the givers, get furs, perfumes, and what is known as costume jewelry.

The furs usually turned out to be as represented but sharply upgraded in price; the perfume, unless from a recognized maker, was apt to be a mate of the toilet water; and the jewelry was high-priced junk.

Those who wanted to give something sound and useful at Christmas only rarely could pick up anything to suit them. No one complained much, taking for granted that the manufacturers had not been able to shift from war to peace.

But now, 8 months after the Japanese surrender, sound merchandise is hard to buy at any price and the sturdy medium—or low-priced goods, on which most of our people depended, are simply not to be had.

Women's rayon and nylon hosiery have been dramatized and the rushes and lineups for them have become a part of life. But nylons can be bought in the night clubs and other hang-outs of the black market at from $5 a pair up.

The counters and shelves of the stores are filled with new sorts of goods and most of it is high in price and low in quality.

In the less expensive clothing for women, the prices have at least doubled, not taking into account the lower quality. The large sizes are not being made.

Everyone knows the situation in men's clothing, underwear and shirts, and the more observant have noted that a considerable portion of the fabrics and many of the finished articles bear the import labels of Latin-American countries and Switzerland, and with here and there something from England.

According to the figures as given out, retail and especially department-store business is booming, therefore everyone ought to be happy.

But reputable manufacturers and merchants are anything but happy, while the customers with money in their hands and unable to fill their desperate needs are most unhappy. It all seems puzzling.

It need not be puzzling.

The booming figures on business are dollar figures.

The volume figures, if they could be assembled, would from all the evidence be startlingly low and, if the upgrading could be exactly appraised, the figures would be even more startling.

Reputable manufacturers are shifting their lines or going out of business.

Reputable merchants, because they lack the goods they have been accustomed to sell, are compelled to stock high-priced, shoddy stuff and to get by on furs, perfumes, cosmetics, and costume jewelry.

The whole great area of making and distributing consumer goods is in turmoil and the honest man is either flirting with his honesty or being displaced by the man who never was honest.

The reason for this is the new pattern for business established by the Office of Price Administration which set out to control consumer-goods industries by price control from cradle to grave and has ended up by stifling honest production and promoting a new, great vested interest in shoddy productions.

The OPA is not controlling prices. It is just messing them up. It is diverting production from standard to substandard goods and, by creating shortages, is forcing those who must buy to buy the sort of goods that in free market they would not buy.

The OPA is grossly bumptious and incompetent, but even if it were urbane and competent, its methods could not under any circumstances work.

The nearest approach to success in price control was under Hitler.

The Nazis scheduled production and every item entering into production and distribution, including human beings.

If we want that sort of control, we should stop trying the men at Nuremberg and bring them over to direct our economy.

WHY ARE THE SHELVES BARE?

The OPA controls prices, but it does not control costs.

The largest cost entering into prices is wages.

In this absurd position, it had the choice of setting prices high enough to cover all costs and a profit. That would be just an elevator going up.

The other choice was to set prices at or below costs and wipe out private business.

It has chosen a course in between of great complexity, which puts every manufacturer and merchant in the air and also at the mercy of the OPA officers.

In general, prices of established concerns are fixed at the 1942 levels with some adjustments and also with what is known as the Maximum Average Price Regulation.

The celebrated or notorious OPA stipulates that, while a manufacturer or a merchant may vary the prices of specific articles, the average price must not exceed the average price of the base period.

On the side is another calculation in which the profits of the 1936–39 period are taken as fair profits and it is held that a concern must be refused price relief unless over a period it demonstrates that it cannot earn its average 1936–39 profits.

That is, one must be able to lose money over a period before one will be permitted prices at which one might earn money if one could see the goods.

No manufacturer in his right senses will lose money for 3 or 6 months in order to demonstrate to the satisfaction of a bureaucracy that he is losing money.

All of this sounds complicated.

It is infinitely more complicated in practice than in statement, for all the OPA regulations are written in that new form of involved English invented in Washington.

For instance, an amendment making the pricing of men's wear easier is expressed in 82 pages of fine print.

And finally there is cost absorption, which means that where a manufacturer is allowed

an increased price, the retailer is not allowed an increased price but is expected to absorb the increase out of profit. In most cases this works out to selling at a loss.

The theory is that manufacturers and merchants will stay in business as usual, matching losses against profits. But in most cases the profits do not match the losses.

However, if a concern were not in business in 1942, it can usually get price schedules based on costs. That has brought in a big gray market of newcomers—the new vested interest.

It has also stimulated shoddy imports, for imports are somewhat obscurely priced on importers' statements.

The legimate, old-line company is driven to finding some goods that it can make at a profit.

The most striking example is that of the largest manufacturer of work socks in the world.

He formerly produced 60,000,000 pairs of them a year.

He tried for 9 months to get a price that would let him continue production, but such a price was refused him because he had a profit on his war operations. He turned to a new number of dress hose on which he had an adequate price.

Now he is operating only 20 percent of his plant and earning more money than if he was producing the cheaper socks. The public is not getting work socks.

These examples are endless.

The National Retail Dry Goods Association took a remarkable exhibit to Washington of standard goods that are not being made or are being made in only small quantities and lined up against them goods from the new gray market which the OPA had created.

The OPA fought this exhibit fiercely with all the smear it could command.

It has not been able to shake the fact that where an established manufacturer was allowed only $8.50 a dozen for good quality infants' dresses—which is below his cost of production—a newcomer got a price of $10.50; or that an established maker of men's shorts was restricted to $3.50 a dozen for broadcloth shorts, while a newcomer was allowed to charge $7.35 a dozen for material commonly used in chenille bedspreads; or that a standard maker of scooters with good rubber tires was held to a price of $1.92 while a newcomer with a shoddy affair made of scrap was allowed $3.75.

This sort of thing is going on everywhere throughout the consumer-goods industry. The people are not getting the goods they want and are willing to pay for. Everyone, from manufacturer to customer, is becoming demoralized.

As Maj. Benjamin H. Namm, the president of the National Retail Dry Goods Association and the head of a large department store, puts it:

"The customers are going on their knees to us. We are going on our knees to the wholesalers and manufacturers, and the moral tone is leaving business. It is the OPA's destruction of moral values that most frightens us."

Harbingers of Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is time that the OPA is unmasked and its communistic visage disclosed to those who have been credulous enough to believe the false propaganda sent out over the radio, through the press, and by means of the movies at the taxpayers' expense.

I am inserting under unanimous consent the timely disclosure of the OPA as a partner of the black market by Samuel Crowther, the economist and author:

HARBINGERS OF HUNGER

The shocking contrast between what the Office of Price Administration pretends to be and what it is shows up nowhere so glaringly as in the family market basket.

When the Office of Price Administration was first organized, it was the intentions of the managed economy boys, who have always dominated it, to use the law to destroy private business and to put our country on a permanently rationed economy under Government control.

That was the reason for the rush of intricate regulations upsetting most of the customs that had grown up in the food trade, including even a revolution in the cutting of meat.

That was the reason for the move from another quarter for the abolishing of private brands in food and the substitution of Government grading. For the controlled state cannot work unless human ingenuity and initiative are blacked out and the people treated as though they were an institution.

The OPA operatives have not succeeded in knocking out private ownership or in establishing a managed economy.

But they have succeeded in knocking out or crippling responsible private ownership and in so mismanaging our economy that today our food production and distribution are in chaos with malnutrition everywhere and hunger in sight.

The moral chaos is even worse than the physical.

The rewards go exclusively to those who evade the law.

The honest merchant is faced with going black or going broke.

The OPA is a partner in crime, whether a voluntary or an involuntary partner remains to be brought out.

In food alone its snarling ineptitude and vindictiveness have cost the American people, directly and indirectly, so many billions of dollars in so many ways that the total monetary damage growing out of its assault upon the American system will never be truly estimated.

The OPA has not held down the cost of living, insofar as foods are concerned.

The figures which it presents on this point are utterly dishonest.

In part they are made up by assuming that the housewife bought at ceiling prices foods which in fact are not on the top of the counters to buy.

And in part, by not taking into account that the foods bought at ceiling prices are in most cases of a quality which ordinarily would not be bought at such prices.

And, of course, the official figures on the cost of living do not say anything about the more than a billion and a half dollars that were paid out by the Treasury as subsidies in 1945 in order that food might be produced to sell at ceiling prices.

In a special report made by Senators WHERRY, BUCK, CAPEHART, WILSON, and CAPPER as members of the Small Business Committee, they set out after hearing days of testimony:

"Reports of the rise in the cost of living expressed in percentage figures whether by Government or by Government officials are therefore wholly deceptive and entirely misleading—for the actual and experienced increase is substantially higher than that which is so reported."

Contrast that considered statement with these paragraphs taken from a propaganda folder issued by the OPA and broadcast by the millions at taxpayers' expense:

"As a smart woman and a good citizen, use this folder to help protect your bank account, your home, your friends and relatives' jobs, and your community's business people from the devastating effects of runaway prices—and the depression which would follow inflation.

"Price control is for the people and by the people. Read this folder, fill out and send in the shopping list and help yourself and the Nation toward security."

Now take a look at the meat. The statistical Research Co. and the C. C. Chappelle Co.—both experienced and reputable concerns, shopped at the butcher shops—not the black markets—for meat.

They visited 1,803 stores located in New York; Providence, R. I.; Newark, N. J.; Washington, D. C.; Chicago, Ill.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Memphis, Tenn.; Houston, Tex.; Denver, Colo., and Los Angeles, Calif.

They bought 3,495 cuts of meat. That is a fair sampling. Of these stores 83.2 percent sold one or more cuts above ceiling prices ranging from a high of 94 percent in Houston to a low of 77.1 percent in Providence. The average percentage of overcharge was: beef and veal 35 percent, and pork 24 percent.

Butchers, generally speaking, can now buy only a fraction of their meats through their regular established sources of supply. That is why some butchers have meat and some have not.

The responsible houses observing ceilings cannot pay the prices for live animals that the new irresponsible OPA slaughtering trade pays.

In 1939 there were 1,942 meat packing companies doing a business of $5,000 or more a year. In July 1945, there were 26,655.

That is the new vested interest which the OPA has created in the Nation's meat supply.

The great reputable meat packing industry with an investment of many million dollars, owned by thousands of persons and normally employing about a half million people, returned to the farmer about 74 percent of the wholesale meat dollar.

That industry is on its way out.

Swift, for instance, during the week ending March 26, out of 36,429 cattle offered in the Chicago market could buy only 1,983 head. At East St. Louis, out of receipts of 10,750, it could buy only 266.

A small old-established packer in Tennessee testified that during the same week at an auction in Chattanooga his company was able to purchase one head out of 150 sold and 3 days later was able to buy 8 out of 300 sold.

The industry had, through research over the years, created byproducts which were the raw material for other industries employing thousands of people.

All of this has been nearly wiped out.

The new OPA industry just slaughters the animals and cuts up the meat. There are no byproducts. Often not even the hides are saved. There is little sanitation.

Over and beyond this market is the black market proper, in which health and morals count not at all.

The OPA itself has estimated that the public is paying about a billion dollars a year over ceiling prices for its meat. This does not take into account the more than half a billion dollars paid in meat subsidies.

Some experts believe that the public, including the subsidies, is paying at least $3,000,000,000 above the ceiling prices for meats alone and that the indirect cost to the Nation, through upsetting the meat trade from packer to retail butcher, will run to another billion.

The story of meat is pretty much the story of what is happening in all our foods. Only the details differ.

HARBINGERS OF HUNGER

The OPA with its rigid ceilings has upset the normal relationships established through the years in which natural prices based on supply and demand direct the distribution of wheat and feeds such as corn, oats, barley and sorghum.

There would be plenty of cereal foods for man, beast and fowl, so say the real experts, had not the OPA by its pricing redirected these foods.

In consequence, and in order to avoid the ceiling, barter in many sections is replacing money sales.

One artificially scarce commodity—with or without something on the side—is being traded for another artificially scarce commodity.

The black market in feeds is everywhere and the bribes are even becoming standardized—$150 for a carload of good corn and $300 for a carload of soy beans.

The same practices run through dairy products. The ice-cream makers with their ceiling prices can afford to pay more for cream than the butter makers with their ceiling prices. And so we do not get butter.

Some prices, because of the $700,000,000 paid out on dairy products, are artificially low. This makes other prices artificially high and in consequence ruin and chaos stalk through the whole dairy industry.

The ceiling prices on coffee have had both national and international consequences.

They have strained our relations with Brazil, our hereditary friend, and have further hurt our relations with Colombia and the coffee-producing states of Central America.

The Treasury is now paying a subsidy of 3 cents a pound on coffee, so the price you pay is not the real price.

But at that we are getting only the lower grades of coffee. The better and higher-priced grades are being held by the producing countries or sent to other markets.

The story on sugar is slightly different. We are short on sugar today because of the control policies instituted by Messrs. Wallace and Tugwell when they were running the Department of Agriculture.

What would happen if all the controls were taken off food?

Let us forget the inflation stuff—the OPA is not controlling inflation and cannot control inflation. That is bare-faced propaganda bunk.

The OPA has one prize example of what would happen if controls were taken off. Coconuts are one. In 1941–42 coconuts sold for around $15 per thousand. During the war, shipping space was hard to get—the consumption of whole nuts is very small—and we get our supplies of copra from the South Seas.

In 1944 the OPA established a ceiling price jumbled to $250 a thousand. That is not remarkable or evidence of anything at all except that it was possible to buy an item which was supposed not to be imported at all. At that price coconuts would shortly have been coming in overland on the backs of men and mules.

After World War I, when sugar, on the speculative market, rose to a dollar a pound, sugar poured into New York from all over the world—sugar that not even the brokers had heard of—and prices dived into the cellar. The problem was then to get prices up to the cost of production.

The prices of foods are now high and they probably will go higher—with or without the OPA—for we have monetary inflation.

But in the opinion of the men of long experience in food trades, the clearing out of the OPA would bring back the forces of competition and, although prices in some lines where scarcities have been created would rise, the customer would have the choice of buying or not buying over a wide range and that would bring all prices into their proper relationship—with some probably lower and a few higher than they now are.

At any rate, they would be natural prices, founded on freedom and morality. And common sense teaches us that prices will and must reflect both the value of the dollar and the demand as compared to the supply of goods.

We are only making trouble for ourselves if we try to postpone the inevitable.

The OPA is now breaking down the only machinery that can put us on a stable basis.

Pension Claims of Veterans With Arrested Tuberculosis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including a communication from Mr. J. H. Leib, national legislative director of the American Veterans of World War II, in which complaint is made over the treatment of veterans who have been discharged from the service with arrested tuberculosis.

It seems to me that a great injustice is being done to many veterans, and it appears to be not a question of legislation but a question of a ruling by the Veterans' Administration. If these veterans were found to be in sound condition and accepted for service, they are certainly entitled to consideration if, when they are discharged, it is found that they are victims of arrested tuberculosis. It seems conclusive that they must have acquired it while in the service.

This situation differs from that of World War I when veterans with arrested tuberculosis were pensioned at the rate of 25 percent disability. The discrepancy is hard to understand. The burden of proof, contrary to law, now seems to be placed on the veteran rather than the Veterans' Administration.

AMVETS URGES THAT VETERANS BE GIVEN THE BENEFIT OF DOUBT IN PENSION CLAIMS AS PRESCRIBED BY LAW

(By J. H. Leib, national legislative director)

Veterans who are currently being discharged because of arrested tuberculosis are finding it extremely difficult to establish service-connected status. In this connection a disabled veteran has called Amvets' attention to a very unfortunate situation which we believe deserves serious deliberation by every Member of the Congress. The facts surrounding this cause may well serve as a test to determine once and for all time whether or not a veteran will be given the benefit of the doubt in disability claims as specifically authorized by law.

The case at hand, which is typical of many others, concerns a veteran who served in the Army from April 9, 1940 to November 9, 1944. He was discharged on account of arrested tuberculosis and the War Department officially admitted that his illness was obviously due to military service. In addition his medical records disclosed edema of the eyelids—lips—and other parts of his body. Rheumatic fever was also evidenced and his electrocardiograph showed a heart disease as a result of arthritis.

This disabled soldier was granted a minimum pension of $11.50 per month based solely on his heart disease. As to his TB status the Veterans' Administration stated that no provision existed in their regulations that would permit the establishment of service connection for such an illness, unless there was evidence of tubercular activity while in the Army. Since there was no report of a TB history while in the armed forces the VA adamantly refused to discuss the matter further. According to official records this veteran's bid for a pension was denied without giving him a chest examination to determine the extent of his present condition. General Bradley's agency took this stand even though the Army admitted that this veteran was in perfect health at the time of his induction.

It is interesting to note that Government officials have advised Amvets that service connection was granted for similar TB cases after the last war at a rate of 25 percent disability, yet for some reason veterans of World War II are not eligible for such benefits.

Bottlenecks such as burden of proof, presumptions, reasonable doubts and lack of medical records—have played a part in disrupting the fair adjudication of veteran claims.

These legal technicalities have caused certain veterans' groups and periodicals to charge either justly or unjustly (1) that the Congress no longer writes its own veterans' legislation; (2) that such laws are skillfully composed by bureaucrats within the Veterans' Administration; (3) that these officials are permitted not only to make their own interpretation of the statutes but to administrate them as well, oftentimes contrary to what the Congress intended to convey.

Substantiating these charges, numerous complaints have been received indicating that veterans are being given a pathetic runaround after filing for a Government pension and that they are obliged to bear the burden of proof at all times Yet, the Congress has directed over and over that any claimant for a pension was to have all doubts resolved in his or her favor.

In conclusion, Amvets contends that veterans who have been disabled because of war service should be justly compensated by their Government and that the burden of proof should be on the Government and not on the veteran. If no authority exists to pay such benefits then it is the duty of the Congress to enact necessary legislation to cover such claims as soon as possible.

A study of Veterans' Administration regulations relative to benefit-of-doubt laws is worthy of review. Here they are:

Public Law 242, Sixty-eighth Congress, approved June 7, 1924, title II, section 200: "that person * * * shall be conclusively held and taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service, except as to defects, disorders, or infirmities made of record in any manner by proper authorities of the United States at the time of, or prior to, inception of active service."

Public Law 141, Seventy-third Congress, March 28, 1934, section 27: "All reasonable doubts shall be resolved in favor of the veteran the burden of proof being on the Government."

Executive order, Veterans Regulation No. 1, under Public Law 2, Seventy-third Con-

gress, March 20, 1933, section C: "hereof a chronic disease becoming manifest to a degree of 10 percent or more within 1 year from date of separation from active service as set forth therein shall be considered to have been incurred in or aggravated by service as specified therein notwithstanding there is no record of evidence of such disease during the period of active service."

Executive order, Veterans Regulation No. 1-A, June 6, 1933, repeats the language in Executive Order No. 1, as previously quoted.

Public Law 361, Seventy-seventh Congress, December 20, 1941: "notwithstanding the fact that there is no official record of such incurrence or aggravation in such service, and, to that end, shall resolve every reasonable doubt in favor of such veteran."

Public Law 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, July 13, 1943, section 9 (b): "hereof every person employed in the active military or naval service shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service except as to defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at time of the examination, acceptance, and enrollment, or where clear and unmistakable evidence demonstrates that the injury or disease existed prior to acceptance and enrollment and was not aggravated by such active military or naval service."

Blocked World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of May 29, 1946:

BLOCKED WORLD

Any hope that between now and June 15 there might be an alleviation of international tension must have been dashed by a reading of Molotov's report on the Paris conference. All the old suspicions of the rest of the world are expressed. New ones are thrown in for good measure. Britain and America, for instance, are accused of ganging up against the Soviet Union. Secretary Byrnes is accused of intimidating Moscow. And the dark threat of imperialism by the anglo-American "bloc" is said to be hanging over the innocent world. The crisis of confidence existing between Moscow on the one hand and Washington and London on the other, in other words, shows no signs of assuagement.

Far be it from us to deny that there is not in our foreign policy an element of what we have hitherto noted as "security imperialism." This is obvious in our obsession with bases. Mr. Molotov, noting this obsession, observed that it is difficult sometimes "to draw a line between the desire for security and the desire for expansion." We don't see the difficulty ourselves. For our part we have wanted to see much more of a disposition by America to rely upon the trusteeship provisions of the United Nations for security purposes. You can't make security collective merely out of a pool of separate schemes of national security.

The reason that in this respect Molotov is so charitable is that in the quest for "security imperialism" the Soviet Union is foremost. Since the war, Russia, in the name of security, has annexed nearly 300,000 square miles and 25,000,000 people. Sometimes a grab is perpetrated without the rest of the world knowing about it, as in the case of Tanna Tuva, the news of the incorporation of which into the Soviet Union appeared only when Tanna Tuva voted in the recent Russian elections. These spoils are apart from the 12 nations and areas which have been forced into the orbit of predominant Soviet influence. Add the 165,000,000 people of these client states, and you get an aggregate of nearly 400 millions subject to Soviet sway. Nothing on this order can be charged against American "imperialists," certainly nothing like it against the liquidating British "imperialists." If this is security, indeed, the old-order expansion looks in retrospect like "chicken feed."

Such a record furnishes an ironical backdrop for Molotov's charges of intimidation and expansion by others at the Soviet's expense. No doubt the charges will be taken at face value by Senator PEPPER and other apologists for the Soviet Union. But only at our peril shall we ignore realities. The fact is that, though we have not taken enough risks for collective security, our foreign policy is nowhere feared, while Russia's is. The reason is that our foreign policy stands for peacemaking in common with all nations. This is the democratic method. Russia's policy, on the contrary, favors the autocratic method of running the world as a Russo-American condominium, and no nation can have confidence in such a system not particularly because of fear of encroachment, but because of the sure prospect that it is bound to break up in war.

Molotov, of course, could cite the periodical invasions that Russia has sustained as justification for the pursuit of individual security. We can understand this preoccupation. But this country cannot afford to court it any further at the expense of other nations. Our course remains just as clear as it was before Molotov spoke. It is to be unweary in our support of the United Nations, in our leadership to improve the United Nations. In this respect we must expect opposition from Russia. But we simply cannot allow Russia to reduce the United Nations to a nullity. The time has come, indeed, when we ought to try to restore the prestige of the United Nations, already reduced to the status of a debating society by Russia's use of the veto. There should be an agreement among those United Nations which are neither Soviet states nor Soviet satellites, that they will act upon any recommendation, not involving the use of armed force, made by seven or more members of the Security Council, including at least three permanent members.

Extension of Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a resolution on the bill to extend price control, adopted by the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Local No. 767, Ottumwa, Iowa:

Resolved, The OPA, while useful and necessary during the war, is now proving to be the biggest bottleneck in the reconversion program.

It is the opinion of the members of Carpenters Local No. 767 that Government control of the kind now embodied in OPA on all except the bare necessities of life should be released immediately and permit free enterprise and open competition to control prices once again.

It is the opinion of this local that as soon as OPA's strangle hold on industry is released the housing problem will solve itself. Give labor the materials and they will respond as they did during the war and veterans' housing will cease to be a problem.

FRANK W. HYATT,
President.
HARRY JONES,
Recording Secretary.

Old-Age Economic Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee recently held hearings on the Townsend plan for old-age security.

At that time I presented a statement to the committee. Under leave granted to me, by unanimous consent, I present that statement herewith, for the information of Members of the House:

I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and your committee for granting me permission to place my remarks briefly in this record.

In considering a plan such as the Townsend plan, which is an all-embracing one, I am impressed by its basic equity. The present system of old-age pensions is very inequitable to some segments of our population. We now have old-age-pension plans for the Government workers; the Army and Navy; for many industrial workers; and for railway workers. Let us see who pays for these various plans. The Government workers pay half of the cost of their plan, the Government the other half. The Army and Navy retirement payments are made up entirely by Federal taxes, the beneficiaries do not make any contributions from their salaries. The various industrial plans usually provide for a contributory plan, the workers paying half and the employer paying half. The railroad retirement plan has about the same set-up.

In looking behind the veil it is found that a great portion of the payments required to meet the cost of these various plans is paid by taxpayers who do not receive any benefit themselves. For instance, who pays the half that the Government pays toward the money required for the Government workers' retirement fund? It is the general taxpayers. In the industrial workers' plans the half that the industry pays is really money from the general taxpayers, as the cost is included in the price of the product or service which the public buys. In the railroad retirement plan, that portion which is paid by the railroad companies is simply added to the freight and passenger rates, so the traveling public pays that part of the plan.

When you look still further you find that great segments of our people who pay the taxes, or increased prices that go to pay for these various retirement plans, get no benefit for themselves. The farmer, the service people such as lawyers, doctors, advertising men, beauty operators, cleaners and dyers,

etc., pay these taxes, but they get no retirement benefits themselves. If they want old-age pensions they must buy them with their own money from life-insurance companies, trust companies, savings banks, etc. In other words these great groups of people pay for the old-age pension plans that others get and, in addition, if they want the same benefit they must pay for that benefit entirely out of their own income.

When viewed from that standpoint it is apparent to anyone that our present systems are very inequitable, considered from the standpoint of the general taxpayer or the general public. It is an inequity that the Ways and Means Committee can well ponder, it being the group that formulates the tax policies of the Nation.

Everyone seems to admit that old-age security is beneficial from the social standpoint. I think that everyone who had worked till he is 65 at some useful occupation has created enough social wealth, so that he had earned an old-age pension. In the twilight of life one who has worked faithfully and hard should have the assurance of financial assistance that will enable him to take care of his basic needs of food, clothing, and shelter. That makes for better citizens and for a healthier social system.

The Townsend plan is the only one that I know of that has this over-all feature. Also, it provides a plan on a national scale that will wipe out the great differences in our various State plans. California, measured in terms of what is done in other States, has a very liberal plan. A uniform national plan would make for more contentment among the recipients and more equity to those who must provide the money.

House Concurrent Resolution 148

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, no problem facing the Nation today is more basic, more fundamental than that involving the relationship between labor and industry. Nothing is more vital to our very existence than the development of an atmosphere in which these two elements of our national life can and will live in harmony, not only with each other but with the 130,000,000 people of which they are an inseparable part. Mistakes and misunderstandings have so beclouded the judgments and the vision of all concerned that clarifications on very broad grounds are imperative unless we want to scrap our whole economic structure and start from the very bottom. This I do not believe the people of this country want to do. It is, therefore, our business to go to the heart of the matter with complete fearlessness and frankness.

There can be no fundamental remedies until the light of full knowledge shines into every dark crevice. House Concurrent Resolution 148 sets up a way of letting in the light, a beginning at least. It proposes the establishment of a joint committee of both Houses to study and investigate existing and pending legislation as well as the whole field of labor relations. Such a study can be fruitful in the extreme or it can die a-borning. Much will depend upon the personnel chosen by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House and upon the approach made by them to the problems involved. Appointment of a woman from the House membership would be a hopeful sign that new methods will be used and broader attitudes obtain.

There is no question of the need of immediate reevaluation of all existing laws involving labor-industry relations. This will take courage, for there will be prompt and vociferous recriminations from the labor camp the moment such matters as are contained in the Norris-LaGuardia and the Wagner Acts are even considered. It is equally probable that industry may become vocal during consideration of the values and justifications for Smith-Connally and the presently controversial Case bill. But such protests should not influence or perturb the joint committee. Rather should it give the Members a deepening sense of the importance of the job to be done and the imperative necessity that it be done without bias, political or otherwise.

Why is it of such vital importance? Because unless we can adjust the relationship between labor and management and integrate this relationship realistically into our national way of life we fail as freemen to meet the challenge of totalitarian ideology. This concurrent resolution, therefore, is quite unlike other such resolutions in that it carries within it implications that can well change the direction of the evolution of mankind.

Once recognize the vital importance of the work contemplated by this resolution and one is faced with the necessity of putting great emphasis upon the second "purpose" as expressed in section 2 of the bill. Imperative as it is to "make a thorough study * * * of * * * labor legislation" it is fundamental that this be accompanied by an equally "thorough study and investigation of * * * the whole field of labor relations." The health and safety of employees is to be given study under this resolution. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the implications of both these subjects be given due consideration upon the very broadest possible lines. I would further suggest that the study of "a uniform system of welfare funds" be not made solely upon the methods of securing and administering these funds but that there be included a broad study of the human elements involved.

To this end, Mr. Speaker, the committee should set up various groups of experts and consultants nationally recognized in their special fields whose findings would be respected by labor, industry, Government, and the people at large. Housing experts, educators, practical economists, public health officers, doctors, social workers, and other such experts should be secured and given such compensation as will insure their best unqualified service.

I realize fully that to stand still, to permit the continuing crises being meted out to the country by labor at this critical period without action pending reports and conclusions and the consequent legislative program suggested by House Concurrent Resolution 148 is not possible. But I do suggest that whatever legislation is passed, whatever action is taken by Executive arrangement or directive during this interval period be reconsidered under the bright light of the criteria that can be developed through this suggested means.

Mr. Speaker, I do urge upon you that in your choice of the seven Members of this House for this far-reaching and momentous work you give new hope both to this body and to the country at large by making your appointments on a basis of qualification for the job rather than by virtue of seniority. Knowledge of conditions from both points of view are of course essential, but breadth of vision and human understanding is equally necessary and vital to the ultimate adjustment of these manifestly basic differences. The Congress may be completely honest in its expression of determination to do a fundamental job, but unless the individuals appointed to this joint committee include in their human understanding beyond most, and broad vision as well, the results will but abort the truth. We must answer the question being asked by all the world: Can a free way of life meet the problem of human relationships with realism and success?

What results from House Concurrent Resolution 148 will depend largely upon the personnel chosen to do this work. It is with this in mind, Mr. Speaker (and I wish I might say the same with equal force to the President of the other body) that I urge you to part with tradition and to choose from the membership those upon whom we can count to do an intelligent, selfless, and consecrated job.

Confusion in Selective Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a résumé of a survey just completed by the New York Times on the question of selective service and Congress' failure to enact long-term draft legislation, which appeared in the New York Times of Tuesday, May 28:

SELECTIVE SERVICE IS IN CONFUSION, NATIONAL SURVEY FINDS

The country's Selective Service System is in a general state of disability and confusion—even completely chaotic in some cases—because of failure by Congress to enact precise, long-term draft legislation, it is shown in a national survey just completed by the New York Times.

Special reports were sent here by correspondents from the capitals of 41 States—7 States did not reply to the Times' request for information—as well as additional data from the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Canal Zone.

They disclose that congressional inaction, coupled with ever-changing and crippling regulations concerning draft procedure have made the Nation's Selective Service System so weak that even in many of the well-populated States there is, in effect, no draft at all.

The stopgap draft law passed in Congress 14 days ago, whereby only single men and childless married men aged 20 to 29 are subject to induction, has so sharply narrowed down the availability lists throughout the country that some States are running behind their monthly quotas by 90 percent and more. Many States reveal that they are able to induct only half of the men they should be drafting, while various State officials who say frankly that they are afraid there will soon be a serious break-down in the entire system are vividly substantiated in their fears by reports showing that induction in some instances has come to a standstill.

HELPLESS, OFFICIALS COMPLAIN

Selective service authorities, struggling with the continuing responsibility of providing replacements for men being discharged from the armed forces, complain that they are helpless to do anything even remotely adequate in filling the Army's and Navy's manpower needs, because the present list of deferment categories seems to include—for one reason or another—just about every man in the country.

It has been estimated that in the entire Nation there are no more than 72,000 men who can qualify for the draft today. That breaks down to some 1,500 for each State, but the Times survey reveals that present selective-service standards are, in fact, so selective that in some of the States they leave only a ridiculously small number of men eligible for induction.

Michigan, with a 1940 male population of 2,694,727, has only 250 men available for the over-all draft pool, or something like .000092 of the State's total manpower. Massachusetts has 35. Washington State has 54, with the monthly quota calling for 696. Oklahoma has some 50 men left for the draft. Officials point out, moreover, that unless Congress does something to extend the Selective Service Act by July 1 even these few men will be unavailable. Arkansas has only 338 men eligible for the draft.

SHARP DROP IN NEW YORK

Sample statistics taken from the columns of figures provided by the 41 States attest the draft crisis. In New York State, for example, 14,933 men were drafted during the first 4 months of this year, while in the same 4-month period in 1945 30,498—more than twice as many—were sent to the Army and Navy. Draft figures for the month of April this year, compared with April last year, show a drop totaling more than 5,500. With voluntary enlistments now "practically at a standstill" since January 1 of this year, Brig. Gen. Ames T. Brown, State selective service director, declared that the State would be unable to produce men "in any number" unless authorization was given for the induction of the 18- and 19-year-olds.

The 4-month comparison for California reveals a drop to 5,106 this year from the 1945 tally of 26,151, or one-fifth as much. Georgia, which often leads its service command in volunteer enlistments for the Army, sent 12,595 men into service during the first 4 months of 1945, but in the same period this year 2,595 men joined the armed forces. For April the contrast is sharply marked, with 3,495 in April 1945 and 666 in April of this year. The situation in Georgia, according to one Atlanta official, is best described in two words: "Break-down threatened."

A tabulation of comments from various State officials reveals that there is almost unanimous agreement on what one authority describes as a "dreary, dismal" outlook for the draft. Quotations from coast to coast blend almost in refrain. "Draft dwindling to nothing," an official says in Alabama. "Induction practically halted"—Arkansas. In Connecticut the situation is described as "a lag and break-down in induction."

BEYOND THE BARREL'S BOTTOM

In Florida there is "considerable confusion and uncertainty." Massachusetts describes its own situation as "critical." Rhode Island reports that it will be unable to meet its draft quota this month for the first time in history. An official in Illinois complains that he is "scraping the bottom of the barrel." From Oklahoma comes the tart comment: "We're not scraping the bottom of the barrel; we've gone beyond the bottom of the barrel." This month in Nevada, for the first time since October 1940, not a single man has been called up.

With so many of the State draft lists now almost bare of names, volunteer recruiting throughout the country also has shown a sharp decline, which first became evident 2 weeks ago when Congress enacted its temporary revision of the selective-service law. Officials declare that the young men of the Nation, no longer under official or psychological pressure to volunteer for military service, are steering clear of Army and Navy recruiting stations.

Again, as with the statistics and official comments on the draft situation, the recruiting story from coast to coast is practically the same in all but two or three States. Some States, such as Wyoming, report a drop in recruiting "almost to zero," and many officials are outspoken in their criticism of Congress, particularly in view of the fact that prior to the passage of the "stop gap" draft regulations the Selective Service and volunteer recruiting system "worked splendidly," as one official in Minnesota put it.

In Texas, whose residents have long boasted proudly that they led all the rest in their willingness to serve in the armed forces, officials referred wryly to current recruiting figures as small and said that the general situation was too adequately covered by the statement "Texas has not been able to meet its quota for months."

Selective-service authorities in Indiana, emphasizing the decline in volunteer enlistments in their State, declared that the public was now very suspicious of both Army figures and Army motives as the result of constantly changing estimates of manpower needs by various War Department officials. A Michigan official was also critical of Washington for the general confusion and demoralization.

There were indications that selective-service board members from coast to coast were openly disgusted with present conditions, and reports tell of increasing numbers of officials preparing to quit, partly out of personal resentment and partly because they feel there is nothing left for them to do as long as the crippling regulations remain in the present draft law.

Many boards declare that they are constantly being hampered even in the comparatively picayune drafting job they are still authorized to do. In one case West Virginia had 450 young men scheduled for induction during the last half of this month, but last-minute congressional deferments published on May 14 reduced this figure to 50. In South Dakota the stand has been taken that since Congress will assume no responsibility for Selective Service local boards are most reluctant to do the job alone.

Draft officials express complete mystification as to where the armed forces will get their replacements. One official declared: "If you think we're worried about replacements, how do you think the soldier and sailor who are waiting for their replacements feel about it?"

SOME VETERANS ARE DRAFTED

In some cases, it was said, battle veterans are being drafted because local boards are falling so far short of their quotas. One example quoted was a New York City ensign in the merchant marine, who had been torpedoed three times and had been machine-gunned on one of his ships. Still undergoing medical treatment for injuries received during the war, the ensign was called up by Selective Service two weeks ago, it was reported.

According to the Times survey, only New Jersey and Oregon report generally favorable conditions in the selective-service program; but although New Jersey, remarkably enough, showed an increase in draftees for the first 4 months of this year over the first 4 months of last year, officials said that there had been a gradual decline in voluntary enlistments since January 1 of this year.

Even in the two or three instances where an apparently favorable picture was to be seen, however, it was believed that hidden statistics could well darken a situation that only seemed bright. For example, the latest figures for draft yields in Utah show that in April of this year 358 men were inducted compared with 599 for the same month in 1945. But a more accurate comparison for trend purposes is to be found in the March tabulation, for a special group of limited service men was incorporated into the April figure. The March tally is 172 for this year, as against 626 for March 1945, a much sharper difference than is represented by the April figures.

The generally critical outlook includes the selective-service program in the possessions. Hawaii has had a recent sharp drop in volunteer enlistments, and officials in the Canal Zone report that about ten men there now become eligible each month for the draft, but even they are not inducted, for they are given special deferments to attend school.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan from the Washington Post of May 30, 1946:

LABOR LEGISLATION

(By Mark Sullivan)

WILL TRUMAN SIGN THE CASE BILL?

Begin by understanding that the President's emergency legislation about strikes is a thing apart. Understand just what it is, and what it is not. It is not a remedy for the labor problem, and does not pretend to be. It applies only to extremely limited kinds of strikes.

For the emergency legislation to apply a strike must be, to quote the President's words, in one of "those few industries" in which a strike "affects the entire economy of the United States." And it must be in an industry "essential * * * to the effective transition from war to peace."

Those are the kinds of strikes which the President's emergency legislation would apply to. To illustrate how many and serious are the strikes which the emergency legislation would not apply to, it happens there was a coincidence.

At the very moment when the President was requesting his emergency legislation, there was a threat of strike—which has since taken place—in Rochester, N. Y., beginning with a dispute between city employees and the public works department, and accompanied by threat of strike by all unions, both CIO and AFL, in the private industries of the city. Such a strike would paralyze Rochester locally as much as the railroad strike paralyzed the country as a whole. But of that local Rochester strike the President's emergency legislation would take no notice. Nor would it take notice of hundreds of local strikes and threatened strikes throughout

the country, harassing hundreds of businesses and communities, embroiling tens of thousands of workers.

No, the President's emergency legislation is not an answer to the country's labor problem, and does not purport to be. In addition to the limitation of scope, there is limitation of time—the emergency bill itself provides that it shall expire 6 months after formal termination of the state of war. Finally, the President's emergency legislation does not prevent strikes from starting, nor attempt to. It comes into effect only after a strike has taken place, and has gone so far that the Government decides to take over the struck industry. The procedure and penalties of the legislation apply only to a condition in which the Government has taken over.

An attempt at answer has been written. It is called the Case bill, and this is to be looked upon as a thing separate from the President's emergency legislation.

The Case bill deals with several aspects of labor relations, including mediation, cooling-off periods, secondary strikes, liability of unions for breach of contract, fact-finding bodies, foremen's unions, equality of obligation of unions and employers to bargain collectively.

The way it deals with some of these subjects may or may not be the best way possible. The bill as a whole may be short of adequate. But presumption that it has been carefully written—and certainly that it conforms to public demand—is provided by two facts. It passed the Senate, after 2 weeks of debate, by 49 to 29. And it passed the House by an even larger preponderance, 253 to 155.

There is surmise that the President will be reluctant to sign. When he was asking Congress to give him his temporary emergency legislation, he at the same time said there was also need for long-range legislation. But he suggested delay. He said, "The whole subject of labor relations should be studied afresh." He recommended a joint congressional committee to "study the whole problem" and "to report within a period of 6 months."

Just now, 6 months is a long time. Before it expires there will be a congressional election in November. Soon after it expires, and before Congress could have time to act, the present Congress will expire and there will be a new one. What has been done about labor legislation would have to begin all over, in a Congress that may be changed by the election.

The immediate question is, Will the President be willing to cooperate with the legislative body by signing a bill which both branches of that body have passed by large majorities?

The Rise and Fall of Labor Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a recent editorial from the Daily Argus-Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., the largest daily newspaper in a five-State area in our section of the country:

THE RISE AND FALL OF LABOR DICTATORSHIP

Saturday marked a notable chapter in American history. It was the end of an era and, we hope, the beginning of a new day in industrial relationships.

The events of Saturday reflected the aroused authority of an angry and an indignant people.

President Truman first expressed this sentiment in his remarkable speech of Friday night. The insolent manner in which his speech was received by the leaders of the striking railway unions was the straw that broke the camel's back.

The people had stood much. They had been friendly to the leadership of organized labor, kindly to it and tolerant toward it.

But it was obvious that the leadership had become arrogant, overwhelmed by its own importance and drunk with its own power.

So when President Truman appeared before Congress Saturday afternoon, the people were prepared to adopt any worth-while recommendation to deflate the labor lords. The last-minute action by the railway leaders did not affect this decision—and should not have done so.

The House, in consequence, approved at once the President's extraordinary suggestion that strikers be drafted into the armed forces in the case of emergency. There was no hesitation on the part of the House and the force of its action is demonstrated by the fact that only 13 members out of the more than 400 in that body voted against it.

LABOR TO BLAME

This attitude was remarkable. Perhaps only a few months ago, perhaps only a few weeks ago, a proposal for such drastic legislation would have been howled down.

But Saturday the House adopted it almost unanimously—and did so with the strong approval of the American people.

The change in sentiment is understandable. It is a result of labor's own excesses.

Labor had been given a free hand. Labor had been permitted abnormal privileges. Labor had been permitted to do just about what it pleased.

And labor, some major groups in particular, abused this privilege and this public sympathy.

The labor leaders, to state it briefly, were given plenty of rope and they went out and hanged themselves.

They demonstrated by their own acts that they were incompetent to assume the responsibilities that were a necessary part of their power.

Labor has been riding for a fall for some years, in fact. The leaders have not been content with fair dealing but have sought to gain undue advantage. They have promoted feather-bedding—the payment of fees and wages to men for doing nothing—and apparently have felt that this form of blackmail was within their rights. One concession to them was merely the opening wedge for another.

ONE EXTREME TO ANOTHER

Labor has gone a long ways since the dark days of some 30 years ago when the abuses were largely on the side of capital and management. Then the workingman was helpless. His pay was small and he received little consideration in the legislative chambers. Men worked from dawn to dusk at wages that were hardly sufficient to provide an existence. The employer's responsibility was nil.

Then the pendulum began to sway in the opposite direction.

And soon some labor leaders, becoming fat with authority, began to assume the complex that resulted in the downfall of Hitler and Mussolini. They started to believe that they were the law, that they were greater than the Government and the people.

The end of the war found a few labor leaders in the saddle and riding hard. They were telling their employers and Congress what they wanted and, seemingly, had the impression that their word was a command that could not be disobeyed.

At first the people continued to be tolerant. They felt that perhaps some adjustments were in order.

But as the strikes continued, they became impatient. They had won a war against destructive enemies abroad and now were beginning to wonder if they had not at the same time lost a war against destructive enemies at home.

Meanwhile President Truman was more than tolerant. He was more than fair. He temporized. He was guilty of vacillation. He gave the labor leaders every reasonable concession and some that were not reasonable. He implored them to be sensible.

But the only response was a further exaggeration of labor's domineering.

The result was a rebellion against the labor leaders—first by the people and then by the President.

The labor leaders have invited this action and have only themselves to blame for the sorry tragedy that is theirs.

A GROWING ANGER

First the automobile and the steel strikes began to arouse the people. There was an agonizing delay in production and a disturbing waste resulting from this impasse.

Then came the strike by John L. Lewis and his miners. The breaking point had just about been reached when Lewis, perhaps sensing it, decided to resume production.

Next was the strike of the railroad engineers and trainmen—a threat that most persons believed never would materialize.

But the strike came. The engineers and the trainmen stepped from their jobs in the full realization that such action on their part would create a virtual stagnation in American industry. They must have known, too, that countless cars of food en route to the starving peoples of the world would be delayed and that many persons abroad would die because they refused to work.

They went on strike, nevertheless. The leaders seemingly enjoyed the economic shambles that they were creating. They strutted vainglorously in the limelight. The limelight was upon them, and, seemingly, they relished it.

That was the setting when President Truman and Congress acted.

Critics will say that the President went too far and that the House went too far.

The Argus-Leader disagrees.

Their action displayed dramatically the temper of the American people. They had been witnessing a strike against the Government, which means, in effect, a strike against the people. This was the equivalent of mob rule, of organized defiance of the power of the majority.

It is unfortunate that such drastic legislation became necessary, but labor—and labor alone—is responsible.

To blame only the leaders—the Lewises, the Whitneys, and the Johnstons—is to ignore the fact that these men enjoyed their authority only because the rank and the file of the unions tolerated them.

It always has been the duty of these men to clean house. It now becomes their deep responsibility if they are to reestablish themselves again in the confidence of the American people.

WHAT LABOR MUST DO

Labor has lost much in the past few months, but it has not lost everything, and no thoughtful American wants to see a return to the early days when capital and management were permitted to do as they pleased without organized opposition.

But labor is now very definitely on trial. Its policies from this point on will determine what rights it should have and what privileges it should be granted. Earnest and fair laboring men throughout the land, we are sure, are well aware of this and will take immediate steps to rid their leadership of the men who have so gravely abused their power.

Fronting for Communism Going Out of Fashion?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, it is a refreshing and healthy sign to find some of our citizens waking up to the dangers of the infiltration of communism in vital organizations in the United States. It is unfortunate that many of these organizations were not conscious long ago of the clever and insidious methods used by Communists to invade American groups and then conspire to undermine them and create confusion and eventually take control. The average American has the reputation of "trying anything once" but when he finds out that he has been "taken in" he can become a tough customer to handle. The following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post covers the subject of communistic infiltration very well:

FRONTING FOR COMMUNISM GOING OUT OF FASHION?

Members of labor unions are beginning to get wise to the way many of them are being worked by the Communists, not to further the social objectives of Americans but to carry out the political objectives of Soviet Russia. In time, even the intellectuals, who are being used for the same purpose, will also get wise and desert the "front" organizations with high-sounding titles to which so many of them lend their names.

A few weeks ago, one of the more important business advisory services sent out a report intended to guide employers who found themselves dealing with Communist-controlled labor unions. The report was an admirable analysis of Communist procedure, which involves every sort of deception, duplicity, violence, and conspiracy—all directed to a single end, the advance of Soviet political policy. Thus a strike "to bring the boys home" is really intended to remove the last military obstacles to Russian expansion. A jurisdictional strike may be intended to heighten the rivalry between unions and add to the confusion from which communism usually profits. In some cases the Communists have reportedly spread word that anti-Communist liberals are really party members, in order to discredit them and reduce the effectiveness of their opposition to the party. The party members do not expect to create a majority in the union. What they want is to spot their representatives in key union jobs, such as secretary, education director, editor of publications, or legislative agent. From such points of vantage they can carry on Moscow's work.

It is this emphasis on key positions which characterizes Communist penetration everywhere and makes silly the easy view that "the Reds are negligible because they are only a small minority." That is true in the Russian zone in Germany, but their numerical weakness did not prevent the Communists from forcing the Social Democrats to join them despite the fact that every vote had been against such a move. In Czechoslovakia and Austria, the voting has been consistently anti-Communist, but the Communists appear to have sufficient influence in the bureaus to carry the day. They put into effect by arbitrary act party-line policies to which the rank and file has declared itself opposed. It will be interesting to observe the Communist procedure in France for bypassing the reversal at the polls last month. The one certainty is that there is a plan to meet just such emergencies.

Sorting out the sheep from the goats is hard work, whether you are a humanitarian in search of congenial companionship or merely an industrialist anxious to avoid trouble. The maneuver is usually hard to detect because it is dovetailed into things that most of us believe anyway. Example: detestation of the Franco dictatorship gets a lot of people into Communist-sponsored movements to make Spain a Soviet subsidiary at the head of the Mediterranean. Nevertheless, the signs multiply that the liberal manpower pool hitherto available for high-sounding committees is becoming more discriminating. About time too.

Problems and Influences Affecting the American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the speech of Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON, delivered before the Propeller Club of Washington, D. C., on May 22, 1946, is constructive and deserves the careful consideration and study of every Member of the House and of all men who are interested in the future of the American merchant marine. The speech on the subject of international problems and influences affecting the American merchant marine, follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, I deeply appreciate being invited to address your organization. I feel highly honored in speaking to you in the presence here tonight of the distinguished chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House of Representatives, the Honorable SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, who more than any other living American has been responsible for the tremendous progress of our great merchant marine. His untiring efforts have given new hope for a prosperous and efficient American merchant marine in the postwar era.

This is Maritime Day. We are met to honor the maritime industry of the United States and all those persons and groups whose combined efforts played such a substantial part in the winning of the military phase of the war. We are here also to talk about the future of the maritime industry of the United States, the future of foreign trade, the future of the gigantic war-built fleet, the future of the shipyards, the future of the thousands of skilled artisans, including the seamen, who formed the backbone of the industry throughout this difficult period.

I do not wish to appear as a pessimist on this day, but I believe that a dash of sound realism will assist the shipping industry. Throughout the war there was considerable propaganda about the rosy future of the maritime industry in the United States. Our large and growing fleet stimulated Utopian dreams of commerce and shipping far beyond the bounds of practicality. It was commonly stated that 50 percent of our foreign trade should be carried in American bottoms without regard for the effects of such a policy on our own and foreign economies. There were statements about the development of shipping to fantastic levels as a means of carrying this 50 percent. I do not doubt that similar statments are made all over the country today by speakers who seek to paint as easy, rosy future.

The military and commercial greatness of the ancient and modern world was based on the usage which was made of the trade routes through the seas. With the exception of Great Britain and possibly Holland, maritime nations have risen and fallen over the centuries. America had her place as a leader among maritime nations during the last century, and as a result of shipbuilding capacity during the recent war.

It is essential for us at this time to ask ourselves why we previously have declined as a maritime nation and why Britain has remained the prime maritime power. While certain economic factors have determined this predominance, other factors have determined it to an even greater extent.

One answer lies in history. A healthy maritime industry is a vital necessity to any nation which seeks peace and prosperity. National policies affecting the merchant marine have varied both with the spirit of the age and the character of the governments of the nations. But it must be emphasized that the policies of these maritime nations have been determined to a greater extent by the number and character of the people inhabiting these nations, as well as other natural conditions, than by the foresight and cleverness of their governments. But one obvious lesson which we can gain from the history of these maritime nations, as well as our own, is cognizance of the necessity for government and industry to integrate their policies and work together to create and maintain a merchant marine adequate for its commercial requirements and its national defense.

To a greater extent than almost any other industry, shipping is an instrument of national policy. This has been recognized in practice by all other maritime nations. Elsewhere the shipping industry in its most inclusive sense presents a united front to a government which is eager to encourage the industry in the development of the plans formulated by the industry and presented to the Government. These countries have developed practical means whereby shipbuilders, seamen, operators, and exporters can thrash out their differences and come to agreed policies whereby national interest and the interests of the shipping industry are fully integrated.

I think we can take Great Britain as the primary example, because that nation is our principal competitor. First, they are a maritime nation. Their geographic position and their colonial policy makes them so. Second, they are ship-minded. There is probably not a man in Parliament or in business who is not in some way imbued with the spirit of shipping, or at least has not been exposed to it. But they also have the British Council of Shipping which is an organization composed of management and industry, which considers the many and varied factors of shipping. It presents a united front to its government counterpart, the British Ministry of War Transport or the British Ministry of Transport, which latter body also has certain control over inland transport. The industry irons out its own internal problems, whether they be coast-wise, off-shore tramp, or offshore liner. They readily realize that if they are to retain the confidence of their government they must place themselves in a position to warrant that confidence. They further realize that the success of all segments of the industry is absolutely necesasry in the interests of the over-all objective. For a large merchant marine makes for a successful shipbuilding and repair industry.

Why has not our maritime industry done the same? The Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, envisages integrated policies and programs.

The Maritime Commission was created to assist the industry, and thus contribute to the well being of the Nation, both at peace

and at war. Let me make it clear—when I say "industry" I mean management and labor, because personnel is an integral part of the industry. It is not a commodity, to be treated as such. I suggest that the Commission examine its long-range policies and readjust them to fit the needs of the industry, if such policies do not now coincide.

In the consideration of integration of policies and programs, the Government must take cognizance of the multiplicity of its agencies in addition to the Commission with which the industry must work. The lack of coordination of the programs of these agencies has caused confusion and precluded cooperation. For example, there are eight or nine separate agencies of the Government concerned with matters relating to seagoing personnel. These agencies act independently of one another, and too often without consultation. If we are to have integration, these agencies should agree on uniform policies and administration.

Integration of government, management, and labor is necessary and desirable now. If we are to solve the competitive problems that will confront us shortly, we must begin to work as a team. By working as a team, I mean, that the industry must present a united front and obtain the confidence of American and foreign business. Government and industry must work together—from the ship chandler to the shipyard, from the coaster, to the overseas passenger carrier. The Nation has a right to expect this.

Government and industry should work together in developing a merchant marine of the air. Do not ever think for a moment that our foreign steamship competitor is not in the air in a big way. Their governments, while fully recognizing the possibilities of air, more fully recognizes the known factor of the surface craft. Steamship lines should be allowed to get into the air. Let the industry in on a comparable basis to their foreign competitors.

Let us examine several of the immediate and long-range problems confronting our maritime industry. These problems can be solved by the industry itself. However, since they involve our own national and foreign policies and the policies of other nations, Government must take a hand. But our Government must look to the industry for its assistance.

Oddly enough, the first problem concerns the free exchange of currency. Today we know and readily appreciate the value of the dollar. I say "appreciate" because the dollar influences practically the entire operation of all merchant marines. London has been viewed for the last three or four hundred years as the shipping center of the world. There is a current saying in London to the effect that a foreign nation would spend a pound to earn a dollar. It sounds fantastic, but it is nevertheless true. The dollar is worth so much more than the value fixed on it in relation to other currencies, purely and simply because the dollar can purchase what these foreign countries need for relief and rehabilitation.

Present limitations on currency is frustrating the efficient utilization of our shipping. All foreign countries endeavor to charter vessels from other countries in currencies other than dollars, even to the extent, if that were possible, where they can take care of their own internal requirements and still maintain a surplus of vessels which could be traded into dollar areas and so earn dollars.

I know also of cases where one country, such as France, would offer to pay another country, such as Norway, dollars for the charter of a ship. Of course, the market on ships is tight, but, practically speaking, the French were cognizant of the fact that the Norwegians would not want francs at this time, since the French could not sell the Norwegians anything for francs which could be used in the immediate future. As another illustration of the importance of the dollar, British ships proceeding from the South Pacific to the United Kingdom have been spotted around Cape Horn as a means of avoiding the expenditure of dollars necessary to transmit the Panama Canal.

The lack of dollar assets in the hands of foreign nations will frustrate in part our foreign ship-sales program. Foreign governments are unwilling to decrease their small dollar holdings for the purchase of vessels. While the United States is the only nation having surplus of tonnage, other governments are making strenuous efforts to buy tonnage from other nations with currency other than dollars. As a result, in contrast to the slowness of our ship-sales program, the British, by February of this year, had disposed of, or processed for sale or charter, practically all government owned or controlled tonnage to private operators for pounds.

A case could be made that it would be to our advantage to loan foreign governments the dollars necessary to purchase surplus vessels. In this connection, two schools of thought manifested themselves during the debates on the ship-sales bill and will probably be presented again during the House debate on the British loan. One maintains that if we do sell our excess tonnage foreign at this time, we will merely find them competing with us in the years to come. The other school maintains that if we don't sell now, these other countries will, within the next 5 years, purchase more foreign-built tonnage of a specialized nature that will be able to more than compete with our standard-type merchant marine. It seems to me that the school of thought of the latter group, with certain modifications, represents a sound approach to this problem.

A second problem concerns the ability of our fleet to compete commercially with vessels presently being built in European yards. The United States has some 6,000 vessels. Some are old and worn, but most of them have been built in the 7 years since 1939. But not all of them are suitable for the fast competition of postwar international commerce. More than 2,500 are slow Liberty ships lacking the speed and other modern features that characterize most of the remainder of the war-built fleet. Others were built expressly for or converted to military use. The rest of the newly built fleet—the fast C-types of the original 1937 long-range program, the tankers, Victory-type ships, and the larger transports—must be the backbone of the fleet that America hopes to maintain as a bulwark of our economic life and military security. This is the fleet that must be fitted into the future. We must and should be able to meet the healthy business competition provided by a dozen other skilled and zealous maritime nations now busily regenerating their passenger and cargo fleets.

Our war-built fleet, though vast, nevertheless is deficient in certain types of vessels.

Of the total number of ships, only the C-3 and certain other C types, T-2 types, and tankers can really be considered as first-class competitive ships in the future trade routes of the world. Today, a ship is a ship, and speed and competitive factors are relatively unimportant. But within the next few years, the competitive feature of these ships will determine which ships will be used and which will not be used.

Let us not kid the man in the street whose future is tied in with a prosperous merchant marine. Our advantage in ships is temporary. It is based on the unfortunate position of other maritime nations and their bottoms. The advantage which we have will continue only in direct ratio to our ability to modernize and improve our fleet in foreign trade.

Let me digress for a moment to state that I am not convinced that we are taking full advantage of our present position. We have a good number of vessels of the C type which can compete profitably with any commercial vessels which the foreign nations may spot against us. Of course, domestic services must receive first consideration in the allocation of vessels. But after having taken care of these trades, we must spot our very best tonnage in essential foreign-trade routes so that we can capture the trade now and capitalize on our immediate advantage. Unless we do this we will lose our place in American foreign-trade routes because our competitors are spotting their best ships against us.

A third problem concerns the utilization of our shipyards. With the sole exception of the United States, there will be for some years a world shortage of shipbuilding capacity.

Failing in their effort to purchase tonnage, these foreign nations are placing orders with foreign shipyards capable of producing vessels. Bear in mind that these foreign nations lost virtually 50 percent or more of their merchant marine during the war. These new vessels are expected to be delivered within the next 5 years. This program must not be lost sight of because in terms of foreign trade and competition it means that within 5 years our vessels will be comparatively obsolete. Many of the veseels which our competitors are presently operating are old and inefficient and at such time as shipbuilding capacities allow, these old vessels will be retired and replaced by a new, efficient and specialized tonnage more than capable of competing with even our best C-type which is now in such great demand.

While the shipbuilding capacity of other nations is being used to the fullest, the shipyards of the United States are either being closed down or partially utilized only for ship repairs. This virtual shut-down of shipbuilding in the United States will unquestionably lead to the critical deterioration of one of the most essential segments of our maritime industry.

Shipbuilding and repair capacity are an essential part of the shipping industry, and, as we have learned to our regret, must be maintained for reasons of national security. In World War I our capacity was tremendously increased at great cost and then allowed to decline to the point where in World War II we had to begin over again to create capacity. We face the danger that the present new capacity will be junked. It is important to realize that capacity of these yards consists not only of physical equipment, but of trained personnel as well. To dissipate and scatter the trained manpower means that shortly we should have to begin at scratch to rebuild the industry.

Foreign countries such as France, Belgium, Greece, etc., are not going to place orders in American yards for new construction. Nor will they make repairs here if they can get what they want in British or other foreign yards. Why should they? Why should they pay our high cost in dollars? Most of these countries are creditor nations to Great Britain and so they have the ability to use some of this credit for the construction of new vessels and the repair of old. True, Britain or, for that matter, the other countries mentioned, will, all things being equal, build up their own merchant marine first. But shipbuilding and ship repair to them are as much an export as coal or articles of clothing. Such cannot be said of the American shipbuilding and ship-repair industry.

While for the next 5 years the foreign yards work full capacity, the American yards lie idle. Some consideration must be given to action which will make it possible for any American yard to build or repair ships for foreigners. Unless our yards are kept going, we are not going to have them when we need them and they are not going to be able to produce for the American operator according to his everyday operational needs. A requirement that American yards be used

might be injected into any loan offered a foreign government over and above those portions definitely needed for its relief and rehabilitation. In other words, we might say to Britain that a portion of the nearly $4,000,000,000 proposed loan would be earmarked for construction and/or repair of British ships in American yards.

The opponents of this theory might say that we are merely building up Britain's merchant fleet to the detriment of our own. But this is the short-range view. They are going to do it anyway and it is just a matter of time. Would it not be better to keep our yards going during a period of our inactivity so that they can be available with proper and sufficient equipment and staff to take over, say in 4 or 5 years for our own account? This later period will be the critical time, much more so than the immediate one.

Probably the greatest of all the problems facing the industry concerns international cooperation. The establishment and maintenance of international accords on the sea along the lines of the United Nations agreement is a difficult and vexing matter. However, we must cooperate with all maritime nations in the prevention of economic wars which ultimately lead to armed conflict.

The international question is divided into two categories: First, general cooperation of the maritime nations of the world looking toward the efficient utilization of all the facilities of these nations in a peaceful and prosperous world.

As you know, the United Nations established a precedent for such utilization during the war: The United Maritime Authority. The United Maritime Authority was conceived in 1944 because it was apparent to the nations who then subscribed to the "agreement on principles" that international cooperation and collaboration in the field of shipping was necessary, not only for the successful prosecution of the war in Europe and the Far East, but also for the carrying out of the common task of supplying liberated areas. It was also recognized that failure to achieve such an objective during the critical period between the cessation of hostilities in Europe and the end of the war in the Far East would result in chaotic conditions and undoubtedly prolong the Japanese War.

United Maritime Authority was perhaps the greatest experiment the world has ever known in international collaboration in the field of shipping.

There was considerable objection to some of the mechanisms of United Maritime Authority, not without some justification. It had its faults. Nevertheless, it achieved its purpose; it worked.

United Maritime Authority was a wartime measure and it was agreed that it would remain in effect for a period not exceeding 6 months beyond the general suspension of hostilities in Europe or in the Far East, whichever were later. United Maritime Authority served its purpose and went out of being on March 2, 1946.

There were held in London in late February of this year a series of meetings prior to the dissolution of United Maritime Authority. The purposes of these meetings were: first, to adopt appropriate mechanisms for the dissolution of United Maritime Authority; second, to consider what to do in the immediate post-United Maritime Authority period; and third, to consider seriously the desirability of retaining some forum or round table for the purpose of discussion of our mutual problems and continuation of international cooperation during the critical period of transition after March 2, 1946.

Ideas and suggestions of the United States delegation were as follows: (a) we favor the return to normal conditions and commercial practices as quickly as possible; (b) the war is over but some wartime conditions remain; (c) aims and policy of the United States are directed toward maintenance of private ownership and operation in the shipping industry; (d) a portion of the common task as it relates to relief and rehabilitation, which the nations in acceding to the agreement on principles accepted as a common responsibility, remains unfulfilled.

It seemed essential to the United States delegation at that time that they should seek to retain a forum for exchange of information and discussion of future international shipping problems. For this purpose they suggested the formation of a consultative body comprised of all interested nations.

Approving the creation of a permanent 12-man commission, the temporary body of the United Nations recommended that there be designated a world-wide intergovernmental shipping body to deal with technical matters. It stated that the United Maritime Consultative Council should be requested at its meeting in Amsterdam, beginning June 17, to consider a permanent organization and to make a preliminary report on this question to the Economic and Social Council of UNO.

If the United Nations is to be the agency to carry out this program—and I think it is the logical agency—then its personnel should be representative of the best shipping brains in government and industry of the world.

The second category of international problems which faces us, is labor. On June 6 of this year the International Labor Office will convene an international labor conference in Seattle, Wash., to consider a series of proposals looking toward the establishment of international employment minimums aboard seagoing vessels. Forty nations are participating, including the United States.

This conference is important to the United States. Let no one here underestimate its importance. The establishment of an international floor under wages, hours, and working conditions will benefit us in that it will raise the employment standards of the other maritime countries far and above the terms and conditions of prewar standards of these countries. But the establishment of these minimums will have a tendency to create greater immediate efficiency and thereby result in a greater competitive threat to the United States industry.

We must participate, therefore, wholeheartedly in our own interest—not only to raise the standards and costs of these nations nearer to our level, but also, to see that full consideration is given to our point of view and our terms and conditions of employment.

I am convinced that the international shipping question and the international labor question are so closely related that they must be considered as one question. I would like to see as close a coordination between the International Labor Office and the proposed shipping council of the United Nations as is possible.

The importance of the maritime industry to our national economy is self-evident. The level of our entire industrial activity will depend to a great extent upon our export capacities.

It is, therefore, of extreme importance that Government and industry cooperate on all matters relating to the industry with a view to developing it to the greatest degree possible. In order to assure such development, it is necessary to determine policies which consider the over-all problems on a long-range basis. Only through integrated and comprehensive policies on all matters can this industry adequately serve the Nation.

The following proposals are made as a starting point in the establishment of a comprehensive and over-all maritime policy:

1. Government adopt a policy which will provide that the Commission study and analyze all matters in the shipping industry on a current basis, both foreign and domestic, and make the findings available to the industry.

2. The Maritime Commission hold hearings in the immediate future, in the major ports, for the purpose of consulting with industry on long-range competitive problems and determine the responsibility of the Commission and other Government agencies concerned with these problems.

3. All government agencies concerned with the industry make an appraisal and analysis of maritime matters as are within their jurisdiction and formulate uniform policies consistent with section 101 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

4. All Government agencies should integrate these policies with the industry.

I believe that there is a great future for the American merchant marine. But I want to qualify my concurrence by saying it is an immediate future only. Unless specific long-range policies are laid down now, we will not have a merchant marine worthy of the United States within the next 5 years. At the moment we have an advantage over all other maritime nations; we have money, shipyards, ships, and trained personnel. Virtually all of our competitors as nations have become bankrupt during the war. But their industries are strong, and they are now building ships, special ships for special trades. The importance of the construction program must never be lost sight of during the next few years. In terms of foreign trade it means that our competitors will have virtually new fleets within 5 years which will compete with our comparatively obsolete ships. And, finally, these foreign nations have the will to build up their fleet—a will which springs from national necessity—a will which extends from the top to the bottom of personnel in the industry.

Thus we have only a temporary advantage. More important than the advantage which we have in ships and other assets, we have time to plan and prepare, time to evaluate our assets in the light of competitive problems, time in which to develop policies and programs which will carry out the practical policies set forth in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended. But the time is short. Five years is not a long period to prepare for the problems which face the American merchant marine.

Citizenship and Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by myself at the annual conference of the National Council on Naturalization and Citizenship, at the Commodore Hotel, New York City, April 26, 1946.

The address follows:

Well over half of the people of this world live in countries bordering the Pacific Ocean. Opportunities for development in the Pacific Basin are an invitation and a challenge to the pioneering spirit of Americans. They offer intriguing prospects in the field of agriculture, industry, and commerce. The movement of our people has always been to the West. The interest in the Pacific, therefore, follows a course that is traditional. Horace Greeley's advice to "Go west, young man, go west," is now certain to carry Americans to all parts of the Pacific.

The war took us right up to the front door and into the homes of the people of most

Pacific countries. Our troops were in Australia and New Zealand. We occupied most of the principal islands of the Pacific and still do for that matter. And we are now in the Orient for good.

We all hope that it is in a role that will preserve peace and foster the mutual confidence that promotes profitable trade and industrial development. The vast spaces of the Pacific have been shrunk by the magic of air transportation. The distance between countries is measured now in hours, not weeks. The contest for the great markets of the Orient and the good will of their people, so essential to the conquest of the former, is on.

Our leadership, our ideas of life and government are being confronted at every important point by the communism of Russia involving ideas of racial equality that must be met squarely, if we hope to sustain our leadership among these people. And we cannot hope to do this if we continue to draw race lines against them in our laws relating to immigration, naturalization and citizenship. These, insofar as they involve questions of race, must be made to conform to the basic principles of democracy.

The people of the Pacific basin have not listened in vain to recitations of the Declaration of Indpendence. When Thomas Jefferson wrote that all men are created equal, little did he calculate on how this dynamic philosophy of human relationships would reverberate on down through the centuries and around the world. Among the great struggling masses of Pacific people, it continues to be the beacon light of American democracy, the battle cry of freedom, American style.

But let us examine the methods by which we have chosen to implement this philosophy in applying our laws of immigration, but more particularly naturalization and citizenship to these people.

The war brought into focus for most of us for the first time the myriad of islands that dot the Pacific. It awakened us to their importance to defense and to commerce and introduced us to the three great groups of people by whom these islands have been inhabited for centuries. These people are the Polynesians, who occupy the islands of the eastern Pacific; the Micronesians, who occupy the islands to the west and north of the Equator, and the Melanesians who occupy the islands to the west and south of the Equator. In the first two of those groups, we have been represented since the turn of the century.

The native Hawaiian people, one of the principal groups of Polynesians, had the good fortune to become American citizens when Hawaii became a Territory of the United States. This was largely the result of the aggressiveness of Americans who had lived in the islands for almost a hundred years.

But their blood brethren and fellow Polynesians to the southwest in American Samoa who have now lived under American naval rule for almost 50 years, after voluntarily ceding their islands to this country, have not even achieved the privileges of naturalization, saying nothing of American citizenship.

They constitute slightly over 10,000 persons, but they are still in the unenviable status of nationals, despite efforts over a period of almost 20 years, to my knowledge, to obtain American citizenship and a few of the elementary privileges of self-government.

The greatest center of Polynesian scientific research in the world today is the Bishop Museum in Honolulu. Its brilliant director is Dr. Peter H. Buck, the son of an Irish father and a Maori mother, a member of the Polynesian race. Dr. Buck fought with distinction with the forces of New Zealand in the World War. His scholarship has won widespread recognition from universities such as Yale where he has taught. He is a man of extraordinary achievements and rare personal charm. He is a man of whom any country could be proud. But he is denied the privileges of naturalization because his mother is of the Polynesian race.

The American flag has been flying, too, for almost 50 years in Micronesia. Our possession of Guam has given us jurisdiction and control of between 20,000 and 30,000 Chamorros. They now call themselves Guamanians by way of drawing a distinction between themselves and the residents of the other islands of the Marianas group.

Isn't it about time that the loyalty of these people to this country be recognized by giving them American citizenship and at least the privileges of naturalization. Up to a few weeks ago, the native people of Guam felt constrained not to hold meetings for the purpose of discussing legislation giving them citizenship because of regulations against political discussions invoked during the war. These regulations have only recently been relaxed. I ask you in the name of common justice and fair play if there can possibly be any justification for perpetuating the political bondage of these people?

Between Hawaii and Guam lie the Marshall Islands. The normal route of trans-Pacific travel is from San Francisco to Honolulu, to Kwajelein in the Marshall Islands, to Guam in the Marianas, and thence to the Philippines. It is four hops. The people of the Marshall Islands have already petitioned this country to be annexed. The Marshallese want to live under the protection of the United States. These and other residents of the Japanese-mandated groups who inevitably will come under some form of American jurisdiction should not be compelled to live indefinitely in uncertainty as to their future citizenship. Some determination now as to where their future allegiances will lie may save a lot of unhappiness and trouble in the future.

But of infinitely greater importance is that fundamental democratic principles rule the application of our laws of naturalization and citizenship to people of Asiatic origin. This country does not have to recede one whit from a policy of restrictive and selective immigration in order to remove the stigma of racial discrimination from the laws of naturalization and citizenship.

The record of the Filipino people should be proof enough of the soundness of a policy that embraces racial equality in dealing with Asiatic people. Their steadfast loyalty to this country stemmed from the conviction that by this means they would achieve complete independence and the recognition of equality that goes with it. This record is an epic in the history of democracy. Residents of Hawaii, like myself, and of the Pacific coast might have had a different story to tell if the Filipinos had not joined our men in sustaining their resistance to Japanese aggression to the bitter end.

Congress is now in the process of enacting legislation for the rehabilitation of the Philippines, but the bill to extend the privileges of naturalization to the Filipino people languishes in a legislative refrigerator. Failure of Congress to enact this legislation, already passed by the House, prior to the establishment of Philippine independence on July 4 will be attended with new doubts about our professions of democracy.

The repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws and the extension to the handful of Chinese residents of this country of the privileges of naturalization was a long step in the right direction. The same steps should be taken for the people of India and Korea if we desire to give strength to the movement for democracy in those countries and achieve in the Orient a position of genuine leadership. The provisions in our immigration laws drawing discriminatory lines against certain races have been too long the weapons of the aggressors and war makers of the Orient to allow them to continue on our statute books.

The war has given proof enough that to deny the privileges of naturalization to persons of certain races who are legally established residents of this country while providing that their children shall be American citizens by reasons of their birth under the American flag has created situations that simply do not make sense.

In the past it has encouraged these parents to foster the alien-language schools, alien religions and an alien press that in the case of the Japanese, particularly, has been a serious source of suspicion, to say the least.

That these agencies were employed to foster foreign nationalism is beyond dispute. But the parents found ready justification for maintaining them in our refusal to permit them citizenship in this country. The position of these people became even more involved when their sons went off to fight with American forces against the country to which they were legally presumed to owe their allegiance. Thus we found the sons being decorated for bravery as American soldiers while the parents were confined to concentration camps for alien enemies.

Koreans in this country were in an intolerable position. Long the bitterest foes of Japanese aggression, they became alien enemies of this country when we went to war with Japan as they were legally subjects of Japan. Koreans who came to this America as children, even though they were moved by a deep sense of loyalty to this country, were unable under our laws to cast off the yoke of Japan.

The people coming within this group are relatively small in number, but they are a significant group. The Chinese who received their educational training in this country with funds from the Boxer indemnity were likewise limited in number, but their influence has been a determining factor in the friendship of China for this country. So with the people of Polynesian and Asiatic origin in this country.

I speak with some knowledge and deep feeling for them as they are concentrated in larger numbers in the Territory of Hawaii than in any other part of the country.

The population of Hawaii has been drawn from all parts of the Pacific. It is a common experience in these islands to find athletic teams, community organizations, social gatherings and agencies of Government with memberships representative of all the principal ethnic groups of the Pacific. People of Polynesian, Caucasian and Oriental origin in Hawaii have found a common meeting ground in American citizenship. The extraordinary measure of harmony in which they live in these islands may be laid principally to this reason.

Differences that have prevailed in their mother countries have disappeared as rapidly as these people have come into American citizenship. Thus there was no consciousness of conflict between the American of Korean ancestry and the American of Japanese ancestry in Hawaii as Korea was being brutally mistreated by Japan, nor between Americans of Chinese ancestry and Americans of Japanese ancestry when China became the victim of Japanese aggression. Nor did the invasion of the Philippines by Japan after the outbreak of war incite attacks by the Filipinos of Hawaii on the Japanese Americans of the islands, and when the time came for the latter to make their contribution to American victory, they did so in a spirit and with a record that has become legend.

The record would seem to vindicate the judgment of Congress in 1900 in making the Hawaiian Islands a territory and giving to their people the privileges of American citizenship. Today all but about 13 percent of these people are American citizens. Despite their diverse origins, they live together in a spirit of mutual respect as American citizens. The Hawaiian experiment has been a

success. It has given new meaning to American citizenship and to democracy. The pattern of racial relationships in this American territory offers new hope and inspiration to the people of the Pacific area.

The doubts that may have prevailed about the wisdom of extending the privileges of American citizenship to persons of Polynesian and Asiatic origin whose residence has been well established in this country cannot be justified in the face of this record. It has demonstrated beyond dispute the wisdom of extending the privileges of naturalization to all persons legally admitted to the country regardless of race. The time has come to wipe out the race lines in our naturalization laws. Now as never before, we know that loyalty is not a question of ancestry and race, but of heart and mind. We should adjust the laws of our country to conform to this great principle.

Mr. Truman and the Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as one of the Members who voted against the Case bill, which I believe is one of the most clever attacks on the rights of labor since my election to Congress, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an excellent article by Mr. Ernest Lindley in the Washington Post of May 31, 1946:

MR. TRUMAN AND THE CASE BILL
(By Ernest Lindley)

The Case bill is a conglomeration. It is much less than the comprehensive overhauling and improvement which our policy on labor unions and the settlement of industrial disputes needs. It is directed at what most people, apart from professional union leaders, regard as evils, but perhaps not in every instance, very expertly. Yet, at heart, it is about as sound as a great many bills that have become law.

Taken as a whole, the bill is not faulty enough to require a veto, but is faulty enough to provide a reasonable, or at least plausible, basis for a veto.

Mr. Truman had indicated that if the Case bill came to him in the form passed by the House he probably would veto it. The Senate revision, accepted by the House, is fully as objectionable from the viewpoint of union leaders. As late as last Saturday, when he asked for emergency legislation, Mr. Truman hoped to head off permanent labor-union legislation at this session—anything, that is, which went much beyond the fact-finding and cooling-off plan he asked Congress to enact 5 months ago. He urged the creation of a joint committee to study the problem and report in 6 months. His drastic emergency proposals—which, now that the crisis threatened by the rail strike has faded, have provoked some of the most savage demagogery of this session of Congress—provided a shield for the veto of permanent legislation.

If the labor leaders who are already predicting that Mr. Truman's emergency proposals will cost the Democrats the elections of 1946 and 1948 are right, he need give no consideration to labor's views on the Case bill. If organized labor has really turned against him, his only hope lies in appealing to the middle-of-the-road voters.

It is very doubtful, however, that the cleavage between Mr. Truman and organized labor is permanent. It probably would not become permanent even if he signed the Case bill. A veto would assuage the feeling of some of the union leaders, even if the veto were overridden in Congress, as it might well be. But all the intelligent leaders of labor must realize by now that certain abuses are going to be outlawed and that the power of the unions generally is going to be subjected to a degree of regulation. This will surely come about. Delay may bring more, instead of less, stringent legislation. For the present state of affairs plays into the hands of the ambitious extremists among union leaders.

The end of the coal strike further eases the pressure for the emergency legislation requested by Mr. Truman in the rail crisis. But it does not obviate the need. The Chief Executive should be equipped to deal with serious threats to the life of the community. No doubt should be left in the mind of anybody that he has the authority to deal with such a situation.

As a matter of principle, this probably should include the power to draft men temporarily for essential work, even though this is a step which would be justifiable only in the most extreme emergency and even though it might not prove workable. In principle, this power in times of extreme emergency is no more undemocratic than is the age-old power of the sheriff to raise a posse. It imposes, not servitude, but the obligation to serve, which is inseparable from the privileges of citizenship, and on which the Chief Magistrate has not only the right, but the duty, to call when the life of the community is threatened.

In this case, practical considerations have doomed a sound principle. Less drastic emergency legislation probably will serve the purpose. But the union leaders who have declared open warfare on those who suggested or favored the power to draft as an instrument of last resort have quite a task ahead of them.

Praise for Tom Dewey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent newspaper comment on Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, written by Westbrook Pegler:

FAIR ENOUGH
(By Westbrook Pegler)

The case of Tom Dewey is an example of the strange moral intimidation of the American people that has taken place since 1933 which saw the beginning of a sustained campaign of nasty belittlement of every dignified and decent trait in public men.

It takes courage to praise him.

There is no Governor today whose record may be seriously compared with Dewey's. To find his equal in Albany it is necessary to go back beyond Lehman and Roosevelt to Al Smith, whose like is not around today because he was Al Smith

But because he is efficient without the leering flippancy which in others has passed for human understanding, because he has eschewed such comedian props as the Ed Wynn fedora and the gas-pipe cigarette holder, because he treats other politicians with more dignity than most of them deserve, Mr. Dewey has been ridiculed and suffers in the public mind. He is unreasoningly regarded as a serio comic little fellow whose very aspiration to the Presidency in 1944 was, of itself, an absurd effrontery.

First, he was too young. That objection faded when it was noted that the Roosevelt who ran for Vice President in 1920 and might have become President, were the ticket elected, had been even younger. Then his stature, something between that of Tom Thumb and Jess Willard, was offered against him until comparisons tended to embarrass LaGuardia, Stalin, and Winston Churchill, when the matter was quietly dropped. During the brief run of that ill-advised venture to smear, a New Deal propagandist sent along on Dewey's train to heckle him hailed one of Dewey's friends one evening with the news that a New York custom shoemaker claimed to have made high heels for the Governor to make him seem taller.

"Yes," Dewey's friend answered, "and I understand your fellow buys those iron legs of his from the Fuller Construction Co."

That, of course, was a vicious reference to the sad infirmity of a great and noble friend of man and in no way comparable to Harold Ickes' sneering jibe at the wheel chair in which the afflicted Lionel Barrymore attended a Dewey rally in Hollywood about the same time. That was humor.

What is the charge against Dewey, anyway?

He has been a student of government and has made government a serious profession. He has refused to frequent night clubs and cultivate the politico-theatrical underworld where brawling mountebanks of the ruling party have made their social headquarters more often than not under the possessive auspices of converted bootleggers and gamblers.

Just over the hills from the inherited barony where Roosevelt took homage from the "simple folk" and paid them coolie wages, Dewey bought a farm on borrowed money and has lived modestly abong his peers, attended by one State trooper, by contrast with the Presidential household garrison of 300 selected MP's who joined the Army as American soldiers and became honor guard of flunkeys. No kin of his have been found on the public pay rolls nor has he ever used the power of his office to swindle trusting lenders reliant on his honor.

Yet, even Republican politicians begrudge him honor, not for sensible objections to his record or ability but because they have been put under the spell. The same reticence is observed toward Herbert Hoover, certainly one of the greatest patriots of his time, who, far from sweating the Presidential office for the last mean and doubtful dollar of personal profit, actually served without pay because he didn't need the money and felt honored in the position. In 1944 Hoover deliberately kept away from Dewey because the propaganda ran that he was the real candidate and Dewey his Charlie McCarthy.

Jim Farley, honest and courageous, despite his years in Tammany and the New Deal, recently exhorted the Democrats to beat Dewey for the governorship next fall. He gave no reason why Dewey should be beaten because his only reason was that Dewey had been altogether too good a governor. That might mean President Dewey in 1948 and better the poor, bewildered County Commissioner Harry Truman or the Stalinesque Henry Wallace than a good Republican President.

Instead, Farley asked the Democrats to nominate a man in the tradition of Smith, Roosevelt, and Lehman when every reporter present knew he had only contempt for Roosevelt. As for the others, no candidate could be found for governor more in the tradition of Al Smith's honesty and worth than Dewey, himself, while Lehman was inferior to both.

Notwithstanding his fine record, Dewey often is subordinated to Stassen of Minnesota, a New Dealer in a Republican wrapper, whose latest record in office is some years old and never was remotely comparable to Dewey's if only because Dewey's problems and responsibilities were so much greater. His war service as an admiral's aide will be urged in his favor but his was, after all, a political job in the war and no intelligent man could argue that such service called for statesmanship.

My issue here is not Dewey's political future, nowever, but an intellectual stupor, the effect of propaganda and regimented prejudices which gives some Americans thought to dismiss him as a silly little man who makes himself the sillier by living decently in well-behaved company, taking life and his responsibilities earnestly, and even saying grace before meals and damn the mockers of his piety.

He has no Ickes in his circle, no Leon Henderson, Tommy the Cork, Harry the Hop, or Sammy the Rose. No Alexander Woollcott has come for dinner to the mansion in Albany to amuse a tired ruler with premeditated rudeness, nor riffraff from the big saloons to make publicity at the expense of his office. He has been, in short, a gentleman in his personal life and bearing, and his wife a modest, honest lady, and so he is inadequate, no man of the people and, in word, preposterous. Most men will remember, from their school days, boys who had the courage to be decent and suffered for it socially.

Extension of Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter I have received today from a constituent, a soldier now serving in the Pacific, signed also by 39 men serving with him:

EIGHTY-SECOND MILITARY
GOVERNMENT COMPANY,
APO 181, POSTMASTER, SAN FRANCISO,
May 24, 1946.

Hon. JOHN. W. HESELTON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HESELTON: If the sacrificing of a million lives and the expenditure of $300,000,000,000 was worth while to prosecute the war, certainly the maintenance of a sizable Army to safeguard the principles for which we fought is reasonable. Under the present draft law that is not being done. In fact, no more inadequate or misleading bill could have been passed by the Congress. The bill provided for the drafting of men—men that are already in the service.

In view of this fact these are our suggestions for enclosure in a bill before the expiration of the present stopgap law. They will meet the Army's needs and still be fair to the men involved:

1. The inclusion of teen-agers in the draft law.

2. The limiting of the period each man will have to serve to 18 months.

3. An increase in pay for men in the lower ranks. The highest increase to the lowest rank.

When we were 18 years old we were drafted to serve in the front lines of the war. We were old enough to fight and, if necessary, to die for our country. Why then is a teen-ager too young to serve in the nonhazardous army of occupation? If this group of men is to be exempted from the draft then all men in that age bracket who are now in the service should be released immediately.

Most men have completed 2 years of college or have already established themselves for their future life by the time they become eligible under the present law. How much wiser and more sensible it is to induct a man when he is 18, who has just finished high school and has not as yet entered college or decided definitely what he plans to do in the future, than it is to interrupt him in the midst of his college education. or just as he is starting in life.

Now that the war has terminated there is no need to keep a man in the armed forces for any lengthy period. Eighteen months is long enough for any individual to spend away from his home, his studies, and his business. All men who now have 18 months of service should be released at once and thereafter as a soldier attains his eighteenth month of duty he would be discharged.

One of the greatest sources of dissatisfaction, and also one of the greatest impediments to reenlistments, has been the low-pay rate for enlisted men. We propose an increase substantial enough to help the enlisted men, particularly those in the lowest ranks.

The victory not so long ago won was costly and destructive. It is our duty to make this victory worth the cost. That will only be achieved if the Congress passes a 1-year extension of the draft law encompassing the preceding enclosures. This is a duty you of the Congress owe to those who gave their lives and to those of us who are bearing the burden of the occupation. We have a right to expect that duty to be faced squarely and an end brought to the absurd dillydallying that has thus far been your answer.

It goes without saying that an answer to this will not only be appreciated but it is expected.

Such letters from men directly affected by the present confused situation as to the future of the Selective Service Act is evidence of the greatest importance.

Secretary of War Says Men in Service Will Have Opportunity To Take College Courses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, recently, in an effort to learn just what provisions the War Department has made to provide educational facilities for men on occupation duty, I addressed a letter to Hon. Robert P. Patterson, Secretary, requesting information on this subject.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD my letter to Mr. Patterson and his reply:

APRIL 30, 1946.

Hon. ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: At the time the bill for the extension of the Selective Service Act was debated in the House several questions were asked regarding arrangements for the education of members of the armed services, and, as you probably observed from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, there were no satisfactory answers to the questions originating on the floor.

This is understandable, of course, since chief interest was in the military aspects of the problem, but in view of the great interest manifested by some Members of the House it seems to me that specific information on this point should be supplied by the War Department.

I recall having read certain newspaper accounts of plans of the Department for providing systematic instruction for students whose educational courses had been interrupted, with full credit to be given by American colleges and universities, and I would be very grateful to you for providing this information.

Sincerely yours,

BROOKS HAYS,
Member of Congress.

MAY 18, 1946.

Hon. BROOKS HAYS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAYS: I am very glad to provide you with some of the information which you requested in your letter of April 30 pertinent to the arrangements which the War Department has completed for the education of members of the armed services.

At present we have four types of schools available in the posthostilities education program, namely, unit schools, technical schools, university study centers, and foreign civilian colleges and universities. The unit schools in general offer literacy training, upper elementary school subjects, standard high-school courses, vocational instruction within the limits of personnel and equipment, including on-the-job training, and junior college courses.

The technical schools were established in or near Army technical service installations or other locations having specialized equipment and have offered a variety of vocational courses. A centralized technical school was set up in Wharton, England, to provide instruction on a higher technical level than that available in the schools conducted by the technical services.

Four Army university centers have provided educational opportunities in the liberal arts, sciences, and preprofessional fields to personnel whose educational needs and interests were not met by the unit and technical schools. University centers were established at Florence Italy; Shrivenham, England; Biarritz, France; and Oahu, T. H. Foreign civilian colleges and universities are also being utilized in the overseas education program. Personnel selected to attend these schools do so on a short-term basis, varying with the schools and courses concerned. Among the civilian educational installations which have been utilized in the European theater are Oxford University, Leeds University, University of Liverpool, University of Sheffield, the Sorbonne, the University of Nancy, the École des beaux-arts, and the Institute National Agronomique. I am taking the liberty of inclosing a fact sheet on the Army education program which will provide you with more detailed information on this phase of our activities.

The United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI) was established to provide educational opportunities to all service personnel during their off-duty time, believing that this effort would increase military efficiency, continue the education of the individual which in many cases was interrupted by the war, and prepare the individual for successful return to civilian life.

The Armed Forces Institute, with its headquarters in Madison, Wis., had branches located in Hawaii, New Caledonia, Australia, Alaska, Egypt, India, Italy, England, France,

Panama, Puerto Rico, the Philippines, Japan, and Germany, and subbranches wherever necessary to fill temporary needs.

The services of the Armed Forces Institute provide individual instruction by correspondence courses or by self-teaching courses, the latter offering over 50 separate courses. In addition, textbooks are provided for locally organized off-duty classes of either the college level or the high-school level and texts for individual enrollment for self-teaching courses are available. Examination and accreditation service completes the work of the institute. The War Department pamphlet on off-duty education in the United States armed forces, which is also attached, provides information pertinent to this activity.

Attendance at any of the four types of schools included in the Army education program does not in itself carry academic credit at an American college or university, but on the basis of such educational experience a person may apply for credit from a civilian educational institution on the basis of experience gained while in the service. The application is usually made directly to the school last attended or to the school the individual wishes to attend. In some cases application may be made to the State department of education for a high-school equivalency certificate. The American Council on Education has prepared A Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experience in the Armed Services, for the purpose of recommending to civilian institutions the number and allocation of credits which the council feels may be allowed for each type of educational experience in the armed services.

The Army has prepared general educational development tests designed to measure general educational growth and experience and also subject tests in a large number of fields, and the individual by attaining a satisfactory score on these tests demonstrates his general educational experience or proficiency in a specific subject, by which the civilian school or education authority may be able to grant credit or advanced standing.

The suspension of portions of the Army educational program in Europe has been necessitated due to the lack of personnel rather than by lack of funds made available for the purpose. It is hoped, however, that this shortage of personnel will cease and that a plan for the operation of all phases of the program will be adopted in the near future.

Assuring you of my appreciation for your interest in the Army education program and trusting that the above information with the enclosures will be suitable for your needs, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

Award of Medal of Merit to Thomas E. Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I desire to include a copy of a citation to accompany the award of a medal for merit, conferred upon Mr. Thomas E. Wilson, of Chicago, on May 22, 1946, by the President of the United States.

Mr. Wilson, a distinguished citizen of the Second Congressional District of Illinois, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, is chairman of the board for Wilson & Co., and the citation is for "exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services to the United States."

The citation follows:

CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE AWARD OF THE MEDAL FOR MERIT TO THOMAS E. WILSON

Thomas E. Wilson, for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services to the United States. A few days after December 7, 1941, recognizing the critical shortage of fats vitally needed in the manufacture of medicines, munitions, soaps, and other items which would result from the loss of importation of vegetable fats from the Philippine Islands and the Dutch East Indies, Mr. Wilson, with characteristic foresight and vigorous resourcefulness, conceived and, as Assistant Coordinator of Civilian Defense, pioneered in the organization of a fat-salvage program for the metropolitan area of the city of Chicago, under which collections were commenced January 19, 1942. The success of the fat-salvage program in the Chicago area, under Mr. Wilson's leadership, demonstrated that such a program could be followed with success in metropolitan centers throughout the country; and the War Production Board, with the advice and assistance of Mr. Wilson and with the approval of the Departments of Agriculture, War, and Navy, sponsored a national fat-salvage program, which was begun in July 1942. With the cooperation of the American housewife, related industries, and the press and radio, many millions of pounds of vitally needed fats were collected. Under the Department of Agriculture, the fat-salvage program is still being conducted to help meet the continued need for fats during the reconversion period. Mr. Wilson's selfless devotion to his country and his energetic leadership in the fat-salvage program have immeasurably contributed to the welfare and security of the United States during the period of the emergency, and the habits of thrift thereby engendered will substantially contribute to the national economy for years to come.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Threats on British Loan Should Be Ignored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, published by Mr. Jesse Jones, formerly one of the New Deal's foremost financial advisers:

THREATS ON LOANS SHOULD BE IGNORED

It has again been testified that rejection of the proposed $3,750,000,000 loan to the British would force Great Britain to quit the Bretton Woods bank and fund. The statement was made Tuesday by William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, before the House Banking and Currency Committee. Mr. Clayton said that Britain had "officially stated she would be forced to withdraw from Bretton Woods if she doesn't get this loan."

It would be interesting to know when the British reached the conclusion that they would be unable to take a part in the International Bank and International Stabilization Fund. There certainly was no such suggestion before or during the Bretton Woods meeting. The bank and the fund as finally adopted are a compromise between the suggestions of the late Lord Keynes and Harry D. White, American Treasury expert. The two organizations contain many features of British origin. Neither the bank nor the fund would have come into existence if the British had not joined in initiating and furthering the program for world financial cooperation. The British signed the Bretton Woods agreement without any reservations. There was no statement made at that time indicating or implying that a loan would be necessary to get Great Britain into the two organizations.

Now we are told that unless the United States loans the British $3,750,000,000 under most unbusinesslike terms, Great Britain will be unable to join in the bank and fund. Just when was that decision reached? What is the nature of the official notification that we would have to pay Great Britain's way into the bank and fund? No Government witness nor any other proponent of the proposed British loan has given the answer to these questions. They are extremely pertinent, for the very clear implication now is that the British are threatening to withdraw from the bank and the fund unless we pay their way in.

As the Chronicle pointed out in its editorial of April 16, there is no reason for us to be interested in threats on the part of the British. We should, as a matter of fact, ignore them. They certainly do not constitute an argument for the United States to loan the British money which it cannot afford to lend under terms that are certain to cost the American taxpayers money.

Food Facts Demanded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee has requested the Secretary of Agriculture to make public the Department of Agriculture's allocation sheets which show the details of Government plans for the world-wide distribution of American food. On May 29, the committee over the signature of its chairman, Hon. THOMAS A. JENKINS, wrote a letter to Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson, making the above-mentioned request. As secretary of the committee, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the letter to Secretary Anderson as follows:

MAY 29, 1946.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As I believe you are aware, the cloak of wartime secrecy is still concealing from the American people the allocations that are made of their foodstuffs. Department of Agriculture allocation sheets, showing how the Government plans to dispose of virtually every pound of American foodstuffs, are still marked "restricted" and kept secret from the public.

There was a legitimate reason for keeping our food allocations secret from the enemy during the war. There is no reason now why these allocations should be kept secret from the American people.

We believe that the American people have the right to know in detail exactly what is

happening to their food, and that their cooperation in famine relief will be far more effective if they are told the whole truth.

We urgently request, therefore, that the classification "restricted" be removed from all Department of Agriculture food-allocation sheets and schedules and that this vital information be made available promptly and freely to the press and public.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Chairman, Republican Congressional Food Study Committee.

Shall We Bring Them Back?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, Congress has made the necessary appropriation to bring home for burial the bodies of those in the armed forces who died abroad. Some 300,000 American bodies, I understand, are buried abroad, and the cost of repatriation would be quite large, but no sum is too large if the relatives of these brave heroes who gave their lives for their country want their remains brought home.

It will be optional with the relatives whether the remains of their loved ones will be brought home, and since some are in favor of returning their bodies and others are not, any information concerning this question, I feel, would be welcome to the relatives who pass upon this matter.

I read recently an article by Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, the eminent preacher of New York City, who gives his reasons why he thinks that it might be best not to have the bodies returned. Whether you agree with Dr. Fosdick or not, his article is most interesting and contains facts which I think relatives of the deceased soldiers should know, and for that reason, under leave granted, same is submitted herewith:

SHALL WE BRING THEM BACK?

(By Harry Emerson Fosdick)

"If I should die, think only this of me:
That there's some corner of a foreign field
That is forever England."

Thousands of American families are today discussing a question which must be answered: Shall they ask the Government to bring home for burial here the bodies of their soldier dead? All over the world American bodies lie buried—the men and women of the Army, the Navy, the Marines, the Coast Guard, the Red Cross, the merchant marine, and the civilian agencies who fell in the war. Congress has laid on the doorsill of the next of kin the right to choose, if they will, the repatriation of their dead—a sensitive question involving deep personal feelings, in dealing with which no one would wish to lay an unsympathetic hand on the tiller of any home's decision. Nevertheless, for what it may be worth, this brief statement represents what one personal counselor would say to a perplexed and inquiring family.

For one thing, intimate though the decision of this question is, it involves a public matter. Some 300,000 American bodies are buried abroad, and the cost of their repatriation would reach nearly $200,000,000. Moreover, at this writing, Congress is considering the establishment of 79 new national cemeteries to meet the demand, at an outlay cost of $123,000,000, with an anticipated maintenance charge of $10,000,000 annually. In the face of the world's appalling penury and starvation, is such expenditure, objectively considered, wise and right? No such consideration is final—I would not interpose it as a conclusive barrier against any home's convinced desire to bring a loved one's body home—but it should be part of the picture as we make up our minds.

Following the First World War the next of kin were permitted to have the remains of their veteran relatives disinterred and repatriated. The families of 30,902 preferred to leave them overseas; 45,833 bodies were returned. After this war, however, the public aspect of the matter looms larger—the number of the dead far greater, the dispersion of their remains far wider, the expense of their return far greater, the provision of adequate cemeteries far more complicated and costly. No family should think of this problem in merely private terms but, with individual desire set in the context of the problem's wider implications, we should ask whether it would not be better if all took the attitude of Rupert Brooke, a British soldier who fell in the First World War.

Rupert Brooke's attitude suggests a second consideration: the desires of the men themselves who now lie buried overseas. The evidence on this point is strangely close to unanimity. First Lt. Harold Martin, for example, writes: "If you could ask the dead, I think they would say they would like to lie where they now sleep * * *. Every man I ever heard mention the subject said that he would not want his body to be taken up and brought back home. He'd want to stay where he fell, his grave one among the graves of his comrades who died with him." So General Patton chose to be buried on a European battlefield, and Mrs. Ernie Pyle, feeling that her husband would so wish it, chooses that his body shall lie on a Pacific island.

While we may have strong sentiments, therefore, about bringing the bodies home, we should at least consider such sentiments to the contrary which, according to all accounts, the men themselves with practical unanimity felt in favor of sleeping where they died. Perhaps it would help us to share their feeling if we could see the American cemeteries on Okinawa and Iwo Jima. One soldier says, "There are no more beautiful spots in all the world than the cemeteries of our dead on the islands of the Pacific. No matter how wild and foreign the place they died, where they sleep now is green with grass and bright with sun and cool with whispering winds."

Congress has given to thousands of our homes the right to repatriate the remains of their dead, but there are thousands of other families to which no such privilege can be given. The bodies of their dead were drowned, burned, blasted into nothingness, destroyed in some blazing airplane or sunk in some submarine. No remnant of the shattered flesh can be brought back to be buried here by families to whose loved ones that has happened. Does this mean that the memory of their dead is not to be as truly kept, the honor due their heroes as worthily bestowed, as in the case of those whose dust is repatriated?

The identification of the dead body with the personality of those we love does an injustice to those whom we desire to honor. The boy whose body fell blazing in some air attack, destroyed beyond physical recovery, is held sacred in our memory, his sacrifice cherished in our gratitude, and his name recalled with honor. No visible grave here could increase that one whit. If he needs no physical disinterment and reburial to express our love, why should those need it who, by the accident of battle, have left, it may be, some small shred of their mortal remains that can be identified?

Especially if I were counseling a family in which religious faith was strong I should stress this. Their boy was not his body. In the First World War a Canadian soldier saw a chum of his blown all to pieces by a bursting shell and his comment was, "It will take more than that to stop him." It is no accident that religious leaders of all faiths—Jews, Catholics, Protestants—who have spoken on this subject have, with practical unanimity, agreed in substance with the official pronouncement of the Social Service Commission of the Episcopal Diocese of New York: "The commission further believes that if all the facts were known to the bereaved families and due consideration were given to the teachings of the Christian faith as to death, burial, and eternal life, they would be convinced that the bodies should remain in dignified burial overseas."

One feels this all the more when one faces frankly, however disagreeable it may be, the plain facts about the battlefield burials of thousands of our men—their interment hasty, their bodies sometimes laid, as in the South Sea Islands, in ground where water is close beneath the surface. Our sentiments picture the return of our loved ones' bodies, but often the bodies cannot be returned, only a few fragments that are no more the men we loved than is the soil with which their bodies now are indistinguishably mingled.

Were not the men right who, with such unanimity, wished to lie with their comrades where they fell, or in some nearby ground set sacredly apart for their interment? There let them lie, and here at home let their names be put in permanent memorials where they can be seen of all and visited by generations yet unborn. Thus, it seems to some of us, we shall best honor them and best express our deep conviction that the things which are seen are temporal but the things which are unseen are eternal.

The Dairying Situation in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERLIN HULL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, in the present crisis the problem of food for our own people, as well as that of supplying foreign countries which are in the midst of the greatest famine ever known, combine to alarm those of our land who are accustomed to plenty. The mere suggestion of restoring food rationing comes as a shock to millions who have generously engaged in a general food-conservation program to relieve conditions at home and abroad. Our Government and its people are spending billions toward such relief.

Among the most acute shortages of food are those of dairy products. Butter and cheese, in particular, have almost disappeared from our domestic markets, and the higher prices alleged as being paid in the black markets are not aiding conditions nor serving to increase production.

The Members of the Wisconsin congressional delegation have been endeav-

oring, not only for months but for years, to point out the difficulties which have contributed so largely to decreasing the production of processed dairy products. Coming from a great dairy State whose production is about 12 percent of the total for the Nation, and from the northwestern dairy region, in which five States have been producing more than half the total supply of butter and cheese, we have felt that the discrimination of the Government agencies would bring about the very results now so plainly in evidence.

When the British Government called upon our country for increased shipments of cheese and dried milk under lend-lease agreements, the first steps were taken to disorganize the great dairy industry which had been developed in Wisconsin. Foreseeing even then at least some of the effects of such a policy, our Wisconsin delegation of Senators and Representatives called upon the then Secretary of Agriculture in June 1941, and gave emphatic warning of what would happen were the proposed policy adopted.

From that time until the present, collectively and individually, the Wisconsin Members in both Houses have been contacting the Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Administration, the Office of Price Administration, endeavoring to prevent the flow of rules and regulations which have harassed, hampered, and gone far toward the destruction of the business of dairy-processing industries, including the cooperative and individually-owned creameries and cheese factories which did such a heroic job of supplying our armed forces, and our civilian population as well, during the war years.

In but few and minor instances were our endeavors heeded. The policy of regulating dairy-processing plants out of existence was adopted. It continues in force. Creameries and cheese factories, many of which had been doing business for 30 years or more, have closed. Specific relief has been sought and denied. Today in Wisconsin over 700 cheese factories have closed. Many creameries have stopped making butter. The supply of butter and cheese has declined to a point where consumers can obtain neither butter nor cheese. And still Government regulators refuse and decline to give serious consideration to the situation.

Clark County, Wis., is one of the great dairy counties. It has over 80,000 cows and heifers on its farms. Its dairymen are experienced and efficient. They have done a remarkable job in helping supply the armies and the civilian population with nearly every form of dairy products. Those farmers and processors have felt the heavy hand of bureaucratic regulation, and still feel it.

The Clark County Press, published by an able editor, Wells Harvey, at Niellsville, is one of Wisconsin's best weekly newspapers. In a recent issue the Clark County Press published a comprehensive statement as to the changed situation in that great dairy county. Of the 85 natural cheese factories doing business 3 years ago, now only 26 are under the same ownership as then.

The article in the Clark County Press is copyrighted, but with the kind permission of Mr. Harvey it is published herewith. It discloses a general situation even though the survey includes only Clark County. Those who wonder why processed dairy products are so scarce and so difficult to obtain may well read it:

LITTLE CHEESE MEN ARE SQUEEZED OUT BY THE OPA—FACING RUIN, THEY SELL AND LEASE TO STOP STEADY LOSS—UNITED STATES CONTROL FORCES THE END OF TYPICAL AMERICAN SMALL INDUSTRY

Of 85 factories in Clark County engaged 3 years ago in making natural cheese, 19 have been closed, 40 have undergone change of ownership or control, and only 26 remain under the same ownership and control. Most of the 26 remaining factories are in a difficult situation, with the prospect that most of them will be driven into a sale, lease, or some other method of escape. For some of them negotiations are now pending.

These changes have come about in part as the natural development of business. A few of the closed factories were so small that it was no longer possible to operate them economically under modern conditions. But many of the changes, and practically all of the recent ones, have been brought about by the policies followed in Government control. Since about January 1 it has been impossible for a factory making natural American cheese to pay the current price of milk, meet its manufacturing costs, and sell its product at the OPA ceiling.

With butterfat at 71 to 73 cents a year ago, most factories in Clark County were able to sell American cheese at the ceiling and get along. But when the price of butterfat mounted toward 80 cents, with occasional payments in some localities up even as high as 83 cents, the maker of American cheese was completely out of luck. Those factories which have continued to operate under the old ownership and control have been taking a loss throughout 1946. In the case of one family-size factory, the identity of which will not here be revealed, the loss has been $2,000, plus the time of the maker and his wife. In another instance a factory already sold to a large processor, lost $1,200 in March, and this is a factory with about an average run. In still another instance, known specifically to the Clark County Press, the present loss is at the rate of $100 per day. This is one of the larger factories, the owner of which saw the storm coming and made his escape in time to let the big fellow worry about this loss.

LITTLE FELLOWS ARE DRIVEN

Losses at this rate are utterly beyond the reserves and staying power of the owners of small cheese factories, who have been forced to seek relief. Their peril has coincided with a remarkable opportunity on the part of the processors, who have customarily bought their product. For the processers have been in a favored position under the OPA ceiling, with a wider relative margin and with a tremendous demand for their output. As the small cheese makers were pondering upon their plight and picturing themselves turning the key in the door, the processors were in urgent need of their product, natural cheese. Without the natural cheese, the processors also would be out of luck. So the processors exercised themselves to find a way out.

Except for price control, this situation would have righted itself in a system of free enterprise. The processors would have raised their payments to the cheese makers sufficiently to keep the cheese coming. But under the conditions of OPA regulation, they could not legally pay beyond the prescribed ceiling.

Under these conditions four methods of escape have been used: The first, and seemingly least drastic, has been for the cheesemaker to retain ownership of the cheese, to arrange with a processor for its conversion into loaf cheese, and then to sell it to the processor in the form of loaf. This method has had some small use in central Wisconsin.

SALES MADE WITH OPTIONS

Another method is an outright sale of the property, including both realty and equipment, made by the cheese maker to one of the large cheese concerns. In some, if not all of these transactions there is an option under which the old maker may buy back at the same price, and perhaps even with depreciation taken off at a prescribed rate. Meanwhile the old maker works for the new owner on a salary. This plan has been styled a sale of convenience, but it is an outright sale, with very considerable sums of money actually passing in recent weeks into the hands of cheesemakers in Clark County. The legal situation in this case has been stated to be unassailable.

The third plan is for the large cheese concern to take a lease on the factory for a prescribed period, and to hire the maker on a salary.

The fourth plan is to go cooperative, a plan which is being promoted in this area by the Rib Lake Dairy Co. Cooperative, represented in this area by J. F. Pinion, of Marshfield, who is manager of its cheese marketing division. Under this plan the margins are automatically spread out, so that the ultimate selling price is significant and not the ceiling on natural cheese.

THEY STOP THE LOSS

Deals of the sort described above are in effect right now in the case of many factories in central Wisconsin. They have the effect of stopping the loss of the small cheese maker, and they provide him the means of livelihood, but he is no longer, in most instances, an independent businessman, with his chance to share in the good picking naturally inherent in a tight market for cheese.

To a considerable extent the deals of purchase or lease involve the so-called big fellow in the cheese industry. They are the large processors and dealers whose names are household words throughout the United States and who are the big factors in the dairy trade. They are the same concerns which, in years prior to the war, were under fire for alleged price fixing, and who were the target of trust busters.

If the Government was once after them for alleged voluntary activity on their part, they now find themselves driven by the Government and by the exigencies of competition to enter directly into the control of their source of supply. For, as the plight of the cheese makers grew, so grew also the threat against the normal course of cheese trade. The danger was that the big fellows would find themselves out on a limb, with plenty of outlet for dairy products, but with a constantly lessening inlet. At their source of supply stood ambitious and aggressive semi-independents, who were out to get the cheese, whatever had to be done to get it legally. Thus it happened, for instance, that one relatively large cheese factory in this country, the Pine Grove factory in the town of Beaver, which had been supplying Dairy Belt at the rate of a million pounds of natural American cheese a year, was sold to Shefford, and this was, in effect, a sale to Standard Brands. But Dairy Belt could not with equanimity look upon the loss of a million pounds a year, and so, as a direct or indirect result, Dairy Belt buys out Herb Uttech at York Center, and thus restores its volume.

COMPETITION AT GREENWOOD

Early in the year the Stewart Cheese Corp. set up in Greenwood, with the policy of securing most of its curd from neighboring factories. But those neighboring factories had previously been a source of supply of

other processors and dealers, and the upset situation presented what was thought to be both a menace and an invitation. So presently Dairy Belt bought out Harry Schlinsog, and the Dairy Plant Operators' Corp., represented by its secretary-treasurer, J. F. Pinion, bought the Ted Mech factory at Greenwood. So the Stewart people found themselves in the necessity of looking to direct purchase from farmers and of arranging for the resale of the Mech good will to themselves.

Now readjustments, such as these, have been bound to upset the connections of Armour, for instance, who have a warehouse at Greenwood. And Armour, under the necessity of protecting its volume, has moved and is moving now. But it is moving under the spur of necessity, and proposes to restore the situation to its old independent basis as soon as market conditions permit.

CHANGE IS REVOLUTIONARY

Thus the entire business of manufacturing natural cheese in Clark County is undergoing a change which is almost revolutionary in character. While in some instances the old situations will be restored by exercise of options or by the expiration of leases, it is altogether unlikely that the industry will return to anything like its old status. Some of these deals, if not the greater part of them, will stick, and the cheese industry, with its vast importance in the marketing of milk in Clark County, will have moved importantly toward centralization and control by the larger interests. Whatever the long-range implications, the present picture is one of urgent competition, with determination to protect sources of supply, and with a strong bid for local milk.

It is certain that the recent more important changes have been brought about directly and inevitably by the policies of OPA. That Government organization has fixed definite ceilings for cheese and butter, but has not set corresponding controls upon competitive use of milk and cream. It is these uncontrolled competitive uses of milk and cream which have driven up the prices beyond the reach of the small cheese maker. Thus price control in the dairy industry is forcing the little fellow out of business. In the State of Wisconsin, as of Wednesday, April 24, about 400 cheese factories remained in their old ownership, while 1,000 of them had passed into strong hands. The change is proceeding with great rapidity, for the little fellow cannot stand the gaff. Within a few months the old-style cheese factory, as a family operation, will have passed out of the picture in Wisconsin.

FACTORIES CLOSED

The following factories have been closed and are no longer in operation:

Bachman, Rudolph; 6 miles south of Thorp; East Worden Dairy; considerations of health; sold to Blue Moon.

Braun, Theodore; 9 miles northwest of Greenwood; Braun Settlement factory; closed; Mr. Braun continues to operate his farm, upon which the factory is located.

Hiller, Otto C.; 2 miles south of Thorp; Clover Belt factory; sold to Blue Moon and closed.

Holt, Alfred; 6 miles southwest of Loyal; Heintown factory; sold to Herbert Uttech and closed.

Huber, Edward; 2½ miles from Spencer; closed and quit; milk goes to Dairy Belt.

Klay, Christian J.; 5 miles southwest of Withee; Oak Grove factory; closed and quit.

Knops, Francis M.: 15 miles southwest of Greenwood; Woodland View factory; had auction and closed the factory.

Laabs, Alfred; 2½ miles northeast of Stanley; Otter Creek factory; closed several years ago.

Lombard Dairy Co.; 7 miles northeast of Thorp; closed 2 or 3 years.

Lombard Dairy Co.; 3¼ miles northeast of Thorp; closed, but reported to have been sold to Broeren and Decker, with prospect of reopening.

Looser, Ernst; 5 miles northeast of Thorp; Junction factory; closed 2 years or more ago.

Losiewicz, Stev; 5 miles north of Thorp; White Eagle Dairy; sold to Blue Moon and closed.

Nurmi, Bruno W.; 5 miles south of Thorp; Sun Shine Valley factory; has been closed for several years.

Pleasant Ridge Creamery Co.; 4 miles southeast of Neillsville; Pleasant Ridge factory; closed for some time.

Reber, Walter; 3 miles west of Granton; North Star factory; closed as an independent operation, but Mr. Reber maintains the patronage and continues the business at his nearby East Pleasant Ridge factory.

Spieles, Jesse J.; 5 miles northeast of Loyal; Beaver factory; closed up without a sale.

Teclaw, Mike; 5 miles northwest of Thorp; Clark County factory; closed.

Wessel, Theodore; 4 miles southwest of Greenwood; West Eaton factory; Wessel sold to Harry Schlinsog; Schlinsog sold to Dairy Belt; the West Eaton factory is now a tavern.

Wry, John Paul; 9 miles southeast of Stanley; South Worden Dairy; sold to Leo Biel, who ceased operating and closed it.

CHANGES IN RELATION

The following factories have undergone changes in ownership, organization or relation. Included are factories which have a conversion arrangement:

Beisner, Arthur W.; 4½ miles northwest of Spencer; Town Line factory; sold to Dairy Belt.

Beisner, E. G.; 2½ miles west of Dorchester; Mayville factory; American, under lease to Kraft.

Blazel, William; 2¾ miles east of Stanley; Roger Creek factory; American; under lease to Wheeler.

Breseman, William, 2½ miles northwest of Granton; York Dairy; now operated by the son, Algernon; American; independent, but shipping to Central Cheese.

Chili Milk Pool, Cooperative; Chili; American; leased to Kraft.

Decker, Edward C.; 5½ miles southeast of Granton; South Lynn Dairy; sold to Ed. Verhagen, who is leasing to Armour.

Durst, Walter; 4 miles north of Greenwood; Hemlock factory; sold to Richard Ashbeck; product goes to Lakeshire, under lease.

Farmers Cloverleaf Coop; 6 miles southeast of Greenwood; bought by Harry Schlinsog who sold it to Dairy Belt.

Flick, Charles; 1¼ miles west of Colby; Dill Creek factory; American; connection with Dairy Belt.

Flunker, Charles A.; 3½ miles northeast of Stanley; Eidsvold factory; American; sold to Wheeler Cheese Corp.

Folesch, George E.; 2½ miles west of Riplinger; Pine Grove factory; sold substantial interest to C. A. Carlson Cheese Co., which in turn sold to Shefford Cheese Co., which is owned by or allied with Standard Brands; Mr. Foelsch continues as manager of this and two other factories under the same ownership.

Franz, Edwin Otto; nine miles northwest of Greenwood; Pleasant Ridge factory; leased to Wheeler Corporation.

Frederickson, Nels; Curtiss; Four Corners factory; sold to Dairy Belt and operation continued.

Gempeler, Werner; 3½ miles southwest of Loyal; North Star factory; sold to Foods Cooperative of Chicago.

Giese, R. B.; 4 miles southeast of Loyal; Pelsdorf factory; leased to Dairy Belt.

Greunke Dairy Co.; 6 miles northeast of Granton; sold to Dairy Plant Operators' Corporation, Rib Lake.

Hillside Coop; 4 miles northwest of Dorchester; bought by Medford Creamery, a cooperative.

Johnson, Ludwig; 2 miles south of Chili; sold to Food Cooperative, Chicago.

Kanneberg, A. E.; 4 miles east of Loyal; sold to Thomas Fisher, who continues to operate as an independent, with a contract.

Krueger, Armand E.; Humbird; sold to Sandmire Cheese Co.

Laabs, E. A.; 1 mile south of Dorchester; American; contract with Armour.

Mandel, A. H.; 7½ miles southwest of Colby; American; Kraft lease.

Mandel, Alfred, 3½ miles northeast of Loyal; Stoney Creek factory; American; leased to Lakeshire.

Marquard & Hoernke; 4½ miles northeast of Greenwood; sold to Winger Bros. of Lublin, who continue operation, with contract.

Marten, E. W.; Riplinger Dairy; sold to Shefford and managed by George Foelsch.

Mech, Theodore, Greenwood Dairy; sold to Dairy Plant Operators' Corp., which resold to Redville Dairy, Inc., an associate of Stewart Cheese Corp.

Meske, Frank; 7 miles southeast of Thorp; America; under lease to Wheeler.

Olson, Clarence; Cloverdale factory; 2½ miles southwest of Colby; sold to Mr. Rindfleisch; operated as an independent; allied to Dairy Belt.

Rach, Edgar; Lynn Dairy; American; first leased to Central Cheese Co.; then sold to Central Cheese, with option to buy back.

Ready, Clarence; 4 miles southwest of Thorp; sold to Marce Wegner, under negotiation.

Reinke, Walter A.; 2 miles southeast of Thorp; Timothy Belt factory; American; leased to Wheeler Corp.

Schmidt, Walter H.; 2½ miles south of Granton; South Grant factory; American; leased to Dairy Plant Operator's Corp., Rib Lake.

Seeman, William A.; 2½ miles north of Loyal; Pleasant View factory; American; arrangement with Dairy Belt.

Soeller, Alex; 5 miles southwest of Thorp; Breezy Hill factory; American; leased to Wheeler.

South Green Grove Cooperative; one-fourth mile west of Atwood; sold to Medford Creamery.

Suda Bros.; 12 miles northwest of Greenwood; Wildwood factory; sold to Ray Wadjinski; leased to Lakeshire.

Uttech, Herb; York Center Cheese factory; sold to Dairy Belt; Mr. Uttech continues in charge.

Wahlen, Rudolph; Shortville factory; sold to Sandmire Cheese Co., and by Sandmire to E. L. Hanson.

Witt, Edward J.; Town of Withee Dairy; sold to Winger Bros., of Lublin.

Wonn, Fremont; Lone Oak factory, Withee; leased to Wheeler Cheese Corp. and making American.

UNCHANGED OR NOT KNOWN

Biel, Leo; 6 miles southeast of Stanley; Hillside Dairy; American.

Buss & Buss; 7½ miles northwest of Withee; Black River factory; American.

Bymers, John; 5 miles north of Chili; Veefkind Dairy; ships milk.

Clover Hill Cooperative; 4 miles north of Curtiss; makes Italian curd for Stewart Cheese Corp.; formerly made American.

Ehlert, August; 5½ miles southeast of Thorp; South Point factory; makes American and processed cheese.

Fisher, George, Jr.; Spokeville Dairy; American; independent.

Gorman Cooperative Dairy; 3 miles southwest of Willard; American.

Greenwood Milk Products Cooperative; Greenwood; American.

Gubeli, Joe; 7 miles northwest of Thorp; White Birch factory; American.

Kasper, Harold; 5 miles northwest of Unity; American.

Kobs, Hugo; 3 miles northeast of Granton; West Fremont factory; American.

Krueger, Laurence; 2 miles southwest of Curtiss; Oakland factory; American.

Laabs Cheese Co.; Curtiss cheese factory; American.

Laabs Dairy Co.; Willard factory; American.

Liebzeit, Clarence, 3 miles northwest of Greenwood; made Edam for a time; now back on American. (Armour.)

Marathon Clark Cooperative; Abbotsford; American.

Mauel, H. B.; Owen; makes Italian curd for Stewart Cheese Corp.; formerly made American.

Natzke, Arthur R.; 3 miles northwest of Thorp; Wild Cherry factory; American.

Neillsville Milk Products Cooperative; no longer makes cheese; makes some butter; makes powder; ships milk and cream.

North Hendren Cooperative Dairy; 1¾ miles northwest of Willard; American.

Rasmussen, Walter; 5½ miles northwest of Greenwood; Elmdale factory; American.

Reber, Walter; 5 miles east of Neillsville; East Pleasant Ridge factory; makes Swiss cheese under contract with Blue Moon.

Riverside Cooperative; 3 miles northwest of Chili; American.

Verhulst, Vilas; 6 miles northeast of Owen; Hoard Center factory; American; independent.

West Worden Dairy Co.; 4 miles southeast of Stanley; American

Witt, Erwin; five miles southwest of Thorp; Reseburg Dairy; American; under negotiation.

Zelm, Mrs. W. A.; 4½ miles south of Withee; has made some Edam; now on American; cheese to Dairy Belt.

Commenting on the above article, editorially, Mr. Harvey describes the revolution in the dairy industry, as follows:

REVOLUTION IN THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

This issue of the Clark County Press makes a record of the current revolution in the dairy industry. That revolution is resulting in the loss to the local scene of the old family owned cheese factory, a distinctive American institution. In Clark County there are today hardly more than a score of the old-style independents. More than three score have either fallen by the way completely or have passed into the control of large operators.

To the extent that this is a logical economic transition there need be no undue regret. It was inevitable that cheese making should ultimately gravitate toward larger units, with better equipment and better facilities for quality and sanitation. But unhappily most of the recent changes have been due to the pressure of price control. Some of the largest factories of the county have been sold because their former owners stared ruin in the face. With the price of natural American cheese limited by the OPA to a ceiling of 27 cents, they just could not make ends meet. So their option was to turn the key in the door or to relinquish ownership or control.

To persons accustomed to the ways of the dairy industry this situation is strange beyond understanding. Why is it that officials supposed to be intelligent and informed have seemingly disregarded a necessity so clear that a child should understand it? In the face of all common sense, they have clamped a ceiling price on cheese, and have left to the chance of the market the price of fluid milk. Yet milk is the raw material of cheese, and every variation in the price of milk is reflected in the cost of cheese. Hence what the OPA has done is to let costs run wild and to demand that the price of the finished product be held down. It requires no master mind to understand that such management must inevitably result in ruin.

Now here is the strangest part of this strange situation; this revolution is the undoing of the little fellow. Despite Washington's hue and cry about the protection of small business, despite the constant warfare of Washington against so-called wicked big business, Washington herself has forced these little fellows out, and has driven them into the arms of the big fellows. Today, spurned by the Government, they are turning to the big fellows as to a house of refuge.

Today the larger organizations of the dairy industry are going to the rescue—the rescue of the cheese factories and the orderly conduct of the cheese business. With all little fellows losing money whenever they sell cheese at the OPA ceiling, the big fellows were threatened with the loss of their source of supply. Also, the largest of them were threatened with the aggressive operations of large independents, who were acquiring the sources of supply. Thus it happens that some of the largest units of the dairy industry have been forced, in the ordinary logic of business, to lease or buy the factories from which they have usually secured their American cheese. In pursuing this course they have not acted aggressively, as a matter of choice, but have proceeded reluctantly, organizing a rescue party to their own loss.

It will be interesting to see how this situation works out. There need be no surprise if, as time passes and conditions change, the big fellows become the villains of the piece. Sooner or later the demand will slacken and prices will go down. Then Washington will not be Washington if the official finger is not pointed at the big fellows and if they are not accused of buying up the cheese industry contrary to the antitrust law made and provided. We now know that such a charge would be without basis in fact; we now know the Government has forced this course by its own blundering. But memories are short and politicians are wily. When the shoe pinches, the politicians will try to see that it is the other foot which gets the hurt.

Could this be the final step, that dairy food plants will be nationalized or socialized? There might be a clamor for that. There is a prejudice today against the big fellows, and it will be easy to build this prejudice up. With a large measure of control of the dairy industry in their hands, it would be relatively easy for the socialistic politicians to build up a case for nationalization. The possibility is not charged by the Clark County Press as a present design or conspiracy, for we do not wish to impute such motives to Americans. But it is fair to say that the course now being pursued is in line with what designing Socialists or Communists might pursue to create a prejudice against private business and to lay the foundation for socialism.

In these days many of us plain Americans wonder what our country is coming to, and certainly we have occasion to wonder when we witness such complete blundering in a matter within our immediate knowledge and concern. How can we have confidence in large matters beyond our view when we know that there is such hopeless maladministration in a matter of our immediate concern?

Who Mans Our Ship of State?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, a very warm personal friend of mine, Mr. Frank M. Crawford, who resides in my home city of Connersville, Ind., and who is a very close student of our Government, has written a poem which expresses a strong sentiment relative to our activities here. The author is a fine and outstanding citizen of Indiana, and during the war, just over, he suffered the loss of a fine grandson in combat. Since this great loss was suffered, this fine Christian gentleman has devoted much time to study and writing, and this is truly in memory of that fine and outstanding grandson—that fine American boy—who gave his life for his country, and for you and all Americans. This poem is especially appropriate at this particular time, and I hope all may read it.

I, therefore, under unanimous consent, extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the poem to which I have referred, which is as follows:

WHO MANS OUR SHIP OF STATE?

In midst of battle or debate
When souls of men are tried,
The minds of great men know that hate
No crisis can decide.

As long they ponder, long they seek
To plan a better day,
'Tis shame that some so selfish speak
Deceitful words that many sway.

How shall they reach decisions right
To guide our ship of state,
When those there are who take delight
Grave discord to create?

Whoever hide by falsehoods vile
The truth, which men should guide.
Who spread confusion, falsehood's guile,
Do they not know our sons have died?

Did founding fathers live in vain
Their words a siren's song?
Will not their kind arise again
Shall truth prevail and not the wrong?

Is there not one in Nation's hall
Whose voice will truth relate,
Arouse our land with clarion call.
Who mans our ship of state?

—*Frank M. Crawford.*

CONNERSVILLE, IND.

Veterans' Administration Cooperates With Amvets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HENDRICKS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 27, 1946.

Mr. J. H. LEIB,
National Legislative Director, American Veterans of World War II, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is in the further matter of your letter of March 9, 1946, addressed to the Administrator, with which was enclosed a photostatic copy of a letter received by you from Mr. Carlton O. Ericksen, adjutant, of the American Veterans of World War II, Daytona Beach, Fla., and which was referred to this office for reply. A report has been received from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, branch office No. 5, Atlanta, Ga., having jurisdiction over the regional office at Pass-A-Grille, Fla., of the action taken to expedite the claims of veterans referred to by Mr. Ericksen.

This report indicates that a representative of the Pass-A-Grille office spent 3 days, April 15, 16, and 17 in the Daytona Beach area. Through the cooperation of the Amvets organization of Daytona Beach, all veterans in the area were advised of the availability of the Veterans' Administration representative in case they had complaints to make or if information of any nature was desired. One hundred and twenty-five veterans were interviewed during the 3-day period. Sixty of this number had complaints to register concerning subsistence allowance, while the remainder had no complaints but were seeking information only.

Information is furnished that 31 original awards were made immediately. Delays were shown to have been caused by various reasons, including delays in transferring necessary files, misunderstanding of trainers in filling out required forms, lack of the State's approval of veterans' trainers, and an unusual amount of correspondence incident to getting forms completed properly, as well as several other miscellaneous reasons. Several amended awards were made adjusting subsistence allowance of veterans who had submitted evidence that had been requested of them or had subsistence allowance which needed adjustment because of late compensation reports.

Mr. Carlton O. Ericksen, adjutant, American Veterans of World War II, Daytona Beach, Fla., has been furnished with a complete report by the regional office, Pass-A-Grille, of the results of the 3 days spent at Daytona Beach, and it is felt by that office that the Amvets are satisfied with the action taken in regard to the veterans' complaints.

The Veterans' Administration recognizes the importance of the matter of delays in payment of subsistence allowance. The efforts of the Administration are being constantly directed toward the solution of the problem. Your interest in veterans' affairs is appreciated. If additional information is desired, it will be furnished without delay upon request.

Very truly yours,

SAM H. COILE,
Director, Registration and Research Service for Vocational Rehabilitation and Education.

James Wheaton Mott

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1946

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JAMES WHEATON MOTT, late a Representative from the State of Oregon

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, for over 15 years Hon. JAMES WHEATON MOTT was a Member of the House of Representatives. During most of his service he was a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and at the time of his death he was a leading Republican member of that committee.

Mr. MOTT was a very able citizen, a loyal American, one of the best speakers in the House, and he had the courage of his convictions.

He represented a district which gave him full support for many years and during the time he was here he and I were very close friends.

One of the penalties which a Member of Congress pays in serving his country here in Washington is that the strain of his service is apt to be such that it will shorten his days and Mr. MOTT certainly paid that penalty.

His work on the Naval Affairs Committee in building up the Navy during the war was magnificent.

I regret very much that he had to go.

The Vanquished Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a poem sent to me by Mr. James C. Spencer; also the remarks of Mr. Spencer regarding this poem:

THE VANQUISHED SPEAK

(By Lieutenant Koenig, August 1942, while prisoner of Japanese)

(Dedicated to the men who died at Camp O'Donnell)

Here on this sun-scorched hill we laid us down
In silence deep, as is the silence of defeat.
Upon our wasted brow you place no laurel crown
But neither did you sound the trumpet for retreat.

Weep not for us, for here defeat and victory are one.
We cannot feel humanity's insidious harm.
Our fight with famine, pain, and pestilence is done,
Our compromise with death laid by that immortal storm.

Though chastened, we know our mission is not dead.
Nor are the dreams of victory we dreamed in vain.
For lo, the dawn is in the east. The night has fled
Before an August day, which will be ours again.

So rest we here, dear comrades, on this foreign hill
This alien clay, made somehow richer by our dust,
Provides us with a transitory couch until
The loving hills of home enfold us in maternal trust.

We are assured brave hearts across the sea will not forget
The humble sacrifice we laid on freedom's sacred shrine,
And hold that righteousness will triumph yet,
And o'er the earth again His star of peace will shine.

This memorial poem for Bataan victims of Japanese mistreatment, hitherto unpublished, was read at memorial services at the prison cemetery, May 1943.

It is indicative of the hopeful, patient endurance of starving men, wasted and worn by imprisonment, yet firm in the faith. It is reminiscent of Flanders Field. Thought perhaps you might be interested in reading it on Memorial Day.

Respectfully,

JAMES C. SPENCER,
A Bataan Veteran.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

America's Greatest Money Lender Appraises the British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by the Honorable Jesse H. Jones from the Washington News Digest:

SUBSIDIZING THE BRITISH EMPIRE

(By Jesse H. Jones)

I do not think the proposed British loan of $3,750,000,000, now before Congress, should be made, and do not believe that any good will come to the American people, or, for that matter, to the economy of the world, from making it in its present form.

If we make this loan to Britain and refuse loans on similar terms to other countries, it would be so much in the nature of an alliance with Great Britain as to cause other countries to feel that we are less friendly to them than to Britain.

I

Furthermore, the proposed loan is most unbusinesslike.

1. Five to fifty-five years, or practically two generations, is much too long a time to lend money to a foreign government without security.

2. No loan of any kind should be made until all considerations incident to it are determined in advance of the loan. Nothing should be left for future negotiations. In the present loan agreement, empire tariff preference and the proposal for the expansion of world trade, in which the United States is so vitally concerned, are left for future consideration. The time for these agreements is before the loan is made.

3. No money should be loaned to Britain for expenditure in other countries without proper security, particularly since the British have substantial profitable investments and operations in the United States which could be used as collateral for a loan.

Prominent among these is insurance from which they make a very substantial profit out of the American people. According to a recent report of the United States Treasury, British-owned assets in this country aggregate more than $3,000,000,000, and include $587,000,000 United States Government securities, more than $40,000,000 in corporate bonds, and 623 controlled branches of corporations having a value of $611,000,000. These and other assets are owned by the British in this country, the profits and income on which are going to them. These assets and the profits of British insurance companies from business written in this country should be used by the British Government as security for any loan of dollars to be spent outside the United States, the British Government accounting to her investors in British money or securities.

II

The British are by no means strapped. It has been estimated that their assets in other countries than ours total some $8,000,000,000, their unmined gold reserves have been estimated to be worth at least $15,000,000,000, and their diamond reserves as much as $8,000,000,000.

In July 1941, the RFC authorized a loan of $425,000,000 to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland under authority granted it by Congress June 10, 1941, to enable RFC to make loans to governments that had defaulted on their loans from us

after World War I, provided such loans were secured by investments in this country. The RFC loan is payable over a period of 15 years, with interest at 3 percent. The loan agreement provides that any sales by the British of the collateral and all income, after taxes, from all the security would be applied, first, to the interest on the loan, and then on the principal. The security includes the net profits, after taxes, made in this country by 41 British insurance companies operating here, and the capital stock of 40 additional British-owned American insurance companies. The RFC made no requirement that any of the collateral be sold.

III

In order to be helpful to the British and still protect our own Federal Treasury in substantial part, I suggest that the RFC increase its loan to Britain by an additional $1,000,000,000 on the present security, with no restriction as to where the money is to be spent, and that the interest rate on the balance of the present loan and the $1,000,000,000 additional be 2 percent, with all net earnings to be applied, first, to the interest on the loan and the balance on the principal. If these earnings hold up as they have over the past dozen years, and in all probability they will increase, the loan would be entirely repaid in about 40 years, and the British would still own their profitable investments in this country.

I suggest that the RFC make further loans to the United Kingdom on British investments and operations in this country, up to the earning value of the security, upon the same terms and conditions—that is, 2 percent interest, with all additional earnings applied to the loan—and that the proceeds of such loans be available to Britain with no restrictions as to where the money shall be spent.

IV

The President has recommended to Congress that we buy critical materials for stockpile purposes and put them away for future use. This should be done. The British can sell us many of these and pay for them in sterling. We can pay them in dollars.

V

I further suggest that Congress consider authorizing the sale of cotton, tobacco, fruits and other farm products, durable goods, and manufactured articles to the United Kingdom for the next few years on credit, in amounts equal approximately to her normal imports of such items from us.

VI

If these suggestions are followed, Britain would get substantially what she needs from us during the next few years, and, in my opinion, on a basis that would be much more acceptable to the American people than the proposed loan now before Congress.

I do not believe that our failure to give Britain $3,750,000,000 on her terms will cause her to impose or continue trade restrictions or other sanctions that will seriously affect our own economy. That is a two-way street.

I have never been much interested in threats, and for the British to say to us that unless we give or lend her X billions of dollars on her terms, they will be forced to impose trade restrictions, dollar blocs, etc., is not my idea of a fraternal association between the United States and Great Britain so eloquently advocated by Mr. Churchill, nor does it square with the kind of friendship that we have shown the British in two world wars, without which friendship the British Empire would have been destroyed.

VII

It has been testified by administration spokesmen that the case of Britain is different from other countries. It certainly is different from other countries that want money from us. Britain is the only country that has asked us to give her money.

It will be recalled that when Lord Keynes and his associates first came over to get the money, they said they were in no mood to consider a loan. They were insisting that we give them $5,000,000,000.

We seem to have lost sight of the fact that Britain, through Lord Keynes, took a prominent part in promoting the Bretton Woods agreements for a world bank and a world stabilization fund, and agreed that Britain would subscribe $2,600,000,000 to these funds.

The question arises now: Where did Britain expect to get that $2,600,000,000 which she readily agreed to put up? It would look to a suspicious person as if she expected the United States Government to furnish it, since she now states that unless we let her have the money she will not be able to participate in the world bank and stabilization fund.

VIII

Another point worth considering is that our executive departments have already sold Britain the more than $6,000,000,000 of our unused materials now in Britain or on the way there for about 10 cents on the dollar, payable over a period of 5 to 55 years, at an interest rate of a little over 1½ percent, and that payable only where her trade balances justify. The sale of these materials has been severely criticized by the Mead committee (formerly the Truman committee) but nothing can be done about it since it does not require the approval of Congress.

IX

We cannot afford to continue printing and spending money indiscriminately, however admirable the cause. Every time we spend another billion we are reducing the value of our dollars, and if we go on spending and lending and giving and losing, without regard to how we are going to pay back the money that we borrow, it will not be long until the dollar will go as the currency of other countries that overspent.

Britain only owes about $80,000,000,000, while our present debt is approximately $272,000,000,000—or $2,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States—and figures cited by President Truman in his Budget message revealed that we have already authorized and proposed to invest $17,000,000,000 in foreign loans and international financing.

It is time that we stop and think of how we are to service our own present heavy debt before we undertake to play Santa Claus to the rest of the world.

X

The United States with 5.8 percent of the world's land area and 6.1 percent of the world's population cannot single-handedly finance and rebuild a war-torn, confused world. The time to recognize this is now.

Another very important point that I do not think has been given proper consideration is that it is entirely too early after the war for anyone to get a clear picture of the future. Britain knows that and hurried over here as soon as the shooting stopped "to get hers." She is smart, has always been smart, and, incidentally, very selfish.

XI

If the British are unwilling to continue the pledge of the security behind their present loan from the RFC for new money, I would give no further consideration to a loan to them of any kind. We owe it to ourselves, as well as to the rest of the world, to approach this whole matter in a completely realistic manner—which is the only forthright and sound approach.

Approval of the proposed loan now before Congress would start the United States down a financial road that is likely to lead to disaster. Too much spending and lending and losing is a sure road to ruin. The Congress should not ignore the dangers that lie ahead.

The Italian People Deserve a Just Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of petitions from citizens in my district bearing many hundreds of names, urging my favorable attention to the conclusion of an equitable and proper peace with Italy. Mr. Speaker, I have examined the proposals of the Committee for a Just Peace With Italy, and under leave to extend my remarks I here include the 10 points of their proposals:

1. That the boundary between Italy and Yugoslavia be based on the Wilson line as modified by the State Department in September 1945; that Trieste remain, as it is in fact, an Italian city; and that if the port of Trieste is internationalized it then be put under Italian administration.

2. That France and Italy find an amicable solution to their frontier problems; that because of their importance to the economic life of Italy, Tenda, and Briga remain Italian.

3. That the present Austrian-Italian frontier be maintained in view of the paramount economic importance of that region to Italian national life.

4. That all colonies acquired by Italy before the Fascist assumption of power remain Italian. The proposal to transfer such colonies to the United Nations organization does not meet with our approval unless this principle is given universal application and is not used as a pretext to give these Italian colonies to other nations.

5. That war reparations or indemnities be not exacted of Italy—this, in accordance with the declared policy of our Government.

6. That restrictions presently imposed on Italian sovereignty by the terms of the armistice be abolished forthwith and in advance of the final peace treaty which may yet require several months before it is concluded. This would recognize Italy's rights as a co-belligerent nation.

7. That all restrictions to Italy's resumption of normal commercial and financial relations with other nations be removed forthwith to enable her to acquire basic commodities such as foodstuffs and raw materials which are indispensable to her national recovery.

8. That the remaining units of Italy's merchant marine, without which she cannot survive, be restored to her.

9. That in accordance with the Potsdam Declaration, Italy be actually granted the rights of a friendly, peace-loving nation. Italy has clearly earned this distinction through her enormous sacrifices and her gallant contributions to the Allied cause.

10. That Italy be accorded membership in the United Nations organization.

I am in accord with the committee's proposals, and I see no reason why they should not be adopted as a basis for American policy toward Italy. I have transmitted these proposals of the committee to the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State. I feel that the State Department and the Congress should give very careful consideration to these suggestions.

I have been urging such just recognition of the rightful claims of Italy for a long time. On May 23, 1945, I said:

At first glance, it might appear that Italy, a recent active enemy, should not be so

recognized. On reflection, however, it is manifest that throughout Italy's history as a kingdom, her relations with the United States have been good. The loyalty of Americans of Italian extraction, during this war, has been signally recognized by official Government policy. The fact that they were misled by a ruthless regime into fascism should not be permanently held against a peaceful, industrious people.

Mr. Speaker, I cherish the personal friendship of hundreds of Americans of Italian heritage in my district. They are good citizens—able, faithful, and loyal. History does not record greater advances for any group than these who came to America, for the most part as unskilled laborers, and who now deservedly sit in the highest councils of the Nation.

They have continued their traditional contributions to the arts and culture of our life.

They are entitled to urge, in behalf of the people of their blood in the old country, that we recognize our long standing friendship with the Italian people, and treat them with equity and justice.

I shall do whatever lies in my power to help achieve this result.

Statehood for Hawaii Wins Support of the American Water Works Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the American Water Works Association at their annual conference held in St. Louis, Mo., on May 6, 1946:

Whereas there are pending in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Congress of the United States, bills to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and be admitted as a State in the American Union, to wit: H. R. 3643, introduced by Delegate FARRINGTON, of Hawaii; H. R. 3659, introduced by Representative HALE, of Maine; H. R. 3690, introduced by Representative LAFOLLETTE, of Indiana; and S. 1630, introduced by Senator KNOWLAND, of California; and

Whereas the question presented to the American people by these bills is Hawaii's right to statehood now; and

Whereas Hawaii was annexed as a Territory of the United States by mutual agreement between the former Republic of Hawaii and the United States, and such annexation has been of immeasurable value to the United States as well as the people of Hawaii; and

Whereas Hawaii and Alaska are the only remaining Territories of the United States, the other 29 Territories which have been organized in the history of the Union all having been admitted to statehood; and

Whereas it was well understood when Hawaii was organized as a Territory that it too would be admitted as a State, the territorial form of government being necessarily only a transitory one, to be followed by statehood as soon as the people of the Territory are capable of self-government; and

Whereas in the 48 years since annexation of Hawaii it has become a modern American community, with a sound economy and a healthy and literate people, who have shown themselves to be fully capable of self-government; and

Whereas the people of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question their loyalty and patriotism to the Government of the United States, as found by the Statehood Subcommittee of the House of Representatives on January 24 of this year in a report concluding that: "The Territory of Hawaii now meets the necessary requirements for statehood"; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior in December 1945, and the President of the United States in January of this year, unqualifiedly endorsed immediate statehood for Hawaii; and

Whereas the high standards of operational procedure and management prescribed by the American Water Works Association, for the guidance of water departments throughout the United States, have been voluntarily adopted and conscientiously maintained by the various municipal and county water systems presently existing in the Territory of Hawaii; attesting thereby to the progressive and enlightened attitude of the people of Hawaii toward a question of vital civic importance: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the American Water Works Association, That this organization endorse and it hereby goes on record as favoring immediate action by the Congress of the United States to enable Hawaii to be admitted as a State; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Chairman of the Commitee on Territories of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the Chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Senate of the Congress, the Secretary of the Interior, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and the Governor of Hawaii.

Strikes Should Be Settled Without Disturbing the Wheels of Commerce and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SHENANDOAH, IOWA, *May 24, 1946.*

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: I beg to offer a little suggestion in the matter of the strikes which are causing much loss, and really a deterioration of faith in our Government, for which so many of our fine young men died. This is serious, far beyond the matter of the commercial side of the question, and really there is no need of it. Years ago people settled personal differences by fist fights and even duels. It was shameful. Popular opinion backed law in requiring people to settle differences by law. Each side had access to the courts, no matter how poor or how rich the persons.

In that same token of thought differences between organized labor and employers could and should be settled without disturbing the wheels of commerce and labor. We know it is natural for man to go too far, when left unrestrained, so courts were instituted to level off the grievances. The Federal Government should by law set up a labor-management court, entirely impartial, nonpartisan, whose duty would be to hear complaints from either side and then decide the matter entirely binding upon both parties. In case of wages or allowances, to be made retroactive to the date of filing the case with the labor-management court. Law requires that in civil cases both sides must abide by the order or finding of a court, and in the same token Congress should require that both sides abide by the findings. In a measure it would be an arbitration under law. The way things are going now we will have to hang our heads in shame over the graves of those who died to make this Government what it ought to be, and not what it seems to be.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES PEARSON.

Memorial Day Address by Hon. Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 31 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Memorial Day address delivered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] on May 30, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are gathered here today to pay solemn tribute to our brave sons who fell on the battlefields of the world.

On this—our first peacetime observance of Memorial Day in 5 long, anxious years, years written in sweat and blood—we are deeply conscious of the great debt we owe to those fallen heroes.

We are deeply conscious that our sons had to pay with their blood to keep alive the spirit of democracy—the spirit which has guided our Nation through seemingly unsurmountable pitfalls.

During those unforgettable years of World War II, our sons went forth to every section of the world—carrying the banner of freedom.

White crosses the world over—out in the treacherous South Pacific, the grim, frozen Far North, the white sands of north Africa, the windswept plains and forests of Europe—tell a story of bravery and heroism that can not be recounted here today in mere words.

We here today pay tribute to those men.

We here today also pay tribute to those brave sons of earlier generations—the brave men who helped mold America into the light of freedom.

Make no mistake. That light has flickered many times.

That light—the light that stands as a symbol for the freedom-loving peoples of the entire world—has almost gone out many times.

But, each time the light has flickered our brave sons left their homes—their homes in the hills, the farms, and the cities—to battle the forces of tyranny and oppression.

Each time our sons have defeated those forces of evil and kept alive the light of freedom and hope.

We here today honor those men.

Memorial Day is more than just a holiday.

Memorial Day is a day of recollection.

Memorial Day is a day of mourning.

Memorial Day is a day of tribute.

Memorial Day is a day of solemn deliberation.

Memorial Day is a day to look back on the past, a day to look ahead to the future.

Many people do not realize it, but it has taken many wars, including the tragic and bitter Civil War to mould our land into a strong, unified Nation.

Many people forget that in the early days of our history, America was a land of individual States, each going its own separate way.

If this situation had continued down through the pages of history, we here in America today might be in a position not far different than Europe.

Our course in history was changed by the Civil War. That long and bloody conflict bound together the States into a strong unified country.

The price was very high. But we today realize that the cost in human suffering, at that time, was not in vain. Far from it.

Our Nation emerged, after the struggle, bound up its wounds, and moved ahead on a course that time has proved to be wise.

It is not for us, here on this occasion, to question the sincerity of those who fought on the side of the Confederacy.

For the brave men of the South firmly believed that they were fighting for a just cause. They were as sincere as those soldiers of the North.

Our own State furnished many of the leaders of the Confederacy.

Stonewall Jackson—the West Virginia boy, born at Jackson's Mill—bravely led his men into battle. And history has recorded that he was one of the greatest military leaders of all time.

Our Civil War was almost a religious conflict. In fact, spirituality was stressed strongly by the leaders, and by the men in the ranks, on both sides.

The war was bitter and long.

In the end it decided that we should have a strong, unified nation, a choice wise almost beyond realization at the time.

The Civil War has been described—justly, I believe—as a bloody healing of the long untended wounds in our land.

And Memorial Day—sometimes referred to as Decoration Day—grew out of that conflict.

We here today are not far from the site of the first casualty of the Civil War.

At the outbreak of the war it was quickly realized that the B. & O. Railroad through northwestern Virginia was the southern lifeline of the Union.

As a result Union troops were rushed into the section near the sites of Clarksburg and Grafton.

Confederate troops already held ground in that section.

History tells us that on the night of May 22, 1861, a Union soldier, Thornsberry Bailey Brown, a native of Simpson Creek, and a member of the Grafton Guards, was on a scouting mission when he was challenged by two Confederate sentinels.

In the fighting that ensued Brown was killed. He was the first casualty of the Civil War.

Six years later Congress appropriated money for the erection of a national cemetery there. While it was under construction, the wife of Gen. John A. Logan, of Illinois, saw a woman in mourning decorating one of the graves.

Her description of this scene to her husband, then commander of the Grand Army of the Republic, was responsible for the issuance of an order in April 1868, requesting that every post of the Grand Army hold appropriate services and decorate the graves of their comrades on May 30 of each year.

General Logan did this—in his well-chosen words—"with the hope it will be kept up from year to year."

Due to the fact that the national cemetery was under construction, and also because of incessant rains, the first Memorial Day service was not held until June 14, 1868.

In 1882 the Grand Army of the Republic urged that the proper designation of May 30 be "Memorial Day"—not "Decoration Day" as it was called in some places.

Memorial Day has lived not only as a tribute to the men of the GAR, but also as a tribute to the sons of that and other generations who went forth to do battle for their country.

They have gone forth to sacrifice their lives in order that the principles of their forefathers may live on.

We here today must rekindle the fires on the altar of liberty, and once again renew the vow that these men shall not have died in vain.

Glorious are those who die for liberty; blessed are those whose blood is shed for the welfare of their fellow man.

I firmly believe that no heroic sacrifice is ever lost.

I firmly believe that the man's character is molded by what his father has done before him.

I firmly believe that American souls treasure all of the glorious influences of the great deeds from Bunker Hill to the far-flung battlefields of our last supreme sacrifice.

But bear in mind that our tributes here today will be little more than hollow shells unless we rededicate ourselves to the causes of human freedom.

We have emerged from a bloody and costly war that has proven beyond all doubt that the world must live in peace or die in horror.

The inventions of modern science—the atomic bomb, the ghastly V-2 rocket, and the other almost unbelievable scientific monsters—have swept away all so-called natural barriers between nations.

The United States, as we pause here today, is passing through the most critical period in its history.

We must firmly resolve to move forward with freedom for all peoples or perish into oblivion.

We must keep abreast of the changing times and serve as a guide to freedom for a sick and hungry world.

Yes; we must do this, even though we know it will not be easy.

Already false prophets are shouting that we can live alone in a world in which millions face hunger, and even starvation.

I say to you that these false prophets are trying to lull us back into a false sense of security.

Do not be misled by their honey-combed, but, treacherous words.

Our course was chartered years ago by a great American, Thomas Jefferson.

On July 12, 1816, he wrote to a friend these words:

"I am not an advocate for frequent changes in laws and constitutions, but, laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind.

"As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered, and manners and opinions change, institution must advance also to keep pace with the times.

"We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy as civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of their ancestors."

Those were the words of Thomas Jefferson.

They are as true today as they were when they were written 130 years ago.

We must move forward with the rapidly changing times.

We must accept our new responsibilities in a world in which events are moving with atomic speed.

As this Memorial Day passes into memory, and when you have forgotten all that I have said here, I beseech you to remember those words of Thomas Jefferson.

Let them serve as your guide.

I say to you in all sincerity that our Nation must take the lead in binding the wounds of those in other lands.

We must help feed and clothe our neighbors.

We must prove to them by deeds—not mere words—that we want, and are willing to work unceasingly for, a lasting peace.

We have the machinery.

The United Nations stands as our last bulwark to world security in this grave hour of decision.

It will pave the way for world peace and world security if we here in America wholeheartedly pledge our support, and redouble our efforts to iron out the world problems.

Without world peace and world security—there can never be peace and happiness, those cherished dreams, for we Americans.

The two are inseparable.

This is the hour of decision.

It is up to us here, on this solemn occasion, to prove that we are willing to cooperate and help our neighbors.

If we do this, and I say we must, and cannot afford to do less, liberty can never die.

We can and must prove that although generations of men appear and pass away their hopes and aspirations are immortal.

As this Memorial Day draws to a close we must honor our gallant heroes by taking a sacred vow that we shall do our utmost to maintain the peace they fought so heroically to win.

Liberty must not fail. Freedom must not perish.

The Federal Government and Civil Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address delivered by Mr. William A. M. Burden, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, to the annual meeting of the Aviation Writers Association at Indianapolis, Ind., on May 25.

Because Mr. Burden is serving as chairman of the United States delegation to the Interim Assembly of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization it was necessary for him to broadcast his speech over the Columbia Broadcasting System from Montreal.

The text of Mr. Burden's address follows:

A birthday occurred this week which gives everyone in the United States reason to congratulate himself. On Monday, Federal regulation and promotion of civil aviation was 20 years old.

As a Federal official concerned with civil aviation myself, I might be accused of self-praise in calling attention to this anniversary. If praise is due, however, I would direct it to the American people themselves. Through their elected representatives, they had the foresight in 1926 to lay the foundations for a civil aviation industry which has outstripped the world. In the two decades that followed the passage of the Air Commerce Act, they consistently supported a policy which built civil aviation to a great national asset, in war and peace.

The United States civil aviation policy has been unique among nations, and its success is another tribute to the effectiveness of the

American way. Some great countries made their civil aviation a government monopoly, and subordinated it to their military air programs. Others left private enterprise to develop civil aviation as best it could, with the government showing little concern for the fate of its air transportation system.

The United States has avoided both these pitfalls. We have kept civil aviation completely separate and distinct from military aviation To us, it is a business which must be operated by businessmen, not run by soldiers or Government bureaucrats. Consistent with this policy, America has given private industry the responsibility for building and operating civil aircraft, but at the same time we have by law declared it the function of government to foster this new form of transport and to regulate it in the public interest as other forms of transport are regulated.

The policy of aiding civil aviation in its development period is a logical extension of the help our Government gave to earlier methods of transportation. As steamships, railroads, and automobiles came into use, we realized how great a contribution each could make to the national economy and the national defense.

To make certain that the Nation should realize the maximum benefit from these new modes of transport, the Federal Government gave prompt and generous help in each case.

For improvement of rivers and harbors, we have spent almost $3,000,000,000, to which might be added $46,000,000 in subsidies to steamship lines and $189,000,000 for construction of ships.

As an incentive to the development of a great railway network, the Federal Government made grants of land and rights-of-way valued at almost half a billion dollars.

More recently, Federal funds exceeding six and one-half billions have been used to build highways, not for the particular gain of car manufacturers or truck-line operators but for the benefit of the Nation as a whole.

In the early years of these programs, some people thought the outlays a dangerous experiment. When the first Federal roads appropriation of $25,000,000 was up for passage in 1916, a minority report warned—and I quote—that this was "a policy which would lead to enormous expenditures in the future, with but little benefit to the people as a whole."

How wrong that minority proved, we all know. Not only have the people benefited greatly but we are well on the way toward recouping, through gasoline taxes, the money invested in roads. It has taken 30 years to reach this point, and it took about 80 years to get back, through reduced rates, what the Government gambled on the railroads, but everyone will agree that the wait was worth while and the people came out ahead in the long run.

What does our balance sheet for civil aviation look like?

In the last 27 years, we have invested less than $875,000,000 of Federal money in this newest form of transportation, compared to the more than $10,000,000,000 we have put into rails, waterways and roads. Already the Government can show a profit on air mail, for the total payments to the air lines have been more than recovered in postal revenue. Our returns from the money spent on services provided to civil aviation by the Civil Aeronautics Administration cannot be measured directly, but it should be noted that in 1939, last normal prewar year, the air lines and aircraft manufacturers alone paid Federal taxes amounting to more that 70 percent of the CAA appropriation.

Far more important, however, are the indirect benefits to the Nation from the aid we have given air transportation. The United States would have faced an even more desperate situation when the Axis delivered its surprise attack in 1941, had it not been for our unsurpassed civil air system. Men and materials were rushed to Alaska and other critical points by our commercial air lines. These products of our commercial aircraft manufacturers, and the great fleet of military aircraft that the same companies built, moved safely and speedily to their destinations over the network of navigation aids built and operated by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The CAA literally transplanted many of its radio navigation facilities to key points like the Ascension Island, lone stop-over in the South Atlantic, and CAA technicians provided the know-how for installation of airways radio equipment at some 200 other overseas locations. Volunteer civil pilots helped smash the submarine menace, and graduates of the CAA pilot-training program, like the late Major Bong, went on to brilliant military careers. Thus in many ways our civil aviation provided a nucleus of badly needed air power for a country which did not maintain a large military establishment in peacetime.

The world is not yet so settled that we can afford to forget this lesson, but it is more pleasant to consider how civil aviation serves the uses of peace.

Aviation is no longer a specialized business serving the few.

Last year more than 8,000,000 Americans rode the air lines. Among these were businessmen seeking to get reconversion moving rapidly; statesmen on missions of world reconstruction; veterans returning to their homes, and ordinary John Public. What a contrast with 1926, the Government's first year of fostering and regulating civil aviation, when only 5,700 passengers were carried.

In 20 years civil aviation has grown to the point where it is both a great industry in itself, and an important factor in expanding and speeding up the operations of our entire economic system. Today it employs perhaps 300,000 people. This is about 30 times the 1926 total, and today's figure easily should be tripled in 10 years.

But in addition, we can look to aviation to make new jobs by facilitating the industrialization of the West and South; by making possible increased foreign trade with existing markets and new, undeveloped areas; and by stimulating greater travel by Americans both at home and abroad just as the automobile did. We can foresee the time when the number of personal planes in use will be counted by hundreds of thousands instead of tens of thousands.

Yes, civil aviation has done a big job for the American people, and it has an even greater contribution to make in the immediate future. But we can realize these gains to the fullest extent only if we continue the judicious support we have given the industry over the past 20 years.

For the next few years we must be prepared to invest substantial sums in order to make up for the enforced lag in civil-aviation facilities during the last five wartime years. Our airways and our airports must be modernized and expanded without further delay if we do not want them to become bottlenecks blocking civil-aviation development.

All this means a rise in Government's annual expenditures on civil aviation but the proportionate increase will be far less than the rise in the volume of civil flying. Our ground facilities will be used more intensively as this volume increases and the cost to Government per unit of flying will decrease. We saw the same process in automotive transport after the last World War, when the use of automobiles began for the first time to approach the capacity of the highway system. Under such conditions the direct return to your Government in the form of taxes on aviation enterprises, on the sale of aviation gasoline and from other aviation sources, will rise very rapidly in the next few years—to say nothing of the tremendous contribution of a large and healthy civil aviation to the efficiency of our national economy. There is little doubt that before many years civil aviation will be returning far more to government than the Government outlay upon it.

For these reasons I am confident that the benefits to be derived from Government-financed aviation facilities and services will prove that the investment in them which is absolutely necessary if aviation is to attain its normal growth is also a prudent investment from the standpoint of our national interest. To you, the American people, who are the owners of this great civil-aviation network, let me report on how your public servants are operating it, and what it is costing you, so you can judge for yourself whether we are exercising our stewardship soundly.

The biggest activity of the Civil Aeronautics Administration is the establishment and operation of the Federal airways. The Federal airways are the lighted, radio-equipped routes which cover the United States, making possible safe aerial navigation in good weather and bad. From the days when pioneer airmen carried the mail across the continent with only bonfires to light the way, CAA tecnnicians have developed a 40,000-mile system that has become a model for the rest of the world.

When clouds obscure the ground, the pilot follows the radio beams sent out by the CAA range stations. He keeps in touch with the CAA communications stations along his route, which relay information about his flight to an air traffic control center. This center makes certain that the pilot is following a course safely separated from that of all other planes in the area, just as stop and go lights and policemen on the ground help to prevent collisions among automobiles. When the pilot nears his destination CAA personnel in the airport control tower take over guidance of his flight until a safe landing is completed.

Effective as these methods have been in the past, many improvements are necessary for today's growing traffic. During the next 2 years CAA hopes to convert its radio ranges to very high frequency, which permits static-free reception and makes available more transmission channels. CAA plans to install at all major airports instrument-landing systems, which will enable the pilot to land in bad weather simply by following a pair of cross-pointers on his dashboard. Over a somewhat longer period, CAA hopes to perfect for civilian use radar devices to warn the pilot of approaching aircraft, and to give the airport tower man a picture of the traffic moving in his control zone. Still more advanced techniques will be developed and applied as rapidly as their safety and efficiency can be assured.

In the field of airports, Congress has just voted a $500,000,000 Federal-aid program, by which the CAA plans to assist local public agencies to build some 3,000 new airports and improve some 1,600 existing ones. Under this program, we hope to make flying convenient for the people in thousands of communities which thus far have been without air service.

CAA will continue its efforts to assure air safety for the thousands of new pilots and passengers, by regulation where necessary and by education where possible. Our guiding objective at all times will be to encourage the growth of aviation by limiting restrictions to the minimum consistent with public safety.

Just what do these activities which we need to help make this Nation preeminent in civil aviation cost the taxpayer? Taking the entire amount spent on civil aviation since 1918, including even the sums that went for airports as part of the work-relief programs during the depression, it has cost each American only 25 cents a year. If we consider only the money appropriated for CAA and its predecessor agencies, Federal regulation and

promotion of civil aviation has cost you and me an average of only 17 cents a year.

But what about this program of modernization and airport construction you are planning, some may ask? Won't this increase the Government's expenditures for civil aviation a good deal?

Yes; it will. It will bring the average cost of CAA to date for each American up from 17 cents a year to an unheard-of amount—all of 21 cents.

Look at the civil-aviation industry we have in the United States today. Consider how much it benefits all of us in war and peace. And then ask yourself, Isn't this the biggest 21 cents' worth that money could buy?

Restriction on Use of Grain for Beer Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a petition I have received from St. Joseph, Mo., locals No. 116 and No. 93 of the International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, and Soft Drink Workers of America, as follows:

Mr. WILLIAM C. COLE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You will find enclosed a petition protesting present and future restrictions on the quantity of grains available for the manufacture of beer. This petition is being presented by Brewery and Soft Drink Workers Locals 93 and 116 of St. Joseph, Mo.:

"Whereas the 30-percent reduction in the amount of grains for use in the manufacture of beer has brought about an acute shortage in the beverage of moderation, thus depriving many Americans of their right to enjoy it; and

"Whereas this reduction has already created hardships to workers in brewing and its industries through unemployment, in many cases recently returned veterans, who have been laid off as a direct result of present grain restrictions; and

"Whereas barley, the principal grain used in the manufacture of beer, is used but little for human food, and thus could be of small consequence in alleviating the suffering of starving peoples abroad; and

"Whereas the protein content of barley is much higher after the grain has been 'spent' in the brewing process than when used whole, and the byproduct of malt houses goes into livestock and chicken feeds; thus creating no waste whatsoever; and

"Whereas the decrease in Federal and State revenues from beer means higher income and property taxes; and

"Whereas our servicemen fought and bled for the democratic American way of life, which certainly includes the right and privilege to enjoy the refreshment of a glass of beer; and

"Whereas any further restrictions would aggravate the hardships placed upon thousands of brewery and allied workers and their families through added unemployment, would still further increase taxes, and would cause even more severe shortages of the 'beverages of moderation,' thus depriving Americans, still more of wholesome enjoyment and refreshment; and

"Whereas, we the undersigned, members of locals 93 and 116 protest against the present 30 percent reduction in grains available for the manufacture of beer, and protest any further restrictions which may be under consideration now, or any future time and hereby request our Senators and Representatives to vote for the elimination of present restrictions and against any additional restrictions at any time. We further respectfully request that this petition be referred to the proper committees and listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD."

M. HOLMES, *Secretary.*

Sacramento Municipal Utility District Obtains Distributing System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in April the Sacramento Municipal Utility District took over the distributing system serving the city of Sacramento and its environs. The transfer ended prolonged litigation between the district and the utility company. The Sacramento Union gives a brief story of this struggle, in and out of the courts, which finally culminated in the publicly owned municipal utility district getting possession of the property at the figure fixed by the California railroad commission as its market value. The editorial also states that the electric power for this publicly owned district should be furnished by certain projects for which the Federal Government has appropriated money and we expect will continue to appropriate until they are finished.

Under permission granted to me, the editorial is published herewith:

PUBLIC POWER COMING

After more than a decade of litigation the purchase by the Sacramento municipal utility district of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.'s transmission system is in its final stages.

An agreement whereby the district will purchase the PGE system for $11,632,000 was approved yesterday by the district's board of directors and by the end of the year the district will be owning and operating its own electricity distribution set-up.

It is high time that this has come about.

More than 11 years ago the people residing in the utility district's confines voted a $12,000,000 bond issue to provide funds for setting up the district and purchase of the PGE system.

As everyone expected, the utility firm fought tooth and toenail against the proposal. Loss of this system to the utility district would mean a great loss of revenue to the company. Every court procedure possible was used by PGE to postpone the inevitable day when the utility district would set up shop on its own.

The district was involved in one of the longest and most complex condemnation suits ever brought in California.

PGE placed a value of $18,302,981 on its properties. The district countered with an offer of $9,963,000.

The case went before the courts and the State railroad commission. The railroad commission finally, in November 1942, set the $11,632,000 figure.

During the period since then there has been more and more litigation, with PGE finally capitulating and agreeing to accept the commission's figure.

The final settlement of the dispute will mean that Sacramento, North Sacramento, and county residents in an area of some 420,000 acres, will finally reap the results of the bond issue they voted in 1924.

Their electric rates will be lower and may very possibly go down even more when the district is able to obtain power from Shasta Dam or possibly from the proposed Folsom Dam.

Profits from the district will help cut down their tax rates.

Before Shasta Dam power can be obtained, however, there remains the matter of obtaining funds for transmission lines to bring the power into Sacramento, and before power may be obtained from Folsom there remains the matter of seeing that the Folsom project is made a high-level dam with a maximum power output and not either a low-level dam or a compromise, medium-level dam as proposed by some.

Sacramento made a great step forward in the matter of public ownership with yesterday's agreement on the purchase of the PGE system. It must now continue to carry on the same fight and see that transmission lines are made available from Shasta Dam and that the Folsom project is not allowed to be sabotaged and become a mere flood control project or become an emasculated multiple-purpose project which will produce only a trickle of power.

A New Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oregonian, Portland, Oreg., of May 28, 1946:

A NEW CODE

What has happened is this: Mr. Roosevelt, entering the White House, sponsored, or at least sanctioned, a series of laws which were heavily weighted in favor of union power. This was true of the labor provisions of the NRA and of the Wagner Act, to name only two of the most vital. If previously the employers and their organizations had enjoyed the advantage in labor-employer controversies, the conditions were now reversed. It was now the employers who had to pull the forelock and who had to operate under the most rigid rules of responsibility, while the unions not only dominated the courts and agencies of mediation but were permitted a remarkable degree of irresponsibility.

And this line of legal development, as directed by Mr. Roosevelt, was so fantastically successful, from the political standpoint, that most of the politicians of the country have been paralyzed or partially paralyzed in their thinking and their actions ever since.

No other President has been elected four times with comfortable majorities. Ordinary citizens may brush that aside, but not those who run for office.

The result has been that instead of attempting to make sense out of the increasingly complex labor legislation of the country—instead of trying to codify the legislation and equalize the duties and responsibilities of labor and capital—the Congress has tried to meet each new crisis as something separate. It has rushed through a

punitive bill against Petrillo; it has tried to circumvent Lewis with a measure to make his form of health fund illegal. It has dumped one punitive bill after another upon the already ungainly accumulation. And there has been no constructive direction from the White House—under Roosevelt because he wasn't working that side of the political street; under Truman because he is playing the political game also, or because he simply cannot get around the subject.

The latter, in the present hour of extreme reaction, has before the Congress his un-American proposal for the drafting of workers, and things really are in a mess. Those who would not listen to reason—who would not reasonably correct the labor laws when there was an open opportunity—are now before us with extreme legislation which could in the long run lead to servitude.

We do not, however, believe that the opportunity for correction is by any means lost. The railroads are running again, and one way or another the coal mines will presently be in operation. No such mess as this is the final mess for a country such as America, or anywhere near the final one.

The question is as to whether there is, in the White House and in the Congress, a capacity to be shocked into action toward a permanent solution. As matters have stood, each new labor crisis which has arisen has resulted in negotiations sponsored by the administration, in which the administration has "bought off" the unions by the greatest possible concessions. Or, the buying off having failed, Congress has risen in one of its occasional outbursts of wrath and put through one of it punitive bills.

That pattern of action cannot continue without national disaster. The railroad strike and now the coal strike have shown the country how unthinkable it is that we should have strikes in industries and utilities which must operate if the people are to live, and which must operate if the Government is to make good its commitments to the rest of the world.

The answer lies in a full and honest codification of the Nation's labor laws, and in a just allocation of responsibilities as between labor and industry. Nothing less will be more than a palliative. And in this revision of laws there must be machinery to prevent strikes in operations essential to all of us—a provision which can be made without the revocation of the Bill of Rights, and without, we think, the uniform and the bayonet.

Monday on this page it was suggested that Senator MORSE, with his WLB experience behind him and with a consistent record of opposition to punitive legislation, is in a favorable position to undertake something constructive of this kind. Certainly, if he does not he will encounter increasing criticism at home; for there is the constant comment that the Senator, in spite of his perfect education for the labor-legislation job, confines himself to voting "no" and produces nothing himself.

In a way, this is unfair. In the United States Senate there are appropriate committees, and wildcat bills have hard going.

However, there really are a lot of Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States who, under the circumstances, could be rallied to a program designed neither for the unions nor for the employers, but for the whole people. As we see it, the political honeymoon occasioned by Mr. Roosevelt's reckless concessions to the unions is over. We have been "struck" into a realization that the inevitable end of this one-sidedness is national paralysis. But we want the solution to be one which will be a permanent solution, not a reaction setting up the conditions for future industrial warfare. And at the moment there seems to be just one possible just solution, and that must come from the Members of Congress who refuse to be in bondage to either side of the fight.

Carter Glass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Washington Star of May 29, 1946, dealing with the life, character, and services of the former senior Senator from Virginia, Hon. Carter Glass. The editorial, in my opinion, so accurately appraises Senator Glass' services and outstanding ability that it deserves a permanent place in the records of the Congress. The editorial follows:

GLASS OF VIRGINIA

Carter Glass was born in a period when American citizens were debating the merits and the morality of slavery, but before slavery had created the issues which set them at each other's throats in civil war.

He died within a few days after a President had appealed in person to a joint session of Congress for authority temporarily to draft employers and employees into the Nation's service should their industrial strife imperil the welfare of the country.

His life thus spanned an era which witnessed great changes in the channels of thought and in the direction of the spiritual and materialistic progress of the people. More than 60 years of this life were spent in public office; for more than 44 of these years he represented his home district and his State as an influential member of Congress.

Yet it would be difficult to label Senator Glass with any tag, as we so often do these days in speaking of public men, and so to identify him with any of the numerous factions and sects which during his long life achieved passing prominence and then passed out of the picture. He will be remembered for his independence of thought, coupled with a moral courage and sureness of purpose which left him a free agent, beholden to no one. He belongs in that select group of distinguished men in our history who have regarded public office as a responsibility rather than as a reward.

He did not weigh his obligation to his constituency in terms of patronage or allegiance to prevailing fancies. He saw his obligation as an untrammeled duty to follow the course which seemed to him in the public interest. It is to the honor of his State that its voters retained him in office year after year because their faith in his integrity and ability outweighed occasional displeasure over his decisions. Age and illness, in his final days, reduced his presence in the Senate to that of a shadow. What many critics of this fictional incumbency failed to appreciate was the depth of his constituency's respect for the tradition which merely his name kept alive.

Sometimes a man's death raises him to the stature of a giant because of the merit we attach to things that are gone. But there was a quality about Glass of Virginia, in his upright independence, which looms large today because it has become increasingly rare. He followed politics as an avocation, in the custom of many Virginia gentlemen who preceded him. It was an avocation dedicated to principle, it scorned passing popularity and angrily rejected that form of political servitude which adopts a known course of action for any set of circumstances. We need more men in public office today who might know the freedom to follow one's conscience that Senator Glass valued above everything else.

What the Case Bill Offers President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, amid all the speculation on what the President of the United States may do with H. R. 4908 which has now been passed in final form by both Houses of the Congress, it occurs to me that it may be helpful to point out the high points in the bill that is going down to the White House and to set forth how the principal features of the bill meet Presidential objectives.

As I have read the various statements made about the bill, I have been amazed to see how inaccurate are some of the impressions as to its actual contents. It occurs to me that the President will want to base his action on what is actually in the bill, rather than what someone says about it.

So, I shall list the outstanding things which the bill does, in the hope that this may help to clear the atmosphere.

FIRST. OUTLINE OF THE BILL

There are 12 sections in the bill in the form finally passed. By topics they are:

Section 1: Declaration of objectives.

Section 2: Definitions.

Section 3: Public policy; responsibility of employer and employee to settle differences without interrupting free flow of commerce.

Section 4: Federal Mediation Board; its composition.

Section 5: Functions of Mediation Board.

Section 6: Emergency commissions; fact finding for public utilities.

Section 7: Interference with trade and commerce—Hobbs antiracketeering bill.

Section 8: Welfare trust funds.

Section 9: Supervisory employees.

Section 10: Suits against labor organizations, making contracts mutually binding.

Section 11: Secondary boycotts, dealing also with jurisdictional disputes and sympathy strikes.

Section 12: Miscellaneous provisions relating to use of information files, statistical records, and other facilities of the Department of Labor Mediation Board.

WHAT THE CASE BILL DOES

First. It establishes machinery for the mediation of industrial disputes—sections 2, 3, 4, and 5: Mediation is not conciliation — appeasement — nor arbitration—settlement by a referee—but may utilize those methods by agreement of the parties. Mediation is an effort to find the common ground of justice between the parties to a dispute and to lead them to it, coming in as the equal friend of both.

The machinery for the Mediation Board is that of the language proposed by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. It follows the recommendations of President Truman in his special message of December 3, 1945, by adapt-

ing the general principles underlying the Railway Labor Act as did the original version of the bill as introduced in the House.

As recommended by the President in his special message, the mediation sections in both House and Senate versions proposed that both employer and employee be required to continue for a limited time under existing wages and working rules while the mediation procedure attempts to solve the questions at issue.

The only point at which a divergence from the suggestions of the President can be noted is that he assumed the Mediation Board would be under the Secretary of Labor. Congress proposes that the Board be in the Department for housekeeping purposes, but makes the Board itself independent, as the Civil Aeronautics Board is independent while established within the Department of Commerce, or as the Interstate Commerce Commission or Tariff Commission are independent. The President is authorized to name the five members of the Board, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and may remove them for neglect of duty, inefficiency, or malfeasance.

The President can hardly veto the bill on the ground that its form places the appointive power for the Board in his own hands rather than in those of the Secretary of Labor.

Second. It authorizes the creation of emergency fact-finding boards in public utilities where rates are fixed by some governmental agency and where a substantial interruption of "an essential monopolized service" is necessary in the public interest—section 6.

This is directly in line with the recommendation of the President in his special message to Congress, except that subpena powers are not granted, but obviously the pertinent records in utilities whose rates are fixed by a Government body are already available. The fact-finding board is not given arbitrary powers, but as the President said in his message:

> The parties would not be legally bound to accept the findings or follow the recommendations * * * but * * * the result, I am sure, would be that in most cases both sides would accept the recommendations.

President Truman further said:

> The procedure should be used sparingly and only when the national public interest requires it.

So he could hardly veto the bill on the ground that fact-finding is limited to public utility disputes of an essential monopolized service and where the Board determines that public interest warrants the creation by the President of an emergency commission.

Third. It provides some restrictions on secondary boycotts, sympathy strikes and jurisdictional disputes—sections 7 and 11.

In opening the labor-management conference which he called in Washington, November 5, 1945, President Truman said:

> Some substitute must be found for jurisdictional strikes. Business cannot stop, life and property just cannot be endangered, merely because of some internal disagreement between factions of labor, * * * There can be no moral or economic justification for stopping production while rival organizations contend with each other.

Section 7 of the bill is the so-called Hobbs antiracketeering bill which makes the definitions of robbery and extortion apply, if such be the case, even though the robbery and extortion take place on the public highway or elsewhere and involve taking one's property without his consent or taking with his consent if that consent was obtained by violence or threat of personal injury. The section specifically disclaims any impairment of the Norris-LaGuardia Act and lays down ordinary jail and fine penalties if an actual felony is committed.

Section 11 of the bill brings conspiracy in labor and agricultural organizations under the Clayton Act, which forbids unlawful restraints of trade and monopolies if the conspiracy by strikes or violence seeks to require one employer to cease using the products of another—rival union, for example—or to require one employer to deal with a particular labor organization or to combine in fixing of prices, distributing of territory, or generally to engage in the monopolistic activities forbidden to business.

The section specifically provides that this shall not be construed to prevent labor or agricultural associations from joining or combining for general purposes.

So these sections, too, directly seek to answer the need voiced by the President, and no one should object to them unless he believes that robbery, extortion, and conspiracy to compel recognition of one union as against another or to engage in monopolistic practices forbidden to business generally are all right when engaged in by a labor or agricultural organization.

Fourth. It legalizes contributions by employers to an employee welfare fund if the fund is operated as a trust, with annual audit and public report, and if those who contribute to it have a voice in its management.

Contrary to the general impression, not the Case bill, nor the Byrd amendment, which is section 8 of the Case bill, but the Wagner National Labor Relations Act forbids contributions of money by employers to labor organizations. That is the law today. The Byrd amendment in the Case bill opens the door to welfare funds as indicated.

The Wagner Act in section 8 says:

> It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer * * * to dominate * * * any labor organization or contribute financial or other support to it.

The Case bill says it is all right for an employer to contribute financial support to "a trust fund established by such representative—labor organization—for the sole and exclusive benefit of the employees, their families and dependents" if the payments are held in trust to pay for medical or hospital care, pensions, injury and illness compensation, disability, sickness and life insurance, and so forth, and if employers and employees are equally represented in the management of the fund and there is an annual audit and the results of that audit are available for inspection by interested parties.

And the sanctity of the fund is protected by making violations of the section subject to a restraining order by injunction. That is the only place where the bill in its present form creates the power of injunction—the protection of the trust welfare fund, obviously in the interest of the employees as much or more as in the interest of the employer.

The Lewis soft-coal agreement with the Government embraces a welfare fund within the principle of the bill, joint management of the fund to which both employer and employee contribute. Without the provisions in the Case bill this fund would seem to be illegal under the Wagner Act. It would appear that the President would want the bill to become law in order to make legal the welfare-fund provisions in the soft-coal agreement which he has approved.

Sixth. It establishes mutual responsibility for carrying out the collective-bargining contract when made by making unions suable as an entity; employers already are liable.

This provision is in direct response to a need expressed by President Truman when he addressed the opening session of his labor-management conference in Washington November 5, 1945, and said:

> We shall have to find methods not only of peaceful negotiation of labor contracts but also of insuring industrial peace for the lifetime of such contracts. Contracts once made should be lived up to, and should be changed only in the manner agreed upon by the parties. If we expect confidence in agreements made, there must be responsibility and integrity on both sides in carrying them out.

The President will not veto the bill on the ground that it gives him what he asked for.

Seventh. It clarifies the situation on foremen's unions by providing that while supervisory employees may become or remain members of labor unions, those who have the authority of hiring, firing or fixing wages in the interest of the employer may not be the representative of general employee organizations in collective bargaining.

In all of his recommendations on the subject, President Truman has stressed the importance of facilitating and strengthening the processes of collective bargaining. It is fundamental that a representative cannot sit on both sides of the table. As NLRB member Gerald Reilly has pointed out:

> In order for a foreman to function properly, he must be respected * * * and just how can he be respected or even trusted, when he is in the position of playing two ends against the middle? In the position of serving two masters at one time?

In testimony before the Senate committee, February 23, 1946, President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, agreed that foremen are a part of management and said that the line of distinction should be drawn—minority report, page 19.

Surely the President will not veto the bill on the ground that it draws the line of distinction at those who in the interest of the employer are charged with hiring,

firing, and fixing of wages, while permitting them to become or remain as individual members of their unions but without right to act as employee representatives in the making of working contracts.

And that is the bill.

On what grounds could the President veto it or want to do so? Most of it he has asked for directly or indirectly. Will he reject it in order to make a plea of necessity for an even sterner measure with powers of property seizure and manpower draft, on emergency grounds? In his special message to the Congress, December 3, 1946, the President said:

It was for the express purpose of getting away as soon as possible from some of the wartime powers and controls that the recent National Labor-Management conference was called in Washington. Instead of retaining in the Federal Government the power over wages and labor agreements and industrial relations which a global war made necessary—

And so forth. And in the same message, he recalled his words opening that conference when he had said:

I hope that I can give up the President's wartime powers as soon as possible, so that management and labor can again have the full and undivided responsibility for providing the production that we must have to safeguard our domestic economy and our leadership in international affairs.

Will he now veto a bill that carries out his positive recommendations in order to hang on to or establish even greater Presidential wartime powers? It is inconceivable!

It may be that opponents of the bill originally created a bad atmosphere by shouting "vicious," "drastic," and so forth. But that has changed and the intelligence of the country, shocked into action by the prospect of chaos and anarchy, has taken a look at the provisions of the bill itself, and is now asking for its approval.

And it is my personal opinion that President Harry S. Truman wants this bill to become law and provide him with tools that will help to meet the problems of the day.

Children Love Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the New York Times of Thursday, May 23, on the subject of Russia and world famine:

RECONVERSION A LA RUSSE

Reading the Daily Worker in this period of reconversion from war to what is hopefully called peace is sometimes an amusing, occasionally a puzzling, but always a heartwarming experience. The other day, for example, there was an article headed "A mean woman," in which a 3-year-old girl with a "strange look in her wonderful face," underwent an ordeal of New York Red Baiting, in an unfortunate encounter on the street with a "warped and twisted" old woman with a "heartful of hate," who didn't like Communists. The symbolism may be familiar to those acquainted with prewar literature on the decadence of a "warped and twisted" old American civilization, as opposed to a strange and wonderful wave of the future.

"So," the Daily Worker writer went on, "we explained to the little girl about Communists and how they love children beyond everything else, and are fighting to make everything good for them. And the little girl said, 'And no more children going hungry in Europe?' * * * the little girl started singing * * * 'I love Communists,' and then, 'go away, you mean woman.'"

On the day this more or less subtle propaganda appeared, the Daily Worker consisted of 12 pages, 5 columns each, but a very careful search therein has failed to discover any mention of the news published that morning in this and other newspapers to the effect that Generalissimo Stalin had rejected President Truman's request for Soviet Russia to cooperate with the United States and Great Britain in feeding the hungry people of less fortunate countries, because the appeal "came too late." This despite Premier Stalin's recent agreement to send 500,000 tons of wheat to France just before the elections in which the French Communists failed to put over a constitution that might have facilitated their seizure of power.

It warms the cockles of the heart to feel that those little children in Europe who "love Communists" will not go hungry. Go away, you mean woman, and all your antitotalitarian brood of truths, freedoms, justices and charities for all and malices toward none. Do not expect food from us, because we love children beyond everything else—that is, children who "love Communists." But what is the world reconverting to? Food for party members only, and elsewhere universal hatred and the inevitable road to another war? Or peace and good will on earth to all men?

Mr. Whitney's $47,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the threat of Mr. A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, that he is to spend the entire resources of that union to defeat President Truman and the 306 Congressmen who voted for the antistrike legislation recommended by President Truman has brought further condemnation upon the head of this labor leader, who has done so much to bring the cause of labor into disfavor.

The New York Times, in its issue of May 28, has an editorial which in a very pertinent way presents the effect of Mr. Whitney's boast, and, under leave granted, same is submitted herewith:

MR. WHITNEY'S $47,000,000

Mr. A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, is revealing himself to be a consistently poor judge of public opinion. This is certainly true of his remark that "we are the richest labor organization" and his reported declaration that his union will use the whole $47,000,000 in its treasury, if need be, to defeat President Truman if he runs for reelection. What does Mr. Whitney think the effect on public opinion would be if the president of General Motors or the chairman of United States Steel announced that "we are the richest corporation and we intend to spend every cent we have to beat the President?" The effect would be precisely what it has been in the case of Mr. Whitney's own remark: to turn sentiment in the President's favor, because the American people do not like large boasts of wealth and power, and large threats to use them to drive public men out of office.

In point of fact, what good reason has Mr. Whitney to believe that injustice has been done him? The case of his union received long and careful consideration under the Railway Labor Act. When negotiations under that statute ended in deadlock, the President appointed a fact-finding board which awarded Mr. Whitney's union a substantial increase from the already high level of wages which had made it, in Mr. Whitney's own words, "the richest labor organization." When this failed to satisfy Mr. Whitney, the President then overruled his own fact-finding board, compromised his own issue and offered Mr. Whitney something more. And when even this was judged to be not enough, it was Mr. Whitney's own decision that called the strike that paralyzed the business and threatened the health and welfare of the country. It was not the Truman administration that stirred the country to protest. It was Mr. Whitney.

Mr. Whitney has, among other things, given a perfect example of why a so-called welfare fund of other millions should not be placed unconditionally in the hands of Mr. Lewis.

Herbert Hoover and Famine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include two editorials on the subject of Herbert Clark Hoover and his attempt to feed the children of the world:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 19, 1946]

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

It ought to mean something to an American that his country is asking for no booty. Maybe it is sentimentality. Maybe it would be good business to strip the countries we occupy, to destroy the economy of the people, to move our foodstuffs.

But we do not do that.

The Morgenthau plan proposed that we should, at any rate, for Germany, reduce that country to the lowest standards of living of Europe.

But we have not done that even in our zone in Germany. We have not done it in Japan. We have not done it anywhere.

We fight but we do not steal. Genghis Khan is not our model. We, the capitalists, continue to give. Maybe it is smarter to take than to give, but it goes against our grain to be that smart.

We cannot pick the bones of starving people, even if those people were our opponents in war. We defeat but we do not conquer; we can deliver a knock-out blow and shake hands afterward.

And that leads to the phenomenon of Herbert Hoover. On August 10 he will be

72 years old. He has just circumnavigated the earth in an Army transport plane.

He was called to serve, and age notwithstanding, he entered upon a mission of love and service.

He has visited every country in Europe and Asia where children starve, and he has brought the hope of a slice of bread and a bowl of soup.

Maybe he only offered a hope—but that is more than these big-eyed hungry infants dared to dream possible.

And having brought back facts and figures, he enters upon another mission and ordeal. He becomes the beggar, the universal beggar. He begs of us a slight forbearance, a slight reduction of waste, a slight sacrifice of a surfeited appetite.

And then again he will fly through the air to South American countries to beg them to save the descendants of their European forbears from starvation.

He will succeed in South America. He will succeed in the Argentine.

For Hoover employs no authority but pity, no power but charity, no claim but love. And no civilized person can resist pity, charity, and love.

These missions of Herbert Hoover may shorten his days. He comes of a Quaker breed that never believed war right, yet always went to war to serve its victims.

The Quaker could not withhold a bread card from a woman or child who happened to be born in the wrong country at the wrong time, nor could he ask a babe the nature of its political affiliations.

The Quaker gives; he does not mix politics and charity. He does not ask a return.

And so Herbert Hoover, American, spends his old age fighting death by starvation. What a blessed old age for any man. What a blessing is a country that in a few months forgets hatred and feeds its enemies.

Maybe all this is sentimental emotionalism to the materialistic dialectician who reasons only from "scientific" facts, but we Americants are not "scientific." We are traditionalists—and our traditions are based upon such expressions of the human spirit as the Ten Commandments, the Psalms, the struggles of Job with truth, the beatitudes of Jesus Christ.

Who can say that we are wrong? Certainly not the little boy who is puzzled by the pangs of a gnawing hunger, by the soft bones of rickets, by the parched mouth of bitterness.

That child cannot understand that he is a warring power and that the peace-loving nations are taking it out on him. Nor can he understand that democracy demands that he is to live his years with a warped brain and a twisted soul

Nor can any American, really. If Herbert Hoover has accomplished nothing else that is noteworthy in his long life, this he has done: He has, in the years when his head is gray and the bones grow weary, when most men retire to peace and reminiscence, become to all who are hungry and helpless the American messenger of the God of pity, charity, and love America's answer to the cry of the hungry is still: Love thy neighbor—even thy enemy—as thyself.

[From the New York Sunday Mirror, May 19, 1946]

A VOLUNTARY TRIBUTE

In these days when nations wrangle over booty and children die of starvation, when an iron curtain blinds half of Europe while men are driven into slavery, Americans witness a spectacle of the Golden Rule in practice.

Herbert Hoover, who in August will celebrate, God willing, his seventy-second birthday, has returned to his country from a service of loving kindness and charity which would have taxed the physical strength and moral courage of a younger man.

He has girdled the earth in a mission of faith and love.

Flying the air, he has visited every country where starvation rides herd upon men, women, and children.

He has witnessed the horror and terror of hunger and has heard the wail of little children who know not why they must suffer for the sins and stupidities of their elders.

He reports to headquarters like a good soldier and prepares to leave on yet another mission of passionate love of mankind.

He has asked no child whether he was friend or foe.

He has asked only: "Are you hungry?"

He has promised only that Americans will voluntarily try to save human life.

That is the symbol of American greatness.

We come not like the horsemen of the apocalypse; we come humbly to bring gifts to God's children who are hungry.

And those who eat cake and complain of the lack of this and that need only think of this American, passed three score and ten, entitled to the pains and aches and comforts of old age, who accepted a mission, more suited physically for youth, that all men might know that America harbors no hate, knows only pity, seeks only justice.

If Christianity has any meaning at all in this world of confusion, herein lies its meaning and its example.

Herbert Hoover is opposed to goodness by force. He is opposed to further rationing as unnecessary and un-American.

He appeals to the American people to do voluntarily what others may only do by force.

Shall we prove him wrong?

If every American will voluntarily eat no wheat products at three meals a week, children the world over will share our bread.

We who have so much are asked to give so little.

We who have oranges and tomatoes and green vegetables and meat are asked only to forego cake three times a week.

We who consume thousands of calories a day of ice cream and candies and fresh fruits are asked to give up a few slices of bread.

Can anyone refuse?

"The child of misery, baptized in tears," calls to us, and shall we not heed the call in a sacrifice so trifling to us, so fulfilling to him?

"But Jesus called them unto Him, and said, 'Suffer little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God.'"

America will respond to this appeal for voluntary aid. What is asked is not dollars, not money, not contributions.

What is asked is forbearance, self-control, kindliness.

Today, set aside a slice of bread to be eaten tomorrow. Set it aside physically, as a reminder and a symbol that Americans can share with an absent guest.

John Buell Snyder

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1946

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOHN BUELL SNYDER, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, Hon. JOHN BUELL SNYDER for a great many years was chairman of the Military Appropriations Subcommittee of the House of Representatives.

It was my privilege to know him well. He was a man of high character and high principles and devoted to his work.

I wish to extend to his people and his family my sincerest and deepest sympathy.

The Life Story of Joseph Medill Patterson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 1 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, on Wednesday, May 22, I attended a very impressive funeral ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery. The occasion was the burial of Capt. Joseph Medill Patterson. He was buried at the foot or on the approach leading to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

I regard Captain Patterson as one of America's great citizens. Notwithstanding his education and position, he enlisted as a private in the Illinois National Guard in 1916, and rose to the rank of noncommissioned officer before World War I. He was a captain commanding a company at the close of World War I.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the story of Captain Patterson's life, as printed in the Chicago Tribune.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATTERSON LIFE STORY

Joseph Medill Patterson was the eldest of a family trio of publishers whose exploits, leadership, and genius for success made history in twentieth-century journalism.

In an eventful lifetime Patterson achieved recognition as novelist, playwright, legislator, administrator, war correspondent, soldier, and editor.

But his name will live with that of the New York News, of which he was founder and president—a unique publishing enterprise he inspired to tremendous success by journalistic brilliance and strength of personality.

NOTED MEMBER OF NOTED FAMILY

The captain or J. M. P., or Mr. Patterson as he preferred to be called, was a noted member of noted publishing families—the Medills, McCormicks, and Pattersons. Surviving members of the famous trio are his sister, Eleanor M. Patterson, publisher of the Washington Times-Herald, and Col. Robert R. McCormick, publisher of the Chicago Tribune.

Patterson, of Scotch-Irish descent, was born in Chicago, January 6, 1879, a son of Robert W. and Elinor Medill Patterson. The newspaper saga of the Pattersons and McCormicks had started half a century earlier with the founding of the Chicago Tribune by his grandfather, Joseph Medill, whose newspaper came to prominence while battling in support of Lincoln in the Civil War era.

GOES FROM COLLEGE TO WAR

The heritage of the elder Medill passed through his two daughters, Elinor and Katherine, to their children. Elinor was the mother of the two publishers, Joseph and Eleanor Patterson. Katherine was the

mother of Colonel McCormick and the late Medill McCormick, who left a newspaper career to become a United States Senator.

The future editor of the News attended Groton from 1890 until his graduation in 1896. He entered Yale in 1897 and was graduated with a bachelor of arts degree in 1901. He left Yale in 1900 to be a war correspondent in China, where the Boxer uprising had assembled an allied force of American, British, Japanese, French, and Italian troops to rescue foreigners imprisoned in Tientsin and the legation quarter of Peking. He returned from China to complete his course at Yale.

The year after his graduation from Yale, Patterson married Alice Higinbotham, of Chicago. They were divorced at Waukegan, Ill., June 10, 1938. On July 5, 1938, Patterson married Miss Mary King, women's editor of the News and fiction editor of the Tribune-News Syndicate. She survives him, as do three daughters—Mrs. Donald W. Baker, Mrs. Harry Guggenheim, and Mrs. Josephine Patterson Reeve—and a son, James, a West Point graduate.

Patterson won his spurs with the Tribune long before his triumph with the News. Prior to and during his Tribune days, he struck out into the literary, political, and military fields, each time was success. But tradition, talent, and temperament repeatedly drew him back to his destiny as one of the ablest publishers of the century.

EXCURSION INTO POLITICS

He had joined the Tribune staff upon leaving Yale, but in 1903 he made an excursion into politics and was elected to the Illinois House of Representatives. He was present at stirring legislative events that included a riot by the assembly against the grip on the legislature then held by "Boss" Charles Tyson, traction magnate and later donor of the Yerkes Observatory.

In 1905–6 Patterson was commissioner of public works in the Chicago city government, a job he performed with a vigor and independence unusual in municipal affairs, to the dismay of spoilsmen, incompetents, and crooked contractors.

He took a short course in agriculture at the University of Wisconsin in the winter of 1906–7. Patterson worked on the Tribune intermittently in this period, but it was a foregone conclusion that he would follow in the footsteps of his illustrious grandfather, Joseph Medill, and his father, Robert Wilson Patterson, who was editor of the Tribune when he died in 1910.

BRILLIANT IN WORLD WAR I

Early in 1914, the young newspaperman went to Mexico as a Tribune correspondent and covered the American occupation of Vera Cruz in the conflict between the two countries over mistreatment of Americans. From that assignment, he hurried to Europe upon outbreak of World War I, and served as his newspaper's war correspondent in Germany, France, and Belgium.

Patterson was back in the United States in 1916, enlisted in the Illinois National Guard, and served on the Texas border as a noncommissioned officer in the field artillery. When the United States entered World War I, Patterson won a commission and went overseas in 1917 with the famous Rainbow Division, later commanding Battery B, One Hundred and Forty-ninth Field Artillery, with the rank of captain, which he held at the time of his discharge.

In the ensuing campaigns, Captain Patterson achieved a brilliant military record. He participated in the second battle of the Marne, St. Mihiel, the Argonne, the defense of Champagne against the last big German drive, and operations in the Lorraine sector.

WAR HEROES PLAN FUTURE

Shortly before the armistice, the two soldier-publishers, Captain Patterson and Colonel McCormick, met for a visit at a ruined French farm near the front where Patterson was quartered with his regiment. There the two cousins discussed their future plans. Patterson, who had been studying the success of tabloid newspapers in London, confided that he would like to start a tabloid in New York after the war.

When Colonel McCormick returned to the United States, he related Patterson's plans to William H. Field, who had been in charge of the Tribune while the two editors were at war. In September 1918 Field started preparations for the tabloid that was to become the gigantic New York Daily News.

On his way home, Patterson stopped at London and called on Lord Northcliffe, who foresaw tabloids as the newspapers of the future. Six months later, on June 26, 1919, Captain Patterson made his debut with America's first picture tabloid daily newspaper.

From 1914 until that time, Patterson and Colonel McCormick had been coeditors and publishers of the Chicago Tribune. Now Patterson left the Chicago scene and administration of the Tribune interests here to Colonel McCormick.

The Patterson-McCormick interests were later to venture into other publications. They founded Liberty magazine and sold it in 1931 to Bernarr Macfadden. They took over MacFadden's Detroit paper, renamed it the Mirror, and operated it until it was decided to suspend it August 5, 1932.

It was on the New York News, however, that Patterson concentrated his attention. He guided it from its first steps as an infant with 57,000 circulation the first year to an eventual circulation of more than 2,000,000 daily and more than 4,000,000 on Sunday.

FUNDAMENTALS NEVER ABANDONED

Skeptics had scoffed at the new newspaper, predicting, "It can't last 6 months." When the News reached its majority of 21 years in 1940, its circulation was twice that of any other daily in the United States. Its daily readers topped the million mark in 1926. Only one other American daily has as yet obtained its first million readers—the News' parent paper, the Chicago Tribune.

The News never abandoned the fundamentals of Patterson's original formula: the smaller format and use of the camera as a reporter to make the photograph a news vehicle. But he did make other changes to keep it leading the parade and ever close to the masses.

In the roaring twenties, his tabloid had set the pace for the flapper-bathtub-gin, easy-money decade. It played up whoopee and the crowd loved it. Then the market crashed, the depression set in, and views changed. While a tabloid competitor of the News plunged on to its death, Patterson sensed the change and told his editorial department:

"We're missing the bus. People don't care so much about playboys, Broadway, and divorces. They want to know how they're going to eat. From now on we'll pay attention to the average man and his family."

UNIQUE GENIUS DISCLOSED

That was typical of Patterson's uncanny understanding of why people laugh, cheer, and cry. He had acquired it by knowing and liking people—his companions and friends from copy boys to world leaders, his employees and associates, and the legions of readers whose lives he touched and influenced through the printed page. He applied that knowledge in creating and shaping his newspaper.

Never did he permit the paper to lose its lighter vein. It continued to remember fun, romance, and adventure—to amuse and entertain. It told men and women about their jobs and welfare, but it served more bread while maintaining the supply of a pleasing dessert.

In this period, the Patterson genius blazed at its brightest. Swiftly and deftly he spun out the ideas that made the News tick.

BUILDS AMERICAN NEWSPAPER

He built a peculiarly American newspaper. It had many pictures, short and breezily written stories. Its simple, understandable editorials made its editorial page the most popular in America.

He encouraged the careful selection of first-run fiction, developed the rotogravure section and later the color studio, and personally started on their way many of the best comics in the country.

It was Patterson who named the "Gumps," recalling that his mother had referred to a goofy person as a "gump." It was he who suggested to Frank King the title of "Gasoline Alley," for the widely popular Skeezix cartoon because at the time of its origination in 1921 people tinkered with their automobiles in the alley on Sunday mornings.

"Winnie Winkle, the Breadwinner" was born with the assistance of Martin Branner's pen because Patterson reasoned that the many stenographers in New York would make popular a strip dealing with a working-girl's problems.

AVIATION INTEREST A CREATOR

Captain Patterson's interest in aviation led to Zack Mosley's adventure strip known as Smilin' Jack. And his paper's temporary interest in starting an afternoon daily in 1925 prompted Harold Gray, a former background artist for the Gumps' creator, Sidney Smith, to submit a strip tentatively called Little Orphan Annie.

Patterson's practice of taking his office boy to a baseball game has provided many of the gags in Smitty, drawn by Walter Berndt. The publisher and his young guest passed on the ideas that came to them in their fan roles of Mr. Bailey and Smitty.

That Patterson alone was responsible for the highly successful strip Dick Tracy is readily acknowledged by the man who draws it, Chester Gould.

CHRISTENS DICK TRACY

Gould recalls the summer day in 1931 when Patterson summoned him to the Tribune office to discuss the drawings of Plainclothes Tracy, which the artist had submitted. Patterson, crisp and direct, announced at once that he considered the work good and liked the name Tracy but thought Plainclothes was too long.

"Let me see, they call cops 'dicks'; let's name him Dick—Dick Tracy," Patterson said. Then he outlined the way he thought the story should begin:

"Let's have this man Tracy in love with a nice blonde (Tess Trueheart). Her old man runs a store and they live in rooms overhead. Every night he takes the receipts and puts them in a box under his bed. Crooks find out about it, hold him up, shoot him, kill him. Over his prostrate body Dick vows to get the killers. He becomes a detective and enters the fascinating field of criminology."

DICK TRACY GOES TO WAR

"And that's the way Dick Tracy started," Gould explained.

During World War II a radio adaptation of the popular comic strip was broadcast around the world through nearly 500 stations so American troops could keep up with the country's most famous detective.

Around him, Patterson assembled some of the brainiest men in the newspaper business, but all recognized him as the mainspring of the machine.

Kindly, warm-hearted, informal, and democratic, Patterson nevertheless delivered his orders bluntly and decisively. It became a rule in the organization: "Don't argue with J. M. P. unless you're sure of your facts.

Never argue with him after he makes a decision."

KNEW HIMSELF AS BOSS

It was related that on an occasion when a hot-tempered executive disputed Patterson's plans for handling a story, his boss told him:

"The fact that I decide against you is no proof that I'm right and you're wrong. It may be true that I'm wrong and you're right. The fact that I decide against you is no proof that there's anything wrong with your judgment. It's purely because of an accident of birth that I happen to be in a position where I get my way.

"But I do get my way, and don't ever forget that," Patterson concluded, banging his fist on a desk.

However, to many of his admirers he was a humble person. Illustrative of his simplicity and self-effacement was the obituary of a friend that he once wrote. It was a three-line "Memo to Max Annenberg," his circulation director, and it said, in part:

"Good-by. I am going to miss you a lot.
* * * Hope to be seeing you some day.
"J. M. PATTERSON."

A MESSAGE TO A FRIEND

It was a simple message. But it touched the hearts of millions who read it, and mourned with the man who had lost his friend.

Despite his many duties, Patterson found time to drop into movies, go on trips with his reporters, and tramp from door to door collecting straw votes.

Always he chatted with and listened to the people. After an excursion among them, his editorials often voiced their views in their language so forcefully that millions of common folks cheered and told their neighbors.

Symbolic of his feelings was the phrase of Abraham Lincoln, a Patterson idol, the last six words of which are chiseled across the front of the News' $10,000,000 building: "God must have loved the common people because He made so many of them."

LEARNS TO FLY OWN PLANE

Throughout his life Patterson sought facts. He learned to fly his own plane and toured the West Indies on a pathfinding trip. He flew to San Francisco, Calif., at the time of the longshoremen's 1934 strike. A few days later he spent a week talking to farmers in the western Dust Bowl.

He toured Europe in 1939 and filed his own stories to the New York News. In 1942 he went to Hawaii for a close-up look at the Pacific war zone; in 1945 he flew to the South Pacific, met the victorious General MacArthur, Admiral Nimitz, and other top military chiefs, stopped at Manila, Leyte, and Guam.

His contributions to journalism continued to come thick and fast. For example, in the 1936 campaign he introduced the "battle" page and donated equal space to the contending parties. This idea developed into mayoral, senatorial, and economic battle pages.

CONTESTS MADE HUGE EVENTS

The News contests—golden gloves, silver skates, beautiful child, and harvest-moon ball—expanded into huge enterprises.

In 1933 the News had been the first paper to get the NRA blue eagle. Patterson agreed to and did support President Roosevelt's policies for a year, and generally on domestic issues throughout the recovery era.

With the approach of World War II the News opposed intervention, but, as it had for years under Patterson, fought for preparedness. Almost every Monday from 1934 on he ordered and wrote an editorial on the theme Two Ships for One in the Pacific. He boldly urged a blockade of Japan years before the attack on Pearl Harbor.

GOES ALL-OUT TO WIN WAR

When the United States entered the war, Patterson mastheaded his editorial column with the declaration of John Paul Jones, "We have just begun to fight," and enlisted the News in the supreme effort to win the struggle.

Patterson was president of the News Syndicate Co., which publishes the News; and he had a deep interest in the radio, building, paper, and shipping companies that were parts of the vast publishing enterprise.

He also had found the time, mostly during the earlier years of his career, to write two successful novels and several plays.

AUTHOR OF SEVERAL PLAYS

His outstanding play was The Fourth Estate, written in collaboration with James Keeley and Harriet Ford, which appeared on Broadway in 1909. Two other Broadway productions were dramatized versions of his books, Rebellion, staged the same year, and A Little Brother of the Rich, in 1911. In addition to these, he wrote two one-act dramas: Dope, a play of remarkable strength based on exposure of the cocaine habit, and Byproducts, both of which were produced and well regarded in theater circles.

His diversified success, his titles and duties, his business position and financial power, in themselves, meant little to Patterson. He valued and used them only as tools enabling him, as a publisher, to find, interpret, and illuminate the problems of the people.

To the end of his life he played this role, modestly and much of the time anonymously, but so well that many who knew him, in one way or another, echoed this spontaneous remark of one News employee:

"He was the most human great man I've ever known."

The Independent Businessmen Look at Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 1 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, on May 15 the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD printed at my request a speech delivered by the Honorable JERRY VOORHIS, of California, which was in support of the cooperative movement. I now ask unanimous consent to have a speech entitled "The Independent Businessmen Look at Cooperatives," delivered by Grey Dresie, executive secretary, Kansas Independent Businessmen's Association, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The Kansas Independent Businessmen's Association and the Wichita Independent Businessmen's Association embrace a membership of 2,500 independent business and professional men in Kansas. Mr. Dresie's speech is in answer to Mr. VOORHIS' radio speech in support of cooperatives.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Kansas Independent Businessmen's Association and the Wichita Independent Businessmen's Association are not engaged in fighting cooperatives. In fact, it is not our purpose to be against anything. On the other hand, there are several things that we stand for and believe in to such an extent that we do not hesitate to accept the challenge of any individual or organization who seeks to oppose or destroy those things.

It is our belief that the American system of doing business is the best system in the world. We back this belief by pointing to what American industry and business accomplished against the rest of the world during the past few years when the chips were really down. We recognize the fact that independent business is the real backbone of this American system. By independent business I mean the grocers, the druggists, and the hardware dealers in your town or neighborhood. I refer to the many small manufacturers and other businesses that are owned by your friends and neighbors. The independent businesses that I mean are personally known by many of you, some as friends and some as employers. They are numerous. Actually they comprise the bulk of American business. The Kansas Independent Businessmen's Association and the Wichita Independent Businessmen's Association believe in these men and feel that only when they are strong can America be strong.

Today independent business is being harassed from many quarters. One of their chief problems is that presented by the competition of cooperatives. Now, the very fact that a man will engage in business as an independent businessman means that he does not fear competition as long as that competition is fair and is forced to play by the same rules that he does. Unfortunately the cooperatives are not bound by the same rules of the game as the independent businessman is.

In 1916 Congress passed a bill exempting from the corporate income tax: "Farmers, fruit growers, or like associations organized and operated as a sales agent for the purpose of marketing the produce of its members and turning back to them the proceeds of the sales less the necessary selling expenses on the basis of the quantity of produce furnished by them." Since that time this exemption has steadily grown until today, through expanded exemptions and Federal rulings, we have an entire class of business that is exempt from the payment of income taxes and yet is engaged in practically every kind of business. Cooperatives produce and sell at retail tractors, farm implements, gasoline, oil, tires, batteries, groceries, cosmetics, radios, furniture, and various and sundry other items. They have established retail outlets in cities and country. They are in direct competition with the independent businessman. Under the Federal income-tax law and Treasury rulings, the independent has no exemption, but the co-ops do. This certainly does not sound right, yet there it is.

A few years ago, when the tax burden was light, the exemption did not mean too much. Today, however, with the tax burden the heaviest in history, income tax is a large factor in every man's business. It compares to his rent and other overhead expenses. The cooperative can keep all of its dollars for expansion while the independent businessman has to pay a large part of his dollar to the Federal Government in income taxes.

How would you like to play in a ball game where the umpire gave the other side four strikes for every batter that came up? That is the kind of game that the co-ops and the independent businesses are playing, and the umpire has given the co-ops four strikes.

There have been some strange results in the past few years as a result of this inequity. As I said before, this discrimination did not mean much until taxes reached their present high level. But, during the past few years, this exemption has been a real advantage as is evidenced by the fact that during these heavy tax years that co-ops have experienced their greatest growth. The cooperatives have recognized the tremendous advantage which they enjoy over other types of business due to this tax exemption; and, during these years when it has meant the

most, they have taken every advantage of it. They have purchased oil wells, factories, refineries, warehouses, and the ultimate cost to the cooperative has been nothing. I will explain this statement. We will say as an example, that they purchase a business for $100. During the years following the purchase of the business, they pay no Federal income taxes on this $100 business. Figuring that they are able to save a large part of their profits because of these taxes which they do not pay, we can see that the business can be and really is paid for by money which any other form of business would have to pay in income taxes. So that really the purchase of this $100 business would cost the cooperative nothing but is actually paid for by the other taxpayers who are forced to pay their share of the taxes.

Cooperative leaders say that they have no profits. That they have no income and that for that reason they should not be required to pay an income tax. They base this statement upon the theory that the money which they have made at the end of the year is merely being held in trust for the members of the cooperative, so your private corporation has to pay a tax upon the money from which they declare their dividends before it is distributed to their stockholders. And then those stockholders of a private corporation are required to pay an income tax upon the dividends which they receive.

It looks to me as if there is one set of rules for the cooperative and another set of rules for private business. Actually, this expansion would not be possible if they were forced to distribute in cash this money which they claim they hold in trust for their members. This, however, cooperatives, at the present time, are not doing; but they are using these members' funds for expansion while the opportunity, due to the unfair advantage which they possess, is present.

Let us take a look at the oil business and see what the cooperatives have done there. In 1942 cooperatives did a petroleum business of $252,000,000 of which $197,000,000 was retail sales. Their wholesale sales were approximately $55,000,000. Their oil-producing and refining activities created additional business to the tune of about $12,000,000. If private business did this business, they would have paid a Federal income tax of about $10,000,000. The co-ops paid very little or no Federal income tax in this business because of their exemptions. Cooperatives own and operate 9 refineries, 300 oil wells, and more than 1,000 miles of pipe lines. They operate river terminals barge lines, and oil-compounding and blending plants. Why were they able to do this? Because, while petroleum cooperatives were using tax-free, war-swollen profits to expand, private business has been forced to curtail and pay up to 80 percent of its profits in Federal taxes.

I will not bore you with figures from other lines in which cooperatives are expanding; but I will say that those figures are comparative to those in the petroleum field. Cooperative leaders have expressed themselves as aiming toward the elimination of the middleman and the retailer. They believe that the profit system of doing business is a wasteful system. Let me quote to you from a speech made by James Peter Warbasse, president emeritus of the Cooperative League of the United States of America.

"The ultimate destiny of the consumer's cooperative movement is to obtain or to produce in factory, shop, mine, sea, air, and land all that the consumers require. * * * As cooperation grows, the need and the possibility of the existence of profit business and of the political state decline * * * the cooperative movement is tending toward a cooperative democracy as a substitute for the political state * * * cooperation already has in operation the machinery which is capable of being a substitute for the political machinery of the state."

I would like to ask you these questions and yet you answer them for yourselves: What will happen to your jobs if the cooperatives achieve the aims above expressed? If you are employed in private enterprise, your employer will be out of business. If you are employed in a governmental position, who will pay the taxes that pay your salaries?

Independent business does not fear the competition of the cooperatives as long as it is fair and equal competition. Cooperative leaders tell us that they are friends of independent business and that their only enemy is monopoly.

In Wichita, at the present time, there is being formed a consumers cooperative whose purpose it is to sell at retail practically any item that you can buy in any retail store in Wichita. Their customers are to be members of the cooperative which they have solicited at so much a membership. I wonder if the independent grocers, hardware men, druggists, and filling-station operators whose customers they are soliciting feel that this consumers cooperative is a friend of theirs. They may be striking a blow at monopoly, but they will destroy independent business before they get to monopoly. These independent businessmen whose survival is at stake are your friends and employers. If you work for the Government, they are the men who pay the taxes from which your salaries are paid. They are the men who have made the American system of economy the most productive in the world.

We believe that the independent is asking no more than everyday American fair play when he asks that his competition, whether it be cooperative, or any other form of business, pay the same taxes that he does.

Communism Called a Real Menace—Bores From Within

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Foote in the Bay City (Mich.) Times of May 14 and 15, 1946:

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times of May 14, 1946]

COMMUNISM CALLED A REAL MENACE—BORES FROM WITHIN

(This is the first of a series of stories on communism in the United States today, answering the query, "Is communism a menace?" By documented evidence, and from the mouths of accredited, dues-paying party members, it will be shown that a revolutionary movement exists in the United States exactly as envisioned by Karl Marx, and implemented in Russia by Lenin. Without branding the innocent, it will be proved that communism seeks to break down religions of all faiths and denominations, is attempting by Trojan-horse methods to infiltrate into all groups, races, and religions, including schools and colleges, political parties, the armed forces, and propaganda among the Negroes.)

(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON.—William Z. Foster, leader of the Communist Party in America, has decreed that communism shall emerge from the underground; that Communists everywhere shall nail their colors to the masthead and openly proclaim their allegiance to world revolution.

This bombastic announcement should be taken with a grain of salt. The Communists will never abandon their time-honored tactics of Trojan-horse methods and subtle infiltration. It means rather that they have thrown over the Browderism of the war period, when Russia and the United States were fighting side by side.

Foster's followers understand. They have merely been told in typically devious communistic lingo to redouble their efforts to turn society upside down and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat.

NUMERICALLY WEAK

Numerically weak, the Communists can and are accomplishing much by their methods of boring from within.

The Communist menace is real. Yet there is no occasion for panic or hysteria. People should be on guard against Communist doctrine and legislation unless they want to see government under the Constitution perish. They should first of all know what communism is:

Here is the definition from the constitution of the Communist Party, officially issued from their national headquarters in New York City:

"The Communist Party recognizes that the final abolition of exploitation and oppression, of economic crises and unemployment, or reaction and war, will be achieved only by the Socialist reorganization of society—by the common ownership and operation of the national economy under a government of the people led by the working class."

MAKE SUBTLE APPEAL

Note the subtle appeal of the first lines of his pronouncement. Nearly all political parties would rid the world of exploitation, oppression, economic crises, unemployment, and war. It's the method that counts.

David Shub, former editor of various Socialist and labor publications, now an editorial writer on the Jewish Daily Forward, in the book, Socialism, Fascism, Communism, says:

"The basic idea of dictatorial communism differs in no way from that of the Fascists. Both ridicule and condemn freedom and democracy. Both preach and practice a bloody dictatorship which seeks to divide the people, in one case in the name of class and in the other in the name of the Nation, to a mythical millenium."

MCCORMACK, Democratic leader of the House of Representatives, testifying before the House Military Affairs Committee on his bill to prohibit Communists from "inciting men in the Army and Navy to disobedience and revolt," summed up the purposes of the Communist Party in America on March 1, 1935, as follows:

PURPOSES SUMMED UP

1. The overthrow by force and violence of the republican form of government guaranteed under article IV, section 4, of the Federal Constitution.

2. The substitution of a Soviet form of government based on class domination to be achieved by abolition of elected representatives, both to the legislative and executive branches, as provided by article 1, by the several sections of article II of the same Constitution, and by the fourteenth amendment.

3. The confiscation of private property by governmental decree, without the due process of law and compensation guaranteed by the fifth amendment.

4. Restriction of the rights of religious freedom, of speech, and of the press, as guaranteed by the first amendment.

VIOLENCE IS BACKED

These specific purposes, by Communist admission, are not to be achieved by peaceful exercise of the ballot under constitutional

right but by revolutionary upheavals, by fomenting class hatred, by incitement of class warfare, and by other illegal, as well as legal methods.

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, speaking before the International Association of Chiefs of Police at Miami Beach, Fla., December 10, 1945, said:

"The Godless, truthless way of life that American Communists would force on America can mean only tyranny and oppression if they succeed. They are against the liberty which is America—they are for the license of their own. When they raise their false cry of unité, remember there can be no unity with the enemies of our way of life who are attempting to undermine our democratic institutions.

"The Fascist-minded tyrant whom we conquered on the battlefields is no different from the American communistic corruptionist who now uses the tricks of the confidence man until his forces are sufficiently strong to rise with arms in revolt.

"MUST BE ON GUARD

"America cannot exist half Communist or Fascist. If we want to improve upon our American form of government we will do it in our own way, in our own time, and with our own blueprint. Therefore, it behooves us to be on guard for an enemy that brazenly and openly has advocated the corruption of America, that spends sleepless nights working one propaganda line after another, that poses behind a dozen fronts, that squirms and twists his way into those great American forces such as the church, schools, and the ranks of labor."

If the reader wants more authoritative evidence of the methods of communism, here is a statement from Lenin, the great modern expounder of Marxian socialism. It is taken from Lenin's book Left-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder. Lenin says:

"We must be able to agree to any sacrifice, and then, if need be, to resort to all sorts of strategems, artifices, illegal methods, to evasions and subterfuges, only so as to get into the trade unions, and to carry on communistic work within them at all costs."

Again in the same book Lenin says:

"But revolutionaries who are unable to combine illegal forms of struggle with every form of legal struggle are poor revolutionaries indeed. It is not difficult to be a revolutionary when the revolution has already flared up and is raging, when everybody is joining the revolution just from infatuation, because it is the fashion, and sometimes even from careerist motives."

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times of May 15, 1946]

FOOTE FINDS AFL UNIONS FREER OF COMMUNISTIC TAINT THAN CIO

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the second of a series of stories on communism in the United States today, answering the question: Is communism a menace?).

(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON.—To what extent has communism infiltrated the ranks of union labor? Are many labor unions Communist-dominated?

Comparatively speaking, there are few Communists in labor unions. The vast majority of union men are fine, upstanding, loyal Americans. They are interested only in doing a good job, educating their children, supporting their families, improving their position in life by getting higher wages and better working conditions, and providing security for their old age.

But the influence of Communists in the labor movement is all out of proportion to their numbers. One disciplined, fanatical Communist is more effective in leadership and influence than 100 confused workmen. This renders the question of whether communism is a menace in labor unions extremely illusive.

By and large the AFL unions are much freer of the taint of communism than the CIO. The United Mine Workers, of which John L. Lewis is czar, bars Communists from membership, as do many AFL unions. Organizations which are often alleged to be permeated or dominated more or less by Communist members or leaders include:

The National Maritime Union headed by Curran, with membership on the east coast, and the longshoremen, headed by the notorious Harry Bridges on the west coast; the American Communications Association in York City; the Fur Workers Union headed by Gold; the transit workers, headed by Quill; the mine, mill, and smelter workers; the recently amalgamated Public Employees Union, and the United Electrical Workers Union, headed by Fitzgerald.

That CIO leaders recognize the danger of Communist domination and influence is proved by the fact that top CIO officials are today quietly preparing for what may soon become a noisy, all-out fight against the Communists. What touched off this fight was the attempt of the Reds to "horn in" on the CIO's campaign to unionize the South. Leaders of the right wing, planning the strategy of the battle, say they want to keep the southern campaign free of communistic influence, and clean house in other parts of the country. Van Bittner, United Steel Workers official, has been appointed director of the southern campaign. He and his associates are hand picking the organizers. "We want no outside assistance of any kind in our campaign to expand the CIO in the Southern States," he said. "Southerners are going to do the organizing—and they're going to do it along straight union lines."

The anti-Communist drive came into the open at the recent utility workers' convention. The union adopted a constitutional clause barring Communists, Nazis, and Fascists from membership. It also provides that former members of these parties cannot hold office in the union.

The utility workers went further than most CIO unions which have anti-Communist clauses on their constitutions; these unions now allow Communists to join but prohibit them from holding office. They take the position that they cannot withhold membership from persons employers hire, but can prevent them from obtaining positions of power in the union.

The Research Institute of America recently sent a report to its 30,000 members, warning them that under the leadership of William Z. Foster, the Communist Party "will push harder for widespread strikes—strikes which will be based on exaggerated charges and demands." The report, entitled "The Communist in Labor Relations Today," says the importance of the American Communist Party is widely misunderstood.

"American Communists live on one principle—Russia first," the report says. "The key to understanding Communist labor activities lies in the basic party philosophy which holds, in effect, that the end justifies the means. Communist strategy, tactics, and aims in labor relations gain force from the conviction of party members and fellow travelers that the Communist philosophy is the only road to a world of peace and plenty."

Business and management are vitally affected by tactical changes of Communist Party policy, which swings influence in some unions and dominates others.

"Foster," the report says, "will favor dramatizing strikes by mass picketing, disregard or injunctions, mass meetings, and violent shock tactics. In no sense can it be said that the recent strike wave in key industries was the result of a 'Communist plot.' Communists were involved, but there are many other factors in the strike flare-up."

The Communist, according to this report, turns seeming liabilities into strong assets. The frequently incorrect Dies reports and the high-handedness of the committee cast the Communists in the role of martyrs and helped the Communists to associate themselves with the non-Communist liberals, who also were singled out by the Dies committee.

"One of the most skillful achievements in modern public relations is the success with which the Communists have convinced many people that 'Red baiting' is a dangerous, devious, undemocratic procedure. By identifying all criticism—legitimate and otherwise—as 'Red baiting,' they have gained almost complete immunity to criticism."

Communists are able to play an important role in unions, the report holds, because "most labor organizations, particularly young ones, tend toward a high degree of factionalism." When factions clash, the report says, the Communists get into a balance of power position and thus influence policy.

It isn't easy to tell a comminated union from one innocent of the Red taint, the report admits. That's partly due to the fact "Communists find it easier to conceal their own identity because others have frequently been mislabeled as Communists."

Asking the question what can the employer do about it, the report answers: "With few exceptions, it is beyond the power of the employer, both legally and practically, to prevent Communists from controlling the union."

Against the Whole People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY CORDON
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 1 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Against the Whole People," from the Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg., of May 22, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGAINST THE WHOLE PEOPLE

In 1937 the then President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, made public a letter he had addressed to the president of the National Federation of Federal Employees. It contained this paragraph:

"Meticulous attention should be paid to the special relationships and obligations of public servants to the public itself and to the Government. All Government employees should realize that the process of collective bargaining, as usually understood, cannot be transplanted into the public service."

Mr. Roosevelt's assertion was in keeping with the views of previous Presidents of the United States, and in accordance with the findings of the courts and with public practice over many years. (Mr. Hoover, when President, had declared: "If civil servants are to strike, they are striking against the Government; they are striking against the entire people, and there is no right or justification for that.")

However, Mr. Roosevelt had gone so far in his support of labor legislation that in his case it came as a shock to his labor following, and as a surprise to unanalytical people in general, to find that he was as orthodox as his predecessors when it came to denial of the right of Government employees to use the strike as a weapon. Cynical folks made

many a quip about it. They said Mr. Roosevelt was like the doctor cauterizing his patient but burning his own finger.

It is not, however, so simple. There are legal intricacies involved which all of us should try to understand, in view of the new crises which are scheduled for later this week over the strike plans of the miners and the railway men. The Government already had acquired the railroads, and yesterday President Truman took the same fateful step with regard to the coal mines. If these actions are completed, that will move both strikes into the forbidden category, at least so far as previous practice—even the practice of Mr. Roosevelt—is concerned.

But why, precisely, are workers denied the strike simply because they are Government workers? Is it fair of the Government to seize private enterprises, such as the railroads and the coal mines, and thus deprive the workers of a strike privilege which previously had been theirs?

Where is the dividing line? If by seizure the Government can challenge the right of miners and railway employees, cannot the Government control the workers in every other business, great and small, in the country?

Fundamental to an understanding of these questions is a realization that no government can actually bind itself by contract. A government is an agency of the whole people, and there being no power equal to, or superior to, the people; then it is patent that the people can, at will, accept or reject the agreements of their governments. So striking employees, even though they appeared to win, would not in legal reality win a true contract. The people, if they desired, could alter the make-up of Congress and slash the wages and conditions of these workers.

There can be a contract between John Jones and the United States Steel Corp. They are equals before the law. But John Jones and the Federal Government are not equals. The latter represents the people and in the last analysis is all-powerful.

When one has clearly in mind the uselessness of striking against the Government, then the concept of actual illegality comes easily enough. The ultimate power—the people—can make illegal anything they wish to make illegal.

And in the general course of public business, this principle has become recognized. In an illuminating pamphlet on employee organizations in the public service, just issued by the National Civil Service League, 67 West Forty-fourth Street, New York City, it is pointed out that most Government employee organizations have openly renounced any claim to the right to strike. In Britain there is an actual act forbidding the strike in such Government businesses as gas, water, and electricity.

But whether specific or understood, the effect is the same. The principle is basic that one cannot strike against Government—that is, without the collapse of Government.

The present difficulty results from the fact that various industries and utilities essential to the life of the whole people have been left in the field of private business. So with the coal and the railroads. And the workers in these industries and utilities have declined to follow the example of actual Government employees. They have refused to renounce the strike as a weapon.

Yet without renunciation—renunciation in fact, whether or not vocally—the country can only be driven toward the acquisition of all such industries and utilities.

And when we use the phrase "all such industries and utilities" we admittedly beg the question of where an affair of this kind starts or ends. Obviously, the whole people cannot, without self-destruction, permit the permanent disruption of the police power, or the water supply, or communications, or transportation, or fuel. But modern economic organization is so complicated that the disentanglement of what is essential from what is not essential can only be left to the future.

This we do know: That use of the strike in industries and utilities which are unmistakably essential can only result in socialization or the complete confusion of society. In the railroad and coal situations the Nation is playing for keeps. Yesterday's seizure of the mines, following earlier seizure of the railroads, moves America closer to the inevitable showdown.

Address by Hon. James M. Mead, of New York, at Academic Convocation of Adelphi College, New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on June 1, 1946, at the academic convocation of Adelphi College, Garden City, Long Island, N. Y., celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the chartering of the college.

In attendance at this convocation were delegates from 142 American colleges and the graduates of Adelphi College.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. Eddy, distinguished guests and friends, I am highly honored at the action of Adelphi College in conferring upon me today the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws.

It is pleasant to look down from the rarefied atmosphere of such a platform as this and contemplate the bright faces of the graduates. You know that they have struggled for four long years, successfully surmounting all the snares and pitfalls their wily professors could lay in their path, and have emerged triumphantly at last to face the world and its responsibilities. In the process they have emerged from cheerful adolescence into manhood and womanhood, still hopeful but also a little frightened, it may be, at the thought that their learning and their talents are now about to be put to the test. Here they have been exposed to that golden mean in education preached by Terence in his comedy, The Adelphi, a golden mean that is still good after 2,000 years.

No less is it pleasant to look into the faces of the friends and relatives of the graduates, especially of their parents. They, too, have sacrificed, in the proud hope that their sons and daughters would be able to face life better equipped than themselves. One of the most significant things to be noted about the American people is their passion for education—and still more education.

It appears to be customary on such an occasion as this to admonish the graduates in respect to their future responsibilities, and to counsel them that the salvation of the world rests upon their shoulders. Well, of course, it does. But that is too obvious to dwell upon. It rested upon the shoulders of us oldsters in our time, too, and while the occasion invites confession of failure, I don't think we need to be altogether too humble about our own modest achievements. This is a better world today than it was, say in March of 1933—a date not altogether selected at random—but there is a good deal of room for further improvement, as these young women may already have discovered for themselves.

But rather than dwell upon the past, this day invites reflection upon the future of the educational process itself at a time when a multiplicity of problems that had their origin in the disruptions of war press heavily upon us. There is famine over much of the earth's surface. We have shortages of various kinds at home, problems of labor relations, of continuing employment at a high level, of housing, and finally of the readjustment of the veterans—both men and women—to the civilian environment. A solution of the latter problem depends in considerable degree upon finding solutions to all the others.

Thousands of these young men and women were called to the colors immediately upon their graduation from high school. Other thousands were called from college and university classrooms. All this was necessary and unavoidable, but we must recognize the injury inflicted not only upon the individual but upon the country itself because of the 4- or 5-year interruption in their education. Fortunately, that injury is not irreparable, if we act in time—the time being now.

The scarcity of young men and women trained in science, who are needed to carry on vitally important research in atomic energy, has been widely noted. A similar scarcity exists in every other field, including the social and political sciences, of men and women trained to carry forward the work of industry, medicine, the law, trade and commerce, and of government in our complex society.

In the GI bill of rights Congress sought to repair some of the damages. One provision of that act entitles the veteran to enroll at the college or university of his choice and to complete his education, the Government paying his tuition fees, within certain limits, and contributing meantime to his subsistence and the subsistence of his wife and children, if he has wife and children. Now, that was a simple act of justice to the veteran, but it was more than that. It was a measure in behalf of the common welfare, and in behalf of the national defense as well. Surely, I do not need to remind this audience that warfare has become so highly mechanized that it calls for a very high level of technical and scientific training for both men and women.

When we enacted the GI bill, however, we solved only half of the problem, and even that half will not stay solved unless we find a solution to the other half. We forgot that education presupposes not only the willing student but facilities for study and learning as well. We imposed a tremendous burden upon the colleges and universities of the country and then, unwittingly, I think, overlooked our further responsibility for sharing that burden.

Let me illustrate the size of the task ahead by recalling a few figures. In 1940, college and university enrollments in the United States totaled approximately 1,300,000, having almost doubled since 1926. If there had been no war and no GI bill of rights they would have continued to increase, as they always have in the past, for the demand for higher education continues to rise year by year.

More boys and girls are going to high school, a larger percentage of them are graduated, and a still larger percentage of the graduates each year want to go on to college. This is a reflection of our rising standard of living, as well as the growing awareness on the part of our youth of the importance of education under modern conditions.

The history of Adelphi coincides with this period of greatest growth. Adelphi was incorporated in 1896, and opened at Brooklyn

with 57 students under 16 teachers. By 1932 it enrolled 553 students. Today, it is twice that. For the country as a whole, college enrollments increased from 250,000 in 1900, to approximately 1,500,000 in 1941. In other words, while the population of the country was increasing by 55 percent, college attendance rose by 600 percent.

Up to about 1941 the colleges and universities were able to expand their facilities to keep pace with growth in the number of students. With the attack on Pearl Harbor, building came to a standstill. Construction of all kinds, except that vitally needed in the war effort—such, for example, as the facilities provided here at Adelphi for students of nursing—was stopped dead. New educational buildings, laboratories, and dormitories that normally would have been built if there had been no war simply were not built. Even certain essential maintenance operations had to be deferred because of material and labor shortages, so that buildings that were obsolescent in 1940 are wholly obsolete today. In addition, the financial resources of most of the colleges declined and costs of operation increased. They now find themselves poorer than they were in the face of the increased demands now thrust upon them.

This is especially true of the private institutions, without whose help the promises of the GI bill cannot be met. We should not forget that, historically, education in America was first a private enterprise. The earliest schools of any sort were instituted by private groups, usually religious groups. Only within the last hundred years has Government recognized an obligation for the instruction of youth, spurred on by the labor movement. It was the working men and women of America, let it be noted, who insisted upon, and fought for, equality of educational opportunities for the sons and daughters of the poor, as well as for the sons and the daughters of the rich. And it may be noted in passing that it was the industrial leaders of the 1840's who, for the most part, stanchly opposed the movement for equality in education. What need, they asked, had the son of the cobbler or the mechanic for learning? Let him stay in the humble place to which providence had called him.

Fortunately for American democracy the workers prevailed. Yet the private college retains its indispensable place in the field of higher education. Without supplementing its resources our promises to the veterans can never be redeemed.

It is well known that the colleges can barely pay operating expenses out of the tuition fees paid by students. Such fees have never yielded enough for capital improvements which, in the case of the private institution, have had to be financed out of the earnings of endowment funds—now at a dangerously low level—and through the gifts of alumni and other interested individuals.

In an address before the National Conference of Social Work at Buffalo last week, General Bradley, head of the Veterans' Administration, said that applications for training under the GI bill have skyrocketed to nearly two million in recent months, and predicted that veteran students would comprise by next autumn 75 percent of the crowded enrollment in men's colleges and from 30 to 50 percent in coeducational institutions.

The force of this impact can again be illustrated by the experience of Adelphi. More than 1,100 students enrolled in this institution last fall. A veterans' division, recently established, returns Adelphi to its old coeducational status. Three hundred veterans who will be admitted next semester will swell the enrollment for the 1946–47 academic year to more than 1,500. Dr. Eddy and the board of trustees are to be commended for this patriotic contribution to the cause of veterans' education. And yet I wonder where they are going to find room to put all these aspiring young men and women.

Indeed, where are any of the colleges to find space for the clamorous, rising tide of ambitious youth? The Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, after an exhaustive study of the problems of our educational institutions, reports that the maximum number that can possibly be accommodated with present facilities is about 1,600,000. It estimates the number who will enroll next fall, if facilities are available, at 2,080,000. General Bradley seems to predict a still higher estimate. But even the lower figure implies that nearly half a million prospective students would have to be turned away unless adequate measures are taken in the meantime. As a matter of fact, thousands upon thousands of veterans, fully qualified in every way, already have been rejected during the collegiate year now closing for lack of room.

What is the use of promising the veteran help in obtaining an education if, when he arrives on the campus, he finds the doors barred to him? It will not do to tell him that if he will come back in 4 or 5 years a place may be found for him. He wants to go to college now. The longer he is forced to wait the more will his desire for further training decline. In all probability he will never go, to his own detriment and to the loss of the country. With most of these veterans it is a case of now or never.

First to develop was the lack of living space in the college communities. There is an acute shortage of housing in college towns just as there is everywhere else. Moreover, living space suitable for one student 6 years ago will not now accommodate his wife and a child or two. At least a third of the men seeking education are married.

I proposed, as a temporary solution of the college-housing problem, that surplus temporary war housing, Army barracks, and other buildings be dismantled, removed to college communities, and reassembled as living quarters for veteran students and their families. Congress approved that proposal, appropriated in excess of $440,000,000, and the program is now being carried out.

But important and necessary as that was and is, it meets no part of the temporary need for additional classrooms and laboratories, and none of the continuing permanent need. Accordingly, I have introduced two bills in the Senate designed to complete the job. One would authorize the Federal Works Administrator to take over surplus Government buildings and make them available to the colleges, and, if necessary, transport them to colleges and universities where needed and reassemble and equip them to provide educational facilities. For this purpose I ask $100,000,000, or such funds as the Congress may find to be necessary.

A second bill is designed to meet the permanent need—educational authorities tell me that the peak demand from veterans will not be reached until 1950 or 1951, and after that there will be a continuing rising demand from high-school graduates. On this same point the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion estimates a total college enrollment of 3,000,000 by 1955—twice that of 1941—and even then the end would not be in sight. So I propose, in the second bill, to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to make loans and grants up to 50 percent of the cost to assist the colleges and universities to construct permanent buildings, both of classrooms and dormitories. For this purpose $250,000,000 would be authorized. Here we recognize the equitable principle that the benefiting institution should meet a just share of the cost.

If these two measures now pending are ultimately approved, the total expenditures brought about through the legislation will be in excess of $1,000,000,000 in public and private funds for housing and educational facilities.

Reliable reports indicate that colleges and universities have plans, either completed or in process of preparation, for new buildings to cost one and a half billion dollars. But the money they have for construction would finance less than half of such a program. The gap cannot be closed without help.

Hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor have been held on these measures. The need is here, it is all too apparent, and it must be met.

Since introducing these measures, I have introduced two additional amendments. The first authorizes the National Housing Administrator to permit the use of temporary housing at educational institutions not only for the servicemen but likewise for members of faculties and their families. A very serious situation has developed because under existing circumstances these institutions are unable to set aside housing for the accommodation of their teaching staffs. This must be corrected.

The other amendment authorizes the Federal Works Administrator to disassemble surplus structures and facilities and to salvage the equipment, materials, and furnishings therein. According to reliable evidence which has come to my attention, a sound program of salvaging building materials from our surplus Army installations and other surplus war facilities will go far toward smashing the black market in these critical construction items.

I have a report from the War Department showing that 32,308 Army buildings are now surplus, or will be by the end of this month, and that an additional 4,715 will be surplus by the end of 1946. And these are Army buildings only. The report does not take account of the thousands of structures which the Navy may have found to be surplus, or of thousands of others, erected by the Government for war purposes, many of which are standing idle. In this critical emergency it is not only foolish to permit those buildings to remain vacant in places where they are not needed but a serious waste of valuable assets.

I am pressing for action on this entire program at the present time because time is of the essence. If Congress will act quickly, at least within the next few weeks, and I believe it will, these surplus buildings can be installed and equipped where they are needed before the fall semester opens. But if we postpone decision for longer than a few weeks the promises we have made in good faith to thousands of our veterans, whose heroic sacrifices we were gratefully recognizing only day before yesterday, will turn out to be as empty as the wind and will engender only disillusionment and bitter cynicism.

I am optimistic over the possibility of early congressional action.

When we review the long past of education in America we see it as a stream swelling forward from the tiny trickle of two centuries ago into a mighty current constantly embracing more and more of our people. It has been the indispensable accompaniment of our democracy and the source of our industrial and political progress.

We have no more important tasks than to keep that stream moving forward to the end that it may be said with truth that no boy or girl in the United States, regardless of the economic status of his or her parents, shall be denied education up to the limit of his capacities.

If we do this, if we keep our promises to the returning service men and women, we shall assure the safety of America and its protection against the growth of any philosophies alien to our way of life.

Rules and Regulations for Radio Station Licensees With Regard to Programing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a speech delivered over CBS on Saturday night, June 1, 1946, by Judge Thurman Arnold, former member of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Judge Arnold's address was in reply to a recent speech delivered over the same network by CARROLL REECE, chairman of the Republican National Committee, in which Mr. REECE made an attack upon the report of the Federal Communications Commission outlining the responsibility of broadcast station licensees to operate in the public interest. The FCC report was said by Mr. REECE to be an encroachment upon freedom of speech. Inasmuch as Judge Arnold wrote the opinion of the circuit court in the famous Esquire case, which was upheld by the Supreme Court, I believe that his views on the FCC report are worthy of consideration. It should be noted that Judge Arnold spoke under the auspices of the American Civil Liberties Union. It would, therefore, appear that Mr. REECE's fears concerning the first amendment are groundless.

May I request unanimous consent to have Mr. Arnold's speech printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am going to talk tonight about a struggle now going on, the result of which may decide the fate of the radio as a forum of public discussion and education. Powerful radio and advertising interests are on the one side. The Federal Communications Commission of the United States is on the other. The issue in that fight is whether our great national highway of radio communication is to be used for the benefit of the public or whether it is to be treated as private property.

Only a limited number of persons can go into broadcasting. The Government is forced to decide between a large number of applicants who is to have the huge profits from these grants of the public domain. The amount of radio time is limited. The comparatively few broadcasters get their maximum profit if all the best hours are sold to advertisers. The public gets its maximum benefit only if an even chance at the best hours is given to education, public discussion, literature, and the best types of music in programs not controlled by any business interests. This is obvious, I think, unless you are one of those who believe that business interests should control public discussion and education.

The American Civil Liberties Union, whose views I am presenting tonight, has enlisted in this struggle on the side of the public interest. Perhaps you've heard of the Union. Its members come from every walk of life, every party, and every creed. They are united for one purpose only, to protect and preserve the fullest opportunity for free speech and public education in politics, in art, and in literature. They are particularly interested that minority groups have access to every public forum because they recognize that progress in ideas and in art have always begun with minority groups. The great public forum of the future is the air. Radio can bring opinions, music, science, and thought to every home in the land. It can bring the city to the country. It can promote the acceptance of new ideas necessary to live in a changing world. It can aid the fair appraisal of economic issues and the increased knowledge of foreign affairs necessary to insure wise leadership in a democracy. It can raise public taste by providing the best in music.

But the programs which sell the most goods may not be those which are the most educational, but those which seek the lowest common denominator of the radio audience. If these are permitted to dominate the forums of the air and destroy their function as educational and liberal forces, we will have taken a long step toward intellectual regimentation and stagnation. The American Civil Liberties Union has enlisted in the fight to see that this does not happen.

The American Civil Liberties Union is not opposed to advertising over the air. It recognizes that advertising is the sole support of this great national forum. England has tried a government monopoly, but that is not our way. Our task is to seek a balance between advertising on the one hand and education, information, and entertainment on the other, to see that the first supports but does not control the other. And that is what the shooting is about today.

The opening gun was fired by the Federal Communications Commission in a report issued March 7 of this year. The Commission proved the vast increase of low-grade commercialism in radio programs at the expense of discussion and education. This was not because the industry was hard up. Profits in radio have increased at a fabulous rate. In 1943 broadcasters as a whole made a profit of 157 percent on the depreciated cost of their property before taxes. In 1944 that profit was 222 percent. Yet the time devoted to the public education and the development of taste and ideas went down as the profits went up.

The Commission went on to compare the promises of the broadcasting companies when they applied for their license to their performance after they had received it. Instance was piled on instance to show that the temptation toward low-grade commercialism was too much for the broadcasters to resist. A simple common-sense remedy was proposed. The Commission announced that hereafter in issuing and in renewing the licenses of broadcasting stations it would give particular attention to the program service that the station had been giving the public. The Commission asserted that four factors would be taken into consideration in exercising its power to grant away the public domain for private profit. The first was the amount of sustaining or nonadvertising programs carried. These sustaining programs are principally the great programs provided by the national networks free to the stations. For example, "Operation Crossroads" over this network last week. But the local stations don't get any money for these sustaining programs. The second factor was the carrying of local live programs which developed local talent and gave opportunity for local expression of opinion. The third was the carrying of programs devoted to public issues. The fourth was the elimination of advertising excesses. The Commission followed the simple principle that this valuable public grant should be given to those who gave more public service in preference to those who gave less. The absence of such a standard in the past has been responsible for the abuses of our forums of the air. It is difficult to see how any rational man can quarrel with this sort of protection of the public interest, as a condition of a public grant.

As usual when a special interest with its feet in the trough is asked to move aside it always claims that the American system of free enterprise is in danger. I prosecuted monopolies for 6 years. The worse they were the more they shouted that free enterprise in America was in danger if their particular monopoly was destroyed. And so all the worn-out antigovernment cliches of the past 10 years were fired at the Commission.

Two weeks ago the Honorable CARROLL REECE, chairman of the Republican National Committee, threw the entire GOP at the Commission's head. He called their action typical of the bureaucratic state. He said:

"In the name of the 70,000,000 listeners we resent the arbitrary actions of seven self-appointed guardians of the listening public. For the benefit of the individual as well as for the benefit of the Nation American radio must be kept free."

What kind of freedom did he mean? He meant that if A, B, and C are asking for a quasi-monopoly grant over the air, the Commission should not take into consideration which one of the three would spend a part of his great profit in making the forum of the air a place of public discussion and educational advancement. Mr. REECE said that he did not care much for education and implied that it was censorship to promote it. I don't believe REECE can make the Republican Party swallow this nonsense. The New York Herald Tribune was one of the first Republican papers to repudiate REECE. Justin Miller, head of the National Association of Broadcasters, shouted this same sort of nonsense at the Commission. He is a Democrat and a former New Dealer. But I don't think Miller can put this over on his former associates any more than REECE.

What the broadcasters ask is that they be delegated the absolute power to decide the proportion of advertising and nonadvertising programs over the radio. Can anything be less American than to put the power to decide a public question in the hands of men who have a financial interest in the way the decision goes?

Suppose you owned a broadcasting station and had your choice of selling a valuable hour of time such as "Operation Crossroads" or giving it away for the public good. Suppose your stockholders were demanding the maximum dividends. Would you act like a hard-headed American businessman or would you play Santa Claus and give the public a program for which you receive no money. The answer is found over and over again, with example piled on example, in the report of the Federal Communications Commission.

The purpose of the great advertisers who support the radio is to sell goods. The Commission knows the importance of selling goods. But it also knows that power to determine what the American people should hear must not be exclusively delegated to men with a private financial ax to grind.

The broadcasters say that unless they have the power to determine the proportion of advertising programs they are being censored. If so, then every magazine is censored today. As a condition of obtaining a second-class mailing privilege—and without the second-class mailing privilege, the magazine cannot compete in the field—the law requires that a magazine be principally devoted to public information, science, art, or literature. Who determines the proportion that must be devoted to public information, science, art or literature and what proportion to advertising? The post office, not the magazine, lays down the proportion of advertising to nonadvertising matter required to meet that condition. This not censorship; it is sense.

The whole controversy can be clarified by an analogy. Suppose in a community there was a publicly owned town meeting house built for public discussion, education, and drama. Suppose that, in order to support that meeting house, the merchants were permitted to give programs advertising their goods. Suppose the mayor told them that as a condition of that privilege they must leave enough time so that the building could function at least in part as a forum of education and discussion. Would such a condition on the use of public property be unreasonable, or bureaucratic, or an assault on free enterprise. The problem is just that simple.

It is up to the intelligent radio listeners of America to see to it that private advertising interests do not get the power to take over our great town meeting house of the air.

The President's Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 3 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "This Is a Time for Cool Heads, Sober Judgment," published in the Washington Teamsters, of Seattle, Wash., of Friday, May 31, 1946. The editorial deals with the recent labor controversy. Although the Senate has made a decision on the matter, I think the editorial is a very timely one. I wish to read one paragraph of the editorial as follows:

Labor must not forget that over the years, during his service in Congress, President Truman made a splendid record of service to the common people. It is our judgment that he went too far in his recommendations. This one adverse step, however, must not outweigh his hundreds of favorable, friendly acts.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS A TIME FOR COOL HEADS, SOBER JUDGMENT

This is a time for cool heads and for calm and sober thought in all branches of our economic life—labor, management, Government, and the public—for we are all in the same boat. This is not a time for hysterical leadership which might take us into even more rugged waters, and perhaps pile us all up on the rocks. Let us not think this cannot happen to us; it can happen.

There is nothing new or strange about the present industrial unrest and uncertainty. It is a condition which has followed every great war. It is a part of the inevitable aftermath of a world struggle. There is real danger ahead only if we depart from our traditional and well-established path of democracy in a vain attempt to apply the philosophy of the defeated nations to our problems.

The teamsters have often enunciated this obvious truth: If business and industry are to be free, then labor must also be free. There cannot be slavery for one and liberty for the other. To the exact degree that labor is placed under the hated control of the bureaucrats will industry also be enslaved. If either loses its rights, free enterprise will not survive.

The teamsters union is committed to the system of free enterprise; it accepts the doctrine of the right of the individual to develop business and industry, and to earn therefrom a fair and reasonable profit. We believe in the profit system. Under our system we have achieved the highest standard of living for working people that the world has ever known. We have won two wars against powerful, regimented nations. Surely we have demonstrated that our way is most effective, the most successful.

Compulsion and restrictive legislation will never bring industrial peace in America.

Only in a land where every trace of liberty has vanished and where absolute control, backed by military power, rests in a few hands, has such a system the slightest chance of producing results. We do not believe the American people will ever tolerate such a revolutionary method, nor do we believe that even a Congrss hostile to organized working people will give it serious consideration.

Labor must not permit itself to be fooled by those who have opposed its interests and welfare over a long period of years but who, for political reasons, are now advocating its cause.

Labor must not forget that over the years, during his service in Congress, President Truman made a splendid record of service to the common people. It is our judgment that he went too far in his recommendations. This one adverse step, however, must not outweigh his hundreds of favorable, friendly acts.

It will be helpful if we place responsibility where it belongs. The Railway Labor Act failed to prevent the recent crisis; it helped create it. It failed, as will all similar legislation fail, because it enforced unreasonable delays in settling disputes, because it was subject to Government meddling and interference, because it emphasized so-called fact-finding boards, and because it required a cooling-off period which, as always, generated greater heat.

These facts speak for themselves: railroad workers are fourteenth in the long list of organized crafts, insofar as wages and working conditions are concerned. They were unable to make the unwieldy machinery of the act serve their minimum needs. They lagged far behind while free unions, through collective bargaining, made substantial gains.

Both the wage increases and the improvements in working conditions sought by the railroad workers—and the coal miners, as well—are entirely reasonable. They are not out of line with the gains made by other labor groups. They do not exceed simple justice.

If the railroad companies are actually in such financial condition that they cannot meet the cost of these necessary wage increases and improvements in working conditions, then they should be granted rate increases sufficient to carry the additional expense. The freight shippers and the passengers who use the rail facilities are not entitled to savings which are taken out of the hides of the rail employees.

As every economist knows, the wages of working people always lag behind the cost of living during periods of inflation like the present. Wage increases never cause inflation. Economic pressures first force prices up. It then becomes necessary for labor to insist on wage increases to compensate in part for the already decreased purchasing power of the dollar. Otherwise, those who toil will be driven into poverty.

The public should understand that OPA must be maintained if our country is to weather this period of economic stress, which is caused by consumer demand running far ahead of production. OPA must, of course, be administered upon the premise that industry is entitled to a fair profit. It must adjust its policies in harmony with this sound principle of free enterprise.

The public must also recognize the fact that if an orgy of rising prices and wild spending is permitted, inflation will be upon us. This will surely cause further labor disturbances, for labor must keep wages abreast of rising prices.

Above everything else, during this critical period, prices must be kept within reasonable limits by adequate controls, if we are to have industry-labor accord.

Members of Congress who seem so eager to impose heavy restrictions upon organizations of working people talk much about the public interest. They forget that the members of labor unions, and their families, comprise a substantial percentage of the public. Labor's welfare has never adversely affected the public interest. What is good for working people is also good for the great mass of common people.

The consequences of evil legislation will bear as heavily upon the public as upon organized labor. Just as surely, the death of free labor will see the end of our American free enterprise system.

It is necessary to understand the motives of those in Congress, and elsewhere, who would make unions impotent by law. They wish to drive wages down, to destroy good working conditions, to lengthen the hours of toil. That has always been their goal. It is the aim of all enemies of the unions. It explains why they are attempting to take advantage of the present hysteria in Washington to promote their pet schemes.

Out here on the western coast we have learned by years of experience that the American way is best. We have proved that cooperation between labor and management works to the great advantage of both, and that we can build lasting relationships upon the solid rock of mutual confidence, of pledges and agreements fulfilled to the letter, of decent respect for each other's rights and opinions. We have not, however, surrendered our right to strike, and we shall never do so. It is our weapon of last resort, to be used only when reason and fairness fail and when every avenue of peaceful settlement has been tried.

The present crisis in Congress impresses upon the mind of labor this outstanding fact: We must in the future devote far more attention and effort to the political field than ever before. We dare not depend upon political party hacks to defend our rights or to protect the welfare of our memberships; we have got to do that job ourselves—at the ballot box.

We repeat, this is a time to keep our feet firmly on the ground. It is a time to settle our differences by common sense, across the conference table.

The OPA and the Strike Wave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I assert without fear of successful contradiction that the OPA has become a lawless, corrupt enemy of free enterprise and free government. It is using the taxpayers' money to destroy all confidence in representative government, thus deliberately playing into the hands of the Communists now operating throughout the United States in an effort to destroy our form of government.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the views of Samuel Crowther, a noted economist, on the OPA as a strike-producing agency of government:

THE OPA AND THE STRIKE WAVE

The Office of Price Administration is indirectly responsible for the wave of strikes from which the country has suffered since VJ-day. It is directly responsible for the length and severity of the strikes and for the industrial chaos which has followed in their wake.

The record shows that the power to fix prices can be used as a power to destroy.

The policies followed have, by coincidence or otherwise, been exactly the policies of Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee, and the spearheads of the movement have been the darlings of the Communist Party—the unions in steel, automobiles, and electrical manufacturing.

The OPA has cooperated in a supreme drive against private ownership.

The course of events has been confusing. That is because the chief actors have themselves been confused.

The administration started off in one direction. Then, without warning, it started off in the opposite direction.

And now it is running around in circles.

Here is the background.

The Roosevelt administration, before the war, largely financed what the New Dealers called reforms by printing and distributing money. It financed the war largely by printing money.

The Truman administration seems determinent to continue these policies and to finance the world by printing money.

Our Nation's big job after VJ-day was to turn productive capacity from making war goods into making peace goods. That would not and could not prevent inflation.

But if goods had been forthcoming in large quantities, with the promise of more, there would have been no incentive to rush for goods at any price—especially if Government spending were at once cut down so that the Budget could be balanced and the money-printing presses junked.

But the picture was so plain that the crystal-ball boys in Washington would not see it.

The President was induced to plug for raising the unemployment allowance to $20 a week and the minimum wage from 40 cents to 65 cents an hour, for the increasing of Government salaries and for the full employment bill to create employment by subsidy.

If this new purchasing power were to be effective, prices had to be held at the old figures. That was the OPA job.

To carry out the program, controls were removed from wages and the information was allowed to trickle out from Washington that industry could raise wages by at least 10 to 20 percent without needing increased prices.

By what does not seem to have been a coincidence, the automobile union, the steel union, and the electrical workers' union made practically identical demands for large wage advances—larger than had ever before been asked. Then, with all possible speed, the unions went on strike.

By the end of 1945 and the early part of 1946, the Nation's industry, which should have been running full strength on peacetime goods, was tied up tighter than a drum.

As industrial concerns shifted from war to peace—and they did so with astonishing rapidity—they found that their costs, due to higher wages granted during the war and the higher costs of materials they were forced to buy, had greatly increased. Some went right ahead with manufacturing, applying to the OPA for new ceiling prices, while others waited for new ceiling prices before they began operations.

The OPA in many cases took no action, leaving the manufacturer in the air.

Where it did act, it mostly denied increases or made very slight increases, taking 1942 prices as a base but also projecting the future of each concern and relating that future back to show that, at the price granted, the company would earn as much profit as during the 1936–39 period.

The OPA fortune-telling division found no difficulty in charting futures for businessmen. The trouble was in getting the businessmen to take their words as inspired.

Of course, if one had not been in business in 1942, one could usually get a good fat ceiling price.

This created, as has been set out in previous articles, a new vested interest. But these interests knocked out only the small people whose affairs required little capital.

The big, basic industries required more money than the fly-by-nighter could raise.

Most reputable manufacturers found themselves with a few lines where the prices gave them a chance for a profit and many lines where they had no profit.

A survey of the Bridgeport, Conn., area disclosed that 48 percent of the concerns had to sell one or more items at less than cost to maintain trade positions; 72 percent had items on which they just broke even; and 63 percent had items on which they did a little better than break even.

Since finished products of any complexity are assembled from a considerable number of items made by different manufacturers, the OPA policy created bottlenecks in assembly and so finished goods did not reach the people.

On top of this condition came the demands for higher wages—which would further increase costs.

The OPA refused to promise higher price ceilings to cover the new wage demands.

The officials maintained, by their Washington formulas, that the companies would have profit enough to pay the wages. The employers knew otherwise. Hence the strikes could not be settled.

In January 1946 only 1,500,000 workers were unemployed instead of the lowest Washington prophecy of 6,000,000.

Then the administration shifted from fear of deflation to fear of inflation. But in the meantime the strike wave had been started and the OPA was holding its line by refusing to grant higher prices to cover higher wages.

The shift in policy came with the settlement of the steel strike.

This was directed by Washington and involved an 18½-cent rise in wages per hour, a $5 a ton increase in price and a new wage-price policy—which no one as yet understands—by which certain wage rises will be compensated by increased prices.

Whatever the policy may be, it is exactly the reverse of the purchasing power policy by which wages were to be forced up and prices kept down. But also it moves in a circle—like a merry-go-round.

The manufacturers who were losing money under the old OPA policy are, with still higher wage and material costs, losing more money—or waiting for decisions from the OPA statisticians and fortunetellers.

That is why the hardware stores are so bare, that is why so many common metal articles are either off the market or hard to buy.

That is why so many men are wondering if it is worth while to try to stay in business.

It all strips down to this. The OPA and the other planned economy boys in and out of the Government believed that the dumb public had to be protected from the dumb but greedy businessmen.

As a result, the public is not even getting what it needs—much less what it wants.

And neither the public nor industry knows where it is at.

Production and Cooperation

REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, the way out of the present dark situation of industrial disagreements and stoppages lies in all of us keeping our tempers and in doing our best to understand one another. Resentment kindles anger. Angry action is never wise.

What America needs and what America must have, is cooperation between employers, employees, and the rest of the consuming public. Without the ideas, the planning ability, and the financial investment and management of the employer the industry could not have been started in the first place. Without the desire of the employee to turn out a good and useful product, without his skilled know-how, without his desire to improve himself, and his job, quality products could not be turned out in quantity. Without the consuming public, the employer would get no profit, the employee would get no wages.

So, we are all in this economic system together. What affects one group, affects all groups. That is why fair dealing and wise policies are prime requisites today.

Let us see what lack of cooperation does and how we can go about cooperating for our mutual prosperity.

Idle factories produce no goods for Americans, let alone for anybody else in the world. Idle railroads take the means of earning a living from millions of Americans in addition to those employed by railroads, and in these tragic days, food with which to preserve the lives of millions of people in Europe and Asia is prohibited from reaching those starving people. Work stoppages at the coal mines cut deep into production in every line on the home front, and bring utter hopelessness to the desperate starvation areas abroad.

This lack of cooperation, as manifested in work stoppages, resulted in a recent announcement by the then Acting Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, that the United States fell 150,000 tons short on its relief exports of wheat and flour in the first week in May. Secretary of Agriculture Anderson said in the Progressive of May 20, 1946, it would be extremely difficult to meet shipping goals for the next 2 months.

Even if there were no rail stoppages and no coal stoppages, it would still be a tremendous task to get food into the mouths of the hungry. Fallow fields do not feed folks. And why do fields become fallow? With nearly 50 percent of the most efficient farm labor gone from the farm—some 30 percent because of the draft, and approximately 17 percent because the labor went into defense plants—American agriculture in the average farm State managed to produce larger food crops during the war than at any other time in the history of our Na-

tion. The farm machinery was the answer. Now, the boys have come back to the farms, the defense plants have disgorged their workers. Why cannot the farms produce as much or more than they did during the war? They cannot make bricks without straw. They cannot produce a bumper wheat crop without the necessary equipment, and most of the farm equipment is worn out or greatly reduced in efficiency. The Department of Agriculture says that some 2,000,000 tractors were turned out for domestic purposes during the late war. If such was the case, most of them must have been put to industrial, construction, mining, or other uses, because not many of them ever got to the farms where they were so desperately needed.

With the coming of peace, the farm implement industry was among the hardest hit by work stoppages. Their small backlog of steel was consumed quickly. Then, came the steel strike. With the steel settlement, the farm machinery manufacturers encountered their own labor difficulties. They were among the first affected.

No segment of American society can win when it arrays itself against many other groups, or against society as a whole. We all lose. Abraham Lincoln well described this very situation when he said during his debates with Stephen A. Douglas: "United we stand; divided we fall." An old folk-fable emphasizes it. You remember the story of the woodsman who tried to break a bundle of fagots over his knee. The bundle resisted his most vigorous efforts. Then he ripped the bundle of fagots apart and broke them one by one. Divided we are vulnerable. When we cooperate, we are invincible. Hitler recognized that axiom in his planned destruction of our civilization. His motto was: "Divide and conquer."

All about us we hear demands for drastic controls of our production machine. The popular temper is at the boiling point. It is as if the old flag of the Revolutionary War had again been raised—the flag with the coiled serpent and blazoned underneath these words: "Don't tread on me." It is reflected in President Truman's May 25 speech to Congress. It is mirrored in the grim certainty that Congress will itself pass restrictive legislation.

It is significant that among the first voices raised against such prospective Congressional action were those of leaders who have oftenest counseled strikes. They cry out that corrective legislation is the first step toward fascism. The first step toward fascism, nazism, or communism—by whatever name you chose to call totalitarianism and dictatorship—is the domination of a nation by the will of a segment against that nation. This always will be true whether that ruling segment is industry or labor or some other powerful group. There is a common good which must be served.

There is no doubt that the stoppages of work must be controlled, both on a short-term and a long-term basis. There is no doubt that minorities, unwisely led, must be prevented from burning out the bearings of our production machine in their mistaken and misdirected self-interest. We must not retreat from our determination to cooperate among ourselves to make reconversion a reality, peace a fact, and a continued American prosperity an actuality.

To act in undue haste at this time would be as great a national catastrophe as deliberately to delay action. We have the right idea—to curb economic suicide in the United States. But, by consciously leaving out the element of cooperation, we are exposing ourselves to still another peril. By going too far, and striking at, instead of dealing with, the parties to industrial disputes, we open our gates to the possibility of extending drastic measures to cover still other groups, whose motives may not be all selfish. There is the germ of a disease which might destroy free government in hastily considered group legislation. We must not let that happen.

When intelligent, firm, labor legislation is passed, without paving the way for encroachments upon individual liberty, then cooperation will come closer to being realized.

Popular opinion made better citizens of what President Theodore Roosevelt called "malefactors of great wealth." Popular opinion may yet make better citizens of these men who today are malefactors of great power. It may be that they have already learned the inherent truth of the old proverb: "There is no fiercer foeman than a peaceful man aroused." The American public is a peaceful, long-suffering public. It is evident that it is now aroused.

This public will no longer take supinely such statements as that of Harry Bridges, president of the longshoremen's union, CIO, "If all CIO members could understand what united political action means, there might not be any more employers or private industry in the United States." This shows definitely that this alien, whom the Congress has ordered deported, which order was nullified by the Supreme Court, would destroy constitutional government and set up in its place a dictatorship under the banner of the red flag.

Perhaps, in the light of current events, he will think twice before further inflaming American public opinion. It is not too late, even after what he has said, for the beginning of cooperation.

Finally, it must be realized immediately that work stoppages in any of the basic industries—coal, steel, railroads, shipping, power—are strikes against the whole people as well as against the Government, and must be treated as such. They are strikes against the vital welfare of the people and the people are the Government.

We have fought our labor disputes in the open, in the press, and over the radio. We have labor-relations boards, mediation boards, fact-finding boards, the arbitrators of the Department of Labor. Our President has met with labor leaders. He has explained to them; he has appealed to them; he has condemned them.

Now it is up to public opinion. These labor leaders who flaunt public opinion do so at their peril. Those who recognize its strength and its righteousness will profit by it. It is with those intelligent labor leaders that management and the consuming public are ready and willing to cooperate. Such cooperation will be to our mutual profit. And it will be a type of relationship in which all parties respect all other parties involved. Labor must have every right and every privilege every other citizen has. More than that it cannot expect.

We have, less than a year ago, emerged victorious from the bloodiest, the most destructive war in the history of the world. We won that war by working and fighting by the side of our allies; by cooperation among ourselves and with other peoples. We must become aware that today, to each one of us, all Americans are our allies and that cooperation is the only feasible plan for winning the battle of peace.

[From the Washington Daily News of June 1, 1946]

DANGEROUS GAME

A British Labor leader, Sir Walter Citrine, has just told a New York audience that passing restrictive labor legislation is a very dangerous game to play.

He added that labor's responsibility should grow with power, but that "I have not yet seen any legislation that could restrain any trade-union movement if the movement wanted to act."

His remarks may offend Americans who interpret them as British meddling in our current troubles. He disclaimed any such intent. And what he said is good for Americans to hear, for it is true.

Writing laws to govern labor does involve danger. If such laws are savage and unfair, a justly resentful labor movement will want to act, and probably will act destructively.

But this does not mean that fair and reasonable laws are impossible or unnecessary.

In this country labor irresponsibility has grown with fast-expanding power. That growth has been fostered by laws and policies deliberately designed to make labor mighty yet keep it free of legal restraints. A few union bosses now have monopolistic power to strangle our whole economy. When they use it, our Government can only beg them to go easy, or bluff them with stern words not backed by law, or appease them temporarily with dubious deals.

British labor, Sir Walter Citrine says, practiced great self-restraint through six war years. Though eager now to get back to free bargaining on wages and hours, it has "wisely acceded to compulsory arbitration for a further period. * * * Thus far we have been blessed with comparatively few industrial disputes. * * * The healthiest symptom in Britain has been the readiness of trade unions to accept their own responsibilities."

Would that such words could be said of American labor. Because they cannot, America must play the dangerous game as safely as it can, since no hope appears that labor responsibility will prevail until legal penalties are provided for irresponsible acts. And so the Case bill is on President Truman's desk. And toward it most of labor's leaders and their pseudo-liberal supporters are taking a terribly irresponsible and dangerous attitude.

As amended by the Senate, the bill is not savage, not unfair, not menacing to honest labor's cause, not stronger than the situation calls for. It does not justify resentment. It will not injure any decent union, or take essential rights from any worker. Those who clamor for a veto should be urging Mr. Truman to make it law, and counseling labor to obey it willingly.

If this bill does not become law, the country must go on with no protection save, perhaps, a fragment of the drastic emergency authority Mr. Truman asked. Then abuses of labor's power will bring crisis after crisis,

each increasing public wrath. And some day soon the dangerous game will be played dangerously; stern laws will be enacted, not with intent to save labor's rights from self-destruction, but with determination to shackle unionism before it wrecks the nation.

Building Record for First Quarter Reveals Need for Housing Program—Permits Were Hunting Licenses—Veterans Still Need Homes

REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Friday, May 31, in the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, the minority floor leader, the Honorable JOE MARTIN, this House was led to the assumption that private industry could meet the Nation's building needs much faster if left alone than if hampered by a Government program designed to aid its efforts, such as the President's program to provide housing for veterans.

My colleague cited the fact that during the first quarter of 1946 more than 171,000 building permits were issued as proof of his contention that no veterans' program is needed. For the further enlightenment of the House I wish that he had seen fit to go more thoroughly into the characteristics of those 171,000 permits to see how they answered the housing needs of the Nation.

In the first place, a building permit is little more than a hunting license in today's critical shortage of materials. It is no proof that construction of a house has started. Actually, the most optimistic estimates are that 153,000 houses were started during the first quarter of 1946. There were 35,000 starts in January and 40,000 in February. But in March the number started jumped to 78,000—nearly double the previous month's figures.

What was the reason for this abnormal jump? If my colleague would care to examine those March permits he would find that most of them were for homes which the builders knew would never qualify under the standards of a housing plan designed to meet the most urgent needs of the Nation. Many of the speculators knew that such a program was coming up, and they were making desperate efforts to beat the gun.

I think my colleague will agree with most Americans that the need to house our returning servicemen should be of first priority to the Nation and to the building industry. Yet, if he will examine these March permits, he will find a great percentage of them were granted to build homes for nonveterans in the higher money brackets—homes so high in price as to be completely out of the reach of the returning GI who was desperately needing a place to live. I do not believe that that was the kind of a housing program that we or the building industry want.

I would like to ask him to look again at those figures to find out how many of those houses were for rent, and how many for sale. All of us know that many returning veterans have no business purchasing a home, and no desire to do so, until they have found a job and have reestablished themselves firmly in civilian life again. Yet, of these 153,000 starts, less than 20 percent were for bona fide rentals. That estimate is based on the applications for priorities for materials—probably the most accurate indication of the eventual use of the property.

There are several other facts about these figures. Some of the houses which were actually started are only 60 to 70 percent finished today, because of the shortage of materials, which private industry has not yet been able to provide. It is estimated that the average completion time for a dwelling, normally 3 months, has risen to a 7 or 8 months' period—again because of materials shortages.

As a matter of fact, the greatest lesson this 3 months' experience has taught us is that the present rate of production of building materials is totally inadequate to produce the homes we need. Therefore, the President's housing program would be absolutely essential if for no other reason than the necessity for speeding the production of building materials to overcome the housing crisis. No truer words have been spoken in connection with our shortage of homes than Mr. Wilson Wyatt's statement that homes as usual and building as usual and business as usual will not house our veterans.

It was for this reason that the Congress saw fit to authorize $400,000,000 for premium payments so that the Government might lend a helping hand to the building industry, as it did to other industries suffering similar shortages during the war. This aid is essential to produce the billions of feet of lumber and the vast quantities of brick and pipe and other materials which we will need to build 2,700,000 homes in the next 18 months. Only through that incentive will factories go on three shifts, will lumber mills stretch their production to their utmost capacity, and the fabricating industries strive for the same tremendous production that brought us victory.

Of course, in time, doubling production of building materials alone would solve the housing crisis for everyone; but the veterans who have been away for four long years are coming home now—are coming home by the hundreds of thousands. They need homes, not next year, but now. What could be more just than to give them priorities on finding a place to live? That cannot be done effectively and efficiently except through the President's program. Until production can catch up, scarce materials must be channeled into low-cost homes—the kind that the average veteran can afford.

My colleague's statement in itself has shown conclusively, by citing the building activity of the first 3 months of this year, that private industry has not given veterans first priority. It has not taken the steps to channel scarce material into low-cost homes, and has been totally inadequate in meeting the construction needs of the Nation.

It is only through the Government taking swift and energetic leadership, as it did during the war, through the practical housing program that Congress saw fit to pass, that we will ever accomplish the unprecedented task we have set for ourselves in bringing decent homes to our returning warriors.

Trend of Communism in the United States Today

REMARKS
OF
HON. DAN R. McGEHEE
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, this country of ours was founded on and has lived under pure democratic principles, more so than any other country in the world. A great majority of the people of our Nation are still imbued with the fundamental principles under which it was organized and set forth in the Constitution adopted by its leadership in the formation of the Union. They have enjoyed a freedom, liberty, and independence as no other people in the world have, but they are disturbed today on account of the trend of world affairs which, of course, in the future, if not properly solved are going to vitally affect not only our present generation but generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, we only have to pick up the morning paper and the information that we receive of the disturbing factors which affect every phase of human life, portrays to us why the unsettled condition of the minds of the people of our country at present.

For instance, in the morning paper, in the first column, is revealed to us the growing danger of the increased spread of communism throughout the world. In this column we find the headlines "Paris area Communists lose four seats in Assembly." It further says, "Communist Party moving into an early lead in Sunday's national election for representatives to a second constituent assembly," and reveals the election of Edouard Herriot, Radical Socialist leader, and Pierre Mendes-France, France's financial expert at the Bretton Woods monetary conference.

Now what is true in the election in France is also true in practically every other election held throughout Europe wherein rank Socialists and Communists are being elected and will practically dominate their legislative bodies. Mr. Speaker, that tendency is growing here. In talking with a student of one of the city's universities a few days ago, she revealed to me the numerous pamphlets and circulars which are being distributed among the student body on communism. Poisoning the young minds of free Americans, a situation which should be stopped, because the principles and dogmas of the Communist Party are absolutely contrary to Americanism and its further activity should be outlawed in

this country. If not, in my opinion, it is only a short time in the future until they will make inroads into our citizenship to the extent it will become a national menace.

Mr. Speaker, we read in the next column of the morning's paper that a Nation-wide maritime strike is set for June 15, which is being called by one Harry Bridges, heading the west-coast longshoremen, and Curran of the east coast. May I call the attention of the membership to the fact that this House passed two bills some 3 or 4 years ago, the purport of which was to deport Harry Bridges and send him back to the land from whence he came, because he is a known Communist and a fellow worker with them. These bills were sent to the Senate and in each instance no action was taken whatever.

It is generally known that Curran also leans far to the left side, yet the newspapers reveal that the Communist wing of his organization has control of it. In the event of the national maritime strike, we know what it means—it will stymie our whole economic set-up. Hence, I am saying to the Congress, How long will it be before we are going to take action to thwart the activities of the Communists of this country?

Mr. Speaker, in another column on the front page of today's paper we notice that the atom research by the Soviet has top priority. The papers need not have revealed that to us, as it is too fresh in our memory of the action of the Communists in Canada a few weeks ago, wherein every effort was made to secure all the information possible for the production of the atomic bomb. We know too well that in the event they are successful in either acquiring the formula for its production from us, or should their scientists eventually be able to make same, it is only a question of time when we will experience a second Pearl Harbor, only on a scale which would practically destroy the civilization of this country, for Stalin, on the day of his election a few months ago, said we were the only capitalistic Nation remaining—the only Nation where free enterprise and opportunity were left for its people, and that the philosophies of communism and that of our Nation were diametrically opposed to each other and both could not exist.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that our Nation told the Russian Nation to join with us and let us work out a world peace, world harmony, and world friendship, and if they do not join hands with us, then use every power within our command to enforce it.

When you turn to the next page of the morning paper, you see it is reported that the UN delegates recommend a break with Spain. Why do they do this? It is because the Soviet Union is desirous of destroying Spain, because they were unsuccessful in their effort to defeat Franco in the civil war of a few years ago. It may be that Spain under Franco's rule is under somewhat of a Fascist regime, but certainly it is not as dangerous to the peace of the world as communism and the teachings and philosophies of the Soviet Union.

In my opinion, we should not forget the part played during the catastrophe of World War II, when Franco, the leader of the Spanish Republic, refused to participate in this war, thereby enabling the navies and ships of the Allied cause to have open and free access of the Mediterranean through the Straits of Gibraltar, wherein we struck the first blow paving the way for the final destruction of Hitler's dream of world dominion. Hence, I think there should be some appreciation by the leadership of the Allied Nations for the firm stand taken by Franco and not permitting Hitler to cross his borders and be in a position to control the Straits of Gibraltar.

Mr. Speaker, in another column, we note "the unsettled cases may delay vacation for Supreme Court." The great majority of the people of this country have certainly not had any faith or confidence in a great number of decisions handed down by this Court in the past 8 or 10 years. We note there is pending, and the Court will likely render a decision in, the case of three Federal employees who were removed from the Government pay roll by a special act of the House and Senate. The House and Senate at that time, acting on the belief and positive proof that these three Federal employees were un-American in their belief, their philosophies and teachings, hence evidenced their disapproval of people of these ideologies remaining as Government employees and living on the taxpayers' moneys to continue their teachings of un-Americanism. We shall await and see what we shall see when this Court renders their opinion.

Mr. Speaker, a great majority of the membership of both branches of the Congress still feel that way, but what we need is more active and direct manifestations of our feelings to stop this tendency in our country. I am saying the people are beginning to wake up and realize the true situation our country is facing today. The complacency which they have apparently gone along with will soon awaken into a fiery demand for action on each and every individual's part to thwart the further progress down the pathway we are traveling.

Who's in the Party Line?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, there have been some unkind words in and out of Congress about party discipline. Leaders of both the Democratic and Republican Parties have been assailed for suggestions that following party commitments might be a good idea.

The reasons for the talk about party discipline are made clear in the following editorial from the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser, a part of which I am inserting in the RECORD:

PARTY LOYALTY IN CONGRESS

The Advertiser has protested repeatedly against the way certain Congressmen have joined Republicans consistently in blocking the legislative leadership of the Democratic administration. Obviously there are times when a man's convictions should lead him to break with his party, but when he makes a practice of joining the Republicans on major votes, there is reason for concern on the part of his constituents.

Press Research, an authoritative Washington service, has just released a careful study of the voting practices of the Members of the House. This reveals that lack of party loyalty is not restricted to the Democrats alone, but that Democrats are more guilty than Republicans. Here are the figures:

	Democrats	Republicans
	Percent	*Percent*
1. Usually vote with party	44.7	63.4
2. Sometimes vote with party, sometimes against it	40.1	31.4
3. Often vote against party	15.2	5.2

Of still greater interest to Alabamians is a classification of Congressmen as to party voting loyalty. This is based upon an analysis of party voting, by party membership, in the House from the beginning of the Seventy-ninth Congress, January 3, 1945, until the Easter recess, April 18, 1946. The study included 57 record votes in which the majority of the House Republicans voted against a majority of the Democrats. On these issues party policy was assumed to be the line followed by the party majority. Votes in which the intraparty split was so even that there was no clear-cut majority were excluded from the study. Absenteeism was not weighed in the results.

It was found that only 27 Democrats, as against 16 Republicans, could be classified as "party-liners," men who had not voted against the party majority on a single one of the controversial issues.

Emergency by Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, May 25, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the opinion of a prominent economist, Samuel Crowther, with reference to the contribution of OPA to the housing shortage is a revealing statement of facts.

I am inserting, under unanimous consent, the statement of Mr. Crowther with reference to the housing shortage:

EMERGENCY BY ORDER

The housing situation gives a perfect example of how Government interference can create an emergency out of what would otherwise be just one more problem for men to tackle and solve.

Government officers, by their lurid pronouncements on housing shortages, on prices and on inflation, and by their rigid rent and material controls, have made black markets in rents and building materials, scared tenants and builders into paying heavy graft, and forced honest landlords and builders to all but stop renting and building.

The housing situation also gives a perfect example of how the failure of bureaucratic control can be twisted and sentimentalized so

that the failure appears not as a reason for chucking the controls but as a compelling reason for more and wider controls.

The administration is now using the failures of a dozen years of Government dabbling in houses, the failure of rent control, and the failure of price control as proof that it needs to be given more power.

Using the returning veterans as scenery, it has put forward a grandiose program under which it proposes, by peeling from a big wad of printing-press money, to provide fine, low-cost housing for everyone.

The men who are making these proposals may or may not know that, in the name of helping the needy and promoting the general welfare, they are asking for the socialization of housing. This translates into asking for the control of nearly a third of our economy.

If the Congress continues the present OPA controls and enacts the administration's housing bill, it will have started us down a road of regimentation from which there can be no turning.

This analysis may seem harsh and unsympathetic, but it is safe to say that there is not a presently crowded city or community which would not find accommodations for everyone, if profit were restored to renting.

With controls off, tenants would have a freedom of choice which they do not have and, considering the bonuses which are now nearly everywhere being paid aside and under the table, rents would be bound to adjust themselves, in some cases upward but in most cases downward, to the worth of the premises.

The plain fact is that in renting and building, the people are being persuaded to ask for the impossible and so they are getting less than the possible.

The Government is not making an honest representation.

It has printed vastly more dollars than there are things to buy with the dollars and so dollars are gradually losing their buying power—that is, prices are rising.

A man who is getting twice as much today for the same kind of work that he did 5 or 6 years ago cannot expect that his dollar will buy as much as it did 5 or 6 years ago.

The 1946 dollar will not buy housing at 1940 prices. Everyone knows that and nearly everyone knows that where materials are available—which is now seldom—it costs a builder from ten to twelve thousand dollars to duplicate a house he put up for $5,000 in 1940, and the new house will not be made of as good material as the old one.

A $10,000 house cannot be rented for the same price as a $5,000 house.

The same holds true for apartment houses. In New York City the old $60 apartment in a new building has to be a $100 apartment. And about the same rule holds true throughout the country.

The decent, low-priced apartment has gone the way of the 5-cent shine and the 15-cent haircut.

The Government cannot change this situation. It can put up housing and rent it for less than cost. But that only means the tenant pays less at the rent window and more at the tax window.

There is a housing shortage, but no one knows how great the shortage is and no one can know, for the adequacy of housing depends upon the standard of living.

During the war period more than 15,000,000 people shifted their residences. An unknown number of families who doubled up during the deep depression would like to separate again.

From 1942 through 1945 there were 6,500,000 marriages, including those of 1,500,000 servicemen, with a gain in new households of 1,500,000.

The National Housing Agency estimates that 39 percent of the housing in the Nation is substandard, and the 1940 census shows that about 46 percent of the 37,000,000 dwelling units then in existence were in need of major repairs.

One may do anything one likes with these figures. The Federal Public Housing Administration estimates that 16,000,000 new dwelling units will be required within the next 10 years to conserve the health of the Nation.

It is always possible to get together the facts on which to proclaim some kind of housing emergency.

Mrs. Roosevelt and Dr. Tugwell found one in the early days of the Roosevelt administration when they began putting up little communal villages.

President Roosevelt found one-third of the Nation ill-clothed, ill-housed and ill-fed. The Federal Housing Administration was organized to promote building by guaranteeing mortgages.

The Federal Government has for many years been closing in on the financial side of residential building, and the old speculative builder is pretty much a thing of the past—that is, much of the individual incentive has long since been taken out of building.

A war order issued April 1942, practically stopped residential building and there would today, in any event, be an acute shortage of desirable new residences. The OPA has turned this shortage into an emergency by practically tying up the manufacture of building material through ceiling prices that did not cover costs. In some cases, as in the lumber industry, the ceiling prices were such as to divert the mills from making the sizes of lumber used in building.

The situation is fairly set out in these extracts from a letter written in January of this year by the Lewis Manufacturing Co. of Bay City, Mich. Mr. T. P. Dixon, the president writes:

"In the face of the greatest demand for moderate priced homes this country has ever known, our factory stands practically idle. Up until 1942, at which time civilian homebuilding was practically stopped to conserve materials for war purposes, we manufactured and shipped from 600 to 750 complete homes annually.

"Our factory employment ran around 200 men and our office personnel was around 50. Today our factory employment is 35, most of whom are doing nonproductive work, and whom we are only retaining because they have worked for us continually for from 15 to 40 years. The same exists in our office.

"The same price set-up that was created during the war for the specific purpose of stopping or discouraging production of lumber items for house construction remains in effect.

"As a consequence, the mills continue to produce premium price items suitable for ship decking, heavy construction, airplane stock, etc., and refuse to produce such items of small dimension, flooring, ceiling, siding, trim, etc., as the ceiling prices on same are too low to allow their production on a profitable basis."

Exactly the same conditions obtain—or have obtained most of the months since VJ-day—in soil pipe, gypsum lath, asbestos cement, and asphalt products, shingles, insulating board, radiators, radiator valves, and in practically all of the supplies needed for building. Some of these supplies can be bought at high prices in the black markets and some builders have had to truck 500 or 1,000 miles for minor items.

In addition to this, wage rates have gone very high, while the skill and efficiency of the workers available seem to have dropped. One builder reports that a job which three men used to do in a day now takes seven men from 2 to 3 days.

The OPA, by its price policy on materials, shut off private building when it was most needed and, by its rent-control policy, made renting a hazard at a time when quarters to rent were most needed. It is these actions which have created the emergency.

The Administration plan advanced by Mr. Wilson W. Wyatt, with the attractive title of housing expeditor, is complicated and its exact provisions are not here important.

The important point is that it seeks through subsidy behind the scenes to present a $10,000 house as a $6,000 house and to rent it for not over $50 a month—that is, it seeks to preserve the appearance of things and to present the Government as a fairy god-mother by shifting the cost of building and renting from the home owner or tenant to the general public, either directly by taxes or indirectly through the public debt.

That is government by mirrors.

Aluminum Cartel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herein an article by myself dealing with the aluminum cartel and appearing in the May issue of This Month magazine. It is as follows:

ALCOA—PORTRAIT OF A CARTEL

(By Representative John M. Coffee)

International cartels are economic arrangements among private interests of several countries for the purpose of regulating and controlling industry and trade. They are the extension into the international sphere of big national monopolies. In 1939 there were 179 international cartels, of which 109 included American concerns.

One of the most powerful of these was the aluminum cartel. Its history, like that of many others, is a long record of international intrigue: price fixing, division of markets, drastic limitation of production, and organized throat cutting of outside competition.

The rise of the Nazis to power in Germany showed how such commercial conspiracies against the consumer public can become a threat to the very existence of great nations. The aluminum cartel was an important factor in the building of the Nazi war machine. It gave wings to the Luftwaffe, supplied the bombs which blasted our allies. At the same time the cartel's policies of restricted production worked for the enemy by aggravating the shortage of vital materials necessary for the defense of France, Britain, and the United States. These policies did not bring the democracies to defeat, but they did delay the day of final victory at a cost of countless American and Allied lives.

In this aluminum cartel, the interests of Alcoa, the Aluminum Co. of America, were represented in three successive forms: (1) directly; (2) through a subsidiary; (3) through its wholly independent offspring, Aluminum Ltd. of Canada.

The story of Alcoa is a graphic study in cause and effect, with the American public cast in the historic role of the unhappy guinea pig, all in the interests of big business and bigger profits.

By 1896 Alcoa, a lusty 8-year-old infant, had completed the first stages of its development into a monopoly of the aluminum industry in the United States. Its only competitor in the American market at the time was a Swiss company. In that year Alcoa negotiated an agreement with the Swiss whereby the latter abandoned the American market, and Alcoa in turn agreed not to sell

aluminum in Switzerland, Germany, or Austria-Hungary.

In 1901 A. V. Davis, present chairman of the board of Alcoa, participated in the formation of a much broader cartel which included one British and two French companies. Realizing that such an agreement, if Alcoa were a direct party, would violate the Sherman Anti-trust Act, Davis announced the formation of an Alcoa-owned Canadian subsidiary, which later took the name of the Northern Aluminum Co. Two days after this announcement, Davis signed the cartel agreement on behalf of this as-yet-unincorporated subsidiary.

The new cartel divided the world into open and closed markets, fixed the price of aluminum. The United States was reserved exclusively for Northern; the Alcoa subsidiary was also guaranteed 21 percent of the sale of aluminum in foreign markets. All of which was very generous, considering that Northern, as yet unborn, owned no facilities for producing any metal.

Effect: Imports of foreign aluminum into the United States decreased, the price here rose from 33 cents (1897) to 40 cents (1906) per pound. During the same period Alcoa's production increased 4½ times—its profits multiplied 14 times.

In 1906 this cartel agreement was renewed. Two years later it was terminated because the cartel members could not agree among themselves on the need for a general price reduction to combat new European competition. Davis of Alcoa vigorously fought the price reduction. When he was defeated, he took Alcoa's subsidiary, Northern Aluminum, out of the combine.

Effect: Imports of aluminum into the United States increased from 113,755 pounds (1908) to 2,035,907 pounds (1909) and to 12,386,897 pounds (1910). Alcoa's price in the United States was steadily driven down from 35 cents a pound in 1907 to 19 cents in 1911. Actual selling prices that year dropped to 16½ or 17 cents, the lowest point up to 1937, when the Government brought its latest antitrust suit against the company.

A new cartel agreement could have halted this price war, but Alcoa was in a very delicate position. The Department of Justice in 1911 had begun an investigation of the company's activities. Early in 1912 Davis obtained an interview with Assistant Attorney General Fowler. Explaining that there was no profit in selling at the current market prices, Davis asked permission to enter into an arrangement with foreign producers which would have nothing to do with imports into, or exports from, the United States.

The Government has charged that this last statement was purposely misleading, that subsequent events showed that such agreements had a profound effect on imports and exports of aluminum. Naturally, Davis forgot to mention the fact that, up to 1912, Alcoa had earned $33,000,000 on a paid-in investment averaging $2,000,000. Nor did he remember to state that Alcoa's annual return on average invested capital from 1909 to the time of his meeting with Fowler averaged 17.6 percent.

Obtaining Fowler's assent to his proposition, Davis immediately went abroad and executed, on behalf of his Canadian subsidiary, a new cartel agreement with French, British, and Italian aluminum producers. The new agreement fixed sales quotas, allotting 16 percent of the world markets outside the United States to Alcoa's Canadian subsidiary. It provided for price fixing and forbade sales to, or purchase from, nonmember producers, except through the cartel.

Effect: From April 1912 to the end of the year the price of aluminum quoted in the United States jumped from 19.58 to 26.46 cents per pound.

In May 1912 the Government climaxed its probe of Alcoa with a suit in Federal courts, charging the company with violation of the Antitrust Act. A month later a consent decree was entered, perpetually restraining Alcoa, directly or indirectly, from making any agreement which would affect the import or export trade of the United States.

However, the 1912 cartel agreement was not affected, because (at Davis' request) it contained a clause specifically stating that the agreement concerned only the European market, "excluding the United States market." This agreement remained in force until January 1915, when it was voluntarily dissolved as a result of World War I.

There is no direct evidence that Alcoa entered into any kind of formal written agreement with foreign producers of aluminum between 1915 and 1931. The Government has revealed a number of significant developments, however, from which observers can draw their own conclusions.

Between 1923 and 1927 Alcoa entered into six different partnerships in aluminum properties abroad with British, French, Swiss, and German companies.

The prices for which foreign aluminum was sold on the American market during this period approximated Alcoa's prices with remarkable uniformity.

Several witnesses testified before the Federal court concerning conversations with Davis and representatives of foreign producers which led them to believe that, during this period, agreements were in force limiting imports and fixing the price of aluminum to be sold in the United States.

Whatever its relations with Europe, Alcoa seems to have been committed to a policy of restricted production. Davis admitted to the court that there was an aluminum shortage in this country of 55,000 tons in 1925, 42,000 tons in 1926, and 23,000 tons in 1927.

By 1928 Alcoa had become a vast enterprise, with properties on every continent, held through 34 foreign companies. In that year the company adopted a plan proposed by A. V. Davis "to put all the foreign business in one company and retain the domestic business in another company." Title to the foreign holdings was accordingly turned over to Aluminum Ltd. of Canada, an outgrowth of the Canadian company formed in 1902 as an Alcoa subsidiary.

The United States Government later charged that this move, in the main, was an attempt to evade the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act. To refute Alcoa's stand that Limited is a wholly independent company, the following evidence was introduced in the 1937 antitrust suit:

1. As late as January 1939 officers and directors of Alcoa and their families, plus the families of Andrew W. and Richard B. Mellon—a total of 11 persons—owned 56 percent of Alcoa's common stock and 51 percent of Limited's.

2. At the outset, most of Limited's officers and directors and its entire personnel were drawn from Alcoa. President of Limited is Edward K. Davis, formerly Aloca's vice president in charge of the sales and brother of Alcoa's A. V. Davis.

3. Until shortly before the Government's suit was filed, Limited made no sale of bauxite (the basic ore of aluminum) to any producer in the United States except Alcoa subsidiaries.

Early in 1931 a growing world surplus threatened to break the price of aluminum and to invade the United States market. A preliminary conference of the representatives of the principal international aluminum producers was held in Montreal. Later the entire party made a 3-day trip in a private railroad car to inspect Alcoa's plants in the eastern part of the United States. The expense of this junket was shared equally by Alcoa and Limited.

Then, on July 3, 1931, a new cartel agreement was drafted in Paris. The world's largest aluminum producers combined to form a jointly owned corporation—the Alliance Aluminum Co.—for the purpose of "the development of the aluminum market." Alcoa was not a party to this agreement, but Limited, its Canadian "fledgling" (the term is Davis'), became the largest single shareholder, taking 400 of the outstanding 1,400 shares, or 28.5 percent of the total.

Limited, in fact, played a predominant role in the functioning of Alliance. The manager of Limited's Berlin office became the manager of Alliance. He was assisted by other Limited employees, many of them formerly associated with Alcoa.

The power of this cartel is manifested by the total production of its members: 147,000 tons per year, as compared with the production of all nonmembers, 10,000 to 16,000 tons. If Alcoa's production at the time, 80,000 tons, is added to that of its members, it will be seen that this combination controlled more than 93 percent of all aluminum production in the world.

In addition to the usual cartel provisions of production quotas, price fixing, and penalties for violation, Alliance in effect assured Alcoa a monopoly of the United States market and Limited was granted control of 29 percent of the remainder of world sales.

Effects: Overproduction of aluminum in Europe and Canada ceased; Limited reduced to 35 percent capacity in 1933 and 1934, and to 46 percent in 1935; the average price of the metal rose; total imports of foreign aluminum into the United States from 1931 to 1938, in proportion to Alcoa's production declined.

One of the members of the 1931 cartel was the Vereinigte Aluminium Werke—owned and controlled by the German Government. When the Nazis came to power in 1933, the VAW notified other members of the combine that it was going to produce in excess of its assigned quota because of force majeur. VAW asked to be exempted from the penalties provided by the agreement.

After due consideration, Alliance agreed to grant the Germans an increase of 6,000 tons for the first 6 months of 1934 and an additional increase of 7,000 tons for the last 6 months of that year.

In 1936 the Nazis did the cartel a "favor" by taking off the market the entire surplus output of a competing nonmember.

By this time Germany was openly arming for war. For what purpose did the American "patriots" in the cartel expect this aluminum to be used?

It is a fact that, with the knowledge, consent and assistance of the cartel, Germany's aluminum production multiplied rapidly so that in 1939, when the huge Nazi war machine was ready to roll, Germany was the largest single producer of this metal in the world.

In 1933, when Hitler became chancelor, Alcoa led the world in aluminum production, turning out 38,614 tons as compared with Germany's 18,900 tons.

In 1934 the Nazis produced 37,200 tons, the United States only 33,647.

In 1939 the Nazis produced 175,000 tons, the United States only 130,129.

In 1939, at the start of the war, Alcoa's full capacity was only 143,326 metric tons, over 26,000 tons less than Germany's 1938 production.

Our country's position as a producer of aluminum on the eve of war becomes clear when we consider these additional figures:

In 1920 Alcoa produced 58.2 percent of the world's aluminum. In 1938 it produced only 22.95 percent.

From 1920 to 1937 world production of aluminum increased 500 percent. During the same period United States output increased only 48 percent.

The full result of this restriction of production for private profit was felt when war finally came. Aluminum accounts for three-quarters of the weight of a military plane. Germany had the largest military air fleet

the world had ever seen. The anti-Axis nations, on the other hand, were dangerously deficient in air power.

By April 1941 our aircraft companies were so short of vital aluminum that Glenn Martin bombers, flown to Army fields, had their propellers removed and shuttled back to the factory for use on otherwise completed bombers. Glenn Martin estimated that 25 percent of their production was being lost for lack of aluminum; Boeing made a similar complaint.

That year naval architects developed a new aluminum destroyer, faster and more maneuverable, carrying more armor plate and guns than any ever built. The Navy wanted these destroyers badly; Henry Kaiser was ready to build them. But the plans had to be shelved because there was no aluminum available.

By June 1941 the Office of Production Management found that the shortage of aluminum in this country, for military and essential civilian needs, amounted to more than 4,000,000 pounds. At the same time the necessity of substituting other metals for scarce aluminum accelerated and intensified the already-felt shortage of copper, steel, and electrical power.

In order to maintain sufficient war production, the United States Government—the taxpayers, that is—was forced to invest more than a billion dollars in the aluminum industry. What this deliberate deficiency has meant in terms of lives and additional war costs will never be known.

The alliance cartel now appears on the Proclaimed List of Blocked Nationals (the Allied blacklist), issued September 13, 1944. But not until May 17, 1945, after the United States circuit court had filed a decision holding Limited's participation in this cartel illegal, did that company take formal action to dissolve its connection with the combine.

Nearly all the functions for which aluminum is employed can be duplicated, with greater efficiency, by another wonder metal: magnesium. Magnesium is one-third lighter than aluminum; it is more readily machined; and, when properly alloyed, has greater tensile strength.

Indeed, magnesium long ago would have displaced aluminum from its dominant place in the production of many consumer goods had not Alcoa, with its customary energy and prevision, taken steps to eliminate the possibility of competition.

From 1919 to 1927 the two principal producers of magnesium in this country were the American Magnesium Co. (a subsidiary of Alcoa) and the Dow Chemical Co. In 1927 American Magnesium entered into an agreement with Dow; Alcoa agreed to cease magnesium production in return for preferential treatment as Dow's largest customer.

The principal world producer of magnesium was I. G. Farbenindustrie, of Germany. In 1931 Alcoa entered into a cartel arrangement with IGF, called the Alig agreement, by which a joint corporation, the Magnesium Development Co., was established in this country. Alcoa and IGF each owned 50 percent of the stock in this corporation; in addition, as a result of the agreement, IGF obtained a 50 percent interest in Alcoa's own subsidiary, American Magnesium.

The Magnesium Development Co. was essentially a patent-holding corporation. IGF transferred to it American patent rights for the fabrication of magnesium, and Alcoa contributed all its process patents. Significantly, the Alig agreement, through licensing of patents, limited United States production to 4,000 tons a year.

In 1934 Dow Chemical officially became a party to this cartel. Dow was assured a monopoly of the United States market; in return, it bound itself to deliver all its foreign exports of magnesium to IGF, with the exception of 150 tons per year to be sold in Great Britain.

During 1934 and 1935 Dow delivered to Nazi-dominated IGF 3,800,000 pounds of magnesium out of a total production of little more than 4,000,000 pounds. This magnesium was sold to IGF at a price 30 percent less than that paid by any other customer except Alcoa, which enjoyed the same preferential treatment.

Recent newspaper articles have revealed IGF's role in the Nazi war machine. Through royalty payments it received from Magnesium Development, IGF was able to inform the Nazi intelligence of just how much magnesium was used in the United States and Britain, and by whom it was used.

In general, the principal consumer of magnesium has been the aircraft companies. Magnesium is used in the construction of airplane engines, frames, interiors, wheels, etc. In wartime this metal is employed in the manufacture of incendiary bombs, tracer bullets, and flares. Bombers can carry 25 percent more magnesium bombs than aluminum bombs.

As a result of this cartel agreement, Britain was dependent upon its enemy, Germany, for the largest part of its magnesium. When war came, Britain was immediately cut off from 88 percent of her total supply.

In 1940, the year that France fell, United States production of magnesium totaled only 5,680 tons. That same year Germany produced 19,000 tons, soon afterward was producing from 25,000 to 50,000 tons a year.

In order to overcome this initial handicap, the United States Government was forced to invest more than $400,000,000 in magnesium producing and fabricating plants to supply our war industry.

In 1941 Alcoa, American Magnesium, and Dow Chemical were indicted in Federal court on charges of violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act. On April 15, 1942, these companies entered a plea of nolo contendere, admitting in effect the truth of the charges.

Their punishment? A total fine of $140,000.

Government Seizure of Private Property in Peacetime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

ALLIS-CHALMERS MANUFACTURING CO.,
Norwood, Ohio, June 1, 1946.

Hon. CLIFF CLEVENGER,
Congressman, Fifth District,
State of Ohio, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Because of the dangerous social and political implications of governmental seizure of private property during peacetime and quite apart from the question of invasion of legal rights without due process of law, we are enclosing for your information four telegrams which our company has sent to Mr. Louis B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor.

Very truly yours,
ALLIS-CHALMERS MANUFACTURING CO.,
NORWOOD WORKS,
R. W. DAVIS, *General Manager.*

JUNE 1, 1946.

The Honorable LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH,
Secretary of Labor,
Department of Labor Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your press release indicates that you threaten seizure of our plants on the ground of our refusal to bargain in good faith with the different unions at our various plants. Our recent telegrams pointed out facts showing conclusively that we have negotiated in good faith with every union at each of our plants. We also have shown that the unions are themselves responsible for the lack of progress in collective bargaining in each works.

We have positive proof to support these statements. We ask for the opportunity of presenting such proof to you. As yet we have not heard from you.

Your charge of refusal to bargain in good faith is a serious one. It is a charge of violation of the National Labor Relations Act. Upon complaint of any interested union, the National Labor Relations Board could pass upon this question. If the charge were proved, then the company would be required by court order to comply with the law.

We are entitled to our day in court before the National Labor Relations Board to answer these general charges at all works.

As to our West Allis works you have charged that we have not bargained in good faith because we have not granted authority to our negotiating committee to negotiate a final collective bargaining agreement for West Allis works.

Prior to May 2, 1946, Local 248, UAW-CIO filed a complaint with the National Labor Relations Board making the same general charge as contained in your press release.

We advised Mr. George Bott, regional director of the Chicago office of the Board, that we would await call from a Board representative in order to furnish such details as the Board might desire. To date, no representative of the Board has ever called upon us. This fact, according to normal practices of the Board, would mean that the Board did not to consider the charge to have any merits.

The charge made in your press release is absolutely false. We have advised you in writing that our negotiating committee for the West Allis works has been delegated full authority to negotiate a collective-bargaining agreement for the West Allis works.

If you believe, in view of all of the data which we have furnished you, that there is a basis for your charge, then we request that you have the National Labor Relations Board arrange for an immediate hearing upon the union's complaint covering such charges.

You have questioned the integrity of the company by making the charge in your press release and are depriving us of the opportunity of proving the falseness of the charge before the National Labor Relations Board by a threat of immediate seizure of our property.

The press release has already done us irreperable harm. We ask that you remedy this grave injustice so far as possible by giving us the opportunity of publicly meeting this charge in a hearing of the National Labor Relations Board on the complaint of local 248, which embodies your charge.

WALTER GEIST,
President, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.

MAY 31, 1946.

The Honorable LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D. C.:

Cincinnati papers carried a press release in which you are quoted as saying that you would recommend Government seizure of the Norwood works of Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., if we failed to enter into negotiations before the end of this week.

As manager of manufacturing of the Norwood works, and as chairman of the company negotiating committee, may I point out that we have at no time refused to bargain with Local 765, U. E. R. & M. W. A.—C. I. O., except during the periods when there was illegal picketing. We have met with United States Conciliation Service Representatives as recently as May 23, and are scheduled to meet again with the union and representa-

tives of the United States Conciliation Service on Monday, June 3.

We have conferred today with the Conciliation Service and plans have been agreed upon to meet as scheduled on Monday, June 3.

Under these circumstances, your press release cannot reasonably have any application to the Norwood works of Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.

ARNOLD THORSEN,
Manager of Manufacturing, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Norwood Works.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *May 30, 1946.*

The Honorable LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH,
Secretary of Labor,
Department of Labor,
Washington, D. C.:

We have been forced to rely upon the accuracy of a press release attributed to you to learn of a threat of governmental seizure of all of our plants, many of which produce no farm machinery.

Because of the fact that we have had no direct word from you, we are severely handicapped in presenting our views to you.

In the press release we are charged with failure to meet with the Conciliation Service in collective bargaining with the unions at our various plants. If you were correctly quoted you could not have made such statement with full knowledge of the facts. This incorrect accusation has done us irreparable harm.

In view of the gross injustice to us and the undermining of our management control resulting from an unwarranted seizure of our plants, we ask that you please give careful consideration to the following facts:

1. Our Norwood, Boston, and Pittsburgh works produce only electrical machinery.

2. Our Springfield works produces crawler-type tractors.

3. Our West Allis works produced 40 percent farm machinery and 60 percent power or general machinery.

4. Our La Crosse and LaPorte works produce solely farm machinery.

5. Our Oxnard works produces farm machinery under a recently executed collective-bargaining agreement which is no more favorable in its terms than the contract proposals made to La Crosse, LaPorte, and West Allis works unions.

6. At our West Allis works three unions are operating under negotiated agreements, recently executed, which are no more favorable in their terms than the collective bargaining proposals which the West Allis works union rejected.

7. According to a statement appearing in the Milwaukee Journal on April 30 wages are not in issue in the collective-bargaining negotiations for our West Allis works. The press release attributed to you indicates a contrary impression.

8. Our negotiating committee at each works is the top-management committee which officially represents the company in all matters of final consideration between the company and the union at each works.

Since these committees represent the company in handling all grievance matters and other negotiations with the unions throughout the contract year, it cannot reasonably be expected that the company should be deprived of their services for the purpose of representing the company in collective-bargaining negotiations.

9. The press statement to the effect that these negotiating committees have no final authority to complete negotiations for contract settlements is incorrect. My telegram to you dated May 2 contained my unequivocal statement that these committees are vested with full power to make final settlements.

10. Thus if you were correctly quoted in your press release in this regard, then unintentionally you are undermining the standing of our management representatives upon whom the company must rely for its vitally important contracts with the unions throughout the year.

11. The Wisconsin Employment Relations Board has completed its hearing upon our complaint of illegal picketing by the West Allis works union. If the Government seized our West Allis works and thereafter the board found the West Allis works union guilty of illegal picketing and ordered them to cease and desist such illegal picketing, the Government would find itself in the dubious position of supporting a union acting in defiance of the State laws.

12. As soon as the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board makes its findings (and regardless of whether or not the board finds the union guilty of illegal picketing and orders them to cease and desist such illegal acts) the company will notify all of its West Allis works employees not represented by Local 248 to report for work immediately after such decision.

13. As soon as these instructions have been issued, the company will request immediate resumption of negotiations.

14. The press release attributed to you seems to express the opinion that we have not bargained collectively at our various works. We request the opportunity of presenting to you our collective-bargaining records at each works in order to clear up this impression to your complete satisfaction.

Under the foregoing facts, it seems clear that a governmental seizure of any of our plants would be an invasion of our constitutional rights and would do us irreparable injury.

We again request the opportunity of having our representatives acquaint you with the real facts in this case.

WALTER GEIST,
President, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *May 29, 1946.*

The Honorable LEWIS B. SCHWELLENBACH,
Secretary of Labor,
Department of Labor Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In our conference last Monday I advised you that I had appointed a negotiating committee to conduct negotiations for the company at each works. I authorized each of these negotiating committees to negotiate and execute a collective bargaining agreement for their works. Each negotiating committee has been ready and willing to meet with the respective unions whenever requested either by the unions or the conciliation service, except where illegal picketing prevailed.

There has been an obvious indifference by the various unions to negotiate in good faith for an agreement. A high ranking officer of the LaPorte union has publicly stated that although his agreement might be signed in LaPorte it would not be negotiated there, thus showing clearly no intention to bargain in good faith.

At our Norwood works, the president of the union has been bound over to the grand jury for assaulting a 60-year-old man. The courts have fined pickets $1,900 for violence and violations of injunctions. Two hundred and twenty-four production workers, many of them veterans, have returned to work under protection of the injunction.

At our West Allis works there have been no negotiations since the strike. Our entire works has been closed down since May 11 because of illegal picketing by local 248.

Our negotiating committee for West Allis works has been ready and willing to meet with the union at any time that illegal picketing ceased.

A complaint was filed with the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board charging illegal picketing. The decision should be handed down in the near future. If our complaint is upheld, the union will be ordered to cease and desist illegal picketing. At that time, negotiations can be resumed.

We have made repeated demands upon local 248 to cease unlawful picketing so that we could resume negotiations which were terminated by the union. Your threat to recommend plant seizure encourages the leadership of local 248 in their defiance of law. Actual plant seizure would nullify the law. The leadership of Local 248 is the same leadership which was responsible in 1941 for the strike-ballot fraud which resulted in our 76-day strike. This strike delayed production of vital material for national defense. This is the same leadership that defied Secretary of Navy Knox and OPM Director Knudsen when they asked our employees to return to work. The response of local 247 to this request was a riot which closed down our West Allis works and stopped production for national defense.

The fairness of our negotiating attitude is evidenced by the fact that four separate unions have negotiated contracts with us on terms no more favorable than those rejected by local 248.

We fully appreciate the country's needs for farm equipment which is about one-half of our production, as well as the important power and other machinery we produce. We fully realize, too, that the American farmer is an important customer of ours. Believe me when I say that is the very reason we made every effort to avert a strike. We offered 18½ cents an hour in addition to a fair contract.

The union, however, by its illegal actions, indicates no desire to resume bargaining to consummate a contract and to make possible our farm equipment and power machinery production.

A government which seizes a plant under such circumstances of illegal union activities not only undermines democratic laws but actually assumes powers dangerously close to dictatorial.

If you desire that negotiations be resumed here then you need only insist that the leadership of Local 248 obey the laws governing picketing.

Therefore, we respectfully request that you direct your official powers toward the support of State laws protecting basic constitutional rights rather than lending support to a union whose record has consistently been one of disrespect for law.

In our short conference I did not have the opportunity of giving you all of the facts and background of our collective bargaining situation at West Allis.

In fairness to both you and the company, I request the opportunity of having my representatives present to you evidence supporting all of the statements made in this telegram and other information which would give conclusive support to our above request.

WALTER GEIST,
President, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.

Asks Early Repeal of Order Limiting Extraction of Flour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, an early repeal of that phase of War Order 144 which limits flour extraction from wheat "because it contributes little or nothing to the desired objective of wheat conservation", was demanded by Carelton McKenzie, retiring president of the Millers' National Federation at the annual

convention of that organization in Chicago, May 14. Mr. McKenzie's address contains much information that should be had by Members of Congress. Therefore, under permission to extend my remarks, I include this important address:

Ladies and gentlemen, members of the Millers' National Federation, and guests, I am glad of the opportunity to welcome you to the forty-third regular annual convention of our organization.

You will recall that last year, due to the war, we did not hold a convention. Let us hope that our series of annual conventions will not be interrupted again for the same cause.

First of all, I would like to express to the officers and members of the federation my sincere gratitude for their loyal support during the 2 years in which I have served as president.

Serving as president of the federation in the wartime years has been a great experience and I would like to assure you most sincerely that whatever time and effort I may have invested in my job as president has been repaid to me many times over by your kindness and loyal cooperation.

This convention is being held at a time and under conditions which no miller will ever be able to forget. In view of the fact that less than a year ago our Nation harvested one of the largest wheat crops on record, and in addition there was a generous carryover from the year before, we are today in a period of flour and bread shortage which cannot be relieved until the new wheat crop is harvested. Never before in American history has there been a period of several months in which the consumers were seriously short of their normal supply of breadstuffs. The series of events which has led to this catastrophe is well understood by all of you and will be discussed elsewhere during this convention.

The flour-milling industry of the United States is entitled to point with pride to its performance throughout the entire period of national emergency which began well ahead of the outbreak of the war and which has been continued, legally at least, for nearly a year after the end of hostilities. With only the addition of a few remodeled mills to the industry's productive capacity, with nearly all of our young men in service, and with the great difficulty in obtaining labor of any kind; despite car shortages and almost all of the other difficulties which beset every segment of American business, the flour mills of this Nation were able to keep both our armed forces and our civilian population fully supplied with all flour requirements during this long and troubled period. This meant a general increase in the production of more than 25 percent. It is doubtful if any such record was ever before made by an important industry for such an extended period of time.

I believe now that we should take credit for a most outstanding, consistent, and workmanlike job in supplying a basic food without interruption throughout the entire emergency period.

We are also entitled to take credit for other valuable services rendered to the Nation during the war period. Perhaps the most spectacular of these was the almost overnight development of the production of alcohol grits from wheat. This took place at a time when the war industries were desperately short of alcohol for the production of synthetic rubber and smokeless powder. It is not too much to say that this single development may have contributed in no small way to shortening the period of the war.

Two other notable services deserve mention in this connection. One is the fact that the milling industry improved the nutritional properties of the major part of its principal product. This was accomplished by the addition of iron and vitamins to flour. Within only a few years the enrichment program has progressed from a strictly experimental idea to a generally adopted plan of nutritional improvement of flour.

The other item which must not be overlooked is the standardization of flour package sizes, which took place under wartime conditions. This is so simple and beneficial to everyone concerned that it now seems strange that the uniform schedule was not adopted a generation ago. It simplifies our manufacturing problem, reduces our bag inventory, reduces our cost of operation, and serves the consumer, as well as benefiting the miller. It is a major reform in the milling field which has been overshadowed by the greater events of the time.

One of the greatest national issues at the present time is whether and to what extent price control should be continued. An imposing array of evidence has been mustered to establish the fact that unnecessary delays in ending price control and improper administration of this control have fostered black markets, reduced the production of goods, deprived the consumer of things he should have, and contributed substantially to retarding conversion to a peacetime economy.

Without engaging in the debate over this issue, I want to take this occasion to emphasize my strong belief that the flour milling industry of the United States has been fortunate in its experience with price controls up to January 1946. This has been due in part to the fact that the OPA officials having the responsibility for price control of flour and other mill products, were in the first instance men of experience in this field; not only did they understand milling problems, but they also exerted every effort to make all price-control orders as workable as possible under the circumstances.

These administrators had the able assistance and cooperation of a long list of men in the industry who were called upon to consult and advise with them from time to time. There were, naturally, some inequities in the price-ceiling structure, and when the flour subsidy program followed, that condition was even more marked; but in a short period of time these inequities were reasonably well eliminated. In retrospect, we can only wonder that our industry's price ceiling and subsidy troubles were not infinitely greater. For that fact we must render thanks to Atherton Bean and his associates for their excellent work in the preparation of price orders, for their wise administration of these orders, and for their fidelity in conducing their wartime assignments in the public interest while at the same time permitting an industry to operate without unnecesasry restrictions. I have no hesitancy in saying that if the same quality of administration had been the rule throughout the entire field covered by OPA, there would now be no great public uproad over the question of continuation of that agency's existence.

I have referred in previous public statements to the wheat and flour controls established during the past 3 months because of the scarcity of wheat supplies. This subject, too, will receive consideration elsewhere during the convention. I wish to observe at this point, however, that bringing the order limiting flour extraction to an end as soon as possible is the most important issue before the flour milling industry today. This particular phrase of War Order No. 144 was adopted hastily and without due consideration; it contributes little or nothing to the desired objective of wheat conservation; it compels the consumer to take a lower quality of product than he wants and at the same time deceives him into thinking that he is helping to relieve starvation abroad; it eliminates the premium products of our industry and destroys the value of trade-marks and good will; it definitely reduces the supply of much needed mill feeds; and it serves no useful purpose whatsoever. We must do everything within our power to bring this feature of the present control program to its earliest possible end. Another year of this restriction must not be tolerated.

At the same time we must recognize not only the possibility, but perhaps even the probability, of continued wheat controls. Needs for food abroad will not be ended with this year's harvest and we can expect a period of short food supplies for some months ahead. How much wiser it will be for our Government to anticipate this situation and to take steps to deal with the problem now, instead of repeating the errors of this crop year and waiting until the crisis is fully upon them before taking any action.

In this connection I emphatically call your attention to the fact that although now, by various amendments to the order, Government has adopted, in principle at least, most of the important points contained in the millers' plan which was offered in January. At that time we received, at top levels, only a complete brush-off and a verbal spanking.

At a meeting which I recently attended, a statement was made to the effect that the milling industry had no friends in the Department of Agriculture. At that meeting I objected to this statement and I shall continue to object to such general statements as this because I believe them to be incorrect. On the other hand, cooperation and understanding of our problems have apparently been largely denied us at the policy-making levels.

Be that as it may, during this temporary famine emergency I consider it the duty of every miller, no matter what his opinion may be of the type of regulation now imposed upon him, to exert every possible effort to aid in making flour quickly available for export to the starving peoples of the world.

I should like now to make a few observations on what we are pleased to call our Government, and in making these observations I offer not the slightest apology to the gentlemen who are with us today representing governmental agencies. I say this because I sincerely believe that despite our differences of opinion we have all tried to the best of our ability to render honest service to government and to industry. The dictionary defines "our" as a "pronominal adjective". I believe that its application to the word "government" is, under present conditions, for all practical purposes, entirely incorrect.

In a speech made before our convention 2 years ago I quoted from an address I had recently heard, this statement, made by Abraham Lincoln, one of the greatest Americans of all time. "Government in a democracy functions most successfully when the people are governed from the bottom upward and not from the top downward."

At that time, government had been veering away from that standard. Certainly in the past 2 years the trend in that direction has been greatly accentuated.

The first question asked by an agency of Government under the present administration, regarding any proposed action, is this: "Is it politically expedient?"

Within itself the milling industry has not and very likely will not alone make itself politically important.

Therefore, my final recommendation to you, as your retiring president, is that you render to formulate a policy whereby you may be able to unite with other closely allied industries, such as the feed manufacturers, the grain trades and possibly with agriculture to form a political bloc of such strength as to halt the regimentation of industry and end this endless succession of ill-conceived, illogical, and impractical regulations.

Surely, gentlemen, you must realize that if this is not accomplished by some means then you are being led down the long, long hill toward national socialism, and after you have

descended beyond a certain point on that hill, no return to the top, which represents the free enterprise system, is possible, except through drastic and difficult revolutionary procedure.

Aluminum Cartel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herein an article by myself dealing with the aluminum cartel and appearing in the June issue of This Month magazine. It is as follows:

ALCOA—DRAG ON RECONVERSION

(By Representative JOHN M. COFFEE, as told to Allen Bernard)

Throughout the Nation the front lines are now forming for a crucial battle. It is the battle to determine the economic pattern of postwar America and, with it, the immediate future of millions of Americans.

The fundamental issue everywhere is the same: Shall we revert to our old prewar "economy of scarcity," marked by monopoly, low production, limited employment, and high profits, or shall we found a brave, new, expanding peacetime economy of free competition, full production, fair profits, and "60,000,000 jobs"?

One phase of that conflict—the bitter struggle between big business and organized labor—has so far occupied the center of the stage.

But behind the scenes, in Washington, giant corporations are locked in battle with Government agencies over another vital aspect of the same conflict. The issue is the disposal of $14,000,000,000 worth of Government-financed war plants. The manner in which these plants are reconverted to civilian production will have a lasting effect upon the postwar economy of the Nation.

The Surplus Property and Reconversion Acts of 1944 state the Government's objective clearly and unreservedly. It is to utilize these properties as fully as possible to obtain full production and maximum employment.

This goal is to be achieved within the framework of private competitive enterprise. Small business is to have full opportunity to participate. Monopolistic practices are to be discouraged. In short, the Government's expressed policy is for maximum use of war-built facilities by private business on a thoroughly competitive basis.

That is the theory. Today, 9 months after the peace, it begins to appear that the large corporations are winning their fight to sidetrack this program.

When the war ended, 1,300 Government-owned plants went on the "potential surplus" list. By the end of 1945 only 287 had been put into civilian production. Through January 31, 1946, only $184,000,000 worth of industrial plants, sites, and real estate had been sold to private owners. This, out of a total of $14,000,000,000 worth.

What is holding up the Government's reconversion program?

The simple truth is that these modern plants in the hands of potential competitors constitute a direct threat to the lucrative industrial empires established during the past two generations by a compact group of private interests. The energetic exploitation of these plants would bring to an end the monopoly exerted by a large corporation in a number of basic industries in the United States.

Whenever possible, surplus plants are being bought from the Government precisely to keep them out of the hands of would-be competitors. The purchaser puts the best equipment to work and junks the rest, destroys the plant entirely or merely keeps it out of production. The cost of the entire operation can be written off against taxes, so there is litle if any financial loss involved—except to the taxpayer.

Sometimes the company dominating a particular industry uses an even simpler method of preventing the effective disposal of Government plants. It merely refuses to release vital patent rights necessary for the operation of these industries.

Consider what was happening until recently in the aluminum industry, where the Aluminum Company of America (Alcoa) reigned supreme.

During the war, the Defense Plants Corporation (DPC) spent $670,658,000 in the construction of some 60 new plants to produce and fabricate aluminum. Power for many of these plants came from the gigantic TVA and Pacific Northwest Government power developments. A pro rata share of these power facilities would bring the Government's stake in the aluminum industry to well over a billion dollars.

Last January, the Surplus Property Administration in a letter to Congress charged that Alcoa, by withholding patents necessary for operation of the Government-owned plants, was preventing their disposal to the company's competitors.

"Alcoa," the SPA said, "was engaged in an attempt to distract Members of Congress and the public from the fact that Alcoa is seeking to obtain the more desirable Government plants and thus to increase and solidify its own monopolistic position."

This is the story of Alcoa's fight against reconversion and a new "economy of plenty."

Our Government's decision to invest heavily in aluminum plants during the war was a direct result, the Attorney General reported to Congress, of Alcoa's prewar policy of restricted production in order to maintain high prices.

As late as the spring of 1941, Alcoa repeatedly promised that it could and would supply all military and essential civilian wartime needs, expanding its plants "to cover the entire program as needs develop." In view of the critical though unofficial shortage of aluminum that had already arisen when these promises were made, it is difficult to understand why Alcoa made them.

Here is the explanation given by the company's senior vice president, George R. Gibbons, in testimony before the Truman committee:

"I might have thought that the war would be over in 3 months (in 1940) in which case there was more than enough aluminum for civilian needs. Suppose England was immediately conquered, as it looked very much as though it would be at times and the war should suddenly subside, where would we land? I didn't know, but I thought we might land with a huge capacity here and nowhere to go."

It was this selfish preoccupation with profits and the maintenance of monopoly, on the part of companies like Alcoa, that brought this country almost to the verge of disaster. By 1941, as we drew close to Pearl Harbor, the aluminum shortage had become so acute that no one could deny its existence any longer. In the interests of national defense, the Government was forced to intervene.

The Government spent more than a billion dollars in public funds to increase the aluminum-producing capacity in the United States from 350,000,000 pounds (1939) to 2,500,000,000 pounds (1945). Fabricating facilities were expanded in a similar fashion. No other major basic industry during this period experienced such a sharp rise in production.

In 1940 Alcoa owned all the aluminum-producing facilities in the United States. In 1945 the Government owned more than 50 percent of the industry's capacity to produce and fabricate aluminum. The DPC owned 52 percent of the alumina (the intermediate product in the manufacture of aluminum), 56 percent of the ingot, and 41 percent of the sheet capacity.

With minor exceptions, all 60 Government aluminum plants were operated during the war by Alcoa. When the war ended, the RFC, in accordance with the terms of the lease, notified Alcoa that these agreements would terminate in 60 days. To keep the plants in operation pending disposal to private bidders, the RFC offered Alcoa a new lease for 1 year, subject to the usual cancellation on 60 days' notice.

Alcoa refused and countered with a bid for two of the units. This offer was rejected by the RFC on the grounds that sale or long-term lease to Alcoa would strengthen that company's prewar monopoly.

In September 1945—a month before its war leases terminated—Alcoa suddenly shut down all the governmental aluminum plants it was operating. So precipitous was the company's decision, that officials of the Government's Arkansas power system were given less than an hour's notice to cut down on their power output. This act nearly wrecked the Government power plants in that area.

Thousands of aluminum workers lost their jobs, and hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of Government power went to waste over the Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams, never to be retrieved.

Let us suppose, for the moment, the war has just ended, and you have the urge—and the means—to invest in the aluminum industry. You are considering the purchase, on easy terms, of some of the Government's new war plants in order to enter into competition with Alcoa. You examine a few of these facilities, and this is what you discover:

Alcoa, your potential competitor, planned, built, and operated until the end of the war 90 percent of the Government aluminum plants.

The production plants were designed to use low-grade bauxite ore through a special lime-sinter-soda process. Alcoa controls the patents on this process and has refused to release them to the Government or to license purchasers of Government plants.

Many of the best plants were designed and built by Alcoa on a larger scale than efficiency and economy of operation warrant. Therefore the manpower problem is more serious, because housing and transportation are more difficult to obtain.

Many DPC plants were built originally to be operated as part of Alcoa's system, not as a basis for future competition. Consequently, little integration has been achieved; separate units are scattered all the way from Tacoma, Wash., to Baton Rouge, La., from Los Angeles, Calif., to Massena, N. Y. This dispersal complicates your railroad transport problem; raw materials have to be hauled over long distances, the finished product shipped out hundreds of miles.

Take, for example, the Government ingot plant at Massena, N. Y. It is located in a section dominated by Alcoa's private plants for more than 30 years. Railroad and power facilities are all owned or controlled by Alcoa. The nearest non-Alcoa source of alumina is at Hurricane Creek, Ark., a thousand miles away. The nearest non-Alcoa fabricating outlet is hundreds of miles distant.

If you are not discouraged yet, you will go on to ask, How does the cost of production at these plants compare with Alcoa's costs?

Here is your answer:

Alcoa's plants in 1937, the last year for which we have authentic data, produced aluminum at a cost of 7.8 cents per pound.

The three most economical Government ingot plants have reported an average cost of 12 cents a pound. Of the six remaining DPC units, five reported operating costs exceeding the 14-cent current market price of pig aluminum.

Of course, this comparison is not conclusive, for Government costs are given during abnormal war conditions. On the other hand, Alcoa's figures are for a period when its total private capacity was only one-third of what it is today. It is the opinion of experts that the company's increased output now will enable it to produce aluminum more cheaply than ever before and at lower cost than any of the existing DPC plants.

Have you looked into Alcoa's resources as a potential competitor?

Alcoa has corralled practically all the domestic high-grade bauxite ore available for aluminum production. Its extensive foreign deposits and its private fleet of ships enable it to bring in raw materials at a lower net cost than any competitor.

Alcoa owns or has under contract the best power for its own use. No one else can get as cheap power for aluminum production, not even from the Government.

Alcoa will be in a position to supply, from its private plants, 275 percent more aluminum than it produced during the peak prewar year of 1939.

Alcoa is in a virtually impregnable financial position to carry on a lengthy price war against all comers. During the 4 years from 1941 to 1944 net income of the company, after taxes, averaged $37,250,000 per year. At the end of 1944 it had $147,000,000 more in current assets than it was obligated to pay out. Its undivided surplus is comfortably large—$162,000,000

What, chum? You don't like the aluminum business? Well, neither did most other businessmen when the Government offered its war plants for lease or outright sale.

The few companies that did offer bids on some of the Government aluminum properties, principally Henry Kaiser and Reynolds Metals, contemplated using a large part of their production in their own businesses.

Nevertheless, without the release of Alcoa's low-grade ore process patents, no transaction for the acquisition of Government plants could be concluded.

Suddenly, on January 10, 1946, Alcoa agreed to grant the Government free use of the disputed patents, as well as the right to license them to any companies taking over surplus war plants. On the surface this looked like a very magnanimous gesture on the part of Alcoa, which isn't exactly famous for such gestures. But, according to well-informed sources, this is what actually happened:

Early in January, A. V. Davis, head of Alcoa, was summoned to Washington by Surplus Property Administrator Stuart Symington and Attorney General Tom Clark. The conference took place in the Attorney General's office. On one side of the table sat Davis, I. W. Wilson, of Alcoa, and Leon Hickman, their attorney. On the opposite side were Symington, Samuel Husbands, of the RFC, and Assistant Attorney General Wendell Berge, Ernest Meyers, and Irving Lipkowitz, all of the anti-trust division of the Department of Justice.

Symington began by pointing out that in March 1945 a Federal court had ruled that Alcoa was a monopoly in violation of the Sherman Anti-trust Act. Decision on the Government's plea that Alcoa be broken up into several small units had been deferred pending disposal of surplus war plants. The Administrator proposed that Alcoa voluntarily give up its rights to the low-grade ore processes.

Davis and Hickman countered with an offer to release these patents if the Government would drop its antitrust suit against the company. Berge refused, and Symington suggested that the solution perhaps would be to use the patents without Alcoa's permission, and allow the courts to decide the issue. This suggestion infuriated Hickman, who accused Symington of using "fighting words."

"Well," Symington retorted, "what are patents except the right to bring suit?"

The following day Davis offered to turn over the patents in exchange for payment of graduated royalties. This offer, too, was rejected.

That night Davis returned and accepted, without any strings attached, the Government's "invitation" to his company. It was the first unconditional surrender in Alcoa's long history of monopoly.

The effect on bidders for surplus aluminum plants was electrifying. Reynolds Metals immediately leased the Government plants at Hurricane Creek and Jones Mills, Ark.; within a few weeks Kaiser leased the Spokane ingot and sheet mills. Last March, Reynolds Metals was awarded a lease on the sheet mills at McCook, Ill., over three other bids for the same property.

Since Alcoa released its patents, $182,000,000 worth of surplus aluminum plants have been leased and one—the Listerhill (Ala.) plant, costing $20,000,000—has been sold to Reynolds. An important barrier in the way of reconversion has been leaped.

Alcoa's release of these patents without a vigorous legal battle undoubtedly comes under the heading of sound strategy. That gesture Alcoa can use in Federal Court as an argument against dissolution of the company's holdings. In view of the fact that several companies now are in a position to compete with Alcoa, it is not at all certain that the court will grant the Government's plea.

However, last September, in his report to Congress on the aluminum industry, Attorney General Clark declared that the mere sale or lease to independents of war surplus aluminum plants would not break up Alcoa's dominant position:

"Alcoa has a 50-year advantage over any independent. During that period it has enjoyed the special privileges of monopoly * * * the odds are so heavily on Alcoa's side today that no one else, regardless of his efficiency or enterprise, can become strong enough to engage in unrestricted competition within the industry."

Reconversion is not enough, says the Attorney General. Something new will have to be added: the guarantee of free competition. Alcoa must be split into separately owned competing companies, each with its closely-integrated system of alumin-ingot-fabrication plants with access to raw material and power.

The present Government-owned facilities could be fitted into the new pattern. Maximum production could be maintained, great potential markets opened up, thousands of jobs provided, and an important contribution made to the economic health of the entire Nation.

The Government's blue print for a new aluminum industry could be applied to advantage in many other basic industries today. If some such action is not immediately forthcoming, billions of dollars of public funds invested in war plants will go down the drain and, more important, monopoly will continue to ride on the back of our postwar economy like a modern old man of the sea.

Memorial Day Address of Hon. Walter Chandler, Mayor of Memphis, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a speech made by Hon. Walter Chandler, the mayor of Memphis, on Memorial Day. Many of my colleagues will remember Mayor Chandler as a distinguished Member of this body and one of the most influential members of the House Committee on the Judiciary. Whenever Walter Chandler speaks upon any subject, he brings intelligent thought and inspiration. I am happy that my friend and your former colleague and now on outstanding mayor of one of the great cities in America should have spoken so effectively.

The speech follows:

In accordance with a custom consecrated by time and long approval, we meet on this Sabbath Day to pay our tribute of respect and honor to our soldier and sailor dead who, at home and far away, sleep under the verdant covering of spring.

For a half century, May 30 has been the day set apart to decorate the graves of men who have died for our country, and it is altogether fitting that the memories of the past be linked with those of the present, and that we of the American Legion and other patriotic organizations should accept the trust from those of '61, and carry on this ceremony of our forebears along with the solemn privilege that belongs to us of World War I and World War II.

Although this is the most significant Memorial Day of all, in that it is the first since the cessation of hostilities in the most terrible war in history, and places in our tender care many thousands of new graves, we do not forget the deeds of valor of those gallant men who gave their lives in the wars of other years. Indeed, the sacrifices and services of all of the fighters for America at Bunker Hill, Kings Mountain, New Orleans, the Alamo, Chapultepec, Shiloh, Antietam, Gettysburg, Little Big Horn, San Juan Hill, and other famous engagements, are sacred legacies transmitted for our veneration, to be cherished, to be preserved untarnished, and to be handed on to after ages.

Today, our thoughts also travel around the world, where rest, in foreign soil, or in the deep blue seas, or in the hallowed earth of our homeland, those Americans, typical of our great Nation, characteristic of its people, representative of its best traditions, whom the cruelties of two wars cut off in the glory of youth or in the meridian of life. Who were they whose names are written high on the scroll of fame? They were the boys from the schools and colleges, from the offices, factories, farms, and fields: Americans with the hopes and ideals, the beliefs and habits, and the good will and generosity of a free, liberty-loving people.

Inspired by the high call of service, and heedless of the consequences, they flocked to the colors and trained day and night to make themselves fit to fight the foe. They left our happy and prosperous country and crossed the seven seas at great peril to reach the battle fronts in many climes. They knew that allies, who were fighting for honor, love of justice, and civilization, were still checked

by the long-prepared forces serving the powers of brutal domination and oppression. They accepted the hard and dangerous life, fearing not the violence of battle, the dreadfulness of new weapons, nor the perfidy of relentless enemies; and, while upholding the proud banners of America, they fell, giving all for those principles which made them the men they were, and our country "the land of the free and the home of the brave."

We are not unmindful of those who paid the supreme price while in training, those who languished and died in the hospitals from wounds and disease, and those whom the hardships of war brought to early graves. They are entitled to the same tribute of love and admiration from a grateful people. There is a poignancy about the going of those who died before their opportunity came to reach and rout the foe.

The experiences of World War I at Chateau Thierry, Soissons, on the Aisne, the Somme, the Marne, at San Mihiel, and in the Argonne too soon became grim lessons for training in another and more stupendous struggle in a single generation. Those of us who returned from Europe in 1919 believed that we had won the war that would end wars. Twenty-seven years ago today, in this very cemetery, in speaking for the men of World War I, I assured those present that peace had come to America to stay, little realizing that sons and daughters, too, of those in that audience would be plunged into a global conflict in less than a quarter of a century. What an unforgettable warning must that fact of history be for everyone who faces the world of tomorrow.

Indeed, the kaleidoscopic, earth-shaking horrors of World War II will ring in humanity's ears forever. The dastardly attack on Pearl Harbor will live a thousand years in infamy, and we must not forget the swiftness of revenge. The brilliant conquest of north Africa, the biggest invasion of all times on the Norman coast, the destruction of the German armies by land and air, the leveling of great cities, and the crossing of the Rhine; those decisive sea fights in the Pacific theater—the greatest in American naval history—Coral Sea, Midway, Guadalcanal, and off the Philippines, the landings at Tarawa, Kwajalein, Saipan, the recovery of the Philippine Islands, the bitter fighting on Iwo Jima and Okinawa, the destroying of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by the atomic bombs, and the fall of Japan—all were exploits that equaled or excelled the victories of previous wars and marked the most complete successes ever recorded in military annals.

With superb preparation and training under a most remarkable commander in chief, who also gave his life, with loyal and unselfish support from those in the war plants and on the home front, with superior weapons and equipment in abundance, with the unflinching aid of our allies, the indomitable courage of our fighting men, and the sustaining power of Divine Providence, the Axis Powers were completely overwhelmed. History affords no parallel for such decisive victories.

But peace seems still far away, although the nations, large and small, have united themselves into an organization to bring the peoples of the earth into an era of tranquility and good will. Already the victors are in disagreement among themselves and our Nation finds itself under the tremendous burden of feeding and clothing millions of hungry and ill-clad, as well as restoring financially prostrate allies. Even at home there is bitter feeling and dissention that must be allayed and healed. Verily, the wounds of war are hard to bind and heal.

What stupendous tasks are ours as we look out on a troubled and exhausted Europe and Asia. To keep faith with those who fell, and to their widows and children who are our special charge, we must not become weary in welldoing. We cannot leave the unfinished work to others. The Atlantic Charter must be preserved and the San Francisco compact must be fulfilled; but over and above the obligations to the rest of the world, we must be true to ourselves. We must be ever vigilant; we must keep prepared. Let us vow that never again shall one American life be sacrificed to unpreparedness. World War II will be a double tragedy if we fail to learn its stark lessons. Astounding as it may be, civilization will not survive another world catastrophe; so we must learn to live together or perish.

Americans have been and are a great people. We have not been in the habit of leaving a furrow unfinished when we put our hands to the plow. Our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines, be they living or dead, are worthy of the noblest traditions of our proud history.

They have proven to us that our country comes first. The welfare of the Nation is paramount every time. While, as free people, we shall have our internal discords and misunderstandings, our dead would have us settle them in the spirit of American good fellowship and good sportsmanship, putting aside our selfish interests for the general welfare. We can, if we will, live together in harmony and unity.

To you who sustained the heaviest losses—the parents, brothers, sisters, wives, children, and other loved ones—we can offer the consolation or high duty nobly done. They, whom we have lost awhile, served their generation well. Their names and their deeds will live always in grateful hearts. We see them as they were, and they see us as we are.

"These tall shadows in khaki shall ever stand by—earth's eyes are unattuned to see,
Or to hear a breath-taking sigh—sacrificed—martyrs, for you and me.
They shall gather at the hearthstones of an evening—with the loved ones abiding there,
They shall know what we are—and they shall judge us—these gallant ones, once young and fair."

"And those we've loved long since, whose banners wave
Beyond the peak of earth's most distant hill;
Although their great procession journeys on,
In what they did and were are with us still.
In life's supremest moments they are nigh
And join us in our work and play and prayer;
They live in high achievement over here,
And march with God's immortals over there."

Labor and the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Labor Beacon, one of the widely read labor newspapers of the State of Indiana in its issue of Friday, May 10, contributed a constructive editorial on the attitude of the southern folks generally in regard to organized labor. Michael Joseph, the publisher and editor in chief of the Labor Beacon, has contributed greatly toward the unification of labor groups in northern Indiana and, through his outstanding talents as a newspaperman, will do much toward labor-management good will in our future industrial progress.

The following editorial by Mr. Joseph is revealing and timely:

LABOR AND THE SOUTH

Many of us northerners are in the habit of thinking of the South as a place where the last of the pre-Civil War colonels still drink juleps all day and sit in lazy comfort as they look out over their vast plantations where hundreds of black men, women, and children chant spirituals as they pick the cotton.

Or we think of it as a barren place where the land has been worked out and the sun and heat have not only ruined the productivity of the soil, but have debased and ruined many miserable share croppers in the best "Tobacco Road" style.

So far as labor is concerned, we are inclined to look upon it not as an industrial section of the country, but a stronghold of reactionary and antilabor courts.

The truth of the matter is, the South is rapidly changing its attitude toward labor. It is becoming as interested in labor and the workers as are its neighboring States of the North. It may be the South which will eventually inject a new and much-needed stream of blood into the labor movement.

Delegates returning from the recently held conventions down in Lakeland and elsewhere in the South express their pleasure and delight over the warm hospitality of their hosts—a hospitality as real, as honest as any they ever read about in books. There was none of that perfunctory, mechanical hospitality so often encountered up North.

Everyone, it seemed, from the Chamber of Commerce on down through to the last private citizen, did their utmost to make the delegates and visitors comfortable. City officials in Lakeland bent every effort to serve the hosts of labor people. Even the newspaper, so often the curse of the North, reported events fairly and decently.

There is much to be done in the South to raise the underdogs—and there are thousands of them—to a better standing of living and appreciation. There are vicious judges and courts who display a stern, fanatical antagonism to labor—as witness some of the antilabor laws passed not too far back.

But we do not feel that they are the true South—the South of warmth and neighborliness. And it is from the latter that a new understanding and unity will develop which will not only aid labor but the country as a whole.

The Propaganda of Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, do we want a regimented state? Those who do need only follow the philosophy of the OPA.

In a speech on April 3, 1917, Lenin shouted:

The world revolution is at hand. The bourgeois are about to be overthrown in all lands. Comrade workers! Take the factories from your exploiters. Comrade peasants! Take the land from your enemies, the landowners.

I want those who believe in free enterprise and free government to read the

statement of Samuel Crowther, an eminent economist, on the propaganda of fear as it relates to the OPA and communism. I am inserting his statement under unanimous consent:

THE PROPAGANDA OF FEAR

The support for continuing the Office of Price Administration has been gained by the most reckless misrepresentation of the facts of our economy and by playing on the fear of inflation.

Men in responsible positions have not hesitated to play with fire and it is of no consequence that some of them do not know they are playing with fire.

Another part of the support comes from the Communists. They clearly see that price fixing in peacetime is bound to lead to the regimented state.

The Communists are interested only in breaking down, and Lenin long ago advocated inflation and price fixing as the surest and quickest method of breaking down a capitalist state.

Sidney Hillman's PAC-CIO follows the Communist line.

Behind these groups, as has been previously brought out, are the great and growing number of people who are cashing in on price control.

BUSINESS FEARS REPRISALS

The opposition to price control by businessmen has not until lately had much expression. During the way they were afraid of being accused of putting dollars above patriotism.

Since then many have been afraid of reprisals, for it is practically impossible to conduct business today without violating some OPA regulation.

That is changing. Men are beginning to speak out.

More than a few politicians, however, who know thoroughly well what price control means and know something about inflation, are playing politics with the country's destiny.

They want to keep the New Dealers in office long enough to reap what they have sown and so they are willing to keep the OPA in some modified form where it can do a minimum of harm but still be in a position to get the brickbats of inflation.

The favorite propaganda device of the OPA is to magnify the 1919–20 boom after World War I and to represent the 1921 depression as colossal.

They do not hesitate to mix up 1919–20 in the minds of younger people with the 1929 stock-market crash and the great depression of the thirties which reached its depth in 1932.

QUESTIONNAIRE WITHDRAWN

For instance, in a questionnaire circulated among Los Angeles school children are these questions:

"Did you know there were more than 11,000,000 men unemployed during the depression after World War I?"

"If all price control were discontinued now, as it was after World War I, do you believe we could avoid another depression?"

Those questions mix the two periods. There were never 11,000,000 men unemployed in this country, even at the depths of 1932–33, and we have no reliable figures for 1920–21.

That questionnaire was withdrawn as soon as it was objected to and it was put down as the work of an overenthusiastic employee.

But variations of that sort of thing have been going on all over the country in many forms. It always happens that the most barefaced propaganda turns out, on investigation, to be unofficial.

The chief officers, however, do not hesitate to emit prophecies as to what would happen if price controls and subsidies were removed. Price Administrator Paul Porter told the House Banking and Currency Committee:

"If we are careless or if we lack the courage of our convictions and understanding, we can very easily cast aside our economic future into a waste land of business failure, farm foreclosure, unemployment, poverty, bitter dissension among groups, intense social unrest, and international insecurity."

Without OPA, he predicted, inflation would drive up prices from 30 to 50 percent within a year.

Secretary of the Treasury Vinson went so far as to tell the same committee that if price controls were continued for at least a year the $300,000,000,000 of savings can be the flywheel for our economy for a long time to come. This can give us the future that all Americans want. It can be the pleasant aftermath of war.

The several administrators of reconversion, including Messrs. Bowles and Porter, reported on April 8, 1946, that "the danger of a severe inflation will have passed by the middle of 1947."

The statements of these men have not the slightest foundation in fact or in theory.

The Communists have a higher grade of showmanship.

They accuse big business of being against the OPA as part of a plot to rob the American wage earner. The Worker, which is the official organ of the Communist Party, quotes one Joe Kuzma as telling the mass meeting on the ending of the steel strike:

"This is the rehearsal for the coming battle. Tomorrow we go after Congress and the White House to see that we are not robbed of our victory by high prices and inflation."

But neither the personality of the OPA nor its methods are the main points in issue.

RESULTS OF PRICE FIXING

The only vital point is that the device of price fixing is being used to cover up the cancer of inflation that is eating the vitality out of the American system of free enterprise and therefore out of the whole system of American freedom.

Nothing whatsoever is being done to stop inflation, but a great deal is being done to stop production.

It needs ever to be borne in mind, and this has been reiterated through this series, that the OPA issue of inflation is a false issue. A perfect holding down of prices would not hold down inflation. It would merely repudiate the money.

Production will not itself avoid inflation. The process of producing generates its own purchasing power and that will be added to the money already extant. But production, to repeat, will bring confidence.

The threat of inflation will remain as long as the commercial banks hold Government bonds, for these bonds are the source of our inflation.

The larger issue is this:

The delicate mechanism of free prices freely arrived at by buyer and seller is fundamental to our freedom.

If a man cannot buy and sell as he pleases, he cannot work or not work as he pleases, and once that great sector of freedom be withdrawn, little is left but an empty shell.

FREE BARGAINING NEEDED

But, cry the proponents of price control, we admit all that. We want to use price control as a method of gaining freedom by holding back the forces of inflation until supply catches up with demand.

The time when supply catches up with demand under price control is never.

Supply and demand can meet by free bargaining. They can never meet by direction.

On July 1, 1947, even if all our present prophets assemble in white robes on the White House lawn to greet the new era, there will be another gang at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue imploring the Congress to continue price control and giving exactly the same reasons as are given today.

The only way to end price control is to end it.

Memorial Day Thoughts for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article in the Waupaca Post, Waupaca, Wis., expresses the sentiments of the World War I veterans residing at King, Wis.:

MEMORIAL DAY THOUGHTS FOR CONGRESS FROM A GROUP OF VETERANS

KING, WIS., *May 20, 1946.*

WARNER BROTHERS,
Waupaca County Post.

DEAR FRIENDS: Your fine publication has proven itself the consistent friend of the veteran. We wish once again to sincerely thank you for this kindness at this moment; we also wish to extend to you especial thanks for your recent splendid front page article in support of the annual poppy sale. Never before have we observed this worthy cause better stated in public print.

And now we come to you in full confidence that you will, if reasonably possible, publish this, our plea for public understanding and support, at a time when the disabled and needy veteran of all America's past wars, is facing a crisis—the hospitalized or domiciled veteran who is single and without dependents.

Disquieting rumors from such reliable sources as the National Tribune, the Stars and Stripes, published in Washington, D. C., would indicate that the present Congress might once again, as oftentimes before, decide to adjourn without even the slightest consideration of simple and utterly fair veteran legislation, much of which has been pending before both Houses and much of which has been deliberately allowed to die in inactive committees for many years.

The disabled veteran and needy veteran is fair in his requests and never unmindful of the terrific tasks of Congress at this time. However, any attempt of the present Congress to adjourn without action on long-pending veteran legislation would constitute an unthinkable injustice.

We are asking civilian and veteran alike to immediately contact their Washington representatives, Congressman and Senator, not to tolerate such a violently dishonest plan if actually intended. Time is short.

The veterans of all past American wars who are single and without dependents have been for the past 13 years shamefully robbed of their legally granted compensation and pension awards when seeking the shelter of State or Federal soldiers homes, "especially provided for their care," for any reason—either sorely needed for hospitalization or domiciliary care. This is a Federal law. All are treated alike when single and without dependents. There are no exceptions. The indescribably wounded especially of World War II, to whom only a few months ago such solemn promises were made; the unfortunates who cannot bring documentary proof of damage sustained while in service; the so-called non-service-connected cases. All, if single and without dependents, are penalized under the disgustingly cheap and unequal provisions of Public Act No. 144, the repeal of which we are pleading during this session of Congress.

Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, in conjunction with Senator KNOWLAND, of California, has introduced S. 2078, which provides for the cancellation of Public Law No. 144 now and without further delay. We hereby publicly thank these fine men for their consideration of our honest pleadings.

They have assured us that it was never at any time the intention of the law to permit any veteran legislation such as Public Law No. 144 to exist or be perpetuated. We include in our thanks at this time all Representatives who will stand by us in correcting a terrible wrong. In all of this discussion we have the wholehearted approval of Gen. Omar N. Bradley, the able and human new Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, who as recently as May 15 issued a smashing indictment against the brutality of Public Law No. 144. We commend reading of same to all. See Milwaukee Sentinel of the above-mentioned date.

Every known veteran organization is demanding its immediate repeal and has done so for years. In the last 2 months the entire chain of the powerful Hearst papers have joined our fight for common justice. Our thanks to you, Mr. Hearst, and your fine associates. Thanks to all other publications who are assisting. Not forgetting Eddie Cantor and all his generous companions of the stage and screen, who personally witnessed the effects of Public Law No. 144 on our frightfully maimed, paralyzed, and otherwise incapacitated comrades in Government hospitals.

Our story is long; we cannot conclude without giving all America a clear look at the awfullest piece of veteran legislation ever enacted. For sheer brutality and complete inequality it stands alone. Public Act No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, is a vicious amendment to the infamous Economy Act of March 20, 1933. Under this act all single veterans who were without dependents were from then on reduced in their compensation or pension awards while cared for in State or Federal soldiers' homes; if service connected in their disabilities, to $15 per month, regardless of their higher rating outside of these homes. The so-called non-service-connected cases who must establish permanent and total disabilities from all causes were reduced to $6 per month, while their outside rating was at that time $40 per month. Then on July 13, 1943, 10 years later, this Public Law No. 144 was approved so as to be sure to include the luckless single veteran of World War II in the rulings of the stated Economy Act of 1933. This incidentally will include your daughter if she served in the WAC's WAVES, or SPARS and happens to be single when accepting governmental hospitalization or domiciliary care. Your aged fathers of past wars and young sons and brothers of the last wars all are penalized under this Public Law No. 144 unless repealed now. There is no possible excuse for further delay.

The angels must have whispered to our legislators on July 13, 1943, for they generously raised the rates of the single veteran from the former rates of $6 and $15 to the present magnificent awards of $8 and $20 per month. A glorious increase of $2 and $5 to meet all unavoidable expenses which constantly arise even though hospitalized or domiciled by the Government.

The score now stands: Injured in the service reduced from $115 per month and over to $20 per, if single. Total 66 cents per day. If nonservice connected and on the basis of permanent and total disability, reduced from $50 and $60 per month "this last amount depending on the age of 65 including the condition of permanent and total disability," to $8 per month, or 26 cents per day.

There you have the sordid details of Public Law No. 144. While we write the law lies before us. Many veterans lose their dependents too while being hospitalized. They at once come under the rulings of Public Law No. 144. All do so whether they remain months, years, or permanently.

We cannot conclude without quoting General Bradley's recent public statement. "Since when is it the business of Congress to attempt by law to insure, by depriving the hospitalized veteran of comforts and essentials during the period of his disability, that he will die a pauper?

"Moreover, the vast majority of sick and disabled veterans in Government hospitals do not go there to die, but to get well, and most of them do get well, and they are entitled to an opportunity to resume their restored, healthful lives, without the handicap of being deliberately impoverished by a meddlesome and callous Government."

Our unlimited thanks to the Waupaca County Post in allowing us to state our story in full.

We are by no means editorial writers and have not attempted to dramatize a situation not generally known to the public. Our statements are authentic. We feel sure the ever-fair American people will support our fight for decent treatment. Thanks, all.

WORLD WAR I VETERANS AT KING, WIS.

The Real Issue Is Not Yet Faced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of May 31, 1946:

THE REAL ISSUE IS NOT YET FACED

The soft-coal strike is settled, and Congress has passed the Case bill, but seems determined to hold the President's national emergency measure in abeyance as a club over the impending maritime strike. So coal will be mined, production gets another fresh start, but the supremacy of the public interests over those of warring labor and management remains a much-invoked ideal, devoid of legal substance.

The enactment of the Case bill does not settle this question nor does it offer too much promise of industrial peace. Representative Voorhis of California put it aptly when he told the House, "The issue on the one hand was whether the Government could meet a crisis." The issue now is legislation—the Case bill—with which the country must live for years.

The Case bill goes no further to meet the ultimate necessities of a strike-caused national emergency than did the Railway Labor Act. If, under the Case bill, the maritime unions should reject the recommendations of a Presidential fact-finding board, the country would find itself in the same situation as that just created by the two railway brotherhoods. The President would again have to ask Congress for adequate powers. The Case bill offers the States no pattern for laws which would meet such a situation as that created in New York by the Rochester general strike.

In other ways this bill is a hasty mixture of very good and very bad. Even with last-minute elimination of the broad restoration of court injunctions, it in effect hands the disputing parties—management in particular—a small arsenal of weapons and tells them to fight it out locally. The President's best argument, should he veto it, would be that it neither meets the emergency nor offers a well-considered permanent code.

As for the coal settlement, while John L. Lewis did not get all he had demanded, he certainly got a lot more than the operators at any time offered. Few will begrudge the miners some of the benefits won. But the operators insist that they are handed a situation disastrous for the industry. If this proves true, and coal further loses out in competition with other fuels, the miners may ultimately suffer along with a losing industry.

There is still time for Congress to enact the President's emergency bill. The defeat of the draft section has weakened but by no means invalidated the measure. Congress still could hold the draft in reserve against the greatest of extremities. What is needed, above all, is for Congress to declare, as has the President, in terms unmistakable, that the Government of the United States is more powerful than any combination of warring interests, and that it will, if need be, assert that power.

Waterways of Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Houston Post of May 28, 1946:

WATERWAYS OF TOMORROW

If this country continues growing and building up, another generation should witness a vast system of rivers, canals, and lakes teeming with commerce, and many waterways harnessed for hydroelectric power, irrigation, domestic water supply, and flood control.

Even now Congress is contemplating a billion-dollar stride in that direction. The House Rivers and Harbors Committee has approved a bill calling for the ultimate expenditure of at least that amount for such developments in a gigantic, long-range program.

Enactment of this measure would not clinch the deal; it merely authorizes the projects. Later legislation would be necessary to appropriate the money, and it probably would be made available in broken doses, from time to time. Besides developing the country's far-flung water resources, the construction would provide a huge backlog of public works to provide jobs in slack times.

Naturally some railroads and private power interests oppose this legislation, and they have their side. It is tough on them to face Government-financed competition, toward which those interests themselves must contribute substantially in taxes. And they have made compelling arguments against some of the waterway projects, for which sponsors seek to obtain congressional approval through log-rolling and pork-barrel tactics, rather than on merit—projects entailing huge expenditures all out of proportion to any benefits they are likely to bring to the American people in our time.

On the other hand, the country's waterways are natural resources, just as are minerals, soil, and forests. When their development appears economically justified, it is to the public interest to develop them. In a report of its hearings the House committee said:

"It was repeatedly brought out that the advantages afforded by low-cost transportation have rebounded not only to the benefit of areas directly served by our great waterway and harbor system, but to the welfare of the country as a whole."

By way of substantiation, the report said that water-borne commerce, exclusive of the Great Lakes and ocean traffic, increased from 7,826,000,000 ton-miles in 1931 to 31,343,000,000 ton-miles in 1944. That is a growth of

400 percent; but of course the 1944 figure includes abnormal wartime transportation. However, the waterways proved a tremendous asset in the prosecution of the war.

The House committee believes that we should prepare now "for the probable trend of the postwar era to decentralize major national activities by making available innumeral sites for the disposal of industrial expansion along the banks of our important waterways and ship channels." Such decentralization may prove one of the most significant effects of waterway development, a graphic example of which may be seen in the Houston ship channel.

Address Before War Veterans' Convention at Hartford, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday June 3, 1946

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Appendix an address I made before a war veterans' convention in Hartford on May 26.

I have felt for some time that the veterans, in particular, should enlarge their scope of interest in the issues of the day and at least voice opinions on matters of concern to the Nation as a whole rather than, as in the past, restrict their activities to measures of specific veterans' concern.

The address follows:

Not long ago, I had a letter from a young veteran of this war. He had been drafted while in his second year of college.

He had been doing some thinking and decided to write his Congressman what he thought. As I read his letter, I could see that kid, exploring his own thinking, and then thinking over what he thought as he typed it. When he left the country for overseas, there was a strong unity tying everyone together. In former years when there were strikes he was too young to think much about them. He had been too young to understand the quarrels between the administration and Congress, and the excitement and tense feeling over legislation, the worry of the months as we adults watched the oncoming of the war. For 2 years before he went into the Army, there had been one thought underlying all our national activity—at first, allied victory over Hitler, and later American and Allied victory over Hitler and Japan.

Now he had come back. He didn't have the problems so many veterans had. He was unmarried. He had a home with his folks. It didn't matter if he didn't go to work immediately. In fact, he was planning to go back to college. But an awful lot of the fellows who had come back didn't have homes. They were crowding in with relatives, even though they were married, and some had children. An awful lot of them couldn't adjust themselves, didn't know what they wanted to work at. Some had gone back to jobs, and while they were working, they weren't happy at work. Some others had got back their jobs and then the plants went out on strike. Many were finding it tough meeting the higher cost of living. It wasn't only their personal problems that worried them. The country seemed at sixes and sevens. One group was saying to the next "You're another!". The allied nations that had gone through so much together you'd think that nothing could ever separate them again, were arguing, disputing, couldn't get together even on what seemed simple issues. Congress was wrangling.

The negro soldier who had come back a hero from battle couldn't get a decent job. White soldiers, each one of whom in his own way had contributed his great part to preserving civilization, found they weren't the heroes in civilian clothes they had been in uniform. Individually and collectively, these veterans who had so looked forward to returning to the land they had saved were beginning to wonder what had gone wrong.

All these thoughts, this veteran, himself prematurely aged by the experiences of war, but in years hardly more than a boy, poured out on paper. But then he went on as a grown man, speaking for the people, rather than for himself or for the veterans.

The war, he said, was too immense for this generation to comprehend in its whole. Its full impact, from the early days of Manchuria, through the launching of the atom bomb, would not be fully sensed nor appreciated until all the details had been drawn together and put down on paper over and over again by the historians, who objectively would weigh one fact against the other, and then try to draw a complete picture. The war, he said, would not be fully understood until the world had weathered through the first several years after Hiroshima and we have seen how far we will have progressed in maintaining the unity of purpose for peace that kept us together in war.

And then he went on with his ideas as to what is needed in the United States for the development of a nation whose people have fought for a good cause and a righteous one.

In his long letter, not once did he ask anything specific for himself as a veteran, nor for veterans. He recommended only measures he thought were good for the American people.

My reaction when I finished the letter was, "what wisdom can come out of the mouths of babes." But even as I said that I knew that this was no child speaking. He had lived a generation in 3 years—and that is what has happened to the great majority of 12,000,000 who went away and lived to return.

I think I am somewhat expert in sensing public sentiment as it is expressed in letters. In my terms in Congress I judge I have received, and answered, about 200,000 letters from people who decided to write their Congressman. These letters have covered every conceivable subject. They have been pro- and anti-labor, pro- and anti-business, pro and anti every issue of the day, pro- and anti-Great Britain, pro- and anti-Russia, some calling for strict isolationism—and today a return to isolationism—some calling for all-out internationalism. Women have written the tiniest details of their difficulty in bringing up their children while their soldier husbands were away. These, to say nothing of the individual problems which people called on the Government and their Congressman to solve.

Veterans have had claims. Soldiers and veterans have had gripes. But for the most part, veterans now, and in former years, have written, urging or condemning a certain proposal which had reference to veterans. We had come to regard the veterans as a group interested only in veterans' affairs. Seldom did they take a stand on a social or economic issue. Something concerned with military development, yes; something concerned with legislation written solely for the veterans, emphatically yes. But I repeat that seldom did veterans or veterans' organizations express a viewpoint, or take a stand, with regard to over-all measures, pertaining to the country as a whole. For example, housing, or labor legislation, or international trade, or social security.

In other words, politically, their interest has appeared restricted to measures that directly affect them. Which brings up the question, Are veterans a special class of citizens? Or does this letter from the young veteran I have cited, foretell a new and enlarged approach to national and international issues, when veterans, as other groups, will regard themselves as citizens just as any others, and look upon issues as they affect the entire country.

It is in line with the battle which has been going on since the founding of our Nation—do we legislate for a section or for the Nation as a whole. Sectionalism is dying down. At times such bills do go through, but the practice is growing weaker as time goes on.

There has been a noticeable change in the thinking of Members of Congress on legislation, at least as I have witnessed it. Men from the West have given all-out support to legislation that had more interest for the East than for themselves—and didn't ask anything in return. It doesn't always happen, but it is encouraging when it does. It foretells the time when in our individual thinking we will look upon all problems as they affect the country as a whole rather than our particular bailiwick. You and I know that what is good for all is good for us individually.

But that must also foretell a broader point of view on the part of special interests. I do not use the term in a derogatory manner. Far from it. I have in mind that the farmer must develop an interest in matters that do not directly affect agriculture, and the worker in matters that do not necessarily directly affect labor, and the veterans in matters whether they directly affect veterans or not.

To be sure, many veterans, as individuals, do write me on the issues of the day, regardless of their nature. But there is no concerted gathering of opinion such as I receive from veterans on matters directly of interest to them.

For example, the mail the other morning brought two letters, one from a veterans' organization, the other from a labor union. The veterans' organization asked my help in getting a necessary appropriation for the necessary veterans' hospital building program. Of course, I'm all for it. The labor union asked for several things, a higher minimum wage, and a guaranteed annual wage—both direct labor measures. But, in addition, they wanted OPA continued and liberalizing amendments to the Social Security Act. And that I must admit is fairly typical of labor unions. Regardless of how you might feel about unions, there is this one thing for which we must give them full credit, and that is that they take an active interest, not only in matters that directly pertain to them, but also in issues of general importance to the Nation as a whole.

Again I emphasize that it doesn't matter what stand is taken. What does matter is that they have emerged from a restricted interest in public questions, and, as citizens, have expanded their interest to practically all the questions of the day.

That is in line with the development of political education which is vastly important to a people who want democracy to work.

Veterans must prepare to take their place in the future leadership of the country as citizens who have devoted a good part of their important, maturing years to the protection and preservation of our Nation and form of government. Social security, full employment, international trade, international cooperation, labor questions, fair employment practices, all these matters and many more are properly the concern of veterans, and veterans' groups, as they are the concern of anyone else.

It is now taken for granted that we are entering a new age. The only question is, when will the new age start, or when will we be aware that we are living in a new age. When will the scientific wonders that the

war produced be put to work for man at peace, to keep him at peace, and to keep him happy at peace?

We are already in a new political era. Political thinking today, and social and economic thinking, too, are vastly different from what they were 15 years ago. We know enough now to know that man-made upsets can be prevented—if we have the will and the self-discipline to prevent them. That is the moot question today. Are we ready and willing to make the temporary sacrifices—or what seem like sacrifices—to ward off future disaster.

The rank and file of the people demand that we take preventive steps to ward off inflation and to rebuild a sound economy at home, to resolve our differences and rebuild peace throughout the world. What do the veterans think—they whose lives were more upset than any other group?

Labor doesn't hesitate to make its thinking known on these issues. Unions have long pleaded for better housing for everyone, that natural resources be developed for the benefit of everyone, that full employment is imperative for a sustained prosperity, that labor and management must get together, that there must be a concerted effort to work in harmony with other nations for better understanding, for more give and take. Individual citizens have long pleaded for these things. Will the veterans, as a group, put themselves on record?

The letter I told you about when I started to speak is one of many I have received from veterans of this war. I singled that one out because it was more comprehensive than most of the others, but from those who have written me, I expect that by and large the veterans of this war will be studying and expressing themselves as citizens concerned with the country as a whole.

Don't think I overlook the importance of veterans' interests. Far from it. I am merely suggesting that the veterans enlarge their scope of interest, take their rightful places as citizens and work and demand measures and programs which will be as important for the miner in Pennsylvania as for the farmer in Iowa.

The men and women who return from this war have had an advantage of living and mingling with people of other parts of the country, and other parts of the world. In that respect the war gave them a benefit. Most of us live pretty much in a circumscribed sphere. Except for occasional travel, most of us live in one community, pretty much among the same kind of people, all our lives. We don't get the opportunity to learn at first hand what makes the wheels go round in other sections of the country, or the world.

But human wants are the same everywhere. Most people want no more than peace and security, and the opportunity to gain them and keep them.

Most economists state that with the tremendous resources at our command there is no reason why we should have depression, why the simple needs that most people require should not always be available. I would say that our experience during the years between the wars, and during the war itself, has proven that we must approach political questions—and social and economic questions are political questions now—from the preventive point of view, rather than from the curative point of view. We have learned it is not necessary for the evils that sicken our economic and social structure to take hold before we attempt a cure. We know what not to do—or should know.

Most of you have had experience in the stock market—and I daresay that it wasn't a particularly happy experience. We were compelled to pass legislation to cure the conditions which permitted inflation in the stock market and the loss of billions of dollars to the people. Conditions would be ripe for a repetition of that situation—but, instead, preventive regulations have been imposed under law, so that the impact of the terrific rise and fall of stock values can and will be avoided.

Of course, there are people who don't like these regulations. They think they are going to be smart this time and get out before it is too late. But, if the controls were not there, millions of people who would not be smart would be wiped out should the crash come—and not only they would be disastrously affected but the economy of the entire country would be disastrously affected as well.

The country is yearning to go forward to production heights we never knew before. We are figuratively on a rumbling economic volcano, and it is the responsibility of government to keep that volcano from erupting. We went through it before, we know it can be prevented, and it will be prevented if the people so demand.

We have ahead of us sustained prosperity, not a prosperity which will reach fantastic heights one year and drop to the bottom without warning. We are ahead of all other nations in our standards of living, in our productive resources, and our know-how. And yet there is vast room for improvement, for despite our happy condition, fully one-third of our people do not enjoy even our minimum standards of living, even though they be better than elsewhere in the world. Until all of our people have a measure of economic and social security in accordance with our minimum standards, we cannot boast of prosperity or even stability.

These are the issues of today and tomorrow. I am not suggesting on what side the veterans aline themselves. We may or may not be in agreement. That is not the important thing now. What I feel is important is that in the years ahead, when every adult in the country will grow more aware of the fact that issues and events do affect his life one way or the other, veterans take their stand as citizens of the country for whose peace, prosperity, and preservation they risked their lives.

Need Firm Hand to Free Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Philadelphia Record of June 3, 1946:

NEED FIRM HAND TO FREE POLAND—BOR URGES STRONG BUT PEACEFUL ARGUMENT BY UNITED STATES AND BRITISH

Poland is being denied the liberty for which she fought with the Allies and "has been delivered in bondage to Red totalitarianism," Gen. Tadeusz Bor-Komorowski, hero of the 1944 Warsaw insurrection against the Germans, charged yesterday.

Only "forceful argument" by the United States and Britain can bring about true freedom in his country, General Bor told reporters. He spoke at a press conference following a luncheon tendered in his honor by the Eastern Pennsylvania district of the Polish-American Congress, in the Bellevue-Stratford.

Through his interpreter, the general hastened to explain that "by forceful, I do not mean fighting. I mean peaceful, but strong, representation."

RULED BY PUPPET SOVIET REGIME

"Poland now is being ruled by a puppet Soviet regime, imposed upon her by foreign powers," he declared. "The Red Army and the Soviet secret police (NKVD) are deciding factors controlling every sphere of political, social, and economic life of the country."

"Out of 60 key posts in the general staff of the so-called Polish Army, 40 are occupied by Soviet officers who do not even know the language of the country," General Bor declared. "A great majority of the division commanders are Russian generals. There is no real freedom of press, of assembly, of political activity."

"So long as the present Polish Government remains in power, more than 200,000 Polish soldiers who fought with the Allies will remain in exile in England, Scotland, Italy, and other European countries," he stated.

POLAND NOT YET FREE

"They fought for liberty for 6 years," he said. "They will not return under present conditions. They realize Poland is not yet free."

At the luncheon General Bor thanked the organization for the welcome accorded him and recalled Philadelphia's tradition of liberty.

"May the moment come soon," he said, "when the sound of the liberty bell will also ring forth in my country, heralding true freedom and independence."

Matthew F. Dombrowski, president of the district organization, presided. Municipal Court Judge Eugene C. Bonniwell introduced the general.

General Bor, who was named head of the Polish armies by the Polish government-in-exile in London, has been touring this country since May 3, the guest of the Polish-American Congress. He plans to return to London the middle of this month. He left last night for New York, after a 2-day visit in this city.

Industry Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of June 2, 1946:

INDUSTRY PROFITS

In answering criticisms of OPA, Mr. Bowles frequently refers to the large wartime increase in profits. He recently produced what he called a typical sample of industry profits, before taxes, in 1944 under price control, compared with prewar (1936–39) earnings—meat-packers' profits, up 566 percent; cotton textile mill profits, up 1,110 percent. In the current issue of the National City Bank Bulletin these profits data are examined. It is pointed out that the large percentage increases reflect primarily the fact that comparison is made with a depressed base period, when many companies in the respective industries were operated at deficits or barely breaking even. Moreover, these figures refer not to profits, but to earnings available for taxes and profits. Since taxes in 1944 were considerably greater than in the prewar period, the profits retained by industry showed a considerably smaller rise than suggested in the figures cited by Mr. Bowles.

The use of such figures fails to show what has actually happened in industry. In its study the bank points out that in 1944 and 1945 net income after taxes for leading meat-packing companies averaged only nine-tenths of one cent per dollar of sales. The highest retained profit during the past 13 years was

1.6 cents per dollar of sales, while the average was 1.05 cents per dollar. A survey of the return on net worth for 20 large meat-packing companies shows that the average in the years 1936–39 was 3.1 percent. It increased to 8.8 percent in 1941 and has declined in each year since then; in 1945 it was 5.4 percent. This latest figure is substantially above the prewar average, but only moderately greater than the 4.9 percent return in 1939 and just about the same as the 5.5 percent return in 1936. An examination of the prewar years shows that the average return was reduced to 3.1 percent because of the deficit recorded in 1938. The average for the other three years of the base period was 4.4 percent.

A similar picture is shown for leading cotton textile mills. During the depressed base period the return on net worth was 2.9 percent. In 1945 the return was 7.7 percent. However, the average net profit margin in 1945 was 3.3 cents per dollar of sales. While there has been a considerable improvement in the cotton textile industry as compared with the depressed prewar period, the extent of that improvement is substantially smaller than suggested by Mr. Bowles' figures of an 1,100 percent increase before taxes.

Profits data do not tell the entire story. Throughout all industry, output rose considerably during the war and this development naturally was reflected in larger profits. This wartime volume has been reversed in many industries. Current profits undoubtedly reflect this development as well as the interruptions to production due to strikes, reconversion difficulties, and related problems.

Address Before United Daughters of the Confederacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the United Daughters of the Confederacy, at Washington, D. C., on the occasion of the one hundred and thirty-eighth birthday of Jefferson Davis:

General Howell, Mrs. Johnson, members of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, ladies and gentlemen, fellow Americans, all, today, on the eve of his birthday, we pause to pay tribute to a great American, a citizen of the great State of Mississippi and of the South, one who through the force of circumstance was placed in the middle of the greatest tragedy of our country's history. Jefferson Davis was a good man, an able man, a man of limitless courage who met the problems of the times with that courage and heroism of which all of us may be proud. True it is that mistakes were made, but they were of the head and not the heart.

Through the years just following the Civil War, perhaps no man was as maligned and castigated as was Jeff Davis. Every order which he issued during his Presidency of the Confederacy was held up as evidence that he was a monster trying to destroy his country. Yet if we will study the record, we find that Jeff Davis was a kindly, tender, gentle, and considerate man. One who it is true was faced with limitless problems, problems he tried to meet. At times harsh orders were issued, apparently in an effort by their harshness to cure the troubles toward which they were directed, for nowhere do we find that there was ever any effort on the part of Jefferson Davis to carry them out.

Ladies and gentlemen, as we study the history of the period just preceding the Civil War, we must come to the conclusion that the real leaders during that period on both sides deplored any conflict between the sections of the country, even to the last the real and true leaders hoped that there would be some way to avoid bloodshed; and that some way could be found to settle the differences peaceably, yet because of propaganda, the work of radical agitators, the two sections of our Nation were moved right on into armed conflict. Southern leaders continued to hope that war could be averted as did the stable leaders of the North. Only when the Federal fleet set out for Fort Sumter did the realization come to the South that conflict was to follow.

As we now look back we can see so many ways that this terrible conflict could have been avoided. In passing judgment, we must realize that those decisions were made in the stress of the moment, at a time when the real issues were obscured by the propaganda of those who would serve their own purposes. Radicals in the North had found it popular in their immediate sections to advocate an upheaval of the basic economy of the South and of southern people. It was popular in many sections to attack the South and its institutions. It was a way for candidates in such areas to get elected; it was a means to obtain crowds for spellbinders; it was a method of collecting large cash contributions to be used by the takers as they saw fit. Then as now there was no special care taken to present the facts as they were, but to present them as the listeners wanted to hear them. To those of us here today we know that if the agitators of the day had devoted their efforts to easing the economic shock of destroying the basic property of the South that the problem could have been handled. Slavery was already proving economically unsound and was even then on its way out.

Today as then we see general attacks on the South and on southern leaders. Again it has become popular in many areas to attack the South. It serves to direct attention away from the shortcomings of the sections where such attacks originate. It gives the speaker or the commentator or the writer a chance to state the facts as he wishes because his listeners outside the South have no way of knowing the true facts and therefore the sponsor of such attacks can make his charges striking. He can make such charges appeal to his readers or listeners because he doesn't have to prove his case. I have even heard it said by a Member of Congress that as long as he "jumped on" the South or on a few southern Congressmen occasionally he would have no trouble getting reelected in his district.

Thus today, as in the days of Jefferson Davis, we see such attacks on our section of the country are a good way to obtain votes. Now as then attacks on the South are a good means of obtaining cash contributions. We see evidence of this in such attacks as are leveled against the poll tax, segregation, and many other of the practices that have proven in the South that these two races, white and black, can live together in peace and harmony. Our school systems are attacked, the poor economic conditions of the Negro and of the southern people is played up in a completely untrue light. Forgotten is the fact that more rapid strides have been made in education in the South in the last 30 years than in any other section of the Nation. Forgotten is the fact that we spend a greater percentage of our tax dollar for education than does any other area of this great Nation.

We know that the economic condition of the Negro in the South is not as good as it could be; the same is generally true of the Nation. It is rapidly improving. We do know that the welfare of the white people of the South is tied with the economic welfare of the Negro, for they constitute a great percentage of the entire population.

I say to those agitators who are trying to stir up trouble in the only section of the Nation where large numbers of these two races have lived in peace and harmony for these many years, that if they are sincere in their efforts to improve education of the Negro in the South, they should be directing their efforts toward Federal aid for education. If they sincerely want to aid in improving economic conditions, they can aid by doing away with the discriminatory freight rates which have done much to retard the economic development of our section.

No, I am afraid that isn't what is desired by these agitators. They want to use the Negro in their own areas first. This they are doing. Now they want to use them in our sections next. We all remember the picture of the dark days of reconstruction, when the northern carpetbagger, the southern scalawag made use of the Negro to visit on our people the harshest existence imaginable, the darkest blot in the Nation's history.

We know that the Negro vote today is largely a controlled vote wherever they are found in great numbers. We know that in those sections of the South where they now vote in primary elections that they are ripe pickings for the political or labor boss, and will be for many years to come, certainly until they reach the stage of development as individuals that they can be relied upon to act as individuals.

As we see around us today these disturbing conditions we cannot help but notice the similarity with the conditions which faced the country in the days of Jefferson Davis. Then it was believed by our Southern leaders that the South could go its way and the North its way; this the South tried to do. It took a deplorable conflict to decide that issue. A war that alined brother against brother, father against son, and resulted in the loss of the finest young manhood of the Nation, North and South. Victory was with the North, yet both sides lost.

Today we can be proud of the men of the South who took part in that conflict. We can be and are proud of Jefferson Davis, of General Howell, and the thousands of Southern soldiers whom he represents here today. The courage they displayed under the most trying circumstances, the effectiveness of their efforts can in no way be discounted because they lost, for in losing, the determination, the zeal, the honorable way in which they conducted themselves is unsurpassed in our Nation's history. Today we pay tribute to Jefferson Davis, to General Howell, and the thousands of the South who believed in a principle.

Yet today, ladies and gentlemen, the Nation needs to study the events leading up to this conflict. We must, as we pay tribute to our distinguished leader of long ago, call on the people of the entire Nation for a courage of a different sort. We must above all have temperance and understanding. Those of us from the South must be temperate ourselves. By the same token, those in other sections must realize we are meeting our problems in the South, that rapid strides are being made. They must help by not trying through the force of the Federal Government to upset those things which have enabled two races, white and black, to live in the South together peaceably and harmoniously.

In this great, broad country of ours, there are many sections. All have their problems. I believe, however, that so far as other areas are concerned, the American people there, are best able to solve their own problems, being Americans I believe they will solve them. I know we in the South are best able to solve our own problems. As Americans I believe we can be counted on to solve those problems, fairly and justly for the good of all our citi-

zens. It is to be hoped that the people of the Nation will not be led to follow these agitators who would serve their own selfish purposes, and thereby defeat the very ends they contend they would serve.

May God help us all in these trying times as we pay tribute to a great man, a man of honor, and the thousands who served with him, leaving to us in the South a heritage of which we can be proud. May all the people of the Nation learn from the mistakes of that era, to have tolerance, and understanding. Then as Jefferson Davis said in closing the only book he wrote of this tragic period of our history:

"It is needful that the truth, the whole truth, should be known so that crimination and recrimination may forever cease, and then on a basis of fraternity and faithful regard for the rights of the States there may be written on the arch of the Union 'Esto perpetua'."

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

STATE OF MONTANA,
LIVESTOCK SANITARY BOARD,
Helena, May 28, 1946.

Hon. WESLEY A. D'EWART.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN D'EWART: One dislikes to complain and especially so when a Federal agency is at stake. I refer to the OPA.

Insofar as Montana is concerned, their regulations most certainly are not for public welfare and definitely against sanitation. If their restrictions on livestock and meat are continued, it may result in a calamity occurring this fall and winter in the State of Montana.

We have more mature cattle in the State at the present time than ever before in the history of the State. The figure given by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, as of January 1, 1946, is 1,810,000 cattle. We are very definitely of the opinion that this is an underestimate and that we have slightly over 2,000,000 mature cattle in Montana. In addition to this, there is every indication that we will have the largest calf crop ever in the history of Montana. We estimate the calf crop at approximately 800,000. That means that counting the calf crop, during the summer months we will have approximately 2,800,000 cattle in Montana to fee. We do not have as many sheep as we usually have, but the increase in cattle more than offsets any decrease in the number of sheep.

Grass conditions in the State are spotted. In some sections we are assured of grass; in other sections conditions are not so good. In some areas they are badly in need of rain and unless we get rain in the last few days of May and early in June, grass will become stunted, and if this occurs, it will mean a shortage in the hay crop. With Federal regulations which restrict the feeding of concentrates to livestock, we know definitely that we will have a shortage of concentrates, grains, and mineral salts to feed our livestock. In the face of this increase in livestock, probable decrease in grass and hay, and a definite decrease in concentrates, the OPA has cut the quota in Montana so that a number of butcher shops have not had a single pound of meat to sell for several days.

At the Buttrey Super Market, David Mix, who operates the meat market, probably the largest in Helena, has not had a meat supply for 2 weeks, other than a dribble now and then that he obtained from Denver, Colo. Yesterday, and for several days past, he has not had a pound of meat to sell to the public. To say the least, it is appalling stupidity which may have a lasting effect not only upon the health of the children of Montana, but upon the health of the children of the United States. We know that the expectant mother must have an adequate protein food if her child is to be born with normal glandular development. We know that the growing child must have an adequate protein food if its glandular development is to grow and be normal. That which is lost in childhood life seldom, if ever, is regained. In animal life, we know that a runt is always a runt.

On Friday last, a returned veteran was in this office requesting our aid. He is a butcher at Missoula. He has a quota, but for some unaccountable reason OPA restrictions prohibit him from having these animals slaughtered at a recognized licensed abattoir or slaughterhouse. He was told that the procedure for him to follow was to go out into the country to a farmer, have the farmer slaughter one of his animals, and then he could buy the slaughtered animal from the farmer. He was told that he, himself, could not slaughter it, but that the farmer must slaughter it and then sell it to him, and that under such procedure it would not count against his quota. It could be slaughtered in a dirty corral, it could be fly-blown, it could be diseased, it could be dirty, and it could be slaughtered without inspection, contrary to the law of Montana, just so long as the unlicensed farmer slaughtered it. If that isn't building up a black market, I don't know what is. If that isn't destroying sanitary precautions drawn up for the protection of public health, I don't know what is. Such procedure not only builds up a black market and endangers public health, but if carried on throughout the United States, it will mean the daily loss of hundreds of thousands of pounds of badly needed fats, and badly needed hormones and medical supplies. This overseas veteran said to me, "If I had known this is what I was coming back to, I would have stayed over there."

If the livestock industry is to be safeguarded and the State of Montana protected against a calamity, now, of all times, we need sane regulations that will aid in immediate, orderly marketing, and preventing a glut of half-fat cattle this fall.

The quota that we must now operate under is the quota for 1944 when many of our boys were in the armed forces and a number of our workers were out of the State on war work. There are more people in Montana today than there were in 1944.

We appeal to you to use your best efforts to have the present OPA health-destroying and Nation-destroying restrictions withdrawn.

Very sincerely,

W. J. BUTLER,
State Veterinary Surgeon.

Williams College Students Set Fine Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a telegram from the student body of Williams College. It explains itself. The spirit shown here is the one on which all the hope of the world depends today.

WILLIAMSTOWN, MASS., *May 23, 1946.*

JERRY VOORHIS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Student body of Williams College intends to commemorate Memorial Day by reducing food consumption for all the day's meals to 1,200 calories and content similar to average in starving nations overseas, with savings contributed to world relief. We feel this small sacrifice is in spirit of consecration in which this Memorial Day will be celebrated, and by emphasizing to each person the seriousness of food situation will discourage food wastage. We urge you to use your influence to secure cooperation of Nation to show rest of world that America is aware of the desperate conditions and is willing to take measures to aid starving pepoles. Done on a Nation-wide basis, savings of both money and food would be material. Would appreciate reply regarding action you are taking. Similar messages are being forwarded to others of the Nation's leaders, State and Government officials, and to the Nation's colleges.

UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL,
WILLIAMS COLLEGE.

This Appears Good Legislation Amending the National Service Life Insurance Provisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, our war veterans have urged and looked forward a long time for the emergence of some such legislation as H. R. 6371. After making the few inquiries that I made today, to the members of the committee having charge of the legislation, the questions in my mind have been cleared up and I want to express myself heartily in favor of this bill. Various other bills have been called to my attention by veterans and veteran organizations, such as H. R. 2379 and later H. R. 5772, which I take it were among the several bills which the subcommittee studied while evolving H. R. 6371, the present measure. With that assurance that all these kindred bills have been studied, and knowing that the subcommittee has worked diligently with great thought and consideration to enact the very best possible provisions, I want to express my satisfaction with this measure.

Several things come to my mind in regard to the question of insurance for veterans, in addition to the fact that prophets of gloom predicted that the Government could not carry on this type of insurance when it was originated in World War I. The one thing that distresses me a great deal is that so many veterans of World War I seemed not to care about their insurance and allowed it to lapse. So far as that is to be expected of human nature, I suppose we must expect the same proportion and a large number by far after World War II to show the same indifference. I hope

not. I am glad to receive the assurance of the gentleman from Kansas that ample provisions are contained in this bill to enable ex-servicemen to reinstate their insurance if it has been permitted to lapse, and also that liberal contracts are now available for their choice of policies. Private companies could hardly offer a greater choice.

This recent World War has been more terrible than any previous war in human history, viewed from many different angles. Not the least among these horrible aspects of this war has been the large proportion of losses at sea or in the remote areas of the earth, from tropical jungles to Arctic snows, where the death of the soldier cannot be positively known, and therefore he has been classed as missing in action. Because of the global aspect of the war, the records must necessarily be incomplete and our information concerning our soldiers lost and how lost rather indefinite. For that reason I commend the committee for having made liberal provisions for automatic insurance and for having resolved doubts, where the records are scant, in favor of the soldier and his loved ones.

The President's Labor Draft Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include four editorials on the subject of the President's labor draft bill.

[From the Hartford Courant of May 28, 1946]

THE FRUIT OF UN-AMERICANISM

With Connecticut's Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE and New York's pink-dyed Representative MARCANTONIO recorded in opposition to the President's emergency program for stopping strikes, with Harold E. Stassen and all the bigwigs of labor organizations denouncing it as un-American, an examination of the causes of the opposition would seem to be in order.

The opposition does not all flow from the same spring. The ire of the labor leaders can be accepted as natural. Their private domain is being invaded by Government. They must protect their vested interest, created by the very Government that now seeks to circumscribe it. While they pledge political punishment of President Truman, they wholly overlook the fact that the bill is as anti-industry as it is anti-labor. Penalties would run against employers if they become as obstreperous as were President Whitney, of the railroad trainmen, and President Johnson, of the railroad engineers. Moreover, the penalties would run to the stockholders of a seized corporation, whether it was their representatives or labor's that forced seizure. All profits under Government operation would be covered into the United States Treasury. Experience with Government operation hardly justifies the expectation of profits, but that does not alter the confiscatory nature of the bill passed by the House and now being debated by the Senate. The law would be a club over the heads of both labor and management. But so far, from the point of self-interest, labor has been the more voluble and aggressive critic. Representative LUCE and Mr. Stassen and Senator VANDENBERG, all oppose the prostitution of the Army by making it a strike-breaker. For Mrs. LUCE, the drafting of labor in peace was "too big a gulp to swallow" because we did not draft it in war. To Mr. Stassen, the bill is "totalitarian in its nature. * * * It is fundamentally contrary to our way of life as to both management and labor."

With these broad criticisms we are in agreement. But America was confronted with a condition, not a theory when President Truman addressed Congress last Saturday, and asked for powers that he emphasized were both drastic and should be only temporary. The club he swung got results insofar as the railroad strike was concerned.

In the final analysis an un-American remedy had to be employed because the chaotic condition prevailing had been produced by un-American procedures. Fire had to be fought with fire to preserve government that could command respect, maintain order, and reassert itself as superior to any clique.

Let us be specific on this general proposition that un-American practices had produced the need for un-American remedies. It is un-American to exempt any organization from the provisions of the Sherman antitrust law because of political power, yet labor unions are immune from it.

It is un-American to grant privileges to one group while withholding the same privileges from another, as does the Wagner Labor Act.

It is un-American to administer any law as that law has been administered, with the NLRB appearing as witness, prosecutor, and judge.

It is un-American to permit extortion as practiced under legal sanction by the teamsters' union in New York and other produce markets, not to mention the practices of Petrillo and John L. Lewis.

It is un-American to excuse managers of huge financial resources from accounting to those to whom responsibility is due as well as to the Government. But the unions enjoy this immunity.

It is un-American to wink at the evasion of the spirit of the law as practiced by the Political Action Committee of the CIO, while forbidding a parallel practice by corporations.

Labor did have grievances that needed redressing. But in attaining that goal procedures were introduced, special privileges granted, immunity from law was accorded—even to President Roosevelt's plea for the passage of an act despite its doubtful constitutionality—that added up to revolution. Un-Americanism has fed on un-Americanism until the choice lies between totalitarianism and an effort to return to the American way.

The way back will not be easy, nor is the prospect for success so obvious as is the fact that a choice must be made. A comprehensive labor policy translated into law must reassert the balance between the elements in industry, and retire the Government to the role of umpire. It must not be a participant on behalf of either labor or management. Either we do this, or surrender to some foreign "ism." That is the decision the American people and their Representatives in Congress must now make.

[From the New York World-Telegram of May 29, 1946]

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Mr. Truman's conduct on Saturday was, to any student of American institutions, startling. He himself referred to his prolonged patience and his loss of patience which really was loss of temper.

The President had notice of the railroad strike fully a month before it was called and informal notice long before that.

He knew, or should have known, that as a result of labor policies pursued by his party since 1933, the manpower of this country has been divided into feudal fiefs, controlled by powerful individuals of unchecked authority.

He knew, or should have known, that A. F. Whitney, leader of the trainmen, differed from all other leaders of railroad brotherhoods in that he alone among them was a left-winger, cited 35 times in the Dies index for participation in Communist and left-wing activities.

Yet, he patiently drooled along for more than a month. He took not a single constructive step during that month.

Then, when the Nation was tied in a knot of industrial paralysis, he proposed measures to Congress which, in the fury of anger at Whitney and the appalling situation, were swiftly and without deliberation passed by the House of Representatives and were stopped from becoming law within a few hours of proposal only by the fortitude and philosophic soundness of Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, who, while demanding a correction of abuses, does not support the reduction of the United States to a fascistic state, governed by the fiat of one man in the atmosphere of an endless chain of emergencies.

In effect, what the President proposed was that the right to strike be reduced to the private judgment of the President of the United States.

Under this bill, he may seize any plant in the United States in which there is a stoppage of work of any kind, for any reason whatsoever.

Once the plant is seized, strikes are forbidden and the President, on his own, and without mediation, arbitration, or collective bargaining, may determine the conditions of work.

He has the power to draft workers and management at will, determine their duties and compensation, without guaranties against involuntary servitude, except as the wisdom and justice of the President prescribe.

Further, he establishes the Army as a penal institution, to which he may without recourse to courts of law, consign men and women, of all ages and conditions, for periods of his own choosing.

This provision, of course, would, if applied, be unenforcible by a revulsion of public opinion.

But it is indicative of a desperate and unimaginative mind that, having a problem to deal with, resorts to the hysteria of the bludgeon, destroying, however, not the object of his anger, but the house itself.

For once our Army becomes a penal institution to which a President could consign the wolves and sheep, alike, no liberty, guaranteed by the Constitution, could long endure. For freedom lies in the protectives of the courts, not in the will of an intermittently patient and hysterical executive.

The American Army exists to defend our homes, our flag and our liberties. It does not exist as an Alcatraz for political opponents.

His provision concerning profits was a political sop that involves an unconstitutional confiscation of property, temporarily or permanently.

For profits are property. It is doubtful whether any Supreme Court, even such a one as we now have, divided between a philosophy of law based upon American precedents and a philosophy of welfare based on higher wisdom, would tolerate so weird a provision in a law designed essentially to restore order.

It is as fascistic a bill as anything produced by the vindictive mind of Mussolini, a departure from every American instinct for the rights of the citizen to freedom of choice and judgment, punitive without regard to constitutional guaranties of, to mention only one, trial by jury, a hodgepodge of blows at recalcitrant individuals without foresight as to

future applications and without regard to its impress upon the structure of American freedom.

The alternative that Mr. Truman offers those who suffer or believe they suffer grievances is revolution.

He, unfortunately, does not realize that. He surely believes that he has saved the day—to lose three centuries of the human struggle for freedom.

[From the Washington Post of May 29, 1946]

DRAFTING STRIKERS

The drastic labor legislation urged upon Congress by President Truman was designed to meet a national emergency. The criterion which must be applied in judging it, therefore, is this: Are the powers requested by the President necessary? Will nothing less serve to overcome the crucial threat to the national economy? No American who cherishes the free traditions of this society can relish the imposition of stringent governmental controls upon labor. Such controls can be justified only by genuine necessity and only to the extent that they are indisputably required for protection of the general welfare. It is in this light, we think, that the proposal to draft into the armed services men who strike against the Government ought to be conscientiously examined. For it is a proposal odious at best and violative of a long-accepted democratic principle.

The coal strike and the railroad strike demonstrated that the self-restraint of men cannot be counted upon to keep them from striking against the authority of their own Government. Since strikes against the Government in an industrial society so integrated as our own are intolerable, the Government must be armed with extraordinary powers to prevent them. The powers which President Truman has requested include the power to seek injunctive relief in the event of strikes conducted against the Government, the power to punish strike leaders by fine or imprisonment, and the power to punish the strikers themselves by depriving them of their seniority rights. These are powerful sanctions—powerful enough in themselves to break any attempt at defiance of the Government's authority. We believe, therefore, that it is needless to supplement them with the additional power which the President also requested—the power to induct strikers into the Army of the United States.

If this additional power is needless, then it is certainly altogether undesirable. It would degrade military service by establishing it as a form of punishment. It would be enforceable only through a distasteful, and perhaps brutal, type of coercion; for it does not follow that men can be made to mine coal or run trains against their will merely by inducting them into the Army. It would entail, insofar as the coercion could be made effective, a discriminatory species of involuntary servitude in time of peace and is therefore of doubtful constitutionality. And, finally, it would place in the hands of the President a power over the lives and liberties of American citizens which ought not to be entrusted to any individual. It seems to us idle to defend this power on the ground that it would be merely temporary. The granting of it would constitute a precedent explosive in its implications. And the precedent, once established, would lie at hand like a loaded weapon ready for use whenever a crisis could be cited as a pretext for dictatorial control.

Violent actions beget violent reactions. The power to draft strikers sought by the President is a reaction to extreme provocation and to the helplessness of the Government in the face of the recent railroad strike. The granting of this power by the House of Representatives, without debate and almost without consideration, was an expression of extreme anger, not of sober legislative judgment. A great service has been rendered to the Nation in the Senate, we think, by the insistence of Senators PEPPER and MORSE and TAFT and MURRAY that real and serious deliberation precede the enactment of any law so novel and so drastic. Theirs has been a soundly sobering influence. It has afforded opportunity for reflection. And reflection forces a recognition that nothing less is at stake here than a fundament of our society.

Let us not shatter this fundament recklessly or needlessly. A government made too powerful is at least as perilous as a government not powerful enough. Balance has been always the American watchword. Balance between the powers of the Government and the rights of the people is the key to freedom. Let us preserve that balance now.

[From the New York Times of May 29, 1946]

A STRIKE-FOMENTING BILL?

The Smith-Connally law when it was passed by Congress was sincerely thought by that body, and by the union leaders who denounced it, to be an antistrike law. But it turned out in practice to be a strike-fomenting law. It compelled a strike ballot to be taken under Government auspices and at Government expense. The natural result was that when such a ballot was taken, and it resulted, as it nearly always did, in a majority in favor of a strike, the strike had the appearance of being specifically sanctioned and legalized by the Government. Moreover, as the law provided for Government seizure of the property involved, and as the employers feared this action more than the workers did, union leaders found that a Smith-Connally strike ballot further increased their bargaining power.

The question may be raised whether the much more drastic antistrike law for which the President is now asking, and for which the House has already voted, may not provoke more strikes than it stops. Under its terms, when a strike occurs in an essential industry, the Government is to seize that industry. The President is then to "establish fair and just wages and other terms and conditions of employment in the affected plants, mines, or facilities." While these "fair wages" are to prevail legally only while the plants are in Government possession, it is obvious that few, if any, employers will be able to reduce the wage previously fixed by the Federal Government when the properties are turned back to them.

Experience shows that the Government practically always awards a substantial wage increase in these cases. It is likely to be much larger than the union concerned could get by really free bargaining. This is true for several reasons. The administration will want to award a wage increase high enough to seem fair and generous to a public that can know little of the specific problems with which particular industries are confronted. The administration will want to prove that it is prolabor. The administration will want to make the award large enough to make sure of stopping the strike, or at least of minimizing public sympathy for the strikers if it continues.

The union leaders will undoubtedly be aware of all this. For these reasons it seems likely that unions everywhere, if the proposed law is enacted in its present form, will be tempted to make impossible demands, to provoke strikes, to compel Government seizure, and to force fair wages far higher than they could get in a free economy. For once the Government has granted the higher wages and saddled them on the employers, the members of the union can peacefully go back to work until the Government withdraws.

The new bill, in short, like the previous interventions of the Truman administration, seems likely, even to a greater extent than the Smith-Connally law, to provoke more strikes than it settles.

Cost of Production for Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article written by Arthur H. Booth, of Sandoval, Ill., recently elected president of the United Farmers of America:

COST OF PRODUCTION FOR AGRICULTURE

The United Farmers of America, do not ask that every farmer should be guaranteed a profit for his efforts, but we do demand, that for every pound of grain, fiber, and livestock that he produces to feed and clothe the Nation, that he should have a price, not less than our average cost of production, plus a reasonable profit.

Thus for every farmer who by efficient methods, is able to produce his products for less than cost, there would be a similar number who would still be receiving less than cost. Is there any other group or organization that is more fair than that to the public and would any honest man expect less than that, unless he were a fool?

Under this kind of a program, there would still be the motive to prompt every farmer to learn to farm well, and it would tend to lower the price of products to the consumer, for the lower became our average cost, the lower would be the average price.

The latest report the writer has on what is our average costs, was as of April 1, 1945. Below will be a small list of some of the major farm products, but our bill now before the Congress, provided for all farm products whose market value exceeds $10,000,000 a year.

Whole milk, $5.167 per 100 pounds; hogs, $22.836 per 100 pounds; wheat, $2.236; potatoes, $1.974; butterfat, $0.812; chickens, $0.407; oats, $1.23; wool, $0.729; eggs, $0.583 per dozen; corn, $1.818; soy beans, $2.776; cotton, $0.354 per pound.

Since the above date, our costs have increased, so the above prices are low, as a result of our increased labor costs and the price of steel and other factors, as a result largely due to the inflationary fiscal policy of the New Deal, and the issuing of many billions of dollars of printing-press money. Also it is the penalty we must pay for some of the assinine economic policies we have pursued, such as killing 6,000,000 little pigs, paying farmers to plow under corn and cotton and fining the farmers for growing wheat.

Subsidies in lieu of fair prices at the market place has also accelerated our troubles, as it has simply further increased the Government debt, until now it equals nearly $5,000 on every man, woman, and child in the Nation or about $866 on every acre of tillable land.

As an example, I will quote from the Sentinel, published at Centralia, Ill., the following: "The new silk stockings, due on the market soon, will have to sell for $2.50 or $3 a pair, says a spokesman for the hosiery industry, because the War Assets Corporation sold silk to manufacturers at $11.75 a pound though it had cost the Government only $3.08 a pound.

"Well, if the black market can't be stamped out, it's nice to have a Government agency in on it. That makes it practically unanimous, as well as adding a certain respectable tone to the whole flourishing business."

When another Government agency offered a 30-cent bonus for grain over the ceiling prices established by the OPA, it was also a

black-market operation. The only complaint the writer has about this one is, that most of the grain had left the farmers' hands and was with the grain speculators, for the Government told the farmer on December 26 that it was their patriotic duty to sell their grain and that there would be no increase in price during this marketing season.

It is not the first time the farmers have been double crossed. For recently, when there was a bill to increase the minimum wage of the industrial worker from 40 cents an hour to 60 cents before the United States Senate, Senator RUSSELL introduced an amendment, that the farmers' labor costs should be included in arriving at parity farm prices, and the presidents of two large so-called farm organizations appeared before the Senate and told them the farmers did not want pay for their labor, even though the suggested price was to be 40 cents an hour.

Thomas Jefferson wisely told us, that eternal vigilence was the price of liberty, and with conditions as they are now, if this does not arouse the vigilance of the American people, it will not require an Einstein to foresee the loss of our liberty and the American way of life.

ARTHUR H. BOOTH,
President, United Farmers of America, Inc.
SANDOVAL, ILL.

Cooperation Between Labor and Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in World War I and again in World War II America amazed the world by its capacity for production. Without that production victory would have been impossible.

The production was the result of team play, of cooperation between all patriotic American citizens, including those in the ranks of labor and management.

Similar cooperation in time of peace could result in incomparable opportunity for the individual and incomparable increase in the standard of living both at home and abroad.

I talked some time ago with an outstanding American who has served brilliantly in both World War I and World War II, who is himself in the ranks of management, and who has always had the best interests of labor at heart.

He told me that for some 15 years he has had in his plant a system of participation certificates. Every worker receives not only his or her base pay but in addition a participation certificate which increases in value with each year that the worker remains at the plant. Whenever a dividend is declared to stockholders, every worker in the plant also receives a dividend in the same percentage of the value of his participation certificate.

In other words, everyone connected with the plant, labor and stockholders alike, has a direct financial interest in the earnings of the company.

The result has been cooperation. Plans and financial conditions have been freely discussed between labor and management. Time after time suggestions have been made by workers looking to increased production or decreased costs with resulting increase in earnings. The many years during which the plan has been in operation have been free from any suggestion of trouble between labor and management.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD a recent article by Eric H. Johnston appearing in the Reader's Digest for May 1946 entitled "Labor Should Have a Stake In Capitalism":

LABOR SHOULD HAVE A STAKE IN CAPITALISM

(By Eric A. Johnston)

(Condensed from the New York Times Magazine)

Under socialism, in theory, every man works for the State. In return for this he is supposed to get security against the evils of life. The State is his perpetual master, and he is presumably its loyal and happy servant.

Under capitalism the theory is that every man is a free agent, even though he is on someone else's payroll. Nobody can tell him what job to take or how long to hold it. Nobody, we say, stops an employee from blossoming into an employer.

Here in America, which represents the fullest development of the capitalistic system, we assure each other firmly that we believe in it with all our hearts. But we know our system is far from perfect. The imperfections permit a noisy minority to jab at sensitive spots in the anatomy of capitalism. This scares some of the believers in capitalism, who seem to be afraid to jab back. Meanwhile, the most of Europe is going hell-bent for socialism.

If we believe in capitalism as we say we do, it is about time we went hell-bent for capitalism. So far, in spite of our magnificent successes, some of which we must admit were the result of fool's luck, we have given little more than lip service to the doctrine of capitalism.

If capitalism involves a system of private enterprise, that means we can't look to Government to keep it alive and make it grow, because that way lies statism. If capitalism is a system wherein the individual is supreme and supremely free, then it is up to us to insure that this supreme freedom is not the privilege of a few individuals but of all. Benefits must go to all men along with freedom of action.

We say that under capitalism every man has a chance to take a chance. The unpleasant fact in this day is that not every man can take a chance. Not every man shares fully in the profits of the profit system.

The average American today is frustrated by his inability to bet on himself. He knows that he is in the capitalistic system, but he doesn't feel that he is of it. He can count on nothing but his pay envelope, and in bad times not always on that. He works for a flat fee. He can't look forward to anything but that flat fee. There is no excitement, no adventure in that. Without an opportunity to reap more from the profit system than a salary or a wage, the average man cannot be blamed if he feels no sense of kinship to the profit system.

Obviously, all people cannot have businesses of their own, but this is no reason why they should not have their American right to share more fully in the benefits of our system. If they can't be in business for themselves, they can be brought into closer partnership with their employers, and take chances on the profits with them.

The four west coast companies with which I am associated had long sought a way to do this. We finally came to the belief that an effective labor dividend and multiple management program would accomplish it, would bring about a situation where our employees would say "we" instead of "they."

We wanted our business enterprises to become joint projects, with the interests of the owner and the worker welding into one; we wanted our workers to determine along with us the chances we should take, and then share in the profits of those chances if they should be realized. Welcoming the advice and suggestions of the workers did not, of course, mean that management renounced its right to manage. Final decisions, we felt, properly lie with management, but no management has a monopoly on ideas, and ideas are the rarest gems in business.

There is nothing altruistic about our program. We think the adoption of labor dividends and multiple management is practical, realistic, and sound business. We do not claim that our plan is the complete answer to industrial strife, nor that it is newly invented. For years progressive businessmen have worked toward the goal of giving their employees a voice in the problems of their businesses and a fair share of the fruits of their labor. We are simply applying techniques of our own devising to our own particular enterprises. We think that our program will minimize human friction. But we know that any such plan will operate successfully only if management works at it as hard as management works at turning out good products for good profits.

The labor dividends, our employees have been told, are not intended to be substitutes for decent salaries or fair wages. We intend to continue to bargain collectively with our employees on rates of pay, hours of work, and working conditions.

The labor dividend is a reward for contribution to the success of the business. The program is based on 25 percent of the net operating profit before taxes and dividends. We intend to pay it to employees in lump sums once a year. We have set up a point system for employees, so that each will receive his just portion, based on such things as length of service, personal responsibility, and the going rate of fixed compensation. The principle is this: To demonstrate to the worker the direct relationship between his production and his dividend.

There are other ways of applying incentives, of course—stock distribution, production bonus system, both individual and group; rewards for outstanding effort. All of these point in the same direction.

Higher company earnings always flow from better management. The best management requires that all talent within any business be called upon for ideas. We think the best way to do this is through a multiple-management plan. Ours will operate in each company through a junior board of directors—seven members, a cross section of office, sales, and factory employees. After the original selection new members of the junior board are elected by the boards themselves. Every 6 months there may or may not be a turn-over of two members, depending on the decisions of the junior boards themselves. Top management executives or senior board members may not serve on the junior board.

The junior boards fulfill two essential purposes: they supply ideas for betterment of the business and they are training grounds for top management positions—perhaps, indeed, for membership on the senior directors' board.

Their plan in no way interferes with the union shop committees which represent the organized workers in our plants or their relationship with the management.

Aggressive ambition on the part of the individual is the lifeblood of capitalism. The more of it we can churn into action, the better for us. The two systems of capitalism

and socialism will compete throughout the world for the minds of men. The two systems are on trial. In the final analysis that system which provides the greatest benefit to the greatest number of individuals will win out. I'm betting on capitalism.

Statement of Scientists on Bikini Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, believing it most important that a proper and accurate perspective be had of the forthcoming atomic bomb tests, I am including with my remarks a statement of the Federation of American Scientists on this matter.

I repeat what I have said many times before in the House: Either we find a way to control, all around the world, this new and universally mighty force or the days of civilization are indeed numbered.

The statement follows:

SCIENTISTS' COMMENT ON BIKINI ATOLL TESTS

It has been stated in the Senate and elsewhere that the atom-bomb tests at Bikini are being held to furnish scientific information. It is thus implied that scientists are professionally interested in these tests to learn more about the potentialities of atom energy.

This is not true. The tests are purely military, not scientific. Appended to this statement is a resolution adopted by the Federation of American Scientists, at a recent council meeting in Philadelphia, in which this fact is stated in unequivocal language. Scientists expect nothing of scientific value, and little of technical value to peacetime uses of atomic energy, as a result of these tests.

Whether or not these tests, involving the expenditure of millions of dollars and tens of thousands of man-hours, are justified, is not a question which scientists are qualified to decide. An atom bomb is a military weapon, and when, where, and how it should be tested are military questions.

The tests, of course, are based on the frightful idea that we—mankind—might have an atomic war in which navies would desperately seek to survive, to defend their countries, or to attack the enemy. Scientists seek by education to teach men that they must abandon atomic weapons to preserve civilization, but we recognize that it may take an atomic war to teach them this lesson.

So long as they have not learned it, the military have a mission, fantastic and short-sighted though it may seem to reasonable men. Scientists are cooperating in these tests at the request of their country's armed forces, although they do so with heavy hearts, and without enthusiasm.

They would like, however, to assist the American people in forming an accurate judgment of the purposes and results of the Navy experiments. We suggest that correspondents and newspaper readers should keep in mind the following considerations. This statement was prepared by the national officers of the Federation of American Scientists. It is based on a special report made to national headquarters by the executive committee of the Association of Los Alamos Scientists—the men who developed the bomb and made the first test at Alamogordo, N. Mex., and who are working on the current tests.

1. THE NUMBER OF SHIPS DESTROYED WILL NOT BE THE BEST STANDARD FOR JUDGING THE EFFECT OF THE BOMB

Reasonable men should discount in advance headlines which may read Fleet Survives Test; Only One Ship Sunk. Area of damage done by the bomb to brick or steel and concrete structures is about 10 square miles. Total destruction extends for a radius of about 1 mile. There will be 100 assorted target ships spread over a radius of miles, and the majority will probably not be damaged to any extent. But there is no doubt whatever that a direct hit or near miss by an atom bomb will destroy any ship ever made: One bomb, one battleship.

Flimsy houses 3 miles from the blasts in Japan were destroyed, but a battleship should be more than 50 times as strong as a Japanese house. It is well known that the variation in pressure is such that one-half the distance it is not more than four times as great, and the estimated lethal blast distance is less than half a mile. Published reports indicate no serious radiation damage to people beyond 1 mile. Persons below decks and well shielded by heavy steel construction would probably be safe from radiation at a shorter distance.

Ships closer than one-half mile will be damaged, but only those closest to the point of detonation will be sunk. Few ships will be appreciably affected, perhaps 10 out of 100, and probably only 1 or 2 will be sunk.

Dr. Hans Bethe, formerly director of theoretical physics at Los Alamos, who had made some studies of the forthcoming test, has predicted that not even one capital ship will be sunk.

Again, it must not be assumed that any conclusions may be drawn from this as to what damage a bomb would do to an American city. Cities are not built like battleships. (See the May Reader's Digest, or contact federation headquarters, for excellent, brief, popular studies of what an atomic bomb would do to an American city.)

2. ACTUAL STRENGTH OF BIKINI BOMB BLASTS SHOULD BE ANNOUNCED

It is possible for an atomic bomb to be a dud or semidud. The Navy has announced that the Nagasaki type bomb will be used in these tests, but the actual bomb used may not explode as efficiently as did the bomb as Nagasaki. Instruments for measuring this precisely will be in operation and unless this data are announced at least in part, no valid conclusions may be drawn as to effect of atomic bombs on naval vessels. We cannot here, of course, discuss future more powerful bombs.

3. THE DEEP UNDERWATER TEST OF NEXT YEAR WILL BE FAR MORE IMPORTANT THAN THE TWO TESTS PLANNED THIS SPRING

All scientists who have studied naval atomic bombing are unanimously agreed that there is nothing final to be said about the subject until a deep underwater test has been tried. The first test will not yield spectacular results, the second test will be more damaging, but an underwater test at an appreciable depth, perhaps using something similar to the bathysphere, is potentially far more dangerous to an entire fleet.

Even the surface test will give some tidal-wave effect, and since water is noncompressible, a deep-sea bombing might have extreme and unpredicted results. The intense shock produced by the chain reaction is dissipated in the air, but below the surface would create a sort of monstrous bubble of energy, which might buckle the plates of ships several miles distant. In this connection it should be noted that even ordinary torpedoes do not wound ships by penetrating, but by exploding on contact, alongside the ship under water.

4. ONE BOMB FOR ONE SHIP—THIS ITSELF IS A REVOLUTIONARY ACCOMPLISHMENT IN NAVAL WARFARE

A battleship costs approximately $100,000,000, even a destroyer $20,000,000. Dr. J. R. Oppenheimer has stated that an atomic bomb could be produced for about $1,000,000. It would be good business to spend not one, but a considerable number of bombs to sink a battleship, and even a few bombs to sink a destroyer. In addition, it takes many times longer to produce a ship than an atomic bomb, an extremely important factor in industrial total war. We already know, then, that it is cheap to sink naval vessels with atomic bombs. Since the bomb creates a ball of fire approximately one-third of a mile across, and does total damage for a half mile on either side, it can be seen that it does not have to be a direct hit in the sense that ordinary bombs are described as direct hits.

5. NONETHELESS BOMBING A FLEET MIGHT NEVER BE TACTICALLY VALUABLE

Despite the economics suggested above, it is still possible that bombing a fleet at sea would not be worth the trouble in an atomic war. Supposing that mankind risks suicide by undertaking such a war, the economics would still be against bombing ships. One square mile of city destroyed atomically would be a loss, in the average American city, representing $500,000,000, or five times the cost of one battleship.

Strategically speaking, when the guided missiles now being developed are perfected, V–2's, V–3's, and other robombs with atomic warheads will arch through the stratosphere far above any Navy, even above air forces, and so far as present science is concerned, beyond reach of any kind of radar detection and defense. Scientists assert there is no foreseeable defense whatever against such an attack in a future war.

6. WHAT, THEN, WILL BE THE MISSION OF THE SO-CALLED FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE IN THE NEXT WAR? WHAT WILL BE THE GOOD OF THE NAVY'S PROTECTING ITSELF BY DISPERSION WHEN IT CAN NO LONGER PROTECT THE HOMELAND THAT IT SERVES?

Scientists cannot know any final answer to this question. A proper answer must take into account the full role of the Navy, as well as many relatively minor phases of atomic bombing.

Even where the bomb might not crush and blast whole ships, radiation and incendiary effects would produce incalculable damage, particularly in harbors. Water in the vicinity of the bomb and dust particles in the air will become radioactive and be deadly to human beings until dissipated by the processes of nature. A breeze containing radioactive particles, blown for miles, might conceivably result in the death of many sailors on ships miles away from an atomic bombing. The precautions taken in allowing personnel to enter Bikini harbor after the bombing may be taken as a fair indication when repair and ship crews might reenter Pearl Harbor, if it were ever atomically bombed.

FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS,
W. A. HIGINBOTHAM, *Chairman*,
MELBA PHILLIPS, *Secretary*,
J. H. RUSH, *Treasurer*.

FURTHER STATEMENTS

We plan at the conclusion of the Navy bombings to issue a statement from scientists who went to Bikini, and further to have available data from individual observers. We would welcome inquiries from newspapermen at that time, as well as copies of published accounts of their observations at the bombings.

STATEMENT ON BIKINI ATOLL TEST BY NATIONAL COUNCIL, FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The President's announcement of postponement of the atomic-bomb tests at Bikini Atoll, we believe, will contribute to a more favorable atmosphere for the meeting of the Security Council and the projected meeting of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. We feel it would have been unfortunate at this time to focus the attention of the world so dramatically on our military preparations.

The Navy tests will have a purely military value. Scientists recognize that such bombings will not add anything to fundamental scientific knowledge—they are not significant from the standpoint of development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

Scientists believe that in the atomic age no amount of military preparation can give us real security. If there is another war with atomic weapons, we and all the world will suffer irreparable losses, no matter who may be the victor. We must put all our best thought on organizing the world for peace.

To this end, we urge full support of the United States program for international controls over atomic armaments, and for the UN program of collective security as opposed to primary reliance on armed might.

The great experiment to which this Nation and its leaders should devote their greatest attention and energy is under way in the United Nations Organization. There we are making the fateful test of whether nations can work out their problems without resort to war.

We do not need further bombing tests to tell us that if this larger trial of world order fails the great UN experiment will end in the most destructive explosions our earth has ever seen.

BIKINI: WHAT CAN IT PROVE?

(Statement by Prof. Louis N. Ridenour, University of Pennsylvania, member of administrative committee, Federation of American Scientists)

When an atomic bomb is exploded, a good deal of our precious and laboriously produced fissionable material is destroyed. The Bikini tests seem an extraordinary pointless way to destroy it.

[From Science Illustrated]

It would have been wiser to expend these bombs, if military demonstrations have to be held, in land tests which would be seen by millions of people. All but the most unimaginative witnesses would gain the deep conviction held so strongly by those who were at Alamagordo last July, that war must be ended for all time. Few except active participants will be present at the tests—not primarily as a matter of policy but because of difficulties in providing transportation and grandstand space.

It would have been useful to test the bomb against buildings constructed along occidental lines. Great publicity has been given to assertions that, while the bombs dropped on Japan did widespread damage, an atomic bomb would be no more destructive in lower Manhattan than a 10-ton high-explosive bomb. Although this is contrary to the conclusions drawn by competent specialists on the basis of careful observation and experiment, some wishful thinkers can be convinced only by an actual demonstration.

The value of the proposed tests for their avowed purpose, setting Navy policy, is dubious in the extreme. Only a prodigal enemy would spend his atomic bombs on ships. Even such an enemy would employ against ships an underwater burst, which is not being tried in the Pacific this year "for technical reasons." A bomb bursting over a city will destroy a square mile and kill 100,000 persons; used against sturdy and widely scattered ships it might overdestroy one or two and do little harm to others.

No one should be surprised if only one ship is sunk by the first Bikini bomb. An air burst is the least effective way of using a bomb against ships. A blast pressure of about five atmospheres is required to do substantial damage to a ship (half that will knock over a brick wall); and such relatively enormous pressure is not likely to exist beyond a radius of a few hundred yards from the point of explosion. Within the small circle encompassing the blast, there is likely not to be more than one ship.

The gamma rays, which killed so many thousands in Japan, will be expended on a few experimental animals whose fate will probably not make the newspapers, should it be released. The flash of heat, which literally cooked those Japanese who were outdoors and within half a mile of the explosion, will be wasted. Even the thin walls of storage boxes for ready ammunition will provide sufficient heat shielding to prevent explosions; hull and deck plating will keep fuel from catching fire.

The effect of the surface burst in the second Bikini bomb test may be greater, but probably will not be spectacular. The underwater explosion in the third test should prove destructive over a fairly wide radius but there are no plans as yet for this, the only really significant part of the Pacific experiment.

Though extravagant in fissionable material and the public funds, the Bikini tests must not be regarded as establishing any result—not even a scientific result. The tests are being held in such haste and under such difficult geographical conditions that there has been no opportunity for proper instrumentation. Even when the Pacific trials are complete, conclusions on naval policy must be carefully drawn. No sound conclusions can be reached until after an underwater burst.

Leading Exposer of Cartels Discusses War Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, one of Americas' most fearless writers on the subject of cartels is Howard W. Ambruster. His forthcoming book is the most forthright expose of this world menace so far written. Recently he wrote me a letter commending me on an article of mine appearing in This Month magazine in which he refers to the concentration of wealth in the hands of certain large corporations and the dangers implicit in such a situation. The letter speaks for itself and is as follows:

WESTFIELD, N. J., *April 6, 1946.*

Hon. JOHN M. COFFEE,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JOHN: I have read your article in This Month on Who Made the Money in This War? with great interest and congratulate you on the compilations and conclusions there set forth. Without the slightest implication of criticism but merely to supplement the last line of your article, I would like to present here a few viewpoints of my own on what may appear to be more serious aspects of the situation; aspects which involve more lasting injury than the enormous expenditures of the war.

Your article refers to the fact that the number of billion-dollar companies in the United States increased fourfold, from 11 to 43. There, to me, is the great danger. And my conclusion is not that of a theorist or research student. It is based upon years of contact with large corporate entities from the inside, including, in addition to my consulting work, that of directing chemical subsidiaries of two American industrial corporations which are the largest in the world in their respective lines.

On the one issue of efficiency, as I testified at the Senate cartel hearings last May, it is inevitable that with every increase in size and scope corporation efficiency decreases. This fact, denied publicly, will be admitted privately by every honest industrial executive who has had actual experience behind the scenes. The talk of our great corporate efficiency in expanding, and in producing war munitions and material, is 100 percent bunk. The efficiency displayed was by skilled individuals who knew their jobs, but the production of enormous quantities and at marvelous speed was accomplished regardless of efficiency as to both method and cost. This was inevitable while we were at war. But in peace the loss of efficiency, due to the constant increases in corporate size, becomes a distinct injury to the public.

This loss of efficiency, however, is the lesser evil to that of absentee management and irresponsibility as one merger follows another—as far as the public welfare and National interest are concerned.

Along with this irresponsibility and the social evils and defiant illegalities of private collectivism which are inevitable, as these enormous corporate entities grow larger and more numerous.

I testified before the Senate Committee that public collectivism was inevitable unless the trend toward private collectivism were turned back—and that when the time came—if it comes—it would require only the action of the Congress to effect this change.

A few weeks later the English election brought about this very thing in that country.

This brings us to my final thesis that the concentration of our industrial and commercial activities into these large corporate units is bad per se, because it means that increasing regimentation of the individual, the stifling of initiative and atrophy of the human soul. These objections apply to either private or public collectivism, both are hateful—and the former breeds the latter.

The danger of communism, or nationalization, or socialism, or call it what you will, in these United States, is not from any boring from without by Russia but from feelings of despair and futility on the part of the mass of the individual citizens, which are engendered solely by the constant increase in size of corporate units within this Nation. No State government can even pretend to control any one of them. And judging from current conditions the executive and judicial powers of the Federal Government are brushed aside or ignored by some of them almost as readily as those of the smallest States.

While Congress twiddles its thumbs!

Few of them could have been formed if the letter of the antitrust laws had been invoked. None of them could have been conceived if the spirit of these antimonopoly statutes were regarded.

In these conclusions you may find the greatest lasting evil from the fact that we now have four times as many billion-dollar corporations as before the war.

They are inefficient—they are antidemocratic, or feudal, in character—and the regimentation of their employees economically is as deadly as any that you may find in Russia.

Faithfully,

HOWARD W. AMBRUSTER.

What a Vet Will Get

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following article is from the Sunday, June 2, 1946, edition of the Washington Post:

WHAT A VET WILL GET IN GI INSURANCE BILL, UP IN HOUSE THIS WEEK

(By Sam Stavisky)

National service life insurance, a blue-chip investment for GI's and veterans alike, is going to pay off even greater dividends in the near future.

This week the House is scheduled to take up a bill materially liberalizing the provisions and benefits of GI-veteran insurance.

The measure was recently approved by the House Veterans' Committee after months of study and discussion with experts from the Veterans' Administration, veterans organizations and private insurance companies.

The law, as already once amended, and the new legislation bristle with technical points, each of which is important to some degree. Boiled down, the major effects of the new legislation are as follows:

LUMP SUM

First. Lump sum payment of the insurance to the beneficiary.

The present law limits payments to small monthly amounts over a long period. Many veterans have felt that the monthly payments, even on a full $10,000 worth of insurance, were too small to be of practical benefit to their families.

The new measure also permits other methods of payment. The beneficiary cannot receive the lump-sum payment unless that is the method prescribed by the insured.

BENEFICIARY

2. Right to name any beneficiary.

Currently, the act limits beneficiaries to wife, child, parents, brother, and sister. This provision would permit the insured to name any person or organization, just as he may do with his commercial insurance.

DISABILITY

3. Total disability coverage.

The new measure provides that upon payment of extra premium, the veteran who becomes totally disabled is entitled to monthly cash benefits.

The disability must last 6 months. In the seventh month the veteran begins drawing $5 a month for each $1,000 insurance. This payment would not affect the face value of the policy or any other compensation or pension being received by the veteran.

The veterans' organizations feel that the total disability coverage does not go far enough. They urged the committee to give automatic total disability coverage to those veterans who are already 100-percent sick or injured and therefore ineligible for the extra-premium privilege.

LAPSED POLICIES

4. Automatic coverage for certain servicemen whose insurance lapsed while they were in the armed forces because of administrative technicalities.

For example, some GI's who went AWOL lost their insurance without realizing it. Similarly, enlisted men commissioned in the field did not realize that they had to take special steps to keep their insurance from lapsing.

RETROACTIVE COVERAGE

5. Automatic retroactive coverage for servicemen who applied for insurance, were turned down for health reasons and yet stayed on active duty to be killed or totally disabled.

This provision would benefit a considerable number of veterans and dependents. In this group are some limited duty men, too.

CONVERSION

6. More flexible conversion program.

Presently, when the veteran turns his wartype insurance into civilian type, he is permitted only three methods of conversion; ordinary life, 30-year life, and 20-year life. The expanded program would also include a 20-year endownment plan, endownment at the age of 60 and endowment at the age of 65.

(The GI or veteran is allowed 5 to 8 years—depending on the date he took out the insurance—of wartype insurance, which costs very low premiums but which builds up no reserve. It is not until the veteran converts to the civilian type that he builds up a cash value in his policy.)

REVIEW

7. Review of Veterans' Administration decisions by courts.

If a veteran, in filing a World War II insurance claim, is turned down by VA, he cannot now appeal to the courts. The bill permits a hearing by a judge on the VA records.

Veterans' organizations have attacked the limitations of this proposal on the ground that it bars the veterans from obtaining a jury trial and therefore is unconstitutional. Also, the veterans' leaders feel the former servicemen should be able to present any records and evidence whatsoever, and not be limited to the VA records.

There will be no attempt to change the bill on the floor of the House, however. Rather, the strategy will be to liberalize the act still further in the Senate and then get the House to agree.

Riverside (Calif.) Enterprise Urges Passage of House Joint Resolution 325

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great encouragement to be able to include with my remarks herewith a forceful editorial from the Riverside Enterprise supporting my bill, House Joint Resolution 325:

EASIEST WAY TO INCREASE FOOD SUPPLY BEING BYPASSED

Our Government has made a definite promise to aid the starving nations of Europe and Asia until such time as their crops may supply the necessary food. We have been committed to deliver 225,000,000 bushels of grain during the first 6 months of 1946, and so far we have failed to make good the promise.

Grain farmers have been given a subsidy of 30 cents a bushel for their wheat, and ceilings on all grains have been raised by OPA from 9 to 25 cents a bushel in order to obtain all stored grain from warehouses. Notwithstanding this outpouring of the taxpayers' money, it looks as though we will fall behind by 35,000,000 bushels of grain in our shipments to the needy nations.

President Truman has appealed to America for help and has named a special committee to raise funds and collect foods for the starving peoples. Chester Bowles, Stabilization Director, has advocated the return of food rationing. Neither, so far, has referred to the easiest and most reasonable solution of the problem, which is the shutting down of the liquor industry during the food emergency.

Congressman JERRY VOORHIS, of California, introduced House Resolution 325 on March 7, authorizing the President to prohibit the use of grain for manufacture of liquor during the present shortage of food in the world or the present shortage of livestock feed in the United States. So far Congress has taken no action on the bill.

Even though there is a sufficient stock of liquor on hand to keep the drinkers of America supplied for a year, the greedy brewers and distillers are using every effort to keep Congress from acting on the Voorhis bill. They want to continue to use about 8,000,000 bushels monthly to make more liquor, regardless of the fact that this amount of grain would feed millions of starving people.

The thinking people of America would do well to write their representatives in Washington to support the Voorhis bill.

Baccalaureate Address for the Class of 1946 United States Military Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. F. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following baccalaureate for the class of 1946 United States Military Academy, delivered by their chaplain, John B. Walthour, June 2, 1946:

A small boy sat spellbound before an open book. His eyes grew larger by the minute. Cold chills chased one another up and down his spine. A new character was dawning upon his horizon; a new personality was climbing upon the pedestal of his hero-worship. Good old Samson. There was a man. Why the circus strong man, lifting great weights with his teeth, wasn't in it with Samson. Samson killed lions with his bare hands. Samson walked off with the ponderous gates of a city on his back. Samson took the old jawbone of a long dead donkey and, with that as his only weapon, killed thousands of his well-armed enemies. And when the traitor Delilah betrayed him he pulled the temple down to end his life by taking more of his enemies into the beyond with him. Yes, sir! Samson was the strongest man who ever lived.

A young man sat lost in thought before an open book. His eyes were focussed on the page before him, but his mind was not on the written words. A sense of disappointment filled him. Did men always let women make fools of them? Look at this "sap" Samson. Apparently he had everything a man of his day needed to become a tremendous success. His was probably the darkest and least civilized age in all the history of

Israel; a time when the nation was weak—the national religion was weak—the people were weak. And in this hour Samson, the extraordinary man, stalked on the stage of history. He possessed remarkable physical strength. He was courageous, and had proved both his courage and his strength on numerous occasions. He had a sharp wit. For no dullard could have propounded that riddle with which he challenged the guests at his wedding:

"Out of the eater came forth meat,
Out of the strong came forth sweetness."

And when, after 7 days, his guests answered that riddle by saying that he was referring to the finding of honey in the carcass of a lion he had slain, Samson knew his wife had told his secret. But his experience taught him nothing. He continued to be a sucker for a good-looking girl, and wound up as a prisoner of the Philistines whose revenge cost him his life. Yes, sir, Samson was a man whose strength got him into more trouble than anything else.

An older man sat deep in the thought provoked by a book that lay open on his knees. One question kept rushing to the fore of his mind: "Who is the strong man?" Is he of the Samson type? Such a man is born with an exceptional endowment of physical strength and an unusual capacity for developing that strength. And, having this abnormal muscular force, he early learns to place his confidence in his physical potency. He may get into trouble, but he discovers that his prowess will get him out of most of it. So he fails to develop other powers—his moral, his intellectual, his spiritual strength are neglected. Samson had developed in just this way. He never learned to control himself. He never learned how to say "No" to a beautiful woman even when he knew it was wrong to say "yes." He kept on relying upon his tremendous physical strength to extricate him from any difficulty. In the final analysis, Samson was not a strong man; he was a magnificent animal—an animal whose strength would vanish with increasing age, an animal whose giant frame and mighty muscles would be bent and destroyed by the ravages of time. And the older man shook his head slowly, "No; Samson is not the answer to the question, 'Who is the strong man?'"

As the reader's mind continued to wander around the problem he had set it, another figure from the same book quietly but insistently claimed his attention. This new figure stood in sharp contrast with Samson. No deeds of physical prowess had been attributed to him, yet he appeared to be far more a man of strength than the famous old judge of Israel. Where the rage of Samson had flared forth and had broken on the heads of others with the sudden rolling thunder of a summer storm, this man, whose provocation was great, showed no signs of anger. Where Samson had slain thousands of his enemies, this man serenely met death while praying for those who took his life. Where Samson had been mastered by his own passions, this man was the possessor of absolute self-control. The reader believed that Solomon, in his wisdom, would have looked on this new arrival in his thoughts and would have called him strong; he believed Jesus the Christ would have concurred in that opinion, for those two great judges of human personality seemed to teach that the true strength of a man is dependent, not upon his physical stature but upon the depth and solidity of the moral foundation he has built for his life.

Out of his own experience the reader had likewise come to believe that no man is strong unless he possesses moral strength; the strength which makes him stand for his convictions whatever anyone else may think or say; the strength which, knowing what may well be the "harder right," refuses to be swayed into the way of the "easier wrong"; the strength which is moved by neither the threat that comes from the insistent roar of a fickle crowd nor by the crocodile tears of a scheming individual.

With such a criterion one could scarcely find in history a stronger man than the figure which now claimed the reader's attention—the quiet, self-possessed Stephen—

"The martyr first, whose eagle eye
Could pierce beyond the grave;
Who saw his Master in the sky,
And called on Him to save."

Called on Him for those at whose hands he was suffering martyrdom: "Lay not this sin to their charge."

As the older man now saw the two figures of Samson and Stephen standing in sharp contrast, he marveled at the manner in which time changes opinions. When he was a boy Samson had been one of his favorite heroes. Like Leonidas and his Spartans at the Pass of Thermopylae—like Horatius as he "kept the bridge in the brave days of old"—Samson had sold his life dearly and had seemed worthy of emulation. The story of Stephen's quiet courage—the account of his brilliant intellectual defense before the Sanhedrin—if indeed he had ever heard them, these had passed by unnoticed and had failed to capture his boyish imagination.

Again the older man remembered how, as a young man, he had been sickened by the toppling of his former idol. He remembered with what disgust he had read of a man who was as putty in the hands of one beautiful woman, and who, having failed to learn his lesson, was the even sorrier dupe of another. He remembered how his scale of values had begun to change, and with what astonishment he was beginning to perceive the strength of men like the once unnoticed Stephen. Yet Stephen, kneeling meekly in prayer for those who were about to stone him to death, was still not quite satisfactory to the young man.

But now, grown older, as he gazed on the two contrasting figures—the reader of the book believed that he saw why Stephen was strong and Samson was weak. Each had willingly laid down his life for a cause—but what a difference there was in the two causes. The blinded Samson stood between the two pillars of a Philistine temple and prayed, "O Lord God, remember me, I pray Thee, and strengthen me, I pray Thee, only this once, O God, that I may be at once avenged of the Philistines for my two eyes." Samson, the magnificent animal, lusted for a selfish vengeance he could accomplish with his physical strength; yearned to destroy those who had taken his sight, even at the cost of his own life. The scene in the temple that day is reminiscent of the final, terrifyingly destructive charge of a mortally wounded grizzly bear. What a different picture is that of the strong man Stephen as he quietly prays for the forgiveness of those who consider him their enemy. If his life is the price he must pay to change their minds and their hearts—then he freely offers that life.

Samson's death resulted in the destruction of a temple and the death of a few Philistines. Stephen's death brought about the conversion of St. Paul, led to the spreading of Christianity, and brought new life to countless men and women. Samson had the temporary strength of an animal. Stephen had the eternal strength of a man.

And now to the class of 1946: Gentlemen, you have seen fit to place in this chapel a memorial window depicting in one panel Samson, with his bare hands tearing a lion into pieces, and in the other panel Stephen, praying for those who were about to stone him. Those panels portray the acme of physical strength and courage and the acme of moral, or spiritual, strength and courage. Perhaps that window symbolizes your own growth in strength during the time you have been here. All of you had to have certain physical, animal qualifications for admission. Over the past 3 years that physical strength has not been neglected—for there is great advantage in the possession of such strength. But far greater emphasis has been laid upon the development of your moral strength. If West Point has succeeded in her mission, you are today a stronger man than you were on your arrival here; stronger in the kind of strength which distinguished Stephen; you are a man whose honor is founded on sure moral principles and who can be trusted to do his duty in the service of his country. Time alone will tell how well that mission has been accomplished. In the meanwhile your class window will stand here forever, reminding you that no man is strong who has not learned to control himself, and that the strong man forgetting self-interest pours out that strength in the service of others. By its two panels the window reminds you that physical strength is a valuable adjunct to moral strength, but without the latter it counts for little.

We pray that as you grow in age so also will you grow in graciousness and truth, and, though in days ahead your physical strength will decline, may your moral and spiritual strength ever grow more and more powerful, until you come at last to the measure of a truly strong man.

Gentlemen, the Lord watch between thee and me while we are absent one from the other.

Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, today is Confederate Memorial Day. It is the anniversary of the birth date of Jefferson Davis, the great chieftain of the Confederacy, who was born on June 3, 1808.

On yesterday, our old friend, Gen. Julius F. Howell, who is now more than a hundred years old, officiated in the memorial services in the Confederate sections of Arlington National Cemetery.

On June 4, 1933, I delivered the memorial address at the same place, and under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting that address at this place.

It reads as follows:

MEMORIAL DAY

(Address of Hon. John E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, delivered at the Confederate Memorial Exercises in Arlington Cemetery, Washington, D. C., on Sunday, June 4, 1933)

General Wilkinson, Confederate veterans, Daughters of the Confederacy, Veterans of the Spanish-American War and of the World War, ladies and gentlemen, if I had known that these exercises were to be broadcast I would have reduced my speech to writing and tried to devote more time and attention to its preparation. As it is, I am sorry to say that I have no address "cut and dried." I feel, however, that by the time I have finished, the verdict will be unanimous to the effect that it was dry enough.

It is not my desire to open afresh the healing wounds of war or to stir the dying embers of sectional strife. I would not for the world utter one word to hurt the feelings of a Federal soldier, or of one who stands in the same relation to him that we of the South do to the men who wore the gray in that unfortunate conflict. I agree with the southern poet who said that—

"None but a coward would revile
An honest soldier's dust."

I have often heard it contended that neither the soldiers of the South nor those of the North were wrong in that contest. My answer to that contention is that they were both right. They were both fighting the battles of their country in a conflict produced by causes over which they had no control. They are both equally entitled to the love, admiration, and respect of the people of our reunited country.

I want to pause for a moment to pay my tribute to the Daughters of the Confederacy, under whose auspices these exercises are held, and to congratulate them on their splendid achievements, one of which is the erection of this magnificent monument, in the shadow of which these exercises are being held.

I once had the pleasure of taking an airplane flight over Washington with Col. Charles A. Lindbergh, and as I looked down upon the many wonderful things to be seen in the Nation's Capital, the most attractive of them all to me was this beautiful cemetery of Arlington—the bivouac of our heroic dead. The most beautiful object in this great cemetery was this splendid monument, dedicated to our Confederate dead, and erected by the generous, patriotic, loving, and loyal Daughters of the Condeferacy.

If I were a southern woman I would rather be listed among your members than to be a member of any other civic or patriotic organization on earth. You are not only the daughters of the greatest soldiers of all time, but you are the daughters of those glorious women of the South who sustained our soldiers in times of war and shared their burdens in times of peace.

You have another monument to your credit which time cannot efface, and that is Memorial Day. On April 25, 1866, about 1 year after the close of the War Between the States, the women of Columbus, Miss., in the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress, went out to decorate the graves of Confederate soldiers. They were the wives, the widows, the mothers, the sisters, and daughters of Confederate veterans—many of them still in the weeds of mourning. There were about 40 Federal soldiers buried in that cemetery. With a generosity that has few, if any, parallels, those noble women decorated alike the graves of the Confederate and the Federal dead.

A report of that incident got into the press and inspired from the pen of the Honorable Francis Miles Finch, a distinguished northern jurist, a little poem called The Blue and the Gray that will live as long as the Stars and Stripes continue to float over a free people, as long as the sweet strains of old Dixie shall stir the southern heart with its "sweet but melancholy pathos," in which he said:

"By the flow of the inland river,
Whence the fleets of iron have fled,
Where the blades of the grave grass quiver,
Asleep are the ranks of the dead;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Under the one, the blue;
Under the other, the gray.

"These in the robings of glory,
Those in the gloom of defeat,
All with the battle-blood glory,
In the dusk of eternity meet;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Under the laurel, the blue;
Under the willow, the gray.

"From the silence of sorrowful hours
The desolate mourners go,
Lovingly laden with flowers
Alike for the friend and the foe;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Under the roses, the blue;
Under the lilies, the gray.

"So with an equal splendor
The morning sun rays fall,
With a touch, impartially tender,
On the blossoms blooming for all;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Broidered with gold, the blue;
Mellowed with gold, the gray.

"So, when the summer calleth
On forest and field of grain,
With an equal murmur falleth
The cooling drip of the rain;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Wet with the rain, the blue;
Wet with the rain, the gray.

"Sadly, but not with upbraiding,
The generous deed was done;
In the storm of the years that are fading,
No braver battle was won;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Under the blossoms, the blue;
Under the garlands, the gray.

"No more shall the war cry sever,
Or the winding rivers be red;
They banish our anger forever
When they laurel the graves of our dead!
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Love and tears for the blue,
Tears and love for the gray."

This poem was first published by Judge Finch in the Atlantic Monthly for September 1867, under the following notation:

"ONLY THE BLUE AND THE GRAY

"The women of Columbus, Miss., animated by nobler sentiments than are many of their sisters, have shown themselves impartial in their offerings made to the memory of the dead. They strewed flowers alike on the graves of the Confederate and of the National soldiers." (New York Tribune.)

From this humble beginning came our present Memorial Day, which was later adopted by the Grand Army of the Republic under General Logan, and is today observed throughout the land.

Sufficient time has elapsed since the close of that war for us to pause and take an impartial inventory of the causes by which it was produced and the questions it involved. The three great causes of that conflict were slavery, secession, and the differing political philosophies, coupled with different commercial and economic conditions of the two great sections of the country.

We are not apologizing for slavery in the South; we were not responsible for it. We bought those slaves from the people of New England. They now call slavery a moral issue. I have often wondered how long it was after the slave trade became unprofitable in New England before it became immoral. It is well known that in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 southern men desired to put a stop to the slave trade at once, but pressure from the Northeastern States prevented them from placing a limitation on it to take effect earlier than the year 1808. To hear some of the tirades that have been made against the South one would think that we reduced a race of people to slavery and that the people of the South were the worst enemies the Negro ever had. As a matter of fact, we elevated the Negro from a position of savage to that of servant, civilized and Christianized him, and showed him for the first time the light of a Christian civilization, through the unfortunate institution of slavery. I say unfortunate, because it was unfortunate for the white people of the South, but it was the greatest blessing the Negro had ever known.

The people of the South have been the Negro's best friends. We are the best friends he has today. In the great depression through which we have been passing since 1929 the Negro, as a rule, has been better cared for in the Southern States than anywhere else under the American flag.

We are glad that human slavery has disappeared from the face of the earth, as we are glad our country is reunited, in spirit and in truth; but we must deplore the efforts of the agitators to stir up strife between the two races, which can only result in detriment to the Negroes as a whole, whenever those peaceful and friendly relations that exist between the two races in the South are interrupted or disturbed. It seems impossible for people of the North to understand the friendly and even affectionate relationships that existed in the South between the masters and their slaves, and even today they fail to grasp it.

I read, I believe, in the New York Times, a few years ago an editorial on that old southern song, Way Down Upon de Swanee Ribber. The editor thoroughly convinced himself that no such language was ever used by the Negro, and that while the music was only fair, the sentiment was entirely overdrawn. It occurred to me that no man who was reared north of the Mason-Dixon line ever really heard that song. Few, if any, of the generation of today ever heard it, or ever will hear it. In order to have caught the real pathos of this soul-stirring melody one would have had to sit in the gathering twilight at the end of a summer day before a humble Negro's cabin door back in the years that are fading on the impoverished estate of a bankrupt planter and heard it sung by an old-time darkey, conscious of the impending desolation of helpless old age, instead of the assurance of that care and protection he had hoped to look forward to at the hands of his beneficent master in his declining years.

Slavery was a grievous fault, and grievously has Dixie answered for it; and in doing so we have answered for the sins of the very ones who have presumed to mete out our punishment.

But our critics tell us that we were guilty of treason because of our secession from the Union. I have often wondered when secession became treason—whether it was before or after the pen of Jefferson, the sword of Washington, and the voice of Adams proclaimed it as a divine right in separating these united Colonies from the dominion of the mother country. I have wondered whether it became treason before or after the Hartford convention in December 1814, where representatives of the New England States met for the purpose of seceding from the Union, in the dark hours of the War of 1812, after an invading enemy had ruthlessly burned the Capitol of our country, and at a time when old Andrew Jackson was leading his Southern and Western volunteers on to New Orleans, where he "taught the newly fledged American eagle to match its talons with the lion's strength," and raised America for the first time to the dignity of a world power.

No one questioned the right of secession for more than 50 years after our Government was formed. In fact, the American people supported secession in the case of Texas, they condoned it in Cuba, they encouraged it in Panama. Abraham Lincoln himself, the great war President of the United States, in a speech made by him in the House of Representatives of the National Congress on January 12, 1848 (60 years after the adoption of the Constitution), as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE of that date, at page 94, volume 17, Thirtieth Congress, first session, in defending the right of Texas to secede from Mexico, said:

"Any people anywhere, being inclined and having the power, have the right to rise up and shake off the existing government, and form a new one that suits them better. This is a most valuable, a most sacred right—a right which, we hope and believe, is to liberate the world. Nor is this right confined to cases in which the whole people of an existing government may choose to exercise it. Any portion of such people that can may revolutionize, and make their own of so much of the territory as they inhabit. More than

this, a majority of any portion of such people may revolutionize, putting down a minority, intermingled with, or near about them, who may oppose their movements. Such minority was precisely the case of the Tories of our own Revolution. It is a quality of revolutions not to go by old lines, or old laws; but to break up both, and make new ones."

I submit that the right of secession was never more clearly or more forcibly expressed by Jefferson Davis or Robert Toombs than it was by Mr. Lincoln in that address. Was it treason then?

The South did not want to secede. They were nagged into it. A few years more and slavery would have fallen of its own weight, as it had done in England. But there were great, selfish interests that desired not only to subdue the South but to drive a wedge between the agricultural States of the South and West in order to plunder them through high protective tariffs and other discriminations that, carried out over a period of more than 60 years, have impoverished those sections, bled their peoples white, provoked retaliation on the part of every nation under the sun, crowded our population into congested centers, and brought to the people of America the present direful depression—the greatest economic calamity in all the tides of human history.

We must get back to the fundamental policies laid down by the founders of the Republic and advocated by the great statesmen of antebellum times, reinstitute the rule of common honesty for that of selfish greed, readopt the Golden Rule, instead of the rule of gold, in all our national and international relationships if we are to enjoy in the future the respect of mankind as well as those inherent blessings of civilization which the God of nature and the God of nations intended for us to enjoy.

I wish to say just a few words about our great leaders during those perilous times. While there are many whose names are written among the immortals, I shall mention only four: Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, Nathan Bedford Forrest, and Stonewall Jackson.

Stonewall Jackson, the matchless soldier of the Shenandoah, whose marvelous achievements in his valley campaigns thrill the world today, and whose name and fame will live as long as that majestic stream bears its wanton tributes to the sea.

Nathan Bedford Forrest, the Achilles of the Confederacy, the greatest genius of them all, whom Lee pronounced "the outstanding soldier developed by the war," the greatest fighter of ancient or modern times. He never had on a uniform until he was 40 years of age, yet in 4 short years he rose to the rank of lieutenant general. Disregarding the didactic precedents of military pomp, he ground his sword to the keenest edge, and invariably led the charge. He killed more men with his own hand than did any other general who ever commanded an army. He had 38 horses shot from under him and was wounded many times. He said no soldier was worth killing who went into battle expecting to come out alive. It is said that he fought more open engagements than any other commander of that war, that he never lost a battle when he was in supreme command, and never bucked a line he did not break. With a genius unsurpassed even by the great Napoleon, he invariably divided his ragged band of "mounted infantrymen" into two or more separate parts on the march, and then successfully concentrated them on the field of battle, inspired them with enthusiasm akin to living fire, and swept all opposition before him with the fury of a storm.

In the unfolding decades that are before us, as the passions and prejudices of war pass away and America comes to recognize the greatness of this illustrious man, his matchless genius, his marvelous courage, his invincible dynamity will furnish a subject for musicians, painters, and poets. The children of future generations will behold him mounted upon his fiery steed, rising in his stirrups as in the heat of battle, his eyes flashing, his body tense, his countenance ablaze, waving his sword as if inspiring his men to victory or death, as he goes charging down the centuries.

Probably the three greatest Christian soldiers of all time were Robert E. Lee, Jefferson Davis, and Stonewall Jackson. Jackson, the puritan; Lee and Davis, the cavaliers—what a picture that will be for a Rembrandt of the future to give to the world—those three devout Christian leaders in solemn counsel on the eve of a great battle.

Lee was undoubtedly the greatest commander of his day, and easily takes his place among the leading military marshals of all time. Old Senator Ben Hill, of Georgia, once said that—

"When the future historian shall come to survey the character of Lee he will find it rising like a huge mountain above the undulating plain of humanity, and he must lift his eyes high toward heaven to catch its summit. He possessed every virtue of other great commanders without their vices.

"He was a foe without hate; a friend without treachery; a soldier without cruelty; a victor without oppression; and a victim without murmuring.

"He was a public officer without vices; a private citizen without wrong; a neighbor without reproach; a Christian without hypocrisy; and a man without guile.

"He was Caesar without his ambition; Frederick without his tyranny; Napoleon without his selfishness; and Washington without his reward.

"He was obedient to authority as a servant, and royal in authority as a true king. He was gentle as a woman in life; modest and pure as a virgin in thought; watchful as a Roman vestal in duty; submissive to law as Socrates; and grand in battle as Achilles."

In the words of Oliver Goldsmith:

"As some tall cliff that lifts its awful form,
Swells for the vale, and midway leaves the storm—
Though round its breast the rolling clouds are spread
Eternal sunshine settles on its head."

He stands out today the most commanding, the most masterly, the most serenely inspiring figure upon the horizon of human history.

No man has ever been so much and so unjustly maligned as has Jefferson Davis, the great President of the ill-fated Confederacy, "the noblest Roman of them all."

The Honorable Caleb Cushing once said of him that he was "eloquent among the most eloquent in debate, wise among the wisest in counsel, and brave among the bravest on the battlefield."

He was the outstanding hero of the Mexican War. At the most critical moment in that conflict, during the terrible battle of Buena Vista, it was Jefferson Davis, the young colonel of Mississippi riflemen, who executed his famous V-formation and saved the day by a military maneuver which the Duke of Wellington said was "something new and masterly." He was the ablest Secretary of War this Nation has ever had. He towered like a giant in the United States Senate, standing at all times by the fundamental principles of the Constitution, and defending against all comers the rights of the sovereign States.

As President of the Confederacy, during the dark and stormy years of war, as a prisoner, suffering indignities that would have been spared even the vilest criminal, as a proscribed citizen during the darker years of reconstruction, he never wavered in his devotion to the principle for which he fought and suffered, but stood at all times as—

"* * * constant as the Northern Star
Of whose true-fix'd and resting quality
There is no fellow in the firmament."

As Bishop Galloway once said of him, "Marvelous, many-sided, masterful man, his virtues will grow brighter and his name be writ larger with each passing century. Soldier, hero, statesman, gentleman, American—a prince of Christian chivalry—the uncrowned chief of an invisible republic of loving and loyal hearts—when another hundred years have passed, no intelligent voice will fail to praise him, and no patriotic hand will refuse to place a laurel wreath upon his radiant brow."

As to the rank and file of the Confederate Army, I do not hesitate to say that they were the greatest soldiers, taken man for man, who ever wore a nation's uniform or followed a country's flag.

Someone has said that many a Robert E. Lee was born to die unknown to fame, that many a Stonewall Jackson lies beneath the sod of mother earth, with no other monument to mark the last resting place upon which a brave hero fell than the green grass that feeds its hungry roots upon his decaying bones. As Hamlet said of his sainted father, "They were men, take them for all in all, we shall not look upon their likes again."

But their monuments are in our hearts. As long as valor is esteemed a virtue, courage is admired, and patriotism is prized, the loyal children of the South will cherish as a most priceless heritage the sacred right to claim kindred with their spirits.

What shall I say to this broken band of veterans in gray, this lingering remnant of the great armies of the Confederacy, who sit before me at this hour? How shall I express to you our gratitude, our love, our admiration?

Fifty years to a day after the Battle of Bunker Hill, in addressing the veterans of the Revolutionary War, who were gathered to witness the laying of the cornerstone of the great monument that crowns that historic eminence, Daniel Webster said:

"Venerable men! You have come down to us from a former generation. Heaven has bounteously lengthened out your lives that you might behold this joyous day. You are now where you stood 50 years ago this very hour, with your brothers and your neighbors, shoulder to shoulder, in the strife for your country. Behold, how altered! The same heavens are, indeed, over your heads; the same ocean rolls at your feet; but all else, how changed! You hear now no roar of hostile cannon; you see no mixed volumes of smoke and flame rising from burning Charlestown. The ground strewed with the dead and the dying; the impetuous charge; the steady and successful repulse; the loud call to repeated assault; the summoning of all that is manly to repeated resistance; a thousand bosoms freely and fearlessly bared in an instant to whatever terror there may be in war and death—all these you have witnessed, but you witness them no more. All is peace, and God has granted you this sight of your country's happiness ere you slumber in the grave."

What a consolation it must be to you venerable men who have "come down to us from a former generation," who now stand where you were 70 years ago—in the midst of a devastating, fratricidal war—how gratifying it must be to you to behold our reunited country and to see our beloved Southland recovering from the wounds of war and the scars of reconstruction, growing in strength and influence, filled with the happy homes of your children and your children's children, and taking the lead in the new development, as well as in the onward march of our glorious country. What a solace it must be to know that the passions of war have passed away, that the world is coming to understand the great principles for which you fought and for which your comrades died. What a comfort it is to us, your children and your children's children, your neighbors and your friends, to have this opportunity to greet you on this occasion, to manifest to you in our humble way a meager portion of our gratitude for the service you have rendered and the sacri-

fices you have made, to lay at your feet the undying flowers of filial love and affection, to add them to your laurels of fame which will live and brighten with the passing years.

"Till the sun grows cold,
And the stars are old,
And the leaves of the Judgment Book unfold."

Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me over Station WLW, Cincinnati, Ohio:

Mr. KINGSBURY. Good evening from Washington. The Nation's station presents the sixty-fourth edition of the Washington Front, a discussion of world and national affairs.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities has been a target for considerable criticism and considerable praise. No middle ground is taken when that committee comes up for discussion. Recently, the House of Representatives voted the committee $75,000 to continue its work. And that vote brought forth more discussion.

Tonight, a member of that committee, Representative GERALD W. LANDIS, of Indiana, is going to consider the committee. Mr. LANDIS represents the Seventh Indiana District. He's been a Member of the House for the past 8 years.

Congressman, before we go into a detailed discussion, would you outline the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities?

Mr. LANDIS. The activities of our committee have been directed to protect the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and Bill of Rights. We want to expose those individuals or groups who challenge these standards and support those who pursue them. Our committee has not endeavored to curb the civil rights of persons whom it has investigated nor has it any intentions of doing so. However, our committee has endeavored to determine whether the persons under investigation have the interest of the United States at heart or whether they are sympathetic toward the establishment of a form of government which would forever abolish the civil liberties of all of the people for the benefit of a few.

It is un-American to advocate the creation of a state-established church, or the disfranchisement of citizens because of creed, or the abolition of the right of private property. It would be un-American to proclaim that our Constitution be ignored by Federal officers.

The Fascists, Nazis, and Communists are against the America our forefathers fought and died for; they are against the established freedoms of America. We prefer our own American way and we do not want subversive groups in this country attempting to undermine our democracy or any of its institutions.

Mr. KINGSBURY. Mr. LANDIS, some Congressmen, opposed to your committee, have charged that its members are waging a one-sided fight—fighting against communism, but not fascism? True or not true?

Mr. LANDIS. This is absolutely not true. We are waging a fight against all subversive groups. The Un-American Activities Committee has investigated the American ramifications of the Black Dragon Society of Japan, the German-American Bund, Fascists, and Communists.

Fascism and communism are both totalitarian systems of government in many respects. Any organization which advocates the establishment of a Fascist system of government in the United States is investigated by the committee upon receipt of authentic information that such an organization does exist.

These subversive groups hate and dread exposure because when we uncover the extent of their infiltration into certain groups it results in the loss of years of work to the followers of these subversive groups in the United States. This is equally true of Fascist, Nazi, or Communist groups.

Mr. KINGSBURY. Not so long ago, Congressman LANDIS, the Committee on Un-American Activities called for the radio scripts written by several widely known commentators. However, we haven't heard much about that during the past few weeks. What's the position of the committee today? Anything planned?

Mr. LANDIS. Since the inception of this committee we have requested radio scripts of numerous commentators. These requests have been made for a number of reasons. Commentators often receive tips of some un-American activity and their scripts prove valuable to our investigators. We also receive numerous complaints by all types of people of this or that broadcast alleging some remarks to be treasonable or a distortion of the truth. As a public agency we are compelled to respect a reasonable request from substantial citizens. The majority of commentators volunteer their scripts to our committee and have expressed their desire to cooperate with our committee. However, when we requested the script of the Communist-supported candidate for Congress, Johannes Steel, this commentator and the Communists in America attempted to discredit the committee as a committee created to destroy free speech. As a matter of fact, all radio scripts are public property.

I also wish to make it clear that we have never subpenaed a radio script, despite the fact that some newspapers in this country have carried this false charge. The position of the committee today in respect to radio scripts is the same as it was in 1945.

As a result of the committee's findings, legislation has been proposed which the committee hopes will in some measure acquaint the American public with knowledge beforehand as to whether a commentator is disbursing news or personal views over the air waves.

Mr. KINGSBURY. Congressman LANDIS, criticism means controversy and controversy makes news. But let's look at the other side of the question. What organizations or people give your group the greatest support?

Mr. LANDIS. Briefly, the committee's main support comes from persons who are opposed to communism and fascism and all that they embrace. Our committee has been supported by the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Knights of Columbus, the Disabled American Veterans, numerous religious and fraternal societies, various other veteran and civic groups.

Mr. KINGSBURY. Well, what about the popular pastime, Congressman LANDIS, of hurling the word "communism" at those who are in disagreement—those who are on the other side of the fence. Isn't it a case of calling wolf too often? Doesn't that habit hamper the committee's work?

Mr. LANDIS. Undoubtedly some people accuse individuals who may be innocently repeating the party line and the planted propaganda inspired by actual Communists. Some people in America also use the accusation carelessly in cases not involving Communists at all. By the same token, Communists and their fellow travelers have the habit of accusing everyone who disagrees with them of being Fascists. However, our committee in both cases studiously avoid identifying either individuals or groups of being Communists or Fascists unless we have substantiating evidence.

Our committee has noted with alarm that many innocent citizens have lent themselves to the furtherance of some phases of communistic doctrines by joining Communist-front groups. It is conceivable that a person may make a mistake once by joining an organization set up by Communists. However, when a citizen belongs to many such organizations he is either intentionally or carelessly helping to sell the United States short.

When these subversive groups are exposed, these American citizens should disavow their association with these groups. Unless they do so, they cannot expect to escape suspicion.

Mr. KINGSBURY. Let's get down to cases. What evidence has the committee uncovered that un-American elements are at work in this country?

Mr. LANDIS. From the evidence the committee has received, we know that there are at least 50,000 Communist members, 500,000 Communist fellow travelers, and 150,000 Communist underground workers in the United States. It should be remembered that an insignificant minority group in Russia, numbering 200,000 persons, gained control of the Russian Government, at a time when that country had a population of 170,000,000 people.

We have found communism to be a foreign-controlled movement whose leaders have openly proclaimed that it advocates revolution and the overthrow of the Government of the United States.

We have discovered that if the Communists get control of the United States we will lose our religious freedom. Communists believe that a belief in God and loyalty to the American flag are wholly opposed to communism. Let me quote from Mr. William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party, when he was before the Committee on Un-American Activities:

"The CHAIRMAN. To be a member of the Communist Party do you have to be an atheist?

"Mr. FOSTER. Many workers join the Communist Party who still have some religious scruples, but a worker who understands the elementary principles of the Communist Party must necessarily be in the process of liquidating his religious beliefs, and when he joins the party he will soon get rid of them.

"The CHAIRMAN. Well, can members of the Communist Party in Russia be married in the church and maintain religious belief?

"Mr. FOSTER. My opinion is that a member of the party of the Soviet Union who would be married in the church wouldn't be of any value to the Communist Party.

"The CHAIRMAN. Would he be put out of the party?

"Mr. FOSTER. Eventually."

Again I wish to quote Mr. Foster:

"The workers of this country and the workers of every country have only one flag. That's the red flag."

Mr. KINGSBURY. Here's a question that's been asked: Why couldn't the FBI or the Department of Justice handle the cases of un-Americans? To put it bluntly—is the committee necessary?

Mr. LANDIS. I absolutely believe the Committee on Un-American Activities is necessary. Today we need the help of every American and every patriotic organization to protect our temples of liberty.

Our committee has performed an outstanding service in exposing the activities of subversive groups and individuals that seek to undermine and destroy our American way of life. This committee is vital to the future security of our country. It was suggested by a few enemies of our committee that we do not need a committee of this kind because the FBI could do the job. The FBI, however, is limited to the handling of illegal activities, to activities which are in direct

violation of the law and to assignments by the Attorney General.

Now let me quote from Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI:

"Today America has become the battleground of foreign agents. They spin their web of alien philosophies to ensnare America, and in the darkness weave insidious plans to scuttle our national defense. To counter and attack these vicious forces is the present task of law enforcement. Never have we had such responsibilities or opportunities. We of the law enforcement already are aware of the potential dangers that menace every community in the land. These increased burdens on law enforcement produce an open invitation to the underworld to plunder and destroy. However, the threats of the underworld are of little consequence today compared to the threats of subverters who are bent on undermining and weakening our Nation, leaving it vulnerable to open attack. Vicious forces menace our national life to such an extent that the far-flung forces of the FBI, bulwarked by law enforcement everywhere, have been hard put to render full protection to our internal security."

Mr. FINGSBURY. Here's a final question, Congressman LANDIS: Your committee has been given a new lease on life—a $75,000 lease. What plans have been made to continue your investigations?

Mr. LANDIS. Yes, we were given a fine vote of confidence recently by the House of Representatives to expand our commitee. At present our committee employs a general counsel, three investigators, a research expert, a stenographer, and a stenographer-clerk, as well as a clerk for the committee.

Today the subversive problem has become so acute that it is necessary to expand our committee staff. This staff should be headed by a chief director. We should form three divisions: 1, investigation; 2, files and codification; and 3, research and publications. Each group should be supervised by a director. We need five first-class investigators and three assistants in each of the other divisions.

Our committee is making plans to expand its activities and to revamp its staff of employees along the foregoing lines.

Mr. Kingsbury, we are determined to protect the things for which our boys fought and died. We should rededicate ourselves to our God, to our country, to our homes with the inspiration of Lincoln's words when he said, "Many free countries have lost their liberty, and ours may lose hers; but if she shall, be it my proudest plume not that I was the last to desert but that I never deserted her."

Mr. KINGSBURY. I believe we have time for one more question, Congressman. Recently your committee made plans for a conference on Americanism. Will you tell us about those plans?

Mr. LANDIS. Our committee has invited the FBI and three of the leading veterans' organizations—the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars—to join us in a conference on Americanism to be held here in Washington in the near future.

Our committee believes that the situation is so acute that we need the coordinated efforts of all believers in Americanism to help combat the evils of subversive activities.

Let me recall again those figures I cited a moment ago, those figures showing how many people and organizations either wittingly or unwittingly, follow the line of un-American thinking.

Mr. KINGSBURY. Thank you, Congressman LANDIS. Representative GERALD LANDIS, of Indiana, a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, was guest tonight on the Washington Front.

Next week, at this same time, another Washington personality will be with us to consider other problems of world and national importance.

Mr. Lewis Wins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of May 31, 1946:

MR. LEWIS WINS

Settlement of the coal strike will be viewed by a good many persons with mixed emotions. There are three questions to ask in considering it. First, was there justification for any such strike in this critical reconversion period when the country is trying to get back on a peacetime economy? Second, are the settlement terms themselves satisfactory to the country? Third, should the Government of the United States itself bargain and sign labor contracts with the miners, or with any union?

To the first question, there can be but one answer. No such strike is justified in the reconversion emergency. Certainly, the miners were not hardship cases at the moment. They had already enjoyed the highest percentage of weekly wage increase since 1939 of any major industry and were enjoying a higher actual weekly wage than the national average. So they could have waited without great sacrifice until industry got moving.

As to the settlement terms themselves, little exception can be taken to them now, in the light of all that is going on in wages and prices elsewhere—from the time we ceased to control them. And some of the terms of the settlement do mark long overdue advances. The safety measures are all to the good. Many mine operators have been disgracefully negligent of their miners' lives and health. In some instances mine company doctors have been of poor grade, and even crooked. Nothing could be worse than the indifference of many operators to the miners' health and welfare. So there will be improvement here.

As to the welfare fund, financed by 5 cents a ton royalty, it is to be administered by a joint board, removing one of the important objections to it. This also makes it conform to the newly passed Case bill. Welfare funds have been created in a number of industries in recent years. Admitting their good purpose, the country will soon have to face several problems in connection with them. How far can we go in allowing many groups of workers, some handling the same product, to go on levying private taxes? Must we not work out some more orderly over-all plan for providing the benefits to which the workers are entitled?

The third question is the hardest of all to answer. It is fundamental. There must be some better way for this country to meet such emergencies as the coal strike than by seizing properties and having the Government bargain with labor. The Government should never bargain with any part of the American people.

The Government should create the machinery for bargaining between labor and management—unless we are truly going to have Government owned and operated mines, and other industry. In the absence of long-needed guiding legislation to handle crises like the coal strike, the executive branch of the Government had little choice but to do what it did. But the method is wrong, unless we are ready for nationalization of industries of a public-utility nature. For that is what John L. Lewis has, in effect, today and will continue to have until the Government persuades the coal operators to take back the mines, by granting them increased prices at the consumers' expense.

Predicts President Truman Will Be Reelected in 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a radio address which I made over Station WWDC the night following the address of former Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, in which the former Secretary in his "sour grapes" speech was unjustly critical of President Truman. The following is my radio speech:

Good evening ladies and gentlemen, my program tonight will be somewhat different, perhaps, than most congressional programs or other programs that you have heard on this station. No doubt you have listened to various news programs, radio commentators, Cabinet members, Congressmen, Senators, and many other people in various prominent walks of life over this station on many occasions. However, I doubt if any of them have been exactly like this program which I am going to present to you tonight. I am going to talk about the most important man in the United States and one of the most important men in the whole world, President Harry S. Truman.

Since I hail from Louisiana, in the deep South, I believe that I can perhaps see President Truman in a little different light than I could if I were a Congressman from a borderline State, such as Pennsylvania or Ohio, where in many of the congressional districts Democrats and Republicans switch back and forth many times, dependent on some occasions upon the President's degree of success. In other words, I believe it is like looking at a forest from a distance, on a distant hill and being able to see the over-all picture of the forest rather than if I were in the midst of the forest and could not actually see the forest for the trees.

And so, coming from Louisiana, what the future holds in store for President Truman, Democrats or Republicans, makes very little, if any, difference, in whether or not our eight Louisiana Congressmen will be elected or reelected, due to the fact that we have only the Democratic Party and practically a nonexistent Republican party—so the Presidential election has little effect upon my reelection, as well as upon most southern Congressmen, and for that reason I feel that I can look at President Truman and his future a little differently and from a more unbiased viewpoint than Congressmen from some States, particularly those who have both strong Democratic and Republican parties. In these Congressional districts, in many instances the election of a Democratic President means whether there will be a Democratic Congressman in Washington.

First of all, let's look at one Harry S. Truman who, a little over a year ago, found himself in the position of filling the largest political shoes in the whole world. The late President Roosevelt had made an impressive record, having been elected to four terms, an honor and an achievement which had never been accomplished before and which is

doubtful that it will ever be accomplished again. To look at President Roosevelt when he stepped into the Presidential shoes in 1932 and President Roosevelt as he was inauguarated for his fourth term, you really saw two entirely different men—one an ambitious, energetic, inexperienced man in 1932, determined to face all challenges, overcome all obstacles and to succeed in the face of overwhelming odds.

In 1945 you see a man inaugurated for the fourth term, far different from the President who took office in 1932, who had in a miraculous way achieved phenomenal success in having made for himself an undeniable place in the records of our history that will always be regarded as one of brilliance, greatness, and achievement—a world's champion in politics. When Harry S. Truman found himself President of the United States after suddenly taking the oath of office upon the passing of President Roosevelt, he must have wondered what was ahead of him and what he would do. Perhaps one of the most striking pictures in the inner workings of Harry Truman's mind was revealed when he told a group of newspaper men, "If you ever have prayed, pray for me." As President of this great Nation he could not help but realize what was in store for him—a short wave of popularity, then to be followed by the inevitable—one crisis after another, rough sailing, disputes both at home and abroad, trouble in our foreign relationships, and one momentous decision to be made right after another. This was inevitable. It was the beginning of the atomic age. These problems in times of crises had to be met head on. There was no dodging or sidestepping. On the other hand, they were a natural reaction, since this world had been shaken to its very foundation by one of the most devastating of all world wars that had ever been witnessed. It was inevitable, that, with the ending of this war, a violent reaction, as far as our domestic and foreign problems were concerned, would certainly occur. It was as natural as a hangover sets in after excessive drinking, or a period of convalescence which must occur after a serious operation.

It has been said both pro and con as to how President Truman has met this reaction and crisis. Frankly, in my opinion, he has shown unusual ability and potential greatness, and, in all fairness to him, even his worst enemy could not help but admit that he is growing in political stature by leaps and bounds day by day.

When you consider the background of Harry Truman, an average midwestern businessman, then a State political officeholder, then suddenly elected to the United States Senate, then into the Vice Presidency, and then catapulted into the Presidency of the whole United States at one of the most vital and critical times in all our history—it is no wonder that we, the people, could not help but wonder what would happen in the future, both to him and to our great Nation. We have seen what has happened for the past year, and today we see President Truman having successfully encountered and hurdled all major obstacles and headed for political achievement and success in the future. The people of this Nation have, in this past year, acquired tremendous faith and confidence in President Harry S. Truman and sincerely believe that he is on the road to destiny to have his name placed in the immortal records of the history of this Nation as one of our greatest Presidents.

Of course what is of paramount interest now concerning national politics, and will increase until 1948, is President Truman's chances of reelection. I firmly believe that if he continues in the future (and there is no reason to believe why he will not) as he has in the past, that the people of this Nation will reelect him for a second term by an overwhelming and decisive vote. Yes, he has had his ups and downs, and anyone who has ever been in politics will readily admit that no politician ever stays on top, but that he is constantly in the process of going up and down. This was demonstrated in the many terms of President Roosevelt, who at times would sink to extreme low levels of popularity, only to bound back and be reelected again, and again, and again. President Truman has had his ups and downs and at present, he is climbing. The firm way he handled the railroad strike, the way he settled it, the way he has settled the coal strike, has given him a tremendous boost in popularity all over this Nation. His political stock is soaring. If the election were 1 week from today, I believe even his most bitter critics would admit that he would be reelected by an overwheming majority of the people of this country. All of his troubles are not over and he will probably go up and down in popularity on many occasions between now and '48, but there is one thing certain—he has definitely climbed a lot in the first year he has been President. Assuming that he continues in the next 2 years as he has in the past, his reelection will certainly be assured. Of course, he is going to meet with opposition from a few labor leaders who, at present, are sore and infuriated. However, the great majority of the rank and file of labor, both organized and unorganized, were behind President Truman and, in all probability, will continue to support him. Some of those infuriated leaders who are smart will cool off and end up supporting the President as well as his future program.

John L. Lewis attempted to defeat President Roosevelt by thoroughly denouncing him and supporting his opponent. President Roosevelt won, John L. Lewis lost, with the amazing result that the same organized miners who had followed John L. Lewis blindly on any and every labor question, refused to follow him politically, and continued to vote for Franklin D. Roosevelt. In the first place, the laboring man, whether he be in the rank and file or a leader has no place to go other than to follow President Truman. To support a third party would be suicide and disaster and put labor in a ridiculously weak spot. Then again, labor would be foolish to line up with the rock-ribbed reactionary Republican Party. The Republicans have little to offer except flattering lip service. They have already indicated that Stassen isn't going to be their choice—that he is too liberal.

Looking at President Truman from a cold blooded, cool, and calculated political viewpoint, it is not difficult to predict his reelection in '48. Many present trends point to his reelection at this time. First of all, he has two requisites that a leader in political life needs more than anything else in order to generate work and effort among his thousands of lieutenants and political workers, and those two assets are—loyalty and gratitude. President Truman never forgets a friend and President Truman rewards his friends and supporters, large or small, whenever possible. On the other hand, the choice of his Cabinet has, on the whole, been an outstanding one. He has surrounded himself with able friends, both political and otherwise. In Robert Hannegan he has at the head of the Democratic Party, one of the most astute, energetic, and capable politicians that this country has ever seen. Whether you like him, agree with him or not, or see eye to eye with him or not, you cannot help but admit to his political greatness. He has done a remarkable job for the Democrats and there is every reason to believe that he will continue. I will frankly admit that perhaps of all jobs, his is the most difficult, and no one man has ever before been called upon to satisfy so many different and diverse groups which comprise the Democratic Party as he has, especially at this time. To keep them peacefully working and pulling together has been, and will continue to be an almost superhuman task. Whereas, there has been some friction and bickering in the Democratic camp, there has been that much and even more prevailing in the Republican camp. Of course, when the Democratic Party as he has, especially at this is written and said about it, whereas, when the Republicans are torn with internal strife it very seldom hits the press or the radio.

I could not help but be amused when President Truman spoke up and rebuked those who predicated a gloomy and pessimistic view for this great Nation of the years ahead, when President Truman said: "The end of things has not come for this great Nation or the world. This is just the beginning." "When the President of the United States by one speech can get Senator CLAUDE PEPPER and Senator BOB TAFT, the Communistic Daily Worker, and the Wall Street Journal in accord, the world is perfectly safe."

These were President Truman's words last night when he spoke at the graduation exercises of George Washington University. While they do not constitute in themselves many words in number, still they have a tremendous meaning. It is a clear-cut example of how selfish motives of men who ordinarily are separated by vast distances of opinion, policy, and feeling find themselves suddenly thrown together fighting on the same side, not for the common good but in many instances for a selfish, individual motive. It shows that some will team up with anyone with completely opposite policies and feelings to gain their selfish desire and end. There will be many who for selfish reasons will oppose President Truman. That is natural and is to be expected, but in this fast-changing world and in the greatest Nation on the face of the earth, the people have faith, and will continue to have faith in the one man whose leadership stands out far above all the others combined, as a symbol of a great Nation—one Harry S. Truman. Will he be reelected in 1948? I think he will, but, of course, time will tell.

Amendment of Wagner Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

AMERICAN REFRIGERATOR TRANSIT CO.,
St. Louis, MO., May 27, 1946.

The Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Can't we make the Wagner Act fair both to labor and management whereas now it is so very heavily loaded in favor of labor and against business and against the American people as a whole as recent events show so clearly. Can't the Act be amended to square it off into equal justice for all, without lessening in any real degree the rights to which labor is justly and fairly entitled? Won't the true interest of labor itself really be served best if this good, but lopsided and unfair act is squared up in the interest of all of us. Labor is a part of "all of us," you know.

I am no labor hater—far from it. I was a switchman, a fireman, a telegrapher, a track laborer, and I worked as a mechanic and as a clerk—in fact in about every work classification on a railroad. In those early years

I was a union member. I know the need for organized labor in our highly industrialized economy and I would not destroy labor unions if I could, but they will destroy themselves and the American Government and people too, if some fair and decent check is not put upon the unbridled power assumed by irresponsible leaders under the Wagner Act.

I am wholly opposed to the President's idea of compelling men to work at the point of a bayonet and so is every fair-minded American who understands and believes in the American principle of Government, but Mr. Congressman, the Lewis', Johnstons, Whitneys, Reuthers, Bridges, Currans, Quills, Hillmans and so on will force this country of ours into statism, or socialism, or totalitarianism of some kind, if permitted by law to pursue their heedless, greedy, ambitious ways.

Can't our Congress overhaul the Wagner act to make it an act for all the people—thereby giving real protection to labor itself as one part of all the people?

Very truly yours,

O. M. STEVENS.

Bipartisan Committee Promotes Federal Aid to Education; Additional Members Welcomed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, more than 65 Members of the House of Representatives are members of a volunteer committee to advance the cause of education through support for appropriate legislation to accomplish Federal aid, as proposed in legislation pending in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the committee welcomes the additional membership of our colleagues. If interested, please contact the Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER, of California, who is secretary of the group. The Honorable EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, is cochairman with myself in this movement.

For the further information of my colleagues, I include the following statement made by Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. MILLER, and myself as carried in the Journal of the National Education Association in the issue of March 1946:

BIPARTISAN COMMITTEE TO PROMOTE FEDERAL AID—MEMBERS OF UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES VOLUNTEER TO ADVANCE CAUSE OF EDUCATION

On November 15, 1945, a bipartisan group of Congressmen met in Washington, on call of Congressman Robert Ramspeck, Georgia, sponsor of H. R. 1296, to consider how they might best express their interest in and support of the proposal to strengthen public education for greater service in the Nation and in the world.

One of the first things the group did was to organize as a Committee for the Support of Federal Aid for Public Schools. Members of the committee believe that in the national interest the education of American children is of grave concern to Federal Government and that it is the responsibility of National Government through grants-in-aid to assist the States that lack financial strength to provide adequate public-school facilities. They also believe that the Seventy-ninth Congress should enact appropriate legislation on this subject.

Because members of the committee regard education as an over-all function of Government on which partisan differences can readily be avoided, the group proceeded to elect its officers on a bipartisan basis.

Any Member of the House of Representatives may become a member of the committee by advising either of the cochairmen, or the secretary, of his wish to affiliate with the group.

We have two choices from which to make a selection today. We can either select for our future the way of war, and perish; or we can select the way of peace, and survive.

If we elect to survive, the great task is that of finding a way to educate the youth of the world to the task of lasting peace. Ignorance is a catastrophe. It is always a door that opens easily to disaster. The safety of the whole world rests with enlightened men. To cultivate personality through faith, respect, understanding of one another and of the peoples of the world is a high art to which we must all dedicate ourselves if we are to succeed in winning and in keeping peace and prosperity.

One of the first tasks which our country must accomplish is that of providing a fair chance for our children to get a decent, respectable education. We know this chance does not exist today in many States. We know this chance is lacking, not because parents want poor schools for their children, but because the parents in thousands of localities are unable to pay for the kind of schools American children need and must be provided.

Federal Government has a vast stake in this matter. Twice in a generation it has called for the enlistment of millions of Americans to win a war for survival. It is today demanding that all citizens give more of their time and more of their money to matters of national significance than at any time in the past. The duties of citizens of the Nation have steadily mounted as compared with those long established in State and local affairs. The hour is now at hand when Federal Government must recognize that youth must be prepared for a different world than the one that existed a short decade ago. There is but one fitting way to express this recognition.

We must improve and intensify the education of our youth to the end that they will come to the tasks of their day as completely prepared to perform them as it is humanly possible for us in this hour of decision to foresee. This is a basic goal to which all Americans can wisely dedicate themselves. It is the goal for which the House Committee for the Support of Federal Aid for Public Schools was organized and which it will strive to attain.

A Plea for the Hungry in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter addressed to me on the subject of the hungry of Europe:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 25, 1946.*

To Whom It May Concern:

Right now millions are starving to death in Europe, China, and India; yet month after month we have been shipping abroad only about half of our grain commitments, and those commitments were set months ago at figures only about half of what the hungry peoples said they needed. Throughout this famine-stricken world our greedy joy ride of unrationed belly stuffing is puzzling everyone. Our garbage cans are filled to overflowing while elsewhere little children grow thin and whimper and die. What Wendell Willkie called our reservoir of good will is rapidly becoming so dry that it begins to look like a volcano crater that could soon spew forth brimstone and ashes.

A report from London by Michael Straight in the New Republic of May 27, 1946, quotes a leader of the British Government:

"One hundred and fifty million tons of American grain are being turned into 20,000,000 tons of meat in America, at a time when only grain can save lives. If every hen and hog and cow in America were fed the same amount of grain now that they were fed before the war, 15,000,000 tons of grain would be freed for export. It could prevent the famine. If famine comes, the world will hold you responsible."

By such modest self-sacrifice as resuming temporarily our 1939 standard of living (even then the highest in the world except for New Zealand) we could keep alive twenty or thirty or forty million people, mostly children and old folks, who otherwise must surely die. If they do die, world opinion will hold us morally responsible for these premeditated murders just as surely as if we had—each of us personally—pulled the triggers of machine guns or pushed the buttons operating poison-gas chambers.

A letter from Charles L. Ames in the New York Herald Tribune of May 23, 1946, reported that in India "there are 120,000,000 people facing death by starvation. * * * At least 15,000,000 will die. * * * Should health control measures * * * break down, the death toll may easily rise to 25,000,000. Completely to prevent this disaster would require 4,000,000 tons of grain * * * India must look for supplies principally to the United States."

The efficient Germans, with all their horrible machinery for mechanized murder, required 6 years of war to kill about 20,000,000 people. It appears that our American plan (or, rather, refusal to plan) will probably result in killing thirty or forty million people in 6 months of peace—and by much simpler, cleaner, and pleasanter techniques than those used by the nasty Nazis—merely by enjoying extra cakes and pies, extra chickens and steaks, extra pats of butter, extra double-scoop chocolate sundaes.

What is needed? Obviously bold, swift, vigorous action by our Government to ration strictly our extravagantly wasteful consumption of grains, meats, butter, eggs, ice cream, etc., and to ship abroad swiftly whatever is needed to keep alive the millions of innocents we are now planning to kill.

But, more important even than governmental action, we must—each of us individually—commit ourselves morally to so act that we save the lives of our fellow men, not slaughter them with our meat-hungry teeth.

Personally, for the duration of this famine, I have made a contract with my conscience that I shall eat no meat whatever, no cakes or pies whatever, as little bread as possible, no butter whatever, and no ice cream whatsoever. Perhaps others would wish to make some similar contract with themselves. Thanks to our abundant supplies of vegetables, fish, butter substitutes, cheese, eggs, fruits, jams, and jellies, such sacrifice will require of us remarkably little suffering.

If we as a people refuse to moderate our berry-stuffing spree and thus condemn to death French babies, Polish grandmothers, Chinese coolies, Greek school teachers, Hindu school children, Italian housewives, Yugoslav workmen literally by the millions, what then should we call our American plan for mass murder by pie a-la-mode? The good-

neighbor policy? The brave new world? The American way of life? How to win friends and influence people? Or just, the new cannibalism?

An intriguing statistical ratio merits note. There are about 140,000,000 of us in 35,000,000 American families. Estimates already given indicate that, if we stick faithfully to our present plan of conduct, we can succeed in killing perhaps 35,000,000 people overseas, thus providing one dead foreigner to the credit of each American family dinner table. Each individual among us can similarly count, in final effect, on eating one-quarter of some remote but real human being.

Wasn't there a Preacher once who said: "Cast thy bread upon the waters for thou shalt find it after many days"? Wasn't there a Teacher once who asked: "What man is there of you, whom, if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone?" I wonder whatever happened to that idea—and to Him. Didn't He die, while quite respectable persons washed their hands and sat down to a good dinner?

On what are you dining tonight—or on whom?

Respectfully submitted.

ATWOOD H. TOWNSEND,
Assistant Professor of Engineering English, New York University.

Capitol Stuff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John O'Donnell, from the Washington Times-Herald:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

It is still the law of the land, our Department of Justice tells us, that any individual or groups of persons conspiring together to overthrow the Government of our republic shall promptly be tossed in the nearest Federal hoosegow.

Which is sound common sense, and we approve of it. Also, if said traitors against this Government of ours try to blow the whistle in wartime, it's not the hoosegow—it's the gallows or the brick wall in front of a firing squad.

Well, we're still at war, and we most thoroughly approve this tough measure for the boys who are now whooping it up for the slick insertion into our way of life of ideas that were bred in their bones somewhere in eastern Europe or Asiatic Russia.

Also, still on the law books of the Nation, and still effective today, is the cold, definite Department of Justice ruling that membership in the Communist Party in this country is—by itself, no further evidence needed—criminal proof that such a person was working for the overthrow of the Government of the United States.

This ruling was handed down by F. D. R.'s Attorney General Francis Biddle (now sitting as justice at the Nuremberg trials). It was braced by F. D. R.'s 1944 campaign repudiation of American Commies and their "pinko" followers—a declaration played down in New York but given a New Deal radio whirl and newsreel twist west of the Alleghanies.

And the snapper on all this, of course, is that those who in wartime give aid and comfort to those who today want to overturn the Government of the United States are just as guilty as the foreigner who comes in with a bomb, a plot to overthrow the Government, or a scheme to steal the secrets of an atom bomb—which has happened.

A swell job is being done right now by our own security authorities in prying apart the soft-headed native-born American suckers and the slick foreigners of outright Commy or eastern European Marxism who have left their slimy trail high in the councils of the New Deal.

That story is bound to crack before the November elections and to split wide open furiously before the Presidential elections 2 years hence. Most of the information will come from the honest American liberals and Socialists who have been suckered into the Moscow-supported fifth columns of fellow travelers.

As usual, the politicians coming up for election are smartest and most alert on the drift. They should be. After all, their lives depend on wetting the finger and knowing exactly when they hold it up which way the wind is blowing, and how hard.

Hence, the swift reaction to the annouucement here of Sidney Hillman's new plan to bring together the various pinkish, Moscow-flavored groups under his control.

As the political drift now goes, the Russia-lovers can give only the kiss of death to an ambitious office-seeker outside of his own rigidly restricted bailwick. That goes for many others.

Hence, watch the cool brush-off that Boss Murray of the CIO will give the backers of Joe Stalin. Watch for a rebroadcast of John L. Lewis' 1940 terrific denunciation of the New Deal's road to war—one of the greatest campaign orations of this generation.

Watch also for the crack-up before next November's election of the slick and hypocritical groups which Hillman has gathered together—ostensibly as completely separate and independent organizations, but actually as identical as the robot marchers in an American Communist parade who run around the corner, catch up with the rear and pass in review 8 and 10 times.

Now just to show the tweedledum-tweedledee relationship of the CIO-PAC set-up under Brother Hillman and the National Citizens Political Action Committee, we now present the names of the big shots who are running these supposedly separate outfits.

Here they are:

CIO Political Action Committee: Sidney Hillman, Van A. Bittner, R. J. Thomas, James B. Carey, Joseph Curran, John Green, Leo Kryzycki, Philip Murray, Emil Rieve, Reid Robinson, Willard Townsend.

National Citizens Political Action Committee: Sidney Hillman, Van A. Bittner, R. J. Thomas, James B. Carey, Joseph Curran, John Green, Leo Kryzycki, Philip Murray, Emil Rieve, Reid Robinson, Willard Townsend.

Now, forgetting Sidney Hillman's CIO-PAC for a moment, let us turn to the persons, male and female, who are either big shots or fat-cat suckers in both Hillman's National Citizens Political Action Committee and the new-born Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

The Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions got off to a pinko, Moscow-propelled whoop-dee-do start, with the sucker list kicking in heavy dough—heavy enough, at least, to put F. D. R.'s eldest son, James the First, on the pay roll at a reported $40,000 smackers a year and Honest Harold Ickes at $25,000.

Now, here's the strangely similar list of those who dominate the two outfits:

National Citizens Political Action Committee: Louis Adamic, William Rose Benet, Marc Connelly, Morris Llewellyn Cooke, Frank Kingdon, Canada Lee, Max Lerner, Martin Popper, Nelson Poynter, Paul Robeson, Edward G. Robinson, Orson Welles, J. Raymond Walsh.

Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions: Louis Adamic, William Rose Benet, Marc Connelly, Morris Llewellyn Cooke, Frank Kingdon, Canada Lee, Max Lerner, Martin Popper, Nelson Poynter, Paul Robeson, Edward G. Robinson, Orson Welles, J. Raymond Walsh.

Last Will and Testament of a United States Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was profoundly moved when I read the bequest of Lt. Ben Toland, age 24, a United States marine who gave his life for his country at Iwo Jima. I quote from an item relating to Lt. Ben Toland's bequest which appeared in the May 1946 letter published by Harding College, Searcy, Ark.:

HEAR YE—

One of the 5,000 United States marines who died on Iwo Jima was Ben Toland, 24, of Concord, N. H., a Yale junior and an honor student. When another officer was wounded in battle, Lieutenant Toland voluntarily took command of his platoon, stormed the ridge and gained the objective before he himself was killed. Toland's estate, less than $4,000, was divided by his will as follows:

	Percent
Benevolence	5
His church	5
His college	10
His prep school	20
The A. F. of L	10
The CIO	10
The NAM	20
The U. S. Congress	20

The will was not a document of profound legal verbiage; just a hand-written note from a military man going into battle.

Not even a cynical critic of the liberty Ben Toland understood and appreciated could detect a tone of bitterness in his harmonious bequests. He met death on February 21 and it is reasonably certain that the will was written at Christmas, far beyond the horizon of merriment but in a spirit of good will toward men. In that holiday gift list rings a clear note of victory and hope.

As if it were his life's last tithe, 5 percent went to church and 5 to a Christmas charity, "the 100 neediest cases," sponsored by the New York Times. Toland knew the worth of learning and paid a tribute to two schools that were peculiarly his own, Yale University and St. Paul's of Concord. The will's other four beneficiaries sound a chord of pure patriotism.

Not every serviceman who paid his life for victory in World War II possessed this young man's grasp of public affairs, but they all wanted the same thing. They wanted to see America the land of opportunity once more. The lieutenant's will expressed all this hope and more, for Toland knew how to save America's freedom: Through peace between labor and management.

This sober young man laid 60 percent of his earthly holdings on the altar of industrial peace. His mother yet lived. No doubt he had personal friends who needed funds. Just the same, his largest single hope beyond his own life span was to retain the American system of free faith, free speech, free enterprise, popular ballot, unrestricted opportunity, and equality under the law.

With 20 percent he asked Congress to heed the plea of many martyrs for laws in the interest of all, not just for pressure groups. Another 20 percent called aloud to the National Association of Manufacturers, a group of small employers such as fill more than two-thirds of America's pay envelopes. Another fifth begged a hearing by labor groups, destined to play an important role in America's future.

Mr. Speaker, to read the bequests of Lt. Ben Toland is to realize that the spirit of sacrifice which has made this Nation great and strong, still lives in the hearts and souls of the youths of this generation of Americans, and let us hope the same spirit will find expression in the youth of countless generations yet to come.

Letter from Soldiers Serving in the Occupation Forces in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following splendid letter, sent me by some 40 or 50 men who are now serving in the occupation forces in Japan.

I wish to commend this letter to the attention of the Members of Congress, believing as I do that it expresses the attitude of the majority of the men, not only those who are still in service overseas, but also those who have previously served, and who feel that this Congress is negligent and short-sighted in not providing adequate draft laws.

Hon. JOHN E. LYLE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LYLE: If the sacrificing of a million lives and the expenditure of $300,000,000,000 was worth while to prosecute the war, certainly the maintenance of a sizable Army to safeguard the principles for which we fought is reasonable. Under the present draft law, that is not being done. In fact, no more inadequate or misleading bill could have been passed by the Congress. The bill provided for the drafting of men—men that are already in the service.

In view of this fact these are our suggestions for enclosure in a bill before the expiration of the present stop gap law. They will meet the Army's needs and still be fair to the men involved:

1. The inclusion of teen-agers in the draft law.
2. The limiting of the period each man will have to serve to 18 months.
3. An increase in pay for men in the lower ranks. The highest increase to the lowest rank.

When we were 18 years old we were drafted to serve in the front lines of the war. We were old enough to fight, and if necessary, to die for our country. Why then is a teen-ager too young to serve in the nonhazardous army of occupation? If this group of men is to be exempted from the draft, then all men in that age bracket who are now in the service should be released immediately.

Most men have completed 2 years of college or have already established themselves for their future life by the time they become eligible under the present law. How much wiser and more sensible it is to induct a man when he is 18, who has just finished high school and has not as yet entered college or decided definitely what he plans to do in the future, than it is to interrupt him in the midst of his college education, or just as he is starting in life.

Now that the war has terminated there is no need to keep a man in the armed forces for any lengthy period. Eighteen months is long enough for any individual to spend away from his home, his studies, and his business. All men who now have 18 months of service should be released at once and thereafter as a soldier attains his eighteenth month of duty he would be discharged.

One of the greatest sources of dissatisfaction, and also one of the greatest impediments to reenlistments, has been the low pay rate for enlisted men. We propose an increase substantial enough to help the enlisted men, particularly those in the lowest ranks.

The victory not so long ago won was costly and destructive. It is our duty to make this victory worth the cost. That will only be achieved if the Congress passes a 1-year extension of the draft law encompassing the preceding enclosures. This is a duty you of the Congress owe to those who gave their lives and to those of us who are bearing the burden of the occupation. We have a right to expect that duty to be faced squarely and an end brought to the absurd dillydallying that has thus far been your answer.

It goes without saying that an answer to this will not only be appreciated but is expected.

Redressing a Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert a most appropriate editorial published in the Evening Star on a legislative mistake that has done a regrettable injustice to a small group of faithful former employees of the Government. The editorial is as follows:

REDRESSING A WRONG

In submitting to the House a report unanimously approving inclusion of a retroactive clause in the Civil Service Retirement Act of January 24, 1942, the House Civil Service Committee has brought cheer to a dwindling group of retired Government employees who long have been penalized unjustly for having retired prior to enactment of the 1942 law, which liberalized annuities. Congress' failure to make the annuity changes retroactive left approximately 7,673 retired employees deprived of the increased benefits, although it had been the policy of the Government in the past to make such benefits retroactive. Some of these annuitants were fortunate enough to obtain reemployment on the Federal pay roll during the war and thereby automatically became eligible for the higher retirement benefits. Many were unable to serve during the emergency because of disabilities and thus were foreclosed from any improvement of status.

During the nearly 4½ years since the 1942 legislative oversight, about one-fourth of the original 7,673 annuitants affected by the error have died. The list has been further reduced by reemployment, as already mentioned, and when it is considered that all of the annuitants concerned are more than 4 years older, the total cost to the Government today of rectifying the situation is estimated at a little more than $8,000,000, or about half what it would have cost in January, 1942. This is a relatively small amount of pay in atonement for a legislative mistake that has done a regrettable injustice to a small group of faithful former employees of the Government. The House can write a happy ending to the sad episode by passing promptly the pending remedial bill, which already has won the approval of the Senate.

B'nai B'rith Honors Gen. Omar N. Bradley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on April 1 it was my privilege to be a guest of B'nai B'rith, America's oldest and largest national Jewish service organization, at the luncheon given by its newly organized National Veterans' Advisory Committee and the National Postwar Service-Americanism Commission in honor of Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, at the Mayflower Hotel here in Washington.

It was a brilliant affair attended by high military and Government leaders of our country, who joined B'nai B'rith in paying tribute to one of America's greatest soldiers of all time, now serving his Nation in the responsible position of Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in time of peace.

It was most heartening to hear the splendid tributes paid to General Bradley by Henry Monsky of Omaha, President of B'nai B'rith, who presided at the gathering; Lt. Col. Elliott A. Niles, of Boston, chairman of the National Veterans' Advisory Committee and a resident of my State of Massachusetts, who opened the luncheon meeting and delivered the address of welcome; Sidney G. Kusworm of Dayton, Ohio, national treasurer of B'nai B'rith and chairman of its Americanism Commission; Vice Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations in charge of Personnel; and Maj. Gen. Edward F. Witsell, The Adjutant General of the Army, who introduced General Bradley.

During the program President Monsky presented to General Bradley a pledge of support, attractively engraved and mounted, in behalf of the 265,000 men and women of the 1,200 lodges and chapters of B'nai B'rith throughout the country.

Invocation was offered by Rear Adm. William N. Thomas, Chief of Chaplains of the United States Navy, and benediction by Maj. Gen. Luther O. Miller, Chief of Chaplains of the United States Army. A most impressive ceremony was directed by Commander Joshua L. Goldberg, Chaplain of the United States Navy in the New York area, who conducted an unusual memorial service for the B'nai B'rith members who paid the supreme sacrifice during World War II. A table with vacant chairs was in the center of

the room, completely set for service, with the American flag and a menorah with seven lighted candles on the table. The dining hall was darkened. A bugler sounded taps at the conclusion of Commander Goldberg's reading of Psalm 23 and the chanting of the traditional mourner's prayer in Hebrew.

B'nai B'rith, only recently awarded citations from the War and Navy Departments for its outstanding war-service record, has already organized an extensive postwar-service program for the disabled veterans in hospitals, for the men still in service, and for those returning home.

B'NAI B'RITH HONORS GENERAL BRADLEY

Colonel NILES. Today is a great day in the history of the B'nai B'rith. This luncheon brings to a close a 3-day joint conference between the Postwar Service-Americanism Commission and the newly created National Veterans' Advisory Committee.

This morning we were privileged to present to President Truman at the White House our program in behalf of the veterans of World War I and II.

Now B'nai B'rith is honored by the presence of this distinguished audience which has come here to join with us to pay tribute to one of history's greatest Americans, Gen. Omar N. Bradley.

B'nai B'rith is proud of this history and of its record of 103 years of service to humanity, which has never been surpassed.

B'nai B'rith has never failed to answer the roll call in behalf of service to humanity. In fact, many times it has been first on the firing line in behalf of these worthy causes. Our organization is proud of its record, and it is proud of its leadership. No one who has ever come under the inspiring leadership of our President, as I have been privileged to do, can keep from answering his roll call in behalf of those causes of which he has been such a vital part during his lifetime. As a soldier in the ranks of B'nai B'rith, I am proud to present to you the chairman of this meeting, the president of B'nai B'rith, Mr. Henry Monsky, of Omaha, Nebr.

President MONSKY. General Bradley, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen: This is a very significant occasion. It is significant because it is symbolic of an age-long tradition that the United States of America and its people remain interested permanently in the veterans who returned from wars that are fought at great sacrifice to them so that our liberties and our principles of democracy shall be preserved and endure.

General Bradley, B'nai B'rith, as was indicated a moment ago by Col. Elliott Niles, who is chairman of our B'nai B'rith national veterans' advisory committee, was organized in 1843 in New York City—organized as a fraternal organization. It has long ceased to be just a fraternal organization. We claim for it that it is the largest and oldest Jewish service organization, and we note with gratification that during the war the B'nai B'rith, through its war service committee and Americanism commission achieved a record which the Army and the Navy were gracious and kind enough to recognize and issue citations.

B'nai B'rith has more than 1,200 units in America. In every State of the Union men's and women's auxiliaries will, as a result of the meetings of the last 3 days, set up committees in their respective communities that will be subject to your call and command, and will endeavor to respond to every demand that may come up for service to the returning veteran. Your graciousness in coming here to be with us today, General Bradley, will serve as a spark of inspiration to that committee, and to the postwar service and Americanism committees of B'nai B'rith. They will go back home with a solemn determination and resolution that as glorious as was the record that we made during the war, we shall excel that record in every way possible to do service in every particular that we can for the returning veteran.

You are already familiar, I presume, with what has been done by B'nai B'rith lodges and auxiliaries for the returning veterans in the hospitals; with collapsible wheelchairs, the bookmobiles, the projected film books, and all of the other many things. General Bradley, this is not a service of which we boast; we are grateful to you, and we are grateful to the Army for having accorded us the opportunities to utilize our great service machinery and all of its facilities and all of this voluntary manpower and womanpower to render service. We ask only that you make demands upon us so that these facilities can be used with the greatest possible efficiency.

With your permission, I should like to introduce the gentlemen who are at the speakers' table. The Honorable Peyton Ford, special assistant to the Attorney General; the Honorable Wilson Wyatt, Administrator, National Housing Agency; Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, Surgeon General of the Army; Maj. Gen. Wilton B. Persons, Director, Legislative and Liaison Division of the War Department; Hon. John M. McCormack, majority leader of the House of Representatives; Mr. Maurice Bisgyer, national secretary of the B'nai B'rith; Senator Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts; Maj. Gen. Paul R. Hawley; Mr. A. B. Kapplin, national director of postwar service and Americanism and also of the National Veterans' Advisory Committee; Col. Eustace M. Peixotto, Assistant Adjutant General, United States Army; Col. A. Robert Ginsburgh, executive assistant to the Secretary of War; Col. Julius Klein, one of our own B'nai B'rith members who distinguished himself during this war, now a personal adviser to the Secretary of War; Mr. Jacob Billikopf, chairman of a special clemency board of the War Department; and last, but not least in importance, one of your fellow townsmen in Washington, Mr. Joseph A. Wilner, distinguished father of four sons who served in the United States Army, two of whom paid the supreme sacrifice in their country's call.

I want to express a word of welcome and greeting to some of our guests here today who, I am very happy, have the opportunity to be with us and to watch this ceremony. They are from Walter Reed Hospital, and I wish them every success and good luck.

It is my privilege now to present to you for a few brief remarks, the chairman of the Americanism commission of the B'nai B'rith, and the national treasurer of B'nai B'rith, Mr. Sidney G. Kusworm, of Dayton, Ohio. Mr. Kusworm.

REMARKS OF SIDNEY G. KUSWORM

General Bradley, President Monsky, distinguished members of the Army and Navy, ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate very much the honor and privilege of being asked to say a few words. I appreciate it because at a meeting of this kind with representatives of the Army and Navy, Senate, other branches of the Government, men of all religious faiths, it speaks much for the continued success and growth of our country, because it is an exemplification of breathing the breath of America, and that is what the 135,000,000 people have to do, breathe the breath of America, in order that we may win the peace that was so bitterly contested during the last war.

And, so, we meet today as Americans in a great melting pot, and so we meet today breathing the breath of America. May we continue to breathe that breath.

President MONSKY. Thank you, Brother Kusworm, for that brief but inspiring statement. Massachusetts may well be proud of its citizens who have given service to the United States Navy. Recently, it was my privilege, as the president of the B'nai B'rith, to receive from the hands of a great citizen of Massachusetts, Admiral Forrest Sherman, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, a citation for the war service work on behalf of the members of the B'nai B'rith.

Today, it is my privilege to introduce another citizen of the great State of Massachusetts, Vice Adm. Louis E. Denfeld, the Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations in charge of personnel. He was commander of the battleship division which, during the spring and summer of 1945, participated in the Okinawa landing. He was part of the task force which struck at the Jap home islands, and participated in the bombardment of Hokkaido and Honshu, and he was awarded the gold star in lieu of the third Legion of Merit. It is my great privilege to present to you Vice Adm. Louis E. Denfeld. Admiral Denfeld.

ADDRESS OF VICE ADM. LOUIS E. DENFELD

General Bradley, President Monsky, while it is always a pleasure to speak on behalf of naval personnel, it is a particular privilege to be invited to this distinguished gathering, devoted as it is, to the welfare of the Nation's veterans. The Navy Department is proud of the manner in which it cared for the physical, spiritual, and morale needs of its personnel during the war. This is because it recognized the paramount importance of such needs, and the high moral considerations—as well as practical considerations—which made it imperative that these needs be met.

The Navy recognized its responsibility to the millions of civilians who were joining its ranks, risking their lives, certainly undergoing hardships, to fight a war which was not of their making. While the Navy takes great pride in its ships, and its aircraft, the Navy takes even greater pride in its men; for the Navy knows that men are what make it the living, effective fighting machine that it is in wartime. And the Navy's record speaks for itself on the caliber and quality of its personnel. These men deserved everything the Navy could give them, every consideration and every tangible good thing that could be provided. The debt the Nation owes these men continues not only through their lifetime, but forever in the memories of men and peoples that love freedom and human dignity.

The Navy Department recognizes its continuing responsibility in this matter. It has pledged itself before, and I pledge it now as Chief of Naval Personnel, to do everything within the limits of the power and resources of the Navy to continue repayment of the Nation's debt to these men. Naturally this cannot be as great and immediate a matter as it was in wartime, when the Navy had its share of these men under its direct command and responsibility. The basic responsibility shifts to the Veterans' Administration and to civilian agencies and individuals. Nevertheless, the Navy stands ready to assist in every way it can, and retains a real interest in the success of the efforts in behalf of its former personnel—now the veterans. For this reason, today's meeting is a heartening thing to the Navy. Here is tangible evidence that aid for the veteran will continue.

The Navy knows this for a fact, because it knows the past record of B'nai B'rith in this field. It knows the past record of B'nai B'rith, and it knows these are not mere words and pious hopes, not somebody's good idea that will be allowed to die after the first enthusiasm wears off and the hard work begins.

As Chief of Naval Personnel it has been my personal privilege to witness the war service of B'nai B'rith. I was Assistant Chief of Naval Personnel back in the spring of 1942 when the plan to "serve-a-ship" was first broached by Colonel Niles in Boston in behalf of the U. S. S. *Massachusetts*, and I saw the B'nai B'rith record of unselfish service develop and unfold until it has amassed the

astounding record of more than 800 ships so served. These ships were supplied variously with recreational, athletic, and musical equipment—with pianos, portable organs, with libraries, and even with mechanical cows. Birthday gifts cheered men just going out into action or returning. A dozen hospital ships were given especially wonderful service. This was by no means all B'nai B'rith did in war service, but what this one project alone meant to the Navy can hardly be overstated.

Admiral Nimitz has been particularly warm in his praises; as Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet at the time, he saw at first-hand how this war service of B'nai B'rith helped combat morale, how it made better fighting ships, how it thus sped the end of the war, and made the sailors' lot more endurable meanwhile. The citation which Admiral Forrest Sherman recently presented on behalf of Secretary Forrestal for the Navy Department to B'nai B'rith's president, Henry Monsky, is but a token of the Navy's appreciation for this great service. With this record to remember, it is affirmation enough for me that B'nai B'rith says it intends now to serve the veteran as it has served the man in uniform.

Great things can be expected and B'nai B'rith can in turn be assured that its efforts will be as greatly appreciated by the men as they are deserved. The Navy applauds this meeting and the project which prompts it. The Navy pledges General Bradley again that his Veterans' Administration can count fully upon our help, and it is most happy to assure General Bradley, as an interested party which has seen B'nai B'rith in action in a similar project, that he is going to get all of the assistance that B'nai B'rith promises.

It is a great pleasure to tell B'nai B'rith that such a statement is nothing more than the simple thanks the Navy owes B'nai B'rith for its service to naval personnel. Thank you.

President MONSKY. We are very grateful to you, Admiral Denfeld, for those very gracious remarks. The Navy owes the B'nai B'rith nothing. The B'nai B'rith owes the Navy much, because the Navy afforded us the opportunity to be of service, and we shall take your remarks as a challenge which shall not go unmet.

I would cherish the privilege of presenting our guest speaker and our guest of honor. But that privilege belongs to another who is both better qualified and is more entitled to that privilege; and, therefore, I am to present to you now the gentleman who will introduce our guest of honor, Maj. Gen. Edward F. Witsell, who has had an extraordinary military career, with 14 years of overseas service, 5 years of which were spent in Hawaii. Following World War I he spent 4 years in Japan where he mastered the Japanese language. For 2 years in Japan he was assistant military attaché, detailed to the War Department General Staff, first in the Operations and Training Division, and later as officer in charge of Japanese affairs in the Military Intelligence Division. Recently promoted to major general, he was nominated for the position of the Adjutant General by President Truman on February 1, 1946, and is now serving in that capacity. It is a great privilege to me to present to you Maj. Gen. Edward F. Witsell. General Witsell.

ADDRESS OF MAJ. GEN. EDWARD F. WITSELL

Mr. Chairman, General Bradley, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I feel very humble in addressing this audience after the very flattering remarks of your chairman. General Bradley, who has already earned his place in history, could have rested on his laurels when he came back from his triumphs in Europe. However, like the good soldier that he is, when the President asked him to assume the duties of running the Veterans' Administration, he bowed to the President's wishes, and he became the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, one of the greatest jobs that has ever been given to any man in recent history.

It is because General Bradley's life has been an inspiration to so many Americans that we are gathered here today to do him honor. I have known General Bradley for many years, and I am privileged to count him as a friend. In the days before World War II, as a junior officer, General Bradley contributed in no small way to the shaping of the military plans and policies of the Army which later on made possible the expansion of our small peacetime Army into the gigantic force which it was during the World War; a goodly part of which he so brilliantly led to victory on the battlefields of Europe.

It is unnecessary that I recite to you the magnificent accomplishments of General Bradley, this Missourian who, as commander of the Twelfth Army Group, contributed so much to the Allied victories in Europe. We are all familiar with his campaign from the Normandy beaches across France and Belgium, and on into the heart of the Reich, eventually linking forces with the Russians on the Elbe, in April 1945. There has never been a more brilliant campaign in the history of the United States. As you know, General Bradley has been referred to often as the "doughboy general." We know the esteem in which he is held by every GI and by every officer. He has always been interested in his men and their welfare. He has deemed this a necessary attribute of a commander both in his military career and in his present position as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and we honor him both for his splendid achievements and for his great humanity. Today, I join with the B'nai B'rith in wishing General Bradley the same success in his present tour of duty.

It is a distinct pleasure to present Gen. Omar N. Bradley, the distinguished guest of honor.

ADDRESS OF GEN. OMAR N. BRADLEY

President Monsky, members of B'nai B'rith, honored guests, thank you very much for asking me to be with you here today.

The establishment of your new national veterans' advisory committee provides us with an occasion that is of particular importance to veterans and to the families of veterans. By simply counting their numbers, we can really see that veterans will, in the natural course of events, greatly shape the pattern of this world in which we live. It follows, therefore, that anything directly affecting their welfare, will in a wider sense benefit all Americans.

In the Veterans' Administration, we are already familiar with the record of your good work. During the long years of the war just ended, you established a reputation of service among our men under arms and our citizens at home. Even before Pearl Harbor catapulted us into the shooting war, you had organized an army of men and women schooled to the needs of other Americans. During the hard-working years we fought our enemies, your services were carried to the men who manned our guns, and to the citizens who built them. The outstanding record of B'nai B'rith was publicly recognized by the War and Navy Departments of the United States. Their special citations awarded to your organization were, I am told, the first of their kind to be presented to any national civilian group. To this public recognition, I shall add my own commendation. As an overseas commander of American combat troops I knew something of your day-to-day contributions to the welfare of our men.

In creating the 1,500 recreational facilities furnished by your lodges and women's chapters for Army and Navy installations during the war, you brought an extra measure of comfort and ease to troops throughout the United States and Alaska. Other projects at induction and training centers cushioned the abrupt changes in the personal lives of our men, and made it easier for them to get along.

There is little need for a thorough accounting of what you have already done. Your best measure of accomplishment is the added happiness you brought to servicemen who benefited from your gifts. Though, perhaps, only a few of them may have had the chance to thank you themselves, their thanks are best spoken in the frequency and delight with which they used your musical instruments, athletic equipment, motion-picture projectors, amplifying systems, yes, and even washing machines, sewing machines, and electric irons. These conveniences followed our armed forces around the entire world. General Eisenhower, of the Army, and Admiral Sherman, of the Navy, both publicly acknowledged your gifts and extended you the thanks of their services in the award of Army and Navy citations not long ago to B'nai B'rith.

I recall these facts first to assure you that I am not unmindful of the services you have already performed. And, again, because they presage a promise of your continuing services in this trying postwar period. I cannot, and I am sure no other American will, forget that you wartime services were given freely on a universal nonsectarian basis. Only one condition was applied, and that was need for service. Contributing generously to men and women of all creeds, all races, all colors, you left unquestioned the hyphenated origins of their birth, the color of their parents, the spelling of their names. It was essentially a service by Americans, for Americans. Eligibility was measured only by service to the Nation. This achievement brings its lasting rewards in the personal assurances you will always have of the great worth of your project. It is ironic that the hate and ruthlessness of war should signal the genuine unselfishiness that characterized so much of your community wartime effort. Best of all, it is encouraging to know that your organization has not permitted itself to backslide into the dangerous assumption that the ending of hostilities also means the ending of the war. For in many ways—in the private lives of millions of our veterans—the war is a continuing conflict still barring their way to happy civilian life.

Everywhere men and women find themselves bewildered and uneasy in the gray dawn of a time when the world has not fully discarded the ways of war, nor fully resumed the comforts of peace. Keyed to high expectations, they find themselves confronted with the thorniest problems of their lifetime. Veterans face their greatest snarl of individual problems at a time when similar problems are almost universal among their many million comrades. For this reason, virtually each problem becomes a vital concern of the entire Nation. Employment, housing, rehabilitation, health service, these are not only the crying wants of veterans; they are the means by which we can recreate an army of vigorous veterans into an army of optimistic, healthy, and productive citizens. If we will place honest solutions before selfish interest, and use our daring imagination, these wants can be fulfilled with a necessary priority interest in veterans. If we curtain those needs with double talk, if we fail to remember the terrible immediacy of those wants, they will become danger signals to the discontent that can rot the chances of several million unemployed, poorly housed, untrained veterans of World War II.

By failing to provide adequately for these veterans now, we shall prevent them from making up the time lost when they might have been establishing themselves in life, and deny them the opportunity to become useful citizens. Within a limited sphere, legislative action can satisfy veterans' needs by providing them with financial aids and Government

services. These benefits were created for veterans of this war by enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, or the so-called GI bill. With this authority the Veterans' Administration can provide specific remedies within a limited field for the wants of veterans. Although our agency represents the greatest socialized activity in the Federal Government, we also have our boundaries. The solutions that we provide for the wants of veterans are tailored to fit exacting situations. If a veteran wants a loan, and the lending agency will make it, he can come to us and have a part of it guaranteed. When he has been disabled, he can come to us for pensions and for rehabilitation training. If he requires medical treatment, he can apply to our hospitals for service.

Those who desire education may apply to us for payment. If the veteran desires to keep his insurance—and we certainly urge him to—we will carry the policy. And if he is unemployed and requires help, he can look to us for the compensation that will tide him over. I prefer to think of our program as a bridge built to carry the veteran from service into civilian life. At the end of the war, the timbers of the Veterans' Administration were growing wobbly when the heavy traffic started across. In 8 months, we have engineered the reconstruction of that bridge, building a solid foundation that will enable us to carry the load. And, although we are still replacing the ancient timbers with modern steel construction, the bridge is open for business, and we can point ahead to the time when the structure will be completed. It is on the farther side of that bridge, however, that the veteran will find his greatest difficulties. And, it is there that the American people must provide the avenues of opportunity along which he can make his way as a happy and useful citizen. There, the veterans' wants are long-term ones: employment that will afford him a margin of opportunity, a reasonable degree of peacetime security; housing that will enable him to raise a healthy family in an orderly community life; a place in the world that can be assured him, not by Government edict or discriminatory legislation, but by freedom of opportunity, the freedom to think, act, and create, to translate ideas into realization.

These needs are far beyond the limits of governmental agencies. They can be provided only by the people of these United States. And then, they can be provided only if we will have confidence in the future, and in these men who will shape our future. We owe them not a dole, not a living, but the chance to make one. We owe them the chance to profit fairly by their labor, and find in our democracy an expression of their freedom. We owe them the chance to show in civilian life the character, initiative, and resourcefulness they displayed against the enemy. It is presumptuous today for anyone to attempt to speak for the veteran. For the veteran is, first, an individual, seeking to reassert himself individually into a place in the world. We dare type him as a special kind of citizen only to describe how common are his wants with those of so many other veterans. Therefore, while I shall not risk talking for the veteran, I feel it necessary to talk on what he needs. No one can estimate the value of 5 years to a young man getting his start. We do know that they are irretrievable. We do know that the veteran cannot turn backward, pick them up, and go ahead as if nothing had ever happened.

When the veteran comes home he is not coming back to the United States of 1941. This is 1946. The veteran is 5 years older, 5 years nearer the peak of his earning capacity. Unless we remember that 5-year gap, unless we are willing to help the veteran fill it in by offering him wider postwar opportunity, we shall condemn him to a 5-year handicap, and fumble a unique historical chance to benefit from his enormous wartime training. Thank you.

President MONSKY. Thank you very much, General Bradley. It is very gratifying that the genius and capacity which characterized General Bradley's brilliant military career will be now made available for consecrated service to the rehabilitation of the returning veterans.

Now, General Bradley, having a full appraisal of the full responsibility which has been placed in your charge, I have the honor, and have been directed, to present to you a pledge on behalf of the B'nai B'rith National Veterans' Advisory Committee. I should like to ask Colonel Niles, who is chairman of that committee, and Brother Kusworm, who is chairman of the National Americanism Commission, to participate in the presentation of this pledge.

General Bradley, as president of the B'nai B'rith, I have been requested to present to you the following pledge:

"To Gen. OMAR N. BRADLEY:

"Whereas B'nai B'rith summoned all of its manpower to prosecute an extensive war-service program during World War II, and immediately after VJ-day we organized these activities on behalf of the armed forces; and

"Whereas with its 1,200 units throughout the country our order is today geared to serve the veterans in military and veterans' hospitals, the men still in service, and those returning to civilian life:

"Therefore to the United States Veterans' Administration and to you, Gen. Omar N. Bradley, great fighting strategist in war, and guardian of veterans' welfare in peace, we pledge that just as our membership was privileged to serve the fighting forces during the war years, so it will continue this service during the peacetime years, with the same measure of consecrated devotion."

It is a great honor, sir, for me to present this pledge to you and to request that you call upon us for anything that it may be within our power to do.

Louisiana Looks Forward to Victorious America's Rendezvous With Destiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert the address made by Maj. Gen. G. B. Erskine, Administrator of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, Department of Labor, to the 1946 graduating class of Louisiana State University, which admirably outlines the glorious future won for us by some 15,000,000 young men and women fighting side by side.

I deeply appreciate the honor of addressing you today. It is a great occasion for me. This is my State. This is my university. The first uniform I ever wore was the traditional gray of an LSU cadet.

In coming back to Baton Rouge I have felt again, as I always do, inspiration and awe in seeing once more our State capitol. I don't believe anyone has ever looked upon its magnificent lines and imposing architecture without carrying away in his heart a little of its splendor, some memories of its beauty. I remember when the capitol was first built and people came from all corners of the State to gaze at those massive doors, those gleaming marble columns, and I remember the pride with which they first viewed this building which was theirs, which belonged to the people of Louisiana. Their dreams, their sacrifices, their hopes were represented in that building.

It is much the same with this university. I know with what great love and pride the people of Louisiana regard this university—a university foremost in the South and in the Nation, an educational institution designed and developed by the people of Louisiana for the people of Louisiana and for the Nation. This university is another great product of, and tribute to, the vigorous forces of democracy in this State, forces so powerful and irresistible that they overwhelm petty jealousies and personal ambitions, sweep aside the base and evil designs of men, imbuing them with the spirit of truth and progress and the urge to look to and plan for the future—a future in which the welfare of the people will steadily be elevated, a future in which all people—businessmen, farmers, laborers—will enjoy to a great extent the fruits of their labor.

Louisiana has always been a forward-looking State. The French voyageurs and the Spanish colonists who settled here gave to you a broader vision, a more cosmopolitan outlook, a keener sense of our relation to the rest of the world than most States have ever had. Since the time when these fertile lands first became a part of our Nation, Louisiana has been an outlet to and a contact with other countries, with new products, new ideas and new concepts. Today—even more than ever before—Louisiana stands as the gateway through which our trade and commerce with our great neighbors to the south will pass.

Louisiana looks outward, not inward, forward, not backward. This is a great time and a great State in which to be young. I know the members of this graduating class have felt the surging desire to press on, to search for new horizons, to reexamine and to rescrutinize the standards and accomplishments of the past with the aim of achieving even greater accomplishments in the future. You cannot be a citizen of this State or a student at this university without being stirred by the challenge of the future. It has been kindled deep within your hearts. It is part of your heritage.

Graduates of 1946, you leave this university to go out into a changing world. But this in itself is nothing new. The world is always changing. Your fathers met a changing world when they finished their academic training; your grandfathers faced a changing world when they started upon their careers; every graduating class of this university in the 80-odd years of its existence has left these classrooms to meet a changing world.

But never before in the history of this university—in the history of our Nation—has the world presented a graduating class with a challenge so vital and keen, with opportunities so limitless and breath-taking, with responsibilities so grave and awe-inspiring.

Our late President once told us that this generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny. He was referring to the war which we fought and won. This war was primarily a fight for survival against the forces of fascism and dictatorship, but also was part of the long-range struggle in which man has been long engaged and in which America now bears the brunt of leadership—a struggle for liberty, for freedom, for greater opportunities for happiness for all men and women on the face of the earth.

We shall meet with destiny again, for we did not reach our ultimate goal by winning the war; we merely gained the advantage of carrying on the struggle without the horrible destruction of war; we gained the advantage of peace in which we are able to devote a greater amount of our time and attention in carrying on our fight.

Like Solomon, who entered upon his kingship after a period of long and laborious wars

and who perceived that the new era of peace was not a time for rest or stagnation, but a God-given time of opportunity to build a great temple which his father, David, had never been able to undertake—so we, greatly privileged to have emerged victorious from wars which mired the rest of the world in desolation, must use this period of peace for rededication and renewal of our efforts in obtaining for ourselves and for all peoples the blessings of liberty and freedom.

This peace which offers us our great opportunity did not just happen. It was fought for desperately and earned by some 15,000,000 young men and women fighting side by side and by the many millions of laborers who worked to give them the tools of war. I know that many of you in this graduating class spent several years working and fighting in the university of war. Many of your comrades, and mine, did not return from this war. For their sakes and for the sake of the world, we who have emerged unscathed from this Armageddon, and especially you, who have had the rare privilege of being able to carry on and to complete your education while the world was still enmeshed in the throes of death, have a tremendous moral responsibility to use your educational talents in the service of humanity.

America entered the war an influential nation and emerged from it the most powerful country in the world. We are in the position, whether we want it or not, of the leader Nation. On our course of action depends the fate of the world.

The other nations of the world know this. They watch us anxiously for a sign to show where we are bound and what course of action we are going to take.

Those of you who served overseas during the war and entered those tired, worn countries in your mission of liberation will remember the exuberance and enthusiasm that greeted American troops everywhere. You will remember the wonder and hope in the faces of these people as they saw their first Americans—the swarms of Italian children who crowded around your jeeps in Rome and Salerno; the humble men and women of France who stood in their doorways to wave at you as you went through their villages; the scrawny, disease-ridden coolies of India who looked up with admiration at your tall, sturdy bodies; the small, ragged, barefoot soldiers of China who were fascinated by your modern equipment, your complicated and efficient machines, your comfortable, adequate clothing.

These people wanted more from you than cigarettes and candy bars. With a little thought and discernment you could see beyond their curiosity and pleas for sweets and perceive their innate hunger and longing for something far more precious than any rations or luxuries you carried with you. They were interested in more than your clothing, your equipment, your food; they were mainly impressed by the boldness of your spirit, by the unimpeded directness of your thinking, by the aura of freedom in which you moved. You walked the earth as conquerors—not as arrogant demagogs of a pseudo-master race—but as freedom-loving, freedom-enjoying individuals, born to liberty and expecting nothing less.

The American soldiers overseas had an unparalleled opportunity to be ambassadors of democracy, but you and I know that many of them failed miserably. They failed to realize that these French, these Italians, these Chinese crowds had any claim on them. They refused to recognize that, whether they liked it or not, they, as citizens of the world's greatest democracy, were being held up as models of behavior.

If any of you here today were among those who closed their eyes to their responsibility to these hungry hordes and returned to America hoping never to have any further contact with these sad-eyed, eager people of Tunis and Naples, Calcutta and Shanghai, I want to say to you that you will have these people on your conscience for the rest of your lives. The memories of the bewildered children of China and Poland must surely return to haunt you. You cannot have done with them so easily. They have a claim on you.

The Director General of UNRRA tells us that for the next few months America holds the fate of the world in its hands. It is up to us whether the world dies of starvation or whether, through our food, it is sustained through this period of emergency until the fall harvests come.

This is an emergency peculiar to this particular time. God permitting, it may not occur again. But I say to you that time and time again in the future the trembling fate of the world will rest with us. These tired, overworn countries will languish and thirst for a draught from the well-spring of our democracy. They will be revived only if we guide them to the paths of liberty and freedom and the basic conception of the dignity of the individual man.

In our own country we have a great and immediate problem facing us—the problem of reconverting the tremendous productive forces of the Nation from war- to peace-time uses. I am not speaking here of the physical side of reconversion. This was accomplished far more rapidly than we had expected.

The physical change-over of plants to peacetime use is virtually completed. Demobilization has been swift. Of the 15,500,000 persons who served in our armed forces during the war, about 12,000,000, or 75 percent, already have returned to civilian life.

But the real job of reconversion is just beginning. We have yet to complete the task of regrouping our human resources and putting them to work to supply the goods demanded in peacetime.

The Nation emerged from the war with the greatest reservoir of human resources in the history of our country. This includes the character, skill, training, and experience of more than 15,000,000 men and women who served in the armed forces and the many millions more whose labor contributed to our phenomenal war production.

This is a crucial time in our history and economy—we must seek that the power and strength of our men and women, so recently mobilized and trained by war, shall be the instrument for full production and maximum employment.

American economy has demonstrated in war its great capacity to produce and expand. We must make full use of this capacity in peacetime to provide high and rising standards of living for all, to offer abundant opportunities for useful and rewarding work, and to contribute to lasting peace—for our country and for the world.

If we achieve this goal, we will then be in a position to discharge our responsibility to the rest of the world. If we fail to reach our goal, we fail ourselves and we fail the world.

For we no longer work for ourselves alone. Our own welfare is no longer the only law that binds us. What we do here in America, what we say and what we believe is witnessed and heard by the people of the whole world.

Remember this as you take up your life work. Whatever is your chosen field—medicine or law, business or art, journalism or teaching—enter upon it with a view of using this profession or occupation as a vantage point from which you can make your contribution to society.

Working only to build up a personal fortune for your own pleasure and enjoyment is not enough. Devoting your time to advancing your desire for power and influence is not enough. A lifetime ruled by these selfish motives would be sterile and meaningless. It would not give you that deep satisfaction and warm inward pleasure that comes from serving others.

Enter upon your careers with all your physical vigor and enthusiasm. Do a thorough job in whatever you undertake; be more concerned with leaving a job well done than in advertising your connection with it; strive to realize the great implications and higher meanings of every detail of your work, how it fits into the broad picture of society, how every step, every decision you make affects society as a whole.

First assure yourself that your career is worth while, that it is needed by and has something constructive to give to society, then lose yourself in your work. Give it every ounce of strength you've got. Let it be the ruling passion in your life. Strive to understand your job in its entirety, work to learn all that you can, all that there is to know about your profession or occupation and slowly but steadily the world will be unfolded before you. You will gain new understanding not only of your own field, but of related fields and of life as a whole. You will find yourself taking paths of service and endeavor you had never thought to tread. You will find yourself being swept on and on in your efforts to understand and to serve.

For almost three decades I have been a marine in my Nation's armed forces. As an officer charged with leading men, I have long been interested in the problems of educating and equipping them to take up the duties for which they were best suited and in which they could make their greatest individual contribution to their unit. Now I am engaged in directing a Government agency which is interested in the education, training, and retraining, rehabilitation, and reemployment of men and women who worked and fought this war. Five years ago, 2 years ago, 1 year ago, I had no idea of ever serving in Government administration, and it is a long way from Guam and Iwo Jima to a desk in Washington. But I realize now that the same interests that motivated my life as a marine have led me to logically related paths of service.

Once a person has become interested in a project, an ideal, a goal greater than himself, he will be drawn by its compulsion and magnetic attraction down new paths, through new fields, toward new horizons.

He will realize the truth of the words of a poet several centuries ago:

"No man is an iland, entire of its selfe; every man is a peece of the continent, part of the maine; if a clod bee washed away by the see, Europe is the lesse, as well as if a promontorie were; as well as if a mannor of thy friends or of thine owne were; any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankinde."

Graduates of 1946, you represent the sacrifices of generations past, the hopes of generations to come. The spotlight is focused on you. As you take up your careers, carry the spirit of this university and of this State with you, the spirit of an institution selflessly engaged in searching out new horizons, the indomitable spirit of a progressive people constantly working to secure for themselves and their neighbors a more perfect democracy.

You are greatly needed in the world today. I wish you good luck and godspeed.

We Shall Speak for Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include a speech entitled "We Shall Speak for Them" by the Honorable Louis A. Johnson, former Assistant Secretary of War and past national commander of the American Legion, delivered on the National Broadcasting Co.'s network on Memorial Day as part of the American Legion program:

My fellow Americans, I speak to you this Memorial Day not in soft words of tribute for our beloved dead. Neither they, nor their living comrades in the American Legion, would have me do so. With their lives these immortals whom we would honor, from Valley Forge to the bloody slopes of Okinawa, sanctified their faith in the democratic principle that, even as men are born to the God-given birthright of freedom, so too shall they be permitted to live in the righteousness of peace.

We can no more add glory to such valor than we can impart luster to the sun or beauty to the eternal stars. Let us not try. Rather let us rededicate ourselves to the completion of the work they so nobly began. Let us give voice to their stilled lips, and speak out unafraid in their behalf. Let us, in all candor, ask ourselves this plain truth:

Is this the kind of world they died to save?

The answer is clear and unavoidable: It is not. Let us honestly confess that we have not kept faith with those who died at Cassina and St. Lo and on the battlefields around the world where American martyrs dared stand between beloved freedom and its barbaric foemen.

What is the state of the world today?

There is no peace. Freedom is still a mocking myth to most of the world's people. The grand alliance that crushed the armed might of Hitler is dead, and in its place there rises a form of totalitarianism which differs from that of the swastika only in name. Little nations which dreamed of redemption were liberated from one form of slavery only to be enslaved anew under a flag of a different color. Suspicion, hatred, civil war, starvation, and greed ride the range of human misery as ruthlessly as when the war lords of Berlin and Tokyo dreamed of their master race. Eastern Europe is closed to western Europe by an iron curtain of censorship. It may be that a new mailed fist reaches out for world dominion. Democracy approaches a deadly tailspin.

Who is responsible for this situation?

We are—you and me and all the rest of the 140,000,000 people who comprise this United States. It has become popular to blame everything on the White House or Congress, or both. But in our kind of country our leaders are what we make them. Public opinion still runs America, but public opinion is punch-drunk from looking to sensational editors and reckless commentators for its leadership when it should have been providing its own leadership.

Even while our boys were fighting their last bitter battle on blood-soaked Okinawa, we plunged into economic strife at home which has postponed world recovery at least 2 years. Unless we come to our senses and terminate the strikes and lock-outs that have stalled our whole economy we will, you may be sure, pass into an era of world chaos that, by comparison, will make the dark days of 1942 and 1943 seem like fun. Today millions of people are starving for want of a crust of bread. Yet, there are some among you who speak fatuously of labor's golden age and capital's greatest era of prosperity.

If we had postponed the settlement of economic issues until reconversion began, labor and capital might, indeed, by this time have been enjoying their golden age and all-out prosperity. If we had maintained our Army and Air Corps at proper strength, I suspect that some nations that talk mighty tough these days would be sitting around the peace table with us right now. Instead they seek to block every move we make to write an honorable and lasting peace treaty. If we had stayed on the job instead of embarking on a futile postwar utopian binge, millions of people who will starve this year could have been saved. Now, thank God, our leaders have taken controls in their own hands, and we will pull out of this threatened tailspin.

Such is the state of our sorry postwar world on this Memorial Day 1946. How do you think our immortal dead would have us speak for them in the presence of these conditions? I believe you will agree with me that they would want us to say something like this:

"Remember the Atlantic Charter and its guaranty of self-determination for all nations.

"Remember the 'four freedoms' and their promise of release from want and fear for all peoples.

"Have done with this grab for personal gain.

"The war has not been won. It never will be won until you who live have won the peace.

"Rekindle the light of democracy in our America. If that light goes out, the world surely will perish in the darkness of ruthless totalitarianism.

"Work.

"Work to feed the hungry.

"Work for a just and lasting peace.

"Work for freedom and democracy throughout the world.

"Work for the social progress and prosperity of which you dream.

"Rebuild the kind of world we died to save.

"Until you have accomplished these things, the ghost of Hitler will mock us in our lonely graves."

Yes, my fellow Americans, I think that is the message our martyred dead, from Bunker Hill to the gates of Berlin, are trying to send through this Memorial Day. When we have completed the mighty task they left unfinished, then—and only then—may we lift up our eyes and say to them:

"We, too, have kept the faith."

Communism in the United States Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper articles by Mark Foote:

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times of May 16, 1946]

COMMUNISTS' INFILTRATION TACTICS INTO ARMED SERVICES EXPOSED

(This is the third of a series of stories on communism in the United States today, answering the question: Is communism a menace?)

(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON.—Communism is a continuing potential threat to military discipline and the very existence of the armed forces of the United States. Opposition to military service in the armies of capitalistic countries is fundamental in the ideology of the Communist Party of America.

During the war Communists were willing to fight for this country only because in so doing they were fighting the battles of Soviet Russia, who was our ally. Now that the war is over they resent having to serve in the Army, and are bitterly opposed to the United States living up to its responsibilities in connection with the occupation of Germany and Japan. They follow the party line in supporting Russia's opposition to American foreign policy.

Back in 1919 the Soviet Government laid down rules for the conduct of Communists in foreign countries as follows:

"In the military sphere: (a) Carry on intensive propaganda among the troops. Cause misunderstanding between officers and soldiers. Unite the soldiers to assassination of the higher officers. (b) Blow up arsenals, bridges, tracks, and powder magazines. Prevent the delivery of supplies of raw materials to factories and mills.

"Thus the complete destruction of the Army will be accomplished and the soldiers will adopt the program of the Social Democratic workers."

INFILTRATION RESUMED

World communism has never deviated from this policy, except during the last war. In another war, it would be plotting to undermine and bring defeat to the American armies, unless they were fighting beside the soldiers of Soviet Russia. American Communists picketed the White House during the Roosevelt administration in protest against our aid to Britain when Russia and Nazi Germany had an alliance. When Hitler invaded Russia, they changed their tune overnight. From then on, what had been to them an "imperialist war" became a "holy war."

The Daily Worker, leading Communist newspaper in the United States, in 1928 carried a story:

"A beginning has been made in practical work in the Navy. Here we note the fraternization of the Young Communist League members with sailors in Philadelphia. We have already begun work in the Army through the sending in of some members. We have formulated demands for the soldiers. We have distributed leaflets to the sailors."

In the same year the Daily Worker initiated a special edition (grouse sheet) under the caption "In the Army and Navy" where grievances, real or fancied, of soldiers were given publicity.

This sort of activity is being stealthily resumed since the war ended. The Communists aided materially in stirring up sentiment for return of American soldiers from abroad, and for the dissatisfaction and demonstrations which occurred among soldiers in foreign countries.

General Eisenhower finally put a stop to these demonstrations. Removal of some of the editors of the Army newspaper Stars and Stripes occurred about this time.

BAN REMOVED

In view of the facts, it was surprising that the War Department on February 22, 1945, made public the information that it had inaugurated a new policy by removing the ban on Communists. This new policy was acknowledged by the Adjutant General, Maj. Gen. James A. Ulio, in a letter to Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Michigan.

General Ulio, reviewing the development of policy bearing on Communists in the Army, stated that it was easy to enforce the ban before passage of the Selective Service Act. The draft made it more difficult, he noted, to enforce the Hatch Act, which excludes from military services persons who advocate overthrow of the Government. Legal proof of membership in the Communist Party was necessary under the law, he continued, and inconclusive proof might provide an escape corridor from the draft.

As a preliminary step, pending determination of proof of membership in the Communist Party or who appeared to be consistent followers of the Communist Party line, they were also not admitted "to sensitive duties."

The new directive, setting up the new policy, was issued in December 1944. After that "consideration was given to the fact that persons in the Army, suspected of, but not proven to be Communists, had not proved to be a source of any difficulty and were loyally supporting the war effort." Their loyal support, of course, was predicated wholly on the fact that we were fighting side by side with Soviet troops.

BORE FROM WITHIN

This attitude of the Army is difficult to understand in view of the sentiments of Communist leaders. Lenin says: "The duty to spread Communist ideas includes the particular need of special and persistent, systematic propaganda within the fighting forces." Lenin told his followers all over the world, not to avoid military service, but to join up and bore from within.

Army men high in authority denied that any Communists held commissions in the Army. The Chicago Tribune then gave the names and addresses of 10 Army officers "about whose Communist connections there can be little question in the light of official records."

Several days later, Earl Browder, in his role as president of the Communist Political Association (as the Communist Party was called during the war), issued two statements:

1. There are actually "some 13,000 Communists in the armed forces."

2. Of course there are Communists holding commissions in the United States Army.

Admiral Clark H. Woodward, writing in the Washington Evening Star, January 12, 1935, said:

"Communistic activities in the Navy began in 1930, and are now 'exceedingly well organized with trained agitators doing their work, constantly following ship movements from port to port.'"

National Commander Edward N. Scheiberling, of the American Legion, urged the War Department immediately to withdraw its directive "permitting Communists to attain officer rank and serve in positions involving military security."

Commander in Chief Jean A. Brunner, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, characterized the War Department decision as "an open challenge to the millions of Americans fighting in the ranks without commissions to preserve the very American liberties and American way of life the Communists scheme and strive to destroy.

"If America becomes involved in another war, and Russia is not on our side, American Communists will seek to sabotage our efforts. They are already planning for the day."

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times of May 17, 1946]

COLUMNIST DECLARES COMMUNISTS PROSELYTIZERS OF NATION'S YOUTH

(This is the fourth of a series of stories on communism in the United States today, answering the question: Is communism a menace?)

(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON.—Knowing that the fate of America is in the hands of the youth of the country, Communists are proselyting desperately in the schools and colleges all over the land. The Young Communist League, which had been in existence for 21 years, was dissolved at a meeting in New York City October 18, 1943, and the 400 delegates in attendance immediately formed the American Youth for Democracy.

The new organization, with a more respectable title, is a transparent camouflage. It is rotten at the core with communism. One hundred and fifty-six members of the Young Communist League joined with 176 representatives of other youth clubs throughout the United States to form the new organization. They wound up their business meeting to the accompaniment of a snake dance and the chanting of Solidarity Forever.

Two members of the late league were named top national officers of the American Youth for Democracy. Former Sgt. Robert Thompson, 28-year-old veteran of the Pacific, who was national vice president of the league when he entered the armed service, was named one of the two national chairmen. Carl Ross, former State chairman of the league, was named executive secretary. Both are residents of New York.

Other national officers elected were: Miss Naomi Ellison of Seattle, chairman of the national industrial council of the young women's association, co-chairman; Miss Winnifred Norman, New York City, chairman of the National Council of Negro Youth, and John Gallo of Detroit, at that time director of recreation of the Ford Motor Co. local of the United Automobile Workers (CIO), vice presidents; William Robert McCarthy of Quincy, Mass., president of a Boston local of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers, secretary-treasurer.

According to the New York Times, the reorganization meeting listened all day to delegates from all sections of the country repeat the need of a united organization of advanced anti-Fascist youth which can collaborate with the broadcast sections of young people to solve new conditions and problems confronting the war generation.

The exception was William Luchtenberg, a Cornell student who is a member of the staff of the United Student Council Assembly, the constitution of which excludes Communists. Saying he was present as a visitor, he challenged a statement made by Marcella Sloane, secretary of the college division of the Young Communists League, to the effect that the assembly's anti-Communist policies had paralyzed that organization. He cited figures to prove his point.

In a speech before the annual board meeting of the Catholic Youth Organization, held in New York City January 8, 1946, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, said:

"In the span of 15 years the Hitler youth movement produced a new generation imbued with but a single purpose—the perpetuation of nazism. It will go down in history as synonymous with terror, debauchery, corruption, and barbarity.

"In our own country and in our own time we have seen another youth movement arise. I refer to that high-sounding, idealistic title, 'American Youth for Democracy,' which conceals the evils and the corruption of American communism.

"This name is but a new one for the Young Communist League. It reflects all the sinister purposes of the Communist Party of the United States. It employs the same techniques and has the same objective—namely, the conversion of our haven of liberty and freedom to worship as we choose—to a godless, totalitarian state where the adversaries of democracy can do as they please. Their attacks should be proclaimed from every pulpit and headlined in every newspaper in the land."

Benjamin Gitlow, Communist candidate for Vice President of the United States in 1924 and 1928; formerly member of the ruling political committee of the American Communist Party and of the executive committee of the praesidium of the Communist international, in his book, I Confess, paints a vivid picture of the effects of communism on young people. Gitlow himself renounced communism.

Gitlow declares that young people often join the party in opposition to their parents. Frequently they cut loose from all family ties. They become stuffed with Communist phrases and ideology, lose youthful attributes, and turn into hard, sophisticated cynics who profess to know the alpha and omega of all questions confronting the troubled world. The author says:

"Young Communists, drawn into life of their own, sure of their own importance and maturity as Communist leaders of the working class, fall easy prey to all the vices of the party, which to them are not vices but expressions of rebellion against bourgeois society and the hypocracy of bourgeois morals."

Gitlow described the funeral of Charles E. Ruthenberg, known as "America's Lenin." Ruthenberg had been estranged from his wife and son since his espousal of communism in 1919. They went to take a last look, but did not attend the meeting in his honor or his funeral.

Max Eastman in a foreword to the Gitlow book says: "The work of the Communist Party in the United States has involved a series of fanatical crimes, not only against the party's own principles and ideals—against the working class. Nothing less than a confession by one of those guilty of leadership in these crimes of insane zealotry could adequately reveal them."

An article in the Daily Worker says: "The theoretical as well as practical, training of our revolutionary youth is highly necessary, therefore the young workers (Communist) league has with the aid of sympathetic organizations been able to hold summer courses in various parts of this country where the teachings of Marx and Lenin may be expounded to the youth."

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times of May 19, 1946]

FOOTE REPORTS COMMUNIST INROADS IN RANKS OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

(This is the fifth of a series of stories on communism in the United States today, answering the question: Is communism a menace?)

(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON.—To what extent are Communists and left-wing radicals infiltrating into the ranks of the great army of Federal, State, and municipal employees?

Evidence that they are gaining a foothold and in some cases occupy key positions where they have wide influence both on government policy and personnel is accumulating.

The Government Employees Council, an AFL union, last week found it advisable to pass a resolution calling on Congress to rid the Federal pay rolls of all persons of doubtful loyalty to this Government.

Speaking before the Catholic Institute of the Press recently, Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, of the Catholic University of America, mentioned the undermining of government by alien and foreign interests. He said it was regrettable that the State Department should find it necessary to state publicly that all its employees ought to be pro-American. Within the last week, the monsignor revealed, in a congressional committee meeting a full-pledged Soviet agent was picked up.

In an anti-Red speech before the Holy Name Society in Arlington, Va., the Reverend John F. Cronin, assistant director of the National Catholic Welfare Council's social action department, charged that 2,000 Communists have bored their way into Federal jobs in Washington. He added that they are engaged in relaying top atomic-bomb secrets to Russia.

One hundred and thirty of the two thousand Communists in the Federal Government hold key posts from which they can, and do, influence policies of the Federal Government involved, the Reverend Cronin charged.

Civil Service Commissioner Arthur S. Flemming refused to comment on Father Cronin's charge that a public investigation "would shake the country." He did say, however, that "as far as our resources permit, we screen out all Communists." He added that civil-service probes of Communist-sus-

pected employees are "made public every year before House Appropriations Committee hearings on the civil-service appropriation bill."

At Atlantic City, on May 2, a new CIO union of 75,000 members was born which is distinctly to the left of center. Known as the United Public Workers it is an amalgamation of the old United Federal Workers of America and the State, County, and Municipal Workers, both CIO.

The new union adopted a resolution charging that the demobilization of American troops throughout the world is being delayed to further the imperialistic ambitions of the United States and Britain and to isolate Russia. It called for immediate withdrawal of American and British troops from all friendly countries, including China, the Philippines, France, Greece, India, Indonesia, Belgium, and Iceland.

This was an astounding declaration. But the issue was stated by Peter N. Demas, an employee of the Jamesburg (N. J.) school for boys. Demas suggested a line be added to recommend the withdrawal of Russian troops from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and other friendly countries. He paid high tribute to the Russian Army, but asked the delegates to play the game both ways. He said what was good for the United States was also good for the Soviet Union.

"I like the Russians," he said, "but I put the United States first."

Demas warned the convention that the CIO was losing members because many workers say it is communistic. He was answered by left wingers who charged the United States and Britain were plotting to destroy the Soviet Union by atomic bombs before the Russians could get themselves prepared. One speaker,—Frank Herbst of New York—even set the date when he was told it would happen, sometime in June. Opponents of the resolution were called reactionaries and Red baiters.

Demas proposal was shouted down, and the original resolution adopted "unanimously" according to union officials.

While many unions specifically bar Communists from membership, the constitution of the public-workers union practically welcomes them to membership. One article of the new constitution reads:

"Membership in the international union shall not be denied by reason of sex, race, creed, color, nationality, or religious or political affiliation or belief."

A distinct minority of the delegates charged that the officers' reports, the foreign-policy resolution, and some parts of the constitution were acts of the left-wing group. But they could do little to stop the trend.

At a caucus of New Jersey delegates, Delegate Joseph F. Hambrose of Camden, an internal-revenue employee, suggested the New Jersey group back an amendment to the constitution as follows:

"We oppose all that is un-American, whether it is nazism, fascism, or communism."

His proposal lost by a voice vote of the New Jersey delegation.

The constitution leaves the door open to strikes against municipal, county, State, and Federal governments.

Defending the strike language in the constitution, Don Murray of Washington told the convention that Attorney General Clark had recently written a letter in which he said there was no prohibition to keep Federal workers from striking.

Clark wrote no such letter. He did answer a letter from Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, who asked if any Federal agency is barred from bargaining collectively with its employees. Clark said he did not know of any such act, but he cited an opinion of President Roosevelt in which the latter said collective bargaining could not be translated into the public service.

A proposal is pending in the Senate to bar from Government employment all who belong to this union which insists on the right to strike against the Government. This could, according to Attorney General Clark, result in the discharge of all 75,000 members of this union.

Silver Manufacturers, Do You Really Need Silver?—A Frank Statement From the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, for years those of us who have come from the mining West have almost—although never quite—become accustomed to malignment, vilification, and vituperation whenever we have deigned to raise our voices on the floor of Congress in the interest of the production of metals. There are few pages in American history which contain as much invective, aspersion, and abuse as has been poured upon us of the mining West whenever we have attempted to call the attention of Congress to the importance of American metal production.

The record of the past 15 years shows that this has invariably been true whenever the West has offered its leadership in connection with gold and silver and their diplomatic opportunities. Strangely enough, all this is despite the record which the mining West has built during this period.

A recent statement which appeared in the New York Times on May 31 over the name of Robert S. Palmer, executive director of the Colorado Mining Association, is so unique in its simple statement of the little understood western mining philosophy that, under unanimous consent, I insert it in the RECORD. The statement follows:

SILVER MANUFACTURERS: DO YOU REALLY NEED SILVER?

Today the currencies of most of the world are in collapse, yet the strength of the United States dollar is everywhere recognized. One of the principal reasons for that strength lies in the substantial stocks of gold and silver which the United States Treasury holds as backing for note issues and for the issuance of coinage. The mining West is happy over the important role it has played in the achievement of that fortunate position. The West is especially proud of the leading role it has played in the rehabilitation of silver—even though the West has benefited only modestly from that rehabilitation.

The West has received little credit for its leadership in respect to silver. In fact, our position has been continuously misrepresented by skilful propagandists. Our western Senators and the small number of Congressmen who represent us have been continuously maligned and vilified. Twelve men against the Nation; fattening on the Treasury; greed unadorned; levy on taxpayers, manufacturers, and other users of silver; indefensible subsidy—these are only a few samples of the vituperation which has been heaped upon us because of our leadership in connection with silver. Yet, we bear no malice toward those whose conception of silver has been so shortsighted.

Now there is another crisis in silver. It is a manufacturing crisis. It is due to a 200 percent increase in the industrial use of silver since 1940, along with a 57 percent drop in domestic silver production and a virtual collapse in imports. During the war, the West cheerfully cooperated in the enactment of special silver legislation which provided silver from the United States Treasury for war production and for civilian manufacture. Here again our western position has been grossly misrepresented. In fact, while your industry prospered over 3,000 of our silver-producing mines were shut down.

For months past we have again offered you our cooperation in the hope of terminating the present manufacturing crisis in silver. We have approached the problem in our customary western spirit of give and take—the only satisfactory method of solving such problems. Months ago, western legislators sponsored proposals which were intended to permit manufacturers to operate successfully on a large scale. Legislators representing silver-manufacturing centers submitted other proposals. After weeks of senatorial hearings a compromise was agreed upon. That compromise was endorsed by Senators from manufacturing States, by Senators from mining States, and by Senators who had no direct interest in the subject. But once more our western position is being misrepresented.

One of the accredited leaders of the silver manufacturing industry has publicly stated that the West has repudiated that compromise. That is not so—that compromise still stands as far as we are concerned. But it seems that a few die-hards are blocking its fulfillment, notwithstanding your need of silver and the gentlemen's agreement.

We in the West believe that the compromise which was agreed upon is fairer to the manufacturers than it is to us—but we have accepted it with good grace. What is the nature of that compromise which was unanimously agreed upon before a senatorial committee? It permits manufacturers to draw generously upon the Nation's monetary stocks of silver for a period of 2 years at 90.5 cents an ounce. That price is lower than the prices ruling in many of the markets of the world. We are not happy over that price. Nor do we like to see a diversion of the Nation's monetary stocks of silver into private industry. But we have agreed to that proposal and our agreement stands.

The compromise permits our western miners—during the same period—to sell their output to the Treasury at the same price at which manufacturers make their purchases from the Treasury. At the end of 2 years our miners will receive $1.29 from the Treasury—a price which we have sought for three quarters of a century. That $1.29 price, we believe, is of major international importance to the United States. It has only modest significance to us, because our domestic silver production is at best a small part of the world's production or of the Treasury's monetary stock.

At the end of 2 years the manufacturing industry should be able to obtain adequate supplies from its customary channels—from Mexico, Canada, Peru, and the other foreign producing countries. It may even be able to obtain more silver than it can use—with correspondingly favorable prices. Until that time we in the West must compete against the poorly paid miners of South America and Africa. Thereafter, the Treasury's purchases from us at $1.29 will offer us the same protection that tariffs now offer to manufacturers.

Yes, we think the silver compromise is more than fair to manufacturers, but we will go along with it. Yet with this talk of

repudiation we don't know where we stand. We are very doubtful if the manufacturing industry does. Congress is planning to adjourn in July and probably will not return until next December or January. If there is no legislation in this session, there can be no legislation for many months, if at all. In that event, manufacturers will have no other alternative than to obtain the elimination of OPA ceilings on silver and to acquire their silver in a run-away market. Our western miners would undoubtedly receive much more than 90.5 cents—but we prefer stability to skyrocketing and possible collapse. We also want you to know where the responsibility will lie.

Won't you let your own leaders know what you think about the present compromise? Won't you let your Congressmen know? Won't you let me know also—by letter or telegram—confidently if you so desire, at George Washington Inn, Washington, D. C.

COLORADO MINING ASSOCIATION AND AFFILIATED UTAH AND NEVADA GROUPS,
ROBERT S. PALMER,
Executive Director.

Increases in Social Security Benefits Are Needed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement to be presented by me before the House Ways and Means Committee:

Mr. Chairman, the question of adequate benefits under the Social Security Act is of great importance to the people of America at this time. The national debt is approaching $300,000,000,000 and will require a service charge of six or eight billion dollars a year. This means that a large national income must be maintained if this service charge is to be provided. It means that the price of commodities and labor must be maintained at rates higher than the prewar level. This also means that higher retirement benefits under the Social Security Act must be provided if the recipient is to be able to purchase the same goods and services he purchased at the time the Social Security Act was put into effect.

Most people realize that there is going to be an increase in the cost of living. This is evidenced by the following resolutions passed by the Brokaw Local, No. 260, International Brotherhood of Pulp Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers, of Brokaw, Wis., and the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, Brokaw Local, No. 381:

"Whereas at the regular quarterly meeting of the Tri-State District Council of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers and International Brotherhood of Pulp Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers of Wisconsin, Minnesota, and upper Michigan, held at Wisconsin Rapids, Wis., on Sunday, March 3, 1946 the present Federal old-age and survivors' insurance benefits under the Social Security Act was presented on the floor for discussion; and

"Whereas after a lengthy discussion it was unanimously agreed that the retirement benefits under this act are wholly inadequate and out of line with present-day costs of living and living standards to allow for the retirement of those becoming of retirement age, thereby causing unemployment of younger men, and proposals for shorter workweek thereby lowering the purchasing power of a large number of workers, when by lowering the retirement age and providing adequate retirement benefits this could be avoided.

"It was moved, seconded, asd carried that all locals of the International Brotherhood of Papermakers and all locals of the International Brotherhood of Pulp Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers, pass resolutions to have said retirement benefits increased to meet present-day cost of living and present-day living standards and that the retirement age be lowered.

"That copies of these resolutions be sent to their Senators, Congressmen, the State and American Federation of Labor, and to our international unions asking them to do all in their power to have this done: Now therefore be it

"Resolved by Brokaw Local No. 260 of the International Brotherhood of Pulp Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers of Brokaw, Wis., That the retirement benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance of the Social Security Act be immediately increased to meet the present cost-of-living standards, and that the retirement age be lowered; and be it further

"Resolved, That if present contributions to the social-security fund are insufficient to warrant such increase in retirement benefits and the lowering of the retirement age that, said contributions be increased to meet the cost of such increase; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our Senators, Congressmen, the State and American Federation of Labor, and our international unions, asking them to do all in their power to carry out the request as set forth in this resolution.

"ELMER R. WEDEPOHL,
"President of Brooklyn Local No. 260."

"Whereas at the regular quarterly meeting of the tri-State district council of the International Brotherhood of Papermakers and the International Brotherhood of Pulp Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers of Wisconsin, Minnesota, and upper Michigan, held at Wisconsin Rapids, Wis., on Sunday March 3, 1946, the present Federal old-age and survivors' insurance benefits under the Social Security Act was presented on the floor for discussion; and

"Whereas after lengthy discussion it was unanimously agreed that the retirement benefits under this act are wholly inadequate and out of line with present-day cost of living and living standards to allow for the retirement of those becoming of retirement age, thereby causing unemployment of younger men and proposals for shorter work-week thereby lowering the purchasing power of a large number of workers, when by lowering the retirement age and providing adequate retirement benefits this could be avoided.

"It was moved and carried that all locals of the International Brotherhood of Papermakers and all locals of the International Brotherhood of Pulp Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers pass resolutions to have said retirement benefits increased to meet present-day cost of living and present-day living standards, and that the retirement age be lowered.

"That copies of these resolutions be sent to their Senators, State Congressmen, and American Federation of Labor, and to our international unions asking them to do all in their power to have this done: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by Brokaw Local No. 381 of the International Brotherhood of Papermakers of Brokaw, Wis., That the retirement benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance of the Social Security Act be immediately increased to meet the present-day cost of living and the present-day living standards, and that the retirement age be lowered; and be it further

"Resolved, That if present contributions to the social-security fund are insufficient to warrant such increase in retirement benefits and the lowering of the retirement age that said contributions be increased to meet the cost of such increase: and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our Senators, Congressmen, and State and American Federation of Labor, and to our international union asking them to do all in their power to carry out the request as set forth in this resolution.

"ARNOLD GOETSCH,
"President."

I trust that the Ways and Means Committee will bring out legislation in the immediate future to provide increased old-age and survivors' insurance benefits under the Social Security Act.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Carl H. Wilken, economic analyst, Raw Materials National Council, Sioux City, Iowa, and member of research staff of the education and research committee of the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries and Directors of Agriculture, before House Banking and Currency Committee on the British loan:

Mr. Chairman, members of the House Banking and Currency Committee, my name is Carl H. Wilken. I am testifying as economic analyst for the Raw Materials National Council of Sioux City, Iowa, an independent research organization which was organized in 1937 and supported by the citizens of Sioux City and the trade area. The purpose of the organization was to study the economy of the United States from a factual basis and present such information to the public.

I have recently completed an analysis for the Colorado Mining Association, which has been put in pamphlet form. As a sidelight supplement to my statement, I would like to leave several copies with the committee. The analysis gives the end result of the operation of our economy and the relationships that exist between the various segments, such as agriculture, factory pay rolls, mining, construction, manufacturing, retail sales, etc.

My purpose in appearing before the committee is to call attention to some of the basic factors which seem to have been overlooked by the proponents of the British loan agreement. I am going to point out conditions that govern our own economy, that of England and the world as a whole.

In analyzing the loan from the standpoint of repayment I wish to call attention to the fact that primarily there are three ways for a nation to become wealthy, which were well stated by Benjamin Franklin:

First. By war or the taking away the wealth of other nations by force.

Second. By trade which to make a profit requires cheating some other nation.

Third. By agriculture, where in planting the seeds we create new wealth as if by a miracle.

Analyzing the three methods for nations to become wealthy we can discard the first because we are bent on having peace. The truth of Franklin's second statement is borne out by the fact that England, the greatest trader in world history, is finding it necessary to negotiate a large loan. The United States with its economy proves the third method of becoming wealthy because we are both the greatest agricultural Nation and the wealthiest Nation in the world.

The weakness of the British type of economy is pointed out by Vincent Vickers, a former governor of the Bank of England, in his book entitled "Economy Tribulations." He states that the people of Great Britain during the past 40 or 50 years have suffered a loss of approximately $20,000,000,000, or roughly $500,000,000 per year. We might ask ourselves in considering the loan whether we intend to underwrite this loss and perpetuate an economy that has been unprofitable and depends upon trickery or exploitation of foreign raw material resources and labor by private British capital.

Another factor which we must consider in making this loan is the differences that exist in the operation of the economy of various nations. Mr. Vickers in his book also says that the world has never had a sound monetary measure of value. The monetary mediums of various nations have been constantly fluctuating which in turn has resulted in fluctuating prices for the production of different nations and peoples. In fact, the unstable price level of the world which in turn created unstable income has been the real trade barrier rather than the tariff. Tariffs, if levied at the normal price level of a nation, are not trade barriers, but rather a consumer tax which is indirectly levied against the people within the nation having the tariff.

As a result of an unsound monetary system the world over a period of years finds itself with three types of capital economy:

First. There is the British system which is an evolution from the economy of the kings, lords, dukes, etc. In this older type of capitalism the ownership of land and other productive resources within a nation were determined by the king and by birth into the royal family. The masses were the slaves, vassals, and serfs living in many instances on the level of beasts of burden.

Second. We have the capital economy of the United States. At the time of the Revolutionary War, the English type of economy existed in the colonies and early records reveal the huge grants of lands to foreign nobility. Under the Constitution of the United States we set up a new system of capital economy which I will call a people's capitalism. Under this type we provided for the new medium of exchange, the dollar, and also provided for the individual ownership of the productive resources of the Nation and the incentive for production by the individual which we like to call our system of free enterprise. Other nations talk about free enterprise but the United States is practically the only Nation where free enterprise has flourished.

Third. There is the system of state capitalism as exemplified by communism, and state socialism. Many people have been led to believe that there is no capital under communism. The communistic form of economy has capital but it is controlled by the few who govern the state. In fact, any economy that measures its values in terms of money has a capital economy.

In analyzing the British economy we need to remember that her citizens are dissatisfied with it and have adopted a partial form of socialism and that the Russian economy is the result of revolution against the same system that has prevailed in the English Empire. Communism is the first large-scale operation of state capitalism.

The English type of economy in its evolution from the days of kings and lords has led to what might be called international cartels or foreign investments in other nations for the purpose of exploitation and trade. We find this system widespread throughout the world and in late years our own financiers have been led to compete in this type of economy.

For example, we have our next door neighbor, Cuba. Our capitalists own 56 percent of the Cuban sugar industry, 22 percent is owned by other foreign capital, leaving 22 percent for the people of Cuba. Similar conditions can be found in the Far East, South America, and Africa. In the near future, and in case we embark on this great program of foreign investments at the expense of the Unied States, are we to use our resources to prevent a revolution in Cuba against the exploitation of foreign capital? In other words I charge that if we make this loan we are underwriting the very type of economy which has been productive of revolutions and wars because of the cheating and exploitation of weaker nations.

Again, we should remember that we as a Nation are the result of such a revolution and gained our economic freedom by throwing off the shackles of a trading type of economy. Since the formation of the United States we have had a production economy, engaging in foreign trade on the only sound business reason for trade, namely, to trade for goods that we didn't have or didn't have enough of. To prove the success of this type of economy, I need but point to the fact that the United States has approximately 47 percent of the world's dollar business within our own borders even though we have only 6 percent of the world's population. In addition we have had consistently approximately 15 percent of the world's exports. In building this tremendous volume of business we have operated continuously with a system of tariffs since the first session of Congress. In fact, the tariff was the only protection we have had against exploitation by the foreign traders.

The third type of economy, state capitalism, is against the natural laws of human progress. If Russia succeeds in the development of her vast raw materials resources she will have to gradually adopt a type of economy similar to those of the United States. The people of Russia will not accept exploitation by the state and will in time force the government to adopt individual ownership by one means or another.

With the three types of capital economy and the many different kinds of money in smaller nations, there is no foundation for free trade as contemplated under the British loan agreement. The welfare of individual nations will make it but a scrap of paper within 24 hours after the ink has dried on the signatures. We of course will be holding the bag for the amount of the loan.

Furthermore, if we make this loan we will find most of the European area and the Far East swinging toward the Russian system. Even in South America as the development of those countries takes place, economic necessity will force them to erect tariffs against our exports and invested capital. No nation can prosper if the earnings of the country are drained off to pay interest on the capital of absentee ownership.

If we adopt this loan agreement we will throw overboard our own economy which time has proved the most productive of all three major types of capital economy which I have mentioned and we will adopt the mess of international pottage from which our forefathers freed us when we fought the Revolutionary War.

It has been admitted by the proponents of the loan agreement that it is necessary to make the loan to halt the growth of socialism in England. If we follow the same course in making loans to stop communism there can be but one result, a bankrupt United States. We have only 6 percent of the world's population and cannot create world prosperity through a world-wide WPA financed by the United States.

The proponents of the loan agreement do not seem to realize that our present ability to make loans depends on our own production and our existing price level. In 1932 we had only $40,000,000,000 of income, as compared to $160,000,000,000 at the present level. The depression of the thirties was a monetary dislocation and the record of the world would indicate that it was a manipulated depression. Unquestionably it was brought about for the purpose of making the American market accessible to the international cartels.

In this connection I will quote Christopher Hollis, an English economist who taught as an exchange professor of economics in our own University of Notre Dame. In 1935, Mr. Hollis, after his period of teaching in the United States, wrote a book entitled "The Break Down of Money," in which he has a chapter on the "American slump." He opens the chapter with the statement that the only reason for the "American slump" was monetary.

Mr. Hollis emphasizes in his book the reasons for the slump as follows: "A money-lending country must be a free-trade country, and the purpose of the money-lending power has been to impose free trade on the United States. It has not been a purpose easy of achievement * * *. In opposition to the sermonizings of the old-fashioned Democrats has been the financiers' policy. Their belief is that the only chance of getting the tariff down has been so to reduce the purchasing power of the American people that they can no longer even approximately acquire for consumption their own products." I have not made a complete quotation; if the committee desires I can read all of it, as I have the book with me.

The condition set out by Mr. Hollis was exactly that of the United States in 1932. We were going hungry because we had too much food. The tariff received the blame for it all even though the record indicates that it was merely a monetary dislocation resulting from too low a price for agricultural products.

The program of reducing our price levels was a comparatively simple matter. In our economy the governing factor in our national income is our gross agricultural income. Gross farm income is the prime mover and the income of all other segments of our economy ratio to it with mathematical precision.

For example, each dollar of farm income will create $7 of national income, a dollar of factory pay rolls, approximately 50 cents of mineral production, $4.20 of retail sales volume and $5.60 of value of manufactures. In 1932, because of the drop in farm prices resulting from the manipulation of currency values and the price of silver, the monetary medium of 60 percent of the world's population, our farm income was approximately $6,500,000,000 less than in 1929 and with the seven times turn of the farm dollar our national income dropped $83,300,000,000 in 1929 to $40,000,000,000 in 1932. If at that time we would have had the common sense to maintain our farm prices there could not have been a depression.

During the thirties we subsidized the farmer not to produce. This subsidy indirectly was a subsidy to the foreign producer. This curtailment of farm production was the biggest fraud ever put over on a nation. We had no surplus, taking the agricultural economy as a whole, and during the period 1934–41 we imported on the average a net amount of agricultural products equivalent to 50,000,000 acres annually. The subsidy program created a market for the internationally owned sources of production and at

the same time created the payment for manufactured goods exported to other nations.

As a result of this program the imports displaced income which we should have had from our own production and with the reciprocal trade agreement program in operation, the same program contemplated under the loan agreement, the imports prevented our farm prices and income from recovering and we found ourselves legislated into a permanent depression.

In the period 1930–41 the Nation lost $473,000,000,000 in income which we could have had and in addition we mortgaged the future income approximately $3,000,000,000 per year as the result of subsidies.

The loan agreement with its stipulation for free trade will force our price level to that of the rest of the world. The world price level ranges all the way from a wage level in England of approximately 50 percent of ours to 10 cents per day for the man working in the cotton fields in India. It is hard to understand how any southern Congressman, knowing as he does that the very lifeblood of our southern economy depends on cotton, can even consider voting for a proposition which will force the South to produce cotton for 10 cents per pound or go out of business.

A break in our farm prices from the present to 1940 levels, which are approximately the same as England, would force the United States to lose approximately $10,000,000,000 of farm income and approximately $75,000,000,000 of national income annually. In addition we would be forced to liquidate $300,000,000,000 of our present capital structure and instead of being a nation with exportable capital we would be in a state of national bankruptcy. It happened in 1932 and it can happen again if we permit ourselves to be "humbugged" into deserting our own economy.

In fact, the loan to England will do just the reverse of what the proponents claim it will do. For example, it will not create employment in the United States unless we are ready to give our exports away. Imports taken in payment for exports will bring in an equivalent amount of labor as is exported in the way of goods. The loan will not increase our normal trade unless we are willing to ration the American people and deprive them of goods for export. Imports taken in payment will displace our own production, income, and consuming power. Our Nation in the postwar period will require less than 5 percent of our national income in foreign trade to bring about full employment and prosperity. Any exports above that amount cannot be paid for with imports for the reason that we don't need the imports.

The loan, if made, will not be repaid for two reasons. First, because the English trading economy will not permit them to make the profit to repay the loan; and, second, we cannot afford to take payment in goods which we already have. To do so will destroy $3 of domestic income for every dollar we receive in payment on the loan. In the words of Lincoln, "If we produce something ourselves we have both the goods and the money."

Finally the loan, if used to perpetuate the British type of economy with its exploitation of India and the Far East, will not prevent the collapse of the Empire. England has 500,000,000 people in her various possessions. If she would permit these people to have a wage and price level of $400 per capita which is less than 40 percent of ours, the British could have an income of $200,000,000,000 per year, a market far greater than her industrial production can supply. England has permitted herself to be forced into her present financial condition through the exploitation of cheap raw materials and labor by her international investment type of economy.

The English have never learned this basic fundamental of economy, that they cannot buy cheap raw materials, produced with cheap labor and have good markets. William McKinley, while President of the United States, said, "I do not prize the word cheap, it is not a word of comfort, it is not a word of inspiration; it is a badge of poverty, a sign of distress. Cheap merchandise means cheap men, and cheap men mean a cheap nation."

In view of the foregoing criticisms I will now make some remedial suggestions, using the economy of the United States to show how we can protect ourselves and give the British Empire and the rest of the world a sound economy without loans. An insolvent debtor must earn some money if he is to recover from financial distress.

Instead of loaning money to other nations we should help them maintain a price level so that they can earn money from production. The course of human events has given the United States an almost complete economy within its own borders. We should use the record of the United States as a pattern in bringing about a sound monetary system for the world with the American price level as the yardstick for future world prosperity, the only foundation for world peace.

If we were to take the funds allotted to Bretton Woods, the Export-Import Bank, the funds voted by the Senate for a stock pile of strategic minerals and the funds contemplated in this loan, we would have ample funds so that the United States could stabilize the world price level at our American level and for the first time in world history give the world a sound monetary system free from international exploitation. Such a program would assure a prosperous United States and would make it possible for other nations to earn their income through like remunerative production.

The United States during the war built war materials for the Allies without foreign loans. There is no need for England to borrow money if she is willing to agree to a program of a world price level which will permit her citizens to earn the money needed to trade with the mother country.

Such a program would help all nations and could be used to restore the economic equilibrium that existed in 1910–14 and 1925–29. Our price level of today is approximately 10 percent above 1926, the average of 1925–29. To have such a price level for the world would not be a theoretical dream because the 1925–29 American price level was the world price level and there is no reason why our present price level cannot become the yardstick for future monetary values in international trade.

The committee may well ask whether it can be done that simply. It can, because the income of the world depends on 40 basic commodities 85 percent of which in value are agricultural products.

In addition, the world has two monetary mediums—gold and silver. If the price of the principal farm products and the price of gold and silver were stabilized by the use of the funds which we are so blindly voting for loans, the world would have a stable income and a sound monetary system. The price of gold and silver could be stabilized at a parity ratio to present farm prices as a yardstick.

This program would break up the silver bloc which has been nothing more than a means of juggling world commodity prices and instead of permitting our creditors to lay down the rules we ourselves should write them. If the Congress of the United States approves this loan agreement without requiring a definite agreement from England to stabilize world commodity prices at our parity level, it will have turned its back on the people of the United States and will have deserted the economy of free enterprise, human freedom and human progress.

The historical record of world depressions can be traced to one source, the exploitation of agriculture and other raw material producers. Without stable agricultural prices at parity there is no chance for future prosperity in the United States or the rest of the world. In our own Nation agriculture is the foundation of our capital economy and agriculture has two-thirds of the capital investment in productive enterprise. Agriculture must be made the foundation of a new world economy if we are to have future peace. The present situation of world starvation is merely the aftermath of generations of exploiting agriculture. The present program contemplates cheap farm products and cheap raw materials. That in turn will mean bankruptcy for the United States and world chaos, a fertile field for communism.

The passage of this loan agreement will force the United States to share in world poverty instead of making it possible for the United States to increase the standard of living in other nations.

If the pending legislation on the British loan is put into operation as contemplated it will perpetuate the exploitation of world production which in the past has led to revolution and war. If we maintain our present farm production and price level the Nation with full reconversion to a domestic economy can have an income of $165,000,000,000 per year. With such an income we can afford to help the countries needing loans, and if they cannot be collected, charge the cost to profit and loss. On the basis of world prices the present production at 1940 levels would reduce our national income to $90,000,000,000, or too low an income to operate our own economy.

Simple arithmetic is proof that there is only one point at which we can go on a free-trade basis, and that is if the world price level is such as to permit a solvent United States.

Human progress and two wars have put the United States in a position of world leadership. To make this loan without protecting our own price level would indeed be a tragedy. It would mean the complete surrender of the freedom which we have had under the Constitution of the United States and an indictment of our leadership so badly needed by a distressed world.

The world is at the crossroads of the future. It cannot heal its wounds with a bankrupt United States, and the only way in which the United States can remain solvent is to maintain its income through production times price. It is indeed an indictment of our educational system in the field of economics to find this committee even wasting its time to consider a program which the science of mathematics proves unworkable. Time will prove the truth of my statement because two times two will still make four regardless of political intrigue and international power politics. Our destiny as a nation should be that of helping the world to a higher price level and a higher standard of living, and not a program leading to world poverty, chaos, and revolution.

The Power To Take

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 27, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, a sinister note crept into the news on Friday, April 26 when Acting Secretary of State Dean Acheson told a group of reporters that the Government, in order to get the wheat which the rulers at Washington have decided to send abroad, the Government should go out and take it.

Acting Secretary of State Acheson coolly advocated this procedure which sounds much like the way they operate inside of Soviet Russia and elaborated upon his theory "go take" in these reported words. I quote:

> Asked what might be done, Acheson replied, there was no great mystery about it, that if you want to get wheat or flour what you have to do is to go take wheat or flour. "There are various ways to do that," he said, "including the possibilty of rationing." He did not elaborate further, but stressed that he was voicing his personal views.

This device, or excuse, or cover-up, used by so many of the bureaucrats is growing a bit threadbare. When the Acting Secretary of State gives utterance to his personal conviction that the Government ought arbitrarily to seize whatever it wants from the citizens, particularly the farmers, he is voicing a policy that he will put into effect if he gets a chance. He is voicing a policy that he will discuss with his colleagues and every chance he gets he will attempt to convince them that his view is the correct one. An official in the position that these highly placed bureaucrats occupy cannot, and does not, divorce his official views from his personal predelictions. If a bureaucrat finds himself unable to put his personal convictions into execution, he will then do a grudging and unwilling job of carrying out policies laid down by somebody else, but the poison of such views as were expressed by Acting Secretary of State Acheson will permeate throughout the whole governmental structure if permitted to do so.

It is gravely disquieting when we find the Acting Secretary of State advocating a policy for dealing with the farmers of America that might well be advocated by some commissar in dealing with Russian farmers in the Ukraine.

There are those, including Fortune magazine, who charge that the administration has courted a domestic wheat shortage by misguided and ill-advised policies. Regardless of whether or not this is true, it remains a fact, that when an officer as highly placed as is the Acting Secretary of State advocates a hard-boiled Russian Soviet technique for the Government of the United States in its dealings with the American toilers, communism has gone a long way in the Department of State.

These expressions are the more disquieting because it has been revealed time and again that the State Department is almost a government within a government; that it harbors a lot of bureaucrats who believe they should carry out their own policies regardless of the policies of the Congress or the Chief Executive, and it has been asserted over and over again that Communists have infiltrated the State Department to an alarming extent.

The administration seems unable to adjust itself to the fact that the war is over and that the regimentation and regulation of all the people's activities and property which the Government employed during the war is not in order when we are at peace.

Another phase of the situation which makes this bold declaration by Acting Secretary of State Acheson so disquieting is that the administrative bureaucracy is increasing rather than decreasing, or if decreasing is going down so slowly that years will pass before the American taxpayers will be rid of the overswollen and arrogant bureaucracy that was built up over 13 years of the New Deal administration, and greatly augmented during the war.

The men and women who went overseas to fight for their country did not go overseas to fight for a government which would oppress them and arbitrarily take their property merely because the ruler of Washington has decided that the American people must undergo certain sacrifices and privations in order that food may be shipped to people across the seas. As Thomas Jefferson once said:

> An elective despotism was not the government we fought for, but one which should not only be founded on true, free principles, but in which the powers of government should be so divided and balanced among general bodies of magistracy as that no one of them could transcend their legal limits without being effectually checked and restrained by the other.

The American people want to do their full share in helping to feed the rest of the world. But Mr. Acheson appears to forget that the American people have borne the great expense and furnished the most men in these wars; that we fought two wars, one of them—the one in the Pacific—wholly unaided by our allies, and fought them at the same time that we poured billions upon multiplied billions of dollars in machines and materials of war, in foodstuffs and clothing for our allies. Mr. Acheson appears to forget, too, that we are being asked to provide nearly half of the entire relief for the whole world, while at the same time, we are being asked to lend more billions of dollars in direct loans—really, actually gifts and not loans—to our former allies. Mr. Acheson appears to forget further that it is not the dollars of the rulers of Washington, or the wheat, or the clothing, or the meat belonging to somebody in the State Department that is being disposed of. The billions of dollars spent for lend-lease supplies for all of these other countries are billions of dollars belonging to the American people. The billions of dollars being spent for relief are the billions of dollars of the American taxpayers and not of the bureaucrats who are spending those dollars. The billions of dollars we are talking about lending to Britain, to Russia, to France, to Poland, to China, to Holland, to all the other countries who are looking to Uncle Sam to finance them, are not the billions of dollars of the bureaucrats of Washington, but are the billions of dollars of American taxpayers, which includes every one of us.

The men and women who went through the hell of war in the Pacific, in the Atlantic, in the Far East, in Europe, and in Africa, and who lived to come home again are going to have to help pay these borrowed billions of dollars together with the interest thereon. For 10 generations it will be their children and their children's children who, through their toil, their sweat, their privations will have to pay these billions of dollars. Therefore, it does not set very well with a veteran who has come home to go back to help his father on the farm, or who has purchased a farm of his own, to hear a striped-pants bureaucrat in Washington say "the Government should go to that fellow's farm and take his wheat if it needs it." That was not the plan of the Government for which we sent our men and women out to fight.

This sinister policy favored by the Assistant Secretary of State confirms again that fact of human nature which has been confirmed over and over, time without number in history—that power becomes arrogant when it is too long exercised by one individual or a group of individuals. It again confirms the wisdom of the founding fathers in providing for a government of checks and balances as a guaranty against one department of the Government becoming too powerful and therefore dangerous to the people's liberty.

Power feeds on itself and it is a startling commentary on our time when an official as highly placed as Acting Secretary of State Dean Acheson bluntly and arrogantly says of the farmers of America that if the Government wants their wheat, and of the millers of America, that if the Government wants their flour, and of the people of America, that if the Government wants their food, the Government should go "take it."

Franklin D. Roosevelt once said, and I quote:

> We have built up new instruments of public power. In the hands of a people's government this power is wholesome and proper. But in the hands of political puppets of an economic hypocrisy such power would provide shackles for the liberties of the people.

There are several kinds of political puppets. In the present bureaucracy we have a lot of political puppets which create a political monopoly that has ruled this country for 14 years with an iron hand. They are using these instruments of public power to provide shackles for the liberties of the people, as witness the OPA administration, and as witness the cool insolence of the Under Secretary of State in advocating his "go take" policy.

There are all too many political puppets of a foreign autocracy—a so-called Communist autocracy—in this country. Many of them have wormed their way into places of high authority in our governmental bureaus. They are now so bold that they are boasting of the chaos and confusion which they are able to produce by the vicious use of these instruments of public power, and of their progress in forging shackles for the liberties of the people.

These so-called liberals who actually, if they can, will hurl this country back into the most reactionary dictatorship the world has known in modern times, are growing bolder by the day. Fifteen years ago it would have been unthinkable that an Acting Secretary of State would boldly proclaim such a doctrine as that the Government, in peacetime, should go to the farms of America, and to the mills of America and seize what it chose because a Chief Executive at Washington had decided that he would send American foodstuffs, clothing, and other supplies abroad to other peoples in other countries.

Such doctrines as that expressed by Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson are the direct outgrowth of an arrogance born of too-long-continued arbitrary Presidential powers provided for war purposes only, but which are now being continued over into peacetime.

There are two facts of life which the American people must ponder very seriously and against which they must defend themselves at all times. The first fact is that power feeds upon itself and is never willing to relinquish its control over the people's lives and activities. The second fact is, as some wise individual once said, "Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

Calvin Coolidge once said that any party too long continued in power would become corrupt, unmindful of the public welfare, and concerned principally with keeping itself in power. In 1932 Franklin D. Roosevelt repeated that sentiment and approved it at the time, as he said, 100 percent. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, on two different occasions made practically the same statement. When high-placed officials like Dean Acheson advocate a Soviet Russian policy of "go take," and when business and business men and women are cursed and abused as they have been recently by Paul Porter, Administrator of OPA, and Chester Bowles, it is a sign that what Calvin Coolidge and Franklin Roosevelt and James A. Farley have said has come true—that the New Deal administration, with its palace clique and its petty bureaucratic czars, has been in power too long, has become unmindful of the public welfare, has become bloated with authority, arrogant, and ripe for being thrown out of office and made to go back to work for a living.

It remains a fact, however, that a great danger faces this country in Dean Acheson's "go take" policy. Where will it all end?

Supreme Court Decisions

REMARKS
OF

HON. DAN R. McGEHEE

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, when the Supreme Court of the United States is in session, the highest Court of our Nation, the public generally await with fear and trembling for the days they hand down their decisions and the papers are going to reveal what they have done to further wreck and destroy the fundamental principles upon which this Government was founded. The people await to see what has been done to further interpret the Constitution in a manner to emasculate it and take away from the people of the sovereign States the rights guaranteed unto them.

We note in this morning's paper the headlines, "Court voids Jim Crowism on interstate bus lines by a decision of 6 to 1." The majority of the six Justices concurring in this opinion have handed down decisions heretofore which are so contrary to real Americanism until I am sure if they were transferred to Moscow even the Soviet people would not stand for the interpretation placed by them on the laws of their land.

The Congress remembers the decision handed down in the New York racketeering case, the Federal Communications case, and others I could enumerate, but all are familiar to us. The Court is writing the laws of the land rather than interpreting the laws as passed by the representatives of the people in the Congress and in the different States.

If we would study the background of each Justice, the people of this country would realize we cannot expect anything else. They are a bunch of mediocre lawyers with no judicial training and limited experience in the practice of law. Their opinions are based on personal belief, bias, and prejudice and they render immature, preconscious opinions in an effort to remake this great country of ours according to their own beliefs and ideologies.

In the case of yesterday voiding the Jim Crow law, taking away the rights of the States of this great Republic to regulate the affairs within their borders, they did so unmindful of the trouble and maybe bloodshed which may be caused in the future. They care not for this—they are trying to destroy our Southland, which the people of the South resent in no uncertain terms.

Mr. Speaker, this Court, which was packed with incompetent, incapable, inefficient, unfit, and unqualified men 5 or 6 years ago, should have been impeached by this Congress long ago, and I am making the prediction when the elections are over this summer, and the Congress reconvenes, impeachment proceedings will be filed against each and every one of those who have handed down such decisions, and when finally disposed of by the Congress, we will be relieved in the future of their disturbing and destroying decisions and men will be placed on the Court who will uphold the Constitution of these United States and the people's rights thereunder.

Draft Not Necessary for Replacements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statements prepared at my request by organizations opposing the continuance of the draft:

RELEASE OF FATHERS POSSIBLE WITHOUT DRAFT

Only 120,000 fathers, according to the War Department, will be in the Army as of July 1, 1946. There are and will be, numerically speaking, adequate replacements for these men. The Army, for other reasons such as the need for skilled men, may be keeping in service men for whom there are unskilled replacements. But the issue should not be confused with the extension of the draft when there are replacements.

EISENHOWER SAYS DRAFT EXTENSION WILL NOT RELEASE FATHERS

It seems apparent from the Army's own testimony in the public hearings that the Army does not have any plans, whether the draft is extended or not, to release immediately the 120,000 fathers. The following is from page 12 of the House Military Affairs Committee hearings:

"Mr. HARNESS. If we extend the draft for any reasonable period, it is contemplated that all fathers that have been drafted will be discharged.

"General EISENHOWER. I did not say that, sir. I did not say that it is contemplated to release all fathers. I say that if I can get the consent of Congress that we make them a special class, I would be glad to do it.

"But I do not believe that the War Department itself would be justified in classing them all as hardship cases instantly and discharging them."

SENATOR SHOWS HOW ARMY CAN RELEASE FATHERS

Senator REVERCOMB on the floor of the Senate May 14 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 4974), said:

"In January of this year, 1946, we were told by the members of the General Staff that they expected enlistments by July 1 of this year of 650,000, and that upon that basis they would release from the Army all except 120,000 fathers by July 1946. Because of the unexpected number of enlistments in March of this year they revised their figures and said they expected 950,000 volunteers by July 1, 1946, 300,000 more than they had estimated in January. So, Mr. President, if they could release all but 120,000 fathers upon a basis of 650,000 volunteers, certainly they can release those 120,000 when they have increased their enlistment estimate by 300,000. I make these remarks because I want to call the attention of the Army to the fact that they can act upon this subject without legislation upon it."

Moreover, despite an adequate number of replacements, the Army is keeping specialists indefinitely and other men in service beyond the announced term of 2 years, as can be seen in the following item from the May 21 Washington Post:

"FRANKFURT, May 20.—A United States Army announcement today revealed that military personnel with 30 months' service overseas are eligible to return home. Certain specialists and soldiers with approved extensions of overseas duty were exempted from the order."

VOLUNTEERS ARE ONLY ADEQUATE REPLACEMENTS

In other words, the Army's need is not for numerical replacements but for specialists. A teen-age draft is a draft of untrained men. Specialists can be obtained only by increased inducements to volunteer.

REPLACEMENTS AND DISCHARGES

The Army on July 1, 1946, according to General Eisenhower, should be at 1,550,000 strength. It should be composed of the following groups: About 806,000 volunteer men,[1] 150,000 volunteer officers, 19,000 Wacs, 575,000 drafted men.

Assuming a reduction in strength to 1,070,000 by July 1, 1947, and the volunteer enlistments estimated[2] by the War Department,

[1] Volunteers April 30, 1946, were 736,590; War Department estimate for May, 40,000; June, 30,000.

[2] Volunteer estimates are 30,000 a month from July 1 to December 31, 1946, and 20,000 a month from January 1 to July 1, 1947.

the following table indicates the approximate number of discharges:

Army strength, July 1, 1946	1,550,000
Army strength, July 1, 1947	1,070,000
Number to be discharged to reach authorized strength	480,000
Number to be replaced by enlistments	300,000
Philippine Scouts	50,000
Wacs (estimated, House hearings, p. 9)	5,000
Approximate total of discharges for whom there are replacements during July 1, 1946 to July 1, 1947	835,000

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12 (p. 3590) is the table (a) of projected Army discharges for the year July 1, 1946, to July 1, 1947. The following also includes a table (b) of 1-year and 18-month enlistment expirations. If the short-term-enlistment expirations are subtracted from the total discharges, the number of remaining discharges (c) reveal the possibilities in terms of discharging fathers and longer-service veterans.

	(a) Total Army discharges	(b) Short-term enlistment expirations	(c) Discharges other than short-term enlistment expirations	How discharges could be worked out
July	135,000		250,000	120,000 fathers. 130,000 long-service veterans.
August	65,000			
September	50,000			
October	60,000	8,460	363,455	325,000 drafted men. 19,000 Wacs. 17,000 decrease in officer strength.
November	105,000	58,776		
December	105,000	41,929		
January	70,000	21,256		
February	70,000	11,291		
March	65,000	8,443		
April	45,000	11,723		
May	40,000	33,210		
June	30,000	31,457		
Total	840,000 =	226,545 +	613,455	

Without any draft extension, there are replacements enough, together with the Army's planned reduction in strength, to permit the discharge during July, August, and September, of the 120,000 fathers still in service and also 130,000 longer-term veterans, leaving only 325,000 drafted men[3] in the Army October 1, 1946.

ONLY ONE-SIDED PRESSURE ON DRAFT PERMITTED BY THE WAR DEPARTMENT

"Love and kisses" telegrams are pouring in to Senator's desks from GI's in Japan who have been told that if the draft is not extended they will be kept indefinitely in Japan. "Love and kisses" is the code asking that the draft be extended which two Army public-relations employees in Tokyo have promoted and explained in a long preparatory cable to Senate and House leaders.

But those soldiers who are against peacetime conscription are forbidden even to write to their Senators and Congressmen asking them to oppose the draft.

WAR DEPARTMENT FORBIDS LETTERS AGAINST CONSCRIPTION

A former soldier, Lt. Col. Roscoe Conkling, stated: "Recently revised Army regulations provide that 'Except as authorized by the War Department, efforts by any person in the active service of the United States to procure or oppose or in any manner influence legislation affecting the Army are forbidden.'"[4]

Lieutenant Colonel Conkling's statement is corroborated by the testimony of Sgt. James T. Donnelly, after his honorable discharge, before the House Military Affairs Committee on December 19, 1945:[5]

"While overseas I heard of a great many speeches by high-ranking Army officers in favor of peacetime training. It seemed to me to be unnecessary and a very alarming and dangerous departure from American democracy. I decided to do what I could to oppose it.

"As an American citizen, the very first thought that came to my mind was to write to my Congressman. After discussing this with one of the company officers, I was told that according to Army regulations I could not write to any Congressman against the proposed bill of universal military training. Nevertheless, I enclosed an article written to the editor of the Christian Science Monitor in a letter to Senator HAWKES, of New Jersey. This letter was returned to me with the following rejection slip:

" 'This letter is returned to sender because violation paragraph 5 AR 600-10, dated July 8, 1944, which prohibits any person in the military service of the United States to procure personal favor through legislation.

" 'THEATER CENSOR.'

"The Office of the Judge Advocate General stated that in the future under threat of court martial I could not write anything against compulsory military training according to Army Regulation 600-10, paragraph 5, which provides that 'except as authorized by the War Department, efforts by any person in the active service of the United States * * * to procure or oppose or in any manner influence legislation affecting the Army * * * are forbidden.'"

In other words, soldiers may work for, but not against, the official policy of the War Department on legislative matters.

[3] In the 18 months preceding October 1, 1946, more than twice this number were drafted, none of whom should have been combat troops since VJ-day came before those drafted earliest could have had even 6 months' training. Half of those drafted is a reasonable number for medical and hardship discharges as well as for reenlistment. For example, out of all those millions still in service, less than 165,000 (including May and June estimates) were discharged to reenlist for minimum 1-year period.

[4] "The Case Against Compulsory Peacetime Military Training."

[5] Pp. 823-24, public hearings, H. R. 515.

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let Congress Reorganize Itself," published in the Buffalo Evening News of June 1, 1946. This editorial relates to the bill which has been sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. The editorial, from which I quote one paragraph, praises the worthy objectives of the bill. It reads in part as follows:

The measure that has now come before the two Houses for consideration is a welcome proof that the Members have had the courage and the wisdom to take a good, hard look at the ills that result from certain time-encrusted habits of procedure, and are willing to attempt to cure themselves. Self-criticism is the first step to the correction of error, and the efforts that have been made in and out of Congress over the past 3 years to identify the principal obstacles to efficient performance, and then to choose among the appropriate ways and means for reform, deserve the applause of the American people.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET CONGRESS REORGANIZE ITSELF

Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE has formally brought before Congress a program for its self-reform. S. 2177, which he is urging as chairman of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, designates itself as "a bill to provide for the increased efficiency of the legislative branch of the Government."

As the Wisconsin Senator said Friday, Congress is at present "neither organized nor equipped to perform its main functions." Now that the United States has become the most powerful Nation in the world, it is of the utmost importance that the National Legislature function efficiently and without undue delay. But the only way Congress can streamline its procedures is by self-examination and self-regulation. As a constitutionally independent branch of the Government, reform can come only from Congress itself.

The measure that has now come before the two Houses for consideration is a welcome proof that the members have had the courage and the wisdom to take a good, hard look at the ills that result from certain time-encrusted habits of procedure, and are willing to attempt to cure themselves. Self-criticism is the first step to the correction of error, and the efforts that have been made in and out of Congress over the past 3 years to identify the principal obstacles to efficient performance, and then to choose among the appropriate ways and means for reform, deserve the applause of the American people.

There is a great deal of solid thinking in the bill. Its principal focus, of course, is on modernizing the committee system. This is the fount and center of congressional performance, and the proposals made for its simplification and energizing are in keeping with its importance. The first step would be to reduce the number of committees, getting rid of such absurdities as that of the disposal of executive waste paper, and ending the floods each session of special committees that then lead a charmed life through sessions without end.

The Senate would reduce its standing committees from 33 to 16; each would have 13 members, and each Senator should serve on two but no more of the standing committees. Each committee would be provided with a professional staff of economists, political scientists, etc., in addition to its clerical force, and in the case of the appropriations committee, each subcommittee specifically charged with proposing funds for a particular administrative agency would have four specialists to keep constantly in touch with the way things are going in the fund-seeking agency. This is one of the most intelligent and constructive provisions of the

entire bill, because expert staff assistance is one of the indispensible working tools of government today.

Another sensible proposal is the formal organization of majority and minority policy committees, of seven members each, "for the formulation of over-all legislative policy of the respective parties." These, too, would have research staffs at their command, the majority Legislative Executive Council would be legally empowered to meet with the President and such of his Cabinet as deemed desirable "to consult and collaborate on the formulation and carrying out of national policy."

These proposals look toward effective team-play, both within the legislative department and as in the Council arrangement, between legislature and executive. They would reduce the gap between the two ends of the Capitol, and also might narrow that on Pennsylvania Avenue.

Is Russia Preparing for War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on the front page of the Washington Evening Star of yesterday appeared the following preliminary announcement of a series of articles the first of which I wish to call to the attention of the Senate and insert in the RECORD. The announcement is entitled "The Answers About Russia." It reads as follows:

THE ANSWERS ABOUT RUSSIA

Is Russia preparing for war? Is Stalin still firmly in the saddle and what would happen should he be dethroned? Does Russia have an atomic bomb? Why do the Soviets consistently oppose promotion of world press freedom?

These are some of the questions arousing widespread speculation in America today. Eddy Gilmore, who has spent 5 years in Russia as Associated Press correspondent, whose marriage to a Russian girl was facilitated by Stalin himself, who speaks the Russian language and corresponds with the generalissimo on occasion, answers them in a series of four articles which begins in the Star tomorrow.

I believe that the article will prove informative to all who will read it. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIVE YEARS IN RUSSIA CONVINCE GILMORE REDS WANT NO WAR—ANTI-SOVIET TALK ABROAD DISTURBS MOSCOW, BUT NATION SERIOUSLY LACKS PREPAREDNESS

(By Eddy Gilmore)

NEW YORK, June 4.—Just back in the United States after almost 5 years in Russia, a correspondent is struck and startled by the questions he is asked about the possibility of war with Russia.

"Tell me," said a young man just out of the Army, "should I go and reenlist and try to get my old captain's job back? You've been living in Russia a long time. Aren't they about ready to fight us?"

You get similar questions from middle-aged businessmen, housewives, laborers, policemen, the inevitable taxi driver, and so on.

Having lived outside the United States for more than 6 years now, I find it very difficult to understand the urgency of such questions and thoughts about Russia going to war.

If 5 years in a country mean anything, if lengthy daily conversations with diplomatic persons in Moscow who have talks with Russian leaders have their worth, if having a Russian wife, knowing dozens upon dozens of just plain Russians as well as a smattering of the party faithful should be contributing factors in helping to understand the Russian mind and attitude of a people, then the only possible answer is:

As sure as there's a face on the Kremlin clock and Joseph Stalin has a mustache, the Russians do not want to fight anybody.

VITAL FACTORS LISTED

In addition to the Russian people and leaders not wanting war with any country—and to be realistic, England or the United States, or both—the following factors which may not be generally known in America are worth consideration:

Russia suffered greatly in her war with Germany. She lost many men and women, a large amount of machinery and livestock.

Russia's coal, iron, and electrical industries are badly crippled, although coming back fast.

Russia, so persons who are informed on the subject say, is far behind the United States and Britain in atomic research.

Russia's people are tired, and even if they were not, they have never been a people who liked or wanted wars.

Russia's Air Force is nothing near a par with America's or that of the British Empire.

NAVY IS SMALL

Russia's Navy cannot be considered in the same paragraph with those of her allies.

Russia's leaders are desperately anxious to get their 5-year plans into operation.

Russians look on peace with something akin to adoration and worship.

Then why all this talk of war here and in Britain?

A large part of it, as I have told my Russian friends, is due to the methods their country uses in carrying out her policies plus a shocking lack of insight into the Anglo-Saxon mind.

The methods are her own and of her own design and the Soviets are firmly convinced that they are conducting their international affairs in the best and just way—for Russia. They can and do (and in the process fairly beat your ears off) seek to justify their every action, from their behavior in Manchuria to Andrei Gromyko's actions in the Security Council of the United Nations.

FEAR "GANGING UP"

They are firmly convinced that the United States and Britain have ganged up on them, that numbers of prominent persons in both countries are still bitterly anti-Soviet, that they are still discriminated against and treated as second-class citizens of the world and that while the United States and Britain want their security, they yell the loudest when Russia tries to batten down the hatches on her own.

People in the United States and Britain who talk about the possibilities of Russia going to war are not alone. At one time this year—before Prime Minister Stalin's answer to the Associated Press—there was an awful lot of loose talk on the same subject in Moscow. It should be added that Britain, not the United States, was the country the Russian people connected with war.

(Mr. Stalin, replying last March 22 to questions posed by Mr. Gilmore, said: "I am convinced that neither the nations nor their armies are seeking another war. They desire peace and are endeavoring to secure peace. This means that the 'current fear of war' is not being caused by this side. I think the 'present fear of war' is being brought about by the actions of certain political groups engaged in the propaganda of a new war and by these means sowing seeds of discord and uncertainty." Mr. Stalin also said that "I attach great importance to the United Nations Organization as it is a serious instrument for the preservation of peace and international security.")

TWO BRITONS BLAMED

Without going into the issues involved, without considering the rights or wrongs involved, if any, the main reasons put forward by the Russians were two men—Winston Churchill and Ernest Bevin. They were doing and saying things which simply were not understood nor liked by the Russians; and there was little or no effort to make them understood.

As Mr. Stalin has said, he believes emphatically that Mr. Churchill wants war with Russia. In recent conversations with foreigners the Russian leader has muttered like an angry bear this very thing, and has added that there are certain other people in the United States and Britain who feel the same way.

On the other hand, the Russians are just as convinced that the American and British people—that is the broad masses of them—want friendship with the U. S. S. R. and are friendly toward the U. S. S. R., and this goes for Canada, too.

There were several verbal broadsides against Mr. Mackenzie King at one time this year, bu. informed persons in the Russian capital never took them very seriously.

Some people think the answer to the question of how we are to get along with Russia and Russia with us lies in the better interpretation of both points of view—the American and the Russian. While this is certainly true the question is definitely much more involved. Ideologies, basic conceptions of many, many things, race outlooks, ancient and not-so-ancient history, emotions, to mention a few, make up the muddle.

New Weapons

REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that whom the gods destroy they first make mad. I do not know whether or not the world is mad, but the following column by Joseph and Stewart Alsop tells about some of the bacteriological weapons which have been developed makes one wonder. Is it possible that mankind is going to drive on and on until at last the perfect weapon is devised, one that can literally depopulate the world? Some way, somehow there has to be a stop to this competitive rearmament. It can be done because it must be. With all the vigor at the command of every nation on this earth there must be work that peace may be established now. And for my part I believe America should now be ready to risk discontinuing this sort of thing at least until we know general enforceable disarmament is impossible

to achieve. I do not believe it is impossible. Surely the realization of the kind of weapons that have been developed may have the effect of making people everywhere say that there cannot be war again.

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

PANDORA'S BOX

A corner of the curtain has been lifted from another of the horrors of our time—biological warfare, the significance of which was long ago stressed in this space. A distorted insight has been given, however, by the references in Congress to a "biological secret weapon" possessed by the Navy. Even in the midst of domestic turmoil, it is vitally important to understand the basic facts of this problem, and they deserve to be set down in brief.

First, it was not the Navy alone which made the discoveries in the act of biological warfare during World War II. On the contrary, the American experiments with biological weapons, which are more horrible although less dangerous than the atom bomb itself, were carried on by a special, independent project similar to the Manhattan district project. Both Army and Navy participated, together with many scientists and several civilian administrators, of whom the most important was George Merck, of the Merck Chemical Co. Three types of weapons were developed.

Type 1 consisted of violently virulent strains of human disease. No experiments were attempted on human victims, but tests on animals led to the conclusion that these disease strains had the capability of decimating enemy populations as soon as an infection was started. The most important strain was developed from a germ which has a spore phase in its life cycle, making it easily transportable. (Germ spores can live for great periods in the air or on the ground, without need of special cultures to nourish them or apparatus to maintain them at a special temperature.) In its spore phase, therefore, this strain could be dropped by bomb or carried by secret agent to start a plague among the enemy.

Type 2 consisted of virulent strains of plant and animal diseases and of poisons noxious to plants. As previously reported here, this weapon would have been used against Japan, in its poison form, if the surrender had not come so soon. A single small tablet of the poison was considered sufficient to kill all the rice in an average rice field. It was intended to confront the Japanese with the specter of starvation by threatening to kill their rice crop by dropping these tablets from B–29's.

Type 3 consisted of poisons sufficiently concentrated for antipersonnel use on a massive scale. Presumably they would have been dropped into the water supply of enemy cities. It is also to be presumed that the poison normally generated by the germ which causes botulism, which is reported to have been isolated and synthesized, belonging to this weapon type.

A moment's thought will show that these are new weapons with a revolutionary strategic significance similar to that of the atomic bomb. Of course, they will not destroy the enemy's productive potential as the bomb can; and even as means of mass murder, they are no doubt less absolute. But they put the same incalculable value upon military surprise and they give a far higher value to underhanded treachery. (The bomb, with its tamping to insure complete fission of the atomic explosives, would have to be broken down and carried to its destination in small parts by any secret agent desiring to use it. But the biological weapons really are capable of being carried by an agent in a suitcase). Worse still, control of the biological weapons is far less easy than control of atomic energy. The manufacture of fissionable material is an immense, complicated process, requiring enormous and costly installations. In contrast, a high authority has remarked that at least one of the biolcgical weapons can be produced in a brewery.

Singularly enough, however, these facts only increase the vast responsibility which has been laid upon the shoulders of B. M. Baruch as American representative on the Atomic Energy Commission. The reason for this is simple. No system of control of atomic energy, however, carefully limited, can avoid one basic necessity. If control is to work at all, each participating nation must yield up some sovereignty. A minimum sacrifice of sovereignty is the very heart of the control system proposed in the Acheson report. A larger sacrifice will probably be urged by Baruch, who has just come to Washington to hold final discussions on policy before offering his recommendations to the President.

Now, if each participating nation sacrifices some sovereignty to a central body, that is a sort of beginning on which a truly workable and effective world organization can be built in process of time. A truly workable and effective world organization, by solving international problems by peaceful means, will in turn make it unnecessary for nations to rummage in the Pandora's box of horror which World War II has opened. That, in brief, is the last hope of the American policymakers.

Justifiable Complaints

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, whether we know it or not, the farmers are getting tired of being made the victims of false and dishonest propaganda. Some of this propaganda is sent out by an ignorant bureaucracy, and some by a few of the loud-mouthed "stay at home" patriots that made millions out of the war.

The truth is that while the farmers of the Nation have had four or five good crops and have gotten war prices, they have been able to break even. They have not been able to lay up a surplus. The apparent bank account represents the worn-out farm machinery and unpainted homes and broken-down fences. When these are replaced, the farmer will be just as deep in the red as he was before the war.

In addition, the farmer worked his young children and old people not only 8 hours a day but 18. He has been made the goat and he has been discriminated against. His prices were kept down. He was not given parity that included the increased cost of living. The truth is that the farmers, as well as the laboring people are now getting on to the hypocritical camouflage of so-called subsidies. They are beginning to know that they cannot pull themselves up by their own boot straps.

Here are a few of hundreds of letters I have received from my own State that show that the farmers are catching on to the ignorant performance of the bureaucracy in Washington:

PEKIN, N. DAK., *April 3, 1946.*

Senator WILLIAM LEMKE,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I must say the world has come to a pretty state of affairs when people are starving to death in the war-torn countries and we farmers here who are willing and can produce all the food they need to keep them alive are held down by our own Government in not furnishing us the necessary equipment to raise the food with. Certainly, something should be and can be done about this machinery shortage. We farm five quarter sections of land (800 acres) and we need a press drill very badly, as we have only a small, old—21 years old—drill to put all this land in with. Is there any sense to these strikes and why don't the Government do something about it? Also why not pay the farmers what their products are worth and I don't mean subsidies. It is true they raised the price of wheat 3 cents. Just think, when we raise 3,000 bushels of wheat this year we'll have all of $90 to do with as we please (and that you can read in as sarcastic a vein as possible). Isn't that a laugh? If they had raised the price 30 cents, there might have been some sense to it. It should have went up 90 cents. Then, perhaps, we farmers could get back on our feet. Give us the price for the wheat and we will raise it—enough for the United States and all its starving allies.

Also, something should be done about this lumber situation. We can't even get a roof board to build a shed with even though we will not use any critical material for the outside covering, but we should have something to tack the rubberoid shingles onto. It seems to me everything is getting so highly organized that we surely are traveling the road to serfdom.

Yours truly,

MRS. OSCAR STROMME.

SCRANTON, N. DAK., *April 5, 1946.*

Hon. WILLIAM LEMKE,

Washington, D. C.:

I am dropping you a few lines regarding the drafting of our young boys. I do not think it is right to take them like they are doing now. Some of us farmers only have one boy left and some not any. At one time we only had two boys left in our township in the draft age.

I had one boy in the South Pacific for 27 months that is home now, and one left at home in the draft age that I think will be going in May. A lot of these boys that have been across are very much of a wreck. They want us farmers to raise food to feed the world, and most of us farmers are between the age of 60 and 70 years old, so the feeling among the farmers is that if they take the boys we may do what we can and let the rest of the farm lay idle, and I hope Congress don't extend the draft law. We have had enough of war for a while, and dictatorship.

Yours truly,

MELVIN TORPEN.

NEW SALEM, N. DAK., *April 15, 1946.*

Mr. WILLIAM LEMKE,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEMKE: I don't know if it is the fault of OPA or drafting of the boys from the farms, or what, but at least one dairy farmer here sold his dairy herd which his father started way back when I was a child—some time—because of lack of help. My aunt from Seattle has been writing us to send them butter for herself and neighbors, as they seldom get any—haven't had any for months—and she says 25 dairymen went out of business on account of the OPA.

My cousin from Tacoma, Wash., wants butter sent there—haven't had any for months. My son in Chicago says they get it in nuggets whenever available there, too.

Here we can scarcely get jells at all, sirup occasionally, and everything so high. My daughter goes to high school in New Salem

and the lady who boards her says that her weekly order, which cost her $6 last week—same things were $13 this week—and she can hardly get food together for her boarders. I don't envy her—we, living on a farm, with only three of us to feed, can scarcely manage.

But worst of all is the sugar. It is such a pity to see things go to waste because of lack of sugar and the cupboards in the basement empty. It seems a terrible sin to know that the breweries can still work full blast and sirup and sugar for the families out of the question. They will say sugar is not available to the breweries but some say there is evidence that it is.

I couldn't get signers for your petition—as I didn't have time—a sick daughter-in-law—my own knee hurt, and 300 baby turkeys to take care of, all alone. I had to take my daughter out of high school a week.

Certainly think you are one Congressman with your feet on the ground and a clear thinking and understanding of conditions.

That chapter in the Bible surely seems to refer to the United States of America where it says—"A nation scattered and peeled." We're being peeled all right. Not yet entirely scattered but that can follow. No one complains at helping the starving overseas but we all say "boo" to the loan to Great Britain. Surely glad they boosted Churchill back to England.

More power to you.

Very sincerely,

MRS. SELMA M. BECKER.

P. S.—Why should we have peacetime conscription? Why ever conscription? If a man sees his country is in danger he doesn't need to be conscripted except for crooked work like last time. Why not pass a bill, or introduce a bill to automatically put all those in favor of war into uniform at once, those will be the first to be drafted and the only ones to be drafted. Let the Harrimans and Morgenthaus fight their own wars.

Atomic Age Infant Needs Heart and Soul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, for several months I had planned to return to my little home town where I spent most of my life and deliver the commencement address to the graduating class of the school where I, along with five others, completed my high-school training 22 years ago.

The emergency labor legislation kept me from going. Therefore, I sent the speech I had planned to deliver and had a friend read it. I hope that each high-school graduate in central Texas may read it.

What I said to the graduates of Johnson City High School applies equally to the graduates of every high school in Texas and to all of our young people. The address follows:

ATOMIC AGE INFANT NEEDS HEART AND SOUL

To the graduates of Johnson City High School, faculty members, and friends, you know, it's always a great thrill to come back to Johnson City and the hill country. There isn't any question about it. Up in the hills the sun shines brighter, the air is fresher, and the clouds are less troubled than anywhere I know of.

I'd like to spend this entire evening just talking about why Johnson City had a better basketball team than Stratford. I'm just as interested in it as you are, and as proud of it as your own folks are.

That's the kind of an evening I'd like to have during one of the rare times when I can get away from Washington. Just about time enough to visit and gossip with my old friends, my old classmates, my teachers, and neighbors.

RECALLS OWN GRADUATION

Unhappily, when you get to be an adult, you take on a lot of responsibilities and duties. They preclude us from following our own inclinations a great deal of the time. And because you young people are reaching toward maturity, I think I would not be true to my responsibilities unless I talked to you briefly of some of the more serious things.

I can remember my own graduation day. It wasn't too long ago. Don't ask me now who was the speaker, you won't remember, either, 15 or 20 years from now. But I do recall that he painted a mighty rosy picture of the future. We had a lot of phrases, then, that most of you never heard of, but your parents will remember. America was on a veritable plateau of prosperity, which would go on and on. Well, you've studied enough history, and heard your parents talk often enough, to know that for those of my generation, those rosy dreams didn't pan out.

HAPPY PERIOD OF LIFE

So that's another reason I think it would not be fair for me to paint you any rosy pictures tonight, without at the same time attemping to impress upon you, realistically, what you must do to make those rosy dreams come true.

You are in a happy period of your life—perhaps one of the happiest. Your cares are few, your heart is light. You are filled with ambition and the energy to translate that ambition into reality. You approach life's working period with clean hands, honest minds, and pure hearts. And most important of all right now, I think, is the fact that you have the two attributes with which almost any troubles in this world can be whipped: Youth and courage.

IF WORLD LASTS

So I know that in saying we live in a troubled world, I do not frighten you; nor do I discourage you by saying that whatever tomorrow's world turns out to be—good or bad, utopia or chaos—is in your hands.

Almost since there have been graduating classes, speakers to those classes have told how the hope of the future is in the hands of the present, until it has become trite. You expect a speaker at a graduation to make some such statement. But I firmly and sincerely believe that never before in all history was this so true. You who comprise the next generation also comprise the hope of the world—if the world lasts until you have the chance to grapple with its problems.

AS ROCK CAST INTO STILL POOL

Never before was it so true that whatever you do here in Johnson City, whatever the other graduating classes over Texas do, will have an effect on people over the entire world. If I may bring that home by a personal example, I am a native of Johnson City, Texas, who happened to be elected to Congress. As a Congressman I try to vote as my people would want me to vote—as you would want me to vote. Yet my vote may be of far-reaching effect. I cannot represent you, except as I represent all of Texas. I cannot represent Texas, except that I also represent the Nation. And it is equally true that what happens in our Nation affects the entire world. What the United States does financially, economically, or politically affects all the peoples of all the nations. So you of Johnson City who influence my voting are thereby helping shape the destinies of our world. That is an example all of you can understand. When you go on into colleges and study systems of philosophy you will find there is one thing upon which all philosophical systems agree: That whatever you as an individual do is a contribution toward what the world does. The civilization of this globe is the sum of the civilization of the individuals who make it up. When you leave this auditorium tonight you go out as a free individual, free to follow a course of your own choosing. But never for one moment think what you do, or what you say or for that matter what you think will affect only yourself. It will affect those about you. And like a rock thrown into a still pool the ripples set in motion by you go ever outward to the uttermost edges of our humanity.

RESPECT FOR TOLERANCE

That is, to me, a wonderful conception of life; yet it also is a frightening conception to know that so long as I walk the ways tread by other men and women, so long as I touch them and they touch me, our lives become an interdependent part of the entire world. This interdependence of man upon man should keep us ever conscious that those who walk with us have the same duties, the same rights as ourselves. It brings to each of us a new respect for a word which I hope you shall not forget in all the days of your life: The word "tolerance." The word "tolerance," which has been translated into the Golden Rule.

But tolerance alone is not enough to guide us into this brave new world into which we may or may not emerge as the years pass.

OUR NATION GREATEST

We in America are the fortunate children of fate. From almost any viewpoint, ours is the greatest nation: The greatest in material wealth, in goods and produce, in abundance of the things that make life easier and more pleasant. It was not always so. Behind today's plenty are generations of hard work, of deprivation, sacrifice, tolerance, and understanding. And of courageous leadership.

In using that phrase, I do not speak of the leadership such as a Hitler practiced: One man making political and economic decisions for a sheeplike people to follow. I speak of the attribute of leadership which has been and must continue to be inherent in the American people.

BETTER WORLD FOR ALL

If we have excuse for being, that excuse is that through our efforts the world will be better when we depart than when we entered. I do not mean better for me as an individual. Not better for the rich man nor the poor man; for Jew or gentile; for black or white or red or yellow; for Catholic or Protestant; but a better world for all the people.

And through time, place, and circumstance there has been placed upon us the burden of making this world a better world for all the peopie. We, in all the world, have the power. Nearly every other peoples lie prostrate and helpless. They look to us for help—for that inherent courageous leadership which we need and the world demands more than at any other time in our civilization's history.

HAVE COME FAR

It would be a supreme pleasure to stand before you tonight and say that there are no problems; that peace everlasting has been secured; that for all time men will live among men as brothers.

I cannot say that.

But I can say that we stand tonight at a threshold, a doorway. We have come far. In limitless time it has been but a moment since we emerged from the Dark Ages. Behind us lie great achievements—achievements of the mind and hand of men. Before us hangs a curtain. What awaits beyond that curtain must be met by you who inherit the earth, not only with the infinitely clever mind and hand of men but with the infinitely compassionate and tolerant hearts and souls of men.

ATOM REQUIRES HEART AND SOUL

You come to maturity in the atomic age, the infancy of the atomic age. But this is a precocious infant, learned in only one direction—the ways of destruction. Forty planes in 40 minutes, strategically flying over 40 American cities, could wipe out the heart of a great nation. This lusty, dangerous infant was born during my day, a product of my generation. But so far my generation has used it only with clever mind and clever hand. You must add to it the heart and the soul which every infant must have before we can say it has reached the golden age of maturity.

You come to maturity in the wake of a great war—the most deadly war man ever has known. That war has been won, but the much more important peace is yet to be won. Starving people over the world must be fed because we know that what happens to them will eventually as the ripples roll outward affect us.

LEADERSHIP UP TO US

Yours is the challenge to nurse back to health and well-being a sick and diseased and confused world. For we cannot hope, merely because we are Americans, that we will remain a fertile, green oasis in the midst of a deadly desert. Either our oasis must grow and expand to cover the desert, or its deadly poison gases and death-laden winds in time will erase that last spot of fertility.

So I am convinced that we, as individuals and as a Nation, must furnish the leadership and the moral courage that will serve as an inspiration to the rest of the world.

I am humbly aware that the solution for the world's ills cannot be found in platitudes about benevolence and generosity and good faith and tolerance and courage. Those are largely intangibles. They are things of the spirit. But as a house must have strong foundations, so am I convinced that our course of conduct must be based upon those attributes; and those attributes must be translated into practical acts which will demonstrate the spirit behind them.

GOLDEN RULE INTERNATIONALLY

When we practice the Golden Rule in our daily conduct with our neighbors, it is understandable to them. They have the same language, religions, and faiths, and customs. If we are to become world leaders we must act so that what we do will be understandable and intelligible to peoples who speak in tongues strange to us, with customs different than ours, and even with faiths we may find repugnant to our thinking.

What do we Americans expect of each other? That a man be fair and honest. We expect that he will not pit class against class, religion against religion, race against race. We expect him to have the same faith in us that we have in him.

That seems to me to be a good rule for a nation to follow—for our Nation to follow in dealing with others.

Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. If we as individuals and as a nation preach class hatred, avarice, greed, you may be sure that the harvest will be bitter fruit.

A QUARTER OF A MILLION CROSSES

We have successfully demonstrated our greatness in winning a war, but the cost was great: a quarter of a million crosses mark the soil of foreign lands where men who once knew life and joy now sleep forever. Each man who fought—those who lay dead and those who came back—fought for some reason. In each man's mind that "something" may have differed. If you asked him to tell you, each man's reply probably would be different. But in each reply would be something of this:

A man wants to live in a land of peace; he wants to feel the security of peace, so that his mind may be free to pursue those endeavors of his daily living. A man wants to live in a Christian spirit of neighborliness and love, and not forever pit himself against his fellow men. A man wants to be free to work and to live, to laugh and love and play. To raise children in a secure world where they, too, may taste the joys of living.

GENERATION'S ETERNAL OBLIGATION

Those are the common denominators of thought which each man held as he fought—those men who died and those who came back.

Our debt to them to preserve, protect, and perpetuate the Nation and its leadership for peace is an eternal obligation of your generation and of mine. As you and I grope toward fulfillment of that obligation—through trial and error, with mistakes and wrong directions making the task more difficult—so will we lead man's march toward the identical goals of a greater civilization and everlasting peace.

Report of Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a month has passed since the report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine. This report unanimously endorsed President Truman's plan for the immediate transfer to Palestine of the 100,000 Hebrews now in Germany and Austria which he first proposed in August 1945, yet nothing has happened and nothing is being done.

Mr. Speaker, how many resolutions has the Congress of the United States to pass? How many requests and statements has the President of the United States to make before some action is taken?

I am inserting in the RECORD a letter to the President of the United States from the chairman of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation outlining a concrete plan for the transfer of the hundred thousand Hebrews to Palestine without waiting any longer for British approval, which should not be regarded as imperative since Palestine is not, and never has been, a British territory.

HEBREW COMMITTEE OF
NATIONAL LIBERATION,
May 2, 1946.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Permit me to express the gratitude and thanks of the Hebrew people for the sympathy and understanding you have shown in your statement commenting on the report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry. This policy of true friendship and your persistent efforts to alleviate the plight of the Hebrews of Europe is in the greatest and noblest traditions of American statesmanship.

We regard it as significant that you have withheld approval of the vague and harmful recommendations of the committee which prejudice the internationally recognized right of the Hebrew people to Palestine and which serve only to encourage antagonism and conflict between Hebrews and Arabs, who have, in fact, achieved a high degree of amity and cooperation. We feel confident that we can rely on your wisdom and statesmanship to support a long-range policy that will provide a just, effective, and permanent solution of the Palestine problem.

We cannot stress too emphatically our regret that although the committee exhibited its awareness of the desperate condition of the 1,500,000 Hebrews who have thus far managed to survive the Nazi horror and its consequences, and, although it acknowledged that Palestine held the only hope for these people, it has evaded the unavoidable recommendation that all of these people should be repatriated forthwith to that country.

Similarly, the committee has made but the vaguest kind of references to the ultimate future of Palestine. It is with deep regret that we find the committee's recommendations as a whole unacceptable since they offer no solution whatsoever but merely endorse the continuation of the status quo of the British military occupation and rule of Palestine.

But, quite apart from the over-all need of a solution to the problem of all the Hebrews in Europe and that of the status of Palestine, there is the specific task of dealing with the 100,000 Hebrew survivors, mostly in the camps of Austria and Germany, who were last summer, and still remain, the objects of your concern. We are deeply gratified at your insistence that the transference of these 100,000 Hebrews should now be accomplished with the greatest dispatch.

In this connection, we respectfully recall to the attention of Your Excellency the proposal submitted by the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation in a letter dated September 7, 1945, suggesting that 10 Liberty ships be assigned to the task of transporting these Hebrew people to Palestine. We calculated that by carrying 2,500 passengers per ship (in accordance with detailed plans we prepared) this fleet could complete the evacuation of the 100,000 within 2 months. We were deeply gratified by the testimony of American Army officers before the committee that the entire project could be completed within 2 to 4 weeks; it is a tribute to the high degree of efficiency characteristic of American operations.

That more than 8 months have passed since you sent your original request to Prime Minister Attlee has enhanced the urgency of this need. An increasingly dangerous situation is developing in the camps; tragic misunderstandings have occurred between American occupation forces and inmates resulting in mass demonstrations, hunger strikes, and loss of life. Your Excellency will agree with us that no further time must be lost.

In the interest of efficacy and dispatch, we respectfully suggest the immediate undertaking of the following measures:

(1) That the American Army Commander in the European theater be instructed to assume the responsibility for the most expeditious evacuation of these 100,000 Hebrews in Germany and Austria who were the subject of Dean Earl Harrison's report.

(2) That the British Government be requested to detail an appropriate officer to cooperate with American authorities in implementing this program and to coordinate the

entire operation with the British Administration in Palestine.

(3) That all United States agencies in Europe be instructed to cooperate in mobilizing the necessary facilities for the speedy transference of these 100,000 to seaports in France and Italy.

(4) That adequate shipping be made available by the War Shipping Administration and the Maritime Commission to transport these 100,000 to Palestine.

The failure of the Inquiry Committee to recommend the early repatriation of the 1,400,000 Hebrews in the rest of Europe who are equally desperate in their need of Palestine creates a difficult situation. This might become extremely dangerous and the purpose which you sought to achieve would be stultified, with serious consequences, if the principle of selectivity were permitted to be introduced by quasi-public organizations cooperating with the British Government, or by private bodies. To permit such organizations to fulfill a quota by selecting Hebrews from all parts of Europe would mean only a slight amelioration of the problem in some places and a complete solution nowhere.

Please accept, Your Excellency, the assurances of my highest regard and consideration.

Respectfully yours,

PETER H. BERGSON,
Chairman.

The Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Standard-Times, New Bedford, Mass., for June 1, 1946:

SHOULD SIGN CASE BILL

President Truman, who called upon Congress to grant him powers to safeguard the Nation against economic paralysis, now has before him the Case bill, which was drafted to prohibit certain practices of labor unions, and which should prove helpful in the prevention of strikes in key industries.

Opponents of any legislation to curb strikes are asking him to veto this measure, and the Secretary of Labor has indicated he may recommend a veto on the ground that it is unfair to labor. The main opponents of the bill are not members of the unions, but their leaders, who wish to be above the law.

In the light of the existing labor situation and the President's own appeal for a much more stringent bill to enable him to avert a disaster like the stoppage of rail transportation, he cannot consistently turn down the Case bill.

The rail strike and the bituminous coal strike have been ended. But a strike of the anthracite miners has begun, and a strike by the maritime workers, which would halve the operation of all merchant vessels, impends. After a Nation-wide survey of industry, John D. Small, Civilian Production Administrator, has said that it will be many months before the lost production of coal can be made up. He declared the production of durable goods, including automobiles, tires, farm machinery, and building materials needed to provide housing for veterans, has been set back at least 3 months.

In a nation still reeling from the effects of strikes, to fail to take measures to prevent more strikes would constitute a neglect of the Government's responsibility for the national welfare.

The Case bill provides for the creation of a Federal Mediation Board to act in disputes which collective bargaining has failed to settle. When the board takes jurisdiction in such cases, lock-outs and strikes are prohibited for a period of 60 days. Considering the grave consequences of strikes like those of the railroad workers and the miners, this is a reasonable restraint which the President should support as being essential to the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

Another provision of the Case bill prohibits obstruction of commerce, and of the movement of goods in commerce on their way from producer to consumer, by means of extortion and threats of physical violence to persons and property. Some time ago Congress sought to outlaw such practices, but the Supreme Court held, in the New York teamsters case, that the antiracketeering law did not extend to labor unions. It suggested that Congress could remedy this deficency, and now it has done so.

Under the law, the aim of collective bargaining is the formulation of contracts between management and labor. Where such a contract prohibits lock-outs, strikes, or slowdowns, the Case bill provides that a violation of it is ground for a suit for damages. A union, as such, may sue in behalf of the employees it represents, but the bill establishes, for the first time, the principle that a union can be sued for violating a contract, and that a judgment against it can be collected from its assets.

The Case bill cannot be classed as legislation conceived in haste in a crisis. Passed originally by the House, it had careful consideration by that body. The Senate made changes in it, and the House accepted them. It is not an antilabor bill, and it does not interfere with the legitimate practices of labor unions, but only with those that have aroused public resentment, and that have been detrimental to the welfare of the people, including organized labor itself.

President Truman asked for a law to enable the Government to prevent disastrous strikes that threaten the entire national economy. He has it in the Case bill which will help to prevent stoppages of vital services and production and he should give it his approval.

Aviation and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Oswald Ryan, of the Civil Aeronautics Board, was the recipient of an honorary degree from Salem College, my alma mater, on May 29, 1946, in appropriate exercises at Salem, W. Va. The commencement address was delivered by our able colleague from Arkansas, the Honorable BROOKS HAYS. It is also appropriate to state that Representative HAYS a few days later received an honorary degree from the College of the Ozarks, and at that time gave the address to the graduates of this institution in his beloved State.

The citation to Mr. Ryan, when awarded the honorary degree of doctor of laws, stated:

In recognition of his contribution to administrative law and to the advancement of our domestic and international civil aviation. In his former service as general counsel of the Federal Power Commission and as an advocate before the Supreme Court of the United States and later as a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, he made substantial contribution to administrative justice. As a member, Vice Chairman, and now Acting Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board and as a member of various United States delegations in the negotiation of air agreements with other governments, he has been a leader in fostering the development of American air transportation both within the United States and throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ryan, at the college alumni banquet on the evening of May 28, when it was my privilege to present him, delivered the following informative and interesting address:

AVIATION AND PEACE

(By Oswald Ryan, Acting Chairman, United States Civil Aeronautics Board)

Aviation continues to be one of the most important subjects in the world, and people everywhere are becoming aware of its tremendous significance to the common life of mankind. Here we are confronted with development that has never happened before in the field of transportation; and that development that has added a new dimension to our life and our thinking.

Throughout all past history and up to the present time, man has been living on the surface of the earth amid the conditions of a two-dimensional world. Now he suddenly finds himself living at the bottom of a great ocean of navigable air, an ocean which touches alike all nations of the earth. With the aid of this new navigable medium and the modern aircraft that will be flying with incredible speed through it, there will not be an important city on this earth that will be more than 2 days distant from this city in which we are assembled tonight. No two communities anywhere will be as far apart by air as Washington is from Los Angeles today by train.

Now what does all this add up to? It means that the age of isolation with its barriers of geography and distance is gone forever; and there is not a man, woman, or child now living in the world whose life will not be deeply affected by this momentous event.

We Americans have a right to be proud of the part which our country has played in this revolutionary development. Only a little more than four decades have passed away since the faith of two Americans proved the power of man to fly. Yet in that brief time we have seen our early American aircraft of primitive construction develop into a flying craft that has challenged the admiration of the world. We have seen those little sheds where American airplanes had their beginning grow into vast manufacturing establishments, where scientific research has joined with engineering and mechanical skill to produce the best airplanes in the world.

Our air transportation reveals a like development.

Less than two decades ago our American air lines first came into existence; yet today our great domestic air network spreads from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico. These domestic air lines of the United States at the beginning of the recent war flew twice as many miles every day as the combined air lines of Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and the Netherlands—the five great aeronautical nations of Europe; they carried almost twice as many passengers; and in comfort, speed, and safety they surpassed the air lines of any other nation.

And within the same brief period of time our adventurous pioneers of air commerce have linked this Nation in scheduled air transportation with far-off Asia, across the

Pacific, with the nations of Europe and Africa, with the countries of Central and South America and the islands of the Caribbean, with Canada and Mexico and with our own territories. But, however remarkable this achievement, the end is not yet. American air transportation still stands upon the threshold of an unexplored world.

Now, what of the future? The Civil Aeronautics Board has predicted a postwar development, both in the domestic and in the international field, that will be without any parallel in the history of aviation. There are several reasons why this is not a fantastic prophecy.

Recent aeronautical developments are opening up the air to the man in the street and millions of Americans are rapidly becoming aware of the unique advantages of the new transportation.

Then, again, the war has been a mighty laboratory of experiment and research in the field of aviation, a laboratory cut of which has come an advance in the technical art which would normally have required 30 years of peacetime to accomplish. The air lines of the United States from necessity are, with few exceptions, still using the same types of aircraft which they used before the war. Nevertheless, they are obsolete aircraft. I do not mean that they are not rendering a splendid service. I found that out not long age on my return from an air mission to Spain. I was able to have breakfast in Lisbon and lunch the next day in New York, although I flew the Atlantic in what is now an obsolete plane. The air lines of the United States, both domestic and international, are only waiting upon the manufacturing capacity to give them the planes with which they are going to be able to carry the air commerce of this Nation and a fair share of the air commerce of the world.

Again, there will be available to the air lines of this country millions of aviation personnel who have been trained in the recent war. I am thinking of the pilots, the mechanics, the meteorologists, the navigators, and the other ground personnel essential to a successful and efficient air line operation. Already they are knocking at the doors of civil aviation and asking for a place in its future development.

Let me pause here to note in passing that in that connection we shall be confronted not only with an opportunity but with a solemn obligation. I am remembering what happened after the First World War. We shall be unworthy of those who shall have borne the battle if we permit once again, as we did then, the streets of American cities to resound to the tramp of unemployed millions of former servicemen searching for jobs they cannot find. If this Nation is to be worth dying for in time of war, we must make sure that it is worth living in in time of peace.

Now I have outlined some of the recent developments which give us reason to predict a promising future for our American air transportation; but that future will also depend upon the soundness or unsoundness of the national policies that will guide its development. And I am going to venture the prophecy that the future success of our air transportation will depend in large part upon the continuance of the sound policies that have controlled and guided its progress in the past.

What are those policies? One of the basic principles of our public policy with respect to air transportation has been development as a privately owned and managed enterprise, rather than as a Government owned and operated undertaking. In this, our air policy has differed from that of other great nations; for the governments of other countries, with few exceptions, have had large participation both in the ownership and in the management of their national air lines. One of the main reasons for the extraordinary progress of American air transportation up to the present time has been its development under the leadership and initiative of private enterprise. I believe that policy should be continued.

The second important characteristic of our national aviation policy has been the principle of regulated competition. It is the dominant and basic policy laid down by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. That act requires that the Civil Aeronautics Board in its decisions shall provide for competition among air lines to the extent necessary to assure the sound development of an air transportation system that will be adequate to the need of our foreign and domestic commerce, our postal service, and our national defense.

Here again the American policy stands out in sharp contrast to the aviation policy of the other great aeronautical nations; for other governments generally have concentrated their air services either in a single national company, either wholly or partly owned by the Government, or in a very limited number of noncompetitive enterprises. But our American policy must be one of economic competition, not destructive competition. We must avoid the economic anarchy of unrestrained competition if we are to go forward in the future as we have in the past.

A third foundation principle of our national policy has been to keep air transportation free from the control of all business interests that might not have either the capacity or the incentive to accomplish its maximum development. So Congress in the Civil Aeronautics Act has provided that no rail, motor, steamship, or other surface carrier shall acquire control of any air line unless it first obtains the approval of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Board is not permitted to grant that approval unless it finds, after a public hearing, that the acquisition will not be adverse to the public interest, that it will not restrain competition, and that it will promote the public interest by enabling the surface carrier to use aircraft to public advantage in the surface carrier's operation. That last condition as construed by the Civil Aeronautics Board means that the air carrier operation must be auxiliary and supplemental to the surface carrier operation, thus providing an improvement in the surface carrier operation.

Now, why did Congress lay down such a cautious policy? The Civil Aeronautics Board has reached the conclusion that the philosophy of the act rests upon the thought that this new form of transportation so vital to the national interest can only attain its fullest development if its management is free from all conflicting loyalties; only if that management is to be wholeheartedly committed to the advancement of air transportation and to no other conflicting business interests. Congress may have feared that if an air carrier were to come under the control of a surface carrier, air transportation with its comparatively small investment and its relatively small profit margins might not be permitted by the controlling management to develop to a point where it would threaten the larger investment of the company in surface transportation and that the interests of the surface carrier would dominate whenever there arose a conflict between the two.

This policy of keeping our air transportation free and independent of the control of other and conflicting transportation interests, except in the special circumstances permitted by the Civil Aeronautics Act, has been a basic aviation policy of this country during the period of its greatest progress. I believe that, at least so long as this industry is in the developmental stage, it is a sound policy and should be continued.

Now I desire to speak to you briefly about a phase of our international air-transport policy which concerns what is probably the most important question that civil aviation presents to the present world. And that is the relation of civil aviation to the future world order. What is to be the role of civil aviation in the great and solemn task of insuring peace and security to mankind in the future?

Whatever that role may be it promises to be one of great significance. For in air transport we are confronted with an agency of beneficent and also terrifying potentialities. It is the only transportation machine that ever operated in three dimensions; the only transportation that is not limited by the barriers of mountains, the shores of oceans, or the political boundaries of sovereign states. As an instrument of war, it operates with such deadly force and range and speed that the very earth itself has shrunk to the measure of its destructive power. As an instrument of peace, it can be an effective messenger of commerce and good will among nations, aiding in the development of the natural resources of distant lands, fostering the exchange among free peoples of the products of their toil and, more important than all else, promoting world travel and the exchange of ideas among peoples and thus paving the way to a better understanding among the nations of the world.

Thus it is that international air transportation will have a vitally important bearing upon the future world order. And whether the aircraft of the future will be going forth laden with passengers and freight or whether they will be carrying troops and munitions will depend in large part upon what we do in the months ahead about the structure of the peace we now build and it will depend in part also upon what we do about international air transportation policy, for that policy is certain to be one of the foundation stones of that peace.

So far there have appeared two fundamentally divergent schools of thought on the question of the most appropriate policy for international civil aviation. One group believes that unless air transportation is placed under severely restrictive and almost prohibitive international controls it will become a menace to future peace and security. Those who hold this view have urged the imposition of strict controls such as the establishment of national quotas limiting the participation of individual countries, the limitation of airline schedules and aircraft capacity, and other brakes on the free expansion of air transportation. That may be said to have been until very recently the prevailing European view.

A second group sees in civil aviation, not a threat of future disaster, but the promise of a better world. This view has had its strongest support in the United States, although it has many adherents in other lands. It stands for the largest possible expansion of air transportation and vigorously opposes the policy of restriction and limitation, holding such restrictions to be not only unnecessary to the attainment of world security, but an actual obstruction to that objective.

We of the United States believe that air transportation should be dedicated, not to the purposes of national prestige or economic imperialism, but to the common service of mankind. Thus only can it advance the peace and security of the world.

A great statesman once said that civilization was a compact between three parties—the noble dead, the living, and the unborn. I am thinking of the great and solemn opportunity now before us as one of the high parties to that compact to fulfill the obligation we owe to our noble dead and to our unborn children yet to come. It is the opportunity to cooperate with the other peoples of good will in the United Nations in determining that these world tragedies shall not happen again.

That opportunity was never greater than it is right now. For the United States stands today in the forefront of the world's economic and social power, strong in the power and influence of its people, great in its military strength, the outstanding champion of free institutions, seeking liberty and justice among men. No nation has ever occupied a larger place in the life of the world, and it will be nothing less than a national tragedy if we fail to fulfill the great promise of the world leadership which has fallen upon us. As Theodore Roosevelt once said, "We Americans hold in our hands the hope of the world, the fate of the coming years, and shame and disgrace will be ours if in our eyes the light of high resolve shall be dimmed and if we trail in the dust the golden hopes of man."

What the British Loan and Trade Agreement Means to You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, Friday, May 31, 1946, former Justice of the Supreme Court Owen J. Roberts appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee in support of the British loan agreement calling for an extension of credit to the British of $3,750,000,000.

It was my privilege to interrogate Justice Roberts, and during the course of cross-examination I pointed out that in my opinion the administration, and particularly the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury, had not sufficiently informed the good people of this country on the ramifications and general scope of the loan agreement and the international trade organization which is to follow as a part of the general agreement with Great Britain. I inquired of Justice Roberts if he had any particular material to submit which he thought would be helpful to the people of this country in their study and better understanding of the general program. In response to my interrogation he submitted a statement prepared by Otto Tod Mallery, in the form of questions and answers, which I now submit for the RECORD:

WHAT THE BRITISH LOAN AND TRADE AGREEMENT MEANS TO YOU

(By Otto Tod Mallery)

HOW THE DOLLAR LOAN TO BRITAIN WOULD WORK

Question. What is the proposed loan to Britain?

Answer. It is a two-sided agreement. The United States agrees to help British reconstruction by the loan of United States goods. In return Britain agrees to support United States policies for releasing trade all over the world.

Question. What is the object of the loan?

Answer. To take a first step toward carrying out the promise made by both in the Atlantic Charter "to further the enjoyment by all states of access on equal terms to the trade and raw materials of the world." This is recognized as one of the purposes for which we fought the war. Another object is to increase trade and employment everywhere.

Question. Why is it called a $4,500,000,000 loan?

Answer. Dollars are emphasized because these dollars are not useful as pounds would be, in British internal trade.

Question. Can the British Government use the dollars received from the $4,500,000,000 loan to buy up British coal mines from their private owners?

Answer. No. Dollars are no good for that purpose. The British Government can pay for coal mines and the shares of stock of the Bank of England with British Government bonds.

Question. Can dollars be used to socialize British industry?

Answer. No. The British Government can do this without American dollars and without American help of any kind. It can carry out any domestic policies British voters approve whether the United States gives Britain a loan or not.

Question. What good does the loan do Britain?

Answer. British buyers can quickly obtain United States wheat, cotton, and pork products, also United States steel for reconstruction, United States dynamos to replace destroyed electric power plants, United States Army trucks, United States oranges, lemons, and apples, United States milk products, and United States machinery and machine tools. Otherwise, the British would have to wait a long time to get enough of these products from other sources.

Question. From what other sources could Britain buy such goods if it does not receive the dollar loan?

Answer. From countries whose money is not dollars.

Question. What countries would Britain buy from if it received no dollar credit?

Answer. First, from those countries whose money is the pound sterling, and, second, from those countries whose money is tied closely to the pound sterling. like Argentina, Sweden, and Holland.

Question. Could countries other than the United States supply all the goods and food Britain needs?

Answer. Not immediately, but in the long run yes, although perhaps at higher prices. In the long run Britain will get somewhere its essential needs if the United States does not supply them.

Question. What would it mean to United States farmers and workers in factories if the British Isles, the Dominions, and the Colonies tried to get along with as little goods from the United States as possible?

Answer. Some unemployment in the United States in 1946 and more and more unemployment as the years go by. If the British Commonwealth of Nations tries to become one big all-British department store for British buyers and sellers only, the result would be serious unemployment and lower standards of living for American industrial workers and farmers in the years ahead.

Question. What is to prevent this happening anyhow, even if the loan is approved by Congress?

Answer. One condition of the loan is that the British government will undertake to negotiate with the Dominions to do away with any such idea as an all-British department store. This all-British tendency is now contained in preference agreements (1932) between the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations. These preference agreements channeled trade within the British Commonwealth of Nations and the British Colonies and away from the United States and away from all non-British nations. The United States in its turn agrees to work against prohibitory and discriminatory trade barriers all over the world which keep out British, United States, or anybody else's goods.

Question. Why were the British preference agreements set at 1932 level?

Answer. As a reply to the United States Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930, the highest in our history, which closed United States markets to many British goods and tried to set up an exclusively United States department store.

Question. Did British and United States trade gain by these methods of excluding each other's goods?

Answer. No, the United States never had as large a share of British trade afterward as before. In the 10 years previous to the enactment of these measures the United States supplied 17 percent of British imports, but only 11 percent afterward.

Question. Did the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act increase United States trade with other countries?

Answer. No. The United States share of world trade fell from 15.6 percent to 11 percent, and never recovered its previous share until World War II began.

Question. What is the relation of this proposed agreement to America's failure to expand its foreign trade and to create full employment at home?

Answer. It is a firm statement that both the United States and Britain are resolved not to make the same blunders again. It is an agreement to turn over a new leaf by opening their markets to one another on equal terms. It goes further by pledging one another to work for equal access to the markets of all the other members of the United Nations.

Question. How can this be approached?

Answer. By setting up an international trade organization to include all the United Nations, the preparatory meeting for which has been called for 1946 as a part of the United Nations organization.

Question. Will this international trade organization be formed anyhow, loan or no loan?

Answer. Probably not. Without such a loan the British in self-defense would have to put a fence around their markets and try to gather in a trade bloc of other countries inside that fence. They would begin with Australia, New Zealand, and the British colonies. They would try to attach to that trade bloc the same non-British countries that the United States wants to trade with.

Question. How would this work?

Answer. The United States might be forced to try the same thing. It might try to form a similar bloc of countries based on the dollar and the Western Hemisphere.

Question. Would two such trading units, one British and one American, not have as much trade as a larger trading bloc which would include them both?

Answer. No; for the same reason that if the United States were divided into two parts with different kinds of money and with discriminatory trade barriers, the trade of the two halves added together would be less than the trade of the present undivided United States without discriminatory trade barriers and without different kinds of money. If the United States were divided into 48 States, each with its own money and its own tariff barriers, unemployment in each of the 48 States would be comparable to what it was during the worst years of the great depression. The world was divided between wars into more than 48 such fenced-off states separated by discriminatory trade barriers and by different currencies, and unemployment was a problem everywhere. In the United States employment was never overcome after 1930 until after World War II began.

Question. What is the relation of the loan to fuller employment in the United States?

Answer. It will help.

Question. Then the United States is not playing Santa Claus in offering this loan?

Answer. No; the United States comes nearer to playing the part of a doctor—a doctor who has walked into a bank to make a deposit and finds all the bank tellers bound hand and foot after a hold-up. Until the doctor frees them no business can be transacted. The aftermath of war, like the aftermath of

a hold-up, has left the arteries of trade of every nation restricted by tight bandages which a trade specialist must remove before goods can circulate once more.

Question. If Uncle Sam is not a Santa Claus, is he acting like a Shylock, demanding a pound of flesh?

Answer. No, Uncle Sam is not acting like a Shylock. He is acting like an investment banker. The banker's terms are stiffer than British negotiators hoped for. But what borrower ever received a loan on terms so favorable that he wanted to give the banker a box of cigars? It is true that many of the members of the British Parliament who voted to accept the loan with its condition of opening up British markets on equal terms to the United States, did so with reluctance and misgivings. The situation is harder because Britain has been the world's banker for centuries and the change to the opposite side of the counter is naturally irksome.

Question. Will the United States get back the equivalent of the loan?

Answer. Yes, if the United States will accept goods in payment, such as rubber for tires, tin for roofs, copper for telephone wires, fibers for clothes and rugs, tea and coffee for the breakfast table, and other basic raw materials from tropical British colonies. The people of the United States will get back more than the equivalent of the loan in added employment and prosperity if trade rises to the high level expected to follow from new liberal and fair trade policies. These policies are conditioned upon the loan and can only be proposed to the other members of the United Nations if the loan is first approved by Congress. Only then can other nations know that the two greatest trading nations have themselves taken the same medicine which they say is good for others.

Question. What if unforeseeable conditions should prevent the repayment of this vast sum of $4,500,000,000?

Answer. Three weeks of war cost the United States much more. This money is not to be shot away but is to be "an investment for, and a prerequisite of, peace."

Question. Who in the United States opposes this loan?

Answer. (1) Those who are still fighting their school-book battles of Lexington and Yorktown.

(2) Those who are so strongly opposed to certain British policies—for instance, in India and Java—that they are inclined to oppose entirely different policies involving Britain which they would otherwise recognize as desirable.

(3) Those who cling to traditional ideas about international relations much longer than they cling to outmoded radios and automobiles.

(4) People who have not noticed the close interconnection between unfair trade practices, struggles for exclusive markets, unemployment, low standards of living, and war.

(5) Those who have not observed that if goods cannot cross frontiers on missions of peace, soldiers will cross frontiers on missions of war.

Question. Who in Britain opposes the conditions attached to the loan?

Answer. (1) Those special interests who want to preserve their present exclusive trade privileges within the Empire because they fear competition on equal terms.

(2) Those who are afraid that Americans will not know how to keep out of another depression like that of the 1930's. They want to avoid any infection from American slumps because they fear unemployment in the United States would bring a low standard of living to the British people.

Question. What essential interests do Britain and the United States have in common?

Answer. Both depend on an increase in total world trade for full employment, and both Governments are in agreement upon the way to bring this about. Between them they conduct three-fourths of the whole trade of the world.

Question. Now that the United States and its allies have won the war, why can't the United States attend to its own business and let other countries attend to theirs?

Answer. Because peace is everybody's business and depends for its continuance upon rising standards of living in other countries as well as in the United States. Peace is indivisible.

Question. Why is the loan and trade agreement the first step toward the organization of a durable peace?

Answer. Because America has a stake in Britain's survival as a going concern, as a customer, and as an advocate of many of the things for which the United States stands. Britain has a stake in the productive power and political ideals of the United States. Each would be weaker if the other were weaker. Only if Britain and the United States work together in world trade policy can either attain full employment and rising standards of living. Expanding world trade is a condition of lasting peace. A peace to be durable must be endurable.

Should Strikes Be Outlawed in Essential Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address recently made by me over Station WINX:

It has been argued that should strikes in essential industries be outlawed at this time labor's rights would be jeopardized. Labor will have no rights unless the Nation's paramount right to produce, live, and go forward is recognized and preserved.

I favor an absolute ban on strikes in essential industries until this country can obtain the necessary production in all fields of major endeavor.

Mr. John D. Small, Civilian Production Administrator, is in a position to know something about this subject and the effect of the present strike wave on the well-being of the country. Mr. Small testified before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that strikes should be prohibited completely for six months, in order to get the production which is absolutely necessary to meet the demands of billions of dollars of pent-up purchasing power. I subscribe fully to Administrator Small's views.

According to the Journal of Commerce of April 29, 1946, consumer spending has increased $20,000,000,000 since VJ-day to an all-time high of an average annual rate of $120,000,000,000. This great purchasing power competing for scarce merchandise can only be avoided by stopping the strikes and permitting the wheels of industry to produce without interruption. The people demand immediate action on the part of both the legislative and executive departments to stop one man, or a small group of men, from wrecking America.

My interpretation of essential industries means light, heat, and food. They are essential to the Nation's livelihood. I absolutely oppose strikes or lock-outs from whatever cause which would deprive the American people of these vital necessities. I favor the right to strike by the workingman so long as his action does not endanger his neighbor and fellow citizen.

The railroad strike would have made the people of the city of New York hungry if permitted to have continued 2 more days. It's that kind of strike that deprives the citizen of those things necessary to his existence that should not and must not be tolerated.

The people are fed up on power-drunk labor czars tieing up the industry of the country. It is time that these men be made to realize that they aren't bigger than the people of America. It is time for employer and employee alike to bear in mind that the rights and general welfare of the whole people must and shall come first.

Veterans' Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the press dealing with the investigation of the veterans' rehabilitation program:

PHILBIN ASKS VETS' CARE INVESTIGATION

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 7.—Calling for a sweeping investigation by Congress of alleged intolerable conditions and "irregularities" affecting hospitalized veterans, in this country and overseas, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Democrat, of the Third Massachusetts District, in a speech on the floor of the House, today said "the impression is quite general throughout the country that the Veterans' Administration is moribund and ineffectual."

At the same time, Representative PHILBIN introduced a resolution to set up a special House committee, made up of 11 Members, with the special task of investigating "the adequacy of hospital and other facilities, the personnel, the food, the discipline, restrictive regulations, inadequate treatment, and all other matters bearing upon the welfare of the wards of the Government now hospitalized."

PHILBIN stated that material in his files evidenced that "beaureaucratic red tape" was throttling the granting of relief, loans, and educational privileges authorized by the so-called GI bill of rights. In addition, he charged that:

1. The latest advances of medical science have not been comprehensively or fully utilized, particularly in the treatment of tubercular and psychiatric patients.

2. Veterans and service hospitals were overcrowded.

3. There is an inadequate number of doctors and nurses to carry the full load of hospitalized patients adequately.

4. The veterans hospital construction program has not been expanded rapidly enough.

5. There are inadequate research activities.

PHILBIN made reference to an article entitled "Third-Rate Medicine for First-Rate Men," in the current issue of Cosmopolitan magazine, which, he said, presented "startling evidence that many of our veterans are being neglected and denied basic rights, benefits, and privileges which Congress has provided for them. This well-documented article constitutes a challenge to this body which, in the interests of humanity and justice and regardless of any other consideration of personality or past merit, must be promptly accepted by the House."

"Everyone agrees that we must maintain the very highest standards in dealing with the supremely urgent problem of the care of the wounded and the mentally afflicted and, therefore, if reports reaching me are true, even in part, the situation cannot be corrected too quickly," said PHILBIN. "A fearless investigation will enable Congress to act. It will stimulate early correction." The Massachusetts Representative did not confine his criticism to the Veterans' Administration facilities, but included some service hospitals as well in this country and overseas.

"There is no room for the philosophy of the brass hat or mailed-fist institutionalized dictator in the care and treatment of veterans," PHILBIN continued. "We will not tolerate incompetence, arrogance, carelessness, and harsh, ruthless discipline in connection with the treatment of these heroes."

PHILBIN remarked that "Rightly or wrongly, the impression is quite general throughout the country that the Veterans' Administration is moribund and ineffectual—frozen to bureaucratic modes developed within its framework for over a quarter of a century, not possessed of the vitality, the fresh point of view, or the administrative capacity to take hold of and successfully solve the multifold and gigantic problems of hospitalization and rehabilitation that must be solved, and solved completely and promptly, in order to prevent suffering, misery, and death, and, indeed, to insure humane treatment and just consideration for millions of our returning heroes."

Urging the Rules Committee to report the investigation resolution back to the House for early action, PHILBIN said: "This is the only way we can do complete justice to the millions of brave American boys who have offered and sacrified their life's blood and their all in order to save our democracy and our country. For us to do less is a dishonor and stigma upon the sacred cause for which they fought and died. In the name of our gallant sons who have fallen in battle, I earnestly urge the early adoption of this resolution."

The text of the resolution follows:

"*Resolved*, That a committee comprised of five members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and six other Members of the House, all to be designated by the Speaker, or a duly authorized subcommittee or subcommittees thereof, is authorized to conduct an investigation into alleged intolerable conditions, irregularities, and hindrances effecting war veterans, and members of the armed forces, in connection with hospitalization, medical, and nursing services, compensation, pensions, vocational guidance and training, and all other matters bearing upon the welfare of veterans and their dependents regarding rights, benefits, privileges, and preferences to which these groups may be entitled under existing legislation.

"The committee shall investigate all hospital facilities, the status, needs, and progress of the hospital construction program, other facilities contemplated by present legislation, the personnel, the food, the discipline, restrictive regulations, care and treatment, and all other matters affecting the rehabilitation and care of returned veterans, with particular reference to wards of the Government now hospitalized in Government institutions, wherever situated, and to prepare and submit to Congress recommendations for remedial legislation to eliminate undesirable conditions, unsatisfactory administrative practices, to provide abundant facilities, and to insure efficient, proper and generous care and treatment for patients in Government institutions, veterans and servicemen and women.

"The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigations, together with such recommendations for legislation and changes of policy and program as it deems desirable.

"For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, or elsewhere, if deemed necessary, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, paper, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member."

[From the Boston Post of March 8, 1945]

PHILBIN IN ATTACK ON VETS CARE—CALLS FOR PROBE OF HOSPITAL—RED-TAPE METHODS HIT

WASHINGTON, March 7.—Calling for a sweeping investigation by Congress of alleged intolerable conditions and irregularities affecting hospitalized veterans, in this country and overseas, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of the Third Massachusetts District, in a speech on the floor of the House, today said "the impression is quite general throughout the country that the Veterans' Administration is moribund and ineffectual."

RAPS RED TAPE

At the same time Representative PHILBIN introduced a resolution to set up a special House committee with the special task of investigating "the adequacy of hospital and other facilities, the personnel, the food, the discipline, restrictive regulations, inadequate treatment, and all other matters bearing upon the welfare of the wards of the Government now hospitalized."

PHILBIN stated that material in his files evidenced that bureaucratic red tape was throttling the granting of relief, loans, and educational privileges authorized by the so-called GI bill of rights. In addition, he charged that:

VICTIMS OF BUREAUCRACY

1. The latest advances of medical science have not been comprehensively or fully utilized, particularly in the treatment of tubercular and psychiatric patients.

2. Veterans and service hospitals were overcrowded.

3. There is an inadequate number of doctors and nurses to carry the full load of hospitalized patients adequately.

4. The veterans hospital construction program has not been expanded rapidly enough.

5. There are inadequate research activities.

"Everyone agrees that we must maintain the very highest standards in dealing with the supremely urgent problem of the care of the wounded and the mentally afflicted and, therefore, if reports reaching me are true, even in part, the situation cannot be corrected too quickly," said PHILBIN. "A fearless investigation will enable Congress to act."

PHILBIN remarked that "Rightly or wrongly the impression is quite general that the Veterans' Administration is moribund and ineffectual—frozen to bureaucratic modes developed within its framework for over a quarter of a century, not possessed of the vitality, the fresh point of view, or the administrative capacity to take hold of and successfully solve the multifold and gigantic problems of hospitalization and rehabilitation that must be solved."

[From the Worcester Gazette of March 8, 1945]

PHILBIN'S PROBE DEMAND CHILLED

WASHINGTON, March 8.—Heads of three House committees dealing with the Army, the Navy, and the Veterans' Administration threw cold water today on a proposal that a special committee investigate treatment of veterans.

But their contention that no special investigation is necessary failed to cool the demand of Representative PHILBIN, Democrat, of Massachusetts, for an immediate inquiry into what he called "alleged intolerable conditions and irregularities affecting hospitalized veterans."

Neither was PHILBIN dismayed by a statement from Brig. Gen. Frank Hines, head of the Veterans' Administration, that the death rate in veterans' hospitals is higher than in other institutions because most of the patients are men who served in the last war and prior conflicts.

"What I want is an investigation of the treatment of veterans of the war we are in now," PHILBIN told a reporter. "Not only the hospitalization facilities and treatment they are receiving but the manner in which other of their legal rights, such as the GI bill of rights, is being conducted."

He expects, he said, early and favorable action by the Rules Committee on the resolution he offered yesterday to set up an 11-man investigating committee.

Chairman SABATH, Democrat, of Illinois, said he did not know when the Rules Committee would consider the Philbin proposal but "if there is any reason for an investigation, we'll have one."

Chairman RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi, of the World War Veterans' Committee, saw no need for a special investigation. His own committee, he said, "is looking into this proposition with a view to correcting whatever weaknesses or shortcomings may be found."

Chairman MAY, Democrat, of Kentucky, said his Military Affairs Committee for some time has been investigating Army hospitals and that conditions it complained of previously have been corrected.

MAY said he is certain that if any conditions in veterans' hospitals need correction, General Hines "will correct them as soon as is humanly possible."

Chairman VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, of the House Naval Affairs Committee, said he sees "no need for an investigation of conditions in naval hospitals."

[From Stars and Stripes, Washington, March 1945]

HINES ANSWERS CRITICS ON CHARGES RELATING TO CARE IN VET HOSPITALS

Charges that inefficient administration in Washington and neglect and carelessness in the field are responsible for "an unconscionably high death rate" among discharged veterans confined in Veterans' Administration hospitals made in the March issue of Cosmopolitan magazine, and the introduction of a resolution of investigation by the Congress, sponsored March 7 by Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, World War I veteran of Massachusetts, drew a sharp retort Sunday from Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The charges are made in an article by Albert Q. Maisel and state that "despite astronomical sums spent for treatment of these veterans" only one patient in six leaves a Veterans' Administration hospital cured. Congressman PHILBIN'S resolution was based on the charges.

A sweeping investigation of conditions in every hospital in the United States operated by the Veterans' Administration has been ordered by Hines, it was revealed Sunday, and inquiry will be made into every charge made. The general, after first ignoring the allegations, let it be known also that he has invited investigations, independent of his own, by outside organizations, including the major veteran bodies.

Representative PHILBIN last Wednesday told the House that complaints indicate "a general unsatisfactory atmosphere which more closely resembles concentration camps than hospitals."

The situation, according to reports, is so serious that agencies in charge cannot correct it without congressional action, he said. He asserted that a "fearless investigation will enable Congress to act."

PHILBIN mentioned "harsh discipline, poor food, unreasonable restrictive regulations, inadequate treatment, and inconsiderate attitudes on the part of superiors" as conditions needing correction.

CALLS CHARGES FALSE

"I intend to get the facts," General Hines said in his radio appearance. "But I say now, with absolute confidence, that any charges that the Veterans' Administration is giving third-rate medicine to war veterans and following antiquated methods in their operation are entirely unfounded.

"And, further, the medical service of our hospitals is up to the highest professional and ethical standards of the medical profession, and our hospitals are on a par with any in this country. I challenge anyone to refute that statement."

[United Press report of March 15, 1945]

CRIES PERSIST FOR HOSPITALS PROBE

WASHINGTON, March 15.—Demands for a special congressional investigation of treatment of wounded servicemen and veterans persisted today despite the decision of the House Veterans' Committee to make an inquiry.

Representative PHILIP PHILBIN (Democrat, Massachusetts) said there were "intolerable conditions and irregularities" in Army, Navy, and veterans' hospitals and that the situation merited a special inquiry. He has introduced a resolution for appointment of an 11-man committee to make the investigation.

[From the Washington News of March 15, 1945]

HINES DEFENDERS WOULD HEAD OFF FULL-DRESS PROBE OF AGENCY

Congressional defenders of the Veterans' Administration moved today to head off a full-dress investigation of that agency by launching less sweeping inquiries of their own. The House Veterans Committee summoned Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Veterans' Administrator, for closed session questioning on charges of negligence in caring for patients in veterans' hospitals.

Chairman JOHN RANKIN, Democrat, Mississippi, meanwhile disclosed plans for inspections of the 95 institutions during the proposed 2-week Easter recess of Congress. He said the visits will be made by committee members and other Congressmen whose homes are in the vicinity of veterans' facilities.

DIVERSIONARY TACTICS

The committee's actions were designed to avert an inquiry proposed by Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Democrat, Massachusetts, who last week offered a resolution calling for creation of a special group to investigate hospitalization of both veterans and present members of the armed services, the administration of loans, benefits and dependency allotments, and the education and rehabilitation programs. Some of these activities are administered outside of the Veterans' Administration.

Representative RANKIN said he saw no need for an independent inquiry in view of his committee's program, adding that General Hines "is doing a splendid job under difficult conditions."

PHILBIN ISN'T SATISFIED

Representative PHILBIN, however, said the Rankin inquiry doesn't go far enough." He made the same criticism of the investigation just launched by General Hines, who authorized leaders of the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, and Veterans of Foreign Wars to go into living conditions and medical treatment in the hospitals.

"What we need is an independent inquiry into all phases of veterans and servicemen's affairs," the New Englander said. "It should be handled by a committee with subpena powers and should go into programs being administered by the War and Navy Departments as well as the Veterans' Administration."

EARLY HEARING

The House Rules Committee has promised Representative PHILBIN an early hearing on his resolution. Representative PHILBIN said his inquiry is intended to "determine whether there is any basis for the general impression that the Veterans' Administration is moribund and ineffectual and that bureaucratic red tape is throttling the granting of relief, loans, and educational privileges."

Particularly he wants the proposed committee to inquire into charges that tubercular and psychiatric patients have been neglected, that hospitals are overcrowded and understaffed, and that the building-expansion program is proceeding too slowly.

Allied with Representative RANKIN in the move to head off a full-scale inquiry are Chairman ANDREW J. MAY, Democrat, Kentucky, of the House Military Affairs Committee, and CARL VINSON, Democrat, Georgia, of the House Naval Affairs Committee, both of whom contend the VA is being operated satisfactorily under General Hines. The May committee is currently conducting its own inquiry into the operation of Army hospitals.

[From Stars and Stripes of March 22, 1945]

HOUSE VETS GROUP ASKS FULL-DRESS PROBE OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION—ARTICLE IN MAGAZINE CAUSES FUROR—HINES INVITES INVESTIGATION AT CLOSED VETERANS' COMMITTEE SESSION—RESOLUTIONS NOW SEEK RULES—ORGANIZATION HEADS ACT INDEPENDENTLY

At the invitation of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives has authorized an investigation of all Veterans Administration facilities, with a special reference to hospital treatment. A resolution, House Resolution 186, has been introduced by Chairman JOHN E. RANKIN, World War I veteran, of Mississippi, who heads the House veterans' group, and it has been referred to the Committee on Rules.

The action followed an executive session of the committee last Thursday at which there appeared not only Administrator of Veterans Affairs, Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, but also Assistant Administrator, Col. George E. Ijams, who has hospitalization directly in charge; Dr. Charles M. Griffith, medical director of the Administration; Edward E. Odom, solicitor for the agency and other members of the general's staff.

Although no subsequent statement has been made by the chairman of the committee, it is understood that individual members of the group will visit the nearly 100 facilities, probably during the congressional Easter recess, and, as the resolution of investigation indicates, there will also be called before the committee by subpena for sworn testimony many who have criticized the medical services rendered to veterans. It is understood, too, that the author of a scathing article which recently appeared in the Cosmopolitan magazine will be one of those witnesses.

PHILBIN ALSO HAS RESOLUTION

Another development was the introduction in the House of a resolution by Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, another World War I veteran, also referred to the Committee on Rules, calling for an investigation of "alleged intolerable conditions and other irregularities" in the treatment of patients in Government hospitals.

PHILBIN TALKS TO HOUSE

Representative PHILBIN's resolution calls for a congressional investigation of alleged intolerable conditions and other irregularities in treatment of veterans at Government hospitals.

He told the House that complaints indicate "a general unsatisfactory atmosphere which more closely resembles concentration camps than hospitals."

The situation, according to reports, is so serious that agencies in charge cannot correct it without congressional action, he said. He asserted that "a fearless investigation will enable Congress to act."

PHILBIN mentioned "harsh discipline, poor food, unreasonable restrictive regulations, inadequate treatment, and inconsiderate attitudes on the part of superiors" as conditions needing correction.

Some Congressmen are inclined to the thought that the Rankin committee action is designed to avert the inquiry proposed by PHILBIN, whose resolution calls for creation of a special group to investigate hospitalization of both veterans and present members of the armed services, the administration of loans, benefits, and dependency allotments, and the education and rehabilitation programs. Some of these activities are administered outside of the Veterans' Administration, although under its over-all control.

RANKIN said he saw "no need" for an independent inquiry in view of his committee's program, adding that General Hines "is doing a splendid job under difficult conditions."

Representative PHILBIN, however, said the Rankin inquiry "doesn't go far enough."

"What we need is an independent inquiry into all phases of veterans' and servicemen's affairs," PHILBIN said. "It should be handled by a committee with subpena powers and should go into programs being administered by the War and Navy Departments as well as the Veterans' Administration." The Rankin resolution calls for such powers.

The House Rules Committee is said to have promised Representative PHILBIN an early hearing on his resolution, which PHILBIN said is intended to "determine whether there is any basis for the general impression that the Veterans' Administration is moribund and ineffectual and that bureaucratic red tape is throttling the granting of relief, loans, and educational privileges."

Particularly he wants the proposed committee to inquire into charges that tubercular and psychiatric patients have been neglected, that hospitals are overcrowded and understaffed, and that the building expansion program is proceeding too slowly.

Allied with RANKIN in the move are Chairmen ANDREW J. MAY, of Kentucky, of the House Military Affairs Committee, and CARL VINSON, of Georgia, of the House Naval Affairs Committee, both of whom contend the Veterans' Administration is being operated satisfactorily under General Hines. The May committee is currently conducting its own inquiry into the operation of Army hospitals.

General Hines has issued no statement about the conflicting plans for investigation, but Representative RANKIN quoted him as having said "he would welcome the investigation."

[Associated Press News Report of March 24, 1945]

PLANS PROBE FOR VETERANS—HOUSE RULES UNIT SIDETRACKS FULL INQUIRY, HOWEVER

WASHINGTON, March 24.—The House Rules Committee today temporarily sidetracked a full-scale investigation of the treatment of war veterans but approved a check-up of the Veterans' Administration.

The committee action came after Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Veterans' Administrator, announced the agency would investigate itself and Representative PHILBIN, Democrat,

of Massachusetts, offered a resolution for a "sweeping, independent, complete and fearless" probe of veterans' affairs by a special committee.

Without an all-inclusive congressional investigation, PHILBIN said, Congress is in for "a national scandal that will shock the country to its roots." He made public letters from patients who said inmates are being tortured and beaten in veterans' hospitals.

DEMAND PUT ASIDE

But the Rules Committee, which guides the course of House legislation, put aside PHILBIN's demand and approved instead a resolution by Representative RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi, authorizing the House Veterans' Committee to investigate "the efficiency of the administration and operation of Veterans' Administration facilities."

PHILBIN called for the resolution "limited in scope" and said he will renew his demand for a thorough-going investigation when the subject reaches the House floor, possibly next week.

The Massachusetts Representative said a torrent of complaints from veterans and their families have come to him of mistreatment accorded patients in veterans' hospitals.

THINKS SMOKE MEANS FIRE

"It brings a clear indication that where there is so much smoke there must be some fire," he said.

General Hines, appearing before the Veterans' Committee voluntarily at RANKIN's invitation, said many attacks on the agency are based on "gross distortions of the facts, or misrepresentations." He said he has started one investigation and would welcome another by Congress.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 25, 1945]

VETERAN AFFAIRS INQUIRY VOTED BY COMMITTEE—INVESTIGATION OF HOSPITALS SIDETRACKED; JOB PROGRAM IS ANNOUNCED BY LEGION

(By Leo Cullinane)

WASHINGTON, March 24.—While the American Legion was announcing a program today for the fullest possible postwar employment of war veterans, the House Rules Committee sidetracked, temporarily, at least, a full-scale investigation of reports of intolerable conditions and irregularities in hospitals for war veterans. Instead, the committee reported favorably a far milder resolution which provided only for an investigation into the efficiency of Veterans' Administration facilities.

Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Democrat, of Massachusetts, author of the resolution calling for the more sweeping investigation, charged that his measure, which was sidetracked, was necessary.

"Our war heroes, wounded and disabled, are being treated by third-rate doctors, using outmoded methods and apparently not aware of the progress of their own medical profession," he said following today's committee action. He charged further that overcrowding exists in many veterans' installations and that some men have to wait months before they receive consideration. He said he had received many complaints of poor food being served.

"The Congress has intended that the supervisors and superintendents presiding over these hospitals shall accord our boys considerate and respectful attention, yet in many instances it is stated that our boys have been treated with insults, unreasonable restrictions, and harsh discipline, more resembling a concentration camp than a Government hospital," Mr. PHILBIN declared.

The House will take up on Monday the resolution which the committee reported out today. It was sponsored by Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the World War Veterans Legislation Committee.

Edward N. Scheiberling, national commander of the American Legion, in announcing the program for jobs for war veterans, said it was based on sound business efficiency and necessity and not on sentiment. He estimated that 55,000,000 postwar jobs must be provided.

He said a survey indicated that 40 percent of the postwar jobs must be found in the field of sales, service, and distribution.

[From the Washington News of March 26, 1945]

PHILBIN FIGHTS "WHITEWASH"

(By Ned Brooks)

The House was given the choice today of voting an independent inquiry into the handling of veterans' affairs or approving a restricted investigation by a committee whose chairman already has assumed the role of defender of the Veterans' Administration.

Chairman JOHN RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi, of the House Veterans' Committee, was lining up support for his resolution to have the inquiry conducted by his group. The Rankin measure would confine the investigation to matters under direct jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration.

Anti-Rankin forces were rallying behind a rival resolution of Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Democrat, of Massachusetts, proposing a broader inquiry by a special 11-member committee, including 5 members of the Veterans' Committee. The Philbin measure would permit an examination into hospitals and other servicemen's facilities operated by the Army, Navy, and other Government branches, as well as the Veterans' Administration.

Representative RANKIN won the first round Saturday when the House Rules Committee by a split vote, reportedly 4 to 3, gave his resolution right-of-way over Representative PHILBIN's. The House test will come, probably today, when the New Englander attempts to have his measure substituted on the floor.

* * * * *

The Rankin resolution was offered 12 days after Representative PHILBIN introduced his measure and criticized conditions in veterans' hospitals.

* * * * *

Urging the broader inquiry by an independent group, Representative PHILBIN said he had received scores of complaints from veterans and their families about hospital conditions and the administration of various benefit programs.

"If there are no irregularities to uncover, I can't see why anyone should object to a thorough and impartial investigation," he said.

The complaints reaching him, he said, indicated widespread "neglect, mistreatment, disregard, and disrespect for returning veterans."

[From the New York World-Telegram of March 26, 1945]

NO WHITEWASH IN VET PROBE

If the House follows the lead of its Rules Committee and ducks a broad inquiry into operation of the Veterans' Administration it will be taking on a heavy responsibility.

The Rules Committee, which is a sort of traffic manager, sidetracked the Philbin resolution for a wide investigation of the agency, and instead recommended the narrow and mild inquiry proposed by Representative RANKIN. Mr. PHILBIN says he wants to investigate reports that wounded veterans are "being treated by third-rate doctors, using outmoded methods." Mr. RANKIN would investigate the efficiency of the Veterans' Administration.

The kind of investigation Mr. RANKIN would conduct was tipped off when he announced, in advance, that "General Hines (Veterans' Administrator) is doing a splendid job under difficult conditions."

Moreover, Mr. RANKIN indicated before the House Rules Committee that he was more interested in investigating those who were criticizing the Veterans' Administration than he was in examining the Administration itself.

Well, if General Hines is doing such a splendid job, why head off a real inquiry? Fending off an investigation always raises the smoke that makes people suspect the presence of fire.

Congress owes it to the thousands of veterans whose affairs are being handled by the Veterans' Administration to let the country take a look at it, and the broader the look, the better.

If the House refuses to permit a real investigation then it must accept, together with the Veterans' Administration, responsibility for whatever conditions exist in hospitals operated by the agency. That might turn out to be a heavy load.

[From the Washington Star of March 28, 1945]

HOUSE GROUP PLANS THOROUGH STUDY OF VETERANS' TREATMENT

The House Veterans' Committee today planned a thorough investigation of the Veterans' Administration as the Journal of the American Medical Association charged that the medical care of ex-soldiers in Government hospitals was "especially poor" compared to that received by active troops in the armed forces.

Authority for the House inquiry came late yesterday. The House voted for a resolution by Chairman RANKIN, of the Veterans' Committee, directing an investigation "which will leave no stone unturned." Investigators will center their attention on hospital facilities.

URGES BROADER INQUIRY

Representative PHILBIN (Democrat, of Massachusetts) told the House the investigation proposed by Representative RANKIN was "too limited," and asked an inquiry by a special 11-man group into "shocking evidence of cruelty and neglect in veterans' hospitals." House rules, however, limited the debate to the Rankin resolution and made it impossible for the Massachusetts Member to put his suggestion into a formal motion.

The American Medical Association organ, quoted by the Associated Press in a dispatch from Chicago, suggested an investigation of veterans' facilities by a commission which would report directly to the President. It added:

"A continuous flow of charges comes from a variety of investigators, commentators, periodicals, and publications whose observations have led them to believe that medical care in the Veterans' Administration is on a standard far lower than that prevailing in ordinary practice in the United States. * * *

"The deteriorated service seems especially poor when contrasted with the high quality of medical care rendered to those in the armed forces. * * *

TIME RIPE FOR PROBE

"Perhaps the time is ripe for a really authoritative, independent investigation of the administration of medical service to veterans, made by a committee responsible directly to the Executive Office of the President."

The Journal reported that the charge has been made that the Chief Administrator of the Veterans' Administration has "little sympathy with a high quality of medical service," and commented:

"Although the Administrator has full authority and adequate funds to avail himself of the very highest quality of consultation

and part-time services of leading physicians, the utilization has been minimal."

[From the Washington Post of March 28, 1945]

PROBE OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION VOTED BY HOUSE

The House voted an investigation of the Veterans' Administration yesterday but efforts to obtain a full-scale probe into all veterans' affairs failed.

The House approved a resolution by Chairman RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi, of the Veterans' Committee authorizing that committeee to investigate the facilities of the Veterans' Administration.

Rankin promised an investigation "which will leave no stone unturned" but Representative PHILBIN, Democrat, of Massachusetts, declared the action "too limited" to uncover the true state of veterans' treatment.

"There is shocking evidence of cruelty and neglect in veterans' hospitals, including the Army and Navy," PHILBIN argued. "The evidence is voluminous and, if true, very distressing."

[From the Paris, France, edition of the New York Herald Tribune of March 27, 1945]

INVESTIGATION DEMANDED AT VETERANS' HOSPITALS

WASHINGTON, March 26.—Representative PHILIP PHILBIN, Democrat, Massachusetts, demanded on the House floor today that a full-scale investigation be started of veterans allegedly subjected to cruel treatment and neglect in Government hospitals.

Mr. PHILBIN claimed the Rankin resolution to investigate "intolerable conditions" was too limited and said he had stacks of letters from servicemen's families complaining of whippings, slappings, and other punishment which should be "tracked down."

[From the Boston Post of March 29, 1945]

PHILBIN HITS HOUSE LEADERS—SAYS THEY ARE OPPOSING SERVICE HOSPITALS PROBE

WASHINGTON, March 28.—Representative PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, today charged House leaders with opposing a full-scale investigation of conditions in service hospitals and treatment of veterans, and expressed hope that the Senate will take up the cudgel for returning servicemen.

PHILBIN, who yesterday attempted unsuccessfully to introduce a resolution putting teeth in the Rankin bill authorizing a House committee checkup of the Veterans Administration, said he was "sorry the House leadership did not see fit to approve a real investigation of veterans affairs."

The Massachusetts Congressman twice attempted to initiate legislation setting up a select committee to inspect army and navy hospitals and administration of veterans benefits under the GI bill of rights.

He said he was unable to propose strengthening amendments to the Rankin bill yesterday because of a parliamentary straitjacket, under which the presiding officer refused to recognize him.

"I don't intend to give up the fight to bring conditions in service hospitals out into the open," PHILBIN said. "Members of the Senate have indicated they may take the matter up and I sincerely hope they will do so."

[From the Boston Herald]

SHADY TACTICS

Congressional investigation of substantial complaints about the mistreatment of veterans in hospitals has become involved in an unmannerly personal controversy. Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, chairman of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, has allowed hatred and notorious prejudice to hamper the progress of the proposed inquiry. He has twice shifted the committee's emphasis from the investigation to the discrediting of critics of the Veterans' Administration.

The first occasion was when Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, turned over to the investigating committee several hundred letters of complaint. Remembering, perhaps, that Mr. PHILBIN had formerly introduced a wholesome resolution, asking for an inquiry into the care of veterans, Mr. RANKIN rebuked him outrageously for failure to investigate the cases personally. The accuracy of Congressman PHILBIN'S charges was a matter of secondary interest to Mr. RANKIN or none at all.

Next, Mr. RANKIN started a dispute with Albert Deutsch, a newspaperman who refused while testifying before the committee to disclose certain confidential sources of information. Under Mr. RANKIN'S urging, the committee voted 15–5 to cite Mr. Deutsch for contempt of Congress. Such action, as Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts, declared with typical vigor, definitely endangers freedom of the press. As a member of the committee, she opposed the contempt citation.

Congressman RANKIN played a creditable role in enacting the excellent legislation under which veterans are now being cared for, but he does not seem to understand that administration and laws are two different things. Certainly the existing statutes do not represent the final word on the subject. Whether the complaints about the Veterans' Administration are all well founded is not known. Probably some of them are specious. Others are certainly not. At least there is Nation-wide interest in the Nation's treatment of its veterans. Congressman PHILBIN, Mr. Deutsch, and others have made out a pretty strong prima facie case for a sweeping inquiry.

[From the New York Times of April 1, 1945]

THE VETERAN—HOUSE VETERANS' COMMITTEE DEFLECTS INQUIRY ON MEDICAL CARE OF SOLDIERS

(By Charles Hurd)

WASHINGTON, March 31.—There occurred here in the past week an example of the interplay of politics in the handling of veterans' affairs which might be comic if it were not so serious in its outlook for the 15,000,000 potential veterans of this war.

The example concerns the Veterans' Administration, the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and a little group headed by Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Massachusetts. Nothing has exemplified as well the stone wall against which butt the heads of those who try to obtain unbiased information about the handling of medical and neuropsychiatric cases among the veterans.

Mr. PHILBIN recently introduced a resolution for a bipartisan, independent, and factual investigation of the Veterans' Administration. Immediately afterward the House Veterans' Committee, of which JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, is chairman, held a private session with Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Veterans' Administrator. Mr. RANKIN thereupon commended General Hines and announced that if any investigation was to be made the standing committee would take care of it.

The House, which generally always backs its standing committees, defeated the Philbin resolution, and on Thursday Chairman RANKIN appointed each of the 21 members of his committee as a subcommittee of one to visit veterans' hospitals in the area surrounding his district and make a report.

DUAL ROLE FOR COMMITTEE

This means that the committee which fathered the Veterans' Administration, approved its actions, passed on its programs, and undoubtedly enjoyed considerable patronage from it now will presumably judge its works. The nature of its report is evident, unless veterans and the families of soldiers bring such pressure to bear, that the committee actually makes a genuine investigation.

The committee will learn nothing it does not already know from these expensive junkets to veterans' hospitals.

If it stops its investigation there, it will hear nothing about the conditions which competent observers have been describing to more receptive but less effectual groups for years. These conditions, incidentally, have prompted the Veterans' Administration to set up various advisory committees, but that has been thus far the end of recognition of them.

It is hoped, and there is yet time, that the House committee will consider seriously testimony of the type gathered in recent months by Senator CLAUDE PEPPER'S subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor.

This subcommittee cited specifically general criticisms of the Veterans' Administration in four categories made before it as follows:

1. Personnel classifications and salaries for physicians, nurses, and social workers are not sufficiently high to attract the best practitioners and workers.

2. Veterans' hospitals are often isolated geographically and medically. They are not commonly associated with teaching and research groups, as are the best hospitals, such as those at the Johns Hopkins, the Mayo Clinic, Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center, and other such centers.

3. Insufficient use has been made of consultation and other part-time services of outstanding physicians.

4. Relationships with medical and other community agencies have been insufficiently developed to the disadvantage of personnel and patients in the Veterans' Administration facilities.

LIMITATIONS SET BY LAWS

The report noted that the Veterans' Administration "is attempting to overcome conditions which have proved a handicap in its work." But this attempt is still within the limits of sharply limited laws.

For one thing—and this is important alike to medical cases and the neuropsychiatrics—there is a peculiar division in the law which actually encourages veterans to enter Veterans' Administration hospitals while denying to them, in numerous cases, the out-patient type of treatment that could be more helpful.

Any veteran with any disability, unable to pay for private treatment, may be admitted to a veteran's facility if there is room for him. But out-patient—for clinical assistance—is granted only to veterans with service-connected disabilities and for those service-connected disabilities alone. Thus a man who lost a leg in service could have the stump treated as an out-patient. But the same man, developing a stomach ulcer or a mental illness, could not have out-patient treatment for these ills, although he could legally be admitted as a resident patient into a Government hospital.

One of the boldest suggestions yet made is that to all veterans with service-connected disabilities there be granted full treatment privileges both as in-patients or out-patients at veterans' facilities while all nondisabled veterans get free care from community centers assisted by the Federal Government to the degree that they grant this care. This would, of course, cut Veterans' Administration operations to a fraction of their level under the laws as they now stand.

Specifically concerning the neuropsychiatric cases, Col. W. C. Menninger, director of the Army Medical Corps Division of Neuropsychiatry, testified that emotional disturbances will not be confined to men who receive medical discharges; that these men of sound mind and body will need guidance and help

in large numbers, at convenient places. And since they will not hold medical discharges, there will be no place for them to turn, lacking community facilities, short of the unthinkable procedure of applying for admission to institutions for the mentally unbalanced.

Then there is the testimony by Dr. George Stevenson, Medical Director of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene, who submitted a report based on a study made in New York among youths either rejected for military service or discharged for neuropsychiatric reasons.

This report showed that 80 percent of the men studied need some sort of sympathetic help, but that only 20 percent recognized the need and, finally, that only 5 percent were getting proper attention. The only answer to this situation was said to be a maximum effort combining the resources of the Federal agencies, the States and communities, and not restricted by Federal law to Veterans' Administration operations alone.

"The veterans' facilities," Dr. Stevenson testified, "have further been handicapped by their isolation. In this they have followed the prevailing pattern of State mental service. They are distant from the communities from which their patients come and they are distant from the authority under which they operate and they are distant from the scientific stimulation of medical centers and research centers that are necessary for the best service.

"They have not been outstanding for their contributions to research or psychiatric education. Their out-patient facilities have really been useful only to those living nearby for any continuous treatment, and then only to service-connected cases. * * * We are more and more conscious of a sharp division between veteran and nonveteran—a division that is not at all helpful to his integration into the community. * * * The separate facility means that frequently the man and the rest of his family are dealt with separately, whereas it would be to his advantage to have his picture seen as a whole."

Now, when members of the House Veterans' Committee go to the hospitals, they will see clean institutions in which probably the principal surface complaint is that youthful veterans of this war are thrown into the depressing association of older men, veterans of the last war.

They will not see these other questions, although not as dramatic in the description as battle news, may be far more important in the long run, if the veteran is to get the break he deserves.

The veterans, the soldier, and their families should realize that while many committees in Congress study various problems and proposals concerning veterans, this House Veterans' Committee which has just headed off the most recent attempt to investigate the conduct of veterans' affairs by an independent committee also holds normally the power to put through any legislation for veterans it endorses or to kill that which it dislikes.

[From Stars and Stripes of April 5, 1945]

HOUSE VOTES VA INVESTIGATION AS NEW CHARGES OF NEGLECT ARE FILED—HOUSE VETERANS' COMMITTEE WILL LOOK INTO COMPLAINTS—"NO WHITEWASH" PROMISED—ALL PHASES OF ADMINISTRATION TO BE EXPLORED—MEDICAL ASSOCIATION ENTERS FIELD; HARPER'S TO PUBLISH NEW ATTACKS BY VETERAN

The House of Representatives on March 27 passed House Resolution 192, authorizing its Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to investigate charges of intolerable conditions in hospitals under the control of the Veterans' Administration. As the action was taken, new complaints over treatment of veterans came from the American Medical Association and new charges of abuse were made by a World War II veteran in an article prepared for publication by Harper's magazine. Passage came on a roll call vote after Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, World War I veteran, of Massachusetts, had urged the chamber to vote it down.

PHILBIN had pending a separate resolution seeking to investigate not only Veterans' Administration facilities and installations and treatment of persons hospitalized by the armed services, but also the administration of other laws enacted for the benefit of veterans of World War II. He asserted that Army and Navy hospitals also have been accused of mistreating disabled and wounded veterans, and should be included in the inquiry.

The House Committee on Rules, on March 24, had considered both the Philbin resolution and the one adopted by the House which was sponsored by Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, World War I veteran, of Mississippi, who is also chairman of the House Veterans' Committee.

The resolution reached the floor on Monday, March 26, but had to go over a day under the rules before being considered. PHILBIN had threatened to amend the resolution on the floor of the House in order to enlarge the scope of the investigation, but the Speaker pro tempore ruled that amendments could be offered only if Representative ROGER C. SLAUGHTER, of Missouri, who was in charge of the rule, would yield for that purpose. This, Congressman SLAUGHTER refused to do.

TO BE "NO WHITEWASH"

"A limited, cursory investigation will not suffice," Representative PHILBIN said. "This resolution is all right as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough." He added that an investigation should be made of the entire rehabilitation program, not just that part administered by the Veterans' Administration.

"There is shocking evidence of cruelty and neglect in veterans' hospitals, including the Army and Navy," PHILBIN argued. "The evidence is voluminous and, if true, very distressing.

"We can't afford to have the impression go out that the House opposes a full and fearless investigation." PHILBIN asserted "The Senate will do it if the House doesn't."

Support for the Philbin resolution collapsed after RANKIN had read telegrams from Francis M. Sullivan, director of legislation for the American Legion, and Omar B. Ketchum, national legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, urging that the inquiry be conducted by the Rankin committee.

WILL COVER ALL FEATURES

Although debate on the resolution was comparatively brief, charges and countercharges were hurled about the House Chamber. In addition to colloquies between PHILBIN and RANKIN, and expressions of approval on the part of numerous Members of the House for an inquiry by the standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Representative MARION T. BENNETT, of Missouri, and a member of the committee, urged a "sweeping investigation" because "one is long overdue." He also introduced into the record a letter from a constituent complaining about a Missouri veterans' facility and cited an instance of "red tape" which delayed adjudication of an insurance claim for many weeks.

RANKIN, in a by-and-large statement, praised generally the Veterans' Administration set-up, said that many complaints of all descriptions had been received, some of them from mental cases, but assured the committee that the investigation would cover all features of the administration.

New complaints and developments came from other sources last week.

CHARGES FROM MEDICAL GROUP

Contending that medical care for veterans appears "especially poor" compared with that in the armed forces, the Journal of the American Medical Association published in Chicago, suggested an independent investigation of the subject by a committee reporting directly to President Roosevelt.

"A continuous flow of charges comes from a variety of investigators, commentators, periodicals, and publications whose observations have led them to believe that medical care in the Veterans' Administration is on a standard far lower than that prevailing in ordinary practice in the United States," an editorial asserted.

"Perhaps the time is ripe for a really authoritative, independent investigation of the administration of medical service to veterans, made by a committee responsible directly to the Executive Office of the President."

The editorial stated that the charge had been made that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs had "little sympathy with a high quality of medical service."

"Although the Administrator has full authority and adequate funds to avail himself of the very highest quality of consultation and part-time service of leading physicians, the utilization has been minimal," was the contention.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 25, 1945]

UNDISCHARGED RESPONSIBILITY

Despite its mighty struggle to produce the much-heralded GI bill of rights, Congress has not discharged even its initial responsibility toward veterans. The American Legion is now preparing and will shortly urge upon Congress amendments to that bill. The amendments are required to cut red tape and relax structures holding up benefits for the 1,500,000 men already discharged. Criticisms of veterans' medical care from the American Veterans Committee, representing the young men of this war, and from the Disabled American Veterans are not to be lightly hushed. Congress cannot afford to wait—must not wait—for valid criticisms to be multiplied as more general demobilization multiplies the problems.

A veteran wishing to understand his rights and the provisions a well-intentioned government has made for him can try to read through a 750-page book of disjointed law. Congress will not be able to discharge its responsibility to him simply by adding more pages to that book. Nor will more bureaus, and coordinating committees and information centers to interpret it be very helpful. What is required is doubtless a prompt and comprehensive Senate-House investigation, such as Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN has urged, to recommend reorganized and simplified machinery for handling veterans' affairs.

We cannot see how anything less than a full-dress survey can correct old mistakes or indicate how to avoid still more disastrous future ones. Congress has made a new mistake in that the GI bill promises, or seems to promise, more than can be delivered. The American Legion finds that the bill imposes too rigid limitations on loans and that the Veterans' Administration is ultra-conservative in interpreting it. Consequently, very few loans have been completed. Similar limitations prevent many GI's from taking advantage of large promises in regard to education. On the medical side, members of Representative JOHN E. RANKIN'S veterans committee, now miraculously transformed into an investigating body to weigh its own baby, the Veterans' Administration, has, to be sure, found no shocking mistreatment in VA facilities. But neither has it suggested means to remedy the professional isolation of those hospitals or the dearth of outpatient care; to provide sufficient inducement to professional and other personnel; to correct defects in the pension system which cause men to quit hospitals before they are cured; nor to correct defects in the

compensation system which, in effect, pays men to stay sick.

We have already noted that actual medical treatment should probably be separated from the overburdened Veterans' Administration. That kind of remedy is not to be secured by a desultory attack on the problem. In fine, we do not see how Congress can streamline the critically important handling of veterans' affairs by one-sided investigations and piecemeal legislation.

[From the Worcester Gazette of May 2, 1945]

VETERANS DIFFER IN HOSPITAL VIEW—SOME COMPLAIN OF LACK OF COMPETENT SERVICE AND EVEN OF CRUELTY; OTHERS LAUD TREATMENT GIVEN

(By Frank Carey)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—Both "brickbats" and "bouquets" have been tossed at the Veterans' Administration about treatment afforded patients in its 94 hospitals. VA says it has received letters of both types ever since it was set up.

The American Legion says it also has received both kinds of letters about VA hospitals. It says prior to the time of current investigations of the hospitals the complimentary ones outweighed the others four to one.

The Legion says any communications regarding the present status of the hospitals—complimentary or uncomplimentary—will be held without comment until the investigations are complete.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars says its experience prior to the present investigations was the gripes outweighed the commendations.

VA has an open file of the complimentary letters. Complaint letters are filed away in the individual files of the men who made the complaints, and officials said they could not permit me to thumb through these personal files in search of complaints because "it is against Administration regulations based on law." (However, they said, if I happened to know that a particular man had made a complaint, they could extract this complaint from his file and show it to me.)

COMPLAINTS ARE CITED

But a number of "brickbats" against VA were read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Representative PHILBIN (Democrat, of Massachusetts), who declared the letters he read were only a few of many he had received.

Here are extracts from some of those he read, and here also are some of the complimentary ones from VA's open file.

PHILBIN said a letter from Missouri stated, "I am a permanent and disabled veteran and have been to the veterans' hospital for treatment and examinations, and all I ever got was a push in the face."

In the VA file is this statement concerning the hospital at Portland, Oreg.:

"I received nothing but the most courteous and willing service." (PHILBIN did not name patients or hospitals, so it is impossible to match complaints with compliments.)

WOULD FIGHT BACK

PHILBIN quoted a veteran speaking of a hospital in the Middle West:

"I would personally much rather be on Iwo Jima Island with our Marines than be in a veterans' hospital under the same experience I have had. I could certainly fight back there, but here you cannot."

From the VA file concerning the facility at Fayetteville, N. C.:

"Its personnel treats the boys as if they were members of their own families."

PHILBIN quoted a Kentucky woman, speaking of her husband, hospitalized in a midwestern veterans' hospital:

"They finally were about to operate for a hernia when out of a clear sky they told him they couldn't operate, that his heart was in such bad condition he would die on the table. We later consulted a heart specialist and were assured his heart was perfect. * * *"

From VA's file: A patient discharged from the tubercular hospital at Rutland Heights, Mass., wrote he had received satisfactory treatment. He added some patients grumbled because "they were not allowed to go to a saloon across the road."

PHILBIN quoted a letter concerning a hospital in California:

"The administration is considerably overstaffed, but even so a veteran cools his heels there for days, weeks, and sometimes months before he can get action on his case."

An excerpt from a letter received by VA from a clergyman after his brother had died at Palo Alto, Calif., facility:

"Were we members of a millionaire's family, money and medical science could not have done more for him."

PHILBIN said he had received this complaint concerning alleged conditions in a veterans' hospital in Colorado:

CRUELTY CHARGED

"An attendant sat on an 86-pound patient and twisted his leg until it broke."

From VA's file, a letter from a Miami, Fla., man:

"Medical care, food, and comfort could not be improved upon. Whenever I made application for hospital treatment, I was given a pullman" (to travel to the hospital).

Following the publication of recent magazine articles (Cosmopolitan and Readers' Digest) which charged "third rate" medicine was being practiced in some veterans' hospitals, VA received many letters. There were about 60 uncomplimentary ones in the files I saw. The file of complimentary ones was about twice as large.

In all the uncomplimentary ones—including a letter that advised Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, the VA Administrator, to "take the lead out of your pants"—I found only one that purported to have direct evidence of improper conditions in the hospitals.

SLAPS AT DOCTORS

This was from a man who wrote concerning the VA facility at Bay Pines, Fla.: (His letter had not yet been placed in his personal file).

"I waited for 8 weeks for treatment * * * and they did not diagnose (cq) my case but made me work on the grounds. Some of the incompetent doctors do not know or do not want to know the difference between arthritis, cyst, and bone tumor. They name it anything to keep away from service-connected disabilities."

From VA's file of "complimentary" letters concerning the same hospital, an excerpt from a letter written by a visitor: "I talked to several of the patients * * * the courtesy and treatment accorded the patients is of the highest order."

[From the New York Times of May 20, 1945]

THE VETERAN—HOUSE GROUP NEARLY SHOWS ITS INABILITY TO ACT ON VETERANS' COMPLAINTS

(By Charles Hurd)

WASHINGTON, May 19.—The House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, headed by Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, came very close in the past week to demonstrating a tragic inability to act as an impartial agency in investigating complaints about the operation of facilities for the care of veterans.

Having embarked on such a presumable investigation after weeks of mounting demand for it, the committee first administered a verbal drubbing to Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, a nonmember, who demanded the study, and then cited for contempt of the Congress a reporter who appeared as a witness after spending weeks in studying and writing about conditions in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Chairman RANKIN took Mr. PHILBIN to task for presenting several hundred letters of complaint without first investigating personally each one of them. The committee then began potential criminal proceedings against Albert Deutsch, a reporter for the newspaper PM, because he declined to divulge confidential sources of information.

QUESTION OF PUBLIC INTEREST

This column is not concerned with any intramural fight between Members of the House. Neither is it treating in this instance the question of the freedom of the press.

But a public interest is at stake, larger than the welfare of veterans themselves, but intimately connected with this welfare, in the history of the past few weeks written by the House committee which is supposed to be the preeminent sponsor and defender of the rights of veterans.

The committees of the House and of the Senate are supposed to be the eyes and ears of the Congress in studying all conditions affecting the public welfare. Some committees, including this one, enjoy such prestige that the House invariably follows their recommendations in legislative affairs. Countless investigations have been conducted by congressional committees based on much less testimony than has been gathered by unbiased sources about the alleged careless treatment of veterans.

In this instance a full and impartial investigation would be justified by the flimsiest rumors, if for no other reason than to prove their falsity.

Instead, the House Veterans' Committee has followed a policy for several weeks of using the most adroit parliamentary maneuvers to avoid involving itself in any form of investigation of procedures built on legislation which it sponsored in the first place.

Mr. Deutsch is not the only writer who has described alleged deficiencies in the treatment of veterans in hospitals operated by the Veterans' Administration. Other newspaper and magazine writers have pointed up the same conditions, quoting responsible authorities.

FINDINGS OF PEPPER'S GROUP

If the House committee wants official basis for its studies, it need only request from the other end of the Capitol a report prepared by Senator CLAUDE PEPPER'S subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor which cited criticisms of deficiency in personnel, technique, and treatment in the veterans' hospitals as serious as any similar charges that have been made.

This subcommittee cited specifically general criticisms of the Veterans' Administration in four categories made before it as follows:

1. Personnel classifications and salaries for physicians, nurses, and social workers are not sufficiently high to attract the best practitioners and workers.

2. Veterans' hospitals are often isolated geographically and medically. They are not commonly associated with teaching and research groups such as Johns Hopkins, the Mayo Clinic, and Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center.

3. Insufficient use has been made of consultation and other part-time services of outstanding physicians.

4. Relationships with medical and other community agencies have been insufficiently developed to the disadvantage of personnel and patients in the Veterans' Administration facilities.

EFFECTS OF QUIRKS IN LAW

The report noted that the Veterans' Administration "is attempting to overcome conditions which have proved a handicap in its work." But this attempt is still within the confines of sharply limited laws.

For one thing—and this is important alike to medical cases and the neuropsychiatrics—there is a peculiar division in the law which

actually encourages veterans to enter Veterans' Administration hospitals while denying to them, in numerous instances, the outpatient type of treatment that could be more helpful.

Any veteran with any disability unable to pay for private treatment may be admitted to a veterans' facility if there is room for him. But out-patient, or clinical assistance, is granted only to veterans with service-connected disabilities and for those service-connected disabilities alone. Thus a man who lost a leg in service could have the stump treated as an out-patient. But the same man, developing a stomach ulcer or a mental illness, could not have out-patient treatment for these ills, although he could legally be admitted as a resident patient into a Government hospital.

RANKIN'S PROCEDURE REVIEWED

What course has Chairman RANKIN pursued?

First of all, in the last week in March he used his prestige on the House floor to kill a resolution by Representative PHILBIN that would have provided for an impartial, complete investigation of charges against the Veterans' Administration by an independent select committee of the House. In the same week he had Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, before a closed session of his committee and immediately afterward complimented General Hines for the manner in which veterans' facilities are operated.

Mr. RANKIN then announced that each member of his committee would act as a committee of one to visit veterans' facilities in or adjacent to the Member's congressional district, despite the fact that such visits would be only useless junkets as far as exploration of scientific procedures used by the hospitals is concerned.

About 2 weeks ago the House committee announced that it soon would open investigations, but then changed the emphasis from investigating conditions to the unprecedented action taken this week in opening its study by attempting to discredit those persons who have presumed to ask for an impartial study.

It may be that the House committee and its chairman have access to information contradicting all of the charges that have been laid before it, but the manner in which it has operated thus far can have no result other than to make veterans and their families fear that in the eyes of the committee the conduct of veterans' affairs is secondary to protection of the committee's patronage and prerogatives.

[From Stars and Stripes of May 24, 1945]

REFUSAL BY WITNESS TO GIVE NAMES BRINGS CONTEMPT CITATION IN HOUSE—DEUTSCH, WRITER FOR NEWSPAPER PM, DECLINES TO FURNISH NAMES OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION EMPLOYEES WHO GAVE HIM INFORMATION FOR ARTICLES CRITICIZING TREATMENT OF VETS—REPRESENTATIVE PHILBIN ALSO QUESTIONED BY HOUSE VETERANS' COMMITTEE

The House World War Veterans Committee, headed by World War I veteran JOHN M. RANKIN, last Friday cited Albert Deutsch, reporter for the New York newspaper PM, for contempt of Congress in refusing to give the names of Veterans' Administration officials who had furnished him with information upon which he based certain articles which appeared earlier this year in his newspaper, charging that veterans receive inadequate care and treatment in veterans' hospitals. In refusing the names Deutsch declared that his information was obtained in strictest confidence and that he was bound by professional ethics and personal integrity not to reveal the names of the individuals who had informed him of conditions.

TRUMAN ADVOCATES CHANGE

Earlier in the week, President Truman, at a press conference, declared that the Veterans' Administration must be modernized and made it clear that he intends to reorganize and expand it and make certain personnel changes.

The action citing Deutsch for contempt came at the close of a 2½-hour session. Committee members said the vote was 13 to 5, although Chairman RANKIN refused to confirm the vote because it was taken in executive session.

Immediately after the action of the committee, John P. Lewis, PM managing editor, issued a statement condemning the action as an application of Mississippi lynch law to the American press.

Deutsch's refusal came after a series of questions designed to bring out his background and training and the admission by him that he had conferred with approximately 100 employees of the Veterans' Administration in the preparation of his articles. He explained his willingness to give most of the names but declared that there were about five whose names he could not and would not disclose.

PHILEIN FIRST WITNESS

The first witness to appear before the House committee when the hearings began last Tuesday was Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, himself a veteran of World War I, who had introduced a resolution on the floor of the House in March calling for an investigation of hospital care for veterans in the Veterans' Administration facilities and the Army and Navy hospitals, laying particular stress on the inadequacy of the treatment given by the Veterans' Administration.

Prior to his examination by the committee counsel, Joseph McQueen, past national commander of the DAV, and by members of the veterans' group, Representative PHILBIN read from a long prepared statement in which he suggested that needed reforms be instituted by the Veterans' Administration at the earliest possible moment. He alleged that there was a steady and sure deterioration of the machinery set up to care for veterans, and, recognizing that some details of the proposed inquiry were beyond the scope of the investigating committee, he stated that there was much of failure, neglect, omission, and inadequacy in the veterans' agency.

The Congressman paid high tribute to the Administrator, Gen. Frank T. Hines, and expressed the hope that he would be given every opportunity to effect remedies, but charged that, whether intentional or not, veterans are not receiving benefits to which they are entitled under the laws and that this is a problem for the Congress to attend to. PHILBIN also spoke of the other agencies involved in servicemen's care and traced the handling of the disabled from the battlefield to the Administration charged with caring for them after release from service. After submitting to many interruptions, the Congressman was permitted to complete his statement in which an eight-point program was suggested.

ASKED FOR INVESTIGATION

PHILEIN asked for hearings at Veterans' Administration facilities from which complaints emanate, with full protection against reprisals; an inquiry into the lag in construction of new facilities which he charged was partially responsible for overcrowding; institution of measures to improve medical service, including additional physicians, nurses, attendants, and more modern equipment and practices, with higher salaries and addition of Army personnel, if necessary; a coordination of hospital and convalescent centers so that veterans can be nearer their homes, a factor in promoting recovery; a close study of the proposition to place hospitals and other conveniences in small communities; expansion of vocational training and guidance to accelerate readjustment; and inclusion of additional clinical means of providing for every possible medical need.

In his initial appearance, the Congressman turned over to the committee his huge file of correspondence as a basis for investigation, and was pinned down to state facts of mistreatment, lack of care or neglect. "We want this from your own knowledge, not hearsay," said Chairman RANKIN. General charges of administrative jams in the Veterans' Administration which are delaying adjudication of pension and insurance claims were, he said, inexcusable and resulted in hardship to applying veterans. "This," said the Congressman, "is due to red tape and inexplicable delay to the disadvantage of veterans, is indefensible, and can no longer be tolerated. The long delay in settling appeals is also inexcusable."

Representative PHILBIN on Wednesday told the House Veterans' Committee he would hesitate to criticize a veterans' hospital for fear of reprisal, if he were a patient there.

In answer to questioning from Representative ROGERS of Massachusetts, PHILBIN said nearly all of the 800 letters of protest he has received from veterans echo this fear of reprisal.

* * * * *

PHILBIN said veteran employees are so behind in their work that at his last count 88,000 claims were pending.

The Thursday session started quietly, with continued questioning of PHILBIN, this time in connection with an article which appeared recently in Cosmopolitan magazine dealing with the care of hospitalized veterans. PHILBIN stated he had no connection with the magazine, but admitted that he had distributed about 500 copies of the issue containing the article to Members of Congress. He said he had received the copies from a personal friend in New York. When he declined to give the name of the friend, who, he said, had no connection with the magazine, there was a flurry of excitement in the committee room as Chairman RANKIN insisted that the name be placed in the record on the ground that there could be no thorough investigation of the charges that had been made if the committee did not know the source of such charges or those interested in making them.

CHALLENGES COMMITTEE

PHILBIN challenged the right of the committee to question him on statements he had made on the floor of the House, but on the insistence of the chairman he admitted that the friend who had sent him the material was Joseph Smith.

Congressman WILLIAM J. GREEN, of Pennsylvania, a member of the committee, objected to the type of questioning, declaring "that we seem to be investigating Mr. PHILBIN rather than his charges." The chairman ruled, however, that the line of questioning was in order, and called for an executive session, when Representative LEO F. RAYFIEL, of New York, another member of the committee, asked the committee to overrule Representative RANKIN'S ruling. After an hour's debate behind closed doors the meeting was again opened, with the information that Representative RAYFIEL'S request had been withdrawn and the committee had decided to give Representative PHILBIN the courtesy of testifying in executive session, reserving the right to put his testimony on record "if considered necessary to the investigation."

COMMITTEE COMMENDS PHILBIN

At the conclusion of Thursday's session, BERNARD W. (PAT) KEARNEY, past commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and a member of the committee, from New York, declared that he felt the committee should commend Representative PHILBIN for his sincerity and cooperation in appearing before the group. The suggestion was assented to by the committee.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of May 16, 1945]

TRUMAN TO LOOK INTO VETS' AFFAIRS—PROMISES REVAMPING OF ADMINISTRATION

President Truman yesterday told a press conference the Veterans' Administration must be modernized, as the House Veterans' Committee opened a probe into numerous charges of misconduct and inefficiency in veterans' hospitals.

Truman made it clear he intends to revamp and expand the Veterans' Administration and will make personnel changes.

Fireworks exploded at the House hearing as committee members repeatedly rebuked Representative PHILBIN, Democrat, of Massachusetts, for bringing charges against veterans' hospitals based on hearsay, not facts.

"We don't need any lectures on our duties or aims," Chairman RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi, told PHILBIN. "What we want you to do is get down to the charges you made on the floor of the House."

PHILBIN said his charges were based on letters.

"Letters," RANKIN cried explosively. "We get them by the hundreds. Most of those charges you identified were brought by mental patients. Don't go on the floor of the House and quote irresponsible individuals. It disturbs parents at home."

PHILBIN retorted with: "It is your duty to go out and investigate these charges, not mine." He agreed to give the committee letters he has received attacking the Veterans' Administration and its treatment of ex-servicemen.

[From Stars and Stripes, Germany edition, June 11, 1945]

BRADLEY HAILED AS IDEAL CHIEF OF VETS AFFAIRS

(By Phil Bucknell)

NEW YORK, June 10.—The appointment of Gen. Omar N. Bradley as head of the Veterans' Administration has been received with approval by the American press, which has in turn shown sympathy with the President's references to the retiring Administrator, Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines.

Discussing the switch, Truman told reporters that as a veteran of the last war, he would not have liked to have had a Spanish-American War veteran conducting the affairs of veterans of World War I.

Typical of the press reaction is an editorial in the New York Times which calls Bradley's appointment a "stroke of inspiration which we believe everyone will applaud." The Times adds that the public will have as its agent one of the ablest generals of the Army, and that the "veteran will feel that truly he has a friend in court."

SCORES "TEN-STRIKE"

The World Telegram says the President has made a "ten-strike," and with a side reference to Bradley, as well as Truman, being a Missouri man, it adds: "We are growing to believe that Missourians are pretty good folks to depend on when action is wanted."

Several papers refer to the present congressional inquiry into the affairs of the Veterans' Administration, saying that the appointment will not hinder its course. Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN (Democrat of Massachusetts), whose report on complaints from the veterans' hospitals led directly to the House investigation, said that Bradley should "move at once to effect a revision of the whole (veterans') rehabilitation program from top to bottom."

The New York Journal-American head line on the story reflects what many people think: "Tough vet job faces Bradley."

[From the Washington News of June 12, 1945]

VETS GET "COUNTY HOSPITAL" CARE

The American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars today demanded immediate and drastic reforms in the Veterans' Administration to avert an imminent break-down of veterans' hospitalization.

In separate reports to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee the two major veterans' organizations presented exhaustive documentary evidence of the steadily increasing handicaps under which veterans' hospitals have been operating.

It appeared that Gen. Omar N. Bradley, soon to become veterans' administrator, will have a front job just as difficult in its way as his battle assignment in Europe.

HOSPITALS CITED

"Hospital treatment and care should be at the same high level as that in the famous Mayo Clinic and Johns Hopkins Hospital," the Legion said. The VFW agreed and said 47 percent of the veterans' hospitals now give inadequate treatment.

Actually, the reports of both groups revealed, standards in veterans' hospitals can be compared favorably only with those in State, county, and municipal institutions in the same areas. A VFW investigator in Montana observed "that's nothing to brag about."

DEFICIENCIES FOUND

In individual reports on veterans' hospitals from coast to coast the Legion and VFW found service being impaired almost universally by overcrowding, staff shortages, low salaries, and red tape. These conditions were hindering claims and legal services as well as medical care.

They found, in addition, a wide range of complaints—from the type of pajamas issued to patients to building sanitation. "Disgraceful," "terrible," "deplorable" were frequent adjectives.

The Legion, on the basis of its investigation of 80 of the 97 veterans' hospitals, proposed a 10-point reorganization plan which would establish a new post of Deputy Administrator. Also proposed was a realinement of authority under six Assistant Administrators, instead of the three now functioning.

MEDICAL CHIEF URGED

The Legion called for a complete overhauling of the medical division under an outstanding medical man with the title of, or status equal to, assistant administrator. The other administrators would handle insurance; finance, loan guaranties, readjustment allowances; vocational training, rehabilitation, and education; adjudication of compensation, pension, and retirement claims; construction, supplies, and contracts.

INDEPENDENT SURVEYS

The reports of both veterans' organizations were based on independent surveys of hospitals throughout the country. The investigations were made at the suggestion of Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, whose resignation as Administrator was accepted by President Truman last week.

Another organization, the Disabled American Veterans, made a similar study. Its report was submitted to Hines a few days ago. No major criticisms were noted and no specific information was furnished.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations of both the Legion and VFW followed the same lines:

1. Expanded bed capacity for immediate and future needs and provisions for women patients which were now said to be highly inadequate. Total hospital capacity at present is 93,000 and is to be expanded to 123,000 by December 1947.

2. Higher wage scales, especially in the lower brackets.

3. More authority for hospital authorities to procure doctors, nurses, and other personnel; more authority for procuring supplies and equipment.

4. Provisions for developing research, for staff to attend medical meetings to broaden their knowledge of all kinds of problems.

5. Expansion and development of rehabilitation and recreation programs, especially for World War II men.

6. More intelligent segregation of veterans with different ailments and different problems to provide the atmosphere most conducive to recovery.

7. Larger and better canteens.

8. Relieve doctors of the administrative work that keeps them from patients.

9. Better counseling service to handle veterans' compensation claims and other personal problems to prevent their leaving hospitals against medical advice.

10. Better personnel training programs.

11. Swift and unprejudiced handling of complaints.

12. Replacement of Army personnel with civilians or putting Army personnel on civilian status.

[From the Worcester Gazette of March 1, 1946]

COMMITTEE FINDS VETS MISTREATED—HOUSE GROUP SUPPORTS PHILBIN'S CHARGES AGAINST SOME HOSPITALS—PROPOSES BETTERMENTS

WASHINGTON, March 1.—A House veterans' subcommittee today reported it had found "some cases of beatings and mistreatment of patients in certain Veterans' Administration hospitals." The finding was one of a series in the report, based on an investigation that started early last year following charges by Representative PHILBIN, Democrat, of Massachusetts, of "inefficiency and callous treatment" of veterans.

The committee made 22 recommendations, including one that the Veterans' Administration undertake "continuous undercover investigation of all neuropsychiatric hospitals."

The committee said its investigation showed "an attitude of complacency and inflexibility" on the part of some administrative heads, but it found also "many loyal and hard-working staff members who were doing all in their power to cope with an increasingly grave emergency, exerting every effort to meet the needs of the sick and disabled."

POINTS TO FAULTS

The assignment of conscientious objectors and Negro troops by the Army to certain Veterans' Administration hospitals has caused some mistreatment and maltreatment of patients.

"There has been maladministration of some hospitals operated by the Veterans' Administration.

"The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs could not discharge incompetent professional medical personnel without preferring charges against the individual and then sustaining these charges in a complicated time-consuming procedure. On account of this, the Administration has followed the practice of merely transferring incompetent employees from one station to another, which causes the patients to suffer."

The committee said it believed recent legislation giving the Veterans' Administrator more authority in hiring and firing medical personnel and establishing a department of medicine and surgery would improve care and treatment of veterans.

WOULD BANISH TITLES

"The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs eliminate immediately the use of military titles and uniforms of a military character, when personnel is no longer in the military service, in all hospitals, homes and stations throughout the Veterans' Administration.

"An independent board of review should be established to hear the complaints concerning the operation of hospitals and the treatment accorded veterans, and such board should report to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

"A regional office of the Veterans' Administration, as well as a veterans' hospital, should immediately be established in Alaska for the benefit of veterans living in that Territory."

[From Stars and Stripes of March 7, 1946]

HOSPITAL INQUIRY REPORT RELEASED—"SOME CASES OF MISTREATMENT" ARE ADMITTED—RECOMMENDATIONS MOSTLY EFFECTIVE NOW

The long-heralded report of the House of Representatives committee named last year to investigate abuses in veterans' hospitals revealed last Saturday that it had uncovered some cases of beatings and mistreatment in certain veterans' hospitals.

It did not say when or where the beatings took place. But the fact its investigation was completed last September indicated they occurred before Gen. Omar N. Bradley succeeded Brig. Gen. Frank Hines as Veterans' Administrator last fall.

As expected, the report was, to all intents and purposes, a complete whitewash due largely to the Hines withdrawal from the scene.

Representative JOHN GIBSON, of Georgia, headed the five-man investigating subcommittee, which began its inquiry early last year, after some newspapers and magazines had cited instances of brutality in veterans' hospitals and stormy hearings began before the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

WERE SOME "DEFICIENCIES"

Although the investigation revealed "a number of deficiencies," the report said, "some of the criticism of the Veterans' Administration were found to be unsubstantiated."

The report made 22 specific recommendations. Among its major recommendations were that:

Veterans' Administrator Omar N. Bradley be given the authority to fire and hire medical personnel without regard to the civil-service qualifications. (The report points out that Bradley already has been given that authority.)

Military titles and uniforms be barred in veterans' hospitals. (Already done in part.)

Medical internships and residences be established in veterans' hospitals and that medical personnel be relieved of routine "paper work."

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

The public relations department of the Veterans' Administration be expanded and that the veterans' agency itself keep the committee and the public informed on its activities. (There is a huge expansion now in operation.)

The agency train its own psychiatrists and provide out-patient treatment for veterans with minor mental disorders.

An independent board of review be established to hear complaints about the treatment accorded patients in the hospitals.

That hospitals install the most modern medical equipment for the care and treatment of neuropsychiatric and tubercular patients.

The Veterans' Administration should conduct a vigorous research program to improve the manufacture and use of artificial limbs.

Joseph W. McQueen, Kansas City lawyer and former national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, was committee counsel.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 20, 1946]

BEATINGS IN VETS' HOSPITALS CHARGED IN MINORITY REPORT

WASHINGTON, March 20.—Seven members of the House Veterans' Committee filed a minority report today saying there has been "cases of beatings and mistreatment of patients" in veterans' hospitals.

The minority listed veterans' hospitals at Northport, L. I.; Lyons, N. J., and Chillicothe, Ohio, in its disagreement with the committee's report on treatment of veterans, which was adopted by a 9 to 7 vote yesterday, with three members absent.

In general, the minority agreed with the majority, but there were other exceptions in addition to the findings on the three hospitals. The majority report only told of "some abuses" at them.

UNIFORMED HELP OPPOSED

Both reports opposed use of uniformed military personnel in veterans' hospitals and blamed many faults complained of on wartime conditions and the increased work load of the Veterans' Administration.

Signed by Representatives JAMES DOMENGEAUX, Democrat, of Louisiana; WILLIAM G. STIGLER, Democrat, of Oklahoma; TOM PICKETT, Democrat, of Texas, LEO F. RAYFIEL, Democrat, of New York; WALTER B. HUBER, Democrat, of Ohio; EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Republican, of Massachusetts; and BERNARD W. (PAT) KEARNEY, Republican, of New York, the minority report was strikingly similar to a subcommittee report rejected several weeks ago by the full committee.

It listed 20 "findings" compared with the 21 in the rejected version, and made 20 recommendations, 2 less than were made in the report turned down.

Not in the minority report was a finding in the rejected version that magazine and newspaper articles failed to show a true picture of conditions and "had a very disturbing effect upon the morale of patients, parents, and the public in general."

OTHER ITEMS IN REPORT

The minority also excluded from its findings reference to the use of conscientious objectors in veterans' hospitals. The original report which the committee refused to accept blamed conscientious objectors and Negro troops for "some mistreatment and maltreatment of patients."

The minority also admonished the Veterans' Administration for "placing its own interpretation on laws without regard to the intent of Congress."

At a news conference at which they distributed copies of their findings, the minority members said that an agreement made by the full committee not to publish either of the reports until both were ready had been violated by Chairman JOHN E. RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN distributed copies of the majority report immediately after it was approved yesterday, but withheld formally filing it with the House until today. Under that procedure, both reports will be printed together as a public document.

The above chronology shows the wide range of my work as well as the intense vigor with which I battled for the veteran's cause. It also demonstrates some definite concrete results which I hope will be of enduring benefit to our servicemen in the future.

The Maritime Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, but one side of the current maritime controversy has been given much publicity in the press. While union representatives and shipping companies, at the request of Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach, were negotiating in the National Capital to avert a strike, the administration announced its intention to seize, during the pendency of the negotiations, all shipping facilities. Thus, in effect, the negotiations have been sabotaged, for managment can sit back in the confident expectation that the Government is officially a partisan of their side.

It is important, therefore, that a factual statement of the position of the Committee on Martime Unity be presented to the Congress and the country. I am appending it herein below:

MEMORANDUM RE STATUS OF MARITIME DISPUTE

In Washington today, seven maritime unions are negotiating with management representatives under the auspices of the Department of Labor to settle satisfactorily their grievances and demands and to prevent the June 15 strike. While the unions have been calmly and carefully presenting their case, the American people are not getting the facts. For weeks, the American newspapers and radios have been flooded with distorted and outright dishonest stories about the union demands and the history of the present negotiations.

On Friday, May 31, the wave of hysteria and confusion reached a climax when President Truman gave his premature assurance to the ship operators that he would smash any strike, or any union by seizing the industry—and this just at the moment when his Secretary of Labor had actually persuaded the operators to start real negotiations with the unions for the first time.

What are the facts in the case?

1. How long have negotiations been going on in this industry?

Answer. The crisis that the newspaper writers and radio commentators have suddenly discovered this past week dates back to last September when many of these unions first asked the operators to negotiate.

2. Has a real attempt been made by both parties to reach a peaceful settlement on wage demands?

Answer. By the unions; yes. By management; no. For example, the National Maritime Union, after 39 negotiating meetings extending through a period of over 7 months, was finally on May 27 for the first time given an offer of an increase amounting to 5 cents an hour. This offer was on the same day unanimously rejected by vote of the membership as totally inadequate. After 9 months of negotiations, the longshore workers were offered 18 cents per hour after east coast longshoremen had already received 25 cents per hour increases. Even the 18-cent offer was conditional. One of the conditions was that the offer be accepted as separate from the other maritime unions.

3. What is the relationship of the Government to the maritime operators?

Answer. The Government, through the War Shipping Administration, owns 80 percent of all United States shipping, and the operators of this shipping act only as agents for the Government. The WSA guarantees to cover the operators' costs plus "a reasonable profit."

First as to the parties to these negotiations:

For labor, six of the seven unions are affiliated with the CIO; these are: the National Maritime Union, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, the Marine Cooks and Stewards, the American Communications Association, the Inlandboatmen's Union, and the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association. The Marine Firemen's Union is unaffiliated.

These seven unions have joined together in a Committee for Maritime Unity. Five of them, with the other two pledging full support and participating in all decisions, have scheduled a national maritime strike to begin at 12:01 a. m. on June 15 unless settlement satisfactory to each of the unions can be reached with the ship owners.

The strike was voted by secret referendum ballot in each union.

These unions are among the most democratic in the world. They are completely controlled by the rank and file membership. They elect their officers by secret referendum vote and have the constitutional right of recall, which, for example, in the ILWU, can be exercised by petition of only 15 percent of the membership.

For the operators, the management representatives are from the American Merchant Marine Institute, Waterfront Employers Association of the Pacific Coast, and the Pacific American Shipowners Association. They are joined together in the National Federation of Shipping.

Management and Labor were called together to Washington by Labor Secretary Schwellenbach last Wednesday to a meeting aimed at solving the differences between the parties and preventing the June 15 strike.

Meeting with these management representatives was not a new experience for these unions. The NMU, for example, first presented its demands to the AMMI early in September 1945. The ILWU opened its negotiations with the WEA at about the same time. That was 9 months ago. The other unions are in a roughly similar position. All have been meeting and trying to negotiate with their respective employers for the past months. And today all find themselves in Washington with a Government representative in the room trying to settle their demands with a strike date already decided upon. How did this situation develop?

When the NMU opened negotiations 9 months ago they presented the following basic demands: a 40-hour week and an 8-hour day at sea and at port, and a 30 percent wage increase.

Seamen, in sharp contrast with the average industrial worker in the United States, now work between 56 and 63 hours per week. They are subject to call 24 hours a day, 7 days a week at sea or in port. Some work 9 hours a day, some work 8 hours a day, but every week they put in 63 or 56 hours of work. One very small part of the unlicensed personnel (estimated at about 8 percent) classified as day workers put in 44 hours per week.

The employers comment upon the request for a reduction of these long hours to something humane, to something long recognized as an accepted American standard has been, again and again, that "a 40-hour week at sea is impossible for the maritime industry." To management there is something holy and inviolate about the 56- to 63-hour workweek—and the possibility of operating under it. The Committee for Maritime Unity has submitted concrete proposals to the shipowners showing that a workweek of less than 56 to 63 hours is possible, and how it can be achieved.

Many foreign lines have shorter hours than these.

These are some of the facts which the general public and Members of Congress are entitled to know. Here are six additional questions to which the public deserves answers:

1. Why a shipping strike?

Answer. Because the maritime workers, after months of fruitless negotiations have exhausted every other means for obtaining the most basic and necessary demands. A strike is their last resort, and they are being forced into it to survive.

2. Who owns the ships?

Answer. The public of the United States owns 2,400 of the 3,100 ships, or 80 percent of the entire American merchant marine. The industry is the most heavily subsidized of any in the Nation. The United States does not, however, operate the ships. It turns them over to private enterprisers who operate them at a guaranteed and unlimited profit. The present dispute is with these private operators.

3. What are the unions asking?

Answer. Basic wages in this industry for sea-going personnel are substandard. They average less than 65 cents an hour. This is the first major industry in this country since the war which has been forced to vote to strike to eliminate substandard wages. The basic demands of the seafaring unions in the Committee for Maritime Unity are the same for each union. These are a flat wage increase of 22 cents an hour and reduction of hours to 8 in one day, 40 in one week. Other important demands call for the elimination of long-standing inequities in working rules and conditions.

The following demands were presented by the Committee for Maritime Unity (CMU) to the three employer associations at negotiations under auspices of the Labor Department:

For seamen:

(a) Flat 22 cents hourly pay increase for all ratings receiving $140 or less monthly, ratings between $140 to $175, 27 cents hourly increase; ratings over $175, 35 cents.

(b) A 40-hour week and 8-hour day at sea and in port.

(c) Overtime payments of $1.25 per hour for seamen receiving up to $175 monthly, $1.50 per hour for those receiving $175 to $200, and $1.75 per hour for those receiving over $200.

These overtime payments are for all work in excess of 8 hours.

(d) Retroactivity to October 1, 1945.

For longshoremen:

In addition to retroactivity, demands are:

(a) Increase of 35 cents an hour base pay of $1.15 per hour and corresponding increase in overtime rate.

(b) Saturday an overtime day.

(c) Elimination of 10 cents per hour carloading differential.

In addition, maritime unions in CMU have other questions governing working rules and conditions to be negotiated after settlement of main issues cited above.

Seamen now work 56 to 63 hours weekly, 7 days a week without overtime payments. This means they work a minimum 240 hours monthly for $127.50 or $31.25 weekly. Seamen in stewards department must be available for work 91 hours weekly on daily basis of 9 hours in spread of 13.

4. What are the ship operators offering?

Answer. The operators offer virtually nothing by way of meeting the basic demands and needs of the workers. What offers they have made have been far below the national pattern set for labor generally. These inadequate proposals have been conditioned upon impossible counterdemands aimed at wrecking the unions.

5. Can the ship operators pay?

Answer. Yes. They would be deathly afraid of any investigation of their wartime profits and financial dealings with the Government, for they know it would reveal a scandal more shocking and far-reaching than Teapot Dome. (The following figures come from the Interstate Commerce Commission and other United States Government sources.) Typical of ship operating profits are these: The Matson Line doubled its assets from $65,000,000 in 1938 to $120,000,000 in 1945. That the line might not have to dig into those doubled assets the United States has agreed to give it $18,000,000 to remake the Lurline, Mariposa, and Monterey into luxury liners. The American-Hawaiian Line in the first quarter of 1946 increased its profits 50 percent over the first quarter of 1945. The Isthmian Line, in 1945, showed a net profit after taxes of $2,300,000, which was 23 percent of its $10,000,000 investment. The American President Line, with 93 percent of the stock owned by the United States Martime Commission, increased 783 percent in net worth between 1938 and 1944. Typical of war profits, for handling lend-lease, were these: On the Red Sea run alone not counting their numerous other runs, American-Hawaiian ships valued at $450,000 made $3,500,000 profit on 10 runs or 8 times the value of the ships; Isthmian ships valued at $1,500,000 made $2,500,000 on 7 trips; Lukenbach ships valued at $1,400,000 made $9,000,000 on 12 trips; Matson ships valued at $238,000 made $1,000,000 on 4 trips; Waterman ships valued at $950,000 made $3,700,000 on 12 trips. The capital risk—to give these fantastic profits to a handful of wealthy enterprisers—was taken by the people of the United States.

6. What will prevent the strike?

Answer. The issues could be settled overnight if the ship operators would recede from their adamant position. We believe that they have more deliberately stalled negotiations for more than 6 months, in the expectation that strikes in vital industries would create an hysteria and atmosphere conducive to the passage of pressure legislation. We believe that they have refused to meet the needs of the workers, not because of any inability to pay, but because of a determination on their part to bust our unions, and in this determination they are also representing foreign imperialist shipping interests, such as the Dutch, the British, and Franco-Spanish, who fear American trade-unions and democratic institutions as a menace to their colonial and other exploitive pursuits. The Government of the United States can prevent the strike by calling the tune for what it owns. It can tell the operators to live up to the spirit of American collective bargaining or get out and try to make their easy profits elsewhere, and on somebody else's money. It is the one industry where the Government has that power.

The Senate Committee on Education and Labor, through the so-called La Follette subcommittee, already has a voluminous record on the antilabor character of many of these employers. The subcommittee has already commented at length in its report to the Senate. This record shows that since 1934 these maritime and water-front employers, have been almost continuously engaged in an effort to smash the unions. The events leading up to this threatened strike closely parallel the determined efforts made on the west coast in 1936–37 to precipitate a showdown with these unions.

In this earlier instance, also, the employers tried to use every available Government agency and public official to accomplish this end. The unions stood solidly together, enlisted the support of public opinion, and forced the employers to submit to collective bargaining.

The tactics employed on the west coast and some of the same persons responsible for these tactics in 1936–37, are now operating on a national scale in 1945–46. The Senate Committee on Education and Labor should once more make a thorough investigation of the causes leading up to this threatened strike.

JOSEPH CURRAN,
HARRY BRIDGES,
Cochairmen, Committee for Maritime Unity.

The Right To Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, when President Truman addressed the joint session of Congress the afternoon of May 25, he specifically pointed out that the benefits which labor has gained in the last 13 years must be preserved, and that he

voted for all these benefits while acting as a Member of Congress. The President also informed us that he has repeatedly urged not only their retention, but their improvement. This point I wish to emphasize—that the President urges their improvement.

The President then proceeded to recommend that the Congress approve certain temporary legislation, and which the House did approve that same afternoon. But, referring to the President's address, anyone interested can obtain information as to the exact provisions which the President requested be included in the temporary legislation.

Mr. Speaker, a sufficient number of forces are now at work in the United States to convince everyone who has given any serious thought to the question of the laws which now govern labor and management, that these laws will have to be amended. Organized labor leaders now recognize that unions as such, and industry as such, and the general public cannot continue under the present laws with any particular degree of satisfaction. The President even recognized that far-reaching changes will have to be made in the present laws. The President pointed out that the time has come to adopt a comprehensive labor policy which will tend to reduce the number of stoppages of work and other acts which injure labor, capital, and the whole population. The President even went so far as to recommend the immediate creation by the Congress of a joint committee to make a study and submit recommendations with respect to permanent long-range legislation designed to reduce the number of occasions where the ultimate remedy of the general right of workers to strike against private employers will have to be adopted.

Mr. Arthur A. Ballantine, of New York, has made some very pertinent observations dealing with this right to strike, and I submit what he has said for the RECORD:

THE RIGHT TO STRIKE

LIKE OTHER LEGAL RIGHTS, IT IS SUBJECT TO REGULATION IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST, MR. BALLANTINE DECLARES

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

It is encouraging to find in current discussion improved understanding of the legal position of the right to strike. There is a growing perception that this right is like all others and is equally subject to regulation in the public interest.

Decisions of English and American courts through which the right to strike gained legal recognition dealt wholly with the effect of strikes on the immediate parties to a labor dispute. For employers it was originally contended that a strike was a conspiracy calculated to cause them damage. This contention was rejected, and the legal rule became that where the strike is believed to be in furtherance of the interests of the employees it is legitimate and damage to the employer is a hazard for which there is no real remedy.

As conditions change the exercise of any recognized legal right may come to have disastrous effects upon the public; it may mean stifling of other rights. Important regulatory statutes almost always limit what were previously unqualified rights. One thinks, of course, of banking acts, antitrust acts, security and exchange acts, and the like. The development has long had effect on such a fundamental right as that of carrying or using weapons.

The President vividly stated the burdens laid upon the public by unlimited exercise of the right to strike. The limitations which he proposed are, of course, based on the proposition that while the right to strike is valid enough as between the parties, that right is not superior to the public interest any more than the right of businessmen to combine or to fix hours, and the like.

It is erroneous to assert that to limit the right to strike is to "condemn the worker to economic slavery." No one questions the right of workers individually to quit. That is not involved. What is involved is the use of concerted stoppage of work, not at all with the purpose of ceasing to be employed but as a weapon to gain advantage. The merits of the advantage sought do not settle the question: What should settle it is consideration of whether in our complex economic structure the public can afford in all cases to have the issue settled by the unqualified use of the strike weapon.

An underlying idea here was well put years ago in a different connection by the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. When Justice Holmes was serving as a justice of the Massachusetts Supreme Court, a case came before him on petition for reinstatement by a policeman of a Massachusetts city who had been discharged for engaging in political activity contrary to a city ordinance. In dismissing the petition, Justice Holmes pithily said: "The petitioner may have a constitutional right to talk politics, but he has no constitutional right to be a policeman."

Those who work have the right not to work, but if they choose to work they, like the employers, can, without question, be made subject to laws passed by the represenatives of all the people to govern that work. The fact that in what is deemed to be the public interest laws restrain conduct on the part of employees is no more a valid objection than that laws restrain conduct of employers.

We cannot have civilization as we know it if any particular class is exempt from law or can assert unqualified rights—rights "unshackled by government." Certainly, legal restraints—permanent not merely temporary—must be developed which prevent the pursuit of advantage, however sincerely sought, when, in the President's phrase, such unchecked pursuit will "cripple the entire economy of the Nation." Back of the law must lie perception that, as no man can live unto himself alone, no group can prosper without recognition that it must stand ready to harmonize its interests with the interests of all.

ARTHUR A. BALLANTINE.

NEW YORK, *May 27, 1946.*

In our general approach to a revision of the present labor laws we should constantly bear in mind that the solution to present problems will not come through denouncing the men representing organized labor, whether they be Lewis, or Hillman, Green or Reuther, or some other individual. I am positive we shall be forced to the conclusion that the wrong primarily lies in the shortcomings of laws which permit labor leaders and their fellow associates to exercise an almost unlimited power to strike and to combine and prevent the production and distribution of goods, and all without any material degree of regulation or control.

Through years the Government, and by this I mean the administration previous and present, and the Congress have built up these powers now being exercised by labor leaders, and during the period in which this creation occurred we have witnessed years of depression and boom, of peace and war, and now with our having failed to regulate alleged labor dictators the present administration and the Congress and the people generally find themselves suddenly astonished at the fact that these labor leaders hold and exercise greater powers almost than the Government itself possesses.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this administration and for this Congress to proceed with the amending of existing established laws dealing with labor-management relations. It is time for Congress to write into these laws provisions which regulate and restrain all threatened strikes against the public interest. These strikes have reached such a scope that they involve on a large scale the public health, good, light power, transportation, safety, communication, and in fact the whole economic and social existence of the 140,000,000 people of the United States, to say nothing about those in foreign lands whom we have led to depend upon us for their subsistence. When these laws are amended the Congress should take whatever steps are necessary to provide that unions must bargain in good faith just as present laws force management to so bargain, or suffer the consequences. And in our amending of the laws we should take due care to clearly define what constitutes illegitimate objectives of strikes.

Communism in the United States Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles by Mark Foote from the Bay City (Mich.) Times:

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times of May 20, 1946]

EXTENT OF EMANCIPATION ENJOYED BY CHURCH IN SOVIET RUSSIA QUESTIONED

(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON.—The attitude of communism toward religion, organized churches, the institution of marriage, and the rearing of children is one of the blackest pages in its history.

The Encyclopedia Britannica, eleventh edition, page 792, says: "Plato (the Greek philosopher), notwithstanding all the extraordinary originality with which he advocated the emancipation of women, was not able to free himself from the theory and practice of regarding the wife as a part and parcel of the property of her husband. The fact, therefore, that he advocated community or property led him also to advocate community of wives.

"He speaks of the possession and use of women and children, and proceeds to show how this possession and use must be regulated by his ideal state."

PERSECUTED CHURCHES

Soviet Russia under Lenin and for a time under Stalin persecuted or suppressed all religions within its borders, including the Greek Orthodox Church, which was the established religion under the Czars. Reinbold Niebuhr, book reviewer for the Nation

(magazine) in a recent number told of the pronouncements of the 1945 Russian council.

He said:

"Atheistic propaganda has been outlawed and the church has achieved toleration." But he hastened to add: "These pronouncements represent a curious mixture of Christian phraseology and Soviet thought, which raises some question about the degree of freedom enjoyed by the emancipated church."

The article in the Encyclopedia Brittanica continues:

"The circumstance that Communists have so frequently wrecked their projects by attacking marriage and advocating promiscuous intercourse between the sexes may probably be traced to the notion which regards a wife as being a mere item among the goods and chattels of her husband."

It would be unfair to infer that all American Communists of today are atheists, or advocates of promiscuousness. But this has been the attitude of many of their most profound and devoted leaders. In recent years greater emphasis has been on revolution to improve the lot of the workingman. But Soviet Russia, up to very recently, regarded children as wards of the state, to be reared by the state; divorces could be had any day, for any cause or no cause.

ATTACKS OTHER CHURCHES

The "emancipated church" of Soviet Russia, however, seems to be devoting an unproportionate amount of time to attacks on other churches.

The Reverend Father Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., vice president of Georgetown University, now adviser at the Nuremberg war criminal trials in Germany, had this to say about such attacks on February 13, 1945, before the war in Europe or against Japan had ended:

"It is wholly understandable that the Communist organ Pravda and the new mouthpiece of world revolution, War and the Working Classes, should periodically attack the Vatican and the Catholic Church even at this period of supreme crisis when unity of mind and heart among men of good will is imperative.

"These Moscow publications admittedly voice the political objectives of Marxism and miss no opportunity for vilification even of their allies, as occurred last year. Pravda accused the British Government of secret negotiations with the Nazis respecting an alleged peace advantageous to Britain.

"But the Orthodox Church of Russia, through the voice of its spiritual leaders recently convened at Moscow for the enthronement of a patriarch should slander the Vatican and insult the hundreds of millions of Catholics throughout the world is melancholy witness to the price it must have paid for its newly recovered freedom of action in Russia."

NO PROTEST AT HITLER TREATY

Father Walsh said he heard not a syllable of protest from the shepherds of the Russian people when the Communist state became a partner of Nazi Germany in 1939 and participated in the rape of central Europe; not a syllable of Christian indignation when this precious cooperation of Germany's eastern frontier permitted Goering's Luftwaffe to rain their fire and destruction freely on Anglican London, on Catholic Belgium, on stricken France, Luxemburg, on orthodox Greece, and Yugoslavia.

USE THE CHURCHES

But American Communists, like those of other lands, do not hesitate to use the churches of any denomination when they can turn them to their own purposes. The Daily Worker, Communist Party organ, recently told of a public meeting held April 11 in a church presided over by Rev. Calvin Lockridge. It was described as the first held in Columbia, Tenn., since the bloody events that followed the attempted lynching of young Navy veteran James Stephenson and his mother.

Now lynching or attempted lynching is a crime and a disgrace to any community or country. Meetings in protest and attempts to prevent such actions in the future most certainly should be held. They should have the support of all respectable citizens of every race and religion.

But who was it who turned up to make the principal address in this community of Negroes in a Negro church? None other than Robert Minor, southern editor of the Daily Worker. Five or six Negro ministers of the gospel also spoke. Minor, according to the Daily Worker said:

"In the quickest possible time, and that means now, every Negro worker must be gotten into trade unions, and every veteran into a veterans' organization. The entire mass Negro population of Tennessee must go forward into the category of full citizenship, serve on juries, voting in all primaries, and holding public office."

No right-minded citizen could take exception to a word of this. But beware of Greeks bearing gifts. This coming to the rescue of a downtrodden people is the entering wedge. There was not one word of Communist propaganda uttered by Minor, according to the Daily Worker. That will come in due time.

The CIO and A. F. of L. which have recently launched separate campaigns to unionize the South are making desperate efforts to keep Communists out of their new organizations, and out of the leadership of their campaigns. If for no other reason, this is a wise decision, because Communist leadership would hurt the campaign. But the Communists are there just the same. They are irrepressible.

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times of May 22, 1946]

BILL OF RIGHTS PROTECTS LOUD BUT DOCILE COMMUNIST PARTY IN UNITED STATES

(This is the seventh of a series of stories on communism in the United States today, answering the query: Is communism a menace?)

(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON.—Since the Communist Party of the United States, like those of every other country, boldly advocates the overthrow by force and violence of all capitalistic governments, why should Congress not outlaw its existence? That is a question frequently asked by those who realize the potential, if not the actual existing menace of communism in America today.

The answer is that Congress and the courts have consistently held that in a democracy mere advocacy of the overthrow of government by word of mouth or printed material, is not a crime unless accompanied by specific acts of violence.

The Supreme Court has held that to outlaw the Communist Party would be to deprive persons of the right of freedom of speech, of press, or the right of petition and assembly as guaranteed under the first, fifth, and fourteenth amendments of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution.

Some States, including Michigan and California, have passed criminal syndicalism laws in an attempt to curb advocacy and use of force by persons or organizations in the accomplishment of political objectives. But they have been seldom used or enforced.

The danger of suppression in a democracy is that once the Government starts to suppress one political party or curtail the righs guaranteed under the Constitution to one group, it will proceed later to suppress other groups.

Hitler ruthlessly wiped out all opposition parties except the Nazi party which he controlled in Germany; Mussolini did the same in fascist Italy. Soviet Russia, which has the only avowedly Marxian government in the world today, has but one party, the Communist Party. All three of these totalitarian states went through the forms of popular elections. But only one party appeared on the ballot. And when election results were announced in Germany and Italy, and in Russia today, the Communist, or government party, gets about 98 percent of the vote.

Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, and Justice Brandeis expressed this fear of suppression in a dissenting opinion in the case of Charlotta Anita Whitney, whose conviction under the California syndicalism law was upheld by the Supreme Court in 1925. They said:

"To justify suppression of free speech there must be reasonable ground to fear that serious evil will result if free speech is practiced. But even advocacy of violence, however reprehensible morally, is not a justification for denying free speech where the advocacy falls short of incitement and there is nothing to indicate that the advocacy would be immediately acted upon.

"Moreover, even imminent danger cannot justify resort to prohibition of these functions essential to effective democracy, unless the evil apprehended is relatively serious."

These two great dissenting justices expressed the opinion which has become the practice of the courts and Congress. In large measure this is in line with the tradition that America always has been a haven of refuge for the persecuted of all nations of the world—especially those persecuted because of political and religious beliefs.

The only weapons, and the proper weapons, for those who abhor communism and socialism are: Exposure of their methods and practices, eternal vigilance to guard against the insidious infiltration of their ideas into group organizations and into legislation both State and Federal; in short, education and enlightenment of the people.

Communists and Socialists have a perfect right in a democracy to advocate changes in government, so long as they seek reform only by means of moral suasion and the ballot. They can even advocate force, as the Communists do, so long as their advocacy does not become a menace to the established government, and so long as they do not resort to actual force and revolution.

At any time when the advocates of communism step over the line, either in their speeches or their acts, Congress and the courts should, and in all human probability will take measures of suppression or criminal prosecution.

Whether or when that time will arrive is the problem.

In 1934–35 the House of Representatives conducted an exhaustive investigation and made a report on subversive activities in the United States, including Nazi and Communists influences. In its report, submitted February 15, 1935, the House declared:

"This Communist movement in this country is not sufficiently strong numerically nor an influence to constitute a danger to American institutions at the present time," but it added: "indications of increasing Communists activity, particularly in connection with recent labor troubles, have been so frequent as to produce a growing demand for more aggressive treatment of radical agitation."

The House committee itself, of which Representative MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and Representative DICKSTEIN, Democrat, of New York, served as chairman and vice chairman, respectively, held that unless Communist activity were curbed, it would so increase as to constitute a definite menace.

The committee, therefore, contended that it was the duty of government to check and control, through appropriate legislation, the illegal actions and methods of such movements, without regard to the improbability of attainment, and to protect itself and its loyal citizens against such subversive attempts.

Representative MCCORMACK and Senator TYDINGS introduced identical bills for the

control of communistic and other subversive activities, which had the endorsement of the Secretaries of War and Navy, American Legion, and other important organizations. Both bills failed of passage.

The Voorhis Act of 1941 required groups subject to foreign control to register with the Department of Justice. In anticipation of the passage of that act, the Communist Party of the United States voted, November 9, 1940, to dissolve its affiliation with the Communist International. Earl Browder, then the party's general secretary and national leader on this occasion affirmed:

"The unshakable adherence of our party to the principles of proletarian internationalism in the spirit of its greatest leaders and teachers—Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin—as well as to the principles of proletarian internationalism to which the life of every Communist is unconditionally consecrated."

The Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has reported to the Congress a good bill properly amending the Railroad Retirement Act. The bill is consistent with the welfare of railroad employees and is reasonable in the burdens it places on employers. I urge the House to give study to this matter and to act favorably on the committee bill. It will make the retirement fund solvent and will extend the coverage of the act in all phases that are wise and just and practical from the standpoint of current possibilities.

The report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, No. 1989, submitted on May 9, 1946, in connection with the Crosser bill, H. R. 1362, contains a misstatement of fact which must be clarified in order to avoid substantial damage and inequity which may result therefrom.

The error appears in the language used to describe the proposal in the bill as introduced to extend coverage to freight forwarders, and in similar language used to describe the action of the committee in eliminating the provision for such extended coverage. As a member of the committee who devoted some study to this question I am in a position to clarify the statement in the committee report on this matter. I have discussed the subject with my colleague who submitted the report, and he agrees that the inadvertent use of language, to which I shall refer, should be clarified in this commentary. The error came about entirely through inadvertence, and not through any fault of the gentleman who submitted the report.

On page 1 of the report, in summarizing the major changes in existing law proposed by the bill as introduced, the report lists, as item 1:

1. Extension of coverage to freight forwarders not controlled by railroads.

Again, on page 7, in explaining the major differences between the introduced bill and the bill as reported by the committee, the report lists, as item 1:

1. Changes in coverage and service credit: The committee amendment does not provide for any changes in coverage as did the introduced bill in respect to freight forwarders not controlled by railroads.

The words "not controlled by railroads" in the foregoing statement are incorrectly used. The matter was correctly stated in the extension of remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] at page A2895 of the RECORD for May 22, 1946, in the following language:

First. Coverage: The committee substitute does not change the coverage of the present law.

The Crosser bill seeks to expand the coverage of the present law and include persons such as freight forwarders, ice companies, warehouse companies, longshoremen, and others not now covered who do not want to come within the scope of the law. Substantially all the classes of persons affected by the proposed new coverage of the Crosser bill appeared at the hearings in objection thereto.

It will be noted that the words "not controlled by railroads" are not used in the foregoing statement. However, specific attention was not directed to the fact that the statement in the RECORD is correct and the statement in the report is incorrect, and that is why this further statement is necessary.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding on this subject I shall briefly explain why it is important to understand that the words "not controlled by railroads" are inadvertently and improperly used in the commitee report.

There are approximately 100 freight forwarders operating under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission in accordance with the provisions of part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act enacted in 1942. The forwarding industry was not regulated under the Interstate Commerce Act when the legislation which resulted in the present Railroad Retirement and Related Acts was being considered and the initial drafts of such legislation contained language which would have brought freight forwarders under the coverage of those acts. However, before passage of the legislation the language bringing freight forwarders under coverage was stricken out, and the definition of an employer as it now appears in the acts follows the language used in the Railway Labor Act. Among other provisions of the definition as it appears in the acts today, are the following:

The term "employer" means any carrier (as defined in subsection (m) of this section), and any company which is directly or indirectly owned or controlled by one or more such carriers or under common control therewith, and which operates any equipment or facility or performs any service (except trucking service, casual service, and the casual operation of equipment or facilities) in connection with the transportation of passengers or property by railroad.

Subsection (m) reads as follows:

(m) the term "carrier" means an express company, sleeping-car company, or carrier by railroad, subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The Railroad Retirement Board contends that two of the largest freight forwarders fall within the purview of the above-quoted language of the present definition, and the Bureau of Internal Revenue has collected taxes under the existing acts from these two companies. As to the remaining forwarders no question has ever been raised under the Railroad Retirement Act, and they are now subject to the Social Security System. The two forwarders in question dispute the contentions of the Railroad Retirement Board and the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and the matter is now being litigated in the Federal courts. Large sums of money are involved in these suits, and the outcome will determine whether two important segments of an industry shall be subject to one retirement system while the balance of the industry remains subject to another.

The intent of Congress with respect to coverage of freight forwarders under existing law must, of necessity, have some bearing on the outcome of these suits.

It will be noted that two things are required, by the provisions of the present definition as quoted above, to bring any company other than a carrier subject to part I of the act, under coverage. Paraphrased, these requirements are, first, ownership or control by a carrier subject to part I, and second, the operation of equipment or facilities or performance of service in connection with transportation by railroad.

From this statement of fact it can readily be seen that the use of the qualifying words "not controlled by railroads" in the report are inaccurate in that, aside from the question of the intent of Congress, they refer to only one of the requirements of the definition. Further, and more important, the words are incorrectly used because they seemingly interpret the intent of Congress in enacting the original law. This ought not to be, and was not intended by the committee.

It should, therefore, be definitely understood by the Members of the House that the words "not controlled by railroads" as they appear in the committee report in referring to freight forwarders, are erroneously used, and the report should be read as though such words were omitted.

It is clearly the intent of our committee that all freight forwarders are completely exempt from the provisions of the act. The present law and this bill is a Railroad Retirement Act and it is not a freight forwarder retirement act in any respect whatsoever. I want it definitely understood by all Members of the House that it was never our intention to bring under the Railroad Retirement Act the business of freight forwarding, the business of ice companies, warehouse companies, and others. The record of the legislative history of the existing Railroad Retirement Act and the record of the deliberations on the proposed bill clearly bear this out. Since the inadvertent language of the report has caused questions to be raised by some of you, I want to assure you positively that no freight forwarder is intended to be covered by this act.

Merchants Plan Protest to OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 31, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it would seem that the OPA would be interested in securing public support for a continuance of that agency at this time. Obviously, a very poor public relations job is being done and throughout the Nation private individuals and small businessmen are continually protesting the activities of OPA officials.

Under permission previously granted, I am inserting herewith an article which appeared in the Janesville Gazette, one of the leading daily papers in my district. It indicates just how serious retail merchants in that city consider the OPA situation:

MERCHANTS PLAN PROTEST TO OPA—GROCERS AND BUTCHERS CRITICIZE ENFORCEMENT METHODS BEING USED

Enforcement methods of the OPA, particularly the imposition of fines for unintentional and minor violations, will be strongly protested by a new organization of food market operators, it was learned today. A group of grocers and butchers at a meeting recently authorized the formation of a new organization to attempt to handle the situation, and a constitution and articles of organization are now being written.

The chamber of commerce, with which many of the protesting merchants is affiliated, made public the information that in recent weeks 42 Janesville grocers and meat dealers have been summoned before OPA price panels and fined $25 and upwards on what they term minor violations. The overceiling prices were said to amount to not over a cent or two in most cases.

The chamber's statement refers to the OPA's "confusing dual method of calculating prices," but it was learned that the larger number of alleged violations has been in the field of canned goods. Grocers say that the OPA regulations provide two methods of computing costs on such merchandise.

DISLIKE GESTAPO TACTICS

It is possible to compute such prices by dividing the cost per case by the number of cans, and then adding the permissible profit to each unit; or by adding to the case lot price the permissible profit and then dividing by the number of units per case. The Janesville price control board, it is claimed, has arbitrarily selected the latter method and is attempting to force all merchants to adopt the same system.

Formal protests were sent to Wisconsin Senators from a meeting held recently, in which the food-store operators said they had no quarrel with the principle of OPA, but felt that there is no room in the United States for the gestapo method of the Enforcement Division.

A city-wide protest is also being organized against the expected OPA price survey, originally scheduled for last December but postponed because of Nation-wide strong protests lodged in Washington.

OPPOSE "VOLUNTEER" CHECK

The OPA, according to information to the chamber of commerce here, is going forward with plans to employ volunteers for a store-by-store and item-by-item check-up on prices, on the assumption that its powers will be extended by congressional action soon.

Merchants are preparing a battle here and elsewhere on the OPA's plan for use of volunteer aides empowered to inspect merchants' records and books. Such a system, they contend, would be subject to wide abuse because the volunteers would be able to enter the records of any storekeeper against whom they might have a grudge, and because unpaid volunteer help would be without responsibility in holding information confidential from competitors or others. They have taken the attitude that such records will be opened only to Government agents regularly employed.

Storekeepers, it was said, are assumed to be familiar with an OPA price order document measuring nearly 2 inches thick, and also with the provisions of 30 amendments.

Extension of the Sugar Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, the original Sugar Act was limited to a term of 3 years, and each extension has been restricted to terms of 1 or 3 years. It has been the policy and preference of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives to so limit these terms so that it would be possible to keep in step with the developments in each of the domestic producing areas and in the United States sugar market. As the Sugar Act provides quotas in a normally limited market, the committee and Congress have taken into consideration the production records.

The quotas established in 1934, and again in 1937, were necessarily based on production and distribution in the years immediately previous to 1934 and 1937. With 12 years of experience under the Sugar Act since 1934, Congress is now in a better position to judge how fair and equitable each area's quota may be in relation to its production and distribution in the United States market.

The Department of Agriculture, as a matter of normal procedure, takes into consideration the historical background. Sometimes the average of 3 years, or even of 5 years, or even of 10 years, is used, depending upon how representative these years may be with regard to normal and future production.

In 1934, the mainland cane area was assigned a completely inadequate quota based upon production in the early thirties. The production records of 1934, 1935, and 1936 demonstrated that the claims of the area were justified and an increased quota was provided. The mainland cane area at that time protested that such an increase was not a full recognition of the record and merits, but the quota was accepted in view of the limited term of the proposed bill.

Despite severe reductions in acreage, including the plowing out of growing sugarcane in some years, the production in the mainland cane area has always averaged greater than the quota. With the suspension of quotas during the war, and regardless of the critical labor shortage, the mainland cane area has provided a complete justification of its claim.

Louisiana has continued to produce the greatest quantity of sugar of any State of the Union. Its war record is the most outstanding of any State or domestic area.

The mainland cane area has distributed during the war years more sugar than it would have been allowed to distribute if the quotas had been in effect during the war. This is a proud record and one that deserves favorable consideration when determining quotas for the postwar period.

The emergency is not yet over and the mainland cane area continues to produce larger quantities of sugar so critically needed by American consumers and industrial users. The planted acreage in Louisiana and Florida potentially suggests the greatest production, even above the production of the war years. Thus the protection afforded by the Government of the United States, through tariffs and through quotas, has been completely justified, and the claims of the producers in Louisiana and Florida have been thoroughly vindicated.

Therefore, in view of the plans for an early adjournment of Congress next month, and in further view of the failure of the domestic sugar-producing areas to meet and arrive at a proposal of a fair and equitable quota ratio, based on production and distribution over a period of recent years, we propose an extension of the Sugar Act for 1 year. In doing so, we suggest that hearings be called early in 1947, so that thorough consideration may be given in fairness to all areas, and particularly with due consideration for the production record in the mainland cane area during the past 5 years, as compared to other domestic areas.

Ed Stettinius Resigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I note that our chief delegate to the United Nations, Edward Stettinius, has resigned his position. The United States has lost an outstanding official in Ed Stettinius because he has proved his ability as Lend-Lease Administrator and as Secretary of State. To him goes the chief credit for the success of Dumbarton Oaks and the San Francisco Conference where the cornerstones of the United Nations were laid. He has contributed untiringly of his time, energy, and ability toward the fulfillment of the necessary ideal of international cooperation. As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee I can bear personal witness to his patriotism and devotion to his country and I know I speak for that great committee

when I say that we and the Government will miss him very much.

His resignation will leave a void that will be difficult to fill but I know that his successor, whoever he may be, will find Ed Stettinius more than willing to place at his disposal all the knowledge and advice he is capable of offering. It is my hope that Ed Stettinius will not be too long out of Government because we need more men like him in these trying and critical times.

St. Vasilios Veterans' Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address delivered by me on May 30, 1946, Memorial Day, in Peabody, Mass., when the St. Vasilios of World War II dedicated a monument memorial as a tribute to those soldiers of the St. Vasilios community who paid the supreme sacrifice during both World Wars. The St. Vasilios community is composed of residents of Peabody, Salem, Danvers, and Beverly, Mass., who are members of the St. Vasilios Church in Peabody, Mass.:

This is the first year of peace—a restless and troubled peace. It marks the first time that we have come together to pay our humble tribute to those who sacrificed for us in World War I and World War II. And even as we say one and two there are those who are thinking in terms of World War III.

At this requiem for those who died too young our minds are not at peace. Somehow we feel that we are not measuring up to the great lesson which they have placed before us, written in their life's blood. This is no time for us to mock the dead with hollow words that lack the conviction of our minds and hearts. With every effort of our being we must believe that some of their spirit lives on in us, for they died in the firm faith that we would redeem their sacrifice and go on to build a better world for all.

In the terrible agony of war there was no time for artificiality. Men were unmasked before one another. Stripped to the bare and urgent need for survival, they did not try to escape in personal flight. Their common fear held them together and they learned the hard way that unselfish cooperation for the good of the group is the only road ahead. They lived and fought and died to open this road for us.

But some of us, satisfied with the past, are refusing to face the pioneering which must go on. Withdrawn into ourselves and our personal worlds, we still think that we can find safety on the islands of our own security, when there are no more islands left. This has become one world over which the restless traffic of life is moving. We must establish order in this traffic before the stream of progress jams. There is no longer any room for a multiplicity of private roads. We want freedom of the highway for all, under safety laws which apply to all, and safety education for all. The world's traffic can no longer permit reckless driving by any individual or any nation. Though we shall open up many more highways in the future, they can never be the highways of monopoly or the highways of irresponsibility.

The men whose memory we honor this day fought to preserve our American way of life from the whiplash of tyranny. They fought not only to save but to develop it. For democracy is not a rigid social order. It is living and growing, seeking to encourage the best in each of us for the over-all betterment of the community. The men who died know that the machine age has placed great instruments of power in the hands of a few men, and this power, wrongly used, can bring suffering and destruction to tens of millions of people. Even in peace, the bungling use of this power has brought about great inequalities, so that we live from day to day in an atmosphere of tension and insecurity.

The men who died to stop the reckless use of power knew that we must find a way to harness it for human welfare. They knew that only through the development of economic democracy, can it be changed from a curse into a blessing for all of mankind.

The dead cannot speak to us in warning. But their buddies, who have come back to us, know what went on in their minds and hearts. The veterans who are here today are the living link between the faith of those who died and that same faith which we must carry on.

But the veterans who have come home from war are puzzled and disturbed by the America which they see. Somehow, it seems to contradict all that they have come to know and believe in. A veteran of World War I might take them aside and whisper, "This is the way we were disillusioned, too, when we came back." And the veterans of World War II begin to wonder if their sacrifices were in vain. For the picture of America in 1946 is strangely like the picture of America after the First World War.

Remember the Ku Klux Klan and the wave of intolerance? Remember how we turned our backs on the rest of the world, failing to take our share of the responsibility for keeping the peace? That happened before and there are signs that it may happen again.

No sooner was that first war over, when our industrial and business leaders plunged into a mad orgy of profiteering that led to inflation and depression. "Get all you can in any way you can" was the theme song of the 1920's. Everybody tried to get on the bandwagon, quarreling over such wealth—more than enough for all—as no other nation had ever enjoyed. Everyone was grasping for the power to have everything he wanted without thought of others. And so we reaped the whirlwind of disaster for all.

We survived those tragic mistakes, but there are signs that we may forget, and have another fling. But let us learn, before it is too late that profund changes have occurred between 1919 and 1946. Though many people have not changed, the world has. And our democracy is under test. The whole world is looking to us, as the reservoir of material power, to see if we, the people, have the intelligence and character to make this system of governing ourselves really work. Not for a few but for all.

Unless we succeed in this we are asking for a dictatorship which, in return for bread and clothes and shelter and regimented labor, will deprive us of all political, social, and intellectual freedoms forever. And we shall become robots instead of men.

Let us have no illusions about this. There are only two ways of life in the world today: Ours and the other. We hope that they may learn to get along together without recourse to war. But we should know that, apart from war, if we fail to put our own house in order, the other will take over from within. The issue is clear and cannot be avoided.

This democracy of ours can only function if all of us are willing and able to cooperate for the general good. No one of us can live unto himself alone, for that leads to millions of separate conflicts, when the crying need of our times is for an over-all unity to prevent chaos. We shall recover that unity which we had in the national emergency only by keeping before us the supreme example of personal sacrifice which we honor this day.

The veterans are the living voice of their comrades who died. We need that voice to constantly remind us of the high requirements of citizenship in this new and challenging age. For military victory alone cannot bring peace, if the people fail in their responsibilities to their government. The fight goes on in another form, with men of good will using every resource of mind and heart to clear away the road blocks of greed, intolerance, and the most difficult of all—indifference. Peace in our time will not happen. It must be worked for. And veterans stand in the forefront of those who must show the way. Already the veterans of World War II have come forward to state that the prime purpose of their organization is to work not for the self-seeking interest of any one class but for the welfare of all of our people. In this is a call to the rest of us to match their high standard of service to the Nation, in peace as well as war.

These men who have come high know what war means. They have been through its blood and destruction and filth and weariness. They have come to hate its separations and regimentation. They are determined that its curse shall not be visited upon their children.

And yet, in spite of its misery, men found in war a deeper feeling for the needs of peace. Common danger brought them to a realization of the only Christian brotherhood they ever knew. There was no room for predatory selfishness in that democracy of suffering and death, no time for bluff or alibis. The men who have come back don't talk about it. They believe that we who did not see and feel what "out there" could not possibly understand. And so they keep silent with their memories of that which is sacred. The memory of men who fought by their side, men who were young, men who loved life, giving it up on the altar of sacrifice for them and for us.

There on some bloody battlefield they saw the incandescent glow of divinity in their fellow men. And to those who saw this love that is greater than life, there came a reverence too fine for words.

No, they will not talk about it. It must not be mocked by shallow talk in this selfish world of peace. The men who have come back are silent about this. But they will not be satisfied with anything less. It is sheer insanity that war should bring out the best qualities in men and peace their worst. That's the way it is, however. And the men who have come back are thinking, thinking hard, of some way in which this devotion to others may be transfused into the minds and souls of those who stayed at home. The crisis of our times is not merely economic and political. It will not be solved by law or plan or experiment alone. It goes much deeper, having affected the very roots of our spiritual being. Somehow, in this complex and confusing world of machines, we have lost fiath in ourselves and in one another.

Our enemies saw the signs of this weariness in us. They thought we could not stand up to their attacks. They thought that ours was a house divided against itself and that we would fall victims to our own disunity.

Overnight a miracle happened to change all this. The men who have come back saw it with their own eyes. There was that kid, what was his name? No matter, names don't count. Maybe he was lucky enough to have a job on the WPA before the war, if you call that luck. Certainly he didn't have

any great personal treasure to fight for. Or maybe he was going to college, training for a decent and useful career in behalf of his fellowmen. That was interrupted and put aside, maybe for keeps. And the strange part of it was that it was nothing he had done or failed to do that was responsible for this.

Too late to look back and ponder why. Here he was, pinned down with you and others while strafing planes zoomed overhead. Then, from the enemy positions, a grenade came hurtling through the air, landing 10 feet in front of you. You stared at it in fearful, paralyzing fascination, unable to move. The kid jumped up, ran forward, and threw himself on the grenade just before it went off. That was all. You and the others had been saved by a kid. It is something you can never forget. Over and over again you keep asking yourself: "What made him give up everything for us?"

Remembering him, and there were others like him, you and your buddies of St. Vasilios Veterans of World War II, have come to dedicate this monument to the heroic dead of both World Wars. Here in the quiet of the church grounds, we join with you in consecration. Before this cross, we offer our humble thanks to the memory of the men from the St. Vasilios community who made the supreme sacrifice. We stand in the presence of that which is sacred.

All else changes. Wealth and fame and material power in time, they all pass away. But the comradeship of men who have learned to live and die for the salvation of others in the image of Eternal Love, this, and this alone, is immortal.

We bow our heads in reverent tribute to the few who gave so much. We pray that we who so desperately need it may come to know the spirit of unselfish devotion which was theirs. Inspired by their faith, may we go forth to build this democracy of ours into a temple of humanity which shall bring us closer to one another and to God.

True Parity in Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to place in the RECORD a letter favoring true parity to farmers, which is as follows:

ENID, OKLA., *September 23, 1942.*

The Honorable VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WICKERSHAM: We have observed by press release the action taken by the House in support of the move to give farmers true parity in the price control bill. We also have observed that again you have supported the interests of our Oklahoma farmers and voted in favor of including farm labor in the parity formula.

On behalf of every member of the Oklahoma Agricultural Cooperative Council, who represent over 100,000 Oklahoma farmers, we want to express our appreciation to you for your fine cooperation in the interests of Oklahoma agriculture. It is needless to say that your cooperation by this action taken is truly appreciated by every farmer in Oklahoma.

Thanking you again and with our kindest personal wishes, we are,

Sincerely yours,

OKLAHOMA AGRICULTURAL
COOPERATIVE COUNCIL,
ROY BENDER, *President.*

Spoon River Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in these times when our national debt is fast approaching the $300,000,000,000 mark and huge appropriations requiring deficit financing are necessary to carry on even current expenses of our National Government, then it is sheer extravagance and folly to make an appropriation for a project which not only is unnecessary, but is against the wishes and best interest of the people in the area where the project is to be located.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what the Army engineers are attempting to do when they propose to build a dam on Spoon River, near London Mills, Ill. They propose at a cost of $7,658,000—and with an aditional Federal annual charge of $314,000—to erect an 85-foot dam which will require the acquisition and taking out of production of some 22,100 acres of good farm land which is to be used for a water storage basin for some legerdemain benefits on the Mississippi, located some 100 or 200 miles away, and for some flood benefits to a smaller area below the reservoir.

How this impounded water could be used to raise or lower the level of the Mississippi to an extent that it would materially benefit navigation is beyond the comprehension of the layman. But no such difficulty is encountered by the Army engineers. They, apparently by mathematical formula, can estimate the alleged benefit even to the exact number of dollars. The estimated average annual benefits to navigation on Middle Mississippi River is $276,600. The reduction of flood damages to the Middle Mississippi River is figured at $70,250 and for the lower Mississippi River at $27,000.

Taking good farm land in Knox County from the people in that area to give alleged navigation benefits to someone on the Mississippi River is like robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Moreover, it does not take very much intelligence to figure out that it is not good economy or even good sense to destroy over 22,000 acres of good farm land, which is not in a natural flood area, in order to protect a lesser acreage that has always been subject to overflow from the beginning of time, and considerable of it has never been tillable.

While I believe in soil conservation and feel it has played its part in flood control, it is not sound conservation to put into production a smaller acreage in a flood area by destroying a larger acreage in a nonflood area.

It is my understanding this project would take substantially out of production 15,000 acres of the 22,100 acres involved. The remaining acreage, amounting to practically 7,000 acres, we are told, could perhaps be rented back to the farmers—that is, if a benevolent Government sees fit to do so. Then the engineers hold out the further hope, on this remaining acreage, that most of the land probably would not be flooded more than once in 3 years.

It is estimated in the area below the dam that there will be a benefit to approximately 1,000 acres not now fully cultivated, and perhaps some benefit to other acreage now in production which is occasionally flooded. So in effect what you are doing is this: You are taking out of production 15,000 acres and jeopardizing an additional 7,000 acres for a problematical benefit to certain areas below this dam and the possibility of securing additional income from 1,000 acres below the reservoir which is not now fully cultivated.

The area affected is 97-percent productive, and there is raised on this land annually crops to the value of $35 to $50 an acre. Again I say, why destroy it?

The Army engineers would do away with all the well-supported precedents of law concerning overflow of natural waters and move these flood areas upstream from their submarginal bottom land to the fertile uplands.

Would not it be more appropriate, if this money is to be spent, that this overflow land below the proposed dam be purchased by the Government—and it could be purchased for less money than the cost of the proposed project—and made into a refuge for wild life and recreation areas for the hunters and fishers of my State?

We have already had enough Government interference along the Spoon River. During the war the War Department took over 17,000 acres for an Army camp and moved the farmers off their land, entirely destroyed one small village, and took all this acreage out of production.

While it has nothing to do with Government action, we have had in this area thousands and thousands of acres taken out of production by strip-mine operations. We do not want more land destroyed.

Not only would this project force many farmers who have been peacefully residing on this land for generations to give up their homes, but it would result in loss of revenue by way of taxes to the State, county school districts, and municipalities. When there are so many other worth-while projects that the people need and are begging for, why erect a project which will do harm and which the people in the area are almost unanimously opposed to?

Mr. Speaker, to me the whole scheme is economically unsound. It is unnecessary, and it is against the best interests of the people most vitally concerned. All they want is to be left alone—free from further Government interference and planning.

Edgar Lee Masters made Spoon River famous by his Spoon River Anthology. We do not want the Army engineers to make Spoon River infamous by destroying the land adjacent to it.

The views of my constituents are well expressed in the resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Galesburg, Ill., which follows:

Whereas, the War Department Corps of Engineers, office of division engineer, upper Mississippi Valley division, St. Louis, Mo., under date of February 25, 1946, presents

under subject of "Notice of partially favorable report on feasibility of providing food protection along Illinois River, Ill., and tributaries" a program for flood control in which, under "Section g, Spoon River" a proposed dam at mile 67 near London Mills, Knox County, Ill., is to be constructed; and

Whereas under the plans and specifications of said program for flood control, 22,100 acres of productive farm land located in Knox County, Ill., above said proposed dam is to be acquired by the Federal Government to be used in connection with such dam and the use of which for agricultural production is to be partially or substantially discontinued; and

Whereas at least 36 grade-school districts and 5 high-school districts derive school taxes from the real estate included in such program and the result of the construction of such dam and such program will be to deprive such school districts of taxes now levied upon said real estate in some instances to the extent of 50 percent of such taxes and in all instances to the extent of a substantial portion of the school taxes now levied upon said real estate; and

Whereas under the plans and specifications for said program for flood control the result of such program in the taking of said 22,100 acres of land above said dam for public use would only furnish partial flood control protection to 20,800 acres of farm land less productive, located below said dam; and

Whereas the estimated annual maintenance cost of said dam and program will average approximately $15 per acre for such partial flood-control protection and the benefits to be derived from such flood-control program are not proportionate to the expense of the construction and maintenance of such dam and the loss of tax revenue to the taxing distr'cts of the county of Knox and State of Illinois; and

Whereas the taxing units of Knox County will lose between $26,000 and $28,000 per year because of the Federal Government action in taking over 22,100 acres of Knox County land for use as the reservoir area; and

Whereas the construction of such dam will cause a very important productive area to be cut off from the city of Galesburg, Knox County, Ill., which is the regular and practical source and means of trading and marketing because of its service facilities. In the sense of economics the city of Galesburg would be sustaining a loss of $613,970.86 in agricultural, livestock, and dairy production per year average, which has a great bearing upon the local food supply and will detrimentally reflect in the loss of employment and business which has been, and is now being, derived from that source: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Galesburg Chamber of Commerce of Galesburg, Knox County, Ill., That they hereby declare their opposition to the construction of the said proposed dam at mile 67 near London Mills, Knox County, Ill.

Adopted this 22d day of May 1946 at Galesburg, Ill.

GALESBURG CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By R. WINN MILLER, *President.*
Attest:
J. WILLIS PETERSON,
Secretary.

Double Talk?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article by Frank C. Waldrop which appeared in the Times-Herald, Washington, D. C., on Thursday, May 30, 1946:

DOUBLE TALK?

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Some Americans whose experiences have convinced them that Francisco Franco's government of Spain cannot get a square deal in print in this country have sent in a quotation of Franklin D. Roosevelt's with the question: "Do you dare publish this?"

It was made by Mr. Roosevelt in November 1942, just after General Eisenhower landed in north Africa with the first of our troops and at a moment when it mattered a great deal to us whether Franco would stay neutral or let the Germans come down through Spain to attack our exposed sea-borne lines of supply. Here is what Roosevelt messaged Franco:

"It is because your nation and mine are friends in the best sense of the word and because you and I are sincerely desirous of the continuation of that friendship for our mutual good, that I want to * * * tell you of the compelling reasons that have forced me to send a powerful American military force * * * to north Africa. * * *

"I hope you will accept my full assurance that these moves are in no shape, manner, or form directed against the government or people of Spain. * * *

"I believe the Spanish Government and the Spanish people wish to maintain neutrality and to remain outside the war. Spain has nothing to fear from the United Nations."

These Americans also sent along quotations from Winston Churchill of May 1944. He was still Prime Minister of England then and Spain was no longer in a critically important spot so far as our strategy was concerned. We had the Nazis covered and D-day was just ahead. Any maneuvers into Spain would have done Hitler more harm than good.

So Churchill was apparently intent upon making a broad report for the record when he said that Spain had done the United Nations a good turn by refusing to give in to Germany. He added:

"I shall always consider it a service rendered by Spain not only to the United Kingdom and the British Empire and Commonwealth but to the cause of the United Nations. * * * I am here today to speak kindly words about Spain. Let me add this hope: * * * That she will be a strong influence for the peace of the Mediterranean after the war."

Now what was all that from Roosevelt and Churchill? Double talk? Was Roosevelt just buying safety for our landing in north Africa with his 1942 message to Franco? Was his "Spain has nothing to fear from the United Nations" just so much hypocrisy?

As of this moment, Franco's government is up before some kind of United Nations kangaroo court on charges to the effect that Franco is threatening world peace. The Russians' stooge government of Poland filed the complaint.

Reports have come to this writer that Americans interested in getting before the said court with evidence helpful to Franco instead get only a bum's rush from functionaries around UN Secretary General Trygve Lie.

Specifically, some American citizens from Baltimore, Md., report that they have tried to submit original documents of importance to the UN and do not get back even so much as a telegraphic acknowledgment of their offer.

As this was written they were planning to go up to New York and bang on the UN front door—if there is one—and at least make the record clear that they did everything they could to get a hearing. We shall see how it turns out.

But as to Spain—what do you make of the quotes from Roosevelt and Churchill here given? What does it make of us, now, after those statements, that Spain is in effect under indictment before the UN as a threat to world peace?

The accusations are that Franco was too close to Hitler during the war and since has harbored Nazi agents.

Well, Russia was closer to Hitler when the war started than any other power in the world, had a treaty with him and harbored plenty of Nazi agents. Not only that, but helped Nazi agents around the world.

And right now, Russia is using Nazis in Europe whenever and wherever it suits her policy to do so. If you doubt it, go look through the statements of official Americans concerning Russian methods of government in occupied Germany.

Anybody who has followed the thing at all knows what's up with respect to Spain. Franco led a revolution against the so-called Spanish Republic.

He used all the help he could get, including German, Italian, English and American—and won. The "Republic" lined up with Russia—and got licked.

J. Stalin is a long and relentless hater. He hates Franco as the fish that got away and he will never forget that. Stalin simply wants the UN to do his dirty work, and never mind those Roosevelt-Churchill pledges.

Well, if Franco is destroyed, what will happen in Spain? Inevitably there will be more bloodshed, more civil war, more shootings, hangings and imprisonments.

There will hardly be any peace in the Mediterranean if Spain, is shoved through the meat grinder again. And what the civilized world now needs most of all is peace, not revenge.

Only Stalin thrives on revenge.

If the USA goes along with a UN lynching of Franco it will be playing the game of revenge, but it will not be building peace, anywhere.

The Oregonian Approves Idea of Alaskan International Highway Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, because a final vote will be taken in the House of Thursday, June 6, on H. R. 2871, a bill to provide for the creation of an Alaskan International Highway Commission, I am happy to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the Portland Oregonian of Thursday, May 30, 1946. This article approves the bill, H. R. 2871, for the creation of an Alaskan International Highway Commission and I recommend it whole heartedly to the membership for its consideration:

LAND TRAVEL TO ALASKA

The House Rules Committee has given its approval to a bill by Representative MANSFIELD of Montana, setting up an Alaska international highway commission which would undertake to improve and develop land travel between the United States and its largest territorial possession. The bill should be passed.

Although the United States has invested $150,000,000 in the project, overland transportation to Alaska is now in a chaotic state. Canada still closes the Alaska military highway to general tourist traffic, although a re-

port of the House Roads Committee maintained that the road would permit travel at a speed of 50 miles an hour. The Canadians give as their excuse that there are no facilities along the highway. However, an article in the current issue of Alaska Life magazine contends that the highway is dotted with hotels, roadhouses, and gas stations that are uniformly hospitable and helpful.

The Fairbanks businessman who authored the article says the trip over the highway from his native community was so pleasant that he hopes to repeat it in the near future.

The Alaska International Highway Commission would not only get down to business with our Canadian neighbors on the present road. It also might be able to do something about the construction of connections from the Pacific seaboard, via the Peace River district of British Columbia as well as from Prince George. The Mansfield bill should be enacted, so that this country has somebody definitely charged with the development of land communication to our far northern rampart.

More Hospitalization for Maryland Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 24, 1946

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 23, 1946.

Gen. OMAR N. BRADLEY,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs,
Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL BRADLEY: The Veterans' Administration operates three hospitals at the following points in Maryland:

Fort Howard: General hospital.
Perry Point: Neuropsychiatric hospital.
Fort Washington: General hospital.

In addition, approximately 200 beds have been set aside at the Fort Meade General Hospital for use by the Veterans' Administration. Likewise, approximately 50 beds are available at the marine hospital in Baltimore for use of the Baltimore regional office. Veterans of Maryland suffering with tuberculosis condition are usually sent to Oteen, N. C.

Inasmuch as the Veterans' Administration has approved 1,000-bed hospitals for Buffalo and Albany, N. Y., it would seem that a metropolitan city the size of Baltimore should also have a hospital similar in size. The establishment of a general medical hospital in Baltimore and the utilization of the Fort Howard General Hospital for tuberculosis patients would adequately meet the needs of the State of Maryland for general medical tuberculosis cases. It would also seem that additional neuropsychiatric beds are necessary to handle the ever increasing neuropsychiatric load. While the good work being done by both the Army and the Marine Corps is appreciated, nevertheless, it is felt that veterans should be hospitalized in hospitals operated exclusively by the Veterans' Administration.

With reference to the contemplated 300-bed tuberculosis hospital to be built in Baltimore, it would seem that the needs could best be served by converting the hospital at Fort Howard to a tuberculosis hospital and constructing a 1,000-bed general medical hospital in Baltimore and that the latter should be so constructed to provide approximately 100 neuropsychiatric beds for those cases residing in Maryland and in need of treatment in such a hospital. The neuropsychiatric load for both white and colored patients is increasing from day to day, and since the State hospitals, private hospitals, and the Veterans' Administration hospital at Perry Point are loaded to capacity, it would appear that immediate action in this direction is necessary at this time in order to alleviate the crowded conditions now existing at those points.

It is felt that since Maryland supplied approximately 300,000 veterans for both World Wars I and II that a 1,000-bed hospital in Baltimore is justified in order to meet the heavy demand anticipated in the not-too-distant future. Likewise, it is felt that by constructing a 1,000-bed hospital in Baltimore, the crowded conditions existing in general medical hospitals in and around the area of Baltimore could be relieved to a considerable degree. Certainly if cities like Buffalo, N. Y., and Albany, N. Y., and other cities smaller than Baltimore justify 1,000-bed hospitals, the city of Baltimore should fall in that category. Incidentally, the city of Baltimore furnished approximately 60 percent of the 300,000 veterans who served in both World Wars I and II. This is another reason why a general medical hospital of approximately 1,000 beds should be constructed at that point.

I am prepared to introduce legislation to bring this about if you think it advisable. May I hear from you on this matter?

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
Third District, Maryland.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 1, 1946.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. D'ALESANDRO: I have your letter of May 23, 1946, relative to the desirability of the placing in Baltimore of a 1,000-bed general medical and surgical hospital and offering to introduce legislation providing for such hospital.

I am most appreciative of your interest in our hospital program and of the suggestions which you have made. It is our hope ultimately to provide a medical center in Baltimore which would consist of a large general medical and surgical hospital in addition to the tuberculosis hospital now authorized. At the present time, however, we have authorization for a 300-bed tuberculosis hospital in that city.

As you know, we have the over-all needs of the country under continuing study and, as soon as these studies indicate the need for a center such as you describe in Baltimore, we shall make recommendations to that effect. Such recommendations are made to the Federal Board of Hospitalization and are approved by the Bureau of the Budget and the President of the United States.

It would not appear necessary at this time that additional legislation be enacted providing for this hospital since it may be authorized under existing procedures as soon as the need for it justifies its recommendation.

You may be assured of our desire to provide adequately for the veterans of Maryland and to utilize to the fullest extent the advantages offered by the medical center in Baltimore. We are obtaining the best possible cooperation from the medical schools in Baltimore in forwarding our hospitalization program.

Very truly yours,
OMAR N. BRADLEY,
General, United States Army,
Administrator.

Extension of Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SHERMAN ADAMS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, it is sometimes difficult to understand the reasons for the attitude of the man in uniform toward the action taken by the Congress on matters that affect him and his service to the country. The following letter is so expressive of an attitude taken by so many men now in service that it might be read with profit by all Members of Congress:

HEADQUARTERS, THREE HUNDRED
AND FORTY-THIRD INFANTRY,
APO 450, UNITED STATES ARMY,
San Francisco, Calif., June 2, 1946.

Hon. SHERMAN ADAMS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ADAMS: This letter is written as an appeal from those of us who are unable to do anything about our present situation, to those of you who are in a position to do something about it. The reason I am writing you is that you are there, on the scene, and you are the ones who are going to have to carry our fight to the floor of Congress, and, if necessary, to the people. I have never voted myself, but by the time the next election rolls around I shall be able to, and so will a lot of others of my age. And the bitter lessons that we are learning today and every day on the inefficiency and cowardliness of Congress, both Houses, in dealing with the matter of the draft are not lessons that we shall easily forget.

I know that you are for the draft extension, and for the drafting of teen-agers as well. So rather than attempt to convince you why you should fight for something as vital as this, I am going to try and tell you why we feel that this is important and vital to the whole world, as well as to those of us whose whole immediate futures depend on it.

We won the war. You and I know that. But, without beating around the bush, I shall say this. We are losing the peace. Just as fast as we can we are throwing away the very things that I and millions of others fought for, and that a lot of us, my unfortunate comrades, died for. I say, "unfortunate." I wonder. For, save for a fleeting moment of agony, they died peacefully, secure in the belief that their country would never let them down in anything, no matter how small or picayune that matter seemed or was. And they were right—at the time. Never in all creation has so much been poured into any undertaking as was poured into the war by us and by all our allies. That is trite to repeat. The reason I do it is to add the urgency of contrast, and a horrible and shocking contrast it is, to my plea for action as regards the draft. I am not just waking up and starting to yell because it has just dawned on me that I might get home as soon as some others—far from it. I have been calling for an extension of the draft and compulsory training ever since shortly after the close of hostilities, when it began to become apparent that we were not doing the job that we should have been doing all over the world. Although I have been overseas for 15 of my 20 months' service, I would still willingly, yes, even gladly, stay over here for 10 more months if I thought it would go any distance toward preserving the peace and security of the world. So would countless others. But we are being let down by our representatives, by our leaders, and most of

all by our own generation. They are bombarding you with letters and telegrams and pleas of all kinds. Don't send my boy overseas; don't send my boy into that horrid Army, etc.

And your not so distinguished colleagues—what of them? Are they big enough to put facts before votes, and the good of the Nation before the willful selfishness of a blinded narrow-minded few? I'm afraid not. At least, not so far. It is up to you to do something about them and to push this thing with all the energy and resources at your command till it is through.

We have not done our part yet, any of us. We are all in this thing up to our necks, and there is nowhere to turn except to the front, and no place to go except forward. There are still those of us who, despite everything, turn to the rear. Too many of them. They are the minority, the vocal minority, unfortunately and they are the ones to whom you are listening. This is our side, the side that we believe with all our hearts and minds to be the right and the best side, and the side we are trying to fight for. It's hard, at this distance, to do anything so big. But we are trying, and we shall keep on trying, and we shall remain convinced that we are right, even if the vociferous minority wins, and the precious teen-agers can go on leading their precious lives in security and smug self-satisfaction.

Listen to us, fight for us, and show us that common sense and moral obligation have not become so many forgotten hazy ideals, lost along with all the rest of the resolutions and promises that we have been making to the world and have never kept.

The issues are crystal clear, the lines are drawn, and it is up to you. Do not let us down. You must not fail us now. It is your duty, it is your obligation, it is your commitment, more than any other you have ever made. It proves to all concerned whether or not you have learned the lessons of the last 25 years or whether you are still going around in a silly cocoon of blind isolationism. The decision is with you.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS NUGENT TROXELL, Jr.,
Personnel Section, Three Hundred and Forty-third Infantry.

No Help From Mr. Murray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of June 4, 1946:

NO HELP FROM MR. MURRAY

In his letter to the President asking him to veto the Case bill, Philip Murray, the president of the CIO, has made it clear that if Congress and the President hope to frame a balanced program of labor legislation, defining the rights and responsibilities of both management and labor in a genuinely two-sided manner calculated to promote industrial peace, they can expect no help from Mr. Murray, for Mr. Murray wants only duties and responsibilities for management; he wants Government coercions directed exclusively against management; he wants only rights and privileges for union leaders and no corresponding duties or responsibilities.

His letter admits of no other interpretation.

Every effort that has been made in the last 10 years to restore the slightest approach to balance in Federal labor legislation is denounced by him as "shameful," "infamous," "vindictive," "bare-faced," "smear," "witch-hunt," "blackmail." Every effort, even the most moderate, to ask for duties or responsibilities for union leaders in exchange for their privileges is denounced as an effort to "shackle labor."

He is not only against the Case bill; he is against any regulation whatever of what he calls the internal affairs of labor organizations. He objects to any supervision whatever of labor by the Federal courts—though not to such supervision of employers. He is opposed to damage suits against unions regardless of the damage that any of them may do. All picketing is apparently by definition "peaceful picketing"; and he doesn't want any control of it.

In Mr. Murray's opinion there is apparently no such thing as an honest amendment of the Wagner Act or any such thing as a sincere effort, prompted by public spirit, to bring balanced labor legislation.

He lists practically every labor bill that has ever been offered in Congress in recent years and declares that all of them had "the sole objective of injuring labor." Wherever he finds provisions on the other side he dismisses them as a mere pretense of even-handedness. In his eyes the word "regulate labor" are nothing but a "chant of hate"—though he insists on the Wagner Act's regulation of employers.

He tells the President that "the labor-baiters have produced" the Case bill now before him. This is in effect to accuse a majority of both Houses of Congress, elected by the people, of being labor-baiters.

Mr. Murray accuses the sponsors of bills in Congress of "artificially stimulating resentment against trade unions" by introducing such bills. But he is clearly confusing cause and effect.

These bills are the result of resentment, not the cause of it.

It is not Congress that tried to tie up all the railways in the country.

It is not Congress that brought the Nation's production of coal to a halt and forced hundreds of factories to close.

It is not Congress that brought automobile production down to a trickle.

It is not Congress that stopped the country's steel production and the production of everything dependent on it.

Congress and the President have been put on notice. If they wish to restore the slightest balance whatever in labor legislation, they will have to do so over the determined opposition of Mr. Murray.

We Are Reaping the Whirlwind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ROLAND KINZER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer last Sunday, June 2, 1946:

WE ARE REAPING THE WHIRLWIND

Look well at the photograph here reproduced and think about its meaning. [Photograph not inserted in the RECORD.]

It is a startling, symbolic commentary on the break-down of constitutional government in this strike-ridden Nation after 13 years of the New Deal and the election of the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt to four terms as President.

This picture shows A. F. Whitney, head of the trainmen's brotherhood, and Alvanley Johnston, leader of the engineers' brotherhood, leaving the office of Secretary of State James F. Byrnes shortly before the collapse, on May 25, of the shocking railroad strike which for 2 days had paralyzed American industry and commerce and rendered democratic processes null and void.

Why had these two rail union moguls been conferring with, of all people, the Secretary of State?

Why hadn't their discussions at this critical hour been carried on with Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach rather than with the titular director of our foreign policy?

The answer should be obvious: There wasn't anybody else. Their visit to Byrnes was typical of the utter confusion in Government which had come about with the advent of the New Deal. Orderly procedures had broken down long ago.

This is the same Jimmy Byrnes, of course, who, as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, had the dubious distinction 4 years ago of delivering a majority opinion holding a New York City teamsters' union exempt from prosecution under the Federal anti-racketeering law.

And at the peak of the rail crisis there was nobody in the executive department but the politically astute Byrnes who was competent enough or commanded sufficient respect to step into the breach with even a faint prospect of restoring peace.

Why? Because the executive department, no less than the legislative and judicial branches of the Government, had for years been completely dominated and dictated to by one man, Mr. Roosevelt.

Let us review briefly the grim record of the downfall of our hard-won, tripartite Government which has produced strike conditions close to anarchy.

From almost the moment the New Deal came into power in 1933 President Roosevelt began bombarding Congress with demands for "must" legislation—and never mind its constitutionality.

Orders for grants of power, for multi-billion-dollar appropriations and for discriminatory laws came thick and fast from the White House.

It isn't surprising that within a short time Congress forgot how to act on its own initiative, forgot that the Constitution gave it coequal power with the Executive, and, as a matter of course, came to look to the White House for "You must do this" or "You must not do that."

Thus were passed, with the blessing of the New Deal President, the dictatorial NRA and AAA, the Guffey coal control bill, the notoriously lop-sided and unfair Wagner Labor Act; and the way was cleared—while the White House kept up a running fire on business leaders as "Princes of Privilege" and "Lord Macaulays"—for the emergence of such labor potentates as John L. Lewis, Joe Curran, Petrillo, Whitney, Johnston, and other unionized challengers of Government authority.

In much the same way that he sapped the spirit and independence of the Congress, President Roosevelt undermined and weakened the Federal courts.

His proposal in early 1937 to pack the Supreme Court with, in effect, jurists sympathetic with New Deal aims, shocked the Nation. The project was stormily rejected by Congress, but, through deaths and resignations, Mr. Roosevelt eventually was able to name eight new Supreme Court justices—including Byrnes, who later resigned—thus virtually remaking the Court to fit his own ideas.

There followed, one after the other, high court rulings upholding the New Deal's preferences and prejudices.

Union pressure groups quickly learned that they were viewed by the Supreme Court majority as outside the laws regulating business and industry. They became so strong that their insistent demands harmed, rather than helped, the broader interests of the great army of loyal, industrious union members who treasure the right to work as well as the right to strike.

From them, naturally, rose arrogant leaders who not only thought themselves greater than the Government but were actually able to seize the Nation by the throat while the Government stood helplessly by.

So, with the executive, legislative, and judicial functioning of its Government crippled by New Deal bungling, the United States has rocketed from one strike crisis to another, while industrial production lagged and inflation perils soared, and while the world stood aghast at the sight of this once powerful Nation floundering in the economic doldrums.

Many centuries ago it was written, Hosea 8: 7, "For they have sown the wind, and they shall reap the whirlwind."

Today the harassed people of the United States are reaping the catastrophic whirlwind which the New Dealers sowed.

Is it any wonder that it's hard to gaze at that symbolic picture of Whitney and Johnston without feeling bitter?

No, it isn't. And it's no wonder that millions of thoughtful Americans now look eagerly forward to the day when, as voters at the polls, they will have the good old American privilege of kicking the New Dealers, their heirs, their apologists, and their Communist appendages from places of power in this great Republic.

Index to Veterans' Handbook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I desire to have printed in the RECORD an index for a handbook of information I have prepared for returning veterans in my district. The index follows:

INDEX, VETERANS' HANDBOOK

American Red Cross 5, 7, 8
Apprentice training 19
Arabian airport 48–51
Arrears of pay 10
Army emergency relief 8
Army hospitals 44, 45
Army rotation policy 41
Boston Veterans' Administration office 38, 39
Civil service 16, 17, 43
Contact service 33
Contact unit 31
Cushing Hospital 36–38
Dependency discharge 5, 6
Dependency benefits 2, 43, 55, 56
Dependents Allowance Act 2, 43, 55, 56
Disability benefits 17, 18
Directory of information 35
Discharge, copy of 28
Discharge papers 42
Discharge review 27, 28
Education 18
EMIC plan 1
Emergency furloughs 7
Emergency relief 8
Family allowances 2, 43, 55, 56
Federal employment 16, 17, 43
Fitchburg contact unit 31, 32
Flags 11
Furloughs, emergency 7
Future benefits 40
Future legislation 40
GI bill 15, 18, 19, 20, 59–62
Gratuity pay 9
Hardship discharge 5, 6
Home-town medical care 22, 54
Hospitalization 13, 21
Income-tax bill 52
Infant care 1
Information directory 35
Insurance 10, 24
Itinerant contact service 33
Legal assistance 13
Loans 20
Luzon prisoners, return of 45, 46
Maternity care 1
Milford Veterans' Council 46
Mustering-out pay 27, 43, 57, 58
National cemeteries 12
Navy Relief Society 8
Nonhazardous duty 13–15
Overseas travel, GI wives 9
Pensions, widow 10
Press comments 44
Readjustment allowances 20
Rest homes 23
Return of war dead 11
Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act 13
Surplus priorities 28–31
Unemployment compensation 20
VA decentralization 47
Vocational training 18, 19
War dead, return of 11
Workshop colonies 23

Away for a While

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a poem entitled "Away for a While," by Henry Gillen, which appeared in the Boston Post on May 30, 1946:

BY HENRY GILLEN

On the wonderful day of judgment
When the souls are gathered in,
And all who have gone before us
Are joined with their kith and kin,
From the dim and the distant reaches,
From the alien sea and isle,
There will come some young men marching,
Marching, amarching—
There will come some young men marching
Who have been away for a while.

There will come some young men marching
And the world that stands about
Will startle the spinning comets
With the thunder of the shout.
And the elders will weep with rapture
But the young will gaily smile,
With the gladness of all returning,
Returning, returning—
With the gladness of all returning
Who have been away for a while.

With the gladness of all returning
They will come to the place at last,
Where the sadness of all the partings
And the absence are past,
And we who have been their debtors
Will kneel by the golden aisle,
As they march to eternal glory,
Glory, O glory—
As they march to eternal glory
Who have been away for a while.

The OPA From Another Point of View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of George A. Martiny to Wisconsin Members of Congress on behalf of the Farm Implement Dealers of Wisconsin:

I hope you men will pardon me for my crude way of expressing myself. I am not an attorney, and I haven't the ability nor the education to make profound statements as you men have, so I must resort to these methods.

As I see the OPA, its past, present, and future, allow me to make a comparison to illustrate my point. In this statement I am not expressing the views of all of the implement dealers of the United States nor the views of even our own Wisconsin group. For as Mr. Walsh and myself have contacted you men here at Washington, I am personally convinced that you men are not all of the same mind as to the OPA and its past, present, and future operation. As a comparison, let us say that we are all confronted with taking a trip down a country road. It appears that we all are going the same direction and all have various pieces of luggage to take with us. This is somewhat of a treacherous road we have to travel so we pool a certain amount of our resources and buy a used automobile for the trip. It looked fair, and we have reason to believe that it will furnish transportation that would be much better than walking this treacherous, hazardous road, and we can junk it at the end of the trip and feel happy; or we can assume that there may be some salvage value left at the end of the trip. But if there isn't any, we all have had good value for the expenditure so it is a sound bet either way.

To illustrate, let us call this automobile OPA. We agree that we must have a chauffeur. To illustrate, let us liken this chauffeur to the management or administrator of OPA. We hire a man to drive us on this trip. We are all satisfied that the man we hire is thoroughly familiar with where we want to go, but other than that we know nothing about him other than that he appears to be a pretty good fellow. The trip is started and we make good progress. Suddenly we hit a hole hard and break a tire. Our driver does not know how to change the tire and assures us that it will go flat nearly as well anyway. We question his judgment but still let him go on. We shortly find ourselves in the ditch, so after sizing up the situation we decide to put our shoulders behind the car and push it back into the road while our driver sits in the seat and rides. We proceed, but the road gets more difficult. We suddenly find that this driver insists on going too close to the trees and too near the edges of high banks and is hitting every obstacle in the road, and we find that if we are not behind pushing, it is much safer to walk than ride anyway.

A native farm boy comes along and reminds us that we have a flat tire. He also knows the road the rest of the way to the end of our journey and can readily make the repair on the tire and appears to have a good, sensible knowledge of the situation, and offers to give us a fair price for the purchase of the car at the end of the trip.

Gentlemen, shall we continue as is, change drivers, or leave it in the ditch and walk. Why have we got a Philadelphia banker, with

apparently no knowledge of agricultural and farm problems, operating the pricing of farm equipment? Shall we walk the rest of the way, change drivers, or junk the car in the ditch? Personally, I'd like a safe ride the rest of the way. I believe little business has walked and been pushed about all it is able.

With OPA, is the servant serving the master or is the master serving the servant? I'm personally afraid that if our implement group doesn't get immediate relief you men in Congress won't need to make any decision on OPA. The people will have made it. If it cannot be administered so as not to increase the chaotic condition and bottleneck production, then we should junk the car on the spot where it is and walk the rest of the way.

We greatly appreciate the courtesies that you busy men have extended to Mr. Walsh and myself in our vital problem, and furthermore want to thank you personally in behalf of the Wisconsin implement dealers group and in behalf of the national association for any immediate relief you can give us.

GEORGE A. MARTINY.

BARABOO, WIS.

Federal Government Violates Its Own Price Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under our constitutional form of government we have three branches or divisions—separate and distinct, yet each cooperating with the other to give proper balance—legislative, executive, and judicial. What form of cooperation can you call the acts of the judiciary when they violate the rules and regulations as promulgated by the OPA under the executive department and sell sugar as high as 18 cents per pound?

EXCERPT FROM BROADCAST OF FULTON LEWIS, JR., MAY 21, 1946

Now, I have here tonight, ladies and gentlemen, a story about sugar—in which you may be interested. You probably are painfully aware of how difficult sugar is to get; it's the one commodity on which rationing is still in effect. You've heard, too, the constant importunings by the Government to support the OPA, by not buying at more than ceiling prices; you've heard it over your radio, in the form of so-called Government plugs. Don't buy anything at more than ceiling prices; if you do, you're encouraging and actually supporting the black market.

Well, that talk is rather vague and indirect, so maybe tonight you'd like to have a few names named, and a few figures and places and details stated, a few actual sales—in this case, of sugar—at more than ceiling prices; way, way more than ceiling prices.

I have them here for you, completely documented, and all of these sales took place in the State of Louisiana on the 1st day of May of this year.

These were wholesale sales, and the total amount was 1,009,000 pounds, a lot of sugar. The wholesale ceiling price on sugar is 6 cents a pound. Remember that. Six cents a pound.

The Seven-Up Corp., of San Antonio, Tex., bought 609,000 pounds at an average price of 8.37 cents per pound. The Mayence-Ship Candy Co., of Texarkana, Tex., bought 150,000 pounds for 14.3 cents a pound. The Bossier Enterprises, Bossier City, La., bought 150,000 pounds at 13.4 cents a pound. The Pepsi Cola Co., at Waco, Tex., bought 100,000 pounds at 18 cents a pound.

Remember, the OPA wholesale ceiling price, which applies to sales of sugar in such quantities as these, is 6 cents a pound.

It may interest you further to know that no ration points were collected from these companies.

There are the sales, and the purchasers. Now, the question remains, Who was the seller and what has been done to punish him. Well, not a thing has been done, nor will it be done, because the seller of these 1,009,000 pounds of sugar, at prices ranging from 8¾ cents a pound to 18 cents a pound was—guess who—the United States Government—itself violating its own ceilings.

Tennessee—An Interpretation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 5, 1946

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by my distinguished colleague from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] on last Saturday at the ceremony held in the Library of Congress on the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the admission of the State of Tennessee to the Union:

Ladies and gentlemen, this cannot be a detailed history of Tennessee. It must be rather an interpretation of its recurrently crucial role in the rise and progress of a people. This is not a statistical summary of the products of its good earth and its mills, but a view of its spiritual contribution to the national character.

Tennessee, within recorded history, never was an utter wilderness without civilization. There has been a culture there for ages. The museums and parks of the State hold that record—the pottery fragments and the images, the sites of ancient towns and temples, which tell of some kinship with the great Indian cultures that once extended from the Mississippi Valley into Mexico and Peru—the civilizations that startled Cortez and Pizarro, and produced Montezuma and Atahualpa.

The earliest Spanish, French, and English explorers found the land of Tennessee occupied mainly by the Chickasaws and the Cherokees, already living in defensive towns and displaying the culture that later ranked them among the Five Civilized Nations of the lower South. De Soto, Marquette, La Salle, French, and Timberlake all found a culture far in advance of any to be observed in more northerly regions. The formidable Chickasaws were so well organized as to be sought as allies; and the Cherokee mixed culture later produced such figures as Elias Boudinot, John Ross, Major Ridge, and Sequoyah. The latter is said to have been the most intellectual American Indian of his time, the inventor of the Cherokee alphabet.

The Cherokees who look at us from old lithographs, in early histories of the Indians, disappoint the romantic seeker of savages daubed and half naked. They show evidence of long contact with the white trader—in their figured coats and jewelry and their oriental-looking turbans of brightly colored stuffs. They were warriors. But they were also a cultured nation, as described in 1765 by Lt. Henry Timberlake, who left to posterity a map of their towns, and took a group of them to London. There they became the "rage," went to the fashionable resorts, and had their portraits done—Chief Ostenaco by none other than the celebrated Sir Joshua Reynolds, painter to the court and the aristocracy.

The allegiance of these people was eagerly sought by both English and French frontier diplomats, in the course of their mortal struggle for possession of the continent. The French had the misfortune to make enemies of the Chickasaws (who as early as 1729 sided with the English), and so lost their chance to hold strategic west Tennessee. This, even though La Salle's expedition left Fort Prudhomme in their country as early as 1682, and Bienville, Governor of Louisiana, built Fort Assumption in 1739. The English fought the Cherokees for possession of the rich Tennessee Valley, and in 1756 built old Fort Loudoun, at the time the most western English stronghold in North America.

The French party among the Cherokees won some battles and destroyed the fort, but the English won the war, and after the Cherokee campaigns of 1760–61 Tennessee was destined to be Anglo-American.

That probably was the first time Tennessee was a strategic place in American history—and certainly it was not the last. Anyone who could hold the Chickasaw Bluffs and the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers was in a fair way to command the great valley of the Mississippi. We shall see this happen again.

Anglo-American penetration and settlement of Tennessee through the mountains, beginning as early as the 1760's, brought the second occasion when Tennessee had an effect upon and shaped the course of our national history. By 1775 the valleys of the northeast were filling with hardy pioneers, largely of the Scotch-Irish breed from Virginia and the Carolinas. It has been remarked that they learned their pioneering craft before they came to America, and that people who had lived for a few generations among the fierce and dispossessed native Irish kerns were likely to find the Indians comparatively mild. So they were not overalarmed by a vermilioned face at the window. Nor were they afraid of Lord Cornwallis' army, which by 1780 had overrun the Carolinas and was extinguishing the patriot cause there. One of milord's arrogant officers—of the type that would vainly order the boy Jackson to clean his boots—made the mistake of appearing as a threat to the "Over Mountain Men" in east Tennessee. They met him at King's Mountain, and by capturing or killing his whole force, gave fresh heart to the drooping patriot fortunes. Maybe it wasn't the turning point of the whole war, but it freed a large part of the South at least.

North Carolina made the error of snubbing them—by trying to cede her western lands to the United States in 1784, thus giving impulse to the movement that started the short-lived state of Franklin, named for the philosopher and scientist, who wrote to Governor Sevier to thank the people for the honor. Short-lived, but important—the first successful State beyond the mountains, out of several proposed in that period! Those pioneers were capable of self-government—they were no lawless mob. They had courts, counties, schools—and the first overmountain college—Greenville College, chartered in 1794. Franklin passed in a brief welter of factional disputes, but the impulse to self-government did not die with it, and continued in the "Territory of the United States south of the river Ohio" (1790–96), and then in the State of Tennessee, after North Carolina ceded the western country in 1789.

Again Tennessee was important in the national destiny. Recognition of statehood in

1796 implied that the whole territory from the Ohio to the Gulf would eventually be marked off into new States. And the new Constitution of 1796 was a step toward the perfect democracy already living in the American dream. For Thomas Jefferson himself declared that it satisfied the ideal of a republican form of government better than any other he knew. The ultra-conservatives of the older States recognized that, too, and vainly opposed the admission of Tennessee. That Constitution marked the rise of the more democratic West, and the ultimate demise of colonialism and political privilege.

Then for a generation Tennessee became the spearhead of the southwestward course of empire—that is, of the frontier. The Creek and Seminole wars, and the encounter with General Pakenham at New Orleans in the War of 1812, marked the thrusts of that frontier, which eventually carried the line clear through Texas to the Rio Grande and the Pacific Ocean. From the mountains and valleys came not only volunteers for the Indian wars, the War of 1812, and the Mexican War—thereby giving Tennessee the name of the Volunteer State. There came also settlers for Alabama and Mississippi, Louisiana, Missouri, Arkansas, and Texas. One of Missouri's first Senators was Thomas H. Benton, who had lived in Tennessee. One of the first Senators from California was William M. Gwin, born in Sumner County. The Governor of Louisiana was William C. C. Claiborne, who also lived in Tennessee. And Tennessee volunteer regiments followed Taylor to Monterrey and Scott to Vera Cruz, Cerro Gordo, Chapultepec, and the halls of Montezuma. A Tennessee general, Gideon J. Pillow, won the commendation of Scott for his valor in the capture of Mexico City.

While the volunteers did the fighting, it was under a Tennessee President, James K. Polk, that the United States pushed its frontier from the Louisiana purchase to the Rio Grande and the western ocean.

This suggests the commanding role the State played through over 50 years of politics and statesmanship, from the election of the "War Hawks" to Congress in 1810-11, to the end of Andrew Johnson's Presidency in 1869. In that period Tennessee furnished three Presidents (Andrew Jackson, James K. Polk, and Andrew Johnson); a Secretary of War, John H. Eaton; an Attorney General, Felix Grundy; an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, John Catron; a Postmaster General, Aaron V. Brown. These are only a few. There were numerous other high Federal officers and diplomats. Also, the first full admiral of our Navy, David Glasgow Farragut; a president of the Republic of Texas, Sam Houston, who, as many have forgotten, also served as Governor of Tennessee; two Speakers of the House, John Bell and James K. Polk, who were rivals for the place. These, I repeat, are only a few of those we could name. A candidate for President in 1836, Hugh L. White, and one for Vice President in 1856, Andrew Jackson Donelson. Also the Southern Union candidate for President in 1860, John Bell. This is an astounding record. Indeed, for about two generations the State might almost be said to have dominated national politics. Jackson ceased to be President in 1837—for 8 years more he was the virtual head of the Democratic Party, and Donelson was regarded as his political heir. Two of the Presidents got practically all they wanted—Jackson and Polk. The latter, whom his enemies affected to consider as a second-rater, was in reality one of four most effective Presidents. Shortly after his inauguration he declared to his Secretary of the Navy that he wanted a sub-treasury and the acquisition of Oregon and California. He got them all. How many Presidents have we had who could say as much? He patiently kept one of our two famous Presidential diaries, in which may be read the record of the rounding-out of our imperial domain, so that a modern poet could say that we Americans "live on the curve of a continent."

It was no fault of Tennessee that there was a seam in the fabric of our Union, caused by the presence in one nation of two rival and unreconciled cultures, and that it was allowed to widen into a rent. The first impulse of most Tennesseans was to vote "No" when secession was seriously proposed—the first referendum on the question of calling a secession convention showed a decided majority in the negative. Only the pressure of actual hostilities pushed the State, reluctantly, out of the Union. And let it not be forgotten that in the election of 1860 Tennessee gave her vote to the Constitutional Union Party of Bell and Everett. A large portion of the State remained loyal to Jackson's toast, "Our Union, it must be preserved!" Her railroads and rivers were vital to both sides in the struggle—and when they fell completely into Federal hands, after 3 years of obstinate resistance, the end was in sight—the Confederacy could be chopped into segments and crushed by the massed manpower and industrial machine of the Federal Govern-

There was death in the pot—bitterness and fratricidal war. But, Tennessee later escaped the worst, degrading features of a reconstruction policy imposed by the will of a few upon a largely disfranchised people. And because of the superb courage of Andrew Johnson as military governor, she came out of the war with the semblance of a government, ready to pick up where the old order had left off in 1861, and to go onward bravely. In Johnson, the State could boast a President who conquered his first bitter impulse and decided to follow the moderate and forgiving policy Lincoln had foreshadowed in the second inaugural. All his past suggested unforgiving vengeance upon the secessionists. His good sense and loyalty to his chief compelled him to bind up the Nation's wounds.

To that same Johnson is due the credit of making a firm stand for the constitutional rights of the executive, in his defiance of the Tenure of Office Act, thus saving the Constitution from the violent hands of a temporary and infuriated faction. The tailor from "Old Greene" demonstrated another kind of courage (as much as in facing a muttering mob)—that of humility—when he consented to serve in the Senate of the United States after having occupied the highest office in the land—the only ex-President so to serve.

When he died, in 1875, Tennessee already was moving away from the war, in which her soil had been the arena of crucial battles, and was preparing for the battles that conquered illiteracy, and yellow fever, and economic devastation.

Somehow, Tennessee learned a valuable lesson from that contest between the feudal-agricultural and the industrial-capitalist societies. How well is seen in the contemporary pictures of her larger cities, especially Chattanooga, Knoxville, and Memphis, which became industrial centers within a few years after reconstruction. The State developed a more balanced and healthier economy, so that when the Nation was called upon for great exertions in two world-wide wars, Tennessee turned her hand to the plow and the machine all at once. And the volunteers kept coming as of old, from the long mountains and the valleys of the great rivers. The ultimate outcome of the development is the Tennessee of Alcoa and TVA, of the giant aircraft plant and the magnificent dam, and of the utilization of atomic energy. In this State, under stress of a national emergency, has grown the promise of a new world—if men can sufficiently discipline themselves to deserve it.

Behind all these facts are people—the people of the most highly native State in the Union. Few States can boast better—the base of Anglo-Saxon and Scotch-Irish, with some infusion of German and old colonial Dutch, and strains of later and more varied immigration in the cities. The ability to build a high civilization has always been there—and the wealth brought by industrialism has nurtured it to flower in a group of modern schools; a brilliant burst of literature, especially since the 1880's; and a history of musical culture practically unequaled. After all, in Tennessee has centered much of the study of American folk music and literature, and the State gave birth to the "blues." All of which suggests that Tennessee's history has the stuff of which the romance of peoples is made.

Tennessee has seen the clash of rival cultures—white man and red man, Latin and Anglo-American, plantation against yeoman and industrialist. It has witnessed the combat of great and vital personalities in the conflicts that shaped our political history—Democrat against Whig, Jackson against Bell and White, Unionist against Secessionist, Andrew Johnson against the Confederate generals Pillow, Polk, and Brown—not to mention "Parson" Brownlow, whose tough fiber and cold resolve are seldom to be matched anywhere—the foe of abolitionists and secessionists all at once.

Tennessee's history abounds in the things that have made the folk tradition of America—the camp meeting which they say was first in Tennessee, with the revival preaching which still is a vital factor in American religion. The war on ignorance and illiteracy was begun by the first settlers, who hired teachers for their children. Their love of the common school was championed by Andrew Johnson. The sporting tradition, that recalls Jackson's horses and the romance of the track. The tradition of song, still strong in the jubilee singers and the sacred-harp festivals. The tradition of frontier humor, that has given us the legend of Davy Crockett and Sut Lovingood, the Bob Taylor stories, and Opie Read of the Arkansas Traveler. The local color and dialect tradition in American literature, represented by Will Allen Dromgoole and Mary Murfree, better known as Charles Egbart Craddock. And the revival of American poetry, since the beginning of the new impulse about 1912, represented in Tennessee by a group whose names are passing into literary history: Allen Tate, John Crowe Ransom, Roark Bradford, Merill Moore, Ridley Wills, Donald Davidson. And the modern novelists—T. S. Stribling, John Fort, Evelyn Scott, and Caroline Gordon—to name only a few. The tradition of science—in Matthew F. Maury, the oceanographer; Dr. Marion Dorset, the agricultural scientist; Edward E. Barnard, astronomer; and Sir Francis Joseph Campbell, famous teacher of the blind.

As always, we come around once more to Tennessee as a people—a tough and enduring people, who have retained an enormous vitality and zest for life, after going through struggles that would have impoverished a lesser breed. They have given of their seed to people other States to the southwest. They have volunteered in our wars far beyond the call for men. They have fought out among themselves the issue of federalism or unity—and everyone knows where they stand. They have struggled out of the poverty of the grim years following civil war, and have met the challenge of modern science, and turned it to their own use. They have given us educators, scientists, great editors, poets, novelists and composers, statesmen, and generals.

Tennessee led the advance of the American frontier of old, to the Mississippi, to Texas, California, Oregon. It is not a platitude to say there is a new and different frontier—the one of the age of electrical and atomic power. Tennessee stands in the center of

that—again, in a strategic position, where the watchword again must be—unity or confusion.

The Nation faces a house-divided issue once more. Not sectional, but social, as the economic strains multiply confusion and bitterness. Tennessee once gave the answer—"Our Union, it must be preserved." The State is stronger now: and it remembers the great defenders of liberty under law, and remembers how its men were leaders, especially in those 50 years from 1815 to 1865. It will not depart from their tradition—"Our Union, it must be preserved."

Record of Hon. Claude Pepper, of Florida—Statement of Tampa Joint Advisory Board of the Cigar Makers International Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an advertisement consisting of approximately three columns in width, published in the Tampa Morning Tribune of May 30, 1946, entitled "Senator Pepper Speaks for the Welfare of the People of the State of Florida," and signed by the Joint Advisory Board of the Cigar Makers International Union.

In the body of the advertisement is the following statement:

The advertisement of this statement is made possible by voluntary contributions of nickels and dimes of organized cigar workers of Tampa.

The advertisement has reference, Mr. President, to the recent labor legislation which was before the Senate.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR PEPPER SPEAKS FOR THE WELFARE OF THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

The Tampa Joint Advisory Board of the Cigarmakers' International Union (AFL), representing approximately 6,000 organized cigar workers of Tampa, adopted a motion at its meeting of May 27 authorizing this advertisement in the Tampa Morning Tribune in answer to the statement of the board of governors of the Tampa Chamber of Commerce, the editorials and cartoons of the Tampa Morning Tribune, and statements of President Truman in support of his so-called emergency labor bill now pending before the United States Senate. The advertisement of this statement is made possible by voluntary contributions of nickels and dimes of organized cigar workers of Tampa.

The board of governors of the Tampa Chamber of Commerce on May 24 sent a telegram to Senator PEPPER stating, among other things, "We deplore your attitude in action on labor legislation" and "you do not represent views of the majority of the people in the Tampa trade area or the State of Florida." The statement of the board of governors of the Tampa Chamber of Commerce constitutes a gross misstatement of fact.

Since then, the President has introduced his draft labor bill, and statements and cartoons critical of Senator PEPPER'S attack against antilabor legislation and particularly the President's bill have appeared in the Tampa Morning Tribune.

Senator PEPPER is severely critized because he has the courage to fight against the President's labor bill, giving the President dictatorial powers over the laboring man, and other like antilabor legislation. Senator TAFT of Ohio, who has consistently voted against labor, is having a difficult time swallowing the President's supermonstrosity which, if enacted into law, will bring this Nation closer to fascistic government.

The members of the board of governors of the chamber of commerce and the editor of the Tribune do not hesitate to attack labor at every opportunity. But they said nothing about capital striking against the Government during World War II when they refused to produce implements of war until they were assured a sizable profit, the extent of which is common knowledge to all now that the war is over.

What few gains have been made by the laboring men and women of the State have not been with the help of the Tribune and the members of the board of governors of the chamber of commerce.

The members of the board of governors of the Tampa Chamber of Commerce have not helped to retain OPA and thus prevent the rise in the cost of living way beyond the ability of the average man and woman to pay. But, on the contrary, they have given active and open assistance to the National Association of Manufacturers in its attack upon OPA. Large advertisements were run in the Tampa Morning Tribune and other newspapers throughout the Nation attacking OPA, all paid by the National Association of Manufacturers. We all know that OPA stands in the way of these manufacturers from furthering their selfish interests and selling their goods at inflationary prices.

It has been brought out by OPA and other sources that many manufacturers have refused to release manufactured goods until OPA be abolished, thus directly obstructing the Government in its plan to bring about reconversion at the earliest possible date.

What is the story behind the railroad dispute? Do you know that the railroad employees are engaged in a hazardous occupation and that there were 589 employees killed in the year 1944? Do you know that the rules governing their work should be changed so as to reduce the number of dead and permanently injured? Do you know that a number of railroads are now only employing approximately 325,000 persons, whereas in 1936 they were employing 510,000 persons? Do you know that profits from class 1 railroads in 1945 were $453,000,000 after interest, rental, and taxes were paid, or more than twice the total profit of the entire period of 1936-39? This profit they were able to earn even though the Government allowed them to pay up what they owed in the way of war emergency charges by adding same to their cost of operation.

The attitude of the board of governors does not surprise the friends of labor. They know that many of the members of the board of governors of the Tampa Chamber of Commerce were actively and openly against Senator PEPPER when he ran for reelection in the year 1944. In fact, some of these members went as far as to bolt the Democratic Party and voted for Senator PEPPER'S Republican opponent in the general election. These gentlemen, by their stand in the primary and general elections in 1944, clearly showed that they did not then agree with the policy of Senator PEPPER. But the clear majority of the voters of the State of Florida saw fit to approve his policy and to reelect him to the United States Senate in the first primary election over a field of four opponents. It is well known that hundreds of thousands of dollars were spent in this election to defeat Senator PEPPER by the selfish interests representing capital, constituting a small minority of the people of the State of Florida. Thus we see where the members of the board of governors of the Tampa Chamber of Commerce attempt to constitute themselves as the official spokesmen for the majority of the people of the State when it is a well-known fact that they only represent a small, selfish, greedy minority who are angry at Senator PEPPER because he prefers to represent all of the people of the State of Florida and not just the few of the money class.

We of organized labor wish to remind the people of the State of Florida that the ones now fighting against organized labor are the same ones who fought every move of the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the Congress to enact legislation for the benefit of the common man and woman of the Nation. Each piece of legislation for the betterment of the common man and woman was enacted after a bitter fight because of the efforts of the selfish and greedy few who are now singing the same song under a different tune.

The board of governors of the chamber of commerce are the same people who have been holding back the progress of the South. Senator PEPPER represents the emerging new South. We are proud of Senator PEPPER. He speaks for the common people and the new South.

JOINT ADVISORY BOARD OF THE CIGARMAKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION.

National Health Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 5, 1946

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement before Senate Committee on Labor and Education on Wagner-Murray-Dingell national health bill submitted by George F. Addes, secretary-treasurer UAW-CIO, May 23, 1946:

On behalf of the organization which I represent, the UAW-CIO, I desire to thank this committee for the opportunity given to us to express the views of our membership on the national health bill.

I do not intend to take the time of the committee to review the general objectives and provisions of the bill. This has already been done by the statement submitted to this committee on behalf of Mr. Philip Murray, president of the CIO, whose support of the bill reflects our own views.

I should like to point out, however, that the membership of the UAW-CIO has given unanimous support to the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, both in its original and present forms, by action taken through their elected delegates at the last two national conventions. It may also be of interest to the committee to know that in our union, which is generally considered to be one of the most democratic in the world, and where there is the fullest opportunity for the expression of every point of view, not a single objection has been voiced to the position consistently and publicly taken by the union in support of this bill.

Fundamentally the reason the auto, aircraft, and agricultural implement workers of America want a national health bill is because their own experience has led them to the realization that an unfair and unnecessary financial barrier has been erected between their families and the proper medical and hospital care which they feel should be available to them.

I will discuss later the reason why we do not relieve that voluntary plans offer a solution. But here I would like to point out that until this financial barrier is removed, a tremendous and unnecessary cost in suffering and human lives is being paid every day by the American people. Let me illustrate from our own experience.

The UAW-CIO established a health institute in the city of Detroit in January 1943 for the purpose of diagnosing industrial diseases among our members and assisting in the elimination of the causes of these diseases in the factories and workshops of Detroit and vicinity.

The institute is under the direction of a licensed practitioner of medicine and under the guidance of a medical advisory committee consisting of physicians of national standing. During the past 3 years over 12,000 workers have been sent to the health institute by the participating local unions.

From the very beginning, the institute staff became aware that a large proportion of the workers who came for diagnosis of their ailments had failed to obtain medical and hospital treatment which they obviously had needed for a long period of time. Upon inquiry it was found that the principal reason for this failure to obtain necessary medical and hospital care was the inability of these workers to undertake the expense which they feared would be involved. The following cases are typical:

Case No. 1: Patient had been to several doctors with severe stomach pain. Each doctor gave him pills but no diagnosis was made since patient did not have enough money for X-rays. The health institute diagnosis was cancer of the stomach. Life expectancy—4 to 6 months.

Case No. 2: Patient had a severe heart condition and was unable to work because of severe myocardial damage. Since he had no money he was not under doctor's care and when he came here he had had no medical attention for over a year.

Case No. 3: Patient had a diagnosis of gastric ulcer made 4 years ago and had had periodic treatment but for the past 8 months has been unable to afford to see his doctor. His wife has a goiter and also had been under care but she has not been to the doctor for 8 months either, although both need medical attention.

Case No. 4: A physician told this patient he could not be hospitalized until he paid $50 for past services. The physician knew the family had no money and had applied for hospitalization for the patient through the county. The physician, who verified this, stated that patient should be hospitalized at once. The family had already paid $55 in medical bills and had exhausted its resources. The physician said that he wanted the $50 as the patient would require many services after being hospitalized by the county.

I believe these cases are typical of the experience of other agencies and are supported by the findings of investigations in this field.

It has been argued that voluntary insurance plans provide the answer to this problem. The Blue Cross plans have been frequently referred to in this connection. Our experience does not confirm this claim.

In Michigan the Michigan Medical Service and the Michiagn Hospital Service have been established to provide an insurance plan to take care of the health needs of the people. For 5 years the UAW-CIO has supported these services. Today our members constitute approximately 50 percent of their subscribers. I believe it to be a fair statement to say that it has largely been due to the support of our union in Michigan that these plans have achieved their present enrollment.

However, our decision to support these plans was not made because we believed they provided any real solution for the health problems of our members. Five years' experience with these plans has not changed our opinion. On the contrary, it has reinforced it.

The hospital-service plan has been the more successful of the two Blue Cross plans. This success was due to the fact that in most cases total hospital costs have been paid by the service and only in a limited number of cases has the worker been required to pay an additional amount. However, even with respect to the hospital service, there are two principal weaknesses.

1. Approximately one out of every five persons in Michigan is covered by the plan. A large proportion of the persons not covered are those who are most in need of the protection.

2. The cost is high (this may account for the fact that a majority of the people have not subscribed to the plan). At present it costs a worker $24 per year for his family for hospitalization. However, the cost is now being increased 40 percent to $34.20 for the same protection.

The heart of any real health-insurance program is the medical protection it provides. Hospitalization is frequently only the end result of lack of early and proper medical care. The Michigan Medical Service has proved completely inadequate to provide for the medical needs of our members. While we have supported the plan because we have felt that it is the best available plan, it has demonstrated to us that voluntary plans are definitely not the answer to the health needs of the American people. The plan has a number of fundamental weaknesses:

(1) It provides for no medical care—only for surgical care, and then only under hospital conditions. Surgical care at home or in the doctor's office, no matter how desirable or necessary, is not covered.

(2) It provides only limited protection, even for the restricted surgical services. The plan pays the doctor on the basis of an established fee schedule. If the subscriber's own doctor is not a participating member of the plan, he is not bound to accept the fee schedule of the Michigan Medical Service and he may charge any fee which he feels is reasonable and apply the amount received from the service on his bill.

Where the subscriber's doctor does participate in the plan, he may, nevertheless, charge the subscriber more than the schedule rate if the income of the subscriber and his family is more than $2,500 per year.

This income-limitation provision has completely destroyed the original objective of the plan. For the past 4 years most of our members have averaged more than $2,500 income per year. They have discovered that in a very large proportion of the cases they are billed over and above the amount which the doctor receives from the Michigan Medical Service. So the worker finds that his premium has only partly paid for the limited surgical service which the plan provides.

As an illustration of this development, in 1941 the average cost to a Detroit worker for an appendectomy was $75. The Michigan Medical Service provided a $75 fee which usually took care of the doctor's entire bill. By 1946 the average cost to the Detroit worker for an appendectomy had risen to $150. The worker today finds that after paying his premium to the Michigan Medical Service he still has a $75 bill to pay the doctor.

(3) No real effort has been made to safeguard the interest of the subscriber so far as it concerns the amount of the fee charged by the doctor. The plan is controlled by the doctors, and I suppose it is only natural that there has been little inclination on their part to remedy the complaints of subscribers.

The grave limitations of the Blue Cross plans are best illustrated by showing the extent to which people have turned to private insurance companies in a hopeful but futile effort to obtain health protection for their families.

I have had prepared and am submitting to this committee a table showing premiums received and the benefits paid by the four leading private health and hospital insurance companies which have sold policies in Michigan during 1941–44, the last 4 years for which such figures have been published by the Michigan Department of Insurance. I have included similar figures for the Blue Cross plans.

I believe that an analysis of these figures justifies the following observations:

1. Although the Blue Cross plans have increased their business from over $3,000,000 in 1941 to over $12,000,000 in 1944, or an increase of approximately $9,000,000, the private insurance companies have during the same 4-year period increased their business from over $23,000,000 to over $42,000,000, or an increase of $19,000,000. Thus it would appear that the increasing concern of people for an insurance plan which might give them real health protection has resulted in private insurance companies obtaining twice as much of the new insurance business in Michigan as the Blue Cross plans.

2. The private companies pay back to the subscriber an amount which varies from 19 to 57 cents for each premium dollar paid in. The average amount which the subscriber recovers from these companies is only 43 cents on his premium dollar. Most of the difference, totaling approximately $75,000,000 in 4 years, obviously represents excessive operating costs, high salaries, high-pressure promotions, and huge profits.

3. One private insurance company alone did a business of over $124,000,000 during this 4-year period, almost four times greater than the combined Blue Cross plans. In its extensive advertising and promotional campaigns this company promises the subscriber complete hospital, medical, and surgical care. It plays upon the deep desire of people for the complete protection which the Blue Cross plans do not offer. And by holding out this alluring promise to the subscriber and his family, this one company collected in Michigan alone over $124,000,000 in this 4-year period, and paid out in benefits only $52,000,000.

The table demonstrates that one of the most important results from the increased public interest in medical and hospital insurance plans during the past few years, since the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill was first introduced in Congress, has been the tremendous increase in the business of private insurance companies, who have thereby reaped phenomenal profits. One can hardly blame them for opposing the enactment of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, since such a development would simply put them out of the health and hospitalization business at their present rates.

It is no coincidence, we believe, that the largest of these private health insurance companies in Michigan has a regular program on a Michigan broadcasting station. They call it Freedom of opportunity. You may be sure that they are opposed to what the propagandists call the socialism of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. What they mean is that they want the freedom which will continue to provide them with the opportunity of amassing huge profits out of the mental and physical suffering and the unsatisfied health needs of the people.

In this connection, I would like to suggest that this committee or some other committee of Congress investigate the extent to which these health insurance companies have financed the tremendous Nation-wide propaganda campaign against the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill.

This propaganda, among other things, has sought to make it appear that the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill would destroy the relationship between patient and doctor and prevent free choice of doctor on the part of the patient. We in the labor unions are not professional people. Most of us do not have the educational background of doctors. But we have studied this bill rather carefully and

are convinced that this propaganda is completely without foundation in fact.

While it is true that under certain circumstances a doctor would not be permitted to collect fees from the insurance fund for an excessive number of patients on his list, we do not believe that this necessary administrative limitation destroys freedom of choice of physician.

Frankly we question the sincerity of the medical associations in raising the issue of free choice of doctor as one of their principal reasons for opposing the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. Workers have good reason to question the sincerity of the medical associations on this issue. For years they have been denied free choice of doctor under the workman's compensation laws of many States. For example, under the Michigan workman's compensation law a worker who is injured in his employment must, willy-nilly, go to the company doctor for treatment. Our union has sought for years, but unsuccessfully, to have the law amended to permit the worker free choice of doctor. Where was the Wayne County and the Michigan Medical Associations in this fight? They never lifted a finger to aid the unions in their efforts to obtain free choice of doctor for the worker.

Apparently the medical associations are not concerned about the deprivation of free choice of doctor if it is the worker who is deprived of this free choice. They apparently are not alarmed so long as it is the employer who is given the right to choose the doctor for the worker.

Is there any wonder that the workers should question the sincerity of the medical associations when they now cry out that the passage of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill will undermine the American system of medicine by destroying free choice of doctor. As the workers see it, the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill for the first time would give them the economic freedom to choose a doctor when they need one. That is the free choice that really matters.

If I may, I would like to comment briefly on the Taft bill which has been introduced as a substitute for the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, and which, I understand, has been referred to this committee.

Insofar as the Taft bill professes to provide medical services for the American people it no more constitutes a national health program than did the pre-New Deal poorhouse system constitute a social security program.

The Taft bill ditches completely the typically American insurance principle under which a person could obtain benefits as a matter of right because he had made his proportional contribution. It substitutes the despised and degrading "means" test under which a person must prove that he cannot afford to pay for medical services before he or his family can get medical attention.

The propagandists talk glibly of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill as undermining American institutions. I can conceive of no more effective means of undermining the morale—the independence of the American people than by imposing this "means" test upon their right to obtain medical care.

It's hard enough to be poor without being required to prove it if your kids get sick.

The American Medical Association and certain other organized groups have asserted that the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, which would provide medical services through an insurance fund to which everyone would contribute, is "communistic." So we are now presented with the Taft bill as a substitute. Presumably these same interests support the Taft bill in the belief that it is free from such contamination, and that it represents the highest manifestation of American principles. Are we to believe then that the American way of life requires our Government to stigmatize an American as a pauper before it can provide him and his family with necessary health protection?

We do not believe there is any alternative to a national health-insurance plan, if health protection is to be made available to every American, rich or poor alike. But those who still seek such an alternative should find food for thought in the current effort by the miners to obtain a health fund by direct negotiation with their employers. Everyone professes concern with the miner's health and agrees that something should be done. Yet, the same interests who cry "communism" when a national health-insurance plan is proposed cry "private taxation" when an effort is made to obtain an industry fund through the good old free-enterprise method of collective bargaining.

Its communism if the Government provides a universal health plan. It's private taxation if the burden is cast upon the industry through collective bargaining. So, in either case, the answer to the workers is "no."

Yes, you can hardly blame the workers for feeling that communism and free enterprise are pure propaganda phrases designed to becloud the issue and block the road to a solution to the people's health needs.

We do not believe that either private funds set up in each industry, or voluntary plans established on a State basis can solve the problem of the people's health. The cheapest, and the only effective solution within the framework of our economic system, is in the establishment of a national insurance plan.

Table of premiums collected and benefits paid by leading sick and hospital benefit insurance companies doing business in Michigan, 1941–44 (based on 1942–45 annual reports issued by Michigan Insurance Department)

	1941			1942			1943		
	Premiums received	Benefits paid	Percent of benefits paid to premiums received	Premiums received	Benefits paid	Percent of benefits paid to premiums received	Premiums received	Benefits paid	Percent of benefits paid to premiums received
ASSESSMENT OR COOPERATIVE COMPANIES									
Associated Mutual Hospital Service of Michigan, Detroit	$113,511.97	$55,914.86	49	$138,006.21	$63,922.05	46	$162,367.11	$72,749.24	45
Michigan Hospital Benefit Association, Detroit	696,498.56	480,083.12	69	896,168.48	556,785.19	62	1,093,543.77	565,929.86	52
Mutual Benefit Health and Accident Association, Omaha	22,254,221.49	10,144,251.68	46	27,007,698.55	11,158,736.62	41	33,395,350.11	13,191,150.51	39
Northern Mutual Casualty, Chicago	(1)	(1)		566,835.00	65,044.00	11	788,122.00	142,593.00	18
Total									
NONPROFIT ASSOCIATIONS									
Michigan Hospital Service, Detroit	$2,795,242.30	$2,061,335.27	74	$4,881,539.73	$4,100,374.84	84	$6,399,890.38	$4,863,958.18	76
Michigan Medical Service, Detroit	971,604.06	789,254.88	81	2,600,281.58	2,208,623.42	85	3,483,464.41	2,876,547.60	83
Total									

	1944			Total, 1941–44 premiums received	Total, 1941–44 benefits paid	Percent of benefits paid to premiums received, 1941–44
	Premiums received	Benefits paid	Percent of benefits paid to premiums received			
ASSESSMENT OR COOPERATIVE COMPANIES						
Associated Mutual Hospital Service of Michigan, Detroit	$203,045.15	$90,012.94	44	$616,930.44	$282,599.09	46
Michigan Hospital Benefit Association, Detroit	1,533,551.00	821,784.00	53	4,219,761.81	2,424,582.17	57
Mutual Benefit Health and Accident Association, Omaha	41,743,810.56	17,771,793.68	43	124,401,080.71	52,265,932.49	42
Northern Mutual Casualty, Chicago	905,407.00	215,813.00	24	2,260,364.00	423,450.00	19
Total				131,498,136.96	55,396,563.75	42
NONPROFIT ASSOCIATIONS						
Michigan Hospital Service, Detroit	$7,739,198.36	$6,085,796.84	79	$21,815,870.77	$17,111,465.13	78
Michigan Medical Service, Detroit	4,624,417.88	3,437,265.50	74	11,679,767.93	9,311,691.70	80
Total				33,495,638.70	26,423,156.83	79

1 No report.

Labor-Management Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio talk I made by electrical transcription over WIBW, a Kansas network, on June 2, 1946, discussing recently enacted labor-management legislation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends in the radio audience, so far as the immediate future is concerned, the world looks brighter today than it did a week ago. This talk of mine, by the way, is being recorded on Thursday, but the chances are that conditions will not have changed very much by the time the record is broadcast by electrical transcription Sunday afternoon.

The railroads are running again.

The coal strike has been settled—though the agreement has been made between John L. Lewis, head of the United Mine Workers and the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. James A. Krug, instead of by Mr. Lewis and the mine operators. But things being the way they are, the mine operators probably will have to sign the new contract. Until they do, the mines will continue under Government control.

Both settlements call for increases in wages to the tune of 18½ cents an hour. The coal settlement, which applies to soft coal only by the way, provides in addition for a so-called royalty of 5 cents a ton for the welfare fund that Lewis insisted upon. However, the contract follows the provision laid down in the Case bill, that the fund will be administered by a board of three men. One will be named by Lewis, one by the mine operators, and the third is to be selected by these two. The Lewis demand originally has been that the fund be administered by himself, and to be raised by a 7-percent payroll tax.

Taking it by and large, John L. Lewis is the winner in his strike against the mine operators and against the Government of the United States. The point he lost, namely, authority to handle the so-called welfare fund as a slush fund solely controlled by himself, is due to the fact that Congress bucked up and passed the so-called Case bill, prohibiting payments of royalties or taxes by employers to labor unions or labor leaders.

The Railway Brotherhoods' victory over the Government was not so sweeping. Mr. A. F. Whitney and Mr. Alvanley Johnston got their 18½ cents an hour increase, but on changes of working rules that would have brought their members additional increased pay amounting to even more than the hourly increase, they had to yield to the President.

The increases in wages, and the payments to the miners' welfare fund will, of course, have to be paid by the consumers of the country, just as the increases in wages won by previous and future strikes will have to be paid by the consumers.

I believe this is something that is not as generally understood as it should be. Wages are a very large part of production costs of every commodity produced; a very large part of every service (like transportation) rendered.

Those who buy the commodity, or the service, in the long run have to pay the cost of production, plus a profit on the investment.

There are some folks who believe this game—that the consumer pays—can be beaten by Government ownership and operation. That belief is a fallacy. It just isn't true. Because if the prices charged are not high enough to meet the production costs plus very high administration costs that go with Government bureaucracy, then the difference will have to be made up in taxes. Additional tax levies can be avoided for a while by Government borrowing, but that just means in the long run that the tax rates are doubled. The only alternative is repudiation of the debt created by government.

As I see it, the two hopeful signs of the past week are these:

The Congress passed the so-called Case bill, in the face of threatening pressures from organized labor.

The Senate rejected the strike-draft provision of the President's emergency so-called antistrike measure, in the face of very strong administration pressure.

And I want to say to you right now, in all seriousness, that the hope of this Nation today rests upon the legislative branch of the Government, the Congress, being free and independent of administration control and being free and independent of pressure groups' control, whether those groups are organized labor or other pressure groups.

Before going on to other matters, and just to keep the hat of history on straight, I believe I will summarize the main provisions of the so-called Case bill, which labor and leftist leaders have demanded that President Truman veto. I don't know whether President Truman will veto the Case bill or not. I will say this much, if he does veto it, I will vote to override the veto, when the bill comes before the Senate. And I hope, for the future welfare of the country, including the future welfare of organized labor itself, that the veto will be overridden—if there is a veto.

And let me say right here that FRANCIS CASE is a fine Congressman from South Dakota, a successful stockman and newspaperman, elected by big majorities every election for the past 10 years.

Here are the eight main provisions of the Case bill:

1. It proposes to create a Federal mediation board, including representatives of management, labor, and the public, to attempt to work out solutions for major labor disputes. It would prohibit strikes or lock-outs during a 60-day period while the mediation board is attempting a solution that labor and management will accept. The decisions of the mediation board are not binding on either party to the labor dispute.

2. The act carries a provision for civil suits against either management or labor for breach of contract, but these cannot be brought against individual members of a union.

3. Any who engage in acts of violence in connection with a strike, including violence or intimidation on the picket line, lose their rights as employees under the Wagner Act.

4. Secondary boycotts are declared to be illegal. Violators would lose their bargaining and reemployment rights under the Wagner Act. This provision is aimed mainly against the use of the strike as a weapon in jurisdictional disputes against parties who are not parties to the dispute.

5. The Case bill also declares that supervisors as such cannot have the rights of employees under the terms of the Wagner Act if they join a supervisors' union.

6. Employer contributions (royalties or pay-roll taxes) to unions for so-called welfare funds are prohibited. However, the act details how welfare trust funds can be created and contributions made by employers, the trust funds to be administered jointly by management and labor.

7. In major labor disputes involving public utilities, the act provides for fact-finding boards to determine and make public the facts. This provision applies only where rates—prices—are determined by a governmental agency.

8. Lastly, the Case bill carries the provisions of House-passed Hobbs antiracketeering bill, making illegal acts of violence, intimidation or coercion by unions or union members to extort money from persons engaged in interstate commerce. Under this provision, farmers driving their trucks to the city cannot be compelled to pay tribute to unions or members of unions under the guise of paying initiation fees or union dues.

Now, my friends, I contend the Case bill is not an antilabor bill at all. In the long run, it is a bill to protect the members of labor unions as well as the public against unfair labor practices by other members or officers of labor unions, and to provide governmental machinery for mediation in labor disputes.

If labor leadership were wise, and alert to the real welfare of the workers, they would be urging President Truman to sign the Case bill instead of demanding that he veto it.

I was and am 100 percent back of President Truman in his final handling of the railroad strike. The strike of two brotherhoods was, as President Truman said, a strike against the Government of the United States and against the people of the United States. Mr. Whitney and Mr. Johnston dealt the heaviest blow against organized labor, also, that labor has suffered in many years. And Mr. Whitney is not helping the cause of labor one bit by threatening to spend as much as $47,000,000 to defeat President Truman for reelection.

However, I could not vote for some of the provisions in the emergency antistrike legislation hastily thrown together and sent to Congress by President Truman. Senator REED and I and 68 other of my colleagues in the Senate voted, 70 to 13, to strike out the provision asked by the President which would have allowed him to draft strikers into the United States Army, make them subject to martial law and take away all their civil rights.

That provision, my friends, I regard as very bad legislation. A bad situation is not cured by bad legislation. On sober second thought I believe the country will approve wholeheartedly the action of the Senate in striking that section from the President's antistrike bill.

There is another section in that bill as introduced which I regarded as contrary to the public interest. This provision was that when the Government took over a plant, mine, transportation or other facility, any profits from the operation would go into the United States Treasury. The two provisions combined would give too much arbitrary power for one man to have, even though he be President of the United States.

I don't know whether Thomas Jefferson ever actually said it or not, but whoever did say this has turned out to be a prophet—"When Washington tells the farmer what and when and how to plant, the people will be without bread."

I had intended to discuss the recent actions of the Government in regard to grains, particularly wheat, today, but I find that my time is almost up. I am having the same trouble the people at home are having in understanding why wheat has to be shipped to Mexico while our own mills are being closed down because they cannot get wheat to grind, and there is not assurance that they will get enough wheat to supply our own people with bread when the new crop comes in. I will have something to say about this situation next week.

Continuance of the Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Gould Lincoln, printed in the Washington Evening Star of June 5, 1946, on the subject of the continuance of the Selective Service Act. The article is a very clear expression on the problem.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL
(By Gould Lincoln)

The reasons for continuance of the Selective Service Act are unanswerable. Nevertheless from many different sources comes clamor against its extension by Congress, or for its emasculation.

Actual fighting has ceased—yet there is no peace. No peace treaties have been drafted, and none made. The United Nations, established for the maintenance of peace, is struggling to get on its feet. The United States is under obligation to police Japan and a part of Germany. It has small forces of men strung out across the world, protecting surplus war materials that are still awaiting disposal and maintaining lines of communication.

The greatest obligation of all, however, is the proper preparation for the defense of the United States should new troubles arise.

No effort has yet been made to say what shall be the strength, in personnel, of the Army and the Navy, once peace has been made. All that we have before us are the estimates of the top military authorities regarding the number of men required for this interim period. These estimates are that the Army of the United States shall be 1,070,000 men cn July 1, 1947, following monthly reduction from a total of 1,550,000 men on July 1 this year. It is the present plan to use 400,000 of the 1,070,000 in the air forces, and the remaining 670,000 in ground and service forces. Approximately half of the Army would be on duty outside of continental United States, and the other half would be used for training and other duties in the United States.

If the Selective Service System is allowed to die, as it will July 1 unless given further life by Congress, there is no assurance whatever that enough men can be found to maintain the Army at the proposed strength—unless the men now in the service are held by the Army irrespective of the length of service, combat or otherwise, they already have completed.

All of this has been outlined in the Senate by Senator GURNEY, of South Dakota, Republican member of the Military Affairs Committee, who strangely enough has been entrusted with piloting the bill extending the Draft Act for a year although the Democrats control the upper House. Two obvious reasons for assigning the leadership to this South Dakota Republican are that his heart is in it and he has the knowledge and ability necessary. Aside from these reasons is the desire of the Democrats to hook the Republicans into an action which they feel is not too popular, no matter how necessary it may be.

Some of the opponents of the continuance of the Draft Act—and they are vociferous—insist that enough men can be obtained for the Army through voluntary enlistment. The truth of the matter is that no one knows that a system of voluntary enlistment will provide the requisite number of men. No one can know. If the Selective Service Act is allowed to die—and the enlistments do not come up to expectation—the Army will suffer, or men already in the service must be retained. Either alternative is abhorrent.

The rate of enlistments is declining. Voluntary enlistment was greatly stimulated after the end of hostilities when Congress provided for short-term enlistment. Young men, who were subject to the draft, or about to be, preferred to enlist rather than be drafted and subject to retention in the armed forces for a much longer period. Unless the Draft Act is extended, volunteering for military service will be substantially less than if it is extended.

The House knocked from its bill extending the draft authority to take boys 18 and 19 years of age. It was thought to be a popular move—with an election coming up. It is not popular, however, with the parents of young men now in the service and who may not be demobilized if the draft fails to bring in the necessary number of replacements without the teen-agers. The manpower reservoir has so dried up that, except for the 18- and 19-year-old men, there are only 50,000 to 60,000 I–A's who can be called into the Army. These are the left-overs after the list has been combed for physically fit men not clearly entitled to deferment.

The United States Army which won the war has been demobilized since the fighting stopped to a degree that has left it a wreck, as it is. It still has a huge job on its hands. But, with the exception of France, the Army now planned for the United States is smaller than any of those of our major allies. Russia has announced plans for an army three times the size of ours.

If the United States is to be in a position to defend itself, if it is to be potent in the drive for a peaceful world, it must be militarily strong. To abolish the Selective Service System now would defeat both these ends.

The British Loan Means Free Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 18, 1946

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, when the American people realize the full import of the tariff and trade agreement provision of the British loan arrangement, they are going to be greatly disturbed, but it will be too late. A great amount of attention has been given in the public press to the British loan, but that is only one part of the arrangement. The other two parts being the settlement of lease-lend and war accounts, and the most important part is the trade arrangements providing for further reductions of tariffs.

Secretary Vinson has repeatedly stated that the trade agreement features, or the commercial policy, is the most important item in our entire arrangement with the United Kingdom. A Treasury bulletin published earlier this year, a part of which bears the signature of the Secretary of Treasury Fred M. Vinson and of Lord Halifax, has this to say in reference to the negotiations for further reduction of tariffs to be followed, and I quote:

> These negotiations will relate to tariffs and preferences, quantitative restrictions, subsidies, state trading, cartels, and other types of trade barriers treated in the document published by the United States referred to above. The negotiations will proceed in accordance with the principles laid down in that document.

The Library of Congress has made a digest of the matter and has published a book called The Anglo-American Financial and Trade Agreements. Among other things stated in that pamphlet we find this significant statement:

> The degree of risk will depend largely on whether we make it possible for Great Britain to pay by lowering our tariffs and other trade-agreement barriers.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my remarks today is to ask the question, What is the degree of risk that this country will be taking in this program of further lowering our tariffs?

The Underwood tariff of the Wilson administration was considered a very, very low tariff. Following World War I, the Congress was assembled in an extraordinary session for the purpose of passing an emergency tariff because of the havoc created by the Underwood tariff. According to Mr. Will Clayton of the State Department, who is in charge of trade agreements, the Underwood tariff was a tariff of 29.4 percent. Because world trade has been interrupted by war conditions, it is hard for the people to believe that the present rates of tariffs under our trade-agreement program are almost equal to the Underwood rates.

When Mr. Clayton was before the Ways and Means Committee advocating the trade-agreements program he stated that he considered a tariff of 27, or 28, or 30 percent as fairly high. He, as a spokesman for the administration, was requesting authority to cut tariffs an additional 50 percent. According to the last published report on foreign commerce and navigation of the United States for 1942, we find a long list of articles that would come under Mr. Clayton's prescription as "fairly high." This is the last public document on the matter and probably is about correct, because few trade agreements, if any, were entered into while the war was on.

Mr. Speaker, this means that every district or State which produces the following can expect a further cut in tariff: Meats; poultry; edible and inedible animal products; leather gloves; boots and shoes and other leather products; furs, dressed or manufactured; fruits; nuts; vegetable oils and fats; sugars, cane, and beet; brandy; rums; gins; whiskys; wines; citrus juices; lead; zinc; bicycles; jewelry; decorative metals; coal-tar products; watches and watch movements; rubber products; tobacco, cigars, and cigarettes; hops; vegetable glue; raw cottons, 1⅛-inch or longer; manufactures of cottons; manufactures of jutes; wool and manufactures of woolens; rayon and manufactured rayon products; straw hats; furnitures; paper and manufactures of paper; glass and glassware articles; china and earthenware; cutlery; hardware; metal alloys; copper; medicinal preparations; scientific instruments; band instruments; dolls and toys; printed matter; clocks and parts thereof.

If the above-mentioned classes of articles were broken down into individual items it would amount to over 650 or possibly 750 items. The free-trade philosophy seems to prevail in this administration and there is danger that the communities affected in the production of this long list of articles may suffer from a further reduction in tariff which is proposed in this arrangement with the British.

Just how reciprocal are these tariff arrangements that are entered into by our State Department? I want to call your attention to one outstanding case. In the trade agreement entered into with the United Kingdom on January 1, 1939, our State Department agreed that we would waive the countervailing provisions of the act of 1930. The British tariff on motorcycles is 33⅓ percent ad valorem, but the United States tariff on British motorcycles is 10 percent ad valorem. In 1939 we were importing only about 360 motorcycles a year. Most of these came from the United Kingdom, but some of them came from Germany.

The picture in reference to the importation of foreign motorcycles is changing rapidly in 1946. In January we imported 219, in February 1,173, and in March 248. The figures for the month of April are not yet available but it looks like the figure will be very high. These motorcycles consist largely of lightweight, one-cylinder motorcycles, but they are not to be confused with motor bicycles. These English motorcycles compete not only with vehicles which are called motorcycles, but they very definitely compete with various types of motor scooters. One of the leading scooters made is the Cushman, which is manufactured by the Cushman Motor Works, at Lincoln, Nebr.

I understand that the English people make some fairly good motorcycles. They do this with labor that is drawing from $15 to $20 a week maximum. It requires about 18 man-days to make a large motorcycle. It requires about 7 man-days to make a motor scooter of the Cushman type. The Cushman Motor Works are producing scooters at the rate of about 29,000 a year, and they are hiring over 1,000 people. It is reported that the United States expects to import about 60,000 motorcycles from England. If that be true it will cause a loss of jobs to about 2,000 Americans. Government reports would indicate these 60,000 vehicles are medium light, but others who have inquired into the situation are of the opinion that a good many thousand of them are heavy ones. If that is true it will represent the work of a great deal more than 2,000 people. It might run 3,500 or 4,000 American workers that would be affected by this importation. These figures do not include the producers of the raw materials, such as the workers in the iron-ore pits, the oil fields, the synthetic rubber plants, the copper mines, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, the astonishing thing about this situation is that months ago when the Ways and Means Committee were considering the subject of trade agreements, this situation was called to the attention of the State Department. It was then pointed out that the agreement with England was not reciprocal. It was pointed out that their tariffs on our products of this type was 33⅓ percent ad valorem, while we were admitting like articles into this country from England at 10 percent ad valorem. The State Department promised to correct this. It has not been corrected. If foreign nations say they cannot rely upon our State Department, what are our own citizens to think, when they know of situations like this.

The State Department's handling of the importation of jeweled watches and watch works from Switzerland is most unsatisfactory. The Swiss have a watch cartel. There seems to be no doubt but that German banks and industrialists are interested directly and indirectly in that cartel. It is a historical fact that after the German Army surrounded Switzerland the importations of watches from Switzerland into United States increased a great deal. Those importations must have been with the consent of the Germans. It is also true that the Swiss cartel provided the German war machine with all of their intricate timing instruments used to kill American soldiers and the soldiers of our allies.

Both the War Department and the Navy Department have stated that the preservation of the American jeweled watch industry was absolutely necessary to the defense of our country. These highly technical timing instruments are an important part of modern warfare equipment. The American watch industry went to war suddenly. Now they are entitled to the first place in the American market for watches. The State Department has refused, in spite of the pleas of many of us, to take adequate steps to restore that market to the producers of American watches.

There are only three American companies manufacturing jeweled watches. Without protection those companies cannot compete with the Swiss cartel. Do we want those factories to disappear, their buildings to remain vacant, and their workers idle? Do we want our country to be without access to an industry so vital to our defense and preservation?

The American people want every step taken that will prevent another war. After a war as terrible as this one it is not surprising that there is an appeal to emotionalism in matters pertaining to the future peace. If the facts were that low tariffs or free trade would prevent future wars, I am sure that the American people would want that very thing. The facts do not bear out any such idea, however.

When the Ways and Means Committee was considering the matter of trade agreements Secretary Will Clayton was asked:

Why was not peace preserved under the reciprocal trade agreements program as we had been promised?

His reply was:

I do not think any responsible official of the Department ever said that the adoption of the reciprocal trade agreements program would prevent war. I do not think anybody ever said that. I do not think anybody believed that.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] said this to Mr. Clayton:

I have gathered from your statement and answers that the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements law will continue to preserve peace.

To this, Mr. Clayton replied:

No sir, I have not made that claim for it at all.

When the Secretary of Commerce, Henry Wallace, was on the witness stand, he was asked if England was drawn into any war during the time that she abolished all tariffs. To this Mr. Wallace replied:

England was engaged in many conflicts.

The records show that England was on a free-trade basis approximately from 1837 to 1920, or a period of 83 years. I asked the Library of Congress to submit to me a list of the wars in which England was engaged during that 83 years. This can be found in the trade-agreement hearings. England was in 35 wars in that 83 years. Out of that entire period, there were only 17 calendar years in which she had no war at all.

During those same hearings before our committee, I asked Secretary Wallace some further questions that I would like to quote:

Mr. CURTIS. During the years gone by, Mr. Wallace, the United States and Canada have invoked the tariff against each other; have we not?

Mr. WALLACE. Undoubtedly.

Mr. CURTIS. And it has been sometimes sudden, as a particular growing or selling season would start; is that not true?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, I do not recall a specific instance, but it is quite possible.

Mr. CURTIS. And is it not likewise true that the boundary line between the United States and Canada is about the longest peaceful boundary line over the longest period of time, of any place in the world? Is that not true?

Mr. WALLACE. Quite possible.

Mr. CURTIS. Notwithstanding the fact that we raised tariff barriers against each other often?

Mr. WALLACE. It is quite possible.

There is nothing in history to indicate that the abolition of all tariffs would assure peace and prevent war. In fact, the tariff wars of the world have not resulted in armed conflict. This does not mean that we could not have unwise tariffs or excessive tariffs, but it does mean that the argument that it is a sure way to peace is without foundation. It might be observed that the two world wars in which the United States has been engaged were during periods of low tariffs. The Underwood tariff preceded our entrance into World War I by several years. The trade agreements method for reducing tariffs had been in operation for more than 6 years when we were drawn into World War II.

Mr. Speaker, let us permit the exponents of low tariffs to argue their case on its merits. If it is good for the economy of this country, let us have the facts. If a reasonable tariff is necessary to keep factories and industries going in this country, which are vital to our welfare, let us face the facts. Let us not mix this problem of tariffs with our peace efforts, because history proves that they are not connected at all.

Mr. Speaker, I again wish to mention the fact that high officials of this Government say that the trade-agreement features are the most important features of our British loan contract. As representatives of the people, it is our duty to weigh the possibilities of this action. Once this action is taken, the constitutional power of the Congress to determine what our tariffs shall be will have been delegated to others, but then it will be too late.

New Damaging Blows Strike Price Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 14, 1946

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted, I submit for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by John H. Crider, titled "New Damaging Blows Strike Price Control," which was published in the New York Times:

NEW DAMAGING BLOWS STRIKE PRICE CONTROL—COAL PACT BATTERS WAGE PATTERN—INFLATIONARY TRENDS GROW

(By John H. Crider)

Ever since the administration permitted the bulge represented by the price rise which made possible the steel wage increase, the bulge in the price line has been expanding until it has come to look more like a big bubble.

Events of the next week or ten days, turning on the fate of the Price Control Act, will have much to do with whether the bubble bursts, but there are those who offer substantial evidence that it may burst anyway, price control or not.

The reason for the unhappy prospect pictured by the gloomier prophets arises from the limited area in which the administration operates to hold back the rising tide of inflation. The problem, these experts say, is far from a matter of price control since to look merely at price control is to ignore the factors which appear to make such controls necessary. One must look at wage policies, the money supply, credit control, and so forth.

EFFECT OF WELFARE GRANT

A wholly new break in the line occurred this week when the Government consented to the 5 cents per ton welfare levy on coal producers over and above the 18½ cents per hour increase in miners' wages. The 18½ cents per hour was, of course, within "the pattern," but John L. Lewis seemed to have suceeded, for the time being at least, in bypassing the pattern.

If accepted by the producers and regarded as a proper form of worker benefit, this amendment to the pattern might well start another wage cycle with the major unions demanding similar welfare funds based on levies against units of production. For while not a direct wage payment, the 5-cents-per-ton levy becomes a factor in the cost of coal just as surely as the miners' wages.

Again, there appeared slim prospect, as the Senate Banking and Currency Committee sat Friday night putting finishing touches on its version of price-control extension, that there was much chance of getting legislation even remotely resembling what the administration asked for and what Stabilization Director Chester Bowles asserted was essential if inflation was not to run rampant.

PRICE RISES ACCELERATED

There was some evidence that the Senate would be even more hostile to the unadulterated price control sought by the administration than was the House when it riddled the official draft.

On the testimony of Mr. Bowles himself, the whole anti-inflation edifice, such as it is, will collapse if Congress passes a badly crippled price-control bill and, of course, if it sustains its view over a Presidential veto. It is generally believed President Truman would veto such a measure.

This week produced further evidence that the administration itself was weakening existing price controls in what appeared to be an attempt to win public and congressional support for the OPA operation.

This incident was the OPA increase in milk, butter, and cheese prices soon after the Senate committee had adopted an amendment to free dairy products from price ceilings. But, on the other hand, this lifting of ceilings was only a repetition of what has been going on at an accelerated rate ever since the "bulge" came into fashion.

Mr. Bowles, of course, said in a broadcast yesterday that the dairy increase was due to his belief that Congress would not supply adequate funds to pay higher subsidies to dairy farmers to cover their increased grain costs due to the recent rise in grain prices. For example, corn prices were raised 25 cents a bushel.

The grain price increase was designed to discourage the feeding of grains to animals and thus make more available for human consumption at home and abroad. There is, here, a typical inflationary spiral. Grain goes up, feed costs go up, dairy products go up.

But the dairy price rise was only one of a number that will have a strong effect on the cost of living. On Friday, a day after announcement of the milk price rise, OPA raised prices 10 to 15 percent on shoes selling under $5.50, which are the kind of shoes at least a quarter of our people wear.

Or, one might add, they are in the price range of shoes which most Americans wore when they could get them, or when the quality of that price offered some attraction. But a great many people who used to buy shoes at $5.50 or less no longer buy them either because they cannot find them, or because they are of too poor quality, or because they have more current income and savings than they did before the war.

FACTOR OF LOWER QUALITY

This development is an illustration of a rather typical situation which, some economists contend, tends to make misleading the cost-of-living index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which now shows a 50 percent rise in living costs for the average family since August 1939.

The contention is that this thermometer of inflation cannot give adequate weight to this shifting of buying preference, from low-cost to high-cost items, and cannot adequately reflect the deterioration in quality of products. This value decline is, in effect, an important element of increase in family living costs.

So, when the Government says prices are inflated on the average of 50 percent over prewar levels, it is probably far from accurate, if for no other reason than that its index omits many important factors.

The inflation in real-estate values, for example, is tremendous. This does not directly affect the majority of average families who pay rents which are under pretty tight control. But it is nonetheless a very important inflationary element in the economy which does directly affect the thousands of new home buyers who are heavily in the market at present.

The writer knows personally of a $13,000 house, built in 1941, which sold this week for $26,000. This instance can be multiplied many times, and in some cases the 100 percent rise shown in this transaction has been exceeded.

Again, farm real estate is going much the same route as after World War I. An increase in farm-land values, greater than the 13-percent rise in the 12 months ending March 1, has occurred in only 2 of the 35 years for which these statistics are available. The March 1 level was 71 percent over the 1935-39 average.

The 71-percent figure is important because it exceeds by 1 percent the corresponding increase in farm-land values from the 1910–14 average to the 1920 peak.

While the credit potential of the country is still enormous, and consumers' pockets and bank accounts are swollen with savings, the Treasury under Secretary Vinson has retired $6,400,000,000 of the public debt and is on the way toward a balanced budget.

IMPORTANCE OF REDUCTION

The importance of Federal debt retirement lies in its reduction of the already great money and credit supply of the country. But whether this can be continued depends upon whether Congress can resist reducing taxes and reckless spending.

But Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, does not think the prospects for controlling inflation in this way offer great prospects unless the Government receives authority to control the kind and amounts of Government securities that the banks can hold. He so testified before the House Banking and Currency Committee.

He is scheduled to make a report soon to the committee at the request of Representative PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, who is the man most likely to introduce this drastic banking legislation.

But, as the over-all inflation situation looks at the moment, it appears that the administration has been relying mainly on price control to hold the line until production could catch up to demand and halt the pressure on prices. But owing to production and transport stoppages due to strikes, the time when production can catch up to demand has been considerably delayed.

Thus, if it now loses such price control as remains, there is little doubt that the inflation bubble will burst sooner than otherwise.

Dr. F. S. Hammett Urging Passage of Legislation in Behalf of Government Aid to the War Against Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 5, 1946

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Provincetown (Mass.) Advocate of May 29, 1946:

DR. F. S. HAMMETT URGING THE PASSAGE OF LEGISLATION IN BEHALF OF GOVERNMENT AID TO THE WAR AGAINST CANCER—BELIEVES BEST BRAINS OF WORLD SHOULD BE MOBILIZED TO COORDINATE FINDINGS—IF ATOMIC BOMB COULD BE DEVISED SO SECRET OF CANCER CAN BE LEARNED

Mobilization at some convenient place in the United States of an adequqate number of the world's outstanding experts, to coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer is being sought in the Neely bill, 4502, now before the House in

Congress, and the Pepper bill, 1875, now in the Senate, and the people of this Nation are being urged to unite in an active appeal for the passage of this legislation. They are being asked to wire or write their Congressmen and Senators to speed the enactment.

SMALL SUM ASKED

A sum of $100,000,000 is being asked to finance the work. This sum is equivalent to the amount spent in less than half a day during the war, yet during the war years cancer killed nearly twice as many Americans as were killed by the Japanese and Germans. It has been estimated by the head of the American Cancer Society that 17,000,000 Americans now living will die of the disease and that there are a half a million cases in this country all the time.

It is believed that the cure for cancer will be no more difficult to discover than the creation of the atomic bomb, and that the method used in achieving the latter will be successful in finding the former, namely, the mobilization of the best skill and brains in the world today.

DR. HAMMETT'S VIEWS

Living in Provincetown and working in his now famous laboratory in Truro is one of the world's foremost research scientists in the study of growth, Dr. Frederick S. Hammett. He was asked to comment on the urgency for the passage of the Neely-Pepper bills and he prepared the following statement:

Those who are asked to contribute to cancer research have a right to know how the money is to be spent.

There are two aspects to research: There is the search for fundamental principles, or academic research, and there is the search for means to put these principles to work. This is applied or practical research. Einstein, Shapley, and Hooton are academic researchers; Kettering, Edison, and Coolidge are practical researchers. The first group give us the ideas. The second gives us the things which help to make living more comfortable. Both are necessary.

Most cancer research funds go for academic research. This is because the principles of cancer as a growth need discovery. But a discovery by Dr. John Bittner some 10 years ago makes possible now some attempt at practical research. Dr. Bittner found that the milk of female mice of cancer history carries a chemical agent which produces cancer in the young which are breastfed. This has been confirmed by many other workers during the past 10 years. So the thing to do now is to make a concerted attempt to isolate, identify, and investigate this transmissible agent in order that something may be devised to destroy or counteract its effect.

TEAMWORK NEEDED

Such an attempt will require the coordinated, cooperative, organized teamwork of physicists, chemists, biologists, pathologists, and all the basic and subsidiary scientific disciplines. Experience has shown that such teamwork is not very effective when the several workers are scattered around in various universities, medical schools, and research institutes. It was tried and failed in the case of tuberculosis. It was tried and failed in the case of poliomyelitis.

Such teamwork is common in industrial laboratories. It is the teamwork which brought about the bringing of atomic energy to practical use. This was for destructive purposes. How much more should it be used for constructive use in bringing practical help to the cancer patient! It is such organized, cooperative, coordinated teamwork which Congressman NEELY is proposing. Support of the Neely bill will help make such an attempt possible. While money is necessary to bring practical benefit to the cancer patient, brains and willingness to work together for a common aim is infinitely more important. Nor are huge and beautiful buildings necessary. For as Plutarch wrote, "That city is well fortified which has a wall of men instead of bricks." It is unfortunately true, as Milne wrote in Nature, "It is the fate of most new concepts to be either ridiculed or ignored."

So today the attempt to get scientists to work together on a project is being either ridiculed or ignored. Save under the impetus of war. Yet if the case for cooperative research in cancer could be strongly enough put, the problem could be licked, and that without the spending of $100,000,000 either, as requested in the Neely bill. All that is needed is willingness to work together, brains, and enough money to see the thing through to the finish. The money can be gotten. The brains are available. All we need is the willingness—not lip service.

Civilian Rule of Pacific Island Asked by Harold L. Ickes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Harold L. Ickes before the Institute of Ethnic Affairs and the Institute of Pacific Relations at the Hotel Mayflower, Washington, D. C., Wednesday evening, May 29, under the title of "Meet the Navy":

Tonight I want to introduce the United States Navy to those whose democracy it is supposed to serve. I do not mean the Navy rushing forth gallantly to meet the enemy. I do not mean the Navy on parade, all dressed up with flags and pennants and bunting, with sailors and marines standing smartly at attention and with chested officers proudly wearing the funny looking hats adorned with ostrich plumes. The Navy that I want to introduce to this audience is the Navy that governs in the name of a supposedly democratic America, in atolls lying in the Far Pacific. I believe that you will discover, as I have, that this is a different Navy than you have ever imagined.

These islands, small and scattered though they be, are not the concern of the American Navy alone, nor is the manner in which they are governed the sole interest of the Navy, or even of the United States. The way that these islands are governed concerns the United States in its relations with the other nations of the world.

At San Francisco and at London the United States spoke out boldly on the subject of what every other nation should do, without delay, for vast areas of the earth's population. We demanded the doing of those things which the United States is not doing for its own present and its prospective dependencies.

Let me show you how the Navy is involved.

We conquered the Marshalls, the Carolines, and the Marianas which had been mandated to Japan under the League of Nations.

Last autumn, the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations brought pressure on all nations holding mandated areas, to declare their intention to trustee them under the United Nations, without delay.

Last February, in the assembly of the United Nations at London, five of the seven nations holding mandated areas formally declared their intention to enter into trusteeship agreements to the United Nations. They were the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Australia, Belgium, and France.

Two nations held out—just two. One was the Union of South Africa. The other was the United States. Yet our obligation is equal to that of the other powers which received their mandates from the League of Nations. We are morally and legally obligated to trustee our mandated areas as the others are being trusteed.

It was not a pleasant prospect—that one at London—of the United States hiding under a blanket with the Union of South Africa in an effort to escape an obligation which the other nations were accepting.

Of course, our Nation cannot maintain such a position permanently. It is too damaging to our leadership and good name. However, there is a larger and greater danger that we will be intransigent long enough to divest ourselves of moral leadership.

I am convinced that American opinion backs up the charter to which we subscribed. Why then has our performance, as in London, been so negative? Is it due to our own confusion on policy and on methods of administration of American Territories? How can we put forward a policy when there is no coordination on Territorial matters between the State, War, Navy, and Interior Departments? I can illustrate this lack of coordination. Last October, President Truman recognized the need for a single United States policy for administration of the Pacific islands. He appointed the Secretaries of State, War, Navy, and Interior as a committee to give him a recommendation on this subject without delay. Since there was nothing secret about that directive, and since I was not unconnected with the matter prior to February 15, I can tell you that that committee had not met, at least up to that date, and to my knowledge it never has met in the 7 months of its existence. The President's directive in October was to the effect that he wanted a recommendation "satisfactory to all four departments * * * without delay." You can see how completely the Army and Navy can block even the fulfillment of a clear Presidential directive. And, as usual, the State Department fails to take the leadership in insisting upon a unified policy. Its representatives content themselves with polite efforts to secure a compromise—but only if the interested parties are willing to compromise.

If we were to make, now, an unequivocal announcement of our intention to trustee these islands, just as other nations are doing, and if we were to come forward with a workable trusteeship agreement, the moral effect would be world-wide.

The United States should take the lead in establishing trusteeships on sound lines. We are not bound by the hampering traditions of a colonial service. And we can take pride in some of the achievements of our overseas areas under civilian rule. Despite mistakes, as in our economic neglect of the Philippines, we have a flexible and liberal territorial policy. We have recognized the principle of self-determination, and we have tolerated a variety of political forms. We have promoted independence for the Philippines. The President has proposed independence for Puerto Rico. We are assisting Hawaii and Alaska in their progress toward self-governing statehood. Hawaii is an example of what can be done by an admixture of races which have attained prosperity and democratic unity within the framework of the American system.

It is time that the State Department ceased to be beguiled by the pleasant tinkle of brass and the luster of gold braid, for it is the Navy which has largely been responsible for our moral failure to date as to our dependencies.

The official pressure to designate the Japanese mandated and other islands as strategic areas in their entirety or to annex them outright emanates from the Navy and

is motivated in good measure by the Navy's desire to have exclusive responsibility for governing the populations of these areas. The Navy does not want to govern when it is subject to inspection, criticism, and publicity. The Navy wants its administration of dependent peoples to be a top secret.

Furthermore, the naval governments of Guam and Samoa have become a naval tradition and it is partly in defiant defense of this tradition and without regard to security considerations that the Navy seeks to govern the other Pacific islands. The Navy is well aware that the Federal Government agency which shall be given civil jurisdiction over the formerly mandated islands would also be made responsible for Guam and Samoa. Any other administrative solution would be unthinkable. Therefore, the Navy is intent upon jurisdiction over the Japanese mandated islands under conditions which will allow it to extend its present tyranny in Guam to an area comprising 3,000,000 square miles of the Pacific.

The history of American Samoa and Guam furnishes one answer to the mystery of our delay in the matter of trusteeships. The Navy's ambitious preparations to rule permanently, by naval absolutism, the civilian populations of the Pacific islands, furnishes another. The Navy is bent upon ruling these island peoples and it is determined that they shall not have those rights which the Charter of the United Nations guarantees; that they shall not have self-government or democracy or racial equality. My charge is grounded upon the undeviating record of naval words and naval deeds in the governments of Guam and American Samoa for the past 47 years.

We took Guam from Spain in 1898. By the Treaty of Paris we obligated ourselves to establish, by act of Congress, "the civil rights and political status" of the people of Guam. With words of great promise, President McKinley launched the naval government of the island. That government, President McKinley proclaimed, would "insure that full measure of individual rights and liberties which is the heritage of free peoples"; it would prove to the Guamanians "that the mission of the United States is one of benevolent assimilation, substituting the mild sway of justice and right for arbitrary rule."

Within 1 year of the date of this pious utterance of President McKinley's, the naval government had abolished all of the very considerable home rule which Guam had enjoyed under Spain. Although the Guamanians had been Roman Catholics for centuries, the Navy had exiled from the island all of the Roman Catholic priests except one, who happened to be a native Guamanian; it had enacted a law prohibiting Roman Catholic religious processions; it had denied entry to the island to the apostolic delegate, an American charged with the oversight of Roman Catholic interests in that part of the world.

Successive naval governors, with a turnover of one every 18 months, added such choice items of liberty and human rights as the following: A command forbidding the ringing of the church bells in the mornings. An executive order prohibiting the Guamanians from whistling on the streets in the vicinity of the naval governor's palace. A prohibition of the use of the Chamarro language in the government or in the schools.

The naval government gathered up and burned the dictionaries of the Chamarro language. The Guamanian native police were replaced by marines.

Segregated schools were established for the Guamanians. Heavy taxation—taxation without representation—was levied by the naval governor on Guamanians but not on Navy personnel.

By the year 1902, the Guamanians were petitioning for those civil rights and that congressionally defined "political status" which the Treaty of Paris had promised them. They are petitioning still, after nearly half a century. A year or two before the war these people, out of their own meager resources, sent two representatives to Washington to beg our democratic government to lift the dictatorial hand of the American Navy from off of Guam and to place its jurisdiction within the Department of the Interior.

Forty-five years ago these subjects of American oppression began to petition to have their municipal water supply chlorinated, because annually hundreds were made ill and many died from dysentery. The cost of the job was $5,000. The naval government waited 40 years before doing this.

Now, let us glance at the record in American Samoa. The Samoans came voluntarily under United States control in 1899, on the basis of an express understanding that they would be given civil status and a rule of law.

From 1899 to and including today Samoan life has been lived under naval absolutism. There, as in Guam, the naval Governor is legislature, executive, and court. Again and again the Governors have proved themselves to be ignorant or bigoted petty tyrants. Their ordinances have snowballed into a body of codified laws too fantastic to be readily believed, but they exist, in print and in practice.

Let me illustrate: The Samoans are sociable people. They like to visit from village to village, going in little parties for games, feasts, marriages, funerals. Such visitations by the people of one village to another are called malagas.

Here is the law of March 8, 1927, decreed by his illustrious highness, H. F. Bryan, naval governor of Samoa. I quote from section 6: "In view of the fact that so much time has been wasted since the beginning of this year in cricket games between villages—some of which were played without authority—no permission will be granted for malagas without further notice.

"SEC. 7. No malaga will be made, at any time, for any purpose, without the approval of the governor.

"SEC. 8. Any disobedience to this order will be considered a violation of section 10, offenses against the government and the civil rights of citizens * * * and dealt with accordingly."

Section 98 of the naval code for Samoa reads: "There shall be levied annually on the 15th day of December upon every male Samoan, who shall have reached the height of 5 feet and 1 inch, a general personal tax, which shall be known as the poll tax, the amount of which shall be fixed by the governor."

Among Samoans, as among many peoples, it is a solemn religious custom, after a death, to hold a funeral feast. The naval code for Samoa prohibits such feasts. I quote section 3: "From and after the coming into effect of this regulation, the giving of, or the holding of, the participation in, the attendance at, and the furnishing of any or all food for, the 'death feast' by any person whomsoever in the Manu's group of islands, is hereby prohibited."

E. S. Kellogg, another exalted naval governor, decreed that both a fine and imprisonment could be evoked for violation of this provision.

The Samoans are a less patient folk than the Guamanians, and in the early 1920's their petitioning for their denied rights became an uproar, though without physical violence. Thereupon their leaders were seized by the naval government and charged with conspiracy. They were thrown into jail and kept there for a number of years. But murmurings of the outburst reached Washington, and in 1930 President Hoover, pursuant to a resolution of Congress, appointed a joint commission to study the Samoan situation. The commission was headed by Senator Hiram Bingham, of Connecticut, and it went to Samoa to do its work on the ground.

The commission unanimously concluded that the Samoans ought to be given American citizenship, a bill of rights, and an organic act. It announced its conclusions to the assembled Samoans, came home, and pressed for the promised legislation. The Senate passed it and the Navy (backed, I regret to have to say, by the Department of State) had it killed in the House. Through successive Congresses this has been the record.

Grotesque, inefficient, tyrannical, not wantonly cruel, but faithless to pledges given—such has been naval rule over subject peoples, as proved by the unvarying record of long years in Guam and Samoa. Such a result is inevitable from naval administration. It is no accident, no mere circumstance which might change. Such is the nature of naval dominance when applied to civilian populations. I quote from Capt. A. T. Mahan, the naval prophet, whose writings have influenced the strategical thinking of the world:

"Naval administration is very clearly and sharply differentiated by the presence of an element which is foreign to almost all other activities of life in countries like Great Britain and the United States. The military factor is to it not merely incidental but fundamental."

What Captain Mahan meant is that naval organization, training, and thinking relate entirely to the tasks of war. They have no relationship to the complicated problems of civilian populations. Every modern government except the United States knows this fact and has acted accordingly. England, France, Holland, Belgium, New Zealand, Australia, and Russia rule their dependencies through civilian, not military governments. The American Navy controls its subject populations by direct and autocratic methods which it frankly labels "dictatorship." In scores of congressional hearings the testimony of naval officers follows the same pattern; the natives are ignorant, lazy, slothful, immoral children. An island is a battleship and is run as such. The civilian population happens to be on the island and cannot be got rid of. It must be endured like other tropical inconveniences. Automatically and with finality, the rules by which the Navy governs itself are clamped down on the civilian population. The result is a rule of authority, color distinction, and the ignoring of the problems of and strivings toward democratic living.

I have cited the record of naval government on our islands during the 40 years before Pearl Harbor. I now give you some of today's facts about the Navy's beneficient rule over the Guamanians. One would suppose that the admirals, when seeking, as they recently have been and are doing, the establishment, by Executive order, of the pre-Pearl Harbor system of naval government for the islands of Micronesia, would try to lift the face of naval autocracy on Guam. But this would be a violent assumption.

The Navy is still arguing that the Guamanians are not qualified to assume the duties and responsibilities of citizenship. The Navy persists in this stand although not a single Guamanian out of 23,000 has been convicted of disloyalty to the United States during their years under the Japanese.

Last autumn, Congress voted and made immediately available funds to compensate the Guamanians for death and personal injury and loss of personal property caused by the naval bombardment or confiscated by the Navy. To this hour the Navy has not settled the claims of these people first rendered destitute by the Japanese and then deprived by the Navy of two-thirds of the good land of their small island.

Large numbers of the 23,000 Guamanians subsist now as mere squatters in shacks and hovels built from dunnage lumber, packing cases, canvas, and salvaged sheet metal. Their homes have been destroyed, they have been ousted from their lands, and they are not permitted to return even today, many

months after the end of the war. Meanwhile, on a hill almost directly overlooking these shanty towns, the Navy is building for its class-conscious officers an 18-hole, 6,000-yard golf course with water hazards and sand traps.

Wage discrimination has become greatly intensified in Guam, even as compared with pre-Pearl Harbor naval practices. A Guamanian carpenter gets 43 cents an hour, a continental American citizen, who starts his employment when in Guam, $1.36 an hour, while the continental American citizen transferred to Guam receives $1.66 an hour. Often the three classes of carpenters are working side by side at the same work.

As for Guamanian laborers, they get 20 cents per hour, a 4-percent increase from the Navy's pre-Pearl Harbor rate for Guamanian labor. Perhaps such wages would not be amiss if prices were correspondingly low, but a pair of shoes cost $7.10, a pound of corned beef 53 cents, and so forth.

The discrimination goes even farther. The Guamanians and the continental American workers are alike paid from Federal funds. The continental Americans get annual and sick leave with pay. If the Guamanian takes such leave it is without pay. The continental American worker gets time and a half for overtime for all time in excess of 40 hours a week, the Guamanian worker gets only straight time, no matter how long he may work.

Naval absolutism sneers at every constitutional guaranty. It permits the inhabitants of Guam to be subject to arrest, trial, and sentence for any offense up to and including a capital one, without presentment or indictment by a grand jury, without jury trial, in a rump naval courts and boards court. The houses of the dependent people can be entered and searched without a warrant, their property seized at will by a police officer, and they can be—and are—ordered from their houses and lands at any hour of the day or night. They exist under a perpetual curfew law. It is unlawful for a Guamanian to ride in a Government vehicle and he would be punished for so doing, by fine or imprisonment or both, even when invited by the drivers. Such is the benevolent rule of which the Navy boasts.

A final affront to the Guamanian, as well as to the American, sense of justice, is the recent announcement by the Navy that naval military rule is being ended at Guam and naval civil rule substituted. Under naval military rule the Guamanians had the slight advantage of at least some forms of law. When convicted on serious charges they had a right of appeal. The naval military courts operated under rules not of their own making, which they could not abrogate at will. Under cavalier naval civil rule, the governor, an admiral, makes the law and the rules, and changes them at will. He is the court, and from his civil or criminal judgment there is no appeal. It is into this system of one-man absolutism that the Guamanians are passing.

I sum up the record and the facts as of today. The Navy in Guam and Samoa, for nearly half a century, has prevented the fulfillment of national pledges made and aucepted in good faith. It has arrogantly overruled the Government of the United States. It has refused to grant on its own motion, and its effective lobby has prevented Congress from granting, any vestige of a bill of rights to its subject peoples. In its own unrestrained conduct of civilian affairs it has violated, wilfully and persistently, many of the tenets of the American Bill of Rights. It has scorned every concept of due process of law and almost every principle of democracy. It has ignored the economic problems of the islanders and has given them inferior education in segregated schools. It has trampled upon, with complete abandon, the standards of social policy of the International Labor Office for dependent areas. Its absolutism has been maintained as a result of effective lobbying in Congress.

There is no sign that the Navy proposes to depart from its prewar methods in Guam and Samoa. The natives are its wards; and by wardship, apparently, is meant a policy of segregation—isolation from mainland culture, from modern education and denial of the protection of our Constitution. There is not one full-fledged lawyer on the island. And certainly it is not to the Navy's credit, after nearly 50 years of its rule, that there is not a single Guamanian dentist, engineer, or active teacher who has had training in the United States.

Now the Navy proposes to extend these abuses into the newly acquired Pacific islands. The Navy wishes that our national moral obligations to trustee the Carolines, the Marshalls, and the Marianas, to the Assembly of the United Nations shall not be fulfilled, and this despite the fact that Australia and New Zealand have already declared their intention of trusteeing the nearby islands which have a like international status.

Nor would the Navy, if it had its will, be satisfied with maintaining dictatorships over peoples of other than American strains. I have not yet recovered from the shock that I received after Pearl Harbor when my friend, the late Secretary Frank Knox, to whom I had a personal attachment, declared in my office that Hawaii should be under naval rule. As if it was the civilian administration that had been responsible for our fleet being huddled like pinioned ducks in a harbor! I disputed this theory then, and I oppose it today. If necessary, I would be willing for the retirement pay of our superannuated admirals to be increased. But I am not willing that more soft berths should be created for them in the governments of dependent peoples in violation of every concept of democracy and the guarantees of the Bill of Rights.

The record shows that the Navy cannot be trusted to rule civilian populations. The Navy is arbitrary, dictatorial, and totally disregardful of civilian rights. I submit that it is not necessary, in the interest of military security, to make a mock of the human welfare and the civilian rights of the peoples of such areas as we have been considering. If there is any merit in the claim of the Navy that it be permitted to keep and put fetters upon the civilian populations of such islands as Guam, Samoa, and the Mandated Islands of Japan; if the Navy is to be permitted to block, as it is secretly doing, statehood for Hawaii, then by a parity of reasoning, civilian rights should be struck down in such areas as Alaska, the Aleutian Islands, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Moreover, if we require Naval absolutism for purposes of military security in such places as these, then there would be no logical reason why we should not hand over to its benign rule such vital continental areas as Boston, New York Harbor, Charlestown, San Diego, San Francisco, and Seattle.

Democracy, as we have understood it in this country, will be entering upon its swift decline if we do not firmly adhere to the principle that our armed forces are for defense in times of war and not for civilian administration in times of peace.

Democracy and human rights and hope for peace in the entire world will suffer if we continue to withhold our national leadership in the vital matter of trusteeships under the United Nations. Our leadership can only be regained and maintained by action, not by mere words. The action needed is the enactment of Representative BIEMILLER'S bill, which would take jurisdiction over Guam and Samoa away from the Navy and give it to the Department of the Interior, and the announcement that we are going to trustee the former Japanese islands under the Assembly of the United Nations.

The Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

May 29, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today after a lapse of 3 months the Case bill has come back from the Senate with some amendments and this House will have to consider and act upon it again. There are two schools of thought in this House. One does not want any corrective or restrictive legislation with regard to labor. These members voted against the Case bill before and doubtless will vote against it today. They very largely represent big city and heavy industrial districts where they rely largely upon the labor vote for reelection. They try to follow out the wish of the big labor leaders who do not want any kind of legislation affecting labor.

The other school of thought to which I adhere believes that the time has come when the rights in this country of labor, the rights of business and the rights of the general public of over a hundred million people should be clearly and fairly defined by law protecting the interest of labor, business, and the general public. That is what we seek to do in this legislation.

I shall vote for this bill today, believing that it is in the best interest of labor, business, and that it will help to protect the public interest.

We have had a recent example of letting big labor leaders and big business fight it out. They have made a sorry failure. The whole Nation has had to suffer. The results have been over a hundred days of the General Motors strike, the steel strike, the Westinghouse, and General Electric strikes, strikes holding up the production of farm machinery so desperately needed and last the great railroad and coal strikes which almost paralyzed the entire business of the Nation. There must be a better way.

These strikes have cost the rank and file of labor all put together the loss of more money than they will gain in the next 10 years. The rank and file of labor is entitled to a better way. Most of them will welcome a better way to settle labor disputes.

They have prevented the returning soldiers, and civilians as well, of an opportunity to buy cars, trucks, washing machines, refrigerators, electrical appliances, and nearly everything one could list.

Mr. Speaker, they have thrown countless thousands of other laboring men out of work. They have held up reconversion and they have kept probably over a billion dollars worth of goods that people want to buy off the market. The people want a better way.

They have greatly speeded up inflation which will hurt the laboring man and everyone by causing a rise in the prices of merchandise. They are threatening the very future of this Government.

They have done great damage to the cause of labor itself. There must be a better way. This bill moves in that direction.

I do not believe the laboring men of my district or the Nation want this chaos continned. The laboring men in my district only want what is fair and right. I know the general public wants something done to protect their interests.

Let me give you one illustration of what slowing down production of steel has done that should shame everyone and make us stop and think.

The Government has planned to bring the bodies of nearly 300,000 soldiers home for burial who lost their lives in battle, and who are now buried in foreign lands. Last week I called the War Department to learn how soon bodies could be returned.

I was told that because of the steel strike and other strikes, sufficient steel was not available to make the caskets and that the delay would probably make it impossible to return any bodies before January 1947. That is an illustration that should make us realize what has happened. We cannot return the bodies of the heroic men who gave their lives defending this country promptly because of work stoppages which slowed down production. It certainly is our responsibility to try to bring about by legislation, industrial peace to the benefit of all.

The returning soldiers want homes to live in. To get them we must have lumber, brick, plumbing, tile, electric appliances for their homes. Think how the production of all these things we owe them have been slowed down by reason of work stoppages that have plagued the Nation. We must bring order out of chaos and get steady production if homes are to be built employing millions of those in the carpenter and building trades from the hod carriers and common laborers up. They cannot work without material.

Mr. Speaker, the Case bill we are considering today passed this House by an overwhelming majority 3 months ago. It will pass by a vote of over 2-to-1 today. If this legislation were not fair and just to labor, to business, and to the public it would not pass the House and Senate by such overwhelming majorities.

There are few, if any, Members of this House who vote for this bill who can honestly be charged as being unfriendly to the rank and file of labor. We want labor steadily employed at high wages. We believe this is necessary to the general economy of the Nation. We realize labor cannot be steadily employed at high wages unless legislation is enacted that will define the rights of all parties fairly which is necessary to keep labor employed and the business of the Nation going at full speed.

With a debt of $275,000,000,000 hanging over the Nation we realize that business and labor must pull together with a constant high production of goods to keep the general income of the Nation high enough that the bonds bought by the laboring men, business, and the farmer may be kept at par. That the income of the Nation must be kept at a high level against which taxes can be levied to pay the running expenses of the Government with a few billion dollars left over each year to be applied to the retirement of the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, there is no other course but work and production by the American people to keep this country sound financially. We must cooperate and work together. We must work and produce. If we fail in this, national bankruptcy will overtake us. If this happens we will lose representative constitutional government. Labor and all of us will suffer and the Nation will go into some type of socialism or communism.

Mr. Speaker, we need labor statesmanship today as never before, a statesmanship that looks at the whole economic picture of America rather than labor leadership in high places which are competing with each other to build up their membership with a lust for power. The drastic bill offered by the President should be a warning to responsible labor leaders that they will serve labor in the long run far better if they will cooperate with the Members of Congress who only want fair and just legislation protecting the rights of all. This bill will not take a legitimate right away from a laboring man in the Nation, but I sincerely believe it will benefit every laboring man in the Nation if enacted into law.

I support this bill without any reservations because I believe it is my duty to do so. I believe we must have such legislation in the interest of the Nation, and I feel certain that the majority of the rank and file of labor in my district when they understand the legislation will commend me for so doing. I have confidence that they will understand that I am acting as much in their interest as I am in the interest of business, or the general public.

Mr. Speaker, what does this bill do?

First. It exempts from its provisions all railroad men who will continue collective bargaining under the Railway Mediation Act.

Second. This bill does not extend the power of injunction. The use of injunction against violence and to preserve the status quo was taken out of the bill in the Senate. It provides for an independent board when a strike of major importance is about to envelop the Nation, which will call for a delay of 60 days until this mediation board can use its influence to try to arrive at a settlement between the parties by encouraging collective bargaining.

If this bill had been passed 3 months ago the General Motors, the steel, the railroad, and coal strikes would doubtless have been settled more promptly with as great gains for labor as they have achieved without the great loss in wages and without tying up the business of the country.

Third. It provides for fact finding and mediation when strikes are about to be called effecting public utilities which furnish the light and power for the people of America.

Fourth. It provides that when contracts are signed between business and labor unions that these contracts must be kept without violation by either side.

Fifth. It does not deny the right to strike anywhere in the bill. It seeks to encourage collective bargaining.

Sixth. It prohibits wildcat strikes by members of a union in violation of the union contracts and only takes the bargaining right away from its members who go out on a wildcat strike. Their rights will be restored when they are rehired.

Seventh. It outlaws boycott strikes which protects the union men as well as the people. Millions of tons of food over the years, particularly in California, have rotted in the fields because one group of union men picked the fruit or vegetables, but the union truckers who happen to belong to another union would not haul it to the processors. Such foolishness must be stopped here in America.

Eighth. It outlaws robbery and extortion which is the essence of the Hobbs bill passed by the House. In many of the big cities farmers are not permitted by the teamsters' union to truck their products into such cities as New York, Detroit, and many other cities without paying to the teamsters' union $9.42 each trip for the privilege of using the streets of the city. In these localities, out-of-town union truck drivers are penalized and extorted the same as if they did not belong to a union. This racketeering must be stopped. It hurts the cause of all labor due to the acts of a few racketeers.

Ninth. It allows the establishment of welfare funds such as desired by the coal miners under joint union and employer supervision.

Tenth. It settles the foreman dispute matter on an equitable and fair basis. It does not prohibit anyone from joining the union, but it does prohibit at the collective-bargaining table such members who belong to the union from representing the company when they are bargaining to bring about a contract. They can only represent the unions, as it should be.

Mr. Speaker, many sincere local union officers have been deceived and led to believe this bill is not fair to the men who work. Such is not the case. I realize that for cheap political purposes there will be some men in the ranks of labor who will accuse the Members who support this bill of voting against the rights of labor. Such charges are worse than nonsense. Such charges will fall flat and will boomerang against those who make the attempt when the honest rank and file of labor understands the facts with reference to this legislation.

The time has come if we are to save this Nation when the Members of Congress must follow the light of their conscience and think only of the best interest of all the people of the Nation. They must have the courage to support legislation to that end.

The time has come when the big labor leaders should accept the responsibility that goes with their power. They must know that the interest of the men they represent, that their future privileges as free American citizens will be more secure if fair and reasonable rules governing the rights of labor and the rights of business are written into the law, rather than to let things go on as they have been until the President steps in and rules both business and labor.

Labor's rights will be better protected by law with such provisions as are written into this bill, than they can or will be protected by any individual in the capacity of the Chief Executive.

This country in the past has been ruled by laws, and not by men. We must get away from the rule by men and back to the American principle of rule by laws in the interest of labor, business, and the general public. This is what this legislation seeks to bring about. This is democracy and representative government.

Surplus Property and Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD an extremely interesting speech which has recently been delivered by Maj. Gen. Glen E. Edgerton, of the War Assets Administration. General Edgerton is one of the many very capable people who are doing a very workmanlike job under the most difficult circumstances in the disposal of their tremendous and far-flung surplus materials which we had accumulated in the war effort. I commend this speech to the attention of businessmen in order that they may understand more thoroughly the tremendous problems faced by our Government in its efforts to channel short supply items into industrial enterprises where they are so badly needed.

SURPLUS PROPERTY AND BUSINESS

GENERAL

It is a pleasure to have the opportunity to discuss some of the principal features of surplus property disposal with businessmen whose attitude toward the subject may be counted on to be practical and businesslike, rather than emotional or political. It is no idle compliment to say that the National Association of Purchasing Agents probably has more members who are able to appraise realistically the problems of surplus property than any other group of comparable size in this country. I am sure you want to know the facts and you need entertain no doubt of my desire to present them without embellishment or prejudice. However, one of my problems at this meeting is to select from the mass of data the comparatively few facts which time will permit me to offer, in such manner as to clarify rather than to obscure the broad aspects of this subject.

One difficulty in selecting the facts is that most of the general statements, which are desirable in an over-all presentation of the subject, have many exceptions that it is necessary to note if complete accuracy is to be sought. Notation of the exceptions tend to blur the picture and so I have chosen to make some statements which are only generally correct and to use figures in rounded numbers instead of precise statistics.

I should like to give you an idea of the magnitude of the surplus property disposal operation, the nature and the reasons for its unique difficulties, some thoughts on its relationship to the business of the country, and features of special interest to purchasing officers. My discussion will be confined, except as otherwise stated, to the disposal of surplus in the continental United States, and not to disposals abroad, which are not under the jurisdiction of the War Assets Administration; nor to disposals in insular possessions, which, although under policy direction by War Assets Administration, are performed by the Department of the Interior.

QUANTITIES

There is in circulation much misinformation concerning the size of the disposal problem. Figures which are inconsistent with each other are often quoted, although apparently drawn from reliable sources. Such inconsistencies are due, in part, to the constantly changing status of the facts so that figures correct as of a given date are soon superseded by later ones, and in part to the use of different criteria by different statisticians.

For the purpose of indicating the size of the task and rate of progress, figures based on original cost are the most useful. They are the figures used by the owning agencies for stating the quantities of surplus declared and disposals on the same basis show how much has been done and how much remains to be done. Although there are five disposal agencies, the War Assets Administration disposes of 90 percent of the total war surplus in the United States and, consequently, its statistics reflect the general situation well.

Here are a few of the most significant figures, stated in rounded numbers—

On hand for disposal	$13,000,000,000
Aircraft (nonsalable)	5,000,000,000
Aircraft (probably salable) (includes 30,000 aircraft and quantities of parts and accessories)	2,000,000,000
Consumer goods	1,000,000,000
Producer goods	2,000,000,000
Real estate (including industrial plants)	3,000,000,000

New acquisitions become available for disposal currently at a rate of $1,000,000,000 per month.

Estimates of the probable total surplus to be declared are liable to large error because the long range stock position of the Army and Navy is subject to policy determinations which will change from time to time. When surpluses are known, they are usually declared promptly. Forecasts must, therefore, be chiefly in the field of intelligent conjecture. Actual declarations of surplus will continue for a long time, as the effects of changes in general plans, improvisations to conform to legislative requirements and limitations (including those of appropriations) international relationships and other presently unpredictable factors, influence the action of the Army and Navy in respect to stocks they should retain. The best prophecy seems to be that the total surplus will be about double that which has been declared today. The division among the major categories will follow the same general pattern as in the past except for marked decline in the aircraft category, both salable and unsalable, a relative increase in real estate, and in both capital and producer goods a substantially greater proportion of articles primarily military in character and consequently less readily salable than the goods previously declared surplus.

OBSTACLES

The progress made to date is creditable, particularly in view of the many changes that the disposal agencies have experienced prior to the establishment of the War Assets Administration on March 25, 1946. No appraisal of the results accomplished nor of the forecasts for the future should be made without recognition of the extraordinary provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 and amendments which are the governing legislation under which the work is carried on. The act sets forth 20 objectives, which conflict and overlap among themselves. Most of the objectives are praiseworthy but they do not point to a definite goal or furnish much practical guidance. Instead they provide some plausible grounds for almost any complaint that might be made concerning the disposal of surplus property under this legislation. The other provisions of the act contain a number of restrictions and directives which are susceptible to varying interpretation so seriously that President Roosevelt expressed doubt of its practical application when he was called upon to sign it. Further complications have been added by the recent amendment, which is primarily intended to give a priority status, instead of a mere preference, to veterans of World War II in the purchase of surplus property.

This is not to say—although it has been said, on high authority—that the law is unworkable, but it is difficult to administer in a businesslike way; and its own provisions provide the principal bases for the current dissatisfaction with the results obtained under it.

PROGRESS

Notwithstanding the difficulties alluded to, $3,000,000,000 of surplus has been disposed of with a return on the salable material of about 45 percent of original cost. The rate of disposal is currently one-half billion a month and steps are being taken to increase greatly the number of sales outlets by means of sales on the site and also to increase the disposal rate at existing outlets. An increase in the total rate of disposal to one and a half billion a month is the goal for the near future.

A UNIQUE BUSINESS

I have referred to difficulties which stem from the governing legislation, but there are, also, other features of surplus property disposal which distinguish it from all ordinary commercial operations. It is neither merchandising nor liquidation but falls somewhere between the two. The enterprise differs from merchandising in that the selling agency has no considerable influence on the quantity, quality, condition, location, method of packing, time of offering nor any other of the essential factors by which merchandising is ordinarily selected. There is no possibility, except by fortuitous chance, of replenishing the stocks of articles which are the most readily salable or which produce the highest return, nor of avoiding additions to the most undesirable stocks. These facts are sufficient to show the wide difference between this activity and commercial merchandising.

The task would be essentially a mammoth liquidation except for the objectives and other provisions of the act. They have effectively removed most of the elements of liquidation, in an effort to promote the interests of economy in the Federal Government, to extend economic advantages to State and local governments, to provide benefits for veterans, to augment public health and educational activities, to encourage, support and maintain small business ventures whether established or to be established, to stimulate full employment, to discourage speculation, to avoid unfavorable impacts of the sale of surplus property on business, and in general to promote the welfare of the Nation and its people. These are worthy objectives but to serve them effectively through the sale of surplus war property, does remove it far from the fields of either merchandising or liquidation and leads it through strange unchartered territory towards an undetermined destination.

RELATIONSHIP TO COMMERCIAL BUSINESS

The relationship of the disposal of surplus property to ordinary business is obscured by the attempt in the legislation to mitigate the unfavorable effects that might result from the rapid release of large quantities of war surplus. It is significant that among the 20 objectives of the act, expeditious disposal is No. 18, and obtaining a fair return for the property sold is No. 20, and the statement of each is even hedged with

reservations which emphasize the primary force of the other objectives.

It is my belief that the subordination of these two objectives, which would be of primary importance in either liquidation or merchandising, stems from the anticipation (and very reasonable anticipation, too) of conditions quite different from those that have been encountered since the end of the war. It was expected, no doubt, that industrial production would be resumed full blast as soon as the war demands were eased. It was apprehended that the principal deterrent to full industrial employment would be encountered in the rapid release of the war stocks which, vast as they are, were then greatly overestimated. It was probably regarded as a cushion to their impact on commercial industry to have them released deliberately and at prices generally in line with the costs of new production. The latter would then develop at a pace not inconsistent with its probable long-range rate for the future and the articles produced would find their markets in moderate competition with the sale of the war products.

If this was the prospect it is far from realization. The sale of war surpluses has been retarded, of course, but the output of commercial production has been retarded too. In 9 months since the end of the war, few of the major industries have regained their normal peacetime production rates and a seller's market prevails in almost every line of goods. It is to be hoped that these circumstances will improve soon and thereafter will conform more closely to those expected when the act was written. But the restrictions imposed upon the disposal of surplus property have retarded sales during the period in which they could have been made to the greatest advantage, and so have increased the impact which must subsequently be incurred by reviewing industry.

There is, to my mind grave doubt of the wisdom of the trying to mitigate the effect of surplus property sales by inflexible restrictions laid down long in advance. One reason for that doubt has just been explained. Another is that stocks of goods known or believed to exist and bound to be offered for sale at some future time may have psychological effects more serious than any of the practical effects that could result from selling the same stocks at once.

SALES METHODS

As purchasing officers, many of you gentlemen are more interested in how this surplus property can serve your needs than in any theories of mine concerning its wisest distribution. The sales of surplus property by War Assets Administration are made in, or under, supervision of 33 regional offices, the locations of which are shown in many of the sales advertising, and their suboffices. The regional offices and suboffices at present sell largely from their general inventories by specially advertised sales, which for a decreasing number of categories are on a Nation-wide basis. The terms and conditions of the sales are set forth in the advertising. Increasing emphasis is being given to sales at the sites of large accumulation of surplus property, such as Army and/or Navy depots and camps, posts, or stations which it is proposed to vacate. In such sales, the dates for offerings to the several categories in the hierarchy of purchasers are established; and following the completion of the sale to one priority group, the sale to the next priority takes place, as set forth in the announcement of the sale.

Machine tools and electronic equipment and supplies are offered through agents of the kind who normally handle such products from commercial production. Aircraft, aircraft engines, and aircraft tires are sold directly to the public by the Office of Aircraft Disposal in Washington. Components and spares for aircraft are sold on consignment by commercial agents. Real property is sold by sealed bid or by negotiation as circumstances of particular properties may dictate.

Ordinarily, offerings of personal, or movable, property, if new and in good condition, are made at fixed prices. Used articles and articles in poor condition are frequently offered for sale by some form of competitive bidding.

Sales are pointed at the levels of trade in which like property is normally handled commercially and prices are established for the levels of wholesalers, large and small retailers, following generally the normal commercial practice. Industrial users are recognized in the trade channels at the levels accorded to them in commercial practice as nearly as they can be determined. Maximum and minimum lots for any purchaser may be established according to trade practice and the requirements of the act in respect to broad distribution. In most lines and circumstances surplus property is not sold in lots suitable for a purchaser at retail.

FILLING ORDERS

The wide differences between the surplus property operation and ordinary merchandising have been pointed out. It is scarcely in order to undertake either to acknowledge or to refute criticisms which have been leveled at disposal agencies by persons who have failed to recognize those essential differences. However, it does seem desirable to take cognizance of delays that have occurred, and are still occurring in too many instances, in filling orders that have been received and accepted. Diligent effort is being directed by the War Assets Administration to improving this situation, but it should be recalled that in the ordinary case, the property is warehoused, handled, and shipped by the owning agency to whom the shipping instructions are issued after a sale has been made. Furthermore, many of the regional offices, for a variety of reasons, have not been adequately staffed for the work they have to do. In all these circumstances, the impracticability of giving the kind of service that an efficient mercantile establishment would be expected to render should be recognized. Notwithstanding all the improvements that have been made or are in prospect, such standards of merchandising are not likely to be attained in the disposal of surplus property.

INDUSTRIAL BUYERS

Owing to the priorities established by the act, ordinary industrial users are not in a very favorable position in the purchase of surplus property. Owing to the manner in which the disposals must be conducted, it is likely to be impracticable for a purchasing officer to purchase what he may want exactly when he wants it. Offerings must be made by the War Assets Administration as promptly as possible after surplus property is declared. A regional office cannot handle any considerable number of special requests for items which are not yet ready for sale without disrupting the main program. However, substantial inventories are offered on open order until the stocks are exhausted, and in some lines the inventories remain available for an extended period of time.

To take the best advantage of surplus offerings a purchasing officer should maintain close contact with a regional office, or a suboffice, of the War Assets Administration. He should scan its advertising carefully. He can hardly expect to synchronize his purchases of surplus property closely with his needs. Consequently he should be prepared to meet his future requirements by purchase when the opportunities occur. His best opportunities will be found in the purchase of surplus articles for which the demand is not too great. Extraordinary ingenuity in adapting to his needs some special purpose articles designed for other uses will earn the highest rewards in the purchase of surplus property.

Surplus disposal is a task involving many categories of goods, many levels of business, and many diverse problems. In a very emphatic way your relationship to the surplus disposal program reflects that of all our prospective customers. We are trying to make it simple to purchase surplus.

The Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 5, 1946

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., June 3, 1946.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Federal Mediation Act of 1946, known as the Case bill, which has been passed by both Houses of Congress, is now before you. On behalf of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, I urge that you give it your approval.

The bill is definitely in the public interest, and the action of Congress undoubtedly reflects a strong public demand for action to minimize work stoppages.

Efforts have been made to label this bill an antilabor measure. We do not so regard it. The chamber of commerce is not antilabor, having repeatedly declared its support for the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively. This bill does not limit nor restrict that right. On the contrary it will implement and smooth the way for collective bargaining by outlawing certain abuses that have become common practice in labor disputes, and that are harmful to the public.

The bill makes both parties to labor contracts responsible for their acts. It protects both unions and employers by penalizing unauthorized strikes. It outlaws royalty payments and pay-roll taxes paid to a labor organization unless management and labor control the funds jointly. It removes supervisory employees from the definition of "employee" under the National Labor Relations Act. It outlaws interference with interstate commerce by robbery and extortion.

It contains provisions for a ban on strikes and lock-outs during a 60-day period, and for the use of a Federal Mediation Board. This procedure is objected to by some in both management and labor. These objections however are greatly outweighed, we believe, by the eminently good points of the bill.

We command your suggestion for a joint congressional committee to study and make recommendations with respect to further legislation. However, we feel that the matters covered in the Case bill have had sufficient study by congressional committees over a long period to warrant their approval at this time.

It is of the utmost importance that this Nation go full speed ahead in the reconversion process, so that production will meet the needs of our people and the world, and at the same time stop the inflationary trend that is now resulting from a lack of goods and services.

Business and industry as represented in the Chamber of Commerce of the United States are hopeful for an early return to industrial peace. We believe that the Federal Mediation Act of 1946 will contribute importantly to that end, and we urge that you approve it.

Very respectfully yours,
WILLIAM K. JACKSON,
President.

Americanization Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 5, 1946

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, recently for the seventeenth successive year the annual Americanization Day exercises were held in Jersey City, N. J. These exercises have always been sponsored by the Captain Clinton E. Fisk Post, No. 132, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. From modest beginnings they have grown to events of immense magnitude. Many thousands of persons marched in the magnificent parade past the reviewing stand in Pershing Field, where they were reviewed by the governing board of Jersey City, Mr. Joseph M. Stack, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; Capt. Joseph J. Smith, State commander, department of New Jersey VFW; and other governmental and veterans' organization officials.

The grand marshal of the parade was Lt. Francis X. Burke, holder of the coveted Congressional Medal of Honor. Mr. Alex Luken was general chairman for the day and presided over the exercises at the reviewing stand. A large representation of disabled veterans of World War II were escorted to the exercises from Halloran Hospital, Staten Island, N. Y., and received the homage of the vast audience Speakers on this occasion were Hon. Arthur Potterton, commissioner of the city of Jersey City, who spoke on behalf of Mayor Hague and the city commissioners; Mr. Joseph M. Stack, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; and Captain Smith, the department commander of New Jersey; and myself. As part of my remarks, I include herewith the address delivered on that occasion by Commander in Chief Stack:

TO SERVE THE LIVING

The United States is the pivot on which world peace is poised, because we have become—as a result of the war—the leader in world affairs. If our leadership fails to bring about genuine cooperation among nations, then another war—a war of total destruction—will be the result. It is the duty of every American citizen to see that this Nation has the strength, the unity and the determination to make its leadership felt. Now, more than ever, being an American citizen means being a world citizen too.

In other words, just as we have learned to get along with one another, so we must now learn to get along with people who live thousands of miles away. We have to shed our old prejudices and fears about people who speak other languages, have different customs and seemingly strange ideas; after all, if our own history has taught us anything, it is that so-called differences aren's terribly important. Underneath superficial contrasts are the same hopes, the same human needs. Today, all over the world, people share the same hope of peace.

That is, everyone hopes for the peace except certain groups and individuals who still put their own power above everything else. These Hitler-imitators have learned nothing from the war. They are deaf to the cries of peace-starved millions. They are deaf to another cry, too—a more sinister cry raised by responsible scientists who have worked on the atomic bomb. These men know what they are dealing with. Their pleas for peace are based on the terrible knowledge that should atomic power ever be used again for war, it would mean the downfall of all mankind.

Every veteran remembers the long, lonely hours he spent during the war just waiting for mail, waiting for chow, waiting for H-hour, waiting for the war to end. There was plenty of time for dreaming—of home, of the good life that would be after the mess was cleaned up. Those dreams kept our men going through endless mud and jungle and sweat and blood—kept them moving straight ahead to victory.

As we approach our first peacetime Memorial Day, we are resolved to keep faith with the GI who never got home to his dreams, by building memorials that capture the spirit of those dreams. The kind of memorial he would have wanted was described by one marine sergeant this way: "They died, that we might live in peace." This would look a lot finer over the entrance to a slum children's playground than on an alabaster vase. Given in his name, it would fulfill his aspirations better than all the marble-columned temples that ever wasted good space, time, and money.

Cold stone and marble cannot express our gratitude to those who made the supreme sacrifice. They brought us victory—the victory of democracy over tyranny, of civilization over barbarism, of liberty over slavery. They gave us the chance to live in freedom and look to the future with hope. Only living memorials—dedicated to the happiness and well-being of living people—can show that we appreciate the true meaning of their sacrifice. You may have heard the story of Mrs. Privett of Blytheville, Ark. Her husband was killed in Luxembourg with the Third Army, leaving her with eight small children to bring up. The people of Blytheville decided to build a practical, living memorial to Pfc Privett—a home for his wife and children. They started a collection. Before they were finished, they had contributions not only from Blytheville, or just from the State of Arkansas, but from every State in the Union. When Mrs. Privett moved into her new 10-room home with her family, all she could say was: "I didn't know God made so many good people."

The citizens of Blytheville have kept faith with Private Privett's dream—a good home for his family, security for his children. Blytheville has also kept faith with everything that Private Privett—and millions like him—fought and died for. He died so that many good people of all nations and creeds might go on living and building together in a free, peaceful world. And those "good people"—his fellow countrymen, his fellow townspeople, men and women from every walk of life—have together built a memorial that is a living example of the ideals for which Private Privett gave his life.

In every part of America living memorials to the heroic dead of World War II are springing up. They are taking many different shapes. But all have one thing in common—they point to a finer, better future, instead of standing as mute and static reminders of a bitter past.

In one city a new medical and dental clinic has been opened in honor of the Army and Navy medics who fell while bringing life and healing to the wounded. Every patient at the clinic will always remember in gratitude their heroic fellow citizens who died to give life to others.

Another community has started an interfaith summer camp in memory of the men of all faiths who died together so that American children might live and grow up in peaceful happiness. Many cities are building youth centers, parks, playgrounds, and schools where youngsters will play and learn together in friendship for many years to come.

The parents of one American soldier who was killed in the Pacific are using his life insurance to establish a university scholarship for a deserving Japanese-American student. "Our boy would have wanted it this way," those parents explained. "We consider it a memorial to what he fought for."

These are living answers to the vicious master-race myths our enemies tried to cram down our throats. Had the Nazis won the war, children all over the world would be taught by edict and official order to despise their neighbors—to look down on other human beings, because their skin is a different color or because they worship God in a different way. Healthy youngsters, growing up with sound minds and strong bodies, are the best memorials we can raise to those who saved us from Hitler's poison.

Children are great imitators of the adults around them. In our everyday shortcomings and goings, we must set the example we want them to follow. In our homes and on our jobs, we must show them what Americanism means. Factories, stores, and offices where each worker is judged by his own merits are monuments to the victory of democracy.

But that victory would be hollow indeed, if the gallant peoples of Europe, who fought by our side and sacrificed so much to defeat Hitlerism, should die of famine, disease, and poverty. Let's not try to forget that the Nazis tried to conquer the world by picking off one country at a time. The Axis Powers were finally licked—but only when the United Nations joined forces in a common cause. Nothing would please our enemies more than to see us turn our backs on our former allies in their time of need. A hungry, weak, divided world is just what the Nazi die-hards are hoping for—so that German militarism may rise again, without strong opposition, just as it did after 1918.

We must do everything we can to help the people of Europe rebuild their lives. We must send boatloads of clothing, food, and medicine for the cold, the hungry, and the sick. Not only because it is the decent, humane, Christian-like thing to do but also because we are smart enough to realize that people who suffer from cold and hunger are ripe for revolution. They can't cover their bodies with our sympathy. They can't fill their empty bellies with ideals and platitudes about freedom and democracy. In their desperation they will be willing to follow any crackpot who will promise them food and shelter. Starvation breeds rebellion. Hunger makes willing slaves out of people who would truly prefer freedom. All these evils mean the beginnings of new wars—wars that can never be confined within the boundaries of one country or one continent. Of course, the greatest memorial we can build for our honored dead is lasting peace in a free world—the dream of every soldier who fought under the stars and stripes. If we do not keep faith with that dream, then the sacrifices of our comrades will have been in vain. All other monuments to their memory will become meaningless.

The foundation of this memorial has already been laid. The cornerstone is the United Nations Charter. The structure of peace is taking shape. Germany and Japan are being ruled the United Nations' way. The Bretton Woods plan for a stable international economy has begun to work. The United Nations are bringing relief to suffering Europe through UNRRA. The UN Security Council is sitting in continuous session in New York, ready to tackle any situation that might lead to trouble—ready to settle all disputes peacefully.

But no structure can rise by itself. It needs people to shape it, to supply the bricks and mortar, to put each essential part in place and to keep it in repair. It needs the human touch. World peace can never materialize unless we, the builders, stick to the

job with energy, patience, and real understanding.

Every veteran knows how much planning and coordination it takes to advance on new fronts in war. Remember how many folks back home clamored impatiently for a second front and how many GI's chafed at the bit, waiting for D-day? Even though each soldier knew that he might not live to tell about it he wanted to get going. Anything seemed better than waiting.

But our military experts were not impatient. They knew that every last detail of each new move had to be worked out with painstaking care. And the signal to advance came only when the whole plan was complete. On every front—in Africa, Italy, France, Germany, and the Pacific—victory was made possible by long, patient planning and careful coordination.

Opening up new fronts in peace takes just as much planning and coordination as the combined operations of war. But, just as we clamored for headway during the war, many of us are impatient today. We want a solid structure of permanent peace to spring into being by some magic formula. But there is no magic formula. To arrive at a working cooperation between nations, we must advance slowly and carefully, step by step. Former Secretary of State Cordell Hull recently warned us against this "spirit of impatience," as he calls it. We should be ready, he said, "to examine the views of others, to ascertain the true facts, to avoid the assumption of adamant positions, and to refrain from exaggerating and over-emphasizing one's own claims and from making an appeal to prejudice." That is sound advice from one of our great statesmen—words to guide us as we move forward toward lasting peace. This is one advance we can make without fear of casualties. All we need fear is losing the gains already made; that would mean suicide for all. Our first assignment is to hold the line—raising the ramparts of peace upon the ground of common agreement already occupied by the United Nations. This is the most enduring memorial we can build to the millions who have suffered and died to give us another chance.

Should Sign Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 5, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Standard-Times, of New Bedford, Mass., with respect to whether or not the President should sign the Case bill. It follows:

SHOULD SIGN CASE BILL

President Truman, who called upon Congress to grant him powers to safeguard the Nation against economic paralysis, now has before him the Case bill which was drafted to prohibit certain practices of labor unions, and which should prove helpful in the prevention of strikes in key industries.

Opponents of any legislation to curb strikes are asking him to veto this measure, and the Secretary of Labor has indicated he may recommend a veto on the ground that it is unfair to labor. The main opponents of the bill are not members of the unions, but their leaders, who wish to be above the law.

In the light of the existing labor situation, and the President's own appeal for a much more stringent bill to enable him to avert a disaster like the stoppage of rail transportation, he cannot consistenly turn down the Case bill.

The rail strike and the bituminous-coal strike have been ended. But a strike of the anthracite miners has begun, and a strike by the maritime workers, which would halt the operation of all merchant vessels, impends. After a Nation-wide survey of industry, John D. Small, Civilian Production Administrator, has said that it will be many months before the lost production of coal can be made up. He declared the production of durable goods, including automobiles, tires, farm machinery, and building materials needed to provide housing for veterans, has been set back at least 3 months.

In a Nation still reeling from the effects of strikes, to fail to take measures to prevent more strikes would constitute a neglect of the Government's responsibility for the national welfare.

The Case bill provides for the creation of a Federal Mediation Board to act in disputes which collective bargaining has failed to settle. When the Board takes jurisdiction in such cases, lock-outs and strikes are prohibited for a period of 60 days. Considering the grave consequences of strikes like those of the railroad workers and the miners, this is a reasonable restraint which the President should support as being essential to the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

Another provision of the Case bill prohibits obstruction of commerce, and of the movement of goods in commerce on their way from producer to consumer, by means of extortion and threats of physical violence to persons and property. Sometime ago Congress sought to outlaw such practices, but the Supreme Court held, in the New York teamsters' case, that the antiracketeering law did not extend to labor unions. It suggested that Congress could remedy this deficiency, and now it has done so.

Under the law, the aim of collective bargaining is the formulation of contracts between management and labor. Where such a contract prohibits lock-outs, strikes or slowdowns, the Case bill provides that a violation of it is ground for a suit for damages. A union, as such, may sue in behalf of the employees it represents, but the bill establishes, for the first time, the principle that a union can be sued for violating a contract, and that a judgment against it can be collected from its assets.

The Case bill cannot be classed as legislation conceived in haste in a crisis. Passed originally by the House, it had careful consideration by that body. The Senate made changes in it, and the House accepted them. It is not an antilabor bill, and it does not interfere with the legitimate practices of labor unions, but only with those that have aroused public resentment, and that have been detrimental to the welfare of the people, including organized labor itself.

President Truman asked for a law to enable the Government to prevent disastrous strikes that threaten the entire national economy. He has it in the Case bill which will help to prevent stoppages of vital services and production, and he should give it his approval.

Interview With Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 4, 1946

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members of the House will be interested in the views expressed by the Secretary of Agriculture in a recent interview with Mr. Everett Mitchell, noted radio commentator. The interview follows:

Mr. MITCHELL. It's a beautiful day in Washington. It's cloudy outside. The temperature is 74 degrees. It's a great day to be alive and I hope it's even more beautiful wherever you are. We are proud to have as our guest today the man who speaks for the Nation's farmers in the halls of Government—the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Clinton P. Anderson.

Mr. ANDERSON. Thank you, Everett. I'm happy for this opportunity to visit with your listeners again.

Mr. MITCHELL. It's been just a wee bit short of a year. Today the problems are different.

Mr. ANDERSON. But we still have plenty of problems.

Mr. MITCHELL. Last year it was production for war. Now it's production to secure the peace—to meet the greatest food crisis in history.

Mr. ANDERSON. You said it, Everett, food production. It's always food production.

Mr. MITCHELL. And today, of course, we face emergency.

Mr. ANDERSON. The hard and bitter truth is that in all the earth there isn't enough food to avert hunger. As former President Hoover has reported, hunger hangs over the homes of 800,000,000 people—more than one-third of the peoples of the earth.

Mr. MITCHELL. And today I know you want to report to America and the world what we have done to help save these people.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, Everett, we are now approaching the end of the wheat-marketing year, and, as you know, wheat is the key to the famine-relief program. A year ago plans were made.

Mr. MITCHELL. A year ago the war was still in progress. Yet the famine need was foreseen.

Mr. ANDERSON. At that time we began to shift our use of grains. Let me explain this carefully. During the war the most urgent needs were for more livestock products. This called for increasing livestock numbers to record levels. It required heavy feeding of grain to livestock for maximum production of milk, meat, and eggs for domestic, military, and lend-lease uses. The end of the war brought a reversal—a new desperate call from war-torn areas for grain for direct human consumption. This necessitated a shift from heavy livestock feeding to direct use of grain for human consumption in order to make limited world supplies go as far as possible in helping save the lives of starving people.

Mr. MITCHELL. And this was a growing demand.

Mr. ANDERSON. Our first goal, set last June, was 225,000,000 bushels of wheat for relief feeding. By October this had grown to 325,000,000 bushels; and by January we had promised 400,000,000 bushels to be delivered by June 30 this year. Drought in southern Europe and in the Far East made the situation more critical than at first anticipated.

Mr. MITCHELL. And has America delivered?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. Bottlenecks were broken. Despite demobilization—and the greatest transportation jam in history—America delivered 195,000,000 bushels of wheat in the last 6 months of 1945. And now we are in the last big push to deliver the rest of the 400,000,000 bushels that we promised. Latest figures show 326,000,000 bushels already shipped.

Mr. MITCHELL. Four hundred million bushels of wheat is about one-third of our year's production, isn't it, Mr. Secretary?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, and even more significant—American exports of wheat will be at least 40 percent of the total food grain exports of the world.

Mr. MITCHELL. That's a record to make America proud.

Mr. ANDERSON. But not to sit back and consider the job done. Especially since the railroad strike, just settled, held us up critically. The cost of this strike in grain alone is great. Altogether the strike froze shipments to starving people equivalent to 32 shiploads of wheat and 8 shiploads of corn. While shipments are being resumed there will still be serious loss. It means that 150,000 tons of grain will not be delivered within the time limit we have set. During the last 5 weeks of this crop year we will make a desperate effort to get every last bushel of wheat that we can possibly ship right now in the most critical part of the famine period. This big push now under way means that housewives temporarily may not be able to get all the bread and flour they want in the stores. But by conserving bread and flour now in the homes and in public eating places we will be able to stretch our supplies during this critical period. This will not result in hardship. Housewives should remember this. Every time they reach for a loaf of bread that isn't there they should not forget that that loaf is in the hands of someone who needs it more. And here at home there are plenty of other foods available to make up any deficit.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will there be other shortages, too?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; additional repercussions next year—less pork, leaner beef, a smaller supply of poultry and eggs.

Mr. MITCHELL. This, of course, is the result of less grain for feeding livestock.

Mr. ANDERSON. And this presents dairying with a serious problem. Feed is short. Dairymen are also squeezed by maladjustments of price. But dairy farmers and their industry are taking extraordinary measures to maintain supplies to help meet the famine emergency. This need will continue as seen by these new estimated demands for export in the coming year: Cheese, 100,000,000 pounds; evaporated and condensed milk, more than 600,000,000 pounds; powdered milk, 275,000,000 pounds. We in the Department of Agriculture are doing all in our power to help producers keep the milk supply at wartime levels. Here again, this calls for production.

Mr. MITCHELL. Production, Mr. Secretary, is the theme of your message in the American Dairy Association advertisement today in newspapers coast to coast. And this message—your message to America—says——

Mr. ANDERSON. Your life, and the lives of millions around the world, depend as never before on America's green meadows and fields, on the will of American farmers to produce. Right now, we need to conserve food, share food. But, in the long run, we need more food, not less—to share life itself and to build a lasting peace. Looking beyond the famine emergency we need more food for you, the Nation, the world; more grain, more meat, more milk, source of our butter, cheese, ice cream, evaporated and powdered milk. We need more of these foods because they are so indispensable to mankind. Peoples of the world who enjoy adequate amounts of dairy foods grow stronger, remain more virile, and live longer than the peoples who must do without. But saying we need more milk, more meat, more grain, cannot produce even one single ounce.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then how can we enjoy true abundance of food?

Mr. ANDERSON. Only if we assure the farmer the means to produce—equipment, manpower—a fair return and a ready, fully employed market for his full production. Production of plenty has always been the farmer's aim ever since primitive man first scratched the soil with a stick, let fall the seed, and exulted with the harvest moon. This is his aim today. It is the Nation's aim. Your aim. Production of plenty must be our common goal. So let us make sure the farmer is provided with the means to produce. Give him an honest return for his efforts. Let us encourage his production of foods for a better life for all mankind. "The greener grow the dairylands, the more productive all our farms, the brighter life for you."

Mr. MITCHELL. Thank you, the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture.

Iowa Boy Wins National Spelling Contest—Congratulations, John McKinney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1946

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the Seventh District of Iowa, which I have the honor to represent, there is a fine, typical Iowa city of Woodbine, Iowa. From that city there came to Washington, D. C., last week one of its best products, a 13-year-old lad named John McKinney, a typical Iowa boy.

John came to compete with junior high school students from schools throughout the Nation in the spelling contest sponsored by the Scripps-Howard newspapers, under the Iowa sponsorship of the Des Moines Register. John McKinney, of Iowa, won the contest and thus became the fourth national champion speller from Iowa in the last 19 years.

We Iowans are all mighty proud of the boy and of his parents and his teacher. Yes, and proud of our great State of Iowa, whose taxpayers insist on providing the best educational system and facilities that can be had for its children, the men and women of tomorrow.

Johnny's victory is another proof that Iowa has lived up to its slogan "Of all things good Iowa affords the best."

My good friend Steve, editor of the Woodbine Twiner, had the following to say about the occasion and the champ:

"CHAMP" JOHN MCKINNEY READS MEDICAL JOURNALS—WANTS TO BE ATTORNEY

All Woodbine eyes were on the Nation's Capital last Friday. For the time being Woodbine was not interested in the railroad strike, John L. Lewis and his miners' strike; we did not care a rap what the politicians were doing and it made no difference whether the Russian diplomats agreed with other diplomats or not.

Woodbine people had all eyes and thoughts on young John McKinney, who was taking part in the national spelling contest in Washington that day, and when word was flashed that John had won the contest and was the champion speller of the entire country, naturally there was much rejoicing here in Woodbine.

Personally, this writer was sure John would win. He is the kind of a lad that has confidence in his spelling ability; he is cool and calm at all times, and nothing excites him.

The Iowa State contest was sponsored by the Des Moines Register and that paper had a reporter in Washington to cover the story. Most Woodbine people have read the Register's story, but the Twiner reproduces it for the hundreds of former Woodbine people living elsewhere who will be interested in reading it.

The big test over, Iowa's national spelling champion, 13-year-old John McKinney, of Woodbine, was just one of the gang again Friday afternoon.

Along with the 29 other State and district champions he competed against, John resumed seeing the sights in the Nation's Capital.

TOURS PENTAGON

His victory seemed to be a thing of the past as he enthusiastically toured the National Art Gallery, the Smithsonian Institute, and the Pentagon Building.

John won the national championship in the twenty-ninth round of the bee when Mary McCarthy, New York parochial school champion from the Bronx, tripped on "flaccid." She spelled it "phlaxid."

The Woodbine youngster did not turn a hair, spelled the word correctly and reeled off "semaphore" as a clincher.

His face broke into a broad grin. Judges and contestants swarmed about with congratulations. Cameras began flashing.

As a reward John was presented with a $500 Victory bond, $125 in cash, and $75 for a 3-day trip to New York City.

RAILROAD STRIKE

That trip was occupying a big place in his mind Friday night because of the railroad strike.

There also was some concern about how he and his mother, Mrs. N. L. McKinney, and Miss Mildred Hawn, his teacher, would get back to Woodbine if the strike continues.

That, however, was not bothering "the champ" too much—two more big days were ahead for him in Washington.

Friday afternoon John topped off his visit to the Pentagon by sitting in Gen. Dwight Eisenhower's chair in the Chief of Staff's office and having his picture taken with Lt. Gen. Curtis LeMay, who directed the B–29 raids on Japan.

Of the 29 finalists, only 28 started the contest. Ruby Romine, of Charleston, W. Va., was reported ill, but came in during the ninth round and was spelled down in the thirteenth.

Two contestants were spelled down in the first round, Marcia Anne Loomis, of Detroit, Mich., on "across" and Joyce Wallmark, of Washington, on "once."

GAINS SYMPATHY

One speller who gained the crowd's sympathy was Mattie Lou Pollard, of Thomaston, Ga., a product of a one-room school.

Charmed by her accent, the audience spelled every word with her, but she was spelled down in the sixteenth round on "anarchy."

By the eighteenth round there were five spellers left. They were Betty Budd, Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Jay Noble, New York; Leslie Dean, Passaic, N. J.; Mary McCarthy and John.

At this point Dr. Harold Harding, the pronouncer, introduced the five contestants and had them introduce their parents, teachers, and sponsors.

MISSPELLED WORDS

Mrs. Wilford White, one of the judges, then asked the sponsors and teachers to spell correctly some of the words that had been misspelled.

Miss Hawn spelled correctly the word "coerce," but Verne Allan, of the Register and Tribune, who came down to Washington with John, misspelled "ukulele." John had to spell it correctly for him.

THE FINAL ROUND

Betty Budd and Jay Noble went down in the twentieth round on "covenants" and "hypotenuse," respectively. Leslie Dean lost out in the twenty-seventh round on "asceticism," leaving John and Mary McCarthy in the final round.

As the two finalists stood in front of the microphone, Dr. Harding told the audience that here were the two best spellers in the

country, and any potential employers shou'd take notice, because "they would be making their mark 10 years hence."

"WHAT'S THE MATTER WITH JOHNNY"

(Tune—What's the Matter With Father)

What's the matter with Johnny? He's all right.
What's the matter with Johnny. He's all right.
He's the Speller from Woodbine, and boy, is he bright?
Dad and mother was "bustin" with pride through the night,
What's the matter with Johnny? He's all right.

What's the matter with Miss Hawn? She's all right.
What's the matter with Miss Hawn? She's all right.
She did a good job and we thank her tonight,
She's deserving of honor, she's modest and bright,
What's the matter with Miss Hawn? She's all right.

What's the matter with Johnny? He's all right.
What's the matter with Johnny? He's all right.
Altho' he's a youngster that spells with delight
He put Woodbine on the map, think of his might,
What's the matter with Johnny? He's all right.

Russia Ranks Stalin Greatest Among Her Historical Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 5 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the second of a series of articles on Russia, entitled "Russia Ranks Stalin Greatest Among Her Historical Leaders," written by Mr. Eddy Gilmore, Associated Press foreign correspondent, and published in the Washington Evening Star of June 5, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA RANKS STALIN GREATEST AMONG HER HISTORICAL LEADERS—BUT THERE ARE SEVERAL YOUNGER MEN TO CARRY THINGS ON WHEN HE'S GONE

(This is the second of a series by the Associated Press chief of bureau in Moscow, who has spent 5 years in Russia and who has just returned to the United States on vacation.)

(By Eddy Gilmore)

NEW YORK, June 5.—Generalissimo Josef Stalin is a highly respected, almost hallowed, figure in Russia today, regarded by his 193,000,000 people as probably the greatest Russian of all time—greater than Peter the Great, Ivan the Terrible, and perhaps even Lenin.

At 66 Stalin is still a vigorous man and still in charge of this nation that occupies one-sixth of the earth's surface.

Elected in February this year to four more years as Russia's leader, Stalin seems likely to fill out his term and, if his health is as good as it is today, be elected again.

Stalin is a Georgian, and Georgians as a race seem to live longer than any other in the Soviet Union. There are at least 10 men in the little southern republic who are reported to be over 100 and one who claims to be tending goats at the age of 142.

Who is going to succeed Stalin is one of those things the Russians just won't talk about, because by talking about it one has to accept the premise that Stalin won't be around forever. It's like anticipating the death of your father. It's just too unbearable.

Loved, respected, and feared, Stalin's stature grew mightily with the war. Although, of course, it was pretty impressive before, the Russians around him, the military men, and the Russian people, seem to be thoroughly convinced that he, more than any man in the world, saved Russia and civilization from Hitler and actually brought about the Nazi downfall.

They give him full marks for Russia's ability to withstand the Wehrmacht, for the elimination of anti-Soviet elements before the war which resulted in the USSR having no fifth column, and for wise planning and thinking for them and their future all the time.

STALIN HAS WILLING BACKERS

The Russians have great faith in Stalin's new 5-year plans and are quite certain that by putting the effort and sacrifice into the work that he says is necessary they are going to emerge the greatest industrial country in the world, the country with the most secure political and economical system and eventually the country with the most spiritual as well as material surpluses.

Any beliefs, fears, or hopes here or elsewhere that there is opposition to Stalin in Russia is nonsense. There is no political group striving to grab power, for the Communists have the power and they are Russia's only party and will continue so.

There is no such thing as a generals' group or clique. There are generals and marshals by the dozens, yes, but they are nothing as a group more than fighting men and would be the most embarrassed men in the Soviet Union to hear themselves referred to as a bloc seeking power.

Who are the men under Stalin and what importance should one attach to them as possible successors to the Generalisismo who, some day, of course, must step down or die, as bad as this would be for the USSR, and, as a lot of foreign diplomats think, bad for the United States, too?

MAN OF MANY TITLES

Stalin's present jobs and titles are: Chairman of the Council of Ministers, which means he's Prime Minister.

Head of all the armed forces.

Secretary general of the central committee of the Communist Party.

Head of the powerful Politburo.

Chairman of the organization committee of the Communist Party.

Deputy to the Supreme Soviet.

Vyacheslav Molotov, the Foreign Minister, appears to rank next to Stalin, for he holds, in addition to what here would be the Secretary of State's job, the post of first assistant chairman of the Council of Ministers. This makes him Vice Premier.

Molotov is also a high-ranking member of the Politburo and a deputy to the Supreme Council—a party man of great drive, ability, and devotion to its country and its causes.

Although a member of the vital central committee of the party, Molotov is not one of its secretaries, nor is he on the organization committee of the party. This fact may or may not figure in his future.

SUBORDINATE CHIEFTAINS

There are three relatively young men who have risen rapidly with the end of the war:

Marshal L. P. Beria.

Gen. A. A. Zhdanov.

G. M. Malenkov.

They are all younger than Stalin, Molotov, or Nikolai Shvernik, the new President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet—Russia's president.

Taking them individually and probably in order of their importance at the moment—and I stress at the moment:

Zhadanov, 50 years old, chairman of the Supreme Soviet's Council of the Union—one of Russia's two legislative chambers. (The Council of Nationalities is the other.) He's a full member of the Politburo, a secretary of the party's central committee, and member of the organizational committee of the party, deputy to the Supreme Soviet, head of the party organization in the great city of Leningrad, and chairman of the Allied Control Commission for Finland.

He is one of the most intelligent and well educated men among the Russian leaders and one can appreciate his important party connections which mean a great deal.

Malenkov is 44, a member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, a full member of the Politburo now, a secretary of the central committee of the party and deputy to the Supreme Soviet. Mr. Malenkov was Stalin's personal secretary for a number of years, which should not be discounted.

BERIA IS FELLOW GEORGIAN

Marshal Beria is 47, and considered to be the ranking member of the Council of Ministers next to Stalin and Molotov. He's a full member of the Politburo, deputy to the Supreme Soviet and former head of Russia's Office of Internal Affairs, indicating the trust Stalin has in him. Like Stalin, he is a Georgian by birth.

There are three other Russians who have taken on added importance since the war. They are Alexei N. Kosygin, Vasily V. Kuznetsov, and Gen. Nikolai A. Bulganin.

At 42, Kosygin is the youngest. He's alternate member of the Politburo, vice chairman of the Council of Ministers, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic and deputy to the Supreme Soviet.

Bulganin at 51 is an alternate member of the Politburo, member of the organizational committee of the party and deputy to the Supreme Soviet.

Kuznetsov, whose broad education includes colleges in the United States, is 45. He is a secretary of the central committee of the party and member of the organizational committee. He is also chairman of the Supreme Soviet's Council of Naticnalities as well as being chief of Russia's trade unions.

From this list Stalin's successor is almost surely to be chosen.

Law, Not Lewis, Cause of Our Predicament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 5, 1946

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Westbrook Pegler, from the Indianapolis Star of May 23, 1946:

LAW, NOT LEWIS, CAUSE OF OUR PREDICAMENT

The recent oratorical and editorial abuse of John L. Lewis was a silly and pathetic exhibition which defeated itself and diginified Lewis. The fact that it accomplished nothing will be established when we discover that the Senate, again, has contrived to wiggle off the spot and do nothing about reforming

the laws which enable Lewis and others to do as they do.

For a few days, this time, it did seem that the Senate might have to act but then, as before, Lewis gave the country a truce which actually was a truce for him at a critical moment. The truce saved Lewis, not the Nation, because if the Government had had the courage to stand pat and go through the crisis, Lewis, not the United States, would have gone down. In a death grapple the Nation will destroy any individual or groups trying to seize such power.

During the excitement we were loudly reminded, again, that Lewis was beetle-browed, arrogant, drunk, and/or mad with power, and a tyrant, all of which had absolutely nothing to do with the case, and none of which was news. This political billingsgate was in the manner of the statesmen of the Communist Party and the left-wing auxiliaries of the Roosevelt machine who have such a low, and accurate, opinion of the common intelligence of Americans that they habitually substitute abusive language for honest debate, and usually win.

Granted that Lewis is beetle-browed, so is Frank Murphy. Roosevelt was lantern-jawed, Henry Wallace drools, and Sidney Hillman speaks a dialect that many Americans would consider laughable. No more arrogant man ever held power in our country than Harold Ickes and the tyranny of Lewis in his union is matched by the tyranny of Dan Tobin, of the teamsters' union, and many others.

ESSENTIALS IN THE CASE

The essentials in the Lewis case were widely ignored.

The causes of the trouble are found in the labor relations law and in the habits of the Government in dealing with unions.

These defects were solemnly and deeply studied by a special committee of the House of Representatives, of which HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, was chairman, in 1940. The committee then made a thorough report revealing the most unconscionable violations of the rights of both workers and employers and the infestation of the Labor Relations Board from its very beginning by Communists. Few of the American people ever heard of this committee, or the revolting conditions which it reported in detail. Some changes were made in the staff but the defects in the law have been guarded as though they were virtues.

During the original debates and in the title of the Wagner Act it was stated that one purpose was to prevent union troubles and their consequent interruption of production and commerce. Since its passage not only have strikes multiplied by four but the magnitude of the strikes, notably the recent troubles in coal, motors, steel, and electrical equipment, has become a threat to the stability of the country and the personal livelihood of millions entirely unconnected with the disputes. Whereas, formerly, strikes were contests between unions and employers over pay and conditions, under the Wagner Act they have developed into political struggles with union executives exerting their power to control retail prices and regulate commerce.

I was one of the early students and critics of the Wagner Act, the Labor Relations Board, and the character of unionism. I foresaw the rise of this enormous power of a few ambitious and ruthless men over the entire people of the United States and the fortunes of the Nation and sometimes was scolded, even by men of similar mind, for dinning away on one subject year after year.

But there has been no more important domestic issue in our time and it is no satisfaction to be able to say today "I told you so."

On the Industrial Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 5, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely article which appeared in the June 1946 issue of the National Grange Monthly entitled "On the Industrial Front," by Fred Brenckman, Washington correspondent:

ON THE INDUSTRIAL FRONT

(Where do the public's rights begin in labor disputes? Strikes have thrown the Nation into chaos, with over 100 million man-days of labor lost since VJ-day—and men still idle.)

(By Fred Brenckman)

What has happened in this country on the industrial front since the close of the war in the Pacific constitutes a spectacle for gods and men. Not only has our system of free enterprise during that time taken the worst blows ever inflicted upon it, but in the process respect for our fundamental institutions of government has been seriously impaired. This does not mean that the people have lost faith in the American system, which is the best in the world, but it does mean that their confidence has been rudely shaken in the way it is being worked or administered.

Elaborate plans were worked out while the war was still in progress to speed up the giant task of reconversion when peace should come, and the people looked forward hopefully to getting the many things which they cheerfully did without while we were fighting two wars at the same time, one in Europe and in Africa, and the other in the Pacific.

But in the main these hopes have not been realized. Today it is just as difficult to buy such simple necessities as shirts, underwear, women's stockings and other wearing apparel as it was during the war. Even such a prime necessity as butter has almost disappeared from the market. When it comes to the supply of durable goods and equipment, the innumerable things that the people need, the situation is equally bad.

OPA AND STRIKES TO BLAME

A large share of the blame for this must rest upon the Office of Price Administration, which, through its unworkable price ceilings, rules and regulations, has thrown our economic machine out of gear and partially strangled production. The rest of our troubles must be attributed to the epidemic of strikes which have brought many of our key industries to a standstill, with disastrous consequences to the Nation.

From VJ-day, August 14, 1945, to the end of March 1946, there were 2,749 strikes, with 83,132,000 man-days of labor lost. On the first of April the most crippling of all the strikes, that of the 400,000 bituminous coal miners, occurred. The paralyzing effects of this strike were rapidly bringing industry and commerce to their knees, when, on May 10, John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, ordered his men back to work as of May 13 "to safeguard the Nation's health and security."

During the 36 working days that the mine strike was in effect, 16,400,000 man-days of labor were lost. Adding this figure to that which had accumulated to the end of March, and taking into account other strikes which were still in progress after the 1st of April, warrants the statement that more than 100,000,000 man-days of labor have been lost as a result of strikes since VJ-day. All this at a time when there was the most urgent need for full production.

The direct loss in wages to strikers is placed at over $800,000,000. Indirect losses to other workers who were thrown out of employment by these work stoppages cannot be computed. Nor can the losses sustained by industry be accurately approximated. The same holds true of the revenues lost to the Federal Government in the form of taxes.

STRIKES WERE UNJUSTIFIED

While it is true that the strikers in practically every instance won substantial increases in wages, the fact remains that in nearly every case reasonable wage increases could have been secured without a strike. Often the difference between the wage increase offered by employers and that which was finally accepted by the strikers amounted to only a cent or two an hour.

As matters stand now, average hourly earnings of workers in the meat-packing industry amount to $1.04; electrical equipment, $1.19; steel, $1.27; automobiles, $1.38, and oil refining, $1.43. Average hourly earnings of all industrial workers in January went over the dollar mark, and numerous increases since granted to large groups, raise the average to higher levels. On the whole, the general wage level is now about 70 percent above prewar rates.

Taking the period from 1910–14 as a base, in December 1945 hourly earnings of factory workers stood at 471 percent of that level; weekly wages per factory worker, 369 percent; cost of living, 188 percent; retail cost of foods, 182 percent, and prices received by farmers, 207 percent. These figures show that industrial workers are getting pretty fair treatment when compared to farmers and the rest of the population.

APPEAL TO THE CREDULOUS

After the steel and automobile strikes were settled on the basis of 18½ cents an hour increase in wages, the CIO spokesman for these groups broadcast the glad news over the radio that they had won the biggest increase in wages in the history of industry. Then they urged everybody to "get back of the OPA," so that there should be no increase in prices.

Those who were fooled by that kind of talk were, of course, very credulous, not to say unfair. The inescapable fact is that higher wages always spell higher prices, unless accompanied by increased production.

However, during recent years some labor unions have resorted to slow-downs, featherbedding, and other practices intended to limit production.

To cite an example, a bricklayer may not lay more than a given number of bricks a day; a house painter may not use a brush of more than so many inches in width; the plumber has long been noted for his ingenuity in making the job last as long as possible and running up costs; the building codes of many municipalities, largely formulated by labor unions and contractors, contain many provisions that make it easy to victimize the public, and which lead inevitably to added costs and grafting.

Under these conditions it has become increasingly difficult for the average man to own a home. Owing to the scarcity of houses all over the country, homes are selling at several times their real worth, while the cost of building new houses is almost prohibitive for people of average means.

Common sense tells us that that is not the way to make progress, nor does it promote the general welfare. The only way to have more is to produce more. What is true of the building industry is also true of any other line of industrial activity.

LACK OF FARM EQUIPMENT

The farmers of the country have particular reasons for feeling aggrieved because they

are unable to get the equipment and machinery they had to do without under wartime conditions.

With nearly one-fourth of the world's population at the point of starvation, the farmers of the United States are being urged to produce food to the utmost limit of their capacity. This they are ready to do most cheerfully, but their efforts are being greatly handicapped by lack of machinery, together with a shortage of labor, due to the higher wages paid in industry.

That famine conditions would follow the global war could easily be foreseen several years ago. It was likewise clear that the world would have to look principally to the United States for the food needed to keep many millions from starving to death.

Under these conditions the United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers, CIO, early last fall served on the International Harvester Co. more than 45 demands, including a wage increase of 30 percent, the union shop, more liberal provisions for vacations with pay, and many others.

On October 1, 1945, the company offered to all unions in its plants a 10-percent increase in wages. This was accepted without prejudice to future wage demands by all unions except the Farm Equipment and Metal Workers, who refused it repeatedly. In January the Secretary of Labor appointed a fact-finding board to inquire into the dispute. After this board had convened, the union called its strike. That was on January 21.

On January 29 the company, in the hope of ending the strike, offered a 17-cents-an-hour increase to the strikers, but the offer again was rejected by the workers.

The fact-finding board eventually recommended a wage increase of 18 cents an hour, plus a retroactive increase of 10 percent, beginning October 1, 1945, which was to be paid until the effective date of the 18 cents an hour increase. The board also recommended an extension of the vacation plan, providing that employees of more than 15 years of service should be given 3-week vacations annually with pay. This had previously been offered by the company. These and most other recommendations made by the board were accepted by the company. But the union still refused to call off the strike.

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

It was not until almost the middle of April that this unfortunate controversy was settled. The principal items in the agreement were these: The 18-cent general wage increase, the 10-percent retroactive increase, the enlarged vacation plan, abolition of the maintenance of membership clause and the substitution of a dues check-off after an opportunity for employees to resign from the union, various liberalizations of wage allowance rules in the company's incentive pay system.

Coming at the time that it did, this strike resulted in depriving farmers throughout the country of the equipment they needed to feed our own population and to stay the grim march of famine in other lands. Since the company is unable to meet the demand for new machinery and equipment, it is putting all possible emphasis on the manufacture of service parts to keep existing machinery in operating condition.

Not content with all the havoc it has already wrought, the Farm Equipment and Metal Workers Union, CIO, is now talking about compelling all dealers who handle the equipment which they help to make to join the union and pay dues under the penalty of getting no implements and machinery to sell.

IMITATING TEAMSTERS' UNION

In taking this position the union is imitating the tactics presently pursued by the teamsters' union in the Detroit area, where the teamsters have served notice on approximately 6,400 retail meat and grocery stores that hereafter they will haul food only to those shops whose owners agree to pay a monthly permit fee of from $2 to $5. The indignant grocers, asserting that this is a form of tribute, say they will not pay it. James Hoffa, business agent for the teamsters' union in the area, declares that there is nothing criminal in the proposed arrangement and that the storekeepers will have to pay or go without supplies.

One is tempted to wonder if the American people still remember the famous words of Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, who in 1796 was sent as our Minister to France at a time when there was a threat of war between the two countries. When it was intimated to Pinckney that peace might be granted in return for a money payment, he replied: "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

RAIL WORKERS DISSATISFIED

As this is written the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, dissatisfied with a wage increase of 16 cents an hour that was awarded to them by a board of mediation, threaten to go on strike on May 18. A. F. Whitney, president of the trainmen, has intimated that even if the Government seizes the railroads the men will refuse to work until their demands are granted. He says:

"There are no laws or other barriers that prohibit members of the brotherhoods involved from leaving the service in a lawful strike and from remaining out of service of the carriers until a settlement satisfactory to them has been reached."

If a rail strike should really happen, it would make an already chaotic situation much worse, inflicting just one more blow upon a long-suffering public. The rail workers come under the Railway Labor Act, which has often been cited as a model because there has been no general railroad strike over a period of many years.

After approving the British loan, the Senate took up the subject of dealing with the strike situation, which was acted upon by the House in February, when the Case labor-disputes bill was passed by a large majority. As the Case bill was reported to the Senate by its Committee on Education and Labor, headed by Senator MURRAY, of Montana, there was not much left of the original measure. Whether the Senate as a whole will have the courage to deal adequately with this question in a campaign year, notwithstanding the combined opposition of organized labor, remains to be seen.

THE WAGNER ACT

It is, of course, possible that some kind of compromise bill may be passed. However, the root of the whole matter will not be reached until the Wagner Labor Relations Act, approved in 1935, is amended to make it a two-way act, instead of a one-way act, as it now is.

Any impartial person reading this act cannot fail to be impressed with the fact that it contains little except an enumeration of the duties, responsibilities, and obligations of the employer, and nothing to correspond on the side of the employee.

The agency established to administer this act is known as the National Labor Relations Board, which acts as prosecutor, judge, and jury in all cases instituted by it or coming before it. Some years ago the members of this Board were J. Warren Madden, Edwin S. Smith, and Donald Wakefield Smith.

The members of this Board and their numerous agents ruled our industrial system with a high hand. At plants where there was no labor trouble, the Board or its agents usually succeeded in creating trouble, and when the hapless employer was brought before the Board for sentence, as a rule, he did not have a chance. It is a tribute to the virility of our system of private enterprise that it did not collapse under this reign of terror.

Finally, the House of Representatives appointed a special committee, headed by Congressman HOWARD SMITH of Virginia, to investigate the National Labor Relations Board. Edmund Toland, a fine lawyer, was engaged as counsel for the committee.

The facts brought out by this investigation shocked the sense of fair play that characterizes the American people, and it led to a reorganization of the Board, most of whose members and agents must have had communistic sympathies.

UN-AMERICAN AND UNFAIR

The present members of the Board, headed by Paul M. Herzog, have not made themselves as objectionable as their predecessors. But that does not alter the fact that the whole set-up is un-American and unfair.

As Congressman SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., of North Carolina, aptly expresses it:

"The most fundamental principle of any system of justice worthy of the name is that every person who brings a controversy to a tribunal for judgment shall have that controversy determined by an impartial judge. The Wagner Act expressly prevents the application of this fundamental principle to controversies falling within the purview of the act. It insures its purpose that controversies covered by it shall not be determined with the cold neutrality of the impartial judge by providing, in substance, that the National Labor Relations Board shall institute and prosecute all prosecutions under the act and shall also be the judge of whether such prosecutions be well- or ill-founded. Justice cannot live under law which undertakes to unite the impartiality of the judge with the partisanship of the prosecutor."

Statistical Summary of Veterans' Administration Activities to March 31, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a statistical report issued by the Veterans' Administration showing its activities up to April 30, 1946.

I am placing these reports in the RECORD as they are furnished to me monthly by the Veterans' Administration, and I hope all the Members will read and study the statistics carefully, so they may be advised of the Administration's activities and of the progress being made in handling the tremendous volume of work now incumbent upon it.

The report referred to follows:

Statistical summary of Veterans' Administration activities

Subject	April 1946	March 1946	July 1945
Veteran population:			
1. Total number of veterans, end of month	15,882,000	15,340,000	6,712,000
2. Number of World War II veterans, end of month	11,902,000	11,354,000	2,688,000
3. Number of veterans of other wars and Regular Establishment, end of month	3,980,000	3,986,000	4,024,000
Vocational rehabilitation (Public Law 16):			
4. Total number of applications received through end of month	336,660	296,479	89,961
5. Number of applications pending advisement, end of month	68,649	65,646	12,810
6. Number in training, end of month	75,109	63,804	16,003
7. Number of regular payments for subsistence allowance made during month	57,072	46,325	12,705
Education and training (Public Law 346):			
8. Total number of applications received through end of month	2,180,930	1,687,765	96,828
9. Number of applications pending, eligibility not determined, end of month	69,716	105,312	7,107
10. Number in education or training status, end of month	620,444	379,513	22,349
11. Number of regular payments for subsistence allowance made during month	453,080	262,392	13,281
Loans:			
12. Total number of applications received through last Friday of month	177,102	[1] 140,775	18,835
13. Number of guaranty commitments granted through last Friday of month	131,285	[1] 117,234	15,249
Readjustment allowances:			
14. Number of initial unemployment claims filed during 4 weeks ending last Saturday of month	639,923	748,746	37,622
15. Number of initial unemployment claims pending determination, end of month	[2] 69,100	100,496	3,897
16. Number of veterans paid unemployment allowances during week ending last Saturday of month	1,619,839	1,595,454	43,286
17. Number of initial self-employment claims filed during month	[3]	202,373	13,211
18. Number of veterans paid self-employment allowances during month	[2] 237,610	141,942	11,926
19. Number of applications pending adjudication in regional offices, end of month	8,218	9,195	1,878
Disability pension or compensation cases, World War II (with service on or after Dec. 7, 1941):			
20. Number of new cases received during month [4]	220,570	352,293	92,790
21. Number adjudicated during month [4]	348,610	451,731	72,623
22. Number pending adjudication, end of month [4]	425,350	555,664	100,959
23. Number of active cases (running awards), end of month	1,380,286	1,260,989	591,762
Disability pension or compensation cases, World War I and Regular Establishment (no service on or after Dec. 7, 1941):			
24. Number pending adjudication, end of month	9,083	8,080	6,540
25. Number of active cases (running awards), end of month	458,647	459,600	460,451
Death pension or compensation cases, total: [5]			
26. Number pending adjudication, end of month	32,921	34,508	52,902
27. Number of active cases (running awards), end of month	390,987	382,273	289,243
National-service life insurance:			
28. Number of applications pending, end of month	116,850	82,681	170,634
29. Number of insured lives on which payments of death claim awards were active, end of month	347,915	341,774	237,993
30. Number of death claims (beneficiaries) awarded during month	7,593	7,170	26,738
31. Number of death claims (beneficiaries) pending, end of month	22,557	20,798	27,901
32. Number of disability claims (waiver of premium) awarded during month	12,727	20,666	31,257
33. Number of disability claims (waiver of premium) pending, end of month	20,329	21,850	29,464
Requests for physical examination:			
34. Number cleared by examination during month	50,029	39,916	28,997
35. Number pending, examination not completed, end of month	194,722	189,894	137,562
Applications for hospital or domiciliary care:			
36. Number received during month	55,776	54,634	30,114
37. Number disposed of during month	56,161	54,414	29,469
38. Number pending, eligibility not determined, end of month	14,199	14,708	4,377
Veterans awaiting hospital admission:			
39. Total number, end of month	26,327	25,985	4,329
40. Number with service-connected disorders, end of month	653	911	169
41. Number with non-service-connected disorders, end of month	25,674	25,074	4,160
Beneficiaries remaining in Veterans' Administration hospitals or homes:			
42. Total number in hospitals, last Thursday in month	75,149	75,033	67,320
43. Veterans with service-connected disorders	24,792	24,553	22,700
44. Veterans with non-service-connected disorders	49,583	49,779	43,907
45. Others	774	701	713
46. Total number in homes, last Thursday in month	11,318	11,682	9,086
Beneficiaries remaining in non-Veterans' Administration hospitals:			
47. Total number, last Thursday in month	10,409	9,699	4,459
48. Veterans with service-connected disorders	2,305	2,127	841
49. Veterans with non-service-connected disorders	8,055	7,546	3,564
50. Others	49	26	54
Construction, new hospitals:			
51. Number authorized, funds appropriated, end of month	78	72	[6] 21
52. Number for which sites have been selected, end of month	31	27	[6] 16
53. Number for which plans and specifications have been completed, end of month	4	4	[6] 2
54. Number under construction, end of month	2	2	[6] 1
55. Number completed, end of month	0	0	[6] 0
Construction—additions to existing hospitals:			
56. Number authorized, funds appropriated, end of month	56	57	[6] 36
57. Number for which plans and specifications have been completed, end of month	31	30	[6] 30
58. Number under construction, end of month	17	17	[6] 28
59. Number completed, end of month	14	12	[6] 0

[1] Data as of Mar. 27, 1946. [2] Partly estimated. [3] Not available. [4] Includes area offices.
[5] Excludes Spanish-American and prior wars.
[6] Data as of June 30, 1945.

War Food Administration Wheat Order

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, the reaction of the wheat growers of Oklahoma, as expressed to Mr. LaGuardia at their recent meeting, is typical of the resentment of wheat farmers everywhere.

Amendment No. 8 to War Food Order No. 144, issued recently by the War Food Administration, is, in my opinion, an invasion of property rights. It sets a dangerous precedent and should be repealed immediately. The order provides, in effect, that a producer shall not deliver wheat to an elevator unless he sells within 15 days from the time of delivery one-half of the wheat delivered. The order further provides that no processor, owner, or operator of a country elevator, and so forth, shall purchase or accept delivery of wheat unless (a) he sets aside one-half of the wheat so purchased, and (b) delivers the set-aside wheat in accordance with instructions from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I contend that the order deprives persons of property without due process of law and it denies other persons the right

to equal protection of the law. Requisitioning and commandeering were common terms used in foreign totalitarian governments. Certainly we have not reached the stage in peacetime where it is necessary to invoke these questionable and totalitarian powers in our own Nation. I contend further that the order—

First. In effect requisitions wheat from the farmer. It amounts to a confiscation of property.

Second. Deprives the farmer of the use of grain-marketing facilities for it states that he shall not deliver unless he sells. To the extent, therefore, that he is deprived of the right of storage, warehousing facilities are denied to him.

Third. Discriminates against the small producer or farmer who does not have sufficient farm storage and who has in the past relied upon country elevator storage space to furnish his warehousing requirements.

Fourth. Requisitions private warehousing facilities in that it requires the operator of a country elevator to accept wheat only when 50 percent of such wheat is offered for sale within 15 days.

Fifth. May attempt to regulate wheat before it enters the stream of interstate commerce. The order quite obviously conflicts with State warehousing laws which require that public grain warehousemen must accept grain for storage to the extent that storage space is available.

Atomic Research in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Russia Giving Much of Energy to Atom Research, Gilmore Says," written by Eddy Gilmore and published in the Washington Evening Star of June 6, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA GIVING MUCH OF ENERGY TO ATOM RESEARCH, GILMORE SAYS—NATION PUTS SCIENTISTS IN TOP BRACKETS IN EFFORT TO OVERCOME ANGLO-UNITED STATES LEAD

(This is the third article in a series by the chief of the Associated Press Bureau in Moscow, who has spent 5 years in Russia and has just returned to the United States on vacation.)

(By Eddy Gilmore)

NEW YORK, June 6.—Russia is devoting a large portion of her national energy to atomic research—toward peacetime possibilities, she says, not toward a bomb.

However, with other nations in possession of the bomb's secrets and showing no inclination to share them, it would be extremely unrealistic, to say the least, to assume that Russia is closing her eyes to that side of the laboratory.

It is, of course, impossible for a newsman stationed in Russia, with the limited amount of information he has on hand on this highly secret subject, to say anything with finality about the Russians and the bomb. However, there is reason to believe—and I emphasize the word believe—that Russia must be well behind the United States. There are those in responsible diplomatic and military positions who hold the same opinion.

MOLOTOV PROMISED ATOM

But, it should be borne in mind that Foreign Minister Molotov, speaking at the Kremlin last November 6, said Russia soon would have atomic energy and many other things. One never should underestimate the Russians.

Heavy emphasis is being placed on science in Russia—heavier than on any other single field. Always respected in Russia, scientists now have been raised several stations beyond any position they've ever enjoyed. They're on a level with the top brackets.

The government is hard at work building them new laboratories, finding the equipment they want, giving them the green light they need. In fact, whatever scientists want they can have for the asking, which is quite a little something in that land.

GOOD CORE OF SCIENTISTS

Russia has a hard core of scientists to build from, although they are mostly beyond middle age. When I left Moscow less than a month ago, an energetic campaign was under way to attract younger people to science.

The Russians also have acknowledged that their scientists are entitled to the best possible material life. They have been awarded special food rations, clothes, automobiles, special salaries, new apartments, and fine automobiles—many with chauffeurs.

In many parts of the country, new housing is being earmarked for men of science. They will get these modern dwellings as soon as anyone, and this includes marshals, generals, and high party functionaries.

Many acres of beautiful woodlands are being set aside as "datchas" for scientists. (A datch is a summer home, an institution dearly beloved by every Russian.) Some of these include one-time playgrounds of the czars.

These datchas are not just something quaint knocked together on the side of a lake or mountain. They're sumptuous. They have electric lighting, heating, and modern sanitation. They have tennis courts, volleyball courts, and many will be enclosed by high rustic fences.

Some, upon request, are being supplied with sailboats or motorboats. Spacious quarters for servants are being built apart from the main houses.

HAVE NO ILLUSIONS OF SPEED

Russia's leaders have no illusions about how far her scientists must progress to catch up with the United States and Britain. They are well aware and impressed with the excellence and skill of Americans. I'm quite sure they are not kidding themselves into thinking they can catch up quickly with the United States in the atomic field, any more than they can draw abreast quickly in making automobiles or refrigerators.

The leaders and the scientists know they must work hard and even then they may lag behind this side of the world. They may have obtained something from Germany, but they are realists enough to know that if they found something there, so did their allies.

The very fact that the Russians don't say much about the bomb is revealing. It is the belief of many informed foreigners stationed in the Soviet Union that, while the Russians haven't asked for the secret of the bomb, it constitutes a great and ponderous factor in all their thinking and action. The use of such phrases as "atomic diplomacy" in referring to moves of her allies is significant.

With America holding the bomb secret, and Britain and Canada in on it in some way (something the Russians never have fully understood) it becomes alarming to the Soviets and their people to see the United States not only talking about but doing something about Atlantic and Pacific bases.

It is very well for Americans to say "we'll never use the bomb for aggressive purposes," but just try to convince the man who hasn't got the bomb of that.

The Bread Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. BUTLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a letter from a group of people in my district on the present shortage of bread. This letter is one of many which I have received but because it covers the subject so well I would like to bring it to the attention of the House.

Like many others, I want to help the people of the world as far as food, clothing, and housing are concerned but I hope we do not deplete our own supply to such an extent that it ruins our own health and economy. I do not approve of the black-market methods used by our Government to obtain food for these people. Our people are always ready and willing to help and have never failed when the call was put to them in an honest effort to help. Our past record will show the response to the call always oversubscribed.

There seems to be a lot of good common sense in the remarks of this group. I hope before any more commitments are made by our Executive the people of this country will be taken into his confidence and the Government will have the good will of everyone who has a family to feed.

The letter follows:

REPUBLICAN TOWN COMMITTEE,
Hamburg, N. Y., June 4, 1946.

HON. JOHN C. BUTLER,
Member of Congress,
Forty-fourth District, New York.

DEAR JOHN: In conformity with a motion adopted by the Republican Town Committee of Hamburg, N. Y., at its meeting June 3, 1946, your help and service is requested to determine the cause and to correct, if possible, the shortage of salable bread in the town of Hamburg, N. Y.

Bread is a basic food to the people of our town.

Many of our people in the lower income brackets are being forced to higher living standards because of their inability to secure bread at our stores.

Bread is almost universally a part of the diet of our children, and we are fearful of their future health as children do not readily adopt substitutes, particularly for bread.

Our workmen who must carry lunches are complaining bitterly about the shortage of bread so necessary for the sustenance for their heavy daily work.

We believe that it is high time someone called a halt on the practice of our Federal administration of making foreign commitments of our grain and our money at the present severe expense to our people.

We have a deep feeling and full sympathy for those unfortunate people of Europe who

lack sufficient food, but we also believe that "charity begins at home."

We believe that it is unfair to our people for the Federal Government to pay an alleged 30 cents per bushel over ceiling for export grain so that it cannot flow into domestic sources.

We believe that it is unfair to cause our flour mills to shut down or work only part time because of these half ripe Federal commitments. Many of our people in Hamburg are employed in the milling industry and are getting short hours because of this mistake.

We believe that it is unfair to ship whole grain to foreign ports when our mills could process it and use the byproducts domestically for poultry and livestock feed.

It is our earnest wish that you investigate this just complaint of our people and initiate such action as is necessary for its prompt correction.

Extending our full cooperation in this matter and wishing you the fullest success, we are,

Sincerely yours,

HAMBURG TOWN COMMITTEE,
GEORGE A. PATTERSON,
Secretary.

Food and Foreign Relief

REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, there is not a single worthy American citizen in the entire land who is not willing and anxious to do everything possible and feasible to help the needy and starving people of foreign countries. The American people have always been most generous and charitable in extending the helping hand to those overtaken by disaster or famine. We have never failed to carry out our obligations to humanity and we will not fail in this crisis. The present situation is infinitely more serious than that which existed after the last war because larger numbers of people are involved. Apparently, the whole eastern world, excluding some Scandinavian countries, is involved. In one way or another, almost single-handed and at very great cost, we have been rendering substantial relief in many places and to many peoples.

Naturally export of these vast quantities of food and supplies has put a tremendous strain on our own economy and is undoubtedly responsible for many present scarcities and price pressures. It is doubtful whether it will be possible for us entirely to relieve current scarcities and price pressures so long as we are sending such enormous amounts of food and supplies overseas. It is also doubtful whether as a nation we can continue indefinitely to serve as the main granary for practically the whole world without very serious repercussions to our own economy and the health and welfare of our own people. The most desirable heartfelt instincts of charity and generosity which prompt us to succor the afflicted and the impoverished, highly commendable and necessary in themselves, should not require us to weaken the physical fiber and morale of our own Nation. Unless America can exist as a free, powerful healthy nation, its people vigorous, enterprising, and industrious, we surely will not be enabled to render maximum assistance to suffering and starving peoples abroad.

In my opinion, in view of current conditions at home, we cannot act too quickly to review and reappraise and readjust the total needs and total availabilities of foodstuffs and supplies. We should and must have a fixed definite publicly declared national policy involving a clear statement of the sacrifices which are expected of the American people in order to help our fellow humans. This policy should set forth and clarify the character, extent, and limits of our assistance and sacrifices as dictated by the demands of our own economy and the health, security, and welfare needs of our own people as well as basic humanitarian motives and considerations.

Let me illustrate. We are presently diverting huge quantities of grain for foreign shipment and this policy among other things has brought two very distressing results: First, serious shortages of wheat foods in our own consumer markets and, secondly, alarming scarcities of feed for our livestock. The first is occasioning hysteria and need among our people. The second is putting many farmers out of business and threatening many other merchants.

While it is generally true that we desire to feed human beings before we feed animals, this problem of choice presents a double-edged sword. If we deny food to our farm animals, herds will be dispersed and slaughtered, as they are being; vital milk supplies will be greatly reduced; butter, cheese, and other similar dairy products will be cut to dangerous minimums. American labor will be displaced, as is already the case in some of our industries, and the health standards of our people will in time be diminished to dangerous levels. This will not only inflict hardship and physical damage upon our children, our aged and working classes, but will also in time gravely impair the ability of our economy to extend assistance and relief to the victims of famine abroad.

Whether conditions I refer to arise out of confused and bewildering bureaucratic abuses, lack of careful and intelligent planning or lack of solid, balanced judgment, whatever the cause, the administrative side of our Government must move forthwith to establish consistent sensible policies that will permit us to render maximum relief overseas and at the same time serve the needs of our own people.

Let the Nation once know what sacrifices are reasonably necessary to help our fellow men and I am sure that the American people will cheerfully respond. Let us recognize that present checks upon the productivity of American industry and agriculture must be released so that we may be enabled to make our full contribution to the relief of distress and hunger while we are maintaining standards at home that will not debilitate either the strength or morale of our working and middle classes.

Of course, persons of means and wealth have no particular problem and face no particular hardship in securing food. Such persons can procure needed food regardless of price or they can patronize restaurants and eating places where the best food is available for a price. Our working people and their families, however, have no such alternative. They must rely on normal consumer channels of trade to furnish necessaries of life. The wife of a workingman with five or six children to feed cannot often take her family to a restaurant for dinner. She must rely on local markets for bread, meat, dairy products, canned goods, and other foods necessary to sustain her family. With meat counters bare for days at a time, with bread lines existing in many American communities, with milk supplies diminishing, with butter and other dairy products correspondingly scarce, and with black markets flourishing, the ordinary American housewife and family are facing continued difficulty and hardship in procuring essential foods. These conditions cannot continue. We can make our contribution to foreign relief, as we all so ardently desire, without inflicting such extreme conditions upon our working classes. Unless the administrators of this Government speedily furnish a satisfactory answer and remedy for this very grave problem, the Congress must take early affirmative action.

Let us continue to answer the cause of humanity as charitably, as generously, and as abundantly as we can. Let us also attend to the immediate needs of our own people.

Settlement of Terminated War Contracts

REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, it is always true that we hear much less about Government organizations that are handling their assignments successfully and smoothly than those that are struggling with unsolved problems. I make this point in calling attention to the effective job that is being performed in the settlement of terminated war contracts under the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, and particularly to the outstanding work being done by Colonel Rose, the Administrator of the Contract Settlement Bureau. I have followed this matter with particular interest because I was chairman of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee which considered and favorably reported the Contract Settlement Act in the summer of 1944.

Terminated war contracts are being settled by the War and Navy Departments and the other contracting agencies, under the over-all supervision of the Office of Contract Settlement created by that act. Since the beginning of war production, more than 315,000 contracts had been terminated, with canceled commitments—the face value

of the terminated part—totaling $65,000,000,000. By April 30, 94 percent of these contracts, covering about 70 percent of the total canceled commitments, had been finally settled. Furthermore, on the 18,000 contracts then awaiting settlement, a high proportion of the underlying work had already been completed. In most of them, inventories had been or were being listed and checked, plants cleared, subcontractors paid, and accounting reviews finished.

Two short years ago, leaders in Government, business, and public life expressed grave concern as to how our economic system could absorb the sudden shock of the mass war-contract cancellations which would inevitably follow VE and VJ-days. It was then feared that war contractors' plants would be clogged with unwanted inventories and equipment, that working capital would be frozen, that uncertainties of settlement policies and procedures would hogtie industrial reconversion.

However, as a result of far-sighted advance planning, good legislation, and able administration, the task of settling war contracts has proceeded speedily and smoothly. A good yardstick of the effectiveness of the job is the fact that, of the nearly 300,000 terminations settled to date, so far only 70 have come before the Appeal Board of the Office of Contract Settlement. Equal credit is due to the agencies of Government and to the generally cooperative attitude of industry.

When we look back on the delays and difficulties experienced in settling Government contracts after the last war—frequently involving many years of litigation—our accomplishment this time seems almost miraculously successful. What was feared as a principal obstacle to reconversion has been almost entirely surmounted so quietly, that few realize it is on the way to substantial completion less than a year after VJ-day.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Racial Segregation in Interstate Transportation

REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court of the United States has just handed down a decision which marks the most important step toward winning the peace since the conclusion of the war. The decision abolishes separation of races on interstate transportation. It strikes at the heart of the unChristian, undemocratic hypocrisy of some Americans. The eminent justice of Alabama, Mr. Hugo Black, in his concurring opinion said it was to be regretted that such action had not been taken by Congress. This morning's Washington Post, in editorial, stated likewise. I agree with them.

It so happens that on February 1, 1945, I submitted a bill, H. R. 1925, to this Congress to abolish Jim Crow on interstate transportation. That bill was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I wrote the chairman of that committee, after waiting for many months, asking for a hearing. He replied that the committee was "too busy." I have talked to members of that committee and they assure me that they would have been willing to have met at any time to have considered that bill. I am now asking the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to give Congress a chance to act. If I do not receive favorable word within the next few days I will place discharge petition on the Speaker's desk.

It is ridiculous that Negro veterans who have fought all over the earth for democracy, returning to the United States must ride in inferior, separate Jim Crow cars while prisoners of war from Germany are allowed first-class accommodations on all trains. It is a travesty that we can fight two wars to make a world safe for democracy in one generation and do nothing whatsoever about our own democracy here. When I say here, I mean here in the Halls of Congress. We have not passed a single win-the-peace law since the conclusion of the war. We have sat by and allowed the Supreme Court to do what we are paid to do. The salaries of Congressmen should not be increased one bit until we are ready to get down to the business of earning what we get now. Filibustering, gagging at and swallowing camels, is not earning $10,000 a year. One reason why we have not increased our pay is because our own consciences have not allowed us to do it. There are going to be a lot of changes made in this body before the next Congress rolls around. In the language of Abraham Lincoln, "You can fool some of the people some of the time but not all of the people all of the time."

Reintegration of Veterans Into Civilian Roles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, it was my good fortune Monday evening, June 3, as the guest of class 7 of the national service officer trainees of the Disabled American Veterans, to hear a very able address by Maj. Gen. Graves B. Erskine, United States Marine Corps.

General Erskine is acknowledged to be one of the most expert strategists in the armed forces. After VJ-day he was assigned the important task of administrator of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration in an effort to coordinate the activities of Federal and State agencies in order to bring about a complete reintegration of veterans into civilian roles.

For these reasons I am sure General Erskine's speech will be of interest to the readers of the RECORD and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, honored guest, national service officers of class VII, ladies, and gentlemen, I am very glad to be here tonight, and to have this opportunity to congratulate this organization on its splendid work for our disabled veterans and their dependents. You are to be congratulated, too, for your clear foresight in anticipating the increased needs occasioned by World War II, and in beginning early to augment your staff in order to give effective assistance to America's disabled veterans in the solution of their complex problems and in assisting them in their return and adjustment to useful civilian life.

You national service officers have a unique opportunity to do a real service. You have a sympathetic understanding of the problems of the disabled veterans. Through your own experience, you know the difficulties they meet and the barriers they come up against on their road to readjustment—barriers which to the individual often appear insurmountable.

Through your training you have been given the big picture. You have been instructed in all of the mechanics and necessary steps in the presentation and preparation of just claims for governmental benefits and in the necessary follow-through of these claims for the veteran.

You can give to the veteran competent, informed advice and that down-to-earth, man-to-man assistance in his problems which will help him to overcome the barriers blocking his path to successful reintegration into peacetime society. At the same time you can be of immeasurable assistance to those Government agencies dealing with veterans' problems by giving the veteran a better idea of their functions and of their method of operation.

The policy of our Government of assuming responsibility toward those who have been injured or disabled while serving in our armed forces is as old as the Nation itself. It dates back 300 years to the days of the Pilgrims when a legislative body declared:

"If any man should be sent forth as a soldier and shall return maimed, he shall be maintained competently by the Colonies during his life."

The Pilgrims were chiefly concerned with the responsibility of the Government to the disabled. Since that time the Government's concern for the welfare of its veterans has expanded greatly. It has come to include all types of disabilities, such as cardiac, pulmonary, and other organic conditions, as well as emotional strains developed in line of duty.

Down through the years we have made progress in evolving a more equitable and enlightened program for our veterans. From our series of wars and their turbulent aftermaths of reconstruction and human rehabilitation, we have made some observations. We have learned a few lessons.

We have begun to realize that any pension system is inadequate to meet all the welfare needs of disabled persons. The pension should be regarded only as a crutch to assist the disabled person to sustain himself during the period when his own abilities and resources are inadequate.

We have begun to realize that only with a program which not only provides for care of the disabled veteran in his present state of impairment, but also which concentrates on preparing him physically, mentally, socially, and vocationally for the fullest possible life, can we hope to arrive at the real meaning of the word "rehabilitation."

With these thoughts in mind, the Government started several years ago to prepare for the return of our disabled veterans. The rehabilitation program planned and begun by our Federal and State governments is the most comprehensive and far-reaching in our national history.

I know you are all familiar with the facilities designed exclusively to provide rehabilitation services to disabled veterans under Public Law 16, as well as educational and vocational opportunities available under the GI bill of rights to all veterans with a minimum of 90 days' service.

However, you may not be so familiar with rehabilitation services available to veterans with non-service-connected disabilities through civilian programs conducted by the States under a Federal-State cooperative relationship under Public Law 113.

Veterans with service-connected disabilities will naturally apply to the Veterans' Administration for the provision of rehabilitation services. Other disabled veterans who are not eligible for rehabilitation benefits through the Veterans' Administration may find it to their advantage to contact the nearest offices of the State divisions of rehabilitation which function under State boards of education and can be easily located.

All of these programs have begun to work and the whole Nation is being benefited by them.

Yet, there is still a great deal that can be done in achieving a more effective rehabilitation program.

The Veterans' Administration is now paying pensions to about 1,500,000 veterans who are suffering from service-connected disabilities. These compensations, therefore, must be supplemented by some form of gainful, suitable, continuous employment.

The USES reports that since January of this year nearly 200,000 handicapped veterans of World War II have applied for jobs and only a few more than 32,000 obtained them. There are at present 260,000 disabled veterans on the active files of USES.

From this it is evident that our rehabilitation program must be strengthened, and—through the coordination and cooperation of all agencies concerned—to provide more effective opportunities for the retraining and reconditioning of our disabled veterans so that they will eventually be totally integrated into the industrial community and economic society of the world today.

The Retraining and Reemployment Administration is interested in every way possible to increase opportunities for disabled veterans to become useful and self-supporting members of society. In fact, RRA is interested in the whole problem of human reconversion, of guiding into paths of peacetime pursuits all veterans—disabled and nondisabled—as well as all workers whose lives have been disrupted by war.

The philosophy back of the establishment of RRA is interesting. In 1944 the Baruch-Hancock report on war and postwar adjustment policies recommended the creation of a new and important post which would be "responsible for finding every possible way in which the opportunities for individual Americans to pursure their chosen peacetime pursuits would be broadened so as to benefit the people as a whole."

As a result of this recommendation, RRA was established.

The need for RRA is apparent when we realize some 42 Federal agencies have programs concerning veterans and workers. Unless the activities of these agencies are coordinated, the resulting duplication and overlapping would weaken the whole program.

The RRA is charged with the coordination, on a national level, of all Federal agencies—except the Veterans' Administration—concerned with retraining, reemployment, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation. It is also directed to work with the States and communities in solving their problems.

RRA is authorized not only to call conferences to settle various problems, but also to issue necessary orders to other Federal agencies concerned to carry out the recommended solutions. We are not an operating agency and do not have a large staff. In our work of coordinating the activities of the Federal agencies under our jurisdiction, we are concerned that everything possible is done which would aid the veteran in his reintegration into civilian life. It is a large field and we have many interests.

We advocate the establishment of more and better community advisory centers, where veterans and others may go in dignity for assistance in solving the many problems which face them in their return to peacetime society. Your service officers can be of immeasurable assistance to RRA in this community advisory center program.

We are helping educational institutions to obtain surplus property for use in replenishing their worn-out laboratory and classroom equipment, so that they may expand to meet the needs of ever increasing numbers of veterans seeking enrollment.

We are concerned with the curricula needs of veterans. We want to obtain for them the credit they deserve for their wartime-acquired experience and education.

We are concerned that on-the-job training and apprenticeship programs are properly administered, so that the 190,000 veterans enrolled in these programs will receive the best type of training that this country can give them.

We are concerned that the 28,000 disabled veterans taking this on-the-job training receive from their employers sufficient supervision and instruction, so that they will eventually be qualified to obtain and hold jobs in the fields in which they have been training.

We are deeply concerned with the problems of the more seriously disabled veterans. In surveying their needs it is apparent that the existing facilities for their rehabilitation are not adequate. Twenty percent of our disabled veterans—one out of five—require special treatment, training, or job opportunities which are not now available before they can take their places in our competitive society.

Among our seriously disabled nonveterans the percentage requiring facilities not now available is even higher. It is undemocratic and inhumanitarian to deny to this large segment of our population the opportunities to live a dignified and useful life just because National, State, and community action has failed to provide adequate rehabilitation facilities.

Therefore, I issued RRA Order No. 7, issued in May, appointing a Federal interagency committee to make an over-all study of existing facilities for these severely handicapped persons. Serving on the committee will be representatives from the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, Commerce, and the Federal Security Agency. I have requested the Veterans' Administration to designate appropriate representatives to serve on the committee.

The first meeting will be held this month. The ultimate goal of the committee is the recommendation of the development of additional facilities sufficient to accomplish the successful rehabilitation of the greatest possible number of our seriously handicapped persons, both veterans and nonveterans.

In our survey of the general field of rehabilitation we have found that there is a lack of coordination at State and local levels between the State vocational rehabilitation and Veterans' Administration agencies. Many State rehabilitation offices lack adequate information regarding available veteran facilities. Some VA offices do not know of the existence and location of the State programs for the disabled. We are taking steps at the national level to effect the close coordination of the activities of these agencies within the States.

Veterans must not be given the impression that they are choosing between the services offered by two competitive agencies, but rather that they are being provided services by their Government in the most comprehensive manner.

All of these rehabilitation and training programs have one goal—to prepare the disabled veteran and civilian for useful employment, to enable him to be self-supporting by working at a job which he is qualified to perform and which makes a dignified and useful contribution to society.

During the war, many industries turned to the handicapped as a source of labor supply and were gratified with their results. Eighty-three percent of our Nation's industries employed handicapped workers and reported that among these workers there was a much smaller labor turn-over, less absenteeism, fewer accidents, and equal or higher production rates.

The performance of these workers also helped dispel on the part of employers the old fear of increased accident rates if handicapped workers were used. Fifty-six percent of the employers reported that the accident rate of the handicapped was lower than that of the nondisabled, 42 percent found the rate the same as for the nondisabled.

In January 1945, one out of every two disabled veterans applying for work was placed. With the end of the war, the closing down of many war plants, and the return of a great number of veterans to the labor market, there occurred a very noticeable tendency to slight the disabled worker in favor of the worker with no disability.

As you can see from this graph, there was a steadily increasing gap between placements and applications all during the year of 1945, and by February 1946, the ratio of placements to applications had reached 1 to 9.

In some States the picture was especially dark—notably Arizona, Utah, and Pennsylvania, where the ratio of disabled veterans finding employment dropped to 1 out of 20 seeking work.

This situation was morally intolerable. Only 10 percent of all service-connected disabled veterans receive total disability. It must, therefore, be assumed that the other 90 percent who are only partially disabled are employable. No one needs to argue the right of the disabled veteran to the best opportunity that can be found for him. Add to this the fact that every study indicates he is potentially an efficient worker, and it is hard to understand the lack of opportunities for him.

However, several private industries have been active in their efforts to place the disabled veterans and make the maximum use of their skills. They reported considerable success with their programs and are well pleased with the production record of their disabled workers.

Gradually, employers are beginning to realize that the disabled veteran is a qualified worker—that properly placed, he can be hired on the sound basis of competitive service and profitable production. You service officers can do much to make employers more

conscious of the talents of the disabled workers.

You will note on this graph that in March 1946, the trend of applicants placed was reversed, and during April 1946, one out of every four disabled workers applying for jobs was placed. I hope that this gap between placements and applicants will continue to close.

Let us keep in mind that the veteran makes up not much more than 10 percent of the population and 20 percent of the labor force of our country. Any program which does not include the other 90 percent of the population and 80 percent of the labor market is bound to be lopsided and partially unworkable.

The veteran does not want special privileges. He realizes that his own welfare depends on the welfare of the Nation as a whole. The veteran would be the first to maintain that civilians, too, should have opportunities for rehabilitation. Yet, the sorry truth is that the majority of our disabled civilians are not included in rehabilitation programs designed to improve their physical fitness, to relearn and to develop skills which would enable them to become self-supporting.

Let us again look at the over-all picture.

In World War II there were about 17,000 military amputations in the Army. During the same period, there were 120,000 major amputations from disease and accidents in our civilian populaton.

The war resulted in about 650,000 combat incurred disabilities. In the same period about 1,200,000 persons in the United States suffered permanent partial injuries as a result of industrial accidents and diseases.

Of our civilian population on any one day, 7,000,000 have disabilities which exclude them from working for varying period of time.

Two million six hundred thousand of these have disabilities which last more than a year. Of this number, about 1½ to 2 million are in need of vocational rehabilitation. This figure is the basis of our civilian vocational rehabilitation program.

It has been estimated by experts in the field of rehabilitation and retraining that up to 97 percent of all handicapped persons can be rehabilitated to the extent of gainful employment.

These citizens have earned the right to work by the record they have made during the wartime manpower crisis. Then they more than carried their share of the load in the battle of production. They are a permanent part of our Nation and of our labor market. They must be given an opportunity to become a productive part.

The cost to the taxpayer is no greater for providing facilities for the rehabilitation into employment of a disabled individual than the expense of maintaining him in idleness. Economically, therefore, it is sound business to make taxpayers out of tax spenders.

But, I do not like to bring the dollar sign into this discussion. I have always said that all the money in the Treasury could not pay for the life of one marine, and I say now that you cannot measure in terms of dollars and cents the transition of a human being from dependency to self-support and self-respect.

We in America are called the most generous and sympathetic people in the world. We possess the knowledge and the great resources to make the more abundant life possible to all of our citizens—veteran and civilian, disabled or nondisabled.

It is time for us to put this knowledge to work to bring to our own people facilities and services which will enable them to exercise their rights as citizens in contributing to our mutual welfare and sharing in our mutual responsibilities.

Eddy Gilmore's Reports on Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Montgomery Advertiser of June 5, 1946. The editorial is entitled "Alabama Welcomes a Great Son," and in it a very fitting and very moving tribute is paid to the author of the articles on Russia which have been appearing in the press, namely, Mr. Edward A. Gilmore, who, I am happy to learn, is a distinguished son of the great State of Alabama.

I hope Senators will have an opportunity to read this very great tribute which the Montgomery Advertiser, which is one of the outstanding newspapers of the Nation, has paid to this son of Alabama for what he has done to contribute to a better understanding of Russia by the 5 years he spent as an Associated Press correspondent in Russia, and by the series of articles he is writing to let the people of this country have a better understanding of Russia.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALABAMA WELCOMES A GREAT SON

Alabama welcomed home a famous son this week—a son whose reportorial achievements have helped hold together the structure of an uncertain peace.

The noted son is Eddy Gilmore, who came through Montgomery Monday night en route to his home at Selma after spending 5 years of his life in Russia. His work for the Associated Press has helped, perhaps more than the work of any other American journalist, to interpret the social, economic, and political life of Russia in understandable language to Americans.

Jessie MacGuire, who interviewed Gilmore for the Alabama Journal, quotes him as saying, "The most important fact which Americans should remember in dealing with the Russians is that they cannot be too impatient. We Americans are trying to rush things. What we should understand is that the Russians are far behind us in the progress of civilization, and it will take years to wipe out the dark years of their past and to put them on the same plane of living as we are. They are actors on a different stage.

"No, I do not recommend communism for the United States. Communism is definitely not for America. But it is the Russian way of living at the present, and it has done wonders for their country. I say let the Russians have communism if they want it."

Gilmore went on to point out that the Russians "have no concept of anything that is not materialistic. They have been forced into their way of thinking by the nature of their civilization. Until the time of Lenin and Stalin, the Russians were industrially and materially poor beyond the powers of our imagination. It is not fair to compare them with America, and it is not intelligent to do so."

Elimination of the language barrier would help the two countries to understand each other, the journalist says, but he believes Americans must do two things if we are to be friends with Russia.

"We must be patient, first of all, and we must realize that they are fundamentally different from us. They admire Americans, their ingenuity, and industrial power. They hold us in awe. But right now they have a chip on their shoulder, and not without cause. I think we can manage to take that chip off, though it may take years."

Having several exclusive interviews with Stalin to his credit, Alabama's Gilmore obviously ranks with the great newspaper men of his day. His State is proud of him. The Advertiser salutes him as a living, thinking, dynamic link between two nations that should and must be friends if the world as we know it is to exist. Keep on writing and talking, Eddy Gilmore!

Communism in the United States Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles by Mark Foote from the Bay City (Mich.) Times of May 23, 24, and 25, 1946:

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times of May 23, 1946]

FOOTE TRACES DEVELOPMENT OF LEFT-WING FACTIONS HERE AND ABROAD

(This is the eighth of a series of stories on communism in the United States today, answering the query: Is communism a menace:)

(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON.—What are the differences between communisim, socialism, and anarchism. Who and what are the Trotskyites?

An elucidation of these questions is necessary to properly consider the problem of whether communism is a menace. These groups are all related, although bitterly antagonistic. They all practice a policy of deceit, subversion, and artifice and very small minorities of them have staged successful revolutions in other countries.

Politically both the Communists and Socialists are so small numerically as to be almost negligible. But each has millions of followers who not only do not profess membership in the party, but would indignantly deny such a charge.

These include the so-called Communist fellow travelers, who blindly follow the party line as laid down in Moscow. They are the real danger to the country, because they pose as altruists and "do gooders," while surreptitiously putting over the party program.

Then there are the "parlor pinks" who continually flirt with Communist and Socialist ideas, like to indulge in the dialectics and jargon of leftist ideologies. Sometimes they are millionaires who fancy the idea of being different.

These fellow travelers are to be found everywhere, in all political parties, in the halls of Congress, in State legislatures, and in city government. They permeate the Federal bureaucracy and masquerade under high-sounding organizational titles, infiltrate colleges, among the faculty and students, the armed services, and even the churches.

But communism is the mother of them all—the lodestones which drives them to un-

dermine all capitalistic governments, either by stealth, day by day, month by month, and year by year hacking away, or by swift, revolutionary blows when they think the time is ripe.

Modern communism may be said to have begun in January 1848, when Karl Marx and Frederich Engels, two German radicals, brought forth the manifesto of the Communist Party, which is accepted as gospel of the society.

The First International Association of Workers (popularly known as the First International), established in London, September 28, 1864, was based on the manifesto.

But from the beginnings of modern communism, its devotees have been prone to split up into warring factions. Often their differences are highly theoretical as to ideology, and frequently the schisms arise through jealousies and contests over leadership.

By 1872 the First International had become so dominated by anarchists that Marx himself withdrew.

Anarchism is a no-government theory of society. It is a principle or theory of life and conduct under which society is conceived without government—harmony in such a society being achieved, not by submission to law, or by obedience to any authority, but by free agreements concluded between various groups.

Before World War I, the chief threat to organized government, both in this country and abroad, was the anarchist movement, whose militant members adopted terrorist tactics in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Outrages in the United States included the Haymarket riot of 1886 when several policemen were killed by a bomb thrown at a labor meeting in Chicago, and the assassination of President McKinley at Buffalo in 1901 by a professed anarchist.

In Europe a bomb exploded in the French Chamber of Deputies in 1893, President Carnot of France was assassinated in 1893, Empress Elizabeth of Austria in 1898, King Humbert of Italy in 1900, and an attempt was made on the life of the Prince of Wales in the same year.

Anarchism is practically a dead letter today, however. It has changed its tactics, abandoned terrorism. Its memoirs are mostly to be found in the ranks of the Communists and left-wing Socialists.

Six years after Marx's death the Second International was held in Paris in 1889. A majority of its members still placed loyalty to country above subjection to party, and as a result of the First World War disrupted the Second International.

It was for the purpose of carrying out the revolutionary program of the Communist party that the Third International, popularly known as the Comintern, was organized by Lenin at Moscow in March 1919.

Even before this, however, German immigrants in this country had formed the Socialist Labor Party in 1877. It had a candidate for President, who polled 21,512 votes. In 1900 a Socialist Party was formed by Socialists who split off from the SLP, and amalgamated with other Socialists groups under leadership of Eugene V. Debs.

Debs was its candidate for President of the United States in 1904, 1908, 1912, and 1920; since which time Norman M. Thomas has become its perennial candidate. Socialists highest vote for President, was registered in 1920, when Debs polled 919,799 votes.

In 1919 a convention of American extremists was held in Chicago, made up of left-wingers of the old Socialist Party and other radicals. This was the beginning of the Communist Party of America. A House committee report, January 17, 1931, stated that a Japanese, Sen. Katayama, represented the American Communist Party and was its spokesman at Moscow for a decade. The report said:

"Almost as soon as the American Communist Party was organized it was driven underground on account of its illegality. In December 1921, the Workers' Party of America was formed as a camouflage for the real Communist Party, which maintained its existence underground. In 1925, the official name was changed to Workers' (Communist) Party of America. But at a convention in March 1928, the Communists threw off all camouflage and boldly came out as the Communist Party of the United States, a section of the Communist International."

The differences between the Communists and Socialists may be briefly defined as: Fundamentally the Communists insist that socialism can be achieved only as a result of a workers' revolution, presumably by force, while the Socialist Party believes in a step-by-step advent of the cooperative commonwealth through the normal processes of political democracy—that is, by the ballot.

Trotskyite literature frequently turns up in factories all over America. Trotsky, like Stalin, was a disciple of Lenin. The two were rivals of leadership of the party in Russia after Lenin died, and Trotsky fled Russia in fear of his life. While writing his memoires in exile in Mexico, he was killed by a man who split his head with an ax. The assassin was generally believed to be an emmissary from Russia.

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times of May 24, 1946]

POLICY OF DEPORTING COMMUNIST ALIENS ABANDONED LAST DECADE

(This is the ninth of a series of stories on communism in the United States today, answering the query: Is communism a menace?)

(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON.—After World War I, beginning with the last 2 years of the administration of Woodrow Wilson and continuing until 1933, the Federal Government pursued a policy of deporting aliens who were Anarchists, Communists, or members of other organizations advocating overthrow of the Government by force.

A change of policy under the Roosevelt administration was evidenced by the fact that deportations fell from a total of 19,865 in the fiscal year 1933 to only 8,879 in the fiscal year 1934. This was the smallest number in any year since 1842. A general "liberal" policy toward subversive elements in their respects has led not only to the invasion by Communists of many of the country's leading organizations, but into the Government itself.

Harry B. Mitchell, president of the Civil Service Commission, was forced this week publicly to take cognizance of the infiltration of Communists in the Government departments. The newly formed CIO, United Public Workers of America, with 75,000 members, was his target. Commenting on resolutions passed at the receent UPWA's convention in Atlantic City, Mitchell said yesterday:

"UPWA's purpose in throwing an utterly uncalled-for proverbial red rag in the face of the American public, the employer of its members, is rather difficult to understand.

"The mere fact that a person attended a convention which declared that the communistic Russian Government was perfect in all that it did, while the Government of the United States was imperialistic in its designs on humanity, would not, standing alone, justify a decision that the person was a Communist, and consequently believed that force to overthrow the Government to which he normally owed his allegiance was justified.

"However, such action is bound to arouse suspicion against its members, as it unquestionably did in the case of your organization."

Further, this union of Federal, State, and municipal workers specifically reserved the right to strike against its employer—the Government.

Congress took swift action in the matter when the Senate Appropriations Committee tacked a rider to the Agricultural Department appropriation bill which would prohibit the Department from employing members of unions which assert the right to strike against the Government.

The so-called Dies committee investigation of un-American activities in the United States (now headed by Representative JOHN S. WOOD, Georgia, Democrat) has been in existence since 1938. It has made astounding revelations from time to time, although under its former chairman, it sometimes put the red tag on persons who did not deserve it.

Every year when the time arrives for extension of the life of this committee, a hot fight is staged in Congress. Many sincere, patriotic Members of the House have opposed its extension, and they were joined of course by all fellow travelers and pinks. But the committee has always won its fight and is now functioning.

Periodically since the Communist Party became established in this country as an adjunct of the Russian Comintern, such congressional investigations have been held, and legislation proposed, but little in a legislative way has been accomplished toward curbing the subversive elements.

In March 1919, the New York Legislature authorized an investigation of seditious activities by the Lusk committee. State police raided and seized documents of the Russian Soviet Bureau (we had no diplomatic relations with Russia at the time), the Rand school, and other radical centers. The committee made a report in four large volumes a year later.

In January 1920, the State of New York Assembly suspended its five Socialist members on charges connecting them with the Soviet Government. The five were subsequently reelected, whereupon three were again expelled and the other two resigned in protest.

In 1920, A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General in the Cabinet of President Wilson, initiated an anti-Red crusade which attracted widespread attention. The public had been aroused by discovery at the New York post office on April 20, 1919, of 16 packages containing bombs. A similar package had exploded in the home of Senator Hardwick, of Georgia, seriously injuring Mrs. Hardwick and the servant who opened it.

Bombs exploded in front of residences of prominent persons in seven eastern and middle western cities. One damaged the house of Attorney General Palmer in Washington and was believed to have killed the person who placed the bomb. A watchman was killed in New York, but other explosives inflicted only property damage.

It was assumed the bombings were the work of revolutionary radicals, but none of the perpetrators of the outrages was ever apprehended.

The Palmer raids were conducted in 11 cities on meetings of the federations of unions of Russian workers. The Department of Labor issued warrants for the arrest of some 600 members of this organization. A total of 425 arrests were made and of these 246 were deported.

Members of the federation to the number of 199, along with 43 anarchists including Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, and 7 undesirable aliens of other types, sailed from New York on December 21, 1919, on the steamship *Buford*, dubbed the Soviet Ark. On January 2, 1920 night raids were carried

out in 33 cities, resulting in arrest of 2,500 persons.

Assistant Secretary of Labor Louis F. Post, who had issued the first warrants, became convinced that raids were conducted with little regard for legal process. "They involved," Post said, "lawless invasion of peaceable assemblies—private and public, political, recreational, and educational." Gradually the excitement subsided and the raids ceased.

But the anti-Red campaign resulted in passage of criminal syndicalism law by 20 States.

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times of May 25, 1946]

FOOTE SAYS STRIKE-BOUND NATION CAUSES COMMUNISTS TO REJOICE

(This is the tenth of a series on communism in the United States today, answering the query: Is communism a menace?)

(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON—Communists are about the only happy people in the country today. Why? Because the United States is paralyzed by strikes. Transportation has stopped dead in its tracks. Production is down to a trickle. Food shortages are imminent. Workmen are idle. Suspicion and hatred are rampant. People are gloomy.

Secret communistic infiltration of labor unions is alarming.

Karl Marx, founder of modern communism, said:

"Strikes are the school of war of the workingmen in which they prepare themselves for the great struggle which cannot be avoided. And as schools of war they cannot be excelled."

Marx and Engels, his collaborators, referred to strikes as social war, as economic revolt, real civil war, guerrilla war, school of war, advance guard collisions.

In a book by Earl C. Ford and William Z. Foster, present head of the Communist Party in America, discussing syndicalism (the French word for labor unions) occurs this passage:

"The syndicalist intends that the workers in each industry shall manage the affairs of their particular industry; the miners shall manage the mines; the railroaders the railroads, and so on through all the lines of human activity."

It is highly significant today that Ford and Foster should pick out mines and railroads as key industries in their revolution.

Ford and Foster continue:

"The syndicalist knows that capitalism is organized robbery and he consistently considers and treats capitalists as thieves plying their trade. He knows they have no more right to the wealth they have amassed than a burglar has to his loot, and the idea of expropriating them without remuneration seems as natural to him as for the footpad's victim to take back his stolen property without paying the footpad for it."

Joseph Kennedy, former American Ambassador to London, referring to the mild sort of socialism under the Labor Party in Britain, said before the Chicago Junior Chamber of Commerce on May 18:

"This experiment in state socialism is violently at variance with our American way of life. It can happen here if our people are not rudely awakened from their indifference and lethargy and stop the drift toward statism."

If the true role of the Communists in the present strike epidemic and their fellow travelers and party line followers could be assessed and revealed it would astound the American people.

The vast majority of the railroaders and miners on strike today, as well as the vast majority of automobile workers, steel, electrical, and other workers who have been on strike, are patriotic, sincere men. They seek only to improve their condition, and get better wages for the support of ther families.

But they are often misled and exploited by unscrupulous leaders. And the Communist influence in many unions, especially in the CIO, is strong. The Wood committee, formerly known as the Dies committee on un-American affairs, on March 22, 1944, issued a report on communism in unions and in the Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee, the arm which was an influence in the 1944 campaign and will again be an ininfluence in the congressional campaign this fall and the Presidential campaign of 1948.

The old Dies committee sometimes went wrong in using too much hearsay evidence, and branding people as "Commies" who were not. But this report is well documented and authenticated.

This report listed the names of 144 CIO leaders who hailed the Daily Worker, chief organ of the Communist Party in America, on its twentieth anniversary in January 1944. The reports say: "It is unthinkable that any of these CIO leaders * * * could have endorsed the Daily Worker in ignorance of its true nature. It must be assumed that they have deliberately called public attention to their allegiance toward or sympathy with the Communist Party and its doctrines."

The foregoing 144 supporters of the Communist Party's Daily Worker include representatives of 25 out of 39 international unions which are affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

When the Daily Worker was founded in this country, on August 23, 1923, Gregory Zinoviev, then head of the Communist International sent a cablegram to Charles E. Ruthenberg, then secretary of the Worker's Party, a section of the Communist International, as follows:

"Know no more important task American workers than establishment militant daily. This should be rallying point for concentration all forces present time. Only after foundation daily will comintern consider we have real mass party in America."

The Communist Party being a subversive organization, pledged to violent revolution, hundreds of thousands of people suppress the fact of their membership. It has only 70,000 dues-paying members in the United States according to William Z. Foster.

But the Communist Party inspires the organization of hundreds of fellow traveler organizations. They spring up almost every day to meet some special situation, then die out, only to be replaced by others.

Otto Kuusinen, secretary of the Communist International, in his report to the sixth plenum (plenary session) of the executive committee of the Communist International said:

"The first party of our task is to build up, not only Communist organizations, but other organizations as well, above all mass organizations, sympathizing with our aims, and able to aid us for special purposes. We must create a whole solar system of organizations and smaller committees around the Communist Party, working actually under the influence of our party."

Only a few of the organizations which the Wood (Dies) committee listed as following the Communist Party line are American Peace Mobilization (which supported Russia when it had an alliance with Hitler), the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, American League for Peace and Democracy, Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder From Prison, committee for support of candidacy of Israel Amter, Communist candidate for Congress in New York City in 1942. Hundreds of CIO members actively supported their organizations, including some high officials.

Service to Hospitalized Veterans by Benevolent Protective Order of Elks

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the Benevolent Protective Order of Elks, through its local Alexandria, La., Lodge No. 546, is undertaking a service to hospitalized veterans which I think may very well be duplicated by other lodges of this association and by benevolent and civic organizations generally. The story is told in a letter addressed to the exalted ruler of the Alexandria Lodge by Dr. T. F. Moore, manager of the veterans' facility which is located adjacent to the city of Alexandria. Besides this letter, I have in my files a statement signed by many of the veteran patients in the Alexandria, La., hospital, expressing the warm appreciation of the splendid work being done by the representative of the Elks.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Dr. Moore be published in connection with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Alexandria, La., May 24, 1946.

The EXALTED RULER, LODGE NO. 546, BPOE,
Alexandria, La.

MY DEAR SIR: This coming month—June—will mark the first anniversary of the services of your hostess, Mrs. May Velotta, at this Veterans' Administration hospital.

It is a source of real pleasure for me to tell you that I am convinced that the Elks Lodge of Alexandria could have served the hospital in no better way than in furnishing such a real, worth-while service to our veteran patients.

In Mrs. Velotta you have an unusually well qualified person for this position. She is respected by all personnel and is dearly beloved by the patients for the outstanding personal service which she is rendering them. As I have told you before, she is rendering a type of service which has not been made available to us by any other of the many splendid organizations which have done so much for us. It is a service which cannot be rendered by the physician, the nurse, the attendant—in fact, by none of our paid hospital personnel.

When a man is ill and in bed there are innumerable little personal services which he desires rendered him and it is precisely these many personal services that the Elks Club is rendering these men through their representative, Mrs. May Velotta.

I join the patients in expressing our deepest gratitude to you for having made this service available and in expressing our sincere apppreciation and thanks to Mrs. Velotta for so efficiently, humanely, and cheerfully carrying them out.

Very truly yours,

T. F. MOORE, M. D.,
Manager.

Application of Antitrust Laws to News-Gathering Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Task for Congress" published in the San Diego Tribune-Sun of May 16, 1946, and an editorial entitled "Not a Public Utility," published in the San Diego Union of May 18, 1946, on the subject of the application of the antitrust laws to news-gathering organizations.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Tribune-Sun of May 16, 1946]

TASK FOR CONGRESS

Awaiting action in Congress is H. R. 6301, a bill designed to give news-gathering organizations freedom from restrictions of the antitrust laws. The measure has the support of 814 publishers, and only 36 of those polled voted against the move.

Until recently the gathering and distribution of news was not looked upon as activities needing such controls as those imposed by the Sherman Antitrust Act. But the Supreme Court changed all this last year when it ruled the Associated Press had no right to refuse sale of service to an applicant, even though a contract of long standing between the Associated Press and a member expressly forbade the service.

While seeking no special privileges for themselves or their businesses, publishers generally feel that this ruling, which was by a bare majority of the Supreme Court, impinges upon freedom of the press. They feel that it well might be the opening for some such regulations as those imposed upon public utilities. In this they see a grave threat to one of the great cornerstones of democracy, the free press.

The pending bill proposes nothing that could do violence to public interest, unless it is to be construed that the whole business program of press associations in the past has betrayed that interest. What is proposed is that a press association shall have the right to select its customers.

This proposal has a parallel in numerous types of businesses which reserve the right to refuse service to anyone. Many restaurants post signs stating this right; theaters often are similarly placarded.

Specialists in the publishing field feel that the Supreme Court ruling establishes a policy and a threat which are against the traditions and the essentials of democracy. Despite this, the Associated Press has amended its bylaws to comply with the decision. The restraint should be removed before it leads to evils menacing to the gathering and distributing of news, and the way to do this has been indicated in H. R. 6301.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union of May 16, 1946]

NOT A PUBLIC UTILITY

Congressman NOAH MASON, of Illinois, has introduced in Congress a bill amending the antitrust law to exclude its application to associations engaged in the gathering and dissemination of news. The bill is aimed to meet the situation created by the decision of a bare majority of the United States Supreme Court, ordering the Associated Press to sell its services to all petitioners, regardless of existing commitments to previous subscribers.

The high court's decision was characterized by dissenting Justice Roberts as "rendering the Associated Press a public utility," and equivalent to making a new statute by court decision. Justice Roberts adds:

"Suffice it to say that it is a novel application of the Sherman Act to treat it as legislation converting an organization, which neither restrains trade nor monopolizes it, nor holds itself out to serve the public generally, into a public utility because it furnishes a new sort of illumination—literary as contrasted with physical—by pronouncing a fiat that the interest of consumers (the reading public, not that of competing news agencies or newspaper publishers) requires equal news service on the part of AP and that a court of equity, in the guise of an injunction, shall write the requisite regulatory statute."

The Associated Press is not a private merchandising institution, but a mutual organization composed of members in individual cities, who not only receive news gathered by the association, but who contribute the news from each member's field. There is no sale of a commodity involved, no restraint against any other news service or any newspaper. There is not and cannot be any such thing as a monopoly in news; news, like gold, is where you find it.

The conception of a news-disseminating service, or a newspaper, as a public utility is incongruous, so far as any relation to monopoly or government control is concerned. Readers are not compelled to rely on the news reports of any particular agency nor to read only newspapers supplying the reports of these agencies. The element of choice, not present in a public utility, always is present.

Congress should correct an unjust situation and move to protect a free press by passing the Mason bill.

Excerpt From Testimony Before Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments Relating to Reorganization Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, hearings have been in progress before the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments in connection with Reorganization Plans 1, 2, and 3. These plans affect many functions and departments of the Federal Government and every Member of Congress is concerned with the reorganization proposals.

I submit herewith excerpt from testimony before the committee on Tuesday, June 4, 1946, together with copy of the Reorganization Act of 1945; copy of House Concurrent Resolutions 151, 154, and 155; copies of Reorganization Plans 1, 2, and 3.

This testimony indicates to some degree the far-reaching results that may follow if Members of Congress permit the reorganization plans to become the law:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS 151, 154, 155

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
Washington, D. C., Tuesday, June 4, 1946.

The subcommittee convened at 10 a. m., the Honorable CARTER MANASCO, chairman, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

We have met this morning in consideration of three resolutions introduced by the Honorable WILLIAM PITTENGER, House Concurrent Resolution 151, which proposes to reject Reorganization Plan 2; House Concurrent Resolution 154, which proposes to reject Reorganization Plan No. 3; and House Concurrent Resolution 155, which proposes to reject Reorganization Plan No. 1.

With that objection, copies of the resolutions will be placed in the record at this point.

(The resolutions are as follows:)

House Concurrent Resolution 151

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 2 of May 16, 1946, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 16th day of May 1946.

House Concurrent Resolution 154

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 3 of May 16, 1946, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 16th day of May 1946.

House Concurrent Resolution 155

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of May 16, 1946, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 16th day of May 1946.

The CHAIRMAN. We have with us this morning our colleague from Minnesota, Mr. WILLIAM PITTENGER. Mr. PITTENGER, do you have a prepared statement?

Mr. PITTENGER. No, I do not.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If it please the chairman, we will take up the plans in their order and I imagine Plan No. 1 would be first.

Mr. PITTENGER. If you would bear with me for a moment, Mr. Whittington, I would like at this point, so we have a complete record, the Committee's permission to have you insert a copy of the law, which is not a long piece of legislation, Public Law 263, December 20, 1945, known as the Reorganization Act, and following that copy of the law, I think it would be well to insert, in the interests of economy, printing and other things, the Reorganization Plans No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3. Following the law I would recommend that that be included in the record. Those are the messages of the President, and if they could be inserted at this point then the record would be clear and in my opinion in shape for the testimony that follows.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I suppose that would be available, but when it comes to inserting the Reorganization Act, Mr. Chairman, you only want to refer to the provisions under question in that act.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any objections to the request? I hear none. The documents

referred to will be included in the record at this point.

(The documents are as follows:)

[Public Law 263, 79th Cong., ch. 582, 1st sess.]

H. R. 4129

An act to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Reorganization Act of 1945."

NEED FOR REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 2. (a) The President shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

(1) to facilitate orderly transition from war to peace;,

(2) to reduce expenditures and promote economy, to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

(3) to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable within the revenues;

(4) to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

(5) to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

(6) to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a) and that such purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under the provisions of this act, and can be accomplished more speedily thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

(c) It is the expectation of the Congress that the transfers, consolidations, coordinations, and abolitions under this act shall accomplish an over-all reduction of at least 25 percent in the administrative costs of the agency or agencies affected.

REORGANIZATION PLANS

SEC. 3. Whenever the President, after investigation, finds that—

(1) the transfer of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of any other agency; or

(2) the abolition of all or any part of the functions of any agency; or

(3) the consolidation or coordination of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, with the whole or any part of any other agency or the functions thereof; or

(4) the consolidation or coordination of any part of any agency or the functions thereof with any other part of the same agency or the functions thereof; or

(5) the abolition of the whole or any part of any agency which agency or part does not have, or upon the taking effect of the reorganizations specified in the reorganization plan will not have, any functions.

is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a), he shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of the transfers, consolidations, coordinations, and abolitions, as to which he had made findings and which he includes in the plan, and transmit such plan (bearing an identifying number) to the Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each transfer, consolidation, coordination, or abolition referred to in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5) of this section and specified in the plan, he has found that such transfer, consolidation, coordination, or abolition is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a). The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session. The President, in his message transmitting a reorganization plan, shall specify with respect to each abolition of a function specified in the plan the statutory authority for the exercise of such function.

OTHER CONTENTS OF PLANS

SEC. 4. Any reorganization plan transmitted by the President under section 3—

(1) shall change, in such cases as he deems necessary, the name of any agency affected by a reorganization, and the title of its head; and shall designate the name of any agency resulting from a reorganization and the title of its head;

(2) may include provisions for the appointment and compensation of the head and one or more assistant heads of any agency (including an agency resulting from a consolidation) if the President finds, and in his message transmitting the plan declares, that by reason of transfers, consolidations and coordinations made by the plan, the responsibilities and duties of such head are of such nature as to require such action. The head so provided for may be an individual or may be a commission or board with two or more members. In the case of any such appointment the term of office shall not be fixed at more than 4 years, the compensation shall not be at a rate in excess of $10,000 per annum, and, if the appointment is not under the classified civil service, it shall be by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

(3) shall make provision for the transfer or other disposition of the records, property, and personnel affected by any transfer, consolidation, coordination, or abolition;

(4) shall make provision for the transfer of such unexpended balances of appropriations available for use in connection with any function or agency transferred, consolidated, or coordinated, as he deems necessary by reason of the transfer, consolidation, or coordination for use in connection with the transferred, consolidated, or coordinated functions, or for the use of the agency to which the transfer is made, but such unexpended balances so transferred shall be used only for the purposes for which such appropriation was originally made;

(5) shall make provisions for winding up the affairs of any agency abolished.

LIMITATIONS ON POWERS WITH RESPECT TO REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—

(1) abolishing or transferring an executive department or all the functions thereof or establishing any new executive department; or

(2) changing the name of any executive department or the title of its head, or designating any agency as "Department" or its head as "Secretary"; or

(3) continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

(4) continuing any function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise, or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made, or beyond the time when the agency in which it was vested before the reorganization would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

(5) Authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress; or

(6) imposing, in connection with the exercise of any quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative function possessed by an independent agency, any greater limitation upon the exercise of independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the carrying out of such function, than existed with respect to the exercise of such function by the agency in which it was vested prior to the taking effect of such reorganization; except that this prohibition shall not prevent the abolition of any such function; or

(7) increasing the term of any office beyond that provided by law for such office.

(b) No reorganization plan shall provide for any reorganization affecting any agency named below in this subsection; except that this prohibition shall not apply to the transfer to such agency of the whole or any part of, or the whole or any part of the functions of, any agency not so named. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection. The agencies above referred to in this subsection are as follows: Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, National Mediation Board, National Railroad Adjustment Board, and Railroad Retirement Board.

(c) No reorganization plan shall provide for any reorganization affecting any civil function of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, or of its head, or affecting such Corps or its head with respect to any such civil function. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection.

(d) No reorganization plan shall provide for a reorganization affecting any agency named below in this subsection if it also provides for a reorganization which does not affect such agency; except that this prohibition shall not apply to the transfer to such agency of the whole or any part of, or the whole or any part of the functions of, any agency not so named. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection. The agencies above referred to in this subsection are as follows: Federal Communications Commission, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, United States Tariff Commission, and Veterans' Administration.

(e) If, since January 1, 1945, Congress has by law established the status of any agency in relation to other agencies or transferred any function to any agency, no reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of, changing the status of such agency in relation to other agencies or of abolishing any such transferred function or providing for its exercise by or under the supervision of any other agency.

(f) No reorganization specified in a reorganization plan shall take effect unless the plan is transmitted to the Congress before April 1, 1948.

TAKING EFFECT OF REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 6. (a) The reorganizations specified in the plan shall take effect in accordance with the plan upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such 60-day period there has not been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan.

(b) For the purposes of subsection (a)—

(1) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

(2) in the computation of the 60-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain; except that if a resolution (as defined in sec. 202) with respect to such reorganization plan has been passed by one House and sent to the other, no exclusion under this paragraph shall be made by reason of adjournments of the first House taken thereafter.

(c) Any provision of the plan may, under provisions contained in the plan, be made operative at a time later than the date on which the plan shall otherwise take effect.

DEFINITION OF "AGENCY"

SEC. 7. When used in this act, the term "agency" means any executive department, commission, independent establishment, corporation wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government. Such term does not include the Comptroller General of the United States or the General Accounting Office, which are a part of the legislative branch of the Government.

MATTERS DEEMED TO BE REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 8. For the purposes of this act any transfer, consolidation, coordination, abolition, change or designation of name or title, disposition, winding up of affairs, or provision for the appointment and compensation of the head or assistant heads of an agency, referred to in section 3 or 4, shall be deemed a "reorganization."

SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. (a) (1) Any statute enacted, and any regulation or other action made, prescribed, issued, granted, or performed, in respect of or by any agency or function transferred to, or consolidated or coordinated with, any other agency or function under the provisions of this act, before the effective date of such transfer, consolidation, or coordination, shall, except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, or made inapplicable by or under authority of law, have the same effect as if such transfer, consolidation, or coordination had not been made; but where any such statute, regulation, or other action has vested functions in the agency from which the transfer is made under the plan, such functions shall, insofar as they are to be exercised after the transfer, be considered as vested in the agency to which the transfer is made under the plan.

(2) As used in paragraph (1) of this subsection the term "regulation or other action" means any regulation, rule, order, policy, determination, directive, authorization, permit, privilege, requirement, designation, or other action.

(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any reorganization under the provisions of this act, but the court may, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after such reorganization takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the successor of such head or officer under the reorganization so effected or, if there be no such successor, against such agency or officer as the President shall designate.

UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 10. The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of this act shall not be used for any purpose, but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

PRINTING OF REORGANIZATION PLANS

SEC. 11. If the reorganizations specified in a reorganization plan take effect, the reorganization plan shall be printed in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as the public laws, and shall be printed in the Federal Register.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The following sections of this title are enacted by the Congress:

(a) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in such House in the case of resolutions (as defined in section 202); and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

SEC. 202. As used in this title, the term "resolution" means only a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan numbered transmitted to Congress by the President on , 19 .", the blank spaces therein being appropriately filled; and does not include a concurrent resolution which specifies more than one reorganization plan.

SEC. 203. A resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be referred to a committee (and all resolutions with respect to the same plan shall be referred to the same committee) by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

SEC. 204. (a) If the committee to which has been referred a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan has not reported it before the expiration of 10 calendar days after its introduction (or, in the case of a resolution received from the other House, 10 calendar days after its receipt), it shall then (but not before) be in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of such resolution, or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to such reorganization plan which has been referred to the committee.

(b) Such motion may be made only by a person favoring the solution, shall be highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan), and debate thereon shall be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No amendment to such motion shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(c) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, such motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan.

SEC. 205. (a) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(b) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed 10 hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

SEC. 206. (a) All motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

(b) All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be decided without debate.

SEC. 207. If, prior to the passage by one House of a resolution of that House with respect to a reorganization plan, such House receives from the other House a resolution with respect to the same plan, then—

(a) If no resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee, no other resolution with respect to the same plan may be reported or (despite the provisions of section 204 (a)) be made the subject of a motion to discharge.

(b) If a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee—

(1) the procedure with respect to that or other resolutions of such House with respect to such plan which have been referred to committee shall be the same as if no resolution from the other House with respect to such plan had been received; but

(2) on any vote on final passage of a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan the resolution from the other House with respect to such plan shall be automatically substituted for the resolution of the first House.

Approved December 20, 1945.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1946

(Message from the President of the United States transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1946, prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1945)

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1946, prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1945.

In my message to the Congress of May 24, 1945, requesting passage of a reorganization act, I stated that an important purpose of the act would be to permit making permanent certain of the reorganization actions taken by Executive order under the authority of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941 (55 Stat. 838). The effect of this reorganization plan would be, in the main, to continue in force some of the reorganization actions now in effect by virtue of Executive orders. The reorganization actions continued in force by this plan all constitute improvements in the organization of permanent functions of the Government or functions which may be expected to be active after the expiration of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941. Those improvements should, therefore, be

made permanent under the procedure established in the Reorganization Act of 1945.

I have found, after investigation, that each reorganization contained in the plan is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1945. Each part of the reorganization plan is explained in further detail below.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The first part of the plan provides for the transfer of certain functions to the Department of State, and imposes certain liquidation duties on that Department.

Office of Inter-American Affairs

Executive Order No. 8840 of July 30, 1941, established the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. Throughout the war period this Office (later redesignated the Office of Inter-American Affairs) played a major role in the development of better relations among the American Republics. In accordance with the general realinement of the functions and organization of wartime agencies in the international field, this Office was abolished and certain remaining functions were transferred to the Secretary of State by Executive Order No. 9610 of April 10, 1946. The plan confirms this transfer, providing specifically for the direction by the Secretary of State of the activities of certain corporations formerly headed by the Director of the Office of Inter-American Affairs.

The necessity for confirming Executive Order No. 9610 arises from the fact that certain of the corporations have program commitments, for which funds have been made available, extending into fiscal year 1949. The reorganization plan will assure that the activities of the several corporations listed in the plan will be under the direction of the Secretary and Department of State so long as they are in existence.

United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands

Under the terms of the Tydings-McDuffie Act, the Philippine Islands will become independent on July 4, 1946. This event makes necessary a change in the conduct of the political relationships between this Government and that of the Republic of the Philippines.

The reorganization plan accordingly abolishes the office of United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands (established by Tydings-McDuffie Acts, ch. 11, 47 Stat. 761, and ch. 11, 48 Stat. 456) and provides for the orderly liquidation of its affairs by the Department of State. It is contemplated that after July 4, 1946, the conduct of relations with the Republic of the Philippines will be carried on in the same manner as relations with other countries.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

(National Prohibition Act functions)

The act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 427), imposed upon the Attorney General general duties respecting administration and enforcement of the National Prohibition Act. By Executive Order No. 6639 of March 10, 1934, all of the powers and duties of the Attorney General respecting that act, except the power and authority to determine and to compromise liability for taxes and penalties, were transferred to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The excepted functions, however, were transferred subsequently to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue by Executive Order No. 9302 of February 9, 1943, issued under the authority of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

Since the functions of determining taxes and penalties under various statutes and of compromise of liability therefor prior to reference to the Attorney General for suit are well-established functions of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, this minor function under the National Prohibition Act is more appropriately placed in the Bureau of Internal Revenue than in the Department of Justice.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

(Agricultural Research Administration)

By Executive Order No. 9069 of February 23, 1942, six research bureaus, the Office of Experiment Stations, and the Agricultural (formerly Beltsville) Research Center were consolidated into an Agricultural Research Administration to be administered by an officer designated by the Secretary of Agriculture. The constituent bureaus and agencies of the Administration have, in practice, retained their separate identity. This consolidation and certain transfers of functions between the constituent bureaus and agencies have all been recognized and provided for in the subsequent appropriation acts passed by the Congress.

By the plan the functions of the eight research bureaus and agencies which are presently consolidated into the Agricultural Research Administration are transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture to be exercised under his direction and control by the Agricultural Research Administration or by such other officers or agencies of the Department of Agriculture as he may provide.

The benefits which have been derived from centralized review, coordination, and control of research projects and functions by the Agricultural Research Administrator have amply demonstrated the lasting value of this consolidation. By transferring the functions of the constituent bureaus and agencies to the Secretary of Agriculture, it will be possible to continue this consolidation and to make such further adjustments in the organization of agricultural research activities as future conditions may require. This assignment of functions to the Secretary is in accord with the sound and long-established practice of the Congress of vesting substantive functions in the Secretary of Agriculture rather than in subordinate officers or agencies of the Department.

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

(Contract Settlement functions)

The Office of Contract Settlement was established by the Contract Settlement Act of 1944. By the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, the Office of Contract Settlement was placed within the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion and the Director of the latter office was given general supervision over its activities.

The reorganization plan transfers all of the functions of the Director of Contract Settlement and all other functions of the Office of Contract Settlement under the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 to the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion and to the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. The plan further abolishes the office of Director of Contract Settlement and the Office of Contract Settlement. The effect of this proposal will be to eliminate entirely one agency, whose mission has been substantially accomplished, without appreciably increasing the burden of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

The functions of the Office of Contract Settlement are, in general, to (1) establish and supervise uniform and fair contract settlement policies and procedures for the Army, the Navy, and other contracting agencies, and (2) establish and operate an Appeal Board to hear and determine appeals by war contractors relating to contract termination matters. Major policies and procedures have been established by the issuance of 20 regulations of general application. No new regulations have been issued during the last 8 months and none are contemplated. The Appeal Board will of necessity continue in operation for some time; but it exercises its authority separately and autonomously, and it can therefore function as well under the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion as under the Office of Contract Settlement.

As of March 31, 1946, about 24,000 war contracts were still unsettled, involving claims filed and expected to be filed of approximately $2,700,000,000. The settlement of these cases, however, is an operating function which rests with the contracting agencies. Moreover, at the current rate of settlements this represents a backlog of only 4 or 5 months' work by such agencies. Policies and procedures for settlements have been sufficiently tested to make it unlikely that new problems of substance will arise in connection with these remaining settlements which will require any action by the Office of Contract Settlement. In the event that any should arise, however, the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion will be in a position to deal with them.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

The plan consolidates permanently in one National Housing Agency under the direction of a National Housing Administrator the main activities of the Government relating to housing.

I do not need to stress again at this time the urgent necessity of taking all possible measures to alleviate the present critical housing shortage. The job of providing adequate housing for our returning veterans will tax to the utmost the resourcefulness and vigor of all parts of the Government that are concerned in any way with housing. And in the months and years ahead, the goal of a decent home for every American will demand the fullest use of all of the Government's resources in the housing field.

If the Government is to mobilize to fullest effectiveness its resources for dealing with the housing emergency, an indispensable step—and one which we cannot afford further to delay—is the establishment of a housing agency on a permanent basis. The fact that we have had a unified housing agency, even though temporary, has enabled us to move more efficiently toward a solution of postwar problems, in cooperation with private enterprise and local communities, than would have been possible without unification of the Government's housing activities; but the present National Housing Agency has been handicapped in its operations by its lack of a permanent status. Having been created during the war emergency, it is not infrequently looked upon as an organization which, now that peace has come, may be abolished in the relatively near future. This has made for uncertainties which have inevitably placed the National Housing Agency at a disadvantage. In order that it may proceed on its program with the fullest confidence that it has a position equivalent to that of any other permanent Government agency, its organization should be confirmed at the earliest possible date.

I fully recognize that S. 1592, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, approved by the Senate on April 12 of this year, provides for the permanent organization of the housing activities of the Government along the lines set forth in this plan. However, since the House must act before S. 1592 can become law, and because of the heavy legislative schedule now facing the House, it is difficult to fortell when such action can be expected. On the other hand, action by the President, taken under the authority of the Reorganization Act, assures decision on the matter in 60 days. Moreover, the fact that S. 1592 is pending in the Congress does not relieve the President of his responsibilities under the Reorganization Act, passed by the same Congress. On the contrary, the action already taken by

the Senate constitutes in effect an expression of approval of the objectives of the plan and therefore strengthens my confidence in the wisdom of the step I am taking.

It also seems desirable to confirm under this reorganization plan as many as possible of the organization changes that were effected under the First War Powers Act, 1941, and that it seems desirable to make permanent. Otherwise, confusion might arise, since specific congressional action on these subjects at a definite date cannot be accurately forecast.

Moreover, I place great weight upon the long congressional investigations which preceded the adoption of S. 1592 by the Senate. After comprehensive studies, hearings, and inquiries beginning in the middle of 1944, the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment of the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning of the Senate issued a unanimous report on August 1, 1945. Founded upon this report, S. 1592 was introduced and, after 2 months of comprehensive hearings, was reported favorably to the Senate. It was then approved by the Senate without substantial opposition. The pioneer work done by the sponsors of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, and also by other members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, and the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment, plus approval by the Senate, has been highly constructive and has helped importantly to point the way for this plan.

Since S. 1592 continues many substantial programs which are essential for the success of the veterans' emergency-housing program, as well as for accomplishing the long-time objective of a decent home for every family, I feel bound to stress that the treatment by this plan of the organizational features of that measure does not diminish the necessity for passing those parts of the bill not covered by the plan. The organizational features are for the purpose of making the National Housing Agency as efficient and effective an organization as possible; but without the other provisions of S. 1592 this Agency, regardless of how efficient and effective it may be, will not be able to meet the requirements of the present housing emergency. While it is not customary to advocate legislation in a message of this character, I do so in this instance to make it clear that those provisions of the pending legislation not incorporated in substance in this plan are made no less necessary as a result of submission of this plan.

Wartime experience has fully demonstrated the necessity for unifying the Government's housing functions. When the defense-housing program began in 1940, housing functions were scattered among a number of different agencies. In February 1942 the President consolidated these dispersed housing functions into a single National Housing Agency—an action which met with almost universal approval. While this Agency was created under the First War Powers Act, 1941, and was therefore necessarily temporary in character, it brought together not only special war-housing activities but also the main permanent housing organizations of the Government.

That the housing consolidation of 1942 served a useful and necessary purpose is uncontested. Without such a consolidation we could not have coped effectively with the difficult and often extraordinary wartime housing problems. It was demonstrated time and again that one housing agency could operate more efficiently and economically than many. In actual program execution there have been enormous savings of material, manpower, and money—savings to localities as well as the Federal Government—that resulted from unity and could not have been achieved with disunity. The lessons of the war must not be ignored in dealing with the very much different but no less difficult peacetime problems of housing.

The plan provides that the functions consolidated in the National Housing Agency are to be administered under a National Housing Administrator to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The National Housing Administrator is authorized to appoint a Deputy Housing Administrator, who shall be in the classified service.

The plan establishes three constituent units corresponding to those now existing in the National Housing Agency, to be known as the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal Public Housing Authority, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration. Each unit will be under a Commissioner to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The functions grouped under each new constituent unit parallel the functions of the predecessor unit in the existing National Housing Agency.

Dissolution of the United States Housing Corporation (existing pursuant to the acts of May 16, 1918, 40 Stat. 550, ch. 74, as amended, and June 4, 1918, 40 Stat. 595) is directed by the provisions of the plan, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Commissioner is required to wind up the affairs of the Corporation. The Office of Federal Housing Administrator, the Federal Loan Bank Board and the offices of the members thereof, the Board of Trustees of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and the offices of the members thereof, the Board of Directors of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the offices of the members thereof, and the Office of Administrator of the United States Housing Authority are also abolished by this plan.

The reorganization of housing functions will, of course, in no wise impair any outstanding obligations or contracts made in connection with any of such functions, nor the pledge of the faith of the United States to the payment of the principal of and interest on debentures now or hereafter issued under the National Housing Act, as amended, nor any annual contributions now or hereafter contracted for pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, nor any of the insurance funds created under the said National Housing Act, as amended.

I have found and declare that by reason of the reorganizations made by the plan the responsibilities and duties of the National Housing Administrator, the Deputy National Housing Administrator, the Federal Housing Commissioner, the Federal Home Loan Bank Commissioner, and the Federal Public Housing Commissioner are of such nature as to require the inclusion in the plan of provisions for their appointment and compensation.

Under the limitations contained in section 4 (2) of the Reorganization Act of 1945, the compensation of the National Housing Administrator cannot be set in the plan at a rate of more than $10,000 a year. The National Housing Administrator now receives a salary of $12,000 a year. I do not consider the $10,000 provided in the plan as adequate compensation, and recommend that the Congress act to increase it, if possible not later than the end of the 60-day period during which the Congress has this plan under consideration. This might well be done in the appropriation bill for the National Housing Agency for the coming fiscal year.

Achievement of the objectives we are seeking—homes immediately for our veterans and a suitable dwelling ultimately for every American family—will require, as I have noted, additional legislation by the Congress. But a sound and stable housing organization, as provided for in this plan, is imperative for present operations as well as for the efficient execution of new policies and programs laid down by the Congress. I have said before that the people of the United States can be the best-housed people in the world. I repeat that assertion, and I welcome the cooperation of the Congress in attaining that goal.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

(Credit union functions)

The plan makes permanent the transfer of the administration of Federal functions with respect to credit unions to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. These functions, originally placed in the Farm Credit Administration, were transferred to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation by Executive Order No. 9148 of April 27, 1942. Most credit unions are established in urban areas, and consequently are not related to agricultural activities. The supervision of credit unions fits in more logically with the general bank supervisory functions of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has performed this function successfully since 1942, and the benefits of its experience may be realized by effecting a permanent transfer.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 16, 1946.*

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1946

(Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled, May 16, 1946, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1945, approved December 20, 1945)

PART I. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SECTION 101. Functions of the Office of Inter-American Affairs: There are transferred to the Secretary of State all functions of the Director of the Office of Inter-American Affairs (which Office was established as the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs by Executive Order No. 8840 of July 30, 1941, and renamed the Office of Inter-American Affairs by Executive Order No. 9532 of March 23, 1945) with respect to the following corporations, namely, the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, the Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc., the Institute of Inter-American Transportation, The Inter-American Navigation Corporation, and Prencinradio, Inc., together with all rights and interests, authority, and obligations of the said Director and of his predecessors with respect to such corporations, including his authority with respect to holding the capital stock of the said corporations on behalf of the United States of America. All functions of the Office of Inter-American Affairs with respect to the aforesaid corporations are transferred to the Department of State. The functions transferred by this part shall be administered by the Secretary of State or, subject to his direction and control, by such officers and agencies of the Department of State as he may designate. The said Office of Inter-American Affairs and all functions thereof and of the Director of the Office of Inter-American Affairs not otherwise disposed of herein are abolished.

SEC. 102. United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands: The office of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands is abolished.

SEC. 103. Winding up of affairs: The Secretary of State shall provide for winding up those outstanding affairs of the agencies abolished by this part which are not otherwise disposed of herein.

PART II. DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

SECTION 201. National Prohibition Act functions: The functions of the Attorney General and of the Department of Justice with respect to (a) the determination of Internal Revenue taxes and penalties (exclusive of the determination of liability guaranteed

by permit bonds) arising out of violations of the National Prohibition Act occurring prior to the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution, and (b) the compromise, prior to reference to the Attorney General for suit, of liability for such taxes and penalties, are transferred to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury: *Provided*, That any compromise of such liability shall be effected in accordance with the provisions of section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code. All files and records of the Department of Justice used primarily in the administration of the functions transferred by this plan are hereby made available to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for use in the administration of such functions.

PART III. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SECTION 301. Agricultural research activities. The functions of the Bureau of Animal Industry; the Bureau of Dairy Industry; the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering; the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine; the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry; the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics; the Office of Experiment Stations; the Agricultural Research Center; and the Office of Agricultural Research Administrator, created by Executive Order No. 9069 of February 23, 1942 (7 F. R. 1409), are transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture, and shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture or, subject to his direction and control, by such officers and agencies of the Department of Agriculture as he shall designate.

PART IV. OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION

SECTION 401. Contract settlement functions: All functions of the Director of Contract Settlement and of the Office of Contract Settlement under the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 are transferred to the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion and the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, respectively, and shall be administered by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion or, subject to his direction and control, by such officers and agencies of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion as he shall designate. There are also transferred to the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion the Appeal Board established under section 13 (d) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 and the Contract Settlement Advisory Board created by section 5 of the said act: *Provided, however*, That the respective functions of each board shall remain vested therein as at present. The quarterly progress reports required of the Director of Contract Settlement by section 2 (b) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 shall be consolidated with the quarterly reports of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion required by section 101 (c) (8) of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 effective with the report required thereunder on the 1st day of October 1946. The quarterly progress report of the Director of Contract Settlement required in July 1946 shall be submitted at that time by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion as a separate report. The Office of Contract Settlement, including the Office of Director of Contract Settlement but excluding the boards transferred under this section, is abolished.

PART V. NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

SECTION 501. National Housing Agency: The agencies and functions of the National Housing Agency established under the First War Powers Act, 1941 (55 Stat. 838), by Executive Order No. 9070 of February 24, 1942 (7 F. R. 1529), are consolidated to form a permanent agency of the same name. Such Agency shall have the officers and constituent units hereinafter provided for, and shall be administered according to the provisions of this plan.

SEC. 502. National Housing Administrator: The head of the National Housing Agency shall be known as the National Housing Administrator (referred to herein as the Administrator). He shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and receive a salary at the rate of $10,000 per annum unless the Congress shall otherwise provide.

SEC. 503. Deputy National Housing Administrator: The Administrator may appoint a Deputy National Housing Administrator under the classified civil service. Such deputy shall receive a salary at the rate of $10,000 per annum, shall act for the Administrator in his absence or disability, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Administrator, unless the President shall otherwise direct, and shall perform such other duties as the Administrator may designate.

SEC. 504. Constituent units: (a) The constituent units of the National Housing Agency shall be as follows:

(1) The Federal Home Loan Bank Administration with a Federal Home Loan Bank Commissioner who shall be the head thereof.

(2) The Federal Housing Administration with a Federal Housing Commissioner who shall be the head thereof.

(3) The Federal Public Housing Authority, which shall succeed to the corporate status of the United States Housing Authority, with a Federal Public Housing Commissioner who shall be the head thereof.

(b) Each such Commissioner shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and receive a salary at the rate of $10,000 per annum.

SEC. 505. Functions of constituent units: (a) The following functions shall be administered by the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration:

(1) The functions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and its members under the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended.

(2) The functions of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation under title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended.

(3) The functions of the Board of Directors of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation under the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended.

(b) The functions of the Federal Housing Administrator under the National Housing Act, as amended, shall be administered by the Federal Housing Administration.

(c) The following functions shall be administered by the Federal Public Housing Authority:

(1) The functions of the Administrator of the United States Housing Authority under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and under title II of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), as amended.

(2) The functions created or authorized by titles I and III, section 401, and title V of the act of October 14, 1910 (54 Stat. 1125), as amended.

(3) The functions of the War and Navy Departments with respect to defense or war housing (except that located on military or naval reservations, posts, or bases) under the act of September 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 872), as amended.

(4) The functions of all agencies designated to provide temporary shelter in defense areas under the acts of March 1, 1941; May 24, 1941, and December 17, 1941 (55 Stat. 14, 55 Stat. 197, and 55 Stat. 810, respectively), insofar as such functions relate to such temporary shelter.

(5) The functions of the Federal Loan Administrator with respect to the Defense Homes Corporation (which Corporation shall continue to be an agency of the United States until its liquidation is completed and shall be administered by the Federal Public Housing Commissioner, who shall receive and hold the capital stock of said Corporation on behalf of the United States of America).

(6) The functions of the Farm Security Administration with respect to housing projects which said Administration has determined are for families not deriving their principal income from operating or working on a farm.

(d) The functions to be administered by the constitutent units under this section shall be deemed to be vested in the respective Commissioners, and in the administration thereof the Commissioners shall be subject to the authority of the Administrator.

(e) The provisions of this section shall be subject in all respects to the provisions of section 506 of this plan.

SEC. 506. Functions of the National Housing Administrator: The Administrator shall have the following functions, which shall be performed by him or, subject to his authority under the provisions of this plan, through such officers and employees of the National Housing Agency as he shall designate:

(a) The functions of the Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy Federal Loan Administrator, and the Federal Works Administrator relating to the functions vested in the National Housing Agency or any constitutent unit thereof under this plan.

(b) The conduct of any research or statistical activities relating to any function of the National Housing Agency or any of its constitutent units.

(c) The determination of general policy and the making of findings with respect to the need for housing and termination of such need under titles I and III, section 401, and title V of the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1125), as amended, the act of September 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 872), as amended (except as to housing located on military or naval reservations, posts, or bases), and the acts of March 1, 1941, May 24, 1941, and December 17, 1941 (55 Stat. 14, 55 Stat. 197, and 55 Stat. 810, respectively).

(d) The responsibility of assuring consistent execution of policy as outlined by law with respect to the program of the National Housing Agency and the constituent units thereof and of devising and applying methods and practices conducive to a unified housing program.

(e) General superintendence, direction, coordination, and control of the affairs of the National Housing Agency and its constituent units; the promulgation of such rules and regulations as the Administrator deems necessary to carry out his responsibilities under the provisions of this plan; and the review and approval, to such extent as he deems necessary, of the rules and regulations made by the Commissioners.

(f) The duty of transmitting to the Congress the annual reports of operations and activities prepared by the Commissioners as required by the second sentence of section 20 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, sections 5, 402 (f), and 406 (e) of the National Housing Act, as amended, and section 7 (b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, together with such report of the programs and activities of the National Housing Agency as may be appropriate.

SEC. 507. Agencies abolished: (a) The following agencies are abolished:

(1) The office of Federal Housing Administrator.

(2) The Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the offices of the members thereof.

(3) The Board of Trustees of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the offices of the members thereof.

(4) The Board of Directors of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the offices of the members thereof.

(5) The office of Administrator of the United States Housing Authority.

(b) The United States Housing Corporation created pursuant to acts of May 16, 1918 (40 Stat. 550), and June 4, 1918 (40 Stat. 595), shall be dissolved and abolished.

(c) The Federal Home Loan Bank Commissioner shall, subject to the authority of the Administrator as defined in this plan, wind up the outstanding affairs of the United States Housing Corporation.

SEC. 508. Interim appointments: Pending the initial appointment hereunder of any officer provided for in this part, the functions of such officer shall be temporarily performed by such officer of the existing National Housing Agency as may be designated by the President.

PART VI. FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

SECTION 601. Credit union functions: The functions of the Farm Credit Administration and the Governor thereof under the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, together with the functions of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect thereto, are transferred to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

PART VII. RECORDS, PROPERTY, PERSONNEL, AND FUNDS

SECTION 701. Transfer of records, property, personnel, and funds: Except as otherwise provided in sections 702 and 703 of this plan, there are transferred to the respective agencies in which functions are vested pursuant to the provisions of this plan, to be used, employed, and expended in connection with such functions, respectively, or in connection with winding up the outstanding affairs of agencies abolished by this plan, (1) the records and property now being used or held in connection with such functions, (2) the personnel employed in connection with such functions, and (3) the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available or to be made available for use in connection with such functions. In the case of the National Housing Agency established by part V of this plan, the transfers made under this section shall be made to the office of the Administrator or to the appropriate constituent unit of the Agency, as the case may be.

SEC. 702. Personnel transferred from Office of Inter-American Affairs: The personnel transferred under section 701 from the Office of Inter-American Affairs to the Department of State shall be limited to such of the personnel employed under the said Office as the Secretary of State shall determine to be required by the Department of State by reason of the reorganizations provided for in part I of this plan.

SEC. 703. Disposition of certain affairs of the High Commissioner: Disposition shall be made as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget of the records, property, personnel, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds (available or to be made available) of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands with a view toward (1) the use thereof by the Department of State for the purpose of winding up the affairs of the office of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, (2) the use thereof by the official appointed by the President under section 402 of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in performing the functions vested in the High Commissioner by section 401 of that act, and (3) such other use and disposition thereof as may be in consonance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1945 and other applicable law.

SEC. 704. Disposition of excess personnel: Any of the personnel transferred under this plan which the transferee agency shall find to be in excess of the personnel necessary for the administration of the functions transferred to such agency by such plan shall be retransferred under existing law to other positions in the Government or separated from the service.

SEC. 705. Dispositions by Director of the Bureau of the Budget: Such further measures and dispositions as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine to be necessary in order to effectuate the provisions of this part or in order to wind up the outstanding affairs relating to agencies or functions abolished by this plan shall be carried out in such manner as the Director may direct and by such agencies as he may designate.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1946

(Message from the President of the United States, transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 2, prepared in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Reorganization Act of 1945)

To the Congress of the United States:

The fundamental strength of a nation lies within its people. Military and industrial power are evidences, not the real source of strength. Over the years the prosperity of America and its place in the world will depend on the health, the education, the ingenuity, and the integrity of its people and on their ability to work together and with other nations.

The most basic and at the same time the most difficult task of any country is the conservation and development of its human resources. Under our system of government this is a joint responsibility of the Federal, State, and local governments, but in it the Federal Government has a large and vital role to play. Through its research, advice, stimulation, and financial aid it contributes greatly to progress and to the equalization of standards in the fields of education, health, and welfare; and in the field of social insurance it also directly administers a major segment of the program.

To meet its full responsibilities in these fields, the Federal Government requires efficient machinery for the administration of its social programs. Until 1939 the agencies in charge of these activities were scattered in many parts of the Government. In that year President Roosevelt took the first great step toward effective organization in this area when he submitted Reorganization Plan I, establishing the Federal Security Agency "to promote social and economic security, educational opportunity, and the health of the citizens of the Nation."

The time has now come for further steps to strengthen the machinery of the Federal Government for leadership and service in dealing with the social problems of the country. Several programs closely bound up with the objectives of the Federal Security Agency are still scattered in other parts of the Government. As the next step, I consider it essential to transfer these programs to the Federal Security Agency and to strengthen its internal organization and management.

Broadly stated, the basic purpose of the Federal Security Agency is the conservation and development of the human resources of the Nation. Within that broad objective come the following principal functions: Child care and development, education, health, social insurance, welfare (in the sense of care of the needy and the defective), and recreation (apart from the operation of parks in the public domain).

These functions constitute a natural family of closely related services, interwoven at many points and in many ways. For example, the development of day-care centers for children has involved joint planning and service by specialists of the Children's Bureau, the Office of Education, the Public Health Service, and several other agencies. The schools are both a major consumer of public-health services and a leading vehicle for health education and for disseminating the results of research carried on by the Public Health Service. The promotion of social security involves a whole battery of activities, especially social insurance, public assistance, health, and child welfare.

In order to proceed as promptly as possible with the development of the Federal Security Agency to meet the postwar responsibilities of the Government within its field of activity, I am transmitting herewith Reorganization Plan No. 2, which I have prepared in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Reorganization Act of 1945 (Public Law 263, 79th Cong., 1st sess.), approved December 20, 1945; and I declare that, with respect to each reorganization made in this plan, I have found that such reorganization is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a) of the act—

(1) To factilitate orderly transition from war to peace;

(2) To reduce expenditures and promote economy;

(3) To increase efficiency;

(4) To group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions according to major purposes;

(5) To reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

(6) To eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort. The plan includes certain interagency transfers and several abolitions and changes in the internal organization of the Federal Security Agency.

The plan transfers to the Federal Security Administrator the functions of the Children's Bureau, except those relating to child labor under the Fair Labor Standards Act. These child-labor functions are transferred to the Secretary of Labor in order that they may be performed by, or in close relationship with, the Wage and Hour Division which administers the rest of the act. The plan continues the Children's Bureau within the Federal Security Agency to deal with problems of child life, but is flexible enough to enable the Administrator to gear in the Bureau's programs effectively with other activities of the Agency.

The child-labor program is the only permanent program of the Children's Bureau that is properly a labor function. The other four—child welfare, crippled children, child and maternal health, and research in problems of child life—all fall within the scope of the Federal Security Agency. The transfer of the Children's Bureau will not only close a serious gap in the work of the Agency, but it will strengthen the child-care programs by bringing them into closer association with the health, welfare, and educational activities with which they are inextricably bound up.

The promotion of the education, health, welfare, and social security of the Nation is a vast cooperative undertaking of the Federal, State, and local governments. It involves numerous grants-in-aid programs and complex intergovernmental relations. The transfer of the Children's Bureau will simplify these relations and make for better cooperation.

To illustrate, State welfare departments now depend on both the Bureau of Public Assistance in the Federal Security Agency and the Children's Bureau in the Labor Department for funds for child-care activities. Similarly, State health departments obtain grants from the Public Health Service for general public health work and from the Children's Bureau for child and maternal health activities. All of these grants involve the establishment of minimum standards and a measure of Federal supervision. The transfer of the Children's Bureau programs will make it possible to develop more consistent policies and procedures and to simplify dealings with the States. This will eliminate needless inconvenience for both parties and

enable the State and Federal Governments to join more efficiently in their common objective of furthering the health and welfare of the American child.

Next, the plan transfers the vital statistics functions of the Census Bureau to the Federal Security Administrator, to be performed through the Public Health Service or other facilities of the Federal Security Agency. In every State but one the State health department is in charge of vital statistics. The work in the States is partially financed from public-health grants administered by the Public Health Service. This transfer will make the agency providing the grants also responsible for carrying on the Federal part of the vital statistics program. Furthermore, it will make for a better correlation of vital statistics with morbidity statistics, which are closely connected in nature and are already handled by the Public Health Service. In addition, the Federal Security Agency, more than any other Federal agency in peacetime, depends on vital statistics and vital records in the operation of its programs.

The plan transfers the functions of the United States Employees Compensation Commission to the Federal Security Administrator, and provides for a three-member board of appeals to hear and finally decide appeals on claims of Government employees. By abolishing the Commission, the plan eliminates a small agency and lightens the burden on the President. The Federal Security Administrator, as the head of the Federal agency with the greatest experience in insurance administration, is in the best position to guide and further the program of the Commission.

The abolition of the Commission as an administrative body and the creation of an appeals board will provide the advantages of a single official in charge of operations while affording claimants the protection of a three-member board for the final decision of appeals on claims. This arrangement has proved both administratively efficient and satisfactory to claimants in many similar programs. It is essentially the plan used in the administration of veterans' pensions and old-age and survivors' insurance and employed by many States in their workmen's compensation programs. The board of appeals created by this plan will deal only with claims of Government employees since appeals on other types of claims under the jurisdiction of the Commission—(a) longshoremen and harbor workers and (b) private employees in the District of Columbia—are heard by the Federal district courts rather than the Commission.

The reorganization plan which created the Federal Security Agency in 1939 provided that the Federal Security Administrator should direct and supervise the Social Security Board, and that he might assign administrative duties to the Chairman of the Board, rather than to the Board as a whole. Thus, it took the first step toward establishing a definite line of responsibility for the administration of social security functions in the Agency. The plan I am now submitting further clarifies these lines of responsibility by providing for the normal type of internal organization used in Federal departments and agencies.

A full-time board in charge of a group of bureaus within an agency is at best an anomaly. The Social Security Board rendered an outstanding service in launching the social-security program, and its members deserve the thanks of the Nation for this achievement. That program, however, is now firmly established and its administration needs to be tied in more fully with other programs of the Federal Security Agency. The existence of a department within a department is a serious barrier to effective integration.

In order to obtain more expeditious and effective direction for the social-security program and to further the development of the Federal Security Agency, this plan transfers the functions of the Social Security Board to the Federal Security Administrator and provides for not more than two new assistant heads of the Agency for the administration of the program. Because of the additional functions transferred to the Administrator by this plan, I have found that these officers will be needed to assist him in the general management of the Agency and to head the constituent unit or units which the Administrator will have to establish for the conduct of social-security activities.

To permit a consolidation of work for the blind, the functions of the Office of Education as to the vending-stand program for the blind are transferred to the Federal Security Administrator, in whom are vested other vocational rehabilitation functions. This transfer will permit the program to be assigned to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, where other vocational rehabilitation activities for the blind are now concentrated.

The office of Assistant Commissioner of Education, established by the act of May 26, 1930, is abolished. A basic reorganization of the Office of Education within the past year has made this officer the head of one of the divisions of the Office. It is, therefore, administratively desirable to abolish the post of Assistant Commissioner in conformity with the present organization of the Office.

The plan also abolishes the Federal Board of Vocational Education and its functions. The Board, established by the act of February 23, 1917, as amended, formerly had charge of the administration of the vocational-education program. Section 15 of Executive Order 6166, of June 10, 1933, issued under authority of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 413, ch. 314), as amended, transferred the administration of the program to the Office of Education and limited the Board to acting in an advisory capacity. The Advisory Committee on Education, on the basis of its study of the vocational-education system, found that the Board was no longer needed and recommended its abolition.

To avoid possible confusion and conflict of authority, the Board of Visitors of St. Elizabeths Hospital and its functions are abolished. The functions of the Board, as provided by section 4842 of the Revised Statutes, include supervision of the institution and the adoption of its bylaws, in addition to visiting the institution and advising the superintendent. These functions overlap the responsibilities of the Federal Security Administrator for the general supervision and direction of the hospital.

In order to enable the Administrator more adequately to coordinate the administration of the grant-in-aid programs vested by statute in the constituent units of the Federal Security Agency, the plan provides that, insofar as practicable and consistent with the applicable legislation, he shall establish uniform standards and procedures for these programs and permit States to submit a single plan of operation for related grant-in-aid programs. Most of these programs involve the establishment of certain minimum standards on fiscal, personnel, and other aspects of administration in the States. In many cases the same State agency is operating under two or more grant-in-aid programs. Much needless inconvenience and confusion can be avoided for all concerned by unifying Federal standards and combining State plans for the operation of the programs in such cases.

After careful consideration of a number of other agencies and functions I have refrained from proposing in this plan their transfer to the Federal Security Agency. Most of these involve activities which, though related to the functions of the Federal Security Agency, are incidental to the purpose of other agencies or are connected so closely with such agencies as to make transfer undesirable. A few are activities which should probably be shifted in whole or in part to the Federal Security Agency, but I believe such shifts can best be accomplished by interagency agreement or action in connection with appropriations.

The reorganization plan here presented is a second important step in building a central agency for the administration of Federal activities primarily relating to the conservation and development of human resources; but, while this step is important in itself, I believe that a third step should soon be taken. The time is at hand when that agency should be converted into an executive department.

The size and scope of the Federal Security Agency and the importance of its functions clearly call for departmental status and a permanent place in the President's Cabinet. In number of personnel and volume of expenditures the Agency exceeds several of the existing departments. Much more important, the fundamental character of its functions—education, health, welfare, social insurance—and their significance for the future of the country demand for it the highest level of administrative leadership and a voice in the central councils of the executive branch.

Accordingly, I shall soon recommend to the Congress that legislation be promptly enacted making the Federal Security Agency an executive department, defining its basic purpose, and authorizing the President to transfer to it such units and activities as come within that definition.

The people expect the Federal Government to meet its full responsibilities for the conservation and development of the human resources of the Nation in the years that lie ahead. This reorganization plan and the legislation that I shall propose will provide the broad and firm foundation required for the accomplishment of that objective.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 16, 1946.*

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1946

(Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled, May 16, 1946, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1945, approved December 20, 1945)

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY AND DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

SECTION 1. Children's Bureau: (a) The Children's Bureau in the Department of Labor, exclusive of its Industrial Division, is transferred to the Federal Security Agency. All functions of the Children's Bureau and of the Chief of the Children's Bureau except those transferred by subsection (b) of this section, all functions of the Secretary of Labor under title V of the Social Security Act (49 Stat. 620, ch. 531), as amended, and all other functions of the Secretary of Labor relating to the foregoing functions are transferred to the Federal Security Administrator and shall be performed by him or under his direction and control by such officers and employees of the Federal Security Agency as he shall designate, except that the functions authorized by section 2 of the act of April 9, 1912 (37 Stat. 79, ch. 73), as amended, and such other functions of the Federal Security Agency as the Administrator may designate, shall be administered, under his direction and control, through the Children's Bureau.

(b) The functions of the Children's Bureau and of the Chief of the Children's Bureau under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1060, ch. 676), as amended, are transferred to the Secretary of Labor and shall be performed under his direction and control by such officers and employees of the Department of Labor as he shall designate.

SEC. 2. Vital statistics: The functions of the Secretary of Commerce, the Bureau of

the Census, and the Director of the Bureau of the Census, with respect to vital statistics (including statistics on births, deaths, marriages, divorces, and annulments), are transferred to the Federal Security Administrator and shall be performed under his direction and control by the United States Public Health Service or by such officers and employees of the Federal Security Agency as the Administrator shall designate.

SEC. 3. United States Employees' Compensation Commission: The functions of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission are transferred to the Federal Security Agency and shall be performed in such manner and under such rules and regulations as the Federal Security Administrator shall prescribe. Such regulations shall provide for a board of three persons to be designated or appointed by the Federal Security Administrator with authority to hear and, subject to applicable law, make final decision on appeals taken from determinations and awards with respect to claims of employees of the Federal Government or of the District of Columbia. The United States Employees' Compensation Commission is abolished.

SEC. 4. Social Security Board: The functions of the Social Security Board in the Federal Security Agency, together with the functions of its Chairman, are transferred to the Federal Security Administrator and shall be performed by him or under his direction and control by such officers and employees of the Federal Security Agency as he shall designate. The Social Security Board is abolished.

SEC. 5. Assistant heads of Federal Security Agency: In addition to the existing Assistant Federal Security Administrator there shall be not to exceed two assistant heads of the Federal Security Agency, each of whom shall be appointed by the Federal Security Administrator under the classified civil service, receive a salary at the rate of $10,000 per annum, and perform such duties and head such constituent unit of the Federal Security Agency as the Administrator may provide.

SEC. 6. Functions under act of June 20, 1936, with respect to the blind: The functions of the Office of Education and of the Commissioner of Education under the act of June 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1559, ch. 638), are transferred to the Federal Security Administrator and shall be performed under his direction and control by such officers and employees of the Federal Security Agency as he shall designate.

SEC. 7. Assistant Commissioner of Education: The functions of the Assistant Commissioner of Education, created by the act of May 26, 1930 (46 Stat. 384, ch. 330), are transferred to the Office of Education to be performed under the direction and control of the Commissioner of Education by such officers or employees of the Office as he may designate with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator. The Office of Assistant Commissioner of Education is abolished.

SEC. 8. Federal Board for Vocational Education: The Federal Board for Vocational Education and its functions are abolished.

SEC. 9. Board of Visitors of St. Elizabeths Hospital: The Board of Visitors of St. Elizabeths Hospital and its functions are abolished.

SEC. 10. Coordination of grant-in-aid programs: In order to coordinate more fully the administration of grant-in-aid programs by officers and constituent units of the Federal Security Agency, the Federal Security Administrator shall establish, insofar as practicable, (a) uniform standards and procedures relating to fiscal, personnel, and the other requirements common to two or more such programs, and (b) standards and procedures under which a State agency participating in more than one such program may submit a single plan of operation and be subject to a single Federal fiscal and administrative review of its operation.

SEC. 11. Winding up of affairs: Suitable measures shall be taken by the Federal Security Administrator to wind up those outstanding affairs of the agencies herein abolished which are not otherwise disposed of by this plan.

SEC. 12. Transfer of personnel, property, records, and funds: The personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds (available or to be made available), which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine to relate primarily to the functions transferred hereunder, are transferred to the respective agencies concerned for use in the administration of the functions so transferred, except that all of the personnel, property, records, and funds of the Industrial Division of the Children's Bureau shall be transferred to such agency or agencies of the Department of Labor as the Secretary of Labor shall designate. Any of the personnel transferred under this plan which the transferee agency shall find to be in excess of the personnel necessary for the administration of the functions transferred to such agency shall be retransferred under existing law to other positions in the Government or separated from the service.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1946

(Message from the President of the United States, transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946, prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1945)

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946, prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1945.

The plan contains reorganizations affecting a number of departments and establishments. Some continue on a permanent basis changes made by Executive order under authority of the First War Powers Act. A few make adjustments in the distribution of functions among agencies. The remainder deal with problems of organization within individual agencies. All are concerned with improving and simplifying particular phases of Government administration.

Each proposal is explained in more detail under the appropriate heading below.

I have found, after investigation, that each reorganization contained in the plan is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1945.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The functions of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation were transferred from the Department of Commerce to the Coast Guard and the Bureau of Customs in 1942 by Executive order under the First War Powers Act. This arrangement has been proved successful by the experience of the past 4 years. Part I of the reorganization plan continues the arrangement on a permanent basis.

United States Coast Guard

The principal functions of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation were those of the inspection of vessels and their equipment, the licensing and certificating of officers and seamen, and related functions designed to safeguard the safety of life and property at sea. Thus these functions are related to the regular activities and general purposes of the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard administered them successfully during the tremendous expansion of wartime shipping, by virtue of improvements in organization and program, many of which ought to be continued.

The plan also transfers to the Coast Guard the functions of the collectors of customs relating to the award of numbers to undocumented vessels. These functions, too, were temporarily transferred to the Coast Guard in 1942.

Bureau of Customs

The plan transfers to the Commissioner of Customs the functions of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and the Secretary of Commerce, relating to the documentation of vessels, measurement of vessels, administration of tonnage tax and tolls, entry and clearance of vessels and aircraft, regulation of coastwise trade and fisheries, recording of conveyances and mortgages of vessels, and protection of steerage passengers. These functions have always been performed at the ports by the customs service, although legal responsibility for their supervision was vested in the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and the Secretary of Commerce until transferred temporarily to the Commissioner of Customs under the wartime reorganization power.

The proposed transfer will permit more efficient administration by ending divided responsibility.

DEPARTMENT OF WAR AND DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Functions with respect to certain insane persons

Prior to World War I practically all mental patients for whom the Federal Government was legally obligated to provide hospital care and treatment, including personnel of the armed forces, were hospitalized in St. Elizabeths Hospital, Washington, D. C. In addition, this hospital served as the mental hospital for the District of Columbia Government. Following World War I, the responsibility for hospital care of mentall ill war veterans was assigned to the Veterans' Administration. Somewhat later, specialized hospital facilities were provided by the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice to enable that agency to care for prisoners suffering from mental disorders.

With the growth in the population of the District of Columbia and the wartime expansion of the armed forces, the facilities of St. Elizabeths Hospital became inadequate. The War Department therefore established its own mental hospitals at the outset of World War II. Furthermore it became necessary a year ago for the Navy Department to discontinue the use of St. Elizabeths and to assume the responsibility for the care of its mental patients.

Since the return of the Coast Guard to the Treasury Department, the Public Health Service now provides care in its mental hospitals for personnel of the Coast Guard in accordance with the basic responsibility delegated to it in the Public Health Service Code enacted in 1944. The plan abolishes the functions of St. Elizabeths Hospital with respect to insane persons belonging to the Coast Guard which are provided for by section 4843 of the Revised Statutes (24 U. S. C. 191).

Responsibility for the care of mental patients has been allocated on the basis of the four broad categories of beneficiaries, namely, (1) veterans, to be cared for by the Veterans' Administration; (2) military and naval personnel, to be cared for by the War and Navy Departments; (3) prisoners, for whom the Department of Justice will be responsible; and (4) other civilians, to be cared for by the Federal Security Agency. The reorganization plan, in order to carry out this policy, provides for the transfer or abolition of certain functions and legal responsibilities now resting with the Federal Security Administrator and Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital.

NAVY DEPARTMENT

Hydrographic Office and Naval Observatory

The plan transfers the Hydrographic Office and the Naval Observatory from the Bureau of Naval Personnel to the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations. The plan would confirm and make permanent the action taken

in 1942 by Executive Order No. 9126 under the First War Powers Act.

The functions performed by both the Hydrographic Office and the Naval Observatory relate primarily to operational matters and thus are more appropriately placed in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations than in the Bureau of Naval Personnel. This fact was recognized in the realinement of naval functions at the outbreak of the war. The plan merely confirms an organizational relationship which has existed successfully for the past 4 years.

Supply Department of the United States Marine Corps

The plan consolidates the Paymaster's Department and the Quartermaster's Department of the United States Marine Corps into a single Supply Department. This consolidation will establish in the Marine Corps an integrated supply organization which parallels that of the Navy Department's Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

The consolidation will make possible a more efficient and more economical organization of the companion functions of supply and disbursement, eliminating the present handling of related items by two separate departments of the Corps.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Franklin D. Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park

At the present time, the National Park Service, the Public Buildings Administration, and the Archivist of the United States all perform housekeeping functions at the Franklin D. Roosevelt library and home at Hyde Park. The plan unifies in the National Park Service responsibility for activities of this character at Hyde Park—that is, the maintenance and protection of buildings and grounds, the collection of fees, and the handling of traffic and visitors. Because of its wide experience in the administration of historic sites, the National Park Service is the logical agency to assume the combined functions.

Transfer of these functions does not affect the responsibility of the Archivist for the contents and professional services of the library proper. It also does not affect the present disposition of the receipts, which is provided by law.

Functions relating to mineral deposits in certain lands

The plan transfers to the Department of the Interior jurisdiction over mineral deposits on lands held by the Department of Agriculture.

The Department of the Interior now administers the mining and mineral leasing laws on various areas of the public lands, including those national forests established on parts of the original public domain. The Department of Agriculture, on the other hand, has jurisdiction with respect to mineral deposits on (1) forest lands acquired under the Weeks Act, (2) lands acquired by the Department as a part of the Government's effort to retire submarginal lands.

Accordingly this reorganization plan provides that these mineral deposits on lands of the Department of Agriculture will be administered by the Department of the Interior, which already has the bulk of the Federal Government's mineral leasing program.

The plan further provides that the administration of mineral leasing on these lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture will be carried on subject to limitations necessary to protect the surface uses for which these lands were primarily acquired.

Bureau of land management

The plan consolidates the General Land Office and the Grazing Service of the Department of the Interior into a Bureau of Land Management.

The General Land Office and the Grazing Service now divide responsibility for the major portion of the multiple-use federally owned lands now held by the Department of the Interior. The lands under jurisdiction of the two agencies are comparable in character and in use. In some functions the two agencies employ the same type of personnel and use the same techniques. Other functions are divided between the agencies, so that both are engaged in management of various aspects of the same land. Consolidating these two agencies will permit the development of uniform policies and the integration of two organizations whose responsibilities now overlap.

Integration of the activities of the two agencies will make possible greater utilization and thus more economic use of expert skills. The same practical experience embraced in range administration on public lands in grazing districts will be available for public lands outside the districts.

Utilization of lands within grazing districts for nongrazng purposes will be subject to only one classification examination, rather than dual examination as is now necessary. Economy will be possible in the construction of range improvements, wherever feasible, to serve lands both in and out of districts. Legal procedures, such as adjudication of issues relating to licenses and leases, hearings on appeal from administrative decisions, and the processing of trespass cases will benefit from unified administration and handling.

In such activities as fire protection, soil and moisture conservation, management of public lands under agreement with other agencies (e. g., Bureau of Reclamation), range surveys, maintenance and improvement of stock driveways, and stabilization of range use on all public domain, the benefits of consolidation will become increasingly apparent. Further, records relating to grazing lands can be concentrated in fewer field offices and hence administered more effectively.

While the establishment of a new Bureau of Land Management under a Director involves the abolition of the Commissioner and Assistant Commissioners of the General Land Office, the Director and Assistant Directors of Grazing, the registers of district land offices, and the United States Supervisor of Surveys, the statutory functions now discharged by these officers are in no way modified. This plan will place final responsibility for these functions in the Secretary of the Interior and make him responsible for their performance in coordination with the other land activities of his Department. Officers whose offices are specifically abolished, but whose experience will make them valuable to the Department, should be available for appointment in the new Bureau.

I have found and declare that by reason of the reorganization made by the plan the responsibilities and duties of the Bureau of Land Management are of such nature as to require the inclusion in the plan of provisions for the appointment and compensation of a Director, an Associate Director, and Assistant Directors.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Functions of certain agencies of the Department of Agriculture

To enable the Department of Agriculture to meet its responsibilities for food production and distribution during the war, there was early and continuing coordination of its programs directly concerned with these phases of the food problem. Beginning with Executive Order No. 9069 of February 23, 1942, those programs and agencies dealing with food production and distribution were gradually consolidated by a series of Executive orders issued under the authority of the First War Powers Act. By Executive Order No. 9334 of April 19, 1943, they were all grouped into a War Food Administration, under a War Food Administrator.

When the fighting was drawing to a close and the emergency purposes of the War Food Administration had been largely accomplished, this Administration was terminated by Executive Order No. 9577 of June 29, 1945, and its functions and agencies were transferred back to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture. Executive Order No. 9577 also authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to organize and administer the transferred functions and agencies in the manner which he deemed best.

Under this authority the Secretary established the Production and Marketing Administration in August 1945. Into this Administration he consolidated the functions of many of the production and marketing agencies which were transferred back from the War Food Administration. Included were the functions of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and the Surplus Marketing Administration and the administration of the programs of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation and the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The plan transfers these functions to the Secretary of Agriculture, in order to permit him to continue the consolidation already effected in the Production and Marketing Administration. This provision makes it possible to maintain the close coordination and integration of food-production and distribution programs, with the resulting benefits that were achieved during the war. It also provides the Secretary with the necessary flexibility to make adjustments in the coordination and administration of these programs to meet changing conditions and new problems, a flexibility which he particularly needs at this period of acute food shortages throughout the world.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Certain functions of National Bureau of Standards

The plan transfers the functions of two divisions of the National Bureau of Standards in the Department of Commerce, namely, the Division of Simplified Trade Practices and the Division of Commercial Standards, to the Secretary of Commerce. The transfer will permit the Secretary to reassign these functions to the Office of Domestic Commerce, which is the focal point of the department's general service functions for American business.

These two divisions were established as a result of the standardization work initiated in World War I. Both divisions have followed the same basic procedure of assisting the producers and the consumers of particular products to agree among themselves on certain standards or on a certain limited number of varieties. Each such voluntary agreement is then published by the National Bureau of Standards and, although not compulsory, has tended to become the generally accepted practice in the trade.

Standardization again proved to be an important device for accelerating production in World War II, and industry has shown renewed interest in continuing these wartime conservation and rationalization programs on a voluntary basis in the production of peacetime products.

The desirability of the proposed transfer was emphasized only a few months ago by the report of a committee of prominent businessmen appointed by the Secretary of Commerce to review the entire question of the Government's activities in this field. These studies indicate that two major benefits will result from the transfer.

First, the association of the two divisions with the National Bureau of Standards has perhaps tended to give the impression in some quarters that voluntary standards and trade practices worked out by industry with the help of these two divisions are in some sense Government standards which are en-

forced on the basis of scientific and objective tests. The transfer of these two divisions to the Department proper would reduce any such misconceptions, and make it clear that these standards and simplified practices are voluntary industry agreements in the making of which the Government acts merely in an advisory capacity.

Second, the other general services of the department to American business, such as marketing, management, and economic and statistical services, are now concentrated in the Office of Domestic Commerce. The association of these two divisions with these other services to business will facilitate their work and enable them to make use of the wide industrial and business contacts of the Office of Domestic Commerce.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Strike ballots under the War Labor Disputes Act

The plan abolishes the function of conducting strike ballots which was vested in the National Labor Relations Board by section 8 of the War Labor Disputes Act (57 Stat. 167, ch. 144). Experience indicates that such elections under the act do not serve to reduce the number of strikes and may even aggravate labor difficulties. The Congress has already forbidden the Board to expend any of its appropriations for the current fiscal year for this activity (First Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1946). I believe that the function should now be permanently abolished.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Canal Zone Biological Area

The plan transfers responsibility for the Canal Zone Biological Area to the Smithsonian Institution. At present the Canal Zone Biological Area is an independent agency of the Government, having as its function the administration of Barro Colorado Island in Gatun Lake as a tropical wildlife preserve and research laboratory. The Board of Directors of this agency consists of the President of the National Academy of Sciences as Chairman, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, three members of the Cabinet—the Secretaries of War, Interior, and Agriculture—and three biologists.

The transfer will locate this function with comparable and related functions already assigned to the Smithsonian Institution, whose staff members have participated since the beginning in developing the island as a research center. It will relieve three Cabinet members of routine duties not important enough to warrant their personal attention.

Under its existing authority the Smithsonian Institution may constitute an advisory board of biologists and departmental representatives if it finds such action necessary.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Placement functions under Selective Training and Service Act of 1940

The plan transfers to the United States Employment Service the functions of the Selective Service System and its Director with respect to assisting ex-servicemen in obtaining new positions. These functions directly overlap the regular placement activities of the United States Employment Service, which is required to provide a special placement service for veterans both by its basic act and by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. The transfer is in line with the policy of the Congress on the placement of veterans as most recently expressed in the 1944 act. The shift will prevent needless duplication of personnel and facilities and will assure the best service to veterans.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 16, 1946.*

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1946

(Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled, May 16, 1946, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1945, approved December 20, 1945)

PART I. DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

SECTION 101. Functions transferred to the United States Coast Guard: (a) There are hereby transferred to the Commandant of the Coast Guard those functions of the bureau, offices, and boards specified in the first sentence of section 104 of this plan, and of the Secretary of Commerce, which pertain to approval of plans for the construction, repair, and alteration of vessels; approval of materials, equipment, and appliances; classification of vessels; inspection of vessels and their equipment and appliances; issuance of certificates of inspection, and of permits indicating the approval of vessels for operations which may be hazardous to life or property; administration of load-line requirements; enforcement of other provisions for the safety of life and property on vessels; licensing and certificating of officers, pilots, and seamen; suspension and revocation of licenses and certificates; investigation of marine casualties; enforcement of manning requirements, citizenship requirements, and requirements for the mustering and drilling of crews, control of logbooks; shipment, discharge, protection, and welfare of merchant seamen; enforcement of duties of shipowners and officers after accidents; promulgation and enforcement of rules for lights, signals, speed, steering, sailing, passing, anchorage, movement, and towlines of vessels and lights and signals on bridges; numbering of undocumented vessels; prescription and enforcement of regulations for outfitting and operation of motorboats; licensing of motorboat operators; regulation of regattas and marine parades; all other functions of such bureau, offices, and boards which are not specified in section 102 of this plan; and all other functions of the Secretary of Commerce pertaining to those functions of the agencies abolished under section 104 of this plan which are not specified in section 102 of this plan, including the remission and mitigation of fines, penalties, and forfeitures incurred under the laws governing these functions and those incurred under the act of December 17, 1941 (55 Stat. 808), as amended.

(b) The functions relating to the award of numbers to undocumented vessels vested by law in the collectors of customs are hereby transferred to the Commandant of the Coast Guard.

SEC. 102. Functions transferred to Bureau of Customs: There are hereby transferred to the Commissioner of Customs those functions of the bureau, offices, and boards specified in the first sentence of section 104 of this plan, and of the Secretary of Commerce, which pertain to registry, enrollment, and licensing of vessels, including the issuance of commissions to yachts, the assignment of signal letters, and the preparation of all reports and publications in connection therewith; measurement of vessels, administration of tonnage duties, and collection of tolls; entry and clearance of vessels and aircraft, regulation of vessels in the coasting and fishing trades, and limitation of the use of foreign vessels in waters under the jurisdiction of the United States; recording of sales, conveyances, and mortgages of vessels; protection of steerage passengers; all other functions of such bureau, offices, and boards which were performed by the Bureau of Customs on behalf thereof immediately prior to the effective date of Executive Order No. 9083 of February 28, 1942 (F. R. 1609); and the power to remit and mitigate fines, penalties, and forfeitures incurred under the laws governing these functions.

SEC. 103. Powers of the Secretary of the Treasury: The functions transferred by sections 101 and 102 of this plan may be performed through such officers and employees of the United States Coast Guard and the Bureau of Customs, respectively, as may be designated by the Commandant of the Coast Guard and the Commissioner of Customs, respectively, and shall be performed subject to the direction and control of the Secretary of the Treasury except as otherwise required by law with respect to the United States Coast Guard whenever it operates as a part of the Navy.

SEC. 104. Abolition of agencies: The Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, the office of the director thereof, the offices of supervising inspectors, principal traveling inspectors, local inspectors, assistant inspectors, shipping commissioners, deputy shipping commissioners, and the board of supervising inspectors, the boards of local inspectors, the marine casualty investigation board, and the marine boards are hereby abolished. The Secretary of the Treasury shall provide for winding up those affairs of the said abolished agencies which are not otherwise disposed of herein.

PART II. DEPARTMENT OF WAR AND DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

SECTION 201. Functions with respect to certain insane persons: (a) The functions of St. Elizabeths Hospital and the Superintendent thereof, and of the Federal Security Agency and the Federal Security Administrator, with respect to the care, treatment, and custody of insane persons, as provided in section 4843 of the Revised Statutes (24 U. S. C. 191), are hereby transferred or abolished as follows:

(1) Functions with respect to insane persons belonging to the Army or falling, by reason of employment or service in the Army, within any of the categories enumerated in said section, are transferred to the Secretary of War and shall be performed by the Secretary or, subject to his direction and control, by such officers and agencies of the Department of War as he may designate.

(2) Functions with respect to insane persons belonging to the Navy or falling, by reason of prior service in the Navy, within any of the categories enumerated in said section, are transferred to the Secretary of the Navy and shall be performed by the Secretary or, subject to his direction and control, by such officers and agencies of the Department of the Navy as he may designate. (For the purposes of this subparagraph (2), the Marine Corps but not the Coast Guard is included in the Navy.)

(3) Functions with respect to insane persons belonging to the Coast Guard are abolished.

(b) Nothing in subsection (a) of this section shall affect the functions and authority of St. Elizabeths Hospital, the Superintendent thereof, the Federal Security Agency, or the Federal Security Administrator, with respect to any person heretofore admitted to St. Elizabeths Hospital and a patient therein on the effective date of this plan under the provisions of section 4843 of the Revised Statutes, or the functions and authority of said officers and agencies or of the Public Health Service with respect to Coast Guard members as beneficiaries of the Public Health Service, as provided by section 504 of the Public Health Service Act (58 Stat. 710, 42 U. S. C. 222).

PART III. DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

SECTION 301. Hydrographic Office and Naval Observatory: The Hydrographic Office and the Naval Observatory, together with their respective functions, are hereby transferred

from the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Department of the Navy, to the Chief of Naval Operations, and shall be administered, subject to the direction and control of the Secretary of the Navy, under the Chief of Naval Operations.

SEC. 302. Supply Department of the United States Marine Corps: The Paymaster's Department of the United States Marine Corps and the Quartermaster's Department of the United States Marine Corps, and the functions of such departments, are hereby consolidated to form a single new agency, which shall be known as the Supply Department of the United States Marine Corps, and at the head of which there shall be the Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps. The office and title of "the Paymaster General of the Marine Corps," provided for in the act of March 24, 1944 (58 Stat. 121), are hereby abolished.

PART IV. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SECTION 401. Certain functions with respect to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library: The folowing functions are hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Interior and shall be performed, subject to his direction and control, by such officers and agencies of the Department of the Interior as he may designate:

(a) The functions of the Commissioner of Public Buildings, under section 208 of the act of July 18, 1939 (53 Stat. 1062), with respect to the care, maintenance, and protection of the buildings and grounds of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.

(b) The functions of the Archivist of the United States, under section 207 of the said act, with respect to the collection of fees from persons visiting and viewing the exhibit rooms or museum portion of said library, excluding the fixing of charges to be collected but including the making of all other regulations with respect to such collection. (Any funds derived from such fees shall be paid, held, administered, and expended in consonance with the proviso in said sec. 207.)

SEC. 402. Functions relating to mineral deposits in certain lands: The functions of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture with respect to the uses of mineral deposits in certain lands pursuant to the provisions of the act of March 4, 1917 (39 Stat. 1134, 1150, 16 U. S. C. 520), title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 195, 200, 202, 205, 40 U. S. C. 401, 403 (a) and 408), the 1935 Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of April 8, 1935 (48 Stat. 115, 118), section 55 of title I of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 750, 781), and the act of July 22, 1937 (50 Stat. 522, 525, 530), as amended July 28, 1942 (56 Stat. 725, 7 U. S. C. 1011 (c) and 1018), are hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Interior and shall be performed by him or, subject to his direction and control, by such officers and agencies of the Department of the Interior as he may designate: *Provided*, That mineral development on such lands shall be authorized by the Secretary of the Interior only when he is advised by the Secretary of Agriculture that such development will not interfere with the primary purposes for which the land was acquired and only in accordance with such conditions as may be specified by the Secretary of Agriculture in order to protect such purposes. The provisions of law governing the crediting and distribution of revenues derived from the said lands shall be applicable to revenues derived in connection with the functions transferred by this section. To the extent necessary in connection with the performance of the functions transferred by this section, the Secretary of the Interior and his representatives shall have access to the title records of the Department of Agriculture relating to the lands affected by this section.

SEC. 403. Bureau of Land Management: (a) The functions of the General Land Office and of the Grazing Service in the Department of the Interior are hereby consolidated to form a new agency in the Department of the Interior to be known as the Bureau of Land Management. The functions of the other agencies named in subsection (d) of this section are hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) There shall be at the head of such Bureau a Director of the Bureau of Land Management, who shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior under the classified civil service, who shall receive a salary at the rate of $10,000 per annum, and who shall perform such duties as the Secretary of the Interior shall designate.

(c) There shall be in the Bureau of Land Management an Associate Director of the Bureau of Land Management and so many Assistant Directors of the Bureau of Land Management as may be necessary, who shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior under the classified civil service and subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and who shall perform such duties as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

(d) The General Land Office, the Grazing Service, the offices of Commissioner of the General Land Office, Assistant Commissioner of the General Land Office, Director of the Grazing Service, all Assistant Directors of the Grazing Service, all registers of the district land offices, and United States Supervisor of Surveys, together with the Field Surveying Service, now known as the Cadastral Engineering Service, are hereby abolished.

(e) The Bureau of Land Management and its functions shall be administered subject to the direction and control of the Secretary of the Interior, and the functions transferred to the Secretary by subsection (a) of this section shall be performed by the Secretary or, subject to his direction and control, by such officers and agencies of the Department of the Interior as he may designate.

PART V. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SECTION 501. Functions of certain agencies of the Department of Agriculture: The following functions are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture and shall be performed by him or, subject to his discretion and control, by such officers and agencies of the Department of Agriculture as he shall designate:

(a) All functions of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and the Surplus Marketing Administration and of the respective heads of such Administrations.

(b) The administration of the programs of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation and the Commodity Credit Corporation.

PART VI. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

SECTION 601. Certain functions of National Bureau of Standards: The following functions are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Commerce and shall be performed, subject to his direction and control, by such officers and agencies of the Department of Commerce as he may designate:

(a) Those functions of the National Bureau of Standards under section 2 of the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), which are now performed by the Division of Commercial Standards of said Bureau, namely, (1) to assist, coordinate, and cooperate with groups of consumers, distributors or producers, technical organizations, and other persons, in the voluntary establishment, maintenance, recording, publishing, and promoting of commercial standards as a nationality and internationally recognized basis for testing, grading, labeling, marketing, guaranteeing, or accepting staple, manufactured commodities moving in daily domestic and foreign trade; and (2) to assist in the development of Federal purchase standards specifications and in providing information to the public and the Government of such standards and specifications.

(b) Those functions of said Bureau under said section 2 which are now performed by the Division of Simplified Trade and Practices of said Bureau, namely, to assist, coordinate, and cooperate with individuals and groups of producers, distributors, and users in establishing, recording, publishing, and promoting a Nation-wide program for the elimination of avoidable waste through the formulation of simplified trade practice recommendations which identify and list the sizes, types, dimensions, and varieties of products that are in national demand in the country, including but not limited to simplified trade-practice recommendations concerning the following commodities: Wood, textiles, paper and rubber products, metal and mechanical products, containers and miscellaneous products, materials handling equipment, ceramic products, electrical products, construction materials, and metal and woodworking tools.

(c) So much of the functions of the Director of said Bureau as relates to the foregoing activities.

PART VII. NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

SECTION 701. Strike ballots under War Labor Disputes Act: The functions of the National Labor Relations Board under section 8 of the War Labor Disputes Act (57 Stat. 162, 167, ch. 144) with respect to taking secret ballots of employees on the question of an interruption of war production are hereby abolished.

PART VIII. SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SECTION 801. Canal Zone Biological Area: The functions of the Board of Directors of the Canal Zone Biological Area (which Board is provided for in the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 724, ch. 516)), together with the functions of the executive officer of such Board, are hereby transferred to the Smithsonian Institution. The said Board of Directors and the office of the said executive officer are hereby abolished.

PART IX. UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

SECTION 901. Placement functions under Selective Training and Service Act of 1940: There is hereby transferred to the United States Employment Service so much of the functions of the Selective Service System and of the Director of Selective Service under section 8 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 890, ch. 720) as relates to aiding persons who have satisfactorily completed any period of active duty or of training and service under the said act in securing positions other than the positions held by them prior to said period.

PART X. RECORDS, PROPERTY, PERSONNEL, AND FUNDS

SECTION 1001. Transfer of records, property, personnel, and funds: There are hereby transferred to the respective agencies in which functions are vested pursuant to the provisions of this plan, to be used, employed, and expended in connection with such functions, respectively, or in connection with winding up the outstanding affairs of agencies abolished by this plan, (1) the records and property now being used or held in connection with such functions, (2) the personnel employed in connection with such functions, and (3) the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available or to be made available for use in connection with such functions.

SEC. 1002. Disposition of excess personnel: Any of the personnel transferred under this plan which the transferee agency shall find to be in excess of the personnel necessary for the administration of the functions transferred to such agency by such plan shall be retransferred under existing law to other positions in the Government or separated from the service.

SEC. 1003. Dispositions by Director of the Bureau of the Budget: Such further measures and dispositions as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine to be necessary in order to effectuate the provisions of this part or in order to wind up the out-

standing affairs relating to agencies or functions abolished by this plan shall be carried out in such manner as the Director may direct and by such agencies as he may designate.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Which plan will we take up first; No. 1?

Mr. PITTENGER. I intend to make some comment on all three of them. I can comment on plan No. 1 first. I wanted to make a general statement ahead of that, if the committte will bear with me.

The first thing I want to say is that I am supporting these House concurrent resolutions. I want to see them passed and I am opposed to plans 1, 2, and 3, submitted by the President, but I have not undertaken to act as a liaison officer between the witnesses and the chairman of the committee.

I understand that the clerk of the committee is taking care of the matter of people who want to be heard, either for my House concurrent resolutions, or against them. I make that statement so my office will not take the responsibility for looking after those details.

The reorganization proposition is nothing new to me, Mr. Chairman. Last year I made some remarks and they appear in the RECORD in which I stated that I was in favor of giving the President authority to consolidate bureaus, so as to eliminate those not needed and where two bureaus were doing the same line of work, to eliminate one of them and let the other one do the work and save the taxpayers some money and contribute to the efficiency of government.

I think I have during my service in Congress supported all reorganization plans and have seen nearly all of them not work out so well. I will not designate the date but I have a clear recollection of the first one when it came on the floor of the House of Representatives under an open rule, a reorganization piece of legislation, and by the time we finished adopting amendments so as to exempt different Government bureaus and departments, there were none left to consolidate that anybody cared much about. That was rather interesting to me as one of the newcomers in Congress.

Later on there were reorganization plans, and without going into the question as to how good or bad they might have been, I never saw anything accomplished in the way of the purpose of the reorganization and consolidation plan, namely to eliminate the number of bureaus, to eliminate unnecessary Federal expenditures, and those are the ideas that I have had in mind in my support of these measures.

Therefore, when I come opposing the plans which the President has submitted I come not because I do not believe there is any need for reorganization, because I think there is.

The war has developed a lot of wartime agencies. They were all developed with a solemn promise that they would only last during the war and if there ever was a time when we need reorganization, I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that this is the time.

My examination is not completed of all these plans, I have not memorized the different things they purport to do or undo in connection with plans 1, 2, and 3, but it has progressed far enough so that I can state to this committee with complete confidence that if you will hear the witnesses who want to appear in opposition to these plans, as I have heard them, some of them, and only a very few of them, and if you will examine these plans, you will find that these plans do not accomplish the purpose intended by Congress, under the act passed last December at all.

It may be the act was a little incomplete but if you are going to have a reorganization you must have a consolidation that is real and probably have a little different line of procedure where somebody acting for the President is charged with keeping after these agencies all the time, because I never saw one yet that would not grow, would not increase its number of employees, and increase its expenses.

I put a challenge in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last year and I challenged somebody to show me one. It may be that nobody reads the RECORD, but those that did read it did not disagree with me.

Mr. Chairman, this proposition is one that in my opinion needs study.

Talking just a little out of turn, after going over this as I have done during the last few days, I am very much convinced, and I will tell the committee why a little later, that this whole proposition, this reorganization, the plans for this reorganization, ought to be rejected now so that they can have more study. This act was passed in December 1945—not a word of which I know from anybody about that act until May 16, this month, just a few days ago.

These plans under the law, and it is important to note this, they go into effect unless both Houses of Congress pass a concurrent resolution that they do not agree in substance to these reorganization plans. That time runs out, I think, about July 14, or thereabouts. Now Members of Congress have been unusually busy. It was interesting to know how many Members of Congress, besides a few of us who have taken occasion to read these plans over for one reason or another, really know about these reorganization plans. These plans were full of tremendous importance under that act of Congress passed in December 1945. I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, and other members of the committee, that every one of these plans, and I hope not the preambles to them, but certainly the plans have all the effect and force of a statute passed by Congress. No. 2 says, "The fundamental strength of a nation lies within its people." It goes on to discuss the duty of the Government, to conserve and develop human resources. Then the plan sets up a more or less permanent approach to a Department of Social Welfare.

I believe it is in plan 2, and I will ramble a little if the committee will permit, for the Office of Education, over in the Department of Labor, I think. It used to be there, they moved around quite a bit, but that plan No. 2 attempts to set up a Department of Social Welfare. I remember many years ago, there was such action, looking forward to another Cabinet position or Department of Education, and that has just got to follow as soon as you get plan No. 2 adopted. It must follow if you are going to be for everything that whoever prepared it, plan No. 2 is for.

I remember many years ago they wanted a department of education with a Cabinet head. They wanted a secretary of education. There was a tremendous amount of opposition to that and it never did become a law because of the opposition and because of the insistence that we had too many departments of Government now, and that that matter was properly being taken care of under one of the branches or one of the departments with a Cabinet head.

As I look back—that was in 1929 or 1930, and I was here—as I look back, I remember the tremendous opposition that was developed to that, when people knew what it was, and now I see not a finger of protest raised against this plan. I think probably this plan had a dozen projects of just as far-reaching importance as a department of education. That was a little bureau which they wanted to raise to the dignity of a Cabinet position.

Therefore, it seems to me that this committee without going too far into the merits and without passing on some of the charges I expect to make this morning, could well report out resolutions 151, 154, and 155 favorably, and stop the reorganization temporarily until a further study could be made.

Now my distinguished colleague, Mr. WHITTINGTON, suggested I take up plan No. 1. Plan No. 1 has a great many interesting things in it, but as I made a little progress, I found that, as I recall, it started to make permanent some of these wartime agencies. It was no consolidation, but something permanent; but the most important thing in plan No. 1 is to make these temporary wartime emergency housing projects permanent.

Now this housing proposition has a long and honorable history. Before the war broke out we had a slum-clearing program that got so bad that Congress quit appropriating money for it, they were wasting funds and not getting anywhere. The name is a long involved name and I forget just what that name is.

There was another housing program which progressed for a while with part of its efforts to relieve the depression and then became more or less inactive. The war then came on and the need for wartime houses—and I am not criticizing that at all because there was real need—created and brought to life under one form or another with the President's reorganization, and I have prepared a memorandum which I will submit for the RECORD giving some of the details, that created these wartime agencies. Then this Congress, as you men know, has been struggling with the matter of emergency housing for veterans, and there is the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, which is now pending before the Banking and Currency Committee, and which establishes or seeks to establish a permanent housing program and some say that it puts the Government in the business of building houses permanently.

If you will study plan No. 1, you will see where the plan is stripped of all of this verbage, perpetuates all of these wartime agencies and establishes a permanent Government policy of having the United States Government go into the business of building houses. Now as an emergency matter, let us assume that Congress has been justified in passing the bills that have been passed. We know there is a great emergency need for housing, but this is a long-range program. Sometimes I hope that the Government will get sufficiently out of business so that our system of free enterprise will again be permitted to function.

No, gentlemen, I see in plan No. 1, a design or a result if there is no design, to put this Government in the housing business, because these emergency agencies derive their authority under, as I recall it, War Powers Act No. 1, and if not No. 1; then the other, and you know they are going to terminate 6 months after the Congress or the President declares the war at an end. We are still at war and those wartime powers are all in existence. When they go out, then these agencies that will be perpetuated for at least 45 years, if my memory is correct, under plan No. 1, those agencies will have the status of a permanent agency created by the law. If this committee wants to sit by—and I do not think it does—and without investigation permit legislation of that kind by the President by means of Presidential message, then I think it is time we gave this procedure consideration.

This committee is faced with a proposition of either taking the action I have indicated in these concurrent resolutions or else permanently committing the country to a system of building houses—something that has never been done in the history of America except as a wartime or as an emergency proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. PITTENGER, right there, in 1933 or 1934, did the Congress not create the United States Housing Authority, and is it not true that the National Housing Authority created by Executive Order 9070, February 24, 1942, was issued to consolidate several housing agencies that had been created by the act of Congress?

Mr. PITTENGER. I think that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Therefore, this order here would not be making permanent a temporary

agency; it would be consolidating and coordinating the functions of the housing agencies that have been created by an act of Congress.

Mr. PITTENGER. No; it takes Mr. Wyatt's agency and ties them all in to a permanent legislative program that is good for at least 45 years. You are doing that by a message of the President, not by an act of Congress, and it has all the force and effect of law.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, under the reorganization plan, the President could not extend the life of an agency beyond the time authorized by the law under which he gave his Executive order.

Mr. PITTENGER. He creates the agency, and the law under which the agency is directed by the Executive directive is authorized to carry on a long-range program of 45 years.

The CHAIRMAN. He cannot extend the functions if those functions under the War Powers Act arose from the authority of the War Powers Act, he could not extend those beyond 6 months after the expiration of war.

Mr. PITTENGER. No; but he would have to designate some other agency to wind up their duties. This makes that procedure as designating some other agency practically impossible.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand the order, it is based on existing law and not on the War Powers Act.

Mr. PITTENGER. The President's directive there, under the first War Powers Act, the President set up a wartime agency under Executive Order 9070—I think I am correct about that.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. PITTENGER. That was in the early part of 1942. He called that a National Housing Agency and then he did what you say he did, he put these other agencies which had been created by prior law in peacetime under the National Housing Agency and he transferred the Federal Home Loan Bank and some others to the National Housing Agency. Is that the one you are talking about?

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. PITTENGER. The National Housing Agency has not actually carried out, as I understand it, the details of a building program. It has become more or less of a research agency. However, this reorganization plan consolidates all of these duties and functions and legal authority under the one agency and perpetuates it.

The CHAIRMAN. However, no function that would die under the War Powers Act can be extended beyond the date of the War Powers Act or the date provided by the War Powers Act.

Mr. PITTENGER. By this reorganization plan they are trying to give the effect of law to these temporary agencies which will die 6 months after the War Powers Act is terminated.

Mr. CHURCH. Will you read the language now which you claim does that in the Reorganization plan No. 1 or the plan No. 2.

Mr. PITTENGER. It was Reorganization Plan No. 1.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the plan No. 1, page 9.

Mr. PITTENGER. They are consolidated to form a permanent agency of the same name—I am quoting now from section 501 on page 9—and shall be administered according to the provisions of this plan. Then section 502 says, "the head of the National Housing Agency shall be known as the National Housing Administrator."

The CHAIRMAN. What provision in this order in part V of the plan is contrary to the Reorganization Act we passed in December?

Mr. PITTENGER. Your Reorganization Act does not permit the extension or the authority for these wartime agencies beyond 6 months after the termination of war. This does it.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but as I understand this plan, the National Housing Agency was established by Executive order in 1942 and succeeded agencies created by acts of Congress. Those functions were not limited to the war power.

Mr. PITTENGER. They were consolidated with it.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right, but I am referring to their functions.

Mr. PITTENGER. They were wiped out, they became emerged in this new agency.

The CHAIRMAN. They continued to function throughout the time under the United States Housing Authority and the different agencies that were building houses under Government programs.

Mr. PITTENGER. This new agency, this wartime agency succeeded all the rights and duties of those agencies, they have been inactive except as they function under this Executive order. Now Reorganization Plan No. 1, if you men will study it, and I will be glad to submit an additional memorandum on it, with the committee's permission, does perpetuate that thing and does perpetuate these wartime emergency housing agencies. As I understand it, some of those contracts can run 45 years, and they are fortified by a period of at least 45 years.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand, under the terms of the act, those were created by act of Congress without limitation of time. If the National Housing Agency, created by Executive order, succeeded the United States Housing Authority and the other building agencies created by law, they could continue the functions authorized by the law creating the United States Housing Authority.

Mr. PITTENGER. I will answer that question this way, and I think I am correct: Those peacetime agencies—they were duplication as I recall from my experience with them—one of them was that slum-clearing agency headed by Nathan Straus. I am sorry I cannot give the name, but there is at least 10 words to the name of that agency and they wasted so much money Congress quit appropriating it for them. They then created another agency for low-cost homes or slum clearance. The power and authority of those agencies were more or less circumscribed. The power and authority of this Executive order under the wartime emergency, they could do almost anything, within certain limitations, but they have considerably more leeway than they had under the slum agencies.

Mr. CHURCH. Following up my question a while ago, directing your answer to page 9, or plan No. 1, the words, "are consolidated to form a permanent agency of the same name," what about that?

Mr. PITTENGER. That is the first thing I said to the chairman.

Mr. CHURCH. I'll assume that it said, "to form an agency of the same name"; is your contention still the same?

Mr. PITTENGER. Yes; until the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 is repealed by the act of Congress, I would say "Yes."

Mr. CHURCH. Do you need to go to other language in No. 1 if you eliminate the words "permanent agency," "agency of the same name"?

Mr. PITTENGER. I would like to study that more before I gave an offhand answer. It is a legal question. I can say to my distinguished colleague, Mr. CHURCH, that I think he put his finger on something when he mentioned the word "permanent," which is a clear indication that this is to be a permanent agency and putting the Government permanently into the business of building houses. Now, if you want it, all right. However, I do not. It is my conception of our Government and our form of government that people build houses instead of the Government doing everything for them.

Mr. CHURCH. I do agree with you in that conclusion, but I want to find out if you can point out other words in No. 1 plan that does make it permanent.

Mr. PITTENGER. No. I believe there will be other witnesses here. I have not consulted the clerk, but there will be other witnesses who want to be heard and probably they can clarify that.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not the gentleman's contention that Plan No. 1 is a good job of juggling and not saving money? Under the 1945 reorganization plan it is stipulated that administrative costs in agencies to be consolidated shall be lessened by 25 percent, and under this plan No. 1, the word "transfer" is used so many times, and we are transferring agencies from one department to the other, not saving money but merely juggling and putting departments under other heads and abolishing very little. About the only thing we abolish here is this High Commissioner to the Phillippine Islands.

Mr. PITTENGER. I believe that is true. I think the gentleman has stated the matter much more ably than I could do and I believe he has run true to the facts in saying that. That same criticism runs through most of these other plans, plan No. 2, and plan No. 3.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not true that if the War Powers Acts were to expire today, that the National Housing Agency which is now in existence under Executive Order No. 9030, the component parts that were used in the Executive order to make up that National Housing Agency, the United States Housing Authority—I do not have the complete listings of them—any other agencies would revert back to the state that existed prior to the issuance of this Executive order and we would still have those agencies building houses?

Mr. PITTENGER. That might be true but I will say to you gentlemen that those agencies functioned so poorly that they were getting no money from Congress and they had to do more or less with a very popular improvement in those days known as slum clearing projects and were never designed to meet or never had in contemplation the housing emergency that the country faces now.

If you let plan No. 1 become law, you have made permanent what I have been talking about as being temporary housing legislation, or made so by Executive order by act of Congress—we passed one a few days ago. I am quite sure, Mr. Chairman, that I am correct about that.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, is there anything in the Reorganization Act of 1945 that permits the President to make permanent any temporary agency that was created under his war powers?

The CHAIRMAN. There is nothing.

Mr. HENRY. Then the testimony here that is being offered today is not in accordance with the facts, is it?

Mr. PITTENGER. I stand on my testimony, Mr. Chairman, that that is what plan No. 1 seeks well to do, either unintentionally or intentionally with good motives or with bad motives. I would be very much interested in knowing who worked out that plan and have them tell us what they had in mind. If they tell you, they will tell you what I have been telling the committee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up all the committee's time, but I want to make one or two comments about plan No. 2.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Before you leave this plan No. 1, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask you a question or two after making this statement: I think the real objection to plan No. 1 is part V, the National Housing Agency.

Mr. PITTENGER. There are others, but that is the only one I mentioned.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am giving you my view with respect to plan No. 1. I think there is much in your contention that it undertakes to perpetuate in violation of section 5 of the Reorganization Act, an agency established by Executive order that would expire 6 months after the declaration of termina-

tion of war, or when the War Powers Act expires.

Here is what I would like to have your view about; as the Chairman has suggested, admitting that name and its continuance to be in violation of the act, what about the clumsily written provisions of this plan. The plan consolidated the existing agencies if the President had chosen some other name than "National Housing Authority." Would he not have had the power to consolidate these agencies authorized by law and given the name, even though that be the name of the temporary war powers agency established by Executive order? What is your answer to that question?

Mr. PITTENGER. I have an answer for it. I will say that I was here when the agencies under those other two acts of Congress were functioning. I certainly was not in sympathy with the way that either agency was administered. That plan was to give low-cost housing to people who could not afford to buy them. Under the slum-clearance plan they wasted money. So far as I am concerned, those have nothing to do with war time emergency. If the war had not come on, they were in process of liquidation. I rather expect I would vote tomorrow to abolish both of them.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Even so, abolish or not, my question now is, regardless of the name, would not the President have the right to combine them, to transfer their functions if he were so inclined, and a plan submitted to Congress and with the plan initiated because he uses the name of an agency which I think ought to be abolished immediately.

Mr. PITTENGER. My response to that is, he is doing more than that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am going to get to that, but let us take that as we get to it.

Mr. PITTENGER. I think probably he would have that right, yes. We will concede that, anyhow.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Now then, secondly, I would like to have your view with respect to section 506 where he actually takes a step toward conferring the functions that now obtain by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. PITTENGER. On what page is 506?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is on page 11.

I invite your attention to section 506, subparagraph (a) which reads as follows: "The functions of the Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of War, Secretary of Navy, Federal Loan Administrator, and the Federal Works Administrator relating to the functions vested in the National Housing Agency or any constituent unit thereof under this plan." As the President tried, with the Reorganization Act to confer functions when his only power is to abolish them or transfer them? Can he continue those by merely conferring the functions?

Mr. PITTENGER. I do not think he can create additional functions, if that is what that does. I have not studied that section. He can transfer or consolidate but he cannot confer new ones. I think you are absolutely correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Thirdly, turn to page 12, section 508 which provides, "pending the initial appointment hereunder of any officer provided for in this part, the functions of such officer shall be temporarily performed by such officer of the existing National Housing Agency as may be designated by the President." Having abolished the function, how can it be conferred, even temporarily?

Mr. PITTENGER. I do not know that I followed the gentleman, but I do not think it can be done.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If you hear of anybody else that thinks it can, I think we should have the benefit of it. I think section V of this act is clumsily written, and is under the guise of doing something that this committee forbade, because we refused to provide for a continuance of any agency organized under the act, and whoever wrote this plan, is clumsily undertaking to continue a wartime agency, and to put the Government in the housing business.

Mr. CHURCH. Do you mean part V? I think you said section V. I agree with you.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is part V.

OBJECTIONS TO SECTIONS 2 AND 3

Mr. PITTENGER. May I go ahead with section 2. In that connection, while it is fresh in my mind, let me say that a rumor is afloat to the effect that the Government agencies involved are going to say just as little and create just as little excitement as they can and maybe submit some statements here and maybe not testify. I do not know, I may be wrong, but I wish you gentlemen of the committee would have some of them for my benefit explain some of these obtuse things that the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi has been talking about. I understand in the case of one or two departments there is an order from the head of the department that no employees should open their mouths, and they are supposed to keep still.

I talked this morning with men who represent a certain group of folks. One man said, "I do not believe I even dare go before the committee when these men are interested, and I am their attorney, and so I am going to keep still, because they are forbidden by department order to mention this reorganization plan as either being for or against it, even though it directly affects their interests."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What I would like to know is, regardless of its being clumsily written, regardless of the undertaking to perpetuate functions, I want to know the solid objections to the coordination and combining of these existing agencies authorized by law, as suggested by the chairman, assuming that part V has gone too far. I want to know how these agencies will be hurt and crippled.

Mr. PITTENGER. I think it would be well to have the agency representatives come in.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I thought perhaps you had some idea.

The CHAIRMAN. You have read page V of plan No. 1, have you not?

Mr. PITTENGER. I have read it all.

The CHAIRMAN. Paragraphs 3 and 4 there, is that not a little unusual to base a recommendation on a bill that has passed only one body and has not been considered nor even enacted into law?

Mr. PITTENGER. What section are you looking at?

The CHAIRMAN. That is page 5, about the middle of the page, third paragraph.

Mr. PITTENGER. Well, I said at the very beginning that these preambles here if you are going to give the preambles, without reading that, the full force and effect of law, that this committee is certainly adopting a startling procedure that is far afield of anything I know of in connection with legislative matters.

The CHAIRMAN. If that would be brought before a court for interpretation they certainly would put nil weight on what some other body had done that had not been enacted into law, would it?

Mr. PITTENGER. I do not want to mention any courts, but there have been unusual decisions lately. I would not predict what a court should do; they might hang somebody if they felt like it. I would not trust this ambiguity here to the courts.

Let me say seriously that I have great faith in the competence and ability of the courts, but if you submit to the courts a jumbled up mess of stuff like all of this preamble here to plan No. 1, and the courts take that seriously, they can just decide a case most any way and then they might figure the Congress ordered them to do it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I understand it, it is a mild suggestion that does not involve a court, but another legislative body. I do not mean to interrupt; go ahead.

Mr. PITTENGER. Well, the House rules forbid me to give a verbal opinion on that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am taking up a lot of time, but I am certainly appreciative of the fact that the committee is on the job, and knows more about this than I do. I always like to be modest and yield to those suggestions.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If you will, just plead guilty and save a lot of trouble.

Mr. PITTENGER. That is right; I will just plead guilty.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not your contention that a great mass of the people object to being instructed and wet-nursed from Washington and want to get rid of a lot of these instructors from Washington, and they expect our committee to do that job? Now here we are; instead of doing a surgical operation, we are just doing a little job of transferring functions from one department to another.

Mr. PITTENGER. As I indicated to the gentleman, my fundamental objection to this is, it does not consolidate and eliminate agencies. Mr. Chairman, I think this is very interesting: I was told, and this is in connection with plan 2, that some of the folks involved in plan 2 have already been before the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the House, have discussed the budgetary requirements in anticipation of the fact that plan No. 2 is going to be adopted, and then I innocently asked the party that I talked to, "Well, how about saving money?" I then learned that every one of those budgetary requirements under plan 2 is enormously increased. In discussing this, I would rather testify in this way because as I told the committee, I have my own ideas, and I do not pretend to be an expert. I said to this fellow after he told me they planned to mutilate the Department of Labor—and I do not know whether it ought to be multilated or not, but it ought to be or whether it ought not to be, he told—I said, "What are you going to do with the Department of Labor after you get through with some of your transfers?" He said, "That is going to be bigger than ever; we will have many more employees over there than we ever had before."

No. 2 seems to be the most harmless and innocent and yet it violates, when I study it, every rule laid by Congress last December, because it contemplates an enormous increase in Government activities, and enormous increase necessarily in Government employees, and enormous increases in expenditures, and if you want confirmation, talk to the Subcommittee on Appropriations, and I am sure—I did not make a note, but they will verify the enormous increases numbered in tens of millions of dollars for some functions under No. 2.

Here is what I want to say to the committee before I go any further: Plan No. 2 is subject to all of these other objections. If you will study plan No. 2 and the preamble, it takes care of everybody from the womb to the tomb. That may be a good thing, but that is what plan No. 2 contemplates. You cannot read that language and reach any other conclusion.

Now for the specific objections to Plan No. 2—and it does not compare with my ideas of consolidation—plan No. 2 abolishes the United States Employees' Compensation Commission. That is a quasi-judicial body. You may say it is not, but I say it is, because they have to perform a quasi-judicial function of determining whether or not a person is an employee of the Federal Government, whether or not the person was injured in the performance of duties and whether or not he comes under the Compensation Act, which I think was passed in 1916. When they determine that, then they have administrative officials who have investigated the case and who go ahead and pay injured persons compensation under the act.

Plan No. 2 abolishes that act and transfers its function to this set-up here, to Federal Security by a new name. They also abolish

the Social Security Board and, right away, then they appoint three members of an appeal board. In the first place, that board is a bipartisan board. It is put there so that the employees will feel that they have a bipartisan, and not a politically governed tribunal, to which they can go to have the determinations made as to whether or not they are employees injured in the performance of their duty for which compensation is to be paid. The law does not carry out the spirit of the act of Congress; it does not save any money, it creates three new jobs on an appeal board.

The employees of this Commission, I think, for the most part have been with them since 1916, or at least the framework. They either are going off the pay rolls and send new employees out in some other agency here or branch, trained to do this work, or else no savings result. If you are going to keep them, why not leave the agency as it is? To me, the United States Compensation Commission is in much the position of the Federal Trade Commission or some of these other agencies who have a definite duty to perform and whose duties do not overlap or interfere in any way with the duties of some other Government agencies. We must have a certain number of Government agencies. What the Reorganization Plan contemplates is, for a historic example, taking 10 agencies of the Government, abolishing 9 of them, and letting the tenth one do the work.

To shorten this up as much as I can, I have some protests from a great many people opposed to the abolishment of the Social Security Board. I know I hold no brief for the Social Security Board, I have fought with them time after time. Here is what the fellows say, and they are 1,500 miles away, probably; if they want to be heard, I am going to speak to the clerk about. They say, "This is a bipartisan board." They do not want the Social Security Board abolished, and leave the administration of the unemployment compensation and the old-age assistance and the other duties relating to social security to the whim or the caprice of some one man. They do not want that law changed until Congress makes the change.

Certainly I have protests here from a number of organizations and groups and they can appear, and I have advised them they should, who are very much opposed to plan No. 2.

Now I had a telephone call from one of the members of the District Government downtown 10 minutes before I came here. I do not know whether one or two of these Government hospitals, Gallinger or St. Elizabeths or some other one come in plan No. 2 or plan No. 3, but they come in one of these, and they told me that this plan abolished the Board of Governors and did about three or four other things that just makes the present confused conditions much worse than they are, as far as the orderly exercise of the functions of our District Government are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean to say they opposed the abolition of the board at St. Elizabeths? I thought they would approve of that.

Mr. PITTENGER. I am only telling the committee what was told to me over the telephone and I suggested that the group interested contact Mr. Manasco and arrange with him for an appearance before the committee where they can explain how far-reaching it is.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the only section in either one of the plans I have had no one protest about.

Mr. PITTENGER. Let me give you another, and I think this other one is in section 3. I am not at liberty to give the name of the man who made the protest, but it is a man whom everyone here knows. You say you have had no protests made about the General Land Office, that is affected here. I have had one.

The CHAIRMAN. I have had one on about everything but St. Elizabeths.

Mr. PITTENGER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to go into some detail about the Children's Bureau there, and later on I may ask the committee's permission, but I want to pass to plan No. 3 so I can finish my statement and not impose on the good nature of the committee. As I say, these various objections that I have made—and I am going to elaborate a little bit at the conclusion of my presentation—they applied to all three of the plans. I have a lot of protests. I have protests from people who do not want the Bureau of Marine Inspection taken away from the Department of Commerce and permanently put under the Coast Guard. The war came on, and then it was put under the Coast Guard where it is now. Plan No. 3 puts it permanently under the Coast Guard. I can say to you men that if you called these marine inspectors I do not believe you will find one of them that wants to stay under the Coast Guard where they are subject to inspection by somebody with a revolver on his hip, and military necessity, and military rigidity, and so forth. They feel much more at home if they can roam about under the Department of Commerce.

There was never any criticism of their efficiency and effectiveness under that Department. I think, by the way, that they probably are subject to some sort of a regulation issued by one of the rear admirals that if they admit their own name before this committee, they will lose their jobs the next day. I think that permeates, probably, all of these agencies, and all of these plans.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that a trend back toward Henry Wallace? I know last year we refused to permit the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to go under him.

Mr. PITTENGER. This does not concern the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, this is the Bureau of Marine Inspection.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, last year, we opposed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation going under the Department of Commerce.

Mr. PITTENGER. I would be glad to have the Chairman make a speech on that subject, I know I could make one. Congress does not show rare judgment on a lot of matters. I predict that if the committee will report this bill out, Congress will show rare judgment in connection with this fumbled-up, jumbled-up mess of plans 1, 2, and 3, which do not accomplish the objectives of Congress, but which mess up matters worse than they are, and which have the dangerous possibilities that I pointed out of committing this Government to a paternalistic, socialistic, communistic pattern of life, certainly in the housing business and certainly in plan No. 2 from the womb to the tomb, because that is only the prelude to the establishment of a Cabinet position known as the Department of Social Welfare, I think it is, with a certain gentleman who I think is temporarily out of the United States, as Cabinet head. They are just getting ready to create another Cabinet position.

If I had my way about it—I have my own plan and you are interested particularly, but I do not think the Coast Guard belongs anywhere else except under the Navy. I never could, as a beginner in Congress, see why the Treasury Department has the Coast Guard, and I could never see any sense in taking these marine inspectors away from Commerce and putting them under the Coast Guard. I do not want to see an order made permanent that keeps them under the Coast Guard because I want to make the boys happy and I know they will work twice as hard if you put them back under the Department of Commerce. They got along all right with Henry Wallace, and they get along with everybody, these marine inspectors, and they are only one of a dozen groups. Some are inarticulate. Maybe there are 24 groups that do not dare come in here, even through their attorneys, and express an opinion on this matter. Certainly, gentlemen, this plan No. 1 here of permitting the Government to embark upon a permanent housing policy ought to be threshed out on the floor of the House with a bill that reads so that everyone can understand it, subject to amendment, subject to the rules that we adopted on January 3, 1945.

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, supplementing my foregoing discussion of Reorganization Plans 1, 2, and 3 with you, I want to repeat that I am supporting House Concurrent Resolutions 151, 154, and 155. As I have pointed out, the best that the friends of the plans can claim is that they were apparently hurriedly prepared and wholly inadequate to accomplish any real reorganization as intended by Congress. These plans ought to be disapproved so that further study can be made looking forward to an overhauling of all Government agencies and bringing about a real reorganization.

No economies are affected by these reorganization plans, and every one of them is met with serious and well-founded objections. In connection with plan No. 1, I call your attention to facts which are carefully worked out for your consideration, as follows:

The President's Reorganization Plan No. 1, which was submitted to the House on May 16 and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, is in no real sense a reorganization plan. It does not simplify the Government's organization by eliminating duplication of activities and overlapping of functions, thereby reducing expenditures and making it possible to administer the Government's affairs more efficiently. To call this a reorganization is a misnomer. What this so-called reorganization plan actually does is to set up a new agency of the Government, an agency which has not been authorized by Congress, and an agency which by its very nature is bound to lead to greater and greater expenditures and to more and more Government controls.

This new agency is called the National Housing Agency.

It is set up in part 5 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 and this is the most important part of this whole reorganization plan. The other parts of this plan are relatively unimportant, but part 5, which sets up a permanent National Housing Agency, is far reaching and of the utmost importance. If Congress approves this plan and sets up this permanent new agency, we will have taken another step along the road which leads to the complete socialization of our economy.

This may sound like an extreme statement. It is not, however, if we will look at the record.

This Government entered the field of financing the building of Government-owned housing and of subsidizing the rentals in such housing back in the thirties for the ostensible purpose of providing employment and of cleaning up the slums in the larger cities. This activity accomplished neither of these purposes. It was a failure and this House shortly before the war refused to appropriate additional funds to continue it.

That is where the matter stood when the war broke out. Public housing advocates for public housing in the Federal Government—and there are many of them—seized upon the war as a great opportunity to continue their own power and influence. They succeeded in getting a war job for the United States Public Housing Authority, which otherwise had nothing to do but liquidate itself.

How did they do this? They did it by getting the President of the United States, acting under the authority given him in the First War Powers Act, to set up a wartime agency of which they would be a principal part. This wartime agency was set up under

Executive Order 9070 in the early part of 1942. It was called the National Housing Agency. The United States Public Housing Authority was put under this National Housing Agency, but given a new name. It was now called the Federal Public Housing Authority, and it was given the job of spending the Lanham funds appropriated for building houses, most of them supposed to be temporary houses, for war workers.

The President also transferred to the wartime National Housing Agency both the Federal Housing Administration and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. When this transfer was made the Federal Home Loan Bank Board of five members was abolished and the administration of this important private home financing agency was put under the direction of one man, the former chairman of the Board, Mr. John Fahey. The Federal Housing Administration was given additional powers by Congress to assist private builders to build houses for sale and for rent to war workers. It continued under its single administrator as formerly. It did a splendid job in carrying out the mandate which Congress had given it through so-called title VI which was added to its basic act.

As far as I am able to ascertain the National Housing Administrator was of little or no assistance to either the Federal Home Loan Bank System in carrying on its work during the difficult war period or to the Federal Housing Administration. About all that the National Housing Administrator did was to take money from both of these permanent and well-established agencies and use it for his own so-called research activities.

During the war the National Housing Agency, as might have been expected from its origin, became a center of Government propaganda and influence for promoting an extension of Government controls and Government spending in the housing field. Long before the end of the war the National Housing Administrator and his general counsel, Mr. Leon Keyserling, and his research assistant spent most of their time in preparing a bill which would make the National Housing Agency a permanent agency of the Government and which would give it complete control over the Federal Housing Administration and the Federal Home Loan Bank System in addition to being responsible for carrying out the public housing activities of the Government. These Government officials made elaborate presentations to the committees of the House and the Senate, pointing out the need for more and more Federal Government activity in the field of housing and particularly the need for continuing them as a permanent bureau. They were positive that the country would continue to need their services after the war was over.

The upshot of all of their activities was that there was finally introduced and passed by the Senate the so-called Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill which set up a permanent National Housing Agency and which gave this agency extensive powers and controls over the private home-financing and home-building industries and which also made subordinate to it both the Federal Housing Administration and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

As far as I know all the private home-financing institutions in the country opposed the setting up of this permanent National Housing Agency through the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. They were alarmed at the prospect of subordinating sound principles of private lending on which depend the safety of insurance policies and the savings of millions of people to the unsound principles of public housing. Representatives of the life-insurance companies, of the savings and loan associations, of the savings banks, and of the commercial banks all appeared before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency to protest the enactment of this legislation. In particular, as I stated above, they were concerned with the setting up of a permanent National Housing Agency which would combine the public-housing activities of the Federal Government with the responsibilities it has undertaken to support and improve the all-important private credit functions of our economy.

This is no place to discuss the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. That bill is now pending before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, as is also another bill dealing with the long-term aspects of the Government's housing activities which was introduced by Congressman WOLCOTT. Before the House is given an opportunity to study these measures and to study all the implications involved in setting up the wartime National Housing Agency as a permanent agency of the Government, the President, or perhaps more accurately I should say the friends of public housing and further extension of Government controls who surround the President, have attempted to foreclose the matter through this Reorganization Plan No. 1. Unless Congress disapproves of this plan by concurrent resolution within 60 days the National Housing Agency with even greater powers than was given it during the war will be saddled on us permanently. Unless we act positively to disapprove this reorganization plan within 60 days it will become law. I urge this committee to report out favorably my concurrent resolution.

In doing so again let me stress that the committee will not be opposing a genuine reorganization plan but rather will be opposing the setting up by the President of a new agency of government under the device of reorganizing its housing agencies.

While I have not raised the point I think the committee might well examine the question of whether the President has not gone beyond his authority in setting up this National Housing Agency as a permanent agency of the Government. This agency he proposes to set up, as I have pointed out, is nothing more or less than a continuation of the wartime National Housing Agency set up by Executive Order 9070 under the First War Powers Act. Under the terms of this First War Powers Act this National Housing Agency would automatically expire 6 months after the legal termination of the war. In the Reorganization Act of 1945, under which this Reorganization Plan No. 1 was submitted, section 5, sets forth certain limitations on the President's powers with respect to reorganization. Among these limitations is this one, namely that no reorganization plan shall provide for or shall have the effect of continuing any function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise, or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made, or beyond the time when the agency in which it was vested before the reorganization would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made.

Clearly the Congress intended by this limitation to prevent the continuation of temporary wartime agencies of the Government under the guise of reorganizing the Government agencies. If there is any agency which is more of a war agency than the National Housing Agency then I do not know what one is. As I stated, the officials of this agency have been up here clamoring for their continuation on a permanent basis. And now the President does continue them on a permanent basis under the guise of reorganizing the Federal Government's housing activities.

There is another limitation on the President's powers with respect to reorganization to which I also want to call your attention. This section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1945 also provides that no reorganization plan shall provide for or shall have the effect of authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress. Under this Reorganization Plan No. 1 the National Housing Administrator is charged with the responsibility "of devising and applying methods and practices conducive to a unified housing program." That language is taken from section 506 of the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1946. It is startling language. It declares through Presidential edict under the guise of a reorganization plan that this country has a unified housing program and that this Administrator of this new National Housing Agency shall be responsible for devising and applying methods and practices for making it effective.

Any member of this committee who has studied the propaganda of the officials of the wartime National Housing Agency understands better the implications of this language. This propaganda has stressed again and again what we need in this country is a unified housing program and a unified housing policy which will see to it that every family from the poorest to the richest has adequate shelter. These public housing advocates no longer believe there is an area in which public housing might operate as a charitable activity. They have given up that small-time approach to the housing problems of the country. They believe rather that the Federal Government should use the private home financing and home building industries as well as publicly financed housing for the purpose of seeing to it that every family throughout the whole country—on the farms and in the cities and in the small communities—that they all get adequate housing. In their view it is not the responsibility of self-supporting families to take care of themselves and to pay taxes to run their Government and to set aside some of their income for charitable purposes. They do not conceive an America of self-supporting and independent families. They conceive of a great Federal Government whose responsibility it is to look after all the families of the country.

The President of the United States apparently accepts this objective as indicated in this message transmitting this reorganization plan to Congress. He contemplates that the National Housing Administrator, even though it may take some additional legislation, will be charged with the objective of providing a suitable dwelling ultimately for every American family. His planners have anticipated this extensive power for the National Housing Administrator by already giving him the authority under the provisions of this reorganization plan, which will become law within 60 days unless Congress disapproves it, to devise and to apply methods and practices conducive to a unified housing program. Under this mandate what can we expect to happen to the Federal Housing Administration and to the Federal Home Loan Bank System? We can expect their operations to be completely subordinated to the vague and indefinite and socialized purposes of the National Housing Administrator. That is the disaster we face unless this reorganization plan is defeated.

As I have indicated, Mr. Chairman, I think it a dangerous thing to act hastily where an old established Government agency is involved. This deals with plan No. 2 which abolishes the United States Employees Compensation Commission and in its place there are three members on an appeal board. The work of this Commission is to investigate accidents and then after the three members of the Commission have determined in a quasi judicial way that the Government is liable for the injury to the employee, administrative details are carried out by a trained personnel.

It is true that Reorganization Plan No. 2 suggests that one of the other bureaus is better able to do this, but we all know that the other employees are doing a different

type of work and that as a practical matter either the present employees of the United States Employee's Compensation Commission would have to be retained or else new ones added to the agency that administers the law. This does not meet with the intention of Congress that departments would be merged in and consolidated with other departments where both departments were doing the same kind of work.

There are also objections which may be of a very substantial character when you take steps to abolish the Social Security Board. I already have protest from people who feel that the activities of that Board dealing, as they do, with old-age assistance and unemployment compensation and pensions, should not be in the sole jurisdiction of any one man. Representatives of employees point out that they feel that their rights are better safeguarded and more free from whim or caprice if a bipartisan board of three members is in existence and has final decision on matters that affect them. Incidentally, this same line of reasoning would apply to the United States Employee's Compensation Commission.

I might add that there is a grave question as to whether or not the changes in the different lines of activity in the Children's Bureau will result in any solution of present objections to the way those matters are handled. I do not want to elaborate on this because, under existing law, the President already has power to take corrective measures where agencies under the same department are involved without an act of Congress.

In connection with a discussion of plan No. 3 I am forced to say that this plan, like plans 1 and 2 fall far short of meeting by requirements of Congress in tackling the reorganization problem. This plan has the same weakness as the other two plans in that it represents an encroachment in the Federal Government on the rights of the people. Quoting from plan 2, this significant statement characterizes all three plans. I quote:

"The time has now come for further steps to strengthen the machinery of the Federal Government for leadership and service in dealing with the social problems of the country."

You will find, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, that all three plans bear this sort of philosophic purpose.

I do not want to prolong an analysis of plan No. 3 but I do believe that Congress ought to make a further study of some of the proposed transfers in plan No. 3.

There is much opposition to a transfer from the Department of Commerce to the Coast Guard and to the Bureau of Customs, of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation. It seems, to me, Mr. Chairman, and I regret I cannot further extend this discussion at this time, that representatives of these different agencies that are involved should be called before your committee and be instructed by your committee to discuss the affect of these changes with you.

There is an ugly rumor that different departments have been told by certain bureau officials that they are not to discuss any proposed consolidations and if that rumor should be true, then it seems to me that your committee should have testimony of department heads before being called upon to act on Reorganization Plans 1, 2, and 3.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, just to show your committee how widespread the interest is in these various plans, I call your attention to the fact that in connection with plan No. 1 the Commerce and Industry Association of New York has advised me that they were making a study of this plan and I presume they have advised the chairman that they want to be heard. Other individuals have also contacted my office.

In connection with plan No. 2, various representatives of labor unions have advised me that they were objecting to plan No. 2. The Mobile Labor Journal, of Mobile, Ala., has forwarded me a copy of a newspaper article indicating that organized labor is opposed to plan No. 2, which proposes abolishment of the present Social Security Board. I have advised these people of the hearings.

Representatives of various Federal employees' groups have also advised me that they are opposed to plan No. 2. I refer to postal employees and also Federal employees in other branches of Government service. I have also received protests from the International Longshoremen's Association of New York City against the abolishment of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission. The post-office employees and other labor groups have likewise indicated opposition. They want the United States Employees' Compensation Commission continued and are very well satisfied with the way it is conducted.

In connection with plan No. 3, I have had contacts with John Hawk, secretary-treasurer of Seafarers International Union of North America, in New York City. Mr. Hawk advises me his group is joined with other American merchant seamen in opposition to plan No. 3. They are opposed to having the Marine Inspection and Navigation Service remain permanent under the Coast Guard. They want this Service, which is temporary under the Coast Guard, to be returned to the Department of Commerce where it belongs.

I have also had protests from the Propeller Club of the Port of New Orleans and also from the Master Mates and Pilots Local No. 15 and also from the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association No. 12 of New Orleans in opposition to plan No. 3.

These are only a few of the groups that have contacted my office and I have referred them to the chairman of the committee so they could arrange for an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. PITTENGER. I would like to leave with the committee, Mr. Chairman, these questions, to be considered in the disposition of the matters before the committee:

Who in the Bureau of the Budget was in charge of the preparation of these plans and who were the principal aids in such work. I think the committee should have that, because I understand the Bureau of the Budget has assumed responsibility.

Mr. BENDER. Is the gentleman prepared to furnish us with his answer to that question?

Mr. PITTENGER. Do you mean me?

Mr. BENDER. Yes.

Mr. PITTENGER. I do not know. That is why I am asking the question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. You are just putting these questions for the benefit of the committee; you do not care for it personally?

Mr. PITTENGER. Yes, sir; I do want it. I am attempting to get it, Mr. WHITTINGTON.

Question No. 2. What special qualifications do those individuals, unknown, unnamed, unhonored, and unsung possess for this work?

Question No. 3. What investigation was made by the Bureau of the Budget as to the effect of the proposed changes and the views of parties interested and affected by these changes?

Question No. 4. Did the Bureau of the Budget discuss the reorganization plan with the Chief of the Children's Bureau, the members of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, and with the members of the Social Security Board; if so, give us the names of those parties. If you do not give them to us, I think the committee should know why, before it swallows this fish without having it cooked.

Question No. 5. Did the Bureau of the Budget discuss the changes with interested parties outside of the Government prior to presenting these plans?

That completes my statement.

Mr. BENDER. Do you mean outside of the United States?

Mr. PITTENGER. No; I mean outside of Government employment.

Mr. BENDER. The gentlemen has introduced three bills or resolutions asking that plans 1, 2, and 3 not be considered favorably, and the gentleman must have studied these plans, and the gentleman is conversant with this provision of the act we passed last December providing for a 25-percent reduction. Can the gentleman tell the committee which of these items would accomplish that 25-percent reduction in cost of Government?

Mr. PITTENGER. I have not been able to get any evidence that any one of these three plans saves the taxpayers a single dollar. The only evidence I have gotten, and that was discovered and not secured by designs, was the evidence to the effect that under plan 2, certain people had been over before the Subcommittee on Appropriations, and everyone was increasing by millions of dollars the budget estimates under Reorganization Plan No. 2.

Now I suggest that you do not take my word for it, but get definite information from the subcommittee on appropriations.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. To which subcommittee do you refer? There are 20 of them over there.

Mr. PITTENGER. It is the one that handles Social Security.

Mr. BENDER. I think the gentleman is a damned Republican, is he not?

Mr PITTENGER I will say that I have supported reorganization plans under Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Hoover and as I recall the first one was under Hoover, I said last year I would vote for one, hoping that Mr. Truman would have people under him that used good judgment and did what Congress wanted, and so I said I would support Mr. Truman's plan last year, and I voted for the law. Until I found out that it had a lot of these objections, I was perfectly willing to go along. My approach is nonpolitical.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman will recall, however, that in 1932 a gentleman ran for President on the plan of cutting the cost of government 25 percent. I believe that under the circumstances the gentleman is just a little suspicious, is he not?

Mr. PITTENGER. I have a right to be.

I thank you Mr. Chairman and I may have some more people inquire by reason of the fact that I am the author of these resolutions and if I can produce more light for the committee and not confuse it any, I shall request the indulgence of the committee a little later.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you, Mr. PITTENGER, you have been very helpful.

Mr. Max Zaritsky, Labor Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, labor is often accused of producing no leaders capable of offering to their own ranks constructive self-criticism and policies in the whole Nation's interests. Mr. Zaritsky is by no means the sole exception to this charge, but he is a notable one. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a short editorial which appeared in the World-Telegram this week:

LABOR STATESMANSHIP

The 40,009-member AFL Union of Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers is holding its

annual convention in New York. Its president, Max Zaritsky, objects to the labor bills just passed by Congress, but has recommended adoption of a voluntary no-strike policy for the reconversion period.

Winning the war against inflation, like winning the war against Hitlerism, calls for unceasing efforts by organized workers, says Mr. Zaritsky, who adds:

"I urge this union to carry its wartime no-strike policy over into the reconversion period. Uninterrupted production is of vital necessity today if the enormous inflationary pressures are to be repelled."

Those seem to us sensible and statesmanlike words. But the Communist party's paper, Daily Worker, resents them bitterly. Mr. Zaritsky, the Daily Worker charges, is a "social democrat" who proposes "complacent compliance" with "the Truman administration's attacks on unions and its move to outlaw strikes."

"Social democrat" or not, Mr. Zaritsky is a respected and successful union leader. It's a great tragedy for the labor movement that so many of its other leaders, instead of emulating his wisdom, are following a course for which the Communist organ has nothing but the most enthusiastic praise.

The Silver Bloc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD an extremely able presentation of the silver question which I wholeheartedly recommend to the House. The article was written by Mr. Wade Lewis, one of the outstanding mining engineers in Montana and the West:

Ignorance, as demonstrated over the ages, is more dangerous than dishonesty. The latter is usually readily combatted, while ignorance frequently wears the cloak of sincerity. A prominent national weekly magazine, under date of June 8, 1946, features an editorial entitled "On the Prowl Again," referring to those particular 12 United States Senators, headed by Senator PAT MCCARRAN (Democrat, Nevada), who sponsored a higher price for silver. The editorial not only impugns the motives of the western Senators, inferring they are selfish motives for the benefit of a minority, but even suggests that higher silver would promote runaway inflation. We attribute honesty and sincerity to the editorial but doubt that the writer thereof possessed full knowledge and facts relating to the economics involved.

First, let us be honest with ourselves and recognize that inflation is already here. Not the runaway inflation that appeared in Germany following World War I, but a degree of inflation nevertheless.

For several reasons, including unavoidable war expenditures, including perhaps some unwise and excessive administration spending, we have inflation, with our national debt approaching $300,000,000,000. This sum will not be paid off in terms of dollars as we have known them. It must then be paid off in a different kind of dollars. The main object now is to pay it off in a manner such that it will hurt no one class too much. The blow must be cushioned, the operation must be as painless as possible.

Three hundred billion dollars is a lot of money. For example, the entire copper production of the Butte, Mont., mines, operating from the surface to a mile in depth, working one to ten thousand men for 80 years in hundreds of miles of underground workings, produced a gross copper value of only about three billions. This sum, representing a part of the real wealth of our country, was spent, during the peak of war expenditures, in just 8 days.

To back our debt and the issuance of billions of dollars in paper money—and our bonds are nothing more than interest-bearing paper money—we have in the National Treasury something like twenty billions in gold and a lesser amount of silver.

After the Civil War was over a farmer entered his local hardware store and asked to buy a stove. The price quoted him was $50 in gold or $150 in greenbacks, the paper money of those times. This situation may not, but can, recur.

Notwithstanding currency legislation and administrative rulings, the people of any country have a way of pegging values to their own liking. In the Western States people prefer silver money to paper. A few already are hoarding silver coins in their dresser drawers. This hedge against inflation may do them little good because the day may come when silver will be called in, in the same manner as gold was withdrawn from circulation.

Already, in Europe, people prefer an American silver dollar to an American paper dollar. In some European sections the American silver dollar is at a premium of 100 to 300 percent over its paper brother.

The writer happens to be a mining engineer and is now mining silver-lead ore. He did not advocate higher silver because he owned silver property or interests; he became interested in silver mining because he anticipated a logical rise in the price of silver. At the present price of 71.11 cents per ounce of silver he is operating at a loss. He thinks in terms of going hundreds of feet underground at high cost to secure an ounce of silver with which to buy a pound of butter produced on the surface. He considers the relative amount of electrical power and human energy consumed in acquiring the ounce of silver and the pound of butter. With many others he is now thinking in terms of hard money as compared to printing-press money, and hopes for a reasonable profit in order to maintain or establish basic pay rolls. The writer might be called a speculator, in the sense of one who thinks and plans for a future event—and acts before it occurs. All persons in the mining business must follow metal prices and be ready to shift from one metal to the other, one property operation to the other, dependent on economic conditions and metal trends. In this sense the mining business is little different from any other business and requires the same principles.

The 12 western Senators from mining States are not advocating a higher silver price per ounce because their States produce silver; they are not advocating it for selfish or silver-bloc reasons; they advocate higher silver because the rise of silver, together with other metals, was inevitable, based on machinery prices, wage costs, and other economic factors; they advocate higher silver because the silver producer was not paid the full value for his product, and because a special group has been buying silver at the expense of the United States Treasury and American taxpayers. Our 12 western Senators know mining costs and know that silver is a byproduct in connection with most mining operations. They know that our currency system will eventually need all the hard-money backing that it can acquire, and they know that mining in general must be stimulated, that doing so will establish basic taxable pay rolls and aid recovery and reconversion. They recognize fully the economic factors involved and are not ignoring a national problem by burying their heads in the desert sands of Washington.

Inflation, to a degree, is here. An important point is to honestly recognize this as an economic fact. Instead of acknowledging our economic situation and approaching it in a remedial, scientific manner, we attempt to readjust our price structure piecemeal. Prices of manufactured goods and wages are directly allied with metal prices. Instead of scientifically surveying our problem we raise first wages, second, manufactured commodities, ignoring the metals taken from the depths of the earth.

Logic would call for an over-all appraisal of our economics, then if need be, raise first, the price of metals; second, manufactured goods; third, wages. Instead, we approach the situation unintelligently and piecemeal, stimulating dissatisfaction and strikes. We operate in reverse, considering first, wages; second, manufactured products; third, metals. The last is a source of the first two. We begin at the wrong end of economics, ignoring the mainspring of industry, metal mining, stumbling along, and do not complete any definite cycle or plan, at least until we are compelled to. Meanwhile our unscientific and ill-advised approach retards industry and hinders reconversion.

Our 12 western Senators indeed represent a silver bloc but only while other selfish and ill-informed interests are blocking the mining of silver. If we aid silver mining, make the business reasonably profitable, by raising the price of silver, operators may produce it and additional basic pay rolls will be established. In Montana we recognize two kinds of dollars, dollars representing paper money off the presses, hard silver dollars taken out of the ground. Our western Senators appreciate the effort it takes to produce a real dollar.

In 1896 a book entitled "The First Battle" was written by William Jennings Bryan. While we may not agree with him in all matters, some of his ideas are again coming to the foreground, and it appears that, in some respects, the democratic Presidential candidate was just 50 years ahead of his time. The writer has just returned this volume to its shelf and suggests the book as good reading for today.

Our 12 western Senators are merely suggesting a realistic, honest, and rational viewpoint in an endeavor to equalize all factors concerning our present and changing economic situation, and, in so doing, are acidly referred to as the silver bloc. Our greatest concern, in relation to silver, is not the silver bloc, but the efforts of certain selfish and ill-informed interests to block silver, an attempt, in consequence, to block the mining of silver, to block pay rolls all along the line, block manufacturing, block recovery and reconversion, and finally block the payment of our national obligations.

WADE V. LEWIS.

BOULDER, MONT., *June 3, 1946.*

Copies to Senator MURRAY, Senator MCCARRAN, Senator B. K. WHEELER.

The Seamen's Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two excellent editorials from the

New York Post on the subject of the seamen's threatened strike:

LABOR NEWS AND COMMENT

GRIMNESS AND HYSTERIA OVER THE SEAMEN'S STRIKE

(By Victor Riesel)

Hysteria is loose again on the strike front.

On all sides they're screaming over the threatened seafarers' stoppage which may tie 3,100 ships to their piers June 15.

There's President Truman, who is talking grimly of calling out the Marines, the Army, the Navy and the Coast Guard to smash the walk-out. You get the feeling that in desperation he might even throw in the Presidential yacht if his family goes ashore in time.

And there is a very tough gentlemen called Joseph Stack, boss of the CIO Maritime Union's New York strike committee. He, too, has been talking wildly. The other day he warned that Mr. Truman could man the ships "over our dead bodies . . . We are prepared to defend our livelihood against any threats of violence." To me this means Stack actually is threatening to keep the United States Army and Navy off struck ships if the White House orders them aboard. That would be civil war.

All this hysterical talk is leading to one of those eleventh-hour crises we grew so familiar with these past few weeks.

Who's to blame for this hysteria?

Mr. Truman must share responsibility for the increasing excitement. In his new "I'll show them" mood he appears to be turning automatically to the Army and Navy when faced by a strike emergency. One cannot escape the feeling that Mr. Truman is reverting to the old Midwest vigilante philosophy that gun-toting citizens once deputized, can always take care of trouble makers—in this case, the unions.

Furthermore, the President is repeating what he did in the rail crisis. He is not keeping his prolabor advisers posted on strategy. The other day, for example, Labor Secretary Schwellenbach told CIO waterfront leaders at a peace conference that he didn't want to start with any threats against either side. But the very next morning, Mr. Truman warned he would call out the military to break the strike. The union men then justifiably revolted.

It was just this sort of thing which brought on the frenzied moments of the rail stoppage.

Of course, the CIO seamen's unions, too, bear much of the blame.

They are threatening a political as well as an economical international strike and it would be just bad reporting not to point out that most of these unions have been ardent supporters of the Communist Party line for years. Therefore, this imminent walk-out is to a great extent unjustified. There is evidence for this charge of political motivation. As I write I have before m the National Convention of Maritime Unions' release issued May 8 in San Francisco. This official document, in announcing the stoppage, said:

"A joint national maritime strike for June 15—intended to force shipowners on three coasts to yield to union demands and to halt the drive of shipowners and American reactionaries toward a new and more devastating world war—was voted today by leaders of seven maritime unions representing 214,000 seamen. * * *"

What can be done to avert the strike and give all sides, including the public, a square deal?

Mr. Truman could call the shipowners, the left-wing union officials, and CIO President Murray, who can control the belligerent waterfront leaders, to a joint conference. Mr. Truman then could lock the door, throw away the key, pound the table, and demand an agreement at the parley. If anyone walked out on the President, he could turn to the press and give the entire story, blow by blow, so the public would know who was responsible.

Five will get you fifty there would be a settlement.

LABOR NEWS AND COMMENTS

A LITTLE GUY LABOR LEADER BLOWS OFF STEAM

(By Victor Riesel)

My friend, the intellectual one who leads a small union, pushed aside his plate of marinated herring, leaned forward angrily and pounded the table.

"These strikes are beginning to annoy the Sunday picknikers and the jitterbugs," he said. "But don't sneer. Who's the public if not Sunday drivers and kids in corner drug stores and their parents? And what's happening? Our labor movement forgets how mad the public can get. On one hand the Communists threaten to close down shipping and cut off gas and food. On the other side Jimmie Petrillo promises to shut off all radio music and end production of jive records. So don't blame the man in the street for getting tough.

"And where's the top leadership all this time? Phil Murray and Bill Green get all excited over the President's labor legislation. But what are they doing to stop their own people from goading the public into cracking down on us minor labor officials who do the everyday job? Life is tough enough already with union meetings, grievances and stubborn bosses.

"Now we might go to jail for calling a strike some place. Why should we thousands of routine union managers suffer for the glamor boys like Petrillo?"

The herring plate bounced long after my friend's fist smashed down on one of Lindy's up-front tables.

"In one corner we have the Commies," my companion continued. "Whom do they think they're kidding? They shout that they're going to run a shipping strike for higher wages but later scream that it's also a walkout to stop 'imperialist war.' Then the Moscow radio also says that Wall Street wants war. And finally the public adds it up as an international Communist propaganda plot which will deprive it of gasoline and rubber tires. Soon everybody is hysterical.

"And what's Phil Murray doing meanwhile? Nothing. Instead of cooling off the left wing CIO maritime leaders, one of Phil's own assistants is going around Washington saying that Mr. Truman could push the trainmen around but the ship union leaders will show the White House this time. Who'll suffer? The left wingers? Nope. They'll get the excitement they want. We'll suffer when the public cracks down. We, who go into the shops every day to bargain for our members."

My friend sputtered again.

"And if it isn't the Commies, it's the overpublicized boys like Petrillo. You know, he lives at the Waldorf-Astoria, eats $10 dinners, is the world's highest paid labor leader and wants a raise now. You newspapermen think this is good color for your stories and soon everybody believes that all we labor people live like sultans. And everybody yells for 'a law' when Jimmie gets tough and threatens a national radio strike."

I agreed.

"Well," my friend shouted, "don't just agree; put something in the paper about it."

What could I say? Could I write that Green and Murray should have anticipated this public reaction when labor, through last winter's strikes, disclosed the enormous concentrated economic power of American unionism? Could I say that labor men should have been ready with their own legislative program for regulating strikes instead of waiting for the conservatives to gang up on them? The union strategists would charge I was antilabor!

But by this time my labor friend was back at his food muttering something about there ought to be an easier way for him to earn a living.

Veterans Make Good Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been closely associated with veterans and young Americans over the past 20 years knew that the veterans of World War II would not be problems but would be the answer to many problems.

An article appearing in the Kansas City Star, June 3, 1946, shows what Midwest employers think of veterans as employees, and should set at rest many doubts others may have had as to future of our veterans.

That article follows:

THE VETERAN-WORKER IS DOING FINE, EMPLOYERS HERE AGREE—EX-GI'S ARE TRYING TO MAKE UP FOR LOST TIME, SOME BELIEVE—DIG INTO JOBS WITH ENERGY AND PERSISTENCE

With occasional exceptions—about what you'd expect in any group of employees chosen at random—the returned veterans in this area are digging into their jobs with such energy and persistence that several employers have speculated as to whether they are trying to make up for lost time.

At the City National Bank & Trust Co., where there are 52 veterans, including 25 former employees, Edward F. Lyle, comptroller, who has charge of personnel, said their attitude was considerably above average.

"Our typical veteran is a man who feels he has lost 4 years and is trying to make up for it," Lyle said. "The men who worked here before are much more in earnest than before the war."

TALKS CONFIRM OPINIONS

Lyle said his opinions on the subject had been confirmed by talks with numerous cost accountants, personnel managers, and employment men.

"Not a kick," was the pethy summary of John Musselman, veterans' counselor and supervisor of personnel relations at the Sheffield Steel Corp., when he was asked how the firm's 42 on-the-job trainees were working out.

"Absenteeism is not a problem with these men," Musselman said. "We're getting excellent cooperation from them."

Sheffield makes a check on each veteran once every 60 days to ascertain how he is fitting in. Foremen and supervisors are interviewed in an effort to find how each man—machinist or electrical worker, or whatever his assignment may be—is adapting himself to his work and whether his make-up indicates he is a round peg in a round hole.

The firm's on-the-job trainees never miss making out the weekly report required by the Veterans' Administration.

ARE REALLY PERFORMING

"These men seem to feel they are performing before many eyes," one supervisor said. "And, for the most part, they are really performing."

From 30 to 50 war veterans are employed, mostly in on-the-job training, at the Emery,

Bird, Thayer Co. About one-third are former employees, who started as stock boys and now are assistant buyers.

"The veteran has an important place in this firm," one of the supervisors said. "He is working out beautifully. He is a serious-minded fellow, and he is building for the future."

Said the employment supervisor in another large firm: "The veterans we have are good—so good that it isn't fair even to compare them to some of the inferior help we had during the war."

At the Union Wire Rope Corp., the veteran is gladly recognized as a man who applies for a job without appending this question: "Is the work very heavy?"

STRONG FOR VETERANS

J. W. Campbell, personnel manager for the firm, said he was "strong for the veterans."

"We had about 200 men in the war," Campbell said. "Well, they're all back except for 25; and they are settling down to work in good shape. I think most of the veterans appreciate their jobs more than they did before the war."

One employer, who did not desire to be quoted, said that he had hired infirm, incompetent, and unstable persons during the labor shortage of the war years.

"If they didn't use more than two canes," he said, "I took 'em on. Of course, most of them did as well as they could, and some of the wartime help was excellent. But each of the veterans I have at the present time is doing the work of two of my wartime helpers."

ARE NO COMPARISON

Another employer said veterans were setting a stiff pace for the rest of his personnel. The same view was taken in other concerns; but one executive insisted that comparisons would be odious if not outright dangerous.

"I probably wouldn't live through it," he said. "You see, most of my other employees are women."

The work record of veterans as compared to that of others may reflect the same assiduous will to do the job reflected in marks chalked up by veterans who have returned to schools and colleges.

Said one veteran expert: "The average working ex-GI is no problem. He is more conscientious than the average civilian with whom he works. He is more mature than when he left home. He has traveled; he has a broader view of life; he knows the score; and he knows what he wants."

There Is a Limit to What Even Jews Can Endure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement published in the Philadelphia Inquirer for June 6, 1946:

THERE IS A LIMIT TO WHAT EVEN JEWS CAN ENDURE

AN APPEAL TO THE CONSCIENCE OF CIVILIZED MANKIND

We make this statement because we are outraged by the continued insensitiveness of that portion of the world which we call civilized to the greatest human tragedy of all time.

Six million Jews have met horrible death in Hitler's extermination camps and ghettos.

One million five hundred thousand or less are left alive in Europe today—most of them homeless, unwanted, and destitute, kept alive by one aim: to quit the scene of their degradation and emigrate to Palestine.

One hundred thousand—at least a fraction of those for whom continued existence in Europe has become impossible—could be saved immediately. But at the very moment when action is most sorely needed, there are new delays and further equivocation.

We submit that there can be no valid reason for failure to act now. The European war ended a year ago. Dean Earl Harrison, of the University of Pennsylvania, was sent by the President of the United States to investigate the condition of the Jewish survivors in Europe. He submitted a report to the President which made it clear that any delay in the transfer of these unfortunate people to Palestine would result in misery and death. President Truman thereupon sent a letter to Prime Minister Attlee on August 31, 1945, requesting that 100,000 of these displaced European Jews be permitted to emigrate to Palestine at once.

The request was rejected by the British Government. Instead, an investigation of the situation—another investigation—was proposed by Great Britain. The Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry was set up.

After 4 months of investigation this committee unanimously recommended what President Truman proposed in the first place—the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews to Palestine. During all these months of investigation Jews who could be leading useful, happy lives in Palestine suffered and died.

One would think that not a moment would now be lost in carrying out this act of elemental humanity. But no. "Conditions" which had been considered and rejected by the committee are now being demanded by Prime Minister Attlee. And our own State Department continues in practice a procedure of "consultations" which may delay indefinitely the attainment of the noble objective to which our Government is fully committed.

Are we to condemn these pitiful Jewish survivors to an indefinite hopeless existence in the internment camps where they now languish? Are they to be left at the mercy of the hostile populations that surround them? Every observer who has recently returned from Europe has warned that there may be mass suicide among these terribly harassed people who have for so long lived under tension and strain unless they are permitted to leave for Palestine without delay.

America refuses to be an accomplice in such an outrageous act of inhumanity.

These displaced Jews can be moved to Palestine in a matter of weeks. The American people want them saved.

We look to President Truman to stand firm on this matter and to direct the State Department to implement what is now the accepted policy of the United States.

We look to the British Government to carry out the unanimous recommendation of its own representatives on the joint committee calling for the immediate transfer of these 100,000 Jews to Palestine.

We demand justice for a tragic people now.

Louis Adamic, Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, Roger N. Baldwin, Manchester Boddy, Van Wyck Brooks, Henry Seidel Canby, Eddie Cantor, James B. Carey, Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, Dr. Emanuel Chapman, Marquis Childs, Dr. George L. Cross, Ely Culbertson, Walter Damrosch, Jonathan Daniels, Prof. John Dewey, Maj. Gen. William Donovan, Melvyn Douglas, Dr. Stephen Duggan, Bishop Angus Dun, Prof. Albert Einstein, Maj. George Fielding Eliot, Frank Gannett, Lewis S. Gannett, James W. Gerard, Frank Gervasi, Morton Gould, William Green, Bishop Francis J. Haas, Moss Hart, Rev. John Haynes Holmes, Dr. B. J. Hovde, Quincy Howe, Fannie Hurst, Dr. Alvin S. Johnson, Dr. Robert L. Johnson, Rockwell Kent, Albert Lasker, Herbert H. Lehman, Dr. Emil Lengyel, Dr. Eduard C. Lindeman, Dr. Walter C. Lowdermilk, Isador Lubin, Henry Luce, Thomas Mann, Prof. Kirtley F. Mather, Prof. Francis E. McMahon, George Meany, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Paul Muni, Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr, Louis Nizer, Dr. Harry A. Overstreet, Dr. Raymond R. Paty, Rev. Norman Vincent Peale, Ferdinand Pecora, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, Walter Reuther, Quentin Reynolds, Mrs. Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Dr. Harlow Shapley, Dr. Guy Emery Shipler, Spyros Skouras, Rev. Ralph W. Sockman, Estelle M. Sternberger, Rex Stout, Nathan Straus, Herbert Bayard Swope, Mark Van Doren, Walter Wanger, Thornton Wilder, Ira Wolfert, Dr. Mary E. Woolley, Darryl Zanuck.

Labor Is the Cause of Inflation—An Interesting Commentary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, as an extension of remarks, unanimous consent for which has heretofore been granted, I am inserting an editorial from the Suburban List of Burlington, Vt., suggesting that labor is the cause of inflation:

LABOR IS CAUSE OF INFLATION

Many men in public life, bankers, experts, economists, and students of finance, have been writing reams of paper about inflation. The Government seems to take the position that wages can be materially increased with little or no increase in the price of commodities.

First, it must be understood that all wealth comes from the ground; and, in its natural state is of little value and mostly unmarketable. It takes labor to bring that wealth from the ground, process it, and put it in the channels of trade.

Therefore, it naturally follows that the price of labor must determine the cost and selling price of all commodities. If the labor cost is high, then there can be no other result than higher prices.

It might be said that the farmer buys food for his cattle. But it took labor to produce that feed.

In view of this condition it must be clear that the maximum price of commodities has not been reached. Practically everything is going to cost more and increased by degrees for at least several years. The reason for this is that the demand is much greater than the supply. But when that demand is met and there comes about a flood of goods, it must be apparent that the old law of supply and demand will rule the market.

This situation has happened time and time again in the past; and it seems just impossible that any law or regulation can stop this natural current of events.

Indications now are that there will not be a surplus of commodities for at least 3 years, possibly longer. But when the time does come that there is a surplus of goods, there will be a reaction and prices will deflate. This deflation will affect all the people, not only those engaged in business but labor and industry as well.

All trends now point to higher prices until there is a large surplus of commodities.

Labor, Wake Up! It's Getting Late!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement published in the Lock Haven (Pa.) Express of June 4, 1946:

LABOR, WAKE UP! IT'S GETTING LATE!

It's about time for the American worker to start facing the fact that his position as such is in high jeopardy. Not only is the worker being jeopardized, but our American way of life is also being so manipulated by certain individuals that the time may not be far off when we shall have exchanged our system for another way of life. Yes, the communistic way of life.

And believe you me, the fellow travelers have certainly been doing a lot of traveling of late into every section of this land and into every walk of life. They are disseminating their communistic propaganda for the natural purpose of attaining their ultimate objective. And that, my dear friends, is not going to be one for the protection of our American way of life as we know it today.

There was a time some few years ago when we could spot a Communist or fellow traveler. In fact, he was easily identified. True to his ilk of that time, he invariably was a bushy-haired, starry-eyed, soap-box orator type. He could be found on almost any public square where he would be shouting the virtues of communism at the top of his voice. The more he shouted, the more real Americans he made. His line of talk against Americanism was so obviously ridiculous that his listeners didn't have to be endowed with an Einstein brain to make two and two add up to four. And when they got the answer, they generally came away from such gatherings as better Americans, because of what they had heard.

But mark you, the present-day promoters of communism are fully aware of the shortcomings of yesteryear's strategy. They understand, as well as do you and I, how ineffectual it was. So, in lines of strategem, they have given their "pill" of communism a new coating. They have dressed up their travelers and today it is indeed a task to distinguish a good American from a bad Communist, by outward appearance alone. At the moment, these men of exotic leanings are to be found in almost every walk of life. They are among gentlemen of the press, educators, Government officials, ministers, and labor leaders. In fact, they have made inroads at every point of vantage that has to do with the forming of public opinion and public authority. These fellow travelers have a definite program to accomplish, and let there be no doubt about it, their program is not lagging. In the promotion of this program, they know no scruples. They wave the flag of the red, white, and blue in their right hands while they keep the plain red hidden in their hearts. Yes, they are cunning and will stop at nothing in pursuing their objective, which is definitely the ultimate overthrow of our Government.

Yes, it is high time to wake up, because unless we do, we may be caught asleep at the switch. We Americans still retain the right to freedom of speech under our present way of life, but unless we take advantage of this American heritage, we stand to lose not only this right, but likewise every other right that is inherent and precious to the American. The propaganda of the Communist is clever. Indeed, it is ingenious. It paints a beautiful picture of an earthly Utopia for everyone—especially for the worker. The guarantee looks good until properly challenged by people in a position to know the actual situation.

Those who know what they are talking about can always show up communism for what it really is by setting up a contrast. When comparison is made of conditions prevailing in Russia, the mother of communism, it is evident that we are fully 100 years ahead of their way of life. Our workers are free, not regimented. They have the right to work for whom they please and when they please. They have the right to voice themselves for their own betterment, whether unionized or not. If necessary, the American workers have a right to rebel against oppression by striking. The Communist speaks of full freedom, and yet, in the motherland of this system, there is no such thing as freedom for the worker. He either accepts the directives of the dictator or he is sent to prison. And cases are on record where he has been made to stand against a wall and shot for refusing to carry out a directive. That is a fair comparison between the freedom of the American worker and the freedom of the Russian worker.

The "fellow travelers" are praising to the high heavens the virtues of unionism, and yet, in the motherland, unionism as we Americans know it is practically nonexistent. And there is real reason for its being so. Under communism there can be only one head, a dictator, who recognizes no other authority, not even that of God. And let me tell you, without God, irrespective of denominational religion, there is nothing for us humans to live for. Naturally, communism in Russia, to the Russian, is a forward step for his well-being as compared to the treatment meted out to him under the system of the Czar, but, by comparison to our system under the American way of life, it falls far short of meeting human demands as we Americans appreciate them.

Unless labor wakes up, and soon, we are going to find ourselves at the mercy of these "gods," who are as godless as the very Devil himself and whose vocabularies contain no words to express the meaning of our word "truth." By this I mean that, in order to attain their objectives of world dictatorship, they will resort to every subterfuge, including the overthrow of the very unions they purport to be friendly with. Proof of this statement is borne out in the fact that their strategy has been aimed at the ultimate weakening of the unions. Oh, if some of our weak-minded labor leaders only realized the extent of the communistic activity aimed at their own destruction, they would not hesitate in coming out openly against these "slickers."

The labor leader who understands his business knows that to have unions, and effective ones, we must have the means of effective collective bargaining. This being the case, how can we have collective bargaining under a communistic system that recognizes no authority other than the dictator, the "god" of the land? How effective would a railroad brotherhood be in its legitimate demands under Government ownership? Or how effective would a union covering power plant workers, telephone workers, and the like be under a dictatorship? The answer to this is—zero. The Communist knows this in advance, and, since he does, he is making for the destination of complete Government control over all industry, particularly over our vital industries. He knows that under Government ownership, under a social ecoomy, labor unions cannot exist very long. The reason for this is quite simple. Under Government control the right to strike is eliminated. That is No. 1 in severing the jugular vein of unionism.

The Communist also knows in advance that, if a worker can secure by government decree short hours, long wages, and other social-security protection by merely asking the Government to give it to him, it is foolish to pay a union for these concessions. It is just as foolish as a railroad man, who carries a pass, to pay for a ride on a train. In short, it would not take the worker long to realize that, if he can get everything he wants by government decree, it is foolish to pay union dues. When the union worker does not pay dues, there is no means of supporting the union. Thus comes the extinction of unions, a condition brought about by the very so-called "friends" of this most worth while American prerogative.

The scheme is diabolical. It is well planned and no detail is slighted. No man is fit to be classed as a leader if he does not avail himself of the facts surrounding this concerted effort aimed at the destruction of our American system of collective bargaining, which is today recognized as an integral part of our American way of life. If I had my way about it, I would encourage every labor leader in this country—and every industrial leader, if you please—to make a first-hand study of how the "slickers" are operating. I mean, by visiting the Soviet Union. When these leaders would return to this country, even though they had been pink or red when they left, they would come back as real red-and-white-and-blue Americans, waving the American flag in their right hands and cherishing it in their hearts.

I do not wish to create the impression that all of our labor leaders are not worthy of being such, because this is far from the fact. We have many leaders who realize that communism and Americanism, like water and oil, are not good mixers. These men are taking the fight right out into the open and showing up communism for what it really is as applied to the American worker, and particularly to the American unionist. In their line of strategy, they are pursuing the course of unionism independent of governmental directives, independent of governmental coddling, and are hewing to the line in the procedure of legitimate collective bargaining.

If we are to save unionism, more leaders of labor must step up and meet the challenge of communism; because, if they don't they will wake up some fine day—and maybe soon—to find that the "fellow travelers" have reached their own front door. Let us bring these "travelers" out into the open. Let's give the American, and especially the American unionist, the opportunity to make a comparison between Americanism and communism. Let's afford them the opportunity of examining the facts as they really exist. When placed in this position, the American workman will not be found wanting in the intelligence to add two and two and make it sum up to four. And when he does, he will be a foursquare American. Therefore, in great alarm I say, labor wake up. It's getting late.

Frankly yours,

MAURICE R. FRANKS,
Editor, the Railroad Workers Journal.

(This space paid for by Public Relations Department Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc., Walter B. Featherson, chairman, 139 North Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.)

Opponents of the British Loan Are Not All Crackpots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there is printed herewith an editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of this morning:

JESSE JONES AND B. M. BARUCH ON THE BRITISH LOAN

When the $4,400,000,000 British loan proposal was up before the Senate, propagandists for it made a big to-do of listing the women's clubs, international bankers, Treasury Department stooges and uncertain Americans, in their corner. And then they threw their spotlights on such loan opponents as Gerald L. K. Smith and the ancient General Jacob L. Coxey, the leader of the now almost forgotten crackpot Coxey's Army march on Washington in 1894.

That was a cagey play designed to make persons in doubt shy away from the loan opposition.

Well, the propagandists for the loan can't continue to make it seem a simple case of screwballs against the brains and respectability of America if they admit facts.

For one who opposes the loan, meet B. M. Baruch, a fairly well-known and respected citizen, not to mention that he is an international financier.

On March 25, 1946, before the House Banking and Currency Committee, Baruch said:

"I am not opposed to helping foreign nations. But until production warrants it, I am opposed to lending them money or assisting them except for direct needs to make purchases when we know they cannot be made here or elsewhere.

"At this time that would be to increase demand. It would be cruel to hold out hopes that will not be realized. I would keep the goods necessary to prevent inflation and then allocate the balance, as they come to hand, where it would help the most."

The administration must think Baruch has a little more sense than General Coxey, for the latest of his many Presidential assignments is that of designing a policy for the United States on the atom bomb.

If he knows enough to know what to do with that bomb, or even make intelligent suggestions, surely his thoughts on the loan are worth serious weighing.

THE GRANDDADDY BANKER OF THE AGES

But Baruch is not the only international financier who has come out against the loan. The granddaddy of all financiers of history is Jesse Holman Jones, of Houston, Tex.

In private life, Jones is a banker and industrialist, as Baruch is a financier, meaning that each tries to buy low and sell high as most other people try to do, only these two do it.

Like Baruch, Jones has long since made all the dough he can use for himself, and like Baruch has put his riper years and wisdom at the service of this country. It was as a governmental money manager that Jones became the granddaddy banker of the ages.

Jones came to Washington first in the Hoover administration, by appointment on February 2, 1932, as a director of the then newly organized Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

When F. D. R. took over, he shoved Jones up to Chairman of the RFC and told him to speed the good work. Jones did, his motto being: "Billions out and billions back." He made the motto work.

But before he could wind up his highly successful peacetime billionairing the war was on us and it was Jones' job to finance literally hundreds of billions of dollars' worth of Government investment in factories, mines, foreign purchases, trades, and war-making money deals of many kinds.

Finally, the palace guard got Jones in January 1945, just as term 3 was melting into term 4, and since then he has been free to speak his mind without the burden of protecting official administration policy.

WHY JONES IS AGAINST IT

Jones' judgment on the British loan is that it would be a bum deal for the United States of America, though very nice work for the British if they can get it.

He set forth his analysis in a letter to the House Banking Committee on June 3, and in smashing language.

Among other items, he declared the claims that we will profit in foreign trade as a result of the loan are greatly exaggerated. He said further that the British have plenty of collateral hidden over here that ought to be pledged against any money they borrow anyhow, an especially wise thought considering how they defaulted on their previous debt.

Finally, and most important, the loan to Britain, Jones said, would be an irreparable mistake that would shove the United States of America along the road to financial ruin.

When two such eminent men as Baruch and Jones warn against this British loan, you're being kidded by anybody who claims that opposition to it comes only from the likes of Smith and Coxey.

One World or None

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ROLLA, MO., *May 31, 1946.*
The Honorable A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the members of the Rolla Book Forum, have just heard a level-headed, nonpolitical physics professor summarize and comment upon One World or None—the book in which 15 scientists, a general, and a distinguished conservative publicist take up the problem posed by the existence of the atomic bomb.

We feel that this book presents two salient truths:

1. As things stand now, the civilized world will very probably be destroyed by atomic war in 5 years—or even less.

2. The sole means of survival now apparent is the establishment of a world authority or government, backed by the appropriate police force, to have direct control over all research in and production of atomic material for military purposes.

As responsible citizens in a self-governing society, we feel that we must do whatever we can to urge realization of these facts and action on the basis of them. We hereby add our voices to those of the great number who respectfully plead with you to begin right now to do whatever you can in your official capacity toward the establishment of this world authority over atomic fission.

I

We should like to present the following additional arguments for immediate and aggressive action to this end:

1. We mobilized our industrial forces and scientific intelligence to beat the Axis to the bomb. Now, this book makes clear mere survival demands imperatively tht we mobilize all necessary intellectual and material resources to bring about "one world" control before the present atom-armament race (which our success initiated) has swept us irrecoverably toward its suicidal conclusion.

2. The atom bomb confers such power over human existence that its possession by any single individual or group (even the Government of the United States) is, within the present world community, simply intolerable. Its possession by a second, or a third, national group will but increase the tension that precipitates explosion. This fatal power must be firmly in the hands of a governing body representing the will and the welfare of the whole human race. Needless to say, such a crucially significant institution must be shaped with the utmost political wisdom and patience of which we are capable.

3. We may grant that, as a people, we are more naturally endowed for the production of a bomb than for the creation of the means to a reign of law which its existence necessitates. We may at the moment see among the great powers little hope for united action in this matter. And yet, faced with the blunt alternatives, one world or none, we must act in our own defense; there is no possible justification—moral or intellectual—for failing to act to avert the doom toward which we move.

4. But the very extremity of the situation in which the civilized world finds itself seems to offer some hope. Whether we present the implications of a bomb-ridden world in all their complexity or boiled down to their brutal essence, we should be able to get the governments to realize this elemental truth: We are all in the same boat and moving toward the same abyss. Resignation to the fact that other powers will not see it this way or, seeing, will actually resist united action is simply an untenable position. With such powerful motives for action, and such tremendous intellectual and technological means of information and persuasion at our disposal, we cannot resign ourselves to evil—we cannot behold ourselves sinking down in some corrupted or phantasmagoris paralysis of will.

II

The precise steps to be taken to achieve this "one world" control over the bomb (and allied weapons) must come out of the conferences of mobilized intelligence—social, political, and technological. And, defeatism to the contrary, we feel that the global action of the United Nations did suggest the potentialities of cooperative human intelligence; now, in the presence of graver emergency, we must think together politically as well as militarily.

The following we feel to be some immediately pertinent considerations:

1. The report of the State Department of Consultants forms a basis for approach. It, incidentally, illustrates what even so limited a mobilization of intelligence can accomplish.

2. We should prepare alternative plans and multiple means of promulgation for each. We should be prepared to act through the United Nations or, if necessary, through some other agency. The principle of action on many fronts was driven home to us during the war.

3. Our intellectual and administrative resources must be organized on the principle of "first things first." Men should be, if necessary, drafted, yet in such a way that

both we and they shall appreciate the worth to mankind of the service they perform.

4. The atomic scientists themselves should be present in these councils. The presentation of the alternatives we face to the Russian scientists is one front on which these men might work most effectively.

5. We must plan to utilize to the utmost the world-shrinking agencies such as the radio and the airways, which helped bring us to this fateful situation, to aid us in achieving the "one world" action to meet it.

6. Unprecedented crises may be met by unprecedented plans: We now have a task worthy of the protean ingenuity which we as a people lavish on trivialities. Let us bring this situation before the minds of men so completely that comprehension becomes motive—and we may yet rise to meet this "greatest crisis in the history of mankind."

III

And if one shrinks from such extreme demands for confidence and resolution, he should return to the refrain of this book: there is no defense, no defense, no defense. The notion, upon which we now seem to be acting, that we may avoid destruction with more and better bombs, strategic distribution, super-plane transportation, etc., appears totally blind to the reality which the writers of "One World or None," set forth. The false sense of security could be fatal.

Very truly yours,

ROLLA BOOK FORUM,
CLARK E. BOYD,
Chairman of Committee.
MARY R. BEECH,
Co-Chairman of Committee.
FRANK C. WINSTON,
President.

Strikes in Farm-Machinery Plants Handicap Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, throughout the entire farming section of the United States, particularly that section in which wheat is produced in great volume, there exists today a difficult situation resulting from strikes. It is imperative that something be done immediately. The Government is asking the wheat farmers of the Nation to produce wheat in great volume. They have been doing this for the past several years.

During this war period most plants making farm machinery have been turned over to war uses. As a result farm machinery has very definitely deteriorated, and today, as the result of strikes, it is not alone impossible to obtain new machinery but it is impossible to obtain parts to repair old machinery.

These are serious problems that come at a time when the Government is asking that wheat be produced in volume to feed the starving peoples of Europe. It is regrettable indeed that strikes throughout the Nation are handicapping reconversion, and by their vary nature are impeding the efforts of the administration to save the starving peoples of Europe with food products.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith a telegram which has been sent to the President of the United States, a copy of which has been sent to my office for attention:

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., *July 5, 1946.*
Hon. CHARLES ROBERTSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Following is a wire sent today to President Truman; we urge you to do anything you can to get action on this matter:

"At a meeting June 4 of 300 Stutsman County farmers and businessmen which considered desperate plight farmers face because of prolonged shut-down of important farm implement factories we were instructed to respectfully petition you, if prompt reopening of these plants through conciliation appears unlikely, to immediately take over the J. I. Case Implement Co. plants at Racine, Wis., and Rockford, Ill., and the Allis Chalmers plant at West Allis, Wis, and the Minneapolis Moline plant at Minneapolis, Minn.

"Stutsman County farmers are continuing all-out production efforts on the same basis as during wartime to meet domestic and world-wide food needs. We need new farm machinery badly. One day's output of the Case plant which has been out of operation since December 26 would go far to meet needs of this country but our most desperate need right now is for repairs that will enable us to make our old machinery do for another year. Failure of machinery dealers to have parts available when we need them will be disastrous to our production efforts.

"Although effects are not so immediately noticeable, failure of the Case officials to even negotiate for reopening their plants constitutes as grave an emergency to food production as recent rail and coal strikes. While other farm-equipment controversies are being subjected to negotiation such negotiations must not be permitted to be further dragged out. We urge you to use your powers with all possible speed to get these plants back into production. The unions involved have indicated they will return to work immediately if the plants are taken over and operated by the Government.

"We respectfully urge you to act.

"Committee for mass meeting signed:
"G. H. KNOBEL, *Farmer.*
"H. W. ANDERBERG, *Farmer.*
"SELVIN HOVELAND, *Farmer.*
"M. S. BURKE, *County Agent.*
"J. A. SCHOONOVER, *Secretary.*
"JAMESTOWN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE."

Shortages and Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *May 25, 1946.*
Hon. GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed form is a poor substitute for a house.

We have no meat, flour, butter, houses, shirts, suits, cars, rights, liberty.

But we do have plenty of Government bureaus, regulations, regimentation, supervision, planned economy, Government employees, propaganda, strikes, debts, politics, lumber for Europe, food for Europe, un-Americanism, stupidity.

Yours for a return to sanity,
WALTER T. PLUMMER,
Ex-Soldier and Member of VFW.

OPA Knifes Dairymen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, time and again on the floor of the House of Representatives I have stated that the dairymen were being ruined by the OPA. Why should this great farm activity, so essential to the welfare of the people, be sacrificed to the whims of Government bureaucrats utterly devoid of common sense in attempting to maintair the price of milk to the farmers below the cost of production? It has been fully demonstrated that this indispensible segment of our economic farm structure can be solved only by the intervention of the Congress. Bureaucracy has failed. The dairy industry must not be ruined. Many fine dairy herds, developed at great expense, have been slaughtered and sold for beef because the prices for dairy products were fixed by the OPA below the ever-increasing cost of production. The situation of the dairymen in the counties which I have the honor to represent is desperate, and, as I have stated calls for immediate congressional action.

I call attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to a resolution adopted by the Farmers' Action Committee at a meeting in Friendship, Allegany County, N. Y., which, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

FARMERS' ACTION COMMITTEE,
Belmont, N. Y., May 31, 1946.

Over 500 dairymen from Allegany County attended a mass meeting in Friendship, N. Y., on Wednesday night, May 29, and unanimously passed the following resolution:

"The cost of dairy feed has increased; dairymen are paying higher farm labor costs and there have been increases in other production costs connected with the production of milk: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the price of milk in returns to producers should be increased by 20 percent over present prices for the period ending September 30, 1946, and by 30 percent over last winter's prices for the period October 1, 1946 through March 31, 1947; be it further

"*Resolved*, That dairymen of Allegany County join with other counties of the milkshed and with the New York Milk Shed Dairy Committee in exhausting every means of obtaining a fair return for dairymen; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the following: Hon. James M. Mead, Senate Building, Washington, D. C.; Hon. Robert F. Wagner, Senate Building, Washington, D. C.; Hon. Daniel A. Reed, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.; Hon. C. P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.; Hon. Paul Porter, OPA, Washington, D. C.; N. Y. State Conference Board

of Farm Organizations; N. Y. Milk Shed Dairy Committee; C. J. Blanford, Metropolitan Milk Marketing Administrator."

The Farmers' Action Committee will continue to act in any possible way to follow out the wishes of Allegany County dairymen as expressed in this resolution.

Very truly yours,

Farmers' Action Committee: James A. Young, Jr., Angelica, chairman; Burton Benjamin, Belmont, Secretary-Treasurer; Carleton Green, Alfred Station; Ceylon Snider, Fillmore; Harold Fuller, Houghton; O. W. Merrick, Cuba; Carl Walradt, Freedom; Rufus Campbell, Friendship; F. M. Alvord, Friendship.

The plight of the dairy farmers in Allegany County and the other dairy sections of New York State is a fair picture of all the important dairy areas of the Nation.

No time should be lost in passing legislation to salvage what is left of this farm industry that has been so ruthlessly weakened by the OPA. The action of a committee in another body to end price control on livestock, meat, eggs, and dairy products on June 30, 1945, is in the right direction. The tyranny of the OPA should be outlawed.

Extension of Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN EDWARD SHERIDAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WLEG at Philadelphia, May 27, 1946:

Good evening ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, this is Congressman JOHN EDWARD SHERIDAN speaking to you and I have been asked by Station WIBG, as a public relations service, to explain the reasons for my amendments to the Selective Service Act and its extension, whereby I prevented the further induction of boys between the ages of 18 and 20 and prevented the further induction of fathers or persons with dependent children.

I am happy to have this privilege because the true statements concerning the needs of the United States Army have not been honestly reported to the people. There is one thing I despise and that is dishonesty in reporting the news or giving half-truths from which the false conclusion must necessarily follow.

I refer specifically to the editorial appearing in the Philadelphia Record under date of May 17, 1946, wherein I, especially, was condemned for sponsoring these amendments and the condemnation also attached to Congressman BARRETT, Congressman BRADLEY, Congressman GRANAHAN, and Congressman MCGLINCHEY, my colleagues from Philadelphia. In that editorial it referred to the one inductee that was processed for induction to the Army of the United States from 16 counties of eastern Pennsylvania, but they failed to disclose to the public, that on that same day there was an increase in the voluntary enlistments at the United States recruiting station in Philadelphia. In that same editorial they would want you to believe that my amendments had caused the United States Army to be disbanded or even jeopardized. Again let's look at the facts. As of that day and date there were over 2,100,000 men in the United States Army. As of this moment that I am speaking to you, there is over 1,960,000. General Eisenhower, when he appeared before my committee, the Military Affairs of the Congress of the United States, told us he needed 1,500,000 men as of July 1, 1946, to meet the national and international commitments throughout the world of the United States Government. As of tonight, as I sit before you, our Army as constituted, is 1,960,000 or 460,000 more than General Eisenhower indicates he needs as of July 1, 1946. And these facts were available to the editor and publisher of the Philadelphia Record when they wrote that editorial.

Let's look at the facts further. As of May 21, which is over a week ago, there was 769,936 voluntary enlistments in the United States Army. The vast majority of these enlistments are for a period of 2 years or longer, so that Army of ours is not disintegrating or disbanding, but getting stronger every day, as a volunteer Army. Only today, after much effort, the personnel division of the War Department, admitted that voluntary enlistments for the month of May, will more than meet the needs of the replacements in the Army and that the voluntary enlistments as anticipated for the month of June will likewise exceed the replacements necessary.

Then again, General Paul informed my committee that if the pay of the soldier were increased 20 percent, the voluntary enlistments would increase 33⅓ percent. A recent survey of some 2,000,000 veterans who had seen service outside of continental United States, showed that 23 percent of these seasoned soldiers would reenlist if the pay were increased. I would like the public to know that we reported out of our committee and passed it in the House, and this bill now reposes in the Senate Military Affairs Committee, a pay bill increasing the base pay of the buck private from $50 to $75 and proportionately through the other enlisted grades, which bill, if the Senate should pass, and I have every reason to believe will pass, will make available a pool of seasoned soldiers of 500,000 or more, many of whom will make the United States Army their life's endeavor. Simple mathematics will therefore affirm that with the 770,000 we now have in the Army of voluntary enlistments, plus this potential group of 500,000 or more, will bring our armed forces well beyond the 1,070,000 which General Eisenhower needs as of July 1, 1947. This of course would not consider the thousands who will voluntarily enlist and who have never had a previous enlistment in the Army, and only today I am informed by the War Department that their monthly requirements for the months of May and June will run about 25,000 per month. The voluntary enlistments today per month are twice that number.

No, no, Mr. Stern and your Philadelphia Record, it is not tramp, tramp, that boy is marching, but rather tramp, tramp, the boys are marching and will march as volunteer soldiers and not a conscript Army in peacetime.

I and my Philadelphia colleagues are further accused of listening to pressure groups. I'll tell you the groups that I have been listening to—every religious denomination in the United States, Protestant, Catholic, and Jew have opposed the extension of the Selective Service Act in peacetime; the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations; the vast majority of the mothers throughout the Nation, those are the groups, and if the Philadelphia Record wants to characterize those groups as pressure groups, then we stand convicted, but let me give further assurance that those are the groups that I shall always listen to, because they represent the people of this great Nation of ours, and we in the House of Representatives are supposed to represent the people, notwithstanding any editorial condemnation to the contrary.

In further explanation of my amendments to the Selective Service Act, can anybody justify the separation of these 18- and 19-year-old boys, especially this group of 81,000, which the War Department wanted to grab, who are just finishing their senior year in high school and were deferred under the provisions of the law to complete that semester; also, approximately, the 165,000 who would become 18 years of age during the months of May and June to be sent overseas to do police duty? I hesitate, but I am compelled to refer to the lack of discipline that had permeated through our theaters of operations overseas. The press recently carried the orders of General McNarney, outlining the rules of discipline, because in one area 427 out of every 1,000 of our soldiers were afflicted with venereal disease. This meant every second boy almost in the ranks. General Eisenhower admitted before our committee that an 18- or 19-year-old boy did not make a good occupational trooper. True, they were fine soldiers during combat, where they showed daring under splendid leadership, and were compelled to so serve when actually at war, but that warfare is now over and the Army should again revert to a voluntary basis because a voluntary army is the best army. I do not want any of the radio audience to believe that I place my judgment superior to that of those charged with the responsibility in the War Department, but a matter of such vast importance as taking an 18-year-old boy from his home environment must be viewed with the greatest scrutiny.

I well recall those holding high position in the War Department appearing before our committee demanding that we draft women of the nursing profession. I voted against the recommendation, and, of course, the bill never became a law, and still no soldier, sailor, or marine was jeopardized through failure of receiving adequate nursing care.

I well recall the demands that we pass legislation drafting labor, either putting them in the uniform of the United States or under military jurisdiction, as labor slaves. We didn't do it. I voted against it in committee and the records will confirm that free labor turned out the greatest volume in the history of mankind and the munitions of war went through on time and in necessary quantities.

Of course, now an attempt will be made to have the public believe that those now in the Army will be compelled to serve indefinite time, and that others now serving in the armed forces will be separated from their families for at least 2 years. Nothing could be further from the facts. The House passed, and it now reposes in the Senate, House bill 6064, which, among other things, provides that inductees shall not serve for a longer duration than 18 months. It is my firm conviction that the 120,000 fathers who now remain in the Army could be discharged tomorrow without affecting in any degree the efficiency or requirements of the United States Army. It has been proven that time and again Congress must make mandatory, under statutory provision, things that should be obviously done by the War Department. Of the 460,000 which must be discharged between now and the 1st of July—within the next 30 days—120,000 of them could necessarily be the remaining fathers in the Army who were inducted.

I'll take further issue in respect to the drafting of 18- and 19-year boys. Nobody will deny that, if drafted, the major part of their duty will be policing Europe and Japan. Would anybody here in Philadelphia propose reducing the requirements of civil service to

permit 18-year-old boys to be policemen? Do you think for one moment Congress would permit 18-year-of-age policemen in the District of Columbia? Never. Then why should they be permitted to do police work in the devastated areas of Europe? The position cannot be sustained. Recently General Textor was delegated by the Secretary of War to make a survey of the availables and requirements of the Army for the years 1946–47. His report to the Secretary showed if the draft were not continued after May 15, we would be short only 1,000 troops on July 1, 1947. He first showed a shortage of 51,000, but after I recalled to his attention that he had overlooked 50,000 Philippine Scouts, his figure was corrected to 1,000 shortage. And, mind you, the general projected his estimates on a basis of only 12,500 volunteers per month. The actual monthly figures of voluntary enlistments are running over four times that number, or well over 50,000 per month. It is obvious that there will be no shortage—and it is now obvious that there is no shortage of brass hats.

I'll state further that when the extension of the Selective Service Act comes up again for congressional consideration on or before July 1, I will vigorously oppose the extension of any provisions of that act which will provide for the further induction of any men in the armed forces. As you know, there are certain other provisions of the act which give the President wartime authority, which, in my opinion, should be continued for a longer duration.

It should be obvious that when the United States Navy now refuses to take any further inductees, but has acknowledged that it can meet all its requirements from volunteers, and has for many months refused to take any volunteer over the age of 29, and the Marine Corps likewise, that there is no further need or necessity for the continuance of the drafting of men. On this issue alone I shall be glad to offer myself to the people of the Fourth District of Pennsylvania in my campaign for reelection on the first Tuesday of next November.

Obstacles to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following realistic analysis of the tragic state of our international relations and some of the reasons therefor. It is reprinted from Human Events:

THE POSTPONED PEACE
(By Felix Morley)

The official communique on the Moscow Conference of last December stated, over the signatures of Secretary Byrnes, Foreign Minister Bevin, and Commissar Molotov, that:

"The Council of Foreign Ministers will convoke a conference for the purpose of considering treaties of peace with Italy, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Finland. * * * The conference will be held not later than May 1, 1946."

In a radio report broadcast to the Nation from Washington on December 30, the Secretary of State repeated the assurance that: "The peace conference is to be called not later than May 1," and added:

"The agreements reached * * * will facilitate the signing of peace treaties which is necessary to permit the withdrawing of troops from occupied territories. Only by the withdrawal of armies of occupation can the people have an opportunity to start on the long road to economic recovery. Only by economic recovery of other countries can we in America hope for the full employment of our labor and our capital in this interdependent world."

Today, a month after the latest date established for the holding of the initial peace conference, there is still no assurance of its convening. Secretary Byrnes says that the date, originally "not later than May 1," should be "definitely fixed for July 1 or July 15." But he would be the first to admit that there is no certainty of this desired outcome. Indeed, it is now possible, if not actually probable, that there will never be a general agreement among the victors on the division of the spoils of World War II.

There is nothing accidental in the fact that no peace treaties are being framed to give reality to the pleasant assurances of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." It is not primarily due to diplomatic inefficiency on our part that progress at the recent Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers was, in the words of the Secretary of State, "disappointingly small." The ugly and depressing picture is one of clear design.

The character of that design was made more clear by Mr. Molotov when, in Pravda of May 27, sharply answering Mr. Byrnes, he defined the latter's self-styled "offensive for peace" as being in reality "an offensive against the Soviet Union." American imperialism, he added sardonically, fails to realize that "the future" lies with communism.

II

The only major power which does not want a restoration of peace, secured by definite treaties, is Russia. For its obstructive attitude there are two very practical reasons.

In the first place, Russia has less than no desire to see that "full employment of * * * our capital in this interdependent world" which Mr. Byrnes has hopefully anticipated. Communist leadership has made abundantly clear that not the restoration but the destruction of the capitalist system is its objective. International political instability assists communism. Peace treaties would invigorate capitalism.

In the second place, continuation of a technical state of war enables the Moscow government legally to maintain its troops throughout the whole huge area of Russian occupation; making Soviet provinces out of Prussia, Saxony, and eastern Austria; bringing the frontier of effective Communist control to a line which cuts the heart of Europe from the vicinity of the North Sea port of Hamburg to the equally vital Adriatic harbor of Trieste.

To assimilate Central Europe into the Soviet system requires not merely time but also dictatorial authority. Both are afforded by indefinite continuation of the present anomalous situation. We forget that as month succeeds month the conquerors can inexorably mold the lives of defeated peoples who are deprived of legal status of any kind. The writing of peace treaties, no matter how drastic, would restore some rights to the conquered and force the evacuation of the Red Army. Therefore, by the always logical reasoning of the Kremlin the writing of peace treaties should be postponed until the people of Central Europe have yielded to steady pressure and embraced communism, to which no alternative is offered.

Secretary Byrnes no longer has any illusions on the subject. In his May 20 report on the recent Paris Conference of Foreign Ministers he said: "The making of peace with Austria is essential to the restoration of anything like conditions of peace in Europe." But, at Paris, "the Soviet representative declined to discuss the Austrian treaty or say when he would consider it."

In the present diplomatic struggle between Mr. Byrnes and Mr. Molotov the latter has some strong advantages and will undoubtedly use them.

III

Russia is in Central Europe "for keeps." The United States is not, and is becoming increasingly restless over occupation costs which for Germany alone are running at the rate of a billion dollars a year. So why should Moscow accept treaties which would evacuate all armies of occupation, Russian as well as American? The latter will eventually be called home anyway, and strong domestic political pressure, unknown in Russia, may be expected to expedite the process.

Another serious weakness in the bargaining position of the Secretary of State is the long series of blunders inherited from the leadership of President Roosevelt on which the Truman administration must face the disagreeable pay-off. Outstanding among these blunders, all of them criticized as such by Human Events when they were in the making, have been:

The policy of unconditional surrender, preventing any utilization of German democratic elements, either to curtail the devastation of the war or to reincorporate the broken remnants of Germany into a unified and spiritually convalescent western Europe.

The policy of appeasement, permitting Russia to advance the lines of Communist control over wide areas—central Germany, Manchuria, northern Korea—where Russian troops did little or no fighting and had no valid claim to the authority we have granted them.

The Morgenthau plan, which through its wholly evil influence on the Potsdam Agreement has disastrously disrupted German economy, making the growth of communism inevitable, in addition to transferring much of German's industrial plant, and the technicians capable of operating it, to Russian control.

The support of Quislings, sacrificing fundamental principles in order to accept Russian stooge governments in Poland, Yugoslavia, and in eastern Europe generally, thus ending all hope of a restoration of democratic processes or representative government in the huge territory over which the iron curtain has now fallen with ominous finality.

The policy of deception, deliberately fooling the American people, through OWI and other tax-supported propaganda agencies, into believing that Russia is a sister democracy and that the mere defeat of the Axis would bring a new Utopia, somehow guaranteed by the misnamed "United" Nations.

IV

The General Assembly of this United Nations Organization is now the last feeble hope of Secretary Byrnes for extracting from Premier Stalin cooperation in the making of those definite peace treaties which the Russian Government is in principle—not merely in detail—unwilling to underwrite. Said Mr. Byrnes in his frank radio broadcast of May 21:

"If a peace conference is not called this summer the United States will feel obliged to request the General Assembly of the United Nations, under article 14 of the Charter, to make recommendations with respect to the peace settlements."

As Mr. Molotov says, however, the Soviet Union can regard this "intimidation" with perfect equanimity. Article 14 only gives the General Assembly power to "recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations * * *." Such recommendations would go to the Security Council, on which the Russian veto power is all but absolute.

Furthermore, the Charter contains another article which Russia can invoke to block util-

ization of Article 14 in the manner Secretary Byrnes suggests. Says Article 107:

"Nothing in the present Charter shall invalidate or preclude action, in relation to any state which during the second World War has been an enemy of any signatory to the present Charter, taken or authorized as a result of that war by the Governments having responsibility for such action."

The wording, like most of the United Nations Charter, is clumsy and obscure. But what it does say plainly is that if Russia wants to keep half a million soldiers living off the land in Hungary, for instance, the United Nations Assembly cannot question its right to do so. Article 107, moreover, has priority over Article 14 and seems to mean that no treaty made with a former enemy state without Russian participation need be in any way binding on Russia—which is quite enough to continue the situation that Stalin wants.

It has not yet dawned on the American public that Russia's interest in the United Nations has nothing to do with the reestablishment of capitalistic world order through conventionally punitive peace treaties. Overdue education in the line of Communist thinking is furnished by Mr. Molotov's observation that the Soviet Union will not underwrite treaties calculated "to enslave other countries economically, even though they may have been on the enemy side in the early war years".

Vermont Farm Bureau on OPA—A Stabilization Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a clipping from the Vermont Farm Bureau News, entitled "The President's Corner," in which the president of the farm bureau, the Honorable Arthur Packard, expresses himself as against OPA, upon a condition, which he states:

THE PRESIDENT'S CORNER

During the past week I have received a request from James Ewing of Montpelier, president of the Vermont Poultry and Egg Producers Association, asking the Farm Bureau to assist the poultry industry to either adjust the ceilings on grain and poultry products or to urge the removal of all OPA prices. Mr. Ewing cited several poultrymen who had been compelled to dispose of their flocks because of the shortage of grain. He said that reliable sources showed that the present cost of production of eggs is 42 cents per dozen, while the OPA ceiling wholesale is 39 cents.

Since receiving this letter I have talked with many able people in many walks of life. Some were strong for the removal of all ceilings. Others were just as strong for an adjustment of these ceilings as is now needed by the poultry industry.

Here are some of the arguments for removal of all ceilings:

1. Price ceilings on grain and poultry products have been discriminatory against the northeastern States so that the poultry industry is being forced away from consuming centers and into the midwestern Grain Belt.

2. Some say that no one actually knows the cost of living due to black market operations.

3. OPA was a crude way during the war of protecting consumers against inflated prices, but now the shooting war is over and ceilings are not adjusted to give consumers what they need; example, butter and cotton shirts.

4. Price ceilings do not allow consideration for short crops. For instance, Vermont has had two short maple crops; and, if the price of maple syrup had gone to its natural level, the producer would receive an income from this source which would encourage him to retain his orchard. As it is today millions of feet of maple lumber are moving out of the maple sugar industry.

5. If price ceilings are now removed it will immediately stimulate the production of all goods, grains, and foods. With this increased production it would act as a stabilizer on runaway prices.

Here are some of the arguments for adjusting ceilings to a consistent level, and retaining OPA until we have more production of commodities which are now short.

1. The cost of living rose faster for 2 years following the First World War than during this war. Granulated sugar for instance reached a level of about 25 cents per pound while today it is less than one-half that price.

2. The back-log of Government spending in World War I was about $30,000,000,000, while in this second war it has reached about three hundred billion, or 10 times in dollars. Therefore, it is imperative that a check be retained on prices for a time.

3. Price control on rents is certainly helping millions of people whose salary has not been adjusted to higher prices. It has also helped many living on pensions or other fixed incomes like annuities.

4. Price control on new and used farm machinery has prevented many farmers from building a debt structure which may sometime be impossible to pay.

5. Farmers, like poultrymen and dairymen, must have an immediate price ceiling adjustment in order to continue to feed hungry people, but postwar activity without some brake could lead to a kind of inflation we have never known. It could lead to a general price level so high it could not be maintained, and, with falling farm prices it could yield unemployment, bankruptcy, and inability on the part of people and Government to meet their obligations. This must not happen.

I have given some of the good arguments I have heard on both sides concerning OPA ceilings. I am now going to give my honest opinion. I would favor removing all price ceilings on one condition.

That Congress and the President immediately replace OPA with a national stabilization board of not less than seven men. That Congress give to this board the necessary powers to maintain a general price level of about 176 which was the 1945 price level. (See Farm Economics, New York State College of Agriculture, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., February issue.)

People may ask: "What powers should these men have?" I will say that if this Nation is smart enough to help win a world war, its economists are smart enough to agree on the necessary powers for a national stabilization board. They might make a few mistakes, but they would not make any more than we made by drifting from 1920 to 1940.

Today the majority of all people want to help build a peaceful world. In order to do this we must have stability at home; we must have jobs for all our people; prices on individual commodities should rise and fall according to the law of supply and demand. Each man or woman should have a choice of the jobs they wish to do. Our constant aim should be, "Let's depend on the Government less and ourselves more."

This is my suggestion as a good way to drop OPA price ceilings, but I would not let 24 hours elapse between the time OPA was dropped and the time that a stabilization plan would take its place.

A. H. PACKARD.

Letter of Marjorie E. Smith, of Chelsea, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CHELSEA, MASS., *June 2, 1946.*

To the Congress of the United States of America, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The morning papers arrived as usual today and the headlines screamed—more headlines of complete confusion, yes, confusion, gentlemen, because they are headlines that should never reach the papers of a nation so rich and so fruitful as the United States of America.

What is happening to our country? Surely a nation such as ours should never be in such a state of chaos.

We have been through a period of complete heartbreak—war. Homes were torn apart. Teen-age boys, older boys, and men fought for the preservation of our country. Many lives were lost in that war period. Those lives were given in the sincere belief and hope that they were being given to restore peace, faith, hope, and a decent way of life to the world. Our men fought bitterly, bravely, and surely courageously.

It was expected that for a time after such a bloody war that there would be a period of readjustment. What we're having now is not a period of readjustment, gentlemen. No. It's confusion and chaos. The people of the United States are intelligent enough to understand it takes time for adjustment, but they are not simple enough to mistake confusion for adjustment.

The people of this country have always been willing to sacrifice, when times confronted them when sacrifice was really necessary. They gave and gave willingly. It's got to the point now where you can't give. Why? Because even the necessities of life are being denied the people, and you certainly can't give what you can't get.

Our democratic form of government affords us the opportunity of voting to place into office men who should be capable of handling their responsibilities. Previous to an election time men, chosen by their respective parties who are expected to be capable of the office for which they are running, spend quite some time campaigning for their chosen office. Science has afforded them many means by which they can reach the public. Their speeches are carefully written in the most intelligent and correct English. They speak over the radio, from the platforms of trains, race by plane from State to State, city to city, and town to town. All sorts of promises are made. The people listen and sometimes when presenting their capabilities, these men running for office would almost make one believe their mental capacity is something that was created special, as if by a magic wand. They can do anything. No problem is too great for them to handle. When the election is over and these men are inaugurated into office and start handling their duties, the people begin to wonder where all that breathtaking

mentality has gone to. It seems to have disappeared like magic. Promises are forgotten. The men in whom the people have put their trust start thinking about getting votes for another election instead of doing their jobs in the manner which they should—for the good of the country as a whole.

What this country needs now—and needs so very badly—is sincere, faithful, and sound judgment. We are in desperate need of this type of judgment in the leaders of our country.

There should be no need for people going from store to store begging—yes, gentlemen, begging for sugar, butter, meat, soaps, bread, and all the other things now so prominently listed under the heading of "shortages." This country can take care of its people and still help when stark necessity confronts other countries.

The eyes of the people of this country are turned to their leaders. They are depending on your judgment, gentlemen. Put aside selfish motives. Vote for laws and legislation that will build and strengthen the country. Forget about election votes of future time.

When you consider the draft remember, gentlemen, when boys leave their homes to serve their country—in peacetime—they would like to know for how long they will have to serve. Remember, they have their lives to live, too. Eighteen months seems long enough for any boy to serve, and our boys in foreign lands would like to set foot back home again after 6 months or a year. We still have boys over there waiting anxiously. Don't forget them. We're banking on you, gentlemen. We want the kind of United States of America that our boys died for. Remember, too, the veterans who returned. They're going without the many "shortages," too.

Very truly yours,

MARJORIE E. SMITH.

Altmeyer Switches Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of June 3, 1946:

ALTMEYER SWITCHES APPROACH

From the very beginning the Federal Social Security Board has favored federalization of unemployment compensation. Chairman Arthur J. Altmeyer has stated again and again that only complete Federal control will satisfy him.

It was surprising, therefore, to find Mr. Altmeyer taking what appeared to be a different position before the House Ways and Means Committee recently. He argued that present rates are too high, that they should be reduced to 1 or 2 percent from the present 3 percent. He offered two separate plans to achieve one or the other reduced rate.

Examination of the plans reveals that both would jeopardize if not destroy the system of experience rating which many States now have and which the Federal Board has never liked. Adoption of either plan would thus be an entering wedge toward federalization, for it would rob the States of the chief present advantage of independent operation of an unemployment-compensation system.

Mr. Altmeyer has thus not abandoned federalization. He has merely switched to a more indirect approach, hoping to fool employers by appealing to their desire to get new bargain rates for unemployment-compensation coverage.

We doubt that he will succeed in fooling many. Under experience rating as set up in States like Wisconsin, the good employer comes out far better than under any plan suggested by the federalizers. Under the Wisconsin system, employment stability is encouraged because that stability is reflected in progressively lower rates. Under Federal plans no advantage comes to the individual employer if he keeps his employment steady.

The federalizers look upon unemployment compensation solely in terms of relief. The States which are fighting federalization have set it up to encourage steady employment as well as to indemnify for loss of jobs. From the standpoint of social purpose served, the advantage is all with the Wisconsin plan. It carries an incentive to employers to promote the social objective of job stability.

"Who's Kidding Who?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following article written by Morris Miller of Washington, D. C., and which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on June 5.

As a former prosecuting attorney and judge during the so-called prohibition era, I think the facts brought out by Mr. Miller are particularly interesting at this time.

The article follows:

"WHO'S KIDDING WHO?"—THE FACTS ABOUT PROHIBITION

The drys are going to work in a big and powerful way these days. They're bombarding Senators and Congressmen with a lot of bunk that they hope will bring about a return of prohibition. They're going at it so systematically, that even the Washington Times-Herald got alarmed the other day, and wrote an editorial titled, "How to Fight the Drys." They suggested that the public write their Congressmen, Senators, and the White House stating that they don't want a return of prohibition.

Well, writing the boys on the Hill is one thing—but presenting facts that they've probably forgotten by this time is another thing. Personally, I think that the facts speak for themselves. And no amount of juggling by the Drys can erase the true facts about the worst crime ever committed within the borders of the United States—Prohibition.

Prohibition, the boys on the Hill should remember, brought about more graft, bribery, blackmail, and oppression than any other piece of legislation ever passed in this country. It was doomed to failure because it attempted to force the habits of part of the people—a minority—on all the people. It was brought about because a minority of people who chose to live in a certain way tried to make everybody else live that way. And, that's always an impossibility. Such laws have never been enforced—and never will be. It's contrary to our way of life. You can't make all the people do what just a few want them to do—regardless of how much power those few hold.

Why not face the truth about the whole thing? Prohibition came into being because the drys said that if you abolish the saloon, you'd abolish crime. But, no sooner was prohibition passed, when the various prisons became so overcrowded that arms and legs were sticking out of the windows. Farms were established to take care of the overflow. In the year 1928, 58,000 men were imprisoned. That was the beginning of the glory of prohibition. Seven million dollars in fines were collected. Suspended sentences were over 5,000. Probationary sentences totaled almost 3,000 years. In a single year, 58,000 human beings were sent to jail. Seventy-eight thousand were arrested. Millions of homes were turned into little breweries, while beer was being made in front of the eyes of little children.

When prohibition came into effect we all thought the vineyards would be destroyed. But the price of California wine grapes rose from $20 a ton to $175 a ton. The reason was simple—people were making wine by the barrel.

And suddenly cider became popular. People found out that if they let their cider get hard and froze it in a refrigerator that they could bore a hole in the middle where the alcohol was and get drunk in 5 minutes. Compared with that stuff old bourbon whisky was a mild tonic. Stills were running in the mountains, along the creeks and rivers, in cellars, in garrets, in garages, and even at times in the jails.

Someone figured out that good whiskey could be made out of corn sugar. In 1914 the sale of corn sugar totaled 175,000,000 pounds. In 1928 it jumped to a thousand million pounds, and they weren't making lollipops out of it either.

Everywhere you went you saw whisky flasks exposed for sale. There were more flasks, more corks, more bottle stoppers, and more corkscrews sold in 1928 than at any other time in the history of the country.

In 1928, a local hardware concern ran an ad in one of our local newspapers, as follows: "Big cut price specials: Bottle caps, 3 gross for 50 cents; 3-gallon charred keg, $1.59; malt sirup, 45 cents."

The country was saturated with poison liquor that was being sold by bootleggers as openly as cigars are sold today. It cost the Government $59,000,000 in 1928 to enforce the farce called prohibition. We did not abolish the saloon—we simply split it into a hundred parts and scattered it into every village and town in the country. We did not close the bar—we simply condensed it into a gripsack. Sales of liquor were made by the case instead of the glass. We did not exterminate the brewery—we installed them in the homes of the people.

These are just a few of the facts that the drys can't afford to face. Space limitations don't allow me to print much more. Next time you hear a discussion of the issue, point out some of these facts, and you will stop any dry dead-cold in his tracks.

MORRIS MILLER.

Rescuing Europe's Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the rehabilitation of a truly democratic Europe depends on the extent to which Americans can, in time, come to the rescue of those men and women in Europe who can

provide vigorous leadership for liberty-loving governments.

The International Relief and Rescue Committee has for many years been engaged in the humanitarian and democratic task of aiding the European refugees from fascism. Today these people still need help, and in addition there are new refugees from the new totalitarianism which has rushed into the vacuum left by the destruction of Nazi leadership.

The IRRC has struck many a blow for the preservation of our own liberties by helping those who, at the risk of death, have sought to preserve their own abroad. In view of this, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the address delivered by Miss Sheba Strunsky, executive secretary of the International Rescue and Relief Committee, Inc., 103 Park Avenue, New York City, at a dinner of the Washington chapter, held at the Roger Smith Hotel, May 29, 1946, at which I had the honor to preside as chairman:

THE IRRC IN EUROPE

Just a week ago—last Wednesday—I arrived in New York after spending 2½ months in Europe. You have heard about the famine in Europe. To the everlasting credit of American newspapers and radio there can hardly be a child in this Nation who is not aware of the horror engulfing the people and Continent of Europe. So much so, in fact, that I doubt that I can tell you anything you do not already know, except perhaps to embellish the story with personal detail as I saw it. But it is not easy to talk lightly of a catastrophe which is almost too huge for the human mind to grasp. It is a little easier on the emotional prostration which any decent human being must feel after seeing Europe today to put it in these words:

It's all true. Every word you have heard is true beyond belief, almost beyond understanding. The sight of a woman in a little Italian town lying on the sidewalk in filthy rags with a small child on either side, glassy-eyed with starvation, beyond asking for anything, beyond caring, is imprinted on my mind indelibly, both as an incident in itself and as a symbol of a condition so widespread through all Europe that it staggers the mind and the emotional resources of human beings to face it with open eyes.

The general suffering is so extensive that the International Rescue and Relief Committee with its limited resources cannot begin to tackle the full scope of the problem. For that matter, I do not know of any single organization in this country which has resources equal to the immensity of the task. Only the fully mobilized resources of the whole Nation—of the whole United States—can begin to tackle that job.

America—as a nation—has waded into that task. And it must and will redouble its efforts. But although America already has done more than any other nation and undoubtedly will continue to do more, nevertheless there are certain important aspects of the European relief problem which neither America nor any of the other democracies has considered. And that is the problem of keeping alive the democratic core of Europe, its democratic heroes and heroines who survived the black-out of democracy by such means and by such fortitude as to make us feel humble in their presence. One cannot help asking oneself how one's own democratic faith would have survived under such conditions.

In the face of the immensity of the task and in the face of the meagerness of our resources we have concentrated them in doing a specialized job of relief in Europe.

We have faced the fact that the problem in Europe is not a single problem. It is two-fold. There is the problem of keeping the people of Europe alive. But there is the simultaneous problem of keeping European democracy alive.

We have faced the fact that democracy is the kind of a culture that is handed on by human carriers. We cannot garrison Europe forever. Nor can we really foster democracy in Europe by doing it from the outside or at long distance. The growth of democracy in Europe must proceed from the seeds in its own soil, from the inside, from its own people.

And, so, in developing our relief work in Europe in the light of our limited resources we have had to become selective. We pick out the tried and tested democratic elements, the cadres of democracy who proved their faith and their fidelity to morality and principle through the black periods of totalitarianism in Europe.

Let me introduce you to Manuel Muino, the secretary of the Solidaridad Democratica Española, a former leader of the miners union in Spain. Mr. Muino invited me to his home in Toulouse for lunch so that I might meet his family. He, his wife, and two daughters live in a room, about 10 by 12, which contains a double bed, two broken folding cots, a table, and 3 broken chairs. The walls are cracked, bits of plaster falling from time to time from the ceiling. There is no heat, no running water, no toilet. They cook on a rusty old wood stove in a tiny adjoining cubby hole that is called a kitchen and because they are Spaniards and not native French their rent is 3,000 francs a month—this out of a family income of 4,500 francs, or $37. And they spoke with joy of this home, how fortunate they were to have it, and what is most important, how happy they were not to have migrated to Mexico because it was so much less demoralizing through years of exile to be working for their less fortunate Spanish comrades, some still in camps in France and to be near enough to Spain to return there immediately upon the fall of Franco. In Italy, in France, in Sweden, in Switzerland, in Turkey, and certainly not least of all in Germany, we have sought out and kept alive the standard bearers of democratic freedom, the men and women who will fight to their last breaths against oppression. What is more, they are all people who eagerly await the day they can return to their own countries—if there is the slightest chance of continuing that fight within their homelands without being thrown into concentration camps immediately after arrival there—or disappearing entirely.

In France we spend over 1,000,000 francs a month on relief to Spaniards alone, besides giving them food and clothing. This is the largest relief action for Spanish Republicans undertaken by any agency. We are about to open a preventorium or rest home in the Vosges Mountains for the rehabilitation of pretubercular Spaniards in preparation for their return to Spain. Of the 120,000 Spanish Republicans in France, 30 percent have tuberculosis, 70 percent are seriously undernourished. Our French office also cares for Germans, Austrians, Balts, and Balkan refugees who were in the forefront of the fight against fascism. In the French Alps, near the Swiss border, we have a children's home where the children of active anti-Fascists are kept for a 6-month period of rehabilitation and then replaced with a new group. At present the home contains 35 Austrian children from the workers district of Vienna, 10 Spanish-Republican children, and 5 French. The parents of 30 of these children were in concentration camps or prisons during the entire Nazi occupation. The staff consists of young people under 30 who all fought in the French resistance.

In Italy we are caring for the families of several hundred Italian resistance fighters in addition to Poles, Yugoslavs, Germans, Austrians, and Spanish. We have just opened a school in Rome for anti-Fascist Italian children where they will receive their daily main meal. We also run a restaurant for our people who have no home-cooking facilities where they receive a well-balanced main meal daily. Food and clothing packages are also distributed to all our cases.

In Switzerland our committee is doing mainly a repatriation and resettlement job. The able bodied and younger people among the refugees are encouraged, even urged to go back to Germany and Austria to work for democracy in their homelands. Also, we are in the process of establishing an individual package service for Germany and Austria to augment the work of CRALOG which can ship only bulk foods into Germany for distribution by approved German organizations. This package service will purchase the food in Switzerland, Denmark, and Sweden and can guarantee delivery 2 weeks after payment for the package is made here. Relatives and friends of anti-Nazi Germans will thus be able to order packages in this country for the three western zones of Germany and Austria. In addition to our German relief activity, we are engaged in an extensive evacuation program in Germany and Austria for the pro-democratic refugees in the so-called assembly centers (which are much too reminiscent of the Nazi concentration camps). These are Poles, Yugoslavs, Latvians, Lithuanians, and Balkan refugees who cannot return to their homelands for obvious reasons. The first group of Polish labor people has just arrived in New York, and one of their most heroic members will talk to you tonight. We have six representatives in Germany and Austria working on this program—one in each city where there is an American consul.

In Sweden we have an extensive rehabilitation and vocational training program for concentration camp victims from Germany. More than 500 refugees have thus not only been brought back to health but are now enabled to earn their own living. Also, we are transporting Sudetan German anti-Nazis and labor leaders from Czechoslovakia to Sweden and to England. Close to 300 have already been evacuated. These are only a few of the Czech citizens of German origin who fought side by side with the Czechs against the Nazis, many of them spent years in concentration camps and they are now being deprived of all their earthly possessions and are summarily deported to Germany to further complicate the dreadful prospect of mass starvation of all the German people—anti-Nazi much more than Nazi because many of the latter have escaped Germany.

In Turkey we assist the same kind of people and have just 2 days ago received a desperate plea from our Turkish committee on behalf of close to 100 Yugoslavs who do not dare to return to Yugoslavia. They are intellectuals and social democrats who fled from the Nazis and now again from Tito. They are utterly destitute and have resorted to begging in the streets.

Obvious signs of starvation and misery are not apparent to the casual visitor in most parts of western Europe. With the exception of Italy, Germany, and Austria when short-trip inspections are made one might return to this country and say "I saw no real starvation." A brief conducted tour like the one taken through Germany by Mrs. Roosevelt can give no true picture of the state of affairs. One must go among the people, visit them in their homes and hear the harrowing accounts of years of privation and of terror. The most horrible fact that strikes you as you talk with the people everywhere in Europe is the realization that no sooner did one terror end than it was replaced by the threat of another equally horrifying.

Relief is supposed to be nonpartisan and nonsectarian. That is the basis upon which all American agencies try to operate. But the IRRC being limited in funds and therefore unable to meet the vaster need has decided that at least one American agency must envisage the need for a more selective job on behalf of human freedom.

We are nonsectarian, but we are not nonpartisan. We are definitely partisan, on behalf of the Spanish Republican who withstood the degradation and misery of concentration camps for 8 years, on behalf of the German anti-Nazi or trade unionist who had the stamina to survive 12 years of hell in a Nazi concentration camp, on behalf of the Italian anti-Fascist who spent 15 years in one of Mussolini's penal islands, on behalf of the forces who have fought and resisted through all these years of darkness and who are not beaten but will continue to fight for freedom. Keeping them alive and enabling them to continue their struggle is your only hope against a new totalitarian blackout that threatens to engulf all of Europe.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper item and also an article by Jesse H. Jones, from the Washington News Digest:

JONES LABELS BRITISH LOAN "ROAD TO RUIN"—OPPOSES EXCLUSIVE ALLIANCE WITH EMPIRE

Jesse Jones, spearheading the opposition to the $3,750,000,000 British loan agreement, declared today it would carry the United States "along the road toward financial ruin" and put it into an exclusive alliance with the British Empire.

"We cannot stay strong if we continue to print dollars and scatter them to the four winds," the former Secretary of Commerce in a letter to Chairman SPENCE, Democrat, of Kentucky, of the House Banking Committee.

CZECHS SEEK THREE HUNDRED MILLION

Meanwhile, Vladimir Hurban, retiring Czechoslovakian ambassador, disclosed that his country is seeking a $300,000,000 loan and he expects it soon. And Wei Taoming, Chinese Ambassador, said virtual agreement has been reached for an extensive American credit to China. It has been reported at $500,000,000.

These two loans would be made by the Export-Import Bank and would not require specific congressional approval, as does the proposed advance to Britain. The ambassadors discussed the prospects with reporters at the State Department.

Jones, former head of the huge Government lending agencies, wrote that he is willing to help the British "to the extent we can afford to help them," but he feels America should demand that Britain put up collateral as security.

SAVED EMPIRE TWICE

"We have fought two mean wars at the expense of millions of our best men and most of our stores and twice have saved the British Empire," Jones declared. "Now we are called upon, in addition to sacrifices already made, including some $25,000,000,000 of lend-lease labor and materials for which we will get nothing, again to save the Empire. * * *

"We must, of course, be friendly to and with the British, but we have already given them enough. If the loan is made as now proposed, it will in all probability prove to be another gift. Certainly in addition it will be a definite alliance with the British to the exclusion of other countries. That fact cannot be successfully denied."

SUBSIDIZING THE BRITISH EMPIRE

(By Jesse H. Jones)

I do not think the proposed British loan of $3,750,000,000, now before Congress, should be made and do not believe that any good will come to the American people, or, for that matter, to the economy of the world, from making it in its present form.

If we make this loan to Britain and refuse loans on similar terms to other countries, it would be so much in the nature of an alliance with Great Britain as to cause other countries to feel that we are less friendly to them than to Britain.

I

Furthermore, the proposed loan is most unbusinesslike.

1. Five to 55 years, or practically two generations, is much too long a time to lend money to a foreign government without security.

2. No loan of any kind should be made until all considerations incident to it are determined in advance of the loan. Nothing should be left for future negotiations. In the present loan agreement empire tariff preference and the proposal for the expansion of world trade, in which the United States is so vitally concerned, are left for future consideration. The time for these agreements is before the loan is made.

3. No money should be loaned to Britain for expenditure in other countries without proper security, particularly since the British have substantial profitable investments and operations in the United States which could be used as collateral for a loan.

Prominent among these is insurance from which they make a very substantial profit out of the American people. According to a recent report of the United States Treasury, British-owned assets in this country aggregate more than $3,000,000,000, and include $587,000,000 United States Government securities, more than $40,000,000 in corporate bonds, and 623 controlled branches of corporations having a value of $611,000,000. These and other assets are owned by the British in this country, the profits and income on which are going to them. These assets and the profits of British insurance companies from business written in this country should be used by the British government as security for any loan of dollars to be spent outside the United States, the British government accounting to her investors in British money or securities.

II

The British are by no means strapped. It has been estimated that their assets in countries other than ours total some $8,000,000,000, their unmined gold reserves have been estimated to be worth at least $15,000,000,000, and their diamond reserves as much as $8,000,000,000.

In July 1941 the RFC authorized a loan of $425,000,000 to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland under authority granted it by Congress, June 10, 1941, to enable RFC to make loans to governments that had defaulted on their loans from us after World War I, provided such loans were secured by investments in this country. The RFC loan is payable over a period of 15 years, with interest at 3 percent. The loan agreement provides that any sales by the British of the collateral and all income, after taxes, from all the security would be applied, first, to the interest on the loan, and then on the principal. The security includes the net profits, after taxes, made in this country by 41 British insurance companies opereating here, and the capital stock of 40 additional British-owned American insurance companies. The RFC made no requirement that any of the collateral be sold.

III

In order to be helpful to the British and still protect our own Federal Treasury in substantial part, I suggest that the RFC increase its loan to Britain by an additional $1,000,000,000 on the present security, with no restriction as to where the money is to be spent, and that the interest rate on the balance of the present loan and the $1,000,000,000 additional be 2 percent, with all net earnings to be applied, first, to the interest on the loan and the balance on the principal. If these earnings hold up as they have over the past dozen years—and in all probability they will increase—the loan would be entirely repaid in about 40 years, and the British would still own their profitable investments in this country.

I suggest that the RFC make further loans to the United Kingdom on British investments and operations in this country up to the earning value of the security upon the same terms and conditions—that is, 2 percent interest, with all additional earnings applied to the loan—and that the proceeds of such loans be available to Britain with no restrictions as to where the money shall be spent.

IV

The President has recommended to Congress that we buy critical materials for stockpile purposes and put them away for future use. This should be done. The British can sell us many of these and pay for them in sterling. We can pay them in dollars.

V

I further suggest that Congress consider authorizing the sale of cotton, tobacco, fruits, and other farm products, durable goods, and manufactured articles to the United Kingdom for the next few years on credit, in amounts equal approximately to her normal imports of such items from us.

VI

If these suggestions are followed, Britain would get substantially what she needs from us during the next few years, and, in my opinion, on a basis that would be much more acceptable to the American people than the proposed loan now before Congress.

I do not believe that our failure to give Britain $3,750,000,000 on her terms will cause her to impose or continue trade restrictions or other sanctions that will seriously affect our own economy. That is a two-way street.

I have never been much interested in threats, and for the British to say to us that unless we give or lend her X billions of dollars on her terms, they will be forced to impose trade restrictions, dollar blocs, etc., is not my idea of a fraternal association between the United States and Great Britain so eloquently advocated by Mr. Churchill, nor does it square with the kind of friendship that we have shown the British in two world wars, without which friendship the British Empire would have been destroyed.

VII

It has been testified by administration spokesmen that the case of Britain is different from other countries. It certainly is different from other countries that want money from us. Britain is the only country that has asked us to give her money.

It will be recalled that when Lord Keynes and his associates first came over to get the money, they said they were in "no mood" to consider a loan. They were insisting that we give them $5,000,000,000.

We seem to have lost sight of the fact that Britain, through Lord Keynes, took a prominent part in promoting the Bretton Woods agreements for a world bank and a world stabilization fund, and agreed that Britain would subscribe $2,600,000,000 to these funds.

The question arises now: Where did Britain expect to get that $2,600,000,000 which she readily agreed to put up? It would look to a suspicious person as if she expected the United States Government to furnish it, since she now states that unless we let her have the money she will not be able to participate in the world bank and stabilization fund.

VIII

Another point worth considering is that our executive departments have already sold Britain the more than $6,000,000,000 of our unused materials now in Britain or on the way there for about 10 cents on the dollar, payable over a period of 5 to 55 years, at an interest rate of a little over 1½ percent, and that payable only where her trade balances justify. The sale of these materials has been severely criticized by the Mead committee (formerly the Truman committee), but nothing can be done about it, since it does not require the approval of Congress.

IX

We cannot afford to continue printing and spending money indiscriminately, however admirable the cause. Every time we spend another billion we are reducing the value of our dollars, and if we go on spending and lending and giving and losing, without regard to how we are going to pay back the money that we borrow, it will not be long until the dollar will go as the currency of other countries that overspent.

Britain only owes about $80,000,000,000, while our present debt is approximately $272,000,000,000—or $2,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States—and figures cited by President Truman in his Budget message revealed that we have already authorized and proposed to invest $17,000,000,000 in foreign loans and international financing.

It is time that we stop and think of how we are to service our own present heavy debt before we undertake to play Santa Claus to the rest of the world.

X

The United States with 5.8 percent of the world's land area and 6.1 percent of the world's population cannot single-handedly finance and rebuild a war-torn, confused world. The time to recognize this is now.

Another very important point that I do not think has been given proper consideration is that it is entirely too early after the war for anyone to get a clear picture of the future. Britain knows that and hurried over here as soon as the shooting stopped "to get hers." She is smart, has always been smart, and, incidentally, very selfish.

XI

If the British are unwilling to continue the pledge of the security behind their present loan from the RFC for new money, I would give no further consideration to a loan to them of any kind. We owe it to ourselves, as well as to the rest of the world, to approach this whole matter in a completely realistic manner—which is the only forthright and sound approach.

Approval of the proposed loan now before Congress would start the United States down a financial road that is likely to lead to disaster. Too much spending and lending and losing is a sure road to ruin. The Congress should not ignore the dangers that lie ahead.

The Cost of Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I am pleased to include my weekly news letter.

In this week's release I have tried to survey and appraise the cost of strikes. I am also pleased to include some statements from responsible labor leaders of high standing in the Nation.

Much of the data are new. For this I am indebted to the legislative reference research division of the Library of Congress. I am also indebted to my colleague the Honorable ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, of Kansas, for several excerpts from labor publications:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN REPORTS

(By Hon. WALT HORAN, Member of Congress, Fifth District of Washington)

"THE PUBLIC BE DAMNED"

It was in 1882 that the railroad magnate, William H. Vanderbilt, answered an interviewing reporter who had asked about the public's interest in transportation with the famous statement: "The public be damned! You get out of here!"

That statement helped bring on the ICC and regulation of powerful railroads in the public interest.

HOPEFUL RESPONSIBILITY

There is a visible similarity in the attitude of some labor leaders regarding the public's interest in key industry walkouts in recent months.

But not all. Along with Congress, many labor leaders are now searching for acceptable machinery to eliminate strikes. Take Daniel J. Tobin's excellent article in the May issue of the International Teamster entitled "Good Leaders Can Avoid Strikes." Says Teamster President Tobin: "I repeat what I have undoubtedly said thousands of times over the past 35 years, that strikes do not pay and should be avoided if it is humanly possible to avoid them; and furthermore, that a strike should not take place until every phase of the machinery of settlement is exhausted."

That's a good statement.

A RAISE CAN BE A LOSS

Take also this excerpt from an editorial by George J. Harrison (himself the head of a union local) in the Kansas City Labor Bulletin of February 8, 1946: "Count the cost of a strike to the workers: Suppose the workers are earning an average wage of $1 per hour. The company offers an increase of 12 cents, but the union turns down the offer because they think a Government board may give them more. They go on strike and stay out for 8 weeks. Each worker loses an average of $358 (pay for 8 weeks of 40 hours at $1.12 per hour). At the end of that time the Government board awards 18 cents, 6 cents more than the company offered. The company accepts the award and grants 18 cents, but it will take the workers nearly 3 years' work before this extra 6 cents will amount to enough to repay their loss.

"If, as seems more likely, the company refuses to accept the award and gives only 3 cents more (15 cents in all), then it will take the workers nearly 6 years of work before their extra 3 cents per hour will add up to the amount they lost by the strike. If the extra 3 cents or 6 cents breaks a price ceiling, workers may take losses they can never regain.

"If, on the other hand, the workers had avoided the strike and used every means to build up a sound relationship of good will between their union and the company, and both sides had turned their attention to getting out production, they could have gained much more than the extra 3 or 6 cents in further wage increases. They could have saved their strike loss and won public good will by turning out the products other people were waiting to buy. That is why responsible AFL leaders bargain in good faith and make every effort to avoid strikes."

That's sound reasoning. Labor leaders are aware that the labor movement has grown up. It must assume its rightful responsibilities. The above two expressions indicate their willingness to do so. As Harrison points out, labor in this Nation today has something to lose and the nonstriking unions often have the most successful records.

Let's hear from Charles J. McGowan, president of the International Boilermakers. In the American Federation of Labor's weekly news service for December 4, 1945, he said:

"It is also of the utmost importance that every labor union in America exercise patience, restraint, and discipline. Unions can serve their members best by avoiding dangerous extremes and by living up to the spirit and letter of their contracts with management.

"Every member of organized labor must scrupulously respect contracts if we expect management to do likewise."

STRIKES: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

It was not always so. "The public be damned" attitude of the 1880's applied to railroad workers, too, and many men worked unconscionable hours at pay rates around 20 cents per hour. Naturally such things bred strikes. Workers formed unions. There was need for them.

Strike statistics go back to 1881. Since then, excluding the years 1906 to 1913, inclusive, for which no official record exists, 114,792 strikes have occurred. These—and company lock-outs—have been expensive. Their total cost is hard to estimate since the total losses involve their effect on other industries and, more indirectly, the very efficiency of society itself. Some idea of the direct losses to the workers can be gained from specific instances.

Again let us remember that in almost every instance the workers were completely justified in protesting, through the strike, in the conflicts here listed.

The Homestead, Pa., Carnegie Steel plant locked out 3,800 employees over a wage dispute in July 1892. This conflict ended in November 1892. Workers lost $820,000 in wages. Company lost $750,000. Sympathetic strikes in the area affected 6,100 additional workers, who lost $945,000 in wages. Company losses, $200,000. This strike was bloody. The Pinkerton Detective Agency was hired by the company and a pitched battle was staged July 5 and 6. Finally the State Militia was called in and the area was placed under martial law.

INJUNCTION FIRST USED IN 1894

Because of the panic of '93, the Pullman Co. announced a pay cut. Employees complained of this and working conditions. On May 11, 1894, 2,500 quit. The union instituted a boycott on June 26, 1894, which soon spread. To offset this, the injunction was first used.

Here, again, costs are hard to measure. Three thousand Pullman men, however, lost $360,000 in wages between May 11 and August 2. Other railroad men (42,041) lost $3,197,317 in wages. The railroads who did report listed losses totaling $8,067,603.

The Commissioner of Labor in his annual report of December 31, 1900, sums up the direct losses from the 23,798 strikes and lockouts occurring from 1881 to 1900 as follows:

Loss to workers, $306,683,223. Spent by unions for assistance, $19,626,254. Loss to employers, $142,659,104. Values are relative, of course, and at today's wages and prices these figures would be higher. The number of strikes and lock-outs during this period ranges from a low 485 in 1884 to a high 1,839 in 1900.

ANOTHER COAL STRIKE

The coal strike of 1902 lasted from May 12 until October 23 of that year. It was for shorter hours, better pay, and carload contract payments wherever possible. Cost (estimated again): Operators, $46,000,000; workers, upwards of $25,000,000.

The famous Lawrence textile strike of 1912 (January 11 to March 14) involved, at the peak, 23,000 workers. This strike grew out of a State law reducing the hours of labor for women (and children under 18) from 56 to 54 hours a week. Uncertainty as to rates of pay under the new law also contributed. Some of the workers were unorganized, some were in a company union, some were members of the IWW. A joint strike committee was formed which successfully negotiated wage increases of from 5 to 20 percent to some 30,000 textile workers and other benefits. This strike was violent; 335 arrest were made. Cost: Over $1,000,000 to mill owners and workers, $75,000 to the city of Lawrence for extra police, and $180,000 to the State for the use of the State militia.

MORE RECENT EXAMPLES

In 1919, 367,000 steel workers struck for union recognition. It was unsuccessful. Estimates as to the losses in this strike range upward to $245,000,000.

The strikes which followed World War I are estimated at $2,000,000,000 for the year 1919 alone. Strikes following World War II reflect much loss. Newsweek (March 4, 1946) estimated the losses in wages to workers in strikes since VJ-day at $480,000,000. The Westinghouse strike cost employees $642,000 per working day. Total loss to business well over $100,000,000. The General Motors strike had cost on its one hundredeth day over $750,000,000

Last week the head of the Civilian Production Administration, Mr. J. D. Small, estimated that the coal strike alone had cost the country close to $2,000,000,000 in lost production, "not counting the loss of wages to the million-odd workers" it made idle.

The American economy "will bear the scars of the coal strike for many months to come," the OPA chief predicted in his monthly report on production.

This gloomy note was in sharp contrast to the rest of the report, which told of record consumer goods production in April, before the full impact of the coal stoppage was felt.

These inconsistent estimates show the difficulty of figuring costs; but inconsistent or not, strikes, like every other conflict, are costly.

Yet our system of freedom has made them the only recourse for oppressed workers to effectively demand corrections. New procedures and new tribunals must be developed so that these equitable corrections can be made without the inestimable cost and continuing friction of strikes and lock-outs.

In the last 12 years we have seen work stopped for other reasons than wages and working conditions. Jurisdictional disputes are political, not economic, and no justification can exist for politics that leads to stagnation instead of progress.

For years American men and women have yearned for management to get around a table and, by mediation, arbitration, and conciliation settle their differences without the waste of violence—and settle them while John Smith still stayed at his job, still brings the regular pay check home, still has faith that a Government (capable of nourishing the ambitions and brotherhood that have made us in a hundred years the world's greatest society) could devise a just method for finding equity in all economic and material controversies.

Today strange voices mingle in one chorus of conclusion as to the future of America. From conservative throats in England, as well as the voice of Stalin, come assurances that America's very freedoms will lead to economic chaos and disintegration. It must not be.

This hour and this day demands statesmanship. I have found it on the floor of Congress where men with vision now seek the methods that the times demand. It is in the minds and hearts of labor's leaders, too, and I predict the dawn of a new day when reason, founded on law, will rule in labor problems.

What's Wrong With Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of June 3, 1946:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH HOUSING

The National Association of Home Builders, consisting of construction men from all parts of the country, has recently compiled its own report on what is wrong with housing. The association's views have been communicated to officials in Washington.

The gist of the report is that, although builders throughout the Nation have taken out priorities for as many houses as the national plan calls for, two-thirds of the homes under construction cannot be completed because one or more essential material cannot be obtained.

Many thousands of units could be completed speedily if gas pipe, utility equipment, plumbing fixtures, doors, hardwood flooring, etc., could be obtained.

The builders assert that the fault for these shortages lies directly on the doorsteps of Government price and material control policies which are obstructing the production of house building materials. The builders add: "These policies must be changed if the houses we need are to be produced. Even the men in policy making positions in the Government admit that. It is time they said so publicly."

It is indeed difficult to find evidence contrary to the builders' assertions. They are more than willing to erect the needed houses, as is shown by the units now under construction—units that would speedily be completed if it were not for the material shortages. It does no good for the Government to remove a few bottlenecks. All must be broken or houses cannot be completed.

The NAHB reports, for instance, that hardwood flooring production is currently at 20 percent of capacity, because hardwood needed for flooring is being drained off into less essential uses. Soil pipe for sewerage and drains is being produced at only 58 percent of capacity. Government efforts so far have resulted in only a 5-percent increase. Bathtub production is retarded by lack of raw materials. The Government has done nothing yet to channel materials into this industry.

Millwork is way behind and OPA adjustments made in the last few weeks should have been made months ago. Furnaces and duct work for heating are short and the Government is not channeling materials to overcome the shortage. Months ago it was obvious that some lumber price adjustments had to be made, but OPA has still done nothing. Other acute shortages involve nails, wallboard, lath, roofing.

All these shortages must be solved, not just some of them. Only Government can solve them, because Government controls are causing them now.

More talk won't help. Action is needed in Washington.

Tennessee Friends Honor Hon. B. Carroll Reece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday at Johnson City the people of east Tennessee paid high tribute to the Honorable B. CARROLL REECE, chairman of the Republican National Committee. A luncheon, parade, and rousing dinner in the evening was the program.

During the evening Mr. REECE was presented with a gold watch as a testimonial of the affection of the district he represented for 25 years in Congress.

The main address was delivered by Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., minority leader of the House. Mr MARTIN said:

Fellow citizens of Tennessee, we gather here today in the beautiful State of Tennessee to do honor to a native son, who has won high distinction as a soldier, as a citizen, and as a statesman. It gives me a very special pleasure to be a part of this occasion because I have a special affection for my colleague, and, perhaps, a special knowledge of his worth and his abilities.

You who have been his neighbors and friends for so many years know the sterling worth of CARROLL REECE. His high character, his great courage, and his devotion to his country have been demonstrated in many years of fine public service.

As a soldier he demonstrated his loyalty to his country and his willingness to fight—and to die if necessary—for the liberty which has been synonymous with America. When his country called in 1918 he did not seek a commission. Men were needed and he responded. He enlisted as a private. When the war clouds had called away he had won the rank of major. His heroism in battle had won for him the highest two decorations his country could award. No man had a better war record than the distinguished gentleman whom we are here to honor.

He won his promotions the hard way. He had been selected to fill a depletion in the Yankee division. He won his promotion among men who hailed from a State many, many miles away from Tennessee. Those Army boys came to have a deep affection for CARROLL REECE. They knew him as a fearless, intelligent, energetic soldier. They knew him as an officer who zealously guarded the welfare of his men; as an officer ready to go into any danger to lead his men.

His service in the Halls of Congress has been just as conspicuous, courageous, and brilliant. He has always worked zealously for the needs of his own people. But above all, he was loyal to America, the land he loves.

For 24 years CARROLL REECE has been a Member of Congress. I think I may say

the United States Congress is the greatest legislative body in the world. In the people's great forum he has helped to shape the decisions on many issues which vitaly affected not America alone but in some cases the entire world. In Congress, as on the field of battle, the ambition and the objectives of CARROLL REECE have been to serve his country, to make his land a better land, and to make certain the boys and girls who were to come after him should have the opportunities that had been his.

He knew that if the Constitution were set aside, no matter how worthy the objective might appear, it would imperil all liberty, and endanger government by consent of the governed. He knew that if our Nation was to go forward it would do so only through the efforts of the 140,000,000 people who have the good fortune to enjoy the privilege of being American citizens. A country can be no better than its citizens make it. The national conscience is only the composite of the spirit of its individual citizens. CARROLL REECE has always labored to enlighten that conscience and improve that spirit.

As I stand here today speaking these words there comes to my mind the fact that in the mountains of Tennessee there has never been any lack of "fightin'" men. The Republicans have summoned from the mountains of Tennessee a new general to lead them.

CARROLL REECE is the quiet, cool, humble type of man who is ever ready to fight for right, but always wants to be sure he is right before he fights. There is one thing about CARROLL REECE that cheers my heart greatly. He knows himself and his colleagues in the Republican Party are genuine liberals. He lets no one forget that—and we are all going to give him the best help we can to make the Nation realize that the real liberals are those who stand for the perpetuation of our American system. As CARROLL REECE has said, "A liberal always has been one who sought to put a limit on the powers of kings, and today the true liberal is the man who fights the encroachments of bureaucracy upon the freedom of the citizen." At another time he said, "The one group that stands alone in the fight to curb big Government today is the Republican Party."

You free men and women who dwell in the Tennessee hills understand this language. You understand this attitude. That is why you folks have sent CARROLL REECE back to Congress again and again for 25 years. I understand that here in Tennessee you have a term which describes those whom you trust and like; it is, "mountain sense." As I understand it, Tennessee mountain sense is used to describe levelheaded individuals who reason their way through things. That is the way Fortune magazine described CARROLL REECE as a Congressman. That now brings me to a subject which I know you are interested in, and which the country is interested in. When any political party seeks to be returned to power there must be good, sound reasons why that party should be returned to power. There are good, sound reasons why the Republican Party should be returned to power in the National Government, and I am sure CARROLL REECE will approve if I discuss on this occasion, which is his day, on which his own people have chosen to honor him, the reasons why the Republican Party should be returned to power in the National Government.

The first reason is:

To assure a resumption of our American system of free constitutional Government, free enterprise, economy, and free society. We cannot afford to sacrifice the blood of our boys, to spend billions of dollars, to load ourselves with a debt beyond human comprehension, and then foolishly to lose the peace. Just day before yesterday America paid tribute to those who have died, or who have borne wounds in the defense of American ideals of government, of a free economy, of equality of opportunity end of individual freedom. We must win the peace, as they won the wars.

How foolish it would be for us to engage in a war for freedom for other peoples in the world, and lose our own freedom in the process. Freedom is not merely a word. It is not merely an idea. It is a way of life. Not only must people who love freedom be always vigilant to protect it, but they must learn how to live it. Freedom is orderly liberty under the law.

I keep in my desk a quotation from John Stuart Mill, an Englishman who in the eighteenth century was a leader of liberals. He defined the price of liberty perfectly. This is what he said:

"A people may prefer a free government, but if, from indolence, or carelessness, or cowardice, or want of public spirit, they are unequal to the exertions necessary for preserving it; if they will not fight for it when it is directly attacked; if they can be deluded by the artifices used to cheat them out of it; if, by momentary discouragement, or temporary panic, or a fit of enthusiasm for an individual, they can be induced to lay their liberties at the feet of even a great man or trust him with powers which enable him to subvert their institutions—in all these cases they are more or less unfit for liberty; and though it may be for their good to have had it even for a short time, they are unlikely long to enjoy it."

The Republican Party does not believe that we are unequal to the exertions to preserve our liberty. We will fight for liberty when it is attacked. But the Republican Party must be returned to power to put a stop to the artifices being used by those who would delude the people and cheat them out of their freedom.

A second reason why we should elect a Republican Congress is to put an end to deficit spending and a rise in public debt, which even now threatens the savings and earnings of every citizen in this Nation. We must elect a Republican Congress ,to stop this trend into a more disastrous inflation than that which bedevils us now, and which spawns black markets and unfair dealing. Continued deficit spending means certain ruin for this country.

You folks in Tennessee, like my New England folks, know the value of thrift. And thrift has a value not alone in laying up something for a rainy day, and in accumulating economic security for old age, but the practice of thrift does something fine for the character of the boy and the girl and the man and the woman who practice it.

An inflated national debt means inflated prices or permanent price controls; constant regimentation; the curtailment of all individual liberty; the encouragement of more and more black markets; and finally, a collapse which would carry down with it the savings, the insurance, and the business of everybody in the Nation. Continued deficit spending means repudiation in the end, whether by inflation and printing press money or by default by the Government of its debt.

A third reason why we should elect a Republican Congress is to stop the continued rise of taxes, and to begin tax reductions as scon as possible. Taxes are paid in the sweat, and the toil, and the privations of all the people. Most of them are paid in the prices of goods and services. All of them bear hardest upon the people of lowest incomes. Death taxes, and corporate taxes, and high income taxes, do not protect the lower levels of income against the ravages of taxation hidden in prices.

After the First World War, when the Republican Party came back to power, we reduced taxes four times and reduced the national debt a billion dollars a year for 10 straight years. That fact, which no amount of deficit spending propaganda and high taxation talk can wipe out, or obscure, proves that high taxes do discourage business, do reduce Federal revenues, and thereby do defeat their own purpose.

It is grossly unfair and unnecessary for veterans, and the young people of America to be saddled with taxes which will eat up their earnings, prevent their accumulating savings, and keep them on the treadmill of tax-toil for the rest of their lives. Today each family in America owes $8,000. We cannot drive that debt any higher, we have got to drive it downward, and the New Deal administration has no sound formula by which to do that. Idle factories and desolate homes, fallow fields and silent mills, are the fruits of excessive taxation. Lowering taxes and rising individual incomes are the earmarks of a durable prosperity.

A fourth reason why we should elect a Republican Congress is to balance our current Government Budgets each year. There is no sound reason why current Government Budgets should be intermixed and confused with the national debt, with foreign relief, and foreign loans, and war costs, so as to make it impossible for the citizens to know the actual cost of his Government year by year.

The administration, from the early days of the New Deal, has talked about what is called double-entry bookkeeping. It has turned out to be double-talk bookkeeping. There are two great needs in our whole Federal system of governmental bookkeeping: one is for more simple honesty and the other is for more honest simplicity.

A fifth reason why we should elect a Republican Congress lies in the absolute and vital necessity for us to restore home rule in this country. We have got to decentralize the great powers the Federal Government has drawn to itself in the past 14 years. You remember Thomas Jefferson once said something to the effect that the best governed people are the least governed people. Our whole system of American freedom, our entire free economy, and our whole plan of free society are based on home rule, and can survive and prosper only through home rule.

A sixth reason why we should elect a Republican Congress is to begin reducing the size and the power of the tremendously gigantic bureaucracy which is now bossing the people and wasting their public funds. The present administration pretends that it is going to reduce this gigantic bureaucracy, but just as soon as it reduces the national inflammation of bureaucracy in one part, it swells up in another.

It is in the nature of bureaucracy always to keep itself in power; to want to entrench itself more firmly year by year; and to create artificial activities which it can clothe in a false appearance of importance in order to stay on the pay roll and hold onto the power. Big Government at Washington and free government at home are uncompromisingly opposed; we cannot have both.

A seventh reason why we should elect a Republican Congress is to clean out the dark recesses of bureaucracy and to put an end to the boring from within by subversionists high up in the Government. They are trying to change our form of Government; they are trying to control our economy; they are trying to regiment our society order finally to achieve a dictatorship in this country such as exists today behind the iron curtain in Russia. You folks in Tennessee don't want any overlord with a bayonet bossing you around. Neither do we New Englanders want it. No Americans want it. May I add further, we Republicans will not permit a totalitarian communistic or fascistic system to supplant our American way of life.

The eighth reason why we should elect a Republican Congress is to put an end to the limitations which shackle business; to restore production; to provide good jobs at good wages; and to permit the flow of plenty to reduce prices; to increase the purchasing

power of everybody's dollar; to make the necessities and luxuries of life accessible to all under a free American system.

The ninth reason why we should elect a Republican Congress is to make such measures as may be necessary to reopen opportunities to our veterans to secure good jobs; or to go into business; or to engage in agriculture; or to enter the professions, whichever they shall choose. We made great promises to the men and women whom we asked to volunteer, or whom we inducted into the service of their country. Now that the fighting is over, and the victory is won, the Republican Party believes those promises ought to be made good, and the Republican Party is ready, when it comes back to power, to make them good. We mean to see to it that cheap, petty bureaucratic interferences and red tape do not cheat the veterans out of their rights and privileges.

A tenth reason why we should elect a Republican Congress is to make a special study of conditions in order to eliminate everything that will stand in the way of providing our young people with the opportunities for advancement to which their abilities and energies entitle them. This can be done only under our traditional American way of giving everybody a fair chance. The youth of America must have its opportunity of today, as we of the older generation had our opportunities in our youth. That means to open up the businesses; the trades; the professions; so to free all of those activities from limitations; entangling red tape, and hampering taxation which now almost preclude the possibility of a success in independent business or in the trades. Youth must have its fair chance in the new world it helped to create through its sacrifices.

The eleventh reason why a Republican Congress should be elected is to put an end to secret foreign dealing; secret executive agreement; secret commitments binding our people, and to conduct our foreign relations openly, keeping the people at all times informed of the results. A wise man once accurately described the dangers of secret diplomacy in these words, which can be applied with full force to our conditions of today. Said he:

"It has been the one song of those who thirst after absolute power that the interests of the state require that its affairs should be conducted in secret. * * * But the more such arguments disguise themselves under the mask of public welfare, the more oppressive is the slavery to which they will lead. * * * Better that right counsels be known to enemies than that the evil secrets of tyrants should be concealed from the citizen. They who can treat secretly of the affairs of a nation have it absolutely under their authority; and as they plot against the enemy in time of war, so do they against the citizens in time of peace."

The secret conferences and maneuvers of the past year have plainly indicated to the American people that these secret dealings breed distrust and dissension and finally lead to war. The American people have the right, as a result of their sacrifices, to the reward of a durable peace. They have a right to insist if there are any nations whose aims are not the aims of peace it is time we found out. Delays and a policy of appeasement in this hour can result in our knowing too little, too late.

A twelfth reason why we should elect a Republican Congress is to replace an administration which has so long been in power it has become careless of the public welfare; warped by political expediency, and confused by partisan cross purposes. This confused, self-contradictory, feud-ridden administration must be replaced by a Republican administration pledged to economy in Government; fair play to all; and devotion to our American system of government by consent of the governed.

CARROLL REECE, my friend, my colleague, and my associate, we Republicans in Congress are behind you in your leadership of the national organization for a sweeping victory for Americanism and good government next November. This fight which you lead is not a partisan fight. It is a fight to save America. Millions of men and women, good Democrats, will join with us in gaining a victory for America. They know the sinister forces which are determined to control the Congress and dominate the Government. These Democrats know, with us, that these anti-American forces can be defeated now only through the instrumentality of the Republican Party in cooperation with all citizens who want to preserve our American way. To you, CARROLL, has been given the opportunity to do your greatest service for our beloved land by leading the fight for Americanism. May God guide and strengthen you for the work, to the end that liberty may be preserved on this continent.

Pension or Retirement Pay to Hospitalized Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY
OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Tuesday, May 21, 1946.

The board met in regular session. Present: Supervisors William A. Smith, chairman, presiding; Leonard J. Roach, John Anson Ford, and Roger W. Jessup; and J. F. Moroney, clerk, by Alice Burks, deputy clerk.

In re H. R. 5549, providing for full pension or retirement pay to hospitalized veterans: resolution urging Congress to take immediate action upon Discharge Petition No. 30.

On motion of Supervisor Roach, unanimously carried, it is ordered that the following resolution be and the same is hereby adopted:

"Whereas under date of April 16, 1946, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, by resolution, urged the Congress of the United States to pass legislation increasing the compensation of hospitalized veterans; and

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress bill H. R. 5549 amending section 4 of the act entitled "A act to provide certain benefits for World War veterans and their dependents and for other purposes," approved July 19, 1939, to provide for full pension or retirement pay to veterans during periods of hospitalization or domiciliary care in veterans' homes; and

"Whereas said bill is now in the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation; and

"Whereas more than 6 months have elapsed since said bill was introduced, and the delay is causing increased hardship, suffering, and privation to hospitalized veterans and their dependents because of the negligible compensation payable to said veterans under the present act; and

"Where Discharge Petition No. 30 has been filed by Representative GORDON L. McDONOUGH to bring this bill to the floor of the House of Representatives for speedy action, in order to end the shocking situation of veterans and their dependents being deprived of adequate support from the Government during such hospitalization: Now, therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That Congress be urged to take immediate action upon this petition, and that the clerk of the Board of Supervisors be instructed to send copies of this resolution to each California Senator and each Member of the Los Angeles County congressional delegation."

The foregoing resolution was adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, on May 21, 1946, and is entered in the minutes of said board.

[SEAL] J. F. MORONEY,
County Clerk of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, and Ex Officio Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of said County.
By ALICE BURKS,
Deputy.

Advertising—Saint or Sinner?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I am including an address made by the Honorable Robert E. Freer, a Commissioner of the Federal Trade Commission at the forty-second annual convention of the Advertising Federation of America held in Milwaukee on May 29, entitled, "Advertising—Saint or Sinner?"

Mr. Freer is well qualified to discuss this subject because he knows the difference between honest advertising, which is good advertising, and smart advertising, which does not always keep to the truth.

In his remarks he pays tribute to the work of the better-business bureaus throughout the country and this praise is well deserved because I know intimately of what these organizations accomplish for the protection of the public and for the everlasting good of business itself. I hope Mr. Freer's remarks may be read by many because they contain much that is sound.

The address follows:

When I first was assigned the topic, Advertising—Saint or Sinner, I regarded it as a very satisfactory subject. I thought that advertising, as the patron saint of business prosperity, while perhaps thus in the early 1930's open to suspicion of a sin of omission in respect of prosperity's loitering around the corner, could never be suspected of any sins of commission, as surely such were not its sins but those of individual sinners who had strayed from the federation fold. I thought naturally, that at a convention of the Federation I should be talking to the very hierarchy of the angels and that simply by roundly scoring the conspicuously absent sinners we all should be left with a pleasant taste and a warm glow of self-satisfaction in the middle regions. Somewhat tentatively I though that I might open the camp meeting with the old American Carriage Co. slogan, "This way sinners," and somewhat modestly I thought I might go down in Federation history as "the Freer that made Milwaukee famous."

Upon closer consideration of the matter, however, I was dismayed to find that sin in

advertising, like sin in general, is something that everyone, like Coolidge's preacher, is "agin," and that an old-fashioned revival would be no more appropriate at a convention of the Federation than it would be in a conference of missionaries. And with all these wings in evidence. I'm certain that there's not a cloven hoof in the room to hit the sawdust trail had I been zealous enough to issue the call.

I am very glad to be here today. In a sense I am returning a visit which some of your members paid to the Federal Trade Commission over 30 years ago when Chairman Joseph E. Davies in whose home State we meet today, invited H. S. Houston, president of the Associated Advertising Clubs of the World, to appear and discuss the status of untrue and misleading advertising under the then newly enacted Federal Trade Commission Act. Attending that November 1915 meeting, too, were W. H. Ingersoll, representing the National Advertisers; E. T. Meredith, farm newspapers; James Keely, newspapers, and Charles R. Porter, advertising agencies. Another participant was H. J. Kenner, then representing the National Vigilance Committee, whose book The Fight for Truth in Advertising, was published in 1936 under the sponsorship of the Advertising Federation of America. Both entertaining and informative, it commemorated the twenty-fifth anniversary of the advertising industry's campaign for self-correction and self-discipline in advertising.

I am deeply serious when I say that I do wish to congratulate the Advertising Federation of America for its tireless efforts to make truth the keystone of modern advertising. The battle of the Federation, its predecessor and cooperating organizations, including the better business bureaus, and of the little band of determined men from the ranks of the advertising clubs who first carried the torch for truth in advertising, is an inspiration to those of us in the Government who must administer the legal sanctions against deception of the public. It is you—the men who employ advertising to sustain your business, who prepare it and who disseminate it—who must determine in the last analysis the effectiveness of any movement to prevent deception.

During the first decade of this century today's maxim "It pays to advertise" was a scintillating slogan whose novelty in that era attested that much trade and consumer skepticism of advertising as an institution was being dispelled. Businessmen were discovering that their customers had faith in the written word of other businessmen who did business in the next State. Countless men even by 1905 were making their living by creating advertising. Only a few years thereafter, Advertising's very foundations were reinforced when an agency was set up to check and confirm media circulation statements.

The Federal Trade Commission and other Government agencies may swing the big stick relentlessly against the border fringe without accomplishing much more than a segregation of those sinners whose horns are developed beyond the legal limit. You, on the other hand, by instilling into the minds of those who actually employ and produce advertising, the hard fact that real truth and good taste in advertising is good business, are in a position to accomplish more than any Government agency.

The Commission is often confronted with advertising claims which lie in a borderline zone—claims which are true literally when subjected to cold legal scrutiny—but which are objectionable because of omission, innuendo or because we all know that the average consumer does not read an advertisement as does a Government lawyer or a Federal judge in a proceeding involving that claim. At times the Commission feels itself in a position to proceed against claims in this borderline, at other times it reluctantly must refuse to take jurisdiction. This is the field in which your organization may be most effective, not by regulation, but simply by educating the businessman and the agency to the appreciation of the fact that the cumulative effect of such advertising policies must inevitably be loss of confidence in the product or its maker by the purchasing public. And for those of you who wish to make of your own or your clients' enterprise a lasting business, confidence of the public, more than mere recognition or knowledge of a brand or trade name is a pearl without price.

The Commission recognizes that sinners in this twilight zone may be dealt with more effectively on a cooperative basis than by formal enforcement proceedings, and has for many years emphasized its trade practice conference procedure. By this means entire industries have met together under Commission auspices to discuss frankly their trade practices, and particularly to undertake to clean up deceptive advertising practices which may permeate an entire industry. The Commission recognizes through this procedure that the average American businessman is no petty pickpocket, to be haled into court at every opportunity, and that giving him the chance to sit down with his competitors and the Commission and work to the objective of improving his business morality is generally more effective than swinging the big stick. By this means many industries which earlier had given the better business bureaus their most severe headaches have been helped to clean house. And while the formal rules adopted by the conferences have marked out the practices which are felt to be unfair under the law, expressions of policy have been adopted which deal with those troublesome problems in the twilight zone, wherein it is sought for the benefit of both industry and the consumer to raise the standards of the industry considerably above the legal minimum.

The Commission has found the Trade Practice Conference to be an unusually fine method of wholesale enforcement of the legal minima in many industries, obviating the necessity of countless formal enforcement proceedings against individual concerns, and the attendant temporary competitive advantage of the recalcitrant firm over those more high-minded or tractable. But principally the advantage lies in the fact that more real good can be accomplished on a voluntary basis than in an adversary proceeding, and much higher standards of ethical conduct adopted.

It is a hard and basic truth that a businessman wants his rivals to advertise truthfully. Upon information or belief that one or more of them is nibbling at truth's edges, he may adopt at his desk certain practical compromises with the concepts of truth in advertising, concepts which only the day before he enthusiastically endorsed when he heard them expressed at his trade convention. When he shares in making trade practice conference rules for others, he is more apt to see to it that his business lives up to them.

I do not mean to infer that such conferences are always filled with sweetness and light. Often there is at least as much heat as light. I can recall particularly conferences which led to adoption of the trade practice rules for the rayon industry. In fact the reverberations are still with us. The history of the rayon industry in this country points a good moral for the advertiser, and if any remark I make in this connection can be construed to bear resemblance to any particular advertiser, it is purely coincidental. It is not in the too dim distant past that the synthetic fibers were considered by the purchasing public to be sleazy substitutes for the real thing. How that impression came to be created may be a matter of debate, but no one ever denied that the best of them were of superior quality to the cheaper natural fibers. As a matter of fact, this was used extensively by opponents of proposals to require accurate descriptions of rayon as an argument to permit continuance of the practices which led to deception of the public.

Justice Holmes once made a statement to the effect that the test of truth is its ability to get itself accepted at the market place. The synthetic fibers have in a few short years demonstrated the truth of their desirable characteristics in the market place, not as substitutes, but as what they really are, demonstrating perhaps more dramatically than is usual that the American consumer can be trusted with the real truth if it is given him. Thus a product which was once advertised and labeled as if its marketers were ashamed of it, and as if consumers would avoid it if possible, now stands solidly on its own feet and commands buyer preference on its own merit. Despite the predictions of many persons that disclosure requirements would seriously injure industry, benefits to the trade actually followed their employment.

It is this characteristic of the public, its ability to handle the truth if furnished with it, that some advertisers seem to overlook. Conditions of modern marketing, where the purchaser may no longer rely upon his senses of touch, taste, or even sight in appraising the wares offered him in such bewildering profusion, make his need for honest information greater than it was even a few years ago. Numerous proposals have been made by consumer groups and others for some authoritative and official source of consumer information. The popularity of some of the private bureaus, institutes, and consumer reports attests this need. I believe this is a field in which advertising itself can do much toward satisfying the consumer's great need, not so much for guidance, as for enough information to make a wise selection. Now I don't mean by that that it can be expected that second- or third-rate merchandising would be so described in such bold language in an advertisement for which good money was spent by an advertiser desiring to sell his products. Even the most visionary reformer would hardly expect human nature to change that much. But the advertising business as a whole never should be heedless of the public search for more honest information than generally is supplied, and, it seems to me, should be seriously concerned with the proposition of supplying it. Advertising should not be considered as a substitute for honest market information, nor as a means for minimizing such information, or the polite consumer agitation of today for more real information may tomorrow become a roar of indignation culminating in establishment of a means of securing that information which will bypass the advertiser.

Another field in which your organization and others honestly interested in advertising may be of real service to yourselves and the public, is that of improving good taste. Now, regulation of good taste in copy is certainly no function of any Government agency, yet lack of good taste is a criticism which may fairly be leveled at some copy, whose preoccupation with various bodily functions, religious beliefs, loyalties, or prejudices is bound to offend a substantial part of the public. When utilizing radio, for instance, as a medium of dissemination, the advertiser may walk in the twilight zone of good taste through the program itself, even though his commercials are above reproach.

No doubt advertisers themselves, with the elaborate aids now available to test the reactions of the public to particular copy will be able to determine, largely, what copy transgresses on the side of bad taste or indelicacy. But even so, every program or piece of copy which offends even a few

people harms advertising as an institution. Your preoccupation will continue, I am sure, to be that of promoting confidence and respect, rather than of ascertaining the limits to which questionable taste or lack of candor can go before they begin to affect sales of the advertised product. It is such an elemental truth that I hesitate to express it, that however fine and constructive advertizing may be as a whole, if any considerable portion of the public loses confidence in it for any reason, whether justified or not, the efforts of the best elements in the business will be wasted.

It is interesting to me to dig back into the advertising media of 10, 20, 30, and more years ago. Only by doing so am I able to apprecite fully the tremendous strides that have been made to improve advertising. Of course, the most obvious improvement is the conspicuous decline of the fly-by-night, get-rich-quick type of ad. They are still with us, like the poor, although to a more limited extent, and will no doubt always be with us so long as any media will disseminate them, since they have a one crop harvest which can usually be gotten in the barn before the frost of a legal proceeding descends. And, like the modern farmer, this type of advertiser is a devotee of crop and field rotation. But the really impressive change is in the advertising of established business, those of you who expect to be in the same business tomorrow, and next generation, and for generations to come. Now this change has been gradual, and it is still in progress, with every likelihood that at your niney-second annual meeting in 1996 someone from the Federal Trade Commission, or perhaps the United Nations Trade Commission, will appear and solemnly note how much better developed your wings are than they were, for instance, in 1946.

The transition has not, of course, been entirely completed, and we still see isolated throw-backs. For instance, the August 14, 1944 issue of Advertising Age referred to a 214-line testimonial advertisement which recently appeared in a midwestern paper. Four columns over, and on the same page as the user's photograph and statement that the preparation was a wonderful medicine for various ailments, appeared his obituary.

Such changes do not come easily, nor do they come as the result of Government regulation. As a matter of fact, if advertisers as a whole were no better than the Federal Trade Commission could order them to be, the situation would indeed be serious. The Commission has participated in this change, and many practices which would have been ignored in the 1920's are now clearly within our jurisdiction. But in this change there is a lag between the minimal legal requirements and the best standards of business itself. By continually raising these standards, you make it possible for regulation to be more effective, and to protect more fully the honest businessman from the depredations of the unscrupulous.

And now, in conclusion, and I do wish to conclude promptly, since I am talking about saints and sinners and an evangelist once observed that no souls were saved after the first 20 minutes, I want to express the appreciation of the Commission for your fine work, and to wish you every success in the future. This is not an entirely gratuitous and unselfish wish, for we at the Commission realize full well that the effectiveness of our work depends in large measure on your support and cooperation, not only in the day-to-day cooperation with the Commission in the investigation and prosecution of cases, but in educating the businessman to the realization that the adage "honesty is the best policy" is not just an old saw, but is the cutting-edge of really effective copy.

Address of Maj. Gen. B. B. Miltonberger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address given by Maj. Gen. B. B. Miltonberger, Office of the Secretary of War, before the members of the National Security Committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars meeting recently in Washington at the Statler Hotel.

The address follows:

The National Guard, in addition to its picture in the national defense set-up, has within the State the primary objective of maintaining State order.

That is not the most desirable duty in the world, but the past 20, 25 years since the Nation Guard has become 90 to 95 percent federalized, it has been handled a great deal better than it has ever been handled before.

The governors of several of the larger industrial States are distinctly disturbed with the conditions.

They are in some cases, sitting on the lid of the racial and industrial unrest, and, as I said before, there is not a single combat element in existence in the United States today that could be effectively used in case the lid does blow off.

Last February I was given the mission by the President of the United States directly, to reorganize the National Guard.

We have made considerable progress, but General Eisenhower amplified these instruction of the President to include that we organize piecemeal as far as we could.

In other words, reconstitute effective elements pointing to our own domestic security first.

That we have been attempting to do, and very good progress has been made.

There are several elements that I will need your support and the support of every thinking American on, if this important phase of the national defense, both domestic and foreign, is completed in the record time in which we hope to complete it.

Those points I will try to take up a little later.

One thing we have to combat tremendously is that we are faced by the atomic-energy proposition, which has in the thoughts of a great many Americans taken out of their minds our need for an effective ground force.

I submit to you that, as far as I know, the fundamentals of war have not changed, regardless of the concentration of fire power at any one given point.

I know of our experiments with guided missiles and rockets.

I know they travel 5,000 miles an hour; and I know, as you probably do, that the German V-2, with modifications, was set up to be fired into the city of Detroit by use of a combination of ionosphere and a flattening-out process on the atmosphere and moving the 2,000 miles into Detroit. That was entirely possible, and I know that, and I know a great deal in defensive precautions and measures are under way to be taken to intercept guided missiles and rockets, and it is possible that they can be intercepted.

Do not get the idea they are going to travel in to us 2,000 miles an hour. They cannot do that. When they hit the atmosphere they will be down to the speed of sound, in which they can be successfully intercepted.

But it cannot be disproved that we do not need these ground troops to go in and occupy the ground.

When all is said and done you have got to slug in and do that. That is the National Guard picture, that we provide ground troops primarily, and, as the chairman has been so kind to say, we do it successfully.

The initial landings in the late war were mounted practically in their entirety by National Guard divisions in both theaters, and they are fine divisions. We hope to make them better divisions.

With that little introductory, I will try to pin down two or three specific points, problems which face me, and which I have to have you people and people like you behind me to be successful.

In the first place, we have been directed, in addition to the purely State functions these people accomplish, to reorganize an M-day force.

That is something the National Guard has never been given before. M-day means we will be ready to fight on M-day.

Always before, it was the National Guard would be mobilized and have M plus 365 or some other figure in order to get the final training.

The thinking now is that there probably would not be any buffer nation to give us that time in the next war. At any rate, that is our mission.

Now, to accomplish that mission, we have to make necessary reforms, and these reforms, I assure you gentlemen, are zealously opposed by a great many people of you know whom.

I feel that I should talk frankly with you on this, but when I was given my mission by the President of the United States, he said "You are to eliminate politics from the National Guard." That, gentlemen, is quite a handful. But, strange as it may seem, I have made good progress, and I do it by reciting thoroughly, until it is almost a rote with me, "We are given a mission to organize an M-day force. Do you think that old So and So could fight on M plus 1? Could he command a division? A regiment? A company?

Most Governors and most people holding responsible office, are interested intelligent Americans.

When you stack up the proposition directly to them, most of them will go along with you on it.

Now, then, one question of officers which is the crux of the whole thing. We have only one large important State in the United States that would not go along with us. I do not intend to mention the State, but the Governor of that State has taken the position, of all things, that our program of officer procurement, which is briefly, that this officer must have had 6 months' honorable service since December 7, 1941; he takes the attitude that that program is class distinction and discriminatory, and he would not go along with us on it.

Obviously he has some fat cats sitting in the background that he is running interference for.

Now, that is one point that you gentlemen, by your influence in your home communities, or influence as a national organization, can help us on.

That is if you can get behind us, if you will keep your eye on the ball with us, and say: "Here, we have got to have proper people to lead these young men."

And we will get the young men. Never fear about that, because the home company of the National Guard always gets them.

We have got to have proper people to lead these young men, and if you stay with me on it, and everybody else stays with me on it, I have got the set-up now so they cannot break us down.

I ask you specifically, when you hear that insidious propaganda that some are so adept at, that a place should be made for a friend

of his, I ask you particularly to stay with us on it.

I am entirely in favor of making a place for that friend if he has the physical and professional qualifications.

Now, to further implement and select the right officer personnel—and it is in effect now—I have asked the Secretary of War, and he endorsed an age in grade policy for the National Guard. It is revolutionary, but it is a very reasonable age in grade.

I have to have it reasonable to get it across. Second lieutenants, age 30. First lieutenants, age 35; and so on, and the top age, 55 for colonels.

But the point is that I got something accomplished in the reorganization, if I do not get anything else done, that one thing is going to be worth the money to us.

For example, on physical examinations, they prescribed for the Regular Army one annual physical examination a year. Now we require the same.

We hope to eliminate the many hundreds of physically unfit officers who have plagued us before.

Professional examination. As I told you, an officer must have served 6 months in a comparable position of importance honorably since December 7, 1941.

General officers will be brought to Washington for examination.

The board is formed and is composed of one Regular Army lieutenant general and two National Guard division commanders, who were successful division commanders in the last war.

That board, I do not need to tell you, will show neither fear nor favor.

That is a brief outline of the steps in the reorganization we have taken as far as officer personnel is concerned.

We will set up 22 infantry divisions and two armored divisions.

We have in addition to that, an active combat air arm composed of 12 wings, approximately 84 squadrons.

Those are all fighter or attack bomber squadrons.

We are essentially a ground force, but we feel that we can provide this small air force capable of immediate defensive or offensive use within any place called on at M plus 1.

The same requirements apply to them, only much stricter on the age in grade as they do to the Ground Forces.

That program is going very well, as General Collins said a while ago, due to the glamour and we do not have much trouble with it. Many of the squadrons are full, and will be ready to kick off by the 1st of July without trouble.

Our armored divisions, one goes to Texas. Present plans are probably one will be in New Jersey.

There will be some readjustments of the divisions at a later date. Probably some of the major States will get an additional infantry division.

We have been given a mission of reorganizing in a strength of 622,500 men. Officers and men. That includes the Air Corps.

Of this the air arm will run approximately 50,000, and in money will cost us about 50 percent of the total.

You gentlemen can help us on appropriations. Our plan for the reorganized National Guard for peacetime training is quite ambitious. It will cost a little more money, but it is not comparable to the cost of a soldier on active duty in any way.

We intend to increase drill pay. We have caretakers on duty with each unit. We have administrative personnel on duty with each unit, and, of course, our ever present problem of procurement of new supplies.

Now here is another particular you can help us on.

If we get 622,500, our armory space is not adequate. The armory space within the United States prior to the war would take care of about 250,000 people. If we jump to 622,500 there is going to be a need for a large increase. That increase above the 250,000 is practically all for Federal purposes, and it is our view that the Federal Government should assume a fair share of the burden over and above and beyond the troops needed for purely State use, which places practically all the new armory construction in the category of needing Federal aid.

We have introduced a bill with which I think a great many of you are familiar, House bill 5762, which is now in the War Department to be sent back over to the Congress with their comment.

I have been unable to contact anybody in the War Department, when I learned I was coming over here, to find out unofficially what the reaction will be, but I am sure that that bill will be out next week prior to the Governors Conference in Oklahoma City.

That bill provides for construction of armories at Federal expense at the home stations of these various units, a great many of them new, some of them old units.

We visualize that probably the money break-down will be something like the roads program in that the communities would furnish the site, and the Federal Government would build the armory on Federal specifications, after which the armory reverts to the State for maintenance and upkeep.

It is highly essential to this increased program from a Federal standpoint that we get approval of this bill.

I have talked to a great many Congressmen, and while I am not in the position of actively lobbying in a political manner, I can speak to them as one deeply interested in its fate, and I have as yet seen no objection to it.

I am asking you gentlemen to get behind us on this proposition. We need your help badly.

Now, I will waste very little time on the question of UMT, as I think I know your sentiments.

But, tied directly into this question of 622,500 people for the National Guard is the question of UMT. There is not a possibility of a chance of a voluntary enlistment program, what with the Regular Army commitments and the ambitious plans that the Navy and Marine Corps have for Reserve units, there is not a Chinaman's chance to get more than in the neighborhood of 300,000 people unless we have assistance.

Now, let me repeat a few things.

Of course, we need your help badly on all phases of this National Guard program, but I want to point out to you where we need your help.

Stay behind me on this question of eliminating politics from the force by word, action, and deed.

I will appreciate it more than you will ever know, because that is a problem that centers on me particularly. I am the focal point of it all.

If you can give us your assistance on the armory construction bill, 5762, and of course I won't even mention UMT any more, because I know exactly how you all stand and I spoke of the 6 months plan merely as a plan from the military standpoint as being considered the one that we could work more nearly into our program.

France Turns Back to the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following comments by Edgar Ansel Mowrer on the recent French election:

FRANCE TURNS BACK TO THE WEST

The French voters have not yet defeated the Communist offensive—they have merely stopped it. But the initiative has passed to the others. From now on, the French Russophiles will be on the defensive. France is not Czechoslovakia.

This does not, in my judgment, mean that Marianne is going to hurry into the arms of the Occident. More likely she will still preserve theoretical freedom of choice. But the eastern suitor will be more and more neglected. And Marianne will spend more and more time at the western window, dropping smiles and an occasional rose while waiting to discuss any honest marriage proposal on her own terms.

Concretely put, before actually coming down into the occidental garden, France is going to want to get this German business settled once and for all.

Foreign Minister Georges Bidault, as marriage broker, is likely to insist even more strongly on the elimination of any German rival from among the western powers.

This is all to the good. For French views on Germany are more sensible than those which Washington and London have until recently upheld.

Closer ties between Paris and the west—economic with Washington, political and military with London—are almost bound to be knotted.

The raw materials for a future western European bloc are going to be at hand, ready to be put together any time that further Soviet aggression should make them necessary.

Within France not too much will be changed—immediately. The new draft constitution will be somewhat less dangerously one-track than the one the French voted down. But most of the democratic features will be incorporated into the new document.

So will the socialistic clauses. For though the Communists got a jolt, the reactionaries suffered a bad defeat. Catholic MRP, Socialists, and Communists will, as before, constitute a solid majority pledged to a vast deal of planned economy.

On the other hand, the economic hangovers from Vichy are likely to be more rapidly eliminated for they have all the defects of socialism with none of its advantages.

Some trace the emergence of the Catholics as the largest party to the women's vote. Be this as it may, one wing of the French Catholics are thorough-going liberals. Since the MRP cannot collaborate with the real reactionaries and ex-Vichyites without soiling its reputation, this wing, under Bidault and Maurice Schuman, is likely to dominate the conservative wing.

For this reason, the return to power of General de Gaulle in any immediate future seems to me highly improbable. It would take something like a Communist insurrection or a world war to provoke it. For the general's lofty contempt for political life has unquestionably offended a large number of French people. Moreover, Georges Bidault has always felt that de Gaulle was too unappreciative of Bidault's role as head of the maquis and master-mind of self-liberating Paris.

Most French experts seem to believe that France will continue to be ruled by the same three-power coalition. But the tendency will be for the MRP and the Socialists to boss the show. For with just one outside group—for instance the Radicals—the Socialists and MRP could muster a majority.

On the question of religious schools MRP and radicals are at swords' points. But in international affairs the two parties see alike and could perhaps ally themselves at least temporarily against a Communist attempt to upset the applecart.

After all, there is nothing very surprising about the return of an essentially democratic and occidental people to democratic and occidental traditions. France is in the position of doorkeeper to western Europe. The French election emphasizes the trend away from Moscow that is sweeping central and western Europe.

Whether this trend continues to swell or dies down to a trickle will not, in my judgment, depend primarily upon France. It will depend principally upon the United States of America and Britain. Together, these two countries have the power to rehabilitate or ruin the western world. If they choose, they can regain the world leadership they so frivolously threw away when they compromised with fascism. And in that case, their attraction will become irresistible, their leadership uncontested.

If on the other hand, they flirt with Franco and Peron, embrace unregenerate Nazis, throw their support to Umberto of Italy and George of Greece, then a new pro-Soviet wave can be expected.

The Allis-Chalmers Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of June 1, 1946:

THE ALLIS-CHALMERS SITUATION

The Wisconsin employment relations board has followed what appears to a layman to be both the spirit and the letter of the law when it bars mass picketing and interference at the Allis-Chalmers plant.

Chapter III of the statutes is so clear and explicit that we do not see how there could be question about it.

The company has pursued the orderly course. When the strike began, the company questioned the massing of pickets and the practice of the pickets in demanding identification of those who passed through the lines. But it did not try to use force to decide the issue. It appealed to the proper agency set up by law to decide such questions. It gets a clear cut decision and it is entitled to the enforcement of that decision.

The union is of course entitled also to appeal the decision to the courts. But in the meantime we hope it will accept the board's order for its temporary guidance. It can lose nothing thereby. The device of demanding, or in effect demanding, identification, was never necessary from the union standpoint anyway. Union leaders could easily tell in other ways whether strikebreakers were going into the plant. And the identification practice was degrading to those nonproduction workers who wanted to go in and had a right to go in.

If the union should now defy the employment relations board that would produce a serious situation. The company is relying on the order, as it has a right to do, and is calling back its nonproduction workers. It will have a right to expect that they will be protected and that interference will be discontinued.

Defiance of the State's order now might lead to outright strife, disorder, and battle. It most certainly would destroy the chances of a resumption of negotiations.

To take up the negotiations again is the great need. And when this is done there should be top officials present, as the union contends. Maybe it was all right to create a company negotiating committee of lesser lights in the earlier stages. The situation has passed beyond that now, certainly. Company representatives are needed who can make decisions on the spot.

This strike is holding up food production. It is seriously interfering with other elements of reconversion. It ought to be settled now, and it can be settled if the men on both sides keep their heads, remain reasonable, and create an atmosphere of negotiation instead of hostility.

Adelphi College Address of Dr. Paul Dawson Eddy and Citation of Honorary Degrees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 6 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. Paul Dawson Eddy, president of Adelphi College, on June 1, 1946, at the academic convocation of Adelphi College, Garden City, Long Island, N. Y., in celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the chartering of the college.

I wish also to include the citations in the conferring of honorary degrees by Adelphi College on that occasion.

There being no objection, the address and the citations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF DR. PAUL DAWSON EDDY, PRESIDENT, ADELPHI COLLEGE, ON JUNE 1, 1946, AT THE ACADEMIC CONVOCATION OF ADELPHI COLLEGE, GARDEN CITY, LONG ISLAND, N. Y.

On June 24, 1896, Adelphi College was chartered by the University of the State of New York as the first institution of higher education in the Brooklyn-Long Island area authorized to confer degrees. The college evolved from the collegiate department of Adelphi Academy, which was established on Adelphi Street as a private school during the Civil War.

The pioneering efforts of the principal of the academy, Dr. Charles H. Levermore, were largely responsible for the creation of the college. Dr. Levermore was appointed as the first president of Adelphi College and later became internationally known as the Bok Peace Prize winner of 1924. The Honorable Timothy L. Woodruff was an able supporter of the proposed college and became the first chairman of the board of trustees.

Adelphi College opened its doors in September 1896 to 57 students under the instruction of 16 members of the faculty. Within 10 years the enrollment had increased to 450 students. During the first decade a normal-kindergarten department and an extension division were created. Many teachers were trained for the public schools. The art department under Prof. John B. Whittaker became widely recognized. During this period the initial indebtedness of the college was liquidated with the aid of the Rockefeller Foundation.

In 1908, Mr. James H. Post, Brooklyn philanthropist and civic leader, became chairman of the board of trustees, and his vital leadership and generous support continued until his death in the spring of 1938. The four presidents of Adelphi College served under Mr. Post's chairmanship. When Dr. Levermore retired in 1912, he was succeeded by the gifted clergyman and radio preacher, Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, as acting president. Dr. Frank Dickinson Blodgett became president in 1915, retired after 22 years of service, and was succeeded by Dr. Paul Dawson Eddy in 1937.

During the First World War, the enrollment decreased to approximately 300, but the postwar period was marked by a rapid increase to 652 students in 1928–29. It was necessary to hold commencement exercises and special events in the Brooklyn Academy of Music.

The material progress of the college was reflected in additions to the endowment fund of approximately $250,000 during Dr. Cadman's administration, and two new buildings were purchased at Clifton Street and St. James Place. Under the leadership of President Blodgett, the period between 1922 and 1925 was devoted to efforts to raise a building and endowment fund of $1,000,000. The conditional offer of $300,000 by the Rockefeller Foundation stimulated the securing of subscriptions of approximately $700,000.

Plans were originally prepared for the erection of a new college building in Brooklyn on the site provided by Mr. Frederick Pratt. The charter had been amended to provide for the separation of the college and the academy, and members of the board selected the institution with which they preferred to serve.

The sale of the new site for over a million dollars led to the decision to move the college from Brooklyn to the 68-acre campus in Garden City. The site is part of the Old Hempstead Plains which Walt Whitman loved so well. The need for a college on Long Island was evident, and it was believed that Adelphi could continue to serve the higher educational needs of the young women of Brooklyn in its new location.

Three large buildings were designed by McKim, Mead & White, architects, and were constructed on the campus. The cornerstone was laid on October 8, 1928, and the college opened its doors on the new site in September 1929, with its largest freshman class and a total enrollment of 653 students. By commencement in June 1930, the campus had begun to assume something of its present-day beauty, but the dark cloud of depression had appeared on the horizon.

It was soon apparent that the inflationary and expansive spirit of the 1920's had affected the college, and the new building program had exceeded the available resources by a million dollars. Deflation, indebtedness, and decreased enrollments created many problems for the college. A heroic and successful effort was made to maintain academic standards in spite of reduced faculty salaries.

After 23 years of conspicuous service, Dean Anna E. Harvey retired in 1935 after receiving the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

In 1937 Dr. Blodgett completed 22 years of service and retired. During his administration the academic prestige of the college had been greatly enhanced; the enrollment increased; the faculty strengthened, and the college established on a new campus. The record of the board of trustees states, "His life has been woven into the life of Adelphi and his influence in the lives of thousands of students will be a lasting testimonial."

When I became president in September 1937, I endeavored to overcome the inroads of the depression and the overexpansion. Attention was given to the reorganization of the financial structure of the college, the reorganization of the board of trustees, the restudy of the curriculum, the increase of

student enrollment, and the expansion of the public-relations program.

The efforts of the administration, trustees, and faculty have resulted in the liquidation of approximately $800,000 in old indebtedness and the maintenance of a balanced operating budget. A new board of trustees is now composed of prominent Long Island citizens. Mr. George L. Hubbell, Mr. Fred Maidment, and Mr. James E. Stiles have given the leadership to the reorganization of the board as chairmen. Since 1940 Mr. Stiles has devoted himself to the problems of the college. The curriculum has been revised and an arts division, a home economics department, and a school of nursing have been included. The student enrollment has increased from 354 in 1937 to over 1,100 in the fall of 1945, and will reach approximately 1,500 in 1946–47. The new public-relations program includes closer relationships with public education on Long Island, cooperation with women's clubs and civic organizations, and wider newspaper publicity.

The internal reorganization of 1938 was followed by the adoption of a personnel plan which has become recognized as a model in the relationships of college administrations and faculties. Restoration of faculty salaries has also contributed to improved morale.

Even prior to World War II, Adelphi was maintaining public forums on international questions. The Nassau County Women's Defense Center was established on the campus before the United States entered the war. During the war, Adelphi was designated as a center of civilian morale service and maintained an active program.

The most significant contribution of Adelphi College to the war effort was the establishment of the first and largest central collegiate school of nursing in the State of New York. Over 600 United States cadet nurses have been enrolled at Adelphi and their clinical training has been provided in 8 cooperating hospitals of the area and the Nassau County Department of Health. The school of nursing has become a permanent part of the curriculum of the college. The coordinated training of nurses, teachers, and social workers is an important postwar project.

The need for housing and caring for this large unit of the Cadet Nurse Corps led to the construction of the two residence halls and the dining hall of the Federal Works Agency under the provisions of the Lanham Act. The dormitories were dedicated on May 6, 1944, by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and other leaders in national life. These facilities will be available for general use next fall.

The postwar era has already created new problems which require new adjustments. Further revisions have been made in the curriculum, and preparations have been made for the largest enrollment of women students in the history of the college. A freshman class of 300 young women will bring the total enrollment to over 1,200, almost double the previous peak enrollment in Brooklyn.

In addition, a veterans' division has been created and next fall 300 ex-servicemen will be enrolled as regular students. Plans have been formulated for a special afternoon and evening division to accommodate an additional 300 veterans and high-school graduates, if there is a demonstrated need for additional facilities. This extension program is being developed cooperatively with Hofstra College, the Long Island Agricultural and Technical Institute and representative public educators of this area.

Adelphi College began the celebration of its fiftieth anniversary during 1945–46 with a series of commemorative events, including the all-college Christmas dinner given by the chairman of the board, Mr. James E. Stiles. The semicentennial will culminate with the anniversary dinner next fall.

Fifty years ago Adelphi College opened in Brooklyn with 50 students. It will begin its second half century of service as a national institution on Long Island with fifteen hundred or more students. The college began as a coeducational institution and become exclusively a women's college in 1912. The second half century of history will begin with men and women on the campus. The future usefulness of the college seems assured.

CITATIONS—THE CONFERRING OF HONORARY DEGREES

CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTORS OF LAWS

Edwiene Schmitt: Graduate of Adelphi College. Bachelor of Laws from the Brooklyn Law School of St. Lawrence University. Member of the bar of the State of New York and the Federal bar in the eastern district of New York. Member of Delta Tau Alpha Honor Society of Adelphi College, and Phi Delta, honorary legal fraternity for women. President, Kings County Republican Women. Member of the Board of Visitors of Brooklyn State Hospital. One of the organizers and chairman of the Brooklyn unit of the American Women's Voluntary Services. Organizer of the first school for women jurors in New York State. Chairman of the legislative department of the Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs. Former president and director of the Adelphi College Alumnae Association and cochairman of the alumnae anniversary fund. For 9 years trustee and secretary of the board of trustees of Adelphi College. Distinguished woman of the bar, active civic worker, loyal alumna.

The candidate will be presented by Prof. John Archer David, M. A., chairman of the department of physics and senior member of the faculty.

James Esmond Stiles: Graduate of Wesleyan University and loyal alumnus of that respected institution.

Pioneer publisher of Long Island whose first weekly, the Nassau Post, was established in 1914 and later combined with other weeklies to become the Nassau Daily Review-Star, the first daily newspaper in this area. For 25 years this paper has served the public interest and sponsored civic, welfare, educational and religious activities in Nassau County.

Champion of the freedom of the press, active member and former president of the New York State Publishers Association. Trustee of Adelphi College and Chairman of the Board of Trustees whose loyalty and enthusiasm have enlisted the interest of representative Long Island citizens in the affairs of the College. During his chairmanship, Adelphi College has experienced its greatest period of expansion.

The candidate will be presented by the Honorable Francis G. Hooley, Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York and Trustee of Adelphi College.

James Pernette DeWolfe: Graduate of Kenyon College where he was trained in theology and received the degree of Doctor of Divinity. Recognized by Columbia University with the honorary degree of Doctor of Sacred Theology.

Ordained a priest of the Protestant Episcopal Church; rector of important parishes throughout the United States. Installed the fourth Dean of the Cathedral of Saint John the Divine and consecrated the fourth Bishop of Long Island.

Builder of churches, friend and counselor of men, able ecclesiastical administrator, patron of the Arts and sponsor of education and social welfare. Since 1944 honored Trustee of Adelphi College.

The candidate will be presented by Professor Francis Knight Ballaine, Ph.D., Chairman of the Department of Philosophy and Religion.

James Michael Mead: Servant of the people, self-educated by wide reading and study in evening courses in a number of colleges. Student of law at Georgetown University. Keen observer of public affairs and social needs.

Champion of the cause of labor and small business; assemblyman in the New York State Legislature for four terms, and for 20 years a member of the United States House of Representatives. For the past 8 years, United States Senator from the State of New York.

Supporter of State and National legislation for social welfare and currently sponsoring legislation to provide better educational opportunities for veterans. Chairman of important committees in Congress, including the Senate Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program. Author of the recent book: Tell the Folks Back Home.

The candidate will be presented by Prof. Chester Leonard Barrows, Ph. D., chairman of the department of history and government.

CANDIDATE FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF SCIENCE

Lise Meitner: Native of Vienna, member of a distinguished family of scholars, recipient of the degrees of master of arts and doctor of philosophy from the University of Vienna.

Professor and chairman of the department of physics at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute in Berlin Germany, where her research in radioactivity won highest acclaim in scientific societies. Research worker in nuclear physics with Prof. Niels Bohr in Copenhagen, Denmark. Research Fellow of the Swedish Academy of Science in Stockholm.

Discoverer of the decisive formula for the release of atomic energy. Special lecturer at leading American universities while on a brief leave of absence from her laboratory in Sweden.

This quiet, unassuming lady of science has been acclaimed the "woman of the year."

Dr. Meitner is lecturing at the University of Illinois today. So important is her knowledge to America that her lecture tour of 5 months could not be interrupted. The symbols of the degree will be received by her sister, Dr. Frida M. Frischauer, a recognized scholar in the fields of physics and psychology. She will be presented by Prof. Hermann von Baravalle, chairman of the department of mathematics, a friend of the family of the candidate.

Address of Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz Before Graduating Class at the Naval Academy

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, before graduating class, United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., June 5, 1946:

On behalf of the officers and men of the Navy and Marine Corps, I welcome the graduating class in their new status as commissioned officers of the United States Navy and the United States Marine Corps. In 1943, when you entered the Naval Academy, you started from scratch and after 3 years of intense and arduous competition you have established your relative ranks on a precedence list which will, to a certain extent, affect your future assignments.

Today when you receive your diploma you will have reached one of the high peaks in

your career. When you join your ship or station, it will be to start again at the bottom of the ladder. You will probably find that no one will know who you are, where you stood in your class whether you were a great athlete, president of the class, on the hop committee, or dragged the prettiest girls. So again you start from scratch. Regardless of your class standing, you have in your own hands the making of your future reputation. Your superior officers will pay far more attention to your performance of duty than to your relative position on the list. I mention this not only to keep the savoirs on their toes, but also to give encouragement to the anchor men to keep trying. As one former anchor man once said, "It takes more real ability to stand anchor than it does first, for if you miss first you come out second, but if you miss anchor you come out a civilian." The experience of the war just ended shows that low class standing is no bar to advancement to the highest echelons of command.

It is customary on this day for speakers to give wholesome advice to graduates. I do not propose to be the first to break that ancient custom. It is not necessary to describe the kind of life you will lead nor the kind of people with whom you are going to associate. Many of you came from the services you will rejoin and all of you have had the experience of practice cruises. Furthermore, most of you have only three short years ago left your associates in civilian life, and when you go into active service you will be surrounded by the same kind of men you left at home—all fine, healthy specimens of American manhood who have voluntarily agreed to serve our great country. Incidentally, I advise you not only to keep your civilian contacts but to increase them in the course of your travels. By so doing, both you and the Navy will profit.

There will be required of you the same qualities of leadership that make for success in all walks of civil life. First of all, in order to lead successfully you must know your job so well that you can be a good teacher, because the Navy is a huge training organization. At the top of the list of desirable attributes I would place patience, tolerance, and sympathetic understanding. Your control of men will be greatly facilitated by precept and the example you set.

The greatest asset you take away from this institution is your good health, and in making this statement I have taken into account the educational advantages you have received here. It should be unnecessary to warn you to safeguard your health, but my long experience and my personal observations in the Navy warrant such a warning. True enough, good health alone does not insure a successful naval career, but bad health can very well, and usually does, stand in the way of optimum development of your opportunities.

I estimate that worry—usually about things that never happen—is at the bottom of many failures in health. You can keep your stomach ulcers at a minimum if you will exert your utmost efforts in matters which are subject to your influence but cease worry about all the others.

At the time I graduated I was nearly convinced that a man's head was like a bucket—it would hold just so much. The Navy quickly revealed to me that the more I live and learn the more I find there is to learn.

Your education never ceases, and rightly so. Inspiration comes seldom to the ignorant. So often timely inspiration—which some call genius—marks the successful leader, but in reality this inspiration or genius is the result of lessons well learned or experience properly exploited.

I am the last person in the world to advise you to be introspective, but I suggest an occasional period of self-analysis—particularly about the time your captain marks up your fitness report. Using that same fitness report as a check-off try to evaluate your services to your organization or ship. It is more than likely that your captain will give you a higher credit than you gave yourself, perhaps because he hopes you can live up to his estimates.

Again let me remind you that the race goes not necessarily to the swift nor to the brilliant. There are many attributes that make for success. Fortunately, all men are not cast in the some mold. Deficiencies in some respects can be overcome by other qualities. This reminds me of an incident that came within my purview at this Academy many years ago.

Two candidates, having learned that they had successfully passed the entrance requirements, planned a celebration in Washington on the eve of their induction into the Academy. Following their arrival in the city by steam train—which incidentally was the only means of rapid transportation out of Annapolis in those days—they were soon enjoying a fine dinner with all the trimmings and with friends at a famous restaurant, and with no greater concern over the future than to report in accordance with orders for induction at the office of the Commandant of Midshipmen at 9 the following morning.

In the midst of the dinner, which was to be followed by the theater, one of the more responsible friends brought up the subject of plans for the return to Annapolis, and stated that to the best of his knowledge the next train from Washington would not leave before midforenoon of the next day, and would not get the candidates back to Annapolis until 11 a. m.—too late to carry out their orders. An immediate check of timetables—which these young men should have done before leaving Annapolis—verified the fact that unless something drastic was done at once, the candidates would fail to carry out their first military orders, to report for induction at 9 a. m.

The hilarious dinner party changed at once into a serious planning group and in a remarkably short time our candidates found themselves on the road to Annapolis in a very uncomfortable one-horse vehicle called a dog cart which was the best the pooled resources of the party could finance at a nearby livery stable.

It was an exceptionally cool September night and the candidates were thinly clad. The driver, who sat on a thwartship seat facing forward, did not know the complicated road net between Washington and Annapolis, and lost himself many times. The candidates, shivering with the cold, sat facing aft and occasionally munched on the remains of the elaborate dinner which now became their lunch. There was ample time for reflection and meditation before they reached their destination—just in time to carry out their orders.

What is not recorded is their remarks when they reached the office of the Commandant of Midshipmen. Instead of finding a long line of fellow candidates as they had expected, they were puzzled—and chagrined—to see a printed sign on the closed office door which read "Hour of reporting of candidates changed from 9 a. m. to 1 p. m."

This incident is worthy of further examination in the light of the subsequent careers of these two candidates. Both eventually attained flag rank in their chosen profession after running the usual gantlet of selection boards. I have no doubt but that certain traits of character evidenced that night helped them on their way. Certainly they were sufficiently adaptable and their minds sufficiently flexible to meet promptly a totally unexpected crisis—and certainly their sense of responsibility and duty was not found wanting. Yet, in spite of their commendable action, they unsuccessfully tried to keep their adventure a deep secret during their time at the Academy—being apprehensive no doubt of the ridicule of their fellow midshipmen. In telling of this story I almost forgot to say that these two flag officers are present today in this hall to witness these graduation exercises. In fact, both are on this platform.

The Navy, from its long experience in such matters, has a good estimate of what it can expect of you, and you are entitled to have some idea of what you can expect from the Navy. In the first place, you are already a beneficiary of the Navy's training system as a result of your Naval Academy experience. Perhaps a similar period spent in some other educational institution might have given you greater personal benefit, but for the service in the Navy for which you voluntarily applied, the training you have received here cannot be equaled anywhere. In return for this training the Navy rightfully feels that it has a prior right to your service—at least until the peace and stability of the world are assured.

As to the stability and permanence of the Navy itself, you can be sure that never, since the early days of our country's history, have our citizens been so conscious of the part played by seapower as in the winning of the last war—and the Navy with its aviation and submarines, was the cutting edge of that seapower. It is reasonable to expect that no matter what kind of an international organization survives, the United States will have a leading part in that organization, and that we will maintain a strong Navy to ensure not only our own protection, but also to aid in the cause of world peace.

What we cannot forecast with accuracy is the form and organization of our Navy of the future. You can be sure that so long as our commerce moves on the seas our Navy will have ships, but that the design and characteristics of these ships will be determined largely by the results of experimentation and scientific research. Your Navy will consist primarily of a group of men—and women, too, if Congress approves our recommendation to continue the WAVES—who will be alert to the changes required by the development of new weapons. Ours must be a forward-looking Navy, ever alert to project with maximum effect and at maximum distances from our shores, our seapower.

You will find in the Navy an honored and an honorable profession where you will gain great satisfaction in duty well performed. You will not grow rich in worldly goods but your life can be full of dignity and enriched by a strong bond of brotherhood with those who serve with you. You will find, as I have, what a grand and glorious privilege it is to serve your country's flag.

I wish for each and everyone of you all success and Godspeed.

Text of President Truman's College Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DUDLEY G. ROE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address given by our beloved President at Washington College, Chestertown, Md., on June 1, last.

Mr. Speaker, the Eastern Shore of Maryland had the honor of a visit from our great President, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, Saturday last, June 1, upon which occasion he was greeted with widespread acclamation by thousands of the citizens of my district.

President Truman became the third President to be honored by Washington College, the tenth oldest institution of learning in the United States, at its one hundred and sixty-fourth com-

mencement exercises. The first President having been so honored was the great Washington, the second President was our beloved Roosevelt, and our present President is certainly highly regarded in the affections of the people of the Eastern Shore.

The address follows:

Dr. Mead, Colonel Brown, Governor O'Conor, distinguished Senators, Congressman ROE, ladies and gentlemen, and this wonderful bevy of graduates—young men and young women—here before me, it is a very great honor to me to be here today.

I can't tell you how much I appreciate it. The honor that is given to me today by this venerable institution—and it is a venerable institution according to our standards in this Western Hemisphere—is one that I'll treasure all the rest of my life.

This college has a wonderful background and history. I listened to President Mead a while ago as he discussed that background and history. One of the things I like about this college is that it is a small college in a rural community.

I was born in a small town. I was raised in a small town. Do not quote me on that in Independence. [Laughter.] I spent the best 10 years of my life operating a 540-acre farm in Jackson County, Mo., and that farm is still home to me.

This is a wonderful institution on account of its connection with the first President of the United States. It was my privilege the other night to be present at the graduation of my daughter—at another Washington University in which George Washington was interested, and in which he had some measure of helping the founding. In fact, he directed that that institution be founded in his will. I understand that he was a trustee of this great institution when he was made President of the United States.

A great honor. My great predecessor whom I succeeded at his death was also an honorary graduate of this great institution and he liked small colleges and small communities and rural communities. He always called himself a farmer. Although he was graduated from Harvard and Columbia in a community that is very large in population, I think his heart ran to the soil. I know mine does.

I think this country is great on account of its small educational institutions, more than anything else. You know James A. Garfield said that his idea of a college was a bench in a log house with himself on one end of that bench and Mark Hopkins on the other, and his idea on that was that Mark Hopkins was famous as an educator because he was an individual educator.

In institutions such as this, the teachers and the professors can give individual attention to each member of each class. As you were receiving your diplomas, I listened to Dr. Mead and he had a special salutation for each and every one of you.

Now I would like for the president of Harvard, of Yale, of Columbia or Princeton to have that individual touch that your president had here today. That is what young men and young women need when they are getting an education. They want someone whom they can trust, and they want someone in whom they can have confidence, to whom they can take their problems and have them solved.

This looks to me as if it is a wonderful class. When the roll was called I thought I was in Jackson County, Mo., the names are exactly the same.

That is true all over the United States in these small educational institutions. You know, I am rather an advocate of small business, and small educational institutions and small communities. I have said time and again that I would much rather see a thousand insurance companies with $4,000,000 in assets than one insurance company with four billion. I would rather see a hundred steel companies than one United States Steel Corp. I would rather see a thousand banks than one national city bank.

You know the reason for that?

Every one of those small institutions gives some two or three men a chance to be "big shots" in their communities. When you go to the National City Bank, or the United States Steel Corp., or the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., you will find one "big shot" and a hundred or so vice presidents—vice presidents—vice presidents. So many vice presidents that you can't tell how the institution is run.

I believe that an institution such as this will contribute more in the long run to the welfare of this great Nation of ours than any other thing that is in this country at this time.

You know I am an optimist so far as the United States of America is concerned. I think it is the greatest country that the sun has ever shown upon, and I think it is facing the greatest age in its history. And I think that is due to the fact that the country is going to be in the hands of you young people here before me today who are going to carry on in the tradition of the great man who was a trustee when he became President of the United States, the man who helped to institute the greatest government in the history of the world—a government, as I have said time and again, which has a diffusion of powers and which prevents any one man or any one group of men from gaining absolute control. Sometimes they think they have control, but it has never turned out that way—and it never will.

Now, I can't tell you how very much I appreciate the honor which you have conferred upon me. I can't tell you how much I appreciate it, but from the bottom of my heart I thank you.

Compare These 1919 Indianapolis Prices With 1946 OPA Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, the OPA propaganda machine has been working overtime to save the jobs of thousands of United States Government office holders. They have warned the country about inflation and insist that we avoid the high prices similar to the ones we had after the First World War. My curiosity was aroused over so much OPA propaganda that I decided to check the Indianapolis newspapers, for the entire month of April 1919.

After a careful study of the ads in these newspapers, I came to the conclusion that the OPA does not know exactly what they were talking about. I realize that some items were rather high, but many items were lower than present day prices. I also noticed that many items were advertised in 1919 that we cannot buy today. In other words, we did not have the OPA in 1919 and we got production, which is our best guaranty against inflation.

If you are interested in making a comparison of 1919 prices with present-day prices just take a little trip with me through Indianapolis and take a look at some of the April ads in 1919. Before we start just remember that today we have shortages in lumber, lawn mowers, work clothes, men's dress shirts, men's suits, candy, women's hosiery, and numerous other articles.

First. Lumber:

Spruce up your home inside and out. This can be accomplished at very little expense by the use of mill work and lumber from our diversified assortment of the best the forests afford. Better still, build a new home. (Brannum-Keene Lumber Co.)

Second:

Get your lawn mower at Vonnegut's now, prices $9.50 to $17.

Third:

Back to old prices: Workmen's clothes. Blue denim overalls, 97 cents; light blue work shirts, 63 cents; sateen work shirts, 97 cents. (The Outlet.)

Men's work shirts, 95 cents; men's overalls, 95 cents. (Marott's.)

Fourth:

Five thousand new shirts at $1.15. (L. S. Ayres & Co.)

Fifth:

Suits of every kind. In demand—plenty of them. $25, $30, $35, and $38.50. Double breasted, plenty of them—single breasted, plenty of them—silk trimmed—plenty of them. (The Wm. H. Block Co.)

Spring suits and topcoats, $25 and up. (L. Strauss & Co.)

Sixth. In 1919 we did not have nylons, so we will take a look at the silk hose ads:

Hosiery 35 cents to 98 cents per pair. (Indiana Dry Goods Co.)

Women's lisle hose 59 cents; outsize hose 75 cents; silk fiber hose 85 cents; silk hose $1.25, and pure silk hose $2.50. (Pettis Dry Goods Co.)

Tucker's hose $1.75 per pair, or three pairs for $5. Lisle top, $1.15; Gordon, $1.35.

Seventh:

Children's coats, $4.95 to $9.95; gingham dresses, 95 cents. (Pettis Dry Goods Co.)

Eighth:

Fifteen thousand ladies' Easter suits at Hauger's, $15 to $35.

Block's tailored suits, $29.75 to $49.75.

Ladies suits for $35 and ladies low shoes for $4.95. (Wassons.)

Ninth:

Wall paper: $8.59 will do your entire home; living room, $3; dining room, $2.14; bedroom, $1.60; bedroom, 89 cents; kitchen, 96 cents. (Worlds Fair Furniture Co.)

Tenth:

Golden Heart caramels, 50 cents per pound.

Eleventh:

Dress sale—L. S. Ayres: $15.95. Satin foulards, of foulards with georgette crepe; of taffeta and georgette in combination with taffeta.

Twelfth. Numerous other articles include Charles Denby cigars, 7 cents; Tuxedo tobacco, 10 cents; Camel cigarettes, 18 cents; brooms, 39 cents; bicycles, $29.85; Brussels rug $19.50; Climax wall-paper cleaner, 3 for 25 cents; baby carriage, $10; house paint, $1.90, and barn paint, $1.29; and a fine house all newly finished, 9 rooms, $6,800.

Roosevelt and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ernest Lindley from the Washington Post of June 3, 1946:

ROOSEVELT AND LABOR
(By Ernest Lindley)

HE ASKED FOR COMPULSORY WAR WORK

Mr. Harold Ickes, as chairman of the Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciencies, and Professions, said, in attacking President Truman's emergency proposals, "President Roosevelt united the country for an all out war against the Fascist powers. He had no such power as this bill gives President Truman. Appealing directly to the people for support of a just war and a great cause, President Roosevelt did not have to draft labor or compel workers to work at a bayonet's point to keep our factories running for victory."

Mr. Ickes is substantially correct. But he leaves the implication that Mr. Roosevelt did not seek authority to compel workers in essential industries—which in wartime included a great many—to stick to their jobs. Mr. Roosevelt asked for this and more. He sought authority to assign able-bodied workers to particular types of work.

In June 1943 occurred one of the coal strikes which threatened the war effort. Seeing that Mr. Roosevelt was apparently determined to break the strike, Mr. Lewis ordered the miners back to work temporarily. In commenting on the situation a few days later, Mr. Roosevelt revealed that the Government had made plans to induct into the armed services all miners who refused to work. He revealed also that he intended to request Congress to authorize inductions for noncombat service of men up to the age of 65.

Two days later Mr. Roosevelt made this request of Congress.

It should be noted also that in vetoing the Smith-Connally bill, passed at that time, Mr. Roosevelt endorsed most of its provisions, including that making it a criminal offense to instigate, direct, or aid a strike in a Government-seized plant. His veto was on different grounds, chiefly that the bill would legalize wartime strikes. It was overridden. But the fact that it was exercised has left the impression that Mr. Roosevelt was opposed to the entire bill, which was not the case, as can readily be verified by reference to his veto message. On the contrary, he was urging simultaneously a still stronger remedy in the event of strikes in essential industries.

In January 1944, Mr. Roosevelt urged the enactment of a compulsory National Service Act. His conclusion that such a law would aid the war was belated, and, as he said, reluctant. It was needed, he felt, not only to curb strikes but to assure that every able-bodied person was doing the kind of work which would help most to win the war. He predicted that if the law were on the books, its compulsory features would seldom, if ever, have to be employed. That had been the experience in Britain, which had adopted compulsory national service in 1940 for women as well as men.

The leaders of labor called Mr. Roosevelt's proposal Fascist. Congress spurned it, and turned, instead, to a work-or-fight bill more particularly to curb strikes. Mr. Roosevelt, nevertheless, renewed his recommendation in his annual message to Congress of 1945.

Although our war production became prodigious and we won the war, the lack of universal service legislation and of means of curbing strikes on the part of those workers who broke the no-strike pledge are not things to boast about. They were weaknesses which proclaimed our unwillingness to go all out on the home front, and they were recognized as such by Mr. Roosevelt. The most serious strikes, those in the coal fields, were bought off, as Mr. Ickes well knows, since he played a key role in the transactions, at a very heavy price. Those who struck with disregard of our national safety were rewarded more handsomely than those who patriotically stuck to their jobs. The aftereffects of this injustice are still being felt, and were in part responsible for the rail strike, which compelled Mr. Truman to take and recommend strong action.

We are no longer fighting. The number of industries in which strikes may properly be held to menace the safety of the Nation is now very limited. But there are some in which general stoppages, especially if they are protracted, are unendurable at any time. The railroad industry is one of them. Coal mining is another. Shipping is still another.

When a stoppage hits directly and swiftly at the vitals of our national life, the Government has not only the right but the obligation to stop it. It has the obligation to use whatever means are necessary to end the threat to our safety. When the obligation is proclaimed and the intention understood, the resort to extreme measures will seldom, if ever, be necessary—as Mr. Roosevelt pointed out in asking for universal service in wartime. But the failure to equip the Government with all the powers might be held to signify that the Government's obligations to the Nation in a moment of crisis are limited—that it can go only so far and if that doesn't achieve the result, it's just too bad, even if the Nation collapses.

Mr. Truman's request for emergency powers, either in substance or in detail, may have violated the Roosevelt tradition, as it is now construed by some of his former associates, but the Roosevelt record is something else.

Peace and Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, as to having a Department of Peace and Good Will, I am including a communication from a number of my constituents.

February 17–24 was designated as Brotherhood Week. We, the undersigned, urge the passage of H. R. 4648, which is to create the Department of Peace and Good Will, in the Cabinet of our Government. We believe it will be a long step forward for permanent world brotherhood and peace so that a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

Mrs. Monroe Levil, Glenn L. Carper, Mrs. James Sibrel, Mrs. F. Baker, Mabel Frankhauser, Helen Simpson, Charlotte Pool, Bettsville, Ohio; Lucy M. Yeagle, Rev. Michael Yeagle, Lindsay, Ohio; Mrs. Glenn Carper, Mrs. Ray W. Cramer, Chas. E. Andrews, Bettsville, Ohio; I. W. Walter, Kansas, Ohio; Mrs. W. Hull, Fremont, Ohio; Carrie E. Andrews, Kathryn B. Feathers, Mrs. E. L. Drown, O. H. Berlekamp, Sallie M. Berlekamp, Bettsville, Ohio; Harriet T. Haley, Ruth D. Patterson, Tiffin, Ohio; Mrs. Lucy Blanche Dornard, Bettsville, Ohio; Mrs. N. C. Baugham, Mrs. W. J. Koenig, Ruth H. Fauth, Mrs. R. T. Ross, Gertrude Snavely, Mrs. Walter Mooney, Mrs. N. I. Woleslagel, Mrs. O. W. Swaisgood, Mrs. Ralph P. Smith, G. E. Fauth, N. I. Woleslagel, Carl E. Cook, O. W. Swaisgood, Walter D. Mooney, Mrs. Lucy Croft, Mrs. Virgil Livingstine, Fremont, Ohio; Mrs. Charles M. Heffner, Lindsey, Ohio; Ray A. Goebel, G. D. Hemings, Frank Spisma, Rollie Cook, Fremont, Ohio; George Haas, Lindsey, Ohio; John Kiger, D. R. Mooney, Melba Pearson, Mr. and Mrs. C. W. Albert, Mrs. Gladys Zahn, Fremont, Ohio; Mr. and Mrs. Ernie Bliss, Lindsey, Ohio; Thelma E. Keiser, Mrs. E. B. Keiser, Mrs. J. D. Jackson, Miss Bonnie Bomer, Mrs. G. L. Wheddon, Mrs. Willetta Michaels, Hayes Michaels, W. J. Adams, Miss Estella R. Schultz, Mrs. W. J. Adams, Mabel A. Shadle, H. M. Shadle, G. L. Wheddon, Grace I. Doll, Mrs. F. A. Firestone, F. A. Firestone, Fremont, Ohio; W. R. Shisler, Fannie E. Shisler, Mrs. L. H. Fruth, Adelbert Foster, Miss Roma-rose Callihan, Gibsonburg, Ohio; Mrs. Carrie E. Mullins, Mrs. C. O. McIntyre, Fremont, Ohio; Lulah Kelley, McCutchinville, Ohio; Mrs. Edward Kemp, Tiffin, Ohio; Mrs. Velma Grove, Mrs. Mildred Stewart, Fostoria, Ohio; Mrs. Mabel Frankhauser, Bettsville, Ohio; Mrs. S. R. Hall, Mrs. K. N. Yates, Republic, Ohio; Mrs. H. K. Cole, Mrs. A. C. Shuman, Tiffin, Ohio; Mrs. J. A. Hurst, Mrs. C. S. Garner, Mrs. Louis Ash, Burgoon, Ohio; Mrs Anna Wyant, Kansas, Ohio; Mrs. C. E. Myers, Miss Evalyn Myers, Mrs. Ida Klopp, Mrs. Jesse Mitchell, Mrs. W. H. Mitchell, Mrs. George Myers, Mrs. Ella Guslin, Mrs. Owen Lewman, Burgoon, Ohio; Mrs. Walter Rohrer, Tiffin, Ohio; Mrs. E. E. Weissinger, E. E. Weissinger, Fostoria, Ohio; Mrs. Virginia Snyder, North Fairfield, Ohio; Mrs. Jessie Klopfenstein, Willard, Ohio; Mrs. David Moyer, Bellevue, Ohio; Mrs. Ray Boardman, Mrs. Albert Foster, Mrs. Edith Harvey, North Fairfield, Ohio; Mary S. Fitterer, Bellevue, Ohio; Mrs. Fannie Carpenter, North Fairfield, Ohio; Loa B. Sterling, Willard, Ohio; Harriett Matter, Mrs. John W. Goudy, Bellevue, Ohio; Mrs. Elfa Denman, Norwalk, Ohio; Blanche Sanders, Anna B. Lee, North Fairfield, Ohio; Clara E. Reitz, Bellevue, Ohio; Lena Starkey, North Fairfield, Ohio; Mrs. Rebecca Dendinger, Bellevue, Ohio; Mrs. Jessie Sims, Vickery, Ohio.

"King" John Morrissey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Tom McGovern from the Lynn (Mass.) Telegram:

LYNN HEARTBEAT

(By Tom McGovern)

"KING" JOHN MORRISSEY

They're taking "King" out to supper tomorrow night. They wanted to play host to him on many an occasion but various things in his busy life prevented all this. But finally they were adamant that he listen to their demands and, so, tomorrow night will be his affair and the legion of friends that he has known and worked with these many years are paying him homage.

"King" John Morrissey will be the recipient of this wholehearted reception and the boys he managed, some while back, are the original Cornet All-Stars who brought fame and good entertainment to the people of Lynn while cavorting on the baseball diamond under his able and inspiring tutelage. And they will be augmented in large numbers by the loyal fans of yesterday; the men and women of civic life who follow the sport world in general.

Meetings have been going on quietly for several weeks and the fruits of the committee's effort will show that an overwhelming crowd of well-wishers will be at the Lynn Armory where a sumptuous meal will be enjoyed, where excellent acts will delight, and where good music and dancing will follow as the night's festivities move along.

Better still will be the acclaim that is given to "King" John by the rank and file who have always held him in the highest esteem. Arrangements for this party have brought together men who once sparkled on the Little River playground as boys and gradually developed into such an outstanding team that they were the toast of the town and carried their wares into cities all over New England. And, as they diligently perfected plans for the testimonial, anecdotes, stories, and memories came back to them all.

They remembered the big crowds that they played to; the close scores of hotly contested ball games; the various colorful characters that enlivened the sport; big-name stars who frequented the park; the mass of model T's that were parked in center field; the trips that took them to other fields where the going was tough; the roar of the fans in their ears over some scintillating play. And during all these moments, "King" John directed the play from the bench, called the plays, counseled his pitchers, and at all times showed the leadership that gave them the courage and finesse to battle it out. They played to win and John was no exception in his zeal to deliver the goods.

They recalled how they had journeyed to Graniteville to play the fast Abbot-Worsted team and how Morrissey started a big, rawboned recruit on the mound named Zink. That game was a tight one until the sixth inning when the opposition got the range on Zink and shelled him to all parts of the outfield. As the runs continued to pile up, quiet "Shorty" Trumbower, a former Brown star, who had been run ragged, came racing in from center field and said to Zink, "Say, what is this, a ball game or a track meet?"

Finally, after a long inning, the side was retired and Zink, unperturbed, walked majestically to the bench as though during the game he had retired the New York Yankees in routine order. Reaching nonchalantly for a bat he started for the plate and got only a few steps when he heard Morrissey scathingly bark, "Where are you going?"

"Why, I'm going to bat, John. I'm the first hitter this inning, you know!" replied the unconcerned pitcher.

"You are, are you?" witheringly exploded John. "After that exhibition you just gave out there, you ought to be ashamed of yourself to even want to bat. You couldn't hit a barn door with a shillelagh. You're done. Get out of the game!" Incidentally, Mr. Zink took an earlier train to parts unknown before the other players left for home.

There was another time when Nashua was leading in a close game and the Cornets needed four runs to win. Two were down with the bases loaded and on a 3-and-2 pitch George Twombly hit a long ball away out into left field. The ball got lost in a covering of small saplings that John had used to protect the newly laid-out gridiron at Little River. All four men raced for home and when they arrived, Umpire Pete McLaughlin met them with a bellow, "Foul ball!" Undaunted they, once again, took their places, and the next pitch was driven to the very same identical spot, this time being called "Fair!" which cleared the sacks and eventually won the game from the hustling rival outfit.

These were a few of the stories they were talking about, all centered around the man for whom they were planning a gala time, and many of the same kind will echo throughout the armory tomorrow night. Because all his boys will be there and it will be a sort of a general reunion as they recall the memories of the days that the "King" sent them out to win another game. And like all great men, John has had his share of defeats and victories but, tomorrow night, it will be proven to him that he won the biggest game of them all: the winning of sincere friendship and gratitude from the young men whom he led and counseled in the days that have gone.

It is well known that, in other lands, it is a custom to open a gay gathering with raised glasses as one of the gentlemen assembled gives a toast to the King. But here, in our community, a group of democratic men will pay the same form of a tribute by their presence at the reception to "King" John Morrissey, and when he returns home and has a moment for quiet reflection over the happiness of the night, he can agree with the words of Dryden:

"The joys I have possessed are ever mine;
out of reach, behind eternity, hid in the
sacred treasure of the past, but blest remembrance brings them hourly back."

This Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown from the Evening Star of June 3, 1946:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

The verbal and written reports of observers who have first-hand information about the regime of terror which prevails behind the iron curtain in Europe exceed the most fantastic fiction stories.

Chambers of horror exist in every country where there are Moscow-sponsored governments. The new methods being used to wring confessions from the political prisoners arrested by the various local branches of the NKVD exceed in cruelty those practiced during the Middle Ages. The stretching of limbs on wheels, the water treatment, and the slow-burning processes are said to have been humanitarian when compared with the new and highly imaginative tortures devised by the NKVD, OZNA, or whatever other names the political police of the countries behind the iron curtain may have.

Ordinary murderers and criminals need not worry. If their crimes transcend even the party lines, they are sentenced to quick death, which political prisoners consider as a blessing.

The state secret police force is not interested in the mere elimination of an important political opponent. He must talk before he is disposed of. The majority of the "political criminals" are ideologists who are fighting for freedom. They have taken chances during the Nazi regime of terror and are not afraid to die. But the old saying that "dead men tell no tales" does not suit the purpose of the dictators, who have sprung up in the areas liberated by the Red armies. Before their prisoners are done away with they must make "confessions" which give the government "evidence" which it can use to good advantage.

The new chemical preparation used extensively by the Germans and the Russians during the war which is said to paralyze parts of the brain and cause the subject to talk at random does not yield satisfactory results against the political victims.

During the war the intelligence services were interested in having a prisoner talk when he refused to do so. Under the influence of the chemical preparation he said many things, and the "specialists" could gather certain data by checking his incoherent statements with other intelligence reports and thus obtain confirmation about the disposition of troops or important strategic plans.

This method, however, is not good enough for the political objectives of the NKVD, which require that the victim be coerced to speak in public and make statements and confessions in an open court. Under the chemical method the prisoner does not remember what he said and is likely to deny certain declarations even after they have been taken down in shorthand. In order to make the political victim talk he must be under the constant fear that the atrocious treatment to which he has been subjected during the investigation will be repeated if he chooses to deny what he had admitted under coercion.

The breaking of the limbs and other tortures applied in the Middle Ages no longer serve the purpose. Other worse methods which cannot be revealed in print are being applied. The prisoner maintains his lucidity throughout the treatment, which extends for several days. Very few, even among individuals known for their physical courage, can stand the tortures for long.

At the end of the "treatment" they are willing to confess almost anything and implicate anybody, including their closest friends and relatives. They know they will not be liberated by death at the hands of the hangman unless they reiterate the declarations made in the torture chamber. Should they attempt to do otherwise, the torture will be resumed after the court declares a recess, and the ordeal will start all over again.

After all that is wanted is taken down in the proper legal form, the victim is given several weeks' respite during which time he is given medical attention and good food. At the end of that period he is no longer a shadow of his former self and he can be presented to the public in fair shape. But throughout the official trial he is reminded by his guards that the slightest attempt to change his testimony will mean return to the torture chamber.

Such methods are reported to have been applied by the OZNA on Gen. Draja Mihailovich, of Yugoslavia, whose trial has been postponed several times since his capture. King Peter's former minister of war and commander of the Chetniks, who is known for his personal courage, attempted to resist the tortures longer than other victims of Marshal Tito's secret police. In the end he broke down like the others.

General Mihailovich's physical appearance, however, is such that the Yugoslav Government does not yet dare bring him before the public lest it should become too obvious how his confession was obtained. He is now reported to be under good medical care so that when the trial opens on June 25 he will look as if he had only to suffer the effects of confinement.

One Good Term Deserves Another

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. EARTHMAN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. EARTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it is my desire to include an editorial that appeared in my home town paper, the Rutherford Courier, on Friday, May 31, 1946.

"GOOD TERM DESERVES ANOTHER

"HAROLD H. EARTHMAN has represented the 11 counties of the Fifth Congressional District in Congress for about 18 months now—and his record in this relatively short time has been such that the Courier is confident the people of the Fifth District will give Mr. EARTHMAN the substantial vote of indorsement on August 1 he so evidently deserves.

"Being a Congressman in this day and time is no soft snap. Washington is a complex place, and the task of getting things done there, which every Congressman faces, is a complicated one. The freshman Congressman, serving his first term, is ordinarily confused like any country boy on his first visit to the big city—and therefore gets nothing done.

"But not Doc EARTHMAN. Quick to make friends, alert and on the ball, he immediately became a personage among the five hundred-odd Congressmen. He had hardly been in Washington 3 months when he was chosen for the important task of visiting Europe as member of a delegation to study the agricultural situation there. Visitors returning to the district from Washington brought back reports that he already had more friends in Congress than many veteran legislators there. They said he knew his way around, and had the contacts to reach the right people and get things done.

"To a surprising and gratifying extent, Representative EARTHMAN has made his first-term presence felt in Washington. He was an early advocate of legislation to encourage volunteer enlistments in the Army to lessen the need for the draft, a measure which has been followed. He urged terminal leave pay and equal benefits for enlisted men and officers—and this is about to become law, according to present indications. He has advocated Federal aid for schools, but without Federal control, and this law is near passage.

"As a member of the House Agriculture Committee—an appointment not easy to obtain—he fills a position where he can be of great service to the people of his predominantly agricultural district. His service for farmers during the short time he has been in Washington already is marked. With regard to prices, farm labor, and distribution of supplies he has been diligent and effective.

"He has been independent in his votes on Congressional measures, the record shows. Sometimes he has been with the national administration, and sometimes against, but in practically every case his action has been, we believe, in accordance with the opinions of the great majority of his constituents. His vote on the draft bill was one example; he voted against drafting boys 18 and 19 years old and against drafting fathers. A snide effort to harm him politically because of this vote came from one source, a newspaper, but it was significant that this newspaper was outside his district, and was one guilty of trying to harm all office holders who do not follow its dictates. His vote on the draft bill, we believe, met with the approval of 95 percent at least of the people of the fifth district.

"Congressman EARTHMAN has been diligent in his support of veterans' legislation, as the record plainly shows. He himself is as much a veteran as was possible for anyone of his age group, which was the between-wars generation; he was 18 and had been in uniform only a couple of months when the First World War ended. He offered his services for World War II, but was not accepted.

"With the groundwork of his first term already so well done, Congressman EARTHMAN will be in a position to be of maximum service to his district during a second term. His home county of Rutherford—the largest county in the district—certainly will give him an overwhelming endorsement for another term. And the Courier is confident that the people of the other 10 counties of the district, too, will present him with a substantial majority of votes indicative of their approval of his past services, and of their wish that he continue to serve them.

Officers' Reserve Corps, ROTC, and CMTC—Address by Brig. Gen. E. S. Bres, Office of the Chief of Staff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address given by Brig. Gen. E. S. Bres, Office of the Chief of Staff, United States Army, before the members of the national security committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. General Bres spoke on Officers' Reserve Corps, and so forth, at a committee conference recently held in Washington at the Statler Hotel.

The VFW committee is headed by Paul C. Wolman, past commander in chief of the overseas veterans' organization, which now numbers close to 2,000,000 members. Other members of the committee are Teller Ammons, former Governor of Colorado, Denver; Ray B. Whitaker, Tulsa, Okla.; Hyman I. Robinson, Miami Beach, Fla.; Francis X. Burke, holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor, Jersey City, N. J.; Brig. Gen. Ralph K. Robertson, New York City; L. P. Cookingham, city manager, Kansas City, Mo.; Charles Sawyer, former Lieutenant Governor of Ohio and recently Ambassador to Belgium; Navy Capt. James E. Van Zandt, former Member of Congress, past commander in chief of VFW, Altoona, Pa.; Forrest Vosler, Syracuse, N. Y. Commander in Chief Joseph M. Stack of Pittsburgh, Pa., and Senior Vice Commander Louis E. Starr are ex-officio members of the committee.

The national security committee, desiring to formulate policies for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, heard authorities discuss unification of the armed forces, universal military training, control of atomic energy, and permanent overseas bases.

The conference speaker list included: Foster Hailey, editorial board, New York Times, speaking on outposts for national security; Lt. Gen. J. Lawton Collins on unification of the armed forces; Maj. Gen. Ray A. Porter on universal military training; Dr. E. U. Condon, director, National Bureau of Standards, on atomic energy; Maj. Gen. B. B. Miltonberger, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, on the National Guard; C. B. Lister, secretary-treasurer National Rifle Association, on National Rifle Association; Brig. Gen. E. S. Bres, office of Chief of Staff, United States Army, on Officers' Reserve Corps and ROTC; and James Frederick Green, associate director of the dependent area section of the State Department, speaking on United Nations.

General Bres' speech follows:

I am highly honored to be here representing General Eisenhower. He has the greatest pride and esteem in your society, and the help you have given us.

My purpose will be briefly to tell you, and to discuss with you, plans for our postwar organization and our problems in accomplishing this program. We believe that the future military security of this country depends on the effective adoption and operation of this program, which, as a major part, carries with it the complete establishment of the Organized Reserve Corps and, with it, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and their vitalization in a higher degree of efficiency and training accompanying immediate reactivation.

Incidentally, I may state I noticed CMTC was included for discussion on the program, but CMTC was discontinued at the outbreak of the war, and if we have UMT it will not be reactivated.

It is strictly an American tradition that the defense of this country shall be entrusted to its citizen army and not to a huge professional army. This tradition has successfully survived two world wars in the past quarter of a century, but we must not follow it blindly and fall into the error of thinking that our citizen armies can be brought into existence overnight with no prior organization or training.

Immediately following World War I there was a general feeling that the war to end all wars had been fought and won. We were lulled into a sense of false security. Let us keep in mind that in World War II we had nearly 3 years in which to mobilize. Should war come again it will come with little or no warning. We cannot hope to have years to prepare and, in fact, would be fortunate to have a few months' time. It is vital, therefore, that we maintain ourselves in readiness so as to permit us to employ our matériel and potential manpower with a minimum of delay and with a maximum of force against an aggressor. It is our conviction that this can be accomplished only by maintenance during time of peace of a powerful and fully effective Organized Reserve Corps, National Guard, and an operative ROTC in addition to a regular organization of sufficient strength. Never again must the Organized Reserve Corps be constituted of units existing only as paper records. Incidentally, that is a matter of much concern to the Officers' Reserve Corps.

It must be made up of the required number of units, fully organized, with officers and enlisted personnel trained and equipped to the point where they can take the field

immediately on the outbreak of war, to be followed by continuing organization as planned. It must have units whose organization and training can be completed within a few months, and, finally, it must be made up of the organizational framework of all the remaining units needed to complete our first year's organization.

Studies have indicated that in the event of a future emergency it will be practicable to mobilize an army of 4,500,000 men during the first 12 months after M-day. That means we would start out with the initial force on M-day and gradually increase this force until the 4,500,000 is attained.

This army will include all types of units in sufficient numbers to form a balanced force and would consist of the three components:

1. The Regular Army, as large as will be required and consistent with the program. There are no specific figures as to the size of the Regular Army organization. Of course, as you all know, that is always a matter for Congress, who determines how much money will be appropriated and how many men will constitute the Regular Army.

We will endeavor to secure the requisite force.

2. The National Guard, under present minimum planning, of 622,000, three times larger than any previous size.

I do not know what figures General Miltonberger gave you; 622,000 was originally set up. He may have given you a larger number. I do not know.

3. The Organized Reserve Corps, which will include all those units required for a balanced force, but not included in the Regular Army or the National Guard. Both the Regular Army and National Guard forces would form part and be included in the 4,500,000 requirement.

In other words, if we have the National Guard of 622,000 and we have 500,000 men in the Regular organization, the Organized Reserves must furnish the difference between that and 4,500,000 men for M-plus 360.

To activate all units of the Organized Reserve Corps will be a tremendous job. It is one that will challenge all of our energies and imagination, and it must be accomplished, for if it is not accomplished it is believed there is little hope of realizing the Army for our national security, which must come into being.

The detailed development of the Organized Reserve Corps divides units into three categories, defined by varying stages of organization and mobilization readiness. These categories have been labeled classes A, B, and C, with class A units further subdivided into class A-1 and class A-2 units.

Class A-1 units are service-type units, organized at full war strength in both officers and men, fully trained and equipped during peacetime and ready for immediate employment on M-day. These units, as far as possible, will be affiliated with civilian industry. Approximately 460,000 officers and men are allotted to units of this type.

Do you think it would be preferable to finish this paper and then come back and discuss it?

Chairman WOLMAN. I would rather; yes.

General BRES. World War II proved that the success or failure of modern armies depends largely on the quantity and quality of the logistical support with which they can be provided. The Regular Army will not, with its multitude of peacetime tasks, be able to include within its limited strength anything like the number of service units which will be needed on M-day. The same is true of the National Guard, since it must perform a State mission in addition to its Federal mission. Therefore, the Organized Reserve must provide these units so vital for our needs on M-day.

Any future attack will come without warning and from the air, and it will strike at our vital industries and communication centers. Utilities must be restored immediately. The demand for them will be tremendous. We must have engineering, signal, and many other services to clear away the damage and restore communications, et cetera, and we must have medical service to care for the injured, both civilian and military.

We hope that these services and many others will be insured through organizing class A-1 units. Some of the other type units that may be affiliated with civilian industries are signal companies, affiliated with telephone and telegraph concerns; railroad battalions, affiliated with civilian railroads; medical units, affiliated with civilian hospitals, et cetera.

Class A-2 units are of combat type—air groups, divisions, antiaircraft artillery battalions, tank battalions, and the like. They, like the class A-1 units, are to be organized with a full complement of officers and men in time of peace. Full equipment will be retained for these units. They are to be organized so that they can be called to active duty on M-day—as a unit—for whatever further training or hardening is required.

It is planned that these units will be ready for full employment in active operations in from M plus 90 to M plus 150 days. The allotment of officers and men to units of this class totals about 266,000.

Class B units are of all types, both combat and service. They will be organized in time of peace with a full complement of officers and not less than a cadre of enlisted men. There is no restriction, however, on the number of enlisted men which these units may recruit over and above the enlisted cadre, and, at such time as they attain full strength, they will pass into class A status. Essential training and individual equipment will be provided these units. Upon being called to active duty they will be filled to war strength and given additional training necessary to fit them for operations. It is contemplated that they will become available for such use in from M plus 90 to M plus 180 days. The allotment for this category is approximately 109,000 officers and men and the full war strength would total about a half million officers and men.

Class C units, likewise, are of both combat and service type but will be organized in peacetime with officers only. Peacetime training and mobilization procedures will be the same as for class B units, and their availability for operations should range from M plus 180 to M plus 360 days. Class C units will require about 39,000 officers and warrant officers. When expanded to war strength this will represent a force of about 400,000 officers and men.

There is no restriction on the number of class A units or class B units that may be organized. Any of the class B or class C units can pass into a higher category when they can procure the required personnel and satisfy the training standard of the next higher classification.

This sketch of progressive organization must, of course, be varied in many instances to meet particular conditions and the War Department does not expect this plan to be followed rigidly but considers it rather as a control to insure that the organization of the Reserve moves steadily on toward its final goal. That goal, when reached, will represent approximately 873,000 Reservists, organized into units, and those units, when expanded to full war strength, will total about 1,800,000 officers and men. That might be termed the "army in being." I do not know whether General Porter or General Miltonberger brought that up, but that force in addition to the Regular Army and National Guard would be our army in being. Certainly a bulwark to national security not to be taken lightly.

I would like here to give you a brief resumé of the Army Air Forces Reserves and of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs.

The Army Air Forces Reserve organization will parallel the basic organization of the Army Ground Forces. Sufficient units will be organized to provide the over-all balanced air force which is desired at this time for national defense. In addition, individuals will have training made available to them so that they may maintain an active interest and become an active part of the Air Reserve.

Emphasis will be placed on the organized units which I have previously described.

These units will have a mobilization date assigned to them in order to provide for a progressive mobilization procedure in time of national emergency or war. Units will also maintain their identity if and when they are called to fill their mobilization assignments. Individuals who are not assigned to units will be utilized to fully man not only the Reserve component of the Air Force, but also the other components of the Air Force, the Air National Guard, and the Regular Army Air Force.

It is contemplated that a certain number of rated pilots will receive a flying training based on a required number of hours to be flown on a monthly basis. Training will also be made available for rated personnel other than pilots. All other personnel, both officers and enlisted men, will receive such training as is necessary to maintain the desired efficiency and proficiency in the position to which they are assigned.

The availability of Air Reserve personnel will dictate the geographical location of the organized units. It is planned that the Air National Guard and the Air Reserve, together, will man 6,000 planes which will form the backbone of the Air Defense Command.

Scattered over the country will be the following units:

Thirty wings, 60 fighter and light bomber groups, 320 fighter and light bomber squadrons. Aircraft warning units, radar and camouflage outfits, and other associated units will be organized.

Turning to the ROTC, perhaps you would be interested in a brief outline of the "interim" program, so called because it is intended to bridge the gap between the wartime program and the permanent postwar program.

During the war, it was necessary to suspend the advanced course because of the time factor involved. This resulted in a break in the normal production of Reserve officers. As soon as the military situation permitted—in fact, shortly after VJ-day—the reactivation of the advanced course was authorized in all prewar units and schools except medical units.

The interim program is intended for enlisted veterans who enter or return to college. These students are permitted to substitute their active military service for the basic course, and thus are enabled to enter the advanced course even during the freshman year, and obtain their commissions in 2 years.

As members of the advanced course, these students receive approximately $20 per month and an officer-type uniform, in addition to the benefits provided by the GI bill of rights. They are not subject to any requirement for extended active duty upon graduation, although such duty will undoubtedly be available.

The War Department is particularly anxious to have veterans take advantage of this training program. These combat-seasoned men should form the backbone of the Reserve in years to come.

A new postwar ROTC plan has been prepared. Unfortunately, I am not at liberty to discuss the details of this program until the public announcement has been released by the War Department.

I can tell you, however, that the War Department fully appreciates the value of the ROTC, and intends to take the utmost advantage of this splendid source of Reserve

officers after the war. If present plans materialize, it is expected that from 25,000 to 35,000 Reserve officers will be procured from this source each year, as compared with 6 to 10 thousand before the war. It will probably be necessary to increase the number of units and schools in the system—approximately 300 are now being considered.

The plan is expected to give us an improved ROTC product and a more attractive and effective program. It has been developed by a special committee in the War Department, after thorough consideration of every phase of the ROTC program. The views of both educators and Army officers who have had long experience with the ROTC were presented to the committee.

In conclusion, I wish to express my thanks for your consideration in having me outline this program to you. I hope that I have given you a concept of our plans and some of our problems in reactivating a postwar nucleus for any future citizen army on which our future national security must depend.

On the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson from the Evening Star of June 3, 1946:

ON THE RECORD
(By Dorothy Thompson)

The United Committee of South Slavic Americans has published a pamphlet summarizing the evidence against General Mihailovich. It consists of 15½ pages of description of Chetnik activities and documentary evidence. Its author is Vaso Trivanovitch.

Meanwhile, the commission of inquiry set up by the Committee For a Fair Trial For Mihailovich has taken evidence, under oath from American military personnel attached as liaisons to Mihailovich's headquarters or rescued by him and returned to the Allies, and has published its findings. The Yugoslav Embassy in Washington, representing Mihailovich's accusers, was invited to send persons to cross-examine the American witnesses. They refused.

The evidence presented by the two committees is contradictory at almost all points. But conscientious study of both reports does throw light on Yugoslavia from the beginning of 1942, until the end of the war. It is only in the framework of that general picture that the case of Mihailovich can be understood.

King Peter's government, and the guerrilla movement, entered the war against the Axis through a revolt in March 1941. Mihailovich became commander of the guerrilla Chetniks. The Croatian population, disaffected for years, and led by Ante Pavelich, welcomed, in large part, the establishment of an independent pro-Axis state. Resistance depended on the Serbs. King Peter's government, disgusted with Croatian behavior, developed a strong Serbian policy.

Until Russia entered the war, the Chetniks were, therefore, the only resistance forces. Vaso Trivanovitch, author of the Case Against Mihailovich, was then, as an officer in the American Friends of Yugoslavia, an apologist for King Peter, and in this capacity sponsored a coast-to-coast broadcast stating that the revolt of March 27 had electrified the world. Answering the Axis propaganda that Chetniks executed by the Axis were Jews and Communists, this broadcast said, "Yugoslavia has some 60,000 Jews, but it has no Communist Party. It is doubtful whether there were more than 10,000 underground Communists. But 80,000 Yugoslavs have already been executed by the Axis and Pavelich's Croatian traitors."

I quoted this for the view of Mr. Trivanovitch at the time concerning the popularity of communism in Yugoslavia, for he is now the supporter of the Yugoslav Communist regime. But he had changed his mind before. He was at one time an apologist for the Nazi economic system, and associated with Professor Aunagen against the boycott of Nazi Germany.

Only when Russia was attacked did a new resistance movement spring up, definitely Communist—and therefore (according to Mr. Trivanovitch) without popular roots—anti-Axis and anti-Chetnik, and fighting for a totally different objective than Mihailovich's.

The result was civil war combined with war against the Germans and Italians. It is the charge of the anti-Mihailovich pamphlet that he abandoned the fight against the Germans and Italians only to fight the Partisans, and documentary evidence is presented to show that he assisted the Germans, and the Italians in particular, in their struggle against the Partisans.

But American officers testified that Chetniks, fighting Germans, were fallen upon in the rear by Partisans—which was certainly collaboration with the enemy. In such a situation, the probability is, and the evidence on both sides indicates, that the Axis did its best to draw consequences favorable to itself from the condition of civil strife, and to drive one resistance movement against the other.

The question, therefore, of who was guilty of collaboration and if so, why, can hardly be answered without asking the prior and fundamental question: Who started the civil war in Yugoslavia? For nothing could have been more favorable to the Axis than civil war. And on this, I believe, impartial history would pin the guilt on the Partisans. For instead of making a common front for the duration of the struggle against the Germans, their fight against the Axis was, from the outset, a fight also against the London government and the Chetniks, and a struggle to weaken and destroy Serbia—the very center of the resistance. To do this, Marshal Tito has not hesitated to welcome the aid of former Pavelich Croatians.

Mihailovich is now being tried for treason by his opponents who, in this case, are prosecutor, judge, and jury. The trial will never unravel the threads of the tragic Yugoslav events, for it is to the interest of the prosecution, which has already presented the verdict, to suppress the complete story of the civil war.

As for the evidence, this columnist was for 4 years a correspondent in the Balkans, and knows too much about Balkan forgeries of documents to accept anything as prima facie evidence, without cross examination before an impartial judge. Knowing also Belgrade police methods, which have not been humanized by Marshal Tito's OZNA, "confession" indicates nothing to me except the efficacy of these methods.

If anything is evidence, the testimony of the American officers and flyers is. That it is barred in Yugoslavia is, in itself, sufficient indication of the sort of trial to which General Mihailovich is being exposed. The American name for it is lynch law.

Tennessean Comments on Reduction in Fayetteville Electric Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. EARTHMAN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. EARTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, for the third time the municipally owned power system in Fayetteville, Tenn., has cut its rates on June 1 to its patrons. This has been made possible because when TVA became available the city of Fayetteville bought its power plant to distribute power purchased at low rates from the TVA. The citizens of this little city have already enjoyed two rate reductions prior to the recent cut; at the same time while reducing their rates, the city has a surplus on hand of more than twice the amount of their indebtedness in the form of power bonds.

The following is a news item from the Fayetteville Observer of May 30, 1946, which is a reprint from the Nashville Tennesseean:

TENNESSEEAN COMMENTS ON REDUCTION IN FAYETTEVILLE ELECTIC RATES

Fayetteville, too, enjoying the profits of its own power system is going to cut rates again. The cut on June 1, amounting to 20 percent, will be the third since the municipality began distributing TVA power, and the readiness of the directors of the service to pass on to the consumers the benefits of efficient operation reflects their own comprehension of the aim of public ownership as well as the healthy state of the utility.

The city still has $60,000 of power bonds outstanding but has laid away War bonds worth more than twice the indebtedness. Having thus provided amply for its financial obligations, it is turning back to the citizens the surplus earnings of the power system, as it engaged to do under the TVA contract.

In Fayetteville, as in other cities in which this pattern is being followed, the cut in power costs means a corresponding increase in the purchasing power of the people in other directions. It means better living. (Nashville Tennesseean.)

May I congratulate the electric department of the city of Fayetteville and the city officials who have so efficiently operated the electric system to the great advantage of the power-using citizens.

I would like to call attention to the fact that this is just another shining example of the great benefits enjoyed by the general public as a result of the advantages offered by TVA.

There are many electric cooperative associations within the TVA area. Now that the war is over, we have every right to expect hundreds of electric lines to be added throughout the rural districts. With the cooperation of the REA, this will afford the advantages of electricity to multiplied thousands in the rural sections.

As a Representative of the area served by TVA and REA, it is most gratifying to see the great change for the better throughout the rural areas that are served by TVA. More and more I am

thankful that our Government has made it possible for us to enjoy the benefits of TVA.

Motor Equipment for Seriously Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following item from the Washington Post, and the address of Staff Sgt. Gerald Gillerman before the House World War Veterans' Legislation Committee, and copy of my bill, H. R. 6304:

[From the Washington Post June 5, 1946]

ONE-LEGGED GI PRESENTS PLEA FOR FREE AUTOS—TWO WORLD WAR I VETERANS SUPPORT APPEAL TO CONGRESS

(By Sam Stavisky)

A 21-year-old GI, who lost a leg in France, yesterday made an eloquent plea for Congress to provide autos for those veterans who can never walk normally again.

Staff Sgt. Gerald Gillerman, a patient at Walter Reed Hospital, presented his appeal before the House Veterans' Committee on behalf "of a group of disabled veterans unregretful of their personal loss * * * yet feeling that their plight can be justly improved."

More than 50 GI lower-limb amputees—from Walter Reed and Forest Glen, on crutches and wheel chairs—jammed into the hearing chamber to lend silent, but nonetheless expressive, support to their spokesman.

WITNESS IS IMPRESSIVE

Six-feet-2, dark-haired and strong-jawed, Gillerman made a "splendid witness," in the words of Chairman JOHN RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi. He presented a forceful case, ripped into arguments presented by Gen. Omar Bradley last week opposing the automobile grant, and answered dozens of questions from members of the committee. He held the witness stand for over an hour.

Gillerman asserted that artificial limbs and appliances have proved through experience to be insufficient for the leg amputees "to overcome the hazards and hardships of day-to-day existence."

To the men who had lost a lower limb, or the use of it, an auto was not a luxury, he argued, but needed to help complete their rehabilitation. To the men who had lost the power of locomotion, he contended, an auto was a mechanical aid, even as were crutches and the wheel chair.

Staff Sergeant Gillerman took up point by point the unfavorable report on the "free autos" bill by General Bradley, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, presented to the committee last week.

BRADLEY'S OBJECTIONS ANSWERED

He noted that General Bradley "recognized the difficulties of public transportation" for the disabled veterans. To the general's argument that even with a car the legless veterans would still have to cope with the problems of parking and getting from and to the parking place, Gillerman replied:

"If something as minor as parking be our only problem, then we have truly and successfully overcome our handicap."

The Administrator had raised the question of responsibility for maintaining the car. Gillerman pointed out that the bill being pushed by the amputees only asked for "initial opportunity," that once given the auto the veteran would maintain it at his own expense.

The bill provides for a grant of $1,500 in lieu of an auto. General Bradley has stated that this cash provision led to the "inescapable" conclusion that the legislation is primarily a bonus for a "limited group." Gillerman said on this point that the cash provision was injected into the bill to cover small groups of disabled veterans who have already cashed their war bonds and "used much of their life savings" to purchase a necessary auto.

Staff Sergeant Gillerman, who is chairman of the National War Amputee Car Committee, told the Veterans Committee that he was making his appeal for the paraplegics (spinal-cord paralysis cases) as well, but added that the bill might well be broadened to include other worthy groups of disabled veterans.

A resident of Brookline, Mass., Gillerman entered the Army shortly after his eighteenth birthday.

Two veterans of World War I added their pleas to that of Gillerman. Former Representative Bill Miller, of Connecticut, who lost both legs in combat, and Representative Joseph P. O'Hara (Democrat, Minnesota) urged favorable passage of the bill.

SPEECH OF STAFF SGT. GERALD GILLERMAN TO VETERANS' LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ON THE SUBJECT OF CARS FOR WAR WOUNDED AMPUTEES

Mr. Chairman and members of the Veteran's Legislative Committee, I would like to make clear that this report has been drawn up by a group of men inexperienced in legislative and administrative activities. It simply represents the opinion of a group of disabled veterans, unregretful of their personal loss, thankful for the fruits of their sacrifice, yet feeling that their plight can be justly improved. Therefore we have come before this committee to present our case, knowing that its merits will be fairly and honestly judged.

The successful cessation of hostilities meant to many the resumption of their normal lives; to a comparatively small group of men, however, it marked the beginning of a struggle of readjustment—brought about by war incurred disabilities.

The Government recognized its responsibilities to these war-damaged men. It assumed the all-important task of rehabilitating these men to as complete a state of normalcy as possible in order that they might resume a useful, independent position in a society for which they sacrificed so much.

Congress and the Veterans' Administration has done much to complete this task. Yet there remains the obstacle of the restoration of mobility to those men who have lost (or lost the use of) their lower limbs. We realize that complete restoration is impossible, but through actual experience we have found that the artificial limbs now supplied us are insufficient to overcome the hazards and hardships of day-to-day existence.

The difficulties presented by snow and ice, as you can well realize, are enormous. Our lack of traction in the use of the artificial limb well nigh prevents us from walking. We could very easily be compared to a pilot who is grounded due to bad weather conditions. But is it fair, gentlemen, that we be restricted to our homes and suffer the loss of a day's and even a week's wages because of inclement weather? Is this what the Government means by rehabilitation?

The difficulties presented by rough terrain are also worthy of consideration. Lack of sufficient muscular control as well as insufficient leverage make walking under such conditions a great hardship at best. Gentlemen, look at these men. Believe me, some will never walk again. Can you honestly say before this committee—before God—that they with their artificial limbs are sufficiently equipped to cope with these everyday difficulties as easily as you are? Remember, gentlemen, that the miracle of being able to walk in order to overcome obstacles has been taken from these men.

Furthermore, the difficulties of public transportation must be mentioned in this report. You must be aware of the jostling, the crowds, the short steps, the quick, discourteous rushes of fellow passengers, the resumption of movement of the vehicle before all passengers are seated or firmly placed. Our clothes completely conceal our prostheses and thus our disability. We cannot ask for or receive special consideration from the public in such situations. In addition, the walking involved in getting to and from public transportation in many cases causes a severe strain and injury to our stumps. In such cases we are extremely liable to develop blisters and rashes on the ends of our stumps.

The difficulties we have mentioned above are conducive not only to physical instability, but also to mental instability. The fear of falling, of injuring ourselves, with a resulting period of hospitalization and all its consequences does not leave our mind at ease. You have already recognized this importance of mental rehabilitation and yet here is an obviously large gap in your program.

After giving due consideration to all these problems we decided that a further mechanical appliance is necessary. An automobile is the mechanical appliance we so greatly need to overcome the above mentiond difficulties.

For this purpose Representative ROGERS and others have introduced several bills into Congress. This report, however, shall deal only with H. R. 6304. H. R. 6304 provides that in addition (reading of bill, etc.).

Several objections to this bill have been raised by General Bradley in his report to this committee. Since General Bradley represents the Veterans' Administration his criticisms are certainly valid and as a result we feel that they must be answered.

First we must note that the General recognized the difficulties of public transportation which we have mentioned previously. On this point we completely agree with the General. However, he went on to say that we would still have to cope with parking difficulties as well as walking to and from the parking space. Gentlemen, I reiterate, we know that we can never be restored to complete normalcy. All we ask for is a chance to, once again, be able to compete for a job with people who are unhampered by such hardships. If something as minor as parking be our only problem, then we have truly and successfully overcome our handicap.

The general went on to say that the Government, if logics were to be followed, would have to assume the responsibility for the maintenance of the car. Again we say that a car will provide us with the initial opportunity we so sorely need and so earnestly desire. Given that opportunity, we are confident that we can shoulder the additional task of maintenance and replacement. The bill clearly provides for this condition.

Furthermore, the general said—here I quote the Washington Post of May 30—that the provision permitting the acceptance of money in lieu of an automobile leads to the inescapable conclusion that the legislation is primarily a bonus.

The money grant was injected into the bill to cover small groups of men who have already recognized the necessity of a car and who consequently cashed their war bonds

and used much of their life savings to purchase an automobile. It is only just that these men be reimbursed, yet there remains the possibility of some men using the money for other purposes. But would any of you part with a severe necessity essential to your well-being for a mere monetary gain? We are earnestly seeking physical and mental rehabilitation and not any illusionary financial gain that would be detrimental to our hopes of a secure and useful life.

The possibility was also admitted that other groups of disabled veterans would attempt the passage of a bill similar to this. First, let us remind you that H. R. 6304 includes veterans who have lost the use of as well as the loss of their lower limbs. We are aware of our own disability and the resulting problems. We need the necessity of a car for us. We need artificial legs and you gave them to us. We ask only for what we need. If you feel that the request for a car by any other group is valid and justified, it is your responsibility to act upon that.

The objection was also raised that administrative difficulties would be encountered. If this committee decides that a car is of certain a necessity to us and yet refrains from the passage of the bill for fear of administrative difficulties then you, as our chosen representatives, will be shirking your responsibility to us as citizens, soldiers, and veterans.

Finally, the general extended his heartfelt sympathy to us. Gentlemen, we don't and never did want sympathy. Sympathy will accomplish nothing for us. We are faced with the hard, sometimes cruel facts of reality. We propose to meet reality with reality.

I would now like to read to the committee excerpts from letters we have received from various disabled men who have been discharged from the Army and who have had the opportunity to face the difficulties which we have previously described.

(Reading of letters.)

The letters which I have just read are typical of the hundreds which our amputee committee has received during the short time of its existence. But our problems are recognized by many others. Various organizations which represent millions of members have rallied to our support in an attempt to aid us in the passage of this bill. To list a few of them: VFW, AVC, RVA, CIO, AFL, also Advisory Board of Prosthetic Division of Veterans' Administration, American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, the student bodies of university and city colleges.

In conclusion the amputee committee feels that the existing state of emergency must be brought to your attention. With each passing day disabled veterans are falling and injuring themselves, not to mention the constant deterioration of their mental stability which results from the fear of physical injury. We respectfully urge that the committee make all possible haste in considering this bill and fervently hope you will see our greatly difficult position in the same light that we do.

Several members of our amputee group are here at this time and shall attempt to answer any question that the committee might put before us.

But before this we would like to show the committee for the purpose of clarification just what a stump and a disability shrapnel wound really look like.

H. R. 6304

A bill to authorize the furnishing of motor equipment to seriously disabled veterans, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That in addition to prosthetic appliances otherwise authorized, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized to furnish a suitably equipped automobile, costing not to exceed $1,500, to any veteran having a service-incurred disability due to loss, or loss of use of, one or more limbs: *Provided*, That except for training the veteran in the use of such equipment, the Government shall have no liability respecting or in connection with the use, repair, maintenance, or replacement thereof: *And provided further*, That at the option of either the veteran or the Administrator there may be supplied, in lieu of such automobile, a payment in amount equal to the cost thereof and not to exceed the amount stated herein.

Record of Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, on American Labor Policy During the Period 1939 to 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the American people have a right to know what their legislators are doing in their name and what they have done in their name.

From time to time, therefore, I believe it is the responsibility of each legislator to review his record and submit it to the people for their judgment.

At this time I want to submit my record on American labor policy during my 7½ years in the United States Senate.

I humbly believe it is a pro-American labor policy, a policy which has been dedicated, too, to the best interests of the American worker, himself.

Why should it not be such? The laborer is the salvation of America. "He who labors as he prays lifts his heart to God with his hands," said a saint. Honest labor is dignity.

In the Book of Books it is written in Genesis 3:19, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground, for out of it wast thou taken." In Ecclesiastes 5:19, it is written, "To rejoice in one's labor, this is the gift of God."

Mr. President, having been a laboring man myself, it is only natural that I have fought for labor. How? Not merely in words, but in actions, in pro-labor, pro-American bills which I have introduced, in votes in which I have stood up and been counted on the side of honest labor.

Mr. President, I have strived to advance the welfare of all types of labor—for factory labor, for the white-collar worker, for the farm worker, for the woman worker, the young worker, the ex-serviceman worker.

Let me briefly cite 10 fronts on which I have made my efforts.

First. For maximum employment opportunities at a decent living wage for all who want to work.

Second. For adequate social security legislation for workers.

Third. For labor's rights—collective bargaining, correction of grievances, democratic union elections and strike votes.

Fourth. Against racketeers in labor and in management.

Fifth. Against inflation which would rob the worker of the bread he has earned.

Sixth. Against war which would butcher the worker as well as all others.

Seventh. For safety precautions and decent human treatment of workers.

Eighth. For public assistance when necessary for unemployed workers.

Ninth. For peaceful settlement of labor disputes so as to spare the worker loss of pay checks in work stoppages.

Tenth. For the American system of free enterprise which has given the American worker the highest living standard in the world.

But I want my record to speak for itself. I ask, therefore, unanimous consent that there be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from my statements on labor policy during the last 7½ years.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECHES BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY ON BEHALF OF A PRO-AMERICAN LABOR POLICY

1939

1. THERE MUST BE JUSTICE FOR THE LARORING MAN—AMERICA MUST HAVE INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY AS WELL AS POLITICAL DEMOCRACY

(From an address of January 14, 1939, before the National Republican Women's Club in New York City as reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 16, 1939)

We have not always been aware of the simple fact that political democracy could not continue to survive unless we also erected as its counterpart an industrial democracy. A political democracy and an industrial democracy are mutually dependent institutions; one cannot survive without the other.

* * * * *

What are these objectives of industrial democracy? They are higher incomes for the underprivileged third of our Nation, security in our jobs, and security in our old age; greater production; an encouraged industry; a reinvigorated farmer class; and, in general, more of the good things of life for all our people.

(NOTE.—See items 24 and 25 for the bill which Senator WILEY introduced in 1944 to help raise the wages of the underpaid workers of America.)

2. ONE MONTH LATER, AMERICA IS STILL DEEP IN THE DEPRESSION WITH 10,000,000 WORKERS UNEMPLOYED. A THREEFOLD APPEAL IS PRESENTED: (A) FOR ENCOURAGEMENT OF BUSINESS SO AS TO CREATE JOBS, (B) FOR AID TO THE NEEDY, (C) FOR SPARING THE NEEDY FROM CHEAP POLITICAL DISCRIMINATION

(From a radio address of February 25, 1939, over a Nation-wide radio network, as reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 1939)

WPA is a creature of our times. It is the result of a break-down in our industrial and economic life. The problem that WPA presents is a tragic one. The answer is not found in destructive criticism. It is to be found in bringing into existence a renewal of confidence and business activity, and the resulting jobs that will remove the need for

WPA. This means reinvigorating and revitalizing America. It means a new leadership.

* * * * *

There are still some 10,000,000 unemployed in the Nation and nearly half of them are receiving public assistance and support. * * * The eventual solution of the unemployment problem depends mainly upon factors outside of relief administration itself, but until sustained recovery is achieved we are faced with the problem of providing for the unemployed.

* * * * *

The primary contention of the Republican Party is that the basic responsibility for the administration of relief rightfully is the concern of States and localities, who best know their needs and how to take care of them. We know, however, that as long as the present volume of unemployment continues, the States will not be able to provide sufficient money for adequate relief. Federal assistance is needed, but it should be provided in the form of grants-in-aid to the States, rather than through direct Federal administration of a part of the relief program. The States, however, must be encouraged to bear a fair share of the burden.

* * * * *

One of the outstanding indictments of administration of relief under WPA is the extent to which politics has dominated the whole program.

* * * * *

We propose that a Federal bi-partisan board be established to administer the grants-in-aid to the States and that its staff be under civil service rather than the present spoils system. To guard against throwing relief administration into the hurly-burly of State politics—which at that might be an improvement over the present national set-up—we propose that bi-partisan boards be set up in the States to control relief administration before Federal grants are made. Such an organization will minimize the influence of partisan politics in relief administration and will offer a far better opportunity for efficiency and economy.

NOTE.—(See item 6 for the bill introduced by Senator Wiley in 1940 to insure fair Public Hearings for WPA workers with grievances.)

3. HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF JOBLESS WORKERS AND PENNILESS FARMERS ARE LOSING THEIR HOMES—A BILL IS INTRODUCED TO STAY FORECLOSURE PROCEEDINGS ON GOVERNMENT-OWNED REAL-ESTATE MORTGAGES

(From an address in the United States Senate on March 14, 1939)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to submit a resolution which, if agreed to, will authorize the courts of the land to stay foreclosure proceedings upon real-estate mortgages to the United States.

This resolution, if agreed to, will not create an arbitrary moratorium. What it purports to do is to give the courts the power to stay proceedings upon such terms and conditions as the courts, by their orders, may prescribe for the purpose of protecting the interest of the mortgagors and the mortgagees.

* * * * *

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 93), as follows:

"Whereas the mortgages held by the United States and its agencies are the property of the Nation; and

"Whereas due to present economic conditions, foreclosure proceedings have been instituted or will be instituted upon many of such mortgages; and

"Whereas the foreclosure of such mortgages would have the effect of depriving many citizens of their homes and farms; and

"Whereas the problems of unemployment and relief would be intensified as a result of such foreclosures; and

"Whereas it is in the interests of the Nation that foreclosures should be stayed in anticipation of improved economic conditions; and

"Whereas the courts in which foreclosure proceedings are instituted are capable of determining the conditions peculiar to each case involving the foreclosure of any such mortgage: Therefore be it

"Resolved, etc., That any court having jurisdiction of any proceedings brought by the United States or any agency of the United States for the purpose of foreclosing upon any real property mortgaged to the United States or such agency shall have power to stay such foreclosure proceedings for a period of time expiring not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this joint resolution. Any such stay of proceedings shall be granted subject to such terms and conditions as the court, by its order, may prescribe for the purpose of protecting the respective interests of the mortgagor and the mortgagee in the mortgaged property."

4. AN AMENDMENT IS INTRODUCED TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY BILL IN ORDER TO SAVE WISCONSIN'S "EXPERIENCE RATING" SYSTEM OF JOBLESS COMPENSATION—THIS SYSTEM HELPS TO REDUCE UNEMPLOYMENT

(From an address in the United States Senate on May 22, 1939)

I should like to present briefly a few facts relating to an amendment which I intend to propose to the Social Security Act.

One portion of * * * (a pending bill) will virtually tear to shreds the experience rating unemployment provisions in the Wisconsin Unemployment Compensation Act.

The Unemployment Reserves and Compensation Act in Wisconsin became law on January 29, 1932. Wisconsin, on November 27, 1935, was the first State to have its unemployment compensation law approved under the Federal Social Security Act. The benefit rights of most of our workers began to build up on July 1, 1936. On August 17 of that year our industrial commission paid to a Wisconsin worker the first unemployment benefit check ever paid in America from a State unemployment compensation fund.

Under the provisions of the Wisconsin law, Wisconsin employers contribute to separate accounts in the State unemployment reserve fund maintained for them and their employees by the State industrial commission. The experience rating system means that each employer's contribution rate will depend on his own experience or record. In Wisconsin by the close of 1938 more than 1,500 employers had their rate reduced. Other employers with a bad experience record paid an increased rate.

* * * * *

It is apparent that the individual employer will work to reduce unemployment when he has this incentive. He will slice the seasonal zigzags from his employment chart and spread his employment evenly throughout the year.

Throwing the experience rating State provision into the discard means that we are one step nearer to a complete and undesirable nationalization of the present State programs. It means that we are snatching the unemployment insurance from the hands of the unemployed and replacing it with something that looks suspiciously like a dole. It means that we are beginning to open the floodgates of unemployment funds with every possibility for a haphazard benefit-payment system. It means that we are setting the stage for whooping up the contribution rates for the accumulation of huge reserves.

(NOTE.—See items 17 and 26 for other bills and amendments introduced by Senator WILEY in later years for more adequate social security legislation.)

5. AN EARLY APPEAL TO CONGRESS TO (A) TAKE THE FIRST STEP TO INSURE ADEQUATE PENSIONS FOR OUR OLD FOLKS, AND (B) TO HELP SETTLE LABOR-MANAGEMENT QUARRELS PEACEFULLY

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on July 24, 1939)

I should have liked to see Congress pass Senate Joint Resolution 145, which provides for an amendment to the Constitution, giving Congress the certain right to levy taxes for old-age pensions. There are those who claim Congress has that right. There are those who say Congress has not the right. If this joint resolution amending the Constitution were submitted to the people, it would enable the people to decide whether they wanted the Congress to have that certain right. The problem of old age is one of the serious problems confronting this Republic.

* * * * *

Another thing which I think the Senate should have accomplished is this: It should have met the capital-labor issue head-on. I mean, the issue presented by the Wagner Act. Congress should have recognized the right of the public in these labor quarrels.

1940

6. LET'S PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF WPA WORKERS—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO INSURE PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR WPA WORKERS WITH GRIEVANCES

(From an address in the United States Senate on February 19, 1940)

I desire to comment briefly on a bill which I am introducing at this time. The bill requires that hearings or meetings held by the Work Projects Administration with respect to the grievances of relief workers be open to the public.

It has long been a traditional American custom that any type of hearing on a matter of public concern is open to the general public and to the press.

* * * * *

I do not wish to intimate that the WPA hearings are backroom star-chamber proceedings. I feel, however, that it is desirable to insure that the WPA hearings be as democratic as possible.

WPA and its administration have been subjected to much criticism. The grievance hearings of WPA workers are rightly matters of public concern.

* * * * *

When hearings deal with the human rights of unfortunate men who have been driven into the lowest class of WPA labor, it is more than ever imperative that orderly, democratic, and public proceedings be held. The American worker in the low brackets of governmental work must not be reduced to the level of the serf. His rights must not be slaughtered on the altar of smug bureaucracy.

If there is politics in WPA hearings, we want to know about it. If any unfair political considerations affect the findings of hearings for these unfortunates, we want to know about it.

7. WE MUST NOT FORGET THE WELFARE OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES—AN AMENDMENT IS INTRODUCED TO SPARE A GROUP OF WISCONSIN AND OTHER EMPLOYEES FROM ARBITRARY TAXATION

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on April 5, 1940)

Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

* * * * *

Mr. President, my amendment proposes to insert a new section 205 in the Public Salary Tax Act of 1939. The industrial commission

of Wisconsin has directed my attention to what it believes is a gross injustice now worked on certain State employees by the Public Salary Tax Act of 1939.

* * * * *

Briefly, the present Supreme Court of the United States found no constitutional limitations on the power of the Federal Government to tax State employees, and vice versa. Accordingly, the 1939 Public Salary Tax Act provided that the Federal Government would not seek to collect back taxes from State employees, which it was at liberty to do under the new interpretation. The act made one exception. That exception was the group of State employees whose salaries had been financed in whole or in part out of Federal grants. This is outlined in section 205 of the Public Salary Act.

This appears to be an unreasonable and arbitrary classification, and may work a serious injustice. This may mean that many State employees will now be called upon to make up, in one lump payment, the tax for some years back, and for a period during which they may have been immune from taxation under a court interpretation. These State employees were in the same service classification and the same salary bracket as other State employees with salary not financed by Federal grants, and a good many of them were in service before the Federal grant of funds.

* * * * *

The effect of my amendment, as modified, is to prevent the collection of taxes for all taxable years prior to 1939 if the compensation was paid directly or indirectly by the United States.

No one can say that this amendment applies only to a Wisconsin baby. We have heard arguments here throughout 2 weeks to the effect that every State has a child of its own. Each Senator is interested in this matter. In my State there are from 500 to 700 public officials who will be penalized. In States, such as New York, the number will run up to from 3,000 to 10,000. If the Government imposes and collects this tax, as it threatens to do, it will reach back 6 years, and take the salary that the individual earns this year.

8. IN THE MIDST OF A CIVIL-LIBERTIES DEBATE, A PLEA IS MADE FOR THE PUBLIC'S LIBERTIES—AMERICA WON'T STOMACH RACKETEERING BY MANAGEMENT OR RACKETEERING BY LABOR AGAINST THE PUBLIC INTEREST

(From an address in the United States Senate on May 20, 1940)

We are talking about civil liberties in this debate, and there has been shown merely on one side a group of violations by men who employ labor, and there should be shown the way in which civil liberties of labor itself have been violated by racketeers, by men who have gone throughout this country in the guise of aiding labor, and who have jeopardized the rights of labor, and again I specifically exempt the conscientious and sincere labor leader and I might add that I believe at least 98 percent of labor and its leaders are sincere.

* * * * *

All my life I have been a working man. I know what it is to work in sawmills; I know what it is to work in planing mills and in lumber yards, and to work at painting houses. But at the same time I know that our country was built, not simply by one segment of our society, but was built by men of vision, energy, and foresight, and men who contributed their physical labor. They joined together and built the State.

* * * * *

In my brief experience in the Senate, I find that interest groups, groups which put the pressure back of what they want, usually obtain the legislation they seek. Two such groups are labor and capital. As I stated in the beginning, there is a third group, which I feel has been too much neglected. I refer to the general public.

Years ago a great railroad man in New York said, "The public be damned." The public has been forgotten by legislatures, because there has been no one to represent the public. In these troublous times, when legislation like this comes up, it is well for someone to look at the legislation from the viewpoint of the public interest.

* * * * *

In my campaign in Wisconsin I believe I was elected because I, with others, convinced both labor and capital that there was no need for them to pull apart, and that they should pull together. False doctrines were preached only in the interest of those who would tear them apart. I reiterate what I then said: "We are all Americans. We have a job to do in building and protecting America."

* * * * *

I have no sympathy with the use of labor spies, strikebreakers, strikebreaking agencies, or oppressive armed guards.

* * * * *

During my experience as a laborer I have seen laboring men settle their own strikes. I call to mind an instance in which a concern was going on the rocks. I saw a great labor union voluntarily come forth and take a cut in wages in order that the business might carry on. That was cooperation. I have also seen instances of racketeers coming in from outside, stirring up prejudice, hatred, and venom, and ruining an industry, forcing it to leave the city and the State. Such racketeering does not build a nation. It does not build a State. It takes taxes away; it takes jobs away; it takes values away.

9. AN EARLY STATEMENT OF THE NEED FOR EFFICIENT PRICE CONTROL TO SAVE THE WORKER AND EVERYONE ELSE FROM RUINOUS INFLATION

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on September 14, 1940)

As a necessary curb on inflation it may be necessary to establish some kind of price limitation. Again, I am fully aware of the undesirable economic implications of such a proposal, but those implications are far less serious than an uncontrolled orgy of inflation precipitated by an abnormal demand which skyrockets prices.

(NOTE.—See items 33 and 34 for statements made by Senator WILEY 5½ years later on the menace of inflation.)

10. AMERICA IS STILL AT PEACE BUT EUROPE IS IN BATTLE—IF AMERICA BECOMES INVOLVED IN WAR, LABOR MAY LOSE ITS HARD-WON RIGHTS—LABOR MUST NOT BE ROBBED OF ITS GAINS UNDER THE CLOAK OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

(From a statement reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 9, 1940)

In Germany, Italy, and France there is no 40-hour week, not even an 8-hour day. There are no unions. I know that American workmen do not want to sit back and lose their gains. They do not want to lose their right to organize and bargain collectively. Yet in each of these countries these rights have disappeared. Why? A man who got more and more power took the rights away.

We know that if America is economically healthy and is at peace labor will not lose its rights. We know that if this country gets into a war labor risks the loss of its rights. Let us hope that neither war nor a further unhealthy economic condition will come to America.

* * * * *

I am an unqualified believer in unions and in collective bargaining. The best way to diffuse wealth is through the pay envelopes and the salary checks of workers.

* * * * *

I would not strip labor of its gains under the cloak of national defense or through any other channel. My whole concern is with the thought that labor may lose its gains through involvement in war, or through a democracy that is weakened by unsound and unhealthy political and economic methods.

1941

11. ANOTHER APPEAL TO SAVE AMERICAN LABOR FROM THE SLAUGHTER OF WAR—SAVE WORKERS, TOO, FROM ACCIDENTS AND DISEASES IN FACTORIES AND MINES

(From an address of April 1, 1941, delivered before the Western Pennsylvania Safety Council and reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 2, 1941)

It is my abiding conviction that the highest obligation of any program dedicated to the conservation of manpower must be the obligation of an insistence that our men will never be sent forth to be slain in any war of conquest.

* * * * *

I say this because I believe that the problem of conserving manpower is inextricably interwoven with our ideals and with our concept of morality—individual morality and governmental morality.

* * * * *

The question of occupational diseases is a question that is closely correlated with morality. In an age when industrial mortality was at a low ebb and inhuman sweatshop conditions prevailed, occupational diseases were infinitely more common than they are today. This was a problem in light, and sanitation, and good working conditions, but above all it was a problem in morality.

* * * * *

The first cooperative safety congress which I can recall was held in my own State in Milwaukee in 1912. It was attended by a small group of industrialists, public officials, railroad men, engineers, and insurance-company officials. These men were conscious of the extent to which accidents were taking a toll upon American industry.

This little group meeting in Milwaukee, Wis., in 1912 was, in a sense, the nucleus of a program to stop industrial accidents. It was this group which conceived the idea of a national cooperative organization to study accident causes. It was this group which later instigated an active program of accident prevention.

It was fully a year later in New York that the National Safety Council was formed.

* * * * *

It is undeniable that in order to have an effectual national defense we must conserve our manpower. It is obvious that every industrial worker can be utilized in our defense program. There must be no waste of American manpower through industrial accidents and diseases. Such a waste is always an appalling tragedy, and in times like these, a national calamity.

During 1939 more than a million and a half people were seriously injured and more than 16,000 men and women were killed. In 1939 accidents and disease meant the loss of a billion and a half man-hours of production. The loss of that much time during this crucial defense period might be fatal.

(NOTE.—See item 14 for another plea for workers' safety.)

12. WAR COMES CLOSE TO AMERICA, BUT A WAVE OF STRIKES CRIPPLES PRODUCTION—A PLEA FOR COOPERATION BY ALL, FOR PATIENCE WITH THE LABOR PROBLEM, AND FOR PROTECTION OF LABOR'S RIGHTS

(From an address in the United States Senate on April 7, 1941)

A recent Gallup poll indicates that a large percentage of the people are in favor of outlawing strikes during the period of the present emergency; but strikes come. Yet we must realize that there are undoubtedly over a hundred men engaged in production where one man strikes. The situation calls for perspective and understanding and patience,

patience with the problems of America, especially the labor problem. We must be careful in this situation to see that the pendulum does not swing away over to the other extreme resulting in the destruction of legitimate rights and privileges. We must remember that sometimes right is on one side and sometimes on the other.

* * * * * *

Every strike causes loss to the public.

* * * * * *

The question is not one-sided. So long as man continues to be man, the battle for economic power will go on. We have known of instances where labor, generaled by racketeers, has overplayed its hand. We have seen instances where the employer through stubbornness and lack of comprehension that he was living in a charging world has missed the mark.

But, as indicated by the polls, this country of ours is in no frame of mind for a stoppage in its production. It is calling out to all Americans for sacrifices. It is asking citizens everywhere for sacrifices. It is time for labor unions, employers, youth in the Army, taxpayers, for all to realize that this is no period for business as usual, no time for labor or management to be swayed and governed by grievances and prejudices. When the house is on fire it is no time for the fire department to go on a vacation.

13. LET US STRAIGHTEN OUT THE MESS OF CONFLICTING GOVERNMENT LABOR AGENCIES—LET US GET A CLEAR-CUT LABOR POLICY—LET NOT THAT POLICY HOWEVER BE WRITTEN BY ENEMIES OF LABOR

(From an address of April 18, 1941, before the Philadelphia Board of Trade. Reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 22, 1941)

We have piled up board on top of another board without giving any of them any genuine power. We had a National Labor Relations Board, we had a Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor, we had a labor set-up in the Office of Production Management, and none of them prevented or decreased labor disputes, and that, after all, is the test of whether they were doing the job. Now, my friends, we have a Defense Labor Mediation Board whose creation is so recent that we cannot completely evaluate its work.

I do not criticize these agencies. I do not criticize their personnel or their policies. I do not criticize their functions or their objectives.

But, my friends, I indict this adiministration for not giving them a foundation. This administration has still failed to write a decisive labor policy. No conciliation board conciliates on the subject of the closed shop. That issue is beyond their province. If strike votes are fraudulent, there is no decisive Government policy which meets the situation.

I believe it is the duty of the administration and the duty of Congress to write a labor policy. I do not want to see such a policy written by the enemies of labor—I do not want to see a policy written which will slaughter the hard-won rights which labor has achieved. I want to see those rights preserved in an intelligent program which also preserves the rights of industry—and the rights of the third party, the public. Such a program will undoubtedly call for sacrifice, understanding, and vision.

* * * * *

Congress alone cannot stop strikes. Representative SUMNERS, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, makes the statement that strikes cannot be prevented by an act of Congress, because Congress can do only 10 percent of the job—90 percent of the job would be up to the administrative officials who would be required to enforce the law. In other words, there will be no definite stoppage of strikes until the Chief Executive takes a more decisive stand.

* * * * *

I do not believe that government, except as a last resort, should take over and operate plants where defense work has been halted by labor difficulties.

* * * * *

I regard this as the first step in what might eventually be the destruction of both unionism and private enterprise. We know that in the totalitarian countries government controls everything and the right of workers to organize independently has been taken away from them. I do not want to see that in America.

(NOTE.—See item 15 for a statement by Senator WILEY in 1942 about the confusion and duplication which continued between government-labor agencies.)

14. LESS THAN 2 MONTHS BEFORE PEARL HARBOR, ANOTHER APPEAL IS MADE FOR RESPECTING THE DIGNITY OF LABOR AND FOR PROTECTING LABOR FROM FACTORY ACCIDENTS

(From an address of October 6, 1941, before the National Safety Council in Chicago as reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 16, 1941)

Today we face a crisis. We want defense—a defense to make America secure. Our greatest need for defense is manpower for our armed forces, and manpower for our productive forces.

We know that today battles are won or lost in factories. Employment in industry has skyrocketed. The battle of production is on. In that battle you technical safety experts are standing in the front lines with Government officials to effect a conservation of manpower.

* * * * *

Man is something more than a mere automaton. He possesses that receptacle called a mind which receives and transmits ideas. If that mind is free from the thought of failure, of fear, of confusion; if it is radiantly expectant; if it possesses ideas that reflect intelligence, the glory of life, the power of discernment, the zest for growth, then accidents will be reduced to a minimum.

* * * * *

I know one employer who will never have a foreman in his shop who would swear at an employee. To some people this sounds silly. But is it? There are certain laws that every school child knows, and they are kindness begets kindness, consideration begets consideration, hate begets hate.

In my experience in my early days I have seen the unruffled spirit of a man become a tempest, because, perchance, he had made some slight mistake and the foreman cussed him out in the presence of others. Yes; the unbalanced mind, due to the presence of anger or worry, causes lots of accidents. The foreman who is really a foreman (one who is supposed to be ahead of the other chap) practices patience, faith, brotherly understanding, so that accidents will go out of the window.

* * * * *

The differences between labor and management in many instances are due entirely to the inability of men to tali things through, to understand each other.

* * * * *

I was in Cuba some years ago and visited one of the great cigar factories, and found there that they played the phonograph throughout the day to those who rolled the cigars. They found that fine music produced better cigars.

I remember relating this incident to an employer of labor some time later and he said, "Yes; the man who sings at his work is the happy man, the safe man. And," he continued, "I have tried in my humble way to see that men were happy in their work." I have so felt the need of harmonious relationship with my employees that I never go out into the shop when I feel grouchy, and I will not have a foreman around who is a grouch. I have found that this prevents accidents."

"We in America," this man continued, "are getting out of that period when an employer of labor thought he had to exemplify the idea of animal dominion in his approach to his employees. I insist that every foreman be a 'rejoicer.'"

1942

15. THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR MUST BE STRENGTHENED—SCATTERED LABOR BOARDS AND AGENCIES MUST BE COORDINATED

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on February 9, 1942)

Another example of duplication in our war effort is possibly indicated by the Labor Department. I dare say that at no time in the history of the United States has a department of Government created under the Constitution and operating under the direct guidance of a Cabinet officer ever been reduced to so low a figurehead level as has the Department of Labor at the present time.

I present no brief for the Department of Labor or for the Secretary of Labor. I merely point out the fact that virtually all the machinery of the war labor effort has been set up apart and aside from the Department of Labor.

The National War Labor Board is undoubtedly doing a fine job, and this comment is in no way intended as a reflection on the War Labor Board or the Labor Division of the War Production Board. It is merely an observation of the fact that the experience and personnel of existing agencies of Government have been used only to a very slight degree in the creation of new agencies.

16. NINETY-NINE PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES AND 99 PERCENT OF UNION MEMBERS ARE FINE AMERICAN CITIZENS—WHAT MORE CAN WE ASK OF ANY GROUPS EXCEPT THAT WE CONTROL AND THEY CONTROL THE 1-PERCENT RACKETEERING ELEMENT?

(From an address in the Senate on April 3, 1942)

In my opinion, 99 percent of the men who have to meet our pay rolls—the so-called industrialists—are good American citizens. In my opinion 99 percent of the members of union labor organizations are good American citizens. In my opinion, no church group, no industrial group, no labor group, or any other group in America can prove that it is 100 percent free from the possible abuses of a limited few.

* * * * *

I have faith that the leaders of industry, that the leaders in the labor movement, will get rid of the very small percentage of men who are false and blind leaders. You remember, Mr. President, that the Good Book says the blind shall lead the blind, and they will both fall in the ditch. The situation demands that we recognize no allegiance except the allegiance to America, and that requires in this hour unselfish leadership in our country.

17. A TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN LABOR AND A CALL FOR LABOR-MANAGEMENT COOPERATION

(From a Labor Day address in Waukesha, as reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 7, 1942)

The rights of labor are part and parcel with the rights of all freedom-loving men and women. The preservation of those rights is vital, not only to labor but to the future of the world.

* * * * *

On Labor Day we seek to commemorate the achievements of labor and the dignity of labor.

We in America have traveled a long way from the days when men were serfs, when

men were mere chattels to be bought and sold as men sell a horse or a cow or an automobile.

* * * * *

On Labor Day this year we must, first of all, dedicate ourselves—all that we are and all that we possess—to winning the war and preserving the American way of life.

* * * * *

To effectuate this high purpose, we must resolve that we will not be carried away by any false "isms" or doctrines no matter how appealing they may be.

We must learn to discount the sugar-coated lures of demagogic appeals promising an easy way out. There aren't any short cuts to victory in the war and there won't be any short cuts to an enduring peace and a sound economy.

Each of us must be wary of those who promise much and apparently ask little. There are economic and social fakirs who make extravagant claims for their nostrums and their quackery.

This war is teaching us that the only certain basis for either victory or security is the time-revered American pattern of thrift, industry, honesty, fair dealing, and justice to all.

* * * * *

On this day we citizens who are laborers—whether it be physical or mental labor—we must get a better understanding of the problems of management and management must get a better understanding of the problems of labor. In the last analysis both management and labor are laborers and have a common problem and a common objective.

* * * * *

Ten million trade-unionists are a tremendous force. They are a tremendous forum for democratic practice. The yardstick for action in any group must be justice for all as a free and untrammeled democratic expression within the framework of our way of life.

1943

18. HOW ABOUT ADEQUATE SOCIAL SECURITY FOR THE AMERICAN WORKER?—A BILL IS INTRODUCED TO CREATE A JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL SECURITY IN ORDER TO INSURE A STREAMLINED AND BROADENED SOCIAL-SECURITY SET-UP

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on January 21, 1943)

In this period of world upheaval we know that at the conclusion of this war we shall face the greatest mass security problems the world has ever known. We have already had statements from the Executive indicating that revisions in our present social-security set-up are inevitable.

* * * * *

I submit, Mr. President, that one of the ways in which this body can recapture public esteem and respect is to initiate such a program. There is only one way to initiate it, and that is, not by waiting for Executive initiative, not by waiting for the superplan of some alabaster-browed intellectual in any bureau, not by considering social-security plans piecemeal in a number of different committees, but by considering one over-all plan by a joint committee on social security which would embrace members from both the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Ways and Means Committee of the House. To provide for such a joint committee is just common horse sense, also.

The committee should make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the need for and the advisability of any modification and enlargement of the present social-security program.

(NOTE.—Later in 1943, Senator Wiley introduced a bill to create a Joint Congressional Committee on the Budget. Two years later, the New Deal adopted this proposal in its full-employment bill which was then passed and enacted into law.)

19. TWO AND ONE-HALF YEARS BEFORE THE END OF THE WAR, AN APPEAL IS MADE FOR POSTWAR PLANNING. WE MUST NOT AND NEED NOT HAVE ANOTHER DEPRESSION IF WE USE FORESIGHT

(From a radio address of February 13, 1943, as reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 5, 1943)

This problem when the war ceases of placing millions of men back to work will be no small job after they are discharged from the military forces and the war production industries. During this period unemployment insurance and dismissal wages may have to be relied upon. There will have to be an efficient job-placement program. But we must think this thing through.

* * * * *

Personally I believe that with vision (and you will remember the statesman of old said, "Without vision the people perish") we need not perish or run into a great economic depression. The job seems to be one that calls for the utilization of the entire economic strength and brains of the Nation.

* * * * *

A reservoir of public works should be built up during good times. States should cooperate with the Federal Government in this respect.

* * * * *

Right now we should be creating a reservoir of projects, planning for slum clearance, urban development, regional development, etc.

20. WITH MILLIONS OF YOUNGSTERS ENGAGED IN PATRIOTIC WAR WORK, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT GOVERNMENT PROTECT CHILD LABOR—GOVERNMENT MUST ALSO PREVENT JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

(From an address of March 27, 1943, before the Rock County Bar Association in Janesville, Wis., as reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 6, 1943)

I am speaking now of the alarming growth of juvenile delinquency. This problem must be met immediately. The Children's Bureau Commission on Children in Wartime recently met at the White House and surveyed the extent of the problems of juvenile delinquency and the resources available for its prevention and treatment. The results of that conference have not yet been completely assembled, but it is apparent that Federal, State, and local agencies must correlate their efforts in a program to meet the special wartime problem and hazards affecting children.

The health, welfare, and educational problems for young people must be safeguarded through measures such as guidance services, placement services, and a law-enforcement program. We are fighting for human freedom and especially for the future of children in a free world.

We must establish the safeguards for children in the midst of this total war. Children must be protected from exploitation in war-production areas. Their home life must be strengthened even though parents have been mobilized for war production. This calls for a program which includes adequate health education and welfare services, recreation activities, school opportunities, and adequate housing programs, a nutritional program for children, and a program of control for wartime employment of boys and girls under 18.

21. WHO IS THE TRUE FRIEND OF LABOR?—HE IS THE MAN WHO FIGHTS FOR LABOR'S RIGHTS AND AGAINST LABOR RACKETEERS AND MANAGEMENT RACKETEERS

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on June 12, 1943)

Mr. President, who is the true friend of labor? I ask that question advisedly. I will tell you. He is the man who generally himself has labored and who appreciates the problems of labor. He is one who believes in labor's rights to collective bargaining, a living wage, reasonable hours, the right to unionize, the right to strike, except in wartime, and against the Government. He is one who believes in improving the working conditions of the laborer. The true friend of labor is he who dares to speak out and tell labor it should know that during wartime strikes, sit-downs, and slow-downs are un-American. He is one who condemns racketeering in labor as well as racketeering in management. The true friend of labor is one who does not hesitate to call a spade a spade.

Mr. President, labor does not want any man in the Congress of the United States to be a representative of a segment of society. Labor wants each Member of Congress to represent the whole commonwealth, the whole group. When he decides how to vote, labor wants him to make his decision on the basis of what is best for the general welfare.

I believe that a great many persons in this country misunderstand labor. Labor is not dumb. It is not in favor of extortion or racketeering. That is done only when a bad man comes into a position of authority. Labor wants to clean its own house. I speak advisedly about that. Frankly, many who have talked to me want an opportunity to clean up conditions. I say that it is our duty to give them a chance to see that they do the job themselves. But we are at war. The safety of the whole country is at stake.

* * * * *

Mr. President, labor, Senators, and Representatives in Congress belong to the same union, as was stated on the floor by the distinguished Senator from Utah. It is the Federal Union. It is the Republic.

22. WE MUST PLAN TO INSURE GOOD JOBS FOR VETERANS—FOR THE CITY BOYS AND THE FARM BOYS WHO WENT TO WAR AND SAVED THIS NATION

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on November 29, 1943)

True it is that we have assumed a moral obligation to give our servicemen their former jobs when they return. I wonder, though, should a survey be taken, how many of them would want the one they held before entering the service. How many of them at the age of 17 or 18 even had a job before leaving high school, or college, or the farm to take on their present grim task of war?

Will the farmer boy we are so proud of today, because we have given him special training, concentrated training, making him an excellent radio man, or a first-class mechanic, wish to return to the farm? No; I question whether many of them will. We have trained him for greater things; we have given him a wider vision; we have shown him other countries, new horizons, and we have made him a highly trained specialist. No; not in every instance will that farm boy wish to return to the farm. On the reverse side, what of the underprivileged city boy whose military training has given him new visions—new visions of working with the soil, new visions of having his own farm? Will he wish to return to his former job—the routine of a gasoline station or the routine of a shipping clerk? I doubt it.

* * * * *

A logical organization—the Veterans' Administration—is at hand.

* * * * *

The Veterans' Administration knows the problems. Almost within hours it could begin the analyzing and consulting with each individual, to ascertain where he might be most suitably placed, where he might be most valuable, and, while doing that, begin the establishment of the necessary great post-war machine.

This * * * is my proposal:

First, before his discharge from the service, prior to or after the armistice, each veteran is to submit his qualifications and desires for future employment. His questionnaire is to contain a complete dossier of his preservice and his service record.

* * * * *

We cannot turn these young men onto the street without some concrete objective for their future. Demobilization pay is important only if there is a definite plan as to where they are going, and what they are going to do. That plan should be executed immediately upon their discharge. If not, there will be countless numbers of unemployed veterans in every large city and community of the country, resulting in the beginning of the bread line again.

Second, acting upon the information contained in paragraph 1 of the questionnaire to which I referred, an employment expert of the Veterans' Administration will personally consult with each of the veterans about to be discharged. Through the facilities of other organizations, such as the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Red Cross, State and Government Employment Services, the United States Employment Service, etc., the expert will have at his disposal recorded lists of jobs and of qualifications for employment therein. After discussion with the veteran, through his experience and training, the representative of the Veterans' Administration will be in a position to determine the man's qualifications for the job best suited for him. He will know the locality to which the young man wishes to return, and why. He will not act arbitrarily, but will attempt to guide the veteran through the confusion of the readjustment period, return him to the section of the country to which he desires to go, with a definite appointment for trial to do the job he wants.

* * * * *

To my mind, the most important phase of our program for the rehabilitation of servicemen is jobs for veterans.

23. THE AMERICAN LEGION ENDORSES THE PLAN FOR INSURING GOOD JOBS FOR VETERANS

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on November 30, 1943)

I was very much elated to receive a letter today from Mr. F. M. Sullivan, executive director, national legislative committee, of the American Legion. I wish to read the letter into the RECORD at this point:

"MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have read with a great deal of interest the address delivered by you in the Senate on November 29, 1943.

"You recommend, in effect, that all Government employment and reemployment activities, pertaining to veterans, be coordinated and placed within the Veterans' Administration. The American Legion heartily endorses this proposal. * * *

"It is our hope that the proposed coordination of all veterans' employment and reemployment activities within the Veterans' Administration will meet with prompt and favorable action by the Congress. Not only would such a coordination bring about a more efficient Government employment service, but it would also effect economy within the Government and, in one instance, release Army officers for other duties.

* * * * *

"The American Legion heartily endorses this proposal inasmuch as it is in accord with the resolution adopted by our nationa' executive committee at Indianapolis, Ind., on November 18 and 19, 1943. A copy of that resolution is enclosed herewith.

"F. M. SULLIVAN,
"Executive Director,
"National Legislative Committee."

(NOTE.—December 2, 1943, Senator WILEY introduced a bill along the above lines.)

24. HOW ABOUT THE WHITE-COLLAR WORKER? HE MUST HAVE A DECENT WAGE, TOO, IN ORDER TO MEET RISING LIVING COSTS

(From a radio address of December 4, 1943, as reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 8, 1943)

Fellow Americans, what has happened to that phantom figure, the forgotten man, society's specter of neglect for the past 11 years and some months? He is still with us, but as a new group, the white-collar worker. Forgotten? He is indeed.

* * * * *

He has been disinherited, abandoned. We have cast him aside.

* * * * *

By our very Government, or rather let us say, by the administrations of the War Labor Board, we have adopted a procedure prejudicial to the unorganized forgotten man who, in the past, relied upon his individual efforts to gain for him an increased standard of living. We know the difficulties of obtaining rulings from this Board on matters pertaining to large organized groups. Imagine, then, the difficulties attendant upon obtaining the settlement of questions involving only the individual. The War Labor Board is chronically and notoriously behind in its docket.

What chance has Mary Jones, the school teacher; Pete Smith, the bookkeeper; Carl Brown, the clerk; or Susie Brown, his sister, in a city, county, or State office to receive prompt attention to her or his individual problem? The far-reaching effects of the neglect of this class will soon become apparent.

* * * * *

What is the cure, the solution? From our seeming inability to face it, it must be an obscure one. But in reality, it is not.

Will subsidies for the stabilization of wages of the white-collared worker do the job? No. Not food nor wage subsidies will do it. Only one thing will do it—a fair and equitable additional increase in their weekly pay envelope. They are wage earners, just as labor, and they are entitled to a just, and adjusted, wage to give them their full share of the earth's bounty in return for their toil. That, after all, is the measure of a man's value—his equity in the world's bounty. Increasing the wage of an underpaid person to where he gets reasonable and fair compensation does not make for inflation. The laborer is worthy of his hire. The white-collar worker is worthy of his hire.

(See items 24 and 25 for actions taken by Senator WILEY in 1944 in order to insure justice for the white-collar worker.)

25. ACTION IS TAKEN ON BEHALF OF THE UNDER-PRIVILEGED THIRD OF THE NATION. AN AMENDMENT IS INTRODUCED TO SLASH GOVERNMENT RED TAPE SO AS TO ALLOW PITIFULLY LOW SALARIES TO RISE TO A DECENT LEVEL

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on June 9, 1944)

Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed amendment to the pending measure, which would, * * * insert the following:

"No action shall be taken under authority of this act with respect to an increase in any wages or salaries in any case in which such increase has been agreed upon by the employer and employee and will not result in the payment of wages or salaries at a rate greater than $37.50 per week. For the purpose of the preceding sentence, if the employee ordinarily works overtime and extra compensation is paid therefor, such extra compensation shall be included in determining the rate of wages or salaries paid."

Mr. President, I desire briefly to state the purpose of this amendment and at the appropriate time to call it up. It will be noted that the total amount of wages that could be paid, including regular wages and overtime, would be $1,950 a year; that would be the top wage. There are literally thousands of cases affecting people who are not engaged in war work where both the employer and employee have reached an agreement on wages. At the present time they have to file an application with the regional office of the War Labor Board in Chicago. Cases have piled up and no decision reached and, consequently, a good many people engaged in private business, not war work, are losing their help because they cannot pay the wages they want to pay to the employees.

So my contention is that in order to afford relief and also to take care of the 20,000,000 in the white-collar class, such as school teachers and clerks, who are not now deriving benefits from war expenditures but are living under reduced standards of living, such an amendment as I propose should be adopted.

It would give employers an opportunity to pay such persons more wages because of the increased cost of living, without going before the War Labor Board. The only relief which under the present law can be granted without WLB approval is in cases where the employee receives less than 40 cents an hour his compensation can be increased to 40 cents an hour. Under my amendment the employer and employee could agree and a raise in salary or wages could be effected without WLB aprpoval up to $1,950 a year.

* * * * *

The argument may be made, of course, that if their compensation is increased it will tend to contribute toward inflation. To that, Mr. President, I say "No." Anyone who lives on a substandard basis in wartime, when the national income has run up to $135,000,000,000, is entitled to have at least a little increase in his earnings and such an increase will not contribute toward the inflationary trend.

Let us do justice to the white-collar class of America. My amendment will do that.

26. STILL ANOTHER APPEAL FOR JUSTICE FOR THE WHITE-COLLAR WORKER—THE SENATE HAD PASSED SENATOR WILEY'S "WHITE COLLAR" AMENDMENT, BUT THE HOUSE HAD REJECTED IT—A LAST PLEA IS THEREFORE MADE TO THE CONFEREES BETWEEN THE TWO HOUSES TO RESTORE THE AMENDMENT

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on June 15, 1944)

Mr. President, my purpose in taking the floor this morning is to urge that the conferees, whoever they may be, will insist on doing equity to this group, the white-collar workers, by keeping my amendment in the bill.

* * * * *

What I am asking for in the amendment is a better balance of income for all our citizens.

* * * * *

There is a lack of balance in the income the white-collar worker has been getting compared to what other classes have received. I am serious about the situation of the white-collar worker; and following the language of him who speaks at the other end of the Avenue, I will repeat again and again and again that we had better do a little equity to the 20,000,000 of these folks. The men and women in the white-collar class have no one to represent them in Washington; they have no organization back of them; they are the "forgotten men." I ask that we do justice to this group.

* * * * *

I know it is said if the wages of the white-collar workers were to be increased to $37.50 a week, it would be a great contributing factor toward inflation. Let us see about that. It has been estimated that in probably 10,000,000 cases the employer and the

employee might agree that wages should go up to $37.50 a week, representing perhaps an increase of $5 a week, or approximately $250 a year for each individual. That would make an increase of $2,500,000,000 in the pockets of those who have been denied a living wage and who have seen their living standards go down, down, and down because Congress has not seen fit to recognize them.

I repeat, they have no organization; they have no organized spokesmen. They are the clerks, the school teachers, and the municipal employees. They are the folks who are doing the work without getting the gravy. They are that class of American citizens who have always been the bulwark of America.

Two billion five hundred million dollars in their pockets, which would increase their standard of living, would not contribute in the slightest to inflation.

Mr. President, I repeat, I trust that the conferees, when they go to conference on this matter, will, for the sake of the people who deserve it the most, see to it that the amendment to which the Senate agreed remains in the bill.

(NOTE.—Senator WILEY'S plea was, however, rejected by the New Deal conferees. They killed the amendment and thus helped to sabotage the welfare of the white-collar workers.)

27. A SUCCESSFUL EFFORT IS MADE TO RESTORE FEDERAL FUNDS VITALLY NEEDED FOR STATE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACTIVITIES—AN AMENDMENT IS INTRODUCED AND PASSED

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on June 15, 1944)

Mr. President, I have received a communication from the chairman of our State industrial commission, Voyta Wrabetz. I ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee to turn to page 41 of the bill. In line 11 on page 41 it will be noticed that the amount proposed to be appropriated is $25,000,000. The Social Security Board recommended $34,000,000 for the fiscal year 1945, and the Bureau of the Budget approved a recommendation for $31,000,000.

The letter from this distinguished citizen of Wisconsin well presents the need throughout the Nation for at least $31,000,000.

* * * * *

I understand that the $31,000,000 is simply for overhead which is badly needed to meet the challenges of the future.

I ask that the figures "$25,000,000", in line 11, on page 41, be stricken, and that in place thereof there be inserted "$31,000,000."

(NOTE.—The Senate agreed to Senator WILEY'S amendment by a vote of 45 to 19.)

1945

28. ONE-HALF YEAR BEFORE THE END OF THE WAR, STRIKES ARE STILL ERUPTING ALL OVER THE NATION, LET US HAVE COMPULSORY ARBITRATION TO SETTLE DISPUTES FAIRLY AND PEACEFULLY

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on March 13, 1945)

Evidences are mounting on every hand that sooner or later we must come to closer grips with the strike problem.

* * * * *

The stories in the newspapers about work stoppages all over the Nation reemphasizes the urgency of this problem.

* * * * *

All this leads to the same inescapable conclusion: America can no longer tolerate the cloud of strikes over its national horizon. Somehow it must permanently dispel the darkness of ruinous industrial disputes and let the sun of labor-management harmony shine through.

This Nation simply cannot afford in peace, let alone in war, the staggering cost of strikes.

It cannot afford the loss in vital production which, in war, is so crucial to victory on the battlefronts and in peace so crucial to successful competition, either at home or with foreign concerns. It cannot afford the loss of bread-winners' wages, the shattering of business confidence for investments, the paralysis of whole communities, the discord, the hatred, and the ill-will which are the grapes of strikes' wrath.

We cannot afford "strikes as usual" while our sons are suffering and dying on foreign battlefields. Nor can we afford strikes as usual when those sons return from foreign fields and seek uninterrupted employment in order to enjoy the blessings of the land for which they fought.

* * * * *

Why do we kow-tow to special groups and not legislate for the general welfare? Why do we throw up our hands in helplessness as we watch industrial warfare in every corner of the Nation exploding in strikes of every stripe—jurisdictional strikes, sympathy strikes, "quickie" strikes, wildcat strikes, and every other sort of temper tantrum on the part of labor or management?

What is the answer to this problem?

I humbly submit this answer, believing it to be simple, direct, fair, and satisfactory. It is compulsory arbitration. Let us legislate necessary machinery which will be automatically and universally invoked in the event that a grievance on the part of labor or management arises and a strike looms.

* * * * *

Even now, as everyone knows, companies and unions throughout America are turning to arbitration to settle their disputes. There are thousands of such cases. However, there is always a small percentage, a fraction of 1 percent, who wish to run the show according to their own rules and not according to the rules of law or according to the mandate of the Constitution with respect to the general welfare.

* * * * *

When a strike injures third parties, as it always does, the third parties have the right to be heard, and yet we have not legislated for third parties. We have not permitted them to have a hearing in the Congress.

* * * * *

I speak as one who knows labor—who has been a laboring man. I have worked in the sawmills in the North for 15 cents an hour, which was considered big pay in those days. I have worked at painting houses, as clerk in stores, as insurance salesman, as farm hand; I do not wish to have it said that I am against labor. I am for labor. But, Mr. President, there is something that is very dear to me, and that is my country. We must have intestinal fortitude. As one Senator has expressed it, we must release our necks from the collar which has been placed there because of fear of one group or another. Unless we do so, assume a position of leadership, and enact the right kind of legislation, you and I will be responsible for what occurs when the war is over and the problems of peace approach.

Arbitration can do the job. It can settle grievances on the basis of what is decent and honorable and just. Arbitration results in better understanding. It removes sources of friction which make for future disturbances. It gets rid of the racketeering element in both labor and management—the element which wants to play the game only according to its own rules rather than the rules of society.

(NOTE.—See item 39 for the bill introduced by Senator WILEY in 1946 to establish compulsory arbitration in key Nation-wide industries.)

29. NECESSARY FARM HANDS MUST BE DEFERRED FROM THE DRAFT IF THE ALREADY OVERBURDENED FARMER IS TO FILL OUR HUGE FOOD REQUIREMENTS

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on April 24, 1945)

Mr. President, a week ago the Senate by unanimous vote adopted an amendment to the national draft law which would forestall the effects of the arbitrary selective-service ruling which was stripping the farms of needed and irreplaceable help. Last week, also, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, the War Manpower Director, and the Director of Selective Service, respectively, requesting that they immediately confer with one another and with the military in order to institute remedial measures which would get more hands on the farms.

* * * * *

Mr. President, evidences are mounting at every hand pointing to the gravity of the farm-help situation. The draft and migration to the cities have wrought a tremendous reduction in the farm force. Right now farm-labor employment is at its lowest seasonal level since the Government started keeping records of it 21 years ago. The farm-labor force is estimated to be 8,500,000 persons, including a little less than 7,000,000 family workers and 1,500,000 hired workers. This force is 150,000 persons below that of a year ago. This morning's newspapers carry the report of 750,000 seasonal women workers being needed to harvest 1945 crops.

30. EVERY AMERICAN WHO IS READY, WILLING, AND ABLE TO WORK SHOULD HAVE A GAINFUL, REWARDING JOB

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on September 28, 1945)

I, for one, want all of my countrymen who are ready, willing, and able to work to have gainful, rewarding work in the American way. I want them to be employed at a living wage and at ever higher standards of living. I want their initiative and their diligence to be well compensated. But, above all, I want unhampered the American initiative to create wealth and jobs, to sustain the Republic. "Leaning on others" never built this great Nation. It was the ingrained, innate, self-reliance and creative energy that did the war job and made us the leaders of freemen among the nations of earth.

The much-discussed thoughts of bread lines, of doles, of apples being sold on street corners by veterans, are as completely objectionable to me as these thoughts are to everyone of my colleagues and to every right-thinking American.

* * * * *

31. LABOR HAS AN ATOMIC BOMB IN ITS HANDS IN THE FORM OF STRIKES. A CONCRETE 10-POINT PROGRAM IS SUBMITTED IN ORDER TO NEUTRALIZE THAT BOMB

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on October 4, 1945)

Mr. President, the strike situation in this country, as we all know, is very serious.

* * * * *

There are occasions when strikes are a necessity, to protect the inherent rights of labor. What is now happening does not present such a situation. The condition is just the reverse.

* * * * *

The strike situation will probably grow worse before it becomes better. The great rank and file of honest American labor is being guided by Judas-goat leaders down a trail which will lead to eventual elimination of many rights which the unions and American labor have worked hard to obtain, and which they are entitled to keep.

America is now suffering from the New Deal's false education of the past decade, which taught labor that it could do no wrong. The air is black with New Deal chickens coming home to roost; chickens of a false philosophy, of fundamentally wrong thinking. But the American public, not the New Deal, is the real sufferer now, and because of that it is going to remember this strike disease in the years ahead—in 1946 and 1948—and it is going to act to eradicate it forever from the American scene.

Mr. President, the crisis is with us; we are nearer to the brink than we think, and the crisis must be met now. A mere watch-

and-see attitude is unthinkable. We watched and saw all through the war. Fourteen thousand strikes occurred, costing 24,000,000 man-days, when men in uniform needed the materials and the arms which could have been produced.

The no-strike pledge was respected by the overwhelming majority of American workers, and for that we humbly bow and say, "Thank you." But there were those who did not play the game. The no-strike pledge was violated while our boys were dying on foreign battlefields. It was violated by the same irresponsible racketeering minority which is creating industrial havoc today.

* * * * *

Labor has an atomic bomb in its hands. It is playing with it recklessly and wildly. That atomic bomb must be controlled by the Government before it blows up labor and America. End strikes or strikes will end America.

Let me propose these actions in the form of a public charter of freedom from labor abuses. I propose that we enter into these actions without rancor, without prejudice, but with an iron determination to secure justice and industrial tranquility.

First. Reevaluate the entire Wagner Act. That act obviously filled a certain need in bygone years, but it is hopelessly obsolete and even harmful today to the best interests of the American people, including labor. It is a segmental act, designed for only one segment of our population. It must be revised in the interest of the public welfare. We have legislated segment-wild. We have made legislation for this segment and that segment, but one great over-all segment has not been regarded, and that is the public. And now if we have any vision we are going to see to it that the public is not disregarded.

Second. Immediately enact legislation to have compulsory arbitration protect the public interest.

Third. Establish the policy of having representatives of the public participate in every labor-management conference.

Fourth. Enact any necessary clarifications of the draft law to insure full protection of the reemployment rights of veterans.

Fifth. Insure full protection by law enforcement officers to all veterans and others who want to take up jobs vacated by strikers.

Sixth. Establish the legal responsibility of unions for all violations of contract in the form of wildcat strikes, and so forth.

Seventh. Require the full and accurate reporting of union finances and officers in the same manner as we require such reports from corporations.

Eighth. Establish the labor-management-public conferences in Washington on a continuing basis rather than on a one-time basis.

Ninth. Request of labor leaders that they themselves come forth with suggestions for legislation that will end the menace of strikes.

Mr. President, I say now, as I said before we went into this war, that if I were in the councils of labor I would say to labor, "This is your opportunity. Come forth with suggestions for constructive legislation in your field which will protect the public interest." I repeat that idea. This country does not belong to any one group. It does not belong to the Democrats or the Republicans, to management or labor, or to the farmer. It belongs to all of us, and in this great world crisis if we are going to meet this situation head-on, it must be by a unity of spirit within us which will bring about constructive action.

Tenth. Amend the Sherman Antitrust Act to make labor organizations whose members are engaged in interstate commerce subject to that act. Prohibit them from engaging in unreasonable restraints of trade; for example, those restraints designed to compel the hiring of useless labor, to prevent the use of cheaper material, improved equipment, or more efficient methods.

(NOTE.—Several of the points in Senator WILEY's program were passed by Congress in 1946 in the Case bill. See item 41. Other points are still pending in legislation in Congress committees.)

32. SAVE UNION TREASURIES FROM BEING PLUNDERED FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES—A BILL IS INTRODUCED TO TAKE SLUSH FUNDS OUT OF POLITICS

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on October 18, 1945)

I have a bill I wish to introduce, and I desire to make a few remarks on it.

* * * * *

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1487) to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, so as to prohibit political expenditures by national banks, corporations, and labor unions, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

* * * * *

This bill, I humbly believe, will cope constructively with one of the greatest single menaces to the Republic now existing on the American political scene.

I refer to the menace of unionism shackled to politics, a menace absolutely inimical and injurious to the America which I, for one, would want my children and grandchildren to enjoy.

* * * * *

Unionism shackled to politics is patently un-American and detrimental to the best interests of labor and the American public as a whole.

* * * * *

I, for one, propose that we immediately break the chains which bind some segments of American labor to any political faction or party.

* * * * *

After the 1944 election, it became apparent that millions of dollars of union funds accumulated for legitimate union labor purposes had been poured through a loophole in the law. That loophole banned political contributions to elections by unions, national banks, and corporations. But the matter of expeditures for political purposes was completely omitted.

It is a farce to bar contributions but not expenditures. If one prohibition is justified, so is the other.

* * * * *

The justification for this amendment to the Corrupt Practices Act is clearly seen when we recognize that under the constitutions and charters of labor unions, national banks, and corporations, the funds in their treasuries are designed to be used for specific purposes representative of each type of institution.

* * * * *

Union, bank, and corporation funds are not designed to be used to capture the Congress or the Government of the United States or elect any man to Congress or to defeat him.

* * * * *

Mr. President, I am not opposed to unionism. I have supported it. We know that almost every week in various sections of the country agreements are arrived at between employers and employees by means of collective bargaining. I believe in collective bargaining. We all believe that there must be maintained in operation a system of checks and balances in order that extreme power may not become lodged in the hands of any particular group. That is why the American Government has been so successful. It has operated under a system of checks and balances.

No one would assert that the officers of the Knights of Columbus, the Masonic fraternity, the Knights of Pythias, the Odd Fellows, or any similar group, which was organized for specific purposes, should take funds out of the treasuries of those organizations for the purpose of endeavoring to defeat or elect candidates for public office. Yet that has been done in the case of labor unions. Labor unions were not organized for purposes of that nature. The Wagner Act states upon what grounds they were organized and for what purposes.

* * * * *

Let no loose thinkers exclaim that my bill would be depriving union members of their civil liberties. This amendment would do no such thing. The individual union members could, if they were so inclined, still make contributions on their own initiative as private citizens to political parties or committees, even as you, Mr. President, and I may do. do. However, no corporation in which we may be stockholders may contribute funds for the purpose of defeating a candidate for office, although we, as individuals, may contribute funds for such purpose. I am thinking of the $160,000,000 now lying in the treasuries of labor unions.

I am speaking for legitimate labor. I do not want the door to be opened so that funds which are in those treasuries for use in protecting the birthright of members of the labor organizations—and this Republic is the birthright of labor organization members—may be used, directly or indirectly, for the purpose of having elected to office candidates who represent the convictions of labor racketeers.

33. A LABOR-MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE IS HELD IN WASHINGTON BUT THREE VITAL PARTIES ARE LEFT OUT IN THE COLD

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on November 6, 1945)

The labor-management conference is, of course, in large degree, unrepresentative of the parties involved. Only a small fraction of the American people is represented. Of the 36 delegates, not a single one represents the public, whose interests are paramount. Not a single one represents independent organized labor, and, of course, the great mass of unorganized labor is unrepresented.

1946

34. THE FIRST SESSION OF THE SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS ENDS—THE SECOND BEGINS—BUT BETWEEN THE TWO SESSIONS THE NATIONAL ADMINISTRATION HAS BUMBLED AMERICA INTO STRIKE CHAOS AND BROUGHT US TO THE BRINK OF INFLATION

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on January 17, 1946)

Since the Senate last met the best interests of the American people have been jeopardized.

(a) The Nation has been bumbled and fumbled into the worst strike chaos in a quarter of a century.

(b) The Nation has been brought closer to the greatest menace facing America in years—the menace of inflation which will make our bonds, our insurance policies, and our money valueless.

* * * * *

The menace of inflation * * * threatens our 85,000,000 war bond holders, our 70,000,000 owners of insurance policies, our 45,000,000 bank depositors.

* * * * *

I am not arguing that the present wage level is equitable. The unions are claiming that they must have a 30-percent wage increase in order to meet the increased cost of living. Perhaps this is correct. But unless we get production, unless we can prevent inflation, what good will the wage increase be?

35. WHAT IS THE STRONGEST WAY TO CONTROL RUINOUS INFLATION? PRODUCTION, PRODUCTION, PRODUCTION

(From a Nation-wide radio address of January 29, 1946, as reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 30, 1946)

My fellow Americans. * * * You don't need to be told that our country is still up to its neck in the worst strike crisis in a quarter century.

* * * * *

Suppose this current epidemic of strikes continues and a general strike occurs, then what?

Production ceases, the economic current of the Nation congeals.

Then, this will result?

1. We will be in for ruinous inflation.

What does that mean?

It means that prices will skyrocket. It will cost the housewife not $2 to prepare a meal but $200 or $2,000. It will cost the laborer not $35 for a suit but $3,500 or $35,000.

This is not fantastic. This is what happened in Europe. Money there means nothing. It cannot buy anything.

* * * * *

But let us continue and see what will happen if strikes continue. If they continue:

2. We will not be able to pay off our $300,000,000,000 national debt with sound money. It might be paid with worthless currency.

That means national financial collapse.

3. If strikes continue, we will not be able to fulfill our international obligations.

That means we won't have the goods to resume trade. It means we won't have goods for necessary foreign relief.

That is a grim picture. But it is a realistic picture. Let all who have eyes see. Let all who have ears hear these truths.

Remember the key word "Production."

* * * * *

Let the Congress meet the strike issue head-on now.

Let it investigate the present strike wave. Let it find out what is behind these strikes, behind these demands for wage increases.

A handful of collectivist labor leaders can issue orders today that can paralyze our Nation, that can lay us open—helpless—to atomic and rocket invasion, that can smash our international trade and our domestic trade.

There is more to this strike situation than meets the public eye. Is labor responsible? Is capital responsible? We know that the public pays the bill and it wants to stop paying through the nose. Let Congress get the facts.

2. Let Congress enact legislation with "guts"; legislation which is for the public, for the great, honest rank and file of American labor, for our white-collar folks, our farmers, our management.

Such legislation would establish compulsory arbitration as a last resort to prevent strikes in utilities and Nation-wide industries.

Such legislation would require democratic union elections, publicized union finances, legal responsibility of unions before the law.

It would prohibit the election expenditure of slush funds by unions as well as by corporations.

I know that in submitting these proposals, I will be smeared as antilabor by the labor bosses.

But I speak for labor. I have been a laboring man myself as well as a farmer and businessman.

* * * * *

Particularly in this atomic age, I think the public interest and welfare are superior to that of any group. This Government doesn't belong to either labor or capital. It belongs to all the people.

* * * * *

Remember the key word: "Production." It means sweat and toil in the American way. It means homes, autos, refrigerators, washing machines, and farm machinery, clothing for civilians and veterans. It means economic health. It means freedom from fear and want about which we have heard so much.

(NOTE.—One-half year later Senator WILEY's proposal for a congressional investigation for the truth in the labor situation was adopted by the House of Representatives whose Labor Committee looked into this matter.)

36. ABE LINCOLN'S SAGE ADVICE TO AMERICAN LABOR

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on February 15, 1946)

Just listen to Abe Lincoln telling us what the attitude of labor should be today. I quote:

"The strongest bond of sympathy, outside the family relation should be the one uniting all working people; nor should this lead to a war upon property or the owner of property. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him labor diligently and build one for himself; thus by example assuring himself, his own will be safe from violence when built."

37. ANOTHER APPEAL FOR COMPULSORY ARBITRATION TO SAVE AMERICA FROM RUINOUS STRIKES

(From a Nation-wide newspaper debate between Senator WILEY and a labor official as reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 25, 1946)

Should Congress restrict the right to strike?

Senator WILEY opens: "Certainly; yes, Congress must protect the public welfare. The public always gets it in the neck when ruinous strikes occur. The public—labor, management, farmer, all of us—are hungry for goods, for production. Shall we instead allow strikes to grow to the point where a general strike occurs and the Nation is economically paralyzed? That must not happen. In this complex, atomic age, full and uninterrupted production all along the line must be maintained. Therefore, in order to protect the public interest, Congress should: (1) ban strikes in Nation-wide industries and public utilities, such as transportation, communications, and so forth; in these instances provide for compulsory arbitration as a last resort and as a substitute for strikes; (2) prohibit jurisdictional strikes between unions; (3) make unions striking in violation of contracts liable for damages just as corporations are liable; (4) change the law so the right to strike does not mean the right to intimidate and coerce others to stop work; (5) provide for cooling-off periods so as to calm tempers and enable reason and judgment to enter into the picture. I submit these five suggestions in order to help save our blessed land from more ruinous strikes. These five suggestions are for the benefit of all of us and are not designed to be either for or against any one segment of our population, but rather to be simple pro-American.

* * * * *

"Ours is a Government of laws, not of men. When labor and management cannot get together and the public interest is violated, Government must legally step in in order to prevent strikes and insure justice for the public. In Sweden (which has a very high standard of living) there are special tribunals attached to the courts. These tribunals get the facts in labor disputes, hand down decisions which are respected by labor and management and thus prevent strikes. Why cannot we here replace destructive wildcat strikes, jurisdictional strikes, and so forth, with peaceful machinery that is fair and equitable for all?"

38. A RUINOUS SOFT COAL STRIKE HITS THE NATION—A WARNING TO THE SENATE ON THE MEANING OF THIS STRIKE TO AMERICA AND THE WORLD

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on April 29, 1946)

Mr. President, the Nation-wide crisis resulting from the 4-week-old bituminous coal strike grows worse and worse with each passing day.

* * * * *

The Nation's railroads, its utilities, power plants—I suggest that it should be remembered that power plants of the REA, in the farm sections, are affected—street railways and gas works are already feeling the pinch of the lack of coal. Innumerable food companies, producing vital relief supplies for Europe as well as food for our own people, have already limited their operations because of the shortage of coal.

* * * * *

The future outlook is grimmer still.

* * * * *

Mr. President, I received today a letter from a canner in my State who operates six pea-canning factories. He says that the situation in his locality is so serious that unless they get coal it will mean that the pea crop of Wisconsin, which represents more than 50 percent of the Nation's canned peas, will be lost.

39. THE COAL STRIKE DRAGS ON AND A RAIL STRIKE LOOMS—ANOTHER WARNING TO THE SENATE OF THE NEED FOR ACTION

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on May 3, 1946)

Think it over, Senators. Thirty days from now our manufacturing plants will be closing down; unless we have, or especially unless the Chief Executive has a little iron in his system to see to it that coal goes into production and that the necessities of life go into production. If that will take place, Mr. President, we will be able to meet the humanitarian demands upon us from abroad. If we do not meet that issue head-on soon, we will be falling down all along the line.

40. THE ISSUE IS NOT JOHN L. LEWIS VERSUS AMERICA—IT IS IRRESPONSIBLE LABOR LEADERSHIP VERSUS THE INTERESTS OF LABOR, MANAGEMENT, AND THE PUBLIC

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on May 8, 1946)

All America—labor, management, and the public—is united as one against the outrageous crucifixion of the public interest by John L. Lewis.

All America knows that this issue, however, is not only John L. Lewis versus the public welfare but irresponsible labor leadership versus the public welfare. What John L. Lewis is doing today to our reconversion program, to our program of foreign relief, to the most essential activities of American life, other power-mad labor leaders did yesterday and can do tomorrow. Yes, another labor dictator such as Harry Bridges, joined with similar communistic bosses, actively allied with forces of international Communist agitation and provocation, can also cripple and lay the Nation prostrate.

We must also have a pro-American labor bill, a bill with guts in its vitals and teeth in its jaws

* * * * *

The principal provision of such a bill, as I have contended for months and years, would be for compulsory arbitration of disputes in all utilities and Nation-wide industries so as to prevent strikes. All such disputes must go to the courts for proper adjudication.

Other provisions would—

First. Set up complete machinery for mediation and voluntary arbitration in all other disputes.

Second. Make unions equally responsible with corporations before the law for any contract violations.

Third. Provide for democratic union elections and publicized finances.

Fourth. Outlaw the use of force and violence in connection with any labor dispute or threatened dispute.

Fifth. Outlaw illegal uses of the boycott.

Sixth. Prohibit unionization of foremen who are legitimately a part of management.

Seventh. Outlaw jurisdictional disputes between unions.

Nothing short of such a comprehensive program will satisfy the people of America.

41. THE MINERS' POOR WORKING CONDITIONS MUST BE CORRECTED BUT THESE CONDITIONS DO NOT JUSTIFY PARALYZING THE NATION IN A TERRIBLE STOPPAGE

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on May 10, 1946)

Mr. President, these remarks of mine are not directed at minimizing what has been characterized as the very deplorable and un-American conditions in which the miners in Tennessee, Kentucky, and elsewhere exist. But such conditions do not justify a strike which cripples the Nation. One crime does not justify another crime. The housing and health conditions of the miners may call for action by State and Government, but by no process of reasoning do they call for building and creating more power in an individual, which results in jeopardizing the health and safety of the Nation.

* * * * *

Right now we see ourselves in a fine how-do-you-do. It has been characterized as a labor-policy depression due to the synthetic, needless, and senseless attitude of the administration now in power. It is a depression because we cannot get consumers' goods—ranging from ordinary socks and stockings and shirts to automobiles and materials with which to build houses. We cannot get these things; though we have more purchasing power than all the rest of the world combined, and only a year has gone by since VE-day, and 8 months since VJ-day.

* * * * *

Mr. President, for the speech I am making now, I shall be called an extreme reactionary.

All the pinks and Communists and radicals in America are in this picture up to their ears, creating disunity, confusing, and poisoning the minds of our people. But we sit back, wondering whether we should pass a law that has some iron in it. Oh, yes, Mr. President; they will say about me, "But he is antilabor." That will be said about a man who was raised in a town of 10,000 people, who worked in the sawmills, who painted houses, who sold books, who clerked in stores, who washed dishes to pay his board in the university. So they will say that I am antilabor. How can they justifiably say that I am antilabor, Mr. President?

42. AN AMENDMENT TO THE CASE LABOR BILL IS INTRODUCED IN ORDER TO ESTABLISH COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on May 17, 1946)

Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending bill to establish compulsory arbitration in utilities and vital Nation-wide industries in order to protect the public interest.

This amendment is integrated with other amendments prepared by a group of minority Senators to the Case bill, H. R. 4908.

I have on countless occasions in past years suggested on the floor of the Senate that nothing short of compulsory arbitration machinery would save this country from the paralysis of ruinous strikes such as we are now experiencing. I feel now that with the strike crisis acute, with a Nation-wide railroad strike threatening tomorrow, a resumed coal strike looming ahead, a maritime strike, and so on, and with this legislation long overdue, it is imperative that this body enact now some such legislation as I am introducing.

This amendment follows the general pattern of the accepted procedures of the Railway Labor Act, except that it makes arbitration compulsory rather than merely voluntary.

* * * * *

I should like now to make certain points regarding this amendment:

First. Mere mediation and voluntary arbitration machinery are not enough to save America from strike chaos. Of course, such machinery must and should be used to the fullest extent. The compulsory arbitration which I now propose would go into effect only after the previous machinery had been fully exhausted.

I believe that it is inconceivable, however, that we should rest our hopes in mere chance machinery such as mediation and voluntary arbitration. I believe that a nation which can and did take 16,000,000 men from its farms, its schools, and its industries and place them in the uniform of our country, can and should enforce compulsory arbitration in order to save the very values for which those men sacrificed so much.

* * * * *

Second. No one regrets more than I the necessity for compulsion. I would infinitely prefer that right reason would prevail and that both labor and management would be free to engage in voluntary mediation and arbitration. But right reason does not always prevail as has been proven so many times in the past when labor leaders and men of management have forgotten their obligation to the public interest.

Third. I believe that if Congress does not enact compulsory arbitration machinery now, then Congress and the American people will have great cause to regret that decision in the months and the years to come.

(NOTE.—Senator WILEY's amendment for compulsory arbitration was, however, voted down by the Senate.)

43. THE HEART OF LABOR IS SOUND, BUT IT MUST NOT ALLOW IRRESPONSIBLE LEADERSHIP TO CRUCIFY THE PUBLIC INTEREST POLITICALLY OR ECONOMICALLY

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on May 24, 1946)

Let me cite an illustration of the ruthless power of irresponsible union leaders. A year ago last November I ran for reelection in the State of Wisconsin. The PAC went after me with barrels of money and newspapers and with circulation of millions of political pamphlets. The Friday before election they sent this instruction to their stewards in the State: "There is one so and so we have got to get, and that is Senator WILEY."

Some of the members of labor unions in the Northwest, Wisconsin men with whom I used to work—some of them painting houses and some working in the mills—said, "Why?" The answer was, "WILEY does not take orders."

To whom does this Government belong? It thrills me to tell the Senate that while I lost the city of Milwaukee by 72,000 votes because those votes were channeled, in the northwest portions of the State many men belonging to the CIO unions resented that kind of talk and voted for me. I even carried the labor wards. So I say that at heart labor is sound. If we are to be fair and square with labor, we will not permit the ruthlessness which exists in certain labor organizations, and which makes slaves out of labor. "There the bosses give orders and labor takes orders."

We have heard a great deal to the effect that we must not put "chains on labor." I could show Senators letters from officers and men of some of the largest unions in my own State, after I had spoken as I have spoken many times, outlining a nine-point program for the general welfare, saying, "Senator, you are absolutely right." I could show the Senate letters from men and their wives saying, "You are absolutely right."

* * * * *

Mr. President, many loose statements without proof about crucifying labor have been made on the floor of the Senate. I trust that such unbalanced statements will not prevent this body from seeing to it that the public is not crucified.

* * * * *

I claim that the legislation I have outlined simply grants a privilege—I refer to the so-called right to strike—and that that privilege is subject to whatever limitations the legislature of this Government may prescribe. Let me repeat that, Mr. President. The whole thesis of my remarks is that the right to strike is a legislative privilege which is granted, and that that privilege is subject to whatever limitations the Legislature of the Government shall prescribe.

We must stop looking at quarrels of the nature of the present one, between management and labor, as simply issues between management and labor. I say again that the public is the primary interest, and the challenge to those of us who are Members of this body is to see that the public interest is not neglected.

44. JUST WHAT ARE THE PROVISIONS OF THE CASE LABOR BILL FOR WHICH I VOTED BUT WHICH THE PRESIDENT LATER VETOED?

(From an address in the U. S. Senate on May 29, 1946)

Mr. President, * * * we are all fairly well agreed on the following propositions:

First. The imperative need of maintaining a Government of checks and balances, so that no group or individual may ruthlessly exercise power to the damage of the general welfare; or, to put it in another way, we are agreed that no individual or group has a right to strike against the Government. I believe that the press has brought that clear conclusion of fact to the minds of the thinking people of the United States.

Second. I think we are all agreed that there is a need for enactment into law of a pro-American labor policy having in mind the rights of labor, the rights of management, and those much neglected rights—the rights of the public. In relation to the second point, the Senate of the United States on last Saturday took a great step forward in bringing about a realization of a comprehensive pro-American labor policy, when it passed the amended Case bill.

At this point I shall state what are substantially its provisions, and I do so particularly for the benefit of those who sit in the gallery. I hope they will pay attention to this statement, because throughout the country there has been gross misrepresentation about the name "Case bill" or "the amended Senate Case bill."

A few days ago I had an experience in that connection. A very ardent laborite from my own State came to my office to see me. He was all "het up" over it. I sat down with him and stated to him the points I am now stating. First, I said, "Would you object to a bill which contained a provision for a Federal mediation board which would assist in the mediation and voluntary arbitration of labor disputes, and which provided that once the board had offered its services the employer and the employee would not be able to strike or lock-out during a period of 60

days, during which there would be opportunity for mediation and arbitration?"

He answered, "No."

Then I said, "Would you be against a provision in law which authorized special emergency fact-finding commissions to look into disputes involving public utilities and to make recommendatons regarding wages, hours, and working conditions?"

He replied again, "No."

Then I said, "Would you be against making it a felony for anyone by robbery or extortion to obstruct commerce?"

Again, "No."

I said then, "Would you be against a provision which would prohibit the making of royalty payments to unions, except for specified purposes, such as health and welfare funds, which must, however, be administered jointly by labor and management?"

On that point he had the usual argument that if it was too narrow he might be against it, but if it was broad enough he would be for it.

But I said "Would you agree that the fund should be administered jointly by labor and management?"

His answer was, "Yes."

I then said, "Would you object to a provision which would make unions legally liable for damages for breach of a contract concluded after collective bargaining?"

He looked me straight in the face and said, "No."

I thrilled to his response. That is a great concept in America—that a contract is a meeting of minds, and that one cannot break it without responsibility.

Then I said, "Would you be against a law that would outlaw the use of secondary boycotts?"

He replied, "No."

"Why," I said, "my dear friend, that is all that the Senate version of the Case bill provides."

He said, "Is that so?"

I said, "Yes."

* * * * *

There is another need, a third need—for what?

Third, the enactment into law of provisions that will protect men in labor unions against the autocracy and Fascist tactics of the labor bosses.

* * * * *

Mr. President, the fourth need is to place on the statute books, in this atomic age, legislation which will make it possible for Government to take appropriate action in any emergency. In other words, the age calls for alertness, and what is more, alertness calls for emergency powers being brought into being during any emergency. In other words, the Republic must be adequate. We must demonstrate prescience. Without foresight of this character now, we will be remiss to the Republic.

45. JUST WHAT ARE THE PROVISIONS OF THE PRESIDENT'S EMERGENCY LABOR BILL FOR WHICH I ALSO VOTED AS AMENDED?

(From a statement in the U. S. Senate as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 7, 1946)

1. Where labor disputes interrupt or threaten the operation of plants, mines, or facilities essential to the maintenance of public health or security and the national economic structure, and the President has taken possession thereof, according to law, he may by proclamation call upon all employees and all officers and executives of the employer to return to their post of duty on or before the final effective date of the proclamation (not less than 48 hours away).

2. He may call upon all representatives of the employer and the employees to take affirmative action prior to the finally effective date of proclamation, to recall the employees and all officers and executives of the employer to their post of duty.

3. He may provide for the establishment from time to time of fair and just wages and other terms and conditions of employment.

4. On and after the initial issuance of the proclamation it is the obligation of officers of the employer conducting or permitting lock-outs or interruption, and the officers of the labor organization conducting or permitting such strike, slow-down, or interruption, to rescind such action and terminate such strike, lock-out, slow-down, or interruption. Any person willfully violating such obligation is subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, or imprisonment for not more than 1 year.

5. Right of injunction is given the Federal Government—not the employer.

6. Any employee who fails to comply with the President's proclamation, or, who after the date thereof, engages in strikes, slowdown, or other concerted interruption of the operation of plants, mines, or facilities in the possession of the United States, shall not be regarded as an employee of the Government or owner for the purpose of the National Labor Relations Act or the Railway Labor Act, unless he is subsequently reemployed.

The provisions of this act cease to be effective 6 months after the cessation of hostilities, as proclaimed by the President, or upon the date of the passage of a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of Congress, or on June 30, 1947, whichever first occurs.

(NOTE.—Senator WILEY voted against that provision in the President's emergency labor legislation which would have inducted into the Army workers who remained on strike in industries seized by the Government.)

Atomic Bill Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1946

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the first business of Congress after the summer recess of 1945 was the consideration of legislation to control the world's most terrible discovery, atomic energy. The War Department drafted a bill and it was introduced by Congressman MAY of Kentucky, chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee and Senator JOHNSON of Colorado, chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee. The House Military Affairs Committee held hearings for 4 days and passed a modified version of the War Department's draft. In my opinion, the Military Affairs Committee of the House acted hastily and without proper consideration of this all important subject. The modified draft of the war department's bill was therefore inadequate in scope and contained many dangerous provisions. Its most dangerous feature was the provision which gave almost complete control of this new and terrible discovery to the leaders of our military forces.

Many of the Members of Congress were greatly alarmed at the military control provision and a constantly growing attack in the editorials of our most responsible newspapers and the concerted action of the scientists who were responsible or this discovery, soon focused public attention on the dangers of the May-Johnson bill.

In the meantime, a special Senate committee, was established for the consideration of atomic energy legislation. This was a bipartisan committee and the chairman was Senator MCMAHON, of Connecticut. This committee held hearings over a period of 5 months. Fifty of the most prominent scientists, industrialists, educators, and administrators in the United States appeared before this committee. After lengthy and bitter debate in executive session the Senate committee finally reported a bill unanimously. This bill, known as Senate bill 1717—more commonly called the McMahon bill—was a compromise between the various and conflicting views of many important forces and organizations. The bi-partisan committee reported it unanimously. It was brought to the Senate floor on June 1 and passed unanimously with only a few hours debate.

As early as October 3, 1945, President Truman sent a message to Congress stressing the necessity for atomic-energy legislation. At that time the President outlined certain provisions which should be contained in atomic-energy legislation. The President has approved the McMahon bill in its present form. Secretary of War Patterson, speaking for the military, has also signified his approval. The majority of our reputable scientists have approved the McMahon bill as now written.

It has now been referred to the House Military Affairs Committee for further action.

It is my sincere hope that the House Military Affairs Committee will reconsider its action on the May-Johnson bill and substitute the Senate-passed McMahon bill. If this substitution is made, it is my opinion that the McMahon bill can be passed in the House without a great deal of objection. It is imperative that action be taken on atomic-energy legislation within the next few days.

A meeting of the Atomic Energy Commission of the United Nations Organization is to be held in Paris June 14. Our delegate to that meeting, Mr. Bernard Baruch, should have a definite commitment by Congress in regard to our attitude on the domestic control of atomic energy, and a commitment from the Congress of the United States that our program of domestic control will be subordinated to, and harmonized with, any international agreement regarding atomic energy, which may be made by the Atomic Energy Commission of the United Nations Organization.

Both of these commitments are contained in the McMahon bill.

If this legislative step is taken by the House, Mr. Baruch will then be in a position to proceed with the second part of President Truman's October 3 recommendation. This recommendation advocated international agreements for the protection of the people of the world against the use of atomic energy as a destructive force. It advocated the development of atomic energy for the benefit of mankind through peaceful industrial application.

Pending the formation of this international control, the President appointed a very distinguished committee to study all phases, both technical and political, to accomplish this recommendation. David Lilienthal, of TVA fame, was the chairman of this committee. Dr. J. R. Oppenheimer, a distinguished physicist from the University of California, and three more highly qualified men spent several months studying this matter These men served as a special committee under the sponsorship of the Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes. Their report was made on March 17, 1946. It is very comprehensive and provides an outline for the nations of the world to follow if they are to solve the problem of living in a world which has suddenly grown too small for atomic warfare.

While the authors of this report on the international control of atomic energy do not claim it completely covers the subject, many of us believe it sets forth a plan which we hope Mr. Baruch will advocate in the forthcoming international conference of June 14.

Until the atomic-energy problem is solved on an international scale, it will hang like the sword of Damocles over the nations of the world. Fear, distrust, and suspicion will spread in ever-widening circles and the peace we fought for will elude our grasp.

Uncontrolled 1919 Prices versus OPA 1946 Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF PEPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 7, 1946

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, we are told that unless OPA is continued wild inflation will result. But we were also told that OPA would hold prices in line and assure an equitable distribution of essential goods. It has accomplished neither. We are in the midst of inflation now, an inflation resulting from the artificial scarcity of many articles. The consumer is becoming more convinced daily that price ceilings mean nothing if goods are not available. Full production is our best guaranty against inflation. When supply is built up to a parity with demand, prices will adjust themselves without the necessity of the OPA. The consumer will be getting the things he needs at prices he can afford to pay.

After hearing so much talk about high food prices after the First World War, I decided to check the ads in the Indianapolis newspapers for the month of April 1919.

Of course, some of the food items in 1919 were slightly higher, as example, sugar, but you could buy sugar in 1919 without a sugar stamp. You could also buy bread without standing in bread lines. However, most of these food items are higher in 1946 than they were in 1919. The market-basket items that cost $5.36 in 1919 will cost you $6.84 in 1946.

1919 market basket cost, $5.36; 1946 cost, $6.84

Merchant	Commodity	Unit	April 1919 price	April 1946 price	1946 subsidy	1946 total
Buehler Bros	Round steak	1 pound	$0.30	$0.41	$0.091	$0.501
Indiana Market	Beef roast	1½ pounds	.375	.49	.12	.61
Wanser's	Pork chops	1 pound	.35	.37	.06	.43
Bills & Boettcher	Ham	do	.37	.53	.085	.615
Langs	Bacon	do	.35	.41	.068	.478
Grand Union Tea Co	Butter	½ pound	.30	.28	.098	.378
Utley's	Tall can milk	14½ ounces	.11	.10	.014	.114
	Fresh milk	5 quarts	.625	.70	.065	.765
Wanser's	Eggs	1 dozen	.40	.44		.44
Pettis	Bread	4 loaves	.36	.36	.04	.40
Wanser's	Flour	4 pounds	.27	.25	.035	.285
Pettis	Oranges	1 dozen	.40	.49		.49
Market	Onions	1 pound	.075	.09		.09
Do	Beets	do	.10	.095		.095
Do	Sweetpotatoes	do	.12	.11		.11
Do	Cabbage	1½ pounds	.15	.12		.12
Wanser's	Potatoes	5 pounds	.12	.26		.26
Utley's	Corn	1 No. 2 can	.12	.15	.009	.159
Grand Union Tea Co	Sugar	3½ pounds	.32	.28	.049	.329
Pettis	Coffee	½ pound	.14	.15	.02	.17
Total			5.355	6.085	.754	6.839

April 1919 prices taken from ads in Indianapolis newspapers.
April 1946 prices from Bureau of Labor Statistics average price figures in Indianapolis, Ind.
Republican Food Study Committee Research Division.
Subsidies on these food items for an entire year would amount to $13 per person or $1,820,000,000 for all citizens of the United States.

Silver Raid on the Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 7, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill has been held up since February by the so-called silver bloc. That bill carries a rider that provides for the release by the United States Government of non-monetized silver at the rate of 71.11 cents per fine ounce. There is now about 225,000,000 ounces of so-called free silver buried in vaults at West Point.

Silver is needed in the photographic, photoengraving, silverware, and electrical industries and in medicine and dentistry.

The silver bloc is now making the extraordinary demand that the price of silver be increased to 90.5 cents per fine ounce and after 2 years a further boost to $1.29 per fine ounce. This is nothing short of plunder. Silver has no such value. In order to get its inordinate demand satisfied, the appropriations bill for the Departments of the Treasury and Post Office is being held up. The dead line is July 1 next.

The bloc has added another barrel to their gun. It has induced the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate to approve a supplementary bill providing for this outrageous boost in price.

Meanwhile, the industrial users of silver are deprived of the use of these huge Treasury reserves. Foreign silver-mine owners refuse to sell their silver because they anticipate the boost and are holding back for the higher price.

In the meantime silver for industrial uses is getting very scarce. I predict that this will cause a grave shortage of silver nitrate and that, as a result, newspapers may have to be published without pictures.

This fine state of affairs has been brought about by the stand and deliver attitude of the silverites.

Address Before Lynchburg (Va.) Rotary Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
O.
HON. J. LINDSAY ALMOND, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 7, 1946

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Rotary Club of Lynchburg, Va., on June 4, 1946:

There are many vital problems facing the Congress of the United States. They relate to the welfare of our people and to the future security of the world.

In this period of transition from war to peace, we are confronted with grave economic problems reaching down into the grass roots of individual existence. In the field of diplomacy and international relations, America stands at the crossroads of her destiny. Democracy is facing a crucial test, not only in the forum of enlightened conscience and statecraft at home, but in the arena of world responsibility and obligation. Government has evolved from a relatively simple process to a maze of conflicting and seemingly irreconcilable complexities.

The cruel demands and hard exigencies of war render imperative the concentration of colossal power in the handr and at the ready disposal of the National Government. The resources of the Nation and the talents and energies of the people are activated, regimented, and centralized in order that concentrated strength may be directed at a focal objective and thereby beat down and destroy the forces bent upon our destruction.

The totalitarian nations, so recently arrayed against us in mortal combat, made their calculations and based their timetables on the false assumption that democracy was inflexible, unwieldy, and cumbersome. They reasoned that our constitutional processes

and our fundamental concepts and traditions were shackles and impediments which would prevent us from raising our guard in time to ward off a fatal blow.

The answer has been given at fearful cost on the field of battle. Those who struck so savagely to destroy us have been destroyed. Our representative form of government has demonstrated its efficacy and its fiber, its ability to survive in the face of imminent and impending disaster. Surely we know that it was through the blending and coordination of all of the integral elements of our national life that enabled us to transform a peace-loving nation into the greatest military power the world has ever known. Devoid of ulterior motives and designs, without malevolence and aspirations of empire, with humane concern for the stricken and starving of the world, championing in the council of nations the cause of the weak, advocating sound autonomy for the oppressed, protecting the territorial integrity of small nations against the greed of aggrandizement, respecting the dignity of the individual and the sacredness of human justice, America today occupies a position unique in the history of the world. The benign power of her transcending moral influence must be thrown into the balance on the side of a sane and durable peace. This is our last chance; we must make the most of it. Those elements of grandeur and greatness which made us invincible in war must now be transformed into the unyielding instrumentalities of peace. We must be as invincible in the ways of peace as we were dauntless in the carnage of battle.

Our economic stability at home is a matter of vital and grave concern, but we must not allow the antagonism engendered by economic strife to blind us to our sacred obligation to the hallowed dead. I have great faith in the potentialities of the United Nations organization. A long and torturous road lies ahead, but we must bend every energy and adapt every resource to the building of a better world. The nations of the world are looking to us for leadership. We must forge ahead. We dare not falter. If we turn back, all is lost. In this age of atomic energy, civilization faces either annihilation or a glorious perpetuity. Let us pray that God will direct us in the making of the right choice.

As we work and pray for a world with enduring peace, we must be no less vigilant in our efforts and unswerving in our determination to harmonize and correlate the discordant elements whose divergent philosophies are rapidly propelling the Nation into a status of economic chaos. The regimentation, collectivism, and concentration of power in the national government, so necessary in war, are inimical to the stabilization of a peacetime economy. The complexities of government must be reduced in favor of simplification. Individual initiative and private enterprise must be restored. Wartime controls, restrictions, and limitations must be eased and then abandoned as early as is compatible with safety from the forces of inflation. Every reasonable and practical stimulant conducive to the adequate production of every essential commodity must be applied. Whenever the production of any commodity approximates a reasonable balance with the pressure of demand, ceilings over that commodity should be abandoned and the subsequent price determined in the field of fair competitive enterprise.

During the period of transition, I recognize the necessity of fair and sanely administered controls. Controls should not be used or permitted to prolong the period of transition. When controls are applied as a strangling force to production, then they become self-perpetuating in that the pressure of demand is not relieved.

I am convinced that the economic laws can be made to function so as to produce a balanced economy. Every segment of the national economy is related to every other segment. In fact, it is one composite whole. When one secures an unfair advantage over the other, then the whole fabric is adversely affected.

I am a firm believer in social security and old-age assistance. However, the able-bodied men and women of our country should be encouraged in the full development of the essential attributes of self-reliance and individual initiative. No citizen, except through dire necessity, should become a charge upon his Government. The Government should not do for us what we can and should do for ourselves. The system of doling out "rocking chair" money is a species of false economy. It makes absolutely no contribution to, but retards economic recovery. It has a deleterious effect upon the maintenance of self-respect.

I have been a Member of Congress only since February 4, 1946. I know that there is hard work ahead. No Member of Congress should ever aline himself as the representative of any one segment of our society. Every phase of our national life is entitled to energetic and impartial representation. Promotion of the cause of one should never be permitted to resolve itself into injustice for another.

The life and death economic struggle now being waged with intensified and relentless bitterness must be brought to a speedy and constructive termination.

It is impossible to adjust our sails, set our sights, use our talents and apply the genius of our brains to the imperative necessities of world peace while here at home our people are torn asunder by the volcanic eruptions of civil strife. The views of discordant elements must be harmonized, their interests adjusted and their rights adjudicated and measured in the scales of economic justice.

Social, economic, and political factors which are swinging dangerously to the left and those which are traveling too far to the right must be brought by sound and practical legislation and policy back to the center of the road of national progress. I concede that this is a generalization of a broad principle, but it is indispensably essential that we establish a sound and practical principle conceived in justice and right and implement it by law which will secure adherence to it.

Something is radically and inexcusably wrong somewhere when one man, two men, or a group of men can, under sanction of existing law, arrogate unto themselves sufficient power to stop this—the greatest Nation on the face of the earth—dead in its tracks, and bring ruin, starvation, pestilence, despair and chaos crashing down upon the heads of 140,000,000 people. Americans died by the thousands upon the field of battle all over the world, thousands were maimed, mangled, shattered, and torn in mind and body on the altar of devotion and duty in a mighty, glorious, and successful effort to prevent Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito from accomplishing the same objective. Will it be said that these heroes gave their last full measure of devotion to save their country from destruction at the hands of a foreign foe and that this same country is powerless to save itself from within, through application of its own democratic and constitutional processes?

The problems posed as a result of the incessant and destructive warfare between management and labor can and must be solved. They will never be solved by throwing brickbats at the one or the other. Accusations, prejudice, bias, and hate promulgated through misrepresentation and false propaganda but serve to widen the breach. Both management and labor are entitled to thrive and prosper. This can only be brought to pass through the permanent establishment of peaceful relations. Each must recognize the absolute necessity for the existence of mutual obligations and responsibilities to each other, and above everything else, each must recognize that the one paramount consideration is the public interest. The lives, health, and security of our people must not be jeopardized by civil strife This is a solemn constitutional obligation of government. Temporary legislation, however imperative, enacted under the urgency of an impending national crisis is not the answer. The clinical aspects of the matter must be analyzed with care and faced with courage. The legislative and executive branches of government must face the issue squarely with an eye single to the welfare of all of the people. This must be done regardless of the dissent of friendship, or the hope of political preferment. He who yields to the demands of any group to the detriment of the Nation's economic stability and who is not the guardian of the relative rights and well being of every segment of our social and economic order is not and cannot be the representative of the people.

The legitimate rights and the welfare of labor must be respected and zealously guarded. This must be done, not because of the demands of labor but in response to and in accordance with the principles of right and justice. On the other hand, the same identical principle applies to management. Neither should be permitted an unfair and throttling advantage over the other. Any existing law or practice which permits it should be superseded by constructive legislation which recognizes, establishes and protects on a mutual and equitable basis, the interests, the rights, the obligations, and responsibilities of both.

I yield to no one in my admiration and respect for the patriotic men and women of labor. Their immeasurable contribution to victory over the arch enemies of humanity in World War II will ever stand as a towering monument of their loyalty to this country in her hour of dire need.

We must recognize and proceed on the indisputable principle that labor and industry are mutually dependent one upon the other and that the welfare of the Nation is dependent upon both. That which is inimical to the welfare of either strikes at the progress and well being of every segment of the national economy.

I believe these principles to be sound and, if applied by the legislative and executive branches of government, will prove conducive to the restoration of order out of chaos.

The National Health Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I made recently before the Senate Education and Labor Committee on S. 1606, the National Health Act, which I have introduced with the distinguished

chairman of the Education and Labor Committee [Mr. MURRAY], and which Representative DINGELL has introduced in the House of Representatives as H. R. 4730.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ROBERT F. WAGNER OF NEW YORK ON S. 1606, THE NATIONAL HEALTH BILL, BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, APRIL 2, 1946

I am very glad to appear before the committee today in support of the national health bill which I have introduced with Senator MURRAY and Representative DINGELL. The bill is designed to establish a national health program along the lines set forth by the President in his message on this subject.

In my opinion this bill is one of the most important bills ever considered by this committee. It is an important bill because without good health the individual, his family, and the Nation, cannot prosper. Good health is a matter of vital interest to every man, woman, and child in the Nation.

A NATIONAL HEALTH BILL IS ESSENTIAL

The national health bill is an essential part of a broad program to improve our domestic security.

There is no doubt of the need for improving the health of our Nation. And there is no doubt that the American people are in favor of improving their health through health insurance.

Every year thousands of mothers and children are dying needlessly from preventable causes. Every year thousands of men and women in the prime of life are dying needlessly from tuberculosis, pneumonia, influenza, and other preventable diseases.

Each year we lose more persons from preventable and premature deaths than we lost on the battlefields during all of World War II.

We cannot allow these preventable deaths to occur year after year. Every year of delay in establishing a national health program means the loss of thousands of lives. Every year of delay means needless suffering to thousands of people who do not now obtain adequate medical care. In the past we have taken some small piecemeal steps to try to deal with the problem. Now what we must do is tackle the job with everything we have.

The most important way now to accomplish that purpose is by the enactment of a national health-insurance plan supplemented by other improvements in existing health legislation.

S. 1606, the national health bill, contains three titles:

Title I provides for grants to the States for health services. This title has three parts:

Part A. Grants to States for public-health services.

Part B. Grants to States for maternal and child-health services.

Part C. Grants to States for medical care of needy persons.

All three parts of title I provide grants-in-aid to the States for health services for which the Federal Government already provides limited funds. In general, the purpose of this title is to amend and broaden existing legislation by eliminating existing restrictions so that present State and local programs can operate more effectively.

Title II provides for national health-insurance protection.

Title III contains general provisions.

HEALTH INSURANCE IS NOT SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Some organized medical groups have criticized a national health insurance program on the ground that it involves "regimentation of doctors and patients," "lowered standards," "political medicine," and "socialized medicine," and so on. There is absolutely no foundation to these charges. Health insurance is not socialized medicine; it is not state medicine. These terms have been used by opponents of the bill to confuse the issue.

Health insurance is simply a method of assuring a person ready access to the medical care that he or she needs by eliminating the financial barrier between the patient and doctor or hospital. Under the bill patients are guaranteed free choice of doctors, doctors are guaranteed the right to accept or reject patients, and hospitals are guaranteed freedom to manage their affairs. Specific provision is included in the bill for hearings and appeals on any issues which may arise between doctors, hospitals, and covered persons. Specific provision is made for the judicial review of any disputed issues arising under the plan. It is clear, therefore, that the bill does not involve regimentation of doctors, hospitals, or patients. Neither do I believe that the doctors of this country will lower the standards of medical care simply because they are guaranteed payment for their services.

Those of us who have sponsored social legislation have faced similar unfounded objections against many proposals for social betterment, but who have lived to see these new programs eventually accepted as part of our basic system of American freedom and democracy even by the very groups who first opposed them. I remember when old-age assistance and free public employment offices were opposed as being socialistic. Similar arguments were advanced against income tax legislation.

Over 35 years ago in the New York legislature I fought for workmen's accident compensation and most of the highly emotional arguments which are being made against health insurance now were made against workmen's compensation then. Employers' organizations, insurance companies, doctors—all are now in favor of the fundamental principle embodied in workmen's compensation laws. All these laws now include medical benefits, which is health insurance for industrial accidents and disease. The time has come for us to extend the principle of health insurance to cover nonindustrial accidents and diseases as well.

The fears and doubts expressed about workmen's compensation, old-age insurance, public-employment offices and other measures for social security have proved to be without foundation. I am convinced that the American Medical Association itself will be able to say about a national health-insurance program, after it is in operation, that many of its present apprehensions and misgivings were groundless.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE SAFEGUARDED

Under the bill each person is guaranteed freedom to choose his own family doctor from among all physicians or groups of physicians in the community who have voluntarily agreed to go into the system. Each doctor or group of doctors is free to go in or stay out of the system. Doctors who participate are free to accept or reject patients who may wish to select them as their family doctor. Patients and doctors may change the arrangements after they have been made if they become dissatisfied.

I want to quote the exact language from page 45 of the bill, lines 2 to 18, to prove this to you and to show you that many of the charges that are made against the bill are false. Here is what the bill actually provides:

"SEC. 205. (a) Any physician, dentist, or nurse legally qualified by a State to furnish any services included as personal health-service benefits under this title shall be qualified to furnish such services as benefits under this title * * * and this provision shall extend to any group of physicians, dentists, or nurses or combinations thereof whose members are similarly qualified.

"(b) Every individual entitled to receive general medical or general dental benefit shall be permitted to select, from among those designated in subsection (a) of this section, those from whom he shall receive such benefit, subject to the consent of the practitioner or group of practitioners selected, and every such individual and every group of such individuals shall be permitted to make such selection through a representative of his or their own choosing, and to change such selection."

Every effort also has been made in the bill to protect the professional position of dentists, nurses, and nursing organizations. Hospitals are guaranteed protection in section 206 (b) against interference in the management of their own affairs. The basic policy has been to provide medical and related services through arrangements that are worked out so that they will be satisfactory to the public and to those who furnish the services. Mutual agreements reached through negotiations and contracts are specified in section 203 (c) of the bill as the method to be used, and that is the democratic way of doing things.

The Surgeon General is authorized to negotiate cooperative working arrangements with Federal, State, or local governmental agencies, and with private groups or individuals, to provide the benefits by utilizing their services and facilities on payment of fair compensation. This will assure local administration and full utilization of all existing facilities and personnel.

The bill provides that the health benefits may be furnished to noncovered persons, such as needy persons receiving public assistance, if appropriate arrangements are made to pay on their behalf the cost of services furnished to them.

VOLUNTARY PLANS AIDED

All qualified hospitals, all qualified medical groups or organizations, will be able to participate in the program as organizations furnishing services to the insured persons who choose them; they will receive fair payments for the services they furnish under the bill, and they will have enlarged opportunities to be service agencies for particular groups or for their communities. This applies to service organizations created by trade-unions, consumer groups, employers, nonprofit community groups, churches, fraternal associations, groups of doctors or individual doctors, medical societies, or many other kinds of sponsors or groups of sponsors. The bill not only provides for utilizing existing service organizations but it also encourages the creation of new ones.

The Blue Cross or similar hospital-insurance plans will be able to continue to act as representative of the participating hospitals and the community groups that own or manage the hospitals. They will have large opportunities to be important public organizations that facilitate the administration of vital parts of the insurance system.

Medical service groups—private clinics, salaried staffs of hospitals, group-service plans such as the Kaiser or similar plans—furnishing service under the system would be as free as they are today to select their own staffs and their own methods of paying physicians and others on their staffs, irrespective of the method of payment which prevailed among the individually practicing physicians or dentists of the local area.

FINANCING HEALTH INSURANCE

How would the cost of the health insurance benefits in title II of this bill be financed?

There is already pending before the Congress legislation to finance the cost of health insurance. On May 24, 1945, I introduced with Senator MURRAY and Representative DINGELL a comprehensive social security bill

(S. 1050 and H. R. 3293) providing for social insurance contributions for all social-insurance programs. This bill was drafted on the assumption that 3 percent of pay rolls (up to $3,600 per year) would be allocated for health insurance of which one-half would be paid by employers and the other half by employees. In other words, 1½ percent of pay rolls would be contributed by employers and 1½ percent by employees. The bill also provides that the additional cost above 3 percent due to the gradual introduction of dental and home-nursing services would be financed out of general revenues.

I have been asked many times why the premiums for health insurance were not included in the national health bill (S. 1606), and I should like to clarify the situation for the record.

Under the Constitution all revenue bills must originate in the House of Representatives. This means that the House must consider and pass revenue legislation before the Senate. In order that the health-insurance legislation can be considered and passed by the Senate without waiting first for House action, it was necessary to consider the benefit and revenue provisions separately.

This separation of legislation between the revenue and benefit aspects is in keeping with previous practice. In both 1935 and 1937 legislation relating to railroad retirement was considered and enacted in this way.

Another reason for separating the benefit and revenue provisions is that under present arrangements in Congress different committees are concerned with these two matters. In the Senate, for instance, the Committee on Education and Labor handles all health legislation such as the hospital survey and construction bill, and the Public Health Service Act. The many technical problems involved in revenue legislation are handled by the Senate Committee on Finance. Similarly, in the House of Representatives, health matters are handled by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce but revenue matters are handled by the House Committee on Ways and Means. The financial details relating to the raising of the revenue for the plan raises many special problems which have a bearing on existing income taxes and pay-roll contributions and should be considered in relation to these laws.

In terms of priority, it is essential that the benefits should be given consideration first. If the Congress thinks that health-insurance benefits should be provided, then the method of financing can be worked out in terms of the scope and character of the medical care provided.

SUMMARY

During the course of the hearings before your committee you will hear from experts who will testify on the technical aspects of the bill. I hope that the committee will incorporate in the bill any constructive suggestion that will come out of the hearings so that we can have a comprehensive health-insurance plan that will meet the needs of the American people.

National Aviation Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address on the subject of the national aviation policy, delivered on June 5 by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], on a Nation-wide radio hook-up of the American Broadcasting Co.

As a member of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program and as a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee, the Senator from Washington has done a splendid job in calling the attention of the Nation to the problems of aviation. I believe his remarks which were made on the eve of the inauguration of the national aviation policy should be made available to the public, and therefore I request that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I welcome this opportunity to talk about a subject of interest to all Americans. That subject is a national aviation policy.

The war brought us to the realization that we live in an air age. This is an age of exciting possibilities in scientific and industrial progress. To realize these possibilities, we must solve many difficult problems. I want to report on some of these problems, as presented by aviation experts to a subcommittee of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The subcommittee, of which I am privileged to be the chairman, is trying to discover the best means of charting America's air future. We believe that an intelligent over-all policy can be established only with the full understanding and support of the American people. In the last analysis, the whole people must decide how our democratic society can be strengthened and preserved.

Why is aviation so important to democracy? The capacity to produce planes and weapons of the most improved types is just part of the job. Military security is an essential requirement and I do not minimize it. We must have a strong up-to-date air force for self-protection, and to carry out any commitments which we may be called upon to make by the Security Council of the United Nations for the preservation of world peace.

But looking, as I do, toward a world of enduring peace rather than a world of strife, aviation appears to me as a testing instrument of our democracy. Can democracy effectively organize its resources with the help of science and technology so that our people can live comfortably and well?

The late President Roosevelt keenly sensed the promise of science for America. He said, in requesting a study of this country's scientific needs and resources:

"New frontiers of the mind are before us, and if they are pioneered with the same vision, boldness, and drive with which we have waged this war, we can create a fuller and more fruitful employment and a fuller and more fruitful life."

Aviation is one of those frontiers. Between the idea in the brain of the scientist and the aircraft flying overhead, there is a vast area that must be explored continuously. As the pioneer settled new lands, so must other men today work in this new field to open the way to better machines and more and better jobs.

First. The scientist, who extends the frontiers of the mind by exploring the general laws of nature as they affect aviation, is said to be engaged in basic research.

Second. The engineers and technicians, who apply these basic findings to the development of specific aircraft designs and models, are said to be engaged in applied research or engineering development.

Third. The managers and workers, who organize industry for the production and reproduction of these aircraft designs and models, are said to be engaged in aircraft production.

These lines of endeavor are not simple and clear cut. They are complex. To carry them out effectively requires the teamwork of science, industry, and labor under the guidance of Government. Effective teamwork is what we mean by a national air policy.

Today a national air policy is not in evidence. We have various Government agencies both military and civilian, as well as private groups and individuals, carrying on aviation research and development. These efforts are not coordinated. One agency finds it difficult to know what the other is doing. Some are not carrying out the responsibilities with which they are charged by law. Working in a corner of the field, they are unable to see the whole field. And the aircraft industry, in the face of so many governmental uncertainties, does not know what to expect, or how to proceed.

The time has come, in my opinion, for a group of outstanding citizens to appraise these various efforts and mark out the course for America's air future.

Such a group would be set up by the bill I have proposed to create a National Air Policy Board. Nine members appointed by the President would undertake within a period of 3 months to make a comprehensive survey of aviation problems and policies, and submit their recommendations to Congress.

Right now we are holding hearings on this bill. It is not my intention to draw any specific conclusions before the subcommittee completes its hearings and issues its report on the merits of the bill. I may say, however, that the testimony so far taken, is a matter of public record, available for those who may wish to examine it. There is general agreement, however, among the expert witnesses upon the vital importance of the over-all objective which the bill seeks—a national air policy.

Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, Chief of Naval Operations, stated, for example, that formulation of a national air policy was of the greatest importance, and that he would welcome it.

Mr. Stuart Symington, Assistant Secretary of War for Air, testified that my bill was "of the greatest significance, because it recognizes * * * a critical need in the development of both civil and military air power."

Gen. Carl Spaatz, commanding general of the Army Air Forces, testified before the subcommittee in part as follows: "The Mitchell bill represents long study and thoughtful consideration of the elements essential to a national air policy. The air forces would like to commend this effort, and endorse the general purpose as being in the best interest of the country."

Mr. Edward C. Wells, chief engineer for the Boeing Aircraft Co., in endorsing the bill, pointed to the need for "an effective means of planning and coordination of our activities which will take the place of the instinct for cooperative self-preservation which exists only during a national emergency."

There is not time to cite the testimony of other qualified witnesses in the aviation aspects of Government, industry, labor, and agriculture. I have tried to convey to you the general character of this testimony.

I said a moment ago that an intelligent over-all policy can be established only with the full understanding and support of the American people. It is gratifying to note the public interest that has been aroused by my proposal for a National Air Policy Board. The courtesy extended by this broadcasting network in enabling me to set the problem before the country matches that of newspaper editors and columnists who have discussed the provisions of the air policy bill prior to the hearings in the Nation's Capitol.

Of course, I am most familiar with the newspapers of my own State of Washington. Editorials have been carried by its newspapers, large and small, without regard to any partisan consideration. A national air policy is above party; it is a matter of concern to everyone. Editorials from the Seattle Star, the Seattle Times, the Tacoma Times, the Hoquiam Washingtonian, and the Yakima Republic, approving the purposes of this bill in an objective, nonpartisan fashion are indicative of newspaper editorial sentiment in other parts of the country.

Questions have been raised, in the course of the present hearings, as to the capacity of a temporary board to do a thorough job in a 3 months' appraisal of this complicated field of aviation. There appears to be an increasing sentiment for the establishment of a permanent board which would sit continuously to check and coordinate policy, and make systematic revisions to keep pace with swiftly changing air developments.

Whatever the mechanism that is finally established, it is clear that the time has come to overhaul aviation policies and outline our future course. Parenthetically, I may note that it could very well be a function of the temporary board to determine whether a permanent board or council for aviation is desirable.

Some of my listeners tonight may recall that in the early 1920's a man named Billy Mitchell raised a storm about the backwardness of American aviation. The history of aviation at that time hardly measured two decades. But out of the charges and countercharges centering around Billy Mitchell came an air policy board of the kind that I am advocating.

In its day—1925—this board performed a useful function. Its findings led to the enactment of basic laws governing civilian and military aviation which are still on the statute books. These laws gave the aircraft industry a new lease on life and enabled it to move ahead.

Today we stand at another critical point in aviation history. We cannot afford to stand in one place, because scientific knowledge is rushing forward. Aviation policy must be made to catch up.

Many of my listeners, having witnessed the tremendous wartime aviation accomplishments of our scientists, engineers, producers, workers, and most of all, our combat and transport pilots, may be surprised to learn how far behind we are in air policy. They may be surprised to learn that all the American aircraft used in World War II combat were based on pre-Pearl Harbor ideas.

I cite this fact to illustrate the complex problems and the terrific rate of technological obsolescence in aeronautics. By the time the brainchild of the scientist is converted into tested usable aircraft, a host of new ideas have sprung up waiting to be exploited. The pace of science is swift and rigorous. Aviation as a vital segment of our industrial economy must be so organized as to make use of all the ideas the scientist can develop.

Let me give a concrete example of the production problems involved in the gap between the scientific idea and the operating aircraft.

In my State of Washington we have the Boeing Aircraft Co. Boeing was the father of the famous B–17 which did such yeoman service in the war. The B–17 was based upon an original idea; it was the first flying fortress or heavy bomber.

The idea of the B–17 gave birth to a larger and more terrifying offspring, the B–29, that soon winged its way over Japan. Allowing for the fact that the B–29 could draw upon the design and production experience of the B–17, how long do you suppose it took for the B–29 to go from drawing board to combat? The answer, as given by an aviation expert, is 8 years. Eight years, mind you, between the time the B–29 was first sketched on a drafting board and the time it was being used to blast the enemy to pieces.

This expert who testified on the B–29 development stated further that to his knowledge, no successful aircraft engine of tactical importance had ever been perfected for combat use in less than 5 years, and that the same could be said for many instruments, propellers, accessories, and the larger functional components of aircraft.

It is no doubt disconcerting to realize that after long years of painstaking, costly experimentation, testing and production, we may come out with a product which is fine and sound, but already a back number, if not obsolete. This is a cost of the steady march of science and progress. While we cannot eliminate that cost, we can reduce its proportions by enlightened and intelligent policy.

An example along this line: Several weeks ago, the people of the Nation's Capital were given a striking exhibition of the Army Air Forces latest jet-propelled pursuit airplane, the P–80. Our combat flyers never had the opportunity to use this plane for the defeat of the aggressor.

Germany, on the other hand, was far ahead of us in this phase of aviation science. Jet propulsion was developed by the Germans before the war, and effectively employed in combat.

The point to be made here is that the jet-propelled planes whizzing over our heads the other day were the latest pursuit planes, but already they are somewhat obsolete in a technical sense. Newer refinements and developments are on the drawing board and on the way to experimental production.

I predict that in the near future the Congress of the United States will be called upon to appropriate sums for basic and applied research in aeronautics approaching the $1,000,000,000 mark.

My concern is that such huge sums should be expended wisely and well, not wastefully. In underscoring the importance of a national air policy to insure these results, I will close by repeating in part what I said at the start of the hearings on my bill to establish a National Air Policy Board:

"When the war ended there were drastic cutbacks in aircraft production. Now we must solve the problem of maintaining an aircraft industry in peacetime. The American people have a tremendous investment in this industry as regards their future well-being and security. In saying this, I do not look to further war. I look to peace and an expanding economy of jobs and production. The aviation industry can make a substantial contribution to this peacetime economy.

"It is important to understand that this great investment in the aircraft industry is costly to maintain. We are living in an age of technological revolution. Scientific research is vital to prevent obsolescence and deterioration of the industry. But research cannot be pursued by industry alone. It requires the expenditures of large sums of public moneys. In ordering such expenditures, the Congress must balance competing interests and mark out appropriate lines of endeavor, to arrive at the policies that will best promote the national welfare. For example, when we in Congress are asked to appropriate hundreds of millions for military research and development centers, we must, to safeguard the public funds, consider the whole field of aviation, in its commercial as well as its military application. How can we do otherwise? That is why, in my opinion, it is fitting that Congress have the benefit of recommendations from an impartial authoritative board that will carefully review the factors essential to keep America abreast of the latest scientific advances in aviation, and to permit the development of a vigorous aircraft industry."

Address by Hon. James M. Mead, of New York, Before Association of Fraternal and Benevolent Organizations of the American Jewish Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address delivered by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] at a dinner of the Association of Fraternal and Benevolent Organizations of the American Jewish Congress, at the Hotel Commodore, in New York City, on May 26, 1946. The dinner was tendered to Dr. Stephen S. Wise on his seventy-second birthday. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in connection with the excerpts from the speech, the remarks made by Mr. Charles Sonnenreich, president of the organization, in introducing the Senator from New York.

There being no objection, the introductory remarks and excerpts of the speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION FOR SENATOR JAMES M. MEAD, MADE BY CHARLES SONNENREICH, PRESIDENT OF THE ASSOCIATION OF FRATERNAL AND BENEVOLENT ORGANIZATIONS, OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS

We are greatly honored by the presence of one of our most distinguished citizens of the State of New York. We sincerely appreciate his presence here all the more since we know him to be one of the busiest and most important Senators in Washington.

Although a resident of Buffalo, he is no stranger to us, for his outstanding record as a champion of humanity has endeared him to all of us.

Like many of us here, he too is the son of immigrant parents. He knows the problems of the immigrant, the refugee, and the displaced persons, problems which are uppermost in our thoughts at the moment.

His life is typical of many leaders of our democracy. Starting in a humble way, he rose from a menial laborer's job to top honors by serving his fellow men and country in various capacities. For over 30 years he has faithfully served the people of the State of New York in the House of Representatives and the United States Senate.

During the height of the war, at great peril to himself, he answered our country's call to visit our fighting fronts as a member of the Truman War Investigating Committee, of which he is now the active chairman. This global trip brought to his observation the problems of the oppressed, the refugee, and the enslaved in many parts of the world. From his personal experience he wrote one of the truly great war books entitled "Tell the Folks Back Home," which will long live as a memorable document of history.

He comes to us as a devoted friend of our people. He has not only spoken out in our behalf, but he has deeply concerned himself in our problem to have the gates of Palestine opened now and has urged the prompt removal of displaced persons from the camps. Only recently a row of trees in Palestine was

dedicated in his name as a mark of appreciation for his support.

Now I have the great pleasure, and privilege, and honor to present our good friend—United States Senator JAMES M. MEAD.

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH OF UNITED STATES SENATOR JAMES M. MEAD

It is with genuine satisfaction that I join you tonight in paying tribute to Dr. Stephen Wise, great American, great Jew, great human being. I say that not because Dr. Wise happens to be one of my favorite constituents. I say it not merely because he has, through 50 years of public activity on behalf of every civilized cause, so richly merited the admiration and affection of his fellow Americans and his fellow Jews the world over. I say it because Dr. Wise so supremely embodies those qualities of democratic leadership the world so sorely needs today.

It is unfortunate that during the past several years we have been far too prone to identify leadership with dictatorship. Democracy, like all systems of government, requires leadership. It requires a different kind of leadership. It requires, in the first place, courage. I mean not the courage which one needs in order to march at the head of ruthless and plundering legions but the courage that is needed to fight for what is just against the most overwhelming odds. It requires, in the second place, imagination. Here I do not mean the imagination to see one's self astride a world dominated by force and shackled by the bonds of poverty and insecurity. I mean the imagination that one can see a world at peace because men have learned to live with each other, to recognize each other's legitimate aspirations, and to respect each other's fundamental differences. And, it finally requires humility—the humility which recognizes that wisdom is not the monopoly of the privileged elite, but that it is to be found in the ordinary man and woman who make up our society.

These qualities of courage and imagination and of humility have more than anything else marked Dr. Wise's life. Whether it be the courage to fight for the rights of labor and the common man years before those rights were recognized, whether it be the imagination to see 50 years ago the inescapable need for a homeland for the Jewish people, or whether it be the humility which has led him to enlist with his fellow men of good will everywhere in every battle for justice and for freedom—Dr. Wise has given to this country, to the Jewish people and to the world, an outstanding example of the kind of leadership we need today. It is for that reason that I am so gratified to join with you in earnest tribute to him on this occasion.

I am particularly happy that I have the opportunity of paying that tribute at this dinner of organizations affiliated with the American Jewish Congress to which Dr. Wise has given so much of his abundant energies and his incomparable eloquence. I know something about the work of the movement. I know of the manner in which, at the end of the last war, you worked to assure the security of the Jewish people throughout the world. I know how your voice was among the very first to be raised in warning the world that the rise of nazism meant the death of liberty. And I have been hearing a good deal lately about the manner in which you are meeting the new and challenging tasks of the postwar period—how you are seeking to end the inequalities by which men are divided and to promote freedom for all groups, how you are developing new means of teaching people to live together in friendship and cooperation, how you are working to make possible a decent future for the Jewish people. These are aspirations which are shared by all earnest and honest people everywhere. These are programs which cannot fail to bring enduring benefit to all peoples.

War is always a tremendous and overwhelming catastrophe. But it is also a great opportunity. Our task is to compensate in some slight measure for the catastrophe by making utmost use of the opportunity—the opportunity to build better and stronger.

Already we have taken the first step in the formation of the United Nations. I refuse to be dismayed by the frictions and tensions that seem to emerge. Every additional day the nations sit together is additional schooling in world government. We must have a good deal of practice in world government before we can fully develop the habit. Practice at first is bound to be somewhat amateurish and inadequate.

We cannot achieve a genuine unity of the peoples of the world until all enjoy decent standards of living and social welfare and health. International economic development and reconstruction is not an act of charity toward less fortunate lands. It is an indispensable condition for the forging of a united world.

That is why I so warmly commend the program and the activities of the American Jewish Congress. By your efforts to raise and secure the status of the Jewish people throughout the world, you are not only bringing the hope of a decent future to a shattered people, you are helping to forge a world united by equality and freedom. Through your magnificent work in fighting for the democratic rights and security of all minority groups in this land, you are not only helping make democracy real for so many people, you are helping to assure the unity of our country. By your application of science to the problems of human relationships, you are not only helping local groups of all sorts to live together in harmony and brotherhood, you are developing basic principles of human cooperation.

This is a program which meets the challenging realities of a world challenged by the power man has created either to live together as one or to die. I wish you strength in that program. I hope particularly that Dr. Wise, who has been both its inspiration and its most eloquent spokesman, will continue to give it for many years his energy and enthusiasm and his leadership.

Shall We Let Britain Default Again?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JUNE 5, 1946.

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Daily we receive word of unrest in the displaced persons camps of occupied Germany. Explosions take place at various points, symptomatic of the mounting tension arising out of the enforced idleness of the displaced Jews, their status of indignity, their sense of not belonging anywhere, and the deferred action on getting them to Palestine where the great majority wish to go.

It is little wonder that such disturbances as the recent one in the Bavarian village of Oberammingen take place. Certainly, antisemitic feeling within that area is not dissipated; on the contrary, reports find such feeling aggravated. The military, duty-bound to keep law and order, find their task more difficult because of this situation. Evidence of irritation with this task is not lacking. It is not easy for anybody not in the position of the displaced person who has spent years in one camp or another, watched his family killed and his friends disappear to understand the depth of despair and panic experienced by the displaced person.

We could, perhaps, be asked to be more patient if a ready solution were not present. But that solution is present, and not only present but accepted. When a solution is available, is acceptable, and is accepted, what further reason exists for inaction? Over a month has passed since the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine recommended the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine. President Truman immediately accepted that recommendation. Foreign Minister Bevin, prior to the publication of that report, in the presence of Cabinet members of the British Government, had promised acceptance, if no minority report were issued.

Nothing has changed in existing conditions to warrant any further delay. We deferred to the wishes of the British when President Truman originally requested that 100,000 Jews be admitted, and we joined in the inquiry committee. Now, after months of delay occasioned by the work of the committee, we are again delayed by condition imposed upon condition. It is unseemly, in view of all the circumstances, that the United States Government be pushed around that way.

I believe it is time for us to put all our moral and political weight behind our insistence that the recommendations of the committee to admit 100,000 Jews into Palestine be acted upon at once. The longer we hesitate, the more conditions will be imposed until the recommendation itself will become a nullity.

The acute needs of the waiting 100,000 Jews demand immediate action. The task of our military grows more involved daily as the tension increases in the camps of the displaced persons. Finally, the United States Government, having committed itself to a course of action with regard to the admission of the 100,000 Jews into Palestine cannot now retreat without loss of moral and political prestige. There is no doubt, too, that inaction spells retreat.

With assurances of highest esteem, I am,
Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Sources of Criticism Against Mr. Snyder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Arthur Krock, published in the New York Times of yesterday, dealing with Mr. John Snyder, who has now been nominated to be Secretary of the Treasury. The article is captioned "Sources of the barrage against Mr. Snyder."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION

SOURCES OF THE BARRAGE AGAINST MR. SNYDER

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, June 5.—The New Deal economists, lawyers, and others who make up the intellectual division of that movement as

contrasted with its practical politicians are highly skilled in polemics.

Ever since they came to Washington in mass formation in 1933 they have ably used this talent in the press and on the radio to popularize their doctrines. But they have employed it as ably to denigrate the public standing of those in the Government whose views and policies have run counter to their own or who have acquired influence at the White House.

Sometimes this campaign of detraction is pursued openly. When, however, the intended victim is deeply entrenched in public confidence, or the campaigners run the risk of turning the President against them if they identify themselves with the barrage of disparagement, these New Deal intellectuals operate with even superior skill as an underground.

Items of inside information, carefully selected to give an unfavorable impression of the object of the immediate campaign, and frequently half-truths only, are fed to the people through willing channels. This destructive process continues until the man under attack has lost public standing and his influence with his associates, or has demonstrated invulnerability.

There have been numerous instances of this operation since the New Deal came to power 13 years ago. Cordell Hull successfully survived it, and for more than a decade Jesse H. Jones did also, though President Roosevelt finally and reluctantly gave the signal for his official execution.

There were others with varying fates. But in the recollection of this correspondent no high official has been under a steadier and heavier bombardment from these sources than the Director of Reconversion, John W. Snyder.

He has made no effort to refute the incessant attacks through the New Deal underground on his ability, capacity and character. Neither he nor any friend of his, insofar as this correspondent has been able to discover, has tried to counter the attack, even by passing out inside information which conceivably would put his official record more in balance.

Yet whenever some left wing counsel is rejected at the White House, or the President engages on an act or policy that runs into trouble in Congress or with the radical groups in the Democratic Party, Mr. Snyder is portrayed in certain sections of the press as the responsible villain.

If the national economy grows worse, some persuasion of his upon the President is cited—often in direct quotes—as the basic reason for this. If a bad or unpopular Presidential appointment is made, inside information is produced to prove that Mr. Snyder did it. If Mr. Truman dallies with labor troubles until they have exploded, in these reports it was Mr. Snyder who gave him the fatal advice.

If the President then proposes curbs which are denounced alike by management, labor, and office holders who must seek current reelection, Mr. Snyder is named as their author.

This press campaign so much resembles its predecessors, and its heroes are so suggestive of the New Dealers who played these parts before, that it seemed fair to inquire how Mr. Snyder appears to high officials with whom he is daily associated.

The inquiry was limited to those who have never engaged in previous underground attacks and to administrators who, though not classified as New Dealers, have at least never been the objects of such campaigns. The composite opinion given was about this:

Mr. Snyder is a realist who has refused to make his computations come out with predetermined answers to suit a political philosophy or planned economy. He is honest. He is neither subtle nor equivocal. He is definitely from Missouri when he analyzes the charts and tables with which the New Deal economists have often proved what they wanted to prove. And on one occasion at least he thought these statistics were the product of wish rather than fact and said as much to their compilers and to the President.

Last autumn the official New Deal line was that wages could be greatly increased—as many unions were demanding—without any general rise in prices. This was the theme of its economists and politicians and Secretary Wallace released a confidential report of the Department of Commerce purporting to show that there could be a general raise of 10 percent in industrial wages in 1946, and 15 percent in 1947, without any price advance. Chester Bowles, then the head of the OPA and now Director of Economic Stabilization, followed the line by resisting price increases in industries commensurate with greatly augmented costs of labor.

The President looked hopefully at the formula. What politician would not? No more wonderful solution of his troubles had ever been offered to an occupant of the White House. But Mr. Snyder said it was nonsense, as it was; proved it on paper as repeatedly since it has been proved in fact; and for a time he stood alone against Mr. Wallace, Mr. Bowles, and other advocates of or sympathizers with the contention.

He has intruded realism on other occasions. But this instance was unforgivable. Consequently he reads of himself daily as the man who does everything stupid, says everything wrong, and stumbles forever through the fog created by a dull and bumbling brain.

This explanation seems sound to one who has traced similar press campaigns to the same sources.

"Appeasing" Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject, "Appeasing" Labor, delivered on March 26, 1946, at Springfield, Mass., by Gilbert H. Montague, a prominent member of the New York bar, in a debate with Lee Pressman, general counsel of the CIO.

The facts set forth by Mr. Montague are well worth the review and consideration of every legislator charged with the responsibility of enacting labor laws which deal fairly with both capital and labor, who must be cooperative partners if the great business and industrial machine of the United States is to succeed and satisfactorily serve the American people.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"APPEASING" LABOR

Great Britain has no statute compelling an employer to bargain collectively, or providing for a closed shop or check-off, or compelling a workman to join a union as a condition of employment, or setting up machinery for conducting and settling labor disputes.

We in the United States today have statutes providing for all these things. And today we have infinitely more labor disorder than Great Britain has.

We used to be told that if union security could be assured, union responsibility would certainly follow.

In 1935 President Roosevelt signed the Wagner Labor Relations Act.

In 1936 labor spent $770,218 in the reelection of President Roosevelt.

In 1938 the Supreme Court held that the Norris-LaGuardia Act protects picketers, even when they are not employees, and that the Wagner Labor Relations Act authorizes the Board to make any "inference" from any evidence, even though such "inference" is contrary to the weight of evidence.

In 1940 the Supreme Court held that picketers may publicize any statements whatsoever against an employer, and that their right to picket and to publicize is the freedom of speech guaranteed by the first amendment of the Constitution, and cannot be abridged by Congress or by any State legislature. But the employer becomes subject to punishment under the Wagner Labor Relations Act when there is any evidence from which the Board might "infer" that some utterance of the employer "interfered" with unionizing activities.

In 1940 the Supreme Court disregarded 20 years' precedents, and held that labor was for the most part immune from the antitrust acts.

In 1941, the Supreme Court went further, and "inferred" in favor of labor a substantial repeal of the antitrust acts, spelling this extraordinary "inference" out of two other statutes of strictly limited scope and purpose.

In 1942 the Supreme Court held that sums extorted from truck drivers, under threats of assault and battery, should be regarded as "wages by a bona fide employer to a bona file employee," and that "interference" with such extortion would be "interference with traditional labor-union activities."

In 1942 the National War Labor Board began to require "maintenance-of-membership" clauses in labor contracts.

When Montgomery Ward refused to include these clauses in its labor contract, President Roosevelt addressed this communication to the company:

"As Commander in Chief in time of war, I direct Montgomery Ward & Co. to comply without further delay with the National War Labor Board's directive order of November 5, 1942."

But in 1944, when James Caesar Petrillo and his American Federation of Musicians refused to comply with the National War Labor Board's directive orders, President Roosevelt addressed this communication to Mr. Petrillo:

"The National War Labor Board and the Director of Economic Stabilization have not recommended Government possession and operation. Under the statute it must be found that the labor dispute unduly impeded the war effort. It is the opinion of the Director of Economic Stabilization that under all the present circumstances the noncompliance by your union is not unduly impeding the war effort. * * * Therefore, in the interest of orderly government and in the interest of respecting the considered decision of the Board, I request your union to accept the directive orders of the National War Labor Board."

It is not surprising that Mr. Petrillo and his American Federation of Musicians declined to comply.

In 1944 contributions from the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America and other members of the Congress of Industrial Organizations to its Political Action Committee in support of the election of President Roosevelt and Vice President Truman aggregated nearly $1,000,000.

Ten years' "appeasement" of labor has now brought us to this:

Today, it is also standard strike practice for a union to throw a mob of pickets around

a plant, and beat up any member of the clerical or supervisory or executive staff that seeks to exercise his lawful right to enter the plant.

Today, it is standard strike practice for the local police and the local city government to ignore this lawlessness as long as they can, and to put on a show of curbing it only after public opinion and the courts compel them to act.

In 1919 Gov. Calvin Coolidge became a national figure by declaring:

"There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, anytime."

"Let every inhabitant make known his determination to support law and order; that duty is supreme."

That was in 1919.

Today would any President or Governor dare to utter such ringing words?

Who is to blame for the present moral obtuseness, in which thousands of good American citizens are today floundering so unhappily?

The blame is not with the rank and file of American labor, for the heart of American labor has always been sound, and has always responded to correct moral leadership.

In all fairness, the blame cannot be placed unqualifiedly and unreservedly upon union labor leadership.

There is not much inducement for correct moral leadership in the Government's policy of always "appeasing" labor, and in Congress' timid acquiescence in that policy, and in the public's good-natured indifference to that policy.

It would appear to be asking too much of a labor leader to expect from him correct moral leadership, when he knows that the result may be his defeat and deposition from office by some rival aspirant who can safely assume that unprincipled and dishonorable tactics will incur only temporary opprobrium, and may win permanent position and great reward.

This is the enervating climate in which labor leaders have been nurtured for many years.

"Appeasement" can never be a long-run national policy.

"Appeasement" of the slave power from 1820 to 1860 led to the Dred Scott decision in 1857 and the Civil War in 1861.

"Appeasement" of fascism in our own day led to Munich in 1938, and World War II in 1939, and Pearl Harbor in 1941.

Whither is our present "appeasement" of the labor power carrying us?

When some group within the Nation becomes dissatisfied with some phase of our national policy, our normal course is to talk it out, and arrive at some adjustment on the basis of equal patriotism and mutual forbearance for all Americans.

But when we have negligently permitted some group within the Nation to gain the power and nourish the inclination to strangle our national life until this group gets what it wants, we must expect to pay the penalty of our negligence.

Since we then can no longer reach any adjustment on the basis of equal patriotism and mutual forbearance, we must instead "appease" that group, by offering it whatever rearrangements may be needed in order to satisfy it.

Equal patriotism and mutual forbearance having ceased to be a basis on which any appeal can be addressed to this group, it follows that these rearrangements must be strictly along lines dictated by this group—like the appeasement of the slave power from 1820 to 1860, and the Munich settlement with Hitler in 1938—and must be extensive enough to procure the satisfaction and acceptance of this group.

Combinations to raise costs and prices and charge them to the public used to be considered monopolistic.

If such combinations had also the power to strangle our national life, we used to think that the odium of their offense far outran the odium of monopoly.

But today, when labor raises costs and prices and charges them to the public, and then threatens to strangle our national life if it is not permitted to do so, we call it "the democratic way of doing things."

The first step toward a solution of our present difficulties is for all of us to get rid of our present complex of continually "appeasing" labor.

This is a man-size job, but equal patriotism and mutual forbearance for all Americans are principles that are native in American labor, just as they are native in every other branch of American life.

If American labor has temporarily forgotten them, it is only because we have all encouraged them to do so, and because good national manners, like good personal manners, are habits that can be learned, and forgotten, and relearned.

When this "appeasement" complex is deleted from our national policy American labor will quickly disown any inclination to strangle our American national life, and will be willing, like all other Americans, to talk over all questions and disputes and to arrive at a mutually satisfactory adjustment on the basis of equal patriotism and mutual forbearance for all Americans.

Report of Subcommittee of Security Council on Franco Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which appeared in the Washington Star of last night, written by Philip Marshall Brown, formerly professor of international law of Princeton University, which has to do with the important crisis in Spain and the report of the subcommittee of the Security Council of the United Nations respecting the question of Franco. I think the letter is a valuable contribution to the subject, and I am glad to offer it for the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER TO THE STAR

CALLS PROPOSED POLICY ON FRANCO A MONSTROUS INNOVATION

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

Allow me to express my entire agreement with your able editorial entitled "Report on Franco."

The report of the subcommittee of the Security Council of the United Nations concerning Franco Spain is astounding. It advocates the principle that the United Nations should dictate the kind of government any people should have.

If Franco is to be ousted because other governments do not like him, the same reasoning as logically might be applied to Stalin and other dictators.

This report does not consider Franco to be an existing threat to international peace, but rather as a potential menace. Just how impoverished and exhausted Spain with an ill-equipped army could be a threat is not made clear.

Franco may be as bad as he is charged and deserving of punishment for his aid to the Axis, but it is quite evident that this is a conspiracy by the government-in-exile, now enjoying the hospitality of France, to foment another civil war in Spain.

The policy recommended to the Security Council is a monstrous innovation in international relations. It is a denial of the fundamental, essential rights of democracy. It would mean the utilization of the United Nations for outside control of elections. It would constitute a perversion of the whole purpose of the United Nations as an agency for the peaceful relations of peoples.

The inspiration for so mad a policy is obvious. The Soviet Union, in its determination to undermine the capitalistic democracies, is seeking to accomplish through the United Nations what it failed to accomplish (by a narrow margin) during the late civil war in Spain when the Communists were in control of the republican government.

It is tragic to watch the murky fog of misrepresentation now spreading through the United States. Those who darken counsel with words of unwisdom are many and influential. Stalin, like Hitler, well knows the art of confusing the minds of good people living in a free country. We should be grateful for the outspoken words of such authorities as Secretary Byrnes, Senators CONNALLY and VANDENBERG, and John Foster Dulles, though they may not be believed by those credulous Americans whom Kravchenko, the author of I Chose Freedom, has characterized as innocent.

PHILIP MARSHALL BROWN.

Choice United States Compulsion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1946

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent editorial in the Atlantic City Press-Union which is a clear statement dealing with the choice that the Government faced during the railroad strike, and clears the air of a lot of hysterical exaggerations. The editorial follows:

CHOICE UNITED STATES COMPULSION

There is a great difference between a government acting from choice and a government acting from necessity.

The current political movement to control employer-employee disputes by law is one thing; the week-end preparation to oblige work in any industry which the Government has seized because it is indispensable to human life and public welfare, quite another.

We see no point to some of the hysterical arguments that President Truman would enslave America, destroy democracy, introduce fascism, etc. He had no choice. Absence of railroad transportation was threatening wholesale destruction regardless.

For democracies, war is a temporary suspension of the form of government. It becomes a military and economic dictatorship, not from choice, but by force of circumstances.

Likewise with any domestic emergency that similarly threatens the national existence itself and for which there is no other remedy.

The real Fascist danger lies in the intolerance of those who would have government

meddle in the freedom and rights of the governed from choice—when nothing is threatened except the fulfillment of their biased hopes based on greed and hate.

Address of Maj. Leo J. Hagerty, Jr., Before the United Nations Security Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 7, 1946

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Leo J. Hagerty, Jr., of Kenmore and Buffalo, N. Y., enlisted in the Army Air Forces in 1941 while at the University of Notre Dame, and subsequently served 33 months in the African, China-Burma, and European theaters during the war as a squadron commander. He piloted planes which dropped paratroops in the invasions of north Africa, Sicily, Salerno, and southern France, and at times served as aerial chauffeur for both General Eisenhower and General Patton. His combat record, a most unusual one, included total flights of 241 missions with 1,970 combat hours. His record of service includes the Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal with four Oak Leaf Clusters, and experience with partisans behind the lines in north Italy, Greece, Yugoslavia, and Austria. Major Hagerty is now the commander of the American Legion Post, No. 1370, while a student at the Columbia University Law School, and in view of his background it seems to me most fitting that he was chosen to speak before the United Nations Security Council at the recent anniversary dinner given by the State Department through the Independent Citizens Committee of the United Nations representatives.

I commend to you, therefore, his remarks on this occasion, which follow:

My first intention was to present to you, in all earnestness, the feelings of an American veteran returning from the last conflict. But in reality there is no basic difference between an American who has seen too many good men "go West," and the Eighth Army Britisher grinding along the desert road, the Russian combat pilot patroling his scorched homeland, or the Chinese infantryman trying again after 9 years of setbacks. They all know two things: It wasn't fun and they couldn't have done it alone.

Today they know two more things: The peace is just as tough to handle—and it can't be done alone. Even more unity and cooperation is required. By unity they mean a singleness of purpose among the great powers. Being practical, veterans do not believe that two-thirds or three-quarters of the earth makes a whole and in one world there must be a working basis found for cohesion among the big states.

For me this was a 400-mile-per-hour war. For others it was a one-hedgerow, one-street block-at-a-time war. Hedgerow or 400 miles per hour makes little difference now. Both are passe—obsolete. They belong with Caesar's forced marches, the Black Prince's dismounted men-at-arms in the history books. The new technique is silent, supersonic, missles and sudden oblivion—the first blow being the last.

Among veterans I have found no one with the slightest inclination to take a chance on such a war. What we ask of the UN is this: A tough, durable machinery for peace. We, the fighters, had your intense cooperation in winning the war, but the actual physical assaults were made, the battles carried by us. Now it is our turn to support you in your endeavor. But the actual responsibility lies with you.

If another war comes it will be an outcome of what happens in your councils now. The means of prevention is in your hands and we look to you to use it.

New Principles in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 7, 1946

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "New Principles in Politics," published in the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of May 29, 1946. The editorial deals with an address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at the annual communion breakfast of the Holy Name Society of the New York Post Office Department, at the Astor Hotel on Sunday morning, May 26, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW PRINCIPLES IN POLITICS

Last Sunday James A. Farley warned Members of Congress that they shirk their duty when through fear of being defeated at the polls they vote for measures in which they have no real faith. In the mind of the former Democratic national chairman, being reelected is not as important "as doing what is best for our country."

Mr. Farley, who knows politics and politicians better than any man in the United States, never spoke truer words. His conviction is that once elected to Congress, a Member represents all Americans and not simply the small constituency which elected him. True, a Member must represent his constituency, but he must never forget that he is helping to make the laws for the entire Nation.

There is confusion in the United States, lack of leadership and courage. If that can be cleared away, the former Postmaster General sees this Nation going ahead to the greatest period of prosperity we have ever known, "but if we fail, the whole world fails." He is not without hope, because while we are living in a sick world, we Americans are fortunate to be living in a great country.

Speaking in the same vein on what is best for our country, Monsignor Fulton J. Sheen said here last Sunday evening that "these are no times for cowards. Courage to act from principle is the quality most needed in American life." Politics must be decided on the basis of principle. "If you wish to keep your rights and liberties, you must also keep your God—that's what I mean by principle.

"We must begin now to declare our allegiance in a different way than in the past. First we based it on parties, Republican or Democratic, or others, which stood for certain ideals and beliefs. Now party labels no longer mean anything. Secondly, we had a class allegiance, and supported those who aided the class to which we belonged, capital or labor. Now the recent disputes have shown us there are not merely two sides to any problems, but three, capital, labor, and the public good.

"Today we must adhere not to party or to class but to principle as our guide. We must choose as leaders and representatives men who act from deep moral principle rather than expediency. Decide in favor of the man who has moral principles."

They are indeed right, for if ever there was a time when politicians should substitute the moral law for expediency in American life it is now. Without it we will surely fail.

Clarifying the Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. MATHEWS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 7, 1946

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter from Hon. Haldore Hanson, executive assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State, which has been received by me as a result of certain remarks which I extended in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 22 and May 24, 1946, relating to the financial structure of UNESCO. Obviously the State Department considers this question important enough to express its views, but whether as important as I consider it, I do not know. Obviously, too, it agrees with a vital point which I raised but not with other conclusions.

And I also include my reply to that letter because I believe the two letters together bring into clear focus a divergence between the State Department and myself not only on the subject of UNESCO, but on broad political philosophy.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, May 30, 1946.

The Honorable FRANK A. MATHEWS, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MATHEWS: Assistant Secretary Benton, before he left the city, saw your references in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning the financial procedures for UNESCO, and asked me to obtain for you the views of the Department on this provision.

The enclosed memorandum was prepared in the Department's Office of Special Political Affairs.

The United States as one member of UNESCO would play a part—probably a leading part—in working out the Organization's program and budget. The representatives of the United States would also participate in discussions of the equitable allocation of financial responsibility.

You are right, however, that the exact extent of American financial responsibility cannot be determined in advance, and the United States alone will not determine the amount of its contribution.

That is a choice which nations, like individuals, make in accepting membership in any fraternal or public-service organization. The dues are determined by the membership, not by each individual.

I am not sure that this fully answers your question. If it does not, might I discuss this with you? My telephone extension in the Department of State is 3368.

Sinncerely yours,

HALDORE HANSON,
Executive Assistant.

JUNE 6, 1946.

Hon. HALDORE HANSON,
Executive Assistant,
Assistant Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HANSON: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of May 30 giving me the views of the State Department on the financial procedures for the United Nations educational, social, and cultural organization, as the result of Assistant Secretary Benton's having read my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (May 22 and 24, 1946) on this subject.

I am particularly appreciative of the following paragraphs of your letter:

"You are right, however, that the exact extent of American financial responsibility cannot be determined in advance, and the United States alone will not determine the amount of its contribution.

"That is a choice which nations, like individuals, make in accepting membership in any fraternal or public-service organization. The dues are determined by the membership, not by each individual."

In drawing the analogy between an individual and this Government joining an organization you have thereby ignored the great fundamental difference which exists.

When I, as an individual American, join an organization I do so as a free citizen of a capitaiistic nation. The obligations I assume are my own; the money I spend, promise, or authorize others to spend or pledge for me, is my own. I have a right to do with it as I choose. Even if I spend it illegally and subject myself to punishment, I still have to account to no one for the money itself.

But as an official of the Government, I have no such rights over the taxpayers' money. That money is not mine to spend, pledge, or authorize others to spend as I choose or they choose. I have no authority over it whatsoever except by the provisions of the Constitution. And I find no authority in that Constitution, direct or implied, for me to delegate to others, particularly those who are not citizens of the United States, the authority to bind me to appropriate the money of the taxpayers of the United States in any amount, known or unknown, small or large, presently or in the future. It ought to be clear that any anticipated relative smallness of the amount cannot change the principle involved and that the question of whether or not the United States has the right to withdraw from the organization in the future can in no way affect the initial commitment.

In the distinction which I have drawn above lies the difference between us. It is a complete divergence in political philosophy. I, as a member of the House of Representatives, regard myself as a trustee for the money of the taxpayers, with absolutely no right to administer the fund save as provided in the Constitution. I cannot subscribe to the theory that I have been given a general power of attorney not only to sign blank checks but to delegate that power to others to sign blank checks for any project, through membership in an organization or otherwise, just because that project may appeal to me personally as a very lovely thing for the taxpayers to have for their money.

You, indeed have helped to clarify the issue.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK A. MATHEWS, Jr.

Displaced Jews in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter dated June 5, 1946, which I addressed to Hon. James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State, on the subject of displaced Jews now in camps in Germany.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 5, 1946.

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The situation of the displaced Jews now in camps in Germany has aroused the compassion of all Americans. Persecuted and tortured by the Nazis, today they continue to exist under circumstances which render it impossible for them to make even a start in the resumption of normal life. Recognizing this, President Truman urged the British Government to admit into Palestine the 100,000 Jews now in these camps. In response to this request, the British Government proposed the establishment of a joint Anglo-American committee of inquiry. The committee was formed under the sponsorship of the two Governments.

The Anglo-American committee has now, after an exhaustive investigation, made its report. In this report it has considered all aspects of the problem of Palestine as well as of the situation of Europe's Jews. Many of its recommendations are matters for the future. These may be a proper subject for further discussion. But this is not the case in regard to its conclusion that the problem of the displaced Jews now in Germany can only be solved by the immediate granting of 100,000 immigration certificates for Palestine.

This unanimous recommendation, which was unconditional, should be implemented at once. It cannot be permitted to wait on the fulfillment of any conditions, nor can it be permitted to be dependent on Arab consent. It must not be made the subject of further parleys. There is little or nothing which such discussions can add to what the committee of inquiry heard in the course of its investigations—or, indeed, to what was clear even before the constitution of that committee.

Every day's delay is critical for the people now in the displaced camps. There is no reason why they should be forced to remain in their present surroundings (in which they have no possible hope of rehabilitation) for 1 day longer than is necessary. I, therefore, urge you to use your good offices to secure the immediate implementation of this section of the report, and to obtain the cooperation of the Government of Great Britain for this purpose. I also urge that the United States offer such assistance as may be necessary for the immediate evacuation of those displaced Jews now in the camps of Germany and Austria, and their resettlement in Palestine.

Such action is required by the dictates of simple justice and humanity. It is necessary also if the two nations which sponsored the committee of inquiry are not to find themselves hopelessly compromised in the eyes of the world.

Sincerely yours,

BRIEN MCMAHON,
United States Senator.

OPA Regimentation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, until the OPA, with its press agents, left-wing propagandists with their program of limited production, is destroyed, root and branch, there will be continued and ever-increasing price inflation.

OPA regimentation is wrecking America. It is significant, is it not, that every Communist, every Red leader in the CIO and PAC, and every un-American radical is lending its aid to the drive. If the CIO had put the energy it has used in an endeavor to aid private enterprise that it has to destroy it, the people of this rich United States would not be drifting toward a starvation level. I call attention to some facts presented by a successful businessman in the congressional district which I represent. Under unanimous consent, I present his statement of facts as a part of my remarks:

JUNE 5, 1946.

Hon. DANIEL REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We do not believe that any thinking person wishes to quarrel with the intent of the act or dispute the necessity of price-ceiling regulations. A great deal of good has been accomplished. On the other hand, it is equally true that under the present statutes and under the present method of administration unnecessary hardships have been inflicted.

As the President of a concern employing over 400 persons, operating three public restaurants, and supplying in-plant food service to over 55,000 industrial workers in the Buffalo-Niagara frontier, we submit the following instances where OPA has inflicted needless hardships upon us and our customers:

1. Our ceiling prices and menu were frozen by OPA as of April 10, 1943. At that time there was a severe shortage of meat, and our menu selection and meat portions had been reduced to meet this situation.

Later meat became more plentiful. Ration-point values were reduced. It was possible for us to add to the meat items on our menu and increase the size of the portions. In a certain large heavy industry where the workmen needed substantial meals they, through their union, requested that we add meat items then available to our menu and to increase the size of the meat portion of their dinners. A satisfactory agreement was arrived at between the union and ourselves by which we agreed to serve the workmen more meat and to increase the price of the dinner in an amount equivalent to the actual cost of this additional meat. (There was to be no additional profit, just the additional cost of the actual meat served.) We requested permission from the OPA to make this increase, presenting all the facts—our request was denied.

2. In accordance with OPA regulations we submitted certified operating statements showing that a certain restaurant was operating at a loss. We requested permission to make certain price increases on the menu that would bring our prices in line, not above, but equal to, prices charged for similar items in other similar restaurants. After a wait of 3 months our request was denied on the grounds that we had not proven the closing of this restaurant would cause the public inconvenience.

3. Under the present regulations we are required to absorb unreasonable increases in the cost of materials. A typical example is apple pie. Our ceiling price as of April 3, 1943, is 10 cents. The price of fresh apples has advanced from $1 a bushel to $5.50 a bushel. Under the present regulations we cannot obtain individual price adjustments. We can only seek relief after we have operated at a loss for 3 months.

4. We can testify from actual experience that the black market has prevented our regular suppliers from supplying us meat and produce necessary for healthful nutritious meals to industrial workers. Only because the plants have been closed down by strikes and other delays in their reconversion program, has prevented this situation from becoming very serious. With the resumption of work in these plants, a solution to this problem must be found.

We and other restaurant operators need immediate relief.

We are not for the abandonment of all price controls; but we do feel that obvious and proven errors in the administration of the present laws should be corrected.

Your efforts to cause the passage of an improved and more equitable OPA will be appreciated by your constituents and the Nation.

Respectfully yours.

Believe It or Not

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following brief editorial from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of Tuesday, June 4, 1946:

DOES THIS MAKE SENSE?

We recommend the following incident, which has just occurred to a Fort Wayne man, to those few newspaper letter writers who have approved continuance of the OPA:

This man happens to have two refrigerators and wants to dispose of one. The Office of Price Administration, after due research through its files of price tables, and after much head scratching and other gestures of thoughtful consideration, told him that he can ask $39.50 for the box. The one-half horsepower motor on it alone sells for $48, and he is allowed to sell this for $35, making the rest of the box worth, according to the bureaucrats, just $4.50.

The box is in no need of reconditioning, but for curiosity's sake the owner asked OPA what he could get for it if he had it worked over. What he found out left him groggy. The reconditioning would cost $90, and after that he could get only $76.50 for the refrigerator. Hence, if he did get it reconditioned, he would lose $13.50 of the servicing expense—and the entire value of the box as well.

Should OPA be continued. You say it.

Wilmington Housing Authority Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News of June 7, 1946:

HOUSING PROJECT FAMILIES PROTEST NOTICES TO MOVE—125 EASTLAKE RESIDENTS ASK COUNCIL TO DELAY, PREVENT MASS EVICTION—WHA EXECUTIVE SECRETARY SAYS LETTERS MERELY ASK TENANTS FIND OTHER HOMES

All of the families which moved into Eastlake and Southbridge, the original Wilmington Housing Authority projects here, under the Government's war emergency housing program will have to move out to make way for Wilmington's low-income families, city council was informed last night.

Notification to council came by way of a petition signed by 125 in-migrant war-worker residents of Eastlake. The petition protested a recent notice sent to all families by the WHA and asked council to use what authority it could find to prevent or at least delay any mass eviction.

But Arthur J. Scotton, executive secretary of the WHA, who attended the meeting and who was called upon by Robert L. Armstrong, ninth ward, for a statement on the agency's position, said that the picture for the Eastlake families was not quite so black as the petition indicated.

LETTERS EXPLAINED

Mr. Scotton presented the following facts:

The projects were built originally for low-income families. When war was declared in December 1941, Congress amended the Federal Public Housing Act to allow war workers, brought into this community and others, to use the homes. Now that the war is over the Federal Government may at any time order a reversion to the low-income policy. When this occurs the WHA will be forced to order eviction. The notices sent out May 23 were actually requests for cooperation from the tenants in finding other homes. The WHA does not have the authority of itself to order eviction.

After these essential facts were placed before the meeting several councilmen queried Mr. Scotton as to what share of the rents the city will receive if the projects revert to their original low-income status.

It was pointed out by Albert T. Strawbridge, twelfth ward, that while the war workers have lived in the 380 houses involved the city has received more than the 3 percent of shelter rent that it had been guaranteed under the city-Federal contract of 1941.

In answer, Mr. Scotton emphasized that the agreement calls for only 3 percent, in lieu of taxes, and that additional sums paid the city during the war were merely policy on the part of the WHA.

RETURN TO OLD STATUS OPPOSED

Mr. Strawbridge then said that he thought it was wrong to raise taxes throughout the city and allow the projects to return to their old status.

Later, Mr. Scotton said that the policy of the WHA as to preferment in the projects was to give veterans who fall in the low-income group the priority.

When he had finished two spokesmen for a delegation of some 25 of those who had signed the petition presented their difficult position, pointing out that eviction now is equivalent to rendering the families homeless because of the stupendously high rents and sale prices for houses.

Council took no action in the matter and after the meeting several members, while expressing sympathy for the plight of the tenants, said that council actually has no authority, that the Federal Government sets the policy involved.

ASK PROPERTY BE USED

In another matter touching on housing, council received a letter from E. W. Parvis, 13 West Seventeenth Street, stating that the city should not allow the property at Twelfth and Market Streets, southeast corner, to continue unused and a hazard to health when it could be remodeled and repaired and used to house the families of three veterans.

This was the second time in 2 weeks that the property has been referred to in complaints from residents of the sixth ward. Once again the matter was referred to the city solicitor.

Council received a petition signed by 14 residents of the area of Ninth and West Streets protesting use of Pythian Castle, 908 West Street, as the new health center for the State board of health. The board is required to move from its present site at Eighth and Orange Streets. This petition was referred to the city solicitor.

A letter was received from John W. Reutter, 229 West Forty-first Street, asking that Todds Lane, between Mendinhall Avenue and Bowers Street, be rezoned because the petitioner wants to build a storage garage. This was referred to the zoning commission.

At the request of Muncipal Court Judge Thomas Herlihy, Jr., council placed Harry Kety, 2500 West Street, on the city pay roll as a special court officer replacing Harry A. Wright. Council placed Mrs. A. Elizabeth Capuano on the department of health pay roll as a clerk and stenographer replacing Miss Marjorie A. Jones who resigned. A salary increase, in view of her city employment of 6 months, was ordered by council as of July 1 for Miss Betty J. Irwin, secretary to the city solicitor.

Council heard the first and second readings of an ordinance which will increase the fees for licenses granted to firemen and engineers whose qualification pass the tests of the board of examining stationary engineers. The ordinance also provides an increase in salary for the three members of the board who meet once a week throughout the year.

The report of City Treasurer Alexander R. Abrahams showing a current balance of $513,699.36, with collections for the past week totaling $7,211.34, was read.

S. 2033

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. GIFFORD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1946

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chemical and Engineering News of May 10, 1946:

BAA, BAA, BLACK SHEEP

The old nursery rhyme which divided the three full bags of wool among the master, the dame, and the little boy down the lane will have to be modernized to include a cut for the Department of Agriculture if S. 2033, a bill recently introduced by Senator O'MAHONEY, becomes a law. The proposed measure allegedly undertakes to correct certain marketing and economic disadvantages under which the western wool grower at the present time is operating, but contains provisions which would put the Department of Agriculture in further direct competition with the independent consultants and testing laboratories of this country. If the Department is given such authority in one commodity it is reasonable to suppose that such powers eventually will be extended to all raw materials.

Under section 9 of the O'Mahoney bill the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to expand and intensify research and studies, and to engage in demonstration work, as to problems relating to the production, processing, preparation, manufacturing, standardization, grading, marketing, and utilization of wool, mohair, sheep pelts, goat pelts, and products thereof, including studies of competing materials and manufacturers and including the establishment and maintenance of laboratories and pilot plants. In carrying out such operations, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with and enter into contracts with public and private organizations.

Under section 10 the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, after investigation and due notice and opportunity for a hearing, to fix and establish types and standards of quality and condition for the grading of wool, mohair, wool tops, and mohair tops, and to conduct tests for the shrinkage, clean content, length and fineness of fiber, and any other characteristics of wool, mohair, wool tops, and mohair tops. Section 10 further provides that the standards fixed and established by the Secretary shall be published in the Federal Register and 60 days after such publication shall become the official wool and mohair standards of the United States.

The most objectionable part of the bill, however, is contained in part (b) of section 10. "Any person who has custody of or a financial interest in any wool, mohair, or tops therefrom, may submit the same or samples thereof, drawn in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture, to such officer or officers of the Department of Agriculture as may be designated for the purpose pursuant to the rules and regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture for a determination of the true grade shrinkage, or clean content, including the comparison thereof, if requested, with types or with other samples submitted for the purpose. The final certificate of the Department of Agriculture showing such determination shall be binding on officers of the United States and shall be accepted in the courts of the United States as prima facie evidence of the true type grade or comparison thereof when involved in any transaction or shipment in commerce. The Secretary of Agriculture shall make rules and regulations for submitting samples of wool, mohair, or tops therefrom for typing or grading."

It is plain that the Department of Agriculture, if the measure is passed as now written, will be in competition with consultants and testing laboratories (small businessmen). The small businessman of the chemical industry, the consultant and owner of a testing laboratory, faces a black-looking future. Apparently he intentionally or otherwise has been selected by those who pose as the friend and champion of small business as the No. 1 sacrifice on the altar of bureaucracy. The proposed O'Mahoney wool bill is but one straw in the wind. The Department of Agriculture, according to information which the editors of this publication believe to be reliable, is engaged at this very moment in direct competition with private testing laboratories in the Chicago area which specialize in egg analyses. It is becoming increasingly evident that determined efforts will be made to carry over into peacetime operation, and in direct competition with private enterprise, many of the department's testing laboratories started during the war to pass on government purchases.

The Department of Agriculture is not the only Government agency providing direct competition to the small businessman in the chemical industry.

On March 22 the Philadelphia office of the Technical Advisory Service, Department of Commerce Office of Small Business, forwarded to us a request for data, aside from that contained in confiscated enemy patents, on methods of manufacturing progesterone, testosterone, and estradiol. Our answer was the suggestion that the firm interested in these products employ a capable consultant. In a letter dated April 1, we were in effect told that we did not understand the operations of the Technical Advisory Service and that a representative of the Washington headquarters would contact us to explain the plan. To date we have not been contacted—and therefore remain unconverted.

The outlook for thousands of men and women, members of the chemical profession, is none too bright. After years of study and experience they are engaged as small professional businessmen and women in performing services for industry. They face increasing competition from Government departments and agencies. The word "research" intrigues the politician, even though he knows little about its many ramifications. He is ignorant of, or chooses to ignore, the fact that the consultant is a small businessman and will be eliminated if Government takes over his means of livelihood. The politician would lead the general public to believe that the chemical industry is solely composed of gigantic enterprises. Nothing is further from the truth. In the category of small businessmen are thousands of independent consultants who are vitally important to industry, both large and small, if the idea of private enterprise is to remain paramount in the American way of life.

At this point perhaps we should all rise and sing to the tune of the old Yale ditty, and more recently adopted by the air cadets:

We are poor little consultants about to lose our way
Baa, Baa, Baa
We are little black sheep who have lost our pay
Baa, Baa, Baa
Gentlemen researchers out of a job, damned from here to Eternity
God have mercy on such as we
Baa, Baa, Baa.

The State of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 7, 1946

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Journal-American of June 3, 1946:

THE STATE OF THE NATION

If an old-line Republican or Democrat—a Jefferson, a Lincoln, a Cleveland, or a Theodore Roosevelt—were called to the White House today as President of the United States, he would have only one duty to perform.

But that duty would be all-encompassing, for it would be to save the Republic from disintegration and decay in order to restore and to preserve the liberties of the people.

The President's first action in the performance of his duty would be to address to the Congress and to the people—as the Constitution requires—a message on the State of the Nation.

And it would not be the kind of message that Congress has been receiving for the last several years.

This message would say—"The Republic is in extreme peril, and the welfare of the people is imperiled equally.

"The evils that afflict us, because of betrayals by our leaders, are numerous and enormous.

"We are overladen with public debts, due to a fantastic fiscal policy called 'deficit financing' which cheapens the value and rots away the integrity of our money and inflicts upon us a ruinous condition of inflation.

"In the long past many strong governments have been emaciated and many wealthy lands have been impoverished by this insidious yet avoidable economic disease.

"We are distracted by widespread and wasteful labor strife—a form of demoralizing but preventable class warfare—which impairs our competent and useful industries, which diminishes the earnings and savings of our workers, which deprives our population of desirable and essential articles of life and comfort, which disturbs the concord and the progress of our national existence, and which makes worse and worse the inflationary malady from which we already suffer so severely.

"By consequence we have seen our most 'responsible' magistrates cringing and bowing to a little group of arrogant labor bosses who dare to assert and to exercise the sovereign power of taxation.

"We are burdened with the exactions and conscriptions of an arbitrary bureaucracy which controls the quality and prices of the food we eat, of the clothes we wear, and of the houses we hope to inhabit; which drives honest merchants out of business or into the murky mazes of lawless black marketing; and which treats our once free citizenry as if they were serfs without recourse to God or man.

"In our relations with other countries the record is the same—incompetent, bewildered, and inglorious.

"Our 'diplomatists' go boastingly abroad on self-chosen missions—and return to us baffled, beaten, and humiliated.

"Great victories won for us by our soldiers and sailors in foreign climes are lost to us in the chancelries of foreign capitals.

"We mortgage our own future to pay tribute to alien powers in the guise of loans or grants—and fail to buy the very things we barter for.

"We involve ourselves in strange foreign complications, such as supergovernmental institutions to construct our trade and our energies—and thereby invite the shoddy competition of low-wage areas to undermine in our domestic marts the prosperity of our high-wage system.

"No nation can long endure as a free and respected society which makes—or permits its leaders to make—so many fatuous blunders in the name of public policy.

"All this must be changed, so that the American people may recover and retain their historic birthrights.

"We must reaffirm and steadfastly defend the immortal precepts of our Federal Constitution.

"We must enact statutes that will dispense justice equally in the common interest of all, and turn back the rising tide of anarchy or of revolution.

"We must cleanse the closets of our Government of the servants and subordinates of alien ideologies.

"We must regain our national independence in the councils of the world and we must reestablish among ourselves the practices and the principles of government by law and not by men.

"If we in public office fail to do our duty, we shall be as traitors to our trust and shall deserve and shall have everlasting obloquy as enemies of the America which our forefathers founded."

Does It Pay to Cooperate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 7, 1946

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the present administration settles each successive major strike by making new concessions. It appears that each concession is accepted by labor as a partial payment on a debt the administration owes it for past support. Each labor crisis is the inevitable consequence of the 12-year appeasement program the administration has carried on toward labor. Our present labor mess can be summed up by saying, "Those who cooperate with the administration lose out; those who refuse to cooperate are given everything they ask." The following examples are cited as a basis for this conclusion:

(a) Farmers who cooperated with the administration and sold their wheat and corn at Government fixed prices as a patriotic duty got gypped, while farmers who held on were given a 30-cent premium per bushel for holding on—a black-market price paid by the administration itself.

(b) The A. F. of L., cooperating with the administration reconversion program last fall in an effort to speed up full-time peace production, negotiated modest wage increases without work stoppages. The CIO–UAW refused to cooperate with the administration, broke their contracts, forced Nation-wide tie-ups, and won a 20-percent wage boost. This was accomplished with the help of a false report gotten out by Henry Wallace and his Department of Commerce assistants.

(c) Seventeen railroad brotherhoods accepted an arbitration award of a 16-cent hourly wage raise, but the Whitney and Johnston railroad groups, after tieing up the whole railroad system of America, received an 18½-cents-per-hour increase—and are still not satisfied.

(d) John L. Lewis, after blustering and bellowing and closing the coal mines, was rewarded by getting more than he expected—a welfare fund, a liberal wage increase, and better working conditions. However, the public will now have to pay 35 cents more per ton for its coal.

The only conclusion one can draw from these facts is that it does not pay a labor union to cooperate with the administration, but it does pay a labor union to make trouble if it gives the administration its support politically.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial taken from the DeKalb Daily Chronicle, a newspaper published in my district, expresses very clearly and bluntly the thoughts and feelings of the people back home concerning our present-day labor mess. It also states what they think about the way our labor problems have been handled by President Truman and his advisers. How long will our patient American voters stand for this pussyfooting and favoritism on the part of the New Deal administration in its dealings with our arrogant overreaching labor leaders?

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE POLITICAL OUTLOOK

For a very long number of years we have been interested in watching the political maneuvers of the State and Nation. Now after the past week or so we can say that we guess we have seen about everything.

Laying aside all considerations of right or wrong in the strike mess and just looking at the political implications of the wrangling we must confess that the situation has us dizzy.

Here is President Truman, a nice friendly guy who has some mistaken ideas and some crummy advisors, faced with a huge economic problem which has its roots deep in the mess of national politics. Lewis strikes the coal men and in a little while Whitney and his stooge, Johnston, call the rail workers out.

Then the President goes before the Congress and puts on an act bawling out Whitney to the plaudits of the Congressmen, interpolating his rousing castigation with an announcement that the rail strike has been settled (a fact that he knew and the Congress knew before he began to speak).

This is all current history. The funny thing to us is the fact that we see Mr. Truman taking his shillalah and knocking the eternal stuffing out of Whitney and advising him and the Nation that he (Whitney) is several kinds of a dirty so and so, when all the time Whitney has been for Truman and the New Deal administrations.

Lewis pulls off rough stuff, even worse than Whitney's, for a longer time and is avowedly against Truman, but in his dealings with the administration it is, "Yes, Mr. Lewis," and "All right, Mr. Lewis," and old shaggy eyebrows gets more than he was willing to settle for when the strike started.

Just what the strategy means we are at a loss to imagine. We would think that if the President was to put on his Tarzan clothes and pose as the strong man he would stage his performances at the expense of the wily Lewis or at least including him in the lashing. It's a cinch he can never get the support of Lewis and he has alienated one of his long-time friends. So far as the rights and the wrongs are concerned, both were culpable, with the emphasis, if any, on Lewis.

But the miners' boss has added the scalp of another President to his collection and can now begin to frame up the possibilities in the demand line for the next flare-up, which is due in a year.

And you, gentle reader, can watch for the time when you will get the bill for the show.

Address of Secretary of War Patterson at Commencement Exercises of the United States Military Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. E. THOMASON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 7, 1946

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War, at the commencement exercises, United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., Tuesday, June 4, 1946:

The war was in full course when you entered West Point. No one could say how long it would last. The German and Japanese military machines were powerful. They still held the greater part of the gains they had won. The Allies had stronger resources, however, both in manpower and materials, and were indicated to win in the long run, provided they could bring their resources to bear in time and provided they should prove to have the required military leadership. The resources were brought to bear in time, and it soon became evident that they had the leadership.

The country looks to West Point for leadership. It has trusted West Point to furnish that guidance for 140 years. It has never found its trust betrayed. Not all leadership in the Army has come from here. We get leadership from many sources—from other colleges and institutions, from the ranks and from civilian life. They all make their contributions. In this free country selection for leadership in military life, as in other pursuits, rests on proven merit, and there is no monopoly in any one location. Nevertheless, the military standards to guide American military leaders are those developed at West Point.

The severest test of battle leadership is battle itself, and in this war 10,000 men in the ranks proved under fire their fitness to command. They were commissioned on the spot. Their education and their training must have helped them, but those factors were of no great moment compared to their behavior in the turmoil of close fighting.

In the Buna campaign in 1942 the first company to break through the Japanese bunkers and drive to the sea was led by a sergeant. No one could gainsay his right to command, and he was made a captain then and there. It would have been idle to send him to officer's candidate school for a test of his ability to lead a company.

Under peacetime conditions, in the absence of a battle laboratory, we depend on training and education for leadership to give us the sort of men we need. West Point has never failed to give America that type of leader.

The training at West Point has instilled in its graduates the unchanging truths of duty, honor, country. It has endowed them with a resolution for growth and development, too. The new course, with its more insistent direction to the humanities and social sciences, should accelerate the adjustment of the newly commissioned second lieutenant to the Army of today and give stimulus to his capacity to command.

The Nation's need for sound military leadership was never more pressing than in 1940. It had become plain enough that Germany and Japan were determined on world rule and that this country would soon have the choice of resistance or submission. The Army had reached a strength of 250,000, with four half-strength divisions and an air force of 45,000. The Army was destined to grow to 8,000,000. The four half-strength divisions were to become 89 full-strength divisions. The Air Force would become 2,000,000. These would form, on ground and in air, the most powerful military force that man has ever know.

In that grave crisis men capable of growth and ready to take firm action were needed. They were found in the nucleus of Army officers then on active duty.

The fortunes of war were to be with us. The campaigns in Africa, Europe, and the Pacific committed the Army to 28 landing operations against enemy resistance. The

names recall to our minds the hazards and difficulties—Sicily, Salerno, Anzio, Normandy, Leyte, and many others. In none of these, or in the heavy fighting that followed, did our forces ever suffer a major defeat. Every operation was a success.

This is not spoken in a spirit of complacence, and there is no suggestion that errors were not made. It is referred to because at present we are passing through one of our chronic postwar periods of censure. Sharp criticism of everything the Army did in waging war is the fashion of the day, most of the criticism coming from individuals who never served and had no notion of serving. That form of sport will pass. But unbalanced judgments will be formed unless account is also taken of the fact that the prime purpose of the armed forces is to win without excessive loss of life. In that purpose the Army won a success without precedent in our history, and this is proof enough of the character of the military leadership. It could not have succeeded if there had been anything radically wrong with our leadership, and I mean the leadership supplied by those in uniform. I have never known it to fail that a general who lacks leadership has an ineffective army, and the rule holds good right down to the corporal and his squad.

The military mind in this war was not the closed mind, the mind in the rut, with lack of imagination, lack of adaptability to suggestion. I say this without reserve, from constant contact with those up and down the chain of command.

The advances made in weapons between 1941 and 1945 were the broadest ever registered. To American science and industry we are bound to give unstinted credit for what was achieved. But the part taken by the military should not be overlooked. The men in uniform pointed out the particular needs for more effective weapons. They shared in development and design. The all-important decisions to adopt the new weapons and use them in battle were almost entirely theirs. The hand of invention reached nine-tenths of the weapons used in the war. The closed mind, I submit, would have finished the war with the same armament we started with.

There was a parallel readiness to adopt strategy and tactics to the stubborn facts and to the new weapons that became available. The heavy losses sustained in the operation of the Eighth Air Force against the Schweinfurt ball-bearing works proved the need of additional protection for long-range bombers. The success of our attack on centers of German industry was at stake. No time was lost in engineering the long-range fighter to cover the bombers. On the ground the development of new tactics for destruction of hostile strong points was an instance of the same sort. I have taken these cases at random. I could call up many others. There were some blemishes, but the record read in its entirety demolishes the charge of the closed mind.

The leadership took account of the dignity and decency of the individual soldier. Our Army goes far beyond the practices of any other army in this regard, and this will be conceded by the most severe ex-GI critic who saw anything of foreign armies. The policy was to bring out the better traits of character. This policy was extended down even to the maladjusted, most of whom would have had their troubles in civilian life, too. The Army salvaged 30,000 men convicted of serious offenses and sentenced to imprisonment and dishonorable discharge with benefit both to the military establishment and to the soldiers so given a new chance. This number does not include the numerous cases overseas where offenders were taken from stockades and restored to honorable service.

There is room for improvement in relationships between commissioned and noncommissioned personnel. The Doolittle Board report is a thoughtful discussion of inadequacies and of remedies. The soundness of most of the recommended measures will not be disputed by Army command, and I have not the slightest fear that they will lead to impairment of discipline. The American soldier has always had a wholesome respect for authority based on competence.

The discipline characteristic of the American soldier was commented on by Steuben 160 years ago, and his words are as true today as when they were written:

"The genius of this Nation is not in the least to be compared to Prussians, Austrians, or French. You say to one of your soldiers 'Do this,' and he doeth it; but here I'm obliged to say: 'This is the reason why you ought to do this,' and then he does it."

West Point is graduating you today to take your part in the leadership of this Army. You have every reason to be proud of that leadership. Your commissions have been earned by hard application and hard work. Many of you have already seen Army life in the field. The Army traditions that were gained in this war are traditions that you helped to build. The service you are called to render is of momentous importance to the Nation. We must not forget that when other methods of conducting international relations have broken down, the destiny of our country has depended on armed strength. Secretary Hull put the point plainly when he said, a few days before Pearl Harbor, that his efforts with the Japanese were exhausted and that he was obliged to turn the matter over to the Army and Navy. You will not cause war. You will help avert war. Soldiers no more cause wars than firemen cause fires or policemen cause crimes.

In closing, I submit a paper styled "Creed Adopted by the Officers of the American Army." It was drafted at Verplancks Point, 20 miles from here, the date 1782. It has its worth in 1946.

"We believe that there is a Great First Cause by whose almighty will we are formed, and that our business here is to obey the orders of our superiors. We believe that every soldier who does his duty will be happy here, and that every such one who dies in battle will be happy hereafter. We believe that George Washington is the only fit man in the world to head the American Army. We believe that the evacuation of Ticonderoga was one of those strokes which stamp the man who dares to strike them with everlasting fame. We believe that Baron Steuben has made us soldiers, and that he is capable of forming the whole world into a solid column and deploying it from the center. We believe in his Blue Book. We believe in General Knox and his artillery. And we believe in our bayonets. Amen."

I spent 3 years in the Army, in my younger days. Those were the most useful years in my life. I owe the Army more than I can express in words.

Representative Ploeser and the OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1946

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I extend an article by Robert B. Armstrong, Jr., chief of Globe-Democrat Washington bureau, from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of June 2, 1946, entitled "Representative PLOESER and the OPA."

REPRESENTATIVE PLOESER AND THE OPA

(By Robert B. Armstrong, Jr., chief of Globe-Democrat Washington Bureau)

WASHINGTON, June 1.—Representative WALTER C. PLOESER, St. Louis Congressman on the House Appropriations Committee and member of the Select Committee on Investigation and Study of the Problems of Small Business, is still fighting the campaign of obfuscation, misrepresentation, emotionalism, propaganda, and power politics which entrenched bureaucracy has used in its attempt to maintain its control of the Nation's economy through the OPA.

As the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency reworks the OPA extension bill by amending it more and more in the form of the measure approved by the Representatives—save for a year's extension instead of 9 months—PLOESER is convinced that the truth about the action of the House is still difficult to find.

He is also convinced that if the Senate will pass a measure similar to the House bill, time will prove the administration spokesmen's threats, warnings, and claims are as false as the statement that the House killed price control.

Despite the screams of anguish from the bureaucrats and professional "bleeding-hearts," the House action did not kill price control. From the bureaucratic standpoint, the crime was much more heinous. The House defined the powers of OPA and specifically told the Price Administration what it could not do to profits.

When the House removed the carte blanche that OPA had enjoyed during the war in the control of national economy, it specifically prevented OPA from forcing producers and distributors to operate at a loss. Whereat the extreme left, along with half-informed emotionalists, went into a war dance designed to frighten the shirts—if any remain—off the backs of the unsuspecting citizenry.

Another provision of the House OPA measure prohibited bureaucratic orders which would force retailers, who form the backbone of the American profit system, to take up increased costs of production from their own incomes. PLOESER has pointed out that this provision is a proper one if small business is to stay in business.

PLOESER and many of his colleagues in Congress have personal knowledge of many small businessmen who have quit because they could not operate under the stringent theory of OPA. These are not business failures—these who were forced to give up did so while they were still solvent—and there are therefore no adequate records. Still, informed estimates would rate these business cessations in the many thousands throughout the country.

PLOESER has made the point that Chester Bowles, former head of OPA and now Stabilization Director, along with Paul Porter, present OPA head, have passed the position of argument and are depending on the siren songs of propaganda and psychological fear drives.

Certainly Bowles' crack after the passage by the House of the OPA bill that it was the first step "in a joy ride to disaster" had the effect of impressing the public that the House of Representatives was suffering from a mass attack of "five o'clock shadow" and just wasn't keeping itself dainty enough to get dates with voters.

As an example of the fuzzy-minded technique of emphasizing the good on the side of the bureaucratic angels and scaring the customers into buying more of the same, PLOESER cited the interchange between himself and Bowles when he charged that the head of the Office of Price Administration was advocating action which would lead to fascism in this country.

Speaking at Yale University in May of 1944 on the role of Government after the

war, Bowles was quoted as saying: "I am profoundly concerned, lest in our eagerness to shed ourselves of wartime government and give free reign to initiative and enterprise after the war, we conceive the role of government too narrowly and cut the scope of powers of government too sharply."

Bowles was also quoted as saying: "Only government can provide the assurance, no, the guaranty, that postwar collapse will be prevented. * * * This does not mean that government, while making broad commitments, need not be prepared only for limited action. On the contrary, it means that government must be prepared to take whatever action, however broad and far reaching it may turn out to be, that is necessary to sustain a high level of industry and farm activity. For guaranties can carry no persuasion unless there is machinery available to make good on them. We must therefore set up that machinery and set it up on the basis so sound and so strong that no one can doubt that through it the level of business activity and national income could be sustained if the need arose."

These and other extracts from Bowles' speech added up to a trend toward fascism to PLOESER. He said so publicly in a speech shortly afterward at Chicago.

Bowles promptly denied any such intent and asserted that, "I don't believe there is any individual who is more thoroughly frightened of the tendency toward fascism and Fascist thinking than I am."

Bowles also demanded a retraction. He added: "I feel strongly that the less government interferes with the flow of business and commerce, the better." To clinch these statements he enclosed a copy of the speech from which PLOESER quoted newspaper-printed excerpts.

The quotes the St. Louis Congressman used were all there, word for word, including Bowles' demand for Government machinery "however broad and far reaching it may be."

PLOESER refused the retraction and told Bowles: "You obviously proposed in your speech the extension of broad over-all government control of business and the economy. How you can preach two doctrines is difficult for me to understand. Usually such preachments have for their base a gross misunderstanding of what constitutes a free, competitive economic system."

So there would be no misunderstanding, PLOESER added this definition of a Fascist economy: "It has been ably said that fascism was and is a form of organized society (1) capitalist in character, (2) designed to make the capitalist system function at top capacity, (3) using the device of state-created purchasing power through government debt, (4) and the direct planning and control of the economic society through corporativism, (5) with militarism and (6) imperialism imbedded in the system as an inextricable device for employing a great mass of the employables."

PLOESER made his position then abundantly clear by telling Bowles that, "Your speech and letter indicate to me that you are drifting into this definition. This is a great disappointment to me because with your business background I had hoped that you would be a true disciple of a free, competitive economy. Until some words of yours very clearly indicate differently, I see no occasion for my defense of your postwar policy."

PLOESER admits he was not greatly surprised, that after the House laid down specifications for decontrol of prices when supply reaches the point where it will do the job itself, that he and others who voted for it were classed with Nation-wreckers by irate OPAsters who saw their supreme economic command being taken from them.

But PLOESER is a little annoyed that even the votes of the Members of Congress have been distorted in the bitter recrimination inspired by power politicians. As an instance, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clearly establishes that Representative JOHN J. COCHRAN, who was ill in a hospital when votes on the crucial amendments were cast, was not paired for, but was listed under a general pair. A general pair does not indicate which of the two Congressmen was for or against the matter in question.

As for his own votes PLOESER is ready, willing but in the meantime he is still trying to dispel to support them in the forthcoming campaign, the emotional political fog raised by the bureaucratic "conjure-men" and spread by those scared by their spells—as well as those to whom confusion is politically and economically advantageous "thunder on the left."

Orientation Programs in the State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I insert therein an article from the Washington Times-Herald of June 6, by Mr. Frank C. Waldrop.

It should challenge the interest of every discerning American that out of 57 instructors listed to orient diplomats on their business, all but 3 are Government officials. The record of the three who are not Government officials ought to awaken the conscience of every American.

Incidentally, Owen Lattimore, one of the three listed, appears to have been on the editorial board of Amerasia, a pro-Soviet magazine whose head is one Philip Jaffe, and in whose possession confidential State Department and even Naval Intelligence Office papers were found. The record of his case and others is now under scrutiny by a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives.

HOW COME?

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Herewith an item that may be of interest to Secretary of State Jimmy Byrnes, who is doing his level best these days to cope with J. Stalin's bucking broncos of the Kremlin.

Whether he finds it interesting or not, he certainly could with profit ask a few questions about a project in his own shop going by the title of the "Orientation Conferences and Training Programs for Personnel of the Foreign Service and the Department of State."

The writer of this piece sat in, uninvited, yesterday on one of those training projects and found it nothing more or less than an example to diplomats on how to needle a man whose back is turned—in this case Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

To begin at the beginning, the State Department has a Division of Training Services which has the very valuable assignment of making better diplomats of the departmental forces.

As a part of this, there are scheduled for every workday, from Monday through Friday all this month, a series of lectures by supposed experts on subjects of importance in diplomacy.

(Don't give up. It concerns you, too, because the State Department is supposed to look out for the interests of the United States between wars and you live here.)

Of 57 instructors listed to give the developing diplomats the real dope on their business, all but three are Government officials.

The three exceptions are Dr. Edward C. Acheson, director of the school of foreign service at the George Washington University here and brother of Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson; Prof. Owen Lattimore, of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore; and Prof. Frederick L. Schuman, of Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.

Lattimore is a bosom pal of Henry Wallace, the great mind of the ages now trying to decide whether he can best save the world by staying on in Truman's Cabinet to bore from within or by resigning to bore from without.

Lattimore also hangs out with other persons less well known, to an extent that ought to give J. Byrnes some pause.

Just an item: He was formerly on the editorial board of Amerasia, the pro-Soviet magazine that got caught in possession of confidential State Department documents in 1944 with result that an editor and a State Department employee were convicted and fined.

Lattimore also has described Stalin's blood purges of 1936–39 as "a triumph for democracy," and that, friends, is just a slight sample.

He's clever, but you invariably find him in all those old familiar places when you check up. Consider his performance of yesterday.

Most people have the impression that on the record and the evidence the welfare of the United States is better looked after in Japan with Gen. Douglas MacArthur in sole command than in Germany where a four-cornered quarrel over the remains grows worse and worse.

To all of this, Dr. Lattimore yesterday issued an hour-long "na-a-a-a-ah, it's lousy." His line is that the Japs have outsmarted MacArthur in that they are holding onto a "conservative" agricultural policy and occasionally rescue one of their industrialists, bankers, and so forth from the hangman's rope.

Match that up, citizens, with what you've been hearing from Moscow, if you bother to listen. And match up with it the realization that such a thought is the best offered our State Department help as expert inside dope on the Far East.

How come the State Department has to drag in Owen Lattimore to tell what's what in the Orient? Hasn't the Department got anybody on its own staff who knows something?

And as for the baby lined up for June 19—that F. L. Schuman—he's all too well known around here, especially to people who have read the records of the Dies committee.

But if you don't already know what he is, you can get him completely in a flash by turning to page 582 of his latest book, Soviet Politics at Home and Abroad, wherein he states:

"The Russian adventure marks a long forward stride toward human mastery of man's fate."

That is how the State Department's expert instructor on United States-Soviet relations sums up Stalin's behavior and the almost 28 bloody years of Communist dictatorship in Russia.

No wonder State Department secret documents leak. No wonder Jimmy Byrnes goes to conferences with Molotov and comes staggering home asking who touched off the blast.

This writer plans to sit in on Schuman's June 19 performance, if it comes off, and will try to report on same in this space. That is, of course, if they don't lock the door first.

Economic Chaos in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include the following article which outlines critical economic problems confronting the American occupational forces in southern Korea and a 10-point emergency program under which it is hoped that order will be restored in that country:

ECONOMIC CHAOS IN KOREA

(By George M. McCune)

Several critical economic problems confront the American command in the American zone of occupation in southern Korea. The situation is getting worse. There is rampant inflation. Consumer goods and coal are virtually nonexistent. Food distribution is inequitable although the land is overflowing with plenty. Transportation equipment is breaking down. Unemployment is reaching dangerous proportions. These are a few of the most pressing problems.

It is impossible to view the situation with complacence. Ironically enough the land is bulging with resources and supplies; an enormous rice crop (rapidly being exhausted by immoderate consumption); heavy and light industrial equipment (formerly run by Japanese now idle because of the Soviet-American split or because of delayed reconversion); large labor reserves (apparently short of high-grade skills). Eight months of American occupation have passed; the country is still divided at the thirty-eighth parallel; the economy of the country is still highly unstable—is, in fact, chaotic.

SOARING INFLATION

The following highlights of the economic crisis now being faced in Korea are briefly noted. The inflationary spiral continues upward. Rice, which normally costs about ¥20 a measure, bounded to ¥500 after the Japanese surrender and has climbed to about ¥1,500 on the open market today. (The nominal fixed price is ¥750.) A blanket sells for ¥4,000 ($266), if it can be bought at all, and there is almost no new production of textiles to meet the clothing and bedding shortage. Other consumer goods are similarly unavailable or priced exorbitantly. Industrial production is estimated by military government officials to be about 10 percent of the preoccupation level.

Bituminous coal, which is needed for industrial purposes, previously came from Manchuria and Japan, and today there is none except for a trickle being imported from Japan. There is, moreover, scarcely any Korean anthracite available, since most of it is mined in the Soviet zone of occupation and is not shipped south.

Over 1,000,000 Koreans have been repatriated from Japan since VJ-day, swelling the total of Korean unemployed and their dependents to over 2,000,000 in a population of 17,000,000 in the American zone. Despite the large number of laborers available, wages are not adjusted to inflation. Moreover, skilled workers are scarce and are not recruited efficiently.

Hunger is rapidly spreading and will probably result in starvation in many areas by midsummer. This condition is not the result of grain shortage, but of poor control of the bountiful supply. The excellent rice crop was kept in Korea after VJ-day (in previous years one-third to one-half of it was shipped to Japan), so that this year more than twice as many pounds of rice have been available to the Korean population than in the past. The prevailing uncertainty of administration brought about vast hoarding by farmers and dealers, and excessive use of grain in making wine and candy, with the result that the urban consumer has been squeezed for exorbitant black-market prices.

Great strides have been taken during the 8 months of American occupation in liquidating Japanese economic control, a necessary preliminary to constructive economic recovery. It is obvious, however, that greater vigor must be employed if there is to be a solution to the critical and mounting economic problems confronting the country. Needless to say, the implementation of a rounded economic program in Korea depends in no small measure upon the extent of coordination between Washington and Seoul, and also upon close coordination between the military and civilian agencies of the American Government. Red tape must be cut and "road blocks" eliminated. There are too many indications that Korea has been "the end of the line," in the phrase of Edgar Snow in his recent article on Korea in the Saturday Evening Post.

ECONOMIC CRISIS MUST BE AVERTED

Aside from its lack of sufficient trained personnel, its preoccupation with explosive political factors and its long distance from Washington, the American command has been handicapped because of two important considerations: (1) only half of Korea was under American control and therefore economic planning was postponed until the country could be united; (2) the American command, acting as trustee for the Korean people, hesitated to take decisive measures of its own, hoping that the Koreans themselves would soon be empowered to solve their own problems.

The situation in Korea after 8 months, however, appears to call for a change of approach. Constructive measures are needed immediately—even they apply to half the country only, and even if it is questionable whether or not they are, in detail, in keeping with the ultimate wishes of the Korean people—in order to stabilize the chaotic economic situation in the country. Further delay will, without doubt, jeopardize the reconstruction of the country and will make more difficult the situation which will face any provisional democratic government set up by the joint Soviet-American commission.

The following suggestions are made, therefore, by way of a constructive study of the present situation, and the program set forth is designed to meet immediate emergency problems. Some of the measures suggested in this memorandum have already been put into effect by the American command in Korea and others are under consideration. For example, a rice-collection program has been instituted, Japanese property has been taken over, Japanese farm land is being sold to Korean tenants, American small ships have been turned over to Korean transportation uses, and many other similar measures have been taken. These measures are included here, together with many others, to fill out a balanced program for the constructive rehabilitation of Korean economy—at least in southern Korea. The urgency of the problem can scarcely be overexaggerated.

EMERGENCY ECONOMIC PROGRAM

(A 10-point program for the American zone of occupation in Korea)

1. Basic foods:

(a) Rice and other grains, dried beans, dried and salt fish, flour and vermicelli, sugar, canned and packaged foods, and other similar food supplies needed to provide a minimum diet for the Korean people, should be declared basic foods.

(b) All purchase payments of government-owned farm land (see below, Agrarian Reform) and all farm taxes should be collected in kind, and the produce thus collected should be stored in government warehouses to be distributed in the manner discussed below.

(c) Synthetic fertilizer, seed, tools, cattle feed, fish nets and fishing equipment, and similar working capital goods should be allotted to farmers, fishermen, and other basic food producers as an incentive bonus through government outlets such as agricultural bureau and fishery bureau offices and farm cooperatives.

(d) Synthetic fertilizer should be distributed at nominal prices solely through government agencies in keeping with incentive bonus plans and other food programs with allotments and priorities established by farm cooperatives.

(e) Basic foods (also essential consumer goods, see below) should be distributed through community trading posts in urban districts and through farm cooperative offices in rural areas, at fixed prices and under rationed quotas; rationing should be undertaken only on basic foods which are scarce or are likely to move into the black market; free markets should be allowed in all luxury and unessential foods and commodities; in urban areas, local boards should issue ration books covering rationed products, redeemable at community trading posts; in rural areas, farm cooperatives should perform such functions.

2. Essential consumer products:

(a) Textiles, clothing, tools, housing supplies, fuel, synthetic fertilizer, soap, and other similar consumer goods needed by the Korean people for the maintenance of living standards, should be declared essential consumer products.

(b) All privately owned enterprises manufacturing consumer goods which are not able to operate successfully under private management should be confiscated or purchased by enforced sale and then placed in operation by the government.

(c) Plant conversion and expansion, and new construction where necessary, should be promptly undertaken under Government priorities and subsidies.

(d) Special assistance in the form of financing and raw-material priorities should be provided to cooperative enterprises and household industries.

(e) All raw materials for manufacture of essential consumer goods should be allocated from government-owned enterprises and stock piles under priorities.

(f) Essential consumer goods should be distributed through community trading posts in urban districts and farm cooperatives in rural areas at minimum prices under rationing. (See basic-food distribution, 1–e, above.)

3. Agrarian reform:

(a) All Japanese-owned agricultural land should be confiscated and nationalized.

(b) All Korean-owned agricultural land not owned by farmers (absentee landlords) should be transferred to the government by enforced sale at fair terms.

(c) Maximum acreage of farming land owned by each landholder should be set by law, say 7.5 acres of paddy or 15 acres of dry fields.

(d) All confiscated or purchased land should be sold by the government to occupant-tenants or qualified claimants through long-term (15–20 year) purchase contracts, annual payments being equivalent to normal tenancy payments, i. e., about one-third of the produce; land so purchased should be nontransferable except within the immediate family and should revert to the government under specified conditions.

(e) Farm cooperatives should be formed under state sponsorship to assist in stabilizing and improving the lot of the farmers; they should be employed as agencies of the government in rationing and similar activities as outlined above; among other things, they should provide financial aid to farmers,

assist in irrigation and soil conservation, and carry out educational programs.

(f) In all tenancy or semitenancy contracts, long-term leases only should be held valid and eviction should be permitted only by showing cause.

4. Industries, forestry, and mining:

(a) All Japanese-owned industries, forests, and mines should be confiscated and nationalized.

(b) Government-owned enterprises should be directly operated by state "corporations"; facilities should be expanded to meet the needs of Korean economy.

(c) Encouragement should be given to small private and cooperative enterprises—capitalized under a maximum sum, say ¥100,000—in specified fields.

(d) Reforestation and forest conservation programs should be immediately enforced to avoid serious spoliation of forest reserves.

(e) Production of all heavy industries, mines, and forests should be allocated through priorities to essential consumer industries and other essential enterprise.

5. Public finance:

(a) A new currency (Korean independency money — Tongnipwon — W, for example) should be immediately established and all Bank of Chosen notes recalled; new currency should be exchanged at about ¥5 to W1.

(b) All banking should be nationalized.

(c) An incentive taxation system should be put into effect: (1) Agricultural land should be taxed in kind on the basis of production (Danish system); (2) urban land should be taxed to discourage turn-over and unearned increment (New York City system).

(d) Foreign exchange should be licensed and controlled by state banks; exchange rates should be established on an equitable basis (about W15 to $1).

6. Labor:

(a) There should be set up a system of free elections under Government supervision to determine bargaining units for industrial labor.

(b) Labor board organization should be established to provide for appropriate labor relations from local to national levels; two sections should be formed: (1) Elections and guaranty of good faith in bargaining, and (2) mediation section for labor disputes; an advisory committee of experienced American representatives of labor, industry, and Government (WLB or Labor Department), should be sent to Korea immediately to assist the labor section of military government, and additional experienced personnel should be recruited in America for duty in labor-dispute settlement "teams."

(c) Comprehensive labor legislation should be enacted, including minimum wage, maximum hours, fair-employment practices, and social security.

7. Transportation:

(a) Immediate rehabilitation of equipment should be undertaken by importation of necessary rolling stock.

(b) Railroad shops in Korea should be given high priority in obtaining raw materials, machine tools, and other equipment, including importation of necessary items, in order that transportation equipment will be kept from breaking down completely and so that replacements might be manufactured.

(c) Sea transportation and trucking should be expanded by assignment of surplus American craft and trucks in the theater.

8. Foreign trade:

(a) A trade board to control and develop foreign trade should be established.

(b) Needed raw materials such as cotton, rubber, petroleum, fertilizer, transportation equipment, should be imported by the government, with payment in gold or exportable goods.

(c) Potential export lines should be promptly developed, particularly such industries as graphite, silk, chemicals, tungsten, fish oil, and rice.

(d) Foreign exchange rates should be equitably established (see "Public Finance" above) and foreign exchange should be made available under license.

9. Technical personnel:

(a) A Korean Civil Service Commission should be established, whose functions would include recruitment of administrative and industrial personnel, both Korean and foreign, control of a civil-service training program, and general management in coordination with Military Government of civilian personnel in government service and government-owned industry.

(b) Qualified Koreans should be sent abroad in a systematic program of technical education.

(c) Technical schools in Korea should be expanded.

(d) Civilian foreign personnel for technical positions in Korea should be recruited by Korean civil service commission "teams" in cooperation with various foreign governments; no foreign personnel should be employed in the Korean government service without the approval of the Korean civil service commission.

10. National economic planning commission:

(a) A national economic planning commission should be speedily organized composed of Koreans representing management, labor, and government.

(b) The planning commission should be given high-priority assistance in Korea and in the United States, should it desire to come to America, in studying its problems.

(c) Short-term and long-term plans of economic development should be formulated by the commission as early as possible.

Conditions in the Southern Pine Industry Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I submit for insertion in the RECORD an address by C. C. Sheppard, chairman of industry-wide committee of Southern Pine Manufacturers, before the forty-ninth annual convention, Arkansas Association of Lumber Dealers, at Little Rock, Ark., on April 17, 1946, which is apropos of the lumber situation today. Also, an editorial taken from the Chicago Daily Tribune, Chicago, Ill., entitled "Low-Priced Lumber—Try To Buy It":

INTRODUCTION OF MR. C. C. SHEPPARD AT MEETING OF THE ARKANSAS ASSOCIATION OF LUMBER DEALERS

(By E. DeMatt Henderson, secretary)

In the victory which our Nation has just achieved the Southland gave unstintingly of her resources of manpower and materials. The South in times of war has always done more than her share; but today with the rest of the Nation the South turns its full energy and resources toward the orderly reestablishment of a peacetime economy. Everyone realizes that in this peacetime economy the building industry will play a dominant role; and it is to this industry that the Nation turns for its needed homes for veterans. It is the American home which is the foundation of our liberty and the very heart and lifeblood of our democratic principles. It is the American home and the power of its influence which keeps America great.

The South has always returned to this Nation her God-given resources of pine timber. Homes of southern pine are the steel sinews which bind our national unity. But homes cannot be built by merely planning or simply issuing governmental directives. The shortage of homes is a shortage of production of building materials, including that of southern pine lumber; and our leaders in Washington are now recognizing that the real cause of our problems is this lack of production.

And, one of the chief bottlenecks to greater lumber supply is the shortage of southern pine lumber. It is a strange paradox that we in Arkansas, which is one of the principal lumber-producing States, are experiencing a serious scarcity of lumber from legitimate and dependable sources.

We are fortunate in having with us today a man who probably knows the situation better than any other individual producer. He is Mr. C. C. Sheppard, president of the Louisiana Central Lumber Co., Clarks, La., and chairman of an industry-wide committee representing all southern pine manufacturers from Virginia to Texas. During the war he served as a member of the industry advisory committee to the War Production Board and continues to serve its successor, the Civilian Production Administration. He was also a member of the price advisory committee to OPA, but resigned because the price control agency refused to act on the recommendations of the price advisory committee.

Mr. Sheppard is also past president of the Southern Pine Association and during his administration, as well as in succeeding years, he always has believed in the strongest kind of cooperation between manufacturer and dealer. He understands your problems, and desires to tell you of some of the things that still contribute to the uncertainties of the lumber industry and which affect the entire housing and reconversion program. I am sure he wants to give you the facts as they are, as cold and hard as they might be, rather than talk to you in flowery phrases and make promises that you and he know can't be fulfilled. He is an outstanding representative of a truly great industry and it gives me great pleasure to present to you now Mr. C. C. Sheppard.

CONDITIONS IN THE SOUTHERN-PINE INDUSTRY TODAY

(By C. C. Sheppard)

For a great many years—probably during the last 30 years—I have watched the growth of the retail lumber industry in the lumber-producing States, east Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and on through to the coast. You gentlemen are not aware of it, but retail lumber dealers of the eastern section of the country and the Middle West think you are getting all of the southern pine today—that you get the first crack at it when it's produced—and that's the reason their supply is so short. If you think they don't believe that, just attend some of their meetings and hear them talk about you.

As a matter of fact, the retail distributor of lumber in the producing areas, in my opinion is at a great disadvantage, and has been through the history of his business for the past 25 or 30 years, as compared with the man operating a retail lumber business in an area outside the producing districts. To illustrate:

Our business is located at Clarks, Caldwell Parish, La. There is not a single retail lumber dealer in that parish. We have been there for 43 years, during which time we have sold practically all of the lumber used for building and repairs in that parish. We have not established a retail department, but have sold it to the people of that community at the same price per thousand feet as we'd sell

it to you, as a dealer, in carload lots. Now, why do we do that? Well, we have thought that was a good policy to pursue because we have to live with those people; we meet them in the courtrooms; we meet the assessor on the streets once in a while; and we feel that we have an obligation to take care of the requirements of the people in the vicinity where our plant is operated.

Lock at the situation today. We can hardly supply the local demand from that one little parish, and when I say that I mean it. They will come in and want to buy specified quantities and specified lengths and grades, but having no inventory, we can't supply it. So finally, as a last resort, they do just what you're doing, take lumber in any form they can get it—1 by 4 and wider, 4 feet and longer, No. 3 and better, some in 2-inch. But worse than that, they come over to our planing mill every once in a while to see what we are doing, to see if we have built up any inventory. And if they see us loading a few cars of lumber, do they criticize us for it. They say, "Why are you loading this lumber and shipping it up to Arkansas or over into Texas, Oklahoma, Mississippi, or on to New York or Pennsylvania, when you can't supply our requirements here at home? That's not right. We grew this timber here that you're cutting, and we think you ought to take care of us." So you see the manufacturer has some troubles right around his plant these days.

SOUTHERN PINE PRODUCTION SINCE 1909

You'd be interested in knowing a little, I think, about the history of the production of southern pine lumber in volume. It reached its peak in 1909 when it had a production of over 16,277,000,000 board-feet. That's a pretty good round figure to keep in mind—1909, 37 years ago. Following that there was pretty steady production running through the years, but I think you would be interested particularly in the production as it ran during 1936, 1937, 1938, and 1939, just preceding the war. Each of these years southern pine producers turned out just a little over 7,000,000,000 feet, a very steady, even production throughout the Southern States.

What happened when the war came on? With all the shortage of men and equipment, the southern pine industry stepped up its production in 1940 to 10,162,000,000. In 1941 it was stepped up again to 10,311,000,000. In 1942 the operators had reached the point of their greatest difficulties in operation, shortage of men, worn-out trucks, inability to obtain repairs and equipment for getting the logs to their mills. That situation existed in 1942, and yet the industry produced 11,761,000,000, the highest it had been since 1929. With men being taken away from us for the various armed services; aircraft builders, ship builders, steel manufacturers sending men into our districts all through the South to recruit labor and, with it, encouragement of the powers-that-be in Washington for a cost-plus basis of operation, and insisting on higher wages than we could possibly pay our men. Yet, even under those conditions, our industry produced in 1942 nearly 12,000,000,000 feet. In 1943 it dropped to 9,961,000,000; in 1944 it dropped to 8,000,000,000, and in 1945 to 7,400,000,000.

OPA CAUSED POSTWAR DECLINE

I am not going to burden you with figures and statistics, but I give you these figures so you can see how we have started on the decline in the volume of production of southern pine lumber. And so you may make a better study with me of the reasons for that, I am going to say to you, very bluntly and frankly, that the reason can be stated in three letters—O-P-A.

They are the fellows that did it. When the OPA put out its first price list covering southern pine lumber, it was the first division of the lumber industry on which they attempted to put ceiling prices, and it was the worst monstrosity of a price list that anybody ever conceived in our industry. In fact, it was not prepared by the industry, nor any committee that knew anything about the lumber industry. It was prepared in OPA's Lumber Branch in Washington, where they didn't know a thing about the lumber business. When that price list was issued, the industry was literally shocked to believe that its Government would ask it to go on producing lumber under such ceiling prices as that list proposed. Such a volume of protest immediately arose that the price executive of the Lumber Branch came to New Orleans with a lot of advisers, called a mass meeting of the industry, and undertook to make corrections. And how did they do that?

HOW CEILINGS WERE ESTABLISHED

A meeting was called on Thursday; and on Friday a special committee was appointed. It worked all Friday, Saturday, Sunday, and Sunday night, because those prices were to go into effect in 2 or 3 days. If it were not so serious, it would be extremely amusing for you to see how they went about correcting those ceiling prices. It was a patchwork affair, by which some of the ceilings was taken off here and some put on there, deducting something here, and adding something there, finally arriving at the revised ceiling prices.

Those prices were not in keeping with the experience of the industry through the years. The relationship between grades, sizes, and lengths was distorted and all out of reason, and the sad part of it is, those lists have never been changed to this day. They've made efforts to correct them, but never have done so, and they're still that way.

All during the war, while the various agencies were calling on the lumber industry to produce in unprecedented volume, OPA lowered the price on flooring, putting it down so low that none was produced. It is true they did that for the purpose of encouraging production of other items required by the war services; but what about flooring today? Can you buy any southern-pine flooring, you dealers? I don't think you can buy 10,000 feet of southern-pine flooring anywhere in the industry today. No other item is in such tremendous demand, it appears to me, as flooring. We are operating an oak-flooring plant. I think we could sell a thousand carloads in 2 or 3 hours at no more effort and expense than the use of a telephone. All over this country, from coast to coast, dealers are begging for it and taking it as they can get it.

OPA DISREGARDS PRICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Another angle to the actions of the price executive and his committee under OPA: Theoretically he has an advisory committee from the industry. He asked me to serve on that committee himself and I accepted, because I thought it was my duty to do so. But through the years of OPA, the lumber section has not taken the advice of its advisory committee. On the contrary, it has done a lot of things that the price advisory committee urged it not to do, and refused to do a lot of things that the committee advised it to do.

Take for an outstanding example, and without expressing my personal views with respect to it * * * the mark-up for the wholesaler and that for the commission-man were never advised by the price advisory committee for OPA. Did you know that? At no time did this committee ever advise that such action be taken. Yet, Colonel Sherrill, acting for the Army, and the OPA working together finally were influenced to believe that, if they would give the wholesaler and commission man the mark-up, it would result in increased production. And they were getting scared because they thought the various armed services would soon be short of lumber. It didn't do it, and no one in the industry contends that it did. Shortly after they found themselves in that situation, the OPA asked its price advisory committee to help it get away from the wholesale and commission mark-up. I don't know whether you knew that or not. Its advisory committee said to OPA, "You put this thing on the industry and this is no time in our opinion to take it off. We do not advise that it be taken off. You put it on and, if you want it off, you take it off."

MR. SHEPPARD RESIGNS FROM COMMITTEE

Finally, because of continued, persistent refusal of OPA to take any of the advice given by their own advisory committe and the continuation of putting into effect a lot of regulations and directives that the committee wouldn't advise, I tendered my resignation from it. I wouldn't have any part in that sort of a program. I thought it was my duty to the industry to get away from that sort of thing, because I certainly did not want to be put in the position of having approved many of the things it did.

I don't know whether you men realize it or not, but, if you are on one of the price advisory committees, legally you are in the position of a confidential adviser to the Administrator and, when you sit in the room all day and work on these problems and the Price Administrator comes out of there with a lot of unreasonable, unfair mandates, you can't talk about it. You are a member of that committee in a confidential relationship and can't discuss it, so I didn't want to be tied up that way. I wanted to be free to talk about it if I thought best to do so.

THE $64 QUESTION

Now what are you going to do for lumber? What are you retail dealers going to do to get some lumber? Can you get it, and if so, how soon? That, I think, is the $64 question these days. Frankly, I don't think you're going to get lumber very soon and, in my opinion, the best thing that could be done in this country today to advance the construction of homes and to assist you men in obtaining the material you need for those homes, is to absolutely abolish the OPA. [Applause.] There just isn't any hope while that crowd sits in Washington and continues to issue directives, rules, regulations, and controls of one kind or another, to secure the production of the material needed to build these homes. I have given up hope of it. It just can't be done.

WILL OPA ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY?

I remember very well throughout the history of the work of the War Production Board when they reached a point where they were extremely worried about the possibility of the war services requiring lumber they couldn't get. A representative of the OPA was always present at those meetings and in the course of time when they got right up to the crucial matter, the OPA would be asked this question: "Do you take any responsibility for production?" And the answer flatly at that time was, "No! No! Under the act creating the OPA, we have no responsibility for production."

You look at your press reports from day to day now and see how Mr. Bowles and Mr. Wyatt occasionally talk about adopting a policy that will increase production. Why are they talking that way, now, men? There's only one reason why you hear OPA intimate that it will do anything about changing the rules so as to increase production, and that reason is that Congress is now considering very seriously whether or not they will extend it at all. And when OPA reaches the point where it is in doubt about whether it will be extended or renewed, it will make promises, but, if it is renewed, it will soon forget. I wouldn't trust it to keep its promises, and don't believe it would do it. I believe OPA is ambitious to put the Government in the business of building homes that the construction industry ought to build.

HOW SERIOUS IS THE BLACK MARKET?

Talk about the black market, the price executive of the lumber branch appeared before one of the investigating committees

in the House and Senate recently and he was asked, "How serious is this black-market thing?" He replied: "Oh, I don't think it amounts to very much." Do you men remember all that he did say about that? If you do, you ought never to forget it. He said, "There is some black market, but it's going direct from the mill through a trucker to a contractor and doesn't carry the dealer's mark-up. Therefore, I don't think it's very serious." Now that simply means that OPA would like to bypass and eliminate every one of you men in this organization and the retail dealers throughout the country. It can't mean anything else.

How much of our production is moving in the black market? If I made a statement using any figures, I'd have to tell you frankly I don't know and can't swear that they are true, because I can't prove them. But I believe there is anywhere from 50 to 75 percent of the present production of southern pine lumber moving in the black market, and you don't get a chance at that stock. There are several reasons for that. In the first place, you men don't want to engage in the business of buying your material in the black market; and in the second place, swarms of trucks are moving down into this producing territory from all through the Middle West, the North, and the large consuming centers of Texas, buying this lumber wherever they can find it, mostly at small mills—buying it by the truckload at any price they are asked for it. They drive it back into a big market like Dallas, Tex., and sell it for $150 or $200 per truckload, practically to the highest bidder. It doesn't move through dealers, and the dealers are terribly disturbed about it—and I think they should be.

A THREAT THAT MUST BE FACED

I'm telling you men now, frankly, if this thing continues, if it goes on and on and OPA's continued regulations are put forth and nothing more done to enforce them—and I don't think they are going to be enforced—the regular, established, honest, and honorable retail lumber dealers of this country are in a dangerous position. No doubt about it, men. You'd better face this thing squarely, because I believe it is a serious threat to you.

COULD WIPE OUT BLACK MARKET QUICKLY, BUT—

Now, why doesn't OPA do something about this black market? Well, I told you of their testimony before the committee. Can they do anything about it? Certainly they can. I think the OPA could put 25 or 30 competent inspectors in the producing areas of east Texas and bring that black market thing to an end pretty quickly. But where do they go? We had a couple of them come into our office the other day, and, if we've sold a foot of lumber in excess of the ceiling prices they have established, we have no knowledge of it. Yet they come and spend considerable time checking our records, while within 30 or 40 miles of us black-market lumber is moving by truckloads, passing them right on the highway. They could check our records, they can't check the records of the fellow engaged in the business of selling lumber at black market, because he has no records.

It's getting so serious that even reputable dealers are beginning to wonder if they shouldn't engage in this thing. We had a letter from one the other day, saying, "It's a heck of a way for an honorable man to do business, but I have about come to the conclusion that we must get some lumber to supply the great need in our area. You work up the plan by which it can be done and we'll bring the money down to the mills to you." Now think of that. The answer, of course, is, "No."

Go into the States of Texas and Louisiana today. Start out after this meeting to buy some lumber—southern pine lumber—at ceiling prices. From how many mills will you be able to buy it? I can give you the names of them, and they won't constitute a very large number, and even they can't supply your demand. Who knows how much of this black market lumber is being produced? Nobody, because there are no records of it. The Southern Pine Association can't obtain any record of production of that lumber, and I don't think any other agency can. The black-market operators are not going to supply it. I picked up a little document here that appealed to me and I am not so sure but what the author is a little more optimistic than I am, "The OPA drags on to its sorry end. Despite its 32,000 press agents, prosecutors and political Pharisees, it is dying on the vine, just as surely as Federal prohibition petered out in a stinking pool of corruption and crime."

OPA may be dying on the vine, gentlemen, but I am afraid it is going to be extended for another year, or perhaps another nine months, although it is possible that Congress will put certain restraining regulations on it that will make it a little more realistic in dealing with these problems.

"ABOLISH OPA"

The lumber industry is not the only one that is having its troubles, and about those you know as well as I do. The black market in meat is worse than it ever has been. A man whom I know says that black market profits on cattle now run up to $50 a head. Swift & Co., at Fort Worth, is laying off thousands of men. Its cattle killing is running 15 percent of normal. The cattle rustlers grab the rest, slaughter them in dirty barns and the profits, of course, pay no taxes. The head of the Corn Belt Live Stock Dealers Association says we face the worst meat shortage this country has ever seen. The dairy and butter distributors say butter is gone, bread is going, and milk is next on the list. Well, now, those conditions, added to those which we know exist in the lumber industry, emphasize that there is just one wise course for Congress to take, and that is to abolish OPA.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of May 31, 1946]

LOW-PRICED LUMBER—TRY TO BUY IT

Anyone who wants to know the current state of the lumber supply in this country need only try to build his wife a few shelves on which to store preserves. If he gets the boards he needs by visiting less than half a dozen lumber yards, he can count himself lucky.

Lumber can be had, of course, in the black market. One man recently found a thousand board feet of pine to finish a contract he had undertaken. He paid $220 for it, much more than twice the OPA ceiling price. The Wall Street Journal recently reported that profits in the lumber black market are so high that small mills engaging in that traffic are even sawing logs so small that they produce only a few 2 by 4's.

Black-market lumber isn't going to meet the Nation's housing needs. The Government estimated that the Nation should have 37,000,000,000 board feet of lumber this year. Production in the first 6 months of the year will not exceed fourteen billions. There is no chance of sawing the additional twenty-three billions needed in the second half of the year.

Richard G. Kimball, technical director of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, said in Chicago recently that while his industry is producing a lot of lumber, it is nowhere near maximum production, which he estimated at 40,000,000,000 board feet a year. That cannot be achieved without price incentives to bring marginal producers into the market. OPA price ceilings prevent that now and Housing Expediter Wyatt's subsidy proposals won't turn the trick, either.

The strangulation of production by OPA regulations is an old story by now. It is particularly effective in discouraging lumber production because a great many timber owners are under no compulsion to cut their logs in any particular year. They are not like farmers, who must harvest a crop when it is ripe and sell it for what the market offers, nor are they in the position of the manufacturer with so high an investment in plant and equipment that it is frequently less costly to run at a loss than to shut down. The longer the trees stand, the more they are worth when finally cut.

A professional forester, whose letter appears today in the Voice of the People, points out that OPA has been so reluctant to allow price increases to compensate for increased operating costs that some operators would lose $5 a thousand feet if they cut their timber at present OPA prices.

OPA can keep a man from making a profit, but it can't force him to go into business and lose money. That's why the country is short of lumber and why it is buying a large proportion of what it gets in the black market at extortionate prices—far above what lumber would cost under a free-price system.

Extension of Emergency Price Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of George R. LeSauvage, chairman, Government relations committee of the National Restaurant Association, before Senate Banking and Currency Committee on the extension of the Emergency Price Control Act, April 22, 1946:

INTRODUCTION

To the Chairman and Members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee:

My name is George R. LeSauvage. I am the immediate past president of the National Restaurant Association, the present chairman of the Government relations committee and chairman of the National Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee. At this hearing I do not appear for the latter committee. At the outset, I wish to express my appreciation and the appreciation of the public-feeding industry for the privilege of appearing before us and expressing our opinions to you concerning restaurant price control.

ECONOMIC BACKGROUND

This statement is being presented to you on behalf of the 525,000 public-feeding establishments who serve daily 68,000,000 meals and who do an annual volume of business of $10,000,000,000. From the figures just submitted to this committee, it can be appreciated that because of the tremendous volume of business, the public-feeding industry ranks among the first five industries of the entire country. The public-feeding industry includes restaurants, limited variety stores, railroad dining cars, hotels, department stores, in-plant feeding, drug stores, and thousands of independent related food service organizations. It is interesting to note, in contrast to the large dollar volume of annual business, that the average food check per meal is only 26 cents per person. I make that statement so that the committee might be apprised of the fact that this brief is not presented on behalf of the luxury type of food service but is truly a brief presented for the public-feeding industry. It may interest the gentlemen of this committee to note that the figures just submitted to you are not those of private industry but represent statistics compiled not only by a Government agency but by that very agency

which has direct control of restaurant prices, to wit, the Office of Price Administration.

The Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee has played a significant role through its individual members throughout the entire war period and up to the present time. The members of this committee, which is a quasi-governmental organization, serve entirely without pay or other form of compensation. In addition to the time gratuitously devoted by the members of this committee, the expenses incurred in the course of publicly aiding the war effort in dealing with the food problems of Government agencies have been borne exclusively by the members of this committee out of their own funds. The members of the National Restaurant Advisory Committee received an award from Mr. Bowles expressing the appreciation of the OPA for their cooperation.

Our position is being submitted to you today by me and Mr. J. E. Frawley, president of the American Hotel Association. I shall endeavor to discuss with you some of the problems arising out of the technical aspects of restaurant MPR 2. Mr. Frawley will present to you for your consideration some of the questions concerning maladministration in the Administrative and Enforcement Department of the Office of Price Administration, insofar as it affects restaurant MPR 2.

Our industry does not appear here in order to oppose the extension of the Emergency Price Control Act. Nor do we come here today seeking an industry-wide percentage increase in restaurant prices. We merely seek to have some of the inequities removed which are adversely affecting the public feeding industry at this time.

From the figures quoted for your consideration, we believe that you will agree with us that the public feeding industry is an important factor in the Nation's economy, particularly to agriculture since Government has stated that approximately 20 percent of the Nation's agricultural products are distributed through the channels of the public feeding industry. In addition, of course, the public feeding industry employs millions of people and, therefore, is a stabilizing influence in the labor market. Further, the industry is a large consumer of the services of public utilities. This purchase of consumer durable goods such as china, glassware, silverware, linens, and other equipment represents substantial sums which will play a vital role in the Nation's economy by giving those industries that furnish these materials the stimulation which will meet the needs of the President's program and which will bring about a high degree of employment for these related industries.

The general purpose of the Emergency Price Control Act was to stabilize prices—in short, to prevent inflation. With the main purpose of the act we have no objection, nor do we wish to ask price control for everyone else and have an exception made for our particular industry. We do, however, seriously object to the administration of the act and the many harsh rules and regulations purported to be issued under the authority of the act.

Since retailing is the immediate channel of distribution with which the consumer deals, for obvious reasons, the burdens of price control have fallen most heavily upon retailers. In general, the Office of Price Administration has ignored the position of retailers—whether or not price adjustments at this level are warranted. The number and complexity of regulations, orders, and amendments issued by the Office of Price Administration have already been pointed out to you.

The Emergency Price Control Act was admittedly not a perfect legislative enactment. Yet despite its weaknesses, it has been reenacted in substantially its original form since 1942—perpetuating both the weaknesses of the law and the causes of its inequitable application. Unless Congress acts, these inequities will be continued or the Office of Price Administration will take the re-enactment of the Emergency Price Control Act in its present form as a mandate from Congress to continue and to extend the present inequitable and undemocratic administration of the act.

The public feeding industry, embracing small and large public feeding establishments in the cities, towns, villages, and crossroads, as well as on the public highways of the country, has what I believe to be three comprehensive and justifiable criticisms of the Office of Price Administration:

1. Absorption by the public feeding establishments of price increases granted to producers and distributors because of certain increased costs—even though the same justification for price adjustments exists at the retail level.

2. Failure to provide adequate relief for those public feeding establishments who because of those increased costs, stated above, are suffering from financial hardship.

3. The method of application and enforcement of regulations and orders issued by the Office of Price Administration in its field offices.

COST ABSORPTION

The policy of cost absorption has descended with particular viciousness upon the restaurant and public feeding industry. The operators comprising these groups are frozen at prices charged during the week of April 4–10, 1943. It is a matter of common knowledge that, since that date, the number of price increases permitted producers and distributors of food commodities aggregates millions of dollars, all of which have been absorbed in the public feeding industry and not passed on to the consumer. Although the rent-control law has been in most cases successfully applied in the matter of residential rent, in the field of commercial rents there have been no restrictions whatever. Consequently, the cost of public feeding establishments leaseholds has increased in alarming proportions. Your committee, of course, is familiar with the increased cost of labor. Unless the Office of Price Administration recognizes these factors and grants relief, the operation of the public feeding industry will be seriously impaired. This threat to our national economy lies not in the distant future, but is a present, stark reality. Because of the current world food crisis, increased production of raw food commodities alone will not solve the problems of the restaurant industry.

The following example is an illustration of our statement on cost absorption:

In the city of Chicago, the bakery industry which serves the public feeding establishments with pies, cakes and pastries were permitted to raise the price of pies during the period from June 14, 1943, to October 25, 1943, from 35 cents to 42 cents. This was an increase of 20 percent. The local Office of Price Administration informed the operators of public feeding establishments that they would be permitted to pass on such an increase to their patrons but after much consideration and deliberation such an increase was not permitted to the public feeding operators and they had to absorb the increased cost of 7 cents per pie as they were frozen to their April 3–10, 1943, prices.

THE NECESSITY FOR MODIFICATION OF ADJUSTMENT PROVISIONS

Restaurant prices are governed by restaurant MPR 2. Section 17, of this regulation entitled, "Adjustments," provides that ceiling prices for any eating or drinking establishment may be increased under certain circumstances, briefly, that they are (1) operating under such financial hardship as to threaten the discontinuance of operations; (2) such discontinuance would result in inconvenience to customers, and (3) that, if the restaurant were discontinued, customers would be forced to pay as much or more than proposed adjusted prices elsewhere.

The language of section 17 of the restaurant regulation has caused confusion in the industry at large. Very few applications for relief under this section have been acted upon favorably by the district offices of the OPA. We are quoting from a letter received from one of the district offices of OPA denying relief under section 17 of restaurant MPR 2:

"In conjunction with processing your application, an audit was made of your establishment's operations during the base period year of 1942, and during 1944 and during the first 3 months of 1945. A comparison of your establishment's profit and loss after deduction of a $2,500-per-year proprietor's salary shows that in 1942 the establishment earned $1,822.87 (6.83 percent of sales) while in 1944 it earned $1,964.30 (3.91 percent of sales). Its earnings during the first 3 months of 1945 was $42.62 (0.37 percent of sales), and while not considered as a conclusive indication of its profit position for the year 1945, do show that the establishment continues to operate profitably."

Another illustration of the bureaucratic red-tape methods of operation of the Office of Price Administration is the case of a restaurant operator in West Haven, Conn., who was "processed" out of business despite the fact the dollar volume of this man's business was greater than in any other similar period in its 45 years of operation. He was losing money because the cost of his sea-food had tripled. The cost of other food commodities had also soared. His labor overhead likewise increased disproportionately. In August of 1945 this operator filed an application for relief with the OPA. Weeks and weeks went by. In response to the operator's frantic inquiry as to when action would be taken he was constantly informed that the OPA was "processing the case." As recently as April 9 this year a letter was received from the OPA asking for further information. In the meantime the operator has been compelled to close down his business. Because this case is typical of the very numerous instances of maladministration in the Office of Price Administration, I should like to submit for the record a copy of a letter, dated April 8, 1946, sent by Richard A. Dargan, President of the New Haven Restaurant Association, to the Honorable JAMES P. GEELAN, a Member of the House of Representatives, concerning this case.

The National Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee on many occasions has asked the Office of Price Administration to revise this particular section of the Restaurant Regulation. As late as October 1945, the committee met with the Restaurant Price Branch of the national office of the Office of Price Administration to discuss this problem. The committee was advised that an amendment covering this section of the regulation had been signed and "would soon become effective." To date this action has not been forthcoming from the national office of the Office of Price Administration. For the benefit of the committee, I quote from restaurant MPR 2, section 17. Generally, I would be averse to burdening your committee with a verbatim statement of the wording of the regulation. However, because of the cumbersome, unworkable, unjust and unfair character of this portion of the restaurant MPR 2, I ask your indulgence and set forth section 17 at length:

"SEC. 17. Adjustments: (a) OPA may adjust the ceiling prices for any eating or drinking establishment under the following circumstances:

"(1) The establishment is operating under such financial hardship as to cause a substantial threat to the continuance of its operations; and

"(2) Such discontinuance will result in serious inconvenience to consumers in that they will either be deprived of all eating or

drinking services or will have to turn to other establishments that present substantial difficulties as to distance, hours of service, selection of meals, food items or beverages offered, capacity, or transportation; and

"(3) By reason of such discontinuance, the same meals, food items, or beverages will cost the customers of the eating or drinking establishment as much as or more than the proposed adjusted prices.

"(b) If you are the proprietor of an eating or drinking establishment which satisfies the above requirements, you may apply for an adjustment of your maximum prices by submitting in duplicate to your OPA District Office a statement setting forth:

"(1) Your name and address and the name and address of your establishment.

"(2) A description of your eating establishment including: type of service rendered (such as cafeteria, table service, etc.), classes of meals offered (such as breakfast, lunch, and dinner), number of persons served per day during the most recent 30-day period, and any other information which is necessary to describe your establishment and the nature and extent of your operation.

"(3) The reasons why your customers will be seriously inconvenienced if you discontinue operations.

"(4) The names and addresses of the three nearest eating places of the same type as yours.

"(5) A list showing your present maximum prices and your requested adjusted prices.

"(6) Detailed profit and loss statements for the establishment for (i) a 3-month period which ended not earlier than 90 days prior to the date of your application, (ii) a 12-month period which ended not earlier than 90 days prior to the date of your application and (iii) the calendar or fiscal year approximating the year 1942."

The above section of the regulations, in my opinion, might have been necessary during the war emergency. We have no objection to the requirement that, before relief be given, necessary information shall be made available to the Office of Price Administration. However, the necessity of proving that patrons of public eating establishments would not be seriously inconvenienced if an operator closed his business is, in our opinion, unwarranted and unnecessarily burdensome to the system of free enterprise. This type of regulation, geared to the strain of wartime economy, has no application during this postwar era. Further the essentiality clause gives to an official or employe of the Office of Price Administration the right to determine whether or not any enterprising American citizen has the right to remain in the public feeding business. We do not believe that the Congress of the United States in the enactment of the Emergency Price Control Act intended that the power of life or death over any American business should be vested in any OPA official.

We would further like to call your attention to the provisions of section 1 (b) (2) concerning the highest price-line limitation. This section of the regulations provides that, if you offer a new food item or beverage which you did not offer between March 7 and April 10, 1943, you cannot offer this new food item or beverage at a higher price than you offered the same food or beverage in the same class during April 4 to 10, 1943. For example, assume that during the base period a public feeding establishment, because of the restrictions on obtaining meat, did not offer sirloin steak but did offer roast beef at $1.50. If the establishment can now obtain and offer sirloin steak, it cannot offer that sirloin steak at a higher price than it offered the roast beef, even though the two meat items are cut from different parts of the beef carcass and there is a marked difference in the raw food costs. The obvious result of this impractical, theoretical, and arbitrary restriction is not to keep down the spiral of inflation but to remove from the menu an additional type of food which otherwise would be available to the American public. The regulation further provides, of course, that you may put this item on your menu by the method of competitive pricing if you sold nothing in the same class during the base period. But, we would like to call to the attention of the committee that the sale of food by public feeding establishments is somewhat different from the ordinary methods of retail merchandising. Therefore, it is not always possible for an operator to obtain within his immediate neighborhood or district a so-called comparable type of establishment with the same service and appointments. I would further like to call to your attention to the fact that industry is repeatedly pointing out to your committee that applications for the addition of new food items to menus that are not covered by these sections which are stipulated in the regulation have taken weeks to process, and in most instances have not been granted because there is no uniformity of interpretation of these sections of the regulation on a national level.

We respectfully refer your committee to appendix A of restaurant MPR 2, "Groups of food items, entrees, and beverages."

Because of the classification in Appendix A of restaurant MPR 2, the industry find themselves in difficulty when they are called before their local price panels on problems relating to their menu prices. For example, because class 20 of the appendix covers all shell fish, the price panel contends that a broiled live lobster, because it is a shellfish, shall not sell for more on the menu than a lobster baked in shell, even though there is no ceiling price on live lobster and a lobster in shell consists of lobster ends and claw meat, with a cream sauce and other ingredients as compared to a broiled live lobster with which you gentlemen are familiar. In short, the OPA completely disregards the well-recognized fact that items in the same class may very considerably in cost.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We recommend that the undemocratic policy of cost absorption and indirect profit control should be eliminated from the administrative programs of the Office of Price Administration by:

(a) An adequate declaration of congressional intent in the Emergency Price Control Act; and

(b) By the direction of your committee to the Price Administrator to amend the applicable section of restaurant MPR 2 so as to abolish the cost-absorption restriction in order to permit a public feeding establishment to introduce new food commodities, items, and beverages in its establishment for the benefit of its patrons by permitting the establishment to use the same precentage of mark-ups over raw cost that it has customarily used when it introduces its new food item or beverage on its menus.

2. We recommend that the highest price line limitation as defined by restaurant MPR 2 and brought into effect by the application of appendix A be revised in accordance with the suggestions in this statement. I feel sure that, if requested, the National Restaurant Industry Advisory Committee will offer its services to the Office of Price Administration in redrafting the regulations in accordance with these suggestions.

3. We respectfully recommend that section 17 (a) of restaurant MPR 2 be amended by striking out subdivisions (2) and (3), and that section 17 (b) be amended by striking out subsections (3) and (4).

I conclude my statement, gentlemen, with the recommendation that your committee direct the Office of Price Administration, in the formulation of its price policies and programs, to take into consideration the realities and increased costs of doing business by the public feeding industry. The justification for the continuance of price control is rapidly being overshadowed by the unwise administrative policies as they are presently applied to American business. Unless Congress recognizes the trend that is being rapidly developed by the Office of Price Administration and takes steps to correct these trends it might be better to abolish the entire price-control program rather than to permit the OPA to break down the system of free enterprise and individual opportunity.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE R. LESAUVAGE,
Chairman, Government Relationship Committee, National Restaurant Association.

Statement on the Case Bill by Senators Ball, Byrd, Ellender, Hatch, Smith, and Taft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on House bill 4908, the so-called Case bill, issued last night by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and myself.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON H. R. 4908 BY SENATORS JOSEPH H. BALL, HARRY F. BYRD, ALLEN J. ELLENDER, CARL A. HATCH, H. ALEXANDER SMITH, AND ROBERT A. TAFT

The newspapers of June 3, 1946, carried the text of a letter to the President of the United States from Mr. Philip Murray, president of the CIO, urging that he veto the so-called Case bill, H. R. 4908. Published with his letter was what purports to be an analysis of the bill by the general counsel of the CIO. The Murray letter and the analysis contained so many exaggerations as to the nature and effect of the bill that we who were active in support of the legislation in the Senate are impelled to make this public statement in reply to these and other misrepresentations of the spirit and effect of H. R. 4908.

Mr. Murray's position is tenable only if we agree with certain basic premises upon which he proceeds:

1. That the right to strike is an absolute right, the exercise of which may under no conditions be curtailed or restrained, even when it threatens to deprive the public of transportation, fuel, light, water, and other essentials of life.

2. That labor organizations should be immune from laws applying to all others, which prohibit robbery and extortion in interstate commerce.

3. That labor organizations should be immune from the antitrust laws, which apply to all others, although the purpose and effect may be the same when done by labor organizations as when done by any others.

4. That although all others who engage in business are responsible for the acts of their

agents acting within the scope of their authority, labor unions should not be held responsible.

5. That although a labor organization is treated as an entity for purposes of exemption from taxation and for purposes of exercising privileges under the Wagner Act, it should not be treated as an entity for purpose of suit for violation of its contracts.

6. That although Federal equity courts may give relief by injunction against various wrongs when committed by others, there should be no such relief against a labor union, no matter what wrongs it may commit, and no matter whether or not the law provides the injured party with any other adequate remedy.

Mr. Murray's position appears to be that labor organizations are entitled to a unique position of privilege and immunity not accorded to other organizations, and that by virtue of being labor unions they are entitled to a position above and beyond the reach of law.

The answer to this position was once made by Mr. Justice Brandeis, a devoted friend of the labor movement, who said:

"The plea of trades-unions for immunity, be it from injunction or from liability for damages, is as fallacious as the plea of the lynchers. If lawless methods are pursued by trades-unions, whether it be by violence, by intimidation, or by the more peaceful infringement of legal rights, that lawlessness must be put down at once and at any cost." (Brandeis, Business: A Profession, revised edition, December 1933.)

Since Mr. Murray describes this bill as part of a deliberate campaign to shackle labor and destroy collective bargaining, it seems well to set forth briefly just what the bill proposes:

CREATION OF FEDERAL MEDIATION BOARD

This bill would establish a new five-man Federal Mediation Board in the Department of Labor. The present Conciliation Service would be transferred to this Board. The Mediation Board would have authority to intervene in order to mediate a labor dispute. If mediation failed, the Board would seek to induce both parties to arbitrate the dispute. Arbitration, however, would be entirely voluntary and it would not be an unfair labor practice for either party to reject the suggestion of arbitration. If efforts at mediation and arbitration should both fail, the Board would inform both parties and the Secretary of Labor. The bill does not make it an offense for any party to decline to accept the recommendations of the Federal Mediation Board or in any way penalize the failure on the part of either party to accept the Board's recommendations.

COOLING-OFF PERIOD

Where the Board has intervened the bill provides that the Board shall be protected in the exercise of its functions until mediation has had an opportunity to function. This is accomplished by making strikes and lockouts illegal for a limited period of not more than 60 days from the date on which collective-bargaining negotiations were first requested.

If an employer failed to maintain the status quo during the so-called waiting period, it would be an unfair labor practice under the Wagner Act; while violations by employees could be punished by termination of their employment without any duty on the part of the employer to rehire them. No other penalties than these are provided for violation of the so-called waiting-period provisions of the bill, and no injunction could be issued under this section against employees. It is to be noted also that section 3 (e) states that nothing in the act (not merely this section) may be construed to require any individual employee to render service against his will.

FACT FINDING IN PUBLIC UTILITIES

The bill provides that if mediation and voluntary arbitration fail in disputes occurring in public utilities, the Board is authorized to request the President to create an emergency commission. Such commission is directed to investigate and report to the President the facts, together with recommendations for settlement of the dispute. The report of such a commission, which is to be made within 30 days, is not legally binding on either party. This provision has its parallel in the Railway Labor Act.

Unlike the provision of the Railway Labor Act, however, the provision in this bill requires that after a commission has been appointed and until 5 days after it has made its report, neither party may change the status quo. If he does so, he is subject to the same penalties as provided by section 3 with respect to non-public-utility cases. The commission is required to make its report in 30 days from the date of its appointment except that, with the approval of the parties to a dispute, the time for making a report may be extended by the President for an additional 30 days. This gives a possible waiting period of 65 days in the case of a labor dispute affecting public utilities.

ANTIRACKETEERING PROVISION (SEC. 7)

Section 7 of the bill would amend the Antiracketeering Act of 1934 in order to remedy a situation created by a Supreme Court decision which held that the act was not applicable to labor organizations. This section of the bill will make it unlawful to delay or obstruct the movement of any article in commerce by robbery or extortion. The section makes it clear that these practices are unlawful whether engaged in by unions or by other organizations. Such acts are subject to criminal penalties, including fines or imprisonment, or both.

This amendment does not in any way change the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the National Labor Relations Act, or the Railway Labor Act.

SUABILITY FOR BREACHES OF CONTRACT

Section 10 makes collective-bargaining agreements, within the scope of the act, enforceable against unions in Federal district courts. In many States unions are not treated as entities for purposes of suit, and may not be sued as organizations. In these States where this rule prevails they may also not be sued in the Federal courts, which are required to follow the State's court decisions on this subject.

Under section 10 any money damages for breach of contract by a union would be enforceable against the union funds and not against the wages or property of individual members. Under the provision that judgments are enforceable only against union funds, it is clear that union members, like corporate stockholders, would be protected by having their liability limited.

Unions and employers which had agreements would both be protected against unauthorized or wildcat strikes in violation of the agreement. The protection would be provided by permitting the disciplining of employees who engaged in such unauthorized strikes. Such employees would not have to be rehired after the strike unless the union approved or ratified the strike. Once reemployed, an employee could not later be discharged for having participated in the strike. The purpose of this section is to discourage and penalize unauthorized strikes and to protect unions from damage suits resulting from unauthorized strikes.

ANTITRUST LAWS—BOYCOTTS

Under fairly recent decisions of the Supreme Court, which has been sharply divided over the question, secondary boycotts when engaged in by unions are not subject to the antitrust laws. Section 11 of the pending measure would make such secondary boycotts subject to criminal and civil proceedings under the antitrust laws. This would be accomplished by amending the Clayton Act so as to declare that it is not a legitimate object of a labor organization (1) to conspire to fix prices, divide markets, or restrict output; or (2) to strike, use violence, or to refuse to handle or transport materials (a) to force one employer not to use, sell, handle, or transport the products of any other producer or manufacturer, or (b) to force an employer to recognize, deal with, or to employ members of one labor organization rather than another which is the certified bargaining representative. This attempts to reach one serious form of jurisdictional boycott. The Norris-LaGuardia Act would be amended to make clear that injunctions could be issued against such violations of the antitrust laws. (Section 11 (a).)

HEALTH AND WELFARE FUNDS

Section 8 of the bill regulates employer contributions to union welfare funds, by prohibiting employer contributions to labor unions, except: (1) Union dues checked off an employee's pay; (2) payment of past or present wages due a union representative who is also an employee; and (3) payments to a welfare fund from which payments can be made to employees or their dependents for medical and hospital care, pensions, and disability insurance, if (a) the fund is administered by equal representation of the employer and the employees, (b) the basis for payment is specified by written agreement, and (c) an annual audit of the fund, open to public inspection, is provided.

Penalties for violation of this section consist of fines and imprisonment, or both. In addition, the district courts are empowered to issue injunctions restraining violations of the section notwithstanding the limitations of the Clayton Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

This section does not apply to any contract existing on May 15, 1946, during the life of such contract.

This section constitutes a declaration of public policy against collection of large sums of money from employers for the use and benefit of the union itself, to be spent for unspecified purposes at the sole discretion of union officers. Legitimate health and welfare funds, pension plans, hospitalization plans, and other programs designed for the improvement of health and working conditions are not affected. The section applies only where money is paid to a labor organization or representative.

FOREMEN AND OTHER SUPERVISORY PERSONNEL

Section 9 of the bill is designed to end the confusion over the application of the Wagner Act to persons who are bona fide representatives of management, by defining the term "employee" to exclude supervisory personnel. In other words, it draws a line between production workers and supervisors who are really representatives of management, whether they be foremen, superintendents, plant managers, or vice presidents.

This amendment does not affect supervisory employees who are members of a union. It does not deny them any right to join. It does, however, relieve employers of any legal compulsion to bargain collectively with their own representatives. It also relieves foremen of the impossible position of being an essential part of management in the application of management policies at the point of contact with production workers, and being at the same time subject to union discipline.

William Green of the American Federation of Labor, in his testimony before the Senate Education and Labor Committee stated, "The line of distinction should be drawn."

Mr. Murray urges that this bill if it had been law would not have prevented or shortened any of the recent disastrous strikes. He thereby admits that the measure cannot be described accurately as an antistrike measure. The fact is that this bill was not designed as emergency legislation to meet current strike situations. It is permanent legislation. It was not, as Mr. Murray claims, hastily passed. He himself says in his letter:

"Every single provision of H. R. 4908, with the sole exception of section 8, 'Restrictions on payments to labor organizations' has been unsuccessfully proposed before."

This statement is correct. Congress has struggled with the problems dealt with in H. R. 4908 for many years. They have been the subject of numerous bills and hearings. But it is common knowledge that for some 12 years past it has been a practical impossibility to get any of these measures, opposed by organized labor, out of the Education and Labor Committee of the Senate or the Labor Committee of the House, even with an unfavorable report, so that the Congress itself could express its desire for or against enactment. Mr. Murray complains that the Case bill did not originate in the appropriate committees. The fact is that the subject matter of the bill was before the Senate Education and Labor Committee for some time, that it held exhaustive hearings, and that except for the Byrd amendment (the so-called royalty amendment), and the Hobbs antiracketeering amendment, the provisions were all considered in the Senate committee in almost precisely the form in which they finally passed. The Byrd amendment, in its original form, was introduced by Senator BAILEY of North Carolina, more than a year ago. It was also introduced in the House by Representative ROBERTSON of Virginia and, together with a similar bill by Representative SMITH of Virginia, was the subject of hearings before the House Judiciary Committee. Incidentally, the Judiciary Committees of the two Houses were the appropriate committees to consider these proposals, since they carried criminal penalties. The antiracketeering amendment likewise had been before Congress for several years, had been the subject of long hearings, and had already passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming majority. The picture drawn by Mr. Murray of powerful antilabor groups conspiring to throttle labor unions is hardly consistent with the fact that for a dozen years no group in public or private life has been able to muster enough strength to secure even one single amendment to the Wagner Act or the Norris-LaGuardia Act. It was not until the excesses of organized labor, practiced with complete legal immunity, brought the Nation to its knees that public opinion finally broke the congressional committee blockade and gave Congress an opportunity to register its will by passing the Case bill.

It is claimed by Mr. Murray that the Case bill will not settle or prevent strikes, but on the contrary will encourage them. He overlooks the fact that the Case bill, except in its provisions for mediation and cooling-off periods, is not designed primarily to deal with labor disputes. It proceeds on the same basis as the Wagner Act—to eliminate some of the demonstrated abuses which have a tendency to produce labor disputes leading to strikes and consequent interruptions to commerce. However, the Wagner Act dealt only with employer practices and placed no restrictions on unions or employees. The Case bill is merely a step in the direction of balancing this picture. It leaves untouched many labor union practices which ought to be dealt with by appropriate legislation. It is not an antistrike bill in any broad sense. It does not discourage collective bargaining. It does not seek to destroy unions. It does not make strikes, or picketing, or violence offenses under Federal law. It leaves them to the States and local communities. But it does make a wholesome beginning toward equal treatment of unions and employers under the law, and thus tends to restore the equality at the bargaining table which has been destroyed by the Wagner Act as interpreted and applied.

Mr. Murray criticizes the effort of legislators to secure legislation which will overcome the effect of court decisions, as in the case of the so-called antiracketeering amendment. But he seems to forget that the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the labor sections of the Clayton Act, and, to a large extent, the provisions of the Wagner Act, were advocated by labor unions and enacted by Congress for the express purpose of overcoming the effects of court decisions which the unions did not like—for illustration, the *Danbury Hatters Case*, the *Hitchman Case*, the *Adair Case*, etc. There can be no sound criticism of those persons, be they employers or labor-union officials, who seek through the exercise of the legislative power to remedy situations disclosed by judicial decisions, particularly where, as here, the Supreme Court has said that, if the Congress desires a different rule, it has only to say so; that the only function of the Court is to interpret the intention of Congress as evidenced by the statute applied. Mr. Murray is willing to accept the benefits of congressional action designed to overcome court decisions he does not like, but is unwilling to accord to others like freedom to advocate congressional remedy for demonstrated evils of labor unionism.

The CIO analysis of section 3 of H. R. 4908 shows clearly that the CIO is opposed to any restriction on the right of unions to conduct a strike in any industry at any time and in furtherance of any demands they see fit to make. Fundamentally, the opposition is to Federal conciliation and mediation, and the CIO submits as the alternative the doctrine that the provisions of collective bargaining agreements should be determined by a test of economic power between the union and the employer.

However, the strike cannot be considered as an isolated phenomenon affecting only the employer and the union involved. The interdependence of communities and industries invests the public, and therefore the Government, with an interest in any work stoppage affecting the national health and security. The CIO would subordinate that interest to the right of the union to invoke the strike weapon at such times and under such circumstances as it determines. They object to the nonstrike mediation period established by H. R. 4908 because, in their words—

"A union may be faced with the necessity of striking in a particular situation at some period shorter than the 60-day period laid down in the legislation. The 60-day period imposes on a union all of the weakening and limiting effects which flow from an arbitrary and unnecessary prolongation of a period of fruitless conference where employer attitudes are clear. The practical facts connected with the planning and organization of a strike must be kept in mind."

To support this thesis that a no-strike period during which the parties to a labor dispute must resort to mediation will not prevent strikes, but will merely aid and abet employers reluctant to concede the demands of the unions, the CIO makes two contentions.

In the first place, they argue that the provision for a mediation period will encourage strikes by producing "the impression that a strike is a federally created privilege to be automatically enjoyed by all workers at the price of waiting 60 days." That assertion is mere sophistry.

The Clayton Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and the National Labor Relations Act, all specifically recognize and safeguard the right to strike. The CIO might with equal logic argue that the provisions of those acts, preserving the right to strike, are an incitement to strikes.

The CIO in its analysis of H. R. 4908 clearly demonstrates that usually strikes are not spontaneous eruptions by the employees, but are planned and controlled activities instituted and directed by the labor unions.

The second contention made is that section 3 would cause strikes because it invites the employer to provoke a strike in order to smash the union. The thesis is that by remaining obdurate during the statutory no-strike period, an employer could create an impasse compelling employees to resort to a strike in violation of the law with the attendant loss of employee status and collective bargaining representation.

That argument overlooks specific provisions in the measure. In the first place, the statute requires the employer, during the no-strike period, to maintain the rates of pay, hours, and working conditions which existed immediately prior to the time the dispute arose, except in regard to changes agreed upon in writing with the employees or their representatives. The employer's failure to perform that duty is made an unfair-labor practice within the meaning of the National Labor Relations Act, and the National Labor Relations Board specifically is authorized to utilize the powers granted to it by that statute to prevent and restrain such practices.

The measure also provides that the no-strike mediation period shall last for 60 days from the date the employer or union requests a bargaining conference, or until the Federal Mediation Board certifies that its efforts at mediation are concluded. In other words, the no-strike period may not last more than 60 days, but in the event that prior to such time the Mediation Board should determine that its efforts to mediate the dispute would be unavailing because of the employer's attitude, the Board then could conclude the mediation period at any time and thus terminate the no-strike period.

Obviously section 3 is adequately drafted to protect employees and unions during the no-strike period and to insure that employers negotiate in good faith during that time.

A strike is an unmistakable sympton that collective bargaining has failed. By creating adequate mediation machinery to make sure that all efforts to resolve labor disputes by negotiation, compromise, and arbitration are exhausted, H. R. 4908 attempts to eliminate the necessity for strikes.

Section 6 of the bill provides that where a labor dispute involving a public utility, whose rates are fixed by a governmental agency, arises, that remains unsettled, the President may create an emergency commission to investigate the dispute upon finding that it threatens a substantial interruption of an essential service. Such commission will make its recommendations regarding the settlement of the dispute and its report shall be made public.

While an emergency commission is investigating, H. R. 4908 requires that no strike or lock-out be conducted and that the status quo prevailing immediately before the time of the dispute shall be maintained.

The general counsel for the CIO criticizes this provision for the same reasons he objects to those contained in section 3. However, in connection with section 6 he makes the interesting observation that "the result in this, as in all other proposed prohibitions on the right to strike, is simply that the Government steps in to protect the employer in any position the employer wishes to take, however unreasonable, in the negotiation."

That assertion is completely unsupported by the history of the various disputes which

recently have been submitted to fact-finding panels appointed by the Government. In the oil, rubber, and automobile situations, the reports of those agencies indicate that they performed their functions without prejudice against unions or employees. It is a matter of record that in the recent railway dispute, while the majority of the railroad operators and the unions were perfectly willing to accept the recommendations of the President's fact-finding panel, two powerful unions flatly refused to acquiesce, and crippled the economy of the Nation until the President went to the country.

In the light of recent activities, it would be blindness not to recognize that Nationwide unions operating in the public-utilities field have it within their power to starve the country into submission in order to further any demands which they see fit to make. The proposal in section 6 that strikes in that field be restrained until a commission created by the President would make a full investigation and report is reasonably designed to protect the public welfare and is not, as the CIO says, designed to place the Government on the side of the employer.

The CIO advances the specious argument that to make special provision for the handling of labor disputes in the field of public utilities is to make a second-class citizen of a worker precisely because he is important in our economic scheme, and is a formula which not only promotes injuries in its immediate application but is inconsistent with the very premises of a free society.

It is well established that an employer who elects to invest his capital and efforts in the conduct of a public utility accepts governmental control and restrictions necessary to insure the public an adequate and continuous supply of the essential goods or services he sells. Certainly it cannot be argued that the worker who elects and accepts employment in that field does not owe to the public an analogous duty to perform his services subject to the same fundamental public necessities.

Section 7 of H. R. 4908 amends the Anti-racketeering Act (18 U. S. C. A., sec. 420a, et seq.). As amended, the statute makes the obstruction of interstate commerce by robbery or extortion a violation punishable by imprisonment or fine or both. The CIO's chief criticism is that the statute, as enacted, does not specifically exempt from its scope union activities and thereby implies that customary and legitimate union activities may fall within the prohibitions of the enactment.

The statute, as amended, is designed to prevent robbery or extortion by means of violence or threats. It specifically provides that nothing therein shall be construed to repeal, modify, or affect sections 6 or 20 of the Clayton Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Railway Labor Act, or the National Labor Relations Act. It is apparent, therefore, that it is not intended to apply to legitimate union activities. The CIO's fears that the Anti-racketeering Act, as amended, may be utilized by antilabor courts to prevent legitimate strike action in furtherance of wage demands, is groundless. Its analysis fails to consider the provision just mentioned.

The amendment contained in section 7 is necessary, because in *United States* v. *Local 807* (315 U. S. 520), the Supreme Court ruled that the statute as previously written did not condemn the use of threats and violence by a union in order to compel employers to make stand-by payments to union members under threats of violence and assault. It was held in that case that such activity was excluded from the scope of the statute, because it specifically exempted "the payment of a wage by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee," and that the offer of services, under threats of violence, even though unwanted by the employer, created an employment relationship within the meaning of the statute.

The general counsel for the CIO complains that the prohibition against contributions to a welfare fund, unless it meets the requirements of the statute, is an unreasonable and unwarranted curtailment of the freedom to bargain collectively and imposes "a rigid and artificial formula for the administration of welfare funds."

The National Labor Relations Act provides that it shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer to contribute financial or other support to any labor organization. While the unions have contended that such proscription applies only in the event the union receiving the support is company-dominated, one of the highest Federal courts has recently held that mere contribution and support, without any domination, infringes the Wagner Act (*Wyman-Gordon Co.* v. *National Labor Relations Board*, C. C. A. 7, Feb. 9, 1946, 17 L. R. R. 823). Section 8, therefore, liberalizes present declared law to the extent of permitting contributions to welfare funds where they are set up as a trust for the benefit of the employees and jointly administered by the employer and the union.

The provision in H. R. 4908 that supervisors, as therein defined, shall not be included within the definition of employees contained in the Wagner Act also is condemned by the general counsel for the CIO as one which will incite labor disturbances and "compel foremen to strike in order to obtain what the law freely guarantees to other employees."

He overlooks the fact that at the present time supervisory personnel occupy a dual status under the Wagner Act. By reason of the definition of employer therein contained, they are regarded as representatives of management in their relationship to the employees they supervise. Consequently, the Supreme Court has declared that the employer is responsible for any unfair labor practices they commit, even though such activities are unauthorized, unknown to the employer, and unratified. (*H. J. Heinz Co.* v. *National Labor Relations Board*, 311 U. S. 514.) At the same time, it has been held that because supervisors are employees within the meaning of the statute, they are entitled to the protection of the statute when they engage in organizational activities and the concerted actions guaranteed to employees by the law; and it has recently been held by the National Labor Relations Board that under the statute they are entitled to bargain collectively through the same union which represents the employees they supervise. (*Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation*, NLRB Case No. 6–R–119.)

The net result of these rulings is to place supervisory personnel in an anomolous position in which their fiduciary obligation to management may conflict with their membership obligation to the labor union.

The National Labor Relations Board consistently has adhered to the doctrine that there can be no true collective bargaining if management interferes with designation of the bargaining agent of the workers. It is equally true that there can be no real collective bargaining if the union which represents the workers is in a position to interfere with and control the personnel to whom management must delegate its control over production, discipline, and the administration of the collective bargaining agreement. Industrial relations stability cannot be obtained through the process of collective bargaining if the personnel to whom management must delegate its functions in day-to-day dealings with the workers is subjected to the disciplinary measures of the labor organizations which represent these workers.

Section 10 of the Federal Mediation Act of 1946 provides that labor unions may be sued in their common name in the courts of the United States for breach of a collective-bargaining agreement which affects interstate commerce. The CIO objects to this imposition of liability because, in its language—

"The section proceeds upon the wholly unfounded assumption that labor unions frequently breach their collective-bargaining agreements and therefore should be subjected to an additional Federal sanction."

They state that—

"Those even superficially familiar with the experiences of labor organizations in the courts know that those organizations can be and are sued in State courts. The sole purpose of creating a special law to render them subject to Federal suit is to harass such organizations and to legislate the prejudice of those who prefer to industrial peace the official adoption of the canard that unions do not keep their contractual obligations."

One of the primary objectives of the National Labor Relations Act as declared by the United States Supreme Court is to compel employers to bargain collectively with labor unions "to the end that employment contracts binding on both parties should be made." (*National Labor Relations Board* v. *Sands Mfg Company*, 306 U. S. 332, 342.) To accomplish that end the statute compels an employer who has reached agreement with a labor organization to embody the terms of that agreement in a written, signed contract made with the labor organization as an entity. (*H. J. Heinz Company* v. *NLRB*, 311 U. S. 514, 522.)

Furthermore, the Supreme Court has ruled that the collective-bargaining agreement supersedes individual employment contracts inconsistent with its provisions. In the language of the Court—

"The very purpose of providing by statute for the collective agreement is to supersede the terms of separate agreements of employees with terms which reflect the strength and bargaining power and serve the welfare of the group. Its benefits and advantages are open to every employee of the represented unit whatever the type or terms of his pre-existing contract of employment." (*J. I. Case Co.* v. *NLRB*, 321 U. S. 332, 338.)

It is apparent, therefore, that by reason of the National Labor Relations Act employers are compelled to recognize and deal with labor organizations as contracting entities. For all practical purposes, a labor organization selected as bargaining representative in accordance with the provisions of the Wagner Act, is the only agency with which the employer may contract.

Despite the fact that the Federal Government by statute recognizes that collective bargaining between employers engaged in interstate commerce and unions is a matter of national interest, the CIO would relegate actions for breach of the resulting contract to the State courts.

In their criticism of H. R. 4908 they imply that such courts are readily available to enforce and redress breaches of such contracts. In reality, however, they are not.

The vast majority of labor organizations are unincorporated voluntary associations, and at common law voluntary associations are not suable as entities in their common name. (*Wilson* v. *Air Line Coal Coal*, 215 Iowa 855; *Iron Molders Union* v. *Allis-Chalmers Co.*, C. C. A. 7, 166 Fed. 45.) Consequently, in the absence of statute, the rule in all jurisdictions is that unincorporated labor unions cannot be sued in their common name. In such jurisdictions to subject the union to process, it is necessary to make each individual member of the union a party to the suit.

Furthermore, whether an unincorporated union can be sued in the Federal courts depends upon the procedural rules of the State in which the action is brought. (*Busby* v. *Electric Utility Employees Union*, U. S. S. C., 89 L. ed. 78.)

Therefore, the statement of the CIO that labor unions "can be and are sued in the State courts" is a misleading generalization. The State courts provide a completely inadequate forum to redress breaches of collective-bargaining agreements, the making of which is compelled by Federal law as a matter of national interest.

It also may be noted that the Norris-LaGuardia Act has immunized unions from injunctions against breach of collective-bargaining agreements. The Federal courts have held that strikes, picketing, or boycotting, when carried on in violation of a collective-bargaining agreement, involve a labor dispute within the meaning of that statute so as to make the activity not enjoinable without a showing of the requirements which condition issuance of an injunction under the statute—conditions so onerous as to destroy the remedy for all practical purposes. (*Wilson & Co.* v. *Birlin*, 105 Fed. 2, 948 C. C. A. 3.) Many States have enacted anti-injuction laws similar to the Federal statute, and the courts in many of those jurisdictions have held that a strike in violation of a collective-bargaining contract is not enjoinable. (*The Nevins* v. *Kasmach*, 279 N. Y. 323; *Bulkin* v. *Sacks*, 31 Pa. D. & C. 501.)

The absence of an adequate forum to redress violations of collective-bargaining agreements and the immunization of unions from injunction proceedings now nullifies one of the primary purposes of the Wagner Act, to wit, the making of contracts which shall be binding upon the parties. The necessity for establishing union responsibility for violations of collective-bargaining agreements, and the desirability of so doing, was succinctly stated by Mr. Justice Brandeis in the following words:

"I can conceive of no expenditure of money by a union which could bring so large a return as the payment of compensation for some wrong actually committed by it. Any such payment would go far in curbing the officers and members of the union from future transgression of the law, and it would, above all, establish the position of the union as a responsibile agent in the community, ready to abide by the law." (Brandeis, Business—A Profession, revision of 1933.)

H. R. 4908 amends section 6 of the Clayton Act to provide that secondary boycotts in restraint of commerce shall be enjoinable under the antitrust laws.

The necessity for legislative action to prevent abuse of the boycott weapon has been recognized by the United States Supreme Court. In *Allen Bradley Co.* v. *Local Union No. 3* (325 U. S. 797), the Court held that where a union conspired with electrical contractors to create a monopoly on electrical equipment going into buildings in the New York area by refusing to work on any equipment not manufactured or wired by the employers with whom the New York local of the union had contracts, the conspiracy was a violation of the antitrust laws. However, the Court specifically held that the union by itself could continue to achieve the same result by refusing to install outside equipment. In the course of its opinion, the Court said:

"Our holding means that the same labor-union activities may or may not be in violation of the Sherman Act, depending upon whether the union acts alone or in combination with business groups. This, it is argued, brings about a wholly undesirable result—one which leaves labor unions free to engage in conduct which restrains trade. But the desirability of such an exemption of labor unions is a question for the determination of Congress."

In that plain language the Court recognized that the present immunity from the antitrust laws granted to labor unions by the Clayton Act and Norris-LaGuardia Act does leave them free to engage in conduct which restrains interstate commerce and which necessitates remedial legislation.

We call attention to a significant omission from Mr. Murray's letter. He does not defend the practices which this bill would prohibit. He does not assert that it is right that unions should practice robbery or extortion by violence in commerce. He does not argue that it is right for unions to paralyze the Nation or a community by pulling the switches and closing down essential utilities without notice. He does not argue that it is right that unions should escape responsibility for the acts of their agents. He does not aruge that it is right for unions to violate their contracts. He does not argue that it is right for unions to combine with others to fix prices or restrict competition. This, apparently, would be carrying the matter a little too far. Yet today every one of these things can be done by a union with complete legal immunity. They could not be done legally if the Case bill were enacted. And Mr. Murray urges that the immunity be perpetuated.

Finally, it is appropriate to ask what remedy Mr. Murray proposes for the demonstrated evils with which Congress has tried to deal. One may search his letter in vain for any suggestion that any of these problems is any of the public's business. His sole contribution is the request that the Case bill be vetoed, and the unions thereby be left free to pursue in future the course they have in the recent past. This attitude of disregard for the public's interest is the most convincing reason why the Case bill should receive Presidential approval.

JOSEPH H. BALL,
HARRY F. BYRD,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CARL A. HATCH,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
ROBERT A. TAFT.

Letter to the President From Philip Murray Urging Veto of the Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Philip Murray to the President relative to the Case bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I write to you at this critical moment in the Nation's history with respect to H. R. 4908, entitled "An act to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes, and for other purposes." I respectfully request you to veto this piece of legislation which has just been hastily passed by both Houses of Congress. This act is not merely ill-considered and injurious to labor, it presents exceedingly grave dangers to the public welfare. Far from removing the causes of labor disputes, it will in fact encourage and increase labor disputes.

The encouragement of trade unionism and the promotion of collective bargaining as an avenue to industrial peace have been the Federal policy for barely 10 years. The benefits of the National Labor Relations Act did not begin to accrue to workers until 1937, when the act was declared constitutional. From the very date of the passage of the National Labor Relations Act until the present the labor movement in America has been the subject of an unremitting campaign of sniping and attack on the part of powerful American industrialists.

From the days of the infamous Liberty League to the present there has never been a session of Congress which did not produce its quota of antilabor bills. H. R. 4908 is but the most recent of a long line of proposals advanced by an antilabor group in Congress for the sole purpose of weakening labor and undermining its bargaining strength. Those who have sponsored and actively promoted this legislation constitute the same vindictive, goal-conscious minority which has been engaged in a campaign for the past 10 years to repress labor and to destroy its rights. There is an unbroken chain from the efforts of the Liberty League to kill the National Labor Relations Act at its very birth to H. R. 4908. After 10 years of witch-hunt, smear, and misrepresentation, after 10 years of a campaign without let-up to lay at labor's door every conceivable charge, the labor baiters have produced H. R. 4908. After 10 years, during which every type of parliamentary trick and maneuver was used to slip through Congress a bill which would shackle labor H. R. 4908 has emerged.

Mr. President, since the adoption of the National Labor Relations Act innumerable bills have been proposed, in session after session, with the sole objective of injuring labor and outlawing its legitimate activities. These proposals fall into certain clear basic categories:

1. Those proposals which seek to regulate the internal affairs of labor organizations, and in that way to undermine their bargaining strength:

Seventy-fifth Congress: H. R. 6148, H. R. 6456.

Seventy-sixth Congress: H. R. 4910, H. R. 8750, S. J. Res. 275.

Seventy-seventh Congress: H. R. 4139, H. R. 4392, H. R. 5015, H. R. 5148, H. R. 5149, H. R. 6068, H. R. 6149, H. R. 6154, H. R. 6444, S. 2042.

Seventy-eighth Congress: H. R. 804, H. R. 1483, H. R. 1781, H. R. 1782, S. 1307, S. J. Res. 9.

Seventy-ninth Congress: H. R. 354, H. R. 544, H. J. Res. 318, S. 1642.

2. Those proposals which attack the right to strike either through outright prohibition or through cooling-off legislation:

Seventy-fifth Congress: H. R. 6456, H. R. 7598, H. R. 7831.

Seventy-sixth Congress: H. R. 4903, H. R. 4910, H. R. 7440.

Seventy-seventh Congress: H. R. 1407, H. R. 2662, H. R. 2695, H. R. 2850, H. R. 4139, Riders to H. R. 4965, H. R. 5924, H. R. 6057, H. R. 6066, H. R. 6068, H. R. 6101, H. R. 6149, H. R. 6826, H. J. Res. 247, S. 114, S. 2042.

Seventy-eighth Congress: H. R. 147, H. R. 992, H. R. 1486, H. R. 1487, S. 1068, S. 1069, S. 1070.

Seventy-ninth Congress: S. 1656, S. 1661.

3. Those measures designed to subject the legitimate concerted activities of labor organizations to the supervision of Federal courts through repeal or amendment of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the application of the antitrust laws to labor unions, prohibition of picketing through judicial expansion of concepts of coercion and force, subjecting unions to damage suits in the Federal courts:

Seventy-fifth Congress: H. R. 5933.

Seventy-sixth Congress: H. R. 7440.

Seventy-seventh Congress: H. R. 1407, H. R. 2694, H. R. 4139, H. R. 5218, H. R. 5259, H. R. 6066, H. R. 6083, H. R. 6149, S. J. Res. 114, S. 2347.

Seventy-eighth Congress: H. R. 653, H. R. 1472, H. R. 1487, H. R. 1694, H. R. 1866, S. 189, S. 712.

Seventy-ninth Congress: H. R. 32, S. 6, S. 371, S. 1644, S. 1647, S. 1656.

4. A fourth line of attack adopted by the labor baiters has been the attempt to legislate out of the area of collective bargaining certain subjects, such as union security or to depress labor standards by prohibiting overtime-wage rates:

Seventy-seventh Congress: H. R. 1403, H. R. 1814, H. R. 2694, H. R. 2695, H. R. 4139, H. R. 6066, H. R. 6149, H. R. 6790, H. R. 6814, H. R. 6826, H. R. 6835, S. 683, S. 2232, S. 2365, S. 2373, S. J. Res. 114.

Seventy-eighth Congress: H. R. 992, H. R. 1173, H. R. 1472, H. R. 1473, H. R. 2681, S. 190, S. 199, S. 235, S. 237, S. J. Res. 4.

Seventy-ninth Congress: H. R. 1337, S. 1643.

5. Finally, there are those proposals, as multitudinous as the fish in the sea, for repeal or amendment of the National Labor Relations Act and for constitution of the National Labor Relations Board.

This incessant barrage of labor legislation had and continues to have certain plain characteristics. It is, first and foremost, exclusively antilabor. Some of the bills display a pretense at even-handedness by purporting to regulate employers too. When stripped of their symmetrical ornamentation, they all stand revealed as directed exclusively toward the rights of workers and their trade-unions.

Of course, all of the bills unctuously purport to guard some fundamental principle, to promote some legitimate and high-sounding objective, to cure some deep-seated evil. They invariably bear some lofty title: "An act to protect interstate commerce"; "An act to promote industrial peace"; "An act to stimulate the production of food"; "An act to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, to diminish unemployment, to establish a national policy for assuring continuing employment in a free competitive economy, and to protect the right to work"; "An act to promote war production"; etc., etc.

When the country is faced with a major problem, be it war production, veterans' reemployment, food shortages, or what have you, the sponsors of these bills are ready with new bills which mechanically repeat the same chant of hate—regulate labor, curb labor, destroy labor. When no problem exists, they invent one and blame labor for its existence. The stock in trade of these men is hatred. During the war they sought to exploit wartime emotions to shackle labor; today they are hopeful of final victory during the trying period of readjustment to a peacetime economy.

Mr. President, we all know these men who, session after session, carry on their vendetta against labor. For the past 10 years it has been basically the same group. These legislators do not seek to cure the alleged labor abuses which arise in their own districts or States. Almost all of them represent rural constituencies where there are few trade-unions. No; these men are the voice of those outside of their constituencies; they are the voice of the powerful antiunion employers in this country.

Of course, not all of these measures have been proposed with a belief that they would become law. A basic aim of the sponsors of these bills has been to use the legislative process itself as a means of smearing labor and of artifically stimulating resentment against trade unions. The program of this group has become and continues to be a war of nerves to soften up or neutralize progressive opposition to antilabor legislation through a constant stream of restrictive bills. This program of misrepresentation in the form of bills also had other more immediate objectives. It was designed to frighten workers away from trade unions, to cheat labor of the fruits of Federal labor legislation, to force the labor movement to operate in a constant state of crisis and thus to dissipate its time and energy in defending itself. Finally, by attacking labor as a whole, this group of legislators encouraged large groups of American employers to attack the unions of their own employees. This group of legislators used the legislative apparatus to promote disregard of Federal labor laws, and to keep alive hopes of repealing them. This process ultimately reached the point where legislation was frequently prepared to meet the antilabor needs of a particular employer or group of employers who had fallen afoul of the law.

With monotonous regularity, one or another member of this group in session after session of Congress introduces bills to reverse a particular court case. Whenever the Supreme Court decides that a certain type of antilabor conduct is condemned by Federal law, a bill is sure to follow to cheat labor of the fruits of the decision by seeking to legislate that conduct out of the reach of the Federal law. And whenever the Supreme Court decides that a Federal restraint, such as the Antiracketeering Act or the antitrust laws, does not cover labor's concerted activities, almost the next day a bill is sure to follow correcting the situation.

Another consistent thread in the pattern which I am describing is the hypocrisy of this antilabor group toward the issue of States' rights. Whenever some form of Federal legislation is presented on a national problam involving the rights or protection of all the people, such as soldiers' voting in Federal elections, health insurance or the USES, the members of this group pose as valiant defenders of the States and of their jurisdiction. But every conceivable labor problem, however local, finds this group in hot pursuit of a Federal law. The very Senators who sought to deny the right of soldiers to vote on the specious ground that the rights of the States were being invaded, hypocritically propose to take a local lawsuit over a breach of contract out of the State courts and place it in Federal courts. The very Senator who bitterly assails the federalizing of USES because labor markets are local, and should be regulated by the States, screams that secondary boycotts which interfere with the labor market must be punished by Federal Government, because everyone knows that labor markets are not locally autonomous.

The antilabor legislative crusade has one further characteristic which, I am sure, you will recognize. It is forwarded and promoted through parliamentary tricks, legislative maneuvers, undemocratic devices. In its drive to shackle labor, for example, this group prefers to withhold its antilabor offerings from the appropriate congressional committees, the House Labor Committee and the Senate Education and Labor Committee. These committees, whose experience has made them alert to detect the partisan and vengeful character of the bills sponsored by this group, are consistently bypassed.

Instead, we find antilabor bills originating with increasing frequency in other congressional committees, such as the Judiciary Committee (which, in both Houses, has approved the Gwynne bill, drastically amending the Fair Labor Standards Act), the Military Affairs Committee (which approved the Smith-Connally Act), the Rules Committee (which engineered H. R. 4908 onto the floor of the House), etc.

A favorite device of this group of antilabor legislators is the rider. This is used to amend existing legislation, such as the Wagner Act, and to compel its discriminatory application or enforcement. Control over appropriations is consistently used to starve Federal labor agencies and to blackmail Federal administrators into submission to the antilabor demands of this group. Attacks upon Federal personnel are likewise used to inject into the employment situation considerations hostile to effective enforcement of labor legislation. And who can forget or omit to mention the loaded smear investigations which sought to discredit the Federal labor program, to intimidate Federal labor officials so as to cause them to abandon vigorous enforcement policies and to shield particular employers, such as those in the food-processing industry, from the consequences of their violations of Federal law?

I think it is fair to say that the frenzy of this group to destroy labor and to alter Federal labor policy has produced serious strains on sound legislative processes. Unless Congress is provided with the means of defending itself against the parliamentary ambushes, the blitz techniques, the calculated obstructions to democratic choice which this group is so fertile in improvising, a break-down of the legislative process is not far off.

I have taken pains, Mr. President, to describe to you the pattern of antilabor legislation which has characterized the past 10 years because H. R. 4908 is a part of that pattern. It must be considered in the light of that pattern. H. R. 4908 is not in any sense of the word a legislative implementation of a new theory of labor relations. H. R. 4908 is a conglomeration of a series of disconnected and motley labor provisions. It is unified only by two things: (1) a uniform animus against labor, and (2) an ignorance, either innocent or assumed, of the basic essentials of labor relations and of the considerations and conditions which make collective bargaining work.

I should point out to you that like all of its predecessors, H. R. 4908 bears a beguiling title, "An act to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes, and for other purposes." Like its predecessors, it addresses itself to a laudable objective, namely, "to encourage settlement of disputes between labor and management by collective bargaining." Like its predecessors, it displays fragments of window dressing as a concession to even-handedness. Like its predecessors, also, it is in fact exclusively and aggressively antilabor.

Mr. President, H. R. 4908 is not merely like its predecessors. Every single provision of H. R. 4908, with the sole exception of section 8, "Restrictions on payments to labor organizations," has been unsuccessfully proposed before.

Like its predecessors, H. R. 4908 was sponsored not by a representative from a State which had a long experience with organized labor and consequently might be deemed cognizant of the problems created by an active labor movement; on the contrary, H. R. 4908 was sponsored by a representative from the rural State of South Dakota.

H. R. 4908 is likewise linked to its predecessors by the unorthodox manner in which it was processed. No House hearings were ever held on H. R. 4908. It was engineered onto the floor by the House Rules Committee through a substitution for another labor bill upon which hearings had been held. Moreover, some of the provisions now in the bill were not even subject to hearings in the Senate Education and Labor Committee. It is important to point out to you in this connection that every single proposal in the bill, insofar as it was the subject of hearings, was condemned by two important administration labor officials, Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach and Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board Paul Herzog.

Like its predecessors, at least two of the provisions of H. R. 4908, namely, section 7, "Interfering with trade and commerce," and section 11, "Secondary boycotts," reflect an attempt to extend the Federal law to apply to labor after the Supreme Court had held the particular type of conduct now condemned to be perfectly proper. Like many of its predecessors, section 8, "Restrictions on payments to labor organizations," constitutes a barefaced attempt to send a legislative rescue party after a particular employer.

Once before Congress legislated specially in behalf of this same employer, the coal operators, when it passed the Smith-Connally Act, with disastrous consequences. Similarly, section 9, "Supervisory employees," is nothing new for the same proposal has been unsuccessfully advanced before. It is but the most recent of a long series of attempts to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to narrow its scope after the employer has failed to convince either the National Labor Relations Board or the courts that his interpretation of the act is a sound one.

Mr. President, the ill-assorted conglomeration of provisions which constitutes H. R. 4908 is a menace to sound labor relations. I attach to this letter a detailed analysis of H. R. 4908, which has been prepared by our general counsel. This analysis demonstrates the objectionable character of the legislation.

Mr. President, I repeat, not one of these proposals will promote industrial peace. Not one of them will reduce strikes or shorten their duration. All of these proposals are merely servings from a warmed-over antilabor stew which has been kept brewing for the past 10 years.

Mr. President, it is vitally important to bear in mind what the true facts are with respect to Federal labor legislation in this country. Despite the harangues of the professional labor baiters and the antilabor tom-toms of a certain portion of our press, labor organizations and the working people of America still do not enjoy the benefits of the Federal Labor program which has been 10 years in the making. Today in the United States there are many powerful employers who still regard the National Labor Relations Act as a temporary embarrassment, who still fight the organization of their workers and use their economic strength to destroy the efforts of the workers to organize. There are areas in the United States—and they are not inconsiderable either—in which labor organizers are beaten and maimed. There are areas in the United States where employers have corrupted the peace officers of entire communities and erected vast open shop citadels in defiance of their Government.

In the recent strikes literally hundreds of injunctions were obtained by antilabor employers to smash peaceful picketing. Police brutality against strikers in large American cities was a routine phenomenon. The lineaments of the notorious Mohawk Valley formula were retraced in community after community in order to break strikes. Employers freely used the enormous tax refunds of our Federal Government to starve their striking workers into submission.

Mr. President, today is not the day and this is not the hour to permit labor to be sacrificed to the petty vengeance of a few. Today, at the very moment when labor is supposed to have reaped the full advantage of the National Labor Relations Act, there are more unfair labor practice charges being filed by labor organizations with the National Labor Relations Board than at any time since March 1938. Every day the Board receives from all over the country 20 charges against employers of unfair labor practices. At a time when collective bargaining is asserted to be the rule and practice of the Nation, the Board has been receiving since VJ-day 102 charges of refusal to bargain a month. The Board is likewise receiving 198 charges a month relating to discrimination for union activity. Do these figures delineate an acceptance of the principles of the Wagner Act in America?

Mr. President, the evidence leads me to believe that we are on the brink of a vast antilabor crusade of which H. R. 4908 is but a forerunner. The raids on the living standards of our working people are increasing in intensity every day. Even the wretched and inadequate levels of the existing Fair Labor Standards Act are widely ignored. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, of some 42,613 establishments inspected for violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act more than three-fourths were found by the Wage and Hour Division to be in violation. For the first 9 months of the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1945, out of a total number of some 30,809 establishments inspected for violations of the act, some 26,775 were found in violation. Is it not clear, Mr. President, that the urgent need of the hour is the vigorous enforcement of the Federal labor policy? Is it not likewise clear that the answer to the problem of industrial strife is not the weakening of labor or the undermining of its rights but the removal of the causes of industrial strife, the enactment by Congress of your 21-point program, a program which has fallen prey to the same antilabor junta which seeks the emasculation of labor organizations through H. R. 4908?

Mr. President, the campaign against labor in this country has three historic peaks, each coinciding with a period of great national tension. The first occurred in 1937 when trade-unionism first became a force in the mass-production industry. At that time labor, aided by a wise and far-seeing administration, successfully defeated the conspiracy of powerful industrialists to shackle the labor movement. The labor movement entered the war a free labor movement. Its contributions to victory as a free labor movement are still the marvel of the world.

The second drive against labor took place during the war itself. The sole product of that attack was the shameful Smith-Connally Act.

Today we are confronted by still a third attempt of organized antiunionism and its congressional spokesmen to utilize the tensions and readjustments of the postwar period for their own sinister ends. This third historic attack on labor, Mr. President, must be smashed because a free labor movement is a vital part of a free America.

I therefore respectfully request you, Mr. President, to veto H. R. 4908.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP MURRAY,
President, CIO.

Industry Looks to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. STANFILL
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. STANFILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Industry Looks to Education," delivered by Mr. Paul G. Blazer at the twenty-ninth annual meeting of the American College Public Relations Association, at Lexington, Ky., on May 8, 1946. It is a very fine address, and I think it should be a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Industry looks to education to furnish brilliant scientists and technologists and to supply the talent for wise, enlightened industrial management; especially during these troubled times when the problems of industry are the problems of all of us, industry looks to education to furnish great political and spiritual leaders capable of lifting individuals and entire economic groups out of their narrow channels of selfish thought, bringing to them a vision of what could be accomplished in this potentially wonderful age of industrial achievement, by cooperation, mutual understanding, and good will.

Industry looks to education to bring to our young people a sympathetic knowledge of the fundamental workings of competitive free enterprise, in order that public opinion of the future may appraise intelligently and provide a benign clime for the ever-growing industrialism which has given us a productive capacity capable of supporting a standard of living such as this world has never known or scarcely imagined.

Industry looks to education to overcome in the younger generation the defects of character and training which account for the confusion and strife we see all about us today.

Many kinds of education are needed, but more than anything else, we need education for citizenship. Even more than we need great scholarship, we need education that will bring to us intellectual honesty, generous understanding, and a recognition of the rights of others. That we have made more progress in the science than in human relationships is quite apparent when we consider the sad spectacle of vast industrial organizations of thousands of highly trained personnel, unable to turn a wheel because of selfish disputes between management and labor—often of a trivial nature. Technology, science, and production engineering could remain stationary for a generation and still we might have an era of unprecedented progress, if during that period we could develop a spirit of Christian understanding and Christian outlook.

Today's problems constitute a challenge to every thinking person and especially to our educators—by educators, I mean every teacher from the primary to the graduate school. The home, the church, and the school mold the ideas, the ideals, and the character of our young people. To the extent that the home falls short or where the influence of the church is not present, the school must assume the obligations of all three. The troubles which confront our country and the world today define clearly the task of our teachers. Advancement in scientific knowledge without corresponding advancement in character constitutes a danger which conceivably could destroy our civilization. Our teaching profession affords the most promising corrective instrumentality.

As we of today are the product of our schools of yesterday; so will our citizenry of tomorrow be determined by the caliber of our teachers of today. I am wondering whether all of us, including industry, have given practical recognition to this fact. If so, how can we justify paying many of our teaching profession a lower wage than is given to industrial unskilled labor? That we have so many fine teachers today is only because highly capable men and women, who have the urge to teach, are willing to make the financial sacrifices necessary to follow their profession. I am confident, though, that many others, equally capable of being outstanding teachers, are attracted to more lucrative occupations. It would not be surprising if this disparity in economic status between education and industry should contribute to a lack of sympathetic understanding toward industry by our teaching profession. The responsibility for giving adequate financial recognition to our teachers lies, of course, with the general public, but it should be of particular concern to industry, which long has recognized the value of good salaries in order to attract and hold capable people. We can obtain the best in education only by having the best of educators.

The students which we entrust to our teachers today will be the leaders, as well as the rank and file, of tomorrow. Their virtues and their faults, their strengths and their weaknesses, will be the composite result of many influences, but more than anything else, they will reflect the caliber and the qualities of their teachers, from grade school

through college. An investment in better teachers will bring greater returns than any other possible investment of public or private funds.

It is widely recognized that a broad general education with particular emphasis on the social sciences is of great value as a training for business leadership; similarly, it seems to me that much the same educational training, in addition to specialization, is needed for successful teaching. A teacher of today should be more than a scholar in one of the arts or sciences; just as today's industrial leaders must be far more than production engineers. With every increasing knowledge to be learned concerning every subject, there is a temptation to overspecialize with a resulting narrowness of viewpoint. Growing demands, especially upon the leaders within each profession, tend to crowd out the generalized knowledge essential for proper orientation. If every industrialist had the time to give more thought to the problems of our educators, and if our teachers were given an opportunity to study and to understand the actual day-to-day workings of industry, I am sure that both industry and education would benefit.

It appears to me that industrial management has been inarticulate and inept in its public relations. It seems to have taken for granted that it will be understood, and seldom tells its personal story except when in trouble and on the defensive. If some of our young people entering business have to unlearn many of the economic and social philosophies they learned in college pertaining to industry, that is more the fault of business than of our schools. Too often large corporations permit their lawyers to determine their public relations policies. They are not nearly so successful in selling themselves as in selling their products and services. Seldom do they give the public the opportunity to know how human, how social-minded, they really are.

Of course, it is difficult to generalize about industry and corporations. There are so many exceptions and the character of corporate management is far from stationary. In the largest corporations, management probably has changed less at the top than internally. Thus, the public utterances of some of the leading names in industry often are more reactionary than the day-to-day actions of their various layers of working management—to which the top management of smaller corporations is more comparable.

Industry-wide publicity campaigns and institutional advertising are not unusual, but ordinarily they take so much for granted that they fall far short of portraying the true character of modern industry. They do little to correct the popular impression that corporations are a concentration of wealth managed by individuals who are concerned principally with the desire for larger profits at the expense of their customers and their employees. If every teacher knew and taught the falsity of that widely held impression, think what it would mean to industry's future public relations and employee relations.

How few people realize that the head of the average company today gives more thought to improving employee relations than to any other part of his business, trying, through fairness and helpful consideration of the needs of each individual employee, to combat the campaign of distrust and hate spread selfishly, and often effectively, by labor organizers who profit thereby, and fostered frequently by uninformed people who are attracted to alien social philosophies which can be helpful neither to those they desire to help nor to the general public.

How few people realize that the manufacturer spends more time trying to figure out how he can lower the prices of his goods than how to raise prices. The thinking of the public has failed to keep pace with that of the industrialist who knows that if he produces better goods in greater volume that can be sold at lower prices, the profits will take care of themselves, and that when he ceases to serve the public effectively, a more capable competitor will capture his market.

How few people recognize the tremendous force that competitive free enterprise exercises toward a higher standard of living. Think of the mistakes and grief that would have been saved this country, if for the last 25 years all our teachers had understood and taught to the present generation the full significance of competitive free enterprise and its related philosophy of maximum production. If there is any single lesson we have learned the hard way during the past 15 years, it is that no man or group of men is wise enough to plan and operate successfully a controlled economy, that no matter how good-intentioned the purpose, the result is far short of what could have been accomplished by an economy based on incentive and production, supply and demand, in which the public is protected by free competition. (In this connection, I do not question the need that existed for wartime controls necessary to accomplish diversion of materials and labor away from civilian goods.) Also, we should all recognize that similar controls must be continued temporarily in those industries producing essential goods, where because of physical limitations, supply and demand could not reach equilibrium in the near future—regardless of the incentive of higher prices. The NRA, with its enforced restrictions upon production and its deliberate stifling of competition, was a glaring example of the handiwork of governmental planners. Each control necessitated another control until it finally fell of its own weight. Even the planners must have breathed a sigh of relief when the Supreme Court killed it; and yet constantly we see the same philosophy, in varying forms, influencing the thinking of a section of governmental Washington.

Industry looks to education to teach certain fundamental principles of economics, a widespread understanding of which is essential to the success of our present system. With no desire to attempt to be profound, and speaking only as a businessman and not as an economist, I suggest the importance of general recognition; that increased production of goods is synonymous, for practical purposes, with a higher standard of living; that in a free economy the cost of goods to the public will parallel closely their cost of production; that human labor is still the most important factor in production; that all work stoppages or other practices intended to limit the output of labor or curtail its productivity are in conflict with a free economy and work just as directly against a higher standard of living as unlawful monopolistic practices of industry, or as any other device intended to create an artificial scarcity of goods with accompanying higher prices; that work stoppages and losses of production, such as are connected with the current efforts of various groups to obtain a larger division of the fruits of production, will result in an over-all reduction in the national standard of living and injure those who may think they are winning their objectives; that since real wages, in the aggregate, are geared directly to productivity and the over-all standard of living, general wage increases, with no corresponding increases in production, can mean nothing more than general price increases and inflation; that the weak cannot be strengthened by breaking the strong, and that poverty can be overcome only by affording both incentive and opportunity; that receiving, except as a reward for effort, destroys initiative and character; that wealth or capital, which is merely a deferred consumption of goods, is essential to the furnishing of tools, machinery, and other facilities used to increase the productivity of human labor, and that for the use of capital, and as an incentive for its accumulation, a rental or return must be paid, the rate determined by supply and demand; that in an ideal economy, which it is possible for us to approach, the productivity of labor is interchangeable as between the various commodities and services required for a higher standard of living, and thus, theoretically, there is no need for unemployment, so long as there are unfilled human needs and especially so long as such a large part of our population lacks the minimum necessities for a comfortable living, and I might add, so long as such a large part of our population is so sadly uneducated; that through the extension of better education to every economic and social group, the interchangeability of human labor and skill will be facilitated, thereby reducing the likelihood of an oversupply of labor in any category with its accompanying tendency toward exploitation; and, that when in the various cycles of business activity, there may appear to be an abundance of goods, it is, actually, only a temporary underdemand due to passing psychological factors affecting buying, and not because of any lack of human need for more goods and services. The limits of demand are no less than the horizons of human desire, and the capacity of our free-enterprise system to satisfy that demand, given a benevolent atmosphere, stretches far beyond our imagination, for the possible limits of productive capacity will be extended by every new achievement of science.

As our industrial economy, through mass production, becomes more complex, we become increasingly interdependent. Each of us tends to become more specialized, performing a single service for many others who become dependent on us, while we do fewer things for ourselves and in turn become dependent on the services of a host of others.

Added to this increasing interdependence, which is accentuated by our evergrowing industrial empires, we find labor organizing and bargaining, with governmental encouragement, on an industry-wide basis. Not only are the operations of an entire industry halted by a labor leader holding autocratic power and in a position to perpetuate his authority, but unless this abuse of power, obtained through governmental favoritism, is checked before it is too late and while the Government still has the will to resist such strongly organized groups, the day is not far distant when a single labor leader will not hesitate to use a general strike to paralyze the entire Nation and force his will upon all of us. The fault lies not principally with our labor leaders, who are only the personification of the ruthless selfishness of growing minority groups that have found a new power, which, through neither education nor the experience of self-discipline, are they qualified to use intelligently.

There is only one solution, and that is through the education and spiritual awakening of our entire people. That can come only through a leadership such as has not been exercised for generations—leaders who seek nothing for themselves, who will strive to allay class hatreds and bring to the people of our troubled world, unity, confidence, and a Christian spirit.

Inaugural Address by William H. Hastie as Governor of the Virgin Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD the inaugural address by William H. Hastie as Governor of the Virgin Islands and following the address an exchange of telegrams between Governor Hastie and former Governor Harwood.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY WILLIAM H. HASTIE AS GOVERNOR OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, DELIVERED AT INAUGURAL CEREMONIES AT CHARLOTTE AMALIE, MAY 17, 1946

It is my hope, it is my sincere belief, that the Virgin Islands stand today at the beginning of a period of significant progress and achievement.

It would be enough to justify this optimism that guests of such distinction and in such numbers are here assembled with us, showing by their very presence that we have good and powerful friends upon whose continuing interest and support we can rely. The President of the United States, in his January message to Congress and in his message to the recent splendid International Caribbean Conference here in the Virgin Islands, expressed both his interest in this community and his determination to support a constructive program for the benefit of all the people. To me personally, the President has expressed similar interest and determination. I know that the prosperity and happiness of these islands and the well-being of the Caribbean neighborhood are in the mind of the President and close to his heart.

The Secretary of the Interior is here today. Various agencies of the National Government upon which we must rely again and again for cooperative assistance, are represented by their chief officers or responsible deputies. Never before have the Virgin Islands experienced such an earnest of good will from the mainland and from our good neighbor, Puerto Rico.

A great American commented a few years ago upon the "reservoir of good will" enjoyed by the United States in the far places of the earth. Today, we in the Virgin Islands are happy and appreciative for an unprecedented demonstration of the reservoir of good will stored up for us in Washington and in this Caribbean neighborhood.

In recent days, the threatened drastic reductions in our appropriation of Federal funds for the next fiscal year may have caused some of you to question the amount of good will we enjoy in Washington. I am confident that we will be granted the funds essential to the maintenance of necessary public services. My only regret is that within a very few days I must leave you temporarily to return to Washington to urge in the Senate the restoration of essential items in our appropriation. Again, I am confident that the ultimate resolution of this issue will further demonstrate the good will and support which we enjoy in the Congress of the United States.

It is also noteworthy that within our own community, in St. Thomas, in St. Croix, in St. John, we are beginning to experience and to act with a greater sense of unity than ever before. For example, your own local committee, after many months of study of our basic law, the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, has very recently recommended, among other things, a single legislative body and a single treasury for this group of islands. Even as the airplane has brought St. Thomas and St. Croix within a few short minutes of each other, your own wisdom and good will are bringing St Thomians and Cruzians more closely together in thought and action for the common good of the Virgin Islands. There are not very many of us here is these islands—some 30,000 in all. Yet, our combined unselfish efforts in any common cause can be effective

In this connection, may I pause for a personal reference. I have already been a beneficiary of your united power. Your united and effective support of my nomination to the office I have this day assumed demonstated the attention which is commanded by the voice of the people of these islands. You spoke through your local councils and your legislative assembly, you spoke through your distinguished representatives whom you sent to Washington, you spoke through countless individual messages and through large community demonstrations. You used the methods which a united people in a democratic society employ to impress their wishes upon the leaders of government. I know that the United States Senate was deeply impressed by your purposeful, planned, and persistent action. I certainly shall never forget nor cease to be grateful for your demonstration of confidence and friendship. But more than that, I hope that you are convinced that the voice of this community will be heard and will have influence when that voice bespeaks internal unity and solemn determinaton to work without tiring for an agreed common objective. My keenest desire is to work with you, both in determining the objectives upon which we can agree and then in applying our united energies and resources to achieving those objectives, whether they can be accomplished by us here at home or whether we must call upon our friends in Washington and elsewhere to help.

In brief, we have two great sources of power; a reservoir of good will beyond our shores and a reservoir of ability and energy and wisdom among ourselves. I believe we are ready to pool these sources of power and to make these islands hum with constructive activity.

It is customary on such an occasion as this to announce something of a program for the future. I have already been asked in the Senate, by the press, and on numbers of other occasions what my program for these islands is. I have refused to try to answer that question, and I still am not ready to do so.

There are two reasons for this. Snap judgment is rarely sound judgment, and then only by sheerest luck. We properly mistrust the doctor who takes only one look at the patient, immediately states everything that is wrong with him and prescribes an elaborate cure. The forces at work in human society are even more complex in their functioning and interrelation than are those of the human body. They are not less deserving of our most thorough study before we prescribe for maladjustments.

There is a second reason for deliberation in the matter of a program for our community. Infinite wisdom is not given to any individual. Yet we know that there is great wisdom in the consensus of all those who will think and reason together upon problems of common interest. I have not been in position to share your thinking and planning in recent years. But it is now my privilege and duty to do so. When and only when we have arrived together at decisions which seem to be wise, and have agreed among ourselves upon hopeful courses of action can we be confident that our program is the best we can devise. We should not be satisfied with anything less than that.

In saying these things, I am not unaware that much planning and experimentation and constructive activity have already taken place in these islands. Fortunately, your first civilian Governor, Paul M. Pearson, was a distinguished educator whose concern with the development of that aspect of community life was as deep as it was rewarding to these islands. His successor, Gov. Lawrence W. Cramer, equally interested in basic human and community values, worked constantly for the improvement of the status of labor, for higher wages and better living conditions for working people. My immediate predecessor, Governor Harwood, has laid the material foundation for our postwar readjustments by winning congressional approval for a large postwar public-works program. We shall not forget our debt to those who have brought us thus far along our way. I am sure that the highest and most satisfactory reward for their efforts will be the success with which we build upon the foundations they have laid.

I have already indicated my reasons for not speaking in terms of specific programs for the future. Yet, since I am not a stranger in these islands, it seems proper that I express certain fundamental ideas which long have been the subject of discussion and upon which I believe we are essentially in agreement.

Underlying our economic problems is the fact that we send a large amount of money out of the community in payment for food and clothes and other commodities produced beyond our shores, while very little money comes from the outside into these islands for things we produce and work we do here. Thus, every successful effort to reduce our dependence upon goods and services from outside and to increase the consumption of local products at home and their marketing abroad will help our economy. This is a simple fact which we have heard before and will hear again and again, and for the good reason that it is the cornerstone of all planning for a prosperous future.

At the same time, money cannot be our sole consideration. We will not sacrifice the spiritual values of human life, the dignity of the community, the civil rights of every citizen, the good manners and respect for law of which we are justly proud for any number of dollars. We shall welcome whatever helps our economy, with the one limitation that our people must not be demoralized, nor their human rights infringed thereby.

I shall comment very briefly upon the political aspirations of the people of the Virgin Islands. The people of these islands are proud to be an integral part of the United States of America. We are citizens of the United States and we take that citizenship seriously The aspirations of the Virgin Islands for future political status are in the direction of more complete realization of the privileges of citizenship in our Republic.

Our country has developed and prospered under a system of local self-government, subject to the paramount authority of a National Government over those matters which cannot effectively be controlled by separate local communities. We believe in that system and at the same time we wish to share fully in the privileges and the responsibilities which it presuppposes. I know how strong is your desire that this community shall have representation of its own choosing through which its voice can be expressed officially in the National Government in Washington. I have been delighted to find so much cordial support of that aspiration in Washington. I know, too, how keen is your legitimate desire for progressive extension of local control over local affairs. In this connection it seems appropriate to emphasize the responsibilities which go with increasing local autonomy. Not the least of these is the responsibility for finding the money to pay for local governmental activities. At the same time this is not, in my judgment, the most serious responsibility by local self-government Our most serious responsibility, and it will be an increasing one, is the responsibility for the wise and unselfish use of power. It is true that such responsibility falls most obviously upon the elected representatives of the people But more fundamentally, it is upon the people themselves It is a truism, not nonetheless true, that people get just about the kind of government they deserve. If we are to have increasingly good government, all of us must play a more active part in the affairs of government We must continually discuss among ourselves the ways in which government can serve us better. We must be honestly critical of what our representatives are doing with reference to the public business. What I do as governor, what, the

councilmen do as legislators, what your municipal hospital does in protecting your health, what your police force accomplishes in the field of public safety, all these and other matters like them are your business. You represent the power of public opinion. By and large these things will be done by your representatives which you as citizens want and want enough to make your will known and felt.

I sincerely believe that men and women who take no active part in discussions of public matters, men and women who do not avail themselves of the privilege of voting, men and women who do not accept civic and political responsibility have no moral right to complain about their Government. On the other hand, in a community in which all citizens take such responsibility seriously, there is relatively little occasion to complain of the way public officers discharge their public trust.

In broader aspect, we have a great opportunity to demonstrate two very important things to all who may wish to observe. The first is that so-called "dependent areas" entrusted with self-government will grow in political wisdom and effectiveness as they are given the opportunity to do so. I believe the history of the Virgin Islands in the 10 years since the adoption of the Organic Act is proof of this fact. It is important that in the next 10 years the ever-increasing effectiveness of local self-government be a further and even more conclusive demonstration of the capacity of the people to conduct their own affairs skillfully and justly and for the benefit of all.

Second, we and our neighbors throughout the Caribbean have an opportunity to demonstrate to the world how peoples can work together constructively and harmoniously, subordinating particular local or national interests to the common good. We are all proud that the Virgin Islands were privileged to entertain the recent Caribbean Conference. But meetings are only the essential preliminary to deeds which shall make this area a functioning neighborhood under several flags. We must continue the friendly interchange of information and ideas with our neighbors. Many of our problems are common to most of us. Something which has worked to improve the economy of Jamaica may be instructive for the Virgin Islands. Public institutions which have proved effective among our French neighbors may give us useful ideas for improving our own organization. The more extensive exchange of commodities throughout the Caribbean will help all of us. And it may be that, more important than any one project or group of projects, our demonstration of cooperation across international boundaries will give hope and encouragement in a world where mistrust and cynicism are becoming all too prevalent.

We live in important times. We live in a small place but it can be a very significant place. For our own happiness and satisfaction, for what we can mean to the hopes and aspirations of men for a good life in a free world, let us make this place in these times as good a place to live as we possibly can.

GOVERNORS HARWOOD AND HASTIE EXCHANGE COMPLIMENTS

The following cablegrams were exchanged between Governor Harwood and Governor Hastie on May 17, 1946:

Message from Governor Harwood:

"Congratulations and best wishes for successful administration.

"HARWOOD."

Message from Governor Hastie:

"Sincere thanks for your congratulatory message. Have already publicly acknowledged in inaugural address our indebtedness to you for laying foundation for important portion of our postwar program.

"HASTIE."

For a Rebirth of Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID I. WALSH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "For a Rebirth of Courage," published on May 28 in the Springfield Union, Springfield, Mass., referring to a speech recently made by Hon. James A. Farley.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR A REBIRTH OF COURAGE

Mr. James A. Farley's intellectual honesty and political courage have not been seriously questioned since he disowned the New Deal and broke openly with the man whom he had twice made President. Few men know more about politics and politicians than the former Democratic national chairman. He speaks, therefore, as an expert when he urges a rebirth of courage and a demonstraton of sound moral principle in American politics.

Coming from Mr. Farley this does not sound like a counsel of perfection. Government has reached a state in America where the one last defense against pressure groups, hence the preservation of our democracy, is a rebirth of courage and a demonstration of sound moral principle in politics. If men are no longer willing to risk the loss of public office by standing for their convictions, we may as well throw in the towel and turn the Government over to the pressure groups who seek to purge the kind of men Mr. Farley pleads for.

He is disturbed and distressed to see men in public office become so anxious to remain in office that they do things and vote for legislation they don't believe in. "They realize that certain congressional action has not been in the best interest of the State, but because they fear the wrath of some of their constituents, they have voted contrary to their personal conscience." Mr. Farley therefore urges legislators to ignore local pressure groups and to vote, not as representatives of localities, but as representatives of the entire country.

We are not without examples of the reward which comes to such men as Carter Glass, whose courage, intellectual honesty, and firm adherence to principle so impressed his constituents, including those who disagreed with him, that they reelected him term after term to the United States Senate. More than ever before, this country needs men of this type. If we are to have them, the voters must support them.

The people get and keep the kind of men in public office that they want. When legislators discover that independence and courage and adherence to principles above expediency are rewarded by support at the polls, we are more likely to get that kind of representative. If the voters fail to support such men, they will be tempted to yield to the demands of the pressure groups, which are so organized as to bring votes to bear in a purge against them.

The logic of this course leads to the usurpation of power by pressure groups seeking their own selfish advantage at the expense of the country. Carried to its inevitable conclusion it would install rubber stamps in Congress, in the form of representatives subordinating their own conscience and convictions to the demands of such groups. In place of our democracy we should then have government by pressure groups which were able to frighten candidates into voting as they were directed; men so anxious to remain in office that they do things and vote for legislation they don't believe in; men who vote as representatives of a group, rather than as representatives of the entire country; men who vote contrary to their personal conscience.

Extension of OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. STANFILL
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. STANFILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from Mr. Paul E. Shipp, of Lexington, Ky., regarding the action of certain persons who have been writing to Senators about the OPA.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BOURBON CO.,
Lexington, Ky., May 21, 1946.

Senator W. A. STANFILL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I noticed a statement in the Sunday Herald-Leader that "More than 4,000 post cards urging continuation of OPA without crippling amendments were mailed yesterday to Senators ALBEN W. BARKLEY and W. A. STANFILL."

When I went down the street about 10 o'clock last Saturday morning, I saw some ladies at a table on the sidewalk in front of the Phoenix Hotel and a lot of children seemed to be signing something. I paid no attention to this as the streets and hotels were crowded with young people attending an annual 4-H rally program and a Transylvania College pageant. About 3 o'clock that afternoon I went back down the street and what appeared to be the same table and ladies were on the sidewalk in front of Wolf-Wile Co.'s store and quite a number of young children were around this table signing something. I stopped to see what they were signing and one of the ladies at the table called to me and said, "Don't you want to sign one of these cards?" I asked what they were and she replied, "They are OPA cards, to keep down costs of living." I saw young children, who looked to be from about 8 to 12 years of age, signing cards. I asked if the children were signing these cards and the lady said "Yes." I told her, "You should be ashamed of what you are doing." She asked, "Do you think it's wrong?" I replied, "You know it is wrong, for these children don't know what they are doing." I told her that I had been fighting crooked politicians for 25 years, but I didn't think that I had ever seen anything worse than this and I thought I would write it up in the Herald. I went on to the Phoenix Hotel where E. H. Fuller (former sheriff of Fayette County), George Edwin Smith, William E. Little, and several other men were standing, called their attention to this, and they all looked and saw the small children signing these cards. When I started into the hotel two small boys came up to me and said, "Mister, are you going to write us up in the Herald?" I said, "Did you boys sign those cards?" They both said they had. I asked, "What for?" They said, "To keep down the cost of living." I asked them how this would keep down the cost of living and they both said they didn't know how it would do it. Finally, one of them took from

his pocket the enclosed circular, handed it to me, and said "You read this and it will tell you about it."

I have since talked with other persons who have told me that they saw scenes similar to the above in other sections of Lexington where children were signing these cards.

As a patriotic American who believes in fair dealing, with equal rights to all and special privileges to none, I feel it is my duty to give you this information.

Very truly yours,

PAUL E. SHIPP.

Russian and American Definitions of a Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD another of the series of articles by Mr. Eddy Gilmore. The one which I happen to have in my hand was published in the Evening Star of yesterday. The title of the article is, "Russia and United States Pages Apart on Definition of a Free Press."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA AND UNITED STATES PAGES APART ON DEFINITION OF A FREE PRESS—SOVIETS CAN'T UNDERSTAND GOAL OF OBJECTIVITY—LITTLE COMMON GROUND SEEN FOR NEWS PACT

(This is the last of a series by the Associated Press chief of bureau in Moscow, who has spent 5 years in Russia and has recently returned to the United States on vacation.)

(By Eddy Gilmore)

NEW YORK, June 7.—The basic conceptions of a free press are so different in Russia and in the United States that it is extremely difficult to see how any agreement presently can be reached on this question within the United Nations, or elsewhere.

The two countries are pages apart on the very definition of what is news, let alone how to present it, or what else to do about it.

Many defenders of the American press call it, along with the British press, the freest in the world. Many of these same persons will argue that the press is not free at all in the Soviet Union.

HOW SOVIET PEOPLE ARGUE

People in the Soviet Union generally argue that the United States and the British press work against the interests of the American and British people and often against the best interests of the people of the world.

Both countries, of course, have a wholly different definition of a free press.

"Your press," a Russian said to me not long ago, "always seems as if it's trying to entertain, amuse, or shock its readers, not to instruct, inform, and guide them the right way."

I asked if he were referring to editorials or new columns.

"News columns," he said with emphasis.

"Guide the readers' mind the right way in a news column?" I asked. "We certainly don't try to do this. We simply try to present the facts and let the reader find his way—that is if he's looking for the way."

I remember an occasion during the war when an American correspondent in Moscow criticized a Russian journalist for not being objective about the war and Germany.

"Objective?" sneered the Russian. "A journalist who is objective in time of war is a traitor to his country."

SOME OF GREAT DIFFERENCES

Here are some of the great differences between Russian and American newspapers, aside from the obvious ones of public ownership and direction:

The Russians don't believe in publishing news about events before they happen. The fact that the Big Three may have agreed to hold a meeting is not news until there is an official announcement. In the United States a story of such a meeting ahead of time is a scoop for the newsman who wrote it and of interest to the newspaper reader.

The Russians don't believe crime is news except a report of the trial and penalty as a means of teaching that crime doesn't pay.

In Russia a train wreck, a building burning, a ship sinking is not news—except when it happens on a big scale abroad.

The private lives of prominent personalities are not news and the Russians can't understand why they should be.

The Russians cannot understand the explanation that a paper's acceptance of an advertisement does not give the advertiser a voice in the paper.

Clashes of personalities at international meetings are not news to Russians.

The Russian writer writes his story on the assumption that it is going to be read from beginning to end and it generally is. He thinks it's idiotic to put all the news in the first paragraph. For one thing, he reasons, it encourages people to read no further.

SELDOM QUESTIONS LEADERS

The Russian newspaperman seldom if ever questions the decisions or policies of his country's leaders. He believes they are better equipped than he is to handle such matters. He may raise the ink on his paper with a castigation of some farm foreman who is lazy, or some factory director who is behind in his work, or is not providing the kind of facilities and conditions his workers need and want, but he won't criticize or complain about the system under which the foreman or director works.

To a Russian, what is known as society news, or personal news, is so amusing as presented by American newspapers that I've frequently seen Russians laughing with side-aching enthusiasm at the account of a wedding.

The Russians have a low opinion of most American newspapers, their publishers, editors, and writers. They class some of the most severe enemies of the U. S. S. R. in this group.

The American newsman in Russia—that is, in the mass—is not thought of too highly by the Russians.

A rather high Soviet official once said to a member of the State Department who had brought him a particular problem concerning a representative of the American press in Moscow:

"My friend, you and I are too busy to waste time on neurotics."

An American newsman's job is a difficult and often unpleasant one in Russia. At the same time, the job of handling these newsmen is just as hard and unpleasant to the Russians.

The Russians do have standards of hospitality, of course, and a newsman in the Soviet Union is not only a newsman but a guest. He gets the best the Russians have to offer in many material ways, like food, clothes, and living conditions. On the other hand, he doesn't always get what he wants in the way of news.

The handling of Russian news in Russia is, the Russians believe very emphatically, purely a Russian matter.

They bitterly resent interference or suggestions from abroad. They do not like to be told how to conduct their affairs or to be criticized about the way they do it.

The Russians are convinced their way is the best way, the only way, and there is not the slightest indication that they are going to change their mind.

Any suggestions by the United Nations is likely to be met with rebuff or ignored. The Russian leaders insist their press is free, and they want to keep it that way.

Food Plank for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. STANFILL
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. STANFILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two brief essays prepared by high-school students in Kentucky on the subject, Food Plank for Peace. These essays were selected as the best from the State of Kentucky in a contest conducted by the Pillsbury Institute.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD PLANK FOR PEACE

(By Robert Lee Vines, Belfry High School, Belfry, Ky.)

In the picture of a bright world I see a dark object, one that brings terror to the hearts of millions, that of appalling hunger; that sense of insecurity, the proverbial wolf gnarling at millions. The greatest problem aside from atomic energy, has to do with hunger, cold, and disease facing the "have nots" in war-devastated countries whose economic status isn't up to par.

Today the United States finds itself in the position of No. 1 nation of the world as we come to the end of the world's greatest crisis. The burden of lasting peace falls upon us. So it is our manifest destiny to see that the underprivileged peoples of the world have a sufficiency of the necessities of life to maintain their health and moral. These include food, shelter, and clothing, especially nutritious foods and medical care.

The problem is so acute now that we must resort to emergency methods and feed millions through UNRRA and other relief channels to prevent utter collapse of the devastated countries through political unrest due to poverty.

We must of necessity share our own food during this emergency. It took well-fed armies to win the war and it will take well-fed people to abide by and be a part of a lasting peace. A big problem of all nations in reconversion is adequate food and adequate markets for raw and manufactured goods. Since ultimate peace is our business, and food is ammunition for either war or peace, it behooves the United States to produce food in the future for world markets which can be used in exchange for raw materials or manufactured goods in order to help weaker nations reconvert to peacetime prosperity.

The greatest political danger lurking in our world today is not Japan, Germany, or atomic power, but hunger. Therefore, "It's American to share" is a slogan that could be adopted by the United Nations until a full realization of peace for which we paid such

a tremendous price has been realized. Our humanitarian instincts will not permit us to sit idle while other starve.

The victors must see that the world has food. Peace cannot be maintained while discontent and confusion abounds upon the earth. The future stability of the world, and a lasting peace depends upon our wiping out conditions that would breed anarchy. So our Nation must see that conditions must not be permitted to exist that would lead to disaster.

A pool of food will be temporary relief. This would probably solve the problem of food for 1945 and 1946 and relieve abject suffering. Rehabilitation is a slower process and aims at making the nations self-supporting. Due to problems arising out of the war the United States is no longer a treasure house of food ready to meet the whole world's needs. Our Nation must share. But we alone cannot solve this problem. It will require world cooperation.

FOOD PLANK FOR PEACE

(By Virginia McKinney, Dunbar High School, Lexington, Ky.)

Hunger—again that word conjures in my mind pictures of people ransacking garbage cans; people diving at scraps Japanese would sneeringly throw at them as if they were a pack of hungry dogs; people just sitting and staring into the void, thinking of a nice, big, juicy steak; small children, ignoring the glorious sunset, stupefied by hunger, wizened and old before their time; pregnant women who brought into a 40-acre world mere skeletons; boys and girls in their teens, missing 3 years of adolescent fun and laughter, and I among them. Do you know what it is to be hungry and to drink water and water from a tin can to fill that empty, growling space? I do, for I was an internee at Santo Tomas.

Should food be shared by the United Nations? Yes; a thousand times yes. Give all that can be given to the millions of unfortunate people. I believe in the American tradition of sharing to the utmost, for it was that same generous spirit exhibited by many Filipinos, Spanish, and neutrals that relieved untold suffering among us.

Our surplus farm products should be marketed in those war-torn countries where farming will be hard to resume for many years. Send those products to those countries in our own ships, free of charge. It is said Americans are too generous, but in times like these I do not think anyone can be too generous to suffering, starving people who stare speechless at the sight of a piece of bread.

The problem of rescuing the starving millions in the Pacific and European continent is a very difficult problem that can be solved only by allowing our boys to put fresh hope and life into soil. Give these people an impetus for life again. Many do not even want to farm their land. They have lost hope. They sit and let the rich, black soil slowly trickle through their fingers while their thoughts are bitter. They are thinking of a time when their crops were abundant and life was worth living. Then the enemy came "like a wolf upon the fold." Life became hard and puzzling to a people who had heretofore had no problems. They still feel unstable and uncertain about the future. Dare they plow the field? Theirs is the fear of the unknown.

The United Nations should pool their food resources to help needy countries. Theirs is the leadership of the world. Let them assume it by giving to the needy and setting an example of generosity to the world. They should not expect payment in return—"the quality of mercy can never be strained." They should not stop by merely pooling their resources, but should see to it that food is given an equitable distribution. The blessings of millions shall be heaped upon them.

Food helped to win the war and it also can help win another war—a war waged by starvation and hunger, both implacable foes.

Let us all join in to relieve those peoples who have had enough of suffering, enough of physical and mental torture. Suffering by seeing their country, their homes, and even kinfolks and friends swept away, they have sacrificed many things for democratic sentiments and ideals. Can we not do a little to relieve such suffering?

Radio Address of Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah, on the Draft Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address dealing with the subject of the draft bill, delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System on June 8, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Selective service is before a conference committee between the Senate and the House. I am chairman of the conference. As representative of the Senate I am bound to support the bill as passed by the Senate.

If I had been asked to come here tonight to discuss a bill, I would not have come. I may discuss with more pleasure, and perhaps in so doing render a greater service, the procurement of armies and navies generally. It is the constitutional function of Congress to raise and support armies and navies. We in Congress are mindful of how this may be done.

The way to raise and support armies and navies is the way to raise and support public servants of any sort. The head of any executive department, the members of the judiciary, the Members of the Congress, presumably could make more money by following some more commercial bent than serving the public. Idealistically, they could not be embarked upon a more praiseworthy enterprise. Hundreds of historical figures who might have risen to commercial kingdoms have preferred to risk poverty in order to give public service, and they have earned the undying thanks of the people. The highest exemplification of this ideal may be found in the Biblical passage: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friend."

In my time in Congress, a great President has cut down his own life, and a great Senate majority leader has cut down his. Many others have less conspicuously laid down their lives in the public service. During the war thousands did so, in high and low military and naval station, and behind the lines in factories and on farms. The public weal has a voice that none may deny, a call that none may refuse to heed. When the public wants an individual, he is theirs, body and soul.

There is something large about all this. It is the key to the growth of citizenship. Without it we are uncharted, and we are lost, for public service never has been richly rewarded, and often has been abused, even smeared. It is not time to heap calumny on a good solider of this war, but I may forecast with accuracy that it will be done. Perhaps a decade from now? Perhaps only 5 years? Perhaps one? Yet had it not been for the public service these men performed as public servants, this country would have been introduced to a system of government remarkable for its denial of progress to such an extent that its very workings are found, upon inspection, to be almost incredible.

The narrow span between the goose step of Wilhelm of Germany, the Bushido of Japan, the fantastic government of Hitler which a word-coiner might term "savagarchy" on the one hand, and the reckless happy-go-lucky personal freedom for everyone which we so revere on the other, was bridged in the giving of service by a preponderance of relatively few citizens of this earth. There was a race for superiority of personal service, and the United Nations won out.

If every nation in the world had only volunteers and there were no selective service anywhere we would have won out just as surely. Then, as now, there was no time to risk applying theories. When in doubt, compel, and this is the lesser of two bad choices. I agree with those who believe that we can have a volunteer army. But we are guilty of procrastination. We did not construct a volunteer army. We did not proceed to obtain a volunteer army. There is not time to prove we can get a volunteer army together. It is not that there is any rush to get troops together. But we can do no less than give the War Department and General Eisenhower the armies they ask for, and the only provable army is one that can be produced in fair weather or foul.

The selection of men is done under the most wholesome conditions possible. We may say, and we do say, that it is not altogether thinkable that we have come to this in American life, but we have come to this in what amounts to peacetimes, and we shall have it with us until we can devise something better.

I spoke of my ideal to an officer in the Army a few days ago. He told me that Congress was not getting such a bad break. He said that the Army could very well say, "Now, see here. You have given us 700,000 men. I mean that many have given themselves to us. They have volunteered. They are our Regular Army, the only Regular Army we have. They are backbone of our defense. Are they enough?" The generals say no. I do not want to share their responsibilities if events turn out badly. As a Nation we often gamble heavily on good winds to carry our ships and providential aims to guide our rifles, overcoming many with few, and performing miracles because we are an inventive and resourceful people. It is not like MacArthur or McNarney to trifle with an assignment, and I assume that there is a lot of military science behind their estimates, certainly more than those of us at home can either possess or muster. They seem to me to be adequately low and greatly reasonable figures. I cannot conceive of anyone questioning them.

I wonder what figures a critic would estimate are needed. * * * Just how he would proceed to write an estimate. We must be happy, happy in the sharpest definition of the word, with the War Department's figures. This does not mean we must be happy with the situation. There is no good American who would not prefer a volunteer army to a draft army. I know of no one who will not work conscientiously toward that end.

Sometimes the Army has a conspicuous lack of salesmanship. It does not mean to say, "Enlist or you will be drafted," but it

does say just that in effect. The result is that we cannot, according to our advices from the Army itself, actually say for sure whether a volunteer is a volunteer strictly, because volunteering under a form of duress is not volunteering at all. The soldier who volunteers in the Regular Army so that his service will assuredly terminate in 12 months, whereas if he remains in he does not know what it will be, is not altogether a volunteer in the same sense of the word as a man capable of $100,000 a year who accepts a judgeship at $10,000 a year or less. Nevertheless these volunteers are patriots who enlisted because they wanted to serve their country. They represent the beginning of the finest army in the world.

The value of the uniform is not half so important as the prestige of the uniform. It is not half so important that a coldier can say he is the wage envy of labor, that he has certain rights forever as a result of his service, that materially speaking he never will have cause to regret joining the Army, as it is important that he can say truthfully that his uniform was not donned under any penalty or for any punishment, was not acquired under any commercial consideration whatever, but since his big brother served so well and so long with so many bullets raining on him, surely 18 months' peaceful service is not too much for the little brother.

If we can ask the Secretary of War the question, "Were you not better off in the private practice of law?" and his answer is "Yes; but I was impelled by a call to public service," is it not just as fair to ask Corporal Jones if he did not go into the Army for the same reason and if he did not work for his stripes because of a desire to serve? Of course, there is a difference in the measure of service. But there is no difference in potentials.

Some of our four-star generals went into the Army as privates. This must have meant that they had an innate desire to serve, because the life they chose to lead meant in the ultimate many, many privations, long, hard studies over tactics and strategy, the responsibility for the lives of thousands upon thousands of men, personal risk in the presence of the enemy * * * and how well must a full general behave in the presence of the enemy at all times. These men might have been astonished at what they were letting themselves in for. They resigned easy living from the moment of their enlistments. They were groping in the dark for an opportunity to give public service, and they found it from the start. The first time they rendered first aid to a sick soldier on a long march they found what they were seeking. The thing grew until night and day their whole lives were engulfed in the troubles of a sick country.

These were imaginative men. Men with less imagination need a more specific appeal. What appeal shall be made to get a volunteer army together? Enlist or be drafted? Not at all. Enlist and get all these benefits? No. Let a young man know that his country is dying unless he will do something about it, and you touch a mainspring in his soul. Let him believe he is betraying his older brother, who really was a hero, and he will go to the colors. Give him an incentive. About all, give him a break. Let us look toward the end of the day when we have a shotgun marriage between the volunteer and his army.

How specifically would I make the service attractive? Time and reform are doing this for me. Nature is taking care of itself. The Army looked into its own system of officers and men, and made its own report. This much in our time is most encouraging. It would have been more encouraging at the beginning of the war, and even more at the beginning of the First World War.

But progress is not like that, and it is to the credit of a progressive leadership in the War Department that it looked into its own weaknesses and began the painful processes of correction. And progress is being made; no one knows it better than I, for I have known the Army closely most of my life, both at home and abroad. No one who ever before enlisted was given greater opportunities for service to his fellowmen than are the boys of today. To be identified with the great institutions which are being born today gives one associations beyond comparison.

I wish those in charge of our Army could get the bigness of their mission and cease uttering fears that their young fellow citizens will be backward in assuming responsibility. I am ready to help build the finest army in the world, but it will never be done as long as our leaders attempt to build any army on the spirit of "Let's get in and get it over—18 months doing time and a lifetime of benefits." Service for a cause builds men. Once our generals and our statesmen learn this then they can select their army from the volunteers.

The Case Bill

REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, a leading Washington newspaper yesterday stated that it had learned President Truman's position on the Case bill, and it was this:

He had not made up his mind what to do about the measure. However, his inclination was to veto it.

Mr. Truman was described as being doubtful as to whether the Case bill would correct the labor situation that had inspired Congress to pass it.

Mr. Speaker, there is no need of President Truman to be doubtful. Any person with a little honesty and common sense can tell him that the Case bill will not bring about correctness or perfection in the labor situation. But it is a step in that direction.

President Truman cannot in one fell swoop bring about that correctness or perfection, even though he was to recommend repeal of labor's exemption from th antitrust laws, repeal of the Norris-LaGuardia anti-injunction legislation and repeal of most of the Wagner Act. That would not spell correctness or perfection. Labor leaders themselves, through injudicious use of these instruments of public power with regard to public interest, may eventually compel the people, as a means of self-preservation, to approximate such action, but at present it would be neither practicable nor desirable. What the American people want is not just promises of perfection, but firm steps in that direction, and I repeat, the Case bill is such a step.

The American people are beginning to realize more and more that promises of perfection from the time of the apple episode in Paradise down to Hitler and Mussolini, have always brought hell upon earth.

President Truman's predecessor, while constantly deriding our Constitution, said: "We have built up new instruments of public power," which in other hands "would provide shackles for the liberties of the people."

For over a decade he built these "new instruments of public power" into the hands of the Lewises and Petrillos, the Whitneys and others. Those shackles that he spoke of are now riveted on our liberties. It will be a long laborious process to remove them and regain our traditional freedom. But let us do it firmly, step by step, until we regain the proper balance between labor and management, among themselves and toward the public interest.

Let us no longer be misled by investigations and promises of perfection, but "Let us" in the words of Washington, "raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the rest is in the hands of God."

Just Treatment for Implement Dealers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 1946, the Office of Price Administration by amendments to MPR 246 and MPR 133 reduced the trade discount to farm implement dealers from 20 to 16 percent and from 35 to 28 percent on extra repair parts. This reduction, if maintained, can have no other effect than to drive the great majority of these dealers out of business and deny to the farmers the very valuable services which these dealers perform.

Mr. Speaker, I call this matter to the attention of the House in order to point out the necessity for prompt action by the Office of Price Administration to correct the injustice caused by their order of May 10, and the necessity for congressional action to assure that a correction will be made. We must assure just treatment for the implement dealer.

On May 27 I joined with the other Members of Congress in calling this matter to the attention of Mr. Porter, Administrator of OPA. As of this date, we are still waiting for corrective action.

In order that this House may have a complete and adequate picture of the problem facing these dealers and agriculture generally, I call your attention to an analysis prepared by Mr. Victor Miller, of St. Nazianz, Wis. Mr. Miller is one of the outstanding farm-implement dealers of Wisconsin. He knows what he is talking about.

GENERAL

The implement dealer is the true agent between agriculture and industry. He is the channel through which the big production of industry flows into the small hands of disunited agriculture. He is at the mercy of agriculture and hence at a peculiar position to the manufacturer. He is bound by trade lines and because of financial investments, duties to his customer as to service and specialized parts inventories, he is limited as to his sales and is not allowed an

opened market for his purchases. He stood with neither industry nor agriculture to reap the profits of the war, as his sales and profits were vastly reduced in a corresponding era of prosperity. He held no war contract, and he received no subsidies, and now as the postwar prosperity looms he is asked to absorb that margin of his profits which normally would provide his profits for the benefit of both industry and agriculture. A reasonable study of the facts will obviously prove that it is least possible for him, of both industry and agriculture, to assume any part of an increased cost of any product.

SPECIFIC

I. The margin of profit allocated to the dealer by the manufacturer and by habit of the trade has been too small since its inception and should have been increased prior to the year 1939, or before the war, for the following reasons:

1. The same rate has existed since the inception of the industry dating back to the invention of the reaper. The habits of the industry have changed since that date, but the percent mark-up has not changed. When the mark-up was originally founded the manufacturer sent his employee to the dealer to assemble the machine which was to be delivered to the customer. This cost the dealer has now absorbed, which with present labor costs is in excess of 5 percent.

2. At the inception of the industry policy of a 20-percent discount most machines were completely assembled or the major part thereof was delivered to the dealer ready for delivery. Today most items come knocked down and in crates, and it is for the dealer to assemble them, perfect their operations, and deliver it to the customer.

3. In the original industry mark-up of 20 percent the manufacturer provided free service to a machine, which after its erection did not properly operate. The industry has withdrawn from the dealer this service and it is now necessary for the dealer to assume the added cost servicing a machine which he did not manufacture. In the early years of the industry the manufacturer provided a service department which provided the manpower and service necessary to demonstrate and properly deliver the machine. This also has been withdrawn from the dealer, and the dealer has found it necessary to assume these obligations with no change in discount.

4. The industry has the poorest type warranty of any other industry. A guaranty of a piece of farm equipment means nothing more than the service by the dealer. The manufacturer who manufactured the machine, or properly delivered it defective will absorb only the cost of the parts that were defective. It being for the dealer to rebuild the machine and incorporate the new part into the machine, pay the transportation of the part from the manufacturer to the dealer's place of business and absorb any loss that the customer may have had in the defective operation of the machine. It is an actual fact that some of the tractors delivered by the manufacturer absolutely failed in the field by a breakage of a major part of said tractor. The dealer had to absorb the replacement of this part, on an entire production run of this particular model tractor. On another occasion a manufacturer released a new model tractor, of which after severe farmer usage the radiator proved defective. The manufacturer replaced the radiator only. The dealer paid the cost of express from some points in Pennsylvania to Wisconsin, assumed the cost of labor which constituted the work of two men for one-half day to replace this radiator. No other industry has a similar service policy. If the dealer wishes a friendlier relationship with his customer, he is forced to assume these costs all of which must be made up out of the 20 percent he is allowed to deliver the machine received by him from the manufacturer. The service policy of the industry has changed, but the dealer discount has not changed.

5. The manufacturer has released more complicated machines which take experienced and highly trained help to assemble and to service at no change in price or no change in discount to the customer, wherein the early years of the industry every farmer could assemble or help assemble his own binder. No farmer now can be expected to service his Diesel engine, to overhaul his variable speed attachments on his combine, or rebuild his milker pulsator. It now becomes necessary to employ Diesel and ignition engineers to properly service the farmer and properly deliver a machine to the farmer. The release by the manufacturer of numerous attachment parts to tractor as labor-saving devices for the farmer have resulted in increased cost to the dealer. As an example, attachments on a tractor to cultivate corn sells for $125, or a gross profit at the 20 percent level of $25. At the present cost of labor very little can be done with $25, as it usually takes three service calls to properly adjust this cultivator in the field, not to speak of the cost of assembly, which is generally high, and consumes from 7 to 8 hours for two men, using up all of the allocated percentage for handling, not considering the tremendous amount of parts stocked by the dealer to attach this unit to various type tractors that the farmer may have. Every tractor attachment part ever sold by any dealer, before or after the war, was sold at a loss by such dealer at the only satisfaction of having a large gross volume with no net profit.

6. Because of numerous additional Government agencies such as social security, unemployment insurance, income tax, etc., it has become necessary for the implement dealer as a sole trader to so enlarge his business to include the expensive cost of bookkeeping, whereas at the inception of the trade discount the dealer could be a sole trader handling his business alone, he now finds it necessary to share part of his profits with an expensive office. The release of new machines by the manufacturer has complicated the supplying of parts to the dealer to such a point that it is further necessary to hire a specialized parts service man to handle the terrific inventory necessary to properly supply the customer when in need. This being a seasonable operation, it makes it necessary for the dealer to absorb the cost of such parts man through the remaining months of the fiscal year at almost no profit, because of the limited sales of farm equipment parts in that portion of the year in which the farmer does not use his equipment, being obviously the major portion of such year.

7. The fixed assets of the dealer have become tremendous as a necessity whereas the inception of the industry policy of the 20 percent mark-up, the dealer could operate out of a blacksmith shop or some similar type frame structure it now becomes necessary that the dealer operate out of a highly specialized supermerchandising type building at a very high cost. This is true for both his shop and the store caused directly by the change in the type of machines sold and the type of service required to properly satisfy agriculture in its advance stages as we have it today.

II. The dealer is not able to absorb any decrease in percent mark-up from cost because of the facts of the emergency created by the war and the changed business conditions resulting therefrom.

1. The dealer had no war profits or Government subsidies out of which to build large reserves by which he could absorb the decreased profits now suggested. Only industry and agriculture were allowed war profits. The dealer has had smaller deliveries, smaller sales, and smaller profits since the inception of the war, and therefore now justifiably cannot be asked to absorb any increase, as his cost of doing business by specific proof will not allow him to absorb these increases in cost and decreases in profits. An analysis of the comparative net income per gross dollar business will prove that the implement industry at the dealer level has never been a normal profit business. This fact has been recognized by all auditors and by the department of taxation.

2. Out of a set margin of profit per item delivered the dealer has been forced to absorb the increased cost of labor, tools, equipment, accounting, taxes, etc., without a corresponding increase in sales. It is illogical to assume that the dealer can absorb increased costs without a corresponding increase in margin, as the only dollar that can be used to pay these increased costs come directly from that portion of the dollar which is charged him by the manufacturer, and which he received from the farmer upon the sale of the machine.

3. Prior to the war the implement dealer could purchase all equipment in large quantities and store it, or receive it upon immediate application to his supplier. Today the dealer is forced to take that machine which the supplier gives him to sell, not being able to specify kind, type or model. In many cases he is forced to take that machine which has a high cost of sale and cannot balance his profits by delivering the machine which has a low cost, and a high profit. If the dealer could deliver 90 percent of his gross sales in farm tractors, no objection would be made to the present change in discount, but it so happens that only 30 percent of the dealers gross sales result from the sales of farm tractors, the remainder thereof being made up by the erection and sale of attachment machines or horse-drawn machines which have a very high cost, and a very low margin of profits. It is obvious that the sales of a horse-drawn grass mower will take as much salesmanship, a higher cost of erection and delivery, and twice as much service as a sale of large type tractor. The gross profits on the sale of a horse-drawn mower is about $25. It is obvious to assume the inequity of the reduction of discount upon the sale of items such as that which constitute 70 percent of the dealer sale.

4. Prior to the war the manufacturer provided an inventory and purchase account of all replacement parts purchased from the manufacturer. This was done to maintain adequate stocks at the dealer level in the time of seasonable demand. Immediately after the beginning of the war, the manufacturer discontinued this service to the dealer, and it was necessary for the dealer to install this additional bookkeeping into his own organization. The cost of keeping these records is very much in excess of 5 percent, and is a direct increase in cost to the dealer, and a decrease in profits as a result of the war and its emergency. This obviously is a major factor and a greater proof in the facts that the dealer cannot be asked to absorb the increased cost of parts without a corresponding increased profit.

5. Machines now delivered by the manufacturer dealer are not complete and cannot be specifically ordered resulting in an increased cost to the dealer upon receiving the necessary parts and attaching them to the machines that have been sold. This is a direct result of the emergency, and is forced to increase cost to the dealer because of the double service and double handling charge to him.

6. The farm equipment retailer has not enjoyed the comparative reduction of accounts receivable over other industries because of the obvious financial position of the farmer and of the seasonable source of his income. If a tractor is delivered to a farmer in winter, arrangements must be made to finance this machine until such time that the income of the farmer will correspond with that type expenditure. This is a further cost of doing business, the elimination of which as in other industries has not added war profits to the implement dealer.

7. The fact that OPA received only 147 returns out of 17,000 questionnaires sent out proves that the industry percent mark-up was never large enough to permit that type bookkeeping necessary to tabulate the figures asked for. Other States may have produced fortunes on implement dealerships, but the records show none in Wisconsin. The industry is too monopolistic as the manufacturers do not allow dealerships large enough to permit high volume necessary in small margins.

8. The following is an analysis of a large progressive implement dealer's books out of one of the best dairy counties in Wisconsin. Notice the unfavorable balance and low margin even before the high cost of doing business was forced upon him:

	1939	1940	1941	1944	1945
Total sales	$69,240	$89,961	$108,304	$98,093	$118,746
Cost of sales	60,837	83,554	94,324	76,739	99,735
Gross profit	8,403	6,406	113,979	21,353	19,010
Operating expenses	8,111	5,432	13,695	21,265	17,669
Net profit	291	974	284	87	1,340
Other income				3,540	4,222
Net profit	291	974	284	3,628	5,563
Salaries to officers	1,234	1,397	1,350	7,446	4,583
Sales of farm equipment (estimated) percent	70	70	70	50	50

SUMMARY

The retail implement supplier is not interested and is not making an application for wartime profits, but is merely demanding the normal profits that are necessary to operate his business, to pay a living wage, and to retain for himself the result of his labor. In the facts above stated it is shown that the margin of profit allowed the implement retailer was inadequate prior to the war, and is now absolutely unjustifiable as reduced in the amended OPA regulations MPR 246 and MPR 133. The mere fact of the dealers limited sales, limited production, and limited profits, with an increased cost of labor, overhead, and products should be enough to support his application that the part of the above-named regulations be deleted, and if an increased cost is necessary that it be placed elsewhere, as both industry and agriculture are better able to absorb any increase than the retailer.

Lumber Exported at a Premium in Spite of Housing Shortage

REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the critical housing shortage in the United States which has rendered thousands upon thousands of veterans and civilians homeless, unable to find decent shelter and unable to build because of the continuing shortage of materials, I have protested repeatedly to the State Department because of the continual exportation of lumber to foreign countries while this deplorable situation exists here in our own Nation.

Five months ago I demanded that the State Department investigate this situation, and curtail the exportation of our lumber in view of the acute shortage of lumber for the building of civilian homes for returning servicemen and their families. Evidently nothing has been done by the State Department. Lumber exportation continues, and Department of Commerce figures show exportation of 168,899,000 board feet of lumber during the first 3 months of 1946, this amount in addition to shipments of lumber to the Army, Navy, UNRRA and foreign countries under lend-lease agreement. Further figures released by the Department of Commerce show that while total lumber production in the United States increased 24 percent, lumber exported from the United States increased 36 percent.

This is a ridiculous situation which the State Department should immediately investigate and curtail. Inadequate housing facilities in the Los Angeles area, the Pacific coast and in fact throughout the Nation is alarming and serious largely due to the shortage of lumber.

Solution of the housing shortage is one of the problems of first importance among those facing the Nation during this critical reconversion period. New houses must be built, and all materials essential to construction of homes should be made available for use in the United States now, and any policy which encourages the lumber industry to export its produce instead of marketing it in this country should be curbed immediately.

I want to submit to you a resolution recently passed by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors presenting further protest against the further exportation of lumber at this time.

Whereas according to the May 1, 1946 report of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association the production of lumber by Pacific coast mills during the first 3 months of 1946 was far below normal; and

Whereas according to the figures compiled by the United States Department of Commerce 168,899,000 board feet of lumber was exported during the first 3 months of 1946, which said lumber exported was in addition to shipments of lumber to the Army, Navy, UNRRA and foreign countries under lend-lease agreement; and

Whereas during February and March of 1946, according to Department of Commerce figures, there was an increase of 24 percent in total lumber production in the United States and an increase of 36 percent in lumber exported from the United States; and

Whereas the West Coast Lumbermen's Association reports that in the first 4 months of 1946 the State of California received only 22 persent of the total west coast lumber production for that period and that the State of California is the most critical area in the United States from the standpoint of urgently needed housing; and

Whereas as shown by the report of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association, at the end of April 1946, west coast lumber dealers had unfilled orders on their books for 632,008,000 board feet and the inability to fill said orders is one of the main causes for the chaotic condition of the construction industry in California whereby urgently needed housing now under construction and projected is being held up and seriously delayed; and

Whereas this board of supervisors is exerting every effort to expedite the construction of needed housing in this area and in the State of California and it is the opinion of this board that removal of the profit incentive for exporting lumber would release millions of board feet for domestic use: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County most strongly urge the Congress of the United States and the Office of Price Administration to remove without delay the motive to disproportionate profit from the export of lumber by either increasing the ceiling for domestic sales or by providing an embargo on foreign shipments during the period of this acute emergency; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of this board be instructed to send copies of this resolution to each California Senator and each Member of the Los Angeles County congressional delegation.

Address of Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah, at Meeting of National Council of American-Soviet Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered at a rally honoring visiting Soviet journalists, under the auspices of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, in Madison Square Garden, New York City, on May 29, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are gathered here tonight to honor not only the three most outstanding war correspondents of the Soviet Union, the goodwill ambassadors of the people who helped to make victory over tyranny and barbarism possible, but all the peoples of the Soviet Union. The three Soviet guests who are with us tonight, the brilliant writers Ilya Ehrenburg, Konstantín Simónov and General Michail Galaktiónov, were the source of great inspiration to the hard-pressed Soviet peoples during the dark days of Nazi invasion. The men honored tonight instilled in the men on the firing line, in the men and women on the production front, and in the hearts of the peace-loving people everywhere faith in the invincibility of the Soviet forces, and in the cause for which our men as well as theirs fought and died. We welcome this delegation to America.

I should like to see a delegation of the Supreme Soviet come and visit the United States and see our Congress at work, and I should like to see a delegation of our Congress go to visit the Soviet Union delegates at work, because Americans generally do not understand the power and the functions of that great body in the Union of Socialist

Soviet Republics. Today we dare not base a policy on ignorance of other people's politics or on their ignorance of ours.

As the American people moved westward over this country, Russians moved eastward over Siberia. American ships bearing men to make treaties arrived in Japan in 1854. Russians moving eastward for various purposes reached Japan and settled in 1858. Russia crossed the Pacific and settled on the American Continent as far south as the Russian River near San Francisco and for years they controlled Alaska. Tnose two great movements, one east and one west, which resulted in splendid friendships and glorious understandings, are now symbolic of our present friendship, for again we have met in Japan. But there was another great time, for as Russian armies moved westward to crush a common enemy our armies moved eastward, and we met again as friends in the land of the common enemy. These are symbols which will not die. There is no doubt in anyone's mind but that the American people are friendly toward the Russian people and that the Russian people are friendly toward the American people. It was a people's war we have fought. It is a people's peace we shall make. Governments in the long run follow the will of the people. Russian-American friendship, therefore, is assured.

Just as symbols which will not die have evolved out of our experiences with Russia, America has had other experiences leaving symbols equally as strong, but because of their strength they do not in the least subtract or detract from our friendship with Russia. I am speaking now of those symbols which have grown from the experiences of America within America and her own development. Our people having traditionally accepted the thesis that "a government of law and not of men" is the proper form, causes us to think in terms of rights. And an attempt to solve problems dealing with the relationship of human beings or of governments, based primarily upon rights, is an invitation to continual clash and not to peace.

The right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is not a right in the strictly legal meaning. It is in reality the echoing of the strivings of the human heart to live in ordinary, everyday life, the ultimate potentiality of man. It is the reechoing of an ideal. The fullness of democratic life is based upon the theory of common consent and the notion that liberty comes from respect of others, not as a result of a basis of demand on our part. These are the ideals which the average man strives for, prays for, and believes attainable. They are the ideals based primarily upon the simple theory of treating others as you would like others to treat you and the basic notion that all social life must have its culmination in mutuality. These ideals are attainable only and are worth while only when they rest upon faith and trust. The institutions which make us great are the individual savings accounts of our kiddies, the insurance of our parents. Thus it is to say, my great idealism is based upon the practical, everyday economics of bread and butter and a place to lay my head. Therefore, American democracy, American freedom, and American liberty all center in and symbolize a single concept; individualism with a social conscience and a sense of responsibility. And when American democracy works and reaches its conclusions, it is understood by all that that which it does, it does by common consent.

Democracy now seems to have but a single thought—to serve—that men, women, and children may enjoy lives economically full, culturally complete, and free from burdening concern and worry. World-wide democracy strives for the better life, internationally seeking to be a better neighbor—nationally the desire of thoughtful nations and free peoples. Surely the United Nations are working to bring into existence that world which Washington dreamed of when he said: "On these occasions I consider how mankind may be connected, like one great family, in fraternal ties," and "My first wish is * * * to see the whole world in peace, and the inhabitants of it as one band of brothers striving to determine who should contribute most to the happiness of mankind."

While men have dreamed of peace since the beginning of time, they did not invent a form of government which might become world-wide and, therefore, insure the peace. But no longer is the concept of world government merely theory. No longer is it based upon prayer and aspiration. The way of peace is in the world. Whether the world will tread the path of peace remains to be seen. It can only do so if it understands where it is going.

It is my firm belief that in the universal acceptance of democracy we have the essential of world unity. With free peoples in free nations where individual rights protect and enlarge the citizen and where self-restraint and united control preserve the nation, a united world is possible.

I may see a larger and more comprehensive example of unity before I die, but I do not expect to see a better working one. I love to read of utopias. I am a believer in the "grand course"—the millennium—but it will not come by fiat. It will come from struggle, planning, experiment, and cooperation. I am not one to despair when the world seems to falter in its efforts to attain such an objective. It would indicate an ignorance of history to expect complete success for so great an undertaking without many an apparent failure. I have full faith in the attainment of the new world unity. But this better world can never come without the development of the concept of the worth, dignity, and importance of the individual.

Russia brought unity by making a union of republics. America brought unity by creating the United States, where each State is guaranteed the republican form of government. Russia has united peoples successfully and so have we.

Soviet Russia's first 25 years of history resembles our own first 25 years. The ideals of the American Revolution struck so hard at age-old injustices that, of course, the revolution was misunderstood from one end of our world to the other. The Russian revolution also struck at age-old injustices, and it, too, was bound to be misunderstood. Both revolutions today, though, can be judged in their true light by their accomplishments.

Tonight we again turn to the idealism behind each revolution. The sacrifices of each makes insignificant every purpose except the idealistic aspirations upon which both revolutions rest. Russia and America are natural allies because the freedom of men, women, and children is the objective of each people. In the sacrifices of the Russian People's Army and the accomplishment of its great victories, the world now sees the strength of men and women united in a fight for liberty.

Two political systems seem to be at ultimate and eternal conflict. But are they? The American objective is to raise the standard of living of all and give individual man freedom to aspire. And our only motto is—to the worthy belongs the reward. Russia is aiming to raise the standards of all, and—only to the worker should be the benefit. The happiness and general welfare of men, women, and children are the objectives of both. Just as political parties in America clash everlastingly over the proper methods for obtaining two objectives, so internationally we may eventually clash over the method of approach, but not over the objectives. That can never be in governments controlled by their people. Ultimately, all must be accomplished by peaceful change, for without that we go back. War takes man down and the long struggle upward comes not by the techniques of war but by the techniques of peace. This we all know. Patience, forbearance, perserverance, tolerance—are the needed words of today. But I would suggest one step further than that. Since we are friends, let us learn to appreciate one another. Appreciation should be our aim. We must look to the strength of ourselves and our own institutions as the best means of meeting the strength and institutions of others. And as keeping our strength and institutions depends so greatly on peace, we must have peace. So must Russia. If two such great countries without real rivalries, and without the memory of a single war between them, both need peace to such an extent, What will prevent them from finding it together?

Homes for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Challenge—Homes for Veterans," delivered by Wilson W. Wyatt, National Housing Expediter and Administrator of the National Housing Agency, before the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, at Buffalo, N. Y., on June 5, 1946. An estimate from the Government Printing Office indicates that the address delivered by Mr. Wyatt will exceed by two-thirds of a page the two printed pages allowed under the rule and that the cost of printing it will be $160.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad of this opportunity to talk over the housing problem with you here in Buffalo because the Niagara frontier section has been in the forefront in showing interest in the problem and in making an intelligent analysis of what it can do to solve it.

In fact, the whole State of New York has long been extremely active in both private and public housing programs and this is reflected in the activities in Washington of your two Senators from New York.

As you all know, Senator WAGNER—the legislative father of housing measures for many years—is one of the authors of the general housing bill, known as the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. The difficult job of drafting this bill and guiding it through to passage by the Senate would never have been accomplished without his strong leadership. I know of no one who has fought harder or more ably to get decent homes for everyone in this country than the universally respected senior Senator from New York.

The name of your native son, Senator JIM MEAD, appears on other important national housing measures, the Mead resolutions which appropriated funds to set up 200,000 units of surplus barracks and temporary war housing in towns and educational institutions. Senator MEAD has been the driving force behind this program which is providing homes for veterans and their families now and is making it possible for thousands

of veterans to attend colleges which otherwise would have no room for them. More than 17,000 of these units have been allocated to towns and universities in New York State by the Federal Public Housing Authority. In addition to these units, which are relocated at Federal expense, many other temporary dwellings have been made available from Government surplus to State and local governments that can bear the cost of moving them and setting them up. This program was also arranged through the leadership of Senator MEAD.

Let me say here and now that the returning veterans of this war can thank Senator MEAD for getting action at a time when plans for emergency housing were completely stymied. It was a dramatic evidence of what vigilant leadership can mean.

Before I came up here I talked with some of the people in the National Housing Agency who are especially familiar with the Buffalo situation and one of them told me the best speech I could make would be to come into town on a trainload of lumber and say nothing.

I am sorry that I don't have that trainload with me today. Believe me, I know that housing plans and construction schedules are no substitute for bricks and lumber. I'm not kidding myself about the seriousness of the shortage in building materials and I have no intention of trying to kid you about it.

I want to tell you as simply and plainly as I can the things the National Housing Agency is doing to try to lick the shortage, why it is doing them, and what results it's getting. I also want to talk a little about a long-range housing program, about the importance to veterans, as well as to all of the rest of us, of passing the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill right away.

I have read with keen interest the housing study made by the Niagara Frontier Planning Board, and I want to compliment the board for the thoroughness with which it has gone into the problem.

On the basis of the findings of your planning board, it would appear that the Niagara frontier is better off than many sections of the country insofar as the supply of building sites and of labor is concerned, but is worse off than some other sections in the most important thing of all—the supply of building materials. In addition to suffering from a general shortage, you are also suffering from bad distribution.

Actually, the national shortage isn't as bad as poor distribution makes it appear to be in Buffalo. Some sections in the West now have enough lumber to cause them to run into a shortage of nails and we're meeting with the industry on that new bottleneck this week. You might think the west coast would be fairly happy over its lumber supply, but actually we have received some complaints that people out there think that too much lumber is being shipped to the East. That's the sort of thing that keeps life from being dull for a housing expediter.

You want to know why you're not getting materials now in Buffalo and when you will start getting them. The only way I know to answer that is to give you the whole picture on the materials situation.

The shortage of building materials is the number one bottleneck in housing, and building materials will continue to be in short supply for the next 2 years despite substantial increases in production.

We made a big step forward this week when we started submitting specific premium payment plans, retroactive to June 1, to representatives of three building materials industries. The three industries are softwood plywood, structural clay products, and gypsum paper liner.

This is the first use of the $400,000,000 authorized under the recently passed Veterans' Emergency Housing Act to stimulate increases in critical building materials. These payments will be made for production over the above quotas based on recent production figures.

We expect these payments to cause a 25-percent increase in plywood output for the next 3 months. The boost in paper liner shipments in June should result in more gypsum board and laths by July. The brick payments will cause old plants to be reopened, old kilns to be patched up and put back into service, and will permit plants to work longer hours. By July and August the increased production from these moves should be felt all over the country.

Similar plans are under way for other industries. In general, we are moving first in the materials fields where the shortages are the most critical or in which premium payments can be put into effect most quickly.

In addition to premium payments, many other steps have been taken by Government agencies to speed up production of building materials. Here are a few of them:

The OPA has granted nearly 100 price increases affecting lumber and other building supplies since the first of the year, and price ceilings are not now a major obstacle to production.

The Wage Stabilization Board has approved many necessary wage increases where low pay was causing a manpower shortage affecting materials producers.

The USES has recruited labor.

CPA has granted priorities for equipment needed by materials producers and assisted them to get scarce materials.

These agencies are working together. For example, the Wage Stabilization Board recently approved an additional wage increase for the southern group of foundries to get more cast-iron soil pipe and at the same time the OPA approved an increase in the ceiling price of this pipe.

Take lumber as another example. During April OPA granted price increases for millwork and flooring and for such major lumbers as Douglas fir, cypress, western red cedar, and hemlock. In May price adjustments were made on northern softwood, northeastern softwood, south central area hardwood, softwood molding, and stock stair parts.

Fifteen million dollars was provided out of the money authorized by the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act to build access roads to out-of-the-way Government timber stands, a step that is expected to add at least 100,000,000 board feet to this year's lumber production and 500,000,000 to 600,000,000 to next year's.

The United States Forest Service has agreed to the overcutting of timber beyond normal yield in certain localities of the South and West for an emergency period as was done during the war. It is estimated that this will add 150,000,000 to 200,000,000 board feet a year for 1946 and 1947.

The Forest Service will give preference to housing and reconversion needs in deciding tie bids in the sale of lumber from national forests. Price ceilings result in almost all offerings receiving tie bids.

Surplus salvage lumber from Army and Navy camps is due to get into normal channels within the next 90 days under arrangements worked out with War Assets Administration and other agencies.

Steps such as these have already resulted in important increases in production. Other steps will be taken as needs arise. But none of these can result in overnight miracles. It takes time to get lumber from a forest to a building site.

Take millwork. Say we start out with Ponderosa pine logged on the west coast. Normally it takes about 2 weeks to get the log to a sawmill. Sawmills' facilities for kiln drying average about 50 percent of capacity. So half of the sawed lumber would be kiln-dried for 30 days and the other half would be air-dried for 6 months. This would mean about a hundred-day average for drying. It takes another 30 days for the lumber to reach the millwork manufacturer who averages about 5 days in additional drying. It takes another 30 days for distribution of the millwork to jobbers and about 10 days after that for it to get to the contractor or retail dealer. The whole process takes about 6 months. Hardwood flooring takes about the same time to get from the forest to a home site and even framing lumber requires about 5 months to get into use if it is properly aged.

So the fact that you won't have all of the lumber you want by next week or next month doesn't mean that nothing is being done to increase production of lumber. As a matter of fact we have a good chance of meeting the 32,000,000,000 board feet that is the goal for this year.

March lumber production was 2,600,000,000 board feet, an increase of 24 percent above February production, more than double the normal seasonal increase. Monthly lumber production figures, expressed in annual terms and adjusted for the 5-year seasonal average show that the Civilian Production Administration forecast of 30,000,000,000 board feet for 1946 may be exceeded. The first quarter production was at an annual rate of 29,000,000,000 but the March production reached a 32,000,000,000 annual rate and only a slight increase is needed to realize the 1946 production goal of 32,000,000,000 board feet. A preliminary report just received that April production hit 2,900,000,000 feet gives us additional reason to hope that we will reach the goal.

Right now iron and steel products are a big headache in building materials. The National Housing Agency and CPA are working with the industry to step up production, but, needless to say, nothing much could be done during the coal dispute, which hurt production of many other materials as well.

However, cast-iron radiation has increased steadily since VJ-day from less than one million square feet per month to 2.35 million in March and 2.56 million in April.

Structural insulation board increased 21 percent to 166,000,000 square feet in March.

Asphalt and tar roofing products expanded from 5.1 million squares in February to 5.8 million in March, raising the first quarter total to 16.6 million squares, a 10-percent increase over the last quarter of 1945.

First quarter production of 180,000 bath tubs exceeded the output in the last quarter of 1945 by 60 percent.

The March rate of production in warm-air furnaces, 47,100 units, was almost equal to the average monthly rate for 1941, the biggest year in the history of that industry.

One thing that complicates the materials' problem is the abnormal demand, a demand so great that even record-breaking production does not meet it. We have acted to cut this demand by stopping nonresidential construction that is not essential or can be deferred.

This was done by a Civilian Production Administration order, strengthened just last week when CPA ordered its field offices to reduce the dollar volume of such authorizations by two-thirds.

But demand is still greater than supply. Remember the cigarette shortage last year? Actually the shortage wasn't as bad as it seemed, but as soon as inventories were wiped out and cigarettes became a little scarce, the normal channels of distribution failed to do the job properly. There were under-the-counter sales, tie-ins where you had to buy some pipe tobacco to get cigarettes, and black-market prices.

Shortages always make for bad distribution. In war we tried to correct this bad distribution by rationing, but we still had black markets and the other evidences of abnormal distribution.

We see the same thing in building materials. Right now distribution is rapidly becoming the No. 1 problem in building materials. You in Buffalo know this from painful first-hand experience. Lumber stays in

the producing area, normal channels are bypassed. The cause of this is not that prices are too low; the cause is that the demand is so great. This is shown by the fact that in materials where no one complains about the price, bad distribution still exists. We are taking the most important step to correct bad distribution in getting increases in production.

The Niagara Frontier Planning Board report specifically raises the distribution problem caused by the fact that mills are permitted to sell at retail in their local areas. This, the report points out, results in lumber being sold at the mill instead of being shipped to other sections of the country.

The trouble is not with the rule but with the abuses of the rule. It has long been customary for mills to make retail sales in their areas to serve customers to whom no other retail outlet is available. But when the black-market operators use this as a dodge to sell wholesale quantities at retail prices it becomes an abuse.

We must stop these abuses. The OPA is moving to do just that. They have just finished training a large number of investigators to work with the Department of Justice to stamp out the black market in lumber.

It takes constant vigilance to make a priorities system work in a shortage as serious as the present one in building materials. I think the housing priority system is working out pretty well, but not well enough. We're going to see to it that it works better by slowing down on the issuance of priorities to get them into proportion with the supply of materials.

Right now priority holders in Buffalo or Kansas City or Atlanta are getting the building materials that go into these towns, but that is scant help to you if faulty distribution is keeping materials from your town. Tighter controls may be necessary. We may have to extend priorities all the way back to the producer.

I don't want any controls that are not absolutely necessary. Industry does not want them either and has said ever since the war's end that uncontrolled distribution through normal channels is the best way to get fair distribution. I sincerely hope that the present maladjustment of distribution is only temporary and that industry will be able to correct it quickly.

We don't want to have to allocate lumber or any other material on a geographical pattern to get normal distribution through normal channels, but we must have a fair distribution of lumber and other building materials.

Another aspect of the materials problem is the development of new products. Such things as light-weight panels using metal and paper or plastic, but as strong as a conventional wall, can be used in factory-built homes as well as in those constructed on the site. They open the way to better homes for less money and they mean that more houses can be built now, even though there are not enough conventional materials to go around. Production of these new materials on large scale is encouraged through the guaranteed market provisions of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act. But, like the developments in conventional materials, these new products do not guarantee overnight miracles. To get mass production of them we first have to tool up, to set up assembly lines.

The building materials problem isn't solved yet, but we are turning the corner and the road ahead is a lot smoother than the road we have just traveled. We haven't licked the problem, but we are licking it. Reports show that 315,000 dwelling units were started in the first 4 months of the year. We're getting better production every day to supply the materials to finish these houses.

What is the alternative to the materials production program I have outlined? To remove all so-called restrictive Government controls. To throw building materials up "for grabs." First come, first served, highest bidder take all. Any such plan would cut the flow of materials for housing to a mere trickle. Non-residential building would get first call on materials. Next would come elaborate mansions and so on down until we ran out of materials somewhere in the upper brackets. This would mean virtually no new houses and apartments for veterans. They would have to be satisfied with second-hand housing or third-hand housing at inflated prices. Why should the veteran be given only the left-overs of housing? He has just performed a dangerous and unpleasant duty for his country. It is not too much to ask of that country that it give him a decent place to live.

There's another important point to remember about removal of all controls. In the past, housing has not developed at the rate of other industries. Almost the only time that housing has moved as fast as the rest of the economy has been during the dizziest whirl of a boom and bust cycle.

What happened after the last war? When controls were lifted, building prices skyrocketed out of reach and home construction dwindled rapidly and didn't recover until after a painful period of deflation. Lumber prices doubled, but production went up only 10 percent. Housing didn't really get going again until the middle twenties. This house-hungry Nation cannot afford to repeat that disaster again.

In fact not only can we afford no housing bust, but it is necessary for the Nation to plan for a 10-year period of sound building at the accelerated pace set by the veterans' emergency housing program. You have recognized this need in Buffalo in your plans for both private and public housing. The Senate of the United States has recognized it by passing the general housing bill which bears the name of Senator WAGNER.

If you want statistical proof of this need, let me read what the Niagara Frontier Planning Board has to say about the past history of housing in Buffalo, a story that is typical of the rest of the country.

"If the 10-year period prior to 1931 is considered as a normal era of demand and construction and the average number of units constructed during that period was 3,145 units per year, then in fairness it may be assumed that in this area there should have been constructed an average of at least 3,000 units per year from the 15 years that have elapsed since 1930, or a total of 45,000 units. Yet 7,442 houses were constructed during the 15 years between 1930 and 1945. This, therefore, indicates a present backlog of needed housing that approximates 38,000 units." Actually, the increase in suburban population during this era, as the report points out, makes it fair to assume the backlog is even greater.

Contrast these figures with your planning board report that the 1946 housing goal for the whole Niagara frontier district is 7,400 units, and you can see why the 2-year program will just be a sprint on a treadmill, a desperate race to keep from losing ground, and why we need a long-range housing plan.

I am glad to see increasing recognition of the importance of planning. I am glad to see that planning is getting out of the doghouse. We have wasted too much time and effort already operating under the fallacious theory that planning is impractical and that the American way is for things just to happen in some mysterious haphazard fashion.

Why anyone should be afraid of planning I don't know. When a manufacturer starts to bring out a new producst, he plans when and where he will get his materials, where he will get the machinery, how he will dispose of the product, what it will cost him to make and what price it will bring, and he sets a sales schedule and a production schedule. Is that long-haired or un-American? Of course not. Well, then, what's wrong with setting production schedules on housing?

When we lay out an automobile factory do we let it just grow up like Topsy or do we plan it carefully? We plan it, of course. Yet somehow we are still afraid to plan as efficiently when we lay out our residential sections; in fact we seem almost proud of not planning them. Sunshine and fresh air are free; they can be had in unlimited quantity without premium payments or raised price ceilings. Yet we have built thousands of homes under the smoke clouds from factories.

The time has come for a complete change in our approach to housing. We must plan neighborhoods as intelligently as we plan huge factories. We must tackle the production of homes with the assembly-line technique. We must welcome new methods, seek them out, adopt them, approve them, and hunt for something newer yet. We must stop building homes with no more ingenuity and imagination than that which put the fringe on top of the surrey. We must use the imagination and ingenuity that changed automobiles from imitation buggies to the well-engineered product of today.

Two facts in housing hit us in the face:

We are now in the midst of a critical shortage. The type of building that produced this shortage and made it worse with every year that passed is not going to end the shortage.

This Nation cannot afford to have the shortage continue and grow worse.

In America we recognize that we have certain public responsibilities. This is recognized in taxation for police protection, courts, and schools. It is admitted that every citizen is entitled to the protection of the law, that all children are entitled to free education. I say that everyone is also entitled to a decent place to live.

But if you want a harder-headed reason, I say that we who have a decent place to live cannot afford the cost of the slums, the crime and sickness that breeds and festers there. Even if the slum is not in your city, you pay for the people in this slum who cannot fight for their country in time of war or add to its production in time of peace. It is cheaper to clean out slums than it is to pay rent for them year in and year out in the form of taxes, crime, and disease.

In the next 2 years there won't be much chance to clear out slums or to build homes for the 10,000,000 nonveterans living in substandard dwellings. To do this calls for the decade of intelligent building proposed in a measure that is also an essential part of the veterans' emergency housing program, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill.

The bill provides four major tools for better housing. One consists of new financial aids to permit private enterprise to meet the needs of the great middle market never served adequately in the past. Funds are authorized to aid towns and cities in clearing slums and blighted areas and in assembling land for housing in accordance with sound planning principles. Other funds are authorized for technical research to lower building costs and to improve the quality of housing. And finally, the bill provides for the building of 125,000 units of public low-rent housing each year for the next 4 years to serve those whose incomes are so low that private enterprise is unable to provide them with decent housing.

The vital contribution offered both to home seekers and to builders by the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill is the aid extended in meeting the demand of the "middle market." It must be realized that although there is today a large potential market for homes from $7,500 up to more than double that figure, in the long run the great demand—the demand which can create a market lasting over the years and challenging the full capacity of the building industry—is in low-

cost homes. These are the homes the worker can buy and rent, homes below the cost of the houses and apartments that have been built in real volume during the past few years.

If we go down to low cost in building—and I believe we can, once we get going, using the technical and financial aids provided in the general housing bill—the housing industry will have a sound and lasting prosperity it has never achieved before.

I know that you in New York State and in Buffalo appreciate the importance of public low-rent housing because communities in the State have applied for assistance to build 24,450 low-rent dwelling units, to cost about $173,675,000. The city of Buffalo is already a leader among communities taking positive action to meet the housing needs of low-income families, with its present 1,900 units built under the United States Housing Act program. I hope that the prompt passage of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill will enable you to build your other proposed units.

The Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill is designed to accomplish one goal—a decent home for all American families, and it is designed to aid private enterprise to do the bulk of the job. The provisions of this bill to get better housing at less cost mean that every veteran who gets a home in the next few years—as well as in future years—will get a better home for less money. Prompt passage of this measure by the House is a necessity for the veterans, and a necessity for all the rest of us.

The housing needs of the United States are plain. We need to start two and a half million homes in the next 2 years so that our veterans will have a decent place to live. We need to keep on building at this pace until everyone in America is decently housed.

We cannot do this if we move forward grudgingly, turning our face from the future to look longingly back at the "good old days." The "good old days" are behind us, gone forever. The "better new days" are ahead. Let's go ahead.

Commencement Address Delivered by Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah, at Gallaudet College

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a commencement address delivered by me as a part of the graduation exercises at Gallaudet College, the Columbia School for the Deaf, Washington, D. C., on June 1, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANKIND NEEDS MEN, MEN THAT CAN STAND ALONE

I think it is a healthful sign when a great institution like this considers one of its trustees worthy of a place on the commencement program. It is a natural tendency in man to look afield and to assume that those who are of us are probably not as worthy as those who are far away. Having said that, it comes to my mind that I have invited a comparison. Please forget it, and I will be on with my talk.

I have never quite understood, since my first confusion over the word "commencement," just why it happened that as soon as a fellow got through with a job and received a certificate, they called it a commencement. I suppose our forefathers who started the custom wanted us to feel that the finishing of preparation meant the commencement of life. That is a fallacious deduction. Life cannot be divided into compartments, and if you do not carry enthusiasms of your school into life you will become dull, indeed.

I thank your great institution for inviting me to come before you today. I do not know whether congratulations should be congratulations or not. I, myself, would love to be back in school. I was glad enough to get out when I was being lectured to by a commencement speaker. Having seen something of life since; I know what a mistake I made. I suppose it is because heaven is so far off that we all hope to get there some day. My philosophy is to live and enjoy a bit as we go, but I have never been able to live up to my philosophy. There is no doubt in my mind that all of you have high and proper ideals, but there is a doubt as to whether any of you will live in accordance with them. I have no advice, not because I am a cynic and believe that graduates will not take advice, but because I merely want to talk about attitudes and trends—attitudes and trends in relation to you and the world. Both are important entities. I must, though, get in a little advice or this will not be a commencement address.

Now for the advice: Every student who ever took an American Government class under me was told to choose some American statesman and read everything he could find about that statesman, learn his life as he learns nothing else. It does not necessarily matter who the man is, but get deeply interested in him. If you will do that you will never want for something to do in any of your leisure hours and you will find that the twentieth or thirtieth book you read about your hero is more interesting than the first one you read. In this way you will find that you are building up your own soul. You do not have to confine your hero to America or to a statesman, but find someone who has lived a worth-while life and learn all of the mistakes he has made. That will help you to avoid mistakes. Learn all of the good he has done, the discouragements he has overcome, and you will learn how to overcome discouragement and do some good.

I chose Thomas Jefferson for my own hero and the study of Jefferson has been fruitful to me beyond words. I am now Chairman of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission and a director of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association. The Commission has erected a $3,000,000 memorial to Jefferson, and the association has purchased Monticello and given it to the American people as a national monument. I have at times become so enthusiastic over the Jefferson Memorial that in my enthusiasm I think of it as something I have done. Of course I know I have contributed but little, but that contribution has become so much a part of my life that I glory in the whole. I remember when the Commission for the memorial in Washington was first established; at the very first meeting of the Commission I told those present that as far as I was concerned I was going to work with such enthusiasm that I was going to take credit for everything the Commission did. I was glad I said that, because within a week the President of the United States called me with the then Chairman of the Commission to give us his ideas. I needn't say more. But just between you and me, the President did not have his way, and the reason he did not have his way was that he had not said the memorial was going to be his, as I had. Under those circumstances you would not have budged for the President of the United States, would you?

The point I am trying to make is this: It took time to bring about the Jefferson Memorial, and the fine people who objected to it in the beginning all gave way in the end. If you make something your own and keep at it long enough you do win.

That brings me to another point. You only go forward with institutions. You cannot go forward alone Identify yourselves, therefore, with causes that result in institutions, then when you are dead and gone you still live. You cannot take George Washington and Thomas Jefferson out of the Government of the United States. Their spirits are here. Both Washington and Jefferson are dead but the Government of the United States is not dead. and in that they live.

Let us take a simpler case. When I used to sit on the deans' council of the University of Utah, some bright instructor in the freshmen English class, and there were bright instructors in those days, even in English classes, asked the students to write a paragraph on why they came to the university. One girl, and I wish I had known her, merely wrote that she came to the university to get a decent husband (period) and handed in her paper (exclamation point). That was so out of the ordinary that one important dean thought it was disgusting and that such a person should be invited to leave the campus. I said it was great, that there was a girl who had a plan for life and she was just working her plan. Probably without knowing it she had accepted the Aristotelian theory that man is a social animal. That girl gave evidence of having a philosophy of life. I wish someone had impressed upon me earlier in my life, than when I got the idea, that life can only be lived properly when one has a philosophy of life.

It was Mencius who brought me to my senses in regard to this fundamental idea. Mencius' dissertation about the earthworm could be summed up in these words: Both man and an earthworm are parts of life, but man should not live like an earthworm. He should have purpose, purpose in what he does and should act in accordance with that purpose. Man should have reverence for the proper relationships between himself and other men. Man should live in accordance with that understanding of those relationships. I should like to go further than Mencius and say that man should have not only a philosophy of life, but he should have a religion. By religion, I mean it in its simplest form. The word "religion," as you know, comes from the Latin word, "religio," which means a tie, or a bond. Religion is merely that bond which connects you with that which has gone before and that which is to come. Thus, man may become part of the eternal scheme in his thinking as well as the social scheme that Mencius stressed.

Would you live like an earthworm? One very great philosopher said that the difference between a man and an earthworm was that when an earthworm digs in the ground he keeps on doing it, but when a man digs in the ground and finds an earthworm, that gives him an idea and he goes fishing. Do you see what I mean? Man does something about the ideas he gets.

Let me suggest that you be very selfish. Not that you break the Tenth Commandment, but that you realize within the bounds of the Aristotelian concept that man is a social animal and that selfishness must of necessity also be social. We would not have electric lights today if Edison had said to us, "This is the way to make an electric light. Now you go ahead and make it." He was selfish. He did it himself. You and I have both had more good from electric lights than Edison got out of them. I am sure that I

got more pleasure out of reading Jefferson's letters than he got out of writing them. I have had inspiration, understanding, history, appreciation of my country, and I have learned the values of democracy. I know from a study of Jefferson not only how democracy works but how it should work. Jefferson did not know that he was giving me any of those ideas when he wrote his letters. The good man does never stops. Jefferson never dreamed that nazism, fascism, and world conquest through horror would overrun the earth and that his defense of liberty, law, and justice would overcome them. But the leaders of the earth today know the strength of his great fundamentals and their power to withstand wickedness.

There is not one of you graduates who had anything to do with the establishment of this great institution, with the planning of the first buildings here, or with the planning of the first student social. You do not know the headaches other people had in going through those experiences, but you got more out of them than the very people who started them. Now, I ask the question: Is it right to be selfish and use benefits that someone else has provided? You cannot dodge those benefits. Who owns this institution anyway? It is yours, and it belongs to those graduates who have gone before you. But all have failed to attain the utmost potentiality this institution offered. That was not Gallaudet's fault. You failed in getting in the fullness all that you might have had. But Gallaudet did its part. You failed to do yours. When you sloughed your last class did you go to the trouble to figure out in dollars and cents who had been cheated? In my school days I never did. My classes did not seem to cost anything until one day I figured out that the State of Utah paid me quite a sum of money for delivering the lecture I did. Perhaps no one is cheated when he sloughs a class. But if a professor has sense enough to say, "I am delivering this lecture for the good it does me," and works so hard in preparation for that lecture with the idea that only he himself will get the profit from it, somebody is benefitted. That is my reason for selfishness. Whatever you do, do for your own upbuilding without advantage-taking and others will be benefitted. You must see basic causes and basic effects. In the individual you will note that the cure for many a clash is attained through the simple device of equal opportunity, a real life of interdependence, a spirit of mutuality. And if you see basic causes and basic effects, you will know that war anywhere is of concern to all everywhere. Poverty anywhere reduces wealth and living standards everywhere. You have a notion that starvation in the middle of Asia does not affect life in prosperous America. Look around you and see what is happening today. Accept the basic fact of life that while men kill each other in hideous war they are thoughtful of each other's welfare nevertheless.

No class in the history of commencements has looked upon a world so wrought in its own destruction as the world you face today. Yet, with the coming of the peace, no class has had greater opportunity to assist in creating a new world, a new world built upon the great American principle. No class has started to tread the path of life with a choice between good and evil so easy to discern. In all the world's history, civilization has never before presented so many excellent possibilities, nor have the destroyers of civilization ever perpetrated so many ills. If, as some of the philosophers held, good and evil exist eternally, never have they dwelt side by side in such close proximity as they dwell today. Man can transport himself quicker, can make for himself greater happiness, can live life more abundantly than it has ever been lived before. He can commit more evil, bring about more destruction, destroy more happiness than he has been able to do before, and yet, hope for the better world looms greater than ever before.

As a result of intolerable conditions in those nations ruled by single-will tyrants, thousands of refugees, dubbed intellectuals, have come to America. The effect of the thinking and working of these men is not yet apparent. I predict a greater intellectual birth in this glorious land of ours, an outpouring of knowledge which will affect the whole world, a bursting forth of scientific thinking and political idealism which will be pointed out by future generations and which will make the last half of the twentieth century a century of inspiration such as the world had in the sixth century B. C. and the first century A. D. We are living in mighty times; times which will result in universal acceptance as significant in the history of ideas as were the democratic ideals of the gospel of Buddha and the antiaristocratic ideals of the Confucian philosophy based upon the training of man whose nature is good; as great even in its lasting significance as was the greatest of all contributions in the development of democracy, the discovery by Jesus of the individual and of that individual's worth in the eternal scheme of things. There will be no single concept quite as great as that given the world by Jesus. But in the coming spiritual outpouring every idea developed will be complementary to those of the sixth century B. C. and the first century A. D. And that the ideas will be lasting is assured because they will be developed under the auspices of those theories which were evolved by our American founding fathers.

And now I am back to my Jefferson to work my way out. The state is important and we should be ready to give our lives for it, but it is not all important from the American standpoint. It is important only to the extent that it serves that which is of greater importance. It is men, women, and children that are important. The state was made for man just as the Sabbath, and man not either for the state or the Sabbath.

The world has known the idea of progress for a century and three-quarters. We have had the concept of evolution for nearly 100 years. We have had the dreams of our founding fathers built upon the notion that America is a promised land and dedicated to the concept of freedom for more than 150 years. We have had Jefferson's great letter to Adams, written just before he died, wherein he said that he and Adams would yet look down from heaven with joy at the fulfillment of their great dream. For over a century America has learned that the four freedoms pay. Even religions thrive better here under the philosophy of freedom of religions and for religions than they do in those lands where particular religions are protected by law. American life is built upon the right to come and go; the right to have and to hold; the right to think, to aspire, and to achieve. These rights are attainable only and are worth-while only when they rest upon faith and trust. The institutions which make us great are the individual savings accounts of our kiddies, the insurance of our parents. Thus it is to say, my great idealism is based upon the practical, everyday economics of bread and butter and a place to lay my head.

All of that is prologue. Your task is to achieve such a prologue, but knowing at the beginning you can do so only through understanding, and understanding of the practical sort comes only through proper education. A society based upon a well-trained citizenry is still America's best dream. It should be the world's dream. There can be no peace until there is some contentment, until living standards everywhere are such that men and women can produce not only enough to live on, but a surplus to keep that living bigger, better, and more complete.

The American Government is still the only Government on earth where the spokesman for that Government and the leaders in it carry on not for the benefit of the Government, but for the people for whom the Government functions. The Constitution may have been written by inspired men, but they did not create through their inspiration something that was to be worshiped. The Constitution is not a god. It is merely the companion of the American people in the accomplishment of the people's social, political, and economic objectives. It goes with the people. It does not lead and they do not follow. It is the people's way of life. It merely says to us, "We will act in accord with it in order to accomplish our good ends." It says to our President, "You lead us in accomplishing our general welfare. You direct us when we are at war, but you direct, command, and lead us with righteousness or we shall cut you down." And with full faith in the goodness of man's nature, we today trust the welfare, not of 130,000,000 people but the welfare of the people of the world, to this man we call the President, because we realize that with righteousness he will direct and lead because 130,000,000 people have imposed that task upon him. The American people say to their judges, "You administer justice in accordance with law and protect the individual in his rights and in his property, and all individuals in their relationship to their fellow men." The American people say to their legislative representatives, "You make the law, but you do it in accordance with the standards laid down by us." That is what the Constitution means and that is the way it functions. And in the history of our country, the failures of these governmental trusts have been so few that you can still count on the fingers of your two hands the number of impeachment trials the Senate of the United States has had to hold. Is that Government weak because it protects the individual in his rights? Are our courts weak because they administer justice and law instead of political theory and expediency? Are our Army and Navy weak because the leaders of that Army and Navy take an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States, which in turn is merely a way of political life for the American people? Democracy is not weak; freedom is not weak; liberty is not weak. These are strong, and you have seen that strength manifest and made certain at the same time that you have heard democracy's weakness proclaimed and its impending destruction assured to cheering mobs by men who now lie in the dust, destroyed ultimately by their own wickedness, their own ambitions, and their own lack of morals.

What then in life constitutes strength? Did Jesus have it, Jesus the world's outstanding failure, killed in his early thirties? His plan for men has not yet been the crowning success which is to bring the world's redemption. But who today would call Him weak? Socrates failed. He too died because he thought that death was better than submission to wrong. Why did those men fail? They decided that morals were important and that ideals were worth while. It was these assertions that brought their destruction, but their way of life is prevailing today in high and low places and the strength which they showed has been displayed by thousands and thousands of our boys and girls who fought; and thousands and thousands more, who died in concentration camps rather than surrender an ideal. Yes, giving their lives that right, decent living, honesty, and morality may have a meaning in this world. The acts of men are so great and the facts of history so stupendous that we who stand here uttering words must seem

insignificant, indeed. But my prayer is that you will all say that American democracy, American freedom, and American liberty all center in a single concept; individualism with a social conscience and a sense of responsibility; and, when American democracy works and reaches its conclusions, it is understood by all that that which it does it does by common consent.

"I saw the powers of darkness put to flight!
I saw the morning break!"

And the world's great task today is the same as it was when that Constitution was written and ratified. How to bring one out of many—E Pluribus Unum—is the task that faces us today as it faced our fathers. It must be done as they did it. It is because of my firm belief in the great American experiment that I always advocate that world unity can only come through American leadership and under the auspices of the American theory. While world unity is the objective, that individual man's life may be bigger, we mean unity as we have accomplised it in our Federal system without destroying either the diversity of individual characteristics or the diversity of local communities. It is in America that the Federal technique of government has been worked out. It is in America that the theory of dual and plural citizenship has been made practical. It is in America that we can unite for some purposes and be divided for others. It is in America that liberty is maintained by promoting voluntary cooperation, instead of forced unity. It is in America that national and State sovereignty are permitted to exist side by side, not without conflict, to be sure, but with those conflicts adjusted by peaceful means. It is in America that the individual has the right to have and to hold, to go and to come, to live life in a greater sense than it has ever been lived before, with man under his own vine and fig tree, as some prophet of old foretold man should live.

After 150 years of experience, if the world would but catch America's spirit, no one need feel that the efforts being made by their leaders today are in vain. Slowly but surely man is being made conscious of the fact that, no matter what nation he belongs to, that nation in turn is but one of a community of nations. That fact realized, that fact maintained, surely then the standard for nations can be as readily set up as the standards for individuals are set up with the community or the nation. Man lives in law and is not free from the restraints of his neighbors. A nation, too, lives in law and should not be free from restraints of its neighbors. If we fail to bring about a better world through the organization of the nations of the earth, we will fail because we did not realize the fact that the earth is a unit and the nations of the earth are but individual entities, within that unit, and must adhere to the prevailing will of the community of nationals. If we but do this, we shall have a sanction for international law as binding and as great as the fundamental sanction which we have in our own Constitution.

Practically every pitfall that is pointed out by those without faith in the earth today was pointed out by those without faith in our American Constitution 150 years ago. If those theories which were dreamed of by the fathers, if that Constitution which we so glibly call inspired contain the elements of truth, why should anyone criticize me when I say that the American Revolution is still on, that it has not accomplished its ultimate objective, and that its full meaning in the earth will not be understood until the world unity is made manifest, that same type of unity which we have made manifest in our 150 years of history. A unity which has destroyed war among us can, by expansion, destroy war in the earth.

While men have dreamed of peace since the beginning of time, they did not invent a form of government which might become world-wide and, therefore, insure the peace. No longer is the concept of world government merely theory. No longer is it based upon prayer and aspiration. The way of peace is in the world. Whether the world tread the path of peace remains to be seen. It can only do so if it understands where it is going. Education is a process of leading. The New World needs leadership. We shall succeed or we shall fail, therefore, on the basis of the character of that leadership. It is to be a leadership based upon the single will, with the followers forced to go where they are told? If so, now is the best time to accept fascism as a universal ideal because the world knows its technique better than ever before. Or, will it be a leadership growing out of deliberations of trained deliberators, using as a basis for argument the knowledge of history, the facts of society, the understanding of man and his nature? That is the democratic way and by no means the easy way as is the technique of the single will. That ladies and gentlemen, is for you to answer. Will you deal with fundamentals, or will you be satisfied with biased partisan strife, or an unquestioned acceptance of the will of the leader?

Thus, I have talked of you and the world. I might have talked of you and many worlds, but I have full faith that the great sacrifices of so many has brought home to all the need for thoughtful approach to bring about that condition among men that destruction by war shall cease. It was a heroine in one of the early Greek dramas, I believe it was one of Sophocles', that wailed—"Oh, why, oh why, do men unite so readily for war, but never unite for peace?"

Is the task hopeless? Are nations so foolish that they will not give a little of that which they claim for themselves in order to gain much for all? There were those among our fathers who talked against our Constitution with that spirit, but they did not prevail. There are those in the world today who still have little faith. But for you, may I suggest this simple approach. Had you lived in Washington's time would you have been happy to have been one of those without faith in Washington's cause? Had you lived in Lincoln's time, would you now be proud that you were one of those who were against what Lincoln was trying to do? You will have to make decisions. Make them so that your grandchildren will point with pride and be happy to be identified as sons and daughters of some great cause which is yours. Do not think it was easier for our fathers to decide than it is for you. It was not. And never forget that—

"Mankind needs men, men that can stand alone
Their faith unsullied in a sordid world.
The age is growing, right comes to its own
Prometheus loosed no more from gods is hurled.
Mankind needs men, such as in days of old
Deemed that bright treasure Honor more than gold.
Should courtesy and courage be upheld
Less nobly now than in the days of old?"

Vinson Backs Congress on Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH McKELLAR
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Vinson Backs Congress on Law," written by John H. Cline and published in the Washington Star of June 9, 1947. It is a very excellent article dealing with the man who has just been named to be Chief Justice of the United States. There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VINSON BACKS CONGRESS ON LAW—APPEALS COURT DECISIONS INDICATE BELIEF IN LEGISLATURE'S RIGHT TO SHAPE NATIONAL POLICIES AS WELL AS SUPPORT FOR LEGAL PRECEDENTS

(By John H. Cline)

The man who will become the thirteenth Chief Justice of the United States when the Senate confirms his nomination is known to a host of people in this country. Many count him as an intimate friend. A still larger company know him well enough to have some impression of his character and his capabilities. But the number of those who can undertake to catalog Fred M. Vinson as a Chief Justice must be exceedingly small.

For the fact is that Judge Vinson, unlike his immediate predecessors in the chief justiceship, has made no record which serves as a reliable guide to the position he may be expected to take with respect to many of the great questions of constitutional law which come to the Nation's highest court for decision. Charles Evans Hughes had served as an Associate Justice before being returned to the bench as Chief Justice, and the late Harlan Fiske Stone had spent years on the Court before his advancement. Consequently, there could be some certainty as to the stand these men would take on basic issues. But Judge Vinson has made no comparable record, his previous consequential judicial experience consisting of 5 years on the United States Court of Appeals for the District. Since his writings during those 5 years constitute the most reliable index of his philosophy of the law, however, they are worthy of examination.

Most lawyers would agree that the local court of appeals is second in importance only to the Supreme Court itself. Because of its peculiar status as both a Federal and a local appellate court its judges have to deal with all manner of cases, and Judge Vinson, from 1938 to 1943, carried his full share of the load. Over this period he wrote upward of 100 opinions—opinions which reveal two basic aspects of his concept of the proper role of the courts in this country.

RESPECT FOR PRECEDENT

The first and probably the most significant impression which one derives from these opinions is that Judge Vinson subscribes wholeheartedly and unwaveringly to the doctrine that it is the function of Congress, and not of the courts, to shape national policy and write the laws. A second rather definite impression is that the new Chief Justice has respect for precedent. This is not to say that he will adhere slavishly to previously enunciated doctrines, but it seems unlikely that he, as Chief Justice, will join in the extravagant overturning of past rulings which once prompted former Associate Justice Roberts to protest that the decisions of the Supreme Court were coming to resemble restricted railroad tickets—good for this day and train only.

As a member of the court of appeals, Judge Vinson did not write any single decision which stands out as being of especial significance. He concurred in, but did not write, the court's opinion holding the practice of medicine to be a trade within the meaning of the antitrust laws. He dealt with will cases, condemnation proceedings, contract issues, injunction suits, tax questions, divorces, criminal cases, patents, and most of

the other controversies which make up the day's work of the court. Occasionally he dissented, rather sharply in one instance, but for the most part he either wrote the majority opinion or joined in it. Running at random over the list one finds such observations as these:

A lawyer was trying to invalidate a provision of an important will on a point controlled by the English common law rather than by statute. After listening to the arguments, Judge Vinson said: "We are told that under the force of logic, of history, of custom, of justice, of morals, of social welfare, we must declare the common law for today differently than it was declared for Britishers in the Thellusson case (1799). We are told that this is a model case for bold action on the part of a court, that we should free ourselves from the stinted legalistic reasoning of the 18th century. We are told that this will is a carry-over from feudal days and is diametrically opposed to the principles of democracy." But Judge Vinson was not impressed. "A court," he said, "does not have as good facilities to study these problems, nor does it represent as directly the people, as the legislative body." So, in this respect, the English common law of 1799 remains the law in the District.

BACKS CONGRESS' AUTHORITY

In another will case there was an attack on the testament because of the difficulty under its terms of computing the amount of the trust funds involved. But prior decisions had settled the law in that matter, and Judge Vinson said that "We do not feel that we should break away from the long-applied rule, supported by authority, reason, and fairness to the parties involved, because of the difficulty in computing the amount of the trust funds."

In one case he refused a request for an injunction against the Federal Communications Commission because the relief sought had not been authorized by Congress; in another he set aside a refusal to issue a radio license on the ground that the FCC action was "arbitrary and capricious."

In one of two interesting dissents, Judge Vinson refused to join his colleagues in affirming the conviction of a junk dealer for violating a regulation against use of the streets for storage. He did not think that the man had violated the ordinance, and he observed rather bluntly that "The courts are not the instrumentality of government to amend the regulation." The other dissent was still sharper. His associates had reversed a lower court finding that a picture book was obscene, their contention being that standards have to be revised as people change their minds about what is and is not obscene. Of this Judge Vinson declared: "The majority have evidently concluded that the country-wide sense of decency has altered in the past few years to the extent that in the present day only a Rip Van Winkle could regard the book in question as obscene. That I cannot believe."

MAY LEAN TO RIGHT

There is one other case which might be mentioned, more for its illustration of the lengths to which judges can go in differing than for the light it sheds on Mr. Vinson's views. The case involved a jurisdictional dispute between the Switchmen's Union and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. Judge Vinson, speaking for Chief Justice Groner and himself, upheld the view of the National Mediation Board. "It is for Congress to determine policy," he said. "Our province is to keep the Board within the confines of that policy." Justice Rutledge, then on the court of appeals, dissented. When the case reached the Supreme Court that tribunal reversed Justice Vinson, the majority holding that the courts were without jurisdiction to hear the dispute. Justices Black and Rutledge, the latter having moved up by that time, did not participate. Justice Douglas, joined by Chief Justice Stone and Associates Murphy and Frankfurter, wrote the majority opinion. Justices Reed, Roberts, and Jackson dissented, their view being that the courts did have jurisdiction.

This setback at the hands of the court over which he soon will preside is not, of course, typical of the conflicting views which the new Chief Justice will be expected to reconcile so far as it is possible to reconcile them. Neither is the pattern of thinking revealed in Judge Vinson's court of appeals decisions necessarily indicative of the way he will think when he takes his place on the highest court.

The chances are, however, that the new Chief Justice will not stray far from his often-expressed view that Congress must make the laws. Yet this permits of a considerable latitude in interpreting the intent of Congress, and it is to be expected that Judge Vinson, with his extensive background in politics, will resolve doubtful issues in favor of the political philosophy to which he has subscribed as a member of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. Those who know him well believe that he will seek the middle course, with the deviation, if any, being to the right rather than the left. Probably this is a good guess, for experience shows that, in most cases, advancement to the Supreme Court, and especially to the Chief Justiceship tends to have a sobering and restraining influence. It seems unlikely that a man who followed the middle of the road on an appellate court will swing over to the left in the highest judicial position in the land.

Address of Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah, Before Mizarchi Zionist Organization of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the Mizarchi Zionist Organization of America at the Hotel Commodore in New York City on June 2, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have spent much of my life in religious work and endeavor. I am, by nature, a deeply religious person. By religious, I do not mean any narrow sect loyalty, but I mean it very much in its big, broad aspect. Religion to me is merely the bond which ties me to those things which have gone before and to those things which will come. Therefore, prophecy is not only God's word, as the prophets spoke for God, but since religion has to do with the past, the present, and the future, prophecy is that medium through which man continues his faith in the purposefulness of creation. Thus, when this religious sentiment is brought over into the field of history, man's record upon this planet becomes a struggle for eternal ideals. When fundamental religious concepts are made part of man's political thinking, then it is not hard for us to see that nations can have destinies and be given the responsibility for keeping their people in harmony with the eternal scheme.

One of the sacred books, which I respect, predicts America as a promised land, a land reserved, until these great days of man's history, for those persons and those people, who, in harmony with God's plans, have come here to create a land where liberty can blossom forth and where the individual can, therefore, receive the ultimate potential of his development. Thus America, to me, is not only a land of promise, but it is a land of purpose. It is not only a haven for the down-trodden of the world, but it is that geographical area in the world which shall be kept free from ignorance, bigotry, and bias. These always end in crushing of liberty, aspiration, and the closing of the door to God's inspiration and revelation. America has a purpose in the eternal scheme of things. This scripture, which I have mentioned, confirms the prophecies of the Bible in that it maintains that the Jews shall return to Palestine under the auspices of the gentiles. We do not know exactly what the great prophecy means. But it cannot mean that the Jews will return to Palestine against the gentiles' will. Auspices must have a free connotation or I do not understand its meaning. The restored Jerusalem, therefore, when it has occured in its fullness, will be a center of peace, a center where the ideals which it has so long symbolized can bear even greater fruit, a center which will come into being much as a result of the strivings of the hearts of men to make a better world and better living for mankind, and to assume leadership in ideals and in action to which the whole world can look for an example. I am thus, in my own nature, probably the most tense, the most devout, and the most idealistic Zionist present.

I know you will forgive me for drawing myself into these remarks tonight. You should forgive me because you will discover that no matter how narrow, how restricted, how self-satisfied any Jew may become with his own individual interpretation of what he conceives zionism to mean, there are, in the world, allies of his plans and aspirations, if not of his narrow zeal of going it alone.

It is over 100 years ago that leaders of my people sent a mission to Palestine with no other purpose than to dedicate that land to the return of the Jews to it, and to the rebuilding of Jerusalem.

Before the First World War, I, with my wife and little baby, went to Palestine. We journeyed over the whole of it, trying to catch its spirit and its meaning. I learned to dislike the rivalries of its peoples. I hated the clash that was there in the midst of the zeal and the devotion; Christians fighting Christians; Arabs fighting Arabs; Jews with no settled policy, side by side, with holy prayers offered in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre; the Mohammedan's zeal, their rigid sectarianism in the Mosque of Omar; the Russian pilgrims coming by the hundreds; zealots all; the clash of the donkey men with the camel men. Jerusalem was confused, a bedlam of madness, contest even among beggars. But still there was also the other thing. God's spirit hovered over the Holy Land in more places than one—the great out-of-doors was still his, the stars, the like of which you see nowhere else in the world but on our own American desert, out where I grew up—with the striving and with the bigness of those who saw the bigness of Gods' purpose in the land. There were also many of the humble of the earth who reflected the divine in man; there were those who were seen praying at the watering place; there were the Christian monks, the priests in their holy cloisters; there was the pilgrim, who, like myself, sat of an eve-

ning on the Mount of Olives and overlooked Jerusalem and read the poetry and the prophecy, the forebodings and the prayers, with hearts that reached up to God. I read the prayer, for example, that I have just mentioned, the prayer dedicating the land of Palestine to the return of the Jews and to the rebuilding of Jerusalem.

President Garfield, at one time in this very city of New York, is said to have said that there are times in the hearts of men and in the experiences of men when the line between the temporal and the eternal is so thin that if man would but thrust out his hand he could feel the eternal presence. As I look back on that evening on the Mount of Olives and remember the sunset, and remember the reading of the prayer, and remembering my own thoughts, I believe that Garfield was right and that man often gets close to the eternal.

I repeat, I had those thoughts before the beginning of the First World War. Palestine was then in the midst of war itself because the war between Greece and Turkey was then being fought and Palestine was the place where the Turks kept Greeks prisoners of war. I thought that the day of fulfillment was about to come. I was sure that Jerusalem would be restored; that it would be restored under gentile auspices; that a finer day in the world was to dawn. Still I knew that wherever I traveled and with whoever I met there was talk of war either in the Far East or in Europe. Someway or another, though, I had faith that man's better nature would prevail and that the mumblings and the threats would not develop into bombings and battles. But I was wrong. Four long years of the First World War, then a peace that was no peace, kept selfishness and hate, envy and distrust, ruling the hearts of men. The peace that came in 1918 seems now to have come merely to have given those who want to rule by hate, by wickedness, by death, by pestilence, by destruction, with all of the bad things in man's nature prevailing, a chance to come to life. We had known pogroms, we had known of the drivings of people from their homes, we had known of the ghetto life, of the arm band as an insignia of a hated people, or some other design to belittle a great people. All of those things we had known. Terrible as they were, today they must be thought of as small wickednesses in the light of what was to take place when hell broke loose again in Europe. The First World War, its hideousness in the East and the West, its sneak attacks, its killings, we all may have anticipated; but none of us felt the horrors of the concentration camps, the killings of men, women, and children, until now it is assumed that at least 6,000,000 Jews were slain primarily because they were Jews. Terrible as we did imagine all things that may happen, the actual happenings were worse.

Why was I, who sat upon the Mount of Olives and dreamed dreams and read prophecy and felt the infinite, called upon to be one of the witnesses of these frightful killings and one of those who signed a report which will remain as an everlasting indictment against the most wicked aspects of wickedness. I repeat, why should I have been chosen one to have left his name as a witness of that horror? Has it dimmed my zeal, or dulled my appreciation of the fact that a better day must dawn and that a better day will dawn? Of course it has not. I have not lost faith in man. I have not lost faith in God. And I have not lost faith in my fundamental belief of the purposefulness of this creation. Zionism, the restoration of Jerusalem, and the return of the Jews to their ancient holy land are all, in their biggest aspects, merely symbols of a better world that is to come. Each and of themselves will be a glorious accomplishment, but each will only contribute to the day when the world itself will have fulfilled the purpose of its creation and its paradisaical glory made complete.

Modern zionism is about 100 years old. The fundamentals behind zionism are as old as Israelite nationality. I, as an oriental student, in attempting to develop a thesis of world unity, at one time tried to bring to our American educational scheme the teachings of the Orient. I saw the necessity of bringing about a bridge between the thought of the East and the thought of the West. Perhaps it was because of my early teaching that I always knew that some day the light would come out of the Orient and the law would come out of the Occident, or that Zion would be built upon the American continent and the Jersusalem would be restored, and that the law would go forth from Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, and that I accepted this world unity upon the basis of the harmony of the hearts and minds of men of the east and the west.

Then I learned to appreciate what it was that caused the Dark Ages in Europe and I discovered that while there were Dark Ages in Europe there were, also, Dark Ages in Asia. The two went side by side. It was Asia's forgetfulness of us quite as much as our forgetfulness of Asia which produced those Dark Ages. Historically, the Dark Ages came about after a rise of a great power which separated the east and the west, the Mohammedan conquest of the Middle East and northern Africa. And during these Dark Ages, Europeans began interpreting all things around a narrow experience, and, during the worst of the Dark Ages, the Jews in Europe were made peoples separate and apart and the ghettos were established. That was one way of western peoples driving out eastern thought. Still, at the same time, that which you call universal history was built around the story of man as told in the Old Testament, and when a great scholar like Voltaire wanted to illustrate how narrow European thought and outlook became, he used the story of a great Chinese going into a Dutch book shop:

"In the year 1723 there was a Chinese in Holland who was both a learned man and a merchant, two things that ought by no means to be incompatible; but which, thanks to the profound respect that is shown to money, and the little regard that the human species pay to merit have become so among us.

"This Chinese, who spoke a little Dutch, happened to be in a bookseller's shop at the same time that some literati were assembled there. He asked for a book; they offered him Boussuet's Universal History, badly translated. At the title 'Universal History'—

" 'How pleased am I,' cried the Oriental, 'to have met with this book. I shall now see what is said of our great empire, of a nation that has subsisted for upward of 50,000 years; of that long dynasty of emperors who have governed us for such a number of ages. I shall see what these Europeans think of the religion of our literati, and of the pure and simple worship we pay to the Supreme Being. What a pleasure will it be for me to find how they speak of our arts, many of which are of a more ancient date with us than the eras of all of the kingdoms of Europe.'

" 'Lord bless you,' said one of the literati, 'there is hardly any mention made of that nation in this work. The only nation considered is that marvelous people, the Jews.'

" 'The Jews,' said the Chinese; 'those people then must certainly be masters of three parts of the globe at least.'

" 'Here I joined in the conversation, and told him that for a few years they were in possession of a small country to themselves; but that we were not to judge of a people from the extent of their dominations, any more than of a man by his riches.'

" 'But does not this book take notice of some other nations?' demanded the man of letters.

" 'Undoubtedly,' replied a learned gentleman who stood at my elbow; 'it treats largely of a small country about 50 leagues in circumference, made by the hands of man.'

" 'The inhabitants of that country,' continued the doctor, 'were all sages.'

" 'What happy times were those,' cried the Chinese; 'but is that all?'

" 'No,' replied the other, 'there is mention made of those famous people, the Greeks.'

" 'Greeks! Greeks!' said the Asiatic, 'who are those Greeks?'

" 'Why,' replied the philosopher, 'they were master of a little province, about the two-hundredth part as large as China, but whose fame spread over the whole world.'

" 'Indeed,' said the Chinese, with an air of openness and ingenuousness, 'I declare, I never heard the least mention of these people, either in the Mogul's country, in Japan, or in Great Tartary. * * * Tell me, what other unknown things does this Universal History treat of?'

"Upon this my learned neighbor harangued for a quarter of an hour and together about the Roman Republic, and when he came to Julius Caesar the Chinese stopped him, and very gravely said:

" 'I think I have heard of him; was he not a Turk?'

" 'How!' cried our sage in a fury, 'can't you so much as know the difference between pagans, Christians, and Mahometans? Did you never hear of Constantine? Do you know nothing of the history of the popes?'

"We have heard something confusedly of one Mahomet,' replied the Asiatic.

" 'It is surely impossible,' said the other, 'but you must have heard at least of Luther, Zwinglius, Bellarmine, and Oecolampadius.'

" 'I shall never remember all those names,' said the Chinese, and so saying he quitted the shop, and went to sell a large quantity of Pekow tea and fine calico, and then, after purchasing what merchandise he required, set sail for his own country, adoring Tien, and recommending himself to Confucius.

"As to myself, the conversation I had been witness to plainly discovered to me the nature of vainglory; and I could not forbear exclaiming:

" 'Since Caesar and Jupiter are names unknown to the finest, most ancient, most extensive, most populous, and most civilized kingdom in the universe, it becomes ye well, O ye rulers of petty states! ye pulpit orators of narrow parish, or a little town! ye doctors of Salamanca, or Bourges! ye trifling authors, and ye heavy commentators! it becomes you well, indeed, to aspire to fame and immortality.' "

The student of today does not react to this conversation by bewailing as did Voltaire the "vainglory" of man, but assumes the responsibility of delving into the great unknowns of history and looks forward to the day when such a conversation will become less and less natural.

It has now been 200 years since Voltaire's Chinese merchant asked for a book in the Holland Book Shop, and during that 200 years great progress has been made in unfolding Chinese history and life in the west. Still, in the realm of political science, western writers on this subject have in one way or another ignored the Chinese field. But the progress of the world will not longer permit us to ignore China, Asia, or any other corner of the earth, because the earth has

grown small and remoteness no longer exists. And because of this we are forced to learn the lessons of history; we are forced to seek that which connects the past with the present and with the future; we are forced to seek an understanding of basic causes and effects. We are at long last beginning to see that war anywhere is of concern to all everywhere; that poverty anywhere reduces wealth and living standards everywhere; and we are learning to understand that history proves that nations who persecute their minority groups do not thrive. Terrible as is the sacrifice of those persecuted, nature in her judgments brings punishment a hundredfold on the persecutors. Six million Jews were destroyed in the late war. No account is made of the destruction of those who were responsible for the destruction of the 6,000,000.

The ancients used to assume that Heaven and Earth dwell together so closely that when a just king ruled the people were prosperous, and when an unjust king was on the throne people suffered. Our own Jefferson put this law of history in his own words, while contemplating American slavery, when he said: "Can the liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God? Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever. Commerce between master and slaves is despotism. These people are to be free." Jefferson, the slave owner, knew history and understood the fundamentals of God's justice.

We of the democratic world, in contrast to single will states, are animated by the religious impulse. We look upon the sufferings through which we have passed, in order to establish our basic fundamentals and principles, as the birth pangs of a new world. And we believe that a new day is dawning for many nations, a day when ancient bitternesses and wrongs will be purged away, and humanity, conscious of its solidarity, will march forward to a new opportunity.

It is no swift and sudden utopia that I offer you, but the deep faith that out of the welter of blood and tears and sweat, which we have survived, mankind will set foot on the road to a brighter future and build a better world. In this brighter future, what people in the world has a greater claim to a just share than the Jewish people? What people in the world has a greater right to expect that its homelessness, its landlessness, its helplessness, shall be redressed? Not only for the sake of the Jews, but for the sake of all mankind this ancient wrong must be righted.

The solution is obvious. The Jewish people must have a homeland. They must have a habitation and a name as a people, a place for the ingathering of all their weary and all their oppressed. What that place is is equally obvious. It is Palestine, the land of their ancient inheritance, the land that is associated with their glorious past.

Thirty years ago the time for their return to their ancient land appeared to have ripened. The Balfour Declaration came as proof that the conscience of man with respect to the ancient wrong of Israel had at last been roused from callousness and lethargy to sympathetic understanding and decisive action. Tonight, as we recall that event, we have a right to regard it as a beacon light in one of the dark nights of human history. That beacon has burned and will continue to burn. Sometimes it has flickered. Sometimes it even seemed to be on the point of being extinguished. But it will not go out.

And in the light of this beacon we dream; we look down, as I did from the Mount of Olives, and we behold the valley of vision. We behold the dry bones of the dead that have come together and assumed flesh and life and hope and aspiration. We behold Israel resurrected. We see thousands of the worn and the bent and the weary winding their way toward the ancient land, and we see the crooked made straight. We see a new light kindled in their eyes, a new energy in their limbs. And we see the hillsides and the valleys of Palestine bloom again. We see groves and forests, villages and towns, schools and workshops rise as if by magic. We witness the reclamation of a land and the rebirth of a nation. And in our dreams we hear the song of liberated men and women, elevated and ennobled.

And who, I ask, would be hurt or aggrieved by that happy transformation of the Holy Land and the transformation of the people to whom this land has been promised?

The Arabs of Palestine would be among the beneficiaries of such a transformation. Their standards of living, their health standards would be raised. And with all the vast opportunities for national progress and national integration that would be opened to the Arab race, is it conceivable that their enlightened leaders will, in the words of Lord Balfour continue to "begrudge the Jewish people that little notch which is Palestine"? That was not the attitude of their leaders 30 years ago. Quite to the contrary. Their attitude then was expressed by their great leader, the King of Iraq, who, in a letter to professor, now Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Felix Frankfurter, wrote, "We will wish the Jews a most hearty welcome home."

It was President Wilson's view then, as it is mine today, that the Near East settlement must be regarded as a whole, and that the Arabs, in claiming and receiving at the hands of victorious Allies the territories and the freedoms which they then acquired, become thereby a party also to the international settlement regarding Palestine. This is not, therefore, a question of the politics of Palestine or even the politics of the Near East. It is, as has been well said, part of "the politics of civilization," which require that this small strip of territory be reserved in order to solve an age-old world problem—the problem of Jewish homelessness.

I have long been a student of the Orient and a sincere friend of oriental peoples—the Hindus, the Chinese, yes, even of the Japanese people. I would not say to the Arab peoples and their leaders: The fate and future of the Arabic people in that part of the world depend upon the democratic world order we are trying to achieve. If you desire, as I am confident you do, to stand with the democracies, to win with the democracies, and to share with the democracies the fruits of victory you must be prepared to share our democratic responsibilities. One of the democratic responsibilities which we cannot and will not evade is the responsibility of civilization toward the Jewish people and the solemn pledge of civilization to restore the Jewish people to their homeland.

To all men to whom it is given to see design in the history of mankind, the vision of Israel resurrected and restored is a thrilling experience. It is a consummation which all men of good heart and good will have devoutly wished for. I need hardly recall again that the Balfour Declaration would not have been issued were it not for the cordial and eager approval of Woodrow Wilson, then President of the United States. And 5 years later, in 1922, the people of the United States in Congress assembled, adopted a resolution, without a dissenting vote, that the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, thus setting its seal of approval on the Balfour Declaration.

Liberal forward-looking America stands four-square for a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine—a Jewish commonwealth that shall be an honorable member of the society of nations. And let no one have any misgivings as to the attitude of America. No one has perhaps better expressed that attitude than our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, when he said: "Out of the world war came a matter of great spiritual significance—the establishment of a homeland for the Jewish people, recognized as such by the public law of the world. In the realization of this aim the United States played a leading role."

In a sense the coming century is likely to be the century of Asia. By that I mean that in the generations which are to come we shall witness a mighty reawaking of that mother of continents which now shelters almost one-half of the whole human race. There is no power on earth which can arrest this process. Our world today is a world with the center of interest shifting fast away from the Western Hemisphere to the East. Asia, like Europe, is allied with distant powers and divided within. Yet the preponderance of Asiatic populations will throw the center of gravity to the Eastern Hemisphere. Asia will be predominating, for the three great social, political, and economic revolutions—the Chinese, the Indian, and the Russian—are essentially Asiatic. And simultaneously in the western corner of Asia a new and strong force is working toward the building of a new democratic civilization. It is the Jewish people returning to Palestine, not as exploiters, not as tools of imperialism, but as pioneers, as democrats, as the builders of a free, cooperative society.

While this metamorphosis is taking place in the Near and Far East, a new era is at hand for America. As a result of intolerable conditions in those nations ruled by single-will tyrants, thousands of refugees, dubbed intellectuals, and among them many of your people, have come to America. The effect of the thinking and working of these men is not yet apparent. I predict a great new birth of learning in this glorious land of ours which will affect the whole world, a new birth of scientific thinking and political idealism which will be pointed out by future generations and which will make the last half of the twentieth century a century of inspiration such as the world had in the sixth century B. C. and the first century A. D. We are living in mighty times; times which will result in universal acceptance as significant in the history of ideas as were the democratic ideals of the gospel of Buddha and the antiaristocratic ideals of the Confucian philosophy based upon the training of man whose nature is good; as great even in the lasting significance as was the greatest of all contributions in the development of democracy, the discovery of the individual by Jesus and the individual's worth in the eternal scheme of things. But in this new birth of learning every idea developed will be complementary to those of the sixth century B. C. and the first Century A. D. And that the ideas will be lasting is assured because they will be developed under the auspices of that government which has evolved upon the theories of our American founding fathers.

Our fundamental concepts of democracy and our religious and political recognition of the dignity of the individual and his inherent rights are necessary to the solving not only of Europe's problems but also of Asia's. Our belief in the rights of revolution gives us confidence in the face of change. With faith, then, in our idealism, the world will go forward as it follows American leadership.

Housing and Accommodation of Veterans at Educational Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Dr. Virgil M. Hancher, secretary-treasurer of the University of Iowa, to be followed immediately by a report from the National Association of State Universities in answer to a questionnaire sent to 47 universities respecting the enrollment needs of the member institutions and their housing needs for the coming year.

There being no objection, the letter and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES,
June 5, 1946.

The Honorable BOURKE D. HICKENLOOPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOURKE: Because of the acute situation, not only with respect to our housing of veterans, but with respect to classrooms, libraries, laboratory and mess hall space and the need for Federal support in each of these areas if the educational institutions are to carry the load of veterans anticipated for next fall, the National Association of State Universities has recently polled its 47 institution members to ascertain their needs. The attached tabulation is a summary of the replies. I trust that you will give it careful consideration.

Sincerely yours,
VIRGIL M. HATCHER.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES SUMMARY OF ANSWERS TO INQUIRY BY SECRETARY RE SEPTEMBER 1946 ENROLLMENT AND NEEDS IN MEMBER INSTITUTIONS

1. Inquiry sent to 47 universities.
2. Replies from 46 as of May 31, 1946.

Question 1. Number of veterans now enrolled: 124,516 in 46 universities; range from 400 to 11,868 per institution.

Question 2: Additional number asking to enroll: 153,000 in 44 universities; range from 400 to 10,000 per institution. Two additional universities reported "300 per week since January and "50–150 daily."

Question 3. Total enrollment expected 1946 if facilities available: 400,000 in 45 universities; range from 3,000 to 37,200 per. This total represents an average increase over the September–June 1940 enrollment in the 45 universities reporting of 48 percent, ranging from a low of 2 percent to a high of 416 percent. (The median value of the estimated increase among the 45 universities was 48 percent.)

Question 4. Facilities needed to meet expected demand for enrollment:

(a) Living quarters, students and faculty, single and married:

For students, 30 universities report a shortage of accommodations for 42,980 students, 25 universities a shortage for 13,442 married students, and 7 did not distinguish accommodations but reported a shortage for 13,550 students.

For the faculty, 35 universities report a shortage of 5,535 family accommodations; and, in addition, 6 universities did not differentiate between accommodations needed for married students and faculty, but report a shortage of 2,650 units.

(b) Teaching space and laboratories: Shortages of teaching space and laboratories were reported separately and combined in various units, as follows:

Classroom shortage: Four universities need 6 classroom buildings; 11 universities need 446 classrooms, ranging from 14 to 100 per institution; 3 universities need 350,000, 10,500, and 171,000 square feet of classroom floor space respectively; 1 university needs additional space.

Laboratory shortage: Four universities need 10 laboratory buildings, ranging from 1 to 5 buildings each; 7 universities need 116 laboratory rooms, ranging from 2 to 35 per institution; 5 universities need 170,000, 5,000, 50,000, 130,000, and 70,000 square feet of laboratory floor space, respectively; 1 university needs 30 percent increased laboratory space; 3 universities report the need of additional laboratory space.

Classrooms and laboratories (not differentiated in reports): Two universities need 60 and 20 rooms, respectively; 5 universities need 1,259,200 square feet of floor space, ranging from 113,000 to 600,000 square feet per institution; 2 universities need 30 percent and 100 percent increase, respectively; 5 universities need additional space for 11,600 students, ranging from 800 to 6,000 students per institution; 1 university needs additional space.

(c) Mess halls: Shortages of mess-hall facilities were reported as follows by 33 universities: Eight universities reported additional needed; 1 university reported 100 percent increase needed; 17 universities reported the need of additional facilities to feed 36,050 additional students, ranging from 500 to 5,000 students per institution; 2 universities reported need for 40,000 and 106,000 additional square feet of mess-hall floor space; 5 universities need 7 mess-hall buildings (1 or 2 per institution).

(d) Infirmaries: Shortage of infirmary facilities were reported by 28 universities, as follows: Six universities reported additional facilities needed; 1 university needs 100 percent additional facilities; 11 universities need from 40 to 800 additional beds each, a total of 1,700 beds; 2 universities need 50,000 and 20,000 additional square feet of infirmary floor space, respectively; 3 universities need facilities to accommodate 1,500, 3,000, and 3,000 additional students, respectively; 5 universities need 7 infirmary buildings from 1 to 2 per institution.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 3, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, America is proud to honor today the first country in the world to follow her lead in adopting a democratic constitution. The Polish Constitution, which was adopted on May 3, 1791, was the first in Europe to recognize the significant trend toward a new era based on the rights of individuals. During the varying fortunes and misfortunes of this gallant country in the last 150 years, Poland has never lost her love of freedom nor her devotion to democratic ideals.

We owe Poland a debt we can never repay. We must never forget that the Polish people were among the first to stand up and shout their defiance of the Nazi conquerors. Knowing that they did not have the strength to defend themselves from a powerful enemy, they nevertheless did not hesitate to oppose the Nazi slogan: might makes right.

The Polish people were slaughtered in their thousands and their tens of thousands. But still they shouted defiance. They were starved and beaten and murdered. But still they had the strength and the courage to struggle. Because they refused to lie down and give up, thousands of Germans who might have been turning their attention to the major battle fronts were tied down in the perpetual business of subjugating a Poland which would not stay subjugated.

Thousands of gallant young Poles were smuggled out to fight against Germany in other countries. Their magnificent job as fighting men brings everlasting credit to their country.

I am confident that the Polish people will successfully work out the grave problems now confronting them in the difficult task of rebuilding their country. Hunger is unfortunately acute in that unfortunate country; it behooves all of us to assist in getting food to Poland.

In the months and years ahead the Polish people will develop their country anew. We must be vigilant and make certain that all international commitments affecting this brave and glorious people are carried out.

What Makes a Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article in the Wisconsin Progressive of June by Richard L. Neuberger, entitled "What Makes a Senator."

This article has warm words of praise for my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL]. I call it to the attention of the Senate because it deals with an issue that goes to the heart of the democratic process.

The article points out that the junior Senator from Washington has been such an able, hard-working and conscientious Senator that he has had no time to cultivate political appeal.

Mr. President, I hope that the people of Washington State and of the whole country will understand that the reputation for wisdom and achievement of this great Senate body is maintained by men who are able, hard working, and conscientious. The preservation and strengthening of democracy depends upon such understanding by the people.

There being no objection, the article referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT MAKES A SENATOR?

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

WHITE SALMON, WASH.—News items are appearing in Washington State papers hinting that Senator HUGH B. MITCHELL, Democrat, may not be a candidate for reelection. These papers concede that MITCHELL has been an able Senator. Indeed, they say he has been too able. They claim he has devoted so much time and energy to his job as a Senator that he has had no time to build himself up as a politician and candidate.

MITCHELL'S opponent probably will be Mayor Harry Cain, of Tacoma, a Republican politician who overlooks no opportunity to point out the fact that he was a colonel in the Army's military government set-up.

The stories writing off MITCHELL as a candidate state he hasn't enough "political sex appeal" as compared to Cain. I'm not quite sure what political sex appeal is. I have a fair idea of what constitutes sex appeal in a movie actress, fan dancer, or artist's model. I have never observed any of these same ingredients in a politician.

However, I get a slight chill when I read a newspaper story which says a man has been so conscientious a Senator that he won't be a good candidate for reelection. Choice of a United States Senator is a serious business in these days of wars, depressions, inflation, unemployment, and famine. A booking agent can pick a fan dancer if she has a 36 bust and a shapely thigh. I doubt if the people of America want political sex appeal to determine who shall send their sons to war or shape national policy for the future.

HUGH B. MITCHELL has been a hard-working Senator with liberal ideas and opinions. Some Washington State politicians are afraid he hasn't enough political sex appeal to be measured against Harry Cain. That old booking agent standard again. Are we picking a strip-teaser to perform at a burlesque show or a man to serve in the greatest deliberating body on earth?

An aged farmer on the streets of this upper Columbia River town spoke a mouthful to me, as we looked out over the Hood River Valley toward Mount Hood's white pinnacle. Said he, "I wonder what we're coming to, anyway? This young fellow MITCHELL is the brightest man we've had in the Senate since Homer Bone. Everyone knows that. Everyone admits it. But some of 'em think he ain't got as much political 'it' as this loudmouth Cain. What is political 'it' anyway? 'Pears to me the only thing that ought to decide the voters is whether or not MITCHELL is a good Senator. I think he's a downright good one."

Occasionally we get our standards mixed. We throw away the yardstick and substitute a piece of string. Some book-publishing houses have been accused of accepting manuscripts for publication after they saw not the manuscript but the dazzling photograph of the female who wrote it. Senators should be a different matter.

Henry Cain is a demagog who has yet to offer a genuine program to the voters of Washington. He has talked incessantly about his military record as a military government colonel. Some papers even made much out of Cain's receiving the Victory Medal—although this medal goes to every single person who served honorably in the armed forces.

I don't think the American people want a man to seek public office by exploiting his service record. That has never worked very well in the United States. The people realize that a man who is not a veteran can serve just as well as a man who has been in service.

I was in an Army uniform 37 months, but I believe that implicitly. The situation in my own State of Oregon proves it. The State's senior United States Senator, GUY CORDON, is a veteran. He votes against school lunches, against veterans' housing, against public power, against all progressive measures. The State's junior Senator, WAYNE L. MORSE, is not a veteran. He votes for liberal laws, he supports the common people, he opposes the greed and avarice of the National Association of Manufacturers.

HUGH B. MITCHELL has been one of the Senate's most useful Members since he was appointed 16 months ago by Gov. Mon C. Wallgren. Liberals throughout the Nation know him for his vigorous sponsorship of the bill to establish a Columbia Valley Authority. This is only one of his many activities in behalf of progressive legislation. He is always found on the liberal side of every issue.

MITCHELL helped materially to get Henry J. Kaiser into the Northwest as operator of the aluminum plants near Spokane. This was a move long resisted by the Aluminum Co. of America, which has been eager to preserve its monopolistic position in the field of light metals. MITCHELL also has gone to bat on the issue of veterans' housing. He was one of the first men to challenge the real-estate lobby, which would rather reap the profits than house war veterans.

Like BOB LA FOLLETTE, who rose to a Senatorship after serving as secretary to his famous senatorial father, HUGH MITCHELL learned about the Senate as a secretary. He was Mon Wallgren's secretary for 8 years in the House of Representatives and 4 years in the Senate. When Wallgren was elected governor of the State of Washington, he appointed MITCHELL to fill the unexpired 2 years of his term. This caused a fearful holler in some sources. People said MITCHELL would be a "stooge." They now know him as a useful and outstanding Senator, a man who is both scholarly and hard working.

One reason that MITCHELL is written off as having no political sex appeal is his plain, somber appearance. He makes no effort to dress the part. He does not wear shoestring ties, 10-gallon hats, swallow-tail coats, and other senatorial affectations. He has decided he would rather be a Senator than look like one. Possibly this is the result of seeing so many who look like Senators but can't fill a Senator's job. There are a lot of phonies in public life. HUGH MITCHELL is not one of them.

HUGH MITCHELL is the youngest member of the Senate. He is 39 years old. An old hip injury kept him out of military service during World War II. Mitchell gave this no publicity because he is the sort of man who presumes that a citizen need not publicly explain or amplify all his actions. This is probably a good hunch.

Veterans running for public office solely on their war records are not doing so hot. Everyone respects and admires a man who has served his country; yet there are many ways of serving one's country—the doctor standing on his feet in the operating room, the miner digging coal, the housewife bending over a hot stove, the nurse feeding little children, the school teacher in her classroom, the conscientious Senator studying reports and bills, the engineer at his throttle; these people serve America, too.

Few new Senators have been as effective as 39-year-old HUGH B. MITCHELL. He has been an outstanding member of the Mead War Investigating Committee. He has brought the Columbia Valley Authority before all the people; in a few short months he has helped educate thousands of northwesterners to the importance of this bill for a regional authority in their area. He also urged the decentralization of American industry so that millions of new workers along the Pacific seaboard would be able to obtain decent jobs.

MITCHELL was born in Montana. He is a son of Harry B. Mitchell, now president of the United States Civil Service Commission. HUGH and his wife have a 1-year-old son, Bruce Cameron Mitchell. The Senator got started in public life as a newspaper reporter in the Washington town of Everett. This commenced his association with a Scandinavian jeweler named Mon Wallgren. They both were Democrats, and in 1932 they teamed up in support of Franklin D. Roosevelt. This was MITCHELL'S beginning in politics, for he became Wallgren's secretary when the latter was elected to Congress.

I have a lot of faith in the voters of the State of Washington. Not for many years have they installed a reactionary in high public office. They have had long schooling in the liberal movement. Such men as Homer Bone, the late J. D. Ross, and Lew Schwellenbach gave them a thorough grounding in public power. I doubt if they will replace HUGH MITCHELL with someone whose only qualification is that nebulous thing called political sex appeal.

HUGH MITCHELL will go to the post urging a Columbia Valley Authority for the integrated development of the Columbia River watershed in behalf of all the people. Harry Cain will probably be talking about his experiences with the military government set-up. Some of his backers may be emphasizing his so-called political sex appeal. The people of Washington, with 200,000 jobs needed in the postwar era, will probably decide that a CVA is more important than the male equivalent of that shapely thigh and 36 bosom.

Memorial Day Address by George Cushing, News Editor of Station WJR, Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very significant Memorial Day address delivered at Brighton, Mich., by George Cushing, news editor of Station WJR of Detroit.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It's a rather strange feeling to be invited back to your home town to talk to your old neighbors.

I feel very humble, and greatly honored.

It's a long time—nearly 40 years—since I've taken part in a Decoration Day program in Brighton.

It's a long time since we marched from the Opera House to the old cemetery—marched proudly behind an ever-thinning rank of blue-clad veterans of Appomattox and Chancellorsville and Gettysburg. Do you remember their flat-peaked caps? The fife and drum corps?

Yes, it's a long time—and those men of Brighton who fought to preserve the Union are now all gone.

Their ranks have been filled by others, by many others, for we've had three more wars since I marched in my first Memorial Day parade in Brighton—the Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II.

How many of us who marched down these same streets a half century ago ever dreamed we would have three more wars—and now we all wonder how many more wars we'll have to fight before the people of this earth can learn to work and live together.

I don't want to be personal this morning, but up in that quiet, peaceful, old cemetery

are five generations of my family—the span of their lifetime covers 187 years. My great-great grandmother who rests up there was a young woman when the Continental Congress signed the Declaration of Independence and the United States of America was born. Pioneers came westward—some of them settled in Brighton—many sleep in the old churchyard beside our veterans today.

In the years that followed America built a great, powerful, and prosperous Nation.

Now, as we observe this first peacetime Memorial Day in 5 years, we face a new crisis, a crisis as great as Washington did at Valley Forge, as Lincoln did at Bull Run.

Our house is divided today, not just politically, for a difference of political opinion is a normal phase of a democracy. We expect that in America.

We are divided today by groups who would use this country for their own selfish ends.

We have reached a period where some men place personal ambitions ahead of their country.

We have lost something in America. We can't blame that on the war. We can't blame it on the Democrats or on the Republicans. We can't blame it on labor or management.

We must blame ourselves.

We've developed into a Nation of many pressure groups, each one working tirelessly for their own selfish ends.

We fight among ourselves while the seeds of foreign ideologies are sown in our midst.

We must always remember there can be no national unity if we allow these enemies of our American way of life to undermine our democratic institutions.

America cannot exist half democratic and half Communist or Fascist.

We are not even united today on the simple principles that made America great.

We are no longer willing to try and govern ourselves. We have become a dependent Nation—instead of an independent Nation.

We seem willing to trade liberty for security.

Is that the spirit that built America?

There's a great difference between liberty and security. Your forefathers and mine came here to find liberty—they fought and died for it.

The peasants of Europe had security for centuries, but they did not have freedom.

We in America chose freedom. Now we must make sure we do not lose it.

We pay tribute on this day to men and women who gave their lives to preserve Brighton and thousands of other places like Brighton.

Are all their high ideals—are all those tiny white crosses on far-away islands—just a hollow mockery?

You may argue that times have changed—that the world now is small—that no longer can we live unto ourselves.

I grant all that.

Modern science has made this universe a very tiny place—this has become an age of split seconds.

But, what has time and distance to do with it?

What if we do live nearer our neighbors?

If all these wonders of science are only to send larger bombs and more deadly bullets, then civilization has failed completely.

Today the world is filled with growing suspicion; great nations distrust one another; small nations are fearful. And, while a few men strive for world peace, there are many here at home who boast loudly about our Bill of Rights and yet ignore all the principles of that sacred document.

There are many who shout about freedom of speech, but these same people would deny it to others.

Equality, tolerance, the pursuit of happiness, a living wage—all are proud claims of a free nation. Too often they have become just empty slogans.

Perhaps someday a Congressman will put his country first; perhaps someday he will worry more about his people than their ballots; perhaps someday service will come first and elections last.

Maybe we are all a little to blame.

Maybe we haven't done our part.

Perhaps it's been easier to leave the job to others.

Today we march to cemeteries to honor men who gave their lives for you and for me. We place a wreath, a bouquet of flowers, on a mound of earth, and then we wait until another year.

We leave the great task of constantly guarding the priceless liberties these men fought for—we leave that—to someone else.

And liberty can't be put away in moth balls or stored in dark attics.

It must be constantly nourished and carefully tended, and kept out in the sunlight of freedom.

Liberty was worth fighting for in the days of Washington and Lincoln—our grandfathers and sons held it high above all else.

It was worth dying for on Okinawa.

It's worth working for today.

Somehow or other I feel the answer is here in Brighton. That Brighton is a symbol of the kind of America that you and I want to live in.

For you typify thousands of other sound and solid communities which dot this great Nation from ocean to ocean.

I cannot believe that where men and women know their neighbors, and trust them, that these radical isms and doctrines which now threaten the unity of our great country will ever find acceptance.

These postwar days will bring their problems—there will be times when we will all be fearful.

But as we stand here together as fellow Americans on this Decoration Day in Brighton, we must resolve to serve our country with all our heart and efforts.

We must realize our full responsibilities and dedicate ourselves to this Nation we love.

Then we can walk proudly as free men and women. It will take courage. It will demand deep faith. But if we will it, then the voice of America will be a united one.

OPA Restaurant Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Bernard L. Willis, an attorney of Lake City, Iowa, together with an application of Palmer's Coffee Shop of Lake City, Iowa, for price adjustments from OPA, and a clipping from the Des Moines Register of Sunday, June 8, 1946, entitled "$950 is paid in OPA cases."

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAKE CITY, IOWA, *June 8, 1946.*

Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Perhaps you recall your visit to the Lake City Community Building a few years back and the warm reception given you.

Have followed your stand on various controversial issues and glad to say you are right on the beam.

We have followed with interest your barrage on OPA and that bureaucrat Bowles. The following might be of some interest to you and might furnish you with more live ammunition.

The following are facts within my own personal knowledge:

1. In the Omaha OPA office is a bird with the name of Kenneth Gebhart (with a long title, but it simmers down to personnel manager) who hires and helps fire employees who in turn act as authorities in every line of trade and who pester businessmen no end, as you know. The said Gebhart has violated the Hatch Act no end, and compares a Republican to a rat. Of chief interest is the fact that this bird Gebhart prior to his lush political appointments was a mere railway mail clerk and is now drawing over $5,000. His personal file will prove his lack of qualifications and prior position as above mentioned.

2. The following case in which I am the attorney for the defendant is one for Ripley:

Paul A. Porter, Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Plaintiff v. *Mabelle Palmer,* filed in Northern District of Iowa, Central Division, No. 267 (filed in Fort Dodge Federal Court), seeking injunction against defendant for overceiling sale of restaurant items and judgment for no less than $500 and alleging for period March 1, 1945, to January 15, 1946, overceiling sale on no less than 2,000 separate items.

Well, this is just one of those hole-in-the-wall hamburger joints, 10 feet by 24 feet; the manager is the former cook who doesn't know a OPA regulation from a fence post. See application for price adjustment which I prepared for her and forwarded to Des Moines OPA office—still no action on same. And to top it off the good people of Lake City are back of her 100 percent, for the reason that she puts out twice the meal for the money than any other place in town; i. e., T-bone steak, large portion of French-fried potatoes, nice salad, bread and a generous portion of butter, and drink, all for 50 cents. And right here in Lake City other places are getting 90 cents for the same dinner, and yet the OPA is after her and dragging her into Federal court. Now you ask the reason for all this. The reason is that she didn't make a voluntary contribution as they requested and so they are out to make an example of her. Just to give you an idea of how raw they are, a local grocer (was in Des Moines paper) was forced to make a voluntary contribution for overceiling grocery item, which item was raised in price and the local price board admitted they didn't send him a notice of the price increase. A nitwit OPA man inferred that the grocery manager should have checked with other stores. Did you ever hear the like—further, that deal was so raw that James Martin, a volunteer price-panel member, of Rockwell City, resigned from the board by reason of such tactics. You wouldn't believe how these birds are throwing their weight around, threatening small businessmen and telling them if they get an attorney it will be tougher, and making their voluntary contribution damage amounts so small so that the small businessman can't afford an attorney, i. e., note small amounts collected by OPA on enclosed notice of OPA cases. And, of course, I should mention each collection makes an alleged good record for brother Bowles to present Congress as to the price-ceiling violations over the country. Hell, they miss the real price-ceiling violators and pick on sitting ducks. I could preach on the subject, but believe you are well posted. In any event, use this information as you please—I'll be glad to help in any way you see fit. Give 'em hell.

Oh, yes, the former owner of the little coffee shop in question gave up because he couldn't get a price increase as he was entitled to and turned it over to his cook, Mabelle Palmer, who the OPA feels is breaking the price line. It is absolutely ridiculous to say the least.

Am sending you my office copy of her application for price adjustment, which the Des Moines OPA is just setting on. Return when you are through with same. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD L. WILLIS.

NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTY DOLLARS IS PAID IN OPA CASES

Settlements totaling $950.10 in 2 days by Iowa's county price panels was reported Friday by the Office of Price Administration.

The settlements:

Ames: The Grid, Sheldon-Munn Hotel, $25; O. R. Shaffer Motors, $17.50 to consumer and $7.50 to Federal Treasury.

Anthon: Boston Store, groceries, $25.

Clinton: Kennedy's Cafe, $25; Harry Lake Grocery, $25; Ketelsen & Son, food items, $25.

Cresco: Grasser Grocery, $25; Sno-White Grocery, $25; Kellan & Co., groceries, $25.

Decorah: Bencas Market, $25.

Des Moines: Des Moines Music House, $16.70 to consumers and $33.40 to Federal Treasury.

Emmetsburg: M. P. Crawe, durable goods, $2.15 to consumer and $22.85 to Treasury.

Fort Dodge: Town Pump, restaurant items, $200.

Fort Madison: Jacobsmeyer Grocery, $37.50; William Ren Lavern, beverages, $37.50.

Glenwood: John Walker, groceries, $50.

Madrid: Margaret Hall, auto, $25.

Mason City: James Brothers, groceries, $25.

Mount Ayr: Wilson Store, groceries, $37.50; Bauldner's Cash Market, $37.50.

Panora: Porter's Food Market, $25.

Patterson: Pace's Grocery, $25.

Saratoga: Kakec Store, $50.

Sioux City: John's Cafe, $25.

Waterloo: Hillcrest Grocery, $25.

Waukon: Waukon Style Shop, $25; Waukon Food Shop, $25.

West Bend: Swartfager Grocery, $25.

PALMER'S COFFEE SHOP,
Lake City, Iowa.

APPLICATION FOR PRICE ADJUSTMENT UNDER RESTAURANT MPR 2

Formal application is hereby made to Office of Price Administration, Liberty Building, Des Moines, Iowa, for increase in restaurant prices in accordance with adjustment provision contained in section 17 of restaurant MPR 2.

Applicant Mabelle Palmer is manager and operator of Palmer's Coffee Shop, Lake City, Iowa, formerly Miller's Coffee Shop. She leased the building and restaurant equipment therein January 1946. Said coffee shop is described as a lunchroom which seats 20 people, consisting of 3 booths which seat 12 persons, and 8 stools; said lunch room is approximately 10 feet wide and 24 feet long. The type of customers is a mixed group, consisting of local and out-of-town customers. The business location is on the main street and services truckers, traveling men, and local trade.

Continued operation under present ceiling prices will cause applicant to close her business by reason of inadequate returns and operating under such financial hardship as to cause a substantial threat to the continuance of its operation, and such discontinuance will result in serious inconvenience to consumers as they will have to turn to other establishments for food and beverage items which lack capacity to serve, and by reason of such discontinuance, the same meals, food items, or beverages will cost the customers of the eating establishments as much as or more than the proposed adjusted prices.

The names and addresses of the three nearest eating places are as follows: Johnson's Cafe, Jolly's Cafe, and Brills Cafe, all of Lake City, Iowa.

Attached hereto marked "Exhibit A" is schedule of present maximum prices and requested adjusted prices.

Attached hereto marked "Exhibit B" is detailed profit-and-loss statement for the establishments for the 3-month period beginning January 1, 1946, and ending April 1, 1946; said being the first 3-month period of operation by Mabelle Palmer as manager and operator of Palmer's Coffee Shop, Lake City, Iowa.

Included in exhibit B is break-down of employees and wages paid and other required information.

Applicant respectfully requests that price increases be granted forthwith as set forth in schedule of requested adjusted prices attached hereto.

Signed this 9th day of May 1946 at Lake City, Iowa.

MABELLE PALMER.

Witness:

B. L. WILLIS,
Lake City, Iowa.

EXHIBIT A

Schedule of present maximum prices and requested adjusted prices

40-ITEM LIST

Item	Maximum price	Proposed increase
A LA CARTE		
1. Vegetable juice (tomato)	$0.10	
2. Fruit juice—prune and orange	.10	$0.05
3. Soup—vegetable and tomato	.15	.05
4. Home-made chili	.20	.05
5. French and American fried potatoes	.10	.05
6. Potato salad	.10	
SANDWICHES		
7. Ham	.15	.05
8. Cheese	.10	.05
9. Grilled cheese	.15	.05
10. Hamburger	.10	
11. Coney Island	.05	.05
12. Egg	.10	
13. Bacon	.15	
14. Bacon and egg	.20	
15. Fried ham	.20	
16. Hot pork or beef with potatoes	.25	.05
BREAKFAST ITEMS		
17. Hot cereal with half and half	.15	
18. Cold cereal with half and half	.15	
19. Hot cake with butter and sirup	.15	
20. Hot cake and sausage, butter and sirup	.30	
21. Hot cake and bacon, butter and sirup	.30	
22. Two eggs, any style, with toast	.25	.05
23. Two eggs and bacon with toast	.35	.05
24. Buttered toast with drink	.15	
MEALS		
25. Beef roast (rump), potatoes, vegetable, salad and desert	.45	.05
26. Pork roast (loin), potatoes, vegetable, salad and desert	.45	.05
27. Baked ham, potatoes, vegetable, salad and desert	.45	.05
29. Fish, potatoes, vegetable, salad and desert		.05
30. Fried chicken, potatoes, vegetable, salad and dessert	.50	.15
31. Cold meat cuts with potato salad	.35	
32. Steak, French fries and salad	.50	.10
33. Pork chops, 2, French fries and salad	.50	.10
34. Hamburger steak, French fries and salad	.45	.05
35. Sausage, French fries and salad	.45	.05
BEVERAGES		
36. Coffee (cup), tea (pot), milk	.05	
DESSERTS		
37. Pie (any kind) per cut	.10	
38. Cake per cut	.10	
39. Ice cream, plain	.10	
40. Ice cream sundaes	.15	

EXHIBIT B

PALMER'S COFFEE SHOP,
Lake City, Iowa.

Profit and loss statement for period January 1, 1946, to April 1, 1946

Total receipts $5,091.05

January 1946	1,323.50
February 1946	1,735.70
March 1946	2,031.85

Expenditures (partial list):

	Shop expenses and maintenance [1]	Stock [2]	Candy and cigarettes	Help [3]
January	$206.16	$728.39	$149.27	$237.50
February	137.22	907.14	182.91	333.00
March	144.62	1,131.89	150.37	408.25
Total	488.00	2,767.42	482.55	978.95

Total receipts for 3-month period	$5,091.05
Total listed expenditures for 3-month period	4,716.92
Total earnings for 3-month period	374.13
Average monthly earnings	124.71

[1] Includes rent, electricity, gas, heat, water, and telephone.

[2] Includes food and meat purchased.

[3] Help item consists of 2 waitresses at $15 and $10 per week respectively: night cook, $15, and day cook, $25 per week; day dishwasher, $12, and night dishwasher $8 per week, plus miscellaneous help. During above mentioned 3-month period Mabelle Palmer, operator and manager, has worked as day cook, thus effecting savings, particularly the month of January. Said manager does have her meals at place of business.

Applicant serves 6,000 or more customers per month, serving over 300 persons on Saturdays and approximately 250 persons or more on week days, operating 6 days per week. More persons are generally served at noon, however, breakfast and evening meal hours are equally full.

Applicant would like to have noted that compared to 1943, all costs have increased with exception of several food items, i. e., rent and wages have increased considerably; same quality food items have increased generally. Overhead is major item of cost increase. However, here is break-down of increase in food items which applicant has been forced to discontinue: Hot dog with chili sauce, 5 cent ceiling price; cost 7½ cents each. Wiener, 3.5 cents (10 to pound at 35 cents), chili sauce, 3 cents per serving, bun 1 cent each; total cost 7½ cents. Also bacon, butter, coffee, cream, soup, creamed corn, potatoes, eggs, prices have increased.

New Industry for North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in recent months we have given serious attention to two problems of national importance: the desirability of establishing a national program of research, and the pressing problem of food.

I have in my hand an announcement issued by the Honorable Fred G. Aandahl, Governor of the State of North Dakota, which I have the honor to represent, in which he states that the technical research branch of our State gov-

ernment, the North Dakota Research Foundation, has developed a new process whereby cull potatoes previously an economic loss, and a sanitary nuisance, can be converted into a product which has high value as a livestock food, or as a raw material for industry.

The process has the outstanding merit of simplicity, of low investment and operating cost, and it is now in successful commercial operation. I commend it to all States in which potatoes are an important crop. Under unanimous consent, I include the statement of Governor Aandahl in the RECORD:

RESEARCH FOUNDATION DEVELOPS NEW INDUSTRY FOR NORTH DAKOTA; CULL POTATOES CONVERTED TO STOCK FOOD

Gov. Fred G. Aandahl, chairman of the North Dakota Research Foundation, announced today the successful operation of a revolutionary cull potato drying process developed by the foundation and now in commercial operation at Grand Forks. "This process," said the Governor, "converts cull potatoes into a marketable stock food at a cost which meets all competition. It takes a waste material which is a sanitary and economic liability and transforms it into feed sorely needed at this time. The foundation has studied the problem for over a year, and this solution is a credit to its staff."

Alex C. Burr, director of research for the foundation, described the process as being "made up of three simple steps: First, the water in the potato is freed by passing the whole raw potato through a hammer mill; second, the major portion of the water is removed by passing the pulp from the hammer mill through a mechanical press; third, the cake from the press is put through a rotary dryer, where the final portion of water is removed. The product is a dry granular material which makes an excellent stock food."

According to Burr, full information and technical assistance has been made available to major potato operators and is available freely to all. A group of Hatton potato men, operating as True Food Dehydrators, Inc., and related companies, with plants in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, have built and are operating the first cull-drying plant. It has a capacity of approximately 60 tons of raw potatoes per 24 hours, and every pound of product is being marketed.

W. M. Fankhanel, general manager of the True Food Dehydrators, in commenting on the process, said, "We are very enthusiastic over the possibilities of the dehydration of cull potatoes because it will have a far-reaching effect on the future development of the potato industry. It will give the farmer a market for the inferior grade of potato he could not otherwise sell. The dried potato will be a distinct advantage to stock growers and feeders because it replaces corn to a large extent in the ration. The process will go a long way toward eliminating unsightly and unsanitary piles of rotten and low-grade potatoes dumped wherever potatoes are graded and shipped. We express our thanks to Dr. Burr, Professor Cooley, and the research foundation for their splendid work."

Math Dahl, commissioner of agriculture and labor, and a member of the Research Foundation, said, "I have followed this development since the beginning. Potatoes constitute one of the major crops in North Dakota. The disposition of culls has always been a sanitary and economic problem. Now by this process they are converted into a needed, money-making product. This is research at its best. Two or three seasons of this process will produce in the State a return equal to the entire biennial appropriation of the foundation. Research pays."

While the technical development of the process was being carried out, actual feeding experiments were undertaken at the agricultural college and are still being continued. Tests show that the new product is well liked by animals and can be used in mixed rations.

In commenting on the success of the process, Burr pointed out that it was the result of concentrated cooperative research. Arrangements for the first experiments on the hammer milling of whole raw potatoes were made with Dean Walster and Dr. Longwell, at the agricultural college, and began a year ago last March. The laboratory work was then transferred to the university, where the facilities of the unit-process laboratory were made available by Dean Harrington and Professor Cooley. As the work progressed, experiments were run in the plants of the Davenport Machine & Foundry Co., of Davenport, Iowa, and the Link-Belt Co., of Chicago. The willingness of the True Food Dehydrators to build the first plant stimulated those working on the project, and the soundness of their judgment has been amply demonstrated. Special mention should be made of the splendid cooperation of Professor Cooley of the university.

This one project demonstrates what can be done in the way of practical research. By bringing to bear, on one pressing problem, the resources of the university and the agricultural college, under the direction of the Research Foundation, the problem is solved and a new industry created. This program of research should have been started years ago, and if continued will solve many of the technical and economic problems of the State.

The Labor Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a broadcast by and interview of Hon. FRANK FELLOWS, Congressman from the Third District of Maine. This broadcast over WOL, of Washington, and WHN, of New York City, took place May 30, 1946, on the program known as Congressional Record on the Air. The subject was The Present Labor Crisis. Mr. FELLOWS was interviewed by Billy Repaid, the news commentator.

Mr. FELLOWS. May 25, the President, finding himself faced with an intolerable situation which threatened to break down the Government itself—to use his own words—appeared before the Congress and stated: "We are dealing with a handful of men who have it within their power to cripple the entire economy of the Nation. I request temporary legislation to take care of this immediate crisis. I request permanent legislation leading to the formulation of a long-range labor policy designed to prevent the recurrence of such crises and generally to reduce stoppages of work in all industries for the future."

The President recognized he had no tools with which to work. After a debate of 40 minutes, the House gave to him the temporary legislation he asked. The Senate now has this proposed law under consideration. This is emergency legislation—temporary in nature, and applicable only to "those few industries" in which a strike affects the entire economy of the United States.

The House of Representatives voted almost unanimously to support the President in a critical emergency. You will note he also asked for permanent legislation leading to formation of a long-range policy. Last February the House passed the so-called Case bill, designed to make contracts mutually binding upon both labor and industry—a bill which takes away none of labor's basic rights, but attempts to draw the line between freedom and license. The Senate, within a few days, had passed this bill, with several amendments, which the House has approved by a 2-to-1 vote.

It is currently rumored the President has been advised to veto this permanent legislation. How anybody could support the emergency legislation and oppose the less-drastic Case bill is beyond my comprehension.

There are now 851 strike notices pending before the National Labor Relations Board and they continue to come in at the rate of approximately 150 a week.

The maritime strike, which may well prove disastrous to our effort to bring aid to the starving millions in all parts of the world, has been called for June 15.

Vetoing this permanent labor legislation, the President will again find himself faced with a crisis and without adequate tools to deal with it.

A study of labor-industry relations is basically a study of human relations, or should be.

I believe the rank and file of labor is neither more nor less selfish than any other element in our society. Labor laws that seek to protect men's rights without establishing their responsibilities—a labor policy whose design has been to use the labor vote for strengthening political position—and labor leaders intent upon gaining power at whatever price to their membership and the public—have combined to threaten our economy and develop antagonism toward labor unionism generally.

Labor leaders represent individual workers, when organized. Industrial leaders represent individual stockholders, when incorporated. Laborers put in their efforts; stockholders their money—the result it may be of their savings while members of the rank and file of labor itself. Both should profit from their investment. Both have rights. Both have responsibilities. The laws should be clear and impartial; their interpretation by the courts should recognize the intent of Congress to make them clear and impartial; and our Labor Department should have at its head a responsible, able, patriotic citizen ready and willing to handle the work of that Department.

Organized labor in my State has set an example by which the country at large could well profit. There is to be a convention in my home city of the State Federation of Labor soon, and the theme of the discussion is to be "cooperation toward Maine's progress." I repeat those words: "Cooperation toward Maine's progress."

Today, when affairs pertaining to labor are at a peak emotionally, I am informed there is not a single strike in Maine involving A. F. of L. workers, nor has there been since VJ-day.

An A. F. of L. affiliate, a papermakers brotherhood, wrote me a year ago: "We have for years had union-shop labor agreements with our company, and our relations have never been disturbed by any controversy. We are worried that the company may not be able to continue its years of production, threatening the future of our jobs. Many of us have worked for the company all our working lives, and are thinking of our sons and neighbors' sons in the armed forces and

their jobs with our company when they return from the war. These mills have been losing money for more than a year because the Government wants their products to win the war, but holds the selling price down so there is continual loss. The company has paid standard wages during all this time and has now agreed to advance our pay 3 cents per hour, in line with what other mills are paying, but other mills have made money throughout the war, and our company cannot continue to run at a loss. We would greatly appreciate what assistance you may give to straighten out this injustice to our employer and its workers."

It is this kind of spirit that offers the solution of all labor unrest.

Questioned by Mr. Repaid:

Question 1. Immediately following President Truman's speech before a joint session of Congress, in which he asked for some relatively drastic labor legislation, Congress seemed to be in a very militant mood with respect to labor's position. Do you think, Congressman FELLOWS, that the temper of Congress remains the same as of now?

Answer 1. If, by the words "temper of Congress" you mean that the Members are aroused to the need for some improvement in our labor laws, I can answer that it remains the same. You cannot in fairness place all the blame for our present condition upon certain labor leaders, because it will be recalled that within a year men in high official positions in our Government have stated publicly industry could increase its labor cost substantially without an increase in the price of the manufactured article. Members of Congress have made vain efforts to improve by legislation our labor laws, but the proposals were not acceptable to the administration. As a result the President today finds it necessary to use words like these: "This is no longer a dispute between labor and management. It has now become a strike against the Government itself. That kind of strike can never be tolerated. If allowed to continue Government will break down."

Question 2. Now, this question, Congressman FELLOWS, we realize, is possibly unfair in that it is putting you on the well-known spot, but do you think there is a likelihood that Congress will temporize with the strike situation in view of the congressional elections this year?

Answer 2. I think the best answer is the vote of the House on Wednesday, May 29. The so-called Case bill, as improved in many of its provisions by the Senate following careful consideration, was sent to the President after the House had accepted the amendments by a vote of 2-to-1. This bill may not be perfect. It may be short of adequate. It certainly is an answer to the President's request of Saturday that he be given "permanent legislation leading to the formulation of a long-range labor policy designed to prevent the recurrence of such crises and generally to reduce stoppages of work in all industries for the future."

Question 3. A few weeks ago on this program, Congressman FELLOWS, one of your colleagues, Congressman HESELTON, of Massachusetts, discussed with us a resolution which he had introduced, calling for a joint committee of the Congress to make an extended study of the cause of strikes. Similar resolutions, we understand, have been introduced in Congress. Then on last Saturday the President also asked that such a joint committee be set up. Is it your opinion, sir, that such a committee might in a period of 6 months or so find the answer?

Answer 3. I heard Mr. HESELTON'S broadcast—a discussion both able and constructive. Great care should be taken that legislation dealing with this problem be fair to the employee, the employer, and the public. When we consider, however, over a period of 5 years various committees of the House have taken testimony on bills similar to the Case bill—that 35,000 pages of testimony have been taken bearing upon labor-industry relations—I personally see no need of 6 months' more of study. If we do not know the answer now, we never shall.

Question 4. Along that same line, Congressman FELLOWS, we notice that Senator MURRAY, of Montana, chairman of the Senate Labor Committee, proposed that organized labor offer Mr. Truman a 6-month strike truce in return for his veto of the Case bill and withdrawal of the strike-draft legislation. We understand he also suggested that Congress study the whole field of worker-management relations during the truce period. How did that proposal strike you?

Answer 4. Not at all favorably. Its purpose is delay—to forestall any legislation.

Question 5. During the past weeks, Congressman FELLOWS, I have, just as I assume Americans all over the land have, discussed these problems with my friends, and invariably the question comes up, where do union demands end. It would seem to me the structure of the union impels the leaders to eternally seek better contracts for the union members. Obviously, that can't go on indefinitely. There is bound to be a point somewhere along the line where the demands are greater than the ability to pay. I mention all of this to you as background for this question: Do you think we are headed for a new concept of labor's position in industry, one that will, for instance, embrace profit-sharing somewhat along the lines proposed by Eric Johnston, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce?

Answer 5. I have wondered for some years just where we are headed. Certainly away from the concepts upon which this country was founded and by which it became the greatest country on earth. Some industries, I believe, have adopted this plan, and, so far as I know, successfully. But that is a matter for the industry and its employees, not for the Government, to determine.

Question 6. The basis upon which many wage increases are demanded is that the cost of living has increased. Would you interpret that as a backdoor charge on the part of labor that the OPA has not been effective?

Answer 6. Certainly the cost of living has increased substantially—OPA notwithstanding. Prices must reflect cost, else a man cannot stay in business. Without business there are no jobs, and without jobs no country. I'd prefer not to get into a discussion of how effective or ineffective OPA has been. The facts are known to everybody.

Question 7. Congressman, we have time for one last question. I am sure that all Members of Congress have been receiving a lot of mail on the President's talk and the strike situation generally. On the strength of such mail which you receive, what would you say is the public's opinion at this time?

Answer 7. I think my mail indicates that the people of our country want it impressed upon the minds of a number of our union leaders that the safety, security, and health of the union we know as the United States of America is of first importance.

The OPA and Its Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, at 9 p. m. on June 4, Mr. Chester Bowles made a 30-minute talk on OPA and its problems, which was broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System. On Thursday evening, June 6, over the same national network and originating from the same station, this talk by Chester Bowles was answered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and myself.

I ask unanimous consent that in the Appendix of the RECORD there be printed, first, the radio talk of June 4 by Chester Bowles; and, following that, the three answering talks in the following order: First, the one by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]; second, the one by myself; and, third, the one by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RADIO TALK BY CHESTER BOWLES

Good evening, everybody.

Tonight I would like to talk especially to you veterans and to your families and relatives and friends. But I think that what I have to say may be of interest to every one of you who works for a living, buys food and clothing, and pays rent.

I want to tell you about some things that have been happening here in Washington during the past few weks—things that have been happening to you—to your pay check, to your savings, and to your whole economic future.

For more than 4 years you veterans have been told that you were fighting the war for a better America and a better world—free of the old violent depressions, free of the old conflicts, the mass unemployment, and economic misery and privation. You were told that nothing would be too good for you when the war was finally won. Over and over again you had the same old slogans dinned in your ears at rallies and in pamphlets and over the radio.

I know you must be particularly confused right now by all the political pulling and hauling with which you are surrounded.

The forces of organized greed must seem to you oblivious to the public interest—determined to get theirs while the getting is good—and that isn't a pleasant picture for you to look upon.

I've talked to a lot of veterans in the last 6 or 8 months. What you want in the years to come is a fair chance at security for yourselves and your families—a fair chance to earn a decent living with a roof over your head and a job you like. But right now many of you are deeply worried about how much your savings and your pay check will buy in the months ahead.

I can only say, in all frankness, that you have a right to be worried over the present situation here in Washington. There are many people here—expert judges of all the political cross currents in Washington—who believe that we are drawing close to the end of effective price and rent controls. After four long, difficult years of battling to hold down prices and rents, they feel that the odds will soon become too great for us.

But I cannot and will not accept this dejected viewpoint. No battle is lost until the final shots are fired.

I refuse to believe that on an issue which is so clear beyond question this great country of ours will deliberately take the primrose path to inflation—with all the skyrocketing rents and prices which would surely result and with a disastrous collapse waiting inevitably for us all at the end of the road.

There is no questioning the fact, however, that we are now going into the final phase of a battle. And the importance of that battle cannot possibly be exaggerated. The forces of self-interest which form the hard core of opposition to the price and rent control program are strong and in a position of great influence. I would be less than

frank if I did not admit that as I talk to you tonight the fight is going against us.

Now tonight I am going to tell you about that battle. I am going to describe for you the price we will pay if we are finally defeated. But first I would like to make these brief points just to set the record straight.

First of all—in spite of all of the pulling and hauling that has inevitably been a part of the Nation's price and rent-control program—in spite of all of the unavoidable mistakes, the irritations and the occasional injustices—in spite of all that—the American people for the first time in any war have so far avoided a disastrous runaway inflation. So far during this war period the cost of living has increased only one-third as much as it went up in the last war.

Secondly while the shooting war was on, we broke all production records. And since VJ-day—in spite of prolonged strikes—in spite of inevitable delays and bottlenecks—production has risen, according to the Federal Reserve Board, to record peacetime levels—even though there are still insufficient goods in the stores to meet the record demand. And these production records were achieved under our present system of price and rent controls.

Third and finally, throughout these past 4 years since price and rent controls have been in effect the incomes of all groups have reached the highest peaks in the history of our country. I don't mean by that that there haven't been some farmers and workers and businessmen who have fared far less well than others. But as a people we have prospered far beyond anything we ever experienced before the war. Furthermore, the future promises even greater prosperity for all groups in the country—if we can avoid the disaster or inflation and collapse.

That is the record to date. When all of the misrepresentations are cleared away those are the things that the American people have achieved in their 4-year fight against inflation.

And yet throughout that entire period we have had to fight not only the natural forces of inflation but we have had to fight the pressure groups which have swarmed into Washington like a cloud of locusts to scramble for weakening changes in the Price Control Act which would give them special advantages.

We have always recognized that the year immediately following the end of the war would be the most dangerous inflationary period. It was then that we made such a mess of things immediately after the first World War. It was then that runaway prices and skyrocketing rents led us into the disastrous inflation which greeted you older veterans of World War I when you returned from France.

The inflationary dangers which we all knew would follow World War II have been vastly increased because of the epidemic of labor-management difficulties in the past few months. These disputes have held back needed production and increased still further the pressure for higher prices and higher rents. Furthermore, we have far more money to spend for all kinds of goods than after World War I.

But in spite of the acuteness of these pressures, I told Congress in March of this year that inflation could be avoided—prices and rents could be kept relatively stable—if only our authority to carry out our responsibility were continued for another year when the Price Control Act expires on June 30.

At that time it was clear that we were in for a battle. Many groups throughout the country were hungry for profits and still more profits. Obviously, if prices and rents could be increased and then increased again, profits would be multiplied.

So as might be expected, the greatest organized lobbying program in the history of our country was launched. Its purpose was either to wipe out price control and rent control entirely or to weaken our legal authority so that effective control would become impossible. The results of this campaign were soon evident.

On April 18 the House of Representatives passed a price and rent control bill which would make inflation inevitable. Through amendment after amendment, our hands were securely tied. As I stated at that time, the final passage of that bill would cause an inflationary statement which would bring hardship and privation to tens of millions of families with a depression waiting for us at the end of the road.

The response was immediate. From one end of the United States to the other there was a spontaneous burst of outraged public opinion. Letters of protest from men and women of all walks of life—many of them veterans—poured into Washington by the tens of thousands. Even some of the lobbyists and pressure groups began to protest that they had not really meant to go quite so far—that they had only wanted a few special advantages here and there—a little of what they called "flexibility." They said they had never really intended to wipe out the effectiveness of price and rent control entirely.

With the House of Representatives clearly on record the millions of our people throughout the country, including your veterans who had fought the war in the hope that somehow it would help to bring about a better world, turned hopefully toward the United States Senate. The spotlight was focused in particular on the Senate Banking and Currency Committee which then was preparing its recommendations for the Senate as a whole.

For more than 7 weeks, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has been at work discussing amendments to the price and rent control act and preparing their recommendations. And gradually we have come to realize that the bill on which the Senate will soon be voting will in in all probability be an even more disastrous bill than the one already passed by the House of Representatives.

A week ago, in the midst of the coal and railroad strikes, I said, "While the headlines have been filled with the railroad and coal tie-ups, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, in spite of the best efforts of a courageous minority, has been quietly and effectively cutting the heart out of price control with a dull knife."

The lobbyists and pressure groups resented that statement. They resented it because it was so obviously true. Let me outline for you briefly what the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has apparently already agreed to do to your price- and rent-control protection.

First, they have voted to recommend to the Senate that all price ceilings—and therefore all subsidies—be removed from milk, cheese, butter, poultry, and eggs on the 1st of July.

Now, last week, as you housewives know, we were forced to announce that the price of milk would soon have to go up 1 cent a quart in all parts of the country, cheese up 6 cents a pound, and butter up 11 cents a pound. With some minor exceptions on butter and cheese, these were the first general increases in the ceiling prices of these items in more than 3 years. This move cost the American people more than $300,000,000.

We had agreed to these increases only with the greatest reluctance. I know only too well what those higher prices mean to millions upon millions of you people—and particularly to you newly married veterans who are starting your housekeeping on narrow budgets.

But we were caught in a vise. In view of Congress' clear intent of sharply reducing the subsidy money needed to hold down food prices, we had no other alternative.

But here is the point which everyone of us must understand. The action which we were forced to take last week is only a hint of what will happen to the prices of milk and butter and cheese and chickens and eggs, if the Senate Banking and Currency Committee proposals become the law on July 1. In that case milk will immediately go up from 2 to 4 cents a quart. Butter will go up 20 cents more a pound. Cheese will go up 8 to 9 cents at retail a pound, and eggs and poultry will quickly jump to higher levels.

But, again, as I have said, those increases are only a starter—a curtain raiser to what lies ahead. Here's why: These particular increases I've just mentioned are the one's you'll pay automatically as a result of the withdrawal of subsidy payments. On top of that, the removal of price ceilings will leave the dairy farmers, the milk distributors, the butter manufacturers, and the cheese producer and the poultry farmer and egg producer and all the wholesalers and your retail grocer free to charge you what they will.

Most of them won't raise prices simply out of spite or because they are selfish or greedy or profit hungry. They will raise them because they will see that price and rent controls are breaking down. They will know that the prices of the things they have to buy will soon be going up all along the line. And, perfectly naturally, they, like everyone else, will be out to protect themselves.

But, again, increases in dairy products and poultry products would be only the beginning of your troubles. Listen to this one: On July 1, if the present recommendations of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee finally become part of the law, all price ceilings and subsidies will be removed from meat. So there can be no misunderstanding, let me repeat—on July 1 there would be no limit whatever on what you could be charged for meat.

This action of Congress would leave the cattle raiser, the cattle feeder, the hog producer, the meat packer, and the meat wholesaler and retailer each free to charge all the traffic will bear. If the result isn't 40- to 50-percent increase in meat prices by the first of September, I miss my guess.

But even that won't be the end of our troubles. If meat prices are allowed to go sky high, there will be almost unlimited profit in feeding our meager grain supplies to hogs and cattle. That can mean only two things.

First, very little grain will be sold as grain for cereals or for the manufacture of flour for bread to be eaten here at home. And you know that bread is already very short in the stores.

Second, after we finish feeding the cattle and hogs, there will be very little grain left for shipment to starving people overseas.

The net result will be that a few people who can afford it will be able to buy steaks at a dollar and a half or so a pound. Meanwhile the rest of us will have even more trouble finding bread—and more millions will starve overseas.

Right now, of course, you aren't getting any meat and the reasons for that are clear. The cattle and hog producers are shipping only a minimum of livestock to market. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee has given them notice that higher prices are in the offing.

Naturally they are holding back shipments for those higher prices which will come their way on July 1 if the committee's present recommendations finally become part of the law.

If it's your job to run a household, you have probably already counted up a good many extra dollars that are going to be added to your food budget after July 1 unless our present authority is continued. But there is still more bad news to come.

In addition to taking price ceilings off dairy products, poultry, eggs, and meat on

July 1, the majority of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has voted to let the Secretary of Agriculture decide when ceilings on other farm and food products should be raised and when they should be taken off entirely. For the past 4 years this authority has rested in the agencies which have been charged with the responsibility for controlling inflation—that is, the OPA and my own office, the Office of Economic Stabilization.

Why is it that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee wants to change this set-up? There is just one reason, and everybody in Washington knows what it is. The committee thinks that the Department of Agriculture will be a lot more likely to raise food ceilings—or remove them altogether—than the regular stabilization agencies.

I certainly do not intend this as a criticism of the Department of Agriculture. In fact, I feel sure that Secretary Anderson does not want this added responsibility. But the Department of Agriculture was set up primarily to deal with farm production problems. The OPA has the over-all responsibility for keeping our economy stable—for keeping your cost of living in line. And, as you know, food is the biggest single item in your cost of living.

But the majority of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee is not through even yet. It has voted also to forbid us to put a ceiling on the price of cotton. This is straight, unvarnished pressure politics. Obviously certain groups want to eliminate controls on cotton because they want the price of cotton to go up. But the committee majority went even further than that. For months I have been fighting to eliminate speculation in cotton—speculation which has been unnecessarily forcing up the price of cotton which goes into all cotton clothing.

Already fortunes have been made on the cotton exchanges in pure speculation. Wall Street speculators who have never seen a cotton plantation have been making millions upon millions of dollars by simply bidding up the price.

Do the people who sweat and struggle to raise the cotton, to pick it and carry it to market, get that money? Not on your life. It goes straight to the speculators.

Clearly my efforts to stop this speculation have aroused the wrath of important people. Now the majority of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has voted that my hands should be tied so that I can no longer attempt to slow down cotton speculation. If their recommendation is finally to become a part of the law the speculation can continue uncurbed and the speculators will be free to have a field day at the public's expense.

But I'm not through yet. The majority of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee also has voted to eliminate one of our most effective controls over the price of clothing. Apparel prices are already too high—much too high. You veterans are well aware of that. Those prices should come down rather than go up.

But the lobbyists and the pressure boys flatly disagree. They are intent on making an even greater killing, and they are determined that OPA shall not stand in their way. So the majority of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate voted to eliminate OPA's maximum average price plan—the plan which forces garment manufacturers to make a certain percentage of low- and medium-priced garments along with the high-priced ones.

If that recommendation becomes part of the final law, apparel prices are going to rise still higher. The estimates run around 10 percent. That is more than a billion dollars' worth of higher apparel bills which will be paid for by you and your family and the millions of others who go to make up the American public.

These are only some of the amendments which the committee has already approved. Each of the amendments has for its purpose higher prices and higher profits. The committee has yet to vote on other suggested amendments—all of which will have the same inflationary result. Still other amendments will be proposed in the debate on the Senate floor.

So far not one amendment has been approved which would help us to hold down your cost of living more effectively. Every single amendment, I repeat, has only one purpose—to boost prices and profits more and more and more. Clearly, under this kind of price-control program, the forgotten men and women of today will be our 140,000,000 American consumers, and especially you veterans and your families.

The amendments already approved by the committee would raise a good many more prices than those to which they apply directly. They would unsettle the price structure generally.

Take rents, for example. Some people I've talked to find a source of meager satisfaction in the fact that so far there has been no direct proposal to raise rents. Even though the prices of food and clothing go up, they say, we can still count on paying the same old rent. But, believe me, that hope is a snare and a delusion. With other prices soaring upward, we couldn't possibly hold rents where they are now. Before long your landlord would be on your doorstep with a demand that you pay more rent or get out.

As you can see, the sum total of the amendments proposed by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee are even worse than those approved by the House of Representatives. These amendments were approved in spite of the courageous fight put up by a minority group on that committee. Every veteran should take off his hat to men like Senator ROBERT WAGNER, of New York; Senator ALBEN BARKLEY, of Kentucky; Senator ABE MURDOCK, of Utah; Senator HUGH MITCHELL, of Washington; and Senator GLEN TAYLOR, of Idaho, for the brave fight which they have put up in your defense.

The majority of the committee, meanwhile, seems to have been following the leadership of Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio. Senator TAFT makes no bones about his belief that your prices and your cost of living ought to go up. In a public speech in New York the other day, he argued that what is needed is a price level "something like 50 percent over prewar." Now if "prewar means January 1, 1941, that would mean an average increase in today's prices—prices which you and I will agree are already too high—of something like 15 percent.

Even if we could have an average price increase of 15 percent—and then by some miracle stop right there—you and your family would be hit and hit hard. All your veterans' benefits, your insurance policies, your war bonds would be worth that much less. It would be just like having the value of your savings, your wages, salaries, or other income suddenly cut by almost 15 percent.

Of course the joker is that we couldn't increase the cost of living by just 15 percent and then suddenly turn a switch and stop it. Meanwhile wages would have been unsettled; business costs and living costs would be going higher and higher; and our friends the speculators would be having a field day. We'd be headed for trouble with a capital T.

If the proposals of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee become law, nobody who is hurt by them—and all of you most certainly would be hurt—can complain that he wasn't warned. Senator TAFT has honestly and openly announced that he wants to raise your living costs sharply; and he makes no pretense that the increase would be temporary.

I will speak just as frankly as Senator TAFT did. To me, the bill which the Senate Banking and Currency Committee seems determined to recommend is a monstrous thing—even though it hasn't yet added on all the amendments Senator TAFT would like to put there.

The bill as it stands would be enough to wreck our hopes of stability and full production in a sound and prosperous peacetime economy.

We have just been going through a period which has frayed the nerves of all of us. While we achieved record peacetime production levels in April, we have been plagued by labor-managment disputes which again and again have put the brakes on just as we were gathering full momentum.

Now this long period of labor unrest is pretty much behind us. Wage adjustments in the major industries have been completed—with the single exception of the maritime industry. The decks are clear for all-out production such as the world has never seen.

But the bill now shaping up in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee would destroy this prospect. If it becomes law, instead of labor peace we can look for a renewal of wage demands, a renewal of management refusals, and a renewal of bitter and costly strikes to settle the issues.

Why will this be so? For the simple reason that working men and women and their leaders will not stand idly by while prices are skyrocketing. They will try to protect their family budgets by seeking higher wages.

But for you veterans and you families of veterans living on fixed allotments—and for millions of white collar workers—there would be no protection at all. You'd be squeezed and squeezed and squeezed between rapidly rising living costs and an income that didn't move.

A Price Control Act, carrying even a few of those amendments, would be an outright fraud against the people of this country for the simple reason that it would be wholly ineffective. To be sure, a Price Control Act would still be on the books. But it would be an act under which the control of prices and rents would become impossible.

If any bill even resembling the House bill or the Senate Banking and Currency proposal is sent to the President for signature, I would urge him with all the vigor at my command to veto that bill in clear and ringing terms.

I cannot, of course, speak for the President of the United States. But it is my personal opinion that the passage of such a bill would be a cruel deception.

Now I am sure that you veterans who are faced with this extraordinary situation on your return from the war must be confused. "Why," you must ask, "are we making such a mess of things?"

The reasons, it seems to me, are relatively simple. No businessman likes price controls. No landlord likes rent controls. The control of prices and rents is a tremendous task. It covers 3,000,000 businesses and 15,000,000 rented dwellings.

Among the thousands of necessary regulations there are some which inevitably create occasional hardship, and practically all of them are a nuisance. If I were a businessman today I am sure I would dislike price controls. I would be anxious to get rid of them just as soon as we safely could.

But most businessmen know that the headaches that go with inflation controls are infinitely more desirable than the cancer that goes with inflation.

The attacks which have produced the present mess and confusion have come from minority groups apparently loaded down with unlimited expense money. These groups have spent thousands upon thousands of dollars in newspaper advertisements, radio programs, and carefully designed pamphlets, special appeals to newspaper editors, in hush-hush entertainment here in Washington, and in the bombardment of Members of Congress with personal appeals and exhortations.

These have been some of the shrewdest—the most devilishly clever—propaganda campaigns which this country has ever seen. And their purpose from the beginning has been the same—either to remove all price control and rent control or to so weaken our authority that our task in holding down the cost of living would become impossible.

Clearly the power of groups like these threatens the very core of our democracy. For against these well-organized efforts you veterans and all you millions of people throughout the land have but little defense.

Some day it is my hope that the activities of these groups in April, May, and June of 1946 will be fully investigated and the true facts brought to light. When that investigation comes—and I am confident that it will come under new circumstances and new surrounding—and I believe the result will be a national scandal.

But in the meantime the result has been profound confusion—confusion in the press and over the radio, and confusion on Capitol Hill.

Under the circumstances, that confusion is wholly understandable. Over and over again each Member of Congress hears price and rent control blamed for this or blamed for that. In spite of the fact that more money is being made today than at almost any period in our peacetime history—in spite of the fact that we are more prosperous today than we ever hoped to be in the days before the war—the average Congressman is given story after story of individual hardship and difficulty.

As a result he is trying to do two things at once. He knows that you people who make up the rank and file of our country are fearful of rising prices and rents. He knows that you want to see the lid tightly clamped on the inflationary forces which threaten us.

But he is troubled by the plausible arguments of the minority pressure groups which harass him from morning to night. He would like to solve their problems, too. And so he votes in favor of the Price Control Act to please the great bulk of our people who want price and rent control—and then he turns around and votes for amendments to that act to please special interest groups—amendments which would make price and rent control wholly ineffective.

During my 4 years of Government service I have come to understand and sympathize with the problems with which the average Member of Congress is faced. With an inadequate staff he is bombarded with new legislative problems week after week and month after month on every conceivable question, most of them highly complicated questions.

It is not strange when you consider the huge forces that have been brought to bear that some Congressmen are now trying to play both sides of the street as far as price and rent control are concerned.

But the issue which we all face is, it seems to me, terribly clear. This is no time to kid ourselves. If we really want to control inflation and if we really want to hold down rents and prices, let's get on with the job under a price control act which enables us to carry out our responsibilities. But if we intend to sell out the public interest in an effort to please the pressure groups, let's be honest about that. Let's eliminate price and rent control once and for all. There are no two ways about it—we can't have our cake and eat it, too.

The price control bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Price Control bill which I believe the Senate Banking and Currency Committee will recommend to the Senate is flatly and absolutely impossible. No honest man would attempt to administer it. It would leave us armed with sofa pillows at a time when we need our heaviest anti-inflation artillery.

And let's not forget, this battle is more than a battle against inflation. It is a battle for a prosperous, secure future, for your children, your neighbors, your friends, for all of us—140 million of us—a future free from want and free from fear. It is a fight for all that is good and decent and worth while in America. It's a fight for all the things that you veterans dreamed about when you crouched in the fox holes in Italy, Belgium, the Rhineland, Iwo Jima, Saipan, and the Philippines.

It is a fight to put an end to apple selling on street corners, to long lines of unemployed in our factories, to miserably low farm incomes, to bankruptcies and foreclosures. It is a fight for sustained prosperity, for the full use of our productive powers to develop good incomes and economic security for all of us. And beyond that it is a fight for a better world and sustained peace among all peoples.

Ladies and gentlemen, we cannot go back to another century of boom and bust and another century of endless wars. The struggle for the kind of world in which you and I believe, is right here now—today. And the first test of our ability to make that future a reality is our ability to lick inflation.

The issue, it seems to me, is clearly drawn right now—here in Washington. It's an issue of the people versus the pressure groups. The public interests versus the special interest boys who can see no further than their own pocketbooks.

The final decision—the decision which may well affect our jobs, our farms, and our businesses for years to come—will be decided here in Washington between now and June 30—just 26 days from tonight. As you can readily see, time is getting very short.

Thank you and good night.

BROADCAST OF SENATOR ROBERT A. TAFT, OF OHIO

Night before last on these stations, Chester Bowles, the Truman Director of Economic Stabilization, made a vicious attack on Congress and all American businessmen, and particularly on myself, because Congress proposes in extending the OPA to force the gradual decontrol of price regulation and impose some legislative restrictions on Mr. Bowles' arbitrary powers.

Mr. Bowles is an advertising man and is not concerned with facts. Congress listened for weeks to testimony regarding the facts. No one could have listened to that testimony without being convinced that in many cases the OPA is unjust, unrealistic, and illogical. Day after day specific cases were given of widespread black markets, falling off in production, and industries forced to do business at a loss.

Mr. Bowles calls names. He refers to American business as "the forces of organized greed, oblivious to the public interest, determined to get theirs while the getting is good." He refers to them as "pressure groups, hungry for profits." I have seen many American businessmen in recent months and heard their stories, sometimes prejudiced, but often convincing to any fair-minded man. As for pressure, there has never been anything like the organized lobbying of the OPA. It admits the expenditure of $2,500,000 a year for publicity. It has distributed millions of pieces of literature aimed to bring pressure on Congress to perpetuate this Government bureaucracy. It has repeatedly violated the law against spending Government money to pressure Congress. In general, businessmen have presented their views with logical arguments and facts. None of them has threatened political retribution. The pressure brought to bear by OPA and its CIO allies threatens political extinction for any Congressman who dares to defy it.

Mr. Bowles slanders Congress by representing it as a group of weaklings, yielding to the cry for more profits. The truth is that if they were that kind of weaklings, Mr. Bowles' pressure groups are three times as strong as any collection of business organizations. Congress is made up of normal men trying to represent the best interest of those who elected them and do their duty on the facts regardless of Mr. Bowles' frenzied screams.

Mr. Bowles' broadcast was full of misstatements of fact.

No. 1. He says that since VJ-day production has risen to record peacetime levels. There is no real evidence of that claim. All production figures are mere estimates until several months after the event. The best opinion is that during the past 6 months production has been at a very low level indeed. You all know how many things there are that cannot be bought at all. Butter, shirts, lumber, meat.

No. 2. He claims that the people have prospered far beyond anything we ever experienced before the war because of price and rent controls. Of course that prosperity is due to the fact that the Government spent $50,000,000,000 a year more than it took in in taxes. It is easy enough to be prosperous when men are dying in war.

No. 3. Mr. Bowles says that he recently increased dairy prices because of Congress' clear intent of reducing the subsidy money needed to hold down food prices. This is completely false. Mr. Bowles made these increases because the dairymen's costs had increased and under former prices and subsidies dairy herds were being rapidly reduced. Dairy costs had increased, first, because the Government encouraged a general increase in the wage level, and, second, because Mr. Bowles permitted a general increase in feed costs. The increase he has just made in milk and butter prices had nothing whatever to do with subsidies, the removal of which would require a further increase. Mr. Bowles is trying to blame Congress for an increase brought about by his own policy and his own action, even before Congress passes a bill. No matter what Congress does, there are bound to be further increases in prices after July 1, and when you hear Mr. Bowles blame Congress in the future for price increases which he makes remember the false charge he has made now.

No. 4. With regard to the removal of subsidies on food, Mr. Bowles is demanding that Congress appropriate $1,700,000,000 to pay these subsidies during the coming year. Why shouldn't the consumer pay the real cost of his own food? Why should the United States Treasury subsidize the food eaten by millions who, according to Mr. Bowles, are better off than they ever were before? Subsidies increase the national debt and are more inflationary therefore than price increases.

Mr. Bowles deliberately exaggerates the effects of removing subsidies. If Congress, instead of giving Mr. Bowles the money he has asked, refuses to give any subsidies for dairy products, the price of milk will increase on that account by 1½ cents a quart, plus an additional charge not exceeding 1½ cents more in a few markets, as compared to the 2 to 4 cents a quart threatened by Mr. Bowles. Butter would increase 11 cents a pound instead of the 20 cents a pound threatened by Mr. Bowles; cheese, 5½ cents instead of 8 to 9 cents a pound. For poultry and eggs there is no reason to think that the removal of price control would have any particular effect. Eggs are a glut on the market today. Poultry has often sold below the ceiling. Mr. Bowles has apparently added into his threatened additional increases in the cost of production which demand either a higher price or a subsidy over and above that Mr. Bowles demanded from Congress. There is no real price increase when we merely transfer the payment of the price from the Government and the taxpayer to the consumer.

No. 5. Mr. Bowles blames the lack of meat on Congress when all the evidence shows that it is due to his pricing policies and the terrible black market brought about by those policies and which he does nothing to restrain.

No. 6. Mr. Bowles deliberately misrepresents a speech which I made in New York, claiming that I advocated the raising of the price level by 15 percent, and that I want to raise living costs sharply. I made no such statement, and Mr. Bowles know it. What I said was that the Government policy had deliberately increased the wage level and other costs to such an extent that we could not prevent a further increase in prices. Mr. Bowles has been largely responsible for the theory that you can increase wages and other costs without increasing prices. It is an asinine theory. What I said in New York was: "The net result of this program of planned economy must be the very inflation which OPA swears it is preventing. We cannot escape it because of the tremendous increase in wages, encouraged and sanctioned by the Government. This must result sooner or later in permanently higher prices. The percentage of increase over prewar will probably be at least 50 percent." I did not urge this increase. I pointed out that it was an inevitable result of Mr. Bowles' policies. He admits himself that average wage rates per hour have increased 62 percent. Prices must inevitably follow.

When you hear Mr. Bowles in the future and read his press releases, remember how many misstatements he made Tuesday night and find out what the facts really are.

RADIO TALK BY SENATOR B. B. HICKENLOOPER, OF IOWA

Ladies and gentlemen, Senator TAFT has accurately stated the facts regarding subsidies and the other points he mentioned, and I assure you he is fully supported by the overwhelming evidence introduced before the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate and other committees looking into this situation. Mr. Bowles' attack upon Senator TAFT and the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, on last Tuesday evening, was not only viciously unfair, but it is typical of the smear tactics of those who want to establish permanent controls on our American economy. It is representative of a new technique in a fear campaign that should be exposed to the American people.

Since when have the American people been afraid of free enterprise and free markets; since when have we been afraid to turn American production loose and assure American recovery?

Mr. Bowles' radio talk over this network last Tuesday evening was astounding—with few exceptions his statements, sentence by sentence can be utterly disproved by the facts, and they have been disproved by the overwhelming evidence introduced before the Banking and Currency and the Agricultural Committees of both the House and the Senate and the Senate Small Business Committee.

Full production has not been attained. The main reason is that Mr. Bowles has refused to set prices on mass consumers' goods, in many cases that permit their maximum production. Cheap shirts, underwear, house dresses, and a host of other things are almost unobtainable, but luxury items and expensive merchandise seem to be plentiful. The war in Germany ended over a year ago and in Japan 10 months ago. We began reconversion over a year ago, but we are still struggling with shortages of necessities, and with the delays, incompetence, and stupidity of OPA.

Vital foods, such as meat and dairy products are either off the market or in the "black market" at high prices, although there is plenty in the country. The creameries are not producing butter and cheese because of price alone—honest surveys in the Nation indicate that at least 80 percent of the meat being sold the public is black market and from 25 to 30 percent above ceilings; butter was selling on the black market in New York this week at a dollar and a quarter a pound—in many places new cars demand almost any black-market price asked—used cars are almost entirely in the black market—honest distribution has broken down and honest production of needed goods for the veteran and the householder has slowed up to a trickle.

Chester Bowles, through his unsound and unworkable price policies is more responsible for this condition than anyone else. Through his refusal to recognize that production cannot be had at a loss, and his continued refusal to decontrol products that are in ample supply, it has become necessary for Congress to act before Mr. Bowles and his price policies throw us into complete chaos.

He complains of an organized lobby to defeat price control. I have seen no lobby, but I have seen dozens of agonized producers of food, clothing, and goods who have come to Washington time and again, petitioning and supplicating the autocratic authority of Mr. Bowles to give them a reasonable price so that they can survive and produce. Usually they are pushed into the vicious circle from one official to another, often ending up after exhausting weeks and months of delay with the first official they contacted, who then says "No." Mr. Bowles seems to think that wages and materials can go up 25 to 50 percent and not affect the price.

The real lobby, the greatest of all time, has been organized by OPA itself. Last year Mr. Bowles, who has been an advertising man, and his organization spent $2,500,000 of public money on the most beguiling, misleading, and extravagant propaganda, trying to sell controls to the public; schools, societies, clubs, and other organizations were flooded with expensive literature designed to appeal to each of them. Newspapers and magazines have been flooded with items, stories, and releases; short and long radio talks and programs have been cleverly designed and fed to the American people; the whole pattern has been one of praise of Mr. Bowles and the creation of fear of dire consequences if he is restrained in any way in his tightening grip on the throat of rapid and full American reconversion and production. About 500 people have been employed in his Information Department, and they have done their job well—they have fooled the American people.

I believe, however, that the American people are awakening; that the wage earner, the housewife, the farmer are all beginning to realize that something is wrong.

The Senate Banking and Currency Committee and the House of Representatives are no longer being fooled by Mr. Bowles, and his propaganda has been stripped of its color photography and kindergarten drawings. The facts have been developed, and they show that we are now suffering from lack of necessities; that OPA is not correcting the situation even though it has had unlimited power and latitude; that Congress must spell out the rules if we are to have adequate production and if we destroy the black markets.

The recommendations of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee do not destroy OPA, but they do establish sound administrative methods, based upon evidence and facts, that can be administered effectively by any capable administrator who desires to do so. While, based upon facts, the committee recommends decontrol of meat and dairy products so that honest markets and full supply can be had by the public, still a great part of our prices and our rents are left under price control for a time.

We hear much about OPA's record in this war as compared to price control in World War I. In the last war price control was successfully operated with a paid personnel of less than 250 persons. Mr. Bowles has had about 64,000 paid employees in OPA in this war—the record shows that during each war prices rose about the same. If you add the subsidies and the black-market prices as well as the inferior grades of materials in this present period, the actual price the public pays for necessary items—when it can get them—is higher than it was during the last war.

OPA can present charts and impressive figures, but they don't tell the actual story as it affects the average worker, the veteran, and the entire public. Lumber and building materials have been shut off at the source because of unsound price policies.

Yes; we are being fooled by OPA, and recovery is being retarded by its present policies.

Mr. Bowles has chanted the hymn of fear and of control for over a year—his slogan has been "No crippling amendments"; what I think he really means is, "No interference with my absolute authority." Whenever we seem on the verge of returning to the system of American full production and distribution, he puts on the witch hunter's mask, throws a mystic powder on the fires of public emotion, and conjures up the specters of economic catastrophe and class hatred—he shouts that the rich are trying to destroy the poor, and he intones that he alone is the true prophet.

In effect he confesses failure and looks for a whipping boy.

What America must have is full production of food and essential goods; if we get that, then the law of supply and demand will take care of our problem in a free economy. OPA, however, by testimony of Mr. Porter, Director, says that its job is to keep that law of supply and demand from operating. Certain controls, such as rents, should be maintained; but when the arbitrary controls of OPA in fields of production that are able to reasonably supply the demand are maintained, with no assurance of the intention of the Government or the Administrators to free them so that production can be secured, then the American public, through its elected representatives, must act for the long-range best interest of our future and of a free economy.

RADIO BROADCAST OF HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY, OF NEBRASKA

Prosperity in handcuffs

The American people, including veterans, will not get the goods and services they must have through Mr. Bowles' demagoguery over the radio. They must get it from the factories and the farms of America.

Under the Bowles price-fixing system that production we should have had has been torpedoed, and that means shot full of holes.

Mr. Bowles has repeatedly stated that since VJ-day production has risen. This is typical Bowles' propaganda. The war ended more than 9 months ago, but I ask you—

Where is butter?

Where are the automobiles?

Where are the shirts, the shorts, and the hosiery?

Where are the tires, the radios, and the washing machines and the stoves and the one hundred and one other things consumers so badly need.

The true test of maximum production cannot be found in the tricky statistics and misleading charts of Chester Bowles. Production can only be found in a supply of those commodities in the market places.

The housewives of America today are asking—

Where can I get a loaf of bread?

Where can I get a pound of meat?

Where can I get shirts for my husband?

Where can I get clothing for my children?

Where can I get all the things I need for my home?

And the returning veteran is asking—

Where can I get a home?

The vital need of this Nation is not new doses of Mr. Bowles' economic bilge water. It is production, and more production, and more production. Failing to get this production, America faces chaos.

The public is tired of paying $1.50 for a 60-cent lunch.

Tired of having to pay $7.50 for a sport shirt, instead of a $2 white broadcloth shirt;

And tired of being unable to buy even a board with which to fix a front step.

For the first time we are witnessing in this country housewives with money having to stand in bread lines and meat lines.

Mr. Bowles' philosophy of a handcuffed economy has done that to America. This is the kind of economy he asks the Congress to perpetuate upon the American people.

Mr. Bowles asserts that if the present recommendations of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee finally become a part of the law, that all price ceilings and subsidies be removed from meat. Further on he said and I quote:

"If the result isn't 40 percent to 50 percent increase in meat prices, the first of September, I miss my guess."

Now, what is the fact?

Eighty percent of the meat sold in America today is passing through the black markets at prices ranging up to $1.25 a pound.

Under Mr. Bowles' punitive policies the black markets set the going price.

The plain fact is—and Chester Bowles knows this just as well as anybody else—that if the price ceilings were taken off, meat would sell in the open legitimate market at much less than it is selling today in the black markets.

The people are being defrauded. They are being deceived. They think they get meat at the ceiling prices Mr. Bowles talks about. What they are actually having to do is to buy their meat in the black markets at the prices the black-market racketeers see fit to charge them.

As Senator HICKENLOOPER has pointed out, with the force of 48,000 people Chester Bowles now has under his control, if he would devote half as much energy to wiping out the black market as he does trying to bulldoze Congress, the American people would be able to buy meat in the legitimate markets at fair prices, which would insure a continuing adequate supply for all.

You wonder why the meat counters are empty, and why, if you want meat, you have to know some bootlegger before you can buy it?

It is because of maladministration by the OPA. Government estimates for 1946, show a meat supply this year of 150 pounds per capita. The largest amount available to consumers since 1911, and about 20 percent more than the 1933-1939 average.

On April 5, 1946, the Secretary of Agriculture said, and I quote:

"There need be no scarcity of meat. The cattle population is sufficient to supply all the meat we need."

Speaker SAM RAYBURN on May 3, 1946, said and I quote:

"I feel that I know that with 80,000,000 cattle in the United States, there is a number and production that is sufficient."

Why then can we not buy meat?

In the first place, the producers and feeders of cattle cannot produce them and feed them under their increased costs and sell them within the price ceilings established by the OPA.

Think of it, with 10,000,000 more cattle in the United States this year than the average 10-year period before the war, the producers, the feeders, and the processors of meat cannot put that meat on the American family table through the legitimate markets at a price, which will give them back their costs.

The proof of this is that more than 25,000 black-market slaughterers have moved in and taken over the business that 1,500 legitimate packers or processors did before the war.

Now, let's consider the processors:

No one can deny that a country-wide, scandalous black market in grain and livestock, does exist today and that Government wartime controls, that have been imposed upon the meat and slaughtering industries over a 4-year period have been in a large measure responsible, for that black market.

Law-abiding slaughterers have been forced to close or curtail their operations.

Retailers are also caught in this squeeze. If they are to stay in business, they must pay illegal wholesale prices, for a large percentage of their meat. The evidence adduced is, that more than 83 percent of the retail stores are forced to sell meat above ceiling prices and make overcharges at the rate of $1,250,000,000 annually.

When you add to the $1,250,000,000 the consumers are now paying in excess of ceiling prices to the $750,000,000 paid in meat subsidies which Senator TAFT just discussed and the cost of administering OPA, it is clear that the cost of maintaining the fiction "that the line is being held on meat" is costing $2,000,000,000 annually.

This is ample evidence that meat is costing the consumers much more than it would cost with the ceilings lifted.

In addition to this cost, there is the loss through the black-market wastes of meat, hides, bones, offal and grease worth many millions of dollars annually. The farmer or the consumer must absorb this loss. The black marketeers must waste these byproducts because they have no way to process them.

In addition to these costs and wastes, there are grave dangers to the American people involved. Many black-market slaughterers are killing and dressing livestock in uninspected plants, in barns, sheds and fields, lacking adequate refrigeration or other sanitary equipment. They are grading their own meat and are selling ungraded, contaminated, and in some instances diseased meat. A large percentage of black-market meat is wholly unfit for human consumption.

Mr. Bowles carefully refrains from any comment on the dangers to the fathers, the mothers and the children of this country who are being compelled to eat meat which endangers their health.

The whole situation is summed up by Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson, in response to questions from the majority leader, ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

Senator BARKLEY asked this question:

"These statements that come to me all head up to the suggestion finally that the way to cure this whole situation in meat is to take off all controls and ceilings on the theory that meat might run up for 30 days in price but it would level off."

In reply, Secretary of Agriculture Anderson said—I quote:

"If with slaughter controls, and with the increased force that OPA is now putting on we are not able to direct these cattle back into decent channels, if we are not able to persuade people that they have got to buy in compliance, and if we are not able to get food for the American people at decent prices, then we surely ought to try something else; the only other 'something else' is an abandonment of these controls."

The Secretary of Agriculture put the controls specified into effect the first week in May. They have now operated 5 weeks. Last week the legitimate packers processed less meat than they did the week prior to Secretary Anderson's testimony. That obviously brings us to the "something else," and that "something else," as Secretary Anderson stated, is an abandonment of these controls.

The Senate Banking and Currency Committee, of which Senator TAFT and Senator HICKENLOOPER are members, has made a recommendation to take all price ceilings and controls off meat. This is squarely in line with Secretary Anderson's recommendation.

The time has come when Congress must reassert itself through legislation.

The American people cannot make pot roasts out of propaganda. Neither can they churn butter out of trick charts. Mr. Bowles in his quest for power is always ready to brand as greedy anyone who disagrees with him. His one purpose, however, is to squeeze the profits out of private enterprise so that Government can take over, that he may achieve the power he apparently craves.

We are perfectly willing to rest our case with the housewife, the farmer, and the laborer of America. I ask of each of these groups, can we, who have been raised to expect meat and bread upon our tables—who have accepted as our free heritage a living standard second to none—live on statistics and propaganda? These are the only commodities on which I will admit production is in high gear and in which the supply exceeds the demand.

We need food for the American people. The only way to get it is by maximum production and no price-fixing program that is an impediment to that production should be tolerated by Congress or the American people.

Democracy Begins at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, Tommy Knight, age 12, a pupil at George Mason School, Alexandria, Va., and son of South Carolina parents, Mr. and Mrs. T. M. Knight, now of 2916 Argyle Drive, Alexandria, Va., has been awarded first prize in an essay contest.

Young Knight has distinguished himself by the writing of this splendid essay, stressing as he does the importance of every qualified person to enroll and vote. This is a timely suggestion to voters.

It is with pleasure that, under unanimous consent, I insert Mr. Knight's essay in the RECORD, the same being entitled "Democracy Begins at Home":

DEMOCRACY BEGINS AT HOME

A war has just ended. A war in which men gave their lives so that you, the American citizen, might continue to vote; so that you might continue to have rule "of the people, by the people, and for the people," or representative democracy. Take advantage of this so that they won't have died in vain.

It is your duty as a citizen of the United States to vote, vote wisely, vote honestly, vote courageously, and vote the way you think is best for your country.

You vote for whom you think would be best for your country rather than for whom you think will get done what you or your friends want. It's your duty to study the candidates and find out who would be best for the country.

The citizen should be interested in the Government, for the progress made by your community, city, county, State, or country depends upon its people. It's your affair, therefore you should take an active part in it. The way you can is to vote and show others the importance of voting. Since only one-half of the citizens in this country vote, it means that half of the people lack interest in their own welfare.

Voting isn't only a privilege but a duty for every American. This war that has been fought was fought so that other countries with dictatorship might rule themselves, and yet you don't take the great advantage of placing in the ballot box your vote.

In framing a democracy you must first "enable the government to control the governed and oblige it to control itself." That

means that the government must control its people and the people through their votes must control it.

You can't have a democracy unless everyone that can does vote, because democracy is and means rule by the people. Democracy must have a 100-percent voting people if it's a true democracy.

Do you want representative democracy? Do you want rule by the people? If you do, then vote.

The true American citizen votes.

Speech By Edgar Campbell Before Lancaster County Industrial Union Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by Edgar Campbell, candidate for Congress, Pennsylvania Ninth Congressional District, before the Lancaster County Industrial Union Council, Lancaster, Pa.. Thursday, May 23, 1946.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Shaub, Secretary Yeager, officers, and stewards of the Lancaster County Industrial Union Council, Lieutenant Governor Dent, Mr. Rhine, Mr. Kramer, and my friends in labor, this is not a political speech. It is merely a sincere and honest effort to answer one of the most brazen, abusive, and atrocious attacks ever made against that free society of honest and God-fearing men who make up that vast army known as American labor.

You, of course, are all aware of a speech made in Philadelphia on May 10 by H. W. Prentis, Jr., president of the Armstrong Cork Co. in an address before the Philadelphia Carpet and Upholstery Club. This speech was somewhat of a repetition of Mr. Prentis' address before the Committee on Education and Labor of the United States Senate on February 5, 1946.

Your esteemed Congressman from this, the Pennsylvania Ninth Congressional District, J. ROLAND KINZER, had that particular speech inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of Thursday, February 7, 1946. I presume that your distinguished Congressman will also have Mr. Prentis' speech before the Philadelphia Carpet and Upholstery Club inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

At least this is an excellent way of having the speech of someone from Lancaster County inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am rather a regular reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and it does make one wonder if perhaps Mr. Prentis is not the Congressman from the Pennsylvania Ninth Congressional District. It certainly, however, is a relief from reading the constant negative votes on all labor measures, preparedness measures, and other constructive legislation as is evidenced by the strong antilabor, antisocial, antifarmer, and isolation voting record of the present Congressman in this district.

I would like to review, with your kind indulgence, these two speeches made recently by Mr. Prentis. The two speeches start off almost identically the same, and I quote, "Labor trouble creates class consciousness and class consciousness if accentuated sufficiently will eventually spell the end of liberty."

I think we can all agree with Mr. Prentis that labor troubles create class consciousness and if to want security in your job, adequate safety standards, minimum hourly rate of at least 75 cents an hour, a guaranteed minimum annual wage, a bonus, royalty or incentive plan, a stronger Full Employment Act, a permanent Fair Employment Practices Act, and 3 months' severance pay creates class consciousness then I think you all here tonight will voluntarily and most happily plead guilty to this charge of this self-styled captain of industry, H. W. Prentis, Jr. This economic royalist, this ambassador of the National Association of Manufacturers, who by his own admission in his speech, so kindly inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by your most esteemed Congressman KINZER under date of February 8, states—and I quote: "That if he were free of his responsibility as an executive he might prove to be an autocrat but he is afraid he would soon go the way of other big and little dictators and think of his own interests or his company's interests almost to the exclusion of the welfare of the other fellow."

Mr. Prentis in stating that he might prove to be an autocrat must certainly know whereof he speaks, and I presume he is acquainted with Webster's definition of an autocrat but just so that the record be straight, and so we all know just how Webster defines an autocrat, please bear with me while I quote:

"Autocrat: 1. An absolute sovereign, a monarch who rules without restriction; 2. Hence, one who insists on the obedience of others to his will, a dictatorial or despotic person."

Would I be out of order, therefore, if henceforth we might, by Mr. Prentis' own admission, refer to this great industrialist as Dictator Prentis or perhaps you might even like Autocrat Prentis better, as he himself suggested. Just what kind of meat does this man Prentis eat that makes him think he has grown so great? He, who for one, cries out in his speech, and I quote, "I, for one, am no labor baiter." If my memory serves me right the beginning of this sentence, "I, for one," has some resemblance to the phrases used by those two past dictators who once attempted to rule Europe. At least it has a most familiar ring. According to Mr. Prentis, there are but two classes: Dictators and slaves. As he aspires to be an autocrat, you, therefore, according to his theory, are slaves.

In Mr. Prentis' Philadelphia speech he refers to loyalty to the corporation of which the employee is a part and states that bargaining is a wedge between the employee and his employer. He goes on to prohibit royalties but the climax of this labor-baiting speech is when he states no union should be permitted to embrace in its membership more than 40 percent of its employees. This, of course, would reduce the union to nothing more than a hollow farce.

Another highly ridiculous statement in this speech before the Carpet and Upholstery Club was this statement, and I quote, "Big labor is even more dangerous to our freedom than big business." Now, that really is a gem. We take a lot of things in this battle for democracy but I think you will all agree that this is hard to take. For let me tell you this, there is a thousand times more danger that capital would swallow up the profits of labor than that labor will confiscate capital. There is also a thousand times more danger from monopolies of management than from any combination of labor.

After that remark by your most esteemed townsman, I would not be surprised but what some of his listeners that evening did not squirm just a little uneasily in their upholstered chairs at this talk from this ambassador of the National Association of Manufacturers before the Philadelphia Carpet and Upholstery Club.

In his speech at Washington he asks: Is there any reason why the Pennsylvania Railroad should pay the Pennsylvania engineer on a fast electric train running from New York to Washington 2 days' pay for 4 hours' work? Evidently Mr. Prentis, on his way to Washington to make his speech, never took into consideration the responsibility assumed by that engineer in operating that train, or do you think, perhaps, his mind was again warped by the thought that labor was at the throttle? The value of a New York-to-Washington train in property is over $500,000 and the value in human lives on that train would reach astronomical figures, Mr. Prentis, of course, included.

I am just wondering if the time consumed by Mr. Prentis in his attacks on labor, which he is doing at the expense of the Armstrong Cork Co., is within his duties as presiding officer of that corporation. I doubt it. Just how long will the directors of that corporation stand for his abuse of the people who buy its products.

Furthermore, if this despotic, arrogant, overbearing, selfish, self-styled autocrat had devoted as much time to the furthering of his own company's interests as he has to labor baiting and abuse of labor in general, he would not find his industrial organization in the predicament it is now in due to lack of essential materials. Or is this just another one of those deliberate slow-downs on the part of management with a view of bringing chaos in industry so as to return to the Armstrong Cork Co.'s and H. W. Prentis' standard of wages of approximately 35 cents per hour?

I agree with Mr. Prentis' speech of February 7 in Washington, D. C., if he were to be freed of his responsibility as an executive so he might have time to be the autocrat he would like to be, or should I say a dictator? At least, that would not be at the expense of the Armstrong Cork Co., as it is just possible by his retirement that labor who have worked so hard and so diligently in his behalf might perhaps be better compensated. It is the highest form of irony, indeed, what his employees have to endure when they realize that through their sweat and toil Mr. Prentis is placed in a position where he can roam the country at will, doing all that is in his power to make conditions intolerable for his own employees and labor as a class.

Mr. Prentis in his Washington and duplicated Philadelphia speech, also said, and I quote, "No organization can achieve high efficiency unless there is dominant loyalty to the corporate organism of which the employee is a part." In other words, basically what Mr. Prentis is saying, is that you in labor should be dominately loyal to him. He seems to have overlooked just one little detail namely: What of management's loyalty to labor? But then what kind of loyalty could one expect from these Prentises, these Pews, these Eugene Graces, these Alfred Sloans, these du Ponts, these Wilsons, and these Mellons, and countless others of these self-styled business tycoons. For what was it Richard B. Mellon said before a senatorial investigation committee, when queried as to his company's possession of a large number of machine guns. This is what he said, "You cannot run a mine without machine guns." That infamous remark will never die.

So Mr. Prentis speaks of labor's loyalty to management. My reply to that is, first let management come with clean hands. Let them earn the respect of labor; for there will never be in any enterprise loyalty without respect. It is quite evident from Mr. Prentis' speech that this phase of the situation is entirely foreign to him.

One of the first great examples of lack of loyalty on the part of management and big enterprise was when J. Pierpont Morgan held up President Cleveland and the entire United States in 1895 for $62,000,000 in much-

needed gold in order to stabilize the United States Treasury. And this man Prentis speaks of loyalty to labor. He should hang his head in shame. How can there be loyalty to management on the part of labor when certain corporations like the du Pont company are indicted and convicted time and time again for violations against the Government, violation of the Sherman Anti-trust Act, price fixing, collusion, cartels, and the like? But what do these corporations do? They willingly plead guilty and pay their fines, in most cases, or else weakly defend these cases and then proceed to do it all over again.

These executives merely hide behind their corporate bodies. They would not dare to do as individuals what they do as executives of large corporations.

Behind all of these illegal practices are people chiefly the richest and presumably the so-called most responsible people in the country. Their enormous wealth confers upon them immunity to carry on highly irregular but most lucrative activities which the average person devoid of such wealth and power could not attempt to do. Their own malpractice has also become a monopoly and it is getting so in this country it is a waste of time to indict and try to convict these individuals or corporations of great wealth. It has been often said—you cannot convict a million dollars.

These corporate bodies are habitual fourth offenders. I defy any of you here tonight as individuals to do what these individuals do hiding behind these corporations. Let us see how far you will get as an habitual fourth offender against society. Our laws should be so revised so that we could get the guilty man because in back of each one of these violations and infractions there is a guilty man. I again repeat, get the man.

Let me give you a concrete example of what in my opinion is a complete absence of loyalty on the part of a billion dollar corporation toward you and our country.

In 1913 the assets of the du Pont Co. were $74,000,000, but at the end of the First World War in 1918, they were $308,000,000. Their sales increased from $25,000,000 to $330,000,000 and their World War dividends equaled 458 percent on the par value of their original stock. In 1945 their gross sales jumped to $925,000,000, of which $611,000,000 were sales to our own Government and the total assets of the du Pont Co. passed the $1,000,000,000 mark and yet when this gigantic corporation who after selling our Government approximately $6,000,000,000 of merchandise were asked by Maj. Gen. Lesley Groves, the head of the Government's atomic bomb program, to assist our Government in its further development, the du Pont Co. agreed conditionally that they would do so provided our Government would guarantee them maximum protection against losses. In other words the almighty dollar came again before love of country. This was explained fully in Collier's issue of Ocotober 13, 1945, in an article entitled "The Man Who Made Manhattan."

I subsequently wrote to the du Pont Co. expressing my opinion of that gigantic corporation which has for so long a time profited so handsomely at the expense of our Government and under date of April 19, 1946, received a letter from the company in which they attempted weakly to justify their position, stating the work represented an abrupt departure from its own field of operations. And yet Mr. Prentis has the audacity and the effrontery to speak to you of your loyalty to management.

Every one of you men here tonight are vastly superior morally and spiritually to management. You come with clean hands and you must all realize how vastly superior to management you are. For let me tell you this, when the roll call is made above these Prentises, these Grundys, these Pews, these du Ponts, these Alfred Sloans, these Eugene Graces, these Mellons will still be stoking the fires of hate and oppression against the little people. While you will be written down as one who loved his fellow man.

In closing let me tell you this. These Prentises, these dictators, are not going to crucify labor on a cross of which the planks were hand hewn by these Bourbonic self-styled captains of industry. For remember it is better to die fighting standing on your feet than to live on your knees in humility and in this great battle for existence and your own self-respect let your battle cry be "Democracy for all and every man an independent" and your battle song Onward, Christian Soldiers.

Unjust Criticism Strikes at Confidence in Congress—We Should Not Help Communists and Fascists Destroy Our Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a very fine article that appeared in the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., June 9, 1946, by the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, on the subject, Unjust Criticism Strikes at Confidence in Congress.

People who would like to change our form of government, including Communists and Fascists, are getting a lot of support from people within our Government who are criticizing it unduly and unjustly. The first thing that the Communists or the Fascists want to do is to destroy the confidence that the people of the United States have in our Government. If they can destroy this confidence, especially in our leaders, it will be much easier for either of them to get control. That is the way they obtained control in other countries. They are both working to the same end. Their methods are the same and the results would be the same. We have the greatest government on earth, a representative democracy. Too little time is consumed by important public-spirited citizens praising and defending our Government and too much time is consumed by those who claim to be great and ardent supporters of it, making statements, writing articles, and otherwise disseminating information that is highly destructive to our Government.

AN HONEST GOVERNMENT

During the greatest depression in all history, when tens of billions of dollars were spent, and during the greatest war in all history, when hundreds of billions of dollars were spent, this money was expended under the direction of a few, very few, prominent officials in our Government in Washington. It is a great tribute to our democratic form of government, and is being pointed to peoples in other lands, that these hundreds of billions of dollars were expended by these few officials without even a charge being made, even from an unreliable or irresponsible source, that 1 penny or 1 dime of the money was unlawfully taken or misappropriated by any of these few officials. Honesty is one of the greatest assets of any government. The taxpayers have a right to expect their money will be spent honestly and according to law.

The article is as follows:

UNJUST CRITICISM STRIKES AT CONFIDENCE IN CONGRESS—FLOOD OF UNWARRANTED AND UNSUPPORTED ATTACKS RESENTED BY LEGISLATOR WHO SEES DANGER TO WELFARE OF COUNTRY

(By CLARENCE CANNON, chairman, House Appropriations Committee)

Wherever dictators and usurpers have climbed to autocratic power in any country, their first care has been to strike at the representatives of the people in the legislative branch of the government. Oliver Cromwell, in proroguing the English Parliament, pointed his sword at the mace lying upon the table of the House of Commons and cried, "Take away this bauble." When it was carried out there went with it representative government in all England.

Again, Napoleon, stalking into the French Chamber of Deputies at the head of his grenadiers, cried, "Follow me. I am destiny. I am the divinity of the day." As his bayonets drove out the representatives of the people, some of them climbing through windows to escape, they drove out civil and religious liberty.

From that day until the end of the Napoleonic dynasty, France, and all Europe controlled by France, was without representative government.

Again, so recently, Hitler, endeavoring to seize the reins of government in Germany, as the first step toward world domination, burned down the Reichstag Building, so that Germany's house of representatives, unable to meet, was scattered in confusion, and before it could reassemble, a large number had been proscribed or were in concentration camps, and free government in Germany had been destroyed, and free government was in peril throughout the world.

PRESSURE GROUPS HIT CONGRESS

Here in America, whenever any man or group of men have sought to establish autocratic control, whether political, economic, or industrial, they have struck, either directly or by innuendo, at the influence of the representatives of the American people in Congress. Of course, the American people have long ago advanced beyond the stage of armed interference with the legislative branch of the Government by military authorities. That would be impossible in America today.

Our state of civilization does not countenance the political prison or the concentration camp. But there are other ways of undermining the standing and influence of the Congress in the regard and confidence of the people, which, whether with or without sinister motives, can be just as effective when carried to their ultimate conclusion.

The Congress has been subject to criticism—as it should be—ever since the establishment of the Republic. One of the most priceless prerogatives of every American is the right to criticize Congress and the Members of Congress, and that right has been widely and fully exercised from the First Congress down to the Seventy-ninth Congress now in session. At times that criticism has been more virulent and more undeserved than at others. And that is as it should be. Better that Congress and Congressmen be unjustly accused on many occasions than that they should escape merited stricture on any single occasion.

FLOOD OF UNWARRANTED ABUSE

But in the last 2 years such a flood of unwarranted and unsupported abuse and castigation has been loosed against Congress and its procedure as has no equal in the annals of congressional condemnation.

Newspaper columnists and radio broadcasters have vied with written and spoken jeremiads delivered before the House to an extent that at times transcend even the bounds of truth and good taste. The abuse of Congress, criticism of the Congress and its membership, and its procedure, has been without precedent since the stormy days of the Sixtieth and Sixty-first Congresses when the House rules were a national political issue.

Effort has been made to convince the American people that something is so wrong with congressional procedure that dire disaster menaces the country, its form of government, and its democratic institutions unless immediate and drastic action is taken to save the Nation and its democratic practices from onrushing ruin and destruction. In order to foster this propaganda a campaign of abuse and disparagement of Congress individually and collectively has been waged.

BITTER SUMMARIZATION CITED

Let me quote from just a few of many such castigations. Here is a summarization of such criticism epitomized by one of the distinguished Members of the other body and published in the Pageant magazine:

"The trouble with Congress is, briefly, Congressmen. Their two main interests have been getting reelected and lining their pockets. Short of everything else, they are lazy and overpaid. They have it soft. The lobbyists write our laws, and in a way that is fortunate, for Congressmen are numskulls, they are windbags, obstructionists, and worse. Only a vigilant press deters them from raiding the Treasury."

Here is a quotation from a statement made on the House floor:

"The people think we are a bunch of clowns."

Here is a statement from a national magazine, Life:

"Like the American people they represent, they are indeed often ignorant, provincial, and greedy."

Here is another statement appearing in Reader's Scope:

"Washington's great Capitol dome covers a lot of statesmanship and a lot of skulduggery and bungling inefficiency."

Again, here is an editorial appearing in one of the great newspapers of the Nation:

"Congress is unintelligent, lacks courage, is bogged down in red tape."

You will notice that there is no distinction here between the Congress and its membership. They do not make that statement with reference to some one or two Members of the House. They make the broad statement that the Congress is unintelligent, lacks courage, and is bogged down in red tape. It is in the deadliest form in which it could be put in order to affect the sentiment of the country. There is no differentiation between the institution and its membership.

Our system of procedure is the product of more than a thousand years of legislative experience. Some objection has been made that it is not up to date, that like a woman's hat or a man's necktie, it ought to change every year. As a matter of fact, parliamentary procedure is based upon fundamental rules of decorum which do not change any more than the fundamental rules of human conduct as set forth in the Ten Commandments changes. It has been built up through centuries of experience in various legislative bodies, beginning with the Anglo-Saxon Witenagemot, continuing down through the development of parliamentary government in the Colonial legislatures in this country and under our own system of government for more than 150 years.

The tenor of these statements is that the Government faces a crisis. That the threat is serious, the danger is real, the life of reprentative government is at stake.

BIAS BY SPEAKER DENIED

Among the statements lacking in accuracy but advanced as a reason for revision of House procedure is the statement that bills are referred to committees in consideration of the attitude of the chairman toward the proposed legislation. The inference is that the Speaker of the House of Representatives will, if he is opposed to a measure, refer it to the committee where the chairman is hostile to that measure, or if he favors it, will refer it to a committee where the chairman is favorable to the legislation.

Nothing could be further from the facts. Never has the oldest Member of the House ever heard, much less known, it to be so much as intimated that the Speaker was governed by his attitude on a bill in its reference to a committee.

Then I think there is no charge that has been made more frequently, and more inaccurately, in an endeavor to secure public approval of some notion that something is seriously wrong with the procedure of the House than the statement that committees have overlapping and duplicating jurisdiction. As a matter of fact, the jurisdiction of the committees of the House is so definitely established and has been for so many years that the question of the reference of a bill never arises on the floor. If a bill should be referred to a committee which does not have jurisdiction, there is every provision for its reference to the committee properly having jurisdiction. If it is a private bill, a point of order can be raised by any Member.

JEALOUS OF JURISDICTION

The committees of the House are jealous of their jurisdiction, and if anybody, at any time, by the improper reference of a bill should infringe upon their jurisdiction, that committee would immediately protest. There are other instances of misstatements made in order to inflame the people against Congress and congressional procedure. One such instance, for example, is the statement that 95 percent of the bills passed by Congress are drafted in the departments. Any Member of the Committee on Appropriations can testify that no department has even written any appropriation bill that ever came to the floor.

Another charge which will not bear the test of accuracy is that the men who serve as chairmen of committees have ex officio the power to report legislation or to kill legislation. On the face of it the charge cannot be sustained. The committee of which I happen to be a member has 45 members and the chairman has 1 vote in the 45 and no more. He cannot report a bill unless a majority of the other 44 members approve and he must report a bill if a majority of the committee directs him to report it no matter how unalterably opposed he may be to the measure. The myth that the chairman of a committee has any more power than any other member of the committee is another fabrication calculated to disturb the people and shake their confidence in the one institution which is the safeguard of their liberties and the guaranty of their right of free government.

SENIORITY NOT BINDING

Let me say just a word about the much-mooted question of seniority. The importance of the chairmanships is greatly exaggerated. There may be a little glamour connected with the chairmanships but that is about all. Some chairmen have extra rooms and patronage, but as chairman of one of the House committees I do not have even these modest perquisites. I have no more personal clerks and no more office space than I had before I became chairman, and I pay for all my own stationery.

Furthermore, the rule of seniority does not always obtain in the election of a chairman. The rule of seniority is in that respect neither absolute nor invariable. In my own committee there have been notable instances in which the rule of seniority was disregarded.

It is difficult to conceive of anything that would have a more disastrous effect on the work of a committee than a continuous potential rivalry between half a dozen members of the committee as to which of them would be made chairman in the next session, or in event of a sooner change. The entire membership of the committee would be immediately divided into factions. There would be such continuous maneuvering for position and such suspicion of every move by any faction, however inconsequential, as to seriously impede the work of the committee and prejudice its conclusions. No chairman, however qualified, could secure maximum results in such an atmosphere.

On the other hand, the present system of seniority has been in effect so long no one gives any particular attention as to who is presiding or who will preside in the future. The system is understood and respected. Attention is concentrated on the work of the committee. The difference between the seniority system and any alternative system is the difference between order and chaos.

We are told that the foundations of free government, the preservation of democracy, and the maintenance of American institutions rests on the number of committees. According to newspaper and magazine statements, if the number of committees is reduced, the Republic is safe; if the number of committees is not reduced, all hope is gone.

Now, what would be accomplished by the reduction of the number of committees? Would there be less work? No. Would the reduction of the number of committees reduce the number of men required to do the work of the committees? No. The reduction of the number of committees would neither reduce the amount of work nor increase the number of men to do the work. In other words, whether you have 10 committees or a hundred committees, you have the same amount of work and the same number of men to do the work, as you would follow the same system of handling the work.

SUBCOMMITTEES WOULD TAKE OVER

The only difference would be that, instead of doing the work in committees, as at present, it would be done by subcommittees made up of the same men. As soon as you combine the 48 committees of the House into 18 committees you immediately appoint 48 subcommittees.

The important thing is to stop all this byplay and stop alarming the country. If there are minor defects which need adjustment, let us make them—preferably on consideration and recommendation by the committee having jurisdiction—and have the matter over with and stop prejudicing the public against the legislative branch of the Government and against their representatives in the House and Senate.

In 1944 the United States Government collected more money, borrowed more money, spent more money, and created a greater deficit than any government in any country has ever collected, borrowed, spent, or owed in human history. It is a world record.

And in 1945 Congress rescinded more appropriations, reclaimed more money, and made greater reductions in expenditures than was ever effected by any government before in fiscal history. That likewise is a world record.

In all the annals of the past there is no parliamentary body which has borne such heavy responsibilities, administered such vast empires of production and distribution, and

discharged its duties so faultlessly as the war Congress of the United States.

POLITICS—POLITICIANS—HOW LAWS ARE MADE

In the booklet, Our American Government—What Is It? How Does It Function?—House Document No. 465, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, which has recently been published, the following questions and answers appear:

1. Question. What is the difference between a pure or direct democracy, and a representative or indirect democracy?

Answer. A pure democracy is a form of government in which the management of affairs is kept actually in the hands of the people themselves, so that the citizens in the mass make the laws, levy taxes, decide questions of war and peace, determine all other matters of policy, and select and supervise the officials who carry on matters of public business which are of such a nature as to require personal and continuous attention.

In a representative democracy the people govern themselves, but they do so by entrusting the entire administration of the State to their representatives whom they choose for that purpose.

2. Question. What are the essentials of a republican form of government?

Answer. A republic may be defined as a government which derives all its powers directly or indirectly from the great body of the people, and is administered by persons holding their offices during the pleasure of the people electing them, for a limited period, or during good behavior.

3. Question. How does the Government of the United States of America combine both democratic and republican principles of government?

Answer. As a pure democracy, defined above is not practically possible in the case of a nation like the United States, large both geographically and in population, and whose citizens in the mass have not the leisure necessary for continuous direct participation in the public business, the National Government took the form of a representative democracy. It is democratic because the people govern through representatives whom they have chosen or elected; it is republican because the people elect the President, the Executive.

38. Question. How many Members has each State in the House and Senate?

Answer. Each State, by the Constitution, is always entitled to two Senators. Under the apportionment following the 1940 census, the States are entitled to Representatives, as follows: Alabama, 9; Arizona, 2; Arkansas, 7; California, 23; Colorado, 4; Connecticut, 6; Delaware, 1; Florida, 6; Georgia, 10; Idaho, 2; Illinois, 26; Indiana, 11; Iowa, 8; Kansas, 6; Kentucky, 9; Louisiana, 8; Maine, 3; Maryland, 6; Massachusetts, 14; Michigan, 17; Minnesota, 9; Mississippi, 7; Missouri, 13; Montana, 2; Nebraska, 4; Nevada, 1; New Hampshire, 2; New Jersey, 14; New Mexico, 2; New York, 45; North Carolina, 12; North Dakota, 2; Ohio, 23; Oklahoma, 8; Oregon, 4; Pennsylvania, 33; Rhode Island, 2; South Carolina, 6; South Dakota, 2; Tennessee, 10; Texas, 21; Utah, 2; Vermont, 1; Virginia, 9; Washington, 6; West Virginia, 6; Wisconsin, 10; Wyoming, 1.

49. Question. What are the duties expected of a Member of Congress?

Answer. They are many and manifold. He should study legislation and attend the meetings of his House. He should listen to a good deal of the debates, but not all of them by any means. Many Members are kept in committee meetings many hours of many days of every session. The average Member develops a large office business. The Members get a vast amount of mail. This requires much study, dictation of replies, and often visits to different executive departments downtown. The departments are far away and often far apart. Many ex-servicemen bring their problems to their Congressman, and he is always glad to help them out when and wherever he can, although he has not the power always to do as much as he would like.

86. Question. How can any citizen get his views considered by Congress?

Answer. The Constitution of the United States provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting * * * the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." A special place is set aside in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD each day for petitions which may be filed by a Member and referred to the appropriate committee for consideration. The notation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recites the name of the Member offering the petition, the name of the petitioner, and a brief summary of what the petition contains.

87. Question. What are the stages of a bill in the House?

Answer. Following in brief are the usual steps in procedure—further details on many of the questions raised will be found in subsequent paragraphs:

(a) Introduction by a Member, by placing the measure in the "hopper," a box on the Clerk's desk; it is numbered and sent to the Government Printing Office and made available next morning at the document room.

(b) Reference to a standing or select committee—public bills and bills coming from the Senate, by the parliamentarian under direction of the Speaker, private bills on endorsement of the Member.

(c) Report from committee—usually after hearing, either before the full committee or a subcommittee.

(d) Placing on the calendar—according to its classification as a revenue bill, private bill, etc. Occasionally a privileged bill is considered when reported.

(e) Consideration in Committee of the Whole, if on the Union Calendar—including general debate and reading for amendment, with speeches limited to 5 minutes.

(f) Second reading and consideration in the House—in the case of bills considered in Committee of the Whole, the second reading is had in committee. In either case, the bill is open to amendment after the second reading.

(g) Engrossment and third reading—the question is put by the Speaker as of course and decided at one vote. Any Member may demand reading in full. A negative vote at this stage defeats the bill as completely as a vote on passage.

(h) Passage—the question of the passage being put by the Speaker as a matter of course without motion from the floor.

(i) Transmission to the Senate, by message.

(j) Consideration by the Senate—usually after reference to and report from committee, reading, debate, and opportunity for amendment.

(k) Return from Senate with or without amendment—if the Senate rejects the House bill it so notifies the House.

(l) Consideration of Senate amendments by the House—either agreeing, agreeing with amendment, or disagreeing with each amendment separately.

(m) Settlement of differences by conference.

(n) Enrollment on parchment paper.

(o) Examination by the Committee on Enrolled Bills—the chairman of the House and Senate committees each certifying as to each House bill examined that it has been found truly enrolled and the certifying by the Secretary of the Senate as to Senate bills.

(p) Signing—by the Speaker first in all cases, then by the President of the Senate.

(q) Transmittal to the President of the United States.

(r) Approval or disapproval by the President—usually after referring it to the Department affected for recommendation.

(s) Action on a bill vetoed—the House or Senate may consider the veto message at once, postpone consideration of the message to a day certain, or refer the same to a committee. If it fails to pass the House to which returned, by a two-thirds vote, no further action is taken.

(t) Filing with the Secretary of State on approval or passage over veto.

93. Question. Why are congressional standing committees necessary?

Answer. Standing committees were established as early as 1803; before that, bills were discussed in Committee of the Whole, and then referred to a select committee for drafting. The development of standing committees of small membership (the largest, Appropriations, has only 40 members) was a practical necessity to insure a preliminary check on the flood of bills introduced. Committee procedure, with its witnesses and cross-examination, offers a much more satisfactory method of reaching the real merits of a measure and presenting it in workable form than the necessarily limited consideration on the floor by a (possible) membership of 435.

94. Question. What are the names of the standing committees of the Senate?

Answer. As of Seventy-ninth Congress, second session (the number in parentheses immediately following the committee titles indicates the number of members on that committee): Agriculture and Forestry (20); Appropriations (25); Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate (8); Banking and Currency (20); Civil Service (10); Claims (13); Commerce (20); District of Columbia (15); Education and Labor (18); Enrolled Bills (3); Expenditures in the Executive Departments (8); Finance (21); Foreign Relations (23); Immigration (14); Indian Affairs (14); Interoceanic Canals (8); Interstate Commerce (21); Irrigation and Reclamation (17); Judiciary (18); Library (10); Manufactures (13); Military Affairs (18); Mines and Mining (13); Naval Affairs (18); Patents (8); Pensions (11); Post Offices and Post Roads (19); Printing (8); Privileges and Elections (17); Public Buildings and Grounds (14); Public Lands and Surveys (15); Rules (13); Territories and Insular Affairs (17).

95. Question. What are the names of the standing committees of the House?

Answer. There are 48 standing committees of the House. Each committee has a chairman and is composed of Democrats and Republicans. The number of members, Republicans or Democrats, on a committee bears a direct ratio to the number of Democrats and Republicans in the House. The names of the committees are (the figures in parentheses indicate the number of members on each committee): Accounts (11); Agriculture (28); Appropriations (43); Banking and Currency (27); Census (21); Civil Service (21); Claims (21); Coinage, Weights, and Measures (21); Disposition of Executive Papers (2); District of Columbia (21); Education (21); Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress (13); Elections No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3 (9 each); Enrolled Bills (7); Expenditures in the Executive Departments (21); Flood Control (21); Foreign Affairs (26); Immigration and Naturalization (23); Indian Affairs (21); Insular Affairs (23); Interstate and Foreign Commerce (28); Invalid Pensions (21); Irrigation and Reclamation (21); Judiciary (27); Labor (21); Library (5); Memorials (3); Merchant Marine and Fisheries (21); Military Affairs (27); Mines and Mining (21); Naval Affairs (27); Patents (21); Pensions (21); Post Office and Post Roads (25); Printing (3); Public Buildings and Grounds (21); Public Lands (21); Revision of the Laws (13); Rivers and Harbors (26); Roads (21); Rules (12); Territories (21); Un-American Activities (9); War Claims (21); Ways and Means (25); World War Veterans' Legislation (21).

In the case of the Committees on Disposition of Executive Papers, on Enrolled Bills,

on the Library, and on Printing, the members of the committee are authorized by the rules of the House to act with the corresponding committee of the Senate as joint committees. The Committees on the Library and on Printing do so act.

97. Question. What is meant by the "seniority rule"?

Answer. It is a rule whereby a Member who has served longest on the majority side of a committee becomes chairman and otherwise acquires additional influence. Members are ranked from the chairmanship according to length of service. It takes time for one to become familiar with the rules of the House and to receive sufficient recognition to enable him to be an effective Member of Congress.

Champ Clark, of Missouri, who served in the House from Missouri for 26 years and was elected Speaker four times, once said:

"A man has to learn to be a Congressman just as he has to learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor. A new Congressman must begin at the foot of the class and spell up. Of course, the more brains, tact, energy, courage, and industry he has, the quicker he will get up."

The seniority rule allows Members who have long service to hold positions of leadership and power in the House. A knowledge of the rules in Congress is valuable to a Member; shrewd parliamentarians are often able to expedite or block the passage of legislation. Many rules and customs, including the seniority rule, seem unreasonable to many people, but they have grown up through the method of "trial and error" over a period of 150 years, and there is no likelihood of substantial changes being made during our lifetime.

98. Question. What arrangements are made for a meeting of a standing committee of the House?

Answer. Each committee has a large committee room, its size and accommodations depending upon the importance of the committee. Each of the major committees of the House has a large meeting room equal in size to the average United States district courtroom. The members of the committee have individual seats in a semicircle behind individual desks. A witness appearing before this committee in support of or in opposition to a bill is usually given time to make his own statement and then the committee members are privileged to cross-examine him. The usual time of meeting is 10 o'clock in the morning and sometimes in the afternoon and night when the House is not in session.

99. Question. Under what circumstances do House committees themselves originate bills?

Answer. Members sometimes present petitions, and reference of such petition to the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter gives it authority to draw a bill. The same is true when communications addressed to the House from the President, executive departments, or other sources are referred to appropriate committees. General supply bills, revenue measures, and other similar proposals originate in the committees.

101. Question. Does the committee to which a bill is referred effectively control its disposition?

Answer. Ordinarily the action of a committee in failing to report a measure spells its defeat. However, the House rules provide machinery by which a public bill may be taken out of committee, if held by them longer than 30 days. A petition, signed by a majority of the membership (218 Members), to discharge a committee from further consideration of the bill, will be placed on a special calendar and may be called up by any of the signers on the second or fourth Monday of any month. Only 20 minutes' debate is allowed on the motion; if it prevails, then the House further votes to consider the bill; it is then considered under the general rules.

This special procedure is resorted to very infrequently, and usually on measures of a controversial character. This is the House machinery for forcing consideration of measures which may be "buried" in committee.

103. Question. What do the letters H. R. represent, such as H. R. 99? In other words, do these letters represent, (a) House Record, (b) House Resolution, (c) House Roll, or (d) House of Representatives?

Answer. The H. R. preceding a number represents House of Representatives, and these letters are used for a bill—not a resolution. They compare with the letter S. preceding the number of a bill in the Senate. For instance, S. 99.

111. Question. What are the functions of the House Rules Committee?

Answer. This committee considers only bills that some other committee has reported; most of its work is to decide whether or not to grant special consideration for bills which otherwise might be long delayed on the various calendars of the House. When the Rules Committee reports a special rule to the House it is usually adopted. When it is adopted, the bill to which it refers is considered under the provisions of that rule.

130. Question. What is meant by a "rider" on a congressional bill?

Answer. A "rider" is an extraneous provision incorporated in an appropriation bill, with the idea of "riding" through to enactment on the merits of the main measure. The practice is very old; in 1837 a rider on the fortifications appropriation bill would have provided for the disposal of surplus funds in the Treasury. Under the rules any item of appropriation in a general appropriation bill that is not authorized by existing law nor in furtherance of projects already in progress is subject to a point of order (this is often waived by a special rule in the House); and the same with any provision changing existing law, unless it is germane to the subject and designed to retrench expenditures (the so-called Holman rule). Occasionally a rider become law, without the point of order being raised.

An example of a legislative rider was contained in the appropriation rescission bill, which was vetoed by President Truman. The rider which was not germane to the bill and wholly unrelated to the subject matter of the bill, provided that the United States Employment Service would be returned to the States in 100 days.

President Truman, believing that this subject should receive separate consideration and entitled to be passed upon by him separate and distinct from any other legislation, vetoed the entire bill to get rid of the rider.

143. Question. Why must tax bills originate in the House?

Answer. The constitutional provision (all bill for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; art. 1, sec. 7) is an adaptation of the English practice. The principle involved, and which had been established in England after long struggle, is that the national purse strings should be controlled by a body directly responsible to the people. So when the Constitution was formulated, as Members of the Senate were to be chosen by the several State legislatures, the initiation of revenue legislation was restricted to the House, where the Members were subject to direct election every 2 years. However, the Senate has had from the start full power to amend revenue legislation.

270. Question. Is there anything unique about the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Answer. Yes. It is the only publication in the United States that is not censored by some person. The language of each Member in the House and Senate is his own and no person has the authority to change it. In that way, the views of people from every section of our Nation are constantly printed in this publication. It covers practically every subject involving public affairs that is discussed. Every library, lodge, club, or other place where books and publications are retained for use of Members should have the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It may be obtained by anyone for $1.50 per month postpaid while Congress is in session. An index is printed every 2 weeks, and furnished to each person who receives the daily RECORD.

271. Question. What are the usual contents of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Answer. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carries a verbatim copy of the proceedings in both House and Senate (except proceedings in "executive session"). It includes notice of all bills, resolutions, and memorials introduced or filed by Members; shows all roll-call votes, and much other information not elsewhere available.

279. Question. What is politics?

Answer. Webster's definition says politics is "the science and art of government; the science dealing with organization, regulation, and administration of state; the theory or practice of managing or directing the affairs of public policy or of political parties." It is through politics that the people rule. The unthoughtful person who says that he is not interested in politics or politicians is saying he is not interested in his own Government or his own business or occupation or profession. It is only through politics that the people control their Government and remain the sovereign power of our country.

280. Question. What is a politician?

Answer. Webster's definition of a politician is: "One versed or experienced in the science of government." The same definition applies to statesman. It is through politicians that the people express their will. Woodrow Wilson said: "A democracy is a government established upon the will of the people." Therefore without politicians there could not be a democracy because it is only through politics that the people have a vehicle to express their wishes and demands so that they can be carried out.

281. Question. What is the importance of politics in a representative democracy?

Answer. It is through political organizations that individuals initiate and collectively express opinions on governmental problems or policies and thereby focus public scrutiny on established or proposed governmental activities. Without politics and politicians, a representative democracy could not function. The public has a fertile, honest, intelligent mind. The collective mind acting through the medium of politics has provided our country, the United States, with the greatest Government on the face of the earth. The totalitarian leaders, prior to World War II, said we would not fight—that there would be so much disunity and dissension among people under a government such as our own where every person could so freely express himself, that we could not carry on a successful, coordinated warfare against our enemies. Events of the past are convincing of how wrong they were.

282. Question. What is lobbying?

Answer. Lobbying has been defined as the activity of a person or body of persons who attempt to influence legislation in any way whatever. Although the term frequently has an odorous connotation, lobbying may be beneficial as well as harmful. It is often a source of important information which would not otherwise be readily available.

A legal definition of lobbyist is one who frequents the lobby or the precincts of a legislature or other deliberating assemblies with the intention of influencing the votes of the members. Sometimes the term is defined as a person who loiters among legislators and solicits them for the purpose of influencing legislation.

283. Question. What forms may lobbying take?

Answer. Lobbying may be carried out by distribution of printed matter, appearance

before committees of Congress, by interviewing or seeking to interview Members of Congress, or by some other means, such as social contacts.

284. Question. Are lobbyists required to register?

Answer. Lobbyists are not required by the Federal Government to register, although such a control has frequently been suggested. Basically, lobbying is a form of petition, and the constitutional protection of the right of petition may explain in part the reluctance of the Government to enact restrictions.

American Policy in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH DE LACY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, in response to a suggestion analysis of certain aspects of American policy in China which Miss Agnes Smedley made and I caused to be inserted in the RECORD, Mr. John Earl Baker has written to comment on one aspect of her remarks which he believes is in error.

Under the leave granted me, I wish to bring the attention of the House to his letter, which follows:

THE BELLEVUE HOTEL,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1946.

Hon. HUGH DE LACY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DE LACY: My attention has been called to the memorandum written by Agnes Smedley and published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix, page A2485, under your leave to extend remarks. In the first column Miss Smedley states the following:

"The wheat loan, given in 1930–31 (as I recall), was allegedly to aid the victims of flood and famine, but it was used by Chiang to feed his armies which were waging war on the Communists."

I was responsible for the handling of the wheat and flour in reference from ship's tackle at the unloading port in China onward. All of this wheat and flour, except portions which I shall mention shortly, were distributed to flood victims, the most considerable portion being paid as wages to the 1,500,000 men who restored the dikes of the Yangtze and Huai Rivers and their tributaries. In so doing these laborers moved a quantity of earth equal to that which would be involved in an embankment 6½ feet high and 6½ feet broad around the world at the Equator.

When the work was done a considerable party consisting of both Chinese and foreign publicists and engineers made a physical audit of this construction so as to verify that the work had actually been done and the quantities were as stated. This is the first inference I have encountered that this huge piece of physical work was accomplished by magic.

The complete story of the above work is carried in the report of the National Flood Relief Commission which is on file in the Congressional Library.

With the permission of the American Government, a few shiploads of wheat were sold to mills on the Yangtze for the reason that we discovered after shipping two trainloads to the Huai Valley that the cars used in hauling the American wheat inland were loaded with native wheat on the return movement to meet needs in Shanghai. By these sales of the American wheat in Shanghai we saved for other economic purposes the precious transportation which otherwise would have been diverted to our uses. In addition, one shipload of flour was sold to the Russians for transportation to Vladivostok. The approximate equivalent of the proceeds of these sales was paid in cash to laborers who restored dikes along the Huai River and its tributaries.

May I hope that this correction can be given the same prominence as was given to the incorrect allegation?

Respectfully yours,

JOHN EARL BAKER.

Address of Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers, of Massachusetts, at Andover, Mass., June 1, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my address at the three hundredth anniversary of the incorporation of the town of Andover, Mass., on June 1, 1946:

I come to your beautiful town of Andover tonight with pride and pleasure. Pride that you so generously voted me your Member of Congress; pleasure that I am to take part in your anniversary ceremonies.

It is a great privilege to join in the celebration today of the three hundredth anniversary of the incorporation of the town of Andover and pay tribute to the notable part that its citizens have played in the history of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and that of the Nation. Andover typifies two great contributions which New England, through the years, has made to the Republic. One contribution is that of character and the emphasis on self-reliance, hard work, and the will to overcome obstacles. The second is the love of and respect for education, which found an expression in the establishment of Phillips Andover Academy, one of the great national schools of the country, long a training school for many of its leaders.

In all our wars, from the Revolution to World War II, the town of Andover has sent forth its sons in generous measure in defense of liberty and freedom. Many Andover boys have cheerfully made the supreme sacrifice. In honoring their sacrifice, we may well recall the immortal words which the Greek poet Simonides, more than 2,000 years ago, used in penning an epitaph on the Athenian dead at Plataea: "If to die nobly is the chief part of excellency, to us out of all men Fortune gave this lot; for hastening to set a crown of freedom on Hellas, we lie possessed of praise that grows not old."

As evidenced by the combat records of its alumni in the two World Wars and other wars, Phillips Andover Academy has been no less eager to serve the country in time of peril, and we can well be proud of the fact that an Andover alumnus, and president of the board of trustees, successfully and brilliantly directed the activities of the largest Army ever mobilized by the American people in their defense—Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War in the Cabinet of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

It is a compliment to Andover that Mr. Forrestal, the Secretary of the Navy, your distinguished speaker tonight, has sent his son to Phillips Andover. He has carried the Navy to victory. We are glad he has consented to serve in the emergency of the postwar period.

Andover has also made a very fine contribution to the education of girls. Abbot Academy was the first girls paid school to be incorporated in Massachusetts. Many distinguished women have been graduated from the academy and have been interested in it.

Other sections of the country are a bit envious of the educational leadership of New England and the home-spun New England virtues which have done so much to shape the building of the national character. In this, we of today must nevertheless prove worthy of our heritage, and look to the future and not alone to the past. It is fitting on this historic occasion, therefore, that we recall the suffering, the endurance, and the heroism of the men and women who laid the foundation of Andover and resolve to carry on the torch by applying their virtues and idealism in meeting the many and complex problems that face postwar America.

Citizens of Andover never took their hard-won liberties for granted. They were ever on the alert and ready to defend their freedoms. In this respect they have a great and important lesson to teach us—the lesson that we, too, must be prepared to guard our freedoms against the advances of those who, like the Communists, are seeking through subversive methods and undercover infiltration, to undermine the American way of life and alter our form of government. We want neither socialism, nor communism, nor fascism.

Today, as in the colonial period and the early years of the Republic, eternal vigilance is the price of safety and the preservation of our basic freedoms.

Andover was characterized by a fundamental unity of spirit, and still is. Though there was a variation of economic status among its citizens, a unity of effort marked its activities. As recent events so eloquently show, there is an urgent need today on a national scale of renaissance among all the elements that make up this Nation for this unity of effort.

There is a need, for example, for a better spirit of unity between capital and labor and the general public, a realization by both management and labor and the general public that each is part of the same team and that each has an equal stake in the prosperity and future of the country. Such a unity of effort would do much to improve management-labor relations and the general public relations, promote industrial peace, and increase the level of national prosperity. If unrest continues, the whole economy of the country will be destroyed, and we shall become a second-rate nation.

In his recent book, A Nation of Nations, Louis Adamic pointed out that diversity is a fundamental characteristic of the American people today—diversity of racial strains, religion and cultural and economic backgrounds. People of the English race made up the larger part of the small population of colonial New England. Our population today has grown to approximately 140,000,000, with nearly every country in Europe represented by substantial racial groups, each making a distinctive contribution to our national life.

Whatever their racial origins, all Americans are partners and stockholders in the world's greatest democracy. Racial prejudice has no place in American life, and racial prejudice will never endanger our national unity if we make as one of our major aims the cultivation of toleration, understanding, and good will among all the diverse elements that make up our population.

Freedom of religion—likewise an expression of the spirit of unity—has been one of the great American contributions to civilization. The horrors of Nazi Germany illustrate what may happen when the clock of history is turned backward and freedom of religion abandoned. We must, therefore, be ever on guard to protest religious freedom and to assure to all minorities the right to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience.

We are a Nation of many sections and regions, each with its own characteristics and economic interests. Pride in the achievements of one's section should not blind us to the virtues of our neighbors, or cause us to refuse to make an honest effort to understand their point of view on current sectional issues. While seeing to it that our position on these issues is made known to others by competent spokesmen, we should treat sympathetically the views of our fellow Americans in the South, the Middle West and the Pacific Coast. People of all sections should cultivate a spirit of unity and mutual understanding, thereby minimizing, if not averting conflicts and tugs-of-war between sections.

Unity in the United States today is vitally important. If we are not united at home we shall have little influence in bringing about international unity to stay, which is the hope for world peace.

In the last analysis a nation's greatness is measured by the character of its people. Material wealth will count for little if character is lacking and if patriotism and the ideals of public service are lost in the scramble for wealth and luxurious living. The perspective of history has thrown into sharper focus the value of the impress of character which New England has made upon the Nation, a contribution which I am confident New England will continue to make so long as the virtues and ideals of such communities as Andover are emulated by New England citizens.

Three hundred years have passed since Andover was incorporated. Though the world and our own country have undergone vast changes since then, and though we face problems undreamed of by our forbears, the character, the fortitude, and spirit of unity that characterized the communities of Colonial New England have lost none of their value. The debt we owe Andover is a large one. We can best discharge this debt by utilizing its virtues and its ideals in building a still better and greater America—an America united in spirit, strong both in its moral and in its physical defenses.

Tonight Andover records its past. Andover, unafraid, looks forward to the future.

Amending the Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my name was one of the early ones on the discharge petition for Representative CROSSER'S bill amending the Railroad Retirement Act. The present disability provisions are insufficient to take care of the permanently disabled railroad employees and I support Representative CROSSER'S stand that employees with 10 years' of service who are totally and for all time disabled, should be entitled to a full annuity. I also agree that annuities should be provided for widows, children, and dependent parents. The Crosser bill is fair to the employees, the carriers, and the public. Therefore I favor it as against the committee version.

Address Before Roanoke Ministers' Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LINDSAY ALMOND, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by me before the Roanoke Ministers' Conference, at the First Baptist Church, Roanoke, Va., on June 3, 1946:

In every phase of human relations and development we must accept and be governed by certain inherently fundamental criteria. Such philosophy is sound and paves the way of progressive safety along every avenue of human endeavor. The laws of nature itself so prescribe. Economic, social and political considerations thrive with health and vigor only as they emanate from the core of fundamentally sound concepts. As man finds himself engrossed with and encompassed by the soul-trying complexities of everyday existence, he will not lose his bearings as long as he makes proper use of his chart and compass. Man's ambitious and explorative nature is an impelling force which incessantly drives him into hitherto untried fields of thought and endeavor. This is as it should be. The slow and tedious evolution of human progress has been the result.

Scientific discovery, the science of government and political economy must revolve around certain definite and sound constitutional postulates. We may veer either to the left or to the right in our effort to broaden the avenues of human service and embrace the entire social fabric, but we dare not sever the life line to inalienable and God-given fundamentals. When we break the anchor chain we plunge headlong into the abyss of radicalism on one side or fall back into the cave of ultra conservatism on the other. Both are fraught with dire consequences to the national and international well being.

As we face the future with its untried avenues, bordered with dangerous pitfalls, there is no more fundamental principle to be taught, observed, and adhered to in our national and international thinking and conduct than that embraced by the brotherhood of man. It emanates solely from the fatherhood of God, and upon it must build a new world or else consign ourselves, body and soul, to a constant nightmare of stark and unreasoning fear and, finally, to the black void of national extinction under the dissolving blast of atomic annihilation.

Discoveries, accomplishment, science, knowledge, and populations have expanded, but the world itself has rapidly shrunk. One hundred and fifty years ago, the population of the world was 800,000,000 people; today, it is in excess of 2,200,000,000. In 1522, it took Magellan 1,083 days to sail around the world; today, the feat can be accomplished in a matter of a few hours.

Now, more than ever, the dire necessity for harmonious world relations on a permanent and practical basis rises to plague us. The time for its institution is all too short. Through the centuries this obsessing thought has been in the minds of a few daring men, but not in the heart of the world. From Plato's Republic to More's Utopia, blueprints have been drawn. Proposals ranging from Confucious' Eight Principles to Wilson's Fourteen Points have been debated—to be discarded. The theory of rule by divine right had its day. Strong national governments with despotic rulers marched down the corridors of time to no avail. Human rights, justice, social betterment, and the dignity of the common man were ignored. Statism was the order of the centuries—and even yet raises its gory head in some quarters of the world.

Then came Montesquieu, Rousseau, and John Locke. They dared to advance the theory that governments were the instruments of the people; that governments were carved from the people and existed to protect man's inalienable rights to life, liberty, and property. Ever since, humanity's cry has been heard for liberty, equality, and fraternity.

A constructive start has been made in the right direction, but a certain essence of fiber had been overlooked and therefore not incorporated in the foundation materials. Jesus of Nazareth had supplied this vital fiber. It was in abundance and freely available. It proclaimed man's inherent worth in a universe of moral law and the unity of mankind in the fatherhood of God. This was the vital and fundamental verity which had been ignored. "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another, even as I have loved you." A disregard of human welfare is to build on sand, and is a violation of moral law. Ignoring the rights of weak nations, exploitation of so-called lesser peoples to economic and political advantages have made the battlefields of the world run red with human blood.

Let us pray that the contaminating rubbish of international discord and distrust has been cleared away through the terrible sacrifice of the last war.

We must carefully lay the foundation of the new structure. That foundation will not be sound and permanent unless it recognizes a moral order in the world, emanating from the Creator of the Universe. The leavening fiber of divine will must permeate the physical order. The human administrative agency must demonstrate divine concern for human personality. The foundation must embody the unity of mankind in God. The spirit of brotherhood must pervade the foundation in deed and in truth.

The proper laying of the foundation is indispensably vital but cannot stop there. We must build upon that foundation the solid pillars of freedom and then cap it with the dome of responsibility. If the foundation is brotherhood, then the pillars must be inseparable from the base. The pillars must be the pillars of freedom from want, from fear, of worship, and of expression. These freedoms are inalienable because the source of their origin is divine will. The pillars must be symmetrical and the essence of their strength ratably and proportionately distributed. In order to serve their functions they must have balance. There must not be areas of exclusion, for a pillar can be no stronger than its weakest point. When one individual, one people, one creed, one race, is denied freedom, or is left subject to fear and want, then the weak spot jeopardizes the safety of the whole structure. We have but to look at the ruins of the old order to be conclusively convinced of the necessity for observance of the moral law in recognition of the unity of mankind in God.

Having laid the foundation of brotherhood and firmly erected thereon the pillars of freedom, we must complete the structure with the dome of responsibility. The pillars can only rise from the foundation, but must be held in place stable and secure. This implies the operation of strength, of equitable, just, and righteous power. A power that protects, a power that carries with it the

responsibility of trusteeship, a power that prevents the exploitation of the weak by the strong, a power that recognizes human interdependence and gives succor and hope to the underprivileged and distraught. A power that recognizes the principles of social responsibility in the building of a durable and enlightened social structure.

At a terrific cost in treasure—blood, sweat, and tears—we fought for this complete structure. Thousands of Americans were slain on the field of battle, many thousands more were maimed, mangled, and torn in mind and body. We wrung victory from those who sought to banish from the earth the principles out of which this structure must be erected. That victory has cleared the way. Let no racial or creedal fissure undermine the foundation, no antithetical force operate to deter us in our determination to keep faith with the hallowed dead. Let us demonstrate to the world and our posterity that we believe in the fatherhood of God and that we practice the brotherhood of man, for it follows "as the shadow the substance," we cannot accept the fatherhood of God and deny the brotherhood of man.

The Wheat Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, according to press reports, substantially every flour mill in the United States is closed.

On May 22, in a press release of that date, I stated that in my opinion the order and directive issued by the executive branch of our Government requiring every farmer to sell one-half of the wheat which he delivers to terminal storage elevators, and in which order it was further provided that every purchaser of wheat in the United States should hold one-half of the amount purchased for the use of the Commodity Credit Corporation—was probably a forerunner of the policy advocated by Food Administrator LaGuardia and others, which would authorize the Government to seize the wheat on the farms in the United States.

It is again noted that there are those in high governmental places in the executive department, who still insist that the Government should take that drastic step.

I want to serve notice now, that the people in my congressional district will never stand for such gestapo methods.

This unfortunate order, issued under the War Powers Act, is further evidence of what bureaucratic bungling does toward making impossible the handling of a product in an orderly manner. In my opinion, this order has greatly curtailed the supply of wheat for human consumption, domestically and abroad. It has resulted, and will continue to result, in the loss of millions of bushels of wheat on the farms, due to lack of proper storage facilities, thus causing the farmer to place the wheat in unserviceable bins or pile it on the ground.

This order has tremendously added to the confusion already existing in the grain trade.

This further bungling in attempting to supplant the law of supply and demand by governmental directives, has already increased and augmented existing bread lines.

If the Department of Agriculture and other governmental agencies in the executive branch of the Government will let the farmers who produce the wheat, and the elevators who furnish the storage and the market, handle our wheat supply, I am sure there will be enough wheat to go around and that we can take care of our domestic needs and furnish our quota of grain for the hungry and starving peoples in other parts of the world.

It is certainly high time that the planners and meddlers take a much needed leave of absence and let those who are familiar with the grain trade and those who are familiar with farm storage problems, handle the wheat situation in a sensible and workable manner.

Jim Farley Is an Enigma to New York Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. KERR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John M. Cummings from the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 9, 1946:

JIM FARLEY IS AN ENIGMA TO NEW YORK DEMOCRATS

(By John M. Cummings)

NEW YORK, May 8.—It's easy enough to become a puzzle or an enigma in this town. All you need to do is keep your trap shut and mind your own business.

This interesting discovery was made by your correspondent while pondering the case of the Honorable James A. Farley, former Postmaster General, two-time chairman of the Democratic National Committee, world traveler, and postcard shooter extraordinary.

To gentlemen who write pieces for the local gazettes, especially the skull-busters whose forte is the field of politics, Jim Farley is a puzzle and an enigma to boot. This is because Jim chaws away on his gum, says little or nothing on politics or the state of the Nation, and is minding his own business.

Folks over here want to know whether Jim Farley is quietly preparing to seek the Democratic nomination for Governor. And because Jim isn't shouting either "Yes" or "No" from the house tops, which are pretty big in these parts, he is biggest puzzle New York has encountered since Einstein propounded his well-known theory.

Before pulling the puzzle apart to see why Mr. Farley is a puzzle let us take a look at the broader field. After all, the man who is Governor of New York is a Governor of a State as well as a city. This something the burghers of Broadway seldom take into consideration. Most of them think Buffalo is a robe and Rochester is a guy they hear now and then on the radio.

Tom Dewey is the present Governor of New York. He is a Republican. In 1944 he was the Republican nominee for President. Tom Dewey is involved in the strategy of both parties in New York State. It is conceded he will be nominated for Governor by the Republican State convention. Reelection would enhance his chances of again being picked to head the national ticket of his party. Should he be defeated—kapoot.

Republicans who do not like Mr. Dewey—and there are some—view his candidacy for Governor with mixed emotions. They know he would be right in there as a potential Presidential candidate if he were to win. This is not to their liking. They also know that if the Republicans lose the 1948 Presidential campaign regardless of the candidate the Democratic strategy is to stop Dewey this year, or any other year he runs for Governor, for that matter.

At the moment Senator JIM MEAD has the inside track on the nomination so far as the gentlemen in control are concerned. The relict of President Roosevelt and others of the Roosevelt clan are for MEAD. Sidney Hillman is for anyone who can defeat Dewey and at the moment is willing to accept MEAD, but like others, he has his doubts.

It seems that even among the MEAD supporters there is fear he lacks what it takes to put the used-car tag on Dewey. And there is some talk that the Senator himself is beginning to take stock of his limitations. There is even a report going around he is fitting more comfortably into his Senate seat.

Ed Flynn, boss of the Bronx, successor to Farley as Democratic National Chairman, and Mr. Roosevelt's ambassador-reject to Australia, is a factor in the equation and an important one. He would rather lose with MEAD than win with Farley. This gives you an idea of the troubles in the Democratic ranks.

There are Democrats other than Flynn who are of the opinion Farley is the only man in the party who might defeat Dewey. This might help you to understand why Farley is holding his tongue, politically.

Not until August will the Democrats select their candidate. Now you know why Mr. Farley is a puzzle, an enigma. If you don't you might just as well move to the foot of the class.

More Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER B. HUBER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lorain (Ohio) Journal of June 6, 1946:

MORE LIGHT

The role of the conscientious voter is hard. He is urged by all groups to write his Congressman regarding all manner of public issues, most of them complex, technical, and controversial.

In the early days of the Nation, men selected for congressional seats were supposed to be statesmen conversant with conditions in home areas and the Nation at large. The country was smaller, geographically, and in population. It was a simpler economy. The people got their ideas to their Representatives in various ways, and there was lobbying of a sort. But not every voter felt qualified to jump into the arena to advise, threaten, or command Congress. In those days it's just possible some citizens felt they lacked knowledge to run Congress.

Information was not so prolifically nor so speedily available as now.

Today everybody is running Congress. Pressure groups of all kinds, from unions to chambers of commerce, with high-paid directors, and little men in the street, all believe they have the answers.

Moreover, it has come to be a good citizenship badge, this writing to the men and women in Washington. Maybe this is an inescapable, and even a good feature of American democracy. But if the citizenry is going to become an advisory body to Congress, it must take the trouble to be thoroughly informed on public questions. Eager interest is not enough. And this is a very big job.

I Am an American Day—Address of Hon. Daniel J. Gillen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an excellent address made by the Honorable Daniel J. Gillen, judge of the municipal court of the city of Boston, made on I Am an American Day on Boston Common in Boston, Mass., on May 19, 1946:

COURAGE AND ENERGY ATTRIBUTES THAT SERVED TO MAKE AMERICA GREAT, JUDGE DANIEL J. GILLEN, OF MUNICIPAL COURT, TELLS I AM AN AMERICAN DAY AUDIENCE AT OBSERVANCE ON BOSTON COMMON ON SUNDAY, MAY 19—ALSO POINTS TO FACT UNITY AND PERSEVERANCE SUBDUED ENEMIES, AND VOWS AMERICANISM CAN AND WILL OVERCOME ANY AND ALL OTHER ISMS—"FOLLOW CONCEPTS OF CONSTITUTION OF UNITED STATES AND WE'LL EVER GO FORWARD" WAS HIS THEME

I know I speak the sentiments of this great gathering when I say we are everlastingly grateful to the sturdy American, William Randolph Hearst, whose vision, initiative, and patriotism instituted I Am an American Day.

As long as I can remember, he has preached the doctrine of Americanism; but he has rendered more than lip service—he has thrown the power, influence, and energy of the Hearst publications into the furtherance of his patriotic ideals.

And I venture to say, when he learns of the thousands who have responded to his call to publicly proclaim their loyalty to America and all that it represents, he will feel amply rewarded, for a great man asks only for the confidence of his fellow man.

We are grateful also to Mayor Curley, whose energy and power of organization has provided a program and meeting that will not be surpassed in any city in our land today.

We can sum it all up when we paraphrase his old favorite, William Shakespeare, and say of Mayor Curley that time cannot wither nor custom stale his infinite resourcefulness.

Historic pride

We meet on one of the most historic spots in our land—Boston Common. We meet in the most historic city in America—Boston.

When we proclaim to the world "we are Americans," we can do it with as much pride and satisfaction as any community in the Nation. The history of Massachusetts and Boston is in a sense the history of America.

On our Massachusetts shores landed the Pilgrims and the Puritans. And with them came the spirit of America a century and a half before these United States were created.

They and those who followed were refugees from oppression and intolerance; but in their breasts burned a hope of freedom and equality of opportunity. The hazards of wilderness, wild animals, and savages did not deter them. "This is our land" was the slogan. God willing, it must be a community of law and order.

Organized government quickly followed; the great and general court came into being; but, before it, towns and plantations functioned. Town meeting, home rule, freedom of elections, assembly, and religion came in due course.

When we turn the pages of history we read of Magna Carta and the English Bill of Rights. But neither of these documents granted the common man freedom of expression. Under the English Bill of Rights only members of Parliament were guaranteed freedom of speech. Mark you—only members of Parliament.

It was in Massachusetts in 1641 that the guaranty of freedom of speech for the people was first written into law anywhere. The general court here in Boston ordered that every person whether freeman or foreigner may come into any court or town or public assembly and set forth his just grievances. This freedom of expression and assembly was to be our keystone.

Produced great men

There must also be education. Harvard College was founded in 1635. But a year before this the town of Boston had created the Boston Latin School—destined to be the greatest institution of its kind. The school that sheltered five signers of the Declaration of Independence, in the persons of Samuel Adams, John Hancock, Robert Treat Paine, Benjamin Franklin, and William Hooper. The school that gave to the world Wendell Phillips, Ralph Waldo Emerson, President Eliot of Harvard, Bishop Fitzpatrick, Edward Everett, Martin Milmore—and countless Members of Congress and famous men in all walks of life.

Farming, industry, and commerce followed. Every theory of planned economy proclaimed by the New Deal 300 years later flourished in the first 50 years of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Yes, even price fixing of commodities existed right here in Boston as early as 1645.

Out of the dreams, the prayers and the ambitions of the colonists and the founding fathers was born the United States of America. Long before the Constitution was written patriots died in the Boston Massacre and at Bunker Hill for the freedoms our supreme law was to later guarantee.

In front of Faneuil Hall is the statue of a great American, located in the shadow of the Cradle of Liberty by the foresight of Mayor Curley. On it is an inscription—"Samuel Adams"—he organized the Revolution." That line tells the whole story.

Boston born, Adams was the flame that set men's hearts on fire in Boston town—to stand firm and assert their claim to a government of the people and by the people.

No king or tyrant could quench the flame. He defied Empire and Parliament. In the dark days of the Revolution he was firm, ever the leader; nor did he rest until he saw his aims and hopes blossom in the supreme law of our land.

Who created the Constitution of the United States? Why was it created? Its first line gives us the answer—"We the people, in order to form a more perfect union."

The President did not create it—the Senate did not create it—the House of Representatives did not create it—we the people. They did not expect complete perfection. for they said in definite language we create it to form a more perfect union. They knew that at best man-made government would be imperfect. They were religious men—they knew that the only complete perfection would be that of the Almighty—the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Defeat predicted

Was there unity when our Government was created? No. Men said in 1787 it would not last 50 years. We will always have defeatists, but our answer to them is that today, after 160 years, we stand the most powerful Nation in the world, because we are now united.

The strength of the American character was the ability to overcome obstacles.

Can America overcome the problems of war? Germany and Japan think so! If we overcame the difficulties of 300 years, if we are the most powerful Nation in the world, then the problems of peace can be solved. Unity, determination, the "can do" spirit of America is the solution.

Each American citizen has in his possession the most powerful and priceless weapon man has created—the right to vote in free elections. The weapon is the ballot. If at times we are dissatisfied with the way our Government is administered, let us remember that generally we the people are to blame—we have been indifferent, careless, not responsive to our civic obligations, fail to vote, fail to exercise our freedoms, fail to crystallize public opinion.

How do we form a more perfect union? By forming a more perfect state—by forming a more perfect city.

Ralph Waldo Emerson once said that every Boston man carried a revolution in his waistcoat pocket. And it's true in 1946; every Bostonian carries a revolution in his vest pocket. But the revolution he carries today is the right to vote for public officials and governmental concepts all the way down to municipal administrations.

When men come to us in our day and tell us we should let the city council elect the mayor, our answer should be the same as it was in 1821, when the citizens of Boston assembled in Faneuil Hall and voted "no" on the same idea, and solemnly proclaimed we the people will elect the mayor. That is the American way—we want no European ideas of local government in Boston.

Preserved Democratic form

In 1821, when a committee made up of Daniel Webster, Lemuel Shaw, and Josiah Quincy advised Bostonians to adopt the plan then in operation in Charleston, S. C., where the board of eldermen elected the mayor, the people rejected it, so that it was the people of Boston who preserved the democratic form in spite of the advice of leaders.

The Supreme Court of the United States has said time and again that Congress cannot delegate the powers the Constitution gave it. And by the same token the people should never delegate the power the Constitution gives them—the right to vote for public officials in free elections.

As we reflect on the glories of the past today, let us look forward with faith to the future of our country.

They tell a story about General Sherman of Civil War fame that is interesting. Some years after he was graduated from West Point he found himself out of employment, so he went for help to his classmate of the Military Academy, Braxton Bragg, later to be a famous general in the Confederate Army.

Through the influence of Bragg, Sherman obtain a position as the master of a private school in the South that catered to the children of wealthy plantation owners. Today the school is the Louisiana State University.

When Sherman was there awhile, Bragg paid him a visit to find out how he was getting along. Then Sherman unburdened himself—told Bragg that he did not have much hope for a land that had so many insolent children. The boys and girls were egotistical, studied when they felt like it, disregarded the rules—nothing good could come of it—

were generally a hopeless group and, if they were the future Americans he trembled for the fate of America.

Passing difficulties

A few years later these boys and girls were the backbone of the South in the Civil War and the foundation of the New South in reconstruction days.

History proved that Sherman's fears were groundless.

What is the lesson from this story? That what at times appears to be major calamities in our land are merely passing difficulties that can be overcome if we have the fortitude to go forward when the clouds are dark.

What made America great? The idea that nothing was impossible. Courage and energy conquered the West; unity and perseverance subdued our enemies; Americanism can overcome all other isms.

If we are united, if we follow the concepts of the Constitution of the United States, we will ever march forward and, God willing, we will be able to go on to heights never dreamed of by the patriots of 1776, who gave their all to form a more perfect union.

Future of Commercial Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, here are some down-to-earth facts about the future of commercial aviation as stated in a speech by Mr. Jack Frye, president of Transcontinental and Western Air, Inc., at Oklahoma City, during the National Aviation Clinic Convention.

HOW CAN AVIATION BID SUCCESSFULLY FOR TODAY'S TRANSPORTATION MARKET

First, aviation should bid only for its share; that is, the part of the market which aviation can serve better than any other form of transportation.

Air transport is not a mass transportation business. It cannot become one until four particular problems are taken into account and solved. In the order of their importance, these are: Safety, dependability, service, and rates.

Some people in our industry believe that we can transform ourselves into mass transportation agencies overnight by cutting costs and rates. I do not agree with this thinking. I believe they have the cart before the horse.

Let us, in the order of their importance, consider these four points I have mentioned.

Safety is No. 1.

I believe the airplane can be made the safest of all forms of transportation because of its potential ability to fly over or around all weather, and its freedom from a close relation with surface obstacles while in flight. However, to achieve this goal will probably take at least 15 more years. What will this cost in money and weight of equipment to be carried in the plane, thus reducing pay load? We won't know until we get there.

The second point is dependability, or the ability to operate regularly on schedule.

Our goal here at least should be to equal the railroads in schedule performance. We cannot hope to attract mass travel until passengers and shippers can depend on us to maintain schedules.

This achievement is probably at least as far away as the safety goal. Again we do not know what the cost will be in getting there.

Thirdly, let us consider service. Quality service has built our business in the past. It has offset our deficiencies to some extent and has built our reputation as an industry. It is responsible for the customer and public loyalty which we enjoy, and certainly until we have reached our goals of safety and dependability, we cannot lower our service standards, risking these, our most valuable assets.

You are no doubt aware of the fact that the railroads generally are planning great improvements in comfort and service.

Let us be careful not to trade reputations with them for service.

Along this line, I would like to point out the deplorable situation in many of our airline terminals.

The condition and operation of most of our terminals in this country have slipped badly—many are about equal to second-class bus stations, with dirty, smelly, unpleasant waiting rooms, toilets, and washrooms.

As another part of what I call service, we should have a broad public-relations program.

We should avoid confusing the public with promises of equipment, speeds, rates, and so forth, which are not feasible in the near future. This same thing could apply to some of our airplane manufacturers who issue statements about passenger and ton-mile costs that take into account only direct flying costs. Such statements lead the public to expect the impossible, and to lose confidence in us when we fail to perform.

We should, by our judgment and conduct, warrant the continued respect and support of the public.

Any discussion of how the air lines can bid for today's transportation markets will inevitably get to the question of rates. I have taken up safety, dependability, and service ahead of rates because I am convinced they are more important to us at this time.

If you agree with my emphasis on them, then you will recognize that the achievement of these goals comes first in our program. I repeat that until we reach them, their costs cannot be known. Until the cost is known, we do not have a sound basis for fixing ultimate rates.

In my judgment there is too much optimism, both in and out of aviation, on low rates for passengers and cargoes. Some of the air lines think it a good idea to get air cargo at low rates to top off normal passenger loads. Any rate that cannot profitably support all-cargo airplanes would be a great mistake. I should like to see our companies proceed soundly, and promise rate reductions only when we are certain what our ultimate costs are going to be.

How much new business can the air lines look forward to? Some passenger traffic will be attracted from the surface carriers, but I see no reason to believe that we will make heavy inroads into their volume. Some have suggested that the air lines must capture a large block of railroad coach travel. In my opinion this is not practicable in the foreseeable future.

It is my feeling that there is a relatively limited amount of cargo business which can profitably be handled by air lines in the United States. This volume is restricted by the splendid low-cost surface transportation available here. An opportunity for the airplane in mass transportation of cargo exists in other parts of the world where good surface transportation is not present.

A fertile field for expansion lies in the carriage of new classes of mail. Here, as in other phases of our business, we should be realistic and go after only that form of traffic which we can handle more efficiently and economically than other types of carriers. It is estimated that the present volume of mail handled by the air lines could be increased about six times over the next few years. This could be done by placing on the air lines the mail which would be better served by air and which would justify such service from the standpoint of cost.

Mr. Speaker, aviation is coming of age and knows it. Its future depends upon how well it follows good, sound, practical business customs.

Précis of Testimony of American Airmen Rescued by Forces of General Mihailovich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

(This précis is based on the evidence of approximately 200 of the more than 500 American airmen rescued by the forces of General Mihailovich. The National Committee of American Airmen to Aid General Mihailovich is collecting additional depositions for inclusion in the evidence.)

PREAMBLE

The many hundreds of American airmen rescued by the forces of General Mihailovich consider the fact that they are alive and well today sufficient proof that the Chetnik movement was a resistance and not a collaborationist movement. Some of the airmen spent almost six months in Yugoslavia; the majority of them spent six weeks to two months. In point of time, their aggregate experience covers the period January 10 to December 27, 1944, and geographically it covers almost the entire area over which Mihailovich's troops were active.

Collaboration is a word with a very material meaning. Either the collaborators fight alongside the forces of occupation; or else they place themselves under their command; or else, for services rendered independently, they receive medical supplies, weapons, munitions, and other matériel; or else they fraternize with them. All of the more than 500 American airmen rescued by the forces of General Mihailovich would testify, if given the opportunity, that at no time during their stay with the Chetniks did they witness anything which suggested collaboration with the Germans; that, on the contrary, they witnessed many acts of resistance directed against the German forces of occupation.

To quote the eloquent words of Staff Sgt. Gus T. Brown, of Luling, Tex., member of the first American crew to be shot down over Yugoslavia: "In five and a half months I witnessed not a single friendly encounter with the Germans. The only encounters I ever witnessed were shooting encounters."

ACTS OF RESISTANCE WITNESSED BY RESCUED AMERICAN AIRMEN

1. American airmen were frequently rescued under the very noses of the Germans. Some of them were rescued only after skirmishes with German searching parties. One was taken from the Germans when the Chetniks stopped a train.

2. In certain cases, the rescued airmen learned from the proclamations of the local German Kommandatur that 10 or 20 Chetnik peasants had been executed as hostages because German searching parties had failed to locate the American crew, or else because the Chetniks had refused to reveal their hiding place.

3. American airmen were escorted over long distances to the evacuation airfield Prajane. On many of these trips the Chetnik escorts fought rearguard skirmishes against German parties.

4. American airmen were accommodated in illegal Chetnik hospitals. Lt. William Rogers, the chairman of the committee, remained for 5 weeks with his leg in a cast in an illegal Chetnik hospital in the village of Ripanj, 5½ miles from Belgrade. Chetnik doctors traveled 50 and 100 kilometers in order to tend wounded American airmen.

5. At all times the rescued airmen received only the utmost kindness and consideration from the local populace. Chetnik peasants insisted that their American allies eat first—and then, when the airmen had finished eating, their hosts would eat the left-overs. They insisted that their American allies sleep in their master bedrooms while they themselves slept in their barns or sometimes in pigsties.

6. Some of the rescued airmen witnessed train robberies and other acts of sabotage, or witnessed the capture and execution of German and quisling soldiers.

LACK OF MATERIAL EVIDENCE OF COLLABORATION

1. Arms and ammunition: The Chetniks in almost every command were pitifully clothed and pitifully armed. Only a fortunate minority had shoes, many of them went barefoot even in extreme weather. Their rifles were obsolete, they had next to no machine guns, and no mortars. Lieutenant Rajachich, of the American Air Crew Rescue Unit, saw the Kolubarski Corps storm the town of Lazarovats. The corps numbered 6,000 men. Between them they had 2,000 obsolete rifles and 1 machine gun, taken from a crashed American bomber at Ljig.

2. Medical supplies: The Chetniks were almost totally without medical supplies. When the American Medical Mission arrived at Pranjane, the local hospital was without a single bar of soap, without a single sheet, without a single drop of antiseptic or anesthetic, without a single bottle of medicine. For every wounded Chetnik who died from the physical consequence of his wound there were 10 who died because of the complete lack of soap, antiseptic, and other medicaments. Had the Chetniks been willing to turn over as much as one American airman to the Germans, they certainly could have obtained medical supplies sufficient to save the lives of innumerable wounded men.

Let Those Who Desire To Give Billions to Britain Answer This Presentation of Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am inserting testimony presented to the Banking and Currency Committee in opposition to the proposed British loan or gift:

STATEMENT OF MISS GERTRUDE M. COOGAN, ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL ANALYST, CHICAGO, ILL., BEFORE THE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, TUESDAY, JUNE 4, 1946

(Education: Bachelor of science (with distinction) 1921; master of business administration, 1922; both degrees from Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.; majored in accounting, corporation finance, banking, and investments. Experience: Eight years financial and security analyst for the Northern Trust Co., of Chicago; 16 years in independent economic and financial research and acting consultant for corporations, universities, and individuals. During an entire 2-year period, with two assistants, searched all the money and banking statutes of the United States from the Colonial period to 1943. This research included how the statutes were written, interpreted, and applied and the effects upon the whole financial and economic system.)

This British gift-loan enabling legislation, Senate Joint Resolution 138, is the blackjack designed for the death blow to the whole traditional American economic and banking system and the imposition of an international totalitarian economic system, blood brother to the Nazi economic system treacherously imposed upon Germany by the Hitler regime.

Apart from the consideration of the multibillions of Americans' dollars involved is the shocking fraud to have Congress convey to international bureaucrats absolute economic powers. Exercise of such powers would alter permanently the whole American production system and level most American industrial and agriculture workers down to the regimented mass poverty of the long-exploited British Empire subjects.

1. Specifically this British gift-loan act, Senate Joint Resolution 138, wipes off the $25,000,000,000 the United Kingdom owes to the United States taxpayers for lend-lease. (Another $27,000,000,000 for lend-lease bad debts owed by the British Empire and other allies will be written off soon.)

Congress is to close the books quickly on lend-lease without any questions asked in the hope that Congress will help conceal forever from the American people how multibillions of American taxpayers' dollars were unjustifiably siphoned out of the United States Treasury.

For example, there is a discrepancy of $13,500,000,000 between the actual lend-lease exports and the total lend-lease billions to be written off.

Besides, "on balance the United States Government cash transactions abroad provided foreigners with $10,100,000,000 net between July 1, 1940, and September 30, 1945." (Survey of Current Business, March 1946, pp. 10–12.)

Had the United States Treasury obtained sterling and other foreign moneys for our goods and services, such as shipping, exported under lease, we would have had the foreign moneys we spent in foreign countries and thereby cut down the cost of the war for American taxpayers tremendously.

But had that been done foreign governments and foreign nationals would not now hold $16,000,000,000 of gold and $7,000,000,000 of short-term dollar balances. This simply means foreigners now have $16,000,000,000 on deposit at the Federal Reserve banks or earmarked and $7,000,000,000 on deposit at the commercial banks. (Figures, Survey of Current Business, p. 26, published by United States Department of Commerce.)

Over and above these $23,000,000,000 of already existing and actual dollar claims held by foreigners and foreign governments the additional authorized "loans" and gifts from the United States approximate at least $14,000,000,000 more, making a total of from $37,000,000,000 to $40,000,000,000 that can be used by foreigners to claim our already short supplies of goods.

2. Specifically this British gift-loan act authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue $3,750,000,000 additional Federal bonds to the banks (Federal Reserve), in exchange for which they will inflate and dilute the currency by $3,750,000,000 more by creating new and additional dollars. These $3,750,000,000 of newly created dollars at the Federal Reserve banks will be given away to the Socialist Government of Great Britain to reimburse the British Treasury in dollars for the capital subscriptions it makes to the International Bank and International Fund, plus the dollars it may pay to the colonies to settle frozen sterling balances. This direct purpose of the $3,750,000,000 gift is stated in the Anglo-American financial agreement under paragraph entitled "Purposes of the Line of Credit—To Help the United Kingdom Maintain Adequate Reserves of Gold and Dollars." Treasury Secretary Fred M. Vinson in his testimony before the Senate committee on March 5, 1946, confirmed this by saying that Great Britain now holds in the United States $1,981,000,000 in gold, $343,000,000 in dollar balances, total $2,324,000,000.

Secretary Fred M. Vinson stated: "These gold and official dollar balances are required for several uses. * * * Second, such assets may be needed in connection with the negotiations for the reduction of sterling balances and payments in connection with the settlement. Third, subscriptions to the Bretton Woods institutions must be paid in part in gold."

In other words, Secretary Vinson told the United States Senate that Great Britain will not use the $3,750,000,000 gift-loan directly, to pay her capital requirements into the International Bank and International Fund or to make good some of her debts to her colonies, but will use her now existing gold and dollar balances for those purposes and the United States gift-loan will simply replace those gold and dollar balances Great Britain now has in the United States.

Right now the Federal bureaucrats propose freezing as high as 50 percent of the deposits in our domestic commercial banks and at the same time are demanding legislation increasing bank deposits for international operations.

As I warned when testifying last June 1945, before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee against Bretton Woods, the domestic commercial banks will soon be reduced to nothing but currency exchanges and check-clearing functionaries. An international totalitarian system cannot allow domestic commercial banks to lend to private enterprises.

3. Specifically under this British gift-loan act the United States Government agrees to become a member of the proposed International Trade Organization Conference to negotiate "tariffs and preferences, quantitative restrictions, subsidies, state trading, cartels, and other types of trade barriers treated in the document published by the United States" entitled "Proposals for Consideration by an International Conference on Trade and Employment" (Department of State Publication No. 2439, p. 3). The United States Government also agrees to implement (give the force of law) the economic proposals of the International Trade Organization.

The State Department Publication No. 2411 entitled "Proposals for Expansion of World Trade and Employment" contains the governing principles and procedures having the "endorsement of the executive branch of the Government of the United States and agreed upon by the two Governments."

Under the title "Governing Principles" is this statement: "Domestic programs to expand employment should be consistent with realization of the purposes of liberal international agreements and compatible with the economic well-being of other nations." (State Department Publication No. 2411, p. 9.)

This means the international bureaucrats would be empowered to subjugate our whole American economic system to their dictates. Under the title "Effectuation of Aims" is this statement:

"There should be an undertaking that no nation will seek to maintain employment through measures which are likely to create unemployment in other countries or which are incompatible with international undertakings designed to promote an expanding volume of international trade and investment

in accordance with comparative efficiencies of production." (Ibid., p. 9.)

Under this international bureaucrats would be empowered to destroy any industry in the United States if the bureaucrats alleged we were "likely to create unemployment in other countries" by maintaining existing American industries.

In other words, the bureaucrats could decree that the whole cattle feeding, cotton, crude oil, dairy, beet sugar, copper, or any other industries be completely wiped out of the American economy. Under the title "Purpose" is this statement: "The purposes of the organization should be: 'To facilitate access by all members, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.'" (Ibid., p. 11.)

Thus the United States could be forced to give up raw materials to every nation in the world that claimed such raw materials were "needed for their economic prosperity" no matter what the consequent disastrous effects the taking of those raw materials might have on our own economy or upon any specific enterprise here.

PERMANENT OPA AND RATIONING, ETC.

The State Department in its analyses and comments on the proposals for consideration by the International Conference on Trade and Employment states: "During the transition it may be necessary to restrict production or exports, to fix prices, or to allocate shares of markets among producing countries." (Ibid., p. 6.)

The transition would be permanent and the excuse for making the transition period 50 years would be the 50-year so-called "loan" to Great Britain.

The absolute totalitarian controls must and will be permanent.

A totalitarian economy cannot be operated without permanent OPA, priorities, allocations, consumer rationing of all essentials of living, and compulsory labor in fact, if not in name.

TOTALITARIAN EXCHANGE CONTROLS PERMANENT

An alleged purpose of this $3,750,000,000 "gift loan" to the United Kingdom is to remove foreign trade restrictions and foreign exchange controls. But sections 8 and 9 of the Anglo-American loan agreement leave loopholes for the United Kingdom to continue trade with the dominions and colonies under the imperial preference system.

And section 7 provides that sterling receipts from current transactions arising out of military expenditures by the Government of the United Kingdom will by agreement be treated on the same basis as the balances accumulated during the war—this means frozen.

This is the loophole for the British Empire bloc to get for nothing billions of war materials for conflict with Russia. One absolute economic dictatorship over the world is sought. Top-flight Government personnel are already discussing the probability of this conflict.

This gift-loan is from government to government. Therefore, government bureaucrats will control all foreign exchange. There will be no such thing as foreign exchange for competitive private industry or ordinary individuals who want it.

All the complicated verbiage, promises, and so-called contracts to release foreign exchange controls and obliterate sterling-bloc controls are rank deception. Every sensible person knows that a totalitarian economy cannot be operated without permanent absolute government controls over all foreign exchange and not without government cartels. (Note the Government in Great Britain has already decreed that the Liverpool cotton market must remain a state trading cartel and not be operated as an open competitive market.) This means the Socialist British Government will continue, as in wartime, bulk buying of all cotton. Strangely enough, the announcement of the British Government's continuing buying of all cotton came the same day that the semiannual report of the Export-Import Bank was released, which expressed grave concern over the continued presence in the United States of foreign purchasing missions engaged in government bulk buying.

What was left of other competitive private enterprises is now being taken over by the Socialist government in England—the Bank of England, coal, steel, and now the railroads.

Lenin, the Communist dictator of Russia, said: "It is essential to proceed immediately in the nationalization of the banks."

The British Socialist, G. D. H. Cole, said: "Before a Labor Government nationalizes any productive industry, it should nationalize the banks. With the banks in our hands we can take over other industries at our leisure." And that is exactly what the Labor Government in England is doing today.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEING TRICKED INTO SUSTAINING BRITISH EMPIRE

This enabling legislation, Senate Joint Resolution 138, the Bretton Woods Agreements, the International Fund, and the proposals for Anglo-American financial agreement, the enabling legislation for the International Bank, and commercial agreements tie the whole ecenomic and financial system in the United States into the British Empire totalitarian bloc and subordinate our whole domestic economic and banking system to the arbitrary demands of the international bureaucrats operating the British Empire totalitarian bloc.

From the following explanation and interpretation of the powers contained in the Anglo-American financial and commercial agreements, the Bretton Woods Agreements, and the enabling acts, it is obvious that foreign governments and foreign corporations through their governments will be able to levy continually upon the people in the United States for practically unlimited billions' worth of the food, clothing, industrial production, and fixed capital assets as produced or already existing in this country.

There is no way a country can export in excess of imports without its own people paying for all excess exports out of their earned incomes * * * i. e., producing currently but going without the use and consumption of the food, clothing, tools, machines, factories, work, and services exported or given away here.

Hence it is high time Congress stopped piecemeal legislation and in conscience took an intelligent look at the whole pattern and inevitable consequences of our already existing and proposed foreign commitments.

What more of our annual output can we give away to foreign nations and still wear clothes, eat regularly, and have places to live?

How much more can we increase our Federal debts, inflate our money, impose totalitarianism here and not have a total break-down of our whole production, distribution, and financial system?

Our badly inflated currency with the shortages due to that and the scarcities due to restricting edicts of Federal Bureaucrats have already brought the American production system to the breaking point.

ECONOMIC FACTS IGNORED—WE CANNOT CARRY THE LOAD

The whole traditional American economic system was operated to turn out:

(1) Consumer goods and services, 82–90 percent.

(2) Physical realities for production—machines, tools, buildings, public works, etc., 10–18 percent.

A higher percentage of capital goods and for export will lower the American standard of living.

(3) Annual rate of increase in volume of production (from 1879 to 1929), 3.5 percent. Since 1929, the annual net income has been less. (The Structure of American Economy, National Resources Committee, 1939.)

(4) As of December 31, 1938, there were in the United States the following man-made physical realities used for production, total, $92,000,000,000.

By December 31, 1945, new plants and equipment suitable for postwar civilian production added, $20,000,000,000; total, $112,000,000,000. Increase over 1938, 21.7 percent.

(5) Between June 1944 and June 1945 the total number of persons employed increased 9 percent.

	1940	1945	Change
	Millions	*Millions*	*Percent*
Total employed	47.8	52.1	+9
Male	36.3	33.8	−7.3
Female	11.5	18.3	+59.1

Bureau of the Census figures, Survey of Current Business, 1945, February, p. 23; September, p. 89.

Average number of hours worked per worker per week increased 19 percent; June 1940, 37.5 hours; July 1945, 44.6 hours.

Theoretically increasing the total number employed by 9 percent and the number of hours worked by 19 percent would increase physical output by 29.7 percent.

But accurate estimates by large-scale manufacturers, such as the Ford Motor Co., indicate labor efficiency—output per worker—since 1940 decreased 28 to 34 percent. Therefore, basic production statistics, as well as empty shelves, indicate that the total physical count of things produced in the United States of America in 1945 was but little more than in 1940.

Although total plants and equipment have been increased probably about 20 percent, arbitrary OPA price fixing, labor inefficiency, strikes, shortages of materials, and loss of ambition to assume greater executive responsibilities only to pay more taxes have caused a sharp decrease in the total annual output of physical realities in the United States of America.

(6) Between June 1940 and June 1945 the total bank debts circulated as money and money in circulation increased 203 percent; June 1940, $57,700,000,000; December 1945, $175,000,000,000. (Interbank deposits eliminated 1945 figures from Federal Reserve Bulletin, April 1946.)

(7) In December 1945 in the United States of America there was three times as much money in existence as in June 1940, but volume of basic production—steel ingots and steel for castings—had increased 19 percent. Coal production increased 23 percent. Crude petroleum production increased 22 percent. Cotton spindle activity increased 9 percent. (Survey of Current Business, February 1946, p. 32.)

"If allowance is made for deterioration of conveniences and services connected with restaurant sales and retail distribution of food, etc., conclusion seems warranted that the average consumer obtained very little more in 1945 than he did for half the expenditure in 1940."

"Consumers' expenditures for clothing in 1945 were more than double those in 1940. Again the available evidence suggests there has been comparatively little increase in physical volume." (Survey of Current Business, February 1946, p. 27.)

(8) In the United States of America the over-all total dollars' worth of natural resources and unconsumed man-made physical realities for production and consumption as of December 31, 1938, were approximately $370,000,000,000. (Both U. S. Government official and reliable private estimates are approximately $370,000,000,000.) New plants

and equipment added since 1938, $20,000,000,000; 1945 approximate total, $390,000,000,000.

Gross public and private debts: As of December 31, 1944, $418,600,000,000; as of December 31, 1945, $456,000,000,000.

Federal public debt: 1944, $240,200,000,000; 1945, $278,100,000,000. (Survey of Current Business, September 1945, p. 15.)

(9) In 1940 the total physical realities produced in the United States of America aggregated $29,100,000,000.

	1940	1943
	Billions of dollars	*Billions of dollars*
Agriculture	5.3	13.9
Mining	1.6	2.5
Manufacturing	20.0	48.0
Contract construction	2.2	4.3
Total	29.1	68.7

N. B. The break-down of national income by industrial divisions beyond 1943 has not been published.

Increasing the volume of money by arbitrarily levying upon all who work—diluting the purchasing power of earned wages does not increase the volume of physical production.

(10) Before concluding that the United States of America can permanently feed and clothe the world, and build multibillions of capital goods to give away all over the world, some of President Roosevelt's own public statements should be recalled:

"I see one-third of a nation ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished." (Speech Jan. 20, 1937.)

President Roosevelt said at Atlanta, Ga., on November 29, 1935:

"National surveys which have been conducted in the past year or two prove that the average of the citizenship of the United States live today on what the doctors call a third-class diet. If the country lived on a second-class diet instead of a third-class diet, do you know what that would mean? It would mean we would need to put many more acres than we use today back into the production of foodstuffs for domestic consumption. If the Nation lived—as I wish it did—on a first-class diet, we would have to put more acres than we have ever cultivated into the production of an additional supply of things for Americans to eat.

"The indications are clear that American consumers, if they had sufficient money income, would constitute a market sufficient to absorb all the production which American industry had the resources to turn out." (The Structure of American Economy, p. 21, June 1939.)

The American market is the best in the world and constitutes over 60 percent of all trade in the world.

(11) If OPA price ceilings remain on domestic products, while there are no price ceilings on exports, paid for through Federal loans to foreign governments, the domestic markets will be denuded of already critically short raw materials and finished products, while American taxpayers and domestic consumers pay a subsidy to exporters of American-made goods.

This will cause continued and more vicious inflation—more dollars in circulation, but less goods to be bought and consumed here by American workers and owners.

Prices for exports far above those allowed by OPA for production for domestic use and consumption are already being exposed. Such illicit practices will force out all independent business firms attempting to supply domestic markets. All competitive private enterprise will thus be eliminated—and all at the expense of United States of America taxpayers, workers, and owners.

While talking about and promising an increase in world-wide production and trade under personal freedom and competitive private enterprise, we are being made a part of a world totalitarian economic system.

The very operation of this totalitarian system will mean the loss of our personal freedom and hopeless poverty and serfdom for the vast majority of the American people.

The workers will not be slaves, i. e., not owned as chattels and dealt with as property, but they will be serfs, compelled to render services to others under circumstances over which they as individuals have no control.

Management will be forced to accept such assignments and remuneration as the international bureaucrats deal out to them.

All domestic distribution will be channelized and only that part of the total production the international bureaucrats dictate will be left here to be consumed.

Agriculture will be altered to fit the pattern of the international bureaucrats' edicts on exports and imports.

Private ownership of wealth-producing properties, by the very operation of the system, will be totally destroyed.

Destruction of our traditional American economic system and the consequent permanent low standard of living for all American workers will bring no real benefits to working people in the British Empire or any other place in the world.

"As it is, frontiers are the natural barriers of all nations against having their internal economy interfered with from without—protections as necessary for those in advanced stages of development as for those still existing in relatively primitive conditions. A premature move in the direction of world unification would endanger nations losing such autonomy as now remains to them and the whole world would be dominated by a dictatorship of those who only seek power over the lives and labors of others." (Frederick Soddy, M. A. (Oxon.), L. L. D., F. R. S. Novel Laureate in Chemistry, 1921.)

If Congress enacts Senate Joint Resolution 138, the British gift-loan enabling act, and thereby imposes the Anglo-American Financial and Commercial Agreements and the International Bank and International Fund become operative, our national barriers will thereby be destroyed and other nations will control our internal economy. We will in fact be "dominated by a dictatorship of those who only seek power over the lives and labors of others."

AMERICAN AND EMPIRE SYSTEM OPPOSITE

There are two opposing politico-economic systems in the world. The Republic of the United States was operated under one of those systems. It was unique, most successful, and the only example in the world.

"Production, production, production," is only half of the equation determining well-being: the other half lies in what is being produced, and who may buy, consume, use, and enjoy the fruits of production.

Application of American constitutional principles of government was man's great step forward in his thousands of years' struggle between the new ideals of personal freedom and obliteration of caste distinctions before the law. These ideals arose but yesterday, contrasted with the deep-seated passion for economic power over others which is as old as the human race itself.

Personal economic freedom and its counterpart competitive private enterprise with the full fruits of science, work, and initiative used and enjoyed by the same persons who did the work were the keys to successful operation of the American economic system.

There can be no personal freedom without economic freedom.

Freedom of speech, the press, of conscience, right of assembly, and equality before the law cannot be exercised without economic freedom.

Freedom is individual and indivisible and the natural terms of all human relations are voluntary agreement of individuals. Subterfuge and force are the only other alternatives.

Under the American economic and political system we attained the highest standard of living and well being for the majority ever known in the history of man.

This was accomplished only because those who did the work or out of their savings (private investments) paid for the tools used could buy, use, and consume the full fruits of their own enterprise. In other words, the whole American economic system was operated to produce goods for use and consumption within the United States and by those who did the work.

The British Empire is an example of the opposite system. The caste is privileged by law to exercise economic domination by force.

The very operation of the Empire system made a very low standard of living for the majority and constant economic strife inevitable.

The annual take of the privileged caste in exorbitant taxes plus the heavy charges for interest, shipping, brokerage, insurance, etc., involved in transporting raw materials thousands of miles and a small part of the finished goods back to the colonies and dominions meant that those persons who did the work were denied use and consumption of much of the real fruits of their own work.

Now that the dominions and colonial subjects are out of debt to London, we American workers and taxpayers are being forced to assume the former economic burdens of the British colonial subjects, and besides support the subjects of the French, Italian, and Russian Empires, China, etc.

Within the British colonies and the other empires there is no shortage of natural resources or labor. Intense poverty for the masses is perpetuated because a ruling caste will not allow the natives to meet their own needs by producing and consuming what they need. Raw materials and labor require only a domestically controlled money system to produce and consume the fruits of their own enterprise, if they get rid of the permanent militarism imposed by the caste.

The age of character and the brotherhood of man will be further away if we tolerate peacetime conscription and become part of a totalitarian bloc.

The only solution is for the British and all other empires to correct their own system and not to destroy us.

HOLC's Successful Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of June 4, 1946:

HOLC'S SUCCESSFUL RECORD

About 2 years ago there was a strong campaign by some private lending institutions to induce Congress to force immediate liquidation of HOLC. The private lenders wanted to force the HOLC to sell its best mortgages to private investors, while leaving the bad ones with the Government.

Congress turned back this attack. The Journal at that time strongly supported continuation of the HOLC on the basis that, if

it was allowed to continue to its normal termination, June 3, 1952, it would probably wind up its affairs with no loss to the people of this country. This happy situation is already a foreseen reality.

The HOLC was set up in the darkest depression days to bail out the distressed home owner and investor. It took over, not the choice but the worst mortgages. It was expected then that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation would eventually take a loss of five hundred million to a billion dollars.

In the first few years, this seemed to be coming true. Losses got up to three hundred and thirty-seven million. Then the HOLC began to show earnings. By January 1 of this year the loss on sales of foreclosed properties had been reduced by earnings to only fifty million. Now assets of the HOLC are in such shape that all loss will be wiped out and the HOLC will wind up with all capital returned to the United States Treasury, plus a modest return on the $200,000,000 investment.

This is why backers of the HOLC have fought so hard to keep private attackers from forcing a premature liquidation of HOLC, which would have cost the American taxpayers millions.

The HOLC earned $22,000,000 in 1945, after all costs and charges. By the end of the year all but 368 of 198,168 foreclosed properties had been sold and now only about 100 properties remain in HOLC ownership. HOLC refinanced more than a million distress mortgages in the black years. More than 348,000 borrowers are all paid up, and most of the rest are in good shape.

The HOLC, in its home-saving job, advanced four hundred and sixty-five million for taxes, two hundred and twenty-five million for repairs and reconditioning, eighteen million for delinquent insurance premiums. At its peak, it had administrative expenses of thirty-seven million a year and employed 21,000 persons. Administrative costs are now down to less than six million a year, and still falling; the diminishing pay roll now carries 1,550 persons.

This is indeed an encouraging record among Government agencies, especially those that grew out of the depression.

The Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. ROBERTSON

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, can it be possible at this serious hour in the history of our country that the Government itself has lost its vitality for leadership? Both Houses of the Congress of the United States have given their approval by substantial majorities to the Case bill. It is sound, intelligent, good legislation. It does not discriminate against one group in favor of another.

It is a much-needed and long-delayed piece of legislation and come what will, sooner or later the President will have to sign a bill of this character lest the Government, as such, cease to function and the people of the country fall victim to economic pressure groups. All of the people of the United States have a right to protection by this Congress and this administration.

Under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the New York Times on the Case bill:

THE CASE BILL

The public statement of six Senators, including three Democrats, BYRD, HATCH, and ELLENDER, and three Republicans, BALL, SMITH, and TAFT, in reply to the letter on the Case bill by Philip Murray, contains in its final paragraphs as compact a statement as has been made of the reasons why the President should sign the bill:

"We call attention to a significant omission from Mr. Murray's letter. He does not defend the practices which this bill would prohibit. He does not assert that it is right that unions should practice robbery or extortion by violence in commerce. He does not argue that it is right for unions to paralyze the Nation or a community by pulling the switches and closing down essential utilities without notice.

"He does not argue that it is right that unions should escape responsibility for the acts of their agents. He does not argue that it is right for unions to violate their contracts. He does not argue that it is right for unions to combine with others to fix prices or restrict competition. This, apparently, would be carrying the matter a little too far.

"Yet today every one of these things can be done by a union with complete legal immunity. They could not be done legally if the Case bill were enacted. And Mr. Murray urges that the immunity be perpetuated.

"Finally, it is appropriate to ask what remedy Mr. Murray proposes for the demonstrated evils with which Congress has tried to deal. One may search his letter in vain for any suggestion that any of these problems is any of the public's business. His sole contribution is the request that the Case bill be vetoed, and the unions thereby be left free to pursue in future the course they have in the recent past.

"This attitude of disregard for the public's interest is the most convincing reason why the Case bill should receive Presidential approval."

Are They Leading to Prohibition?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cudahy Enterprise of June 6, 1946:

ARE THEY LEADING TO PROHIBITION?

If the manufacture of beer takes so much grain that America and her allies will starve, then the manufacture of beer should be halted immediately and the grain turned into bread and other necessary items of food.

But that does not seem to be the case.

Beer manufacturers tell us, and they seem to be reliable, that the amount of grain used in beer is so minute that it will not be of any value to the relief of hungry people.

The statements are borne out by local beer distributors who served their Nation very highly during war and would not want to hurt anyone during times of peace. Several of them are daily sending packages to loved ones overseas.

The people of Cudahy and the people of America are hard-working people. Beer to them is not a beverage of intoxication, it is a beverage which is of food value and nourishment after a hard day's work. It is the prescription of many medical men to young mothers who need nourishment for their babies.

If Germany can manufacture beer while she is so short of food and if the British can have their stout and porter, it seems unfair that America be deprived of her beer.

And, if certain authorities are using the hunger of people of foreign soils to bring on prohibition, we want no part of it.

The beer industry and its affiliated manufacturing organizations provide a great share of the employment of the United States. Stopping the production of this beverage will not only lead to unemployment and hard times, but will bring the return of the speakeasy, hijacking, and gang rackets.

So, we urge our national representatives to resurvey the manufacture of beer and, as we said, if it must be stopped to save people from starving, stop it, but if, as it appears, it is merely a means of bringing about unwanted prohibition, let us immediately remove the barriers and allow the amber fluid to flow freely.

In the United States Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, much is being written these days about the situation in the United States today. One of my young friends, Mr. Ben Atkins, of Gastonia, N. C., writes an article each week for the Gastonia Daily Gazette. Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which he wrote for the issue of Saturday, June 8. It is well worth reading. The article is as follows:

I don't suppose there has ever been a time in the history of the United States when we have been more confused than we are today.

That goes for the Government itself as well as for the people at large.

We are afraid of inflation. We are afraid of the forces that are trying to prevent inflation.

We are afraid of Russia. And we are afraid of all the forces, including our own Government, which are trying to browbeat the Soviet into some sort of queer agreement on democracy and spheres of influence which doesn't suit the Russians at all.

It seems that nobody trusts anybody any more, either at home or abroad.

The strikes that we have had and that we continue to have in the United States furnish ample evidence of the distrust that has rooted itself in America.

The aggravating and consistent failure of the Security Council of the United Nations and of the Conference of Foreign Ministers to reach any worth-while agreements is evidence of the suspicion and distrust that apparently overshadow all the best efforts of all of the best minds from around the world to achieve a beginning at understanding.

That's the way it looks today to the casual observer as well as to the hardened student of world affairs.

Even the most optimistic and tolerant of our internationalists are almost ready to admit that we have come up against a stone wall that threatens to wreck all of the ideals and all of the hopes that we nursed so fondly a year ago for a real, a lasting brotherhood of man.

Today, more than ever before, we must realize that patience is of the essence. We must realize that it will take years—not months—that it may take a few scattered wars here and there in various parts of the world—to resolve world opinion and to bring the United States, as well as her allies and her enemies, to their senses.

We are, in many ways, a peculiar people. In war we are fiercely united. We are united to the point of fanaticism. Yet in the middle of a battle we gripe about inconveniences and shortages.

Now that our latest war has been finished, we have permitted ourselves to become the most disunited people on the face of the earth.

Labor is fighting capital. Capital is fighting labor. Races are fighting races.

The manufacturers are cursing the retailers and the retailers are cursing the manufacturers. And the average man in the street is cursing both of them.

We want sugar and butter and meat, we want suits and shirts and shorts and nylons, we want automobiles and refrigerators and all the other gadgets that we used to have, and we want them with the snap of a finger.

We want life to suddenly revert to 1938.

It doesn't happen that way. It can't happen that way. We know it. And yet it makes us mad.

I think our greatest vice is impatience.

Or perhaps our greatest vice is selfishness.

We like to help other people—other nations. We like to help the world at large—and we always do more than our part in that respect.

But if we find that we can't help the rest of the world and still get all the things we want we start raising particular cain about it.

We are consistent in a way—yet we are terribly inconsistent. We want a peaceful world. We want it so badly that we have been willing to fight for it many times.

Yet we want our private lives to go along in an even tenor, with all conveniences and with what luxuries we can afford.

We are just like a bunch of little children. We want to have our cake and eat it, too.

It's time we realized that things don't work out that way. It's time we grew up.

We need understanding now more desperately than we have ever needed it before, either for ourselves or for the world.

God grant that we may achieve it.

B. E. A.

Defeat the British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, during the coming week we Members of the House will be called upon by the administration to approve the British loan for $4,000,000,000.

We will be called upon to lay this additional burden upon the taxpayers of our country to help out England financially during her postwar reconstruction. The action we are to take places a tremendous responsibility upon us. Personally, I feel it my duty to try, as best I can, to protect the interest of the nearly 300,000 people I represent from my district as well as the interest of our entire Nation.

Under our representative form of government, I must cast their vote as to whether they are willing to be taxed to pay their part of this gift-loan. I say gift-loan because none of it will probably ever be paid.

From all the correspondence I have had from my district and from other information I have been able to get I believe that 90 percent of the people I represent prefer that I vote against this loan. In addition to my desire to carry out their wishes from what study I have been able to make on this question, it is my personal opinion that the loan should not be made in its present form.

For the past 14 years our public debt has been mounting until it stands at $275,000,000,000 today. For the past 16 years the administration has failed to balance the Budget. We Members of Congress cannot ignore these danger signals. If the administration continues to pile up the Federal debt, it will bankrupt this Government financially. If this is done, it will not only bring untold suffering upon the American people but the world will lose the stable leadership this Nation is now called upon in contributing its strength toward world peace. I do not want to take this gamble on the future. For this reason I cannot support the British loan.

Mr. Speaker, during the war we gave Great Britain about $25,000,000,000 in lend-lease and this loan wipes out and forgives the payment for our lend-lease extended to that country in the settlement.

In addition to our money, we threw in millions of men and expended billions of dollars to defeat the Axis Powers. Thousands of our men lost their lives on the continent of Europe and many more thousands were wounded. Our national debt today is said to be greater than all of the national debts combined of all the nations of the world. Our influence is needed in an effort to perpetuate world peace and is being fully given.

If we loan England $4,000,000,000 we may have to loan Russia a large amount, and France, China, Greece, Italy, and other countries large amounts possibly totaling $10,000,000,000. If we loan England this money and refuse to loan substantial amounts to other nations we will be charged with playing favorites and probably place our Nation in a most embarrassing position. Obviously, we cannot go all the way through and loan this vast amount of money.

The amount of this loan would pay all the pensions and benefits of every kind for our veterans for the coming year. To get a better idea of how much money this is it would build 1,000,000 homes for our returning soldiers at a cost of $4,400 per home and today there are over a million returning soldiers who would like to buy or build a home if they had the money.

It establishes an interest rate which begins after the first 5 years when no interest will be paid on the loan, of about 1.68 percent. Our cheapest interest rate for returning soldiers is 4 percent. Obviously the rate, even if it cannot be paid, is too low, and the contract in this loan requires that interest be paid only when Britain has a favorable trade balance or is able to pay it.

It would be a gift, because if they could not pay a $4,000,000,000 loan at the end of World War I they cannot pay this loan we are now contemplating. As you know, the last loan was never paid and never will be, for World War I.

I am against the loan because the British Empire has vast resources all over the world in gold, diamonds, rubber, tin, lumber, and copper, all of which the United States could use and the British Empire could spare to pay on this loan.

Let me quote from the testimony of Jesse Jones, former Secretary of Commerce and former Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Mr. Jones has been recognized as the ablest financial leader throughout the Roosevelt administration. He has loaned more money probably than any man in the world.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jones has opposed the loan to Britain from the outset. Last week he testified before the Banking and Currency Committee. Let me quote briefly one of his terse statements:

We cannot stay strong if we continue to print dollars and scatter them to the four winds.

Jones, former head of Government lending agencies, wrote:

I am willing to help Britain to the extent we can afford to help them, but I feel America should demand that Britain put up collateral as security.

We have fought two mean wars at the expense of millions of our best men and most of our stores and twice have saved the British Empire. Now we are called upon, in addition to sacrifices already made, including some $25,000,000,000 of lend-lease labor and materials for which we will get nothing, again to save the Empire.

The administration continues to point out the danger of inflation. The Members of Congress realize the danger of ruinous inflation and are constantly trying to prevent it. Inflation is caused because of more money with which to purchase goods than there are goods to purchase. Certainly if we issue bonds and convert them to dollars and loan Great Britain approximately $4,000,000,000 with the agreement that she will spend the most of it in buying American goods, at this critical period we increase the inflationary pressure by approximately $4,000,000,000.

It has been my contention from the beginning that, through the vast reaches of the British Empire, they can deliver in materials of which we are short in this country a billion dollars' worth of merchandise a year. In return for that merchandise, which we will have to buy anyway, we could trade our American dollars for this merchandise, giving Britain the help of a billion dollars a year in a fair exchange which will give them the assistance they need without adding this cost to the expense of the people of the United States.

Britain has certain strategic islands and bases which we need for the defense of our country in the future which could be given to the United States also in part payment for such a loan. They have billions of collateral in the United States today, at least a part of which could be pledged as collateral against such a loan.

Mr. Speaker, those who argue in favor of the loan say that it will put England

in a position to lower her tariffs, bringing about a free international flow of trade and commerce greatly to the benefit of the United States, that unless this loan is made a trade war will follow. Yet, there is nothing in this agreement with respect to this loan which guarantees that the present preferential trade practices of England and the United Kingdom will be discontinued. When the lend-lease master agreement was made and when the Atlantic Charter was agreed upon between Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt, they agreed, at that time, in definite terms that these trade barriers and preferential agreements would be abandoned.

Now, the administration which urges this loan comes back with the same argument, yet there is no agreement with reference to this loan nearly so strong as the two past agreements and commitments already made. In other words, we are confronted with an economic Munich. We must appease Great Britain if we are not to have economic warfare. We must purchase, at the taxpayers' expense, her fulfillment of the master agreement for settlement of lend-lease aid which was made at the beginning of the war and which was one of the provisions of the Atlantic Charter.

I, for one, do not want to see the American people put in the position of buying fulfillment of Britain's pledge again, especially when we have no assurance that they will be fulfilled.

The agreement on this loan signed by the British and American Governments contains nothing that requires the British to abolish Empire trading preferences. The American negotiators did ask the British to guarantee the abandonment of these restrictions, but they refused.

Mr. Eccles, chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank, brought this out in his testimony before the Senate Committee.

All Great Britain does is to agree to discuss the issue of ending her Empire trade preferences at a later date.

The administration recently loaned France $1,500,000,000. They are loaning China $500,000,000 and through the Export-Import Bank they will be loaning billions of dollars to help other countries in their postwar reconstruction. The end is not in sight. We must call a halt.

For years the substance of the people's money has been wasted on the various other governments of the world. I think we should start, even though it is late, by refusing this loan under present conditions. If we will do this probably something can be worked out that will give the United Kingdom some relief she badly needs without casting too great a burden on the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, may I close by pointing out to the Members of Congress how really bad our financial situation is at the present time.

These figures should cause the Members to stop and seriously ponder the action we are about to take. If you add to the $275,000,000,000 Federal debt all of the public and private debts of the Nation, you will find that the American people owe $441,000,000,000. There are only 435 congressional districts in the United States. That debt load if equally distributed over the districts, would amount to a debt of more than $1,000,000,000 for every congressional district in the United States. That would amount to a $25,000,000,000 debt for Illinois.

Obviously, the wealth of the Nation is not divided according to congressional districts but this illustration, I think, is sufficient evidence that the time has come when every Member of this House should fight against the waste and extravagance and giving away of the people's money. Many of us seek to cut appropriations at every turn of the road. We have tried to reduce the Federal pay roll by a million and a half people in an effort to save $4,000,000,000 a year. Many of us will continue to vote for economy believing that we must reduce the national debt and reduce the burden of taxes on the people if we are to keep this country sound financially.

I hope the Members of the House next week, when the vote comes on the British loan, will have the courage and the wisdom, as I see it, to vote against such loan.

Address of Hon. James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy, at the Three-Hundredth Anniversary of the Incorporation of the Town of Andover, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy, at the three-hundredth anniversary of the incorporation of the town of Andover, Mass., on June 1, 1946:

For Americans a visit to Andover, like a visit to any New England town, is a pilgrimage. Here, under the elms and along the quiet streets, the visitor senses the continuance of changeless values—of self-dependence within the framework of discipline, of frugality of speech and conduct, of the wisdom which caused the founders of Massachusetts and the other New England Colonies to build their communities upon the foundation stones of education and religion.

With those men who settled in these towns three centuries ago, education came high on the list of the necessities of living. It could truly be said that they recognized that men could not live by bread alone. Here in Andover, and its neighbor, Exeter, two devoted scholars founded schools that have had extended influence in American education.

I doubt if New Englanders realize the extent to which the New England spirit pervaded the rest of the country in the nearly three centuries since the founding of Andover. In the last 6 years I have been in most of the States of the Union and I have been struck by the enduring imprint of New England culture, education, faith, and discipline in great areas. In cities and towns, in churches, and schools of Iowa, Illinois, Ohio, and Kansas, there is the easily recognized evidence of the New England tradition carried thither by the migrating families of generations ago, and in the great Northwest you will find towns that will give the traveler from New England a nostalgia for the place of his nativity.

The years are many since a small group of English people established the settlement of Andover. The complexity of society has increased, but the principles upon which they built still remain first principles. By choice and by necessity their problems were handled by themselves. There was no great Federal organization to which they could turn for help or relief. Their houses, their furniture, even largely the clothing they wore had to be fashioned by their own hands. Their schools were the result of individual sacrifice and the faithful service of scholars.

Today we live in a world foreshortened in time and space, in which the pattern of action unfolds at so rapid a tempo as to challenge the capacity of men to meet it. We shall have need in great measure of the undaunted courage and faith with which your forefathers met difficulties or a more limited but fully as demanding character as those we face.

The people of the early Andover days and the people of the Massachusetts Bay colonies in general never avoided responsibility for local problems. That sense of responsibility must be retained if we are as a Nation to avoid bring swept into the abyss of collectivized society. To the degree that the social and economic framework makes possible in each instance, every community must shoulder its share of its own burdens.

The Government of the United States cannot avoid taking Federal action on many problems, and in so doing it makes decisions affecting the lives of millions of our people. But there is no conscious desire to broaden the area of that authority. Whether it widens dangerously or only in response to pressing necessities will depend a great deal on whether your tradition of self-reliance prevails, of not avoiding responsibility, of solving problems at home wherever possible.

There are many links between New England and the Navy. On the banks of the Severn, in another colonial town, hundreds of young men in midshipman uniform pass daily under the statue of a New England historian. In the long and level light of evening one feels that the spirit of George Bancroft looks down upon the visible evidence of his statesmanship and foresight. The lively curiosity of that searching mind created the intellectual foundations for training officers for the modern American Navy just as it laid the foundation in point of fact for the organization of the Department itself.

You are all familiar with the physical birth of the original American Navy, of its evolution in the shipyards of Maine, and its manning by the self-reliant seamen of Boston, Newport, Falmouth, and Salem. There are present links as well. Not the least of these is that between Andover itself and the Naval Academy. Of the six battalion commanders in this year's fourth-year class which will be graduated next Wednesday, two are Andover men—O. S. Hallett, '42, and Richard Duden, '43. Many of you know these young men. It is not inappropriate to enumerate the reasons why they were included among the leaders of the brigade of midshipmen. Selection depends upon ability, leadership, character, and constructive contribution of time and effort to the good of the brigade. Of the nine Andover men now in the senior class at the Academy, none has been in serious scholastic difficulty, and of the 42 Andover men who have entered the Naval Academy in recent years, only one has ever failed.

I should like to close these informal remarks with one brief additional comment on the world of today and of tomorrow. There are two great forces which now challenge the minds of men. One is the force of democracy as we know it: The democracy of liberty, of individual freedom, of equal opportunity, of religious and political tolerance—the goals, in short of the early settlers

of New England. The other is the thesis of total authority in a Central Government, the creation of a monolithic state for solutions to all problems, for the expression and direction of all the hopes and aspirations of men. It cannot be taken for granted that because our system is the best for us, it will necessarily be accepted by the rest of the world. If the Anglo-Saxon concept of democratic government is to hold its present high place in the contemporary and future world, we shall have to make our democracy dynamic. Fortunately, that dynamism will be a benevolent one expressed in terms of help to the distressed millions of many countries. The story of democracy will be heard by people who have the physical strength and the spiritual faith to make them believe that they can successfully govern themselves. A totalitarian state is born in a soil of hunger, anarchy, and of economic chaos.

There is no curtain, either iron or silk, behind which we can shut off the rest of the moving world. If we take the part proportionate to our capacity for help, and if we provide the leadership which the world awaits we may have reasonable hope that the lamps of liberty, of tolerance, and peace may again be lighted throughout the world.

Protestant Protest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. RYTER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. RYTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of June 8, 1946:

PROTESTANT PROTEST

It seems to us that the Protestant clergymen who last Wednesday demanded of President Truman that he recall Mr. Myron C. Taylor from his special mission to the Vatican are agitating themselves quite needlessly. We share fully the devotion of these clerics to constitutional principle of the separation of church and state, but we fail to see that it is in any way violated or in the least endangered by Mr. Taylor's presence at Vatican City.

The fact that the Pope, besides being a territorial sovereign, is the head of a religion claiming numerous adherents throughout the world does not, as far as we can observe, affect the question. No such question, as far as we can recall, was raised about the diplomatic representatives sent by the United States to the Sublime Porte, although the Ottoman Sultans of Turkey were also Caliphs of El Islam. Nor was it ever raised in the case of diplomatic embassies to the court of the Romanov czars, although those monarchs were also heads of the Russian Orthodox Church. The United States also maintains an embassy to the Court of St. James', that is, to the court of the monarch who by virtue of his office and in the name at least is head of the "Church of England by law established." For that matter, the United States maintained a regular diplomatic mission to the Holy See until the dissolution of the Papal States in 1870.

Apart from precedents, the advantages of having a representative at the Vatican are so numerous and so obvious that the objections seem almost frivolous. The United States at this stage of its history is very deeply involved in European affairs, and the papal influence on European politics just has been demonstrated by the results of the recent elections in Italy, France, Holland, Austria, and elsewhere. Moreover, it happens that the United States and the Vatican have a common interest in hastening political and economic stabilization of the Continent.

Great Britain and other nations in which Protestantism, in one or another of its forms, is an established religion, have also found it advantageous to have diplomatic relationship with the Vatican. This was also true of France even when anticlerical influences were ascendant in French politics. Throughout the recent war, of course, the diplomatic missions to the Vatican became of enormous importance to all the anti-Axis powers. Precisely what part was played by the Vatican as intermediary in the negotiations for the Italian surrender has not yet been disclosed, but it is certain that the overthrow of Mussolini and the surrender itself were made easier by the presence of Allied representatives at Vatican City.

Unjust Criticism Strikes at Confidence in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH McKELLAR
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and splendid article published in the Sunday Star of June 9, entitled, "Unjust Criticism Strikes at Confidence in Congress." The article was written by Representative CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. I hope every Senator will read this very fine article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNJUST CRITICISM STRIKES AT CONFIDENCE IN CONGRESS—FLOOD OF UNWARRANTED AND UNSUPPORTED ATTACKS RESENTED BY LEGISLATOR WHO SEES DANGER TO WELFARE OF COUNTRY

(By CLARENCE CANNON, Chairman, House Appropriations Committee)

Wherever dictators and usurpers have climbed to autocratic power in any country their first care has been to strike at the representatives of the people in the legislative branch of the government. Oliver Cromwell, in proroguing the English Parliament, pointed his sword at the mace lying upon the table of the House of Commons and cried, "Take away this bauble." When it was carried out there went with it representative government in all England.

Again, Napoleon, stalking into the French Chamber of Deputies at the head of his grenadiers, cried, "Follow me. I am destiny. I am the divinity of the day." As his bayonets drove out the representatives of the people, some of them climbing through windows to escape, they drove out civil and religious liberty.

From that day until the end of the Napoleonic dynasty, France, and all Europe controlled by France, was without representative government.

Again, so recently, Hitler, endeavoring to seize the reins of government in Germany, as the first step toward world domination, burned down the Reichstag Building, so that Germany's House of Representatives, unable to meet, was scattered in confusion, and before it could reassemble, a large number had been proscribed or were in concentration camps, and free government in Germany had been destroyed, and free government was in peril throughout the world.

PRESSURE GROUPS HIT CONGRESS

Here in America, whenever any man or group of men have sought to establish autocratic control, whether political, economic, or industrial, they have struck, either directly or by innuendo, at the influence of the representatives of the American people in Congress. Of course, the American people have long ago advanced beyond the stage of armed interference with the legislative branch of the Government by military authorities. That would be impossible in America today.

Our state of civilization does not countenance the political prison or the concentration camp. But there are other ways of undermining the standing and influence of the Congress in the regard and confidence of the people, which, whether with or without sinister motives, can be just as effective when carried to their ultimate conclusion.

The Congress has been subject to criticism—as it should be—ever since the establishment of the Republic. One of the most priceless prerogatives of every American is the right to criticize Congress and the Members of Congress, and that right has been widely and fully exercised from the First Congress down to the Seventy-ninth Congress now in session. At times that criticism has been more virulent and more undeserved than at others. And that is as it should be. Better that Congress and Congressmen be unjustly accused on many occasions than that they should escape merited stricture on any single occasion.

FLOOD OF UNWARRANTED ABUSE

But in the last 2 years such a flood of unwarranted and unsupported abuse and castigation has been loosed against Congress and its procedure as has no equal in the annals of congressional condemnation.

Newspaper columnists and radio broadcasters have vied with written and spoken jeremiads delivered before the House to an extent that at times transcend even the bounds of truth and good taste. The abuse of Congress, criticism of the Congress and its membership and its procedure, has been without precedent since the stormy days of the Sixtieth and Sixty-first Congresses when the House rules were a national political issue.

Effort has been made to convince the American people that something is so wrong with congressional procedure that dire disaster menaces the country, its form of government, and its democratic institutions, unless immediate and drastic action is taken to save the Nation and its democratic practices from onrushing ruin and destruction. In order to foster this propaganda a campaign of abuse and disparagement of Congress individually and collectively has been waged.

BITTER SUMMARIZATION CITED

Let me quote from just a few of many such castigations. Here is a summarization of such criticism epitomized by one of the distinguished Members of the other body and published in the Pageant magazine:

"The trouble with Congress is, briefly, Congressmen. Their two main interests have been getting reelected and lining their pockets. Short of everything else they are lazy and overpaid. They have it soft. The lobbyists write our laws, and in a way that is fortunate for Congressmen are numbskulls, they are windbags, obstructionists, and worse. Only a vigilant press deters them from raiding the Treasury."

Here is a quotation from a statement made on the House floor:

"The people think we are a bunch of clowns."

Here is a statement from a national magazine, Life:

"Like the American people they represent, they are indeed often ignorant, provincial, and greedy."

Here is another statement appearing in Reader's Scope:

"Washington's great Capitol dome covers a lot of statesmanship and a lot of skulduggers and bungling inefficiency."

Again, here is an editorial appearing in one of the great newspapers of the Nation:

"Congress is unintelligent, lacks courage, is bogged down in red tape."

You will notice that there is no distinction here between the Congress and its membership. They do not make that statement with reference to some one or two Members of the House. They make the broad statement that the Congress is unintelligent, lacks courage, and is bogged down in red tape. It is in the deadliest form in which it could be put in order to affect the sentiment of the country. There is no differentiation between the institution and its membership.

Our system of procedure is the product of more than a thousand years of legislative experience. Some objection has been made that it is not up to date, that, like a woman's hat or a man's necktie, it ought to change every year. As a matter of fact, parliamentary procedure is based upon fundamental rules of decorum which do not change any more than the fundamental rules of human conduct as set forth in the Ten Commandments change. It has been built up through centuries of experience in various legislative bodies, beginning with the Anglo-Saxon Witenagemot, continuing down through the development of parliamentary government in the Colonial legislatures in this country and under our own system of government for more than 150 years.

The tenor of these statements is that the Government faces a crisis. That the threat is serious, the danger is real, the life of representative government is at stake.

BIAS BY SPEAKER DENIED

Among the statements lacking in accuracy but advanced as a reason for revision of House procedure is the statement that bills are referred to committees in consideration of the attitude of the chairman toward the proposed legislation. The inference is that the Speaker of the House of Representatives will, if he is opposed to a measure, refer it to the committee where the chairman is hostile to that measure, or if he favors it, will refer it to a committee where the chairman is favorable to the legislaion.

Nothing could be further from the facts. Never has the oldest member of the House ever heard, much less known, it to be so much as intimated that the Speaker was governed by his attitude on a bill in its reference to a committee.

Then I think there is no charge that has been made more frequently, and more inaccurately, in an endeavor to secure public approval of some notion that something is seriously wrong with the procedure of the House than the statement that committees have overlapping and duplicating jurisdiction. As a matter of fact, the jurisdiction of the committees of the House is so definitely established and has been for so many years that the question of the reference of a bill never arises on the floor. If a bill should be referred to a committee which does not have jurisdiction, there is every provision for its reference to the committee properly having jurisdiction. If it is a private bill, a point of order can be raised by any member.

JEALOUS OF JURISDICTION

The committees of the House are jealous of their jurisdiction, and if anybody, at any time, by the improper reference of a bill should infringe upon their jurisdiction, that committee would immediately protest. There are other instances of misstatements made in order to inflame the people against Congress and congressional procedure. One such instance, for example, is the statement that 95 percent of the bills passed by Congress are drafted in the departments. Any member of the Committee on Appropriations can testify that no department has ever written any appropriation bill that ever came to the floor.

Another charge which will not bear the test of accuracy is that the men who serve as chairmen of committees have ex officio the power to report legislation or to kill legislation. On the fact of it the charge cannot be sustained. The committee of which I happen to be a member has 45 members and the chairman has 1 vote in the 45 and no more. He cannot report a bill unless a majority of the other 44 members approve and he must report a bill if a majority of the committee directs him to to report it no matter how unalterably opposed he may be to the measure. The myth that the chairman of a committee has any more power than any other member of the committee is another fabrication calculated to disturb the people and shake their confidence in the one institution which is the safeguard of their liberties and the guaranty of their right of free Government.

SENIORITY NOT BINDING

Let me say just a word about the much-mooted question of seniority. The importance of the chairmanships is greatly exaggerated. There may be a little glamour connected with the chairmanships but that is about all. Some chairmen have extra rooms and patronage, but as chairman of one of the House committees I do not have even these modest perquisites. I have no more personal clerks and no more office space than I had before I became chairman, and I pay for all my own stationery.

Furthermore the rule of seniority does not always obtain in the election of a chairman. The rule of seniority is in that respect neither absolute nor invariable. In my own committee there have been notable instances in which the rule of seniority was disregarded.

It is difficult to conceive of anything that would have a more disastrous effect on the work of a committee than a continuous potential rivalry between half a dozen members of the committee as to which of them would be made chairman in the next session, or in event of a sooner change. The entire membership of the committee would be immediately divided into factions. There would be such continuous maneuvering for position and such suspicion of every move by any faction, however inconsequential, as to seriously impede the work of the committee and prejudice its conclusions. No chairman, however qualified, could secure maximum results in such an atmosphere.

On the other hand, the present system of seniority has been in effect so long no one gives any particular attention as to who is presiding, or who will preside in the future. The system is understood and respected. Attention is concentrated on the work of the committee. The difference between the seniority system and any alternative system is the difference between order and chaos.

We are told that the foundations of free government, the preservation of Democracy and the maintenance of American institutions rests on the number of committees. According to newspaper and magazine statements, if the number of committees is reduced the Republic is safe; if the number of committees is not reduced all hope is gone.

Now what would be accomplished by the reduction of the number of committees? Would there be less work? No. Would the reduction of the number of committees reduce the number of men required to do the work of committees? No. The reduction of the number of committees would neither reduce the amount of work nor increase the number of men to do the work. In other words, whether you have 10 committees or a hundred committees, you have the same amount of work and the same number of men to do the work. And you would follow the same system of handling the work.

SUBCOMMITTEES WOULD TAKE OVER

The only difference would be that instead of doing the work in committees, as at present, it would be done by subcommittees made up of the same men. As soon as you combine the 48 committees of the House into 18 committees, you immediately appoint 48 subcommittees.

The important thing is to stop all this by-play and stop alarming the country. If there are minor defects which need adjustment, let us make them—preferably on consideration and recommendation by the committee having jurisdiction—and have the matter over with and stop prejudicing the public against the legislative branch of the Government and against their representatives in the House and Senate.

In 1944 the United States Government collected more money, borrowed more money, spent more money, and created a greater deficit than any government in any country has ever collected, borrowed, spent, or owed in human history. It is a world record.

And in 1945 Congress rescinded more appropriations, reclaimed more money, and made greater reductions in expenditures than was ever effected by any government before in fiscal history. That likewise is a world record.

In all the annals of the past there is no parliamentary body which has borne such heavy responsibilities, administered such vast empires of production and distribution, and discharged its duties so faultlessly as the war Congress of the United States.

The Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS RIZLEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 29, 1946

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has presented for our consideration the so-called Case bill as amended by the Senate. It is regrettable that the other body has delayed the consideration of this bill all of these months, and apparently only the pending threatened disaster to our national economy and even to the Government of the United States, sufficiently jarred the other body and caused them to take action on legislation that we believe would have prevented, had it been the law, the emergency which has now arisen.

These strikes and threatened strikes against the Government of the United States must be stopped. Labor unions must be made responsible for their conduct. As the President said in his emergency message—and he was merely reiterating what Calvin Coolidge and Grover Cleveland had long ago declared—that strikes against the Government of the United States will not be tolerated at any time, or any place, or under any circumstances.

If the President is in good faith in requesting his emergency bill, then certainly he will permit the Case bill to become the law of the land. It is nonsense to say that this bill is "anti-labor," unless it is claimed that labor unions are immune from any legislative control.

Briefly, the bill does about as follows:

First. Sets up a new and badly needed Federal Mediation Board with limited powers;

Second. Outlaws extortion of money from farmers hauling their own produce to market in their own trucks;

Third. Bans exclusive union administration of welfare funds financed by an employer;

Fourth. Exempts supervisory employees from the provisions of the Wagner Act;

Fifth. Authorizes suits for damages against labor unions for violation of protective bargaining contracts;

Sixth. Curbs secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes;

Seventh. Provides penalties for the use of force or violence in labor controversies;

Eighth. Deprives workers of their status as employees under the Wagner Act, if they fail to observe a cooling-off period prior to striking.

While of course this bill does not achieve perfection in the field of labor legislation, it is certainly a long overdue step in the right direction. It leaves much undone, and the light of experience no doubt will show need of change in some of the provisions. It is, however, a beginning on the long overdue task of revising and balancing laws which have been heavily weighted down in favor of labor unions.

The President recognized this need months ago, when he recommended that Congress do something about stabilizing and writing permanent labor legislation overhauling the existing law.

It will be remembered that the President in a subsequent message several weeks ago said that if the Congress did not like his recommendation, to write a law of their own. This the House of Representatives did and passed the Case bill in its original draft and sent it over to the Senate months ago. Of course the President, apparently playing a little politics on Saturday when he requested an emergency legislation, asked that a joint committee be set up to study the question and bring forth some legislation within the next 6 months. Obviously, this recommendation is without merit, because for years at different intervals permanent labor legislation has been studied by the House; the Case bill is the result of years of study; and the Senate has finally acted.

The overwhelming votes by which this legislation has been passed, first in the House by a vote of 230 to 106, and finally in the Senate by a margin of 49 to 29—is indicative that these overwhelming votes are the result of extended consideration of the bill and hearings that have been held in both branches of the Congress from time to time; and a further determination on the part of the Congress based upon the experience of years with the labor abuses which this bill is designed to correct.

The public's safety and the peace and health of the people of the United States are paramount to the whims of either labor or management. The public demands a better deal from the Congress and from the President, than to wait until an emergency is here which threatens the very existence of our Republic and the economy of the country, by then passing emergency legislation.

We must prevent these emergencies from arising, and that is exactly what we propose to do in the Case bill.

I trust that the President will speedily sign the bill, so that it may become the law of the land. The farmers are entitled to be protected against racketeering. The Hobbs bill now a part of the Case bill, will stop racketeering and permit the farmers to deliver their produce in their own trucks in a peaceable way—the American way.

The other provisions of the bill will protect the people of the United States against those unscrupulous so-called labor leaders who have threatened our safety and have even threatened the destruction of our Republican form of government.

Communism In the United States Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles by Mark Foote, from the Bay City (Mich.) Times:

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times of May 28, 1946]

LABOR LEADERS AMONG WHO'S WHO OF UNITED STATES "COMMIES" AND PARTY LEADERS

(This is the eleventh of a series of stories on communism in the United States today, answering the query: Is communism a menace?)

(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON.—Herewith is presented a very limited Who's Who of Communists and Communist fellow workers in the labor-union movement today, particularly the CIO. It includes the names of only a few of those who have worked their way to high official positions in important unions and represent several million workers.

The names of the unions they represent and the positions they hold indicates the far-flung infiltration they have attained. The list could be enlarged almost indefinitely if nonoffice holders in unions were to be included, and space permitted.

The United States Civil Service Commission which tries (unsuccessfully) to keep Communists out of Federal Government service, defines a Communist for its purposes as follows:

"One who has followed the Communist Party line through one or more changes."

Thus the United States Government names as Communists not only the comparatively few who pay party dues and proclaim party membership. It includes also all those who follow the party line.

One of the fellow travelers is Grant Oakes, president of the CIO United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers, who Saturday condemned President Truman's speech before Congress which ended the railroad strike. He charged Truman had betrayed supporters of President Roosevelt, that his speech was a whitewash of the rich and arrogant railroad operators, and that Truman had committed suicide for the Democratic Party.

Here are a few of the out and out Commies:

1. Ben Gold, president of the International Fur and Leather Workers of America, and member of the executive board of CIO. In 1931 Gold was Communist Party candidate for the New York State Assembly from the Bronx; in 1933 for its candidate for aldermanic president; in 1936, again a candidate for the assembly, his union was thrown out of AFL for communistic leanings.

2. Donald Henderson, general president of the United Cannery, Agricultural and Packing and Allied Workers, a CIO union. He has been a publicly avowed and card-holding member for 10 years. Writing in The Communist in September 1935, he spoke of necessity of the Communist Party carrying through its idea of Soviet power.

HELEN KAY

3. Helen Kay, editor of News, official publication of the State, County and Municipal Workers, CIO, since merged in the United Workers Union. Her real name is Kolodny. She has been a Communist Party member for 12 years. In 1933 she was editor of the New Pioneer, Commy Party publication for children.

4. Lewis Merrill (real name Louis Cohen), president of the United Office and Professional Workers of America, CIO. John P. Frey, president of the AFL metal trades department, declared under oath he is a member of the Communist Party in New York.

5. Frederick N. Myers, vice president of the National Maritime Union, cochairman of a committee to honor Georgi Dimitrov, former head of the Communist international, frequent contributor to the New Masses. Signer of United May Day conference promoted by committees.

6. Michael J. Quill, president Transport Workers Union, CIO. John J. Murphy testified under oath before the Un-American Activities Committee of Congress: "I sat in unit 19–S of the Communist Party with Quill." Michael Kelly testified Quill had asked him to join the Communist Party and attend the party's workers school.

7. Harry Sacher, general counsel of the Transport Workers Union of America. Thomas Humphrey O'Shea, former party member, and first president of the Workers Union, identified Sacher as a high trusted insider in party councils.

8. William Sentner, vice president, United Electrical, Radio, and Machinery Workers Union. In an interview in Fortune magazine in November 1943, Sentner said: "When I jointed the Communists I told everybody." He admits he pays party dues and devotes most of his time to getting new members.

9. Seymour Siporin, national legislative director of the United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers of America. In 1939 he was chairman of the Communists Party's May day celebration in Chicago. Has been arrested frequently in connection with Commy riots and demonstrations.

10. Ferdinand C. Smith, also of United Farm Equipment Workers. September 24, 1942, he spoke at a Communist Party second front meeting in New York City. In same year he endorsed Communist candidate for Governor and alderman. He was sponsor of defense of Morris U. Schappes, a Commy teacher ousted from City College, N. Y., and now serving a sentence for perjury.

11. Louise Thompson, in 1940 vice president of International Workers Order, a Communist auxiliary. A Negro, she is a frequent contributor to Commy magazines and speaker at Commy gatherings.

12. Ruth Young, an official of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America which has 600,000 members. She makes no denial of Communist membership.

PARTY LINERS

Here are a few of the party liners:

1. John J. Bernard, organizer of the United Electrical, Radio and Machinery Workers of America.

2. Louis Allen Berne, president, International Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians, CIO. Identified as a Communist by Walter Johnson, former vice president of the federation in two letters dated July 8, and November 6, 1939.

3. Neil Brant, lecturerer at the Commy School for Democracy, arrested for defiling the United States flag.

4. Harry Bridges, president, International Longshoremen & Warehousemen's Union. Declared a Communist by Attorney General Biddle, but Supreme Court absolved him. Always follows commy line.

5. Joseph Curran, president, National Maritime Union, he said in 1943: "Only one member of Congress is labor's Congressman—Vito Marcantonio—a Communist."

6. Abraham Flaxer, President of United Government Workers.

7. Eleanor Fowler, secretary-treasurer, CIO Women's Auxiliary.

8. Frank R. McGrath, president, United Shoe Workers and member of the executive committee of CIO, the body's highest governing body.

9. Lew W. Michener, west coast director, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers Union, CIO.

10. Saul Mills, secretary-treasurer, Greater New York Industrial Union Council.

11. Morris Muster, president United Furniture Workers of America of 46,000 workers.

12. Eleanor Nelson, United Federal Workers of America.

13. Lee Pressman, general counsel of CIO-PAC, and also of CIO.

14. Reid Robinson, president, Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers Union, CIO.

15. Joseph P. Selly, internation president, American Communications Association.

All names are taken from sworn and documented evidence of Committee on un-American activities.

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times of May 29, 1946]

HIGHLY CONSERVATIVE ORGANIZATIONS DOMINATED BY FELLOW TRAVELERS

(This is the twelfth of a series of stories on communism in the United States today, answering the query: Is communism a menace?)

(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON.—It is amazing how highly conservative organizations, groups, and individuals allow themselves to be associated with or dominated by members of the Communist Party and fellow travelers. In some cases important people permit use of their names by an organization with an altruistic purpose and afterward regret it.

In other instances they are less innocent than gullible. They think their own conservative liberalism will compensate for the suspected or known subversive character of their associates. Politicians notoriously accept the support of any voter group or even individuals with whom they would not otherwise be associated.

Take, for instance, the recently organized Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, the left-wing organization, of which Harold L. Ickes, former Secretary of the Interior, is director, at the reported salary of $40,000 a year, and James Roosevelt, son of former President Roosevelt, is political director at $25,000 salary.

No one would accuse either Ickes or Roosevelt of being a Communist. But the fact is the American Communist Party has strongly infiltrated and is working strenuously to dominate the organization. According to information in Government files, the Communists are taking credit for organizing the committee and have placed active members in key positions.

The forerunner of the present committee was the Independent Voters' Committee of the Arts and Sciences for Roosevelt, organized in August 1944 by Jo Davidson, the sculptor, and a few associates to work for reelection of Roosevelt.

That group was serving a perfectly normal political purpose. It operated only in New York and held two rallies in Madison Square Garden, one of which was addressed by Bette Davis, the motion-picture actress, and the other by Secretary of Commerce Wallace.

Following the election, according to official information, plans for the reorganization of the group under its present name were made at Communist headquarters in New York. Among the sponsors, again headed by Jo Davidson, were Louis Adamic, James Cagney, Bartley Crum, Howard Fast, William S. Gailmore, Lillian Hellman, Langston Hughes, Canada Lee, Paul Robeson, and Edward G. Robinson.

While there is no conclusive evidence that these sponsors were Communists, their close affiliation with Communist front organizations had been established to the satisfaction of Government investigators.

The Daily Worker, organ of the Communist Party, published the organization of the committee. On December 24, 1944, it said: "It is good and important news" that the committee had been formed. On January 17, 1945, articles of incorporation were filed in Albany, signed by Jo Davidson and Frederick March. March sponsored the council of American-Soviet friendship, and was identified by a communist appearing before the Tenny fact-finding committee of the State of California, as a member of the party.

Later the New York Communist Party took credit for organization of the committee. In August 1945 Jane Hoffman, head of the cultural section of the party, stated: "The comrades of the cultural section have helped to organize and build a vitally important mass organization; one which you all know as communists, the independent citizens committee of the art, sciences, and professions."

At the same convention, Benjamin Davis, a Negro member of the party, discussing accomplishments of members recommended for the party's State committee, singled out Lionel Berman, who was slated to head the cultural section. An early press agent of the committee at a salary of $10,000 was Roy Torr, former member of the staff of the Daily Worker.

Ickes' predecessor in the post of executive director was Hannah Dorner, former press agent for the council of American-Soviet friendship. The committee has branches in Hollywood, Los Angeles, Chicago, Washington, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Greenwich-Stamford, Conn. The Hollywood branch is said to be Communist dominated. The paid Secretary of the Chicago branch, June Blythe, has a long Communist record, according to Government reports.

In late April of this year the Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts Sciences and Professions join with New Dealers, left-wingers, and some very conservative organizations and individuals in giving a $12.50-a-plate dinner in honor of Trygve Lie, secretary-general of the Security Council of the United Nations, at the Hotel Astor in New York.

Lie had jused "ruled"—to the surprise of all delegates except those of Russia and Poland—that the Iranian disput might not be legally kept on the Council agenda after Stalin sent word he would withdraw Soviet troops.

On the executive committee sponsoring the dinner were: Bartley Crum, who was chairman last year of a Red rally in Madison Square Garden, at which Harold Laski, British labor leader attacked the Vatican. Howard Fast, one of the editors of the New Masses, official Communist Party magazine; Langston Hughes, Communist poet whose poems in Communist publications have mocked the divinity of Christ and upheld revolution by force and violence.

Some very different organizations were included among the sponsors, for instance, the American Bar Association and YMCA. But also there was the National Lawyers' Guild, many times accused of Red leanings. A. A. Berle, Jr., former Assistant Secretary of State, and Robert H. Jackson, former Attorney General, both denounced it as a Communist organization.

The New Leader, Socialist Party organ (but anti-Communist) said in its issue of April 22, 1946:

"Mr. Ickes and James Roosevelt have a right as paid officials of the ICASP to demand a thorough housecleaning of those elements whose names have appeared on every communistic front of the past decade."

The New Leader continues: "Paul Robeson's role as a Communist is now widely known, and his name as a sponsor is no surprise; neither is the name of Frank Sinatra—consider the bobby soxers' interest in the American Youth for Democracy, successor to the Young Communist League.

"Messrs. Ickes and Roosevelt may argue that the Communists are in a minority in their organizations and cannot influence policy. But we might ask: 'Why did the ICASP back Johannes Steel, an ex-Nazi radio commentator recently exposed by the New Leader as the American Labor party candidate for Congress in New York City?'"

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times of May 30, 1946]

COMMUNISTS TOOK RADICAL MANTLE WHEN SOCIALISTS FINISHED WITH IT

This is the thirteenth of a series of stories on communism in the United States today, answering the query: Is communism a menace?

(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON.—The United States never had a political party which openly advocated overthrow of the Government by force to accomplish its ends, except the Communist Party and the Socialist Party in its early days. The latter has long since abandoned the advocacy of violence.

The Communist Party could be, and to some extent is today, a menace to our traditional two-party system of government. As it gains strength by infiltration into other minor parties, its support becomes important, and is eagerly sought. This is the situation in New York State where the Communist-dominated American Labor Party admittedly holds the balance of power in Presidential and gubernatorial elections, as also in mayoral elections in New York City.

Ever since its organization in 1936, the American Labor Party has polled upwards of 400,000 votes in State-wide elections in New York, except in 1942. It furnished the margin to defeat Thomas E. Dewey for Governor in 1938, by endorsing the Democratic candidate. It duplicated the feat in 1940 and 1944 by throwing its following to Franklin Roosevelt against the Republican nominee.

In 1944 tht American Labor Party polled 496,000 votes in New York State, while the Liberty Party which split off from ALP, because it would not stand for Communist infiltration, polled 330,000.

Sidney Hillman, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union and David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers were the leading spirits in forming the American Labor Party in 1936. It was formed out of trade unions (250), Old Guard Socialists and labor's Non-Partisan League.

SPLIT EXPLAINED

The split between Hillman and Dubinsky over communism is told by Prof. Hugh A. Bone, in an article in the April number of the American Political Science Review:

"Hillman made the alliance with the Communists who were eager to control the American Labor Party," says Bone. "Hillman, supported by the CIO industrial union council, proposed to 'root' the party in trade unionism by welcoming the Communist unions en bloc and inviting them into their councils.

"The right wing under Dubinsky feared this plan would close the door to sympathetic middle-class progressives, and insisted that only non-Communist groups and unions be admitted, but his pleas were unavailing. The left wing won decisively in the ensuing primary."

After futile efforts to heal the breach the right wing at an organization convention in May, launched a new party under the name, "Liberal," and proceeded to nominate Roosevelt and Wallace.

To stave off Communist infiltration, a special bylaw refused membership to any person who advocates, supports, follows, adheres to, or espouses any totalitarian doctrines, philosophy, or activity, whether Fascist, Nazi, Communist, or known by any other name.

A statement was issued March 29, 1944, by 200 liberal and labor representatives, under the heading:

"BROWDER INFLUENCE

"The primary returns leave no doubt that Earl Browder (then the Communist Party leader) has captured the ALP."

The statement continued:

"The overwhelming Communist-dominated new State committee (of the ALP) undoubtedly will also attempt to nominate non-Communists on its executive committee in order to present an innocent facade to the public and thereby to expand its insidious influence. Liberals and progressives will be wary of such a trap and its consequences. Under no circumstances will true liberals serve as a front for a band of masked Communists and their fellow travelers."

This statement was signed by Dean Alrange, who made a very credible race for governor on the ALP ticket in 1942, and by the former State chairman, secretary and treasurer of the ALP.

Hillman, although denying that he is a Communist and saying the charge is merely a smoke screen, is doing nationally in the CIO Political Action Committee what he is doing locally in New York.

As the Communist Party gains momentum in the great industrial centers, as it is today, and as it infiltrates parties like the ALP or one of the major parties, it may some day hold the balance of power in a Presidential election.

Editorial Research Reports, a nonpartisan research organization, made a study of the elections of 1912 and 1916 which is revealing as to future possibilities. Discussing the 1912 election, it said:

"The only Presidential election in which the Socialist Party (the Communist Party was not then in existence) has received more than 5 percent of the total vote was the three-cornered contest of 1912 in which Eugene V. Debs polled 6 percent of the total. There were 15 States in which the Socialist vote was larger in that year than the plurality for the candidate who won the electoral vote of the State.

"The total electoral vote of these States was 77, sufficient to control any close election. The point is, not that a Socialist could have been elected, but that the Socialist vote might have swung the election to either of the two major parties.

"RADICAL REINS CHANGE

"The Presidential election of 1916 was the most evenly contested since 1876. It resulted in 277 votes for Woodrow Wilson and 254 for Charles Evans Hughes—a majority of 23. The Socialist vote, although amounting to only slightly more than 3 percent of the total, was greater than the plurality for Wilson in three States, with a total of 24 electoral votes, and that for the plurality for Hughes in four States, with a total of 40 electoral votes.

States carried by Wilson in 1916: California—winner's plurality 3,866, Socialist vote 43,250, electoral vote 13. New Hampshire—winner's plurality 56, Socialist vote 1,311, electoral vote 4. Washington—winner's plurality 16,144, Socialist vote 22,800, electoral vote 7.

States carried by Hughes in 1916: Indiana—winner's plurality 6,942, Socialist vote 21,855, electoral vote 15. Minnesota—winner's plurality 3,392, Socialist vote 20,117, electoral vote 12. Oregon—winner's plurality 6,726, Socialist vote 9,711, electoral vote 5. West Virginia—winner's plurality 2,721, Socialist vote 6,140, electoral vote 7.

The Communist Party since the Red revolution in Russia in 1917 has succeeded the Socialist Party as the organization supporting pure Marxism and appealing to the radical elements. In 1938 a referendum of the Socialist Party voted to omit belief in the class struggle as one of the requirements for membership.

Change in the Socialist Party leadership is shown by the contrast between Debs, its former leader, and Norman Thomas, its present leader. Debs was a workingman who had little formal education, who served two jail sentences for violation of Federal law, and was prone to urge his followers to use force.

Thomas comes from a family of clergymen, was an honor graduate at Princeton, receiving an honorary degree from that institution in 1932, and was for a time a Presbyterian minister.

It is not the Socialist Party which today gets the votes or yields the power. It is the Communists who follow the Marxian theories, rather than the "revisionists" who are the danger.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include several clippings from the St. Louis Star-Times.

Here is some private power sabotage against the people's efforts to electrify rural America.

This is further evidence that there should be an investigation without delay of the activities of the power companies and power lobby. An investigation now will show even more skulduggery than did the fruitful Walsh investigation:

U. E. PROFITS IN CITY DISSIPATED OUTSIDE, REA OFFICIAL HINTS—SKIPPING AROUND TO SKIM CREAM APPEARS TO PREVENT ORDERLY DEVELOPING OF FARMERS' OWN POWER PROGRAM, W. J. NEAL ASSERTS

(By Harry D. Wohl)

WASHINGTON, May 22.—A survey of St. Louis County last August disclosed that 1,199 rural families in a territory criss-crossed by the lines of the Union Electric Co. of Missouri were without electric service, the Star-Times was informed today.

Charles W. Bradley, right-of-way supervisor for the Crawford Electric Cooperative of Bourbon, Mo., said the survey was made to determine if the cooperative could give families pocketed among the Union Electric lines the electricity for which at least 200 were asking.

Except for a few cases, this was found to be impossible.

"NOT MY TERRITORY"

Allen M. Pritchett, manager of the cooperative, said he asked a Union Electric representative in Franklin County why the company was not going in to serve these St. Louis County "pockets" instead of, as Pritchett alleged, "erecting spite lines in Jefferson and Franklin Counties to hinder the cooperative's program." The representative told him, Pritchett said, "St. Louis County is out of my territory."

Commenting today on alleged construction spurts by Union Electric and other private utilities into "cream" sections of cooperative systems in Missouri and throughout the Nation, William J. Neal, Acting Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration in the absence of Administrator Claude Wickard, told the Star-Times:

"The purpose of such activities appears to be to prevent the orderly development of the farmers' own electrification program."

REPLY BY NEAL

About a statement by Pritchett that Union Electric was offering farmers a 60-cent monthly minimum for 10 kilowatt-hours, Neal remarked:

"If it is true that Union Electric is offering rural service at a 60-cent monthly minimum, little higher than in densely populated St. Louis, it would appear that profits being made in the city are being dissipated in the country. Such low-minimum bills in thinly settled rural areas in comparison with charges in St. Louis make this appear to be discrimination of a type which should be investigated." (Union Electric's minimum St. Louis bill is 50 cents a month, which includes 10 kilowatt-hours of service, except in the case of former Laclede customers, who get 11 kilowatt-hours for 50 cents.)

The cooperative charges a minimum of $2.75 a month wherever the consumer is located. Union Electric's 60-cent rate, it was said, applies only where the consumer is 600 feet or less from a road along which a line runs. Beyond that distance, the minimum goes up.

Bradley said he and an REA representative made the St. Louis County study.

"U. E. LINES EVERYWHERE"

"We started at the Missouri River on the north and rode all the roads south, and then east and west," Bradley narrated. "We didn't go into the St. Louis suburban areas. The Union Electric lines were everywhere. We mapped the network and found at least 100 pockets of 5 to 25 homes completely surrounded by power lines. Although these homes never were more than a mile from the power lines, except in a few instances, they didn't have electricity.

"At West Lake Park, a community along Natural Bridge Road and Highway 40, we found five families within a quarter of a mile of two power lines. They told me they didn't have electric service because the company wanted them to sign 3-year contracts with a minimum of $8 a month—more than they could afford."

When the survey began, Bradley continued, the possibility of starting another cooperative in St. Louis and Jefferson Counties had been considered. However, surveyors found that the territory was "cut up so bad and homes were so isolated, we couldn't build lines to them and we couldn't get rights-of-way." The St. Louis County cooperative idea was dropped.

In a small district east of Pacific, close to the Franklin County line between highways 50 and 66, they found about 100 unserviced families, Bradley said. He called a meeting at the home of Otto Clagmann in Pacific about August 15, he related, and signed up a dozen families for the Crawford cooperative service.

U. E. MOVES IN

Two or three weeks later, he stated Union Electric was in there building a 3-mile north-and south line along Fox Creek Road, which gave service to a few of the families, gave none to those east and west of the line, and made it more difficult for the cooperative to attempt to reach those ignored.

Ten or twelve of the families will be serviced by the cooperative, which now has a line about 2 miles from the St. Louis County border.

"Wherever I show activity," Bradley complained, "so does Union Electric. I have a pick-up truck with my name on it. When my truck is in an area, the company soon follows. It solicitors tell the people the company will come in immediately and give cheaper service. Trucks drop poles along the road. Holes are dug. But as soon as I leave, the company activity stops.

"If I hold a meeting to sign up farmers, the company comes right after me. Its agents tell the people we'll forget them or that they have bought us out in that neighborhood.

ACTIVITY CHANGES

"We're cutting brush in preparation for a main line from a point a few miles south of St. Clair in Franklin County to the neighborhood of DeSoto in Jefferson County. Along that route, Union Electric has had seven or eight solicitors busy. If we change our direction of work, the whole company activity moves with us.

"At one place," Bradley went on, "the company came in where we had all the people signed up. They promised three or four families they would build to them immediately. Those families jumped at the chance to get service after all these years. Well, no farmer wants two power lines going across his lands, so we lost our rights-of-way. Because of Union Electric's action, we had to build our line 2 miles across a bad range of hills, increasing our work costs."

Bradley lives near Catawissa, Franklin County. One mile to the north, 1½ to the west, 2 to the south, and 2 to the east of his 178-acre farm, he declared, run the lines of Union Electric, yet he never could have got electricity, he declared, until REA came along. He thought so much of its program he went into it himself. He wanted to see a job done in the rural areas, he said. It was a big one, with plenty of work for the utilities as well as the cooperatives. That's why, he said, he couldn't understand competition which came in to take the cream and leave the stragglers for a cooperative to pick up at high cost.

COULD ENDANGER PROGRAM

Tactics such as have been reported from Missouri, Neal said, could endanger not only the future progress but the present success of the REA program.

So far, Neal stated, no cooperative has gone broke, and it has been necessary to foreclose on only one borrower—a private utility.

Forty-two REA-financed cooperatives in Missouri serve more than 80,000 families. Up to February 28, allocations to the Missouri cooperatives exceeded $38,000,000 and loans, $27,500,000.

Throughout the country, 1,436,000 families have been given electricity by REA in 10 years. Loans of about $700,000,000 have been made to 853 cooperatives and 58 power districts and municipalities.

They have built 450,000 miles of lines.

Farming in 1935, REA said, was largely muscle work, and living was pretty drab. Hours were consumed pumping water and carrying it to livestock and fowl. Sharpening a tool, shelling corn, pitching hay, washing, ironing, sewing, grinding feed, and many other tasks made life a drudgery.

FOOD WASTED

The overworked farm wife saw food waste for lack of refrigeration, wilted over a hot, wood-burning stove. Her husband often finished his chores in darkness in the barnyard.

The farmer dwelt in a coal-oil world, where man lived by the sweat of his brow, and the kind of living city folks enjoyed was a vague dream.

The farm people, statisticians said, aged faster than they should. The young people left the farm. Schools were badly illuminated. The small lightless communities lacked recreational and cultural advantages—even movies and job opportunities were nonexistent, because industry needed power.

"Before 1935," an REA spokesman said, "not many people were greatly concerned whether the farmer ever got liberation from the slavery imposed by hand power and the kerosene lamp. The farmer couldn't get electricity which in a few minutes or a few seconds would perform the back-breaking tasks. If he wanted it, he would have to plank down sums ranging to $3,000 a mile to pay power companies for construction. There were cases where electricity cost as much as 25 cents a killowatt-hour."

AT A STANDSTILL

"Little more than 3 percent of the farms were getting central-station service by 1925. By 1931 perhaps 10 percent had it. For the next 4 years rural electrification was practically at a standstill."

The bottleneck was broken in 1935 when an Executive order created the Rural Electrification Administration. Congress passed the Rural Electrification Act in 1936, which authorized REA to lend funds at low interest over an extended period to cooperatives, public utility districts, municipalities, or private companies to finance the construction and operation of power lines and plants for rural power. The act also authorized loans for the wiring of rural establishments and the purchase of appliances by those receiving service.

Whereas only 11 percent of the farms had electricity in 1935, more than 30 percent had it by 1940. By 1945, about 3,000,000 farms, approximately half of the Nation's estimated 6,000,000, had realized "the vague dream."

This American Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made at a banquet held in Boston, May 27, 1946, conducted by the Massachusetts Committee of Catholic, Protestants, and Jews by Gen. Carl Spaatz, Commanding General, United States Army Air Forces, This American Idea:

Mr. Toastmaster, you have chosen to honor me tonight by naming me a good American. An American soldier could ask no greater distinction. My hope is to merit it, and to cherish your thought, always.

Also as a soldier, and from my heart, I want to share in your tribute to the fallen, to those who didn't come back. They died as Americans. Every American killed in battle means one free man less, regardless of whether he was a Catholic, a Protestant, or a Jew. As Americans shall they be remembered. The enemy flak knew no creed.

The aim of your committee is to practice in daily life the political faith which unites religious faiths under its banner, and makes Americans of us all.

Our political precept is that the government exists for the people, not people for the government. In that unifying creed each individual has a validity, a dignity, and identity of his own, with a right to his own soul.

That is the American idea in peace, a Nation of individuals who respect the individuality of other citizens, and who preserve their free system through voluntary cooperation in self-government.

That is the battle cry of America at war, of free individuals alert to their own peril at times when individuals in other lands beome enslaved to states. Only the strong can remain free.

I. THE UNITED STATES ARMY

Respect for the individual is carried over into the Army. The soldiers represent a cross section of our people. They are, in fact, the people. That gives the peculiar character to a democratic citizens' Army, the soldiers are front-line citizens, entitled to all the things available to civilians.

General Marshall, at the time of the passage of the Selective Service Act, wrote to field commanders:

"The men selected for service, together with those now enlisting, are representative of the citizen-soldier who has always defended our Nation in the past. These men come from all walks of life, with widely varying degrees of education, intelligence, and native ability. They differ in racial characteristics, religion, philosophy, social training, physical development, and material wealth. It will tax the skill and wisdom of leaders of all ranks to mold these citizen soldiers into a unified Army prepared to accept cheerfully * * * the hardships of service in the field. * * *

"There must be no pampering of individuals, no distinctions between men because of their previous military experience or conditions of entry into the service. In a spirit of mutual respect and cooperation, the Army of the United States must now proceed with its high purpose of welding from the elements of the American democracy, a disciplined, seasoned fighting force capable of defending the Nation."

The citizens' army of such diverse elements was unified into a team and galvanized into an implacable will to victory. Along with other armed services, it carried the battle to the enemy in distant fields and seas, remote from our own shores. It added new brilliance to the annals of democracy at war, and proved once more that individuals die in fighting but nations only die in yielding.

We of the Air Force were aware of the special qualities of young America at war. We had air equipment that required individual initiative, skill, and nerve endurance to a degree never known before in war. Our pilots, air crews, and ground crews were equal to their weapons. They were aggressive. They were self-reliant. And they never let up until they had blown the enemy from the skies over Germany and Japan, and, by strategic destruction of war potentials and transport, prepared the way for the surface forces and total victory.

In many ways democracy is costly and inefficient. But we know there is something more precious than efficiency. Perhaps we fought for the right to be inefficient in our own way. In one important particular democratic government is the best ever known, and that is in producing men who can fight. Less depends on the size of the dog in the fight than on the size of the fight in the dog. Our soldiers don't have to be told why they are fighting. They have in their blood—the American idea.

Because of the independence of thought of our young men we were able to develop the best fighters in the world, who went against the impossible and conquered it. The Germans were good; they were not good enough for our fighters. Our boys, without war experience, went up against them, and right

from the start met them on even terms. At first they knocked the Germans down 1 for 2, then 2 for 1, and eventually 10 for 1, because they were better. They were better because of the form of government under which they grew to manhood.

Our air casualties overseas were about 122,000. By these losses we saved millions of other lives. For instance, the Japanese were prepared to hold out for months in the caves of Kiushu. If we had been compelled to invade Japan, our losses might have reached half a million. The Air forced the surrender, while there were still 4,000,000 Japanese under arms. Our Nation owes a debt of gratitude to these youngsters, many of whom never can come back.

II. AMERICAN OPTIMISM

Now, America stands for many things, good and bad. There is one word, however, which colors our whole life, which makes us somewhat peculiar among nations. That word is optimism. American optimism is not always justified, as for instance that easy-going optimism about our defenses before Pearl Harbor. But, despite such bad moments in our history, we have a good record for achievement through inspired optimism. And we can continue to be optimistic provided we understand how and why we got that way.

The first thing to remember is that older nations are bound together by common traditions. America, without long traditions, and having been founded and developed by immigrants, America is bound together by a common faith in the future. Faith in the future distinguishes America, and is the basis of our optimism.

Second, our natural abundance, in a condition of vigorous climate, made possible the development of mass production and technical experimentation on a continental scale. These elements were the foundation of the vast arsenal in World War II, which astonished our enemies as well as ourselves, and saved the cause of the United Nations.

For nearly 300 years America had an internal frontier. The habits of thought, the self-reliance and initiative of the frontier, dominated our national growth. We are still frontiersmen in the sense that we are confident we can do the job, whatever it is, if we are not hampered by man-made restrictions. That may be part of our trouble now, that we cling to frontier methods even when attempting to solve problems rooted in the historic soil of the older continents of Europe and Asia. In any case, abundance on the frontier, free land, and free life, have made the American character rugged, fearless, and optimistic, even when pessimism may be more in order.

A third element in our optimism is the fact that we are a racial mixture. The American Revolution began with an appeal to the rights of Englishmen; it soon shifted to an appeal to the rights of man. That changed the whole temper of the cause. America became the refuge for the political and religious oppressed of other lands.

Emigration to America was the greatest transplanting of peoples in all history. Between 1820 and 1940 a total of 38,000,000 immigrants were admitted. A large part of these people arrived here ready to go to work, with their training paid for elsewhere. They brought their skill and their education; they helped to build America.

These diverse racial origins of the American people had a strong influence on American foreign policy. We could not be intolerant of any one racial group, as that would be intolerance of ourselves. It is interesting to note, however, that hyphenized citizenship (e. g., German-American), which was still a problem in World War I had almost completely disappeared before World War II.

During this last war we had an abundance of officers and men who spoke foreign languages. Wherever our armed forces went, there were interpreters in American uniform, no matter what the language or dialect of the world, whether Eskimo, or Arab, or Mongol, or any other.

There is emerging a new type among peoples of the world—the American personality which is a racial cocktail. You can tell an American abroad by the way he walks.

That, too, is a source of optimism; America absorbs all strains to make a richer blood.

And then the fourth element in our optimism is the American idea: the goal of a land giving equal opportunity to all, a fluid society without class distinctions, and a faith in the common man as the foundation of freedom.

This idea is the emotion common to all Americans who preserve the concept which inspired America's fight for freedom. It would not be true to say the goals have been fully attained. Nor has advance toward the goals been even throughout our history. There have been some retreats, as, for instance, between the Civil War and the end of the nineteenth century. But it is faith in the idea and persistent effort toward fulfillment which distinguishes America among nations. That, too, is a source of optimism.

III. CONCLUSION

In conclusion we might say that your committee is dedicated to preservation of the American idea and the advancement of the sublime belief that America really can become a land of equal opportunity without class distinctions as the foundation of freedom for the common man.

We are confident that political democracy is the only form of government or people who know the meaning of freedom. We know that whatever men may feel compelled to do in order to gain temporary security they will always revert to the age-old quest for freedom. We in America have attained a large measure of freedom; we intend to defend it.

Also we are confident that we have the means and the will to do so. Political democracy was founded on two previous enlargements of opportunity: First, the discovery of America; and second, the industrial revolution.

We believe that a third enlargement of opportunity is at hand through air power and atomic energy. These make a new dispensation. We must understand their social implications. We must go forward with the American idea, unaltered in principle, but adapted to the technical age.

To do so we must remember there is a responsibility as well as a privilege in the enjoyment of freedom. That responsibility was expressed nowhere so well as by Thomas Jefferson, writing from Monticello to Edward Rutledge, December 27, 1796:

"There is a debt of service due from every man to his country proportioned to the bounties which nature and fortune have measured to him."

To return to society what we take out is the essence of the American idea. If we can continue to do so on a voluntary basis, we shall continue to be Americans. And America will continue to be free. That is the goal of your committee. It is the hope of America.

Keep On Keeping On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem by Horace C. Carlisle, entitled "Keep On Keeping On."

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEP ON KEEPING ON

Keep on keeping on until all hope is gone,
Then keep keeping on—perseverance
Is always the price, born of real sacrifice,
That laughs to scorn all interference—
"The race," though no gift yet, "is not to the swift,"
Yea, "nor to the strong is the battle"—
Peace cannot be won, unless "Thy will be done"
Be prayed, ere atomic bombs rattle.

Keep on keeping on with your face to the dawn—
No night can continue forever—
The sun will arise, and the stars in the skies,
Ashamed of their feeble endeavor,
Will all cease to shine when, just over the line
Of Nature's far eastern horizon,
They see the bright face of the searchlight of space,
Whose light they close their blinded eyes on.

Keep on keeping on, though the light be withdrawn,
Of sun, moon, and stars, high above you,
Behind the dark shrouds of the blackening clouds—
Since God still continues to love you,
He'll drive them away, when the great Perfect Day
Dawns on you, in all of its beauty,
And you, from the sod, hear the angels of God
Sing, "Come on home, you've done your duty."

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Terminal Leave Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the bill to give enlisted men in the armed forces the same terminal leave pay as is given officers. I can see no reason or justification in the Army's point of view that an officer is entitled to more consideration than an enlisted man. They are all American citizens with equal status in the eyes of the law. The differences in their military abilities and training are compensated for by the difference in the pay of the several ranks—that is not questioned here—the problem we face now is a matter of principle. Frequently you will find brothers born of the same mother and father who are one an officer the other an enlisted man. I even know of one instance where the son was an officer and the father, without military training and too old under Army regulations to secure a commission, volunteered as an enlisted man and served throughout the war as an enlisted man. This man was over draft age but he was fired with a patriotic zeal to get in there and do his bit. Do not you think he was entitled to as

much consideration as his son? I do. He thinks so, too, and so does his son.

Much has been said about the cost of this legislation. I understand that it is estimated to cost between two and three billion dollars. Well, what of it? No one said anything about cost when there was fighting and dying to be done. These enlisted men were great heroes in those days, and while many of you are prone to forget, now that the shooting has stopped, I want you to know that they are still heroes to me. The best was none too good for them then, and it is still none too good for them today.

I know something about war. I served during World War I and fought on foreign soil. I was overseas more than a year. I returned to a booming America, but I was months getting readjusted to peacetime pursuits and finding a job. My son, an enlisted man in the Navy, has just been discharged after some 2½ years of service, of which more than a year was with submarines in the South Pacific. He did not have any leave during those months at sea, and he could not even go to town for the weekend. The same happened to thousands, yes, even millions of other American boys. They were on the battle fronts. They could not take the leave, so it piled up to their credit. It was credited to them, so it is theirs. They are entitled to it and should be paid for it.

We are spending billions on ungrateful foreigners. Why not do something for our boys at home? They did the fighting. They won the war. Let us show our gratitude and pay the enlisted man the same as we pay the officers.

Mr. Speaker, I favor and urge the passage of this most meritorious bill, H. R. 4051, to grant to enlisted personnel of the armed forces certain benefits in lieu of accumulated leave.

Federal Court of Labor-Management Appeals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the relations between employer and employee, I am including herewith a communication from a constituent together with a plan for a proposed court of labor relations, which I am referring to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Congressman ALVIN W. WEICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: In view of the indisputable fact that during the last few months, this Nation has been at frequent times partially or entirely paralyzed by strikes of one group or another, which have brought our economic reconstruction to a virtual standstill, it seems to me imperative that measures must immediately be taken to give the public at large the future protection it so undeniably deserves, under this the last truly democratic government in the world.

Labor has gained the collective-bargaining power it sorely needed the several decades past, to equalize against the dollar power of rich industry. Management has always had the right to decline the demands of labor, but both parties have been guilty of indifference toward the interests of the in-between people of the Nation who have never had adequate Government protection from the damage which falls upon them when they are denied the products or service of labor and industry while those two minorities are in contest to gain their differences.

I am a private citizen, and, as every other American, I am interested in seeing my own personal economy remain unendangered while labor-management contests are being fought.

I do not want trains to stop running, mines and steel mills to close, placing each American in the position of an innocent bystander, no matter what his personal stake or opinion may be.

I deplore a method of governmental process which places the Chief Executive in the role of a common referee in labor-management squabbles, for the following reasons:

(a) Labor-management disputes should remain beneath the dignity of the office of the President of the United States, regardless of its political occupant.

(b) It draws attention to the sore fact that democratic processes for managing such crisis have completely broken down.

(c) It places the President in the harsh light of diverse public opinion and regardless of his efforts, decisions or recommendations, it brings down upon him indignities from which his high office should be protected. No matter which direction the President would take in such labor-management crisis, there would be those who would cry bribery or political coddling or worse.

Congress has in the past provided suitable legislation to curb certain abusive practices of labor and management but it has failed insofar as I know to provide the necessary legislation to govern the settlement of issues when labor and management fail to adjust their claims.

Our people have always had deep respect for our high judicial bodies They have always received judicial guidance with more sympathetic understanding than can be said for past executive suggestion and recommendation. Therefore, in light of present conditions, and to progress toward future solution in handling crises brought about by labor-management disagreements it seems to me expedient that our judicial branch of the Government be broadened to include the inception of a high court to guide and decide in times of grave crisis of such disagreements.

It is therefore, with great respect for your high position that I submit for your serious consideration, the attached suggested plan, which I believe will be helpful in drafting future legislation. Fully realizing my novice ability in legal phrasing or structure, you may feel free to revise any or all parts of the enclosed. My whole and only object is to offer for your exploration the idea for such a court. I assure you that I submit this plan humbly and in all sincerity, with no strings attached and freely offer it as a token of my deep interest in the human welfare of our country for which my son so valiantly gave his life.

Thanking you for your past fine public interest, I remain

LEGISLATION PROPOSED—A FEDERAL COURT OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT APPEALS

SECTION I

Article A

Congress would pass adequate legislation to immediately bring into existence a new Federal judicial body to be hereafter designated—the Federal Court of Labor-Management Appeals.

Article B

Congress would immediately empower the President of the United States to appoint five judges to preside over the new court.

Article C

Presidential appointments to the court to be confirmed or rejected by the Congress.

Article D

The judges would serve staggered terms not to exceed 6 years. Two appointments would expire January 1, 1949, and would be filled by vote of the national electorate, and all expired terms to be filled by the same procedure thereafter. All unexpired terms made vacant by death, resignation, and so forth of any judge would be immediately filled by Presidential appointment and Congressional confirmation.

Article E

The judges would receive not less than $15,000 nor more than $25,000 per annum and be sworn to duty by oath comparable to that of the highest judicial bodies.

Article F

The court would be provided with quarters befitting the dignity of a high court and of considerable space to accommodate mass hearings.

SECTION II

Article A

Congress would fix the powers of said court to preside over all deadlocked labor-management disputes arising from any industry engaged in any phase of Interstate Commerce, or those of heavy basic industry such as steel, coal, power, and so forth, when petitioned or requested by either party of labor-management, or any industry, or human service whose disputes endanger the national health or welfare.

Article B

Labor groups in Interstate Commerce would be compelled by law to file with the court the date of their intended strike and complete comprehensive summation of all demands and differences, such notification to come not less than 30 days before date of intended strike.

Article C

Industry, if seeking relief from labor abuses or demands, would file with the Court a complete memoranda of such claims.

Article D

The Court would have full power to restrain all parties from strike action, violence, work-stoppage, lock-outs, or disciplinary action of ownership against the petitioning labor body.

Article E

The Court upon receipt of joint or single petition of the two parties would call upon them to agree upon one judge of the Court to preside as acting superior judge for the duration of open hearings.

SECTION III

Article A

The acting superior judge would be provided power to draw sufficient investigators from the Federal Bureau of Investigation should he deem it necesasry to employ their use. Such investigators to be chosen for their knowledge of the industry or condition to be investigated. Such investigators to be used only when either party would demand investigation of the other, at which time both parties would be equally investigated.

Article B

The investigators would be aided by duly appointed stand-by representative of each concerned party and would be selected by their respective groups.

Article C

Stand-by representatives would be available at all times to assist the investigators by answering such inquiries as deemed relative to the task of fact-finding.

Article D

Investigators would be permitted to examine any or all properties of both parties, conditions of work, personnel, or such records, etc., which would aid in the successful conclusion of their findings.

Article E

Upon completion of their findings, the investigators would render their whole information to the four associate judges of the court without recommendation or personal opinion. Such investigation to consume not more than 30 calendar days.

SECTION IV

Article A

The acting superior judge to be excluded from all chamber reviews of such information of investigators but would use his time to acquaint himself through research of all ramification of the case and Federal laws directly affecting the industry and labor group in question.

Article B

The acting superior judge would, after the expired 15 days allotted to chamber review by the four associate judges, summon both parties concerned to ascertain whether or not the parties were willing for chamber arbitration or public hearing.

Article C

Should the parties agree to chamber arbitration, the acting superior judge would set immediate date for the hearing and preside as the impartial deciding factor in deadlock. Such decision of arbitration to be held as binding and final as public hearings. Such chamber hearing not to consume more than 15 calendar days.

Article D

Should one party demand public hearing, the acting superior judge would set immediate date agreeable to both parties, at which time he would preside as deciding factor in deadlock, decide legalities, court order, and procedure, with power to draw on Department of Justice in disputed opinions. Public hearings to consume not more than 15 calendar days.

Article E

Both parties would present their case in legal manner, presenting such data, information, witnesses, etc., as they deemed necessary.

Article F

The decision of the four associate judges would be final except in deadlock, at which time the presiding judge would immediately recess the court for chamber review with the associate judges. He would then, after full review, render the decision of the whole court and make the court's recommendations.

SECTION V

Article A

The decision of the court would be final and binding for both parties for one calendar year, after which time the case could be reopened in the court of labor-management appeals, upon 60 days' notice from either party before the end of the calendar year, or brought to the Supreme Court of the United States as the only recourse.

SECTION VI

Article A

Penalty for proven bribery of any judge, investigator, witness, or their representatives, to be not less than 10 years in a Federal penitentiary and fines to be not less than $10,000.

Article B

Perjury, concealment of information, or hampering investigations would carry a penalty of not less than 5 years' imprisonment in a Federal penitentiary and a fine of not less than $5,000.

Article C

Noncompliance with any decision of the court would invoke prison sentence of not less than 10 years in a Federal penitentiary and a fine of not less than $10,000.

Lost Prestige of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting under unanimous consent a powerful, timely, and able address delivered by Chancelor Samuel Capen, of Buffalo University, which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News of June 3, 1946, as follows:

DR. CAPEN SAYS UNITED STATES HAS LOST MUCH OF ITS PRESTIGE OF YEAR AGO

Charging that the United States has flagrantly mismanaged its affairs in the first year of peace, Chancelor Samuel P. Capen of the University of Buffalo asserted Sunday afternoon that this democracy is being "murdered in its bed" by members of its own household.

In a forceful baccalaureate message to the class of 1946 in Edmund Hayes Hall, the chancelor declared that the race between democracy and totalitarianism is still on, and admonished that, to win it, "we must set our house in order."

Dr. Capen struck out at both the executive and legislative departments, and at the selfish elements responsible for unrest in the country. He pointed out how America was the toast of the world a year ago—envied, respected, and admired for our war effort, our power, and our unity—and how proud and confident we ourselves were, and how most of mankind was turning hopefully toward the dawn of a new peace and prosperity.

ENVY NOW TINGED WITH DISTRUST

And he declared:

"This was a year ago. If we review the events of the last 12 months, how do we feel about them? If we ask ourselves how far have we Americans met what was expected of us or fulfilled our own expectations, what will be the answer?

"Are we now envied? Probably to some extent, but the envy is tinged with distrust; here and there with hate. Are we respected or admired? Not much, I gather from reports that come to us through the public prints. Our unseemly haste to scrap our military power has hardly contributed to the respect in which we are held in those quarters of the world where military might is still the dominant factor in the relations between nations.

"We may think we have been generous in our efforts to relieve the distress of peoples bereft of the bare necessities of existence. But those peoples do not think so. They see chiefly the delays, the maladministration, the enormous gap between what we led them to expect and what they have received. Is the uncertainty of our foreign policy an object of admiration?

WRECKING OUR PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY

"And if we turn our eyes upon ourselves—if we look honestly and objectively at America as contained within its national boundaries—what is our verdict? We see the most successful Nation in history—judged by any standards that measure human success—the strongest, the richest, the freest, engaged in mass sabotage of its own power, wrecking its own productive capacity, undermining its own administrative machinery, abandoning its unity in favor of a reckless struggle between irresponsible and selfish chieftains of industry and labor for mean personal advantages; advantages which, if won, are largely illusory.

"We see racial and religious intolerance once more rearing its ugly head. We see ourselves hovering on the brink of preventable inflation. We see lawmakers who lack the courage to enact laws to protect the general interest.

"We see executives who stand helplessly by without even attempting to guard the public safety. We see the greatest democracy being murdered in its bed. And the assassins are not invading aliens, not even the small though troublesome body of native converts to alien political theories, but the members of its own house."

CONFIDENCE IN FUTURE

We may still be justly proud of our war record, of the sacrifices of our youth and the good sense and good will of the great majority of Americans, the chancelor asserted, "but if we feel any pride in the way we have managed our collective affairs in the first year of peace, then we must be hopelessly besotted with self-esteem."

"Are we confident?" he asked. "I trust that most of us are. Above all I trust that you are, and those of your generation. I trust that you are still confident that with our help—yours and mine and that of millions of our fellow citizens—an international organization can be perfected which will prevent wars and further the spread of justice throughout the world.

"I trust that you are confident of our ability to master our domestic problems, to preserve the American system of political and economic freedom, to develop civic cooperation, to demonstrate as we have never yet demonstrated the limitless potentialities of American energy and brains and resources for the improvement of life on this planet.

WARNS OF ALTERNATIVE TO PEACE

"But if we are confident, it should not be a passive confidence. Peace must be fought for, and not grudgingly or half-heartedly. It must be paid for by every one of us; paid for in money, yours and mine; paid for by denying ourselves things we much desire; paid for by individual and national self-control; paid for by thought and imagination persistently applied by all of us. We cannot dump the task in the laps of our political leaders and go on about our private business.

"We must create and maintain a climate of opinion which will support our chosen representatives in the long and arduous business of strengthening the machinery of the United Nations until it can cope effectively with any possible threat of war.

"The creation of this climate of opinion is not a job that can be delegated, it remains the collective responsibility of all the plain citizens of the United States."

WEAKENING STRUCTURE OF SOCIETY

Chancelor Capen pointed out that democracy is governed by a set of rules and that these rules have recently been more honored in the breach than in the observance.

"We shall have to concede," he said, "that officials in high legislative and executive positions have ignored one or more of them or acted counter to them. It will be clear that powerful individuals and organizations

have no intention of observing some of them, and have been allowed by our servants, yours and mine, to break them with impunity. And it should be clear that every successful violation of any of them weakens the whole structure of American society.

"I am persuaded that Americans in an overwhelming majority want to reestablish the rules in full force and effect.

SEES UNITED STATES SICK OF PUSSYFOOTING

"I am persuaded that in an overwhelming majority they want as representatives in State legislatures, in Congress, and in the courts, persons who are neither spokesmen for, nor subservient to, any special interest either of capital or labor or agriculture, or any ism or creed; who have the intelligence to see and the courage to stand for the general interest; who have the integrity to disappoint some of their friends and to antagonize, if need be, some of their constituents for the sake of the welfare of America as a whole.

"I am persuaded that the overwhelming majority of Americans are sick of pussyfooting by either legislative or administrative officials, that they are disgusted with a supine attitude toward industrial terrorism, that they are ashamed to the bottom of their souls that this great country should be plunged into chaos, unable to meet its moral obligations to the world, unable to unleash its strength for the benefit of its own people."

For this majority, Dr. Capen concluded, there is one answer—to talk, write, vote, and think with the interests of all the people, not a special few, in mind.

For A Modern Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "For a Modern Congress," published in this morning's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR A MODERN CONGRESS

One has only to read the current debate in the Senate to realize what an extensive compendium of essential reforms the proposed legislative reorganization act of 1946 is. Each of the recommended changes in congressional procedure and organization represents a significant step toward modernization of our democratic system. Together they constitute a broad declaration of progressive policy in the shaping of our governmental machinery to its present responsibilities.

It is almost tragic that some Members are not considering the bill in this light. Petty issues of patronage and privilege are obscuring the larger vision of modernizing Congress so that it can meet its colossal responsibilities. "Opponents of the measure," as Senator WHITE declared on Saturday, "argue trivialities when the world is on fire."

We do not imply, of course, that the bill is sacrosanct and should not be amended. A useful change was made in allowing the President a free hand in cutting appropriation estimates to stay within the budgetary limits to be fixed by Congress, instead of requiring a uniform percentage cut. Adjustments will also probably have to be made to harmonize the bill's fiscal controls with the machinery to be set up under the so-called full-employment act. But the general purpose and policy of the bill seem to us above reasonable challenge.

Attention has properly been centered upon the proposal to revolutionize the committee structure. The La Follette committee pointed out in its recent report that "today there are more than twice as many standing committees in the Senate as there are principal provinces of public policy." It suggested accordingly that the number of standing committees be reduced from 33 to 16—that committee assignments be reduced from an average of six for each Senator to an average of two. Despite the opposition from many of the committee chairmen who would be displaced, the bill contains so many other advantageous features that in the end even the minority of disgruntled committee chairmen may be induced to support it.

Not the least of these improvements is the proposed increase in congressional salaries from $10,000 to $15,000 and the opening of the Government's retirement system to Members of both the House and the Senate. Equally constructive is the provision enabling standing committees to exercise year-around surveillance over administrative agencies for which those committees handle legislation. Sensational investigations can thus be avoided. Legislators familiar with each field of law can check to determine whether it is being properly administered. There would be no occasion for special committees and they would be forbidden.

An administrative assistant would be allowed each Member to permit him to devote more of his attention to policy-making. Additional help would be forthcoming through committee experts and expansion of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. A special personnel office for Congress would replace haphazard patronage appointments, and a stenographic pool would relieve the piling up of work at special periods. Time would be more effectively divided between committee work and sessions on the floor, and regular annual recesses would enable legislators to renew contacts with their constituents.

All the committee's suggestions can be put into effect, Senator LA FOLLETTE informed his colleagues on Thursday, at an expense of approximately $12,000,000 a year. The cost of Congress would still be less than that of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. We agree that the extra cost is a pittance compared to the benefits which the country could expect from this legislation. For, as the committee report says, "our machinery of government, which was devised for the simpler tasks of the nineteenth century, is breaking down under the tremendous work load." That is the chief consideration. "Democracy itself is in grave danger of disintegrating from internal dissensions under the terrific pressures of the postwar world." We cannot help insisting that correction of this weakness stands high on the list of the obligations of the present Congress.

Address of Maj. Gen. G. B. Erskine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Maj. Gen. G. B. Erskine, United States Marine Corps, before the graduating class of Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, La., May 27, 1946:

I deeply appreciate the honor of addressing you today. It is a great occasion for me. This is my State. This is my university. The first uniform I ever wore was the traditional gray of an LSU cadet.

In coming back to Baton Rouge I have felt again, as I always do, inspiration and awe in seeing once more our State capitol. I don't believe anyone has ever looked upon its magnificent lines and imposing architecture without carrying away in his heart a little of its splendor—some memories of its beauty. I remember when the capitol was first built and people came from all corners of the State to gaze at those massive doors, those gleaming marble columns—and I remember the pride with which they first viewed this building which was theirs, which belongs to the people of Louisiana. Their dreams, their sacrifices, their hopes were represented in that building.

It is much the same with this university. I know with what great love and pride the people of Louisiana regard this university—a university foremost in the South and in the Nation, an educational institution designed and developed by the people of Louisiana for the people of Louisiana and for the Nation. This university is another great product of—and tribue to—the vigorous forces of democracy in this State, forces so powerful and irresistible that they overwhelm petty jealousies and personal ambitions, sweep aside the base and evil designs of men, imbuing them with the spirit of truth and progress and the urge to look to and plan for the future—a future in which the welfare of the people will steadily be elevated, a future in which all people—businessmen, farmers, laborers—will enjoy to a greater extent the fruits of their labor.

Louisiana has always been a forward-looking State. The French voyageurs and the Spanish colonists who settled here gave to you a broader vision, a more cosmopolitan outlook, a keener sense of our relation to the rest of the world than most States have ever had. Since the time when these fertile lands first became a part of our Nation, Louisiana has been an outlet to and a contact with other countries, with new products, new ideas, and new concepts. Today, even more than ever before, Louisiana stands as the gateway through which our trade and commerce with our great neighbors to the south will pass.

Louisiana looks outward, not inward, forward, not backward. This is a great time and a great State in which to be young. I know the members of this graduating class have felt the surging desire to press on, to search for new horizons, to reexamine and to rescrutinize the standards and accomplishments of the past with the aim of achieving even greater accomplishments in the future. You cannot be a citizen of this State or a student at this university without being stirred by the challenge of the future. It has been kindled deep within your hearts. It is part of your heritage.

Graduates of 1946, you leave this university to go out into a changing world. But this in itself is nothing new. The world is always changing. Your fathers met a changing world when they finished their academic training; your grandfathers faced a changing world when they started upon their careers; every graduating class of this university in the eighty-odd years of its existence has left these classrooms to meet a changing world.

But never before in the history of this university—in the history of our Nation—has the world presented a graduating class with a challenge so vital and keen, with opportunities so limitless and breathtaking and with responsibilities so grave and awe-inspiring.

Our late President once told us that this generation of Americans has a rendezvous

with destiny. He was referring to the war which we fought and won. This war was primarily a fight for survival against the forces of fascism and dictatorship but also as part of the long-range struggle in which man has been long engaged and in which America now bears the brunt of the leadership—a struggle for liberty, for freedom, for greater opportunities for happiness for all men and women on the face of the earth.

We shall meet with destiny again, for we did not reach our ultimate goal by winning the war; we merely gained the advantage of carrying on the struggle without the horrible destruction of war; we gained the advantage of peace in which we are able to devote a greater amount of our time and attention in carrying on our fight.

Like Solomon, who entered upon his kingship after a period of long and laborious wars, and who perceived that the new era of peace was not a time for rest or stagnation but a God-given time of opportunity to build a great temple which his father, David, had never been able to undertake—so we, greatly privileged to have emerged victorious from wars which mired the rest of the world in desolation, must use this period of peace for rededication and renewal of our efforts in obtaining for ourselves and for all peoples the blessings of democracy.

This peace which offers us our great opportunity did not just happen. It was fought for desperately and earned by some 15,000,000 young men and women fighting side by side, and by the many millions of laborers who worked to give them the tools of war. I know that many of you in this graduating class spent several years working and fighting in the university of war. Many of your comrades—and mine—did not return from this war. For their sakes and for the sake of the world, we who have emerged unscathed from this Armageddon, and especially you, who have had the rare privilege of being able to carry on and to complete your education while the world was still enmeshed in the throes of death, have a tremendous moral responsibility to use your educational talents in the service of humanity.

America entered the war an influential nation and emerged from it the most powerful country in the world. We are in the position, whether we want it or not, of the leader nation. On our course of action depends the fate of the world.

The other nations of the world know this. They watch us anxiously for a sign to show where we are bound and what course of action we are going to take.

Those of you who served overseas during the war and entered those tired, worn countries in your mission of liberation will remember the exuberance and the enthusiasm that greeted American troops everywhere. You will remember the wonder and hope in the faces of these people as they saw their first Americans—the swarms of Italian children who crowded around your jeeps in Rome and Salerno; the humble men and women of France who stood in their doorways to wave at you as you went through their villages; the scrawny, disease-ridden coolies of India who looked up with admiration at your tall, sturdy bodies; the small, ragged, barefoot soldiers of China who were fascinated by your modern equipment, your complicated and efficient machines, your comfortable, adequate clothing.

These people wanted more from you than cigarettes and candy bars. With a little thought and discernment you could see beyond their curiosity and pleas for sweets and perceive their innate hunger and longing for something far more precious than any rations or luxuries you carried with you. They were interested in more than your clothing, your equipment, your food; they were mainly impressed by the boldness of your spirit, by the unimpeded directness of your thinking, by the aura of freedom in which you moved. You walked the earth as conquerors—not as arrogant demagogs of a pseudo-master race—but as freedom-loving, freedom-enjoying individuals, born to liberty and expecting nothing less.

The American soldiers overseas had an unparalleled opportunity to be ambassadors of democracy, but you and I know that many of them failed miserably. They failed to realize that these French, these Italian, these Chinese crowds had any claims on them. They refused to recognize that, whether they liked it or not, they, as citizens of the world's greatest democracy, were being held up as models of behavior.

The Director General of UNRRA tells us that for the next few months America holds the fate of the world in its hands. It is up to us whether the world dies of starvation or whether, through our food, it is sustained through this period of emergency until the fall harvests come.

This is an emergency peculiar to this particular time. God permitting, it may not occur again. But I say to you that time and time again in the future the trembling fate of the world will rest with us. These tired, overworn countries will languish and thirst for a draught from the wellspring of our democracy. They will be revived only if we guide them to the paths of liberty and freedom and the basic conception of the dignity of the individual man.

In our own country we have a great and immediate problem facing us—the problem of reconverting the tremendous productive forces of the Nation from war to peacetime uses. I am not speaking here of the physical side of reconversion. This was accomplished far more rapidly than we had expected.

The physical change-over of plants to peacetime use is virtually completed. Demobilization has been swift. But the real job of reconversion is just beginning. We have yet to complete the task of regrouping our human resources and putting them to work to supply the goods demanded in peacetime.

The Nation emerged from the war with the greatest reservoir of human resources in the history of our country. This includes the character, skill, training, and experience of more than 15,000,000 men and women who served in the armed forces and the many millions more whose labor contributed to our phenomenal war production.

This is a crucial time in our history and economy. We must seek that the power and strength of our men and women, so recently mobilized and trained by war, shall be the instrument for full production and maximum employment.

American economy has demonstrated in war its great capacity to produce and expand. We must make full use of this capacity in peace to provide high and rising standards of living for all, to offer abundant opportunities for useful and rewarding work, and to contribute to lasting peace—for our country and for the world.

If we achieve this goal, we will then be in a position to discharge our responsibility to the rest of the world. If we fail to reach our goal, we fail ourselves and we fail the world.

For we no longer work for ourselves alone. Our own welfare is no longer the only law that binds us. What we do here in America, what we say and what we believe, is witnessed and heard by the people of the whole world.

Remember this as you take up your lifework. Whatever is your chosen field—medicine or law, business or art, journalism or teaching—enter upon it with a view of using this profession or occupation as a vantage point from which you can make your contribution to society as a whole.

Working only to build up a personal fortune for your own pleasure and enjoyment is not enough. Devoting your time to advancing your desire for power and influence is not enough. A lifetime, ruled by these selfish motives, would be sterile and meaningless. It would not give you that deep satisfaction and warm inward pleasure that comes from serving others.

Enter upon your careers with all your physical vigor and enthusiasm. Do a thorough job in whatever you undertake; be more concerned with leaving a job well done than in advertising your connection with it. Strive to realize the great implications and higher meanings of every detail of your work, how it fits into the broad picture of society; how every step, every decision you make affects society as a whole.

First assure yourself that your career is worth while, that it is needed by and has something to give to society, then lose yourself in your work. Give it every ounce of strength you've got. Let it be the ruling passion in your life. Strive to understand your job in its entirety; work to learn all that you can, all that there is to know about your profession or occupation, and slowly—but steadily—the world will be unfolded before you. You will gain new understanding not only of your own field but of related fields and of life as a whole. You will find yourself taking paths of service and endeavor you had never thought to tread. You will find yourself being swept on and on in your efforts to understand and to serve.

For almost three decades I have been a marine in my Nation's Armed Forces. As an officer charged with leading men, I have long been interested in the problem of educating and equipping them to take up the duties for which they are best suited and in which they can make their greatest individual contribution to their unit and to their country.

Now I am engaged in directing a Government agency which is interested in the education, training, and retraining, rehabilitation, and reemployment of the men and women who worked and fought this war. Five years ago, 2 years ago, 1 year ago I had no idea of ever serving in Government administration, and it is a long way from Guam and Iwo Jima to a desk in Washington, but I realize now that the same interests that motivated my life as a marine have led me to logically related paths of service.

Once a person has become interested in a project, an ideal, or a goal greater than himself, he will be drawn by its compulsion and magnetic attraction down new paths, through new fields, and toward new horizons.

Graduates of 1946, you represent the sacrifices of generations past, and the hopes of generations to come. The spotlight is focused on you. As you take up your careers, carry the spirit of this university and of this State with you—the spirit of an institution selflessly devoted to searching out new horizons, the indomitable spirit of a progressive people constantly working to secure for themselves and their neighbors a more perfect democracy.

You are greatly needed in the world today. I wish you good luck and godspeed.

The Tee Davis Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a fund-raising campaign sponsored by the Workers Defense League for the purpose of freeing one Tee Davis from the Arkansas Peni-

tentiary. Tee Davis was charged with the crime of assault with intent to kill one Harold Weaver and sentenced to the penitentiary from the Crittenden County, Ark., circuit court for a period of 10 years. He appealed his case to the Supreme Court of Arkansas, which sustained the judgment of the lower court by its opinion handed down on January 31, 1944. A full statement of the facts and the decision of the court will be made a part of my remarks. I include below the full text of a letter dated March 11, 1946, and signed by Lillian Smith appealing for funds to free Tee Davis:

MARCH 11, 1946.

(You can help free our conscience of its guilt and shame.)

I want to tell you the story of a black man in Arkansas.

It is an old heartbreaking story familiar to us who live in the South. We have heard it a thousand times. Always it is the same story of a black man stripped by white men of his rights as a human being.

This time it is about Tee Davis. One night Tee Davis, a black man, refused to open the door of his little shack when a white man kicked the door and yelled at him to open up. Instead Davis, afraid of thieves, picked up his shotgun, aimed it at the bottom of the door and fired. No one was hurt. But the voice ordering him to open the door belonged to a white sheriff and, though he had no warrant and had not said that he was sheriff, he arrested Tee Davis. The white plantation owners saw to it that the black man was sentenced to 10 years in prison.

Tee Davis' crime was that he did not do what a white man told him to do. Simple as that.

Your crime and mine is that we let things like this happen to human beings in our country. We cannot blame the sheriff too much, nor the plantation owners too much, for these men would not dare do these things if we did not let them. We cannot release ourselves from guilt by blaming a villain far away. We good people of America are permitting this to happen. We can stop it if we want to.

One way is to support the Workers Defense League in their work of dramatizing specific cases such as this one of Tee Davis. For one Tee Davis we hear about there are a thousand others unknown to us. But by turning the spotlight on Davis we turn it also on the others. If Tee Davis is freed, it will not be as easy next time to put a man in jail and keep him there just because he doesn't do what a white man wants.

Your money will help. Your letters to the governor, who has refused a pardon, will help. These are the things to do now. But the big thing is to reach out with your heart and mind and learn to feel what it means to be a Negro in America today. If you once do that, you will never rest until he is treated like a human being. The simple truth is that none of us can be human unless we all are human.

Don't forget it. Do something about it today. Send a contribution to Rev. Aron S. Gilmartin, chairman, Workers Defense League, 112 East Nineteenth Street, New York 3, N. Y. Send in $100, $50, $25—whatever you can spare—to help to free Tee Davis and to help the league in all the vital work it is doing in defense of black and white workers.

Sincerely yours,

LILLIAN SMITH.

Being a resident of Crittenden County, Ark., having resided in that county for many years past, I am personally acquainted with Harold Weaver, Ivan Dickson, Bud Holland, prosecuting witnesses; Hon. Zal B. Harrison, circuit judge; and practically every member of the jury which tried this case.

Mr. Weaver is a merchant and the town marshal of the little town of Edmondson, Ark. He has lived in Crittenden County all of his life and is an outstanding citizen and businessman. Mr. Ivan Dickson and Mr. Bud Holland are deputy sheriffs and very efficient law-enforcement officers. Circuit Judge Zal B. Harrison, before whom the case was tried, is an able, conscientious, and learned jurist and is held in the highest esteem and respect by the people of his judicial district and of the State.

Our juries in Arkansas deal more leniently with a Negro than they do with a white man on the same state of facts.

As a lawyer I have tried cases before Crittenden County juries for a number of years and have always found them to be predominantly fair and impartial to defendants, and especially Negroes charged with criminal offenses. Negroes are given as much or more consideration at the hands of Crittenden County juries as white people charged with the same or similar crimes. That was the case with Tee Davis, who was sentenced to 10 years when he could have received a maximum of 21 years. This 10-year sentence was imposed in the face of the fact that he had previously been convicted of firing a shot into a wagonload of cotton pickers in the year 1937.

It is a serious charge that a defendant did not get justice at the hands of the law-enforcing officers of a county, the trial court, the jury, and finally the Supreme Court of Arkansas. Such a charge is preposterous and unfounded in fact. We citizens of Arkansas resent the action of outside interests attempting to stir up race prejudices at a time when unity is so essential to the well-being of the whole Nation. The Arkansas Supreme Court affirmed the decision of the lower court unanimously and found no error in the proceedings of the trial court. Those supreme court justices were elected by the electorate of the State because of their judicial sound judgment and because they so richly deserved the elevation to such a high place of honor, trust, and responsibility.

Let us examine this Workers Defense League, and some of its members.

Among the sponsors of the national convention of the Workers Defense League was Powers Hapgood, who was cited by Benjamin Gitlow, former head of the Communist Party in the United States, as one of the most trusted members of the Workers—Communist—Party.

Another sponsor is Philip Randolph, now head of the Pullman Porters Union, who, during his earlier days, was identified as a member of the Communist movement.

A third sponsor is Warren K. Billings, who, along with Tom Mooney, took an active part in activities opposed to the well-being of the United States and served a term in a criminal institution.

One of the more important sponsors of the group is Freda Kirchway, who has been one of the most active Communist propagandists in America. She has been a sponsor of and associated with over 20 communistic organizations in the United States.

The socialistic element in this organization is represented by Norman Thomas, who has consistently waged war against the capitalistic system in the United States.

Royal Wilbur France, also a sponsor of the national convention, signed a letter demanding the abolishment of the Dies committee in January 1943.

Still another sponsor is Paul R. Christopher, who like fellow traveler France also joined in asking for the discontinuance of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

One of the more important sponsors of the Workers Defense League was Lewis Hacker, who was a member of the advisory board of the American Student Union. This, you will recall, was one of the Communist fronts whose first objective during the Hitler-Stalin pact was to preach against war, calling England and France the imperialist nations and the war a conflict of the imperialists. Hacker, like all good party leaders, had a change of heart when Adolf Hitler attacked Russia. The war then became a war of the proletariat, a people's war.

Julius Hockman, a sponsor of the Workers Defense League, was likewise on the advisory board of the American Student Union, as was Freda Kirchway, Norman Thomas, Robert Morss Lovett, and Waldo Frank. They also were sponsors of the Workers Defense League Convention held in Labor Temple on June 1 and 2, 1940.

The American Students Union was cited no less than 10 times as an arm of and a part of the Communist Party in the United States. This organization was cited by the Massachusetts House Committee on Un-American Activities by Prof. John Dewey, of Columbia University; by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities; and by the California Report on Un-American Activities. The Rapp-Coudert committee in its report in 1942 found the American Students Union to be cooperating with the Communist League. On December 1, 1941, the American Students Union was cited by the same committee as a subversive organization.

Among other sponsors of the Workers Defense League, we find the name of Tucker P. Smith, who was an instructor at Brookwood Labor School, which has been identified on many occasions as an institution instructing in and disseminating Communist propaganda. Mr. Smith was a member of the arrangements committee for the United States Congress Against War, which came out of the American League Against War and Fascism. Next to Mr. Smith we find Jack Stachel, who headed the Trade Union Unity League, which has been identified under oath as the Communist Labor Party arm in the United States. Jack Stachel for years has been the leading contact man for the Comintern and Communist headquarters in Moscow and the Communist Party in the United States. Mr. Robert Morss Lovett was also a member of this committee.

An examination of the objectives of the Workers Defense League reveals that

they followed completely the planned program of organized dissension as preached and promoted at the NKVD University abroad.

In 1940 they prepared an M-day program. The object of this plan was to agitate against America's preparedness for war and to agitate against any program to aid England and France, who later became our allies. In this program they set forth, and I quote:

Mobilization-day plans of the War Department are preparing this country for a military dictatorship over labor in the event of war.

This program was instituted in 1940 and was identical with the Communist Party program, whose objectives ran parallel to the foreign policy of the Soviet Government, which at that time, was an ally of Adolf Hitler. They agitated race hatred, agitated against deportation of undesirable aliens, and stated that the alien bills before Congress would establish concentration camps, regiment opinion, and sharply restrict freedom. They also agitated, as do all Communists, against the lynch laws, calling the southern share croppers America's refugees, and stated that the share croppers and migrant workers must fight planters to get a living wage. This organization also agitated against the poll tax and denounced individuals who were attempting to bring order out of the chaotic strike conditions which existed in key industries supplying England and France with materials to protect themselves against the Nazi aggressors.

I would like to draw to your special attention, Mr. Joseph Schlossburg, who likewise sponsored the Workers Defense League. In the early twenties this gentleman and his present superior, Sidney Hillman, of the CIO-PAC, visited Italy during the communistic uprisings. According to the report of Schlossburg and Hillman, which was given at the Clothing Workers Convention, held in Chicago in 1922, he had this to say of his visit to a factory in Rome, and I now quote:

In Rome I was doubly welcome; the secretary of the metalworkers union gave me a letter, the only key to open the gates of this factory. [Laughter.] With my Italian comrades I landed in front of the factory, which looked attractive because of the fine red flag which adorned the building and the red sentinel who was keeping watch. [Applause.] I stayed for lunch with the members of the factory council. The council then took me through the factory. The first thing that attracted my attention was a series of inscriptions on the walls, including the Soviet emblem. [Applause.]

I include the full and complete decision of the Arkansas Supreme Court in the case of *Davis* v. *State* (177 S. W. 2d, p. 190):

ARKANSAS REPORTS, VOLUME 206, 1943–44, DAVIS *v.* STATE (177 S. W. 2D 190)

OPINION DELIVERED JANUARY 31, 1944

1. Assault with intent to kill: Appellant was not justified in firing shots at W., who came to his door in a peaceful manner, asking admission only by and with his consent, and was not making an attempt to enter in a violent, riotous, and tumultuous manner for the purpose of committing a crime. Pope's Digest, 2999.

2. Criminal law: Under the circumstances as shown by the facts it was a question for the jury to determine whether the assault made by appellant upon W. was justified as one made in defense of his home or place of residence.

3. Assault, with intent to kill: An assault with intent to kill may be inferred from the facts and circumstances of the assault, such as the use of a deadly weapon in a manner indicating an intent to kill or an act of violence which would ordinarily be calculated to produce death or great bodily harm.

4. Assault, with intent to kill, inferred, when: In determining whether or not the intent to kill should be inferred, the jury may properly consider the character of the weapon employed and the way it was used; the manner of the assault, the nature, extent, and location on the body of the wound inflicted, if any; the state of feeling existing between the parties, and all other facts and circumstances tending to reveal defendant's state of mind.

5. Criminal law, assault with intent to kill: Under the facts and circumstances the jury was warranted in finding that appellant entertained a specific intent to kill at the time he fired the shots at W.

6. Criminal law, evidence: A defendant who testifies in his own behalf may, on cross-examination, be interrogated with respect to prior crimes for which he has been convicted.

7. Criminal law: Where no objection to the introduction of evidence is made and no exception to the ruling of the trial court thereon preserved in the record, it will not be considered on appeal.

8. Criminal law, discretion of jury: Where the statute fixes the punishment for assault with intent to kill at from 1 to 21 years, it cannot be said that the jury abused its discretion in fixing appellant's punishment at 10 years in the penitentiary (Pope's Digest, 2961).

Appeal from Crittenden Circuit Court; Zal B. Harrison, judge; affirmed.

K. T. Sutton, for appellant.

Robert L. Brobrick, Ernest Fleischman, Thurgood Marshall, Milton R. Konvitz, Edward R. Dudley, William H. Hastie, and Leon A. Ransom, amici curiae.

Guy E. Williams, attorney general, and Oscar E. Ellis, assistant attorney general, for appellee.

Knox, J. Appellant was charged with the crime of assault with intent to kill, allegedly committed by shooting one Harold Weaver. Trial resulted in a verdict of guilty and punishment was fixed at imprisonment in the penitentiary for a period of 10 years.

The motion for new trial sets out eight assignments of error, the first four of which are the usual stereotype declarations that the verdict is contrary to the law and the evidence. The other assignments are: (5) the verdict was excessive; (6) the jury was prejudiced; (7) the evidence was insufficient; and (8) that the defendant was in his home attending to his own business and had every reason to believe that his house was about to be burglarized and that he and his family were in danger of great bodily harm or loss of life and that he had a right to defend himself and his family and home.

The shooting occurred shortly after dark on the night of March 22, 1943, at appellant's home, located about one-half mile west of the little town of Edmondson, Crittenden County, Ark., of which town the victim of the assault was marshal, and where he and his wife operated a store, and Mrs. Weaver also acted as postmistress.

Late in the afternoon of that day Deputy Sheriffs Dixon and Holland came into the community for the purpose of apprehending and arresting one Eddie Mayberry on a charge of larceny. Acting upon information that Mayberry was hiding or being hidden in a house near Edmondson, the location thereof and the name of the family living therein being unknown, they decided to make a search of all of the houses in the neighborhood, and, since Weaver was familiar with the location of the different houses and knew the occupants thereof, and the best method of reaching such places of abode, they called upon him to assist them in making the search.

The three officers had searched all of the houses in the neighborhood except the house of Tee Davis, the appellant. The last house searched by them was that of Will Gilyard. Appellant lived about 200 yards south of Will Gilyard's place. There was a swamp or muddy slough between Gilyard's place and appellant's home. A railroad ran north and south along the east side of the Gilyard home and the Davis home. Because Weaver had on boots he could and did cross the slough going to the Davis home, but the other officers, wearing only shoes, found it necessary to first go east to the high ground furnished by the railroad dump and thence back west to the appellant's home. Officer Weaver reached appellant's house sooner than the other officers, and, according to his testimony, began rapping on appellant's door with his knuckles. The witness testified: "He (appellant) asked who it was and I told him, this is Mr. Weaver at Edmondson. I told him we were looking for Mayberry and I wanted him to open the door and let me look. He said, I asked who you are and I told him again and I probably waited 2 or 3 minutes and he didn't come to the door. I thought he was probably trying to get ready to come to the door and he didn't answer and I was knocking on the door and had a flashlight in my right hand * * * and he cut loose with a shotgun and shot it out of my hand and he shot me in the knuckles and my hunting coat has probably 15 shot in that." The witness testified that he was standing to the side of the door and that his body was out of the range; that after appellant had fired the first shot he, the witness, pulled out his pistol and fired one shot and that appellant then fired a second shot, and that he, witness, ran to the ditch bank and got behind it for protection, and witness thereupon fired two shots from that position; that officers Dixon and Holland rushed up and Dixon called to appellant "to put his gun down and stop shooting, this was the law and to open the door"; that the door was thereupon opened and appellant was standing there with his gun in his hand. Appellant's version of the occurrence is as follows: "A. When Mr. Weaver came to my house on that night, Mr. Weaver come up on the porch and he kicked on the door with his foot, gentlemen, with his foot, and the bottom of his foot, and he bust the door from the crossbar on the door to the bottom. He kicked the door and said, 'You ——— ——— black ———, open this door,' and I said, 'What do you want?' and he said, 'Open this door and open it quick,' and when he kicked that frightened me and I hit again the trunk and I fell and when I fell I got my shotgun and turned back and shot it off." Other quotations from appellant's testimony will be hereinafter set out.

Appellant's wife testified in his behalf, but she fails to corroborate his statements as to the abusive language or the kicking on the door. Her testimony is to the effect that the first she heard was Weaver saying, "Open the door"; that he didn't tell his name and that her husband asked him what he wanted and that she failed to hear him tell what he wanted and then the shooting occurred.

Deputy Sheriff Dixon testified that he was not close enough to hear all of the conversation but that he did hear the prosecuting witness tell appellant he was Mr. Weaver and that in a few seconds thereafter the shotgun was fired. Officer Holland testified that before the shots were fired and while he and Mr. Dixon were going up the railroad he heard Officer Weaver call the appellant and say, "Tee, this is Mr. Weaver; come to the door, I want to ask you something." Officer Dixon testified that after they had gone in the house and taken the gun from appellant he examined the door to see where

the shots had gone through and that there was no crack through the door caused from kicking it or otherwise.

Among other instructions given at the trial were instructions 12 and 13, in which instructions the trial court charged the jury as follows:

"No. 12. The defendant contends that he fired the shot in defense of his home or place of residence. Section 2998 of Pope's Digest of the Statutes of Arkansas provides: 'Every man's house or place of residence shall be deemed and adjudged in law as his castle.' And 2999 provides that a manifest attempt and endeavor in a violent, riotous, and tumultuous manner to enter the habitation of another for the purpose of assault or offering personal violence to any person dwelling or being therein shall be justification of homicide. A bare fear of those offenses, to prevent which the assault is alleged to have been committed, shall not be sufficient to justify the assault. It must appear that the circumstances were sufficient to excite the fears of a reasonable person, and that the party committing the assault really acted under their influence and not in a spirit of revenge.

"No. 13. Therefore, if you find from the evidence in this case that the defendant made the assault acting in good faith and as a reasonable person under the apprehension that his home or residence was about to be entered by some person for the purpose of committing burglary or robbery or for the purpose of assaulting or offering personal violence to any person dwelling therein, and that he fired the shots under that belief, acting in good faith and as a reasonable person, then he would not be guilty of any crime and your verdict should be 'Not guilty.' "

Appellant's counsel concede that the instructions above quoted properly declare the law with respect to the rights of a person to defend his habitation, but they insist that there is no substantial evidence in the record from which the jury could have found that appellant was not acting in good faith under the apprehension that his home was about to be entered in violation of his rights.

This argument of necessity must be founded upon the theory that appellant actually did not know who was at the door. Likewise, in order to support such argument, parts of the testimony of appellant must be accepted as true and other parts of his own testimony and all of the testimony offered by the State must be disregarded.

On his direct examination appellant did in fact testify that he did not know who was at the door at the time, and before, he fired the shots, but on cross-examination appellant testified he (Weaver) knocked on the door and said, "This is Weaver." "Question. * * * You knew it was Mr. Weaver that ran the store? Answer. I didn't know.

"Question. You had in mind that it was him? Answer. Yes, I thought it was him. Question. You admit to the jury, in spite of what Mr. Sutton said, you thought that it was Mr. Weaver knocking on your door? Answer. After he called his name I knowed who it was. Question. He called his name before he knocked, didn't he? Answer. Yes, sir. Question. When you got your shotgun to shoot through the door, you knew you were shooting at Mr. Weaver? Answer. It wasn't my intention."

It is probably true that Weaver failed to advise appellant that he was an officer. Appellant was living within one-half mile of the town of which Weaver was marshal, and although he had lived at such place only about a month prior to the shooting he had resided in the locality of Edmondson for several years. Appellant admitted that he had been in Weaver's store two or three times, and on one occasion he and another person with whom he was having a dispute over an automobile accident called on Mr. Weaver to assist in the settlement of the dispute. These facts and circumstances were sufficient to justify the jury in drawing the inference that the appellant knew that Weaver was an officer.

Weaver's status as an officer and appellant's knowledge with respect thereto is not material. Appellant would not have have been justified in firing shots at anyone who came to his door in a peaceful manner, seeking admission only by and with his consent, and who was not making a manifest attempt and endeavor in a violent, riotous, and tumultuous manner to enter the appellant's home for the purpose of committing burglary, robbery, or for the purpose of assault or offering personal violence to a person dwelling therein.

The testimony of appellant that Weaver violently kicked the door and used vile and abusive language tended to show an attempt to enter in a violent, riotous, and tumultuous manner in violation of appellant's rights, and if there had been no other testimony in the record with respect thereto, the trial court doubtless would have been justified in directing the verdict in favor of appellant. Appellant's testimony, however, in this regard is directly contradicted by the testimony of the prosecuting witness, and the testimony of Deputy Sheriffs Dixon and Holland, and also his testimony is not corroborated by his own wife, who was called as a witness in his behalf, and, likewise, some of the answers elicited from appellant on cross-examination are not in accord with his testimony on direct examination. Under these circumstances it is clear that it was a question for the jury to determine whether the assault made by the appellant upon Weaver was justified as one made in defense of appellant's home or place of residence. (*Hall* v. *State*, 113 Ark. 454, 168 S. W. 1122; *Bealmear* v. *State*, 104 Ark. 616, 150 S. W. 129.)

It is argued that the evidence is insufficient to justify a finding that appellant had the specific intent to kill the prosecuting witness, Weaver. In the case of *Craig* v. *State* (205 Ark. 1100, 172 S. W. 2d 256), we again stated that one of the elements necessary to sustain a conviction of assault with intent to kill was proof of a specific intent to take life, and we there said: "In the case of *Lacefield* v. *State*, supra (34 Ark. 275, 36 Am. Rep. 8), Mr. Justice Harrison, in discussing the character of proof required to establish the intent, says: 'Whilst it is true that every person is presumed to contemplate the ordinary and natural consequences of his act, such presumption does not arise where the act fails of effect or is attended by no consequences, and where such act is charged to have been done with a specific intent such intent must be proved and not presumed from the act.'

"Although the State is required to prove that the defendant actually intended to kill, it need not depend upon declarations made by the defendant to establish such fact. While the intent to kill cannot be implied as a matter of law, it may be inferred from facts and circumstances of the assault, such as the use of a deadly weapon in a manner indicating an intention to kill, or an act of violence which ordinarily would be calculated to produce death or great bodily harm. In determining whether or not the intent to kill should be inferred, the trier of the facts may properly consider the character of the weapon employed and the way it was used, the manner of the assault, and the violence attendant thereon; the nature, extent, and location on the body of the wound inflicted, if any; the state of feeling existing between the parties at and anterior to the difficulty; statements of the defendant, if any; and all others facts and circumstances tending to reveal defendant's state of mind. *Chrisman* v. *State* (54 Ark. 283, 15 S. W. 889, 26 Am. St. Rep. 44); *Beavers* v. *State* (54 Ark. 336, 15 S. W. 1024); *Davis* v. *State* (115 Ark. 566, 173 S. W. 829); *Killian* v. *State* (184 Ark. 239, 42 S. W. 2d 12); *Higgins* v. *State* (171 Ark. 1187, 285 S. W. 359). It is not essential that the intent should have existed for any particular length of time before the assault, as it may be conceived in a moment. *Hankins* v. *State* (103 Ark. 28; 145 S. W. 524); *Evans* v. *State* (147 Ark. 69; 226 S. W. 1063); *Slaytor* v. *State* (141 Ark. 11; 215 S. W. 886)."

We are of the opinion that under the facts and circumstances disclosed by the record here the jury was fully warranted in finding that appellant entertained the specific intent to kill at the time he fired the shots through the door.

During the course of the cross-examination the prosecuting attorney asked appellant if he hadn't fired a shot into a wagonload of cotton pickers in 1937. Objection was made to the question on the ground that such inquiry could go only to cases where the defendant was convicted of the crime. The court sustained the objection, and thereupon, the prosecuting attorney asked appellant if he had not been convicted and sentenced for such crime, and appellant admitted that he had been. No objection was interposed by counsel for defendant to this line of questioning, and no exception whatever was preserved. It is now argued that this prejudiced the minds of the jury against the appellant and constituted error, calling for reversal of this cause. It is well settled by our decisions that a defendant who testifies in his own behalf may on cross-examination be interrogated with respect to prior crimes for which he has been convicted. It is also well settled by our decisions that where no objection to the introduction of evidence is made and exception to the ruling of the trial court thereon preserved in the record, it will not be considered for the first time on appeal.

It is earnestly insisted that the sentence imposed in this case is excessive. As was said in the case of *Cheney* v. *State* (205 Ark. 1049, at 1053, 172 SW. 2d 427): "In fixing the punishment for the crime of assault with intent to kill, our lawmakers, in 2961, Pope's Digest, have very wisely given to the jury much latitude. It is provided in that section that the punishment may be fixed at 'imprisonment in the penitentiary not less than 1 nor more than 21 years,' the evident purpose being that the punishment in each case should be fixed in accordance with the facts."

After a careful consideration of the facts and circumstances presented by the record here before us, we find nothing which shows that the jury abused its discretion in fixing punishment.

Finding no error, the judgment is affirmed.

Mr. Speaker, Arkansas is proud of her heritage, proud of her Americanism, and justly so. We in the Wonder State can point with pride to the fact that 98 percent of our citizens are native-born Americans.

Arkansas people will not stand idly by and have its courts and its people's integrity and good name challenged at the hands of an off-brand subversive and un-American organization such as the Workers Defense League.

The United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include

an address delivered by James Frederick Green, acting associate director of the State Department's Dependent Areas Section. Dr. Green talked before the members of the national security committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars recently at the Statler Hotel.

His address follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, as I was sitting at home this afternoon putting together a few notes for my informal remarks and discussions with you, and not for a speech to you this evening, I found I was the subject of very great interest to my 5-year-old daughter, who kept coming up ever so often to find out what was going on. She has never had the misfortune of hearing a speech by myself, or by anybody else for that matter, on any subject, and I had a little difficulty explaining to her what a speech was. She said, "Are you going to sing some songs, daddy?" I said, "No." She said, "Are you going to tell some stories?" I said, "No; at least none of the stories I tell you." About 5 minutes later she came back and said, "Well, how do you start? What do you say first?" That was just what I was working on, so I said, "Well, you say, 'Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen.'" She thought for a few minutes and said, "Is that a joke, daddy?" [Laughter.]

I feel particularly embarrassed because of the difficulty of starting a speech this evening, because I am probably the only one here who is not a veteran of foreign wars, either in the technical sense of having served in the armed forces or in the other sense of being a member of your organization. I feel particularly sorry that I am not a member of your organization, because I find it has had the good judgment of settling in Kansas City, which is my home town, and a very good one.

I can only qualify on this program this evening as being a veteran of the battle of Washington for 4½ years, and if any of you have served in the campaigns of the Pentagon and the skirmishes of Constitution Avenue you may feel some sympathy for me.

I feel a little as if I were the subject of a story I heard in London while I was there this winter, of a young British civilian who was riding into London on a train. Opposite him in the compartment were a couple of very elderly colonels, dressed in full uniform and with campaign bars and ribbons, who were, unlike General Stearley and Commodore Glass, little of the Colonel Blimp type. They spent about a half an hour denouncing the dangerous trend in which so many young men were working in factories, in scientific laboratories, in the Government, and so forth, and were not out in the armed forces. They kept commenting on the fact that in the last war everybody who could walk was over in France in the trenches. When the train came into London, the young man turned to the colonels and said, "Gentlemen, I do not know whether your remarks were aimed at me or not. but just in case they were, I would like to explain that I tried to join the Army and the Navy and the Air Force, but they would not let me because of Government regulations. I am in what is called a reserved occupation. What is more," he said, "I work for the Foreign Office, and if it had not been for the Foreign Office you would not be having your old war." [Laughter.]

Of course, I do not want to cast any aspersions either on the British Foreign Office or the American Department of State.

I do feel at some disadvantage, not having shared your experiences abroad either in this war nor in the last one, nor understanding in detail either the traditions of the armed forces with which you are familiar or the future of the armed forces which you have been discussing here in Washington.

The traditions of the services remind me of the story I also heard in London about Mr. Churchill. I think it is the sort of story that makes Mr. Churchill one of our favorite statesmen. It is said to have happened at the first Quebec Conference, when he met with President Roosevelt. He was meeting at the time with his own naval staff. Admiral Cunningham, I believe, was beginning to protest about some of Mr. Churchill's grandiose plans for strategy in the Pacific. Mr. Churchill was laying out some spectacular arrangements for operations by the Royal Navy. The admiral said, "Mr. Prime Minister, that is quite contrary to all naval traditions and strategical concepts." Mr. Churchill put his glass of Scotch down and put his cigar aside and said, "Admiral, I have been First Lord of Admiralty twice in my long life, I have been with the Navy, I have studied it, and I know as much about it as any civilian in His Majesty's Empire. As far as I know, there are only three traditions in the Royal Navy; the press gang, gin, and the lash." [Laughter.]

I have been looking over your very crowded but interesting agenda, and I find that most of the topics you have been working on and will be working on tomorrow, deal with the national defense of this country and, I assume, with ways and means of preventing another world war. There is nothing more important than these two topics which any organization, and especially a veterans' organization, could take under consideration.

I understand that you will be drafting resolutions which will be considered at your September encampment. I should like for my contribution to take up one aspect of this question of national defense, in terms of the United Nations. I have discussed it in terms of universal conscription in peacetime, in terms of problems of unification of the armed forces, and in terms of other problems which I am in no way competent to discuss. I should like to take up a few aspects of your general problem as it relates to the United Nations and to discuss four or five topics which you might want to consider making the topic of further study or the subject of resolutions at your encampment.

I should like at the outset to lay down several general principles. The United States has become a member, and a charter member, of the United Nations, not out of any charitable desire or philanthropic considerations. We are not joining the Organization and paying some money—not very much in terms of modern budgets—to maintain it just because we think it is a good thing. We have joined it—the President with the overwhelming approval of the Senate has subscribed to the Charter and has placed the United States as a member of the United Nations—because, I think, we have found that no nation, even one as rich and powerful as ours, can afford to stay out of an organization like the United Nations, and that no nation, no matter how rich and powerful, can live alone and expect to be left to live alone by other countries.

Therefore, we justify our participation because it is to our advantage to be in the United Nations, because it is to our advantage in terms of national defense and security, and in terms of our determined efforts to prevent the recurrence of another world war.

The United Nations, as you know, is now a going concern. Within 13 months of the opening of the San Francisco Conference in April of 1945, we have had the General Assembly meeting in London, the Security Council meeting in London and at Hunter College, New York, with Mr. Stettinius representing the United States as its delegate, the Economic and Social Council, with Mr. Winant as the American representative, as well as a number of subsidiary commissions, committees, of the Council going into the technical problems, and the Atomic Energy Commission created by the General Assembly in London, which is to meet in 2 or 3 weeks, with Mr. Bernard Baruch as our spokesman. There will ultimately be a Trusteeship Council when there are a sufficient number of administering states actually governing territories.

Out of the 57 varieties of activities which I could discuss and relate to our problem of national defense, I would like to take five of them as ones which seem to me to have a special bearing on the general problems you have been discussing here in Washington.

The first one, and the most obvious one, is the function of the United Nations in restraining aggression, in trying to check an aggressor when he breaks the law, violates the principles of the charter to which he subscribed, and undertakes military action against another state. That is the last resort; that is the club in the closet of the United Nations.

Article 43 of the Charter provides, as you know, that the members of the United Nations undertake to make available to the Security Council upon its call, armed forces, and assistance of various kinds. The type of armed forces which will be marked for delivery to the Security Council on its call, and the particular technical arrangements; are a subject for subsequent negotiations. Special military agreements must be worked out between our Government and the Security Council. They have to be scrutinized by the Military Staff Committee, under which representatives of our Joint Chiefs of Staff and the representatives of the Chiefs of Staff of the other four great powers sit, and have to be approved by the Security Council. I presume that ultimately this will be done as soon as the discussions have been completed within our own Government and the negotiations have been undertaken with the Security Council.

There will be, I assume, under that arrangement, a certain number of armed forces which can be called upon by the Security Council in the decision of which Mr. Stettinius as the American representative must concur. The votes of the five great powers must be included in a calling out of forces of this kind.

I mention the military aspect of the United Nations—enforcement, sanctions, restraint of aggression—as the most obvious part of the Organization which relates to our national defense, but the part which we hope will be used as little as possible.

There is a second aspect related to the enforcement procedures: the specific settlement of disputes. The settlement of controversies and disputes and situations which are likely to lead to war, before they get to the critical stage where the Security Council must call out, or consider calling out, the police force. That side of the Organization will be handled largely by the Security Council; that is, after negotiations have broken down between two states, or after arbitration or any other form of peaceful settlement has broken down. The Security Council is supposed to be the final resort in the political field of disputes and situations which cannot be handled by other means. We have already had a few of these: Indonesia and Greece, in London; Iran, in New York.

These subjects fill the agenda of the Security Council even before it had any rules of procedure to know how to handle such disputes. They have been handled remarkably well considering the fact that the Council did not know how to dea with these things, how to vote, and how to conduct even its routine procedure.

I think if you will follow the work of our own delegate, Mr. Stettinius, and also the work of Mr. Byrnes during the Iranian discussions, you will see that regardless of the substance of dispute, our representatives determined that any State which wants to bring to the Council a controversy or a dispute or a situation threatenin the peace, will have a fair hearing. whatever the matter of the dispute. This is essential if the Organization is

to last. If the Organization is to settle disputes so that they will not come to the enforcement stage, it must have open and above-board discussions and must give a frank hearing to anyone who wishes to present a case.

That is the reason why Secretary Byrnes insisted that the Iranian dispute remain on the agenda until we had full proof that it was no longer a matter of serious consequence, or until the Iranians themselves were willing to withdraw it.

There is, of course, on the legal side, the new International Court of Justice which has just met in the Hague to organize itself, which will continue the traditions of the World Court of the Hague. The court will have cases referred to it by the Security Council and will have opportunities to pass upon situations which involve the legal interpretations before they get to the critical stage.

There is a third field, which I shall merely mention without going into details, because I am not at all competent to discuss it—the international control of atomic energy. I see you are to have a discussion of that project tomorrow with a scientist, so I merely mention it as one of the fields in which, for our own safety, we will want to participate, and take part as one of the states which has a great deal at stake in this very controversial and very dangerous subject.

Thus far the United Nations have merely appointed, as a result of the initiative of the great powers, a commission on the atomic energy. That commission is composed of the representatives of the 11 members of the Security Council, including the five great powers, plus Canada as a state which has a special interest in atomic energy.

The General Assembly has authorized that commission, which is to meet very soon in New York, to study the problem and make recommendations on the question of exchange of information, of control of atomic energy, of limitation of atomic weapons, and instituting proper safeguards such as inspection and other means which are to be studied for these controls.

We have also had, on the part of our Government, a resolution debated and discussed in Congress, but I believe no final action has been taken for the control of this problem within our own borders. I am not competent to discuss the details of this subject; I simply throw it out as one matter related to national defense within the field of United Nations, to which you may want to give further attention.

I should like to call your attention to the report on international control of atomic energy which was prepared by a group of scientists under the direction of the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, General Groves, and others who are concerned with this problem. I believe that your organization or any committe working on this problem will want to study this document which in many ways is a great state paper, well conceived, organized, and written by some of the men with the best scientific knowledge of the subject.

A fourth field in which the United States has a stake because of this general problem of national defense and the prevention of another war, although it may not seem to be immediately related, concerns international trade. That is a perennial subject of discussion in Washington and a subject of debate and controversy; various departments have different views on it, quite apart from the debates between our own Government and foreign governments. It is quite clear that conflicts in the economic field, trade rivalries, the struggle for markets, and the struggle for the control of raw materials, etc., are among the sources of international conflict and among the many sources of the wars which have plagued us in the past. If we are to move ahead in making a third world war impossible, we must move ahead in this very complicated and controversial field.

The General Assembly of the United Nations has authorized the Economic and Social Council to call a conference on trade problems. It is generally assumed that this conference will set up an international trade organization to handle the technical problems of opening channels for trade, of breaking down artificial restrictions, barriers, quotas, and exchange controls. The organization will seek to make sure that the man in the Middle West who wants to sell his wheat or corn has a fair chance to, or the man in the South, who wants to sell his cotton, or the man in Detroit wanting to sell his automobiles, can do it in fair competition with the manufacturers or the farmers of other countries, and that the consumers in the country have a fair chance to buy products from outside the country.

Again, I do not go into details, I merely throw it out as one aspect of this problem of national security which is not among the immediate subjects which you have been discussing but which I think you may want to consider in the broader problem of safeguarding the United States in the future.

The last of the topics I have selected as being significant in the field of national defense is the general problem of dependent territories. Three of the nineteen chapters of the Charter of the United Nations deal with peoples who, according to the Charter, have not yet achieved a full measure of self-government—people not directly represented in the United Nations. I think that the fact that 3 out of 19 chapters deal with dependent territories indicates the importance which the drafters at San Francisco gave to what is usually called the "colonial problem."

Chapter XI of the Charter is entitled "Declaration Regarding Non-self-governing Territories." It is really a historic document, because for the first time the nations have laid down in an international treaty the fact that they have a special responsibility for people who have not yet attained a full measure of self-government. In chapter XI the states which administer colonial or non-self-governing territories have accepted as a sacred trust the obligation to carry out certain responsibilities, to promote the economic, social, and political advancement of the inhabitants of these territories toward self-government, to assist them in various ways, and finally to report to the Secretary-General of the Organization about conditions in these territories.

Here again is the subject which may not strike you immediately as involved in the problem of national defense. I think it is, however, because many of the areas on the periphery of this war were areas which are colonial in status—Germany was striking out to get control of Africa, Japan was striking out further and further into Southeast Asia. As long as you have peoples who are weak, backward, or undeveloped, who have not attained full self-government, you have danger spots. There you are apt to have a vacuum into which great powers seek to get control. We have had many examples of this in the past century. The whole imperial struggle for control of bases, raw materials, markets, and so forth, in areas outside of the sovereign states, has been a subject of great study and investigation, and is one which has been placed in the Charter of the United Nations as deserving special attention.

The other two chapters of the Charter I mentioned, deal with trusteeship. I shall not go into the details of those chapters, but simply explain that the drafters in San Francisco provided that there are certain categories of territories which may be placed—it is purely voluntary—under the trusteeship of the United Nations: the present mandated territories, any territories detached from the enemy states in this war, or any territory voluntarily turned over to the system by the state responsible for it. It will be a matter for subsequent agreement, under individual trusteeship agreements, as to which territories are placed under the system, and as to what are the terms of trusteeship.

The trust territories may be administered within this system by one or more states, or by the Organization itself. The trusteeship council, which it is generally expected will be set up in September, will have general supervision, as did the Permanent Mandate Commission of the League of Nations, over the administration of these territories. In many cases, in the case of the present mandates, the administration will be in the hands of a single state.

Here are the five important topics—the restraint of aggression, pacific settlement of disputes, control of atomic energy, international trade, and dependent territories—each one of which would keep you busy for weeks if you went into them in detail. They are topics which are related to our national defense and to this general problem of averting another international conflict at all cost.

I would like to say, in conclusion, that I think you must look at our participation in the United Nations, and at these five problems (to pick out only five of the 57 varieties) as you look at the work of any organization, any association or club or national state. You, as members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, pay dues, have special obligations, because you think there is an advantage to you and your fellow veterans to belong to this organization. You contribute to it, you work for it, and the organization succeeds or fails insofar as you contribute to it.

There is nothing in the organization itself and its charter or its constitution which gives it any life. That is up to the members, to individual members working together. The United Nations is likewise just a piece of paper. It works only if the individual members want it to work. If they do not, it will fold up the way the League of Nations folded up—because people did not want to use that particular machine for their foreign policy.

You get out of the United Nations organization what you put into it—just the way you as individuals get out of this organization what you put into it. If you work for it and give something to it, you get something out of it in return.

I started at the outset by saying that the United Nations is not a philanthropic, charitable organization; we are putting things into it because we expect to get something out of it. We expect to get national security, the safeguarding of our national prosperity, general improvement in world conditions, and ultimately the prevention of another war.

It is these general principles which I want to stress as part of this whole problem of national defense, part of the whole problem of safeguarding, developing, and advancing the American way of life, and of making sure that the world is so organized that we can enjoy the American way of life without having hanging over us the threat of another war. We know that another war would upset our whole political and economic system more than this war has done for the past 5 years, and that without the new weapons of another war would do more damage than even the terrible damage that was done in the war just ended. We simply cannot afford another war. Participating in, working for, contributing toward, and throwing our weight behind the United Nations is one way, and I think a very good way, in which we can safeguard the United States by preventing such a war.

Thank you. [Applause.]

Sault Ste. Marie High School Choir and Its Swing Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my weekly broadcast over the radio stations in my district: WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie; WDBC, Escanaba; and WMAM, Marinette-Menominee:

As I prepare this transcription in Washington on Thursday morning, myself and my office staff are eagerly anticipating the arrival at 8:30 tomorrow morning, Friday, June 7, 1946, of the Sault Ste. Marie High School choir and its swing band, and their chaperons. The choir of 135 voices and the 18-piece swing band are all under the capable direction of Mr. Earl P. Thomas, director of music at the Sault Ste. Marie High School.

Mr. Thomas is also chairman of the committee on music of the Michigan district of Kiwanis International.

This entire trip all started when sometime ago the district governor of the Kiwanis listened to a concert given by the Soo Choir and thereafter arranged for them to be invited to sing on two different days next Monday and Tuesday at the Kiwanis International Convention at Atlantic City, N. J. This started the snowball rolling. Mr. John Merrifield, secretary of the chamber of commerce of Sault Ste. Marie, called me off the floor of the House one day on the long distance telephone and told me that Earl Thomas had an idea in mind and requested my cooperation. Mr. Thomas then told me about the invitation to sing in Atlantic City and said en route he would like very much to have the group spend a day in Washington, and, if possible, they would like to sing on the White House lawn serenading the President. Failing that, any other arrangement I could make would prove satisfactory to him.

Upon inquiry I learned that because of pressure of business and constant demand for such Presidential invitations on the part of all kinds of groups and hundreds—if not perhaps thousands—of high-school groups, the President absolutely had to draw the line on all such entertainment. I thereupon asked General Eisenhower if he would like to have the group appear in the court of the famous Pentagon Building and have them sing a few numbers for him and carry on their concert for the benefit of some 20,000 employees who are always on duty in the Pentagon—even in these so-called days of peace. Many of these employees patronize the open-air restaurant in the court of the Pentagon—and these arrangements were speedily made—thanks to the cooperation of the commandant of the District of Columbia Military District, Gen. Robert N. Young, under whose direct control comes the operation of the Pentagon. Well, to make a long story short, one thing led to another. Realizing the technical difficulities I was getting into, I returned to Washington a week early, during our Easter recess, in order to drive Mr. Thomas to Washington to check up on the technical details for several concerts that we were in the process of arranging, and believe me, there has been a raft of detail work done since then to perfect the arrangements which are as follows:

At 8:30 tomorrow morning the entire group of about 150 persons will arrive at Union Station here in Washington. From then on they will be transported everywhere in a fleet of five 35-passenger sightseeing busses of the latest type. In addition, we will have three trucks at Union Station to take care of their baggage, their choir robes, their musical instruments, etc. Each piece of personal baggage, properly marked by the owner, will be delivered to their rooms in a local hotel, which rooms, however, they will not see until later in the day.

The entire group will be taken to a leading cafeteria in Washington for breakfast, then will proceed for a tour of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—which we all know as the FBI—where they will be greeted by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and one of our own Michigan men who is one of Mr. Hoover's assistants, Mr. Louis B. Nichols, famous for the direction of the capture of the largest spy ring in history as portrayed in the motion picture "The House on Ninety-second Street." Thence, the group will proceed to the Pentagon Building and will be given a military escort to that building. At noon I will introduce the choir and the director to General Eisenhower and those assembled in the Pentagon Court. They will give a 30-minute concert, following which they will be given a brief tour of the Pentagon itself, and will be served luncheon in the court of that building. Following that, the group leaves for the United States Capitol, visiting both the House of Representatives and the Senate. I expect to introduce them to the House when they are in the gallery, and Senators VANDENBERG and FERGUSON will meet the group on the Senate side. Thereafter, they go through the Library of Congress and the Supreme Court.

By the way, not the least of our difficulties in arranging for a trip such as this—and in the handling of such a group—is the necessity for absolute strict timing and the insistence that everyone be in his bus at the proper time. And now I am going to give you some facts on timing on the schedule. At 4:15 p. m. the group goes to check in at the Annapolis Hotel in downtown Washington. Four are assigned to each room. Their baggage will be in their rooms on arrival. Therefore, immediately they will get settled and cleaned up. At 5 p. m. they have dinner in the Everglades Room of the hotel; at 6 p. m. they leave the hotel for the Naval Medical Center at Bethesda, Md.

I am having a police motorcycle escort at the hotel to take them through traffic which will be heavy at that time in order that they may arrive at Bethesda by 6:30—and that is a distance of about 15 miles from the hotel; whence they will change into their choir robes and render a 20-minute concert for the veterans and staff of the Naval Hospital. At 7:10 p. m. they will leave for the United States Army Walter Reed Hospital—perhaps the most famous Army medical center in the country. The choir will not disrobe and the band members will carry their instruments with them on the bus. They will again have the police escort in order to be on the stage at Walter Reed to sing and play to the veterans at 7:30 p. m. Following a 20-minute concert there the group leaves Walter Reed Hospital for Griffith Stadium where they will be the guests of Mr. Clark Griffith, president of the Washington American League baseball team who will be playing a night game with the Chicago White Sox. The choir will sing the first stanza of the Star-Spangled Banner at the stadium and at the end of the game they will be transported back to the hotel for the night.

On Saturday morning after breakfast the group leaves at 9:00 o'clock for the Mount Alto Veterans' Hospital in Washington. There they will perform for three programs. First of all, they will be rehearsed for a radio broadcast and during that time they will be photographed in sound and color for a motion picture to be released later by the United States Veterans' Administration entitled "The Veterans' Administration Reports to the Nation." At the same time, they will, of course, be entertaining the veterans who are bedridden in the hospital and those who are able to get out in the open air.

At 11:30 Saturday morning they will broadcast a 30-minute program dedicated to the President and entitled "The High Schools of America Salute the President." This will go out over radio station WWDC here in Washington. At this point I might say that arrangements have been made to transcribe all these concerts and, if possible, at least some of them will be broadcast over this radio station for your enjoyment. Furthermore, I hope that the motion pictures in color and sound will be shown in your local theater before long. As soon as the broadcast is over at Mount Alto Hospital, the group will return to their busses and proceed to the hotel for luncheon and then will go on a real sightseeing trip both afternoon and evening. In their busses they will see the Sixteenth Street foreign nations' embassies and legations, National Zoological Park, Georgetown, Fort Meyer, Arlington National Cemetery, visit Lee Mansion, Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, and Memorial Amphitheater, a sightseeing tour of Alexandria, and thence to Mount Vernon for a visit of Washington's home and tomb. On return to Washington they will drive through the National Airport whence throughout the latter days of the war the Army Transport Command sent huge airliners overseas and received them at the rate of one every 8 minutes, 24 hours a day—and then they will visit the Jefferson and Lincoln Memorials. After dinner at the hotel they will be put aboard an excursion steamer for a moonlight cruise on the Potomac. They will enjoy dancing aboard the steamer and will have a 45-minute stop-over at an amusement park about 20 miles below Washington. Believe me, they will be tired when they go to bed.

On Sunday morning immediately after breakfast those who are of the Catholic faith will be taken to historic St. Patrick Catholic Church for 9 o'clock low Mass. Then the entire group will check out of the hotel; their baggage will be taken to Union Station and checked through to Atlantic City—and the choir in uniform will then go to the famous Foundry Methodist Church to sing for the 11 o'clock service. The pastor of that church is the Chaplain of the Senate, the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, and the church itself was founded in 1815 by Henry Foxall. It is named the Foundry Methodist Church because during the War of 1812 when the British were in our Capital and set fire to our Capitol Building, itself, this Mr. Foxall vowed that if the British did not destroy his foundry—which was located in historic old Georgetown—he would "establish a church to the Glory of God" in thanksgiving. His foundry was not harmed during the war and shortly thereafter he did establish the Foundry Methodist Church. Our late President Roosevelt took Mr. Churchill to this church when he visited our country right after Pearl Harbor. It is also interesting to know that many of our Presidents have attended this church in the past.

Immediately following the service the busses will take the group to Union Station, where the Pennsylvania Railroad has provided two special air-conditioned cars for them, and a private dining car. They will proceed on the 1-o'clock train to the Kiwanis International Convention at Atlantic City, and I believe when they leave Washington your Congressman will be a tired man, but I believe that our entire district will owe a debt of gratitude to the Sault Ste. Marie High School Choir and Band who, insofar as Washingtonians are concerned, will be very definitely well remembered.

In closing, may I add that as a result of the publicity we have already received, we have had numerous inquiries in our office as to just what our vacation facilities are in our north country, and I believe that the citizens of Sault Ste. Marie, who through individual and group contributions from all sources—and to whom I am extremely grateful—raised some $12,000 to pay the expenses of this excursion to Washington and Atlantic

City will be repaid many times over and all of us in northern Michigan and, indeed, in our entire State of Michigan, will feel a debt of gratitude to the citizens of the Soo and to the choir and band who have represented them in the Nation's Capital. It has been a pleasure to do our part in my office to work out the details of this trip for them insofar as Washington is concerned, and I repeat, we are looking forward to the weekend with them.

Churchill's Grim Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lorain (Ohio) Journal of June 6, 1946:

CHURCHILL'S GRIM PICTURE

The western democracies and Soviet Russia are drawing closer to a momentous decision.

Events of the past few days in Europe, climaxed by Winston Churchill's grim speech yesterday, have made that plain. The question resolves itself into this:

1. Whether the two radically opposed political systems can exist side by side and work together for a peaceful world.

2. Whether they will be drawn into a struggle for supremacy, by one side or the other, which eventually can lead only to a third world war.

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, who led the western armies to victory over Germany, said in Chicago on Monday that talk about methods of waging a new world war is vicious and that anyone discussing its possibilities is doing the world a disservice.

World statesmen nevertheless are mentioning the possibility of a new war, but more with the idea of shocking the nations into taking steps to see that it cannot happen, rather than inciting them to prepare for it.

The dread thought creeps consistently into many speeches, other than that of Churchill before the British House of Commons yesterday.

The problem, as seen by spokesmen of the western allies, is for Russia to quit proselytizing and trying to establish pro-Soviet government in as many countries as she can reach, no matter how far distant from Soviet borders. The western powers fear, according to Prime Minister Clement Attlee, that Russia will not be satisfied until the bulk of the world has embraced communism.

Russia, on the other hand, professes to be deeply suspicious that the democracies are intent on destroying her system, either by political and economic means or, as a last resort, by war.

In this charged atmosphere, the prospect of anything like general agreement on the complex problems to be faced by the Big Four foreign ministers in Paris on June 15 seems remote. Yet the inherent dangers of another complete failure may lead to concessions which will to some extent lighten the present dark picture.

Anything would be preferable to the grim prospect envisaged by Churchill, who said it would be better to see a dividing line set up between Soviet Russia and her satellites, on the one hand, and the rest of the world, on the other, "than tamely to accept the continued degeneration of the whole world position."

Government's Place in the Realm of Human Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. GARDNER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered last Wednesday:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a very happy occasion to me to return, on the thirtieth anniversary of my own graduation from the portals of your school, to talk to those who will tonight commence their participation in the practical problems of life, both governmental and domestic.

Well do I remember the early history of the school from which these boys are now graduating. I recall the insurmountable problems that were under discussion as early as 1905, regarding the formation and location of this Catholic high school, which had no precedent to follow since the Hamilton Catholic High School was one of the first Catholic high schools to be organized in the United States of America.

I remember the first 4 years of the school's history and the great rejoicing that attended the opening day of our own class in our freshman year of 1912. This marked the first day that the school was a full-fledged high school, with four classes completely organized.

The sacrifices entailed by those families who would provide their children with Catholic education were well exemplified by the history of my own class. We started in 1912 with over 50, and ended in 1916 with only 6. The costly burden of higher Catholic education had taken its toll, and most of those who entered with us found it necessary to take employment to bolster the family income rather than continue to spend a part for their own further education.

In that problem which I have just outlined lay the foundation for my own continuous study during the past 30 years. Early in life I resolved to study the principles of economics which had such a bearing upon the lives of individuals. In that period of time I have had the opportunity of studying the principles and interpretations under the Jesuits in Xavier University, under what some refer to as reactionaries in the University of Pennsylvania, and in a continuing study of modern trends in the University of Cincinnati.

In speaking to you tonight I would like to emphasize the necessity for universal participation in Government by all citizens of our country. I would like to emphasize the necessity for securing a solid background of information concerning historical happenings in the realm of human relations, both as regards the rights of people and the rights of property. It is essential that we study these historical facts in order to intelligently appraise the happenings of our own day.

As early as 1891 we found the term liberalism very popular, and it was a long time before the attention of the world was called to the fact that liberalism was a vicious error. Liberalism means that men are free to do whatever they please, no matter how much they may harm other men. It was Pope Leo XIII who spoke out bravely and declared that the worker had a right to a living wage, that liberalism was a vicious error, and that a remedy had to be found to relieve the worker from the unjust burdens placed upon him.

The Socialists of Leo's time were urging class conflict as the way to right the wrongs of labor. However, Pope Leo declared that you cannot right a wrong by another wrong, and that cooperation is the remedy, for capital cannot do without labor, labor cannot do without capital. The Socialists of 1891 claimed they knew the remedy for these bad conditions. The Socialists said, "Do away with the owning of private property. Let the state or the government take charge of all ownership for the people. Then each person will have an equal share of whatever there is, in land, houses, food, and clothing." The Pope's answer to this was, "No. It is wrong to take away from people what they own. God has given each person the right to own things. The state or the government has no more right to do this than one person has the right to take what belongs to another. It is stealing, and God's law forbids stealing. Furthermore, such a remedy will only make things worse, and especially for the workers. Conflicts will result and the state and government will become tyrants acting as they please, and no one will be able to stop them."

We explain the right to private property in this way. A man works for pay. He has the right to use that pay as he pleases, provided he does not harm anybody. He saves his pay, buys a piece of land, a house, furniture, food. All these things belong to him, for he has earned them from his labor. If he wants to sell or give away any or all of these things, he has the right to do so. The Socialists would deprive the worker of this right, and so prevent him from bettering his condition in life.

The state should not take care of all these things because this is not the state's business. If the state owns all things, it will not stop until it owns man himself. But man does not belong to the state, the state belongs to man, for man has made the state. We in the United States hold that the individual, both logically and biologically, precedes the state. We hold that the individual is dowered by nature, and ultimately by the author of nature, with certain natural rights, such as the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Individuals joining together form the natural institution known as the family, which has likewise, under the law of nature and of nature's God, certain rights and sanctities. Lastly, in both the logical and the historical order, is another natural institution known as civil society, or the state, composed of the two prior institutions, the individual and the family. It is the primary function of the state to protect and not to usurp the rights of the individual and of the family. It is the secondary function of the state to promote the common welfare of citizens by regulating the complexities of civil life and welfare, and to engage in such activities as are beyond the scope or the ability of either the individual or the family. This is the very soul of the American system, and all of the distinctive features of our Government are only means to protect the aforementioned doctrine. The written Constitution, the system of checks and balances, the Supreme Court, the Congress, the Senate, and the President, are simply means to an end.

Opposed to this doctrine is the one we fought against and which has come to be known as totalitarianism. This word is easily defined. It means that the total man belongs to the state. All rights originate with and can be destroyed at the will of the omnipotent state. In more detail, personal rights of the individual, such as life and liberty; political rights, such as freedom of speech, press, and assembly, and formation of political opposition to incumbents; economic rights, such as rights to personal property, family rights, and religious liberty; all these basic rights and liberties in the totalitarian concept have their origin in the state. The state, therefore, may at will abrogate or curtail any or all of these rights as expediency demands. Opposed to the totalitarian philosophy of the state, which is the very soul of

communism and of fascism, is the American political philosophy of life, which is known as the doctrine of natural rights. It is that doctrine which is referred to in the Declaration of Independence when it speaks of those things which are granted by "the laws of nature and of nature's God." It is that doctrine which is more specifically detailed in the famous Bill of Rights which forms the first 10 amendments to the Constitution.

History, which is the record of what man has thought, said and done all down the years, tell us this: Man has always believed in private property, because it is a help to him in living a peaceful life. And so he has made laws about private property, telling how it is to be used, bought, sold, and exchanged. And very long ago God spoke to man about private property, when He told him: "Do not covet a man's house or field or anything that belongs to him." If a man is the father of a family he needs property. In fact, his need is greater, for he must take care of his wife and children and provide for them when he dies. It is only by owning property that he can do this in the best way.

When the state looks upon the family it should remember that the family comes first, for it is by the gathering together of families that the state is made. The state should help the family when it is in trouble, but the state has no right to take over the family.

I have previously referred to the fact that cooperation rather than conflict is the answer to problems arising in our work-a-day world. Pope Leo pointed this out when he called upon the workers to give a fair day's work for a fair day's pay, to be honest, just and responsible in their duties as workers; upon the employer he placed the responsibility to respect the dignity of the worker and to remember that he is a man and a Christian, not a slave nor a cog in a machine. The employer must remember that justice is to rule his dealings with the worker and that to profit from the weakness or the need of the worker is against all laws, human and divine. Force, fraud and trickery used against the worker are sins crying to heaven for punishment.

But justice between employer and worker alone is not sufficient—we must have friendliness and understanding if we would have happiness. It is as certain as that the night follows the day that human skill and intelligence will not be so applied as to secure commercial and industrial efficiency unless there is human happiness. If men are dissatisfied and unhappy they will be receptive to every suggestion of trouble and ready to magnify every misfortune or discordant note, and the state of mind of the worker is usually transmitted to his family and associates. We are, therefore, faced with the problem of bringing about such a condition of human happiness as will at least lay the foundation for such stability as must be secured before permanent progress can be made in any direction.

Those who are wealthy must remember that their wealth is a big responsibility. We are reminded by Pope Leo XIII that money and things are given us by God to use for our eternal welfare. Whether we have much or little matters not at all. It is the right use of things that really matters. The wealthy have a right to their wealth, but not the right to use it as they please. God alone is the absolute owner of all things. The wealthy are the stewards of their wealth, and should consider it their duty to give of their riches to those who are in need. All we have, God has given us, and He expects us to use what we have for our own good and also for the good of others. No human being can ever substitute for the charity that was taught us by Christ. Nevertheless, the state should do its part. In fact, all human means must be used to relieve the widespread poverty in the world today. It is the first duty of the state to see that the laws of the land are for the benefit of the many and not for the few. Its laws should safeguard good moral living and healthy family life, and its taxing power should be used justly. In brief, the state should do everything that makes for the welfare and happiness of its citizens, and first among those should come the welfare of the working people. Laws that look to the good of the worker benefit the entire population, and render special means of relief needless.

The state must give justice to all—to the poor as well as to the rich. Each group in the population is entitled to justice. All classes in the state cannot contribute in the same way to the common good. The legislators and other officials in the state contribute in one way, the professional groups in another, and the workers in still a different way. But it must be remembered that the worker in the shop or in the field contributes a very great deal to the common welfare. Indeed, it may be said that it is through the cooperation of the workers in the common effort that states grow prosperous, and so it follows that working conditions must be safe and healthful. Men cannot live as men, virtuous and law-abiding, unless they have decent wages. The state should, by its laws, see to this. In so doing the state is not only aiding the working group but it is benefiting every class of the population.

The state should safeguard the population in all its parts—groups, families, individuals. It must not absorb them; it should protect them. This is its business and its only business. The authorities of the state, speaking through the laws of the state, should take action when the general interest of any particular group in the Nation suffers. It is to the public interest as well as to the interest of the individual states that peace and order prevail, that morality and religion prosper, that family life be lived according to God's law, that justice rein among citizens and among the different classes. If conditions arise that threaten this healthy order the authority of the state should intervene. However, that authority should not go beyond what is required to correct abuses.

It is the state's duty to protect the rights of its citizens. In this regard the wage earner has a better claim on the protection of the state than the man of wealth. The worker needs protection against the agitator who tries to lead him into crimes of violence, urging him to seize the property of others. He must be taught at all times to respect the right of private property. His lot cannot be bettered by the false theories that, under other names, call for the spoliation of others' fortunes.

The primary right of the worker, as of every man, is to his eternal destiny. In this all men are equal. There is no difference between rich and poor, employer and worker, ruler and ruled. Working conditions, then, must be such as to allow for the development of the mental and spiritual life of the worker.

The struggle for security is one of the outstanding incentives in every human life. We plan, we work and serve, to gain, as far as possible, security for our loved ones—security in health, security in position, security in our homes, security in the place we hold in the hearts of our friends and associates, and security for old age.

This never-ending effort to find security is the great impelling power which has brought the world to its present state of development. It is the moving force which builds character and muscle, which develops brawn and brain, and which will carry us individually and as a nation on to still greater accomplishment.

Our real national strength lies in the great unheralded armies of men and women who are the backbone of the communities, large and small, in which they live, work, and serve. They are men and women of character and of integrity of purpose, who represent the best in human life. The great majority of them may be nationally unknown, but their name is legion and their lives run like the deep waters of a mighty river, unseen, unruffled, unchecked, but flowing on irresistibly to a definite goal, until life is finished and they reach the great seas of the life beyond. Herein lies the inexhaustible strength of America, which cannot be measured by any political or material yardstick.

However, we must remember that we have a much greater work to do than merely working out our own happiness and prosperity. We must, among other things, bear some of the burdens of our more unfortunate associates who have left countless thousands of widows and orphans to struggle through life as best they can without the help of those who were pledged to their support and who, having placed love of and loyalty to their country above every other consideration, have given up their lives in its defense. There is much that we can and should do, and we have the duty to include this responsibility as one of our first problems in the general readjustment of world affairs that must take place.

I hope that I may have awakened in the minds of those listening—in the minds of the graduates here tonight—an interest in practical life that does not find its foundation in the lust for material things. It is sometimes the practice at times such as this to speak on the subject of material success, but I have purposely avoided that for the reason that every good thing in life can be abused; every constructive instrument can be made an implement of destruction. Material success can and will bring ruin if character and high purpose sufficient to meet the strain have not been developed. Success must be earned through hard, persistent, constant digging, and when earned one usually finds it full of responsibilities to the many who helped make it possible through their giving of that good will, respect, and confidence for which he has striven.

It would seem as though there is a limit as regards the wordly success that any human being can successfully stand. Life was apparently so ordained so that great effort and high purpose should be necessary to character development. The longer I live the more certain I am that the great difference between men, the great and significant difference, is energy, invincible determination, and honest purpose once fixed, and—victory. That quality will do anything that can be done in the world, and no substance, no opportunity, will make of a two-legged creature a man without it.

You will find, as you enter the competition of life, that the world has become and is becoming better and better. One who has not investigated the facts would be astounded at the progress that has been made during the last 30 years in the way of better working conditions, better living conditions, and better wage conditions.

Throughout the United States many practical living examples of industrial peace and contentment can be found, which simply prove that a better order of things is possible if those interested are willing to pay the price in time, patience and service.

And tonight as I bid you Godspeed on your commencement of the voyage of practical life I hope that you will have as much enjoyment in your participation in the solving of problems of everyday economics as I have been permitted to have during the past 30 years of my participation.

Good luck and may God bless you.

Law Ignored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, we are living under the rule of men and not of laws. Laws enacted by the Congress are deliberately violated by certain bureaucrats. These functionaries use the taxpayers' money to influence legislation in violation of law, yet nothing is done about it.

When law is violated with impunity by those sworn to obey the law as a condition precedent to holding a public position of trust, it means that if such officers are not brought to the bar of justice and held responsible for their illegal acts, then tyranny soon replaces law and order.

Those who receive telegrams from the OPA officials to support the OPA and those who listen to the frantic appeals of OPA officials over the radio to support the OPA may well read the Federal law with its penalties for thus violating the plain mandate of the statutes. I insert act of July 11, 1919 (41 Stat. 69), as follows:

ACT OF JULY 11, 1919 (41 STAT. 69)

SEC. 6. That hereafter no part of the money appropriated by this or any other act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers and employees of the United States from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Any officer or employee of the United States who, after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him is found to have violated or attempted to violate this section, shall be removed by such superior officer from office or employment. Any officer or employee of the United States who violates or attempts to violate this section shall also be guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an editorial from the Wall Street Journal under date of June 11, 1946, entitled "Gestures to a Lie":

GESTURES TO A LIE

To a recent issue of this newspaper Mr. Bryant sent a Washington dispatch about a cute scheme which has been cooked up by the self-anointed master minds of OPA.

Price fixing authority expires June 30. It is clear Congress will extend it only with amendments which are intended to keep the price fixers within the bounds of law and good sense. This irks the price fixers. So the scheme is to have President Truman veto the amended bill on the very eve of June 30. The theory is that Congress then would be faced with the choice of extending OPA "as is" or of taking the responsibility for its demise.

There are a good many flaws in this scheme, the principal one being that it implies that Congress and the country generally have barely enough sense to get out of the rain. The scheme is worth discussion only for what it reveals about the OPA debate and about the OPA master minds.

The discussion is not on the point of whether or not OPA is a good thing; no one, except those most immediately concerned in its administration and those who want to use it as an instrument of centralized power, even pretends that it is a good thing. The discussion is about who will take the responsibility for ending OPA.

That this is the sticking point has been apparent for some time. A good many businessmen who take the line that "OPA is bad, but—" will say in private that they think the whole thing should be killed but that they hesitate to take any of the responsibility for killing it. Exactly the same sentiment is met in groups of economists and publicists. In private many of these gentlemen will condemn OPA across the board, but publicly they feel that they must make gestures toward the monstrous propaganda which has been set up in its behalf.

Adolf Hitler pronounced the theory that if one will lie largely, assiduously, and vehemently, he will find many people ready to believe his lies and a great many others too weak to call the lies what they are. The fear to combat the official propaganda in behalf of OPA is certainly evidence in support of that proposition.

Certainly the majority of business people who have dealt with OPA believe it to be a bad thing which is holding back production. The witnesses before the congressional committees have given an imposing list of its crimes. The majority of Congress is disgusted with OPA and shows it by votes. It is very probable that if the majority of President Truman's close advisers would speak candidly, they would exhibit a sentiment not greatly different. Yet all hesitate to do the honest thing and kill OPA. The country has been told that the OPA is going to hold down prices and prevent inflation. It can't. It never could. Instead of saying that honestly, there ensues an unseemly jockeying to place responsibility for its failure.

Probably the only people who really believe in OPA are the people engaged in running it. It seems that they really believe that if something happens so that the country is deprived of their ministrations, there will be a public outcry which will cow the Congress which voted to curb their power. There is no other explanation of their scheme to have President Truman veto an amended OPA Act and put responsibility of prolonging or ending it quickly on Congress.

Of course the death of OPA would bring no such outcry except the one synthetized by official propaganda, which would have the usual aid of the whole leftist contingent. The people are well aware of the OPA failure; they are the ones who are disregarding OPA rules.

Do Farmers Want Social Security?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Nebraska Farmer, which is published by former Gov. Samuel R. McKelvie, of Nebraska, at Lincoln, I prepared an article on social security for farmers. This is one of the leading farm papers of the Nation and it is edited by Mr. Tom Leadley. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article:

Machinist Brown has reached the age of 65 years. His wife is 65 years, also. Machinist Brown was covered by the Social Security Act, so the Social Security Board mails him a check each month for $33, and a monthly check to his wife for $16.50. If Machinist Brown dies prior to his wife's death, the Social Security Board will send his wife a check for $24.75 each month the rest of her life. All of these payments are made without proving that they are in need. These figures are based on the fact that the average wage Machinist Brown received was $150 per month.

Farmer Brown grows old and reaches the age of 65. His wife is 65, also. The Social Security Board, or no one else, sends him or his wife a check. This is also true of all other self-employed people, the heads of unincorporated businesses, and other excluded classes such as municipal employees, employees of nonprofit associations, and the like.

Let us take another case. Grocery Clerk Smith is only 40 years of age and he dies. He has worked the required length of time in employment covered by the Social Security Act to be protected thereby. His average wage has been $100 per month. He leaves a widow age 35, and twin girls age 10. The Social Security Board sends a check for $20.62 for the wife, and $13.75 each to the two children, or a total of $48.12. They do this each month until these twin girls are 18. The payments then stop, but when the wife reaches 65 years of age, the Social Security Board will again begin sending her checks for $20.62 for the rest of her life. Likewise these payments are made without showing that they are in need.

Farmer Smith is the same age as Grocery Clerk Smith. He, too, dies and leaves a widow age 35 and twin girls age 10. The Social Security Board does not send her any checks neither during the minority of the children nor when she reaches 65. If Grocery Clerk Smith worked in a store, where the business was unincorporated, the owner of that store gets no protection for himself under social security. The owner of an unincorporated business, like the farmer, is considered self-employed and is not covered by the Social Security Act.

DO FARMERS WANT IT?

Immediately the question comes to mind, Do the people not now covered by social security, such as the farmers, self-employed, and others have a right to come under the Social Security Act? Obviously no system of social security can be defended which takes care of some groups and excludes other groups of millions of people. Therefore it is not a question of right. The $64 question is, Do the farmers want to be covered by social security and what will it cost?

The Congress of the United States will be deciding some time before long whether or not farmers and other self-employed people should be covered by the old-age and survivors insurance of the Social Security Act. Once that decision is made an individual farmer or a group of farmers have no choice about it. They are then in the system for the rest of their lives and they will have to pay the social-security tax. The old-age and survivors section of the Social Security Act is nothing other than compulsory Government insurance. Premiums are collected through the power to tax.

The committee of Congress, of which I am a member, the Ways and Means Committee, have been studying the whole program of social security for about 4 months. It seems to be highly advisable that we have public

discussion on whether or not farmers should be under social security. Farmers and their families should speak out on the subject. Certainly farmers and others who are now excluded from the program should direct their attention to the burdens of social security and not alone to the benefits.

The present rate of tax for social security cannot be accepted as a criterion as to what the rate of tax will be in the years to come. Right now the tax is 2 percent, half of it taken out of the employee's check and half of it is paid by the employer. If a self-employed person is called upon to pay the entire tax himself, he would be paying 2 percent. It must be borne in mind, however, that the social-security system is new. It is like a young insurance company, of the assessment type, that is taking the premium from thousands of people, but hasn't started to pay very many losses as yet. A government has no money except that which it takes away from its citizens. Our committee has tried to find out what the rate of tax would have to be in the years to come. Some of the best actuaries in the Nation were either loaned to the committee or hired by the committee to assist with our study.

TAX TO BE HIGHER

The conclusion of the experts is that 50 years from now the social-security tax might reach a total of 10 percent. An employee drawing $100 per month would have to pay $5 a month, and his employer would have to pay $5 a month. If a farmer's income is $1,500 a year, 10 percent of that is $150. It is a lot of money. Other experts made estimates a little lower than 10 percent, but all were agreed that the tax must be much higher than it is now.

Consequently, a farmer, who in not too many years will reach 65, should not decide this question on how good a retirement deal he can get out of it, but he must also weigh the situation from the standpoint as to how it will affect his son, who as a farmer may have to pay the social-security tax for 35 or 40 years, at a much higher rate.

There are some troublesome problems about social security that need correction. These are the questions of rates, benefits, and the reserve. The answer to these problems should be determined before the final decision is made by the farmers as to whether or not they want social security. For instance, it has been suggested that the Congress at this time fix a top limit on the social-security tax of 6 percent and provide that the rates could not increase beyond that point and if more money than that was needed to pay benefits it would be paid from other Government funds. Six percent of one's income is a sizable insurance premium at that. Should farmers be covered under the social-security system? In answering that question we must keep in mind that social security consists of both burdens and benefits. What do you think?

Dr. Edward Benes and His Policies As Seen by Maurice Hindus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, from the land of my birth have come many of the noblest ideas and the noblest idealists of the world. I am proud, and all Czechs and Slovaks are proud, of the contributions made by immigrants to the United States to their adopted country, for my people also are practical; they put their ideals to work for the benefit of all people.

One of the noblest of Czechoslovakians is the present President of the Republic of Czechoslovakia. He has taken up the burden where the late great President T. G. Masaryk, first President and father of his country, left off. I can claim to be at least a godfather of the Republic, for during the First World War, I intervened personally and directly with President Wilson to help bring about the freedom of Czechoslovakia and the other free states of middle Europe.

I was glad to find in Liberty magazine of May 25, 1946, the article entitled "Doctor of Reason," by the distinguished correspondent, Mr. Maurice Hindus, which I believe accurately portrays the problems, the conditions, the aims, and aspirations of present-day Czechoslovakia. Under leave granted me, and in the hope it will contribute to a better understanding in America, my adopted country, of Czechoslovakia, my native land, I am inserting the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Czechoslovakia boasts the two largest steel mills in central Europe, one in the town of Witcovice, the other in Trinac. During my recent sojourn in the country I visited both and was astounded to learn that Witcovice has not had a strike since 1923, Trinac since 1919. This in a land of free, educated labor.

Progressiveness in law and in life, reasonableness in thought and in deed, have ever been the watchword and the creed of the Czech Nation. I asked Dr. Eduard Benes, the little professor-President of the Republic, how he accounted for the highly advanced status of his people, and his reply was as challenging as it was enlightening.

"We're a small nation," he said. "To survive at all we've had to be more progressive and more reasonable than our neighbors."

These words explain Benes himself even more than the Czech people, for it is he and leaders like him who have fashioned the thoughts and fathered the spirit of the Czech Nation and made it what it is today. That is what makes Benes in these days of blight and bafflement and battle for a new Europe so important a figure not only on the Czechoslovakian but also on the world scene. While leaders of other nations are indulging in violent denunciation of Russia's economic collectivism or of America's economic individualism, he, more than anyone else in the world, is seeking a balanced fusion of the two.

BENES NEVER LOST FAITH

Because he so keenly understood Hitler and the Germans, Stalin and the Russians, England and America, he never lost faith in the future, and not even the late Franklin Roosevelt foresaw so clearly and predicted so accurately the sweep of forthcoming events. To Benes, Munich meant world war. That was why, shortly after the infamous agreement was signed between England, France, Germany, and Italy, he hastened to exile himself from his native land.

The Russo-German Pact of August 1939, had elicited from him only one comment: Russia and Germany must fight. Once Germany launched hostilities in Europe, he was convinced that American isolationism would shatter itself on the international turbulences of the times. When the Germans were rolling over the Russian lands on their way to Moscow, Leningrad, Stalingrad, and leading statesmen and generals were predicting the imminent collapse of the Red Army, Benes took loud and voluble exception to these predictions. He summoned all the brilliant logic and erudition at his command to persuade the London Poles, who based their diplomacy not on the victory but on the defeat of Russia, to reverse their policy and to seek an immediate end to their ancient and fiery feud with Moscow.

"I told the late General Sikorsky," Benes said to this writer, "that the Red Army would occupy his country and mine; would roll into Berlin, and that he must shape his diplomacy accordingly." How different would have been the position of Poland now had the London Poles heeded Benes' prophetic counsel.

If only because in the past he had been so singularly right in the interpretation and forecast of coming events, his thoughts on the Europe of today and tomorrow, as reflected in his most recent utterances and the policies he is championing in Czechoslovakia, deserve everyone's searching scrutiny.

OLD EUROPE IS GONE

On the 15th of December 1945, in the ancient and resplendent Spanish ballroom of Prague Castle, the Kremlin of Prague, it is sometimes called, I attended a memorable ceremony. The University of Prague, one of the oldest and most renowned in Europe, conferred on Benes the degree of Doctor of Laws. In the presence of foreign diplomats and the most distinguished audience that had gathered in the Czech capital since his triumphant return home, Benes took occasion to deliver one of the most incisive pronouncements in his life.

He told not only the Czech people but the world that the Europe of 1938 was gone; that the new epoch mankind was facing was a break, a transition, a creation. The excessive individualism of the nineteenth century, he emphasizes, had resulted in conditions that were sapping the vitality of the individualism of our times. Yet only nations that were backward might make the shift from the old to the new era with violence and in disregard of democratic precepts. Democracy itself, he assured his hearers, as an idea and a way of life, was too vital to be threatened by anyone, but the democracy of the age of excessive individualism no longer fitted the pattern of the times. It was therefore imperative to give the word a fresh definition and include within its sphere not only politics but economics.

He insisted that the world need not fear Russia, that it must see Russia's present in relation to its past, and must learn to understand and correctly to appraise the creative aims Russia is struggling to achieve. Russia, he continued, "was developing and will continue to develop greater and greater individual freedom within the framework of its Socialist state." He is one of the few, very few, non-Communist statesmen in the world who have implicit faith in the eventual triumph of individual freedom in Russia. He also warned his audience that the battle for world security and world civilization is indivisible.

NATION LOOTED BY NAZIS

When Benes says the world of 1938 is no more, he cannot help thinking of his own country. In the pre-Munich days it was one of the most prosperous and liberal lands in the world, with large gold reserves and foreign securities in the vaults of its banks, with ample trade balance in foreign lands, with an educational system second to none anywhere, with food cheap and abundant. Coffee from South America, tea and spices from India and China, oranges, lemons, raisins, figs from California were available in most remote villages.

Now nothing is left of the gold and the foreign securities. The vaults of the banks are stuffed with tons of worthless German papers. Not a drop of real tea or coffee is served in the most exclusive hotels in Prague. A new generation of children knows neither the sight nor the taste of oranges.

The Germans have looted the country of the gold, the foreign securities, even the

textbooks and laboratory equipment in schools and colleges. To Benes it was clear that holding onto the prewar economic setup was out of the question. Its very pillars were blown into rubble and ashes. To avoid anarchy and violence and to salvage, at least in part, the assets of the little man—farmer, factory worker, small merchant, white-collar folk—something new and drastic had to be launched at once. "Not to fear to go ahead and act boldly," has ever been Benes' motto.

In consequence, the Prague Cabinet prepared and Benes signed a decree nationalizing the bankrupt banks and insurance companies, putting under state ownership key industries and most manufacturing establishments with more than 150 to 500 workers, though none with less than 150. The decree leaves the farmer in possession of his land, the small manufacturer, retail trader, artisan, in full control of their properties, the cooperatives—once among the most advanced in Europe—under their prewar joint ownership.

DECREE CHALLENGE TO RUSSIA

The decree is Benes' answer to the challenge of Soviet Russia with its complete negation of private enterprise, and of America with its almost complete negation of state ownership. It is an embodiment of what Benes and his cabinet regard as the best features of both systems.

When implemented with appropriate social legislation, the new decree, so Benes holds, will eliminate the hectic and explosive economy of booms and slumps, of unemployment, of helplessness of factory workers and white-collar folk when they lose their jobs. For once there is to be economic security for everybody. Working girls are to receive more generous dowries than in the prewar years and needy mothers and children are to be the beneficiaries of greater state aid.

In the operation of the state enterprises there is to be no duplication of Russia's early recklessness. Not politics but executive ability shall be the determining circumstance in the choice of directors and managers. They shall be paid at least as high salaries as under private ownership. They shall be vested with at least as much responsibility. Workers shall have their voice in management, but the final decision shall rest with the manager. Everyone within a given enterprise shall be continually encouraged by generous monetary and other material rewards to improve output and production through new inventions or through a more neat division of labor. The incentive of material reward shall always be emphasized, indeed glorified. Nothing and nobody shall be unreasonable or unprogressive.

Unlike other statesmen in the west, Benes, as already stated, has no fear of Russia. It is significant that in the diplomatic wrangles between Washington and Moscow, Czechoslovakia, like Finland and Norway but unlike Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, has never been an issue. Much as some members of our diplomatic corps dislike or detest the nationalization decree, none of them has uncovered cause for clash or controversy with Russia over anything that has happened in Czechoslovakia.

GERMAN MENACE HAUNTS BENES

Benes has come to look upon Russia as the sole and final guaranty of his country's independence. The menace of a powerful Germany haunts him as does no other possible catastrophe. Ten or eleven million Czechs and Slovaks can never be a match for sixty or seventy million united and armed Germans. He has told this writer that he cherishes no illusion as to the continuous helplessness of Germany, nor as to her future good behavior. Skilled in science and industry, brilliant in invention and organization she could, and if offered the opportunity would, become strong enough within 5 years to overpower, as Hitler had so shrewdly done, one after another of the small countries on her borders, including Czechoslovakia.

The rising tide of "soft-heartedness" in England and America toward Germany and Germans disconcerts not only Benes but every Czech. Benes cannot help asking himself what would happen if Germany ever again lifted its powerful fist over Czechoslovakia. Where would aid and salvation come from? For America, Czechs and Slovaks have boundless admiration. Over 1,000,000 of their countrymen have migrated here. They have been among the sturdiest and thriftiest pioneers. The constitution of the First Republic, which Hitler had obliterated, was modeled after our own. Woodrow Wilson was among the architects of that republic. All over the country streets, schools, and other institutions have been named after him. American institutions dedicated to the study of American civilization and a fostering of friendliness between the Czech and American peoples have sprung up in city after city. But America is far away. Isolationism is again loud in some quarters. Even while American obligations still remain unfulfilled, GI's in Europe and Asia are sick of foreign lands and are clamoring to go home. In time of danger, as in the pre-Munich days, America might offer sympathy, moral support, but against an armed and threatening Germany these would be as futile as Franklin's impassioned rhetoric in 1938.

France is weak. Besides, she bears the stigma of cruel betrayal. In the moment of grave peril she shook herself loose from the alliance she had signed with Prague. Britain, too, is untrustworthy, for it was her Prime Minister who was the driving force in the move to abandon Czechoslovakia to the mercy of Hitler and the German people.

Only Russia, with her powerful Red Army, had come to the rescue of his country, so Benes and every leader with whom I discussed the subject are firmly convinced. Russia is Slav like the Czechs. Russia denounced Munich. Even after France and Britain abandoned Prague and Poland and Hungary joined Hitler in the assault on the Czechs, Stalin was not unwilling to cross swords with the German warmakers. It was Benes himself who quailed at the possible consequences.

Besides, Benes knows that a German attack on Czechoslovakia can only mean an attack on Russia. Out of mere self-interest, therefore, if for no other reason, Russia will have to meet the challenger and battle him to the end. Hence the tightly drawn military alliance Benes has concluded with Moscow. All the more pressing was the need for the alliance because to Benes, as to every Czech, it is now clear that if the Germans again sweep over their country, they will outdo Hitler in brutality. They will seek a zoological solution of the Czech problem, as they speak of it. They will exterminate the Czech Nation.

PLANS NO REVOLUTION

Yet despite the tightly drawn military alliance and the close racial bonds Benes feels toward the Russians, he is not modeling the revolution in his own country on a Soviet pattern. He is championing a bloodless revolution. There have been no political murders or political executions in Czechoslovakia; not one. Again and again Benes has said that his people are sufficiently cultivated and politically mature to achieve a transition from the old to the new epoch in history and to meet the challenge of both Russia and America, the two most powerful nations left in the world, without strife, without civil war, wihout dictatorship.

In his speech of December 15 he did not hesitate to take clear-cut exception to the Russian interpretation of history, to Soviet theory and practice of government. He has never swerved from his faith not only in democratic ends but in democratic methods. He believes in a system of society that affords every citizen economic security; but, heir as he is to the tradition of liberty in the western meaning of the word, he abhors the thought of scrapping it, though he admits there are moments and emergencies when a momentous decision can best be made by leaders of existing political parties rather than by a vote of the electorate. Class dictatorship, whether of the right or the left, no man in the world loathes more than he.

It is no accident that save for the bleak living conditions, Czechoslovakia has been a little paradise for the foreign correspondent. Nowhere is there the least curb on freedom of movement. Best of all, there is no censorship.

Benes does not delude himself as to easy or swift success. Six years of German occupation have left their mark upon the very body of the country. He is calling on his people to be patient, to trust in the future, to spare neither time nor energy, in the fulfilment of the blueprints for the future. "When the initial difficulties have been overcome," he said, "and normal conditions have been attained, even the few who are doubtful will appraise this step with new eyes."

Is his faith justified?

Only time will tell. The task is stupendous. Of one thing this writer is convinced: If the Czechs with their high education, their skill in commerce and industry, their political acumen and their proverbial reasonableness, fail in achieving a reconciliation between the ideas and practices of Soviet Russia and the democratic nations of the west, no other nation, least of all in central and eastern Europe, will succeed.

Summary of Major Changes in Existing Law Proposed in Crosser Bill and of Action Taken Thereon by the Committee

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Crosser bill proposes six major changes in the present railroad retirement system, as follows:

First. It proposes to provide for the payment of annuities to the widows, children, and other survivors of deceased railroad employees and pensioners similar to those now available under the Social Security Act, but on a basis averaging about 25 percent higher.

Second. It proposes to liberalize the provisions of the present act with respect to granting annuities on account of disability.

Third. It proposes to change the provisions of the present law with respect to minimum annuities with the effect generally of raising the minimum materially.

Fourth. It proposes to reduce the retirement age for women employees from 65 to 60.

Fifth. It proposes to change and greatly enlarge the coverage of the present act so as to include a vast number of persons who are not railroad employees and have no connection with railroad operations.

Sixth. It proposes to increase the taxes levied for the support of the railroad retirement system to the extent of an added

5-percent pay-roll tax, to be divided equally between the employers and employees.

Of those six major proposals, the committee bill adopts five, in whole or in part. It incorporates the proposal with respect to survivor annuities, but fixes them on a parity with those accorded under the Social Security Act instead of making them 25 percent higher. It incorporates the proposal with respect to disability annuities with certain minor modifications which will be explained later. It adopts in full the proposal with respect to minimum annuities and the proposal to reduce the retirement age for women from 65 to 60. It also incorporates in substance the proposal with respect to increased taxes. It does not adopt any part of the proposal with respect to changes in the present coverage provisions of the act.

The Crosser bill proposes three major changes in the railroad unemployment insurance system, as follows:

First. It proposes to increase the present maximum weekly benefit from $20 to $25 and to increase the present maximum period for the duration of benefits from 20 weeks to 26 weeks.

Second. It proposes to provide additional benefits to be payable in the case of unemployment due to sickness (including confinement incident to childbirth) or accident from whatever cause. These added benefits would be payable in the same amounts and for like periods as the benefits payable for unemployment.

Third. It proposes the same enlargement of the coverage of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act which it proposes for the Railroad Retirement Act.

The committee bill does not adopt any of these proposals. Instead, it incorporates provisions making changes in the present flat tax of 3 percent of pay rolls levied upon the railroads for the support of unemployment insurance, so as to provide for a graduated tax ranging from one-half percent to 3 percent, depending upon the amount of the reserve balance in the unemployment insurance account. The committee bill thus proposes to give railroad companies the benefit of a sliding tax scale for the support of unemployment insurance similar to that accorded other industries under nearly all the State unemployment insurance systems, but on somewhat less liberal terms than are accorded other employers under many of the State systems.

In extending this experience rating or merit rating or sliding tax scale now generally used in State unemployment insurance acts and authorized by the Federal Security Act, it should be noted by the House that in a great, great many instances the railroads pay higher taxes and will continue to pay higher taxes than employers covered in the various State funds by reason of the fact that all the State funds place a tax only on the first $3,000 of annual wage, whereas, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance System provides the tax on the first $300 of monthly wage or a maximum of $3,600 per year, as compared with the $3,000 taxable maximum under the State laws.

As soon as the committee had reported the legislation that is now before the House, there was a statement made by Chairman Altmeyer of the Social Security Board before the House Ways and Means Committee on May 20 regarding unemployment insurance, in which Mr. Altmeyer said, and I quote:

> The Social Security Board is of the opinion that the present 3-percent Federal unemployment tax rate is higher than is necessary, and, therefore, recommends a reduction to 2 percent.

This statement refers to the maximum tax to be paid into the State funds under the State laws and will not affect the experience or merit rating already provided by those laws except to reduce the maximum.

The action of the committee in not including increased unemployment insurance benefits may well be justified by the fact that this session of Congress has not yet acted on the recommendation of the President to grant increased unemployment insurance benefits to workers in general industry. You will recall that the President asked for a maximum of $25 for a maximum of 26 weeks as a temporary measure to apply during the reconversion period. You will also recall that the Senate reduced these maxima to $20 for 20 weeks, which is the amount of benefits payable under the present Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, but up to now the House has not yet adopted even this temporary proposal of the Senate.

The Congress has, however, extended unemployment insurance to the returning veteran under certain conditions. The law which gives the returning veteran unemployment insurance benefits gives him a maximum of $20 for 20 weeks, which again is exactly the maximum contained in the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. I do not believe the House would be acting consistently if it gave to railroad workers greater benefits than it gives to GI's.

Answers Critics of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James F. King, from the Kansas City Star:

ANSWERS CRITICS OF CONGRESS

(By James F. King)

WASHINGTON, June 6.—In the midst of wide-spread public clamor for a change in the rules of procedure to streamline the activities of Congress, a gentleman from Missouri sits in the House as a sober and calm influence, advises his colleagues that the system under which national legislative policies are framed is the most flexible and democratic ever devised by man.

His are not idle words spoken in debate in opposition to any change but are the considered judgment of perhaps the greatest living authority on parliamentary law and procedure in America. The fact that Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Elsberry, dean of the Missouri delegation in the House, was responsible for the interpretation and the adoption of much of the present-day procedure had no influence on his position for he is thoroughly convinced that nothing the world has ever seen can equal the American Congress for efficiency and soundness.

Representative CANNON has set forth his views in a little booklet published at his own expense containing a digest of speeches he has made on the floor in connection with a resolution for investigation of the proposed streamlining. He spoke not in opposition, but in explanation of the procedure, for, as he said: "Certainly, go ahead. Investigate to your heart's content. It may not do any particular good but it can't do any harm."

For proof of his assertions that Congress has an extraordinarily fine system of procedure he cited current history of congressional action on conduct of the war.

"It is a great Congress—and it could not have operated so satisfactorily without a great system of procedure," Mr. CANNON declares.

"Never before has a nation been changed from peacetime basis to war status or has industry been converted from civil to military production in so short a time. The speed and skill with which the transition has been effected bordered on the miraculous.

"Through what agency has the American people effected this remarkable transition? Primarily through the American Congress, representing them, acting for them, raising the money, appropriating the funds, auditing the expenditures, and shaping the legislation which transformed the velvet glove and armed the mailed fist that protected American institutions and shook the foundations of despotism throughout the world.

"It is true that the immediate direction of war is under the executive branch of the Government. But only Congress can declare war, can approve major appointments and commissions, can provide money, ships, planes, armaments, and the sinews of war, without which the executive power is impotent. In the last analysis it is Congress, representing the Nation by direct commission at the polls, which makes war, supports the war, and brings the war to a successful conclusion. And no Congress has more competently exercised its functions or better performed its duties in that respect than the Seventy-ninth Congress.

"The Continental Congress at times all but abandoned Washington and his ragged regiments. The Civil War Congress, torn by internal dissension, was frequently a handicap rather than a help to Lincoln in his efforts to preserve the Union. The Spanish War Congress reeked with embalmed-beef scandals and delinquencies in fever-racked camps that took a greater toll of American lives than the enemy. Even the World War I Congress moved with such confusion and delay that not a single American plane or piece of American artillery ever reached the battle line. What a contrast presented by the Seventy-ninth Congress in its prompt and adequate provision for every need and contingency of a vastly greater theater of action. Its record is without parallel."

Mr. CANNON reported that in the last 2 years "such a flood of unwarranted and unsupported abuse and castigation has been loosed against Congress and its procedure as has no equal in the annals of congressional condemnation."

"And yet," he added, "I would not circumscribe by one word the flow of malodorous and unreasoning criticism that is the daily lot of every Congressman individually and collectively. It is a tribute to our form of government. No citizen of the Reich ever could utter a word of such comment or criticism against the German Reichstag. Only in the democracies is such criticism permitted. And so I thank God that here in

America any citizen, responsible or otherwise, may still throw brickbats and custard pies, actually or verbally, at any official of the Government, including his representatives, his only safeguard against autocracy and dictatorship."

Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day in American history. I have just listened with great disappointment to the President's message vetoing the Case bill. I have just voted to override that veto. We lacked five votes getting the necessary two-thirds majority, and the Case bill is dead.

The Case bill sought to hold labor unions responsible for their contracts, to prevent rash and unreasonable strikes, to prevent sympathetic and jurisdictional strikes, to prevent strike violence, to settle strikes involving public utilities or the national safety, in short, to protect the rights of all citizens from abuses by giant industries or giant labor unions.

During the early years of this century America suffered from industrial oppression. Labor was compelled to organize to secure reasonable wages and reasonable working conditions. Now the pendulum has swung to the other extreme and the public must again suffer, this time from the abuses of the labor bosses. Industry is entitled to reasonable profits, labor to reasonable wages. But whenever goods or services bring more than honest values the public loses. The small business and agricultural sections of America have long paid tribute to the big industrial centers. Apparently this tribute is to be increased.

The President's veto of the Case bill will doubtless encourage another wave of strikes in such big industries as automobiles and farm machinery, steel, coal, railroads, and so forth. The increased prices and wages in these industries have already forced inflation upon the country, and have retarded production so badly needed for national prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, big industries and big labor unions through various practices and devices such as strikes, slow-downs, limitations on work, abuses of cost-plus contracts, the hoarding of labor, and so forth, added about $100,000,000,000 on to the cost of the war. Even the railroads overcharged the Government many millions of dollars. If we are to pay these war debts, if we are to maintain our national solvency, we must have a prosperous country. If we are to have a prosperous country we cannot tolerate these gigantic strikes that stymie production, or excess profits that rob the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, I want the folks whom I serve in the Congress, I want posterity to know of my efforts to cure the evils above described. For the sake of the record I quote short excerpts from some of the speeches I have made on the floor of this Congress on this subject:

March 11, 1941, speaking on lend-lease:

Causes for strikes must be removed and strikes that delay production must be prevented. Profiteering in any way out of this crisis is abhorrent to democratic ideals and insulting to American citizenship.

March 31, 1941, in a 15-minute speech condemning strikes and profiteering in defense industries:

They rightly and strenuously object to profiteering by industry, labor, or others. They object to any slowing or stoppage of production for any reason.

March 31, 1941, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under Letters About Strikes, referring to the boys in service:

They have a right to demand a square deal from labor, industry, government, and all of the individuals and groups of individuals in this country.

June 6, 1941, in a speech entitled "Labor and the Defense Program":

Last September an emergency was declared, this May a state of unlimited emergency has been declared. Yet today we find the strike situation worse than ever before. * * * Is labor to be the Achilles' heel of the Roosevelt administration?

December 3, 1941, speaking in support of the Smith bill to outlaw strikes in time of war:

Had the Smith bill been law 1 month ago, the mine strike called by John L. Lewis would not have occurred. If the Smith bill now becomes law, such unnecessary and unreasonable strikes will not be called in the future, or, at least, during the continuance of this emergency. Let us not pass a milk-toast bill.

February 24, 1942, in a speech condemning strikes, slow-downs, and the 40-hour week in time of war:

Today any person who slows down or stops our war production for selfish reasons is an enemy of this country. * * * Limitations on hours of work in government and elsewhere should be removed for the duration.

February 26, 1942, speaking in support of an amendment to suspend the 40-hour week for the duration of the war:

Today, more than ever before, this is a war of production, and I submit that anybody, saint or sinner, rich or poor, farmer, laborer, industrialist, Government official or employee, or anybody else who stops or interferes with production is an enemy of this Republic.

March 18, 1942, speaking on profiteering:

The American taxpayer is taken for a ride whenever double time is paid for work in war production. In addition to suspending the 40-hour week for the duration, this Congress should immediately enact laws to eliminate all excess profits by industry. Profiteering out of the blood, sweat, and tears of this emergency by industry, labor, or anyone else is a crime against American civilization.

February 26, 1943, speaking on strikes and slow-downs in defense industries:

Mr. Speaker, the country and the American war effort has again been insulted by a strike and a slow-down in an aircraft factory in this country. * * * Any kind of profiteering out of war is criminal.

March 17, 1943, speaking on inflation control:

Mr. Speaker, if John L. Lewis carries out his proposed strike of the bituminous-coal miners, he will become the Benedict Arnold of 1943. Higher and ever higher industrial wages have from the beginning led the inflation parade.

June 19, 1943, in a speech condemning efforts of Government employees belonging to a CIO union to defeat the Smith-Connally bill:

If this sort of thing continues we may one day have Federal employees themselves striking against the Government that employs them.

April 1, 1946, speaking on the coal strike:

Mr. Speaker, when the history of this generation is written the most shameful chapter thereof will be the Government's absolute failure to deal with management-labor difficulties in our big industries. All authorities agree that our biggest problem and our greatest need is full production. Still we permit powerful labor unions and big industries, one after the other, to stymie and bottleneck such production. The steel strike set us back 6 months. The coal strike, if continued for more than a week, will set us back another 6 months. If long continued, such strikes will absolutely destroy all the hope we have for full and peaceful reconversion.

We force men to fight and die for their country. We even draft them in peacetime and make them serve for $50 a month. But we refuse to interfere with jobs or profits of civilians. The politicians in both parties are afraid to do anything about strikes or work stoppages.

We ought immediately to act upon the suggestion of Bernard Baruch for a year's moratorium on strikes. However, the President and the politicians apparently would see this Nation in hades before they would pass such a law, without, of course, first clearing it with Hillman, Murray, and Lewis.

We are urged to extend the draft, to extend price controls, to enact compulsory peacetime military training, in order to win the peace and promote the security of this country. None of these things compares in immediate importance with full production. Full production and rapid reconversion is the very foundation upon which our national strength and hence our peace and security must rest. Still the Government vacillates, pussyfoots, and evades this biggest and most serious problem.

The big corporations and all-powerful labor bosses continue to ride recklessly and ruthlessly over the American people. Mr. Speaker, how much longer will we continue to tolerate these abuses?

May 24, 1946, speaking on the railroad strike:

Mr. Speaker, democracy is on trial. Our Government is in danger. Six months before Pearl Harbor I stood on the floor of this House and predicted that our failure to establish a firm, consistent labor policy would get us into serious trouble. Now we have the miners and the railroads on strike aginst the Government. Recently a union of Federal employees have insisted they have a similar right.

The very least we can now do is to write immediately into law two things: (1) that to strike against the Government at any time, under any circumstances is a crime; (2) that industrial disputes in which the public health, safety, or welfare is seriously involved shall be submitted to compulsory arbitration. To say that such laws cannot be enforced is a stupid admission of futility. A

government that can draft men to die for the safety of its people can force men to work for the same reasons.

The American people have a right to be alarmed. They are asking: Will the big labor bosses continue to vie with each other in seeing who can squeeze the most out of a defenseless public? Can big industries and big labor unions defy with impunity the Government of the United States? To answer these questions affirmatively is to insult the character and the intelligence of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I can imagine Hitler and Mussolini looking up from their beds in hell and laughing at our puny efforts to save ourselves from economic and political destruction. Or perhaps in anguish and remorse they simply cry "Oh, if we had only waited."

Mr. Speaker, I belong to the working classes of this country. All of my forebears have been farmers and laborers. The worker is certainly entitled to his hire. All of us, I know, would like to see his standards of living constantly improved. This cannot be done, however, by cutthroat methods recently employed by the all-powerful labor bosses. The public and the consumer must be protected from abused power. That any individual or group within this country can defy our Government and ride roughshod over our people with complete impunity is unthinkable.

Since coming to Congress I have voted for numerous bills to bridle the big labor bosses and the big industrial bosses. I have voted to extend the antiracketeering laws to labor unions. By one means or another all of these bills have been defeated. Notwithstanding all of this discouragement, I shall continue to strive for legislation that will bring order out of chaos, and that will open the roads to production and progress.

Railroad Unemployment Benefit Provisions Under Present Law, Crosser Bill, and Committee Substitute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the present Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, enacted in 1938 and amended in 1939 and 1940, provides unemployment benefits for railroad employees involuntarily separated from their railroad occupations.

The committee amendment proposes no changes in the benefit features of that act, which are more liberal than the average scale of unemployment benefits provided in the unemployment-compensation laws of the several States. They are on the whole more liberal, in respect of the various elements that govern those benefits, than the corresponding provisions of almost all State laws. These elements are the length of the so-called waiting period an employee must serve before beginning to draw unemployment benefits, the amount of benefit per week, the number of weeks he may receive such benefits in any one year, and the maximum and minimum benefits he may receive, either per week or in the course of a year.

Briefly, the present Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act provides that an unemployed railroad worker who was on a railroad pay roll at any time during a given calendar year—such as 1945—called the base year, and during that year has earned $150 or more, becomes eligible for unemployment benefits if he loses his job at any time during the year beginning on July 1 of the following year—July 1, 1946, to June 30, 1947—the so-called benefit year.

He serves what is in effect a waiting period of 1 week, because he receives benefits for 7 days in the first 14 days of unemployment. Thereafter, he receives benefits for 10 days out of each 14 days, thus being placed on the basis of a 5-day week. He may draw benefits for a maximum of 100 days, or 20 weeks, in any one benefit year, which need not be consecutive. In addition the waiting period is served only once in a benefit year.

The daily benefit rate is scaled to the amount of compensation he has earned during his base year. This scale is as follows:

Compensation in base year and daily benefit rate	
$150–$200	$1.75
$200–$475	2.00
$475–$750	2.25
$750—$1,000	2.50
$1,000–1,300	3.00
$1,300–$1,600	3.50
$1,600 and over	4.00

Multiplying the daily benefit scale by 5 days per week produces a weekly unemployment benefit range of $8.75 to $20. Multiplying the daily benefit scale by 100 days per benefit year, the annual unemployment benefit ranges from a minimum of $175 to a maximum of $400.

The minimum weekly benefit of $8.75, under the railroad scale, is greater than in 41 of the 49 State laws, including the District of Columbia law enacted by Congress. The maximum weekly benefit of $20, under the railroad scale, is greater than is provided in 25 State laws, and the same as in 18 State laws.

The minimum annual benefit of $175, under the railroad scale, is greater than is provided in 42 of the 49 State laws. The maximum annual benefit of $400, under the railroad scale, is greater than in 26 State laws, and the same as in 11 State laws.

The committee amendment proposes no changes in the scale of unemployment benefits now provided by the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended in 1940. The Crosser bill, however, proposes a still higher scale of unemployment benefits, running up to $5 per benefit day and up to 130 days, or 26 weeks, per benefit year. The total cost of these increased scales of unemployment benefits were calculated by Mr. Myers, the independent actuary to which reference has already been made, at 2.3 percent of the annual railroad pay roll. Inasmuch as he based his calculations on an estimated future railroad pay roll of $2,750 million, his cost estimate in dollars was $63,000,000 per year.

But the Crosser bill does not stop with a proposal to increase the scale of unemployment benefits. It proposes to superimpose upon the present system of benefits payable for unemployment a wholly new and untried system of benefit payments for sickness and maternity, such as does not exist in the social-security system, nor in the unemployment system of any State, at the sole expense of the employer. Two States, Rhode Island and California, are experimenting with a moderate sickness benefit system, but in each case the tax levied for financing such a system is paid by the employee and not the employer. The Crosser bill proposes to finance all sickness and maternity benefit payments at the expense of the railroads as employers.

The committee considered this proposal as to sickness with great care, but decided not to include it in the committee amendment, for the reason I shall now briefly outline.

Addition of a system of sickness and maternity benefits to the present system of unemployment benefits in the railroad industry, all to be financed at the sole expense of the employer, would change the whole concept of unemployment as embodied in present law by expanding it to include nonoccupational unemployment by reason of sickness or accident in no way caused by or related to railroad employment. Disability from pregnancy and maternity would be included. These benefits would be paid in the same amount and for the same duration as the liberalized benefits for occupational unemployment. Both unemployment and sickness benefits could be drawn in successive period of the same benefit year, making it possible for a railroad employee to receive benefits of one sort or another for each of the 52 weeks of a benefit year, all at the expense of his employer, who pays the entire unemployment tax.

In proposing thus to impose upon the railroads the total cost of financing a proposed new health, accident, and maternity insurance system, the Crosser bill would make them pay, with no conceivable benefit to themselves, for something for which they have not even the remotest responsibility. This is not only unjustified, but would also discriminate against the railroads, in that they would be required to finance a system of sickness insurance, whereas their transportation competitors and all employers in general industry are free from any such requirement.

The committee believes that if a system of sickness insurance is to be made a part of our whole social security system, it should be considered and developed for all industry and industrial workers as a common social problem, and not added in piecemeal fashion to existing unemployment systems, such as railroad unemployment insurance.

Furthermore, the additional cost of the sickness and maternity benefits proposed in the Crosser bill is a matter that called for and received careful study by the committee. According to the actuarial report prepared for the committee by Mr. Myers, the annual cost of the proposed sickness insurance alone, not including unemployment benefits, would

range from 1.0 to 1.3 percent of the annual railroad pay roll, or from $27,500,000 to $36,000,000 per year. He believed that the cost might go as high as $41,000,000. Mr. Myers found it extremely difficult to make an estimate on this point, because of the wholly untried nature of the proposal, but the following excerpt from his report is highly significant:

It should be borne in mind that the general experience for any type of sickness or disability benefits has been for the cost in the early years to be relatively low, leading to an undue spirit of optimism among the administrators. Also the plan starts off with a fairly healthy group of persons covered. After a few years there may be an accumulation of substandard individuals who are able to work long enough each year during a seasonal employment peak to qualify for benefits. In such cases benefits will be quite high relative to earnings (for example, $150 of earnings in a year will qualify for benefits up to $227.50 per year). After a few years the insured persons become more familiar with the benefits available and make more use of the system, thus producing higher costs. If the sickness benefits are adopted, it is likely that a very favorable experience can be expected for the first few years but too much long-term credence should not be given thereto.

Also, a very important factor in regard to the cost of sickness insurance plan is the quality, efficiency, and attitude of the claims administrators. For one thing the cost can vary considerably, depending on whether the supervising agency takes a strict interpretation of the law or whether it is primarily concerned with paying benefits to all persons it believes should get them. As to efficiency, the quality of the claims administration may be poor, even with the highest-grade personnel, if shortage of funds makes it impossible to have a sufficiently large organization to do more than merely process applications.

For all these reasons, the committee amendment retains the existing provisions for unemployment benefits, liberal as they are, but does not include the highly experimental, speculative, and discriminatory proposals of the Crosser bill as to sickness and maternity insurance.

These present liberal unemployment benefits afforded railroaders provide the same maximum of $20 per week for the same maximum period of 20 weeks that the Congress has extended to the GI's. I submit that the railroad workers of the United States do not expect a greater unemployment insurance benefits than the returning veterans who served this country so nobly in the recent war.

Congress Amends the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 To Increase the Rights of Veterans Thereunder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, by the passage of H. R. 6371, veterans' national service life insurance is placed on a peacetime basis. The bill as passed has the endorsement of the Veterans' Administration, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans and the Purple Heart. The act covers all veterans but it is of special benefit to the millions who served in the ranks of all our armed services.

Under its provisions:

First. National service life insurance may be paid to a designated stepparent.

Second. Under section 2 all persons in active service between October 8, 1940, and September 2, 1945, may apply for national service life insurance at any time upon the showing of good health. Those suffering from disability incurred in active service may apply for insurance at any time prior to January 1, 1950, if less than totally disabled. Any person in active service, who applied for insurance in writing between October 8, 1940, and September 2, 1945, and whose application was denied on account of his health, and who thereafter continued to perform full military or naval duty and thereafter became permanently and totally disabled in line of duty or died in line of duty shall be deemed to have been granted such insurance, and that such insurance continued in force to the date of death or the date of the enactment of this act. Premiums on such insurance are paid from the national service life appropriation.

Third. Under section 3, gratuitous insurance granted under section 602 (d) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is increased from $5,000 to $10,000. Such insurance is authorized to be paid to parents, if there is no widow or child, regardless of dependency. And gratuitous insurance is granted to those who died in line of duty prior to September 3, 1945 and within 120 days after entry into service.

Fourth. Gratuitous insurance previously granted is increased from $5,000 to $10,000 and includes veterans who became totally disabled as a result of injury or disease incurred in line of duty within 120 days after entry into service, prior to September 3, 1945. This increase in gratuitous insurance from $5,000 to $10,000 is extended to those captured, besieged, or isolated by the enemy.

Fifth. Parents may sue in the courts for benefits denied them by the Administrator.

Sixth. Twenty-year-endowment policies may be issued payable at 60 or 65 years of age.

Seventh. Any person or legal entity may be designated as a beneficiary of national service life insurance. Under existing law only a wife, husband, child, parent, brother, or sister can be named as beneficiary.

Eighth. A beneficiary of any national service life insurance may elect to receive a refund life income in lieu of the present mode of payment.

Ninth. When deductions of premiums from active service pay have been authorized in writing by the insured, the insurance shall not lapse so long as the insured remains in active service; notwithstanding that authorized premium deductions were discontinued (a) because the insured was discharged to accept a commission; (b) was absent without leave, if restored to active duty; or (c) was sentenced by court martial, if he was restored to active duty, or was required to engage in combat or was killed in combat.

Tenth. Four methods of payment are provided: First, lump-sum payments; second, payment in equal monthly installments of from 36 to 240; third, payment as an annuity for 120 months certain, with payments continuing throughout the lifetime of the first beneficiary; and fourth, payments as a refund life income in monthly installments for such periods as will equal the face value of the contract, the payments continuing throughout the life of the first beneficiary.

Eleventh. National service life insurance heretofore and hereafter issued shall be incontestable from date of issue, reinstatement or reconversion except for fraud, nonpayment of premium, or on the ground that the applicant was not a member of the military or naval forces of the United States.

Twelfth. Without prejudice to any other cause of disability, the permanent loss of use of both feet or both hands or both eyes, or of one foot and one hand, or of one foot and one eye, or of one hand and one eye, or the loss of hearing of both ears, or the organic loss of speech shall be deemed total disability.

It has heretofore been held by the Supreme Court that such disabilities do not necessarily result in total disability.

Thirteenth. Calculations are authorized to determine the values of life contingencies and liabilities based upon such mortality table or tables as the Administrator may prescribe with interest at the rate of 3 percent.

Fourteenth. Decisions of the Administrator are authorized to be reviewed by United States district courts.

Fifteenth. A beneficiary may assign insurance to which he or she is entitled to certain specified relatives of the insured.

Sixteenth. Suit may be brought by the insured or his beneficiary in the United States district courts in the event of a disagreement as to a claim involving waiver of premiums or payment of benefits for total disability.

I gladly supported and voted in favor of the passage of this liberalized fair statute designed to protect and extend the rights of the veterans of this war and those they desire to protect by national service life insurance.

Woman's Part in a Postwar World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer for printing in the RECORD a brief address delivered by Miss Stella N. Marks, a recognized champion of the veteran's cause, at a meeting of the Daughters of the

Constitution recently held in the Biltmore Hotel, Providence, R. I. The address follows:

It has been said that World War I gave women their first glimpse of freedom. While previous to that time the genius of women had been identified with the finer arts and the gentler things of life, they ventured into public work by the thousands. They laid aside the office routine at the signing of the armistice and returned to their homes remote from the busy avenues wherein they had tasted a degree of freedom.

There were some who in the decades that intervened were never satisfied with the limitations of the domestic sphere. They no longer wanted to excel in the routine of homemaking. They were mothers of course, but as soon as possible the care of their children was passed along to the state, and the schoolrooms of the Nation held firmer ties than many a fireside.

Someone wrote and often is it quoted: "When the homes of the Nation are safe the Nation is safe." We have seen two generations go forth to war to hold the homes of America intact. Much as our lives were thrown in reverse by the demands of war, we at least knew that bombs would not disturb our rest and our shores would not be invaded for ultimate destruction of our cities.

This war found women working shoulder to shoulder with men in the mills and factories. They donned slacks and ignored make-up in the torrid rays of the tropical suns as well as endured without flinching the frigid frosts of the Arctics. Their pay envelopes were equal that of the men, and they moved along without thought of what was missing in the sacrifice for supplies to carry out the Nation's plans for war. Never in history had women subjected themselves to greater degree of inconvenience nor endured such reversal of their natures. Out of all this will come evidences of independence not alone in thought but in every emotional trend of their existence. The come-back to the fireside and the sacred shrine that they helped bring into existence years ago will be measured by their ability to evaluate the purpose of life as it is entrusted to them.

What are we going to do about it all? On the high seas at this time are countless thousands of young wives and mothers. They have counted the hours of months of separation from your sons, who have preceded them to their homeland. They have visions of a grand and glorious Nation. They are hoping you will find in them a degree of worthiness that attracted your sons. Will you find the women folks of the servicemen receptive to their loved ones now anxious to share our America? There are thousands en route. We must make up our minds to be gracious and to exemplify the womanhood of America. The boys have not thought much about the adjustment that will seal forever their own happiness and it will be up to the women of the Nation to practice the Golden Rule, for your sons were received into foreign homes when they were far from you. Many battle weary and homesick found solace in the company of women who would never have been their choice in the homeland, but in the hour of trial they were grateful for any degree of attention that reminded them of home. Our duty to the strangers will define itself in terms of tolerance and consideration and in the end establish contentment for the new family unit born of war.

To you of this group, whose ability to assimilate policy and interpret it to others will come many opportunities of acquainting the veterans with the provisions within current legislation for them.

On every side you will find servicemen boys of a few years ago. They will be slow to make environmental adjustments. The screen, the radio, and the press are generous in outlining for them many phases of rehabilitation but they will pay more attention to the man or woman next door. It is timely that we realize our responsibility to these heroes is measured in centrifugal units expanding from your own son to his comrades and on to the boys not of your circle but the neighborhood group.

You will find many reticent to advance and claim their dues. You will find them evading contracts of beneficial nature. This type of war weary youth made the grade through regimentation. Independent action would never have made for victorious invasion. The solid regimented forces went forward through the enemy's lines. They followed universal commands but they accepted individual scars of battle. Each one today is a class by himself and not to be classified for universal remedy. It will be a long time before this type evidences ability to stand alone. You can be alert to the need of a varied program to cover their rehabilitation.

The setting aside of the uniform, the attempt to resume community interest all present a new front to these men. They were sandlot ball players when they call to service echoed in the land. It all seems like a strange stage on which they are now due to act a part of a matured man. Be gracious and help make possible occasions in which the young veterans can come forward by degrees. Their greatest victory will be in conquering timidity; you will be doing a service, not to be measured, in their ultimate absorption into the community life of which they are rightfully a part.

After all, let it be your responsibility to guide these men into avenues of approach to agencies prepared to serve them. Teach them to accept the guidance of those trained in service and designated to bring them within every phase of their rights. Present an affirmative atmosphere and let it be said that America has not wasted any time debating as to what is not due by reason of this or that but convincing the public as well as the men that a grateful Nation realizes its obligation to even the least of our returned defenders.

In conclusion, let us admit that the safety of the Nation reposes in the security of its homes; the fate of the defenders of these homes determines the degree of patriotism that will live to guarantee a world free from war and inhabited by a generation appreciating the real meaning of victory.

The Ovibos in Vermont

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I wish to include in the RECORD portions of an article by Vilhjalmur Stefansson, entitled "Farming Without Barns," which appeared in Harper's.

The famed Arctic explorer and author owns a farm in Bethel, Vt. Based on his experience there he urges the establishment of a colony of ovibos in Vermont. I think his idea is an excellent one.

And what is an ovibos? Let Mr. Stefansson answer by excerpts from his article:

Most nearly the ovibos is a gigantic sheep, twice as heavy as a reindeer and four times the weight of a medium domestic sheep. Like the sheep it has a coat of wool. It gives more milk than any domestic animal except the cow, and the milk does not have a strong taste. Its flesh has the look and flavor of beef, without any strong smell such as that of mutton.

The ovibos not only provides good milk and good meat. It also supplies wool. Looked upon as a sheep, it is more valuable than the ordinary domestic variety because it is larger; looked upon as a steer, it has extra value because it can furnish wool as an annual crop. And the wool is good.

A thorough technical study of ovibos wool, made during the 1920's by Alfred Farrer Barker, professor of textile industries at Leeds University, led to the conclusion that cloth made from it has roughly the wearing qualities of merino, is softer than cashmere, has an agreeable soft brown color, bleaches readily and can then be dyed any shade. But the trait which thrilled Professor Barker was that garments made from it will not shrink, even if you wash and rub them in hot water. Professor Barker considered that ovibos wool, if available in quantity could be sold at a higher price than any of the ordinary domestic wools.

Some objectors have pointed out that if you clip ovibos you find in the wool many guard hairs that are stiff like the mane of a horse, and that even if you curry the beast, as they do with sheep in Iceland, you still get some hairs with your wool. Barker claimed, however that machinery was available to separate these hairs from the wool and that the hairs themselves would have a market value that would more than defray the cost of processing.

It would seem obvious that we have in the ovibos a beast that need fear nothing from a New England, Dakota, or Montana winter. It is today the most northerly of the large grazing animals, for Peary found it on the north coast of the most northerly land in the world, that northward extension of Greenland which is known as Peary Land. True, there is a heavier winter snowfall in every part of New England than in most regions where the ovibos is now found; but it prospers in sections of the east coast of Greenland that have deeper snow than any part of New England.

Nor would the ovibos suffer inordinately from the New England or Dakota summer heat. These animals frequented the prairie south of Point Barrow, Alaska, where temperatures run above 90 degrees in the shade, until the Eskimos killed them off. Musk oxen used to range as far south as Kentucky, as we know from bones which have been dug up.

It is pretty certain that prehistoric hunters cleared the ovibos from the United States and southern Canada; but there is a possibility, of course, that we have down here now hostile bacteria that are lying in wait to destroy them. All we can say on this score is that calves, yearlings, and animals more than half grown—perhaps 3 years of age—have been brought south frequently and sold to zoos in various of our cities, including New York, and to zoos scattered through Europe. It does not appear that their longevity has been notably lower than that of domestic cattle.

From a small experimental herd of ovibos there would be an income from the start, through the wool. Superfluous males could be sold to zoological gardens at first, later for beef. Meats strange in name, though not necessarily in taste, bring a high price when sold to connoisseurs—as buffalo, without claiming superiority to beef, sells at a higher price because of its rarity. Then, if the first experiment has a good press, breeding stock can be sold at high prices, as was the case when the silver fox and mink industries were new.

I am not, of course, arguing for ovibos alone. (The native New England deer and the Rocky Mountain elk would also do well in a large enough fenced Vermont enclosure. They are not so competent as ovibos in look-

ing after themselves, but will require no feed during most winters.) What I am urging is the general plan of raising on abandoned New England farms, and on other submarginal land, those animals which require no barns or haymaking, with a minimum of labor and other costs, so that the money you take in at harvest time shall not be eaten up in a multiplicity of expense.

When he discussed the proposition with me, I told my constituent—here I brag—that he should take a look at Knight's Island and Butler's Island in the Great Back Bay in Lake Champlain, where every element necessary to the sustenance and maintenance of a small herd of ovibos, experimentally, is naturally afforded except a wire fence to keep them off the ice in the winter.

Such fencing as might be necessary to keep the animals off the ice would be a minimum expense. They would do all of us a service if they ate up the grass which has grown on farms formerly occupied and well-fertilized. There on those islands in Lake Champlain is the finest location for experimental purposes to be found in any area. It conforms ideally to all the requirements of the ovibos.

Vermont in my judgment might well be a pioneer—as it was with the Morgan horse—in the development of a self-sustaining, money-producing animal which cannot be raised profitably everywhere.

Frontiers Between Freedom and Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, apathy on the part of people who desire freedom is a dangerous state of mind. Those who aspire to dictatorship, whether it be a collective or an individual form of dictatorship, always proclaim their program to be in behalf of the people. When the shift comes from freedom to a bloody, tyrannical regime, with it purges and concentration camps, it is then too late for those who have been misled by false promises to regain the constitutional rights which, through neglect of their civic duties and responsibilities, they sacrificed.

Is it not time to heed the dangers at home rather than attempt to regulate the world? Under leave to extend, I am inserting an article from Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly, under date of June 10, 1946:

EUROPE

Last week's statements by Messrs. Bevin and Churchill, following the milder comments of Secretary of State Byrnes, have brought out into open discussion the obvious things about Russian aggression which hitherto American official circles had studiously ignored, but which Barron's has been discussing for many months. The very fact that it has become fashionable to say these things publicly is evidence that for the present the tide is running against the Russians. The monstrous dictatorship in Poland and the tyranny over Russian-occupied Axis satellites have turned world public opinion against the methods of torture, terrorism, and mass murder that they represent. Impressed by the lack of Communist progress in the nations where free elections have been held, the leaders of the Soviets may perhaps seem fairly conciliatory in the next meeting of foreign ministers at Paris.

Unfortunately, we cannot expect the anti-Russian trend to be permanent. There is no country in Europe that does not have major and fundamental political and economic problems to grapple with. It is only human to err, and it is, therefore, certain that the various liberal, socialist, and moderate governments in power will make mistakes. And while evidences of economic recovery are making their appearance in the traditionally richer countries like Holland, France, and Czechoslovakia, it is more than likely that some problems will prove quite intractable and persist for years to come. In every one of these cases it will be the moderates, the socialists, or the liberals who will get the blame. And the Communists, being more often than not outside of the governments, will be able to hold out false hopes that they might do better if they were allowed to establish their purportedly gentle but actually bloody dictatorship.

FREEDOM'S BOUNDARIES

There is no hope at all for freedom in the one-third of non-Russian Europe which is under Russian domination, for the Russians will not be dislodged short of war. Thus the occupation zones are not temporary, they are permanent frontiers between freedom and tyranny. That is the situation which the Roosevelt-Churchill appeasement of Red Fascism has created, and for which Churchill himself pleaded guilty last week. He sees already that thereby the air forces of a new tyrant have been placed within easy striking distance of the western European democracies, which used to be our first line of defense. But it will probably take the American people a very long time to realize the potentially disastrous strategic situation that has been created by the betrayals of Tehran and Yalta.

In our hemisphere, the pleasant events at the inaugural of President Peron of Argentina will hardly promote satisfaction with our foreign policies. The ceremonies were marked by the crowd's cheers for both the Ambassador from Spain and the Russian delegation, while the American and British groups were booed. These apparently conflicting sentiments result, obviously, from the Spruille Braden policy of publicly insulting the Argentine Government with charges of fascism and of continuing to try to put pressure on it on the same grounds. Now that Argentina and Russia have resumed diplomatic relations, it is hard to recall that only a year ago we were instrumental in making Argentina a member of the United Nations over the opposition of Russia.

Destruction of Army Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we have listened to statements made on the floor of this House by various Members concerning the destruction of Army and Navy equipment—all paid for by the taxpayers' money. I have just been advised, through reliable sources, that on or about the 18th of November 1945, on board the *Kota-Baroe*, a Dutch vessel operated by the United States Army as a troop transport, returning from the Philippines with approximately 2,200 troops, an order was issued over the ship's public-address system instructing all troops to carry to the open deck any unwanted and/or excess clothing and equipment. Subsequently a detail of enlisted men was put to work, and numerous items, consisting of the following, were thrown overboard: Khaki cotton shirts, khaki cotton trousers, GI boots and shoes, Army fatigue clothes, Army coveralls, leggings, woolen blankets, socks and underwear, towels, cartridge and pistol belts, water canteens and covers, mess equipment, sleeping bags and sleeping-bag covers, white mattress covers.

I am given to understand that this clothing and equipment was not condemned, and this action was simply a wanton destruction of Federal equipment. I intend to ask the War Department for an explanation and demand an investigation, fixing the blame, if any, on the responsible parties. Too many of these instances have been reported and it is about time they were stopped.

The Rape of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by me from Everybody's Digest for July:

THE RAPE OF JUSTICE BY COURT MARTIAL

(By Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr.)

Long before they had a chance to fight for democracy, scores of American soldiers—officers as well as enlisted men—were executed by a vicious, undemocratic court-martial system.

Forty-eight thousand men who once wore the uniform of the United States Army or Navy are today serving sentences imposed by a jury not of their peers, but of judges with superior rank. These men stood trial with inadequate defense counsel appointed by a prejudiced court. They were often denied witnesses who might have testified in their behalf. They did not have the inalienable right of habeas corpus.

This arbitrary manner of accusing, trying, judging, and sentencing men in uniform is America's great shame.

While the Negro GI was the likeliest victim of our outmoded and unjust military courts, men and women of all races and religions suffered under the system.

GI prisoners are now serving time in barbaric military jails for offenses that might have meted them 10 days in any police court in the land—but they're doing 10 years, 20 years, even 50.

Let me begin in the States: In Port Chicago, Calif., 50 fear-shocked sailors were court-martialed and convicted of mutiny after they had refused to load live ammunition. Their hearing lasted only 45 minutes. Seven brass-hatted judges presided. Here's what Lt. Comdr. James Coakley said: "Any

man who is so depraved as to be afraid to load ammunition deserves no leniency." Just 3 weeks previously, 320 American sailors had been blown to bits at the same pier.

In Nashville, Purdie Jackson, a Negro, walked into a drugstore reserved for whites, defended himself against assault, and was tenderly sentenced to 12 years at hard labor.

One of the most flagrant miscarriages of justice was the case of John Thorpe, who was tried on the new theory of accessory before the fact, a procedure unknown to Anglo-Saxon law in our civil courts. Thorpe got 15 years at hard labor.

If I hadn't been appealed to by Mrs. Kay Andrews, of Chicago, her son, Pvt. James Howard, would have been done to death by a United States military court in Europe. Accused of killing a criminal investigation agent, James was sentenced to death without being allowed to call witnesses for his defense. Brig. Gen. Robert Dunlop wrote that James was going to have a new trial and went on to say: "The record of the trial was legally insufficient to support the sentence."

There's an almost endless variety in the indictments brought by men of good will and intelligence against our court-martial procedures. Grasslands, N. Y., a huge prison erected by the State, now houses hundreds of military offenders who failed to salute a pompous officer or had a personality wrangle with a superior and were casually charged with dereliction of duty.

There is the case of the four WAC's in Massachusetts who refused to scrub floors in a hospital. They were dishonorably discharged and sentenced to hard labor. Only the most strenuous efforts on my part resulted in having the WAC's reinstated and the colonel in charge removed.

Capt. Leroy Clay had served his Nation honorably for 15 years. In the midst of a heavy engagement with the Nazis, Captain Clay contacted a colonel by radio. It was alleged that he had been instructed to contact the colonel personally. For this infraction, Clay was sentenced to 50 years. Only after widespread protest was his sentence reduced to 20 years, and he was later cleared and permitted to reenlist as a private so that he might earn an honorable discharge. It was a tacit admission that a grievous injustice had been perpetrated.

Last year our Government instituted a policy of paying a fee to any woman overseas who accused an American soldier of rape and was able to prove it. Naturally, this has resulted in an avalanche of such charges by enemy nationals. American servicemen are lured into voluntary sexual intercourse, charged with rape, and often executed while the woman is paid off by Uncle Sam.

In Backnang, Germany, Benjamin Miller was sentenced to death because he refused to enter his commanding officer's jeep and voluntarily returned to the stockade. The unit surgeon testified that the accused was probably an epileptic suffering from temporary loss of memory. Miller permanently lost his life via court martial.

And how do you like this one? Four men were arrested for the same crime—rape. Two were tried in the morning, found guilty, sentenced to be shot to death; the other two—with identical charges, identical witnesses, but with different court-martial officers—were set free because the court decided there was no evidence of rape, merely evidence of fraternization. I do not want to use the names of those involved, but the case is on file in my office and in the office of the Secretary of War.

Today Ike Edwards is serving a 12-year sentence in Leavenworth. Originally he was given a 30-year sentence for mutiny, commiting a riot, and unlawfully and riotously assaulting another, according to his court-martial record. My efforts in his behalf made the reduction of sentence possible. Evidence in the file indicates that Ike wasn't even at the scene of the crime; he drove up in his Army truck after the riot was over.

How does a court martial operate? The atmosphere is cold and precise. The defendant is assigned a counsel, very likely an officer who does not wish to offend the accuser, often a high-ranking officer. Many constitutional rights that obtain in civil courts to protect the defendant against injustice simply do not exist. Not for 25 years has the court-martial procedure been revised.

There is no painstaking spinning out of evidence. Sentences are ground out with the regularity and monotony of an assembly line. The fact that the accusation is being made by a superior officer stacks the cards against an enlisted man or an officer of lower rank. The dice are loaded, a charge virtually presupposes a conviction, and punishments never fit the crime.

And military prisons are hardly de luxe. The offender is treated not as a human being but as a bill of lading. The recent exposé of brutal conditions at Lichfield Army Camp in London, where American boys were beaten and abused, is not an exception but an example.

American prisoners at Lichfield were forced to eat heavy meals and then administered castor oil. A "nose and toes punishment" was a daily occurrence. This consisted of binding a prisoner with a heavy rope in such a way that his nose touched his toes. Sometimes the GI was forced to remain in this position for as long as 24 hours. Rubber hoses were used for the slightest offense. Prisoners were strung up by their hands, so that only their toes touched the floor. Usually the prisoner fainted after 2 hours.

Recently, Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson appointed a civilian board of nine prominent judges and lawyers to look into the grievances voiced by outraged families and those victims of military court martial who were able to get their stories out to friends and the press.

Those who believe firmly in genuine democracy—even for the members of our armed forces—hope that the current investigation of courts martial will not turn into a whitewash. Not only must the entire system be revised in recognition of our constitutional rights but the officers responsible for unpardonable injustice in every case must be punished. Unwarranted death before a firing squad is cold murder. And we cannot permit the guilty officers to get away with murder.

Hand and Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, for over 60 years Whitworth College, Spokane, Wash., has guided the youth of our great Northwest. As glorious as is its past, this school can look forward to an even greater future.

The commencement address, which I was privileged to deliver, June 10, to the graduating class of 1946, follows:

It is indeed a pleasure to participate in these commencement day exercises. I can well imagine the pride with which Dr. Calvin Stewart, Whitworth's first president, would view this assembly. In his mind he would see the struggle of this institution from its founding 62 years ago as an academy in Sumner, Wash., down through the period of its residence in Tacoma until now, when it occupies this broad and growing campus and serves an ever-increasing enrollment.

This Pacific Northwest of ours is destined to become one of the great areas of the earth and that destiny is inexorably linked with an approaching crisis in the history of mankind.

Nothing could be more reassuring than to see the growth of our institutions of higher learning. Spokane must inescapably become one of the world's great cities. If she is to have a balanced growth, her population increases must be matched by the growth of education and seats of learning.

The violence of war has passed. For half a decade we succeeded in molding humanity into a controlled machine of single purpose. Our triumph of arms is complete. Our mechanical genius stands unchallenged in a material world.

Yet mankind wavers—confused, cynical, distrustful—knowing not which road to tread in search of peace.

Behind the ambush yonder lie the cossacks of intolerance; the trees swarm with the snipers of prejudice; the earthworks of arrogance loom in the distance, thrown up by the blind fury of selfish ambition; in mankind's ranks still lurks the fifth column of ignorance; a willful worship of the glories of materialism dilutes the fuels that should fire our legions beyond the false vantage of triumph until the real victory—peace—is reached.

It is a time for penance and dedication. It is a time for thinking men to take counsel of their strength that it not fail them.

"And why beholdest thou the mote which is in thy brother's eye but perceivest not the beam that is in thine own eye?"

What a time to graduate! What a time to begin life! What a time for commencement!

We here in America hold in our hands all of the advances that enlightened science has so far devised. We hold in our hands all of the mechanical achievements of technology. We hold in our hands the fearsome challenge of atomic energy and the promise of men flying through the air at a speed faster than sound. Imagine Chicago as close as Wilbur is now by automobile; Washington, D. C., as close as Wenatchee; London as close as Seattle; and Moscow no farther than Portland, Oreg., now is by car! I have seen the supersonic experiments at Langley Field, Va., and can say that this promise is most real.

Note the recent achievements in the material world of American scientists and researchers: Penicillin, sulpha, and now antibiotics, that may conquer tuberculosis; new textiles rivaling wool, cotton, and silk; new alloys replacing conventional metals in strength and weight; new building materials; new appliances; new designs, methods—but why go on. In a material world we rank first.

We are A–1 in materialism—and the drama of that preeminence is what frightens us. It is high time that we cast the beam from our eye so that we might realize what else we are.

We are a young nation. Our preeminence is largely the product of a century. Most of us are the descendants of European peasants. Our resources are not outstanding; it is what we have done with them that stands out. Our educational institutions do not excel the best in other countries; it is what we have done with them that excels. Our religion is unified, but so are other nations blessed with unified religions. It is because ours is Christian that we have progressed. Our Government is not the only representative republic in the world; it is because ours constantly strives to liberate and improve the individuals who compose it that it has survived.

We are the composite result of the Renaissance. Europe awoke in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Men sought freedom of expression in many ways until the domination of scholasticism, of feudalism, and of the church in secular matters was displaced by nationalism. This friction speeded our settlement and, because it infused its aspira-

tions on our leaders, determined the civic foundations of our society.

There was a pain in my heart one day last winter. For 3 years I had periodically visited the mezzanine of the Congressional Library to view five of the great documents of history. Those five documents became almost personal friends of mine. Now, one of them—the Lincoln Cathedral copy of the Magna Carta—was going home. The war was over and safekeeping in America was no longer necessary.

But while it was here we became real friends. Gazing at that parchment, I let my mind travel back to that shaded meadow at Runnymede where, on June 15, 1215, the nobles forced King John to live up to his promise of a government that respected men as individuals with definite rights. Often I have thought of the Atlantic Charter in connection with the circumstances that attended the signing of the Magna Carta.

Not far away is another document. It belongs in the Congressional Library of the United States. It is the Gutenberg Bible in three volumes. It was printed in the middle of the fifteenth century.

It is good that the Bible—containing the New Testament and man's universal Magna Carta (when we learn how to read) should commemorate to us the invention of movable type. Up to then, education could be, and was, a monopoly. Now it was to become progressively, available to the most humble of men.

My three other friends on the Library mezzanine owe much to the two I have mentioned. The first is the Declaration of Independence, in Jefferson's own handwriting, with his original corrections.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

No American can gaze and read without thrill. That statement stunned a Europe subsiding into an acceptance of modified feudalism.

Why here, they said, was an attack on government itself.

Yes, it was—an attack on government that made the individual the property of the state. What the Declaration had said was that the state should be the servant of all enlightened citizens and should be responsive to their enlightened will.

From the Magna Carta, the Gutenberg Bible, and the Declaration, we pass naturally to gaze upon the American Constitution—an amendable document, subject to our will as progress dictates—and the Bill of Rights.

Those five documents have inspired me. To see them is to understand how you and I, in truth the descendants of refugees—political, religious, social, perhaps, but refugees nevertheless from Europe—could, on this foundation, build in a century the preeminent Nation of this earth.

In a word, we have come close to freeing mankind in society. Sure, our attempt has been faulty, as all human attempts to chart rocky channels in advance must be faulty, but our preeminence is evidence enough of its success.

Our job, and the one we must face on this commencement day, is how to preserve and to progressively perfect that freedom.

To win the war we had to imitate, up to a point, the very controlled economies of the Axis nations with whom we were at war.

If we are to carry out the purpose of our American heritage—sired by the multiple rebirths of the Renaissance—we must preserve the freedom of the individual and provide for his improvement. If we are to employ force, let it be compulsory education.

We here in America hold in our hand the fate of the world.

No. That isn't right.

We here in America hold in our hand the hope of the world, for we here in America must hold in our hearts a compassion for all mankind. In saying that, I am not suggesting a patronizing America. I am merely suggesting that a tyranny which bears down upon humanity, anywhere in this new small world is a threat to our security. I am something like the Irishman who wishes England no good, but no evil either, since bad times would make England a poor neighbor.

All of the world is our neighbor now and the welfare of 2,000,000,000 souls will progressively influence the welfare of our population.

Being preeminent, holding fast to the forelock of material progress, assuming the role of the world's foremost solvent nation—these preclude any once happy hope of isolation. If that's not enough, let me say that I, myself, flew last September from Jerusalem to Washington, D. C., in 40 hours. It can be done in less time.

It was a part of a trip I made 11 months ago to the United Kingdom, France, the Low Countries, Scandinavia, Denmark, Germany, Switzerland, Russia, Italy, the Balkans, Greece, Turkey, Egypt, and the Near East.

The British, the Low Countries, and the Scandinavians were determinedly and purposefully facing the policies and the problems of the future. England, particularly, was about her age-old economies of export or die and, inspired and unified by the period of blood, sweat, and tears cannot be lightly laid aside as an obsolete system of an abandoned principle. France appeared confused, falling once more into a political order of social classes ruled by bureaucracy. Italy was prostrate—and only lately has some semblance of civic purpose appeared there. This, however, is to be expected in a nation that for two decades submerged the individual. Germany was chaos, a socialized state with the works shot out. Russia was as absolute as ever it was under the Czars, excepting that the absolutism of the 20 men who control the party of 6,000,000, who, in turn, control the destinies of 190,000,000, perhaps more, souls, is working toward a better—that is material—day for the Russian.

But he will lack political freedom.

Therefore the challenge of political responsibility will never confront him. And it is on this theme of political responsibility that I wish to dwell.

But first I must tell you of the Near East, where, to me at least, the dawn of a truly constructive American influence is at hand.

Jerusalem will both inspire and nauseate you. I stood on the Mount of Olives, and I know why Jesus wept. You won't like the harpers and the vendors selling trifles around the sites of sacred history.

But you will like the American YMCA in Jerusalem. You'll like it as a marvelous expression of a simplified America.

You'd like, as I did, hearing a Presbyterian missionary with 40 years' experience in Arabia, preach a real sermon in the Presbyterian Church at Jerusalem. His theme and text was "He raises up." He was referring to Christ, and we Americans, as Christians, must.

You'd like, as I did, to visit the American University at Beirut, in Lebanon, and the Presbyterian Women's School at Beirut, educating, last year, 16 separate nationalities in that Near East. Incidentally, Helen Naundorf, a resident Spokane is proud of, has taught there for many years.

You'd like, as I did, to visit Roberts College in Istanbul where, with other American educational institutions of the Near East, the present and, of course, the future leaders of those countries are being educated.

You'd like, as I did, to visit the Christian Prime Minister of a Moslem country—Syria—and know that Moslems had elevated him to such a high position. That's the faith that divergents can place in Christianity when it's real and when it's sincere.

"We don't want your money. We want your sincere friendship." That's what the President of Syria (a Moslem) said to me.

Material America. It's great—the prefabs and the refrigerator—the auto and the radio—the airplane and air-conditioning—material America. It's great. But our hope still lies in spiritual America. Thank God it exists and lives—and spreads.

"Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not love, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal."

I came home last summer with a renewed faith.

I came home with the conviction that Americans could be educated to outlaw conflict in all its forms. That is a challenge to a civilization that, in 3,442 years of recorded history, has known but 227 years of peace. We, ourselves, have had in our short history 13 major and 30 Indian wars.

I came home to work at this business of educating our neighborly folk as to the material and spiritual costs of conflict.

Materially, the last war cost us more than 60,000,000 souls, killed. It cost at least, and these are substantive facts, a trillion and a half in money. It can cost us civilization itself, for our engineering genius has acquired the know-how to achieve it.

It must not be, and the choice is continued acceptance of impending conflict or the embracing of mediums to avert it.

I came home convinced that social disorders were unnecessary and dangerous. We, you and I, have no right to stand erect until we have found a safe and just means of solving labor and other economic conflicts short of the destructiveness of strikes and lockouts. They, too, are costly; estimates approximating $5,000,000,000 attend the strikes we have had since VJ-day.

Manifestly there is work for statesmanship here at home as well as abroad. The Nation must be healthy and productive. We must not fail. The strange voices that mingle abroad in one chorus of conclusion as to the future of America must be stilled. The Conservative in England who harmonizes with the voice of Stalin in the swan song of our destiny—what do they say? They say that America's very freedom will lead to economic chaos, political disintegration, and social decay.

It must not be.

Our hope is education. Our strength is a responsible citizenship. Our faith is in God and the teachings of His Son. Our goal is a society capable of dissolving conflicts short of blind violence, and once again, our hope is education.

We here in America hold in our hand the hope of the world. That hope depends upon the will and the wisdom of our Christian heart.

A few years ago, my church celebrated its fiftieth anniversary On that occasion the son of one of our former pastors preached the anniversary sermon. Dr. Laurie ended his inspiring message with this poem. May I, now, send you out into a maligned and challenging world with it?

"I stand at the end of the past.
Where the future begins, I stand.
Emperors lie in the dust
(Men may live to command).

"Over my head the stars,
Distant and pale and cold.
Under my feet, the world,
Wrinkled and scarred and old.

"Back of me all that was—
All the limitless past.
The future awaiting before me,
Silent, untenanted—vast!

"I—at the center of all that has been
(Or that which is to be).
The task still unfinished and now
God and man depending on me!"

On the Industrial Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, our old friend, Fred Brenckman, for the past 18 years the able, alert, and conscientious Washington representative of the National Grange, has written for the official organ of that organization a thought-provoking article on the labor situation entitled "On the Industrial Front," which presents in a fair and comprehensive way the manner in which the rights of the general public are all too often overlooked, or ignored, in labor-management differences. Like Mr. Brenckman, I strongly feel the rights of the majority are paramount in all such instances and should have first consideration.

ON THE INDUSTRIAL FRONT—WHERE DO THE PUBLIC'S RIGHTS BEGIN IN LABOR DISPUTES—STRIKES HAVE THROWN THE NATION INTO CHAOS, WITH OVER 100,000,000 MAN-DAYS OF LABOR LOST SINCE VJ-DAY—AND MEN STILL IDLE

(By Fred Brenckman)

What has happened in this country on the industrial front since the close of the war in the Pacific constitutes a spectacle for gods and men. Not only has our system of free enterprise during that time taken the worst blows ever inflicted upon it, but in the process respect for our fundamental institutions of government has been seriously impaired. This does not mean that the people have lost faith in the American system, which is the best in the world, but it does mean that their confidence has been rudely shaken in the way it is being worked or administered.

Elaborate plans were worked out while the war was still in progress to speed up the giant task of reconversion when peace should come, and the people looked forward hopefully to getting the many things which they cheerfully did without while we were fighting two wars at the same time, one in Europe and in Africa, and the other in the Pacific.

But in the main these hopes have not been realized. Today it is just as difficult to buy such simple necessities as shirts, underwear, women's stockings, and other wearing apparel as it was during the war. Even such a prime necessity as butter has almost disappeared from the market. When it comes to the supply of durable goods and equipment, the innumerable things that the people need, the situation is equally bad.

OPA AND STRIKES TO BLAME

A large share of the blame for this must rest upon the Office of Price Administration, which, through its unworkable price ceilings, rules, and regulations has thrown our economic machine out of gear and partially strangled production. The rest of our troubles must be attributed to the epidemic of strikes which have brought many of our key industries to a standstill, with disastrous consequences to the Nation.

From VJ-day, August 14, 1945, to the end of March 1946, there were 2,749 strikes, with 83,132,000 man-days of labor lost. On the first of April the most crippling of all the strikes, that of the 400,000 bituminous coal miners, occurred. The paralyzing effects of this strike were rapidly bringing industry and commerce to their knees, when, on May 10, John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, ordered his men back to work as of May 13 "to safeguard the Nation's health and security."

During the 36 working days that the mine strike was in effect, 16,400,000 man-days of labor were lost. Adding this figure to that which had accumulated to the end of March, and taking into account other strikes which were still in progress after the first of April, warrants the statement that more than 100,000,000 man-days of labor have been lost as a result of strikes since VJ-day. All this at a time when there was the most urgent need for full production!

The direct loss in wages to strikers is placed at over $800,000,000. Indirect losses to other workers who were thrown out of employment by these work stoppages cannot be computed. Nor can the losses sustained by industry be accurately approximated. The same holds true of the revenues lost to the Federal Government in the form of taxes.

STRIKES WERE UNJUSTIFIED

While it is true that the strikers in practically every instance won substantial increases in wages, the fact remains that in nearly every case reasonable wage increases could have been secured without a strike. Often the difference between the wage increase offered by employers and that which was finally accepted by the strikers amounted to only a cent or two an hour.

As matters stand now, average hourly earnings of workers in the meat-packing industry amount to $1.04; electrical equipment, $1.19; steel, $1.27; automobiles, $1.38; and oil refining, $1.43. Average hourly earnings of all industrial workers in January went over the dollar mark, and numerous increases since granted to large groups raise the average to higher levels. On the whole, the general wage level is now about 70 percent above prewar rates.

Taking the period from 1910–14 as a base, in December 1945, hourly earnings of factory workers stood at 471 percent of that level; weekly wages per factory worker, 369 percent; cost of living, 188 percent; retail cost of foods, 182 percent; and prices received by farmers, 207 percent. These figures show that industrial workers are getting pretty fair treatment when compared to farmers and the rest of the population.

APPEAL TO THE CREDULOUS

After the steel and automobile strikes were settled on the basis of 18½ cents an hour increase in wages, the CIO spokesman for these groups broadcast the glad news over the radio that they had won the biggest increase in wages in the history of industry. Then they urged everybody to "get back of the OPA," so that there should be no increase in prices.

Those who were fooled by that kind of talk were, of course, very credulous, not to say unfair. The inescapable fact is that higher wages always spell higher prices, unless accompanied by increased production.

However, during recent years some labor unions have resorted to slow-downs, featherbedding, and other practices intended to limit production.

To cite an example, a bricklayer may not lay more than a given number of bricks a day; a house painter may not use a brush of more than so many inches in width; the plumber has long been noted for his ingenuity in making the job last as long as possible and running up costs; the building codes of many municipalities, largely formulated by labor unions and contractors, contain many provisions that make it easy to vicitimize the public, and which lead inevitably to added costs and grafting.

Under these conditions it has become increasingly difficult for the average man to own a home. Owing to the scarcity of houses all over the country, homes are selling at several times their real worth, while the cost of building new houses is almost prohibitive for people of average means.

Common sense tells us that that is not the way to make progress, nor does it promote the general welfare. The only way to have more is to produce more. What is true of the building industry is also true of any other line of industrial activity.

LACK OF FARM EQUIPMENT

The farmers of the country have particular reasons for feeling aggrieved because they are unable to get the equipment and machinery they had to do without under wartime conditions.

With nearly one-fourth of the world's population at the point of starvation, the farmers of the United States are being urged to produce food to the utmost limit of their capacity. This they are ready to do most cheerfully, but their efforts are being greatly handicapped by lack of machinery, together with a shortage of labor, due to the higher wages paid in industry.

That famine conditions would follow the global war could easily be foreseen several years ago. It was likewise clear that the world would have to look principally to the United States for the food needed to keep many millions from starving to death.

Under these conditions the United Farm Equipment and Metal Workers, CIO, early last fall served on the International Harvester Co. more than 45 demands, including a wage increase of 30 percent, the union shop, more liberal provisions for vacations with pay, and many others.

On October 1, 1945, the company offered to all unions in its plants a 10 percent increase in wages. This was accepted without prejudice to future wage demands by all unions except the Farm Equipment and Metal Workers, who refused it repeatedly. In January the Secretary of Labor appointed a fact-finding board to inquire into the dispute. After this board had convened, the union called its strike. That was on January 21.

On January 29 the company, in the hope of ending the strike, offered a 17 cents an hour increase to the strikers, but the offer again was rejected by the workers.

The fact-finding board eventually recommended a wage increase of 18 cents an hour, plus a retroactive increase of 10 percent, beginning October 1, 1945, which was to be paid until the effective date of the 18 cents an hour increase. The board also recommended an extension of the vacation plan, providing that employees of more than 15 years of service should be given 3-week vacations annually with pay. This had previously been offered by the company. These and most other recommendations made by the board were accepted by the company. But the union still refused to call off the strike.

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

It was not until almost the middle of April that this unfortunate controversy was settled. The principal items in the agreement were these: The 18-cent general wage increase; the 10-percent retroactive increase; the enlarged vacation plan; abolition of the maintenance of membership clause and the substitution of a dues check-off after an opportunity for employees to resign from the union; various liberalizations of wage allowance rules in the company's incentive pay system.

Coming at the time that it did, this strike resulted in depriving farmers throughout the country of the equipment they needed to feed our own population and to stay the grim march of famine in other lands. Since the company is unable to meet the demand for new machinery and equipment, it is putting all possible emphasis on the manufacture of service parts to keep existing machinery in operating condition.

Not content with all the havoc it has already wrought, the Farm Equipment and Metal Workers Union, CIO, is now talking about compelling all dealers who handle the equipment which they help to make to join the union and pay dues under the penalty of getting no implements and machinery to sell.

IMITATING TEAMSTERS' UNION

In taking this position the union is imitating the tactics presently pursued by the teamsters' union in the Detroit area, where the teamsters have served notice on approximately 64,000 retail meat and grocery stores that hereafter they will haul food only to those shops whose owners agree to pay a monthly "permit fee" of from $2 to $5. The indignant grocers, asserting that this is a form of "tribute," say they will not pay it. James Hoffa, business agent for the teamsters' union in the area, declares that there is nothing criminal in the proposed arrangement and that the storekeepers will have to pay or go without supplies.

One is tempted to wonder if the American people still remember the famous words of Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, who in 1796 was sent as our Minister to France at a time when there was a threat of war between the two countries. When it was intimated to Pinckney that peace might be granted in return for a money payment, he replied, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute!"

RAIL WORKERS DISSATISFIED

As this is written, the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, dissatisfied with a wage increase of 16 cents an hour that was awarded to them by a board of mediation, threaten to go on strike on May 18. A. F. Whitney, president of the trainmen, has intimated that even if the Government seizes the railroads, the men will refuse to work until their demands are granted. He says:

"There are no laws or other barriers that prohibit members of the brotherhoods involved from leaving the service in a lawful strike and from remaining out of service of the carriers until a settlement satisfactory to them has been reached."

If a rail strike should really happen, it would make an already chaotic situation much worse, inflicting just one more blow upon a long-suffering public. The rail workers come under the Railway Labor Act, which has often been cited as a model, because there has been no general railroad strike over a period of many years.

After approving the British loan, the Senate took up the subject of dealing with the strike situation, which was acted upon by the House in February, when the Case labor disputes bill was passed by a large majority. As the Case bill was reported to the Senate by its Committee on Education and Labor, headed by Senator MURRAY, of Montana, there was not much left of the original measure. Whether the Senate as a whole will have the courage to deal adequately with this question in a campaign year, notwithstanding the combined opposition of organized labor, remains to be seen.

THE WAGNER ACT

It is, of course, possible that some kind of compromise bill may be passed. However, the root of the whole matter will not be reached until the Wagner Labor Relations Act, approved in 1935, is amended to make it a two-way act, instead of a one-way act, as it now is.

Any impartial person reading this act cannot fail to be impressed with the fact that it contains little except an enumeration of the duties, responsibilities, and obligations of the employer, and nothing to correspond on the side of the employee.

The agency established to administer this act is known as the National Labor Relations Board, which acts as prosecutor, judge, and jury in all cases instituted by it or coming before it. Some years ago the members of this Board were J. Warren Madden, Edwin S. Smith, and Donald Wakefield Smith.

The members of this Board and their numerous agents ruled our industrial system with a high hand. At plants where there was no labor trouble, the Board or its agents usually succeeded in creating trouble, and when the hapless employer was brought before the Board for sentence, as a rule, he did not have a chance. It is a tribute to the virility of our system of private enterprise that it did not collapse under this reign of terror.

Finally the House of Representatives appointed a special committee headed by Congressman HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia, to investigate the National Labor Relations Board. Edmund Toland, a fine lawyer, was engaged as counsel for the committee.

The facts brought out by this investigation shocked the sense of fair play that characterizes the American people, and it led to a reorganization of the Board, most of whose members and agents must have had Communistic sympathies.

UN-AMERICAN AND UNFAIR

The present members of the Board, headed by Paul M. Herzog, have not made themselves as objectionable as their predecessors. But that does not alter the fact that the whole set-up is un-American and unfair.

As Congressman SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., of North Carolina, aptly expresses it:

"The most fundamental principle of any system of justice worthy of the name is that every person who brings a controversy to a tribunal for judgment shall have that controversy determined by an impartial judge. The Wagner Act expressly prevents the application of this fundamental principle to controversies falling within the purview of the act. It insures its purpose that controversies covered by it shall not be determined with the cold neutrality of the impartial judge by providing, in substance, that the National Labor Relations Board shall institute and prosecute all prosecutions under the act and shall also be the judge of whether such prosecutions be well or ill-founded. Justice cannot live under law which undertakes to unite the impartiality of the judge with the partisanship of the prosecutor."

United States Encouragement of World Inflation and Borrowing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the facts and figures having to do with the British gift-loan point to the conclusion that by committing herself to this kind of international financing as a permanent policy America will be caught in a vicious circle of recurring need and demand from which there can be no escape.

The Treasury Department itself stated in January 1946 that:

It must be remembered that aside from the United States and Canada nearly all the capital-lending countries have been physically devastated by war and are themselves in the need of aid. Therefore England must look to the United States for the bulk of the credit she desires.

There can be no question that as the pattern of the postwar world has crystallized America has been confronted with a wholly different world than was anticipated. Instead of a world where multilateral trading and equal access to the trade and raw materials of the world was possible, we are now confronted with a world that has been torn into two camps of bitterly conflicting ideologies and interests. America has been left with the permanent deficit economies of western European and eastern Asiatic countries on her hands. What is even more tragic is that these countries, together with those nations which have been betrayed into the hands of Russia, are already engaged in pouring what remains of their devastated economies and depleted resources into a mad rearmament race, instead of into the desperately needed peaceful reconstruction of the shattered economies and societies of the world.

It is into this insane struggle that America is now projecting all her plans for rehabilitation through financial aid. Without waiting for any real settlements to be reached even among the victor powers, without waiting for a decent solution to the terrifying problem of what is going to be done with the former enemy countries, America is taking a wild plunge into a rising sea of international anarchy and chaos from which, on the basis of her present policies, she cannot emerge with our traditional American system intact.

It is this kind of a world that the facts and figures concerning the terms and nature and design of the British gift-loan take on a wholly new meaning.

There are three separate agreements involved in this alleged and misnamed loan.

In the first agreement Great Britain is enabled completely to liquidate all her wartime loans under lend-lease which she received from America—over $29,000,000,000 worth of equipment, goods, and services, as well as cash and credit, for the sum of $650,000,000, and a badly inflated and overcharged reverse lend-lease account. This amounts to a settlement of 2½ cents on the dollar. The American taxpayer will continue to take an annual loss of $500,000,000 a year on the sums we are thus canceling.

So far as this first agreement is concerned, it is provided that England shall pay this $650,000,000 in $50,000,000 installments, at no specified time. Yet not one cent of this will be permitted to leave the British Empire. The United States is pledged in the agreement to spend that credit within the British silver bloc area.

The second agreement provides for an outright loan—in reality a gift—to the British of $3,750,000,000, which is to be repaid in 50 annual installments at a rate of what amounts to 1.62 percent interest, since a moratorium on principal and debt has been established for the first 5 years.

This means that the American Government, which will have to finance that debt at the rate of at least 2½ percent, will have to take an annual loss of $33,000,000 a year just to pay the interest. And this will be true, even if Britain repays the interest and principal promptly. All this on top of the $500,000,000 loss annually which the American taxpayer will have to pay for our cancellation of the huge lend-lease debt.

So far as the third agreement is concerned, we have only Britain's promise

that she will support America's trade proposals at an international trade conference scheduled for some time this summer.

These first two financial agreements are of such a nature that no sane businessman or banker would have anything to do with them. The third agreement is only a vain illusion. Great Britain not only is not going to support our proposals in the forthcoming international trade conference, she cannot support them unless she wants to commit economic suicide. What has America to offer England, or the British Empire, in the way of inducements which will in any way make up for the advantages she obtains from her imperial trade preference system, and all the other means and methods she has used to develop her own economic security during the past 100 years?

So far as America is concerned, the terms of this gift-loan confront us with the real nature of the terrible dilemma in which we now find ourselves. It would be far better to have made an outright gift to Britain of a more modest sum, and, at the same time, supported sane and constructive solutions to the present problems of peace which are making any hope of international reconstruction for peace impossible.

As matters now stand, America is challenged, as never before in her history, to find just such a constructive alternative to her present policies, if she is not to face destruction, not only from forces without but from forces within.

America was founded by men whose political and spiritual faith and insight dictated the necessity for keeping us free from all foreign controversies and entanglements. This policy was wise. Under it we had the time and the security and the friendship of other nations which would give us the glorious chance to develop a nation dedicated to the realization of the dignity and liberties of men. To this end this Nation was founded. On this principle it grew great. America could never have debated and deliberated and experimented and decided, on the basis of ballots instead of bullets, to the point where a free society has created the highest standard of living in history, unless we had been able to set our internal problems and their solutions above every other consideration. It has been an American tradition to make certain that our internal life dictated our international life.

Now, we confront a complete reversal of this wise and time-tried philosophy. Today America finds as the consequence of two armed world interventions in one generation that she can no longer continue down the road she is going without destroying her own way of life from within. This British gift-loan is a tragic illustration of the fate that now threatens.

In the first place, these financial agreements place an added burden on the back of the American taxpayer and his children's children. Certainly there is no one naive enough to believe that this gift-loan is not going to set a precedent. The terrifying pattern of the postwar world, which leaves America as the financial angel to all the bankrupt economies of over half the world, makes such an assertion senseless. Instead we are already confronted with an endless line of borrowing nations from which we shall never escape, without hastening the complete collapse of what remains of the world's economy outside of the Russian sphere.

But neither can we continue on the road this gift-loan is taking us. For instance, by granting this British gift we are establishing the precedent that, for the first time in our history, the American Government is going to supplant private investment sources as an international financial agent, and use the American taxpayers' money, this time not for financial, but for purely political purposes.

In other words, the political situation has already become so threatening that the economic desperation of the nations caught between the two great power-centers of the world, Russia and America, is going to be dealt with on a purely political basis as a matter of security.

When the time comes that the American Government accepts, as a permanent policy, the lending and giving of the American taxpayers' money for political purposes, the time has come when our American way of life is doomed. Under such conditions the external relations of this Nation will inevitably dictate to the internal structure of our economy and society. This will require increasingly an extension of bureaucratic controls over an ever-widening area of American life until finally our American way of life is gone.

Perhaps a benevolent despotism may be all that we could hope for, in the face of the changed nationalistic, economic, and social forces this war has brought in its wake. All over the world nations are struggling just to keep body and soul together. The specter of fear is haunting a suffering humanity. The breakdown of all normal channels of intercourse has forced totalitarian controls on every country under the sun just to keep government functioning, and to minister in the only way possible to the awful needs of millions of suffering and starving people.

But to permit the external affairs of the world to continue longer to dictate the internal economy and structure of our society here at home becomes suicidal when we realize just how war-breeding and self-defeating the policies are which the acceptance of this kind of international financing is supporting.

In the first place so far as America's vital interests are concerned, this British gift sets a pattern of international financing, which is already contributing to the creation of two violently antagonistic world economic blocs. Secretary Vinson recently admitted that this loan would have that very effect. But what no one seems to be willing to admit is that not only are we creating a western bloc through this gift-loan, but, by continuing such loan policies, we are contributing to the development of a Russian bloc as well.

At a time when our economical and financial power needs desperately to be used for peace we are directly setting in motion the forces of such an economic war as the world has never seen before, and we are setting those forces in motion on both sides.

On May 8, 1946, Mr. Constantine Brown wrote in the Washington Star:

> The Rumanian economic agreement provides for the formation of Soviet-Rumanian syndicates for the exploitation and development of all the resources of that country. It is, in fact, a most stringently monopolistic agreement, aimed at the exclusion of all other foreign interests.
>
> Thus Rumania * * * will be prevented from transacting any business deals with the capitalistic countries. It will be Moscow which will act as an intermediary in all such cases.

On March 23, 1946, A. T. Steele cabled the New York Herald Tribune:

> The withdrawal of the Red army from Mukden lays bare the pattern of Soviet economic expansion in Manchuria. The Russian troops are gone, but Soviet banks, trading agencies, and technical experts are taking up where the army left off. It is now evident that in 6 months of military occupation the Russians laid strong economic foundations for exploitation of Manchuria as a source of supply for the Soviet Union and as a potential market for Soviet goods.

It takes little imagination to understand why the British themselves stand aghast at the stupidity of American policy, when they see General Marshall being forced to give the kiss of death to the Chungking government, and being given the power to veto loans to China until the Nationalist government embraces the Chinese Communists, who will support democracy only to destroy it.

It is just becoming apparent to the American people how far reaching the political betrayals of this war are. Even many of our statesmen are just discovering that political betrayals are basically economic, and social, and even military in nature. For instance, on March 28, John Hanna wrote to the New York Herald Tribune concerning Russo-Finnish relations:

> The reparations bill amounts to 2½ times all Finnish agricultural products, plus all its cattle, and $65,000,000. So long as reparations continue, Finland will have nothing to sell to the rest of the world, except as may be permitted by Russia, to enable Finland to expand its metal industries for reparations. Whatever the ultimate outcome, recent American credits to Finland through the Export-Import Bank are a contribution to Russian reparations.

In other words, the whole American loan policy to foreign governments has become sheer madness. We are setting in motion through this British gift-loan, and through our Export-Import Bank credits, the conflicting forces in both of the world economic blocs, which are now engaging the nations of the world in one vast armaments race, and draining our resources at home. On top of all of this, we are establishing a policy which, by reversing our traditional way of life, now necessitates that the external relations of this Nation dictate to the internal structure.

Never before in history has any nation so willingly and so deliberately planned and contributed to its own destruction both from without and from within.

There may be no way to arrest the present terrifying trend toward another

suicidal war, and the destruction of our freedoms from within as a necessary prerequisite for it. But sanity demands that if the world is to be spared such a monstrous doom, America no longer continue as the engineer of such a catastrophe.

Instead, we ought immediately to suspend the formulation of our future economic and financial policies until some kind of formal peace agreements have been reached.

We ought immediately to declare a moratorium on "reparations in kind," by which the whole of Europe, and a large part of Manchuria, and Korea, and Japan, are being stripped of the desperately needed industrial machinery, by which economic reconstruction on a peaceful basis might be hastened.

We ought immediately to declare an end to the state of war; and we ought to take the lead in forcing the nations of the earth to at least go on record, so far as the abolition of conscription and progressive multilateral disarmament are concerned.

Whatever else we may or may not do, America must stop this insane international pump-priming spree, which is only hastening the inevitable outbreak of a desperate economic war, and an eventual atomic catastrophe. Certainly, financially, economically, and socially, the path we are laying out for ourselves in this British gift-loan will lead to our own destruction both from without and from within.

For Permanent Industrial Peace, Light, Not Heat, Must Be the Objective in Study of a Permanent Labor Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, we are not going to bring peace between labor and industry by passing any hastily concocted bills dreamed up by corporation lawyers. We are not going to solve our economic problems by commanding the sun to stand still.

Not long ago we passed an administrative procedure act upon which the most distinguished attorneys of our land, high-ranking executive officials, and faithful and intelligent Members of the Senate and House Committees on the Judiciary had labored for a full decade.

A little before that we passed a monstrosity termed "An act to facilitate settlement of labor disputes" which no committee of Congress had ever studied.

That bill is again before us. It has now received some study in the other House. It is still a bad bill with relatively unknown potentialities for promoting, not ending, labor-industry disputes; for aggravating, not soothing, friction in industrial relations.

I commend to the attention of the Members of Congress, Mr. Speaker, an intelligent and dispassionate analysis of the situation in an editorial from the Chicago Times of May 31. I do not agree with the Times in its disposition to regard the Case bill lightly; but I do believe the editorial makes sense.

Note, Mr. Speaker, that the Times, which is not a radical newspaper, denies that the Wagner Act throws undue advantage to organized labor; that the failure of Congress to enact needed legislation is cited; and that the paper soberly predicts continued friction if the Case bill is rushed through.

Under permission granted me, I am inserting the editorial in the RECORD.

FOR PERMANENT INDUSTRIAL PEACE

With the soft coal and rail strikes settled, it would be pleasant to take an optimistic view and report that the labor situation has stabilized and that a period of peace and production lies ahead.

Unfortunately, such a view is not justified.

The Senate-revised Case bill passed by the House of Representatives Wednesday afternoon represents one of the lowering clouds on the horizon. The impending strike of maritime workers is another, and more immediate, threat to labor peace. And now the miners of hard coal are out. Over the Nation in general there are hundreds of minor labor-management deadlocks, none very important in itself, but each choking off some small capillary or vein in our integrated industrial and economic body.

We do not share either of the extremist attitudes toward the Case bill. On the one hand we cannot see that it represents "slavery" for labor, or unduly restricts legitimate union activities. On the other hand we are far from agreeing that it is a panacea for our labor-management difficulties. We seriously doubt whether it will ever prevent a major strike where the roots of disagreement between management and labor are deep.

The trouble with the Case bill, as with the Smith-Connally Act, and the President's rejected drastic proposal of drafting strikers into the Army, is it deals with symptoms, not causes. The President's proposal, in a black hour, was admitted to be no permanent cure. In an emergency, it served its purpose.

WHY THE WAVE OF STRIKES?

If there is to be long-range industrial peace, there must be an understanding of the long-range reasons for the current disputes. President Truman's suggestion for a 6-month study of permanent labor legislation has receive rough treatment. It has largely been dismissed with the sneering observation that there has been plenty of study.

Actually, however, nearly all the "studies" which have been made on this subject have come at an hour of crisis. There has been little or no calm, reasonable examination of the problem. Light, not heat, must be the objective.

In this moment of lull it is well briefly to review some of the more obvious reasons for labor's present unrest. Is it, as so freely charged, due to labor "arrogance," arising out of laws—principally the Wagner Act—which unduly weigh the scales in labor's favor?

It cannot be denied that certain labor leaders—Messrs. Lewis, Whitney, and Johnston, to be specific—have displayed an apparent arrogance and disregard of the public welfare. This has reacted badly against all labor. In the case of the railway workers, for example, it is easy to forget the 18 brotherhoods which accepted the Government mediator's recommendations.

IT TAKES TWO TO MAKE A STRIKE

One factor should be borne in mind. From the beginning of the industrial revolution, late in the eighteenth century, until a dozen years ago, the cards ran against labor. Wealth, the laws, the courts, the executive branch of Government generally sided with ownership.

It is only since NRA and the Wagner Act that the cry has been heard that Government and the laws were unduly on labor's side. Today it is doubtful if the scales are more than even. Management almost always is still better able to withstand a strike than are the workers. It is hardly surprising that, in little more than a decade, labor may not have developed a mature responsibility to accompany its new power.

Moreover, labor unhappily has allowed itself to be maneuvered into a spot where the finger of blame for strikes has pointed at it alone. If labor could have ended the soft coal and railway strikes, management, in each case, could have been more helpful. Recalcitrance may be a sin of ownership quite as well as of labor.

For many months—certainly since passage of the impetuous Smith-Connally Act—labor has had cause to be uncertain as to its future at the hands of Government. With increased minimum wages, FEPC, the national health insurance bill extension of OPA, and virtually every other progressive proposal smothered in Congress, labor's uneasiness and unrest are understandable.

If hasty laws are to be Congress' solution to this problem, an "equal and opposite reaction" by labor is inevitable. Sober and just long-range legislation is the only hope for industrial peace.

The Supreme Court Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of June 8, 1946:

THE SUPREME COURT APPOINTMENT

The President's nomination of Fred M. Vinson to the position of Chief Justice of the United States will meet with widespread approval.

Mr. Vinson has a record of outstanding service to his country in the three branches of its government—legislative, judicial, and executive. He will bring to the highest judicial position in the Nation a background of experience and a close knowledge of the Nation's problems that are equaled by few Americans.

He is particularly qualified to meet the issues of finance and economics that will undoubtedly be involved in many court cases in the years ahead. He was long the leading expert on taxation and finance in the lower House. He has been considered, in his short career as Secretary of the Treasury, one of the most competent members of the Truman Cabinet. His wartime experience as Director of Economic Stabilization, as Federal Loan Administrator, as head of the RFC, and then as Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion has given him intimate knowledge of the economic woes besetting the country.

As Chief Justice, Mr. Vinson will probably be a member of the liberal group, for his is a liberal record. Yet it is an independent liberalism that has at times seen him stand stubbornly against leaders of his own political party.

His independence, his ability to see all sides of a controversial issue, his quality of being able to oppose men and yet keep their confidence and respect may provide his greatest contribution to the Court. These traits may serve to restore a unity to the Court that has been missing in recent years. This disunity, so evident in divided opinions, has tended to weaken the standing of the Court.

It should be pointed out, lastly, that the Vinson appointment proves again that this America is a wonderful land of opportunity, something we are inclined to forget in these troubled days. Now, in the highest judicial seat in the land, will sit a man born 56 years ago in the front room of the jail in Louisa, Ky., an obscure mountain village. His father was the town jailer.

Investor's Billions Must Be Saved—Senator Wheeler Answers Criticism of Mr. A. A. Berle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, within a few days the House of Representatives will have an opportunity to vote upon a measure, H. R. 5924, introduced by me, which has been reported favorably to the House by the Committee on the Judiciary. Another bill, S. 1253, introduced by Senator WHEELER, of Montana, having a similar objective has been favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Since these bills have been before the two Houses, respectively, there has appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Post of May 8, 1946, a communication by Mr. A. A. Berle, sometime Assistant Secretary of State, under the caption "Wheeler bill penalizes bondholders," describing railroad reorganization as "a happy hunting ground for political maneuvers in Washington."

Mr. Berle's charges were answered seriatim and conclusively by the distinguished Senator from Montana in the same paper. In order that Members of the House may be advised as to the nature of the charges advanced to defeat desperately needed remedial legislation, I am inserting in the RECORD this exchange of published correspondence between Senator WHEELER and Mr. Berle:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of May 8, 1946]

COMMUNICATION

WHEELER BILL PENALIZES BONDHOLDERS

Railroad reorganizations have long been a happy hunting ground for financial adventurers, and for political maneuvers in Washington; but a bill now pending in Congress (the so-called Wheeler bill, S. 1253) comes close to setting a high-water mark in vicious finance since the days when the Goulds and the Fisks plundered the Erie. Unless some attention is paid to it, another financial scandal will be added to the checkered history of railroad finance.

In the late 1920's and 1930's a great number of railroads were unable to pay their debts, and their creditors went unpaid. These creditors were mainly bondholders; and the bulk of these bonds were and still are held by the savings banks, insurance companies and other institutions whose business it is to protect the savings of humble people.

The plan of the Wheeler bill is certainly simple. Under it, bondholders and creditors of a railroad may be made to go unpaid, or to accept less than their claims, but the courts and the Interstate Commerce Commission are prohibited from impairing the position of stockholders who by this bill must be left in complete ownership and control. In plain English, creditors and bondholders can and will be sacrificed; stockholders, however, are to get the benefit of money taken away from the people who paid for and get first claim on the railroad property and its earnings. This is literally robbing Peter to pay Paul.

The type of interest which will profit by this amazing scheme is not hard to find. Every railroad man remembers the Van Sweringen manipulations in the twenties, when a pair of remarkable operators, using a holding company, bought up at bargain prices the common stock of a number of railroads and thereby created an empire composed of a major part of the American railroad system, built on a comparative shoestring. It is recent history that on the death of the Van Sweringen brothers and the financial involvement of their companies, the control of the empire was peddled about and finally sold for a still smaller shoestring, control coming to rest in the holding company known as Alleghany, which owns a select line of stock of various railroads.

It is also common knowledge that during the past 10 years common stocks of railroads which were either actually or nearly without value, were accumulated by a good many speculators, apparently as a flyer in financial politics. S. 1253 looks suspiciously like the pay-off.

During the early thirties, many railroads whose earnings did not justify their financial structure and which defaulted on their bonds were put into reorganization under a carefully worked out amendment to the Bankruptcy Act. These reorganizations are now substantially completed. They were carried out by the Interstate Commerce Commission and by the Federal courts, and in a number of cases the plans have been passed on and approved by the Supreme Court of the United States. Where the common stock of a railroad was worthless or nearly so, the courts and the Interstate Commerce Commission said so, and turned over the property and its control to its bondholders and creditors who had put in their good money, chiefly savings.

Just as the job of reorganization is about to be completed, and for the first time in many years, the weaker railroads of the country are about to be put on a solid financial base, capable of standing the stresses of the postwar era, along comes S. 1253 reported out on April 11, coolly providing that all railroad reorganization proceedings now carried on under the Bankruptcy Act, "shall be forthwith suspended and discontinued." Also, that the railroad managements, or the Interstate Commerce Commission, may cut down or modify the interests of creditors or bondholders (with their consent if it can be got, but without if the Commission is unable to get it), and that any such cutting down of the creditors must "not be adverse to the interests of the holders of any other class of the carrier's securities"—that is to say, stockholders.

In plain language, this is a bill to protect railroad stockholders, no matter how worthless the stock may be, at the expense of bondholders and creditors who are to go partially unpaid for their benefit. It is class legislation which can make fortunes for fly-by-night speculators in comparatively worthless railroad stocks; and it is legislation calculated to legislate into permanence the shoestring empires of the Alleghany-Van Sweringen holding company type. And it throws overboard a decade of careful and competent work which is on the point of giving the country at last an approximately self-respecting situation in railroad finance.

S. 1253 is one of those pieces of legislation which ought not to be voted on until the public has a clear knowledge of who wants it, and why, and what it is all about. It affects billions of American savings, and the management of our most essential transport. It ought not to pass; and if passed it ought to be vetoed. As far as I can see, it will harm many thousands of Americans for the benefit of only a few, and it will pay large speculative profits to certain groups who have no possible right to them.

ADOLF A. BERLE, Jr.

NEW YORK CITY.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of May 15, 1946]

COMMUNICATION

SENATOR WHEELER REPLIES TO BERLE

While I rarely write letters to newspapers answering criticism of legislation pending before the committee of which I am chairman, I am complying with your request for my views regarding the letter of Mr. Adolph A. Berle, attacking S. 1253, a bill designed to stop the unjust forfeiture of some $2,000,000,000 of investments in railroad stocks and junior bonds, published in your issue of May 8. If one eliminates the 10 principal statements in that letter, each erroneous, only its invective remains.

Mr. Berle was one of the authors of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, hurriedly passed in the closing days of the Hoover administration. The railroad industry assumed that this section was intended to protect railroads and their security holders through reorganizations. Unexpectedly to the railroads which availed themselves of this apparently beneficent statute, it was administered as a forfeiture statute. When this became known, railroads in need of reorganization but not yet subject to this statute, avoided it as if it were the plague. In 1939 they proposed the enactment of a conservation statute for railroad reorganization. Mr. Berle opposed the conservation statute, and evidently still does not like such legislation, though its soundness has now been established beyond any possibility of doubt, even on the part of those who were extra cautious in their estimate of that statute in 1939.

The Interstate Commerce Commission helped railroads to reorganize under the conservation statute, in order to escape the forfeiture statute of which Mr. Berle was one of the draftsmen. S. 1253, the bill he now attacks, is modeled on the 1939 conservation law, for railroad reorganization.

Under this bill, the bondholders will retain their bonds, with such interest modification as money market conditions make appropriate; and the bondholders will make appropriate adjustment of, but will retain until paid, their claims for accrued interest. No reorganization could be affected under this bill unless the Interstate Commerce Commission authorized it. The commission could not authorize a reorganization under this bill unless the commission found that the reorganization plan was just, reasonable, in the public interest, in the best interests of the railroad company, in the best interests of its bondholders, and was not adverse to the interests of any of its security holders.

I will now comment on each of Mr. Berle's 10 principal statements.

1. Mr. Berle says that the section 77 reorganization statute, which he favors, is "a carefully worked out amendment to the Bankruptcy Act."

One look at the record in the Senate when this law was passed will demonstrate that

he has forgotten scenes he may then have witnessed.

The Senate passed the bill in 1933, without any hearings before any committee or subcommittee of the Senate, and without consideration of the bill by any committee or subcommittee of the Senate. Numerous prominent Senators arose on the floor to warn against action under those circumstances.

Senator Bratton, now a member of the Circuit Court of Appeals, warned of "the mistakes that have been made in the past in enacting legislation in the rush and the pell-mell of the closing days of the session * * * The Committee on the Judiciary by an affirmative vote more than a week ago indicated that it felt that it did not have the time to go into the legislation and report it to the Senate with that deliberation which it deserved."

Senator Norris, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, warned that the Senate was being asked to act blindly on the bill, "without knowing what it is. * * * We are probably going to take this half-baked proposition and enact it into law and will regret it the balance of our lives."

Senator LA FOLLETTE said: "If it is impossible for the 15 members of the Committee on the Judiciary devoting undivided attention to this matter for 2 or 3 days, to work out any solution of it, how much more preposterous it is to suppose that 96 Senators here on the floor of the Senate can write legislation properly."

Senator Dill objected to legislating "with the cursory consideration that has been given to it in the rough-and-tumble debate here on the floor of the Senate."

Senator GEORGE objected that the bill "ought to have been submitted not only to the Judiciary Committee but to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. I dare say no more important piece of legislation has been before the Congress at any time in recent years."

Senator CONNALLY said: "The Senate here now, in the last 3 days of its session, under tremendous pressure in a mere brainstorm, passes this legislation. * * * The matter has not had proper consideration. In other words, they have considered it briefly, they know something ought to be done, they know one of the patient's legs ought to be cut off, but they do not know which one, and they will just cut off one in order to be doing something."

Senator Smith said: "This proposition is most astounding to me. * * * Out of a clear sky we are asked to consider and pass within an hour or two a measure involving the transportation of all the United States. * * * I want to enter my protest here this evening against coming in, during the last hour of the consideration of the measure, with a proposal to reorganize the entire railroad system * * * we sit here and on the say-so of one man are about to pass a bill that nobody knows anything about, and I doubt very much if the author himself knows about it."

I said: "It is a very poor way to legislate, to come in and offer an amendment which deals with the complete reorganization of the railroads * * * without the amendment having ever been considered by a committee of the Senate."

Senators experienced in matters relating to the railroads, such as Senator WAGNER, Senator Costigan, and Senator Robinson, of Indiana, pointedly questioned the procedure.

The result was as Senator Norris predicted. The hearings before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee in October and November 1945 were one constant complaint against section 77. Not a single witness said a good word for it. It was condemned by leading members of the Interstate Commerce Commission and by the spokesmen for the insurance companies, the savings banks, the Association of American Railroads, the investment bankers, and the Railroad Security Owners Association.

Security holders all over the United States, big and little, persons who invested for themselves or as trustees for other men and women, have all complained of section 77, under which their investments are forfeited on the basis of a Federal Government official's guess about the future—guesses which have been invariably disproved every year since they were first made public.

2. Mr. Berle says that under S. 1253 the bondholders may be forced "to accept less than their claims. * * * In plain English, creditors and bondholders can and will be sacrificed."

That is true of section 77, which he drafted. It is not true of S. 1253, which he rejects. Under section 77 the ordinary bondholder is harshly dealt with. He is compelled to surrender the bond he bought and to accept in exchange a miscellaneous assortment of bonds and stocks in fractional amounts, which he would never have bought. This confuses him, and makes him the prey of sharpshooters.

Section 77 is even worse than that. It subjects bondholders to forfeiture. For example, under the pending reorganization plan for the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad, its general mortgage bondholders are being compelled to forfeit 90 percent of what is due them.

S. 1253 makes such forfeiture impossible. The bondholder will be treated as he is treated under the conservation statute which was enacted in 1939, over Mr. Berle's opposition. Under a conservation statute, the bondholder keeps his bond, making appropriate adjustment of interest and maturities.

3. In his many indictments of S. 1253 as "vicious finance" and "financial scandal" and the like, Mr. Berle attacks one phrase in the bill as an attempt to help stockholders at the expense of bondholders, principally the insurance companies and savings banks. The phrase in S. 1253 which he charges will do them harm is paragraph 20b (2) (b); it was drafted by them in collaboration with the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Senate committee has not changed a syllable of the words in this paragraph they submitted to it, and in which Mr. Berle now finds a plot against their very draftsmen.

4. Mr. Berle, speaking of the bonds of railroads that are in court under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, says that "the bulk of these bonds were and still are held by the savings banks, insurance companies, and other institutions whose business it is to protect the savings of humble people."

Either Mr. Berle is wrong, or the responsible officers of "the savings banks, insurance companies, and other institutions" testified falsely before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee. Mr. Stedman, one of the chief insurance officials in railroad reorganizations, including the largest case under section 77, the Missouri Pacific case, used it as an example in his testimony before the Senate committee. He testified that the holdings of railroad bonds by those institutions have shrunk drastically. At the present time they own only 7 percent of the bonds under reorganization in the Missouri Pacific case, and a much smaller percent of the total investments in that company. Mr. Stedman's testimony also shows that they never owned "the bulk" of the bonds, as Mr. Berle claims.

5. Mr. Berle states that in the section 77 reorganizations the Commission "turned over the property and its control to the bondholders and creditors." Neither the Commission's reorganization plans nor the testimony of any bondholders or creditors support Mr. Berle's statement.

The institutional group, speaking for a 6 to 10 percent minority of the bonds, and a much smaller minority of all the securities, has insisted in these railroad reorganizations on setting up voting trusts, to enable this small minority to control the railroads when they are reorganized, and to deprive the security holders of their voting rights. Mr. Otto Kahn, New York banker, when examined by Mr. Pecora in the banking investigation of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, finally admitted that voting trusts of this sort stem from "the devil," as he put it. Mr. Ecker, of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., registered, in a confidential document since made public during a senatorial investigation, the fact that once this minority institutional group gets control through a voting trust it can perpetuate its control long after the expiration of the trust.

Former Governor Ely, of Massachusetts, condemned this method of reorganization in his testimony in March of this year, and stated that the life insurance group, owning a few percent of railroad securities, are moving into the control of one railroad after another, under section 77—the reorganization method Mr. Berle prefers to the bill now before the Senate, S. 1253, under which such voting trusts and such seizure of control by a small minority cannot be included in any reorganization plan.

6. Mr. Berle speaks of the "bondholders and creditors" as people "who had put in their good money, chiefly savings." This idyllic portrait of the great body of the bondholders fits some of them. But it rather dismisses from view the tremendous amounts of the bonds of railroads undergoing reorganization, purchased by persons who paid from 15 cents on the dollar down to 1 cent on the dollar, and even a fraction of 1 cent on the dollar. The reports of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee give the figures showing the prices during tht last few years, and the volume of trading on the New York Stock Exchange.

Of this more prosaic picture Mr. Berle says nothing in his letter. Nor does he mention the example on which the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee and the Interstate Commerce Commission both took evidence. The case deals with one bondholders' committee prominent in the financial section of New York, working hand in glove with the savings banks, life insurance companies, and other institutions which loom largest in Mr. Berle's letter. The chairman and almost every member of this bondholders' committee bought the first mortgage bonds of the railroad they are trying to reorganize, and paid as low as 15 cents on the dollar for those bonds. They have already received in interest from the United States Court in charge of the railroad three times what they paid for those bonds, and the market price of the bonds is now six times the price they paid. That committee is given two directors of the reorganized railroad company, under the terms of a voting trust in the reorganization plan, although it represents only 2 percent of the bonds which are being reorganized under section 77—the Berle-drawn and Berle-favored reorganization statute.

7. Mr. Berle says that the pending bill, S. 1253, is directed to helping speculators who bought railroad stocks cheap. If he will read the testimony received by the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee at public hearings from October 1945 to March 1946, he will learn that large amounts of railroad stock in companies now undergoing reorganization are held by owners who paid high prices for them, that these stockholders include many employees of the railroads and old people who cannot afford to lose their savings through forfeiture under Mr. Berle's statute, and that a vice president of Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. testified that most of the speculation had been in the bonds, not the stocks, of the railroads which are being reorganized.

8. It may throw some additional light on the extent to which Mr. Berle's letter corresponds to the facts, to consider his statement that the Van Sweringens "bought up at bargain prices the common stock of a

number of railroads." Much that the Van Sweringens did is sufficiently subject to severe censure to make it unnecessary for any critic to resort to statements which a glance at public reports available in any public library would demonstrate to be sheer imagination. The Senate Interstate Commerce Committee's hearings show just what stocks of railroads now in reorganization were bought by the Van Sweringens, and the prices paid. They paid, not the "bargain prices" mentioned by Mr. Berle in his letter, but high prices, up to $100 and $150 a share.

9. Mr. Berle says that the stocks which are being forfeited under section 77 are "worthless or nearly so," "worthless," "comparatively worthless." To defend the reorganization plans under section 77 he must also regard as worthless the half a billion dollars of bonds and bank and businessmen's claims which are being forfeited.

Forfeitures are based on the guess that the railroads will not be able to earn anything on the forfeited securities. In the last few years, since the first forfeiture guess that the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad (to take one example) will be unable to earn anything on most of its general mortgage bonds, it has earned on each $1,000 bond about $1,700.

Similarly, the railroad stocks wholly or almost entirely wiped out in the forfeiture plans under section 77 have repeatedly disproved the guesses that the railroads could earn nothing on those stocks. For example, the St. Louis Southwestern. Everyone who has testified before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee about the stock of that railroad, at present under a section 77 forfeiture decree, agrees that it is a valuable stock and that it would be grotesque to forfeit it. In fact, that company can pay all its matured interest coupons and should be discharged from court without any reorganization plan or any forfeiture. It is an abuse of security holders, of congressional legislation creating the district courts, and of the Federal judicial system for the District Court in St. Louis to be holding onto this company as if it were a bankrupt. Its stock, "comparatively worthless" to Mr. Berle, earned in the last 5 years $172 per share on the preferred and $144 per share on the common.

The same applies to the Gulf Coast Lines, which earned more than $100 a share in the past 5 years, can pay all its accrued bond interest and considerable of its unmatured bonds, and is being kept in court control in an artificial insolvency, a hothouse falsity. The court trustee is keeping about $20,000,000 in surplus cash instead of paying matured bond coupons of about $5,000,000 and letting the railroad get out of court. The purpose of this scheme is to consolidate this road, forcing the first mortgage bondholders of a solvent and highly profitable railroad to give up their bonds and receive new securities, a gross injustice to the bondholders as well as the stockholders. The insiders claim they can consolidate railroads in such circumstances under the section 77 reorganization statute, and that it permits them to disregard the consolidation law carefully developed by Congress. When section 77 was debated in Congress, no one remotely suggested that it contained such a joker, although it is true that Senator Norris pleaded against section 77 as "this ill-considered legislation, with the possibility of jokers."

The evidence before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee demonstrates conclusively that stocks belonging to other people, which Mr. Berle wants to forfeit as unable to earn anything, have made larger earnings than the stocks of railroads protected against forfeiture under the conservation statute—railroads like the Baltimore & Ohio, the Lehigh Valley, the Delaware & Hudson, and the Colorado & Southern. Mr. Berle wanted to forfeit their stocks as well, opposing the conservation statute of 1939. So he may not give any weight to that comparison. But he cannot disregard the fact that the earnings of stocks he deems worthless under section 77 compare favorably with the earnings of the stocks of railroads which neither he nor anyone else would call insolvent or worthless—railroads such as the Atlantic Coast Line, the Burlington, the Great Northern, the Louisville & Nashville, the New York Central, the Nickel Plate, the Northern Pacific, the Pennsylvania, the Southern Pacific, and the Union Pacific.

10. Mr. Berle says that pending reorganizations under his statute "are now substantially completed. * * * Just as the job of reorganization is about to be completed * * *", S. 1253 stops the further operation of section 77. The quoted words are correct only as the expression of a wish of the statute's author.

Even if the pending plans are not sent back to the commission by the courts, they are a long time from effectuation. For example, the St. Louis Southwestern plan was sent to the court by the commission in 1942 and is stymied in the courts for a long time to come, additional to the 4 years it has already languished there. The commission issued many reorganization plans for other railroads in 1944, in substitution for previous plans it had to discard, as it will also have to discard the 1944 forfeiture plans.

All the pending plans for the important railroads are headed for the wastebasket. The one nearest completion, now pending in the Supreme Court, was the subject of apologetic references by the trustee when he testified before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, was unanimously rejected by the Circuit Court of Appeals, and was not too well liked by the district judge, who had evidently gotten tired of trying to tell the commission how to do the job right.

In the hearings before the Interstate Commerce Committee this year members of the commission, the representatives of the savings banks, witnesses for the insurance companies, and others said that the pending reorganization plans ought to go back to the commission for revision. Senator REED summed up their views as follows:

"We have come to a point where even large creditors are disposed * * * to admit the equitable side of this calls for further consideration. * * * They rather accept the idea that all the facts and circumstances call for a further consideration by the Interstate Commerce Commission."

Either Mr. Berle did not know that the pending reorganization plans, for whose early completion he pleads, are grossly unjust, or he would rather have injustice to numberless investors in every State of the Union than correction of his legislative handiwork. I prefer the attitude of United States Circuit Judge Evans, senior judge of the seventh circuit, presiding in Chicago. He recently expressed regret for the forfeitures already completed, in disregard of the tremendous earnings which had outdated the forfeiture decrees and the forfeiture statute, saying:

"That don't set very well on your conscience. If you did it wrong, it is about time you correct it."

That is the purpose of S. 1253, recently approved by the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee by unanimous vote, and now pending in the Senate.

It should be noted that the hearings, both last year and this year, on the bill ran for many days, both morning and afternoon, that a large number of witnesses was heard, and that there has been the most thorough examination and careful consideration of the bill for many months by members of the committee before it was reported. You may also find it of interest to read the report recently made by the House Judiciary Committee and the bill unanimously recommended by it to the House. In some respects they go farther than the reports and the bill we submitted to the Senate in condemning and correcting the unjust forfeitures under section 77 of more than $500,000,000 owing by railroads to bondholders, banks, and business creditors, and $2,000,000,000 of preferred and common stock.

B. K. WHEELER.

WASHINGTON.

A Second UAW Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of June 8, 1946:

A SECOND UAW THREAT

Last January, UAW men in Chrysler plants got a pay raise of 18½ cents an hour, as part of the industry-wide adjustment to peacetime conditions. Now these workers are talking about a second 18½-cent rise. The first, they say, has already been absorbed by the increase in the cost of living since the beginning of the year.

Can't these men see what the situation really is? Do they suppose that, if a second 18½-cent rise becomes general (and it will if they set the pattern for it), the condition will be remedied? Can't they see that 18½ cents must follow 18½ cents in increasing tempo to meet the price rises, unless organized labor begins to think in broader terms than terms of pay per hour?

Walter P. Reuther, president of the UAW, argued that automobile workers could get even a larger than 18½-cent increase without lessening company profits and with a decrease in the price of automobiles. His argument, faulty at many points, at least presupposed capacity production.

Now Mr. Reuther, along with union leaders in every field, is confronted with the fact that production is far from capacity. Last month the production of cars and trucks was 223,000, compared with 519,000 in the same month of 1941. The profits of the motor companies were nonexistent or negligible and the prices were up by a considerable percentage.

The thing did not work out as Mr. Reuther predicted, largely because the strike movement he started has led to thousands of other strikes, big and little, with consequent loss of production, wage hikes, and price increases. The automotive industry has been a heavy loser because of all this foment. Its production has been held up again and again for want of parts made in supplier plants closed by labor trouble.

An industry with a backlog demand of 12,000,000 cars and trucks is now operating so spottily that its production is barely keeping pace with the present day by day retirement of out-worn units. No dent whatsoever is being made in the great backlog of demand.

If any one person and any one organization started all this, it was Mr. Reuther and his UAW. Now, realizing that the 18½-cent raise has given little or no lasting advantage, the UAW can think of nothing better than to prepare to demand another 18½ cents. Are these people so blind as not to see that the hourly wage boost has proved itself an

empty weapon in this time of critical production emergency?

First of all right now we need to get to producing. Labor has just as much responsibility to cooperate in this as management. The effort to blame employers for all that is going wrong is wasted with the American people, for they can see that it is the strikes that are tying things up—the work stoppages and to a lesser degree the work slowdowns.

What does it profit labor to gain a high hourly wage if distant strikes operate to shut down the shops for want of materials and parts? What does it profit labor, or anybody else, if lack of goods lowers our living levels and high prices charged for the little that is available absorb all wage gains?

Of course, there are some dictatorial and utterly selfish employers these days, but they are fewer than ever before in history. The time will come to fight them. Their existence does not justify labor in adopting a similarly dictatorial and short-sighted attitude in this period of national crisis.

No permanent or effective adjustment in earnings can be made until production problems are solved. Labor's present tactics work to unsettle production conditions rather than to improve them. A UAW demand for a second 18½-cent rise would solve nothing. It would merely start our economy level on a second great upward swing. Far from improving matters, it would lay another heavy load on the shoulders of all of us. It would delay recovery, already long overdue, for another indefinite period.

Empire Preferences Will Not Be Given Up by Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the assurances given the American people about all the concessions Britain is going to make in her foreign trade policies in exchange for the billions we have undertaken to cancel, and the additional billions we are asked to give, we have been told Britain would support our proposal to reduce, and eventually to eliminate, the imperial trade preference system of the British Empire.

What is imperial preference? Reduced to its simplest terms, the expression imperial preferences simply mean special, low rates of import duties on the products imported into England from Canada, Australia, and other countries making up the British Empire. They are lower than the tariff rates which England applies to products imported from other countries. Thus, imperial preferences may be compared with ordinary commercial discounts on purchases made by members of a storekeeper's family but not on purchases made by the public generally. These imperial preferences originated as long ago as 1902 and were enlarged and extended in a series of agreements among the countries of the British Empire signed at Ottawa in 1932. They have become one of a series of discriminatory practices under which American exports to British Empire countries are seriously handicapped and restricted.

According to Secretary Byrnes' speech of February 13, 1946:

> The most significant of the benefits * * * is the British commitment to support the United States trade poroposals. * * *
>
> If the loan is approved, we can look ahead with considerable confideence to a general reduction of tariffs and the elimination of preferences.

The trade proposals of which Mr. Byrnes was speaking contain the United States suggestions for the reduction of the Empire trade preferences system, and its eventual elimination, which are formally to be presented at an international trade conference some time this summer.

However, there is more than enough already in the record to warrant the conviction that the British have no more intention of abandoning their trade preference system throughout the Empire than we have to lower our own tariff walls to let in an indiscriminate flood of cheap-production-cost goods, or the products of slave labor.

Prime Minister Attlee interpreted the real nature of Britain's commitment on this point. In his speech, concerning the loan, in Parliament he stated that:

> It is recognized that reduction or elimination of preferences can only be considered in relation to and in return for reduction of tariffs and other barriers to world trade in general.

Mr. Churchill also insisted during the same debate that throughout the war he had considered the system of Empire trade preference to be the lifeblood of the British Empire, and that during the Atlantic Conference, and during the lend-lease agreements, he had received complete assurance from the late President Roosevelt that they "were no more committed to abandoning Empire preferences than was the United States to abolish her tariffs."

Mr. Churchill went on to say:

> It is, therefore, in my view, quite untrue to say that we are at this time being committed by the Government to any abandonment of imperial preference and still less its elimination. Of course, if we find ourselves in the presence of proposals to effect a vast, sweeping reduction of tariffs and trade barriers and restrictions all over the world of a character to give a great exporting power to this island and to British shipping, which is a vital element in the services we render to other countries, and a vital feature in our means of earning our daily bread, if we were faced with that, then undoubtedly, we should be confronted with a new situation to which we should have to do justice.

But Mr. Churchill added the following solemn warning to his fellow members of Parliament:

> I make no concealment of my personal view that if all this came to pass the vision before mankind would have to be brighter than we imagine. I do not see any probability of such a point being reached. It is more likely * * * that tariffs and trade restrictions of all kinds, even though reduced, will still be maintained at levels which severely hamper progress toward the ideal of free interchange for mutual advantage of goods and services throughout the world.

This certainly does not indicate any general or specific understanding or intention on the part of the British to abandon their Empire preference system. Fear marks the general British attitude toward the hazards of the postwar world. The London Economist stated on December 8, 1945, that:

> The British Government has evidently made up its mind that it must retread the path of 1925 and accept a system built on the assumption of stability and expansion before the stability and expansion can be assured. * * *
>
> But the probability is all too great that the decision will be regretted on one side of the Atlantic and its principles reversed on the other.

In the April issue of the authoritative British publication the Nineteenth Century and After, Mr. F. A. Voigt as much as admitted that, on the basis of America's present foreign policy, Britain's whole economic, political, and military structure and security are beyond repair. Mr. Voigt stated that:

> Russia, partly through her martial prowess, partly through her sharpness of perception and singleness of purpose, and partly through the catastrophic political defeats suffered by Great Britain during the war, has and continues to determine the character of the peace.
>
> She alone of the victorious powers has achieved more than the defeat of the common foe. She has conducted a combined offensive against enemies, allies and neutrals. * * * But her conquests have just begun, and will not have been completed until she is master of all Europe, until she has established hegemony over Asia, and until the extent of her power is such that she will be able to intervene decisively in all the major affairs of the world.

In other words, Britain sees herself faced with the kind of a world which she fought this war to destroy. In the process of fighting, she bankrupted herself. She helped to destroy that kind of world economy and stability by which alone she could recoup her losses. It is preposterous therefore to imagine that Britain would ever surrender her empire preference system unless she were to receive a satisfactory substitute in exchange, by which she could succeed in getting out of the desperate economic predicament in which she now finds herself.

The financial agreements provide, at the outset, that Britain shall not be required to pay either interest or principal on this gift-loan, until December 31, 1951. Even then it is specifically provided, so far as the payment of interest is concerned, that the United States will grant a waiver, if:

(a) The Government of the United Kingdom finds it necessary, in view of the present and prospective conditions of international exchange and the level of its gold and foreign exchange reserves; and

(b) The International Monetary Fund certifies that the income of the United Kingdom from home-produced exports, plus its net income from invisible current transactions in its balance of payments, was on the average over the five preceding calendar years less than the average annual amount of United Kingdom imports during 1936–38, fixed at 866 million, as such figures may be adjusted for changes in the price level of these imports.

In other words, so far as the repayment of the interest charges is concerned, Great Britain is in a position to dictate completely to the United States. There is no prospect whatever that during the next 5 years any such tremendous expansion of British exports is going to take place.

So far as repayment of the principal is concerned the monetary fund of the Bretton Woods Agreement specifically provides, as the publication, Planning, published in London, on January 4, 1946, stated:

> The right, in any circumstance, to maintain the necessary controls to regulate international capital movements still applies to Great Britain.
>
> Great Britain must find some way to balance her international payments if she is ever to recover from the predicament in which she finds herself. To this end the abolition of the Empire trade-preference system could only come after the discovery and application of new trade measures which would guarantee her own economic recovery. No nation can maintain a permanent deficit economy for long without either going into bankruptcy and repudiation or, finally, resorting to war.
>
> What are the prospects of a happy solution for Britain?
>
> In the first place if we turn to the British white paper we find the British Government anticipates a continuing deficit up to the year 1950 of an amount almost double the suggested figure of this gift-loan. According to the white paper:
>
> On the basis of a $3,000,000,000 deficit in 1946, it would not be safe to base policy on the assumption of less than $2,000,000,000 to provide for the 2 years 1947 and 1948 taken together and for some more modest deficiency in 1949–50 before the attainment of stable equilibrium.

But what is more revealing is the further admission in the white paper that the establishment of this optimistic equilibrium between imports and exports may require a volume of exports nearer 75 than 50 percent in excess of the prewar level.

Just how does anyone imagine that Britain is going to be able to manage such a staggering revival and extension of her export capacity in the face of the following obvious conditions?

In the first place Britain is now confronted with a state-controlled, closed-door trade policy, which has been imposed by Russia around half the world.

Secretary Byrnes admitted that to achieve the kind of a world in which Britain would be able to abandon her present practices we must have a world system of multilateral trading. Said Mr. Byrnes:

> If interchange is not free and easy, the trade world tends to freeze into two separate areas.

Now word comes from the House Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning report issued on February 8, 1946, that:

> A new type of Soviet control joining economic and political advantages is emerging which makes a substantial extension of multilateral trading with those countries—within the Russian sphere—impossible.

Britain is also confronted with the other half of the world—outside the Russian sphere—being torn in two from within by the self-defeating policies of the United States, which have destroyed one of Britain's greatest markets, namely, Germany. With the destruction of Germany's productive capacity, which represented 25 percent of the world's productive capacity in steel, machine tools, and technical and research equipment, Britain has been forced to watch a great part of her other markets disappear. Germany played a tremendous part in the economies of the other nations in Europe and Asia, which enabled those nations to carry on trade with Great Britain.

On top of this serious blow, Britain is also loaded with the terrible burdens of rearmaments, to say nothing of the terrible costs of occupation, and the continued costs of conscription. On March 4, 1946, Mr. Rhys Davies stated on the floor of Parliament, so far as these anticipated costs were concerned:

> I am surprised at the glib way in which honorable Members talk about these 2,000,000 men and cost of their upkeep. Has it occurred to most of them, I wonder, that we are spending on these forces referred to in the white paper, more than the total sum we are about to borrow from America? It is twice as much as the total sum we intend to spend on the social services, including education, housing, unemployment insurance, health insurance, and pensions.

Britain is also staggering under the tremendous burden of the silver bloc debt with which she emerged from this war; a debt totalling around $15,000,000,000. Some way must be found for her to liquidate that debt along with her other problems. It seems difficult to believe that Britain will follow the course advocated by the American proponents of this loan, that she refund her silver block indebtedness and force her colonies, and many of her dominions, to accept an American-dominated gold standard in return.

This gift-loan is actually the beginning of the end of the British Empire. We are taking a step in which we actually start to underwrite, and finally to incorporate the economies of and the failures within the British possessions.

Britain is also confronted with a contradiction in terms by the very fact of her vast nationalization program. The world has yet to see a nationalistic economy or government which did not have to turn to self-sufficiency to protect its own interests in the face of threatened shortages and insurmountable trade restrictions which made internal conditions unbearable and unworkable. Not only has Britain gone in for the nationalization of her banks, of her mines, and other of her essential industries, but Britain is already committed to the Beveridge plan. That plan provides for a so-called stable level of economic security from the cradle to the grave. History has yet to show an example of a society based on centralized government controls, which guaranteed certain basic standards, that did not have to maintain and extend those controls over every aspect of national and individual life.

Britain can never maintain such a social standard without applying even more rigorous controls, and without extending those controls far across the Atlantic and Pacific to her entire imperial structure. That, her Dominions would never submit to.

Thus, if we grant this gift-loan, we will be financing, in part at least, a system of socialism diametrically opposed to our American system of free constitutional government, free enterprise, and free society.

In the face of these tremendous problems, it seems obvious that England's one last hope for an expanding world market, based on a genuine revival of multilateral trade and multilateral tariff reductions, especially on the part of the United States, offers little inducement, and no real opportunity for her to abandon her present empire trade preference system.

There has been much talk in recent years about the United States lowering her tariff walls and leading the way in breaking down trade restrictions. We are already experiencing tremendous difficulty within our own economy. Any system of economic or political international socialism which rests entirely upon America for its future success is doomed to failure. Russia has already demonstrated that her course is to continue to be one of extreme nationalism.

If we really want to help the British to regain a high production and high consumption level of economy, and thus to enable them to get back on their feet, it could make a far greater contribution toward that end by repudiating the political betrayals and reversing the terrible postwar policies we have pursued thus far. Certainly, Britain would welcome such a change.

The Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of June 6, 1946:

TO PUT THINGS STRAIGHT

The terrific cloud of dust kicked up by that weird alliance of prolabor liberals and proindustry conservatives over pending labor legislation is more and more obscuring and confusing the issues. It is time to get them straight again.

The Case bill has passed both Houses of Congress and awaits action by the President. Mr. Truman's strike-emergency legislation has been passed in different forms by the House and Senate and the two versions must be reconciled and passed again.

The Case bill is not a substitute for the strike-emergency bill, nor could the latter carry out the purpose of the former. The emergency legislation, in the words of Representative JERRY VOORHIS, is needed to determine "whether the Government could meet a crisis"; the Case bill belongs in the category of "legislation with which the country must live for years." The question is not, which is the better of the two, but how does each

measure up to the distinct situation it was designed to meet.

What needs justify the President's emergency measure or something very like it? First, there is the desperate need for Congress to speak out, as the President has done, and proclaim that no private interest or combination of interests is bigger than the Government of all the people.

Second, there is the very specific and immediate threat of a tie-up of the American merchant marine. Note that, as the President firmly prepares to translate into action his promise that essential ships will move, the utterances of the Maritime Union leaders grow less extreme and both sides draw closer together.

Third, the passage of vigorous emergency legislation would give Congress time in which to prepare more thoughtfully measures which get at the root of industrial strife instead of merely striking at its more aggravating manifestations.

Does the Case bill offer a labor code with which the Nation should be expected to live for years? It is the kind of patchwork of good and bad which usually results from improvising long-range legislation in the heat of a crisis. Philip Murray's recent letter to the President gives added evidence that union labor will fight any abridgement whatever of its strike weapon. But union labor seems convinced that the Case bill in particular springs from sources more interested in breaking unions than in developing good working relations with them. In this respect, if in no other, the bill holds poor promise for peace.

Viewed from the other side, the Case bill leaves unsolved the problem of the ultimate emergencies in utilities and quasi-utilities, so recently exemplified in the rail strike. Nor does it get down to the real causes of union labor's unduly monopolistic power: the special legal status under which big unions too easily acquire sole bargaining rights, and the helplessness of the rank and file in too many unions against rule by intrenched leaders or cliques.

What, then, should Congress do? The answer seems clear. Pass the President's emergency legislation at once, holding back, if it so prefers, the badly misrepresented draft provision as a resource in reserve. Then, should Mr. Truman veto the Case bill, create a joint committee, bipartisan, and representative of the interests of management, labor, and the consumer, to draft a labor code, thoughtfully, promptly, but not hastily. That sort of action will get somewhere.

Joint Resolution To Elect United States Representatives to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, the recent resignation of Mr. Stettinius, United States representative to the United Nations, brings to public attention in a new way our national relationship to that international body, and points the need for a closer popular participation in the selection of our representatives to it.

Mr. Stettinius was our first representative. He was appointed by President Truman to the post, after resigning as Secretary of State to make way for Mr. James F. Byrnes. Aside from his formal confirmation by the Senate, he held no mandate directly from the American electorate. In plain words, he was, as any Presidential appointee must be, a subordinate member of the incumbent administration.

His resignation now leaves a gap which will be filled by a locum tenens until next January, a 7-month period of the greatest stress and danger in international relationships, during which every political indication forecasts a series of major crises, directed at weakening the internal and international position of the United States. Our representative to the United Nations will need all the popular support he can command in this situation.

Our representative-nominate, Senator WARREN AUSTIN can count upon such popular support. His appointment shows President Truman's perception of the importance of the post, and is a happy sign of the President's honorable intention to impress upon it a national character, rather than to use it as a tool for partisanship. However, there is no assurance that this high-minded policy will always prevail.

This is only one reason why many believe that Presidential appointment of our representative to the United Nations Security Council will not permanently serve the best interests of the United States; or the best interests of a United Nations which is strong enough to keep the peace, once peace shall have been made. Such people, and I am one of them, are convinced that our representative to the United Nations should be elected by direct vote of the people of the United States, and preferably chosen at an election to be held regularly for that sole and special purpose, so that the policies of the candidates may be made clear, and the representative will hold his post by choice of the people upon such policies.

Certainly, if the United Nations is to fulfill the hopes we all hold for it, we should choose our representative to it no less carefully than we choose a President whom we elect by the ballots of the whole voting population.

Under our Constitution, of course, no provision now exists for such an election. In order that it may become an established part of our political fabric, and help the United Nations to grow into a confederacy which holds together the peace-desiring peoples of the world, it is necessary to attach an amendment to our basic charter.

For that purpose, I submit the following joint resolution:

The following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

ARTICLE —

SECTION 1. The Congress shall have power to provide for the election by popular majority vote of the representative, or representatives if the Charter of the United Nations shall provide for more than one representative, and deputy representatives, of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations. The term of office of each elected representative or deputy representative shall be 4 years, unless the Charter of the United Nations shall provide for a specific term of office of other than 4 years for the representatives and deputy representatives of the permanent members of the Security Council. No person shall be eligible to be elected to the office of representative or deputy representative of the United States on the Security Council unless he shall be eligible for the office of President of the United States.

SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.

Threatened Rider to NLRB Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is reported that an effort will be made this year to attach to the National Labor Relations Board appropriation a rider similar to that which was attached last year to the War Labor Board appropriation. This rider would prohibit the Board from using its funds for any cases involving over a million and a half workers who are under the law entitled to the protection of the National Labor Relations Act. The rider as attached to the War Labor Board appropriation last year reads:

That no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used in connection with investigation, hearing, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed in whole or in part of agricultural laborers as that term is defined in the Social Security Act, in section 409, title 42, United States Code.

Section 2 (3) of the National Labor Relations Act now defines the employees who are entitled to the protection of the act. Workers who may be truly regarded as farm labor are by the terms of this section presently excluded from the operation of the act. The farmer's hired hand and other employees engaged in ordinary cultivating and harvesting operations have never been included under the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Act.

What the rider proposes to do is to refuse to permit the Board to exercise its lawful jurisdiction in connection with employees in highly industrialized, mass production packing shed and processing plants located off the farm. This would cover approximately 1,000,000 employees.

Moreover, by a trick phrase the rider would exclude an entire bargaining unit as long as a single worker in the unit can be regarded as coming within this false and expanded concept of agricultural labor. It is estimated that an additional group of half a million will be excluded by this device. The rider would further result in great confusion because of the difficulty of determining whether a bargaining unit includes any

single worker who can be said to come within the excluded category.

Apart from these evils in its contents and its substance the proposed rider typifies the viciousness of seeking to evade the obligations of law by the backhanded device of riders attached to appropriations. There have been efforts in the past to amend the act to exclude these broad groups of workers from the benefits of the act. Up to this date Congress has refused to enact such an amendment. The device of appropriations riders is thus being brought into play in an effort to evade the proper procedures of amendment. The law is left on the books but the use of funds for its enforcement is so circumscribed as to make the law a nonenity.

By thus seeking to legislate through appropriations, Congress has been placing the Board in the position of seeking interpretations of these riders from the Comptroller General. The result is that the Comptroller General, and not the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals (as required by statute) is forced to render decisions as to when and where the act may be enforced. The Comptroller General is not a judicial officer and yet the rider device converts him into a superjudge.

The Truth About Railroad Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and more particularly as a member of the Subcommittee on Transportation of that committee, I feel it my duty to make a statement in the interest of the House having the true facts regarding the proposed legislation dealing with railroad retirement and unemployment insurance.

There have been many statements made here and elsewhere about the committee amendment that is proposed to the bill, H. R. 1362, which statements simply do not square with the facts. In the first place, the full committee and its Subcommittee on Transportation have given more hours of profound study and work to this legislation than to all other matters that have come before the committee in this session of Congress.

The committee's work took longer than should have been required because the proponents of the introduced bill refused to consider any amendment whatever. They sat back adamantly insisting that the committee report to the House the introduced bill with no changes.

Instead of cooperating in arriving at workable provisions, their efforts were directed at obstructing such procedure.

The committee amendment was adopted by the overwhelming vote of 15 to 6, which is conclusive evidence of the superiority of the committee amendment over the introduced bill.

Let me digress to say that if the attitude of the proponents of the original bill were to be adopted by the House, that the House might as well abandon the committee system. If the committee is to be falsely accused because it tries to perfect an introduced bill, then why refer the bill to the committee at all?

But this legislation was so involved and so technical that the individual Members of the House did not have and could not have had the time to properly study and intelligently decide a course of action. Acting under the established and proven procedure and assuming that the membership of the House did want the advice of the committee which had made such a thorough study of the subject matter, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has recommended, and will stand solidly by its recommendation, the features contained in the committee amendment.

Interested persons outside of the Congress have, through ignorance or deliberate misrepresentation, caused many railroad workers to believe that the committee amendment provides no additional benefits for the worker or his family. Railroad workers in my district have falsely been led to believe that the committee amendment gives them nothing in the form of additional benefits, but merely increases the tax on the employee while decreasing the total tax on the employer. Other Members of the House have told me of similar misapprehensions held by railroad workers in their respective districts.

In order to clear up this widespread misrepresentation let me suggest that every Member of the House read the report—No. 1989—which accompanied H. R. 1362. In that report it is shown clearly and concisely what the committee amendment proposes to do and what it does not do by comparing the points covered in the Crosser bill, the committee amendment, and the present law. Let me briefly state them here:

(1) Survivors' annuities: The Crosser bill proposed to give annuities to surviving widows, dependent children, and dependent parents in an amount 25 percent higher than the Social Security Act gives persons covered under that act. The committee amendment adopted this general proposal, but scaled down the amount of benefits to equal the benefits paid employees in other businesses covered under the Social Security Act, at the same time holding down the cost that would have had to be assessed against railroad employees for the higher benefits.

(2) Liberalized disability annuities: The committee amendment adopted the provisions covered in the introduced bill almost exactly as proposed in the introduced bill with the sole exception that, if a disability annuity is to be allowed for less than 30 years of service, the disabling injury or illness must be in some way related to the employment.

(3) Reduction in retirement age for women: The committee gives exactly the same reduction in retirement age for women as was given in the introduced bill.

(4) Liberalization of minimum annuity provisions: The committee amendment gives exactly the same benefits proposed in the introduced bill.

(5) Increase in the tax: The committee amendment increases the tax on employees and employers in the amount advised by the skilled actuary employed by the committee, viz, by a total of 5 percent divided equally, i. e., 2½ percent on employees and 2½ percent on employers, to cover the new benefits and to make up the deficiency in the present fund.

(6) The introduced bill would set unemployment-insurance benefits for service-connected disemployment at a maximum of $25 for a maximum of 26 weeks, and would grant unemployment-insurance benefits for illness or accident, however incurred, at a maximum of $25 for 26 weeks. The Congress has refused to adopt a maximum of $20 for a maximum of 20 weeks to employees under State unemployment-compensation systems as recommended by the President of the United States. The Congress has given to the GI $20 for 20 weeks, which is exactly the benefit given railroad employees under the present Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. The committee feels that railroad workers are not entitled to more liberal treatment in this respect than are the GI's.

(7) The committee granted an experience rating or a merit rating or sliding scale tax rate on unemployment insurance—which tax is paid solely by the employers—along the lines that the same arrangement is extended to employers in 45 of the State systems.

(8) The committee did not adopt the increased coverage provisions proposed in the introduced bill.

There you have the facts, Mr. Speaker. Let the House take its choice between the Crosser bill and the committee amendment, but in doing so the Members should have the misrepresentations cleared up and the truth set out. That I have done in these remarks.

Black Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of June 10, 1946:

BLACK MARKETS

The fact must be faced here and now that the only market left in the United States in which commodities are always available at a price is the black market.

Everyone who eats meat is trading in the black market, either knowingly or unwittingly. To a large extent this is true of many other commodities and of virtually all the consumer goods for which the public is bidding up prices.

It sounds very noble of OPA and Department of Agriculture officials in Washington to talk of preventing commodities from reaching the black market, but the same sen-

timents have been expressed during the past 4 years, even while OPA was at the peak of its power, but the black market grew, flourished, and has taken over management of virtually everything in short supply.

The indignition of the majority of the people of this country over the shabby treatment they have received, contrasted with what they were entitled to expect from their Government in the matter of stabilization, is rapidly coming to a crisis. There are the dim beginnings of a consumers' strike.

All the head wagging being done about the amount of wild money in circulation, which is being gambled, used to compete for consumer goods, or squandered in luxuries which are nonessential, cannot accomplish the needed stabilization. Campaigns to sell new issues of Victory bonds will not tap a fraction of the immense amount of money in free circulation.

It cannot be concealed from the people that bad planning and lax administration of the law is rifling their pockets of all they saved during the war. The homes they planned to build will not be built because, by the time they are able to buy materials their money will be gone, either into the black markets or into frivolities, or taxed away by numb-brained lawmakers who are still floundering around with an economic situation which they have not tried to comprehend.

The checks and balances in our Government, favorite phrase of phrase quoters, are no longer infallible. Labor has turned monopolistic while the Government has manacled management.

Those who would blame management for exerting constant pressure to obtain higher prices to offset increases in labor costs are ignoring the fact that labor has made full production and lower prices impossible by preventing the attainment of a full volume of consumer goods to meet the exorbitant demands for goods.

Too many people take the attitude that the person who buys nonessentials in the black market comes under the aphorism that "a fool and his money are soon parted." It is not that kind of a black market, however, which is wrecking the Nation's economy and sending prices soaring to inflationary levels. It is the black market which is depriving the American people of shelter, food, and clothing, the essentials of life, by grabbing for higher and ever higher prices, victimizing a whole nation to benefit a few.

In their confusion the American people are blaming other nations for not sharing the burden of rehabilitating the world, and they are blaming everyone except those who are actually at fault—the men who made the laws, but lacked the courage to stand up against pressure groups, theorists, and selfish interests. They could have given the American people a square deal, and they still can snatch control from greedy hands of black marketeers. It will not be done in bits and pieces, however. It must be done by an overall plan.

United Spanish War Veterans Auxiliary Presents Prize-Winning Essay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Ladies Auxiliaries of the United Spanish War Veterans have been conducting essay contests throughout the Nation. First prize in California went to John Powers Schmitt of Whittier, Calif. This 13-year-old young American has developed so interesting a discussion of the relation of the Spanish War to World War II that I am asking to place his essay in the RECORD.

HOW THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR HELPED TO MAKE WORLD WAR II SUCCESSFUL IN THE PACIFIC

The Spanish-American War was a short war between Spain and America and took place in 1898. This war started over Spain's relations with Cuba and resulted in our taking over the Philippine Islands. The subject of this essay will be the Spanish-American War and How It Helped to Win World War II.

The Spanish-American War originated in Cuba, a moderately sized island in the Gulf of Mexico. Cuba, at this time, was a colony of Spain. Spain imposed heavy taxes on the Cubans and raised tariffs on practically all goods entering the colony. America had many commercial interests in Cuba and also as another American country, we shared the feeling of freedom of the Cubans. The United States took sides with Cuba, and the battleship *Maine* was sent to Cuba to protect the city of Havana and American interests there. This ship was mysteriously blown up in Havana Harbor on the night of February 15, 1898. The blame for this explosion was never actually placed on any one person or groups of persons, but the American public believed the Spanish were at fault, so war was inevitable.

The United States Congress formally demanded the withdrawal of all Spanish forces from Cuba and surrounding islands, but before Spain had received this message, the American ambassador was dismissed, and on April 24, Spain officially declared war with the United States of America.

The Battle of Manila Bay was the first major engagement of the war and took place in Manila Bay in the Philippine Islands on May 1, 1898. The battle was between an American fleet under Commodore (later Admiral) George Dewey, and a Spanish fleet of equal strength under command of Admiral Montojo. The Spanish fleet was supported by land batteries. The American fleet, which was in Chinese waters at the opening of the war, shifted to the Philippines as soon as war started. Dewey engaged the Spanish fleet in a fight that lasted several hours. During the battle 10 Spanish ships were destroyed and about 400 Spanish sailors were killed. None of Dewey's ships were lost, no men were killed and only 7 were wounded. Within a month Dewey was reinforced by land troops under General Merritt, and on August 13, 1898, the city of Manila was taken by the United States Army.

Before 1898, American officials did not want bases far from the shores of the United States, but after Dewey's victory at Manila Bay the need for a central Pacific base showed up. The Hawaiian Islands, then unclaimed, were annexed in 1898 with the approval of the Hawaiian people. During World II, Pearl Harbor, on the island of Oahu, served as the major base for the Pacific Fleet.

Manila was thoroughly ridden with disease when General Merritt's troops took over. Some of the worst diseases were yellow fever, malaria, typhoid fever, diphtheria, plague, tuberculosis, and certain parasitic diseases. One of the United States' first jobs was to clean up Manila and soon the rest of the Philippines. The medical research of the Spanish-American War aided greatly in fighting disease in World War II.

While the Spanish were in power, they did not believe in wide education for conquered people. The United States immediately set about to build schools, universities, and churches. As the Filipinos learned more of self-government, they were given more of it, and finally they were promised complete independence in 1946. By doing all this we have won practically all Filipinos to our side.

During World War II many Filipino guerrilla bands were organized and took countless thousands of Japanese lives and destroyed immeasurable quantities of Japanese material. By adding to confusion behind Japanese lines, these brave Filipinos had a small but vitally important job in winning World War II.

The treatment given the Filipinos has set an example for the rest of the world to follow in dealings with subject peoples.

The Spanish-American War gave the United States its first experience in dealing with subject peoples, and from the above it can be seen how our policy of fair treatment of such peoples has been repaid by their help to us toward the winning of World War II.

JOHN POWERS SCHMITT,
Jonathan Bailey School.
WHITTIER, CALIF.
February 23, 1946.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial on the British loan taken from the Daily Kennebec Journal, Augusta, Maine, May 1:

BRITISH LOAN

Opposition to the proposed $3,750,000,000 loan to Britain largely is the product of unconsidered provincialism. One congressional faction felt that the fund might be used to develop colonial cotton production to the detriment of the American cotton market. Another asked whether, in exchange for the loan, the British would cede American-developed military bases on British possessions. It was held that by this loan the United States would subsidize nationalism and socialism in Britain. It was viewed in some quarters as a source of hand-outs for Russia and her satellites. There was the suspicion that Britain would default this loan.

The people of England desperately need this loan because 6 years of war scuttled British economy. Because England physically is small she must import food and industrial raw materials. To maintain a favorable living standard, the British must manufacture and sell 50 percent more goods than in the prewar years. Her foreign investments were impounded during the emergency and sold to finance war spending. She lost a fourth of the merchant fleet so important to national economy. She contracted new foreign debts; her export industry was wiped out, so that until exports can be rebuilt her annual deficit will be one and one-quarter billions of dollars per year. Five years of such a deficit would be disastrous.

If Congress grants this loan, $3,750,000,000 line credit would be established in this country for England. Her prewar trade with us was $578,000,000, equal to one-sixth of our export business. In return, Britain would abandon trade blocs and work to reestablish multilateral trade relations. Our predicted export business would be $10,000,000,000 per year, sound insurance for full employment in the United States. If the loan is denied, European nations will establish high tariffs,

and form anti-American trade blocs. The result would be a destructive trade rivalry.

The loan would contribute nothing to a possible effort to undermine our economy. First, England is obligated to feed and clothe her own people who, after 6 years, remain on commodity rations. As the economic balance returns, competition can be stopped at ports of entry, but by helping restore this balance we will exclude any pressure on Britain to find export outlets to compete with us. The subject of military bases should be excluded in consideration for this loan. The loan is a straight business transaction carrying enough interest to pay for its handling and to make it a sound business proposition. The question of military bases is quite apart from a financial deal and properly should be discussed by military and State Department agencies.

There is no possibility that this fund will be used to support the nationalization of British economy. That project must be paid for in British sterling raised by domestic loans. American dollars loaned to Britain must be spent abroad to stabilize domestic reconversion.

This loan to Britain does not commit us to a similar course with any other nation. It will not signal the opening of the Treasury for mass hand-outs. Each nation must make its own deal and any loan will be made on merit. If the loan is made to Britain it will be made on the basis of the relationship between us and on that basis we have far more to gain than to lose.

Resolutions Adopted by the One-Hundred and Fifty-first Annual Diocesan Council of the Episcopal Church, at Richmond, Va., May 15 and 16

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, because they have a direct bearing on certain problems which Congress must confront, and because they offer constructive Christian guidance to us in consideration of those problems, I am asking consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include certain of the resolutions of the last Diocesan Council of the Episcopal Church of Virginia:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIRST ANNUAL COUNCIL HELD IN ST. MARK'S CHURCH, RICHMOND, MAY 15 AND 16, 1946

RESOLUTION ON FOOD SITUATION IN THE WORLD

In view of the unparalleled and appalling famine sweeping Europe, Asia, and other parts of the globe, where men are seeking to keep alive on from one-half to one-third of the daily caloric content necessary to preserve life, the diocesan council affirms its conviction that the people of America are now ready to support any drastic action, even including rationing, our Government may take to avert the starvation of millions of people abroad.

Furthermore, we call upon the members of our churches to practice rigid self-denial in the consumption of food, particularly wheat, cereals, and fats, which are most needed abroad, and of which there will not be enough to prevent starvation unless the American people reduce their consumption of such foods. We commend President Truman for announcing that the White House will go on a "European diet" of 1,500 calories twice a week, and urge our people out of sympathy for the needy to follow his wholesome example.

Finally, we ask that each minister in the diocese read this resolution from his pulpit and ask his people for immediate cooperation inasmuch as the crucial period for relief lies within the next 3 months.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

Resolved, That we do hereby petition the President of the United States and our Government that conscientious objectors who have no other charge against them than that of conscientious objectors be made beneficiaries of the three following conditions:

First. That they receive full and complete amnesty.

Second. That those who risked their lives receive the same benefits of those serving in the military services under the Selective Service Act.

Third. That these men be released and returned to civilian status at once.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Whereas the United States has acknowledged the interdependence of its life with that of the other nations of the earth by participation in the organization of the United Nations; and

Whereas the prestige and power of the United States gives it a special responsibility under God to provide leadership in achieving justice, peace, and well-being among the nations;

Therefore we urge the Congress of the United States to do everything in its power to further justice, peace, and well-being for all the peoples of the earth; such as, by providing the loan to Great Britain, providing food for starving peoples, making every effort to achieve permanent amicable and just relations with Russia; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives from Virginia.

UNITED NATIONS CONTROL OF ATOMIC BOMB

Resolved, That the council of the Diocese of Virginia go on record as favoring the placing of the control of mining and procuring the elements that make up the atomic bomb under an international commission of the United Nations;

Resolved further, That we go on record as being willing to surrender such national sovereignty as shall be necessary to accomplish this end; and

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to the Virginia Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

It Lies With OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, evidence continues to mount against the maladministration of OPA. Its effectiveness has deteriorated to a point where it can no longer serve the people of this country. It should be abolished forthwith.

Mr. Speaker, as an illustration of what is going on in the minds of the people of this country, I include as part of my remarks two editorials; one from the Rochester Times and the other from the Chicago Journal of Commerce:

[From the Rochester Times-Union of June 5, 1946]

NO MEAT, NO BUTTER, NO BREAD, AND NO SENSE

Bread lines are on the way back. Not the bread lines the planned economy people said they only could eliminate! These are the bigger bread lines that are and always have been the consequence of permitting the planned-economy people to take over.

One Rochester housewife visited 11 stores before she found a loaf of bread.

The Millers National Federation says that 98 percent of the Nation's flour mills are closed because of Government diversion of wheat.

The New York Association of Retail Bakers says every bakery in the State will have to close 1 or 2 days a week for lack of flour.

We have been managed out of meat. We have been managed out of butter. We are being managed out of bread.

For a long while the managers had an airtight alibi. They told us during the war that we couldn't get what we wanted to eat because the Government was sending it to our boys. Nobody could complain about that. But our boys came home and things were worse.

Now the managers tell us we can't get bread because we are sending it to dear old humanity. The world is starving—which is true because the managers have it by the throat—and we could not look our conscience in the eye if we didn't do our part.

We certainly could not. But our part is just as certainly not the part of standing idly by while the managers manage us out of bread and destroy the bread producing and distributing system of this country.

The fact is that flour mills from Buffalo to Kansas City were closing down months before the Government jumped into the relief business.

The mills couldn't get wheat at OPA ceilings. It was more profitable to feed wheat to livestock, dissipating the most fabulously bountiful crops on record.

While the flour mills were closing, Chester Bowles kept telling the farmers there was no need to hold their wheat because the ceilings would not be raised. But the farmers weren't that stupid.

In the end ceilings not only were raised twice but the Government formed its own black market by offering a 30-cent bonus for wheat. It went further and compelled any farmer offering wheat for sale to sell half of it to the Government.

So having destroyed the mills' and bakers' power to produce bread, the Government played havoc with meat, too. Its buying program created feed shortages which forced sale of brood stock—mostly in the black market—which means fewer calves and pigs this year.

Remember pork in wartime? It takes 2 or 3 years to build up droves and herds when the brood stock is slaughtered. Just now we are living on a large poultry supply. But when that is gone any sort of meat will be hard to get.

We have paid dearly for bargains we thought OPA was giving us, in nylon lines, butter lines, and shirt lines. Now we will pay in bread lines.

[From the Chicago Journal of Commerce]

LESS BUTTER AND CHEESE

Three news items in 2 days testify to the contribution that OPA price ceilings are making to the shortages of butter and cheese.

At Dixon, Ill., the Lakeshire Marty division of Borden Co., employing 125 workers, is closing because the OPA ceiling for Cheddar cheese at that factory is 27 cents a pound and a ceiling of 31 cents is required to break even. In addition, OPA's regulations en-

courage the diversion of milk to such products as ice cream.

At Fond du Lac, Wis., cheese makers of the State voted to withhold from market their production of Cheddar, which in a year amounts to 400,000,000 pounds, until price ceilings take account of costs. The cheese makers refuse to continue to take a loss of about 5 cents a pound.

Butterfat costs from 78 to 86 cents a pound in Wisconsin, and in some dairy products its use is economically feasible, but not in cheese.

At Minneapolis, Land o' Lakes Creameries, one of the Nation's largest butter producers, announced the closing of one packaging plant and the curtailment of operations of two others because the ceiling price of 46 cents a pound for butter at the creamery is less than the cost of labor, feed, and processing.

Officials in Washington have told the country recently that greater shortages of such dairy products were in prospect. They are thinking of rationing butter and cheese, along with other food items, again.

But they don't tell the public that production of scarce foods is being discouraged by OPA policies.

Milwaukee's Cops Are Democracy's Salesmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the June 10 issue of the Progressive entitled "Milwaukee's Cops Are Democracy's Salesmen":

MILWAUKEE'S COPS ARE DEMOCRACY'S SALESMEN

(By Ben Blake)

A small-time Chicago racketeer visited the neighboring city of Milwaukee, Wis., to see if there were any nickles lying about. He returned and gave his confederates a glum report.

"Them Milwaukee coppers are smart and hot," he said ruefully. "They picked me up the minute I stepped off the train. But that's not what bothers me—they read books! While we rode to the station in the squad car, those cops just kept their noses buried in books—with long words, too."

The hoodlum didn't realize that his uniformed hosts in Milwaukee were boning up on their lessons in democracy and what makes it tick. That night, a written exam on their studies was scheduled at police headquarters—and no Milwaukee policeman would let a petty thief from Chicago interfere with his study time.

The police of this city of 600,000 people are unlike any cops you ever saw. They shovel snow and run errands for the sick and for busy housewives. And when they nab you for speeding, they do it with a "Pardon me, sir," instead of the usual "Where's the fire, bub?"

This happy state of affairs in Milwaukee has been developing for twenty-odd years, ever since the city fathers decided that if college was good for their sons, it would be even better for the men who guard lives and property.

Today the training school operated by the police department for the 1,107 members of the force is world-renowned. Law enforcement officials from Great Britain, Europe, and South America come to visit it. Distinguished clergymen, scientists, criminologists, and exponents of democracy lecture as often as three times a day for uniformed students who take their lessons in shifts.

If Thomas Slabajic, age 9, loiters on a street corner, the cop on the beat doesn't ask gruffly: "Hey, kid, what are you up to?" Instead, he draws Thomas out about his home life, interests, ambitions if any, and his friends. Somewhat defensively, Tommy may admit that he's "nuts about taking pictures, but there's never enough money in our house for me to have a camera."

"I know where you can take all the pictures you want—and with good cameras," says the cop. "It won't cost you a cent. You can develop and print your own stuff, too. Want to come with me?"

And he takes Tommy to a youth center where photography lessons and equipment are available for young hobbyists. They don't talk much about juvenile delinquency in Milwaukee; they're too busy being neighborly.

Three big, plain-spoken men are responsible for the interest shown by Milwaukee policemen in making democracy work. The first is Joseph Kluchesky, who instituted the training scheme during his years as police chief. Now retired, he is helping other cities set up similar programs.

The second is the new chief, John W. Polcyn, a burly ex-marine. The third is Capt. Herbert Dax, towering "principal" of the police training school.

"Our police force itself is a cross-section of Milwaukee," Dax says. "We have Negro and white officers and those of every creed and national origin. They are instructed never to refer disparagingly, even in jest, to each other's racial or religious background."

On the beat the policemen's blue coats are stuffed with such pamphlets as The Races of Mankind, The Bigot in Our Midst, Why Anti-Semitism?, Race Riots Aren't Necessary, and Tolerance in Police Work. They read this material on their own time, then discuss it in class.

Chief Polcyn has organized a flying wedge of police officers who can give talks on tolerance before veterans' posts, schools, colleges, women's clubs, and schools. Milwaukee's policemen cheerfully leave printed literature in barber shops, beauty parlors, taverns, clubs, and grocery stores.

One of the most telling arguments against race intolerance was given to the policemen by Prof. Wilton Krogman, famous anthropologist from the University of Chicago. He showed how in taking samples of blood from Negroes and white man, he had discovered there wasn't a particle of difference between them. Other speakers have stressed the contributions made by every race and creed to American life. "That," says Polcyn, "goes over big in Milwaukee, where we have more than 40 nationalities."

Men on the force are told to forget they're policemen, and to be earnest neighbors. One day, for example, several Jewish boys had been severely beaten up and kicked by non-Jewish boys solely because of their religion. Instead of arresting the culprits, a sergeant interviewed every boy involved in the fights singly. He learned that some of the attackers had acquired their religious prejudice from their own parents.

The next step was the private interviewing of the parents, who were told that they were detouring their kids onto a path of brutality and violence.

"That's how Fascist households get started," the sergeant told them. "This is America; we want none of it here. Take these pamphlets and read them over with your boy."

As a result, the flurry of teen-age altercations subsided.

To a white youth who asserted he disliked all "niggers," a policeman said safely: "Look at your own city. Minorities made Milwaukee big, son. The Germans were first; then the Poles gave us their labor and friendship; and the Italians, Slovenes, Irish, and Jews pitched in. The Negroes have helped make our city an industrial giant. All are minorities—every one. You're attacking America when you act proud of your prejudice."

The boy, thereafter, went out of his way to be friendly with colored lads of his school.

The policemen's college has modern quarters on the ground floor of the city's imposing Safety Building. Exhibits from the FBI, movie equipment, a library, blackboards, and scientific apparatus, plus a handsome auditorium seating 500 help to make class sessions interesting.

New policemen must attend school faithfully for 60 days. They are in class 4 hours every morning and on their beat 4 hours every afternoon. Freshmen cops are herded into Milwaukee courts to observe trial procedure and the presentation of evidence. When they return to class, Dax, himself a graduate lawyer, probes them on what they have observed.

Unexplained absence from class can result in suspension from the force. Tests are frequent and tough. If a student makes a poor showing, he must stay after class for individual coaching.

Teachers, picked from the force, discuss table manners; the handling of family affairs in the policeman's own household; public deportment, and the department's emphasis on courtesy and service to citizens.

"Know your city thoroughly and be able to answer questions about it," rookies and veterans are told. "If you can't answer a query, refer the questioner to somebody who can."

"Nobody in town receives preferential treatment," Chief Polcyn says. "We have locked up an alderman for drunken driving and we have arrested other city officials when necessary. The 'I-gotta-drag' fraternity is out of luck here."

The attitude of the city's policemen to civic responsibility is summed up in this incident: An old man who for years had refused to vote on the ground that "those fellows in Washington are all alike—they're running the country." When the old man was laid up all alone one summer in his tiny cottage the cop on the beat ran errands for him—fetched groceries, mailed letters, and swept his porch. He laid in firewood and washed dishes after working hours.

"What can I do for you, Joe?" the man asked when he had recovered.

"Nothing at all—except to vote next week," the policeman replied. "And don't ever brag that you aren't interested in improving your country—you've been setting a bad example for the kids."

Address at Wisconsin State Convention of Amvets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Dr. Clyde M. Longstreth, of Atlantic, Iowa:

Delegates to the convention, friends, and citizens of Wisconsin, it is a singular privilege to be permitted to enjoy the hospitality of the city of Oshkosh in the splendid State

of Wisconsin. In addition, it is a source of gratification to observe the zeal and enthusiasm with which you Wisconsin veterans are carrying out the program and objectives of the Amvets here in the Nation's dairyland, under the able leadership of your State commander, Frank J. Ross, who is also one of the national vice commanders of Amvets.

Wisconsin is nationally recognized as being a progressive State along social and political lines. It is little wonder then that Wisconsin veterans should turn to a progressive veterans organization such as Amvets in which to give expression to their progressive ideals.

I come from Iowa. We have a lot of Amvets in Iowa, too. Essentially, however, the Iowa Amvets are not very different from the Wisconsin Amvets, or, for that matter, from Amvets all over the country. We all share the same ideals, face the same problems, and strive for the same objectives. All Amvets, wherever they may be, seem to take the same long, forward-looking view which the problems of our times demand. I have been careful to observe that this is particularly true of the Wisconsin Amvets.

But probably you Wisconsin veterans take this as a matter of course. You have merely followed the progressive traditions of your great State. I say this not to flatter you, but rather to pay a sincere tribute to your vision and practical progress toward our common objectives.

I bring to you at this time the well wishes of the national organization, which looks upon conventions such as this one as essential instruments in welding the purposes and efforts of Amvets not only in this area but throughout the Nation.

The organization of veterans of World War II was a logical outgrowth of the remarkable spirit of teamwork and cooperation which was mainly responsible for the victories achieved on the battlefields. We worked together then to win a war. Common sense dictates that we continue to work together to win the kind of peace that we fought to attain. It is inconceivable to me that veterans who learned so well the lessons of cooperation during the war should fail to appreciate the value of continuing that cooperation during peacetime by belonging to a well-knit, progressive veterans' organization.

Amvets is just such a well-knit, progressive organization. Many people may wonder just why it is that Amvets has been able in such a short time to attain its present enviable status on the national scene. To those of us who have been associated with Amvets for any length of time, however, there is no mystery. After its early period of growing pains was over, Amvets emerged with a positive program. The objectives of that program were set forth at the 1945 Chicago convention.

In the language of the principles adopted at that convention, Amvets believe in the future of America and in the men and women who have made it great and who will make it greater. In this faith, we dedicate ourselves to the fullest development of the spiritual, mental, physical, economic, and human resources of the Nation.

Amvets recognizes that there are important decisions facing us, not only as veterans but as citizens of the world's greatest democracy. We have passed through trying times. There are trying days ahead. As veterans and responsible citizens, we have a solemn obligation to continue to fight for the kind of a world we all believe in. This is, I believe, primarily a young man's fight. I am no longer a young man, by the usual standards. But I have sense enough and vision enough to see that the tasks that lie ahead can be accomplished only by young hands backed up by young hearts. The record of history is that the elder generation has started the wars and the young men have fought those wars. I say to those whose turn it is to become the next "elder generation," are we going to make the same mistakes or are we going to be militant in our demands and earnest in our efforts to bring about a peace in which democracy may thrive? That's a rhetorical question—no answer required.

I venture to assert that nothing less than complete unity and cooperation is adequate to cope with the perplexing national and international problems that confront us. George Bernard Shaw once said: "The old notion that people can keep to themselves and not be touched by what is happening to their neighbors, or even to the people who live a hundred miles off, is a most dangerous mistake." He then added, "The saying that we are members one of another is not a mere pious formula—it is a literal truth; though the rich end of town can avoid living with the poor, it cannot avoid dying with it when the plague comes."

Amvets recognizes this ideal in its slogan, "We fought together; now let's build together." One of the most significant and inspiring sights of modern American history was the sense of unity which held Americans together during the war. They buried their differences. They put aside the areas of disagreement and they held together to a common task. But the peril of it is, and we see it up and down in this country, that the honeymoon is over. And the danger is that we shall tumble apart into broken and brittle factions, each seeking some advantage at the expense of the other. But above this chaos rises the voice of the veteran, who has learned well the value of unity. He is beginning to insist upon a return to our former unity. He is ready to cooperate with his former comrades and with all elements of our national life to bring about a unified approach to the manifold problems which beset us as a Nation. Amvets is an effective instrument through which that unity may be achieved. Fifty-five thousand Amvets all over the country are contributing to American leadership and building American unity.

What greater contribution can a veterans' organization make than to foster and demonstrate that teamwork which carries forward, with all the effective ability of which it is capable, the objectives for which we all strive?

I am certain that the Wisconsin Department of the American Veterans of World War II, and the local units of which it is composed, shall unite with the great body of organized veterans throughout the entire Nation in fostering measures and programs relating to the increased well-being of this mighty Nation of free people.

I thank you.

Article in America on the President and Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most astute, sincere, and objective students of labor-management relations in the United States is Rev. Benjamin L. Masse, associate editor of the Catholic magazine America. I ask consent to include with my remarks herewith his article entitled "The President and Strikes" appearing in America for June 8, 1946:

THE PRESIDENT AND STRIKES

(By Benjamin L. Masse)

On Tuesday, May 21, 4 days before the end of a 2 weeks' truce in the dispute between John L. Lewis and the coal operators, the Government seized the coal mines.

Two days later, following an almost contemptuous rejection of a special offer by President Truman, and despite the fact that the Government had taken over the railroads, the locomotive engineers and the railroad trainmen began a Nation-wide walk-out. Within 24 hours the country was paralyzed.

These dread events brought to a head a crisis in industrial relations which had already mortgaged the Nation's future and endangered peace and liberty throughout the world. Save for the tragic days of the Civil War and perhaps the beginning of the first administration of Franklin Roosevelt, no President of the United States had been confronted with such a deadly challenge to the national community as faced President Truman. However much the prospect may have frightened him, he had to act. The rail strike had to be broken.

On Friday night, May 24, he stepped to a microphone and announced to listening millions that their Government was being "challenged as seldom before in history." Referring by name to Alvanley Johnson, head of the locomotive engineers, and A. F. Whitney, leader of the trainmen, he said: "It is inconceivable that in our democracy any two men should be placed in a position where they can completely stifle our economy and ultimately destroy our country." He declared himself a friend of labor—as, indeed, he has been—but he warned that if the workers did not return to their jobs by 4 o'clock the following afternoon, he would operate the trains "by using every means within my power."

The next afternoon, before a cheering joint session of Congress, President Truman asked for drastic legislation to deal with strikes. Shortly before the finish of his grim and militant talk, Leslie L. Biffle, Secretary of the Senate handed him a small slip of paper. In decisive tones the President read: "Word has just been received that the rail strike has been settled on terms proposed by the President." From the Representatives and Senators, from tense and crowded galleries, he received an ovation.

Mr. Truman had broken the rail strike.

But the rail strike was only the worst and most urgent of the President's headaches. The coal strike was still unsettled and a maritime strike, not without ominous political overtones, had been called for June 15. Meanwhile, as production slowed down, inflationary pressures continued to increase and the flow of shipments abroad was seriously interrupted. Only steady work, the President knew, during the next 6 or 9 months could save the Nation and the world from an unparalleled disaster. The rail strike was over, but how was he going to deal with John L. Lewis and the pro-Communist leaders of the CIO maritime unions?

Mr. Truman asked the Congress for legislation, but he distinguished sharply between the immediate emergency and the long pull ahead. With respect to the latter, he recommended that Congress create a joint committee to make a thorough study of industrial relations as the basis for permanent legislation. This legislation should be fair to labor and to industry and to the public at large. To deal with the present crisis, he called for an admittedly drastic law designed to stop what he called strikes against the Government. Thus began one of the most fateful and historic debates in the Nation's history.

The legislation requested by the President would be strictly limited both as to duration and to coverage. Written to expire 6 months after the official end of World War II, the

law would apply solely to those few industries in which the President by proclamation declares that an emergency has arisen which affects the entire economy of the United States, and it would apply to them only after the Government had seized the properties. In such circumstances, the President would be empowered to take the following measures:

1. Authorize injunctive proceedings against union officials, forbidding them to encourage workers to leave their jobs or to refuse to return to work. Failure to observe the injunction would expose the officials to contempt proceedings.

2. Deprive workers who strike against the Government of their seniority rights and their status of employees under the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act.

3. Provide criminal penalties (fine of not more than $5,000 and imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both) for employers and workers who violate the law by encouraging or participating in a strike or lock-out or slow-down.

4. Designate arbitrators or otherwise establish fair wages and conditions of employment.

5. Induct into the Army of the United States employees and officials of the Government-seized business, as well as leaders of the organizations representing the employees, who fail to return to work, without permission, within 24 hours after the deadline set by the President.

6. Cover into the Treasury of the United States any net profit accruing from Government operation of the business.

Obviously, no law affecting industrial relations has ever been passed in this country, in peace or war, which matches in severity the language of this bill. Under its terms the President becomes the virtual dictator of American industry. While in theory the law would have a restricted coverage, applying, as was said above, only to those few industries in which the President by proclamation declares that an emergency has arisen which affects the entire economy of the United States, in practice the President has sole power to determine what these industries are. Certainly they include steel, rail, and sea transportation, and coal mining, but even such a mild and undictatorial character as President Truman might easily be led to apply the law to a half-dozen other industries.

In all these industries, the President, should he deem that an emergency exists, would have the power to dictate the terms of the labor contract, to appropriate profits, to force labor and management, under military discipline if necessary, to work against their will. Such powers resemble the totalitarian authority of a Fascist or Communist state. While they would not necessarily lead to the socialization of property or to a political dictatorship—the good sense of labor and management could render their use unnecessary, and, if used, they could be applied reasonably—they are nevertheless a clear break with our democratic traditions.

This does not mean, however, that in the present unprecedented situation, and for a strictly limited period, a grant of such powers may not be necessary and justified. That Mr. Truman's action had widespread public approval appeared from the spontaneous response to his address on the night of May 24, as well as from the action of the House which passed the recommended legislation by an overwhelming majority, within 2 hours after the President's appeal.

The American people are among the most democratic on earth. They have a traditional, almost anarchic, aversion to compulsions of any kind, but especially to governmental compulsions. Yet the gravity of the present crisis is such that they seem willing to submit temporarily even to dictatorial controls. While no one can place his finger on the pulse of America and give anything like an infallible report it is my impression that the majority of our people are solidly behind the President in the courageous course he has chosen; the action of the Senate, where strong opposition to Mr. Truman's proposals has developed, to the contrary notwithstanding. Sensing a peril to the community, they want it made clear that no private group, whether of workers or employers, is bigger than the Government of the United States.

Three weeks ago, discussing the crisis in industrial relations, the present writer said in these pages:

"The stoppages in the production of autos and electrical goods, of steel and of coal, have done irreparable harm to the Nation's reconversion program. They constitute a deadly break-down in industrial relations, the kind of break-down which no government in the world can afford to ignore. Indeed, they provide sufficient excuse, if excuse is wanted, for government seizure and operation."

And I went on to appeal to the leaders of labor and management to stop slugging it out, warning them that the American economy is punch-drunk and reeling, and that it cannot absorb many more blows like the coal strike without going down for the count.

Some readers wrote in to say that this was a pretty sour view of the situation, that the crisis had been exaggerated, and that with a little patience everything would come out all right. Whether they still think that way, I do not know, but if the stoppage in coal, the 2-day rail strike, and the dramatic events of May 25 and 26 have not yet opened their eyes to the magnitude of the present disaster, nothing anybody can say will convince them. Only the start of the national maritime strike on June 15 would do that.

So far the chief opposition to President Truman's plan of action has come from three widely dissimilar groups: From organized labor and its friends; from prominent Republicans and others who have been advocating restrictive labor legislation; from the Communist Party and its conglomerate collection of stooges and innocents. With respect to the latter, no comment is necessary. Normal Americans will give no credence to the idea that President Truman, dragged along by Wall Street and the monopolists, is hell-bent on war-breeding imperialism abroad and fascism at home, which is what the Daily Worker is fantastically charging.

With the rest of the opposition it is easy to sympathize since no one really likes the Truman proposal, not even its author, and it certain has its dangers, as has been pointed out above. However, not all the arguments against it are valid or devoid of politics. Without in any way questioning the sincerity of men like Senator TAFT and Minnesota's former Gov. Harold E. Stassen, it happens to be excellent politics for Republicans to oppose President Truman on the ground that his plan is too harsh toward organized labor. As a canny and anonymous Congressman said following the President's address to Congress: "The public quickly forgets, but labor has a long memory."

Some of the arguments against the proposed legislation assume that the right to strike is absolute and that to abridge it in any way is undemocratic and an injustice to organized labor. This is most assuredly not true. Moralists unanimously teach that certain conditions must be fulfilled before any strike can be considered legitimate, one of which is of the utmost importance right now. The failure of some labor leaders to meet it constitutes the whole justification for President Truman's position. It is this: the good results which are expected from a strike must be proportioned to the evils which it causes. If, therefore, a strike brings evils, even though not intended, which are greater than any possible good the union hopes to achieve, the strike is immoral and the workers have an obligation to stay on the job, even if this involves a temporary injustice. In the present parlous state of national and international affairs, President Truman is taking the stand that no possible gains to the workers can match the evils to the contrary and the world resulting from a Nation-wide stoppage in coal mining and rail and sea transportation. The burden of proof is on those who think otherwise.

A second argument, equally dubious, against the President's proposal is that it would force involuntary servitude of labor. If there was any question of forcing men to work for a private employer, as was the case with the labor draft advocated by the late President Roosevelt during the war, this argument would be convincing. But such a supposition has no validity in the present case. None of the Presidential powers enumerated in the bill passed by the House would become operative until the Government had seized the business. The workers would be employees of the Government and, if they refused to work, they would be striking against the Government. If it is not involuntary servitude to draft men to fight, or to be trained to fight, I do not see that it is involuntary servitude to draft them to run locomotives or mine coal for the Government during a national emergency.

The other chief arguments against the House-approved bill stress its alleged impracticability and the threat to organized labor. At one and the same time, the bill is said to be so inept that it cannot be enforced and so dangerous that its enforcement would destroy organized labor. Both contentions seem exaggerated.

As these lines are being written, word comes that the coal strike has been settled, that the Senate has rejected the draft clause in the antistrike bill, that the House has passed the Senate version of the Case bill. All this adds up to a very muddled situation, the outcome of which cannot be foreseen.

With so many professionals predicting dire consequences for Mr. Truman, an amateur ought to maintain silence. After all, who would have the hardihood to suggest that such queer bedfellows as Senators TAFT and PEPPER, the Daily Worker, and the Wall Street Journal, could possibly be wrong? But I should like humbly to suggest that of all the actors in last week's drama, President Truman stood head and shoulders above the rest. Regardless of the wisdom and the fate of his legislative proposal, he faced and broke a threat which gravely menaced the general welfare. And what delicious irony it will be—and how embarrassing to certain intemperate union leaders—if a Presidential veto saves organized labor from the crippling effects of the Case bill, a much more dangerous proposition than the purely temporary law Mr. Truman wanted.

Primary Campaign in Fourth New York District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, George H. Rooney, my CIO opponent in the Democratic primaries, is the business agent for Local 450 of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America.

Last week in Dayton, Ohio, the president and the financial secretary of the CIO United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America resigned. The

president, Ralph E. Moses, told a meeting of 800 delegates that he was quitting because "every district local president of the United States and Canada, with the exception of four, are known Communists." He then urged the local to affiliate with the American Federation of Labor.

Local 450, of which Mr. George H. Rooney is the business manager, has consistently in its activities followed the Communist Party line and is unquestionably dominated by the Communists.

I welcome a primary fight from such a source. It will enable the Democrats of Queen County to express their feelings on the issue of communism versus Americanism.

Address of Harold Nommensen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by Harold Nommensen, president of the Progressive Steelworkers Union, at the dedication of a plaque in memory of 63 employees of the Wisconsin Steel Co.'s plant in Chicago who lost their lives in World War II. The plaque is located in Trumbull Park in Chicago.

Parents, families and friends of our departed comrades, distinguished guests and fellow employees: It is indeed a special privilege for me to be present here today, for the dedication of a memorial to the boys of the Wisconsin Steel Works who gave their last full measure of devotion to their country in World War II; so that we, gathered here today may live in freedom.

Speaking to you, their loved ones, is the most difficult task I have ever been asked to perform. Because, mere words on such an occasion as this seem so empty to me, unless they are backed up by a sincere effort to do the things we said we would for those boys who offered but were not called upon to make the same sacrifice that your boy made.

A sincere effort to fulfill those promises to the boys who were fortunate enough to return could well be a living memorial to all the soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen who left, never to return. Who, because of their loyalty, gave that which we fight the hardest to keep. Who fell so that our flag may continue to proudly fly over the home of the brave and the land of the free.

This sincere effort means a great many things. It starts for us right here in our own plant and it extends throughout our great Nation. Yes, even to and including the world. It can only be accomplished by the concerted effort of every one of us, individually and collectively, throughout our community, State, Nation, and the world as a whole.

On December 7, 1941, when our country went to war, we united as we never united before. With an unwaivering determination to be victorious and to retain our freedom and way of life. Everyone was called upon for his or her contribution. Some were called upon to give a great deal more than others, such as your boy, who gave his all, or that boy now lying in some veteran hospital hopelessly wounded, who in living death may well have made the greatest sacrifice, if misery and pain is the medium by which sacrifice is weighed. Some were asked to give their limbs, others were asked to work long hours to produce the weapons and materials for which we as a Nation are famous, and all were asked to loan our money.

Together we made a team and in the face of almost unsurmountable obstacles we were gloriously victorious over the known enemy. The Stars and Stripes now fly over some section of almost every part of world at a great cost in men and of materials. It has become apparent to me, more and more as time rolls on that these gallant soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen who gave their lives to obtain the stepping stones which made ultimate victory possible for us, would feel that they gave their lives in vain, if the team of which they were a part disintegrates before the game is finished.

Today the world looks toward us for leadership and help. Help from a financial, and especially food standpoint, and it behooves all Americans, both native born and naturalized, to shoulder the burden of bettering this scientifically fast shrinking world, because, the horizons which lie before us, will need all the patriotism, spirit, courage and loyalty of our magnificent American people to complete the game called war. The shooting is over but a war still goes on. A war to down the greed and avarice that seem always present in this world of ours. Only more so at this time when the world is desperately trying to come out from under the biggest and most vigorous struggle that it has ever gone through, and it also seems that a certain element is always ready to pounce upon a weakened prey.

If we don't want our boys to have died in vain, then we should and must help and protect the weakened prey from the element of which I speak. We must lift them from starvation and despair to a level of contentment and freedom. Then, and then only, will we and the world know and enjoy real peace. Then, and then only, will our boys who gave their lives or were wounded feel that their sacrifice was for a good cause.

To you parents, families, and friends of our departed comrades let me offer this assurance: your loss is our loss and our Nation's loss. Mere words will not compensate for that loss. We must unitedly vow, here and now, that no one ever again will be called upon to the supreme sacrifice. Take consolation in the knowledge that your deceased gave his all. God nor country can ask more of any man, and if we are resolved that these dear dead shall not have died in vain, then we are, in some small measure repaying those whom we honor here today.

Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MALCOLM C. TARVER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I desire to publish in the RECORD the following poem, which expresses a sentiment which has been helpful to me and I believe will be helpful to others. So far as I know, it is a poem heretofore unpublished, and I do not know the author. An engrossed copy of it has been furnished me by Mr. Henry V. Hesselman, who is clerk of our House Committee on Enrolled Bills.

FRIENDS

If nobody smiled and nobody cheered,
  And nobody helped us along;
If everyone thought of himself alone,
  And good things all went to the strong;
If no one cared just a little for you,
  And nobody cared about me,
And we all stood alone in the battle of life,
  What a dreary old world it would be.

Life is sweet just because of the friends we have made,
  And the things which in common we share.
We want to live on, not because of ourselves,
  But because of the people who care.
It's giving and doing for somebody else,
  On that all life's splendor depends,
And the joy of the world, when you sum it all up,
  Is found in the making of friends.

Segregation on Busses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of June 10, 1946:

SEGREGATION ON BUSSES

Under its power to regulate interstate commerce, Congress might long ago have ended race segregation on interstate busses and other public carriers. Since it did not do so, the Supreme Court last week took upon itself the responsibility of proclaiming such a policy from the bench. When we criticized the Court for thus invading the policy-making field, Representative ADAM C. POWELL, Jr., of Harlem, called attention to the fact that he had introduced a bill to abolish Jim Crow practices in interstate transportation a year and a half ago. He thinks, as we do, that the initiative in thus regulating interstate commerce in accord with our democratic principles should have been taken by Congress.

"We have sat by," said Representative POWELL, "and allowed the Supreme Court to do what we are paid to do." His remarks clearly point up the desirability of legislation in this field of regulation that the Constitution has so clearly assigned to Congress. Nor can it be assumed that the need for such legislation has now passed. There is no assurance that the Supreme Court's opinion in the Irene Morgan case has disposed of the issue. It rested on the ground that the requirement of changing seats as busses pass from the District of Columbia, where there is no segregation, to Virginia, where segregation has been the rule, was a burden on interstate commerce. Obviously there would be no such burden in the cases of busses operating between Alabama and Mississippi or between any other two States when both adhere to segregation rules. It is quite possible, too, that even if laws on this subject are invalidated in all the Southern States, segregation will still be accomplished through regulations set up by the bus operators.

Now that the Court has upset State Jim Crow laws, or at least some of them, it seems more than ever desirable for Congress to fix a policy that will leave no room for confusion or survival of undemocratic practices in interstate commerce. We think that the Powell bill ought to be studied and made the subject of hearings with this end in view. Failure of Congress to act does not, in our

opinion, excuse the Supreme Court for moving in and exercising the policy-making function, but the fact that the Court has done so should certainly stimulate our legislators to a keener appreciation of their duty.

Retirement of Civil-Service Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks I made before the Committee on Civil Service on June 11, 1946, on H. R. 4718, a bill to provide optional retirement for civil-service employees after 25 years of service:

I welcome the opportunity to speak to this committee in reference to the bill which it now has under consideration dealing with proposed amendments to the Civil Service Retirement Act. We all recognize the constant need of strengthening and extending the provisions and benefits of legislation aimed at greater social security, particularly as they affect old age and retirement. The committee is aware that I have introduced two bills, H. R. 74 and H. R. 4133, designed toward that end and with the supplementary intent of aiding reconversion and stimulating employment of younger persons by enabling older employees to retire. My remarks will express my reasons for proposing these bills, which are similar in intent to the bill now under consideration, but which I am less familiar with.

As a preface to my remarks I would like to call attention to the study directed by Lewis Meriam, recently published, which concluded that social security in the United States should offer comprehensive benefits to all who need them. Now I know that it is not necessary for me to detail the needs that do exist in this country today. But we should constantly keep in mind the as yet uneliminated factors in our economy which make provisions for adequate security for all a pressing concern. We all are too well aware that the disastrous business cycle with its dread consequences has not been eliminated as a fearful possibility of our future. And, as I say, not the least of those who are threatened with insecurity are the older people of our Nation, and retirement plans play a large part in our campaign against this type of insecurity.

Therefore, I should like to cite several changes that I believe should be made in the existing laws and to present brief arguments in support of my recommendations.

H. R. 74, which I introduced, provides in substance that any employee in civil service who shall have rendered 25 years of service shall be eligible for retirement on annuity and may be retired on his own request. H. R. 4133 provides in substance, that any employee who has completed 30 years of service and who has reached the age of 55 may voluntarily retire on annuity.

Basically these recommendations are designed to meet a need which can be and are too often overlooked. The present requirements for retirement do not account for what I call the individual deviation from the average. The present requirements of 30 years of service and an age of 60, or in some cases of 55, equally requisite, impose a hardship on many people in our civil service who cannot complete one or the other of the requirements. We are too familiar with the frequency of a break-down in health not to recognize the individual deviation from the average. We should be aware of the not infrequent weakening of mental vigor, the hazardous nature of a not inconsiderable portion of civil employment. We should recognize that adaptiveness and ability to meet new requirements diminishes rapidly among many people as they grow older. There are a thousand and one contingencies and impediments which cause the present requirements to mitigate against individuals who suffer from them. And not the least of such discrepancies which I propose should be remedied is the fact that many employees do not, cannot enter civil-service employ while they are young, and this is a two-way concern now as I will indicate.

It should be a fundamental consideration of ours that we have not eliminated unemployment, with all its weakening and disheartening effects on our social structure. And this prospect, which cannot be ignored, takes on a harsher significance when the veteran, the fellow who, as we cannot forget, sacrificed 3 years of his life and work for us, is threatened as he is today. And by permitting civil servants who have worked 25 years or who have reached 55 years of age to retire with protection, remembering that those who have need to retire will do so, we can simultaneously open up opportunities to the veterans and for other young people who are eligible and capable.

For this question also involves the practical necessity of clearing the channels of promotion for those who have worked faithfully can continue to do so, and whose advancement is retarded only by lack of opportunity. Such a retirement plan would add to the attractiveness of civil-service work and serve to attract capable young people to the service. It would improve personnel efficiency and limit superannuation.

For superannuation can operate to the detriment of the individual who has lost efficiency and would retire if he could, it detracts from the efficient functioning of any work which must endure it and limits the opportunity of the young, particularly the veteran who with the just preference accorded to him is prepared to work faithfully and vigorously.

The Civil Service Commission has, in spite of such advantages, recommended adverse action in the measures I have proposed. I do not know what stand they have taken on the bill now being considered, but because of the similarity in content and intent, I would like briefly to answer their objections.

Primarily the Commission fears a substantial loss to the Government from the proposed earlier retirement of the more efficient civil employees and the delayed retirement of the less efficient. The Commission fears that the persons who would avail themselves of the opinion would be those who believe that they could better themselves in private life with the annuity as basic income. This after 25 years of service. Surely, the Commission must have reason to believe otherwise. The Commission surely does not seek people who are in their late fifties. It must know that even less does private industry seeks such people. It must be aware of the great difficulty that people over 45 have in obtaining employment, and this is all the more true when a change from civil employment to private is concerned. Moreover, I am convinced that there must be a particular reluctance of efficient workers to leave an agency where they have worked for so long and where, as our civil-service system strives to achieve, their efficiency has been rewarded by responsible work. I am convinced that loyalty is much greater among those who have demonstrated efficiency and where it has been recognized.

Mr. Lewis Meriam stated in Public Personnel Problems, a study published by Brookings Institution in 1937, the writer's own guess would be that relatively few employees will really and entirely voluntarily take advantage of early retirement provisions, althought they may be influenced seemingly to take advantage of them through administrative pressure. I do not suggest that the Civil Service Commission or any other Federal agency does exert pressure on the less efficient to retire, though such would be unnatural, but presumably the less efficient, because less well placed, would be the more likely to retire. And I repeat that those whose efficiency has been seriously retarded by the many circumstances which we cannot control should be enabled to retire.

The Commission further objects by estimating high additional costs to the retirement fund in figures in hundreds of millions of dollars. But these sums are quite boldly stated and I find no accounting for them. The figures are extravagant and because they are not fortified, or until they are, I can give them little credence. However, I should point out, that the figures are based on the presumption that if this lower option were approved all eligible employees would immediately take advantage of it, which is absurd and which the Commission itself contradicts in the same letter. I recall to your attention Mr. Meriam's observation on the same point.

Finally the Commission objects to my proposals on the general grounds that they are very liberal. They are liberal to the number of people whose ability to work at the peak of their skill is seriously impaired before they reach the present level set for retirement. I repeat that those who retain their efficiency will not retire. But those who need to retire and are enabled to do so will be replaced by the young, efficient, and ambitious. To these latter, too, my recommendations are very liberal, to the veteran whom we are obliged not to pamper, but to provide opportunity for employment they are liberal.

It is not from a motive of charity, but of enlightened self-interest that society must prevent or mitigate the harmful effects of the internal struggle of the survival of the fittest. It is from motives of enlightened self-interest that we must all take in account the individuals who suffer in that struggle and at the same time give the young and the eager broader opportunity. The amendments proposed will not be excessive, but will rather operate to the continued benefit of our Nation and its people.

Finally, as an appendix to my remarks, I strongly recommend that the House of Representatives correct the serious omission of the 1942 amendment to the Retirement Act when we failed to make increased benefits voted at that time retroactive. The aging and forgotten group of employees who retired before January 24, 1942, have continued at the lower rates and done this through 4 years of rising prices. It is high time we matched the Senate action and corrected this obvious injustice.

Great Britain Adds Dishonor to Inhumanity—Allows the Grand Mufti to Renew His Crimes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Great Britain has again shown her true colors as to Palestine. It is shocking to learn that she supplied a plane to bring the pro-Nazi Arab, the so-called Grand

Mufti of Jerusalem, from supposed exile in France to Damascus, Syria, there to harangue and develop opposition to the immediate admission into Palestine of 100,000 Jews. This stooge of Hitler, organizer of the Arab Brigade which fought against American troops, will again lead the Arabs in pogroms against the Jews. Is this the way Britain keeps the peace in the Middle East—by reimporting this Arab riot rouser and killer? He should be facing a firing squad as a war criminal.

His Berlin broadcasts aroused the Arab world against the British and Americans. He is now permitted to return and renew his crimes. It is most inhuman for the British to refuse the entrance of 100,000 Jews into Palestine. Now they add dishonor to their inhumanity and become coconspirators with this Grand Mufti, who will insist upon having the blood of Jews on his hand.

What Will the Internationalists Get Us?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, day after day we are told we must draft the 18-year-olds in order to meet "our commitments." Will someone please tell us just what "our commitments" are?

It is now quite apparent that World War I did not end all war; that World War II will not take the "four freedoms" to the people of all the world; that it will not give other peoples an opportunity to select their own form of government. It appears to be certain that we or some other nation is to determine the form of government under which smaller nations are to live.

In a land possessing rich natural resources, with a people who are the masters of mass production, we have an alarming scarcity of food, clothing, materials for homes.

Some of us here at home are not the only ones who believe that we might well put our own house in order before attempting to regulate the individuals and the national lives of other people—other nations.

From a farm boy who lived in my home county, who was drafted—some folks like to call it selected—when 18, who left home in September of 1945, was given 3 months' training in South Carolina, who had no furlough, and then was sent to China, comes a letter, an excerpt from which reads as follows:

If the big wigs in the States would try and straighten out our country first, and keep their nose out of every other country, they'd be a lot better off.

But I suppose it isn't so bad to sit in the White House and send us young guys all over the world and guard and police the money man's property.

I figure those marines who got killed have got killed for nothing. I wish it could have been some Congressman's son instead. In the last 3 nights five of our boys got killed and before anyone could get there they were stripped of all their clothes.

So far 38 of our boys got killed by the Chinese during peacetime.

I wonder if the smart politicians who are promising the veterans this, that, and the other think that the men who return, who have had the experience that this boy is having, are so foolish as to believe that, when the men all get back, they are going to vote to continue to strip our country of everything worthwhile, including its youth, in order that other nations may carry on their quarrels and fights?

In my humble judgment, some day there will be a day of reckoning.

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., before the Great Lakes Harbors Association, at the Palmer House, Chicago, Ill., on Thursday, June 6, 1946.

I am glad to have the opportunity to discuss the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. I have advocated this project for many years and I am happy to be able to tell you that we are nearer to securing congressional authorization now than at any time in the past.

I was privileged to be a member of the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which held 3 weeks of hearings on this subject recently and heard over 160 witnesses on every pertinent aspect of this great program. An excellent case was made for the project during those hearings. On March 26, the subcommittee voted favorably, 3 to 1, and on May 1, Senator HATCH submitted the report of the subcommittee to the full Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Yesterday morning (June 5) the full committee reported the bill out favorably to the Senate.

With the overwhelming vote of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in favor of approval of this project, I have no doubt that the Senate as a whole will also approve it whenever the crowded Senate calendar will permit the St. Lawrence resolution to be taken up on the floor of the Senate. Of course you must realize that this measure, like any other important measure before the Senate, must compete for time with such other matters as the extension of the draft, labor legislation, extension of OPA, appropriation bills, atomic energy control, and various other propositions of equal importance. I can assure you now that no effort will be spared to secure its consideration and approval at the earliest opportunity. I believe it can be passed when the Congress has an opportunity to consider it.

I make this prediction based on my experience with this project over a period of years. You will recall that this same matter was before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate in 1933 and 1934. We were able then to secure the favorable vote of a majority, 46 Senators for, 42 opposed. Being in the form of a treaty, the measure then required two-thirds approval, and therefore, in spite of a majority, it did not secure Senate ratification. This time, as a result of careful preparation of the legislation, we have reduced the Canadian-American agreement of 1941 to the bare-bone essentials of constructing the necessary works in the United States and Canada for the creation of the seaway and power project. It is the consensus of reputable legal authorities that, as now defined, this measure can be approved by majority vote of the two Houses of Congress under the provisions of the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty.

Another factor which adds to my optimism on the ultimate outcome is the greater appreciation throughout the country of the benefits of such constructive projects. The favorable experiences of the people during the past 15 years with similar projects in other parts of the country, and the effect of the educational work that is being done by such organizations as the National St. Lawrence Association, under the leadership of Mr. Julius Barnes, has broadened public acceptance of such undertakings. It is a tribute to the essential soundness of this project that whenever people are informed of what it will do, they usually approve it, unless they have some private axe to grind.

I said a moment ago that the present legislation has been stripped to the essentials which will permit the construction of the St. Lawrence project. In this process we have eliminated many controversial subjects which can be better handled separately, such as the question of navigation rights on Lake Michigan and connecting canals of the Great Lakes system, and additional water diversion at Niagara Falls. It is a measure of Canada's keen desire to have this project considered that she has been willing to discuss and subsequently to arrive at mutually satisfactory arrangements with the United States regarding some of these matters which were originally placed in the 1941 agreement. I commend Canada's cooperative attitude in this regard. Canada appreciates, as we do, that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence watershed is the life line of the industrial and agricultural heart of the North American Continent.

One of the controversial issues which has been a matter of discussion in this city and in the Mississippi Valley has had to do with the freezing of additional diversion from Lake Michigan. There is a provision in the Canadian-American agreement which though it does not restrict the freedom of either country to effectuate additional diversion, gives the right to each country to protest and ask for arbitration of damages in case the other country causes additional diversion from the Great Lakes system. There are those who have construed this as giving veto power to Canada over additional diversion. I do not construe it as such. But as long as the issue has been raised, and it is essentially not germane to the construction of the St. Lawrence project, I for one am willing to see the matter dropped from the agreement.

This action would not change the status quo of the problem of diversion, but would leave the matter in the hands of the Supreme Court and Congress of the United States, where it now stands. In other words, by dropping paragraph C, article 8, of the agreement we do not change the situation that exists at the present time nor the situation that would exist after the construction of the St. Lawrence project. It will rest in the hands of the highest constituted authorities of our Government to decide what to do with the question of diversion. I therefore support the amendment offered by Senator LUCAS, of Illinois.

I consider it unnecessary on my part to try and convey to you the benefits of this project to the Great Lakes area. You who represent municipal and port authorities in the Great Lakes district are well aware of

the great advantages to your communities in having access to the ocean lanes of the world through low-cost water transportation. It is hardly necessary for me to point out that with the construction of the seaway your transportation costs to foreign ports on most products will probably be lowered by one-half, eliminating much of the cost of overland transportation to seaports.

The present Congress has approved many measures designed to promote foreign trade. To mention a few, the International Bank of Reconstruction, the Monetary Fund, the trade-agreements legislation, and lending authority for the Export-Import Bank. The ability of the Great Lakes district, particularly of Wisconsin, Illinois, and Minnesota, located 1,000 miles or more from the seacoasts, to participate in the expanded foreign-trade possibilities will be distinctly limited by the higher transportation costs which we are called upon to pay. This disadvantage is made even more severe as the result of the Interstate Commerce Commission's decision to raise the class rates in the Northeast and lower them in the South. The only way this part of the country can cope with this situation and participate to a large extent in foreign-trade potentials is by lower transportation costs through the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

It has been a matter of considerable concern to me that our part of the country, which is the breadbasket of America, and now we are told it is the breadbasket of the world at large, has been discriminated against by our own Congress. Your Representatives in Congress from the Great Lakes district have gone along with developments in other parts of the country, whether they be located in Louisiana, California, Texas, Washington, or Oregon; whether they involved improvement of the port of New York, the intercoastal canal, or the Mississippi River. We have gone along with these projects on the general conviction that whatever helps America as a whole helps all of us, directly or indirectly. We have voted generally on the technical merits of these projects as presented to us by the constituted authorities of our Government, the Corps of Engineers. But whenever the subject of the St. Lawrence project comes up there is a tendency in some parts of the country to wave aside the proved merits and the essential character of this improvement, to discredit the testimony of the Army engineers, and to adopt an obstructionist, self-centered attitude as if the general economic improvement of the 50,000,000 people who live in the tributary area of the Great Lakes is a matter of great detriment to the people of Texas, California, or New York. In fact, it seems easier to obtain large appropriations for economic aid to foreign countries than it is to obtain a comparatively small contribution to the improvement of the condition of our own people. Sectionalism and special-interest legislation, so rampant in the present administration, are weakening the very foundation of our system of popular government established and conducted in the interest of the people as a whole.

In the case of the St. Lawrence project, this sectionalism has already cost us much, not only in high cost of living and in the greater cost of the conduct of the war, but also in actual lives lost at sea during the terrifying submarine warfare of 1942 and 1943.

I cannot help but feel that much of the opposition arguments against the construction of this project is advanced with tongue in cheek. When the railroad and port interests in Texas, Arizona, or California express overwhelming fear of harm and economic devastation resulting from the construction of the seaway, one need only to look at the map of the United States to see that the arguments of the diversion of traffic and competitive disadvantages are overdrawn and unrealistic. There is no possible way in which the winter wheat of Oklahoma and Texas, which finds its way into the trade channels of the world through the port of Galveston, could possibly be diverted to Chicago and the St. Lawrence route. There is no possible way in which the trade, however small, that goes by way of the port of Mobile, can be affected by the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. There is no imaginable way in which the railroad workers in Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota and all States west, could be affected adversely. If anything they would directly benefit by the seaway, since the western railroads would become terminal roads directly feeding ocean navigation on the Great Lakes.

And yet, by these flimsy arguments a great wave of sectional phobia has been raised against this project, with the result that it has long been delayed at a tremendous cost to our people. The record before the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee proves beyond doubt that the failure of Congress to approve this project when it was first before it has cost our people, in dollars and lives, a heavy price. The States of Illinois, Wisconsin and other States in this area made their supreme contribution to the successful conduct of the war, and no other section of the country can take pride in a better record. We sent our youth, we gave our food, we built the instruments of war, the guns, the ships necessary for mechanized warfare without reservation.

We were not always sure, however, that the ultimate objectives were well defined or that our effort was administered in the most economical fashion. We are now beginning to learn slowly the terrific cost of our shipbuilding program under the administration of the Maritime Commission. One phase of the maladministration of that program has not received sufficient emphasis, and that is the uneconomical distribution of our shipbuilding facilities. Everyone must recognize that the Great Lakes, with the abundant supply of steel, tools, skilled manpower, and cheap water transportation was the most economical location for shipbuilding. The State of Wisconsin made a great contribution in the construction of smaller vessels and submarines. We are proud of that record. But our effort was limited by the navigable depths and the dimensions of the locks of the St. Lawrence River and the Illinois Waterway. At great cost, we had to float our ships through shallow waters for 1,500 miles from the Great Lakes to New Orleans, at a tremendous cost in dollars and manpower.

When it came to conserving manpower, materials, and money, everybody was for it in the interest of efficient conduct of the war. We even had to give up agricultural implements and other essential tools of production in order to conserve resources. But the War Department didn't mind pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into such projects as the Alaskan Highway, the Canol project, the Pan American Highway in Central America. When it came to the St. Lawrence seaway, the most natural outlet for the arsenal and granary of democracy to the outside world, they all said no, we must conserve men and materials. But did we really save materials and manpower by failing to construct the St. Lawrence seaway? It cost us more money and more manpower to take ships out of the Great Lakes by the cumbersome methods we were forced to use, estimated at 10 percent more per ship.

We had to build a large number of new power projects for steam generation, requiring more manpower for construction and operation, more critical materials, more manpower for digging coal, more transportation facilities to carry the coal from mine to power plant, with the result that the total cost of power to our war effort was greater than it would have been if the St. Lawrence project had been constructed. In fact, one is justly skeptical of the genuineness of the opposition arguments advanced in 1940–41, in the light of the fact that the very people who were so negative about the St. Lawrence project were at the same time quietly and secretly providing the money and materials, under rush orders, to build the Shipshaw project in the wilds of Canada, for the account of the Aluminum Co. of Canada.

This delay in building the St. Lawrence project has cost us dearly in other ways. Lacking adequate outlets from the Great Lakes we had to build shipyards in far-away places—in Florida, Texas, and California—and to build those we had to ship the machinery and equipment from here. We had to transport the skilled workers, we had to build entirely new communities at tremendous additional cost to the Government. Of course, we had to have the ships, but we paid for them through the nose. This was not good planning for total mobilization.

In the matter of transportation, while the administration failed to construct the St. Lawrence seaway because they said it would require too much manpower and materials, we had to transport our goods overland at a cost to the Government of hundreds of millions of dollars in extra railroad freight charges, which could have been saved if the seaway had been constructed. We had to pay this extra cost not only in our own war goods, but on lend-lease goods as well.

Not the least important consideration is the protection that the St. Lawrence route would have provided our merchant ships, for a distance of 1,000 miles into the north Atlantic against submarine attacks, instead of the exposed open-sea lanes from the Gulf and Atlantic ports. How many lives and ships this route would have saved cannot now be calculated.

It is well to know that the Joint Chiefs of Staff realize the importance of these factors. In their recommendation to the subcommittee, they stated that, in the interests of total mobilization in case of another national emergency, the industrial and shipbuilding potentials of the area and the protected water route over the St. Lawrence, would make a greater contribution to national security if the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is constructed.

Opponents are trying to belittle this project by saying that the arguments for it are constantly changing with the passage of time. They cite specifically the fact that when first proposed some 20 or more years ago, one of the principal arguments was the saving in transportation costs on agricultural products, particularly grains. I, for one, do not believe that agricultural exports will remain permanently at a low level, particularly the products of our cattle and dairy industries. Make no mistake about it, there is a tremendous market and demand for the products of these industries for a long number of years. The only limitation will be that of supply and also artificial limitations upon the market. The greater part of the population of the world is deficient in their diets in products of protein content, which is necessary for energy and survival.

I believe that over a period of years the improvement of dietary habits and standards of consumption, both in this country and abroad, will give us a consistently expanding market for meat and dairy products. It is not enough to have the desire and demand for these products. It is equally important to make these products available at a reasonable price which will yield a return to the producer and under conditions which will permit reciprocal payment. In this the cost of transportation is a major item. It costs now $20 to $24 a ton to transport dairy products from Wisconsin to tidewater by rail. We can cut this cost in half to the eastern coast of the United States, which is our major market. I feel certain that the cost of transportation to foreign countries over the St. Lawrence seaway will be equally reduced.

We are dealing here with a subject as old as man; we are dealing here with the problem

of better utilization of water resources to meet man's needs. When these needs change, the use of water, the use of water transportation, the use of waterpower will change accordingly. But it will never become obsolete.

Those who oppose this project are selfishly or foolishily blocking the welfare of the Middle West and the entire country. They cannot indefinitely shackle the country, and especially the great producing and consuming region of the Middle West, from obtaining the manifold benefits of this project. They cannot indefinitely blockade a natural highway to the sea and divert all commerce to a few favored ports.

They cannot hope to get the mass of people in any section or any State to give their support to an opposition policy based on special interests. No matter how much they propagandize, the opponents cannot make the criminal waste of a great natural resource popular with the people. On the contrary, an alert and informed public, if given an opportunity, will give whole-hearted support to the leadership of your organization and those of us who are urging the immediate and vigorous prosecution of this program.

The National Rifle Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address given by Mr. C. B. Lister, secretary-treasurer of the National Rifle Association, before the members of the National Security Committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which met recently at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C.

The National Rifle Association was organized in 1871. We are celebrating our diamond jubilee this year. We do not and never have received any direct financial support from the Congress. Our affiliated clubs sometimes are assisted by issues of arms, ammunition, and targets, but the national organization is not subsidized by the Government.

The National Rifle Association was organized by the militia officers, who, of course, were, in those days as they are today, civilians, and it operated primarily as a small arms training group for the militia until the turn of the century, when the organization succeeded in getting Congress to approve the annual national rifle matches, which were then beginning to get the interest of the regular armed services in a definite program of small arms training.

You may or may not believe it, but it is a fact that the first small arms training manual that the Regular Army used was written by the then president of the National Rifle Association. It was reprinted by an Army officer under his own imprint (and he was sued for plagiarism), so that the present background of small arms training in the regular services, as in the National Guard, originated with this group of small arms advocates.

The present series of military rifle targets and pistol targets were designed originally by the NRA, and, unfortunately, are the same targets now as they were in 1888. They have not been changed since; we have been trying to get the Army to change them, but suggestions about "military" targets are not seriously considered in some Army circles if the suggestions come from "civilian" sources. Today's Army officers do not realize that their "Army targets" are, in fact, the NRA targets of a bygone day.

Another misconception of NRA is that it is a target-shooting organization. It definitely is not that. We view target shooting only as a means to an end. We realize that the competitive stimulus is the greatest stimulus to success and perfection in any activity, so we merely use competitions to stimulate the interest of the regulars and the guardsmen and the civilian, in perfecting himself in small arms marksmanship.

There has been a great deal of criticism in the Infantry Journal during the war and in other places prior to the war about the national matches being "artificial." That these matches were all known-distance firing, using a black aiming point on a white background, and did not train anybody for the actualities of war.

The statement was often made that anybody could hit the targets under those conditions.

That is not exactly correct. Anybody cannot hit them under all conditions, but it is not feasible, generally, to do target competition under field conditions. It is just physically impossible to get 5,000 men to Camp Perry, or any other match, and hold musketry competition or anything like that. That is tactical training, and should be done in divisional maneuvers.

However, it is interesting, I think, to know that we tried, back in the 1930's to interest the Army in this business of sharp shooting, so-called. There is nothing on it in the Army training manuals. You men know that as you took the Army or Marine Corps training, they did not teach you to hit a running deer or a quail on the wing. We have a standing position, but you get into it very slowly. There is nothing in the manual to teach a man to bring the gun from the port or from trail, snap it into his shoulder, sight it, and get off a quick, aimed shot.

We introduced that in Perry in 1933 or 1934, but we never got the Army interested in that training.

As the result of that failure, a lot of these kids who got into the service during the war for the first time preached hip shooting, and we had a lot of divisions that paid serious attention to shooting from the hip, because they thought that was the only way they could get off a quick shot.

Why they should think that, I do not know, except that they had never seen a deer or quail hunter get off a quick, aimed shot.

However, that has been the general conception of the NRA—that is, that we were a bunch of "belly shooters," only interested in slow fire and known distances.

I want to correct that. We believe in known-distance shooting as basic training because you cannot teach a man what is wrong with his shooting unless you have standards to go by. You have got to have a big target so that he can miss the bull's-eye and still hit in the lower left-hand corner, so that you can point out his mistakes to him and get him on the right track.

We are definitely interested in the other problems, but we cannot do them in Camp Perry for lack of facilities.

Because the NRA is essentially a semimilitary organization, even though it is owned and controlled largely by civilians, we are the only sportsman's organization in the country recognized by Congress with a semiofficial status. We were able all during the war to get small-bore ammunition for our groups, and small-bore rifles, when the rest of the country was completely dry, because we do have a semiofficial status. On the surplus-property list we rate with cities and States because of that semiofficial status.

We are the only sportsman's organization that devotes a major portion of its time to teaching kids to shoot, and that now is our primary concern. We have reached the conclusion that once you create a shooter—a "shooting nut"—you cannot lose him. He stays with you. It is like having malaria—it keeps coming back in the spring and fall every year—so we do not worry much about the old-timers. We are just letting them pay the freight for the kids. Our primary concern is in the introduction of rifle shooting with the .22 rifle primarily to the secondary schools, 4–H groups, the YMCA, and similar outfits. As I say, it is hard to believe, but we are the only sportsman's organization in the country that stresses that thing.

We are also the only sportsman's organization in the country that places prime importance on the subject of gun safety. Ducks Unlimited, Izaak Walton League, even the ROTC seem to take it for granted that a kid will know how to handle a gun safely. They accent the supply of game and accuracy with the weapon, but they have not done anything at all to educate the general public or to accent gun safety in their training. We got into that field about 10 years ago and have done a lot of talking to State game commissioners, and have worked closely with the National Safety Council on that subject.

We have prepared the first and about the only gun safety code, and posters, that the National Safety Council has used. (Although the Institute of Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers have distributed many thousand copies of the safety code under their own imprint and with no credit here to the NRA.) They are using our material in their school broadcasts on gun safety, and we are trying our damnedest to teach people to handle guns safely first and accurately second.

Probably many of you know the lousy safety record that we had, and the British had, in the armed services during the war. There were far too many men killed in training camps and even in barracks and guard houses by accidentally discharged weapons which would have been avoided if the men had proper training in the safe handling of weapons. That is, I would say, No. 2 on our present program.

The third big problem now is the matter of the antifirearms legislation. We have been fighting for 20 years. A little better than that, about 25 years. There has been a growing campaign in this country actuated by a very diverse group, which now apparently includes the "commies." It started out with the ordinary reform element to get the guns out of the hands of the average citizen. It is played up from the standpoint of crime, largely. That is, if we could eliminate firearms we would eliminate crime in the United States. That is the normal approach.

With the arrival of so many souvenir weapons in this country, the antigun crowd are on in full cry again. The pack is running.

I anticipate another attempt in the next session of Congress to enact a Federal firearms law which will require the registration of all weapons, including shotguns, which are owned by the citizens of this country. They will have to be registered with the nearest collector of Internal Revenue. We have beaten that three times on the Hill. They went down to the States, but they were unsuccessful there. They now see in this, as they call it, "flood of foreign arms" that they have another talking point, and they are back on the same deal.

You see a lot of figures in the paper about the numbers of guns brought in, and the number of crimes, and the increasing crimes.

I can tell you without equivocation every statement of that type is either a complete lie or a half-truth.

I have been doing a little research in the last 2 weeks on crime figures. I do not have all the data, but, as nearly as I can tell, this increase in crime which we are hearing about still leaves us considerably below the crime level which prevailed in the middle 1930's.

There has been a very large increase in many types of crime in the latter half of 1945 and early half of 1946, but you must remember that the increase is based on the figures of 1943 and 1944, when we had 13,000,000 men in the armed services, and those 13,000,000 men all came from the age brackets in which we have the greatest amount of crime. The age brackets in which we have the greatest amount of crime in the United States are the same age brackets as show the greatest amount of automobile accidents. In other words, it is the young fellows looking for excitement who have automobile accidents, and it is the young fellows looking for excitement who get into the criminal net and once there stay there. Sixty percent of all crimes are committed by repeaters.

Before you fall for this proposition that "we must control firearms, we must register all the firearms that the honest people in this country possess, and we must let the police tell everybody when they can have a gun or not," see if you cannot get behind the figures. I hope by the middle of July to have a very complete report on this subject, and if any of you fellows are interested in it, I will certainly be more than happy to furnish it to you, because it is a matter of public education, and the VFW, through its posts, can do much to help us prevent getting the United States into the position in which England found itself when the war came.

The Labor Government in England in 1921 enacted a federal firearms registration law, and between 1921 and 1939, they succeeded in so disarming England, so killing off the sport of shooting in England, that you know what happened.

After Dunkirk we had to send our entire supply of war reserve Enfields there to establish a British reserve. They in England tried to persuade these "lawless" Americans to turn the guns in to the British so that they could arm the British to do this fighting in the streets Mr. Churchill was talking about.

The British fighting in the streets would have been a joke if it had not been for American guns, and the primary reason for that was the British Firearms Law enacted in 1921 by the then new Labor Government.

I cannot say that there is any connection between the interest of the 1921 British Labor Government in disarmament and the present activities of our "commies" and labor element in this country. It may be only a coincidence, but it is a fact that we have right now another wave of antifirearms legislation facing us. It is being introduced in city councils, which is awfully hard to fight, because you do not hear about it in time, and it will be introduced in most of the State legislatures that convene in December and January this winter.

We need your help in that, and with your help we can lick it again.

Now, as to the NRA in connection with the national security picture, you may be interested to know that when the war broke out, the NRA had the only small arms training films available in the United States, and we supplied the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Australians and British, with small arms training films.

We supplied them at no cost because we had them ready, and the Army did not have them for other than automatic weapons until the latter part of 1943.

We thought we saw the thing coming and, after all, we are doing a selling job, trying to use selling mediums. Training films, safety films, all are a part of any business's normal sales program, so we have them and we were ready to supply them and did supply them.

Another thing in that connection of interest is that the award of war contracts in 1939–40 and 1941 to American firms were accompanied by the requirement that those firms install adequate security measures for the plants. That is, antisabotage measures. There were no manuals available. The War Department, the Navy Department, and the FBI did not have any printed literature of any kind. When the Navy went into the plants, awarded a contract, and said, "You have got to make this plant secure against sabotage," they were not able to tell the plant managers how to secure the plant against sabotage. It was all new to the civilian plant managers and they were very much at sea. We have contacts with th FBI and other people, and we prepared the first internal security manual that was available in this country for new war contractors and that manual was approved by the Provost Marshal General of the United States, and was distributed by us, and with his approval, and under his recommendation, to some 5,000 war plants around the country. It told them everything from how to protect the sewers that went into the plant and provided one means of ingress, to how to check employees in and out morning and night. That was the first manual available. Subsequently, the Navy and the Army and the FBI issued other manuals which incorporated all we had and put in some additional ideas that had been developed in the months in between.

We also started, in 1940, a preinduction training program. We have about 3,300 rifle clubs around the country, and we told those groups that the war was coming. Most of their local kids were going into the armed services, with no basic training, and it would be a good idea to start them at home.

We instituted altogether about 1,300 of those preinduction training schools in the communities around the country. They trained some 86,000 kids in a basic course, which when the War Department adopted its preinduction training program somewhat later was adopted.

Our manuals and our wall charts, our training films, all were adopted in toto and were accepted as official by General Weibel, Chief of the War Department preinduction training program.

And again, because of this splendid work, the War Department was able to immediately utilize material which had proved its worth and which was available and which did not cost the taxpayers of the United States a nickel.

Another thing that we were able to do which would immediately occur to you, of course, was to supply several hundreds of experienced small-arms training instructors. The Army Service Forces, as you can realize, had not given a great deal of thought to small-arms training. The Motor Transportation Corps, the Quartermaster, Ordnance, Signal Corps. This business of three dimensional warfare was new to them, a new idea, and they had never paid much attention to training in small arms for truck drivers and people of that sort.

When the war broke, we had requests from the Provost Marshal General, the Quartermaster General, the Chief Signal Officer, and the Navy, practically all of those branches which for years had neglected their small-arms training, "Can you recommend people whom we can commission or issue warrants to as small-arms instructors?" And we were able to help them out to a marked degree.

I think it is a perfectly true statement that the entire Signal Corps small-arms training program was in the hands of NRA civilians commissioned for that purpose.

The whole Navy small-arms program was supervised by NRA people. Ray Whitaker was one of them. They dumped it in our laps. They said, "We don't know a damn thing about it. All of our men that knew about it are admirals; we need lieutenants and lieutenant commanders."

We gave them to them, and they were pleased.

I give you that as a background to indicate that the NRA is not a civilian belly-shooting bunch, only interested in the small-bore shooting at 50 and 100 yards and match-target shooting at 1,000 yards.

Now, as to the postwar picture and what the VFW can do to cooperate with us, and what we can do to cooperate with you:

We are starting a postwar program with a backlog of about 3,600 clubs. They are in all the 48 States, and Hawaii, Panama Canal Zone, and Puerto Rico. That, of course, is all only a drop in the bucket to what we should have.

I was thinking about that when General Miltonberger was talking this morning.

The civilian, in many cases, for reasons which seem sufficient to him, cannot give his time to the National Guard. Maybe his reasons are sufficient; maybe he only thinks they are, but, anyhow, he does not get into the Guard. We cannot make a soldier out of him in the civilian rifle club, but we can teach him something about range discipline. We can teach him something about basic small-arms firing. We can teach him something about handling guns safely. We can teach him something about the benefits of teamwork and the necessity of teamwork and discipline. And we are, when the pinch comes, an excellent recruiting source for the National Guard.

They found out in this war, as they did in the last war, that these "damned civilians" who go out and shoot on Sunday and won't join the Guard, when a pinch comes, when they can see some good reason for giving up the job and their families and getting into military service, the kind of people who like to shoot, are the kind who enlist in the National Guard and Regular services.

The development of the civilian rifle clubs in all the communities around the country is a backlog of material who have already been oriented to get into some branch of the military service, and who will go in.

The junior program is probably the one in which we are all the most interested, because all of us who have been in this show and the other one, are "over the hump" now.

I started an argument in our own executive committee last month, when I said that the senior rifle groups and the veterans' organizations were in a sense a waste of effort, because anybody who is old enough to be a veteran is over the hump, and his value to national defense lies in the moral support which he can give in voting for bills on the Hill and in preventing these damned anti-firearm laws, and primarily in what he can do to take some kid by the hand and say, "Come on, son, let's learn something about this shooting and the military business."

We need the civilian clubs for two reasons: We need them to pay for the kid work and we need them to take the kid by the hand physically and teach him how to shoot. But what is most important to the national security is the junior program.

Now, the junior program bogs down, not by the fact that the kids do not want to shoot, because they do, but it bogs down because the school board is afraid that this terrible shooting business is too military, and some of the Quakers and the Baptists and the Presbyterians and the other good folk do not want a rifle club in the high school for the same reason they do not want a high school cadet corps. It is too military. That is where the VFW can be a whale of a lot of assistance.

Many VFW people are on the school boards. They are all voters. Many of them are prominent in the communities. The local posts and the national organization can do a whale of a lot to put over the secondary-school rifle club, which I think is the meat of the coconut as far as NRA and basic small-arms training is concerned, and I do hope, and I am sure that with Buck Rogers and the rest of you folks, that we are going to be able to do something about this secondary-school shooting program.

Now, the school may not have a cadet corps. It may not want a junior ROTC, but we can get in the back door. We can begin indoctrinating these kids with a rifle club. It is better to have a half a loaf than none.

The third thing is this antifirearms campaign. If we have a firearms registration law in this country or in the States, the average American will not bother to shoot. He resents restrictions as a national characteristic. And while the police might be willing to grant you a permit, although there is nothing on the record to show that they will, you will not take the trouble to go down to the local police station with all the cockroaches and the tobacco juice and ask some supercilious sergeant to let you have a permit to shoot a gun. You just will play golf. It is easier.

There is a place for firearms-control legislation. We do not want the crooks to have a gun for crime, and if a man uses a gun for a criminal purpose, we should throw the book at him; but that does not mean that reputable citizens should not have a gun to shoot if they want to.

On the antifirearms picture, you can be of enormous help.

There have been cases in which your local post commanders have been sold a bill of goods by these antifirearms people. Up in Cleveland the post commander or the district commander has publicly announced that all these souvenir weapons should be registered by the police.

It is a matter of education. We need to tell them the story. Foreign service is perhaps the place to tell them the story, and we can work that out.

That is very sketchy and very rambling, gentlemen, but I hope it gives you something of the picture of what the NRA is, how it came into being, and what it is trying to do.

From there on, I would solicit your personal inquiries by letter or verbally, and I can give you the rest of the picture.

Thank you very much.

Terminal Leave Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMORY H. PRICE
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House has received many complaints during this war regarding the discrimination against enlisted men. The matter under discussion today is only one instance wherein the enlisted men have suffered. There are many practices of the armed forces that have caused our young men to leave the service of their country after having fought bravely and in many cases making great sacrifices with a definite and well-founded grievance against his country. It therefore is a real responsibility of this Congress to find and furnish a remedy for as many of these grievances as possible. I feel sure that the action about to be taken by this body today is equitable and just from every viewpoint, and I hope that other steps will be taken to guarantee that all Members of our armed forces will be treated fairly regardless of his rating or rank. Our enlisted men deserve and should receive the careful consideration of Congress in order that they will be sure to receive fair treatment. No Member of this House regrets or complains about the fine treatment of the officers in this war, but we should insist on the enlisted men getting justice, and that is all the men want.

Victory in Asia—Soviet Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown from the Washington Evening Star:

THIS CHANGING WORLD
(By Constantine Brown)

Victory in Asia is a Soviet propaganda film which, while widely distributed in the countries behind the iron curtain, is not likely to be shown in the United States or in western Europe.

A high American official had the opportunity of seeing the film at a private showing in a European capital. He had to exercise a good deal of insistence to get the Soviet officials to produce it for him and said that for the first time since he has had dealings with the U. S. S. R. they looked somewhat sheepish at the end of the performance.

The film starts with events preceding the first Japanese-Russian war. The people of Russia were then living in peace, looking after their usual business, while the Japanese war lords were working feverishly preparing for the war. This, of course, is all true. The picture then shows the Japs' sneak attack on the Russian fleet at Port Arthur, the valiant resistance of the Russian armies on the plains of Manchuria and their ultimate defeat because of the rottenness of the imperial government and its corrupt and incompetent officialdom in St. Petersburg. This also is true.

The picture becomes "somewhat slanted," however, when it shows the Soviet registering a single-handed victory over Japan in the Second World War. And this is the most important and the longest part of the film.

Pictures of long trains taking large Russian forces abroad are presented to the public. Mobilization and transportation scenes are shown for such a long time that the onlooker gains the impression that millions of men must have been poured into Asia immediately after the defeat of the Reich. This also is sketched out as an exclusive Red Army victory, since it shows the occupation of Berlin and the surrender of the Nazis without the slightest reference to the other Allies.

Once the Russian forces reach Manchuria, fierce and bitter fights are shown to have developed against a large and stubborn Nipponese army. Although the entire Soviet campaign in Manchuria did not last even a week and consisted only of some skirmishes, Victory in Asia creates the effect that the Red armies had to fight for many weeks before a fierce enemy was crushed in battles as violent as those waged against the Nazis.

Then comes the grand finale, which embarrassed even the Soviet officials who had to attend the private showing.

The Japanese are defeated. They surrender. The surrender occurs on a Russian battleship. The Soviet actors who impersonated the representatives of Emperor Hirohito arrive aboard the stage battleship, which is crowded with high-ranking Russian military and naval officers. They bow low and are ready to receive the conditions imposed on them by the victorious Nation—the U. S. S. R.

In the background, behind the bevy of heavily gold-braided and bemedaled Soviet marshals, generals, and admirals there can be seen a foreign uniform. It is so distant and indistinct that it is difficult to make out whether it portrays an American or a British officer.

The unfair and gross emasculation of history ordinarily would have caused only a smile on the part of the American official who was privileged to see the film. But it is known that Victory in Asia is a "must" for all the satellite countries, which know little about what went on in the war against Japan. It tends to strengthen the belief of the peoples behind the iron curtain that Russia's power is irresistible and that the Red Army won the war on all fronts single-handed.

The showing of pictures such as Victory in Asia is linked up with radio broadcasts of the same nature. Our military observer at Yenan reported that Soviet loudspeakers placed in every town or large village in the Communist-controlled area of China never once mentioned that the United States had contributed in any shape or form to defeat Japan.

There has been no protest or unofficial representation about Victory in Asia. The American high official politely thanked his Russian hosts when the show was over and remarked smilingly that the film was very interesting and edifying.

United States Destroyers Sold to Russia by Britain Downed United States Plane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House who was serving here prior to our officially being at war with Germany will recall the fact that President Roosevelt during the fall of 1940, without any authority whatsoever, transferred to Great Britain 50 American destroyers of the four-stacker type. In return for these valuable ships of war we were supposed to receive 99-year leases to certain world bases. So far as I have been able to learn, no bases have as yet been leased to us for 99 years or any other length of time. In other words, this transfer of destroyers was a gratuity only.

When the transfer was made, no one here contemplated that later those ships, after being sold to Russia, would be used to shoot out of the air an American airplane, bringing death to an American airman, when on a peaceful mission and after having fully identified itself to the Russians. Subsequent events disclose the fact that the Russians had paid the British 1,000,000 pounds sterling each for a number of these destroyers which we turned over free of charge to the British.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an article by Capt. Robert C. Durham, who was in the American airplane when it was shot down by the Russians:

UNITED STATES DESTROYERS SOLD TO RUSSIA BY BRITAIN DOWNED UNITED STATES PLANE

(By Capt. Robert C. Durham)

(The writer is a veteran of 39 combat missions over Europe. In 1944 he was assigned to a special detachment of the United States Strategic Air Forces under Col. Bernt Balchen. He helped to bring back to England for study by American and British scientists the first V-2 rocket which fell intact in Sweden.)

NEW YORK, June 8.—Back in the days of the so-called phony war when neutral America convoyed supplies across the Atlantic to aid the British cause, Winston Churchill appealed to President Roosevelt for some fast destroyers to help bolster the British fleet.

In order to make the transfer of the ships more palatable to the American people a deal was worked out whereby the United States would receive 99-year leases to world bases in return for the outright gift of a number of destroyers of the four-stacker class.

These destroyers were supposed to be desperately needed to keep the Union Jack flying over the north Atlantic. Yet in September of 1944, eight of these same destroyers were lying at anchor in Kola Inlet just north of Murmansk, flying the Hammer and Sickle of the Russian People's Commissariat to the Navy!

GIVEN 2,800-MILE MISSION

At that time I was a member of a crew which was to attempt one of the longest missions flown in the European theater of operations. We were to take off from an airport in northern Scotland, drop two Norwegian army lieutenants by parachute about 100 miles southwest of Petsamo and return to Scotland, a flight of some 2,800 miles. The mission was being flown as an operation of British supreme intelligence.

We took off shortly after noon on September 20, with Lt. Col. Keith Allen, one of the American Air Line's senior pilots before the war, and Maj. David Schreiner, Columbus, Ohio, alternating as pilots. I was acting as navigator and bombardier and Lt. Lester Schick, Tech. Sgt. William Jesperson, Tech. Sgt. Albert Sage, Tech. Sgt. Albert Krasevac, Staff Sgt. Neil Richardson, and Staff Sgt. William Bollinger completed the crew.

Just before reaching our target our No. 1 engine caught fire and the propeller had to be feathered. Colonel Allen succeeded in completing the task assigned us and then it was decided to make for Murmansk, since it was impossible to return to Scotland, and Petsamo was occupied by the Germans.

DISPLAYED DISTRESS SIGNALS

Approaching Murmansk every effort was made to identify the plane to the Russians. Distress signals were sent in international "Q" code. We were carrying the Russian colors of the day for just such an emergency. These were fired as rapidly as possible. We turned on all the plane's lights, yet as we came in at less than a thousand feet, every Russian land battery and all the units of the fleet opened fire. The plane was soon enveloped in flames and Colonel Allen ordered the crew to bail out. He remained at the controls, fighting to keep the plane in the air long enough to allow us to get clear. He gave his life, but saved every member of his crew.

Several of the first to jump landed in the waters of the inlet, but they were fished out. Due to the long distance between the parachute landings it was nearly 2 days before the entire crew was assembled at the British Naval Hospital at Vaenga, a small suburb of Murmansk. After 2 weeks there the British battleship *Rodney* brought us back to England.

RUSSIANS REFUSE TO TALK

During our stay at Vaenga I had ample opportunity to talk with a number of Russians as well as many of the British representatives. Two of the ex-American destroyers were tied up at a dock in the harbor and we were permitted to go on board. It was difficult to get the Russians to do much talking since familiarity with foreigners subjects any Russian to possible exile or worse.

We learned, however, that Russia had a few light units in a minor fleet in the Baltic and a heavy cruiser and some light units in the White Sea. Their principal navy, however, was the northern fleet at Murmansk, under the command of Admiral Golovko.

We also learned that the Russians had paid the British £1,000,000 apiece for the American destroyers and a larger sum for the cruiser.

Alternate Actions on Case Bill Weighed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the Washington Star of June 10, 1946:

ALTERNATE ACTIONS ON CASE BILL WEIGHED—DELAY IN INDUSTRIAL PEACE SEEN IN VETO OF MEASURE

(By David Lawrence)

Either of two sets of consequences can flow from the decision of President Truman this week, depending on whether he signs or vetoes the Case bill. This measure endeavors to remove violence and irresponsibility from the acts of labor unions in their relations with management.

The bill is a mild proposal. It doesn't begin to do what ought to be done to eliminate the abuses of collective bargaining and the damage that is being done to the public interest by extremists in labor's ranks. But it is a start toward a long-overdue reform.

If, therefore, the President vetoes the bill, here is what may be expected to happen in America from both the economic and political points of view:

1. Violence, illegal picketing, disregard for present Federal and State statutes and usurpation of more power over management will be encouraged and industrial peace will be further delayed.

AID TO COMMUNISM

2. Management will be discouraged and the incentive to undertake new projects will be impaired and the reconversion process will be deferred over a long period of time or at least until a new President and a new Congress are elected who recognize that the inequality between labor and management will not promote industrial harmony.

3. Communism will be encouraged, because it thrives on friction and class war.

4. A Republican President will be elected in 1948 who will not be a progressive. For the Republicans will figure they can win with anybody. Congress will go heavily Republican this autumn.

5. More and more strikes will occur, for labor will figure that the President uphold them in almost anything hereafter because he fears the labor vote. Extremism will be given an impetus.

IF HE SIGNS

If, however, the President signs the Case bill or lets it become law without his signature, here is what may be expected to happen:

1. Labor will threaten and criticize and attack but will support the Democrats at the polls just the same, for labor knows it can receive far more benefits by a continuance of the present administration than by putting a conservative Republican into the White House—a natural and inevitable result of any third party or desertion of the President.

2. Most middle-of-the-road voters and many independent Republicans will support the President on the theory that he is not an extremist himself and is trying hard to hold the scales even.

This independent vote is far more likely to swing away from Mr. Truman if he deserts it than is the extreme labor vote, so it is far more important in 1948 to the Truman administration than a dozen Political Action Committees.

3. Inasmuch as Mr. Truman was able to win the nomination against Henry Wallace in the 1944 Democratic Convention through the support of the anticommunistic elements in the Democratic Party, particularly important church elements, he will hold that support—something that would be lost to him in the event of a veto.

JEFFERSON SUPPLIES ANSWER

4. The President will retain the respect of the vast number of citizens who, while disagreeing perhaps with some of the provisions of the emergency legislation proposed in connection with the recent rail strike, had cause to admire Mr. Truman for his courage.

5. To veto the Case bill on some specious pretext after having advocated sterner measures only a fortnight or so before is an inconsistency that can never be explained on the stump. To sign the Case bill irrespective of the fate of the stronger measure is not only consistent but understandable and will appeal to the electorate generally as a sensible course.

Mr. Truman has been weighing the problem for several days to find the right answer. If he will reread the principles of Thomas Jefferson, he will find it. The answer is that government cannot rest on special privilege for any group and that the public interest must be served irrespective of the pressures by groups which seek materialistic privilege. The Case bill is a measure to abolish special privilege and put management and labor unions on an equal footing before the law.

Terminal Leave Pay for Enlisted Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH PETERSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the bill granting terminal leave pay to enlisted personnel, H. R. 4051, should be overwhelmingly passed by the House. I am giving my unqualified support of this measure, and I hope there will not be a vote against it.

The enlisted personnel of our armed forces are entitled to this compensation, and it should be given to them as quickly as possible. Under our selective-service system the men were forced to serve in the various branches of our armed forces whether they wished to or not, and those who served as enlisted personnel were just as good soldiers, and just as good American citizens as those who served as commissioned officers. They fought side by side. It was more or less a fortune

of circumstance that some were commissioned officers and some enlisted personnel.

The men and women, whether commissioned officers or not, have done their best to win the war. Now that the war is over and they are returning to civilian life, they should certainly be treated alike in the matter of terminal leave pay benefits as well as in all other respects.

I was among the enlisted personnel of World War I. As a veteran and as a member of the American Legion for over 20 years I am glad to vote for this measure and to assist in securing for the enlisted personnel and their families these and all other benefits which they so richly deserve.

RECORD SUPPORTING VETERANS' BENEFITS

In order that my constituents, especially veterans and their families, may have complete information as to my record of 100 percent cooperation with and support of veterans and their families, I have compiled my voting record, and submit it as follows:

VOTING RECORD OF CONGRESSMAN HUGH PETERSON, OF GEORGIA, ON MEASURES PERTAINING TO SERVICEMEN, SERVICEWOMEN, VETERANS, AND THEIR FAMILIES

Seventy-seventh Congress (1941–42) (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88).

S. 2025. Pay Readjustment Act, 1942:

On amendment to raise the pay of enlisted men of the sixth grade from $48 to $54 and those in the seventh grade from $42 to $50, page 4145 (May 13, 1942). Vote "yea."

On passage, page 4146 (May 13, 1942). Vote "yea."

On motion to recommit with instructions that House insist on base pay of $50 a month, page 4670 (May 27, 1942). Vote "yea."

On motion to recommit conference report with instructions as to the provisions for certain retired Army officers, p. 5098 (June 10, 1942). Vote "nay."

On agreeing to conference report, page 5099 (June 10, 1942). Vote "yea."

Seventy-eighth Congress, first session (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 89).

H. J. Res. 159. Emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

On passage, page 7770 (September 22, 1943). Vote "yea."

S. 1279. Liberalizes family allowances for servicemen's dependents.

On passage, page 8466 (October 18, 1943). Vote "yea."

H. R. 3356. Increases monthly rates of compensation or pension to disabled veterans for service-connected disability to widows and children.

On passage, page 9714 (November 16, 1943). Vote "yea."

H. R. 3377. Increases rate of pension of World War veterans.

On passage, page 9748 (November 17, 1943). Vote "yea."

Seventy-eighth Congress, second session (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 90):

S. 1543. Mustering-out payment bill, 1944.

On passage, page 427 (Jan. 19, 1944)—vote "yea."

On agreeing to conference report, page 750 (Jan. 26, 1944)—vote "yea."

H. R. 4115. Veterans' preference in Federal civil service.

On motion to suspend rules and pass the bill, page 3506 (Apr. 17, 1944)—vote "yea."

S. 1767. GI bill of rights.

On passage, page 4677 (May 18, 1944)—vote "yea."

On agreeing to conference report, page 5853 (June 13, 1944)—vote "general pair."

Seventy-ninth Congress, second session (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 92):

H. R. 4761. Housing stabilization.

On motion to recommit, page 2001 (March 7, 1946)—vote "general pair."

H. R. 5455. Authorizes $250,000,000 for additional housing units for veterans.

On passage, page 2282 (March 14, 1946)—vote "general pair."

H. J. Res. 328. Makes an additional appropriation of $253,727,000 for veterans' housing, and so forth.

On passage, page 2634 (March 26, 1946)—not voting.

H. R. 4761. Veterans' Emergency Housing Act, 1946.

On agreeing to conference report, page 4939 (May 13, 1946)—vote "yea."

The three votes this spring showing no vote were taken while I was away on official business for the Government. I favored the passage of this legislation providing Federal housing aid to veterans, as is clearly shown by my vote on May 13, 1946, in favor of H. R. 4761, Veterans' Emergency Housing Act.

Reorganization Plan No. 2, Submitted by the President, Is Opposed by Government Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out the dangerous possibilities of Reorganization Plans Nos. 1, 2, and 3, submitted by the President to the House of Representatives on May 16. These are known as House Documents 594, 595, and 596.

Testimony is in progress before the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments and every Member of the House is concerned with that testimony because it indicates clearly that all of us have constituents who may be very injuriously affected by these plans. The testimony of George D. Riley, submitted on behalf of Government employees on June 7, calls attention to some startling possibilities. Mr. Riley opposed the abolishment of the United States Employees Compensation Commission, as proposed by Reorganization Plan No. 2. Mr. Riley pointed out the fact that this plan was a first step in a drive to kill the Civil Service Retirement Pension Fund of all Federal employees, including postal workers, State Department foreign service officers, and others.

Mr. Riley also pointed out that under Reorganization Plan No. 2 the Federal Security Agency would logically go ahead and seek jurisdiction over the pension fund of the Railroad Retirement Board and all other pension funds. This would include the pension funds established by various police and fire departments in the cities throughout the United States. It would also affect pension funds for ministers of religious denominations, for school teachers, and for State and municipal employees. In this connection it is important to note that many private industries have pension funds, and a noteworthy example is the Bell Telephone Co. and its subsidiaries.

Every Member of Congress should interest himself at once in connection with this matter. Mr. Riley's very able statement before the committee reads as follows:

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS BY GEORGE D. RILEY, OPERATIONS DIRECTOR ON REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, Government employees are far more than passingly interested in what is done with any agency which looks to those employees for more than 60 percent of its volume of business. The immediate reason the Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor is concerned with Reorganization Plan No. 2 is because an agency of the central government with which members of its unions transact such vital business has been marked for abolition.

We might be called one of those "special interest groups" to which the Bureau of the Budget refers when it declines to hear the other side of the story on governmental reorganization. We are such a "special interest group" that we have taken a pronounced stand against throwing the United States Employees Compensation Commission into a public welfare set-up. This Commission was never intended to do other than provide a form of retirement, as a quasi-judicial agency, and not in the popular concept of public welfare.

The Employees Compensation Commission, established in 1916, came into being through the desire of organized labor to have just such agency of Government created. It must be said that this Commission has been one of the most successfully operated establishments of the executive branch. Even the Bureau of the Budget says the Commission with its 500 personnel has functioned on close budgetary rations. The Bureau of the Budget tells us that the manner in which the Commission operates is one of high efficiency and that at no time has there ever been any difficulty or question over the relatively meager funds which you, as the Congress, grant this agency.

The Congress set forth in title 1, section 2 of the Reorganization Act of December 20, 1945, Public Law No. 263, the purposes which reorganization plans must meet to merit your approval.

They are:

1. To facilitate orderly transition from war to peace.

2. To reduce expenditures and promote economy.

3. To increase efficiency of operation to the fullest extent practicable within the revenues.

4. To group, consolidate, and coordinate agencies and functions according to major purposes.

5. To reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions.

6. To eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

I submit that not one single intent of the six set forth by the Congress as the reasons for wiping out this small and inoffensive independent office has been met by this order abolishing the United States Employees Compensation Commission. The Commission admittedly is efficient. To abolish it does not promote efficiency or effect savings. As a matter of fact, the Bureau of the Budget tells us the Commission, as a part of the public-welfare agency, is going to have more money to spend, as is the entire public-welfare enterprise which is being planned as

big business. So economy seems to be no part of the purpose of throwing the Commission into an agency which includes relief for the needy, the aged, the widows and orphans, and indigent or financially incompetent portions of the population.

No overlapping or duplication of effort is eliminated by this order, so far as this Commission is concerned, because there is no other agency performing any like or related function.

Thus, the entire outline, as set forth by the Congress as the purpose of reorganization, so far as the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is concerned, either has been ignored or lost sight of. Reorganization Plan No. 2 has missed the mark which Congress so clearly defined as the pattern for reorganization.

This plan has come to you, along with two others, at a time when much confusion prevails over the entire world. You, as busy lawmakers, will hardly have time to breathe deeply, yet you are confronted with a set of reorganization orders, each far reaching, though not as vast as some others you are going to receive. These are merely trial-balloon plans. The Congress undoubtedly would greatly prefer to have time to study these orders when there is far less of international and national importance than there is today. Though you nominally had only 60 days in which to decide yes or no on these orders, the relative time you actually will have had to consider the reorganization plans might be said to be reduced to a few days or a few hours because of the pressure of much other business.

In Public Law No. 263, the Reorganization Act, you said, in section 5, among other things, that "no reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—

"(5) Authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress * * *."

Since the Congress intends that all acts and proposals of the executive branch be entirely lawful, I am suggesting particularly to those of you who are of legal bent to consider the fact that when the Bureau of the Budget says it wants your approval of an order which permits the Federal Security Administrator to set up a board of appeals for compensation cases, that here is a wide open violation of the Reorganization Act which says, as I have just quoted, that no agency may exercise any function which is not "expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to Congress."

At the time this plan was composed, there was no board of appeals in the United States Compensation Commission. Nor is there any such board today. If this reorganization plan is approved, the Congress in substance will be saying in the law that an agency may not perform a certain operation. And at the same time, it seems to me, it will be saying that it is quite all right to violate the law.

Though the Congress did not specifically forbid creation of agencies which, according to your definition in the Reorganization Act, also includes boards, it did forbid exercise of "any function" which was not being performed at the time these orders were submitted to you. The board of appeals, which this reorganization plan announces, is an agency function and as such is forbidden under Public Law No. 263.

Now, your committee may want to consider section 5 (a) (6) of the Reorganization Act, Public Law 263, which reads as follows:

"No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—

"Imposing, in connection with the exercise of any quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative function possessed by an independent agency, any greater limitation upon the exercise of independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the carrying out of such function, than existed with respect to the exercise of such function by the agency in which it was vested prior to the taking effect of such reorganization; except that this prohibition shall not prevent the abolition of any such function."

There is not today any board of appeals in the Compensation Commission. But the creation of an administrative board of appeals with authority to make final decision on appeals in respect to Federal employees' claims, I believe this committee will agree, does violate section 5 (a) (6) of the Reorganization Act.

Under the plan as submitted, the independent judgment and discretion of the three-member bipartisan Commission is abolished in favor of a board of limited power and discretion which would be subject to partisan control of the appointing power whose decisions in theory it is supposed to review. Such board would have no authority to determine policies or questions of law, for that power which under the statute now vests in the Commission would be transferred to the Federal Security Administrator.

You now will witness the final anomaly of the Federal Security Administrator appointing a subordinate board of appeals to review decisions made in his name. The board of appeals thus will be reviewing the acts of the head of the agency. Is this the kind of administrative confusion and contradiction the Congress invited? The head of the agency would be big enough to decide cases and even appoint a board of appeals, but not big enough to avoid being overridden by his own creature, his own board of appeals. Where else in all this vast Government has there ever even been proposed such a piece of hokus-pokus as this?

While we are trying to be fair in weighing these reorganization plans, we also must be alert to amateur lawmaking, which is thus being permitted in the executive branch of Government. This plan No. 2 is an excellent example of what happens when we try to wear the left shoe on the right foot.

If you will refer to a copy of House Document No. 595, which is the message on Reorganization Plan No. 2, you will find at the outset a great deal of flag-waving and "corny" truisms which, for some unannounced reason, were omitted from plans Nos. 1 and 3. We are told, for illustration, that "the fundamental strength of a nation lies within its people." That is the opening sentence the Bureau of the Budget set before the President for his signature. All the platitudes of all the ages appear to have been scraped together for use in gaining assent to this reorganization plan. Another quote is "the most basic and at the same time the most difficult task of any country is the conservation and development of its human resources." That is the kind of statement nobody cares to dispute. Having gotten agreement and seeming confidence on those and other trite observations, the recitation moves along into this type announcement:

"By abolishing the Commission, the plan eliminates a small agency and lightens the burden on the President."

There will never be an agency of Government which has done a better job than the United States Employees' Compensation Commission to lighten that famous burden on the President. This Commission is never heard from except when time comes to submit its annual report. It never gets in anybody's hair. It doesn't specialize in hiring any persons of questionable American-like leanings. It tends to its assigned business and keeps too well occupied to mix in with anything in which it is not concerned.

But it is often true, even in the case of an individual, that those who work the hardest and with a minimum of noise reap the reward of failure to politic in the right places with the right persons.

As a matter of fact, I believe this committee will find if it will call for the White House calling lists as far back as 1916 when this Commission was created that there have been only six times when any members of this Commission ever called to see the President or were invited except at social functions. So, it can hardly be said that this Commission has soaked up any of the official time of the President whose burden the Bureau of the Budget has decided it has to lighten.

The Bureau says too many persons see the President or, as officials, have to see him and that so much of his time is absorbed by such visits. Any governmental agency whose head or heads have talked to the President no more frequently than once every 5 years can hardly be said to constitute a "burden on the President," which so far as this Commission is concerned is nonexistent.

The Bureau of the Budget, over the signature of the President, tells you that "the Federal Security Administrator as the head of the Federal agency with the greatest experience in insurance is in the best position to guide and further the program of the Commission." The Bureau of the Budget, the fiscal control agency for the entire Federal Government, herewith betrays an amazing, even an alarming, ignorance of the functions of the respective agencies. The reason is simply that the United States Employees Compensation Commission is not engaged in administration of an insurance program.

The Commission is engaged in the exercise of quasi-judicial functions and administration of specialized statutory functions wholly unrelated to any functions of the Security Agency and the experience of that Agency in the same field does not qualify it to guide or further the functions of the Commission.

When I say this, Mr. Chairman, I am speaking as one who is asking that there be no destructive devices permitted to be applied to the act of Congress which relates to Government employees—the Compensation Act. The beneficiaries of that act are entirely satisfied with the manner in which your law is being applied to the facts in each compensation case. You have not heard any complaints from any of them.

In this connection, I recall what has been happening in the Social Security Board which has applied predatory and bureaucratic cannibalistic techniques toward the civil service retirement system. In the retirement system are assets of several billion dollars built up with the deductions from employees' earnings in the Federal Government. The Social Security Board has been making frantic efforts to grab control of the civil service retirement fund which is entirely sound financially and which is being administered to the entire satisfaction of the Government employees for whom it was created.

Because I believe that much of this Reorganization Plan No. 2, so far as it relates to Government-employee benefits is concerned, was written in the Social Security Board, it is not too early to express concern at what will happen to the retirement fund if you fail to disapprove this latest maneuvering in plan No. 2.

Two months ago, the Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor presented its case before the House Ways and Means Committee for retention of the civil service retirement system, entirely separate from a marginal or submarginal welfare insurance system, charity, or dole as operated by the Social Security Board.

I believe the council sufficiently impressed that committee with the deep earnestness of its plea that, as you can note from the printed proceedings, one member of that committee after another gave clear assurance that the assets of that fund would not be allowed to get into the hands of the Social Security Board. In fact, Representative FORAND, of Rhode Island, at the conclusion

of the hearings outlined the composite view of the committee giving full assurance that confiscation of the retirement system would not be permitted. On that note we rested our case.

But now we seem to find the Social Security Board making an end-run to ram its program through in reverse and by taking charge of the compensation machinery set up for Federal employees in the sweet name of reorganization. An inoffensive Commission tending to its own affairs, efficiently and economically, is marked for obliteration because the Social Security Board and the Bureau of the Budget say it is engaged in administering an "insurance program."

I have information that before long you will receive further reorganization orders "streamlining" the Federal public power projects into the Interior Department. And that one of these orders if adopted eventually will be the knock-out blow to all public hydropower activities, not only of the Federal Government but also of power project authorities within States. Further, that the St. Lawrence waterways would literally go down the drain as something to be forgotten for all time to come, all as the result of a seemingly innocuous reorganization order designed only to "streamline" power projects.

And while the Federal employee directly is not concerned with power policies, he is interested in what is causing the reorganization orders which affect him directly, such as the one to abolish the Civil Service Commission, in line with the Brownlow-Gulick-Merriam reorganization outline which the Congress rejected in 1938.

And though you did disapprove the Brownlow plan at that time, much of it is coming back to the surface. In 1938, the reorganizers partitioned the Department of Labor by saying they had decided what the "rights" of labor were and what were its needs. When the reorganizers of that day got through, it was found that the rights of labor were so few that the Department of Labor was almost entirely stripped of everything except the Women's Bureau and the Children's Bureau..

It was decided that labor had no "right" to a job but that labor had a "need" for a job. So labor's "need" for a job was shifted to Social Security Board along with the old-age and survivors insurance and other such enterprises. The same theme appears to have obtained during the recent war when it was decided to give the Federal Security Administrator the added job to control manpower, so Mr. McNutt was both Chairman of the Manpower Commission and Administrator of the Federal Security agency.

If you ask the Bureau of the Budget why interested parties were completely ignored when it accepted and approved these reorganization orders for the President's signature, you are told that the President ordered the Bureau to refuse to discuss the matter. The Bureau says this is on the grounds that anyone who wants to present its side of the story so as not to take up the time of busy lawmakers is of a "special interest group" and therefore must not be tolerated.

Some of the very flaws I am pointing out now might have been avoided if the Bureau of the Budget had not wanted to be secretive and to practice that passion for anonymity. Reorganizers make mistakes. They are not the supermen, except they do not admit it. In a reorganization order of several years ago, Mr. McNutt was referred to as the Governor General of the Philippines though he actually was High Commissioner, so reorganizers have no supernatural or occult powers.

Creation of a super Department of Public Welfare can become a fine opening for any Cabinet officer who is assigned to head up such Department. It could be that some large insurance company might want the services of just such a man after he is built up to Cabinet stature. Any suggestion of building up a job as a potential stepping stone to a better paying job can hardly be endorsed by the Government employee when agencies designed for his benefit are scraped together to help supply the justification for such Cabinet post.

The Bureau of the Budget says in the reorganization order that abolition of a statutory bipartisan commission and substitution of an administrative board of appeals with a single official in charge of operations has proved satisfactory to claimants in many similar programs, and that:

It is essentially the plan * * * employed by many States in their workmen's compensation programs.

The statement regarding the practice of the States in workmen's compensation administration is definitely contrary to the facts. Nor can the Bureau of the Budget plead that it did not know any better. The facts are and were definitely known to that Bureau. In 36 of the 47 States workmen's compensation laws are administered by independent commissions. Only eight States have departmentalized administration and in three States administration is by the courts.

In no instance is this specialized administrative and quasi-judicial function administered by an agency comparable to the Federal Security Agency.

The plan for substituting a single administrator for a bipartisan board destroys the important advantage of continuity of policies and decisions and would make possible partisan control of workmen's compensation administration.

Repeatedly, the International Association of Industrial Accident Boards and Commissions have emphasized the importance of commission form of administration of this function. The American Federation of Labor, employees' organizations in general, and insurance associations affected by the Federal workmen's compensation laws likewise have advocated this form of administration and retention of the independent bipartisan commission

I believe your committee may want to ask the Bureau of the Budget if, at any time, it or any other agency ever made first-hand and consultative investigation of the operations of the Compensation Commission to determine what practical advantages might be expected from this change of administration. Or did it do the whole job of arriving at its conclusions in this case as a paper project? Also the committee may want to inquire whether any person or "special-interest group" in Federal Security Agency were heard on the general theme of reorganization. Certainly the Estimates Division of the Bureau will tell you that the Commission repeatedly has been complimented upon its economy of operations. Unless the Bureau can demonstrate that some one or more points in Congress' design for reorganization can be met under this order, I ask this committee to support the resolution of disapproval—the House concurrent resolution—offered by Mr. Pittenger.

In this Reorganization Order No. 2 there is language which gives the Federal Security Administrator authority to perform the present functions of the Commission "in such manner and under such rules and regulations" as he may prescribe. Such blanket authority places no limitation upon his powers and obviously leaves to his discretion any changes in administration as he may decide upon.

This is as brash an example of administrative lawmaking as I have ever read. It comes at a time when some had reason to believe that the function of lawmaking was going to be returned entirely to the legislative branch. To approve such language in a reorganization order is going to open the Congress wide, through precedent, to worse examples of ceding of legislative prerogatives to subsequent reorganization orders.

Now while, as stated, the Federal Security Administrator would be creating a board which, in turn, would review his actions, since compensation matters would be handled in his name, there is still another interesting aspect. The plan would, in effect, vest in one individual the right to determine with finality of decision any question arising under the Federal employee compensation law without review of such determination by any other official or by any court of the United States. The Board of Appeals provided for under this plan is a creation of the agency Administrator and serves at his pleasure. Consequently, such board lacks all of the semblance of autonomy essential for the exercise of free and independent judgment. And by its origin, it likewise is susceptible to partisan control and personal politics.

May I summarize the reasons I am here asking that a flat-footed rejection be given Reorganization Plan No. 2 until its purposes can be made to conform to the outline as set down in the Reorganization Act. The reasons are:

1. The law is not being complied with. It is proposed to establish administratively functions which did not exist when this plan was submitted.

2. Certain statements in this plan are at variance with the facts, which could have been obtained without difficulty.

3. Administration of the compensation law does not belong in a public-welfare agency. Compensation is for injury on the job and is not what is commonly referred as "rocking chair" money, as I have heard Members of the House apply the term to some forms of social security.

4. Abolition of this Commission or any other of similar size will not lighten the Presidential burden in the slightest degree. This Commission has never been a burden upon the President.

5. A board of appeals of limited authority and discretion can be subject to partisan control of the appointing power. If the agency head comes to dislike the manner in which his board of appeals functions, he can fire all members.

6. The manner in which the present Commission is functioning is entirely acceptable to its clientele, the employees of the United States Government.

7. No persons, or their representatives affected by operation of the compensation law have been permitted the slightest opportunity to offer any constructive proposals which might have made this reorganization order conform to law.

8. Abolition of the Employees Compensation Commission would be the first step toward abolishing the civil-service retirement system which was established and perfected laboriously so many years.

9. The ends of economy and efficiency are not served by this order of abolition.

I ask you in the name of the Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor, largest grouping of Federal personnel who believe that the American Government is still the best ever devised by man, that your committee report out the House concurrent resolution.

The Compensation Commission exercises only one function, namely, the quasi-judicial function of deciding workmen's compensation claims. The Commission administers compensation laws in two relatively broad classes: 1. Where compensation is paid directly by the United States, as in the case of Federal employees. 2. Where compensation is claimed by employees against their private employers or insurance carriers.

The processes are somewhat similar. In the first example, the Commission functions largely as a judicial body: Claims are filed within a certain time, notices thereof are given and answers thereto filed by employers. There are intermediate details with which

I will not burden you. In the case of Federal employees' cases, the process involves determination of the facts by the Commission, upon evidence, and the fixing of substantive rights of claiming individuals which involves receiving, weighing, and resolving the evidence.

A workmen's compensation law is the substantive right of an employee against his employer for the employer's liability or common law action. The right to compensation, therefore, is a substantial fundamental right and the processes for determining the rights are in their very essence quasi-judicial. In *Crowell* v. *Benson* (285 U. S. at p. 75), Mr. Justice Brandeis spoke of review of the "quasi-judicial decisions" of the Federal tribunals such as exist under the Commission (under the Longshoremen's Act) and he referred to the power entrusted to the Commission "to make initial determinations in matters within, and not outside, ordinary judicial purview." Similarly in *Paramino Lumber Company* v. *Marshall* (18 F. Supp. 645) the Court said that the deputy commissioner of the Commission "is a quasi-judicial officer having certain recognized jurisdictional and discretionary powers."

As I read your Reorganization Act, I am convinced that you intended to preserve the quasi-judicial functions of agencies discharging the laws you passed.

The Reorganization Plan No. 2 would abolish this statutory quasi-judicial independent commission, diffusing its functions into the Federal Security Agency, not as a separate workmen's compensation commission or board, but passing the functions to the Federal Security Agency to be performed "in such manner" as that agency shall prescribe.

The most serious objection to abolition of the Commission appears to rest on a constitutional ground. The Reorganization Act is not a law requiring administration which sets up standards for the President to apply. It contains a clear delegation to the President of legislative authority of the kind which the lawyers tell me is unconstitutional (Cf. *Schechter Poultry Corp.* v. *United States*, 295 U. S. 495). The Compensation Commission was created by statute. I am told it can only be abolished by specific statute, that is by Congress which created it. It apparently is beyond the power to surrender to the executive authority to abolish any agency created by Congress. Yet, the reorganization plan says the Commission is "hereby abolished."

Under previous reorganization plans it had been clearly understood by Congress that the power to abolish necessarily lay with Congress and could not be delegated. Reference to this can be found readily in House Report No. 1126, dated April 25, 1932, accompanying H. R. 11597, in which the statement appears on page 11:

"The power to abolish agencies of the Government created by statute cannot be delegated under the Constitution."

Significantly enough in the Reorganization bill of 1937 (S. 2700, 75th Cong.) it was provided that the President could not abolish any independent establishment.

Reorganization Plan No. 2 requires a board of three to be appointed to "make final decision on appeals from determinations and awards" in Government employees' workmen's compensation claims. I find no place in the act which purportedly authorized such creation by anyone outside Congress. The only authority I find empowering the President to create functionaries is that in section 4 (2) of the Reorganization Act of 1945, which permits appointment of "the head and one or more assistant heads of any agency." The appeals board in section 3 of plan No. 2 is not designated the head of any agency. The only "head" of an agency referred to is the Federal Security Administrator.

Mr. Chairman, on March 5, 1946, I appeared before the Ways and Means Committee to present a brief on retention of the civil service retirement system under its present auspices and separate and apart from social security and public welfare in general. The members of that committee were astounded to learn that anybody had designs on the retirement system. After nearly 90 minutes of presentation and colloquy, here is how Representative FORAND, in the presence of fellow committeemen, summed up the situation in speaking to another witness:

"Now I want to ask you, you have heard the remarks of several members of the committee here a few moments ago while Mr. Riley was on the stand. You have heard several of the members give assurance of the fact that in no way is it the intent of this committee to tamper with existing benefits under the civil service, and I want to add my voice to those voices that you have already heard, and I think all of you can rest assured that we in no way intend to jeopardize any of the benefits that are yours now."

Chairman DOUGHTON made this statement in support of Mr. FORAND:

"The chairman would like to join with what the distinguished gentleman, Mr. FORAND, has said, that it is the purpose of this committee to protect the Federal employee under the civil-service system."

Mr. Chairman, this abolition of the Compensation Commission is the first step toward doing what we have assurances from your own Ways and Means Committee will not be allowed. I have knowledge of the fact that without great delay, as soon as you permit this Commission to be wiped out, that the professional relief bloc will proceed to move in on the civil service retirement system and you soon will be handed a bill to remove exemption of Railroad Retirement Board from this act.

One more point, Mr. Chairman, your committee has been diligent in asking for some representation of savings in reorganization. You have been given no promises. I personally have been told that the greatest budgets for public relief or welfare are in the offing as soon as you put your stamp of approval on plan No. 2. You may have sensed this by reading all the buttery language at the outset.

But if you really want a story of economy which you will remember a long time, here it is. Administrative costs in the Compensation Commission today, despite several salary adjustments, are far less than they were when the agency started business. Today the cost is only 6.4 percent. I ask if you know of any agency in any government—State, Federal, or city—which can match that figure. I am submitting a table of administrative percentage costs for all years since 1917, when the cost was 22 percent:

Percentage cost of administration

Year:	
1945	6.4
1944	6.3
1943	6.1
1942	5.9
1941	4.8
1940	5.5
1939	5.6
1938	5.5
1937	5.5
1936	4.3
1935	4.0
1934	4.3
1933	4.0
1932	4.7
1931	5.0
1930	4.9
1929	5.3
1928	4.3
1927	5.5
1926	5.7
1925	5.5
1924	6.3
1923	5.7
1922	5.9
Year—Continued	
1921	6.6
1920	6.7
1919	9.3
1918	11.0
1917	22.0

I thank the committee for its attention.

American Testimony for General Mihailovich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, in Belgrade, the former Yugoslav Minister of War, Gen. Draja Mihailovich, has just been put on trial for treason. His chief accuser, the dictator of Yugoslavia, Marshal Josip Broz, alias Tito, was an honored guest of Moscow when, in 1941, General Mihailovich led the Yugoslav Army against the German invaders of his country. At that time Moscow was an ally of the Nazi German Government.

These are facts available in any American newspaper file. They can even be found in the Communist Daily Worker.

The manner in which, for 4 years, General Mihailovich conducted operations against the German armies is known to a number of Americans who were officially sent to Yugoslavia as members of our armed forces to aid the Yugoslavs and to observe the progress of Yugoslav resistance against the Nazis. These Americans have no interest to serve except that of justice, and their offer, supported by a request from our own State Department that they be permitted to testify to facts within their own knowledge as to General Mihailovich's guerrilla operations, was made according to American concepts of the right of any man accused to present witnesses in his behalf.

Most Americans have been shocked and outraged by the arrogant refusal of Marshal Tito's puppet government to permit these American witnesses to testify at the trial. Such exclusion of proper evidence violates every basic tenet of our common law and our idea of justice. It is, however, exactly according to the Soviet code of punishment described recently by Soviet Minister Andrei Vishinsky in an address which scandalized the French Bar Association in Paris.

Although American testimony will not be heard by General Mihailovich in his trial at Belgrade, this testimony has been made of record under oath. A voluntary commission, consisting of Mr. Arthur Garfield Hays (chairman), former New York Gov. Charles Poletti, former Assistant Secretary of State Adolph Berle, Jr., and Mr. Theodore Kiendl, held hearings at New York City on the 13th, 15th, 16th, 17th, and 18th of May of this year. The witnesses were sworn and the proceedings were taken by a certified shorthand reporter.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of justice and of the American tradition of a fair hearing, I ask leave to insert into the RECORD the chief portion of this sworn testimony, in order to assure that history at least will be able to render a just verdict between his accusers and Draja Mihailovich.

REPORT OF COMMISSION OF INQUIRY, COMMITTEE FOR A FAIR TRIAL FOR DRAJA MIHAILOVICH—IN THE MATTER OF DEPOSITIONS OF AMERICAN AND ALLIED MILITARY PERSONNEL

The undersigned members of the commission of inquiry in this matter submit the following report:

Preliminarily, and to avoid any possibility of misunderstanding, we emphasize the fact that * * * our assignment did not contemplate the formulation or expression of any views regarding any question of internal politics in Yugoslavia. We are convinced, however, for reasons hereinafter assigned, that the testimony given before us is material on the question of the guilt or innocence of General Mihailovich as a war criminal, and that under standards of justice which have been recognized by civilized nations throughout the years, the exclusion of such testimony from the trial of the charges against General Mihailovich would be so highly prejudicial as to prevent the possibility of his obtaining a fair trial. Further than that we do not go.

The commission opened its public hearings at the New York County Lawyers Association on May 13, 1946. Those hearings continued on May 13, 15, 16, 17, and 18, 1946. The proceedings were reported, and the witnesses were duly sworn, by Clarence Bonynge, Esq., a duly qualified Notary Public of the State of New York, a certified shorthand reporter of the State of New York, and a member of the New York bar. A copy of the transcript of the proceedings is annexed to this report.

I. GENERAL BACKGROUND

On April 6, 1941, the German Government attacked Yugoslavia. At that time Draja Mihailovich, the subject of this inquiry, was serving as a colonel in the Yugoslav Army.

On April 13, 1941, the Germans captured Belgrade. Shortly thereafter they occupied the rest of Yugoslavia; and on April 18, 1941, the Yugoslav Army officially surrendered. The Yugoslav Government joined other governments-in-exile in London.

Colonel Mihailovich did not surrender but immediately went into the mountains to organize and continue resistance to the enemy occupying forces. He was promoted to general and was appointed Minister of War by the Yugoslav Government. In that capacity he served as commander of the field forces of a government recognized as an ally by the United States in the late war.

On March 24, 1946, the present Yugoslav Government, headed by Marshal Tito, announced that General Mihailovich had been captured on March 13, and would shortly be brought to trial on charges of treason, collaboration with the Germans, and surrendering Allied personnel to the Germans. Such charges against General Mihailovich are of particularly grave concern to the United States for the reason that during the period of his alleged collaboration, General Mihailovich was not only regarded as an ally by the United States but was being advised by American military personnel operating under authority of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

On March 30, 1946, the United States Government addressed a note to the Yugoslav Government, stating that General Mihailovich "without adequate supplies and fighting under the greatest hardships contributed with his forces materially to the Allied cause," and that members of the American armed forces who had served in Yugoslavia during the war desired to testify at his trial. The United States inquired whether their testimony would be received.

On April 5, 1946, the Yugoslav Government answered that note, stating in substance that it was solely within the province of the military court as to what witnesses would be summoned, and adding:

"The crimes of the traitor Draja Mihailovich against the people of Yugoslavia are far too big and horrible that it could be or should allow to be discussed whether he is guilty or is not."

On April 22, 1946, the Minister of the Interior of the present Yugoslav Government stated:

"* * * it is expected that Draja Mihailovich will be charged with collaboration with the occupiers, assisting the Axis Powers in the struggle against the United Nations, as well as with concrete crimes against our people, such as murder, arson, plundering, and the handing over to the Germans of members of our National Liberation Army and Allied airmen."

The undersigned commission of inquiry was thereupon selected to take testimony of American military personnel, present within the United States, who might have knowledge of the matters charged, with a view to presenting their testimony to the Yugoslav Government and to the Yugoslav court. It proceeded to do so, upon the dates and at the place specified. The hearings of the commission were public. All persons having knowledge of matters material to the inquiry were invited to testify. The Yugoslav Government was invited to be represented and to participate in the proceedings.

Upon the evidence taken, the commission unanimously finds as follows:

II. WITNESSES EXAMINED

All of the witnesses who appeared before the commission were American citizens. With two exceptions they were members of the United States armed forces who had been in Yugoslavia during the late war. Those witnesses fell into three categories:

1. Members of American missions officially attached to General Mihailovich.

2. Members of American missions officially attached to Marshal Tito.

3. American airmen forced down by enemy action in Yugoslavia.

There was no conflict in the testimony of these three classes of witnesses.

* * * * *

IV. ALLEGED COLLABORATION WITH THE ENEMY

All classes of witnesses were constantly on the look-out for collaboration, had full opportunity to discover it, and would be expected to have discovered it if it had existed.

* * * * *

With respect to opportunities for observation, all the witnesses testified that in Mihailovich's territory they were allowed to go freely, and without escort, wherever they wanted, to talk without restriction to civilians and soldiers alike, and to make whatever observations they wished. * * *

There is substantial evidence to show that charges of collaboration were current at Tito's headquarters. * * *

One American officer testified that he saw an American bomber forced down by German action. Eight members of the crew (three of them badly wounded) parachuted into Chetnik territory. Shortly afterwards, the Partisans attacked the Chetniks and forced them to retreat, taking with them the five unwounded American airmen. The Partisans reported to the American officer that the Chetniks were seen taking the Americans to the nearest German garrison. Upon later investigation, he discovered that all five had been safely evacuated from Chetnik territory. The three wounded Americans, whom the Chetniks had been forced to leave behind, were tended by a Chetnik doctor who came back secretly at night through Partisan lines to administer to their needs.

Another American officer saw in operation at Tito's headquarters a photographic laboratory at which a fake photograph, purporting to show fraternization between Chetniks and Germans, had been manufactured and was shown to him.

* * * * *

In September 1944 an American officer was serving with the commander of a corps of Chetniks under General Mihailovich's command. The American officer, with the approval of the Chetnik corps commander, attempted to negotiate the surrender of a German garrison. At the same time he attempted to negotiate with the local Partisan commander for a truce and for a combination of his forces with the Chetniks for a joint attack against the Germans. The Partisan commander rejected the offer. The Chetniks, after beating off Partisan attacks, then proceeded to assault and capture the town and take the German garrison prisoner. They then delivered the town to the Russians, who were advancing in the vicinity. A few hours later, the American officer was imprisoned by the Russians in the same jail with some of his late German opponents and the Russians then proceeded to disarm and imprison the Chetniks who had taken the town. According to the Belgrade newspapers, the Chetnik corps commander has since been executed after "confessing" that he was guilty of collaboration.

V. OPERATIONS AGAINST THE ENEMY

The evidence of American officers before the commission indicated not merely the absence of collaboration between General Mihailovich and the Axis Powers, but also established that General Mihailovich and his men continued to conduct hostile operations against both the Germans and the Italians, even after the Allies had stopped sending him supplies and had concentrated their support in favor of Marshal Tito, and even after the date of the Italian surrender.

* * * * *

(i) On at least two occasions, when American officers were present, German forces made direct attacks on General Mihailovich's headquarters, and were driven off, with casualties, by detachments led by General Mihailovich in person.

(ii) On several occasions, American officers participated with Mihailovich troops in attacks on German and Italian garrisons.

(iii) On other occasions, General Mihailovich directed and his troops carried out, the destruction of specific military targets recommended by United States or British officers attached to his headquarters. On one such occasion, an operation jointly planned by General Mihailovich and the American officer on the spot was countermanded by radio from Cairo, on the ground that the Allies were switching their support to Marshal Tito and for reasons of policy did not wish Mihailovich troops to carry the operation out.

* * * * *

(v) In various instances witnessed by American officers Mihailovich troops engaged in battle against the Germans were compelled to break off combat with the enemy to defend themselves against attacks on their flanks or rear by Partisans.

Members of the American missions stationed with General Mihailovich were given free access to operational reports and orders, both incoming and outgoing, and participated freely in conferences with the general and his staff. Their testimony tends to establish that not only General Mihailovich but all personnel under his command, as well as the civilians in his area, entertained feelings of bitter hostility against the Germans, and that they were prevented or deterred from carrying out more extensive operations than

they did by the following factors, among others:

1. Inadequacy of supplies and equipment.
2. Reprisals conducted by the Germans.
3. Attacks by Partisans.

* * * * *

The testimony indicates that General Mihailovich's forces had little or no equipment, their weapons consisting chiefly of rifles and other small arms of various calibers, with very inadequate supplies of ammunition. A small amount of supplies, consisting largely of German equipment captured in North Africa, was dropped in by planes of the Royal Air Force (British) at various dates prior to October 1943; but the supplies thus sent in were totally inadequate to equip or maintain any sizable force or to enable General Mihailovich to conduct extensive operations. From October 1943 onward, even those supplies ceased to be delivered, apparently because of a switch of Allied policy in favor of Marshal Tito. The policy of the German forces appears to have been to conduct savage reprisals against civilians whenever hostile actions were carried out by the Chetniks. The destruction of a section of railway line, which could easily be repaired, would be followed by the burning of an entire village in the neighborhood and the execution of a number of local peasantry.

Under such circumstances, and in view of the inadequacy of his equipment, General Mihailovich stated to members of the American mission that it was his policy to conserve his forces, to conduct only operations which promised substantial military benefits, and to call for general mobilization and all-out effort only in conjunction with a major Allied offensive. It appears that the intent and effect of his operations was to pin down substantial numbers of Axis troops who might otherwise have been employed elsewhere against the Allies. It does not appear that either he or members of the American or British missions were ever informed of Allied plans in such a way as to enable him to use his forces to the best advantage.

Notwithstanding the difficulties outlined above, at the time of the Allied landings in Italy, General Mihailovich gave orders for a step-up in operations, which resulted in the capture of substantial Axis forces and other results. Approximately a year later, in September 1944, he directed a general mobilization and announced to American officers at his headquarters that he would endeavor to take Belgrade, at that time strongly held by the Germans. His plans for a general offensive at that time were frustrated by a large-scale Partisan attack upon his headquarters, which compelled him to retreat.

After September 1943, apparently because of a change in Allied policy, the British Broadcasting Co., whose broadcasts into Yugoslavia were the principal source of information from the outside world, appears to have adopted the policy of crediting all resistance activities to Marshal Tito and the Partisans, without mention of General Mihailovich or the Chetniks. American officers testified to several instances where they had participated with Chetnik troops in operations against the Germans or in the capture of German garrisons, only to hear the particular operation shortly afterward announced by the BBC as having been carried out by Partisan troops under Marshal Tito.

The German occupying authorities distributed indiscriminately offers of reward for the delivery, dead or alive, of either General Mihailovich or Marshal Tito. The amount offered (100,000 gold reichsmarks) was the same in both cases. In some of the posters General Mihailovich was described by the Germans as a "British agent" and Marshal Tito as a "Russian agent."

* * * * *

VII. RESCUE OF ALLIED AIRMEN

Evidence of American personnel before the Commission tended to disprove completely the charge that General Mihailovich or his forces surrendered Allied airmen to the Germans. On the contrary, that evidence establishes beyond any reasonable doubt that General Mihailovich and his people (both soldiers and civilians) made every effort to rescue, protect, and return to Allied territory Allied airmen of all nationalities forced down in areas under their control, and that those efforts were successful.

The testimony indicates that upward of 500 Allied airmen were thus rescued and repatriated. The overwhelming majority of those airmen were Americans; but other Allied personnel, including British, French, and Russians, were similarly treated. All of the numerous witnesses interrogated on this issue, including officers of the air-crew rescue mission and a number of the airmen themselves, were unanimous and emphatic in stating that they had never known or heard of a case where an Allied airman failed to receive the best possible treatment from the Chetniks, or where any such airman was ever turned over or abandoned to the enemy. All of them were loud in their praises of the cooperation and assistance which they received. An officer on duty at headquarters of the Fifteenth United States Air Force in Italy testified, on the basis of his official records and investigations, that there had been no known case where Allied personnel had been surrendered by the Chetniks to the enemy.

In one instance, personally investigated by an American officer attached to Marshal Tito's headquarters, a false charge that Allied airmen had been surrendered to the Germans was shown to have emanated from Partisan troops. In another instance, personally investigated by another American officer likewise attached to Marshal Tito's headquarters, Partisan troops produced a badly beaten Chetnik prisoner whom they accused of having murdered an American airman. The prisoner denied the charge, and it was later ascertained that the airman in question had been safely evacuated by Chetnik help.

Where the rescue of Allied airmen was concerned, General Mihailovich and his forces appear to have spared no efforts and did not hesitate to engage in hostilities with the Germans or to incur reprisals.

* * * * *

The German authorities had outstanding offers of a substantial reward for the surrender of any Allied airmen, but there appears to have been no instance where such offers had any effect.

The note from the Yugoslav Government to the United States State Department of April 5, 1946, states in part:

"The Government of the FPRY admit and believe that Draja Mihailovich assumed the appearance as though he had a loyal attitude toward America, and that a number of American airmen forced to land on territory under his control were saved. But could he do elsewise—the more because he expected assistance in food and weapons for this favor?"

The implication in the second sentence above quoted appears contrary to the evidence. The evidence in fact indicates that the great majority of Allied airmen involved were rescued and repatriated after October 1943, when Allied support had been switched to the Partisans and all supplies to General Mihailovich had been cut off. One American officer, in charge of the air-crew rescue mission, testified that he himself told General Mihailovich that in return for the rescue of Allied airmen he could expect no further Allied assistance or supplies. Efforts by the Chetniks to rescue Allied airmen appear to have continued unimpaired, notwithstanding that announcement and the cutting off of Allied supplies.

For the purpose of evacuating American airmen, General Mihailovich directed the construction of an air strip in a field near Pranjani, and disposed a substantial part of his meager forces around it, to protect the field from German attack and to safeguard Allied airmen collected there to await evacuation. The field was operated with substantial success, and a large number of American planes flew in, landed, and evacuated Allied personnel.

The circumstances under which this field was abandoned are perhaps worth noting. The American transport planes which came into the field to evacuate American airmen from Chetnik territory arrived empty, or carrying only a small amount of supplies specifically earmarked for the immediate needs of the American airmen to be evacuated. Before landing at the Chetnik airfield, however, those planes, pursuant to instructions, had circled over Partisan territory and had dropped to the Partisans loads of supplies, weapons, and ammunition. In September 1944, with the aid of those American supplies, the Partisans attacked the airfield, and the American rescue mission, together with General Mihailovich and his troops, were compelled to withdraw. * * *

There is also evidence that the Chetniks, when unable through lack of facilities to evacuate American airmen direct from their own territory, arranged for such airmen to be passed through the lines to Partisan territory from which they could be evacuated, the evacuation in such cases being credited to the Partisans.

Several of the rescued airmen, as well as members of the American missions, had opportunities for extended interviews with General Mihailovich. In the course of those interviews, even after Allied support had been switched to Marshal Tito, General Mihailovich uniformly expressed, in strong terms, his admiration for the United States and his hopes for a postwar settlement based on the principles of the Atlantic Charter. The last American officer on duty at General Mihailovich's headquarters, at a time when all Allied recognition and supplies had been long cut off, offered General Mihailovich an opportunity for evacuation with him by air to Allied territory. The general refused, saying that he felt that it was his duty to stay with his country to the end.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION

In the opinion of this Commission the evidence of the American military personnel who testified before it is material and relevant, under commonly accepted standards of civilized justice, on the issue of the guilt or innocence of General Mihailovich. The witnesses who testified were in an excellent position to have known of collaboration, if any, and were under a duty to report it; but they testified to none. On the contrary, there is abundant testimony of facts inconsistent with the existence of collaboration. Substantially all of the witnesses who appeared before the Commission stated publicly under oath that they would be willing to go to Yugoslavia, if opportunity were given, to testify at any trial of General Mihailovich in the same way and to the same effect as they testified before the Commission. Since it appears that such an opportunity may not be afforded, the Commission recommends that a copy of this report and of the accompanying testimony and exhibits be delivered to the State Department, with a request that it be forwarded to the Yugoslav Government,

and that another copy be sent directly to the tribunal having charge of the case.

Respectfully submitted.

ARTHUR GARFIELD HAYS,
Chairman.
CHARLES POLETTI,
ADOLPH BERLE, JR.,
THEODORE KIENDLE,
Members of the Commission.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 24, 1946.*

Psychology and Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following series of observations and research studies released by the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues on the psychological problems of international security and accord:

PSYCHOLOGY AND ATOMIC ENERGY

Atomic energy has become a psychological problem. Our warmest hopes and deepest fears have been caught up in it.

Atomic energy is producing an international fear psychology. But such a fear is not necessarily bad, for human fear releases great psychological energies. When the source of fear is well understood and a constructive solution is seen, these energies serve as powerful supports of well-directed efforts to overcome the danger. But when the source is not well understood, and no clear solution is seen, these energies lead to a general, vague anxiety accompanied by panicky behavior, helplessness or despair.

Our fear of the atomic bomb does stem from a real and frightful danger. This danger comes from the fact that there is no military defense against the atomic bomb. This fact must always be kept clear and our first objective must be to mobilize a healthy, action-goading fear for effective measures against the real danger—war.

The other kind of fear, however—the intangible, unhealthy fear—threatens our achievement of this objective. Three factors are responsible for this:

1. The policy of secrecy renders us confused and ignorant. We are left with no clear idea of the bomb's terrible potentialities or whether a defense against the bomb is at all possible. We are not even certain whether its use can ever be controlled.

2. Military control of atomic energy creates the mental set which leads us to think of atomic energy only as an instrument for destruction and war.

3. The intense rivalries among the nations for access to atomic power suggests to us that the world is full of sovereign states preparing for aggression against each other.

From all this a crippling feeling of ignorance, impotence, and general insecurity may result.

In an individual vague fear soon leads to a sick individual. The fear spreads and influences all of his thinking. Then he either behaves in an immature and helpless manner or he becomes panicky and destructive.

If we as a nation become victims of such a fear, we may seek relief in escapist thinking. We will then try to find comfort in the pronouncements of dubious authorities that the bomb is not dangerous. We will indulge in wishful thinking that some defense against the bomb will be developed—despite what the scientists say. We will hope unrealistically that we can always keep the secret of its manufacture, or we will feel secure in the knowledge that we are accumulating more and more bombs. These immature and escapist reactions can only hinder the constructive solution of this problem at the very time when such solution is most needed and most possible.

Or, what is equally fatal, we may become frantic in our precautions against this unknown danger. We will then accept the suppression of freedom of speech, of research, and of criticism in our own country because we will have become spy conscious and secret conscious. And like the sick patient ridden by an ill-understood fear, we will see threats to our safety everywhere. We will support a national policy of universal conscription, militarism, and political isolation. This panicky and destructive thinking is just the mental preparation which sets the stage for international conflict and violence.

People in other countries will also be ridden by fear and confusion. They can have little confidence in our intentions when we continue to manufacture and stock-pile bombs against vague future contingencies. When our spokesmen declare the atomic bomb is safe in our hands other countries note that atomic energy is still controlled by the military arm of our Government, and remember, too, that it has been used as a weapon for warfare. They suffer, in short, the same anxieties that we would experience if some other great power were the sole owner of the atomic weapon.

We in America have a tremendous opportunity. Our position is unique in that we alone are actual producers of atomic energy and for the time being, therefore, we can have a unique influence. We can use this influence to reduce panicky fear and suspicion and to awaken all men to the real danger.

Toward that end the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues proposes the following six-point program:

1. The real danger of the atomic bomb—the possibility of another war—must be made clear to all of our people.

Everyone of us must be made aware and continuously kept aware of the overriding fact that there is no military defense against the horrors of the atomic bomb. The prevention of war must be the goal of all our actions.

2. Serious and intelligent action must be taken to advance international friendship.

Neither war nor peacefulness is inborn in man. Hatred of other peoples is learned and springs from a misunderstanding of their purposes and ways of life. So, too, is liking and trusting of other peoples learned. Every means possible must be used to establish contact and exchange of ideas and to develop friendly attitudes and mutual understanding with people of all nations and especially politically important groups in major nations.

3. International control of atomic energy must be established.

Suspicion and apprehension among nations can only disappear when all people share knowledge of and responsibility for atomic energy. International control as proposed by the State Department's Lilienthal-Acheson report must be undertaken as soon as possible. While such arrangements are being developed we must give positive assurance now that we will cooperate fully as soon as the international organization is set up.

4. We must stop making atomic bombs immediately.

If we are to remove a source of suspicion among other nations and a source of false security among our own people, we must immediately discontinue the manufacture of atomic armaments.

5. An effective civilian control of atomic energy must be instituted in our country at once.

Anxieties resulting from the fear of the military use of atomic energy and from ignorance about atomic energy can be reduced by civilian control. This control should be embodied in legislation designed to promote the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes; and should be rendered effective by a choice of civilian commissioners with imagination, courage, and a proven devotion to the public interests. A policy of maximum public candor rather than maximum secrecy should be established.

6. The possible benefits of atomic energy must be emphasized and developed.

The atmosphere of demoralizing fear which surrounds the phrase "atomic energy" can be reduced by presenting the facts in honest, unexaggerated peacetime terms. Electricity was once feared because only its destructive manifestation, lightning, was familiar. The boons to humanity which atomic energy promises must be emphasized and must become familiar. A free and vigorous program of research and engineering to turn this energy to the service of human welfare will help us think of atomic energy in other terms than as destructive lightning.

We must see the importance of our own psychology, our own ways of thinking, for preventing war and controlling the use of atomic energy. No cannon, no airplane, no atomic bomb can declare war. Only man can do that. The atomic bomb has not plunged the world into an area of the dark and fearful unknown—man's psychology is doing that. Just as atomic fission was accomplished by cooperative physical research, the fear which it created can and must be dispelled by cooperative social endeavor.

The statement, released by the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues through its Committee on International Peace, in response to a request from the atomic physicists of the Federation of American Scientists, represents a new departure in scientific cooperation. To our knowledge, this is the first time that physical scientists have called upon psychologists to pool scientific information on a problem which concerns all the people.

The letter from the Council of the Federation of American Scientists follows:

MAY 7, 1946.

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL PEACE,
SOCIETY FOR THE PSYCHOLOGICAL
STUDY OF SOCIAL ISSUES,
DIVISION OF THE AMERICAN
PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

DEAR SIRS: The Federation of American Scientists has found that the problems of the control of atomic energy require for their solution the constructive efforts of a great variety of specialists. That contributions must be made by natural scientists and by specialists in Government has been obvious from the start.

Since the attitudes of the people in this country and in the rest of the world toward this problem and the related problems of human welfare and military security will ultimately determine whether a solution can be found and made effective, it appears to us that an important contribution should be made by the specialists in the field of social psychology.

Therefore, under instructions from the Council of the Federation of American Scientists, I call upon the Society for the Psychological Study of Social issues to investigate from the psychological point of view the problems which are involved in the establishment of effective international con-

trols over atomic energy and to make their findings known to the Federation of American Scientists and to the public.

Yours very truly,

HUGH C. WOLFE.

Dr. Wolfe is a council member and is secretary of the Association of New York Scientists.

THE FAS AND THE SPSSI

The Federation of American Scientists is the recently organized group of atomic physicists, engineers, and other physical scientists, in which local groups at Oak Ridge, Chicago, New York, and other centers are constituent units.

The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI), organized in 1936, is a professional organization of social scientists, chiefly social psychologists of American colleges and universities. Its members combine their scientific interest with their interest as participants in the society in which they are living. Their purpose is specifically scientific research into the human psychology aspects of immediate social issues, and the widest dissemination of accurate, unbiased information toward the solution of issues of human welfare.

In 1945 the society became a division of the American Psychological Association. The committee on international peace was set up in 1946. Present officers of the society are: Chairman, Dr. Theodore Newcomb, University of Michigan; vice chairman, Dr. Rensis Likert, United States Department of Agriculture; Dr. Daniel Katz, Brooklyn College, treasurer.

The committee on international peace includes Dr. Richard Crutchfield, Swarthmore College; Dr. Eugene Hartley and Dr. Gardner Murphy, City College of New York; Dr. Theodore Newcomb; Dr. Ruth Tolman, Pasadena; Dr. Goodwin Watson, Columbia University; Dr. Ralph White, Stanford; with Dr. David Krech, Swarthmore College, chairman.

Human Nature and Enduring Peace, a symposium edited by Dr. Gardner Murphy (1945) is the most recent volume published by the society. Its Journal of Social Issues interprets for general readers the results of psychological research on such problems as labor management, race relations, group prejudices.

Unconstitutional Language

REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday in his veto message President Truman used unconstitutional language. I just want to keep the RECORD straight so far as the constitutional prerogatives of this House are concerned. He used the expression, when he addressed the House by way of the message, that he was speaking as a representative of all the people. That is unconstitutional language and there is not, of course, a word of truth in it. He has no constitutional powers as a representative of the people and cannot claim to be a representative of all the people.

Daniel Webster spoke on that question during the Jackson administration, and I will read what he said:

In some loose, indefinite, and unknown sense, the President has been called the representative of the whole American people. He has called himself so repeatedly, and been so denominated by his friends a thousand times. Acts, for which no specific authority has been found either in the Constitution or the laws, have been justified on the ground that the President is the representative of the whole American people. Certainly this is not constitutional language.

Certainly, the Constitution nowhere calls the President the universal representative of the people. The constitutional representatives of the people are in the House of Representatives, exercising powers of legislation. The President is an executive officer, appointed in a particular manner, and clothed with prescribed and limited powers.

It may be thought to be of no great consequence, that the President should call himself, or that others should call him, the sole representative of the people, although he has no such appellation or character in the Constitution.

But, in these matters, words are things. If he is the people's representative, and as such may exercise power, without any other grant, what is the limit to that power? When the Constitution expressly created representatives, as Members of Congress, it regulates, defines, and limits their authority. But if the Executive Chief Magistrate may assume to himself another character, and call himself the representative of the whole people, what is to limit or restrain this representative power in his hands?

New Orleans Steamship Organization Protests Reorganization Plan No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I find increasing interest in connection with Reorganization Plans Nos. 1, 2, and 3, submitted by the President on May 16, 1946. As I have heretofore indicated, all of these plans have uncertain and some of them very dangerous implications and possibilities. They ought to be investigated and any action on reorganization of Government departments should be postponed until further study can be made. I have suggested that all of these plans be rejected now and, of course, they can be brought up when Congress reconvenes in January 1947, at which time Members will not be busy with election problems, and they can study these various matters.

Just to illustrate how far-reaching the interest in an opposition to these plans may be, I set forth a statement from a telegram from the New Orleans Steamship Association of New Orleans, La. The telegram reads:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *June 6, 1946.*

Hon. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

New Orleans Steamship Association, whose membership is composed of representatives of practically all ocean-going tonnage using port of New Orleans, has repeatedly recorded its opposition to the retention in times of peace of Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation under United States Coast Guard. We understand you have introduced bill to override Presidential order retaining bureau under Coast Guard, and we beg again to record our earnest belief that this bureau in peacetimes should be restored to civilian control and administration. While greatly admiring and honoring record of Coast Guard we feel that organization is essentially military, and that best results from Marine Inspection Bureau would not come from a military organization because of formalities and restrictions inherent and necessary in all military organizations.

NEW ORLEANS STEAMSHIP ASSOCIATION.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, it is significant to note that the employees of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation are all reported to be opposed to their Bureau being permanently kept under the jurisdiction of the United States Coast Guard. There is an ugly rumor to the effect that a Coast Guard order prohibits these men from expressing an opinion on the retention of this Bureau permanently in the Coast Guard. These men, most of them having experience of up to 30 years in this service, are stationed in about 47 ports throughout the United States. They total about 600 in number. During the war, they have been temporarily in the Coast Guard Reserve and in uniform.

Since the Government operated all ships there was no opposition generally to this uniformed inspection service, but it is generally known that these inspectors and the shipping industry throughout the country generally feel that this inspection service is not of a military character, but inherently civilian. Serious questions arise also in reference to the seniority, promotion, and retirement rights of these inspectors. If they are continued in the Coast Guard, they must compete with the regular members of the Coast Guard in connection with promotion. Some of them are beyond the age for retention in the Coast Guard, so that there will be a division in the ranks of these inspectors, some being in uniform and others being civilian employees of the Coast Guard. All their previous position in Government service will be wiped out and considerable new legislation will be necessary to fix their status as members of the military set-up in the Coast Guard. Until the war they were attached to the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation in the Commerce Department and there was never any complaint about the service from that Bureau in the shipping industry. It has always been credited with the highest efficiency in Government service.

The general feeling among the men themselves in the shipping business is that if there would exist any sufficient reason why they should not be returned to the Department of Commerce, the more logical place to put them in any reorganization plan would be under the Maritime Commission rather than the Coast Guard.

My personal opinion is that there is no real reason for taking permanent jurisdiction away from the Department of Commerce.

The Situation in Washington

REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, some of the newspapers in my district have criticized me with respect to my record in regard to votes on the labor bills that have been presented to the Congress recently. In this respect I wish to say that on February 8 I issued a statement which covered my position in this matter. This statement was included in my weekly letter of the date mentioned, and was published in newspapers in my district under the caption "The situation in Washington."

This statement was issued shortly after the message of the President to the Congress in January, and while much has transpired since that time, I think the statement is just as appropriate today as it was at that time, and Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this statement be included in these remarks, as follows:

FEBRUARY 8, 1946.—I know that the conditions of the Nation are not satisfactory to my constituents and the country at large. In contacting many of my constituents, and by my mail, I have learned that they are not satisfied with the progress of the reconversion program, and neither am I. However, we must bear in mind that the transition from war to peacetime economy cannot be accomplished overnight, and that it will take time to bring about a readjustment. Of the final outcome, I am certain, but patience will be required.

I think that the President was unfair in placing the blame on Congress for all of the ills of the country, for after all he and the administration are still possessed of all of the wartime powers, none of which have been taken from the President, and he is still practically in a position to issue directives to take care of any situation. In addition, the country looks to the President and his administration for leadership not only in a crisis, but also in normal times.

I was, and I know that any citizen of sound judgment was, disappointed in the message of the President to the Congress when he proposed higher wages and lower costs of goods produced. Anyone who will reflect will admit that this is not only inconsistent, but is an impossible position to assume at this time, or at any other time.

So far as I am concerned, I consider myself, due to my business training, as a conservative southern Democrat. I believe in fundamentals, and the law of supply and demand, and while the war has brought many changes in scientific and other matters, there are certain rules of life and fundamentals which, in my opinion, still prevail.

In regard to labor and capital, I believe that both are entitled to full protection. Capital should be safeguarded and all reasonable protection given to capital and industry for it was through capital and private enterprise that this country has grown and prospered and grown great. On the other hand, the laborer is worthy of his hire, and I have never in my legislative career voted for the exploitation of labor. Labor is just as necessary as capital, and one is necessary to the other.

The contribution of labor to the winning of this war is acknowledged. I do not believe either labor or capital should abuse the privileges which they enjoy under our system of government.

I do not believe in strikes on the part of labor unless there has been exhausted every means of adjustment of differences between labor and capital, nor should capital or industry exploit or take advantage of labor if it is within their power.

It seems to me that there should be some middle ground where labor and capital can adjust their problems. This machinery has not yet been set up, but eventually I believe that such machinery will be established which will make it possible for both sides to obtain justice.

Mabel Boardman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received from Mr. Pliny A. Wiley, Wichita, Kans., a poem which pays a fine tribute to the late Miss Mabel Boardman, who, for many years, was an active official of the American Red Cross, and resided in Washington, D. C. I ask that the poem be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MABEL BOARDMAN

This tribute she so well deserved
On Mabel Boardman's tomb I place.
Humanity she loved and served
Will grant her fame and honored place.

Born in Cleveland on the lake,
Inheritor of wealth was she
Who choose to give instead of take.
She spent her life in service free.

The Red Cross glowed within her hand;
She breathed in it the breath of life.
It was the servant of our land
In ordered peace or bitter strife.

In flood and pestilence and fire
Her Red Cross was the sufferer's friend,
And Mabel Boardman's heart's desire
To help and heal and blessing send.

Our soldiers in the foreign field
Learned to revere this Cross of Red
And sailors found in it a shield
And comfort in the hours of dread.

Her Red Cross gleamed around our globe,
The greatest mother of them all;
Symbol of mercy in her robe,
Responding to each suppliant's call.

Rest, Mabel Boardman, now in peace!
A shrine shall be your honored tomb!
You made the sufferer's pain to cease!
You made the flowers of mercy bloom!

—*Pliny A. Wiley.*

Communism in the United States Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles by Mark Foote, from the Bay City (Mich.) Times:

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times of May 31, 1946]

FOOTE WARNS AGAINST APATHY IN REGARD TO COMMUNIST ACTIVITY

(This is the fourteenth of a series of stories on communism in the United States today, answering the query: Is communism a menace?)

(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON.—"It can't happen here." That's the usual complacent, apathetic answer of the ordinary citizen when a warning is sounded against the potential danger of communism in America today. He is lulled into inactivity because the Communists numerically are negligible, and employ subtle, boring from within, Trojan horse methods, rather than shouting their propaganda from the house tops.

Benjamin Gitlow, formerly high in the leadership of the Communist Party in the United States, who recanted—says in his book, I Confess:

"The Lenin group began with 22 members, counting Lenin and his wife."

As a matter of fact Lenin was an exile in Switzerland, where he had fled because of opposition to Russia's participation in World War I, just before the October revolution which set up the Bolshevist regime, the present Government of Russia. Germany considered him such a dangerous radical, it allowed him to pass through its territory only in a sealed car.

In the book Socialism, Fascism, Communism, I. Yourievsky, in a chapter From Lenin to Stalin, says:

"The basic active nucleus of the new ruling class under Stalin consists of only about 1,000,000 former workers and some 235,000 camp followers recruited chiefly from petty bourgeois elements. Among the latter, outside of a small group of former revolutionists who have not become grandees of the state, are many who under no regime except that of the Stalin autocracy could yield the power they now do. The Stalin autocracy is a dictatorship of the social groups over the classes smashed by the revolution."

So the Russian revolution is shown to have been made possible by a very small group. Such a thing is possible in any country just as it was in Germany when Hitler came to power, and in Italy when Mussolini staged his march on Rome. It would be possible here with a fanatical leader like Huey Long or Gerald L. K. Smith, given favorable circumstances—a long depression, and a soil made fertile by infiltration.

Communism is to be found today in the schools and colleges, in the Government departments, which have unions insisting on the right to strike against the Government, and praising Russian foreign policy to the detriment of American policy, in labor unions generally, in political parties, in the Army and Navy, in veterans' organizations and among the Negroes. It is being preached in shops, factories, mills, mines, and on the railroads from coast to coast.

Fred W. Perkins, labor expert of the Scripps-Howard Alliance, writing of the Atlantic City CIO United Automobile Workers

convention in which Walter Reuther defeated Roland J. Thomas for president, said:

"In deciding this fight, all the left-wing groups were active and considerably more vocal than the conservative unionists.

"Most important among these groups were the Communists. They probably outnumbered all the other avowed left-wingers and appeared to hold a balance of power in the union. Among them was Nat Ganley, a member of the national committee of the Communist Party, who sat on the platform as a member of the UAW resolutions committee."

Even the 100-percent American organization, the American Legion, is becoming worried about infiltration of Communists. Under the Legion constitution, any 15 veterans anywhere may form a post and petition the commander of their department for a charter. Some 200 new veterans' organizations have been organized since VJ-day. Some of these, picked at random are:

The American Veterans of World War II, known as the Amvets; the American Veterans' Committee; Father Coughlin's Sons of St. Sabatien; and Edward James Smith's Protestant Veterans' Association.

It is significant that since the Russian revolution, the Socialist Party has steadily declined in this country, while the Communist Party, its fellow travelers and front organizations have steadily increased. It is the Communist Party that advocates the bringing about of the dictatorship of the proletariat by force and violence.

UNITED STATES REPELS LEFTISTS

There are many reasons, however, why the American workingmen will be slow to espouse Communism. First is the comparative prosperity of the United States, under which they are accustomed to live in comfort and invest their savings. Under these circumstances, they are generally left unmoved by the often-quoted adjuration of Marx and Engels in the Communist manifesto:

"Workers of the world, unite! You have nothing to lose except your chains, and a whole world to gain."

Another deterring influence is that there is a relative absence of rigid economic and social stratification in the United States. A third factor is the presence of a marked proportion of foreign-born among Communists and their candidates. Fourth, there is a belief that any legislation based on Communist principles would be declared unconstitutional.

Fifth, the traditional two-party system of this Goverhment tempts the average elector to use his vote to help assure victory, rather than recording a minority protest for principle. Under the European parliamentary system minority parties combine to control the government. Another factor is that the American people have a traditional distrust of "Government in business." Finally the Communists, although steadily gaining strength, have so far been unable to command the adherence of the American trade-union movement as a whole.

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times of June 1, 1946]

COMMUNISTS HERE TIED TO SOVIET APRON STRINGS, COLUMNIST SAYS

(This is the fifteenth of a series of stories on communism in the United States today answering the query: Is communism a menace?)

(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON.—Any discussion of the problem of communism in the United States inevitably leads down the trail to the Soviet Government in Moscow. This for the reason that there is a spiritual and organic connection between the Moscow group and its agents in this country.

For 5 years after the organization of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, this country refused to recognize that Government. One of the principal reasons why we refused diplomatic relations was that the Soviets would not give a clear-cut promise not to propagandize for communism in this country. Their attitude was understandable, as the essence of communism is world revolution.

Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes' position on propaganda of a foreign country was based on a memorandum of the Chief of the Division of Russian Affairs in the State Department, which said:

"The program of the Russian Communist Party is one of world revolution and the Communist international is avowedly the directing and coordinate center of an international revolutionary movement to establish the world Soviet republic. It is impossible to differentiate as to world policy between the Russian Communist Party, the Third Communist International, and the official Soviet administration, because of the system of interlocking directorates.

"There, while the Soviet institutions, as such, may agree to abstain from subversive propaganda abroad, neither the Russian Communist Party nor the Third International would be bound thereby."

The Comintern was dissolved during the war, but the propaganda continues.

REDS ANTAGONISTIC

It is a lamentable fact that despite the great war record of Russia, and the concerted and sincere efforts of the United States through the United Nations organization to cooperate with Russia, the results are not promising. And what Secretary Hughes said years ago remains true today.

The fact is Russia on one hand and the United States, Britain, France, and other nations are today in continual conflict. Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov this week charged the United States and Britain with all the things of which Russia is guilty—of aggressive expansion, of forming a bloc to divide the world, of preventing a settlement at the Paris conference, of domination. Why did Molotov indulge in this sort of talk when the Paris conference was adjourned to meet again June 15 in order to give time for heads to cool?

William Henry Chamberlain, writing on The Balance Sheet of Russian Expansion in the current issue of American Mercury magazine, said: "Soviet Russia has annexed 273,947 square miles of territory with 34,355,000 people since September 1939. The record of outright annexation includes eastern Poland, Finnish Karelia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Bessarabia, and Bukovina, Moldavia, Petsamo, Koenigsberg area of East Prussia, Carpatho-Ukraine, South Sakhalin, Kurile Islands, and Tannu Tuva."

Nine other nations with an aggregate population of 165,000,000 also have been forced into the orbit of predominant Soviet influence. These are Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, eastern Germany, and Finland.

"Soviet apologists are inclined to cover the whole phenomenon with one word: 'security,'" says Chamberlain. "It gives Stalin both a revolutionary justification for aggression and ready-to-hand fifth columns in every country. Recently Stalin reaffirmed the traditional Communist dogma that the Socialist 'fatherland' in Russia is unsafe as long as there is a 'capitalistic encirclement.'"

WAR IN PROSPECT

Yet when Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, on the initiative of Senator VANDENBERG, offered a long-term alliance between the United States, Russia, and Britain, as security, Stalin brushed it off. It will be interesting to note how Russia will react to Byrnes' latest proposal of limitation of armaments.

No one wants war with Russia. The fact that there is conflict of opinion does not mean there will be war. But the prospects for agreement which will bring peace to Europe do not look promising. The gulf between the Soviets and the western world may remain for years. The Soviet Union seems bent on retaining and tightening the iron curtain hanging across Europe, including Germany.

Moscow appears determined either to force the United States to withdraw from Europe entirely, or go back to a western European bloc to stem Soviet expansion and infiltration. United States policy in Europe has been based on the Potsdam declaration, which contemplated coordinated rule of Germany by the four powers. But one of the powers refuses to cooperate.

As to Austria, the Russians do not even reply to a mass of communications regarding common policy. The United States plan for production has not been discussed, although based on the Moscow declaration and the announced intentions of the Russians when they entered Vienna. So the Austrian treaty hangs fire.

Russia refuses to discuss the question of the Ruhr. France wants to separate the Ruhr and Rhineland from Germany, but Britain and the United States reject this settlement. The Italian problem is still unsolved. Russia will favor anything that maintains the present division between France and Britain, whose junction in a western bloc Moscow has long professed to view with apprehension.

Brooklyn's Three Hundredth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times on Monday, June 10, 1946, in connection with the observance of Brooklyn's three hundredth anniversary as an organized community:

THREE HUNDRED YEARS OLD

If the casual wayfarer from some other part of the city happens to stray to Brooklyn Wednesday he may well rub his eyes in amazement at the flags, bunting, and general air of festivity and celebration that have been promised for the occasion. It will not be an advance public tribute to Independence Day, but rather the observance of Brooklyn's three hundredth anniversary as an organized community.

Of all the events planned for the 3-day observance, the one that most strikes the fancy is the "rediscovery of Brooklyn" planned for early Tuesday afternoon. With the help of that modern wonder of science, radio, Borough President Rogers, of Manhattan, is going to cruise across the bay from his borough to the Hamilton Avenue ferry slip, where he is going to find awaiting him—of all persons—Borough President Cashmore, of Brooklyn. Just to make it official, Mr. Rogers will give Mr. Cashmore a replica of the first flag of the old city of Brooklyn.

It is heartening that in the year following the end of the greatest war in history a thriving urban community like Brooklyn, through civic and commemorative programs, and through special exercises in its schools, courts, business concerns, and public buildings, will take time out to pay tribute to the spirit that gave it being and made it an integral part of American life.

The Shades of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Paul Revere Meet in the Old North Church in Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. REED of New York Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial entitled "Past and Present," which appeared in the Portland Homebildor under date of June 8, 1946:

PAST AND PRESENT

The shades of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Paul Revere meet in the Old North Church in Boston.

Revere: "Gentlemen, again, welcome to Boston. It is fitting that you gather here where initial steps were taken for independence."

Washington: "Boston charted the way and today I hope that the Nation will take heed and chart its course along the proven lanes so splendidly mapped out."

Lincoln: "Paul, I was always thrilled by the stories of the Boston Tea Party, the Battle of Bunker Hill, and your famous ride. As I said, a couple of weeks ago, our call now should be 'Awake America, before it is too late.' Your ringing warning echoed down the pages of history; our call should be equally heeded."

Jefferson: "Paul, you are a newcomer to our present-day councils, but you had an important part in helping to lay the cornerstone of our independence—I would like to hear what you think of today's trends in our government. You are very real in American minds at this time, as you were in your time. The business you established, the Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., is one of the proud and thriving industries of the country today.

Revere: "Tom, I have read of your sessions and I agree with you fully; that our people must be aroused again as they were when they threw the tea overboard and served notice that arbitrary dictation would not be tolerated. Then they were for freedom—freedom of opportunity, freedom to work and profit therefrom, freedom to live under broad principles of law without petty restrictions and inhibitions. That is the American way and I shudder when I see foreign ideologies and isms working their insidious ways into our governmental operations and thought. The boys at Breed Hill and Bunker Hill fought organized tyranny, fought to establish a free America. They won the freedom, now it is for our present-day citizens to keep it, cherish it, and make it work."

Washington: "I want to see our Government stand like the pyramid pictured on our dollar bills, stand strong and firm in fair weather and foul—undaunted, undismayed, unchanged in its solidity. We, like old Egyptian pyramid builders, 3200 B. C., established this Nation on a firm foundation and for 170 years it has withstood the ravages of time, of foes without and within, and, under God, it will withstand the assaults being made upon it today. Our sacrifices were not in vain, our underlying foundation principles are unchanged, it is only the drifting sands of power-seeking totalitarians that seek to obliterate its face. Those sands will be swept away by a hurricane of independent American opinion and the pyramid of government will emerge unscathed. But we must mobilize that opinion, arouse it from its lethargy, and awaken the Nation to the peril that confronts it today."

Lincoln: "Yes, George, we want stability and the only way we can have it is by following the principles laid down with respect to the rights of the people under law. Our foundation is assailed by the usurpation of power not granted by law, but assumed by those who attempt centralization of all direction from Washington. As you once said, Tom Jefferson, 'Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread.' This has been amply illustrated when farmers were ordered to kill little pigs and plow under their corn. It is being repeated today in many, many avenues of governmental dictation. Our people now want materials for homes, cotton goods, shirts, butter, and hundreds of other items, the production of which is stifled by those in power. Yes, the sand of bureaucracy are assailing the pyramid of Government but with the help of Congress and an aroused people we will emerge sound, safe, and sure."

Revere: "In this Old North Church, then, gentlemen, let us hang up the beacon of warning that all may see and respond as they did in answer to my cry back in 1775. America will see the light and heed the warning."

The shades depart to meet in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, 2 weeks hence.

CARLOS W. HUNTINGTON.

This Bill Is a "Must"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following comments in an editorial written by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, contain some earnest thought which should be beneficial to our membership in modernizing congressional procedure:

THIS BILL IS A "MUST"

Unless the congressional reorganization bill is enacted into law by Congress it will be impossible to develop an efficient Government in an age when the lack of efficiency may lead to our destruction. The present bill, which was written by Senator LA FOLLETTE'S committee, would reduce the number of committees in both houses and give each Member many fewer committee assignments.

Everyone in Congress and elsewhere who has studied the problem realizes that the present set-up has been outmoded for many years and yet the inertia is so great and the love of power so ingrained that it is believed the bill will be shunted aside. Every Member of Congress who would be reduced in his committee assignments is not enthusiastic for the change and indeed many Members are fighting it in every way they can.

Although some members would lose some power and prestige there is no question that every Member would be better able to do the job of enacting legislation. For the bill recognizes that Congressmen cannot be legislators and errand boys at the same time. Competent assistants would be provided to handle the details and the running around while Congressmen would be able to give their attention to legislation.

A great deal of time and study have been put into this bill and it is must legislation if there is such a thing. If after all this effort the chance is lost to modernize and make effective the Congress it will be a terrible blow to the future of this Nation. To some extent Congress has almost reached the break-down stage and only a modernization such as this bill contemplates can save it.

Shortage of Hardwood Flooring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from a constituent which outlines one of the reasons why so many new houses are standing incompleted; namely, the difficulty in getting flooring under present Government regulations:

TWIN CITY HARDWOOD LUMBER CO.,
St. Paul, Minn., May 31, 1946.

Dr. WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. JUDD: This will acknowledge your letter of May 24, regarding the recent increase in OPA price ceilings on hardwood flooring.

While I am hopeful that this will increase the production of hardwood flooring, still I am doubtful that the result is going to be anywhere near what we wish it would be.

I believe that you will find as long as OPA has control over certain items in our economy and no control over other items, that the supply of materials will flow to the uncontrolled items. It is my understanding that there are a number of items manufactured from wood that are not under price control. One of these so I am told, is furniture. The manufacturers of hardwood flooring are finding it difficult to obtain lumber at prices that will permit them to come out whole when manufacturered into hardwood flooring, because of the competition in buying this same lumber for manufacture into furniture. We are told of extensive black markets in the lumber business, caused principally by consuming industries who do not have ceilings, going out and purchasing this material, regardless of price ceilings on the lumber. Right here at home the restaurant and bar fixture manufacturers have no price ceiling on their product and have told us many times that they do not care what price they pay for lumber, since they pass it on to their consumer, and price has very little to do with their selling. They are anxious to get the lumber, willing to pay any price, legal or otherwise, and are getting the lumber, but not entirely through old established channels.

We are told of certain flooring manufacturers who have gone into the furniture manufacturing business, thus increasing their return per 1,000 feet of lumber with practically the same labor from $70 to $75 to more than double that figure. Under such circumstances, why should they manufacture the lumber they receive into hardwood flooring, when by manufacturing into furniture they can double their return?

* * * * *

Yours very truly,
TWIN CITY HARDWOOD LUMBER CO.,
By L. S. CLARK.

P. S.—Since dictating the above, I have been talking with some of the retail lumber dealers who are forced to handle hardwood flooring under the new reduced mark-up allowed by OPA. This reduced their mark-up from 35 to 25 percent.

Under this regulation, the dealers now pay us 10 percent over the base price and are forced to sell at 25 percent over the base price, giving them a gross mark-up of 15 percent. From this 15 percent they are forced to pay less-than-carload freight charges from Minneapolis or St. Paul to their point, making it absolutely unprofitable for them to handle hardwood flooring where it has to be shipped local freight.

Many of these dealers are handling asphalt tile, rubber tile, linoleum, and carpeting in competition with oak flooring, and as a result they are concentrating their efforts on these other more profitable lines to the detriment of hardwood flooring and the GI who wants hardwood flooring in his home. All in all, the new regulation, including the distribution amendment No. 22 to MPR 215, has succeeded in further clouding the issue and will, I believe, help little in getting more flooring moving to the final consumer.

L. S. C.

The Theater Guild

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD a manuscript entitled "The Theater Guild." I have a special interest in its history because I am one of the original subscribers to the Theater Guild and during the 27 years of its existence I have enjoyed immeasurably its productions.

The Theater Guild has been a strong, vitalizing force in the advance of the American theater. Its founders and directors have never worshiped the status quo for its own sake, but have consistently experimented with form and substance to give our theatergoers new experience and appreciations.

They have delved into musical comedy and have given a new twist to that form. Oklahoma and Carousel are excellent examples of this. They have gone into radio and will, eventually, I assume, participate in television broadcasts, and I am happy to note that the Theater Guild has interested itself in motion pictures and has wisely decided to present the Shakespearean motion picture Henry V with the distinguished English actor, Lawrence Olivier.

The Theater Guild is an excellent example of American vigor and enterprise. May the Theater Guild grow from strength to strength.

The manuscript follows:

THE THEATER GUILD

Twenty-seven years ago a group of young enthusiasts banded together under the name of the Theater Guild, inspired by their faith that America wanted and needed a theater devoted to ideas and ideals of maturity and integrity. A handful of others, including Arthur Hopkins, Winthrop Ames, the Provincetown Players, and the Neighborhood Playhouse shared this faith, and the belief that the American public would not only welcome but support an adult theater. Since then, through the efforts of the guild and its like-minded contemporaries, the American theater has blossomed into an institution which compares favorably with the theaters of any other country in the world, and, indeed, in standards of writing, acting, and production, surpasses the theaters of most.

From the day of its founding the Theater Guild set itself the task of upholding the living drama against the most comprehensive competition it has ever faced. The standards of the American theater are of paramount importance to the cultural life of the country, for, though it reaches only part of America's millions, the theater sets the patterns which are followed by the screen, radio, television, and other media of mass entertainment. Today's successful play is tomorrow's successful motion picture; the songs and music from successful theater pieces are heard over the air throughout the length and breadth of the land. A mature and important theater is reflected in the maturity and importance of its sister arts, giving cultural values and influences far beyond the immediate audiences which it reaches.

In the following, we have attempted to describe some of the activities of the Theater Guild during the past quarter of a century. Generaly speaking, the guild set out to take the curse off the word "artistic" in the American theater, and, in doing so, has demonstrated that the best plays—best as works of art—would receive genuine popular support. The guild has always had faith in the American public's desire for the finest theatrical work, and, in most instances, its faith has been more than justified. In some cases (notably Eugene O'Neill's Strange Interlude and the Rodgers-Hammerstein Oklahoma) there was great skepticism as to the guild's wisdom in taking the financial risks involved; yet the enthusiastic public support of these plays, after the risks were taken, made not only artistic history in the theater but box-office history as well.

As a result of the steady growth of the Theater Guild, it may truly be said that America already has a national theater, for it has, for many years past, performed all the functions of a national theater, aided by the subscription of its huge membership, which is the largest of any subscription theater in the world. It has already brought the best plays of the living theater to the largest centers of population throughout the country, and it has also brought important plays, actors, and directors from abroad in order that we might learn from the best which Europe has to offer.

It not only tours its own plays to a large number of cities throughout the country, where audiences are organized to support them, but it also tours the worth-while plays of other managers.

Its Shakespeare company is carrying the immortal works of the bard of Avon throughout the country. Its educational and cultural efforts are constantly devoted to developing new talent in the theater. All these are the functions of a national theater.

While not organized as a nonprofit association, nevertheless in actual fact the Theater Guild has never declared a dividend, and has ploughed back its profits into its productions, while paying the heavy corporation taxes which are levied upon commercial enterprises generally, as part of its contribution toward the cost of the war and government.

The Theater Guild has devoted special attention to the organization of audiences, its members, who subscribe to an annual series of plays now numbering over 145,000, located in 20 leading cities from coast to coast. In no country in the world has there ever been a subscription system dedicated to good plays such as that now operated over a 3,000-mile circuit by the Theater Guild and its associated organization, the American Theater Society. These and the many other activities of the Theater Guild will now be described in greater detail.

THERESA HELBURN, COADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR

Theresa Helburn has been involved in the supervision of more Broadway plays than any other woman in the entire history of the American theater. A member of the board of managers of the Theater Guild from almost its very beginning, its executive director for 15 years, and its coadministrative director since 1939, a playwright, producer, and director, she has had a hand in most of the 157 plays that the guild has presented in the 27 years of its existence.

Miss Helburn was born in New York near what is now the heart of the theatrical district, on Forty-sixth Street, two blocks east of Broadway. At an early age she moved with her family to Boston, where she attended Miss Winsor's School. At Bryn Mawr she acted in and managed both class and college plays. As a graduate student at Radcliffe, where she joined Professor Baker's famous 47 Workshop, and later at the Sorbonne, she began the serious study of the drama.

Back in New York, she turned naturally to the bubbling centers of new, youthful theatrical enthusiasm, burgeoning then in Greenwich Village. In one play-reading circle, she renewed an old acquaintance with Lawrence Langner and was cast opposite him in a group reading of George Bernard Shaw's Press Cuttings. For the Washington Square Players, which began to flourish, she wrote her first one-act play, Enter the Hero, which has been a favorite in amateur theaters ever since.

Through her continued association with Mr. Langner she was part of the group that he rallied to the formation of the Theater Guild. At that time she was serving as dramatic critic for the weekly, the Nation, and became play adviser to the new guild. Almost immediately she was invited to become a permanent member of the board. The first executive director resigned and Miss Helburn obligingly offered to fill in for a few weeks. The weeks stretched into years. After a sabbatical year in Hollywood she returned to become, in 1939, coadministrative director of the Theater Guild with Mr. Langner.

As executive director, Miss Helburn's duties were over-all, covering every phase of play production. As part of them, she became immersed in casting and through the years she estimates that she interviewed nearly 10,000 actors and actresses. Hers became the search for new talent and to her goes much of the credit for the first pairing of Alfred Lunt and Lynn Fontaine in the Guardsman.

But it was because of these same myriad responsibilities that she had to sidetrack her play-writing ambitions. In 1918 she wrote Crops and Croppers, which was produced by B. Iden Payne and reproduced as Alison Makes Hay. Sandwiched in between other duties, she wrote Denbigh, in which Alice Brady appeared in 1921, a year which saw still another of her plays, Other Lives, which she wrote in collaboration with Edward Goodman.

She also wrote a fantasy called the Prince Was Too Clever, based upon an original story by Andrew Lang, which the Federal Theater made into a musical comedy entitled "A Hero Is Born" and presented in New York in 1937. She also did an adaptation of a French play by Andre Birabeau, which was produced in 1941 under the title "Little Dark Horse."

Miss Helburn turned to directing in 1932 with a play called Chrysalis, produced by Martin Beck in association with Mr. Langner and Miss Helburn. A year later she undertook a similar directing assignment for the Theater Guild and staged Maxwell Anderson's Mary of Scotland, which starred Helen Hayes and which won 10 best honors for the season.

In 1934 and 1935 Miss Helburn spent 12 months in Hollywood as an executive of Columbia Pictures Corp. Back in New

York with the guild, she was persuaded by the major motion-picture companies in 1936 to establish the Bureau of New Plays, which for 2 years arranged national competitions and provided fellowship awards for undergraduate and postgraduate college playwrights. For several years more it also maintained a seminar for the encouragement and inspiration of young writers not yet able to cope with Broadway.

In whatever time she can still find from a full schedule of play reading and producing, Miss Helburn continues to write articles on all phases of the theater. She has also written verse, which appeared in Harper's, New Republic, Century, Poetry, The Bellman, the Smart Set, and various anthologies.

More for a lark than anything else, she took one fling at acting: in Langner's Suzanna and the Elders during its first summer try-out at the Westport Country Playhouse.

LAWRENCE LANGNER, COADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR

Lawrence Langner is one of the world's fortunate few who have been able to pursue vocation and avocation simultaneously and successfully. Original founder of the Theater Guild, its coadministrative director since 1939, playwright, producer, director, and theatrical pioneer, he is also a leading international patent attorney.

Born in Wales, schooled in London, Mr. Langner as a boy, was introduced to the theater as a junior clerk with J. Bannister Howard, a noted London manager. He grew to love this magic realm, peopled by illustrious names like Ellen Terry, Ben Greet, and Gordon Craig, but his mother was less impressionable. She apprenticed him to a chartered patent agent, sent him to study patent law at Burbeck College, and engineering at the Polytechnic Institute; and, in 1910, he passed the examination of the British Chartered Institute of Patent Agents.

Less than a year later he decided to seek his fortune in America. By 1913 he had established the firm of Langner, Parry, Card & Langner, a firm which he still heads, with offices in New York, Chicago, Washington, and London.

His love of the theater, however, crossed the sea with him, and he spent all his leisure hours with kindred spirits, meeting to establish the Washington Square Players which was to become so popular for its experimental daring in the theater. The first program of this semiprofessional group included a one-act play, Licensed, written by Langner. He wrote other one-act plays, and in 1917 a full-length comedy, The Family Exit, which won him critical attention. This was followed by several other short and long plays and a successful musical play, Tangerine, of which he was a coauthor.

The First World War forced a suspension of the Washington Square Players' activities, while Mr. Langner, an American citizen in 1917, became a consultant to the Ordnance Department of the United States Army and later a member of the Advisory Council of the American committee preparing the patent sections of the Versailles Treaty.

After the armistice, he called together several members of the Washington Square Players and, at his suggestion, a new theatrical group was organized, a new name was adopted, and plans set to go forward toward a subscription art theater. Thus the Theater Guild was founded. Mr. Langner contributed the first $500 of its original capitalization, an equal sum being contributed by Maurice Wertheim upon his return from Europe.

During the run of the first guild production, it was Langner who found in a New York book shop a copy of a neglected play by St. John Ervine, with whom he had once debated as a youth in London. The play was John Ferguson, destined to become the Theater Guild's first success.

All through the guild's subsequent history, Mr. Langner has been active on its policy-making board, developing new ideas, urging experimentation, bringing new and old playwrights into the fold and working actively in the production of a majority of the plays. With Theresa Helburn, he shouldered the preponderant share of the managerial responsibilities of the organization.

In 1933, he again turned to playwrighting to see his name listed as coauthor of three plays that season; with Armina Marshall, his wife, he wrote the comedy hit, The Pursuit of Happiness, with Arthur Guiterman, The School for Husbands (which he also directed), said to be the first stage production to use ballet on Broadway; and with Robert Simon, Champagne Sec, a rewriting of Die Fledermaus, which ran a season in New York. Three years later, with Miss Marshall, he wrote On to Fortune and after another interval, Suzanna and the Elders.

In addition to the Theater Guild, Mr. Langner's interests included the New York Repertory Theater, which he established in 1931-32 and which was aimed at developing a permanent acting company for the revival of important plays, and the Westport Country Playhouse, now one of the leading summer theaters.

Mr. Langner fathered and served as secretary of the National Inventor's Council, United States Department of Commerce, an advisory body of America's leading civilian inventors and scientists, which during World War II evaluated for the Army and Navy over 200,000 inventions. He is also secretary of the National Advisory Council to the Committee on Patents of the House of Representatives, which he originated in 1939.

This past year, Mr. Langner has taken up the Theater Guild's new interest in radio drama and each Sunday evening, as master of ceremonies, he helped to bring the flavor of the theater to the millions listening to the Theater Guild on the Air.

THE THEATER GUILD: ITS FOUNDERS AND ORIGINAL BOARD

The Theater Guild was founded in 1919 by a group of young lovers of the theater who felt that a place was needed for drama of fuller form and richer content, patterned somewhat after the theaters of Europe. It was an outgrowth of the Washington Square Players, and its original board, after a few initial changes, consisted of 6 members: Theresa Helburn, Lawrence Langner, Philip Moeller, Lee Simonson, Maurice Wertheim and the late Helen Westley. For 20 years, 1919–39, this board governed the policies of the organization.

From the earliest years of its existence, the guild was managed by the combined enthusiasm and talents of the entire board. In those years, marked by many of the most successful guild productions, the board operated as a committee of 6, performing together all the multitude of tasks involved in play production. Later, as theater experience became more general, the 6-man board divided itself up into smaller production groups, each carrying the responsibility for separate productions.

By 1939, however, the governing board system of operation had become impractical and was divorcing from the guild some of the best American playwrights, who preferred to deal with one or two persons rather than 6. Hence the guild was reorganized, with Lawrence Langner, who called it into being in 1919, and Theresa Helburn, for 15 years its executive director, remaining as administrative directors in charge of all its artistic activities; and Maurice Wertheim staying on as a member of the board of directors, a post he held until 1945.

The American theater has often paid its tribute to the brilliant achievements of the original Theater Guild board members, whose generous talents have enriched it so much.

Philip Moeller

As an outstanding director, Philip Moeller was responsible for staging more than 50 of the Theater Guild's plays, among them 23 of the guild's most important successes. He staged the epoch-making O'Neill dramas, Strange Interlude, Mourning Becomes Electra, and Ah, Wilderness!, but perhaps his greatest gift was in the brilliant sparkle with which he endowed such comedy offerings as The Guardsman, Volpone, Caprice, Fata Morgana, The Second Man, and so many others.

Lee Simonson

Lee Simonson has left an indelible mark on the record of scenic artistry in the American theater. He created the decor for more than 40 guild plays in the two decades he sat on the governing board, among them such memorable productions as Liliom, Elizabeth the Queen, Volpone, Roar China, and others, contributing at the same time his keen intelligence to the selection and production of plays, as well as their costuming.

Maurice Wertheim

Now senior partner in the investment banking house of Wertheim & Co., Maurice Wertheim was a graduate of Professor Baker's famous Forty-seven Workshop at Harvard. He was enthusiastically interested in the selection of plays, helping also to establish the inner organization and general policy of the producing group. He contributed greatly, not only to the artistic achievements of the group, but also to the firm economic foundation on which the guild was built.

Helen Westley

Helen Westley, whose death literally found millions in mourning, was one of the first-rank actresses in the theater of this generation. Instinctively a personality of the theater, she could be counted on to contribute something especially her own to all productions. Each season for years she was among the leading cast members of at least one guild play; and for some years she appeared in as many as six. Memories will not soon fade of her performances in John Ferguson, Jane Clegg, Liliom, Volpone, Green Grow the Lilacs, The Guardsman, and Reunion in Vienna.

The Lunts and the Theater Guild

One of the happiest partnerships in the contemporary theater is the 23-year long actor-manager association of Alfred Lunt and Lynn Fontanne and the Theater Guild. It was in the fall of 1924 that the Lunts were started on their joint path to becoming the best loved acting team in the theater. The guild was preparing to present one of those gay and delightful comedies of the Hungarian stage, Ferenc Molnar's bubbling The Guardsman, when it ran into a problem of casting: men stars complained that the feminine lead was the better part, and the women stars charged that it was the male lead that was the choicer role.

The difficulty was overcome by putting a married couple, the Lunts, into the parts, marking the first time that they acted together. How much of an inspiration it was to team the then relatively unknown pair was not appreciated fully at the time.

After appearing together in many guild plays, the Lunts became the keystone of the famous Theater Guild Acting Co., organized in 1926–27 and, as the plays demanded, they appeared either jointly or singly.

Together they appeared in The Second Man, Elizabeth the Queen, Caprice, Idiot's Delight, Reunion in Vienna, Amphitryon 38, The Taming of the Shrew, There Shall Be No Night and The Pirate.

Individually, Mr. Lunt appeared in Ned McCobb's Daughter and Marco Millions among others; while Miss Fontanne appeared in Strange Interlude and Pygmalion.

In the 23 years of their association, the Lunts has appeared in more guild plays than any other actors, the total number being 23. And practically every one of their appearances has turned into a theater event, adding up to an impressive percentage of the guild's entire total of successes.

Two years ago the Lunts concluded a run in The Pirate and turned to Robert E. Sherwood's There Shall Be No Night (produced by the Playwrights' Co. and the guild), in which they had won world-wide attention. The war was at the height of its fury then and the Lunts felt it a duty to take the play to London, which they did. For more than a year they regaled the English public with their performances, after which they sought and found a new comedy, designed to lighten the hearts of a people under a heavy load. This was Terrence Rattigan's O Mistress Mine, which ran for another season in England and was shown also to the fighting men at the fighting fronts, under the title Love in Idleness.

The Lunts have ended their 2-year absence by bringing O Mistress Mine to New York, where presented by the Theater Guild and John C. Wilson, it is one of Broadway's most popular attractions.

Eugene O'Neill and the Theater Guild

America's most distinguished playwright, its only Nobel prize dramatist, three times winner of the Pulitzer prize, Eugene O'Neill, is breaking a dramatic silence of almost 10 years to bring to the public, under Theater Guild auspices, three new plays, which he has been writing during the interim since 1933–34, when his last plays were presented.

They are not to be expected until next season, but already every possible preparation is being made to assure the careful production which they warrant. Of the three, two are scheduled for the season 1946–47: The Iceman Cometh and either A Moon for the Misbegotten or A Touch of the Poet. Eddie Dowling has already been selected for the task of directing The Iceman Cometh.

The third O'Neill play will be held over until the year following.

Since January 1928, when Mr. O'Neill's Strange Interlude was produced by the Theater Guild, the guild has presented all of his new works. The list includes Marco Millions, Dynamo, Mourning Becomes Electra, Ah, Wilderness!, and Days Without End.

The Theater Guild on the Air has provided the guild with a new opportunity for reproducing its O'Neill plays. It has presented Strange Interlude in two parts, Ah, Wilderness!, and the two one-act plays, done originally by the Provincetown Players, The Emperor Jones and Where the Cross Is Made.

O'Neill's plays have been produced in many foreign countries. Days Without End and Strange Interlude have recently been presented in Italy by the Catholic Theater Center, an affiliate of Catholic Action.

George Bernard Shaw and the guild

In 1920, the second year of the Theater Guild's existence, it became the American theater for George Bernard Shaw by presenting the world premiere of Heartbreak House. Since then it has given three other of his plays their first performance anywhere: Back to Methusaleh, Saint Joan, and Too True to Be Good.

Shaw turned to the Theater Guild because of the experience of another well-known English dramatist, St. John Ervine, whose play, John Ferguson, had been rescued from neglect by the fledgling organization. The guild has also presented Shaw's The Devil's Disciple, Caesar and Cleopatra, Arms and the Man, Androcles and the Lion, Pygmalion, The Doctor's Dilemma, Major Barbara, The Apple Cart, Getting Married, and The Simpleton of the Unexpected Isles.

Still hale and irrepressibly hearty, Shaw can be expected to reappear on a Theater Guild schedule at any time.

THE THEATER GUILD AND THE MUSICAL THEATER

Now that it has sponsored such resounding hits as Oklahoma and Carousel, the Theater Guild is being recognized as an innovator in the musical theater as well as in the dramatic and comedy forms.

All told, the Theater Guild has produced six musicals, each adding a new note to the development of the American musical theater. In the 1920's the Garrick Gaieties set the pattern for the intimate revue, which has been so popular since. Parade, presented in 1929, paved the way for the topical, political musical, later to be used for Pins and Needles and Sing Out the News. Taking one of its early successes, DuBose and Dorothy Heyward's Porgy, the guild produced Porgy and Bess, with music by George Gershwin and lyrics by his brother, Ira. It became one of the first full-length American folk operas.

Another early guild play, Green Grow the Lilacs, became the basis for Oklahoma, which has created an entirely new approach to musicals in the 3 years since its presentation. It was based on an American pioneer theme, its color and spirit blew wholesome winds through what was becoming a hothouse form, its use of the ballet popularized the dance and set it as a fashion for other Broadway musical productions to copy. In Sing Out, Sweet Land, the Guild tried a new kind of musical, one based upon the authentic folk music of all sections of this country. This high lighted the popularity of native folk songs and brought them into full status as accepted art sources for the theater to draw upon.

With Carousel, based on still another early Guild play, Liliom by Ferenc Molnar, the guild pointed to more profound contents that could be integrated fully into the musical framework. It sought to enrich the scope of the musical theater by making possible the use of more fully bodied themes than boy meets girl. In Carousel, fantasy, comedy, and tragedy are woven into a single pattern of musical theater expression.

Richard Rodgers and Oscar Hammerstein II

When the Theater Guild brought together Richard Rodgers and Oscar Hammerstein II for the music, libretto, and lyrics, Rouben Mamoulian for direction and Agnes de Mille for the choreography of a musical play, based on Lynn Riggs' Green Grow the Lilacs, it could not have guessed that the resulting Oklahoma would soon be hailed as America's outstanding musical.

It was the first association of Rodgers and Hammerstein, a partnership that has gone to make additional contributions, via the guild in Carousel, and through themselves in productions of their own, I Remember Mama, State Fair, and others.

Something uniquely American was introduced to the theater with both Rodgers' masterful music and Hammerstein's poetic lyrics and libretto for Oklahoma. Howard Vincent O'Brien, of the Chicago Daily News, perhaps phrased it most felicitously: "Its [Oklahoma] extraordinary popularity is a portent of something deep and fine in the American character. From horn to hoof, it is uniquely and peculiarly American. In the ditty, The Farmer and the Cowman, is packed a whole library of American history. The trial scene is an epitome of American justice. And the ballet is a profound and revealing analysis of the American soul."

The Theater Guild is understandably happy to have brought about the partnership of Rodgers and Hammerstein, which it is convinced will result in many more historic achievements in the musical theater. Before Oklahoma, Mr. Rodgers was first known to guild audiences as the composer of the score for the original Garrick Gaieties, which he wrote in partnership then with the late Lorenz (Larry) Hart.

Philip Barry and the guild

For many years the Theater Guild has been associated with Philip Barry, one of America's most successful writers of high comedy. Acclaimed as the author of Paris Bound and Holiday, Mr. Barry found his pen turning to a play, more poetic in feeling, almost fantasylike in concept. He entrusted it to the guild for presentation and an association now of almost two decades' duration began. The play was Hotel Universe and it was presented in 1928.

In 1939, he was once again writing brilliant comedy, so well exemplified by the Philadelphia Story and Without Love. By this time he was firmly intrenched as a Theater Guild playwright. The Philadelphia Story was fateful for the guild, for Mr. Barry, and for Katherine Hepburn, for whose talent its main role was ideally suited. Reorganized that year, the guild found strength for its own future in the success of the Barry play: it was perhaps tht author's biggest hit; and it revitalized the career of Miss Hepburn.

Between the two comedies for Miss Hepburn, Mr. Barry again followed his more fanciful muse and wrote Liberty Jones, which the guild produced.

Then in 1945 Barry merged his two playwrighting tendencies into Foolish Notion, in which Tallulah Bankhead appeared from coast-to-coast. Foolish Notion was the premiere offering in three of the four new Theater Guild-American Theater Society cities, which expanded the network into a Nation-wide system this past year.

S. N. Behrman and the guild

Ten plays by S. N. Behrman in 20 years—from his very first, to his most recent in 1946—is the record of association of this world-famous American author and the Theater Guild. In 1927 Behrman's The Second Man, with Alfred Lunt and Lynn Fontanne in the key roles, launched this author-producer collaboration with acclaim. Everywhere it was hailed as one of the most brightly written comedies of the period.

With regularity thereafter, the Behrman plays were highlights of succeeding guild schedules. Biography brought Ina Claire back to the theater from the screen and confirmed the opinion of everyone of the talents of its author. The Lunts played in Meteor, following which came Rain From Heaven, in which Jane Cowl starred. The list includes End of Summer, again starring Miss Claire, and Wine of Choice.

Even after Behrman joined the Playwrights' Company, he maintained strong ties with the guild, for whom he was again at work with Amphitryon 38 and later with The Pirate, which both producing organizations sponsored.

Behrman's unique gift is the writing of brilliant comedy, which is suffused throughout with thoughtful seriousness. In 1944 he achieved a remarkably successful integration of both in Jacobowsky and the Colonel, a comedy based on a play by Franz Werfel, which won for him the New York Critics' Circle Award for the best foreign play of the year.

Turning to a postwar theme, Behrman penned Dunningan's Daughter this past season, a penetrating and witty study of the struggle of peace, his tenth play for the Theater Guild.

THE THEATER GUILD AND THE EUROPEAN PLAYWRIGHT

From its inception the Theater Guild has been instrumental in introducing the works of the outstanding playwrights of the world to this country. In its early days it refused to succumb to the then current practice of Americanizing the works of European authors, feeling it was a more positive contribution, both to the theater and to international cultural good will, to preserve as much of the original as possible in the process of transplantation to our stage.

In the beginning of its career the Theater Guild had to rely heavily on the works of European authors to provide plays of the artistic stature which it had set for itself. As a result, the guild roster was weighted preponderantly at first on the side of the foreign dramatist. It was not until some

seasons had gone by that the native writers began to see that an audience had been created for more ambitious efforts on their part.

The guild's first play, which opened on April 19, 1919, was the work of Jacinto Benavente, called The Bonds of Interest. Its first success was St. John Ervine's John Ferguson. It has presented plays by Tolstoy, John Masefield, August Strindberg, David Pinski, George Bernard Shaw, A. A. Milne, Ferenc Molnar, Emile Verhaaren, Leonid Andreiev, Arnold Bennett, Georg Kaiser, Karl Capek, Paul Claudel, Henrik Ibsen, and others. The plays presented, many of which have since become classics of the stage, included Jane Clegg, St. Joan, Liliom, He Who Gets Slapped, Morn to Midnight, R. U. R., and Peer Gynt.

Later the American playwrights began to appear in guild programs in ever-increasing numbers, but the guild still maintained its liaison with authors on the other side of the ocean. The author's gallery expanded to include John Galsworthy, H. R. Lenormand, Ernest Vadja, Ernst Toller, and Franz Werfel. The plays included were Windows, The Failures, Fata Morgana, Man and the Masses, and Goat Song. Still later came Fyodor Dostoievsky, Luigi Pirandello, Stefan Zweig, Sil-Vara, Ivan Turgeniev, Hans Chlumberg, Alfred Savoir, Anton Chekov, and the modern Russian writer, Konstantin Simonov.

The cultural geography represented by the Theater Guild plays included England, Ireland, France, Norway, Sweden, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Russia, and Austria.

In more recent years, the tide has turned and American writers, whose plays the guild presented, are now being applauded in the European capitals, their works hailed as examples of America's maturing theatrical art. It has proved beneficial in more ways than merely theatrical; the interchange of cultural ambassadors has helped break down international barriers of misunderstanding and ignorance.

THE THEATER GUILD AND THE AMERICAN PLAYWRIGHT

Anxious to do a play by an American author, the Theater Guild managed to include one in its second season, the Rise of Silas Lapham, by Lillian Sabine, between John Masefield's the Faithful and Tolstoy's the Power of Darkness. In its fourth season it presented its second play by a native writer, Arthur Richman's Ambush, which opened in the fall of 1921. A year later Elmer Rice's expressionistic the Adding Machine was received with excited attention. After the lapse of another full season the guild program included two American plays, Sidney Howard's They Knew What They Wanted, which won a Pulitzer prize; and John Howard Lawson's Processional. From then on the Theater Guild produced more and more of the plays of the serious young American playwrights.

It had taken all these years for two processes to mature: The growth of an audience demanding fuller content on the stage, and the confidence of the American dramatist in the guild as a producing unit.

Once begun, however, the influx developed rapidly. Sidney Howard was represented a second time as author of the Silver Cord, and later by Ned McCobb's Daughter and the Ghost of Yankee Doodle. S. N. Behrman's name appeared and Maxwell Anderson's with Both Your Houses, Elizabeth the Queen, Mary of Scotland, Valley Forge, and Masque of Kings. Robert E. Sherwood's plays for the guild were Idiot's Delight and There Shall Be No Night. In later years some of the above plays were sponsored jointly by the Theater Guild and the Playwrights' Co.

The lists have continued to grow: Philip Barry, Eugene O'Neill. The guild helped sponsor the first production of a play by William Saroyan. It provided a production chance to a first play by Tennessee Williams. It has produced plays by Lynn Riggs, DuBose and Dorothy Heyward, John Wexley, Paul Osborn, and many others.

Through its scholarships and seminars it is seeking to develop even newer figures in American playwrighting, by whose hands the future of the stage will be molded.

THE THEATER GUILD SHAKESPEARE COMPANY

No English-speaking theater can be worthy of its name unless it provides fully for continual productions of the works of William Shakespeare; and then not only for the bard's so-called popular tragedies.

The 1945–46 season has seen another project of long standing bearing fruit on the American stage: The Theatre Guild Shakespeare Company, a group of actors and actresses assembled with the idea of keeping Shakespeare's plays continuously alive. In England, the Old Vic has proved the never diminishing favor in which the plays are held, generation after generation. It is the guild's plan to maintain a somewhat similar project operating here.

The first production of the Theater Guild Shakespeare Company was The Winter's Tale, a fantasy-drama written at the maturity of the bard's life, which, however, had not been seen in this country for almost 30 years. With a cast featuring Henry Daniell, Florence Reed, Jessie Royce Landis, Romney Brent and Whitford Kane, The Winter's Tale played in most Guild-American Theater Society cities before coming to New York, where it was greeted with critical acclaim and its success would have been even greater if the theater shortage had not forced its closing.

Two days afterward the company was in rehearsal again, this time with Shakespeare's holiday-spirited Merry Wives of Windsor, in which Charles Coburn has the starring role of Falstaff, with Miss Landis playing Mistress Ford. This production, too, will journey the length and breadth of the land before it passes in review on Broadway.

The pattern has thus been set, which will keep Shakespeare a living dramatist to millions of American theatergoers.

Except for the Paul Robeson Othello, the guild's ventures into Shakespeare have all been in the master's lighter and more fanciful works. Its first was the vigorous The Taming of the Shrew, in which Alfred Lunt and Lynn Fontanne starred. Helen Hayes and Maurice Evans disported in the second, Twelfth Night. Both were received with delighted warmth, dispelling all doubts as to their popularity.

With its third Shakespearean play, Othello, presented with Margaret Webster and John Haggott, the guild turned a Shakespeare box-office tradition into its opposite. What was deemed his least profitable tragedy became his most successful. Othello ran to capacity audiences in New York for an entire season and another throughout this country and Canada. It is the unchallenged champion of champions among American productions of any of Shakespeare's plays.

THE THEATER GUILD'S PRIZE PLAYS

Since 1924 Theater Guild productions have been crowned seven times with the laurels of the Pulitzer Prize. The first was Sidney Howard's They Knew What They Wanted. Maxwell Anderson's Both Your Houses was second, after which came Robert E. Sherwood's Idiot's Delight, Eugene O'Neill's Strange Interlude, Mr. Sherwood's There Shall Be No Night (presented jointly with the Playwrights' Company), and William Saroyan's The Time of Your Life (presented with Eddie Dowling), which also won the palm from the New York Critics' Circle, the first play to be thus doubly honored.

Because Oklahoma was based on another play, a special Pulitzer award was made to Richard Rodgers and Oscar Hammerstein II.

In 1945–46 Carousel won a special citation from the New York Critics' Circle as the best musical of the season.

Guild productions, in addition, have been included season after season, almost without interruption, often with two and three entries in the annual Ten Best Plays of the Year, compiled by Burns Mantle. The S. N. Behrman-Franz Werfel comedy, Jacobowsky and the Colonel, was also singled out as the best foreign play of the year by the New York Drama Critics' Circle.

THE GUILD AND ROUBEN MAMOULIAN

Not only the leading playwrights and actors have long histories of association with the Theatre Guild. Rouben Mamoulian is a director who has staged nine plays for the producing organization over a period of 20 years. His most recent are Carousel and Oklahoma.

But like the guild, Mamoulian has not limited himself to any one kind of theater. In 1927, he was put at the helm of the DuBose and Dorothy Heyward play, Porgy, and brought it to vivid, successful life. Then several years later he presided over the musical play based on it by George Gershwin, Porgy and Bess. He directed as wide a variety of theatrical offerings as Eugene O'Neill's Marco Millions, the atom-bomb prophesying Wings Over Europe, The Game of Love and Death, A Month in the Country, and R. U. R., the Capek play which introduced the word "robot" into the English language.

Now a motion-picture director of note, Mr. Mamoulian pioneered in the development of sound, in technicolor film processing and won international awards for many of his films.

THE GUILD'S NATIONAL SUBSCRIPTION THEATER

In January of this year, the Theater Guild was finally able to see the successful fruition of a project which it had been preparing for many years—the establishment of a Nation-wide subscription membership, stretching from Boston to Los Angeles. In Kansas City, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Seattle, the four subscription cities added in January to link up the west coast with the 14 original cities in the East and Middle West, the response to the coming of the Theater Guild-American Theater Society was enthusiastic, In each locality, the civic and community leaders put every facility at our disposal to insure the success of our subscription season. But, if we needed additional proof of our welcome, it came from many other municipalities, such as Minneapolis and St. Paul, who asked us to expand the circuit still further to include them in the Nation-wide subscription program. This is now being done for next season.

In the year 1919, 135 intrepid theater lovers subscribed to our first season. Today, in 20 cities, covering 12 States, Theater Guild-American Theater Society subscribers total more than 145,000. They see an average of five plays each season, making the number of evenings at the theater supplied to just our own members between three-quarters and a million evenings. This does not include, of course, at least twice the number again of theater-going evenings spent by nonsubscribers in the same cities.

These figures become more significant when it is remembered that the plays presented are selected for their unusual qualities, for their importance to the theater and its arts, rather than for the more superficial aspects of entertainment.

The Theater Guild-American Theater Society Nation-wide subscription circuit includes: Baltimore with approximately 7,500 members; Boston with 14,000; Buffalo, 2,500; Chicago, 15,500; Cincinnati, 3,000; Cleveland, 2,300; Columbus, 3,000; Detroit, 7,700; Milwaukee, 3,000; Philadelphia, 13,000; Pittsburgh, 5,500; St. Louis, 3,000; Washington, 13,500; and New York, 16,000.

Kansas City has added over 4,000; San Francisco and Los Angeles over 10,000 each; and Seattle approximately 5,000.

Particularly helpful in the development of the national subscription system has been Marcus Heiman, president of the United Booking Offices, and Lee Shubert, owner of many theaters throughout the country.

The Theater Guild has also resumed publication of its Theater Guild Bulletin, a quarterly magazine for its subscribers, which serves as a medium of information about the developments of the theater on a national scale.

THE THEATER GUILD OF THE AIR

Radio broadcasting was in its infancy in 1919, when the Theater Guild was founded. As both flourished, the guild, for many years, did no more than toy with the idea of using the broadcasting channels as still another stage for the presentation of plays. Too many limiting circumstances were always appearing to make obstacles more formidable than the results that might possibly have been expected. Hence for a quarter of a century, the Theater Guild wished radio the best but it confined itself to its parent art, the stage.

This year all the limiting circumstances were waved away by the unstinting cooperation of another newcomer to radio, the United States Steel Corp., and the chairman of its board, Irving S. Olds, who sought as we did, to make radio a challenging, mature medium for the presentation of challenging and mature plays. As a result the Theater Guild turned to radio with a new point of view and a new excitement and launched last September the Theater Guild on the Air, a Sunday evening hour-long dramatic series which is broadcast nationally by the American Broadcasting Co. from 10 to 11 o'clock eastern standard time.

In the months that have followed, the Theater Guild has learned more and more to appreciate the flexibility of radio broadcasting as a dramatic form of expression and it has, in turn, brought to it some of the more rounded, three-dimensional features of the legitimate stage. Both have profited from the association with results that have proven themselves in the acceptance of the program from coast to coast. In a few short weeks, radio editors all over the country voted it among the first two dramatic hours on the air, a verdict confirmed by the year-end balloting of radio's trade publication, Radio Daily, and by the fifteenth annual poll of Billboard, theatrical trade publication.

It was awarded a plaque by This Month magazine for its contribution to the wider audience it was creating for important plays in America's dramatic library. The annual poll of radio editors in the United States conducted by Motion Picture Daily placed the Theater Guild on the Air in its hall of fame as "one of the three leading dramatic programs for 1945." The Institute for Education by Radio on the occasion of its tenth annual exhibition of radio programs gave the Theater Guild on the Air first place in the cultural division of the American exhibition of educational programs. The illustrated magazine of the theater, Stage Pictorial, cited the guild broadcasts with honors for "contributing to the encouragement of the dramatic arts by bringing the world's outstanding plays with the theater's foremost stars to millions of listeners." And commentators on radio's affairs have been more than generous in their tributes to this program, which has won more awards in a single season than any other program in radio history.

Since September, the Theater Guild on the Air has presented radio adaptations of plays primarily chosen from among the lists sponsored by the Theater Guild, but many representative examples from other managements were also included. Given to the vast audience of the airwaves were: Wings Over Europe, Jacobowsky and the Colonel, John Ferguson, The Guardsman; Ah, Wilderness!; Mr. Pim Passes By; Sing Out, Sweet Land; At Mrs. Beam's, Storm Over Patsy, The Emperor Jones, Where the Cross Is Made, Pride and Prejudice, Morning's at Seven, Elizabeth the Queen, Ned McCobb's Daughter, The Royal Family, Little Women, Knickerbocker Holiday, Three Men on a Horse, The Silver Chord, Yellow Jack, The Front Page, The Second Man, Prologue to Glory, On Borrowed Time, Dead End, The Show-off, The Barker, The Masque of Kings, I Remember Mama, Strange Interlude, Seven Keys to Baldpate, The Green Pastures, Mary of Scotland; Mary, Mary, Quite Contrary; Payment Deferred, They Knew What They Wanted, Boy Meets Girl, and Call It a Day.

The Theater Guild on the Air was fortunate also in being able to bring to radio again Alfred Lunt and Lynn Fontanne, who, just returning after an absence of 2 years in London, agreed to appear 10 times. Other well-known stars who have contributed to the program are Burgess Meredith, Louis Calhern, Annabella, Oscar Karlweis, Walter Huston, Burl Ives, Paulette Goddard, Canada Lee, Boris Karloff, Joan Fontaine, Stuart Erwin, Fredric March, Katherine Hepburn, Ralph Bellamy, Ruth Hussey, Estelle Winwood, Walter Abel, Melvin Douglas, Michael O'Shea, Zachary Scott, Pat O'Brien, Ray Milland, Sir Cedric Hardwicke, Mady Christians, Oscar Homolka, Walter Pidgeon, Martha Scott, Juano Hernandez, Helen Hayes, Helen Mencken, Gertrude Lawrence, Charles Laughton, Elsa Lanchester, John Garfield, Leo Carillo, June Havoc, and Gene Kelly.

The Theater Guild's radio department includes Armina Marshall, administrative assistant of the guild, who heads the department, with the title of executive director; Homer Fickett, well-known radio director, who stages the plays for the air; George Kondolf, once a play producer himself, who is the radio-producing executive; Harold Levey, former musical comedy conductor and composer, who writes the musical backgrounds and leads the orchestra; and H. William Fitelson, who acts as special counsel to the department.

THE THEATER GUILD'S WAR SERVICE

With the fullest cooperation of Richard Rodgers, Oscar Hammerstein 2d, Rouben Mamoulian, Agnes de Mille, and Lynn Riggs, the Theater Guild was able to make available to the USO a specially produced version of Oklahoma for a tour of the wartime installations in the Pacific theater of operations.

Equipped with scenery, costumes, and a full chorus of singing and dancing girls, the USO camp shows presentation toured thousands of miles, putting on performances in hospitals, receiving areas, relocation centers, and forward zones where they were permitted. Over a million and a half of our boys were free guests at the performances and they often were moved to express their appreciation and gratitude in touching letters which we are preserving in a special file.

If its morale value and emotional therapy were even a fraction of what the servicemen called it, the play itself could be proud of the way it upheld the theater and its tradition. Returning to civilian life, many of the men are coming to the theater to see the full production and their sentiment that the one sent them overseas suffered nothing in comparison makes all connected with its presentation delighted and gratified.

But the morale problem of the overseas serviceman was not the only one that was brought to our attention. In New York itself, a busy port of embarkation and debarkation, thousands of men spent brief days, often their last before sailing for the battle fronts. In particular, Oklahoma presented a knotty problem of ticket distribution, because the demand was so great. Uniformed men, with little or no advance warning of their stay in New York, found it almost impossible to gain admittance. To remedy this situation, the guild, again with the full cooperation of all the artists involved in its creation, presented a series of 32 special servicemen's matinees, at greatly reduced prices. More than half a million men and women in uniform, that of our allies as well as our own, were thus accommodated.

The Theater Guild, however, did not restrict itself only to its productions to make its contribution to the Nation at war. Its personnel, from top to bottom, took active part in many aspects of the war effort, both in and out of uniform. Lawrence Langner, coadministrative director, organized the National Inventors' Council and acted as its voluntary executive secretary. During the period from 1940 to VJ-day this organization evaluated over 230,000 inventions for the Army and Navy. Theresa Helburn, also coadministrative director, participated in all the Nation-wide war bond campaigns and lent valuable assistance to the American Theater Wing and other war activities. Armina Marshall, administrative assistant, was one of the organizers of the Stage Door Canteen in Washington, D. C., and served as its acting director for nearly 2 years. Warren Munsell, business manager, entered the Army with the rank of major and rose to a full colonelcy. Jerome Whyte, who stage-managed Oklahoma, was given full responsibility for the stage management of Winged Victory. Joseph Heidt, press representative, donned khaki to assist in the popularization of the same famous Army Air Force production.

OWI PRESENTS THE GUILD

To popularize American institutions among our allies, the Office of War Information felt that an exhibit of the American theater would be desirable. It turned to the Theater Guild, then celebrating its twenty-fifth continuous year of play production on Broadway, and together they worked out an elaborate exhibit of photographs, posters, designs, programs, accompanied by a textual commentary, which was then shipped to London, Dublin, Stockholm, Rome, Cairo, Australia, and other world capitals. It was translated, we are informed, into Italian, Russian, Arabic, and other languages and exhibited with great interest.

THE GUILD AND THE EXPERIMENTAL THEATER

The best illustration of the Theater Guild's unflagging concern with new and untested ideas on the stage is the story of its negotiations with George Bernard Shaw to present Back to Methuselah. Asked for a contract, the ebullient G. B. S. said: "What for? No other producers would be lunatic enough to do it!"

Even though the underlying theme of its entire approach to the theater is to break new paths whenever possible, the guild has, at times, found itself with production projects so unusual and so unprecedented that it has been forced to label them frankly "experimental." Sometimes these were presented only on a single evening during the week, offered as extra attractions to the loyal subscribers who supported the organization.

In this category came some of the well-remembered productions of plays that would probably never have reached the stage under other circumstances. They include August Strindberg's The Dance of Death, David Liebovitz's John Hawthorne, Von Scholz's The Race With the Shadow, Kirchon and Ouspensky's Red Rust, Emile Verhaaren's The Cloister, George Kaiser's From Morn to Midnight, and others.

Regretfully, the guild has had to abandon this method of experimental production because of the restrictive regulations and exorbitant costs that in recent years have been imposed on them. Whenever conditions ease, it plans to return to its experimental program with even greater vigor than in the past.

The guild's innovational thinking has taken many forms. It has given new life to classics, both in strict reproduction and in freer-hand adaptation. It has introduced expressionism and impressionism both in decor and in writing, setting patterns that others later picked up and followed. Its impress has been left on every department of the American theater.

To choose just a few high lights to illustrate: It dared ring up the curtain on Strange Interlude at 5:30 in the afternoon; it also saw a renewed interest in the stage "aside" in the same O'Neill play. Mourning Becomes Electra and Back to Methuselah were two- and three-part plays, which were courageous theatrical enterprises. The introduction of the ballet in Oklahoma; the Paul Robeson "Othello," establishing a new premise for the basic theme of the play; Sing Out, Sweet Land, with its pioneering in musical Americana; all these theatrical paths were first charted by the Theater Guild.

THE THEATER GUILD, THE GROUP THEATER, AND THE PLAYWRIGHTS' COMPANY

With an understanding of the aspirations of youth, the Theater Guild encouraged the formation within its own ranks of a studio grouping, headed by Cheryl Crawford, its then casting director; Harold Clurman, its play reader of the day; and Lee Strasberg, who had acted in many guild productions. They formed themselves into the Group Theater and produced one play under the wing of the parent. Then, wanting to strike out on their own, they were given a helping hand by the guild in the form of two plays, Paul Green's House of Connelly and Paul and Claire Sifton's 1931, together with half the financing required to put them both on. The success of the House of Connelly gave the Group Theater its impetus to carry on an enlivening influence in our theater, which resulted in the development of two playwrights of prominence: Clifford Odets and Irwin Shaw.

A group of prominent playwrights—Maxwell Anderson, S. N. Behrman, the late Sidney Howard, Elmer Rice, and Robert E. Sherwood, growing dissatisfied with the general conditions of the theater, formed their own producing unit, the Playwrights' Company. The guild, for many years, maintained a working relationship with them, and jointly they have sponsored such plays as The Pirate, Candle in the Wind, and There Shall Be No Night. Prior to the formation of the Playwrights' Company, the guild had presented a total of 19 of the plays by these authors, 15 of them successful.

SCENIC ARTISTS AND THE GUILD

The panoply of sets and costumes, the investiture of its plays on the stage, has always been a prime concern of the Theater Guild. To achieve its desired effects, it has turned to some of the theater's foremost artists, notably Lee Simonson, Robert Edmond Jones, Stewart Chaney, Jo Mielziner, and Lemuel Ayers.

Mielziner started in the theater as a stage manager for the guild and, when he moved over into scenic artistry, he found the guild one of his most enthusiastic patrons. Among the many settings he has designed are Carouse and Foolish Notion. Lemuel Ayers was called on to create the American background for Oklahoma, and Mr. Chaney to decorate the settings for such an imposing list as Twelfth Night, The Innocent Voyage, Embezzled Heaven, Jacobowsky and the Colonel, Dunnigan's Daughter, and The Winter's Tale.

Mr. Jones, who created the backgrounds and costumes for such memorable Guild productions as Strange Interlude, Mary of Scotland, Mourning Becomes Electra, and Othello, has taken on the scenic assignment for the forthcoming Eugene O'Neill play, The Iceman Cometh.

THE THEATER GUILD STAFF

Appreciating the importance of its personnel, the Theater Guild has endeavored to attract and retain the ablest talents in each field for its permanent organization.

Chief aide to the administrative directors is Armina Marshall (Mrs. Lawrence Langner), actress, playwright, producer, who, with the title of administrative assistant, heads the Theater Guild on the Air, and also serves from time to time as associate producer.

Kenneth C. Rowe, head of the playwrighting department of the University of Michigan, is on leave to be chief of the Theater Guild play department, in which he is assisted by Anne Ross. Mr. Rowe also conducts a seminar of Theater Guild award-winning young playwrights.

In the production of plays two men hold key posts: Karl Nielsen, general production manager for all guild dramatic shows, and Jerome Whyte, his counterpart for all guild musical shows. To keep constant watch on the shifting reservoir of acting talent is Bettina Cerf, casting assistant, known to hundreds of prospective and established actors and actresses.

Peter Davis and Sara Greenspan regulate the business affairs of the guild. Jack Koritzer is the comptroller in charge of the bookkeeping and auditing department. Addie Williams, once a Ziegfeld showgirl, is known to thousands as head of the New York subscription office, and to other thousands for her supervisory work with the entire Guild-American Theater Society network. She is aided by Jane Munsell, who is in charge of the ticket distribution staff. The press and promotion of the Theater Guild plays is under the direction of Joseph Heidt, assisted by Peggy Phillips, and national publicity and promotion for the guild and the radio program is assigned to Alfred H. Tamarin. Fitelson and Mayers are the Guild's attorneys.

The guild is particularly happy to have kept the long and devoted services of its mechanical department heads: Abe Kurnit, chief carpenter, himself an inventor of stage machinery; Fred Leturmey, chief electrician, a master of the intricacies of stage lighting; Marty Fontana, chief propertyman, in charge of the guild warehouse, who is expert in providing stage effects; and Hallye Clogg, head of the costume department, who ably supervises the vast wardrobe of both past and present productions.

THE THEATER GUILD ALUMNI

The Theater Guild has seen countless numbers of young men and women, playwrights, directors, craftsmen, actors, and actresses developing their talents in its midst. As many have gone on and up to win fortune on their own, they take with them the fond wishes of the Guild. Producers Russell Crouse and Cheryl Crawford were one-time press representative and casting director, respectively, of the guild. Warren Munsell, now establishing himself as a London producer, was for two decades the business manager of the organization. Harold Clurman was a play reader; Elia Kazan, now a producer-director, once an assistant stage manager. Robert Sisk, formerly publicity director, is now a moving-picture producer, and Helen Deutsch, who held a similar post, a front-rank motion-picture scenarist. John Gassner, for 15 years head of the play department, is now a well-known authority on the drama and a play executive for a major Hollywood studio. John Haggott, for years the production manager, is also in Hollywood, where he has begun a producing-directing career on his own.

The list of important actors who have played with the Theater Guild is even longer: Walter Abel, Luther Adler, Sarah Allgood, Glenn Anders, Judith Anderson, Edward Arnold, William Bendix, Tallulah Bankhead, Ethel Barrymore, Richard Bennett, Elizabeth Bergner, Humphrey Bogart, Alice Brady, Mary Boland, Romney Brent, Ilka Chase, Ina Claire, Bobby Clarke, Charles Coburn, Claudette Colbert, George M. Cohan, Donald Cook, Ernest Cossart, Jane Cowl, Laura Hope Crews, Dudley Digges, Alfred Drake, Eddie Dowling, Augustin Duncan, Claire Eames, Florence Eldridge, Stuart Erwin, Maurice Evans, John Emery, Jose Ferrer, Lynn Fontanne, Pauline Frederick, Helen Gahagan, Margalo Gillmore, Dorothy Gish, Lillian Gish, Sydney Greenstreet, John Halliday, Sterling Holloway, Walter Hampden, Helen Hayes, Katharine Hepburn, Celeste Holm, Libby Holman, Miriam Hopkins, Henry Hull, Whitford Kane, Gene Kelly, Dennis King, Alexander Knox, Otto Kruger, Jessie Royce Landis, Eva LeGallienne, Beatrice Lillie, Pauline Lord, Alfred Lunt, Fredric March, Philip Merivale, Edna St. Vincent Millay, Douglass Montgomery, Ralph Morgan, Paul Muni, Alla Nazimova, Elliott Nugent, Claude Rains, Paul Robeson, Florence Reed, Edward G. Robinson, Joseph Schildkraut, Walter Slezak, Zachary Scott, Gale Sondergaard, Franchot Tone, Henry Travers, Spencer Tracy, Clifton Webb, Hope Williams, Alexander Woolcott, Roland Young, Blanche Yurka, and many others.

GUILD AID TO NEW TALENT

The ending of the war permitted the Theater Guild to set up a series of aids and encouragements for young, talented playwrights, which it had first announced in 1944 on the occasion of its twenty-fifth anniversary. Five playwrighting scholarships had been established, four of them allocated for men returning from war service. Three of these have been assigned and a fourth turned over to a Negro playwright, whose work showed extraordinary promise.

The other twenty-fifth anniversary scholarships, awarded then to promising young actors and actresses, are still in effect and a contingent of youthful thespians is studying diligently at the American Academy of Dramatic Arts on grants made them by the guild. Some of them already are showing more promise than could have been foretold and can be expected to be among the brighter actors and actresses of the coming years.

The Theater Guild, however, did not feel that cash awards to playwrights were enough. It therefore organized a seminar for its scholarship winners to provide them with a laboratory in which the problems of dramaturgy might be explored and resolved. To officiate it assigned the head of its play department, Kenneth C. Rowe, well-known playwrighting instructor, whose courses at the University of Michigan won him wide attention. The guild's directorate also makes itself available as visiting lecturers and advisers.

THE THEATER GUILD LOOKS TO THE FUTURE

Now that the war is over it would seem that the American theater has before it the prospects of a future brighter than any period in its recent history. The wartime theatrical services, USO camp shows, the soldier theater undertakings like This Is the Army and Winged Victory, as well as the many productions given in local posts for local consumption, have all broadened considerably the potential audience for the theater. Many of the men were seeing their first living stage production.

In the theaters themselves, on Broadway and throughout the country, there is a happy rush on the public's part to witness and enjoy what the stage has to offer. Here, too, many are recultivating habits of theatergoing that had fallen into disuse in other years.

As a result, the situation seems ripe for the fullest possible realization of the best the American theater can offer. The Theater Guild hopes to continue to contribute its share toward the advancement of the art of the theater as energetically in the future as it has in the past.

United States Needs Modern Legislative Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Richard L. Strout:

UNITED STATES NEEDS MODERN LEGISLATIVE PLANT

AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, has now formally introduced into the Senate, in behalf of his all-but-unanimous special committee, the comprehensive program for congressional reform. To meet the turbulent days ahead and the crowding problems that press down upon the Legislature, some improvement in efficiency is vital. The American legislative plant ought to be modernized.

Here is a program that has been worked out with painstaking care by a joint committee of Congress itself. Democrats and Republicans joined in the recommendations. It is the program by which Congress would reform itself. It is characteristic of the very faults of congressional procedure that this elaborate scheme may never be voted upon by the present Congress. As is usual at the end of the term, Congress is caught in a dreadful snarl of overwork. It has dilly-dallied, and the Senate, for example, has wasted a month on the British loan quasi-filibuster before taking the vote that might as well have been taken in 4 or 5 days.

Congress is always overworked under its present system, where petty matters must be decided along with big ones. Congress today is piled up with appropriation bills and pieces of must legislation, and consequently dozens of other important proposals must be dropped overboard if the Legislature achieves its goal of a long vacation to encompass the fall election.

If the La Follette-Monroney program is not adopted now, all its 2 years' work will be lost, and the matter must start again from scratch at the next session.

Congress is encumbered by its ancient appendages. It has too many committees and these committees overlap. Its lack of expert legislative secretaries is a scandal. At many times, Congressmen are voting in the dark. Furthermore, the gap between legislature and executive is widening dangerously. The separation of powers which makes the congressional form of government different from the parliamentary system was never meant to produce a chronic stalemate. The streamlining proposal would set up a joint legislative-executive council that would throw a bridge across this abyss. The proposal is that the majority party in Congress would create a policy committee in House and Senate, and that meetings of this committee with the President and his Cabinet should be formalized.

Furthermore, party regularity would be strengthened under the program. At any rate, the attempt would be made. Policy committees of the two parties would be set up in either Chamber, for the formulation of over-all legislative policy. A yardstick would be established under this plan, whereby the votes of individual members could be judged in relation to the policies laid down by their parties.

Congress has been surprisingly parsimonious with itself. A poor and inefficient Congress is a liability to the United States, and deserves small salaries; but a first-rate Congress, with a system under which the good men come to the front, is almost invaluable. The caliber of the men in Congress is just as high as it ever was, but the Legislature is much bigger than it used to be. There are more committees, more complicated problems; the individual must spread himself out thin to cover the field.

The La Follette-Monroney committee comes to the aid of the individual Member. It would improve his secretarial service, improve the research assistants available to the legislator, pay him more money, trim the committee structure and hearings to manageable proportions, remove thousands of details from the work of Congress, provide a more efficient calendar.

In his report to the Senate, Mr. LA FOLLETTE puts the matter in a nutshell:

"Devised to handle the simpler tasks of an earlier day, our legislative machinery and procedures are by common consent no longer competent to cope satisfactorily with the grave and complex problems of the postwar world.

"They must be modernized."

OPA Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FESTUS, MO., *June 7, 1946.*

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CARNAHAN: I have been intending to write you for some time in reference to the OPA situation. I am of the opinion, and it is the opinion of the vast majority of the people here, that Congress could make no worse mistake than to relieve present OPA restrictions. Most people here that I talk to think there should be even more, rather than less, restrictions. The OPA requirements have been frequently violated and penalties have been assessed. I have not talked to a person here who wanted these price controls materially changed or abolished, except some man who had something he wanted to sell at higher than ceiling prices.

The price of building materials, of course, is just beyond the ability of any ordinary laboring man or mechanic or factory employee to pay. These people simply cannot own a home under present conditions. Why this feature has not been better handled or could not be, I have no idea, but we all feel certain that if price ceilings are abolished on meats, dairy products, other food, clothing, and other necessities, that laboring men will simply be compelled to strike and will be justified in doing so.

Of course, we are way back here in the country, but there is the general feeling here that people cannot understand why Congress will even seriously entertain any substantial changes in OPA restrictions. There was no ceiling price on strawberries; they sold as high as 70 cents a quart.

Yours very truly,

ALBERT S. ENNIS,
Attorney at Law.

Letter to Martin Thames

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include a letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1946.

Mr. MARTIN THAMES,
Henderson, Tex.

DEAR MARTIN: I recall your letter of May 17. It is true, on February 23, 1939—51 days after I became your Congressman—I voted to fortify Guam; I voted for the Selective Service Act and the extensions of the act; the first extension passed the House by only one vote—a vote, according to President Roosevelt, the Secretary of War, and General Marshall, which saved the Army of the United States. I voted to arm our ships; I voted to permit our ships to go to any place conducive to the success of our war effort—this measure, although backed strongly by President Roosevelt, passed by only 18 votes, 3 weeks before Pearl Harbor. In the 7½ years I have served you in Congress I have voted for every measure to strengthen and keep strong America. I have supported all legislation coming before the House to bring about an enduring peace, and all legislation providing for the participation of the United States in this effort. On September 21, 1943, I voted for the Fulbright resolution; on June 7, 1945, I supported and voted for the Bretton Woods agreement. On December 18, 1945, I voted for the United Nations Participation Act. I have voted for every measure—including terminal leave, housing, surplus-property preference for veterans legislation—to aid and raise the compensation and pay of all veterans, their widows and dependents, our men in service, and their dependents.

I am the author of H. R. 2349—now a law—to adjust the pay status of warrant officers. On December 18, 1943, I introduced H. R. 3875 to provide terminal leave for enlisted men; on January 8, 1945, I introduced H. R. 1160, a slightly modified form of my first bill, which was endorsed by the American Legion; I was 1 of 218 Members of the House to sign the petition which authorized the bringing of the legislation to the floor of the House. I had 14 first cousins in service—7 overseas; 1 was an officer, 13 were enlisted men. I might add neither had an independent income to sustain his dependents while away and neither had 3 or 4 years of a term of office to which to return. I have responded to every request of veterans and their widows and dependents to represent them before the Washington Board of Veterans' Appeals; I have supported the Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, and all legislation to eliminate subversive elements; I was the author of H. R. 4817—now a law—to strengthen our immigration laws. I have worked to prevent delays; I have worked sincerely to help prevent inflation. I have endeavored to aid and I have supported all legislation to assist our farmers, aged, blind, crippled, unemployed, and those who toil, our independent and small businessmen, and our boys and girls endeavoring to attend school.

In the 7½ years I have been your Congressman, Congress, with the exception of some 6 months, has been in session all or part of every month. I have been at my post of duty, which is exactly what was

requested of the membership of Congress by our Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt; the Secretary of War; and the Secretary of the Navy. Yes, I have been at my post of duty just like each of the 21 Texas Members of the House is at his post of duty, just like every Member of the 435 Members of the House and 96 Members of the Senate is at his post of duty.

I have had 9½ years of legislative experience—7½ years in a wartime Congress dealing with war and postwar measures. I might add, I have served on seven committees in Congress. I am the sixth ranking Democratic member of 27 members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the only committee on which Speaker RAYBURN served and the committee of which Speaker RAYBURN was chairman when he became majority leader and later Speaker.

Always I'm glad to hear from you; write me any time. I always shall be grateful for your friendship. Call on me any time.

Your friend,

LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

Why Bread Is So Scarce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the main reason why the American housewife cannot find a loaf of bread at the market place is because the New Deal planners planned it that way.

The New Deal is built on scarcity. There is nothing the New Deal planners fear so much as plenty of wheat, plenty of butter, and plenty of the other products of American farms.

The New Deal has intentionally created scarcities so that it could keep food prices high and could establish and enforce its bureaucratic control over the American farmer.

Every wartime food-production program has been hamstrung and sabotaged by the New Deal fear of abundance. Out of one corner of their mouths they have asked the farmer for all-out production. Out of the other corner they have warned him against producing too much.

To make certain he did not produce too much, they have curtailed his supplies of farm machinery, fertilizer, and labor; they have hampered him with restrictive quotas and regulations.

We are now asked to export millions of tons of wheat to help feed the world. Nobody objects to this if we have the wheat. But for several years, under the New Deal program of controlled scarcity, the United States actually imported more wheat than it exported. For example:

	Bushels
Exports:	
1934	21,532,000
1935	15,929,000
1936	21,584,000
Total	59,045,000
Imports:	
1934	25,134,000
1935	46,638,000
1936	47,924,000
Total	119,696,000

In 1937 over 70 percent of the wheat exported was subsidized by payment of an export bounty; in 1938 over 76 percent of the wheat exported was subsidized; in 1939, with wheat as low as 54 cents per bushel, a 25- to 30-cent-per-bushel export subsidy was paid on wheat.

Millions of dollars have been paid to American farmers for not raising wheat. One big Texas operator received $112,000 in 1 year for not raising wheat and other crops.

Even during the war these restrictions were continued. Wheat farmers were penalized and fined for harvesting too much wheat. The shackles were not removed from wheat production until August 1943.

Farmers knew the New Deal economy of scarcity was a failure by 1939, when the price of wheat, after 8 years of New Deal pump priming, was 34 cents a bushel lower than it was 10 years before.

Consumers, too, now realize that an economy of scarcity can only mean markets bare of bread, meat, and butter—high prices caused by short supplies—and partial failure of our efforts to relieve world starvation.

This administration is afraid of abundance. By its policies, it will never be able to relieve starvation abroad, eliminate malnutrition in America, or provide an adequate supply of food at reasonable prices for consumers.

Donald Barrows Partridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to note the passing of Donald Barrows Partridge, a former member of this body. Born in Norway, Oxford County, in my State, he was graduated from his local high school and from Bates College, the latter institution conferring a bachelor of science degree in 1910. Three years of teaching followed, then admission to the Maine bar, the law becoming thereafter his principal interest.

Other activities included 12 years of service as clerk of courts for Oxford County, clerk of his native town, and on the Maine Industrial Accident Commission. He was on business for the commission just named, at Portland, when his death occurred June 5.

He was elected to the Seventy-second Congress in 1930, from the Maine Second District, which then included six counties—Androscoggin, Franklin, Knox, Lincoln, Oxford, and Sagadahock. Four of these counties are now in the area I represent. Because of redistricting, the other two are a part of the First District.

His service at the Nation's Capital—14 years ago—was brief, but there are those, still Members of this body, that remember him as an industrious and conscientious legislator. He was highly regarded in his native town and throughout the State.

Graduation Address to Sacred Heart Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD an address by one of Montana's outstanding citizens, Monsignor Denis P. Meade, to the graduating class of the Sacred Heart Academy at Missoula, Mont. I commend his talk to your consideration because it contains much food for thought for all of us in these trying times.

MONSIGNOR MEADE ADDRESSES GRADUATING SENIORS OF SACRED HEART ACADEMY

Rev. Howard Luger, S. J., pastor of St. Francis Xavier parish, conferred the diplomas on the graduates of Sacred Heart Academy Wednesday night at St. Francis Xavier Church.

Graduation day opened with a special chapel exercise at 10 a. m. at the academy. Rev. Joseph Stack, S. J., of Santa Barbara, Calif., a former pastor of St. Francis Xavier parish, Missoula, addressed the entire student body on Devotion to the Sacred Heart. This month is the fiftieth anniversary of Father Stack's membership in the Jesuit order and he was present for the fiftieth commencement exercises of the academy.

An assembly followed at which the seniors presented their class will and prophecy, concluding with the singing of the school songs and the hanging of the senior class picture.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. D. P. Meade addressed the graduates at the evening exercises.

THE ADDRESS

Excerpts from his address follow:

"'A young man according to his way, even when he is old will not depart from it'" (Proverbs xxii: 6).

"As the mighty tree was once a tiny sapling, so the full-grown man or woman was once a helpless babe. And as the tender sapling contains all the essential characteristics of the stately monarch of the forest, so the child contains all the characteristics of the man. As the strength and growth of the tree is developed by its resistance to the elements that surround it, so our characteristics, so the courses of our individual lives, are formed by the action of our wills upon external circumstances. These circumstances which affect us most deeply and last the longest are those which belong to our youth. There are some who say that a man is made or marred in the first 5 or 6 years of his life."

MUST BEGIN EARLY

"If religion and morality are not early inculcated, they seldom become a second nature and will with difficulty attain the necessary strength for a full Christian life. The Christian education of youth therefore is a matter of supreme importance. It cannot be begun too early, nor can it be carried out with too great efficiency.

"The proper education of a human being is the training of him as a whole, the development of all his faculties, the preparation of him for all his duties, the making of him, as nearly as possible, a perfect man. A disproportionate development of any one faculty to the neglect of others is in itself an imperfection, and it generally involves the impairment or arrested development of the other faculties. * * *

"Education as it is understood in many parts of the world today is by no means the training of the whole man, as it ought to be.

The training is one-sided and disturbs the proportion that should exist between the different faculties of man. Modern education takes the mind, endeavors to strengthen it, to sharpen it, to inform it, and to get from it the greatest practical result within a given limit of time. Knowledge and cleverness, however, are by no means the only equipment which man needs for the many works of life. Yet from this kind of education the un-Christian world expects the best results. Knowledge is indeed power but special training is needed to teach the proper use of power. The world forgets that the mere possession of power affords no assurance against the mischievous use of power. Need I labor this point in view of the state of the world at this very moment?"

SAD EXAMPLES

"History affords many sad examples of great intellect and great intellectual training without virtue. Solomon was one of the wisest of men but he forgot the law of the Lord and sank into the depths of lust and idolatry. * * *

"Who have been, after all, the greatest enemies of human progress and especially of human happiness, of liberty, and the welfare of society but those who have had and now have all the power that secular education can give. Cruel tyrants, reckless conquerors, profligate statesmen, swindling financiers, crooked politicians, corrupt teachers of youth—these pests of humanity are usually endowed with intelligence and knowledge but are deficient in moral and spiritual training.

"This sort of education after a century of sway over our Nation and the world is now bearing the fruit we might naturally expect. Crimes, the very ingenuity of which betray a brilliant and trained mind, are the order of the day. The viciousness and cruelty displayed in their execution indicate a barbarous age rather than the refinement of the twentieth century. It would seem the more schools we build the more jails we need. * * *

"There is, among the many gifts of God, hardly any more important, hardly any greater blessing than that of a good, thorough education, embracing the body, the mind, the heart, and the soul. To secure this kind of education has ever been the aim of the Catholic school."

Terminal Leave Pay for Enlisted Men Aid to Rehabilitating Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the enlisted service personnel of this Nation must be pleased, indeed, to observe that Congressman ROGERS' terminal leave bill, H. R. 4051, passed the House of Representatives without a dissenting vote.

I was among those Members of Congress who signed the petition to have this bill reported out of committee and was in hearty agreement with the bill as it passed the House of Representatives.

This legislation is necessary because enlisted personnel need this extra pay to readjust themselves to civilian life. It is necessary in order to eliminate unfair discrimination between enlisted men and officers.

If this measure becomes law, servicemen will be able to more leisurely find the kind of employment for which they are best suited in civilian life. It is my sincere hope that the Senate will vote overwhelmingly for H. R. 4051 as soon as possible.

Dictatorship in the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1946

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from a constituent who is in the grain business. It concerns the ill-advised amendment No. 8 to War Food Order No. 144. The letter reads as follows:

DEAR MR. HOPE: Please advise me how to keep out of jail, or, at least, which jail I will be in under the following circumstances:

Under the Department of Agriculture WFO Order No. 144, amendment 8, I am instructed to make a storage customer sell me one-half of the wheat which he brings in and legally tenders me for storage in my public warehouse.

If I don't do this, I am threatened with a very fancy list of penalties, but if I do do it, I am threatened, on the other hand, with another fancy list of penalties for violating the State and Federal Warehouse Acts, which provide that a bonded warehouseman must accept storage grain from anybody tendering it in good faith if he has the room. It is a matter of common knowledge that we now have the room.

If I am in jail at election time, I probably won't get to vote.

I also am in receipt of another letter from a large grain company operating both terminal warehouses and country elevators. This letter in part reads as follows:

DEAR MR. HOPE: I read in the paper and hear on the radio that the United States Government proposes to make the farmer sell half of his wheat he delivers to the grain elevators and that the grain elevators in turn must sell half of the wheat they buy to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Under the State public warehouse law, we must take for storage, as long as we have room, the wheat a farmer wishes to deliver to us for storage and give him a warehouse receipt.

You see, then, we are governed by two conflicting laws. Which shall we obey? Naturally, we expect our country elevator managers to accept any and all wheat for storage that a farmer desires to deliver, as long as we have room. If the farmer does not choose to sell half of his wheat, then that, no doubt, is something to be settled between himself and the Government. Are we correct in this, and if not, what are we to do?

It seems to me that these two letters show very clearly that the order in question was drafted without the careful consideration which any order of such importance should have received. As I pointed out on May 23 there is certainly grave question as to the constitutionality of such an order. Laying that question aside there is small likelihood that the order will be successful in securing the wheat which is now so urgently needed. This order is thoroughly un-American. It smacks of fascism. It should be promptly rescinded. I predict that it will be rescinded in time because American farmers, if I know them, are not going to stand for this type of dictatorship.

The Real Labor Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

THE REAL LABOR PROBLEM

The administration's so-called labor policy appears to be confused and aimless only if it is viewed as separate and distinct from anything else that goes on in Washington.

It takes on a very different aspect when it is considered in conjunction with almost every other administration "policy."

It is of the same nature as the New Deal's reconversion program, by which the supply of merchandise—from fuels and raw materials to finished products, from the farms and cattle ranges to the meat packers and the dairy kitchens, from the cotton fields and wool yards to the textile mills and the clothing shops—is bossed from the Capital by the Administrator of Civilian Production, by the Office of Price Administration, and by the Economic Stabilizer.

It embodies the same spirit and purpose as the administration's housing plans and a long list of similar legislative schemes, ranging from socialized medicine and Federal control of scientific research to vast centralized satrapies supplanting State and local governments in the great river valleys.

It belongs in the same category as the British loan agreement and the use of Export-Import Bank funds, the actual effect of which will be to create an international trade organization in which American finance, industry, and commerce will be subjected to bureaucratic domination abroad as well as at home.

The policy is, in fact, one segment in a complete system of controlled economy that is being riveted part by part upon the uncomprehending Nation by diverse and devious methods.

At present this labor policy is being enforced in the guise of emergency measures to deal with the long series of demoralizing strikes in vital industries.

President Truman's temporary antistrike bill would have given congressional sanction to the policy for an indeterminate period.

Within that period permanent legislation was to be prepared; and, with so much power already exercised by the Government, it is a foregone conclusion that the permanent law would simply make the emergency permanent.

The essence of the New Deal's postwar labor policy is governmental wage fixing.

The wage fixing is accomplished by the device of Government seizure of private property in which a strike occurs—a peacetime misuse of a wartime power which was first flagrantly and unconstitutionally abused in the Montgomery Ward seizure.

Having seized a plant or industry, the administration substitutes Government operation for private operation.

The next step is for the Government to settle the strike—itself determining, acceptably to the labor bosess, the wage rates and working conditions of the men by a pretense of collective bargaining.

When that has been done, the owners and operators, who have no voice in the strike settlement, can recover their properties only by accepting the terms which the Government and the labor bosses have made.

There is no assurance, in law or elsewhere, that the settlements will be such as the affected industries will be financially able to sustain—the alternative prospect being continuous Government operation, or Government ownership.

In his emergency antistrike bill, the President proposed a still further usurpation—that any profits accruing during Government operation should not be left to the business but should be retained by the Government.

Here is a form of outright confiscation the like of which has never before been suggested by an American administration.

There is a way—an American way—of solving the labor problem, but it is not the New Deal's way.

First. Legislation is needed to abolish the inequities and racketeering evils inherent in the Wagner Act.

Second. The Corrupt Practices Acts must be applied in politics against labor unions as well as business corporations.

Third. Labor unions should be required to incorporate, to hold honest elections, and to account for their funds.

Fourth. Labor unions as wel. as employers should be held legally liable for breach of contracts.

Fifth. The equity powers of the courts to issue injunctions in strikes, especially against illegal actions, should be fully restored.

Sixth. Judicial tribunals to hear and determine as arbitrators all labor disputes should be established, impartial courts to which labor or industry could readily resort, just as citizens now appeal to civil courts for the redress of grievances and settlement of disputes, instead of taking the law violently into their own hands.

Two things must be abolished: (1) Governmental seizure, by Executive orders, of private property and (2) wage fixing by governmental bureaucracies or political appointees.

If, on the other hand, the Federal Government is to have permanent power to determine wages, then also the Federal Government must have permanent power to fix prices and to control all the processes of production and distribution.

This is obviously the power the New Deal wants—and is really using now—because it is a part of the New Deal's entire program of socialism and regimentation.

This is exactly what the New Deal must not have if the American people are to become again a free people and if our matchless economic and social progress is to be resumed.

Extension of Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CIRCUIT COURT CHAMBERS, COURT HOUSE,
La Crosse, Wis.

To the EDITOR, MILWAUKEE JOURNAL:

Your editorials in recent issues of the Journal entitled "A Cowardly Draft Bill" and "Draft Fiasco Comes Home" are so inconsistent with your previous editorial sanity and consistency they come as a distinct shock to my long years of implicit faith in the Journal. You call it cowardly for Congress to exempt the 18- and 19-year-old youths from the draft extension, and in the later editorial call the Wisconsin Congressmen by name as leaders in the so-called fiasco. Just how do you get that way? What actual use would an 18- or 19-year-old boy be in that purely occupational force? That is a policeman's job that requires age and matured judgment. The only explanation for your stand is that you too have joined the great army of the brass hats in their drive for a militaristic form of government here. This draft extension of teen-aged youths is just the forerunner of a permanent peacetime conscription that is just as unconstitutional and undemocratic as any other form of human slavery. Have you actually fallen for the Army and Navy plea to the effect that a year's training under such plan will help to build up the physical and moral character of the youths of the land? If you have, you should consult a good psychiatrist, or better still, take a poll of the judiciary of your own State. They have seen boys come and go to these training camps and have had occasion to be confronted with many of them on their return. To be taught the fine arts of murder as a substitute for government by law; to herd together hundreds of thousands of boys just on the brink of manhood without the social contacts or home ties that they sorely need at that age, doesn't breed character nor respect for the opposite sex, nor regard for law and order.

And lastly there is no need for them in the armed forces now or in the long-distant future, notwithstanding what either the President or General Eisenhower says about it. An advance in pay for the private will bring all the volunteers needed. All this needling of Russia and communism is a well-planned propaganda to make the people of this country fall for a standing army of such huge proportions as to keep our heirs and assigns on the delinquent tax rolls for a hundred years.

R. S. COWIE,
Circuit Judge.

OPA Price Fixing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible to contemplate the very great and grave mistakes that have been made by the OPA. Of course, the people realize that those mistakes have been made, but those in charge of OPA—those who fix price ceilings—are the very last to realize just what mistakes they have made. Evidently men of little, or no experience have charge of price fixing, or those who do have charge of that feature in that agency care very little about the problems the people are facing in this critical period. However, the OPA continues on its way, taking the people along with it—and all along the way we find the stragglers, those who have been forced out of their businesses, who are left behind—except, may we say, those who have been driven into the black markets, and they are trying to withstand the blow directed at every businessman in our country.

Mr. Speaker, a very enlightening article appeared quite recently, in the Indianapolis Star on the subject of milk, and milk products. Under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the article, which follows:

WATCHFUL WAITING ON MILK

Advances in prices on milk, cream, and butter have come after long demands that OPA abandon its stubborn refusal to encourage greater production by inducements to producers. Milk in the Indianapolis area has gone up 1 cent a quart, cream 1 cent a half-pint, and butter 10 cents a pound. Producer prices on bulk milk have been raised 40 cents a hundredweight.

Chances are that milk production will not be increased materially, although the upturn is likely to keep more farmers in the market. That will prevent an even more acute shortage. Demand has been heavier and conditions would be aggravated through decline in current supplies.

The public will be especially gratified if butter output emerges from the period of virtual rationing. Many families have difficulty getting adequate supplies either of butter or substitutes. Utility of the hotel, club or restaurant roll has been diminishing because one anemic pat is utterly insufficient for an average meal.

The upturn in milk prices, therefore, may serve to demonstrate the OPA blunder in maintaining inadequate ceiling prices. Something drastic must be done to eliminate conditions which, in many instances, are worse than the public endured during the war. Sacrifices then were made cheerfully, for they contributed to victory. Current Washington bungling, without the war excuse, leads to suspicion that some of the economic planners have made permanent regimentation of the citizen a major objective.

Veterans' Unemployment Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, with the introduction of H. R. 6746, 2 years of intensive work have gone into the preparation of this legislation by the best authorities we could find in the country who have a knowledge of government, veterans' affairs, industrial engineering, banking, finance, economy, business, industry, and overseas trade. We have left no stone unturned to enable this legislation to fill the gap that is wide open and the problem that is the most serious before the Nation today—that is, veterans' unemployment.

With the pressure on Congress and the Government attending reconversion from war to peace, we have neglected the most important matter of all. There is more business on veterans' affairs before the Congress than all other matters combined. The most important of all veterans' problems is that of unemployment.

General Bradley, the Veterans' Administrator, stated the problem quite clearly on Monday of this week in addressing the Thirty-first Annual Convention of Kiwanis International, in saying:

Four million veterans would be unemployed next fall unless new jobs continued to be created.

The Administrator said also:

It is time we stopped indulging in the sacrifices of veterans and worked harder instead to fulfill their wants. It is time we took stock of the promises we made while they were still overseas. The Veterans' Administration with its GI provisions can offer only a narrow foothold to veterans. Although jobs are the No. 1 issue, our Administration is limited to helping veterans with only training for jobs.

Yesterday I introduced a bill, H. R. 6746, known as the Veterans' Employment and National Economic Development Corporation Act as the answer to General Bradley's alarming statement. It is our direct interest to veterans and to all our people in every community to pass this legislation in this Seventy-ninth Congress. This program will be no expense to the taxpayers. On the contrary it will reduce their taxes as it will reduce the cost of government and reduce the billions of dollars paid to idle veterans.

Veterans are already facing acute unemployment problems that will be further aggravated. On account of the time lost in war service they will have greater difficulty getting into and staying in business than the average businessman and professional person. The veterans are at a disadvantage because of their loss of job opportunities, job property rights, job seniority, experience, financial gain, and contacts suffered by them during their war service: 7,000,000 veterans have no reemployment rights and of these 4,000,000 had no occupation of any consequence prior to military service and have no particular job to return to; 2,500,000 discharged veterans are unemployed of whom more than 1,500,000 are drawing unemployment compensation. There are more than 350,000 disabled veterans of World War II who have registered for work but cannot find it.

The phenomenal technological wartime advancement will produce increasingly more and more peacetime products and utilize fewer and fewer people. In this technological unemployment the veterans will be at a disadvantage. During the recessions and depressions between World War I and II there were as many as 1,500,000 veterans on the relief rolls at one time. With three times as many veterans of World War II as of World War I it is clear that a cycle of boom and bust will give us more than three times as many World War II veterans unemployed unless we take action now.

This is an opportunity for the Congress in this seventy-ninth session to serve the veteran, labor, and all the people. This is a real opportunity for organized labor, in view of the fact that by providing employment for the millions of unemployed veterans, the inevitable conflicts will be avoided by taking the veterans off the unemployment rolls. The objectives of this act will open up new segments of our economy, make use of untapped and undeveloped natural resources, supply foreign countries with the unprecedented demand for American goods and services, and make use of the hundreds of thousands of captured enemy patents, processes, and trade secrets. Let us take a few cases, for example. Who are more entitled to the profits from the hundreds of thousands of commercially useful enemy patents, processes, and trade secrets than the families of our soldiers, sailors, and marines who gave their sweat, blood, and lives to capture? Shall we give these captured assets, as we did after World War I, to big corporations and monopolies that do not need them; or shall we give them to the most deserving group of our people who have won them with their own hands? These enemy patents, processes, and secrets will enable our veterans to spread the base of our economy and drive a new wedge toward an ever-expanding economy instead of a restricted economy for the few big corporations.

It would require the writing of many books to describe in detail how this Veterans' Corporation will not cost the taxpayers one penny but, on the other hand, will reduce their taxes. This program will reduce the cost of government, reduce the billions of dollars which will be paid to idle veterans in the form of unemployment compensation or bonuses, or other palliatives which at best cannot take the place of gainful careers in our free enterprise system.

This is without a doubt the greatest opportunity in American history to raise our standard of living for all the people and, at the same time, discharge an obligation to the veterans who gave their sweat and blood to defend our way of life. It is an amazing situation when one stops to think that by this piece of legislation we can utilize the unused war plants and equipment of the Nation to meet the serious backlog and shortages of consumer and durable goods and services and to supply the world with the new phenomenal demand for American products and services merely by putting the unused skills of our unemployed veterans to work. It is far simpler than devising an atomic bomb, or planning an invasion, or fighting a world war to a conclusion, yet we know it can work if we put our American genius for organization to work on this program now. It is within the power of the Seventy-ninth Congress to discharge its great obligation to those who actually fought the war to preserve our Nation. It is the duty of the Congress to take advantage of this opportunity to retain American leadership throughout the world and fortify the peace of the world by exchange of trade and free ideas. Who are better prepared to strengthen the position of the United States internally and economically in world-wide trade and international relationship with other countries than the veterans of our foreign wars. In fact, it is possible and probable that our veterans can so strengthen the United States—in turn to strengthen the United Nations—that they alone will be the most important factor in preventing World War III. This will assure the peoples of the earth desiring peace, freedom and prosperity that their dreams will actually come true. Twenty million living veterans of our wars with their families and friends represent potentially the most powerful force in the history of the United States. Having served once in war they will gladly serve again in an economic war to raise the standard of living for all our people, increase prosperity, and help to prevent World War III. If we give them this chance through the Veterans' Corporation to contribute their moral support and energies to the success of this program, they can again serve the Nation.

Among the features of the bill are: First, special provisions for creating gainful job and business opportunities for the disabled veterans who virtually cannot find employment under present conditions; second, provisions to enable veterans to trade abroad so as at the same time to meet the new great demand in other countries for American goods and services and promote friendship and confidence in countries such as China, Korea, India, Iraq, France, Iran, Turkey; and, third, authority for the Corporation to secure its funds by selling its bonds to the general public, through, or with the approval of, the Secretary of the Treasury, to permit direct and patriotic participation of the people in this veterans' enterprise.

As an example of how the Veterans' Corporation could strengthen the United Nations by promoting international cooperation and confidence among nations, consider the case of modernizing China. The Government of China is interested in having discharged veterans who can serve as technical missionaries to aid in the modernization and economic strengthening of their country. This program for our veterans would open vast new and perpetuating markets for American goods and services and create fuller markets for American goods and services. This veterans' program will create fuller employment not only for veterans but for all American workers. Peaceful economic approaches to China and other countries would eliminate promptly many of the world trouble centers and assure peace.

The Veterans' Employment and National Economic Development Corporation would thus open up for these veterans gainful career opportunities. In addition, it will enable these veterans to stimulate increased prosperity for all Americans and fortify by peaceful means our national security.

Comparative Provisions of Present Railroad Retirement Act; Original Crosser Bill and Committee Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted to me, I wish to give the House the benefit of the following analysis:

Comparative provisions of present Railroad Retirement Act; original Crosser bill (H. R. 1362); and committee amendments to H. R. 1362

	Present Railroad Act	Original Crosser bill (H. R. 1362)	Committee amendments (H. R. 1362)
Coverage	Designed to be the same as under the Railway Labor Act, with only few modifications. Generally speaking not intended to go beyond persons usually regarded as railroad workers.	Would specifically add freight forwarders and railroad-controlled motortruck companies to present coverage; would include many independent activities having no relation to the railroad industry.	Proposes no change in coverage provisions of the present act.
Retirement benefits: Age retirement.	Both males and females at age 65 irrespective of length of service. Both males and females at age 60–65 after 30 years of service, but with cut-back of one one-hundred-and-eightieth for each month under 65.	Same as present act except retirement of women at age 60 with no cut-back would be permitted.	Same as original Crosser bill.
Disability retirement	Persons with 30 or more years of service who become totally and permanently disabled (occupational or otherwise) may retire, regardless of age. If worker has less than 30 years of service he may claim a pension at age of 60, subject to a reduction or (cut-back) for each month under 65.	Individuals disabled (occupational or otherwise) for work in any regular employment after age 60 or with 10 years of service—no cut-back. Individuals disabled (occupational or otherwise) for work in regular railroad occupation after age 60 or with 20 years of service, and who have a "current connection" with the railroad industry (not less than 12 months' service during last 30 consecutive calendar months).	Cut-back provision of present act for disability for employment for hire at age 60 with less than 30 years of service is eliminated. In addition original Crosser amendments are adopted except that disability must be related to employment.
Computation of retirement annuities.	(*a*) 2 percent of first $50 of average monthly compensation. (*b*) 1½ percent of next $100 of average monthly compensation. (*c*) 1 percent of remainder up to $150 of average monthly compensation. (*d*) Monthly annuity equals sum of (*a*)+(*b*)+(*c*) times number of years of service.	Same as present act.	Same as present act.
Maximum retirement benefit	$120 per month (after Dec. 31, 1966, maximum may exceed this figure).	do	Do.
Minimum retirement benefit	$40 per month, except that if monthly compensation is less than $50, the pension shall be 80 percent of the monthly compensation. If such 80 percent is less than $20, the pension shall be $20 or the same amount of the monthly compensation, whichever is less.	$3 multiplied by the number of years of service, or $50, or the monthly compensation, whichever is the least. Individuals must have a "current connection" with the railroad industry and not less than 5 years of service.	Same as original Crosser bill.
Survivor and death benefits: General provisions.	Grants to a retiring employee the option of converting his prospective pension into a so-called joint and survivor pension. Under this arrangement the employee, by accepting a somewhat reduced pension payable to himself for life, assures a life pension thereafter to his surviving spouse. The combined actuarial value of the two pensions is the same as that of his own basic pension. If employee dies before or after retirement a cash refund is made to his beneficiaries of all the pay-roll taxes paid by him, plus an allowance for interest, less the sum of any pensions paid to him to the date of his death.	Would eliminate both option of joint survivorship annuity and cash death-benefit refund of present act. Would substitute in lieu thereof a system of benefits to surviving widows, dependent children, and dependent parents, similar to such benefits now provided by the Social Security Act, but increased by 25 percent above those provided by that act, and a lump-sum death benefit about 50 percent greater than provided by the Social Security Act.	Would eliminate joint survivorship option of present act, but retain cash death benefit refund of present law, so far as it has accrued to an individual up to Jan. 1, 1947. Would provide survivor annuities to the same persons who would receive those benefits under the original Crosser bill, but computed according to the formula of the Social Security Act, i. e., about 25 percent less than provided by original Crosser bill.
Retirement tax rates	On compensation not in excess of $300 per month.	On compensation not in excess of $300 multiplied by months of service in calendar year.	On compensation not in excess of $300 per month.

	Railroad	Employee	Total	Railroad	Employee	Total	Railroad	Employee	Total
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Jan. 1, 1937, to Dec. 31, 1939	2¾	2¾	5½						
Jan. 1, 1940, to Dec. 31, 1942	3	3	6						
Jan. 1, 1943, to Dec. 31, 1945	3¼	3¼	6½						
Jan. 1, 1946, to Dec. 31, 1946	3½	3½	7	5¾	5¾	11½	3½	3½	7
Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948	3½	3½	7	5¾	5¾	11½	6	6	12
Jan. 1, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1951	3¾	3¾	7½	6	6	12	6	6	12
Jan. 1, 1952 and thereafter	3¾	3¾	7½	6¼	6¼	12½	6	6	12

Railroad unemployment insurance:			
Maximum benefit period	20 weeks.	26 weeks.	Same as present act (20 weeks).
Maximum weekly benefit	$20.	$25.	Same as present act ($20).
Minimum weekly benefit	$8.75.	$8.75.	Same as present act ($8.75).
Sickness and maternity benefits.	None provided.	Would change concept of unemployment as embodied in present law by expanding it to include individual unemployment by reason of sickness or accident in no way caused by or related to railroad employment. Disability from pregnancy and maternity would be included. These benefits would be paid in the same amount and for the same duration as the liberalized benefits for occupational unemployment. Both unemployment and sickness benefits could be drawn in successive periods of the same benefit year.	Same as present act (no sickness or maternity benefits provided).
Unemployment insurance tax rates.	On compensation not in excess of $300 per month—3 percent.	On compensation not in excess of $300 multiplied by months of service in calendar year—3 percent.	On compensation not in excess of $300 per month. If the balance to the credit of the account as of the close of business on Sept. 30 of any year, as determined by the Secretary, is: — The rate with respect to compensation payable to employees for services rendered during the next succeeding calendar year shall be: $350,000,000 or more — ½ percent. $300,000,000 or more but less than $350,000,000. — 1 percent. $250,000,000 or more but less than $300,000,000. — 1½ percent. $200,000,000 or more but less than $250,000,000. — 2 percent. $150,000,000 or more but less than $200,000,000. — 2½ percent. Less than $150,000,000. — 3 percent.

Comparative provisions of present Railroad Retirement Act; original Crosser bill (H. R. 1362); and committee amendments to H. R. 1362—Continued

	Present Railroad Act						Original Crosser bill (H. R. 1362)						Committee amendments (H. R. 1362)					
	Railroad retirement		Unemployment insurance		Total		Railroad retirement		Unemployment insurance		Total		Railroad retirement		Unemployment insurance		Total	
	Railroad	Employee	Railroad	Employee	Railroad	Employee	Railroad	Employee	Railroad	Employee	Railroad	Employee	Railroad	Employee	Railroad	Employee	Railroad	Employee
Combined railroad retirement and unemployment insurance tax rates:	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Jan. 1, 1946, to Dec. 31, 1946	3½	3½	3	-------	6½	3	5¾	5¾	3	-------	8¾	6¾	3½	3½	3	-------	6½	3½
Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948	3½	3½	3	-------	6½	3½	5¾	5¾	3	-------	8¾	5¾	6	6	[1] 1½	-------	6½	6
Jan. 1, 1949, to Dec. 31, 1951	3¾	3¾	3	-------	6¾	3¾	6	6	3	-------	9	6	6	6	[1] 1½	-------	6½	6
Jan. 1, 1952 and thereafter	3¾	3¾	3	-------	6¾	3¾	6¼	6¼	3	-------	9¼	6¼	6	6	[1] 1½	-------	6½	6

[1] Per cent upon reserve of $350,000,000 or more.

For Services Rendered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention again to a bill H. R. 6505 I introduced recently which would, among other things, permit the Attorney General to suspend deportation of aliens who have made valuable contributions to our war effort and loyally aided the United States during the war. It is unthinkable that those aliens who have proved their devotion to this country and its institutions by serving it loyally even in war against the land of their ancestry should be rewarded by us by being deported as if they were unworthy and unfaithful—and deported to what, in many cases, would be a death sentence. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the New York Times for June 1, 1946:

FOR SERVICES RENDERED

There are in the United States some 2,000 alien Japanese, according to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, whose attitudes and loyalties and activities have been scanned by the Federal Bureau of Investigation more thoroughly than have those of most native-born citizens. Most of these Japanese have long been residents under classifications as students or "treaty merchants." Many of them served in war agencies, some in confidential and important capacities. Under our immigration laws, however, they are lumped with several thousand other Japanese, many of whom maintained their loyalty to their native country all through the war, and are subject to deportation.

One specific case is that of Atsushi Jun Iwamatsu and his wife, Tomoe. Iwamatsu served this country loyally in the Office of War Information and the Office of Strategic Services. His work was especially valuable in the latter-named organization. Last fall he went to Japan as an interpreter with the Strategic Bombing Survey, thus definitely identifying himself to Japanese extremists. To deport Mr. and Mrs. Iwamatsu to Japan under the circumstances would probably be tantamount to a death sentence for them, and certainly poor pay for their services.

There are before Congress several bills covering both the group generally and special cases such as that of the Iwamatsus. The special bill introduced in their behalf would permit also the entry of their 12-year-old son Markoto, whom they left behind when they came here in 1939. These bills run the risk of being caught in the legislative jam unless Congress can be prevailed on to consider them. It is a race between the process of immigration machinery and passage of the legislation. The loyal 2,000 would seem to deserve that much consideration from the representatives of the American people.

The Meat Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CHANDLER, ARIZ., *May 31, 1946.*
Hon. RICHARD HARLESS,
Member of Congress, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HARLESS: You have probably already been hearing about the meat situation. We operate three meat markets, and have owned stock in two associated companies, so feel that I can write you with definite information, at the same time asking you for your help.

At the present time we cannot buy a pound of meat from a legalized packing house; they are all closed. Maricopa Packing Co. has several hundred head, but they won't kill them on account of the wholesale ceiling price; they have to get 18 cents commercial and 20 cents for United States good. With the amount of subsidies considered, they cannot come out, so they are just waiting.

The only present source we have in which to get meat is from the farmer; we can, legally, buy five head from each farmer. However, you cannot buy anything now for less than 13 cents a pound that is worth putting in the meat case. This dresses out to us for about 25 cents a pound; the ceiling is 18 cents for commercial and 20 cents for good. We are supposed to buy the meat we sell at these ceilings. So if we have meat for sale, it costs us about 7 cents a pound over the ceiling. We are forced to do one of the following: Buy from the farmer, sell meat at ceiling and operate meat markets at a loss, lay off the butchers and close the markets, or keep the butchers employed and sell the meat a little over the ceiling in order to operate. I am wondering which we should do. If we do the latter, we live from day to day in fear of being caught by the OPA as they do have shoppers visiting the stores.

I do think the OPA can do a lot of good during these times. They have handled the fresh produce with efficiency as pertaining to the food markets. I am also in the laundry business and find they have done a good job in that business. It is the meat situation that is in a mess and needs attention at once.

Hoping you can be of assistance.

Yours sincerely,
BASSETT T. WRIGHT.

Restore Confidence in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 12 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have before me an able article entitled "Restore Confidence in Government," written by Mr. A. Q. Miller and printed in his paper, the Belleville (Kans.) Telescope. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESTORE CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT

(By A. Q. Miller)

Last week the Government faced one of the greatest domestic crisis in its history—it faced the threat of a complete breakdown in authority over 140,000,000 people; it faced the decision of whether or not any individual or any group could defy constitutional authority under our American system.

The crisis called for courageous and vigorous action on the part of constituted government authority. President Truman, who still retains his war powers, arose to the

occasion and challenged the right of anyone to strike against the Government, as he called it. Government machinery set up to settle labor disputes failed to function and it remained for the Government either to step in and use its constitutional powers or witness a complete paralysis of the economic life of the country. The President called Congress into joint session and requested unprecedented authority to deal with the problem. He told Congress: "The rail strike is no longer a dispute between labor and management—it has now become a strike against the Government itself." "That kind of strike," said the President, "can never be tolerated in this country; if allowed to continue, government itself will break down; strikes against the Government must stop, therefore I request immediate legislation designed to help stop them." These were strong words and brave words, though issued somewhat belatedly. Congress cheered the President lustily and White House aides reported that an avalanche of telegrams and letters poured into the White House such as had never before been experienced during the Truman administration.

One writer on national affairs said: "Radical labor leaders, smug in their gain of 12 years under the New Deal, had become arrogant and were not afraid to challenge a government which had always been sympathetic toward their aims." A blight had settled down upon the country and an epidemic of strikes had halted production so much needed to stop inflation in the reconversion program.

John D. Small, Civilian Production Administrator, said: "The coal strike alone has cost the country $2,000,000,000 in lost production, not counting the loss in wages of millions of dollars." In Chicago a 9-day dim-out on account of the coal strike cost $131,000,000, and in Detroit the Ford Motor Co. lost $500,000,000 in production besides a loss in wages of Ford employees of $237,000,000. These are samples of how the economic system of the country was being paralyzed and the Government seemed impotent to act effectively.

It is not a happy thought to say that people were becoming disillusioned and expressions of lack of faith in the Government was being heard across the country, and it was not a happy picture in this stronghold of democracy for foreign countries to see. It is imperative for Congress to act to preserve constitutional government under our American system, and if the President does not have authority under his emergency powers, Congress should give him sufficient authority to compose labor-management difficulties and set up machinery for the equitable adjudication of labor-management disputes.

Urges Congressional Charter for Amvets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

URGES CONGRESSIONAL CHARTER FOR AMVETS

(By J. H. Leib)

Today a House subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee opens hearings on two bills, H. R. 6143 and H. R. 6719, respectively, to incorporate Amvets, American Veterans of World War II. These hearings culminate a long and extended campaign led by youthful and courageous leaders throughout the Nation to bring recognition to this new organization made up exclusively of veterans of this war.

Amvets is now the largest veterans' organization that has emerged from this world conflagration. It has over 600 posts and is organized in 42 States of the Union.

Unity of purpose and action for the maintenance of a strong postwar America is the primary goal of Amvets. This veterans group is the outcome of a spontaneous desire of service men and women of World War II to express their awareness of the responsibilities inherent in the peace through their own organization. President Truman was well aware of the GI point of view when he appointed General Bradley, beloved veteran of this war, as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. In the natural course of events, the Amvets membership believes that leadership in veteran affairs should be sought among the veterans of the recent war.

The policies formulated by Amvets will be a direct expression of a majority opinion of the membership, which is composed of men and women, officers, and enlisted personnel in or out of the armed forces.

Amvets is proud to present to its brothers and sisters in arms a firm foundation, painstakingly built for the erection of a strong edifice from which we hope will emerge the full realization of the American dream.

On May 30, 1946 we received the following letter. It was an eventful day in Amvets national headquarters. Amvets had won hearings on its petition for a congressional charter. We were on our way. Here is what it said:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 29, 1946.

Mr. J. H. LEIB,
Amvets, National Legislative Director,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEIB: Please be advised that I have arranged for a hearing for the Amvets at 10 a. m. Wednesday morning, June 12, in the Judiciary room. The hearing will be held and witnesses will be heard before the Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Judiciary Committee, of which subcommittee I am chairman.

Yours very sincerely,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Frank Scriven, former national executive secretary writing in the first issue of our magazine, the National Amvet, gave a brief and interesting history of how Amvets was founded and what we hoped to be. I trust that every Member of Congress will read it fully and carefully. We are bound together by our famous slogan: "We Fought Together—Now Let's Build Together." With this determination we cannot fail. Here is the story:

"American Veterans of World War II, Amvets, was the idea of many men. Men in hospitals, men aboard ships, men in the air, men in the islands, women in hospitals, women overseas and at home in the armed forces—all had the same idea.

"The bonds and ties of combat, service together, fighting and working for the same goal, made them as one.

"World War II was separate and apart. The men and women who fought in it all felt and hoped it was a war to end wars. They appreciated the need for a continuation of service together for their country in years to come.

"It was in this spirit in December of 1944 that representatives of local groups throughout the country met in Kansas City, Mo., to talk with one another to make plans for a new national organization of the veterans of this war.

"'We want an organization of our own,' was the keynote.

"Local groups from New York, Oklahoma, Texas, Washington, D. C., California, Rhode Island, Florida, and Tennessee gathered at the Muehlbach Hotel. Out of 2 days of discussion which considered many plans and saw some altercations, came Amvets. The delegates left, imbued with the idea that this World War II organization would build to be the greatest in the country. Their ideals were high, their hopes great, and their prospects problematical.

"There followed a year of striving, a year of dissension, a year of clashing personalities, and a year of growing pains. Many pioneers were instrumental in keeping the life blood flowing, though feebly at times. These included Elmo W. Keel, the first national commander. All had the same determination—'we want our own organization.'

"The way was not smooth. Personalities clashed; some few were greedy, looking out for their own interests, rather than the interest of the whole. Money was nil. There was a degree of confusion. Only the common denominator held the organization together and that was the need—need of a World War II organization to be a sounding board for World War II veterans.

"Goals were indefinite, opinions varied, ideas were vague, but there was still the need. Outside money was secured but the interests of this money in the organization was not clear. Nothing was defined. The ship was near the sinking state when it was decided by the founders and the pioneers that there was a need for action. The action taken did the job. It was the first national convention held in Chicago in October 1945.

"By the time of the convention, many of the State departments came prepared to bolt. Many had their fingers crossed. They wanted to see what was making Amvets click. They wanted to see whether it was on the level. They wanted to become sold that this organization, as opposed to all other organizations, was the one that would do the job. They came as skeptics, as scoffers, and as inquirers. They left a united group.

"Delegates from 131 posts were present at the assembly in Chicago. They represented all walks of life, a cross section of America. They were laborers, farmers, professional men, salesmen, politicians, and tradespeople. They were unemployed, employed, and employers. There were rich and poor—but they were all veterans. They all felt the need of a World War II veterans' organization. Was Amvets going to answer that need?

"It was a serious group which assembled at Chicago. There were no demonstrations, no brawls. There was no bill from the hotel for broken furniture. These men and women were there doing a job and they devoted themselves seriously to getting it done. All sessions were well attended. Their interest was so keen that one session lasted the whole night. The past was dug up, aired, and in the main renounced. Censorship of prior activities was rife, accusations and counteraccusations were made—more grow-up pains.

"But out of it all came a unanimous adoption of a set of principles that assured the future of Amvets. Out of it came a jelling of all the forces, a unity of purpose, and a fervent desire to create and maintain an organization that would carry on in doing a job of making this a better and more worthwhile world in which to live. Enemies became friends. Strife ended."

[From the Stars and Stripes, Washington, D. C., of April 25, 1946]

AMVET LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE HAS WON COLORFUL WAY

Joseph H. Leib, legislator director of the Amvets, American Veterans of World War II, became perhaps the most congressionally quoted American private citizen last week, having been mentioned from time to time by legislators from all 48 States. Representative HARRY L. TOWE, World War I veteran, of New Jersey, completed the national tally of States.

Leib's items or statements about him have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on 509 different occasions.

During the past few years the Amvets' legislative leader, through his tireless work on Capitol Hill, has been credited in many circles with having initiated the campaign to raise the base pay of Army privates from $21 to $50; first suggesting the establishment of the Senate War Investigating Committee, and the war-fraud section of the Department of Justice; leading the fight that brought about the recent indictment of the artificial limb industry; instigating the investigation of the aircraft industry by the Truman and Mead committees, and among other things, starting a campaign which led to the investigation of veterans hospitals.

A long record of service to veterans marks his career. He has been credited in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as having saved the Nation more than $11,000,000,000 through passage of the renegotiation and war-fraud bills.

Leib, who was sketched recently in the Washington Sunday Star by Howard Bluett as the "legislator without portfolio," launched his career when, as still a teen-ager, he walked into Al Smith's national headquarters in New York and became a campaigner. Later, at a tender age, he started the first Roosevelt for President Club in the United States, became chief of correspondence of a large Federal agency, and then, leaving partisan politics after a break with the Roosevelt administration over the Supreme Court "packing" issue, he began his present occupation as a free-lance writer.

Following his discharge from the Army in World War II, Leib aided in the formation of the Amvets, and today is the organization's "voice on Capitol Hill."

The British Loan and World Economic Stability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Daily News, one of the leading newspapers in southern California, on Tuesday, June 4, 1946:

Prompt congressional approval of the proposed $3,750,000,000 British loan not only will mean much to world economic stability—which means, in the last analysis, world peace. Approval of the loan will mean much to southern California business. It will mean more jobs and higher wage levels for local workers.

According to a fact-finding report released this week by the California Committee on International Economic Policy more than nine important local industries will benefit directly by the increased export business the loan will stimulate.

These industries are: Machinery and vehicles, chemicals and related products, nonmetallic minerals, textiles, food and beverages, inedible vegetable products, wood and paper, metals and manufactures, animals and animal products, and others.

During 1940, the last year for which export figures are available, these industries, according to the report, shipped to Great Britain and British-dominated countries exports totaling $50,513,477 and furnished employment to 20,201 workers.

"Importance of the British Empire market," the report states, "is emphasized by the fact that it normally takes one-third of the total southern California exports to all nations of the globe and 2½ times as much as the 20 Latin-American countries."

Exports to British Empire areas plainly are of great importance to the regional economy. Passage of the loan would sweep away trade barriers by mutual agreement, when exports to the United Kingdom confidently may be expected to expand in proportion to the ingenuity and enterprise expended in development of this trade.

"Without these exports," the report reveals, "southern California would suffer an adverse trade balance with British Empire areas. Vast quantities of raw materials and hundreds of products must be imported from British-controlled countries to bolster the economic life of this region.

"In 1940, for example, southern California imported goods from British areas totaling $41,000,000. Without a vigorous two-way trade, this region would have to buy large quantities of goods every year without having any way to pay for them with exports."

A break-down of the export figures into various classifications shows the following:

	Value	Jobs
Machinery and vehicles	$11,258,509	4,503
Chemicals and related products	3,319,226	1,327
Nonmetallic minerals	6,592,724	2,637
Textiles	6,205,019	2,482
Food and beverages	2,666,454	1,066
Vegetable products, inedible, except fibers and wood	1,629,709	651
Wood and paper	1,028,900	411
Metals and manufactures except machinery and vehicles	814,283	325
Animals and animal products	105,250	42
Unclassified	16,893,403	6,757
Total	50,513,477	20,201

Figures used in this analysis are derived from export statistics on the sterling areas of the United Kingdom (England, Scotland, and Wales), Australia, British Guiana, British Honduras, British Malaya, Burma, Ceylon, India, Hongkong, New Zealand, Oceania. Trinidad, Union of South Africa, and Egypt; and the sterling dominated countries of Belgian Congo, Belgium, China, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Iran, Iraq, Netherlands, Netherlands East Indies, Netherlands West Indies, and Turkey.

Railroad Retirement Pension Bill Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, a bill is now pending in the House to amend certain provisions of the law relating to employees in the railway service. We will vote on these amendments very shortly and I hope that this legislation will prevail. There is widespread interest among railway workers in connection with this pending legislation. Typical of the correspondence that I have received on this subject is the following letter:

ORDER OF RAILWAY CONDUCTORS OF AMERICA,
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE, STATE OF MINNESOTA,
Duluth, Minn., May 11, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We beg to direct your attention to the amendments to the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Acts, as set forth in H. R. 1362, which are in the interest of all our members and all other employees of railroad service. Therefore, your aid and support of these amendments is earnestly requested by the undersigned.

May we not hear from you as to your views with reference to the above-mentioned amendments?

Very truly yours,

F. H. WILSON,
Chairman, Minnesota State Legislative Committee, Duluth, Minn.
H. N. HANSEN,
Secretary-Treasurer, Minnesota State Legislative Committee, St. Paul, Minn.

In connection with this proposed legislation I signed a discharge petition so as to bring the bill out before the House for a vote and the motion to discharge the committee became effective, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 18, 1946, pages 4025 and 4026. Thereafter, the Rules Committee granted a rule for consideration of this legislation, which is known as the Crosser bill or Crosser amendments. These are amendments sponsored by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]. I expect to support Mr. CROSSER's amendments because they are in line with a program of social security for employees who have been totally and permanently disabled; for widows of railroad men who have been retired because of age; and for unemployment insurance and sick benefits for railway workers. We have such benefits for Federal employees and for employees of State and local governments and this legislation seeks to extend the same benefits to railroad employees.

During my service in Congress I have voted for legislation beneficial to these employees, including the original legislation which created a Railroad Retirement Board and provided pensions and other benefits. Before Congress adjourns I hope that the Crosser amendments will be enacted into law.

Italian-American Victory Council of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, America, the country we all love, our country, is a Nation of descendants of immigrants. We owe our greatness to people from other lands who came here and gave themselves to their new country.

Among the other nations who contributed to America's greatness is Italy. Not

through the will of the Italian people, but because of the false leadership of Mussolini and his Fascist terror, Italy came into the war against the United States; but when Mussolini was overthrown Italy became an ally. The Italian people, in a free, open, and democratic election in which most of the adult men and women of Italy took part, have just renounced the monarchy and fascism forever, and chose to have a republican government modeled on the American way of life.

In my city of Chicago, Mr. Speaker, more than 50 clubs, societies, trade-unions, and other organizations made up of people of Italian descent banded themselves together, when war broke out, in the Italian-American Victory Council of Chicago. It was a spontaneous and voluntary movement. The purpose of the victory council was to unite the entire Italian-American community for the wholehearted support of the war effort of America and of the United Nations.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of the Italian-American Victory Council of Chicago, Mr. Speaker, in maintaining a high morale of Americans of Italian birth or ancestry during the difficult days when their adopted country was at war with the mother country.

Under permission granted me, I am inserting in the RECORD, first, the statement of principles and purposes adopted during the dark days of World War II, and secondly, the resolution more recently adopted by the council in regard to American and world relations with Italy, which I think points in the right direction:

PRINCIPLES

The members of the Italian-American Victory Council are loyal and devoted to the United States of America. They know that the American principle of government of, by, and for the people has brought to them and their children great opportunities, benefits, and privileges. They are determined to defend against all enemies the Government of the United States and its principles of freedom and democracy.

The members of the Victory Council remember with pride the beauty of Italy and the contributions of the Italian people to the culture and civilization of mankind. They remember, too, the immortal achievements of the great Italian patriots and fighters for freedom—Garibaldi, Mazzini, and Cavour.

The members of the Victory Council know that Mussolini and fascism have brought the Italian people loss of freedom, financial ruin, disastrous wars, and now slavery to Hitler.

As the supreme act of betrayal, Mussolini declared war against Italy's traditional friend, the United States of America.

Only the victory of the United Nations can break the bondage into which Italy has been cast. The Atlantic Charter guarantees to Italy her independence, and to the Italian people the right to determine their own way of life.

It is only by this victory that democracy can be preserved in America and throughout the world.

Knowing these truths, the Italian-American Victory Council has pledged itself to do all in its power for the defeat and unconditional surrender of the Axis Powers. Inscribed upon the banner of the Victory Council is the slogan: "Victory for America—freedom for Italy."

PURPOSES

The Italian-American Victory Council of Chicago is dedicated to the accomplishment of the following ends:

1. To establish unity and cooperation between all organizations in the Chicago area having an Italian-American membership, for victory for the United Nations, and to serve our country by participation in every possible patriotic endeavor.

2. To distinguish between the Fascist government and the Italian people, thus overcoming the confusion created by two decades of Fascist propaganda, and to expose and combat fascism wherever it is found.

3. To preserve and increase mutual esteem between loyal Italian-Americans and their fellow Americans of other origins.

4. To aid anti-Fascist noncitizens who are loyal to democracy.

5. To conduct an educational campaign for democracy and against fascism, utilizing all possible means, including mass meetings and rallies, radio broadcasts, metropolitan and Italian-language newspapers, furnishing speakers to organizations, and publishing a Victory Council Bulletin.

6. To work for a just and durable peace for the liberated people of Italy, and the restoration of friendly relations between them and the United States.

Whereas the Italian-American Victory Council of Chicago was organized to unite the entire Italian-American community of Chicago and vicinity "for the wholehearted support of the war effort of America and the United Nations, and for an early and complete victory over the Axis"; and

Whereas the council is composed of over 50 organizations with an aggregate membership of 50,000 Italian-Americans; and

Whereas the council stressed in its principles that the Atlantic Charter guaranteed to Italy independence and "to the Italian people the right to determine their own way of life"; and further the council established as one of its purposes "(6) To work for a just and durable peace for the liberated people of Italy, and the restoration of friendly relations between them and the United States"; and

Whereas the council fostered and tirelessly executed a continuous program supporting every phase of war activities, by printed matter, radio and mass rallies with attendance in excess of 20,000 at a single rally; and broadcast appeals to the Italian people calling for "immediate unconditional surrender" and for "the complete destruction of fascism" and urged that only in this way would the Italian people achieve "the right to choose the form of government under which they will live"; and

Whereas because of its record of loyal and patriotic service the Italian-American Victory Council of Chicago feels it has earned the right to be heard and to have its views given careful consideration; and

Whereas the record of the Italian people themselves in aiding to bring about the overthrow of fascism constitutes a great contribution to the United Nations victory; the Italian people at tremendous cost of lives and sacrifice saved countless lives of the soldiers of the United Nations; and

Whereas the council feels a deep sense of responsibility and obligation of good faith in the promises made and the hopes held out to the people of Italy to hasten their surrender and separation from the Axis; and

Whereas the council is even more deeply concerned with the establishment of a just and durable peace based upon the principles of the Atlantic Charter and designed to prevent the rising anew of fascism in any form; and

Whereas the council deplores what it regards to be a patent violation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter concerning Italy; that in the case of Italy it includes intervention in the right of the people to retain or oust the monarchy; obstruction of the appointment of chosen men to high government posts; unwarranted delay in providing adequate relief for impartial distribution; failure to modify harsh surrender terms; and the continuing postponment of the acceptance of Italy into the United Nations family, and

Whereas the foregoing has brought about a resurgence of Fascist thinking in Italy and in the Italian-American communities here and are daily furnishing a base for the heaping of discredit and blame upon those loyal anti-Fascists who made the all-out fight for democracy, and

Whereas these conditions have likewise brought about a grave crisis in Italy which threatens to destroy the progress made there toward democracy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United Nations organization, and each constituent nation thereof, is hereby petitioned and urged immediately to:

1. Effectuate the principles of the Atlantic Charter by ceasing all intervention affecting the right of the Italian people to self-government.

2. Withdraw all foreign troops from Italy.

3. Give full encouragement to the democratic movements of the Italian people.

4 Extend UNRRA relief to the widest degree possible with full safeguard against its use or distribution, directly or indirectly, for antidemocratic purposes.

5. Establish credits for the industrial rehabilitation and reconstruction of Italy to hasten her becoming self-supporting and contributing to the world economy.

6. That in addition to the foregoing credits, Italy, in order to carry out this program, needs now and should have a loan of not less than $900,000,000.

7. Modify the surrender terms.

8. That Italy cannot make cash reparations from domestic assets and such reparations as may ultimately be required of her be in services and goods which she may be able to provide or furnish.

9. Accept Italy as a member of the United Nations organization.

Be it further resolved, That this resolution be spread of record and copies transmitted to the United Nations organization, the President of the United States and the United States representative in the United Nations organization, the State Department, the Italian Government, the Illinois Senators and Representatives in Congress, other Victory Councils and similar bodies throughout America, and to other interested individuals and groups as well as to the national and local press.

THE ITALIAN-AMERICAN VICTORY COUNCIL OF CHICAGO,
By Judge GEORGE L. QUILICI,
General Chairman.

Attest:

ERNEST DE MAIO,
Secretary.

Longshoremen's Association Protests Reorganization Plan No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, there is widespread opposition to all three reorganization plans of the President. One agency singled out to be abolished by Reorganization Plan No. 2 is the United States Employees Compensation Commission. This Commission has given satis-

factory service to all people who have had occasion to make contacts with it. From the standpoint of efficiency, from the standpoint of proper management, and from the standpoint of service it rates high among all Government agencies. Yet, without any convincing arguments against the Commission, Reorganization Plan No. 2 seeks to abolish it, with no saving to the taxpayers or reduction in number of Federal employees. Some time ago a statement was submitted to me by Joseph P. Ryan, international president of the International Longshoremen's Association, pointing out the protests of his union against Reorganization Plan No. 2.

TELEGRAM FROM MR. RYAN

In a telegram from New York City, signed by Mr. Ryan as international president of the international union and John R. Owens, secretary-treasurer of the group, the following statement was made to me:

International Longshoremen's Association opposes abolishing the United States Employees Compensation Commission and the transfer of its functions to the Federal Security Agency as proposed in President's Reorganization Plan No. 2, submitted to Congress on May 16, 1946. Commission has administered longshoremen's and harbor workers' compensation law for 19 years and we have found that the three-member bipartisan commission is the best possible assurance to all parties in interest of a fair and impartial administration of the law. We strongly object to putting administration of longshoremen's and harbor workers' compensation law under a single individual who is a political appointee and conferring on such person authority to direct administration of the law in such manner and under such rules and regulations as he may find expedient to prescribe. Request that you use your best efforts to have Congress disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 2.

These men speak for several thousand workers who have contacts with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, and in view of the fact that this group of employees endorsed the work of the Commission, it seems to me that Congress should demand some good reason for asking it to consent to the abolishment of this Government agency.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

JESSE JONES AND B. M. BARUCH ON THE BRITISH LOAN

When the $4,400,000,000 British "loan" proposal was up before the Senate, propagandists for it made a big to-do of listing the women's clubs, international bankers, Treasury Department stooges, and uncertain Americans, in their corner. And then they threw their spotlights on such "loan" opponents as Gerald L. K. Smith and the ancient Gen. Jacob L. Coxey, the leader of the now almost forgotten crackpot Coxey's army march on Washington in 1894.

That was a cagey play designed to make persons in doubt shy away from the "loan" opposition.

Well, the propagandists for the "loan" can't continue to make it seem a simple case of "screwballs" against the brains and respectability of America if they admit facts.

For one who opposes the "loan," meet B. M. Baruch, a fairly well-known and respected citizen, not to mention that he is an international financier.

On March 25, 1946, before the House Banking and Currency Committee, Baruch said:

"I am not opposed to helping foreign nations. But until production warrants it, I am opposed to lending them money or assisting them except for direct needs to make purchases when we know they cannot be made here or elsewhere.

"At this time that would be to increase demand. It would be cruel to hold out hopes that will not be realized. I would keep the goods necessary to prevent inflation and then allocate the balance, as they come to hand, where it would help the most."

The administration must think Baruch has a little more sense than General Coxey, for the latest of his many Presidential assignments is that of designing a policy for the United States on the atom bomb.

If he knows enough to know what to do with that bomb, or even make intelligent suggestions, surely his thoughts on the "loan" are worth serious weighing.

THE GRANDDADDY BANKER OF THE AGES

But Baruch is not the only international financier who has come out against the "loan." The granddaddy of all financiers of history is Jesse Holman Jones, of Houston, Tex.

In private life, Jones is a banker and industrialist, as Baruch is a financier, meaning that each tries to buy low and sell high as most other people try to do, only these two do it.

Like Baruch, Jones has long since made all the dough he can use for himself, and like Baruch has put his riper years and wisdom at the service of this country. It was as a governmental money manager that Jones became the granddaddy banker of the ages.

Jones came to Washington first in the Hoover administration, by appointment on February 2, 1932, as a director of the then newly organized Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

When F. D. R. took over, he shoved Jones up to Chairman of the RFC and told him to speed the good work. Jones did, his motto being: "Billions Out and Billions Back." He made the motto work.

But before he could wind up his highly successful peacetime billionairing the war was on us and it was Jones' job to finance literally hundreds of billions of dollars' worth of Government investment in factories, mines, foreign purchases, trades, and war-making money deals of many kinds.

Finally, the Palace Guard got Jones in January 1945, just as term III was melting into term IV, and since then he has been free to speak his mind without the burden of protecting official administration policy.

Jones' judgment on the British loan is that it would be a bum deal for the United States of America, though very nice work for the British if they can get it.

WHY JONES IS AGAINST IT

He set forth his analysis in a letter to the House Banking Committee on June 3, and in smashing language.

Among other items, he declared the claims that we will profit in foreign trade as a result of the loan are greatly exaggerated. He said further that the British have plenty of collateral hidden over here that ought to be pledged against any money they borrow anyhow, an especially wise thought considering how they defaulted on their previous debt.

Finally, and most important, the loan to Britain, Jones said, "Would be an irreparable mistake that would shove the United States of America along the road to financial ruin."

When two such eminent men as Baruch and Jones warn against this British loan you're being kidded by anybody who claims that opposition to it comes only from the likes of Smith and Coxey.

Case Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington Star:

CASE BILL VETOED

President Truman's message vetoing the Case bill, a message in which he embodied many of the specious objections to the measure which had been raised by the CIO, will come as a sharp disappointment to those who had hoped that, despite the Democratic Party's political alliance with organized labor, he would not use his veto power to kill legislation approved by large majorities in both branches of Congress in response to a clear public demand for a long-overdue reform in one-sided labor laws.

Last December the President asked for fact-finding legislation, including a cooling-off period, in the hope that it would help get production going. On January 3 he appealed to Congress: "If the measures which I have recommended to accomplish these ends do not meet the approval of Congress it is my fervent wish—and I am sure that it is the wish of my fellow citizens—that the Congress formulate measures of its own to carry out the desired objectives. That is definitely the responsibility of Congress. What the American people want is action." What happened? Congress did not approve the fact-finding bill but formulated measures of its own. It discharged its responsibility. The people got action. And now the President has killed off the whole business with a veto.

There is no point in discussing the veto message in detail, for there is little of substance in it. The President stresses the contention that the Case bill, if it had been law, would not have "prevented or shortened the strikes which have so seriously damaged our economy these last few months." He was talking there about such things as the steel strike, the coal strike, the automobile strike, the meat strike, etc. These were strikes against private employers, except for the coal strike, which continued as a strike against the Government after the mines were seized. The Case bill, of course, was not designed to "prevent" strikes except as mediation may prevent them. But why does the President complain of that? In his message to Congress on May 26 the message asking for emergency powers to deal with the railroad strike against the Government—he said: "The general right of workers to strike against private employers must be preserved." And yet the Case bill is vetoed on the major ground that it would not have prevented some of the big strikes against private employers.

The President said that in his study of the bill he did not consider it from the

standpoint of whether it favors or harms labor, or whether it favors or harms management. Yet the message is replete with arguments that the bill would harm labor. He objects on the ground that employees striking during the proposed cooling-off period might have lost their status as employees under the Wagner Act. (His own proposal of December 3 would have made it unlawful to strike during the cooling-off period.) He voices the unexplained fear that the proviso against racketeering might be construed as making it a felony to strike and picket peacefully. He is against the proposed section regulating welfare funds because, despite the Government's hasty negotiation of a welfare fund agreement with John L. Lewis while the miners were on strike, "this whole subject needs long and careful study." He fears that another section would be prejudicial to foremen, that another might repeal the Norris-LaGuardia Act or imperil the principles of the Wagner Act, and that still another might revive the improper use of injunctions against labor by private employers.

The President proposes no tangible alternatives to the provisions to which he objects. All that he has to offer is a renewal of his suggestion for study of the question by a joint committee of Congress and the vague indication that he might approve some kind of legislation. The fact remains, however, that the President for unimpressive reasons has killed the only labor legislation which it has been possible to get through Congress in 12 years. And he must have done so in the knowledge that it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to get through another bill which is adequate to deal with the abuses and also innocuous enough to meet the objections which he has raised to the Case bill.

Report of United Nations Subcommission On the Status of Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I wish to include the recent report of the United Nations Subcommission on the Status of Women to the Commission on Human Rights. The members who prepared the report were Mrs. Bodil Begtrup of Denmark, chairman; Miss Minerva Bernardino, Dominican Republic, vice chairman; Miss Angela Jurdak, Lebanon; Mrs. Hansa Mehta of India; Mme. M. H. Lefaucheux, France; Mrs. Way Sing New, China; and Miss Fryderyka Kalinowska, Poland; together with the following ex officio members from the Commission on Human Rights: Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, United States; Prof. René Cassin, France; and Mr. Dusan Brkish, Yugoslavia. The report follows:

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS SUBCOMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN TO THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS, MAY 13, 1946

The Subcommission on the Status of Women, established by the Economic and Social Council under Council resolutions of February 16 and 18, 1946, to submit proposals, recommendations, and reports to the Commission on Human Rights regarding the status of women and to submit proposals to the Council through the Commission on Human Rights regarding its terms of reference and definitive composition met at Gillet Hall, Hunter College, New York City, during the period April 29 to May 13, 1946, under the chairmanship of Mrs. Bodil Begtrup. Discussions centered on the fundamental principles to be adopted, the scope and program of work to be undertaken, and the composition of the full Subcommission.

There was a general feeling among the members of gratitude toward the Economic and Social Council for taking up the question of the status of women, and for setting up this Subcommission to study the problems involved, and in this way implementing the principle stated in the Preamble of the Charter, "the equal rights of men and women."

It was recognized that the Subcommission was set up to advise the Commission on Human Rights on problems relating to the status of women. In consequence, the Subcommission must work in harmony with that Commission. There was general agreement that the Subcommission should study the status of women in all its aspects and make the broadest possible recommendations to the Commission on Human Rights on the scope of the work to be undertaken by the Subcommission when fully constituted. The ideals at which to aim, and guiding principles on which to work, were defined by the members as a preliminary to their detailed discussions. Members considered that the work of the Subcommission should last until women had reached the point where they were on equal footing with men in all fields of human enterprise. In practice, priority had to be given to political rights since little progress could be made without them. Nevertheless, improvements in civil, educational, social, and economic fields were especially important and, therefore, these problems should be attacked simultaneously.

The question whether the Trusteeship Council, when it came into being, should be invited to consult the Subcommission regarding the status of women in the non-self-governing territories placed under its charge was discussed, having in mind Article 76 (c) of the Charter. It was generally agreed that this was a matter that could well be left for later sessions of the full Subcommission.

During the discussion on the question of definitive composition of the Subcommission, the advantages and disadvantages of a small membership were carefully weighed. A smaller body could be more efficient, although a large one would give more universal representation of women's activities. It was decided to recommend a minimum figure of fifteen, to include three ex-officio members from the Commission on Human Rights. The additional members were to be selected from regions insufficiently represented in the nuclear Subcommission, and particularly from countries where women had reached different stages in status. There was a difference of opinion on the question of representation. Some members considered that representation should be on a governmental basis since without the support of governments the work of the Subcommission could not be effective. Others were of the opinion that members should be elected in their individual capacity in the same way as the nuclear Subcommission had been appointed by the Economic and Social Council. The members reached the conclusion that since, in practice, the Economic and Social Council would not appoint individuals who were persona non grata with their governments the selection should be made, according to individual capacity, by the Council. With regard to term of office, the members felt that continuity was necessary during the first years of the application of their program. After 1950 a system of rotation should be put into effect which might follow the lines laid down by the Economic and Social Council for the other Commissions.

In the course of the discussions the members of the subcommission expressed their belief that democracy is now the only social order in which women can enjoy full rights as human beings, and that women, a great number of whom have made so many sacrifices in the cause of democracy and liberty and who have proved in action that they are able to face all duties and tasks, affirm their resolution to work in the service of world peace with all their heart, mind, and will.

Accordingly, the Subcommission recommends that the full Subcommission should be guided by the following ideals in its future work:

Freedom and equality are essential to human development and whereas woman is as much a human being as man and, therefore, entitled to share them with him;

Well-being and progress of society depend on the extent to which both men and women are able to develop their full personality and are cognizant of their responsibilities to themselves and to each other;

Woman has thus a definite role to play in the building of a free, healthy, prosperous, and moral society and that she can fulfill this obligation only as a free and responsible member.

In order to achieve this goal the purpose of the Subcommission is to raise the status of women to equality with men in all fields of human enterprise.

I. POLICY

Therefore the Subcommission recommends that its aims shall be as follows:

A. Political: Equal participation in governments and possibility to exercise all the rights and assume all the duties of a citizen which comprise:

1. Universal suffrage.
2. Equal right to vote.
3. Equal right to be elected.
4. Equal right to hold public office.

B. Civil:

1. Marriage: Freedom of choice, dignity of the wife, monogamy, equal right to breach of marriage.

2. Guardianship: Equal right to have guardianship of her own and other children.

3. Nationality: Right to keep her own nationality, and her children having the right to choose the nationality of the mother on majority.

4. Property: Equal right to hold and acquire, administer, and inherit property.

C. Social and economic: Full possibility of taking equal part in social life, which implies full opportunity of fulfilling her duties toward society.

1. To prevent discrimination against women in social and economic status and customs.

2. (a) To abolish prostitution by removing the legal and customary provisions pertaining to it.

(b) To take strong measures to put down traffic in women and children.

(c) To prevent clandestine prostitution by providing conditions that make it no longer necessary for women to earn money by these means.

(d) To enable former prostitutes to return to normal life without discrimination by providing work for them as well as a broad and widely accessible educational system.

3. While no disability should be attached to woman on the ground of her sex, in regard to the enjoyment of full equality, in the exercise of social and labor rights and in the assumption of social and labor duties, special consideration on grounds of health may be given equally to men and women and special consideration to women on grounds of motherhood.

4. There shall be an effective scheme of health and social-insurance legislation which will provide equal preventive and remedial opportunities for women and will include

special provisions for maternal and child care.

D. Education: Equal opportunity for compulsory, free, and full education, equal opportunity in all specialized fields as well as training in authenics—the right to enjoy scientific discoveries applied to human growth and development.

To achieve these aims, the Subcommission proposes:

1. That world public opinion be stimulated in favor of raising the status of women as an instrument to further human rights and peace. The Subcommission also recommends that in view of the fact that the governments of all the United Nations in signing the Charter recognized that one of its principal aims, as stated in the preamble, was "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small," the Subcommission on the Status of Women expects the full collaboration and support of the governments of all the United Nations in their endeavors to raise the status of women throughout the world. At the same time, this Subcommission earnestly desires to render all possible assistance to those governments, in the application of the principle of equal rights as between men and women.

2. That the Subcommission collaborates with United Nations Commissions, with governments, with specialized agencies, with public and private agencies, with international and national women's organizations,[1] with any other experts deemed necessary, and that representatives of the former organizations should be invited to participate as observers or as consultative agents.

3. That the Subcommission welcomes reports and recommendations.

II. PROGRAM

Bearing in mind this broad outline of their goal the Subcommission proposes the following program of work:

1. To undertake a world-wide, up-to-date, reliable, and valid survey of laws pertaining to the status of women, their application and the actual status of women. (The Subcommission should secure the information through governments, specialized agencies, women's organizations, academic institutes, trade unions and others.)

2. To conduct polls in various regions to sound public opinions on matters of interest to the Subcommission.

3. To organize a forum to hear the views of the consultative agents.

4. To call a United Nations women's conference to further the program.

5. To arrange for international exchange of all categories of manual and intellectual women workers, including the industrial, agricultural and cultural fields.

6. To collect and systematize records on women's affairs in the form of books, pamphlets, charts, and so forth (preferably as a section of the United Nations' archives).

7. To implement the proposal to create a world-wide public opinion through the media of the press, radio, publications, lectures, motion pictures, and so forth.

8. That the United Nations Information Section prepare material about the United Nations to be distributed on request.

9. To request reference to the Subcommission of all communications and information concerning matters of interest to women received by the United Nations.

10. To train leaders in a course on women's affairs and to encourage the promotion of scholarships.

11. That public and private agencies be urged to plan and equip the homes in ways which will enable the housewife to devote more time to participate actively in civic affairs.

[1] See appendix I.

12. That an executive office on women's affairs be established as part of the secretariat to deal with all work of the subcommission, under the leadership of a highly competent woman who will be appointed after consulting the Subcommission and will be assisted by qualified staff.

13. That an executive committee be formed from members of the Subcommission residing in the vicinity of the headquarters of the United Nations. The purpose of this committee shall be to guard the general policy of the Subcommission.

III. COMPOSITION

Following the terms of reference in document E/27, section B.4, that the nuclear Subcommission shall make recommendations on the definitive composition of the Subcommission, the nuclear Subcommission recommends:

1. That the future composition should be 15 members including three members from the Commission on Human Rights.

2. That the members should be appointed by the Economic and Social Council in their individual capacity.

3. That the additional members should be selected from the regions of the Balkan States, Great Britain, Latin America, and the United States of America to make up the definitive composition of the Subcommission.

4. That selection should be made from among women prominent in public affairs.

5. That before final appointment by the Economic and Social Council, the chairman of the Subcommission should be consulted.

6. That in view of the fact that the present Subcommission is eligible for reelection and that its work cannot begin before October or November 1946, all members be reelected for a period of 3 years commencing on April 1, 1947, to serve effectively during the period of initiation.

7. That after this period a sound system of rotation be adopted.

8. That members should attend regularly.

9. That in the case of an emergency, alternates may be designated according to the rules of the Economic and Social Council.

10. That the next session of the Subcommission should take place before the end of the year, the date to be determined by the chairman of the Economic and Social Council in consultation with the chairman and vice chairman of the Subcommission.

Members of the Subcommission wish to emphasize that action by the Economic and Social Council in establishing this Subcommission has awakened hope and expectancy among women in all parts of the world. It is the firm belief of the Subcommission that all the recommendations for social progress which it has made are equally important; yet it wishes to stress that immediate action can and should be taken under the headings proposed:

1. Executive office (par. II, 12).
2. Survey (par. II, I).
3. Education (par. I, D).
4. Women's conference (par. II, 4).
5. Political rights (par. I, A).

The Subcommission on the Status of Women earnestly requests the Economic and Social Council to direct an appeal to the governments of the United Nations that have not accorded suffrage to women, to take such action at the earliest date possible within their frame of government, in order that all the terms of the charter of the United Nations shall be put into effect.

In conclusion, the Subcommission expresses the hope that the full Subcommission will explore the vast field of complex problems concerning the status of women all over the world so that it can play its part in building a better world in which men and women in full equality work together toward universal peace.

APPENDIX I

MEMORANDUM TO THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS FROM THE SUBCOMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN, DATED MAY 6, 1946

As the meeting of the Committee on Nongovernmental Organizations is being held on May 20, the Subcommission wishes to make the following recommendation:

For the efficient handling of the work of the United Nations it is important that the Subcommission on the Status of Women should stimulate the interest of women of the international and national organizations, to collaborate with these organizations and coordinate their efforts.

Therefore, the Subcommission requests the Economic and Social Council to refer to it all communications and information received concerning all matters of interest to women.

The Subcommission would appreciate if it should be consulted in all matters pertaining to women before any decision is reached by the Council. The Subcommission would appreciate if the Commission on Human Rights would transmit this to the Economic and Social Council.

Twenty Billion Dollar Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Sunday News of June 9, 1946:

TWENTY BILLION DOLLAR PARADE

It looks as if the $20,000,000,000 overseas parade of United States money has got started and will be difficult if not impossible to stop.

First on the parade schedule was the proposed "loan" of almost $4,000,000,000 to Great Britain. This one was approved by the Senate some time ago, and is now being investigated in friendly fashion by the House Banking Committee.

* * * * *

Former French Premier Leon Blum had been in this country for weeks, applying for a big loan to France. The wheels of the Export-Import Bank were speeded up and a 2-ply loan totaling $1,400,000,000 was extended to France May 28.

* * * * *

British "loan" advocates are confident that this deal will get second place in the parade of United States dollars overseas.

It has already cleared the Senate hurdle, and many Representatives seem impressed with the argument that we must bribe the British away from communism and the further argument that this deal will be good business for us.

Meanwhile, Vladimir Hurban, retiring Czechoslovak Ambassador to the United States, has revealed that his country expects to get a "loan" of $300,000,000 from us fairly soon. Chinese Ambassador Wei Tao-ming says arrangements for a United States credit to China, reported by other sources to total $500,000,000, have been about completed.

AT UNCLE SAM'S PAY WINDOW

A credit of $90,000,000 to Poland is being held up in an effort to woo the Moscow-dominated Polish Government away from some of its Communist practices. This makes Russia mad—but bets can be placed

with fair safety that Russia won't be mad enough to turn down a United States loan of $1,000,000,000, or $6,000,000,000, or any sum our Government may see fit to press on Russia, just so it is a large sum.

All of which gives an idea of the reason for the caption on top of this editorial—"$20,000,000,000 Parade." Observers who ought to know are predicting that before this postwar "loan" jag of ours is over we will have to put out about $20,000,000,000 all told in these "loans."

We prefer the "loan" attitude of Jesse Jones to that of the kiss-the-billions-goodbye global thinkers.

Jones says the British could put up collateral and should be required to do so. He also says this "loan" will sew us up in a risky but "definite alliance with the British to the exclusion of other countries." He takes a dim view, too, we understand, of all international loans not secured by collateral.

WISDOM FROM JESSE JONES

Jones should know what he is talking about. For years he managed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and this was one New Deal agency which balanced its books and handled its affairs in businesslike style while helping Americans to fight depressions and recessions. It didn't put out unsecured loans while Jones was running it—which was one reason why New Dealers had their knives out for Jones for years and finally got him.

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. SHARP
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, it is my great privilege and pleasure to introduce into the RECORD the address of Hon. W. Kingsland Macy, of New York, made on May 30, 1946, at Patchogue, N. Y.:

That the village of Patchogue has served its country well is attested by the honor board to my right with its hundreds of names and its many gold stars, and by the Civil War monument erected here by patriotic citizens in honor of the 14 men who died for the Union, and the 149 members of the Richard J. Clark Post of the Grand Army of the Republic.

Earlier this month as a regent of the University of the State of New York, I was the guest of Fordham when it conferred an honorary degree on President Truman and unveiled as its World War II memorial, the Admiral Nimitz bell. The inscription on that bell moved and impressed me deeply, dedicated as it is to the memory of our dear young dead.

This morning I know we are all thinking of our dear young dead—those who lie in far places and sleep in the darkness of all the world's seas—our sons and our friends. They are not forgotten. We think of them pridefully and uneasily but upon our consciences we carry the tragedy of their unlived years. We sent them out to preserve our institutions and since they did not return, daily must we ask ourselves: What of our institutions? Are they being preserved or are they disintegrating?

We look about us and see sectional wrangling and factional intrigue. Our leaders are uncertain adventurers charting the ship of state with a latitude of primaries and a longitude of election days. Prejudice is rife. Tolerance is no longer an inbred American instinct but a form of outward good manners cultivated by the more responsible. There is no famine in this land but there are shortages and commercial unrest that have fomented costly and unnecessary strikes and demonstrated that modern civilization is industrialized to a point where it is dependent upon smooth uninterrupted functioning. This machine-age complexity is a threat to our free institutions and will destroy them unless we bring them both into harmony. The men who founded this country warmed and fed their own families. Today we depend upon suppliers who rely on the coordinated efforts of thousands of unknown workers. The recent rail and coal strikes have shown us that when key industries strike the public is thrown into confusion, made to suffer inconvenience, and in some instances actual hardship.

The day of economic self-sufficiency for the individual is done, and we must evaluate our rights and privileges if we are to maintain a mutually beneficial society under our constitutional form of government. As a free people we Americans resent regulation; we chafe under restraint; we pull away from control. We are traditionalists who wish to go along the old way and are prone to ignore the industrial Frankenstein we have created. We battle in factories in Detroit or Oskosh and skirmish along the water front while actually dealing with a national situation. We deliberately refuse to take a long perspective on this the greatest internal problem confronting us today. The labor-management relationship is the pivot upon which our economic life turns. It cannot continue to revolve on a hodge-podge of so-called labor laws proffered by one pressure group, emasculated by another, and voted onto our statute books in some form of compromise. We cannot arrive at lasting solution under stress in legislative fury; we cannot hobble management or permit it to run wild; and we cannot force labor into productivity reaching American expectations and standards.

Labor and management today need specific legislation with the forensic clarity and the fluidity to meet change, a declaration in which the rights of labor and the rights of management are set forth and defined, and, if necessary in certain key industries, circumscribed. It should be legislation conceived and enacted as in 1791 were those first 10 amendments to our Constitution that are commonly called the Bill of Rights. It should be legislation suitably formulated by our States, and so enacted as to be enforceable as the law of the land. Conferences of big businessmen and bellicose labor heads get us nowhere, for both selfishly seek immediate opportunism. Congressional commissions harassed with routine and political expediency cannot do a long-range job. The people of America must make their will known.

If the recent strikes have taught us anything they have taught us that no strict diagonal divides capital and labor. When one group of labor strikes at capital, another group of labor cannot get to work. It is prevented from working by shortages of vital materials and loses along with capital. It is as simple as that. Only under slavery is there a division. The free laborer is also a capitalist. He is no mere unit of horsepower but a dual factor in a free economy. He is a purchasing power. He is money. And, as has been well said, "The laborer is worthy of his hire." That latent recognition of this joint-ownership idea underlies the labor-management structure is evidenced by the fact America generally concedes labor's "right to strike." The sooner, however, American labor starts thinking constructively of itself as an integral component of the capitalistic system and not something apart, the sooner will there be an end to unnatural schisms. Only after full acceptance of this basic truth will the strike be laid aside as the primitive weapon that it is.

Labor has had to depend on the strike too long, for often when it tried to force itself into the legislative chambers to be heard, it found that the agents of capital had already been long at work. The American laborer, or to use a better term, the "American producer" should not have to strike. There should be authorized and accepted procedure for him to follow. There should be recourse at law and the right of appeal in circuit courts where a benchship symbolizes the epitome of legal fame. He should not be the beneficiary or the victim of a conflicting mass of bureaucratic directives and contradictory legislation hinging on raw precedents and he should not have to depend on labor czars and racketeers to browbeat, bully, and battle for him. Nor should capital be bullied or browbeaten or exploited by squeezes or unreasonable demands. Nor should capital merely look upon the law as a deterrent to labor or a defensive mechanism.

It is easy to villify and condemn labor; it is easy to criticize and attack management. The intelligent thing to do is do something about alining them. And we will do something if we pause long enough to stop taking sides in angry partisanship. It is time for the American public to realize that they are made up in the broader sense of the conflicting elements generally known as labor and capital. There are some who do not consider themselves as belonging to either group because they are not employed or do not own a business. They think of themselves as a third group. But however that be, they are affected nonetheless and will be more and more as the new technocracies fatten the industrial colossus that America is rightfully destined to become. The issue then is not a union-management fight or a labor-union question. It is an issue that concerns the entire American public. The public should have something to say. Commonality of interest should end the internal war now smouldering. Unless it does, internecine struggle will eventually bring an end to our free enterprise system and we must give way to State socialism or communism. The greatest problem confronting America today is that of balancing our concept of personal freedom with the minimum basic demands of our economic superstructure. To do that America needs a bill of rights for labor and management.

Veto of the Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from today's New York Times:

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO

Mr. Truman's veto of the Case bill is a profoundly disheartening development which must add greatly to the gravity of the present labor crisis. The veto message is convincing neither in relation to the real state of affairs nor in relation to Mr. Truman's own past record and statements.

Let us take, for example, the reasons that Mr. Truman gives for disapproving of section 7 of the bill, which declares that any person

who obstructs commerce by robbery or extortion, or who commits or threatens physical violence in connection with such a plan, shall be guilty of a felony. Mr. Truman declares that he is "in full accord with the objectives which Congress here had in mind" but objects that section 7 ought to declare that it is not a felony to strike or picket peacefully. There is no more reason why section 7 ought to add this complete irrelevancy than why it ought to add that it is not a felony peacefully to drive one's car or to go to a theater. The fact is that the Supreme Court has ruled that under present law it is quite all right for members of labor unions to do what this section would forbid. Mr. Truman's veto continues a legal situation which the late Chief Justice Stone declared would render common law robbery an innocent pastime.

Mr. Truman objects that section 9, which explicitly declares that supervisors are not employees under the Wagner Act, would "strip from supervisory employees the rights of self-organization and collective bargaining now guaranteed them under" the Wagner Act. This is a strange interpretation of an act which specifically declares that "the term 'employer' includes any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly." Mr. Truman himself admits in his message, moreover, that supervisory employees, "in dealing with the employees under them, * * * act for management." Section 9 of the Case bill was made necessary only by the extraordinary reasoning by which a majority of the National Labor Relations Board, in spite of this explicit provision of the Wagner Act, ruled that it did give foremen the status of employees.

Mr. Truman objects to section 8, which would outlaw "welfare funds" administered solely by employee representatives. He declares that "it is inadvisable to remove such a question as this from the scope of collective bargaining between employer and employee." But it must be clear that in this Mr. Truman is endorsing the private tax on phonograph records levied by Mr. Petrillo and the private tax on coal levied in the interest of Mr. Lewis' union; that he is going to let loose a whole series of such private taxes, and that demands for such private taxes are in fact made possible by the extreme power which existing Federal legislation places in the hands of labor leaders.

At many points Mr. Truman's objections to the Case bill are in conflict with his own record. For example, he declares: "President Roosevelt warned the Congress that the strike vote provisions of section 8 of the Smith-Connally Act would not lessen but would promote industrial strife. That prediction was fully borne out by subsequent events." Yet Mr. Truman himself has never called on Congress for the repeal of the Smith-Connally Act. On the contrary, he has repeatedly made use of the authority of that act, and proposes to continue to do so, to seize strike-bound properties.

Again, Mr. Truman criticizes the cooling-off periods for strikes provided in the Case bill. Yet in his message to Congress on December 3, in urging his own remedy of fact-finding boards, he recommended the same type of cooling-off periods.

Only two arguments are put forward by Mr. Truman to distinguish provisions that he objects to in the Case bill from the kind of measures he has himself recommended or endorsed. He declares that his own drastic proposal was "limited to strikes against the Government. It did not apply to strikes against private employers." This is an extremely technical distinction. Nation-wide strikes in the coal mines or on the railroads are just as disastrous to the national welfare whether or not the Government has technically taken over the properties. It is a matter of arbitrary decision whether or not the President elects to seize a property and make the strike one against the Government rather than against private employers. Moreover, when the President fixes wages for "the Government" to pay on these properties, all he does in fact is to saddle these wages onto the private owners and private employers of such properties.

The President's second distinction is that between "temporary" and "permanent" legislation. Though his own proposals are incomparably more drastic than those of the Case bill, his argument for them is that they are merely "temporary" and that the Case bill is "permanent." And though "temporary" legislation can be drafted and passed in a few hours even without debate, as were his own antistrike recommendations by the House a few weeks ago, it appears that "permanent" legislation should be drafted only after "long and careful study," "painstaking and exhaustive consideration" and with "infinite care."

AFTER THE VETO

The immediate question before Congress is what it can do about the problem with which the President's veto of the Case bill has presented it. It must today reread with a little bewilderment the President's words about labor and other legislation in his Nation-wide broadcast on January 3: "If the measures which I have recommended to accomplish these ends do not meet the approval of the Congress, it is my fervent wish—and I am sure that it is the wish of my fellow citizens—that the Congress formulate measures of its own to carry out the desired objectives. That is definitely the responsibility of the Congress. What the American people want is action." Congress in this case took the President at his word, formulated a measure of its own, and acted; but there is no action. Though the House voted yesterday by a majority of 255 to 135 to override the veto, this was 5 votes less than the two-thirds majority required.

What can Congress do in the situation in which it now finds itself? It can pass the substance of the Case bill once more with a small amendment which would make it a new bill. This amendment would make the Case bill "temporary" in the same way as the drastic legislation proposed by the President. Congress can add to this also a provision giving the existing Wagner Act the same life termination as the revised Case bill, and providing that in the meantime a study of permanent legislation will be made by a joint congressional committee.

If Congress were to do this it could accomplish several objectives at once. Making the new bill "temporary" would dispose of the basic objection that the President brings against the bill he has just vetoed. By making the Wagner Act also "temporary" Congress would prevent its labor committees from systematically smothering all proposals for reform as they have in the last 11 years. Only by doing this, in fact, would the proposed congressional committee study for which the President asks be likely to lead to any real action.

The proposal has been put forward that Congress attach the Case bill as an amendment to the "temporary" legislation which the President has himself requested. This, it is argued, would oblige the President to sign it. But this is a dangerous procedure. It is dangerous because the labor legislation that the President himself proposed should not be passed under any circumstances. The principles it embodies should not be accepted even temporarily. Even the bill as drastically revised and passed by the Senate would be not only unnecessary but harmful. For it provides that the President, after seizing a strike-bound plant or facility, shall "provide for the establishment from time to time of fair and just wages and other terms and conditons of employment in the affected plants, mines, or facilities which shall be in effect during the period of Government possession." This would clearly be a strike-fomenting measure. Unions would strike in order to force Government seizure, have the President raise their wages or meet their other demands, and then turn the properties back saddled with this new arrangement to the employers.

The outlook following Mr. Truman's veto is not promising. The veto may well mean more strikes, more arrogance on the part of certain labor leaders and more industrial chaos.

Communism in the United States Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles by Mark Foote, from the Bay City (Mich.) Times:

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times of June 2, 1946]

TWO "FELLOW TRAVELERS" LEADING MARITIME STRIKE, MARK FOOTE SAYS

(This is the sixteenth of a series of stories on communism in the United States today, answering the query: Is communism a menace?)

(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON.—The situation looks dark. That, in effect, was what President Truman said at his Friday press conference in respect to the possibility of a maritime strike.

Our merchant fleet was built with billions of dollars of taxpayers' money. Now the unions are making demands which are exorbitant. A shipping representative protested Friday that seven maritime unions have increased their wage and hours demands during negotiations designed to avert a strike scheduled for June 15.

Who are the leaders and promoters of this strike?

A couple of Communist "fellow travelers."

None other than "hell bent" Harry Bridges, president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, a member of the CIO executive board and active in the Political Action Committee.

And Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union of America, another important figure in the CIO Political Action Committee.

On May 28, 1942, Francis Biddle, then Attorney General of the United States under appointment of President Roosevelt issued an order as follows:

DEPORTATION ORDER CHANGED

"I therefore order that the alien, Harry Renton Bridges, be deported to Australia at the expense of the Government on the charges that:

"After entering the United States he has been a member of an organization, association, society, or group that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the United States."

Immediately there sprung up overnight the Harry Bridges defense committee, the citizens committee for Harry Bridges, and the Harry Bridges victory committee, all alleged by the Wood (Dies) Committee on Un-American Affairs to be Communist-front organizations, and all pledged to preventing his deportation.

Bridges took his case to the Supreme Court which rendered a decision written by Justice Douglas blocking the deportation on the grounds of insufficient evidence. The late Chief Justice Stone delivered an opinion concurred in by Justices Roberts and Frankfurter, dissenting, and holding Bridges should be deported.

Bridges was the leader of the disastrous San Francisco maritime strike of 1934 which paralyzed industry on the West Coast.

Jack Stachel, trade-union specialist of the Communist Party at the time, and member of its powerful executive committee, wrote in the November issue of the Communist for November, 1934:

CURRAN CONTROLS EAST

"The San Francisco strike proved that it is not only possible for the Communists to organize and lead struggles in unions, but to win struggles." Concerning future possibilities of the situation he asked: "What will happen if the workers elect not only one Bridges, but hundreds of Bridges? The workers will become revolutionized."

A book entitled "Men Who Lead Labor," by Buce Minton, editor of the New Masses (a Communist organ) and John Stuart, a contributor, eulogized Bridges. It said:

"One thing Bridges grasped—and endlessly repeated—that class was aligned against class." At the time, when charged with being a Communist, Bridges replied, "I neither affirm or deny that I am a Communist."

Adam Lapin, Washington correspondent of the Daily Worker, official Communist organ, referred to Bridges as the "west coast communist Leader"; in the issue of that paper for March 13, 1943.

The Wood committee names 16 alleged Communist-front organizations in which Bridges was active over a period of years. Many witnesses appeared before the committee to substantiate these charges.

Joseph Curran has the same stranglehold on shipping unions on the east coast that Bridges has on the west coast. The Wood committee says: "The National Maritime Union of America, under Curran's leadership and domination, has toed the Communist party line through all its changes in recent years."

Again the Wood committee: "Curran himself was on the picket line in front of the White House (when Roosevelt was President) denouncing lend-lease, convoys, and the imperialist war. All that changed for Curran and his union within a space of hours.

"It required only the entrance of Russia into the war to transform Curran and his machine into what George Washington called 'the impostors of pretended patriotism.' A few years ago there were two schools of isolationism in the United States. One of them suddenly abandoned its isolationism when the United States was attacked, and the other when Russia was attacked. Joseph Curran belonged to the latter school."

[From the Bay City (Mich.) Times of June 3, 1946]

GOVERNMENT POWER, CONTROLS OVER INDUSTRY GREW TIGHTER DURING WAR

(This is the last of a series of stories on Communism in the United States today, answering the query: Is Communism a menace?)

(By Mark Foote)

WASHINGTON.—A few years ago Adolf Hitler, according to Herman Rauchnig, in his book, the Voice of Destruction, said:

"It gives us National Socialists a special secret pleasure to see how the people about us are unaware of what is really happening to them."

Adolph Berle, Jr., who held various important Government positions in the United States for the 12 years, ending with Assistant Secretary of State when President Truman entered the White House, said before the temporary National Economic Committee a few years back:

"The Government (United States) will have to enter into direct financing of activities now supposed to be private, and a continuance of that direct financing must be inevitably that the Government will ultimately control and own these activities.

"PLANT OWNERSHIP SEEN

"Over a period of years the Government will gradually come to own most of the productive plants of the United States."

If that isn't Marxian socialism, what is it? The only reason it is not communism, is that Berle does not advocate the change by violent overthrow of the Government. It is what Samuel B. Pettengill, former Member of Congress from Indiana, calls smoke screen or creeping collectivism.

For more than a decade Government control of credit—the lifeline of business under the system of private initiative—the number of Government corporations, Government land ownership, and Federal grants-in-aid or subsidies have mushroomed alarmingly. Government bureaucracy has become a menace, Government control over the lives and activities of corporations and individuals—restriction on human liberties—has gone ahead by leaps and bounds.

BOOK TELLS STORY

Granting that some of these activities were necessary for winning the war, they should be dismantled now and returned to private hands. Before the war they were enormous. Pettengill in his book, Smoke Screen, tells the story. As of February 1940 (before the war) the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had authorized loans of $13,414,000,000. Its disbursements then amounted to $10,483,000,000, with repayments of $5,833,000,000.

Congress at that had written off losses of $2,720,000,000.

There are at least 38 other Government lending agencies.

Pettengill says: "Control credit and you control the bloodstream of life. Hitler, Mussolini, and Lenin seized control of credit and used this government monopoly to lift themselves to dictatorship."

SUBJECT TO AUDIT

President Truman signed a bill last December subjecting for the first time 32 Government corporations to audit. Incredible as it may seem, these 32 and in addition 9 others subject to partial audit and 10 more audited by public accountants, were spenders of public funds, many of them competitors of taxpaying enterprise.

The Citizens National Committee, a nonpartisan research organization says of them: "Government corporations benefit from practically unlimited Government credit at low interest—freedom from Federal, State, and local taxation (with few exceptions), enjoy free mailing privileges.

"Never before in the history of free government have such enormous resources, such sweeping powers, and such vast operations been conducted under the cloak of secrecy. Concealment of vital facts is shocking. It is dangerous to democracy."

The report continues that they lend huge sums to agriculture, commerce, industry, urban and rural home owners, cooperatives, banks, apartments, hotels, office buildings.

REHABILITATE PROPERTY

"They rehabilitate property damaged by floods; operate barges on the Mississippi River, produce, buy, sell, and store critical materials, provide insurance against war damage, train, and provide employment for prison inmates, strengthen relations between Latin and North America, control floods, generate and distribute electric power, loan money to stimulate foreign trade. There is hardly a part of the economy they do not touch."

Pettingill says that as far back as 1932, the Government had invaded 225 fields of private business.

Assistant Attorney General Norman Littell revealed that at end of 1943, the Federal Government, through 23 agencies had acquired 1,500,000 acres of property, and 21,000 other parcels not measured in acreage. Deals were pending for 18,500,000 additional acres. These were war purchases only.

NHA at the same time owned 523,000 dwellings, 123,000 temporary homes, 52,000 dormitories and 30,000 trailers; under lease were 1,400 warehouses, 2,300 other storage facilities, 2,800 offices and buildings, 800 hospitals, schools, and hotels, 6,762,000 acres for airports, camps, and ranges.

STATES GRANTED AID

In the fiscal year 1942, the United States Government granted Federal aid to the States in excess of $3,000,000,000, consisting of $693,900,000 known as grants-in-aid and other Federal payments within, but not directly to the States, known as quasi grants, amounting to $2,462,000,000.

The Federal-aid system is demoralizing to local morale and local fiscal policy. The Tax Foundation of New York, a nonpartisan research organization says, "The scheme emphasizes the vicious circle of Federal taxes and Federal subsidies which return a large part of the taxes to the places and sections where they are collected.

"A grant appears to be something that is obtained at expense of someone else. Governors, mayors, and other officials have scrambled and begged for these grants, and gladly surrendered their own prerogatives and responsibility to Federal agencies in exchange for them.

"State and local officials have done this crawling and begging even while realizing that the grant consisted of taxes paid into the Federal Government by their own people."

JEFFERSON'S VIEW

Thomas Jefferson said, "The government is best that governs the least."

President Truman has pledged to reduce the Federal bureaucracy of some 3,500,000. But the process is slow. Once established it is almost impossible to abolish a bureau—bureau heads want more employees, not less.

The congressional Committee on Roads has a bill to grant $1,500,000,000 for Federal roads, over a period of years. There is also a bill for a huge public-works program. There is a bill for socialized medicine, which would give free medical care and hospitalization to everyone regardless of ability to pay, and another bill to give further grants-in-aid to the States for educational purposes. These are mere samples of proposals for spending the people's money and centralizing the government in Washington.

People of the United States never have voted for a Communist or Socialist program. The highest total vote of the Communists, Socialists, and Socialist-Labor Parties combined in recent years was only 981,048. This was less than 1 vote in 40, but under the subterfuge of a better social order, otherwise conservative people are being entrapped into Government projects which lead down the road to Marxism.

Communism or Republicanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on May 28 at Springfield, Mo.,

Congressman B. CARROLL REECE, chairman of the Republican National Committee, addressed a crowd of several thousand Missouri citizens at a rally sponsored by the Women's Republican Clubs of the Sixth and Seventh Missouri Congressional Districts and by the Greene County, Mo., Young Republican Club. Unanimous consent of the House having been granted, I extend in the RECORD my introduction of Mr. REECE on that occasion together with his address which was so well received by all who heard it both at the Shrine Mosque where delivered and over Springfield's three fine radio stations· KTTS, KGBX, and KWTO.

ADDRESS OF HON. MARION T. BENNETT, OF MISSOURI, INTRODUCING HON. B. CARROLL REECE

Fellow citizens, when Congressman B. CARROLL REECE, of Tennessee, was last month elected chairman of the Republican National Committee, howls of anguish arose from the New Deal camp.

Congressman REECE is a fighting Tennessean who does not know the meaning of defeat. He is a war veteran with an exceptional career of valor. He is a veteran, too, of the battles of 26 years public service in the Congress of the United States. During the last 14 years of his distinguished service in Congress he has been given no opposition in his district by either Republicans or Democrats. While Missouri, like Tennessee, is a border State, we are not used to getting anything by default in Missouri, but we are willing to learn from Congressman REECE how he does it. Apparently it took him a few terms in the House to learn. He was first elected to Congress at 30 years of age. His seniority, gained by his repeated election to Congress, and his devotion to his district, State, and Nation, have convinced his constituents and citizens everywhere that he is a great American. We like him in Missouri not only for what he believes in politically, but because Missouri is his adopted State. His only daughter is in school at Stephens College at Columbia, Mo. Congressman REECE, as a former school teacher himself, knows that Missouri has fine schools. Congressman REECE is also a lawyer and a banker and a farmer. He knows and understands the problems of people like ourselves. He represents a district similar in economics, topography, and politics to our Sixth and Seventh Congressional Districts in Missouri. He speaks our language.

Just a word now about his legislative career which has been climaxed by his election as chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Congressman REECE served 10 years on the House Military Affairs Committee, of which my eloquent colleague, Mr. SHORT, is now a member. He initiated the resolution adopted creating the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee, of which I am a member. He is the daddy of the American Air Force and the World War I veterans' bonus. He is a coauthor of the Railroad Retirement Act which has meant so much to thousands of citizens of the Sixth Missouri Congressional District, which boasts of the general shops of three great railroads. His legislative pen helped draw the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the Stock Exchange, Securities, and Utilities Acts, the Federal Communications Act, and the Motor Transportation Act, to mention only a few pieces of legislation.

It is my proud privilege to present my colleague, captain of the drive for a Republican majority in Congress, chairman of the Republican National Committee, the Honorable B. CARROLL REECE, of Tennessee.

SPEECH BY B. CARROLL REECE, CHAIRMAN OF THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Fellow Republicans, this year our party has the most important job to do which has confronted it since 1860. In that year a Republican administration was elected to preserve the United States.

At that time this Nation was threatened with dismemberment along sectional lines. The Republican Party rose to the occasion and preserved the Union. Today we are threatened with an even more vicious form of dismemberment, one which disregards geographical areas and sets one segment of our population against another. Class warfare of the kind encouraged and stimulated by the policies of the present administration is a more dangerous threat to the maintenance of our Republican form of government than was secession in 1860.

I say it is a more dangerous threat because even if the Southern States had been successful in their efforts to secede from the Union, the basic fundamental structure of a representative republic would have remained, at least, in those States which chose to retain their allegiance to the Federal Government. The threat which confronts us today is the destruction of the basic fabric of our form of government both within the States, and in Washington.

This threat has come into dangerous actuality because a group of alien-minded radicals has been successful in seizing control of the party which bears the label of Democrat. That party today is no longer the historic Democratic Party. It is a group of discordant and warring elements held together over the past 14 years by the spoils of politics. Its record in Congress, particularly, during the past 4 or 5 years is the conclusive proof that it has no coherent or united purpose, and its record in the executive branch and in Congress has demonstrated beyond all doubt that it is completely incapable of administering the Government of the United States.

Within the ranks of the Democratic Party there are, of course, millions of loyal and patriotic Americans. Within the ranks of its Members in Congress there are probably only a very few who are consciously or willingly seeking to destroy our form of government. Nevertheless, the Democratic Party policy, as proclaimed by its officially chosen spokesman—the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and even the present occupant of the White House—bears a definite made-in-Moscow label. That is why I believe I am justified in saying that from a long-range viewpoint the choice which confronts Americans this year is between communism and republicanism.

I am sure all of you will agree that no taint of communism attaches to the Republican Party. The same cannot be said of our opposition. It is a matter of common knowledge in Washington that persons known to be either members of the Communist Party or sympathizers with the Communist theory of government occupy key positions in the upper ranks of our Federal bureaucracy. They have insinuated themselves into these key positions over the past decade or more by virtue of the carelessness, or the sordid political practices, of the present administration and its predecessor. Today they are entrenched beyond possibility of removal except by the election of a Republican Congress this year and a Republican President in 1948.

This alien wrecking crew now occupies this position of great authority because their followers hold the balance of power within the Democratic Party. In the largest and most populous State in this Union it is admitted freely that no Democratic candidate for State-wide office has even a remote chance of being elected unless he has the open endorsement of the group known as the American Labor Party. That party, as you well know, is one of the many false faces worn by those who seek to Sovietize the Government of the United States. In other States different false faces are worn, but the net result is the same.

This year we have startling evidence of the extent to which the radical element has taken over management of the Democratic Party. Boldly and boastfully the Political Action Committee, at Atlantic City only 2 weeks ago, issued a challenge to the American people. Backed by a $6,000,000 slush fund, it proclaims its purpose to retire to private life Members of Congress who refuse to be stooges of this Communist-dominated political organization.

Here is a direct challenge to the American people. Shall we allow a Congress to be elected which will be controlled by political buccaneers? Shall we, at the demand of this special privileged group of leaders, reduce Members of Congress to a bunch of Charlie McCarthys? Or, to express it another way, shall we give up a people's government here in the United States and establish a totalitarian government with Sidney Hillman as the dictator?

The American people will be called upon to give the answer at the elections this fall—and I am sure it will be an emphatic vote for an independent Congress and for the continuance of the American form of government.

The boys who fought and won the World War will not be led astray by fifth columnists, hiding in Trojan horses, who would turn our government over to a communistic group. The American people have never failed to give the right answer in a crisis.

I want to emphasize that this brazen announcement of a plan to buy the elections with a $6,000,000 slush fund does not come from the Democratic National Committee, the official campaign organization of the Democratic Party. No; it comes from the Political Action Committee, headed by the man with whom the chairman of the Democratic National Committee was instructed to "clear everything" during the 1944 Presidential campaign.

Thus, in effect, Republican candidates for the Senate and House this year will not be running against candidates of the Democratic Party, but against Political Action Committee candidates. I have said heretofore that there are many Democrats who are not infected with virus of communism, but I certainly do not believe that the same can be said of the leaders of the Political Action Committee. Therefore, if you agree with me on this point, I am confident that you will also agree with my statement that this year the fight basically is between communism and republicanism.

It is true, of course, that the Democratic national organization will probably take some small part in the campaign in support of the PAC candidates. However, it will be a comparatively minor role. It will not be an effort backed by any $6,000,000 slush fund because the Democratic National Committee does not have any such fund at its disposal and, under the terms of the Hatch Act, would not be allowed to accumulate that amount of money in any one year—this upon what may be a violent assumption that the law would be enforced against the Democratic National Committee. However, the Democratic National Committee will spend a considerable amount this year. Probably all of you have read about the $100-per-plate dinner held in Washington recently for the purpose of raising campaign funds under the guise of doing homage to Andrew Jackson. I have often wondered what that patron saint of the Democratic Party would say if he were asked to pay $100 for a dinner—particularly at a time when the same men who were arranging the dinner were also appealing to all Americans to save food for the starving millions in Europe.

In this connection, also, I was a little bit puzzled because the OPA, for some unknown reason, failed to invoke ceiling-price regulations with respect to these dinners. It happens that I dine occasionally in the

same hotel in which this feast was held. But I can assure you that $100 per plate is not the customary price for a dinner, nor are there any $100 ceiling prices posted upon the walls of that hotel.

I understand that approximately 2,000 persons—most of them Federal office-holders—paid $100 apiece for tickets to the Jackson Day dinner held in Washington. That in itself would build up a rather sizable campaign fund. But Washington was not the only place where such dinners were held. Probably the Democratic National Committee raised at least half a million dollars through this fund-raising device. I presume that amount, plus whatever other money the Democratic organization may have on hand, will qualify it for a junior partnership with the PAC in the campaign this year.

Be that as it may, it is obvious that the PAC is the dominant group in the opposition camp. That brings me back again to my statement that the issue this year is communism versus republicanism.

Now, let us examine the meanings of those two words. Communism, of course, is a form of totalitarianism. It is based upon the theory that the individual has no rights which the State must respect. In practical operation communism means that the citizen does what he is told under pain of liquidation. He may not give free expression to his thoughts, either by word of mouth or in writing. He may not worship God as he pleases. He may not own property. The fruits of his labor go to that governmental monstrosity known as the totalitarian state. I am not talking theory. We have in this world today a large area of the earth's surface subject to Communist government. We know what it is.

In the United States we do not yet have outright communism. But, we have gone far along the road toward it during the past decade or more. Every year has seen an extension of the bureaucracy in Washington, and every year that bureaucracy has extended its controls over the daily life of the citizen. Some of these extensions were perhaps necessary and justifiable during time of war. But the war is over—at least we hope it is—and still the bureaucrats continue to tell you and me and every citizen how to run his business, how much he can eat, how much of his own money he may retain, and what he can do with it. All of these manifestations of the bureaucratic lust for power are mileposts on the road to outright communism. We have passed a great many of those mileposts already.

This is the time for the American people to call a halt, to serve notice that their Government is their servant and not their master. If they do not do so, all of the blood and treasure which we have spent in two world wars will have been wasted. The time to stop this march toward slavery is now. We have an opportunity to do so at the polls this year. We may not have many more such opportunities.

What do we have to offer as an alternative? The word is "republicanism." Just what does that mean? It means a resumption of the form of government under which this Nation advanced to a position of preeminence and prosperity which made it the envy of the world. It means an America in which every citizen is free to order his own life as he sees fit, so long as he does not infringe upon the rights of his fellow citizens. It means an America in which the worker may enjoy the fruits of his toil. He may spend his money or save it. He may provide security for his family. All this without obtaining permission from some tax-eating bureaucrat in Washington. It means an America in which there are no class distinctions and no distinctions of race or color. It means an America in which the citizen is a freeman and not the ward of the state. In short, republicanism is the opposite of communism.

As I have pointed out previously, and as I shall continue to point out, republicanism is true liberalism. One of the tricks of our Communist opponents is that of confusing the public by the misuse of words. All too frequently over the past few years we have heard the word "liberal" or "liberalism" used as a synonym for "radical" or "radicalism." There are no two words in the English language whose real meanings are further apart. A liberal is one who fights against encroachments upon the rights of the citizen by government—be that government a monarchy, a soviet or a federal bureaucracy. I know of no group in the United States which has fought harder or more consistently against such encroachments than the Republican Party. We are winning that fight today, and we shall continue until our victory is complete.

Your State of Missouri is one of the principal battlegrounds in this war. In this State you may be sure that our opposition, seeking to restore the prestige of its faltering leader, will concentrate its shock battalions and its heaviest artillery. I am confident, however, that the Republicans and other patriotic Americans in Missouri will be able to repulse that assault.

Incidentally, before I left Washington I told some of my friends that I was planning to speak in Missouri, and they told me they thought it would be a waste of time to go to Missouri because they were under the impression that most of the population of Missouri had moved to Washington and attached itself to the Government pay roll. I told them that I thought they were mistaken because I knew that there must be a large number of hard-working citizens in Missouri paying the taxes to keep the rest of the population in Washington. I am glad to see from the size of my audience that I was right in that assumption.

We are within sight of victory. To insure the triumph of republicanism over communism we must win only 26 additional seats in the House of Representatives and only 9 additional seats in the United States Senate. I am confident that unless we throw away our opportunities, we will win many more seats than the numbers I have mentioned.

That will mean that when the new Congress assembles next January there will be a Republican Speaker of the House, and a Republican presiding officer in the Senate. It will mean that we will have Republican majorities on every committee in Congress. That, in turn, will permit us to translate into law our constructive program to insure a prosperous and free America. Also, it will mean that we will have the power, and I am sure we will have the disposition, to investigate and reveal the causes for the sorry mess in which the Nation finds itself today. The present administration has been in power for so many years that it has become obsessed with the idea that what it does is none of the people's business. We believe that government is the people's business, and you may be sure there will be a thorough audit of the present administration just as soon as the Republicans take control of Congress. I am confident, although I am sorry to have to say it, that the revelations which will then be forthcoming will shock every loyal American.

To do the job which the welfare of the country demands, we must have substantial majorities of real Republicans in Congress. I have found, during my travels about the country, that in some localities there is, unfortunately, a disposition to be satisfied with Democrats who occasionally vote with Republicans in Congress. Of course, we are always glad when a Democrat sees the light and votes to support a Republican position, but the occasional support of Democrat Members is not enough to give us effective control of Congress. What we must have is an outright Republican majority. That is the only way in which we can elect a Republican Speaker and set up Republican-controlled committees. To those Democrats who believe in the Republican philosophy of government, I offer the suggestion that they join our party. We are always glad to welcome patriotic Americans.

The present administration knows that its back is to the wall, that it is fighting a rear-guard action. For that reason you may be sure it will fight desperately. We cannot afford to relax for one moment until the votes are counted next November. But the fight is worth the effort. The prize for victory is the salvation of the American Republic.

Your Turn, Mr. Murray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal:

YOUR TURN, MR. MURRAY

President Philip Murray, of the CIO, recently sent a letter to President Truman demanding, rather than suggesting or requesting, that the President veto the Case bill. Mr. Murray's communication amounted to one more tune on the frayed old string of contention that anyone who proposes to balance the powers of organized labor with legal responsibility for their proper use is conspiring to destroy the unions. There were the usual garnishments in the way of charges of fascism, snatching hard-earned benefits from labor, and so forth. Mr. Murray left out hardly anything except a repetition of the phrase about malefactors of great wealth.

Mr. Murray's letter to the President was accompanied by a so-called analysis of the Case bill supplied by the chief counsel of the CIO, a gentleman who quite naturally stated his own side of the matter to the exclusion of the other side. Senators JOSEPH H. BALL, HARRY F. BYRD, ALLEN J. ELLENDER, CARL A. HATCH, H. ALEXANDER SMITH, and ROBERT A. TAFT, all of whom supported the Case bill in the Senate, have issued a statement of their own. They center their fire on Mr. Murray's letter and what it did not say.

In brief, this bipartisan group of Senators finds that Mr. Murray's position that the Case bill is designed to shackle labor and destroy collective bargaining is tenable only in case one agrees with "certain basic premises on which he proceeds." The statement lists these assumptions by Mr. Murray as follows:

1. That the right to strike is an absolute right, the exercise of which may under no conditions be restrained or curtailed, even when it threatens to deprive the public of transportation, fuel, light, water, and other essentials of life.

2. That labor organizations should be immune from laws applying to all others, which prohibit robbery and extortion in interstate commerce.

3. That labor organizations should be immune from the antitrust laws, which apply to all others, although the purpose and effect may be the same when done by labor organizations as when done by any others.

4. That although all others who engage in business are responsible for the acts of their agents acting within the scope of their authority, labor unions should not be held responsible.

5. That although a labor organization is treated as an entity for purposes of exemption from taxation and for purposes of exercising privileges under the Wagner Act, it should not be treated as an entity for purpose of suit for violation of its contracts.

6. That although Federal equity courts may give relief by injunction against various wrongs when committed by others, there should be no such relief against a labor union no matter what wrongs it may commit, and no matter whether or not the law provides the injured party with any other adequate remedy.

The Senators sum it up by saying that Mr. Murray proposes that labor unions, merely because they are such, are entitled to a position above and beyond the reach of law.

It is Mr. Murray's turn now, and while we wait for him to reply, the President must have found cause for profound thought on the basis of the bipartisan challenge from these Senators to the labor leader.

Give the Voter a Clear Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent of the House having been granted, I extend in the RECORD the following speech which I delivered to a joint meeting of the Sixth and Seventh District Republican Women's Clubs at the American Legion home, Springfield, Mo., May 28, 1946:

Fellow members of the Republican Party, I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak this afternoon to a meeting sponsored by the Sixth and Seventh District Republican Women's Clubs from the two banner Republican districts of Missouri. Your presence here in such large numbers is an encouraging indication of your vital interest in the important 1946 elections.

We Republicans this year face a new and crucial responsibility which the broad sweep of events has placed upon us. The responsibility falls equally upon Republican men and women. It can only be discharged if we muster all our strength. We face powerful enemies. They are the enemies of free representative government, and the issue is free representative government itself.

We, who, through 14 years of New Deal, have fought to preserve traditional American freedom, now see with new clarity and sharper vision the clear-cut issue of the present day. We are able to see the issue because we understand and respect the fundamental processes of the republican form of government which the Constitution and its Bill of Rights undertake to guarantee us. Our respect and devotion to those principles of free government have been strengthened, not only by our own unflagging fight to preserve them but also by the sight in recent years of the rise of new forms of tyranny, which have crushed the peoples of the world and ground them down in the miseries of fear, hunger, and physical cruelty.

Thinking Americans have relearned the true meaning of freedom in the example of those who have lost it. We have relearned the meaning of freedom by losing some portion of it ourselves. You and I, despite our stubborn and unrelenting opposition for these many years, have seen a measurable part of American freedom taken away. All of us in wartime voluntarily submitted to governmental controls and the broad blundering supervision of our personal lives, yet the necessities of war served only to accentuate a trend which had already existed in this New Deal Administration before the war. That record being carried forward today promises only continued assaults on American freedom, if the New Deal continues in power.

Our responsibility as Republicans in this time is twofold: We must take vigorous measures to perpetuate the knowledge of liberty in coming generations and we must take immediate action to turn back the enemies of freedom now.

The success of the American form of free, representative government depends upon the ability of each rising generation to understand it. Herein Republican women have a long-range responsibility—a vitally important responsibility—separate and distinct from ordinary organizational activity in political campaigns. The American woman of this generation must not only engage in the tactics and strategy of campaigning in which she has proven herself to have such great talent and initiative, she must likewise, as the mainspring of the home and family life, inculcate in the next generation the philosophy and ideals upon which our free representative government is based.

We must remember and never forget that freedom begins in the American home. A people who would enjoy liberty must have knowledge of it and love for it. Freedom is based upon character and character depends upon training. The destiny of future generations of Americans, therefore, places a charge upon the women of America not only to rise to the challenge of these uncertain times and turn back the enemies of freedom, but to instill in the youth of America that love of independence, that innate self-reliance, that integrity of purpose which are the marks of a free people and which provide the foundations of free, representative government.

But all Republicans—men and women alike—have a critical and immediate mission which must be performed today and will not wait for the faith or the energy of some new generation to undertake it. We must not bequeath to American youth the choice between the bitter cup of tyranny and a bloody struggle for liberty. We must provide the rallying point and the instrument for the fight to maintain American freedom against the destructive radicals of this present time.

It has become increasingly evident that the Democratic Party is held captive in the tight grip of the radical and fellow traveler. It has become increasingly evident and is even now openly declared that the power and influence of the present administration is to be employed to advance the influence of leftist New Deal elements and to destroy or drive from the Democratic Party all those who do not blindly subscribe to the radical line. President Truman and the Democratic National Committee have substantially endorsed the repeated statements of Secretary Wallace that those who do not conform to this line as conceived by the CIO-PAC should be purged from the Democratic Party.

You may wonder why it is that after remarking upon the responsibilities of the Republican Party I suddenly turn to consideration of the divisions and dissensions within the Democratic Party. I do so because the most significant political fact of our generation is this: That the exponents of the master state, the radicals who call themselves New Dealers, the fellow travelers, and the Communists have now disclosed their intention to bid jointly and openly for permanent political power. The Truman administration seeks their support. With cynical disregard for the very traditions which have given them their opportunities as men, administration leaders now betray the spirit of America for the sake of a bloc of votes. For the support of a minority, for a few million votes at the polls, administration leaders now forswear the ideals of the vast majority of Americans, Democrats and Republicans alike. They seek first to drive from the Democratic Party, and then from the entire American political scene, all men and women who oppose their radical schemes and who wish to conserve the philosophy and the practice of free representative government.

This issue then transcends ordinary party considerations. It is no longer just a contest between Republicans and Democrats. It is a contest, and a bitter vital contest, between fundamental philosophies of government and of life.

Republicans hold that this Government is the servant and not the master of the people. We hold that the governing of our society must be under a rule of law laid down by the people themselves through their elected representatives instead of a rule of personal whim of some bureaucrat in an alphabetical agency. We oppose irresponsible persons who use the authority and power of government to inflict their personal ideas and ambitions or their private greed upon the American citizen. This is a fundamental view for which the Republican Party has fought with unceasing devotion from its very birth. It is a view shared by all true Democrats for it is the view of the founders of this Nation. This is a principle upon which the great achievements of America have been based. It was never questioned before by any major party. The issues between the Democratic and Republican Parties have been issues of policy or detail, but they were never issues involving the very form of constitutional government and the most sacred concepts of human freedom which are now raised by the professional radicals of the New Deal who have captured the machinery and the banner of the Democratic Party.

Democrats, true Democrats, have now lost their traditional political home. Henry Wallace, the rainbow-chasing political maverick, may talk of party responsibility, but the men and women of the Democratic Party who truly believe in the traditions of Jefferson and Jackson and who truly believe in the American system of free, representative government cannot now bridge the gap between their scruples and the imported radicalism of the New Deal. Nowhere is this in greater evidence than in the quarreling factions of the Democratic majority in Congress.

This, then, is the doom of the Democratic Party. It is the final rift which has ruptured all possible cooperation between the left and right wings of that party. It is the final foreclosure of any hope that good government can emerge from a party whose own best statesmen in Congress repudiate the philosophy and the practices of its radical leaders in the executive department. It is now the responsibility of the Republican Party to provide that constructive, forward-looking leadership which can emerge only from a party whose members all agree on its fundamental tenets of faith. It is no longer a question of political labels. It is no longer a conflict between sections, of east or west or north or south. It is a crucial and dynamic issue involving the fundamental approach to government itself. We welcome to our ranks and want to make salvation easy for all those who would now fight with us to preserve our way of life and that form of government against the sinister and powerful influences which willfully and sometimes traitorously, I fear, assail it from every side. There are now just two main parties in the United States—the Republican Party and the New Deal Party. The differences in principles and intentions between the two parties are wide and distinct. They must be made clear to the voters of America in order that they may be able to make an intelligent

choice between the plans and beliefs of the New Deal Party and the plans and beliefs of the Republican Party. They must be made clear in order that the voters may choose at election time, in order that they may decide upon stated and adequate grounds to which party they wish to entrust the administration of the affairs of this Nation.

The Republican Party is wide awake. There shall be no compromise or appeasement or imitation of the New Deal so far as we are concerned on the fundamental principles of constitutional Government. We know what we are for and what we are against. We know what is right and what is wrong. We have defined the causes of battle and we have drawn rigidly the battle line. We will fight it out on this line. We say, "America once more shall be free and with an abundance of those goods and services our people require." America needs production but all the Truman New Deal has produced thus far is a bumper crop of political boils.

What is the Republican Party? What does it stand for? To me the Republican Party is the party of forward-looking wisdom as opposed to the party of reckless experiment.

The Republican Party is the party of Americanism opposed to a party riddled and inoculated with foreign, left-wing ideologies.

The Republican Party is the antiradical party, opposed to the radical party.

The Republican Party is the antiregimentation party opposed to the party that would put a nation under the thumbs of political top sergeants.

The Republican Party is the antibureaucratic party opposed to the party that would fasten the dry rot of a vested bureaucracy upon every phase of American life.

The Republican Party is the party of governmental economy opposed to the party of governmental waste and prodigality.

The Republican Party is the party which believes that civil governmental employees should be drastically decreased in number instead of recklessly increased until their salary list alone has become an almost unsupportable burden to the taxpayer.

The Republican Party is the party that believes in treating every man as an individual citizen opposed to the party that believes every man must belong to some class or group and is just another statistic for the bureaucrats to shift around. It is a party opposed to the stirring up of class or racial strifes in opposition to the party that fattens on class prejudice and racial warfare.

The Republican Party is the party that knows the vexing question of labor-management relations must be settled fairly and squarely so that industrial peace shall come again to the Nation. It is opposed to the party which believes that this question should not be settled but should be fomented and inflamed, because that party fattens on quarrels, strife, and unrest. The Republican Party believes that capital and labor should be regulated in their conduct by fair and just laws, honestly administered. It believes that the security of the public is the paramount consideration and that both capital and labor must recognize the public interest. We don't believe the country should be run by labor unions, the NAM, nor veterans, farmers, businessmen, school teachers, nor any other one group not elected by the people.

The Republican Party is affirmatively the party of competition and the right of the individual to carry on his business subject to fair regulation in the public interest but without improper governmental meddling. The Republican Party believes that the natural law of supply and demand can never be repealed and that no spurious enactment can permanently become a substitute for the law of supply and demand.

The Republican Party is the party that believes in firm, honest, unselfish, open dealing in international affairs in opposition to the party that places its faith in secret agreements secretly arrived at. It is the party that believes in telling the facts to the public in opposition to the party that works in secrecy and fails to tell the public to what conduct it has been committed against its will and without its consent. The Republican Party is the party which opposes making this arsenal of democracy the arsenal of either colonial or Communist imperialism. We are the peace party as opposed to the war party.

The Republican Party is the party that supports our Constitution as the framework of just government in this land. It is the party that believe that changes in the Constitution should be made, when necessary, by amendment openly advocated, rather than by devious, conspiratorial, revolutionary technique.

The Republican Party believes that no department or bureau should be above the law and that any decision by any appointed, not elected, official should be subject to review by the properly constituted courts of the land.

The Republican Party will fight to conserve the resources and the Government of this Nation in opposition to the party that wishes to undermine, waste, destroy, and give away our national resources. There will always be a United States of America if the New Deal doesn't give it away.

The Republican Party is the clean politics party as opposed to the party which maintains itself in power by alliance with the corrupt big city political machines, the CIO-PAC, the solid South and the bought vote.

These matters that I have here described are the broad purposes and principles of the Republican Party. They are stated to you as the opposite of the purposes and principles of the New Deal Party. The line of demarcation is plain. It is upon this line that we shall fight. We must now point out to others the clear difference between the New Deal and the Republican Parties. It is the citizens' right to decide which they prefer to entrust with the responsibility of governing them in the years to come. The choice is clear. The chasm that stretches between the parties is wide and cannot be bridged. We must have the one thing or the other. The decision rests with Americans. The day of decision comes on election day, November 5, 1946. In this land the majority rules. Let the majority speak. If they believe that the Republican Party, fighting for the principles I have here stated, is the party they wish to trust, then let them cast their votes for Republicans. If they desire to preserve this Nation as it is constituted with liberty and freedom for all, they will vote the Republican ticket. If they want to continue the America of our forefathers, and an America in which our sons will enjoy equality and individual freedom and the right to achieve, limited only by their own talents, ambitions, and industry, then the vote will be for our side. If they wish a changed, uncertain, regimented, socialized America under bureaucratic tyranny, without pride in its past or hope for its future, then they will cast their vote for the New Deal Party.

As you go forth to carry this issue and to delineate this choice to the American people, it is well to bear in mind what results Americans may expect from the system advocated by the New Deal as opposed to the free system to which we devote all our energies and devotion.

The end product of the New Deal can only be the worst combination of governmental corruption and tyranny in history. Too many times over the past years have we seen the pattern of New Deal operation repeat itself. They move from crisis to new powers in the name of humanitarian ideals. Those new powers they then use to grasp for greater powers. The starry-eyed radical announces great flaming challenges to the humanitarian instinct of all men. The crooked Missouri Pendergast gang moves in to exploit for its own advantage and feather its own nest. Its motto is "Mo for Mo."

Let the New Deal continue, and the success or failure of an American businessman will finally depend, as it does now in large measure, upon which inside track he can develop to governmental favor. The job of the workman will depend, as it does in the CIO, upon how well his union delivers a vote and campaign money for the administration. The housewife may set her table well or poorly because her husband is in or out of favor with the party in power which appoints the ration boards. The farmer will continue to obtain a high or a low price for his product, depending upon the arbitrary whim of this or that bureaucrat from Brooklyn sitting in Washington in a swivel chair with his feet in the wastebasket and his head in the clouds. The white-collar worker will continue to be granted a raise or refused one and pay high prices for cheaper merchandise because some New Deal henchman has decreed it so, some bureaucrat for whom he did not vote and cannot vote against.

We are opposed to such practices. We will fight tooth and nail to restore to American citizens the rule of law which will provide equal justice to all, regardless of political faith or contacts, which will protect the weak against the strong, which will guarantee the rights of the individual against the political favorite, which will stop the spending of enormous amounts of the people's money for the sake of the privileged few, and which will remove from the backs of our people the deadening and discouraging burden of this administration whose only political hope and whose greatest vested interest lies in ever-increasing debt, ever-increasing control, ever-larger Government pay rolls, ever-present strife, and new emergencies to solve with another $1,000,000,000 and more autocratic power over the people.

We hold out on the other hand the promise of an America released from the dead hand of bureaucracy, restored to the sound principles of management and finance which spell economy and sanity in Government and more money in the pockets of the citizen. We repudiate the system of political caste and privilege which has been foisted upon the American people by the New Deal. We will restore to America a state of affairs wherein any American may stand before his government and demand fair play, regardless of his race, color, creed, or political beliefs. We will repress this sprawling Government until it once again becomes the servant and not the master of the people. We will restore a rule of law under which no man, be he Republican or New Dealer, can willfully violate the rights of others and draw unto himself instruments of power improper for any American to hold.

Finally, we will so release the energies of the American people that the creative spirit of this Nation may contrive new approaches and open new avenues to a broad and magnanimous future. In the poorer third of the American people, economically, is a great challenge to industry, agriculture, and labor to utilize the genius of America to produce new and better products, greater and more satisfying services at such lower cost as to bring this lower third of our Nation within the compass of luxury. We will so foster and so encourage the enterprising spirit of American youth that the war veteran and the young men and women of this time may look forward with true enthusiasm to new goals of achievement and new marks in the forward progress of civilization.

From the great struggle through which we have just passed have emerged the devices and inventions of a new and wonderful age—an age in which the sciences of electronics, of nuclear physics, of chemistry, biochemistry, mechanical engineering, and television hold

out to Americans of this generation and the next an advancement in the standard of our living far above the fondest imaginations of our fathers. Release the productive energies of American industry which the New Deal has kept penned up since the shooting was stopped, and we can bring not only to America itself, but to the broadcast spread of humanity all over the world, a new hope in the dynamic possibilities of independence and a concrete example of the physical rewards which are the ultimate product of personal freedom.

Yet, there is some other increment, some other and almost indefinable thing, which makes freedom worth fighting for itself. During the war, about a year ago this month, I visited the battle fronts of Europe on invitation of General Eisenhower. I was in Germany while Hitler lived. I saw in this great slave nation a people who had traded their political liberty to a dictator for economic security. This is the same basement bargain offered by the New Deal to American voters today. I could see the sad effects of that unfortunate bargain in their dull eyes, their hopeless expressions, their shattered cities. I realized then, more than ever before, that it is not the automobiles, Frigidaires, radios, and Ivory soap which make this a great Nation. It is not the gadgets or the insurance policies alone which make this the happiest people on the face of the earth. Men and women may be kept as prisoners in palaces amid the utmost extravagant luxury, yet find no satisfaction for themselves. There is a measure of satisfaction in freedom which can be taken only from within and which cannot be marked out on the dimensions of a golden bath tub, nor measured in dollars and cents. Freedom's greatest satisfaction and reward lies in the knowledge of it. It reposes in the mind and heart and shows itself in a man's carriage and his character, and bespeaks itself in his eye.

Here is the spirit of freedom and of enterprise. Here is the spirit of moral courage. Here is the spirit of advancement. Here is the spirit of America. Here is the hope of the world. We Republicans must fight to keep that spirit alive. If we do, you may rest assured that God will bless America.

Surplus Goods for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Everett Allied Veterans Council, of Everett, Mass. I believe the views of these veterans, as expressed by Mr. Wells, the secretary of the council, are typical of those of veterans all over the country concerning the method in which surplus commodities are being disposed of by the constituted agency.

EVERETT ALLIED VETERANS COUNCIL,
Everett, Mass., June 8, 1946.

Representative ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
Eighth Massachusetts Congressional District, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GOODWIN: The Everett allied veterans' council know and appreciate your efforts in veterans' legislation. At the monthly meeting of the council it was voted to bring the matter of surplus war commodities to your attention.

One of the principal complaints of many veterans is the method in which surplus commodities are being disposed of by the constituted agency. Veterans are having many sad and trying experiences in attempting to purchase surplus commodities. Red tape, the lack of proper priorities, and the "run around" demand further investigation and cooperation from the legislative branches of our National Government. Veterans should have No. 1 priorities in more commodities, less red tape, and better attention to their specific needs. Proposed sales of the commodities should have greater publicity among veterans. Veterans' organizations should be circularized so that their membership can be aware of the sales.

We would appreciate your support and cooperation in securing these objectives.

May we be favored with an early reply from you.

Respectfully yours,
HENRY E. WELLS,
Secretary.

Duffy's Tavern Radio Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and accompanying editorial from the Pilot:

LAWRENCE, MASS., *June 10, 1946.*

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I am herewith enclosing editorial from the Pilot, official organ of the Catholic Archdiocese, of Boston, relative to the program Duffy's Tavern, over the NBC network, and sponsored by the Bristol-Myers Co., of New York.

I have written this concern regarding their sponsoring of this offensive program, which, in our opinion, is a direct insult to people of Catholic faith and Irish ancestry, but a reply from them states that they are unable to control this person who broadcasts under the name of Ed Gardner, and are, therefore, unable to remedy the situation.

The Bristol-Myers Co. admits that the program is offensive but that they are unable to do anything about it, as this person, Gardner, persists in his weekly insults, with the full knowledge that the program is offensive.

A letter to NBC brought no satisfaction.

I am bringing this matter to your attention in order that some action might be taken to prevent our people of Catholic-Irish faith and ancestry from being lampooned and insulted over the air waves.

Will you kindly advise.

Respectfully,
PATRICK J. SCANLON.

[From the Pilot, Boston, Mass., of June 8, 1946]

THE SECOND OFFENSE

Just after St. Patrick's Day we referred editorially to the radio program Duffy's Tavern, sponsored by the Bristol-Myers' products, Minit-Rub and Vitalis. It seemed to us that the Vitalis and Minit-Rub humorists showed poor taste in dragging the revered name of St. Patrick into the whisky-soaked atmosphere of Duffy's saloon. We accused them of nothing worse than bad taste. It was never our thought that Archie, the manager, and his supporting cast intended a deliberate insult to Catholics. But after the program the evening of May 31, we are not so certain that the Duffy's Tavern people are merely having fun.

The May 31 program opens with Archie's account of a wake he attended the previous evening. The wake was a rowdy, disreputable affair. And as usual the characters were O'Flaherty, O'Rourke, etc.

So apparently Minit-Rub and Vitalis intend to go on lampooning Americans of Irish antecedents. They know that the humor of the Duffy's Tavern program conveys offense. And while there is no law to punish boorishness, neither is there any law compelling Catholics to make boorishness profitable.

The Bristol-Myers people are evidently not greatly worried about the objection voiced by a single Catholic periodical. Possibly if our Catholic organizations were to express dislike for the insulting character of some of the Duffy's Tavern humor, Bristol-Myers might think it politic to launder their programs a little more carefully.

Aviation Builds a New World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, is the author of Aviation Builds a New World, appearing in the July number of Tomorrow magazine. This article is most informative and challenging. It follows in part:

The airways cross and recross the entire globe's surface, like a giant spider web, revealing an exciting vision of tomorrow's aviation and the part it can play in shaping the future history of mankind. New routes are being added daily to the air transport network. Even before VJ-day air routes had reached a total of more than 410,000 miles.

The air lines of the United States have emerged from the infancy of aviation as a most powerful and colorful factor. There are 144 principal air carriers operating over every expanse of earth or ocean, and 23 bear the Stars and Stripes. Of the total route miles, American carriers were operating over more than 121,000, including domestic, territorial, and overseas lines.

Domestic air transport in the United States far outdistances in volume the operations of our overseas carriers and will probably continue to do so, relatively, even though international air travel looks forward to amazing expansion with the gradual disappearance of wartime obstacles. Overseas air transport is the branch of aviation which is most dramatic. It has a profound effect upon the progress of flight and will have a deep influence on our lives in tomorrow's challenging world.

Aviation began and flourished on the framework of science, but it would never have soared to its present heights without vision and imagination. Predictions of still more amazing progress in the immediate future, based on gas-turbine and turbo-jet engines, laminated flow wings, supersonic speeds, electronics, and radar, give confidence to the experts and to the operators of a limitless tomorrow in the air. It is obvious that better planes will encourage more people to fly because of greater safety, more dependability and cheaper fares. But the vision of what all the mechanical improvements will mean in human terms creates the

stimulus to travel. Unless people really want to fly, the best planes in the world will take off with many empty seats. That is why air transport linking the continents, though still in its adolescence, assumes a major place in tomorrow's world.

In the recent war years, the airplane proved its ability to destroy. But it also demonstrated its capacity to transform the world in an era of peace. By carrying millions of American travelers to all countries of the earth, international air transport can help stabilize world economy, one of the prerequisites to elimination of armed conflict. Aircraft is vividly reinforcing its position as the principal vehicle for the exchange of ideas as well as of goods and passengers. Just as one example: without the airplane in these days of disrupted communications, it would have been impossible for United Nations statesmen ever to meet and establish a system for solving the problems of the postwar period. Flourishing trade, steady jobs, sound prosperity in all the countries served by the far-flung airlines will, indeed, contribute substantially to the security of each nation and the understanding of all in relation to each other.

There is another angle to the future of air transport which would hardly have been imagined a few years ago. Today it is inspiring to learn that the progress of aviation has brought us virtually to the brink of mass transportation by air. History has taught us, and so has a conviction within us, that next to his family, man loves his home. At the same time many of the most exciting and often tragic pages of history have revealed that man also has a compelling urge to wander, or more often has been compelled by forces beyond his own control to follow weary trails in search of a home.

Familiar to all are the migrations of history, large and small, dating back to the dim days when hordes continually trekked through the wastes of Asia or the wilds of Europe. Today the tiny fleet of Columbus and the *Mayflower* are imperishable symbols. The covered wagon, and later the crude steam vessels which brought to the United States thousands from Ireland, Germany, and many other oppressed lands, have become part of the saga of our country.

Hardship, pain, disease, weariness, unbearable delay marked these migrations. There probably will be migrations to the end of time. The airplane promises to make them less tragic and more expeditious. We are at this moment in the midst of the greatest migration in history, and aircraft has demonstrated a steady capacity to serve. Air transport planes of our commercial carriers, together with the fleets of the Army and Navy, have played a major part in bringing home millions of our vast overseas forces, many of them wounded or sick, and many in nonstop flights of more than 3,000 miles. The headlines remind us daily of the disheartening experiences of the millions of displaced persons in Europe. Destruction is so complete that even airplanes cannot function to solve the problem but they have contributed materially to the maintenance of communications without which no progress could have been made in handling such a formidable task.

The forces of the future which may make migrations unavoidable or even desirable in opening up hitherto inaccessible but fruitful areas are unpredictable. The course of such events will depend on the leaders of nations, upon the success of the United Nations, and more and more, upon the will of the peoples themselves. But if and when such movements become realities, the air transport fleets of the near future will be able to meet the situation.

The air lines of the United States, for example, expect to have by the end of this year or early 1947 more than 1,200 planes, with a seating capacity of more than 48,000 persons and the ability to operate more than 10,000,000,000 passenger-miles in a single year. When you realize that most of the new planes will seat from 44 to 100 passengers, and a few over 200, and will fly from 240 to 300 miles an hour, the magnitude of the forecasts appears conservative. This is especially true when it is realized that individual commercial planes usually are kept in the air 12 to 13 hours of every 24. The unit mileage of a big air line's fleet is over 531,000 miles a year, which compares with 145,000 for a sleeping car and 70,000 for an intercity bus.

The air-line fleets of tomorrow are ready to tackle whatever problems may arise. The confidence of their operators is not simply based on the drawing boards of the engineers who are planning tomorrow's planes. The planes that can do the job are here, and have already performed a magnificent war job which gives proof of their capacity. During the first 3 years of our participation in the war the air lines of the United States flew more than 8,000,000,000 passenger-miles and carried more than 850,000,000 ton-miles of cargo. Their overseas war routes, operated directly for the Army and Navy under contract, accounted for more than 2,500,000,000 of the passenger-miles and more than 600,000,000 of the ton-miles.

They have flown the equivalent of 26,000 times around the world at the Equator. Carrying the same tonnage of cargo the same distance they have operated during the war, the air-line fleets could have moved all the one-hundred-and-forty-thousand-odd passenger cars registered in the State of North Dakota from Seattle to Tokyo. Or they could have moved by air the entire population of Philadelphia to London. This is not just a statistician's figure of speech but is indicated by the fact that in the United States cargo planes have already moved entire loads of household furniture from coast to coast.

The international air routes already form a pattern which will stand for many years. This pattern reveals the United States starting with some definite advantages. Even now it is impossible to say which air lines of what countries will fly more than a few of the routes. An idea of the forthcoming rivalry appears in the applications of some 15 nations for operating space at New York's yet unfinished Idlewild Airport. The power of air transport to change the customs of millions of people is indicated by this fabric of intercontinental routes.

The speed of the airplane, increased by the short cuts possible only in the sky, opens routes new both to business and recreation travel because of the precious time saved. The location of the air routes of today and tomorrow also indicates a lessening of the seasonal and directional peaks and valleys of passenger volume which have plagued other forms of transportation. The winter-storm hazards and discomforts will be bypassed to a large extent by the airplane. And the vacation travel rushes can be mitigated because the airplane routes take travelers to good vacation climates within a few hours at any time of year. Thousands of Americans who heretofore could afford the cost but could not afford the time for a vacation to Europe via steamship will soon be able to reach London or Paris in 18 hours or less, and even with only a 2-week vacation will have 12 days to spend at their destination.

These advantages of the air lanes favor each of the three regions in which the United States is most vitally concerned. In the North Atlantic the winter storms have been especially discouraging to out-of-season voyaging. The short-cut feature is likely to spot the United States and Canada as a transit area from Australia to Europe, in competition with the trans-Mediterranean route, for the Great Circle distances are about the same either way.

In the trans-Caribbean area, the avoidance of surface handicaps is unusually advantageous to aircraft. For example, the trip from Texas to Bogota, Colombia, requires a long sea voyage and then in Colombia, alone, 7½ days by rail, river, and highway. The flight is measured in hours. Even to the seaports of southeast South America, air travel saves 12 to 15 days.

In the Pacific, the air routes show their greatest annihilation of distance. From the west coast of the United States to Asia or Australia, several weeks of surface travel are saved by air.

Yet the trans-Pacific ranks potentially last for several reasons. The Arctic route offers possibilities of opening undeveloped areas in northern Asia, but the distances are great and wealth small. To the south is the obstacle of close local relationships with the parent countries of Great Britain, Holland, and France. The distances are great to Australia, yet wealth in that area is substantial. Travel by air and sea between here and Australia has been heavy compared with that to China and Japan. To Hawaii and Alaska, this class has been twice that of all other Pacific travel of the same class, and most of it has originated in the United States.

There is no doubt that the dreams for the future over these long air trails, bringing all parts of the world closer together, can be fulfilled so far as the aircraft, the airlines, and their operators are concerned. There is a word of caution, however, to be injected. Expense was no object in aviation during the war. In peacetime days, cost is a very vital factor and so is the financial condition of the millions of prospective passengers.

The general soundness and prosperity of our country and of other countries, linked to us by air, will be the over-all factor in the growth of air transport, which may well influence world economic development in ways with which we have had no real experience. But in ways with which we have had ample experience, we know definitely that economic conditions in general are going to influence the growth of air transport to a high degree. If times are not good, people will not have the money to travel. What is good for the stability and growth of our country is vital for the future of the airlines. What is good for the whole world picture will be an aid for the future of air transportation.

This is particularly true when we think in terms of overseas routes. The rapid succession of new inventions, such as jet propulsion and other advances which promise more speed and greater range, altitude and carrying capacity, suggests possibility of more frequent and longer nonstop schedules. Yet conditions in Germany, Japan, the Philippines, France, Russia and other devastated countries are doubtful factors having a direct bearing on the immediate success of intercontinental air routes.

The air lines have come of age. With the energy and optimism of youth, they face their task. Seasoned by the experience of war, they are confident. Tennyson prophetically linked the "parliament of man" and the argosies of the skies. Fulfillment of the two visions holds high promise for the progress and peace of the world.

Not by Bread Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. KOPPLEMANN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, under leave given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial reprinted from the Hartford

Courant entitled "Not by Bread Alone." I consider this editorial one of the most telling comments on the lack of understanding of some of our citizens to the importance of our food program for the nations abroad:

NOT BY BREAD ALONE

So, let us rush to the bakeries now and buy bread because there is a shortage. Let us rush with the money that is jingling in our pocket. Yesterday we had no toast for breakfast. We may suffer again tomorrow if we are not craftier. Let us get there early, and instead of our usual two loaves let us buy four. We cannot use four. But it's better to be safe than sorry, whether it be bread, sugar, or nylons.

Let us write to our Congressman, too. Ask him what he means by sending our precious flour abroad to feed those foreigners. They are used to eating only cheap black bread, anyway. What are we trying to do, pamper them, get them used to eating our nice, white American flour? Flour—flour, yes, let us buy flour, too, if we can. Grasp it in our eager, greedy hands even if we don't use it. There is comfort in having it on hand for an emergency.

So let us be off to the baker's. But we must be careful on the way not to think too deeply. For then with each step we shall be treading on the face of a dying child, or some old woman, who has been living on clay and weeds. Let us step trimly over these. Let us banish the haunting vision of their faces from our mind. For we must have toast for breakfast tomorrow.

Lynn Heartbeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the very excellent article that appeared in the Lynn Telegram on June 6, 1946, by Tom McGovern, on the life of John P. Morrissey.

LYNN HEARTBEAT

(By Tom McGovern)

"MY FRIENDS, I CAN'T GO ON"

"My friends, I can't go on." Those were the final words uttered upon this earth by John P. Morrissey, beloved superintendent of parks, as he sank to his chair during what was to have been the climax of the reception in his honor last night at the Lynn Armory.

There was nobody any closer to Johnny in the entire armory than myself and what could I do but shake my head in regret at the interruption. For a few brief seconds, I hoped against hope that it might be simply a heart attack that John would weather, but it soon became obvious to me and the several hundred others gathered within the spacious armory that a darma of no mean proportions was being unfolded.

A flood of memories hit me as I saw Bill Joyce, the Classical coach, cup Johnny's face in his hands and talk to him desperately. Father Jerry Gearan, of Sacred Heart Parish, was more realistic. He sensed the end had come for he immediately relieved Bill and began to chant slowly over the park superintendent's limp form the last rites of the Catholic church.

Soon John's niece, Lt. Josephine Donohue, a Navy nurse with overseas experience, was on hand endeavoring to be of assistance. Joseph E. Scanlon, Jr., son of the fire chief, a pharmacist's mate in the Navy in World War II, removed his coat and went to work but as the minutes passed it became apparent that there was nothing that could be done.

Father Burris was on hand from St. Mary's Church by this time and as he adjusted his stole and began praying somebody remarked: "What a tragic ending to such a beautiful evening."

I couldn't see anything particularly tragic about it. I prefer to look upon it more as a wonderful ending to a beautiful evening. Johnny Morrissey being called to his eternal reward while the friends who loved and revered him looked on.

It was no secret to members of the committee who planned the testimonial party to the park superintendent and old Cornet manager that the reception was a veritable race with death, for the hand of the grim reaper was visible upon John since he suffered a severe heart attack more than a year ago.

Members of his family, buoyed up by John's enthusiasm, were nevertheless aware of the seriousness of his condition and they undoubtedly came to the armory last night with fear in their hearts.

Those were the people we felt sorry for last night. Johnny's daughter, Madeline; his sister-in-law, Gert Cull, whom he had reared from infancy and whom he regarded as nothing less than a daughter; his grandchildren, particularly the youngest boy, Donnie, who had practically lived with him since babyhood. What a terrific loss for them to endure.

But today I ask all of them to be realistic and to face the fact that several years ago while undergoing a delicate operation in Salem Hospital, John's heart stopped beating for 1 hour and 10 minutes. It was a medical miracle which kept him alive since that time and John always recognized the fact. That miracle gave him several more happy years upon this earth.

Last night it was fun to sit alongside of John and watch his reactions. "Tom, don't let these fellows talk too long," he said. "That Cornet will talk all night long if you let him!"

Later on as former Mayor J. Fred Manning spoke, John asked me to make a few notes for him and he said: "I'm going to answer a couple of those questions." There was a gleam in his eye and we sensed the Morrissey of old, the man who never found a situation that was too tough for him to handle.

Earlier in the evening, he broke down continuously. "Tom, I'm all right until they come up and speak to me and then it's too much for me. Please get the thing started. Can't they talk while they're eating. Let's get the thing going." It seemed that he knew it was a race against time.

There was no question about it being the most wonderful night in the life of John Morrissey, the man who had risen from the humble status of a playground laborer to be lauded by three mayors as one who had done more for the city of Lynn than any other single citizen.

Not since the passing of the late Congressman William P. Connery, Jr., has the city been so stunned and shocked at the death of a public official.

Johnny Morrissey represented an important chapter in about everybody's life. He was one of the writer's particular idols as he directed the Cornets from the bench, presided over turbulent sessions of the park league, saw Manning Bowl and Fraser Field to successful completion, did more on less money than any man in the history of the city.

There must be sorrow among Johnny's boys today, his old Cornet stars we mean. They perhaps feel that the emotional strain of such an evening may have shortened his life span.

Perish the thought. If my opinion stands for anything, the only thing that kept John Morrissey alive for the past few months was the thought of that grand reunion with his former players.

"They should have done this years ago," he told me last night as he looked over the assemblage. And then he started to name the different faces he saw.

Well, today the king is gone and we don't have to say, "Long live the king," for his memory will live long after most of us are forgotten. Johnny Morrissey was a man of destiny. Of humble parents, he rose to the position of one of Lynn's most important men. He became an outstanding figure in his community, a man acclaimed as an expert in his field.

I'm going to miss Johnny very much myself but when I think of how his loved ones are going to feel the loss, I can't feel too badly. What a man he was and what a life he lived.

The readers may have noticed I've written in the first person for the first time today. That's because I want nothing abstract about my personal tribute to my old pal.

There were many quotations you could apply to John but his life tells the whole story. He never smoked, he never drank. He never did anybody any harm. He lived for his family. What more could you say for any man?

Personal Government Fails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Indianapolis Star of recent date:

PERSONAL GOVERNMENT FAILS

Ever since President Truman moved into the White House he has been handicapped by a precedent—the precedent of personal government. Particularly in his dealings with labor has this inherited weakness been apparent. President Roosevelt used to handle all major labor disputes himself. His Department of Labor was a pathetic washout. When big labor disputes came to a head, Philip Murray, William Green, John L. Lewis, and Sidney Hillman trotted off to the White House and had their disputes settled by Mr. Roosevelt. They got in the habit of this type of labor arbitration.

Mr. Truman has none of Mr. Roosevelt's prestige with labor, and lacks his diplomatic finesse. But he does have a pathetic Department of Labor. This was bound to get him in trouble, since he had no machinery to settle labor disputes. It died with Mr. Roosevelt. There simply was no legal or administrative machinery created to handle major labor-management strife. Labor leaders still went to the White House, but did not listen to Mr. Truman, and there was little he could do about it without proper legislation. So he had to ask for legislation.

Nothing could better illustrate the essential weakness of personal government. Without President Roosevelt and withou adequate law Mr. Truman was almost helpless. The threat of law settled the railroad strike. If we do not now get equitable laws by which labor and management can settle their own disputes we shall continue to follow the road of irresponsible dictating to the Government.

Raymond Moley has truly said in his Newsweek column, "the National Government must stop negotiating with the parties to a labor dispute except to serve as a means of bringing the two parties together." Labor and management can settle their own disputes if they are both equal under the law. With adequate legislation, personal intervention by the President should be rarely necessary.

Paterson Salutes Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last Friday Mayor William P. Furrey, Publisher Harry B. Haines, and a group of distinguished citizens of my home city of Paterson, N. J., journeyed to Columbia University to salute and pay deserved tribute to Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, world-renowned educator and promoter of good will, who spent his early days in Paterson.

When Dr. Butler was presented with a beautifully engrossed scroll he was deeply moved and with no little emotion he recounted many rich memories of the great industrial city, named by Alexander Hamilton after William Paterson, one of the founding fathers.

The Paterson Evening News last Saturday editorialized on the event as follows:

A CITY'S TRIBUTE OF RESPECT AND APPRECIATION TO A BELOVED AND REVERED SON

Paterson, as a city, yesterday, paid a heart tribute of genuine sincerity to one of the really great men of the world.

Sitting on the platform in the beautiful and dignified rotunda of the famous Low Memorial Library at Columbia University, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, his eyes darkened by blindness, but his heart and mind brimming over with the memories of his early days spent in this city, heard well-earned and deserved encomiums from the mayor of Paterson and the editor of the News, interspersed with heart-warming messages of respect and appreciation from Gov. Walter E. Edge, of New Jersey; Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York; and Mayor O'Dwyer, of New York City.

It was a thrilling and impressive occasion, with just a tinge of sadness, as this great educator, the builder of Columbia University, and a man revered and respected, not alone as a national figure but in all truth as an international celebrity, sat on the platform in the great library hall and listened to the record of his life of years ago and of the gratitude and appreciation of his fellow townsmen of other days.

That Dr. Butler was deeply moved was apparent and when he arose to make acknowledgement of the magnificent and beautifully engrossed scroll, presented from his Paterson friends, there was a bit of tremor in his voice, and on his face was portrayed a combination of sincerity and happiness which was wonderful to behold.

In a strong and resonant voice Dr. Butler retraced his steps to the days of his early manhood when at 24 he was a prominent and important figure not only in Paterson but in the State of New Jersey—a journey backward through memory lane of 6 decades.

All of those within sound of his voice were as deeply moved as was Dr. Butler and none privileged to be present will ever forget the solemnity and the joy of the occasion.

In honoring Dr. Butler, Paterson in truth honored itself and there was an indescribable thrill in giving this great man his flowers while he could still smell their fragrance.

May God in his infinite judgment grant to Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler many more years in which to spread the gospel of wisdom, sound advice, and good cheer of which he is so outstanding an exemplar, and to preserve for him in memory a vision of the great institution of learning which he developed and of the fast-moving world in which he has been for so many years an outstanding figure and leader.

Dr. Butler, Paterson salutes you as one close to its heart in imperishable gratitude and admiration.

The full text of Dr. Butler's remarks upon receiving the scroll follow:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. President, Mr. Mayor, and our distinguished guests, it is not easy to find words with which to express my emotions on this occasion. It is a truly moving tribute to a single human life. I feel that more accomplishments have been accredited to me than would be possible for any human being, but I am indeed not only grateful but deeply moved by what has been said.

These words carry me back in memory over the early years of a long and busy life. My memories of those days in Paterson are still acute and very moving.

My father's parents came to Paterson from Great Britain in 1838. They lived for a time on Market Street opposite the terminus of Clark Street. They were then on the edge of the settled city. From that time until recent years succeeding generations of the family have had their homes in Paterson and have taken a more or less active part in its industrial and its public life.

RECALLS HIS OLD TEACHERS

My own memories are most acute and most gratifying of my school days. I went for a short time to Public School No. 1 on Van Houten Street, destroyed, I think, by the fire of 1902. I then was taken to the high school on Ellison Street, which was, I think, the first of its kind in that part of New Jersey. There I had four most remarkable teachers who made a deep impression upon my mind and life. Three of them were women, in the D class, in the C class, and in the B class, each one a member of a well-known Paterson family. The fourth was the principal, William B. Ridenour, who had a remarkable outlook upon life and an equally remarkable and sympathetic method of dealing with his youthful students.

We were graduated, as I remember, a class of nine of which I ranked not No. 1, but as No. 3. Two of the girls of the class ranked as No. 1 and No. 2.

There was only one other boy and he, after some years of business in Paterson, moved to California where he died many years ago. I had a letter from him a very few weeks before the end of his life came. From one of my girl classmates who married and went to live in California I had a letter about 4 or 5 years before her death a number of years ago. Now they are all gone except myself, but the memory is acute and vivid.

It is also gratifying to know that I had the opportunity, by the appointment of the Governor and later by the appointment of the mayor, to serve on the administration of the public-school system of the city and try to do something to improve that system and to remove it from the clutches of politicians. That, I think, we satisfactorily did in the few years at my disposal.

VOTED HERE FOR YEARS

During the later years, after leaving high school, it was not long before the center of my intellectual life was in New York and old Columbia College. I retained, however, my official residence in my father's home, 175 Hamilton Avenue, and registered and voted from there for many years after I was spending by far the most of my days in the city of New York in order to carry on my work at Columbia College. The distance was not great and I was able to keep the two bound together, greatly to my satisfaction. Of course, as the years passed, those with whom my life was associated have passed away in increasingly rapid numbers and now there are very few, perhaps none, left of the group of my friends of Paterson school days.

I have always been greatly interested in the history of the city and I have spoken of it many times on both sides of the Atlantic—how Alexander Hamilton selected the site as the center of a great industrial development; how he had organized what we have always known as the SUM—Society of Useful Manufactures, which, after its long history I read in the Paterson paper, came to an end by dissolution some months ago and transferred its assets to the city. The same ingenious architect who planned the city of Washington conceived the plan by which the water-supply outlet, before reaching the waterfall, was put into these canals and then rented by the foot front to tenants who would use it for industrial purposes. It was a very extraordinary thought, but, of course, was soon outmoded when steam and electricity were developed.

NAMING OF PATERSON

The city was named Paterson by Hamilton because of Governor Paterson, the outstanding citizen of the State at that time, who took a very great interest in the development. He was afterward appointed to the United States Supreme Court.

I have always told this story, in larger detail, as I say, on both sides of the Atlantic, because an extraordinary man like Alexander Hamilton can accomplish great results in what seems to be a modest fashion.

I have been proud and happy of my association, and of my family's association, and the honor done my father by the city, and now by this extraordinary outgiving of friendship and appreciation to me.

Believe me, Mr. Mayor and my friends from Paterson—believe me—I appreciate it to the full and I have no words with which adequately to thank you.

Mr. Speaker, present at the ceremony, in addition to the distinguished guest of honor, which took place in Columbia University's Low Memorial Library, were the following: Mayor William P. Furrey; Publisher Harry B. Haines; Frank D. Fackenthal, acting president of Columbia University; Judge Alexander M. MacLeod; Judge Milton H. Schamach; Dr. Clair S. Wightman, president of the Paterson State Teachers College; D. Stanton Hammond, president of the Passaic County Historical Society; John C. Trimble, president of the Paterson Chamber of Commerce; Rabbi Max Raisin; Fire Commissioner Jack Stern; Joseph K. Thompson, president of the Paterson Board of Aldermen; David Golden and Ted Webbe of radio station WPAT; Edward B. Haines, business manager of the News; Abe J. Greene, associate editor of the News, and Edward Furrey, assistant secretary of the Paterson Board of Education.

Food Plank for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, Philip Maus, of Maynard, Minn., was one of the two winners in Minnesota in the Nation-wide Food Plank for Peace essay contest, sponsored by Pillsbury Institute of Flour Milling History.

I am glad to have the privilege of inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this essay written by Philip Maus, as an analysis of the essay will prove it to be of unusual caliber for a high-school student:

FOOD PLANK FOR PEACE

(By Philip Maus, Maynard High School, Maynard, Minn.)

We have just emerged victorious from World War II. Our present problem is to win the peace. The conflict just ended was fought to preserve the right of all nations to partake of the four freedoms: freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom of worship and freedom of speech. A first essential in striving to our goal of world peace will be to establish and uphold the four freedoms throughout the world. Freedom from want, a most important freedom and one not easily obtained by everyone, would perhaps do the most in our plans of abolishing war. People who are well fed will not be as easily led to arms. A popular saying, "money talks," could be changed to "food talks" in today's suffering and starving countries.

Our United States is regarded by the world as a land of plenty. Certainly we have more than enough foodstuffs and commodities to satisfy our own people. Are we going to deny starving people assistance? Would that be in parallel with our plane of thinking that "all men are created equal"? We would be frowned on as greedy, and our reputation for good will in foreign lands would be undermined. Distrusting attitudes can never foster a peaceful civilization.

Besides the psychological benefit, organized assistance to the needy nations would in time be realized as a financial benefit. World trade can never be developed to its most beneficial extent without good will and sound financial systems in all countries.

The benefits of increased world trade would greatly benefit the American food producer. He has always been faced with producing against a surplus till the war came. Aid needed by helpless lands would provide a goal outlet for full production. Crushed countries of Europe will find it exceedingly difficult to reestablish their financial condition within a reasonable length of time unless they are helped in their present hour of crisis.

The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration has already been established to help the needy of the United Nations. However, the greatest need is for food at the immediate present. Without it political and financial crisis will arise that could give unscrupulous powers a chance to rise as they did in the last decade.

Surely our America, through careful organization, could ship large quantities of needed commodities and not cause any great problem to our own consumers. We must realize that getting help to needy nations as soon as possible would be the first consideration in all plans. It would be a tremendous undertaking but America is equal to the task.

Such a plan of aid would not be charity, but common sense; for in helping people to help themselves we are assisting "down and out" nations to regain a healthy position in the world. In that way we are also creating good will for ourselves and laying the foundation of world peace. Upon the food plank in the platform of reconstruction let America take her stand.

Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago, on March 27, I brought before the House the charges made originally by Dr. William A. Wirt, and the finding of a special committee, at that time, of insufficient proof of the charges made by Dr. Wirt.

The charges were that, in effect, the United States is in the process of a "deliberately planned revolution."

At the time I discussed Dr. Wirt's charges I said I would introduce a resolution calling for a reexamination of the charges he made in 1934, in the light of what has happened in this country and the world, in the intervening 12 years. It may be purely coincidental that the big Communist plots to overthrow the Government of the United States have followed similar patterns and generally a time cycle of 12 years.

The first documented plot collapsed with the Bridgman, Mich., raids in August 1922. The 1934 revolutionary action, planned through a general strike technique, failed because the plot was exposed in time.

This, 1946, is 12 years after 1934, just as 1934 was 12 years after 1922. I believe the strike actions since VJ-day, and the increasingly brazen actions of admitted Communists in the United States, warrant the committee action proposed in the resolution I have introduced today.

The resolution follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Un-American Activities of this House, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to make a thorough reinvestigation of the charges made by Dr. William A. Wirt, as referred to in the hearings of a Select Committee To Investigate Charges Made by Dr. William A. Wirt, of the Seventy-third Congress, second session, pursuant to House Resolution 317, to the effect that the United States is in the process "of a deliberately planned revolution."

The committee is authorized and directed to summon and examine such witnesses and make such further investigations in connection with such statements, and the reasons and persons activating the same, as the committee in its discretion may deem advisable.

The committee shall report to the House during the present session of Congress the result of its investigation, together with recommendations, including such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places in the District of Columbia, whether or not the House is sitting, is recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to request the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, by subpena or otherwise, to take testimony, to have such printing and binding done, and to make such expenditures not in excess of amounts made available for the purpose of this resolution, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman, and shall be served by any person designated by him. The chairman of the committee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question, pertinent to the investigations heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties provided by section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

Address by Hon. Henrik Shipstead to the Military Order of the Purple Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on February 21, 1946, to the Military Order of the Purple Heart, at a dinner given in Minneapolis.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, and ladies, and gentlemen, it is very appropriate for the Military Order of the Purple Heart to gather and dine on the eve of George Washington's Birthday.

The Purple Heart, America's symbol of honor and courage, was established by Gen. George Washington during the War of the Revolution. Awarded only to members of our armed forces wounded in action, posthumously to those whose wounds are mortal, it is the oldest existing decoration for valor in the world.

The significance of the Purple Heart is known to every American and to many others of every land. Millions of words have been written, millions have been spoken in tribute to men who hold this decoration, but no dramatization will ever tell the complete story as clearly and impressively as the simple language of two great Americans.

Their words are written indelibly in the hearts of all true Americans.

"Let it be known that he who has been awarded the Order of the Purple Heart has given of his blood in the defense of his homeland and shall forever be revered by his fellow countrymen." (George Washington.)

"The Purple Heart is the only decoration which is completely intrinsic in that it does not depend upon approval or favor by anyone. Enemy action alone determines it. It is a true badge of courage and every breast that wears it can beat with pride." (Gen. Douglas MacArthur.)

Behind the stern mask which history has fashioned for George Washington, there lived a very romantic man, one who sensed the full emotional values of life.

On August 7, 1782, Washington established in his headquarters at Newburgh, dictated the orders of the day:

"For fatigue tomorrow the Second Massachusetts Regiment.

"Countersigns: York, Lancaster."

Following the designation of the countersign, Washington, in previous orders of the day, had listed the promotions and commissions which had been granted. But no commissions were ordered that day.

Only a short time before, Congress had ruled that no more officers were to be commissioned by the generals in the Army. Money had become scarce.

Thus the only recognition which Washington and his generals had been able to bestow for unusual bravery and service had been removed from their power. Out of his poverty of rewards for distinguished service there was born an Order of Valor, save for the Cross of St. George of Russia, the oldest decoration for gallantry and bravery known and the first to be truly democratic in its spirit. The Purple Heart denied rank or social distinction as playing any part in heroic action. By its significance and its romance it stands out beside any decoration which the minds of men have fashioned for a tribute to heroism.

On the same 7th day of August an entry was made in Washington's orderly book. It is one of the great documents of the democracy. It reads:

"The general ever desirous to cherish virtuous ambition in his soldiers, as well as to foster and encourage every species of military merit, directs that whenever any singularly meritorious action is performed, the author of it shall be permitted to wear on his facings over the left breast, the figure of a heart in purple cloth, or silk, edged with narrow lace or binding. Not only instances of unusual gallantry, but also of extraordinary fidelity and essential service in any way shall meet with a due reward. Before this favor can be conferred on any man, the particular fact, or facts, on which it is to be grounded, must be set forth to the commander in chief, accompanied with certificates from the commanding officers of the regiment and brigade to which the candidate for reward belonged, or other incontestable proofs, and upon granting it, the name and regiment of the person with the action so certified are to be enrolled in the Book of Merit which will be kept at the orderly office. Men who have merited this last distinction to be suffered to pass all guards and sentinels which officers are permitted to do.

"The road to glory in a patriot army and a free country is thus open to all. This order is also to have retrospect to the earliest stages of the war, and to be considered as a permanent one."

It has been said of George Washington, he was first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen. I think it is significant that out of all the Presidents of the United States, who have served in history, there are two whose birthdays are revered and observed by private and public functions and in the memory of our citizens—one is George Washington and the other Abraham Lincoln. Each one of them has left living in history an address that I predict will continue to live so long as the United States exist—one is the Farewell Address of George Washington and the other is Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

The laws of the United States provide that each year on the 22d day of February, the Senate shall be in session and a Senator is delegated by the Vice President of the United States to read Washington's Farewell Address to the Senate.

Some years ago, I had that honor—was appointed for that purpose by Vice President Charles Dawes.

Tomorrow it will all be read in the Senate and all of it or excerpts of it will be read wherever George Washington's memory is revered.

The sentiments of patriotism and an outline of the essentials of good government in that address I have been asked to read on this occasion as a fitting testimonial to the respect of George Washington's statesmanship. The address is too extended to read in toto on this occasion, but fitting observance of the day which is the eve of Washington's Birthday, I shall read a few paragraphs out of respect to his memory:

"Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens), the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful forces of the republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial; else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation, and excessive dislike of another, cause those whom they actuate, to see danger only on one side; and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

"The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

"Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships and enmities.

"Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

"Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own, to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

"'Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than to private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But, in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise, to extend them.

"Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, in a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

"Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying, by gentle means, the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the Government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be, from time to time, abandoned or varied, as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay, with a portion of its independence, for whatever it may accept under that character; that, by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion, which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

"In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our Nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations. But, if I may even flatter myself, that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit; to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigues; to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare, by which they have been dictated."

Let me repeat that this address of farewell to his countrymen by George Washington, and Lincoln's Gettysburg Address are the only two pieces of literature that are constantly living in the minds of the American people. Other Presidents have come and gone, but so far none has produced a system of principles of government in an address that has remained so popular in the minds of the American people.

The Challenge to Freemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Eugene Holman, president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, to the graduating class at Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, Tex., June 3, 1946, on the subject The Challenge to Freemen.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I would like to talk this morning on what is probably our richest inheritance—human freedom.

I would like to discuss how we—you and I—can preserve and expand this priceless inheritance.

Yesterday this was cattle country. Today it is also oil country. A large part of the wealth of west Texas is in the great reservoirs of oil which have been found underground, and there is something about these two fields of human activity which creates a strong spirit of independence. Oilmen and cattlemen have in common a powerful impulse to be free and to set a high value on human freedom.

If this is the place to talk about human freedom, this is also, I think, the time. Two faiths are in conflict all over the world today—a belief in human freedom and a belief in the subordination of individual freedom to some higher authority of the state. Everywhere throughout the world the question how human society should be organized is being asked. Established systems have been shattered by war and the people of the world are today deciding on what plans they will rebuild.

It seems to me of the greatest importance that they should move in the direction of human freedom. No other system has given man so much.

This great Nation of ours, which continually astounds the world by its productivity, is an infinitely complex organization. It could not have been conceived and built by any one man or any small group of men. It is the product of millions of people. It came into existence because great numbers of free men were free to use their imaginations and their courage to the utmost—were free to compete with one another for the rewards of energy, initiative, and daring—were stimulated as only men in a keen competition can be stimulated. America has harnessed the power of millions of individuals and proved that free men are the greatest productive force in the world.

You have had the statistics of this fact presented to you in many forms. We, in the United States, have no more than 15 to 20 percent of the potential petroleum resources of the world and yet we have produced and are producing 70 percent of the petroleum products of the world. The difference between ourselves and others is simply the way we go about the job. In the United States the emphasis is on the individual. Every man has the hope of great rewards—and the freedom to try. The result is that great numbers do try, and inevitably many succeed.

It is from the upward pressure of tens of thousands of small enterprises that democracy gets its strength. There is a value in bigness which cannot be achieved in any other way. This is true of many mass-production operations, for example. It is true of the petroleum industry, where large integrated enterprises are essential. But the individualist is a strong force in the petroleum field. Half the crude oil run in the domestic refineries owned by our company and its affiliates is purchased from independent producers. Probably 90 percent of the products we sell to consumers reach the customers through independent dealers and distributors. The existence of a large number of vigorous, enterprising individualists in the petroleum industry, as in all fields—including education—is the best possible assurance that our democracy will remain strong.

The company with which I am associated does business with people all over the world. As a result, we see not only the achievements of our own country, but the accomplishments of people in other lands. And I think that no member of our organization would question for a moment that the strength of the American system lies in the challenge and the opportunity which it continually presents to the individual.

The principal systems of government which have attracted wide followings in the past 100 years are democracy, socialism, communism, and fascism. I will not take time to try to define the details of these various beliefs, but it does seem to me that socialism, communism, and fascism all lead in greater or less degree to the same result—namely, the suppression of individual freedom. In contrast, we can say without question that democracy has been magnificently successful in creating a nation stronger and richer than any other nation in the history of the world, and that no other form of government has clearly demonstrated that it can do anything like so good a job. Democracy has delivered what rival systems continue to promise.

I am a geologist, not an anthropologist. I would not say that the American is inherently more competent than the citizen of any other country. I think that the difference lies chiefly in the systems under which we live. We have had universal education in this country for a long time. We have a far larger number of educated young people on which to draw. Our respect for the individual as expressed not only in our political democracy but also in our free competitive economic system and our free education system, has paid big dividends. It is my own view that when any country in the world wants the high standards of living which we in this country enjoy, it must turn to the American system to get them.

We cannot assume, however, that our system is perfect. If there is one lesson written across the face of history, it is the great truth that change is inevitable—that what is today will not be tomorrow. And there is a corollary to that truth—one which the geologist reads wherever there are remains of ancient life, namely, that adaptability to change is the greatest asset of any organism. The huge beasts that walked this world in times long past disappeared because they could not adapt themselves to new conditions.

If this free society of ours which we value so much is to survive and grow, it must meet the challenge of the new. Without losing any good principle, it must shape itself to changed conditions.

What I would like to do is to consider with you some of the challenges which we as a democratic, freedom-loving people must meet today. It is my own feeling that they are not only challenges but great opportunities.

The first is a moral and spiritual challenge. Within the past quarter century a plague of dishonesty has swept the world. Millions of men and women, millions of young people and children, have been intentionally infected with the belief that deceit is admirable, that dishonesty in the service of the all-powerful state is proper, that the standards of decency to which the world has rallied for centuries are signs of weakness.

A sound and peaceful world cannot be built on such a foundation.

The reestablishment of a belief that honesty and integrity are great ends in themselves is a challenge which must be met by any system of government which hopes to prevail. There is no greater force in the world than the good example of men and women of honesty, integrity, and high purpose. Men respond to it as they do to stirring music. It is the only base on which a peaceful world can be built.

In a democracy this is a challenge to each of us individually.

In these unsettled times every effort will be made to unseat democracy. Human freedom will be attacked because it is most powerful. And in a free society the dishonest propagandist must be heard with the rest. Democracy must resist the adoption of policies and practices of its opponents.

You have learned to weigh evidence and to judge the true from the false. You will have ample opportunity to test your abilities during the years ahead. You will be subjected to arguments in favor of giving up many of your privileges as free men and women in return for various "benefits." You must continually determine, we must all continually decide, whether we are being asked to sell our birthright of human freedom for a mess of pottage.

The second great challenge, it seems to me, is to raise the standard of living in this country and throughout the world. Another name for this might be "the challenge of production."

It may seem strange to say this at a time when the whole world is astounded by the capacity of the United States to produce, and yet we must continually consider how very far short we are of anything approaching maximum productivity.

How is this greater productivity to be achieved?

Still further improvements in our technology will be one road. Great strides are still being made and the promise of technology is limitless.

The rewards of technology cannot be overestimated. Some 30 years ago we, in this country, could expect to recover no more than 20 percent of the oil which we located underground. There was five times as much oil under our wells as we knew how to bring to the surface. Today, we can expect to recover as much as 80 percent of the oil we find. This means a fourfold increase in the petroleum wealth of this Nation. Twenty years ago it was unusual to drill 5,000 or 6,000 feet below the surface of the earth. Today, we are continually reaching down 2 or 3 miles for oil. We have vastly increased the vertical frontier of the world.

The longhorn of the cattle ranges has been replaced by the superior Hereford. In the oil fields, the 65-foot derrick of yesterday has given way to the 150-foot derrick of today. Both are results of improved technology. In fact, technology is the great multiplier of all our resources.

However, the greatest challenge to increased productivity may lie in another direction—in the greater use of ourselves as people. It has long been the belief of the company with which I am associated that people are its greatest single asset. What is true of a company is also true of a Nation. The machines of an industrial nation can be bought or otherwise acquired, but it is the skill and willingness of the people to use such equipment which will, in the end, be the deciding factor.

If I were a young man starting out today, I would be tempted to consider the opportunities which lie in the broad field of human relations. If you are looking for new frontiers, here is one which will give you great scope for imagination, energy, and capacities for achievement.

The world has been inefficient and wasteful in the use it has made of its greatest natural resource—human abilities. Someone recently said: "Mankind's desperate need is for new social inventions, new inventions in human relations comparable in scope with the progress in physical science."

It is quite evident that the human relations problems of industry have not yet been adequately solved on a national basis. At a time when the Nation badly needs production, we find that the machinery of our human relations is continually preventing full national production.

It is significant, I think, that we must begin with the individual in approaching our task of increasing the productivity of the Nation.

If we can produce more refrigerators in one year than in another year simply because we have more people manufacturing refrigerators, we have gained relatively little. But if, with the same number of people, or even fewer people, we can manufacture more refrigerators, we are on the road which leads to a higher standard of living. A greater

productivity per capita is the road to a higher standard of living per capita.

We sometimes hear expressions of alarm and disaster about overproduction. The answer to such situations, in my opinion, is more consumption, not less production.

The challenge to democracy today is not simply to out-produce any other political system because it has already demonstrated its capacity to do that. Our problem is to improve the democratic system itself, without, at the same time, destroying it.

The third challenge is the challenge to individual responsibility. In every organized society there must be order. There must be rules for the game. Every individual cannot have his way. There is a common interest which is more important than the interest of any individual or group. The state is important—sometimes more important than an individual or any group in the state. It should be obvious that in a democracy, no small group can in the long run benefit at the expense of the many.

Here we have the great and eternal challenge to democracy and the free society. Human beings band together in organized societies for their own protection. They will achieve order and security one way or another. The classic road to dictatorship is the road of intentionally created disorder so that the dictator can appear as the desperate solution to a crisis. The dictator always appears first in the role of the hero—offering security in place of freedom.

It is the worst of all possible bargains.

But the way to avoid the down-hill path is to achieve order and security under freedom—and that me..ns only one thing in a democracy: Individual responsibility.

When I speak of "individual" responsibility I mean not only the responsibility of you and me as persons, but of organizations and groups within the Nation. The individual has an obligation both to exercise self-control and to stand firmly for self-discipline among the groups which compose our society.

Self-control is one of the most difficult challenges to a free society. It is a responsibility which no one of us can escape. You cannot answer for anyone but yourself—and you must answer for yourself.

The fourth challenge is the challenge to achieve world cooperation.

This is a vast, unexplored field and one in which great progress is going to be made because the only alternative is mass destruction.

How we are to accomplish increasing cooperation is anyone's guess, at the moment. The roots of human experience and custom go deep and it takes time to develop new forms of human organization by evolution.

But world cooperation on a large scale and in a great many fields is a necessity of our times. The atomic bomb did not create the need, it merely dramatized it. And the great mushroom cloud that rose above Hiroshima made it impossible for anyone to believe that we can any longer retreat from universal cooperation and universal peace. We knew then that space had run out and that we could not escape.

It is my belief, of course, that in the years which lie ahead the human race should be organized under a system where men and women are free. Since the world is growing too small to remain divided up into independent compartments, democracy now, I think, faces its largest test. It has demonstrated its superiority for people like us in a land like ours. Now it must begin to prove itself able to work realistically and sympathetically in areas where the problems are quite different from ours. Furthermore, it must continue to demonstrate at home its ability to meet new problems because it can hope for no great following in distant lands if it fails to meet its challenges in this country.

I think that what disturbs most of us when we start thinking internationally is the feeling that we are cutting the ties of affection which attach us to our homeland and which have come to mean so much to us. We all draw deep satisfaction from our patriotism and love of country.

It seems to me, however, we overestimate the need for thinking internationally in this sense. The company which I represent has had a broad experience in the foreign field. Its representatives are found in the farthest corners of the earth and must deal with people of every conceivable national background and experience. I think it is not unfair to say that the more we do business abroad, the more American we become. But, at the same time, we have found that it is not by any means difficult to unite a great diversity of peoples in a common enterprise. It takes patience, sympathy, and hard work, but we must proceed in the conviction that it can be done and, in my opinion, it will be the good fortune of the world if the leadership in this vast undertaking is vigorously democratic.

To summarize then, I see before you and before all of us who believe in political democracy and freedom for the individual at least four great challenges to our system and our faith:

1. The challenge to reestablish throughout the world a dynamic faith in individual honesty and integrity.

2. The challenge to increase the standard of living in this country and throughout the world, giving particular attention to the better, more productive use of ourselves as human beings.

3. The challenge to the individual and to institutions in a free society to recognize and accept increasing responsibility in the general interests.

4. The challenge to find the routes by which the human race may move toward world peace and prosperity through cooperation in many fields.

Tomorrow will be different from today. The world i: constantly changing. If the American system is to survive and grow in our own country, and is to give its great benefits to all the people of the world, it must meet the great challenges of its time. How it fares in the next century will depend to a very great extent on what young people like you stand for and what you achieve. You are stepping into a world which offers you the vast opportunities which can be found only in times of great change.

High Place for an Arkansan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "High Place for an Arkansan" from the Arkansas Democrat of June 8, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGH PLACE FOR AN ARKANSAN

A native Arkansan, John W. Snyder, is nominated by the President for one of the most important places in the administration. He will be Secretary of the Treasury, when approved by Congress, filling the place occupied by Fred Vinson, whom the President nominated to be Chief Justice of the United States.

Mr. Snyder, as Treasury head, will have a guiding hand in the vast and complicated financial affairs of the Government. The significance of this office, and the caliber of man it requires, is indicated by the Federal statute which ranks the Secretary of the Treasury second among Cabinet officers in the line of succession to the Presidency, coming only after the Secretary of State.

And that statute was enacted long ago, before the Government became the gigantic spending machine it is today.

Many Arkansans have held, and are today holding, high places in the Federal Government. But Mr. Snyder is only the second Arkansan who has been named for a place in the Presidential Cabinet. He is the first native Arkansan, for Augustus Garland, who was President Grover Cleveland's Attorney General, was a Tennessean by birth.

Both nominations should meet with wide approval. Both men have earned confidence in their abilities.

Mr. Vinson takes to the great office of Chief Justice a broad understanding of national affairs, from his experience in Congress, as associate justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, as a prominent figure in essential wartime activities, including the direction of the huge Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and then as Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Snyder, who was born in Jonesboro, rose from a modest start in banking in his native State to successively higher positions in the financial world. In 1932 he was appointed liquidator of a St. Louis bank, and later was associated with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. He is now Director of Reconversion.

Radical elements will not like the Snyder nomination. He is credited with having advised the President to adopt the vigorous course he took when the rail strike was paralyzing the Nation. He early saw the urgent need of production after the war as the only means of avoiding a disastrous zoom of prices, and expressed himself forcibly to that effect.

Mr. Truman reassures the Nation with these appointments. They will be interpreted as meaning that he wants to foster greater harmony in the Supreme Court, and introduce a wholesome note of conservatism into the management of the Nation's finances. And both of those purposes are all to the good—sorely needed at this time.

Application for Business Loans From Reconstruction Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a struggling businessman in the United States seeking a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is put through a third-degree examination to determine whether he is a good risk, not so a defaulting foreign government acting through Congress.

I am inserting a list of the questions he is required to answer to establish the fact that he is worthy of credit:

R. F. C. Form L-236 (Revised 4-19-38)

PRELIMINARY APPLICATION OF A BUSINESS ENTERPRISE FOR A LOAN FROM THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION UNDER SECTION 5D OF THE R. F. C. ACT, AS AMENDED

(To be submitted in duplicate to loan agency serving your district)

_____, 194__
(Date)

Name of applicant_____
Address—street_____
City and State_____
Business_____ Established_____
Amount of loan requested, $_____

1. Purposes of loan: (Specific purposes for which proceeds will be used. Avoid general statements.)

Nature of expenditure	Amount
_____	$_____
_____	_____
Total_____	$_____

2. The number of present employees in the applicant's business is _____, and the applicant estimates the loan applied for would result in the employment of _____ additional.
(If employment will not be increased, insert "none")
3. With what bank or banks are you now a depositor?_____
4. To what bank or banks are you now indebted?

Name and address of bank	*Amount*	*Security*
_____	$_____	_____
_____	$_____	_____
_____	$_____	_____

5. Will your bank participate with R. F. C. in the loan requested? _____ To what extent?_____
6. Proposed method for repayment of loan: (State sources of funds and dates payments are to be made.)
_____
_____
7. Recent efforts to obtain bank credit:
State efforts to obtain credit, within 60 days preceding date of application, from banks or other sources (including loans of the character herein applied for), results, and reasons if refused. (NOTE.—The R. F. C. is authorized to make loans to business enterprises only "when capital or credit, at prevailing rates for the character of loan applied for, is not otherwise available." Accordingly, applicant should show that it has applied to each open bank listed above, or if applicant has no banking connection, to at least one bank, or explain the reason for not doing so.)
The banks to which applications for credit have been made and other information with regard thereto are as follows:

Name and address of bank	Date of application	Amount of credit available at bank at prevailing rates	Maximum term for which credit available
_____	_____	$_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

8. The applicant offers the following-described collateral for the repayment of such loan:

Description	Date acquired	Cost	Book value (net)	Appraised value. State by whom appraised
_____	_____	$_____	$_____	$_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

9. Financial statement as of _____, 194__ (Fill in all blanks, using "none" where necessary.)

Assets			Liabilities		
Cash on hand in open banks	$_____		Notes payable for merchandise	$_____	
Notes receivable of customers (good)	$_____		Notes payable to banks	$_____	
Accounts receivable of customers (good)	$_____		Notes to officers, directors, and stockholders	$_____	
Merchandise (how valued):			Notes to others	$_____	
Finished $_____			Accounts payable for merchandise	$_____	
Stock in process $_____			Accounts due officers or stockholders	$_____	
Raw material $_____	$_____		Interest on bonds due and payable	$_____	
Total current assets	$_____		State and other taxes	$_____	
			Other current liabilities (itemize)	$_____	
Due from controlled or subsidiary concerns:			Total current liabilities	$_____	
For merchandise $_____					
For advances $_____	$_____		Bonded debt	$_____	
			Mortgages on real estate	$_____	
Due from officers, directors, stockholders	$_____		Chattel mortgages	$_____	
Other investments (itemize)	$_____		Against what assets?		
Life insurance—cash surrender value (net)	$_____		All other liabilities (itemize)	$_____	
Land	$_____		Reserves (itemize)	$_____	
Buildings	$_____		Preferred stock $_____		
Machinery and equipment	$_____		Common stock $_____	$_____	
Furniture and fixtures	$_____				
Prepaid expenses	$_____		Surplus	$_____	
Goodwill	$_____		Undivided profits	$_____	
Patents and trade-marks	$_____		Net worth (if individual or firm)	$_____	
Other assets (itemize)	$_____				
Total	$_____		Total	$_____	

Contingent liabilities: Accounts or notes receivable discounted or sold with endorsement or guarantee, $----------

If any of the current liabilities are secured, state amount and itemize collateral pledged as security----------

10. Comparative statement of sales, profit or loss, etc.

	19----	19----	19----	19----	19----	19---- (to date)
Net sales	$	$	$	$	$	$
Profit or loss before depreciation						
Depreciation and depletion						
Net profit or loss after depreciation and withdrawals but before dividends						
Dividends paid						
Total salaries paid to officers and withdrawals, included in expense						

11. List all officers or employees receiving over $2,500 per year and total compensation, direct or indirect, to each:

Name *Amount* *Name* *Amount*

$ $

List names of any firms in which applicant or its officers or large stockholders own a substantial interest and from which any officer or large stockholder receives any compensation, fees, commissions, or dividends, directly or indirectly; and any firms with which applicant has business dealings and from which any officer or large stockholder of applicant receives any compensation, fees, or commissions.

Name of firm *Person receiving compensation* *Annual amount received*

$

12. Officers and largest stockholders or partners: (Use separate sheet if necessary.)

Name	Office held	Percent of ownership	Net worth outside of applicant	Insurance carried for benefit of applicant

The above information is furnished for the purpose of inducing you and ---------- (Bank) to grant credit.

(Signature) ----------

By ----------

(Title)

Ah, my friends, when a defaulting foreign government seeks a loan, or rather a gift, from the American taxpayers, Congress is not expected to ask questions, but rather to waive interest, security, and ultimate payment. What if obligations of the United States aggregate over $650,000,000,000? Do the taxpayers not owe it to themselves?

Proposed Investigation of War Shipping Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Piracy of the Treasury," from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 9, 1946, relating to the affairs of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PIRACY OF THE TREASURY

The charge of piracy of the public Treasury has been put before Congress like a storm warning. Either there will be an investigation of the Shipping Administration now, as Senator AIKEN and Representative WIGGLESWORTH demand, or our merchant marine may flounder in misspent public funds.

A thorough sounding must be taken. It would reveal, says Senator AIKEN, "that unscrupulous business interests, which in the last few years have succeeded in looting the Treasury of what will undoubtedly amount to several billion dollars, are still attempting to control the affairs of the Maritime Commission, and may succeed in doing so unless prevented by Congress."

The evidence is that the Commission and War Shipping Administration pumped out dollars like bilgewater. Comptroller General Lindsay Warren reported that $8,000,000,000 had not been properly accounted for by the two agencies. Where did the money go? That is the subject for congressional inquiry. But the record on 3 of the 6,000 ships formerly operated by the Government might give a bearing to investigators:

1. The Government paid insurance to the extent of $2,250,000 in excess of book value when the steamship *Santa Lucia* was sunk.

2. The Maritime Commission purchased the steamship *City of Alma* for $660,000, although it had been built by the Government in 1920 and sold then for $81,000.

3. The Government paid the freight when the steamship *Gateway City*, valued on the books at $36,000, made $195,000 on one Red Sea voyage.

And is such wind-blown handling of public money entirely new? No, the Shipping Administration has been involved before in what the New Republic magazine, in recent articles, describes as Operation Plunder. For instance, the magazine notes that after the last war R. Stanley Dollar bought seven new President ships from the Government for $3,850,000, on easy terms. Those ships cost the Government $29,000,000 to build.

That is an example of what happened after the last war and now that the Government is relinquishing ships to private owners once more, and providing both building and operating subsidies, that is what could happen again.

Isn't an eight-billion-dollar scandal enough? So much money has rarely been in public question. Unless Congress investigates, dives for the loot, and battens down on maritime spending, the wartime shipping record will be left like an apology to Captain Kidd.

Inter-American Peace and Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Forces of Right and Justice," written by the brilliant editor of the Birmingham Age-Herald, Mr. McClellan Vanderveer, and published in that paper on May 13, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FORCES OF RIGHT AND JUSTICE

Many are the advocates of special interest and particular purpose in the making of the peace and the reorganization of the world. The leaders of governments are charged with the protection of the respective interests of their peoples. Some leaders have their own special purposes which are not consistent with the interests of the world as a whole. Those most immediately concerned with the formulation of peace settlements inevitably are largely influenced by their own particular viewpoints, responsibilities, and aims.

This, of course, is a natural process. It is to be expected. It can be constructive. But its hope of success will be greatly strengthened if voices throughout the world are raised in behalf of basic principles—of right, of justice, of freedom.

There are innumerable millions of men and women eager to support such principles. But giving effect to their convictions is often difficult. They cannot attend peace conferences. They cannot all write books or editorials or make speeches. But for citizens eager to add their influence in behalf of

fundamental principles in the remaking of the world there usually are means of some kinds.

The Peoples' Mandate Committee for Inter-American Peace and Cooperation recently held a conference on peace settlements attended by women from all the American Republics. The conference adopted a set of principles regarded as indispensable to a peaceful world. It recommended that endorsement of these principles by organizations and individuals be invited, that the declaration be brought before the heads of American governments and presented to the forthcoming peace meetings.

This is the kind of action by which the forces of right and justice can strive to make sure that they are heard in the world. Unless free peoples everywhere unite in effective efforts in behalf of fundamental principles, the danger will be greatly increased that such principles will be subordinated to the special interests and pressures now figuring so largely in the processes of peacemaking and reconstruction.

What have you done in behalf of a good peace?

Judicial Explosion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, we have ever held our courts in the very highest esteem, and especially is this true of our Supreme Court, as well as all of our courts from the highest to the lowest. The recent "feud" which apparently exists, and which has just been brought out into the open, in our own Supreme Court, is a regrettable incident. It is my considered judgment that a court which is so constituted, by appointments, and is made top-heavy politically on the side of either one of the major political parties, is not best for the country or the people. As the Supreme Court is now constituted, there is but one Republican upon that bench. Eight of the members are Democrats. This feud is between the Democrats, and the lone Republican is trying to administer justice and to uphold the dignity and prestige of the Court, without becoming involved in this entanglement.

Mr. Speaker, a very enlightening editorial appeared in the Washington Evening Star, of date June 12, upon this very subject, which I ask unanimous consent to include with my own remarks upon this subject. The editorial follows:

JUDICIAL EXPLOSION

The unprecedented statement by Associate Justice Jackson brings into the open a feud within the Supreme Court which cuts deeper and which is more bitter than had been generally realized, even among those who knew that the internal situation in the Court was very bad. Perhaps it is better to have the whole business out in the open instead of permitting it to fester in the traditional atmosphere of secrecy which is supposed to cloak such things. But it is also a fact, and a deplorable fact, that the prestige of the Supreme Court has suffered serious damage.

Justice Jackson says that the controversy between himself and Justice Black—a controversy which involves other Justices—"goes to the reputation of the Court for nonpartisan and unbiased decision," and certainly, in this respect, the reputation of the Court has been impaired.

Briefly, the dispute revolves around the refusal of Justice Black to disqualify himself in a suit brought by the United Mine Workers under the Wages and Hours Act to obtain payment for travel time in the mines. Justice Black had supported and managed this bill as a Member of the Senate. In deciding, as a judge, in favor of the miners he reversed a position he had taken as a Senator. And the chief counsel retained by the miners to argue their case before the Court was a man who formerly had been Justice Black's law partner and who had been employed as counsel by the then Senator Black when he and a Senate committee became involved in litigation over the seizure of telegrams.

Because of these circumstances, Justice Jackson thought that Justice Black should have disqualified himself in the case. Justice Black thought otherwise. An unnamed member of the Court proposed that, during a mine strike over a contract, the decision in the travel-time case be handed down without waiting for the opinion and dissent. The apparent purpose, according to Justice Jackson, was "to influence the contract negotiations." Justice Jackson wrote an opinion hinting at his objection to Justice Black's part in the case. Justice Black threatened a "declaration of war." Justice Jackson told him that he would not stand for "any more of his bullying." Justice Black took the position, according to Justice Jackson, that "I must join him in covering up the facts or have war." And so on.

Those who have admired Justice Jackson and who have felt that he was the outstanding member of the Court will regret the tone of his statement. It suffers from a lack of restraint, although it is directed to a condition which he presumably felt did not call for restraint. Unfortunately, public statements seldom remedy bad conditions, and, assuming that the personnel of the Court remains unchanged, it may be expected that the interpretation of the law in our highest Court will continue to be embarrassed and prejudiced by clashing personalities.

Carter Glass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a remarkably fine editorial, published in the Lynchburg News, regarding the public service and life of the late Senator Glass.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARTER GLASS

Carter Glass has pride in being the author of the Federal Reserve Act, one of the greatest constructive pieces of legislation of the twentieth century, and which proved a veritable financial rock during the First World War. He won the respect of the world of finance for his services as Secretary of the Treasury, under Woodrow Wilson, especially by his brilliant handling of the successful Victory Loan after the war's close. He accounted as his greatest service to Virginia his part in framing the present constitution of Virginia in company with a most distinguished body of Virginians in the convention of 1901–02.

Though lacking the platform presence, the imposing personality, and the sonorous voice usually associated with the typical orator, Carter Glass could make a speech that aroused enthusiasm, stirred the emotions, and appealed to the intelligence of his audiences. He was equally at home at a political rally, on the floor of Congress, in the presence of a small group of specialists, as a layman addressing the congregation of his church. Though he disliked speechmaking and approached each appearance in that role with reluctance and some trepidation, remaining silent in the House of Representatives for his first 10 years, he soon forgot himself in the fervor of his cause or the indignation of outraged justice. The secret? Conviction and character, fire and elan. And knowledge of whereof he spoke. He had informed himself, or he held his tongue. The speech that routed the congressional foes of his Federal Reserve bill, his defense of sound money in his 1932 sickbed speech of the first Roosevelt campaign, his half raging, half contemptuous, wholly righteous excoriation of the attempt to pack the Supreme Court, were three of the greatest forensic efforts of his time.

As a polemical writer he had no superior and few equals. His style was clear, concise, forceful, bolstered by allusions gathered from life and literature. When aroused he was without mercy until the controversy was ended.

None of these constructive legislative and executive efforts and none of these platform triumphs was Carter Glass' greatest contribution to his beloved State and his beloved country. His greatest contribution was his moral courage, his intellectual integrity, his absolute disregard of and contempt for the political consequences of the course of action upon which his mind and his conscience had compelled him to embark. There was no power on earth that could swerve him from that course. There was no pressure that could be applied that had other result than to confirm him the more in it. A firm believer in the American form of democratic republicanism, he could accept the decision of the people, but his own decision was for him to make. He regarded himself as a representative of the people but his opinions were his own to form, leaving to the people who elected him the choice of sustaining or repudiating his political judgments and his political actions. If they liked those judgments and those actions they could return him to office, and he was glad, but if they didn't like them they could choose another, and he would have no regrets.

It was these characteristics that were the admiration of his peers in the halls of legislation and the envy of the timid and the trimmer. It was these characteristics that endeared him to his people even when they disagreed with him, sometimes violently. It was these characteristics that sent him to Virginia legislature and convention, to the House of Representatives, to the Senate of the United States, that dictated his choice as Secretary of the Treasury. It was the memory of these characteristics which earned for him the sympathy of the people in his last years of helplessness resulting from the disabilities of age and illness, which elected him to another term in the Senate even as he stood on the threshold of lasting infirmity.

In his private life Carter Glass was blameless. In his home he was loving. To his friends he was loyal and devoted. In his

dealings with his fellow men he was just and meticulously honest. His generosity was never exploited. For these things and for his public service his sometime asperities could be overlooked by those closest to him as of no moment and forgiven by others.

Carter Glass was a great Virginian, a great American. He served his people to the full extent of his great abilities, to the last fiber of strength remarkable in one whose physical build was never sturdy and who spent not a few years of his life battling nature's attacks upon his health, battling instinctively even toward the end when instinctive courage and tenacity were his only weapons. He gave. His frail body reinforced by an indomitable spirit, he gave service. He gave patriotism. He gave heart and he gave mind. When a definitive biography is written many things will be said of him, but one thing that will be said is that he stood as an example of the greater qualities of the courage, of the devotion, of the mental and spiritual qualities, of the integrity, a true statesman must have.

R. G.

A Letter to the President About Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, as one who was present when the British delegation headed by Lord Balfour, declaring that Britain's back was to the wall, pleaded for our support in the First World War, and gave positive assurance of fair treatment of the Jewish people in Palestine, I read with a great deal of satisfaction Winston Churchill's speech in 1939 which apparently pledged the British Government to carry out those promises.

I was therefore amazed when they issued the white paper willfully and deliberately violating their pledge given to all the nations of the world before they were entrusted with the mandate for Palestine.

But that is in the past.

Despite this double dealing, through the years of World War II I have supported by my vote and by my words every aid to Great Britain, as I did in the First World War. When the Conservative coalition government was overthrown by the Labor Party, the world expected, and had a right to expect, a liberal administration, and the righting of the wrong that had been done.

When a representative of Reuter's News Agency showed me the first dispatch from London carrying an extract from Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin's speech I was dumfounded; I could not credit the words. But there was no error.

I had just dictated a letter to the President of the United States, Mr. Speaker; my faith in the intentions of the British had been shaken by the interposition by the British of conditions and qualifications never before mentioned, and by other serious and depressing news. In the light of Mr. Bevin's astounding statements, I revised the letter immediately. As well as I was able, I sought to reassure the President that his position on immigration of Jewish refugees from Europe into Palestine is sound; that the American people will uphold his hands; and to allay any misgivings he may have had.

That letter was delivered today, and under leave I am inserting the text in the RECORD. May I say further that my attention has just been called to an advertisement which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on behalf of former Senator Gillette's organization which so clearly and so boldly sets forth the history and the present status of the Palestinian situation I hope it will be widely reprinted and that the American people may know the real truth about British double dealing.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RULES,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1946.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There has just been brought to my attention the following dispatch by the Reuter's News Agency from London:

"British Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin said today at the annual Labor Party conference:

" 'The agitation in the United States, and particularly in New York, for 100,000 Jews to be admitted to Palestine is caused by the desire not to have too many of them in New York.' "

An Associated Press dispatch further quoted the Foreign Minister as having said:

"If we put 100,000 Jews into Palestine tomorrow, I would have to put another division of British troops there. I am not prepared to do it."

This reckless and unjustifiable outburst, with its alarming overtone of anti-Semitic bias, cannot but alarm and disturb me and millions of other Americans; it would seem to forecast the refusal of the British Government to accept the recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, as the British Government has refused to carry out the solemn promises of the Balfour Declaration.

Naturally, the Foreign Minister's statement adds to the concern caused by your own reference the other day to the danger that the admission of 100,000 Jews to Palestine or of any further Jewish immigration into that country might lead to large-scale violence in the Middle East, as a result of which numerous troops—perhaps 500,000 of them—would have to guard the peace in that part of the world.

I understand that this question has been thoroughly investigated by competent parties who have reached the conclusion that any such danger is entirely out of the question. Arab rioters in Palestine never numbered more than 3,000 and could be taken care of by routine police operations. The armed forces of the Arab states are small and ill equipped. Egypt, by far the most important Arab state, has only a badly trained army of 22,000. The few troops of Iraq, Syria, and Transjordan are controlled and even commanded by British officers. Saudi-Arabian troops are mostly cavalrymen, totally unfit for modern war, and lack the facilities to conduct military operations in Palestine, several hundred miles north of their home grounds. Whatever modern armaments are found in those countries have been given to them by the American and British Governments.

Because of this situation, the experts agree that Great Britain, with its Palestinian garrison of close to 100,000, and with its troops, warships, and air force in general control of the Middle East, is more than able to take care of any disorders that might take place in that area without needing a single additional British or American soldier. I think that if you ask the opinion of the General Staff they will probably agree with this conclusion. As a matter of fact, the British commanding general in Palestine told the Anglo-American Committee that even if the British were to withdraw their troops, the Jewish self-defense formations in Palestine could hold the country for several years against the combined forces of the Arab countries without any outside support.

The economic and political situation makes large-scale Arab disorders even more unlikely. All Arab countries are dependent on American and British good will in many ways: subsidies, royalties, munitions, food, shipping space, etc. In addition, they are frightened to death at the possibility of increased Soviet influence in their countries and, therefore, though they talk glibly about calling on the Soviets for help, they are more than ever anxious to remain in the good graces of the two western great powers. I have made careful and exhaustive inquiries in many quarters to ascertain whether or not Russia is furnishing any war materials to the Arabs, and I can assure you I have been unable to find any evidence to support such charges.

I think, therefore, Mr. President, that you can set your mind at rest regarding the danger to international peace involved in the admission of Jewish immigrants to Palestine. No such danger exists, and there is no need to send to Palestine even one American doughboy. Our British friends must know it very well, and if they keep talking about American troops, I am afraid that we must set it down to their usual cleverness in raising imaginary objections and difficult conditions in order to avoid doing something which they don't feel like doing. I think you can safely disregard this and continue advocating Jewish immigration to Palestine on its merits. In doing so, you will endanger neither world peace nor the lives of any American citizens, and will only earn the gratitude of a great many people for the help which you give in a tragic humanitarian problem.

Respectfully yours,

A. J. SABATH,
Member of Congress.

The Road to Economic Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 7, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a thoughtful article by Wendell Berge, of the Department of Justice, which appeared in the Progressive magazine of Monday, June 3, 1946. The article reads as follows:

THE ROAD TO ECONOMIC DEMCCRACY

(By Wendell Berge)

On certain principles all Americans are in general agreement. We want a way of life in which there are many free choices for us to exercise as individuals. We resent seeing anybody pushed around. We want free opportunity for the little fellow. We want a government of law because we know that only under law can there be freedom. And we want laws that create and strengthen equal opportunity; not laws that create special advantages for particular classes. We believe in private property and free enterprise, but not in special privileges for propertied people.

With respect to these basic principles most of us are in agreement. No sizable group of citizens advocates any radical departure from the pathways of our political and economic freedoms. Most of the argument among us moves on the plane of ways and means of choosing the instruments and procedures to attain the ends we all seek. Our machine is one we like—the one in which we want to ride. The only difficulty is in finding the route to take.

With the constant struggle among different groups to get their hands on the steering wheel, the machine seems to be forever veering from one side of the road to the other. When it goes too far to the right, public clamor joins the demands of the opposition, and then sometimes it is jerked too abruptly to the left. Our complaints are generally against the driver rather than the machine itself, and we are constantly accusing each other of tampering with the mechanism.

Some believe the machine would work if it were operated by businessmen; others point to the decade prior to 1932 when business had the wheel and the country was steered into a terrific economic disaster. Some are convinced that the system would work if the machine were turned over to labor; others argue that the past decade has revealed such weaknesses in labor leadership that it would be an unwise guardian of the Nation's destinies.

Nevertheless, the pressures from these divergent groups have not shaken our faith in the essential soundness of democratic principles of government and the free competitive way of conducting business.

What each of us wants, of course, is for the machine to be operated by the driver of his own choice and to be driven along the road which each of us wants to travel. We all believe abstractly in a free economy, but we are not all agreed on what it means. What most of us have in mind when we speak of a free economy is freedom from the drivers who will not steer the machine along the avenue of our own particular choice.

We do not all seem to be in agreement as to what we mean by a free economy. Probably we usually mean freedom from any top control. But many people identify control with supervision by the Government. They do not think of control as regulation or regimentation of industry by private authority. But private control may be even more sinister in its effect upon freedom than government control because it substitutes complete irresponsibility for the checks and balances of public opinion.

A monopoly, as well as an agency of state, may seek to impose control and direction of an industry. Yet no Government agency has ever gone as far in regimenting business as have private cartels. A supreme authority subject to no judicial review or public responsibility issues licenses to a trade, keeps out persons it does not want, assigns particular operations to different companies, divides markets and territories among the elect, allocates quotas for production, sets up rigid schedules of prices, and, in fact, decrees a private code of laws.

In its decisions only the seller is represented; the consumer is stripped of all the rights he possesses in the open market. If any government should attempt to do such things—exclude firms from the industry, carve their markets as proprietary domains, fix the conditions under which a firm could carry on, place floors beneath which prices could not fall—you can imagine the hue and cry which would arise.

Any national administration which persisted in such arbitrary action would be driven from office immediately. Yet far greater powers than any we are unwilling to entrust to government are assumed daily by combinations of large corporations. Not only is the range of regulation greater; it is exercised in secret, without a public record. The power is wielded away from public knowledge, not subject in any way to the public interest. This pattern of control extends to the essentials of life—foodstuffs, housing, railroad transportation, iron and steel, heavy metals, chemicals, and many other commodities and services.

Under a truly free economy decision as to what shall be produced and where it shall be produced, where and how goods shall be marketed, what prices shall be charged, would be determined not by a Government agency nor by a group of industrialists exercising monopoly power. Such decisions should be made by the competitive activities of businessmen themselves, and in no case should the choice of a single producer or distributor be controlling.

If some enterprising and courageous businessman is willing to gamble his money or his judgment attempting to produce a better and cheaper article than any made by existing concerns, he is typifying the very essence of the competitive system. If the industrialists already in a business cannot compete successfully with newcomers under a system of a fair field and no favors, they are condemned to failure by their own arguments. It is more than inconsistent to demand a free economy on the one hand, and yet advocate measures of private restrictive control on the other. Such self-contradiction bespeaks unmistakably a willingness, if not indeed a desire, to abandon the historic foundations of free enterprise.

The antitrust laws are more than 50 years old. Their strict enforcement has been pledged by both major political parties in every party platform since 1900.

Despite nearly universal agreement on principle, the trend toward concentration of control over business and industry and the elimination of small business has grown alarmingly during the last several decades. It was estimated in 1929 that 200 nonfinancial corporations controlled 49 percent of the assets of all such corporations. By 1933 the percentage had increased to 56 percent. The 200 largest corporations were directed nominally by about 2,000 individuals, but actually the control resided in the hands of a much smaller number of men.

Taking another group of comparative statistics, in 1909 there were 268,000 manufacturing establishments in the United States. Their total products were valued at $20,000,000,000. In 1939 there were only 184,000 such enterprises, with a total production valued at $56,000,000,000.

On balance, this amounts to a reduction of 84,000 establishments in the face of an increase of $36,000,000,000 in value of production. And add also the fact that during this period the population of this country increased by some 39 million.

Consider several particular industries:

Fifty years ago there were 15,000 tobacco manufacturers; now there are less than 800, with 4 major companies dominating the industry.

Fifty years ago there were 28,000 manufacturers of lumber and timber products; now there are less than 12,000.

Fifty years ago there were nearly 700 iron and steel manufacturers; now there are less than 350.

And so it goes on through agricultural implements, shoes, chemicals, cotton goods, glass, and other wares. In another generation, unless the trend is reversed, there will be no opportunity for a businessman, no matter how ingenious or well financed or daring he may be, to enter any of the hundred or so basic industries in this country, except by the tolerance and patronage of the three or four companies controlling the entire industry. In other words, competition will have ceased to exist in this country.

Unfortunately the men who are in control of these huge concentrations of economic power use their private power in a way which would be unthinkable of public power within the framework of democratic government. If the Nation wanted to impose a sales tax of one-half of 1 percent and thereby decrease the people's purchasing power, the question would be publicy debated for months. There would be long discussion and hearings and those who took the action would be held accountable for it. On the other hand, if the great industries subject to monopoly and cartel control wish to raise their prices 10 percent, there is no public debate, there is no hearing for those who may pay the exaction, and those who lay the burden need acknowledge no public responsibility.

We read the lesson of recent history and learn that if we are to have an expanding economy with a rising standard of living in the years immediately ahead, we must break up existing cartel arrangements and prevent the growth of new ones and the resumption of those prewar cartels which of necessity were suspended during the war.

We have learned also that if we are to preserve the essential characteristics of what has been called the American way of life, we must reverse the trend toward concentration of the private control of industry and open again the paths of opportunity to independent entrepreneurs, to the veterans; in short, to the many men and women throughout the country who only want a fair chance to make their individual contribution to our national well-being.

The antitrust laws are an important factor in the accomplishment of these objectives. Enforcement of the antitrust laws is not an attack on business. Indeed, it is quite the opposite. And an antitrust suit is not a contest between government and business. Rather, it presents an issue between those businessmen who want a free market and those who want a privately controlled market so long as they can sit at the seats of control.

No one wants to break up efficient mass producing business concerns; but no one, except maybe a monopolist, tries to justify combinations formed to gain monopolistic advantage. The line between efficient mass production and arbitrary monopolistic control over industry cannot be drawn in the abstract. It depends on the facts in each case. And businessmen know now, if they did not know before, that price fixing arrangements among competitors, division of markets, and deliberate suppression of competition are illegal.

Active enforcement aids the law-abiding businessman. Most American businessmen are law abiding. Only a few want to use economic brass knuckles. If businessmen can depend on active antitrust enforcement, they will not have to resort to monopolistic devices in self-defense. They will not be compelled to compete in a controlled market.

Most of our cases originate in complaints. But we always have more complaints than we have people who can handle them. Our job is to select cases so that we can do the most to help establish a free peacetime economy. The purpose behind the cases we are going to push in the immediate future are:

1. To break up international cartel arrangements which weaken our national economy;

2. To help small businessmen. Returning veterans particularly want and deserve a chance to set themselves up in business. We'll do our best for them;

3. To protest the consumer. For example, housing is one of the most important problems today. If we can eliminate restraints on the manufacture and distribution of materials, on new methods of building, such as prefabrication, it will help relieve the housing problem. Clothing and food cases are equally important;

4. To eliminate restraints that lower production and hence reduce employment;

5. To protect the farmers' markets.

If we fail to curb monopolies, the alternative will be some kind of Government regulation. Effective regulation of monopolies

would require a bureaucracy so great that it would amount virtually to a reversal of our conception of the function of government. Effective regulation would require a governmental organization with power to gather all of the pertinent facts about production, distribution, and prices. Government agencies would have to make all the important decisions affecting production, distribution, and prices, and then have power to enforce their decisions.

To do this in peacetime, during a period of ample production, would be quite a different matter from doing it in wartime during a period of shortages. The circumstances requiring wartime controls are quite different from those which obtain normally during peacetime in this country.

When there are shortages, someone must decide who will get what there is, and someone must hold the lid on prices. That someone obviously must be the Government. And wartime controls, of course, must continue as long as shortages exist. But the purpose of wartime controls is to direct the supply of commodities into those channels where they are most needed and to prevent runaway inflation.

When ample production replaces scarcity, the necessity for the wartime type of control no longer exists. My point, however, is that if we are to have regulated monopolies as a permanent part of our economy, effective regulation will require detailed governmental supervision of all the major aspects of industry, which will make wartime controls seem minor by comparison.

In England, where they have no antitrust laws, they have found it necessary to take drastic action to deal with monopoly. When the Prime Minister of Great Britain was here in November, he said to the Congress:

"There is and always will be scope for enterprise [in England], but when big business gets too powerful so that it becomes monopolistic we hold it not safe to leave it in private hands."

Other countries have followed a similar policy. But our approach has been different. We are trying to leave business in private hands, and we want the principal role of the Government to be the prevention of private monopolistic interference with the operation of a competitive market.

I am not saying that enforcement of the antitrust laws will bring a utopia. It is obvious that a lot of other things are needed to create and preserve a free competitive economy. But if we follow a consistent policy of vigorous enforcement, we will help preserve the opportunity to engage in private business. The result will be to help small business and promote economic democracy. In that way we will strengthen our heritage of political democracy.

It's Time We Declared Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from this week's issue of the Saturday Evening Post entitled "It's Time We Declared Peace," which I commend to all Members of this body:

IT'S TIME WE DECLARED PEACE

We have had so-called peace for almost a year now, but the reconstruction of the world has hardly got anywhere at all. In the wrecked enemy countries the population still mopes about hopelessly in the rubble; the occupying forces still gripe and take pot shots at each other; the representatives of the victorious allies still find agreement impossible. There is desultory activity in the prosecution of war criminals, competitive looting of enemy industrial plants, and imitations of Hitler such as book burning and arbitrary confiscation of property. But whatever constructive ideas we thought we had when the fighting was on seem forgotten in the welter of discouragement, confusion, and morose futility.

What is missing? Some people say "Russo-American cooperation." Others point to Stalin's revolutionary plans; still others to an alleged revival of Fascist reaction in out-of-the-way places. Actually, the root of the tragedy is that nobody is building anything or seriously thinking about building anything. On the contrary, the accent is on tearing things down. With the world facing an unprecedented agony of starvation and poverty, politicians from the victorious countries assemble in international conferences to wrangle over how to divide up the obsolescent plants and machines of the vanquished, as if we had fought a war for the privilege of picking over a junk heap. Statesmen solemnly confer on the need of restricting the diet of the Germans to a stated level, when conditions of peace demand the increase of food production everywhere. While the United States is asked to strain its productive effort to send relief all over the world, the so-called peacemakers, after a year, give no indication that they understand the importance of a world-wide revival of production.

Undoubtedly the conflict between Communist Russia and the western allies makes it difficult to replace this degenerative impotence with a positive program for production and peace, but that conflict need not veto such a program. Indeed, the contest between democratic capitalism and totalitarian communism should stimulate in the western nations an insistence on leaving behind the concepts which shackle us to planned poverty and on going ahead with the release of the productive energies which alone can produce anything like peace. If President Truman or Prime Minister Attlee, or both, would simply state that from now on the policy of their countries was to stop prowling about in the ruins of a moribund fascism looking for keepsakes, and to encourage Europe and Asia to rebuild their cities and to begin working out political arrangements for the rebuilding of Europe, sabotage from the Kremlin would be impossible. Instead, Stalin would be forced to join the competition. The danger of a totalitarian world lies in the intellectual and moral paralysis which grips the democracies.

It is apparent that those responsible for the administration of occupied Germany have finally grasped the fact that the Potsdam and Morgenthau programs, while they may be effective in punishing the Germans, are leading to the swift ruin of Europe. The embargo on the further shipment of industrial equipment from the American to the Russian zone represents belated recognition of the dangerous potentialities in loot as a national policy. But this and other reversals of policy are purely negative. We still lack agreement on the basic principles which must underlie a positive program of rehabilitation and pacification. The peacemakers pursue the dismal routine of bickering over boundaries and imaginary lines as if nothing had changed in military or industrial realities since Bismarck. Small wonder that their only item of agreement is the date of their next meeting. Things will remain at the prevailing dead center until world statesmanship rises to the needs of a new world instead of pawing about furtively in the ruins of the old.

A Time for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 13 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, last night I had the privilege of addressing a very large audience at a rally in Madison Square Garden, New York, sponsored by the American Zionist Emergency Committee. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the risk of being tiresome, I feel compelled to make a brief reference to the historical background of the Palestinian crisis as a basis for my firm conviction that the American people must insist upon action now.

No comprehensive consideration of this age-old problem is possible without first going back to the Balfour Declaration of November 2, 1917, in which His Majesty's Government pledged the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. That historic commitment, made without pressure, laid the groundwork and prepared the way for the mandate over Palestine which Britain eagerly sought. Undoubtedly, due to the commitments of the Balfour Declaration, the British Government, following World War I, got at San Remo the mandate she wanted so desperately but with the expressed and explicit stipulation that she assume the full responsibility for putting into effect the Balfour Declaration. Britain didn't say anything then about seeking the approval of the Arab chieftains. She didn't say anything then about American troops nor did she give hint of her historic policy of divide and rule. She didn't hedge on anything then. She gladly accepted the mandate and the responsibility which went with it without reservation. Therefore, she has no historic alibi and no present-day justification for her faithless failure to abide by her own agreement. If her present purposes to go to any lengths to evade the responsibilities which she so willingly assumed were premeditated and planned merely to acquire the mandate, all the greater the shame.

One other basic historical fact also should be noted. In April 1922, the Congress of the United States passed a resolution pledging the support of our Government to the Balfour Declaration. Our State Department and our President not only agreed to the Palestine mandate including the specific provision that Palestine was to be a national home for the Jewish people, but our own Congress in a deliberative session enacted an official resolution which pledged American support to the execution of that very policy. Ours is a double pledge therefore, and our failure to follow through is second only to that of Britain to fulfill. It was a wise and a just decision on our part but whether it was wise to adopt such a responsibility and make such a pledge is not now the issue. Since 1922 it has stood as a binding commitment upon the American Government which cannot be set aside today. We made it in good faith and in good faith we must keep it.

Gradually, since 1922 when she voluntarily assumed the task of making Palestine a Jewish national home the British Government has steadily restricted the immigration of Jews into Palestine. During World War II and since almost no Jews were admitted.

Even before this war broke out in Europe, the smart political Arabian potentates began playing Hitler against Britain and Britain herself, adept at that game, began playing Arab against Jew. Her political chess game, employing helpless human beings as her pawns, was as reprehensible then as it is today and equally unnecessary. She knew then that she could not trust the slippery Arab chieftains and she knows it now. She had proof then and she has abundant proof now.

Hundreds of thousands of Jews, doomed to mass destruction and horrible death in Central Europe who might have found refuge in Palestine, were denied entrance into Palestine. With an open door to Palestine they might have escaped Hitler's insane wrath, but the British Government in their hour of desperation utterly failed them. The British "iron curtain" fenced them in and gave Adolf the Butcher the magnificent support he needed to earn for himself the vilest name in history.

Many of these wretched people could have gotten out of Central Europe and into Palestine, but Britain said to them in effect, "You stay right where you are and be slaughtered like rats in a trap. Your destruction will help the Allied cause." They were slaughtered, they were gassed, they were exterminated, they were put to death in the most cruel and inhuman chapter of all the world's most barbarous history. For centuries that tragedy must stand as a blot upon the vaunted Christian civilization of this day. Buchenwald, Dachau, and Belsen! Bigotry, brutality, and duplicity!

But the maniac, Hitler, and his storm troopers did not completely wipe out all of these unfortunate people. The timely arrival of General Eisenhower and his American and British troops put an end to the brutal orgy, and many of the dying have been nursed back to life. Out of 7,500,000 Jews in Central Europe, 1,500,000 are still alive.

Following the ignoble suicide of Hitler and the surrender of his SS band of brigands, President Truman ordered Earl G. Harrison, dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, to make a complete survey of the condition of the displaced persons of Central Europe, as these homeless survivors now are politely termed. The dean's bold, hard-hitting report caused a sensation both here and abroad. The platform of the Labor Party having declared for Jewish immigration to Palestine, the President discussed the subject informally with Prime Minister-elect Attlee at Potsdam. Attlee seemed sympathetic but nothing came of it; so in September 1945 the President dispatched a letter to the newly-installed Prime Minister suggesting that a hundred thousand Jews be immediately certified to enter Palestine. He called attention to the lamentable plight of these unfortunate survivors who were being herded by the Allied troops into concentration camps in the occupied areas, and urged a quick decision.

In Congress the response to the President's letter was spontaneous and spirited. A shout of joy resounded in the marble corridors of this Nation's Capitol. A concurrent resolution was rushed through commending the President and declaring that the United States should cooperate with Great Britain, the mandatory power, to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development.

Prime Minister Attlee countered by suggesting the creation of a joint committee, American and British, to study the Palestine problem with special reference to immigration. That maneuver appeared to be a play for time to give the Arab world an opportunity to organize formidable political resistance. That is what I said about it at the time. Events have proven my intuition correct.

Nevertheless, the United States Government agreed somewhat reluctantly to this new delay, and the concentration camps continued their doleful task. For the men and women who were marking time in these unhappy institutions, the 3 months dragged slowly into history. At long last, however, the anticipated report by the Committee of Inquiry was announced.

To those of us who have championed the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine the report was a keen disappointment. As a final disposition of the Palestine problem, it was and is unacceptable.

However, a distinction should be drawn between the immediate objectives which it outlines to relieve the present lamentable situation and the long-range political policies which should be worked out once again around the world peace conference table. If an understanding on that point could be had, I would be enthusiastic about the report. It is far better than I had anticipated. The joint committee report recommended, first, that 100,000 certificates be authorized immediately for the admission into Palestine of Jews who have been the victims of Nazi and Fascist persecution; secondly, that these certificates be awarded as far as possible in 1946, and that actual immigration be pushed forward as rapidly as conditions would permit.

The committee also recommended that restrictions on the purchase of land by the Jews be largely removed so that such land might be available for the prospective immigrants.

On April 30, 1946, President Truman gave the committee report and its pressing recommendation for emergency action his strong approval. He appeared elated that his original suggestion for the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews into Palestine had been endorsed unanimously by the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry. It was a complete vindication of his position at Potsdam and afterward.

The President issued a public statement on April 30, pointing out that the report insures the protection, the preservation, and the safeguarding of the holy places in Palestine, sacred to Moslem, Christian, and Jew. Furthermore, the President noted that provisions are made to guarantee the civil and religious rights of the Arab population as well as the constant improvement in their cultural, educational, and economic position.

Did Prime Minister Attlee issue a similar statement? He did not. Once more he stalled. He desired still more time for the Arab chiefs to organize their political resistance. Delay again was his secret weapon. He insisted that to make his own committee's report effective would require troops and that the United States should furnish the troops. He shrewdly surmised that such a suggestion would develop consternation in America and cause us to back away. Strangely enough our own State Department stepped into the breach and helped him promote further delay. Evidently our State Department follows the British Prime Minister instead of the President of the United States. In a jockeying mood it invited parties interested to present further arguments for or against the recommendations of the report of the official Commission of Inquiry. After the President of the United States had given this report his wholehearted blessing his State Department invites further arguments. Little wonder we are shocked. Small wonder we feel frustrated. There is no obvious explanation for such behavior.

Obviously the Near East Division of the State Department has other irons in the fire than the early emptying of European concentration camps. I say to them, "What in the name of God are you waiting for? Don't you realize that men, women, and children are rotting in concentration camps? Patience with you has become a vice. Further delay and procrastination cannot be tolerated." After an official determination has been reached at the highest level, namely, the office of the President, ordering further consultation and comments and arguments amount to a confession of diplomatic bankruptcy. This new delay can only confuse an otherwise crystal-clear proposal. Delay and muddying the waters are old tricks but hardly worthy of highly esteemed American statesmen.

Thirty days for comments or suggestions ordered by the State Department after the President has expressed his warm approval. Evidently more time is needed to build up and encourage Arab political resistance. The grand mufti of Jerusalem, Hitler's old pal, must be given time to get into action. Eleven months ago President Truman made his original request to Prime Minister Attlee at Potsdam for the admission to Palestine of the surviving Jews of central Europe; 9 months ago he officially suggested to Attlee by letter that 100,000 Jews be given immigration certificates to Palestine; 6 weeks ago he approved the Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry's report recommending the repatriation of 100,000 Jews in Palestine; last week, according to the press, President Truman offered to transport 100,000 European Jews to Palestine, and to aid in their rehousing and resettlement if the British would agree to admit them. And in this decisive hour our State Department orders an additional 30 days' delay obviously in the hopes that more and bigger protests may be forthcoming. A time for arguments is past. A time for coordinated action between Britain and the United States is at hand. This is at least one proposal which Russia has not vetoed.

The immigration of 100,000 Jews into Palestine at this time does not change the basic population situation to any appreciable extent. Arabs now outnumber Jews in Palestine more than two to one and 100,000 additional Jews cannot possibly change that ratio. In fact the more Jews who go to Palestine, the more Arabs is the country able to support. If 100,000 Jews migrate there 200,000 additional Arabs are certain to move in also. It must be remembered that Arabs are free to migrate there and that thousands avail themselves of that privilege almost daily.

As the ranking member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, I have given special attention to the Prime Minister's charge that the admission of 100,000 Jews to Palestine would threaten international peace and require American troops to maintain law and order. There is absolutely no basis for Attlee's tricky allegation. In the first place please note the Prime Minister did not clear his demand for American troops with the Anglo-American Joint Chiefs of Staff where his top generals meet regularly with ours. Nor was it presented confidentially to President Truman as it would have been were there any military basis for it. Instead it was given with a blare of trumpets to the World Press so that the Arab politicians would be certain to take notice. Attlee reasoned that the United States would not take his suggestion seriously if handled in such an off-hand manner and that no official reply would be forthcoming. And doubtless it was hoped that the Arabs would interpret America's failure to respond to this silly suggestion as weakness and insincerity on our part.

The whole Arab world has practically no facilities for producing or even repairing modern weapons of war. Such arms as they possess today have been given to them by the American and British Governments. At the time these gifts were made Hitler was already on his way to defeat. The German

and Italian Armies were out of north Africa and the threat to the Middle East was over. In any case, any observer should have known that the Arabs did not have the slightest intention of joining us in fighting the Axis. Why arms were being supplied by Washington and London to the Arab states remains to be solved. However, whatever effective arms are in the hands of the Arabs are under the control of the American and British Governments and unless the American and British Governments tolerate it, these arms cannot be used.

Were the British officials as truly concerned over the danger of Arab military uprisings as they profess to be, and were this the one consideration that keeps them from admitting displaced persons to the Jewish national homeland, they would have prevented the return to Palestine of the well-known Arab instigators of former disorders. Every facility is being given to Arab extremists to renew their unbridled agitation, and now—in one of the most shameless gestures which has ever come to my notice—the war criminal, Hitler's friend, the traitor against Britain herself in time of war, the former Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, has been given safe conduct on board a British airplane to Syria, from whence he will be able to stir up more of that same trouble which the British officials pretend to fear. If Britain does not want trouble why is she promoting it?

What is involved here is the most serious question which can be raised in a public discussion—the question of good faith. One should be most careful about questioning anyone's good faith, but when the British plead for American troops to ward off an alleged danger, when careful study shows this danger to be nonexistent; when the British themselves refrain from taking the elementary precautions that would be called for were such a danger present; when all this is done to justify British reluctance to undertake a committed course of action—then, I submit, it is reasonable to say that in this matter the British Government is acting without the least shred of good faith, and that this entire issue of the need for American troops is being trumped up for the sole purpose of scaring off this country so that they may be left to continue in Palestine their nefarious and shameful policies of playing one group against another for selfish purposes.

The absurdity of contemplating any war that would involve the Arabs in serious difficulties with Britain and America is unthinkable. Trans-Jordan and Iraq are under effective British control with British forces stationed there. The rulers of Iraq and Egypt derive tremendous benefits from British oil royalties, and the major part of Ibn Saud's income comes from British subsidies and American oil royalties. Most Arab nations are dependent for many necessities, including food, on imports which can reach them only from British and American-controlled sources and in British or American-controlled ships. In addition, the ruling potentates in all those countries are mortally afraid of any increase of Russian influence in that part of the world, since that would result in the growth of revolutionary mass movements and the total loss of their wealth and political power. The ruling classes look upon Britain and America as their only safeguard against left-wing movements from the masses. The last thing they will ever seriously contemplate is war with us.

I recall vividly that a full-fledged pro-Axis war waged by Iraq against Britain was easily suppressed by two British battalions in a couple of weeks. Saudi Arabian rifle-armed horsemen are very picturesque, but cannot be taken seriously in these days of mechanized warfare. A Syrian army is beginning to be formed under British instructors. The Trans-Jordan army is commanded by British officers. Egypt, the most populated and developed Arabic-speaking country, has an army of 22,000 ill-armed and ill-trained conscripts, without armor, without an air force, and without warships. I do not see where there arises a danger to peace in the whole Near East which cannot be taken care of by a small, honest, efficient police force. No wonder that, when questioned on this point by the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry 2 months ago, the British commanding general in Palestine stated that, even if the British troops were to withdraw, the Jewish self-defense formations could hold the country against any combination of Arab forces for several years without any outside support.

A moment ago Dr. Frymer likened the outburst of Mr. Secretary Bevin to Nazi propaganda. As I read his unfortunate statement I could not help thinking "It is the voice of Bevin but the words of Herr Goebbels. The British are masters at divide and rule." Now, Secretary Bevin would divide America into two camps, he would array the balance of the country against the Jews in New York. He has stooped to anti-Semitism to gain political advantage in the Middle East. Yesterday President Truman appointed a committee of three of his Cabinet Members to work out the details of the migration of 100,000 European Jews to Palestine. Today, Mr. Bevin tells the President of the United States that there are no details to work out because no Jews are to be sent there. That, my friends, is a gratutious insult to the President of the United States and his Cabinet. Harry Truman will not take this affront lying down.

Today's press discloses that President Truman has appointed a committee of three at the Cabinet level to review again the Palestine situation. To say this is disconcerting is the gross in understatements.

Britain has proved she is unwilling and unable to carry out her responsibilities with respect to the Palestine mandate. I most respectfully suggest that she relinquish this mandate now and turn it over to the United States to administer. She is pressing us to assume all of the responsibilities. We should also assume the decisions.

One is forced to the conclusion that a clever smoke screen has been laid down over Palestine by the British Government which can only be penetrated by an aroused public opinion in the United States. Time is the important element, and time is running against us, so we dare not falter. We must be up and at them. Confusion is their strong right arm and delay is their ally. The pitiable remnants of a once-proud European Jewry pleading for deliverance should spur us on to greater action. They represent this "one world's" forgotten men. For them we must work as we have never worked before so that for them the war of liberation shall also spell victory.

Troop Overflow at Camp Kilmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news item from the Associated Press dated at Camp Kilmer, N. J., on May 15. This would seem to be positive proof that we do not need a draft to get replacements. I am informed that Col. Cecil L. Rutledge, who released this item of news, has been recalled from his long-held post as commander of Camp Kilmer, If true, this is surely of great significance under the circumstances. The item follows:

TROOP OVERFLOW AT CAMP KILMER

CAMP KILMER, N. J., May 15.—A backlog in troops destined for overseas shipment has caused the War Department to send an overflow of soldiers from here to Fort Dix. Col. Cecil L. Rutledge, commanding officer at Camp Kilmer, only receiving depot remaining on the east coast, announced yesterday that this post was overcrowded because commanders in overseas theaters had not requisitioned men in sufficient numbers.

Report on Handling and Distribution of Army Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago the War Department received a report on Army handling of food submitted by a special civilian committee appointed by the Secretary of War.

There have been charges in the press, made by reporters themselves, that only portions of this report were made available to the press, with some of the more critical parts being withheld.

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, is opposed to secrecy of any kind during peacetime on a subject as vital as food.

I asked the Secretary of War for a copy of this report so that the information it contains could be made available to other Members of Congress. He has graciously provided me with a copy, from which the classification "Restricted" has been removed.

Because of the unusual interest of other Members in this report, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include the complete text of this report entitled "A Report of Army Food Service Activities—To the Secretary of War":

HON. ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Under date of August 24, 1945, each member of the committee subscribing hereto was addressed by you as follows:

"Army subsistence activities, including storage, distribution, and food preparation have been subjects of great interest to the American people. The public interest has increased considerably in recent months because of food rationing.

"Our records over the past 4 years indicate that ample quantities of good food have been made available to Army installations. However, in view of world food shortages and public interests in Army subsistence, I believe that much good would result from an impartial survey of our subsistence activities by a group of citizens whose business is concerned with the purchase and distribution of food."

In pursuing your instructions the committee has travelled approximately 12,076 miles, and has visited Army installations in practically every gecgraphical section of the

United States, thereby assuring committee members of a general, over-all observation of conditions and problems in Army subsistence.

Forty-two posts, camps, stations, and depots as detailed in an attached appendix were visited. Included were 22 of the Army Service Forces, 7 of the Army Air Forces, 8 of the Army Ground Forces, and 5 combined posts. The activities at the various stations included unit replacement and school training centers of the Ground Forces, technical, flying, and replacement training centers of the Air Forces; personnel centers, staging areas, general, and convalescent hospitals, redistribution centers, ports of embarkation, schools for bakers and cooks, regional depots, and replacement training areas of the Army Service Forces. Troop and hospital trains, troop transports, and WSA vessels were surveyed.

More than 250 messes were inspected serving white and colored troops, healthy and sick, active and inactive men and women of the Army. These messes included cafeteria, family style, and plate service types, ranging in size from messes serving 50 men to those accommodating 6,000.

Food handling facilities were visited, including commissaries, dry grocery warehouses, cold storage plants, bakeries, central meat cutting plants, and central pastry shops. The quality, quantity, and condition of food in storage or preparation were carefully surveyed.

Food Service personnel, both commissioned and noncommissioned, was questioned as to experience and training, grades and rates of pay, hours of duty, and general working conditions. Efficiency and attitude toward mess duty were noted. Observation was made of the system of training Food Service personnel and of the methods employed in training instructors. The Army system of organization for mess operation was also studied.

It may be worthy of note that seven of the nine members of the committee appointed by you had served for a considerable period of time during the war as Food Consultants to the Secretary of War and were, therefore, familiar with the Food Service Program of the Army Service Forces and with Army messing and food handling. This wealth of previous experience proved most helpful to the committee on its present mission.

After studious consideration your committee desires to report to you herewith its unanimous findings, observations, and recommendations as a result of an impartial survey of Army subsistence in the Continental United States.

QUALITY OF FOOD

The food purchased for Army use is good quality, standard merchandise of the type normally used by American people of moderate means. This class of food represents the greatest economy in food procurement, excluding the low grade product which tends to waste because of inferior quality, and also excluding the fancy grade obtainable only at premium prices.

STATUS AND CONDITION OF FOOD STOCKS

In our observation food stocks held at most posts, particularly dry groceries, are substantially in excess of the 45-day maximum authorized by the War Department. Post sales officers disclosed the fact, verified by us, that regional depots had made forced issue of quantities of unneeded commodities, such as sugar, flour, canned fruit juices, and other canned goods, and that market centers similarly had overshipped to posts supplies of vegetables, butter, cheese, and meat; all this in a period of critical civilian shortages.

Control of dry grocery stocks on Army posts is a responsibility of the regional depots and monthly inventory reports rendered by the post to the depot are presumed to be used as a basis for checking requisitions and supplying the correct amount of different items to maintain the proper inventory balance. The subsistence division, Office of the Quartermaster General, has neither record nor control of transactions between the depot and a post. No method is presently available by which this division can establish a reliable record of post stocks, although post inventories, in our opinion, amount to more in tonnage than that which is stocked in regional depots and necessarily should be calculated as part of available domestic supplies in any planning for future procurement.

Lack of proper control in requisition and distribution of post stocks is resulting in a serious loss of food. In the course of its spot checking the committee found, for instance, 500,000 pounds of flour badly infested with weevil, 10,000 pounds of wormy dried fruits, 1,000 or more cases of unusable deteriorated canned milk, 14,000 pounds of musty or mildewed macaroni and spaghetti, 1,000 or more bags of coffee which had been roasted for more than 90 days. Many other significant instances were noted of supplies which had deteriorated in storage through improper requisition and distribution.

Further serious losses, principally in perishable supplies, are caused by improper storage practices. Crates of spoiled beets, peaches, lettuce, celery, and melons were found on one post. Slimy beef at other posts was caused by improper storage at high temperature. Incorrect stacking in warehouses resulted in the crushing of perishable products. Contamination of butter and eggs stored with fish and onions, mixed storage of dairy products with smoked meats, fruit and vegetables, and failure to maintain correct cold-storage temperatures were not uncommonly noted. At most posts no system is employed by which commodities, such as beef, eggs, etc., are marked to show the date of receipt, and, therefore, the products last received are often issued ahead of stocks longer on hand. Many cold-storage rooms were found to be without reliable thermometers, hence there could be no accuracy in checking, correcting, and controlling temperatures. In only isolated instances was there found any visible directive or instruction to personnel as to the proper temperature to be maintained in different storage rooms for the various classes of perishable supplies.

Another observed cause of waste is the apparent failure of inspectors to require contractors to mark packages as prescribed in specifications. Very few canned goods inspected by us show on the exterior of the case the date of packing, which is necessary if the oldest supplies are to be used ahead of others. Several instances were noted where the milling date stamped on bags of flour was subsequent to the date on which the committee visited the posts. We found flour delivered to post warehouses which had no date of milling stamped on bags or tags.

Inspection failures resulting in acceptance of inferior quality merchandise must also be recorded. At one post 275 crates of cantaloupes were received which were too green and immature to ripen before spoilage. At another depot 14 carloads, representing 16,800 cases, of rancid peanut butter were found which had only recently been received from the contractor.

ADEQUACY AND ARRANGEMENT OF FACILITIES

Dry-storage warehouses in the main are adequate and well located for efficient handling of cargo either by truck or rail. Interior arrangement and sanitary condition of storage rooms are generally satisfactory.

Cold-storage warehouses are deemed to be adequate in most instances where proper storage activities are conducted. There are exceptions, such as at Fort Sheridan and Chanute Field, where cold-storage facilities are entirely unsuitable for the purposes served.

Generally speaking we are of the opinion that the planning, equipment, and operation of post bread bakeries are superior to all other Army food preparation activities. Bread bakeries, however, are not uniform in design and are obsolete and unsatisfactory at a number of permanent posts. Bakeries installed between 1938 and 1941 were not planned for efficient and practical operation. Subsequent installations are well designed.

Central meat-cutting plants and central pastry shops are innovations in the Army. Processing of food in these facilities results in a superior product and considerable economy. We believe that their installation should be mandatory at all Army posts of sizable strength and that construction and arrangement of these facilities should be standardized throughout the Army.

Equipment for bakeries and central meat-cutting plants has been standardized in tables of allowances which in our opinion provides adequate modern machinery and utensils for efficient operation.

Kitchen and mess halls (we would hope that the latter might be officially designated as dining halls) have been designed to fit every organization from a small detachment eating place to the large cafeterias serving 6,000 men. Exceptional messing installations were noted at the convalescent hospital of Brooke General Hospital, Fort Sam Houston, and at Fitzsimons General Hospital, Denver, Colo. These might well serve as models in future planning.

We firmly believe that an immediate study should be made to develop better plans for construction and arrangement of dining halls and kitchens, and thus, in the light of modern concepts, provide the basis for standardized design in future construction and in the correction of errors in present installations. The widely varied experience in feeding millions of men during the war should prove to be of inestimable value in this effort.

Equipment for various types and sizes of kitchens and dining halls has been prescribed in tables of allowances and tables of equipment, but this prescribed equipment has not been generally installed.

An outstanding deficiency in kitchen equipment is the lack of instruments for determining and controlling range oven temperatures. It was also observed in a number of instances that the insufficiency of hot water for dishwashing machines prevented proper sterilization of trays and utensils. Correction is important and should not prove difficult.

Cafeteria counter and steam table fixtures and utensils in messes lack uniformity. The misuse of one piece of standard equipment is particularly objectionable. This is the 12-inch deep food pan supplied for steam tables. By the time the top 6 inches of the food in this pan is served the remaining food is a broken up mass which presents a most unattractive appearance and causes food wastage. Deep pans may well be employed for soups, gravies, cream-style corn, green peas, and other similar foods, but standardized shallow pans should certainly be provided for sliced meats, omelets, fragile vegetables, and all similar foods. A considerable amount of chipped enamelware is in use. This is both unsightly and a hazard to health. The use of enamelware should be discontinued as soon as replacement with stainless steel or similar metal can be obtained.

Food carts utilized in hospitals to transport hot food from the kitchen to the wards are not satisfactory. Further engineering research should be conducted on food carts to insure the proper delivery of hot food to the hospital patient.

The reduction of the Army to its peacetime strength will cause many existing Army posts to be discontinued. The modern equipment in bread bakeries, meat-cutting plants, pastry shops, dining halls, and kitchens at these posts should by all means be inventoried and salvaged for the needed efficient equipment of permanent Army posts.

PREPARATION AND SERVICE OF FOOD

In general, the preparation and service of food in Army messes are inefficient and wasteful. The cooking and the serving of food are definitely below the accepted practices of commercial hotels and restaurants. We regret to report that in many messes sanitary conditions are inexcusably substandard.

Our observations convince us that the failure to make the most efficient and economical use of facilities and food in the Army is due to—

(a) The general inferior quality of personnel assigned to food preparation.

(b) Unsatisfactory conditions of pay and rank of Army food personnel.

(c) Laxity and incompetence of supervision.

(d) Inadequacy of training.

Inferiority of personnel: As to the inferiority of personnel in food preparation, it appears to this committee to be the result directly or indirectly of a failure of the War Department and of too many commanding officers to appreciate the vital importance of good and palatable food in a soldier's life. Almost everywhere in our travels we listened to dissertations on the value of food to a soldier's health, efficiency, and morale. Unfortunately in all too many instances this vocal interest in food was not reflected in the kitchens and dining halls.

The committee is of one mind in its opinion that this personnel problem must be squarely met and sympathetically considered by the War Department before preparation and service of food in the Army can be improved to the standards desired and possible of attainment.

Under the existing system the responsibility for the operation of messes belongs to individual organization commanders. Many of these officers have so little appreciation of the effect of food services upon their men that they persist in transferring trained cooks from their food duty to line duty, and evidence no conscience in sending men of inferior mental or physical condition to schools for training in the preparation and service of food. In this regard it may be noted that the members of this committee who have served as consultants to the Office of the Quartermaster General or to the commanding general of service commands, agree that the objectives of the 1943 food service program would have been reached in many instances if commanding officers had possessed proper appreciation of the importance of food and food service. It is recommended that a concerted effort be made by the War Department to impress strongly on every commanding officer the necessity of taking immediate steps to improve the food service in all messes under his command.

It is a logical conclusion, we believe, that to make the best use of food in the Army it is essential to develop in every echelon of commissioned personnel a proper understanding of food. This can be accomplished in part by requiring every staff and field grade officer, who had not previously done so, to attend a 10-day school on nutrition and mess management and by requiring all newly commissioned officers to attend a 30-day school on the subjects. A carefully planned mess management course of 30 days' duration might properly be included in the curriculum of West Point Military Academy, enabling graduate officers to realize the importance of good food service and to possess a knowledge of food service direction.

Pay and rank of personnel: A principal contribution to a successful civilian feeding operation is the skill and interest of cooks and other employees in food preparation. The degree of enthusiasm and efficieney displayed by a commercial employee depends almost entirely on his rate of pay, hours of duty, working conditions, and a sense of importance of his work impressed upon him by his employer. These simple concepts seem to have been overlooked by the Army in planning for the personnel to conduct the operation of its food service.

Conditions, rates of pay, grade, and opportunities for promotion in Army messes must be such as to induce good quality men to desire food-preparation assignment and make food service a career. One of the greatest obstacles to securing or retaining good men for Army messes is an unfortunate attitude throughout the Army that mess work is menial. One of the most severe blows recently dealt to food service was the assignment of prisoners of war as kitchen police or cook's assistants in American Army messes. This immediately degraded kitchen duty to the level of a task to be performed by prisoners. The committee also desires here to report instances in its observation where our soldiers were required to perform kitchen police duty as punishment for infractions of military regulations.

In most combat organizations cooks and mess sergeants hold the grades and ratings to which they are entitled by Tables of Organization, but in a great many of the messes in the Army Service Forces, established grades and ratings are not held by mess personnel. Instances were found where privates and privates first class were performing the duties of staff and technical sergeants. At one post the central pastry shop was under the supervision of a corporal, although the shop was staffed with civilian bakers being paid from sixty to seventy dollars per week. In an Army hospital an enlisted man with a technician, fourth-grade rating, drawing $78 per month was working with civilian cooks who were being paid $60 per week. The fact that a man is in uniform does not deprive him of his intelligent sense of proportions. In Army messes cooks work an average of 63 hours per week. Their duties are demanding and are performed under conditions that are far from attractive. At one camp we interviewed a recruit who had spent 3 of his first 4 days in the Army on kitchen police duty, from 5 a. m. to 7:30 p. m. Men will not elect to remain on kitchen assignment unless given pay and grade sufficiently attractive to compensate for the hard work and long hours involved.

Due to the rapid discharge of men from the Army and the fact that skilled cooks and mess sergeants are for the most part men with considerable service or above average age, at least 50 percent of the men formerly working in key mess positions have been discharged and their replacements have had no training in food service. These replacements apparently desire to avoid kitchen duty and get out of the Army. This attitude toward kitchen duty throws such an extra burden upon the good men who remain on the job that they, too, soon become discouraged and, in turn, seek relief from further kitchen duty. The committee was informed of efficient cooks reenlisting in a different branch of the service simply to escape further kitchen drudgery.

Supervision: The supervision of mess operation at the present time is not competent. Officers are too often designated as post food-service supervisors or mess supervisors merely because regulations require an appointment and without regard to qualification. With the importance we attach to these positions it is regrettable that officers with little or no knowledge of food or mess management should be perfunctorily assigned to these responsibilities. In numerous instances we found clerks, salesmen, mail carriers in civilian life, intelligent and well-meaning men, but without experience, training, background, or natural adaptability placed in charge of baking operations, cold-storage warehouses, and food preparation and service; in all of which technical skill and knowledge are prerequisites to good management.

We have observed that too often food service officers have multiple duties which so divide their time as to deny sufficient attention to proper food supervision. At one post an officer with no training in messing duties was the supervisor of 40 messes—an impossible job if the work were to be reasonably well done. It was generally observed that where qualified and interested officers were assigned to supervisory responsibilities in food service and permitted to devote time to the task, the operation of messes was invariably of a respectable nature.

Training: The committee visited schools for bakers and cooks at Fort Sheridan, Fort Riley, Fort Sill, Presidio of San Francisco, Fort Sam Houston, Fort Knox, Fort Benning, and Camp Lee, and noted the courses of instruction offered at the schools and the methods of teaching. It is the opinion of the committee that methods of instruction are in keeping with modern techniques, and that courses of instruction are reasonably well planned.

We believe the 8 weeks allotted for the training of cooks is insufficient.

There is no centralized responsibility for assignment of students to these schools from Army Service Forces, Army Ground Forces, and Army Air Forces. The responsibility for the operation of schools for bakers and cooks rests with the commanding generals of the service commands. These officers, being without jurisdiction over the Ground and Air Forces in their areas, have no way of arranging for student quotas other than to inform the Ground and Air Forces that they are at liberty to send students up to a certain number. Generals of the service commands are without authority properly to screen student personnel to determine interest in or adaptability to food-service work.

This training activity prior to 1943 was a part of the Quartermaster Corps, and the Quartermaster General was responsible for the training, rating, assignment and transfer of all instructor personnel. Because of this fact most of the instructor personnel now at the schools belongs to the Quartermaster Corps. There appears to be no regulation which stipulates that instructors shall come from the Quartermaster Corps, and there appears to be no means whereby instructors can be obtained or trained except by selecting the best available mess sergeants within the service command for assignment as school instructors. This method does provide a semblance of training but ordinarily will not develop instructors above the level of the best instructor who happens to be at the school. If the best instructor at the school is mediocre, there is a danger that the men sent to the school to fit themselves for instruction will not go beyond mediocrity. The committee is informed that a school was recently established by the Quartermaster General at Camp Lee for advanced education of bakers' and cooks' school instructors. In our opinion this is a progressive step in food training and it is hoped that this school may provide the key instructors now desperately needed by all schools in food service.

Except as above noted the committee believes that, in general, the present training system cannot produce desired results and should, therefore, be changed. In our opinion, the responsibility for staffing and operating all bakers' and cooks' schools should rest with one central agency of the War Department. It is further believed that substantial economy in manpower could be effected and better instruction given by abolishing the nine Service Command Schools in the United States and establishing at three or four large Army posts training centers for mess personnel, and also one Food Service Academy for the training of instructors and for research in the field of mess management.

An outstanding example of the benefits of centralized training responsibility is the work of educating bakery managers by the Quartermaster Corps during 1942–43. Using the facilities of the American Institute of Baking and its staff of expert civilian instructors, the Quartermaster Corps graduated 36 baker managers in each of 12 successive classes. The successful operation of field

and garrison bakeries at home and on every battle front during the war can be largely attributed to the excellence of that training.

ORGANIZATION

The Army has no specialized organization specifically responsible for food-service activities. In 1943 the Army Service Forces created a staff agency in the Office of The Quartermaster General commissioned merely to guide and to advise in this work. The Air Forces subsequently adopted a somewhat similar program and in 1945 the War Department put into effect a food-conservation program. The responsibility for selecting, training, and assigning mess personnel remains decentralized, and the operation of messes is still the responsibility of organization commanders, most of whose time and energy is devoted to training soldiers for combat or to directing the activities of command organizations.

In our Army the Signal Corps, as an independent function, trains radar operators and assumes responsibility for their work. Similarly, the Medical Corps trains and employs hospital and other technicians, and the Engineer Corps trains construction experts. The planning of meals and the preparation and service of food require the combination of science and skill. We thoroughly believe that cooks, mess managers, meat cutters, bread and pastry bakers should be classed as skilled workmen. We also believe that their training and the control of their mess operations should be under the authority and direction of a central Army agency, as is true in the above-mentioned technical services.

The Transportation Corps in 1943–44 developed central messing organizations for troop trains, transports, and for its fixed installations at ports of embarkation and staging areas. The Food Service Branch, Office of The Quartermaster General, sponsored this work and also developed similar organization for ASF redistribution centers. Their experience clearly demonstrated the efficiency and desirability of this centralized type of operation. It is our recommendation that this system be expanded into an over-all Army program and that the food personnel involved be assigned to a centralized agency—a Food Service Corps similar in organization, authority and independence to the Signal, Medical and Engineer Corps. A Food Service Corps, charged with complete responsibility for feeding the Army, would provide the means whereby the obstacles which now confront food services could be readily removed. Recruits of proper character and aptitude could be selected for initial assignment. Experienced and trained soldier cooks and mess sergeants could be transferred when and where required. Higher grades and better pay would attract better quality men to food service. Adjustment of working hours and conditions would influence men of a higher type to remain on food duty and, if dignity and recognition were added to this work, the personnel would most probably become career men.

SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES OF A FOOD SERVICE CORPS

The Food Service Corps as here proposed should be charged with the duty and full responsibility of food procurement, operation of commissaries, dry and cold storage warehouses, ration break-down points, the planning of standard diets, and the operation of all messes, meat-cutting plants, bread and pastry bakeries, and other facilities relating to Army food. The Food Service Corps should prepare specifications for food, food machinery, food handling equipment and fixtures, dishes, tools and utensils. It should have final approval over the design and arrangement of buildings and space used for food handling and consumption and for the lay-out of machinery and equipment.

ORGANIZATION OF A FOOD SERVICE CORPS

Under your letter of appointment and instruction to members of this committee it might possibly be deemed beyond the scope of our mission to suggest a plan of organization for a proposed Food Service Corps. Having definitely recommended to you a program for a Food Service Corps, we believe that organization may properly be considered an integral part thereof. Accordingly we have conferred with officers of the Army whose knowledge of Army food problems and organization is held in the highest regard. We herewith submit a tentative plan for your consideration.

While statistics are not available as to the number or percentage of personnel permanently assigned to the food duties previously enumerated, it is estimated that not less than 6 percent of the Army strength is presently so engaged. If this estimate is approximately correct, a million-man Army would call for a Food Service Corps with a strength of around 60,000 officers and enlisted men.

The headquarters staff should be set up on operational lines such as:

(a) Procurement, depot storage and distribution.

(b) Sales commissaries, dry and cold storage warehousing, ration break-down and issue.

(c) Bread and pastry bakeries and coffee-roasting plants.

(d) Central meat cutting and fat rendering plants, ice cream manufacturing plants, fluid milk distribution.

(e) Food machinery and equipment.

(f) Mess management and operation.

(g) Training, and direction of food service schools and other training agencies.

(h) Administration, logistics, statistics, and fiscal.

The number of operation personnel assigned to any part of the work should be on a volume basis, provision to be made for the rapid shifting of personnel as volume may vary.

Supervisory personnel should include:

(a) For each Army and service command or overseas base, a Director of Food Service in the grade of colonel or lieutenant colonel.

(b) For each division and post, camp or station, a food service supervisor in the grade of lieutenant colonel or major. This grade should also be in charge of the Food Service Academy.

(c) For each regiment or equivalent strength in consolidated messes or provisional organizations, a mess supervisor in the grade of captain or first lieutenant.

(d) For each battalion or equivalent strength in provisional organizations or consolidated messes, a mess steward in the grade of warrant officer or master sergeant.

STANDARDS OF TRAINING FOR PERSONNEL OF A FOOD SERVICE CORPS

The training of personnel should be arranged so that second cooks would be trained to a standard now set for first cooks. First cooks should be made from second cooks by virtue of additional training. Mess sergeants should be recruited from first cooks, who, through further training, have learned the operation of every type of soldier mess, how to prepare menus, how to judge food, both raw and prepared, how to operate a cost accounting system, how to prepare job sheets for all employees, and how to administer personnel. Mess supervisors, in noncommissioned grades, should be obtained from mess sergeants who, by additional training, have learned all phases of bread and pastry baking and meat-cutting operation, who understand the elements of nutrition and are able to give instruction in any phase of mess work.

GRADES AND PAY FOR ENLISTED PERSONNEL OF A FOOD SERVICE CORPS

All mess personnel in key positions must, of necessity, issue orders to cooks' helpers and kitchen police, and, therefore, they should have necessary military rank. Second cooks should be corporals; first cooks should be sergeants; mess sergeants should be technical sergeants, and mess supervisors or assistant supervisors should be master sergeants or warrant officers.

Because of extra hours of labor and the hard work involved, the pay of mess personnel should exceed that of other men of equal rank to remove causes for discontent and to create a spirit of interest in food service. The second cook, for example, in addition to being a corporal, should receive additional pay of $15 per month. Special pay should be allotted to managers and operators of bakeries, pastry shops, and meat-cutting plants.

As previously indicated, the duty of cook's helper or kitchen police has unfortunately been classed as menial or degrading. Men assigned to this work usually are on duty long hours. It is believed that this task should be classified as a straight military duty to which every man except noncommissioned officers would be assigned, in turn and roster. Indeed, it should become a sought after duty and so arranged. This could be accomplished, in our opinion, by allowing each KP, properly performing his duty, extra pay of $1 for each day of work. The number of KP's who might draw pay for kitchen duty would be limited according to the number of men fed in the mess. Men on permanent KP duty would receive extra pay on a monthly basis.

ESTABLISHING A FOOD SERVICE CORPS

The operation of a food service corps might well be initiated in fixed installations of one service command and progressively spread throughout the Army, eventually extending to mobile organizations. This could be accomplished without interference with the prerogatives and responsibilities of organization commanders. Food service personnel assigned to a combat organization would remain therein for duty, regardless of its location, and be subject to the orders of the organization commander in every way. The only restriction placed against the organization commanders would be that they could not relieve men of food service personnel from their food assignment and transfer them to other duties except in emergencies. Any personnel provided by the food service corps, upon being relieved by the organization commander, would revert to the food service corps and a replacement provided.

The total effort involved in purchasing, storing, distributing, cooking, and serving 5 pounds of food per man per day makes it the leading tonnage activity in the Army. At a cost of 60 cents per ration, the money expended for rations is second only to that expended for pay. Food has no meaning until it is consumed, but the consumption of an adequate and attractive diet has a greater bearing upon physical fitness and morale than any other single service rendered to a soldier. However, owing to its present system of mess operation, the Army, in our opinion, is not making the best use of manpower, equipment, and food. Our suggested solution is that, through the use of trained and permanent personnel in each phase of the work, a food service corps could more efficiently handle the food used by the Army with fewer men than are now employed. Undivided responsibility for the purchase, storage, and preparation of food in a food service corps would result in a tremendous saving of food and money.

Properly organized and operated, a food service corps would provide the basis for superior physical condition of soldiers and add immeasurably to their welfare and contentment. Such a program would be reflected in improved physical and health standards of all American citizens.

CONCLUSION

During the war, the armed forces, working with scientists and businessmen in civilian life, developed and expanded armaments, explosives, weapons, transportation and equipment, the like of which the world has never

seen nor dared to imagine. There is still much room for development and expansion in Army food service if the problems incident thereto are thoughtfully approached. The National Restaurant Association, American Hotel Association, American Bakers Association, American Warehousemen's Association—four leading representative groups of the food industry in America—stand ready and willing to assist in the improvement of Army food and in the accomplishment of the recommended objectives contained in this report.

May we assure you, Mr. Secretary, that it has been the pleasure of each and every member of this committee to serve you in this instance. For your personal interest in our mission, the hearty cooperation of the War Department, and the many courtesies extended to us at all Army installations, we are most appreciative. It is our sincere hope that our findings, observations and recommendations will be helpful to you and to the Army for future planning. If further service by us may, in your opinion, be of benefit to a program for the betterment of food for the American soldier, we readily hold ourselves at your command.

Respectfully submitted.

John L. Hennessy, Reuben D. Clark, Johnn T. McCarthy, Andrew J. Crotty, J. C. Frawley, Callee O. Appel, Fred A. Simonsen, H. A. Ross, Robert T. Paul.

The committee visited Chicago Depot; Fort Sheridan; Chanute Field; Fort Knox; Brooklyn Army Base; Camp Kilmer; Fort Dix; Halloran General Hospital; Fort Des Moines; Fort Riley; Fort Sill; Fort Sam Houston; General Brooke Hospital; Randolph Field; Camp Plauche; Fort Benning; Redistribution Centers, No. 1 and No. 2, Miami Beach; Towers, Nautilus & Biltmore Hospitals, Miami Beach; Percy Jones Hospital; Buckley Field; Fitszimons General Hospital; Lowry Field; Ogden Depot; Hill Field; Presidio; Letterman General Hospital; Fort Mason; Camp John T. Knight; Camp Stoneman; Fort Ord; Camp Anza; March Field; Redistribution Center, Santa Barbara, Calif.; Luke Field; Fort Bliss; Beaumont General Hospital; Camp Hood, South; Kennedy General Hospital; Camp Campbell; Redistribution Center, Asheville, N. C.; Camp Lee.

Small Businessman Pleads for the OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a letter received from Mr. Norman Bernstein, 7654 Phillips Avenue, Chicago, Ill., a small businessman who urges extension of the OPA:

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 13, 1946.*

Hon. WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
United States Congressman.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROWAN: As a small businessman in South Chicago, I am writing to you to do all in your power to keep the OPA in its present unstripped form. In my business I come in contact with many steelworkers who are 100 percent in accord with the ideas of OPA and who wish to have it continued.

It would be strange indeed if a man who was taught civics at Bowen by the late Minnie O'Sullivan turned out to be a reactionary. I know if she were alive today she would be wholeheartedly in favor of the progressive ideas embodied in OPA and other agencies which have the little man's interest at heart.

Yours truly,

NORMAN BERNSTEIN.

Bevin Reaches a New Low Level

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the wanton and reckless disregard of human dignity embodied in the speech by British Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin Wednesday has filled the world with foreboding.

When the vast British Empire, on which the sun never sets, holds its pledged word so cheaply that it can repudiate without wincing an agreement less than a year old—when the second minister of that great empire can so lightly toss off language more suitable to Adolf Hitler—what hope can there be for world peace and world stability?

Reaction to Mr. Bevin's speech was immediate.

Perhaps the most clear-sighted estimate of Bevin's incredible approach to the Palestine problem was the column by Barnet Nover in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "Bull of Bashan" and subtitled "Bevin Reaches a New Low Level." Under leave, I am inserting this column in the RECORD:

BULL OF BASHAN

(By Barnet Nover)

BEVIN REACHES A NEW LOW LEVEL

No British statesman of modern times ever before reached so low and despicable a level as did Ernest Bevin when he discussed the Palestine problem in a speech before the Labor Party conference at Bournemouth on Wednesday.

"The agitation in the United States and particularly in New York for 100,000 Jews to be put into Palestine," he said, * * * "is because they do not want too many of them in New York."

In the midst of this outburst Bevin interjected the remark: "I do not want the Americans to misunderstand me." It was quite unnecessary for him to say that. Nobody is going to misunderstand him.

His statement stands revealed in all its nakedness as an outright anti-Semitic outburst that would have gladdened the heart of the late Adolf Hitler. It shows that Joseph Goebbels is dead only in the flesh and that while Julius Streicher is on trial at Nuremberg for crimes against humanity his spirit still marches on.

To keep the record clear, the history of the proposal to admit 100,000 European Jews to Palestine is worth recalling:

The first formal suggestion of it came in a report made to President Truman last summer by Dean Earl G. Harrison of the University of Pennsylvania Law School following an inspection the latter made of displaced persons' camps in Germany and Austria.

This was followed on August 31, 1945, by a letter sent by President Truman to Prime Minister Attlee of Great Britain in which the Harrison proposal was strongly urged on the British Government.

"On the basis of * * * information which has come to me," President Truman wrote, "I concur in the belief that no other single matter is so important for those who have known the horrors of concentration camps for over a decade as is the future of immigration possibilities into Palestine."

"The main solution," President Truman added, "appears to lie in the quick evacuation of as many as possible of the nonrepatriable Jews, who wish it, to Palestine. If it is to be effective, such action should not be long delayed."

In his Bournemouth speech Mr. Bevin very conveniently ignored Mr. Truman's sponsorship of the plan to admit 100,000 Jews to Palestine. He also very conveniently sidestepped the fact that the very same recommendation was made, following an exhaustive investigation, by the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry.

That body, be it recalled, consisted of six Englishmen and six Americans. Every one of the six Englishmen named to the committee was Bevin's own appointee. And every one of these came to precisely the same conclusion on the matter as President Truman had done and as their American colleagues did.

Furthermore, Bevin ignored his own party's repeated stand on the Palestine problem.

Until it came into power last year the British Labor Party's stand on this matter was clear and unequivocal.

It supported the Balfour Declaration and the assumption by Great Britain of a mandate for Palestine.

It denounced the infamous white paper of 1939.

That document, said the resolution approved by the Labor Party conference of 1939, "by imposing minority status on the Jews, by departing from the principle of economic absorptive capacity governing Jewish immigration, by making Jewish entry dependent on Arab consent, and by restricting Jewish land settlement, violates the solemn pledges contained in the Balfour Declaration and the mandate.

Only last year Hugh Dalton, now Chancellor of the Exchequer, declared at the annual party conference:

"It is morally wrong and politically indefensible that any Jew wanting to go to Palestine should be hampered in doing so. On the contrary, Jewish immigration into Palestine should be freely encouraged and assisted." And the national executive committee of the party, on the eve of last year's general elections, reaffirmed the traditional Labor Party policy by calling upon the British Government "to remove the present unjustifiable barriers on immigration."

Bevin has conveniently passed over all that, too. Instead he has given vent to a cheap outburst which does no credit to him, his government or the great British people whose destinies are temporarily in his fumbling hands.

It is a tragic fact that at a time when Anglo-American relations are so important, the post occupied and honored by a Palmerston, a Canning, a Salisbury, and a Balfour is now filled—if the readers will forgive the exaggeration—by a Bevin.

Blunders and Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, as a further contribution to the mass of cur-

rent opinion as to how far the bungling of price control is responsible for present food shortages, I include the following editorial from the Medford (Mass.) Press of June 6:

BLUNDERS AND BREAD

The current bread famine represents another blunder. The scarcity of wheat is due not so much to our relief shipments abroad, as it is due to blundering official interference with production.

There is, naturally, a limit to the amount of grain we can spare others. But with properly stimulated production and intelligent management we could have met relief needs without running out of bread ourselves.

Americans are easy-going. They have done without butter and often gone without meat; they have put up with many, many shortages—most of them unnecessary—the result of official bungling and an attempt to prolong artificial price controls.

By rousing the people as nothing else could, the bread famine may at last force our officials to stop fooling with crop and price controls and give unhampered production and the law of supply and demand a chance to work as in the past.

Congress, Call a Surgeon—Uncle Sam Has OPA!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I never believed that the OPA could become the inspiration for a poem. But wonders never cease. Anyway here is a poem by Dakota Cal on the OPA, which is worth reading. There is perhaps more philosophy in this poem than we find in most of the speeches made on the OPA.

I take pleasure in inserting here as part of my remarks a poem that I think is very appropriate since the resolution extending the OPA comes up in the near future:

CONGRESS, CALL A SURGEON—UNCLE SAM HAS OPA

Do you have a housing muddle?
Are you living in a tent?
Does a red-tape fuddle-duddle
Haunt you as you try to rent?
Do you hear the griping grocer?
Do your merchants tell you "nay"?
Is the standard answer "No, sir!"
Wake up! It's the OPA!

Are there strikes in every section,
Is there silence in the mills?
Distribution's grim infection?
Does the system give you chills?
Why is this once mighty Nation
In the throes of jammed delay
In production, so inflation
Grows: It feeds on OPA!

They have set them up as judges
Of the good and of the bad,
Camouflaged behind their smudges
They've gone monkey-business mad!
Rapping out new regulations
Snarling up the country's stores,
Till the body of the Nation
Festers with projected sores!

Can you buy that pair of britches
On which they have set the price—
Or the cloth that's free from itches
And from some darn fool's advice?
Cars or fruit or zippered dresses,
Stockings, shirts, or underwear—
Butter, coal, or metal presses;
Look around in your despair!

Friend, do you have recollection
Of a time when you could buy
Anything, without inspection,
From an apple to a pie?
When a man could look at trousers
That were cuffed above the feet—
Wear a vest, and shirts were "rousers"—
When his overshoes were neat?

We will never know those pleasures
Till return of freedom's day
Takes through Congress firm, strict measures
To dispense with OPA.
They've disturbed the normal functions
Of supply and of demand—
With their simulated unctions
That make simple products banned.

We are in the OPA hole
And they'll never get us out,
While these bureaucrats-on-pay-roll
Pour our money down the spout.
Worse they are than are the evils
To correct which they had birth—
Sabotaging sleek Bowle-weevils
In the cotton fields of earth!

Take them from the country's pockets,
Or lend-lease them to Allies,
Clear their persecuting dockets
That reduce them all to spies.
Take them off the backs of mammon,
For as long as they hold sway
We'll have economic famine,
Nurtured by the OPA!

—*Dakota Cal.*

MINOT, N. DAK.

The Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from my constituent, Mr. William Seibert, which I think will be of interest to the Members of the House of Representatives:

SEIBERT & RIGGS,
New York, N. Y., June 11, 1946.

Hon. JAY LEFEVRE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEFEVRE: In this morning's press appears a copy of a cable sent by Supreme Court Justice Jackson from Nuremberg to the chairmen of the Judiciary Committees of the House and of the Senate.

Inferentially, the integrity of the Supreme Court is placed in question thereby, for the failure to observe the highest standards of conduct and legal morality by even one member of that Court affects the Court as a whole.

In a government of balanced powers, such as ours, even an accusation against this great Court strikes with evil at the very basis of our freedoms. How can our citizens be certain that our fundamental rights, provided for by the Constitution, will be safeguarded if the very Court established for the purpose of deciding issues arising from those rights be tinged with the slightest suspicion that its judgments or the judgment of any member of the Court is subject to be influenced by personal favor, by political partisanship or by any thought other than that of strict and impartial justice governed by duly passed laws and by precedent and only subject to the limitation of the provisions of the Constitution?

Not even that question, decided some years ago against increasing the members of the Supreme Court Justices in order to procure vacancies to be filled by the President, transcends the implication coming from Justice Jackson's cable.

Nothing less than an immediate and thorough investigation by the House of Representatives is demanded.

So important is the issue that even a shred of evidence against the integrity, or the lack of capacity to recognize integrity, of or by any member of the Supreme Court should be followed by impeachment by the House and trial by the Senate.

This matter is or should be of the greatest concern to everyone of us, and I hope that you will bend every effort to restoring to the people their faith in the Supreme Court.

Sincerely yours,

W. S. SEIBERT.

The American Economic Goal—A Practical Start Toward Postwar Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 3, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Leon H. Keyserling, general counsel for the National Housing Agency; postgraduate, Harvard Law School and Columbia; member of Phi Beta Kappa; coauthor of Social Objectives in Education; member of the American Economic Association; American Political Science Association; and the American Bar Asscciation was the winner of the second award of $10,000 for presenting one of the winning plans to the Pabst Postwar Employment Awards Committee.

Mr. Keyserling assisted greatly in the passage of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act which was signed by the President May 22, 1946. He has been interested in full-employment legislation and other progressive proposals.

Mr. Keyserling's winning plan is as follows:

THE AMERICAN ECONOMIC GOAL—A PRACTICAL START TOWARD POSTWAR FULL EMPLOYMENT

THE PROMISE OF AMERICA

This war has awakened Americans to the promise of America. We are now producing goods at a rate more than 50 percent higher than during the best year before the war. And when peace comes, we shall have millions of our finest manpower, drawn from the men and women in our armed forces, to add to our production forces—if we have the brains to make room for them. We shall have a chance to abolish poverty, to reach higher standards of living than ever before. We can set an example to the world by solving economic problems underlying so many wars.

AMERICANS SHOULD PULL TOGETHER

Today there is one main obstacle to realizing this promise of America. We lack some simple and practical method for developing a purpose and program on the domestic front. In economic matters Congress and the executive departments, liberals, and businessmen, farmers and labor groups, are all at odds. The boys overseas cannot get all the facts, and some of them are developing prejudices against the folks back home.

Democracies do not want totalitarian unity. But any system, to go ahead, requires some agreement on fundamentals. In our war program we have preserved our civil liberties and argued about many things, but we have not debated whether we need to win the war. We do not want our postwar economic life to become as intense and rigorous as our war program. We prefer a lot less drive and a lot more flexibility. Nonetheless, we must evolve some economic rules of the game and some economic ideal to strive for, so that we can plan and work and prosper—and not bicker our way to postwar disillusion instead of America's postwar promise.

We need an American economic policy and an American economic goal.

Time is short. Any plan must have a chance to be tried—quickly. We cannot start with elaborate details or theories, producing endless disagreements. We must start with a proposal so plain, democratic, and consistent with our way of doing things that it will appeal at once to the American people, be accepted by Congress, and be supported by a vigorous President.

AN AMERICAN ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

To start, Congress should establish an American Economic Committee, with three Members from the Senate and three Members from the House of Representatives, appointed by their presiding officers, three members appointed by the President from his Cabinet, and six members appointed by the President to represent American enterprise, including two each from industry, agriculture, and labor. The President would designate the chairman. The committee would have a small technical staff, supplemented by experts from Government agencies who would serve in rotation, staying for a time and then returning. Each committee member could be called before Congress for questioning and exposition. The committee, in addition to representation at weekly Cabinet meetings, would make quarterly reports to the President.

The committee would have four main tasks:

1. To recommend to Congress, at the earliest opportunity, an American economic policy, and periodically to recommend improvements in this policy;

2. To define and popularize an American economic goal;

3. To outline broad tasks of research and information to help achieve the American economic goal (these to be undertaken mostly by other public or private bodies);

4. To evaluate governmental tools, emphasizing which tools developed during wartime should be retained, altered, or abandoned to help achieve the American economic goal in accord with the greater freedom and flexibility of the American economic policy—and to recommend "modernization" of congressional procedures and of the executive departments accordingly.

The committee would not recommend specific legislation—because that would confuse it with specialized agencies, bury it in pressure politics, and distract it from its big job.

The committee would be the first practical step in an evolving democratic teamwork by American enterprise, Congress, the Departments, and the President—toward an American economic policy and an American economic goal.

AN AMERICAN ECONOMIC POLICY

The Congress should adopt by joint resolution, and the President should approve, an American economic policy, taking into account the recommendations of the American Economic Committee. This policy would not be a regulatory code of obligations, but only a framework of reference for an affirmative, purposeful economic program. To emphasize its flexibility, the resolution would recommend to the President (i) that he comment upon the policy in each annual message, and (ii) that whenever he signed or vetoed a major law affecting economic matters, he attach a short statement relating his decision to the policy.

This might be a first American economic policy:

1. Conversion to peace does not mean a $90,000,000,000 income, privation, and millions of unemployed. The American economy should enable all the people to enjoy material comfort, good education, security, jobs, and creative leisure. These standards of living should rise as invention and efficiency enlarge our national income.

2. Maximum standards of living depend upon full employment of manpower, skills, plant, and resources. This is the American economic goal.

3. Even at some sacrifice of some speed, we should not continue in peacetime the more drastic wartime tools incompatible with the broad freedoms of this American economic policy. Tools consistent with this policy and essential to help achieve the American economic goal should be utilized.

4. Full employment of manpower includes all who are willing and able. Soldiers and war workers will be the largest group seeking postwar employment. But special systems to take care of veterans, instead of treating the whole economy comprehensively, would harm veterans as much as the rest of us.

5. Achievement of full employment is predominantly a task for the system of American enterprise, including industry, agriculture, and labor, working in a democratic environment which encourages collective bargaining by all groups and discourages restrictive monopolies by any;

6. The Government should provide incentives to American enterprise to expand toward full employment, beginning with:

(a) A Government policy stable enough to encourage enterprise to plan;

(b) Direct incentives to enterprise to plan, including tax incentives where workable;

(c) Governmental research and fact-finding where enterprise needs facts but cannot get them alone. For example: The timing and volume of demobilization of the armed forces and war workers, and the skills and areas of residence of these groups; major locations of job opportunity according to type; technological factors in plant "conversion"; research into new products, methods, and markets here and abroad; and overall "needs and resources" facts relating to the American economic goal;

(d) Timely simplification of restrictions and regulations peculiar to wartime;

7. Insofar as additional incentives are needed to expand American enterprise toward full employment, the Government should prepare fiscal incentives, moving only where necessary from narrower to broader commitments, in this suggested order:

(a) Government insurance or guarantees, such as those stimulating $4,000,000,000 of private housing investment without public cost, should be utilized in additional fields to encourage large-scale investment at moderate return;

(b) Public credits, providing cheaper money in the city and on the farm;

(c) Marginal public expenditures to generate private investment. For example: Interest subsidies on insured, long-term low-rate loans for acquiring and clearing blighted urban areas, could stimulate $80,000,000,000 worth of city rebuilding, mainly by private construction, over a 10- to 15-year period;

(d) We should boldly explore additional incentives, using systems and funds to encourage employment at least as willingly as palliatives for unemployment, and discarding the paralyzing doctrine that utilizing American enterprise is incompatible with planning or adequate social controls;

8. Where all these incentives fail to achieve full employment by American enterprise, direct Government programs represent bedrock civilized responsibility. Profiting by experience, these programs should be readjusted as follows:

(a) We should abandon defeatism, such as seeking more unemployment protection by higher pay-roll taxes on low wages and low employment, using shorter hours to share unemployment, taxing excess profits without questioning the inevitability of capital stagnation, or planning public works on the assumption that seven to ten million postwar unemployed are inevitable. If we over-emphasize economic Maginot Line strategy, we shall be overwhelmed by the magnitude of postwar problems;

(b) Adopting a creative offensive against unemployment, we should integrate spending, taxing, and regulation with an American economic policy, measuring their long-term effect upon all employment, and using them primarily as incentives to full employment by encouraging a healthy balance of prices, business activity, savings, investment, and consumer expenditures, instead of just using them to cure maladjustments after they occur;

(c) Public works and related undertakings to provide jobs, instead of being planned in isolation, should be coordinated with plans for expansion of American enterprise, so that they will be really supplementary to the employment capacity of American enterprise;

(d) Public works should be planned to enrich our environment instead of just "making jobs" and to avoid new manpower maladjustments by sporadic overexpansion of construction. The harnessing of water power, conservation of natural resources, improvement of public facilities for communication, are all dramatic aspects of the American economic goal;

(e) These improvements in method will tend to stabilize public undertakings at reasonable levels, not by sacrificing goals, but by success in achieving them.

9. We should continue measures to prevent exploitation, establish decent standards of work and pay, set up systematic protection against old age, accident and illness, and maintain community services—reflecting what an expanding economy can permanently afford, rather than what a stricken economy turns to for temporary relief.

10. America should participate in international economic arrangements, to enlarge world trade and to make our world healthier, more stable, more prosperous, and more peaceful. This participation should be part of an American economic policy and not random political or economic adventures.

THE AMERICAN ECONOMIC GOAL

The American Economic Committee should define an American economic goal, reflecting America's optimum productive capacity, national income, and employment, and correlating these with an optimum standard of living within the reach of all American families. The goal would be a continuing inventory of our needs and resources—with subgoals reflecting major categories.

This goal would involve neither regimentation nor compulsion. Democratically conceived by a representative committee, it would express America's voluntary sense of its power and promise. We would not proceed toward it under the forced draft of

war quotas. We would move at whatever pace the people approve.

To achieve this goal, American enterprise and government, whose tools have proved superb in producing for war, would function in peacetime under the greater freedom and flexibility, but equally clear purpose and determination, of an American economic policy.

The Committee would present the goal to the public in a brief, popular report signed by Committee members and approved by the President. At intervals there would be progress reports, including timely features such as the reemployment of veterans. The President would discuss these reports in radio talks.

Thus the driving force toward the goal, focusing continually upon the performance of both enterprise and Government, would be that prime weapon of democracy, the watchful eye of an informed people.

We wait breathlessly for reports on war progress. Nation-wide interest and discussion relating to the goals of peacetime will increase our postwar progress.

WE SHOULD START NOW

Americans should not fear planning above board. They should fear the confusion and dissent which enable evil groups to plan secretly.

This plan takes a first practical step toward bringing one increasing purpose into our economic life.

It strengthens the capacity of enterprise, Government, and the people to fulfill that purpose.

It establishes no blueprint, because Americans perfect their plans in action. But it suggests how to get into action.

Parts of the plan could be changed without affecting its core.

For these reasons, it might be adopted quickly.

To realize America's postwar promise, we must begin now.

Resolution of Little Business Men's League of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution approved by the southeast council of the Little Business Men's League of America:

At a general meeting and luncheon of the Little Business Men's League of America, Southeast Chicago Council, held on June 4, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon, at St. George's Church assembly room, 847 East Seventy-sixth Street, Chicago, Ill., the following resolution was made, seconded, and unanimously approved.

Whereas with the price increase in so many foods and other commodities, the percentage of profit for the little businessman, retail merchant, or distributor has been steadily growing less, notwithstanding that the prices to consumers keep going upward.

The little businessmen and merchants are suffering decreased earnings in practically all lines and as consumer prices keep increasing the squeeze is more pronounced, lessening the margin of profit accorded the retail merchants or retailers as prices increase.

To list but a few concrete examples: Milk formerly sold in Chicago for 10 cents a quart; cost the retail merchant 8 cents; gross profit of retail merchant 25 percent. Now milk is sold in Chicago at 16 cents a quart; costs the retail merchant 14 cents, profit of 14⅔ percent, or a decrease of 10⅓ percent in the merchants' profit, notwithstanding the higher price to consumers and the fact that the retail merchants have to pay more for help, for refrigeration, and paper bags for the milk bottles than ever before.

Hundreds of examples of this kind could be given; but here is one more illustration: Bread formerly sold in Chicago for 10 cents a loaf; cost the retail merchant 8 cents a loaf; gross profit, 25 percent. At the present time a loaf of bread sells for 13 cents a loaf; costs the retail merchant 11 cents, or a profit of 18 percent; which again reduces the gross profit of the retail merchant by 7 percent. In other words, the more prices increase the greater the squeeze is placed upon the little businessmen.

Nor does this apply to food distribution alone; it is a practice that seems to be growing ever more popular, that with each increase in price, the margin of profit for the retail distributor, or for the small businessman engaged in services to the consumer, is materially lessened, notwithstanding that the little businessman's rents are increasing, costs for labor are increasing, and almost everything essential to their business is increasing, except the little businessmen's margin of profit.

Does this condition exist because the little businessmen have not organized as has big business, capital, and labor unions? True, the little businessmen are the group safest to put the squeeze on, and with almost all increases in prices, the margin of profit becomes proportionately less for the little businessman, including retail merchants and those engaged in service to the consuming public. Just how long this can continue without the little businessman being forced out of business and the big combination of wealth and organized labor taking over, depends on two factors:

(a) How soon little business will organize and stay organized on such a grand scale that they can be heard before all tribunals having to do with prices, just as capital and labor are now organized.

(b) How soon the representatives in the Congress and the legislatures and in the administrative tribunals realize that it is highly essential to the economic interests of a Nation that little business not be repeatedly reduced in its profits until it is ultimately legislated out of the economic picture entirely.

Impositions—the squeeze—on little business will in the future become more and more burdensome; then we hope organization of little business will be perfected; then recognition and respect for little business, as the power of capital and labor are now respected.

Motion was made, seconded, and approved that copies of this resolution be sent to the President, Members of Congress, United States Senators, and the press.

EARL V. CATES,
President.
A. G. KIRBACH,
Secretary.

JUNE 4, 1946.

Untapped Source of Immediate Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there have been many plans suggested to ease the present housing situation, and there seems to be an untapped source of housing not heretofore generally known. I am speaking particularly with reference to thousands of homes throughout the country partly occupied by aged persons who would gladly rent all or part of their homes to veterans. However, it seems they are handicapped by regulations whereby they are not allowed to rent these homes to supplement their meager old-age pension. If these regulations were lifted and the worthy aged people permitted to rent these homes to veterans it would materially provide additional housing. I am including herewith an editorial from the Monroeville Spectator, of Monroeville, Ohio, saying there are more than 15,000 such potential homes for veterans and nonveterans throughout Ohio if such regulations were lifted, and I am asking the Governor of Ohio to consider the matter.

TEN THOUSAND HOMES FOR VETERANS?

With the progress appallingly slow in providing homes for returning veterans and their families, it would seem only prudent that the Federal Government and State of Ohio should take immediate steps to tap what appears to be a sizable reservoir of potential living quarters now unavailable because of Government red tape.

These thousands of homes are to be found among the old-age pensioners, who could continue to live undisturbed and happily, while performing an outstanding act of patriotism and humanitarianism, if but one rule governing payment of pensions were relaxed.

Many who receive pensions reside in homes to which they gave title to the State in order to become eligible for the pension. They are given forty-odd dollars per month, and are denied the privilege of any other income on penalty of having their pensions reduced. Consequently they must live alone, while many, if permitted, would be happy to rent a part or all of their homes to get the much-needed added income and companionship.

In Monroeville area there are perhaps half a dozen pensioners living alone in houses large enough to accommodate an entire family. Their pensions must be pitifully inadequate in these times of spiraling prices—and many of them must suffer from the solitude imposed by a bureau of our Government. Yet the rules of the old-age pension plan make it inadvisable and unprofitable for them to share or rent their homes.

As we stated above, there are perhaps half a dozen family-sized homes in Monroeville, which could be made available to veteran families.

In Huron County there are approximately 80 such homes. If the same ratio of pensioners living in family-sized houses exists throughout Ohio, there are between 10,000 and 15,000 potential homes for veterans and their families, or nonveterans for that matters, sequestered by the silly rules of an impractical Government.

If an identical old-age pension system prevails throughout the Nation then several hundreds of thousands of homes could be made available to help relieve the housing crisis. It would only be necessary to eliminate the rule forbidding any other income than pension. A specific amendment allowing pensioners to rent their homes to veterans and their families would prevent wholesale abuse of such a step.

As result of this condition it appears that the State and Federal Governments, jointly responsible for pension rules, have done much to create a housing shortage.

The pension bureau maintains the dwellings deeded to them by pensioners, makes necessary repairs, and even improves them. Right now the pension bureau is faced with

the necessity of increasing all pensions at the expense of the taxpayers.

If pensioners living in family-sized houses were permitted and urged to make available for rent all or part of their homes with the understanding the revenue might be retained by them, an addition to their pension allowance probably would not be needed, thereby saving a vast amount of public money. Such a step would place on the rent market thousands of homes, give relief to house-hunting veterans, to pensioners, and ease the demands upon taxpayers.

We submit this proposition for the consideration of our Government, the Pension Bureau, and, above all, to the American Legion and other veterans' organizations, whose membership is made up of those vitally affected. It seems grossly unfair that veterans should be homeless, pensioners underpaid, and added taxes assessed when such a simple step would benefit all three groups, and no one or no agency be the loser.

Case Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Courier-Journal for June 12, 1946.

A VETO PROPERLY UPHELD—NOW FOR A FAIR LAW

It is no secret to readers of the Courier-Journal that this newspaper has been saying for 3 or 4 years that the country needed new labor legislation. It would still have needed labor legislation even if the Case bill had been passed over the President's veto because the Case bill would not have been effective in bringing industrial peace.

It was inadequate as to the machinery for the settlement of strikes; it was superficial in its approach to the fundamentals of labor's rights and obligations and it contained features which, in their distinct unjustness to labor, would have bred rather than killed the germs of strife. On the contrary it did contain some features that should be incorporated into basic labor law.

A major provision was for the creation of a five-member Federal mediation board to take over the conciliation and mediation functions of the Department of Labor. At the time the Case bill was introduced, it might have been argued that the proposal had some merit. But, the steel strike, the General Motors strike and particularly the railway strike have demonstrated that in mass industries gravely affecting the public interest something more than mediation is needed.

As a matter of fact mediation was tried up to the last minute in the railway strike. The strike did introduce a new principle into our approach to the solution of industrial trouble: it demonstrated that mediation, backed by all the power and prestige of the Presidency, could not prevent the calling of a strike. Even in the Case bill, which was glorified far beyond its deserts, Congress did not dare to take the step which it is now obvious must be taken to settle trouble in industries that affect health, welfare and national interest. That step is to force arbitration when collective bargaining, conciliation and mediation have broken down.

Nor is the 60-day cooling-off period provided under the Case bill any good at all. In the steel strike, the workers and management had from September to late January to cool off and the workers still struck. In the railway trouble, the "cooling-off" period ran for months while the Government exhausted all its machinery, but the strike went on. John L. Lewis cleverly used the enforced "cooling-off" period provided under the Smith-Connally Act to get a license from the Federal Government to strike. By giving notice to the operators before he even began negotiations, he made his strike, no matter how much against the public interest, entirely legal and in order. The cooling-off period of the Case bill would have done the same thing, nothing more, nothing less.

The provision for setting up special fact-finding machinery for disputes affecting public utilities was wholly ineffectual. We have fact-finding boards in all major labor disputes now. Both management and labor have defied the facts. General Motors refused to accept the findings of a board in that case and the railway workers refused to accept the facts as found in that case. A fact-finding board means nothing if there is no power to enforce its findings. If an industry is so much affected with the national interest as to require fact-finding, then the national interest also requires enforcement of the findings. A permanent labor bill should carry that power as to public utilities and essential industries.

Labor unions should certainly be made accountable in the courts for breaches of contract. They represent concentrations of economic power no less than the power concentrated in pools of capital and they should be made accountable for that power. That provision of the Case bill should go into a permanent bill, along with an outlawing of the racketeering and strong-arm methods which are dealt with in the bill.

Moreover permanent labor legislation should strengthen the provision which withdraws an individual employee's protection under the Wagner Act if he participates in an unauthorized strike in violation of a contract. The penalty should go to the whole union, not to the individual. Such a provision would give the national and local officers of unions a greater responsibility than too many of them have demonstrated. Philip Murray argued speciously against that feature of the Case bill when he said unions and union men should not be penalized for unauthorized strikes. Labor has no business having unauthorized strikes. It must come to the same sense of responsibility which it and we of the public require of labor's opposite number in the field of big business, the employer.

There were provisions outlawing secondary boycotts and making labor subject to the anti-trust laws that should go into a labor charter, but there were also features unjust to labor and provocative of trouble. It is perfectly true that history in the United States has demonstrated on the whole a judicial antipathy to labor. The situation got so bad that the Norris-LaGuardia law of 1932 outlawed the use of injunctions in labor disputes. The Case bill virtually threw labor back upon the mercy of the courts without sufficient safeguard of its rights. Practices in restraint of trade should be punished under antitrust laws, but labor should not be deprived of its weapons in industrial warfare by court injunctions. That section of the Case bill could have been turned against labor in such a way as to wipe out gains it had legitimately won over the years. If Congress is to legislate in the field of labor in the courts, it should be done much more carefully than it has been done.

Obviously some legislation as to welfare funds is desirable. There is no objection per se to welfare funds, if they go to welfare. The danger comes in the concentration of money that can be used for political purposes or or power grabbing. John L. Lewis and Petrillo and their type make supervision of welfare funds not only desirable but urgent.

Because it was ineffectual, because it was superficial in its approach, because its provisions had already been outmoded by developments since it was introduced, and because it did contain elements of injustice to labor, the Case bill was properly buried. Now, a new start should be made. We need labor legislation. But we need legislation that comes out of what we have learned in the past few years, not out of blind prejudice that expresses itself in clichés. Congress could do no better than to pass the President's temporary proposal, minus the draft of labor, and then make the study he suggested.

And labor could do no better than to face the reality that it has asked for and will get regulatory legislation. Labor leaders would do much better by their men if they made sound suggestions toward that end instead of indulging in demagogic, hysterical protests that Congress is out to knife labor. Congress is merely following a people's mandate to curb abuses of power that the people of the country never have stood for, whether they came from capital or labor.

Food Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, at the present time, citizens of my home city of Springfield, Mass., are suffering from a most serious food shortage. The Springfield Evening Union of Friday, June 7, 1946, carried the headlines "City hospitals short of meat," "Shortage is 'worst ever,' officials say." In speaking of the conditions at the four largest hospitals in Springfield, a city of 160,000 persons, the article states that:

MERCY HAS NONE FOR WEEK END—SPRINGFIELD, WESSON CAN GET THROUGH SUNDAY

The meat situation in Springfield's major hospitals was characterized today as the worst it has ever been, conditions varying with no meat at all for the week end at Mercy, just enough to get through Sunday at both Springfield and Wesson, and a week's supply at the more fortunate Isolation Hospital.

The Massachusetts Hospital Association, stating that most hospitals have only enough meat for tomorrow and none for Sunday, announced this morning that superintendents throughout the State had joined in sending a telegram to OPA for relief, but up to now have had no response.

Superintendents at hospitals in Springfield were unaware of the State association's action and had not participated in the appeal to OPA.

The Union of Saturday, June 8, carries the banner headline "City housewives form meat lines at dawn." Part of the news story is as follows:

MEAT LINES FORMED BEFORE SUNRISE HERE—DESPERATE HOUSEWIVES ON HAND HOURS BEFORE STORES OPEN—500 WAIT IN EAST SPRINGFIELD

Desperate housewives, veterans, and men and women of every age and walk in life were standing in line as early as 5 this morning merely on chance of securing a low number ticket for meat which would not go on sale here until after 9.

91 WAIT AT 6:30 A. M.

While similar scenes took place from the North End to markets in the Forest Park Section, most amazing was the scene at a small retail store in East Springfield, formerly a wholesale meat establishment, whose practice of having meat for sale for the week end has spread its name all over this area.

One housewife living in the neighborhood reported that she fell in line at 6:30 a. m. and 91 meat seekers were already ahead of her.

Only a short time ago, a young war bride from overseas fainted after standing for a long period of time in a line of housewives waiting to secure an opportunity to purchase butter in a local store on our main business street.

Each day I am receiving letters from constituents, Democrats and Republicans alike, showing that they now realize fully that the present administration has shown itself to be incapable or unwilling to handle the bread, meat, and other food production and supplies for our people efficiently and fairly.

Last Tuesday's front page newspaper article by the Associated Press in the Springfield Union was as follows:

MEAT AND BREAD SUPPLIES DWINDLING, WITH SHORTAGES EXPECTED TO GROW WORSE—SOAP, BUTTER, AND COOKING FATS NOT FAR BEHIND ON SCARCITY LIST, SURVEY SHOWS—WHEAT CROP NOT TO MEET DEMANDS

The basic American staples—meat and bread—either were gone or rapidly going from dealers' shelves over a great part of the Nation yesterday and new supplies to fill the gap were apparently weeks away in most areas.

The expectation in several of the cities covered by an Associated Press spot survey was that the shortage would grow worse before it grew better.

Soap, butter, and cooking fats were reported not far behind meat and bread in the scarcity list.

My constituents have now gotten to the point where they write me a short letter and back it up with all kinds of news articles, each one showing how serious the situation has become. Mr. Bowles and Mr. Porter may believe that there is no black market in meat worthy of the name. My letters from home indicate that everyone in Springfield believes that the chief source of meat supplies for the public today is by paying black-market prices to some person or other operating in flagrant and open violation of OPA rules and regulations. Apparently, this practice can be carried on with impunity although the Government has nearly 3,000,000 employees on its pay rolls. My constituents are asking why the Government cannot control the situation when more than one out of every five adults is on the pay rolls of the Federal Government at the present time.

I would like to close my remarks by referring to one letter in particular. It reads as follows:

DEAR CHARLIE: These clippings make one believe that perhaps the honest people of our home town deserve as much consideration as the inhabitants of China, Tibet, Libya, and way stations, respectively.

At the foot of the letter the three following newspaper articles from Springfield papers were pasted:

WHEAT PARLEY

An appeal has been made for the diversion of some portion of the Nation's wheat supplies destined for overseas to meet the crisis in the United States.

A third response to the appeal was received today from Senator DAVID I. WALSH promising to investigate wheat shipments.

Bakers here have made no move yet to obtain wheat loans for millers who supply this area and according to George Merrow, secretary of the association, feel that relief could not come fast enough from the Department of Agriculture to bridge the gap between the present emergency and the arrival of the new wheat crop, almost ready to start moving to the mills.

Merrow said that one baker in the association membership indicated today he would have to close June 22 as his flour supplies will be exhausted by that time. Many others will close shortly after that date unless relief comes from "some source not yet known."

NO BUTTER TODAY AND LITTLE DUE BEFORE JULY 1

There was no butter today but no one bothered to ask for any for the same dreary situation has prevailed so long the consumer is apathetic about the whole subject. Increased cost of butter which OPA has allowed, to become effective July 1, is not expected to bring any immediate betterment of the situation, distributors say.

It will take several weeks before butter will start an appreciable comeback for right up to July 1 when controls are slapped back on heavy cream still selling without ceiling, little butter will be manufactured. The butter industry won't start rolling again until cream and butter prices are balanced to permit making butter at a profit.

The bread situation was less dreary than earlier in the week. Even up to now it was possible to buy a loaf at any of the downtown stores and in neighborhood markets bread was out in the open a good part of the day.

PUBLIC IS NOW BOILING

Sullen comment of thousands of men and women, standing wearily in meat lines today or gazing hopelessly at empty meat counters seemed equally divided between bitter condemnation of "the mess OPA has made of the food situation," acrid criticism of the meat-packing industry for its sit-down strike to smash price control, and scathing denunciation of black marketeers exploiting the meat-hungry public.

Demands for immediate remedying of the critical situation were sounded by John Lynch, a veteran and candidate for State representative on the Democratic ticket from ward 2, who insists that Governor Tobin should request the attorney general to initiate an investigation of the meat situation in this State to dig the black market out by the roots and return meat so diverted from legitimate channels back into the retail stores.

Some of those who had bought meat sight unseen, accepting anything that was offered, were outraged when they reached home and totaled up the score to find they had averaged 75 cents a pound for purchases which included a pound of bacon, a pound of sausage, a skinny chicken, and a little beef.

Housewives did not place the blame for these inflation prices on their grocers, feeling equally culpable as desperation had brought them to the point of ignoring ceiling prices.

Mr. Speaker, the OPA has issued a beautiful bulletin stating that beef and pork products are now available in quantities 40 percent larger than before the war started. They blame the shortage in this expensive booklet on the excessive demand of the public for meat at this time because of the large amount of money in the hands of the public. It seems to me that it is about time that some capable person be put in charge of the production, allocation, and distribution of the common, ordinary, everyday food supplies of the American people in place of those who are now bungling one of the most important jobs facing the administration. It is bad enough for the public at large to be gouged and mistreated. It is going far too far when patients in hospitals are deprived of the kind of food which they need for the recovery of their health.

Report of Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the President of the United States from Mr. Lessing Rosenwald, president of the American Council for Judaism:

MAY 10, 1946.

The PRESIDENT,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is my very great pleasure to follow the instructions of our Executive Committee to send you in its behalf, as well as in behalf of our entire membership, our sincere thanks and deep appreciation for the part you played in enabling the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry to render its magnificent report. I have likewise been instructed to convey to you our opinions regarding the report, which I do most respectfully, with the hope that you will consider them as a constructive policy which you can wholeheartedly endorse. Fundamentally, we urge the complete acceptance of the recommendations of the report as a whole, and we look forward to its implementation at the earliest possible moment. I stand ready to confer with you to the end that our organization may be useful in bringing this report speedily into effect.

We believe that some day, when the passions of the moment will have become a memory, the unanimous report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry will be regarded as one of the most lucid, wise, humane, and statesmanlike documents of our times. Composed under incredible pressures, within a limited time and on subjects on which there is intense feeling, the report is a monument to good sense, to clarity and to breadth of vision. The unanimity of its sponsors is a tribute to their rational wisdom.

The unique quality of this report lies in the fact that it is one report. While designed to deal with a number of complex problems, each of its recommendations is an intrinsic but subordinate aspect of a larger total; each section is related to and intertwined with all others. No greater disservice can be done to the judicious findings of the able and sincere men who composed the committee than to mutilate their recommendations by fragmentary action; by breaking up the unified coordinated structure they have reared of humanitarian vision, political wisdom and high-minded aspirations for peace.

The magnitude of the report can be judged from the fact that it deals, and deals with utmost wisdom, with four basic interlocking considerations:

1. The report recommends action on the immediate problem of about 100,000 Jews who are among the displaced persons of Europe, who are actually, not theoretically, homeless and for whom new homes must be found. The views of the committee are that these homes should promptly be found for them in Palestine.

2. The report logically and properly then turns to conditions for peace and progress in Palestine. What service would be rendered to the 100,000 displaced Jews by merely transferring them from an unhappy postwar atmosphere to a tense, potential, prewar environment? The crackle of gunfire, the bursting of hand grenades, the bombing of buildings, the barbed-wire enclosures of a military encampment do not constitute an atmosphere suitable for those deeply injured men, women, and children. They must be removed to a land of peace. To urge their transfer to Palestine without regard for the other recommendations would only give the appearance of solving a problem without actually considering the fate of the human beings who constitute that problem.

Throughout its recommendations the committee clearly indicates its goal: that Palestine be a peaceful land in which all of its inhabitants shall be bound by a common loyalty to that country and to no other; in which they will all pool their skills and resources for the common good, not merely for partisan good. To this end it advises that all discriminatory practices of group against group, whether a white paper restricting Jews or a Jewish national fund lease excluding Arab labor, shall be rejected.

In the committee's report the relationship between all these elements is made apparent. The transfer of these deeply injured people from Europe to Palestine is not enough. The move must be accompanied by procedures that will make for a peaceful habitation of all of the people of all of Palestine.

3. The committee's breadth of vision is also made clear in those sections of its report which deal with the status of the remaining Jews in Europe.

In regard to them, the committee expresses the view that the whole world shares a responsibility, both for those who may still need to emigrate and those who will continue to live in Europe.

Corresponding to the position that we of the American Council for Judaism have steadily maintained, the committee's emphasis is on giving effect to the provisions of the United Nations Charter for the protection of fundamental human individual rights.

The Committee's insight and profound wisdom are summarized in its statement that: "A considerable number of Jews will continue to live in most European countries. In our view, the mass immigration of all European Jews would be a service neither to the Jews themselves nor to Europe. Every effort should be made to enable the Jews to rebuild their shattered communities, while permitting those Jews who wish to do so, to emigrate."

The committee rightfully recommends action for the economic, political, and social reintegration of the Jews of Europe: "The only really effective antidotes are the enforcement by each government of guaranteed civil liberties and equal rights, a program of education in the positive principles of democracy, the sanction of a strong world public opinion—combined with economic recovery and stability."

4. Finally, the committee's report deals with the fundamental character of the relationship of the Jews of the world to Palestine. This may be, over a period of years, the most important service that it renders. It makes clear what are the acceptable as against the unacceptable relationships between Jews the world over and Palestine as a proposed state.

The committee states: "Further, while we recognize that any Jew who enters Palestine in accordance with its laws is there of right, we expressly disapprove of the position taken in some Jewish quarters that Palestine has in some way been ceded or granted as their state to the Jews of the world, that every Jew everywhere is, merely because he is a Jew, a citizen of Palestine and therefore can enter Palestine as of right without regard to conditions imposed by the Government upon entry, and that therefore there can be no illegal immigration of Jews into Palestine. We declare and affirm that any immigrant Jew who enters Palestine contrary to its laws is an illegal immigrant."

A Jew who enters Palestine legally is there as of right. So is the Jew who enters any other country in accordance with its immigration laws. Justifiably, this declaration rejects the Zionist claim that Palestine has been given to the Jews of the world, and that therefore all Jews have special rights in regard to Palestine.

By this significant declaration the committee clears the way for the important task that must be given priority by Jews all over the world; the historic process of their full integration into the countries in which they live or to which they remove. In this way they will further the traditions of western civilization and democracy.

We respectfully submit the above in support of our contention that the committee's report be accepted in its entirety and that promp action be taken to implement all of the provisions of that report.

Sincerely yours,

LESSING J. ROSENWALD,
President.

Terminal Leave for Enlisted Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the House has just voted unanimously to extend to enlisted men the same terminal pay that has heretofore been extended to officers. I was happy to have the privilege of voting for this very worthy bill. This is justice to the enlisted men. This bill when enacted into law will give them this terminal pay now. Many of them will be engaged in business and this will be of material assistance to them. I hope very much that the Senate acts promptly on this legislation so that it may be approved by the President and become a law at an early date.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy that I enlisted in the cause for this bill at an early date. I am one of those who signed the discharge petition to bring this bill to the floor for action. The action of the House today in passing this bill unanimously vindicates my judgment in signing the discharge petition and my effort to bring this issue to its successful conclusion. I know that the news of the passing of this bill will bring to the heart of every enlisted man not only happiness but a feeling of a deep sense of fair play in this great American Nation of ours. The enlisted men feel that they are entitled to this and today's action shows that the House of Representatives feels the same way about it.

The Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Press of June 10, 1946:

HOW WOULD IT HURT LABOR?

Labor leaders are ordering President Truman to veto the Case labor bill, shouting that it will enslave labor and destroy unions.

The Case bill would create a new, independent Federal mediation board, appointed by the President. That can't hurt labor.

It would authorize this board to try—by mediation, conciliation and voluntary arbitration, to arrange peaceful settlement of labor-management disputes that threaten serious injury to the public. What's wrong with that?

It would place on management and unions in such disputes a positive duty to refrain from violence and to give the board a maximum of 60 days for peace-making efforts before restoring to strike, lockout, or arbitrary changes of wages and working conditions. Such cooling-off periods have promoted good industrial relations in Minnesota and other States.

It would authorize a special fact-finding procedure for disputes effecting public utilities, with a maximum of 65 days in which strikes and lock-outs would be forbidden. Will it "enslave labor" for the public to have this reasonable protection against sudden, arbitrary stoppage of services essential to life and safety?

It would authorize labor unions and employers to sue each other in Federal courts for breaches of contract, imposing on both the same responsibility for living up to signed agreements. Does the life of unions depend upon freedom to break contracts without legal responsibility?

It would forbid unions to use the "secondary boycott" as a weapon in their battles with employers or with other unions. Is it a necessary right of unions to punish innocent bystanders when they cannot agree with each other on jurisdictional questions, or to fight their quarrels with employers at the expense of other employers who have no connection with the controversies?

It would subject to Federal Anti-Racketeering Act penalties unions found guilty of obstructing commerce by robbery or extortion. Does honest labor need Federal immunity for robbery and extortion?

It would require joint union-employer responsibility for proper use of health-and-welfare and similar funds contributed by employers through production royalties or pay-roll levies. Can labor not live without the right, not only to tax the public in this manner, but to use money thus taken from the public exactly as unions or their officers please?

It would allow foremen to join unions but leave employers free to refuse to recognize unions as bargaining agents for foremen. Is it either essential or desirable that unions should have power to usurp management functions by forcing foremen to be represented by the same labor organ-

izations as the workers they are supposed to supervise?

These are the things the Case bill would do. Many of them are things President Truman has said should be done. Which of them do you think would injure any well-intended union? Which of them justifies the frenzied clamor of the labor leaders?

We believe the Case bill provides moderate and fair means of preventing intolerable abuses of labor's power. President Truman should sign it to protect the Nation and its workers from the drastic and immoderate legislation sure to come if the abuses are continued.

The Meat Subsidy and the OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. COLE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CLARENCE A. SPEER & CO.,
St. Joseph, Mo., June 8, 1946.

Hon. WILLIAM C. COLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COLE: There is always the question on the part of an individual as to whether or not to write his Senator or Representative in favor of or against issues before the country. I have at times thought of writing a letter of protest or a letter in favor of certain matters and then it seemed to be futile to add one person's opinion to the avalanche of letters that you receive.

However, I am enclosing a letter with reference to the meat subsidy and the OPA which is a specific case condemning the idea of the OPA. The Merrigan Super Market at Pattonsburg, Mo., acquired a slaughtering facility to supply their market. While Mr. Todd was away in the service, Mrs. Todd managed the store in his absence. This is one of five stores linked together in a series of partnerships. I looked after the accounting work and tried to help Mrs. Todd figure out her other problems too. In this particular instance because of some infraction of the price regulation, they were sued and got judgment as is done in so many of these cases. While this was in process of settlement, she was told very emphatically by an OPA representative that their claim for subsidy would not be approved by the OPA. It is necessary for an applicant to have the OPA approval before the Reconstruction Finance Corporation can pay the subsidy. Previously, when no subsidy was due, information was given us that no report be made. In this case we wondered about making application for subsidy when there seemed to be doubt as to even getting it when the OPA would not approve it. Mrs. Todd and I could not arrive at a conclusion so when I came back from Pattonsburg, I called the Kansas City office of the OPA to see if there was need to file these reports. Whoever I talked to on the telephone stated that under no circumstances would they approve these applications when an applicant had a case in the enforcement division. I told him that all we were concerned about was whether or not to file the reports requested and if there would be no consideration given it, it appeared that there was no need to file the report. He stated very explicitly that no consideration would be given. So with this reply I called Mrs. Todd and we came to the conclusion over the phone that evidently there was no use in filing the reports.

Sometime later another representative came through checking the records and said that we were wrong and that all reports should have been filed. Mrs. Todd called me and I immediately went to Pattonsburg and made up these reports.

All the applications were considered and paid except the November and December which amounted to $197.88 for November and $98.46 for December. The enclosed letter from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation discloses the rejection of the payment of this subsidy because of the lateness of making the application.

Naturally, in our work it is necessary for us to do the best we can in keeping up with the changes in income-tax regulations. The best we can do in this, we are always behind in keeping ourselves informed on the latest income-tax procedure. It was not possible to keep up on OPA regulations so we had to depend on getting the information from the offices of the OPA.

This whole matter is just characteristic of so many cases in our experience. Very seldom have we been able to get an answer to a specific question. I am sending this to you just to present a specific case in my own experience as to how difficult it is to deal with the problem when it comes up in connection with the OPA. There may be advantages from price control but the glaring instances such as this still leaves a condemnation of the whole procedure.

Very truly yours,
CLARENCE A. SPEER.

LOAN AGENCY OF THE
RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
St. Louis, Mo., May 31, 1946.

Re meat subsidy, Merrigan's Super Market, Pattonsburg, Mo.

CLARENCE A. SPEER & CO.,
St. Joseph, Mo.

GENTLEMEN: After receipt of your letter dated April 26, 1946, we passed to our Washington office your letter dated April 15, 1946, copy of our response dated April 17, 1946, and your letter dated April 26, 1946, and asked for instructions as to the acceptance or rejection of claims filed after the prescribed time for the slaughtering during the months of November and December 1945.

The response has been received as follows:

"The explanation given on behalf of the applicant by Clarence A. Speer of Clarence A. Speer & Co. in his letters of April 15 and 26 is not such as to alter our decision. OPA obviously made no statement as to subsidy, since it referred only to reports. Since all applicants have been warned as to our filing requirements, we see no reason the applicant should not have taken the question of subsidy up with RFC if he thought the claims should be delayed. The applicant is, of course, bound by his attorney's delay."

We are sure that you will appreciate that, under the circumstances, we have no alternative to the refusal of the claims, therefore, we are returning your claims covering operations for the months of November and December 1945.

Very truly yours,
RALPH GROSSWILER,
Chief, Loan Application Division.

National Cemeteries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from John Thomas Taylor, director of the national legislative committee of the American Legion:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1946.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The national convention of the American Legion, held in Chicago, Ill., November 18–21, 1945, passed a resolution urging prompt enactment into law of the bill S. 524, to establish one or more national cemeteries in every State. This action was brought to the attention of Senate and House committees during consideration of the legislation. The bill has passed the Senate, was reported favorably to the House of Representatives, and it is our understanding a rule has been granted and the bill will be considered by the House in the near future.

Realizing the great importance of providing these national cemeteries, particularly in view of the law recently enacted to return deceased members of the armed forces to the United States, the national executive committee of the Legion, at its session in Indianapolis last week, reiterated prior recommendations and unanimously adopted the following resolution; be it

"Resolved by the national executive committee of the American Legion in meeting duly assembled this 6th day of June 1946, That the national legislative committee be instructed to use every possible means for immediate enactment into law of S. 524; and be it further

"Resolved, That the national legislative committee impress upon the proper authorities of the War and Navy Departments that in the preparation of the regulations pertaining to burials in all national cemeteries there shall be no discrimination as to sizes or locations of grave sites because of rank or rating of deceased members of the armed forces."

On behalf of the American Legion I strongly urge your active support and influence for immediate passage of S. 524.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Committee.

Commercial Fishing Industry on the Great Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the commercial fishing industry is vitally important to many cities and villages located along Lake Michigan shores and serves as a means of livelihood for thousands of families; and

Whereas the fish production has gradually fallen off during the past few years, due chiefly to the destructiveness of the steadily increase population of lamprey eel, which have long been a menace to lake trout; and

Whereas the fishing has become so poor out of Milwaukee Harbor that local fishermen are barely able to continue operations; and

Whereas the commercial fishing on all of the Great Lakes, with the possible exception of Lake Superior, has suffered greatly as a result of the increase of the lamprey eel: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That it realizes the danger confronting the commercial fishing industry, and hereby joins with the commercial fishermen along Lake Michigan's shores in urging that the proper agencies of the Federal and State Governments join together in taking some immediate action if the commercial fishing industry is to be saved; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to United States Senators LA FOLLETTE and WILEY, Congressmen WASIELEWSKI and BIEMILLER, the Federal Fish and Wildlife Commission, and the State Department of Conservation.

William Lemke, of North Dakota, and His Aid to the Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Commonwealth Review of June 4, 1946:

WILLIAM LEMKE, OF NORTH DAKOTA, AND HIS AID TO THE FARMERS

Virginians are truly grateful to the Honorable WILLIAM LEMKE, of North Dakota, for the battle he is waging in the Congress to protect the farmers of the Nation from the exploitation of the fertilizer industry, and they hope that other Members of the Congress may join hands with Congressman LEMKE and help him secure the enactment of the bill that he has introduced for the protection of the farmers: H.R. 3775.

Virginians have always admired men of courage and devotion to duty, and their hats are off today to Congressman LEMKE, who is undoubtedly one of the ablest and most courageous champions of the cause of the farmers and of the small businessmen that we have in Congress today, or have had at any other time.

The service that Congressman LEMKE is undertaking to render is Nation-wide in its scope and far-reaching in its character.

The bill he has introduced in the Congress—H. R. 3775—requires the fertilizer manufacturers to name the materials used in making the fertilizer, the number of pounds of each material and the number of pounds of sand or other filler. The bill also prevents the use of certain materials known to be harmful to certain crops, and it prohibits the use of coloring matter that is frequently used to mislead and deceive the farmer.

The law that Congressman LEMKE has in mind would bring present methods of fertilizer manufacture into the open and throw the pitiless glare of public opinion upon them. This would undoubtedly result in formula changes, and these formula changes would make it possible for the farmers to grow better crops with considerably less fertilizer per acre. This would lower the cost of the farmers' annual fertilizer bill $100,000,000.

Since the farmer is the economic backlog in thousands of communities in this country, the mistreatment of the farmers is undoubtedly a proper cause for concern to the Congress of the United States.

A great statesman once said that if you burn down your cities, prosperous farmers will build them up again, but if you destroy the purchasing power of the farmer, your cities will grow up in bushes.

We need only to review the happenings in a recent Nation-wide fertilizer trial to see the urgent need of Federal regulation of the fertilizer industry for the protection of the farmers.

One hundred firms and individuals were indicted in the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of North Carolina for having exerted an undue influence on State fertilizer legislation and law enforcement.

The defendants admitted their guilt and paid a quarter million dollars in fines, but the collusion still exists and the farmers are suffering from the effects of it.

This malign and dangerously corrupting influence is a menace to popular government.

Unless it is curbed large numbers of our farmers will become the bond slaves of these predatory interests and will be powerless to resist or prevent their mistreatment.

It goes without saying that the farmers of this section are grateful to Congressman LEMKE for the battle he is waging in their behalf, and firmly believe that the justice and need of this undertaking will appeal to our national lawmakers when the facts in connection with this matter become fully known.

Arbitration of Disputes Betweeen Management and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution unanimously adopted by the 1946 Victory Convention of Kiwanis International.

Be it resolved, That the interest of the general public is paramount to the special interests both of labor and management; that the entire economy of our Nation and the well-being and security of all our people suffer from uncontrolled conflict between management and labor, that we believe in the rights of labor to organize, to bargain collectively, and to protect its interests by all reasonable and lawful means, and in the rights of management to have peaceful enjoyment of its properties and free choice in establishing its policies provided that none of these rights be exercised without due regard to the rights of the other party, nor in such a way as to subject the public to loss or undue inconvenience.

Be it further resolved, That we call upon our respective National Legislatures to enact laws which will define clearly the respective duties and responsibilities, as well as the rights and privileges both of management and labor, and which will effectively enforce those duties and responsibilities, protect the rights and privileges, control disputes between them, and provide for compulsory arbitration of all disputes prior to the calling of a strike which might endanger the national welfare or impinge upon the constitutional rights of the citizen;

Be it further resolved, That we call upon our legislative bodies to enact legislation which will prevent effectively any individual or groups of individuals from disrupting the economy of our Nation, and that the antitrust laws be expanded and revised to achieve that end; it being our considered opinion that excessive power over the economy of the country in the hands of any individual or groups of individuals are inimical to the public interest, whether such individuals represent labor, management, or any other group, and that the rule of law shall be restored and maintained.

It Seems to Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, the following bulletin published by the Gardner Advertising Co., entitled "It Seems to Us," is extended by request of Miss Marjorie Hall, of University City, Mo.

IT SEEMS TO US

GARDNER ADVERTISING CO.,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR SIR: Snap out of it, America.

Ever since this Nation blew its economic top in 1929 our people have been dragged through one crisis after another.

From the dismal valleys of depression through the bloody fields of global war into the current quagmire of industrial strife.

We're up to our proverbial ears in debt. We're starving for materials and goods. We're holding legitimate industry at bay. We're squandering time, rejecting golden opportunities, stifling initiative, choking competition.

We're prostituting free markets, making black-market crooks out of otherwise honest men and women, losing billions in tax revenue. We're bound up in a legal crazy quilt. We're preaching democracy abroad and practicing statism at home. In our quest of social gain for favored minorities, we're enforcing cockeyed economic theories which would, in time, bring on total collapse.

Our elected leaders have delegated their powers of leadership to a handful of labor bosses who brazenly dare to tell us when we may work or loaf; when we may have light, heat, and power; when we may travel; when we may have goods and what they should cost; how our legislators must interpret our laws—or lose their jobs.

This de facto leadership rejects responsibility, equality, the sanctity of a contract, majority rule. It bows only to the total power of Government—and the threat of military draft for all of its striking workers.

It's a hell of a way to run this country, a shameful way to win the peace, a shocking act to put on before the whole wide world.

This isn't the way you want it. It isn't the way we want it. It isn't the way the overwhelming majority of farmers, industrialists, businessmen, workers want it. It isn't the way the majority of our elected leaders want it. It is the way the enemies of capitalism want it. It is the way the black market wants it. It is the way it is.

It's time to snap out of it.

It's time to give the majority of our people what they want. They want the domestic tranquillity set forth in the preamble of our Constitution. They want their chance to participate in the pursuit of happiness. They want permanent protection against abuse of power in any form—by capital, labor, government.

They want dependable, understandable leadership. They want to know where they're going and why. Give our people the low-down and they'll stick to their tasks from "hell to breakfast." They want leadership based upon the untainted American book.

They want a new labor policy. One which cuts both ways, fairly, squarely, swiftly. One which rewards its supporters and cracks down on those who defy it. One which encourages mass production and consumption of goods. One which enables tool owners and those who use the tools to earn good wages for their investment of time or dollars. One which keeps the public interest inviolate. Above all, a labor policy which will work and endure.

They want all workers protected against exploitation by legal process—and not by paralyzing strikes. They want workers on their jobs turning out goods. They want to shop in open, free markets where they can exercise freedom of choice, pay prices kept fair by the competitive process—and not in black markets where they must take what they get, paying noncompetitive, extortionate prices.

And they have billions to spend.

This Nation has drifted from the only safe road to prosperity, domestic tranquillity, and the pursuit of happiness. We're far off the beam.

The right to strike, as we have seen, has been debauched. Unless this right is promptly brought under control in the public interest, the worthy cause of all organized workers will have been dealt a crushing blow by the ineptitude of their own leaders.

We're desperately in need of universal work, profitable production, abundantly stocked market places. Desperately, we need perpetual motion of men, money, and machines to head off inflation before it engulfs us.

Snap out of it, America.

Very truly yours,

GARDNER ADVERTISING CO.

Selective Service Realities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of June 13, 1946:

SELECTIVE SERVICE REALITIES

A conference committee of Senators and Representatives began yesterday consideration of the differing versions of a continuance of selective service that have been voted by the two Houses. Each measure agrees on the number of men that are to be in service on July 1, 1947—1,070,000 in the Army; 558,000 in the Navy, and 108,000 in the Marine Corps. Each House also has increased the pay of soldiers, by as much as 50 percent for privates. The Senate included this provision in the extension bill; the House did it by a separate act. These, however, were about the only points of agreement yesterday as the conference began. The Senate bill continues the registration and induction, if needed, of 18- and 19-year-olds; the House measure exempts all men under 20. The Senate would extend the act to May 15, 1947; the House bill would extend it only to February 15, 1947, and in addition provide a holiday until October 15, with inductions to be resumed thereafter only at the direction of the President.

If the armed services are to be guaranteed the men that are needed to carry out this country's international commitments and provide for our national security it is difficult to see how there should be, or can be, any considerable compromise on the Senate bill. Both Houses agree on the number of men needed. The Senate bill provides that if voluntary enlistments fill the quotas, no inductions will be made. Certainly this is a prudent provision, when there is agreement as to the need. The House bill prefers to gamble, by declaring a holiday and then placing on the President the onus of a resumption of inductions, if that course is necessary. In exempting all those under 20 years old, the House bill also takes another flight into unreality, disregarding statistics which show that if other present exemptions for fathers and essential workers are continued, that provision would leave a pool of men almost infinitesimal.

One other reality the House overlooked in adopting its bill last April—by a teller vote only, on key amendments—was the probable necessity, if its view prevailed, of retaining in service many inductees and many of them husbands and fathers who have served 18 and 20 months and longer. Some of these men also saw combat service. There have been reports that House Members have been hearing about that from the men themselves and from their families. How many such protests have been received has not been divulged, but they may have served as a counterweight to the arguments of those who are credited with influencing the House vote against inductions of teen-agers.

Selective service should not be regarded as a political question. If the conference committee goes at its task with the idea of doing what is best for the country, with awareness of the fact that our commitments abroad and our national security are more important than any transitory and probably imaginary political advantage that might be gained by gambling on enlistments, then the only compromise will be a reversal by the House of its previous position and the acceptance, substantially as it stands, of the Senate-sponsored Gurney bill.

Pattern of Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the trial of the former Yugoslav Minister of War, Gen. Draja Mihailovich, the statements of our principal military delegate to Yugoslavia, Col. Robert McDowell, are of definitive importance.

Excerpts of this testimony have appeared in most American newspapers with the exception of PM and the Communist Daily Worker.

In view of the extraordinary conduct of this trial in Belgrade, and the accusations now being made against Americans, including Colonel McDowell, by the prosecutor of Dictator Tito's Communist regime, this authoritative statement of the facts, as authorized by our own War Department, should be made of permanent record. For that purpose I ask leave to insert.

It is pointed out by the American Committee for a Fair Trial for Draja Mihailovich that the pattern of prosecution in this case is a logical extension of the pattern disclosed in the Moscow trials of Polish emissaries in 1945.

The Belgrade trial today is less concerned with proving facts about General Mihailovich than with recording accusations against the United States and Great Britain. This puts it in the consistent pattern of all previous similar show trials as a deliberate operation of well-prepared propaganda directed against the security and morale and prestige of the United States and of all other noncommunistic nations.

Colonel McDowell's statement, read in comparison with the accusations from Belgrade make this fact very clear, and his full testimony is attached hereto for the information of legislators and public who are, alike, attacked by the charges:

The Committee for a Fair Trial for Draja Mihailovich today issued a statement by Col. Robert McDowell, former head of the American Mission to General Mihailovich, answering charges brought by the Tito Government against Colonel McDowell at the Mihailovich trial in Belgrade.

Colonel McDowell's statement completely refutes the charges of collaboration between Mihailovich and the Germans; declares that he personally and not Mihailovich arranged the conferences with the Germans and that the arrangements were made in instructions from the United States High Command; and makes the startling revelation that these conferences were not concerned with collaboration but with German offers of surrender.

Besides exposing the falsity of the Tito Government's attack on General Mihailovich and on the American Military Mission, which he headed, Colonel McDowell's statement goes on to completely deny other charges of the Tito Government against the Chetnik leader, saying that he had "seen and heard of absolutely no evidence serving to connect General Mihailovich personally, or officers under his direct command, with any form of collaboration with the Germans. The evidence includes not only personal observation, but the totality of the documents seen and conversations held with United States, Allied, and even enemy personnel."

The colonel's statement also describes the Chetnik national uprising against the Germans of February 1, 1944, and makes the sensational charge that Tito's Partisans in their invasion of Serbia avoided all contact with the Germans and instead attacked the Chetniks in the flank.

The full text of Colonel McDowell's statement, which was issued with the permission of the War and State Departments, follows:

"STATEMENT OF COL. ROBERT H. MCDOWELL TO COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO CASE OF DRAJA MIHAILOVICH

"1. PERSONAL BACKGROUND

"The undersigned, as part of a total 25 years residence in the Near East and adjoining countries, acquired a broad general knowledge of Yugoslavia. Prior to the recent war, as a professor at the University of Michigan, he taught modern Balkans history. During the war he has been concerned with Balkans intelligence since the autumn of 1942; has been in close touch with all Allied groups covering this area; and has had access to all pertinent material.

"The undersigned was employed by the Army because of his broad and intimate background of expedience and study and because he had established a certain scholarly reputation for objective approach to and consideration of research problems. The Army record of the undersigned demonstrates that in war service this objectivity and balance have been maintained.

"The undersigned was sent on a mission to General Mihailovich in August 1944, and left Mihailovich territory on November 1,

1944. During this interval of almost constant travel in western Serbia and eastern Bosnia, the undersigned, the United States officers attached to him, and the rescued United States airmen who were encountered were all given complete liberty of movement and of access to the population. Unlike the situation which prevailed where United States officers were attached to Yugoslav Partisan headquarters, the United States personnel in Mihailovich territory on the one hand were permitted to be present at important staff conferences, on the other hand could pick their route, their night's lodging, and their associates, unaccompanied by Mihailovich officers or men.

"Finally, it should be emphasized that the undersigned has been a lifelong liberal, at times labeled as a 'pink' or Communist.

"In 1942, before Tito received general recognition, he advocated military aid to the Partisans on the same basis as to the Nationalists. After the mission to Mihailovich he volunteered to return to Yugoslavia for further investigation in the company of Partisans and Allied officers who supported the Partisans. This offer was refused.

"2. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

"(a) The undersigned has seen and heard of absolutely no evidence serving to connect General Mihailovich personally, or officers under his direct command, with any form of collaboration with the Germans. This evidence includes not only personal observation but the totality of the documents seen and conversations held with United States, Allied, and even enemy personnel. This includes very highly placed and responsible British officials.

"On the other hand, a very substantial body of evidence supports the conclusion, to which the undersigned completely subscribes, that General Mihailovich, a known bitter anti-Nazi before the war, devoted himself wholeheartedly to the task of driving the Germans and their satellites out of Yugoslavia. That he accomplished relatively little toward this end was due to circumstances beyond his control, particularly the civil war fostered by the Yugoslav Communist Party.

"(b) The evidence on which General Mihailovich is accused in part is false, in part is a distortion of truth. His accusers, whatever the mouthpieces they find, are the few Yugoslav Communists who, by deception, have prostituted and destroyed the popular resistance movement which they led and who, during the war, were repeatedly proved guilty of gross falsehood and misrepresentation.

"The real crime for which General Mihailovich is accused is that in the minds of 80 percent of the Yugoslav population he became, and remains, the symbol of the simple, sturdy Yugoslav peasant resistance to tyranny, whether foreign or domestic.

"(c) The nature of the movement led by General Mihailovich is widely misunderstood outside the country. As the general repeatedly emphasized to the undersigned, the Nationalist movement of resistance against the Axis invasion came into being spontaneously all over the country. As in the American Revolution, the primary loyalty of the followers in each district was to the local leader, of whom there were, and are, thousands. The role of General Mihailovich was to attempt to coordinate all activities, and the general was sincerely embarrassed by the propaganda outside the country which misrepresented his position. This form of organization gives strength to a movement—since its roots are so widespread—but is also a source of weakness in that coordination and discipline suffer. General Mihailovich was in full control of only his own small force and of the forces of a few other leaders. He was in partial control of numerous bands, whose leaders accepted the broad strategy laid down by the general, but had no control whatsoever of other bands of Chetniks.

"(d) The term 'Chetnik' is equivalent to guerrilla. There were Chetniks serving Mihailovich, but Chetnik bands also were raised by the Serb puppet government, by the Germans and by the Italians, and some bands accepted no higher sponsorship.

"(e) In addition to the Axis-sponsored bands, various resistance leaders, including both Communists and Nationalists, at various times made accommodations with the Axis authorities. As stated above, neither Mihailovich or those directly under his command can be accused of such accommodations. But certain leaders, Communist as well as Nationalist, made truces or agreements not to operate in certain areas, or exchanged supplies for munitions, etc. German authorities constantly worked to bring about an increasing measure of collaboration. The Yugoslav Communist leaders today ignore their own record of accommodation and occasional outright collaboration with the Axis, and impute to Mihailovich actions with which he was not concerned.

"(f) The relative contributions to the Allied cause made by the Nationalists and Mihailovich on the one hand and by the Partisans and their Communist leaders on the other, is a moot point. The evidence on both sides possessed by the undersigned may be summarized as follows:

"(1) Throughout the period of Axis occupation of the Balkans, on the average, Axis troops were concentrated as heavily in Nationalist territory as in Partisan territory.

"(2) Axis reprisals against Nationalists, and particularly against men known to be loyal to Mihailovich, on the average were heavier than were those directed against Communists. There is ample evidence that over-all the Germans were more fearful of and displayed greater venom against Mihailovich than Tito; Mihailovich Serbs suffered greater reprisals than did Czechs or western European resistance groups.

"(3) Mihailovich was particularly active against the Axis during 1941 and 1942, when he made a very real confirmed contribution to the Anglo-American campaigns in Africa through harassing of German lines of communication. During 1943 and the first half of 1944 the strength of German reprisals led him to adopt a more cautious policy, similar to that ordered by the Allies for other resistance groups in Europe. At the same time the Nationalists suffered constant attacks on the part of the Communist-led bands.

"(4) When the undersigned reached Mihailovich headquarters in August 1944 a general Nationalist mobilization had already been ordered. The undesigned was shown the plans and orders issued for an all-out attack on Axis forces and, along with the other United States officers, personally witnessed the troop dispositions made for this offensive. The evidence was unmistakeable that General Mihailovich had disposed his forces properly for a major effort against the German garrisons, depots, and lines of communication, but in doing this had been obliged to leave his rear and left flank exposed to attack on the part of major Partisan concentrations which only recently had been attacking the Nationalists.

"Insofar as the small group of American officers were able to cover the front and make observations, during September the Nationalist forces engaged German and Bulgarian forces to the extent of their capability in equipment. Axis movements were thoroughly disrupted and considerable quantities of munitions and prisoners were taken.

"At this moment the Communist-led forces of Marshal Tito attacked the Mihailovich forces on a broad front. This attack was personally witnessed by the undersigned and his staff. In attacking the Mihailovich forces, the forces of Tito passed through the German line of garrisons on the Zap Norava River and ignored the Germans in favor of this attack against men already engaged against the Germans. Thereafter the principal effort of Tito's forces in western Serbia was directed not against the Germans but toward the capture of General Mihailovich and the American mission. These series of attacks forced General Mihailovich to retreat into Bosnia.

"(5) There is good evidence, including the observations of a United States officer attached to the undersigned, that the forces of General Mihailovich, during October, were reorganized in Serbia and during that month, as well as subsequently, made a very substantial contribution to the defeat of German forces, including joint operations with the Soviet forces, until Communist intrigue and attacks led to their dispersal.

"(6) The communiques issued by the Communist-led Yugoslav forces consistently presented a false picture of military operations. In Cairo during the first half of 1944, the undersigned was directly concerned with an Allied committee to evaluate the state of Axis lines of communication in the Balkans. This group had at its disposal all sources of information. The Communist communiqués of their operations against German communications proved themselves so consistently untrustworthy that their evidence was finally deemed worthless.

"As a result of the above experience the undersigned maintained a group of personnel to evaluate these Communist communiqués on the basis of their own evidence. This long range study revealed that Communist claims of territory liberated in Yugoslavia and of defeats of Axis forces were consistently contradicted by subsequent communiqués. It was evident that they were put out as propaganda, and they put in serious doubt all Yugoslav Communist claims of contribution to the Allied cause.

"Prior to the departure of the undersigned behind the lines in Yugoslavia, he was shown the official maps of the Yugoslav Communist headquarters, showing the respective territory held by Mihailovich and Tito. The area into which the undersigned planned to drop to make contact with Mihailovich was shown as part of a larger area of western Serbia allegedly liberated and held by Tito's forces. The United States Air Rescue Mission and the undersigned with his group landed in this area and traveled all over western and much of central Serbia. Outside of the German held towns the whole countryside was held by the forces and administration of Mihailovich. There was no evidence that Communist control had ever been established in this area.

"Subsequently, when the undersigned retreated into northeast Bosnia with Mihailovich he found all that area, outside the Axis held towns, held by Mihailovich forces. The population, as in west Serbia openly wore the royal insignia, and there were Nationalist hospitals and schools. Yet at the very time the undersigned was travelling around this area, he listened to American broadcasts quoting the Yugoslav Communist communiqués in statements describing their liberation of this area.

"Subsequently again, in the Bosna River Basin around Doboy, the undersigned spent some weeks traveling freely and meeting everywhere with a joint Nationalist administration set up by Serbs, Croats, and Moslems in opposition to the German puppet regimes. During this period the undersigned again heard the broadcasts of communiqués claiming Communist-led operations in this area.

"The undersigned is convinced by all the evidence that the rank and file of the movement led by Tito and the other Communist leaders sought to resist the Axis just as did

the Nationalists. However, the actual resistance offered to the Axis was strictly limited by the priority imposed by the Communist leaders to the civil war and the effort to destroy the influence of Mihailovich. Under the circumstances no group of Yugoslav resistants was able to make a substantial contribution during 1944 and 1945.

"3. GERMAN OFFICIALS AT THE HEADQUARTERS OF MIHAILOVICH

"Much has been made of reports of visits to the headquarters of General Mihailovich on the part of a certain Herr Starker, a German foreign office employee, in the fall of 1944. The following is the true account of this incident. German officials made a contact with the undersigned for the purpose of discussing the surrender of German forces. As is now well known there were many such German contacts during the last months of German resistance, and they had little significance due to the Nazi unwillingness to realize that the Allies were serious in their demands for unconditional surrender. The undersigned was instructed to listen to and transmit any German offer. General Mihailovich was most unwilling to have any contact with Germans but agreed to Starker's coming, on the insistence of the undersigned. The undersigned had two interviews with Starker. As the general was with the undersigned both prior to and after these interviews, there could have been no opportunity for the general to have had private meetings with Starker. During the period covered by these meetings the Yugoslav Communist efforts to capture Mihailovich were so constant and severe that it must have been evident to the Germans that the general was in no position to aid them or to accept aid from them. The undersigned is convinced that this incident is simply an example of the effort made today to destroy the reputation of General Mihailovich by the distortion of facts.

"ROBERT H. MCDOWELL,
"Colonel, GSC."

OPA as Viewed by Housewife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under order previously granted, I am inserting as part of my remarks a letter received from a housewife and constituent. Her letter deals with OPA and she has quite forcefully expressed her opinions as to this whole problem. I am sure it will be of interest to the Members:

———, WIS., *May 24, 1946.*

LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In answer to your appeal made over the radio to write to our Congressmen in regard to the OPA, I am taking time out to tell you, "Out with the OPA." If I had been on the fence about it up until now, I distinctly know that I am on the opposite side now. It is the finest education in making chiselers, sneaks, double crossers, grafters, and crooks that ever was set up. Just for instance, take the automobile racket; just today we found out how that is run. You are number four on the list and the fourth car is yours if you want it. That is, the fourth car that comes through—at ceiling prices. O. K. so far. There are countless fellows throughout the country that go to the dealers and say, "When you get such and such a car let me know at this address." Then they make arrangements to receive the car at another address where they hand over a substantial bonus in cash. The check for the OPA ceiling price is handed over and there you are. A perfectly worthy potential customer can just wait 'til the black-market customers are taken care of. And who on earth, including the OPA, can catch up with them? And as for stockings, they are being sold in countries where there is no ceiling on them. I wish I could send you stockings that I have to wear. I've had to take the legs of old pairs to make feet for other old pairs. As for dresses, and yard goods—where are they? What good are ceilings when there are no goods to buy at these ceilings? A while back I bought a 5-pound bundle of—presumably material. I wish you could have seen it.

If the postage wasn't so much I would send it to you to display in Washington. I paid $1.69 for it—ceiling—I suppose. There wasn't enough material in it to make an apron out of. I made one apron—a small one—of three kinds of material. They were all odd lengths from 4 to 10 inches. They either had seams sewed through, the patterns were mismatched or practice sewing. It was the worst swindle I ever saw. Just why isn't there any yard goods? I suppose the OPA wasn't to blame for that. If the OPA was an organization to be of some help, we wouldn't gripe. But they are so generally in disrepute that everybody bucks them at every turn. We have spent two perfectly good working days in May trying to find some short-sleeve long-legged underwear to fit my husband. There just isn't any and a man can't work without clothes. What good is a pair of overalls at $1.79 for instance, when there just isn't any to buy? What we need is clothes not price ceilings on them. As for keeping controls on items until there is a surplus, they just won't make or sell them and there will never be a surplus. One day pretty soon the farmers are all going to rise up, and put on a strike to end all strikes and controls. They are just seething underneath. What we need is not more controls, but freedom of enterprise. When a man gets grabbed by the throat he gets desperate, and the harder he is being chcked the harder he will fight to preserve himself.

If this Government would spend half the time trying to iron out its own difficulties, instead of trying to wash the whole world's dirty linens maybe we'd get somewhere. We sure must have a lot of prestige in other countries, when we come there to run their affairs, and our own are in such a mess at home. As far as feeding the world, some of it has always been more or less hungry, and has lived in it's own mire, so why should we try to change it. We'll just get stabbed in the back for our trouble.

Now Russia wants a loan. What has she done so great for us. She has bucked everything at every turn, that has been said or done by United Nations or UNRRA. When the English loan and any other loan comes up, sell bonds like Victory bonds. I'll bet there won't be any bought by anyone except the CIO, and they'd ought to get a belly full of their own fool systems. They've caused more trouble in this country. When the General Motors union struck, they acted as if they were the only ones who needed a pay boost. And now that the ball is rolling, they'd ought to be caused to have to have to lay off a whole year, till they have enough.

The farmer has to go on and on at 1914 parity. Let them work for 1914 wages and see what they say. About Truman's raise in wages, if they wouldn't harbor so much poppycock in Washington to pay for out of income taxes his wages would go further, but they seem to find more young ones to support all the time.

Sincerely,

MRS. HERBERT F. LIPKE.

P. S.—About this food shortage: If those at the head of it would put half as much work and worry into getting production as they do in trying to ease the shortages, it would be far better. The farmers are working with the worst machinery they have ever had. When something breaks, why, it's busted for a long time. Then the farmer must wait for a week to a year for repairs. I know. We waited a whole year for corn-picker parts. Have waited since last year's corn planting for a part for the seed box. After running all over the country and waiting till everyone else was through, we finally borrowed the part, and so it goes. Last fall on account of daylight-saving time, lack of machinery, help, and repairs, the awful rains and wet, the corn had to stay in the fields. Now they howl. They want to be hungry. A magazine that carried that awful piece about the farmers ought to have every last copy rammed down its own throat with a tampon. We've been the worst abused group of people in America, but when people get hungry they suddenly expect miracles. The weather has been against us all spring, to say nothing of all the other monkey wrenches that are in the works. Price control doesn't help production. Better listen to Fulton Lewis, Jr., and hear what was put on by the OPA personnel, Carolyn Ware, over the radio. I don't know of anyone around here who favors the OPA and still she went on record as representing parent-teacher organizations, League of Women Voters, Catholic teacher's societies, etc. All politics and more politics, but nothing constructive. We'll just have to oust the Democrats if we want to get anywhere.

Sincerely,

MRS. HERBERT LIPKE.

What Is a Judge?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Washington News of June 12, 1946.

Rarely has a statement ever been made which so correctly portrays the qualifications of those who must judge the laws and actions of others than in the short extemporaneous statement of Newton D. Baker, one of the greatest legal minds of his day. Let the present generation read and reflect by its action the high standard set forth in these few lines and act accordingly. Our day and time needs men and women who will render impartial justice without taint.

WHAT IS A JUDGE?

"Well, what is a judge? Who is fit to be a judge?

"A man of learning who spends tirelessly the weary hours after midnight acquainting himself with the great body of traditions and the learning of the law—

"A man who bears himself in his community with friends but without familiars; almost lonely, devoting himself exclusively to the most exacting mistress that man ever had, the law as a profession in its highest reaches, where he not only interprets the law but applies it, fearing neither friend nor foe, fearing only one thing in the world—that in a moment of abstraction, or due to human

weakness, he may in fact commit some error and fail to do justice. That is the judge."

That was said extemporaneously by Newton D. Baker, one of the greatest lawyers of our time, in a contempt-of-court argument in which a judge had been offended and had brought to bear the power of his position to punish his critics.

That judge was a minor one. He was a chicken-dinner, baby-kissing, back-slapping judge, one who attended all the picnics he could get around to, in his zeal for perpetuity in office. He lost his case.

Nevertheless, as things are now trending in the legal stratosphere, we think each member of our highest Court could do worse than to read what Mr. Baker said, and ponder. For, after all, a real judge must take the veil. He must be like Caesar's wife. He must bring to bear in his work that cold neutrality of which Edmund Burke spoke in his famous discussion of the duties of a judge. He must be at least almost lonely. He can't attend all, if any, of the cocktail parties, and still maintain the concept of "what is a judge?"

The Jackson-Black affair is merely part of a story which began when a President sought to show that the end justifies the means; that we shouldn't worry too much about the constitutionality of an issue.

That President failed with his court-packing law. But age and time and death and retirement made the packing process possible in a fairly short time after the law was turned down in Congress. He got the infusion of new blood he yearned for, the hurry-hurry effect he desired. He succeeded for a time in turning the judiciary from an agency of law to a sprocket in his New Deal political machine.

And now he is gone. So we see what we see. Every man for himself in the Supreme Court. And a couple of the disciples in muddy robes wrestling it out in the public square.

What has happened has not so much to do with the capabilities or the lack thereof of the individuals appointed. Rather, it is the inevitable result of a Chief Executive trying to twist the courts to fit his transitory dream of political reform. He sowed his packing plan. We reap a brawl.

Entry of Jews Into Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the statement of British Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin in rejecting the entry of 100,000 Jews into Palestine that the agitation in the United States and particularly in New York for 100,000 Jews to be put in Palestine was because they do not want too many of them in New York is an insult not only to all Jews but to every American who believes in justice and fair play for those distressed people.

This morning, and over my opposition, the Banking and Currency Committee voted to make a so-called loan of $3,750,000,000 to Great Britain, which in reality is a gift. A good share of that money will come from taxes paid into the United States Treasury by American Jews. If that loan should pass the House, I wonder if Mr. Bevin would be as much opposed to taking their money as he is opposed to granting them their rights promised under the Balfour Declaration.

The New Deal President and the New Deal Supreme Court Are the Captives of Big Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of June 12, 1946:

THE PROOF

Mr. Truman's veto of the Case bill and the explosion in the Supreme Court have given the Republicans all the proof they can ever need of the degradation of government under the New Deal.

Mr. Truman, like all the other New Dealers, belongs body and soul to Big Labor. The reasons are obvious. Mr. Truman's party is comprised of three elements. He isn't afraid of the solid South because he is confident it will vote for him in 1948 against any opponent. He isn't afraid of the Hagues and Kellys because he knows they will have to support him to carry their State and local tickets, and besides, he can always handle them with a share of the spoils. But Big Labor doesn't have to indorse him unless it wants to. He can't win without this element and therefore he and his party are its slaves.

Both the Supreme Court incident and the veto prove the point, if proof were needed. The New Deal zealots on the Court decided the miners' case as Big Labor wished it to be decided. That is the significance of the damning passage from Professor Dodd's comment in the Harvard Law Review, from which Mr. Jackson quoted with such telling effect. To reach their politically inspired conclusion, the majority had to desert their own legal dogmas and their own often asserted interpretation of collective bargaining.

Mr. Truman's veto of the Case bill bears the same humiliating stamp. His message was skillfully written, but it couldn't conceal his own abject fear of big labor. The bill, he says, would not achieve the purpose set forth in its preamble, the promotion of labor peace. If he had been consistent he would, at the same time, have demanded the repeal of the Wagner Act on the same ground, for everybody knows that its promise to avert strikes has not been realized, though it is stated in the law. The biggest and most prolonged strikes we have had in recent years have occurred in precisely the industries which were unionized as a result of the Wagner Act. This doesn't prove that all of the Wagner Act is bad, but it does suggest that it is in need of amendment. That is what the Case bill was intended to accomplish, but Mr. Truman wouldn't give it a chance because Big Labor wouldn't let him.

Mr. Truman can find a great deal to say in opposition to the Case bill's provisions for delaying strikes while mediation is undertaken. We can agree with much that he says on this point and have said many of the same things ourselves, but he is in no position to take this position now because his own formula for avoiding walk-outs was substantially the one he now condemns. It was Mr. Truman who talked of cooling-off periods and fact finding. Now he condemns such measures because Big Labor doesn't want the Case bill and he has to find plausible excuses for vetoing it.

The veto message complains that such delays are an infringement of labor's right to strike. It is odd that he didn't think of that when he was the advocate of cooling off. It is even odder that he is now the champion of the absolute right of workmen to join in walking off the job, but only a few weeks ago was demanding of Congress a law to impress strikers into the Army so that they could be forced to work under penalty of military law and the firing squad.

Mr. Truman tries to explain this away by saying his slave law was to be only temporary, as if there were any power in our Government to enslave men at any time. If Mr. Truman were really concerned for the constitutional rights of workmen he could accept the cooling-off period with far greater ease than he could accept his own recommendation for drafting employees.

A great deal is made in the veto message also of the theory that the workman may be enslaved if the Government has taken over the mine or factory, but not if the property is still in private hands. That doctrine is vicious nonsense. The essential wrong is identical. The hocus-pocus of taking over strike-bound property doesn't make a particle of difference so far as the Constitution is concerned or so far the employees are concerned.

The New Deal President and the New Deal Supreme Court are the captives of Big Labor. If the Republicans do not make the most of these revelations they will miss their opportunity and their duty in the congressional elections this year and in the Presidential election in 1948.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Illinois State Register of May 20, 1946:

LIGHTER VEIN

(By V. Y. Dallman, admiral)

LOG OF FLAGSHIP SMILES

Silent, smiling lips of "Big Jim" Farley give politicians of New York case of jitters

With the people for him and the politicians against him, smiling "Big Jim" Farley is the paradox of New York politics today.

But don't think that Jim is worrying about it. He has his own private affairs all bottled up like Coca-Cola. He is economically free, politically independent, socially a lion, and temperamentally the greatest optimist east of the Alleghenies.

It was a joy to watch Jim Farley perform at a number of functions in New York during the various sessions of editors and publishers. Tall, broad-shouldered, and wearing a most illuminating smile at the annual Associated Press luncheon, he was like a Pied Piper with admirers following frantically after him, eager to shake his hand, say "Hello, Jim," and have him fire back their first names from a memory that is the marvel of the age.

When Jim reached the outer lobby, he was tackled like a football player trying to run the length of the field, but never failing to make a touchdown in the hearts of all who sought to feel the charm of his smile and the vise-like grip of his warm, broad hand.

Big Jim was the center of a similar drama at the Banshees' luncheon sponsored by the ANPA and whenever he appeared among the editors and publishers in the lobby of the Waldorf.

Republicans as well as Democrats would shake Jim's hand and one after another say, as they turned away: "There's a great guy and what a real Governor or President he would make."

Those allusions to politics justify a few words of explanation why Jim Farley is, as I say, a paradox—popular with those who do the voting but not with the politicians who do the handpicking of candidates.

I had a chat with Jim, but for publication he had nothing to say except that he had "nothing to say, but if anything develops, Vince, I'll let you know."

Jim is in a very strange situation politically. Though he was the master organizer who corraled the delegates for Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932 and, next to Roosevelt himself, was the strongest factor in winning the nomination for Franklin D., the remnant of the old Roosevelt organization in New York State has nothing in common politically with Jim Farley today.

I think I know something about the alleged breach of faith which caused the break between former Postmaster General Jim Farley and the late President Roosevelt, but that rests in confidence.

Today Jim Farley is not being consulted by the Democratic leaders of the Empire State as to his possible candidacy for Governor. They form the remnant of the old Roosevelt organization and are for United States Senator JIM MEAD for Governor, while a lot of the rank and file are clamoring for Farley as his party's opponent to Gov. Tom Dewey.

There's a Presidential bee in every political bonnet in New York. Governor Dewey is assured of renomination in August by his party and regardless of what the Chicago Tribune and the isolationist anti-Dewey forces in the Midwest are plotting. Tom Dewey, if reelected Governor, is going to let those who oppose him for Presidential nomination know that they've been to the races. Dewey is talking State government while his machine is plotting national politics.

Whether JIM MEAD can defeat Dewey for Governor in November is a political Chinese puzzle. Ed Flynn, State Democratic chairman, and successor to Jim Farley as national chairman, is for MEAD, who was classified by Farley in 1944 as a "stuffed shirt" or words to that effect. Jim refuses to confirm what he said about MEAD in the past, but he certainly doesn't toss any rose petals in his path now or indicate a willingness to support him for Governor.

So it looks like MEAD against Dewey for Governor with support of the Roosevelt forces, minus Farley, but with Jim worrying them more by silence than if he turned loose a broadside.

Like the atomic bomb test in the Pacific, there is likely to be a political explosion in New York any time with Jim Farley touching the button. I know that Farley smile. It speaks much louder than words. If there's a smile in America today that has atomic force, it's the one that's playing around the Farley lips in New York that never touched liquor or tobacco but which are the outlet for a mental control station which still has the power to make governors and Presidents.

Lay a Wreath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Commander Isadore Chernin, Binghamton, N. Y., Post, No. 80, the American Legion:

LAY A WREATH

Lay a wreath for those of Antietam,
Of Bull Run, and of Manila;

Lay a wreath for those of Belleau Wood,
The Hindenburg line, and Chateau Thierry,

And lay a wreath for the aviators
Who crashed in flames.

Lay a wreath for those of Pearl Harbor,
Bataan, and Corregidor,
Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Saipan, and Okinawa,

And let us lay a wreath for them
Who died in Africa, Sicily, and Italy.

Lay a wreath for those who gave their lives
On the bearch heads of Normandy,

And for those who died in France,
Belgium, and Germany.

Lay a wreath also for the sailors
Whose eternal rest is an ocean of unknown
place and depth,

And let us lay a wreath for the others
Who bled and died, in many unnamed places.

They, too, died that we may, forever,
Live at peace with the world.

For all of them today,
We lay wreaths.

A Connecticut Housewife Asks: "Where Are the Lobbyists for America?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter from Mrs. Betty Knowles Hunt of 2149 Elm Street, Stratford, Conn., to the editors of Life, which appeared in the June 3, 1946, issue of that magazine. Mrs. Hunt, a housewife and a mother, voices the demands which, made in increasing number throughout the United States in recent weeks, built up the pressure that led the congressional crackdown on strikes.

A CONNECTICUT HOUSEWIFE ASKS: "WHERE ARE THE LOBBYISTS FOR AMERICA"

To the EDITORS OF LIFE:

As an ordinary citizen, represented by no pressure groups in or out of Washington, may I raise my voice in protest at the way our present administration is playing politics with American disaster.

We the people are frantic, disgusted, and helpless—yet what can we do? An honest, factual letter of protest to our Congressmen, representing hours of thought, is rated one "nay"—if it is read at all. It has no more value than any of the tons of "Yea" signatures high-pressured and financed by union leaders or administration propagandists.

Where are the lobbyists for America, for justice and for truth? The great overwhelming majority of thinking American people are doing what they can, desperately and ineffectually, as individuals. Why cannot your publication urge its every reader, regardless of politics or partisanship, to demand that our administration act at once to stop these strikes that are paralyzing our country and killing our prestige abroad? Have you no such right? Why are our church leaders silent and evasive when our Nation is in danger? Have they no duties to fight for what is right on earth?

Thirteen years ago, the New Deal swept into power on the premise of abolishing special privilege, but in 13 years it has succeeded only in transferring that special privilege from Wall Street trusts to organized labor. The present extreme is worse than its predecessor. Our whole economic system lies helpless in the hands of one man, John L. Lewis. But he is not to blame. He is only using the power our Government has blindly granted him.

Is democracy destined always to place the public welfare in the hands of pressure groups and politicians? If it is, then we might as well concede the world victory to totalitarianism right now.

Who will save democracy for America and the world? True—that is a job for the whole people, but they are helplessly confused, bullied by unions, and propagandized by politicians. Eventually they will come to its rescue, eventually they will distinguish between the lie and the truth, but eventually—may be too late.

Every citizen in this country should have a letter or a telegram in Washington right now demanding that our Government act immediately to stop the strikes. Is that antilabor? Ask Mr. Reuther's auto workers, ask the Ford employees, ask the steel workers what they think of John L. Lewis' strike. Is it helping them? Will it help them to have it settled in Mr. Lewis' favor, with all the subsequent boosts in coal prices, freight rates, steel prices, auto prices? Is anybody winning anything from all this industrial warfare? Production is at a standstill, inflation is rampant, democracy is a joke, and a dying world lies begging and helpless across the seas.

It cannot be true. I have three little children for whom it must not be true. I should be scrubbing the kitchen, mending the stockings, weeding the flower beds, and planning the dinner. Much of my time and energy has been spent in trying to teach my three little minorities that their private interests will often conflict, but that they must learn to sacrifice in the larger interest of our family as a whole. For what am I preparing them? Is it of any value to teach them democracy at home, while our Government in Washington fails to teach its minorities to sacrifice and work together for the common American good?

No. That is why I raise my single, powerless voice. That is why my household duties wait, while I lobby from my hearthside for my children, for my country, and for a better world. Perhaps it will encourage one other voice to cry out, and that voice encourage another, until the great unheard voice of America's unorganized majority drowns out all propaganda and all greed, demands to be heard and obeyed, and proves once and for all time that democracy is alive and strong and ready to lead the way.

BETTY KNOWLES HUNT.

Foundations of Christian Civilization Are at Stake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, more and more of our people are becoming aware of the dangers of communism

over the world, including its threat to America. No other force has done so much in combatting the spread of this anti-God campaign than has the Catholic Church, but to effectively guard our church, home, and democratic form of government from the spread of this ideology we must all—of all churches—be positive in our action against the forces of Red-fascism in America.

The forces of godlessness in America are not silent. It is the eleventh hour for the American people to act and drive them from places of power. The minority groups used as fronts by the communistic elements must be defeated by the ballot.

Following is an article from the May 27 issue of Newsweek:

PIUS XII AND POLITICS

In a Europe which had once been wholly Catholic, but which now seeks sheer existence rather than an ideology, the Vatican with the war's end faced one of the gravest problems of its history. With increasing alarm, Pope Pius XII felt that the encroaching power of the Soviet Union threatened to engulf starving millions who saw in communism the political answer to their needs. The time had come for action—to fight secular education with religious education, the state supreme with the Church of Christ, and, finally, politics with politics. Already the Vatican had begun to throw its strength into a political struggle such as the Roman Catholic Church has not known since its medieval days.

Increasingly in the past year, Pope Pius XII has indicated in his pronouncements that to preserve its moral and spiritual integrity, the church must enter the whole stream of man's existence. In combating the materialism and secularism of the communistic state, the Supreme Pontiff has repeatedly urged the world's 338,000,000 Catholics to think and act socially and politically according to their faith.

CHURCH OR STATE?

Since VE-day a year ago, the Pope has delivered more than 25 speeches whose major emphasis lies on this secular program of Catholicism. The culmination came last week when the Holy Father spoke on May 12 to some 40,000 Italian women in St. Peter's about the coming Italian elections June 2. In one of the most frankly political pleas of his 7-year pontificate, Pope Pius urged the newly enfranchised women to vote only for those candidates who give "sure guaranties that they will respect the rights of God and of religion." Obviously condemning a vote for the left, the Pontiff warned "this duty is sacred for you. * * * It is a question of guarding and conserving, for your people, their Christian civilization. * * * The hour is grave."

In leading the church into a new political life, the Holy Father has already drawn criticism on himself and the church. Vatican interference in matters of the state has been decried by America's Protestant and in liberal press as well as such Soviet papers as Izvestia—a constant gadfly after Papal addresses. The most recent attack came 2 days after the May 12 speech, when the Daily Worker, New York Communist organ, accused the Pope of "actively electioneering" in Italy.

In defense, the Holy Father could point to the position he took in a March address to Italian parish priests. Telling the priests to counsel their flocks on matters of politics, he said then: "Use of the right to vote is an act of grave moral responsibility. It is the concern of the church to explain to the faithful their moral duties which derive from this electoral right." However, he added that the church has no intention of "mixing itself in purely political questions in which it leaves to Catholics as such full liberty of opinion and action."

Moscow can interpret this dividing line as it chooses. But there is no doubt the ideological conflicts of Catholicism and communism, somewhat obscured by the complex military conflicts of the Second World War, are today a sharp relief. As Pope Pius said at the February consistories: "Now our silence cannot be counted upon when the faith or the foundations of Christian civilization are at stake."

As the fight has grown more bitter in the past year, the Vatican and the Kremlin have mutually accused each other at every opportunity of cut-throat tactics. The Holy Father announced in December the choice of 32 new cardinals from every continent, stressing the fact that the church must be supranational and no longer governed by an Italian majority. Izvestia immediately attacked the selections as a move to spread the Vatican's "reactionary" policies throughout the world and increase Vatican prestige in democratic countries.

The Moscow radio announced in March that the Ruthenian Church in the Ukraine had forsworn its 350-year allegiance to Rome and was returning to the Russian Orthodox Church and the Moscow see of Patriarch Alexei (Newsweek, April 1). Three months before, the Vatican radio had charged the Soviet Union with persecution of the Church in the Ukraine. In one of the longest encyclicals of his pontificate, the Holy Father on January 19 accused Patriarch Alexei of openly preaching desertion from the Church of Rome. The Moscow radio retaliated by branding the encyclical anti-Soviet and anti-democratic." The Vatican declared the Ruthenian break void.

The Ruthenian quarrel struck the final blow at any possibility of imminent rapprochement between the Vatican and the Kremlin. There could be no turning back for Rome.

NEW WORLD

At 70, Pope Pius XII welcomed the fight against a political system which he has always hated. Before becoming Supreme Pontiff, Eugenio Pacelli had ample opportunity to study it first hand during his 12-year stay in Germany as Papal Nuncio after the First World War. So strongly was his voice raised against communism even then when a group of Red soldiers tried to assassinate him in Munich in 1918. His present tolerance of the Franco Government stems from the fact that Spain now gives religious freedom to the church, the Pope's primary concern. Catholic circles feel that the removal of Franco at this time would mean Spanish chaos—and chaos breeds communism.

With an uncertain future in Europe the Vicar of Christ is turning more and more to the New World as the hope of the postwar church. But the aid he expects from this country is more than material and financial. In a specialized way, the United States is a land where the Catholic Church has thrived under democratic principles. The church would like to see more nations in which Catholicism is given such latitude.

Meanwhile, the Holy Father sees the struggle for Catholicism as the main force in the lives of its faithful carried throughout the world by his cardinals and clergy. Prelates like Francis Cardinal Spellman of New York and Bernard Cardinal Griffin of England echo the cry for political action. Only last week in Chicago, Cardinal Griffin—on a visit to this country—said that "In England the church permits its members to vote in any party excepting the Communist."

Pope Pius' plea to the women of Italy was, in actuality, a plea to all Catholics everywhere for a church militant: "Be conscious of your responsibility. Go ahead with your example. Go and illuminate the ignorant consciences, the uncertain, the hesitant one. Go home by home, family by family, street by street, country by country."

Mr. Speaker, an example of what is taking place in America is emphasized by the Vatican's sharp criticism of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of June 11, 1946]

VATICAN FLAYS POST-DISPATCH FOR ATTACK ON POPE'S ADDRESS

VATICAN CITY, June 10.—The Vatican newspaper, Osservatore Romano, tonight in a front-page editorial criticized the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for tackling problems "which it does not understand or knows only through Moscow broadcasts."

The newspaper took issue with a Post-Dispatch editorial which criticized Pope Pius' June 1 speech, charging that he was inviting French and Italian voters to vote against communism.

The newspaper said the Post-Dispatch accused the church of mingling in European politics.

"The Post-Dispatch would do well to keep itself outside of that which it does not understand, or knows only through Moscow radio broadcasts and a partial press."

Quoting a long passage of the Pope's address in which he said the voters must choose between Christianity or a materialistic atheistic state, the Osservatore said: "Are these temporal matters? Is this a religious question and one of Christian civilization?"

The Vatican newspaper asked whether the church should not advise its members "of what threatens them when they are confronted by a materialistic form of government which makes itself the arbiter of the social life of those individuals which the church considers the free children of God."

"Should the church remain silent and not warn its sons on the eve of decisive hour only because the decisions are being reached through a political act?" the newspaper asked.

Noting that labor organizations did plenty of talking on election eve "without any newspaper anywhere in the world, much less in the United States, having anything to say about it," the newspaper defended the papal address.

Universal Military Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address by Maj. Gen. Ray A. Porter, United States Army, given before the national security committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. General Porter talked on universal military training.

Gentlemen, I have appeared so frequently before groups of Veterans of Foreign Wars, and I will say it is always a pleasure to me to do so, but I feel my remarks today may be considerable of a repetition for many of you.

I trust that the importance of my subject will enable you to hear without being bored much that many of you have already heard me say on previous occasions.

Let me say that success in war depends on many factors including the resources, the industrial capacity, and the character, morale, and physical stamina of the people on many factors including the resources, unmatched industrial capacity, and the

sterling qualities of a people constitute only an attractive prize for gangsters bent on aggression unless the nation possessing those God-given advantages is willing to support a sound program for military security.

In considering a sound military program it is important to bear in mind:

1. That such a program cannot be planned and maintained without accurate knowledge of the military capabilities of all potential enemies, and

2. That wars are fought with weapons and equipment operated by men.

This Nation must maintain an effective world-wide intelligence service if we are not to be surprised by sneak attacks and newly developed weapons. We must support the most efficient and least restricted program of scientific research if we are to hope that our weapons and other accouterments of war are to be the best. We must have available large forces of men properly organized and adequately trained to handle our machines of war.

That last requirement—the requirement for men—is the one which all of us would like most to be able to avoid. Wars are such distressing tragedies for all whose lives they touch that our naturally kind-hearted people are forever cultivating the alluring hallucination that if we must have wars we may at least be able to win them with machines and without the mass participation of our people.

In the first place, the objectives of war are achieved through the destruction of people and of the man-made institutions in which people are massed and destroyed incidentally. In the second place, machines must be transported and disposed by men, protected by men, operated by men, and supplied by men.

All of the history of war, every prediction of science indicate conclusively that as the machines of war become more numerous, more complicated, and more terrible an ever greater and greater number of men must engage in war and that training for war becomes more important, more difficult, and more time consuming.

Hard put for any argument with which to support their position, the opponents of preparedness have declared as an excuse for doing nothing that those responsible for military planning do not know at this time what the exact nature of combat will be in a future war. I readily admit that, of course, we do not. The adoption of definite assumptions as to the nature of warfare at a future period more distant than warranted by the limited capabilities of human prevision has invariably stifled progress.

There is no finer example of that mistake than the conception which grew up in France and in England to some extent after World War I, to the effect that there could never again be a war of movement.

Some of the leading thinkers stated you could only win through defensive methods.

In 1939 and 1940 they had to pay for their attempt to judge too far ahead what the nature of war would be.

In view of the aroused interest in scientific research and development, it is especially undesirable at this time to adopt positive assumptions as to the changes that may take place in the nature of warfare during even the next 10 or 15 years.

To do so would tend to create a mental attitude not conducive to full, free, and open-minded research and development. However, the demands of national security are current and constant.

Any war commencing within the next few years would of necessity initially be fought primarily with weapons and equipment now on hand or in production. That conclusion may be accepted as a starting line for future plans.

Immediate plans for organization and training must be based on the weapons and equipment now on hand or in production at home and abroad. The soundness and adequacy of all plans must be maintained through a process of continuous evolution. Military planners must be sufficiently alert to analyze the developments of military and scientific research and to evaluate correctly their effects on organization and training in time to accomplish necessary modifications in plans before the innovations are in production in sufficient quantities to materially influence the nature of warfare.

The determiation of proper organization and the conduct of appropriate training are responsibilities that may be properly charged exclusively to the military leaders.

A sound appreciation of the degree of readiness in which our armed forces should be maintained is a responsibility that must be shared by all of our people if the necessary means are to be made available to our military leaders.

All of you know how improbable it is that we shall ever again be permitted the time deliberately to prepare for war after the outbreak of hostilities. Twice already that mistake has ultimately cost international gangsters the decision in their bid for world dominion. Any aggressor of the future will be keenly alert to the advantages of an initial attack against an unprepared nation possessing the only reserve resources in the world sufficient to support a long sustained war. The knowledge now available to all nations has provided practicable solutions for reducing the efficacy of distance, weather, and geographical features as military obstacles.

The progress achieved in the fields of long range bombers, guided missiles, and airborne and amphibious operations has already created the capability of launching sudden and devastating attacks against our communications, our industries, and our homes. Nor do we dare to hope that our position will not become progressively more vulnerable. If we ever again revert to our traditional state of unpreparedness, any new agressor will possess both the impelling incentive and the appropriate means to attack our own homeland with such sudden fury that we would be unable to mobilize our industries or to improvise an army from the untrained youth of the Nation.

The fearfully destructive power of the most modern missiles, the economic capability to produce them by even the small nations, and the practicability of employing them against targets hundreds of miles distant without the progressive advance of large masses of sea and land forces have made it possible for any country possessed of scientific resources and ruthless purposes to inflict devastating blows against the most powerful nations. Since such missiles can be discharged from small, well-concealed, and widely dispersed installations, it is probable that their effectiveness will continue practically unimpaired until ground forces have worked their way forward and seized or destroyed stock piles, productive capacity, and launching sites.

These developments have made it imperative for our citizens to understand that to insure any degree of national security worthy of the expenditure of public funds, we must maintain balanced forces which will in actuality constitute strength in being.

Such forces must be so organized, equipped, and trained that they are at all times immediately ready to anticipate aggression or to counter successfully a sneak attack and act without delay to wrest from the aggressor that initiative of action so decisive at the outbreak of hostilities.

The ever-multiplying complexities of the world's economy increase the probability that any war of the future will eventually extend to global proportions. To insure the readiness of reinforcements as required by a developing world war and of replacements for the heavy casualties to be expected in modern conflict, it will be necessary to maintain a large reserve over and above the forces constituting strength in being. Such a reserve may be maintained in varying degrees of organization and training so long as there is assurance that its organizations and individuals would become progressvely available as required.

How, without prohibitive cost, can we provide the large forces of highly trained men necessary to constitute strength in being and a reserve adequate to insure timely replacements and reinforcements?

A Regular Army, Navy, and Air Force of sufficient strength to safeguard this Nation through the 12 months or more that would be required to produce the first reinforcements would bankrupt the Nation.

The personnel possessing the intelligence, aptitudes, skills, and education essential to a modern army of such magnitude could not be raised without conscription. No; we have no alternative. We must continue to place our reliance in a citizen army and only such an army is consistent with the democratic principles on which this Nation is founded.

War Department Circular No. 119, dated April 24, 1946, prescribes the fundamental structure of the military establishment as follows:

1. The forces maintained to constitute strength in being will include:

(a) The Regular Army.

(b) The National Guard of the United States.

(c) Such units of the Organized Reserve Corps as are required to constitute a balanced force of adequate size and which it is not practicable to provide in the Regular Army or National Guard.

2. The Reserve will include such organizations and individuals of the Organized Reserve Corps as are not provided under the forces that constitute strength in being and as would be required to meet the demands of the first year of a major war. It will include:

(a) Units which in peace are organized and trained to the extent necessary to insure their orderly and rapid mobilization and the completion of their training by successive increments as required.

(b) Additional commissioned and enlisted personnel necessary for the initial expansion of the Regular Army and National Guard to war strength and to provide loss replacements for casualties during the early months of war.

If from choice, as well as through necessity, we elect to rely on a citizen army, we must make certain that our system does in actuality produce strength in being.

The most difficult factor in our problem is to provide adequate training for the personnel of the National Guard, Organized Reserve Corps, and Reserve Officers Training Corps. I find that very few who did not actually participate in combat during World War II can understand how much time and how many training aids and facilities are necessary to prepare a soldier for effective participation in modern combat.

When the infantry won battles with only the aid of salvo artillery fire; when the rifle and bayonet dominated the battlefield, and the men had mastered the marksmanship of their only shooting weapon as an incident in their pioneer life; when troops marched to combat in mass formations and maneuvered under fire by drill-book evolutions, vacant city lots, armory floors, and college campuses were adequate to provide a considerable degree of training for war. The basic military training that can be conducted under such conditions has almost no application to modern combat.

To provide a satisfactory proficiency in combat and a normal chance of survival in battle the training of the soldier requires many continuous weeks of hard and intensive work. There must be available large areas

of varied terrain—woods, plains, mountains, valleys, swamps, and difficult streams.

There must be firing ranges of scores of different types. There must be mock towns through which the soldier painstakingly learns to fight his way from house to house. There must be individual bunkers and pillboxes and then extensive fortified areas which he progressively learns to assault and overcome. The majority of the necesary training aids and facilities can only be provided on large military reservations. They could but rarely be made available at or near the home stations of the National Guard or Organized Reserve Corps or in the vicinity of college campuses.

Furthermore, success in modern battle without appalling losses depends largely on the skillful employment of well-trained teams consisting of infantry, artillery, tanks, tank destroyers, antiaircraft units, engineers, reconnaissance troops and air formations. Essential team training can only be attained where regiments are trained together and where the supporting arms and services are available to participate. Such conditions never exist for our civilian components, scattered as they are by companies in civil communities throughout the Nation.

Several consecutive hours of preparation, participation, and discussion are required to derive material benefit from the majority of training exercises. Our civilian component organizations will continue to be composed of patriotic citizens who must earn their daily bread outside the profession of arms, and who, consequently, can devote but a small fraction of their time to military training.

If it were possible to provide necessary training aids and facilities at the home stations of the National Guard and Organized Reserve Corps, they could not be effectively used due to the short duration of the weekly training periods and the fact that training must most frequently be conducted at night.

The short training periods would absolutely prohibit effective team training even though the necessary organizations, arms, and services could be assembled. The time available during summer camp periods is likewise wholly insufficient to provide anything approaching adequate individual and small-unit practical training.

Furthermore, it is important that the summer camp periods be devoted to division and higher unit training if the men are to have experience in extended field exercises and if the commanders and staffs are to have an opportunity to practice their duties.

An individual receives but the equivalent of approximately 48 days of required training during a 3-year enlistment in the National Guard. The effectiveness of that meager time is reduced manyfold by the fact that it must be scheduled through numerous short periods, each separated from the next by many days filled with other interests. I do not understand how anyone could expect the civilian components with the time available to them to conduct any considerable amount of the training which is so necessary to the preparation of the soldier for modern combat.

The training problems of the civilian components can only be solved by providing a pool of trained manpower from which their organizations can recruit their personnel. An effective program of universal military training is the only practicable and the only democratic system of creating and maintaining the pool of trained manpower so essential to insuring that our citizen army will be available as required in the event of a future emergency.

It will never be practicable during periods of peace for the National Guard to provide the complete training of its personnel to the extent that it would be able to participate successfully in modern combat immediately following mobilization. The reasons are, as has been shown, that the National Guard does not have the necessary training time or the necessary training facilities, nor does it have the opportunity for essential team training.

And at this point I would like to say that I do not see how we can hope that our National Guard and high-category units of the Reserve will not have to participate in combat either successfully or unsuccessfully immediately following the outbreak of hostilities in a future emergency.

It is a question of whether we will have them ready or not. It is not a question, I believe, of whether they will have to participate or will not have to.

However, if its enlisted men were all graduates of an adequate course of universal military training, the weekly armory drills and the summer training period would be sufficient to maintain high standards of individual and team combat efficiency and our National Guard could be at all times immediately ready for combat. The same would be true of those high-category units of the Organized Reserve Corps that will be assigned to the forces constituting strength in being.

Those units of the Organized Reserve not required immediately on the outbreak of hostilities would be maintained in varying degrees of organization and training. In event of war, all would be activated immediately at full strength. Since the organizations would be constituted exclusively of men trained under universal military training, the necessary reserve units could be made ready for combat progressively as required. The readiness of the Regular Army or National Guard would not be delayed through the necessity of withdrawing from those components trained personnel to act as cadres and instructors.

In spite of the time made available to us through the heroic sacrifices of our allies and the military mistakes of our enemies, we experienced greatest difficulty in providing replacement for our casualties after the first belated engagements of both World War I and World War II. Had we been forced to engage in decisive combat immediately following our entry into either war, our total lack of loss replacements might well have resulted in disastrous defeats. With universal military training, we would build up a pool of trained manpower from which we could draw replacements after the first few days of any future war.

The Reserve Officers Training Corps program in the colleges and universities has been deficient in large part for the same reasons that our National Guard training has been deficient—inadequate training time, facilities and terrain.

Basic training on the campus was unrealistic and in general inapplicable to modern combat. In the advanced course we have sought to train the young student to be a leader in an activity with which he was not sufficiently familiar and which he could not visualize. Universal military training will provide for the ROTC student the background of military knowledge and experience without which no man can become an entirely satisfactory officer.

On October 23 of last year, the President recommended to Congress the enactment of a definite and thoroughly sound program of universal military training. The salient features of the President's program are:

1. Every young man not totally disabled physically should be required to take one continuous year of training.

2. Trainees should be inducted for training only. They should not be members of the armed forces nor subject to any of the operational demands made on the armed forces.

3. The training should be conducted by the Army and Navy in military camps or naval installations.

4. The nature of the training should be military, for its goal would be to create a pool of well-trained citizen soldiers.

5. On graduation from the program, the young man should be assigned to a general reserve for a period of 6 years. While in the general reserve he should be subject to no compulsory training or service except in an emergency declared by Congress.

Many proponents of universal military training have recommended that certain options be provided under which the trainees could complete a portion of their training with one of the civilian components or in the ROTC. Such options would undoubtedly be of great assistance in the recruiting programs of the National Guard and organized reserve corps, and in filling ROTC quotas with selected men. However, that fact alone does not make an option acceptable. No number of men enrolled in organizations would constitute strength in being unless those men were adequately trained for the mission expected of their organization.

To be acceptable an option must provide for the transfer of a trainee to an organization or agency capable of maintaining the level of training proficiency at which he is received and of providing essential additional military instruction.

In general, only the National Guard, the Organized Reserve Corps, and the ROTC could meet those requirements.

In evaluating options it is necessary to consider:

1. The training objective that must be achieved in military camps before trainees are permitted to exercise options, and

2. The results that can be accomplished in military camps during periods of varying duration.

If universal military training is to accomplish its mission it is obvious that before being permitted to exercise an option the trainee must have completed all essential training that cannot be adequately and efficiently conducted by the organization or agency to which he would be transferred. I believe that every battle-experienced leader of the recent war will agree that perfection in regimental combat team training is essential to successful participation in modern combat.

As I have already shown, neither of the civilian components nor the ROTC can conduct any semblance of regimental combat team training at their home stations. There is not sufficient time during the summer-camp periods to more than barely initiate this training. Furthermore, all of the meager time available at the summer camps must be devoted to division and larger unit training since that training cannot be provided elsewhere. If universal military training is to make it possible for the National Guard, Organized Reserve Corps, and ROTC to accomplish their respective missions the program must provide for the completion of regimental combat team training in military camps before options are exercised.

Now let us consider what can be accomplished during training periods of varying duration.

I have tried to put down into the next few paragraphs the long-studied views of the War Department on the values of the different periods of training in the military camps.

A universal military training program providing 12 months of training under the Army at military camps would permit the Army to complete adequately all phases of military training, including large-unit training and extended-field exercises. The training under each phase would be sufficiently thorough to insure its retention by the trainees during the necessary period of time.

With their personnel recruited from the graduates of such a program, the National Guard and class A units of the Organized Reserve Corps could be maintained at all times at a standard of combat efficiency

comparable to that of the new divisions entering combat during the last 12 or 18 months of World War II. A longer period would be prohibitive in its cost and would constitute an unwarranted interference in the normal lives of the people of the Nation. It is the firm opinion of the War Department that 12 months in military camps is the desirable period for all trainees and that it is the essential time for trainees who would pass out into a General Reserve and who would receive no additional or refresher training prior to their possible induction to constitute new units of the Reserve.

Nine months of training at military camps would permit instruction to include the division level with limited field exercises. It would be necessary to somewhat reduce the training time allotted to each phase of training and consequently the trainees would not retain the subject matter as long as they would, should the instruction be more thorough.

A 9-month period would be satisfactory for trainees enlisting in the National Guard or class A units of the Organized Reserve Corps or enrolling in the ROTC. Other units of the Organized Reserve Corps constituted with graduates of a 9-month course could be made ready for combat within approximately 6 months after mobilization. The War Department considers that 9 months training under the Army in military camps with certain sound optional provisions for continuation of training with the National Guard, Organized Reserve Corps, or ROTC would possess high value.

A 6-month training period at military camps would necessitate the elimination of all phases of training above the regimental combat team level. This is the shortest time in which regimental combat team training could be adequately covered. All phases of training would of necessity be somewhat more curtailed than the War Department would desire. Six months of training at military camps is the absolute minimum for personnel enlisting in the National Guard or class A units of the Organized Reserve Corps if those components are to be maintained in a state of combat readiness insuring even minimum reasonable national security. Other units of the Organized Reserve Corps constituted from graduates of a 6-month course could be made ready for combat within approximately 9 months after mobilization. The War Department considers that 6 months' training under the Army at military camps with certain sound options for the continuation of training with the National Guard, Organized Reserve Corps, or ROTC would be of material value in a program of national security and that its benefits would justify its cost.

A program providing anything less than 6 months' training under the Army at military camps would be considerably less effective than was our 17-week replacement training program during the recent war, since public opinion would not permit peacetime training of such intensity as was practiced in the wartime replacement training centers. The National Guard and Organized Reserve Corps cannot conduct satisfactory regimental combat team training with the time and facilities available to them. If the universal military training program is to make it possible to maintain the National Guard and high-category units of the Organized Reserve Corps in such a state of readiness that they could be employed successfully in combat without several months of additional training subsequent to mobilization, it must include effective training at the regimental combat team level.

No responsible Army officer will say that effective regimental combat team training can be included in a universal military training program of less than 6 months. The War Department will be compelled to recommend that a program of universal military training providing for less than 6 months' training in military camps would be so ineffective that the money which it would cost could be more wisely expended for other security purposes and therefore that such a program would detract from, rather than contribute to, the over-all combat efficiency of our armed forces.

In considering whether or not you will support any less effective program than that recommended by the President, I urge that you give serious thought to the fact that, if adopted, universal military training will constitute the preparation for combat of the men who must bear the burdens of the first year of any future war. To insure that the graduates of the program will be qualified in combat to perform their individual and team duties proficiently and enjoy a normal chance of survival, the instruction of the trainees must be undertaken just as conscientiously and conducted just as thoroughly as was the training of our young men during World War II. Any less efficient program would be a betrayal of the youth of the Nation. It would cost vasts sums of money without commensurate returns. It would lull our people into a false sense of security from which they might well be awakened by disaster.

There is one particular point on which I desire to express my most emphatic attitude for your consideration. I could not conscientiously recommend and I do not see how this great patriotic organization can conscientiously recommend the adoption of an inadequate program of universal military training on the ground that we do not believe that we can get an adequate program.

In the first place, how can we justify such a defeatist attitude when every recent national poll has shown an average of 70 percent of our people to be in favor of 12 months of training. In the second place, so long as we have any responsibility whatsoever for the security of our Nation it is our solemn duty to advise the American people honestly. How can our people know what is required if those most devoted to our national welfare advocate only such measures as they believe will be adopted and fail to advise the public honestly, fully, and frankly as to our needs. We are not bound to win but we are bound to be honest.

I am an idealist who believes most sincerely that every dishonesty on our part will come home to damn us. If you sincerely believe that 4 months of universal military training is adequate, you are entirely justified in advocating such a program.

But if you believe that a longer period of training is needed, let me implore you as a fellow veteran and as a comrade in the Veterans of Foreign Wars that you do not permit the exponents of expediency and opponents of all preparedness to induce you to recommend a program which you know to be inadequate to our national security.

In advocating the adoption of universal military training and in standing forth for an adequate program, I speak with intense feeling since any mistake on our part at this time may well cost us our national liberties and our national institutions.

It has been my sad lot, gentlemen, to see fine American boys dying needlessly and to very little avail because they were inadequately trained.

During World War I, I am sure had my men and I been as well trained as were the officers and men who invaded the European Continent in 1944 we would have gained more decisive results with fewer casualties in every fight in which we engaged.

I landed in Africa with the original landing force, and stayed through the Tunisian campaign, and I am firmly convinced that a minimum of 50 percent of our casualties resulted from the inadequate training of our men, and could have been saved had our men been as well trained as they were later on in the European theater.

I have also had the opportunity to see well-trained men perform miracles of achievement with unprecedented low casualties.

In 1945 I commanded the Seventy-fifth Infantry Division in the European Theater of Operations, and I would like briefly to inform you of one operation of my division, and I offer no apologies for the somewhat boastful remarks I shall make, because I think the story of my division is the story of every division up and down the front at that time.

My division attacked for 14 consecutive days and nights, during which time it totally destroyed four German divisions, two of them being the best units left in Hitler's army.

That operation cost the lives of but 150 American boys.

You may well ask, "How could that have been possible?" Adequate training was the answer. Those men of the Seventy-Fifth Division had in the first place survived those bitter months of December and January in the Ardennes because of long training in the field where they had learned how to take care of themselves and each other.

Those men had learned the technique of their own weapons. They had been trained for weeks to operate as teams. They had been trained how to fight through woods, through swamps, across plains, over mountains, down city streets, across wide rivers.

When their hour of battle came they knew how to use all means of perfection and they knew how to cope with every weapon possessed by the enemy. During those 14 days and nights where we chose to fight we covered every enemy in a position to oppose us with such terrific fire that he just didn't dare to raise his head to shoot.

In recommending the adoption of universal military training, and in standing further for an adequate program, I am pleading that every boy in America who may have to participfate in war at any future date will have the same chance that my lads had in Germany.

Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Family Allowances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the pen of Nicholas Blatchford as printed in the Washington Daily News of June 12, 1946, under the caption: "Family allowance plan adopted by England, Canada, elsewhere":

FAMILY-ALLOWANCE PLAN ADOPTED BY ENGLAND, CANADA, ELSEWHERE

The family-allowance plan—which provides that a cash sum be paid to the head of a family by the government or his employer as a contribution to the support of his dependents—may raise eyebrows in the United States, but it's an accepted, established procedure in more than 32 foreign countries, including Canada and the British Empire.

So Dr. Kirby Neill, assistant professor of English at Catholic University, who in a recent issue of the American Bulletin proposed that family allowances should be paid "at all moderate income levels" is asking for nothing new.

Family-allowance schemes are of three major types:

Those confined to public services, including the armed forces.

Those financed by private industry; jointly by the state and private industry; or jointly by the state, private industry, and the workers.

Those involving direct family endowment by the state.

FREE MEALS, TOO

Great Britain passed a family allowances act in 1945 which provides approximately $1 per week to each child in every family including two or more children, except for the eldest child. The law is estimated to cost the British Government about $230,000,000 annually. In addition to the cash allowance, free milk and meals are provided school children at an estimated annual cost of $242,000,000.

Allowances are considered as taxable income, but the income-tax exemption of $200 per child is continued.

Australia passed a similar act in 1945, raising previously established child allowances to a point slightly above the British level.

Canada adopted a family allowance act last year with a graduated scale of monthly payments ranging from five to eight dollars for each of the first four children, depending upon their age, and decreasing progressively for each subsequent child. Payment is made to the mother of the family, who is considered a safer bet than the father for wise administration of the cash. The measure is expected to increase the Nations' buying power and consequently to provide additional employment. Families having an income over $3,000 benefit only by tax exemptions for dependents.

WIDESPREAD

Limited versions of the family allowance are in effect or under consideration in India, South Africa, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Denmark, France, Italy, Norway, Russia, Rumania, Spain, Sweden, and the Latin American Republics.

At least 16 cities in the United States are paying family allowances or married men's differentials in their public school systems, ranging as high as $500 cash payment to a teacher with dependents.

Income-tax deductions for dependents (which have little benefit for parents in the low-income brackets), school lunches, and payments to families of service personnel constitute this Government's gestures toward a family-allowance system.

Fearing that family allowances would act against its claims for increased wages, organized labor first cast a fishy eye at proposed legislation, but since wage scales in both Australia and New Zealand have risen following adoption of child-endowment acts, labor's attitude is more favorable.

The World Trades Union Conference in London last year heard a recommendation by the Committee on Postwar Reconstruction and Immediate Trade Union Demands which stated "the welfare of children must be one of the primary concerns of all governments, and therefore protected by the payment of family allowances."

Address of Hon. Josephus Daniels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address by Josephus Daniels to the graduating class of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, N. C., on June 10, 1946:

I congratulate you, I felicitate you, I envy you, graduates of 1946. I am tempted to covet your heritage as you are coming into your citizenship at a time when the world is fluid, and spiritually and politically without form and void. It awaits your trained hand to make it jell. The old pattern is broken and shattered. What was and what was worshiped is in the discard. The globe of yesterday is out of date. Darkness and doubt have descended upon the face of the earth. Men who once walked with confident tread now stumble amid the shambles of a world that has lost confidence in the old order and many are groping for a firm place to stand upon. I am afraid that some older heads today are misled by the dangerous shibboleth: "Speak roughly and carry a big stick."

The scourge of war through which we have lately passed, and which took toll of the flower of your generation, not only blasted farms and factories and the land itself (material things can be restored), but the bursting bombs destroyed something more eternal than things. They destroyed faith by the older generation in the things they thought were immutable.

As over the radio and in the press charges and counter charges are voiced against capital and labor, and nations lately bound together as allies in war hurl defiance at one another, and military men tell us that another war with atomic destruction is in the offing, many of the older generation—disturbed lest their world fall apart, cry out with Hamlet:

"The time is out of joint—O cursed spite,
That ever I was born to set it right!"

As you pass over the threshold of tomorrow, the one thing the elders, doubtful of themselves but with faith in you, bequeath to you is what may be likened to the father who gives his son a box of blocks, at sixes and sevens, and says: "Take these blocks and assemble them into a noble temple." Even the blocks are so seared by the fires of war and so marred by the smoke of archaic creeds that those old in spirit are skeptical whether youth, even with all the king's horses and all the kind's men, can put them together again. That is the legacy that yesterday gives to tomorrow.

If today we could hand to you who are shortly to leave the campus the best gift it would be a world as impressionless as a clean sheet of white paper without wrinkle or blemish, so you could begin to shape it from scratch. It would be a world free from the tracings which have marred it by the generations that preceded you. Their mistakes have left indelible impressions and depressions on the world you are to shape. You cannot fail to see the pitfalls, but you can by taking cognizance avoid them.

There is a wretched old false maxim that history repeats itself. I do not agree with Henry Ford "that all history is bunk," but I beg you to study history in these difficult days in order to avoid the errors of those whose blindness caused them to bequeath to you the task of the reconversion of a broken and debt-ridden and hungry world. At the outset I charge you to discard traditions and make your own precedents.

Study history, not for guidance, but as a warning against repeating the errors which precipitated the world into destructive war and its aftermath. Knowledge of history will not let us believe there never was a good war nor a bad peace, as Benjamin Franklin held, but that no war was ever enterprised for the weal of mankind. Most wars have originated in greed or hate. That certainly is true of the two greatest wars in which, by no overt act of its own, your country has lately been involved. And when victory at arms was won in both wars the peace has eluded us. Why? Because a war-shocked world has not been ready to pay the price for lasting peace.

I am not sure that Georges Clemenceau, the cynical "Old Tiger," was not right when he pointed out to Woodrow Wilson and Lloyd George the way to end war. Speaking to the two English-speaking premiers in 1919 he said:

"You can have permanent peace if you mean what you say. We can remove all causes of war if you have counted the cost and are ready to pay it. If we end future wars we must all—

"1. Give up our empires—all hope of empire. You, Mr. Lloyd George, you English will have to come out of India. We French will have to come out of Africa. You Americans, Mr. President, will have to come out of the Philippines and Puerto Rico and leave Cuba alone."

"2. We must tear down our tariff walls and open to the whole world free trade and traffic."

"3. There are also other sacrifices we dominant powers must make."

When Wilson and Lloyd George did not feel that these sacrifices were necessary, Clemenceau said: "Then you do not want permanent peace enough to pay the price."

We have traveled far since 1919. On July 4, 1946, the Philippines will celebrate their full independence. The strings that bound Cuba have been cut and we are trying to withdraw from Puerto Rico; Britain has promised to come out of India and Egypt and give to the people independence; and the Atlantic Charter for "all over the world" promised self-government to all people and equal access to all raw material. But, while some steps have been taken, Spain is still Nazified, and there are lions in the path that stand in the way of permanent peace which need to be slain before the promises to end the exploitation of other peoples will bring the peace for which millions fought and died.

What are the elder statesmen thinking about which is delaying and threatening the peace pledged at San Francisco? Russia has her covetous eyes on countries in eastern Europe and other selfish advantages for the achievement of which it keeps a mighty army ready in case. Britain wants the Mediterranean to be a British lake and be able to boast that it is mistress of the seas and governs an empire on which the sun never sets. France and other European countries are unwilling to give up colonial possessions. Italy craves to make the Adriatic Sea an Italian lake; Uncle Sam's Navy would like to convert the Pacific Ocean into an American lake with naval bases like crown colonies. And there has been a strange silence about keeping the promise that all natural resources shall be available upon equal terms to the people of the whole world, though there is much lip service to the idea of one world.

Do we not need a 1946 Clemenceau to again warn against selfishness? The older generation did not agree with Clemenceau then and, like Ephraim of old, some still cling to idols they promised to overthrow when Roosevelt and Churchill gave an impetus to world peace by promulgating the Atlantic Charter.

As elder statesmen dally and debate I am persuaded that the hope of attaining the boon of permanent peace to bless us in the tomorrows depends upon the high resolve of youthful spirits to create a public opinion—America's only king—so strong that it will compel the attainment of the peace that our men in the armed forces died to achieve. You have been, so to speak, handed a torch lacking heat and flame. But the torch you receive has the lightwood unsinged. There is land even if some of it is

scorched. In America there has been no destruction except of manpower and no weakness except of faith. Your elders hand you the torch with fear and trembling lest you lack the power to rekindle the flickering flame. That, plus the inheritance of a courage, and a place whereupon to stand, is all that is delivered to you with your diploma.

You will be warned by those hugging the shore that unless you take in sail and turn your bark to outmoded harbors you will be shipwrecked by Scylla or Charybdis. Do not listen to these jeremiads. I have an abiding faith that neither Little Fear nor Big Fear nor any of the giants that affright the timid will deter you from daring to believe that "The best is yet to be" and to achieve it by valorously blazing new trials and treading new paths.

From time immemorial speakers on commencement occasions have felt the compulsion to give advice to graduates. This is true even though advice is seldom welcome; and those who need it the most always like it the least. Though I am a congenital nonconformist, I feel the compulsion of precedent to conform and give you advice unasked.

If you wish or need any counsel from an octogenarian in years and a youth in optimism, I would say, "Shut your ears to all the voices of doubt and fear and pessimism that tend to weaken or destroy your faith in your ability to overcome your inheritance of pessimism and put on the armor of high resolve to reach the heights." I advise you to turn to the scriptures, and say, as did the warriors of old, "We are able" to take the ramparts. May I suggest a few of the faiths that will conquer. Believe in these five maxims:

1. Make it a cardinal faith that the force of an ideal is stronger than the ideal of force. All about you there will be voices crying out that force and force alone will always insure an abiding peace. Do not harbor that false dogma which has done more to produce wars than any other one thing. Fight to destroy when peace is undergirded all the instruments of war on the face of the earth in your better world of tomorrow and give no heed to the militaristic distrust in the force of an ideal.

2. Hold fast to the truth that all people in every country have the inherent right to govern themselves. Last week Italy repudiated inherited rule and sent its king into exile. All kings are on their way out. After ordering the troops out of Egypt and pledging to India full independence, Bevin recently told Parliament, "It is not a very popular thing now in international affairs to maintain troops on other people's soil," a declaration in keeping with America's plan for Philippine independence.

3. Never doubt the people are the divinely appointed rulers and the only safe repository of freedom. Yes, the people. In the past, and in my day, some men believe they were born booted and spurred to ride on the backs of others. The people are not always wise but their collective wisdom is more to be trusted than any self-appointed ruling class. If your desire is to insure justice and equality you must disregard the spirit of favoritism and caste and commune with the people and love them. You cannot establish a stable world on any foundation other than popular sovereignty and faith in the people.

"It is not that I adulate the people. Without me there are fools and demagogs enough to tear down every steeple and set up in their stead some common stuff I do not know. I wish to be as free from demagogs as kings—from you as well as me."

4. Practice the admonition, "Do not put new wine in old bottles." The world you are to make is to be a very different world than that in which any other generation has lived. Old things have passed away and all things have become new was not spoken to destroy faith in God, in justice, in democracy. These truths are immortal, but their forms and applications are not sacred. Your new wine of sound justice and freedom from war must be an elixir that stimulates the making here below of a new earth and a new heaven. I charge you to throw away the old molds. Dare to tread new paths. Listen to the command of the Almighty to Moses and do not be afraid to follow it, "Speak unto my people, that they go forward."

5. And lastly, may I counsel each member of the class of 1946, as you set forth to navigate on the uncharted seas ahead, to "sail on" by the chart and compass given you by the great Apostle:

"Forgetting those things which are behind and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Jesus Christ."

The Menace of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have called attention to the Communist menace in America in days gone by are glad indeed to notice that others in America are awakening to the peril in our midst. We who long ago pointed out that Communists are not to be trusted, either in peace or war, were ridiculed and pilloried by supposedly more learned and brilliant men in recent years. Yet, as the pattern of Soviet conquest has unfolded, it has been seen that the men who warned of aggressive communism and treacherous Communists in our midst were men seeing things more clearly than their tormentors—the so-called liberals who welcomed Communist support and one of whom pardoned as a gesture the most despicable Communist in this Nation.

I am constrained to make these comments, Mr. Speaker, because my attention has been drawn to a front-page editorial in a recent issue of the Protestant Voice, published in Fort Wayne, Ind. As we all know, this publication serves all Protestants, not just this or that denomination, and is widely read and quoted in religious circles throughout the Nation.

In this front-page editorial, Dr. Homer R. Gettle, the president, and David Hogg, the general manager, draw attention to the present Communist menace not only in this Nation but on a world-wide scale. Further, they point out that in the Protestant Voice there will be carried a series of articles regarding communism. These articles are being written by Robe Carl White.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the lead editorial of the Protestant Voice for June 7, 1946, and the first of a series of articles by Mr. White in the same issue:

THE LEOPARD IN OUR MIDST

In America, the Communists ply the same artful tactics which have misled—and ruined—millions of well-intentioned people of Europe, and have made it the dark continent. From the Robert Owen fiasco at New Harmony, Ind., in 1827, through the trials of Italy, Spain, and Germany, to the stupendous Soviet Government of Russia, there are the same certain and disasterous sequences, in three parts.

First. Citizens conclude that their individual struggles are futile and become accustomed to the philosophy that the state should take over their economic affairs and security. The preliminary advocates are usually harmless, persistent, and often Christian. Robert Owen promised Utopia. Hitler, after each successive defeat, increased the scope of his promises, until every German was to be a landed proprietor dwelling in a castle, his children educated in the famous universities, and his wife exalted with every luxury. Hitler never duped any foreigner more than he duped his own Nordics by deceitful promises.

Second. On obtaining power in a Socialist state, representative government always breaks down completely. Kerensky led the Socialists into power in Russia. Lenin took over. Kerensky escaped with his life only because he crawled into a woman's dress. In peaceful new harmony, after admitting failure of the Socialist experiment under most favorable circumstances the leaders met and decided that the only way out, if at all, was by the appointment of a dictator. In Socialist government hard-boiled leaders always take control. In liquidating opposition, the leaders murder tens of thousands of citizens, plunder their property, destroy churches and decree death to all who oppose them. A communistic government cannot endure unless it is administered by an absolute dictatorship.

Third. To maintain a dictatorship, freedom of worship and freedom of speech are forever abolished. To establish a free church in Italy, France, Germany or Russia meant swift and certain death. Churches, such as they are, are subordinated to the dictator. The state is the supreme authority over the human soul. In this stage, the well meaning propagandist who preached an easy and plentiful socialistic regime, grows restless and is liquidated. Only the subservient and the serf are left. Less than 80 men hold the supreme authority in Russia.

Be not deceived. The Socialist, Communist, Nazist and Fascist get all their teachings and inspiration from the writings of Karl Marx, an infidel. His books are the source of their knowledge and power. Fundamentally, they are the same. Step by step we are condoning communistic methods in America. From every doorstep, we must proclaim the danger of the Marxian philosophy. Our Socialist agitators are harmless but they are like children whose hands are full of poison. The signers of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution of the United States were Protestants. If we continue as a free church the Protestant pulpit must continue to lead. In the temptation, Jesus was offered the power and indugence of the world. He declined. He knew all these things were to be found only in the individual worth of men and women.

THE PROTESTANT VOICE,
DR. HOMER R. GETTLE,
President.
DAVID HOGG,
General Manager.

COMMUNISM, FOE OF RELIGION AND LABOR—TACTICS SAME IN RUSSIA, ITALY, AND GERMANY

(By Robe Carl White)

Communism has been the main issue before the American people for the last 14 years. It is only fair that the workers and the people in America should know what communism has done for the peasants and workingman in Russia during these same 14 years.

It is common knowledge that the world has been led upon more fiction than truth concerning life and events in Russia. This was

made possible through the fact that the Communists, on assuming control of Russia, established a strict censorship on all news concerning what was going on in that country. As some writers say, they built an impenetrable iron wall or curtain around Russia. They permitted nothing to enter and permitted nothing to go out except what they wanted the world to know. This secrecy and isolationism enabled the Communists and left-wing propagandists to flood America with false and misleading information concerning conditions and events in Russia.

COMMUNIST DECEIVE FOR POWER

However, the old saying that "truth will out" still holds true. Now, after the lapse of years, through government reports, investigators, and the writings of economists and others, the true picture of Russia can now be given the people of America. To know just what has happened to the common labor man in Russia under Communist rule should be of deep and vital interest to American workers in particular.

To understand fully, the reader should keep in mind that over 50 percent of the population of Russia is made up of farmers, or peasants as they are called; that the European class system of government has been in vogue for many, many years and still is under Communist rule; that the people have never known or experienced freedom or equality as we in America know it; that at the time of the Communist revolution the great natural resources of the country—mines, waterpower, and industry of all kinds were largely undeveloped; that prior to the Bolshevik revolution they were ruled by a Czar, who was an absolute monarch.

The great Russian revolution took place during World War I. The revolutionists seized control of government and seated Kerensky, a temporary leader, who was soon succeeded by Lenin. Lenin and Trotsky, two followers of Karl Marx, were the real organizers of the revolution. They were both trained pamphleteer writers and agitators and for years had been fostering what they called a "peoples revolution" against all forms of government, except communism. They had organized the Communist Party through which they functioned. Later Mussolini followed with the Fascist Party in Italy. Hitler used the same tactics in organizing the Nazi Party in Germany. The main objective in each case was to secure power for themselves. They all succeeded. We all know how Mussolini and Hitler used their power when acquired. The world is just beginning to know how Stalin, successor to Lenin, is using his power.

Stalin tells the world that the people of Russia rule; he claims that communism helps the common man; that it gives him better schools, better security, more rights, more freedom, and a higher standard of living, equal opportunity, and makes men equal in every way. It sounds ideal but how has it worked out?

RELIGION OUTLAWED

First, the Russian revolution was one of the bloodiest in all history. After gaining government control, it liquidated by death all of the opposition who could not escape their native land, and killed thousands of the property-owning and educated classes; it nationalized land, industry, and business; it organized, under Trotsky, a huge army; it outlawed all religions and religious worship; it took away the sanctity of marriage and the marriage vows; it established a powerful espionage system and the most vicious system of propaganda and censorship the world has ever known; it forced upon the people collectivism in all things—collective farming, collective security, even collective rearing and raising of children. These are not all, but a few examples that should give the common man in America food for thought.

It should be evident to all Americans that all such theories of government are directly opposed to the American theory of government and the American way of life. It should be clear that if America decides to adopt Russian communism, it means the loss of all individual rights, such as the right to worship God in your own way, the right to own and control your farm or home or business; the right of free speech; the right of trial by jury of your peers, and above all, it means the loss of the right to choose and follow the career of your own choosing. These are not idle statements but historic facts.

The Communists employed constant and continuous propaganda in America, much of which was not founded upon facts, or when so founded the truth was juggled and twisted to suit their revolutionary purposes, and the true conditions existing in Russia were deeply and skillfully hidden.

Through this and other devious methods, many workers in America were led to believe that under communism the people would be in charge of the Government; that the masses would control and have a real say in all Government affairs; also they were led to believe that the Russian workers were enjoying equal rights, equal opportunities, prosperity, and security to a greater degree than in any other country in the world.

A DISMAL RECORD

The official record of events in Russia discloses an entirely different picture. It shows:

That Russian communism is a one-party system of dictatorial government. No minority party nor other power through which the voice of great masses might be heard is permitted.

The record also shows that the Communist Party membership is limited and comprises only a very small percent of the total population, to wit, about three to four million out of 190,000,000. Therefore, some one-hundred-and-eighty-odd million of Russian peasants and industrial workers are left without any semblance of control in their Government affairs. Of this number, only a few self-constituted leaders have any voice whatever. Blood purges silence all opposition. All that is left for Russians to do is obey all orders issued by this small governing group.

It would help to understand the present unsettled and chaotic conditions in America, and the world if our people would give more thought to the methods used by agitators and revolutionary-minded men when they start out to gain control of, or change, or overthrow existing governments.

Hunger, Communism, and Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an address I made to the Alumnae Association of the Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart on June 1, 1946, which was also carried on Station WINS:

Reverend Mother, dear mothers, Monsignor Hartigan, and ladies of the alumnae association, today, many grave and puzzling questions, both foreign and domestic, face our citizens and our legislators. Our relations to Soviet Russia, to all our war-torn Allies, and to our former enemies, present a vast and unhappy complex, closely interrelated to our domestic problems. For example, there is not a single diplomatic decision which will not be affected by the decisions we take on the extension of the draft, compulsory military training, and the size of the regular armed forces. In the economic sphere, the current domestic question of strikes in essential industries will have world-wide repercussions. For world prosperity depends on our own swift conversion to full production.

What aspect of this vast complex can you and I tackle first, and with equal effectiveness?

What is it that, whether we are old or young, men or women, legislators or private citizens, all Americans want most? Plainly—we want a peaceful world. And what do we mean by a peaceful world? We Americans mean a world in which men and women will have the widest opportunity to save their own souls, build their own characters, and reap the honest fruits of their own labors. We mean a world of physical and spiritual security. For we Americans know that to offer men liberty without bread is to betray the physical man; but to offer him bread without liberty is to betray the spiritual man. Bread and liberty—the most of both—is the political program of all truly democratic peoples. For without both, either peace will not be achieved, or it will be a police-state, concentration-camp peace, sustained only by bayonets.

What I am going to tell you today is this: Before we can hope to solve the problem of the ever dwindling, and yet ever more viciously assaulted liberties of mankind, we must solve the problem of bread. In some eras of history a want of liberty has been the essential political fact. But the greatest, the overwhelming political fact in the world today is hunger.

Some 20,000,000 people in Europe and Asia are doomed to die of hunger in the next few months, unless they get bread. And if they don't get bread in sufficient quantitis, millions—perhaps hundreds of millions more will seek to fight their way out of the intolerable trap of slow starvation in terms of bloody civil warfare and communism.

There are only a few nations in the world rich enough in surplus foodstuffs to help solve this hideous problem. Leading all the others is America. And I tell you in no uncertain terms that if this country does not address itself to the task of defeating famine as wholeheartedly as it addressed itself to the task of achieving military victory we shall certainly lose the peace. Food will write the peace, for if we do not send it abroad in sufficient quantities, and before it is too late, our former friends in Europe and Asia will come to hate us—with good cause. And hating us, they will, in our own time, turn for political guidance to communism. Then, everywhere in Europe and Asia God-fearing men of all faiths, and all men who love liberty, and all their churches will be driven into the dank undergrounds that none will dare frequent but great saints and martyrs. Then the light of faith and liberty will be extinguished over more than half the world. Then those Americans who yearned for isolation will, at long last, see its achievement. For then this America will become a small and embatled island of God-fearing and free men who, alas, neither feared God enough nor loved liberty enough, when both were challenged by the fleshless mask of hunger. If that day should come, I question whether our isolated island could long survive either in freedom or in faith.

The other day in a diplomatic rejoinder to Secretary of State Byrnes, Soviet Russia's Molotov, explaining the alleged world trend toward communism, particularly in eastern

Europe, said tauntingly, "A full man cannot understand a hungry man."

Is Molotov right? Can Americans, full men, understand the hungry men of Europe in time?

Let me tell you some of the famine facts that face the world:

Southern Europe and French North Africa, two of Europe's greatest breadbaskets, have recently parched under the worst droughts in half a century. South Africa, and the Russian Ukraine have had torrents of rains which have washed away much of their normal crops. India, with its poverty-stricken 400 millions, was struck by a cyclone last year, which wiped out 100,000 tons of crops, and a tidal wave in the Madras section destroyed 200,000 more, and the rain-bringing monsoons failed of their healing arrival. Australia and the Argentine have suffered excessive droughts. War-torn China has had a terrible drought in the food province of Hunan, and locust plagues in five other provinces. Devasting floods on the Yellow River have destroyed 2,000,000 food acres in Anhwei and Honan. Many of the Japanese rice bowls have been wiped out by unusual floods.

In war-torn Europe, the massive destruction of bridges, railroads, farm implement factories, fertilizer plants, market trucks and livestock has hopelessly impaired the capacity of Europe to feed its urban population.

Thus, as a result of weather and war, a half a billion people in Europe and Asia face starvation. And all this while Americans, unscathed by drought or flood, their industries and cities intact, and their farms bursting with produce, continue to eat about 20 percent more food, measured in calories, than nutritionists recommend as a healthy diet.

And yet it remains largely up to the American people to decide how much of the anguish and death abroad we will allow.

Now you want to know two things: What has America done about meeting this famine situation; and what can we, in the future, as individuals do about it?

Speaking of the famine, which all wise men could long see coming, President Truman said almost a year ago: "We must help to the limit of our strength, and we will."

Now I tell you that neither this administration nor our people, who applauded that promise, have really tried to make it good. Indeed, our failure to do so has been a national disgrace. To be sure, none of us has risen up and said of the world's starving, "Let them eat grass"—which multitudes are doing in China, incidentally—but we, in our individual selfishness and blindness, and our administration, owing to political cowardice, have encouraged and permitted economic policies which have almost come to the same thing. And this, as I say, in spite of the fact that many American voices for months have been raised in desperate warning against the ultimate political folly and inhumanity of such attitudes and policies.

Let me explain a few simple facts to you about wheat, which is the essential commodity all Europe and Asia cry for. Now, wheat can be used in a variety of ways. It can be directly made into bread, or it can be used instead to feed livestock. Let us take 1 ton of wheat. One ton of wheat fed to chickens will make 250 dozen eggs; fed to cows, 840 quarts of milk; fed to pigs, 430 pounds of pork; fed to cattle, 207 pounds of beef; to poultry, 350 pounds of chicken. But made into bread, it will produce 1,930 loaves. Far more food calories can be got out of wheat turned into bread than wheat fed into animals. And if this were not true, animals and animal products are far more costly, cumbersome, and perishable to ship and distribute.

But if I am an American farmer, and I grow wheat, how shall I sell it? Well, if I get more money for pigs, eggs, milk, beef, and chickens than wheat itself, I will naturally feed the wheat I grow to my animals, and then sell the more profitable animals or their produce. But if I get more for wheat selling it, so to speak, straight, I will sell the wheat. You can see that when profits on wheat, translated into terms of pigs, eggs, milk, beef, and poultry, are higher than profits on wheat, sold cold, what the farmer will do. So when an administration, by its agricultural and price-control policies, encourages the farmer by the lure of higher profits, to feed his grain to domestic pigs, it encourages a national policy of starving foreign children. And that is what the administration has done. Honesty requires me to say it has done so largely because too many thoughtless Americans have demanded, since the war's end, more beef and eggs, and milk and poultry in their diet. And, because an election is in the offing, the administration has not dared to tell them that the satisfaction of this desire means certain death to countless children abroad.

When Herbert Hoover returned after traveling 35,000 miles throughout Europe and Asia, and visiting 22 countries which have food deficiencies, he reported to the President on May 13 that the world's cereal needs were 14,484,000 tons of cereal stuffs, but that the food-surplus countries of which this is easily the greatest are 3,600,000 short. Other food statisticians say that Mr Hoover's statistics are too optimistic, and that the famine areas are really over 7,000,000 tons short, which is, in case you are interested, 12,624,000,000 loaves of bread.

Now every dictate of common sense, of Christianity, of a love of human liberty, and a hatred of human suffering counsels us, as a nation, and as individuals, to prevent the world-wide famine these figures indicate. That would be the most hideous of all catastrophes, a catastrophe that would dwarf the war itself, and make the horror of even atomic warfare seem, by comparison, humane.

But how shall we avert it? May I suggest a variety of things which you can do, as individuals, and which you, because of your splendid education of the highest Christian ideals can do with particular effectiveness?

First, you can write to your Congressman and Senator, and get everyone you know, and every influential group you know, to write to them, and tell them that as hunger is the decisive political fact of our world, and that as the survival of bodies and souls in Europe and Asia, and eventually our own national security depend on America's meeting it, you want them, indeed you demand them, under pain of losing your vote, to further all agricultural and economic policies which will result in the export of wheat and fats and oils to the starving countries. Such policies can include rationing of the American people in these stuffs, the requisitioning of what by the Government, with subsidies or price ceilings, if necessary, to cereal growers and livestock producers so that they shall not have to bear the whole burden of financial loss alone; and the encouragement of the revival of the farm-machinery industry, so that tools can quickly be sent abroad to help people raise their own food. And you can add that you will applaud any reasonable policy of his own that his fine and fertile congressional brain can bat out to cut down domestic consumption of cereals and fats. That's what you should tell your Congressman you want him to do. And then you can do things yourselves. Rigorously eliminate as much of these things as you can from your own diet, substituting potatoes and cornbread. And urge your neighbors to do likewise. And then, of course, you should send food abroad, packages and canned stuffs—though I know what splendid efforts you have already made in that direction here. And wherever possible you should contribute to those voluntary, charity groups which are dealing with the food problem abroad. There is not a shadow of doubt that even if 6 out of 10 Americans energetically did these things, we should go a long way towards saving Europe and helping to mitigate the immemorial hunger anguishes of Asia.

Let us full men and women do what the Communists claim we can never do—understand the hungry ones. For if we do, we shall win the war, write the peace, and save democracy. "Thinkest thou such force is in bread?" cried the poet Milton. And said that great mystic Russian Dostoevski, "There is nothing more positive than bread."

But we, as Christians, know this word bread, in both its physical and spiritual sense. And because we do, we understand the proper connection between body and soul. The mystery of the body that is bread, upon which the souls of men can feed for their own salvation, is the mystery that has cradled, and brought to flower all that is best in our whole western civilization. And yet, how often our blessed Lord spoke of bread in both senses.

When our Lord returned, by the Sea of Tiberias to His disciples, the very first thing he spoke of was food: Food for the body, as well as the soul. "Children," He said, "have you any meat?" And "come and dine," He said to them. And then three times He asked Simon Peter if he loved Him—once for each time the human Peter had betrayed him. And when Peter answered, "Lord Thou knowest I love you," our Lord gave him this commandment to prove that love, "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep."

His lambs and His sheep are all the children everywhere who are dying piteously for the want of food today. They are a hungered, athirst, and naked and sick. What we do unto the least of these, He said, we shall do unto Him. Thus the greatest political challenge of our times—hunger—is essentially the greatest religious challenge. We dare not call ourselves His followers if we do not meet it. I know that each of you will try even harder than you have before. And I assure you, that in doing so, you are striking the wisest and most noble blow you can, as individual citizens for country, for liberty, and for God.

Labor and Your Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include a very interesting and instructive article written by Mr. Fern R. Rauch, vice president, Illinois State Federation of Labor, and secretary, Central Trades and Labor Union, East St. Louis, Ill.

Mr. Rauch knows whereof he speaks. An outstanding labor leader in East St. Louis and the State of Illinois for more than 20 years, he nevertheless has always found the time to be active in every affair which meant civic improvement. I am proud to say that these labor leaders in our State with whom I have the pleasure of being personally acquainted have all taken deep interest in civic affairs.

Perhaps it is their deep-seated interest in their fellow workers that make them

so zealous in the interest of the community. I know of no group who gives more of their time in an effort to improve their home community than representatives of organized labor and the workers they represent.

Mr. Rauch's article follows:

LABOR AND YOUR COMMUNITY

(By Fern R. Rauch, vice president, Illinois State Federation of Labor, and secretary, Central Trades and Labor Union, East St. Louis)

Organized workers after many years of struggle have secured rights which are well established.

The organized worker is not only a member of his local or trade-union, he is also a member of the community in which he lives and works. The life of that community in turn is a definite part of the life of the Nation. Trade-unions in a free democratic society must integrate themselves deeply into community life. Through continuous struggle the organized worker succeeded in introducing in his work a measure of industrial democracy.

Now that he has won the right to bargain collectively, to improve his economic condition, equally important is his status as a union member, feeling of "belonging," of self-importance, of human dignity.

Through an active union, he becomes a functional part of the community and the Nation. The workers want, through organization, to better their working conditions and wages, to be able to lead a better life, to provide for themselves and their families a secure home and that their children will receive a good education and enough leisure time to enjoy the best in culture.

Therefore, union recognition is not an academic question, it is the difference between autocratic rule and industrial democracy.

We know that the people of a community group together in accordance with their social, ideological and economic interests. These groups should cooperate in supporting activities and developing attitudes for the good of the community. Here is where the worker and his union is a definite part of these community groups—when through his organization he participates financially and morally in community activities. This voluntary civic responsibility enhances his self-respect and usefulness and he will make many sacrifices to preserve our democratic processes and extend free institutions, provided he is convinced that he is no stepchild of the industrial system. Imagine what would have happened if our Government had been compelled to recruit into our fighting forces men and women from the breadlines for defense. They would have the right to ask. Defend what, the breadlines?

Organized labor fought the methods of breadlines of the devastating depression that deprived millions of their livelihood. It took brave men and women to suffer this sort of ordeal and still retain confidence in our democratic processes. So from bitter experience the workers ignored family traditions of loyalty to political parties, and voted to abolish breadlines never to reappear again.

We are proud of our American heritage, the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. The foundation of our Republic is sound, but the structure is not completed. This was recognized by the forefathers of our Republic when they provided in the Constitution an instrument for building on this structure, namely the amendment. We must contribute to this ever-rising structure. This is the test of a living, dynamic democracy.

The labor movement has reached a position where it branches out into fields of social activities in the community, in the Nation, and in the world. One of its tasks, therefore, is to stamp out political and social "illiteracy." We must become aware of the problems of our time, of new trends, and new attitudes. The labor movement stimulates a greater interest in public affairs on the part of millions of workers. The new interest that workers develop for the welfare of others is not confined to members of their own union. The understanding is carried over into their daily contacts with other individuals and groups.

This brings us to a realization of the only legitimate organization providing representation for and acting in the interest of millions of workers. The price that has been paid, a price which cannot be estimated in dollars and cents, because included in its total are the lives of many of our officers and members, upon which no value can be set, has been too great to permit us to endanger these organizations by enabling those whose interests are purely political or whose interests are closely identified with those of a dual organization or whose efforts are prompted by their own personal ambitions to ever secure control of any group of our members.

There must be a distinction made between what is right and what is wrong and there can be no compromise with any policy which is not entirely right.

The cry that used to be raised by some that union organization invariably leads to strikes and industrial conflicts has as much truth in it as the contention, were it made, that the Pilgrims came to America for the purpose of fighting the Indians.

The future productive capacity can provide better homes, better food, clothing, and medical care. There is no substitute for a job. This can be done intelligently only as we keep open the avenues of education, association, organization, and communication.

Public enlightenment and free discussion define a social necessity. Those who would curb these basic democratic rights to protect narrow class privileges and those who would abuse them in the slavish service of foreign governments and alien party lines, strike at the very foundation of our freedom. We will continue to fight for these rights and to expose and oppose all who would abridge or impair them for any reason whatsoever.

A Federal housing project in East St. Louis honors the memory of a great American who founded the American Federation of Labor, The Samuel Gompers Homes.

In the early depression days here it was pointed out that many school children were undernourished for the want of proper food. The local labor movement sponsored a school hot-lunch program for all schools where the need was apparent. This program received national recognition.

Labor representatives locally are assisting as board members of character building, health and child care organizations.

The representatives of the building and construction trades local unions meet every Thursday in the interest of their membership and the building industry. For the past 40 years the Labor Day parade and picnic are enjoyed by the families of labor.

The annual celebration of the central trades and labor union is a January social rally. A 20-team A. F. of L. bowling league is the fall and winter indoor recreation where the principles of social and sportsmanship are of the highest standard, as is the A. F. of L. sponsored junior baseball team.

Labor is represented on all important civic committees—zoning and planning commissions—safety councils.

Central body delegates give to the community the inspiration for further improvements for the general welfare of the people—living, working, and playing together with common interests for the social and economic betterment of all.

Food Supplies To Combat Famine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted to me, I present for printing in the RECORD the following resolution adopted by the Greater Providence (R. I.) Joint Board of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO. The resolution follows:

Whereas as of this moment many thousands are dying of starvation in China, the Philippines, India, Japan, and other war-devastated countries of Asia; and

Whereas famine conditions will become more severe and widespread than anything now existing in these lands within the next few weeks unless much larger quantities of foodstuffs can be shipped where needed than are at present in sight or likely to be made available; and

Whereas in the European countries, the deaths from starvation will not be as numerous nor conditions as desperate as those in Asia, nevertheless actual famine exists in, to a lesser or greater degree, almost every Allied or Axis European nation; and

Whereas it was recently found that in Warsaw 84 percent of all children are suffering from malnutrition and 50 percent are now actively tubercular, and this condition is fairly typical of other European countries; and

Whereas the average intake of calories per individual in European countries is well under half the number of calories consumed by the ordinary citizen of the United States, and it is estimated that over 140,000,000 people in Europe are living on a diet of under 2,000 calories a day, which is the minimum amount needed by a normal individual; and

Whereas poor crops or crop failures in southeastern Europe, north Africa, and in India, South Africa, Japan, China and the East Indies, coupled with the break-down of transportation, inability to ship fertilizers, farm equipment, livestock, etc., have all combined to create a human catastrophe of unprecedented proportions; and

Whereas all experts agree that food supplies in most nations abroad will not improve, and in several countries will be even worse, for at least another year; and

Whereas the United States, Canada, Australia, and the Argentine are virtually the only countries that can export substantial quantities of foodstuffs, principally cereals, to beat back famine; and

Whereas the United States actually has no present surplus of wheat and can only meet the quota set by the President of a million tons a month to be exported by cutting down on the amounts consumed at home; and

Whereas the organized labor movement in the United States pointed out when food rationing, except for sugar, was abandoned in this country shortly after the end of the war, this step would lead to famine abroad; and

Whereas the utterly reprehensible action of the House of Representatives in practically killing effective price-control legislation in this country will force food prices upward and thus still further restrict the amounts that other countries can buy because both UNRRA and the individual nations who buy in this country have limited and inadequate funds and will be able to take less when the costs are more: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Greater Providence Joint Board of the Textile Workers Union of

America, CIO, call upon the Congress of the United States and Government of this country to reestablish a long-range rationing and food-control system in this country geared to present conditions and aimed at providing essential food supplies to starving people and dividing equitably supplies for the public in this country; and

1. We particularly urge that steps be taken to economize on wheat and other cereal consumption in this country; that milk consumption by healthy adults in the United States be cut down so that evaporated milk can be sent to save the lives of children abroad; and

2. We demand continuance of an expanded subsidy program to increase all possible food supplies in this country for at least another 2 years; and

3. That the United States take steps now for a long-range program of expanded food production to insure against catastrophe in the future, instead of acting on the assumption that surpluses may cause commercial interests to lose money; and

4. That the United States act through the United Nations to do everything that will enable the countries of this world to rehabilitate their economies and their agriculture so that they may not only become self-sustaining, but can aid in raising living standards for all peoples; and

5. We ask that all these things be done, not merely out of feelings of simple humanity and decency, but because we are profoundly convinced that only when freedom from want is actually achieved can any nation permanently establish a system of society based on democracy and the essential freedom of the individual.

National Cemeteries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, before this legislation was presented I sat with a group of other interested Congressmen and discussed the necessity for creating national cemeteries. Having a national cemetery in my district, I have always had an interest in them and always believed that the Federal Government should have burial places for our soldier dead.

However, this bill, S. 524, as drawn, raises a good many questions in my mind. The bill provides that the Secretary of War shall be authorized to acquire land and establish cemeteries in the various States, if needed. I would like to know what constitutes a need. It appears to me that in every State there would be at least one who would want to be buried in a national cemetery. Would that constitute a need? Then, too, it gives the Secretary of War the authority to acquire these lands without limitation or restriction. It further provides that before any improvements are made on these acquired lands he shall have the advice of the Commission on Fine Arts. Now, to me this looks as though these cemeteries might become extremely expensive projects from the beginning, and whether or not they do, from what I have observed through the years they will become tremendously expensive as time goes on regardless of what promises are now being made.

The proponents of this legislation emphatically declare that provision is made for the burial of veterans and their families. I am afraid they are taking in too much territory. Of course, it is in line with the paternalistic program now being advanced. But think of what it would mean if the more than 10,000,000 men and women in uniform and their families were all to be buried in national cemeteries. One of the proponents said that the opposition comes from certain cemetery associations. Well, maybe there is opposition from that source, but I am wondering whether some bureaucrats might be wanting another gigantic set-up over which they could dominate and in this way expand the tremendous personnel on the Federal pay roll.

The bill also provides that the personnel engaged in the administration shall be selected, when available, from meritorious and trustworthy officers, warrant officers, or enlisted men of the armed forces who have been honorably discharged. Now, so far as the expense of administration is concerned, it does not make any difference whether they be selected from civilians or honorably discharged military personnel. It does, however, mean that the Federal pay roll will be greatly increased. And, if this personnel is selected on the same basis as they are now being selected for similar projects, then a man will have to belong to the party in power to get these jobs. And if the lands acquired are selected on the same basis as the War Department has selected sites heretofore, then it might become pork-barrel legislation.

Now I have had a great many parents, as well as relatives, of men killed in action urge me to support legislation to bring our soldier dead home. And they do mean "home." This I know, for in every case I have questioned these interested people as to where they want their soldier dead to finally rest, and without exception the answer has been "in the family plot." And unless they finally rest in the family plot they will never have been brought "home."

There is a question in my mind whether the War Department will long have jurisdiction over these cemeteries when they start out with the advice of the Commission on Fine Arts.

Gettysburg battlefield and cemetery, our greatest national shrine, which is in my district, has in recent years been transferred from the War Department to the Department of the Interior and is now administered by the National Park Service to the complete dissatisfaction of the people of Gettysburg and vicinity who have always had a keen interest and who are very sentimental concerning these sacred grounds.

We find the Federal Government now coming along and wanting to take over, through civil service, the guide force which has served the public so well these many years. So now, instead of it being a battlefield and national cemetery, it is a national park. Should Interior have its way and place the guides under civil service, together with the guides of more than 300 other national parks, as is their program, then it is quite likely that many of the guides at Gettysburg, who have grown up with the community and know the battlefield and cemetery as only they know it, might be transferred to other national parks, like Yellowstone and Grand Canyon. And vice versa, Gettysburg might have a group of guides that might come from the four corners of the country, for that is the way civil service operates.

For instance, there is a little farm-labor office operating in Gettysburg at this time employing five people under civil service. The manager comes from the State of Washington; the fiscal officers come from Connecticut; and another employee comes from Philadelphia. This is what would likely happen to the guide service.

Now Gettysburg does not want this to happen and I am going to bend every effort to see that it does not happen. The War Department should have maintained control over the battlefield and it should never have been made a park, for when that change took place the battlefield and cemetery lost some of its appeal and the hundred thousand visitors there annually are not getting the patriotic inspiration they used to get when the place was more rugged.

In view of these conditions, together with the fact that there is still sufficient vacant space in our established national cemeteries to accommodate our needs for probably 20 years, I am compelled to oppose this bill. And I would support legislation to have the battlefield at Gettysburg returned to the War Department.

Price Control or Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of June 10, 1946:

PRICE CONTROL OR CHAOS

The calamity that confronts the American people if, in extending OPA, Congress takes away its controls over some of the major necessities like meat, poultry, and dairy products, is not at all exaggerated in the statement of the four Senators who comprise the dissenting minority of the Senate Banking Committee.

The scant benefit that might temporarily be reaped by farm producers could not offset, even in a small way, the harm that would inevitably be done to the Nation's economy. Since meat and dairy products are certain to remain in short supply for some time, no matter what the price, competition cannot possibly keep prices within reasonable limits.

Skyrocketing prices of these primary foods would put them beyond the reach of millions in the low and medium income groups. The demand for substitutes would certainly force rapid price increases for other foods. There would be additional temptation for hoarding by consumers. There would be tremendous incentive for dealers, all along the line, to hold their supplies as long as possible to make greater profits on a zooming market.

No one can honestly believe that food prices could go wild without setting off a new inflationary spiral involving prices of all other short necessities, new wage demands, further disastrous production stoppages. It would spell greater disaster to the poor, the frugal, the salaried workers, wage earners, and all those on fixed income. In fact, it is hard to see that any solid segment of the economy could score any permanent gain, not even the farmers, though it would surely pour millions into the pockets of some smart speculators and profiteers.

Despite the fumbling and the bumbling of OPA, and the mistakes that may still be made if effective price control is continued, the great majority of American people just simply cannot risk the staggering costs of abruptly and immediately removing, or drastically curtailing, controls over the costs of essentials of life. That would be to invite economic chaos for the Nation—nothing less.

How Long, O Lord, How Long?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a poem entitled "How Long, O Lord, How Long?" written by my fellow Mississippian and boyhood friend, Brig. Gen. William Edward Brougher, together with a foreword.

The poem is one of a series written by General Brougher while a Japanese prisoner in Bataan, which have been published in book form under the title "The Long Dark Road."

Brig. Gen. William E. Brougher graduated from Mississippi State College in 1910, and has served in the United States Army ever since. He was stationed in the Philippines at the outbreak of the war as a lieutenant colonel, where he had been ordered in October 1939. He was assigned to the Fifty-seventh Infantry Regiment, Philippine Scouts, at Fort McKinley, and commanded that regiment for about 1½ years during 1940 and 1941. His family went home in May 1941 when the Army women and children were ordered to the States.

In September 1941, he was assigned to command the Eleventh Division, Philippine Army, in north Luzon. The Eleventh Division was the first Philippine Army unit struck by the Japanese and was continuously fighting until the night of April 9, 1942, the day of the surrender of the American forces in Bataan.

After surrendering, General Brougher was taken with other prisoners to Camp O'Donnell, where 3,000 Americans and 20,000 Filipinos died during the first 2 months of imprisonment. On May 10, 1942, the generals and colonels were separated from the other prisoners and moved to Tarlac, where they were joined by General Wainwright and the other generals, colonels, and Navy captains from Corregidor. In August 1942 this group of high-ranking prisoners were transported by ship to Formosa where they were joined by similar groups of top-ranking British and Dutch prisoners. They occupied three different camps on Formosa during the next 2 years and were beaten and starved and worked like slaves by the Japanese.

In October 1944 the Japanese, anticipating the approach of the Americans from the south, moved these prisoners to Manchuria, transporting the general officers by air from Formosa to Japan and on to Manchuria by boat and rail. In Manchuria they were better fed and were allowed to have a substantial shipment of Red Cross food. On August 16, the day after VJ-day, they were contacted by a parachute party of six Americans sent by General Wedemeyer to bring the news of the Japanese surrender and to take steps for the protection of the prisoners in the climax hours of the war. Two days later the Russian Army took Mukden and the prisoners were liberated that same night. On August 27, General Brougher flew from Mukden airfield in the American plane which brought General Wainwright and the first contingent of his prisoner comrades out of Manchuria.

During the almost 3½ years of imprisonment all the prisoners had hobbies. General Brougher undertook to record in verse the history of the prisoners and their reactions to the experiences of prison life, which has been published, as I said, in a small volume entitled "The Long Dark Road."

The foreword and the poem, How Long, O Lord, How Long? follow:

FOREWORD

The period of imprisonment was a long, weary time. During the second and third years there were times when the prisoners became greatly discouraged and depressed. My old friend, Brig. Gen. James R. N. Weaver, shared a small room with me in the barracks at Shirakawa, Taiwan. Frequently as he lay down on his little hard straw mattress at night old Jim would say, "How long, O Lord, how long?" This heartfelt utterance of my roommate expressed a feeling that I knew was quite general among my comrades. Our anxiety grew mainly out of three interests—our miserable condition as prisoners, failure to get news of loved ones at home, and what was happening to our military careers while we were rotting for years in prison camp.

HOW LONG, O LORD, HOW LONG?

How long, O Lord, how long? No answer given.
Again the plaint assails the gates of heaven:
How long, O Lord, can men endure the fate
Of blasted hopes, defeat, and vengeful hate?
How long can spirit live, can will survive,
And keep the flickering flame of faith alive?
In thralldom dark, depressed with cank'ring care,
How long can hope contend with black despair?

How long, O Lord, how long? Foredoomed to shame
We're waiting still for help that never came.
Escaping death, live but to wonder why—
In living death, a thousand times to die.
Proud valor mute when base derision mocks,
And rank, degraded, yoke mate to the ox.
Life's crowning goal of honored high command,
Now coolie slave, a shovel in my hand.

How long, O Lord, how long? For all I know
My loved ones may be dead long months ago.
No letter comes, no word of love and cheer,
For weeks, for months, and now another year.
How long, O Lord, before the callus grow
On tender spots where heartaches pain me so?
When love's reward is naught but vain regret
Must I grow hard and make myself forget?

How long, O Lord, how long? While ships delay
My precious years run out, my powers decay.
My birthright lost by ruthless time's decree
To lads who learned their alphabet from me.
A rusting sword upon a garbage heap—
God give me grace to smile when I would weep!
Eternal justice, judge of right and wrong,
Dost thou still live? How long, O Lord, how long?

Philippine People Warn That Full Independence May Be Undermined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH DE LACY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, one of the brightest pages in colonial relations is that which records American relations with the Philippine Islands. In contrast to other nations, the United States has been able to pride itself on giving and keeping its pledge of independence to the Filipinos.

Yet today, danger exists that this independence may be nullified by little-known steps to tie the Island economy with iron bands to big American interests.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, the following cable from Manila will interest every Member:

MANILA, *June 13, 1946.*

Congressman DE LACY,
Washington, D. C.:

Earnestly request inform American Congress sentiment of masses here regarding Bell Trade Act and Tydings Rehabilitation Act. Liberal elements believe it most unfair that rehabilitation law tied up with trade act which contains following most objectionable features: First, it compels us amend our constitution, resulting in destruction of guarantee to our posterity benefit and enjoyment of our natural resources; second, it contains unilateral privileges for Americans derogatory to sovereignty and dignity of Philippine Republic; third, it imposes on our domestic economy system of monopolies reminiscent of British East India monopoly; fourth, it makes Philippine Republic a puppet regime in violation of Tydings-McDuffie independence law and American commitments from President McKinley to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Although McNutt and Roxas administration pressing bills acceptance popular sentiment is that if rehabilitation bill is

made contingent on Bell Act acceptance public welfare will be better served without both. Urge approval of Knutson bill and every other practicable step in line with these sentiments.

1. Civil Liberties Union of the Philippines.
2. Philippine Lawyers Guild.
3. Congress of Labor.
4. Congress of Youth Organizations.
5. Philippine Students Union.
6. Philippine Veterans Association.
7. Society of Economist Statisticians and Accountants.
8. National Peasants Union.
9. Philippine Newspapermen's Guild.
10. Philippine Writers Association.

Representative Dondero Battles Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from Michigan, Mr. DONDERO, has been rendering an invaluable service to the people of this country by calling attention, from time to time, of Communist activities and techniques which the same Communists and fellow travelers are employing to undermine our Government. In a recent speech on the floor of this House our colleague has directed attention to a movement on the part of Sidney Hillman, and his ilk, to organize a subversive school in the Hotel Willard, Washington, D. C. The remarks of our distinguished colleague caught the attention of Mr. John O'Donnell, editor of Capitol Stuff, which appears in the Washington Times-Herald under date of Thursday, June 13. Mr. O'Donnell comments on the speech made by Mr. DONDERO. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial by that eminent columnist, Mr. O'Donnell:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John C'Donnell)

Just at the moment when we were blithely shopping for our freshman cap of the good old puce and green and scampering over to the bursar's office on the Hotel Willard campus to slap down our 10-buck matriculation fee so that we could be educated in Sidney Hillman's hot shot "school of political action technique" some tough guy up on Capitol Hill pulled the political plug on the "clear it with Sidney" educational racket for Reds and Pinks.

The tough guy who blew the whistle, just at the moment we were panting for political education, happens to be a sturdy Michigan Republican by the name of GEORGE ANTHONY DONDERO.

Representative DONDERO doesn't like "Commies." He doesn't like other individuals who also, according to the law of the land, are coconspirators and ripe candidates for the hoosegow.

Our clients may recall that about 3 weeks ago, just before Sidney Hillman's PAC was kicked around by the election returns in California (where GOP Gov. Earl Warren won both Republican and Democratic nominations against Brother Sidney's pressure boys) PAC formally announced that they were establishing a "school of political technique" here in the Capital.

The school would instruct the eager scholars, according to the announcement, in such slick Moscow technique as the use of pressure groups to needle Members of Congress.

Their professors would instruct them in a discussion of "the importance of religious and racial factors in political campaigns, * * * the use of the clergy in political action," "long-range significance in using youth in political work," the "organization of veterans," and various other tricks by which the honest American voter could be politically seduced by the patriotic appeals of the distinguished Sidney.

For a normal and definitive answer to Sidney Hillman's PAC racket in the education of Reds and other criminals, we point to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under date of June 12, pages 6699–6702, in which Representative DONDERO—for the benefit of the Nation and his colleagues up on Capitol Hill—blows the whistle, once and for all, on the set-up behind the latest of the Hillman-Moscow-Pal Joey anti-American moves.

Said DONDERO:

"It's my purpose to expose what I believe to be a Communist fraud perpetrated upon the people of Washington through the guise of a so-called school of political action techniques to be conducted by the National Citizens Political Action Committee. * * *

"The outfit has the effrontery to print a picture of the National Capitol on the cover of its catalog."

The Michigan Congressman, holding a sheaf of documents and Government reports in his hand, then tossed this charge:

"The faculty of this school is largely composed of individuals who have rendered yeoman service to the Communist Party and its front organizations.

"A number of these individuals with subversive records are former Federal officeholders.

"This project is actually an attempt to establish in Washington a branch of the chain of Communist schools to be founded throughout this country."

And at this point, Representative DONDERO went into the personal backgrounds and history of the faculty and advisers of dear old PAT.

"John Abt: Husband of Jessica Smith, who is editor of Soviet Russia Today. Mrs. Abt worked in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics from 1922 to 1927; for the Soviet Information Bureau in Washington from 1929 to 1933; and was editor of the Soviet Union Review until 1935.

"She was formerly the wife of Harold Ware, Soviet agricultural expert. Remember that Communist marriages must be based upon political affinity.

"John Abt was known as the commissar of top-level Communist forces while in Washington.

"He is general counsel of Sidney Hillman's Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, of the CIO Political Action Committee, and of the National Citizens' Political Action Committee.

"Tilford E. Dudley, assistant to the chairman, CIO Political Action Committee, was a member of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, which defended Federal employes charged with subversive activities.

"Abraham Zeitz: Secretary of the Committee on Free Elections in 1940, which defended the ballot rights of the Communist Party; speaker at the pro-Communist National Action Conference for Civil Rights held in Washington, April 19–29, 1940.

"Elmer Benson has 23 citations in Appendix IX, a study of Communist-front organizations published by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities.

"Martha Fletcher: Former chairman of United States Arrangements Committee for World Youth Conference, which was Communist inspired and dominated, held in London in 1945."

Sgt. Alejandro R. Ruiz Awarded Medal of Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. E. THOMASON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure and honor to be invited to the White House this morning, where President Truman awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor to Sgt. Alejandro R. Ruiz, of Barstow, Tex., and a resident citizen of the district I have the honor to represent. He was born near Carlsbad, N. Mex., and the citizens of both Texas and New Mexico are very proud of this young man and his heroic military record. I counted it a privilege and honor to witness the ceremony and I know the people of his home town join with me in congratulations and good wishes to Sergeant Ruiz.

For singlehandedly attacking under concentrated fire and destroying a Japanese pillbox on Okinawa, thereby saving the lives of many men in his platoon who were wounded and trapped by enemy fire, Sgt. (then Pfc) Alejandro R. Ruiz, of Carlsbad, N. Mex., has been awarded the Medal of Honor, the War Department announced today.

The Nation's highest award will be presented in the near future to the former Twenty-seventh Division Combat Infantryman, who was discharged on Okinawa on January 14 for the purpose of reenlisting in the Regular Army for duty in the European theater. Now on reenlistment furlough, Sergeant Ruiz is attached to the reception station, Fort Bliss, Tex.

In April 1945, Company A, One Hundred and Sixty-fifth Infantry Regiment, was assigned the job of cleaning up the remnants of a battalion of Japanese, who were firmly entrenched in a network of underground fortifications commanding a series of ridges known as Item Pocket. Their defensive position was strengthened by well-camouflaged concrete pillboxes on the crest of the main ridge, which were connected to the underground tunnels and caves.

The platoon in which the then Private Ruiz was a rifleman was given the task on April 28 of capturing the ridge. "This ridge was about 150 feet high and dropped sharply away from the crest on both sides," said First Lt. Matthew C. Masem, of 1701 Centre Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., commander of the platoon.

Progress was hindered by jagged rocks and constant rifle fire. Three small pinnacles about 30 yards apart dominated the crest. Members of the assault platoon, who witnessed Ruiz' gallantry, and who have since

been discharged, continue the story of the action.

"We worked around the first pinnacle without a mishap," said Tech. Sgt. Frank Distefano, of 860 Hunts-Point Avenue, The Bronx, N. Y., "and started toward the second when we learned it was a well-constructed pillbox. Almost immediately the enemy opened up with machine guns, rifle fire, and grenades."

The platoon was trapped. The Japs had held their fire until the Americans circled a deep coral cut from which a man unaided could not climb out. To retreat the way they had come would have meant silhouetting themselves against the sky. In a few minutes every man in the two assault squads, except Ruiz and his squad leader, were wounded by nearly 100 potato-masher grenades directed at them by the fanatical Japs.

Staff Sgt. Peter J. Bulger, of 749 East One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Street, The Bronx, N. Y., stated that six of his squad members were casualties of this attack. Staff Sgt. Ivan A. Coley, of 1731 Glendale Avenue, Evansville, Ind., saw Private Ruiz grab an automatic rifle from a fallen man and rush through the excessively heavy fire to the pillbox. "As he fired into one of the emplacements the weapon jammed, so he clubbed a charging assailant with the useless weapon."

According to Sgt. Presley B. Land, of 1633 West Seventh Street, Fort Worth, Tex., who was later killed in action, Ruiz ran back to the rest of the squad for another Browning automatic rifle and for more ammunition. He retraced his steps through the deadly hail of lead, and again climbed on top of the enemy bastion.

"Private Ruiz moved from position to position, firing first into the apertures while covering the advance of his squad. The rest of the platoon were so inspired by his actions that they wiped out the enemy positions," stated Sgt. Joe J. Becay, of Falfa, Colo.

Private Ruiz was born June 24, 1924, at Loving, N. Mex. Prior to his induction into the Army on September 9, 1943, he drove a truck. After basic training at Camp Roberts, Calif., he sailed for the Pacific theater, where on December 20, 1944, he joined the Twenty-seventh Division.

He was appointed private first class on February 1, 1945, and fought against the Japs on Okinawa from April to August 1945. In addition to the Combat Infantryman's Badge, he wears the Purple Heart for wounds received on May 4, 1945.

The citation is as follows:

"Pfc Alejandro Renteria Ruiz, Company A, One Hundred Sixty-fifth Infantry, on April 28, 1945, on Okinawa, when his unit was stopped by a skillfully camouflaged enemy pillbox, displayed conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty. His squad, suddenly brought under a hail of machine-gun fire and a vicious grenade attack, was pinned down. Jumping to his feet, Private Ruiz seized an automatic rifle and lunged through the flying grenades and rifle and automatic fire for the top of the emplacement. When an enemy soldier charged him, his rifle jammed. Undaunted, Private Ruiz whirled on his assailant and clubbed him down. Then he ran back through bullets and grenades, seized more ammunition and another automatic rifle, and again made for the pillbox. Enemy fire now was concentrated on him, but he charged on, miraculously reaching the position, and in plain view he climbed to the top. Leaping from one opening to another, he sent burst after burst into the pillbox, killing 12 of the enemy and completely destroying the position. Private Ruiz's heroic conduct, in the face of overwhelming odds, saved the lives of many comrades and eliminated an obstacle that long would have checked his unit's advance."

The Situation in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a splendid editorial on British policy toward Palestine appearing in yesterday's New York Post, together with a statement I issued yesterday on the same subject. I desire to associate myself completely with the views expressed in the editorial—views which are forceful but no more so than the situation demands or Mr. Bevin deserves.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENT OF SENATOR WAGNER ON REMARKS OF FOREIGN SECRETARY BEVIN ON THE PALESTINE SITUATION

The statement of Foreign Secretary Bevin, declining to admit 100,000 Jews into Palestine at this time, is an outright repudiation of the unanimous report of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry. This committee was itself established at Britain's suggestion, at a time when the situation brooked no delay and when the action required was plain to every mature and humane person anywhere in the world. Mr. Bevin's statement is also a flat rejection of the same proposal which had been made even in advance of the committee's work by President Truman. Mr. Bevin's statement coincides with the utterly irresponsible act of permitting the Axis collaborator and Hitler's friend, the notorious Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, to escape confinement and enter the Middle East, with the patent intention of stirring up bloodshed and strife against the Jewish National Home and against the immediate proposal to admit 100,000 Jews into Palestine.

Mr. Bevin's statement referring to the agitation in New York for the latter proposal, is a gratuitous and studied insult which will not be forgotten. It is hardly the contribution to a grave international question to be expected of the Foreign Minister of a friendly power which has been the recipient of generous, wholehearted, and comradely aid by all the people of America in fighting the war and winning the peace.

Mr. Bevin raises new obstacles—of financial aid and of military aid. It should be realized that Britain has never assumed the financial obligation of Jewish settlement or made financial contributions toward it. As for military aid, British forces now in Palestine are more than adequate, and they are already there for reasons of general imperial security.

It is hard to escape the conclusion that Britain has no intention of meeting the solemn obligations which it assumed as the mandatory power in Palestine, or of contributing constructively to the immediate need to rescue a limited number of the tragic remnants of the Jewish people in Europe.

Those of us who have been interested in these problems—and that includes the overwhelming majority of Americans of every race, creed, and color—will not take this repudiation lying down. I for one will continue to press the issue in every forum open to me.

[From the New York Post of June 13, 1946]

BRITAIN STRIPS HER MASK

The British Government's policy toward Palestine is out in the open now where we can see it. The sham of the interminable inquiries, round-tables, reports—17 in all—was exposed yesterday by Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin in his speech to the Labor Party conference.

Ernest Bevin made it plain that his government repudiates the basic principles which in the past, as the opposition party, it offered the English people and the rest of the world for dealing with Palestine.

In Bevin's speech there was no hint of the reasonable note he sounded when the camouflage was on, when Britain was trying to get this country to help her waste time in studying a program for Palestine—"The recommendations of a committee of inquiry * * * will be of immense help in arriving at a solution of the Palestine problem."

Instead, the fraud, deceit, trickery that has characterized British policy in Palestine almost since the Balfour Declaration was proclaimed got a rare, publicly enunciated fillip from the Foreign Secretary. He trotted out his latest evil weapon, anti-Semitism, and made a bid for the support of the racists. "The agitation in the United States for 100,000 Jews to be put into Palestine—and I do not want the Americans to misunderstand me—is because they do not want too many of them in New York."

We don't "misunderstand" the Foreign Secretary any longer. At last he has spoken so that all can clearly understand him.

We were taken. The 4-month inquiry, recently completed, which resulted in a just and reasonable solution, unanimously agreed to by both British and American delegations (and which Bevin promised would be adopted if it were unanimous), was just another signpost along the old path; it was intended to be one more avenue to evasion, frustration, and more do-nothing.

But Mr. Bevin wasn't quite suave enough to carry it off. He had asked the Jews and Arabs to submit their opinions of the report, promising that there would be no decision until after June 20, when the conflicting testimony would be in. However, he didn't even bother to wait and continue the deceit.

He opened up prematurely and told the world that the heart of the committee's recommendation—the demand for immediate entry of 100,000 Jews—was out. No nonsense about delaying his decision until he could study the Jewish-Arab briefs.

The British have been smoother about that sort of thing in days gone by.

They wouldn't have left our Government looking so silly, either, in times past. Remember that on the very day before Bevin was to go to the Labor Party and announce he had no intention at all of implementing the entry of the 100,000 he was still leading our Government to believe that that particular recommendation might well be fulfilled.

Our Secretary of State was saying he was prepared to discuss with the British questions they had raised in connection with the 100,000 less than 24 hours before the British Foreign Secretary publicly announced the idea hadn't a chance in the world with him. Truman was naming Cabinet officers to negotiate "matters arising out of the recommendations of the Anglo-American committee of inquiry" just as it became plain that such matters were not even open for discussion any longer.

Could betrayal be any plainer? Do we have to have our noses rubbed in fraud yet another time before seeing it for what it is? Surely we've learned our lesson now.

His Majesty's Government acts as though it owns Palestine; as though that land were a crown colony about which it can make any

decisions it pleases. It's time now to confront Britain with a few unpleasant facts.

Palestine is no imperialistic loot like Hong Kong. It is a mandate, assigned His Majesty's Government by the League of Nations. In that mandate the 51 signatory powers and the United States, by virtue of the Anglo-American Convention of 1924, have an important vested interest.

They have obligated themselves, in agreement with Britain, to see that certain developments take place in Palestine. As the mandate document puts it, "the high contracting parties agree(d) that the mandatory (Britain) should be responsible for putting into effect the (Balfour) declaration * * * by the Government of His Britannic Majesty * * * in favor of establishment of a national home for the Jewish people."

Well, the mandatory has not lived up to its obligation, but has consistently nullified it. To guard against such contingencies the mandate document had provided that "the consent of the Council of the League of Nations is required for modification of the terms of the present mandate."

Britain tried but couldn't get such consent from the League Council. In spite of that, taking advantage of the fact that the League was dying, the world was in chaos, and we were complacent, she went ahead anyhow and violated her solemn contract.

Now's the time to call her to account. She has acted illegally, in contravention of two solemn treaties (one with 51 nations, the other with the United States).

The United States should either take over the mandate or push it into the lap of the United Nations. Either course would give us the chance, no longer possible under British rule, to reach an honest solution of the Palestine issue. But we must act immediately.

While we delay, the preparations for the slaughter of innocents goes on. The ex-Grand Mufti, whose career as a Nazi war criminal Edgar Ansel Mowrer brilliantly documented in the pages of the Post, has, with British connivance, returned from French "exile" to the scene of his terrorist activities.

Maybe Britain did not supply this murderer with a plane. She did supply him with the chance to "escape."

His Majesty's Government should have demanded the Mufti's extradition to stand trial at Nuremberg. It did not. His Majesty's Government should have accepted the French offer to relinquish the Mufti to the British authorities. It did not.

Instead, the only action it took during this time was to demand that the Jews in Palestine give up the arms they have accumulated in self-defense. Having liberated a fanatical killer on their borders, the British want the intended victims to surrender their means of protection.

If we stand by and allow Britain to pursue her present course in Palestine, we will be accomplices in murder.

And no one can say later that we didn't know.

Yesterday Bevin exposed the ugly visage of British policy in Palestine for all the world to see. The reasonable-appearing fripperies are off, the gilded promises turn out to be worthless.

We know exactly where Britain stands now. It's time for us to make plain where we stand.

BRITAIN PLEDGED HER WORD

"Palestine as a mandated territory is one of our responsibilities. One of the great tragedies of the world has been the persecution of the Jews." (Ernest Bevin, now Britain's Foreign Secretary, in 1937.)

"There is surely neither hope nor meaning in a Jewish national home unless we are prepared to let the Jews if they wish, enter this tiny land in such numbers as to become a majority. There was a strong case for this before the war, and there is an irresistible case for it now." (Excerpt from the plank on Palestine adopted by the annual conference of the Labor Party, December 1944.)

"The committee * * * calls upon the British Government to remove the present unjustifiable barriers on immigration and to announce without delay proposals for a future Palestine, in which it has the full sympathy and support of the American and Russian Governments." (Resolution adopted by the national executive committee of the Labor Party, April 1945.)

"The British Labor Party recalls with pride that in the dark days of the great war they associated themselves with the ideal of a national home in Palestine for the Jewish people. * * *

"They have never faltered, and will never falter, in their active and sympathetic cooperation with the work of political and economic reconstruction now going forward in Palestine." (Clement Attlee, now Prime Minister, on the eve of the general election of 1935.)

Grain Shortage

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Lowell Sun states, in part:

Farmers can't feed Government speeches to their poultry, and we can't eat them, either.

And that is all we seem to be getting at present, may I add in my own words.

The Sun published a picture of 200 or more dead chickens at Chelmsford farm—dead from starvation because the owner could not get the grain necessary to keep them alive.

Those dead birds—and their counterparts on nearly every farm in the greater Lowell area and the whole of Middlesex County as well—were New England's assurance against hunger next fall and winter.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

MUTE EVIDENCE

Proof of all that has been written concerning the grain shortage and its effect on New England poultrymen was given in an irrefutable manner yesterday when the Sun published a picture of 200 or more dead chickens at a Chelmsford farm—dead from starvation because the owner could not get the grain necessary to keep them alive.

Those dead birds—and their counterparts on nearly every farm in the greater Lowell area and the whole of Middlesex County as well—were New England's assurance against hunger next fall and winter. Whether grown for meat or for their egg production, they were going to fill the gaps in New England's menu caused by the shortage of beef, pork, and lamb. They—and their number is legion—will be mourned by all of us before the winter is over.

The immediate financial loss, of course, is the farmers. They have written, telegraphed, and stormed Washington to put their plight before the authorities, and all they have received so far are vague promises and nice-sounding speeches; along with a goodly sized boost in the price of grain, without any increase in price of eggs or poultry so the farmer could hold his margin of profit. This increase in price benefits only those who grow the ingredients of mixed feed; and that means that the favored Midwestern States are the only ones profiting.

The ultimate loss, however, is going to be shared by every consumer, for production of poultry and eggs cannot be maintained at anywhere near its present scale with grain almost impossible to buy. New England so far has been able to get through the meat shortages by turning to poultry, but this will not be possible this fall and winter if the farmers have to kill off their flocks now or have them die of starvation.

Poultry raising in New England is a major industry—just as is the production of textiles, shoes, and other articles of commerce—and anything that hurts any industry hurts the community as a whole. In recent years New England has not fared well in Washington and the Government's handling of the grain situation well may add another casualty to the list of this district's industries.

Farmers can't feed Government speeches to their poultry, and we can't eat them either.

The situation is serious—in fact, it is critical—and it is about time that our Federal officials realized this fact and concentrated for a while on American problems before the country's economical set-up is completely destroyed.

Address by the Postmaster General at Convention of Missouri Chapter, National Association of Postmasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK P. BRIGGS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Postmaster General Robert E. Hannegan at the convention of the Missouri Chapter, National Association of Postmasters, in St. Louis on Friday, June 7, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In addressing friends and fellow workers in the post office, it is customary for the Postmaster General to take up problems of administration and operation of the mails, and to leave economics and politics for other occasions.

I have no wish to break with that custom. Today, however, the greatest and most immediate problem in the administration and operation of the mails goes right down to basic economics, to the soundness of our national economy.

That factor—basic economics—was at the heart of the interruption of the mails a few days ago. It is our problem today. We cannot solve it alone as employees of the United States, but we can help to solve it as citizens of the United States. And unless we join our fellow Americans in doing so, it will remain our problem of tomorrow.

You have heard it said many times that the post office is the biggest business in America. That is true. But perhaps it has not been said often enough that our responsibility in running this business does not end with the making of routes and schedules or in keeping the equipment in good condition.

As managers of this business, we must recognize and understand its relation to other business in America. We must be aware of the fact that a 1-cent rise in the price of bread in New York City, or a demand

by a labor union in San Francisco, may have a very definite bearing on the prospect of continued delivery of the mails in St. Louis.

Stated in this way, it may sound far-fetched. But the relationship of wages and prices to the operation of this business of mail delivery was brought home to us—all too forcefully—only a few days ago.

I consider it fitting, therefore, to discuss with you the broad economic situation on which will depend your own ability to deliver the mails without further interruption.

It is easy to say, you know, that the mails will go through. It is nice to think so. But they don't go through without railroads and aircraft and trucks to transport them. Your couriers, as you know, are stayed by "neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night," but there is nothing in that familiar quotation on the subject of labor disputes or stalled railroads.

Now, what has been at the bottom of the Nation's labor troubles in these past few months? Suppose, 5 or 10 years hence, an economist should look back on this scene with the advantage of hindsight and the perspective that time affords. What would he find?

We would find, first, that President Truman was accurate in his message to Congress last September when he said, "A vast backlog of orders may soon make possible the greatest peacetime industrial activity that we have ever seen. But this can happen only if the Congress and the administration move vigorously and courageously to deal with the economic problems which peace has created."

In other words, the factors of supply and demand—so often our chief block to prosperity in the past—now favor us. We have that vast backlog of orders. And we have the means of production to supply them and the purchasing power to pay for them.

On that basis alone, American business and American labor have a tremendous opportunity to prosper. But the President emphasized that this opportunity is not the only new factor which peace has created in our economy. There are other problems, too.

One of these problems—the greatest one of all—is the threat of inflation. Inflation, if we allow it to develop, would not only wipe out our opportunity to prosper; it would close in upon our existing economy, unbalancing our industrial machine bit by bit, until we would lapse into complete paralysis. Then, instead of the opportunity to prosper, we should have the reality of want.

Already, as we in the Post Office know, we have had a taste of that paralysis.

The inflation that threatens us comes in the form of higher prices. It is not a fear for the soundness of the dollar. It has not reached the catastrophe that economists describe as "monetary inflation."

What we are suffering now is only an incipient form of the disease. Monetary inflation—the final stage—is brought about when a whole nation becomes afflicted with the jitters. Price inflation is the symptom of a nation that has become afflicted with the give-me.

It is this disease, the give-me, that has brought on our labor troubles. And the give-me is an economic virus that feeds upon itself.

In the beginning, as we emerge into the postwar world we find that producers are operating at high rates of profit, as shown by their income statements. They have come out of the war with a bad case of the give-me.

To maintain that high rate of profit, the price of the necessities of life is set beyond the workingman's reach. He cannot pay those prices and keep his family housed and fed and clothed. He needs higher wages.

The leaders of his union then make demands for higher wages. But they make their demands excessive. They, too, have come down with a case of the give-me.

At that stage the company and the union fight it out. A strike is called. It may last weeks, months. Finally, a settlement is reached, and the workingman is given part of what his leaders have demanded, hoping that with this increase he will now be able to pay the price of living.

But the people who have the give-me are not cured. The fever comes on again and again there is the tug for higher prices. Manufacturers complain that they cannot pay the higher wages without raising prices. But their complaints do not harmonize with their income statements. Those statements show they still have the give-me.

We have the proof of this in the extreme pressure that has been brought to bear on Congress to end price control.

If these pressure groups have their way, the workingman will be where he started—trying to stretch his earnings over a higher and higher cost of living until his problem again becomes impossible and he finds that he cannot go on without another rise in wages.

At that point his union leaders will undergo a new attack on the give-me and once again they will make excessive demands. Their demands, and the refusal of management, bring on new conflict; and each time this conflict descends upon our industries, it is of a more virulent and damaging character. The end result, of course, is paralysis, stagnation, and want.

The President foresaw this threat. He attempted to forestall it. He asked Congress to extend price control. An overwhelming majority of the American people want and demand price control, as shown by popular polls—three out of every four. They have flooded Congress with mail. I have seen some of those letters, and I know they are spontaneous—not the standardized, uniform kind that organized lobbies dump in the lap of Congress—but letters written by hand, letters from housewives, from small businessmen, white-collar workers, and war veterans.

Faced with the plea of workingmen for higher wages, President Truman moved quickly to correct the unbalance and remove the threat that hung over them and their families. He placed Chester Bowles and Paul Porter in the key positions in our machinery to stabilize the economy. He asked Congress to extend OPA—the agency of price control—for another year.

At the same time the President and his advisers worked day and night to reach a settlement of the great labor disputes that had developed in major industries—a settlement that would bring the workingman's take-home pay into balance again with the higher prices that he had to meet to live. At times both sides of these disputes were arbitrary in their demands, obdurate in their attitudes. But settlements were affected, and work was resumed.

Now, anyone who tells you that 100,000 or 200,000 American workers are willing to walk out and keep an industry idle over a period of weeks just to get a little extra money for the movies or for a vacation in Florida, or for the frills of life, does not know these men and how they live. When they go out on strike, they go because they are afraid they will not have the necessaries of life for themselves and their families. They are afraid of being evicted from the homes they rent, or losing the homes they have bought with their savings. A strike is a grim and costly business. It is born of fear and fed on fear.

On the other side, anyone who tells you that management's only motive is to keep the workers ground down as they were in the old days of Charles Dickens does not know American business and how it is run. The reason the businessman does not grant labor's demands more readily, resists those demands, is fear. He is afraid of loss, of eventual bankruptcy. Even when his current income statements are good, he moves against labor because he is afraid.

What are they afraid of?

They are afraid of inflation. "Yes," says the union man, "with my recent raise I can make ends meet." But what if prices continue upward? "Yes," says management, "with our recent price increase we could meet this higher pay roll." But other producers will be paying more for their labor now, the things we buy will cost us more, and we shall be caught in the upward spiral. What if we can't keep pace?

The only parties to this vicious cycle who are not afraid are the irresponsibles on both sides—the reckless labor leader who is too willing to pit the strength of his union against the Nation—against Government itself—and the minority of big businessmen who are attempting in their blindness and greed to do away with price controls, the men who want more and more profits and who care not what disaster may befall their fellow Americans in this ruinous scramble.

President Truman has taken his stand against those irresponsibles. He has been told by some that this is bad politics. But in his heart he knows it is good Americanism, and I can assure you, he will carry on, answering the dictates of a heart that beats only for America.

In the meantime, the fight against price control goes on in the Halls of Congress. And it is in the controversy over price control, in the vote of Congress on this question, that future labor relationships in America will be decided.

The prospect, if Congress elects to discontinue price control, is appalling. Food prices will go up 20 percent in their first jump. And other jumps will follow.

If we have price increases of that kind, corresponding demands for wage increases to meet them are inevitable. American labor must either make such demands or accept a lower standard of living. There is no other way out. And if anyone should tell me that American labor must accept a lower standard of living in this age of productive miracles, I would answer that he is libeling our system of free enterprise.

Recently two labor leaders set out to stop the railroads of America and keep them stopped. They should have called their scheme "operation paralysis."

They did not succeed. The President of the United States saw to it that they did not. And I might add that he also saw to it that the railroad men got a raise in wages deemed reasonable both by Federal mediators and by the rank and file of railroad workers.

Our country and its system of free enterprise occupy an island today in an unfriendly sea. The tides of that sea are running against us. Our stamina, our foundations, are being tested. Before the world, we are on trial. And there are those among us who are so blinded that they would bring upon our economic system a verdict of guilty before any jury of our international peers.

In the offices on Capitol Hill, men have brought pressure which has forced America to the brink of self-conviction before the world.

But there is still time to win out against this danger. Until the last day and hour of the battle to carry on price control, it is not too late to fight.

Last September, in announcing my intention to ask Congress to reduce the rate on air mail, I stated the hope that the action of the post office might set an example to both industry and labor. As I said at that time of this proposal to decrease the rate:

"The resulting increased volume will bring down the unit cost of delivery, and, within a reasonably short time, justify the cut.

"That is a tried and true principle in the peacetime business of our country.

"In time of war, when labor and materials were scarce, of course we have had to set that principle aside. And sometimes, in the inflated wake of war, we forget it. We forget that it works, and we try other ways, inflationary ways, short-sighted ways, that work for a while but in the long run get us into trouble.

"It is my thought that in once again proving the soundness of this principle of Ameri-

can business, our Government, moving strictly within its own field and handing down no directives that reach outside that field, will be setting a good example to both industry and labor.

"Along that road—the road of farsighted policy, of temporary concessions for the sake of permanent benefits—lie prosperity for our people and security for our Nation."

Address by Hon. Frank Carlson, of Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD a speech delivered June 12, 1946, by the Honorable FRANK CARLSON, representing the Sixth District of Kansas in the National House of Representatives, at his home town of Concordia.

With this speech Representative CARLSON opened his campaign for the Republican nomination for Governor of Kansas. We Kansans are very proud of the record FRANK CARLSON has made during his six terms in the House of Representatives. His work on the Ways and Means Committee has received national recognition in the past few years. I believe our colleagues in the Congress, as well as the people of Kansas, will be interested in the very able and statesmanlike address Mr. CARLSON delivered at Concordia. It is a genuine and frank statement of his ambition to serve his State as Governor. I predict that he will make a good Governor, just as he has made a good Member of Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, home folks, and friends of the radio audience, this is a day I shall always remember with pride and gratitude.

The man never lived who did not think of everything in relation to his home town and his home folks. This gathering of my friends and my own people tightens my throat more than a little. Your presence is an inspiration and an encouragement.

And, by contrast, how hollow and empty the future would seem if it were any other way. Thank you so much for coming to help me clear this first hurdle. The assemblage here is far greater than I have any right to ask. Most of you have left your work, your businesses, to attend this opening of my campaign for the Republican nomination for Governor. You would not have done this if you did not feel it was your campaign too. I assure you that it is your campaign and that whatever is said here is being laid before you all—and the radio audience as well—as proposals for the progress of our Kansas and for your approval and criticism.

The plans and ideas that I am going to present came from many of you in the first place. You must tell me if you think them incomplete, insufficient, or overreaching. Your advice, report, and support must continue, or there is no need for my asking this nomination. In the fullest sense, Kansas government must be one of the people. I will participate in no other kind.

With all my heart I want to be your Governor. It has been a long-cherished secret ambition. Even today the dome on the Capitol at Washington does not seem proportionally larger than ours at Topeka.

And so today, while I am thrilled beyond expression at beginning the effort toward realizing a farm boy's ambition, I feel humble and not a little presumptuous in this request of the citizens of my native State. I hope, and I am sure you will, understand this.

Already you have sent me to the State legislature and to the Congress. The record of my legislative activities is there for study. I do not pretend it is perfect, but it is upon this background of coming to grips with both State and National problems that my candidacy is projected. I would have planned it that way, too, if by determined design I had set out to be Governor of Kansas.

I feel certain that the governor of any State in these recent times faces not only the traditional legislative problems but of necessity he must be familiar with the constant encroachment of the Federal Government on the rights of the States. Federal bureaucracy, controls, and regimentation have grown out of all bounds.

Today, one-fourth of every dollar of our income flies to Washington as taxes. This tribute to what is fast becoming an oppressive political machine will require our utmost skill to reduce.

Knowing that all Kansas breathes the air of freedom, I know that I, as your governor, could say to all Federal officials who would trample upon our rights as a State and as citizens, "You stick to your Constitution; I'll stick to mine and we'll get along fine."

Fortunately this conflict isn't even a party issue in Kansas. My Democratic friends tell me they are as apprehensive of big government as I am. They also fear that the national administration has been captured by a radical minority who are willing to bypass the Constitution.

This minority would socialize America, preaches communism under other titles, and seeks to divide us by class hatreds. It has rooted on our seaboards; has footholds in our Congress and high offices. It has wealth and power; a voice in press and radio. Its vehicle is propaganda, and it has access to many channels of Government publicity.

And so I do not blame my Democratic friends in Kansas for their apprehension and their reluctance to vote their own party ticket for fear of their national party leadership. We offer them and welcome them to the safety of the Republican vote until our plague of Red termites is exterminated. I wish it were otherwise and that Republicans and Democrats could discuss issues in proper public debate without this specter of Old World hates haunting us.

Stripped of its clever sales talk, you can put it down that the radical movement is simply the economic opportunism of rabble rousers. They are Americans by name only, wanting to divide up our hard-won fruits of labor—without the labor.

Their boast has been that they would "force America to spend itself into bankruptcy." As a member of the Ways and Means Committee of Congress, I should warn you that in this respect they are much nearer to success than most of us realize. Repeatedly, since war's end, I have tried to install an automatic ceiling on the Federal debt to keep an absolute limit on Federal spending, only to be blocked by New Deal leadership.

We must not let big government throttle our destinies as men. We cannot build houses and grow food by votes alone. Neither can you trade freedom for security. If each of us were obliged to toil as directed by some bureaucrat, where would we get the scientific progress that comes from free thinkers and free men—the progress that makes our civilization and defends it with the best airplanes, tanks, bombs, and the best soldiers in the world. That is the way to lose security; the sure road to serfdom.

I say we Kansans like to travel the way of free enterprise and freedom of action. We know it isn't the road to regimentation and controlled economy. So, let's waste no opportunities in Kansas. Let's plan and build ahead—bigger and better schools and churches; raise more and better wheat and meat, dig more coal, pump more oil—let's live and be free in the manner God Almighty intended. Here are some of the ways Kansas can.

I. VETERANS AND YOUTH

Somehow I am not too worried about older folks being carried away with newfangled "isms." But remembering my own venturesome and inquisitive youth, I am determined that our American plan of living gets at least an even break by comparison in the minds of Kansas young people.

Ours always has been a state of young ideals and progress. Family life is the heart of Kansas. Generally our personal ambitions are wrapped up in our early youth. We all want a State where our children will be happy, will remain near us, and will prosper.

In the decade 1930–40, our population declined nearly 82,000. Census estimates say our civilian population in Kansas declined less than 75,000 between 1940 and 1945. As the State furnished over 215,000 men and women for military service during this period, we actually gained about 150,000.

As Governor, my prime concern would be a State economy that offers the best opportunities for our youth and a State educational system that will support it.

We must act quickly to avail ourselves of the talents and the manpower of our returned veterans. This is no concession; it is an opportunity. Every Kansan will insist on taking care of the veterans without stint. Our veterans have earned and must be given the prior rights to finish delayed educations and to resume careers and jobs. Let us remove every hindrance possible.

In many ways I envy the advantages of the Kansas boys and girls today. Life today is much more interesting and filled with more wonders than ever before. But it is more hurried and crowded with an avalanche of parental problems. In the midst of these great new advantages and attainments the Nation at large has its most serious problems with juvenile delinquencies.

The building of schools and staffing them with teachers does not alone provide for our future as a State. I would like to emphasize that there must be parental responsibility and care, and beyond that, wholesome social contacts.

The splendid programs of the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Campfire Girls, YM and YW, the 4–H Clubs, and similar organizations must be encouraged. The help and study of all responsible organizations is solicited.

II. AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRY

So that our youth can grasp the vision of our future development and thereby grow in the pride of our statehood, the forces of agriculture and industry which underlie our State's economic life must expand.

The mechanization of our farms is steadily reducing the number of man-hours required to produce a bushel of wheat or a gallon of milk. It also is reducing our fatigue and increasing our leisure. This is progress, and I would have it no other way. But it does pose the problem of a decrease in employment in agriculture even though our agricultural output continues to increase. Farms are larger; jobs are fewer.

What's ahead?

Our State has, or can have, the best laboratories, researchists, surveys, and planning commissions. Many of these are already well-founded and functioning at the capitol, in our State schools, and in private industry.

Many new frontiers already are charted. Let's count a few of our opportunities.

Our cereal wealth still is largely unprocessed before it leaves the State. Most of our meat leaves Kansas on the hoof.

Our clays and limestones make the finest of brick, cement, and pottery. Our climate and topography are unexcelled for aeronautical pursuits. In coal and petroleum we have fuel for thousands of factories.

Count your blessings and compare them with those of any State in the Union. We've got the world at our doorstep. Why any person, old or young, should seek or have to seek opportunities outside of Kansas is more than I can understand.

This is the challenge of our time to keep our children with us as our rightful heirs of the Kansas prairies and its free traditions. The great expenditures for our schools and colleges are lost to Kansas if we fail to provide job opportunities for our boys and girls.

The Kansas Industrial Development Commission has been encouraging the creation of industry for several years. It would be my intention as governor to regularly canvass this activity and to form regular conference groups as a permanent and never-ending force for a greater State.

It would seek to promote capital investments in Kansas, and would lay before the legislature its recommendations for the best economic and tax climate as inducements. It would fight for equitable and competitive transportation facilities and rates.

The presence or absence of people is an important factor in what makes business good or bad and clearly what we need is more employment opportunities.

We have the best, the healthiest manpower and brains on this whole planet. Kansas flexed its industrial muscles for war and set production records. Industrial employment increased 230 percent. Starting from scratch, Kansas workers proved themselves in training for and in producing for war.

Trades learned in war now are being changed to peacetime pursuits. We must forge ahead.

And here's what can be ahead in Kansas industry and agriculture.

1. Expand old, create new industry.
2. Explore and exploit natural and agricultural resources.
3. Chart and catalog our opportunities for the convenience of the investing public.
4. Promote Kansas through advertising and publicity.
5. Direct our educational facilities toward the best interests of our State.

III. THE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Kansas has undertaken the biggest road-building program in the history of the State. By the end of 1946, over $26,000,000 will have been expended in construction contracts. About $20,000,000 in contracts already have been let for the building of primary, secondary, and urban highways.

This is a practical farsightedness that has my utmost approval. The last session of the Kansas Legislature launched this new secondary-road program. I assure you that if this program does not build farm-to-market roads, the law will be changed to provide them. Our roads must lead to the church, the school, and the market place.

Everyone who lives in the present is in favor of building roads and does not object to paying for them. Transportation is the key to progress. But we expect results for our money. And we must anticipate the traffic demands of our growing State 5, 10, and 20 years from now with an over-all plan to provide a network of farm-to-market and feeder highways.

I expect to vigorously promote a road-building program within the means of our ability to pay.

Coincident with the development of our highway system, Kansas must continue its outstanding record among the States in the safety of its highways. Our traffic laws must be sound; our city regulations should be as uniform as possible, our road-marking system should be adequate. Above all, the enforcement of traffic laws should provoke cooperation of our citizens. It will pay dividends in lives saved if we promote and encourage a State safety program.

IV. LAW ENFORCEMENT AND RESUBMISSION

My position on the proposed resubmission of the prohibition amendment is well known. To avoid any possible misunderstanding, I repeat that the people of Kansas can and will, if they choose, repeal any law at any time. I have confidence in the sound judgment of the citizens of Kansas.

I am a member of the Baptist Church and I am dry. I have many warm friends who are neither, and we do not argue the points. But we do agree, as do most Kansans, that intemperance and intolerance are alike, an evil in any government.

But whether the people of Kansas decide that prohibition is a matter of personal decision or a matter of State law, I want everyone to know that our State laws are going to be enforced if you elect me your Governor. The State of Kansas will not tolerate the operation of any type of illegal or even questionable traffic under the cloak of State, county or local office. I promise Kansas a regime of law and order.

Perhaps it is because of our free-wheeling bureaucrats who think they can make up the laws as they go along, or it may be because of the war, but I think all of us are greatly concerned about present tendencies to evade law. There has been a temptation to beat the game on every hand—such as in the black markets.

It is almost a frame of mind, extending from the "fix-it" boys of the corrupt city machines to the country bootlegger. Winking at the law and special privilege is the dry rot of democracy. It is not American; certainly not Kansan.

The real America today looks to the West as its strength and its salvation whence must come a real regeneration from the grassroots. The call is for men of courage, character and self-discipline. Respect for law and enforcement of law must be reborn—must be taught in homes, schools, churches, by veteran's groups and civic organizations. Let us fill our churches and schools first, then we need not worry about our jails or the safety of our homes.

As Governor I would expect to cooperate fully with other law-enforcement agencies such as the FBI and those of other States. I would hope to build, with the counsel of Federal, State, city, and county enforcement officers, a cooperating enforcement organization, free of petty rivalries. Some of our methods and overlapping jurisdictions perhaps need reexamination and should be studied.

V. EDUCATION

The war's shifting of populations has considerably dislocated our plans for primary and secondary schools. Under these changing conditions, it is no longer as true as it should be that our educational system presents equal opportunities to all.

Some school districts have been depopulated; others are overcrowded.

In 1945, after considerable study, the Kansas Legislature passed the school reorganization law. It sought to balance the inequities of the system, and I believe everyone will agree that such provisions were needed by many school districts.

There have been some objections to the law—valid objections—but I do not believe it should be repealed. Rather, it should be amended to meet valid objections or to make it practical and operative in the respects it is not.

In our higher institutions of learning we must, as I have said, make available courses and accommodations for our returned veterans seeking to take advantage of the benefits under the GI bill of rights. We cannot afford to do less.

Above all, I would here pay tribute to Kansas' splendid group of teachers. Although often underpaid, they have continued devotedly and unselfishly in their professions during these past difficult years. We owe them our gratitude and consideration.

VI. LABOR

Industry and labor are partners in the joint enterprise of production. In every reasonably founded enterprise there is a fair wage and a fair profit. Management and labor derive advancement alike from a better product, better processes, and wider markets—and not from the defeatist idea of cutting profits or wages. The liberal and progressive idea is that both should rise.

Management should know it kills the lifeblood of investment when it pays niggardly wages. Labor should know that it destroys employment when through arbitrary action it closes plants, disrupts service, and irritates the public.

Responsible management is loyal to its employees, as are responsible labor unions loyal to their employer and product. They accept their working contracts as binding as a note at the bank. This is only the test of character, and in Kansas labor there is a wealth of character. Our State is proud of its war record of friendly relationships between management and labor.

Of course, there can be honest differences between them. And for these situations and, indeed, for labor's continued advancement, labor has its hard-won right of collective bargaining. The State's interest is the public's interest, and as Governor I would expect to protect that interest against any reckless action by either management or leaders of labor. But as this State embarks on what should be its glorious era of expansion and prosperity, I urge that both these elements of industry consider seriously the long-range gains at stake rather than immediate profits.

I expect to devote my every effort to the continuation of our State's fine labor record. Indeed, the direction of nearly every proposal I make today is with the fundamental idea of creating more and better jobs.

VII. SOCIAL SECURITY

As a member of the House Ways and Means Committee of the Congress I have made a thorough study of social security and have had the opportunity to hear all sides of the question as presented to the committee in both public and closed hearings.

Social security is emerging from infancy and I believe that its proper growth will correct many of the inequities now apparent. The present act is unfair to many of our citizens. Congress is now studying these inequities and I am confident changes will be made that will be helpful to those in declining years.

There is one outstanding inequity with social security for which a remedy must be found. That inequity is that moneys paid out of the fund have gone to the highly industralized sections of the country at the rate of $4 per capita, whereas in the agricultural Midwest the payments have averaged only $1 per capita.

This inequity is more serious when you consider that the social-security tax is added to the price of articles sold. When you buy tractors, combines, trucks, and other articles with which to produce to feed the people of this Nation—and now the world—you pay that added tax cost for the benefit of people of other sections.

State government must make its position known and felt in national legislation which affects people of the State, and I shall exer-

cise the prerogative of the office of governor to make known the position of Kansas on Federal legislation which affects the people of Kansas.

VIII. AVIATION

In aviation, too, our State has a boundless opportunity to advance. We are the center of the United States; the crossroads of the compass points are between our greatest cities. We have pioneered in aviation and greatly expanded that industry under the impetus of our air defense. We must hold and forward this preeminence in the air industry.

During the war, the Army and Navy established 41 airports within the State. Nineteen of them have now been declared surplus. It is important that we take advantage of this expenditure on the part of the Federal Government.

Congress recently enacted Federal legistion for the construction of airports in cooperation with the States and municipalities. To obtain this benefit, Kansas must pass additional laws and I am heartily in favor of early action.

It is my intention to cooperate fully with those familiar and interested in the expansion of our aviation program, just as I have as a Member of Congress.

IX. STATE INSTITUTIONS

As Governor, I would ask the authorities in charge of our excellent educational, charitable, and penal institutions to submit plans and recommendations compatible with the modernization and maintenance of their facilities.

This program necessarily was delayed during the war years, and it is only good business now to repair, rebuild, and construct new buildings where needed.

Now I do not delude myself nor attempt to tell you that in these nine points are all the answers. As the campaign progresses I expect to expand this outline.

One thing I do know—if we have a working, prosperous Kansas, our problems will be few. We have the means, the will, and the courage. The main idea is to build, expand, and grow.

Kansas can and will.

I thank you.

Conditions in Yellowstone National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BILLINGS, MONT., *June 11, 1946.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Last week I took a 2-day trip to West Yellowstone through the northwest portion of the main loop in Yellowstone Park.

Nature was as glorious as ever. Perfectly oblivious to restraining war directives 1 year after the war ended, United States bureau misleading production publicity and propaganda, labor arrogance and its mishandling, OPA regulated inflation through scarcity and want, Congress' hesitancy to act in positive and forthright fashion to end the war officially and return the people they represent to a state of comparative individual freedom, thus ending the bondage which was created as part of the win-the-war fervor.

I say, nature was at her best in the park. Unfortunately, in spite of the tremendous industrial production, Federal publicists tell me through radio and press, I could not record this natural splendor and vivid coloring because it is just impossible to purchase color film. I tried in every town between Billings and West Yellowstone. We were told during the war the material was used by the services. But the war was over to the average layman just short of a year ago. And the film shortage is more acute in 1946 than in 1944. This in spite of CPA, OPA, and statements of their superior officials to the contrary. I am sure fed up with Federal officials telling me otherwise at a cost of $74,000,000 annually to the Nation.

Well, let me again get back to the logical development of my story and assure you the inspiring natural wonders and majestic scenic splendor of the park is as it was always. Man as yet, thank God, has not undertaken to plan the lives of the flora and fauna nor to regulate its daily habits. The moose, elk, antelope, Canadian geese, and trumpeter swans we saw were as always pictured. This is about the only experience on the trip which was what we ordinarily consider normal living and custom out here.

I worked for several hours in a conference attended by folks from Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana in the park area, all of whom could be called experts in handling summer tourist travel. We were all agreed the outlook is for a very messy and scandalous situation in and around the park unless immediate action is taken to correct the deficiencies. Herewith are some of the items which led us to this conclusion:

TRAVEL INCREASES

We were told at 11 a. m. in the morning, at the entrance, all available sleeping accommodations in the park were taken for the day (same the second day). As predicted since 1942 by postwar planners and inevitably according to American habit, park travel in early June is almost at midsummer peak. Three hundred and fifty cars in one entrance before 10 a. m.

CONGRESSIONAL INACTION CREATES PARK HAZARDS AND CONFUSION

But what unfortunate conditions are faced by these eager travelers? Congress decided that all park employees should be limited to a 40-hour workweek. This institution, which serves a restless, surgent, movement-hungry public, is utterly unsuited for a punch-the-clock system of public service. This Congress could not have taken into account, because it did not adjust the Budget structure to provide three times the postwar number of park rangers which must be done if the park is to handle the job at 40 hours per man at a time when everybody predicted the greatest travel year of all time.

Therefore Yellowstone Park is forced to operate with less than one-fourth of its normal prewar staff and its business already is more than quadrupled.

It is unfortunate, but apparently normal to Washington thinking, that Mr. John Q. Public receives the brunt of the unpleasant conditions resulting. Traffic is backed up at the entrance gates, park concessionaires unable to secure sufficient help cannot prepare facilities fast enough to meet the demands. Mr. Public, on a long-deferred and well-earned holiday, must rush out of the park to entrance towns for his meals and lodging. An inadequately staffed park is not able to police traffic for safety, accident hazards are multiplying on roads on which normal maintenance has been deferred since 1941 and for which new appropriations, proposed in Congress, are insufficient to meet the requirements for public safety and convenience.

The 40-hour week, insufficient appropriations, abnormally increased travel, and insufficient help and accommodations at this early date are creating a most undesirable condition. We commend to the Congress some immediate and substantial action before mid-season demands create a sensation because of failure to correct these deficiencies.

THE PRODUCTION PLENTY IS EXPLORED

As we traveled through this great livestock producing area between Billings, Livingston, and Gardiner we marveled at the number of juicy steaks and lamb chops on the hoof that were to be seen; greater in numbers than at any time in my experience. People seem to have plenty of money and the desire to buy meat—which is considered necessary to an optimum diet—but something is certainly interfering with the normal American way of doing.

Restaurants in Gardiner, West Yellowstone, are forced to close parts of days because of food-stock shortages. These people turn to Bozeman and Livingston for fresh stocks of meat, but it is not to be had. Park restaurants cannot open because they cannot get meat. I saw a queue in Livingston of housewives waiting hopefully for a meat market to open—but there was no meat. And please remember, the increased population in this area visiting the park is far from its peak in volume.

I went shopping for some clothes to get my mind off the pitiful scarcity of food. I have visited every store in the towns between Cody and Powell, Wyo., Billings—Livingston, seeking a pair of frontier pants. There is not a pair to be had although in prewar days thousands of pairs were stocked and sold annually. They are worn in this region in place of the "city slicker" slacks. But somehow the war planning has dislocated the system which produced and distributed these pants. Not a luxury item, but a standard daily necessity. Jeans or levis are in the same category—we can't get them.

I tried to buy the wool shirts commonly worn by stockmen in this region. None to be had. They, like the frontier pants, are everyday apparel and are commonly stocked and sold in quantities at all stores.

I can't believe these abnormalities are due entirely to war aftermath. It reminds me of the fear attitude which continued the depression of the early thirties unnecessarily. Only this time the fear, or something like it, is in Washington among those who are expected to give courageous leadership in steering the Nation's course. Actually some of these fear motivated leaders using Federal funds are trying by press and radio to communicate this fear complex to the Nation.

Sure think it is time for those Washington representatives who do recognize these facts to immortalize themselves and lead Congress to do those chores it knows must be done to right this topsy-turvy Nation and get it on a peacetime basis.

Hope you have read this far.

Sincerely,

H. BUCK,
Secretary-Manager,
Billings Commercial Club.

The Age of "Chiselization"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on May 28, 1946, at the Shrine Mosque in Springfield, Mo., I had the pleasure of addressing a meeting of more than 3,000 people sponsored by the Republican Women's Clubs of the Sixth and Seventh Congressional Districts.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks, the address follows:

Mr. Chairman, voters of the Sixth and Seventh Congressional Districts in Missouri, friends from all over the State, I am sure we all feel greatly pleased and highly honored to have with us tonight an able legislator, an efficient organizer, a brave and much-decorated soldier and a great American, my good personal friend, our new national Republican chairman, who will be introduced at the conclusion of my remarks by my colleague, your own faithful and fearless Representative, Hon. MARION T. BENNETT. To each and all of you who have cooperated and worked so hard together to make this meeting a success I want to extend my personal thanks.

America emerged victorious from the two most cruel, brutal, and destructive wars in human history. The war in Europe and the war in Asia cost us more than a million casualties and left us with a Federal debt of $275,000,000,000. Our sacrifices are not yet ended and many of our problems were not solved by victory in combat.

Every sane person knows that the aftermath or backwash of war is as bad and sometimes even worse than war itself. It is impossible to blow the brains of millions of men into the mud and to blow up hundreds of billions of dollars of the world's wealth in smoke and powder without every nation engaged in the conflict, and even those that fortunately maintained neutrality, suffering serious political upheaval, social chaos, and economic dislocation.

War pulls nations and peoples up by the roots and disorganizes all their lives. The problem of readjustment for individuals and nations is a stupendous one.

In the wake of war follow hunger, starvation, pestilence, and often revolution.

Most of the worries of the generals and admirals ended with victory over Italy, Germany, and Japan, but the troubles of statesmen and headaches of Congressmen just began.

Never before in our history were the American people and the American Congress confronted with so many complex, difficult, and baffling problems as they are today. Demobilization, reconversion, management and labor disputes, strikes, revision of taxation, control of the atomic bomb, proposed loans to foreign countries, peacetime military conscription, merger of our armed forces, disposal of surplus property, priorities in the production and distribution of goods, price ceilings on commodities—these are only a few of the myriad complicated problems which have left America confused and bewildered.

It is now over a year since Germany unconditionally surrendered and it will soon be a year since the total capitulation of Japan. We have had 4 years of war and 1 year of peace. When the two wars ended there was the biggest pent-up demand for civilian goods in our history. This was caused by the sacrifices and self-denials made by our people and the accumulated shortages during 4 years of war. We also had, on VJ-day, not only the best domestic market and the biggest demand for goods but the American people, because of extraordinarily high wartime wages and accumulated savings, had the greatest purchasing power in our history.

By all rules of the game we should have entered immediately, or very shortly after final victory, upon an era of unprecedented production and unparalleled prosperity because both the demand and the purchasing power for goods were present. It must also be remembered that many of our wartime plants and industries began their reconversion programs long before the collapse of Japan.

The natural, normal, and expected prosperity, however, did not follow and today, after a year of peace, our country is bogged down in its reconversion program. Selfishness, greed, and strife are to be seen on every hand. An epidemic of strikes has brought about commercial and industrial paralysis.

The personal conflict between capital and labor did not commence overnight. The bitter class hate engendered by the New Deal began with the sit-down strikes several years ago, before the outbreak of the global war. Since 1933 New Deal politicians have pampered, courted, and coddled labor in quest of votes. We have sown to the wind and are now reaping the whirlwind. The broth we are now served has been simmering for the past 12 years. People are now getting what they voted for. As the St. Louis Globe-Democrat said in an editorial last Friday: "It is also the price the country pays for White House leadership which has played a high and handsome game of favoritism with the unions, started by Roosevelt and continued by Truman."

Many people have blamed Congress for the tragic plight we are in. And Congress, partially—at least one branch of it—is to be blamed for it. I wish to remind this audience, and I wish all the American people thoroughly understood, that the House of Representatives has passed different labor bills only to have them pigeonholed and die in the United States Senate because of a few prolabor, radical New Deal Senators. Weeks ago we passed the Hobbs antiracketeering bill and also the Case bill. Had these measures been immediately accepted by the Senate we would not have gone through all the turmoil of recent days. Because of the Senate's failure to act and because a weak and vacillating administration, which wants most of all to keep itself in power, refused to take a firm and positive stand, labor ran wild and the country drifted into chaos.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in the right of labor to organize. I believe in the right of collective bargaining. I believe in the general and fundamental right of labor to strike. But the right to strike does not cancel other rights. I believe every laborer is worthy of his hire. I do not believe, however, that any selfish minority in this country is greater than the American Government or that their interests should be placed above the public welfare. Every individual has the right to work and the public the right to live. I hold no brief for the sins of industry in the past, but the pendulum has swung altogether to the other extreme until now a few, just a little handful, a coterie of high-powered racketeers, many of them from the Old World who lived in poverty and who are living better now than they could ever have lived had they stayed where they were born, are over here shaking down Americans to pay exorbitant initiation fees and monthly dues to join a union and stir up trouble even if it has to be jurisdictional fights.

Following the fall of Japan the AFL renewed or renegotiated workers' contracts without stoppages by raising wages from 10 to 15 percent. The CIO, however, began a drive for a 30-percent increase in wages, chiefly because the President himself said that this increase could be granted without increasing prices. Of course, this argument was illogical, erroneous, and unsound—if not downright silly. In the hope of holding the support of labor by making it such ridiculous and impossible promises a whole series of strikes followed. First, the United Automobile Workers, next the steel strike, then the coal strike followed by the railroad strike, and now a threatened maritime strike.

Because the President's fact-finding board granted the steel workers an increase of 18½ cents an hour in wages, this encouraged all the other groups to follow suit. The situation became so intolerable that the American people rose in their holy wrath and demanded an end to the administration's vacillation before we reached the brink of rioting which would end in anarchy.

Last Friday night and again Saturday afternoon Harry Truman spoke as if he meant business. Let us hope and pray that he stands firm. No doubt he had heard from the people back home because his smile had disappeared and there was no grin, thank goodness, on his face. An overwhelming majority of the people and of the Members of Congress, regardless of politics, approved most of what he said. Our fellow Missourian was facing a crisis, as was the whole country, but it was for the most part brought on by his own policy and of his predecessor's. Because of the tragic position in which the Nation found itself the President recommended drastic legislation, harsher than any we ever passed, even in time of war. In a fit of hysteria the House of Representatives passed it immediately with little debate or consideration by an overwhelming majority. It is fortunate that the Senate waited a day or two for the atmosphere to clear and tempers to cool when the extreme legislation could be considered more calmly and reasonably.

No one, in or out of Congress, has more deplored or opposed work stoppages, strikes and lock-outs than have I; however, I fear that the conscriptive and injunctive provisions of the emergency legislation just passed by the House, which would give new and extreme power over labor is really moving in totalitarian direction and is likely to be followed by similar legislation to increase Government power over capital and business. This, of course, would destroy our free economy. No more Republic!

To be sure there are a few buccaneers in business and certain racketeers in labor who have put their own individual welfare above the Nation's and who have sought personal gains and private profits instead of promoting the general welfare. Of course, these individuals are despicable and deserve only the contempt of all true Americans. They should be and could be properly punished under existing law if this administration would carry out the mandates of Congress. A blanket delegation of powers of doubtful constitutionality should never be granted any one man, in war or peace.

Jeremiah S. Black, in his time the leader of the American bar, said: "It is precisely in a time of war and civil commotion that we should double the guards upon the Constitution. * * * When the Mississippi shrinks within its natural channel and creeps lazily along the bottom, the inhabitants of the adjoining shore have no need of a dike to save them from inundation. But when the booming flood comes down from above, and swells into a volume which rises high above the plain on either side, then a crevasse in the levee becomes a most serious thing. So, in peaceable and quiet times, our legal rights are in little danger of being overborne; but when the wave of arbitrary power lashes itself into violence and rage, and goes surging up against the barriers which were made to confine it, then we need the whole strength of an unbroken Constitution to save us from destruction."

Most employers and employees are honest and patriotic Americans. They did a marvelous job during the war and many of them gave their sons, daughters, brothers, and husbands to the victory we won. Their blood, as well as their hands were in the war and the majority should be given credit for their intelligence and patriotism.

Perhaps we need some additional legislation, but what we need most is not more legislation but some honest, efficient, and fearless administration. The crisis developed was due, not to a deficiency of laws, but the failure of the administration of existing laws and political favoritism in Government.

Do not misunderstand me. I believe now, as I have always believed, that labor unions

should be incorporated, held liable for damages, and made responsible for their acts the same as any corporation. Union leaders also should be compelled to give an accounting of the receipts and expenditures of all moneys.

Violence should be outlawed and goon squads abolished. Labor unions, the same as corporations, likewise should be prohibited from making political contributions. In other words, fairness and justice should be dealt alike to all. Management and labor are partners in an enterprise. Contracts should be binding upon both. Every player should abide by the rules of the game and we should not have one set of rules for one club and another set for the other. The sauce that is good for the goose is also good for the gander.

Having said this, I wish to emphasize that we should not allow the excitement of the moment to carry us to an opposite extreme in correcting an evil condition. Now is a time for management to act more intelligently than certain leaders of labor. I, along with many other genuine friends of labor, have warned them time and again during the past 14 years that unless the unions set their own house in order and be reasonable and fair in their demands, labor would lose many of the gains it has won during the past half century.

This is an hour in which we must exercise tolerance and understanding, realizing that we must live and get along with each other.

Of course, the radical measure recommended by the President is to be temporary, to continue for only 6 months after the cessation of hostilities, as proclaimed by the President. However wisely he might use it, the vast power granted him is more than any good man should want and more than any bad man should have.

It is to be hoped that permanent legislation can be written which will deal out impartial justice to all and which will prevent strikes in the future. History has proved, and experience has shown, that free labor has been and is always more efficient and productive than forced labor. You can't dig coal with a bayonet or run a train with a shotgun. With all our faults, mistakes, strikes, and bad management we have demonstrated to the world that American free labor can and has out-produced the slave labor of Germany, Japan, and Italy combined. The miracle of this modern age is the industrial output and productive capacity of America.

We do not want to raise up a Hitler in America after getting rid of one abroad. We are not going to abandon the freedom for which our men and women fought and for which many died. We are not going to adopt any Fascist system which we paid so much in blood and treasure to destroy.

Democracy has not failed and we do not have to resort to conscription. Man might be forced, under the threat of severe penalty, to enter a factory but he cannot be forced to work without costing us twice the effort we could get out of him. Place a drafted worker alongside a voluntary worker on the assembly line and you will weaken the morale of both. It is impossible to legislate patriotism, industry, or morality. The iron hand of Government must not place a halter around the necks of the American people, either employer or employee, and reduce them to penal servitude. It is going pretty far when the Federal Government confiscates all profits of a private enterprise and places them in the Treasury of the United States. What we need in this dark hour is more internal conviction and less external compulsion. Most of all we need a moral regeneration and a spiritual awakening.

Let us forever keep America a land where every man can walk the earth his own king, the equal lord of every other man, to go his own way, work out his own will, weave into the warp and woof of the magic days the dreams that haunt, the duties that inspire and urge him on.

Our people are being regimented by New Deal politicians in Washington who want to maintain indefinitely wartime controls. They are more interested in retaining their autocratic power than they are in setting the people free. The infinite red tape and voluminous, intricate, and contradictory rules and regulations by an overgrown, arrogant, and arbitrary bureaucracy has stifled initiative and enterprise, cut down effort and production, and retarded reconversion and recovery.

Today in this land of plenty we are faced with scarcity. One cannot find butter. It is hard to get meat, the shelves of our dry-goods stores and hardware stores are empty. We still have raw materials in this country and the tools and skilled labor to produce goods, but both OPA and CPA, by their artificial controls, have reduced output. By increasing wages and costs and by freezing price ceilings, more than a million small businesses have been liquidated in the past 2 or 3 years.

The other side of the picture is just as bad. In 1940 we had $6,500,000,000 in circulation—money not in banks. Today we have $26,500,000,000 in circulation, or more than four times as much than at the outbreak of the war. But what will your dollar buy? Men and nations are not made rich by printing money. We have plenty of money but no goods. In fact, money is about the cheapest thing we have, but unfortunately men can neither eat nor wear it. Our greatest need today is to stop printing money and begin producing goods, because money without goods will drive us to a ruinous inflation. Any sensible man knows that a nation is no different from an individual. Neither one can live beyond its means, nor spend more than it makes without getting into serious difficulty. On the one side we need to expand production; on the other to reduce the Federal debt.

By creating scarcity and running our printing presses, the prices of all commodities are increased and black markets everywhere flourish. The Government loses revenue on bootleg transactions and the people pay exorbitant prices for inferior goods.

Future historians will call this the age of chiselization, and for very good and indisputable reasons. The OPA has made chiselers, cheats, cowards, and crooks out of good, loyal, law-abiding, honest American citizens.

If we are to avoid disaster, there must come an immediate and swift flow of goods which people want and need—houses, automobiles, washing machines, refrigerators, radios, electric irons, men's, women's, and children's clothing—all of good quality to satisfy long pent-up demands.

Competition in an open and free market will automatically bring about fair prices. Congress cannot repeal the natural economic law of supply and demand.

The meat packers and processors, the dairy farmers—many of whom are selling their herds for slaughter—the sawmill men, the lumber dealers, the automobile salesmen, the strawberry growers, the canning men, the small-town merchants, and nearly everyone else engaged in legitimate private enterprise have spoken or written to me crying for relief from this modern Spanish Inquisition that has exercised tyranny over them and that has destroyed private enterprise, which has made this Nation great.

It is admitted that in time of war, or as long as wartime conditions prevail, a certain degree of governmental control, especially of some things, is not only necessary but desirable. However, the OPA has been so clumsily administered, such favoritism has been shown, and so many restrictions imposed that vital production has been throttled. OPA is nothing more than NRA in disguise—she is the same old political siren dressed up in gingham instead of calico. Her aims and methods, however, are much the same.

It is inconceivable that in this great Nation which produced planes, ships, tanks, guns, and the many other implements of war, and produced the food and fiber to feed and clothe not only the 12,000,000 men in our armed services but most of our Allies as well, we now find it next to impossible to buy not only the luxuries but many of the most needed things in our businesses and daily lives.

The miner, the farmer, the poor manual laborer cannot buy cheap work clothes, overalls, cotton shirts, or even underwear, but the wealthy class can find sport shirts though they have not tails to cover an essential part of their anatomy, and slacks though they are shoddy and cost three or four prices.

The farmer used to worry about droughts, dust storms, grasshoppers, boll weevils, corn borers, hail, erosion, farm prices, mortgages, and floods, but today he worries about getting machinery that he can't find, about labor shortages that he cannot fill, about clothing which he cannot buy, and the lack of material to repair his houses and barns. The farmer wants not only the ability to buy but also the products available for purchase. If a farmer had $100 in his pocket and bananas were 10 cents a dozen, it would do him no good unless there were bananas to buy. It does not help that the ceiling has been kept on low-priced house dresses if those dresses can't be found on the shelves of stores. The richest farmer in any community can't save his crop unless there is a combine that he can buy. High lines by the front door do not help much if appliances and wire can't be found.

America occupies about 6 percent of the world's surface and has only 7 percent of the world's people. Yet that 7 percent consumed, before the war, three-fourths of the world's silk, 60 percent of the world's rubber, and half the world's coffee.

We have half of the world's telephones, one-third of the world's railroad mileage, one-third of the world's improved highways, 60 percent of the world's life insurance, and 80 percent of the world's automobiles.

In the United States we have 1 radio for every 3 people; Russia 1 for every 90 people. The American worker earns twice as big a market basket as the British worker for the same amount of time, three times the German worker, four times the Italian, and seven times the Russian. Yet the New Deal uplifters and do-gooders in Washington would have us believe we have been doing everything wrong in America. In the language of Tugwell, they would roll up their sleeves and make America over.

No American claims his country is perfect—and some things should be made over, but every true patriot certainly must believe that this is the best government on earth. I have no quarrel with the form of government any people have if they are free to choose it for themselves. If Russia wants communism, she is welcome to it and if for one moment I thought her government better than my own I would go to it as quickly as I could get there. I have been there and I know the individual has nothing because the state has all. If Great Britain wants to nationalize her industries it is all right with me, but I do not think the American taxpayers should be called upon to give her $4,400,000,000 to carry on her experiments in state socialism.

Ladies and gentlemen, with Lincoln I agree that if this Nation is ever destroyed it will be not from without but from within. Edwin Markham years ago must have felt the same when he wrote:

"I fear the vermin that shall undermine
senate and school and citadel and shrine.
I fear the worm of fraud, the fatted worm of

ease, and all the crawling progeny of these. I fear the vermin that shall honeycomb the walls and towers of state in unsuspecting hours."

If we have sense enough to keep ourselves strong we will never be attacked from without, not if we hold onto our secret weapons. I do fear the vermin, the rats who are boring from within, who are undermining the senate and school and citadel and shrine. I fear men with alien ideas and foreign philosophies contrary to the spirit and genius of the founders of this Republic, who would undermine and destroy the very foundations upon which this great Government rests.

I am not easily scared but I have seen and heard too much of these subversive activities. We have too many coming into Washington on special trains from the east side and from the dark places. They do not look any too good to me. They do not talk my language and Heaven knows I do not like their smell.

The strife of war has given way to the strife of peace. Those of us who have faith in economic freedom, in free individual enterprise, must insist that we return to the American way of life. No wonder Bernard Baruch recently said: "The whole world is watching us, amazed at the exhibition of a giant who cannot pull himself together even to take care of his own needs."

Friends, it is high time that we stop our bickering and settle down and go to work. Monetizing of the Federal debt must stop. Deficit financing cannot forever go on. Our gigantic debt must be reduced if taxes are to be lowered, if our country is to prosper, if our people are to be given full employment, and if we are to live in a Nation of peace and plenty.

Fellow Americans, tomorrow night in Illinois I speak not far away from the tomb of the Great Emancipator, the founder of our party. The next day is a sacred one to all Americans for on that day we memorialize those men who fought and died in all our wars to build and preserve this America. From Valley Forge and Yorktown to Lake Erie and New Orleans; from the Alamo and San Jacinto to Gettysburg and Appomattox; from San Juan and Manilla to Chatteau-Thierry and the Argonne; from Pearl Harbor to Berlin, Rome and Tokyo, our fellow countrymen by the thousands gave their last full measure of devotion in order that a Government of, by and for the people should not perish from the earth.

Let us rededicate ourselves tonight to complete their unfinished task that all men everywhere might enjoy the liberties that are ours.

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and for his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations."

Begin Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, is anybody satisfied with the way in which labor-union bosses and racketeers have been performing during the last few years? Have the strikes benefited the country? Did anybody, except the bosses and the racketeers, benefit from the steel strike, the General Motors strike, the coal strikes, the railroad strike, and the almost innumerable other strikes in the past few years? It has long been conceded that the bosses and the racketeers are the chief benefactors of a strike and that perhaps there would not be many strikes if it did not materially help and make money for the union bosses and labor racketeers.

Certainly strikes, work stoppages, slowdowns, and lock-outs do not help the economy of the people. Generally, the public suffers tremendously from these eruptions. Our entire equilibrium is upset.

The rank and file of labor usually lose time and money while the strike is in progress, and their families are deprived of the necessities of life pending the settlement of the differences between management and labor. These losses in wages frequently are not overcome by increased payments for many months and sometimes the injury cannot be repaired.

The employers, frequently referred to as management, have their incomes and profits cut materially and their operations disorganized. Consequently, the public suffers from loss of income taxes which otherwise would have been paid on profits and the public suffers in many ways as a result of discontinuance of operations and production.

The Roosevelt and Truman administrations, covering the past 13 years, have been characterized by a catering to the labor racketeers and union bosses. The New Deal administration has passed many laws favorable to these racketeers and bosses, with slight preference, in some instances, to the laborer. It has been a policy of appeasement, designed to get votes and perpetuate the New Deal in power.

Something is radically wrong. Everyone will admit that. Labor and management are confused beyond words. The people are infuriated and mad. Production has been slowed down, reconversion has been stifled and crippled on every hand. Industry is hamstrung and does not know which way to turn. The public demands relief, and is entitled to it.

Many blame the operations of the National Labor Relations Act passed in 1935. Senator WAGNER said in 1935 that:

> The enactment of this measure will clarify the industrial atmosphere and reduce the likelihood of another conflagration of strife.

Eleven years later, we are now experiencing the bitterest labor strife in history.

Senator WAGNER further stated 11 years ago that:

> There is not a scintilla of truth in the propaganda that this bill will create a labor dictatorship.

Now a few labor bosses are dictating to industry, to the Government, and to 130,000,000 American citizens. John L. Lewis was successful in accomplishing practically everything for which he precipitated the coal strike. Another labor boss denounced the President and Congress, stating that his union has $47,000,000 in its treasury, and definitely said that $2,500,000 would be used this year against the reelection of the Members of Congress who refused to take orders from these labor dictators.

Senator WAGNER, speaking further in 1935, of the National Labor Relations Act, said:

> This bill is designed to promote industrial peace.

Apparently it has had the opposite effect. The recent railroad strike, the strike of the coal miners and others which paralyzed our communication systems and threatened our whole economic structure, are examples. The public is in a dreadful state of suspense, fearful of what may happen as a result of the Communist promoted international maritime strike and many other strikes that are scheduled.

Let us see what the Wagner Act has done. During the past 11 years there have been more than 37,000 work stoppages—three times as many as there were the 11 years before the passage of the act by Congress in 1935. The number of workers involved in the work stoppages for the past 11 years is almost 17,000,000, again approximately three times the number for a like period before the passage of this act. Hence, roughly speaking, there have been three times as many idle, time wasted, and production lost since, as compared with a similar period before the Wagner Act—National Labor Relations Act was passed in 1935.

Consider these facts: In January 1946 there were 325 new work stoppages, with a carry-over of 175 strikes from the month before, both together involving 1,750,000 workers, and 19,200,000 man-days lost. In February 1946, 260 new work stoppages were added to the 200 carried over from January, involving 1,450,000 workers and 21,500,000 man-days lost. In March 1946, 385 new stoppages were added, with a carry-over of 270 from February. Strike notices have increased until now more than 1,000 per month are filed, with current loss in production of 100,000,000 man-hours monthly.

All of this has led many of our best thinking people, who do not want to clear everything through Sidney, or some other union boss, to reason that the Wagner Act and other labor partiality measures passed by Congress during the past 11 or 12 years have resulted in restraint of trade, unemployment, increased prices to consumers, contempt of law and authority, corrupt elections, dictation to government, denial of a citizen's right to work, and undermining the foundations of the freedom of labor itself. Many have suggested that these ills can be cured by rewriting or amendment of the Wagner Act in several important respects, which will result in placing organized labor and labor management under laws similar to those which regulate and control management, and that these changes are essential to the proper safeguarding of the interests of the people and of labor itself.

There are others who demand that all of this New Deal labor legislation, socialistic and communistic in many of its aspects, be repealed and that new laws be enacted which will hold organized la-

bor equally responsible with industry, and where the rights of the public are considered of paramount and first importance. They say we should begin again and legislate from the foundation, upon equitable principles, demanding fair treatment of labor and management. Each has its function to perform. Each should be restrained from infringing upon the rights of the other. American labor has enjoyed the highest standard of living of any labor in the world. This has always been true, it should always be true. No one should want the standard of living reduced in America. But, if conditions continue, and if the public is forced to suffer as a result of the arrogance of labor bosses and racketeers, the time will surely come when the pendulum will swing in the opposite direction, and labor will suffer most. In the meantime the racketeers may have garnered immense fortunes, but the rank and file of labor will have its standard of living reduced and its gains will be discarded with the dictatorial powers which should not have been granted. The frenzied public often resorts to extreme measures. One extreme usually begets another, the public will not continue to tolerate the outrageous treatment to which it has been subjected during the past 11 years. The public is not in a frame of mind to be further ignored. The appeasement policy of the New Deal was born of expediency, which is based upon the theory that might makes right. Mob psychology is in danger of asserting itself to the detriment of all concerned. It is never safe to follow the mob, but history is replete with instances of where the people grow impatient, and are no longer tolerant of those who occupy high places. Hence, in many quarters the people are demanding the repeal of existing laws, or at least the amendment of these laws, to permit free enterprise and free public enjoyment of American principles in this country.

The Case Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial entitled "The Case Bill Veto" from the June 12 issue of the Battle Creek (Mich.) Enquirer and News.

THE CASE BILL VETO

Two weeks ago President Truman wanted to go the limit and beyond, in dealing with strikes. He wanted legislation to draft men into the Army for mine and railroad service and to seize property and confiscate its profits if any.

Yesterday he vetoed a moderate bill which undertook to get at underlying causes of the strike epidemic by correcting widely recognized faults in the Wagner Labor Relations Act.

Within 2 weeks, from the time the President proposed to out-radical the most radical in establishing government dictation over men and property, to the time when he could not consent to the Case bill's moderate approach to control of misuse of misgranted power, there had been considerable talk and some partisan worry about the "labor vote," and a good deal of threatening as to what would be done by the labor vote. Practical gentlemen of the President's party had been reported as offering suggestions how labor, having had a harmless scare thrown into it, might be assured that all again is politically rosy.

The Case bill made a start at balancing up the Wagner Act which established one kind of law for labor and another kind for everybody else. The President vetoed that.

The Case bill would have prohibited robbery and extortion in interstate commerce, as practiced in the past upon farm produce marketeers entering metropolitan centers and which the Supreme Court held are not prohibited to labor unions under the present laws. The President vetoed that.

The Case bill would have made collective-bargaining agreements within the scope of the act enforceable against the unions as well as employers, in Federal court; would have made contracts when arrived at binding upon both parties. The President vetoed that.

The Case bill would have made secondary boycotts (not now subject to control) liable to criminal prosecution under the antitrust laws. The President vetoed that.

The Case bill called for the extension of the antitrust laws to labor unions in the matter of conspiracy to fix prices, divided markets, restrict output, or engagement in practices of monopoly harmful to the public, now forbidden to all others under the Clayton Antitrust Act. The President vetoed that.

The Case bill would have prohibited contributions by employers to labor funds, as demanded by John Lewis, wholly and exclusively administered by union authority. The President vetoed that.

The Case bill set up a distinction between supervisory foremen as representatives of management, and production workers, in compulsory collective bargaining, without changing the rights of either to union membership. The President vetoed that.

The Case bill provided a five-man Federal mediation board in the Department of Labor, with authority to intervene and mediate in a labor dispute. Voluntary arbitration was provided where mediation failed. When the board had intervened there would have been a 60-day cooling-off period during which strikes or lock-outs would be illegal and subject to penalty for employers under the unfair practices provision of the Wagner Act, and, for employees, the penalty of loss of their employment. The President vetoed that.

The Case bill provided that in disputes in public utilities, where mediation and arbitration had failed, the President could be called on to set up a commission to investigate and report to the President on the facts, and that within the period of 35 days, while the report was in preparation and following its delivery, no change in the status quo could be made by either party to the dispute without liability to penalties as previously described. The President vetoed that.

Two weeks ago a Presidential speech calling for precedent-smashing powers to draft labor and property by way of handling strikes. Now, the veto of a calmly reasoned approach to the regulation of labor abuses by putting labor on an equality with everybody else under the law, and so correcting the evils of past legislation from which the present abuses and tyrannies spring.

The Case bill was not a complete answer, but it was a temperate and conservative beginning of reform of a special privilege law which has hatched evils from which the country is in constant threat.

The President dresses his veto in righteous-sounding words. But the veto came from politics.

The public now knows what it must do and how far it must go, to reclaim its Government.

The Land Grant College: A New Chapter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABE MURDOCK
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 10 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, on June 8, 1946, Mr. David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, delivered the commencement address at the Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, Utah. His subject was The Land Grant College: A New Chapter. I have read the address very carefully, and find it to be one of the best explanations and statements concerning our land-grant colleges that I have ever read. I think it would be of interest to every Senator to read it. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I may say, Mr. President, that I find the manuscript exceeds by one page the two printed pages allowed under the rule of the Joint Committee on Printing without an estimate being furnished. An estimate has been furnished of $180 as the cost of printing the address.

There being no objection, the address was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You upon whom the Utah Agricultural College today confers the honor of her degree have reason to be proud of the distinction she has conferred upon you. For this is a land-grant college, one of the uniquely American institutions in every State in the Union that symbolize and embody a great democratic conviction—that progress in everyday life of the community and the Nation comes through education of the people.

The beginnings of the land-grant college go back to the days of Abraham Lincoln's Presidency. It has been a dynamic institution. Like any force for education that is worthy of the name, it must continue to grow and develop to meet new conditions and new obligations to the people.

In the Tennessee Valley in the past dozen years there has been a convincing demonstration that the land-grant colleges are institutions of education with such a capacity for development and adaptation to new conditions, oportunities, and obligations.

The partnership that has been worked out between the Tennessee Valley Authority, a Federal regional development corporation, and the land-grant colleges of the seven Tennessee Valley States, constitutes a new chapter in the long and honorable history of this characteristically American educational institution.

This new chapter and its portent is the theme of my words to you today. For this story from the far off Valley of the Tennessee bears directly on an issue that concerns every one of you in this graduating class, every member of your faculty—indeed all men of serious purpose everywhere in our land. For that issue is nothing less than this question: How can we Americans find a

reasonable and workable way to halt and to reverse the continuing trend toward centralization of power in the vital affairs of our lives; centralization both in the private administration of economic affairs and in governmental centralization of administration in Washington bureaus and departments—centralization that brings with it remote economic control and absentee government?

This issue is no narrow one of States' rights versus Federal or congressional power. Only an antiquarian will fail to recognize that the country must entrust the Federal Government with extensive powers and responsibilities, and that these responsibilities will be broadened rather than narrowed as time goes on. How can it be otherwise, in view of the advancements in transportation and communication, the new mobility of our population, the swift contagion of our once local problems? But there is a vital distinction between Federal powers and the administration and execution of those powers. Because the Federal Government has been entrusted with a responsibility, and because Federal appropriations are involved, it does not follow that that function must necessarily be administered in local communities by Federal agents, employed by and reporting to a distant Washington bureau. The real issue is not one of States' rights but rather: How can the people of our vast country enjoy the advantages of a strong and responsivle central Government and yet escape the evils and hazards of concentrated economic power and of remote, top-heavy, centralized public administration?

To such a question the actual results of this partnership between the State land-grant colleges of the Tennessee Valley and the TVA—a Federal agency—present one answer, in the vital field of agricultural development and education. (I use the term "education" in its broad and true sense.) It is largely for that reason that the Tennessee Valley region has received such widespread attention. For in America we are less persuaded by rhetoric than by results and experience, and the Tennessee Valley offers such actual experience. There men can see for themselves, and weigh and judge the actual working of an arrangement under which a Federal resource-development agency, the TVA, sponsored and created by act of our National Congress and using Federal funds, has carried out its agricultural responsibilities by and through the State land-grant colleges and the State extension services, by and through men selected, paid, and directed by the State agencies reimbursed by TVA funds. That experience shows clearly that national responsibilities concerning soil development and agricultural education can be competently discharged without administrative centralization in far-off Washington.

The new chapter is being written in the Tennessee Valley, but it is being read and studied wherever men are concerned about this growing trend toward detailed decision-making in centers remote from the people, in business and in government; wherever men are looking for some workable alternative to the too easy reliance upon Federal agents to perform for them in local communities tasks admittedly important to the whole Nation. This is of special significance in land and water development and education.

And it is because you as graduates, staff members, and friends of a land-grant college, and your counterparts the country over, have a vital stake in the results and implications of this new chapter that I take this occision to review with you this aspect of the story of the Tennessee Valley development.

The year that TVA was created, you will recall, was 1933 and the Tennessee Valley, potentially one of our great river valleys, was suffering with the rest of the Nation in the great depression. But the TVA was not merely a product of the depression. For 15 years the Congress had debated setting up a regional agency to develop navigation on the Tennessee River, to harness its substantial water power, to control its frequent flood waters, and to make useful the World War I munitions plant at Muscle Shoals in the interest of farmers of the valley and of the Nation.

Since those beginning days of 1933 great changes have come to that region. The Tennessee River has been transformed by 26 dams into a series of placid lakes through which river commerce passes for the entire 650 miles from Knoxville, Tenn., to Paducah, Ky., where the river flows into the Ohio. The once-wasted and destructive waters of the Tennessee and its tributaries now generate billions upon billions of kilowatt hours of low-cost power for new factories and business, for homes and farms. In times of high water these same dams hold back the waters that once flooded property and destroyed human life in the valley and along the lower Ohio and the Mississippi.

The old World War I munitions plant at Muscle Shoals—built to make nitrates for war—TVA put to work, too, producing phosphatic fertilizers, not nitrates. When the fertilizer-research program got under way, more than 10 years ago, experts from the State colleges and the Department of Agriculture advised the TVA Board that nitrates were readily available to farmers if they grew the legumes which could capture this element from the air and put it back into the soil. The greatest need of the American farmers was for phosphatic fertilizers. Soil minerals, especially phosphate, the experts told us, were only present in limited quantities in many soils of the Nation. As a consequence, farmers living on mineral-deficient soil were unable to develop the kind of farm systems which would conserve their soil, produce nutritious food and feed, and give them a greater degree of economic freedom and security. In the Tennessee Valley itself it was all too apparent that something was wrong with agriculture. Erosion, abandoned and wasted land, scrub pine, poverty grass, and broomsedge—the symptoms of a mineral-poor land—were all too common.

Phosphate with lime, properly used, held the hope, however, of making it possible to substitute legumes and improved pastures and meadows for erosive corn and cotton row crops and for worthless broomsedge. But I need not dwell on the importance of phosphate here at Utah State Agricultural College. You have at your doorstep and in neighboring States the largest American deposits of phosphate. Your distinguished president emeritus, Dr. Peterson, helped actively and effectively to focus national attention on this important mineral. The report of the Special Phosphate Committee of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges, of which Dr. Peterson was chairman, in effect, confirmed TVA's decision to emphasize phosphates in our research and experimental production program. (I should add that in 1940, at the request of the War Department, we rebuilt and modernized the nitrate-producing facilities of our Muscle Shoals plant and produced great quantities of ammonium-nitrate for munitions purposes. When munitions requirements dropped off, the plant was put to use producing nitrates for agricultural purposes; and so long as the food emergency continues, this plant continues to produce 13,000 tons of agricultural nitrate per month, the product being distributed by farmer-owned cooperatives. During the war, too, our phosphate plant was devoted almost entirely to producing elemental phosphorus for war purposes.)

In 1933 farmers, generally speaking, used fertilizers simply as a stimulant to increase the yield of a particular row crop without much regard to basic readjustments in farming which a fertile soil makes possible. This did not make sense, as one evidence of which let me point to this fact: that although the South used the bulk of fertilizers consumed in the country, the soil and the agriculture of the Tennessee Valley and the South remained poor, and was getting poorer all the time. This fact was grim testimony that fertilizer alone, fertilizer not accompanied by far-reaching shifts in the use of land, cannot restore or maintain essential soil fertility.

But how were farmers to be aided in making these shifts in their way of farming—and living? How else than by education and the methods of education? In the answer to this question lies the real significance of the TVA fertilizer plant at Muscle Shoals and the express congressional authorization of 1933 to conduct large-scale "practical" tests and demonstrations of the use of the newly developed fertilizer materials. It is not easy for farmers, even with the help of their technical advisers, to bring about a change in the habits of an agricultural community. To the farmer (as to most everyone else) seeing is believing; and he must see more than the plots of the experiment stations to learn how to change the management of a whole farm. Demonstrations—thousands of them—on whole farms, practical working farms seemed to provide the answer.

This educational program, using demonstration farms, begun in 1935, operates generally in this way: The farmers in a community called together by their county agent, select several of their own number who are willing to have their working farms serve as a demonstration for the rest. The hub about which these whole-farm demonstrations turn is the mineral phosphate, in one of the several new or improved forms developed at the Muscle Shoals plants. These thousands of typical working farms are in a sense the school-rooms of the valley. Here the farmers, their wives and children with their neighbors learn and demonstrate the methods of changed farm practices that soil conservation principles of farming require, and test their economic value. With the technical guidance of their county agents and assistant agents, and back of them their land-grant colleges and experiment stations, they are learning by doing, and they are teaching their neighbors, who come to observe, to suggest, to contribute to the learning and teaching process.

This demonstration program is, of course, essentially education—there can be no doubt about that. Fertilizers, pastures, terracing, strip cropping, farm records, animal husbandry—these are familiar aspects of soil improvement programs, but such soil conservation and development work is of coourse a program in agricultural education. To be really effective this or any program with these objectives must be educational—if it is in the democratic tradition.

The demonstration and soil improvement program has worked out very well in practice—extraordinarily well in a substantial percentage of cases. It has enabled thousands upon thousands of farmers to stop growing low-yielding corn and cotton on steep hillsides and to shift to the only kind of agriculture which their soil would permanently support, namely a grass and livestock agriculture. It has helped TVA to discharge in increasing measure the part of our mandate which had to do with soil erosion and flood control. It has been a factor, a substantial factor in healing the scars left by agricultural maladjustment. It has provided farmers with the soil minerals that enabled them for the first time to make a decent living without mining the fertility of their land. It has helped to restore both the agricultural resources of the valley and the will and hope of its people.

But my theme today is not such material results but the methods followed in that valley, and the new chapter it has written in land-grant college history.

When the TVA program was first set up we were confronted with a choice as to the administrative methods we would use in carrying out our responsibilities. In not a few respects the easiest way for TVA to have worked would have been itself to hire the necessary agents and gone directly to the people of the region without regard for the local and state agencies which were already functioning in the area. As you know, we did not take this course. We felt that the most effective way to develop the resources of the region was for TVA to foster local initiative and to encourage local agencies and institutions to assist the people in planning and carrying out the development program. TVA early adopted the principle of not duplicating, competing with, or attempting to displace local agencies. That same principle the Department of Agriculture, consistent with a succession of laws relating to the land-grant colleges, had long followed.

TVA's general guide was that in carrying out our Federal responsibilities TVA should do no part of the task directly that some local or State agency could appropriately do as well or better. Hence, instead of two field forces—a Federal and a State—two budgets, and two programs, we tried to develop one jointly planned program singly executed through State and local agencies.

As these joint relationships developed we found it necessary to invent new administrative instruments. One of the most useful of the latter is the memorandum of understanding in which TVA's policy of intimate collaboration with existing agencies working in the field is formally embodied. Such is the agreement between the United States Department of Agriculture, TVA, and the seven Tennessee Valley colleges of the States of Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. This memorandum is simply a formal expression of the purposes and relationships among the agricultural agencies in the valley through which procedures are determined and our varied activities of research, extension, land-use planning, and educational activities are coordinated and carried out.

In the field of agriculture, then, we came to talk not about "the TVA agricultural program" but about "the valley agricultural program."

(In other fields of TVA's responsibilities than agriculture, similar arrangements with local and State agencies have been entered into following the same principle—in mineral exploration, food preservation research, forestry, rural electrification education, and so on.)

The memorandum of understanding recognizes the need for joint planning as well as the soundness and desirability of relying on the land-grant colleges for carrying the program to the people. It is supplemented where necessary by specific contracts, such as those we make with the extension services for employment, by them, of assistants to county agents to further the demonstration program in the valley counties. All these demonstration program field workers are trained, employed, and paid by the colleges. They are members of the staff of the college and its extension system in the State and in the counties. They are not distinguishable from those whose salaries come entirely from funds of the college. TVA, under the contract, reimburses the colleges for these staff services.

I have referred to this memorandum of understanding, this agreement of the USDA, the land-grant colleges, and the TVA, because the method it establishes reflects a clear-cut and conscious choice by TVA between two drastically different systems by which Federal public services reach the individual citizens. Each of these systems has profound and different consequences for all of us as citizens and for the kind of governmental atmosphere and administration we create or foster.

Under one system Federal agents carry on local educational activities whether in agriculture or in some other field. This introduces a new and hazardous factor between local citizens and their governments. Federal employees, no matter how competent, conscientious, disinterested are not clearly responsive to local, county, and State control. Their tenure, purpose, and the content of their activities can be influenced only indirectly by the groups to which they provide educational leadership and assistance. The more national an educational program becomes, under the auspices of a Federal agency and carried on by Federal employees working directly with the farmers or citizens of a local community, the greater is the danger—we may even say the necessity—of developing—and later dictating—a uniform content of what is taught. Uniformity under such circumstances inevitably leads to the promulgation of a kind of "party line" in educational tactics, devices of reward and discipline. The final consequence of this system is the dependence of the citizen upon the favors of the remotely controlled Federal agency he invited in, or whose offer to do the job for the citizen was accepted with a shrug and "What can I lose?"

Such a system is an accomplished fact today in a major sector of the land-use and soil improvement program of the Federal Government.

TVA had the same provocation to adopt such a system, to take this direct and alleged "quick" approach to soil improvement. We rejected that system. That is the meaning of our early decision to go the other route by joining with the land-grant colleges and the county agent system.

The TVA board considered that choice a matter of major policy. We believed, and our experience confirms that belief, that TVA's responsibilities to the rural people of a whole region consisted of more than helping them to adopt better farming methods, soil conserving cropping and engineering practices, and thereby to achieve higher incomes and better material standards. We believed in 1933, and still believe, that the TVA should help in these physical matters by fostering educational methods—enlisting the farmers to try things out on their own land and in whole communities. And believing this we saw that providing funds by contract to the college and county agent system of education and extension teaching was the best way to obtain those results on the land; at the same time we, a Federal agency, could avoid the danger of fastening upon the people, desperate for assistance, a system of Federal supervision beyond their convenient and direct control, a system that would inevitably sap their initiative, rather than encourage it, substitute armchair brains for their own, discourage a wholesome and necessary diversity of ideas and practical experimentation, and weaken an already undernourished system of State and local research and educational leadership.

We knew the State agricultural college and county agent system not only had strength but some faults and weaknesses as well. We were aware of the drag and inertia against new ideas that a long tradition imposes upon an educational institution—any institution, for that matter. We knew that many counties in the Tennessee Valley had no county agents; that in some cases where there were county agents they were in reality agents only of the more well-to-do farmers. We knew of other weaknesses. But we were confronted with a choice between systems.

Once we made our choice—to encourage the State and local system—we deliberately developed and shaped the program for which we were responsible so that it would help the college and its extension system become stronger and more fully aware of how each State and county agency could increase its effectiveness in the job of building the whole region. And as we gained experience under this alliance for a common cause we saw more and more clearly that this method, this partnership, placed upon TVA a desirable self-imposed restraint, a brake on those with a burning zeal for quick short-cut reform on every man's private acres. We saw that we were taking on a bigger and more fundamental task than that of aiding the farmer to get a higher income. That bigger job was to help make it possible, by the decentralized methods we espoused, for the people to understand the dangers of excessive economic and administrative centralization which some assert these days (falsely, I believe) is the price of our advance in science and technical knowledge.

The TVA, by its reliance upon the college and its county-agent system, is deliberately encouraging intelligent resistance to centralization of administrative and economic power, by demonstrating constructive alternative ways for the people to capture the benefit from science and knowledge without loss of diversity, local strength, and individual freedom.

This issue, turning on administrative method, is not new. It was the same issue in essence that produced the land-grant college. My present colleague and teacher, Dr. Harcourt Morgan, and one of the original directors of the TVA, was fully aware of this when our board first faced this question in 1933. He knew the history of the land-grant college from a long period of activ and fruitful service as scientist, teacher, extension agent, dean, and president in the family of land-grant institutions. He had helped to shape the Federal policy which in this century has by successive legislative enactments and otherwise confirmed and strengthened the democratic ideas of Federal-State relations expressed in the beginning of the land-grant college movement. He taught and interpreted for us, in the TVA, the history of the revolution in education which your institution and its sister colleges represent. The full significance of TVA's experience with the colleges in choosing to aid the course of decentralized administration of education and resource development can be better understood if I review that history briefly.

The tradition of which you of the land-grant colleges are the inheritors goes back a long way; much farther back than the signing of the first Morrill Act by President Lincoln in 1862. In the Tennessee Valley it goes back almost another century to the rough and unruly Carolinians and Virginians who followed Daniel Boone's wilderness road across the Blue Ridge and down into the valleys of the Tennessee and its tributaries, the Watauga and the Holston. There, in 1784, they established the revolutionary State of Franklin, political predecessor of what is now Tennessee. In the constitution of this abortive principality, provision was made for the establishment of a State university, to be endowed by a substantial grant of land. Comparatively few of those founding fathers could read and write; they could only put their marks as signers of the constitution. But they knew the importance of education and they had their own very definite ideas about the kind of education they wanted. Their college, they wrote, would be "dedicated to the promotion of the happiness of the people at large." And in addition to habituating the youth to an amiable, moral, and virtuous conduct, and teaching them the usual ancient and modern languages, it would instruct them accurately in the "various branches of useful science."

Note those phrases "the people at large" and "the useful sciences." This was to be a people's university. The backwoodsman's sons, too, were to be taught the classical

languages and the humanities which hitherto had been the exclusive prerogative of the tidewater aristocrats, the economic centralists of their day. But in addition they were to be given the chance to learn about the practical knowledge and arts that would help them to discover and use the resources of the new land.

This was one of the early signs on the stage of history of what was to appear later as that unique American institution, the land-grant college. It was a brief appearance. The revolutionary State of Franklin lasted only about 4 years and before the projected college was ever established, its projected land grant was hopelessly overrun by successive waves of settlers. So that although the idea of the land grant was clearly conceived by those Tennessee backwoodsmen it was not until after 1862 that their dream was realized.

Nearly a century had passed, but the objective had not changed. For in the preamble of the Morrill Act, passed, you will remember, in the midst of the Civil War, we read that the leading object of the new colleges would be "without neglecting other scientific and classical studies, including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts in such manner as the legislatures of the States may prescribe in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life."

When the authors of the Morrill Act wrote mechanic arts they wrote in the cultural context of the period, a period when a good deal of this continent was for all practical purposes still unexplored, unsettled, and unexploited. They wrote at a time when every farmer was by necessity a pretty good mechanic and when most mechanics were only a step or two removed from the land; when the industrial revolution was just coming into its own and the great age of modern technology was still far below the horizon. They wrote at a time when the first phase of the long bitter fight for a free public school had been won. In an era of fast concentration of new economic powers and crowding populations in the East and North these men of insight believed that a diffusion of knowledge and skills would correct a fatal trend to concentration of privilege, and give new meaning to American concepts of liberty and enterprise.

During this period the industrial classes, as they were then referred to, were repeatedly scolded by the leading representatives of the higher learning. The heads of the literary colleges, products of their own cause, saw nothing incongruous in preparing preachers and lawyers and doctors for their vocations, but were shocked when farmers and mechanics insisted that their sons and daughters needed and were entitled to equal consideration. It was indeed a revolutionary idea, unique in the history of education, and it took nearly half a century before it became thoroughly absorbed into the main stream of American life.

Thus in 1933, when the TVA came on the scene, we found in the land-grant colleges an institution that had a long tradition of working with the people of their respective States. In other words, these institutions were local agencies adapted to an understanding of local diversities and needs, and subject to the control of the people locally. They combined facilities for teaching the young people on whom progress in the valley inevitably had to depend, with facilities for research and facilities for extension. They were, in short, the recognized local agencies of agricultural education—not only in formal classes and in research, but through the extension service, in the educational problems of making a living on the farm.

We in TVA welcomed the fact that in working with the colleges we would be dealing with seven widely differing institutions—one in each of the seven valley States—because in this diversity I think there is something profoundly right. If I understand the matter correctly, it is the business of our land-grant colleges and experiment stations to be different because the regions and the peoples they serve are different. It is the business of the land-grant college to concentrate upon local and regional problems, to embody in its research, its teaching, and its extension work both the best understanding of these problems and the most effective ways of dealing with them. Finally, in my opinion it is, or should be, the business of the land-grant college, and I speak now as a representative of a Federal agency, both to resist any outside usurpation or weakening of its appropriate public responsibility and functions, and to press for the enlargement of these local and regional responsibilities and functions whenever the needs of the people require such an enlargement. For the colleges to fail to do these things is for them to fail in their obligation to the people they serve.

It is our conviction that in a democracy, development of resources, development of agriculture, must ultimately rest upon the education of the people, the businessmen, the merchants, the farmers. Not education in the narrowly defined schoolroom sense, but education which has as its purpose bringing facts and information to the people so that they may act in accord with the best scientific and practical knowledge. For almost a century land-grant colleges had this type of education as a major objective and have been the focal point of the national agricultural development program.

In the light of this history it was only to be expected therefore that in 1933 we in TVA should have considered the land-grant colleges indispensable in the resource development of the Tennessee Valley region.

Our 13 years of experience in working with the land-grant colleges has strengthened our reliance upon them. We feel that our joint relationships in this one region of the country have written a new chapter in the illustrious history of the land-grant college movement, a chapter which is of great significance to you people of Utah and the West as well as to the Nation generally.

Untold wealth of natural resources lies here yet undeveloped in your region. Here too, as in the mountains of the Tennessee Valley are headwaters of some of the Nation's great rivers. The opportunities for development of your resources stagger the imagination. Not the least significant today is the urgent need for the increased development of your western phosphate and potash deposits in the interests of the Nation's agriculture.

It has been said, not without reason, that the land-grant college movement made us the greatest tool-using people in the world, so that by producing incredible quantities of both industrial and agricultural products we were able to win two world wars. The war is won, but there remains the peace that we do not yet have. And there remains the struggle which we dare not relax against the forces both at home and abroad that would substitute the blanket general rule of remote control for those precious assets of regional and local life, of learning and will, on which the growth and greatness of this country are based.

In the Tennessee Valley, we, TVA people and the land-grant-college people who have worked with us, have tried not to forget this, and now that the horizons of resource utilization are widening it behooves us all to watch well how the remainder of this new chapter of Federal and State and local collaboration is written.

The land-grant colleges, as I have tried to show, have a great past. Always close to the regional and local grass roots, they have helped the country to grow and they have grown up with the country. Not only have they matured the tremendous new forces of the technological age, they have also developed the knowledge and the capacity by which these forces must be harnessed to the service of human life and enlargement of human freedom.

The land-grant colleges of the Nation can aid us in finding a way to have a strong, alert, and responsive National Government and yet encourage a decentralized administration of those essential responsibilities the people have vested in their Central Government. It is natural, therefore, that America should turn to these institutions and to the young men and women whom they have trained in confronting the challenges of today and tomorrow, for the pace of change is unremitting. It is for you to bring to fruition a great American tradition. It is for you to build on the foundation of a great past a greater future.

Case Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in the Indianapolis Times of date of June 11, 1946, which editorial is as follows:

CASE BILL VETO

President Truman vetoed the Case bill today on the ground that the measure would only foment additional strife.

We believe the President's action showed a disturbing lack of courage and fortitude, a faltering approach to one of the country's most serious problems.

The Case bill would have created a new, independent Federal mediation board, appointed by the President. That couldn't hurt labor.

It would have authorized this board to try—by mediation, conciliation, and voluntary arbitration—to arrange peaceful settlement of labor-management disputes that threaten serious injury to the public. What's wrong with that?

It would place on management and unions in such disputes a positive duty to refrain from violence and to give the board a maximum of 60 days for peacemaking efforts before resorting to strike, lock-out, or arbitrary changes of wages and working conditions. Such cooling-off periods have promoted good industrial relations in Minnesota and other States.

It would authorize a special fact-finding procedure for disputes affecting public utilities, with a maximum of 65 days in which strikes and lock-outs would be forbidden. Will it "enslave labor" for the public to have this reasonable protection against sudden, arbitrary stoppage of services essential to life and safety?

It would authorize labor unions and employers to sue each other in Federal courts for breaches of contract, imposing on both the same responsibility for living up to signed agreements. Does the life of unions depend upon freedom to break contracts without legal responsibility?

It would forbid unions to use the "secondary boycott" as a weapon in their battles with employers or with other unions. Is it a necessary right of unions to punish innocent bystanders when they cannot agree with each other on jurisdictional questions, or to fight their quarrels with employers at the expense of other employers who have no connection with the controversies?

It would subject to Federal Antiracketeering Act penalties unions found guilty of obstructing commerce by robbery or extortion. Does honest labor need Federal immunity for robbery and extortion?

It would require joint union-employer responsibility for proper use of health and welfare and similar funds contributed by employers through production royalties or pay-roll levies. Can labor not live without the right not only to tax the public in this manner but to use money thus taken from the public exactly as unions or their officers please?

It would allow foremen to join unions but leave employers free to refuse to recognize unions as bargaining agents for foremen. Is it either essential or desirable that unions should have power to usurp management functions by forcing foremen to be represented by the same labor organizations as the workers they are supposed to supervise?

These are the things the Case bill would have done. Many of them are things President Truman has said should be done. Which of them do you think would injure any well-intended union? Which of them justifies the frenzied clamor of the labor leaders?

We believe the Case bill provided moderate and fair means of preventing intolerable abuses of labor's power. President Truman should have signed it to protect the Nation and its workers from the drastic and immoderate legislation sure to come if the abuses are continued. And Congress should pass it over his veto.

Mr. Truman's Shoes Don't Fit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Sun:

MR. TRUMAN'S SHOES DON'T FIT

President Truman is a small-town politician.

He was brought up politically with small ideas that will stay with him always.

"Get the votes" was the Pendergast creed on which Mr. Truman was reared, and "Get the votes" is his motto now even though he may not realize it.

Political fright and the weakness that flows from it were evident in every word of the veto message that Mr. Truman sent to Congress yesterday. It was not even a clever attempt to fool the general public about the nature of the surrender to the union bosses. It incorporated so transparently false an argument that nobody of reasonable intelligence is likely to be fooled by it.

The President had good reason to be worried by the obvious and inevitable comparison between his veto of the Case bill and his continued advocacy of drastic emergency labor legislation. He knew, without inquiring, that common-sense Americans would ask why he should veto a relatively mild bill, meant to give labor and management an even break, and then continue to call for enactment of a drastic bill that would draft strikers.

Mr. Truman begs Congress and the public not to be confused about the Case bill and his plea of May 25 for emergency legislation.

There will be no confusion, Mr. President.

There has never been any confusion on the part of the public when an administration has played politics on the lowest and cheapest level. There has never been any confusion when an administration offered the wrong reasons for failure to do the right thing.

No more specious argument was ever offered in a veto message than the one that the President submitted to the effect that his emergency legislation is justified because it is limited in application to strikes against the Government. What were the automobile strike, the steel strike, the coal strike, and the railroad strike but strikes against private employers? What was the proposal of May 25 but a plan for taking over a private strike after it had become public? This argument is not likely to fool anybody in Congress or out of Congress.

As further justification for his veto of the Case bill Mr. Truman referred to another proposal that he made on May 25. That was for a long-range study of labor relations by a joint congressional committee, with authority to make recommendations within 6 months. It is plain what this repeated proposal means. Six months from May 25 would be November 25, 20 days after the 1946 election date. Six months from now would mean pushing the whole problem out of the public eye until the elections are out of the way. With this brought about, voters on both sides of the street can be fooled and cajoled until it is too late to express themselves at the polls.

No; there will be no confusion. There is no occasion for confusion. The President admits that there is an emergency—an emergency practically continuous since he upset the apple cart last August with his suggestion that wages be hiked—yet he pretends that the emergency justifies the most drastic and unprecedented legislation, concocted by unknown hands, and at the same time forbids enactment of carefully considered and long-debated legislation.

The Case bill was no overnight affair. Nobody knows this better than the President. It was introduced in the House of Representatives on January 30 last. Nobody knows this better than the President. But it is older than that, for it covered problems studied by Congress for more than 8 years; some of its sections had been considered over and over again; yet the President has the nerve to believe that he can persuade the public that the vetoed measure went too far—too far in a country stalled and stifled and sick to death of labor disputes.

Mr. Truman must have a poor opinion of the duration of the American memory. He must expect that between now and November 5 Americans will forget that an opportunity was presented to even the scales between labor and management—to end some of the abuses produced directly and indirectly by the Wagner Act. He must believe that Americans will forget that this opportunity to do equal and exact justice was muffed by a President who pretended to be moved by concern for the general welfare, but who patently was more concerned for the welfare of his party in the November election.

In brief, Mr. Truman's Presidential shoes don't fit.

Balanced Farming Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of Thursday, June 6, 1946:

BALANCED FARMING NEEDED

The Commercial Appeal finds a happy augury for Memphis and the mid-South in the fact that M. P. Moore, of Senatobia, Miss., made a speech to the Rotary Club on balanced farming that moved President Edmund Orgill, of the chamber of commerce, to start planning ways in which his organization could give definite point and impetus to the movement. Mr. Moore is qualified to speak because of his own outstanding success in raising fine cattle and conserving and improving the soil through application of the very program he advises for others. The man who has done a thing is in the best position to recommend it with authority.

Mr. Moore's program has the twin virtues of idealism and practicality. In another manner of speaking, what he proposes is helping the Midsouth help itself because so doing will increase our measure of health and happiness by augmenting our prosperity and raising our income. A Yankee visitor to these parts told us once that God had done more and man had done less for this area than any place he had even seen. Mr. Moore and Mr. Orgill propose that man shall pitch in from here on out and do his share. They should have the enthusiastic backing of every element in our social and economic order.

In round numbers, Mr. Moore proposes 30 percent more beef, 35 percent more pork, 51 percent more dairy products, and 26 percent more poultry instead of the one-crop cotton system. Mr. Orgill has in mind that the chamber of commerce should add experts in beef cattle and on dairying to its regular staff. These men would be available to advise with farmers in all the Memphis area. We need this type of balanced farming because it would improve the health and vigor of our people, and would substantially increase the cash income of the farmers of this area. It would stabilize our entire economy.

Mr. Moore and Mr. Orgill are issuing a challenge to Midsouth and Memphis people all the way from the field to the bank. The Commercial Appeal has also preached their gospel for years, and welcomes the opportunity to say amen to it again. This is something we can do for ourselves and ought to do for ourselves, because it is utterly sensible and practical, and calculated to benefit all.

Geneva Steel Plant

REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am against monopolistic controls in principle. It is foolish to say that the United States Steel Corp. has not exercised such controls. It is most important to the economic development of the West to have a western owned and operated steel plant of major proportions located there. The West must have a sufficient supply of steel to meet its expanding needs and this supply must be priced in accordance with the actual cost of production plus a fair profit and the actual cost of freight from the point of production to the point of use. I believe the amended bid of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co. indicates that these things can be realized if that bid is accepted.

Particularly on the basis of the recent ruling of the Supreme Court in the tobacco companies' case, I do not see how

the Attorney General can fail to set aside the awarding of the Geneva steel plant to the United States Steel Corp. For in that decision the Supreme Court ruled that if a corporation or a small group of corporations has the power to control prices and exclude competition, and if there is evidence of any intention of doing so, then it is not necessary to prove that prices have actually been fixed and competition excluded in order to show that monopolistic control exists. The United States Steel Corp. alone accounts for more than one-third of the total United States steel production, and if the Geneva plant is added, this figure will, of course, be substantially increased. Along with Bethlehem and Republic, these three companies control close to two-thirds of the steel produced in the United States.

The essential thing for the West is to secure independent western pricing of steel based, not on "Pittsburgh plus," but on the actual cost of production plus actual transportation from the point of production to the point of consumption plus, of course, a fair profit. For years the West has suffered from a lack of any steel industry of its own. We have a chance now to push forward the development of the western steel industry if a western company operates the Geneva plant. The Colorado Fuel & Iron Co. will undertake to expend money for new facilities at Geneva so as to make it capable of producing all particular steel products needed in the development of the Western States. Colorado Fuel & Iron would have every interest from its own point of view in expanding Geneva production. Certainly this cannot be said of United States Steel or, for that matter, any other huge eastern company. In the past, if a western company has wanted to buy sheet steel from the steel trust it has had to pay a price which has included not only cost of production and a fair profit, but also an amount equal to what it would have cost to haul the steel by rail from Pittsburgh regardless of whether the steel had to be shipped from Pittsburgh or not. This is the kind of thing we want to get away from in the West. How we could conceivably do it if this plant is awarded to United States Steel I am unable to understand. Competitive pricing of steel products is important, not only to the West, but to the whole United States. It can hardly be assured by adding still further to the monopolistic control of United States Steel. It might well be accomplished by enabling a western company to operate Geneva.

Extension of Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to set out a letter regarding the proposed extension of the draft, written to me by Mr. Harry M. Reed, of Waterloo, Iowa. I have known Mr. Reed for 35 years, from the time we were in college together at the University of Iowa. During those 35 years I have observed his leadership in everything he has undertaken from college activities to his service as United States district attorney for northern Iowa. In this period of time he has rendered outstanding service in the Army during World War I, and he has continued to render outstanding service throughout all the years from World War I to the present time in the American Legion.

One of the saddest experiences that has come to my attention in World War II was his loss of his 18-year-old son in combat in the European theater.

Throughout all the years that I have known Mr. Reed I have had many, many occasions to discuss the national defense of our Nation with him, especially in connection with our work and our interests in the work of the American Legion in this field. I have tremendous confidence in his judgment in matters of national defense and for that reason I was especially glad to receive a letter from him recently in which he discussed the matter of the extension of the draft and other problems in connection with the reorganization of our armed forces. Mr. Reed's experience and judgment merits your careful reading and study of his letter and I am glad to have the opportunity to set his letter out herewith so that you may have the opportunity to read it:

REED & BEERS,
Waterloo, Iowa, May 31, 1946.

Hon. TOM MARTIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR TOM: I was glad to see in the Courier that you had come out definitely against the drafting of 18-year-olds and in favor of universal military training rather than conscription.

Is it possible to bring to the realization of the War Department that there must be something wrong with the War Department when it cannot get sufficient men for the Army without a draft. At the present time Army pay is pretty good. It really compares rather favorably with the civilian pay that most of the boys will get on discharge, particularly when one considers the retirement features. Yet the fact remains that few of the 10,000,000 men who were in the Army are willing to reenlist. The boys would rather drive garbage trucks or kill hogs or plow corn or do a variety of hard, dirty jobs rather than go into the Army. It seems to me that the conclusion is irresistible that it isn't because of the pay but is because of the Army set-up. At the present time the United States Army is the least desirable employer in the United States. That is no great compliment to the Army, and no great compliment to the men running the Army in that it isn't necessary that it be so considered.

I think that the draft is having a very adverse effect on 18-year-olds. They all think of the Army training as an utter waste of time, basing their opinion on what they have been told by the boys who had the training. From the standpoint of the parents of 18-year-old boys I believe that they will continue to battle the draft because they do not believe the Army is a fit place for their boys.

Haven't we about reached the situation where Congress is in position to say to the Army that it must be modernized and improved before it will be trusted with the American boys? During the war it got our boys because we could not help ourselves. The delays and inefficiency could then be charged to the exigencies of war. That excuse is not now available.

I would make the following suggestions which I believe would go far toward changing the attitude of parents of 18-year-old boys toward the Army:

1. The court-martial system should be thoroughly overhauled, made modern, fair, and American. I thought the report made by some committee was very much to the point in recommending enlisted men on the court and in insisting that the men sitting on a court martial should know something about punishment. The penalty should be drastically reduced. The man at the head of it should be someone who knows that severity of punishment does not prevent crime. The Attorney General of the United States had a very good article on that proposition in a recent Iowa Law Review. Under the present court-martial system a boy can be sent to the penitentiary for offenses that would simply keep him after school for 2 hours if committed in civilian life. My personal opinion is the first step would be to fire the Judge Advocate General and his immediate staff and start out all over.

2. The Army should recognize that 18-year-old boys are 18-year-old boys and not men even though they are in the Army. This would mean a certain amount of segregation of these youngsters and much closer supervision. It would mean that they should have a continuing educational program. From anything I can learn the vast majority of the men in the Army now spend a considerable portion of their time killing time. There is no reason why schools could not be set up in every camp and the boys spend at least 3 hours a day in school. Those who intend to go on to college could be given college preparatory work and a limited number of trades could be taught in each camp. Even in a small camp they could learn the mechanics of an automobile and an airplane.

3. I think that before the Army gets very far it is going to have to revamp its notions on rank and get away from its present caste system, at least to some extent. I realize that any talk like this is pulling the tail of the sacred cow.

4. Above all I think the Army is going to have to recognize that it must be frank with the people of the United States and cannot continue with its "public be damned" attitude. Any improvement in the Army apparently comes as a result of tremendous public pressure. I don't see why that should have to be true. I see no reason why the Army could not occupy much the same position in the community as the public schools. Schools are continually trying to improve. They are interested not in improving the school but improving the product of the school. No particular pressure is required to persuade them to adopt changes that will be beneficial to the youngsters. They are not afraid to talk the matter over with parents and with the public generally.

On the contrary, the Army seems to be afraid of the public. It seems intent on keeping its ancient forms and habits and customs which are outmoded. The proof of the fact that they are outmoded is that neither the 10,000,000 boys who were in the Army nor the American public generally want any part of the Army.

It is certainly important that we have an Army of the proper size, or at least trained men who are available for that Army. If the Army could be persuaded to think of itself in the same relationship to the American public as do the public schools, I believe the problem could be solved satisfactorily. While this would mean that the Army would have to change both its ancient forms and its "public be damned" attitude, it would certainly receive in exchange a tremendous consideration. It would be grand if we could

think of not only "our" schools and "our" Army rather than "our" schools and "the" Army.

With best personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

HARRY M. REED.

Political Predictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times of June 11, 1946:

POLITICAL PREDICTIONS

We read in the papers that Chairman REECE, of the Republican National Committee, predicts that his party will elect a majority of the Members in both branches of Congress this year. His statement has a familiar sound because the same prediction has been made previous to each election since 1930. There should be no criticism of this prophecy, since it is the duty of the leader to inspire his followers with hope, which is said to spring eternal in the human breast.

No doubt in due time the Democratic chairman will counter with the claim that his party will retain control of Congress. This seems to be a part of the political game. No seasoned politician is seriously impressed with the rival claims of the party leaders. The predictions are a sort of prologue to the dramatic movements that are to follow. The result in elections is determined not by the claims of the chairmen but by the conditions which they only remotely control.

In the approaching congressional elections the Republican Party is the party in opposition, and the Democratic Party is the one in defense. The outcome of the contest will depend upon the strategic position of the opposition and the defense. The Democrats by force of circumstances must support the administration. This means that they must in the main base their appeals for approval on the conduct of the Government.

The Republicans, not having responsibility for the administration, are free to criticize and attack the party in power. There are grave political dangers for them in this situation. Lack of responsibility leads to weakness and disorganization. In course of time the party in opposition becomes a mere negative influence and loses initiative and constructive power. Political leaders fall into the habit of condemning everything done by the party in power regardless of the value or benefit.

The Democratic Party has been in control of the Government for many years. In that time it has many achievements to its credit, and some mistakes must be admitted. There must be evaluations, and a balancing of accounts. The success of the administration must be determined not by some isolated action, but by its over-all accomplishment. The administration rescued the Nation from the worst depression in its history. It took the lead in winning a world war. It is restoring the country to a peacetime basis in an orderly process.

It must be said to the credit of the Republican Party that with the exception of a few isolationists, it cooperated fully in carrying the war to a successful conclusion. In domestic affairs it has opposed reform and liberal movements, and supported special interests in preference to the welfare of the common people, as shown in its opposition to price regulation during the period of reconversion. It has attacked the President and his administration for situations which by the acts of its Members in Congress it has created.

For illustration, Republican leaders have condemned the increase in bureaus and departments, and demanded reduction and consolidation. Recently the President recommended that certain bureaus be combined. A Republican Member of Congress moved to reject the recommendation and he was supported by his party colleagues. An examination of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will reveal many instances in which the Republican Members of Congress have voted against measures recommended by the President and then later condemned him for the outcome.

These Members do not seem to realize that their record makes them responsible for the things they blame on the administration. We have the impression that the public will be more analytical than usual this year. Claims and predictions may be in order in opening the coming campaign, but the records and the achievements of the parties and their leaders will be the biggest factors in the final results. We are electing Members of Congress, and not a President, this year. The incumbents must stand on their records. The record shows that Democratic Representatives from West Virginia have consistently supported the interests of the common people.

The Sugar Situation

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a newspaper article saying that the United States marshal for the western district of Louisiana recently sold more than a million pounds of sugar to the highest bidders. One corporation got 609,000 pounds for 8.37 cents a pound, while another corporation bought 50,000 pounds at 20.1 cents a pound. It looks like a little black market is going on. I do not like to speak disrespectfully of Uncle Sam, but this looks a little shady. Another bidder got 122,000 pounds at 8.34 cents a pound. I do not like that kind of business. The American public does not like it either. They need sugar.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

BOTTLERS HIGH BIDDERS FOR SEIZED SUGAR

The Pepsi-Cola Bottling Co. of Waco, Tex., and Seven-Up Texas Corp., San Antonio, Tex., were successful bidders for large quantities of sugar sold by the United States marshal for the Western District of Louisiana May 1 at Alexandria.

The sugar, located at mills at Erath, Abbeville, and Jeanerette, La., was seized by the Government as the result of a suit brought against the Chandler Laboratories of Philadelphia by Edward F. LeBlanc, manager of the mills. More than a million pounds of sugar was disposed of at an average price of better than 11 cents per pound. Candy manufacturers and other industrial users were also among the successful bidders.

The Seven-Up Texas Corp. obtained 609,000 pounds at an average price of 8.37 cents. The Pepsi-Cola Bottling Co. of Waco was successful bidder for 100,000 pounds, average price 18.01 cents. On 50,000 pounds of this quantity, the Pepsi-Cola Bottling Co. paid 20.1 cents a pound, top price of the sale, while the same company paid 16.01 cents a pound for another 50,000-pound lot.

Lowest bid was the 8.34 cents paid by the Seven-Up concern for 122,475 pounds.

No ration evidences were needed for the sale. OPA officials explained in New Orleans that if the sugar is used or resold, ration accounting must eventually be made, however.

Mr. Truman's Cringing Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 11, 1946

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, St. Louis, Mo., under date of Wednesday, June 12, condemning the action of the President in his veto of the Case bill.

I want to particularly call this editorial to the attention of the Members of the House as I regard it as the most forceful and well-written editorial I have yet seen on this subject.

MR. TRUMAN'S CRINGING VETO

President Truman vetoed the Case bill yesterday and thereby gave the appearance of a man vastly frightened by the shadow of organized labor. What purported to be a reasoned analysis of the legislation which would restrict labor's ability to paralyze American industry at will proved to be but a kowtow to the political forces which have threatened to defeat him and his party at the polls.

The President donned the toga of statesmanship but turned out to be merely a politician who regrets his recent panicky call for somebody to do something when the Nation was in the throes of rail and coal strikes. The Case bill is all wrong, he said, and made the convenient appeal for long-range legislation by Congress, a careful and exhaustive study with a report made some 6 months hence—after congressional elections are well into history.

The President was unwilling to accept the Case bill because it is not the perfect instrument to meet the growing labor difficulties. He dissected it section by section and found it wanting in every particular. He made the bland assertion that it will adjust no differences, that it would not have pertained in the recent coal and rail strikes, and with fine presumption in so many words told labor to strike when and if necessary, so long as a Government-seized property is not concerned.

In short, Mr. Truman vetoes a measure which is the first fair labor bill Congress has passed in a decade with the excuse that Congress should take its time and write a better one. He is so unimpressed by what has been going on in recent months that he rejects a measure which places needed restrictions on labor and invites the unions to return to the status quo John L. Lewis.

After he made his dramatic appeal to Congress for both emergency and long-range legislation, this newspaper questioned editorially whether he meant what he said. We thought then that he had been the sudden victim of hysteria when he saw the Nation's economy going in collapse—and would regret what he said when the labor chiefs started

batting him around. Now we are convinced he has recanted, and the big question in his mind is, did he go far enough yesterday to win back the labor votes he lost a few weeks ago. His virtuous declaration of devotion to the public weal was the hollow oratory of a man running for office.

It is unfortunate that the President's first consideration in estimating the Case bill was votes. The country has been wracked by strikes. It went without fuel, and transportation was tied up because of excessive labor demands which the operators could not meet. Postwar reconversion has been greatly retarded; the Nation's confusion has been as great as at any time in war. The public has demanded—it still demands—that something be done to halt the parade of defiant unionism.

Congress stirred from its lethargy after hearing the voice of the people, and passed the Case bill. Not perfect, true. But it was a long-range measure which would have reduced the opportunity for hurtful strikes. It did not "crack down" on labor to deprive it of any of its just rights; it merely corrected certain evils in the Wagner act and required labor to assume responsibilities which it should, now that it is, as Mr. Truman said yesterday, "coming of age."

If Mr. Truman were sincere in his protestations that something must be done to ease the friction between labor and management, he would have signed the Case bill. Then, with it on the books, Congress could have taken its time in studying possible revisions in the formation of a long-range program. This the President refused to do, preferring to risk the chance that there will be no new labor legislation rather than offend the group which in 1944 gave the Roosevelt-Truman ticket 72 percent of its votes.

The Case bill was passed by the House last February by an overwhelming vote. It was sent to the Senate, where it was pigeonholed until the strike situation forced it to the floor. It was passed, 49 to 29, with a few amendments. The House concurred, 230 to 106. Here was reflected what the Nation thought about the measure.

The Case bill provides:

1. Federal mediation board to be created with authority to step into major labor disputes and forbid strikes or lockouts for 60 days while it seeks to solve them, the board to consist of representatives of labor, management, and the public.

2. Provision made for civil suits against either labor or management for breach of contract.

3. Bargaining rights to be lost by anyone engaged in violence while picketing or striking in violation of the proposed law.

4. Secondary boycott in strikes to be barred, with violators to face loss of bargaining and reemployment rights.

5. Unionization of supervisory workers for collective bargaining purposes barred unless such employees actually perform manual productive labor.

6. Employer contributions to worker-welfare funds administered exclusively by unions barred.

7. Fact-finding commissions to be established to determine facts in major labor dispute involving public utilities.

8. Workers interfering with movements of goods in interstate commerce subject to severe penalties, a provision embodying terms of House-passed "anti-racketeer bill."

Is this unfair to labor? No. Does it provide the public with some protection against unfair strikes? Yes.

The President's message yesterday was without temper. Posing as the friend of all the people, he examined each section of the bill and said it wouldn't do; that it would provoke rather than diminish strikes; that the right to strike against private employers must not be curtailed; that the bill goes too far in holding labor unions responsible for violation of their contracts.

To some degree there was plausibility in what he said, but shining through each paragraph of his message was the gesture to organized labor and the "I'm still your boy friend" reminder to those who have threatened to do dire things to him and his at the polls.

Mr. Truman could have made himself a great President yesterday, but he missed the bus.

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, while OPA is so much before Congress for consideration, I am glad to set out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very timely discussion of OPA that has come to me from one of the outstanding community leaders of my district:

WHY DELAY THE ISSUE

(By Louis J. Kehoe)

One year after the war and we find ourselves little nearer to a normal way of life than we were during the war. Under programs of Government control, little progress has been made toward getting a balance between supply and demand, which is the only true measure that insures plenty at normal cost. When we see lines forming to get meat in legitimate channels as defined by the Government; when these same lines are now growing for bread and many articles of clothing and prospects of other commodities being supplied in the same manner, it would seem that we have a legitimate doubt as to the practical effectiveness of these control programs. Even if we concede that these programs are well intended and probably as well administered as the inherent nature of the work permits, yet it must now be evident to everyone that it is not making progress toward any real solution of our economic problems.

Under this system, we see black market and bootleg activity in the marketing of a wide variety of commodities and an unjustified, artificial scarcity in all so-called legitimate channels.

Experience of the past has shown that unrestricted manufacture and distribution and unrestricted competition in a free, open trade is the only way plenty, at reasonable cost, can be brought about. In this transition, which will no doubt last for from 6 months to a year; when production reaches its maximum, we can expect substantial rises in cost and some hardships to result, but this will be only temporary, if the Government steps out of the picture and lets the true laws of economics work.

This issue we will have to face either now, in 1946, or later, whenever these controls are discontinued. Under these controls, we are just delaying the crisis that we must eventually face, and as a result delaying the arrival of normal living conditions again.

Aside from the racketeers who are now making a harvest just like the liquor bootleggers used to, I don't suppose any of us like the present crazy conditions to continue, but continue they will until Government gets out of business and returns to its proper sphere. We might just as well face the issue now and get the crisis over with as wait and just put up with present conditions and face it later.

Under the present set-up, the Government seems to crave to control everything but the things that require Government control, and these matters like the controversies between management and labor that are plaguing the public, the Government is reluctant to do anything about.

It is just as important to face courageously the correction of our own economic problems, as it is to impoverish ourselves to insure Europe and Asia against the consequence of their war folly, by robbing this country to feed them.

Either an open, free and competitive trade economy is right, or it's wrong. It is not both. The American people should decide which course they prefer, and then follow it. Either the American plan of free competitive trade, or the European plan of government control and regimentation incident to a planned economy, should be accepted. The two plans don't mix.

Proposals are constantly suggested for the removal of these controls on certain items and retain them on others. Something like cutting a dog's tail off, an inch at a time to keep it from hurting him so much. This is an absurd simili, but it is equally absurd to free controls from some items without throwing out of balance our price structure as it affects others, with the incident hampering of production and the scarcity that will naturally result. An example is to remove ceilings on meat and retain ceilings on feed. One being dependent on the other, disaster must follow.

If we want a free economy, it is better to face the issue now. The OPA, and similar agencies have served their purpose. They should now be dispensed with entirely and pass on to their place of history, receiving such credit or blame as future developments in our economy will decree them entitled.

Memorial Day, 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Ollie M. James from the Cincinnati Enquirer of May 30, 1946:

MEMORIAL DAY, 1946

Words are puny things on an occasion like this. What resounding phrases can compare in eloquence with the silent trickle of life's blood down the dusty cheek of a tired and battered youngster on Okinawa? What can you say, those of us still privileged to be alive, to the men who toppled in the reddening snow at Bastogne?

What can you ever say to the dead—those with no ears for the hearing of sympathy or tribute?

There isn't much you can say, with words. If you use words at all, they're apt to be clumsy, tumbling out awkwardly in a stream of inexpressible feeling. To a loved one, or friend, though, they suffice. There really isn't much that needs to be said, there.

But what do you say to men whose names you've never known, and will never know? What do you say to those hundreds of thousands who had nothing left to bring back but victory?

Shall we write them a letter and tell them that the world's politicians are frittering away the hope of enduring peace for which they died? Shall we tell them that even though we're jeopardizing that bright postwar future—in which they'd hoped to share—we're

straining to return to a dog-eat-dog way of life?

Shall we tell them that bungling and cupidity have choked the production of goods for which a war-weary Nation has waited too long?

Shall we tell them we're not doing our full share to ease the suffering in the wake of war abroad? Shall we tell them that here at home the Ku Klux Klan is rising up to mock the vision of justice they followed to the four corners of the earth, and death?

Shall we tell them that politics tangle the feet of those who've tried to keep America on course, that even the safeguarding of their victory is now a political football?

Shall we tell them that their wives and mothers can't buy stockings, and their dads and brothers and buddies can't buy white shirts or suits? Shall we tell them the economic and industrial life of the Nation has been at the mercy of a handful of men who snarl even at the restraining hand of Government? Shall we tell them that these latter-day Caesars have jeopardized the gains that the working man has made in a generation of toil?

Shall we tell them, in short, what has gone on since they "got it" in some far-off land?

No. God, no! Let them sleep, thinking, perhaps, we were more deserving of their sacrifice.

The American Famine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, you may say we do not have a famine in America, that there is no American food famine. Technically this may be true. But we are so close to having an actual food famine in this country, that the subject is no longer to be treated lightly.

You cannot laugh off the fact that we have bread lines in this country today. It is a sad commentary upon the management of our economy, that bread lines with 800 people strung out for two blocks, have been reported by the newspapers, where the people recently were reported to have been standing in line for a loaf of bread. When they get to the counter, in many instances, there is no bread. This is due in some cases to strikes by bakery employees. But it is due in the main to the utter failure of the attempt at planned economy in this country.

Last year's yield and production of wheat was one of the largest in the history of the country. Yet the bakeries cannot get flour with which to make bread. The people cannot buy flour to make their own bread. The people are panicky and have a right to be. In the land of plenty, we have no bread. But we have bread lines in peacetimes. The situation is much worse than it was during the days of hostilities. What is wrong?

Thirteen years ago, the New Deal administration inaugurated a program of planned economy. There is nothing new about the so-called New Deal program. It has been tried in many other countries and always failed to accomplish the desired results. The people lost their liberties, a dictator took charge, or a socialistic or communistic regime, or some form of stateism, was ushered in.

The New Deal plan is based upon a philosophy of scarcity. Its leaders declared we had overproduction. So they killed the little pigs and cattle by the millions, plowed under corn, cotton, and sugar beets. They curtailed and diminished production and produced a scarcity in this country. Some people were out of employment, poorly fed and illy clad with inadequate shelter. They were destitute, but were promised Government assistance, and were actually fed, clothed and housed at the expenes of the taxpayers. The Government began to take charge of business enterprises, and to compete with private concerns, and to furnish employment to our citizens.

This was a cunning scheme. We were told that it was planned that way. Such programs wherever they have been tried and put into operation in other countries, have always been developed a step at a time. The people become discouraged and desperate. They followed false leadership, and at every step in the program they lost some of their freedom.

A study of the New Deal program over the past 13 years, should convince any reasonable person that we have progressed to the point where we must either surrender to absolute regimentation, or we must throw off artificial barriers and controls and allow the people to operate their own business affairs without governmental permits, restrictions, and regulations from Washington. The remedy is to fire the bureaucrats, dethrone bureaucracy, control labor organizations to the same extent that organizations of capital and industry have been controlled by law, and thus afford the relief and protection the public is entitled to demand in a free, representative democracy such as ours. Then abundant production will follow and this will again become the land of the free and the home of the brave.

But we have bread lines right here in America. Our citizens are deprived of the food they need for themselves and their families. This is done under the deception and plea of wanting to feed the starving peoples of other sections of the world. More scandals will be revealed about the mismanagement and the misapplication of food supplies supposed to be shared by us with other peoples of the world, than it is possible for the most imaginative to conceive at this time. We are being sold down the river every day. The hue and cry is that we should deny ourselves in order to prevent others from starving. Yet much of that which we are sending abroad is going through black markets to build up potential and possible future enemies of this country. We are actually strengthening administrations of governments that are diametrically opposed to our ideals and conceptions of freedom.

The trouble is that those who plan the program want to bring us down to the low level of the peoples of other lands. They are willing to do this to a point where we will not be able to sustain ourselves, much less share with others, and if continued much longer we shall find ourselves too weak to avoid a dictatorship or some other form of stateism in this country.

Throw off the heavy shackles of Government. Take Government out of business and out of competition with private enterprise. Reestablish free and competitive business in this country. This will allow individuals the freedom that is necessary to encourage them to produce abundantly. But this will never be done under a plan of controlled economy. It will never happen until controls are released, and they can and should be released now.

If this New Dealirium continues much longer the American famine will become a reality. We will have to go to some Government official, or political puppet for our food, our clothing, and our shelter. That will be famine in America. What a burning shame. What a disgrace to this administration, that it has pursued a policy of appeasement of labor bosses and racketeers to the extent that they can and are producing an American famine. When the administration enters the black market, or becomes the greatest black-market operator in the country by buying wheat and corn at 30 cents per bushel above the price individuals are allowed to sell and buy, when dealing with each other, and then takes that grain and gives it to the peoples of other lands to the utter deprivation of our own people, it is going too far. Charity should begin at home. Remove the restrictions, and the farmers will grow more wheat. The millers will produce more flour. Remove the restrictions on slaughtering and the sale of meat and we will have plenty of meat for the people to eat, for we have a tremendous quantity of cattle on the hoof. Quit shipping our grain abroad, and we will have plenty of feed for our livestock and poultry. No man, or set of men, is wise enough to tell the American people what to do and what not to do in all cases. Our people know better than the bureaucrats how to produce, and they will do so if the restrictions are removed. The New Deal must be dethroned. Americanism must be reestablished, safeguarded and protected against foreign ideologies now cherished by all too many of the people of this country. Let us return America, and all we have in this country, to Americans, and preserve and protect America for Americans.

Our Army Is Undemocratic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted, I am inserting herewith a very interesting and thought provoking article by Capt. Joel W. Westbrook which appeared in Collier's, May 4, 1946. It is especially well written and Captain Westbrook, the author, has a

wonderful World War II record as the article discloses. Captain Westbrook is now assistant United States district attorney for the western district of Texas. It is as follows:

CUR ARMY IS UNDEMOCRATIC

(By Joel W. Westbrook)

(The big question is: Does an efficient army have to be undemocratic? A former officer gives the reasons why he believes it does.)

I hate to be the one to defend the Army in this matter. There are so many bones I have to pick with the War Department and some of its lower echelons. For example, I am one of the Thirty-sixth Texas Division Rapido River survivors, and I think that something is very wrong with the system that selects and protects the man responsible for such a tragic fiasco. Still, someone should point out that the sober truth is not being published today about this very fundamental question of democratizing the Army.

It is popular to attack the "Army's medieval caste system," to recite stories of cases of Scotch on B-17 consignment to General X, to lament the humiliation of distinctions between officers and men. And this point of view is freely supported in "letters" columns, in testimony before congressional committees, and countless other public forums.

Generally, the reformers want uniform distinctions (except for actual rank identification) abolished. This is already being done. They want separate mess, separate PX, separate theater, and other separate facilities abolished. They want pay and allowance equalization, and enlisted representation on courts martial.

It is argued that, without these reforms, there will not be sufficient enlistments to constitute a volunteer army. With such reforms, plus other inducements to enlisted personnel, they claim that a volunteer army could be established, thereby obviating the need for universal military training.

To the average reader, apparently this whole scheme of a reform-inducement-volunteer army—with no universal military training—sounds so sweetly reasonable, and flashes so with sparkling words like "democracy" and "caste," that the drab facts of military experience are unpublished.

First, let me briefly qualify myself: Volunteered as private in fall of 1940, commissioned from ranks, ended war as captain, now major in Reserves. Almost entire service in infantry. Hold Combat Infantryman's Badge, Aircraft Observers' Wings, Silver Star, Purple Heart, European-African-Middle Eastern Ribbon with four battle stars and Bronze Invasion Arrowhead, American Defense Medal, Victory Medal. Twenty-nine months overseas. I was relieved from active duty January 18, 1946. The other day I received some War Department material suggesting that it would not be too difficult to secure a Regular Army commission. I have no desire whatsoever to return to military service—even if, as I believe should be done, extra inducements for officers are provided.

Now I take exception to the argument that reform is the only means of securing the volunteer army that will make universal military training unnecessary. In the first place, I don't believe that a large volunteer or mercenary army is the kind of an army we want. Such an army would place great power in the hands of the military, or whoever controlled the military leaders, and be a constant threat to our national life.

However, even if such an army were desirable, the fact remains that professional soldiers—the mercenary volunteers, that is—are the ones who most readily understand and accept the need for officer privileges.

But now let us get at the argument on its merits, irrespective of whether we are to have a volunteer mercenary army or a relatively small professional army with a large civilian trained reserve.

THE BEST SOLDIERS DIDN'T COMPLAIN

Let us first of all recognize that something definitely has been wrong with our officer-man relations. Even allowing for the large amount of irresponsible and meaningless grousing, even considering that the best soldiers probably were not those who spent their time writing complaining letters, that civilians are bound to be unhappy in an army and that it is natural for them, with or without reason, to take it out on their officers—still there is no question that there existed much genuine and justified dissatisfaction.

Critics have analyzed what most enlisted soldiers (including the good, the bad, and the indifferent) thought was wrong. But they should have considered that further investigation was necessary, rather than to take it for granted that those who lack the responsibilities, as well as the privileges, have soberly, intelligently, and responsibly solved the problem.

The answer is possibly too simple. But the answer is that so many of those who were using—and abusing—officer privileges were not worthy of them. In its selection and training of officers the Army emphasized tactics and techniques, which are relatively easily taught. But the Army badly neglected character, the nature of officers' responsibilities, the function and requirements of duty, and standards of conduct, all of which are seldom found inherent in candidates and are most difficult to inculcate.

Privilege, understandably, becomes gross and unjustified when exercised by those who fail in their responsibilities or abuse their privileges. But privilege is necessary in the maintenance of a good officer corps, and a good officer corps is necessary to an efficient army.

An efficient army will inevitably be undemocratic. In the past there has been experimenting with democracy in armies. Where this has been done on any considerable scale, the results have been dismal. The Civil War elective-officer system, for example, was most unsatisfactory.

Possibly the most considerable reforms made in modern times in officer-men relations were made by the Red Army during and after the First World War. The Soviets made a drastic attempt to form an egalitarian army (which is really what the reformers are asking for when they say "democratic army"). They even abolished the salute and titles of rank. Due to the complete failure of these theories, which obtained in large part during the Finnish war, the Red Army reinstituted the age-old perquisites of rank. It was, at the close of business on VJ-day, probably more rank-conscious than any other of the principal armies, with the possible exception of the Germany Army.

Democratic armies are simply not efficient and disciplined; and inefficiency and indiscipline mean lost battles and high casualties.

The paramount need of an army is discipline. Any other advantage it possesses in matériel or ideas or position is of greatly lessened value without discipline. That saying—an army without discipline is just an armed mob—is hackneyed. Yet it is very, very true.

People in armies are required to do some very dangerous things, at least some very unpleasant ones; and the conditions of work are frequently such—under shelling and so on—that intelligent reasoning power is not always available. Commanders must have confidence that their orders are being carried out, that other units and other soldiers likewise have that confidence. Soldiers generally don't like attacking machine-gun positions. They like it even less if they aren't sure that the other platoon is taking care of its job.

EASY TO CRITICIZE ASSIGNMENTS

Human beings, especially soldiers, can easily rationalize any unpleasant job assigned them as stupid and unnecessary. And the temptation to do so, especially when life is at stake, is very great. Therefore, no matter how offensive the concept is to free-thinking people, obedience is the paramount military virtue.

Now the kind of discipline that is necessary in an army is very difficult to attain. It must be made into a habit, as close to automatic reaction as possible. This takes drill, a continuing demand for precise performance, and an over-all employment of psychology that secures respect, not for individuals, but for authority per se. That's hierarchical, that's totalitarian, perhaps. But experience convinces me that it is necessary to an efficient, disciplined army.

First-rate, high-quality officers are essential to good discipline. "There are no such things as good regiments and bad regiments," said Napoleon, "there are only good colonels and bad colonels!" An example I remember was B Company, One Hundred and Forty-third Infantry, which, under poor commanders, was an undisciplined, inefficient unit. But when my friend, Henry Waskow (whom Ernie Pyle wrote about in Brave Men and who became the prototype for the captain in the movie Story of GI Joe) took it over, with practically the same personnel, it became an exceptionally good rifle company.

Generally speaking, a company of average Americans from Indiana, Brooklyn, and Texas is about the same as one composed of Iowans, Californians, and State of Maine men. The difference in performance is the difference in command.

I have sat on court-martial boards where I was sure that the defendant, if he had been in F Company, instead of G Company under poor officers, would not have been up for "misbehavior before the enemy." The men who were sentenced for cowardice were frequently no poorer spirited than those who got through with honor. But they were in outfits where the weak were not encouraged by resolute officers to hold on, where poor leadership engendered a general lack of confidence. The absolute requirement, for the sake of the soldiers, for the sake of the mission, is good leadership.

It seems to me unintelligent, therefore, to adopt a program of inducing a large numerical enlistment, and overlook the need for inducing the kind of leadership to which these troops are entitled. In fact, the would-be reformers are doing worse than that. They are trying to diminish the prestige of leadership.

Proponents of a democratic army themselves recognize that the pay scale does not supply the significant difference in rank. For instance, the difference in the responsibilities of an average first lieutenant and an average sergeant is not, and could not be, measured by a difference in pay. Indeed, a flying-status sergeant can take home monthly more pay than an infantry or tank lieutenant.

During this war we had replacement depots, "Repple Depples," through which came our replacements, officers and men. During much of the war, most of these "Repple Depples" democratically treated officer replacements like enlisted men. The officers stood in the chow lines with them, policed their own quarters and area, and generally had neither privileges nor responsibilities.

When we got them, their confidence in themselves, their belief in their authority and duty, had been sadly dissipated, except for those considerably above average in character and intelligence. Especially was this true of second lieutenants who, of all people, needed confidence and belief in their authority, for they worked under the most critical conditions and made the decisions which were the toughest to follow.

If you treat a lieutenant like a corporal, don't expect more than a corporal's work from him, and don't impose more than a corporal's responsibilities on him. (Not that this

didn't happen, too, unfortunately.) The outfits that really got results not only treated lieutenants like officers, but also treated sergeants and corporals like noncommissioned officers, and in consequence these in turn performed like noncommissioned officers instead of like privates.

I wish familiarity did not usually breed contempt, but it does—or at least it breeds reservations. You can spin this out in fine logic all you want, but experience is what counts. There are a few men who can lead their units well without benefit of bars or leaves while on intimate terms with their men (usually picked troops). But there are very few. And such sad things happen when ordinary average officers, commanding ordinary average troops, try to emulate them.

A lot of nonsense has been written about "going to hell for the Old Man; he's a regular guy." Men are almost never willing to die for another man; in fact most men are reluctant to die for a woman, for anything. They will move in jeopardy of death, however, if they have been disciplined to obey average men carrying the President's commission and the right to order their movement in those dangerous places. But if this same average man is their buddy and seeks to enlist his following on a personal basis, there is so often an embarrassing disinclination to follow. That is fact, not theory.

THE BASIS OF COMRADESHIP

People have been misled by what they believe to be the informality of officers and men at the front. I have slept many times with a sergeant or private, and squatted down to chow with him over the same fire. And it is true that there is not much saluting at the front. But both officers and enlisted men recognize that their familiarity at the front is only a matter of practical convenience, and that the deep comradeship comes from shared dangers. There is an affection of captain for sergeant that the captain would never feel for a rear-echelon officer. But—and I realize this is a difficult concept for the uninitiate to grasp—the relationship still is not personal, and both of them, good soldiers, understand that it would not be fair to the other men of the officer's command if it were personal.

The captain's decisions are difficult enough, without his having to worry how his orders may affect his friends. Those who receive the orders should not have to wonder how much influence friendship played. Even a suspicion of favoritism is sufficient to wreck an organization.

Furthermore, under the regulations an officer is charged with an almost complete responsibility for his troops. He should be distracted by no personal worries. I remember a lieutenant bragging about digging his own fox hole. And I remember what the battalion c. o., who was the most courageous and most effective battlefield commander I ever saw, said to this lieutenant: "Lieutenant, did you check the dispositions of your troops before you dug that hole? Did you see that the machine guns were tied in? Did you check your contact on your flanks? Had you assured yourself about ammunition? Had you taken care of feeding arrangements for the night, seen that the rolls were brought up, the water? Did you check on your communications? Did you?"

The lieutenant had not done these things, nor could he have done them and still dig his hole. His job was to take care of his men. In the military concept, which actually is, I suppose, feudalistic, it is therefore desirable and proper that his men take care of him. And seasoned troops do see that their officers are relieved of personal annoyances.

An officer is entitled to go to the theater occasionally. If there were no reserved seats, he would stand in line. Superficially, it may appear that it is doing the Army a great deal of good to ask the colonel to spend the same annoying hour or so of waiting and shuffling that the private undergoes. Realistically, if the Army asks its colonel to assume a colonel's responsibilities during duty hours, and then treats him like a private off duty, the Army will suffer from a lack of high-grade colonels, because the pay differential alone will not be justification enough for many good men.

It is a very good idea to have separate bar and hotel facilities for officers and men. Otherwise you have a most undesirable competition in them. You have officers constantly considering when the interests of discipline require them to intervene in minor disorders; men either overrunning the officers or uncomfortable in their presence.

Enlisted men enjoy themselves a good deal more without the brass around. What makes them sore, and justifiably so, is officers failing to provide adequate facilities for them, forgetting the principle that the welfare of the troops comes first.

I went back for a 3-day rest to Naples during the 1943–44 Italian winter campaign. At the rest camp there, the officers had a relatively good mess. The men were required to stand in long lines in the rain to get their chow, and then did not even have tables outside to eat on. That was inexcusable, and I so reported to my commanding officer.

Nor did I think it proper in the Delta Base Section area around Marseilles that considerable labor and materials should go into construction of officers' clubs and facilities before adequate provision had been made for the troops.

In the really good Army outfits, at least as far forward as regimental CP's, visiting officer journalists were much more likely to be saluted than in front of their own rear-echelon officers. Regimental staff officers were given a great deal, comparatively speaking, of the limited comforts available. And the performance in those outfits was way beyond that in headquarters characterized by more egalitarian conditions.

In rest and training areas, or when just in reserve a kilometer or so behind the lines, battalion and company headquarters of really first-rate fighting units showed more military courtesy, more respect for authority, and less superficial camaraderie between different ranks than was found either in poorer combat organizations or in rear-echelon areas. Back in the base section we were amazed at the informality between officers and men; we were amazed also at the officers' widespread failure to discharge their responsibilities to their troops, and at their preoccupation with their privileges, with easy living; and we were shocked at the lack of discipline and efficiency.

It is extremely unlikely that discipline and efficiency could have been secured there by abolishing segregation in bars and hotel, and by similar equalizing measures. But if officers had been held to a high standard of performance, relieved and court-martialed for failure to discharge their responsibilities, if troops' welfare had been given first consideration, and just, firm officer-administration insured, I believe there would have been a marked improvement in discipline and efficiency. Experience of other units in generations of soldiering proves it.

GOOD OFFICER CORPS A "MUST"

Insofar as court-martial reform is concerned, here again there was no doubt a great deal wrong, but very little that cannot be corrected by having a good instead of an indifferent-to-poor officer corps. Enlisted men possessing the characteristics desirable for members of a court-martial are certainly eligible for commissioning, and should be.

I propose, therefore, that we do our enlisted men the very considerable and necessary service of giving them officers who will lead them intelligently and fairly. They will get far more under good officers who enjoy special privileges than under indifferent ones with none.

If officer privileges and distinctions are abolished, it is possible that, for a while, we will get more enlistments, but we shall certainly have an even poorer-quality officer, and so, necessarily, a poorer-quality army.

The remedy is in careful selection and training of officer personnel, increasing the prestige and privileges of rank, sternly demanding that responsibilities be discharged and ruthlessly eliminating the unfit.

In short, rather than abolish privileges, make them be earned. Instead of eliminating distinctions, demand that those distinctions make sense in practice.

But above all, let us not predicate any of our planning for our Military Establishment on the assumption that we can get good soldiering or good fighting from people who are in the service because they think it is an easy go. Let us rather make conditions such that good men can justify themselves in serving, and realize that the best results will come from people who know that their job is a hard and not-too-pleasant one, but a necessary public service, honored as such.

The alternative, a large mercenary standing army of specially induced volunteers, would be a miserably undemocratic solution.

General Bor Visits Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial that appeared in the Washington Evening Star of June 13, 1946, commenting on the visit of Poland's valiant soldier, Gen. Tadeusz Komorowski:

GENERAL BOR VISITS US

A distinguished foreign visitor has come to Washington. His visit to the Nation's Capital is unofficial, because his mere presence has given rise to diplomatic controversy, but nonetheless he is assured of a warm welcome among Washingtonians. This visitor is none other than the almost legendary figure of the heroic Polish underground resistance against the German occupation of Poland. The pseudonym under which he operated was "General Bor," and by that name he is still most widely known. His real name is Tadeusz Komorowski, and he holds the rank of lieutenant general from the London Polish government-in-exile and is still regarded as the commander in chief of the armed forces of that regime, which totals some 230,000.

It is those veteran and victorious forces, including a substantial air arm and a navy, which fought as separate units throughout the late war under the British over-all command. And it is to speak in behalf of the continued existence of those forces while the war has not been officially terminated that General Bor has been touring the United States at the invitation of the Congress of Polish-American Societies. Wherever persons of Polish birth or descent are free to speak anywhere in the world, most of them continue to support the London government-in-extile and bitterly protest the recent decision of the British Government to demobilize those Polish forces and translate them to a civilian life-in-exile, since they refuse to return to their native land under Soviet domination.

No more effective spokesman could have been chosen than General Bor, the leader of the magnificent Warsaw rising against the Germans on August 1, 1944. For 63 days

Polish underground fighters, numbering some 300,000, including women and even children, battled the Germans until ultimately crushed, while a Soviet Army on the opposite bank of the River Vistula looked on impassive and even hampered air succor by American and British planes. General Bor was thereafter held prisoner by the Germans until liberated by American troops shortly before VE-day. He then went to London and was made head of the Polish armed forces. General Bor now suggests that those seasoned troops be taken over by the American high command as a foreign legion and used for the occupation of the American zone in Germany, thereby easing the strain on American manpower. The proposal is interesting, but is not apt to receive serious consideration here.

Settlement of Jews in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Philadelphia Record of June 13, 1946:

TOBEY SAYS UNITED STATES WILL HELP JEWS

The United States will transport 100,000 uprooted European Jews to Palestine and aid in housing and settling them there—if the British will agree to admit them, Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY (Republican, New Hampshire) told a crowd of 7,500 last night in Convention Hall.

That offer, he said, places the responsibility squarely on the British.

THREE HUNDRED PRESENT PAGEANT

He spoke preceding presentation of a pageant, That We May Live, under the sponsorship of the Palestine Emergency Fund, Inc., which used a cast of 300 in a moving pantomime dramatization of British policy on Palestine from its inception to the present moment. Eugene O'Neill, Jr., son of the playwright, gave a running commentary on the pageantry.

Among other speakers, all greeted warmly by the audience, were William B. Ziff, author and publisher, and Rabbi Howard J. Ralbag, of New York.

FOR JEWISH PALESTINE

"I am for a Jewish Palestine," Senator TOBEY declared. "The needy multitudes cannot be served with the trickle of our limited immigration quotas. They must have a homeland, to which they can migrate freely, where they can enter in large numbers speedily, and solve satisfactorily their own particular national and individual problems. They are entitled in justice to a home which they can call their own, for which they have dreamed, and to which they earnestly desire to go. That home should be Palestine."

CHANCE FOR REHABILITATION

He urged the plan as a means of rehabilitation for those broken by years in concentration camps of the Nazis.

"I do not mean," he emphasized, "subsistence behind Allied barbed-wire camps. I mean spiritual as well as physical reconstruction; an opportunity to live again in peace; a chance for a livelihood, a free community, an opportunity once more to sense the dignity of man to man."

Attacking British policy on Palestine, Ziff reported his findings on a recent trip to that country. "In Palestine," he said, "there is one law for Jews and another for Englishmen and Arabs. Jews pay an income tax, but Arabs pay no income tax. Jews may not buy land in certain districts, just as in the Russian pale."

JEWS ARE RESTRICTED

"Only Jews," he continued, "may not enter as immigrants. The Arabs may come in freely as they please. Jewish industry is subject to continuous discrimination. Everything in the country is done upside down and the opposite way to what is done in other well-regulated countries.

"I declare now that if this situation is allowed to continue as it is, the world has gone absolutely mad and senseless, and we are all on the way to ruin," Ziff said.

A Tribute to Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. SAVAGE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, last year on the way home from Europe on a convoy, I had the opportunity of cultivating a friendship with the commodore of that convoy, John W. W. Cumming, who is a great American, one who has deep respect and love for our flag and country.

In commemoration of Flag Day, I wish to insert in my remarks A Tribute to Our Flag, the author of which is Captain Cumming. And, since this is the one hundred and sixty-ninth birthday of our flag, I would also like to include herewith A Brief History of Our Flag, which is another of Captain Cumming's compositions:

A TRIBUTE TO OUR FLAG

A salute to thee, Old Glory, the Stars and Stripes—our flag!

Thou wast born June 14, 1777;

Thy field of blue with 48 stars of white doth represent the Union of States while thy 13 stripes of red and white, the original Colonies; but thou art more;

Thou art a silent symphony of red, white, and blue, the harmony of home and country composed by God, Himself, the master of life, liberty, equality, and the pursuit of happiness;

Thy azure blue, like the firmament, displays now a galaxy, a constellation of bright shining stars in one of which each of us has a home, yet, every other star is likewise a home for each of us—one for all and all for one—a perfect union;

Thy stripes of white, six in number, emblazon on high, the purity of purpose of creation by the Almighty God whose omniscience and omnipotence, in 6 days, brought into being all there is, including earth and over all therein gave He dominion to man—and—God was pleased because all was good; thus was thy birth first planned;

Thy stripes of red, seven in number, one for each day of the week in which to render passionate, living, virile worship, and service to the Infinite, by man serving man in joy and sadness, in plenty and poverty, in health and sickness, regardless of cost, sacrifice, race, color, or creed; thus do our part by Providence planned;

I salute thee, my flag, because thou dost symbolize all I hold most dear—God! home! country!—and, I will defend thee against all enemies, domestic and foreign!

I salute thee!

JOHN W. W. CUMMING.

JUNE 8, 1942.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF OUR FLAG

Although the United States is thought of as a young Republic, few flags can boast a longer continuous history as a national emblem than can the flag of our country, the United States of America.

The oldest among the national flags of the present day is the flag of Denmark which is known to have been flown by the Danes ever since the thirteenth century and the flag of Switzerland dates from the fourteenth century, if not earlier; also, the flag of the Netherlands, in its present form, has flown the seas since 1650.

On June 14, 1777, the United States Congress adopted our flag, the same to have one star and one stripe for each State, starting with 13 of each.

On January 13, 1794, two stars and two stripes were added for Vermont and Kentucky, making 15 of each.

Fifteen stars and fifteen stripes continued until 1818, by which time 5 more States had been added to the Union, with further additions in prospect, resulting in Congress, on April 4, 1818, restoring the original number of stripes, 13, but providing that, thereafter, there be added to the flag one star for each new State.

Congressmen Jensen, of Iowa, and Ploeser, of Missouri, Render Great Service on Appropriations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to make a beginning toward relief for the taxpayers, it will have to be done by giving publicity to some of our Government agencies which were created by Congress in good faith, for certain definite purposes. When those agencies betray their trust, someone has to call that fact to the attention of the House of Representatives, as well as to the attention of the American people.

This rare public service has been rendered by two of our colleagues, the Honorable BEN JENSEN, of Iowa, and the Honorable WALTER PLOESER, of Missouri, who are entitled to our gratitude for their courage and fidelity to their duties in exposing in a minority report the activities of the Export-Import Bank.

Some days ago the newspapers carried an item that the United States was to lend France $1,370,000,000. This loan was to be accomplished in various ways, and Congress was very clearly to be bypassed by some superb financial highway-construction work. The newspaper item said that a direct loan of $650,000,000 was to be made to France from the Export-Import Bank. That was part of the loan. The next day the newspaper carried an item that the French Communists complained that the loan was insufficient and that it should have been increased. This sort of an episode confirms me in my belief, that if the United States has a foreign policy, the policy is thoroughly rotten and I suspect the American people are beginning to get the odor.

In connection with the foregoing, the following newspaper item from the Associated Press for today, Thursday, June 13, 1946, is taken from the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C. It calls attention to the fine work that our colleagues JENSEN, of Iowa, and PLOESER, of Missouri, are doing on behalf of the American people. Under our forms of government publicity is one of the greatest aids—next to the political surgery—that there is in curing a common disease, whose symptom is evidenced in an effort to promote internationalism at the expense of America. The disease, of course, is commonly known as being generous with the other fellow's money. The other fellow in this case is the United States.

The newspaper item reads:

REPORT CRITICIZES EXPORT-IMPORT BANK PRACTICES

A rare minority report of the House Appropriations Committee said today the Export-Import Bank has "become a means of avoiding" specific congressional approval for foreign loans.

Republican Representatives JENSEN, of Iowa, and PLOESER, of Missouri, did not amplify their criticism of the $3,500,000,000 Government institution, one of several Federal corporations they rapped in their dissenting report.

The bank has made multi-million-dollar loans in recent months to France, Poland, Holland, and Norway, and would provide the funds for and credit arrangement that might be worked out with Russia. But actual negotiations for a loan to the Soviet Union have not begun.

The views of JENSEN and PLOESER were attached to the full committee's report sending to the House floor the Government corporations appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1947.

FIGHT IN SIGHT

It was the first time the operations of the 33 corporations were reviewed in a body by the committee—result of a 1945 law requiring them to submit their budgets annually to Congress for study.

It was the first time in years, too, that the committee sent a split report to the House floor. This presages a lively fight when the bill is debated tomorrow.

While comparatively little cash is involved in the legislation, the agencies involved deal in billions of dollars a year, largely through loans and operating revenues. The committee estimated their cost to the Treasury during the next fiscal year at $4,020,135,206.

The committee directed the Tennessee Valley Authority, one of the corporations affected by the legislation, to amortize within the next 40 years its investments representing the cost of power-producing plants and facilities.

EARLY LIQUIDATION

It called for early liquidation, without specifying any date, of various war programs financed through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The minority report, in addition to criticizing the Export-Import Bank, called for tighter restrictions on the far-flung financial operations of the corporations.

It also was critical of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for making public works loans for programs not specifically authorized by Congress, asserted there was confusion in the veterans' housing program, and urged liquidation of the Inland Waterways Corporation.

The committee majority ruled against disposal of the waterways corporation, which operates barge lines in midwestern waters.

Secretary of Commerce Wallace, under whom the Corporation operates, told the committee that sale of the Corporation to private interests would be appropriate at this time. Wallace said he did not believe the Government "should compete with private business in any field unless there are conditions that justify such continuation."

Air Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to review for the Congress a program for the extension of air postal services which is now pending in the Congress, and which has been recommended by the Postmaster General. On the 3d of April this year I introduced H. R. 5993 which sets forth a comprehensive program for air postal service. A part of this program was to establish a 5 cent air-mail rate. This particular item was taken up separately by the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and H. R. 5560 introduced by Mr. MCKENZIE, of Louisiana, for this purpose has passed the House of Representatives. The other phases of this program that are required, which seem to me to make a balanced and complete air postal service, are:

First. Air parcel post service.

Second. Authority for the Post Office Department to lease facilities at airports.

Third. Establishment of a committee of the various Government departments concerned with aviation.

Fourth. Establishment of an Assistant Secretary of State for Air.

AIR PARCEL POST

At the present time there is no air parcel-post service; some small parcels are sent by air through the mails but the tariff is the same as the air-mail rate—currently 8 cents an ounce but under the rate approved by the House to be 5 cents an ounce. The establishment of air parcel post will enable us to utilize to the utmost the planes and trained personnel that are available as a result of our war activities in aviation. It will extend the facilities of over 42,000 post offices and approximately 32,000 rural routes to the service of rapid parcel transmission.

The efficiency of the postal service will be increased not only from the standpoint of speeded-up service but the increased volume is expected to result in a substantial reduction in present costs per ton-mile to the Post Office Department. This is a part of the volume factor in the establishment of a 5-cent air-mail rate. The advantages of the volume increase by a reduction of the air-mail cost together with the increased tonnage of parcel mail will reduce the cost to the Department for each ton-mile of mail transported. The estimated figure for this reduction is that contained in a show-cause order issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board in December 1944 which would represent a reduction from the present rate of the four main carriers of 45 cents per ton-mile to 32 cents per ton-mile. This increased volume will as well make possible better utilization of the air transports, and will make practical shipments consisting entirely of mail. This will enable the Post Office Department to schedule planes in accordance with postal needs rather than having to meet passenger schedules.

As an indication of the time that would be saved by the air parcel-post program, let us consider the following: A plane leaving New York at 7:45 p. m. on any Monday is scheduled to arrive in San Francisco on Tuesday at 12:52 p. m. This would permit the delivery of air parcel-post packages to the addressee the next day. Conversely, a train scheduled to leave New York at 11:40 p. m. on Monday is not scheduled to dispatch mail in San Francisco until about 6:50 a. m. on Friday, resulting in delivery 5 days after mailing. Therefore, the time advantage from New York to San Francisco in favor of air transportation amounts to about 4 days.

The costs of air parcel post have been figured on the same basis as regular parcel post, that is, by the eight postal zones. We propose to start the schedule of costs with a 45-cent minimum charge. This minimum is established to avoid a parcel weighing less than 8 ounces requiring more postage than a heavier parcel sent as air parcel post. This is premised on the adoption by the Congress of the 5-cent air-mail rate, recently passed by the House of Representatives. If the new rate is not adopted, the minimum charge can be adjusted accordingly. The rates shown in H. R. 5993 are set at estimated cost. The problem of the amount of profit which the air parcel post should show, it is believed, should be decided after the volume and other factors are established by actual experience.

LEASING OF FACILITIES AT OR NEAR AIRPORTS

Under the proposed improved air postal service the Postmaster General will be authorized to lease land and other facilities at or near airports for use in connection with the care and distribution of the mail. Space is presently furnished by the carriers and has not been very satisfactory. Only two of the existing 29 air-mail field distributing offices have enough space for the employment of sufficient personnel to distribute all of the mail authorized for distribution at such points. With the expected increase of air mail which will come as a result of the reduction from the 8-cent to the 5-cent rate the leasing of space becomes a "must" with the postal service. The postal service providing their own space at airports will also eliminate this indeterminate factor from consideration in fixing charges of the carriers to the Post Office Department. Now that the war is ended, it is anticipated that the increase in foreign air mail will make it good administrative procedure to effect routing and distribution of mail at airports where foreign mail is received. The air parcel-post service will be an additional factor making autonomy in the selection of space a practical necessity for the postal service.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE

It is proposed to establish an interdepartmental committee to consider and make recommendations to the Congress on matters relating to joint problems affecting air-mail transportation. Membership of this committee will consist of a representative of the following departments: Post Office, Commerce, and State. It provides as well for a representative of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the aviation industry. The Postmaster General would serve as chairman of the committee and the findings and recommendations of the committee will be included in the annual report to Congress of the Postmaster General.

This committee would be a part of the increased liaison that is necessary between the Postmaster General and the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Post Office Department as the largest single customer of the commercial air lines should actively participate in the functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board affecting the transportation of the mails. This will become increasingly important as the trend becomes more and more toward all long-haul first-class mail being transported by air.

Air mail is becoming more and more a tool of commerce. The encouragement given to the air industry by the postal contracts have been an important mainstay of our infant air-transport industry. With the impetus that has been given to aviation during the war and in this period immediately following the war, the air industry and the needs of the postal service complement each other. Congress has assured the rapid expansion of aviation by the recently passed S. 2, which provides for the expenditure of $650,000,000 over a period of 10 years for airport improvement. We should as well take every advantage of the expanded facilities to improve the service that we are giving to the people of the United States in the distribution of the mail. With this rapid expansion and the new services which are being instituted there are going to be many complex problems that involve the departments which will be represented on the interdepartmental committee. The formation of an accepted procedure for their discussion and solution will save much time and bring about more satisfactory results.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR AIR

Daily problems are coming to the fore which involve foreign countries and their relationship to air travel. With the airplane we have shortened the distance between countries. We have not kept pace in the development of governmental procedures to cope with the problems that have accompanied this development. International rate fixing, rights of entry, and other international agreements having to do with air travel and shipments are handled by the State Department. Postal rates between countries are dependent, as well, upon international agreements. Reciprocal agreements should be made with all foreign countries, eliminating interior handling charges. An Assistant Secretary of State for Air would expedite action on these international relations having to do with air traffic.

SUMMARY

May I summarize the program which we hope to see a reality in the near future, a program which will give the United States the best postal service possible. First, there is the reduction in air-mail rates from 8 to 5 cents an ounce. Second, the establishment of air parcel post. Third, authorizing the leasing of adequate quarters at airports for postal operations. Fourth, establishing an interdepartmental and business committee to deal with air problems affecting postal service. Fifth, the establishment of an Assistant Secretary of State for Air, which will assist not only our postal service but all air traffic of the United States outside our own boundaries.

Reorganization Plan No. 3, Part I, Meets With Opposition From Seafarers International Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated there is widespread opposition to the President's Reorganization Plans 1, 2, and 3. Hearings before the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments indicate clearly that these plans are little understood by the public, and that they ought to have further study because of the far-reaching consequences which may result if these plans become the law.

JOHN HAWK TESTIFIES

I call attention to the testimony of John Hawk, secretary-treasurer of the Seafarers International Union of North America, before the committee on Thursday, June 13, 1946. Mr. Hawk vigorously opposed part I of Reorganization Plan No. 3 which provides that jurisdiction over the American merchant seamen is permanently placed in the United States Coast Guard under Reorganization Plan No. 3. Mr. Hawk testified at some length and advised the committee that the American merchant seamen wanted jurisdiction over them restored to the Department of Commerce, where it was located before being transferred to the United States Coast Guard as a wartime emergency measure. He also testified on behalf of other groups of sailors and indicated that they were universally opposed to having jurisdiction permanently taken from the Department of Commerce.

I call attention to Mr. Hawk's testimony because Members of Congress whose districts border on the Great Lakes in the Midwest, as well as those whose districts border on the Atlantic seaboard, the Pacific seaboard, and the Gulf Coast, all are very much directly concerned in connection with this problem. Speaking very frankly to the committee, Mr. Hawk stated that the Executive order which took the sailors from the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce and put them under the Coast Guard was to terminate 6 months after the end of the war. He said the men all wanted that order terminated; that they had been satisfied with the Department of Commerce and wanted to be returned to its jurisdiction. I had occasion to listen to his testimony; and in my opinion Mr. Hawk's argument should prevail and Reorganization Plan No. 3 should be defeated. He also pointed out that he had written the President about this matter and had had replies from some assistant secretaries but had never been able to get a hearing on behalf of the Seafarers International Union members. Mr. Hawk's testimony in part was as follows:

TESTIMONY OF HAWK SET FORTH

In my letters to the President I had pointed out the fact that the Bureau had operated successfully under the Department of Commerce since 1884. Seamen and shipowners alike were satisfied with it under that Department. I had pointed out to the President that when the transfer was effected all of the old Bureau employees were transferred, too. They were merely supplemented by Coast Guard officers who superimposed Coast Guard ideas. The real work of the Bureau continued to be done by the old employees.

All of my letters were answered in noncommittal, official, Washington doubletalk by a Budget Bureau doubletalk master. Each time I received an answer from him in reply to one of my letters to the President, I was inspired to new hope. They were in such a bright and cheerful vein. Everything was going to be rosy, they assured me. Oh, yes, thank you for your kind letter; we are glad to entertain your views. But they didn't seem to mean anything. Nothing happened.

The next thing I knew, the President's Reorganization Plan No. 3 had been submittted to Congress. Part 1 hit me in the face when I picked it up.

The main argument for continuing the Bureau under the Coast Guard seems to be that it will more efficiently handle the matter of inspection of vessels and their equipment, since it is responsible, in a measure, for their safety at sea. No argument could be more fallacious. The inspectors under the Department of Commerce were always former merchant captains or engineers. They understood the problems of a merchant ship much more fully than a man without merchant experience ever could.

It is our experience that the inspectors under the Commerce Department always investigated our complaints regarding items of safety aboard ship quickly and completely. The same cannot be said for the Bureau since the Coast Guard took it over. Coast Guard officers always seem to regard any complaints of unlicensed seamen with a jaundiced eye. They take the attitude that we have something up our sleeves.

I see no reason to believe that our complaints would be entertained with any more respect if the inspections are under their permanent jurisdiction.

IN CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, other parts of Mr. Hawk's testimony, equally as interesting as the foregoing, are contained in his statement before the House committee. It does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that these sailors, part of whom are represented by Mr. Hawk, have a real grievance, and that they are entitled to a hearing and that they are entitled to submit their complaints in writing. So far as I know, there never was any criticism of the way the Department of Commerce handled the merchant seamen, and I think Reorganization Plan No. 3 ought to be de-

feated until further study can be made. If, after proper hearing, the administration officials wish to do so, they can reintroduce this plan when the new Congress convenes in January 1947, and there will be more time to carefully consider the whole matter.

Statement on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I ask to include the following statement on foreign policy of the Union for Democratic Action. In so doing I cannot, of course, commit myself to complete agreement on every point with this statement, but its general emphases I do believe are sound and offer the most hopeful course for our country to pursue. Certainly it is high time forward-thinking Americans who oppose totalitarianism of either right or left spoke out with clear intent and strong purpose.

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNION FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

(Prepared and adopted by the national board of directors, under the chairmanship of Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr)

The Union for Democratic Action seeks to rally liberal and progressive opinion of America around the following objectives of foreign policy:

A. We believe that the peace of the world in the coming decades depends neither upon pure constitutional schemes nor upon unilateral policies of strategic defense. It depends upon the development of a system of mutual security, for which the beginning lies in the United Nations organization. The progressive movement must be critical of the unilateral and irresponsible use of power by any nation.

B. We believe that we must make the democracy of the west meaningful to the hungry and desperate people of Europe and Asia by throwing the weight of our influence behind every policy in Europe and Asia which offers the people economic security within the framework of freedom. The conservative tendency to equate democracy merely with free elections or free enterprise and to deny the nations help in achieving economic order and security must be resisted.

C. We believe that a long-range policy of education will be required to make clear to our Nation and to all nations that the world community ultimately demands organs of world order more perfect than those now devised. On the other hand we must insist that this goal must be approached step by step, so that tentative forms of mutual trust, now established, be not destroyed.

More specifically these three principles of foreign policy mean:

A

1. We must continue to seek for mutual agreements with Russia. The progressive movement in America must find a solid position between those who regard Russia as the fixed point of international virtue and those who hate and fear Russia to the point of supporting every policy which widens the gulf between Russia and the West. It is essential to develop a positive democratic program on which mutual understanding can be developed among all nations of both the eastern and western worlds.

2. Purely strategic policies, either of yielding or standing firm in our relations to Russia, are themselves fruitless. It is apparent that peace cannot be preserved either by the division of Europe and Asia into spheres of influence, or by the effort of either Russia or the West to dominate these continents. We must make it clear to Russia and the world, by opposing any American imperialist policies or those of other nations, that our opposition to Russian imperialism is because it is imperialism, not because it is Russian. Russia and the West must finally cooperate to give political stability and economic health to the continents which lie between them. In seeking for higher strategies of mutual accord to gain this end, the progressive movement must be as critical of purely strategic and unilateral schemes of the West as of those of Russia. Such schemes are not meant to prevent war but to strengthen the one side or the other for the event of war.

3. We believe that atomic energy in our own country should be under civilian control and should not be allowed to be dominated by military consideration.

We believe that the report of the State Department committee, providing for the creation of a United Nations atomic development authority, represents the most hopeful possibility of a solution for the atomic-energy problem. It avoids the opposite dangers of either holding the atomic secret as an exclusive possession, on the one hand, and of sharing it with the world, on the other, before there are adequate instruments of control. We believe that the neutralization of fissionable material will help to develop the constructive uses of nuclear energy on an international scale, while the complete international control of all sources and processes of atomic energy will prevent its irresponsible use. The elimination of the big-power veto as applied to all phases of atomic energy is imperative.

4. The progressive movement must support every measure which makes for a tolerable relationship between the wealthiest and most powerful nation on earth and an impoverished world. That means the support of—

(a) Every measure, including rationing, which will prompt us to share our abundance with a starving world. The American people are ready for a rationing program. The special interests which seek to prevent it must be overcome.

(b) Economic policies connected with and flowing from the Bretton Woods Agreement, and making for a free and mutual flow of goods between the nations.

(c) Generous loans at low interest for postwar reconstruction among war-ravaged nations until such time as normal conditions will make the credit resources of the World Bank and World Fund adequate. Considering the necessity of maintaining an economy of full employment in a nation of high productive power, such loans are in our national interest. Interest rates ought to be low, not as a matter of charity but of good business.

B

1. The progressive movement must insist that the democratic reconstruction of Europe and Asia requires that economic and property issues be dealt with radically. The primary way to combat Communist dictatorship and the extension of totalitarianism in Europe and Asia is to support those political movements which seek to establish economic security and industrial democracy within the framework of freedom. We must cease to follow policies which increase economic confusion and extend the political vacuum, which totalitarianism then fills. Europe cannot achieve economic health without wide-scale planning in terms of social democracy. If American power, under the influence of American conservatism, cuts off this alternative, western as well as eastern Europe will be delivered into totalitarian hands.

2. Any sign or symbol of a military alliance between ourselves and Britain must be avoided. Every military question must be subordinated to the quest for a wider accord among all the powers. Within this framework the progressive movement must seek to understand and support the British Government and all other imperial powers in any efforts that are made to find democratic solutions for their inherited problems of colonialism and imperialism. In this connection we heartily endorse the offer of freedom to India made by the British Labor Government, and its proposal to withdraw from Egypt which it is already beginning.

It is particularly important that Britain and America seek to solve both their economic and political issues by mutual rather than unilateral action. The Palestinian problem is a vivid example of this necessity. The report of the Joint Commission on Palestine is a step toward a solution. It is essential, however, that Britain should not evade responsibility for carrying out the recommendations of the report and that America should support the solution jointly arrived at, by such political and economic aid as may be necessary. We advocate that this issue as other similar issues become the responsibility of the United Nations in due course. Both countries should resist the temptation to make unilateral use of power, either economic or political.

C

1. The progressive movement must join with other world peace organizations in showing the inadequacies of the United Nations organization, which gives the great powers excessive authority in the council of nations and which offers no constitutional security against war.

2. The progressive movement must, however, be astute enough not to allow these more ultimate demands to interfere with the achievement of an immediately operative system of mutual security which will give us some security until stronger foundations can be built. If the world is plunged into war in the next decades, it will be small comfort that this was done in the name of a pure idealism. Our task is to build provisional bridges across deep chasms of mistrust and fear. We may fail in the task. But if we fail, our civilization is lost, no matter what ultimate ideals it may have cherished.

Our Monetary Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. LINK
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by M. S. Szymczak delivered before the one hundred and fifty-seventh dinner meeting of the Economic Club of New York, Hotel Astor, New York City, May 1, 1946:

The monetary problems that we face today are largely a heritage of the most tremendous war financing in history. This financing was successful because we all worked together to win the war as quickly and as effectively as possible.

Now that the war is won, we need to work together again—this time, to win our fight against the immediate danger of inflation. Countless millions of Americans have loyally supported the home-front battle against the inflationary forces generated by the war. It

would be tragic to lose this battle at the eleventh hour by prematurely abolishing essential price controls and the other remaining protective measures, irksome though many of them may be, and eager as we all are to be rid of such restraints as soon as we can safely do so. If we were to permit inflation to demoralize our economy now it would place in jeopardy our justifiably high hopes for establishing an enduring prosperity at home. And a prosperous America is essential to a lasting peace abroad.

A solution of our monetary problems is a part of winning that fight against inflation. I should like to touch on some of these monetary matters tonight.

At the outset we should admit that we cannot solve our monetary problems with some simple, single device, with some single action, or for all time. We must move cautiously, not abruptly, and we must take the problems as they come—as objectively as we can. That is the economic and politic thing to do. There can be no easy nor quick way.

We do not live and work in a vacuum. We live and work in an active day-to-day economy under a free enterprise system, which we propose to preserve under our form of government. This Government, like our economy, has many parts, and these parts have many departments and divisions in which responsibilities are not always exact and precise. Solutions to national economic problems do not lie in any one single part, department, or division, nor in any one segment of our economy. The solutions should not result in favor of any single group or groups of our people. The solutions of our monetary problems must be considered with one fundamental aim—economic stability at a high level of production and employment. That goal cannot be reached through monetary and credit measures alone, but it cannot be achieved without appropriate monetary and credit measures.

In peacetime, as has been said often before, the primary objective of Federal Reserve policy is to provide monetary and credit conditions favorable to sustained sound economic activity in commerce, industry, and agriculture. In wartime this objective continued to be of great importance, but it was influenced by the special requirements imposed by military necessity. In reconversion from war to peace, it is influenced by the special requirements imposed by the accumulated demands for goods here and abroad, the short supply of certain goods, the large purchasing power in the hands of the public, and the interest cost on the extraordinarily large public debt—all resulting from the war. The primary problem, therefore, is to meet the accumulated demands for goods, needed both at home and abroad, through an expansion of production that will achieve as rapidly as possible a better balance between supply and demand without at the same time causing a rapid inflationary rise in prices that would end in deflationary collapse.

It is important to note right here that inflation increases the cost of government as prices rise sharply. The increased cost would likely continue during the subsequent collapse as the Government would need to make expenditures for recovery and relief.

To fight inflation we need to encourage continued savings by the public on a substantial scale. The savings-bond program is, therefore, vitally important and deserving of support. We should exert every effort to insure the balancing of our budget. Hence we should not reduce taxes further in the coming year and should hold Government expenditures to the minimum.

On the monetary side, as you are aware, individuals and businesses have accumulated huge amounts of liquor assets which are held in the form of currency, bank deposits, and readily convertible Government securities. The public, even after paying greatly increased wartime taxes, had a large excess of income relative to the supply of goods and services available for purchase. If the public had spent a larger part of this excess income, the result would have been a ruinous inflation.

Notwithstanding the fact that taxes were increased heavily and that tax receipts of $153,000,000,000 comprised about 40 percent of all funds raised during the war period, the public debt rose from less than $50,000,000,000 before the war to a peak of approximately $278,000,000,000.

This increase in debt inevitably added tremendously to the liquid assets of the public. Liquid assets—that is, currency, bank deposits, and Government securities—held by individauls and businesses, exclusive of financial institutions, rose from about $80,000,000,000 at the time we entered the war to approximately $225,000,000,000 at the end of 1945—an increase of some $145,000,000,000. This is an inflationary potential that dwarfs anything in our past.

As you know, it has been the policy of the Government to sell the largest practicable amount of its securities to investors other than commercial banks and to induce these nonbank investors to hold their securities. The purpose has been to channel as much as possible of the current income and idle funds of nonbank investors from the purchase of scarce goods and services to investment in Government securities. This, in turn, has retarded the increase in bank deposits and thereby limited the amount of funds that were in readily spendable form for purchasing goods and services, either during the war or afterward. You are familiar with the devices used to implement this policy—war loan drives, pay roll savings plans, and issues of Government securities whose ownership was generally restricted to nonbank investors.

In spite of this, a large part of the Government securities went to the banks.

It is often said that the basic cause of inflation is the Government deficit and the resulting borrowing from banks that creates new money. This is essentially true, but the results of that situation now exist and they cannot be eliminated overnight. No country has ever been able to impose sufficient taxes to finance a war without borrowing or creating new money in the form of bank deposits. Now that the war is over, the deficit has practically disappeared; it is no longer necessary to create this new money by borrowing to finance the Government. Nevertheless, the money created during the war still exists and might be expanded through further transfers to the bank of Government securities already in the market. Until those funds are firmly invested or until our economy has grown up to them, they are potential inflationary tinder.

These funds, in addition to current incomes that result from current production of goods and services, are available for spending or investment in other assets. Thus the potential spending power can continue far in excess of the current flow of goods and services even though production should increase considerably. Expanding production would not prevent or check inflation, if the public should attempt to spend its accumulated savings as well as current income. Nor can these accumulated liquid assets be substantially reduced except by debt retirement—at best a slow process. We can hope that they will remain firmly held until they can be gradually invested in peacetime pursuits. In the meantime, controls of various sorts over goods in limited supply and over prices will continue to be necessary.

Although this background is familiar to you, it is so vital to any discussion of our monetary problems that it bears repeating.

In the monetary field the responsible authorities face a difficult though not impossible dilemma. Under the existing structure of interest rates, with its wide spread between short-term and long-term rates, there is an incentive for both commercial banks and nonbank investors to shift their holdings from short-term to longer-term securities. By this means they can obtain both the higher yield on the longer-term securities and the profit that accrues as each issue, with the passage of time, automatically becomes shorter and consequently declines in yield and increases in price. For this reason there generally has been a supply of short-term securities in the market and a demand for longer-term securities. The Federal Reserve is continuing, as it did during the war period, to support present short-term rates by purchasing all of the short-term securities that are offered in the market at those rates. On the other hand, the Federal Reserve cannot supply the market demand for longer-term securities, because it has already virtually exhausted its portfolio of these issues.

The result is that so long as holders of Government securities want to shift from short-term to longer-term securities, Federal Reserve holdings increase. This increases member-bank reserve balances at the Federal Reserve banks. On the basis of these increased reserve balances, commercial banks as a group can expand credit for whatever purpose they choose by six times the increase in reserve balances at the Federal Reserve banks. The expansion averages six times the increase in reserve balances because on the average a given amount of reserve balances will support six times that amount of deposits. Expressed the other way around, present reserve requirements for the various reserve classes of banks are at levels that equal, on the average for all member banks, one-sixth of net demand deposits. To summarize, so long as present short-term rates can be maintained only by Federal Reserve purchases, there is an inducement for bank credit to expand further. This increased bank credit is available to the public for spending in addition to their current income.

You may ask, quite properly, at this point: "Why not use the methods that the Federal Reserve has employed in the past? Why should not the Federal Reserve discontinue buying Government securities? Would not this stop the further expansion of bank credit? If the Federal Reserve discontinued buying securities, would not this make it more difficult and more costly for nonbank investors to raise funds by selling Government securities, by borrowing from banks, or, as in the case of corporations, for example, by the issuance of their own new securities?"

I think the answer to these questions is that the present situation is entirely different from anything in the past. The difference lies in the large public debt, the large interest cost of that debt, the large profits that commercial banks as a whole receive from Government securities, and the large holdings of Government securities by nonbank investors.

If the Federal Reserve discontinued buying the securities, short-term interest rates would no doubt increase. This, in turn, would increase the interest cost of the debt to the Treasury as maturing short-term issues were refunded at higher short-term rates. The importance of this interest cost is shown by the fact that, as a result of the wartime expansion of the debt, it has increased fivefold from a billion dollars a year to about five billion a year. Who pays this interest cost? The taxpayer. As you know, the public and the Government are in no mood to increase the cost of servicing our tremendous public debt.

An increase in interest rates also would unnecessarily add to the profits of commercial banks. The importance of this consideration is shown by the fact that, as a result of wartime purchases of Government securities, commercial-bank profits have more than doubled. You may say that, since an increase in bank profits was of no concern to the Government in the past, it should

be of no concern now. I believe, however, that the difference lies in the fact that in the past bank profits came principally from the public in the form of business loans, corporate securities, and like assets. At present, however, a considerable part comes from the Government, which in the last analysis means you and me as taxpayers. More important still is the continuation of our free enterprise system, and increasing the profits of commercial banks at this time at the expense of the taxpayer is not a good way to preserve the system of free enterprise—or, to be more specific, to preserve our private banking system.

I do not want to seem in any way to disparage either the need for the existence of a healthy commercial banking system or the excellent job that commercial banks did for their country during the war. Commercial banks were an important factor in selling Government securities to nonbank investors. Also, they purchased the Government securities that the Treasury was unable to sell to nonbank investors. They performed many other valuable functions in the war effort. Always—in war or in peace—they are vital, useful institutions and as such they must earn sufficient profits to maintain their existence. Also, in exceptional circumstances, some individual banks or groups of banks have not participated in the general increase in profits but banks in general do not need to obtain higher rates of interest on Government securities to maintain their existence.

There is a third reason for avoiding a rise in short-term interest rates, in addition to the effect on the interest cost of the debt and on commercial-bank profits. It is said that a rise in short-term rates might result in liquidation of present holdings of Government securities by nonbank investors. If this were to reach large proportions of a flight from Government securities, it would have inflationary consequences. After interest rates have been prevented from increasing for 4 years, the first break in the dike might possibly bring on a flood. For my part, I do not believe that this would be the result, but the possibility at least indicates that we should proceed with caution, and there are those who stress this point.

On the other hand, there is the long-run danger that lies in the fact, well known to you, that as commercial banks purchase medium-term bonds from nonbank investors and the nonbank investors in turn bid against each other for long-term bonds not available to commercial banks for purchase, yields on these bonds decrease. A decline in long-term yield tends to result in such attractive premiums that holders of long-term bonds other than institutional investors are tempted to sell them at those premiums, with profit, and to seek other employment for their funds. The result is that the funds tend to shift to other markets—first, to high-grade corporate bonds depressing their yields to the point where they become unattractive, then into lower-grade bonds, stocks, real estate, and so forth, bidding up their prices and tending to accentuate speculation in such investments. A decline in long-term yields tends to reduce the income of insurance companies, savings banks, and endowed institutions, which hold a large part of the savings of the public and perform essential public services. It seems to me, therefore, that lower interest rates, especially at this time, would not be desirable.

What I have been saying up to this point seems altogether negative. There is something, however, on the positive side. Most important is the state of the Federal Budget. In the first quarter of this year the Treasury had a small surplus of tax and other receipts over Government expenditures. Receipts were larger and expenditures had been reduced more rapidly than had been expected. The Budget is close to a balance on an annual basis. As long as inflationary pressures continue, however, there is no justification for further tax reductions and Government expenditures should be held to the minimum of public needs. I believe that budgetary surpluses to retire public debt should be the order of the day.

The favorable trend in the Budget means that the Government deficit is not nearly so large as it was and that there has been a reduction in the excess of the public's income over the available supply of goods and services. In addition, it means that the Government debt will not continue to increase.

In fact, the Government debt has already started to decrease because the Treasury very wisely has been retiring maturing and called securities by using part of the large cash balance not needed for current expenditures. Since the cash balance is still large, the Treasury is in a position to continue to retire debt. Since banks held a large proportion of the maturing and called issues, the result is a substantial reduction in bank credit. From March 1 through May 1, 1946, the Treasury retired a total of $6,400,000,000 of certificates, notes, and bonds. Of this amount commercial banks held somewhat over $4,000,000,000 and Federal Reserve banks $1,200,000,000.

Another new factor that may retard the monetization of our public debt is that the yields on the medium-term bonds that commercial banks have been eager to purchase have declined to 1⅜ percent, compared with 2 percent only a little over a year ago. The spread between these bonds and the ⅞-percent certificates consequently has been reduced from 1⅛ to ½ percent. The type of switching that leads to further expansion of bank credit is not nearly so profitable as it was formerly. Finally the debt retirement has reduced commercial bank holdings of the shortest-term securities and consequently has lengthened the average maturity of their portfolios. This also tends to make them a little hesitant to extend their maturities further by selling certificates and purchasing medium-term bonds. In fact, during recent weeks commercial banks seem to have been shortening rather than lengthening the maturities of their Government securities.

In any event, because of this combination of circumstances, the situation looks much more favorable than it did a few months ago or at the time you invited me to speak here. The demand deposits of individuals and businesses have stopped expanding, and the total of bank loans and investments has actually declined. Total loans and investments by weekly reporting member banks declined from $68,000,000,000 in February to $65,500,000,000 on April 17. Whether this is a temporary phenomenon or a major change I would not undertake to say, but I hope it is a major change.

In addition, a return flow of currency and gold imports, which could have been a basis for further expansion of bank credit, has been offset by a decline in Government securities held by the Federal Reserve banks. Currency in circulation has declined by about $700,000,000 from the wartime peak of nearly $29,000,000,000 reached last December. Gold imports in this period have amounted to about $200,000,000. The effect of these movements, which is to increase bank reserves, has been more than offset by a decline in Government securities held by the Federal Reserve banks. As a result of the Government's debt retirement program and sales of securities in the market, the Federal Reserve System's portfolio has been reduced by $2,000,000,000 since the first of the year. It is now $22,000,000,000.

As I have indicated, there are serious obstacles under present-day circumstances to the use of the traditional monetary powers to implement anti-inflationary policies in a way that would increase interest rates. Our Board announced last week Thursday that it "does not favor a higher level of interest rates on United States securities than the Government is now paying." The problem of exerting further pressure to arrest unnecessary and undesirable monetization of the public debt through the commercial banking system may require congressional study and legislation.

One perhaps relatively minor but certainly desirable step was the ending of the wartime preferential discount rate of ½ percent on Government securities due or callable in a year or less. This special rate was established purely as an emergency war measure to help the Treasury in the successful sale of its securities to obtain funds required to win the war. It was designed to enable commercial banks to obtain more readily the excess reserves needed to purchase Government securities that could not be sold to the public, to facilitate them in adjusting their reserve positions, and finally to encourage them to buy short-term rather than long-term securities.

This rate not only had passed its period of usefulness but had made it possible for banks to borrow at ½ percent in order to purchase higher yielding Government securities. The magnitude of the possible credit expansion is several times the amount borrowed from the Federal Reserve because, as I have already explained, the bank reserves created by the additional Reserve bank credit provide the basis for a six-fold expansion of bank credit. The preferential rate also encouraged banks to lend on Government securities at low rates, thus giving substantial profits to borrowers and encouraging speculation. Although such loans have declined from the wartime peak, they still exceed $3,000,000,000. The preferential rate has not been an important instrument of monetary policy and its elimination is merely a postwar adjustment in conformity with the Government's stabilization program.

Various other proposals concerning our monetary problems have come to my attention. For example, to stop further expansion of bank credit and a further decline in the long-term yield, and to do so without increasing the interest cost of the public debt and without increasing further the already large profits of commercial banks, several suggestions have been made to require commercial banks to hold a certain minimum amount of Treasury bills and certificates, or, following the example of the Canadians, to prohibit the commercial banks from holding more than a certain maximum amount of Treasury bonds.

It has likewise been proposed by some that the required reserves of central reserve city banks be increased to 26 percent against net demand deposits. They are now 20 percent—the same as at reserve city banks—while so-called country banks are required to hold reserves of 14 percent against their net demand deposits. That is the limit of our authority. It has also been proposed, therefore, that the Federal Reserve ask the Congress for some additional power to raise reserve requirements above the present maximum for each of the three classifications of member banks. It seems to me that whatever merit there may be in the various proposals that have come to my attention, one thing is evident, and that is that they deserve very careful study, for, as you know, they have both advantages and disadvantages.

Sudden or drastic action with respect to our monetary situation is not advisable, economically or politically. We should move slowly, cautiously, moderately—step by step—in the monetary field, giving whatever help we can to increased production—giving whatever help we can to prevent inflation. What we do in the monetary field, while essential, is only supplemental to the larger economic influences inherent in the budget and in debt retirement, for example. Monetary and credit policies can help, but they can't do the whole economic job alone.

Forums such as this are important and necessary to widen our understanding of the economic problems of the times and to aid us in arriving at the most satisfactory solutions. Some of the problems are complex and not widely understood by the general public. I think we may justly classify the problems of debt management, of interest rates, and of monetary action through the commercial banking system as being among the most complex and least understood generally.

If you feel that I have dealt in too general terms in speaking about some of these monetary matters, I must confess that I have done so deliberately and, in part at least, in the hope of stimulating discussion rather than assuming to know the final and best answers to many of these complex problems today. We shall arrive at the right solutions by patient, open-minded study and discussion—not by dogmatism or any narrow consideration of our individual interests apart from the broader interests of the Nation as a whole. By your program and your presence here you signify your desire to hammer out the right answers on the anvil of full and free discussion. That, in essence, is democracy—and by the same token, we shall preserve our democracy and our economic system only by such full, free, and fair discussion and debate.

The World's One Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in asking that the following column by Joseph and Stewart Alsop be printed in the RECORD with my remarks, I only wish to add my fervent hope that the predictions the Alsops make therein will prove well founded. The one great need of American foreign policy at this moment is that the proposal of the Acheson-Lilienthal report be the cardinal official purpose of that policy. Or, better, that a still more forthright and practical method of world-wide control over atomic energy and atomic weapons such as may be proposed, according to the Alsops, be adopted as the policy of the United States.

It is later than we think. And only the highest statesmanship will suffice.

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON, May 23.—Strikes, international tensions, and all else sink into relative insignificance compared to one development which is now proceeding quietly without a line of attendant publicity. The search continues for a solution of the problem of control of atomic energy, which is the master problem of our times. In a week or 10 days Bernard M. Baruch, American representative on the Atomic Energy Commission of the United Nations, will be ready to recommend a policy to President Truman. And it is far from impossible that his recommendations will include suspension of the Big Five veto on United Nations action in cases of violation of atomic-control agreements.

The present status of the question is extremely fluid, but it is possible to report certain vitally significant facts and tendencies. These developed at a series of meetings held here last week, at which Baruch and his associates for the first time met with Under Secretary Dean Acheson and the group who worked under him to prepare the great Acheson report.

A VITAL DECISION

With Baruch were his personal advisers, John Hancock, Ferdinand Eberstadt, and Herbert Bayard Swope; his scientific adviser, Dr. John Tolman; and his military liaison officer, Maj. Gen. T. F. Farrell. With Acheson were John J. McCloy, Dr. Vannevar Bush, and the members of the committee of consultants who did the main work of the report, headed by David E. Lilienthal and Prof. J. R. Oppenheimer. Round-table talks continued for several days. By the end of the meetings, it is understood that Baruch had clearly indicated his decision to adopt in broad outline the Acheson report's proposals.

This in itself is of vital importance. It means that the United States will advocate establishment of an atomic development authority under the United Nations, which will own and operate all mines, manufacturing plants, and other installations contributing in any way to the production of fissionable material. It does not mean, however—and this is equally important—that Baruch accepts the Acheson Reports' conclusions on the fundamental problem of safeguards. He is known to feel, in fact, that the Acheson report begins in the right way, but that it is necessary to go further. That is why suspension of the veto may be recommended.

THE THREATS OF PUNISHMENT

The safeguards proposed in the Acheson report are essentially simple. Fissionable material cannot be produced without uranium and thorium ore. All uranium and thorium mines would be owned and operated by the atomic development authority. The authority would conduct continuous geological surveys all over the world, to locate new sources of the ores and to insure against illicit mining. Illicit mining, or even obstruction of the authority's geological surveyors, would be taken as proof of potential aggressive intent. The complying nations, thus early warned of the presence of an aggressor in their midst, could take such countermeasures as seemed suitable to them.

If Baruch is correctly represented, he is inclined to believe that this method is incomplete, and to desire a system by which penalties of a severe kind would be automatically imposed on any violator of the rules. The line of his thought is simple. The United Nations military force, which the chiefs of staffs are now planning, would be constituted an enforcement agency for the atomic-energy convention. It would be armed with a suitable number of atomic bombs. At the same time, the veto would be suspended in all cases of violation of the atomic control. The Security Council would thus be empowered to order the United Nations military force into immediate action. And the penalty of violation would be both as severe and as automatic as possible.

GREAT PROBLEMS

The revolutionary implications of such a proposal must be obvious to everyone. It would, in effect, make the United Nations into something very like a world government overnight. At the same time, if put forward as United States policy, it would create enormous problems of the utmost complexity. The first and most serious would be the embittered opposition of the Soviet Union to any tampering with the United Nations veto. In all probability Soviet consent to such an arrangement could only be obtained by the threat of force—which is a situation that cannot be lightly risked. And there would be other problems also, as, for example, finding a place where the United Nations military force could be based and could store its bombs. Such a place would have to be truly neutral, in the sense of being beyond range of surprise attack by any major power. Yet in these days only the moon is in that happy situation.

It must be emphasized that Baruch and his associates are only considering the idea and have not yet decided that such an extension of the Acheson report plan is essential to American security. Moreover, after Baruch has made up his mind, President Truman will, of course, be required to approve or reject his recommendations. And finally, if the President approves a policy including suspension of the veto, the American people will have to make up their minds also. No more grave decision has ever faced a nation and its leaders.

Communism in Our Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a radio address delivered by me over radio station WWDC, here in Washington last evening:

We in America are proud of our national literacy, as compared with other nations of the world. We are proud, and justly so, of the fact that every child in America may start in kindergarten and go through to a college degree, whether that child's father is a wage worker or a millionaire.

We are proud of the physical structures for advancing education in the United States. But it is a homely old adage that pride goeth before a fall. Before we become too proud—before we fall—we should examine, now and without delay, the structure and the product of this vast educational system of the United States, see what is being done inside the walls, by termites, on the vast tax-expenditures each year for education.

It requires painstaking investigation, and careful thought, to separate inherent evil and cancerous growths in an over-all good system, without wrecking the entire structure.

Tonight I desire to point out some serious conditions in our educational system. They shall be set forth only after careful thought and research.

This country is being systematically communized, perhaps unconsciously, through its educational institutions.

These institutions are instruments through which left-wing theories and philosophies may be and are taught to large groups of young Americans by persons whom they respect and trust—their instructors.

That process has been going on for years, in an insidious manner.

As a consequence, we now have an entire generation of voters who do not appreciate our Constitution, or our national history, who believe the profit system is wrong and private ownership is undesirable, who are easy victims of demogogy, and who listen with credulity to false and misleading propaganda, of or from Russia.

If this program is not exposed and changed, it will soon be too late to save free enterprise and free government in the United States.

All of the prophets of un-Americanism are not Communists. A few of them are aliens, but all of them are carriers of the same disease—the disease of Marxism.

Such charges constitute a serious indictment and should not be uttered without proof. I feel that I would be remiss in my

duties as a Member of Congress and faithless to my oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, against all enemies, foreign or domestic, if I did not offer what I believe to be reasonable and adequate proof. Such proof may be found in the records of the Congress of the United States, and I shall list a portion of it for the benefit of those who may challenge my findings. But first, before looking into the record and offering it, let us consider what may be done to deal with this menace.

Only the Congress of the United States can act adequately. Legislatures cannot go outside their geographical jurisdictions, and this problem is an interstate or internal problem within our gates. Legislatures are at a disadvantage in coping with a movement that has ramifications, and usually its higher leadership, in other jurisdictions. For this reason investigations such as have been made in Massachusetts, New York, California, and elsewhere have been useful in proving that the menace is real, but ineffective in checking it.

Furthermore, a congressional investigation should be conducted by a special committee and restricted to this single subject of subversive education. A single committee to investigate all subversive movements, or all phases of one subversive movement, cannot give this problem of subversive education the intensive study required.

Congress has the jurisdiction to make such an investigation of subversive education, arising from these facts:

1. An Office of Education, with interstate duties, exists in the United States Government and Congress provides its funds.

2. Federal money is now provided for State and local schools for a number of purposes.

3. Bills have been before Congress to provide as much as $500,000,000 a year for direct Federal aid to State and local education. Congress therefore has a right as well as a responsibility to ascertain what kind of education it is asked to finance.

There should be first a general investigation of subversive education in order to determine and publicly expose the nature and extent of the movement. Thereafter, investigations in separate States and of individual institutions may be made on the basis of the evidence developed. It will undoubtedly be found that some training colleges and schools are focal centers and should be investigated in a group and singly.

This general investigation should follow a chronological course to show the nature and development of subversive education, to indicate the American origin and leadership of the movement, to show where Russian propaganda actively entered the field, and a résumé of the present extent of the movement.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, April 2, 1936, on page 4837, a speech is recorded in which this paragraph appears, and I quote:

"To every intelligent, unbiased, unprejudiced person who will carefully study same with an open mind, I intend in this speech through facts and incontrovertible evidence to prove that Dr. Charles A. Beard, Dr. George S. Counts, Dr. W. W. Charters, and Dr. Frank W. Ballou were the master minds who, aided by Ada Comstock, Harold O. Rugg, Carleton J. H. Hayes, and Charles E. Merriam, confederated, conspired and worked together for 5 years in a deliberate, preconcerted plan to communize schools and colleges of the United States."

Other references, in the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities, refer to these individuals in instance after instance in which they approved, aided, or were participating members of organizations which worked for the good of Russia, and held the Russian political ideology to be superior to our own constitutional form of government.

The so-called Rugg textbooks, which ridiculed our national heroes, such as George Washington, and brought radical teachings directly to our American children, infiltrated into many State educational systems before their nature was discovered and they were gradually rooted out.

By 1941—and there is a long documentation of this—radicalism was rampant in teachers' organizations, one in particular—the Teachers Union in New York—reaching such an open blatancy that a legislative committee investigated it and took action to block its communistic aims. This was done only after radical organizations among the students in schools and colleges in at least six States showed the extent of the plot. It was proved that there were clubs on some school campuses openly teaching Marxism, and led by members of notorious Communist-front youth groups.

Going back for a moment to the appearance of Russian propaganda in this plan, in early 1935 Intourist, Inc., from headquarters at 545 Fifth Avenue, New York, issued a pamphlet outlining summer trips for American educators to summer sessions of the University of Moscow, in Soviet Russia. Intourist, Inc., was the official travel agency of the Russian Communist Government.

This pamphlet listed the Institute of International Education as the American advisory organization, of the American section of the Moscow University summer sessions. It listed George S. Counts and Heber Harper as advisers, and then gave the names of 24 members of the national advisory council, including prominent educators in some of our best-known colleges and universities.

Under the heading "Purpose," this revealing pamphlet declares, and I quote:

"Moscow University summer session conducts an Anglo-American section, open to all academically qualified foreigners who are interested in the cultural and educational aspects of life in the Soviet Union. Instruction is in the English language, by an all-Soviet faculty of professors and specialists. The director of the Moscow University summer session is a Soviet educator. The summer session is officially an organizational part of the Moscow State University.

"The Moscow University summer session is sponsored in the Soviet Union by the Peoples' Commissariat of Education of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic; by VOKS, the all-union society for cultural relations with foreign countries, and by Intourist, the state travel company of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Intourist, through its educational department, will supply information to persons interested."

This paragraph, on page 19 of the Intourist pamphlet, is significant:

"New York City school teachers may offer the certificate issued by the University of Moscow to meet the requirements for annual salary increment (alertness credit)."

This means salary increase.

In other words, American tax-paid teachers from New York City, by taking a summer session in the official Russian Soviet university at Moscow, where communism was the subject taught, might attain credits upon which they might increase the amount of their pay from American tax-paid sources after their return.

If there were no other indications of the brazen effort of Soviet Russia to infiltrate our American educational systems, that one paragraph would prove it.

It is interesting to note that the cost was $20 for each course pursued at the University of Moscow and that the minimum travel expense was $176. Newspaper clippings of that period show that 210 American educators attended the first summer session of the University of Moscow, with 510 listed as scheduled for the second course. The 1935 prospectus of Intourist was for the third course.

Many of the names of the advisory council listed are still connected with positions high in the educational system of the United States.

The Institute of International Education, advisory group to the Intourist-conducted propaganda plan, was under the directorship of Stephen Duggan, with Samuel P. Capen, J. McKeen Cattell, Joseph P. Chamberlain, Livingston Farrand, Virginia Gildersleeve, Alvin Johnson, Thomas W. Lamont, Paul Monroe, Henry Morgenthau, Leland Rex Robinson, William F. Russell, and Mary E. Woolley among the 24 members of the board of trustees. The names I have listed all appear in records of the House Committee on un-American Activities.

That shows the Russian plan—the Communist plan—to get into our educational system and teach communism to an entire generation of young Americans.

Did it work?

The Social Frontier, edited by George S. Counts, reported in its November issue of 1935, under the heading, "On the battle line," activities in six States of the Union.

In Eureka, Calif., Victor R. Jewett, social-science teacher in a junior high school, had been ousted, Counts reported, but had "obtained legal aid" and was fighting his case.

In Harvard University, after the State of Massachusetts passed a law requiring a teacher's oath of loyalty, the 1,800 faculty members took the oath, but only after President Conant told a sizable opposition group that the law made dismissal obligatory for those who did not comply.

An 8-year-old boy in another section of Massachusetts was reported as having refused to give a salute to the flag because his parents had taught him it was a sinful act.

In Illinois a commission was announced as having been appointed to study school problems in the State, including organized teacher demands.

In Idaho teachers formed a union, then enlisted the support of copper-miners' unions and forced through a teachers' raise. Three teachers were fired, whereupon the teachers and copper-miners' unions went into "political action" and boasted that the commissioners controlling county finances were swept out of office. The Counts magazine didn't report the tax increases.

In the University of Michigan four student agitators were dismissed. The charge was interfering with the work of the university. The National Student League put in a racial issue and created turmoil for several weeks—until the university authorities won their point of discipline.

In Chicago, at Crane High School, seditious pamphlets were distributed by a small group. Students administered self-discipline and the American Civil Liberties Union stepped in to back up the distributors.

Throughout the Nation chapters and councils began to spring up on high-school and college campuses, like the National Student League, the National Student Federation, the Student League for Industrial Democracy, the American Youth Congress, and the student divisions of the American League Against War and Fascism.

The Communist infiltration in education reached the high schools and colleges in 1935–41, our last prewar year. By March 1941 the New York Times reported 40 Reds on the teaching staff of the City College of the City of New York, with a listing of the party names of the members of the teaching staff and the infiltration of Communist youths into the ROTC units of the college. One of these instructors, Morris U. Schappes, was subsequently sentenced to jail under New York State laws.

With the entry of our country into war, with Russia as an ally, the campus-trained Communists of our educational system tried indoctrination of our troops. It is a high commentary on the basic patriotism, perception, and loyalty of American youth that this indoctrination failed to any appreciable degree. The danger is that the effort could

have been made, from within the very bulwark of American national defense.

Now, as we seek to revert again to peace, bring about mass production, and preserve the political and economic ideologies that twice made America great enough to save the entire world from chaos, steps must be taken—drastic steps—to trace communistic teachings to their source in America, and then eliminate them.

Hitler built his effort for totalitarian power on his ability to indoctrinate and fanaticize German youth from 1930 to the beginning of the world war in 1939, 9 years. Our American youth have been under a sustained Communist indoctrination drive since 1935, 11 years.

The parallel is deadly. We see it on all sides. Germany developed totalitarian, brutal, brown shirt fascism. Italy, teaching its youth to follow Mussolini blindly, developed black-shirted fascism. Communists seek to develop in America an equally brutal, equally totalitarian Red fascism.

We who love America say it must not happen here.

The place to root it out is at the roots—in our schools.

Shortage of Bread and Other Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I get a certain satisfaction out of saying, "I told you so," when we discuss this subject of the shortage of bread. On April 30, I inserted my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dealing with this subject, and they are found in the Appendix on page A2378. I pointed out then that the Government program was foolish and would lead to tragic results. Again, on May 27, I extended my remarks in the RECORD dealing with the same subject, and they are found in the Appendix on page A3020. At that time I warned the administration that its foolish policies regarding food would take bread from the table of the American wage earners, as well as other people, and at the same time would reduce the exportable amount of food production for famine-stricken sections in the Old World.

The different results have now occurred and I comment upon these developments because the demagogs, the uninformed, and the political opportunist will seek to blame Members of Congress for the misdeeds and ignorance of administration officials. The only way we can overcome such an attitude is to constantly keep in mind the facts. The following comment by a Duluthian is in point.

STATEMENT BY A DULUTH CITIZEN

If I could write you all I think, it would not be just the best; that is, in relation to this food situation. The other morning we had 1,200 cars of wheat on the track and they were holding the people here down to one half loaf of bread in the bakeries. Our flour mill has shut down. They have flour for only 6 days. Some of these charitable organizations ought to remember that we cannot send everything to Europe. When I think of 1,200 cars of wheat down on the railroad tracks and our flour mills shut down because we have no wheat and people are unable to buy any quantity of flour, then I say it is about time that something is done. There must be somebody else in the country besides the people who are runing the OPA.

They are examining this wheat and grading it as if they are getting $4 a bushel for it, leaving the trash and junk for us and sending the good grade stuff to Europe free. You can't get half a pound of meat in the city, and we are in a State, together with North Dakota, that ships as high as 60,000 cars of cattle a year.

We are shipping out of this harbor something more than a million bushels of wheat a day and still we are offering people half a loaf of bread. Now, remember, when you stop the flour mills and have stopped the dairy feed, outside of grass, you cannot get production of milk on grass alone. Many of our people are selling their dairy concerns so consequently we have very little butter. It is going to be a serious thing if we continue to take food from our own people and ship it thousands of miles away. Charity begins at home, and if our Government don't change some of these plans people will begin to think that we have no Government any more.

I want to tell you it is time something is done and Bowles should be shown that he is not the only pebble on the beach in the United States. People are sick and tired of the set-up.

This statement, Mr. Speaker, comes from a man who has had varied experience in different lines of business. He constantly contacts people every day in all walks of life. He is not an alarmist. He is a level-headed, common-sense, American citizen. I recommend that the administration, if it will ever wake up to its numerous mistakes, take cognizance of this warning. This man who wrote me is typical of thousands of other people similarly situated in my district.

I hope that every housewife in my district will have an opportunity to read these remarks and then come to the only possible solution, namely, that we will have to get rid of incompetent Government bureaucrats and put in their places men of judgment and experience. Otherwise, matters are doing to keep on going from bad to worse.

Mrs. Roosevelt Reports on Her Trip to Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Journal-Every Evening, Wilmington, Del., for Thursday, June 13, 1946:

MRS. ROOSEVELT REPORTS ON HER TRIP TO DELAWARE

(As the guest of former Senator John G. Townsend, Mrs. Roosevelt paid this State a visit on Tuesday. Her impressions, as contained in My Day, are printed herewith through special permission of United Feature Syndicate, Inc.)

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

Yesterday my son and daughter-in-law, Elliott and Faye, and I went down to look at one of the most remarkable farming operations which I have ever had the pleasure of seeing. Of course, southern Delaware with its mixture of sandy soil and rich bottom land and its areas of woodland is an ideal farming country. The fields are broad and flat without stones. To a New Yorker, it seemed an incredibly rich and easy land on which to farm. Over the whole area, chickens were being raised in great quantities and every farm looked like a satisfactory and prosperous undertaking.

The extent and variety of enterprises on this particular project which we saw are probably among the reasons for the farm's great success. Perhaps if you had grown up with this operation it would not stagger you as it did me. The dairy farms were beautiful. The fields of peas and beans and other produce seemed endless. The peach orchards, we were told, will produce very little this year, because of a hot spell in February, which brought out the blossoms too soon. The apple trees are not up to maximum either. I kept wishing that I could have seen these acres of fruit trees in bloom. Near us on the Hudson River, I know of no more beautiful sights than Henry Morgenthau, Jr.'s orchards in bloom in the spring. His land is hilly country, however, and you climb up and down to reach the various orchards. In Delaware all is level and where the new orchards are planted, rye grows almost to the tops of the little trees.

This particular undertaking is not just a one-man kingdom, but a family proposition. Sons and daughters, with their families, have an interest in land which is far flung in the State of Delaware. Family holdings also include two chicken farms in Maine.

VISIT BEACH RESORT

The world is small, and as we sat on the porch of a delightful house in a beach resort in the late afternoon, after having toured all day, a very pretty young woman commented that she remembered playing with my two younger sons at the Corning place in Albany and coming to the executive mansion for parties when they were all in their teens. Another charming girl told me that she had been at Connecticut State College when I had spoken there some years ago. Since then, she had served with the Red Cross in the Pacific and had seen the results of war in the Philippines.

Altogether, it was an interesting day. My son and daughter-in-law and I spent the time in our return train trip trying to determine what we could apply, from our new learning, to a very small farming project in New York State.

Atomic Energy Control

REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, ever since the first atomic bomb was dropped, many of us have been saying that the only way in which mankind could be saved from a terrible destructive fate was by an act of statesmanship comparable in its wisdom, its

boldness, and its dynamic force to the realization of atomic energy itself. In my opinion, such an act of statesmanship has been performed by the United States representative to the Atomic Energy Commission on behalf of this Nation. The proposal advanced by our country through Mr. Baruch does have all of the elements of statesmanship just mentioned. If accepted by the other nations and sincerely and vigorously put into effect, it cannot only save mankind from the devastation of atomic war, but it can become a gateway through which the nations could march to a truly peaceful world. This report should be the No. 1 item in the foreign policy of our country, as I hope and believe it will be. America has made it clear that she is ready to throw into the scales for building a structure of enforceable peace everything she now possesses provided only that other nations will agree to do likewise. If any of them refuse, it will be clear to the whole world that it is they and not the United States who are standing in the way of this most necessary accomplishment in thousands of years.

I ask unanimous consent that these remarks of mine appear in the Appendix so there may be included with them the text of this great address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(The address referred to follows:)

TEXT OF BARUCH'S ADDRESS AT OPENING SESSION OF ATOMIC COMMISSION

My fellow members of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission and my fellow citizens of the world, we are here to make a choice between the quick and the dead.

That is our business.

Behind the black portent of the new atomic age lies a hope which, seized upon with faith, can work our salvation. If we fail, then we have damned every man to be the slave of fear. Let us not deceive ourselves: We must elect world peace or world destruction.

Science has torn from nature a secret so vast in its potentialities that our minds cower from the terror it creates. Yet terror is not enough to inhibit the use of the atomic bomb. The terror created by weapons has never stopped man from employing them. For each new weapon a defense has been produced, in time. But now we face a condition in which adequate defense does not exist.

Science, which gave us this dread power, shows that it can be made a giant help to humanity, but science does not show us how to prevent its baleful use. So we have been appointed to obviate that peril by finding a meeting of the minds and the hearts of our peoples. Only in the will of mankind lies the answer.

It is to express this will and make it effective that we have been assembled. We must provide the mechanism to assure that atomic energy is used for peaceful purposes and preclude its use in war. To that end, we must provide immediate, swift, and sure punishment of those who violate the agreements that are reached by the nations.

PENALIZATION ESSENTIAL

Penalization is essential if peace is to be more than a feverish interlude between wars. And, too, the United Nations can prescribe individual responsibility and punishment on the principles applied at Nuernberg by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, France, and the United States—a formula certain to benefit the world's future.

In this crisis, we represent not only our governments but, in a larger way, we represent the peoples of the world. We must remember that the peoples do not belong to the governments, but that the governments belong to the peoples. We must answer their demands; we must answer the world's longing for peace and security.

In that desire the United States shares ardently and hopefully, the search of science for the absolute weapon has reached fruition in this country. But she stands ready to prescribe and destroy this instrument—to lift its use from death to life—if the world will join in a pact to that end.

In our success lies the promise of a new life, freed from the heart-stopping fears that now beset the world. The beginning of victory for the great ideals for which millions have bled and died lies in building a workable plan. Now we approach fulfillment of the aspirations of mankind. At the end of the road lies the fairer, better, surer life we crave and mean to have.

CAN ERECT SAFEGUARD

Only by a lasting peace are liberties and democracies strengthened and deepened. War is their enemy. And it will not do to believe that any of us can escape war's devastation. Victory, vanquished and neutrals alike, are affected physically, economically, and morally.

Against the degradation of war we can erect a safeguard. That is the guerdon for which we reach. Within the scope of the formula we outline here there will be found, to those who seek it, the essential elements of our purpose. Others will see only emptiness. Each of us carries his own mirror, in which is reflected hope—or determined desperation—courage, or cowardice.

There is a famine throughout the world today. It starves men's bodies. But there is a greater famine—the hunger of men's spirit. That starvation can be cured by the conquest of fear and the substitution of hope, from which springs faith—faith in each other, faith that we want to work together toward salvation; and determination that those who threaten the peace and safety shall be punished.

The peoples of these democracies gathered here have a particular concern with our answer, for their peoples hate war. They will have a heavy exaction to make of those who fail to provide an escape. They are not afraid of an internationalism that protects; they are unwilling to be fobbed off by mouthings about narrow sovereignty, which is today's phrase for yesterday's isolation.

BASIS OF SOUND POLICY

The basis of a sound foreign policy in this new age for all the nations here gathered is that: Anything that happens, no matter where or how, which menaces the peace of the world, or the economic stability, concerns each and all of us.

That roughly may be said to be the central theme of the United Nations. It is with that thought we begin consideration of the most important subject that can engage mankind—life itself.

Let there be no quibbling about the duty and the responsibility of this group and of the governments we represent. I was moved, in the afternoon of my life, to add my effort to gain the world's quest, by the broad mandate under which we were created. The resolution of the General Assembly, passed January 24, 1946, in London, reads:

"SEC. V. Terms of reference of the Commission:

"The Commission shall proceed with the utmost dispatch and inquire into all phases of the problem, and make such recommendations from time to time with respect to them as it finds possible."

SPECIFIC PROPOSALS

"In particular the Commission shall make specific proposals:

"A. For extending between all nations the exchange of basic scientific information for peaceful ends;

"B. For control of atomic energy to the extent necessary to insure its use only for peaceful purposes;

"C. For the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction;

"D. For effective safeguards by way of inspection and other means to protect complying States against the hazards of violations and evasions.

"The work of the Commission should proceed by separate stages, the successful completion of each of which will develop the necessary confidence of the world before the next stage is undertaken."

Our mandate rests, in text and in spirit, upon the outcome of the conference in Moscow of Messrs. Molotov, of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; Bevin, of the United Kingdom; and Byrnes of the United States of America. The three Foreign Ministers, on December 27, 1945, proposed the establishment of this body.

PROPOSED BY THREE POWERS

Their action was animated by a preceding conference in Washington on November 15, 1945, when the President of the United States, associated with Mr. Attlee, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, and Mr. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, stated that international control of the whole field of atomic energy was immediately essential. They proposed the formation of this body. In examining that source, the agreed declaration, it will be found that the fathers of the concept recognized the final means of world salvation—the abolition of war. Solemnly they wrote:

"We are aware that the only complete protection for the civilized world from the destructive use of scientific knowledge lies in the prevention of war. No system of safeguards that can be devised will of itself provide an effective guaranty against production of atomic weapons by a nation bent on aggression. Nor can we ignore the possibility of the development of other weapons, or of new methods of warfare, which may constitute as great a threat to civilization as the military use of atomic energy."

Through the historical approach I have outlined, we find ourselves here to test if man can produce, through his will and faith, the miracle of peace, just as he has, through science and skill, the miracle of the atom.

UNITED STATES URGES WORLD AGENCY

The United States proposes the creation of an international atomic development authority, to which should be entrusted all phases of the development and use of atomic energy, starting with the raw material and including:

1. Managerial control or ownership of all atomic energy activities potentially dangerous to world security.

2. Power to control, inspect, and license all other atomic activities.

3. The duty of fostering the beneficial uses of atomic energy.

4. Research and development responsibilities of an affirmative character intended to put the authority in the forefront of atomic knowledge and thus to enable it to comprehend, and therefor to detect, misuse of

atomic energy. To be effective, the authority must itself be the world's leader in the field of atomic knowledge and development and thus supplement its legal authority with the great power inherent in possession of leadership in knowledge.

PREVIOUS FAILURES REPORTED

I offer this as a basis for beginning our discussion.

But, I think, the peoples we serve would not believe—and without faith nothing counts—that a treaty, merely outlawing possession or use of the atomic bomb constitutes effective fulfillment of the instructions to this commission. Previous failures have been recorded in trying the method of simple renunciation, unsupported by effective guaranties of security and armament limitation. No one would have faith in that approach alone.

Now, if ever, is the time to act for the common good. Public opinion supports a world movement toward security. If I read the signs aright the people want a program not composed merely of pious thoughts but of enforceable sanctions—an international law with teeth in it.

We of this Nation, desirous of helping to bring peace to the world and realizing the heavy obligations upon us, arising from our possession of the means of producing the bomb and from the fact that it is part of our armament, are prepared to make our full contribution toward effective control of atomic energy.

WOULD HALT MANUFACTURE

When an adequate system of atomic energy, including the renunciation of the bomb as a weapon, has been agreed upon and put into effective operation and condign punishments set up for violations of the rules of control which are to be stigmatized as international crimes, we propose that:

1. Manufacture of atomic bombs shall stop;

2. Existing bombs shall be disposed of pursuant to the terms of the treaty; and

3. The authority shall be in possession of full information as to the know-how for the production of atomic energy.

Let me repeat, so as to avoid misunderstanding: My country is ready to make its full contribution toward the end we seek, subject, of course, to our constitutional processes, and to an adequate system of control becoming fully effective as we finally work it out.

Now as to violations: In the agreement, penalties of as serious a nature as the nations may wish and as immediate and certain in their execution as possible, should be fixed for:

1. Illegal possession or use of an atomic bomb;

2. Illegal possession or separation of atomic material suitable for use in an atomic bomb;

3. Seizure of any plant or other property belonging to or licensed by the authority;

4. Willful interference with the activities of the authority;

5. Creation or operation of dangerous projects in a manner contrary to, or in the absence of, a license granted by the international control body.

VETO POWER INVOLVED

It would be a deception, to which I am unwilling to lend myself, were I not to say to you and to our peoples that the matter of punishment lies at the very heart of our present security system. It might as well be admitted, here and now, that the subject goes straight to the veto power contained in the Charter of the United Nations so far as it relates to the field of atomic energy. The Charter permits penalization only by concurrence of each of the five great powers—Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, China, France, and the United States.

I want to make this very plain that I am concerned here with the veto power only as it affects this particular problem. There must be no veto to protect those who violate their solemn agreements not to develop or use atomic energy for destructive purposes.

The bomb does not wait upon debate. To delay may be to die. The time between violation and preventive action or punishment would be all too short for extended discussion as to the course to be followed.

As matters now stand, several years may be necessary for another country to produce a bomb de novo. However, once the basic information is generally known, and the authority has established producing plants for peaceful purposes in the several countries, an illegal seizure of such a plant might permit a malevolent nation to produce a bomb in 12 months, and if preceded by secret preparation and necessary facilities perhaps even in a much shorter time.

SPEED ON PENALTIES VITAL

The time required—the advance warning given of the possible use of a bomb—can only be generally estimated but obviously will depend upon many factors, including the success with which the authority has been able to introduce elements of safety in the design of its plants and the degree to which illegal and secret preparation for the military use of atomic energy will have been eliminated. Presumably no nation would think of starting a war with only one bomb.

This shows how imperative speed is in detecting and penalizing violations.

The process of prevention and penalization—a problem of profound statecraft is, as I read it, implicit in the Moscow statement, signed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States, and the United Kingdom a few months ago.

But before a country is ready to relinquish any winning weapons it must have more than words to reassure it. It must have a guaranty of safety not only against the offenders in the atomic area but against the illegal users of other weapons—bacteriological, biological, gas, perhaps, why not? against war itself.

In the elimination of war lies our solution, for only then will nations cease to compete with one another in the production and use of dread secret weapons which are evaluated solely by their capacity to kill. This devilish program takes us back not merely to the Dark Ages but from cosmos to chaos. If we succeed in finding a suitable way to control atomic weapons, it is reasonable to hope that we may also preclude the use of other weapons adaptable to mass destruction. When a man learns to say "a" he can, if he chooses, learn the rest of the alphabet, too.

FACE PROBLEM OF ETHICS

Let this be anchored in our minds:

Peace is never long preserved by weight of metal or by an armament race. Peace can be made tranquil and secure only by understanding an agreement fortified by sanctions. We must embrace international cooperation or international disintegration.

Science has taught us how to put the atom to work. But to make it work for good instead or for evil lies in the domain dealing with the principles of human duty. We are now facing a problem more of ethics than of physics.

The solution will require apparent sacrifice in pride and in position, but better pain as the price of peace than death as the price of war.

I now submit the following measures as representing the fundamental features of a plan which would give effect to certain of the conclusions which I have epitomized.

THOROUGH CONTROL PLAN

1. General: The authority should set up a thorough plan for control of the field of atomic energy, through various forms of ownership, dominion, licenses, operation, inspection, research, and management by competent personnel. After this is provided for there should be as little interference as may be with the economic plans and the present private, corporate, and state relationships in the several countries involved.

2. Raw materials: The authority should have as one of its earliest purposes to obtain and maintain complete and accurate information on world supplies of uranium and thorium and to bring them under its domination. The precise pattern of control for various types of deposits of such materials will have to depend upon the geological, mining, refining, and economic facts involved in different situations.

The authority should conduct continuous surveys so that it will have the most complete knowledge of the world geology of uranium and thorium. Only after all current information on world sources of uranium and thorium is known to us all can equitable plans be made for their production, refining, and distribution.

3. Primary production plants: The authority should exercise complete managerial control of the production of fissionable materials. This means that it should control and operate all plants producing fissionable materials in dangerous quantities and must own and control the product of these plants.

4. Atomic explosives: The authority should be given sole and exclusive right to conduct research in the field of atomic explosives. Research activities in the field of atomic explosives are essential in order that the authority may keep in the forefront of knowledge in the field of atomic energy and fulfill the objective of preventing illicit manufacture of bombs. Only by maintaining its position as the best informed agency will the authority be able to determine the line between intrinsically dangerous and nondangerous activities.

WOULD PROMOTE PEACETIME BENEFITS

5. Strategic distribution of activities and materials: The activities entrusted exclusively to the authority because they are intrinsically dangerous to security should be distributed through the world. Similarly, stock piles of raw materials and fissionable materials should not be centralized.

6. Nondangerous activities: Function of the authority should be promotion of the peacetime benefits of atomic energy.

Atomic research (except in explosives) the use of research reactors, the production of radioactive tracers by means of nondangerous reactors, the use of such tracers, and to some extent the production of power should be open to nations and their citizens under reasonable licensing arrangements from the authority. Denatured materials, whose use we know also require suitable safeguards, should be furnished for such purposes by the authority under lease or other arrangement. Denaturing seems to have been overestimated by the public as a safety measure.

7. Definition of dangerous and nondangerous activities: Although a reasonable dividing line can be drawn between dangerous and nondangerous activities it is not hard and fast. Provision should, therefore, be made to assure constant reexamination of the questions and to permit revision of the dividing line a changing conditions and new discoveries may require.

RIGID INSPECTION OF PLANTS

8. Operations of dangerous activities—any plant dealing with uranium or thorium after it once reaches the potential of dangerous use

must be not only subject to the most rigorous and competent inspection by the authority, but its actual operation shall be under the management, supervision, and control of the authority.

9. Inspection: By assigning intrinsically dangerous activities exclusively to the authority, the difficulties of inspection are reduced. If the authority is the only agency which may lawfully conduct dangerous activities, then visible operation by others than the authority will constitute an unambiguous danger signal. Inspection will also occur in connection with the licensing functions of the authority.

10. Freedom of access: Adequate ingress and egress for all qualified representatives of the authority must be assured. Many of the inspection activities of the authority should grow out of, and be incidental to, its other functions.

Important measures of inspection will be associated with the tight control of raw materials, for this is a keystone of the plan. The continuing activities of prospecting, survey, and research in relation to raw materials will be designed not only to serve the affirmative development functions of the authority, but also to assure that no surreptitious operations are conducted in the raw materials field by nations or their citizens.

11. Personnel: The personnel of the authority should be recruited on a basis of proven competence, but also so far as possible on an international basis.

SET-UP TO REQUIRE TIME

12. Progress by stages: A primary step in the creation of the system of control is the setting forth, in comprehensive terms of the functions, responsibilities, powers, and limitations of the authority.

Once a charter for the authority has been adopted, the authority and the system of control for which it will be responsible will require time to become fully organized and effective. The plan of control will, therefore, have to come into effect in successive stages.

These should be specifically fixed in the Charter or means should be otherwise set forth in the Charter for transitions from one stage to another, as contemplated in the resolution of the United Nations Assembly which created this commission.

13. Disclosures: In the deliberations of the United Nations Commission on Atomic Energy, the United States is prepared to make available the information, essential to a reasonable understanding of the proposals which it advocates. Further disclosures must be dependent, in the interests of all, upon the effective ratification of the treaty.

When the authority is actually created, the United States will join the other nations in making available the further information essential to that organization for the performance of its functions. As the successive stages of international control are reached, the United States will be prepared to yield, to the extent required by each stage, national control of activities in this field to the authority.

14. International control: There will be questions about the extent of control to be allowed to national bodies when the authority is established. Purely national authorities for control and development of atomic energy should, to the extent necessary for the effective operation of the authority, be subordinate to it. This is neither an endorsement nor a disapproval of the creation of national authorities. The Commission should evolve a clear demarcation of the scope of duties and responsibilities of such national authorities.

WILL MAKE DATA AVAILABLE

And now I end. I have submitted an outline for present discussion. Our consideration will be broadened by the criticism of the United States proposals and by the plans of the other nations, which, it is to be hoped, will be submitted at their early convenience.

I and my associates of the United States delegation will make available to each member of this body books and pamphlets, including the Acheson-Lilienthal report, recently made by the United States Department of State, and the McMahon committee monograph No. 1, entitled "Essential Information on Atomic Energy," relating to the McMahon bill recently passed by the United States Senate, which may prove of value in assessing the situation.

All of us are consecrated to making an end of gloom and hopelessness. It will not be an easy job. The way is long and thorny, but supremely worth traveling. All of us want to stand erect, with our faces to the sun, instead of being forced to burrow into the earth, like rats.

The pattern of salvation must be worked out by all for all.

The light at the end of the tunnel is dim, but our path seems to grow brighter as we actually begin our journey. We cannot yet light the way to the end. However, we hope the suggestions of my Government will be illuminating.

Let us keep in mind the exhortation of Abraham Lincoln, whose words, uttered at a moment of shattering national peril, form a complete text for our deliberation. I quote, paraphrasing slightly:

"We cannot escape history. We of this meeting will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we are passing will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation.

"We say we are for peace. The world will not forget that we say this. We know how to save peace. The world knows that we do. We, even we here, hold the power and have the responsibility.

"We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth. The way is plain, peaceful, generous, just—a way which, if followed, the world will forever applaud."

My thanks for your attention.

Nebraska's Political Complexion

REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and much more has been said recently concerning the significance of the Nebraska primary election results. Far from reading national and international meaning into these results, I believe that they represent locally the expression of the will of the people. I emphatically do not consider myself as an oracle capable of explaining the trend in the entire State of Nebraska or in any other congressional district of Nebraska except the Third District—my home. Nevertheless, it has become necessary to answer several of the misconceptions that have arisen out of the recent election.

The mistaken ideas about the Nebraska primaries that have appeared from time to time are hardly intentional in origin. They are, rather, the product of hasty judgments. Even these hasty judgments may be excused. With the Case bill, the OPA bill, the draft bill, and other legislation of great importance before Congress; with the deep public concern over the contention within the Supreme Court; with the spotlight of popular interest focused on the activities of the White House; and with the international situation what it is today—Washington, D. C. is, as it should be—the nerve center for American news.

It would be difficult for a good radio or newspaper reporter to make a flying trip to Nebraska, stay there 2 or 3 days, and talk to a limited number of Nebraskans only to hurry back with the complete picture of how 300,000 or 1,300,000 Nebraskans think and act. It is impossible to arrive at such a decision with any degree of accuracy at 1,500 miles distance from the scene.

In the Third District of Nebraska—my home—we depend upon the land for our livelihood. The farm is first. That is just. The extent to which all the people in my district enjoy prosperity depends on the prosperity of the farmers. If the farmer is making money, the railroads, the merchants, the elevator operators, the industries make money. If the farmers have bad years, then everybody has bad years. What the primary vote means to me—whether that vote came from city or small town or the rural areas themselves—is that the people whom I represent want me to continue to give constant attention to legislation having to do with the well-being and progress of the farmers. If the farmer is benefited, so will they all be benefited. There are no hidden meanings in the openly expressed challenge.

The people of the Third District of Nebraska want no "ism" attached to their name except the "ism" that is Americanism. These people do not cheer wildly at the mention of internationalism. Neither do they lightly take to the charges of isolationism. Nebraska is third in our Nation in war-bond purchases. If we consider that 24 percent of the farmers of fighting age served in our armed forces; if we consider that the farmers in my district turned out more necessary food products with the labor force of 52 percent of normal during the war years due to the drain of labor from the farms to the Nebraska defense plants; if we remember the casualty lists that do not omit a city block, a village, or a township—then we will realize that Nebraskans call on no "ism" save Americanism. There are large numbers of Americans of German origin. There are large numbers of Americans of Swedish origin. There are large numbers of Americans of Czechoslovakian origin. But there are no hyphenated Americans in the Third District. Every one of us, no matter where we came from or where our fathers came from—are all Americans. We have merged with our countrymen. We have no other allegiance. We have no other home.

There is no need of further explanation, gentlemen. The people of the Third District have the right to vote. They vote as they see the right.

The British Loan

REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD W. LANDIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I know it will be difficult to beat the propaganda machine and the Washington society lobby backing the loan to Britain. But I actually believe it can be done. If this loan passes it will be against the wishes of the American taxpayers. If the American people had an opportunity to vote on the British loan or gift, I am sure they would vote against it.

We must not bankrupt America in order to finance Great Britain and the rest of the world. Our own experience in foreign investments has not been a happy one. Loans by Government during and after the First World War totaled $10,350,000,000. To date they have repaid $2,751,000,000. We have a loss of $7,599,000,000. We have loaned about thirty-eight billion through lend-lease, and we will receive no more than a token payment. Private lending before and after the First World War presents a brighter picture. Private investors loaned $11,077,000,000, and they got back $7,705,000,000. There was a loss of $3,372,000,000—United States News figures.

I want to give you some of the reasons why the British loan should be defeated:

First. Congress has no right to tax its people to make foreign gifts without security.

Second. Many understood the Bretton Woods agreements and the Export-Import Bank were set up to make foreign loans and stabilize the currency without additional loans.

Third. Since Great Britain did not pay their debt to us after the First World War how can we expect her to pay back this loan.

Fourth. There is no legal way of collecting a debt from a foreign country.

Fifth. If we make this loan to Britain we will be compelled to loan other nations, or we will create disunity throughout the world.

Sixth. We owe about $272,000,000,000 and Great Britain owes about $80,000,000,000.

Seventh. The British are by no means strapped. They now own 1,500,000 shares in United States industries. They have unmined gold reserves of $24,500,000,000, unmined diamond reserves of $8,800,000,000, and $14,000,000,000 in foreign investments. They possess vast stores of rubber, aluminum, wool, cotton, and valuable scrap.

Eighth. We have already sold Britain $6,000,000,000 worth of goods, now in Britain, for about 10 cents on the dollar.

Ninth. We must not bankrupt America in order to finance the world.

Tenth. This loan will cost every man, woman, and child in the United States at least $34 each. They already owe $2,000 each on our national debt.

Eleventh. The amount of this loan will purchase 750,000 $5,000 homes in America.

Twelfth. The interest rate on the British loan amounts to 1.62 percent and the Government charges our own farmers and veterans 3 to 4 percent. Why the distinction?

Thirteenth. Britain should be required to utilize its own assets to whatever degree it can, for funds or as collateral, before we supply additional funds.

Fourteenth. If we finance British industries and reduce our tariff rates we will either have to lower wages for our workers or many of our factories will have to close.

Fifteenth. If we make this loan to Britain and other foreign loans, I would like to know where we are going to get the money to pay the interest on our national debt, pay veterans benefits, pay old age pensions, pay for foreign relief and ever balance our yearly budget?

Sixteenth. American taxpayers should not be required to finance huge salaries and allowances to support royal households in foreign lands.

Seventeenth. The great hope of subversive groups is that the United States will spend herself into destruction.

Eighteenth. The time has come to look after Americans first.

Nineteenth. The time has come to call a halt on these foreign society lobbys which are invading Washington.

Twentieth. Let us not forget: There will always be a U. S. A. if we do not give it away.

The Minimum Wage Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over the Columbia Broadcasting System on June 15, 1946:

During recent weeks the attention of the country has been focused on the strikes and threat of strikes in large and essential industries. Much of the country, I am sure, would agree with President Truman in his veto message on the Case bill when he said that "the outstanding domestic problem confronting this country today is the maintenance and increase of production," and that "strikes and lock-outs are the greatest handicaps to attaining vital production."

I hope as many will agree with his statesmanlike analysis that "Industrial strife is a symptom of basic economic maladjustments. * * * As we move from war to peace, severe strains are placed upon our economic system. Labor and management alike are seeking security. * * * A solution of labor-management difficulties, therefore, is to be found not alone in well-considered legislation dealing directly with industrial relations, but also in a comprehensive legislative program designed to remove some of the causes of the insecurity felt by many workers and employers." The President then called attention to the fact that during the last 10 months he has repeatedly urged the Congress to enact such a program, including "adequate insurance against unemployment, health and medical services for families of low and moderate income at costs they can afford, a fair minimum wage, and the continuance of the price-control and stabilization laws in effective form." These measures, the President concluded—and I agree—"would greatly aid in achieving industrial peace."

I want, today, to discuss one of these measures: the establishment of a fair minimum wage. Since last July, bills have been before the Congress to bring up to date the obsolete and disgraceful minimum wage of 40 cents an hour which has been established by the Congress for interstate workers in the Fair Labor Standards Act. Last fall, committees of both Houses held extensive hearings on proposals to lift this wage to 65 cents an hour immediately, and to 75 cents an hour during the next few years. After considerable debate, the Senate passed a bill providing for a straight 65 cents minimum, but provided that it would not go into effect until 10 months after final passage of the bill—provided, in other words, that millions of our fellow citizens who are trying to subsist on 40 and 50 cents an hour, should continue in semistarvation for 10 more months after Congress had decided that 40 cents is too low.

On June 11 the House Committee on Labor voted to report out a bill for a 65-cent minimum wage. This bill is now before the Rules Committee awaiting a rule which will permit House debate on the measure. It is my earnest hope that the Rules Committee will act promptly in order to permit the House to legislate before this session of Congress is brought to a close.

Amendment to the minimum wage law is not and should not be a controversial or party measure. In both the Senate and the House, an increase in the national minimum was supported by both Republicans and Democrats. In the hearings held by committees on both Houses, no one challenged the need for an increase in the minimum. The sole dispute concerned the amount of increase. In my own view, both the Senate and the House Labor Committees were too cautious. I believe that a 65-cent minimum immediately is essential, but I also believe there should be provision for a gradual increase to 75 cents, or even higher, as our increased national production permits. In a dynamic society, we cannot adopt a static minimum wage policy. That was the mistake Congress made in 1938. We should not repeat this same mistake.

The beneficiaries of an increase in the minimum wage are not merely the three or four million workers who are now being paid less than this amount. True it is that they are the direct beneficiaries and that their needs for a living wage would alone justify action on the part of Congress. With current living costs, no one can argue that 65 cents an hour, $1,300 a year on the unrealistic assumption of a full 52 weeks of work at 40 hours a week, will yield a wage which will support an American family in health or decency. All that it will do is to remove these three or four million American families from the very brink of starvation to a meager subsistence level. This is important and worth whatever slight cost the bill might have to the consuming public.

Even more important, to my way of thinking, is that this measure is vitally needed if we are to attain our peacetime goal of full employment for all of our people and a national income at levels which the war has demonstrated we can achieve. If we are to accomplish this objective, already incorporated in the full employment bill, we must develop a substitute for the Government pur-

chases for war purposes. A $200,000,000,000 national income is easily a possibility, if we plan our affairs right. A minimum-wage bill should be regarded not merely as justice to workers who will directly benefit but as one essential plank in the program of full employment and national prosperity.

Why do I say that a bill providing for a raise in minimum wages to at least 65 cents an hour will benefit not just our working men and women, but our whole economy? Why will it help us to achieve a stable and permanent prosperity?

First, because our economic prosperity depends upon a living wage. Our national output, or productivity, which ever you choose to call it, has risen to staggering heights. But it is simple truth that there must be purchasers available for this endless supply of desirable commodities. And the bulk of the purchasers must be our own people. Obviously, a man making 40 cents an hour—$16 a week, is not a good customer. Even 65 cents an hour—$26 a week—does not make too good a market, but it is definitely an improvement. When we remember nearly 4,000,000 workers, plus the workers in many enterprises who are not covered by any minimum wage or overtime legislation, have a substandard living wage, we certainly have a serious threat to continued prosperity in America.

This is, indeed, the practical side of minimum wage legislation. If ability to buy is allowed to lag behind ability to produce, depression is inevitable. The failure of wages to keep pace with rising productivity was a major cause of the last great depression, which we do hope was the last.

Let me give some specific examples of the way in which better wages for underpaid workers benefit other sectors of our economy. The hard-working, conscientious American farmer, for example, gains from the continuing ability of other people to buy his products in quantity. It is a well-known fact that a large percentage of the American family's income goes for food and clothing—products made from the cotton and wool, the corn and wheat and milk raised on American farms. Thus a farmer from Bucks County, Pennsylvania, testifying in behalf of a minimum-wage bill before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, was giving an illustration of his personal benefit from the experience which I have just discussed, when he said:

"I have been farming since 1914 and through all these years I have found that when laboring people are getting a good wage, we farmers are able to dispose of our products at better prices."

Secretary of Agriculture Anderson has pointed out that an increase of $1,000,000,000 in workers' incomes means an increase of $200,000,000 for the purchase of food products alone.

And think of our veterans who have certainly won the right to wages better than $16 a week. Minimum-wage legislation will guarantee to us that we have done one more part of our job in repaying the debt we owe them. It will mean that they have a chance to come home to decent jobs at decent wages, an opportunity to raise families, and once more join the American scene at something better than the kind of pay checks that cannot even guarantee their kids enough milk to drink.

Certainly, in view of all these facts, Congress must pass a bill to raise the minimum wage. As I have already pointed out, some action has been taken in the Senate, and there is now the possibility that the House will have such legislation before it soon. But I must warn that there is a danger that no action will be taken in this session of Congress. The hour is late since Congress is now bent on adjournment by the middle of July. There is serious danger that the bill may be scuttled on the floor of the House by amendments that will so weaken the act as to make a decent burial preferable to an innocuous statute.

With the cost of living rising with each passing hour, the plight of millions of Americans is getting desperate. Could you make ends meet at $16 a week? Could you be a customer contributing to national wealth if you have insufficient purchasing power because of substandard wages?

In the House of Representatives a group of nearly 100 Congressmen have gotten together under the chairmanship of GEORGE OUTLAND, of California, to work in every possible way for passage of some effective minimum wage legislation. I have the honor to serve as secretary of this group. It is an honor because I sincerely believe that by this work I am contributing something not only to the future of individual Americans, but to the future of this country. It is one step in a concerted program to avoid business cycles and economic depressions and even wars.

Because we who are members of this steering committee for a minimum wage bill are frankly worried that Congress will end without passing such legislation, we must have the people with us to support our efforts. And we do have the people with us, because it is inconceivable that any American, who is after all brought up to understand the principles of fair play and common decency, can continue to condone payment of wages that do not permit a man and his family to have the things which are minimum necessities to healthful, happy living. It is also inconceivable that any American would be in favor of the continuation of an economic sore, workers on substandard wages, who are a decided threat to our continuing and permanent prosperity.

What Would Happen If Gift-Loan Were Denied?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, everything about this so-called British loan, that is known both to the British, as well as to the American people, suggests that it is an act of desperation on the part of those who are seeking to salvage the illusion of economic and political security from war.

Like so many other international commitments, some of which in recent months have been bludgeoned through Congress, others being financed through the Export-Import Bank, and in other ways, this Anglo-American financial agreement has been formulated and forced upon both the American and the British people by a high-powered propaganda machine which has consistently refused to present an honest and unbiased picture of the real issues involved.

On this side of the water Senator VANDENBERG complained that it was a grave mistake "not to have consulted Congress when the contract was in the making, instead of waiting to confront us with a finished product which is far from satisfactory in many serious details."

On the other side of the water no less a person than Mr. Churchill complained in the House of Commons that he resented "with every other honorable member, the indecent haste with which these most serious matters have been thrust before us and have to be settled." Mr. Churchill, too, condemned the long months of secret negotiations and the rumors about these negotiations, "which have been contradicted by the rumors of the day after."

The more thoroughly one analyzes the record of these transactions, the clearer it becomes that this gift loan is an act of desperation on the part of those who are now watching their cherished plans for "a brave new world of international cooperation" being supplanted by the same savage struggle for the balance of power, and for the control of world markets, that have already involved the United States in two tragic wars in one generation.

For instance, it is significant that Secretary Byrnes attempted to defend this gift-loan in his speech of February 13, 1946, by drawing the following picture of the differences between the conditions surrounding this so-called loan, and the conditions surrounding our first world postwar loans upon which Britain and so many other nations have defaulted in the past.

In speaking of the defaulted portion of the debt Britain incurred during the First World War, which she has not even begun to repay, he said:

> The circumstances surrounding this credit are entirely different from those applying to the British debt after the First World War.
>
> First. That debt was incurred for materials largely destroyed in the fighting. * * * This credit is for new goods which will help create new production and new wealth. * * *
>
> Second. The earlier British debt was larger than this credit, and the interest rate was higher. * * * The British made payments * * * until * * * 1931.
>
> Third. Last time we raised our tariffs and made it harder and harder for British goods to enter this country.
>
> Last time we and the rest of the world let the great depression happen. * * * It was that which stopped the payment on the British debt.

Those statements are not true, of course. It was the giving away of billions of dollars of our goods and materials on credit, and the subsequent default of the debtor nations, led by Great Britain, which brought the depression. Secretary Byrnes is too intelligent, and he has too many able assistants who are aware of the facts, for him not to know that. This is a clear example of false and specious arguments, half-truths, and downright misrepresentations which have been used to delude the American people into again giving up billions of dollars' worth of their goods and services, their sweat and toil, to finance competition against themselves. The First World War loan defaults shattered the confidence of the nations of the world in each other.

As usual, however, Secretary Byrnes and all the other proponents of this so-called loan, with, perhaps, the single exception of Secretary Vinson, have failed completely to do justice to the tragic consequences of this war with which this gift-loan is ostensibly designed to deal.

The truth is that the real difference between the conditions following the First World War and the conditions which are rapidly developing in the wake of this war is so great and so terrifying it is little wonder that our modern statesmen do not dare to admit its existence.

To begin with, the kind of world upon which the whole structure of wild-eyed international affairs is based, and through which we continue to be dragged, is disintegrated. That kind of a world was based—and had to be based—upon the genuine participation by Russia in all economic, political, financial, and military problems of the postwar world, and her cooperation in their settlements.

That world required the participation, as genuinely sovereign and independent states, of the score or more of those miserable nations which have now been betrayed into the cruel despotism of Russia's ever-expanding sphere of influence.

That world required the implementation of the promises and principles of the Atlantic Charter, especially that promise that following the war, there would be "free access to the trade and war materials," of the whole world for "victor and vanquished alike."

Certainly that kind of a world demanded the rehabilitation of the conquered nations into the family of nations as democratic, self-respecting, and self-supporting participants.

It is no wonder the proponents of this so-called and misnamed loan have nothing to say about the terrifying revolutionary turn of events which, since the cessation of hostilities, have destroyed the very foundation, and the very hope of such a world in the foreseeable future.

Instead, we are now caught in the grip of a bitter rivalry between Russian and British imperialism. That rivalry has torn the world in two. It has now set one-half of the world against the other in what is proving to be an insane armaments race, which renders all the extravagant international schemes promised a despairing humanity throughout the war, utterly and completely futile illusions.

The British pastmasters in the art of world power politics, as they are, now find themselves desperately fighting for their colonial and Empire policies. Certainly there is no other way to account for the bitter opposition of the vast majority of the British people, the British press, and British statesmen to the gift. Only on that basis can rest their cry that the acceptance of the terms of this so-called loan constitutes a dagger pointed at the very heart of the British Empire.

If the reaction of the British has been so generally antagonistic as it has, it certainly follows that such opposition would never have manifested itself if the opponents of this gift-loan on the other side of the Atlantic felt that it was an absolute necessity to the maintenance of a decent standard of living and to the security of the British Isles and Empire.

The record on this point speaks for itself. It is irrefutable and convincing. For instance let us take the attitude of the British press as reflected during the debate on this loan in Parliament.

On December 15, Mr. Mallory Brown cabled the New York Times from London that—

> In London this week all the signs pointed to the probability that acceptance by Britain of the Anglo-American loan agreement has opened a period of unprecedented Anglo-American disagreement. Not for many years, not since the British defaulted on the last war loan, and perhaps not even then, has there been so much resentment, such widespread bitterness, against the United States as one finds expressed in Parliament, in the press and by the general public in Britain today.

In the same week the London Economist, which seldom fails to express the attitude of the British business circles, generally stated that—

> If the purpose of the American Congress, which decides American policy, is, as it often seems to be, deliberately to wound and afflict the British peoples, it certaintly has succeeded.

The left-wing weekly Tribune, which reflects the belligerent wing of the British Labor Party, stated that—

> American capitalism has driven a savage bargain.

Again in the same week the middle-of-the-road conservative Spectator commented that—

> The bargain which has been made at Washington is, indeed, a bad omen for the opening of the "American century" which we have been promised as the prize of victory, for unless the United States can learn to use the immense wealth and power she has acquired by the Allied victory with greater magnanimity and generosity, and with greater understanding of the needs of others, than she has shown on this occasion, then the "American century" will prove an unmitigated evil to every country that cannot escape it.

Our immense "wealth and power" which the Spectator speaks of turns out to be an American national debt of about $275,000,000,000, a lot of wounded veterans, a disrupted domestic economy, and apparently not even enough power in world politics to persuade Russia not to swallow all the small nations contiguous to her.

The moderate labor weekly, the New Statesman and Nation, indignantly lamented in the same week:

> As matters stand our conclusion is that we have been forced into a disastrous bargain. We run grave risk of ultimately being compelled to invoke all the ingenious "escape clauses" in the agreements and of becoming an insolvent debtor when we shall have forfeited our power of economic independence.

It becomes increasingly clear that this financial arrangement was not at all what the British were seeking to begin with. They wanted freedom of action during the gravest crises in their history. So much the record now proves.

For instance, during the debate in Parliament Hugh Dalton, Chancelor of the Exchequer, stated:

> I will frankly tell the House that this agreement (in its present and final form) is by no means what we at first proposed. Our representatives first proposed at Washington that, to enable us to restore the gravely disturbed balance of our economy * * * we should receive some form of grant-in-aid, or failing that, an interest-free loan.

British statesmen who negotiated this agreement did not want a loan. They wanted a grant-in-aid or an outright gift, a gift that woulud not tie their hands. Certainly even the terms of his so-called loan have been so ingeniously devised and worded that, as the late Lord Keynes observed during the debate in Parliament:

> The various qualifications which have been introduced, the full significance of which cannot be obvious except to experts, may allow in practice a workable compromise between the certainty they wanted and the elesticity we wanted.

Mr. Robert Boothby, leader of the Young Conservatives, stated in the same debate:

> A close examination of this document indicates it will be very easy for England to escape paying either interest or principal whenever it suits her purpose.

In other words, the opposition of the British is directed not so much against the actual terms in themselves as it is directed against the kind of international agreement by which England is to be bound, at least morally, by accepting this agreement. The real significance of this opposition thus seems to be that, although the British are fighting for their lives economically, politically, and perhaps even militarily, they have no intention of tying their own hands by such an agreement, nor do they desire to be guided by the reins of an American foreign policy.

On December 7, 1945, Mr. Robert Boothby stated very simply and clearly the basic reason why the British would be fools to take this so-called loan agreement seriously, if they accepted it at all. Said Mr. Boothby:

> The loan agreement would be harmful to Britain in that it would restore an international gold standard, abolish the sterling area, and cause a return to the disruptive principles of nondiscrimination in trade which would deprive the British Empire of effective control over its national economy.

England cannot survive an international trade war with her own hands tied behind her back and with nothing more than a completely exploded myth of economic cooperation among the signatories of the United Nations as a guaranty of her own economic and political future.

The whole world is now confronted with Russia's iron curtain of slave-labor, state-controlled trade monopoly erected across the heartland of both Europe and Asia. Treasury Secretary Vinson, in testifying recently before the House committee, admitted that this so-called loan would largely seal the world into two economic blocs.

On April 4, 1946, Mr. Chabot Smith wrote to the New York Herald Tribune from London that:

> Great Britain is preparing for the forthcoming international trade conference on the assumption that the Soviet Union will take no part in international trade in the foreseeable future.

Half the world is now completely isolated. The destruction and partition of Germany has destroyed a large percent of Britain's market on the continent, both in Germany and in those countries for which Germany was such an important customer. Not only are these markets gone, but Britain is now saddled with the tremendous burden of occupation, as well as the continued burden of armaments and conscription, which she has just continued for 2 more years.

Neither Britain nor the world can expect a high-level production and consumption economy if the nations of the world are going to continue, as they now are doing, to put their terribly depleted resources into armaments instead of into peacetime reconstruction.

The British, at least the vast majority of them, are bitterly antagonistic to this proposed loan. Certainly they would not have such bitter opposition if they thought for one moment that by defeating the proposition they would be selling England down the river.

Churchill was adamantly opposed to the whole arrangement and ordered his party to abstain from voting on the issue in Parliament. He is credited with saying when he learned of the terms of the agreements: "It is too bad to be true."

Lord Keynes said:

> What a gulf separates us from Washington, and what a depth of misunderstanding governs the relationships between even the friendliest and most like-minded nations.

Sir John Anderson stated that his first impression "was one of keen disappointment."

Even Harry Pollitt, general secretary of the Communist Party in Britain, remarked:

> It is a terribly hard bargain, and Britain would have found a better response if she had appealed to Russia.

Again I say that the British would never have made such a record as the record of the vote taken in Parliament if the British thought for one moment they were betraying the future of England by opposing this gift-loan.

On December 18, 1945, Herbert L. Mathews cabled the following report of that record to the New York Times:

> A reluctant House of Lords ratified today the financial accord with the United States by 90 votes to 8, with about 100 Conservative peers abstaining and some 600 absent. Immediately afterward the Bretton Woods agreement was also passed. * * *
>
> All the reluctance, the fears, the resentments, and the disappointments that Britains feel were summed up in the keenest debate the House of Lords has heard in years.

Labor Warned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in the Detroit News of yesterday, columnist Blair Moody, their able representative, pens a warning fit for study by those who have labor's interests at heart.

The article follows:

LABOR WARNED TO CLEAN HOUSE

(By Blair Moody)

WASHINGTON, June 15.—It's time for the rank and file of labor to rise up and clean its own house.

It's time for the workers to throw out of their unions the Communists, the gangsters, and the unscrupulous politicians whose leadership threatens to wreck the unions and help wreck the country.

The CIO is tolerating in positions of local and national influence men who are trying to make the United States a Communist colony in a world Soviet empire.

The AFL is shot through with monopolists and racketeers, who use their powers, too often with all the instincts and ethics of Capone mobsters.

The whole movement is pock-marked with so-called leaders preaching the false philosophy of getting more for doing less.

These politicians do not grasp the fact that the Nation cannot go forward, but will slide back into the worst depression of history—a depression which would hit labor first and hardest—unless growing money wages are matched by a full and growing contribution by labor in production.

TRUMAN LOSES CONTROL

The country is in grave trouble. Leadership in Washington is at a low ebb. A well-intentioned President made so many snap-judgment mistakes in the first days after victory that he has lost control of the situation.

Congress seems hell-bent to legislate the country into an inflation the extent and ramifications of which no man can measure in advance. Industrial management, insofar as it is represented by the National Association of Manufacturers and like-minded organizations, has been shoving Congress along this path, which may end in a national disaster, just as its refusal to be reasonable has often forced labor into striking for just demands.

All this is quite aside from the world crisis which is arising from the failure of Russia and the western democracies to reach an understanding.

This is the time, above all others, when labor needs strong, courageous, intelligent, responsible leadership from men who are loyal first to their country and second to their union.

It does not need men who are loyal third to their country, second to their union, and first to a foreign power.

It does not need men who discredit the honest objectives of trade unionism by using their positions in labor for shake-down purposes.

GAINS ENDANGERED

In the last decade, labor has made great gains. It has begun at last to get the greater proportion of the fruits of production to which workingmen have long been entitled.

But those gains will be lost—the new strength workers have found by banding together industrially will be undermined—if they do not realize that with that strength must go responsibility and if they continue to tolerate as their spokesmen men whose motives run counter to the interests of the Nation—and of labor itself.

The agents of Moscow inside the CIO are playing the rank-and-file workers from whom they draw support for suckers.

They are smart. They are a small but professional minority, who know exactly what they want and how to go about it. They "capture" non-Communist union politicians who are not above risking alliance with foreign agents to attain personal power. They pose as the vanguard of the labor movement, fighting for greater gains for the workers, when their real objective is the ultimate confusion, depression, and destruction of the American system.

They capitalize on the stupidities of corporations. They are quick to characterize an attack on themselves as a Fascist attack on all labor. They know how to become supremely useful to the highest official in labor, and to take over local unions and stewardships far out of proportion to their number.

NEARLY WON UAW

In recent months they have all but captured the biggest union in the world, the UAW (CIO). The former president of this union, R. J. Thomas, eagerly accepted their support when he was faced with defeat. He has read before Senate committees speeches prepared by the union's legislative agent in Washington—its contact man with Congress, mind you—whom every Senator and Congressman who is not sound asleep knows is at least a fellow-traveler and probably a member of the Communist Party.

For years, the canny secretary-treasurer of the UAW, George F. Addes, has been politically allied with the Communists. When the anti-Communist Walter P. Reuther was elected president of the union, the Communist faction, led by Thomas and Addes, countered by capturing the executive board, preventing Reuther from cleaning out Communists from powerful union jobs.

Even Richard Leonard, international vice prisident, who is no friend of the Communists, was maneuvered into supporting the Communist Party candidate in a recent local election.

The Communist infiltration carries straight to the top of the CIO. Philip Murray is anything but a Communist. But the very fact that he is regarded with such respect by the rank and file of labor provides a convenient shield for the party-line boys who partially surround him.

Murray's steel union is clean. But his general counsel, Lee Pressman, former lawyer for John L. Lewis, is the nerve center of the CIO.

Pressman is probably the ablest man in the national organization. When long-distance calls on such urgent matters as strike strategy come to national headquarters, more often than not they're handled by Pressman. He writes the Murray speeches, one of which termed the President's mild proposal for a fact-finding system to help prevent strikes as a move to "destroy labor"—and thus helped to discredit the standing of Murray's protests. His close contact with the Communist crowd is well known, but appears not to concern Murray.

CIO officials admit that Communist politicians control more than half of the CIO's unions, including a couple of the large ones, though Communists comprise an infinitesimal percentage of CIO members. Men like Harry Bridges and Joe Curran have great political power in the organization.

"Party line" boys have made it their business to take over the PAC in many sections.

Any American who chooses to believe in the Communist system has a right to do so. But the rank and file of industrial workers also have a right to examine the actions and motives of their leaders.

They have a right to recall that the professional Communists among those leaders did all they could to block war production while Hitler and Stalin were partners, that they went overboard for all-out war production when Russia was attacked, and that since the danger to Russia passed have been throwing all the monkey wrenches possible into the American system.

The rank and file also have the right to ask themselves whether they want Communists in key union positions in the unfortunate event of trouble with Russia. And they have the right to get rid of any leaders whose motives do not seem to coincide with the best interests of the United States, and of labor.

The Communists, of course, watch carefully for the blunders of capital and of Congress to make hay with the rank and file. It is true that many representatives of management could read the Pope's encyclicals on labor with great profit to themselves and the country. It is also true that some of them have been arrogant and unreasonable, and tend to confuse the issues, much to the delight of Moscow, by calling any union leader able enough to challenge their supremacy a Communist.

But at this moment when the future of all Americans is so critically in the balance, and when labor's standing has been severely damaged by false and inferior leadership, the one path to protect past gains and open the way to more is that of constructive labor statesmanship.

Why not a public declaration that labor's fight is not for less production, but for more—and an equitable division of its fruits?

Why not a proposal that a system be worked out, without going back to piece work, where the earnings of workers over a fair basic wage be geared to what is produced?

Don't the leaders of labor realize that what they need more than anything else, to regain the standing which the cause of their workers merits, is restoration of public confidence in their sincerity and character?

Don't the workers realize that it is the pungent aura of communism surrounding the CIO which plays into the hands of those in Congress and out who want the just rights of labor to be crippled by law?

Don't the rank and file in AFL know that by their tolerance of little dictatorships and thinly veiled gangsterism they are making new laws sharply restricting unions inevitable and necessary?

Don't both realize that the wisest possible course for labor would be to collaborate in the preparation of fair laws which would help decent union leaders to curb abuses?

Unless the workers themselves rise up and take over—unless they throw the Communists and the gangsters out of power, the Case bill is mild medicine indeed compared to what labor has coming.

Food Allocation

REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture in its plan of disseminating information with reference to the allocation of food puts out periodically a long list indicating what it does and how it allocates food. Heretofore those lists have been more or less secret. As chairman of the Republican Food Study Committee, I was instructed to ask the Secretary of Agriculture if these lists could not be made public. He has graciously permitted this to be done.

His letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, June 10, 1946.

Hon. THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Chairman, Republican Congressional Food Study Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JENKINS: This is in reply to your letter of May 29 which urges that the Department's worksheets regarding allocations of United States foodstuffs be made available to the public.

These worksheets undergo various changes as they proceed through the allocations committee structure in the Department. An allocation becomes firm only after signature by the Secretary of Agriculture, and then only for the next forward quarter. When an allocation reaches this stage, it is the general practice of the Department to issue press releases which explain the allocations. In certain instances, comparable information is provided through releases regarding the establishment of—or changes in—the quantities which are required to be set aside for sale to the Government.

The Department ordinarily issues a release each quarter which indicates the total distribution of United States food supplies during the preceding quarter by commodity groups—the quantities distributed to United States civilians and to the military services and the quantities exported to United States Territories and various foreign countries.

We are now in position to make public the final allocation sheets and we shall be glad to make them available to anyone interested in the detailed information which they contain.

Sincerely yours,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

New York Times Urges Legislation to Prevent Unjust Deportations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 14, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on June 1 the New York Times carried an editorial directing attention to the plight of several hundred Japanese, who are likely to be deported under existing laws. These Japanese are aliens only in a technical sense and they have proved their loyalty to America in a manner that certainly entitles them to be spared deportation with those who were not loyal and who served the enemy cause during the war. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has introduced a bill, H. R. 6505, which would permit the Attorney General to suspend the deportation of aliens of this type, those who have contributed to our war effort and whose loyalty to the United States cannot be questioned. In the interest of simple justice, this proposed legislation should receive prompt and favorable action by the Congress and I trust that we can thereby prevent a threatened injustice to those who have demonstrated their loyalty to our country.

There can be no question about the appreciation of our people for the notable contribution of many Americans of Japanese descent. The heroism of their battalions in the Italian campaign has been acclaimed. Many members of the families of these men are involved in the deportation referred to by the New York Times and we should act speedily to protect the veterans against such a tragedy.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I feel that all men and women who have served their country during the time of war should have made available to them full information in regard to benefits provided for them by their Congress, and, therefore, at the end of these remarks, I am inserting the schedule of veterans' benefits as prepared by the Veterans' Administration under date of March 21, 1946.

In addition to the benefits announced in the schedule, additional legislation has been approved by the House of Representatives to liberalize the provisions and benefits of Government life insurance held by veterans of World War II. I want to urge all veterans to investigate if they have dropped their insurance. I also wish to call attention to a bill—H. R. 4467—introduced by me last October providing for terminal-leave pay for all GI's. Such an authorization has now been approved by the House of Representatives and I anticipate that the Senate will take similar action on both of these bills.

During my service in Congress, I have cooperated with the service officers of the various veterans' organizations in my district, as well as with thousands of veterans who have written me directly in regard to their disabilities and benefits provided by Congress. I shall be glad to continue this service for more than 30,000 veterans in the First Congressional District of Minnesota. Each of the 12 counties in the district has a county service officer, who stands ready at all times to assist all veterans. The service office is located at the county seat in each county. The Veterans' Administration has also established branch contact offices at Albert Lea, Austin, Faribault, Rochester, and Winona. Similar offices may be established in other communities.

The schedule referred to follows:

VETERANS' BENEFITS

If you have a son, husband, relative, or friend who is a veteran save this page. It

contains a list of Government benefits and services available. Below is a list of benefits veterans are entitled to, with most of the stress on veterans of World War II; some benefits are for others who served in the armed forces.

Governmental benefits and services available for veterans

Type of benefit	Basis of eligibility	Nature of benefit	Administering agency
Pension or compensation for disability, service-connected.	Disabilities resulting from injuries or disease incurred in or aggravated by active service. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.	$11.50 to $115 a month, depending on degrees of disability, World Wars I and II. $8.62 to $86.25 peacetime service. Additional benefits for helplessness, blindness, loss of limbs, etc.	Veterans' Administration office having jurisdiction over place of residence.
Pension for disability not service-connected.	90 days' active service during World Wars I or II; or, if less, discharged for disability in line of duty. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.	$50 per month for permanent total disability. Increased to $60 after continuous receipt for 10 years, or age 65. Income limitations.	Do.
Readjustment allowance (unemployment insurance under Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended). Applies to World War II only.	In active service after Sept. 16, 1940, and prior to termination of present war. Must have had 60 days' service; or, if less, discharge for disability incurred in service in line of duty. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.	Compensation, $20 per week, less any wages received in excess of $3. 3 weeks' benefit for each month of first 90 days' service; 4 weeks per month thereafter. Maximum number of weeks, 52. Self-employed veteran entitled to difference between net earnings and $100 per month.	Veterans' Administration through State unemployment compensation agency.
Unemployment compensation, State.	Veterans must have accrued credits prior to entering service. No service requirements.	Credits preserved and available after discharge. Can be used prior to use of rights under readjustment allowance.	State unemployment compensation agency.
Loan guaranty. Applies to World War II only.	In active service on or after Sept. 16, 1940, and prior to termination of present war. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable. Service must have been for 90 days or more; if less, discharge for service-incurred disability required.	Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may guarantee up to 50 percent of a loan for purchase or construction of homes, farms, or business property, or farm or business equipment. Maximum guaranty, $4,000 real-estate loans; $2,000 non-real-estate loans.	Veterans' Administration office having jurisdiction over place of residence.
Federal vocational rehabilitation (in schools, colleges, or industry). Applies to World War II only.	Active service on or after Sept. 16, 1940, and prior to termination of present war. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable. Pensionable service-connected disability and need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome handicap of such disability.	Vocational training or school expenses paid. Subsistence allowance $65 monthly if without dependent, $90 monthly with dependent or dependents; minimum payment of allowance, plus any pension or other benefit, $105 monthly if without dependent, $115 monthly if with dependent, plus for additional dependents; $10 for 1 child and $7 additional for each additional child, $15 for a dependent parent.	Do.
State vocational rehabilitation	Need for training to overcome vocational handicap due to disability. No service requirements.	Tuition, books, tools for training, treatment, appliances, maintenance under varying circumstances, by State Federal funds.	State vocational rehabilitation division State capital city.
Educational program (provided by Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended). Applies to World War II only.	In active service on or after Sept. 16, 1940, and prior to termination of present war. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable. Service must have been for 90 days or more; if less, discharge for service-incurred disability required.	Education or training for period of 1 year plus time in active service after Sept. 16, 1940, and prior to termination of World War II. Total period not to exceed 4 years' educational expenses up to $500 yearly paid to educational or training institution. Monthly subsistence allowance $65, if without dependent, $90 with dependents.	Veterans' Administration office having jurisdiction over place of residence.
Reemployment. Applies to World War II only.	Service after May 1, 1940. Discharge under honorable condition. Apply for reemployment within 90 days after discharge.	Entitled to reemployment under terms of Selective Training and Service Act, of 1940, as amended, if prescribed conditions are met.	Reemployment committeeman or local selective-service board.
Employment	Service during a war period. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.	Vocational guidance and placement by veterans employment representative in U. S. Employment Service offices.	Local U. S. Employment Service office.
Civil-service preference, Federal (also provided by some States).	Active service in time of war or service-connected disability. Separation under honorable conditions.	Extra credit points and preference allowed under certain conditions.	U. S. Civil Service Commission regional office. (Information at local post office.)
Hospital care in Veterans' Administration hospitals.	Service during a period of war, or a service-connected disability due to war or peacetime service, with discharge under conditions other than dishonorable. For nonservice conditions veteran must certify inability to defray expense.	Complete hospital care in a Veterans' Administration hospital, including transportation. Emergency care elsewhere may be authorized by Veterans' Administration for service-connected disabilities. Prosthetic appliances supplied under certain conditions.	Nearest Veterans' Administration hospital. (Authorization for admission should be secured before patient goes to hospital. Veteran's physician can arrange by telephone in emergencies.)
Medical treatment and prosthetic appliances.	Service-connected disabilities requiring out-patient care or prosthetic appliances. Prior authorization required.	Out-patient treatment by designated physician including necessary medication. Prosthetic appliances provided through Veterans' Administration.	Veterans' Administration office having jurisdiction over place of residence.
Domiciliary care, Federal (also provided by some State soldiers' homes).	Service during period of war or service-connected disability due to peacetime service, with discharge under conditions other than dishonorable. Must be so disabled as to be unable to earn a living and without adequate means of support.	Full care, including medical treatment in Veterans' Administration home.	Do.
National-service life insurance (veterans of World War II only).	National-service life insurance must have been secured during service in armed forces after Oct. 8, 1940. Premium payments must be continued after discharge and policy must be converted within the term period to continue insurance.	Death benefits payable under monthly plan as selected. Waiver of premiums during continuous total disability (commencing before insured's 60th birthday) which continues 6 or more consecutive months.	Director of Insurance, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.
Pension or compensation for death due to service.	When death while in active service was the result of an injury or disease incurred in line of duty. When death after discharge was caused by service-connected disability. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.	Widow receives $50 per month with additional amounts for minor children. Total limited to $100. Dependent mother or father, $45 per month; dependent mother and father, each $25 per month. (Above rates for World Wars I and II. Lower rates for peacetime service.)	Veterans' Administration having jurisdiction over place of residence.
Pension for death not due to service.	90 days' service or discharge for disability in line of duty during World War I or II. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable. No other service-connection requirement for World War I veterans. World War II veterans must also have had at time of death service-connected disability for which pension would be payable if 10 percent or more in degree.	Widow will receive $35 per month with additional amount for each minor child. Total limited to $74. Income limitations. No benefit for parents.	Do.
Burial allowance, Federal (also provided by some States).	Service during a period of war, or discharge for disability incurred in line of duty, or in receipt of pension for service-connected disability. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.	Maximum allowance of $100 for cost of burial and funeral expenses and transportation of the body.	Veterans' Administration office having jurisdiction over place of residence.
Burial in national cemeteries	Service during a period of war. Peacetime service qualifies if in destitute condition at time of death. Honorable discharge from last period of service in all cases.	Burial in national cemetery. Under certain circumstances may also include wife, widow, or children.	Superintendent of nearest national cemetery.
Burial flags	Service during a period of war, or a complete enlistment, or discharged for disability incurred in line of duty. Discharge under conditions other than dishonorable.	American flag to drape casket and to be presented to next of kin after burial.	Veterans' Administration or county seat post office.
Headstones or grave markers	Last service must have terminated honorably	Uniform type of headstone or grave marker furnished free, delivered to nearest railroad station.	Quartermaster General, U. S. Army, Washington 25, D. C.

Office of Assistant Administrator for Legislation, Veterans' Administration, Mar. 21, 1946.

Full information available at your nearest Veterans' Administration office at Minneapolis, Minn., or the county service officer in your county.

Fascism and the House Committee on Un-American Propaganda Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to ignore House Report 2233 of the House Committee on Un-American Propaganda Activities.

The editorial on the report in the Washington Post of Sunday, June 16, is, however, so pointed, that I feel it should be inserted in the RECORD. The editorial is headed very simply Fascism and points out the failure of the committee to treat Army Talk 64 as the fair and proper warning against fascism which it was.

The committee's report will be shocking to fair-minded Americans.

It is filled with anti-Semitic innuendoes, with derogatory remarks about American citizens who happen to belong to some racial or religious minority. It is filled with wholly gratuitous editorial comment which has no place in the factual report of an impartial investigating committee.

OFPOSED TO ALL ISMS

I want to make clear, Mr. Speaker, that I am not criticizing the small portion of the report actually devoted to the factual investigation of alleged subversive activities in the United States by revolutionary communists.

I have, in fact, repeatedly stated on this floor, and repeat again, I demand only that all un-American activities and subversive organizations should be investigated. Furthermore, I have repeatedly stated, and repeat again, I am just as much opposed to communism as I am to fascism or any other ism except Americanism.

I hope I can obtain information as to the name of the actual perpetrator of this lopsided document they call a report. I should like also to know if a majority of the members of the committee have seen it, read it, and approved it; it is highly noticeable that the report is not signed.

CRITICIZES LACK OF OBJECTIVITY

I do criticize the complete lack of objectivity in the report; the strained effort to extend the smear of Communist activities to every liberal and progressive individual or organization in the United States; the astounding one-sidedness of the committee's investigations; the naive declaration that fascism and communism are similar; and the amazing statement that—

> Any organization which advocates the establishment of the Fascist system of government in the United States will be investigated by the committee upon receipt of information that such an organization exists.

I criticize the effort to interfere with the right of free speech self-exposed in the strange section on radio broadcasts.

FACT SHEET DID NOT RECOMMEND COMMUNISM

But, most of all, Mr. Speaker, I resent and criticize the effort of the report to label as Communist the Army's Fact Sheet 64, and to say that it "actually recommended the Soviet form of government."

This is sheer distortion of an admirable dissection of fascism. It is unjust to the War Department.

Clearly stated in the first paragraph of the Fact Sheet is the keynote of the entire talk:

> We can best combat it (fascism) by making our democracy work.

The same statement could be made as to combatting communism.

It cannot be too often repeated, Mr. Speaker: The alternative for all loyal Americans to communism is not fascism but Americanism.

American democracy, under our written Constitution, has worked for almost two centuries, and it will continue to work as long as Americans have faith in their own form of government and will fight for American liberties and the American way of life.

We can best combat fascism, communism, and every other ism by making our own democracy work better and better. We cannot do it by labeling every American who believes in that democracy a "pink" or a fellow traveler.

There follows the text of the editorial already referred to:

FASCISM

It is entirely in character for the House Un-American Activities Committee to damn as "Red poison" any effort to explain the nature of fascism. In March 1945 when the war was at its height, the War Department Information and Education Division published Army Talk 64, an orientation fact sheet entitled "Fascism," designed to further understanding by troops of the nature of the enemy we were fighting. The fact sheet was so brash as to suggest that there were persons of Fascist mentality in America and to give a few criteria by which they could be recognized. The outcry by the Wood-Rankin committee was loud and anguished. The culmination of this outcry is to be read in the committee's annual report, which takes parts of the fact sheet completely out of context and deliberately misconstrues them.

Over what is the committee so incensed? Over the statement that "In the United States native Fascists have often been anti-Catholic, anti-Jew, anti-Negro, antilabor, antiforeign born." This is used by the committee as justification for the ridiculous charge that "If a person is anti-American, or anti-Gentile, or antiwhite man, under the Army teachings he is quite all right." Much of the report is concerned with supplementary material at the end of the Army Talk which is entirely divorced from the main theme. Ignoring the fact that we were allied with Russia during the war, the committee says that since the orientation sheet did not condemn Russia in explaining the differences between fascism and communism, here is evidence that communism is favored. It adds that "It is quite evident that the brand of democracy referred to * * * is quite different from the western democracy cherished by true Americans."

What the committee did not include in its report, and doubtless would have been embarrassed to mention, was the real meat of the fact sheet. After a description of how fascism came to power under the Axis and referring to certain Fascist groups indicted in this country, the Army Talk continues:

> "A Fascist attempt to gain power in America would not use the exact Hitler pattern. It would work under the guise of 'super-patriotism' and 'super-Americanism' * * *. Pitting of religious, racial, and economic groups against one another in order to break down national unity is a device of the 'divide and conquer' technique used by Hitler. * * * Fascists deny the need for international cooperation. * * * Many Fascists make the spurious claim that the world has but two choices—either fascism or communism, and they label as 'Communist' everyone who refuses to support them. By attacking our free enterprise, capitalist democracy, and by denying the effectiveness of our way of life they hope to trap many people. * * * The only way to prevent fascism from getting a hold in America is by making our democracy work and by actively cooperating to preserve world peace and security. * * * The Fascist doctrine of hate fulfills a triple mission. By creating disunity it weakens democracy. By getting men to hate rather than think it prevents men from seeking the real cause and a democratic solution to the problem. By fake promises of jobs and security, fascism then tries to lure men to its program as the way out of insecurity. * * * Fascism thrives on indifference and ignorance. It makes headway when people are apathetic or cynical about their government—when they think of it as something far removed from them and beyond their personal concern."

If that is considered subversive, it doesn't take much imagination to know what sort of "democracy" the Wood-Rankin committee would like to have in America.

Good Labels for Bad Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 6, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Pathfinder magazine of June 5, 1946:

GOOD LABELS FOR BAD BILLS
(By Wheeler McMillen)

How is the citizen to judge the merit of bills before Congress?

Here is a bill that proposes medical care for everybody; one is offered to support better educational facilities for areas where better schools are desirable; another bill plans to relieve practically everyone from saving for his old age.

Are you against the idea that everyone shall have medical care? Is there anyone who does not favor the best possible education for every youngster? Wouldn't it be nice if everyone could count on a secure and comfortable old age?

Certainly no reasonable person can oppose such purposes. Should everyone, therefore, be in favor of whatever bills that are introduced to accomplish them?

Without arguing the merit of particular bills, let's look at a fundamental principle that applies to some such proposals.

Two ideas of Government sharply oppose each other in today's world. This is nothing new. The same two ideas have been in conflict for centuries. The titanic struggle never ends. That is why "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Our forefathers called one of these ideas tyranny. It has been called totalitarianism, autocracy, dictatorship, absolutism, and other things. The philosopher's name for it is statism. It says the state, or government, shall be superior in power to the individual,

and shall be conceded to be superior in wisdom.

Whatever the name, the idea remains the same. The result comes to the same point. Government becomes the master of the individual, rather than his servant.

Opposed to statism is freedom, individual liberty. Here stands the idea that the Government is merely the servant of the citizen, that it has no powers except those which come from the people, and no wisdom except the wisdom of such men as the people hire to conduct their affairs.

The services which Government may perform are many. Government defends the people against aggression from without and against aggression from their fellow-citizens within. It carries the mail, charts the harbors, predicts the weather, and maintains the national parks, for examples. Government thus serves as a sort of national cooperative to do things which individual interest would not freely attempt.

New services are constantly being proposed. They seem so desirable that generous-hearted citizens rally to their support.

Yet, very often the accomplishment of these fine purposes by law can be brought about only by giving Government new power over the actions of the citizen.

Sometimes such measures are offered not, as they are labelled, to help the less fortunate, but actually for the prime purpose of increasing the powers of Government.

The citizen may then well ask himself a basic question. Which does he think more important? The preservation, unimpaired, of the principle of individual freedom? Or, to take chance that some desirable social objective will be hurried up?

He may want to keep in mind that under the American system of individual freedom more people have attained good education and good medical care, and more have been able to provide for their own old age than any other people have ever done anywhere under any system of statism. What reason is there to suppose that, if left completely free, Americans cannot in a few more decades produce enough wealth to bring everybody up to or well above present standards?

One standard for judgment is whether a bill proposes to clip any citizen's liberty. If it does, the bill probably is bad.

Some Folks Like the OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include three letters which I have received from people in my district, all of whom urge the extension of price control and the defeat of all crippling amendments:

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 28, 1946.*
Hon. WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing on behalf of my immediate family of eight sisters and brothers, six of them married, and my parents, and my own family. We ask that you vote against any legislation weakening or crippling the OPA. Please listen to the people who will be snowed under by the resulting inflation if the OPA's effectiveness is reduced.

Did you see what happened to the prices of citrus fruits last winter when the OPA removed the ceiling prices? Why, overnight oranges increased 30 cents in cost per dozen to the consumer; then fortunately the ceiling was put back on.

I know that the plant where I work, which makes shoe soling, would jump the selling price 50 percent and still operate at capacity as it is now under ceiling MPR's. A higher price couldn't and wouldn't increase our output. We're operating at full capacity now as is every single rubber plant in the country.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

B. S. FREEMAN.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 28, 1946.*
Hon. WILLIAM ROWAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ROWAN: As my Representative in Congress and that of my family you have a right to know what we think about OPA.

This is the first time I have ever written to a Representative regarding any pending legislation. However, after witnessing the shameful, thoughtless exhibition of mob psychology displayed in the House of Representatives the other day when the great majority of Representatives allowed themselves to be stampeded into wrecking the future of the OPA by a relatively small group of selfish and vicious men, then it is high time that more of us citizens express our view in this matter.

Please understand that there is nothing personal intended in the foregoing statements—I realize that you were among the few who had the courage and foresight to exert your influence in favor of the majority of your constituents. However, I believe there are some issues, such as control of atomic energy and extension of the OPA, which so closely affect the future and welfare of all of us that they should be above party politics. Surely this belief is not too naive, even in present times. Obviously, also, the people to whom to express these thoughts are those who have been given the power to properly and adequately administer the future of the Nation.

One does not need to be an educated economist nor even a very bright individual to foresee what will happen to commodity prices, rents, and the value of the dollar if the powers of OPA are not extended unhampered for at least another year.

I am in favor of private enterprise and individual initiative, but when the selfish action of a few people is allowed to affect my standard of living and my pocketbook adversely in the name of either politics or personal profit, I object.

And I shall continue to object by every means at my disposal, now and at election time.

Thank you for your efforts in behalf of the OPA thus far, and I sincerely hope that you will continue to exercise your authority to see that the powers of the OPA are extended unhampered for at least another year.

Very truly yours,

CARL B. WILLIAMS.

BUTLER SPECIALTY CO.,
Chicago, Ill., April 25, 1946.
Hon. WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We urge you to do your utmost in preventing passage of crippling amendments to the Price Control Act.

We have been manufacturing furniture since 1930 and hope and expect to be manufacturing furniture for the next hundred years. To this end we definitely go on record as opposing any type of legislation that will defeat us in our purpose. We are a typical small American manufacturer and what defeats us, we believe, will defeat our national economy. We firmly believe the proposed amendments to the Price Control Act will have the effect of creating run-away inflation and a serious dislocation of industry and thereby put us out of business.

As one of our representatives, it is in your power to prevent this.

Very truly yours,

BUTLER SPECIALTY CO.,
HARRY BERGMAN,
President.

Tributes to Sault Ste. Marie High School Choir and Swing Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 13, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my radio broadcast recently put on the air over Stations WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; WMAM, Marinette, Wis.; and WDBC, Escanaba, Mich.:

Mr. BRADLEY. Things are a lot more calm and peaceful with me this week end than they were not so long ago in Washington. However, the privilege and the extreme pleasure that I enjoyed, as your Congressman, in doing my small bit to make the Washington arrangements for and to help entertain the young men and young women of the Sault Ste. Marie High School Choir and Swing Band—and their accompanying chaperons—is a treasured memory that will remain with me always. Without hesitation, I say that never before have I ever seen a group of 140 young people who behaved themselves so excellently; who were so easy to direct and manage in their extensive tours of the District; nor have I ever been privileged to hear a more magnificent series of performances wherever they went. They certainly sold themselves to everyone in Washington with whom they came in contact. The people of the Soo, who by their most generous personal contributions and by the contributions from the various labor unions, veteran organizations, and civic organizations who made this trip possible, can rest assured that theirs was a most wise investment for which the members of the choir and band showed their sincere appreciation in the superb quality of their public performances. You do not have to take my word for it. I am going to have others join me on this program to tell you their impressions.

After the group arrived Friday morning, each carrying his own choir gown, they put them in a special Army truck waiting at the entrance of Union Station. Then boarding busses we went up town for breakfast and thence immediately to the FBI, where each was greeted personally on his bus by the Assistant Director of the FBI, Mr. Louis B. Nichols, who is from our own State of Michigan, and then the entire group passed through Mr. J. Edgar Hoover's office and each met him in person. Now I am going to call Mr. Hoover on the phone and let him tell you personally his impression of this splendid group of young people from the Soo.

Mr. J. EDGAR HOOVER. Fred, we all enjoyed those young folk immensely. I was very much impressed with them as I shook their hands in my office. Then, their broadcast from Mount Alto Hospital Saturday morning was most inspiring. I am sure that the boys and girls in the choir and band will not cause us any trouble. I think the Sault Ste. Marie High School is to be commended for the splendid manner in which its program has been arranged to keep its young

people's minds occupied by such worth-while activities.

Mr. BRADLEY. Myself and Mr. Thomas went ahead to the Pentagon to supervise arrangements for the concert which started promptly on time at noon. After an all-night train ride which showed plainly on their faces, nevertheless the choir gave us a most beautiful concert that by its applause was welcomed most generously by approximately 20,000 people who crowded into the court of the Pentagon, which is a tremendous building. This was the first high-school choir to be invited to sing in the Pentagon and the first choir to have been greeted personally by General Eisenhower. Now, as I sit in the studio I am going to call Brig. Gen. Robert N. Young, Commandant of the District of Columbia Military District, and ask him in a few words to give us his impression of the concert in the Pentagon. Just a minute now.

Gen. ROBERT N. YOUNG. War Department employees in the Pentagon, which included General Eisenhower, are most grateful for the splendid recital given last Friday by the Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., High School choir and band in the center court of the Pentagon. Thank you very much.

Mr. BRADLEY. We have been told that because he had a very important staff meeting in progress that General Eisenhower could be with us for only 1 minute. However, when the choir sang the general's favorite tune, Jingle, Jangle, Jingle, as he was coming down the steps he stayed with us much longer than our previously looked-forward-to 1 minute. Here is the choir and here is General Eisenhower.

(Choir's rendition of Jingle, Jangle, Jingle.)

Gen. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER. Mr. Thomas and members of the Soo Choir, this visit of yours to Washington gives me an opportunity to express the appreciation of the War Department to a very famous war organization. Every soldier knows that the one real weapon that wins wars is a unified public opinion. The undivided support of every individual that makes up a Nation is a thing that wins victories; it produces the weapons; it supports the war financially; it even produces the morale of the fighting forces. This organization, by devoting its time and its obvious talents to keeping up that morale during the period of the war has rendered a service that the United States cannot afford to forget. Least of all will this gathering, representing the War Department of the United States, ever forget it. I thank Mr. Thomas and each member of his choir not only for that war service but for their very fine entertainment.

Mr. BRADLEY. Our full program in the Pentagon was slightly delayed when we discovered to our amazement that one-half of our band instruments were left at the depot but they finally arrived and the crowd stood by while we were all given lunch through the courtesy of the Army—and then the band played before we left that point and they did a mighty fine job. That afternoon there was a brief sightseeing trip and then we got the group into their hotel—the Annapolis—in time to give them a brief rest before dinner. After dinner our fleet of five busses were led by motorcycle police escort that really gave the boys and girls a thrill when they took them the 11 miles from the hotel to the United States Naval Hospital in Bethesda, Md., in just 15 minutes. There they did a beautiful job entertaining the staff and patients and now I am going to ask Capt. Robert E. Duncan, commanding officer of the United States Naval Hospital, to give us his impression of their performance.

Capt. ROBERT E. DUNCAN. Mr. BRADLEY, I am very happy to have this opportunity of expressing my appreciation of the most excellent program given by the Sault Ste. Marie choir and band. Hundreds of patients in this hospital—many of them battle casualties—were inspired and thrilled by these fresh, young, and well-trained voices and the excellent music of the fine young band. The patients were unanimous in their praise and appreciation. We are deeply indebted to you Congressman BRADLEY, and to the Sault Ste. Marie Chamber of Commerce for bringing this delightful concert to our hospital.

Mr. BRADLEY. Then we had a quick trip across the city to the United States Army Walter Reed Hospital where the group again gave a splendid entertainment to the staff and a great many wounded veterans in wheel chairs and even on stretchers. If you think they didn't enjoy it, listen to this:

(Whistles and applause from Walter Reed Hospital.)

Then the group were taken to Griffith Stadium where the Washington Senators were playing the Chicago White Sox. For most of the group they were to see their first major-league ball game and for every one in the party it was their first night game. Unfortunately, we were 15 minutes late and, therefore, missed a prearranged schedule to sing the Star Spangled Banner but we were welcomed most cordially over the loud speaker system by the ball-park management. Our old friend from the Detroit Tigers, "Bobo" Newsom, had just returned to Washington for the fourth time and pitched a beautiful game limiting the White Sox to two hits and Washington winning three to two. It was a tired group that returned to their rooms in the Annapolis Hotel that night. Saturday was destined to be another busy, yet happy, day. We arrived at the Mount Alto Veterans Hospital here in Washington at 9 in the morning, which hospital has about 350 veteran patients of which 90 percent are bedridden. Mr. John T. Marshall, chief of special services at that hospital will now give you his impression of this group:

Mr. JOHN T. MARSHALL. The music and singing of the Sault Ste. Marie High School Choir and Orchestra was by far the best entertainment of its kind that I have been privileged to present to the patients of Mount Alto Hospital and I might add, superior to any presented to Army camps where I served as special service officer during the war. You will long be remembered and praised, Congressman BRADLEY, by the patients and staff of the Mount Alto Hospital here in Washington, D. C., for your efforts in making arrangements for this program; as well as Mr. Earl Thomas and his coworkers in presenting this fine concert. We expect to play the transcription made of the choir to each new group of patients for many months to come.

Mr. BRADLEY. At Mount Alto Veterans Hospital photographers photographed this group in sound and color to be used later in a picture to be released by the Veterans' Administration entitled "The Veterans Report to the Nation, Series No. 3." This picture will be released in August or September and will be shown in your local theaters. Mr. Joseph Yovin of the publicity department of the Veterans' Administration directed this picture and I will now ask him to give you his impression of the choir and band.

Mr. JOSEPH YOVIN. Hello, Fred. I certainly enjoyed directing the motion picture short the Veterans' Administration just made of the Soo High School Choir and Band. I have worked with the Roxy Theater Chorus and the Russian Chorus and I tell you this Soo Choir really gave me a thrill. You deserve a lot of credit in bringing them to Washington to entertain the veterans. They loved the shows you put on and sure appreciated hearing the kids.

Mr. BRADLEY. Then at 10:30 we went down to the Recreation Auditorium for a rehearsal for our broadcast which went on the air over WWDC and the Atlantic Network at 11:30. For our broadcast we were directed by Mr. Ira Walsh, Program Director of WWDC, who for a period of 4 years has written and directed the famous radio program "America I Hear You Singing," which was placed on a coast to coast hook up over 189 stations. I want to ask Mr. Walsh to tell you how he liked directing our Soo Choir and Band.

Mr. IRA WALSH. Fred, it was a great treat to work with these boys and girls of the Sault Ste. Marie Choir and, especially, their extremely competent and personable director, Earl Thomas. I feel that Michigan has done three things to publicize itself nationally here and in the Nation's Capital: No. 1 is the Detroit Tigers winning the world's baseball championship; 2, the University of Michigan coming up with its usual great intercollegiate football team; 3, the Sault Ste. Marie Choir which electrified the Nation's Capital with its exceptional performances last week-end, proving itself the outstanding high school choral group in the country; and the other sure bet to keep Michigan's name in front of the Nation and the Nation's Capital is to bring back the Sault Ste. Marie Choir and Band again next year.

Mr. BRADLEY. Saturday afternoon was given over to a sightseeing trip which took in the Arlington National Cemetery and Mount Vernon and the National Airport—among many other interesting places. Saturday night we all went on a moonlight boat trip down the Potomac and on Sunday morning the group sang three numbers in the famous Foundry Methodist Church in the heart of Embassy Row on Sixteenth Street in Washington. This famous old church was founded in 1815 and we were there at the invitation of Dr. Frederick Brown Harris who is the Chaplain of the Senate and has been pastor of the church for many years. Dr. Harris will you please tell my audience what you think of our choir.

Dr. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS. That high-school choir of Sault Ste. Marie is a grand group. As I told an audience of 1,200 when they sang for us at Foundry Church last Sunday morning, they are an inspiring example of young America at its best. Their entrance in the processional—with their lovely surplices—was thrilling. Their demeanor in the crowded chancel was perfect. Their singing and tone technique showed talent and training. The fact, that with their whirlwind schedule, they wanted to appear in a church on Sunday speaks volumes about them. Michigan can well be proud of this wonderful choir. They made a splendid impression in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. BRADLEY. All of the programs in Washington, with the exception of that in the church were recorded and will be played over your local radio station, I hope, in the very near future so that you, yourselves, can judge just how fine the choir and band sounded on each program. Also, due to the fact that our very good friend and very noted newspaper columnist, Mrs. Esther Van Wagoner Tufty—who covers numerous Michigan papers including the Evening News at Sault Ste. Marie—has been seriously ill and therefore was unable to be with us. Nevertheless, she assigned her assistant, Mrs. Lois Merrill, to cover all of the performances and even join us on our sightseeing trips. Mrs. Merrill will you come in now and tell us what your general impressions were of this splendid group.

Mrs. LOIS MERRILL. What was Mrs. Tufty's hard luck became my very good luck. It was a thrill to cover this group for the Sault Ste. Marie Evening News. Never have I met 135 more active, alert, and beautifully talented young Americans. Of all the mental pictures I will remember of their visit to Washington, my favorite is that of the blue and white robed choir in the chancel of the Foundry Church grouped directly under the three matching stained glass windows. It was really thrilling. Thank you, Mr. BRADLEY, and your staff for their excellent cooperation.

Mr. BRADLEY. And now before I close I know you will want the impression of someone else in Congress besides myself and so I am going to ask the dean of our Michigan delegation the Honorable ROY WOODRUFF of Bay City, to tell you how much he and Mrs. Woodruff enjoyed the choir's Sunday morning service.

Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF. Mrs. Woodruff and I attended the service at the Foundry Methodist Church where we had the unalloyed pleasure of hearing the 135-voice Sault Ste. Marie High School youngsters in their program. Both of us are greatly interested in music, especially of the vocal variety. We are agreed that never in our lives have we heard group singing by youngsters which was comparable to their's. The harmony was beautiful at all times; their collective diction surpassed anything we have ever heard, even by professionals. Each word was as clear and as distinct as it would have been had it been uttered by a single individual. Their rendition was a splendid tribute to their teacher, as well as to themselves. Thank you, Fred, for giving me this opportunity to pay tribute to this wonderful organization.

Release by Polish American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a release by the Polish American Congress on Gen. Bor Komorowski, commander in chief of the Polish armed forces, made on his visit to Baltimore at St. Stanislaus Hall, Baltimore, Md.:

Gen. Thaddeus Bor Komorowski, commander in chief of the Polish armed forces, addressed today a rally of Americans of Polish descent.

In his speech General Bor explained why the 200,000 soldiers of the Polish armed forces abroad and the 60,000 former prisoners of war in Germany—who, for political reasons, were prevented from joining the Polish Army, and, despite their liberation by the Americans and the British, are still being held in their old prisoner-of-war camps—cannot return to Poland, which is at present governed by a Soviet quisling regime.

He summed up Poland's all-out war effort and related some of his own experiences as commander of the Polish underground army during occupation.

Speaking about German crimes perpetrated in Poland, General Bor stated, in part:

"It is difficult to describe what our nation has suffered in these long years of occupation. If you have not seen it and experienced it yourselves, you will find it hard to believe. In the course of 5 years, the Germans murdered 6 to 7 million Polish citizens, of all creeds, in the most beastly way possible.

"Polish Jews, who, since the end of the 14th century had enjoyed religious, economic, and cultural liberties in much greater measure in Poland than in other countries, from which they had repeatedly fled, have been almost entirely wiped out by the Germans in the space of a few years of the twentieth century.

"We are still too close to this tragedy, that has no equal in the annals of mankind, to fully grasp the enormity of the horrible atrocities perpetrated on Polish soil, but I firmly believe that the verdict of history against the German Nation for these dreadful crimes will be implacable."

The Warsaw uprising—this ultimate expression of human effort by the people of Poland, who sacrificed everything to become free, failed, after 63 days of excruciating misery and heroism because of the lack of Allied help, and, particularly, because of Russia's hostile attitude.

All endeavors of the Polish home army, which, by aiding the Russians in their offensive against Germany it was hoped would bring about a Polish-Soviet understanding were frustrated by the uncompromising Soviet stand. Subsequent developments have proved that the Russians had planned the occupation and forcing on Poland of their eastern communism from the very outset. That's why they rejected all offers of cooperation and adopted a hostile attitude toward the soldiers and officers of the home army.

The main concern of the Red Army and of the NKVD, after occupation of the whole of Poland, was the extermination of the Polish underground army, which, under the pressure of the United States and Great Britain during the Warsaw uprising, had been granted a combatant status, even by the Germans. The same attitude was adopted by Russians toward the Polish civilian administration.

The general concluded his address as follows:

"Today Poland is occupied by Soviet Armies which live off of our country, and by imposing contingents upon it, deprive our population of the remnants of its food. That is why, if our countrymen in Poland are to survive, they must constantly receive maximum material assistance from abroad, above all, in the shape of food and clothing.

"It is not the fault of our nation that Poland is ruled by the stooges of Moscow, who, supported by Soviet bayonets, have introduced a Communist regime against the will of the nation.

"It is not the fault of our nation that the NKVD, for the most part in Polish uniforms, terrorize the population, deporting those who resist, to eternal exile in the interior of Russia.

"Russia has illegally appropriated age-old Polish cities. Our nation suffers as never before. Against its will this nation, the most faithful of the Allies, which has been described as the 'inspiration of the world,' has been fettered with the chains of bondage for its indominatable will and for the deeds of its soldiers. Never will the Polish Nation, nor its rightful soldiers, accept this unilateral decision. Our nation wishes to be the sole architect of its own future. But today, having neither freedom nor independence, it is compelled to be silent, for those who pass themselves off as the exponents of its wishes are its oppressors and tyrants, at the will and order of Moscow.

"That is why, as I said earlier, the soldiers who have fought uninterruptedly for 6 years for a free and independent Poland, today refuse to return to their country. They cannot become reconciled to the satisfaction of their conscience with the present abandonment of Poland to the mercy of Soviet Russia for misery and enslavement.

"As a soldier and commander who, for five long years of cruel German occupation, sent people to their death in the daily battle against the Germans and on the barricades of Warsaw, I consider it my duty to appeal to the conscience and honor of our allies.

"Let no one delude himself that the Polish cause can be settled by passing over it in silence. An evasion of responsibility toward Allied Poland and other helpless smaller nations cannot bring to the western democracies anything but the mortal danger of complete domination over Central Europe, and later, over the whole of Europe, by the destructive ideology of class struggle. Supplanting the freedom of individuals and nations by the totalitarianism of an all-powerful state threatens the inundation of all mankind by a sea of hatred and tyranny.

"No country has suffered as much as Poland, the land of your fathers. None has given such eloquent evidence of unshaken faith in the righteousness of the cause for which the war was waged. None deserves a greater degree of justice.

"Throughout the long years of war the western democracies aided us politically and morally in our fight against the common enemy. They supplied us with arms, ammunition, and material means, enabling us to die heroically for the common cause.

"Today, after a victoriously concluded war, the Polish Nation demands that those same western democracies enable us and help us to live, that they employ the abundance of peaceful means at their disposal to restore our freedom to us."

The Management of the Federal Interest Bearing Debt as Related to Commercial Bank Earnings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me at Philadelphia on June 14, 1946, before the Pennsylvania Bankers Association:

Believing it is highly beneficial to the Congress and to your banking industry for us to meet together I am here today for this informal discussion. You have a story to tell to the Congress and to the people about your industry that you should forever keep telling and of course I refer to the constructive service which you have always rendered to the public. Especially do I have in mind the signal service you rendered to the public and to the Government in the financing of the war expenditures incident to the recently ended world conflict.

As a Member of the Congress there too is a story I wish to tell to you. I am one of those formerly and presently closely associated with banking and business generally and a Member of the Congress who believes in our representative form of government and who is very certain that the Congress as an institution is not obsolete and no longer of any value to the people in their industrial activities. So believing in your industry and in the usefulness of Congress I think we have a mutual interest in being here together.

Those who have had occasion to comprehend our State and Federal laws as they affect the operation of banks even after the individual banking charter has been granted and the capital structure completed are fully aware of the influence legislative bodies may have over the operation of banks by reason of the provisions contained in State and Federal laws. Furthermore, it is of course a fact that forces are now coming into play which will bring about far-reaching amendments to Federal laws at least as they affect the operations of member banks of the Federal Reserve System.

Only a few days ago when Chairman Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors appeared before our House Banking and Currency Committee I inquired of him when the Board expected to file with Congress its recommendations for the revision of certain banking laws. This report has, as you probably know, been under consideration for some time. It is of course no simple report to

prepare because what it will call for will be of great importance to not only commercial banks but to all those who do business with commercial banks as well as all investment houses, insurance companies, building and loan associations and others who purchase and sell Government securities in the open market. I understand from Chairman Eccles that the report will be forthcoming within a short time. I shall not be surprised if we have it before us before the adjournment of the present Congress which is now scheduled for not later than next August 1 to 10.

I do not expect the Congress to take any action upon the recommendations that may appear in that report before the present Congress adjourns. However, if you will permit me to make a guess it is to the effect that the forces now running will develop sufficient pressure to cause the Eightieth Congress to act sometime shortly after it convenes January of next year.

Within 5 years the total assets of your insured banks increased 132 percent and on December 31 last aggregated slightly more than $169,000,000,000. While this was occurring the change in one major type of assets held by these insured institutions jumped over 445 percent. I refer to your holdings of United States Government obligations which on December 31 last, exceeded $96,000,000,000. This most interesting development occurred while your loans, discounts, and overdrafts increased only 51.6 percent and your miscellaneous assets actually declined 25.3 percent.

There is, to me, an encouraging sign in that while during the war most of the industrial expansion was financed directly by the Federal Government rather than by the banks, with the end of hostilities and with the beginning of the reconversion of industry there has been a sharp upturn in the volume of commercial industrial loans. Let this continue with all the speed possible for reasons I shall later point out.

While on December 31 last the insured operating banks had demand and time deposits booked to the credit of individuals, partnerships, and corporations over $112,000,000,000, these same institutions carried loans, discounts, and overdrafts of only $29,000,000,000, leaving an excess owned by the customers of $83,000,000,000, or say 74 percent.

This ownership of deposits by bank customers is of the greatest significance when related to present banking laws, bank investment policy, Federal Reserve bank powers over reserve requirements, and open market operations and the control of the public's attitude towards purchasing consumers' durable and nondurable goods. Insofar as I am informed, never before in the history of banking in the United States did a similar situation prevail. Your industry, bank supervisory authorities, and a few Members of Congress are beginning to wonder what can and should be done about some of these matters.

On the other hand, we, the people, banks and their owners, depositors, and every other citizen, have this $270,000,000,000 debt. Its management goes to the very heart of politics. No major political party can ignore the vast economic, social, and political ramifications incident to such a debt in a country where labor monopolies exercise such unbridled powers as have been evidenced here in the United States during the 10 months' interim since major hostilities ceased. The flow of total national income, of tax dollars to the Treasury, of social security "takes" to be invested in the special issues of the Treasury, the attitude of the working and thrifty public to investments in Government issues or to cashing savings bonds, the scarcity or ample supply of consumers' durable and nondurable goods, and many other less important factors, are all involved in these strikes.

The play of these many forces bring into the open clear conflicts in the opinions and policies of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve authorities and the political administration in power. It will be an amazing example of coordinated effort if these three arms of Government can travel the difficult road of Federal debt management during the forthcoming 25 or more years without bringing great economic and social upheavals to our people.

Congress fully comprehends the political fact that the Secretary of the Treasury is a political appointee of the party in power. This individual may be highly qualified for the job or, speaking bluntly, he may be appointed upon the basis of his political value to the party. Such a set of facts may resolve matters to where the actual determination of debt management policies may fall to career men in the Department or to Department employees who have none too many qualifications for the job. And it is conceivable that men who are outside the Treasury and who carry no particular public responsibility for Treasury policies may exercise great and direct power in debt management.

The Secretary of the Treasury must give consideration to the politics of the general situation as pressed upon him by his Cabinet colleagues and the President himself.

If we may assume that a postwar budget of sane proportions will prevail then we must likewise assume that the cost of servicing the present debt at the rate of interest which now governs on the various stratas of the debt will be one of the major top (if not the largest single one) items in the Federal budget. It will, under such circumstances, be a perfectly natural political development for the administration to continue to move in the direction of a greater and greater proportion of the Federal debt to be stratified into obligations carrying a declining rate of interest so as to reflect (insofar as the total interest burden is concerned) a smaller proportion of the total budget and a lighter load on the taxpayers of the Nation.

The declining rate of interest on that portion of the total debt carried in the bank portfolios of this Nation will directly affect earnings of banks. This is squarely the issue your industry faces. In due course the Congress will have the matter before it and in the form of recommended legislation. We might as well begin now to openly discuss the direct influence such a policy of cheap money or low-interest rates will have on commercial banking, on the operations of insurance companies, and all other institutions and citizens who heavily invest in short-term issues of the Federal Treasury.

The fact that the insured banks of this country own in the neighborhood of $100,000,000,000 worth of the debt (say 40 percent) places your industry directly in the spotlight and in a manner which will not permit the administration to overlook the political significance of the proportion of your total earnings which you receive from the Treasury in payment of interest to you on the Treasury issues you hold. Let me implore you to not overlook these basic facts.

A careful analysis of the character of the debt outstanding on the last reported date, May 31, 1946, shows securities maturing within the year, $61,000,000,000, and before January 1, 1952, $124,000,000,000. Optional securities which can be matured June 15, 1946, aggregate $1,800,000,000 additional. And in addition there were the $49,000,000,000 of savings bonds, payable for the most part on the demand of the holder.

Place yourself in the position of the Secretary of the Treasury and ask, "What would a falling bond market mean in the face of such a refunding job?" Again, if the average interest rate on a $270,000,000,000 debt is to be advanced only 1 percent—1 percent of $270,000,000,000 equals $2,700,000,000—every low-income-bracket citizen in this country would be interested in his share of the tax burden incident to such an increase. The public is now acquainted with the effectuation of subsidies on foodstuffs, costs of housing, and other subsidized operations all sold and given to them as emergency measures. The public will go along with the extra budget cost incident to subsidy programs applied to emergency and temporary periods but emphatically protest against being taxed to meet an increased interest burden imposed to carry a deadweight debt primarily held, as to concentrated holdings, by the commercial banks. This is a political fact to which you must give attention.

While the House and the Senate have indicated how far they will now go in restricting the powers and activities of that famous Federal agency—OPA—its demise or liquidation has not yet been effectuated. OPA, with all of its benefits, whatever they may be, and its miseries so arrogantly imposed upon thousands of citizens, is a part of the political inflation-prevention machinery. This agency with its good and its bad is accepted as a Government institution by scores of our radio commentators, columnists, and editorial writers along with many millions of our citizens. Therefore, it is now a part of the machinery of government designed to assist the Federal Reserve Board, the Treasury, and other Government agencies in dampening down the price-rising tendencies resulting from the efforts of the people to momentarily purchase more than the markets offer.

This temporary umbrella now known as OPA will not suffice when the full storm of consumer demand breaks on the markets of this country. More efficacious methods will have to be used. No political party dares longer entirely to depend upon OPA to solve this problem which hovers over the social and economic horizon.

Full employment and greatly increased production under OPA will not necessarily do the job. This because it is sound reasoning to say that if our people now hold a backlog of buying power represented by some $225,000,000,000 that with full employment and great production of peacetime goods the operation will finance itself and under present wage levels the people will further add to their backlog of savings and the potential inflationary base will be expanded—rather than diminished. So, the answer to "potential inflationary activities" will not be found in full employment and production. The "potential" will still be there ready to exert itself (in the absence of additional laws, rules and regulations) as, when and if bad management of the present debt causes the people to lose confidence in the ownership of the dollars they hold and proceed to convert dollar holdings into goods and equities.

In the past, occasions have arisen at which time central banking authorities have curtailed bank credit, advanced interest rates and in this manner precipitated deflation. These steps were taken under the concept of a shortrun purpose.

We have to admit that in most every case the restricted effects of these intended shortrun deflationary forces have gone beyond, in time, the occasioning circumstances. I refer you to the situation in 1920; and in 1929 and in 1937—the latter bringing to us the most precipitous drop in prices, production and employment I believe we have on record.

Upon each of these occasions I have just mentioned, we did not have governing conditions such as prevail today. I refer to the stratified debt; the vast refunding operations which must be constantly faced by the Treasury; the "owned" time and demand deposits the good citizens now hold to their credit in the commercial banks: The additional reserves of the people in the form of currency in hand, Federal Savings Bonds constituting demand calls on the Treasury

and still other reserves to the extent now present.

If these excess (as measured by past aggregates) savings are to be spent for consumers' goods in a period of full employment and production that is one thing. If they are to be invested in this country in buildings, machinery and machine tools for the production of goods for internal and/or external consumption, that is quite a different matter. But large-scale investment plans applicable strictly to the United States or to other countries through the machinery of Bretton Woods have to be made far in advance. Increases in interest rates aggravate your long-run difficulty in inducing the public to invest their savings. Historically, low interest rates have encouraged expansion of productive facilities and caused higher profits to be anticipated. For the Government to again precipitate deflationary forces will greatly affect the market value of long-term Treasury issues as well as other outstanding securities and accentuate the price risks incident to the highest grades of all investment securities.

While during the past several years the lower incomes have been constantly moving upward the political mind will hold that interest-bearing securities are largely held by those classed in the upper and middle income groups. It is true, however, that during the war with full employment, millions of those classed in the lower income brackets acquired some of the savings bonds carrying the highest interest rate of all the Treasury issues placed during the period of the stratification of the present Federal debt. But it can be substantially argued that most of the interest-bearing securities, insurance policies, and deposits in building and loan associations are still today primarily held by those not classed in the lower income groups and that any increase in interest rates will increase, rather than diminish, the present inequality of income between the two groups. Within recent years those who have so strongly advocated the value to the citizen of the social state have made great progress in conditioning the minds of the masses to believe that dollars in the hands of the people whether received from the State through deficit financing or actually earned, stabilize employment and maintain the flow of social income.

It will prove extremely difficult, politically speaking, to again precipitate any kind of a short-run deflationary movement and at the same time avoid the initiation of great public-works programs leading to further deficit financing on the part of the Federal Government covered by low-interest-rate issues. The administration will be sufficiently politically sagacious to recognize how important it will be to have citizens with great savings ready and willing to purchase low-interest Treasury issues; or, in the absence of a willing public to buy the paper for the Treasury to be able to place it with the banks.

We are forced to recognize that for the central banks to greatly restrict credit (in whatever way possible) and bring forth an advance in interest rates that with the banks holding in the neighborhood of $100,000,000,000 of Treasury issues, bank earnings would be appreciably advanced and this would be argued before the public as coming at the cost of the taxpayers (or the Government).

Since the inception of the Federal Reserve Act we have been taught to look to the Reserve authorities for policies pertaining to the quantity and cost of credit. Upon these authorities the law imposed some rather definite responsibilities. Commercial banks and the public during the period 1913 to 1940 watched to see what the Reserve authorities would do.

But during 1945 the already unprecedented money supply in the form of currency and bank deposits increased substantially and chiefly through indirect participation by commercial banks in Treasury financing. Increase in bank loans to business was a minor factor. Total deposits—adjusted to exclude interbank deposits and "float" between banks—plus currency, increased about $24,000,000,000 during the year to approximately $175,000,000,000, compared to $61,000,000,000 at the end of June 1939 before the outbreak of war in Europe, and $78,000,000,000 at the end of 1941 when the United States entered the war. Now let me ask you what the Reserve authorities can actually do with respect to controlling the amount and cost of credit in the face of such a set of conditions?

The public, not being too well informed on the techniques involved in all these banking and currency matters, have a right to assume that the Reserve authorities will act in the interest of the general welfare and that if conditions justify, the authorities will come to the Congress and point out deficiencies or inadequacies in present laws. And, too, the administration in power owes to the public the responsibility of keeping the Congress and the public informed on what new steps, if any, should be taken to protect the Federal Reserve Act and commercial banking generally from any great catastrophe by reason of bad administration or political expediency.

You recall when the term "control of credit conditions" largely carried with it the meaning that the control was to be accomplished through alterations in the rediscount rate and through open-market operations of the Federal Reserve banks. Results obtained were not always exactly as planned or desired but what the banks did, had a very dominating influence in money and capital markets. Now, we have very dissimilar conditions. The management of the present debt makes it quite impossible for the Federal Reserve to function as it once did. We shall have to give some attention to this fact.

It is my frank opinion that the time is now ripe for some drastic changes in the framework of our monetary system and I trust we shall not have to wait too long for the recommendations from the Board and the administration.

In referring to the increased supply of money it is well for us to bear in mind what we read in the January Monthly Review of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York which said "since early in 1942 the great expansion in bank credit, the accompanying growth in the money supply in the form of bank deposits and currency, and the continued low interest rates have been made possible chiefly by an expansion of Federal Reserve credit which has lifted the total loans and investments of the Federal Reserve banks from less than $2,500,000,000 to nearly $25,000,000,000".

The administration determined the cheap money policy. The Federal Reserve, in war time, was duty bound to go along. Some may claim that the Treasury did not make money cheap and plentiful or that the Treasury could not do such a thing—that it had to be done by the Federal Reserve alone. Well, in my opinion, such reasoning can well afford to be questioned at this particular moment because we are sufficiently informed to know that the Treasury has some views about this cheap money and low interest program which do not exactly conform to the views of the Board.

It is not possible for me to feel that the commercial banks are entirely responsible for this cheap money policy as some claim they have supported it without any particular protest. It appears to me that one is on sound ground when he claims that (1) the administration did not want to ask for taxes that would more substantially finance the war expenditures; (2) that the administration had for many years advocated deficits and low interest rates; (3) that the Administration did want a stratified debt; (4) that the Administration did expect the commercial banks to stand by and be ready to take the excess of any offering not subscribed for by individuals and other investors other than the commercial banks. The commercial banks had no other choice as their functions are such they could not possibly go on strike in wartime and refuse to buy Government's securities, especially, after excess reserves had been provided through the Federal Reserve going along with the administration and providing the reserves for the use of the commercial banks.

Upon every occasion and at every opportunity you can make, you should, as a banking institution point out that during the war you voluntarily did practically everything in your power to persuade your depositors to draw down their deposits and purchase the issues offered by the Treasury. You rendered valiant service without any cost to the Government—the costs being absorbed by your operating revenues. Had you not gone along with the general program it would have necessitated the direct absorption by the Federal Reserve banks of the Government securities with consequent direct money inflation: The Government's war needs had to be met (once the policy was established) in any event, and this you should make known to the public.

The public does not understand what has happened. If you come to my bank and arrange a loan, we credit your account with the amount of money borrowed. You, of course, can proceed to draw checks against that credit and circulate those checks as money. But dealing with you as an individual, our bank must maintain a reserve against your deposit. Possibly our bank may have to borrow from the Reserve bank or sell securities to obtain the necessary and required reserves against our deposits, however created. But our bank and your banks faithfully supported the program of the Government. We acted as the residual underwriters of the Federal deficits.

Now, with the banks having gone along and with the December 31, 1945, figures on all insured commercial banks showing "all other loans (than real-estate loans) including overdrafts" aggregating only $21,000,000,000 and "United States obligations, direct and guaranteed," of $89,000,000,000, we have many who propose that the war loans made by the banks to the Government, or say a major part of them, be frozen in the banks at a nominal rate of interest fixed by the Treasury. Time will not permit a discussion of the many proposals and the most that we can do is just mention some of them.

Following the Civil War the country moved in under the influence of rigid bond-secured currency. About 33 years ago we launched ourselves on the sea of the Federal Reserve Act. The Federal Reserve Act was promoted and intended to give us some relief through providing an elastic currency that would meet the demands of our industry, agriculture, and people generally.

The question has been raised, "Shall we now box the compass?" and freeze the debt of the Second World War into the banks and thus return to a bond-secured currency again? Some economists would have this very thing occur.

Shall the legal reserves required to be kept by the member banks with the Federal Reserve be materially increased? Will greatly increased legal reserve requirements suffice with respect to meeting the public's demand for some kind of inflation prevention? What seeds are now being sown by the administration in "conditioning" the minds of the people to believe that inflation can be prevented by legislation or by agencies of the Government exercising vast powers over the investing, buying, selling, and saving activities of the citizens?

Would reserve requirements apply equally to all banks? They would not.

Are the Federal Reserve banks in a position to raise the central bank's discount rate to a level sufficiently high to precipitate a radical

drop in the price level, contract credit and currency, and curtail imports and exports and materially control employment? Well, as I have pointed out, we today have conditions very dissimilar to those which governed when the central bank could so effectively operate. With more or less fear evident; with famine cries spreading over the world; with prices reaching a point where the desire to spend is being dampened down, with some of these lessons taught to our people by the recent strikes, with the public generally becoming a little more discriminating in its purchasing, just how far do we dare go in repeating the scarce-money experiments of years past?

Possibilities can be found in the proposed long-term, low-coupon bond that would be restricted specifically for bank portfolios if joined with certain tax-exempt privileges. If the bonds were totally exempt from taxation as to both principal and income and applicable to all banks irrespective of the total earnings of the holding bank that would be one proposition. On the other hand, if bonds are to be only partially tax-exempt as to income many complications can well enter the consideration of issuing such securities. The income exempt from taxes might be a stated percentage of the gross or net amount of the individual institution's earnings; or a percentage of the gross or net income applicable to Government issues only as separated from the income from other investments and income of the bank in question. If banks could be induced, by mutually beneficial arrangements, to hold a very great percentage of the total floating debt of the Federal Government and at the same time lower the interest burden and reduce the possibility of quick changes in the relation of near money debt and currency or deposits under the control of the individual citizens, we might greatly benefit thereby. The need for great flexibility in the management of Federal finances may force us into some interesting and new policies and procedure.

There are also possibilities in the proposal to permit banks to make capital loans (provided funds used for such purposes are segregated) out of undistributed earnings on a less restricted of supervised basis than those investments made, the major purpose of which is to protect depositors' funds. Somewhere down the line, and let us hope not too far distant, banks should be able to increase their capital accounts through sale of stock to the public. Certainly a drastic reduction in bank earnings due to Treasury policy will not be conducive to inducing the public to acquire new stock issues offered by the banks.

Legislation to absolutely prohibit banks from acquiring marketable Federal securities other than directly from the Treasury or the Federal Reserve banks may be, by someone, introduced. In the event the Budget is not balanced, or brought sufficient near to balance to just accommodate the investment, in new issues, of Government trust funds, we might find that it will be utterly impracticable, if not economically impossible, to impose such restrictions on bank portfolios. After all, if the Congress makes the appropriations, someone must purchase the Treasury issues put forth to finance the appropriations unless we wish to resort to direct central bank or printing-press financing. There is not much, if any, difference.

If changes are made in the law permitting banks to invest all legal reserve requirements in Treasury short-term, low-income issues, that, too, might afford a chance to further reduce the rate of interest without materially adversely affecting the earnings of banks.

If one strictly pursues the possibilities within the range of modified taxation as applied to bank earnings and all as related to encouraging banks to carry a large portion of the Federal debt—long-term or short-term—there are innumerable suggestions that might be made—some of which could prove very helpful.

And it may be that we face many changes in our service-charges policy. Should an administration that is in power find that public policy calls for retrenchment in the making of loans by commercial banks and at the same time determines that the total interest rate on the Federal debt must be reduced with the banks holding the greater percentage of the outstanding Treasury issues, we may find that banks will be forced to greatly increase their service charges in order to maintain the amount of bank earnings required to protect these necessary institutions. So long as the banks do not know just what the Federal policy is to be, they are in no position to materially increase or decrease service charges. As in the field of transportation and communication, the business of banking is sufficiently related to the public interest to prevent any administration, under monetary and fiscal conditions such as now govern, from overlooking the importance service charges may play in the coming and immediate years.

Finally, we have reason to assume that in 1945–46 we have, for the present era, witnessed the top in total commercial bank earnings. Many will be surprised if the calendar year 1946 gives as great net returns as related to total capital as the banks enjoyed in calendar year 1945. But assume this current year ranks higher, in earnings after taxes, than did last year, we certainly have no reason to assume that 1947 will equal either 1945 or 1946.

Therefore, under the many and varied problems which we now have and which are so directly or indirectly related to the management of the present debt and the Government's over-all fiscal policy, I must conclude that the subject we have here so briefly considered is one to which banks and the Government must give prompt and serious and constructive consideration.

The Case for a 65-Cent Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 12, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article I have prepared entitled "The Case for a 65-Cent Minimum Wage":

I

It is high time that Congress raised the worn-out wage floor which was first laid by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. That law set a floor of 25 cents an hour for the first year and 30 cents an hour for the next 5 years. Industry committees during this time could recommend and the Administrator of the act could approve higher wages in certain industries up to 40 cents an hour. By October 1945, however, the 40-cent minimum was to go into effect in all covered employments unless the Administrator found that it would create undue unemployment. Since 40 hours was also prescribed as the basic working week, this meant that the minimum standard weekly wage rate was $10 for the first year, $12 for the next 5 years, and $16 a week thereafter. On the basis of a full 52 weeks of employment during the year, this came to full time yearly rates of $520, $624, and $832 respectively.

In practice, by the recommendations of the industry committees, wages were raised in many industries before 1941 beyond the 30-cent mark and in some cases up to the full 40 cents. After our entrance into the war, industry after industry was put upon the 40-cent basis until, by the end of 1944, there were no less than 21,000,000 workers who were guaranteed this minimum.

It is encouraging to note that almost none of the gloomy predictions which were made by the original opponents of the act ever materialized. While the rulings raised the wages of several million of the lowest paid workers, there is little evidence that any unemployment was so caused. In many cases the raising of the basic wage forced the employers to improve their ways of production so that labor costs per unit of output (which is far more significant from an employer's viewpoint than are wages per hour) did not in these instances advance. It is, of course, true however that the increase in the basic wages took place in a period during which both production and prices were advancing and that from 1941 on, the system floated in on a tide of advancing prosperity. But it is also true that this was not the case during the first 2 years of its operation and that wage increases occurred then without having harmful effects upon either employment or the prosperity of the employers. I have never heard, for example, that the textile, tobacco, or timber industries, which had been fearful of the act, were injured by its application.

As the first period of the act drew to a close, it was evident that a further increase in the basic wage was absolutely necessary. Both living costs and production per capita had increased so rapidly that the existing provision that the minimum should not be above 40 cents an hour was obsolete. This was shown by the ruling of the War Labor Board in early 1945 that employers could increase wages up to 55 cents an hour without approval of the Board. While not declaring that 55 cents was an adequate minimum, this rule did show that any wage less than this amount was substandard.

As a result, an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act was drafted by progressive-minded Senators and Congressmen and was introduced in the Senate (S. 1349) on August 1 of last year by Senator PEPPER and others and by a number of Congressmen in the lower House. Hearings on this bill were held before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor and by the House Committee on Labor, and on March 5 of this year an amended bill was reported out by a majority of the Senate committee and was considered on the floor of that House. This bill provided that during the first 2 years there should be a flat minimum of 65 cents an hour in the covered industries. This was to increase to 70 cents during the next 2 years, and at the end of this second period, or 4 years after the effective date of the act, the minimum was to rise to 75 cents. During these 4 years, however, the minimum could be raised in certain industries up to 75 cents an hour by the procedures governing industry committees. In the discussions of the act in the upper House opposition centered on three points: (1) One group believed that the wages provided were too high and that the minimum should instead start at 55 cents an hour and then after a period of 18 months rise to 60 cents; (2) some also believed that the coverage should be so restricted as to exempt transportation and the first processing of farm and fishery products; (3) a further group believed that a revision of the farm-parity formula should be added to the bill in order to include the cost of farm labor, including that of operators and their families. This was urged as a necessary counterpart for farm families of the increases provided in S. 1349 for the lower-paid industrial workers.

From a study of the Senate debates on this subject, it is clear that the sponsors of the bill thought that they could not get a ma-

jority for the 65–70–75-cent scale. They compromised with the advocates of a 55-cent base and secured the approval by the Senate of a flat 60-cent minimum but with no further increases thereafter. This was not to go into effect until 9 months after the passage of the act. Then, however, the farm-parity bloc won a majority for their particular amendment in spite of President Truman's warning that if it were included in the act he would veto it. At this point the minimum was raised again from 60 to 65 cents. The bill will soon come before the House of Representatives. Everyone familiar with the facts must conclude that a very large increase in the basic minimum is necessary from nearly all points of view. Certainly I cannot believe that anyone would dare to argue publicly that the present 40-cent minimum should be continued, and yet this is just what will happen if we do not take some action.

II

A very large increase in the basic wage is necessary for at least the following six reasons:

1. The rise in the cost of living requires the basic wage to be greatly increased.

Since 1938, when the act was passed, the cost of living index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows an increase of 30 percent. Even on this basis the 40-cent minimum has only the purchasing power which 31 cents had at that time. But in fact this index has some defects which, as the representatives of labor have pointed out, understates the actual price increases for working-class families. Among these hidden increases are (a) the disappearance of loss leaders or goods sold at less-than-standard prices in order to attract trade. These were of special aid to the low-income groups. (b) Sales of goods at above OPA prices. In spite of sincere efforts by the OPA, there are many open and secret violations of its maximum price rules. It would be naive to believe that businessmen would report or the agents of the Bureau of Labor Statistics be able to measure many of these excess charges. (c) Just as during the war, there was an upgrading of workers so was there also an "uptrading" of goods. This was a shift of production from low-price and low-profit lines of production to higher priced and higher profit lines. While the OPA has made valiant efforts to check this practice, the method is so tricky that it is hard to detect. This practice is especially marked in the field of clothing, house furnishings, etc., but it can also be used in the case of packaged groceries. It falls with special hardship upon the wage earners and low-income groups since they are the ones who would buy the lower priced lines of goods. (d) Finally, there is the matter of quality deterioration. We all know that clothes and shoes do not wear as long now as they did before and that colors run more readily. This same tendency exists in other types of goods as well.

I certainly do not question the competence, good faith, or the integrity of the officials of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In my judgment they have done their best in a very difficult task. But taken altogether, these hidden increases should make us realize that this index understates the actual increase which has taken place. It is difficult to figure how much should be allowed for this. Some authorities think the error does not exceed 3 or 4 percent—but there are others who believe it is much more. In any event these concealed increases should require some added increases in the minimum hourly wage. It should also be remembered that the low wage worker pays a Federal income tax today which he did not do in 1938. It seems probable that 55 cents an hour is only about the equivalent of the 40 cents of 1939.

2. The great increase in average productivity should lead with safety to an increase in the "real" minimum hourly rate.

While the minimum paid for an hour's work must be increased if the low-paid worker is to buy as much with an hour's work as the framers of the original act had intended, there is also need to increase the money wages by more than this amount so that the workers at the bottom may buy more with each hour of work. This is because the real national income has itself shown a tremendous advance. The national gross income when measured in 1944 dollars rose from one hundred and twelve billions in 1939 to one hundred and ninety-nine billions in 1944. Since 45,600,000 workers were gainfully employed in the former year, and 63,200,000 in the latter, this meant that the average real per capita product increased during these 6 years from $2,450 to $3,140. This was an advance of 28 percent. This is with dollars of constant purchasing power and with price trends eliminated. Part of this increase was undoubtedly attributable to the greater number of hours worked per week by employed workers and some was also due to the shift to mass-production industries turning out war goods. But after making full allowance for these factors, it is clear that there was a real increase in the average over-all output per man-hour worked. This increase is shown by the fact that while industries are now (June 1946) almost reconverted to peace and the working hours are much shorter than they were during the war, industrial output is about 60 percent above its 1935–39 level and civilian production is at the rate of $150,000,000,000 a year.

In fact, over long periods of time, total production has tended to increase by from 3 to 4 percent a year and the number of workers by a little over 1 percent, so that the average per capita increase has tended to be from 2 to 3 percent. Since hours worked per week have been reduced appreciably, hourly output has risen even more sharply. Thus average hourly output in manufacturing in 1945 was approximately four times what it had been in 1906 or on the average had doubled every 20 years.

If with the output which prevailed in 1938, a wage of 40 cents an hour could then have been sound, with our much greater output of today a much higher net wage can be sustained. This would mean that if 40 cents was correct in 1938 and 1939, more than 55 cents would be correct today. Allowing for a growth rate of only 3 percent a year, this would indicate that a 65-cent minimum would be about as fair in 1946 as 40 cents had been 8 years ago. It is certainly only just that as the country progresses, the low-priced workers should at the very least keep step with the general advance.

3. The cost of maintaining a bare minimum standard of living requires large increases in the basic wage.

It is too bad that the Bureau of Labor Statistics has not yet finished its survey of the cost of living for families of various sizes in a number of different cities on various levels of living. Opinions of course differ as to what families need. One method is to work out the physical quantities of food, clothing, furnishings, housing, fuel, and services needed in a year for families of various sizes and then to price these commodities and services. Then if the families were all to spend their money for these items and for nothing else, an income equal in amount to these totals could be considered adequate. These studies could be made for various levels of living such as bare emergency, maintenance, maintenance plus, comfort, and so on.

But since people in practice do not spend their money with the cold-blooded efficiency of a high-salaried purchasing agent buying raw materials for a factory, there is a second test which can be made. This is the point at which families on the average break even and neither put away savings in nor go into debt. This standard takes men as they are and not as budget experts believe they should be. The best general evidence we have concerning the first test is the budget developed by the WPA in 1935–36 and priced in 34 large cities. These budgets were conservatively drawn and at December 1941 prices showed an average cost of around $1,500 with a gap of about 15 percent between the lowest and highest cost cities. In view of the recent increase in living costs, it seems fair to estimate these costs at not far from $1,800 to $2,000 today.

On the other hand, the Bureau of Labor Statistics in its study of Family Spending and Saving in Wartime (Bulletin 882) found that in 1944 the average break-even point for families of four persons was $2,180. With these figures as very rough standards, let us now compare what the 65-cent minimum would give the workers. At this hourly rate, the weekly figure for 40 hours work would be $26. If the workers were then employed for every week during the year—which few will be—their yearly earnings would amount to only $1,352. After making all allowances for (a) somewhat lower living costs in the smaller cities and the differences here are by no means as great as is commonly believed, and (b) those cases where the workers do not have a family of four dependent upon them, is it not obvious that such a yearly income of $1,352 is in fact about as little as we should give to able-bodied workers? Such a minimum would permit millions of workers and their wives and children to have a more decent life. The health of the people would be bettered, infant mortality would be reduced, home life would be happier, and we would have a better-educated citizenry.

4. A large increase in the basic minimum is needed to absorb the huge volume of mass-production goods which industry and agriculture in this country can turn out.

There is now no doubt of the tremendous productive powers of our industry and agriculture. But who is going to buy these mass-production goods? That requires mass consumption and mass consumption requires decent wages for the great masses of economically submerged workers. From the standpoint of general self-interest alone, therefore, employers and farmers should favor higher wages for these low-paid workers in order to find a greater market for their products. If the minimum were raised, there would be a much greater demand for milk, butter, cheese, fruits, vegetables, meats, and a host of agricultural products. There would be a greater demand for more clothing and for better housing. Dentists would have more work, and more books and newspapers would be read. The good effects would spread through most sections of our country. This increased purchasing power would also give greater stability to demand and reduce the dangers of future depressions.

Conservatives sometimes reply to this argument and say that if the employers were permitted to get higher profits out of low wages, then they would also spend or invest it, and so give as much employment to labor. There are at least two faults in this reasoning: First, to the degree that the employers spent these sums, it would largely go for luxuries. But the great mass-production industries are geared for mass-consumption goods, and to divert the market from them to luxuries would strike a blow at the organized and highly capitalistic sector of business. Secondly, while the wealthy save a large part of their incomes, these savings at times stay in banks and do not flow out as investments. When this occurs, there is a break in the economic mechanism, demand falls off, and unemployment results. Higher

wages to the lower-paid workers would, on the other hand, give a continuing and more stable demand and so create a more stable economy.

5. A large increase in the hourly rates of the poorer paid workers is needed to keep them in balance with the wages of skilled and unionized labor.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the average hourly earnings of factory workers in January of this year were almost exactly $1 per hour. Since this average includes the low-paid workers, the higher paid and skilled workers received more than this figure. The average for the steel mills was $1.09, for machine-shop workers $1.14, for locomotive shops $1.23. Since January there have been further wage increases to millions of organized workers amounting to from 16½ to 18½ cents an hour.

It is to the credit of the labor organizations of this country that while looking out for their members, they have not neglected the low-paid and unorganized workers. The unions have not been content with letting the unorganized remain on a low level with hourly rates of from only one-third to two-fifths of the rate for skilled labor but by backing the movement to increase minimum wages have also sought to bring the less fortunate up closer to them. This is desirable from every point of view.

6. An increase in minimum hourly wage rates is also desirable as an offset against the fall in weekly earnings caused by the shortened number of hours worked.

During the war when the 48-hour week or more was general, the workers were commonly paid time and a half for all hours over 40. This meant that they received 52 hours' pay for 48 hours' work. Even the 40-cent-an-hour man or woman who worked 48 hours then received $20.80 per week while the 50-cent-an-hour worker received $26. When the hours were cut to 40, the weekly earnings were cut to $16 and $20 respectively. This was a severe loss. It should also be noted that the cost to employers for each hour worked was also reduced by 2 cents an hour or from 42 to 40 and from 52 to 50 cents. Since more can be turned out per hour over periods of time on a 40-hour week than on 48 hours, this has meant a still further reduction in labor cost per unit of output. It is only fair that labor should get some of these gains by an increase in the base hourly rate.

For all these reasons, I believe the evidence is clear that a large increase in the minimum wage is needed and that a 65-cent minimum would be fair both to labor and capital. I hope that both Congress and the country may see the problem in this light. I also hope the situation will not be confused by injecting the farm-parity proposals into the minimum-wage bill. That issue should be considered separately in dealing with agricultural prices but nothing is to be gained by including it in the wage measure. Incidentally, it should be realized that any such parity measure would not directly benefit hired farm labor but would merely raise farm prices. It would thus benefit the landowners rather than the hired workers.

But in turn, if and when the minimum is so raised, I hope that labor will cooperate with management to raise production in the low-wage industries and thus help to overcome some of the difficulties which may arise. I have full faith that if labor is decently treated and paid, it will so respond. If this happens we may look forward to the opening up of a fuller life for those at the bottom of the industrial ladder. The proposed measure will be good for them and their families; it will be good for industry in general, and it will be good for the communities of this Nation and for the country itself.

California's Housing Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I append to my remarks a telegram from Gov. Earl Warren, of California, to President Truman regarding the tremendous increase in population of over 2,000,000 people in the State of California.

The appended telegram analyzes the increased immigration of veterans and the need for additional housing:

TELEGRAM TO PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN AND WILSON W. WYATT

JUNE 13, 1946.

California's housing problems have been a matter of great concern to the State Government for more than 2 years, but the sphere of State authority is limited in developing solutions. The California Legislature has recognized the problem, has appropriated funds to aid housing construction, and has recommended congressional consideration of measures designed to alleviate the shortage. Within the past month, we have held a series of conferences—one designed to assure a supply of timber to the mills in California forest areas, and the other to develop essential facts about current shortages in critical materials. From our studies of the situation, the following facts emerge:

1. California's needs for more housing are greater than those of any other State because (a) California now has 2,000,000 more population and over 600,000 more families than were reported by the 1940 census. This far exceeds the numerical population growth of any other State during the same period. (b) California has more than 900,000 demobilized veterans of World War II, of whom nearly 300,000 came from other States.

2. In recognition of California's needs, its home builders received priorities to June 7 for 89,200 homes under the priorities assistance program. This is equivalent to about 15 percent of the national total and is the largest allotment to any State.

3. Actual construction depends upon increasing the supplies of materials and equipment available to builders. It is the opinion of those who have studied the situation that only about 20 percent of the critical materials required for home building in California are now being provided for such construction. For lack of materials, between 10,000 and 14,000 homes remain unfinished in the Los Angeles area, and from 5,000 to 7,000 homes are standing unfinished in the San Francisco Bay area. Completion of these homes and construction of additional needed housing requires the channeling of more construction materials to our builders.

To expedite construction of homes so urgently needed in California for veterans and civilians alike, I respectfully urge:

1. That nails and cement be immediately added to the critical materials covered under HH priorities.

2. That at least 50 percent of all critical construction materials allocated to the Pacific-coast area be definitely channeled into housing for this area.

3. That a substantial portion of the $400,000,000 subsidy for housing materials recently provided by the Congress, and approved by you,[1] be allocated to California manufacturers to increase the supply of critical materials that are essential for veteran housing construction in this State.

4. That except for the retention of a 90-day supply to be used for maintenance purposes only, all building material now in the Pacific Coast States, in possession of the armed forces, the War Assets Corporation, and other Federal agencies, be retained in this area and not be stock-piled or shipped elsewhere but be made immediately available solely to builders of veteran housing.

EARL WARREN,
Governor of California.

[1] In telegram to Wilson W. Wyatt, this clause read "and approved by the President."

Contribution to Confusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the recent attitude exhibited by President Truman, regarding the management-labor situation, is the strongest evidence of the confusion that has resulted following his fence-straddeling performance. When the President made a personal appearance before the joint session, coming from a conference in which the strike against the Government was under discussion, and in which conference he had attempted to act as mediator, he was determined to do something fo. the people and the country. All are now entirely familiar with the demands which he made. His voice had hardly become stilled, in the House Chamber, when the majority leader [JOHN MCCORMICK] introduced the bill which the President wanted introduced and passed. His measure was passed by a very large majority. The President knew, or he should have known, what was necessary at that time. He made the positive assertion that such legislation was necessary. The measure which he sponsored was very rigid and forceful. A much milder bill had already passed in the House, and was then before the Senate—the so-called Case bill—which the Senate passed very quickly, and the House agreed to the Senate amendments, and that bill was sent to the President. Every American is aware of the attitude the President took respecting that measure—he vetoed it. It is doubted, by many, that any other act has depressed the American people, and the honest laboring men and women, and the veterans, as has that one act of the President. The laboring people want to work—the returned veterans want to continue their work—but when a stoppage is authorized against our own Government, and that policy is sanctioned by the President, or at least he appears to desire no action taken thereon, our country is left in a sad and sorry state. Confusion—utter confusion—is the result. Our people do not know what to do, and they do not know what they should do, under the circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, fairness to both labor and management is all that the American people want—and that is all that labor

wants, and that is the policy that management wants. Any other program keeps everyone out of step, and our country can make progress only when our people are satisfied, contended, and work in unison and in harmony.

A very interesting and enlightening editorial appeared in the Indianapolis News, of recent date, which I ask unanimous consent that the same may be printed herewith, and as a part hereof, in the Appendix of the RECORD, which I hope all may take the time to read. The editorial follows:

CONTRIBUTION TO CONFUSION

The atmosphere of confusion and conflict in Washington has been increased by President Truman's veto of the Case bill. By rejecting the only constructive attempt to date to solve the Nation's labor problem, a measure that was passed by an overwhelming majority in both Houses of Congress and has the support of the American public, the President now must assume full personal responsibility for any strikes and strife that may lie ahead. By rejecting what was intended to be a moderate measure to restore the industrial balance between labor and management, he exposes labor to the danger of more stringent restrictions later on.

The President, by inference, at least, admits the necessity for corrective legislation when he says in his veto message: "Where excesses have developed on the part of labor leaders or management, such excesses should be corrected—not in order to injure either party—but to bring about as great an equality as possible between the bargaining positions of labor and management. Neither should be permitted to become too powerful as against the public interest as a whole."

Anyone at all familiar with recent events must recognize that excesses have developed, that the bargaining positions of labor and management, under the Wagner law, are nowhere nearly equal, and that the Petrillos, Lewises, and Whitneys not only have become too powerful as against the public interest but have done a great disservice to the cause of labor. It was exactly for that reason that the Case bill was drawn and passed. Yet, while recognizing the need, the President rejects the remedy.

Nor does he have anything of a constructive nature to offer as an immediate alternative—except for the emergency labor-draft legislation that certainly goes far beyond anything contemplated in the Case bill. His only suggestion is the phrase oft-repeated in his message "a comprehensive study."

That is a convenient device, but certainly not a solution. It is dictated by political expediency, and is an abdication of effective leadership. It only adds to the confusion.

The American people recognize that something must be done if the Nation's economic machinery ever is to get rolling in uninterrupted production. The need is now; the house is burning and the President, in effect, has said to the firemen, "Now, let's just sit down and study the situation."

The present situation could have been, and was, foreseen a year ago. Mr. Truman might have started comprehensive study at that time. Instead, he let matters drift and used the power of his administration to oppose all efforts to consider the problem.

As a result leadership has fallen from his hands and he cannot regain it by this futile gesture. It is doubtful if any joint committee could develop much in the way of facts not already brought out in the 265 days of hearing and the 23,000 printed pages of testimony that produced the Case bill. So the comprehensive study can only be regarded as an effort to sidestep the issue and to appease labor sentiment that has turned against Mr. Truman. It will not appease an American public that sees clearly that something more than a congressional investigation is necessary. Mr. Truman has attempted to turn back the clock. It is too late for that.

Ceiling on Red Tape

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 10, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed editorial certainly calls the turn of Government red tape. The facts set forth in this editorial should be studied by all Members of the House. Under leave previously granted to extend my remarks, I am inserting at this point editorial in question:

[From the Evansville Review]

A CEILING ON RED TAPE

Regardless of whether the Emergency Price Control Act is renewed or abandoned, something must be done to put a ceiling on red tape issuing from OPA. The variety trade, which accounts for a tremendous volume of retail sales in the United States, must abide by thousands of confusing orders. Following is a summation of them as of March 1, 1946:

First of all, there is the general maximum price regulation, to which there have been 66 amendments. There are 15 supplementary regulations under the GMPR and 390 amendments thereto affecting goods and services sold through the variety trade. There is a maximum import regulation, and nine amendments, all of which are potentially of interest to the variety trade. There are 268 numbered price regulations, with 2,506 amendments covering goods and services sold through the variety trade. There are four food product regulations that affect the thousands of variety stores that have soda fountains, luncheonettes, and food departments, and these four food regulations now include 25 supplements with 97 amendments. There are 3 procedural regulations with 12 amendments which variety stores as well as other retailers and business concerns must observe. There are 39 supplementary orders with 131 amendments that directly cover goods and services sold through the variety trade. There are three general orders with six amendments. The total of these regulations, orders, amendments, and interpretations is 3,676.

But in addition to these there have also been 11,848 individual orders, of which half, or more probably two-thirds, affect either the purchase costs or the selling prices, or both, of goods handled in variety stores.

Finally, the OPA has issued and is issuing a large number of individual orders that are not even printed in the Federal Register, known as letter orders. These orders authorize prices in individual cases of manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers. There have been hundreds, perhaps thousands, of them. The variety trade is concerned with every one of these letter orders that fixes a price for one of its members, its sources of supply, or its competitors.

The variety trade which was affected by a mere 800 regulations, orders, amendments, and interpretations back in April 1944 was on March 1, 1946, affected by 3,576 general regulations, orders, amendments, and interpretations. If one may include the individual orders listed in the Federal Register, not to mention the letter orders issued to individual concerns that are not even printed in the Federal Register, the present number of regulations, orders, amendments, and official interpretations that do concern the variety trade is in excess of 8,000, 10 times the number reported in 1944.

Final Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop from the Washington Times-Herald of June 16, 1946:

FINAL WARNING

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

So many professors and heavy thinkers are busy all the time trying to force the United States to give away its power that when a really distinguished one says something to the contrary, it's important news.

Important because professors have stepped outside the classroom and become politicians. Consider how much influence Felix Frankfurter has on your personal life.

Here was a little fellow who came to this country when he was 12 years old, worked hard and became a teacher of law at Harvard University. He was just one among many.

But he had inside him a drive for power that nothing could stifle. He used that drive first to educate a generation of lawyers to think his way. Then he busied himself getting his crop of one-pattern thinkers into our Government.

Today, Frankfurter agents are everywhere in key positions to influence United States policy, and Frankfurter himself sits on the Supreme Court as their guide and master.

He is undoubtedly the most powerful single individual in the United States because his mind controls so many other minds which in turn control the lives and property of millions.

His power is a terrible thing because Frankfurter is not for America first. But that's another story. We mention him today only to remind you that when you laugh at the idea of a college professor as a real force in the world you're kidding nobody but yourself.

And so, consider the pattern of professors who are working to give away the keys to America's scientific and financial power.

It wasn't until about 1920 that professors in this country got that way. But a great number of them got bit about that time with the bug of communism. They saw Communist Russia as the land of ideal virtue in which all the energies of mankind would be concentrated for good and greed and poverty would fade away.

They saw it wrong, for all such claims by Communists were just campaign oratory. But the proof came too late.

For, like Frankfurter, they educated a generation to their way of thinking. These professors made "capitalist" a cuss word and "socialist" a word associated with everything good. They even got many a capitalist to sighing that socialism would be wonderful if we could only bridge over to it peacefully.

Sure, and if wishes were horses, beggars could ride.

It happens that Communist Russia is exhibit A in proof that the bridge is never made in peace, and that peace does not arrive even after you cross the bridge in violence.

For the Communist reign in Russia has been from its beginning down to date one unbroken, bloody civil war. The Russians have never stopped shooting one another in their struggle for power.

Not even when they were fighting Germany did they stop. Did you know about the 200,000 Communist soldiers who joined Hitler against Stalin?

Well, it's a fact. Ask your professors about it sometime and if they deny it, this writer will be glad to cite the evidence. Our State Department has the whole story.

But the Russia-lovers go on plugging for the United States of America to give away its power to Russia on the ground that Russia is working only for good.

So it is interesting and important to know that at last a swing has started away from that "nutty" notion—and among the professors, too.

William Yandell Elliott, professor of history at Felix Frankfurter's Harvard, and Vice Chairman of the War Production Board here during the war, deserves the thanks of all good Americans for challenging the Russia-lovers.

Speaking at Whitefield, N. H., before the New England Council, on Friday night last, Elliott came out in opposition to giving Russia either scientific information or money "loans." Said Elliott:

"It is perfectly clear that Russia is bending her energies not to satisfying the enormous needs of her own people and those of her satellite states for improved living standards but to building up the industrial and scientific resources for harnessing atomic energy to war.

"There are today very few people so naive as to imagine that when Russia gets atomic energy in amounts adequate for military use the rulers of Russia will be restrained by the same considerations which make it unlikely that we will ever use the atom bomb, except in retaliation and then perhaps too late.

"Russia has asked for $6,000,000,000, as I know myself from the highest authority, Generalissimo Stalin, himself. * * *"

For what? Says Elliott: "For war." That is a terrible, and final warning.

If we finance Russia for atom war, that will be the end.

Here's hoping Professor Elliott repeats this warning early and often in Washington, until he rattles Frankfurter's teeth.

The Mariners' Museum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, all Members of the House and other persons interested in an American merchant marine will find the Mariners' Museum located about 4 miles north of Newport News, Va., extremely interesting and highly instructive. Nothing equal to it may be found elsewhere in the United States. It is about 175 miles from Washington, D. C., and slightly under 75 miles on route 60, the main highway from Richmond to Newport News, Va. The article inserted below is a graphic description, but to be fully appreciated the museum needs to be seen. One can spend days in the museum if he so desires, but with a few hours he can learn much and enjoy every minute.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I append an article published in April 1946 issue of the Tiller, a monthly magazine published in Newport News, Va., entitled "A Sailorman's Paradise, the Mariners' Museum," by Jacque LaTour. The article follows and is reprinted by permission from the Tiller magazine:

A SAILORMAN'S PARADISE—THE MARINERS' MUESUM

(By Jacque LaTour)

Turning off highway route 60, some 4 miles north of Newport News, Va., onto Cedar Lane, a lovely highway arched with knarled and twisted old cedar trees, enhances the approach to the James River and the impounded waters of Lake Maury. As the road turns north to follow the river upstream, the landscape spreads open into a panorama of Virginia pine, cedar, and dogwood trees against a backdrop of blue sky. On a high knoll, facing the junction of the James River and Lake Maury, and flanked by little Kettle Pond, stands an immense monument whose inscription reads, "Devoted to the Culture of the Sea and its Tributaries, its Conquest by Man and its Influence on Civilization." Thus one enters into another world, for directly ahead through the parkway can be seen first the old ship weathervane, then the gray brick front of the Mariners' Museum.

Situated within this park area of some 800 acres, the museum was established by Archer M. Huntington in 1930. Within its walls are exhibits and trophies of the sea that have been gathered from the four corners of the world. Keeping pace with the material exhibits, a nautical library was established which now contains in excess of 23,000 volumes devoted to maritime subjects. This includes many old manuscripts, early books, ship logbooks, as well as the most modern magazines and technical books. The library also cares for thousands upon thousands of photographs.

Anchors of various types and sizes adorn the exterior walls of the museum buildings. Flanking the front entrance are a pair of ancient bronze cannon which formerly guarded a Cuban fortress. On entering the lobby, one finds sufficient material to fill a small museum. There are large steering wheels that tower above the visitor, tall binnacles of the days of wooden ships, and running lights which shone at night for guidance of the lofty old grayhounds of the sea. Passing through the electric doors, one enters the great main room.

Assembled here are ships' figureheads, mounted on the walls, and a collection of oil paintings and watercolors depicting a variety of subjects of maritime interest. Table and wall cases contain ship models ranging all the way from Fulton's *Clermont* to the massive *Berengaria* and the new liner *America*. There are cases filled with navigational instruments from ancient astrolabes to modern radio compasses, chronometers that date back into the eighteenth century, and barometers of all ages and types. An excellent collection is on exhibit of salvage material taken from vessels sunk during the Yorktown siege in 1781.

The north wing, or the newest section of the building, contains a priceless collection of lithographs and oil paintings, as well as a number of ship models and china.

Another section of the museum has an interesting display of scrimshaw, the artistic skill of the days of Moby Dick. Four years was the usual full whaling voyage, and whether it was greasy luck or not, the men found opportunity between spells to carve and decorate teeth from the captured denizens of the deep. Jagging wheels of the housewives at Nantucket to crimp the edges of the pies; scrimshaw ivory headed canes from the backbone of fish, to carry in style during the days ashore, are on display. In this same room are several cases of small arms, and the walls also are covered with all types of early flintlock guns. Two cases are filled with beautiful sea shells, and another with Bristol glass that never fails to thrill the lady visitor. Then there are the displays of wood and material from such famous ships as the HMS *Bounty* of mutiny fame, the *Constitution*, and others.

A long wing adjoining the Library is filled to the roof with similar objects waiting their turn to go on display. All material is carefully cataloged, photographed, and either stored or placed on display. This makes it possible to change the exhibit display with the minimum amount of delay. In assembling the collections, no particular period or locality has been stressed to the exclusion of others, the basic idea being one of wide scope.

A large courtyard between two of the main building's wings affords shelter for an exhibit of actual small craft. A few of these, including a gigantic Portugese fisherman, are lifesaving boats, long boats from the whaling ships, lifeboats, both wooden and steel from recent ships, West Indian dugouts, Chinese sampans, Tahitian pirogue, Eskimo kayaks, a Dutch tjotter, grass boats from Peru, life cars, and dozens of other types completely fill the yard. A short walk through the woods leads to the boathouse on Lake Maury. One of the few surviving Chesapeake Bay log canoes rides quietly at anchor, and across the lake may be seen the hulk of a Tarpon Springs (Fla.) sponge fisherman.

It would be impossible to enumerate in detail the countless other nautical exhibits which are gathered together in the museum, for new material is being added daily. The Mariners' Museum must be seen to be appreciated, a task that cannot be accomplished in a few hours, or even in 1 day.

Legislative Reorganization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include several editorials endorsing the legislative reorganization bill, S. 2177, which have recently appeared in newspapers throughout the United States. These editorials reflect widespread public approval of the action of the Senate on June 10 in passing this legislation. They also reflect a Nation-wide demand that the House follow suit and act upon this No. 1 domestic issue at the present session. The time has come for Congress to reform itself. The time to act is now.

The editorials follow:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of June 13, 1946]

LA FOLLETTE'S WORK

Congratulations to the Senate, and in particular to Senator LA FOLLETTE, for the 49 to 16 vote in favor of the reorganization bill which embodied the report of the La Follette-Monroney committee. It was a victory for good government that was as welcome as it was unexpected. So many vested interests have been built up in the creaking machinery of Congress that few observers had anticipated either quick or affirmative action. Let this be a lesson to those of little faith. It is apparent now that more Senators than we had dreamed of had become troubled over

the negativism and procrastination—inseparably associated with our Topsy-like system of government—which inhibits action in Congress. Improvement can come only from awareness, and the Senate has demonstrated that awareness. It is a heartening spectacle and we hope that statesmanship of the same order will be shown in the House when the Representatives begin their consideration of the Monroney bill.

Senator LA FOLLETTE, in presenting the legislation, referred to the criticism to which Congress is subject. He implied that much of it is unjust because "under our present archaic organization, it is impossible for Congress to transact the business which it has become imperative that it handle." But institutions are man-made. Granted that the archaic organization has throttled action, yet the criticism of Congress has hitherto been justified by reason of congressional chariness to take remedial steps in streamlining the machinery. Indeed, the neglect has gone on so long that the La Follette bill should be regarded as only a first installment of improvement. The new bill, for instance, omits any recommendation for better means of selecting committee chairmen and personnel, for clarifying the powers of the tyrannical Rules Committee of the House, for experimentation with periods for questioning executive department heads, for the limitation of senatorial debate. We trust that Senator LA FOLLETTE will not tire of his well doing. He began something in the Senate that will be a lasting memorial to him, though we trust he will spare a niche in that memorial for the late Senator Francis Maloney of Connecticut, who started the job that in the present instance the Senator from Wisconsin has so excellently finished.

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun of June 11, 1946]

FOR A MODERN CONGRESS

The favorable vote of the Senate yesterday (49 to 16) on the bill to reorganize Congress brings a long-needed reform one step closer to completion. Before the final chapter is written in this long fight "to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government," the bill must still pass the House, but its success in the Senate gives the measure increased promise.

For the most part, the bill which the Senate passed yesterday incorporates the recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. This committee, headed by Senator LA FOLLETTE and Representative MONRONEY, studied the operations of Congress for a full year before making its report and it achieved almost unanimous agreement upon all of its findings. The Senate bill which grew out of the committee's report provides for the reorganization of the committee system, and it reduces the number of standing committees from 33 to 15. In addition, it raises the annual salaries of Senators and Representatives from $10,000 to $15,000, establishes a system of retirement benefits for legislators and requires the registration of all lobbyists.

Perhaps the most important part of the bill which Senator LA FOLLETTE referred to yesterday as the "keystone of the arch" is the provision under the committee reorganization section which authorizes the appointment of four professional staff members on each standing committee. The professional staff members would be added to the regular clerical staffs, and would be most useful in lightening the work of Members of Congress and in speeding up legislative machinery. With the aggrandizement of the executive branch, Congress has simply been unable to keep up with its responsibilities. The addition of professional research analysts to the committee staffs should be of great help to Congressmen in keeping abreast of administrative practices. The Senate did the right thing in approving the reorganizing bill, and its action should be quickly endorsed by the House.

[From the Baltimore Sun of June 10, 1945]

A CHANCE FOR CONGRESS TO REINFORCE ITS AUTHORITY

The opening of debate in the Senate on the La Follette-Monroney plan for reorganization of the Congress is a matter of deep importance. On the success or failure of this proposal the future efficiency and authority of the National Legislature may to some extent depend. Most people now concede that we are at some kind of a turning point in our constitutional history. That makes it doubly important that Congress be prepared to do its best work.

The fact is that the Congress more, even, than the Executive and more than the kind of Supreme Court we now have, is the essential and characteristic sign of a free and representative government. There are, after all, executives in the tyrannous states. In those states there are courts which are deferential to the executive's friends and are staffed with men chosen, as some of the less recent Supreme Court nominees have been chosen, for their friendliness to the executive point of view. But there is no parliament, in the Anglo-American sense, no congress, in any dictatorship ever heard of.

We have already had faint but suggestive indications of the way things might conceivably go were Congress weak in the face, say, of executive aggrandizement. The minority groups now most arrogant in their demands for special privilege have for years looked less to the Congress than to the Executive and the Supreme Court to get what they want. They behaved in this way because it was relatively easier to control the Executive, whose election might swing on the sentiment of one highly specialized assembly district in, say, New York City. It was less easy to control 450 Members of the Congress who came from the North and the South, the East and the West, from rich districts, from poor districts, from wheat and cotton districts, from iron and coal districts, and in this infinite variety gave a faithful reflection of the various views and interests of the whole people.

True, Congress has made errors, some of them, like certain OPA votes, grievous errors. Mere organizational changes will not make Congress perfect. But so far as errors can be prevented or minimized by structural and procedural reform, the La Follette-Monroney group wishes to begin operating. They appreciate, of course, that only the electorate, exercising its judgment at the polls, can cut down the level of fatheadedness in the Congress. But they think legislative committees can be reduced in number and increased in efficiency. They think Congress ought to have more technical assistance in the various fields of legislation. They are for an intensification of the historic congressional control over the Government purse. And so on.

Some of the proposals may, of course, be overzealous, others overtimid. Certainly all of them will have to be debated in full. But it is clear that at the core the plan is sound, and that it aims in general at a sharpening and sensitizing of Congress as an instrument of the public will. Should the Members slight these proposals, should they let current constitutional unbalances go on by default, Congress would be standing in its own light and in the people's light.

[From the New York World-Telegram of June 11, 1946]

IMPROVING CONGRESS

The Senate has approved by a thumping majority the La Follette-Monroney bill to cut down the number of congressional committees, hire adequate staffs to help handle committee work, provide members with competent assistants to take care of those chores for the home folks, and otherwise "streamline" Congress.

One reason for the large favorable vote probably is the provisions increasing congressional pay to $15,000. With such a reorganization, permitting more effective work, Congressmen will be worth more pay. We hope the House approves the same bill.

[From the Philadelphia Record of June 13, 1946]

IT'S 1946—NOT 1880

In a machine age, virtually now in process of transition into the atomic age, it is an absurdity and a handicap for the country to struggle along with a horse-and-buggy Congress.

The Senate, showing awareness of its own defects, has passed a bill to streamline the archaic structure of the Congress.

Reform is long overdue in the cause of the same efficiency in Congress as is common in business.

The Senate bill would boost salaries of Representatives and Senators by 50 percent, provide pensions, reduce the Senate's present 33 committees to 15, limit Senators to membership on 2 instead of 6 to 10 committees, require lobbyists to register, etc.

We hope the House will be as cognizant as the Senate that the times and the demands of the times have changed, that it is 1946 and not 1880.

The Congress should waste no further time in bringing to its branch of Government the advantages of modern efficiency methods.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening of June 8, 1946]

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

It is encouraging to note that the program to modernize the machinery of Congress is receiving bipartisan support. Senator TAFT, of Ohio, and Senator WAGNER, of New York, who are usually as far apart as the poles in their political views, have both announced their support of the La Follette Committee's plans. They have joined forces on this issue because both men have been around Congress long enough to become acutely aware of its deficiencies and because both realize that Congress must revamp its procedure if it is to play its proper role in government.

Unfortunately, this is not true of all of their senatorial colleagues. Many of the older men are bitterly opposed to the proposals to reduce sharply the number of standing committees and to provide the committees with a staff of four experts each.

The motives behind this opposition are not particularly elevated. Resistance to the reduction in the number of committees stems from the fact that this will result in the elimination of a number of highly prized chairmanships. These now go to legislators with the greatest seniority, regardless of their fitness for the particular job. The proposal to have a personnel director control appointment of the staff of experts is opposed because Senators would like to get their own hands on this juicy bit of patronage. Legislators balk at voting the higher salaries and pensions which Members of Congress ought to have because they fear this will react against them in the fall elections.

In the long run, we trust, without too much confidence, that the sounder judgment of men like Senators TAFT and WAGNER will prevail. It will be a tragic thing for both Congress and the country if personal pride, the desire for patronage, and political timidity are allowed to stand in the way of these urgently needed reforms.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 13, 1946]

FOR AN EFFICIENT CONGRESS

Now that the Senate has passed the bill for reorganizing Congress by the substantial vote

of 49 to 16, the House should follow suit. The proposed reduction in the number of committees is an important reform, although unfortunately it left untouched the seniority rule for choosing chairmen. The provision for tighter control of the purse strings through joint meetings of the Senate and House committees on appropriations and revenue is a long step toward Government economy.

A point that has received little attention is the proposed increase of Members' salaries from $10,000 to $15,000. The Senators who opposed this action were unnecessarily modest, since there is no other way of raising these salaries except by the Members themselves. It has been urged that better pay would attract a higher grade of men, a theory which seems to disregard the manner in which practical politics works, with the selection of nominees largely in the hands of party leaders.

A more convincing reason for additional compensation is the rise in living costs, which bear especially on Members who must maintain homes both in Washington and elsewhere. The country will not begrudge them their first salary increase in many years.

[From the Birmingham Age-Herald of June 11, 1946]

CONGRESS STREAMLINING

The Senate has up for consideration legislation prepared by a joint House-Senate group which studied for a year the possibilities of making Congress a more efficient legislative organization. There appears to be some opposition to certain features of the bill, naturally enough. But Senator TAFT, a leading Republican, and Senator WAGNER a leading liberal Democrat, have both endorsed the basic plan for reorganization.

The bill is designed, largely, to trim the committee structure of the Congress, both in House and Senate, and to eliminate a great deal of the routine which presently encumbers Members. For instance, if a constituent writes in for some information, under the present set-up, it may be that the Representative or Senator must spend valuable time getting up such information or replying to the constituent. The new arrangement would not eliminate this entirely, but each Member would have an administrative assistant to relieve him of much of this burden. Of course, each Member now has a secretary and staff. But under this program, a salary would be provided sufficiently high to enable Members to retain specially qualified men, in short, first-class administrators.

The Congress as a whole would be relieved of the duty of acting on many and various types of special legislation. This means valuable time is taken up now through handling damage claims to the Government, whether they be $100 or $100,000, authorizations for small bridges in counties—and the like. This could better be handled by an agency other than the Congress. Constituents could always call on Congressmen for checking on any such authorizations, but even then, the bulk of such work could be handled by the administrative assistant.

The truth is that legislating is now a bigger business than ever it was before, and with so many matters of genuine national significance claiming the time and study of Representatives and Senators, fulfillment of this more important duty often is restricted through an overabundance of details.

The Senate, under the bill, would limit the number of its committees to 16. At present there are 33 of these and 10 special committees. With this trimming, much overlapping which now exists would be eliminated. Each committee would be given the services of four experts to provide background information for the members, thereby relieving them of additional restrictive details.

One provision would establish a personnel director with the authority to make committee appointments. This, with the reduction of committees, will meet with strong objections, since pride and concern for patronage are usually on Congressmen's minds. The reduction of committees seems to this newspaper to be a very important and helpful proposal. It would be wise to limit the power of any personnel director, but basic reasons for establishment of such an office are strong.

Congress has taken many years to work up to the present point of self-examination. It should receive encouragement from all citizens in continuing the effort. Congressmen need not be shy about pushing the portion of the bill which would enable them to take advantage of the Federal retirement or pension system. They are entitled to seek such protection. A straightforward explanation will probably be welcomed by the public.

The Red Hand of OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of June 14, 1946:

THE RED HAND OF OPA

The Nation's supplies of insulin and some other immensely useful drugs derived from animal organs are being exhausted. There is no room for doubt of this fact. The men in the laboratories and the drug trade assert it and are obviously alarmed. The statistics from the stockyards fully confirm it. Normally thousands of cattle are slaughtered every working day here. Latterly the number has been reduced almost to nothing.

The live cattle are going east and into the black market. The animal glands from which the drugs are processed are not reaching the laboratories in the usual quantities. Much of this material is going into the sewers. Accumulated supplies of the extracts are, therefore, being drawn upon. Unless this trend is halted and reversed, the time is going to come when many sufferers from diabetes are going to be without insulin and sufferers from Addison's disease are going to be without the drug that keeps them alive.

There isn't any doubt, either, about where the responsibility lies. OPA and only OPA is doing this. Mr. Bowles will be the luckiest man in Washington if Congress forces him to relinquish all control of the meat industry. Otherwise he stands an excellent chance of being indicted for manslaughter, if not for murder, and it is hard to see what his defense could be. He can't pretend that the meat packers and the drug industry have not warned him of the consequences he was inviting. He can't pretend not to know that the drugs in question mean the difference between life and death.

The moral responsibility, of course, will be shared by the whole silly, squawking brood of OPA defenders. Everybody who wrote a letter to his Congressman demanding the continuance of OPA, and everybody who carried a placard in an OPA picket line will share the guilt. The only defense they can offer is that they didn't know about the interference with insulin production until the damage was done.

That isn't all they didn't know. They were told, but didn't believe, that the economic organization of the country is extremely intricate and that interference with the free movement of prices at any point is certain to result in disorganization elsewhere. The wisest man that ever lived isn't wise enough to foresee all the consequences in their infinite ramifications. Therefore, no man is wise enough to fix prices. The free play of supply and demand does a better job because in the market are assembled all the men with experience in satisfying men's economic wants. In the market, the rival claims are adjusted and balanced with the supply.

Mr. Bowles and his crew weren't smart enough to foresee even the more obvious dislocations they were going to cause. The OPA thought it was going to hold down the price of meat, but the housewives can't find any meat at the butcher shops at the established prices and not very much at bootleg prices, either. The tanners complain of the difficulty of getting hides and of the inferior quality of those coming from the black market. The same story is repeated in textiles, in grain, in lumber, and in any other trade that anyone wants to look into.

The propagandists for OPA direct their appeal to ignorance and selfishness; to ignorance of economic fundamentals, and to the selfishness of the man who has a flat at low rent and doesn't want his rent raised, even though he knows that low rents prevent building and for lack of building thousands, including veterans, are without adequate shelter.

This is OPA, the people who run it, and the people who defend it. We can only hope that their stubborn folly will not lead them to add the taking of human life to their other sins.

Unions Oppose Appropriation for Southwestern Power Administration Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, during the last few days I have received numerous letters from union labor locals, and individuals and businessmen in my district, expressing their emphatic opposition to the expansion of the Southwestern Power Administration and its activities in Oklahoma, and the appropriation of public funds to enable such expansion to proceed. This proposition is very unpopular among the people of my district.

It will be recalled that this is the appropriation covered by the amendment submitted by the Speaker of the House of Representatives in support of which he addressed the Committee of the Whole House, advocating the construction of a high line to connect the Denison Dam, the Pensacola Dam on Grand River in my district, and a project in Arkansas.

I feel that I owe it to the Members of Congress, and to my constituents, to voice the sentiments of my constitutents on this subject. Their attitude is clearly expressed in the following communications which I have received:

BARTLESVILLE TYPOGRAPHICAL
UNION, NO. 648,
Bartlesville, Okla., June 8, 1946.

Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: We understand that the appropriation request of the Southwestern Power Administration was wholly denied by the Senate and that it will next be before a joint committee of the Congress.

We believe that no funds whatever should be appropriated for this agency. The SPA plan is contrary to our principles in that it further places the Government in competition with its citizens. This is un-American and we oppose it strenuously. The SPA plan, if carried out to any degree, would result in the destruction of the electric companies which have pioneered in the development of our State, and which are heavy taxpayers supporting our towns, schools, and State and Federal Governments. The electric companies are large employers of labor, pay good wages, provide good and safe working conditions, provide employee benefits such as insurance, hospitalization, retirement annuity, etc., working cooperatively with union organizations.

We hope that you will actively oppose any appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration.

Yours very truly,
NEIL ZINK, *President.*

BARTLESVILLE CENTRAL TRADES
AND LABOR COUNCIL,
Bartlesville, Okla., June 8, 1946.

Hon. GEORGE B. SCHWABE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: We have just seen a letter from Senator THOMAS reporting on the status of appropriation bill for Southwestern Power Administration, and note that the Senate denied wholly the request of SPA.

We believe the plan of Southwestern Power Administration is un-American. It is a very serious threat to private enterprise and individual enterprise and freedom. The plan would destroy the savings of millions of individuals invested in the existing electric companies. These companies are large employers of labor and have been found to be fair in their dealings. We do not want them driven out of business.

We feel that you share our feelings in this matter and we hope that you will vigorously oppose the granting of any money for Southwestern Power Administration.

With best wishes, we are,
Cordially,
R. J. LAWVER,
President,
JOE YOUNG,
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, the following letter, as well as the above, and all others referred to in these remarks was voluntarily addressed to me, this one, under date of June 10, by one of the most outstanding attorneys of the Tulsa, Okla., bar, a lifelong Democrat, whose letter I quote in full as follows:

It is my understanding that there is pending in the House a bill, in which the House originally allowed, and the Senate eliminated, a large appropriation for expenditure under the supervision of the Southwestern Power Administration, to build an electrical transmission system to interconnect flood-control dams; probably to become a part of a larger system in which even steam generators would be used to implement the dams for the manufacture, sale, and transmission of electricity. It seems to me that the House should sustain the Senate action in eliminating that appropriation, as it would seem that an effect of such an appropriation, plan, and construction would be such governmental competition with the present private-utility systems of our State as those systems would be unable to meet; and would in effect condemn and destroy, not only the private investment of citizenship in those utilities, but the opportunity of those utilities to continue to render what has been as a whole satisfactory and happy service to our Oklahoma communities. The communization of our Government, by the entry of government into business and industry apparently is one of steps, or a step-by-step accomplishment of elimination of private industry and opportunity, and absorption of the individual by the state; and it seems to me that such an appropriation, plan, and construction make up such a step.

Mr. Speaker, without disclosing the names of the authors, I quote the following letters received by me on the same subject during the past few days:

I feel sure that you believe as I do, that the plan of the Southwestern Power Administration is un-American, aimed at state socialism, and is a serious threat to private enterprise and individual freedom. I believe that no public funds whatever should be appropriated for it.

I hope that you will use every means at your command to see that this agency is denied all of its requested appropriation.

With knowledge of your efforts opposing encroachments of government in business, I am confident that you will make every effort to oppose the granting of any public funds to the Southwestern Power Administration.

I am unalterably opposed to the plan of this agency, which is a very serious threat to private enterprise and private individual initiative.

I hope you will be able to exert all of your influence in denying any public funds whatever to be appropriated for the plan of the Southwestern Power Administration. This program, if carried out, would be a long step in the direction of socializing industry. I am opposed to it, and I hope that you will be able to successfully sustain the action of the Senate.

I am unalterably opposed to the plan of the Southwestern Power Administration, which is a threat to private enterprise and private individual initiative, and I hope you will make every effort to oppose the granting of any public funds whatever to it.

All Kinds of Sense But Common Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to approve the editorial written by Mr. Wilbur D. Matson, editor of the Morgan County Herald, of McConnellsville, Ohio.

Mr. Matson is a clear thinker and a facile writer. The editorial is as follows:

ALL KINDS OF SENSE BUT COMMON SENSE

A few days ago a friend came to us and said that he had been offered twice what he had paid for his property. "What will I do with the money, if I sell? he inquired. Again, if I pay my income tax on capital gains, it will cut heavily into the profit derived from the sale. And where can I go to live? I guess I will keep the home."

Cases similar to the above are common. People who own only a home are afraid to sell as they do not know where they can buy another. Others with real estate as an investment are in a quandary about selling, for they likewise do not know what to do with the money and they dislike paying out a substantial portion of the dollar profit in tax. They also wonder about inflation, what the value will be tomorrow, and if, after all, under present conditions real estate is not the safest and best investment in the world.

The veriest tyro in finance can answer the above questions as wisely as a Wall Street investment banker. We are pretty much alike in our thinking. When prices are rising, the air is infectious with optimism, everyone wants to buy, and it is a seller's market. In periods of depression everyone wants to sell and prices spiral downward in a buyer's market. In good times the public is always deluded with a belief that the sun will shine forever and, in bad times, that it will never shine again. The people who have grown rich in this country have been those who bought when everybody wanted to sell and sold when everybody wanted to buy, which is something easier to say than to do.

Never before were the thrifty and those who want to take care of themselves confronted by so many perplexing problems in investing their savings. Twenty-five years ago, $10,000 in 4¼ percent Government bonds meant an income of $425 a year in sound money, redeemable in gold. Today, the same sum invested in bonds will bring only half the dollar return in a cheapened currency. Who in Morgan County under present conditions can start at scratch and in a lifetime of earnings and savings provide for himself a sufficient income from Government bonds or gilt-edge investments to be independent in old age?

And there are those who think the industrial future will follow the pattern of World War I post period of history. It will be recalled that, after the ending of that war, there was a tremendous upward surge in prices in 1919, followed by the collapse of 1920, and a creeping paralysis in farming which required another war to pull agriculture from the slough of despond. But the period from 1921 until the sky fell in 1929 was one of the most prosperous industrial eras of national history. We were told by the wiseacres of the day that the Nation was on a new plateau and those who followed the opinions of the great financiers of the country, went broke—all except the ones who took the advice of the canny Mr. Mellon who said just on the eve of the collapse that, "It is a good time to buy bonds."

But new factors have entered the equation in drawing any parallel between our period and the close of the First World War. What will be the effect of 13 years of unbalanced budgets, with a national debt so fabulous and so astral in proportion that the figures long since have become meaningless—an indebtedness so huge that billions in interest are a fixed annual charge on the Federal Budget, to say nothing of any reduction of principal in the public debt. And what will happen when the world gets in full production once more and produces on a competitive basis with the products of the American factory and of the American farm? Will it be a question of ever-higher wages and shorter hours for labor or a grim competitive struggle for existence with people who must produce or starve?

Out of the present political and world upheaval, if we survive the revolutionary and explosive forces and the wave of communism which have swept the world, we must return to fundamentals. We must work and produce so that there is abundance instead of scarcity to divide. There is no way to have more by producing less of real wealth, nor does lasting prosperity lie in an economy of scarcity. There must be retrenchment in government, with hundreds of thou-

sands of useless employees discharged and economy of the kind advocated by Senator BYRD, Senator TAFT, and their following, which will bring the budget under control. It is superficial folly to shriek that the OPA controls prices, while the Government itself makes inflation inevitable through waste, extravagance, and deficit financing.

Daily it becomes more obvious that George Washington and the founders of the Republic may have ridden in a "horse and buggy" instead of an airplane, but they had something on the ball when they told us to beware of foreign entanglements. There is no adding machine in the world with sufficient figures to give the total in billions and the cost in human life and suffering which our failure to heed this wisdom of the Father of his Country had cost us. And it is time to get our soldiers out of Europe and Asia and home from a war which ended nearly a year ago, although teachnically, we remain at war with extraordinary war powers lodged in the Executive. It is time to quit meddling into the affairs of Asia and Europe, weed our own garden, and sweep our long-neglected doorstep. It is time that we quit worrying about the British Empire and lower our sights to the humble task of finding out why in the world's greatest industrial state, the people have no shirts or underwear, farm machinery, butter, meat, and a myriad of common household articles. It is time to ascertain whether John L. Lewis and a few labor czars are running the country or whether the Government at Washington is supreme. It is time to rid ourselves of a horde of bureaucrats which swarm over the land like locusts, devouring the substance of the taxpayer. It is time for the Government to cease attempting to regulate the private life and business of the individual, dictating to the businessman the prices he can sell for and the farmer when and how much he can plant, with a ceiling over the prices of what he produces. We lived before the OPA and it is hoped there is sufficient resourcefulness and initiative left in the American people to get along without having our private business run by politicians.

But, you ask, what has all of this to do with the man selling his property for twice what he paid for it? It is merely illustrative of inflation—not inflation that we are going to have, but inflation that we have now, and of the boom-bust type. It is also illustrative of the fact that when you get off on the wrong foot, each day finds you deeper in the woods. Today, no one, big or little, knows where we are or where we are going. Political quacks and charlatans by shallow and irresponsible thinking have the greatest country on earth floundering in the morass of confusion, and hanging over the ropes.

Is there any remedy for the mess we are in? Well, we are optimistic enough to believe that the sound sense of the middle classes of America will again assert itself as it always has in past crises. There are enough sensible Democrats and sensible Republicans to save the country if they would vote together, instead of so many times as they have in the past 14 years believed the same way but voted against each other at the polls—shook the tree and the radicals, Communists, and crooked politicians gathered the fruit of purblind partisanship.

We believe that the country must return to time-tried principles of government, which made of us the greatest nation of all times, until a few smart alec professors and impractical doctrinairies got in the driver's seat and upset the applecart. We must have sound government, a sound dollar, sound economics and sound business management at Washington—a system of private enterprise which is not stifled by bureaucrats who never made anything themselves and are envious of anyone who is successful. Above all, let us return to the home front lest while our attention is diverted to a bankrupt Europe, we go down with them in the vortex. While at home "Rome burns," public attention is focused on the bickering between Mr. Molotov and Mr. Byrnes over the disposal of Trieste; whether or not Franco is a menace to world peace; the withdrawal of Russian troops from Iran and what policy we shall pursue in Manchuria and the Argentine. It doesn't make sense to us to let this country go to seed while we wreck our own economy with foreign loans which will never be paid and let our own country go to the bow-wows while attempting to solve the insoluble and endless problems of Europe and Asia. In moments of pessimism, it seems to us that we have the capital, the know-how, and the genius for everything it takes in this country except common sense and the political sense to administer our public affairs with intelligence. Is it not high time we chose big men for big office and keep the little men at home? Better "think on these things" before it is too late.

The OPA Muddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I submit for your consideration an editorial from the Jackson Herald, Ripley, W. Va., presenting another sound discussion of the OPA.

The Jackson Herald represents the thought of a prosperous and progressive rural community in West Virginia, and the statement should make clear to the advocates of continued Government control over our economy that Congress is listening to the folks back home in the consideration of the OPA extension bill. It appears that the campaign on the part of Mr. Bowles and other left-wing economists to create confusion and hysteria to conceal their real purpose has been far from successful.

The editorial follows:

THE OPA MUDDLE

Out of the welter of propaganda coming over the radio, through bureaucratic releases, the newspapers, and the conflicting opinion of statesmen, about the only thing that has come out of the battle to extend the life of the OPA for another 12 months is confusion. Most of the propaganda, aside from paid advertisements in metropolitan newspapers, has been a barrage favoring the continuance of the OPA without curtailment or amendment. Much of this propaganda has come from the bureaucrats themselves, who are interested not so much in preventing inflation as in holding on to their jobs for another year. Much of it, directed at Congress, has originated in left-wing political circles, whose chief interest is not so much inflation prevention as keeping the Government in hobbles. They want bureaucratic control continued, and regard the OPA as a test case. If it comes through unscathed they believe they can keep all Government controls indefinitely, and they are using the mimeographed letter and chain post card in a way which they believe is turning the proper amount of heat on Congress.

Much fog has been caused by the Bowlesites in creating the impression that critics of the OPA as at present constituted want it abolished entirely, or amended to death. This is not true, but has raised a fog of hysteria among the supporters of OPA as is. On the other hand, there have come reports that if the meat situation, which is tragic, does not improve within 90 days, meat controls will be abolished entirely. The people don't know what to believe.

But the people themselves are not the only ones who are confused. Look at the plight of businessmen. They know hardly which way to turn. They say the OPA cannot keep up with its own orders, revisions, amendments, and exceptions, and is strangling the small businessman in a mass of red tape. In a comprehensive pamphlet which everyone interested in OPA ought to read, prepared by Lawrence Sullivan, well-known Washington writer, for the National Small Businessmen's Association, Mr. Sullivan declares that during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, the OPA issued no fewer than 44,259 orders, regulations, amendments, and exceptions in its price control and rationing decrees, an average of about 3,700 orders per month. He adds:

"For the convenience of those harassed businessmen who feel that OPA creates more problems than it solves, we present below the official tabulation of OPA orders and rules for the fiscal year 1945: National orders, 23,135; amendments, 13,970; field orders, 3,276; amended regulations, 2,484; protests acted upon, 1,179; new regulations, 215; total orders for year, 44,239.

"In addition, OPA issued 195,000 orders authorizing individual rent adjustments, and circulated 331 general questionnaires—or about one new questionnaire every working day.

"These breath-taking figures, as we read them, present a clear picture of bureaucracy slowly hanging the national economy with paper ropes from its mimeographs."

Here we see something of the problems of the average small businessman. He cannot get the goods. In fact, he is unable to digest the orders and revisions issued by the OPA concerning the goods which he can't get.

Lease-Lend Grant to Colombia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Steffan Andrews, from the Washington Evening Star of June 13, 1946:

FIFTEEN MILLION LEASE-LEND GRANT IS REPORTED FORCED ON COLOMBIA

(By Steffan Andrews)

The United States gave the Colombian Government $15,000,000 in lease-lend during the war, despite representations by the Colombian President that $2,000,000 was all that was needed by that country, it was learned today.

A high official diplomatic source revealed for the first time that Washington military and lease-lend officials insisted on giving Colombia this huge grant, despite protests of American Embassy officials that the lower figure was more than adequate to cover the South American country's wartime needs.

The $2,000,000 was requested by Colombia's former president, Eduardo Santos, in 1940, and the $15,000,000 grant was awarded in 1941, it was disclosed.

In subsequent negotiations, the diplomatic official declared, this $15,000,000 figure actually was boosted to a $16,000,000 lease-lend

credit, but with actual billing against the Colombian Government reduced to $6,500,000.

TRANSACTION CALLED FANTASTIC

Under the lease-lend settlement being worked out between the two countries, he said, less than half the final amount will now have to be paid back to the United States.

The details of this hitherto undisclosed lease-lend transaction, termed one of the most fantastic in our South American dealings, was releaved as Colombia's newly elected President, Dr. Ospina Perez, was visiting Washington on the personal invitation of President Truman.

Neither Colombian Embassy officials nor State Department lease-lend officers would comment on the transaction. One Department lease-lend official insisted that "no settlement had been worked out yet."

The diplomatic source, who asked anonymity because of his official position, said that to his knowledge Dr. Perez had no connection with the "loan" transaction, since all the negotiations were carried on during the preceding administration of President Santos.

FUNDS ASKED FOR PATROL BOATS

He said President Santos turned down demands of his military leaders for a big lease-lend grant and instead asked Washington for $2,000,000. This amount was agreed to by American Embassy officials who "thought it would save American taxpayers some money."

President Santos' original modest request of $2,000,000 would have included only lease-lend patrol boats to build up the country's coast guard, and badly needed repairs on the country's two over-age destroyers.

When the $2,000,000 request came up for approval by Washington, however, stunned embassy officials were informed that higher officials wanted to give the Colombian Government $15,000,000 and that embassy officials had better hold their tongues.

COUNTERPROPOSALS MADE

Here is the sequence of events from then on, according to the diplomatic official:

The $15,000,000 later was suggested as a loan, with $8,000,000 of the amount returnable in $1,000,000 yearly installments for 8 years. But there would be no interest.

President Santos refused to accept the huge amount and countered with a proposal that the United States give Colombia $4,000,000 at 4 percent interest payable in 10 years. This was turned down by the United States.

Ultimately, the full amount of the larger grant was awarded and the unneeded lease-lend equipment started pouring into Colombia. The shipments included tanks, jeeps, planes, machine guns, and patrol boats. It reportedly took American Army men 8 months to train Colombian troops in the use of tanks.

States Solvent—Uncle Sam Financially Embarrassed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr Speaker, too many people, in late years, have been looking to the Federal Government for financial assistance. In fact, it has become a habit. We used to take care of most of our charity cases and our schools, our roads, and public improvement, out of funds derived from the State treasuries and local subdivisions of the States. But more recently, it has become the custom to look to Washington, and the States and local political subdivisions have unloaded upon the Central Government.

The potential results of a continuation of this program are most discouraging and foreboding. To the extent that the Federal Government is asked to foot the bills, the Federal administration can, and usually does, accept and often demands certain things in return from the localities and recipients of such benefits. Usually some qualifications have to be met and certain conditions must be complied with, in order to entitle the applicant to obtain the funds. Translated into plain language, this means more and more Federal control—more and more regimentation and regulations from Washington, more bureaucracy. The possible results of extending this program much further are most alarming. When projected, it is easy to imagine the certain loss of States' rights, and substitution of a strong, autocratic central control, which logically will lead to dictatorship, or some form of statism.

One of the highest authorities on this subject, all will have to admit, based upon his unusual observation and experience, is the Comptroller General of the United States, Lindsay C. Warren. Recently he addressed the chamber of commerce at a dinner at Asheville, N. C. An account of Comptroller Warren's observations, with editorial comment, appears in the May issue of the New Age, which I quote as follows:

UNITED STATES OFFICIAL ON BUDGETS

Gravely viewing the financial condition of the United States Government, Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren has reached certain conclusions about remedies for what seems to be a dangerous situation. However, the remedies are for the taxpayers to study and concern themselves about, for, without their insistence, very likely little will be done very soon. As the fifth of five remedies, all of equal importance, he suggests that the States assume a proper share of their responsibilities toward the Union instead of looking to the Federal Government for more and more assistance.

Speaking at a chamber of commerce dinner at Asheville, N. C., he did not specifically mention Federal aid for education, now a matter being considered in bills before a United States Senate committee, still his words are a very powerful argument against such Federal aid, or any Federal aid for States for projects they should handle themselves. Said he:

"The States are now, for the most part, in excellent financial condition. Their budgets, unlike that of the Federal Government, are in balance and most of them have comfortable reserves. If the States will assert their leadership in their proper sphere, there will be less incentive for further expansion of Federal power. If the States wish to retain full power and prestige, they must assume their full responsibilities and render to their people a high quality of public service that cannot be duplicated by the Federal Government."

Other excerpts from his address are the following:

In the face of today's conditions, the cry of State rights can, indeed, become a hollow cry, utterly meaningless, going back to issues long fought over and decided. Therefore, I do not come to you tonight to make a fetish of State rights.

What, then, is to be left to the States? Will they in time become merely convenient areas to divide Federal activity? If this should come to pass, this Nation will cease to have the kind of government described in the Constitution. Frankly, there are many who doubt that our Nation could long survive under those circumstances as a great democracy. The history of nations tends to show that, when all power and authority have been concentrated in the central government, the Nation becomes ripe for regimentation and dictatorship.

I, for one, still believe that there are important functions to be exercised by the States and their subdivisions. There are highly proper and necessary contributions that the Federal Government should make, but if the States, in order to obtain Federal funds, surrender too many of their rights and functions to the Federal Government, something very precious, something very valuable and democratic, and something uniquely American will have gone out of our public service. The danger is that our people, looking to Washington indiscriminately for aid, will sell their political birthright for a mess of Federal pottage.

The greatest centralizer of power in Washington is war. Under the influence of World War I, the Federal Government grew mightily, and we now see, as the result of World War II, that the Federal Government towers above the States with unprecedented prestige.

Naturally my own concern has been directed to the fantastic fiscal effect of that trend. Through 10 years of plodding escape from the slough of depression, through 4 years of underwriting, then actively waging history's greatest war, your Federal balance sheet has reached such a state as any honest man must call an alarming one. Do you know, for example, that the yearly bill for interest alone is greater than the entire Government budget a few short years ago? In fact, our own State's annual share of the interest charges on the national debt would operate the whole State government for well over a year.

The free-spending philosophers, who insist that an enormous, back-breaking national mortgage is a good thing, call anyone an alarmist who is brazen enough to recite the facts. What are the facts? To speak in billions of dollars and Nation-wide totals—now two hundred and eighty billions—is only a way to escape the uncomfortable realities, to lull us into the feeling it will be somebody else's burden. * * *

With a national debt that staggers the imagination, should we not have an appraisal of the never-ending succession of new programs proposing large drains upon the Federal Treasury.

While some of these programs may be promoted from Washington, too often does Congress mistake as "the voice of the people" the urgings of special pleaders, blocs, privileged seekers, and treasury raiders. It is fashionable to blame Congress for all the ills of the body politic. They are only human and are merely a good cross-section of the Nation. The fact is they have been propagandized and lobbied so much that a good part of their resistance has been broken down. What encouragement in a legislative way do they get from home? Everyone has an advocate in Washington except the people. It would be news indeed if a chamber of commerce commended a Congressman for his statesmanship or for a negative vote, rather than praising him for some Federal money he had secured for his section. I know from experience how sweet it is to the ears of a Congressman to hear the plaudits of those who wanted Federal money, and who did not stop to think it had to be paid back. We justified a lot of this in an era of big spending, but the reckoning period is now coming on.

It's Time for the Governed To Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert R. Wason, from the York (Pa.) Dispatch of June 10, 1946:

IT'S TIME FOR THE GOVERNED TO SPEAK!

(By Robert R. Wason)

Never was the prospect for prosperity greater than on VJ-day. Now, 9 months later, the Nation, which ought to be creating a better living for all, confronts three road blocks to prosperity. They are:

First, lack of equality between labor and management before the law;

Second, the production-preventing controls of OPA; and

Third, an inflationary fiscal policy, based on continued deficit spending.

THE GOVERNMENT'S SELL-OUT TO LABOR

Let us deal with the first of these three obstacles to freedom and prosperity—the Government's sell-out to labor.

Concessions given to CIO are at the expense of all other organized labor, of all unorganized labor, of agriculture, of white-collar workers, of every other segment of the economy.

The administration's labor policy supplants collective bargaining by Government compulsion. It takes place on the White House steps in Washington instead of at a plant in Chicago.

Nine hundred new strikes have Government clearance to start within the next 30 days. Government trend is plainly to nationalize labor negotiations with big industry by setting Nation-wide patterns. Some labor leaders may not see the danger because of the benefits they obtain.

CALLS ADMINISTRATION, NOT LEWIS, THE CULPRIT

Unions will not so freely indulge in irresponsible actions if they know the Government will not bail them out. Such strikes as the railway and coal strikes would never have been called unless the unions knew that a subservient administration would intervene in favor of the union.

The labor unions, largely free of any legal restraint, have developed economic dictators to control the daily lives of the people.

Today 140,000,000 Americans live under a reprieve from John L. Lewis as to coal, and from Messrs. Whitney and Johnston as to train service. These and other economic dictators such as Reuther in automobiles, Murray in steel, and Petrillo in music, are operating as a super-government.

They have created the present economic anarchy, now at an all-time high in America. At a press conference on Wednesday I was asked whether I would prefer to deal with Lewis or Murray, and I replied that I preferred Lewis.

The reporters asked, Why? and I said, Because Lewis keeps his bargains. I said I had nothing against Lewis as an individual. In fact, as a labor leader, loyal to the interests of his union members, he was not to be criticized for exploiting fully the special privileges which Government had given him.

My object was not to strip Lewis of his character but of his autocratic powers. Lewis is the stooge—the administration is the culprit.

My answers were presented Nation-wide, however, in a fashion that made me praise Lewis as a loyal American and even made me a backer of the Lewis approach to labor negotiations.

I trust what I am saying here will correct any such misunderstanding.

CONGRESS NEEDS TO CHANGE THE LAW

Lewis, Whitney, Johnston, Petrillo, Reuther, Murray—all claim they are within the law. If that be so, Congress needs to change the law.

President Truman calls the coal strike a national disaster. He is silent on the rail strike. President Truman makes no legislative recommendations to reduce the disaster or to protect the American people.

Washington appears baffled by the resistance of the public to this labor whipsaw of strikes. Actually, the administration still thinks it will be easier to push the public around than to inconvenience Lewis, Whitney, and Johnston.

The administration is talking about new boards, new procedures, for settling the coal strike. John Lewis can laugh at these new procedures, as he has laughed at the old ones, and he can continue to coerce new boards as he has coerced the President of the United States.

The railroad brotherhoods reject the 16-cent wage increase recommended by the Government's Railway Mediation Board. They demand a new award from a higher source, at public expense. They want 45 changes in feather-bed regulations that are inflationary.

DON'T APPEASE LABOR; ESTABLISH EQUALITY

The President of the United States disavows the Mediation Board and offers 18½ cents at public expense.

Little by little, the earnings of the Nation are passed on to labor in exchange for votes.

The answer to strikes and to the present rail and coal strikes is not for Government to appease individuals like Lewis and Whitney, but to deal with the whole national labor policy as such and restore equality between labor and management.

Congress has passed an antiroyalty law for Petrillo. Let Congress make it clear that the same law applies to Lewis and to all unions.

The power to tax is the power to destroy. Congress has that power and uses it. It should not be handed over to the supergovernment of labor.

Under the law, labor is not required to bargain collectively. However, in consideration of $3,000,000 back pay for 4 holidays and in consideration of 7 percent royalty on all soft coal pay rolls, Lewis now agrees to tell mine operators what his demands will be. Up to now, they are not known.

Seven percent on pay rolls would total $54,000,000. The earnings of the operators after taxes total in average years about $50,000,000.

The President has set 18½ cents as the legal wage raise ceiling under the Stabilization Act. Until the President raises it that is the legal ceiling.

GROUP FORCE MUST NOT CONTROL GOVERNMENT

Lewis, Whitney, and Johnston are striking to compel the President to raise the ceiling. That's a strike against Government. It is civil insurrection calculated either to coerce Government, or to force employers to disregard Government by breaking through the ceiling established by law.

In a nation where the ballot box is always open, group economic force has no place to control Government action, no matter how powerful its voting strength.

John L. Lewis has granted the Government of this Nation a 2-week reprieve from union dictatorship at the supplication of the President of the United States. Congress should not wait 2 weeks to strip John L. Lewis of the power to paralyze the economic lives of 140,000,000 people of the United States.

On Saturday the President breathlessly announced that the railroad brotherhoods would grant 5 more days of railroad transportation. Now the reprieve is up and we have the rail strike.

Congress can and must protect all the people by stopping all such strikes against the people's government now.

Failure of the Wagner Act to develop industrial peace, and a decade of resultant strikes, indicates the need for a long-term labor policy in the interest of all the people.

The public interest demands harmony between organized labor and management. This Nation cannot long endure being knocked to its knees every week by unions which are legalized monopolies in restraint of our daily lives.

The people are not against labor; they are not against unions; but they are overwhelmingly against the unrestrained violation of the people's rights by bad union leadership made possible under present laws.

Congress, and Congress alone, can give the public relief. Certainly Congress can make all management and labor equal under the law, and that is all management asks.

If the administration withdrew its opposition to equality for both ownership and labor before the law, Congress would clear up the present anarchy quickly.

Congress can end coercion of government by strikes. Congress can make collective bargaining a real two-way instrument for settling disputes, instead of being used as a blackjack in the hands of irresponsible union leaders.

Until equality between ownership and management on one side and labor on the other is restored by Congress, economic anarchy will increase in America.

The second great road block to prosperity is the OPA. In peacetime it serves a restrictive war function after the war has ended everywhere in the world except Washington, D. C.

OPA HOLD-THE-LINE A GIGANTIC BLUFF

Through OPA, without benefit of laws or review by courts, American collectivists impose foreign ideas of control on our land in peacetime.

Congress writes the laws, but the administrators write the regulations. OPA took unto itself powers in its regulations never granted by the Congress.

OPA has disorganized production lines and crippled orderly distribution of goods to the consumer.

OPA is the parent of all black markets, which are making us a Nation of law violators.

When OPA says that it is "holding the line" and preventing inflation it is engaging in a gigantic bluff.

A survey of 722 companies made by the National Industrial Council shows that OPA rulings have forced 60 percent of these companies to abandon production of certain goods for which there is a strong public demand. In another survey of 1,400 members of the National Association of Manufacturers, 94 percent of them said that OPA was seriously hindering production.

Because OPA is holding down production, it is, of itself one of the most powerful and dangerous inflationary forces in this country today.

OPA is hindering production by attacking profits instead of controlling prices.

OPA ATTACK ON PROFIT IRRESPONSIBLE, IMPRACTICAL

The OPA attack on profits is impractical and irresponsible. The right to sell at a fair profit is as fundamental to our economic freedom as the right to a job at fair pay. Goods that can't be made at a fair profit just don't get made.

The greatest contribution that American industry gives to the postwar period is its solvency. Except where the productive facilities remain solvent, employees will be fewer or none. A "busted" enterprise provides neither goods nor jobs.

Washington gives no indication of understanding the effects of the profit squeeze on the small businessman. With the OPA profit squeeze, the curtain for small business is quick. Small business in 1939 gave 8,000,000 jobs and produced $43,000,000,000 of goods and services. The Administration has overlooked the massive importance of small business.

Big business crowds the headlines; small business makes our Nation. The small manufacturers are nine times as numerous as medium and big manufacturers combined.

The small businessman is the new forgotten man. He will be the first casualty of the new wage-price policy. If little businesses are sunk by the profit-squeeze, it will leave a hole big enough to sink the entire economy.

Those zealots of the new order who have turned price control into profit squeeze know only too well that profit is what distinguishes private enterprise from socialism. Continuing OPA is a step toward economic servitude.

OPA says that it has to set and police "something like eight million prices." If the prices set by OPA are to be reasonable, OPA must know the costs of production and the costs of distribution and the historic conditions of profit on each of these 8,000,000 items. No Government bureau, even if it were efficient and well-intended, can do that job without delays, confusions, losses of production. That has already been completely demonstrated by OPA.

In New York City alone, the OPA administrator has testified that even if he had 10,000 additional enforcement agents he could not police the black markets of that one city.

We are at the point with OPA where we were with prohibition when it was washed out by the anger of the American people.

The American people are naturally concerned with what will happen to prices if OPA dies on June 30, as it should. Will prices skyrocket, as OPA is shouting from the housetops? Responsible businessmen don't sacrifice markets built up over the years in order to make a quick profit of a few dollars. The real producers—those who have made our standard of living what it is—know that it is only by keeping their prices fair that they can stay in business. In their own self-interest this same policy when OPA price controls are removed is the price of their survival in business.

PRICES WILL HOLD IF CONTROL ENDS

If OPA ends on June 30 prices will not rise above present actual prices. Present price tickets do not include costs of subsidies, poor quality, black markets, luxury substitutes for necessities, wage increases forced by Government but paid by you.

Without OPA we would not really pay more. The price tickets would show what we are really paying now. The cost of living—the total outgo from the pocket—would be unchanged.

In the judgment of NAM, if OPA is continued, prices will be higher at the end of another year than if OPA is dismissed now on its record. The upward march of prices, now in full swing, will never stop under OPA, and cannot be stopped by OPA.

What the producers in the country want is a chance to turn out the everyday supplies of goods with which to smother inflation and save America. The legitimate producers want a chance to price the black marketeers out of business—to put an end to the consumer gouging that today is being practiced by chiselers all over the Nation under the auspices of OPA.

CONTINUE OPA AND ORGANIZE NEXT CRISIS

These objectives can be attained only with a full market in which the American housewife, not OPA, sets the ceiling prices. That is the only form of price control that serves the public.

Under OPA, the market never can be full of goods. The inflationary pressure of unsatisfied purchasing power will increase in the absence of goods. The price line will be driven progressively upward.

If Congress continues OPA, it organizes the next great crisis in America.

The third great road block to prosperity is the inflationary fiscal policy of the Government. It arises from the first two road blocks—from the mistakes of Government in taking charge of wages and prices in order to obtain votes.

The wage-price mechanism in favor of labor is the root of your trouble with OPA. Wage increases politically bestowed, that are not based on production of goods, simply feed the fires of inflation.

We are still in the first, or progressive, stage in inflation. We must avoid the second, or runaway, stage.

OPA has never asked for a ceiling on the printing of money. Lacking this control of money, prices must rise as OPA prevents goods coming onto the market. The Government constantly borrows money to pay its bills for you to pay later. This abundance of money, in combination with shortages of goods caused by OPA, creates the real danger of inflation.

This financing by deficits creates money, credit, and purchasing power without producing the goods which alone can validate the money.

The resulting inflation is not something to talk about only in terms of the billions of dollars that the Nation owes in debt. It must be talked about in terms of what is owed by the people who pay for this Government.

The people can't pass the debt along. They are the end of the line.

Many are deluded by the abundance of money caused by the war. But the Government debt overhangs your job, your chattels, and whatever savings that you have.

The policy of deficit financing levies its cost against your living and your future.

Deficit financing reduces the value of insurance policy you hold by reducing the purchasing power of the money.

Deficit financing goes through your safe-deposit box and reduces the values in it without opening the box.

"WE MUST STOP ADDING TO THE DEBT NOW"

Deficit financing reduces the value of every savings bank deposit without changing the credits in your bank book.

Deficit financing reduces the value of the money in your pocket while you hold on to it, without changing the numerals on the folding money or the figures on your coins.

Deficit financing robs all the elderly who on the sunset side of life depend on fixed incomes or annuities, and who lack the strength to reenter the ranks of workers.

Deficit financing reduces the values of trusts for old and young, for retirement or for education.

Deficit financing in peacetime is a selfish plan to enjoy privileges and immunities in the present at the expense of our children and our grandchildren in the future.

Deficit financing is an invasion of the purchasing power of the poor. It reduces the amount of groceries the housewife can purchase by increasing their prices.

Deficit financing raises the costs of shoes and clothing by increasing the costs of the farmer who supplies cotton, wool, and leather.

Deficit financing menaces the security of all civil service employees, of all white-collar workers who function as servants in all parts of the economy but not as pressure groups.

Deficit financing invalidates even the wage increases of labor by reducing the purchasing power of the money with which the increases are paid.

The Government should get a realistic plan to balance the budget. Until it is balanced, we cannot sweep back the rising tide of inflation.

We must stop adding to the debt now; not 5 years hence. Nations, like individuals, pay their debts only when they plan to do so.

Meanwhile, the only way to handle the Government debt is to expand the economy to fit the debt. This is prevented by OPA.

OPA ceilings should be put on the production of debt and taken off the production of goods.

We might well use at home the fiscal policy exported to Tokyo. In January, MacArthur required the Japanese Government to follow a correct fiscal policy. He required the Japanese Government to do in Japan what our own administration must do in America if run-away inflation is to be prevented. The Allied command demanded that deficit financing cease, and added this order:

"1. The Japanese Government must cut expenses to the minimum;

"2. Deficits must be financed from the savings of the Japanese people—or from actual banks deposits rather than from the newly printed currency;

"3. The Japanese Government must refrain from selling to the Bank of Japan or other banks hypothetical obligations demanding in exchange actual circulating currency."

NATION AWARE OF ECONOMIC ANARCHY

MacArthur's fiscal policy for Japan is a plan for solvency. It should be the plan for America.

America is aware of the economic anarchy that now shakes it.

The people are uneasy about their abundant money, which cannot buy goods at prices they should pay. They know black markets have been created by OPA restrictions on production. They know people are idle when work is plentiful. They are tired of favors to labor in exchange for votes. They seek removal of all road blocks to prosperity. They want to know how they can help to regain the freedom that they have lost.

The answer for the producer is to demand the restriction of all our rights, to denounce the controls of all collectivist planners, in order to stop the hell-bent descent of this Nation to the ultimate monopoly of the people's rights by the authoritarian state.

Your speaker is not addressing you as a partisan. He speaks as an American deeply indebted to this Nation of ours.

He is no more a partisan than HATTON W. SUMNERS, life-long Texas Democrat, retiring from office after 33 years of service. He stated recently for all of us the case against concessions at public expense in exchange for votes:

"By concentration of governmental power and drafts upon the Federal Treasury, we have now a financially 'busted' great piled-up mass of governmental confusion beyond human comprehension, impossible of democratic control, extravagant, wasteful, inefficient, and by its nature the instrumentality of favoritism, tyranny, oppression, and corruption, and the destroyer of the self-reliance and self-respect and governmental capacity of the people, qualities without which no people can remain free."

IT'S TIME FOR GOVERNED OF NATION TO SPEAK

If your liberties are further reduced, your indifference contributes to their reduction.

Governments are man-made. They derive their power from the consent of the governed.

It's high time for the governed of this Nation to speak!

Getting rid of OPA right now and cutting down Government deficit spending are two big steps we must take to achieve economic freedom.

Representative government in America is dying under your eyes, with your permission.

In history its successor has always been dictatorship.

It is not important that the dictatorship be nominated by the politicians or the union leaders that control the politicians. The result is the reduction of your liberties.

Collectivism has brought our economy dangerously close to the point of ruin. As the lights in the White House are dimmed by union action, our liberties fade out all over America.

Freedom has never been kept alive by any people through compromise. Only alertness to defend and to fight for freedom can keep it bright in this land.

The fight to regain our lost liberties is worthy of everything you have and everything you owe your children and your grandchildren. In this fight each man must help. In this fight there can be no bystanders.

Men of Chicago, get up and fight!

Listen to the American Servicemen in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the American boys in uniform in the occupied countries, are beginning to understand what is going on and why they are being kept in service instead of being sent home. They are beginning to understand that the reports we get do not coincide with the facts as they witness them from day to day in the armies of occupation.

The following letter, signed by 13 men in the service stationed in Taegu, Korea, expressing their feelings freely, and the message signed by them shows that their morale is not up to the high level it has been pictured to us:

TAEGU, KOREA, *May 29, 1946.*

HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN: We, the men of the Third Battalion, First Infantry, stationed at Taegu, Korea, have been quite surprised over numerous reports which have been given to the American people. For instance, recently General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower visited Seoul, Korea, and reported the morale of troops here excellent. To what depths is morale expected to sink to be reported otherwise than excellent?

We are reported to be the best-fed Army in the world. Just how long will it take the troops over here to consume the surplus C rations which were on hand when the war ended?

Is it justice for some stateside 1-year reenlistee to be discharged and returned to the comforts of civilian life before combat men and draftees held against their will are discharged?

The Army has stated that it doesn't intend to fall back into training methods merely designed to pass the time. To what purpose is elementary close-order drill, sanitation, and first aid, etc., given to combat men and to men who have been overseas for some time? As regards combat men, training: The expressed opinion of same commanders have been that certain men upon questioning show the need of such elementary training; strange that so many forget so soon that the same men 9 months ago were victoriously winning the battles against obstinate, fanatical Japanese. This inefficiency and need of training seems to be as prevalent and as sudden as the bubonic plague which swept over Europe in the Middle Ages.

The American people have been flooded with honey-fed reports of big-purpose information and education programs over here. Any vestiges of such a program here is purely coincidental. Forty-hour training schedules one week, and constant fatigue details the next is the greatest amount of variations practiced.

These reports herein stated are not the error of any immediate command, but are the result of policies set forth from higher headquarters. These opinions do not reflect only those of the above-listed organization, but are the opinions of all units encountered in Korea.

We have always been led to believe our Congressmen are the representatives of the people. Is it too bold to ask that we teenagers may someday cast a vote toward better representation on the part of those now presently in that position?

I am sure that many Members of Congress are getting what we call love-and-kisses telegrams from the boys serving in the areas of occupation. This is a code message which they have adopted to signify their malcontent and resentment of the treatment they have been receiving, much of which is outlined in the above letter. These love-and-kisses telegrams when decoded mean that they expect Congress to bring them home. They expect us to enact laws which will require the military authorities to take the necessary steps to bring these boys home. My impressions have been that the military authorities have not given the voluntary enlistment system a fair trial and really do not want to see it succeed. Many of us are convinced in our own minds that they want to continue the Selective Service Act and to draft the teen-age boys into the service. We all know that these boys will not make good policemen, and that no city in the United States would think of employing 18- and 19-year-old boys on their police forces.

If the voluntary system were given a fair trial, and if the standards were lowered to the point where a lot of those who were not called during the days of hostilities because they were classed as IV–F men, and a lot of those who were deferred on account of employment in war industries, where they made good salaries, were taken into the service at this time, we would have men of more mature years, who would make better policemen and be more adapted to the program which the armed forces have attempted to carry out in policing foreign areas.

Parents are being worried to death by the threats of having their sons drafted into the service at a time when it would interrupt school attendance and training and in most instances will result in their never completing their scholastic courses.

It seems to many of us that it is mere subterfuge, an attempt to deceive the people, to say that it is necessary to draft these teen-agers and keep the Selective Service Act in force, in order to relieve a lot of these boys who want to come home and who are entitled to come home.

This is a great deal like a system adopted by military authorities and the heads of this administration when they discriminated between officers and the enlisted men with reference to terminal leave pay. Many think that there was no legal authority for the administration to pay terminal leave to commissioned officers. Certainly, we are all convinced that it was not fair to have paid the commissioned officers and refuse to pay terminal leave to the enlisted men. This is a part of the caste system of the Army that must be broken down in this country or we will be in danger of having a militaristic regime which prevailed in Germany so long. Drastic action in Congress may be necessary before our military leaders are brought to the realization that it is just as incumbent upon them to deal fairly with the boys in the service as it is in civilian life for men to deal with each other on a fair and honorable basis in business relations. Many think the time has not yet come when we can rely implicitly on the statements of those who head our military organizations. The people, and especially the enlisted men, have very little faith in the candor and reliability of the statements and representations of our military leaders, made to the boys when they are entering the service and while they are in uniform. The servicemen come home with reports that statements and inducements have been made them at the time of enlistment, and occasionally during their service, that are almost unbelievable, and that such promises are not kept, with a result that many of the boys have an utter disregard for and distrust of statements and promises from such sources. This ought not to be true.

With the passage of the increase pay bill as passed by the House, and with fair and honorable treatment of our boys in the service, I have no doubt that confidence would be restored and the voluntary system would produce all the men we need in our armed forces for peacetime operations.

Housing Shortage in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues to the following communication from the Governor of California.

Included with the Governor's letter is a copy of a telegram recently sent to President Truman and to the Housing Expediter, Mr. Wilson W. Wyatt. The housing situation, which is bad throughout the entire country, is desperately acute in California. I sincerely hope that President Truman and Mr. Wyatt will give prompt attention to Governor Warren's request for channeling additional materials into the State of California at the earliest possible date. Thousands of homes now standing empty and idle can be utilized if the necessary construction materials needed for completion can be obtained.

The letter and wire follow:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Sacramento, June 13, 1946.

Hon. JOHN Z. ANDERSON,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed is a copy of a telegram sent by me today to President Harry S. Truman and to Wilson W. Wyatt, National Housing Expediter.

Shortages of critical building materials for home construction are causing work stoppages as well as further delay in resuming work due to irregular deliveries; they are also causing noticeable loss of wages in the building trades; and, above all, are seriously delaying completion of sorely needed housing in our State.

May I urge your assistance in meeting California's housing needs by supporting the recommendations set forth in my telegram?

Sincerely,

EARL WARREN,
Governor.

TELEGRAM TO PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN AND WILSON W. WYATT

JUNE 13, 1946.

California's housing problems have been a matter of great concern to the State government for more than 2 years, but the sphere of State authority is limited in developing solutions. The California Legislature has recognized the problem, has appropriated funds to aid housing construction, and has recommended congressional consideration of measures designed to alleviate the shortage. Within the past month, we have held a series of conferences—one designed to assure a supply of timber to the mills in California forest areas, and the other to develop essential facts about current shortages in critical materials. From our studies of the situation, the following facts emerge:

1. California's needs for more housing are greater than those of any other State because (a) California now has 2,000,000 more population and over 600,000 more families than were reported by the 1940 census. This far exceeds the numerical population growth of any other State during the same period. (b) California has more than 900,000 demobilized veterans of World War II, of whom nearly 300,000 came from other States.

2. In recognition of California's needs, its home builders received priorities to June 7 for 89,200 homes under the priorities assistance program. This is equivalent to about 15 percent of the national total and is the largest allotment to any State.

3. Actual construction depends upon increasing the supplies of materials and equipment available to builders. It is the opinion of those who have studied the situation that only about 20 percent of the critical materials required for home building in California are now being provided for such construction. For lack of materials, between 10,000 and 14,000 homes remain unfinished in the Los Angeles area, and from 5,000 to 7,000 homes are standing unfinished in the San Francisco Bay area. Completion of these homes and construction of additional needed housing requires the channeling of more construction materials to our builders.

To expedite construction of homes so urgently needed in California for veterans and civilians alike, I respectfully urge:

1. That nails and cement be immediately added to the critical materials covered under HH priorities.

2. That at least 50 percent of all critical construction materials allocated to the Pacific Coast area be definitely channeled into housing for this area.

3. That a substantial portion of the $400,000,000 subsidy for housing materials recently provided by the Congress and approved by you[1] be allocated to California manufacturers to increase the supply of critical materials that are essential for veteran housing construction in this State.

4. That except for the retention of a 90-day supply to be used for maintenance purposes only, all building material now in the Pacific Coast States in possession of the armed forces, the War Assets Corporation, and other Federal agencies be retained in this area and not be stock piled or shipped elsewhere but be made immediately available solely to builders of veteran housing.

EARL WARREN,
Governor of California.

[1] In telegram to Wilson W. Wyatt, this clause read "and approved by the President."

New Deal Synthetics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE B. SCHWABE
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a letter from a member of the Oklahoma State Legislature, describing his views of New Deal synthetics. Apparently he has developed his ideas rather clearly and they are expressive of the ideas of the midwesterners where the spirit of America still lives, if it lives anywhere in the United States.

I quote from the letter as follows:

We read and hear sometimes about the various ages of the world—the stone age, iron age, and others. Some call this the atomic age. It looks to me like it is the synthetic age, with all the things synthetic we have to contend with—synthetic rubber, oil, leather, gas, glass, and even food products such as butter and milk. Even with our vast production of cotton and wool we get synthetic clothes, socks, shorts, shirts, and pants.

To top it all we have synthetic thinking and leadership, synthetic diplomats who are trading our good American way of free thinking and enterprise for a bunch of foreign isms that don't work there and won't work here. This country was made great by independent people free to work out their own way of life and free enterprise which made us the greatest nation on earth. So great that we have through two great wars fed and clothed allies and have fed our enemies, furnished all the implements of war and then have done the bulk of the fighting to win those wars. Now we are called upon to lower our standard of living (and that is what it amounts to) in order that we feed and clothe those who would destroy us.

The Scripture admonishes industry of the individual in order to live and eat. Capt. John Smith said that "he who woudn't work shouldn't eat," but, "No," say our sympathetic smart boys, "we have to feed them or they will start another war." They want and plead for food production as if it were a 1-day job and not a whole year in most cases. They want fats and oils and plead with us to save, then fix it so we can't get the proper grains to fatten our stock, especially hogs, in order that we can produce the fat they plead for. Then tell me that they are not a synthetic leadership and devoid of statemanship and in many cases the manhood to even tell the truth.

Why not a change from the part truths and catering to special classes and pitting one class against another? Why not, I say, tell the American people the truth for once. What a change that would be from the high-sounding platitudes with which we are afflicted by these world-wide "do gooders." Take the strangulating regulations off industry and let's have production of goods for our people who need them.

Who makes the black markets we hear about? Nobody but the OPA with their mismanagement, even during the war. How are the people going to preserve and save the fruit crops coming on without sugar and even a limited amount of corn sirup? Let the interference of and by political parasites and hate mongers stop, then the worker and management can get together. Do away with the OPA and kindred set-ups and you will have done away with the so-called black markets.

They say we have it to keep down inflation. What a joke. Where is there someone so dumb who doesn't know we already have inflation, and production would cure that. I think it would be a good plan to load up a lot of these synthetic thinkers and managers of OPA and like set-ups and take them out in the country and see how long it takes to grow wheat, corn, or almost any other crop, and to hear a real hog grunt, and to find whether a cow's horns are in front of her ears or behind them.

A lot of people lament about the use of grain to make liquor. Why don't they think back (if possible for them to do so) to November of 1932 and see how they voted then and what resulted? Some of them had better do some praying before they cast too many stones. For myself, I never voted the way most of them did and won't again, no matter what pressure.

OPA Despotic Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the OPA has issued some very despotic regulations, and these are now harassing business of every kind and character in our country. The chief cause of the general clamor for the abolishment of the OPA is the conduct of that agency itself. The American people are well informed, and they are fully advised, upon this entire system inaugurated by the OPA—and they are wanting all of the bungling stopped. They want the opportunity to go forward as Americans.

A very interesting article appeared in the Boston American on May 28 which I ask may be included under the unanimous-consent rule with my own remarks. This newspaper article is as follows:

OPA DESPOTIC REGULATION

Despotic totalitarian practices employed by the Office of Price Administration in its harassment of American business have not as many Americans have supposed, grown out of ignorance or overenthusiasm on the part of subordinate OPA officials.

They were ordered from the top of the OPA organization.

A confidential memorandum, sent out by Chester Bowles in his former capacity as head of OPA and just now discovered by researchers for the Senate minority conference committee, directs regional, district, and local enforcement officials to prosecute the most respected businessmen and firms in each community.

Mr. Bowles instructed his subordinates that unintentional failures to obey the OPA's confused and arbitrary regulations must be punished as harshly as deliberate violations.

He wrote:

"Most of our activity is concerned with violations on the part of hitherto reputable individuals or firms, with violations that frequently result from indifference or carelessness rather than from criminal intent.

"A large part of our public relations job, therefore, must be to demonstrate why every violation of a price or rationing regulation is a threat to the Nation's security and well-being, no matter who the violator is or what his intentions were."

Mr. Bowles made it plain, however, that while the intentions of the violator were a matter of indifference to him, the business standing of the violator interested him profoundly.

"In selecting cases," he instructed his enforcement officials—meaning, of course, deciding which violations are to be prosecuted—"we normally look for quality, not quantity. * * * Since our regulations apply primarily to businessmen, such violators are not 'criminals' in the usual sense. Rather, the selection of key cases will often involve action against what have hitherto been some of the most respectable members of an industry.

"Violations arising out of carelessness or indifference may well be more important—in some situations—than willful violations."

What this amounted to was simply an order for the OPA bureaucracy to attack reputable American business.

And the victims were to be selected without regard for the question of actual, intentional guilt, just so they were important enough that smearing them would attract widespread attention.

Unfortunately the Red Fascist philosophy of enmity toward free enterprise prescribed by Mr. Bowles in his totalitarian order has been largely embraced and put into practice by the OPA.

Bevin's Quibbing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Sunday Morning Star, Wilmington, Del., for June 16, 1946:

BEVIN'S QUIBBING

Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin of Britain decidedly put his foot in it last week when, he nonchalantly told the Labor Party Conference that: "The agitation in the United States for 100,000 Jews to be put into Palestine—and I do not want the Americans to misunderstand me—is because they do not want too many of them in New York."

This was but one item of his speech, but it was sufficient to show in which direction the wind was blowing. It will be hard now to convince Americans that British policy has been anything but evasive, tricky, and insincere ever since the Balfour Declaration of more than two decades ago, just as it has been for so many years with India.

Lest there be misunderstanding, Palestine is not British territory, but a mandate assigned to her by the League of Nations, and the British are responsible, under that mandate, for steps "in favor of establishment of a national home for the Jewish people." How Palestine is ever to become a Jewish homeland unless Jews are permitted to enter, not perhaps as they will, but certainly in large migrations at this most critical stage of their European existence, passes human understanding.

No, Palestine is not British territory, to be used as a pawn in eternal schemings to hold populations in check for her own advantage and to block development by other nations, as witness her finger in every pie in Europe from Spain and Italy to Greece and the Dardanelles.

Since Britain has coolly thurst aside the mask, it is now high time that the United Nations, heir to the League of Nations, should now remove Palestine as mandated territory from her grasp, and put a stop to this interminable evasion of the problem of a Jewish homeland—a homeland into which Jews will actually be permitted to enter.

Communism Plans To Conquer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, those Americans who point out that the road to Moscow for our people is the road to ruin often find plenty of opposition from certain groups in our country. Different people give different reasons for suggesting that Russia is suspicious of us and has a right to be. It is fashionable in certain spots to defend the communistic philosophy which comes from Moscow.

Those who believe in communism have a well-defined plan and they are carrying it out in every wa possible from day to day. They seek to undermine the American way of life and form of government. The attack takes different forms, shapes, and developments. But it always has the same purpose and result. So far only occasionally has anyone had the courage to say that the communistic plan to dominate the world would stop at nothing; not only would the Communists violate all the principles of honor, integrity, and self-respect, bu' they would starve people to death if that served their desire for world domination. In yesterday's newspapers is a startling statement by Herbert Hoover. Mr. Hoover modestly accuses the Communists of willingness to cripple and defeat our purpose to help famine-stricken people, because such an accomplishment would promote the cause of communism, even though it meant the starvation of untold thousands of women and little children suffering from disease and hunger. Such is the policy of the rulers of Russia.

The following newspaper item in the Washington Times-Herald for June 16, 1946, is worthy of careful reading and thought:

HOOVER ACCUSES RED PRESS OF PLOT TO BLOCK FOOD RELIEF—CHARGES ATTEMPT TO "PRODUCE CHAOS" BY DENYING SUPPLIES TO NEEDY NATIONS

RIO DE JANEIRO, June 15.—Herbert Hoover told a press conference here today that the "universal party line of the Communist Party in every country is trying to break down the provision of food for hungry people and thus produce chaos where they can fish in troubled waters."

Hoover, in Brazil on a food study in South America for President Truman, said that if his analysis of the Communist policy on food were "not the case, it would appear that this is the time for Moscow to establish a new party line in the Communist press of the world."

ATTACKED BY RED PRESS

Hoover—who said the Government and people of Brazil were eager to help relieve world famine and could furnish rice, beans, and corn—was attacked upon his arrival here by the Communist press as "the ambassador of Wall Street coming to take bread from the Brazilian people."

"In Brazil as well as in the 37 other countries I have visited," Hoover said, "wherever there is a Communist press, and this is in most of them, that press has attacked this effort to provide food for the hungry working people of the world, alleging the food was to be used for political purposes.

"In Latin America it also takes the form that we are trying to take food from the people, when our only purpose is to provide food. The unity of the opposition is interesting because the Communist press is aware that the Christian world today is denying itself food in order that the working people of France, Belgium, Italy, Poland, Yugoslavia, and 20 other countries may be saved from starvation. Among these people there are millions of Communists who have received their full share and whose lives were saved by our action.

CITES PAST AID TO SOVIET

"It is still more interesting because after the First World War, at the request of the Soviet Government, I organized relief for the great famine among the working people of south Russia and received the most fulsome documents of thanks and appreciation signed by the highest officials of the Russian Government.

"As we are feeding Communists in all countries and always have done so, there obviously has been no use of food for polilitcal purposes or no intent to make such use of it."

AS FOOD ADMINISTRATOR, MR. HOOVER CARRIED ON RELIEF WORK IN RUSSIA

Perhaps the most interesting and significant quotation in the foregoing newspaper item is that part in which Mr. Hoover comments on the fact that in World War I he was in charge of relief work and had to do with sending food to the famine-stricken people among the working classes of Russia. Some of us will recall that there was in America a great wave of sympathy and generosity. Food was collected and aid was extended to these people in a manner that befits our kind of civilization and our type of Christian leadership. I have a rather distinct recollection of a Member of Congress, one of my predecessors, taking great pride in the fact that he had voted for a direct appropriation of many millions of dollars out of the Treasury of the United States to buy wheat for shipment to Russia. Now in the hour of the world's greatest opportunity, the Communists, under orders from Russia and its leaders, are interfering with the program of furnishing food to famine-stricken Europe.

In the face of these facts we still have people in this country who have mud in their brains and whose thinking is so chaotic that they say, "Russia is suspicious of us and has a right to be." Those individuals who utter those sentiments need to be watched. People who applaud that type of a statement are equally guilty.

Farm Cannot Meet Wage Scale of Industry at Present Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from the Times-Herald of June 17, written by Frank M. Smith. The article points out one of the important issues confronting the Nation today.

The newspaper article follows:

I talked to a dairy farmer in Montgomery County last week who looked more like a grease monkey than a hayseed. His farm is mechanized.

He said to me:

"You can forget about butter until the price reaches 90 cents a pound. And, if farm labor organizes, it'll go to $1.25."

LAUGH AT HIRED HANDS

Across the road his neighbor said people laugh at the hired hands who work for him. Each morning the cars gather at Gaithersburg. Men tumble into them and start for town. Laboring jobs with contractors pay 90 cents to $1.05 an hour for a 40-hour week. Farm jobs pay $25 to $35 a week for a 70-hour week.

Result?

Fifty percent of the farm labor is on an unofficial but all too effective strike.

Farm hands don't belong to unions—yet. They don't picket. They don't hold continuous meetings. They just walk away and don't come back.

CAN GO ON RELIEF

They go to town and get $40 to $50 for a 5-day week, or they go on relief. They don't have to get up at 3 a. m. to milk cows, so they can clean the barn, cut the feed, bale the hay, water the stock so they can milk the cows again and go home, go to bed so they can get up at 3 a. m. again to milk the cows.

W. Lawson King wants to give his laborers a raise. He's got five big farms on the main drag between Rockville and Washington. Down the pike past his barns the autos speed other help to better paying jobs in town. They laugh at his hands. It makes him sore.

So, he's going to sell out January 1. He says so and I believe him. He's a dynamo, by the way. He runs an automobile business and a farm machinery business, besides being the largest milk producer in the county. He says he can't make any money at current prices. So he's going into something else.

WANTS MEN ORGANIZED

Meanwhile he wants his men to organize. He wants OPA to go jump in a lake. He wants to raise his prices so he can: 1. Give his men a salary boost; 2. Put them on three shifts, 8 hours a day; 3. Set up a retirement system for them.

There's nothing radical in that, he says. Big industry does it. And brother, he's the biggest industry in Montgomery County.

And he says:

"The parasites in Washington tell me what price I'm to get for my product. John L. Lewis and some others tell me how much I've got to pay for the things I need to produce my product. All I do is produce. I'm getting out."

If he makes good his threat, it'll cost Washington 1,000 to 1,500 gallons of milk daily.

STOP SUBSIDIES AND RELIEF

King wants to stop subsidies besides throwing out OPA and stopping relief.

"The 52-20 club is making bums out of our veterans," he said. "Pay them off at once. Make everyone on relief reapply. If they are physically able, make them go to work by stopping the relief. By God, I've been on relief. I've been getting a subsidy. It ought to stop."

Basil Mobley predicted the $1.25-a-pound butter. He's a neighbor of King's. He had grease up to his elbows when I met him. He was tinkering with a one-cylinder motor that drives his elevator. He has a pick-up baler, combine, tractor, trucks, and is trying out artificial insemination for his herd.

But he needs men to run the machines. The ones he has want more money. He thinks they ought to have it. He can't get them to work a full week for the wages they get. He had two boys loading hay on the elevator while he talked.

MAY TRY BONUS PLAN

"The men just walked off this afternoon," he said. "I think I'll give them a bonus. Then they might not walk off. I think I'll give a bonus to each one who works through the week. That's one trouble, they won't work a full week."

Mobley thinks we have shipped too much food to Europe. "After they stop that," he said, "we'll have so much food in 6 months we won't know what to do with it."

Elizabeth McCulloch is strong and healthy. She says she's glad she is. And you ought to be, too. For she runs a dairy farm at Silver Spring. And you need her dairy farm with its good Guernsey herd. You'll need it more than ever if Lawson King quits.

The reason it's so important that she keep in the pink is because she had to run the whole shebang by herself for a month last fall. Couldn't get any help. She's got one man now. She used to have three.

CAN'T RAISE HERD FEED

Now all she has to do is help with the milking, clean up the dairy, feed the heifers and the chickens, care for the horses, cultivate the grapes, clean up her house, care for her mother, and speak kindly to her Dalmatian. She hasn't time to pet him.

She doesn't have time to raise any feed for her herd, either. And that's the sad part of the story for you. Someone else has to raise grain for her cattle. The grain that someone raises can't be sent to Europe, or baked into bread for you. If it is, her cows will drop down in the quality and quantity of their production. And you can try water on your baby's cereal.

Otto Anderson, Montgomery county agent, says mechanization will save the farmer. Elizabeth McCulloch would like to have her Lurelake farm saved right now. She's got an order in for a tractor. She wishes someone would tell her when she is going to get it.

Otto Anderson also says he's afraid of what might happen when complete mechanization comes to the farmer. What will the veterans and the displaced war workers who are now on relief do then?

SEE PERMANENT DOLE

It'll be too late to come back to the farm. The jobs will be all gone. Will they have to go on a permanent dole? It's a good question to mull over because if they do you and I will have to pay the bill.

Out in Montgomery now they only use screens to keep the cats out. They are getting ready to cut the tails off the cows. It's part of the mechanization. Anderson just goes out and sprays a barn with DDT. All the insects die. A fly can't live 5 minutes in a barn after he's finished with it. He'll give you 5 bucks for every one that does.

Think of the men it used to take to make screens, put them up, repair them, wash out the barns with disinfectant, and put on haphazard insect-killing drives. They don't need the men now.

After he's fixed up a barn, Anderson takes his big sprayer and puts in 24-d. He sprays the fence rows. All the weeds die. It used to take men long hours to cut them down. You can't get them to do it now, and when they are ready to do it they won't be needed.

Anderson doesn't know what to do with these men when they try to come back. He thinks maybe it will means a class entirely dependent on relief. He doesn't think giving them small farms to run is the answer. He saw the small farm areas in Europe. The poverty and general mismanagement was terrible, he felt.

It looks like higher prices or higher taxes or both.

How About Lower Prices?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted by the House to extend my remarks, I include therein an editorial from the Daily Tribune of Royal Oak, Mich., my home city. It contains some sane thinking and common sense, which has been denied to much of the present younger generation.

Pressure groups believed they could beat simple arithmetic. Sooner or later we all learn to our sorrow it cannot be done. That inexorable and unrelenting truth is beginning to dawn on a Nation which has been living on its children and grandchildren. A brighter and happier day will come to this favored land when government is returned to the grass roots of local control.

I commend the reading of this editorial to you, my colleagues, that we may be reminded of a cardinal principle on which America grew great and strong among the nations of the world.

The editor deserves a vote of praise from all of us.

HOW ABOUT LOWER PRICES?

(By Floyd J. Miller)

Isn't it about time that we got away from everybody's grabbing for higher wages, higher prices—then more higher wages and still higher prices—and considered the old idea of lowering prices and so benefiting everyone?

You don't have to be an expert in economics to realize that what we have been doing for the last few years is pretty screwy. And it keeps getting worse. Maybe if we started to do a little thinking and sweating for ourselves, instead of appealing to all the experts and the statesmen down in Washington, we would at least put the brakes on the wild ride on which we are now embarked.

Everyone of us, on everyday on which we try to buy something, receives one more demonstration of the fact that you can't turn things all over to the Government and get the right answer.

For "the Government" is just a collection of human individuals like you and me. These individuals are in some ways smarter than the average citizen. They have been able to attract enough attention so as to persuade voters to send them to Washington or persuade Government executives to hire them.

But we make a colossal mistake, I believe, if we assume that these persons have the

least bit more of honesty, sincerity, or fundamental understanding of American ideals than the average of us who remain at home.

It is a great tragedy that so many of our younger citizens have never lived in anything but an American society which looked to the National Government as the principal spark plug for ideas, the principal thrower-out of life preservers to those in difficulty, and also the main source of easy money for those who decided they might as well get theirs while it was being passed out.

I am not a believer in thirteen as an especially unlucky number, but I am quite willing to admit that the last 13 years have been very sad ones for the development of American character. And I realize that American character means something slightly different to each of us. What I have in mind mainly, right now when I use that phrase, is a character that wishes a fair chance to make good on its own initiative.

During the depression and then during the war we had to look to the Federal Government for many decisions. We decided to surrender (temporarily, we thought at first) some of our individual liberties in order to unite our strength and resources to fight threatening economic conditions or hostile nations.

So we have got into the habit of working through what we call pressure groups. Among other things we have thought it necessary to have the Government help us get bigger incomes. If we are depending on wages or salaries to support us, we have to have bigger ones to meet the higher cost of living. If we are engaged in making and selling goods, we have to have higher prices to meet higher costs of production.

Aren't we all beginning to get a pretty clear idea of where this is leading us?

How many remember the days when business and industry were encouraged—even forced—to strive unendingly for lower prices. Competition was what made this necessary.

A concern that could make or sell a satisfactory article cheaper than its competitors got the business. Those who wanted to stay in would not depend on some Government bureau to grant them higher prices. They had to rack their brains and burn the midnight oil to think up new ways of improving their products or turning them out at a lower cost.

What most people seem to have lost sight of is that every time a price was decreased every individual who was a prospective buyer instantly received a wage or salary increase. If the price of butter went down, everybody's dollar was worth more. If automobiles decreased in cost from $2,000 to $400 (as they did), the real value of everybody's wages received a tremendous boost.

It was not necessary to go through a costly strike or stir up all the hard feelings that are likely to accompany one. A decrease in prices was an achievement which brought happiness to the buyer and a greater business to the manufacturer or seller.

I wonder how long it will be before we head back in that direction?

Supreme Court Stabs Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the public is losing the faithful confidence that it has always had in the Supreme Court as to its protecting the people in their constitutional rights, and I am including herewith an editorial by Spencer A. Canary, editor, Sentinel Tribune, Bowling Green, Ohio:

HIGHEST COURT STABS CONSTITUTION

It is hard to believe that the Supreme Court of the United States has handed down a majority opinion that Government agents, while on official inspection tours, may conduct searches and seizures without a warrant.

Such search and seizure were among the causes of our Revolution in 1776. Our forefathers prohibited it in the Constitution under the Bill of Rights. They had experienced the iron hand of tyranny. They wanted none of it. They knew that expediency might prompt officers to do just what the Supreme Court now says Federal officers may do.

So they said in article IV of the Bill of Rights: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

Justices Frankfurter, Murphy, and Rutledge dissented and condemned the opinion; and it seems to the editor that this decision is a brazen disregard for the basic law of the land.

"Britain-First" Americans Are Trying To Ignore Nebraska Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, by almost a 2-to-1 vote the people of Nebraska turned thumbs down on the British loan last week in the senatorial primary.

The Britain-first crowd in America does not like that verdict by the people.

So they are slyly ignoring that mandate.

But let us keep the record straight. The outstanding address of the campaign was made by William C. Fraser, of Omaha. Let us look at excerpts from that speech to find the issue in the Nebraska primary:

The platform of the Republican Party adopted in the State convention on March 19, 1946, with reference to foreign loans stated:

"We oppose the making of loans to foreign governments on other than a sound financial basis. Any such loans should be made by and through private channels."

HUGH BUTLER is running for reelection to the United States Senate upon that plank in the platform and every other principle stated therein. He demonstrated that conclusively when, together with Senator WHERRY, he voted against loaning, pardon me, I mean giving, to Great Britain $4,000,000,000.

Governor Griswold is in favor of the loan and loans to other friendly powers and so stated publicly on March 27.

Eleanor Roosevelt, in a speech in Omaha on March 28, also endorsed the making of the loan.

Eleanor and Dwight see eye to eye in that respect.

On Friday last, commenting on the senatorial contest, the World-Herald said:

"Save for a difference of opinion as to the British loan, there has been little if any public joining of issues between the Senator who wants to hold onto his job and the Governor who wants to supersede him. Republicans sufficiently interested to vote in the primaries can decide whether they like Hugh better than Dwight, or Dwight better than Hugh. And that's all there is. There isn't any more."

* * * Upon the one issue that the candidates have taken opposite positions, the cleavage is complete—BUTLER is at one end of the line—Griswold at the other. BUTLER took a position against loaning $4,000,000,000 to Great Britain, and, when called upon, voted against it. Griswold recently said: "I favor a loan to Great Britain even though it should not be entirely sound from a commercial standpoint." BUTLER says, if private money wants to make the loan, all right.

BUTLER justifies his position because the United States will probably never be repaid. We forgave or have forgotten a default debt of $4,000,000,000 from World War I; we have already forgiven a lend-lease debt of almost $25,000,000,000.

Just think, $4,000,000,000 World War I; $25,000,000,000 lend-lease in World War II. Have you analyzed how much that means to every man, woman, and child in Nebraska? In round figures $200 that each of us have already contributed to Great Britain. Over one-tenth of our national debt is on account of loans and advances to Great Britain.

Now Governor Griswold says let's each chip in $30 more. That will be about $40,000,000 from Nebraska. Enough to build four State capitols. Enough to build new State institutions for our insane, our blind, our crippled, and our delinquents. If ever any condition calls for spending money in Nebraska, it is new and better shelter for our unfortunates.

Nebraska's road-building program is being hindered for lack of funds. We are $10,000,000 short of being able to match Federal funds for the 3-year period. Shall we loan and ultimately give money to a foreign power or use it at home for things direly needed?

Our schools are in trouble—some are running short time—our teachers are woefully underpaid. Shall we use money for these local necessities or send it overseas?

One of the greatest anomalies in our time is the willingness to spend or give away money if it is done in Washington. Who pays the bill? You, and you, and you.

Suppose a bill were introduced in the next session of the Nebraska Legislature appropriating $40,000,000 to be loaned to Great Britain. Would it muster one vote? I doubt it. Would you, Governor Griswold, sign a bill making such an appropriation?

Suppose an ordinance were introduced in various city councils of Nebraska appropriating money to make the loan to Great Britain as follows: Omaha, $7,000,000; Lincoln, $2,500,000; Grand Island, $600,000; Norfolk $325,000; Scottsbluff, $360,000; Chadron, $125,000; Gordon, $65,000; and so on throughout Nebraska and the Nation until the total of $4,000,000,000 was reached. Do you think one town or city in America would vote the money? I doubt it.

Let us for once be realistic about this indiscriminate spending of money. The taxpayer, and that's all of us, pays the bill. Why are we all paying so much of our income to Uncle Sam? Just because it has been apparently so remote when Washington spent money. But let your State legislature or county board or city council go on a spending spree and see the spontaneous springing to arms in protest.

Great Britain wants the money and Eleanor and Dwight say we should loan it to her. Good old common sense Hugh says, and voted, "No."

There you have the issue in Nebraska—the British loan.

Mr. Speaker, there is another aspect of the British loan decision that is disturbing many patriots. If what is labeled representative government persistently fails to realistically reflect the views of the people, then representative government exists only in theory.

Even though the forms of representative government remain, it ceases to exist when the minority party does not fulfill its function to take issue on genuinely controversial issues. The two party systerm is emasculated when the minority, unorganized, can only conduct guerrilla legislative opposition tactics on major issues.

If that trend continues, the people will lose faith in the Congress of the United States and it may become a mere front for one-party totalitarianism. That would be a tragic reward for the peoples' sacrifices in World War II.

The New Deal, from stem to stern, from Wallace to Eleanor, is for the British loan.

Where is the Republican Party organization—that should give the people an organized and effective vehicle of opposition to this deal?

The revolt against inflationary handouts like the British loan has reached ominous proportions in the Farm Belt. Those people are no longer going to exchange their products for a deteriorating currency which will not buy them the things they need.

The Americans who produce the food that feeds America want forthright fighting leadership against inflationary hand-outs in Washington.

Will the Republican Party give it to them? That action may even win an election, but, vastly more important, it will give freedom a chance to survive in its traditional homeland, America.

Courage Versus Opportunism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Henry J. Taylor:

Mr. TAYLOR. One night when I was with General Patton rolling along in his tank column we had run ourselves pretty far into Germany.

It was the second night of what turned out to be his famous 10-day rampage east of the Rhine.

Our spearhead tanks were under a news black-out, prohibiting any dispatches about Patton's tremendous advance.

We were running in a corridor between German forces, 20 miles deep on both sides. The tank crews thought we were encircling the enemy and protecting ourselves somehow in that way.

But on this second night, stretched out in his trailer and about to get a little sleep, General Patton confided in me that we were not "encircling" the German forces.

We were just going straight through them.

"Straight through them," said General Patton. "Our flanks aren't protected. The Germans could cut us off right now. But by the time they find that out we'll be ready to turn around and fight them from the rear."

Now this courageous general was positive our column would not be cut off.

The answer is that it was not cut off.

General Patton won his great victory easier and quicker by his courage than would have been possible any other way.

"You know," he said when it was all over, and it's his words I'm thinking about now, "I want to tell you something, young fellow.

"Just remember," he said, "ninety percent of the things people are afraid of in life wouldn't happen if they were not afraid and had less fear."

NO PARTY LABEL ON FEAR

So, tonight let's talk about fear in your land and mine. For fear itself is at the root of our governmental confusion—fear so humiliating, so paralyzing—in the greatest Nation on the face of the earth.

This fear is a fear that comes early and stays late in the minds of many Government representatives. It is the fear of not being elected again. It's a highly personal thing with each representative who has it.

But, like cancer, it weakens and destroys the basic tissue of our self-government on which we must all depend.

And this fear of not being reelected isn't, as you know, a partisan fear. It wears no party label. Democrats or Republicans shiver alike when they have it.

For it is a natural, human fear. It is as natural as anyone's fear about losing his job.

We shouldn't think too badly of those in political life who shiver this way.

Yet we ordinary citizens are left to pay the bill for weak government because of the personal fears of many of our own representatives about their own personal careers instead of gaining the benefits in good government from their courage and independence.

And until that personal fear plays a smaller part in the behavior of representatives we are deprived of the basic principles of courageous representation on which our Government is founded.

And this is the same as saying that until the heart is put back into the body we cannot have a healthy man.

Now, one excuse used by fearful representatives to relieve their conscience and help their reelection is the exuse that they are on the job to do what the majority of people want done.

It is safer for them, they feel, to count noses, or telegrams, or add up their mail, or pledge themselves to the demands of various groups than it is to stand on their own two feet.

They sanctify their weakness by saying that the Government of the United States is a democracy—a statement which, of itself, is not correct.

They say that if they do what they think the majority want done about any bill or measure they are fulfilling their duty.

A more dangerous and reactionary misinterpretation of our American Government could hardly be stated.

A democracy means rule by the people directly. Throughout history, this has always led to rule by pressure groups, and, sooner or later, rule by the organized at the expense of the unorganized, and rule by the few who shouted the most over the many who remained silent.

For, remember: Every democracy in history has floundered on the rock of organized pressures, crumbled and died.

Consider Athens.

When wise old Plato in ancient Athens, which was at times a democracy, wrote of a republic and endowed immortal literature with his book, he was not writing of Athens, where the democracy alternated between mob rule and dictatorship until it simply collapsed in disorder and corruption and fell.

No, in writing of a republic, Plato was writing of a splendid dream.

IMPROVEMENTS ON A DREAM

The founders of our Republic improved the dream here and swore that in wonderful new America it could come true.

Through the Constitution, they gave us every possible safeguard to protect us from direct government.

Our forefathers instituted in America the fundamental principle of representative government, a republic.

So remember, the Government of the United States is a Republic.

Through representative government it was intended that this great Republic of ours should never become the Government either of a few powerful men or of a mob.

God willing, it was intended to be a representative government in which each representative was to stand on his own feet, on his worth as a man.

Our Republic is designed to give us the same safety through representative government that we employ in other successful human activities.

And that's where the oath-bound responsibility of our Representatives comes in.

For one of the most elementary facts of life, and you know it as well as I do, is that when everybody is responsible in any enterprise, nobody is responsible. When everybody's judgment prevails, nobody's better judgment has a chance. When the only rule of wisdom is majority rule, the ship flounders on the reef of short-sightedness and greed.

Take a business, for example. Let's talk a little common sense that applies equally to government.

A company may have several hundred thousand stockholders. The stockholders own the business, just as we citizens may be said to own our Government. By their votes they elect a board of directors, just as by our votes as citizens we elect our Government representatives.

The board of directors is responsible to the stockholders as are also the officers of the company through the board of directors.

Now, the time comes to decide on a dividend to be paid to the stockholders.

How much can the company afford to pay? Should it pay any dividend at all just now?

Studying the company's complicated problems, knowing it must remain solvent in the interest of stockholders and employees, and trying to determine the future business outlook, the board of directors, if it's any good, must decide the dividend question on its own responsibility.

RESPONSIBILITY IN BUSINESS

A conscientious board of directors, not the stockholders themselves, must determine what dividend, if any, can be paid to the stockholders in order to serve best all concerned.

What would happen if the directors merely acted as agents for the demands of the stockholders, as mere registering machines for stockholders' immediate wishes?

Supposing the directors received thousands of telegrams from stockholders saying, "We want to be paid a big dividend now." Supposing even a majority of the stockholders needed that payment—as well they might—can a member of the board simply say, "The majority of the stockholders want this big dividend. I will vote for it, even though it throws the company into bankruptcy, throws the workers into idleness, and costs the stockholders themselves the safety of their investment."

"You see," a director might say, "I'm here to give the people what they want. And if I give them what they want, they will reelect me to the board."

What kind of man would that be? What kind of management would the company have? And who can imagine for a minute that such avoidance of responsibility can work any better for the association we call government than for a company?

We see on all sides the bad results of the attempt at such folly in Government operations.

Yet we must not lose the Republic we have here through the fear of our own representatives to act independently and with courage even though they fear it may cost them some votes at the polls.

Now the question: Will fear, lack of courage, really be to their political advantage at a time like this? I do not believe it.

The fear of not being reelected which leads many Representatives to throw their backbones out the window, may actually cost a Representative reelection instead of assuring it that way.

We Americans like courage when we see it. We're certainly searching for it now. As Americans we like men who are willing to stand up and be counted. We respect their gameness and we respect it in a very big way.

The American people rise and cheer for brave men. And Americans will vote for brave men, too, if given half a chance.

The fears of many of our Representatives are false fears.

Applying the words of General Patton: "Ninety percent of the things they are afraid of probably won't happen if they are not afraid and have less fear."

TIME FOR COURAGE

Like Patton's attack against the Germans, courage now is liable to bring many Representatives more chance of reelection victories than any other course they could pursue.

As for our part, we can take heart in realizing that there is nothing the matter with our form of government that courageous representation will not cure.

To assist that improvement in courage, you and I as citizens have our own responsibilities, too.

In the long run we'll get no better government here than we deserve. We ourselves help to create the vicious circle reflected in the behavior of weak Representatives by not clearly understanding the importance of supporting courageous independent representation whenever we see it.

And this lack of understanding leaves courageous representation, and there are many courageous men in our government whose problems we only half understand, largely stranded in a vacuum of neglect. And the indifference of ordinary citizens gives many other Representatives an added excuse to fall down on us simply because the great body of American people fail to tell them not to be afraid to do what is fair for all.

Too often, the Representatives' attempts at independence are greeted in silence by the overwhelming majority of the population at the very same time that they are being loudly threatened and told what they must do by special interests who want them to be mere echoes of special demands.

If you really want good, representative government and if you do wire or write your Congressman, Senator, or any other representative, do not tell him what to do. Just wire him one word—one word—courage.

Ten thousand times that word could revive the entire Government of the United States.

But at this critical time—as we drift further and further from courageous representative government and deeper into the wilderness of weak opportunism—there is no time to lose.

Just let our Representatives go straight through the artificial obstacles to better government—straight through them—and there can be a victory of justice for all, favors to none, and a rebirth of true freedom in your land and mine—easier and quicker than we may think.

Pinning the Donkey's Tail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERKELEY L. BUNKER
OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware, the United States today finds itself in an impregnable monetary position because of its substantial stocks of gold and silver, our two monetary metals. As you are also aware, that fortunate position has not been achieved by accident. It has been achieved only after exhaustive labors and hard-fought battles over this matter. You are well aware, also, Mr. Speaker, that those of us who hail from the West have always played a leading part in those labors and those battles. We of the West are happy over the contribution we have thus been able to make to our country's economy.

Recently, two committees of the Senate unanimously approved new silver legislation. That legislation has two purposes: first, to provide a unique peacetime source of silver—the United States Treasury—for silver manufacturers, whose normal sources have dried up; and, second, to afford some measure of relief to the thousands of our silver-producing mines which have been forced to close down in the past few years. Under the conditions prevailing today, we in the West are not in the least enthusiastic over this legislation because it does not seem to take into account all of the western facts of the matter. But we are prepared to go through with this legislation in the same cooperative spirit which Senators representing manufacturing States demonstrated in their approval of this legislation.

Recently, however, a group of academic monetary economists—this group having invariably been in the forefront of the enemies of silver—have reemerged from their comfortable classrooms and have instituted a new publicity campaign designed to fool the public in respect to this legislation. It is surprising how much of the public's misunderstanding of this thorny subject of silver can be traced to the closed-minded and pernicious outpourings of this group. Pinning the donkey's tail is easy in the case of this group.

Under unanimous consent, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a reply by Mr. Robert S. Palmer, executive director of the Colorado Mining Association, to Congressman CELLER's letter to the New York Times of recent date:

To the EDITOR of the NEW YORK TIMES:

The advertisement which appeared over my name in the Times of May 31—with the heading "Silver Manufacturers—Do You Really Need Silver?"—was a message from the mining West to silver-using manufacturers of the East. That advertisement contained a message of good will and cooperation from Americans who earn their bread in ore pits and deep tunnels of the West to fellow Americans who gain their livelihood amid the tensions of eastern industry.

The response of the manufacturing East to my statement of the western case for silver has been refreshing beyond my expectations. That response shows clearly that our fellow Americans in the East will always be fair and generous to every other section of the country, whenever they are put in possession of the facts. Far more of the facts which I attempted to outline are contained in a book which Mr. Wendell Berge, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, recently published under the title "Economic Freedom for the West."

Now Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of Brooklyn, in his letter in the Times of June 7, has the blandness to question some of my principal statements. Let me first of all emphasize that Congressman CELLER has for years past specialized in that misrepresentation and vituperation of the West which my advertisement outlined. In fact, his letter to the Times contains new instances of his venom. "Plunder," "a double-edged sword wielded against the public," and "pampering of silver and the silver interests"—these are Congressman CELLER's latest descriptions of silver legislation which two senatorial committees have recently unanimously recommended.

Let me now nail Congressman CELLER to the record, once and for all time, I hope, for his latest dissemination of misinformation on this subject:

1. There are not, as Congressman CELLER states, $26,000,000,000 of gold at Fort Knox, Ky. There are only $20,200,000,000. Verification of this is obtainable from the Daily Statement of the United States Treasury of June 7.

2. Congressman CELLER states that "the 3,000,000,000 ounces of silver do not add one whit" to the strength of the American dollar. This is a plain matter of statistical fact. Backing the $43,100,000,000 of Federal Reserve notes and deposits of June 5 was a reserve of 43.7 percent in gold. This, of course, is extremely close to the minimum backing of 40 percent against notes and 35 percent against deposits which was required under the law until recently amended. Under that amendment, minimum requirements were reduced to 25 percent gold against both notes and deposits. In other words, backing each dollar of Federal Reserve notes and deposits at the present time there is only 43.7 cents in gold and this may legally be reduced to 25 cents.

Behind every dollar in silver certificates and behind every silver dollar, however, stand approximately three-quarters of an ounce of silver. At 71 cents, therefore—the OPA ceiling price, which no longer attracts much silver from anywhere in the world—there is over 53 cents behind every dollar of silver certificates and behind every silver dollar. At 90 cents, the apparent average price for silver in the commercial markets of the world, there is over 67 cents of silver behind this silver currency. Ultimate fulfillment of our national monetary policy in silver—which we of the West feel is now in sight—will mean that there will be 100 cents of silver behind every silver certificate or dollar. Obviously, therefore, some of the strength of the silver dollar and of the certificate which is backed by silver is imparted to the dollar which is backed by gold.

3. Congressman CELLER has the carelessness to state that "it took 2 years for the Green bill to pass." He even has the temerity to question my statement that the West cooperated in the enactment of that law, stating that "it was only with the upsurging of public opinion that we were able to get the Green bill passed." Here are the facts from the record:

The first Green bill, S. 2768, was introduced on September 14, 1942. The President signed the compromise Green bill—and allow me to emphasize that it was a compromise bill—on July 12, 1943, not 2 years but 10 months from the introduction of Senator GREEN's original bill. I should also like to stress the fact that the Senate passed the bill—with full western support—on June 18, 1943. The House of Representatives—again with full western support—passed it on July 5, 1943,

after a few die-hards had delayed it for several weeks.

But this is only part of the history of the Green Act By October of 1942, the War Production Board stated that under its policies it anticipated a shortage of silver. They also stated then that "we are currently in a period of surplus supplies, which we feel is only temporary." Early in 1943, the shortage of silver which the War Production Board anticipated was fast approaching reality. On January 7, 1943, therefore, Senator GREEN introduced a revised bill, S. 35. On the same date Senator MURDOCK, of Utah, offered another bill, S. 192, also providing for the sale of Treasury silver for war purposes and for civilian use. Senator MCCARRAN, of Nevada, offered a similar bill on April 26, 1943, when Senate hearings were progressing favorably. The legislation as finally enacted, although known as the Green Act, contained features from all three bills and had the overwhelming support of both western mining and eastern manufacturing interests.

4. Congressman CELLER's claim that raising the price of silver, as recently proposed by two major committees of the Senate, is plunder, and his comment respecting the by-product status of silver in the mining industry are again mere matters of mining and monetary fact. The courtesy of the Times will not permit adequate treatment of them here. But exhaustive and authentic data on both these features of the pending legislation are contained in the minutes of the Senate Appropriations Committee. These data are available to Congressman CELLER, as they are to that part of the public which desires to study this matter dispassionately and sympathetically.

In summary, we in the West are hopeful that the pending silver legislation will provide wholesome benefits for both American mining and American manufacture. Certainly with over 3,000 of our silver-producing mines closed down for several years, we in the West desperately need those benefits.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT S. PALMER,
Executive Director, Colorado Mining Association.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 11, 1946.*

Amendment of Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Acts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN GORSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, by extension of his remarks the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A3394 seeks to clear up some alleged misconceptions or misstatements about the railroad men's proposals for improving the railroad retirement and unemployment insurance systems. In the process our colleague makes a number of statements and arguments which themselves call for some clearing up.

The gentleman seeks to explain the long delay in committee—over a year after the conclusion of the hearings—on the ground that the proponents of the bill refused to consider any amendment whatever but adamantly insisted that the bill be reported to the House with no changes. Similar statements were made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] during the course of the debate on June 10. The gentleman from North Carolina asserted that they were told that a satisfactory bill would not permit of the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t," notwithstanding I have been informed that there came before the committee representatives of two of the brotherhoods who opposed it in its present form. The record is to the contrary. Neither the gentleman from Oklahoma nor the gentleman from North Carolina has seen fit to tell the House, and the committee report makes no reference to the fact, that the heads of the two brotherhoods referred to by the gentleman from North Carolina joined with the representatives of the other 18 railway labor organizations in a letter to the committee chairman suggesting certain specific amendments and stating that with these amendments the Crosser bill would have the support of all standard railway labor organizations including the two referred to by the gentleman from North Carolina. So far as appears, the committee never once gave any consideration to these suggested amendments throughout the period of over a year that it supposedly deliberated upon amendments.

Again, the transcript of the hearings shows that repeatedly during the hearings, as fears were expressed that some of the coverage provisions contained in the introduced bill might be construed to extend coverage to work outside the railroad industry, the proponents declared their willingness to accept any amendments that would assist in clarifying coverage. The committee, however, so far as appears, made no attempt to work out clarifying amendments but instead discarded the subject matter of coverage entirely from the bill. The record simply does not square with the asserted explanation for the long delay in committee.

The gentleman from Oklahoma further undertakes to show that the committee bill adopts much of the Crosser proposals. He states that the survivor-benefit proposal was adopted but that the committee scaled down the amount of benefits to equal the benefits paid under the Social Security Act. He does not advert to the fact that railroad employees would under the committee bill pay six times the tax rate imposed under social security, nor does he mention the fact that the committee bill leaves unprotected the survivors of several hundred thousand railroad employees who have died since the enactment of the Retirement Act, nor the fact that the committee's substitute would jeopardize the protection of some whose employment may shift between railroad employment and other employment and would provide duplicate benefits for others.

With respect to disability, the gentleman states that the committee adopted the provisions of the introduced bill "almost exactly as proposed in the introduced bill" except that the disability "must be in some way related to the employment." He does not explain what the required relationship is. In fact, under the committee proposal the disability must be one arising out of and in the course of the employment—the traditional test for workmen's compensation benefits which under workmen's compensation laws are paid for exclusively by the employer. Retirement systems, whether public or private, including the private pension systems in effect on most railroads before the enactment of the Retirement Act, do not concern themselves with the cause of disability. By seeking to introduce this irrelevant restriction into the Railroad Retirement Act the committee would have the employees pay half the cost of disabilities which should be compensated by the employers alone and would deny annuities to about 90 percent of the beneficiaries for whom the disability proposals of the Crosser bill were intended to provide relief.

In justification of the committee's refusal to adopt any of the Crosser bill proposals for liberalizing unemployment benefits the gentleman makes two arguments. First he points to the fact that Congress has not adopted the recommendations of the President for supplementing State unemployment insurance benefits generally. That circumstance is irrelevant. The major issue raised by the recommendation of the President to which the gentleman refers did not concern the liberality of benefit provisions but rather the proper functions of the Federal Government and the several States in the general unemployment insurance system.

The second argument is based on the assertion that "Congress has given to the GI $20 for 20 weeks which is exactly the benefit given the railroad employees under the present Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act." It is then stated that, "The committee feels that railroad workers are not entitled to more liberal treatment in this respect than are the GI's." If this is a correct statement of the basis for the committee's conclusion, and I do not question that it is since the gentleman is a member of the committee who supports the committee's proposal, then the committee ought to confess error and recommend the Crosser bill proposals. By some means the committee evidently acquired a completely erroneous understanding of the provisions made in the GI Act. The $20-weekly benefit provided in the GI Act is not "exactly the benefit given railroad employees under the present Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act." The Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act provides a graduated daily benefit rate varying with base year earnings; the weekly benefits range from $8.75 to a maximum of $20.

Obviously, since the lower-paid railroad employees are most subject to unemployment, a very great many of the unemployed draw benefits at rates of less than $20 per week. The average actually paid in January of this year was $16.25. The $20 provided in the GI Act, on the other hand, is a flat rate applicable to all who qualify.

With respect to duration of benefits the committee's understanding of the GI Act was even further from the mark. The maximum duration provided is not 20 weeks, but 52 weeks—over twice the maximum duration proposed in the Crosser bill.

It is difficult to overemphasize the seriousness of this error on the part of the committee. The generality of the misconception in the committee is attested by the fact that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] makes the same erroneous statement in two arguments of his appearing at pages A3375 and A3376 of the Appendix of the RECORD, and the gentleman from Indiana in the course of debate on June 10, 1946, also expressed this error—RECORD, page 6736. With three of the principal spokesmen for the committee substitute having stated this erroneous conception of the provisions of the GI Act, it would appear that the committee could not in good conscience do otherwise than withdraw its adverse recommendations on the proposals of the Crosser bill.

Inflationary Aspects of Foreign Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this Anglo-American financial agreement is turning out to be the last desperate attempt of our international schemers to salvage their plans for dominating what now remains of the world outside of the Russian sphere.

During the debate in another body it was stated that if we amend "this agreement in any way we might as well throw the whole thing out the window. If England cannot go in, there will be little use trying to make the Bretton Woods agreements effective."

President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, put the whole matter even more clearly when he told a Senate committee:

> If we choose not to aid Britain now, the whole structure—monetary, economic, and political—of healthy international cooperation will inevitably begin to crumble.

But no American proponent has yet been as frank as former Secretary of the Treasury Vinson concerning this British loan. On May 15 he told the House Banking Committee, according to the Baltimore Sun, that:

> The American loan is likely to range the two English-speaking powers against Russia in two opposing economic blocs.

The full significance of this development has been pointed out in the American and British press. For instance, on December 16, 1945, Mallory Browne cabled the New York Times that:

> The British feel they are not only being obliged to surrender their economic independence for a loan not large enough to get them on their feet, but that the various conditions attached to the loan will lead to a general economic catastrophe.

What the British really feel is nowhere better described than in the words of Lord Beaverbrook, of Robert Boothby, leader of the Young Conservatives in Parliament, and of Winston Churchill, himself.

Lord Beaverbrook charged that this British loan, and the conditions attached, meant "a return to the gold standard" dominated by America.

On April 29, in one of the most scathing attacks ever leveled at a British Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill charged that Mr. Attlee was destroying the British Empire and leading England into bankruptcy. Mr. Churchill charged that:

> If the normal processes of enterprise and production were bent and blurred by the violent infringement of a utopian government scheme, Great Britain was on the road—and a direct and short road—to financial bankruptcy and economic collapse, the inexorable effects of which will be an immense decline in our present standard of living, and the final and fatal loss of our world position, by which alone we can keep ourselves alive.

On May 16, Robert Boothby wrote to the London Times that Europe and England could not survive unless they became federated to resist the "absorption of Europe by a Communist bloc, and the absorption of Great Britain by an American bloc." According to Mr. Boothby, the western European nations could not survive as isolated units because they were flanked by the tremendous aggregation of political and economic strength represented by a federated Soviet Union and by a federated United States.

In other words, the British fear the complete destruction of their imperial system, as well as of their security, which is based on a balance of power supported by independent states. In this tremendous political revolutionary change they see their own economic and political independence being underwritten and absorbed by the United States.

There are not many American people who realize how far reaching the effects of this proposed British loan really are. It would be one thing to attempt to take over the British Empire, along with what remains of the world outside of the Russian sphere, if we were able to support that half of the world and at the same time remain financially solvent, and economically and politically free, here at home.

But the truth is that down the road we are heading lies a predictable catastrophe that might well be avoided, even now. We cannot undertake to refinance one-half of the world, and take on the liabilities and burdens of the British Empire, without bringing the whole economic, social, and political structure of the world crashing down around our heads.

What the proponents of the British loan are unwilling to admit is that our postwar policies toward the vanquished nations have laid the foundation for a complete collapse of the productive capacities of the world which make possible the high standards of living, the free flow of international trade, and the economic and political stability which alone can prevent a world economic break-down.

The picture of the real world with which we are now confronted as a result of the political betrayals of this war should startle many of our policy makers into the realization that political betrayals have disastrous economic, financial, and social consequences.

What so many of our high Government officials have not yet been willing to tell the American people is that they have made England's problems our problems. The moment we start in on this desperate international pump-priming venture we shall have committed ourselves to underwrite far into the indefinite future the bankrupt economies of those nations of the world which have not yet been swallowed up by Russian aggression. The fatal flaw in this so-called international pump-priming policy is that what we actually are undertaking is not to prime the pumps but to fill wells which have been sucked dry by maladministration and endless wars in the bankrupt nations of Europe, Asia, and the Orient.

The American people cannot possibly realize that such a policy as lending endless billions to bankrupt nations leads not only to a tremendous and uncontrollable inflation within our own economy, but to a world inflation and collapse. Even our own officials in the Government have not yet awakened to the fact that on such a basis world reconstruction will collapse with the first American economic dislocation or depression.

This British loan is, by its very nature, wildly inflationary. So far as the record of debate on this measure is concerned, the proponents of this loan have studiously avoided any honest discussion of its inflationary aspects.

It is little wonder the proponents of this legislation will not discuss its deadly self-defeating inflationary consequences.

In the first place the American people are not interested in the technicalities of the postwar monetary problems of foreign nations.

Yet the whole future of our society is wrapped up in the relationships of the monetary problems of other nations which we are now about to start underwriting and stabilizing with American taxpayers' money to try to encourage the productive capacity and output of the world. It is misleading in the extreme for the proponents of this loan to lead the American people to believe the trouble with the world's economy is a shortage of money. The exact opposite is true. The world is flooded with printing-press money from Berlin to Port Arthur.

Here in the United States inflationary measures, such as the reduction of the gold content of the dollar, and a spiral of prices during and following the war, have already sent our own printing presses and minting machines into overtime production, until today we have more money in circulation than ever before in our history—and price and production control, and black markets as the fruits of the policy.

A few illustrations of how plentiful money is abroad is found in the condi-

tions with which Belgium, Brazil, and China are now confronted.

Belgium faced such an inflationary boom that the Government immediately blocked investment savings up to 60 percent of deposits, and issued Government bonds, which could be redeemed only as the production increased, to help bring prices back down within reason, so far as availability of goods was concerned. In other words, Belgium had to save herself by taking over the whole private financial structure as well as the whole economic structure of the Nation. We do not want that in America.

For the time being Belgium has been able to control her financial structure through governmental control of public and private investment, and the freezing of surplus buying power. This extreme nationalistic measure provides little means of acquiring foreign exchange with which to carry on foreign commerce. Especially is this true when throughout Europe currencies have skyrocketed into such inflationary heights that it is not possible to establish an acceptable basis for currency exchange, even within national economies.

Brazil is another example of what a flood of printing-press money is doing to the world. In the New York Herald Tribune of May 16 Joseph Newman writes from Rio de Janeiro:

> The Government is trying to avert an economic crash which responsible businessmen predict will be the result of the inflationary (dizzy) wave sweeping this country.
>
> The country is flooded with the equivalent of $700,000,000 in paper currency or roughly six times the amount of money which was in circulation in 1930. Since last October, the Government has issued $48,000,000 in new currency, which raises considerable doubt as to its ability to fulfill its promises.

There is no lack of paper money around the world today. The world lacks the productive capacity and output with which to absorb that purchasing power and stabilize prices by closing the tremendous gap between supply and demand. This problem the United States Government is attempting to solve on a self-defeating basis.

In the first place, the war destroyed the productive power of Germany in Europe. The tremendous productive capacity of the eastern European nations has now been lost to the normal channels of international trade through their forcible acquisition by Russia and by our reparations commitments.

So far as Germany is concerned, the following figures give a picture of what policies of destruction mean to England and to Europe as well as to Germany itself. Germany's commerce with industrial Europe in 1928 was more than 50 percent of her total trade. In 1938, in spite of the Nazi nationalization of industry and state-controlled trading practices, her commerce with Europe amounted to 40 percent of her total trade. Even after 5 years of Nazi self-sufficiency methods, German exports in 1938 were more than $2,000,000,000 and her imports were $1,700,000,000. To destroy what amounted to 25 percent of the world's productive capacity in steel, basic machine tools, and laboratory equipment in Germany naturally was bound to result in one of the most self-defeating acts ever committed by civilized nations. It is productive capacity and output alone that can restore the shattered economies of Europe, England, France, and the whole world. It is productive capacity and output alone which can possibly provide reparations to the victor powers. Germany's skills and genius are desperately needed for the development of the new technology necessary to end the misery and suffering of vast sections of the human race. Yet the death sentence has been passed, in addition to the destruction of the equipment and facilities without which such genius decays and is lost to the world. On the other hand, the German people simply could not—and cannot—be trusted with the economic power or production to shatter the peace of the world again.

One would think that in the light of these glaring facts this Government would be trying desperately to rebuild the tragic peoples among the victors who are now caught between the two great power centers of the world. Instead we are called on to start this international pump-priming scheme and pour out additional floods of purchasing power into the hands of nations already overburdened with printing press notes. The world needs more production.

Now we are told this loan will not set a precedent; yet it is perfectly obvious that if we are to underwrite the British Empire, and if we expect any kind of stability, even on that basis, in this new financial and economic world we are setting up, we shall also have to serve as the financial angel to all the other nations which are left outside the Russian sphere.

England cannot repay her indebtedness in the kind of a world being forced on her. Her statesmen are vigorously protesting the Potsdam provisions for the destruction of Germany, and are already ignoring those directives in favor of a completely new policy directed toward the reconstruction of Germany and the reincorporation of the German economy into the economy of Europe.

If this is not done we may find ourselves taking over the permanent deficit economies of Europe and Asia, and pouring money down rat holes until we can no longer keep up such a foolish practice. The crash that will follow such a breakdown is too tragic to contemplate. But the crash is inevitable if we continue to try to fill all the wells and prime all the pumps in the world—including Russia.

With Europe's markets largely lost to her, with eastern Europe caught in the Russian bloc, and a similar catastrophe in the making in the Orient, England must look to America for an ever greater market if she is to survive. If this is true of England, it is true of all the other nations which we are now leading to believe we can save through international price fixing, tariff reduction, and international pump-priming.

France herself has already secured a tremendous loan from this country. The largest part of it barely enables France to balance her budget for 1946. What is France going to do in 1947 unless we continue to subsidize her deficits, as we shall have to do for so many other nations?

This inflationary epidemic can perhaps be better illustrated by the further fact that on such a basis as the present loans to Britain and to France we are starting on a very brief excursion into the American century of imperialism. But it is at this point the American people have one last chance to stop, look, and listen before it is too late.

Russia has embarked on a vast imperialistic venture of cruel and ruthless expansion of an empire drama she has nourished for centuries. This Bolshevik Russian Empire, however, is something entirely new to the world. It is wholly political in nature and uses the fruits of its conquest for political and military purposes. It has no regard whatever for the welfare of the peoples caught in its grasp. It is without any concern whatever as to whether or not these imperial advancements are self-supporting or promise instead a return on the investment in power. Russia can continue for a long time to expand and take over economies and societies which have become permanently bankrupt because of the new division of the world into Russian totalitarian and free-enterprise blocs.

But America can no more succeed in an attempt to underwrite the nations of western Europe, or the suffering masses of eastern Asia, and remain financially solvent, economically sound, and politically free here at home, than Hitler could succeed in his dream of world conquest.

The greatest blessing, the greatest contribution we could make to the economic reconstruction of the world, as the basis for future peace, would be to repudiate the disastrous policies we have been pursuing, and begin all over again to rebuild the shattered economies of what remains of free peoples all over the world, by policies which will encourage them to help themselves rather than by policies which encourage them to rely for the future on endless American doles of billions of dollars.

Opinion on OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a report of a meeting recently held in Waterloo, Iowa, and which was attended by 500 wholesale and retail grocers and meat dealers. The report states:

> Consensus of opinion was that OPA has created black markets, has not prevented inflation, but has crippled and retarded production, and should be discarded now. General belief was that if there was any skyrocketing of prices, it would be of very short

duration, and that production, once commenced, the law of supply and demand would level off prices. OPA hasn't worked and won't work. Cutting down of OPA pay rollers will help to balance National Budget. All taxes should be used to cut down national debt and not be used for perpetuation of political bureaus. Proposed cut in sugar to bakers will cause further shortages of bread and baked goods. Sugar ought to go off rationing at once.

People generally are becoming more conscious of fact that OPA is not a protection and are beginning to realize that only ones benefited are black marketeers and political bureaucrats. Hope all our Iowa Congressmen have the courage to utilize every means at their command to return country to a system of free enterprise where labor and industry will have a chance through collective cooperative bargaining to put the wheels of industry going so that needed foods can be grown and processed without hindrance from a tyrannical government.

We are certainly in a sad mess in this country. People are standing in line to buy bread. Creameries are closing, driven out of business by unworkable orders from the OPA. Meat is virtually under the domination of the black marketeers.

This tragic situation could be understood in a country without resources. But we have the land, the minerals, the timber. Our workers are the most skilled in the world. But the efforts of this great majority are set at naught by an arrogant blundering bureaucracy—aided and abetted by lying radio commentators and columnists.

To paraphrase a famous statement, "Never have so many been destroyed by so few in such a short space of time."

Warnings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Warnings," published in the Chicago Times of June 13, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WARNINGS

On Tuesday, George M. Harrison, grand president of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, was a speaker at the monthly luncheon of the Chicago Federation of Labor. Yesterday, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY (Democrat, Wyoming), an earnest and sound student of government, delivered the convocation address to the De Paul 1946 graduating class.

Perhaps it was coincident, perhaps it was their deep concern for the great decisions we Americans are facing, but both men uttered almost identical warnings:

If labor and management do not work out rules for industrial peace and apply them, the continual invitation for Government to settle such disputes ultimately will bring us to a totalitarian form of government.

Harrison was on the inside of the recent railway strike although his union was one that did not strike.

He said Government seizure of railroads and basic industries was no solution for our economic ills. If labor wanted Government ownership of basic industries, as in England, it could accomplish it overnight. All labor would have to do would be to strike every time railroads, coal mines, etc., were returned to private hands.

But, said this veteran labor leader who bitterly resented the way the Truman administration handled the railroad strike, workingmen should not encourage Government ownership. That would lead to a form of government such as they have in Russia. Harrison didn't want that to happen. Totalitarian government destroys, among other things, the rights of unions.

Short-sighted labor and business leaders play into the hands of those who want a totalitarian form of government when they force the Government to step in. Such a step might settle matters temporarily. Communists want confusion and unrest. They seize upon legitimate and worthy labor objectives. Big labor and big management are cutting their own throats when they refuse to compromise, and Government abets the situation when it, too, takes a slipshod attitude toward basic problems. These thoughts were particularly well expressed by Senator O'MAHONEY, who said:

"The whole aspect of our living is being completely changed but leadership in Government, in business and in labor is apparently oblivious of what is transpiring. * * * Foes of democracy see in economic warfare the efficient medium through which to abolish personal liberty and to establish the all-powerful state.

"I undertake to say that both labor and capital will invite their own destruction and their subjugation by the totalitarian state if they permit the economic struggle to go much further than it already has gone."

Neither Senator O'MAHONEY, nor the Times, thinks such statements constitute "red bating." Senator O'MAHONEY directs his warning to management just as strongly as he does toward labor. He doesn't say, "Labor, you're getting too big—you're heading us toward Communism." He says there ought to be Federal standards of responsibility and duties for management to curtail its powers to exploit both its own interests and those of stockholders. And there should be such standards for labor, too.

So, while most Congressmen are talking loudly about curtailing labor, Senator O'MAHONEY thinks there are some abuses in management, too, that still need to be eliminated by a national code of responsibility.

Democracy's salvation, as O'MAHONEY sees it, lies in more democracy—in all of the organizations upon which the economic life of the people depends.

Yes, he believes that as society gets more complicated, workers as well as stockholders must have a stake in business that is not fixed entirely by management, which is "hired" as much as labor is hired. And the workers must take a more active, more intelligent interest in their union policies and actions. They, too, must not be dominated by their hired management, but by the rank and file.

Both business and unions must work "consciously for the public good." That would leave government the function merely "to foster and expand opportunity for the citizen without regimenting him."

There are great changes in the air. The New Deal of the thirties was only a beginning. The choice before us is either a continuation of the New Deal's strengthening of democracy according to twentieth century standards, or a flip-flop into a form of government repugnant to most of us.

The first choice will take level-headed planning and thinking, such as O'MAHONEY'S.

We can reach the second alternative simply by closing our eyes and pretending that there is no choice necessary at all—that everything is as rosy as a sunrise in June.

Farley's True Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely tribute to Hon. James A. Farley which appeared in the Syracuse Herald-Journal, June 1, 1946, entitled "Farley's True Words":

FARLEY'S TRUE WORDS

In admonishing Members of Congress to base their votes on what is best for the country and not on the political premise of what seems shrewdest from the standpoint of reelection, former Postmaster General James A. Farley voices the thought that is in every patriotic American's heart.

In Washington these days altogether too much consideration is given to the question of what constitutes the politically smart course.

Mr. Farley truthfully says that if sound leadership and legislative courage and integrity succeed in dissipating the present postwar confusion "we can go on and enjoy the greatest period of prosperity we have ever known but if we fail—the whole world fails."

The one way in which the confusion can be dissipated is for our public men to give their undivided attention to the urgent problems that now confront the Nation and forget the pressure groups and the maneuvering for the elections.

There are plenty of brains in the Capital—the trouble is that many of these brains are thinking along selfish lines instead of being dedicated to the progress of the Nation as a whole.

Al Smith was always saying that the best politics was to give good government. There never was a truer remark. If Members of Congress would forget the elections and drop political maneuvering they would undoubtedly experience much less trouble politically.

It is when they base their votes on what they consider the politically smart thing to do that they get into hot water and drag the country in with them.

Housing Administration Delays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, some time ago we passed legislation, after a lot

of publicity from the pressure groups and after being solemnly assured that the legislation would solve all troubles involved in building houses for veterans. We voted for this housing legislation in the hope that it would be ably and properly administered. We were promised that there would be no delay and no red tape.

In spite of the fact that Congress up to date has cooperated 100 percent with the administration in passing legislation to solve the emergency housing question, it appears that the program is already a failure. It has bogged down in red tape and governmental inefficiency. Many of us pointed out, when this legislation was before us, that you could not build legislative houses. We pointed out that the building of houses required building materials and required skilled workmen. The political "whoopee" makers who are continually trying to mislead the veterans condemned everyone who suggested that the Government's program would bog down and be a failure unless some other sensible things were done.

Some of us pointed out that OPA policies had prevented the production of building materials and that the real trouble in the program of building emergency houses was the inability to get lumber and brick and other manufactured products that go into the erection of a dwelling house. The administration leaders did nothing about that. All they wanted were some laws and some subsidies so they could have money to waste and throw away in creating new jobs and in going to a lot of expense. They even selected a wonderful fellow who was guaranteed to build houses so fast that people would have to wear dark glasses to keep from being dazzled by the sunlight of his perfection. He was called an expediter.

HOUSING ADMINISTRATOR WYATT STARTS TO ALIBI

Imagine my surprise to read in the Sunday Star of Washington, D. C., for yesterday, June 16, 1946, the following news item:

NEW PRIORITY SYSTEM SEEN SOLUTION TO UNITED STATES HOUSING FOR VETERANS

Housing Administrator Wilson W. Wyatt last night said that through use of a new top priority for materials the Government expects to be able to complete its first 100,000 units of temporary housing for veterans by September 30.

Such housing has been lagging to an alarming extent in recent weeks owing to difficulty in obtaining materials. It is critically needed in municipalities throughout the country and on college campuses. Part of the housing will be converted from temporary war-housing units and the remainder from Army and Navy barracks.

Mr. Wyatt last night announced details of the priority plan, which was first disclosed in the Star last Thursday. Under it, the Civilian Production Administration will approve priorities assistance to prevent construction stoppages.

Top priorities will continue only for the time needed to prevent shut-downs or start work on projects already halted, the Housing Administrator explained.

Top priority ratings, he estimated, will be extended for 3 percent or less of the production of any single item during the next 30 days, and use of the new aid will be largely limited to that period.

CPA will advise manufacturers of the amount, time, and location of material requirements, he said.

The full program of 200,000 veterans' temporary housing units is expected to be completed, or in final stages of construction, by the end of this year, Mr. Wyatt explained. The program was authorized by Congress at a total cost of $445,627,000. Work is done by private builders under contract to the Federal Public Housing Authority.

"The program has been seriously retarded and completion of units under construction delayed by lack of materials and equipment, threatening to prevent thousands of veterans from entering universities and colleges this fall," Mr. Wyatt said.

CONTRACTOR POINTS OUT FAILURE OF ADMINISTRATION HOUSING PROGRAM FOR VETERANS

Then right in line with this newspaper item which I have just quoted above are a few statements which I take from a letter just received from a contractor in northern Minnesota. He points out that "newspaper slogan" houses, or legislative houses, which were all going to be built so fast for the veterans, are not working out so well. In my home town of Duluth he says there is no Federal Housing Administration office at all, and he has been trying to accommodate veterans and others who wish to build by carrying a supply of forms in his office so that they might make the necessary applications for such permission to build. Then he says:

We wrote the other day for a new supply of these forms and got back the enclosed form HH-1015 entitled "Instructions to Builders," with our new supply of CPA 34836, which is the application for permission to build. You will notice on HH-1015 that the applicant must file a plot plan, two sets of plans, two sets of specifications which may be made out on an HH-1012 or HH-1014. In addition, if he is to have an individual water supply system he must fill out Form HH-2217, and if he wishes an individual sewage-disposal system he is required to fill out Form HH-2218.

How in the name of Providence does the FHA expect the ordinary individual, veterans included, to fill out all these forms themselves. We, in our office, do not have the time to do it for them, and there is no Government office in Duluth that can do it for them. So much publicity has been given out in the last few months as to how Chester Bowles, Wilson Wyatt, et al., are doing so much to help the veteran get a place to live, but it seems to us hereabouts that all a veteran is able to do is to unwind red tape, and when he gets through with that he is so confused that he doesn't know whether he is coming or going.

So there you are, Mr. Speaker. A plain statement of facts by an experienced contractor who tells how these four-flushing politicians who are trying to capture the soldier vote are just fooling the World War veteran. I submit herewith a couple of documents, one of them Form HH-1015, Instructions to Builders. This is a "honey"; and if you will read it, you will find where the poor veteran must file a plot plan, drawings, and so forth, and they must also fill out a form about a sewage-disposal system, as well as other things. Read it. It is as follows:

Form HH-1015.

INSTRUCTIONS TO BUILDERS

APPLICATIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION, CPA FORM 4386

When application is made on CPA Form 4386 for residential construction under (b) (1) (ii) of PR-33, the applicant will be required to submit the following exhibits to the FHA office having jurisdiction:

1. Application for residential construction. Form CPA 4386 (3 copies): This form must be fully completed by the applicant.

2. Plot plan (1 copy): (a) Plot plan, indicating the location of the principal building(s) on the lot. If a subdivision is to be developed, a complete subdivision plot plan is required with each contemplated structure properly numbered and identified.

3. Drawings (2 sets for each type of structure proposed): Complete drawings, drawn to scale and fully dimensioned, including all floor plans, all elevations, sectional wall details, and heating lay-out.

4. Specifications: For single family detached, semidetached, and row houses—material schedule, Form HH 1012 (2 copies for each type of structure proposed). For multifamily structures of three or more dwelling units—outline specifications, Form HH-1014 (2 copies for each type of structure proposed). Submission of these exhibits, executed in a clear and complete manner, is mandatory, regardless of the use of other specifications as contract documents.

5. Individual water-supply system: If an individual water-supply system is proposed, Form HH-2217 is required (1 copy).

6. Individual sewage-disposal system: If an individual sewage-disposal system is proposed, Form HH-2218 is required (1 copy).

7. Priority construction notification: Construction must equal or exceed the HH minimum property requirements applicable to the type of structure proposed and must comply with the exhibits submitted with the related application, as corrected by FHA.

When an application for residential construction, Form CPA 4386, is approved the applicant will be provided with three priority construction notification cards, form HH 1010, for the purpose of notifying the FHA office:

1. When construction is started.

2. When construction has reached the roughing-in stage.

3. When construction is completed.

Inspections will be made by construction examiners when construction has reached the latter two stages, to ascertain compliance with applicable requirements. If noncompliance or variation from the exhibits is reported, correction and reinspection will be required, and the applicant will be provided with an additional card for the purpose of notifying the FHA office when corrections are completed.

In order to avoid delay it is advisable for the applicant to mail the notification cards in anticipation of the time when the inspection stages will be reached in order to allow time for mailing and for the inspector's travel to points remote from the office.

If financing will be obtained through an FHA insured mortgage the priority construction notification card will be used only for the purpose of notifying the FHA office of receipt of the commitment. It is not to be used for requesting FHA compliance inspections.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the culmination of human ingenuity and brain trust superintelligence is found in Form CPA-4386. I said that HH-1015 was a "honey." Well, let me tell you that HH-1015 is just pure vinegar compared with this sweet morsel of silliness, red tape, and bungling bureaucracy known as CPA-4386.

It would require not only a Philadelphia lawyer but attorneys for the Aluminum Corp. of America, together with a few brain trusters in Washington, to even understand this document, let alone make it out properly. Speaking in the language of red tape, it is a "humdinger." In common with many of my colleagues, I expressed the fervent hope, when all of this legislation was pending, that it would not tie up the building of houses with a mass of red tape, so that all we would get in the end would be red-tape houses but no real houses of lumber and brick, and so forth. I fear that my hope has been blasted. I am prompted to make this comment because in the campaign this fall the political demagog and opportunist will be out yelling his head off about what the administration has done in passing legislation for the benefit of the veterans. Form CPA-4386 is part of the dismal answer. It is as follows:

Form CPA-4386
(4-10-46)

United States of America
Civilian Production Administration

Budget Bureau No. 12-R675-2
Form Approved

APPLICATION FOR RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION UNDER PRIORITIES REGULATION 33, AS AMENDED
VETERANS' EMERGENCY HOUSING PROGRAM

Project Serial No. (to be filled in by processing agency).

INSTRUCTIONS.—File three (3) signed copies with the local Federal Housing Administration Field Office, except that applications covering dwelling accommodations on a farm should be filed with the appropriate County Agricultural Conservation Committee, and applications by educational institutions or public organizations should be filed with the appropriate Regional Office of the Federal Public Housing Authority.

SECTION I. (To be filled in by all applicants)

1. Is this application for farm dwelling? (Check which)
☐ Yes. ☐ No.

2. Name and address of applicant (owner of project):
Street, City, Zone, State:
Telephone No.

3. I control the land on which this project will be built by:
(Answer both (1) and (2) below)
1. ☐ ownership ☐ option or contract or ☐ other (specify).
2. For a ☐ fee simple or ☐ leasehold estate or ☐ other (specify).

4. Builder (give name and address, if other than applicant).

5. Location of project, city
County | State

Give street address if known, otherwise give legal description showing lot numbers and name of subdivision, if available. (Attach separate sheet, if necessary.)

Lot frontage	Lot depth
(Feet)	(Feet)
(Feet)	(Feet)
(Feet)	(Feet)

6. I have ☐ have not ☐ arranged for financing.

7. Description of work to be done. Check the boxes applicable or specify materials under each heading only for construction of new structures and for conversions that will provide new dwelling units. If the following description does not apply to all new units to be constructed, submit separate check-list for each type of unit. For repairs and alterations, explain nature of work in block "t". Attaching separate sheet, if necessary.

(a) (✓) Type of structure:
---- Single-family detached.
---- Row.
---- Multifamily (3 or more).
---- Elevator ☐ Yes ☐ No
---- Single-family semidetached.
---- One-over-one.
---- Other (specify)
Number of stories
Total floor area, not including basement square feet
Percent to be used for other than dwelling purposes, if any percent

(b) (✓) Exterior wall construction:
---- Frame, wood siding.
---- Frame, brick veneer.
---- Frame, stucco.
---- Frame, asbestos siding.
---- Masonry, brick.
---- Masonry, concrete.
---- Masonry, brick veneer.
---- Other (specify)

(c) (✓) Exterior wall sheathing:
---- Wood.
---- Gypsum board.
---- Other (specify)

(d) (✓) Interior wall surfacing:
---- Wood lath.
---- Gypsum lath.
---- Gypsum board.
---- Metal lath.
---- Other (specify)

(e) (✓) Interior wall finish:
---- Plaster.
---- Wallboard.
---- Other (specify)

(f) (✓) Heating system:
---- Hot water.
---- Steam.
---- Gravity air.
---- Forced air.
---- Other (specify)

(g) (✓) Fuel:
---- Coal.
---- Oil.
---- Gas.
---- Other (specify)

(h) (✓) Attic:
---- Unfinished.
---- Floored.
---- Walls and ceilings finished.

(i) (✓) Roofing:
---- Asphalt.
---- Asbestos.
---- Wood.
---- Tile.
---- Metal.
---- Other (specify).

(j) (✓) Basement:
---- Full.
---- Partial.
---- None.

(k) (✓) Insulation:
---- Ceiling.
---- Attic (between rafters).
---- Walls.
---- None.

(l) (✓) Type of insulation:
---- Mineral wool.
---- Rigid board.
---- Other (specify)

(m) Decorating (specify):
Walls
Kitchen
Ceilings
Baths

(n) Special floors (specify):
Bathrooms
Kitchen

(o) (✓) Kitchen equipment:
---- Cooking range (specify make and model) (or equal)
---- Refrigerator (specify make and model) (or equal)

(p) (✓) Plumbing:
---- Running water.
---- Bathrooms (specify number).
---- Bathtubs (specify number).

(q) (✓) Garage:
---- Detached.
---- Attached.
---- Basement.
Specify car capacity

(r) Garage (specify):
Floor
Roof
Walls

(s) (✓) Special equipment:
---- Automatic water heater.
---- Water softener.
---- Screens.
---- Storm sash.
---- Weatherstripping.

(t) Other (specify) and in addition indicate if a prefabricated house

(u) Attach one copy of plans for each type of house (not required for repairs or alterations).

SECTION II. (To be filled in by "Veterans" as defined in PR-33 for 1-family dwellings for owner-occupancy)

1. Indicate your status by checking one of the following:
☐ A veteran of World War II discharged under conditions other than dishonorable.
☐ A spouse of a deceased veteran of World War II or of a member of the Armed forces who died in service, who is living with a child of the deceased.
☐ A member of the armed forces of the United States.
☐ A citizen of the United States who served in the armed forces of an Allied nation.

2. Check type of work proposed:
☐ Construction of new 1-family dwelling.
If farm dwelling, total cost of work $
If non-farm dwelling, maximum proposed sales price $
☐ Repair or alterations.
Estimated cost of work $

Veterans completing section I above and this section II must execute the certification in section V, and need not fill in the remaining sections of this form.

SECTION III. (To be filled in for all construction for sale or rent to veterans)

INSTRUCTIONS.—Sales prices must be given for all new one and two family properties. Rents must be given for all units in new structures for more than one family and for all one family dwellings intended for rent. Include all construction already under way for which no HH rating assistance has been granted. Any preference rating issued will be limited to a specified number of units which will not exceed the number that are listed for starting within the first 90 days after approval. Subsequent authorization to use the rating for the remaining units must be requested on Form CPA-4387

DEFINITIONS.—"Dwelling unit" means a separate accommodation for year-around occupancy which provides adequate space and facilities for one family for living, sleeping, cooking and sanitation. "Room" means living room, bedroom, kitchen if area is 60 or more square feet, dining room if area is 110 or more square feet. Kitchenettes with 50 or more square feet, and dinettes with 70 or more square feet, may be counted as one-half room each. Bathrooms are not counted as rooms.

1. Fill out for new structures only:

Number of dwelling units (a)	Number of rooms per unit (b)	Maximum monthly rent per unit: Shelter rent (c)	Charge for services (explain in 3 below) (d)	Charge for garage in multiple units only (e)	Total rent per unit (f)	Maximum sales price per complete unit including land (g)	Construction schedule (number of units to be started by 90-day periods after issuance of rating): Period	Units
							1st 90 days	
							2d 90 days	
							3d 90 days	
							4th 90 days	
							Total	

2. Fill out for conversion of existing structures (only where added habitable dwelling units will result):
Number of dwelling units before conversion ____ number of dwelling units after conversion ____

Number of dwelling units (a)	Number of rooms per unit (b)	Maximum monthly rent per unit [1]: Shelter rent (c)	Charge for services (explain in 3 below) (d)	Charge for garage in multiple units only (e)	Total rent per unit [2] (f)	Maximum sales price per complete unit including land [3] (g)

3. Tenant services (list services for which charge is shown in 1 or 2 above)____

SECTION IV. (To be filled in when sections II and III are not applicable)

1. In column (a) check the type of construction for which you are applying and furnish the additional information required in column (b) for the particular type of construction:

Type of construction (a)	Information to be supplied in blocks 2 and 3 below as indicated (b)
☐ Completion of dwelling accommodations under construction Mar. 26, 1946, for which sale or rent to veterans is not practicable.	Complete block 2, and in block 3 state why accommodations cannot be sold or rented to veterans.
☐ Reconstruction of damage by fire, flood, or similar disaster	Describe extent of damage in block 3. If work involves rebuilding more than half of the building, complete block 2. If it involves rebuilding less than half, give estimated cost of work in block 3.
☐ Repairs or alterations	In block 3 give estimated cost of work. Explain why dwelling is not habitable without these repairs, or what additional space will be provided by these alterations. State whether dwelling is vacant or not, and if vacant, for how long.
☐ Construction of new farm dwellings, including bunkhouses	In block 3 give number of dwelling accommodations and estimated cost of work. Explain why new accommodations are necessary at this time.
☐ Construction of dwelling accommodations necessary for the production of scarce materials or products.	Complete block 2. In block 3 specify scarce product involved, name of producer, location of plant, and the extent to which the proposed construction will maintain or increase production.
☐ Other construction of new dwellings	Complete block 2. Explain in block 3 why a new dwelling is necessary at this time.

2. Proposed rent and sales price schedule. See definitions of "dwelling unit" and "room" in section III.

Number of dwelling units (a)	Number of rooms per unit (b)	Maximum monthly rent per unit: Shelter rent (c)	Charge for services (explain in (h) below) (d)	Charge for garage in multiple units only (e)	Total rent per unit (f)	Maximum sales price per complete unit including land (g)

(h) Tenant services (list services for which charge is shown above)____

3. Additional information required by column (b) above____

SECTION V. Certification (to be executed by all applicants)

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am the applicant or that I am authorized to execute this application on behalf of the applicant, and that the facts herein set forth are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. I further certify that I will construct, repair, or alter the dwelling units described in this application in accordance with the description given, and that I will comply with the provisions of priorities regulation 33, including, wherever applicable, the requirements with respect to preferences for veterans and to sales prices, costs, and rents. I have examined and I am familiar with priorities regulation 33.

Legal name of project owner ____ Signature of owner or duly authorized official ____

Date ____ Title ____

Section 35 (A) of the United States Criminal Code, 18 U. S. C., sec. 80, makes it a criminal offense to make a willfully false statement or representation to any department or agency of the United States as to any matter within its jurisdiction.

(Space below for use by processing agency only)

☐ Preference rating HH is hereby assigned for use in accordance with PR 33, in purchasing the minimum quantity of materials listed in schedule A to PR 33 required for completion of ____ units of the project described herein. This rating does not apply to any other units.
☐ Preference rating HH is hereby assigned for use in accordance with PR 33, in purchasing the minimum quantity of materials listed in Schedule A to PR 33 required for completion of the construction described herein.
☐ You are hereby authorized to do the work described in this application. This authorization does not include priorities assistance.
☐ No authorization can be granted for the construction described herein because:

NHA, Federal Housing Administration:

Date ____ Authorized agent ____

United States Department of Agriculture:

Date ____ Authorized agent ____

NHA, Federal Public Housing Authority:

Date ____ Authorized agent ____

[1] Rent need not be shown for unit to be occupied by applicant or continuing tenant.
[2] In areas under rent control these rents must be registered with OPA and may be reduced by that agency.
[3] Sales price need not be specified for two-family dwellings when one unit is to be occupied by applicant or continuing tenant.

IN CONCLUSION

If you have mastered this master questionnaire, then I believe it is in order for me to suggest that the way we are going to get houses is to cut out this idea of Russian regimentation and this idea of having the Government go into the housing business. We should return to or make possible our American system of free enterprise. We should permit the manufacture of building materials instead of preventing it. We should make it possible for the bricklayers and carpenters and others to use the lumber and brick and other housing materials in the construction of new dwellings or homes. We should give the economic system under which we live a chance to function. When we do that there will be plenty of people to help finance the building of homes, there will be plenty of people to build the homes, and we will take a long step forward toward solving the housing shortage. There will be no questionnaires and no horde of Government locusts to determine the question of whether a man should build a privy or locate some toilet facilities inside the building, or determine other details on the theory that the average American has lost his mind and no longer can look after his own business.

Of course, Government aid should be extended and Government financing should be possible for those who need funds to supplement their plans to build a home. This can be done, however, without having the Government crowd out private industry in this land of free enterprise.

Cancer Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Gallup poll on cancer research which appeared in the Washington Post of June 12, 1946:

PUBLIC BACKS CANCER RESEARCH WITH TAX-RAISED FUNDS

(By George Gallup, Director of American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., June 11.—A substantial appropriation by Congress for cancer research, as provided in the Neely-Pepper bills, would have very wide support from the general public, which is even willing to see taxes increased for the purpose.

The Neely-Pepper program calls for an appropriation of $100,000,000 for research on the disease. Public reaction to this plan was tested in the following manner in the poll:

"Do you approve or disapprove of having the Government spend $100,000,000 to find possible ways of preventing or curing cancer in this country?"

The vote:	Percent
Approve	87
Disapprove	9
No opinion	4

"Would you be willing to pay more taxes to provide this money?"

	Percent
Yes	72
No	27
No opinion	1

Those unwilling to pay more taxes include the 9 percent who disapprove the whole program.

A year ago the institute polled the Nation on the idea of a $200,000,000 congressional appropriation for both research and treatment of cancer, the money to be raised by additional taxation. It found a very high vote in favor. That vote remains high today, as a new poll shows, although the number willing to pay additional taxes to make such a fund possible is somewhat smaller.

"Should Congress pass a law which would provide $200,000,000 for the study and treatment of cancer in this country?"

The vote:

	Today	Last July
	Percent	Percent
Yes	82	81
No	11	10
No opinion	7	9

"Would you be willing to pay more taxes to provide this money?"

The vote:

	Today	Last July
	Percent	Percent
Yes	69	75
No	27	20
No opinion	4	5

The Salvation of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege on Wednesday last to make the address at the forty-eighth convocation of De Paul University in the city of Chicago. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks upon that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Looking backward through the mists of almost 2,000 years during which the dignity of the human soul has been preached by saints and taught by scholars, man beholds the high state of perfection to which he has brought the art of war. He sees also the chaos into which the art of living has been plunged.

Against the background of religion, philosophy, and Christian morality stand the prodigious achievements in destructive warfare which are the mark of the twentieth century. The history of the conflicts of the past tells of no terrors to compare with the efficient horrors of the two world wars this generation has seen. Yet, though less than half of this century—this modern, this progressive, this civilized century—has passed, men are already talking helplessly and hopelessly of the Third World War they fear will soon enguif the globe again.

Can this be the legacy the twentieth century is to bequeath to the future—the dedication to destruction with ever-increasing precision and ever-mounting frightfulness of all the fruits of intellect, imagination, and skill? Have technology and science outpaced the moral capacity of mankind? Do men lack the character and courage necessary to use the triumphs of invention and discovery for the preservation and advancement of the race before civilization itself is overwhelmed in total ruin wrought by science?

These questions present themselves to every thoughtful mind. They cannot be absent from the contemplation of all those who, like the members of this class, find themselves in the year 1946 leaving college behind and turning toward the active pursuit of their chosen careers.

"BETWEEN TWO WORLDS"

It will be for you to decide the kind of world in which the next generation is to live. You could scarcely be blamed if you were to say that the generations which have preceded you have given you little with which to work save the problem itself, for it is clear that the leadership of the past has failed to show men how to avert the disaster of ever recurring wars. Leadership has failed to solve the simpler problems of production and distribution. It has failed to adjust the daily life of man to the machines he has invented, to the organizations he has created, to the authority which governs him, and even to the education he is obtaining.

We live in one of the great crises of all history. The shape of the world we have known is fading away. Empires have been shaken to their foundations New forms of national, international, political, and economic structure are arising and the fundamental relationship of man to his government is undergoing a profound test. As Matthew Arnold put it in another connection, we are "between two worlds, one dead and the other incapable of being born." This is the scene upon which the class of 1946 is entering.

We know, however, that our world is divided between two systems. One, the authoritarian, prevails by force and will not tolerate individual freedom The other, the democratic, prevails by reason and self-restraint, by tolerance and by individual example. Its very virtues are its greatest weakness, for democracy is not suspicious; it is trustful. Democracy does not suppress opinion. It encourages debate. Democracy is slow to anger. It will not attack unless attacked, but, in the modern world with its scientific means of warfare, democracy can be overwhelmed before it realizes its danger.

A FREE WORLD OR A CONTROLLED ONE

It is clear that the world of the future will either be free or it will be controlled. If it is to be a free world, it will be one in which the individual is the source of all the mundane authority which is exercised over him.

If it is to be a controlled world, the controls will be exercised by either private or public power. Whether it be private authority or public authority that exercises this power, the individual in a controlled world will not be the master of his destiny, but the subject of a will which imposes itself upon him.

All of us who in the past have been graduated and who are now being graduated from American colleges have received the legacy of the democratic ideal. It is our inheritance from both our political forebears and our Christian teachers, for democracy is based upon a fundamental belief in the freedom of the individual, just as the Christian religion is based upon the conviction that God endowed all men with free will.

If freedom be the gift of Providence, men cannot throw it away. Whatever advances they may make in science and technology men cannot repeal the divine law of their creation. As Americans we are committed to the firm faith of the founders of this Nation that God gave the people the capacity to rule themselves and by self-government to bring

forth a constantly improving social structure. The repudiation of this doctrine, the establishment of arbitrary power and the managerial concept in either our economic affairs or in our political affairs is a repudiation of the fundamental nature of man.

AMERICA MUST SAVE DEMOCRACY

In a very special sense it is the task of America to save democracy for the world. Ours is the opportunity and the duty to rescue men from slavery to the state and to preserve the popular sovereignty upon which the United States was founded. It is for America to justify the experiment in free government established upon this continent when the Constitution of the United States was adopted and yours is the generation that must act.

This is the hour of which Washington spoke in his first inaugural address when he said:

"The preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the destiny of the republican model of government are justly considered, perhaps, as deeply as finally staked on the experiment intrusted to the hands of the American people."

Over and over again in their inaugural addresses and their messages to Congress the early Presidents correctly referred to this Government as an "experiment" until John Quincy Adams, assuming the duties of the Executive office on March 4, 1825, declared that it was a source of gratification and encouragement to him to observe "that this experiment upon the theory of human rights has, at the close of that generation by which it was formed, been crowned with success equal to the most sanguine expectations of its founders." Later, when the advance of human rights was threatened by the institution of slavery, Lincoln called the people back to their fundamental faith that the United States was indeed a "new Nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

It was this people, the people of America, who had launched the experiment in free government who in this century twice contributed the weight which turned back the attempt of arbitrary power to destroy the sovereignty of the individual. But the task has not been completed. World peace has not yet been established on the basis of human rights. It cannot be established on that basis without us, for no other people has carried the experiment so far forward as have the people of America. If we fail now, if through selfishness or weakness, we falter and relinquish our patrimony of liberty, the whole world will be thrust back into an era of arbitrary power from which it will be difficult indeed for mankind to emerge because the instruments of force which science has made available to those who seize authority are such that the individual cannot resist. The modern instruments of warfare, like the modern instruments of economic life, are incapable of individual ownership or individual use. They can be produced and utilized only by groups and organizations of men and when these groups and organizations are directed by arbitrary power from the top, the freedom of the individual is inevitably lost.

It is imperative, therefore, that America learn and learn quickly how it has come about that in the middle of the twentieth century the democratic ideal of living finds itself in mortal peril. It is imperative that America shall not weaken itself by divided councils on internal issues: that, in false security because our military forces have ceased firing and have been almost completely disbanded, it shall not indulge itself in short-sighted and destructive conflict over domestic problems.

TOTALITARIANISM BEGINS IN CONFUSION

American friends of democracy must realize, first of all, that the totalitarian struggle for power begins in the attempt to create confusion. Whatever our views or purposes may be in the current unrest over labor, management, and the distribution of the national product, we must understand that the foes of democracy see in economic warfare the efficient medium through which to abolish personal liberty and to establish the all-powerful state. Yet, in a democracy, economic struggles cannot be safely suppressed and the right of men to improve their lot should not be denied. Democracy must live by the inherent quality of its nature, the willingness of free men to solve their disagreements by conference and compromise.

I undertake to say that both labor and capital will invite their own destruction and their subjugation by the totalitarian state if they permit the economic struggle to go much further than it has already gone. It is not that I have fears for the overthrow of free government here by internal revolution. It is rather that a calm view of the international scene makes it clear that world peace and the reestablishment of free government abroad cannot possibly be attained if we dissipate our strength in senseless conflict over the distribution of the plenty which America has already demonstrated it can produce. Without world peace, we shall be condemned to continued preparation for war and freedom will be under bondage to fear.

We know now that there is more than enough to go around. We know now that the achievements of science and technology can be used to produce everything that man can desire. We know now that we can raise the standard of living here higher than it was ever raised before and that by the example of cooperative effort we can show the whole world how to use the resources of nature for the benefit of mankind instead of for the destruction of civilization. We must teach the world by this example that free men can in peace achieve and maintain unexampled prosperity just as in war free men have always demonstrated that they constitute the most effective military force.

HUMAN RIGHTS NOW IN JEOPARDY

It is the tragic truth that modern leadership in business, in Government, and in labor has failed to comprehend the fact that human rights have been placed in jeopardy by the development of economic organization in the modern world, although it has been generally supposed they had been made permanently secure.

The democratic theory of society was based upon the concept that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Having thus stated the rights of men as individuals, Jefferson then stated the nature of Government in these words of the Declaration of Independence:

"That to secure these right, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Thus the supremacy of the people over government was clearly enunciated. This was the belief of a society composed of men who were economic equals, that is to say, free to arrange their own lives and pursue their own happiness according to their own will, free to support themselves by their own unaided efforts. It was natural for such a society to establish a Government which was controlled by the people. Thus there came into existence on this Continent a democratic society of individuals capable both of supporting themselves and of governing themselves.

The modern crisis which threatens the existence of democratic society developed when, in the economic structure, power passed from the hands of individuals into the hands of managers of groups of individuals. When economic organization became stronger and more powerful than the individual, when the latter became dependent upon the will of the organization and the use of the tools which only the organization could own, the economic system and the political system were thrown out of gear. The economic system ceased to be democratic when, in greater and greater degree, economic organizations were controlled by managers at the top. The inevitable result was that when men as individuals became more and more unable to support themselves and more and more dependent upon organizations they did not control, managerial power began to develop in Government. Thus it was that in the political sphere the dictatorial state began to develop, justifying itself by the claim that in exchange for their liberty it would give men economic security.

Control from the top in the organizations of the modern world is secured and strengthened by the false promise that managers, whether it be in government or in business, can do more for men than they can do for themselves. All history teaches the falsity of this pretense. The progress of mankind has been the result of freedom, of the free use of the mind, the heart and the soul. When the spirit of men is controlled, the controlling power is always more concerned in preserving its own privileges than it is in winning progress for the people. Vested interests of whatever kind, in property or in power, have always been barriers across the path of human progress; and arbitrary power, whether it is exercised in the economic sphere or in the political sphere, always defends the vested interest.

MEN SLOW TO LEARN FROM EXPERIENCE

It is not the will of man, but his capacity to understand which is the impediment to progress. Habits of thought and habits of acion becloud the vision. Men are slow to learn from experience and find it difficult to perceive the meaning of the transformations they see about them.

John Adams, one of our Revolutionary leaders, the man who followed Washington in the Presidency, after he retired from public life early in the nineteenth century, made the following observation:

"I am old enough to remember the war of 1745 and its end, the war of 1755 and its close, the war of 1775 and its termination, the war of 1812 and its pacification. Every one of these wars has been followed by general distress, embarrassments of commerce, destruction of manufactures, and a fall in the prices of produce and of lands."

If he had written in 1924 instead of 1824 he could have described the same results in the wake of the wars of the twentieth century. Yet in Congress and throughout the country leaders and people alike, perhaps leaders more than people, are denying the meaning of this experience and are seeking to persuade themselves that somehow or other we can follow a narrow and selfish course, but nevertheless escape the distress, the embarrassments and the destruction that followed the excesses of every other war.

An airplane flies in a few hours across the continent which two generations ago could be spanned only by painful journeying through weeks or months. In the annual report of the Douglas Aircraft Co. this year one finds this significant sentence:

"It is apparently not generally realized that, because of its greater speed, a single airplane of the DC–6 type can carry as many passengers between distant points during a week or a month as an entire train can transport in the same period."

The airplane has revolutionized the world. Both the economic and the political structure are feeling the impact. The whole aspect of our living is being completely changed, but leadership in Government, in business, and in labor is apparently oblivious of what is transpiring. We are acting as though we

still live in a world in which the individual inhabitant builds and owns his own vehicles of transportation.

The steam engine changed the world in much more than a mechanical manner. It changed it economically and politically by conquering boundaries which until that time had separated men into local communities. Electricity and aviation have carried the transformation tremendously further and yet we think and act and talk and govern ourselves as though this were still an individual economy instead of a huge organized economy from which the democratic principle seems to be disappearing.

That is the problem which the modern world must solve. We face it on two fronts in the international sphere and in the domestic sphere. Unless we preserve democracy in domestic affairs we cannot preserve it in world affairs. It is still eternally true, man cannot be half slave and half free. He cannot be politically free if he becomes economically dependent. We cannot preserve freedom and peace internationally if domestically we allow ourselves to drift into internal dissension.

MAN MUST REMAIN HIS OWN MASTER

The principle upon which this dilemma can be dissolved is a simple one. It is to be found in the recognition of the fact that there must be a rule of conduct and responsibility for the concerted action of men. The individual is free because God made him free, but the organizations which men create are not entitled to that same prerogative, for organizations are the mere creatures of man.

The creatures must not be allowed to restrain the activities of their makers. It is the function of government to foster and expand opportunity for the citizen without regimenting him. It is likewise the duty of the industrial corporation, of the labor union, and of every other organized group to work consciously for the public good by expanding opportunity for the people without private regimentation.

The whole is greater than any of its parts. The whole people of America are greater than any segment of the population. No group or class is greater than the whole people. Working together in the war, the whole people of America demonstrated that working together for the peace they can achieve the production that will mean new and higher levels of prosperity and culture for all.

To gain this end, man must devise the rule by which every organization he creates, whether in the economic or the political field, shall remain his servant and shall not be permitted to become his master.

South Dakota Ranks High Among the Farm States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the Greater South Dakota Association has recently completed a study of reports of the South Dakota Crop and Livestock Reporting Service, Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture, and other Government reports. This study shows the high rank that South Dakota holds in the Nation's agricultural economy.

It is such a tribute to the South Dakota farmers, who, in spite of the shortage of manpower and farm machinery, contributed so much in producing the food so essential in winning the war and relieving destitution in the world starvation areas of today that I feel it should be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of the history of what America did in World War II.

The farmers of the Nation as a whole made a remarkable record during the war. With less machinery, less help, and fewer replacements, they did the greatest food production job in all history.

It is no disparagement of other States, but rather a measure of the high mark of all, to point out what South Dakota farmers did in comparison with other States. So as a method of emphasizing the remarkable record established by all, may I say that a comparison with the north central States of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, and Wisconsin, this compilation by the Greater South Dakota Association shows that South Dakota:

First. Led in the reduction of farm mortgage debt, 1930–44.

Second. Is first in the average value of livestock per farm.

Third. Is first in the number of cattle per farm.

Fourth. Led in the pounds of cattle produced in 1945.

Fifth. Was first in 1945 in wool production per farm.

Sixth. Is first in average number of acres per farm.

Seventh. Was first in 1945 in value of rye produced.

Eighth. Was second in value of barley produced in 1945.

Ninth. Was second in average harvested acreage per farm, 1934–43.

Tenth. Was second in chickens produced per farm in 1945.

Eleventh. Is second in number of tractors per 100 farms.

Twelfth. Was third in gross State debt reduction, 1940–45.

Thirteenth. Was third in value of flaxseed produced in 1945.

Fourteenth. Was third in value of all sorghums produced in 1945.

Fifteenth. Was third in the value of alfalfa seed produced in 1945.

Sixteenth. Was fourth in average cash farm income per farm in 1945.

Seventeenth. Was fourth in hog production per farm in 1945.

Eighteenth. Was fourth in average value of corn production per farm in 1945.

Nineteenth. Was fifth in value of oats produced in 1945.

Twentieth. Was fifth in value of all wheat produced in 1945.

Twenty-first. Was fifth in 5-year average cash income per farm, 1941–45.

Twenty-second. Is fifth in the number of automobiles per 100 farms.

Twenty-third. Is sixth in value of land and buildings per farm.

Twenty-fourth. Was sixth in value of sweet clover seed produced in 1945.

Twenty-fifth. Was sixth in value of potatoes produced in 1945.

And South Dakota was ninth State in the Union last year in the value of corn produced.

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I now place in the RECORD the compilation made by the Greater South Dakota Association to which I have referred:

South Dakota fourth in per farm cash income in 1945 in the North Central States

[Without Government payments]

Iowa	$7,156
North Dakota	6,548
Nebraska	6,508
South Dakota	6,025
Illinois	5,631
Kansas	5,420
Minnesota	4,501
Wisconsin	4,201
Indiana	3,823
Missouri	2,897
Ohio	3,209
Michigan	2,791

South Dakota twelfth in all States, and more than double the United States of America average, in cash income per farm in 1945

California	$12,619
Arizona	10,527
Delaware	9,804
Nevada	7,977
Wyoming	7,279
Iowa	7,156
New Jersey	7,089
Colorado	6,976
North Dakota	6,548
Nebraska	6,508
Montana	6,194
South Dakota	6,025
Florida	5,995
Idaho	5,937
Illinois	5,631
Washington	5,527
Kansas	5,420
Connecticut	4,823
Rhode Island	4,583
Utah	4,563
Minnesota	4,501
Oregon	4,487
Wisconsin	4,201
New York	4,118
Maryland	3,952
New Mexico	3,878
Indiana	3,824
Massachusetts	3,305
Ohio	3,209
Pennsylvania	3,054
Maine	2,902
Missouri	2,897
Texas	2,851
United States (average)	2,862
Michigan	2,791
Vermont	2,774
Oklahoma	2,490
New Hampshire	2,243
North Carolina	2,210
Alabama	2,057
Virginia	1,913
Louisiana	1,810
Kentucky	1,787
Georgia	1,624
South Carolina	1,513
Arkansas	1,415
Tennessee	1,352
Mississippi	1,108
West Virginia	852

South Dakota fifth in 5-year average of cash farm income per farm (1941–45) in the North Central States

Iowa	$6,288
North Dakota	5,086
Illinois	4,899
Nebraska	4,778
South Dakota	4,354
Kansas	4,256
Minnesota	3,778
Wisconsin	3,491
Indiana	3,204
Ohio	2,712
Michigan	2,351
Missouri	1,987
Average for the area	3,817
Average for the U. S. A	2,862

South Dakota leads in reduction of farm-mortgage debt (1930–44) in the North Central States

	Percent
South Dakota	64
North Dakota	56
Nebraska	54
Kansas	53
Missouri	53
Illinois	47
Iowa	45
Wisconsin	43
Michigan	32
Indiana	25
Minnesota	23
Ohio	16
Average for the area	44
Average for the U. S. A	41

South Dakota ranks second in average harvested acreage per farm (1934–43) in the North Central States

FIFTY-TWO CROPS

North Dakota	209
South Dakota	174
Nebraska	152
Kansas	130
Iowa	98
Minnesota	94
Illinois	88
Indiana	56
Wisconsin	54
Missouri	48
Ohio	43
Michigan	41
Average for this area	84
Average for the U. S. A	54

South Dakota leads in average value of livestock per farm (Jan. 1, 1946) in the North Central States

South Dakota	$4,071
Iowa	4,043
Nebraska	3,753
Wisconsin	3,163
Minnesota	2,582
North Dakota	2,537
Illinois	2,390
Kansas	2,271
Indiana	1,627
Missouri	1,579
Ohio	1,452
Michigan	1,324
Average for this area	2,412
Average for U. S. A	1,603

South Dakota leads in number of cattle per farm (Jan. 1, 1945) in the North Central States

South Dakota	36
Nebraska	33
Kansas	28
North Dakota	27
Iowa	26
Wisconsin	22
Minnesota	19
Illinois	16
Missouri	14
Indiana	11
Michigan	11
Ohio	10
Average for this area	19
Average for the U. S. A	14

South Dakota leads in cattle production per farm (1945) in the North Central States

	Pounds
South Dakota	9,500
Nebraska	9,404
Kansas	7,888
Iowa	7,542
North Dakota	6,675
Minnesota	4,747
Wisconsin	4,620
Missouri	4,159
Illinois	4,003
Indiana	2,634
Michigan	2,340
Ohio	2,206
Average for this area	4,903
Average for the U. S. A	3,166

South Dakota ranks well in hog production per farm (1945) in the North Central States

	Pounds
Iowa	19,337
Illinois	10,137
Indiana	8,415
South Dakota	8,306
Nebraska	8,263
Minnesota	7,332
Missouri	5,230
Ohio	4,882
Wisconsin	4,089
Kansas	3,598
North Dakota	3,511
Michigan	1,692
Average for this area	7,334
Average for the U. S. A	3,193

South Dakota top in wool production per farm (1945) in the North Central States

	Pounds
South Dakota	161
North Dakota	89
Ohio	53
Iowa	41
Minnesota	37
Kansas	36
Missouri	35
Michigan	28
Illinois	25
Nebraska	24
Indiana	20
Wisconsin	14
Average for this area	39
Average for the U. S. A	53

South Dakota second in chickens produced per farm (1945) in the North Central States

	Pounds
Iowa	1,235
South Dakota	1,200
Nebraska	1,186
Minnesota	980
Illinois	837
Indiana	754
Kansas	722
North Dakota	713
Ohio	612
Missouri	584
Wisconsin	581
Michigan	539
Average for this area	799
Average for the U. S. A	504

South Dakota farm autos rank high in the North Central States

[Number of cars per 100 farms]

Iowa	110.9
Minnesota	105.7
Nebraska	104.3
Wisconsin	100.8
South Dakota	100.3
Ohio	98.9
Illinois	98.6
North Dakota	97.2
Michigan	96.5
Kansas	96.2
Indiana	93.7
Missouri	68.8
Average for this area	96.6
Average for the U. S. A	67.9

South Dakota farms second in use of tractors in the North Central States

[Number of tractors per 100 farms]

North Dakota	66.7
South Dakota	60.9
Kansas	60.8
Iowa	60.2
Illinois	59.1
Nebraska	58.5
Minnesota	53.2
Wisconsin	43.5
Indiana	39.6
Ohio	38.4
Michigan	35.5
Missouri	17.6
Average for this area	46.5
Average for the U. S. A	25.7

South Dakota per acre tax costs are low in the North Central States

[Average tax per acre of farm land, 1943]

South Dakota	$0.19
North Dakota	.20
Nebraska	.30
Missouri	.32
Kansas	.33
Michigan	.47
Minnesota	.67
Ohio	.70
Indiana	.70
Wisconsin	.78
Illinois	.97
Iowa	.99

South Dakota sixth in value of land and buildings per farm in the North Central States

Iowa	$12,614
Illinois	11,887
Nebraska	9,399
Kansas	9,092
Minnesota	7,312
South Dakota	6,976
Indiana	6,781
North Dakota	6,628
Wisconsin	6,365
Ohio	6,176
Michigan	4,865
Missouri	4,324

South Dakota first in average acres per farm in the North Central States

South Dakota	622
North Dakota	588
Nebraska	426
Kansas	342
Minnesota	174
Iowa	164
Illinois	153
Missouri	145
Wisconsin	132
Indiana	112
Michigan	103
Ohio	98

That, Mr. Speaker, is the South Dakota story for 1945, a magnificent story of a great effort and a great achievement in the final year of World War II.

The Housing Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] on the housing problem from the national viewpoint, delivered in Washington, D. C., June 17, 1946, before the Citizens Council for Community Planning.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am happy to be with you tonight to discuss the housing problem from the national viewpoint. At your meeting last year it was my privilege to address you on the subject of housing conditions in the city of Washington.

A few years ago I set out upon an undertaking which I knew would be difficult, but which I thought would be wholly successful.

It was my aim to participate in the development of a housing program for America which would meet with the support and accord of all groups and individuals. I knew this objective could be gained only if certain conditions were satisfied. I sincerely believe the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill has fully met them.

The first condition was that the Congress itself make a detailed and thorough study of the whole housing picture. It could not leave this task to any Government agency, or to any so-called impartial commission, or to any combination of interested groups. All the American people are involved in this housing problem, and only the Congress can represent and properly reflect their interests.

Certainly, the Senate has executed this responsibility successfully. For almost 2 years, we have held hearings and engaged in deliberations. Every line of the bill represents reflection and thought. No measure within my recollection has been so thoroughly planned and worked out.

The second condition, which I thought necessary to produce agreements all around, was that the bill should be founded upon principles which have common acceptance in America. One of these principles is that private enterprise shall be aided and encouraged to do as much of the housing job as it possibly can. Consequently, we probed and examined practically every suggestion which the spokesmen for private enterprise have made over the years on the housing subject. There is hardly an important and worthy suggestion of this type which has not been fitted into the framework of the bill.

Not very long before the bill was introduced, the spokesman for about 12 representative private enterprise organizations, engaged in home-financing and home-building, submitted to me and to the other sponsors a draft of a bill of their own. They called it the "private enterprise bill." Far from being hostile to their recommendations, almost all of the principles and objectives proposed by them were incorporated in the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. We did so, not to cater to any group, but because we believed these proposals were right and just, and corresponded with our views after most careful study.

Specifically, the spokesmen for the private-enterprise groups have long urged that there should be Federal aid for slum clearance and land assembly, so that communities might plan the redevelopment of their blighted areas. That is necessary so that the land cost might be reduced to a point where private enterprise can do most of the redevelopment. We have written into the bill the best plan we could devise, directed toward this objective.

The spokesmen for private enterprise have long urged that the FHA system of mortgage insurance be liberalized and extended. They have desired the opportunity of building more houses for people in middle-income groups. They have felt that loans of longer maturity, with a higher percentage of Government insurance, and a lower down payment, would contribute toward this end. We have agreed with them, and we have incorporated these provisions in the bill.

The spokesmen for private enterprise have suggested there were vast, untapped sources of investment capital which could be brought into the development of rental-housing projects if the Government stood back of these investments and made them reasonably secure. We have included a plan for that purpose in the bill.

The spokesmen for private enterprise have long pleaded that the public low-rent housing program be restudied so that it could be placed in the most desirable form human ingenuity could devise. Particularly, they have insisted that every safeguard should be written into the law so that public housing would be held strictly noncompetitive with decent private housing, and so that only those communities which really took the initiative in determining the need for public housing should receive Federal aid. We have written into the bill the most rigorous requirements to afford private enterprise this safety and protection.

The spokesmen for private enterprise, over many years, insisted that the Government should have a consistent and farsighted housing policy. They criticized, with much justification, the sprawling and overlapping housing agencies and activities which had grown up. The sponsors of the bill were in thorough agreement with their contentions; therefore, the bill provides for a national housing policy and a single national housing agency.

There was a third condition, which I felt had to be met before we could get general agreement on comprehensive housing legislation. This third condition, which I wish were not present, but which unfortunately is present, is a serious housing emergency—an emergency which vitally affects the welfare and well-being of millions of people. I thought this emergency would cause everyone to set aside minor points of disagreement—would be conducive to the setting aside of petty personal interests—and would cause everyone to stand shoulder to shoulder on the platform of an intelligent, honest, and realistic housing program.

Despite the meeting of all these conditions, I must confess to a certain amount of personal disappointment. We cannot truthfully say that we have achieved almost complete agreement about the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill. There is still a considerable amount of opposition.

This opposition comes from two main sources. First, there are people who have been misinformed about the bill. This misinformation reaches them through cunningly contrived propaganda documents. But there is an antidote for this misinformation, to be found in the available reports of the two Senate committees which processed this legislation. The truth became so apparent to the fair-minded Senate of the United States that it passed the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill without a dissenting vote. Republicans and Democrats were joined together, not only in the sponsorship, but also in its passage.

The second source of opposition to the bill comes from some who are not misinformed, but who have a strange conception of the functions of the Federal Government. They seem to think that the first responsibility of the Federal Government is to help those who are doing fairly well, to do even better, and that the last responsibility of the Federal Government is to help those depressed and suffering to better their lot in life.

Some of these people call the bill un-American or socialistic because it departs from them on this subject; but I submit that they, rather than the sponsors of the bill, are mistaken as to the American theory of government. I submit that the first duty of Government is to assist those who need help most—and to bring those who are living under substandard conditions up to an American standard of life.

It is inconceivable to me that those who have been in favor of Federal subsidies to help them acquire land so that they can make profits from its reuse—and I am in favor of doing this—can be opposed to Federal subsidies to take families and their children out of the slums. It is inconceivable to me that those who favor Government insurance, which after all is a form of financial aid, to help people make more profits by expanding the output of houses—and I favor doing this—can at the same time oppose participation by the Government in the strictly nonprofitable undertaking of providing decent housing for families of very low income. I must confess that this attitude is shocking to my sense of fair play.

And yet, the opposition of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill is based entirely upon this one-sided, and I may say short-sighted attitude. At bottom, this opposition arises because the bill contains some provisions for public housing for families of very low income. I asked one of the witnesses at the Senate hearings whether his opposition to the bill would be withdrawn if the public housing provisions were removed. He stated this would substantially overcome their objections. I believe he was frank, even though he was not correct.

Further, he was not correct, even from the viewpoint of his own best interests. Nobody can look the facts squarely in the eye and come to the conclusion that public housing could possibly compete with private enterprise. In one metropolitan area today, the top rents on privately financed housing are set at $80. The private builders, and I do not say they are wrong, are now asking that this ceiling be raised, on the ground that it is too low to permit them to operate successfully. Let us assume that, when we reach a more normal situation, they could operate profitably at $50 or $60 a month rent, instead of $80 or $90. How in the name of reason, then, can they be hurt by a public-housing program which is confined solely to those who cannot afford to pay more than $20 or $30 a month, or even $35 a month, for their housing? The proposition is so transparently plain that to state it is to answer it.

I do not believe the future of private enterprise in this country rests upon keeping a quarter of our population in urban or rural slums. I think that the future of private enterprise—and may it be a bright one—rests upon a prosperous, contented, and well-housed people.

I believe that a healthy nation depends upon healthy communities—and communities cannot be healthy so long as slums and blighted areas are draining their resources.

Now, there are some who say: "What has all this to do with the veterans' emergency housing program? Can we not defer this long-range program until we solve the veterans' housing problem?" Again, I say that the answer to these questions is very plain.

Who are the veterans, if not a cross section of the American people? Do the veterans all have family income of more than $4,000 a year? Can they all afford to buy $8,000 or $9,000 houses, or pay more than $750 a year for shelter rent? Did none of the veterans live in slums before the war, and are none of them back in the slums now?

There is no essential difference whatsoever between the kind of housing we need now for the veterans and the kind of housing we will need 3 or 4 years from now for the veterans and the rest of the people. The only difference is that we need it now more badly, and more quickly. We can no more solve the veterans' housing problem of the next 2 years without the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill than we can solve the housing problem of the next 10 years without the bill.

Certainly, the House Banking and Currency Committee should hold hearings on the bill. But I do believe such committee should attach great weight and importance to the 2 years of study which has been given to the measure by the Senate. This is particularly true because the Senate committee which initially studied this whole subject was not a busy legislative committee, but a special subcommittee on housing and urban redevelopment which conducted a thorough investigation and wrote a comprehensive report—and a unanimous report, at that. I would have preferred it if this investigation could have been made by a joint committee of both Houses, but it was not feasible to do that. However, the Postwar Committee of the House has made a written report on the subject of housing, and its basic recommendations are substantially along the same lines as those of the Senate.

For these reasons, and in view of the urgency of the situation, and the nearness of the recess, I earnestly implore the members of the House Banking and Currency Committee to conduct their hearings with speed and brevity—and to get this matter before the House for a quick decision by the end of this month or early next month.

There has been enough study and preparation. There is very little more to uncover about what needs to be done. The time has come for action. And let us have action—now.

Keynote Address by Hon. Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina, Before Nevada State Democratic Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. P. CARVILLE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. CARVILLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the keynote address delivered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] at the Democratic State Convention at Ely, Nev., on May 14, 1946.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

These are great times in which we find ourselves. There seems little doubt to me that historians of the future will record this period through which we are passing as the high peak of human history. We have just emerged victorious from the greatest armed conflict the world has ever seen and a conflict more devastating and costly in human life and in materials and equipment than the peoples of the world could ever again survive.

When American research, American ingenuity and scientific development smashed the tiny atom, we entered into a new era in the science of life. Man has reached the cross of civilization. No longer can we wander and muddle through. We are at the point in the human history where we must choose annihilation or choose the road to unlimited achievement and boundless improvement.

I stand in awe of what the future offers, but I am unafraid. I gain confidence and strength from my faith in the common, solid people of America and of the world.

We must follow the principles and ideals of democracy if we are to preserve the rights and privileges inherited from the undaunted, undefeated men of vision and understanding who have gone before.

Our Democratic Party was founded as the party of the masses of the people. It was designed and developed to foster and to protect the "little man" from the special privileged few who thrived on vested interests.

I, like a great many of you, am of humble origin. I was born the son of a tenant farmer and spent some 10 years of my early life working in the cotton-textile mills of my home State of South Carolina. I know how to toil with my hands. I am proud of my heritage. It is noble and honorable. I believe in the dignity of hard, honest toil. I am grateful for the recognition and the honor that my people have given to me.

The opportunities of service that have been extended to me have been and will continue to be, an inspiring challenge to better serve my fellow man.

From the very beginning of our early American political life, there were two schools of thought. One led by Thomas Jefferson and the other by Alexander Hamilton.

Jefferson, more than any other individual, formulated the political philosophy which has grown to be the American way of life. From his virile, vigorous pen flowed the phraseology of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights.

Thomas Jefferson was a philosopher and a great one. Yet he refused to relegate himself to the secluded life so characteristic of the philosopher. Jefferson was even greater because he was a practical man.

Dropping his pen for a battle-ax, Jefferson sallied forth into the political arena, and fought tooth and nail to guarantee that his philosophies were written into the fundamental law of this country.

Jefferson was the forerunner of the Democratic Party. He planned true democracy in a practical way. It was his courage and vision to sponsor the cause of the common people at a time when it was politically dangerous to do so.

And while Jefferson was admittedly the father of the democratic principle in American Government, it remained for Andrew Jackson, the invincible Indian fighter, rugged, dauntless, pioneering soldier of the frontier to wrest the actual reins of Government from the Bourbonic aristocrats who had originally gained control. Jackson placed Government in the hands of the people.

The great Jackson was supported not only by the Democratic Party, but by thousands who had no party or who had belonged to other parties. He could not rest, but instead, was forced to fight every inch of the way for the ideals and principles of the democratic Republic which was his ideal. An overwhelming proportion of the Nation's material power and wealth opposed him. The media for the dissemination of information were all arrayed against him. It seemed sometimes that all were against him—all but the people of the United States.

Of Jackson's election, one of the great editors of his day wrote, "It is a proud day for the people because Andrew Jackson is their own President." And as the people's President, he immediately went to work to relieve human distress and suffering.

Senator Benton described Jackson's coming into power as "a triumph of democratic principles and an assertion of the people's right to govern themselves." It has been said of Andrew Jackson that, "He was a standard bearer of a mighty democratic organization which was destined, before it ran its course, to break down oligarchical party organizations, to liberalize State and local governments, and to turn the stream of national politics into wholly new channels. It was futile for men of the old school to protest and to prophesy misfortune for the country under its new rule."

Old Hickory represented the average American in all walks of life, the small planters of the South, the farmers along the eastern seaboard, the pioneers, who incidentally, were the ancestors of you good people here today, along the western frontier, and the small merchant and businessman everywhere. He spoke and acted for all of those who were sick and tired of bank rule, and special privilege, and "judge-made law" which at that time was perverting the intent of legislative statute.

Jackson quickly struck down the tariff of abomination which was thwarting the efforts of your West and my South to expand and develop, and which had been a burden on the common people generally.

He and his supporters broke the hold of the reactionaries on the Supreme Court. They used their influence for the repeal of laws that allowed imprisonment for debt, obviously a piece of class legislation against the poor. They exerted their efforts to advance the cause of public education. They led the movement for the codification of the law so that the people could better know what it was and what it meant.

Jackson fought his way through a turbulent and effective first term and came up for reelection. Every vested interest in the country, all the economic royalists, every paid advocate and unpaid apologist for special privilege were arrayed against him. Reminiscent of our day—no one can be as mean and as vulgar as your better people at times—Jackson was submitted to a torrent of malicious gossip and vituperative abuse, most of it patent nonsense.

As Jefferson had been an "atheist" to his enemies, and Roosevelt was to be a "Communist," so Jackson was a "bloodthirsty Jacobin—a detestable, ignorant, reckless, vain, and malignant tyrant"—a "barbarian from the West," bent on destroying the last vestige of civilized order.

With the support of the people, upheld by their enthusiasm, he marched from triumph to triumph, until he had shattered the forces trying to strangle democracy and the American way of life.

The people had good reason to trust and reverence him. In their hour of need, they had called and he had come. Like some folk-hero of old to right their wrongs and scatter their enemies—the vandals who had managed to seize the citadel of government by subterfuge, and looked upon the Federal Government only as an instrument for their own aggrandizement.

When the time came for Jackson to step down, he was honored as few Presidents before or since have been. Having delivered his farewell address from the steps of the Capitol on March 4, 1837, the noble old man descended to his carriage, and the huge crowd assembled on the lawn—tens of thousands of plain Americans—yielded at last to their pent-up feelings and let loose a roar of shouts and cheers—their long, last irresistible tribute to the man they loved."

The Democratic Party, under the leadership of Grover Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, has carried forward the political philosophy of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

At the present time under the leadership of Harry S. Truman, this Nation is still pressing toward the high democratic principles laid down by Thomas Jefferson.

There will be a day when this Nation will appreciate what Franklin D. Roosevelt did for us when he came into power in 1933. At that time democracies, the world over, were wavering and falling before the ills which beset them and their ills were not unlike those that attended us in 1933.

It has been wisely said that if this Nation had not been snatched out of the hands of the Republican Party, and a man such as Franklin D. Roosevelt placed in charge of this Government of ours, it is very doubtful but what we would have fallen along with the other democracies of the world.

Yes, my friends, the history of the development of freedom in America is written in the stories of men who, to a greater or lesser degree, adhered to the policies and the principles of Jefferson and Jackson.

We in America boast of our freedom. We flaunt to all the world its glories. Yet, we know that our people haven't always enjoyed such freedom. They had to make it * * * toil and sweat over it, fight and bleed and die in order to protect it.

Remember this: Our Government did not make men free; instead, freemen made our Government.

We American people, knowing the pleasures and privileges of freedom, will never

allow ourselves to lose it. A thing so fundamentally good must never die. Today, more surely than ever in our history, we must follow the democratic principles with vigor and enthusiasm in order that our philosophy of government for the benefit of the majority of the people, rather than for the privileged few, may survive.

Recently I read with interest a quotation attributed to Congressman CHARLES A. HALLECK of Indiana. That gentleman, as you probably know, is president of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee; he is also head of the seven-man group which the Republicans named to draft a new program of their objectives.

He said:

"This is the kick-off. This begins the campaign of 1946 * * * and in waging the Republican campaign we will go back to 'old-fashioned conservatism.'"

Back to "old-fashioned conservatism." Yes, that is the Republican idea of how to meet America's problems in 1946.

And what do they mean by this "old-fashioned conservatism"?

The conservatism of these leaders of the Republican Party was fashioned back in the days when they were last in power. It produced Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge, and Herbert Hoover.

And it made other contributions to our history: corruption in government, corruption in Wall Street, depression in Main Street, ineptitude, blundering, and rank stupidity in foreign affairs.

And again they are trying to peddle these outmoded, shopworn wares to the American people.

We of the Democratic Party are convinced that the great hope and the only hope for continued prosperity in the United States and peace among men throughout the countries of the world lies in the administration's reconversion program. Following, as he promised to do upon his elevation to office, the policies and ideals of the late great President Roosevelt, our present leader is giving us a program of action—a liberal, aggressive program.

It is a program we can all understand.

How great is the contrast with the Republican Party's vague platform, their synthetic program of generalities that offers nothing concrete, nothing definite, nothing constructive.

Yet we all know that the Republicans need no platform—no announced platform, that is—to inform the American people of their sole aim and purpose for existence.

They represent now, as they represented under Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, a program of unlimited privilege and protection for the wealthy at the expense of the majority of the people. The masses have sought no special privilege, but through the magnificent efforts of Jefferson, of Jackson, and of Roosevelt have had to fight for the retention of their very rights.

And the Republicans say: "We will go back to old-fashioned conservatism." Like Lot's wife, the Republican Party stopped, turned, and looked back. It turned into a pillar of salt. Its eyes and its heart are frozen on the dead, fixed past. It will continue to be the party of the past—the party of reaction, the party that seeks solution to the problems of today and tomorrow in the methods of yesterday.

It cannot or will not accept the methods which the ways of the present and the indications of the future demand.

The old elephant is dead and it has that peculiar aroma of the dead.

The high-sounding phrases of the Republican speechmakers have that familiar, insincere ring of the parson's eulogy at the funeral of the town's most worthless drunkard.

Republicans have tried to make political capital of the fact that there have been differences and disagreements in the Democratic Party.

True, the Republicans have lived together in harmony in recent years. I point out to you that their do-nothing program, if it can be called a program, could make nobody mad. I almost agree with it myself.

In the Democratic Party, however, we have a broad, aggressive, vigorous program, and, too, we have a large, vociferous, and vigorous party membership, quite unlike the Republicans.

You people in Nevada and we South Carolinians don't always agree as to the method of manner of accomplishment, but in general we agree on principles.

If the Democratic platform were such a jumble of vague promises and shabby apologies like the Republican Party, then it probably would evoke no disputes from members of our party. All would join in a continuing love fest. We, however, come to grips with major issues as they rear their ugly heads and together we battle our way through to some solution.

If, as the Republicans do, we came out boldly and unequivocally for the flag, the Constitution, the way of our forefathers, mother love, and the law of gravity—then we might all find ourselves in perfect agreement.

But that is not the way we Democrats do things. We know that there are important issues facing the country and we realize that weasel words will not solve them. Instead, we face the issues squarely and offer what we believe to be an honest and workable solution.

That is what President Truman has done in laying his program before our people. I do not for a minute consider it strange that a program of such scope and vigor would arouse some opposition—even within our own ranks. For one, I cannot agree in full with all of the provisions of this program.

Again, I say, that it is not so strange in a country, as vast as this, where there are so many differences of tradition, of opinion, and even of immediate interests, that we do not agree on specific proposals of a broad program. I feel that it is a sign of the strength and virility of the democracy within our party itself. It shows that we follow no man nor any small group of men with blind obedience.

We Democrats think for ourselves. And we speak for ourselves.

Despite the many danger signals in the country today, our economy is in good condition and is constantly improving.

Our national income today is double that of the predepression year 1929 and more than four times as large as when Mr. Hoover was evicted from the White House.

Your State, like mine, has considerable agricultural interests. You should note with interest that farmers are in better condition today than ever before. The net income of farmers reached an all-time high in 1945 of about $13,000,000,000, compared with a prewar yearly average of less than $5,000,000,000.

Net income per farm operator averaged more than $2,000 yearly during the war. This compares favorably with the earnings of the average city worker.

Farm prices last year were almost double the prewar average and were about 15 percent above parity.

Last year our food production was 36 percent over the prewar average and total agricultural production 31 percent above the prewar level.

During World War II, farmers paid off their debts, whereas during and after the First World War they continued to go into debt. At the time of Pearl Harbor, farm-mortgage indebtedness stood at six and one-half billion dollars. Today it is down to $5,000,000,000 and steadily decreasing. This is in striking contrast to the situation after the First World War. In 1917 farm-mortgage debt amounted to $5,800,000,000, but by 1923 it had risen to a peak of $10,800,000,000.

Annual foreclosures of farm mortgages have been reduced to one-twentieth of the 1932 total.

As the farmers of this country entered the year 1946, they had on hand financial assets such as war bonds, cash, bank deposits, and warehouse receipts, of more than twice the amount of their indebtedness. Before the war their indebtedness had exceeded their assets.

The real job is yet ahead of us. It is the task of building the peace, of keeping our promise of a job for every returning soldier, the task of maintaining the purchasing power and the living standards of the American people. It is the task of defeating the reactionaries who would keep us from reaching this goal.

The war has brought a large amount of industries to the West for the first time in history. This being true, the fight of the Westerner to enter new peacetime branches of production, to increase their output, to multiply oportunities and to engage in competitions in fields that heretofore have been closed to them, offers a chance for expanding and developing its resources as never before. This being true, we must bear in mind that our Party which advocates the breaking down of obstacles which hamper the free movement of goods from one part of the country to another, will mean much to this section of the United States.

Monopoly, in all of its forms, must be pierced and killed before development can occur. The Department of Justice is working today as never before to rid this Nation of cartels and monopolies.

In closing let me wish for the good of Nevada and the good of America that the Democratic ideals and principles practiced by our Democratic Party be allowed to remain in control of this Government.

A Fair Price for Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am getting tired of hearing some eastern Congressmen using the House of Representatives as a platform to excoriate the so-called silver bloc in the House for our stand on a fair price for silver. I think it is about time to call a halt to the use of such terms as "plunder," "a double-edged sword wielded against the public," and "pampering of silver and silver interests" when discussing silver legislation. This type of language is used against the Representatives, Senators, and silver producers of the Rocky Mountain area on every occasion when we try to get decent consideration of the silver question.

Is it not plain to all our people that silver is necessary in a monetary sense if we are to be able to maintain a sound currency? Behind every silver certificate and every silver dollar stands approxi-

mately three-quarters of an ounce of silver. What we of the West want is the ultimate fulfillment of our monetary policy which means 100 cents of silver behind every silver certificate and silver dollar.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to note that a Senate committee has recommended a raise in the price of silver from 71.11 to 90.3. I hope it will not be too long before the price will be raised to its full statutory value of $1.29 where it should be.

We are not opposed to industrial users of silver having access to silver in the Treasury but we are opposed to giving it to them at 71.11 when the statutory price is $1.29. This means that the Treasury—the Government and people of the United States—suffer a loss, at present, of 58 cents an ounce. We want a fair price for silver so that our 3,000 silver-producing mines in the West will be able to reopen, operate at a reasonable profit, give employment to our miner, and contribute to the welfare of the country. We want a square deal and we intend to get it.

Some Observations on World Industrialization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Some Observations on World Industrialization," by Morris Llewellyn Cooke, consulting engineer in management, Philadelphia, Pa., published in the May 1946 issue of Mechanical Engineering. I have been requested by the Farmers Union to insert this article in the RECORD. I was very much interested in reading it. It is of a little more length than allowed to be printed in the RECORD without an estimate. I have received an estimate from the Public Printer that it will cost $210 to print the article in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON WORLD INDUSTRIALIZATION [1]

(By Morris Llewellyn Cooke, consulting engineer in management)

TECHNICAL SUMMARY

Industrialization of the world's undeveloped areas, with the increase in production of inanimate energy that this implies, appears to be the master key to world progress. Areas that depend too heavily on agriculture are greatly, and in many instances unnecessarily, handicapped by comparison with those that have achieved higher degrees of industrialization.

Some degree of industrialization is possible in almost every country of the world, for energy resources, the first requisite of industry, are widespread. Hydroelectric power, the most convenient and effective of all energy sources in its economic consequences, is available at least potentially in most areas needing the benefits of heightened industrialization.

The development of these water-power resources, preferably in small units dispersed over wide areas, would provide an effective beginning to a world program of economic development. And such a program would benefit not only the countries in which it was undertaken, but also the whole world, through resulting increases in the productivity and the economic welfare of mankind.

Nuclear energy if and when available for peacetime uses may greatly facilitate these developments.

This paper outlines a global program under which the foregoing alluring possibilities may be brought to fruition under the inspiration and leadership of engineers throughout the world.

Part I. Engineering and the times

In normal periods, and in accordance with usual custom, the engineer is engaged on assigned tasks. His plans are worked out in the light of existing and measurable conditions. But the engineer's plans heretofore have not been supposed to comprehend social and political factors.

Practically all peacetime engineering has been based on a relatively static situation both in the immediate environment and in the world at large. It has been pretty largely the engineering of materials and material forces, conditioned in varying degrees by the employer-employee relationship. It has not included what might be called the engineering for peoples, affected as they are by imponderables not to be calculated on the slide rule.

In view of the total world situation there is today an expanding field of opportunity for the engineer, one in which he can function with an ever higher order of authority. Because of the promised widespread use of nuclear energy, the vast growth of facilities for international communications and transportation, the rising tide of education, the coming together of the nations in new and higher types of international cooperation, and other developments in the life of man on this earth, the engineer, if he is to increase his prestige and usefulness, will be forced to make his designs in the light of social conditions yet to be brought about. He must take his place in those echelons of political and social planning where continent-wide and even global undertakings will increasingly be thought out. In some cases the realization of objectives will seem to be discouragingly distant. This, however, is the niche for the engineer to fill if he is to play any important role in the solution of large-scale and pressing problems—some of which challenge even the survival of the human race.

Under such a concept of engineering the profession might well assume as a task fitted to its wide range of technical competence an attack on the paralyzing poverty that to a considerable extent needlessly blights the lives of more than one-half of the world's two billion and more of people. Definitive master techniques for poverty abatement are not known. Their study with human welfare as the dominant incentive has hardly begun. Seemingly the most promising over-all attack on this devastating penury is to be found in widespread but better balanced and socially-minded industrialization. The engineer has considered the mechanics involved as a field peculiarly his own. Economists, physical scientists, diplomats, businessmen, politicians, medical men, and other professional groups each will continue to have their specialized parts to play in this far-flung and inspiring endeavor. But this does not relieve the engineer of a primary responsibility. The management engineering group may well make the initial moves.

Here undaunted optimism is the only key to success. Fears and apprehensions or even too many seemingly relevant reservations will spell defeat. We need the inspiring attitude reflected in the slogan of the Sea Bees (C. B.—Construction Battalion of the United States Navy, Corps of Engineers) as epigrammatically used in World War II: "The difficult can be done at once—the impossible takes a little longer."

Part II. The project

The poverty and suffering of peoples is reflected by many different indices and follows a pattern that is seldom uniform throughout a given area. Pools of relative plenty dot vast regions noted for human squalor. Within even highly organized cities in the industrialized United States on the one hand and in agricultural Brazil on the other are to be found spots where human life exists at unbelievably low levels. In various parts of the world, but especially in Europe and China, similar areas have resulted from war's devastation. But generally speaking, it can be shown that industrialization implies a relatively high level of living, living in all sections of the economy including agriculture. So we can use as an index in the delimitation of our problem the estimated percentages of the population dependent on agriculture of the several continental areas:

	Total population, in thousands [1]	Population dependent on agriculture	
		Population, in thousands	Percent of total
World	2,029,435	1,188,295	58.6
Europe [2]	373,673	135,770	36.3
North America [2]	[3] 133,496	34,031	[4] 25.5
Tropical Latin America	90,941	67,286	74.0
Temperate Latin America [2]	17,953	6,286	35.0
Asia	1,091,623	746,071	68.3
Africa	143,017	109,882	76.8
Australia and New Zealand [2]	8,265	2,031	25.0
U. S. S. R.	170,467	86,938	51.0

[1] The totals for the world are not as high as the present assumed total of 2,170,000,000 because it has been necessary to use earlier population totals and estimates for occupations.

[2] The percentages of the total population dependent upon agriculture are lower for Europe, North America, temperate Latin America, and for Australia and New Zealand, because of the large proportion of the population in the cities of these areas. North America includes the United States, Canada, Alaska, Newfoundland and Labrador; and temperate Latin America includes Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay.

[3] This figure is the summation of the United States census 1930 figure, Canada, 1931, Newfoundland and Labrador, 1935, and Alaska, 1929—these enumerations being for this group the last containing prewar occupational data.

[4] In 1940 the United States alone had an estimated 23 percent of its total population dependent on agriculture. As estimated for January 1945, about 18.1 percent of our total population was on farms. Of the total number of gainful workers in the United States 10 years of age and over, approximately 18.8 percent were engaged in agriculture in 1940, in contrast with 64.5 percent in 1850, and 71.9 percent in 1820.

There is happily considerable evidence in support of the conclusion that substantial benefits will accrue to agricultural peoples through industrialization, accompanied as it usually must be with improvements in transportation facilities. Economists hold that practically every increase in industrialization

[1] A preprint of a paper to be given at the International Engineering Congress, Paris, France, Sept. 16–21, 1946.

can be spelled out in terms of widely distributed higher living standards. It has been shown [2] that there are standard differences in per capita income for similar differences in the degree of industrialization.[3] The evidence of this is to be found in the income data for the several States of the United States and for the various countries of the world. Thus, in the several regions of the United States the difference between per capita income in States having 40 percent of their workers engaged in agriculture and those having only 20 percent is a difference of about $200 (1939 prices), or a difference of 80 percent for Southern States and 50 percent for Northwestern States. For Europe, Latin-America, and Asia also the difference between 40 percent engaged in agriculture and 20 percent is a difference of about $200 (average prices 1925–34). For certain of the undeveloped portions of the world this much advance in industrialization would mean more than doubling per capita incomes.

Furthermore, it is asserted that such betterments can be consciously planned, and that substantial results have actually been achieved by such planning. For instance, it appears that the U. S. S. R., through state action, made as much of a shift from an agricultural to an industrial economy in the one decade, 1929 to 1939, as had been achieved without over-all planning in the United States in the last four decades of the nineteenth century.[4]

More evidence as to the effect of industrial development on levels of living may be adduced from the relationship between energy consumption for productive purposes—a prime index of industrialization—and national income. Certain studies conducted within the United States Government have shown how close this relationship is. The same studies have also shown that there is a direct, but less precise relationship between total energy consumption and per capita income.

Some idea of this range in energy consumption for productive purposes (1937) and its reflection in per capita income (1925–34), may be gained from the following table, in which are listed representative areas comprising a wide range of living levels. The table also contains the corresponding percentages of agricultural workers in the total working population (1930). These percentages are, of course, highly correlated (inversely) since increased use of nonhuman energy is usually accompanied by a relative increase in nonagricultural activities. The relationships would be even more striking if the three sets of data had been available for the same years.

Area	Per capita consumption of energy for productive purposes [1]	Per capita income [2]	Percentage of agricultural workers in total working population [3]
World	1,250	121	
United States	7,000	508	22
United Kingdom	5,500	465	6
Western and central Europe [4]	3,630	310	26
France	2,800	298	36
Japan	1,250	114	50
Eastern and southern Europe [5]	827	109	63
Bulgaria	350	83	81
China (excluding Manchuria)	170	22	80

[1] The kilowatt-hour electricity equivalent of all the energy obtained from coal, oil, fuel wood, peat, and natural gas; the derivatives of these fuels (gas, gasoline, coke, thermal electricity, etc.); hydroelectric power and the efforts of men and draft animals. Fuel and power used for house heating have been excluded insofar as possible. It is assumed here that only 20 percent of the free energy available in fuels is actually recovered. The data of reference are 1937 with the exception of Spain (1935) and Japan (1936). These years were selected as representing most recent normal peacetime economic conditions in both countries.

[2] Equivalent dollars per year calculated from Colin Clark, The Conditions of Economic Progress, London, 1940. Income of China independently estimated. The data are averages for the years 1925–34. This period includes what may be regarded as an entire trade cycle with about the same number of boom and depression years.

[3] Includes fishing, hunting, and forestry. Calculated from official census data for various years, largely since 1930.

[4] Sweden, Norway, Denmark, United Kingdom, Eire, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, France, Switzerland, Austria, Germany, and Czechoslovakia.

[5] Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Greece, Yugoslavia, Italy, Spain, and Portugal.

In addition to these real economic gains enjoyed by the whole population, there appear to be certain advantages—some of them psychological—accruing to the individual agricultural worker through being exposed to the influence of an advancing industrialization. It is common knowledge in the United States of America, that since the coming of the tractor and the automobile our farmers have become more mechanically minded and more tool conscious, more discriminating in the choice of tools and more competent in their use. Tractors and cars bring repair shops, in many instances leading to the small beginnings of local industrialization. From there on the talk of the district is apt to include mechanical discussions, sometimes acrimonious, along with more desultory observations on crops and the weather. Then follow the beginnings of a more conscious and advanced type of planning. It is admitted that one may not change the weather but the ways of circumventing its bad effects are increasingly studied. So acts of God against which man is unable to compete become less frequent. Such a drift in a people's thinking may be more important than that wrought by more orthodox education.

That our intensive American industrialization increasingly influences farming practice for the better is a weighty argument in this discussion. American commercial farmers, producing goods for the market, are as a class and hour for hour the most efficient agricultural workers in the world. Their output last year had nearly a $21,000,000,000 value. The labor-saving equipment that made this possible includes small-grain combines, rubber-tired tractors, multirowed cultivators, mounted corn pickers, field choppers, tractor and truck buckrakes, flame-throwing cultivators, sprayers, dusters, cotton pickers, tree-shakers, and other devices. The greater availability of electricity on the farm in recent years has made easier and more satisfactory the use of refrigeration, milking machines, water systems, brooders for chicks, pigs, and lambs, elevators for grain and hay, grinders, hot beds, and lights for increasing egg production, and made possible the barn haydrier.

Mechanization alone, however, is not enough. With all the machinery that has been brought in to increase the productivity of American farms, farmers in the United States are still faced with the problem of paying higher wages, confronted as they are by diminishing soil fertility and increasing fixed costs. These problems must be met with better production planning, more economical use of land and equipment, and easier and simpler methods tied into the newer technological developments—techniques bound to be adopted in any agricultural economy utilizing a mechanized program. A move in this direction has already begun in the form of a national farm work simplification program carried on by 12 of the land-grant colleges. The program has already shown that about the same savings of time and energy can be made in agricultural jobs as in industrial jobs.

Yet with all the technical advice and governmental assistance that has been available to farmers in the United States practically none has been comparable to that supplied currently to industry by a vast army of industrial engineers. Yet the operation of an average American farm has today become so complex that the individual farmer could use, and, in fact, absolutely requires, a large measure of the same type of planning and management techniques available to his cousins in industry. It is high time that the growing group of agricultural engineers seize the opportunity to introduce the philosophy and some of the practices of Frederick W. Taylor and scientific management into agriculture.

Because energy resources translated into mechanical power are the touchstone of industrialization, the development of energy resources is particularly desirable in countries lean in other so-called natural resources,[5] for these are the countries least able to support their people adequately by employment in the primary industries alone. Energy not only enables them to branch out into the processing and transportation industries that characterize better balanced economies; it also creates the opportunity to synthesize some of the raw and semiraw materials they lack, such as nitrogen compounds, rayon and staple fibers, dyes, stains, and rubber.

There are some, perhaps, who question the wisdom of promoting industry in areas that now provide so much of the world's raw materials. But, insofar as energy resources are adequate for such development, it offers only good, not only to the undeveloped areas themselves, but also under proper trading arrangements to the countries that now see in these areas only markets for their manufactured goods.[6]

Inanimate energy means increased productivity of individuals and, in the long run, lower prices for what they have to sell. The development of the United States has been

[2] See International Industrialization and Per Capita Income, by Louis H. Bean, Part V of Studies in Income and Wealth, National Bureau of Economic Research Inc., 1946.

[3] Desirable as a high per capita income usually is it does not necessarily follow that well-being in all its myriad aspects is a function of money income.

[4] Premier Stalin on Feb. 9, 1946, asserted that in planning the recent industrialization of U. S. S. R. the Communist Party had chosen to develop heavy industries as contrasted with the lighter consumer goods industries which latter he claimed had been heretofore the universal pattern for industrial development. He further gave it as his opinion that this quite general adoption throughout the world of consumer goods industries was dictated by the smaller capital requirements. It presumably follows that to industrialize in the first instance through heavy goods industries there must be a will on the part of the people or their government to hold in check or restrict the use of consumer goods. There must also be available the energy resources requisite for heavy industry but many areas requiring industrialization do not have such resources of sufficient magnitude for this purpose. It is possible, for instance, that Italy has unduly expanded her heavy industries since she is forced to import 60 percent of her energy resources either by sea or over the Alps.

[5] See Resources—An Evolving Concept, by Erich W. Zimmermann, professor of resources at University of Texas, Proceedings and Transactions Texas Academy of Science, 1944, vol. XXVIII.

[6] See The Economic Consequences of Power Production, by Fred Henderson, John Day & Co.

marked by phenomenal rises in wages; increases in the productivity of labor in the United States, which have made the wage increases possible, have been even more phenomenal. The net result has been, in general, a constantly decreasing unit cost of many of the things we consume.

The explanation of this paradox lies in the relative inexpensiveness of energy from inanimate sources. Fantastic as it may seem, a kilowatt-hour of electricity which will keep your 60-watt bulb burning for 16 hours at a cost of perhaps 1 cent, will do more work than most men can perform in 8 hours of real hard labor.[7] A ton of coal, worth roughly $3 at the pithead, can be made to do more work than 500 men can perform in 6 working days of 8 hours each.

Both engineers and scientists appear to view with confident optimism the utilization of the split atom as a source of controlled energy especially for power-generating stations. In fact, this great quest of the race has already been begun. Heat in the volume and under the controlled conditions required for the generation of mechanical energy is already being produced through nuclear fission. Further it seems likely that this new source of power will first be developed for use in novel situations or in sparsely populated areas away from the normal haunts of men where because of expense or for some other reason the usual power sources are unavailable. If the promise of these early beginnings is fulfilled, the task outlined in this paper will be very greatly simplified, but it seems wise to base conclusions in this discussion on immediately available resources. France, endowed by the inspiring Curie tradition has shown her confident faith in the outcome by appropriating $12,000,000 for nuclear research with Joliot-Curie in charge.

Generally speaking, the industrialization of any nation or area is largely dependent on the energy resources actually within that area or fairly near at hand. Over longer distances transportation costs are prohibitive. Only 13½ percent of the world's fuel and power crosses national boundaries. And while half of this is oil moving from a few great centers to all corners of the globe, most of the remainder is coal moving short distances between countries already industrialized—from Britain and Germany to France, from the United States of America to Canada.

The world's coal is largely concentrated in a dozen countries. Most of the economically undeveloped regions of the world are relatively lacking in coal, and likewise remote from coal-producing areas. In Africa, only the Union of South Africa has substantial coal reserves, and such reserves are negligible in most of Middle America, South America, the Pacific islands, western and southeastern Asia. They are relatively unimportant in much of eastern and southern Europe.

Fuel wood, while widely and in some cases—such as Brazil—profusely distributed in the industrially retarded areas under discussion, is an inefficient energy resource. It is commonly held in Brazil, for instance, that wood-burning power stations cannot be operated more than 6 hours in a day. Similarly peat plays only a negligible part in economic development. Wind power in restricted areas such as northern Russia is gaining increased acceptance. But wind as a generally available source of energy must for the present be discounted.[8] Oil has such high value as a source of energy for transportation of ships, automobiles, trucks and even locomotives, and as a lubricant, that it has become too costly for any considerable use for power under the vigorous competitive conditions which obtain in most industries today.

Seemingly hydroelectric power will prove to be the prime factor in the industrialization of areas not now enjoying a satisfactory level of economic well-being. Most such areas have at least modest reserves of water power. In fact most of them have little else except forests, or wind, or possibly oil, none of which can be considered for reasons already stated. Fortunately, some of the world's greatest water-power reserves are in these less-advanced countries. But in spite of their potential significance, only a tiny part of these reserves is being utilized today. It is conservatively estimated that the world's total water-power resources are capable of yielding some 4,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity annually, approximately as much energy as is now obtained annually from all sources. Only one-twentieth of this type of energy has thus far been put to work.

In addition to power, hydro-electric projects would bring to these undeveloped areas certain recognized advantages in navigation, irrigation, and flood control. They would also afford an all-around opportunity for giving local labor some of the training required to fill jobs in a mechanized civilization. As a large percentage of the funds needed for hydroelectric plants goes into the purchase of local materials and local labor, a total investment of several times the original amount may be generated before the loan is repaid.

When these projects are small, decentralized units, thought of in most instances as elements in an ultimately integrated system, they will prove the desired leaven in the total situation, training local people at all levels in the more effective ways of industry, and thus making each such plant part and parcel of the advancing democratic life. A few relatively small developments more or less model from this point of view will give our movement a world-wide impetus far stronger than that which might be expected to result from larger and more bizarre enterprises such as the suggested billion-dollar power plant on the Yangtze River in China.[9] Large power units eventually find economic justification—after a considerable measure of industrialization has been achieved,[9] and a corresponding purchasing power developed. But beginnings of industrialization should be through smaller power units locally, as was the case in the United States of America during the early nineteenth century.[10]

Excessive regard for the large accompanied by neglect of the small have been a constant blight on civilization's progress. The vast temples that have been built in each period of man's history have undoubtedly inspired men's souls but they have frequently been built with little thought as to the humble homes and the living conditions of the masses.[11] With the invention of the steam engine and the advent of the industrial revolution there ensued a demoralizing concentration of the industrial population nearby the power station. The electric transmission line theoretically freed us from the limitations of the line shaft and the leather belt. But nevertheless our industry still piles up geographically in such a way as to make decent living for the workers very difficult. Such congested centers in the United States of America as Pittsburgh, Detroit, and Schenectady make the maintenance of anything approaching a spiritual quality in industry well-nigh impossible. Thus careful planning of the environment must be a part of every one of the proposed installations. Urbanization as we have known it must be avoided. The Swiss on the River Aar[12] have demonstrated how effectively this can be done even in a heavily industrialized area.[13]

The main purpose of planned, socially minded industrialization, particularly in the less prosperous areas, should be to build up local purchasing power so that locally grown agricultural products can be consumed locally while manufactures and excess agricultural products are exported in exchange for needed imports, of consumer goods, to buy more machinery and to pay off loans. But this has not been the usual pattern in industrialization. Shanghai, for instance, appears to be a prime example of a distant industrialized people exploiting a distant agricultural people for the former's advantage, not the latter's. This is not an example of developing, it is an example of exploiting, a backward people.

Here modern machinery was brought into a reservoir of cheap labor. Products were then manufactured at low cost but sold primarily on a foreign market yielding foreign credits. Shanghai did not buy the major portion of its food supply from Chinese farmers. Shanghai bought most of its wheat in foreign markets. The same was true of rice to a somewhat lesser extent. Chinese farmers, on the other hand, produced little more than enough for themselves and their families. They had almost no surplus crops for exchange or for sale. Consequently, their purchasing power continued to be low and they were unable to buy many of the products of Shanghai's industries.

If the industrialization of China follows this pattern, then the farming population of China—more than 350,000,000 people—will be left to little more than subsistence agriculture with its implications of low purchasing power. From that it could easily become a bedding ground of social unrest and even revolution. But if the industrialization of China follows a pattern of decentralization of consumer goods industries, a more hopeful situation is in prospect. Farmers will gradually gain purchasing power not only as a result of increased productivity but as a result of the increased demand of the workers in industry to support the further industrialization of the country including some heavy industry, and the social structure throughout will become more stable. The same holds for other nonindustrialized areas.

There are some who hold that population growth must be under control before industrialization will benefit peoples with

[7] For instance, a man turning a crank continuously for 8 hours puts out less than 1,300,000 foot-pounds of work (see Marks' Handbook, 4th ed., p. 1131). This is roughly the work equivalent of two-thirds of a kilowatt-hour of electrical energy.

[8] See Electric Power From the Wind, by Percy H. Thomas, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., March 1945.

[5] See Resources—An Evolving Concept, by Erich W. Zimmermann, professor of resources at University of Texas, Proceedings and Transactions Texas Academy of Science, 1944, vol. XXVIII.

[9] The U. S. S. R., even with their heavy industry program, admit that they made the mistake of building their first hydro installations too large.

[10] Hydroelectric developments made possible these small early installations. A listing of Japan's hydro plants, compiled during the war, show that out of a total of 447 such plants 264 range from 1,000 to 5,000 kilowatts, 73 from 5,000 to 10,000 kilowatts, 74 from 10,000 to 30,000 and 36 were over 30,000 kilowatts. According to World Electrical Markets, No. 123, more than 80 percent of Italy's hydroelectric power plants as late as 1934 had capacities of less than 5,000 kilowatts. Nearly 90 percent had capacities of less than 10,000 kilowatts and 95 percent had capacities less than 20,000 kilowatts.

[11] See From Rameses to Rockefeller, by Charles H. Whitaker, Random House, New York, 1934.

[12] See Multiple Purpose Rivers, by Morris L. Cooke, Journal, Franklin Institute, April 1944.

[13] Equal to the combined capacities of Boulder Dam, Grand Coulee, and Shasta.

unsatisfactory economies. This argument appears to be based on the theory that an increase in income in depressed areas necessarily results in larger families and therefore larger populations and more distress. But experience in the United States, England, France, and Czechoslavakia indicates that as the situation of the individual worker improves, smaller families become the rule and voluntary population control a part of the demographic pattern. The rate of natural increase in the United States population has declined steadily in conjunction with a constantly rising level of industrialization. According to the United States of America Census Bureau "as education goes up birth rates go down"—the education including in varying degrees among the several economic groups "knowledge as to the means of controlling the birth rate."[14] With 20,000,000 displaced people at the end of World War II we are in process of learning something about the techniques of moving populations—both as emergency as well as long-term measures. We should have in mind that there are areas needing population just as there are overpopulated areas.

Now for a summary on a global basis. The One World we live in today is inhabited by something over 2,000,000,000 human beings, supported by the work of some 800,000,000. Of these 800,000,000 60 percent, or nearly 500,000,000 persons are now engaged in tilling the soil. Any world-wide program of economic development must be designed to reduce this number by one-third, and it can be effected only by creating new and attractive opportunities in other fields of endeavor for more than 150,000,000 of the people now employed in agriculture, the removal of these workers from agriculture being compensated by better farm organization and greater development of chemurgic processes and mechanization. The industrialization of undeveloped areas affords one means of achieving this object. We cannot expect to create 150,000,000 new jobs in industry, but every job that we do create in industry means also a new job in the tertiary occupations—transportation, trade, or services. If we can create perhaps 75,000,000 new jobs through the industrialization of undeveloped areas, then, we can double living levels in those areas, and raise the world average by at least 59 percent.

Can the United Nations have a more inspiring objective than this? In its accomplishment our profession, still in its adolescence, may find a new level of being.

Part III. Paths toward accomplishment

Having set a few of the stakes outlining the projected task, how do we proceed? The changing pattern of international relations calls for a change in our thinking. We engineers in common with other groups—the scientists for instance—must "reassess our role in civilization," we must become more community minded.[15] The front office, the shop and the laboratory—traditional lairs of the engineer—may remain dominant in our lives, but now we must acknowledge the need for participation in community affairs—local, national, and international—as leaders or high privates, as the case may be. The techniques by which we shall become citizens in this new and broader sense will be varied, but most of them will become quite obvious once the obligation and opportunity are admitted.

One direct result of this changed attitude toward the common life of mankind will be the breaking down of many of the bulkheads that now separate our specialisms and their practitioners. The engineering profession will not only close ranks but the mutual dependence of the various engineering disciplines and the myriad ways in which they complement each other will become increasingly apparent. The sharp lines of demarcation between our national engineering societies—merchanical, electrical, civil, and chemical—certainly the rule in England and the United States of America—will soften as the areas they cover merge or overlap at their outer edges. The several specialties, of course, will persist. National engineering federations will become generally possible. Then for the first time will a well knit and competently functioning international federation of engineering societies become feasible.

The next, and perhaps the most difficult step will be for engineers and their organizations to become conditioned politically by constant association with their own national legislative bodies and their politically minded members, and with the executive departments of the National Government—such as foreign affairs, Commerce, Interior, and Agriculture—the departments in the future to be concerned with matters affecting industrialization, national and international. Such contacts between engineers and government are common in some countries—Czechoslovakia, for instance—but they are relatively new in the United States of America.

Finally, as we become more internationally minded we can set up our lines of contact with the United Nations Organization and its various agencies, particularly those like the Social and Economic Council, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and the proposed International Trade Organization that have a special interest in world-wide economic development. One step in this direction has already been taken. The international group of scientists that recently went to London was completely successful in having the name of UNESCO[16] changed from the United Nations Educational and Cultural Organization to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, thereby obtaining amplified recognition for scientific objectives.

Diplomatic usage of course suggests a meticulous recognition of the various echelons of interest and authority—nations, colonies, dominions, mandates, trusteeships, and what-have-you. But once engineers have familiarized themselves with this hierarchy, constituting the family of nations, short-cuts in obtaining official consideration for proposals—and even for the execution of projects—will doubtless be discovered. For example an early move might be made by urging the UNO secretariat to set up a general staff of technicians, charged with responsibility for exploring the means of furthering industrialization, advising on problems of economic development, and giving other assistance as the occasion may demand. Such an agency for peace might have a set-up somewhat comparable to the Allied Chiefs of Staff during World War II.[17] As our data are fully interchangeable, engineering on an international basis should be relatively easy.

Fairly liberal financing for some projects of this type has already been provided by private American interests. On other occasions financial support can be obtained through national treasuries and/or from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development provided for in Bretton Woods agreement. Under article IV, section 7 of this agreement all loans involving construction must be approved by committees comprising technicians selected by the receiving country and the bank. Our own Export-Import Bank as a rule makes the employment of American engineers a feature in loan contracts.

Education must be a large part of this program. As the teaching staffs of engineering schools throughout the world become conditioned to a world point of view, and their studies of society as expressed in their increasing insistence on the social science in drafting curricula, colleges, and universities can be utilized as rather ideal research centers. They can serve as focal points for the study of almost any specific proposals for industrialization, hydroelectric or other. Each such study will prove especially attractive to young people because it will have a tendency to tie them in with the throbbing life of the times. And studies of this sort, associated with the program of action advocated in this paper, would have a special appeal.

Coming in from schools all over the world to some designated center, such studies would in themselves constitute a sizable contribution to world understanding especially if they could be supplemented by international engineering conferences. There should also be created a nonprofit international Institute of River Valley Development standing quite aloof from the diplomatic handicaps of a Governmental agency.[18] If even a small percentage of the engineering organizations of the world could be induced to hold one session, or contribute one single paper, once a year, a prodigious amount of material and influence would result therefrom. Thus in time the good life in town and country would become the background of broader engineering thinking.

My own country is already equipped to make an outstanding contribution to this enterprise by making available data on all types of industrialization projects. The building of a vast hydroelectric project on the Tennessee River,[19] resulting in highly significant economic and social developments as conceived of and fostered by those two great Americans—Franklin D. Roosevelt and George W. Norris—has been described by many writers and in many languages. That it has served even more directly as an inspiration to the rest of the world is attested by the fact that representatives from over 50 nations have visited the Valley and technicians trained by TVA are to be found in all corners of the globe.

It is not necessary to go further into the details of this proposal now. I love my profession. No one can appreciate more fully than I the significance of its past performance, notably since the turn of the century. I have known intimately and worked with many of the leading engineers of my period—John Fritz, Henri Le Chatelier, Charles de

[14] See Population Bulletin of the Population Reference Bureau, vol. 2, Nos. 1–2, January–February 1946.

[15] Science for Democracy, by Ward Shepard, Science, Jan. 18, 1946, and Science Knocks at the Door of American Politics, by Morris L. Cooke, Mechanical Engineering, September 1945.

[16] See The Charter and Challenge of UNESCO, by Harlow Shapley, The American Scientist, January 1946.

[17] Some idea of the widely ramifying operations in this field may be gained from the fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority lists among its employees about 150 different technical positions such as aquatic biologist, biologist, botanist, chemist, community planner, economist, entomologist, epidemiologist, forest ranger, geologist, land appraiser, librarian, malariologist, pharmacist, photogrammetrist, plant physiologist, statistician, and transportation economist, together with many varieties of engineers such as cartographic, chemical, civil, cost, electrical, erosion, highway, industrial, mechanical, metallurgical, mining, navigation, rate, safety, structural, and valuation.

[18] See Regional Development Projects Abroad, by Morris L. Cooke in World Economics, vol. III, Nos. 11–13, October 1945.

[19] See TVA—Democracy on the March, by David E. Lilienthal, Harper's, New York; also Construit pour le Peuple: "TVA"—une experience de la Democratie Americaine, Les Editions Transatlantiquies, 1945.

Freminville, Frederick W. Taylor, John R. Freeman, Ambrose Swazey, John Brashear—skilled in performance yes, but dreamers too. I am sure that they would join me in praying that our distinguished profession might swing into the tempo of the times by making this task its own. My greatest hope is that at some future date the traveler may find on the walls of one of the buildings of the United Nations Organization a tablet reading somewhat in this fashion:

"This tablet is erected by the United Nations Organization to honor the engineers of the world represented by their internationally federated societies, who appalled by the poverty attending the lives of over half of the world's people, and inspired by the loftiest motives of disinterested public service, and recognizing that the times demanded new concepts and new efforts for the safeguarding and promotion of our civilization—have through the years made constant and fruitful suggestions for the amelioration of the lot of the most unfortunate of our fellow men.

"Quamdio fecistis uni ex his fratribus meis minimis, mihi fecistis."

OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a resolution passed at the fifty-seventh annual convention of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association, held in Omaha, June 13, 14, and 15.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question but what price control has broken down. The black market is flourishing. The cattlemen of the country have had to put up with roll backs, slaughter quotas, subsidies, regulations for feeding cattle, price ceilings and many other directives which have hindered the production of meat.

It was just 3 years ago this month that some of these orders were put into effect. I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at that time, a wire from the cattlemen in Nebraska, which reads, in part, as follows:

We believe that production will be further curtailed and black markets increased by subsidies. Government bureaus must listen to common sense if we are to ward off starvation. Proposed subsidy programs will mean further Government control will increase black markets tremendously and will add materially to already much confused conditions. Subsidies will reduce production and cost of operation will be exorbitant.

I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 3 years ago this month, a letter to the then Director of War Mobilization, James F. Byrnes, part of which is as follows:

It is the considered judgment of the livestock producers and packers that the rollback program as it will affect livestock and meat is very unwise. Such a move will add to the already existing confusion, which means red tape and rationing in the livestock and meat industry. This industry has heretofore had an unequaled record of patriotic cooperation in our national war effort. Subsidies and roll backs will, in the end, not only create chaos, but encourage black markets and decrease the production of meat. The entire food subsidy idea will cost the taxpayers of this country billions of dollars; the giving of subsidies is an unwise economic experiment designed to fool the people. It is un-American and unnecessary. Such a move will be an additional form of inflation. It is entirely devoid of any merits. Subsidies will act as a crippling narcotic, which will, in the end, lull industry to sleep and eventually paralyze and stifle free enterprise. Subsidies for food are a political juggernaut—when once started it never turns back. The paying of subsidies would add billions of dollars in taxes to our national debt. The administrative cost would be tremendous.

Mr. Speaker, this letter is merely an expression of the thinking of the cattle producers and feeders of Nebraska. Their prophecies made 3 years ago, as to just what would happen, has come true. The OPA has failed to follow the considered judgment and advice of the advisory committee. These impractical OPA theorists and armchair planners have brought our Nation to the brink of agricultural chaos. They now have plans in which they expect to seize all grain, livestock, and other foods for distribution as they feel and think best. When this is done this country will have adopted the Russian system—lock, stock, and barrel. It is high time that this Frankenstein monstrosity, called the OPA, is either curbed in their activities which have produced a shortage of meat, or it should be buried 6 feet underground. The cattlemen are determined and serious about the elimination of the ceiling prices on livestock. This must be done or the black markets and meat shortages will become more and more acute. The resolution follows:

Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association, assembled this 14th day of June 1946 at Omaha, Nebr., in annual convention, endorse the action of the Senate of the United States in voting to remove OPA price controls from livestock, meat, and meat products.

This convention is convinced that price controls over meat have so utterly broken down that complete elimination of ceiling prices is the only solution to the end that production of livestock be increased and meats equitably distributed to the people at honest prices arrived at through open competition.

Proposed Amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERLIN HULL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable controversy with respect to the Crosser bill, H. R. 1362, and the committee substitute concerning the amendment to the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. Under leave to extend my remarks, I append a statement prepared by the Railway Labor Executives Association with regard to the matter:

At page A3378 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] included in an extension of his remarks his version of the differences between the Crosser bill, H. R. 1362, and the committee substitute with respect to the amendment of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. His version is not an accurate one.

The gentleman undertakes first to show that the benefits now provided under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act are more liberal than those under State laws. The showing consists of specifying the number of States whose laws in one particular or another are less liberal than the railroad act. Such an approach leads nowhere; one could also specify the numbers of States which in one particular or another are more liberal. Admittedly the varying factors comprising relative liberality make comparisons difficult. But certainly as to amount of benefits available the most significant thing to the unemployed worker is the size of the benefit check when he has been unemployed for a given period. According to the latest comparable figures available (January 1946) the average weekly benefit paid under the railroad act is $16.25 whereas the comparable average under State laws was $19.13.

Mr. WOLVERTON states that the cost of railroad unemployment insurance with the increase of the maximum weekly benefit to $25 and the extension of the annual duration to 26 weeks as proposed in the Crosser bill is 2.3 percent of the taxable pay roll. That, says Mr. WOLVERTON, is the estimate made by Mr. Myers, the actuary on whom the committee relies exclusively even though he disagrees with all the actuarial evidence presented at the hearings and his report was never subjected to critical examination or refutation. Now it appears that Mr. Myers is also at odds in his cost estimates with Chairman Altmeyer of the Social Security Board whom Mr. WOLVERTON quotes at page A3376 of the RECORD for the same day. Mr. Altmeyer is there quoted as saying that the general Federal-State unemployment insurance system can be financed for 2 percent of the pay roll. Since each State must rely on its own reserves, it is unthinkable that Mr. Altmeyer's statement referred only to the average State or the less liberal States; he cannot have intended that the more liberal States, such as, for example, the State of Washington, which already has a $25 weekly maximum and a 26-week annual duration, should have its funds exhausted. Thus it is clear that Mr. Altmeyer thinks that State systems providing for a $25 weekly maximum and a 26-week duration can be supported with 2 percent of pay roll. It is a known fact that the State systems cost a greater proportion of the covered wages than the railroad system does. Hence the conclusion is inescapable that Mr. Altmeyer would estimate the cost of the railroad system even with the increased maximum and the extended duration proposed by the Crosser bill at something less than 2 percent rather than the 2.3 percent estimated by Myers.

The gentleman from New Jersey attacks the proposal in H. R. 1362 for the payment of unemployment benefits where unemployment is due to sickness, on several grounds. One of these relates to cost where again he relies on the estimates of Myers notwithstanding the fact that throughout the hearings on the bill it was never disputed that the extension of compensability to this type of unemployment as well as the increase in maximum rates and the extension of duration could be accomplished without increasing the tax rate. What has already been said regarding the Myers report should adequately indicate the untenable nature of an attack based on costs.

Apparently the major reason advanced against compensating for unemployment due

to sickness is that the employers are not responsible for sickness in any causative sense. This is an argument which the employers repeatedly made during the hearings. During the hearings, however, the argument was applied equally as a reason why survivor benefits should not be provided, but these the committee now agrees should be provided.

In response to this argument the proponents of H. R. 1362 pointed out that this same type of argument was formerly used against providing for industrial accidents occurring without the fault of the employer, retirement due to age, and unemployment due to general economic conditions. The employer is not responsible in any causative sense for any of these hazards. The justification for providing insurance protection against them at the employer's expense in whole or in part lies in the fact that these are all hazards which workmen must meet out of the proceeds of their employment, and experience has shown that in far too many cases wages and savings from wages do not permit these hazards to be adequately provided for. Unemployment due to sickness does not differ in any essential respect from unemployment due to economic conditions. The individual suffering its effects is as genuinely unemployed as the individual who is well but cannot find a job. Certainly the needs of an individual unemployed by reason of sickness are no less but greater than those of the individual who cannot find a job.

The gentleman from New Jersey concludes his justification for rejecting all liberalization of the Unemployment Insurance Act on the ground that the present maximum benefit of $20 per week for a maximum period of 20 weeks is the same as that the Congress has extended to the GI's. The gentleman evidently has not examined the provisions Congress has made for unemployment readjustment allowances for servicemen. Under those provisions $20 per week is not a maximum placed on a variable rate but a flat rate applicable to all eligible. Under the railroad legislation most claimants are not eligible for the maximum rate of $20, and some are eligible only for benefits as low as $8.75 per week. The average for January of this year was $16.25 per week. With respect to duration the maximum duration for servicemen is 52 weeks, or twice the duration proposed by the Crosser bill for railroad men. Under the provisions made for servicemen the duration varies according to the length of time spent in military service. Eight weeks of benefits are allowable for each month of service during the qualifying 90-day period so that persons meeting that qualification become eligible for at least 24 weeks of benefits; thereafter, 4 weeks of benefits are allowable for each additional month of service, so that service for seven more months after the qualifying period is sufficient to make the servicemen eligible for the maximum of 52 weeks. Thus a comparison with servicemen's unemployment readjustment allowances gives no indication that the proposals of the Crosser bill are too liberal. On the contrary it tends to indicate that they may be too conservative.

Letter of Polish American Congress of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. GORDON. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter from the Polish-American Congress, of Chicago, Ill., addressed to the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State, under date of June 11, 1946.

I am of the opinion that the suggested conclusions contained in this communication, will aid in untangling the many tragic and oppressed conditions now existing in the smaller nations of eastern Europe.

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., June 11, 1946.

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BYRNES: The Polish American Congress, representing 6,000,000 American citizens, submits to you, prior to your departure for Paris to participate in the Conference of Foreign Ministers, the following declaration:

Unless a complete revision of the Yalta decisions take place, the forthcoming Conference in Paris will have no more chance of success in restoring Europe to its prewar freedom than the previous conferences of London, Moscow, and Paris.

The inability of the western democracies to reach an understanding with totalitarian Russia is traceable directly to Yalta and not to any situation that might have arisen since the termination of hostilities.

Yalta was a great evil and no good can ever come out of evil.

It is difficult to conceive that representatives of an enlightened country, where a civil war was fought just 80 years ago to end slavery, would be a party to so ignoble a deal. If President Roosevelt were in robust health it is more than likely that he would have had the physical and moral strength to refuse to sign the death warrants of the free nations of Europe. That it gnawed at his conscience is recalled by this statement made upon his return to our shores:

"I did not agree with all of it by any means."

It is dangerous to maintain that our Government is bound by the Yalta decisions. In the light of all legal and moral concepts of justice and international law, they are absolutely illegal. That an aggressor nation was permitted to sit in judgment upon its own acts of aggression, while the victims were even barred from presenting their case, is without precedent in history.

Through clever political manipulations, Stalin has usurped the leadership of the world. Encouraged by concessions from American statesmen, he has dictated as he willed from Moscow through Tehran and Yalta.

The war was just a temporary military success. Our war aims have not been achieved. All the noble work begun by President Wilson was undone at Yalta. Nation after nation set free after the First World War has found itself enslaved after the Second World War. The truth is that the security of America is now in the gravest of peril.

Out of the terrible errors committed at Yalta is the tragedy of Poland. Bereft not only of the territories which Russia seized during the partition of Poland in 1939 as German's collaborator, Poland was also bereft of even any semblance of freedom, in what was left of that country, by the dismissal of a genuinely democratic constitutional Polish Government in favor of an illegal Moscow-conceived puppet government.

It is this Communist outfit that was formally recognized by the United States, pending the elections, slated for early spring but still not in sight. In fact, the leaders of Poland today are for the most part not Polish but Russian citizens.

With the connivance of the usurpers, Russia has stripped Poland of the little machinery and other property that escaped the devastation of war. The country, for whose territorial integrity England and France went to war, today lies prostrate, a fourth of her population destroyed, 6,000,000 children facing starvation, and others being pushed from pillar to post by the lawless elements in control with the help of Red army bayonets.

As a result, millions of loyal Poles in exile are afraid to come home to this land of terror.

The Polish soldiers, who fought for the freedom of all nations, including that of America, prefer to go anywhere than to Poland, although that is where their heart is.

Thus, the world is treated to the extraordinary spectacle of having an army that fought and bled for the liberation of its native land denied the precious freedom for which it sacrificed so much.

In view of Poland's tragic plight, the Polish American Congress respectfully submits to you the following conclusions:

1. Under present circumstances, free and democratic elections are inconceivable in a country which has ceased to be independent. Free elections will only be possible when the last Russian soldier leaves Poland and the Quisling regime is recalled to Russia.

2. The so-called Warsaw Government has not fulfilled the conditions upon which it was recognized. It was this failure to abide by its pledges that prompted the United States to withhold credits to Poland. We urge you, therefore, to take into consideration the necessity for the withdrawal of American recognition from the Warsaw puppet governments and the restoration of diplomatic status to the legal Polish Government now in exile in London, until the Polish people, through honest and unfettered elections held under strict Allied control, can freely express themselves as to their choice of a new constitutional government.

3. We call upon you to prevail upon the English Government to suspend the proposed demobilization of the Polish Army units until conditions, both in Europe and Poland, will enable them to return to a free and democratic Poland.

4. In the event that England carries out its threat of demobilization, the homeless Polish soldiers are entitled to our help if only in consideration of the services rendered by them to the common cause of freedom. In view of America's responsibility for the debacle at Yalta, which puts these Polish heroes in the awkward position they are, our country should either offer them a temporary haven or else permit them to serve as a complete Polish unit in occupied Europe under the flag of the United States.

5. The Yalta decisions, made without the knowledge or consent of Congress or the American people and in direct contradiction to the Constitution of the United States, are not binding upon the United States Government. The American Constitution grants no one the right to sell friendly nations into slavery or to give away other people's lands.

6. Moreover, the Soviet Union's failure to live up to all the pledges of Yalta frees the United States from any legal or moral obligation to abide by them. It is a maxim of law that the failure to perform any part of an agreement automatically vitiates the entire agreement.

7. The repudiation of the Yalta commitments, followed by the institution of remedial measures, would be the first constructive step toward the restoration of Allied Europe to its prewar status.

8. The moral and political recovery of Europe depends upon the elimination of aggression where it began—in Poland.

9. In the interest of world peace, we urge you to press openly and vigorously for the immediate removal of Soviet troops, puppet governments, and secret police from Poland and all Soviet-occupied countries.

10. No nation, no matter how big, should be exempt from obedience to moral laws.

For the Polish American Congress:
CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President.

Amendment of Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, on June 11, 1946, an extension of remarks was placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A3375, which undertook to summarize the major changes in the railroad-retirement and unemployment-insurance laws proposed by the Crosser bill, H. R. 1362, and to state the action of the committee thereon. I should like to comment on these remarks, and especially to point out what in my judgment appear to be errors or omissions.

The impression is given that in most major respects the committee has followed the Crosser bill. The unexpressed premise is that one of the virtues of the committee substitute is that it incorporates so much of the proposals of the Crosser bill. I would agree that the committee substitute would derive virtue from close adherence to the Crosser bill, if it did in fact adhere closely.

It is stated that of the six major proposals of the Crosser bill the committee adopts five "in whole or in part." The truth of the matter is that the committee adopts only two of the Crosser bill proposals, and of these at least one is among the relatively less important proposals. These two are the minimum annuity provisions and the provision for reducing the retirement age for women from 65 years to 60 years.

With respect to survivor benefits the gentleman correctly states that the committee rejects the Crosser-bill proposal that benefits be scaled about 25 percent higher than the social security level. He does not make explicit that railroad employees will be paying taxes at six times the rate paid by employees under social security. Of course, railroad employees who live long enough will get the advantage of these higher taxes in higher retirement benefits. But under the committee proposal, those employees who die before reaching retirement age will leave their survivors only the same amount of benefits they would have left had they been under Social Security and paid one-sixth as much for the protection.

Two other very important departures which the committee makes from the Crosser bill proposals on survivor benefits are not mentioned in the statement. The survivors of over 240,000 railroad men who have died since the enactment of the retirement law would be protected under the Crosser bill but are given no protection by the committee substitute. And the committee substitute fails to combine survivor benefit credit based on railroad employment with credit based on other employment; in consequence, some persons with mixed employment will have no survivor protection because each type of employment considered separately is insufficient to give them an insured status—though they have been paying taxes on all of it; others will have dual protection and will draw double benefits. The Crosser bill avoids both these extremes.

The statement is also made that the committee substitute "incorporates the proposal with respect to disability annuities with certain minor modifications which will be explained later." One may search the statement in vain for any specification, let alone explanation, of these "minor modifications." What the committee in fact does is to condition these new disability benefits upon the employee's being able to show that the disability was caused by his employment. Under workmen's compensation laws employers alone pay for such disabilities. The committee proposes that they be made compensable under a retirement system in which the employees pay half the cost. The "minor modification" results in cutting out about 90 percent of the disability retirements that would be compensable under the Crosser bill.

The gentleman concedes that the committee has rejected all the Crosser bill proposals for improvements in unemployment insurance benefits. This is justified primarily with the assertion that the present $20 per week maximum benefit for a maximum duration of 20 weeks corresponds exactly to the provisions Congress has adopted for unemployed veterans. Let us examine this assertion. Under the GI bill, benefits are paid at a flat rate of $20; that is the minimum and the average as well as the maximum. Under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act the benefit paid for a week of complete unemployment may be as little as $8.75 and in January of this year the average benefit was $16.25. As to duration of benefits, the GI Act provides a duration of 52 weeks, twice the duration proposed in the Crosser bill, not 20 weeks as asserted.

The gentleman also admits that the committee departs from the Crosser bill in proposing to reduce the contributions made by the railroads to the railroad unemployment insurance account. The reduction proposed is from 3 percent to one-half of 1 percent. In justification reference is made to a statement of Chairman Altmeyer of the Social Security Board expressing the conclusion that the present 3 percent rate under the Federal-State unemployment insurance system is more than is necessary and recommending a reduction to 2 percent.

It is indeed surprising that this statement by Mr. Altmeyer should be invoked by a sponsor of the committee substitute. The most significant thing about the Altmeyer statement is that in my opinion it completely discredits the cost estimates made by the actuary Myers on whom the committee relies to the exclusion of all actuarial evidence introduced in the hearings. Mr. Myers estimated the cost of the present railroad unemployment insurance system at 2 percent of pay roll. State laws which Mr. Altmeyer was discussing are said, by the proponents of the Crosser bill, to be about 20 percent more liberal than the railroad act, and in any event there is irrefutable proof that the costs of the State systems per dollar of wages earned in covered employment is very substantially greater than the costs under the Railroad Act. Hence, if Mr. Altmeyer is right, as I have no doubt he is, Mr. Myers has far overstated the costs.

The supporters of the Crosser bill have no quarrel with Mr. Altmeyer's statement that present unemployment insurance benefits can be supported with a 2 percent tax on pay rolls. However it should be pointed out that Mr. Altmeyer was speaking exclusively of the cost of present benefit schedules and that he has repeatedly joined with other members of the Social Security Board in recommending that the States all adopt liberalizations of their unemployment insurance laws corresponding to those proposed in the Crosser bill. Mr. Altmeyer has not repudiated those recommendations and he has not said that their adoption should be accompanied by a reduction in taxes or should be precluded by such a reduction.

Legislative Reorganization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include several editorials endorsing the legislative reorganization bill, S. 2177, which have recently appeared in newspapers throughout the United States. These editorials indicate that the Nation is deeply interested in strengthening the Congress. They reflect a widespread public demand that the House follow the example of the Senate and approve this bill at this session.

[From the Journal of Milwaukee (Wis.) June 7, 1946]

GOOD NEWS FROM WASHINGTON

It is heartening to note that the program to reorganize the machinery of Congress is moving along. This progress marks one bright spot in the gloomy Washington picture.

This is the vitally important program aimed at making the legislative branch of our Government modern and efficient. The congressional workings were last improved in 1893, when we had a $350,000,000 Government. Now we are trying to run a $35,000,000,000 business with the same kind of organization.

A nonpartisan committee of Senate and House worked out a comprehensive modernization program. Senator LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, introduced the enabling bill (S. 2177) on May 13. Although the bill covers matters that are the concern of various committees, chairmen of these committees and members of the House Rules Committee

agreed that the measure should be handled by the six men who represented the Senate on the Joint Reorganization Committee. This concession was a great gain for the bill.

The friendly committee consisting of Senators LA FOLLETTE, THOMAS of Utah, PEPPER, of Florida, RUSSELL, of Georgia, WHITE, of Maine, and BROOKS, of Illinois, was in a position to approve the bill immediately. It is being debated in the Senate this week. Senator LA FOLLETTE, the chairman, is confident that he can get the bill through the Senate and to the House for action before Congress adjourns in July or August.

If this Congress enacts the reorganization measure it will have done something to redeem itself for its futility on so many other issues. And it will have armed the next Congress with machinery that will enable it to approach its tremendous tasks with confidence and enthusiasm, no longer bound by antiquated ways and outworn traditions.

The importance of this legislation was aptly stressed by Representative MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, in a recent speech to American Society of Newspaper Editors. We quote:

"It doesn't sound very important, perhaps, to talk about the reorganization of Congress in the light of problems like the atom bomb, labor, open shops, veterans' housing, the extension of OPA * * * but, do you realize that all these vital issues are merely the cargo items on the ship of state. It is the ship itself that I am worried about. I am worried about its horsepower, its steering gear, its chartroom, its rusty boilers. I think it is time for the ship of state to have a little better coordination on the bridge and to get the controls a little bit better established. I feel that, important as are all the collateral issues we face, the issue of the reorganization of Congress must occupy almost the paramount position."

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune of June 11, 1946]

CONGRESS STREAMLINED

Congress is earnestly seeking a way to reform itself. The proposed remedy, drafted by a joint congressional committee and passed by the Senate, is a bill to reduce the number of committees, provide each committee with a staff of experts, increase the pay of Members, and take other steps intended to promote congressional efficiency.

The present congressional machinery is cumbersome and inefficient. There have been occasions when this has been a blessing to the country. Self-serving laws promoted by pressure groups or by a power-hungry President are hard to get through the present unwieldy congressional machine.

Congress can act quickly when emergency measures are being considered. During the war appropriation bills and other critical measures were passed with dispatch. The main argument for reforming Congress is not to help it deal with a crisis but to help it in the drafting of unspectacular long-term legislation.

Certainly there is good reason for reducing the number of committees. The Senate now has 33 standing and 10 special committees. It is proposed to limit the number to 16. Already we are hearing the wails of those who might be deprived of chairmanships and patronage and the whole reform plan is said to be threatened by their petty, self-serving objections. Back home in the polling places nobody will object if the Senate has fewer committees.

Another portion of the bill, providing for a director of personnel who would appoint employees of committees, was wisely eliminated by the Senate. Committee chairmen now make such appointments. The director of personnel would have become an exceedingly powerful person on Capitol Hill, perhaps more powerful than is desirable.

Congressional committees unquestionably need experts to help them, since few Congressmen have the skill in research or the time to become intimately acquainted with all the complex problems they are called upon to consider. At present Members are often dependent for advice on experts, or pseudo-experts, from the executive departments, who have their own axes to grind. The committees should have their own experts responsible only to Congress. It seems more than doubtful, however, that the appointment of experts should be in the hands of a single director of personnel. Why not let the committee chairmen appoint them? If the experts are indispensable men, their reappointment will be assured as new chairmen take office.

The proposed bill calls for increasing the salaries of Members of Congress from $10,000 to $15,000 a year. Congressmen are sensitive to criticism of pay raises for themselves and properly so if they are rubber stamps like most of the present delegation from Chicago. Other hard-working, competent Members of Congress deserve the increased pay and should not be fearful of admitting it to their constituents.

Congressmen without independent means now find it necessary to put their wives and other relatives on the pay roll in order to meet the cost of living in Washington. Men of ability frequently refuse to run for Congress because of the low salary. The country would profit if more men worth $15,000 a year had a hand in making our laws.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star of June 1, 1946]

OUR LEGISLATIVE MACHINERY

In presenting a comprehensive program for the reorganization of Congress yesterday, Senator LA FOLLETTE sensibly remarked that good machinery cannot be expected, by itself, to solve all the problems which now confront our National Legislature. For that purpose, he admitted, we must also have "good men, good will, and good policies." But the Senator nevertheless was able to make out a strong case for the plan developed by a special legislative committee of which he served as chairman.

Unquestionably Congress is no longer equipped to handle the manifold and complex tasks assigned to it today. Its rules and procedures, as Senator LA FOLLETTE noted, are still geared to the nineteenth century. No self-respecting private enterprise would tolerate such a condition of general obsolescence. If it did, it probably would go out of business overnight.

This is not a matter involving a fundamental change in our American system of government by checks and balances and therefore one requiring an amendment of the Constitution. The recommendations of the La Follette committee deal only with the mechanism of the legislative branch. Thus, they would greatly reduce the number of standard committees in each House, clarify the scope of their authority (to avoid overlapping) and synchronize the committee structure as between the two Houses. The plan would relieve Congressmen of much unimportant routine and provide them with competent technical assistance, as well as raise their salaries by half.

Among other proposals embodied in the pending legislation are a provision for the establishment of majority and minority committees in each House, to decide on broad issues of party policy, and one to improve liaison between Congress and the President, through the creation of a joint legislative-executive council. Most of these reforms had been under public discussion for several years before the congressional committee was appointed to study the situation and report its recommendations. The committee's program bears on its face the evidence of careful preparation.

These are, as Senator LA FOLLETTE declared, critical days for a democratic government. We cannot afford the luxury of an obsolete legislative plant. This program offers no substitute for sound statesmanship on Capitol Hill. It should make that statesmanship substantially more effective.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of June 12, 1946]

VICTORY FOR CONGRESS REFORM

Senate approval of the La Follette-Monroney congressional reorganization bill is a triumph for Senator LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin. It stands to the credit of the 26 Democrats and 22 Republicans who voted for it. The bill as amended, while it is not perfect, is a great improvement over the archaic 1893 organization which still exists.

The biggest improvements are that the bill reduces the number of committees from 114 to 49, putting an end to overlapping; sharply defines the committees' provinces, so that Presiding Officers can no longer prejudge bills by selecting friendly or hostile committees to send them to; and prevents the attaching of riders to appropriation bills, making it impossible for a weak bill that could not stand on its own feet to ride through Congress and the President on an imperative fiscal measure.

The most important omissions from the bill were that it did nothing about the seniority evil, which minimizes ability and maximizes length of service in elevating Members to positions of authority; and that it did nothing about the life-and-death power which the House Rules Committee exercises over legislation. However, it was generally agreed that a bill that dealt with either or both of these issues would stand no chance of passage. The measure which the La Follette-Monroney committee reported was a worth-while compromise based on the practical possibilities.

The most substantial amendment made in the Senate eliminated the director of personnel, who was to have introduced a merit system into congressional employment and assure the continuity of technical staffs attached to committees. The Senators wanted to retain the patronage of the Senate's employees, and it was a small enough quid for the quo of a modernized committee structure.

The bill as it goes to the House is a good first step in congressional reform. It is about as big a step as could be taken in view of the political realities involved. It provides something solid on which succeeding Congresses can build. Upon Representative MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, now devolves the responsibility for doing in the House what LA FOLLETTE, with skillful direction and compromise, has done in the Senate. He will have an advantage in the prestige which the surprisingly large Senate vote has given to the measure. The House is on challenge to take as forthright a view of Congress' shortcomings as the Senate has taken.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Star-Times, of June 1, 1946]

OVERHAULING JOB FOR CONGRESS

The necessity for a drastic overhauling of Congress has again been pointed out by Senator LA FOLLETTE'S joint committee. Since the weary Members of both Houses still must dispose of much urgent business, it is doubtful whether they will take up this streamlining job before adjourning for the summer recess. In the long run, however, congressional reform is perhaps the most important item on the list of legislative musts. As the committee pointed out, Congress today is trying to handle complicated twentieth-century problems with slow-moving nineteenth-century machinery. Today its Members

have too little time to develop the world statesmanship so desperately needed.

Early in January of 1945 the National Planning Association made some excellent recommendations for reform. Most of these were incorporated in the La Follette-Monroney bill introduced on March 4 of this year. This measure would lift many minor time-consuming burdens from Senators and Representatives by providing each of them with a full-time assistant to look after political chores. It would make available better research help and such practical devices as a stenographic pool. Also it would provide better pay and a retirement plan.

Much time is now wasted in an excessive number of overlapping committees. Therefore, the bill recommends reducing the 48 standing committees of the House to 18, and the 33 Senate committees to 16. Such a reduction would work wonders, but it will be only a half-measure so long as it does not end the old evil of selecting chairmen on the basis of seniority. These men ought to be chosen for ability and special experience. Since old-timers naturally oppose this reform, the La Follette committee did not include it in its recommendations. But the change must be made sooner or later—the sooner the better.

The worst thing about Congress, however, is that it has fallen out of step with the other branches of the Government. Both the executive and the judiciary have managed after a fashion to keep up with the times. Congress, however, has grown progressively more individualistic and more irresponsible. To check this trend, the committee recommends not only closer association with the executive agencies, but also the creation of so-called policy committees to coordinate the work of both the majority and the minority in each House. The shoddy way in which Congress currently is handling the labor problem alone is enough to warrant the adoption of the proposal.

The Star-Times has frequently endorsed the recommendations of the La Follette-Monroney committee—both as a whole and individually. Unless Congress finds a way of cutting down the secondary chores which now take up so much of its time and of devoting this time to truly serious matters, it will slip farther and farther away from its functions as the people's representative in the Government.

Tasks which Congress allows to go by default must somehow be performed by the administration. Thus, the White House rather than the Capitol is becoming more and more the center of Government. It is high time to shift emphasis from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue to the top of the Hill, but this can't be done until Congress settles down to a thorough overhauling job.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat of June 2, 1946]

TEST OF CONGRESSIONAL COURAGE

The much-commended proposal to streamline Congress is now in position for each Member to show very quickly whether his heart is where his mouth is. After a year's study, during which the Nation has waited anxiously for some indication that our creaking legislative processes actually are to be reorganized for efficient handling of an unprecedented load, the La Follette-Monroney joint committee has submitted its report and recommendations.

In submitting it to the Senate, Senator LA FOLLETTE told that House bluntly that Congress today is neither organized nor equipped to function properly. Remedies urged include fewer committees, better fiscal controls to make expenditures match revenues, establishment of major and minor party "responsibility" committees, better bill-drafting and research services, more help, fewer onerous routine duties, registration of lobbyists, salary increases, and longer vacations, to name only a few. Although many desirable changes were omitted for expediency reasons, the recommendations ought to be put into effect, and quickly.

As the situation now stands, Congress can accept the report and conveniently proceed to do nothing about it. Or it can empower the committee to draft a bill embodying the proposal and offer it for passage. The latter course will mean it is willing to clean its own house as the people demand, and as Congress itself has admitted is urgently needed. The former course will mean that it is not ready to sacrifice to efficiency the personal prestige and emoluments of the committee chairmen who would be eliminated. Here, as in few issues, is a test of congressional courage.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin of June 12, 1946]

TOWARD A BETTER CONGRESS

Congressional reorganization, long talked about, took a big step forward when the Senate approved the La Follette bill. Raises in the salaries of Senators and Congressmen need not monopolize attention when the measure contains many fundamental changes in procedure aimed to create a more effective legislative body.

Chief among these is the joint session of the four revenue-raising and appropriations committees of the two Houses to estimate revenues and expenditures and give Congress and the Nation a comprehensive view of Federal finances. If the new joint committee estimates at the beginning of the session that expenditures will outrun receipts, a concurrent resolution by both Houses raising the debt limit would be required.

Congress under this procedure would not stumble by separate appropriations into an unbalanced Budget, but would face the issue from the start. Many Members of Congress who vote for appropriations so willingly would hesitate to commit themselves at the opening of Congress to an unbalanced Budget.

A reduction of the number of committees is accomplished by giving each one of them an economic staff. Too frequently Senators and Representatives have been at the mercy of experts employed by special interests. Individual Members of Congress cannot be authorities on most of the matters that call for their decision. The public interest is served by having experts at the elbow of Congressmen to give them guidance through the maze of complicated problems they are called on to solve.

[From the New York (N. Y.) Herald Tribune of June 12, 1946]

A VICTORY FOR STATESMANSHIP

Contrary to predictions, the Senate has passed the La Follette-Monroney committee's bill to reorganize congressional machinery. The vote was 49 to 16. This is a signal victory for the statesmanship once traditional in the United States Senate. In presenting the legislation, Senator LA FOLLETTE said in part: "In this postwar world a tidal wave of complex, difficult, and intricate problems is threatening to engulf the legislative arm of the Government. * * * Congress has been subject to much criticism * * * but I submit that under our present archaic organization it is impossible for Congress to transact the business which it has become imperative that it handle." He urged that the Senators "seize this opportunity for the first time in our history to thoroughly reorganize the legislative arm" and "give it the tools and machinery which are essential to the efficient transaction of its business."

The bill goes far to furnish some of the tools and to put the broken-down law-making machinery in running order. The consolidation of committees, the definition of functions to eliminate confusion and overlapping, the provision of expert assistance to committees and to members are designed to that end. So, too, is the establishment of party policy committees and of a joint committee to serve as a liaison between Congress and the President. Other important matters covered include a curb on deficit financing, registration of lobbies, provision of adequate salaries and a contributory pension system for the legislators, and relief from congressional responsibility for settling private claims. Another proposed relief, that setting up a charter commission for the administration of the District of Columbia, will be dealt with in a separate bill.

The bill is not a perfect reorganization bill, but it is a big forward step. The committee omitted to recommend better means of selecting committee chairmen and personnel. And Senator LA FOLLETTE agreed to some amendments to meet opposition. Chief among these was elimination of a section setting up a director of personnel. The section was opposed by some who saw it as an abrogation of Congress' prerogatives—prerogatives sometimes known as patronage. The Senate bill leaves for House action the consolidation of House committees.

Let us hope that the House, like the Senate, will rise above all personal considerations to enact this measure revitalizing the essential function of the legislative branch—which is to carry out the will of the people.

Waste of Navy Equipment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have brought to the attention of Congress alleged instances of waste on the part of governmental bureaus and departments. Most of these have been denied.

Other Members of Congress have pointed out similar instances. The able and energetic gentleman from Oregon, WALTER NORBLAD, has done likewise.

The following article from the Philadelphia Record of June 12 describes still another instance of waste of usable material which could well fill a great need in this country and other parts of the globe.

Waste is abhorrent in any form. It is time that this administration put a stop to it.

WASTE OF USABLE NAVY EQUIPMENT FOUND AT DUMP—SUPPLIES NEEDED IN HUNGER AREAS DISCARDED; PROBE ORDERED

Waste of usable and much-needed Navy equipment and supplies was discovered by the Record yesterday.

Almost daily for several months, trucks from the Philadelphia naval base have dumped lumber, tarpaulins, metal trays, and canteens, cleaning substances—and edible foodstuffs—on the city's Penrose Ferry Avenue dump.

SURPRISE TO NAVY

Informed of the waste, estimated to run into thousands of dollars, a Navy spokesman said:

"This comes as a complete surprise. The stringent wartime rules of salvage have not been relaxed. This dumping has been done

without official sanction, through collusion or gross negligence on the part of Navy or civilian personnel.

"When the situation was brought to the attention of Adm. Calvin H. Cobb (commandant of the base and of the Fourth Naval District), he ordered an immediate and exhaustive investigation."

REPORTERS MAKE HAUL

The indiscriminate dumping has become an open secret among many South Philadelphians. Before the trucks pull away, scores of treasure-seekers swarm over the unsightly piles on the west bank of the Schuylkill near the Penrose Ferry Avenue Bridge.

In 90 minutes Monday evening, two Record reporters (who arrived long after the latest consignment had been worked over) found:

Two dozen hatch covers, 8 x 8 feet, of rubberized canvas. They were soiled, but in such good condition that the manufacturer's stamp and printed instructions for cleaning were plainly legible.

MESS TRAYS AND CANTEENS

Six metal, compartmented mess trays in good condition.

Several metal canteens, damaged but repairable.

Four feet of rubber molding 2 inches square.

Also hammocks, life preservers, unused paper forms by the ream, sea bags, and lumber of assorted sizes.

Finally, the reporters salvaged 6 cans of emergency ration biscuits. Each can contained about 980 calories—enough, in all, to keep one person alive 4 days in the stricken areas of Europe and Asia.

The lone city watchman said the Navy dumping has been going on "quite some time." Pressed for a more exact answer, he said: "A lot of months."

An employee of the Navy base, who was accompanied by a friend with an automobile, had filled a trunk with material when the reporters arrived and was loading the back of his car with more.

HOUSE BUILT WITH MATERIAL

"I have a friend," he said, "who built a house with the material he picked up here in 18 months. That includes pipes for the plumbing, too—not just the lumber. He said the Navy stuff started to appear in quantity along about last September."

The employee, who produced his naval identification papers but asked to remain anonymous, said he saw "hundreds" of mess trays on the dump 2 weeks ago. These are much in demand in the hunger areas of Europe.

His "take" Monday evening included: Three heavy tarpaulins, heavy rope, six mess trays, a case of canned caustic soda (used for bleaching, refining oils, making soap and rayon, etc.), 2x4-inch lumber, and three lengths of 2-inch fire hose in good condition.

BOMBS DUMPED, TOO

"It's a crime the way they waste stuff down at the yard," said the man, who has worked there for 11 years. "They even dump bombs here. That may not be wasteful, but it could be dangerous."

He said he found 2 unexploded missiles while shooting rats on the dump last week. After taking them to Fort Mifflin to have them rendered harmless, he swore off shooting.

A veteran from World War I found 28 cans of biscuits last week. Nearby was a stack of 20 cans of malted-milk tablets, each containing 120 tablets. The label said 19 tablets was the daily ration for one man. The veteran fed the biscuits and the tablets to his dog. He tried some himself, and found them very palatable, he said.

The biscuits brought back by the reporters also were in good condition. Some were not even broken, though the cans apparently had been wantonly damaged with a hammer.

Material not rescued by the waiting scavengers becomes buried, or more often, consumed by the fires that burn almost continuously on the dump.

Mr. Eugene Meyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial about Mr. Eugene Meyer from the Washington Post of Tuesday, June 18, 1946, entitled "Mr. Meyer's Task":

MR. MEYER'S TASK

With the announcement today, Mr. Eugene Meyer leaves his duties with the Post and takes on new duties as president of the Bank of International Reconstruction and Development. The appointment, as will be seen from excerpts in another column, has been applauded by the American press. This testimony to the choice of the executive directors of the World Bank gives singular pleasure to Mr. Meyer's old associates on this newspaper. They know from daily experience with Mr. Meyer the organizational gifts which he will bring to the new institution.

Mr. Meyer is used to the task of building organizations from the ground up. When he took over the Post property the newspaper had fallen on evil days, and it was in a moribund condition. All his old friends—even those who knew of what he had done with his private business and then with the successive departments of American Government which he had established—told him that this time he had undertaken a hopeless proposition. It was, they said, a pig in a poke. But, as the healthy condition of this newspaper testifies, Mr. Meyer builded better than perhaps he knew, and he hands over the direction of the Post to men who fully appreciate how well and truly he laid its foundations.

These comments are pertinent to the new assignment that Mr. Meyer is shouldering at the world bank. No doubt exists in our minds that the organization he will create will be as sound as could be devised. Mr. Meyer is used to meeting organizational challenges, and, indeed, thrives on them, and he will give to the infant body the vitality that will insure sound and vigorous growth. But he will bring to his responsibility something more than his talent for organization. He will be the example to those who work with him of vision and faith. Mr. Meyer has what the poet calls "the rapture of the forward view." In time of war he foresaw, before most of his contemporaries, the need to prepare for peace. That is why he always counseled gradualness in the relaxation of controls till the American economy had been thoroughly reconverted. That is why he advocated the stock-piling of food—he felt that liberation migh prove a mockery if food did not come on the very heels of the liberators. Alas, there was so little preparedness for peace that the liberated countries had to go through ordeal by famine on top of their ordeal by fire.

Yet Mr. Meyer, foreseeing this, whipped up a national interest in the coming emergency, being the sponsor of the Famine Emergency Committee, which spotlighted the approaching crisis and brought home to the American people and the administration the crucial need for remedial steps. It was characteristic of him that, when this organization had taken shape, his questing and farseeing mind was concerning itself with another famine on the horizon—the famine in productive facilities. As he used to say, only the restoration of productive facilities could solve the problem of one food famine after another; in other words, of permanent state of mendicancy in much of the world.

This was long before he had the vaguest notion that he would be one of the instrumentalities for curing this famine of productive facilities. That is the job of the new world bank. The bank is not an eleemosynary institution for the purpose of giving money away to needy borrowers; financial aid of this kind is provided through relief agencies such as UNRRA. The new world bank, armed as it is with the financial resources of the world of nations, will make productive loans in capital-poor countries so as to put them on their own feet and at the same time reestablish the link between capital-goods producers and capital-goods users. It is this link, and this link only, that can promote general prosperity. Public policy, it is said, must cater to being and well-being. This latter achievement is the aim of the world bank, with a sphere of operations that is indeed world-wide. Mr. Meyer is thus the world's first world banker in the true meaning of this phrase. Hitherto international bankers have been nationals with foreign connections, but Mr. Meyer's loyalty is now supranational.

While Mr. Meyer will have to be more statesman than banker, it is a good omen that his appointment is favorably spoken of in both investment and banking circles the world over. In these circles Mr. Meyer is respected for a judgment and a prudence which, before he took up official life, earned him a rich success in the field of investment banking at home and abroad. This reputation will inspire confidence in the new institution on the part of the investors who will invest in the bonds that will be floated under the auspices of the world bank when it sets up in business.

The Nuremberg Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a paper on the Nuremberg trials, by a distinguished attorney from Chicago, Mr. Samuel A. Harper.

I am informed that the manuscript will make two and one-third pages of the RECORD, and that the printing will cost $140.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NUREMBERG TRIALS

An International Military Tribunal has been established to try the fallen leaders of a conquered nation for alleged war crimes, and these trials are now going on at Nuremberg.

The Articles of War under which previous military commissions have been created rest for their authority upon the power conferred upon Congress by the Constitution (Art. I, sec. 8, c. 1.10) to "define and punish * * * offenses against the law of nations."

The people of the civilized world entertain substantially identical opinions with reference to the German leaders in the late war. They invented new crimes and horrors, new methods of perfidy, persecution, death, and destruction which shocked the conscience and outraged the normal feelings and natural sensibilities of mankind, and their conduct of the war from beginning to end was diabolical and fiendish beyond our capacity to believe. That just punishment should be meted out to all those responsible for criminal acts of this nature is beyond dispute. But these considerations do not answer our problem. They do not justify our abandonment of devotion to justice as defined in our fundamental laws even in dealing with a fallen enemy who happens to be wholly within our power. To conclude otherwise is to admit that the enemy has lost the battle but has destroyed our ideals.

At a time like this, when emotions are understandably high, it is difficult to adopt a dispassionate attitude toward trials of this character. Yet, as so well stated by Mr. Justice Murphy, "now is precisely the time when that attitude is most essential. While peoples in other lands may not share our beliefs as to due process and the dignity of the individual, we are not free to give effect to our emotions in reckless disregard of the rights of others. We live under the Constitution, which is the embodiment of all the high hopes and aspirations of the New World and which is applicable in both war and peace. We must act accordingly." (In re Yamashita (Nos. 61 Misc. and 672, U. S. Supreme Court, October Term, 1945).)

In the recent book entitled "The Case Against the Nazi War Criminals" (Knopf, 1946), we find the following statements as to the origin and creation of the International Military Tribunal now sitting at Nuremberg: "On May 2, 1945, President Truman appointed Associate Justice Robert H. Jackson, of the United States Supreme Court, as the United States representative to negotiate with the principal Allied Powers in the establishment of an International Military Tribunal for the trial of the major European Axis war criminals. He also appointed him as United States Chief of Counsel to prosecute in behalf of the United States before any court that might be established." Gordon Dean, of counsel for the United States, in the preface to the book referred to says: "There never had been an international criminal court. This was something new. There had been a World Court but its function had been quite different. It had no jurisdiction to try criminal charges or punish offenders. To further complicate matters, there was in existence no international code of criminal law. Such codes had been suggested after the First World War but nothing had come of the suggestions." (Ibid., pp. 70 and viii.)

The Articles of War (10 U. S. C., secs. 1471–1593) recognize the "military commission," appointed by military command, as it had previously existed in United States Army practice, as an appropriate tribunal for the trial and punishment of offenses against the law of war. But this International Military Tribunal is not such a commission. It was created by the agreement of four Allied Nations, and the charter which this agreement adopted is the single source and sole jurisdiction of the tribunal. This is admitted by the United States prosecutor in his opening statement. And of the 20 defendants indicted under this charter, at least 15 are civilians. (Cf. *Ex parte Milligan*, 4 Wall. 2; *Duncan* v. *Kal.anamoku*, No. 15, U. S. Supreme Ct. Oct. term, 1945.)

The unprecedented character of the whole proceeding is, at the very outset, indicated by Mr. Justice Jackson temporarily stepping down from his high place on the United States Supreme Court (whose tradition has heretofore been to refrain from all outside distractions and activities, political or otherwise) and accepting the job of organizing and directing the prosecution of European warmongers in a foreign state, and the statement which he makes with reference to his unique undertaking: "This is the first case I have ever tried when I had to persuade others that a court should be established, help negotiate its establishment, and when that was done, not only prepare my case but find myself a courtroom in which to try it." (The Case Against the Nazi War Criminals, p. 13.) [1]

The grave issue presented by these trials is whether a military commission established by the agreement of four nations of the world to try citizens of a fifth nation may disregard the procedural rights of an accused person as guaranteed by the Constitution, especially by article I, section 9, prohibiting ex post facto laws, and by the fifth amendment relating to due process. The ex post facto provision of the Constitution is simply that no ex post facto law shall be passed. The provision of the fifth amendment relating to due process is: "no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." Ex post facto (after the deed is done) means that criminal laws either substantive or procedural cannot be made to apply to acts already committed. "It is not in our tradition for anyone to be charged with crime which is defined after his conduct, alleged to be criminal, has taken place." (In re Yamashita, supra; *Cummings* v. *Missouri* (4 Wall. 277); *Kring* v. *Missouri*, (107 U. S. 221).) "Due process" means that course of legal procedure that is in accordance with the law of the land. It also means a fair trial, including a jury, in regularly established courts, for every person in the world whenever and wherever he may be prosecuted by the United States of America or any of its agencies or representatives.

Ex post facto. The gravamen, or substantial basis, of the offenses with which the defendants at Nuremberg are charged in the indictment is conspiracy, "the formulation or execution of a common plan or conspiracy to commit * * * crimes against peace, war crimes, crimes against humanity," etc. (The Case Against the Nazi War Criminals, p. 114.) The main charge, therefore, is the conspiracy to commit the named crimes rather than their commission. This form of charge was deemed necessary in order that all the defendants might be tried together and the evidence against any or all of them introduced in the same hearing, a tremendous advantage to the prosecution. Except for the conspiracy form of the charge the defendants would have been entitled to separate trials.

It is alleged that the real conspiracy began in 1933 when Hitler came into power, and that it was complete on December 11, 1941, when Germany declared war against the United States (ibid., pp. 119, 134). The International Military Tribunal was not created until August 8, 1945. Three months before that date Germany had unconditionally surrendered. It thus appears that the tribunal which is trying these defendants at Nuremberg was created by agreement after the offenses with which they are charged were committed. At the time of their commission there were no previously organized tribunals authorized to try the offenders, except the regularly recognized courts of the country in which the crimes were committed. The prosecution of the defendants should therefore have been assigned to these courts which at that time the Allies had taken over. The claim of the prosecution (ibid., p. vii) that our experience after World War I proved that satisfactory results could not be attained in the local courts does not change the law with reference to the venue of causes nor affect the rights of all people to the protection of our Constitution. Justice and not the satisfaction of the prosecutor is, or should be, the aim of a criminal prosecution.

Heretofore it has never been claimed that a court of criminal jurisdiction could be created by agreement. But in the Nuremberg trials for the first time in recorded history we have the spectacle of a number of men in Germany being tried by the agreement of those who are trying them. The United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and France entered into this so-called agreement in London, on August 8, 1945, after the war was over, for the sole and only purpose of trying German war criminals. It should be borne in mind that this agreement is the only existing procedural law or authority for these prosecutions. Although, of course, it is not law in any proper sense, in the absence of the procedure set up in this so-called agreement there could be no prosecution of the defendants except in the recognized and established criminal courts where the alleged crimes were committed.

The four United Nations and Germany could, of course, make an agreement for the punishment of their respective individual nationals who should commit war crimes after the date of the agreement, which would be effective as to all the signers, including Germany. Such an agreement signed by four of the nations could not possibly be effective as to a fifth nation. This would seem to be too obvious for argument. It is equally obvious that laws cannot be made by one nation or four nations which will be effective as to the citizens of any other nation.

What is international law, and to whom does it apply? The United States Supreme Court has said that "international law or the law of nations consists of those rules and principles which govern the relations and dealings of nations with each other" (*New Jersey* v. *Delaware* (291 U. S. 361)). Halleck's brief definition is "the rules of conduct regulating the intercourse of states" (Halleck International Law (4th ed.) p. 50). Westlake, another recognized authority, says: "International law, otherwise called the law of nations, is the law of the society of states or nations" (1 Westlake International Law (2d ed.) p. 1). And finally one of our United States courts definitely states that "it is a law for the government of national communities and not for the government of individuals" (*U. S.* v. *Active*, 24 Federal Cases, No. 14420). In other words international law relates exclusively to the mutual rights and duties of sovereign nations, as such, based upon their voluntary agreements. It does not even pretend to deal with the rights or duties of individuals. It contains no criminal code defining crimes and misdemeanors and providing punishment as do the laws of the several States. No criminal prosecution of individuals is authorized, and no criminal court or tribunal of any kind is set up to try them. This is all frankly admitted by Gordon Dean, of counsel for the United States, and by Justice Jackson, Chief Prosecutor for the United

[1] The facts would seem to indicate that in an appropriate proceeding to raise the question it probably would be held that Justice Jackson had resigned his position as Associate Justice by accepting appointment to an incompatible office. The office of prosecutor for the United States would seem to be quite incompatible, at common law, with the office of Justice of the Supreme Court. In case the defendants at Nuremberg should ultimately apply to the Supreme Court, for a writ of habeas corpus, as they undoubtedly will, the prosecutor would be expected to appear and resist the application in the court in which he is still a judge. Also, judges of the Supreme Court are, by statute, prohibited from practicing law (28 U. S. C. A., sec. 373). At least, a reasonable sense of the proprieties would have suggested the appointment of some other able man as prosecutor. But as Colonel Bernays says this is a "revolution in law enforcement." (Reader's Digest, February 1946, p. 56.)

States (The Case Against the Nazi War Criminals, pp. viii, 77). The charter of the International Military Tribunal is therefore a new law which attempts to make individuals criminally responsible for war crimes committed before the charter was adopted. There being no international law that will reach these individuals, the victor nations got together and prepared an agreement to prosecute them. The whole procedure cries loudly of power, but there is not an audible whisper of authority.

Due process: The right to a fair trial in accordance with the law of the land as guaranteed by the due process clause of the fifth amendment to the Constitution relates specifically the procedure in a recognized court of justice.

Article 19 of the charter of the International Military Tribunal provides: "The tribunal shall not be bound by technical rules of evidence. It shall adopt and apply to the greatest possible extent expeditious and nontechnical procedure, and shall admit any evidence which it deems to have probative value" (ibid., p. 106). The tribunal's judgment is thus made final as to what shall be accepted in evidence against these men who are being tried for their lives. If it may admit any evidence which the tribunal itself deems to have probative value it may, and does, admit affidavits, ex parte depositions, reports of investigations, insufficiently authenticated statements, documents and papers, records and findings of other military courts, commissions, or tribunals, etc. (ibid., p. 106). This is a discretion wholly uncontrolled by any of the safeguards which the Constitution offers to all accused persons. No evidence of this character would or could be admitted in any criminal court in this country. This matter is not one merely of rules of evidence. It goes to the basic right of defense, including the right of cross examination of witnesses in open court, instead of being forced to accept their ex parte affidavits and depositions. It goes also to the testing of the probative value of the miscellaneous reports, documents, and other papers by requiring those who make or furnish them to be present in court for examination, on the witness stand, by counsel for the defense. These are the fundamental rights which under our American laws and traditions are to be safeguarded for all men everywhere.

Article 25 of the Articles of War prohibits the use of depositions in the trial of capital cases before military commissions, except by the defendant. Article 38 provides that military courts and commissions shall so far as practicable apply the rules of evidence generally recognized in the trial of criminal cases in the District Courts of the United States (10 U. S. C. 1496, 1509).

These Articles of War would seem to apply directly to the defendants in the Nuremberg trials and protect their rights under our Constitution. If not, then Congress has neglected its duty in that regard and the Constitution itself must be invoked in their behalf. If our cherished laws and traditions can be brushed aside by the setting up of the Nuremberg Military Tribunal then indeed will we have entered upon a new but foreboding era of law. Our fundamental laws are superior to the rules of military courts and commissions and to the military itself. "The military should always be kept in subjection to the laws of the country to which it belongs, and he is no friend to the republic who advocates the contrary. The established principle of every free people is that the law shall alone govern, and to it the military must always yield" (*Dow v. Johnson*, 100 U. S. 158, 169).

Col. Murray C. Bernays, who is said to have "formulated the basis for the war-crime trials," makes the following remarkable statement which is high-lighted by brackets in his article which appeared in the February (1946) issue of the Reader's Digest: "True, what is happening in Nuremberg is revolutionary. But it is not a revolution in the law. It is a revolution in law enforcement." In other words, it is lawless enforcement. It is a revolution against the due-process clause itself. Of course, there is no more justification for a revolution in the enforcement of the law than there is for a revolution in the substantive law defining the crime. Indeed, it is the method of trial which is the special concern of the due-process clause.

Mr. Justice Jackson, in his opening statement for the United States in the Nuremberg trials, refers to the Geneva Protocol (1924), the Eighth Assembly of the League of Nations (1927), and the Sixth Pan-American Conference (1928), in each of which a declaration was made that aggressive war is a crime. These declarations are all merely expressions of the opinions and sentiments with which we all agree. They definitely lack the sanctions of our internal criminal laws. All war is criminal. But as a basis for the prosecution of individuals, with a penalty of death for those found guilty by a self-appointed commission representing four nations of the world, these declarations of opinion and sentiment are worthless.

The United States prosecutor, admitting that we have no judicial precedent for the proceeding (The Case Against the Nazi War Criminals, p. 77) asks the tribunal judicially to extend the present provisions of the law of nations in order to supplement and cure its admitted weaknesses. Such action would amount to usurpation. In international law, extensions and amendments can be made only by agreement among the nations who adopt and wish to be governed by them.

Referring to the general declarations of the world conferences mentioned by him in which aggressive warfare is called criminal, Mr. Justice Jackson makes the following incredible statement: "The very minimum legal consequence of the treaties making aggressive wars illegal is to strip those who incite or wage them of every defense the law ever gave." And he adds that he cannot subscribe to the "perverted" reasoning that progress in the law cannot be made at the expense of morally guilty lives (ibid., pp. 76, 77). In other words, in a prosecution in which the death penalty may be demanded we are to strip the accused "of every defense the law ever gave him" and take the lives of morally guilty persons, without any proof of legal guilt, if we think "progress" in the law makes it necessary or desirable.

The writer sincerely believes that all law-abiding citizens of this free country will share his feeling of deep regret that a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States should have made these utterances.

What becomes of the cherished charter of our liberties, the fifth amendment to the Constitution, if these doctrines are entertained and accepted? We will let Mr. Justice Murphy, a fellow member with Justice Jackson on the Supreme Court of the United States, answer:

"The answer is plain. The fifth amendment guaranty of due process of law applies to 'any person' who is accused of a crime by the Federal Government or any of its agencies. No exception is made as to those who are accused of war crimes or as to those who possess the status of an enemy belligerent. Indeed, such an exception would be contrary to the whole philosophy of human rights which makes the Constitution the great living document that it is. The immutable rights of the individual, including those secured by the due-process clause of the fifth amendment, belong not alone to the members of those nations that excel on the battlefield or that subscribe to the democratic ideology. They belong to every person in the world, victor or vanquished, whatever may be his race, color, or beliefs. They arise above any status of belligerency or outlawry. They survive any popular passion or frenzy of the moment. No court or legislature or executive, not even the mightiest army in the world, can ever destroy them. Such is the universal and indestructible nature of the rights which the due-process clause of the fifth amendment recognizes and protects when life or liberty is threatened by virtue of the authority of the United States." (In re Yamashita, supra.)

Colonel Bernays in the article referred to concludes his argument with the following startling statements: "Moral responsibility must be supported with the tools of justice." He says that moral responsibility is an individual thing and that our domestic law rests upon the principle that only against the individual can ultimate justice be enforced, and that therefore international law "must remain a futile and helpless thing if it fails to bind the individual to its obligations." It is admitted that international law lacks the criminal sanctions of our domestic law with reference to individuals. Colonel Bernays merely restates the position of the United States prosecutor that the tribunal should judicially extend the provisions of the present international law to cover individuals who are not mentioned in that law, which action, again, would be judicial usurpation. The colonel further says: "The nations of the world have had ready to hand agreements among themselves under which to scourge those leaders who plot war. That law of nations has lain idle." In other words, it has never been adopted and accepted. Here is an agreement which if adopted would really give the International Military Tribunal jurisdiction over these defendants. But international law will indeed "remain futile and helpless" unless the nations of the world execute this agreement which they have had "ready to hand" but have failed to sign. And now although the law has admittedly "lain idle" and this principle of individual responsibility has not been included in any international agreements, we must still apply the "tools of justice" and punish the Nuremberg culprits even unto death for their breach of moral laws, violations of which are not punished by the penal laws of any civilized nation in the world.

Finally Colonel Bernays says: "The man in the street knows the score." This flippant phrase touches the last depths of supercilious scorn for international law, or of any law whatever. We are asked to accept the opinion of the "man in the street," our outraged feelings, our anger, our spirit of revenge, our wish, if you please, that the law might be stretched to fit the crime, and then proceed without any legal sanctions whatever to destroy the lives of men. This is, indeed, a lawless revolution in law enforcement.

Quoting Mr. Justice Murphy once more: "In my opinion such a procedure is unworthy of the traditions of our people or of the immense sacrifices that they have made to advance the common ideals of mankind. The high feelings of the moment will doubtless be satisfied. But in the sober afterglow will come the realization of the boundless and dangerous implications of the procedure sanctioned today. * * * But even more significant will be the hatred and ill-will growing out of the application of this unprecedented procedure. * * * The effect in this instance, unfortunately, will be magnified infinitely for here we are dealing with the rights of man on an international level. To subject an enemy belligerent to an unfair trial, to charge him with an unrecognized crime, or to vent on him our retributive emotions only antagonizes the enemy nation and hinders the reconciliation necessary to a peaceful world." (In re Yamashita, supra.)

That great patriot, Tom Paine, said: "He who would make his own liberty secure must guard even his enemy from oppression; for if he violates this duty he establishes a precedent which reaches himself."

George Bernard Shaw with his usual wisdom, in a recent interview in which he was questioned about the German atrocities said, in substance: "Yes, but war is the great atrocity."

The atrocious acts of which we rightfully complain and which constitute the factual basis for the Nuremberg trials are merely incidents of the great atrocity which is war. Our chief concern therefore should be to abolish war, the greatest of all the world's evils. And who is responsible for this greatest of all atrocities? Man. We are all responsible for Hitler and all other atrocious war leaders because we permit conditions to exist which create them.

War is man's biggest social problem. He alone must solve it. All our social evils are due to a break-down in our social machine, and this is one machine which our scientists and technicians have neglected. The causes of war must be ascertained and removed. This is not an easy job, of course, but the scientific method which has been used so successfully in the physical field must be used here. Killing a few German leaders is attacking the problem from the top rather than at its source. Behind man's marvelous achievements in the physical realm lies a record of long intellectual struggle with the problems of physics and mathematics with all its many chapters of experiment and failure, but through it all there runs a persistent and indomitable courage which worked and fought until many seemingly impossible problems were at last solved. This is the sort of sincere and persistent effort which will solve the problem of war.

Is it not silly, therefore, to kill off a few top war leaders, who, after all, are mere symptoms of conditions which we permit to exist, thereby antagonizing an enemy nation in a world which is seeking peace?

Killing these murderers will not prevent like crimes in the future any more than the execution of murderers under our internal laws prevents future murders. According to our criminologists these executions do not even reduce the ratio of murders.

The proceedings at Nuremberg are not only illegal—they are unscientific and futile.

Veto Excuse of Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when President Truman vetoed the Case bill last week he gave a perfect exhibition of the "man on the flying trapeze." On May 25 he rose to great heights in the estimation of the public when he spoke for the people during a great national crisis. On June 11, in his veto message, he plummeted to the depths and this exhibition was accomplished with the greatest of ease.

Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Journal has always been fair in its comments of President Truman. In a recent editorial it analyzes his veto message and calls it "A 4,500 word veto excuse." Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point the editorial in question:

A 4,500-WORD VETO EXCUSE

If President Truman, in vetoing the Case bill, had pointed briefly to a few provisions in it which he could not accept, there might be more inclination to respect the sincerity of his veto. As it is, the very marshaling of 4,500 words suggests that the bottom of the barrel was scraped to build support for a predetermined—and a political—decision.

It is hard, indeed, to follow his reasoning. He requests again passage of emergency legislation to meet the strike wave and also some permanent legislation, yet he vetoes the Case bill partly because it is "permanent," ignoring the fact that no American legislation is permanent; all statutes can be repealed or amended as the situation warrants.

He asks for a "study" of long-range labor policy when we have had years of study already, and need some action now. The suggested joint committee to study the whole labor subject is a political stall and the prime device of those who want no labor legislation.

Mr. Truman lamely argues that because we are in an emergency, justifying emergency measures, we are still not justified in passing permanent legislation. Again, it must be pointed out, none of our legislation is permanent. Mr. Truman says we must not make a false start. No! But we must make some start.

The President criticizes the Case bill for having two unrelated parts, yet, in the same breath, he asks for a comprehensive labor bill of many parts. He cites President Roosevelt's unsuccessful veto of the Smith-Connally bill and calls the bill a failure. Yet it was a try—and, under its seizure provisions, many strikes have been settled, even though the method is far from ideal.

If Mr. Truman sees in section 3 of the Case bill a loophole to encourage "quickie" strikes, let him suggest that the loophole be plugged, not that the entire bill be junked. Mr. Truman says that none of our great strikes would have been prevented by the Case bill. Maybe not. But some attempt at sobering legislation should encourage more responsible labor leadership, if only because the leaders saw the way the public wind was blowing. The 1927 British Trades Dispute Act outlawing general strikes, only recently repealed, was seldom if ever enforced, but its very passage had a sobering effect on British labor leaders.

Mr. Truman criticizes the Case bill for applying fact finding to public utilities but not to other industries of equal importance. This, indeed, is straining for veto arguments. Half a loaf is surely better than none at all.

Regarding section 9, Mr. Truman voices fears for the rights of foremen and other supervisory employees to unionize and to bargain. He fears they would strike to enforce their demands. This problem we already have with us, and the President goes far afield indeed to drag this in to support a veto.

As to the danger of possible extravagant enforcement of the Case bill against labor, it seems that Mr. Truman is using a lively imagination. It isn't in the cards. American courts are not in that mood. Our problem is, and has been for some time, to obtain adequate enforcement of any provisions controlling or regulating politically powerful union labor activities—even when they get over into the field of racketeering and hijacking. How can the President really believe that labor would be persecuted under the Case bill? The American public would not condone persecution, even if it were possible, which is not proved by the President.

Toward the end of his veto message Mr. Truman gets down to pious platitudes and meaningless generalities. He believes it is right and fair to hold labor unions responsible for violations of contract, but—he has no solution. He believes that some effective means can be found for enforcing labor's responsibility. What means?

He says, sounding like the hysterical labor leaders themselves, that men cannot be forced in peacetime to work for private employers. The Case bill doesn't provide any such servitude. No provisions, seeking to establish rules for striking, prevent anyone from quitting. And Mr. Truman himself has requested legislation forcing men to work that is far more stringent than anything contemplated in the Case bill. He would draft men to work. His own request refutes him.

The President's veto peroration is as thrilling as a 2-day-old soggy pancake. Many suggestions, by many persons, should be considered—and something should be done.

There you have the Truman leadership at this minute. What has happened since he showed courage in the railroad crisis? One is reminded of a little boy who fired a gun and was frightened by the report.

The only conclusion we can draw is that Mr. Truman, listening to would-be political advisers and to misguided associates, has vetoed the Case bill solely, or almost entirely, for political purposes, hoping to regain some of the labor support he may have lost in his stand in the railroad strike. We can find no sincerity in this veto message. The voice is his, but the words are those of a Hannegan.

Construction of House From Lumber Owned by Builder 27 Years Halted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent heretofore granted, I include as a part of my remarks a statement appearing in the Ponca City (Okla.) News, Sunday, June 9, 1946.

This statement is an excellent example of the misuse and abuse of authority by appointed Federal public officials, who arrogate to themselves all wisdom and who fail to observe common sense and common decency toward the public with whom they are dealing. The article follows:

CONSTRUCTION OF HOUSE FROM LUMBER OWNED BY BUILDER 27 YEARS HALTED

Construction in Ponca City of a frame house from materials which the builder has owned for 27 years has been stopped on advice from Federal housing authorities that the project did not comply with Federal regulations.

The house was being built at 700 North Union Street by Mr. and Mrs. R. C. Poulter, who operate a grocery store and filling station at 701 North Union Street. All lumber for the structure was brought here in March from Poulter's farm near Rich Hill, Mo.

Poulter estimated that the only materials needed to purchase in erecting the structure would be roofing, window frames, glass, and cement and sand for the foundation.

The lumber was salvaged from a house, barn, and granaries on Poulter's Missouri farm, which he purchased in 1919. The original structures were erected prior to Poulter's purchase 27 years ago.

SECURED CITY PERMIT

After the lumber was brought here by truck, Poulter applied for a city building permit certifying that the plan of the structure

conformed with municipal ordinances. The permit was issued on March 25.

Foundation, floor joists, and one section of the subfloor had been completed when on May 11 a man who, according to Mrs. Poulter, did not identify himself stopped at the building site and questioned carpenters employed by Poulter.

The carpenters were asked who was putting up the house, for whom it was being built, and whether or not a Federal permit had been issued on the structure. The carpenters told the interrogator that they did not believe a permit had been obtained from the housing authority.

The following day, Poulter received a telegram from Federal housing authorities in Dallas advising him that work on the house could not continue until he conferred with housing representatives in Oklahoma City.

On May 15, Poulter went to Oklahoma City. There he was told that regardless of where he obtained his materials he could not complete the house unless he agreed to rent or sell the structure to a veteran.

TWO SONS SERVED IN ARMY

Poulter has two sons who served in the Army during the war. He asked housing authorities if he could complete the house in their name. This could not be done, he was told, unless one of his sons established his home in the house.

Poulter told the officials that both his sons have their own homes and he was building the house for his wife and himself.

"You had 7 years during the war to build yourself a house," one of the officials was quoted by Mrs. Poulter as replying.

The foundation and lumber stand today as they were on May 11. Poulter covered the lumber with sheets of galvanized tin also brought from Poulter's farm, in an effort to protect the planks from rain. He took out fire and tornado insurance on the lumber.

Poulter estimates that he spent about $140 on the foundation. Transportation charges on the lumber and the costs of labor, roofing, and windows were the only other expenses he expected to encounter.

Poulter at the present time is visiting his son, Freddie Poulter, in Portland, Oreg. The Poulters' other son, Leslie J. Poulter, lives at 904 South Waverly Street.

Strike Troubles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an informative editorial which appeared in the Janesville Gazette and which deals with this matter of strikes and the cause therefor. Members of the House will find this most interesting:

NUB OF NATION'S STRIKE TROUBLES

The strike paralysis that besets this country was inevitable. It is largely the result of deliberate legislative and judicial acts of the past decade. Gilbert Montague, a distinguished constitutional lawyer, reviews the process categorically:

"In 1938 the Supreme Court held that the Norris-La Guardia Anti-Injunction and Picketing Act protected picketers even when they are not employees; also, that the Labor Relations Act authorizes the Board—National Labor Relations Board—to make an inference from any evidence, even though such inference is contrary to the weight of evidence. In 1940 the Supreme Court held that picketers may publicize any statement against an employer. This right to publicize is the freedom of speech guaranteed by the Constitution. The employer, however, is subject to punishment under the Wagner Labor Relations Act when there is any evidence from which the Board might infer that the employer interfered with union activities.

"Again, in 1940, the Supreme Court reversed the decisions of 30 years and held that labor was for the most part immune from antitrust acts.

"In 1942 the Supreme Court held that sums extorted from truck drivers under threats of assault and battery should be regarded as 'wages of a bona fide employer to an employee,' and the interference with such extortion would be 'interference with traditional labor-union activities.'

"In 1942, in wartime, the National War Labor Board required 'maintenance of membership' in labor contracts, contrary to the intent of the Wagner Act when passed.

"Next, the Government took over Montgomery Ward because it refused a maintenance-of-membership clause. But, in 1944, Petrillo refused the President's request that he accept the directives of the National War Labor Board. Nothing was done about it."

No wonder strikes have approached the point of revolution in the United States.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution:

We, the citizens of Cleveland of Polish descent or extraction, gathered at the one hundred and fifty-fifth anniversary celebration of the May 3 constitution, which was to Poland what the Declaration of Independence was to America, do hereby adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas May 3, 1946, commemorates the one hundred and fifty-fifth anniversay of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, to which the people of Poland look longingly for inspiration, moral courage, and spiritual resistance against the enemies of their freedom; and

"Whereas the Polish people have always been defenders of freedom and democracy, as demonstrated by the immortal Generals Kosciuszko and Pulaski, who fought as aides to General Washington in America's fight for independence; and

"Whereas Poles were the first to fight nazism and fascism in this Second World War, now, therefore, we the citizens of Cleveland of Polish descent feel that Poland deserves better treatment and consideration than she has received, and we ask you, Mr. President, and the Secretary of State, to intercede for justice for the many suffering and homeless millions of Polish people under the Soviet yoke.

"Since we all know that the present puppet government of Poland does not truly represent the Polish people, we ask the Government of the United States of America, to request immediate withdrawal of Soviet forces from Poland, and allow the Polish people and not the Soviet bayonets to elect their representative government.

"We feel that the golden promises of the constitution of 1791, will never be fulfilled in Poland until her people are truly free and independent.

"We further resolve that the copies of this resolution be sent to the President and the Secretary of State, and to our representatives in both Houses of Congress."

Z. B. DYBOWSKI,
Chairman, Resolution Committee.
GEORGE J. WORST,
Chairman, Polish Constitution Day Committee.

The Sham War Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Henry Hazlitt, from the New York Times:

THE SHAM WAR AGAINST INFLATION

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Had the Office of Price Administration made a real effort toward decontrol beginning immediately after the cessation of hostilities last August, most of the price controls of the war period could already have been removed. It is questionable whether this is now true of as much as 10 percent of the price controls that were placed on civilian goods and services in the war period. And now that the House and the Senate Banking and Currency Committee have written into the proposed price control extension law amendments, which the Senate plans to consider this week, that would make real steps toward decontrol, the most vehement protests come from the officials in charge of price control and from other groups.

The people who make these protests declared that their main object is to "prevent inflation." Yet most of them pay no attention whatever to the Government policies that are really responsible for inflation. They say not a word about the cumulative deficit of the last 16 years, or about the planned deficit for the fiscal year to begin July 1, both financed by borrowing and the issuance of new money and bank credit. They treat the fact that American money and bank credit has more than tripled since the outbreak of the war, as if it were unrelated to the whole subject of price rises and the bidding up of goods. The Treasury's policy of infra-low money rates, which stimulates credit expansion just when it is least desirable to have further credit expansion, is something that is in their minds, so far as its bearing on commodity prices is concerned, might just as well be taking place on some remote planet.

Yet the most important cause of the upward pressure on prices is not a shortage of goods (though that is a real factor in some cases) but a surplus of money. The rise in the prices of goods reflects mainly a fall in the value of the monetary unit. If we may take the Federal Reserve index of production at its face value, industrial production in March was running at a level 68 percent in excess of prewar production. The price rise cannot be charged to an over-all shortage of goods.

How did we ever get into the Alice-in-Wonderland situation, moreover, in which it is precisely the Murrays and Greens and Reuthers who insist on the wage increases that are most responsible for the rise in production costs and in monetary purchasing power

that force prices up, who are also the most insistent on Government compulsions to keep prices down? It was two and a half months ago that Bernard M. Baruch began his testimony on price control by declaring: "Increase production. * * * Stop increasing the money supply. * * * Stop bunking the public by saying wage increases can be granted without increase in price levels." Yet the process of bunking the public has since gone to greater lengths than ever.

Mr. Baruch's reference to production reminds us that it is those who throw their whole insistence on the unmitigated continuance of price control who profess to be the greatest if not the only friends of "the great consuming public." But, once more, how did we ever get into the Alice-in-Wonderland situation in which the greatest friends of the consumer are those who wish to do most to keep producers from producing? Consumption depends on production. Production depends on the incentive of profit margins on the side of commodities, the greatest assurance of low prices is maximum supply.

Yet every amendment to the proposed price control extension suggested by Congress to encourage production or to protect the producer from being put out of business is denounced by the proponents of all-out continuance as "just as bad as outright repeal." It is true that the amendments proposed by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee are inconsistent and illogical. What purpose would a price control be serving even in theory, for example, that took the ceilings off meat and eggs and milk and left them on Cadillacs and furs? But those who have been managing OPA have mainly themselves to blame for this situation. They have refused to grant reasonable relief to producers. They have failed to give evidence that they wish to taper off and finally terminate price control of their own initiative. They have denounced all amendments to price control extension as "crippling," but have refused to submit any substitute amendments.

Labor-Management Relationship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address made over the radio by my colleague, Hon. ROBERT HALE, of Maine, on June 17, about the very much alive and vital question of labor-management relationship. In his address Mr. HALE reviews the three principal Federal laws pertaining to this problem and then proceeds with a review of what was provided in the so-called Case bill recently vetoed by the President.

Mr. HALE points out clearly that the right to strike is not an unqualified or a restricted right. In speaking of this phase of the question, he says:

The right of freedom of speech does not carry with it the right to defame our neighbor or to blaspheme. The right to freedom of worship does not mean that in the name of worship we can indulge in practices repugnant to the general sense of morality, like polygamy or human sacrifice. The right of peaceable assembly is not one which can be exercised without regard to time and place and the sensibilities of those whom the assemblies might affect.

This approach to the important question of labor-management is sound and unassailable and clarifies a great deal of muddled thinking on the subject. Mr. HALE is to be commended for a most intelligent and statesmanlike address and I urge that the Members of Congress read it carefully. The address follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, I want to express my appreciation for the opportunity to talk to you this evening over the facilities of WWDC here in Washington. It is most helpful to us in Congress to be able to talk to all the people about the issues which are troubling us.

I have decided to speak tonight about the question of labor relations, because that is one of the most important issues in the United States and our future depends upon our capacity to legislate wisely.

While the whole subject is doubtless controversial, a great deal of the excitement and resentment commonly expressed may be allayed if we approach the matter coolly and try to analyze what is wrong before we decide on the remedies. In order to do this we have to know just what the Federal laws are.

There are three principal Federal enactments affecting labor relations in this country. The first of these was the Clayton Act passed in 1914 which prohibits injunctions in cases between an employer and employees, or between employees, or between employees and persons seeking employment, involving or growing out of a dispute concerning terms or conditions of employment unless the injunction is necessary to prevent irreparable injury to property. The act further provided that no injunction should prohibit anyone, singly or in concert, from terminating the relation of employment, or from ceasing to work, or from recommending, advising, or persuading others by peaceful means so to do, or from peacefully assembling in a lawful manner for lawful purposes, or doing anything which might lawfully be done in the absence of a dispute. This act was a first step in doing away with the injunction to prevent strikes and other lawful measures resorted to by employees wishing peaceably to assert their rights to get better wages or better working conditions.

I do not think that there is anything wrong with the provisions of the Clayton Act and there are not many people who would advocate changing them.

In 1932 the provisions of the Clayton Act were enlarged by a statute commonly known as the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which also deals primarily with injunctions in labor disputes. It recites that the "individual unorganized worker is commonly helpless to exercise actual liberty of contract and to protect his freedom of labor, and thereby to obtain acceptable terms and conditions of employment" and that he should have "full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation" of his own representatives "to negotiate the terms and conditions of his employment," "free from the interference, restraint or coercion of employers." Any contract in contravention of these essential rights is made void and specifically any contract on the part of an employee to join a union or not to remain a member thereof.

The act also forbids the issuance of an injunction to prohibit anybody in a case growing out of a labor dispute from ceasing to work, becoming or remaining a member of a labor union, paying strike benefits, aiding strikers by lawful means, giving publicity to the existence of a labor dispute and so on. Strikers are not merely as strikers, to be held to be in unlawful combination or conspiracy.

The Norris-LaGuardia Act does not forbid injunctions to prevent acts of violence, but it does lay down procedural requirements which make it in fact almost impossible to obtain such an injunction. Thus the plaintiff has to show who the people are who are picketing or threatening violence and prove that they are members of the union and that the union has authorized their acts. This is generally impossible. Often the striking union imports pickets who are not employees of the strikers and are not agents in the ordinary sense. As far as I am concerned, I find no fault with the principles embodied in the Norris-LaGuardia Act, but I think that the procedural requirements should be relaxed in cases where actual violence is threatened, so that a concern which has a plant or factory actually menaced as a result of a strike can obtain an injunction against such violence without being required to know the names of all the people who threaten the violence. No doubt any amendment to the Norris-LaGuardia Act would meet opposition in Congress, but I am convinced that section 7 should be amended.

In 1935 the Congress passed the National Labor Relations Act commonly known as the Wagner Act for the recited purpose of eliminating the causes of strikes, encouraging collective bargaining and protecting the exercise by workers of freedom to organize and choose negotiating agents. The act condemns the inequality of bargaining power between employees who do not possess full freedom of association or actual liberty of contract, and employers who are organized in the corporate or other forms of ownership. It asserts that this inequality of bargaining power tends to aggravate recurrent business depression by depressing the purchasing power of wage earners in industry. "Experience," the act declares, "has proved that protection by law of the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively safeguards commerce from injury, impairment or interruption, and promotes the flow of commerce by removing certain recognized sources of industrial strife and unrest."

Whatever one may think of the National Labor Relations Act, it can scarcely be claimed to have diminished labor disputes. Whether this results from defects in the act or from defects in its administration, may be arguable, but I think that there are obvious defects in the act. For example, it defines certain acts as unfair labor practices by employers, but it does not define any acts as unfair labor practices by the employees. Under the act employers can do wrong but the employees cannot. The actual decisions of the National Labor Relations Board created by the act have been heavily in favor of organized labor as against employers. The result is that today the employees are generally in a substantially stronger bargaining position than the employers. The conditions which existed in 1932 and earlier and were recognized in the Norris-LaGuardia Act no longer exist.

I am one of a majority of Congressmen who believes that this present situation must be corrected by permanent legislation.

We made an attempt to deal with labor disputes in the War Labor Disputes Act of 1943, commonly called the Smith-Connally Act. This enactment is of a temporary character, and terminates 6 months after the cessation of hostilities. I was in Congress at the time this act was passed. A coal strike was then threatening. The act was nominally an amendment to the Selective Service Act of 1940, which defined the powers of the President to take possession under certain circumstances of "any plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of articles or materials required for the war." It provided that whenever such plant, mine, or facility was in the possession of the United States it should be unlawful for any person to coerce, instigate,

induce, conspire with, or encourage any person to interfere, by lock-out, strike, slowdown, or other interruption, with the operation of the plant, mine, or facility, to aid any such lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption by giving direction or guidance in its conduct, or by providing sums for its conduct, or for the payment of strikers, employment or other benefits to participants. Leaders were subject to fine or imprisonment, or both. Under this act, the President recently took possession of the coal mines.

The powers conferred by the act might have been exercised by President Truman against the striking coal miners and the striking railroad men. But the President did not elect to use them.

Under the Smith-Connally Act employees of a war contractor are required to give 30 days' notice of a strike, and the National Labor Relations Board is required to take a secret ballot of the employees on the question of whether they will permit any interruption of war production. This section of the Smith-Connally bill has been widely, and I believe soundly, criticized as tending to countenance and encourage strikes rather than otherwise.

The Smith-Connally Act also forbids political contributions by labor organizations in connection with any election to a political office. But this provision of the Smith-Connally Act has been a practical nullity, for the individual members of the labor organizations may make political contributions which in some instances have been very heavy.

The Smith-Connally Act has not been a very satisfactory piece of legislation, but I think it does not merit the denunciations which have been heaped upon it. As I have said, it will die a natural death 6 months after Congress or the President declares hostilities terminated.

Seizure of industrial plants by the Federal Government is not a satisfactory weapon in the case of strikes. In some instances the seizures might do almost as much harm as the strikes. Certainly if we favor private enterprise, as I emphatically do, businesses no more want the Government to walk into their plants than they want their employees to walk out. The need is for some machinery for mediation which will obviate the necessity for either seizures or strikes.

The Case bill was the first enactment of a general character dealing with labor disputes to pass both branches of the Congress since 1935. The House passed bills in 1940, '41, '43, and '45, but the Senate never concurred. I will not attempt to discuss the provisions of the Case bill in detail. It was not as comprehensive as it might have been, and, as President Truman said, it did lack unity, in that it attacked various unrelated abuses in the field of labor relations. I do not, however, think that this was any serious objection to the measure, nor do I sympathize at all with the President's objection to the bill as "not a permanent solution of our difficulties." We cannot expect to pass any legislation which will effect a permanent solution of our difficulties. In the field of labor relations we must necessarily proceed by a method of trial and error. We tried the National Labor Relations Act of 1935; we know now that it embodied grave errors of policy and these should be corrected.

The President's legislation both in the form in which it was introduced into the House and in the form in which it passed the Senate is applicable only to strikes in which the Government has actually taken possession. Also it purports to be only a temporary measure. Therefore it cannot be an important contribution to the general problem.

I do not think that there are any Members of Congress so benighted as to feel that labor should not stand as nearly as possible on an equality with management in bargaining about wages and working conditions. On the other hand, no enlightened legislator should imagine that the right to strike is an unqualified or an unrestricted right. None of the basic constitutional rights is unqualified. The right of freedom of speech does not carry with it the right to defame our neighbor or to blaspheme. The right to freedom of worship does not mean that in the name of worship we can indulge in practices repugnant to the general sense of morality, like polygamy or human sacrifice. The right of peaceable assembly is not one which can be exercised without regard to time and place and the sensibilities of those whom the assemblies might affect.

I have little patience with those people who feel that bona fide attempts to equalize bargaining power in labor relations, to encourage mediation, and to prevent strikes are a stab in the back at labor or are antilabor or anything of the sort. There are some people in Congress who are not even willing to legislate against robbery and extortion by labor unions. I deplore such extravagant partisanship.

There is nobody in Congress who does not know that without the welfare of laboring men we can have neither prosperity nor peace in the country. On the other hand, everybody in Congress knows that strikes are enormously destructive, and that the social effect of strikes may often be comparable to the social effects of war. The strike is no more than war a satisfactory instrument of national policy.

If, as I think, there is substantial agreement upon these general principles, it ought to be possible to pass new legislation which would discourage strikes and improve social harmony. The great labor organizations ought to be willing to collaborate in bringing about reforms. Obviously, Congress cannot make happy labor relations any more than it can make happy marriages. But legislation in both fields can penalize improper practices. When I use the word "penalize" I am not talking about fines and imprisonment. I am simply saying that certain practices defeat the purposes of the marital or the employment relation, as the case may be, and therefore must be deemed to void the relationship altogether.

We must remember that under the modern law the striking employee does not give up his job, but only his work on the job, which is quite a different thing. If the strike is, as it is, an institution protected by law, then I see no injustice in saying that a man who accepts certain types of employment like a Government job or a job in a vital public utility must by such acceptance be deemed to have relinquished the right to strike at all. The British have a provision in their trade disputes act of 1927 which provides that strikes are illegal if not in furtherance of a trade dispute or if against the Government. This act certainly has not prevented labor from attaining complete political maturity in England.

The formulation of enlightened public opinion on these questions may assist the Congress in the performance of its legislative duty. We must legislate for all the people, not for labor or for management.

Ghastly Hindrance to Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this Nation could and would produce a surplus of food even in these trying times if the palsied hand of bureaucracy could be removed from their throats. The military deprived the farmers of help at a critical period of the war. The Tydings amendment was ignored and boys essential to the continuation of food production were put in the Army in violation of the mandate of Congress. Industry as a whole was overstaffed with young men needed on the farms. The wages drained men from agricultural production. Farm-machinery production has been throttled so that the farm could not be supplied with labor-saving machinery to replace the loss of farm labor. OPA regulations have contributed its ghastly hindrance to the production of food. It has by its stupid regulations forced dairymen to slaughter tested herds. Feed for poultry and cattle has been wasted as well as used for nonfood purposes.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article written by Wheeler McMillen entitled "Along the American Way":

ALONG THE AMERICAN WAY

(By Wheeler McMillen)

Why are we saving food at our tables these days? Why have our hearts been touched again to respond to the relief of want?

The reason lies in the countless failures which the rulers of men have inflicted upon peoples everywhere. The hunger in Europe and our foregoing of wheat and fats trace direct to the persistent ignorance of statesmen.

Science has conquered hunger. The know-how for production of abundant food supplies for everybody on earth not only exists but is published free to the whole world. The United States Department of Agriculture, to mention only one agency, has printed millions of free bulletins filled with technical knowledge of food production. The Department has no secrets. The information it has, the new practices state experiment stations have developed, the practical experiences of farmers, all have been published over and over in the farm press and summarized in dozens of plainly written books.

KNOW-HOW

Any king, maharajah, prime minister, president, general, war lord, or dictator with $100 can buy up-to-the-minute agricultural information enough to prevent a single person in his realm from ever missing a meal. If any ruler cannot spare the $100 exchange, Secretary Anderson doubtless will gladly send him a complete file of free bulletins.

All of this information is crying to be used. Engineers have designed marvelously fine equipment that enables one farmer today to grow more food than a dozen men can produce without it. The basic ideas are so old that most of the patents have run out. Neither are there any secrets about means to haul food from any nation's farm to its cities.

Most of the universal wants—food, clothing, and shelter—must be supplied from agriculture. Chemurgy is constantly showing how new things can be made from farm materials.

Science has not only conquered hunger, but it has removed every excuse for man to be in want of life's necessities.

Yet statesmanship has not learned this supersensational fact.

BLIND STATECRAFT

Offer a typical Old World statesman a tractor or a machine gun and he will choose the gun. Offer him a fancy document or a good cultivator and he will reach for the document. His trade is in documents and guns.

The farmer, the scientist, the engineer, and the industrialist are always interested in producing more and better goods at less cost for more people.

Statesmen have been interested in power and prestige, neither of which can fatten a hog or bake a loaf of bread. Now and then a ruler dimly realizes that his people need food and goods. If they clamor loudly, he proposes to help them by starting a war to steal what some other country has.

Kings, generals, and dictators have never understood that production pays infinitely better than aggression.

So, while science has conquered want, statesmanship has not. Statesmanship simply has not caught up with the producers.

FOOD FIRST

Heads of state the world over have blundered into two great wars this century. If they would hereafter work half as hard at producing food as they have always worked at getting people into trouble, hunger and want and poverty could in a few years be wiped off the earth.

The proof is in the United States. Here, where the heavy hand of excess government was long restrained, the people themselves have abolished the kind of poverty the Old World has always known.

Virginia Farmers, Rich in Hay, Cannot Find Help To Harvest It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of June 18, written by Frank M. Smith. This is the concluding article of a series by Mr. Smith dealing with a serious problem confronting farmers not only in Virginia but in all sections of the Nation.

The article follows:

"Come into my parlor,
Said the farmer to the cow,
I'll turn on all your spigots
And Jake can take the plow."

That's not as damn silly as it sounds.

In Fairfax County they are talking about specialization on the farm. It goes hand in hand with mechanization. It would create an assembly-line farm, as in an auto factory.

They have them on dairy farms in New Jersey now. They call them milking parlors. Six men can milk 2,000 cows in 24 hours and often do.

CAN'T GET MACHINERY

Of course right now they are having labor trouble in Fairfax. They can't get machinery. They couldn't specialize if they wanted to. But a man can dream, can't he?

That's what J. E. Beard, the county agent is doing. His assistant, O. D. Turner, helps him. They dream about a streamlined dairy community in northern Virginia. Milking parlors. Farmer Brown specializing in alfalfa. Jake doing the plowing. Henry with his balers, combines, tractors, and so forth, doing the harvest. Each man trained and well equipped. More production. Less waste. Less cost. More profit. Higher wages. Shorter hours.

But Beard and Turner have grim reality to struggle with right now. No labor, low wages, bad housing for tenants, no machinery, fallow fields.

It's as bad as it is in Maryland, sometimes worse. Farmers have curtailed their crops from 25 to 40 percent. It's no wonder you can't get any meat or butter. It's no wonder the Government had to offer a 30-cent bonus on a bushel of wheat to meet its famine commitments.

The farm pay in the county averages $100 a month plus house, lights, water, fuel, milk, meat, a garden spot, and a place for chickens. And just as in Montgomery county, that isn't enough to attract the farm boy veterans. They are taking that old unemployment compensation, twenty a week, and staying away from work. Or they are crowding the cities where the pay is higher. Don't look now, bub, but so are the living costs and nothing is free.

HAY BUT NO BALER

Richard Dove is a man who believes in proving what he says. He is foreman of Maplewood Farm, McLean, Va. He listened to the Government agents when they predicted labor and machinery would be plentiful this year. He planted a 65-acre field with wheat.

"Now I don't know how I'm ever going to get it in," he said. "I wish you would go down and look at it." I did. It's ready to cut now.

A week ago when I talked with Dove, he was bringing in his hay. He doesn't have a baler. Can't get one. Two of his neighbors were helping him. He's got regular help but only half of what he needs.

The hay was burning up on the field where it had lain 3 days. It was an emergency and the neighbors helped. They are doing that all over the Washington milk shed. The farmers know you've got to get feed for the cows. Cows aren't like automobiles that simply stop when they run out of gas. Cows wither and die without feed.

But Dove doesn't know when he can get help to get his wheat field cut. Sixty-five acres of wheat would make a lot of flour. A lot of flour would make a lot of bread. When did you get your last loaf without a struggle? Where do you think you are going to get your bread this winter if the fields don't get cut?

SELLING HERDS

And about those herds they are selling. Dove knew all about Mrs. Browning's sale (mentioned yesterday). He also knows why it's bad to sell. Maybe you prefer a good steak to a glass of milk anyway. But when you eat the steak, that's all there is, brother.

"County agents will tell you," Dove said, as he unhitched his tractor from the load of hay, "that it isn't so bad to break up a herd. The other farmers will buy the cows. And the total production will remain the same in the area.

LABOR PROBLEM

"I say that a farmer goes to a sale to buy a cow with good production. He hasn't the help or space for more cows. So, he culls out one of his own that isn't doing so good. Off she goes to the slaughter house. And a cow that goes to the slaughter house never returns. And never produces any more milk for anyone."

Dove certainly doesn't know the answers. He's merely glum and discouraged.

James King owns the Fairview Farm with the twin barns, big, up-to-date, immaculate buildings. He suffers the typical labor problem. Last week he hired eight men at 80 cents an hour to cut silage and work around the barn. They worked four days. Then they said they wanted $1 an hour. He said no. The next day only one out of the eight turned up for work. He was blind.

King pays good salaries—$100 to $175 a month plus the usual house, fuel, milk, etc. He had three men working for him who went into the Army. Only one has come back but not to work on the farm.

King says the reason farm labor is so scarce is because the men think they should get the same wages on a farm they pay in the city.

They settle labor disputes in industry by raising wages. Of course, then the price of the product goes up.

But it's a little more serious on the farm. If they raise the price of an auto too high, you could use a bus. But you've got to eat. No matter what they do about prices or labor or machinery, you've got to eat. That's what you think. The farmers think differently.

One said, "Someone is going hungry this winter."

A Virginia county agent said, "We won't get labor back on the farm until we reach the depths of a depression. And we've started on one now."

BREADBASKET GETTING BARE

There's the picture. Washington's bread basket is getting bare. The farmers are mad. They can't get what they want.

One farmer hasn't worn underwear for 3 years because he couldn't get shirts and shorts when he wanted them. He doesn't care much if you eat or not.

He's discouraged. He's cutting down on his production. You will soon be cutting down on your diet.

But he may never be able to start up again if his best herds go to the slaughterhouse. His fields lie fallow, his help goes on relief. His deliberate, good-natured faith and will to carry on curls up and dies. He may quit for good. Some have already.

The farm problem soon may far overshadow any industrial troubles. Right now there's trouble around Washington. I know I saw it.

The Value of Meat in the Human Diet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an address I gave before the fifty-seventh annual convention of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association in Omaha on June 14, 1946, on the subject, The Value of Meat in the Human Diet:

Members and friends of the Nebraska Stock Growers' Association, I feel honored because you have invited me to attend the Stock Growers' annual meeting, for the third time. Last year I had the privilege of addressing you upon the subject of the Value of Meat in the Human Diet. Today I desire to enlarge somewhat upon this subject. I desire also to make some pertinent observations as to what Government regulations have been doing to the meat and food industry.

For the past several months I have been investigating rather thoroughly, the new approaches to the value of meat in the human diet. Several universities have been doing some extensive research on amino acids and proteins in meat and other foods. They are developing a microbiological method for the assay of 12 of the 22 amino acids in food. They are working closely with the Quartermaster Corps of the Army. Some of their findings, until recently, have been of a restricted nature, and some of this information has not yet been published. When the findings are published, they may well prove to be revolutionary and give us new knowledge in the field of nutrition.

Meat is essential in the human diet because it contains all of the essential minerals and amino acids needed by mankind. The

nations who are strong physically and mentally, consume meat.

It is a well-known fact that the people of India eat no meat or animal products. They have a population of about 470 people per square mile. It is estimated that there are something over 200,000,000 head of cattle in India, yet an average of 3,000,000 people starve to death every year. This has been true for the past 100 years. The Indian has a rigid diet of cereals and vegetables, and they certainly are not a physically strong race of people. In the past hundreds of years they have neglected to maintain the fertility of their soil or adopt modern methods of farming.

In my 20 years of medical practice I have had the opportunity of comparing some of the strong, healthy boys and girls of Nebraska, where they eat plenty of meat and other good foods, to those boys and girls of India, China, the Philippines, and similar countries. I vividly remember speaking to a group of children in China, and in India—those in the public schools. I remember similar groups of children crowding around the docks of Bombay, Ceylon, Calcutta, and Hong Kong. There was such a striking contrast of these half-starved, spindle-legged, pot-bellied, emaciated children, to those of our rosy-cheeked, well-muscled, and growing children of Nebraska. Nebraska has no children who need to be undernourished. These orientals crowd around incoming ships, patting their empty bellies and hold up begging arms, saying, "No papa—no mama—no whisky soda," which, in our language, they are trying to say, "We need food."

Starvation is rampant in this world today. Many children and older people never have a full belly. It is not uncommon to see the Chinese, Hindu, and children of the Orient digging up roots, eating grasshoppers and cats and dogs. I am convinced that the garbage pails of many American families would feed several families in the starvation areas.

Well-cooked meat is appetizing and tastes good. It stimulates the flow of the digestive juices from the mouth to the stomach, and this aids digestion. Meat is important because the proteins and the essential amino acids in meat make up a part of every cell, tissue, and organ in your body. The proteins are needed to make blood, supply the glands, to repair tissue, and produce energy for work. Nature has so endowed no other food with essential vitamins and minerals as it has meat. Meat is a masterpiece of nature's laboratories. The muscles, the glands, and the corpuscles of our body are constantly in need of meat, its amino acids and proteins. The proteins in meat provide the necessary repair parts which must be carried on continuously to keep this complex human machine of ours working satisfactory. They are not carried in reserve and are 98 percent digestible after being cooked.

Research laboratories have discovered that there are 22 amino acids in meat. Our body needs 12 of these acids in order to keep healthy. The proteins, the acids, and vitamins in meat are required for that growing boy and the working man and woman.

When your youngster at home eats hearty meals 3 times a day and raids mother's cupboard for jellies and other foods, it shows he is in buoyant, vigorous health. When he goes out and picks a quarrel with his brother or the neighbor's boy and they try their strength in wrestling or some other physical feat like rope climbing, jumping or lifting the calf in the barnyard, it tells a real story. That youngster has vigorous health because he has had the proper minerals and vitamins which make his muscles and body grow. It means the glands of his body, with its hormones and internal secretions, are functioning properly. He has had the proper amount of proteins and vitamins, from the day he was born, through the nursing and growing period of boyhood to manhood. This means vigorous, buoyant health.

Science has learned a great deal about nutrition in the last quarter of a century. There is much still to be learned. The University of California has explored the field of feeding both livestock and human beings. They have found that proteins are not properly utilized unless they contain an adequate supply of phridoxine or one of the vitamins of the B group. Deprive the animal or the human being of phridoxine and vitamin B, and you will find that the human and the animal will show muscular weakness, severe anemia and, frequently, convulsions. Further studies will show that the cause of many of the ills of both animals and human beings, which up to now have baffled the medical and veterinary sciences, is directly due to improper diets.

The Nebraska College of Agriculture has carried on some interesting feeding experiments. They have shown in many tests that for each pound of protein supplement fed to calves, being wintered on prairie hay, the calves made an additional pound or more of gain. In other words, 1 pound of soybean-oil meal, worth between 3 and 4 cents, and fed with prairie hay, produced more than an extra pound of beef, over the calves which had hay alone. The beef should be worth between 16 and 18 cents a pound. These calves were weighing 450 and 575 pounds apiece, and they never had corn or any other grain. At the end of the wintering trial, they needed only a short period in the feed lot on grain, hay and supplement or in the pasture on grain, grass, and supplement, to make very satisfactory beef animals.

Plants and animals are composed of the same chemical elements, but there is a great difference in the proportions and forms in which these elements are acquired. The proteins in vegetables cannot entirely replace animal proteins in the human diet. This is due to the great variety of amino acids in animal protein. The animal must have certain proteins and minerals if they are to grow and become healthy. If the animal lacks calcium there may be weakened bones, stiffness of the legs, swollen joints, rickets and milk fever. A lack of phosphorus results in bone chewing, poor growth, and poor reduction. A lack of iodine means enlarged neck or goiters in calves and young animals. It means hairless pigs. The lack of iron and copper means pale blood, pale skin color, faded hair and so-called "thumps" in pigs. A lack of magnesium means a nervous animal with poor appetite and tendency to convulsions. The type of food produced in grains is directly tied to the fertility of the soil. Lack of fertilizer means that the plants will lack many essential minerals which the animal craves.

The Shetland pony was originally a horse brought to the island from England. Its size could be attributed to poor soil and food. It took but two generations on our rich soil to make the Shetland pony a horse.

The richness of the soil in the Kentucky blue grass region has been recognized for years, and breeders of race horses have taken over this region. Horses raised on the limestone origin and grasses of Kentucky have stronger bones, sounder muscles and nerves than the breeds raised elsewhere. A 2-year-old horse raised in the blue grass region of Kentucky attains a maturity size sooner than that of a 3-year old on less fertile soil.

Yes, we miserable human beings who weigh about 150 pounds are made up of about 6 pounds of minerals. That is what would be left if we were cremated. The balance is oxygen, hydrogen, carbons, and some of us have a generous supply of hot air. These 6 pounds of minerals, which you get from the soil, are just as essential to your life as the 144 pounds of other elements from the air and the water. The ability of this human machine to withstand the stress and strain, and all the abuses it takes, depends upon the supply of minerals in your body. The nutrition the human body gets depends upon the chemical contents of the plants consumed by the animals, and the nutritional value of the plants consumed by the animal and then the man. This all depends upon the mineral elements the soil yields to the plants.

In times of food shortages, the primary protein foods of animal origin are usually the first to be affected. Cereals and grains can be stored. The time to raise them is rather short—usually one season. Vegetables and fruits can be raised in a short time. Such protein foods as meat cannot be replenished so quickly. A shortage once established may take years to overcome.

In closing this part of my talk on the value of meat in the human diet, let me again stress the importance of protein. Proteins are important because every cell, every tissue, and every organ in the body needs and contains protein. Proteins are needed to repair tissue; they mean new growth and new tissue in the child. In pregnancy they are required to develop the coming child. Meat above all foods has proteins of high quality. Meat contains the essential amino acids required for good health.

Mr. Speaker, it is hoped that the several Government agencies dealing with food, and particularly meat, will make no move which will further decrease the supply of meat for human consumption. There have been many signs on the horizon that the feeding of grain to animals might be prohibited. If this should be done, it would greatly decrease the amount of meat for human consumption. The animal must have some grain if his carcass is to be grade A or better. A small amount of soybean meal and grain can greatly increase not only the quantity but the quality of meat.

Scientific studies now being made reveal how important a part meat plays in keeping not only the individual but the Nation strong and energetic. A free unhampered cattle industry producing meat must be preserved if the essential pattern of free enterprise and initiative in our democracy is to endure.

Memorial Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include the following beautiful address delivered by our former and able colleague, Hon. Louis E. Miller, before the Lawyers Association of St. Louis at its annual memorial exercises on Wednesday, May 29, 1946:

Mr. MILLER. If Your Honor please—

"There is no friend like an old friend
Who has shared our morning days;
No greeting like his welcome,
No homage like his praise.

"Fame is the scentless sunflower,
With gaudy crown of gold,
But friendship is the breathing rose
With perfume in every fold."

A portion of this day has been set aside from our active calendar to commemorate the memory of our departed colleagues. This is not so much a day of sorrow as it is a day for retrospection and reflection. This day

has the dignity and tenderness of funeral rites without the sadness.

Some years ago a famous agnostic asserted that life is a narrow veil between the cold and barren peaks of two eternities. He beheld life as a wasted wandering through a desolate wilderness, surrounded on all sides by dismay and despair.

What an empty description to give to a thrilling adventure; what a weakness of words; what an abominable absence of faith in the sublime promise of the greatest teacher of all times. To me—and I am certain to all of you—life has been a journey, full of fine and worth-while contacts, priceless friendships, and hallowed memories. Life to the philosophical traveler is a journey through green valleys where we hear the murmur of the brook as it wends its way to the sea of eternity; where man is born, exults in youth, attains maturity, works, and succeeds according to his abilities and his ambition to win. In springtime as in youth we watch the trees and plants shooting their buds, which eventually burst forth into a profusion of foliage and flowers, while in the skies our feathered friends thrill us from dawn to dusk with their melodious symphonies. In midday as we stop in the peaceful shade beside the stream of life, we contemplate the goodness and the greatness of our Creator while before us pass in rich review cherished friendships that have become treasured milestones in the journey of life.

In the fullness of autumn when the golden glow is on all nature, we reap what we have sown. It is then that we gather the fruits of our labor and the blessings of well-spent lives devoted to the service of others.

"Sculptors of life are we
With our own lives uncarved before us,
Awaiting the hour when at God's command
Our life dream passes o'er us."

When the life dream described by Oliver Wendell Holmes passed over our fallen colleagues, they awoke to find themselves standing ready to chisel from the marble of tomorrow, enduring monuments of integrity and truth. To have dreamed a dream, to have striven for the attainment of that vision, and then to have at least come into a small degree of realization of one's ideals, is a combination of pleasure and grief that fills the cup of the average practitioner. This is true of those whose memory we honor today. They were incorruptible and honest. They were sincere and dependable. In any contest they were worthy opponents; in any society they were genial and charming company and in any life theirs was a friendship worth forming and keeping. We can draw inspiration from their lives and try to emulate the fine example and high standard of service which they set. Death coming at any time is a tragedy. However, coming as it did in the zenith of the lives of most of those whom we honor and as they were approaching the fullness of their capacity to serve, makes our loss and their leaving the more profound and irreparable.

The practice of law is an exacting profession. It calls for constant courage, absolute fidelity to duty, relentless effort and unswerving faith in our fellow practitioners. Perhaps no other profession is so rich in opportunity for real service to the community and to the country.

Service is the rent we pay for the space we occupy in this world. Next to the ministry, the law is the noblest profession. It has given to the Government some of its finest sons and daughters. From the first Continental Congress down to the present time, those of our profession have been the architects of our form of government. In these troublesome times there is a need for men and women of the legal profession in government. Too often do we hear the chant of predatory peoples for a change; and too often do those without legal training and experience steer the ship of state from it constitutional course into and upon the shoals of their own stupid and selfish projects. The legal profession is the anchorage of a free government, a beacon light of hope to the persecuted in this and other less-favored lands. To us, it is hard to understand how an individual, or a group, can find in their hearts the will to persecute those of other creeds, races, or colors. We accept the doctrine that God created man in his own image, and that such persecution is a rejection of divine dogma and a reversion to barbarism.

These difficult days are freighted with complex and vexatious problems. At times we almost despair of the future and can scarcely see a star of hope in all the heavens. For a solution, the Nation must turn to those trained in law, who really believe in our form of government and who are willing to sustain it despite the temporary temptation to follow the mouthings of the mob.

These times cry aloud for honest, wise, and fearless leadership—leadership that is consecrated wholeheartedly to what is best for the world and particularly to what is best for America. The call is for those who are willing to submerge themselves in the cause of the many. Such persons are to be found wherever patriotic men and women meet and it is upon them that the hope, safety, and perpetuity of this Republic depends. God give us men who are not afraid to brave the smear of an un-American opposition or the storm and contumely of passing whims, prejudices, and passions. God forsake us not in this troublous hour when courage appears to have taken flight and reason sometimes totters on her throne. We have passed through many similar and worse experiences in the past.

To remedy present-day ills and maladjustments, will need time, thought, and effort, but a people resolved to find an answer to these problems will discover and supply them as surely as the rising of tomorrow's sun. We will not, we can not fail to do so. What will come out of the travail and suffering that mankind is now undergoing? It is for us to decide. Shall it be economic and political slavery or continued freedom—freedom to dare, to venture, to achieve, or are we henceforth to live the lives of weak and helpless wards of the State? Rather should we not resolve to remain human eagles free to soar to loftier heights, to attain yet nobler objectives, to accomplish yet greater things? Again, the answer rests with ourselves.

The true spirit of America is epitomized in a statue erected to the memory of the pioneer woman situated on the Old National Trail some miles east of Washington, Pa. There she stands, self-reliant, unafraid with a babe in arm, an older child clutching her skirt, armed with a squirrel rifle, peering earnestly ahead for hidden dangers which she fears for her brood, but cannot see. Strong, brave, self-reliant she typifies the America we all revere. She it was who made possible the development of this great country we all love. We have had transmitted to us a heritage of bravery, self-reliance and confidence in ourselves and in our destiny, which gave us the strength and the will to make this the greatest Nation of which there is recorded history. Today we miss the wise counsel and advice as well as the warm friendships of our departed colleagues. We must cling to the will and the wish to create, to build a better and a greater America. There are subversive influences which would undermine the foundations upon which the Republic rests. Here there can be room only for those who love our country, honor our institutions, and revere our traditions. To those who do not subscribe to these requirements they must seek haven in other lands. Here there can be no divided allegiance. America must be first and never second in the thinking and conduct of anyone who calls himself a citizen.

Since our last Memorial Day, 24 members of our profession have answered the last call of the docket of life. For them the turbulence of this forum has subsided. Today they have their place in a higher body, where strife, objections, exceptions and appeals are unknown. While they are no longer with us in flesh, their spirit is ever with us and the memory of their labors here is an inspiration to us to carry on. Their names are written in letters of living light on the scroll of service to their profession and their fellow men. They are not dead, they are merely away. "I am the Resurrection and the Life. He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."

As we face the future in the aftermath of the most colossal war in the world's history, we find that it has shaken civilization to its foundations; bankrupted governments, upset their economies, and touched the hearts and darkened the homes of countless thousands with sorrow.

And as we approach that phase of the aftermath of this ordeal we might well ask ourselves, for what is all this sacrifice? For commercial profits? No. For the political gain or personal glory of those who were engaged in the management of this maelstrom of misery? No. For the extinction of a few mad men from the face of the earth largely because of our own neglect of the world's morality? Not this alone is our aim, imperative as it is and must be, to eliminate such criminals from the midst of law-abiding persons, but something more.

The peoples of the world will have lost this war if it ends in a mere conference of victors which know only how to fashion the trade, the economics, the boundaries, and the resources of the nations who won the victory. For war that merely divides the spoils or rearranges the possessions of the vanquished will not have been worth the effort. This last war was a warning to the whole human race—it seems explainable in no other way—a warning that man cannot rely on the rules of pragmatic science or the greed of commercial selfishness to set up a system of human behavior. We need advocate no Utopian formula that divides all wealth into equal parts and merely waits until the more talented acquire what their less talented brethren forfeit in the competitive game of life.

We have tried the way of materialism and it is inadequate. We have tried the road of mechanized achievement. Although it conquers time and space, it is helpless without the triumphs of the human spirit that must accompany gains in the realm of invention and discovery.

We have tried the life of intellectual attainment, its scholarly approaches and its masterpieces of arts and letters. While they help to develop the mental stature of man, they do not by themselves light the pathway of human endeavor. Indeed, in none of these byways, where ambition beckons, can we find the great goal of life itself. We can find the guideposts—the stop and go signs—of tomorrow's world if we accept humbly the markings set forth for us by the Great Leader of all times. Through the centuries have the road maps come to us. Through the centuries have we too often chosen to imagine that another way of life, another route, is better until war at last—the leveler of us all—dramatizes the meaning of life itself.

By bringing death closer, this war has made life plainer. And what could be plainer than Lincoln's simple words of memorial—that it is for us the living to make sure that they who die shall not have died in vain.

In death the age-old question is asked. "If man die shall he live again?" I am not a theologian and have but scant knowledge of the scriptures, however, I count myself one of the followers of the lowly Nazarene. The message that he brought to this earth has

been such as to inspire those who believe in him to undergo persecution, oppression, and ridicule, witout complaint. Many have suffered exile from their homeland and even martyrdom for its sake, but their faith always saw them through, and with the passing of time, their number has increased until the cross has been carried into every corner of the earth. To countless millions it has become a symbol of hope, a refuge in time of storm.

Religion has been assailed times without number, but none have been able to offer anything substantial or tangible in its place. It has been, is, and ever will be the greatest known balm and source of comfort to mankind. It greets us at the cradle, sustains us throughout a trying life, and through its generous and merciful ministrations enables us to face the end with hope, with courage, and with fortitude.

To the sorrowing mother who grieves over the loss of her child; to the abandoned Magdalene who walks the streets; to the man who has lost his faith; to the wayward son who roams the earth; to the cynic who scoffs and doubts—to these and to all mankind the promises of the Saviour come as a solace in their hour of darkest despair. It is then, when one and all turn to Him for hope, peace, and comfort. There is, there can be no other outlet for our heart's desire. In Him rests the hopes of mankind. Without that hope life would be a vast black void.

He has promised us eternal life free from pain and doubt and despair. We know that he has prepared a place for his followers where they shall some day gather, where broken family ties will be reunited, where cherished friendships will be renewed. What a precious promise; what a glorious fulfillment.

"Death is only a quiet door,
Set in a garden wall;
On gentle hinges it gives, at dusk
When the thrushes call.
Along the lintel are green leaves,
Beyond, the light lies still;
Where willing and weary feet
Go over that sill.
There is nothing to trouble any heart,
Nothing to hurt at all.
Death is only a quiet door,
In an old garden wall."

And to our departed comrades whom we memorialize today, I utter the sincere prayer, in the faith that I have, that when their dying eyes began to read the mystic meaning of death they heard in the silence of the receding night the great waves breaking upon the farther shore and upon their wasted brows they have already felt the breath of eternal happiness.

Address by Hon. Richard B. Russell, of Georgia, Before University of Georgia Alumni Society

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the alumni society of the University of Georgia, at Athens, Ga., on June 13.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is the first meeting of the alumni society since the end of World War II. Our university has gone through six of our country's wars—the War of 1812, the War with Mexico, the War Between the States, the Spanish-American War, World War I, and the greatest of all wars, World War II.

This institution has grown and expanded with our State and Nation, and more of the sons and daughters of old Georgia participated in World War II than in any of the other conflicts. More of them gave their lives in their country's service. As we meet here today, it is but fitting that we should pay tribute to those from this institution who played well their part in every theater of war and on each of the seven seas where armed forces of our country were deployed against our aggressors. The sentiment in every heart is, "Tears for those who made the supreme sacrifice and will not return—cheers and all honor to those who were spared and came back to us."

We may take great pride not only in the heroic service of our fellow alumni, but in the whole-hearted devotion with which this institution was dedicated to the war effort. Its staff and all of its facilities were unstintingly placed at the disposal of the War and Navy Departments, and the official records at Washington disclose the notable contribution made by our alma mater in the mobilization and training of the civilians who won the war.

It is likewise gratifying to know, now that the war is ended, that the greater part of the student body, which overtaxes the capacity of this school, is composed of veterans who are now undertaking to make up for the time spent in their country's service. All of these things add to the glory of the institution that we love and affectionately hail as alma mater.

Americans are not a militaristic people. We have never maintained considerable military forces in time of peace. As before, the outbreak of war found us unprepared. I shall not deal with the miraculous achievement of a free people in organizing the finest army and navy in the world and forging the weapons of war, not only for ourselves but for our allies. Suffice it to say that our civilian armies, composed of men who had been taunted as too soft and too spoiled to fight, proved themselves the superiors of the professional soldiers of the Axis Powers. The foul attack at Pearl Harbor unified our people as one, and enabled us to again crush our enemies in battle.

VJ-day brought World War II to an end. We are now engaged in the great struggle to build the machinery for a permanent peace.

The most costly and oft-repeated mistake of mankind is the erroneous idea that victory in war brings peace. Since the earliest recorded history, men have gone forth to die in battle in the mistaken belief that by overcoming an enemy on the field of battle they could assure peace in their time and spare their children the horrors of war. Until now mankind has never learned the oft-told lesson of history that peace cannot be assured merely by winning a war.

The men of my generation won a war in 1918, and thought that thereby we had brought about permanent peace. Again history showed that permanent peace cannot be assured by crushing the aggressor of the hour. Within a quarter of a century three times as many young Americans as were called in 1917–18 were compelled to leave their homes to save our common country and our cherished institutions.

Victory brings a cessation of hostilities. It may destroy some dictator and his scheme of world domination which threatens mankind everywhere. Victory in battle may put down the forces of aggression for the time being, but it has never secured the establishment of permanent peace. The yearnings for peace in the hearts and minds of the people of the earth are always infinitely greater just after the sacrifices of war. The human tendency to forget in periods of armistice we have experienced between wars has heretofore lulled people into a false sense of security. It has caused them to refrain from making the sacrifices necessary to assure a permanent peace.

Those who gave their all, and all those who sacrificed in any degree in the greatest of all world conflicts from which we have just emerged, suffered that their loved ones and their fellow countrymen might enjoy the blessings of peace. They had before them the ideal of the right of all men everywhere to be free, to stand upright without fear, to live and to work and to strive to succeed, and to hold such views on religion and government as they might choose in a blessed atmosphere of permanent peace.

Despite the yearning for peace in the hearts of the common men everywhere, we are confronted with the bald fact that the obstacles and the difficulties in the way of a complete world understanding to bring about peace and freedom are greater than they were even in 1918. It is little wonder that the faint-hearted are discouraged. However, the danger which menaces civilization is so great that we must resolve to contribute as patriotically and as unselfishly to the peace offensive as did the men who stormed the beaches of Normandy and Iwo Jima. There must be some way, somehow, to bring into reality that day of permanent peace for which people everywhere in the world are praying and hoping. We must not become discouraged or deterred from our sacred purpose. We must realize each and every day that our duty to labor for peace was not relieved by the surrender in the red schoolhouse at Reims or on the decks of the battleship *Missouri*.

As civilization has progressed through the years, each generation has evolved weapons of increasing destruction. World War II was not only the bloodiest and most destructive war that the world has yet seen but it ushered in the atomic age. The sacrifices of those who fell should have been a sufficient challenge to the world to create a system of settling disputes without war. It had not done so in the past. Even the great destruction of this war might not have sufficed to bring about world sanity if the bomb which fell on Hiroshima had not posed so dire a threat to world survival.

As a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy, I sat through several weeks of hearings on matters related to this lethal weapon. As I listened to the scientists describe the bombs of Nagasaki and Hiroshima as being near the bow-and-arrow stage as compared with the possibilities of future bombs, I could not escape the feeling that I was living in another world. If men resort to war again, with the great development of planes and rockets and atomic bombs, the war will be over in a matter of hours, and the casualty list will be so great that the few survivors will probably never compile it. The human family is faced with the grim necessity of learning how to live together in peace or of preparing to die together in an atomic war.

Isolationism is all but dead in this country. It is our duty to see that it is not revived. The clearly established foreign policy of the United States is to meet all of the other nations of the earth more than half way in reaching agreements for a just peace and for the settlement of future disagreements which may arise, without resort to war.

We are not an imperialistic people, and in the very nature of our institutions we will never be an aggressor against other nations. Our representatives have gone into every

conference of nations with clean hands and no cards up their sleeves. We not only contributed to all of our allies during the war but are today making enormous loans and expending large sums of money in the effort to prevent world suffering and to restore the ravages of war.

We have acceded to every reasonable demand of our great Russian ally for security. Some of the concessions that we have made hardly seem justified, but in our effort to allay all suspicion and to give evidence of our good faith we made them. Despite all our concessions the victors have not been able to agree upon a peace treaty with Germany, Italy, and Japan, and the wheels of the United Nations have been stalled by the use of the veto power in every matter involving Russia.

It is difficult in our fair land of freedom to understand why there should be any great trouble in men of sound sense and good will getting together and building an enduring structure of peace. During the war we clothed all of the Allied Nations with the cloak of democracy, and made the issue a war between democracy and dictatorship. In war phraseology, the dictatorship of the Communists in Russia and the dictatorship of Chiang Kai-shek in China were lumped together as democracies. Our admiration for the fighting powers of the Russians and the capacity for resistance displayed by the Chinese was so great we fostered the myth that these dictatorships were all democracies under the skin with us and the British.

If we are to make a frank approach to the problems before us, we must now admit that the wartime honeymoon of these dictatorships with American and British democracy was a marriage of convenience. We will never successfully deal with the problem of world peace if we do not pull our heads out of the sand and face conditions as they really exist.

The efforts of the representatives of our Government to build an enduring structure of world peace are in the very nature of things difficult enough. Their strivings to maintain the supremacy of man in the contest with statism and to work out a fair peace are certainly not made any easier by the self-styled superliberals in this country who defend and plausibly explain every demand of the Russians, whether in the Balkans, in Korea, or in north Africa, while parroting Pravda and Moscow radio with the patent falsehood that our Government is imperialistic in its designs.

I have no quarrel with communism in Russia if that be the form of government the Russians desire. I do have an unspeakable contempt for the fellow travelers in this country who seek to poison the minds of the unthinking by their subtle attacks on the men of good will in positions of responsibility in our Government whose only aim is an enduring peace. These fellow travelers have adopted the primary propaganda principle of all those who have hated democracy in recent history that if you will get up a big enough falsehood and reiterate it loudly and often enough the masses of the people will eventually accept it as truth.

There is no difference of opinion expressed in Russia over the views of the Communist government on any international question. There are many sound reasons for this apparent unanimity of opinion. In this country, freedom of speech is being sorely abused. One group is openly communistic, and in a recent meeting in Madison Square Garden urged their sympathizers and fellow travelers to encourage strikes in every section of the United States, to seek to prevent amicable adjustment of any labor dispute, and to try in every possible way to disrupt our economy in the critical reconversion period. To their credit, be it said that this group boldly wears the badge of communism and openly advocates measures to destroy our form of government. They are not as dangerous as the group that denies the communistic label, and who work under cover.

In the halls of Congress, representatives elected by the American people have denounced our country as being imperialistic while finding excuses for Russian policies. Within the past few weeks employees of the Federal Government met in Atlantic City and organized a union. They proceeded to pass resolutions denouncing the United States and Great Britain for not immediately removing troops from various war sections. One delegate offered a motion to include a denunciation of Russia for the same reason. He was howled down and the original resolution was adopted.

This same union adopted a constitution which in effect asserts the right to strike against the Federal Government. Without exception every President of the United States has stated that there is no such thing as a right to strike against the Government. This is true for the very simple reason that a government which can be strike-bound is not a government at all.

There is such a thing as abuse of freedom of speech, and the spectacle of Government employees evincing their allegiance to a foreign nation while on the pay roll of the United States comes in that category. I believe that there are enough loyal American citizens to fill every position in our Government, and that the time is at hand when this issue must be determined once and for all.

Those of our leaders who have the onerous duty of devising and defending our foreign policy are of course properly subject to criticism in a free state, but they should be spared attacks in the back by employees of their Government on such wild and unfounded charges while carrying on their negotiations.

The Russian press and radio seek to capitalize on these attacks. The teeming millions who live within the "iron curtain" have no other source of news, and they of course assume that these attacks upon American foreign policy represent a large measure of public opinion in the United States, and that instead of pursuing a policy of altruism we are engaging in an international grab game and imposing upon the rights of the weak.

Every loyal American citizen, while reserving the right of constructive criticism, will support the efforts of our Government to bring about a United Nations Organization upon which both the weak nations and the strong may rely for equal justice.

Unfortunate though it may be, power is still the dominant factor in world politics. The voice of our representatives who are engaged in critical international negotiations will soon be muted if we pursue a policy of demobilization and disarmament which renders us impotent as a military power. Neither can we discharge our obligations to the United Nations without maintaining a strong military establishment.

Military service in time of peace is not attractive to the average American. However, thousands had died to win the victory. It is unthinkable that any considerable number of our young men should be unwilling to do their part after the dangers of battle are past to contribute to making secure the peace. Permanent peace is the most priceless gift which could be bestowed upon the world, and it cannot be achieved without some sacrifice.

It is all too evident now that permanent peace cannot be secured by mere platitudes nor written formula. The United Nations must be given the strength and virility which will enable it to function in the cause of peace. This will be hard and tedious work. We must exhaust every possibility to come to an understanding with Russia. Without it we cannot be assured of peace. There is no danger of war in 5 years, or probably 10, but unless all of the peoples of the earth accept in good faith the structure of international accord which we are seeking to build through United Nations, we will plant the seeds of another war which will bear awesome fruit in the next generation.

Our relations with our allies as we seek agreement must be maintained with the dignity befitting our position as a great nation. We must strive for tolerance and understanding of the viewpoint of others. This does not mean appeasement and surrender, for we have learned through sad experience that this will not work. Conditions do not justify military alliances with any one or two nations. Such a step would be sure to confirm the ill-founded suspicions which now divide us. We must depend upon the consuming desire for peace which is universally a part of human sentiments and instincts in all countries, and by seeking to appeal to that sentiment, and dealing with patience and firmness and with infinite labor, we will not fail.

The most important contribution which can be made by the average man is to present the same unity of purpose in the fight for peace which made us invincible in time of war. Unity of purpose and an unselfish desire for peace on the part of all the free peoples of the earth will eventually make itself felt even through the so-called "iron curtain." Such a spirit of solidarity, stemming from the hearts of all freemen, will eventually prevail over an apparent solidarity imposed upon the many through fear of the ruthless power of a few men.

We are far from that unity today. Unrest and confusion always follow in the wake of war. It is not surprising that there is so much confusion in our country today, now that we have found momentary release from the common danger which cemented us together during the war.

If we are to properly support the efforts of our country to bring sanity and agreement to the international front, we must eliminate the internal strife which plagues us today. Production was the key to victory in the war. Reconversion and production are today the key to victory in the fight for permanent peace. We must forego the fight for personal and selfish vantage to forge the weapons for peace.

Our representatives at international conferences hear the confusion of voices and the din of strife at home, with men offering old panaceas which have failed and new definitions which fit selfish purposes. In recent weeks there has been much discussion of a proper definition of modern liberalism and as to what constitutes a political liberal. This debate has brought forth some strange concepts. There are those in public life who take the position that to be a true liberal one must advocate revealing all of the secrets of atomic energy to all the world before having any agreement through the United Nations denying the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes or any provision for inspection to see that no nation seeks to take advantage of others by preparing for atomic warfare. In this group are usually found those who take the position that every demand made by Russia in international affairs is always right and that the United States is an imperialistic power for opposing Russian policies anywhere in the world.

Such people usually undertake to prove their liberalism in domestic affairs by proclaiming that they have never voted for any bill which organized labor opposed or against any bill which organized labor advocated. I do not accept this definition of liberalism. I refuse to let people belonging to that school of thought define liberalism for me.

The American people demand liberal policies on the part of their Government. Such policies are necessary to make us strong at home and respected abroad. However, in our

quest for international understanding the great masses of our people expect reciprocity from the other nations of the earth, and demand that they be protected from any threat of aggression from any source until the United Nations is generally accepted and clothed with the authority and power to assure world peace.

To make our Nation strong at home, the true liberal believes in the greatest measure of individual freedom for each man within his own sphere, so long as he does not impinge on the rights of another individual or threaten the welfare of the whole. A true liberal believes in equal rights to all. That means equality before the law and equality of opportunity for all of our people. It does not mean that you can equalize the wealth of the country by dividing it up at stated intervals. God created men with different aims in life. He did not create them as exact equals in talents, in ability, or in degree of ambition. Government administered by men can and should work for equality of opportunity, and for those measures of security which do not require the surrender of freedom. But it can never completely equalize the lives of all of the people of the state without total regimentation and the destruction of all individual liberties

Under my conception of liberalism, the state cannot tolerate monopoly in any form. This is true because monopoly is the natural enemy of individual freedom and the free state. A democracy cannot tolerate a political monopoly whereby a few men impose their will upon the many. We have long waged war with economic monopoly, the great combines in finance which have denied individuals an opportunity to improve their lots in life and threatened control of the free government of the majority.

Within the past few months our Government, and indeed the very lives of our people, have been threatened by strikes against the Government. This is a form of monopoly. It has focused the attention of the people upon the importance of fair and just legislation which will place upon organized labor a responsibility toward the public interest in some manner commensurate with its present position of power. This legislation should not and must not deny the right of labor to strike in ordinary circumstances, or the right to organize into unions of their own choice, or to collective bargaining. It should in no way hinder or discourage the age-old aspiration of the toiler to a higher standard of living and the better things of life. But on the fundamental principle that no single group of men can assume a power which threatens the Government formed to protect the public interest and to protect the welfare of all the people, labor must recognize that the public interest and the welfare of all is paramount to the rights of any group.

An arrogant labor leader can be as dangerous to the life and health of the American people as an arrogant captain of finance. Both must be brought to recognize that they possess no right which is not subordinate to the Government which protects them.

I am sustained by the profound conviction that the sound common sense of the majority of the American people will make the proper verdict on the many perplexing questions which confront us. I believe that we will work our way out of this welter of confusion to a higher ground than that which we have known. We will not seek to attain unity by crushing one group for the benefit of another, but by holding firm not only to the form but the spirit of democracy.

I have an abiding faith that the men and women who have passed through these classic halls and who constitute the membership of the alumni society will be found in the forefront of the fight against tyranny in any form, either at home or abroad. We will not succeed in securing universal acceptance of the principles of the United Nations Organization merely by damning communism or totalitarianism in any form. We can only achieve that end by making democracy work in these United States as a lesson to the world. We will not make democracy work in these United States merely by damning either capital or labor or any other segment. We can only make democracy work by practicing it in our daily lives and taking the time and the trouble to measure up to the responsibilities of citizenship in this great Republic.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 18 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project, Its Contribution to the Country's Postwar Economy," delivered by Hon. Leland Olds, Chairman, Federal Power Commission, at a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project meeting, Syracuse, N. Y., on May 27, 1946.

I have received from the Government Printing Office an estimate which indicates that the manuscript will exceed by one-half page the two printed pages allowed under the rule without a statement of cost. The estimate shows that the cost will be $150.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT—ITS CONTRIBUTION TO THE COUNTRY'S POSTWAR ECONOMY

You have asked me to talk about the St. Lawrence project. And, although I come from an agency which is primarily concerned with electric power, I am going to speak of the seaway and power project as a whole—because the navigation and power developments should be considered inseparable. Taken together they offer this region and the country one of the outstanding water resource projects of the world. I am sure that no other nation would have failed to take advantage of such an opportunity for growth.

Before giving you a more detailed view of some aspects of the project, which incidentally have been grossly misrepresented by the short-sighted interests which oppose it, let me summarize briefly what it offers the workers and farmers and business interests of this region.

The St. Lawrence project will assure a tremendous development of new industry, providing more jobs and wages for industrial workers, not only in New York and Vermont, but also throughout the Great Lakes area.

The St. Lawrence project will thus provide much broader business opportunities for wholesale and retail trade, as well as for the many service occupations in the region, enabling it to support a larger population, particularly in the areas which have been under developed.

The St. Lawrence project will thus offer the farms of the region all the advantages in the way of profitable operation which flow from an expanding local market for their products. Dairy, fruit and truck farms will no longer suffer from the disadvantages of dependence on the more remote markets represented by great metropolitan centers.

The St. Lawrence project, by thus expanding taxable wealth in the region, will reduce the burden of taxes.

The St. Lawrence project will assure much larger participation of the industries of the region in foreign trade by improving the competitive position of its products in the markets of the world.

The St. Lawrence project will assure much lower electric rates for homes and farms in New York State and New England. This will encourage a great increase in the use of electricity, with a resulting stimulus to the market for electric appliances and farm equipment.

Taking all of these effects together, the St. Lawrence project will assure more high-class transportation business for the great railroads which service the region, more business for the cities which serve as its commercial centers, and ultimately more business for the entire country.

For in this country today we are all interdependent. Gains in one region, like a pebble dropped in a pool, create concentric waves of stimulus to business which ultimately reach out to all the confines of the land.

These are not unsupported general assertions. They are based on years of detailed study of all aspects of the project and the region which it will serve. And I will now proceed to give you a few facts to support these conclusions.

ST. LAWRENCE POWER IS CHEAP POWER

St. Lawrence power is very cheap power. The Aluminum Co. of America recognized it and wanted to develop it. The power companies recognized it and wanted to develop it. No honest man can deny it.

The powerhouse, which the New York Power Authority will operate, will provide each year about six and one-half billion kilowatt-hours of electricity, at an average cost, before it goes on the transmission lines, of about 1 mill (one-tenth of a cent) per kilowatt-hour. That is less than one-third of what it would cost to generate the same power in the lowest-cost steam station which could be placed a the same location.

The Federal Power Commission staff has made a thorough study of the cost of this power transmitted to various cities in New York and New England. The results are shown in the following figures, which include interest and depreciation on the entire investment in power plant and transmission facilities:

	Total cost, mills per kilowatt-hour delivered		
	100 per-cent load factor	80 per-cent load factor	60 per-cent load factor
High tension bus, Barnhardt Island	1.014	1.014	1.014
Burlington	1.60	1.73	1.84
Springfield	1.91	2.10	2.26
Utica	1.55	1.66	1.76
Schenectady	1.75	1.91	2.05
Poughkeepsie	2.03	2.26	2.45
Binghamton	1.75	1.91	2.05
New York	2.24	2.51	2.74

In broad terms these figures show that St. Lawrence power can be generated and delivered throughout New York and New England at an average cost of about 2.2 mills for 80-percent load factor power. This closely approximates the cost of power delivered from such Columbia River plants as Bonneville and Grand Coulee in the Pacific Northwest.

This is less than the bare operating costs of existing steam stations in the region, which in 1944 ranged from 2.5 to 5 mills without taking into account any return on invest-

ment. Actually, electric energy from the St. Lawrence project would, in most instances, cost less than fuel costs alone at the more efficient existing steam-electric plants.

If, instead of building the St. Lawrence power plant to supply power for the growing needs of the region, the present power systems were to build the best modern steam plants in the several market areas, the average over-all cost of producing the necessary energy would be over 5 mills per kilowatt-hour, or approximately two and a half times the cost of St. Lawrence power delivered to the same areas.

These figures show how silly, or dishonest, is the argument of opponents that you people here in New York State could get your power more cheaply from steam-power plants.

ST. LAWRENCE POWER WILL FIND A MARKET

Studies by the staff of the Federal Power Commission show that there will be an ample market for St. Lawrence power without taking into account the tremendous stimulus to demand for power which will result from the very availability of this cheap electricity. There is no question about it.

In 1945 the region was already using 34,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, or nearly six times the output of the proposed St. Lawrence power plant. From 1927 to 1940 the increase in the region's energy requirements was running at an annual average rate of more than 5 percent.

An average annual rate of growth of more than 6 percent from 1940 to 1950 is clearly indicated. Assuming only half that rate of growth after 1950, it appears that the region will require additional capacity equivalent to at least two St. Lawrence projects before the development can be completed even if it is undertaken immediately. Actually, the utility companies already have plans under way for new generating capacity nearly equivalent to that of the proposed project.

POTENTIAL GROWTH OF RESIDENTIAL AND FARM MARKET

But the present low average use of electricity by homes and farms in the region provides an even stronger assurance that St. Lawrence power will be readily absorbed if marketed under the plan of the New York Power Authority for assuring much lower rates.

In this connection I want to call your attention to certain results developed from the Federal Power Commission's long study of typical electric bills throughout the United States. The results of that study are published each year in a report showing such bills for various classes of consumption for all communities of more than 2,500 population.

I will ask you to look at a map of the United States which was included in the 1945 report. It gives a bird's eye view of comparative residential rate levels by States, using the average bill for 100 kilowatt-hours a month as the measure. States in which the average bill for this service was under $3.50 are shown in white. States in which the bills average between $3.50 and $4.50 are shown in gray. States in which the average bills range above $4.50 are shown in black.

You will note that, except for New Mexico, Louisiana, and Florida, the black high-rate areas are concentrated in the natural market area for St. Lawrence power. Yet this St. Lawrence market area, with its tremendous concentration of power loads, should enjoy as low rates as any part of the country.

With high rates we naturally find that this region is characterized by abnormally low average residential use of electricity. In 1944 the average use was only 898 kilowatt-hours at 4.4 cents, as compared with an average use of 1,445 kilowatt-hours at 2.5 cents in the seven States which constitute the TVA area, and 2,348 kilowatt-hours at 1.84 cents in the Pacific Northwest.

Without taking into account the stimulation of new uses of electricity through lower electric rates, we may expect a yearly increase of about 500,000,000 kilowatt-hours in use of electricity by homes in New York and New England. In 12 years this would require electric energy equivalent to the entire output of the St. Lawrence project.

If, however, low-cost St. Lawrence power results in lower rates and the average home in the St. Lawrence area raises its consumption to the level today prevailing in the State of Washington, this will mean an increase of about 7,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours in the annual requirements of New York and New England homes. Such an increase would represent more energy than the entire output of the United States' share of the St. Lawrence project.

Can electric rates in this region be made low enough to encourage such increased home use of electricity? Of course they can. And I predict they will be made low enough to encourage much larger usage than that which now prevails in the Pacific Northwest. Furthermore it will mean higher rather than lower profits for the owners of electric utilities if they see the light and really get out and sell electricity as goods are sold in a competitive market—by basing their rates on the unit costs which will prevail with greatly expanded sales.

Time will not permit me to expand on that idea. But I will point out that a thorough investigation of the costs involved in providing New York State with vastly expanded power supply, including power from the St. Lawrence and a redeveloped Niagara, showed that residential rates outside New York City could ultimately be reduced to $1.80 for 50 kilowatt-hours, $2.30 for 100 kilowatt-hours, $3.80 for 250 kilowatt-hours, and $5.55 for 500 kilowatt-hours of monthly service.

This Power Authority study, based on the assumption that all the power business of the State, except the St. Lawrence and Niagara generating stations and their trunk transmission lines, continued in the hands of the existing private systems, was published in the Eighth Annual Report of the Authority.

Taking the residential bills now paid in Syracuse, Utica, Schenectady, Troy, or Albany as examples, this would mean broadly that you people would get 250 kilowatt-hours at what you now pay for 100, and 500 kilowatt-hours for less than you now pay for 250. I leave it for you to estimate whether, with such rates, you could find a use for St. Lawrence power—all of it.

ST. LAWRENCE POWER WILL BUILD INDUSTRY

The fact is that we will not have to search out a market for St. Lawrence power. For such cheap power will create its own market. By creating its own market it will build up the regional economy, benefiting workers, farmers, and businessmen throughout the area.

Studies by utilities, engineers, and economists indicate that each additional 75,000 kilowatts of economical power developed in a region may be expected to provide for industrial expansion involving some $50,000,000 of new investment and employing about 7,500 industrial workers. But in the St. Lawrence power project the region will get at least ten times 75,000 kilowatts. It offers the region, then, the possibility of perhaps $500,000,000 of new investment in industry providing about 75,000 more industrial jobs.

Now the needs of these additional industrial workers with their families, together with indirect effects of the operation of such new industries, will provide occupations in trade, finance, service, and transportation for at least double their number. All told, the project should result in employment for perhaps a quarter of a million additional workers. With their families, this means support for a million more people.

Coupled with increased use of electricity for all purposes on the farm, this will raise the entire economy of the region to higher levels. That, I assume, is what you people of the region want. That, I assume, is what the entire country wants when it reaches for a high national income and full employment.

ST. LAWRENCE GAINS NOT AT EXPENSE OF OTHERS

It has been charged that the gains, which New York and its neighbor New England States will unquestionably obtain from the development of St. Lawrence power, will be at the expense of other parts of the country. Opponents say it will draw industry away from existing industrial centers and militate against location of new industries in sections of the country not adjacent to the project. They say it will displace steam-generated power and so deprive coal miners and railroad workers of jobs.

This kind of argument, like its companion argument—that the seaway would deprive the railroads of traffic—completely overlooks the fact that cheap power and cheap transportation create business which would otherwise not exist. In a real sense, this ultimately means more rather than less business for seemingly competing regions and agencies.

The importance to the general development of the entire country of industries in which low cost of power is a determining factor in plant location cannot be exaggerated. Examples of such industries are aluminum, magnesium, ferro-alloys, artificial abrasives, calcium carbine, electrolytic zinc, chlorine, and some other chemical products. In these industries the future development within the United States depends in considerable measure on the world competitive situation.

Thus, in the case of an abrasive plant, the choice of location in the past has been not between New York and Indiana but between the Niagara Falls area and certain favored locations for cheap power in Canada or Norway. There is no power source in Indiana or any other Northeastern State that can provide electric energy at a cost to make the product competitive with similar abrasives produced in the Niagara Falls area or in foreign countries. There is no additional cheap power to be purchased at Niagara Falls, and, except for the Pacific Northwest, the question is, therefore, whether more of the product shall be produced in the St. Lawrence area or in foreign countries.

The same comments apply to many other electrochemical and electric-furnace products. The expansion of such industries, to be made possible in New York and New England by construction of the St. Lawrence project, will provide new manufacturing employment in plants that otherwise will be built outside the United States or not at all.

The development of such industries in the St. Lawrence power-market area will provide raw materials for the expansion of allied fabricating plants throughout the entire northeastern region. These will draw upon more remote parts of the country for other raw materials and semimanufactured products. Many of them will call for supplies of coal for use in their processes.

The resulting expansion of population and commercial activity will create expanded markets for consumer goods produced in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Indiana, the Carolinas, Texas and all the other States of the Union. Altogether this will provide new business for the railroads, calling in turn for additional supplies of coal. In this way the stimulus from the development of St. Lawrence power will be felt throughout the land.

And there is another phase of the matter which must not be overlooked—that is,

the great stimulus to the production of electrical facilities and appliances which will result from the availability of an abundance of electricity at low cost. With farms throughout the region lifting their average annual consumption of electricity to six, seven, eight, and perhaps twelve thousand kilowatt-hours, and with many homes averaging something approaching the 7,000 kilowatt-hour average of all-electric homes in Seattle, there will come an expansion of business and employment in all the lines associated with the manufacture, distribution, and servicing of electric facilities.

Now let me comment briefly on the argument that the very low cost hydroelectric power, which will make such industrial development possible, will displace power produced in steam plants using coal. My answer rests on the fact that the expansion in use of electric energy which this cheap power will stimulate, will greatly exceed the supply which the project will furnish.

To make this point very concrete, however, I have secured from the Federal Power Commission staff an analysis of the trend of coal consumed in the generation of electricity for public use from 1930 to 1945. The trend is shown for the United States as a whole and then, on the one hand, for the State of Tennessee and the seven States composing the Tennessee Valley Authority area; and, on the other hand, for New England, New York, and Pennsylvania, constituting roughly the St. Lawrence market area. Corresponding trends are shown for production of electric energy for public use by hydroelectric plants.

These figures show that the consumption of coal for generation of electricity over the 15-year period increased 297 percent in Tennessee and 189 percent in the seven States constituting the TVA area as compared with only 23 percent in New York, 49 percent in New England, and 87 percent in Pennsylvania. The increase for the entire country was 74 percent.

Corresponding figures for increased production of hydroelectric power show 997 percent for Tennessee and 237 percent in the TVA area as a whole as compared with 47 percent in New York, 107 percent in New England, and 259 percent in Pennsylvania. For the United States as a whole, the increase was 151 percent.

In very brief and simple terms, these figures show that, of the various groupings shown, Tennessee, with the largest proportional increase in hydroelectric energy in the 15-year period also had the largest proportional increase in consumption of coal for the generation of electricity.

Correspondingly, New York State, with the lowest proportional increase in hydroelectric energy, also had the lowest proportional increase in consumption of coal for the generation of electricity.

Interpreting the figures another way, with the combination of New England, New York, and Pennsylvania treated as the St. Lawrence power-market area, we get the following results:

1. If consumption of coal for production of electricity in the St. Lawrence area had increased from 1930 to 1945 in the same proportion as in the 7 TVA area States, there would have been a market for approximately 20,000,000 additional tons of coal.

2. If consumption of coal for production of electricity in the United States as a whole from 1930 to 1945 had increased in proportion to the increase in the 7 TVA area States, there would have been a demand for about 50,000,000 additional tons of coal.

Perhaps these interpretations sound like exaggerations of future possibilities. But they may not prove so far from the ultimate results. For, if the average residential use of electricity in New England, New York, and Pennsylvania should increase to the average for all-electric rate homes in Seattle, this alone would increase the energy requirements of the St. Lawrence area by six times the United States share of St. Lawrence energy. The greater part of this increase must come from steam generation.

If the increase in home use in the region reaches only half that figure, the additional power required from steam stations will mean a market for some 6,000,000 additional tons of coal. Truly, the coal miners have a tremendous stake in these programs which aid at lower electric rates.

Now, just a few words in closing about the navigation features—the seaway which, by flooding out a few rapids, will open our great natural inland seas to ocean transportation.

Opponents of the seaway offer strangely conflicting arguments. They contend, in one breath, that it cannot be justified because shipping will not use it and, in the other, that it will injure the railroads and existing ports by diverting traffic. I think we may find the answer to both arguments in the actual experience of the Norwegian Fjell Line which, despite the present limitations imposed by canals of only 14-foot depth, set out to operate direct cargo vessel service between Great Lakes ports and Europe.

The Fjell Line began in 1933 with a single 2,400-ton capacity cargo vessel. By 1939 its fleet had expanded to 17 vessels which were operating regularly between European ports and Chicago, Milwaukee, Duluth, Muskegon, Detroit, and other Lake cities, carrying full cargo both ways.

Some idea of the nature of the trade carried by this line is found in the record of Muskegon's share. Unloaded at that port were regular cargoes of pulpwood for Michigan paper mills, shipments of cod-liver oil, green salted horsehides for specialty leather manufacturers, and chalk. Out-bound for European markets, Muskegon shipped hundreds of refrigerators and washing machines, refrigerator and washing-machine parts, gas stoves, canned goods, apples and cherries. In one instance, it was possible to make arrangements by cable for the marketing in Europe of Michigan's surplus apple crop via Fjell Line.

Some idea of the competitive advantage to manufacturers, from even this limited direct shipping service, appears in the fact that on refrigerators to Malmo, Sweden, the direct freight charge was about $4 per box. If shipped through Atlantic ports the ocean cargo rate would have been approximately the same but the shipper would have paid, in addition, $3.21 per box for rail shipment to the seaboard.

Further evidence of the advantage of such direct shipping service to Europe is found in a case decided by the Maritime Commission on November 30, 1939, in which the Commission ordered that certain North Atlantic Conference agreements be modified to remove discrimination against shippers utilizing the services of the Fjell Line. The Commission's opinion cites several instances of the advantage to shippers of using even such small cargo vessels for direct exports to Europe. The following quotation is particularly significant:

"The Great Lakes Steel Corp., Detroit, markets its products in the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Scandinavia, and other countries. It competes with manufacturers of similar steel products in the United States closer to the seaboard and with manufacturers abroad. Prior to 1935 its exports were negligible. It has since developed an appreciable business in Europe, principally in the United Kingdom, where it markets steel sheets. It has never had a contract with respondents (North Atlantic Conference) and made use of every one of approximately 25 sailings out of the Great Lakes in 1938, the shipments amounting at times to 1,000 tons per vessel. When the Great Lakes are closed to navigation, it ships through North Atlantic ports.

"This shipper points to the greater hazard to commerce involved in the transfer of shipments at the seaboard necessitated by the contracts than in the use of direct service. Whereas it has had no claims for damage arising out of the use of direct service, damage to shipments made over the transshipment route resulted in one instance in actual loss of business. It is testified that the ability to ship direct from the Great Lakes to the United Kingdom has been an important factor in the development of business in that country. In competing with manufacturers in England, it discovered that buyers feared that highly finished sheets could not be safely shipped to them. Direct service was a means of relieving this apprehension."

The Maritime Commission also cites the estimate of the McCord Radiator and Manufacturing Co. of Detroit, exporting automotive parts and accessories and refrigeration and air-conditioning equipment to Europe, where it encounters American, French and German competition, that it could effect an annual saving in transportation charges of approximately 50 percent by shipping over the direct route from Detroit instead of using the rail-water route. This company testified that such a saving would have enabled it to better its competitive position on many occasions.

We have thus had an example of the part which a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, improved to permit navigation by regular ocean-going cargo vessels, could play in facilitating midwest participation in the expanded world trade of the postwar era. The Maritime Commission, in the opinion referred to above, states emphatically:

"The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence route is one of our great natural waterways upon which millions of dollars of Federal, State, municipal and private funds have been expended in the expectation of a natural development and growth of traffic from areas contiguous to its ports. The testimony of shippers using this route shows convincingly that the economies as well as other advantages inherent in the direct service have enabled them to penetrate European markets despite severe competition from abroad and at the Atlantic seaboard."

The Fjell Line example establishes two things:

1. It is poppycock to contend that ocean-going cargo vessels will not use a seaway of 27-foot depth when a constantly increasing commerce was using vessels constructed specially to overcome the handicap of the 14-foot canal limitation.

2. The commerce which tends to flow, when direct shipment to Europe is offered, is not so much diverted from other transportation routes or services as it is new commerce which arises because of lower rates and the other advantages of direct shipment.

In other words, in the same way that the low cost power from the St. Lawrence project will create its own market and in this way stimulate business and employment, the seaway will create its own commerce and so make its contribution to the higher levels of production and national income which all are seeking. This is bound to benefit the railroads and the port cities which participate in today's trade.

This is borne out by a comprehensive study issued in 1934 by the President's Interdepartmental Board on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence project, dealing with the possible effect of the project on the country's coordinated transportation system. This study took the opening of the Panama Canal as a somewhat parallel case to the opening of the St. Lawrence to ocean navigation. It found that, although in the 10 years 1921–30 freight interchange between our east and west coasts via the canal was carried at an aggregate saving of $878,000,000 as compared with the cost of shipment by rail, the competing railroads were among the most profitable in the country.

The explanation was that the cargoes moving through the canal were new cargoes, meaning greater commercial and industrial activity on both Atlantic and Pacific coasts. This increased activity produced steadily increasing rail shipments of the higher classes of freight which produce more revenue. This will be found to be the case when the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway is opened.

So I conclude that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project will play an important part in postwar plans for full employment, high national income, and a war-free world of cooperating peoples. By increasing the participation of the Middlewest in foreign trade, without depriving rail carriers and Atlantic or Gulf ports of their present volumes of traffic, it will play its part in world solutions.

But to this region in which you here in Syracuse are interested, the project offers extraordinary opportunities for industrial expansion. For it means that large blocks of the lowest cost power will be available at the equivalent of tidewater. Industries utilizing this cheap power can obtain raw materials and ship products in ocean-going vessels which can call practically at their warehouses. Such a combination of cheap power and ocean frontage is offered by few other regions throughout the world.

The American Home—Address by Mrs. Claude Pepper Before the Highland Park Women's Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mrs. Claude Pepper before the Highland Park Women's Club, of Richmond, Va., on March 25, 1946.

I have been informed by the Public Printer that it will cost $150 to print the address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Like every other citizen, especially every other southerner, who comes to this city with its grand past and its glowing present, I am happy to be here. I can never come into the inspiring atmosphere of Richmond without feeling a new richness. And I am glad to find that this old shrine has lost none of its luster, and that everywhere one can see unmistakable evidence that it is the determination of the people of Richmond that glorious as has been Richmond's past, its future will be greater still.

I am particularly happy today that you have given me the privilege of coming here to speak upon that most vital of all subjects, the American home. Surely we are putting first things first, when we put our primary emphasis upon the home. As we look at the challenging problem of the future, as we try to hold our balance in this agitated world, we can find no place of firmer anchorage, we can find no stronger source of abiding and encouraging hope, than through the hospitable portals and by the warm and sacred fireside of the American home.

In trying to discover what will assure the security, the welfare, and the happiness of the American home, we find certain things to which we must give serious consideration.

The first and most important is the family income. Family income determines to the greatest degree the kind of home the American family is to have. When we think of the American family, we must not think of just the 10 percent of our families who have family incomes of $5,000 a year or more, but of the 50 percent of our families who have incomes of less than $2,000 a year, and the 21 percent whose total incomes are less than $1,000 a year. We housewives who have to meet the family budget can imagine the standard of living, the quality of the American home, when the family income is under $2,000 a year, less than $1,000 a year, because we know that family income determines to a large degree the kind of dwelling in which the family is housed, the sort of food the family eats, the kind of clothes it wears, the quality of medical care and dental care it gets, and whether they have recreation and leisure enough.

This vital relationship of the family income to the family home has been of deep concern to many of our Senators and Representatives. Among them is my husband, who now has upon the Senate floor a minimum wage bill which he sponsored. This bill will fix the minimum wage standard for the country, and it of course applies to the workers in the lowest income groups, the ones receiving annual incomes today of less than $1,300 a year. We know that it is among these people, where the standard of living is the lowest, the health is poorest, the education most inadequate, the diet most insufficient, and the dwelling itself most slum-like, that higher wages are most desperately needed.

But not only the prosperity and the health of our country is endangered by these low standards of income. Its very security is weakened by the lowered standards of living which result from these pitifully small earnings. Here is what we found out during the war, of vital interest to the Nation, about the health of the people. We found that upward of 40 percent of the men eligible for military service were not acceptable because of mental, physical, educational, or moral deficiencies. We also found that most of these men came out of the lowest income groups in our population.

So that is the reason we are all deeply interested in increasing the incomes of our people, the skilled and unskilled workers, the farmers, and every segment of our population.

That, too, is the reason we women would also be interested in seeing that working women receive a decent income when they are the breadwinners of the family. We must always be interested in protecting the women who work not only as to working conditions but as to decent pay for the work they do.

Incidentally we women believe that women are entitled to equal pay for equal work. I hope that the legislation now proposed in the Congress to do that will in due course be enacted.

The second really important thing to strengthen and improve the American home in all regions of the country and on all social levels is education. We must realize that, if we want every worker's family to have a better income, we are going to have to raise the skill and the capacity of the breadwinners in such families. We don't want to give them what they do not earn, nor do they wish to receive it.

That means that we are going to have to give greater educational opportunities to the children of the Nation—the boys and girls of the whole country. It means, too, that we ought to do what we did in wartime when we gave workers a chance to go to night school and there obtain training which made them more skilled. If we do that now, we will enable today's workers to make a contribution to our economy which will give them a larger income from it.

That is the reason why we also favor Federal aid to public education. I would not—here in this glorious old city of Richmond, which has been the citadel of States' rights—suggest, of course, that we should lose to the Federal Government our control over our own public-school systems. On the contrary, all the legislation on this subject which has been proposed has been careful to preserve to the State and to local authorities and subdivisions the right to select their teachers, to determine their curricula, to govern and administer their school system as they see fit.

The Federal contribution which the supporters of such legislation propose is really an equalization fund paid from the National Treasury to make up for the discrepancy in the distribution of the children of the Nation and the wealth of the Nation.

The third essential to stronger and happier homes is good health. We know what it means to a family if the breadwinner is ill and unable to work. It may come as a shock to many of you to learn that America's health is nowhere nearly as good as it should be, and as it could be if we had better distribution of medical care.

Few people realize, for instance, that more than six hundred million man-days of work are lost in the United States every year because of sickness. Every day a man is away from work, sick, is a day lost from production and from adding to the national wealth. We have heard a lot about how much time we have lost as a result of strikes, but the time lost from illness is enormously greater. In fact, in 1943 over 47 times as much time was lost because of illness as was lost because of strikes. The common cold alone is a far more serious menace to the Nation, and causes the worker a far greater loss of time and pay, then many of the things which excite us more.

But that is not all. Not only do we lose hundreds of millions of days of useful production every year because of illness, but every American home stands in danger of being broken and cast down in tragedy by the death of one of its loved ones—death from causes which science knows can eventually be prevented. Just consider that although the average life expectancy of anyone living in America is well over 62 years, over 438,000 people in 1942 died from diseases before they had reached the age of 60.

More than 110,000 people under 60 died of heart failure in 1942. Over 63,000 died of cancer, and nearly 47,000 died of tuberculosis before their time. More than 55,000 babies under 1 year of age died of diseases common to the first year of life—diseases the prevention of which or the cure of which are known for the most part today. These figures indicate how discouraging and how almost frightening the health picture of the Nation is.

Now, how can we improve this health situation? Well, one way we can do it is by increasing the family incomes of the people of the country so they can afford better health care. But most of us are convinced that this is not likely to come about soon enough or on a large enough scale to solve the problem in our time.

Meanwhile, another approach to the problem has been tried and found wanting. Many voluntary health insurance plans exist in the Nation, and these plans are trying to make it possible for people to insure themselves against the costs of sickness by paying a sort of monthly insurance premium, or a prepayment, of their medical costs.

These plans have done much good. For example the Blue Cross System, which provides prepaid hospital care, though very little medical care, has a membership of over 18,000,000 people today. Various medical societies in States and local subdivisions have promulgated plans, and they too have helped. Many large industrial enterprises have group

medical care plans of their own, and there are some good consumer health plans, organized by people in one community, that are doing a fine job.

All these plans are in the right direction—but are they adequate? It has been the conclusion of the Pepper Subcommittee on Health and Education that these voluntary health plans cannot meet the situation or the demand. The subcommittee's experts have shown that not 5 percent of the American people are today getting full and complete medical care under a prepayment plan.

Even tax assistance does not make a voluntary plan work. According to a study that was made by the Department of Agriculture, even when the Government subsidized some rural families to a very considerable extent, those families that were profiting by the voluntary plans in their communities did not keep together and retain their memberships. Many families who needed the health care most dropped out. This makes it apparent, therefore, that one of the advantages of a compulsory system of health insurance is that it would give everyone who would not otherwise get it the benefits of good medical care.

It is not that the voluntary systems are not good, but it is that they never can provide the medical and hospital and nursing facilities needed to protect and improve the health of the people of this country. Indeed, history has proven that neither the private system of paying a fee for each medical service, nor the newer system of voluntary prepayment, can do the job. The Health and Education Subcommittee of the Senate has just prepared a report in which they conclude that we can never beat this health challenge to our families unless we do it through some kind of compulsory insurance system.

Now I realize that there is a good deal of misunderstanding about such a proposal. Some people call it socialized medicine. That is entirely untrue. Under socialized medicine, the Government would pay all the bills and run all the hospitals and hire all the doctors. We would never think of such a thing here. The plan which is now up before Congress is a national insurance system in which the people will themselves provide the major part of the funds by their own periodic payments.

Such a system will make it possible for every ordinary family to budget its health costs in advance. For example, suppose you have a family making $100 a month. If they pay 1½ percent of their income as wage earners and the employers put up 1½ percent, enough money will be collected to give every family in America full medical coverage. The cost to the family earning $100 a month will be only $18 a year.

A farmer or an independent businessman who is self-employed can pay 3 percent of his income up to $3,600 a year, and he and his family will also get full medical and hospital and most of his dental work.

Now, of course, the Nation will have to experiment with this method. There will be many mistakes made. The new legislation will, no doubt, be defective. But it is earnestly believed by many people, and I commend it for your thoughtful consideration, that we can never provide the necessary health care to the people of this country without bringing every family, every home, under some kind of compulsory health insurance plan.

Of course, we must in all events retain free choice of doctor by the patient, free choice of patient by the doctor, and also give the patient the free choice of the hospital he or she wants to go to. This is provided in the legislation which Congress is now considering.

That is the kind of law we need, if we want to make sure that the American home is the healthiest, the happiest, and the most secure in the world. But strangely enough, even such a bill would not guarantee that available, because in many parts of the Nation there are not enough hospitals, or everyone would be receiving the best care enough doctors, or enough maternal and child care facilities. A bill to provide for a huge hospital construction program is awaiting action in Congress; and another very important one which will give American mothers and children the best and most scientific care has been introduced by my husband and some other Senators.

To show you how wide the support is for this maternal and child welfare act, let me list those Senators. They are Senators WALSH, THOMAS of Utah, HILL, CHAVEZ, TUNNELL, GUFFEY, LA FOLLETTE, AIKEN, and MORSE. The last three are not even Democrats—which shows that the bill is really nonpartisan.

It will provide Federal aid to the States in establishing clinics for expectant mothers and for new babies, and it will also encourage the States to improve their own school health programs and other health services for mothers and children. Even more, it sets up a system of national aid to States for their programs of rehabilitation and retraining for crippled children. I was much impressed to learn that if all the States in the Union had as good child health care programs as the State of Connecticut has, over 30,000 babies would be alive each year which are dying today.

In this connection, though, I would like to refer to Virginia's own splendid hospitalization plan for indigent maternity and infant patients. On of the experts in the Children's Bureau in Washington told me that it was one of the best plans any State has, and that it is an example they all ought to follow.

Another extremely important health bill, important to every family in America no matter what its income level, was recently introduced by Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, Senator TAFT, Senator LA FOLLETTE, and my husband. This bill attacks the problem of social disease throughout the Nation, and makes it possible for the Federal Government to continue to help local communities to fight this enemy of the American home.

The police and sheriffs associations of the country have practically unanimously supported this bill. In no sense does it allow the Government to reach down into the city or the town or the county and take over these problems directly. On the other hand, it does enable the Government to carry on the research, to correlate the activities of the sheriffs and the police, and to aid, advise, and assist the social-welfare agencies, in an all-out effort to meet this problem in a really adequate way.

I mention this because the Federal Government, in conjunction with local authorities, had pretty well met the challenge of prostitution in the areas around Army camps. But now that peace has come, we find that the greatest danger is now in the areas where such help from the Government is not to be found.

Surely all of us can agree that we should put every possible emphasis and give all possible aid upon any program to stamp out this monster which is devouring the health and the happiness of hundreds of thousands of families in the Nation.

After good income, good education, and good health, comes the fourth requirement for good American homes. And that fourth requirement is just that—a good home, a good house.

We have always thought of the home as a sacred place. We called it a castle. We have written songs about how sweet it is. Yet we know that the kind of a family we have is to a considerable degree determined by the kind of a home in which the family lives.

We know today that there are nowhere near enough homes. Everybody knows about the housing shortage. But not so many of us realize how dangerously bad a great deal of our present supply of houses is. Just let me give you a few facts from the 1940 Census.

According to the housing census, one out of every five houses in America is in such bad condition that it needs major repairs to make it decent to live in. One out of every five American homes is still using kerosene for lighting. Even worse, 3 out of every 10 houses have no running water. Of course, the worst housing conditions as far as plumbing and electricity goes are in the country, on our farms.

Mr. Wilson Wyatt, who is doing a good job running the veterans emergency housing program has estimated that we need over 3,000,000 new houses the next 2 years, just to take care of the veterans that are coming home from the fronts of the war. But that 3,000,000 homes will not affect the horrible housing conditions of those families who today are living in our run-down, slatternly, unhealthy and uncomfortable slum homes.

The Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill proposes to bring closer the time when every American family will have living quarters which will be genuinely conducive to health and happiness. That home does not have to be a palace. It does not have to be ornate. Perhaps it does not even have to be spacious, though it should have ample room for every member of the family, so that each person can have privacy. It should however have all the necessary modern sanitary conveniences, including running water and an indoor bathroom. It must have individuality, so that a mother will not feel that she is rearing her children in "House No. 3" instead of her own home. And in this electric age, it must have the equipment which will relieve the housewife of the many chores that are too familiar to all of us. This is especially true of the home in the village or in the rural district, where today they do not have access to the services most of us enjoy in the larger cities.

The fifth important factor in strengthening the American home, and in making it a happier and a more useful social unit, is the great need we face of widening the horizons of opportunity. I speak not only of opportunity for the individual, for that, of course, must be the first emphasis of a democratic society.

We must never allow monopoly, or shortsightedness, or any kind of combinations of the selfish, to narrow the horizons of America's opportunities for the individual. This Nation has stood above every nation on earth for the theory of rags to riches, for the opportunity of the boy born in a log cabin to rise to the exalted duty and power of the White House.

This opportunity must never be lost, and it is the duty of all of us who love America to see to it that those doors of opportunity for boys and girls, men and women everywhere, in every part of the country, are continually swinging open. With the beckoning hand of ambition inviting and challenging initiative.

But today I am thinking more of the opportunity of scientific research, and of what the miracle of science can do to open wider the doors of opportunity not only for our people, but for all people everywhere. I feel that we are just entering upon the threshold of the really golden age of all the world. We speak about the golden age of Pericles, yet I doubt if many of us modern housewives would like to live under the conditions which to the housewife who lived in Athens in the golden age of Pericles were ordinary matters of course. It must, therefore, be our constant duty to give all possible aid to public and private sources of research in the fields of the natural sciences, the physical

sciences, the social sciences, and medicine, so that incalculable gains can be derived from the relatively small expenditures of money which are required.

Private enterprise is spending huge sums of money for purely business and industrial research, but nonprofit research is a stepchild. Government help for these nonprofit fields of research are provided for in the national science foundation bill which is pending in the Senate.

This bill provides funds for medical research, for instance. During the war we learned that much could be accomplished by Federal aid to medical research. I need only point to the development of penicillin and of blood plasma as examples.

These great discoveries were achieved as a result of Federal coordination of all research in a given field, and of Federal aid wherever it was in the public interest that such aid be granted. A relationship was worked out with doctors, biologists, chemists, with hospitals, universities, private research organizations, and even some industrial laboratories, so that the research was planned and financially aided on a scale never before attempted. This was done in a fashion guaranteed not to retard individual initiative, or to destroy the true scientific spirit of the expert.

Let's just take cancer, for an example of what we hope to do by research, now that peacetime medical studies can be started again. One out of every eight, yes, one out of every eight of us in this room, will die from the horrible death of cancer. That is the story recent figures tell us. Feeling that we should make a special attack upon this great enemy, which is twice as deadly as was the war itself, several Senators have introduced a bill to assure an all-out attack upon cancer. This bill authorizes the President to convene scientists from all over the world, and put them to work with Federal funds, to discover the cause and the cure of cancer, and to rid the human race of that terrible scourge.

The largest cause of death in the United States is heart disease. Every year about half a million people die from this dread scourge. Yet we have made practically no progress in finding the cure for this enemy. Under the National Science Foundation, such work will be made completely possible, and great impetus be given to research in this field

Even old age is not outside the scope of research. Most of the medical authorities believe that a reasonable amount of money spent in this field would incalculably lengthen the lives of our people, by finding a way to counteract the effects of hardening of the arteries and other diseases of age.

We should, of course, encourage extensive research in the fields where sulfa drugs and penicillin and steptomycin have accomplished so much. It should be our purpose to see that these lifesaving drugs, which have already very often kept whole a home which otherwise might have been broken by a tragic death, should be available not only to the people of this country, but to every home and every family in all the world.

The sixth, last, and, I feel, most important factor of all in assuring the continuance and happiness of the American home and the American family is peace. We women should be the sentinels on the watchtowers of peace. We should stand as the guardians on the threshold of every home, to keep out war. We should tell the people in authority that they have to answer to the women of the world in case of war.

Today the world has in it a new thing—something which we women can promote, encourage, and strengthen with our support—something to counter the atom bomb, and the equally dangerous bomb of national hatreds. It is the United Nations Organization. This UNO must be made to work. It cannot be permitted to fail. We women must make it our solemn responsibility to remember what war means, to fight against war, and the American tradition of isolation which will lead to another war, and to support international organization with all the strength we possess.

The danger is great that we Americans may tend to drop back into our old isolationist ways of thinking. We may get busy with our petty little everyday occupations and ambitions and forget about the great challenge of the peace. Then we may repeat what we did after the last war, and forget that we are not alone in the world, that our interests are not the only interests in the world, and that with modern communications and modern airplanes we are next-door neighbors to the other side of the globe.

We are no longer isolated—we can no longer be isolated. Indeed, we stand at the front of the great parade of nations, the strongest in power and the strongest in moral qualities. We must not, any of us, ever forget this. It is our task, ladies, to show the world the way to a permanent and abiding peace, through international cooperation and through international understanding.

We love our homes—of that there can be no question. Then can we be so blind, so foolhardy, as to wish to see those home blotted from the face of the earth? Think of the countless millions of homes in France, in England, in Czechoslovakia, in Russia, that are now no more than rubble, and people living in the rubble, trying to make a home out of it. Think of the millions of crippled children, some of whom my husband told me about, as he saw them on his recent trip to Europe. Children without eyes, without legs, without arms, without hope. Think of the wandering people of Europe and Asia, scattered over the face of the earth, driven from their homes by the dastardly Nazi Germans, the vicious Japanese.

It will be our homes, our children, our people, if ever again there is war. And when we think of the tragedies and terrors of war as we have heard and seen them from those of our families or friends who have been there, we women can really appreciate what it means to have peace. We can really appreciate the solemn obligation upon us to see to it that America leads the world in the preservation of peace and goodwill among the nations of the earth.

It seems to me, therefore, that we women have the most vital stake of all in the kind of a world we have, in the sort of a nation which is ours, in the health and happiness of our States, our cities, our towns and villages. But all these social and political units, whose security and prosperity are so important to us, are only parts of the great pyramid which rises into the sky above the solid base of the American home. This social organization of ours, the social organization of the world, cannot be more powerful, cannot be greater, cannot be more noble than the base upon which it rests. No nation can ever rise above the level of its homes, and of the women who make those homes. This is why it is so important that we realize our responsibilities, we women, our responsibilities in maintaining our homes, our towns, our States, our Nation, and the world, in peace and in happiness and in security.

In this land of great riches, which providence has so markedly blessed. I venture to say that it is possible—if we will but set ourselves to the task—to build even in our own lifetime such prosperity, such health, such education, such skill into our Nation and into the nations of the world that we may at long last, in this new world, escape what Thomas Hardy has called—

"The long drip of human tears
Which peoples old in tragedy
Have left upon the centuried years."

Two Worlds or One?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thought-provoking editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for June 16, 1946. The editorial is entitled "Two Worlds or One?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO WORLDS OR ONE?

"In this new and frightful age, the only true enemy is atomic war itself."

These words by Correspondent Leland Stowe might well be carved, not in stone, but in the minds of the Foreign Ministers of the Big Four now meeting in Paris to lay the groundwork for peace treaties for World War II. Because the universal longing for peace has been clouded in recent months by international misunderstandings and disputes, peoples and statesmen alike are forgetting that atomic war, rather than any one nation or group of nations, is the ultimate challenge to civilization.

Russia and the Western Powers, divided by disagreements on the shape of the postwar world, are growing apart. What has happened?

Look first at Soviet moves which have disturbed the West.

Russia, during and after the war, annexed 273,000 square miles of territory with nearly 25,000,000 population. Its aggressive penetrations of adjoining territories were made in most cases by unilateral action before the United Nations was formed, and these vast areas are now locked from view by what Churchill has called "the iron curtain." Not by national plebiscites but because of Soviet expansion, 25,000,000 people are newly living within the Russian sphere. To what extent this expansion might be excused by Russia's understandable desire to protect its borders against future attack is debatable.

FAILURE OF LAST PARIS MEETING

In the dispute over Iran, Russia deliberately violated a treaty in which it solemnly pledged to remove Soviet troops by a certain date. There is every reason to believe that Russia aided and encouraged if indeed it did not foment the Azerbaijan insurrection. When the Security Council of the United Nations placed the question of Iran on its agenda, Mr. Gromyko, the Russian delegate, stalked out of the meeting and remained away while the dispute was being considered.

In the treatment of Manchuria, it is evident that Russia, without consulting the Allies, looted the land of its industry, both Chinese and Japanese, and withdrew, leaving for its ally, China, an empty carcass. The stripping of Manchuria was an act of banditry, all the more ruthless for being committed by a world power and an ally of China during the war.

The failure of the last Paris conference, described in detail by Secretary of State Byrnes, was largely the fault of Russia, whose delegates blocked nearly every major proposal made by the Americans. When Mr. Byrnes, in good faith, offered a four-power pact for the disarmament of Germany, his proposal was viciously attacked, for reasons which are not known, in the Moscow press.

If the Russians had reasons for not wanting the pact, they should have stated them through diplomatic channels. As it was, the misinformed Russian people, fed through their controlled press, were coached to greater dislike and distrust of the Western Powers.

SOVIET ALOOFNESS

Granting that Russia has an interest in the Middle East and granting that the Soviet's landlocked mass has a claim to warm-water ports, her threatening gestures toward Turkey cannot be condoned. Machinery has been set up in the United Nations for the orderly handling of international claims.

Russia has refused to consider reopening the great Danube River to the free traffic of the countries through which it flows causing one of Europe's means of communication to be locked except to a Russian key. What a contrast the Suez and Panama Canals provide!

The aloofness of the Soviet Union has resulted in its failure to join many agencies set up for international cooperation. Without Russia's support these organizations cannot avoid a regional rather than global approach of the problems under their consideration. The resultant weakening of these agencies is apparent. John Foster Dulles, in Life magazine, points out that Russia has not yet joined the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization, the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the Emergency Economic Committee for Europe, and the European Coal Organization. It has not yet accepted our invitation to attend a conference preparatory to the establishment of an international trade organization.

Why this aloofness?

BIAS OF THE RUSSIAN PRESS

In Korea insurmountable obstacles have been met by American forces in the south attempting to coordinate policy with the Russian occupiers in the north. There are evidences that Russia has withdrawn industrial equipment from the northern area and that it intends permanent separatism for northern Korea in spite of promises that that unhappy country was to be given its freedom.

The Russian press, constantly hostile toward the western democracies, grossly misrepresents them to the Russian people. The desire for lasting peace which motivates our international relations has been cynically labeled "imperialism." What could be further from the truth? The list of major acts by Russia which have aroused American misgivings in recent months could be prolonged. Minor irritations, too, may be picked at random.

Soviet aircraft have repeatedly threatened American planes. Russian aircraft fired on and forced down a B-29 near Kanko, Korea. They forced down a C-47 at Grossenheim, Germany, and held the crew incommunicado for 4 days. A B-17, lost en route to Korea, was forced down by two Soviet fighters.

What is the explanation for the threatening speed runs by two Soviet planes at General Clark's personal plane over Vienna? An Army Air Forces major, forced down in Soviet Korea, was third-degreed under hot blue lights about the atomic bomb and radar.

OTHER SIDE OF THE MEDAL

Soviet Russia's inordinate suspicions, its chip-on-the-shoulder attitude, its unilateral actions, its stubbornness at meetings of Foreign Ministers and the United Nations, its aggressive penetration of adjoining territories—all these have brought about a virtual diplomatic war between the United States and Great Britain on the one hand and Russia on the other.

Of course, there are two sides to the medal.

Look now at what the Western Powers may have done to arouse Russian misgivings and to cause their failure to join agencies for international cooperation.

For a long period after the Russian revolution, the Soviet Union was virtually a pariah among nations. Armed rebellions against it were organized and financed by the Western Powers. The United States sent a force to Archangel. Soviet memories of this interference are long and properly so.

For years Russia was denied admittance to the League of Nations, and not until President Roosevelt took office was the Soviet Union recognized by the United States. For years, under the leadership of Maxim Litvinov, Russia attempted in vain to set up a system of collective security in Europe, the Western Powers resisting. When Hitler and Mussolini practiced modern warfare by intervening in Spain before World War II, Russia went to the aid of the Loyalists, but Britain, France, and the United States refused to do so.

MORE CAUSES FOR SUSPICION

When Chamberlain and Daladier went to Munich to negotiate a European settlement with Hitler and Mussolini and shamelessly abandoned Czechoslovakia, Russia was the only great power excluded from the conference. Moreover, there were evidences that Chamberlain's policy was to pit Germany against Russia and thus avoid a conflict between the Western Powers and nazism.

When Hitler attacked Russia, in June 1941, Soviet forces made their long, costly withdrawal to Stalingrad, where they were the first to stop the Germans. After the slow, bloody fight back across the scorched earth to Germany, the Russians have reason to feel keenly that the western world is in their debt for their military prowess and for the immense sacrifices that Russia made for the allied cause.

Perhaps the biggest fear that grips Soviet Russia is our possession of the atomic bomb—and that is understandable. Would we not feel deeply apprehensive if the secrets were held by Russia and not by us? Yet, if the Russian people understood us they would realize that the American people and the British people do not want to use the atomic bomb except in self-defense. Moreover, Russia should give full weight to the hard thinking we are doing—as shown in the Lilienthal report—toward an international control of atomic energy. Now that the substance of the Lilienthal report has been laid before the UN Atomic Energy Commission by Bernard Baruch, will Russia accept it in good faith?

So, at many actions of Great Britain and ourselves—such as our acquisition of bases in the Pacific or the stationing of British troops in Greece—the Soviet Union looks askance.

SUPREME TASK OF STATESMEN

But the Western Powers are making a sincere effort to safeguard world peace through the United Nations. And despite our many concessions to Russia, including a grant of over $9,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease aid during the war, the Soviet Union goes its lone-wolf way.

Russia must be made to understand that it will have to meet the Western Powers halfway, lest there be two worlds instead of one. The consequences of two worlds—of an eastern world dominated by Russia and a western world led by the United States—could be infinitely tragic.

Let the statesmen who are now in Paris contemplate the universal desire in ordinary men for peace. Let the representatives of the Western Powers and of Russia review the causes of their misgivings in order to dispel them. Let them remember that the Soviet Union existed from 1917 in the same world with the so-called capitalistic democracies and that a way must be found, preferably through the United Nations, to keep both systems in one world. The alternative would lead inevitably to conflicts, and conflicts could too easily lead to the intolerable tragedy of war.

Above the immediate issues of today's Paris Conference, let the Government of Soviet Russia as well as the Governments of Great Britain and the United States remember at all times in their deliberations that civilization in this atomic age cannot endure a third world war.

Byrd's Stand on the Labor Situation and Labor Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] over the Virginia radio stations on Monday night, June 17, 1946. The Senator from Virginia is one of the recognized leaders of the Senate and is a fearless statesman, a courageous public servant, and a great American. His address is sound and thoughtful and deserves to be read by the American people.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On Thursday, May 23, at 4 p. m., every railroad train in the United States ceased to operate. The bituminous coal mines had been on strike for nearly 60 days. A dual strike of the railroads and the coal mines paralyzed the activities of our Republic. This day will go down in American history as "black" Thursday.

The strike of the engineers and trainmen that forced the railroads to stop was not a strike against the railroad management, but against the United States Government, which had taken them over in the national interest when the strike threat became critical. The John L. Lewis coal-mine strike also was a strike against the American flag, for the mines had been taken over for the same reason.

Never before in the history of our Republic had the American people been confronted with such a domestic menace. This paralysis of functions essential to the maintenance of the life and well being of our citizens shocked and disturbed the American people as nothing else has done since the War Between the States.

The ominous aspect of these two strikes was that three men—two representing the employees of the railroads and one the coal miners—arrogant and ruthless labor leaders, as they are, wielded a life and death power over 140,000,000 Americans. Citizens everywhere began to ask themselves what conditions had brought about a situation such as this.

We boast of our democracy in America—we hold it up as a model to be emulated by peoples elsewhere in the world, but here in this free land power to determine the destinies of the Nation has been seized by a very few men not elected or responsible to the people.

One man, Philip Murray, can close down the operation of all the steel companies. One man, Harry Bridgs, can send out on strike the longshoremen and sailors and stop all water commerce. One man, Caesar Pe-

trillo, can take broadcasts off the air. Lewis can stop hard and soft-coal production. Whitney can order the railroads to cease operations.

In all the history of our Republic, nothing so arrogant has occurred as the recent statement of Caesar Petrillo that he intended to deliberately violate a law of Congress and then threatened that if this law was not declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, he would stop the broadcasting of our great radio system. He has carried out his threat and the issue now is before the courts.

To temporize with lawlessness such as this imperils the very foundation of the institutions of our democracy. What has brought about this situation? The time has come for courageous action and clear analysis of conditions which have led up to the autocratic control exercised over our American life by a few labor leaders.

For myself, and as a member of the United States Senate, without fear or favor, and without regard to my political fortunes, I intend to meet this condition in a way which will be for the best interests of America.

The first step in building up this great power, which has been grasped by ruthless labor leaders, was the passage of the Wagner Labor Act. I was one of the members of the United States Senate who voted against the Wagner Labor Act, and for this I have been condemned and abused. I voted against it because it established special privileges for labor unions.

Immediately before the adoption of this act, I voted in favor of the establishment of the Securities and Exchange Commission, which required all corporations and industries to register, make reports, and come under the rules and regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission. This, in connection with the Sherman antitrust law, abolished the last remnant of special privileges for industry.

I regard these two votes as consistent for both were to deny special privileges to any class. I believe that America can survive as a democracy only if equality of rights of all citizens, corporations, and organizations is written into law as the basis for justice to all.

The next step leading to the present situation was the sit-down strikes in 1937, under the leadership of John L. Lewis, who then was president of the CIO. If the lawless action of the labor unions in taking possession of private property at that time had been punished in accordance with the common law of the land, the arrogant labor leaders of today would have known at the start that they must conform with the same laws that govern the rest of us. Instead, the administration then in power did not even condemn this action. No effort was made to eject those who had taken possession of private property, and Miss Perkins, then Secretary of Labor, actually condoned and defended this lawless action.

Then, in the years that followed, time and time again these same labor leaders who have just recently defied our Government struck in time of war without regard for stopping production of goods and arms for our boys who were fighting all over the world for our homes and the American way of life. On two occasions John Lewis closed the coal mines during the most critical periods of war and would open them only after he got the advantages he demanded.

So, step by step the power of these great unions, under ruthless leaders, has been built up; so now do you wonder that the ego of these leaders is so inflated that they actually believe they are greater than the Government itself. The special privileges guaranteed by the Wagner Labor Act, followed by Government appeasement of these dictatorial labor leaders, have made them indifferent and fearless of laws and Government authority.

Our democracy is founded upon the basis of an association of all the citizens, and under our doctrine no man can exercise power which is destructive of our institutions of Government.

What can be done about the situation? In saying what I intend to say, I want again to emphasize that I am not an enemy of labor, as has so often been charged. I believe in unions just as I believe in corporations, but both should be controlled so that they cannot injure the welfare of all the people. I believe strongly in collective bargaining, but a bargain must mean what it says, namely, that a bargain made is equally binding on both parties to the agreement. Labor unions have a proper place in the economic life of America. Labor unions are, and should be, here to stay, but if we are to have orderly business and labor conditions, labor unions as such, along with industrial management, must have mutual legal responsibility to perform in accordance with their contracts.

What can be done to curb these ruthless men who have usurped power that no American should have? The first thing is to provide for mutuality of responsibility between industry and labor. Labor unions should not be exempted from liability for the damages resulting from broken contracts when all citizens and business corporations can be sued when a contract is violated. We may as well try to build a house without a foundation as to enact legislation to prevent industrial and labor strife without first providing for mutual responsibility.

I have introduced legislation, which is now pending, to incorporate all labor unions, to require them to make reports to the Securities and Exchange Commission, as business corporations are required to do; to make them responsible, as a union, for civil damages, either for the breach of its employment contracts or for the unlawful damage or destruction of property. It is needless to say that this legislation is being bitterly opposed by the labor leaders. The last thing that John Lewis, Philip Murray, Caesar Petrillo, and other powerful labor leaders want is to expose their financial transactions to the light of publicity as corporations are required to do.

In doing this I think I am urging a procedure which will be helpful to the cause of unionism, as unions, with the great power they now have, cannot continue to exercise that power in conflict with the public interest.

Labor unions in America have "grown up." They are now "big business" in their power and financial assets. They must assume full responsibility for their acts affecting the economic welfare of America. This is but one step, but I think it is a fundamental and vital step. Let me repeat, establish equality of rights of unions and corporations in the law on a basis of justice to all.

Now, a word on recent developments in Washington regarding efforts of Congress and the President to prevent a recurrence of national strikes in vital industries. At this point, let me make clear my position on the use of troops to operate in case of a strike. I favor this only in those industries which are vital and essential to our daily living, such as railroads, public utilities, production of coal and those of like character, without which we cannot continue to live. If our democracy is to survive, the things essential to our existence cannot be denied to us. In other words, there must always be a means for our Government to protect the general welfare. For that reason I entirely approved the action taken by Governor Tuck, but I favor it only as applicable to a public utility of general necessity.

For the same reason I favored the bill presented by President Truman, giving him the power to induct into the military service those engaged in essential industry. I was 1 of 13 Senators to vote with him on this section of his legislation. If it is right for us to draft our sons in peacetime to preserve order in foreign countries, I do not think it can be argued that it is not right to prevent disaster at home by requiring those who work in essential industries to continue and not strike by concerted action.

I know this is a harsh measure, but it was also harsh when the railroads were shut down and the coal mines ceased to operate.

Certainly there has got to be some way for the country itself to be protected and defended against the usurpation of power which has been built up in the hands of these arrogant leaders and which has been so badly misused.

I was one of those active for the amendments to the Case bill adopted by the Senate. The amendment offered by me to prohibit a labor union from exacting at the point of a gun a welfare fund to be administered exclusively by the unions was adopted. This amendment has been deliberately misrepresented. It would not prohibit welfare funds, but did prohibit John L. Lewis from exacting a royalty on coal, equivalent to $100,000,000 a year, and using the money in any way he desired, without reports or without supervision.

John L. Lewis obtained a royalty, but did not succeed in controlling the spending of it.

If he had succeeded, every other labor union would have demanded the same, with the result that the funds so derived would have built up even more the gigantic financial resources of the unions to be expended as they pleased, and the increased cost would have been borne by the American people.

This and other amendments to the Case bill were adopted after days of thorough debate in the Senate. Time does not permit me to explain to you all of the amendments that were incorporated into the Case bill by the Senate. I can say briefly that violence in picketing was penalized by the loss of bargaining rights, a ban on secondary boycott strike was established, a prohibition against the unionization of foremen was adopted, severe penalties were established for illegal interference with the movement of goods in interstate commerce, and the unions were made suable for a breach of contract.

There was nothing in the Case bill that, in my opinion, justified the President in vetoing the legislation. I deplore this action, and its significance lies not so much in what was in the Case bill, but in the fact that after weeks of bitter debate the Case bill was finally adopted by Congress by large majorities in the House and in the Senate, and this was the first legislation in 13 years that has been enacted by either body to correct the special privileges that have been given to labor unions which have resulted in the condition that now confronts us.

There was a time when corporate interests abused their power, but now corporations have been brought under control, and in the interests of the checks and balances upon which our democracy is founded, we must likewise find means to bring the labor unions under proper control, because it is inherent in our democratic form of government that no group of citizens shall enjoy any special privileges and exercise those privileges in such a way as to injure the well-being of the people as a whole.

I think many laboring people realize this, and many do not agree with their leaders. I have received numerous letters indicating that laboring people themselves only desire just treatment and do not approve these excesses and abuse of power by their leaders.

I have been asked by many Virginians what they can do to correct this serious situation. My answer is that every candidate for the House and the Senate should, without equivocation or the use of weasel words, be compelled to state clearly his position respecting this vital question. The source of relief lies in the Congress of the United States. The Congress is elected by the people. If the people do not see that those elected by their

votes to represent them carry out their expressed will, then the people have only themselves to blame.

For myself, I want my position crystal clear; I will do nothing to injure the legitimate rights of the laboring man, but, if reelected to the United States Senate, I intend to use my utmost influence, as I have done in the past, to correct the conditions which are responsible for the situation now confronting us. No threats or personal vilifications by dictator labor leaders will lead me from my purpose. I would prefer to be defeated a thousand times rather than to yield in the smallest degree to a Petrillo, a Lewis, a Hillman, because in doing so I would feel I had betrayed the American people, and particularly those in Virginia.

Until the vital legislation before the Senate is disposed of, my duty is clearly to remain at my post in Washington. This is the first of a series of political speeches I will make over the radio to my constituents at this hour each Monday, so that I may discuss the issues and make known my position. On next Monday I will discuss the political activities of the Political Action Committee of the CIO.

I thank you.

National Health Bill—Interview With Hon. James E. Murray, of Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address by me on the national health bill, in the nature of an interview, which was broadcast on June 12, 1946, over the network of the American Broadcasting Co.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. One of the most significant measures before Congress today is the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill. This proposal, which would provide a national system of health insurance, is designed to make complete medical care available to all of the people, regardless of the size of the family purse. Today we have in the studio Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, one of the sponsors of the health insurance bill.

Mr. MICHAEL. Senator MURRAY, I am wondering just how this bill would operate if it became law. Suppose my wife had to undergo a serious operation? Would all of her expenses be covered by this sickness insurance?

Senator MURRAY. Absolutely; yes. She would be entitled to the services of her family physician, to specialist care as may be necessary, to hospitalization, and to surgery.

Mr. MICHAEL. What about drugs and X-rays?

Senator MURRAY. They also would be included. All necessary medicines, X-ray and laboratory services with a minor exception. You might have to pay for usual inexpensive medicines when she is at home.

Mr. MICHAEL. What if she required a nurse?

Senator MURRAY. She would receive all necessary nursing services while in the hospital. In addition, she could have a nurse at home if recommended by the physician, up to the limits of our available nursing personnel.

Mr. MICHAEL. Would care of the eyes and care of the teeth be covered by the bill?

Senator MURRAY. Yes; they are included. Eye examinations and glasses whenever prescribed. Adults could not be given complete dental care immediately, because there are not yet enough dentists. But adults would be entitled to examinations, cleaning, and serious extractions or mouth surgery. There would be complete dental care for children and as more dentists are trained, the dental program would be expanded.

Mr. MICHAEL. How many people would be covered by the plan?

Senator MURRAY. Practically everyone who works for a living, that is, at least four out of five in the whole country. As now written, the bill does not include railroad employees and Government workers. But several plans have been suggested under which these groups can be brought in. And, of course, it covers all the worker's dependents—his wife and children and parents.

Mr. MICHAEL. Then the coal miners would also be included? Wasn't the miners' demand for a welfare fund for health protection one of the main issues in that dispute?

Senator MURRAY. That is correct. Anyone who has studied the health needs of this Nation can readily understand the desperation with which the miners have been pressing their claims. But they are only one out of many such groups which must have insurance protection in meeting medical costs. This legislation would give all of the people what the miners are asking for—and give it more adequately.

Mr. MICHAEL. Hasn't there been some discussion as to whether or not it is fair to make the employer bear the added costs? For example, the coal operators in that case?

Senator MURRAY. Yes, of course. The same kind of protest was made in connection with workmen's compensation laws. But today everyone grants that workmen's compensation has been a great benefit to business. Actually, a national health insurance program such as we are proposing would reduce business costs. It would cut down on absenteeism. About 500,000,000 man-days are lost each year due to illness. And it is estimated that 1 day's illness costs the employer one and one-half times the worker's daily wage. Sick workers are obviously not efficient producers. The health insurance plan will improve the health of workers and increase productivity. It will cut down on industrial accidents and disease. We know, for example, that factories which have health programs have records of greatly reduced accidents. But, most important of all, businessmen will gain from the increased economic stability, contentment, and prosperity of a healthy community.

Mr. MICHAEL. Such a comprehensive program sounds expensive. How would it be paid for?

Senator MURRAY. Well, you must remember that we are already spending in this Nation over $4,000,000,000 a year, approximately 4 percent of our national income, for medical care. That same amount would pay most of the cost of the program I have just outlined. In fact, it would go much further under the new system, because it would provide regular physical check-ups, resulting in the prevention of disease to a large degree. Obviously, it is far cheaper to keep people well than it is to provide medical care for sick people.

Mr. MICHAEL. I can understand your point. But, still I am wondering just how the payments would be made.

Senator MURRAY. The plan is that a premium amounting to 1½ percent of the worker's wages up to $3,600 a year would be regularly deducted from the worker's pay check, just as is done for old-age and survivors' insurance. That premium, you see, would be scaled according to the size of the worker's income. The employer, because he also benefits, would contribute a like premium based on the size of his pay roll.

Mr. MICHAEL. And it is from this common fund, built out of premiums, that the doctors and nurses and hospitals would be paid?

Senator MURRAY. That is correct. That is why we call this an insurance plan. As matters now stand, medical costs are unpredictable both as to time and amount. Sickness strikes suddenly, and often all out of proportion to the size of the pocketbook. A serious illness is often a family catastrophe. Most families find it extremely difficult to absorb the cost of a major illness. Under this national health insurance plan, however, medical costs would be spread evenly and in proportion to ability to pay. Through the magic of averages, every family would be given access to complete medical care, at a cost provided for in advance.

Mr. MICHAEL. Senator Murray, is this something new—this idea of insuring against the costs of sickness?

Senator MURRAY. No, indeed. Far from it. Practically every progressive nation in the world has some system of prepaid medical care. And we have been thinking about it in this country for at least 30 years. Actually, we have done more than think about it. Since 1798, American merchant seamen have received medical care through Government hospitals under the Public Health Service. That system began as an insurance plan. We have also workmen's compensation programs in 47 States, which is health insurance for work-connected disabilities and diseases. And, of course, we have thousands of private health-insurance groups insuring members against medical costs and risks. As a matter of fact, our present system of social security is just not complete without health insurance. Under unemployment compensation, you see, we protect the worker when he is well but just happens to be out of work. But, when a worker is out of work because he is sick, he has no protection and he is left without earnings or compensation, and, in addition, he has to pay his doctor bills.

Mr. MICHAEL. I understand that the American Medical Association is opposed to this bill. Is it the idea of insurance that they don't like?

Senator MURRAY. On the contrary, organized medicine is officially and publicly committed to the idea of health insurance—but on a private or voluntary basis only and provided it is under the control or direction of medical men. It is true that until a few years ago, the American Medical Association was opposed to private or voluntary insurance plans. But when the idea of national health insurance began to be better understood, the American Medical Association threw their support behind the voluntary systems of insurance.

Mr. MICHAEL. Well, couldn't the purpose of your program be achieved by encouraging everyone to join a local voluntary insurance plan?

Senator MURRAY. Well, that is just the difficulty. You cannot get enough people to join. Many of the voluntary plans are excellent as far as they go. But so far in this country, they have succeeded in giving full medical care to only 2 to 3 percent of the population. The extent of the health care is limited and in most cases covers only surgery and hospitalization. And the cost is much too high to attract people of moderate incomes, those who need it most.

Mr. MICHAEL. Why do voluntary plans cost more than national health insurance?

Senator MURRAY. Well, first there is the high cost necessary to induce people to join. Second, there is the cost of collecting the premiums. These expenses, of course, would be eliminated under our plan. Third, people tend to drop out of voluntary plans after a few months, especially after they have had medical or hospital care and think they won't need it soon again. There is also the

fact that it is largely those who are in poor health or those who expect to need medical care that join a voluntary plan. The rest hope that they can get by. But most important of all is the simple fact that voluntary plans necessarily cost more because they do not have such a large group over which to spread the cost. Experience has demonstrated that the only way to bring everyone into the plan is by requiring participation by law.

Mr. MICHAEL. Would doctors be compelled to participate?

Senator MURRAY. Not at all. It is up to the doctor to decide whether or not to operate under the plan. He may even choose to combine private practice and insurance practice, each on a part-time basis. And he will be just as free under the plan as he is now. Free to accept the patient or not. Free to care for him in his own way without interference. Free to determine his own hours. Free to choose his own method of compensation for his services.

Mr. MICHAEL. What about the patient? Can he too choose his own doctor?

Senator MURRAY. Certainly. And his own hospital or dentist. The main difference from the present system is that there would no longer be a money barrier between the doctor and the patient. The patient will have provided the doctor's fee in advance.

Mr. MICHAEL. I understand that Senator TAFT has also introduced a health bill. Does that provide for voluntary or for compulsory health insurance?

Senator MURRAY. No; not really. It rejects the principle of national health insurance, and provides instead for ar enlarged system of State or free medicine for the poor. His bill gives Federal grants-in-aid to the various States to be used for medical care for those people who can prove that they cannot afford it. Senator TAFT himself has said that his bill is intended to "provide medical care for the indigent." That, of course, is quite different from giving all of us an opportunity as self-respecting citizens to cooperate according to our ability to pay our own way under a national system of health insurance.

Mr. MICHAEL. Would Senator TAFT's proposal give poor people the same comprehensive medical care as is provided in your bill?

Senator MURRAY. By no means. Only medical and surgical services in hospitals and clinics. No home or office care. Moreover, the burden is thrown largely upon the States. This means that the poorer States and rural areas would continue to have much lower health standards. There would be no way of attracting doctors and dentists and nurses and hospitals to rural areas. On the other hand, under the national health insurance plan, medical purchasing power would be spread evenly all over the country, so that a child would have an equal opportunity to grow into a healthy and useful citizen regardless of the financial position of his parents or where he happens to be born.

Mr. MICHAEL. How would this bill affect the veteran, Senator MURRAY? ISN'T he already entitled to all of these benefits under the GI bill of rights?

Senator MURRAY. Oh, no. He can receive complete medical care for any injuries or disabilities resulting from his war service. But not for anything that may happen to him after he leaves the service—except on a charity basis if he cannot pay for care elsewhere. And then only if he is willing to go to one of the veterans' facilities—which may be 100 miles or more away from his home. And this is true only if there is a bed available. And, of course, his family gets no care at all from the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. MICHAEL. Well, now, tell me, Senator, how does the bill stand now in Congress?

Senator MURRAY. Right now it is in the hands of the Senate Education and Labor Committee, of which I am chairman. We have been holding extensive public hearings. The great majority of witnesses have testified in favor of the bill.

Mr. MICHAEL. What do you think the chances are of getting your bill, the national health insurance bill, through Congress this session?

Senator MURRAY. If we have an early recess of Congress it may not be acted on at this session, but I am confident that it will become law in the not-too-distant future. I would say that if the people continue to study this proposal and make themselves heard on this issue, national health insurance will soon become a reality in this country.

Mr. MICHAEL. Thank you, Senator MURRAY.

The LaGuardia Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, for the benefit of those interested in the subject, a proposal affecting the solution of the labor-management strife in the country, proposed by former Mayor F. H. LaGuardia.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAGUARDIA PLAN

The time has arrived when proper machinery and new technique for the settlement of labor disputes must be provided. The Norris-LaGuardia Act established the rights of labor. The "yellow dog" contract is a thing of the past. The right to strike has been recognized. No one questions that today. Collective bargaining has been accepted in law and in practice.

Sufficient time to provide experience has elapsed from the day when organized labor had no rights, when the power of the courts was misused and abused to suppress the rights of working men, when the demands of labor were answered with the policeman's night club. We have reached maturity, and therefore it is necessary to act in an adult manner. As the abuses of old were abolished, so must new methods of abuse be prevented. Duress, unreasonableness, irresponsibility have no place in labor-management relations in our country. That, of course, applies to both sides.

Agreements entered into through the processes of collective bargaining must be respected and maintained by both sides. A plan for the settlement of disputes, when direct negotiation or conciliation fails or arbitration is rejected, must be provided. The source of such adjudication must have the respect and confidence, not only of labor and management, but of the entire country. A way must be found to limit interruption of production or services where the health, life, or safety of the people is involved. Speedy adjudication must be provided where the economy of the entire country may be affected.

Based on past history, present unsettled conditions and techniques developed since the Norris-LaGuardia and Wagner Acts, the following is presented for the purpose of discussion as a plan for the settlement of labor disputes:

1. There shall be established a separate court to be known as the United States Industrial Court. There shall be four such courts, permanently located in four geographical sections of the country, with as many parts as further study may indicate are necessary.

2. The judges of such court shall be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, from a panel selected and approved by the Supreme Court of the United States, selected from the present sitting judges not over the age of 55, with at least 5 years' judicial experience of the United States District Court, and from judges of State courts having unlimited civil jurisdiction.

3. Each court shall consist of three members.

4. The salary of the judges shall be fixed so as to net $17,500 a year.

5. Tenure shall be for life.

6. In order to qualify, each appointee shall file with the Clerk of the Supreme Court a pledge in affidavit form that he will not run for public office within 5 years of resignation or removal, that he will engage in no other remunerative activity, that he will not lecture, broadcast, write, or otherwise engage in any extrajudicial activity.

7. The judicial districts shall cover the Northeast, South, the Middle West, and the far West of continental United States.

8. There shall be one appellate court located in the city of Washington, composed of three members in the same manner appointed, except that they shall be selected from sitting members of the United States circuit courts of appeal or from State appellate courts of last appeal. Appeal to such court shall be by certiorari and limited to specific causes to be defined by Congress.

9. There shall be an Industrial Court Administrative Office in the city of Washington, where all notices of disputes shall be filed and where all records shall be kept. The administrator of said office will bring such cases to the attention of the appropriate court and calendar the case for hearing.

10. The judges of the court are not to have any secretary, clerk, or personnel. They shall be expected to hear the cases themselves and themselves to decide.

11. Judgment shall contain findings of facts and definite decisions on the issues involved. Explanations and opinions are to be omitted.

Disputes may be brought to the industrial court in any of the following cases:

1. On consent of both sides.

2. By either side after a strike has been in effect five calendar days, or after failure or rejection of conciliation, arbitration, or direct settlement.

3. On filing a notice of dispute and application for settlement by the court, the lockout or the strike shall be suspended and the establishment open for operation or the men return to work, as the case may be.

4. Any increase of wages or other benefits shall be retroactive from the date of return to work.

5. The case shall not be heard until operations are resumed.

In the case of industry or services where the public health, life, or safety is involved, notice of strike or lock-out shall be filed with the administrator at least 20 days before the effective date.

If after notice is served as hereinabove provided, the management refuses to submit its case to the court, it shall be required to pay to its employees an amount equal to unemployment insurance benefits paid for such industry and in such State during the continuance of the strike and until settlement.

If labor refuses to submit to such court, it shall not be entitled to receive any retroactive increase of wages or benefits, and it shall not be entitled to any unemployment

insurance payments until such time as eligibility is reacquired by employment.

Procedure in said court shall be within the discretion of the court. It may proceed by conference or consultation or fact-finding or hearings or in any way that it deems best to ascertain all of the facts necessary to reach a just and fair decision. Technicalities accepted in court procedure need not be binding on said court.

The court shall render decisions within 30 days after the termination of hearings.

Decisions are to be made public and binding on both sides of the controversy.

If management refuses to abide by a decision no deductions of labor cost shall be permitted in establishing corporate or personal income tax. It shall be held liable for losses suffered by individual or an organization for failure to comply with the decision of the court.

If labor refuses to abide by the decision of the court, it shall forfeit all rights of unemployment insurance benefits, until eligibility is reestablished, and shall not be entitled to privileges and benefits now provided where a labor dispute exists.

The aggrieved party may enter a judgment against the defaulting party that no labor dispute exists within the meaning of any existing law. The management or the labor organization shall be liable for damages, as the case may be.

Resort may be made to the court at any time during the term covered by a decision for clarification or interpretation where differences in construction may arise. Notice shall be given by either side that provisions of the decision require clarification. Such matters will be heard informally and expeditiously, and prompt decisions shall be rendered. Decision shall be for a period of 1 year. Long-term agreements may be rendered on consent of both parties. Provision may be made in long-term agreements for review by the same court on consent of both sides or on application of either side, if decision contains such provision.

In cases where either side breaks the agreement or any part thereof the injured side may bring the matter immediately to the court having jurisdiction, and all the remedies provided for failure to abide shall be applicable to the aggrieved party.

I admit that there are some novel provisions in the make-up of this court. In the first place, it is absolutely necessary to have judges of unimpeachable integrity, experience, and judicial temperament. The method of selection suggested seeks to meet objections raised by management and labor from time to time. There are over 190 Federal and about 1,500 State court judges from which to select. Both sides would have an opportunity to file objections when the names are before the Senate for confirmation. It is necessary to provide economic security and life tenure to avoid uncertainty and the temptation to gain popularity and run for office or exploit the office by extrajudicial activities. It is also imperative to have men of such mental capacity able to hear and determine a case for themselves, avoiding the need of court clerks and secretaries, who in turn would be subjected to the same temptations.

Strict legal formalities and ancient technicalities of the rules of evidence are intentionally not made binding, in order to enable the court to secure all of the information and get right to the source without long-drawn sessions.

In will be seen that every safeguard of inherent rights has been provided for both sides. All labor disputes are eventually settled, and therefore an orderly established procedure cannot reasonably be found objectionable. The courts are provided as a means of last resort.

Any strike lasting over 5 days causes losses to both sides. In many instances, long strikes create greater loss than all the increased wages and benefits that might eventually be gained. A survey of recent strikes will show that the settlement eventually reached could, with reasonableness, have been reached within a few days after the strike. It would also perhaps show that responsibility is about equally divided between management and labor.

The plan, as submitted for discussion, is, of course, susceptible to perfecting amendments and modifications.

This plan, of course, requires legislation on the part of Congress.

Award of Chilean Order of Merit to Philip W. Thayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief statement concerning the award of the Order of Merit by the President of the Republic of Chile to Philip W. Thayer, cultural relations attaché of the American Embassy, who is a life-long friend of mine. This is an unusual honor, and I think it warrants printing this statement in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The President of the Republic of Chile conferred the decoration of the Order of Merit, with the rank of officer, on Philip W. Thayer, cultural relations attaché of the American Embassy, on March 11. The presentation of the medal and diploma was made by the Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs at a dinner given by the Chilean Government and attended by representatives of the Foreign Office and the diplomatic corps. In making the presentation the Under Secretary praised the distinguished services rendered by Mr. Thayer in promoting the friendly relations between Chile and the United States.

Idaho Power an Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Idaho Power an Example," written by Harry D. Wohl and published in the St. Louis Star-Times of May 24, 1946.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IDAHO POWER AN EXAMPLE—PRIVATE UTILITIES ARE CHARGED WITH CONDUCTING CAMPAIGNS TO BUY RURAL COOPERATIVES

(By Harry D. Wohl)

WASHINGTON, May 24.—Private power companies, it was charged here today, have launched campaigns in various parts of the country to buy up rural electric cooperatives which are located in strategic positions with respect to other cooperatives and present or planned public power-generating sites.

This campaign, according to the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, is merely one phase of a coordinated private utility war against all attempts to make electricity cheap and abundant.

It is in addition, the association said, to other tactics—such as "spite line" activity—to get in the way of universal distribution of low-cost power.

Clyde T. Ellis, executive manager of the association, said the Prairie Power Cooperative of Fairfield, Idaho, has just turned down a bid by the Idaho Power Co. for its properties. This cooperative stands between a planned Bureau of Reclamation power development along the Snake River and several cooperatives to the northeast.

Idaho Power has been successful, however, in buying two other cooperatives, one in Idaho, the other in Oregon, on either side of the Snake River region.

Ellis also asserted that the Farmers' Electric Generating Cooperative at Gilmer, Tex., had rejected an offer by the Southwest Gas & Electric Co. to buy it out.

Claude R. Wickard, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, stated recently that cooperatives in northeastern North Carolina had been approached by power companies. Urging the North Carolina cooperatives not to sell out, Wickard at that time said:

"The result in this case inevitably would be that a large percentage of the consumers who could be reached on an area-coverage basis would be left wholly at the mercy of the power company."

The first purchase by the Idaho Power Co. was the Jordan Valley Electric Cooperative, of Jordan Valley, Oreg., close to the Idaho border and southwest of the proposed Snake River development.

Jordan Valley was one of the smallest cooperatives REA has ever financed. It was established in response to the request of this isolated community of approximately 90 persons.

According to the REA field man who investigated the project, "the Idaho Power Co. turned down the town as an impossibility." But after the start of the survey to determine prospects for a cooperative, the company was reported to have made three offers to build a line to serve Jordan Valley.

REA allocated $30,000 to Jordan Valley in May 1940 for the construction of 4½ miles of distribution line and for installation of a generating plant, since no source of wholesale power was available. Idaho Power Co., it was asserted, had declined to build 9 miles of transmission line necessary to supply the cooperative with wholesale power.

Immediately after the war, the cooperative began work with REA on details of a plan for putting a hydro plant into operation. The plant would have greatly reduced power costs, but before the plan could be carried out, the membership voted late last year to sell out to Idaho Power.

Ellis said that the utilities' world immediately seized upon this sale to attempt to show that "electric cooperative enterprises are doomed to failure." Stories appeared all over the country. A leaflet entitled "A bankrupted electric cooperative taken over by a private utility company," appeared in Quebec, where cooperatives recently have been established.

"The Idaho Power Co.," REA said today, "which before the war declined to provide

service for this group of consumers and refused even to supply wholesale power, is now committed to serving the area at rates which it claims are 30 percent less than those of the cooperative."

Next acquisition of Idaho Power was the Long Valley Power Cooperative at Donnelly, Idaho, north of the proposed Snake River development. The Long Valley Cooperative was established to serve one of the most fertile valleys in the State.

The original REA allocation in December 1940, for $119,000, called for the construction and acquisition of 117 miles of line to serve 368 consumers.

Early in 1942 the cooperative received a further REA loan allocation of $35,000 for acquisition of the generating and distribution facilities of the Grimes Pass Power Co. The hydro facilities there were intended to furnish power for the entire system. But before the plan could be put into effect a flood washed out the Grimes Pass Dam, rendering the generating plant valueless.

The cooperative then used portable generating equipment to furnish power to consumers in the several small towns formerly served by the Grimes Pass Power Co.

In 1945 the cooperative entered into a contract with the Idaho Power Co. for the delivery of wholesale power at an average rate between 10 and 11 mills per kilowatt-hour.

Early this year, just as construction funds stopped during the war had been released and new work was about to begin, Ellis said the membership of the cooperative was persuaded to sell out to Idaho Power for about $200,000.

REA has not yet approved the sale. It seeks assurance from the Idaho Power Co. that all consumers in the area will be served.

A. C. Inman, vice president and general counsel of Idaho Power, appearing before a congressional committee in October 1945, complained that the Long Valley Cooperative had acquired the Grimes Pass Power Co., including its "35-year-old timber-crib dam," for $42,500 when Idaho Power had offered only $15,000.

Inman introduced into the record a photograph of the washed-out dam and implied, according to Ellis, that the whole REA endeavor was a financial blunder.

Yet in the acquisition of the Long Valley Cooperative the Idaho Power Co., REA stated, is paying for that same dam at 100 cents on the dollar.

Idaho Power is making attempts to buy still other cooperatives in the region, it is said. Cooperatives held a State-wide meeting recently and condemned the campaign. Their resolution said in part: "On the basis of past performance it is clear that this campaign does not reflect a great new concern for the welfare of Idaho farmers, nor is it founded on the hope for large profits from the operation of acquired cooperative systems.

"The stakes are much higher—control of the power which is being developed in Idaho by public power agencies and which will soon be ready to flow to market. By buying up the cooperatives, the power companies can monopolize public power."

Lt. Col. William B. Gemmill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, this afternoon I attended the funeral of a distinguished son of Illinois, Lt. Col. William B. Gemmill, who was buried at Arlington Cemetery. Lieutenant Colonel Gemmill was the son of one of the most distinguished judges Illinois ever had. Lieutenant Colonel Gemmill was in both World War I and World War II. He is survived by a son who flew 50 missions over Germany, carrying on a great family tradition. I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement concerning his life and services be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Lt. Col. William B. Gemmill, Chicago attorney and veteran of both world wars, died Friday night, June 14, at Walter Reed General Hospital, Washington, D. C., after an illness of several months.

Funeral services were held at 1:30 p. m., Wednesday, June 19, at Memorial Chapel, Walter Reed Hospital. Burial was in Arlington National Cemetery.

Colonel Gemmill in World War II served as executive officer to Brig. Gen. B. M. Bryan, Jr., provost marshal general of the Army. Colonel Gemmill had charge of organizing and coordinating the Army's program for the reeducation and orientation of prisoners of war. His duties took him overseas, where he secured first-hand information in connection with his work with prisoners of war.

Colonel Gemmill's father, the late Judge William Nelson Gemmill, served on the superior court bench of Cook County for 26 years.

Prior to entering the service in this war, Colonel Gemmill was a member of the law firm of Murphy, Lilliander & Gemmill, with offices in the Chicago Loop. He was a member of the American, Illinois, and Cook County Bar Associations, and a master in chancery of the Cook County Circuit Court. He graduated from the University of Chicago and Kent College of Law. He was a member of Delta Kappa Epsilon Fraternity, the South Shore Country Club, and the Chicago Athletic Association. He was a member of the Masonic Lodge.

In World War I he volunteered as an ambulance driver with the American Field Service in France prior to the entry of the United States in the war. When the United States entered the war, he joined the Air Corps Branch of the Signal Corps, serving as a balloon observer, and was commissioned as a first lieutenant.

Colonel Gemmill is survived by his widow, Mrs. Francis T. Gemmill, and son, William B. Gemmill, Jr., of 4400 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.; his mother, Mrs. William N. Gemmill, 1671 Orrington, Evanston, Ill.; and sister, Mrs. D. B. Grasett, 797 Walden Road, Winnetka, Ill.

Colonel Gemmill's son, William, Jr., flew 50 missions in Europe with the Army Air Corps in this war. He was discharged with the rank of first lieutenant and is now attending George Washington University.

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD sundry editorials commending the action of the Senate in the passage of the La Follette bill relative to the organization of the Congress.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Macon (Ga.) Telegraph of June 4, 1946]

STREAMLINING CONGRESS BEGUN

Embodying the results of extended hearings by a joint committee of the House and Senate, a bill has been introduced in the upper chamber by Senator LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, intended to streamline the legislative branch of the United States Government in the interest of economy and efficiency.

Senator LA FOLLETTE pointed out that the law-making machinery was designed for the simpler tasks of the nineteenth century and is breaking down under the tremendous load of today.

In the first place, there are entirely too many committees, both in the House and in the Senate. Service by an individual member on a number of these committees absorbs so much of his time that he is unable to give proper consideration to the broader aspects of legislation.

There are other provisions in the bill, but this newspaper is especially delighted to know that it includes an increase in the salaries of Senators and Representatives, a larger expense allowance and a plan for retirement at the end of their service.

It is hoped that Congress will have the courage to endorse these features instead of yielding supinely as it did several years ago when a similar proposal was ridiculed to death by John Boettiger, a west coast newspaperman, who started a sarcastic movement known as Bundles for Congress. It was a time when the American people were being asked to meet the needs of their English cousins by sending bundles for Britain. The lawmakers were thus represented as objects of charity.

Congress was weak enough to bow to this ridicule and the bill was never sent to the White House.

We have always contended that many Members of Congress, after giving the best years of their life to the public service, have been defeated or found it necessary to retire voluntarily, without having accumulated a sufficient amount of property to support them in their declining years. We have contended that as a matter of simple justice they should have salaries large enough to meet all their current expenses at the National Capitol, having in mind the increased cost of living, but even more important, that this system of retirement pay should be set up to insure a competency for their old-age, whatever might be their political fortunes.

Members of Congress are only human, after all, and we cannot wonder if they sometimes yield to the threats of pressure groups rather than take a chance of suffering defeat at the polls and having to start life all over again without adequate resources.

We feel confident that this retirement system alone will greatly strengthen the independence and clear-thinking of our representatives and while other features of the streamlined legislation are highly desirable, we feel that this retirement fund, to which the Members themselves as well as the Govment are to contribute, would be a long step in the right direction.

[From the Winston-Salem (N. C.) Journal of June 12, 1946]

FOR GREATER EFFICIENCY

The Senate caught step with the trend of the times when it passed the bill to streamline Congress, by a vote of 49 to 16. We are proud that our own Senator HOEY, as presiding officer, played an important role in

achieving victory in this fight to overhaul the outmoded machinery of the Congress.

This bill is a measure to provide for increased efficiency of the legislative branch of the Government. It reduces the number of Senate committees from 33 to 15 and limits most Senators to memberships on only two committees instead of the 6 to 10 on which they now serve. It provides an administrative assistant for each Senator to do nonlegislative work and each of the 15 committees may employ four experts to assist in handling the matters referred to it.

If this measure becomes law it will greatly facilitate the work of committees. Under the present system Senators serve on so many committees that it is impossible for them to attend meetings of all of them.

Another important feature of the bill is the section requiring registration of all lobbyists. This will make it possible for the public to know at all times what forces are at work in Washington favoring or opposing pending legislation. In North Carolina lobbyists at Raleigh during the session of the legislature have been required to register for a number of years. It is surprising that such a system of registration was not put into effect at the National Capital long ago.

Under the proposed law the regular committees of Congress would make a continual check of the operation of Government Departments so that Congress may know at all times what is being done or left undone by these departments. Such a system would undoubtedly result in much greater efficiency in the numerous departments and agencies of the Federal Government than prevails at present.

Not the least important provision of the bill as finally passed by the Senate, as we pointed out in an editorial last Sunday, is one requiring that Congress adjourn in July of each year in order to give the Members an opportunity to spend some time with their constituents back home. By getting out of the Washington atmosphere for a few weeks and mingling with the people who elected them, Members of the Senate and House will be able to serve the country better. As the committee sponsoring the reorganization measure pointed out, "proper functioning of Congress as a representative body demands that the Members serve not as residents of Washington, but as citizens of their respective States and districts, with intimate first-hand knowledge of the problems of the places they represent."

The bill calls for larger salaries for Congressmen, which together with the cost of other changes it provides for, will amount to an expense of approximately $12,000,000 a year. But even then the cost of Congress would still be less than that of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. We agree with the Washington Post that "the extra cost is a pittance compared to the benefits which the country could expect from this legislation." For, as the committee which reported the measure to the Senate pointed out, "our machinery of Government, which was devised for the simpler tasks of the nineteenth century, is breaking down under the tremendous work load. Democracy itself is in grave danger of disintegrating from internal dissensions under the postwar world."

This, to our mind, is the chief reason why Congress should write into the Federal statutes such a plan of reorganization as the Senate has approved. While the measure is expected to meet stiff opposition in the House, the overwhelming majority it received in the Senate ought to mean that this bill will become a law.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution of June 13, 1946]

MODERNIZING CONGRESSIONAL MACHINERY

Long overdue is the congressional overhauling provided in legislation which the Senate has passed, 49 to 16, and sent along to the House.

The reduction of standing committees has been recommended by virtually every authority to make a study of our outmoded legislative machinery. Some of our lawmakers are serving on eight and nine committees, with the results they are not able to do justice to any. Under the proposed measure, Senate committees would be reduced from 33 to 15 and House committees proportionately. This would mean no Member would be called upon to serve on more than two.

In addition to reducing the number of committees it is provided each committee shall be furnished four full-time experts in its field, thereby allowing Members to have comprehensive studies made of matters under advisement.

The Congressmen themselves would get a salary increase from $10,000 to $15,000 a year, a new $8,000 a year administrative assistant, and the right to contribute to and share in a retirement fund.

Moreover, in order to lighten the load on them, Congressmen would no longer be required to consider minor matters such as personal claims against the Government or proposals to build bridges across navigable streams.

The reorganization bill, in short, is aimed at giving our Representatives and Senators more time to devote to important legislation and more capable help to aid them therein.

Our only regret in the matter is that the Senate rejected a proposal to do away with the patronage system of dispensing capitol jobs. Senator LA FOLLETTE had suggested that a personnel director be named who would hire congressional help on the basis of merit and that these employees would hold their jobs under Civil Service. This, however, the patronage-minded Senate refused to do.

By and large, though, the congressional modernization bill is a good one and, if it succeeds in getting by the House, should result in faster and better legislative government.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune of June 3, 1946]

FOR A MODERN CONGRESS

The congressional reorganization bill which the La Follette committee presented to the Senate Friday is the minimum necessary to prevent the highest deliberative body of our Union from becoming, in the words of George B. Galloway, of the American Political Science Association, "a relic of the ox-cart era in the age of the rocket ship."

To appreciate the need for reform, it should be understood that not since 1893 has the machinery of Congress been overhauled. Despite the specialized tasks and the tremendous increase in national expenditures, Congress is still using ox-cart methods in an attempt to meet the demands of a modern age.

It is the aim of the La Follette committee program to overhaul Congress so that it is fit to be dated 1946. If the program can be achieved, the outstanding accomplishments would be to make the individual Member of Congress more efficient, to give feasibility to the outlandish Congress within a Congress which the committees (transacting some 90 percent of the business) have become, to enable the plenary Congress to function more effectively, and to establish party responsibility in national affairs.

The individual Representative or Senator would find his efficiency improved by expanded legal and reference service to be established within Congress, by the aid of an administrative assistant to relieve him of the individual services to constituents which now take up most of his time, and by being limited to one or two committee appointments instead of anywhere between 5 and 23, as at present.

He would be better able to represent his electorate by virtue of having a recess period of 2 or 3 months every year during which he could go home and learn the opinions of his constituents. He would find his effectiveness enhanced also by the relief from financial worries which would come with an increase in his $10,000 salary, usually inadequate, to $15,000, and eligibility to join a Federal retirement program.

The effectiveness of the voter, moreover, would be enhanced by these changes, and those still to come. He may some day be able to look on the promises of political candidates as something more than statements of intentions to get votes.

In short, with the adoption of this program, the voter could look on a modernized Congress with the pride which should be inherent in the mighty right arm of representative government.

National Cemetery Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues several facts in connection with the national cemetery bill on which the House will vote on Thursday.

The enactment of S. 524 will enable the bereaved of this country to pay homage to those members of their family who have died in the service of their country and or those who served their country honorably in the armed forces who have been, or desire to be, buried in national cemeteries.

Many of the bereaved at the present time are denied the consolation of frequent visitation to the gravesites of their loved ones by the great distances from their homes to the existing recognized national cemeteries.

The enactment of this legislation would eliminate the condition and provide national cemeteries for the 21 States which are now without national cemetery facilities.

The enactment of S. 524 will inculcate in the hearts of Americans for all time, wherever these proposed cemeteries shall be located, a greater appreciation of the tremendous cost in lives for the securing of the freedom these living Americans now enjoy.

The equitable distribution of these cemeteries will permit each State's veteran or other patriotic organizations to observe memorial services comparable to those observed at Arlington National Cemetery. This certainly would have a more direct meaning to the people in each State or Territory than is at present possible.

S. 524 provides for 79 new national cemeteries. These will be in addition to the 80 existing cemeteries. Most of these 80 existing cemeteries in the near future must through necessity be inactivated through the inability to enlarge them or to acquire additional acreage contiguous to the present cemetery. Consideration must also be given that

many of the older cemeteries are memorials to Civil War battles and are not particularly adaptable for any other purpose.

If S. 524 is enacted, 79 new cemeteries will be constructed and 13 of the existing cemeteries will be expanded, all for the sum of $123,000,000. It is interesting to note this sum will not be expended immediately, but will be prorated over a 10-year period, or an even longer period if needs are not shown to exist within the 10-year period.

This money will pay for all necessary construction, beautification of grounds, and where needed it will pay for the securing of ground, although in many cases ground is offered as a gift for this purpose.

The estimated cost for the maintenance of these cemeteries—79 new and the 80 existing, making a total of 159 cemeteries—would only be $9,117,860. This amount in its entirety would only reach its ultimate with the beginning of the eleventh year after construction. It must be noted that new construction does not necessitate multitudinous repair so soon after construction. Later maintenance costs are expected to drop to about $6,000,000 annually.

It also must be noted with satisfaction that all personnel for these national cemeteries are selected from the veteran ranks, with preference shown to men who are unable to do many other kinds of work due to infirmities.

Much has been said in favor of giving $100 to $300 to the next of kin for slab and burial expense in lieu of the enactment of this program. May I emphasize the fact that having sufficient national cemeteries does not compel anyone to use them. Sixteen and two-thirds percent of veterans have requested burial in national cemeteries in the past, and undoubtedly many more requests would have been received if there had been a national cemetery in closer proximity to the home. We must keep in mind that everyone is not entitled to this distinction, only those who had served their country in the armed forces and who have been honorably discharged therefrom. Also, we must remember, no one entitled to this distinction should be denied the right of burial in a national cemetery and no obstacle, especially distance, should be put in their way.

If consideration is given to the allotment of $100 to $300 to the next of kin, then consideration must be given to the next of kin of all veterans buried in private cemeteries since the establishment of national cemeteries in 1862; otherwise, it would be considered as a discrimination. This would, of course, boost the cost tremendously.

We have at the present time approximately 20,000,000 eligibles, multiply this number by $100 to $300, the sum is staggering for future generations to liquidate. There is no way of prorating this amount.

The enactment of S. 524 would involve $123,000,000 and this amount would be prorated over a 10-year period the amount for maintenance of these cemeteries would involve $9,117,860 and this would not be reached until the beginning of the eleventh year.

In the creating of the 79 new national cemeteries, the differences which exist in the privileges afforded officers over enlisted personnel in the present national cemetery burials, would be eliminated by the uniform size of burial plot, which will afford opportunity for the husband and wife to be interred side by side.

In the creating of these new national cemeteries, when and where needed, the care in perpetuity of these graves of our honored dead will be assured. There will never be the haphazard care as noted in many of the very old private cemeteries where families have become extinct and where these cemeteries have been left to town councils, which change their officers every so many years, to maintain. These cemeteries, where families are no longer able to care for them, either by the few remaining in a family which has moved to distant parts, or families have died in entirety, are neglected and overgrown with weeds and the tombstones have fallen on their faces obliterating the facts known and obliterating all history of the fallen.

At the time of bereavement families are very distraught, and unscrupulous salesmen often prey upon the bereaved and sell them ideas which often prove too costly. Burial in a national cemetery is by choice of those who are eligible for this distinction and not by compulsion.

Religious beliefs and family prejudices are respected in every case.

The objectives which enactment of this bill will accomplish are:

First. That each State and Territory will have unto itself a counterpart of Arlington National Cemetery, the design to conform to the immediate section of the country, thereby creating a more intimate local reminder and a visible evidence of national patriotism.

Second. To provide adequate burial space for the probable request of 16⅔ percent (percentage based on that of present requests in national cemetery interments) of all eligible veterans, that is, Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II, taking into consideration that 16⅔ percent of the 20,000,000 eligible at the present time would amount to over 3,000,000. By adding 80 percent for wives, widows, and dependent children, as at present, as well as those who will be eligible by future conscription, there is an additional great number to be provided for.

Third. To provide added consolation to the bereaved, especially those of infirmity or age, who would not be able to travel great distances to visit the graves frequently, if at all, due to distance of national cemetery from their homes, but could travel without inconvenience 100 to 300 miles.

Fourth. Lest we forget, there is the possibility of enshrining in those States and Territories, those, who are known to have come from that State or Territory but who have not been given individual identifications, thereby giving added consolation to those who have suffered the added torment of having a loved one declared dead but not having the identification of the specific body made possible.

Fifth. The contemplated shrines in each State or Territory would conform in design to that of the section of the country in which it will be constructed, i. e., Spanish or mission type of architecture in California, Colonial, in the New England area, and so forth. In these shrines would be the trophies of war; the memorials and tablets to groups and events which should be memorialized pertaining to that State and section of that State. These would include tablets to those missing in action, not only of the Spanish-American War, but World War I and World War II and they would mean more to the people living in that area as well as help to build a more fervent respect for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I now wish to call attention to very strongly worded endorsements of this legislation by the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. They follow:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1946.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The national convention of the American Legion, held in Chicago, Ill., November 18–21, 1945, passed a resolution urging prompt enactment into law of the bill S. 524, to establish one or more national cemeteries in every State. This action was brought to the attention of Senate and House committees during consideration of the legislation. The bill has passed the Senate, was reported favorably to the House of Representatives, and it is our understanding a rule has been granted and the bill will be considered by the House in the near future.

Realizing the great importance of providing these national cemeteries, particularly in view of the law recently enacted to return deceased members of the armed forces to the United States, the national executive committee of the Legion, at its session in Indianapolis last week, reiterated prior recommendations and unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Be it resolved by the national executive committee of the American Legion in meeting duly assembled, this 6th day of June 1946, That the national legislative committee be instructed to use every possible means for immediate enactment into law of S. 524; and be it further

"Resolved, That the national legislative committee impress upon the proper authorities of the War and Navy Departments that in the preparation of the regulations pertaining to burials in all national cemeteries there shall be no discrimination as to sizes or locations of grave sites because of rank or rating of deceased members of the armed forces."

On behalf of the American Legion, I strongly urge your active support and influence for immediate passage of S. 524.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Committee.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., June 17, 1946.

To the Members of the House of Representatives:

On Thursday, next, June 20, 1946, the House of Representatives will consider the bill, S. 524, to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory, and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of war veterans.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States at its forty-sixth national encampment in October 1945 unanimously adopted a resolution endorsing the bill, S. 524, and directed the national legislative service, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, to petition the Congress to act favorably on

the bill. Accordingly, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has supported the bill and viewed its progress through the Senate and House of Representatives with great concern yet confident that its passage would meet little, if any, opposition. Therefore, it was with no little trepidation that we noted in the proceedings of the House on June 14, 1946, that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union voted 78 to 31 to recommend to the House that the enacting clause be stricken, thereby dooming the bill.

In the roll-call vote scheduled for Thursday, next, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States respectfully commends to you the favorable consideration of the bill S. 524. The recent enactment into law of legislation providing for the repatriation of our honored dead makes imperative the enactment of this bill.

We must insist that our honored dead be united with their brothers-in-arms in a distinctively hallowed burial ground provided by the Republic they served so well. We must insist on the attractive, dignified setting appropriate to the sacred trust left by those who made the supreme sacrifice for this Nation. A national cemetery will be a great memorial to our honored dead and it will truly be symbolic of the history and setting of the State in which it is located.

So long as the element of profit has a direct bearing on the lay-out and maintenance of a private cemetery the standards which we must insist on will vary too greatly. While some of our war dead may be buried in the best possible private cemeteries, others will come to sleep in neglected and abandoned ones. The Veterans of Foreign Wars had its inception immediately following the Spanish-American War and recent unfortunate experiences in discovering departed comrades of yesteryear in cemeteries long neglected because of the dissolution of cemetery associations or the utter thoughtlessness of underpaid caretakers make it imperative that the United States institute an effective national cemetery program.

In behalf of the 1,700,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, all of whom have served on foreign soil or in hostile waters, I beseech you to vote in favor of S. 524, the national cemetery bill.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN C. WILLIAMSON,
National Legislative Representative.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the favorable report of the Bureau of the Budget merits consideration. It follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1945.

The Honorable The SECRETARY OF WAR.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have received letters dated April 7, 1945, from the Deputy Chief of Staff of the War Department, requesting advice as to whether there is any objection to the submission to the appropriate committees of Congress of the proposed reports on the similar bills, S. 524 and H. R. 516, "to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of war veterans."

The proposed reports, favoring the enactment of this legislation, are accompanied by statements setting out, specifically and in detail, a program for the abandonment of 65 cemeteries now in existence, establishment of 79 new cemeteries, and further development and extension of 14 existing cemeteries, at a total estimated cost for establishment of the cemeteries and their operation during the first year, of approximately $123,000,000.

The proposed national cemeteries program of the War Department contemplates the providing of space for all interments which may be required up to the year 2028 for eligible veterans of all wars up to and including World War II, and indicates that the maximum yearly burial rate will not be reached until 1987.

I am in favor of the development of an appropriate program for meeting the cemeterial needs of our war veterans. However, I do not think the United States should now be committed to a specifically detailed plan based on the estimated requirements for the next 80 years. I believe that new cemeteries should be established only as required and that the over-all plan should be considered as a general pattern which would be reviewed and modified from time to time, as conditions change.

While therefore there would be no objection by this office to the submission to the appropriate congressional committees of such reports and accompanying statements as you may deem appropriate, this advice should not be interpreted to involve any commitment as to the relation to the program of the President, of each and every specific cemetery proposal contained in the statements that accompanied your proposed reports.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director.

Party Line Yardstick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, accusations are common today that this or that person is a Communist, or is following the Communist Party line. In that connection and for the protection of those who are improperly accused, the following article by Barnet Nover in the Washington Post of June 6 provides a convenient yardstick.

I insert this article in the RECORD for the benefit of all who want to know just what the present Communist Party line of the Kremlin officially demands. Those who advocate several of these theses—without plausible and extensive reasons adduced therefor—may be considered as following the party line. Contrarily, no one should be accused unless he does hold with some of these attacks upon our country.

RUSSIAN BARRAGE

(By Barnet Nover)

UNITED STATES NOW THE CHIEF TARGET

The United States has now replaced Great Britain and is far in front of Spain, Turkey, Chiang Kai-shek's China and even the Vatican as the No. 1 target of Russian propagandist attacks.

Day after day in the Russian press and over the Russian radio American foreign policy and American domestic developments are being described in highly critical, even sinister, terms.

For the moment, at any rate, the United States has become the villain in the piece. The picture of this country which is being presented to the Russian people and to the outside world is that of a willful, domineering, antidemocratic, and imperialistic forces which, driven by reactionary elements at home and allying itself with Fascist remnants abroad, is seeking to impose its will on the rest of the world.

In one 48-hour period—May 31 to June 2—for instance, the Soviet press and radio in a spate of articles and broadcasts attacked the United States on at least 12 separate counts.

The significance of this barrage is not to be gaged by the standing of the men who signed the articles and made the broadcasts. So far as available records indicate none of them—Izakov, Malnikov, Smolensky, Baratov, Kudriavtsev, and the others—holds a position of any importance in the Soviet hierarchy.

The attack they simultaneously launched on the United States is not to be discounted, however. Obscure as they are, they are all, perforce, mouthpieces of the Kremlin.

The form and substance of these attacks are worth examining.

1. In a broadcast on the night of June 2, the New Times, generally believed to be the organ of the Soviet Foreign Office, is quoted as denouncing the United States for what is described as its "strategy of starvation."

The people of liberated Europe, said the article, "have felt no shortage of one thing only, and that is the promise of American help." America, it went on to say, has been using food reserves and promises of loans as a form of political pressure on the peoples of Europe. It cites in particular the case of Poland, from whom promised American credit was withdrawn.

New Times did not say that this action only occurred after the Polish Government had refused to carry out certain obligations regarding freedom of the press and free elections assumed by it when the loan agreement was signed. Incidentally, these conditions were precisely those which Russia, as well as the United States and Great Britain, had laid down at Yalta.

2. A denunciation by Boris Izakov over the Moscow radio in its European service of what is alleged to be Anglo-American bloc politics, and whose purpose, he insisted, is to force the will of the United States and Great Britain "on the Soviet land."

"Firm and lasting peace," he said, "can result only from a real international cooperation. The future belongs to friendly peoples collaborating with each other."

This bit of propaganda follows the now familiar Soviet strategy of stealing the enemy's thunder, of blandly accusing Russia's critics of the very charges for which Russia herself stands condemned.

3. An attack by the New Times on the role played by the United States and Great Britain at the Paris conference. Echoing Molotov, the two western democracies are accused of leaguing together "behind the backs of the other wartime allies."

In the same article the suggestion is advanced that the two countries are abandoning a policy of cooperation "for a policy of force and foreign expansion," i. e. "world hegemony of the Anglo-Saxon race."

4. A commentary by V. Malnikov on the action of Lt. Gen. Lucius Clay in temporarily barring further reparations to Russia from the American zone in Germany.

This action is denounced in strong terms. "It is not hard to see that we are now face-to-face with a direct attempt to encourage the forces which are striving for a rebirth of Germany's aggressive power and restoration of her military and industrial potential."

Nothing was said by the commentator about Russia's unwillingness to send food from the Russian zone, where Germany's principal food-growing areas are located, to the American, British, and French zones.

5. A radio commentary by Philip Baratov in which he says that the tendency in the United States is to "put striking workers on a par with criminals of the last century." The Government of the United States, he adds, has returned to Wall Street.

6. A commentary by Peter Orlov in which the United States is accused of "knocking together an Anglo-American military bloc in preparation for a third world war."

7. Sharp criticism by Izvestia, official organ of the Soviet Government on Secretary of State Byrnes and his role at Paris. In particular the proposal for a 25-year four-power treaty of alliance is singled out for attack, as is also the rejection by the United States of the Soviet proposal to investigate German armed forces in the four zones.

The point is passed over lightly that this rejection followed the refusal of Russia to carry out a simultaneous investigation of war factories in the various zones.

8. In the same article there is a strong attack on American policy in Italy and with respect to Italian colonies.

9. A Pravda article denouncing the role and the attitude of the United States in Korea.

10. An article in Izvestia declaring that American policy in Japan fosters the revival of reactionary elements in that country.

11. A broadcast stating that American forces are taking part in the civil war instigated in China by the reactionaries.

12. Denunciation of the United States for attempting to stay on in Greenland and for seeking to retain a base in Iceland.

All this, be it remembered, in one 48-hour period.

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 19 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials from the Boston Herald of June 12, 1946, the Manchester (N. H.) Union of June 10, 1946, the Brooklyn Eagle of June 11, 1946, and the Buffalo Courier-Express of June 7, 1946, all expressing approval of the reorganization bill which was recently passed by the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Herald of June 12, 1946]

SENSITIVE CONGRESS

Many motives are involved in the passage of any important legislation, but a reading of the Senate's debate on the La Follette reorganization bill indicates that the dominant factor behind its gratifyingly swift passage was an awareness that Congress simply cannot function efficiently under its present procedures, and that the country is becoming increasingly critical of this failure. Frequently Senators said that, although they were not sure that this measure was the answer, they felt compelled by public opinion to take some action. Congress has at least some consciousness of its own shortcomings and, in the Senate at least, most Members want to correct them.

Senator LA FOLLETTE'S handling of the bill was masterful. He gave ground on nonessentials, and held stoutly where it mattered. The bill was already well sugared with a pay raise of $5,000 for all Members of Congress and the creation of a generous pension system. The main obstacle to passage was the bill's plan to establish a Director of Personnel who, horrors of horrors, was to appoint committee clerks and other congressional employees on the basis of merit. Southern Senators, hoary with seniority and jealous of large patronage preserves, balked stubbornly at this. So first Mr. LA FOLLETTE compromised. Later, resignedly, he chucked the whole merit system out.

But he saved what he regards as the keystone of the arch, the cutting down of the number of Senate standing committees from 33 to 15 and in the House from 48 to 18. He also preserved provisions to strengthen the surviving committees by equipping them with permanent research assistants and enabling them to maintain continuing studies of their opposite Government departments or bureaus.

Senator WHITE, of Maine, recalled that when he was secretary to his senatorial grandfather 45 years ago, "he thought he was being oppressed by the people of his State" if he received 15 letters a day. Now, a Senator or Representative receives hundreds, sometimes thousands, many of them calling for extended investigation. That is why the La Follette bill provides each Congressman with an administrative assistant to do the leg work on constituents, requests while he devotes himself to legislative problems.

But this is only one phase of a thoroughgoing reorganization which promises, at long last, to facilitate the study by Congress of important, intricate problems and to establish between it and the bureaucracy of Government a much-needed method of coordination and control. If the lower House fails to pass this bill, millions of hopeful Americans will be bitterly disappointed.

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union of June 10, 1946]

STREAMLINING CONGRESS

It is not surprising that opposition should arise in Federal Government circles against the new bill to modernize the procedure of Congress. This bill, drafted by the joint La Follette-Monroney committee, with the unanimous support of its membership, has received wide commendation both within and outside the Government. But it calls for reforms that cut across rights and privileges that Congressmen have enjoyed for many years and that they are reluctant to relinquish.

This fact becomes clear from a review of the reforms that the new organization program calls for. First, this program proposes that the number of committees shall be reduced so as to coincide with the major executive divisions of the Government. Each legislative committee would have a department of the Government under its oversight, with a staff of experts to aid in its work.

Another reform would require pressure groups and lobbyists to register under a detailed system specified by the La Follette-Monroney committee. Still another would remove the payment of private claims from the responsibility of Congress, so that the legislative body would have greater freedom in shaping important policies.

Another proposal would establish an annual correlation between Federal income and outgo, through the adoption of Federal Budget totals by joint action of the military and Naval Appropriation Committees of the two Houses, a matter handled in the past by four committees with little coordination or cooperation. Budget estimates would be rigidly adhered to, unless modification was granted by special congressional action.

This partial list of proposals in the new reorganization bill is sufficient to reveal why opposition should arise in Congress. Congressmen are reluctant to relinquish the prestige they feel they achieve through appointment and promotion in the multiple committees that exist today under the present plan of organization. They are not anxious to vote themselves out of committee positions by approving the elimination of committees to which they happen to belong. Pressure groups and lobbyists oppose the idea of being put under regulations, and they use their influence to persuade Congressmen to kill such a proposal. For these and other similar reasons, opposition to the reorganization bill is so strong that there is doubt that its approval can be gained in the present session of Congress.

This is exceedingly unfortunate, for the program to reorganize Congress is not a passing whim. It is something vitally essential to the future effective functioning of that body. It is generally recognized that the present organization of Congress is incompetent to meet the highly complex and enormously increased work load that the legislative arm of the Government faces. The words of Senator LA FOLLETTE in presenting the reorganization bill on this point are deeply significant:

"A tidal wave of complex, difficult intricate problems is threatening to engulf the legislative arm of the Government and ultimately to submerge it. These problems are not only on the domestic front, they are on the foreign front as well.

"Congress has been subjected to much criticism because it has not passed upon the entire legislative program of the President; but I submit that under our present archaic organization it is imposible to transact the business which it has become imperative that it handle and dispose of at each session."

This opinion has been endorsed by Senator TAFT and others. It is not a question of approving all the details of the reorganization plan proposed by the La Follette-Monroney committee. It is a question of Congress reorganizing itself so that it can operate efficiently under modern conditions. This task should not be delayed or postponed longer. Congress should take action on the matter. Personal considerations should not be allowed to defeat what is obviously essential to Government efficiency.

[From the Brooklyn Eagle of June 11, 1946]

LA FOLLETTE REFORM BILL WOULD CHECK DIMINISHING PRESTIGE OF CONGRESS

Eventually there may be a Congress whose spirit of enlightened progress will lead the way to that revision of procedure which is so essential to businesslike functioning and which has so long been needed. There is nothing in the record of the current Congress to suggest that such a reform, which would disturb seriously the long-established order, will be adopted.

From the viewpoint of the professional politician, to whom precedents, patronage, and other factors concerned with personal interest mean so much, the present archaic organization of Congress is highly desirable. Members with long service in Congress enjoy many advantages, particularly with respect to their control of jobs, which has enabled them to make provision on the public pay rolls for members of their families and political supporters.

It is not difficult to understand why the proposal to create the office of director of personnel should meet with a bitter reaction and why Senator LA FOLLETTE'S bill to simplify the machinery of Congress should be denounced by veteran Senators as "abhorrent."

The evil of this measure in the eyes of its opponents, of course, lies in its interference with their personal interests. Furthermore it constitutes an affront to the pride and the dignity of the Members of Congress because it suggests to the American people, in the words of Senator CONNALLY, "that we are running the Senate in a slipshod way—that we need somebody to come in and tell us what to do."

Actually the Senator expresses the feelings of many Americans quite accurately. They have seen Congress during this year of decision reach the extremes of futility. They

have seen vital legislation thwarted by reason of obsolete procedures. In consequence Congress approaches the end of its session with major measures caught in a hopeless jam.

Changes in procedure would not provide a complete solution for the problem of discreditable congressional performances. A fundamental requirement is a sufficient change in personnel to throw the balance of power to the side of enlightened and disinterested public service. Nevertheless the adoption of Senator LA FOLLETTE's bill would be helpful to the dignity, the integrity, and the efficiency of the Senate. The alternative, as Senator WHITE, of Maine, reminds the Members, is a continuing loss of prestige with the American people.

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express of June 7, 1946]

REMEDY AT HAND

A proposal to streamline Congress is under consideration in Washington. One of its purposes is to do away with such time-consuming chores as congressional determination of claims against the Government. Here is one example of how time-consuming and absurd such chores can be.

An American immigration service adviser was transferred from Belfast, Ireland, to New York. He put in an expense account for $163.20 for shipping his household effects. Red tape held up payment of the amount because the adviser had shipped his belongings on a vessel not of American registry. Finally the adviser filed a claim against the Government and a bill authorizing payment was introduced in Congress according to the regular procedure.

That was 16 years ago. The other day Congress at long last got around to acting on the matter. It agreed to pay the claim.

There is no reason why the immigration man should be made to wait 16 years, or even a year, for the payment of a perfectly proper claim. There is no reason why the Congress of the United States should have to be bothered with such a picayune matter. And there undoubtedly are many others of equal unimportance on file.

Small wonder Senator LA FOLLETTE remarked that Congress is "neither organized nor equipped to perform its main functions."

The program for reorganization and modernization of the entire legislative machinery is one of the most important questions Congress has before it. And in contrast to some of the other questions, the answer is easy.

Railroad Retirement System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of William J. Kennedy, Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, at convention of Order of Railroad Telegraphers, May 23, 1946, Columbus, Ohio:

I am indeed honored to be with you on this third day of your convention. As Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, I am undoubtedly expected to speak to you about the Board's administration of the railroad retirement system. Personally I wish that you had waited at least 60 days to hold your convention because in 60 days I shall have been chairman of the Board 3 months instead of 1. By that time, I should be able to tell you more than I can now about the retirement system and how some of the problems involved in the administration of the system have been solved. Now, however, I must limit my discussion to a few of the major problems I have encountered in the 1 month I have held office.

The problems I have in mind fall into 2 categories: Those which are inherent in the provisions of the legislation itself and thus can be solved only by congressional action, and those which may be solved by an improvement in administration.

In the first category is the provision of the act that a railroad employee who is totally and permanently disabled for all regular work cannot get an annuity unless he has 30 years of service or is 60 years old. If he is less than 60 and is short even only 1 month of the required 30 years, he is entitled to nothing at all. Thus, 1 month of service may make a difference between as much as $120 a month and nothing. In my opinion this is a very harsh provision. There should be some way by which a disabled employee who has any substantial railroad service could get some benefit, if not a full 30 years' service annuity, at least a benefit based on his attained years of service. Thus a disabled employee who has only 20 years of service should not be denied an annuity completely but should be given an annuity of, say, two-thirds the amount he would get if he had 30 years; and those with less years of service should be paid proportionately, assuming of course that they have enough railroad service that they may be regarded as railroad employees, and taking into account also that someone would have to pay for this liberalization.

I cannot leave this subject without mentioning the need for another type of disability annuity. Many a railroad employee may not be totally and permanently disabled for all regular work but he may nevertheless be physically or mentally unable to perform the duties of his regular occupation. Yet the present law provides no annuity for him at all because he is not totally and permanently disabled for all work. This seems to me very unrealistic. For all practical purposes, a railroad employee in his fifties, who is unable to perform his regular duties, is no better off than if he were totally and permanently disabled for all employment because his training and experience is all in the railroad industry and he is considered by many employers too old to be trained in new fields. The result is that no other industry would employ him at that age. It would certainly be reasonable to award an annuity to an employee who is disabled for work in his regular occupation if he has worked in the railroad industry at least 20 years or if he is at least age 60.

In the same category is the death benefit provision of the Railroad Retirement Act. This benefit to the survivors of an employee actually amounts to a refund of the retirement taxes paid by him during his lifetime. But the amount refunded is reduced by the amount of annuities, if any, paid to him during his life. So that if annuities have been paid to any appreciable extent, there is no death benefit payable at all in most cases. And even where a death benefit is payable the result is frequently inequitable. For instance, if an older railroad employee dies after working, say 25 years, he would have enough death benefit credit to provide a sizable total for his survivors. I might point out, however, that these death benefits are paid only with respect to compensation earned after 1936, so that it would still be about 15 years before a worker could have such a period of 25 years. In the usual case of an older worker, his children are all grown and self-supporting and he may have been able to put enough away to provide for his widow. On the other hand, if a young railroad employee dies after, say, 5 years of railroad service, the total retirement taxes paid by him during this short period (that is, his death benefit credit) will have been extremely small, and the amounts paid to his survivors will hardly be enough to pay his funeral bill. And where a young railroad employee leaves a young widow and two or three small children, as is, of course, not unusual, these will be left completely unprovided for, either by way of death benefit or by putting aside savings. The net result is that the death benefit amount is greater where the need of the survivors is least, and smaller where the need of the survivors is greatest.

Another provision in this category is that under which a railroad employee may elect to take his annuity in a joint and survivor form. Under this provision, a railroad employee who is in good health, or who is willing to wait 5 years for his annuity to start, may elect to divide his single-life annuity into two smaller annuities, one to himself during his lifetime and the other to his widow after his death. This provision has proven to be almost a 100 percent failure. In the first place very few people are in good health at the time they first become serious about taking their annuities, that is, just about the time they become 65 or shortly before. Because of this they can elect the joint and survivor form only if they are willing to wait 5 years for their annuities to start. But in most cases the need for the annuity is immediate. In the second place, very few can afford to divide their annuities into two smaller ones because even on a single-life basis the average annuity is only about $67 a month. Finally, very few can afford to speculate over an element which is out of their control. An annuitant, who makes an election, must guess right—that he will die before his wife, because if his wife should die first, his own annuity would remain in the reduced amount, or that his wife will survive him for some appreciable time, otherwise, he will have made a bad bargain. What railroad employee should be expected to gamble this way on the average annuity?

The result, as might be expected, is that less than 2 percent of the annuitants have made elections of joint and survivor annuities. In many cases, too, employees have made elections without realizing that their own annuities would be reduced. In the early stages of the Board's administration, the Board found that, in many cases, it was not until the receipt of his first annuity check that the employee discovered that his own annuity was reduced because of this election. The Board thus had to adopt complicated procedures of notice and confirmation to get the joint and survivor annuity machinery working in such a way as to accomplish what the employee really had in mind.

When one compares this necessarily complicated provision with the simple provisions in the Social Security Act for benefits to surviving widows, minor orphans, and dependent parents, without requiring any reduction in the employee's annuity, without requiring proof of the employee's good health, or requiring the employee to postpone his annuity for 5 years, one may well wonder why the Railroad Retirement Act does not have a similar provision.

As I said earlier, the solution to these problems requires congressional action. I understand that Congressman CROSSER, of Ohio, has introduced a bill which would not only take care of all the difficulties I have just enumerated, but also many other difficulties which I have had as yet no opportunity to learn much about in the short period I have held office. I understand also that the Railroad Retirement Board is officially on record as favoring the enactment of the Crosser bill. I take this opportunity to say that I am heartily in favor of it myself, that had I been a member of the Board at the time the Board

made its recommendation on this bill, I would have been very glad to join in the Board's recommendation. The bill, as I understand it, has been reported out, in a drastically amended form, by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the House itself, but I have no information now as to how soon action thereon will be taken.

I should like now to say a few words about the problems which, in my opinion, can be solved, and I hope will be solved very soon, by improving the Board's administration. In the short time that I have been in office I have been able to do little more than find out what some of these problems seem to be. I am not yet ready to speak of them here because I want to make certain what they really are. When I am ready to speak of them I hope to be ready also to speak of the solutions we found for them.

Perhaps the greatest administrative problem with which you are most likely concerned is the delay in the adjudication of some claims, a delay which, I am happy to say, does not exist in the vast majority of cases. As to this I want to assure you most emphatically of my position. It is that the Railroad Retirement Act was intended to provide railroad employees with some security during their old age, that is, that every annuity should be awarded quickly and expeditiously so that the retired employee may enjoy the benefits provided for him by the act while he is still alive, and may begin that enjoyment at the time he quits working. If a retired employee must wait months before getting his annuity or, as has occurred in some cases, he dies without receiving the annuity to which he is entitled, the purpose of the act is, to my mind, completely defeated as far as this unfortunate employee is concerned. I understand that there have been some such cases in the past, and I do not know how many such cases there may be before the Board now. But I assure you, with all the sincerity I possess, that I will do all within my power to eliminate any such situation. If an applicant is really entitled to an annuity, we are going to see to it that he gets it at once; and if the unfortunate result should be that he is not entitled to an annuity, we want to find that out immediately so that all applicants may know as soon as possible where they stand. Steps are now being taken to put this desired result into effect.

I have as yet had no opportunity to give thorough consideration to the operations under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. I gave preference, in my consideration, to the Railroad Retirement Act because up to this time there has been little unemployment in the railroad industry. I felt, therefore, that the problems, if any, under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act cannot be so immediate as to be entitled to preferred consideration from me. I shall, however, get to any such problems after I have had an opportunity to get first-hand information from our several regional and other field offices. With this in view, and in order to enable me to act intelligently on board problems, I am now in the middle of a tour of our regional and other field offices so that I may see for myself what difficulties or problems we may have in administering the unemployment-insurance system. At this point, I may say that, aside from the need for such improvements as sickness insurance and longer benefit periods, which are matters for congressional action, and also provided for in the Crosser bill, it is my impression that the unemployment-insurance system is working smoothly and well.

In concluding I want to thank you again for the courtesy extended to me and I am hopeful that at your next convention I shall be able to tell you that the problems with which we are now concerned have been solved and that our retirement and unemployment-insurance systems are accomplishing to the fullest extent the purposes for which they were established. And that we can accomplish this is not to be doubted. In this great democracy of ours no goal is unachievable. Only a short time ago our great country was forced into a terrible world war at a time when we were almost totally unprepared. There were skeptics who doubted our ability to organize and gather our forces and means in time to prevent total defeat. And their doubts were not without basis because the task was an enormous one. Yet, we did it. We did it in a measure that was almost inconceivable at the time. We not only enrolled and trained over 13,000,000 fighting men and women but we equipped them and made them the greatest fighting force in the history of the world. In addition, when the very fate of our allies was at stake, we were able to, and did, supply them with enormous quantities of war equipment and materials of all sorts. We may well ask ourselves how we did it. The answer is simple; we did it because, and only because, all of us—labor, capital, and government—cooperated to the utmost. Our patriotic fervor stimulated us to victory. And victory we achieved.

Speaking of this victory, however, I must admit that it has thus far been only on the battlefield. We have not yet achieved victory to the point where we can say that we have won the peace. By this I mean the security of everlasting freedom from the horrors of war. To win that, gentlemen, we must not for a moment cease our efforts—the joint efforts of labor, capital, and government—to carry this victory into everlasting peace for ourselves, our children, and our posterity.

Listen to me, men, I want you to get this: You can forget everything else I have said to you if you will take this one thought with your from this convention—and I say it with all the sincerity at my command, with all the emphasis of my soul—America's future, yes, the future of democracy, does not rest in the city hall of Columbus or the statehouse at Columbus or even the White House. The future of this country and the future of democracy are in the hands of organizations like yours.

Proposed Increase in Price of Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following reply to a Denver (Colo.) Post editorial by Walter E. Spahr, professor of economics, New York University:

A REPLY TO THE DENVER POST EDITORIAL OF MAY 13, 1946, ON THE PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE PRICE OF SILVER

(By Walter E. Spahr, professor of economics, New York University, executive vice president, Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy)

The following is the editorial from the Denver Post, Denver, Colo., May 13, 1946:

"The economists' national committee on monetary policy is 'all wet' in its contention that proposed increases in silver prices would be an 'indefensible subsidy to silver producers.' The fact of the matter is that a price of around $1 an ounce for silver would not be a subsidy at all, in the usual sense. It wouldn't cost the taxpayers anything.

"Gold and silver are the two monetary metals which are used all over the world. More people use silver for money than use gold. Whatever price the Government of the United States pays for silver can be paid by coining the silver purchased or issuing silver certificates against it. The Treasury now carries silver on its books at $1.29 an ounce. That is its value for monetary purposes. Every silver dollar the Treasury issues is a dollar it does not have to borrow and on which the taxpayers do not have to pay interest."

Perhaps the most important thing to note in this editorial is the fact that it did not attempt to deal with the following two sentences, of a fundamental nature, insofar as principle is concerned, in the statement issued by 66 monetary economists on May 10. Those sentences read:

First. "The only price at which the Treasury should purchase silver is that determined in competitive world markets."

Second. "There is no more validity in the argument of the silver bloc that silver should be bought and sold at its nominal monetary valuation of $1.29 per fine ounce, or at any price above the open-competitive market price, than there would be in an argument that the paper used to make paper currency should be bought and sold in the market at the nominal monetary value of the piece of currency manufactured from this paper."

These are the fundamental issues which the silver-subsidy advocates should face if they are as objective, from the point of view of the public welfare, as they generally profess to be.

The statements in the Denver Post editorial that "a price of around $1 an ounce would not be a subsidy at all, in the usual sense," and that "It wouldn't cost the taxpayers anything" are typical of the common evasions of the basic principles involved. But they are, moreover, inaccurate for these reasons:

If the price is above the free-market price, it is a subsidy. And any price above the free-market price costs the taxpayers just that much.

The silver-subsidy advocates assert over and over that, so long as the Government can make a profit above the subsidy price paid for silver, the silver does not cost the taxpayers anything. For example: If the subsidy price is 71.11 cents per ounce, and the world free-market price is, say, 35 cents per ounce (which prevailed 1939–1941), the silverites would contend that the subsidy of 46.11 cents per ounce paid to the silver producers costs the taxpayers nothing for the reason that the Federal Government coins an ounce of silver costing 71.11 cents into $1.29 thus making it a profit of 57.89 cents per ounce. What these silver-subsidy advocates do not point out is that had the Government purchased the silver at the free-market price of, say, 35 cents per ounce, the Government's profit per ounce would have been $1.29 minus 35 cents or 94 cents instead of 57.89 cents. The loss of the taxpayers is always the difference between the subsidy price and a lower market price.

If the editor of the Denver Post and other advocates of governmentally fixed prices for silver are convinced that $1, or 90.3 cents, per ounce for silver is not a subsidy price, then the question arises as to why they do not advocate a free-market price for silver. The editor of the Denver Post does not face this issue.

One may find reports of several cases abroad at which silver is said to sell at prices above our nominal or silver-coin price of $1.29 per fine ounce of silver. But in most, if not all, such instances the question arises as to whether these are local or special situations, perhaps due in part to inaccurate translations of the value of a depreciated foreign currency into our dollar, and as to

whether these local prices reflect in any important way what is, or would be, a world free-market price for silver.

The fact is that, insofar as this country is concerned the price of silver at New York has exceeded $1.29 per ounce only in 1919–20 for the entire period since 1874 at which time it stood at approximately $1.29 per ounce. A recognition of this history of the usual differences between the market and our mint (coinage) price for silver is probably the fundamental reason why the silver-subsidy advocates do not wish to rely upon free-market prices for their product.

If they are entitled to governmentally fixed subsidy prices for their product, other producers have the same right. The fact that silver is used in some of our coins does not alter the other fact that the basic principle is governmentally fixed versus free-market prices. Paper is also used for money, as are copper, nickel, tin, and zinc.

The Denver Post also advances another argument generally used by the silver-subsidy group. It is this: "Every silver dollar the Treasury issues is a dollar it doesn't have to borrow and on which the taxpayers do not have to pay interest."

That statement can be made with equal truth regarding paper money issued by the Government. If that is an important or relevant point, then the argument is weightiest, insofar as profit to the Government is concerned, for fit paper money which would yield the Government almost a 100-percent clear profit on the cost of its monetary material—ignoring all other antisocial costs, just as the silverites ignore them.

It was because the silver-subsidy crowd, the devaluationists, and a great variety of other currency manipulators who were attempting to serve their own, rather than the general, interests, could not be counted upon to present facts to the general public in an objective manner that a large group of monetary economists formed the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy in November 1933.

The purpose of these economists was, and is, to counteract misleading statements and distortions of factual data, insofar as they may be able, by presenting to Members of Congress, the press, radio commentators, and other formulators of public opinion the facts which they as scientists think they have learned. None of them has a personal interest of a type that would invite allegiance to anything but the truth in respect to monetary matters. Each member who signs one of these statements stakes his reputation on its accuracy and is individually responsble for what is said.

Bevin's Shocking Statement on Palestine an Affront to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, Great Britain is dealing the same kind of cards to the Jewish people in regard to their immigration into Palestine as she did to the Irish people over a period of 700 years. The recent statement of British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin reached a new high in racial and religious intolerance and has shocked the sense of fairness of the American public. Under the permission granted me, I include a splendid editorial on this subject published in the Brooklyn Eagle of Friday, June 14, 1946:

BEVIN'S SHOCKING STATEMENT ON PALESTINE AN AFFRONT TO UNITED STATES

The evil of racial and religious intolerance which came into full flower under the guidance and inspiration of Hitler did not die with the defeat of Germany and the death or imprisonment of the Nazi hierarchy. It flourishes still in Europe, where men and women suffer because of their faith or their race. It cannot fail to be revitalized by the amazing utterances of British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin in announcing the Labor government's policy on the question of the immigration of Jews into Palestine.

In a few words whose meaning was not susceptible to ambiguous interpretations, Mr. Bevin accomplished several purposes. He affronted the United States, its Government, and its people. He blasted the hopes of Jews that soon they may find refuge from oppression and a decent way of life in their traditional homeland. Not the least significant of his accomplishments was his stripping of British foreign policy of some of the insincerity and hypocrisy with which it has been invested insofar as the welfare of the Jews is concerned.

British consent to the creation of the Anglo-American Inquiry Commission for study of the Palestine issue was accepted as an important initial step toward the solution of this troublesome problem. The recommendation of the commission that 100,000 Jews be permitted to enter Palestine this year, a moderate concession to human decency and to justice, was received with approval both in the United States and, to a large extent in Britain.

But it proves to be too extreme a measure for the pseudo-liberal government of the Labor Party, whose decision is expressed in crude, offensive terms by a foreign secretary who seemed to be giving voice to his own warped concepts of decent human relations as well as to official foreign policy.

Apparently such intangible considerations as human sympathy, even-handed justice and moral responsibilities have been subordinated to strictly material interests. Britain feels now, as in the past, that she has most to gain by thwarting the aspirations of the Zionists and playing the game of the Arabs, whose Mufti, an Axis agent during the war, is back with his people under strange circumstances.

It is fair, under the circumstances, to question the sincerity of Britain's past professions of sympathy for the welfare of the Jews. Mr. Bevin and his government were interested and compassionate up to a point—the point of Britain's own interests.

Connecticut Food Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a speech made by Mr. Henry B. Mosle, Connecticut State food administrator, at a mass meeting of the New London famine emergency committee in New London on June 15, where I also made a speech at the request of Mrs. Mason T. Record, chairman of the New London committee, and Mr. Thomas L. Hagerty, representative from Groton, Conn.

Mr. Mosle's analysis of Connecticut's food supply and the Government's policies which have led to serious State food shortages are of tremendous interest and importance to every one of Connecticut's citizens.

CONNECTICUT'S FOOD SUPPLY

I am more than anxious to dispel the idea that America's contribution to the famine emergency is the cause of food shortages in Connecticut now. The world is short of grain and grain is mankind's basic foodstuff. It is true that if we had not sent grain to relieve suffering and famine abroad, we could eat more than we are now likely to eat. Nevertheless, exports to relieve famine are not the cause of present shortages here.

The United States is the world's best fed nation and the one most able to help keep 800,000,000 people from possible death by hunger. The famine emergency program has contributed to present food shortages only by bringing us face to face with the consequences of previous policy a little sooner than would otherwise have been the case.

When the United States entered the war we had on hand the largest grain reserves on record. These reserves, accumulated during the depression under the ever normal granary plan, were almost an embarrassment to the administration. Under the circumstances it was perhaps natural for the Government to seek means of disposing of them. A method of doing so was found by establishing prices for meat in relation to grain which favored the production of meat in grain producing areas over the sale of grain for cash. Taking the corn-hog ratio as an example, the corn farmer found that under price control he could get more for his corn by feeding it to hogs than by selling it as corn for cash. This program, designed to reduce our heavy grain surpluses and step up the production of meat and fats, did just what it was supposed to do. We had set in motion a chain of economic consequences destined to reduce the world to its present grain-deficit position.

It may have been the original intention to change these price relationships later on. However, President Roosevelt's "hold the line" order intervened, and this relationship was frozen into our economic system for better or for worse. I want to stress that this relationship was established expressly to use up over-heavy grain reserves, that is to convert grain into human food by the most wasteful instead of the most conservative method. For when food is short the best use that can be made of grain is, first, to eat it directly, as in bread or cereal; second, to combine it with forage unsuitable for human consumption in the production of a balanced, nutritious food such as milk, or to feed it to egg laying hens because these, too, produce a balanced food. Meat, while an excellent food, uses up more grain to sustain one human life than do these other foods. To concentrate on meat production was wasteful of mankind's basic food resources. Nevertheless our fundamental policy under price control and the "hold the line" order favored meat production over other uses of grain.

By 1943 we had already made substantial inroads into our grain surplus. Farmers with dairy cows and laying hens in grain deficit areas, in spite of favorable crop conditions and above-normal grain harvests, experienced great difficulty under existing price relationships in obtaining feed grain. Clearly a reappraisal was in order. But the Federal Government elected to seek grain in Canada, the Argentine, Brazil, and elsewhere, rather than modify a price relationship which was at one and the same time depriving grain deficit areas of access to feed supplies and stimulating grain consumption at rates exceeding its production. This decision to import grain for the production of milk and

eggs and other foods produced in grain-deficit areas meant that sooner or later we would empty not only our own grain bins but those of the rest of the world. As a result, when the war ended, there was little grain elsewhere to relieve that famine which in a world politically disrupted, economically prostrate, and physically dismembered, whose peoples were either homeless or without foods or fuel, or money or health, without even leadership, was bound to occur.

Nevertheless, the effects of the Government's program did not reach critical proportions either in 1944 or 1945. True, the fact that grains were hitched to the ascending parity formula under price control, whereas byproducts manufactured from them remained at base-period levels, caused farmers in some producing areas to substitute high quality byproduct feeds far less valuable, though more expensive, whole grains, thereby causing severe shortages of some of the ingredients needed in the manufacture of mixed feeds for dairy and poultry rations. This particularly handicapped milk and egg production in grain-deficit areas. But nature in these years was particularly bountiful, and in both these years provided weather which enabled farmers throughout the land to mark up new production records. We were still getting by, but it was by the skin of our teeth.

In spite of the fact, however, that the Nation now had more food to eat than in any prewar year, the food situation nationally remained tight. Under full production at high wages, with less competition for the consumer's dollar from civilian goods, America developed an astonishing appetite. Food consumption rose steadily. There were signs which indicated that within the general framework trouble spots were developing. Connecticut, for instance, a food- and feed-deficit area, which obtains most of its food from outside and relies on imported grain for its milk and egg and poultry meat supplies, not only experienced persistent difficulty in obtaining grain enough to sustain milk and egg production, but also, when foods like meat were short, received less than its fair share of these supplies—less, that is, on a per capita basis than other areas nearer the source of supply. The basic reason for this is to be found in the fact that under the ceiling-price system not enough margin had been left to cover distribution costs to areas distant from the centers of production. Established prices offered producers either more profit in other markets or else actually forced them to accept losses when furnishing scarce items to Connecticut consumers.

It is well to remember that rationing, not price ceilings, was the means employed to force distribution under our wartime managed economy. After rationing was lifted, nothing was done to replace its distributive force. This failure to seek other means of making distribution effective, more than shortages themselves, is responsible for the recent prodigious growth of black markets. Price controls, if held on the same basis as before without rationing and without an abandonment of the hold-the-line formula, could not affect this situation. The whole distributive process was disrupted when rationing was abandoned. At the same time the public appetite for food was unleashed. We Americans are now eating substantially more measured by dollar volume than we did during the war.

There are three possible ways of obtaining better distribution. After VJ-day it would have been sensible, and might conceivably still be possible, to abandon the hold-the-line order and substitute for it an order directing the Office of Price Administration to use its controls (1) to encourage needed production of foods such as milk and (2) to induce better distribution by making it at least as profitable to sell food in food-deficit areas as in other parts of the country. The Office of Price Administration did not ask for authority to use its powers in this way.

Conceding, as all thinking people must, that a precipitous rise in food prices ought to be avoided it would still have been possible through the Commodity Credit Corporation or some other Federal agency to take title to scarce foods and allocate them to deficit areas as needed. This plan could be combined with the previous one but it would tend to perpetuate the managed character of our economy and would perhaps not have encouraged gradual price and other adjustments such as are nedeed if we are to return to a free economy. Nevertheless, this plan would have helped to avoid the break-down of supplies which is now depriving us in this deficit area of equal access to national food and feed supplies.

Finally, the Government can give up price controls on all grains and the food products dependent on them. This would raise prices. On the other hand it would also effect better distribution of available supplies more rapidly, remove the speculative and political barriers to freer food movement more effectively, encourage needed production more directly, and readmit deficit areas to a fair share in national supplies more successfully than any of the previously suggested methods. The question for us today is almost whether we prefer to continue enjoying price ceilings which do not provide us with either enough or a fair share of what we need, or whether we would prefer to get a fair share of national supplies at a higher price but not necessarily at prices higher than black-market prices which we are now paying. How high would food prices go? The answer depends on this year's harvests. Nature this year is more unkind than in the past years and does not provide us with another bumper crop. Make no mistake about this: We are all gambling on this year's grain crop because up to now the Federal Government has supported a price policy which favored wasteful use of grain over its conservation.

I want to repeat what I have said before: The famine emergency program, which deserves the unqualified support of every American citizen, is not responsible for our current food shortages. It is unfortunate, but at the same time it is at least partly a consequence of the failure of our Federal Government to set up an over-all food authority, that in its timing famine abroad should coincide with the break-down caused by consistent mismanagement of our food supplies at home.

I should now like to review briefly some of the things which affect particular shortages in the Connecticut market. Take butter for example: Butter is made normally out of surplus cream. Surplus cream in turn is made out of surplus fluid milk. But milk production has not been encouraged nationally. By holding down milk prices some 900 dairy farms discontinued operations in this State in the last 12 months. A decade ago there were 7,176 dairy farms in the State: today there are only 4,373 left. Nor will these survive long if returns to the dairy farmer don't soon compensate him for his increased costs, especially feed and labor costs. How does this affect the butter supply? To continue supplying Connecticut people with fluid milk it has been necessary to invade markets where cream and even butter used to be produced, thereby limiting the milk available for cream and butter production. There has been some increased dairy activity in these areas but this, too, is now declining. Milk production must be encouraged. The way to relieve the butter shortage is to increase fluid-milk prices in areas like Connecticut to the point at which local demand can be met by local production. This has not been done and this fall we here are going to be shorter of milk than last year. If we do not get grain soon, we will be very short indeed.

Bread goes with butter and we can look at that situation, too. As has been said, it is more profitable to hold grain off the market and convert it into meat on the farms where it is grown than it it to sell it for cash. This has made the purchase of grain difficult since 1943. Yet last fall the Federal Government committed itself to supply large quantities of grain for foreign relief. No attempt was made, however, really to get grain until the Government began to fall seriously behind on its commitments. Then it, too, discovered that farmers were more interested in higher profits obtained by feeding grain under the hold-the-line order than in selling for cash. The Government then committed a serious blunder. It ordered flour millers to sell to it all but 21 days of their grain reserves, thereby certifying to the speculative world that all the flour mills of the country would be totally out of grain at precisely the same time. Still behind on its commitments and unable to persuade enough farmers to forego the higher profit to be obtained by selling their grain through animals, the Federal Government then offered to purchase wheat and corn at prices substantially above legal ceiling prices in the same market in which flour millers and grain dealers were expected to make their purchases at ceiling price. Grain owners had now learned that if they ignored appeals, the Government would itself break the ceiling price. They had also been told that every flour mill in the country would be wanting wheat in 21 days time. Flour mills are now shut down. No one knows when they will be able to buy grain again or at what price. Meanwhile, bakers in this area are receiving, not 75 percent of their last year's volume, as suggested by the Federal Government, which in any case has set up no means of assuring equitable distribution of such flour as may be still on hand, but less than 50 percent. Bread is going to be very short in Connecticut.

Shall we look at meat now? The meat situation is complicated Even during rationing whenever meat was nationally tight Connecticut received relatively less than did areas nearer the source of supplies because price ceilings did not afford packers as much profit here as in some other markets. In consequence, we had a mushroom growth of local slaughterhouses created by the demand of the people for the meat with which the large packers could not supply them. To control the rising black market in the spring and summer of 1945 the activity of these slaughterers was restricted by an over-all quota system. Connecticut, however, is forced to rely almost entirely on local slaughter, since the large packing houses now send us less than 15 percent of the meat they formerly supplied to us. Added to this, uncertainty about future price ceilings has nearly halted slaughtering operations except in the black market which is restrained but has not been blocked to the same extent. Fortunately, heavy slaughter of laying chickens occasioned by the failure of the feed grain supply has helped to tide us over this situation without too much difficulty. But if the slaughter of laying hens goes much further, however, we will not have too many eggs later on. Looking a little further ahead, we can expect more meat than we now have before the year is over, just when will depend on future price policy. Looking a little further, however, meat is going to be shorter in 1947 in all probability. Connecticut will not receive its share legally unless the present system is changed.

I am not going to go on with this recital. Enough has been said to indicate that our present food shortages are the result of gross mismanagement of the food situation by the Federal Government rather than the result of the famine emergency abroad. We must face the facts. The world is short of its basic foodstuff, grain. To protect our own

food supplies we cannot continue our present policy of favoring the wasteful use of this essential resource. To protect these suppliers we cannot continue our present food-buying spree. There isn't that much food. Either we will restrain ourselves; or when foods get short enough prices will rise to the point where many of us will not be able to afford to buy. We still have more food to eat than any other nation. To use it wisely we must back policies which will effect its equitable distribution. To serve ourselves and protect 800,000,000 people faced not with inconvenience but with possible famine we must produce, conserve, and restrain waste. We have just fought a war. Let us not, in our blind preoccupation with our own inconvenience, allow conditions to grow abroad that will lead to another war. Food can write the peace. Let us work for that peace.

United Jewish Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by me entitled "United Jewish Appeal," Grossinger's Hotel, Sunday, June 16, 1946:

UNITED JEWISH APPEAL

There is dramatic contrast between our surroundings today and the surroundings of our Jews overseas whose fate is now being decided. I'd like you to keep that in mind, not as a matter of conscience or self-reproach, but because it goes to the very heart of the matter. If the remnant of European Jewry were free to go where they pleased, if they weren't ragged and tired and hungry and prisoners of state, we wouldn't have to make those contrasts.

That's exactly the point I want to make—the dispossessed Jews are prisoners of state, and no matter how much protest is made, the fact does remain that they are political prisoners, for no other reason but politics, power politics at that, they are barred from going to the one place where they want to go and where they are welcome—Palestine.

All this palaver about committees of inquiry and consultation and negotiations between the United States and Great Britain sticks in my throat. It's time for some honest talk. Let the British say they don't want the Jews admitted into Palestine, that they are concerned with their control of the Middle East for military reasons—and for oil. Let them stop this refined talk about sympathy and committees and objectivity. Just whom do they think they are hoodwinking?

Now we learn that Haj Amin el Huesseini has returned to the Middle East. He is reputed to have left France and by way of a British plane reached Damascus, Syria. Let us see how significant that return is. Haj Amin's criminal record is a long one. After the riots of 1920 which he instigated in Palestine against the Jews, he was given a long prison sentence by the British, but managed to escape. He was duly rewarded by the British and given an amnesty. As a further reward, he was made Grand Mufti of Jerusalem. He became good, very good, friends with Mussolini and Hitler. He instigated the Irqui revolt in 1941. He formed the Arab brigade which fought American and British soldiers. In Yugoslavia, he founded the Mohammedan SS. In a document introduced at Nuremberg, a high official of the Gestapo is quoted as saying that the Mufti repeatedly suggested to Hitler, Himmler, and Von Ribbentrop the extermination of European Jewry. He considered this a comfortable solution for the Palestinian problem. He constantly urged that the extermination rate be accelerated.

This, then, is the manner of man that is permitted to return to the Middle East to stir the passions of the Arabs, an exercise in which he is most adroit. One of the excuses Britain gives for not permitting the entrance of 100,000 Jews into Palestine is her fear of an Arab uprising. Well, allowing the Mufti to get back to the Middle East is one certain way of insuring that Arab uprising. Maybe Britain's protestation that she wants peace in the Middle East is on the same level of honorable conduct as was her conduct during the war with regard to the Jews when, in spite of death and terror faced by the Jews of Europe, she kept the doors of Palestine sealed against them. She does not fear an Arab uprising; she hopes for one; in fact, with the Mufti story, it is more than a slight suspicion that she is working for it. The Arabs are easily quelled and she knows it, but should what appears to be a spontaneous uprising take place, then she will say, "See, I told you so." Another commission will be formed and Britain will again step in "to keep the peace."

The whole mess seems like the vicious play of some vapid practical jokers. I have the feeling many a time that, surely, they can't be serious; they don't really mean what they are doing. Frankly, it would be ludicrous were it not so tragic.

Almost 2 months have passed since the report of the Anglo-American Committee on Inquiry on Palestine was made public. After the wracking, tragic delays of the past 13 years, a little hope came with it when its recommendation of 100,000 Jews to be permitted entrance into Palestine was accepted by our President. But again there are delays. First, Attlee imposes conditions of disarmament and joint military and financial responsibility. Then our State Department says it must consult with Arabs and Jews again. Why did we have the committee in the first place if consultation must follow consultation and condition be imposed upon condition.

We could perhaps be asked to be more patient if a ready solution to the homelessness of at least 100,000 Jews were not present. But that solution is present, and not only present but accepted. When a solution is available, is acceptable, and is accepted, what further reason exists for inaction—unless it be foul play.

Nothing has changed in existing conditions to warrant any further delay. The United States deferred to the wishes of the British when President Truman originally requested that 100,000 Jews be admitted, and we did join in the inquiry committee. Now we are put off again. It is unseemly, to say the least, that in view of all the circumstances the United States Government should allow itself to be pushed around that way.

I believe it is time for the United States to put all its moral and political weight behind its insistence that the recommendations of the committee to admit 100,000 Jews into Palestine be acted upon at once. The longer we hesitate, the more conditions will be imposed, the more opportunity will be given to men like the Mufti and his cousin Jenal to make trouble, the more the waters will be muddied until the recommendation itself becomes a nullity. The acute needs of the waiting 100,000 Jews demand immediate action. The task of our military in Germany grows more involved daily as the tension increases in the camps of the displaced persons. It is little wonder that such disturbances as the recent one in the Bavarian village of Oberammergau take place. Certainly anti-Semitic feeling within that area is not dissipated; on the contrary, reports find such feeling aggravated. The military, duty bound to keep law and order, find their task more difficult because of this situation. Evidence of irritation with this task is not lacking. It is not easy for anybody not in the position of the displaced person who has spent years in one camp or another, watched his family killed and his friends disappear, to understand the depth of despair and panic experienced by the displaced person.

I say that the United States Government, having committed itself to a course of action with regard to the admission of the 100,000 Jews into Palestine cannot now retreat without loss of moral and political prestige. There is no doubt, too, that inaction spells retreat.

There is a little paragraph that appeared in the Jewish Chronicle, a British publication, which caught and held my attention. I believe you should listen to the philisophy of its few sentences: "The difficulties call not for despair, but for cool consideration on merits—only one thing would be unpardonable—the lackadaisical shelving of these problems, the shirking of plain and unfettered discussion. Do nothing and funking a difficult issue, these are pitfalls which the Jewish people must strenuously avoid. In the affairs of a people, as in those of a man, they are the predestined forerunners of defeat and disruption. Yet a little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands to rest, so shall thy poverty come as a robber, and thy want as an armed man!"

Very well, then, we shall let it be known that there will be no little sleep, no little slumber, no little folding of the hands to rest. Very well, then, the issue has been very clearly drawn.

Our fight to help in the survival of these Jews; to transport them to Palestine, to help them into the United States and to feed and clothe and shelter them has just begun, and everyone of us here today must be a soldier in that army.

I know you were all as deeply shocked as I was by the statement Mr. Bevin made at the labor meeting the other day. I have yet to encounter such open dishonor, such boorish soullessness in high office as Mr. Bevin displayed in that tragic statement, which reads as follows: "The agitation in the United States and particularly in New York for 100,000 Jews to be admitted to Palestine is caused by the desire not to have too many of them in New York." It is the lowest level he has reached in all his obvious maneuvering to keep the homeless 100,000 Jews out of Palestine. I cannot understand how any one human being, aware as he is, of the sufferings of the displaced Jews could permit himself to descend to such degrading depths. He should be repudiated therefor by the Labor Government which only before election had included in its platform the strongest pro-Zionist statement yet to appear in the platform of any party, including those made by the parties in our country.

And so he goes on to say that in order to transport the 100,000 Jews into Palestine, it would be necessary for Britain to send more troops into Palestine and that Britain is not prepared to do. When I called the inquiry committee when it was formed "a dodge and a stall," I hoped then I would be wrong. But, most obviously, Britain never intended to take a single recommendation of the committee seriously. It was clearly a delaying action, and we were duped thereby. It is foul play to delude the waiting, dispossessed Jews. It is dishonorable to embark on what seemed to be an honest undertaking and then reveal it for what it is—an excuse to delay action, a smokescreen to hide behind while all the time scheming and plotting how not to admit the Jews into Palestine.

The United States has likewise announced a United States Cabinet Committee on Palestine, consisting of the Secretaries of War, State, and Treasury, or their alternates. Thus we have yet another committee. It is another committee piled upon committee,

superimposed upon another investigation covering another report. Yes; now the question will be discussed and rediscussed and discussed once more. What further light can be shed on the subject? They either want to admit them or they don't. If they do, then let them proceed; and if they don't, let them say so.

That's what I mean when I say the fight has begun. If the beneficiaries of the United Jewish Appeal needed you before, how much more do they need you now? If before they looked for succor, for a dignified way of life, for a bit of bread, for a garment on their backs, for the way out to a new life (for all these are the ways the moneys of the United Jewish Appeal will be spent), how much more do they look to you now? Through the United Jewish Appeal, we let it be known that we will take care of our own, we will cherish our own, and we will honor our own despite the base betrayal of governments, of broken pledges and discard of faith. We who only by the mere accident of birth escaped the fate of our brothers overseas, we are asked to give, not our lives, not our homes, not our children, but money. We cannot find such giving, certainly, beyond us.

The UJA is one of the answers to the challenge that has been flung to us. It is one of our weapons in a resistance fight, a fight against callous disregard of human lives and human values. We shall accept that challenge as we do the responsibility. We must remember that the center of Judaism has shifted from the Old World to the New. The synagogue, the temple of learning, the communal strength have departed from Europe. The torch of Judaism lies in our hands now, for we have the strength and we have the numbers. We have the choice either to hold the torch aloft, to keep its light clear through the ages yet unborn, as the Jews of the Old World did in the civilizations that have crumbled. Or we can let it drop, dimming and then extinguishing the culture, the tradition, the love of God, and all that spiritual richness that has given the world its code of morality from the hand of Moses. We can, if we will, turn back in smugness and complacency, and forget feeling secure because our backs never felt the lash of the whip and because we never had to wear the yellow badge of David on our sleeves. Or we can, if we will, rise to meet the challenge of the stormy, confused, tear-driven world, and, in our way, try, in some measure, to set the world right again.

We must remember that if the dispossessed Jew loses his humanity, we lose ours. For insomuch as one man, one Jew shall suffer needlessly, it adds to the sum total of all the pain of the world. The million and one-quarter Jews in Europe, the Jews in Palestine, the refugees seeking welcome here will live again through you, and through you Palestine shall be redeemed.

The New Deal Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a news article by Mr. George E. Sokolsky, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald. The subject matter of this article is one that should have the attention not only of the people of this country but of the Congress of the United States. Justices Black and Jackson have no alternative but to resign, and they should do this immediately in order to maintain the integrity of this high judicial body.

Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed Hugo Black to the Supreme Court in a moment of cynical contempt for the majesty of that institution and annoyance with the public for having opposed his insistence upon packing the Court with the object of turning it into an instrument of the New Deal.

His "Dutch" was up, and he showed his contempt for an institution which he found an impediment to his plans.

The country was shocked. Hugo Black was neither by training nor temperament suited for the highest judicial responsibility. He had been a politician—but nothing more.

As a Senator, he became chairman of one of those free-lance investigations, usually referred to as the Black committee, which violated the constitutional rights of citizens by seizing their private papers, invading their residences, and confronting them with what, in effect, were seized and stolen documents.

The Black committee formed a pattern which was subsequently followed with less rowdyism by the La Follette and Dies committees.

Then it was found that Hugo Black had been a member of the KKK, as a night-shirted raider among his fellow citizens, and when confronted with the fact he delivered a speech so full of vaudevillian corn and pathos that it actually served the purpose of enveloping him in an atmosphere of pity.

To take the heat off the Black appointment, to divert public attention from this foul deed, Franklin D. Roosevelt went to Chicago and delivered the "quarantine speech" which as far back as 1937 divided the world into dictatorial and peace-loving nations and instructed the world that it must quarantine the lawless countries.

The speech was so sensational, such a bombshell, so bellicose, that it threw the Black appointment into obscurity, where Roosevelt wanted it. It was showmanship of the lowest order.

As Charles A. Beard said, "One Roman holiday was substituted for another." According to Hubert Herring in And So To War, written in 1938, it served notice on Great Britain and France that if war came, the United States would be on their side. Mr. Herring said:

"The chancelleries of Europe and Asia, more skilled in reading the full score, knew that Mr. Roosevelt had taken the first irrevocable step by which the nations are drawn into conflict."

The quarantine speech saved Hugo Black and he was permitted to sit on the United States Supreme Court, where he assumed the guise of a great liberal so that the New Deal claque applauded him and wrote in well-feigned astonishment of his liberalism.

But there were other reports that from time to time leaked out. It seemed that his colleagues on the Supreme Court regarded his knowledge of the law inadequate and his familiarity with propriety even less so.

Of all such rumors and reports I cannot speak, for naturally I know nothing of my own knowledge. Yet it would be of the greatest service to our country if a congressional committee could, after investigation, lay the ghost of indignity.

By which I mean that it damages the prestige of the Court almost beyond repair and wrecks the morals of the country when it is oft repeated and too often believed that any Justice of the Supreme Court is incapable of writing his own opinions and has to employ bright young boys to aid him. Ghost-written wisdom does not serve the ends of justice. Congress needs to discover the truth of this.

Now, Mr. Justice Robert Jackson, driven to exasperation by a low feud pursued behind his back, while he is outside the country performing a public duty, tells all. The feud in the Court arose over a question of propriety.

In carefully judicial language Mr. Jackson accuses Mr. Black of impropriety. His full statement denounces Mr. Black's conduct as prejudicial to the Court. Mr. Black may pursue one of two courses:

1. He may serve his country by resigning from the bench;

2. He may demand a full investigation by Congress.

This much the public has a right to demand, namely, that no hush-hush policy, no official courtesies, no diversions into domestic or foreign policies must be permitted to still these charges.

The Supreme Court must be saved from the degradation of these charges.

Gross Inequities in the Present Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, the majority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in recommending a substitute for the original Crosser bill (H. R. 1362) failed to correct one of the most glaring injustices or inequities to railway employees which is contained in the present Railroad Retirement Act. The original Crosser bill, which has my full support, would remove this injustice. I refer to an employee's qualifications for an annuity when he reaches retirement age and to the many thousands of such employees who happened to not be in active railway service on August 29, 1935, the enactment date of the original act.

Unlike social security, railroad employees' benefits are figured upon the number of months of compensated service that they have had in the railroad industry and the average monthly compensation that they have earned in that service. For example: if the employee had to his credit, under the law, 12 months (1 year) of service and his monthly average earnings were $200, he would be entitled to an annuity of $3 a month at age 65; if he had 120 months (10 years) of service at a monthly average wage of $200, he would be entitled to an annuity of $30 a month at age 65; with 240 months (20 years) and an average monthly wage of $200, he would be entitled to an annuity of $60 a month at age 65; and, if the employee had 360 months (30 years) of service and a monthly average wage of $200, he would be entitled to an annuity of $90 a month at age 65.

In figuring annuities there are two kinds of service to consider: subsequent service and prior service. Subsequent service is the service performed from January 1, 1937, up to the month in which the employee attains age 65; prior

service is the service performed on the railroad before January 1, 1937.

Each month of subsequent service performed by an employee is credited to him as a month of service whether such service is broken or continuous. This is not true of prior service. In order for an employee to receive credit for prior service—service before January 1, 1937—he must have been an employee working or having an employment relation with an employer under the act on August 29, 1935. Therefore, if an employee was not performing actual work on that particular day, August 29, 1935, he must have been on furlough, or subject to call and ready and willing to serve, or on leave of absence, or absent on account of sickness or disability; and such furlough or absence from duty on August 29, 1935, must have been covered by an agreement rule or practice in effect on that date on the railroad for that particular occupation. In other words, in order for an employee to get credit for prior service—service before January 1, 1937—he must have performed railroad service on August 29, 1935, or he must have had a right to return to his job on August 29, 1935.

Before August 29, 1935, during the great depression, hundreds of thousands of railroad employees were furloughed and many of the agreements in effect at that time only gave an employee 60 days to 6 months or a year in which to be called back in order to retain his rights on the railroad. Thousands of other employees, such as auditors, claim agents, and general office help, had no agreements and there was no rule or practice in effect that gave them a right to return to the service; and on that particular date, August 29, 1935, because of the condition covering these railroad employees, they did not have a right to prior service—service before January 1, 1937—because they did not have an employment relation on August 29, 1935.

Many of these railroad employees were called back to service substantially in the order of their seniority and thousands who had lost their rights, because of the time limit on the furlough rule, were called back because of the war. Many of these employees were called back or were requested to take their former railroad work and many of these former railroad employees who came back and answered the call of duty on the railroads left other occupations, but these employees are out as far as prior service is concerned and the only service for which they may get credit under the present law is the service they performed on the railroad after January 1, 1937, and up to their sixty-fifth birthday.

For example: Let us take the cases of four railroad employees, a brakeman, an engineer, a machinist, and an auditor; they all worked for the same railroad. They all started to work on January 1, 1907, and worked continuously for 25 years until December 31, 1931, when they were all furloughed. The furlough agreement covering the brakeman and the engineer protected the rights of those employees until they were called back to service. The furlough agreement covering the machinist protected his rights for 2 years, but there was no agreement, rule, or practice in effect that gave any returning rights to the auditor. They were all called back to service on January 1, 1942, to help handle war traffic. The brakeman refused to come back to service, but the other three returned to railroad occupations. Let us further assume that each of these four employees had average monthly earnings on the railroad of $200 and attained age 65 on December 31, 1946, and then filed claims for retirement benefits.

The brakeman, who refused to come back, was protected by an agreement and, even though he had not paid a penny of tax to support the legislation, he would be entitled to an annuity of $75 a month based on 25 years of prior service.

The engineer who returned and worked from January 1, 1942, to December 31, 1946, would be entitled to an annuity of $90 based on 30 years of service; 25 years of prior service protected by an agreement and 5 years of subsequent service.

The machinist would be entitled to an annuity of only $15 a month for 5 years of subsequent service, having lost his right to 25 years of prior service because of an agreement which limited furloughs to 2 years.

The auditor would also only be entitled to an annuity of $15 a month for 5 years of subsequent service—January 1, 1942, to December 31, 1946—having lost his rights to 25 years of prior service because there was no agreement, rule, or practice in effect to protect his prior service right.

The injustice of such a situation is manifest. There can be no valid reason advanced for not correcting it.

The Railroad Retirement Board in the administration of the employment relation feature of the present retirement act is charged with the responsibility of determining what the rules and practices are for the various occupations on the various railroads and further determines whether a particular absence is in accordance with the rule or practice in effect on August 29, 1935.

There are many cases which have been under examination for some years which have required an enormous amount of work by the Board and have not as yet been completed because of rules having been changed and company unions have gone out of existence. The finding of facts has been extremely difficult and the formulation of a rule is impossible.

The majority of the committee, in reporting its substitute, failed to recommend any change in the present law to remedy this condition, but Representative CROSSER, in submitting the original H. R. 1362, included an amendment to grant prior service credits to any employee who returned to railroad service after August 29, 1935, and rendered service to an employer for 6 months or more before January 1, 1945. The limiting date has already passed; therefore, no person can receive credit for prior service at this time merely by returning to service for 6 months. This change in the present law is necessary not only for aiding the administration of the Railroad Retirement Act but to make provision for allowing prior service credit to thousands of railroad employees who have been deprived of annuity benefits for such service because of the great depression and through no fault of their own were out of service on that particular date of August 29, 1935. The cost of this change in the existing law is offset by another provision in the original Crosser bill which would no longer permit former employees—such as the brakeman in the above example—who declined to return to railway service in the 1935–45 period, and who have never paid a penny in contributions to the retirement fund, to be given the benefit of service performed prior to 1937. The original Crosser bill, on the one hand, provides benefits to many men who are certainly entitled to them and who do not now get them, and on the other hand, it takes away prospective benefits from men who are obviously not entitled to them. The committee substitute does nothing about the situation.

This is one of many reasons why Members of the House should reject the committee substitute and enact the original Crosser bill.

National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letters:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Baltimore, Md., June 6, 1946.

Col. WILLIAM H. NEBLETT,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLONEL NEBLETT: I shall deeply appreciate it if you would prepare and send to me, for the information of the National Security Committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, an article or statement setting forth your views upon national security insofar as the same may apply to the needs of the armed forces in the event of an attack upon our country by a foreign power.

While we anticipate no such an attack and look forward to a long and lasting peace, we are conscious, nevertheless, of the needs for an understanding of what we now possess as against what we would require, in the event of such a catastrophe.

May I assure you that an expression from you will be warmly received by all of us.

With kind personal regards, I am

Respectfully yours,

PAUL C. WOLMAN,
Chairman, National Security Committee.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 10, 1946.*

Mr. PAUL C. WOLMAN,
Chairman, National Security Committee, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Baltimore, Md.

DEAR MR. WOLMAN: I undertake with considerable humility the answer to your letter of June 6 which asks me for a statement of my views on national security, because I know that the members of your committee are highly skilled on the subject upon which you ask my opinion.

POSSIBILITY OF FUTURE WAR

I am in accord with your statement that no attack upon us is anticipated and that we all look forward to a long and lasting peace,

but that there is an urgent need for an understanding of the problems of maintaining peace. There is, in my opinion, slight possibility that there will be another war in our generation.

If our country can escape a war during our time, it is probable that there will never be another one. However, it is certain that, if there is another war, it will come through the air and over the North Pole. In the region lying below the North Pole and above the thirtieth parallel of latitude north, are the manufacturing centers and productive areas, population centers, and the great capitals of all of the nations capable of making war upon each other. The shortest distance between them and our country is across the North Pole. On the probability of war, the direction from which, and the manner in which it would come, all military strategists agree, even though they may disagree upon our means and methods of meeting such an attack.

PRESENT AND FUTURE WEAPONS

There is now only one defense to an attack through the air and over the North Pole and that defense is more destructive countermeasures against the attacking nation. If war does come, it will come quickly and it will be directed against our manufacturing, transportation, and population centers. Hitler set the pattern of all future wars in this machine age when he went into Poland in 1939 and during the London blitz of 1940 and 1941.

No aggressor nation will expect to win a war by the invasion with conventional armies of any country nearly equal in strength to itself. Our airplanes of today could meet an ordinary invasion force hundreds of miles out and destroy it, whether it came by sea or land. Countermeasures against enemy manufacturing, transportation, and population centers more destructive than anything he could possibly throw against us will be the single effective defense upon which our national security must depend, if we would survive an attack with modern weapons.

THE BRUNT OF WAR

It must be understood that since war can now come to us only through the air and over the North Pole, our civilian population would be the principal sufferers from an attack. Improvements in weapons and transportation have made the defeat of armies relatively unimportant to a decision in war. As long as the productive capacity of a nation is in good working order its capacity to make war with weapons now at hand is unhurt. To think in terms of any other sort of war or to prepare to fight one of the conventional type is to close our eyes to the realities of the situation which have been brought about by new instruments of war.

MODERN WEAPONS

The only instrument of war now capable of taking effective countermeasures against any nation which might attack us is the long-range, land-based bomber. It is likewise the only instrument of war capable of attacking us. The region surrounding the North Pole across which war must now come, if it comes at all, is impassable to all forms of surface craft—land or sea. It is as easily traversable through the air as any other part of the globe. The vital centers of all nations capable of making war on us and lying within that region above the thirtieth parallel of latitude north are in easy reach of the long-range bomber of today. It is the instrument of war upon which we must now rely for national security. Many nations are feverishly working upon guided missiles. It is practically certain that within the next 5 or 10 years, guided missiles will succeed to the position held by the airplane as the present effective weapon upon which our national security depends. We cannot afford to wait upon the perfection of guided missiles but must keep a force of aircraft sufficient in range and strength to fill the gap in our defense between the present and the time when the range of guided missiles has been lengthened and their accuracy improved.

PRIMARY PRINCIPLES OF DEFENSE

We should remember that we must always be ready to make war in the enemy's country—to carry the fight to the aggressor, making his homeland the battleground. This is the primary principle of an adequate national defense and consequent world peace, whether we act as one of a union of nations or alone. We are and always will be strong enough to keep the enemy from landing in this country in force but we know of no defense to an attack through the air and over the North Pole except more destructive countermeasures against the enemy than he can bring to us. We have the weapons now with which to do that and we will continue to be able to do it unless we allow the advantages we possess to deteriorate from the complacency which has plagued us at the end of all of our wars. Unless we sleep upon our advantages we will not now let the rust of overconfidence corrode the military power we have devoted to peace and to progress toward a better world. Maintenance of our air power at the proper level will make us safe in the present; the continued development of guided missiles will give us supremacy when they have superseded the airplane.

HISTORY OF PAST ACHIEVEMENTS IMMATERIAL

Divergent views on the methods and instruments of war, upon which we should rely for our national security, based upon claims as to which arm or service contributed the most toward winning the past war, bring on controversies which are purely academic. Those are things to be settled by historians, who will probably not reach an agreement upon them during our time. Such controversies have no effect whatever upon the use of atomic fission as a war weapon or upon the ability of the long-range airplane now in being to convey it to the target.

It is unfortunate that dogmatic claims are constantly being made by persons of high military position that there is now a defense to the long-range airplane and that one will soon be found to the atomic bomb and to guided missiles. The proponents of the idea rely upon the nonexistent military maxim that no weapon has ever been invented to which a defense has not soon been made effective. There is no defense today to a projectile and the world has been seeking one for over 500 years; nor is there any absolute defense to the airplane. It is true that interception and antiaircraft have greatly improved and undoubtedly will continue to do so. But if they ever do improve to the point where they can put up an absolute defense to the airplane, then those defensive weapons will in turn become offensive weapons and take the place of the weapons which they have bested. Such arguments are but supporting evidence of the real military maxim that there will never be another war unless it comes through the air.

Even though interception and antiaircraft should become as effective as its proponents claim, it will always be impossible to prevent a few of the attacking planes from getting through to the targets—and a few loaded with atomic bombs will be enough. War will be decided by the nation which gets the most bombs to the targets quickest, whether transported by long-range aircraft or by guided missiles. The old military adage ascribed to Gen. Nathan Forrest that a battle is won by the commander who gets the most men there first should be revised to meet modern conditions so as to read that the war will be won by the nation that first gets the most atomic bombs on the vital centers of the other nation. In these modern circumstances no nation can win unless it is always poised ready to retaliate or, even better, to attack first in anticipation of an enemy's known intention to attack it. While time and space factors have been eliminated in war by the development of new weapons and improved methods of carrying them to the target, these factors have not been entirely abandoned in our official life or we would have long before this have been reorganized militarily so that our armed forces would now be working together as a single unit with our preparation for national defense pointed to the north, the only direction possible from which war may now come.

ORGANIZATION AND TRAINING

The War Department announced April 24, 1946, in War Department Circular No. 119, the general principles governing organization and training in preparation of our postwar plans. Circular No. 119 is recommended to your organization for its consideration and study. It emphasizes the establishment of a military force organized, trained, and equipped in accord with modern weapons and improved transportation. Circular No. 119 says, in part:

"Under current conditions and those of the predictable future, the influence of air power cannot be overemphasized. The nation which supports the most efficient and the least restricted program of scientific research will lead the world in the development of arms and the other accoutrements of war. The nation maintaining the most effective world-wide intelligence service will be least likely to be surprised by sneak attacks and newly developed weapons. An acceptable military leadership must possess the creative imagination to provide scientific research with the performance requirements necessary to maintain an advantage in weapons and equipment. It must be capable of promptly adjusting organization and the conduct of battle to the developments resulting from military and scientific research. Forewarned by an effective intelligence service, it must have the ingenuity to devise ways and means for defeating innovations developed abroad before they become available for practical use by potential enemies.

* * * * *

"The basis for all plans for a postwar peace establishment will be the second type of military organization: based upon the conception of a professional peace establishment (no larger than necessary to meet normal peacetime requirements) to be reinforced in time of emergency by organized units drawn from a citizen army reserve, effectively organized for this purpose in time of peace; with full opportunity for competent citizen soldiers to acquire practical experience through temporary active service and to rise by successive steps to any rank for which they can definitely qualify; and with specific facilities for such practical experience, qualification and advancement definitely organized as essential and predominating characteristics of the peace establishment."

You, of course, realize that, under our form of government, the War Department has no authority except to recommend the type of military establishment which it believes will make us secure and which will make us able to enforce the part we have assumed in world affairs. The responsibility lies wholly with Congress. Until Congress does establish an adequate peacetime force, we must maintain in being an air force strong enough to fill the gap left in our defenses by too rapid demobilization. No other sort of known force is now capable of successfully defending us against an attack through the air and from across the North Pole except a stronger air force than that of any possible enemy.

PERMANENT PEACE—THE ULTIMATE OBJECTIVE

It is apparent from the destruction our B–29's brought upon the Japanese industrial and transportation centers that the single objective of all military preparedness must be permanent peace. War is already too terrible to be engaged in by intelligent nations.

The early perfection of supersonic planes and guided missiles armed with atomic bombs as war instruments is too awful even to contemplate. However, so long as some strong nations regard overpowering military strength as the only assurance of peace, we, the single nation on earth which has the intelligence, the strength, and the desire to use our power wisely, must keep ourselves in the military position to enforce peace throughout the world. It is an office which we assume with reluctance, but no other practical way is seen by which we can meet our responsibility. Finally, I believe that we can perform the task of maintaining permanent peace which has been forced upon us by world conditions, when we have reorganized our military forces and then trained and equipped them as recommended by War Department Circular No. 119 (24 April 1946).

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. NEBLETT,
Colonel, Air Corps, Reserve.

The Medical Rehabilitation Program in the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very fine report of the medical rehabilitation program in the Veterans' Administration. This report was prepared by Dr. Donald A. Covalt, the Acting Assistant Medical Director, Medical Rehabilitation. Dr. Covalt is one of the fine assistants to General Bradley.

When Maj. Gen. Paul R. Hawley, Chief Medical Director for the Veterans' Administration, first took over veterans' medical care, he had two aims: First, to provide the very best medical care possible for sick and injured veterans, including improved facilities and an elevation of professional medical standards; second, to establish a complete medical rehabilitation program.

In order to accomplish this latter aim General Hawley immediately created in his Washington office a medical rehabilitation service for all veterans' hospitals. He is determined that every wounded veteran shall have his opportunity for psychological, physiological, social, and economic rehabilitation, and that this program must begin in the hospital.

The assistant medical director in charge of medical rehabilitation is directly responsible to General Hawley. His service includes a complete physical medicine department, with assistant chiefs directing programs of physical therapy, occupational therapy, and corrective physical rehabilitation. In addition, there are divisions in aural rehabilitation for the hard-of-hearing and for the blind, for educational retraining, for industrial therapy, and a complete shop program. We will go into those in more detail later.

As you all know, it is impossible for any group of people in one office building in Washington to manage the multitude of affairs of the Veterans' Administration. For this reason General Bradley has undertaken a plan of decentralization through which the operating functions of his organization will be delegated to branch managers in various parts of the country. Thirteen such branch offices have been established. Each represents a smaller version of the Washington central office and is responsible for the successful operation of all regional offices and hospitals in its area. In each of these branch offices there will be a physician experienced in medical rehabilitation who will supervise and guide the program in all of the hospitals of that area. He normally will be assisted by a medical administrative specialist with extensive and valuable training in rehabilitation in the Army or Navy.

Both Generals Bradley and Hawley have insisted that each general medical and surgical, tuberculosis, and neuropsychiatric hospital shall have a complete medical rehabilitation program. In order to accomplish this, the position as chief of the medical rehabilitation service will be established in each of the 97 hospitals operated by the Veterans' Administration. This man may or may not be a doctor. We wish to obtain as many physicians as possible to fill these positions. However, there is a very grave shortage of doctors in all categories. This is particularly true in rehabilitation, for few physicians have established themselves as specialists in this field. In those cases where the service is directed by a trained layman, he will work directly under the chief of the professional staff, or, as we call them in veterans' hospitals, the chief medical officer. In addition, he will work in very close coordination with the chief of physical medicine or other physician designated as special consultant for the service.

The office of vocational rehabilitation is separate from the Department of Medicine and Surgery but very close liaison is maintained at all times with this office. Vocational rehabilitation has consented to place a vocational guidance officer in each veterans' hospital. He and the rehabilitation officer will see the patient soon after his admission. By means of vocational guidance testing and short job experiences, it will be determined what the patient wishes to do and what he can do in terms of his mental and physical abilities. As soon as he is ambulatory, and in some cases even before that time, an extensive program will be made available to him. Complete and well-equipped physical therapy departments will enable him to loosen up a stiff arm or leg. In addition, the more seriously injured will be assisted in their recovery by corrective physical rehabilitation personnel, who will specialize in the corrective techniques developed recently in the services These young men, most of them with degrees and advanced work in physical education. have had valuable experience in the armed forces, working with seriously injured patients These men are extremely important in such work as in teaching the patient to put on and take off his braces, in learning to walk in the proper fashion, and in teaching the proper methods of crutch-walking and gaits.

A very large number of patients will wish to go into the academic program while in the hospital. A wide variety of subjects can be studied, thanks to a three-way approach to educational retraining. First, there will be a staff of competent instructors assigned to the medical rehabilitation service in the hospital who will teach classes and assist with individual study. Second, the United States Armed Forces Institute, which did such an outstanding job in the educational field for the armed forces during the war, has made available to us 92 different courses for correspondence work and self-study. These courses break down into three general classes: Technical subjects such as automotive repair and electronics; academic subjects such as English, foreign languages, and social studies; and business subjects such as typewriting, business management, and accounting. The third phase of the educational program consists of close cooperation with local universities, colleges, and high schools who can be of tremendous assistance in furthering this work in our veterans' hospitals.

In this educational program, we consider it vitally important that the patient be able to secure scholastic credit for the work he accomplished. Many of our veterans did not complete sufficient work to obtain a high-school diploma before they entered the service; others need credits to apply toward college degrees. In many cases, this work can be completed while they are convalescing in the hospital. This was demonstrated most successfully during the war. In one Army Air Forces convalescent hospital last year, a total of 122 men received their high-school diplomas while still in the hospital. With the pressure of war removed, we feel that such a program will be even more successful in Veterans' Administration hospitals. All of this education program will be free of charge to the patients.

There will be an intensive shop program in each hospital. Through our experience in the armed forces, we have found out just which shops appeal to the majority of these men. They are more particularly interested in radio repair, the fundamentals of electricity, carpentry, woodworking, sheet-metal work, and small-machine tools. In these shops, the patient can choose for himself the type of work he wishes to do for the rest of his life, if he is capable of doing such work. This is really prevocational training and it leads to a continuous process of rehabilitation. By the time a patient is ready to leave the veterans' hospital, sufficient data have been obtained about him so that he can enroll immediately with a vocational program. Through the GI bill of rights or Public Law No. 16 he may immediately be placed either in on-the-job training or perhaps be enrolled with a university for more advanced instruction. Rehabilitation must be a continuous program. Any lag-time loses people from the program forever. Our veterans' hospitals today are caring for many men who have been in the hospital since the last war and who might have been rehabilitated and become useful citizens if a full program had been in effect. It has been estimated that each World War I veteran who has been in a hospital since World War I has cost the Government approximately $40,000. But this is the least of the cost. His ability to produce has been lost to the Nation, along with his own self-esteem and his ability to take his rightful place in the community.

We have some particular problems in the Veterans' Administration and I would like to go over a few of them with you. First, among these are our hard-of-hearing and deafened, for which there is a need for a complete aural rehabilitation program. The Army and Navy have established three aural rehabilitation centers. Approximately 13,000 service personnel have passed through these centers for intensive training, not alone for the use of their hearing aids, but also acoustic training, speech correction, voice retention, and lip reading. At one of our regional offices where veterans in need of any kind of medical care may be examined, it has been estimated that only one-third of the hard-of-hearing and deafened veterans who have been discharged from the services have had the benefit of the intensive program of those aural rehabilitation centers. You can see that this presents a big problem, for the hard-of-hearing veteran does not do well in his vocational rehabilitation training. Because of such handicaps, it becomes necessary to establish small auditory clinics in our regional offices through the country. Here a trained audiometric technician and an audiometer will be used to pick up those men who need further training, and they will be referred to an aural rehabilitation center. We plan three such centers for the immediate future—one on the east coast, one in the Middle West, and one on the west coast. Veterans will be expected to stay there for at least 1 month for training. At the end of that time, they will be able to leave and will have had the very best training this country can provide for the hard-of-hearing and deafened. In order that every such veteran may realize that this service is available, an

educational program is contemplated for all contact representatives of veterans' regional offices, as well as doctors and nurses who work with patients on out-patient basis, so that we may pick up every one of these veterans who have been deafened and who have not had the advantage of this intensive training.

The partially blinded and the blinded veterans must have special consideration. The Veterans' Administration has established nine blind centers at Bath, N. Y.; Kecoughtan, Va.; Los Angeles, Calif; Wood, Wis.; Tuskegee, Ala.; Bay Pines, Fla.; Bronx, N. Y.; Mountain Home, Tenn.; and Dayton, Ohio. At each center, a complete program of orientation and instruction will be made available for these men. At the present time, I have one man who is making a survey of each of the nine centers in order to see that our program is as complete as possible. I assure you that whatever steps are necessary in order to improve our program for the blind will be taken.

Neuropsychiatric hospitals present another particular problem in the Veterans' Administration. It has been known for a long time and has been proven in the armed forces in this war that an active occupational therapy and industrial shop program is excellent adjunctive psychotherapy; and that in those neuropsychiatric hospitals where patients are given proper exercise the necessity for sedation and restraints has been cut to a minimum. Out-of-door work such as farming, dairying, gardening, etc., is particularly valuable for these patients.

In the tuberculosis hospitals, our activity must take a different approach than in our other hospitals. One of the problems which has long confronted the Veterans' Administration has been the constant readmission of tubercular patients to our hospitals. General Hawley has decided to do something about this. Heretofore, a patient would enter a hospital with tuberculosis, his disease would be arrested, and he would be discharged to return to his old employment. If his employment was in a heavy industry, it was only a question of time until this man broke down again and had to be readmitted. General Hawley has effected a program of rehabilitation for such a patient so that during his hardening process he would be given an opportunity to learn physically light, easy work—work that he can do within his physical tolerance. The patient will be given an opportunity in our shops and classes to learn what he likes to do and is able to do. Then, upon leaving the hospital, he will be given training under the Vocational Rehabilitation Division in order that he may follow a vocation that will not cause his disease to become active again. For these people, we will stress the academic portion of our program. Salesmanship, office management, and all related subjects can be considered in rehabilitating these patients in the terms of their physical tolerance.

I would like to tell you about one other project which will be brought into our hospitals which are located in or near industrial cities. I am bringing into my office a man who has had several years' experience in industrial therapy, where small assembly shop work and piece work may be brought into the hospital and even to the bedside. The Army Service Forces have had a lot of experience in this during the past 3 years and it has proven most successful. We believe it will be a good project for veterans' hospitals. The patient will have the additional incentive of being paid for his work and it has been found that many companies are more than happy to cooperate in the project. A patient will be appointed as group leader for six or eight other patients. He will distribute and keep track of the work and the amount that each patient does. By means of a simple accounting system, only one civilian employee and a stenographer will be necessary to establish this project in each hospital. All other personnel may be obtained from the patients.

Our broken-back cases, the paraplegias, are another particular problem. There are approximately 2,000 of this type of cases at the present time. Those are men who have been severely wounded and are paralyzed from the waist down. Heretofore, life expectancy of those men was not very long. Now, by means of increased knowledge, both of drugs and surgical management, there is no reason why these people cannot live as long as so-called normal people. At the present time, the Veterans' Administration has 400 of these cases and the remainder are still in five Army Service Forces hospitals. Three of these paraplegia centers will be taken over from the Service Forces by April 1, 1946. We plan that the paraplegias will be concentrated in six or seven paraplegia centers where special rehabilitation teams will take charge of each patient. As in all other types of rehabilitation, it is the team which makes a program work. The longer I am in rehabilitation the more I realize that a well-integrated group of all types of specialists is necessary if we are to be successful, and I consider the paraplegia the supreme example.

Here the team must be composed of a neuro-surgeon, a psychiatrist, urologist, orthopedic surgeon, physical therapist, physical therapy technicians, corrective physical rehabilitation supervisors, social service workers, and nurses. Every member of this team must carry his full load or the program of rehabilitation falls apart. After definitive medical and surgical care has been completed, these patients are given an intensive course in ambulation. Shoulder girdle muscles must be developed by special exercises and hours must be spent in learning to put on and take off braces. I have known paraplegic patients who spent 2 hours putting on braces the first time and who now do it in 15 minutes. There must be a willingness on the part of the patient to work and to sweat. He must have a driving ambition, an untiring determination, to recover in order that he may walk once more. At our hospitals we have some patients who are able to get up and down steps, off and on busses, cross streets and go shopping, and this with a complete paralysis from the waist down.

There are many thousands of severely disabled veterans of other types, and each type presents its own peculiar problems to our service. A recent survey indicated that some 7,000 of these handicapped veterans have been discharged from hospitals. These men are now at home and are in need of further rehabilitation measures and training if they are to become productive members of the community. For a variety of reasons, they have not been able to obtain this training. Some have been unwilling to apply for it, because of the severity of their disability; some have not been able to find suitable "on-the-job" training; others have found that universities consider further training under ordinary facilities to be impractical. Besides these 7,000 who have been discharged from the hospitals, there are many thousands more who are still in our veterans' hospitals and who are not able to leave. For these seriously handicapped people, an additional step must be taken, and we will propose a three-way program: First, a new type of installation which may be designated as a "colony or community for the severely handicapped"; second, sheltered workshops in some of the larger communities; third, contractual relationships with suitable existing sheltered workshops, where the severely disabled can be employed upon referral of the Veterans' Administration.

The latter two proposals need no further expansion at this time, but I do want to go further into the proposed communities for severely handicapped veterans. We wish to start a pilot program which must be near an industrial city with permanent-type construction and using only the ground floor. Steps would be abolished throughout and ramps installed for the use of crutches and wheel chairs. Only a small definitive bed hospital will be needed, for these veterans will have had all of their medical and surgical care before admission to the community. Large workshops will be provided and again we will bring in small assembly work and piecework which can be done by handicapped veterans. Here they may work 1 or 2 hours per day, and, as they become better fitted, this may be increased to 5 and 6 hours a day. When he finally becomes able to put in a full day's work, the Social Service and the Vocational Rehabilitation Division will step in and find this man a place to work and live. He will be asked where he wishes to live—either in his own original community or elsewhere. By means of such a project, we will provide another step for those severely handicapped veterans who, previous to this experience, were not employable in private industry. I have obtained the services of Major General Ent, one of General Arnold's right-hand men, who was injured early in the war as the result of an airplane accident, in which a broken propeller blade struck the seventh thoracic vertebra and left General Ent completely paralyzed from the waist down. At this time, General Ent is ambulatory again. He is a man of vast experience in organization and is an executive of the very finest caliber. I wish him to take over the management of this pilot program.

The Veterans' Administration realizes the immense strides that have taken place in rehabilitation during the past 5 years. In the planning of the 30 new hospitals which we contemplate building during the next 2 years, rehabilitation has a prominent place. The new hospitals are being located as close to our medical centers and universities as possible. Most of these will be 1,000-bed general medical and surgical hospitals, and in each hospital much space and attention has been given to a fully developed physical medical department with physical therapy equipment of the very latest types. Each of these new hospitals will have classrooms and all of the shop equipment as I have previously described to you. The program will follow in principle the plans as laid down by the Baruch Committee on Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation and we believe that they may well serve as a model for the future needs of civilian hospitals.

Public attention in our country has become focused on the disabled and handicapped because of the war. Few people realize that prior to World War II we had in the United States some 23,000,000 persons who were handicapped to some extent by disease, accident, or from former wars. Each year some 350,000 persons are permanently disabled in this country by accidents alone. In 1940 we had six and one-half million disabled males between the ages 15 and 64 years, who normally would be income producing. During the first 4 years of the war there were some 17,000 amputations in the Army and Navy, but during this same period there were 120,000 major amputations from diseases and accidents in our civilian population. There were 11,000 soldiers injured on the beaches of Normandy after D-day, but we had more than twice that many civilian casualties from auto accidents alone during those same 10 days in the United States.

The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation under the Federal Security Agency has proven that rehabilitation is well worth while from a monetary standpoint alone. There were nearly 44,000 handicapped persons taking training under vocational rehabilitation in this agency in 1944. Twenty-two percent, or more than 10,000, had never been gainfully employed and nearly 90 percent or nearly 40,000 were not employed at the time they started their rehabilitation. The average annual wage of the entire group prior to rehabilitation was $148 per year. After rehabilitation, the average wage was $1,763

per year. The total earnings of the entire group rose from $6,500,000 to nearly $78,000,000. The entire cost of the rehabilitation program was approximately $6,500,000, or an average cost of only $300 per case. These 44,000 persons represented only one-twentieth of the persons who need such a service. These figures alone show the great need and the practicability of such a program.

In conclusion, I would like to point out once more that General Hawley wishes a complete program of rehabilitation in every veterans' hospital in the United States, in order that every injured veteran will not alone have the finest in medical and surgical care available for him, but also to insure that every patient may be restored to the highest possible standard of mental and physical condition. In this manner, the greatest possible percentage of veterans should be able to return to their communities to live, to work, and to produce for themselves, their community, and their country.

Mead and Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article by George E. Sokolsky, which appeared in the New York Sun under date of April 30, 1946, entitled "Mead and Farley":

THESE DAYS
(By George E. Sokolsky)
MEAD AND FARLEY

The effort of Senator MEAD to obtain the Democratic nomination for Governor of the State of New York has this national importance: If the Democrats can, with the aid of the CIO and the Communists, elect a Governor in New York, they will eliminate Thomas E. Dewey as a possible Presidential candidate. Sidney Hillman has made the defeat of Tom Dewey the No. 1 PAC job of 1946.

Ed Flynn, the Bronx boss, believes apparently that he and Sidney Hillman can put Senator MEAD over. The Republicans feel that MEAD would be an excellent candidate for their purposes. The Communists back MEAD to the hilt because they regard him as pliable. Jim Farley, who has acceded to the moral position of Al Smith, regards MEAD as unfit. MEAD himself, who was sure that he had the nomination in his vest pocket, has now postponed his political aspirations until September.

The attitude of Jim Farley grows in importance. The man who made Roosevelt, who sacrificed his career because he opposed a third term, weakened his stature in the past by supporting the Roosevelt candidacies for the third and fourth terms in spite of his opposition to both on the basis of traditional Americanism. Even his friends held that Jim Farley lacked the courage to break with his party when his conscience dictated a break.

It was not that at all. The personal relations between Farley and Roosevelt transcended politics. Even estrangement could not lessen Farley's strong sense of personal loyalty. He could differ from Roosevelt's judgment but he could not oppose his friend. He stated his objections, withdrew from intimate association but never sullied his own sense of propriety by the kind of personal antagonisms that marked the relations between Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft. He could not kiss and tell even after a quarrel.

No such personal relations exist between Jim Farley and Senator MEAD. While Jim admired Mr. Roosevelt's abilities, he regards Senator MEAD as unfit for administrative office. He feels that the Senator is just a local politician, not a worthy successor of Charles Evans Hughes, Al Smith, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman, and Tom Dewey. If his party cannot do better than JIM MEAD, it is likely that Jim Farley will protest the choice. His protest will count among those Democrats who have wearied of the kind of politics that Ed Flynn has been playing with White House approval. Few admire Flynn even in the Bronx.

Jim Farley has grown in stature and wisdom since he left the Postmaster Generalship. A small-town politician, he became Mr. Roosevelt's manager in the days when Mr. Roosevelt was not a national figure. For years he devoted himself to one man with all the limitations such a focus places upon the devotee. In recent years, he has traveled widely in Europe and South America as well as in the United States. His views on men and events have broadened and his concept of the role of his country has ceased to be related to the fortunes of individuals and the exigencies of local politics. Ed Flynn, for instance, seen in such perspective, is a little boss of the Bronx—that and nothing more. And JIM MEAD is just a pliant politician who wants more—that and nothing more.

Republicans in New York are not too enthusiastic over Farley's assumption of a moral leadership in his own party. They had counted on MEAD to run. They feel that MEAD has been on so many sides of so many issues that they can make their choice and hammer him accordingly. They were certain that he could not carry his own city of Buffalo with its large Polish constituency. Their fear is that if Jim Farley offers decent Democrats in New York a chance to free themselves from Boss Flynn, they might turn to Jim Farley as the Democratic candidate for Governor. Jim Farley has repeatedly denied that he is a candidate, but men have been known to change their minds when the bird in the bush flies into their hand. That would not be so good—for the Republicans.

Interpretation of the News Through the Eyes of Two Returned Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I had the pleasure of visiting with two young men who have just returned from the Pacific area. They were officers in the United States Navy and were connected with the public-relations branch of the service. Both are university graduates and they have returned from the wars filled with a desire to do something for their country other than the routine tasks of holding down jobs. They are Lawrence A. Marsden, of Luverne, Minn., and Leonard G. Doran, of Dartmouth, Mass.

In their service abroad they were in contact with hundreds of young men who were bewildered and disconcerted over the political and economic confusion that existed at home. It was then that they determined to embark on a journalistic venture.

They will syndicate a column called Representative Opinion. This column will be factual and nonpartisan. The writers will factually present the essence of pending and existing legislation and will report the opinions of the legislators regarding such legislation. These opinions will be transmitted to the newspapers of the State from which the legislators come. For the present this column will be circularized to all the papers in the State of Minnesota. In time these gentlemen plan to extend their service to other States.

It should be pointed out that this column provides contact between the legislators in the Capitol and the represented people throughout the country. It is a well-known fact that the successful functioning of a democratic, representative government depends on a free flow and the interchange of information between the representatives and the people.

These young men will be compensated for their work by newspapers that use their column.

There always is a need in the country for fair reporting. The people always need to know the facts and they have a right to know them. It is my belief that this column is a step forward toward achieving that end, and I wish these young men much success.

The Case Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial in the June 12 issue of the Kansas City Star relative to the Case bill.

This editorial serves to support my contention that in order to promulgate any labor legislation that would be fair and equitable to both sides, a commission should be set up consisting of a representative from each of the following organizations and industries:

American Federation of Labor.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.
United States Chamber of Commerce.
National Association of Manufacturers.
Air and railway industries.
Secretaries of Labor and Agriculture.
National lumber manufacturers.
Four bipartisan Members of Congress.

These representatives should report and recommend legislation within 60 days so that we can take charge of this strike situation and get reconversion and production going without further delay.

Members of Congress should have had some experience in employment and handling of their own employees or employees of other firms.

UTTERLY INCONSISTENT

In the Star's opinion, the President has made a grave mistake in his veto of the Case bill. It is grossly inconsistent with his own previously declared position.

This veto has all the appearances of a political decision and it leaves the country without the assurance of protective legislation after the long troubled months of labor-industry strife, a fact that was quickly shown by the House failure to override the veto.

In this veto the President has endangered any chance he might have had to obtain his temporary and emergency bill in a helpful form, while his proposal of a 6-month study for permanent legislation is a face-saving device which means that nothing finally will be done.

As early as last fall the President himself had suggested permanent legislation in his fact-finding, cooling-off-period measure—and early this year he had expressed regret that Congress had neither accepted that bill nor offered a solution of its own. Now in the Case bill Congress had accepted the President's fact-finding measure and also added a solution of its own. And the President rejects what he previously had invited.

The important reasons for the veto include the following:

1. That the Case bill would not prevent but would promote strikes, a similarity being found to the wartime Smith-Connally Act.

2. That it embodies the principle of compulsion, and "men cannot be forced in a peacetime democracy to work for a private employer under compulsion," the Case bill therefore being unlike his emergency bill in that respect.

3. That the Case bill consists of two unrelated parts, one having to do with the settling or prevention of strikes, and the other with a prohibition against racketeering, unauthorized welfare funds, the organization of foremen, and so on.

4. That the bill usurps mediation and other functions of the Labor Department.

5. That it does not deal with the underlying causes of strikes but only with the symptoms.

6. That it invades unduly labor's protection against injunctions as provided in the Norris-LaGuardia Act and also the principles set forth in the Wagner Act.

These objections may be answered briefly.

1. the Case bill was not offered as a panacea but as a needed step toward balancing up the responsibility of labor and industry under the law. This was and is a clear principle of justice. To contend that it would not prevent strikes is on the same basis as a contention that the Declaration of Independence would not prevent a revolutionary war or that the Constitution would not prevent a civil war.

2. There is much less compulsion in the Case bill than in the President's own emergency bill with its extreme proposal of drafting workers into the Army. The only compulsion in the Case bill is restraint against strikes or lock-outs during the cooling-off period, a principle already incorporated in the Railway Labor Act and designed to affect workers and private employers in peacetime, also incorporated in the President's own fact-finding bill, which he urged Congress to pass.

3. The so-called unrelated parts are carried in the Case bill simply because there had been no chance for the separate enactment of the anti-racketeering and other provisions. The separate bills previously had been locked up in committee by a handful of prolabor Senators. Bringing all these provisions into a single measure meant inclusive action without necessarily weakening the value of the legislation.

4. As to usurping functions of the Labor Department, that branch of the Government has been ineffective to the point of impotency for the last dozen years and there is no present assurance that it will be made any stronger.

5. As to the alleged failure of the Case bill to deal with the underlying causes of labor-industry strife, it is designed simply to remove some of the inequities in relations between the two sides and thereby to reduce the unwholesome effects of legislation that has served to promote rather than to lessen strife.

6. Therefore an invasion of the lopsided Wagner Act and also the less important Norris-LaGuardia Act is exactly what was needed. There can never be the reasonable prospect of labor-industry peace until such a fair adjustment has been made.

The Case bill is dead. But its principle must be kept alive if the conditions which the President says he desires and the condition which the country sorely needs is ever to be attained. Politicians with an eye on the next election cannot do this required work. The chief regard must be the welfare of all the people and not simply that of pressure groups with their blocks of controlled votes. What will be the response of Congress and the administration?

Reorganization Plans Nos. 1, 2, and 3 Require Further Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, these remarks will be brief. Heretofore I have called attention to Reorganization Plan No. 1, House Document 594; Reorganization Plan No. 2, House Document 595; and Reorganization Plan No. 3, House Document 596. These were submitted to Congress on May 16, 1946, and unless Congress passes resolutions disapproving these plans within 60 days after May 16 they will become the law of the land.

I am opposed to these plans. I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 151 to repeal plan No. 2; House Concurrent Resolution 154 to disapprove plan No. 3; and House Concurrent Resolution 155 to disapprove plan No. 1.

Plan No. 1 has to do with housing agencies and many other governmental departments. Likewise, plan No. 2 deals with many Government agencies, abolishes the Social Security Board, and abolishes the United States Employees Compensation Commission, and so forth. Plan No. 3 deals with numerous agencies, the General Land Office, transfer of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation permanently from the Department of Commerce to the Coast Guard, and in effect, making permanent legislation out of the temporary authority granted under the War Powers Act. This same procedure is attempted under all three plans. Some of the proposed consolidations may be meritorious but others are highly objectionable. Some appear to be innocent but may have far-reaching effects.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR PUBLICATION QUESTIONS PLAN NO. 2

As I have indicated, among many things sought to be done by plan No. 2 we find a proposal to abolish the Social Security Board. In my testimony before the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments on June 6, 1946, I commented on this fact briefly. See Appendix, pages A3225–3242, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 6. I pointed out that laboring people were concerned in this proposed change and that they ought to be consulted about it.

MOBILE LABOR JOURNAL DISCUSSES PLAN NO. 2

Just to illustrate the widespread interest in these proposed reorganization plans, I quote the following comment of the Mobile Labor Journal, of Mobile Ala., under date of Friday, May 24, 1946, in which the editor discusses the matter, as follows:

WHY THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE SOCIAL SECURITY SET-UP?—EVERY RECOMMENDED PRESIDENTIAL CHANGE AFFECTS MEN, WOMEN, AND CHILDREN IN THE LOWER BRACKETS

It may be somewhat early to make extended comment upon the announced plan of the President for the abolishment of the present Social Security Board, but it is not too early to ascertain, in the interests of the tens of millions of wage and salaried workers, whom the President has in mind to supplant the present members of the Board and especially the present Chairman of the Board—the Honorable Arthur J. Altmeyer, than whom there has been no more able and conscientious administrator.

Excepting for the opposition of the large insurance companies and such agencies as the National Manufacturers Association, which have persistently tried their damnedest to cripple the Social Security Board in its administration and opposed any and all changes for increased benefits to those coming within the scope of the act, there have been only the highest praises and commendation.

It would be a most serious blow to the Nation and the social-security work, at this time, to summarily displace Chairman Altmeyer.

It might well be in order for those entrusted with the responsibility of leadership in organized labor's ranks, to make careful and thorough investigation as to whether the sudden decision and recommendation for the consolidation of certain agencies dealing so closely with problems of more than passing interest to two-thirds of the people of the United States, were made at the behest and insistence of groups which have been opposing, not only the present coverage of the Social Security Act, but who have almost vehemently opposed the coverage of workers not now covered.

Mr. Farley's Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune under date of April 25, 1946, entitled "Mr. Farley's Standards":

MR. FARLEY'S STANDARDS

Elder statesmen in American politics are traditionally supposed to develop a mellow, philosophic attitude toward public affairs and hold themselves aloof from the clash

of personalities. Mr. James A. Farley kept his observations on a fairly broad, academic level when he talked to reporters in his Madison Avenue office the other day, yet it was quite clear that his warning against hasty action in selecting a Democratic candidate for Governor and his review of the qualifications for that office were directed against the candidacy of United States Senator JAMES M. MEAD.

Mr. Farley doesn't think much of Senator Mead, either as a man or as a statesman. When he led the Bennett forces in the gubernatorial campaign of 1942, a campaign that didn't turn out well for Mr. Farley, Mr. Bennett or Mr. Mead, he charged Mr. MEAD with deceit and said he was not equipped with the stability or the forthrightness to be Governor.

For a man who has been around as long as Mr. Farley and has presumably developed a tolerance for human frailty in politics this was blunt and emphatic language. He may not be as popular or as influential in Democratic affairs as he once was; but Mr. Farley has many friends and they know that the former chairman is not given to impulsive judgments on his fellow man, nor to unnecessary acrimony.

Perhaps Mr. Farley's attitude is based on some deep personal affront, or on the violation of some basic tenet of political loyalty. On the other hand, it is possible that the former Democratic chairman, being an old-timer, is judging Mr. MEAD by the standards of another political era, when errand-boy services in the Senate for pressure groups and postal clerks and civil-service employees and ingratiating vote-getting appeal were less important than statesmanship.

Could it be that Mr. Farley is measuring the prospective Democratic candidate for Governor by the stature of some Democratic figures of his own experience, the late Alfred E. Smith, for instance? Time often plays tricks like that on elder statesmen.

House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I have received from Mrs. Stanley T. Manlove, recording secretary general, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution:

JUNE 14, 1946.

Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Member, Un-American Activities Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. THOMAS: It is my pleasure to transmit to you the enclosed resolutions adopted by the Fifty-fifth Continental Congress of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

We request your special attention to the resolution, House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Sincerely yours,
MARJORIE R. MANLOVE,
(MRS. STANLEY T. MANLOVE),
Recording Secretary General, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.

The resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, express its faith in the principles and purposes for which the Committee on Un-American Activities was established, and its belief in the service rendered to the Congress of the United States and to the people; and urge the preservation of its valuable records.

(Copies sent to: The President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; Speaker of the House of Representatives; chairman of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives; and the members of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives.)

Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee Presents Carefully Prepared, Sound Legislation as to Railroad Retirement and Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, pending legislation relating to social security under the Railroad Retirement Act, the Carriers' Taxing Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act involves a comparison of the provisions of H. R. 1362—the Crosser bill—and the committee bill dealing with the same subjects.

I believe that the figures given in this statement are as well warranted as can be established at this time. Actuarial estimates are subject to unforeseeable events but must be accepted as a basis for legislation.

H. R. 1362

I regard this bill as improvident. It would create an ultimate tax burden of approximately $760,000,000 a year on the basis of a $4,300,000,000 pay roll. The total tax paid for these purposes last year was $410,000,000. Thus we have a startling proposal to increase the tax burden $350,000,000 per year.

H. R. 1362 is written in disregard of any comparable relation to our general social-security program. It would create benefits beyond any practical or comparable basis with beneficiaries of our other social-security laws.

This would place the beneficiaries of this legislation on a special-privilege basis as compared with what is possible for other workers of the Nation.

If comparable benefits were provided for other prospective beneficiaries of a broadly expanded social-security plan, it would cost the Nation over $20,000,000,000 a year.

Under H. R. 1362, the carriers would be liable for a cost of 7 percent for retirement and 4 percent for unemployment and sickness, or a total of 11 percent. The employers other than carriers would be liable under Social Security for an average of 3 percent for retirement and 2 percent for unemployment, making a total of 5 percent.

There is a deficit under the present Railroad Retirement Act, as measured by a level payment plan of financing, due to the fact that tax collections of about $130,000,000 a year less than liabilities being created are required to place it on a sound basis.

H. R. 1362 provides an increased tax of 1½ percent or $65,000,000 a year, which would cover only half the growing deficit. Without fully meeting this deficit, H. R. 1362 provides for expanded benefits which would further substantially increase the burden of the Railroad Retirement System.

It would also create new burdens under the Unemployment Insurance Act. It would create new liabilities against the unemployment fund of about $43,000,000 a year in excess of tax funds to meet such liability.

It would create this great expense and leave the financing of its burdens in an unsound condition.

THE COMMITTEE BILL

The committee bill would place both the retirement and the unemployment funds under those two acts in a sound condition and assure the beneficiaries of those funds that they are going to get what was promised them.

The committe bill would provide for about $70,000,000 per year for new benefits to employees and their beneficiaries.

The committee bill provides for the collection of taxes both under the Retirement and Unemployment Acts by the Bureau of Internal Revenue instead of by separate agencies as at present.

The committee bill leaves the provisions as to unemployment as at present; it does not provide for increasing unemployment benefits nor for paying maternity and sick benefits under the guise of unemployment insurance as does H. R. 1362.

Even a superficial examination of the report of the committee will show that the committee bill represents a patient, earnest effort on the part of the committee to eliminate the improvident provisions of H. R. 1362. It substantially provides a more accurate system of retirement and unemployment benefits financed on a sound basis so as to assure the fulfillment of all obligations to the employees. This is done with just regard to the rights of the public, the employees, and the carriers.

From a legislative standpoint, the committee bill has been framed after due consultation of the House legislative counsel with representatives of the Treasury Department, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Railroad Retirement Board, and the Federal Security Agency.

In other words, the committee presents to the House a carefully prepared, well considered, sound piece of legislation as compared with H. R. 1362, which is improvident in its irresponsibilities and indefinite as to many of its provisions. The committee refused to be coerced into support of a measure which would be contrary to the best interests of the country and in the end, disappointing to its beneficiaries.

The committee has had to carry on its work under misrepresentations and thinly veiled threats of pressure groups.

The petition to discharge the committee from consideration of this measure was not filed until after the subcommittee had voted to report a bill and requested the legislative council to prepare it. The report of the subcommittee was presented on the 9th of April. The justification for the discharge petition, if it had any, was not that the committee refused to act on the legislation but rather that it was not acting in accordance with the desire of certain proponents.

We believe we have done a worthy job that deserves the support and approval of the Members of the House.

A Square Deal for All Grain Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing H. R. 6827, a bill to correct the inequity apparent in bonus payments on grains. The policy followed by the Government in raising the price of wheat and other grains after most farmers had disposed of their product on the advice of the Government and on the assurance that the price would not be advanced is, in my opinion, not only unjust but highly inflationary. Despite this latter factor this inequity must be corrected in the interests of fairness to all grain farmers.

I am hopeful that the House will see fit to adopt my measure so that the farmers who turned in their grain at the old price will receive the same financial benefits as those who delayed doing so and, when they did turn it in, did it in the light of increased bonuses for their produce.

A bill to provide for the payment of a bonus of 48 cents per bushel for all wheat and 55 cents per bushel for all corn and 5 cents per bushel for oats purchased and sold between January 1, 1945, and April 18, 1946, and providing for a payment of additional bonuses if paid by the United States Government

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to pay, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, to any farmer, upon application and the furnishing of satisfactory proof within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, a bonus of 48 cents per bushel for all wheat and 55 cents per bushel for all corn and 5 cents per bushel for oats: *Provided further*, That if the Government agency or the United States Government or any department thereof raises the price or pays any bonuses to farmers of any additional sums that said increases in price or bonuses shall also be paid to any farmer for wheat and corn and oats produced and sold by such farmer during the period beginning on January 1, 1945.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Amend or Repeal the Wagner Act?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the United States News:

AMEND OR REPEAL THE WAGNER ACT?
(By David Lawrence)

(So long as labor refuses to accept any compromise to correct the abuses in the Wagner Act, relief lies in making present statute "temporary"—Presidential veto for benefit of minority thwarts will of majority.)

An overwhelming majority of both Houses of Congress have sought through the Case bill to correct some of the abuses in the Wagner Labor Relations Act.

The President, casting his lot with the left wing, has used the veto to thwart the will of the majority, who at present wish only to amend the Wagner law.

Experience over a long period of time with intransigeant and uncompromising positions taken by the proponents or opponents of legislation leads to the conviction that the CIO and AFL are determined not to let the Wagner Act be amended, even though 10 years of the law's operation have revealed glaring abuses.

Apparently the President, whose veto message parallels the CIO arguments against the Case bill, now has joined the "do nothing" forces.

It is significant that union labor has not offered a single constructive suggestion in 10 years to help remove from the Wagner Act the ambiguous phrases which have permitted the National Labor Relations Board to give labor unions a monopoly and to gag employers so that they cannot meet openly the intrigue and misrepresentations involved in organizing tactics and the collective-bargaining technique—misrepresentations that undermine businesses.

So long as the CIO and AFL intend to fight any and all amendments and a left wing President sides with them, there is nothing left for the citizens who believe in fair play to do but insist on a complete rewriting of the Wagner Act.

WAGNER ACT HAS FAILED

This means a drive for repeal. Only when enough votes are mustered to threaten repeal will the labor-union politicians see the handwriting on the wall and accept compromises.

The prohibitionists made the mistake of fighting off compromises in Congress and, in the end, provoked a "repeal" movement that swept the country.

Strikes and work stoppages have been on the increase despite the promise in the preamble of the Wagner Act, passed in July 1935, that labor strife would be materially reduced by its operation.

There can be no satisfactory labor relations between management and labor when they are based on antagonism and class-conscious attitudes. The Wagner Act as interpreted by the unions with the support of the Democratic administration's appointees, has bred ill feeling and bitterness even in businesses where previously there had been amicable and satisfactory relations between management and the employees.

AMENDMENT BY "RIDER"

Employers are virtually helpless today to fight lies and misrepresentations circulated among their employees. The minority of the employees who are compelled to accept majority rule are also helpless. The Wagner Act should be amended so that freedom of speech can be assured and so that any employer can talk at any time with his employees without fear of reprisals through frivolous litigation permitted by the Wagner Act.

But there is no hope apparently for any amendments at present. The only hope for a better law lies in mobilizing public opinion behind a plan to repeal the present statute and to offer a complete substitute for it.

One way to accomplish the purpose is for Congress to put in future appropriation bills or to attach as a "rider" on any piece of legislation that has to be accepted by the White House a provision which limits the life of the Wagner Act to the term of other temporary legislation. The President asked that his drastic proposal for the drafting of workers expire 6 months after peace is formally declared.

Mr. Truman has objected to the Case bill on the ground that it is "permanent" legislation and he wants a committee of Congress to make further study. Surely there can be no harm then in putting all the labor laws, including the Wagner Act, on a temporary basis so that the tasks will necessarily be approached by all groups on an even keel.

If, on the other hand, the labor-union politicians know they can depend on the Presidential veto power to save them from any amendment to the Wagner law, they will not display more than a casual interest in any study made by Congress. The House and Senate have studied the problem for a decade through their committees.

The only new thing that could happen would be a change of attitude on the part of the labor-union groups toward amending the Wagner Act. This, however, will not come from anything a congressional committee may recommend or do.

It will come only when the voters signify their desire to have something done about the irresponsibility of groups in the community who have used their collective power to threaten the health and safety of the Nation. Groups which hold that economic power must not be restrained or regulated and that the right to use violence and extortion must not be impaired are forgetting the public interest. Even the Hobbs anti-racketeering bill, a piece of separate legislation slumbering in a Senate committee, has been fought by the spokesmen of organized labor and no effective substitute to cure the nasty situation described in Supreme Court opinions has been offered by labor. It was inserted in the Case bill only to be criticized by the President as hamstringing labor's activities.

This writer never believed the day would come when he would find himself discussing a repeal of the Wagner law. That course has been urged heretofore only by ultra-conservatives who refused to grant labor its right to organize. But the situation has gone beyond mere theory. It is a condition now which faces the country and the majority in Congress.

A President who abuses his veto power and stands by a minority in utter disregard of the national welfare cannot blame Congress if a majority resorts to the rider method or to the denial of appropriations in order to secure respect for the majority will.

POLITICAL MISCALCULATION

Mr. Truman has made a major blunder in vetoing the Case bill. The reasons he gives are specious. They are contradicted by his own words in previous messages to Congress. After urging a cooling-off period of at least 25 days in his message to Congress last December on permanent legislation, he now

finds fault with the cooling-off process altogether and says, curiously enough, that it will promote strikes.

Mr. Truman could not have written the message he sent to Congress last week. He must have accepted memoranda from partisan and class-conscious advisers who read the CIO brief and swallowed its reasoning completely.

If the President had delved into the subject himself, he might have come up with a better answer. As it is, he is evidently yielding to the labor union pressure, believing it will be helpful to him. No President in recent years ever made a bigger miscalculation in appraising the temper of the people.

ECONOMIC COLLAPSE AHEAD

For, if the strikes and work stoppages continue and if the White House settles major disputes in the future as it has in the past by giving labor substantially all the increases in wages it asks for, the Nation is headed for a severe depression and economic collapse.

Wage increases cannot be absorbed wholly out of profits. There must be increases in labor output if prices are ever to come down. The present theory which labor has dramatized calls for more money for less hours of work. That theory will ruin the "risk capital" or free-enterprise system—which is, of course, what the Communists who are a part of the left wing in America really want.

Unwittingly Mr. Truman has allied himself with the elements in our midst who want economic chaos. He has forfeited the support of those voters who admired him for his courage 2 weeks ago but who now see in his humiliating retreat just another capitulation to a pressure group by a politician in the White House.

The American people have met crises before by demonstrating that the will of the whole people is stronger politically than that of privileged groups.

Whenever any group in the community seeks to block the will of the majority, it stirs up antagonism which eventually leads to an extreme reaction.

Logically, of course, the Wagner Act should be amended and rewritten and not repealed, for its principle is sound. But so was temperance. A word to the wise among the labor leaders will be conveyed by the lessons of our prohibition experience.

Flag Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1946

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a speech delivered by me at the Flag Day program sponsored by the Chelsea Lodge of Elks, Chelsea, Mass., on June 14, 1946. The program opened with the Shurtleff School Band playing selections under the direction of Guido Ottavi. The exalted ruler, Charles T. Pierce, presided at the ceremonies and was assisted by Herbert L. Wagner, Esq., John Craig, Adolph J. Perrota, and Edward R. Gold. Chaplain Frank McDonald, past exalted ruler, read the prayers and Mayor Bernard L. Sullivan gave the history of the flag. Musical selections were rendered by Sadie E. Patrick, assisted by Mrs. Eugenie Kelly Cronin.

The speech follows:

This bright flag is the symbol of our unity. The diversity of American life comes to a common meeting ground in the presence of this banner which ever reminds us that out of many we have become one.

Ours is not the forced unit of an authoritarian state, but an association of freemen. We are learning the difficult job of working together to solve our problems. This requires, more than in any other nation, the vital play of intelligence and character in each one of us. America is less a form of government than a way of life. In time of danger, under this standard, we rally to defend that way of life from those who would destroy it. But of more importance, because it is the day-to-day living of democracy that makes it grow, we honor this flag whenever we see it. Through the years of our schooling we began each day with a pledge of allegiance to it. We raise our hats to it when it passes us in parade. We display it on many of our holidays. We see it in the courts and in the legislatures of the people. Annually, we set aside this day to reaffirm our faith in the principles for which it stands.

In many countries of this world, where people struggle to lift themselves from the ruins of war, this flag inspires hope and confidence. They do not need to know our language. This symbol tells them that help in coming from the great young nation across the oceans. Food and clothing and the means to reconstruct their economies so that they may become self-supporting members of the family of nations. To the people of these countries, however, our flag represents not only material power. If it did, we would have dollar signs in place of the stars. Our flag speaks to them in terms beyond the narrow prejudices of race and creed and color. The sight of it stirs in them the age-old human longing for a unity under which all men may be encouraged to work for peace and progress together.

All religions have taught this need. Ours is the first form of government ever conceived by man, which has succeeded in bringing this spiritual hunger toward its measure of fulfillment in this life. We are proud of what we have accomplished so far, not in material progress alone, for that is but the visible result of the deeper, underlying cause which has inspired us to this growth. We are not a suspicious people, reaching for short gains and then holding on to what we have—like a miser who hoards what he has—and gives nothing in return to the circulation which makes for economic health and progress. All of our history has been characterized by this confident spirit of adventure. Freed from the taboos and restrictions of the old world, men gladly faced the challenge of the unknown. From this enterprise and its achievements, developed our American optimism. In spite of the dangers and the sacrifices, ours has been a forward-moving way of life, never bogged down by hardening of the arteries. There is no place here for any rigid system which will impede life and growth by the intolerance of its own particular viewpoint.

Some years ago I met a worker who was an enthusiastic believer in the organized labor movement. To him, this represented a solution for all of our problems. He firmly believed that only the man who works with his hands is a producer. Over and over again, he passionately asserted this as the sole and unchallengeable core of his faith. Soon after, he became a full-time official in the labor movement. His progress was rapid. From the many contacts which he now experienced, he came to know all walks of American life. His native ability, plus hard work and a broad education in human nature, gave him a new value. He became very successful. A large corporation, noting his achievements, made him an attractive offer. He changed jobs and became a labor relations adviser for the corporation. In his new work he has contributed much to the cause of improving relations between management and labor, enjoying the confidence of both.

Recently, I had occasion to confer with him. He was seated behind the desk of his private office, working with his brain and his voice, as he gave dictation to a secretary. Then he checked with the girl on the schedule of his appointments. They would run far into the night. There was no longer any 8-hour day for him.

As a Congressman who has consistently supported progressive labor legislation, I was curious as to what this change in circumstance had done to him. The passionate insistence had gone, replaced by a patient and intelligent spirit of compromise. He was seated in an executive office but his strong, rough hands told the story of manual labor in his younger days. I could not resist a certain temptation.

"Remember," I said to him, "how you used to say that only the man who works with his hands is a producer? How do you reconcile that with your present position?"

I thought I had him there, because he smiled wryly, like one who is caught in a contradiction.

"I have come a long way since then," he said. "I believe in the labor movement, but I also believe in management. Neither one can be supreme. The solution lies in their working together. I have also come to realize that a man can work with his head and with his heart as well as with his hands. We need all three. Very few things in life are all white or all black, all right or all wrong. There are two sides to every question, and adjustment is the best way of settling most misunderstandings. That, as I see it, is the American way."

As I came away from his office, I could not help but think of the fact that this America of ours is the product not only of a few individuals or groups or racial blocks or creeds but of an over-all human unity that is greater than any one of these. It is a feeling, rather than a self-conscious expression. Every American goes out in life to do the best for himself and his family. He becomes a natural competitior, but he likes to think that he is a fair one. He wants to play the game hard but clean. Sure he wants to win but without taking undue advantage of the other fellow. The pace of American life is swift, and sometimes a man is guilty of an injustice when he does not deliberately intend such. Some rugged individualists have mistaken license for liberty, but sooner or later, the pressure of American public opinion catches up with them and they are rebuked in no uncertain terms.

Our founding fathers believed in the fundamental decency and intelligence of the people. They wanted to encourage the development of responsible freedom in each one of our citizens and so they established a form of government for the community which should serve as the instrument of the people's will and not its master. With practical vision, they set up a system of checks and balances among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government, so that no one of them should dominate the others.

This principle should apply, with equal merit, to our social, political, and economic life. We have always believed in the two-party system, respecting the need of minority opposition. In economics, we are trying to formulate a balance between capital and labor. Even in our social life, through nondiscrimination, and intermarriage, we are arriving at a working partnership where any

fear that one racial strain or creed might dominate to the prejudice of others is fast fading away.

There are some aspects of the picture, however, which are disturbing. This came to my attention, in an unusual manner, when a young woman walked into my office, not long ago. She was young in years, but there was a strange bitterness in her face and her voice. I listened to her story.

She was an ex-Army nurse. Early in the war, she had volunteered for duty, had received her commission, and was assigned to the Pacific theater of operations. Much of her work was done close to the lines, even under enemy fire, as she cared for the seriously wounded and the amputees. And there she came to know, not only the horrors of war, but the great and generous hearts of the men who had suffered most from its fury. Their patience and courage and the wisecracks by which they tried to forget their disabilities filled this girl with a deep and abiding reverence for their unselfishness.

She was discharged from the service 6 months ago, and she returned home with high hopes of taking up the life she had known before she went away. But somehow, home didn't look the same to her. All about her, she saw the mad scramble for power and profit which mocked the sacrifices of the men she had known. As if the people back home never realized that our men endured so much and gave up so much only because of their firm belief that life must become better for all because of their giving.

And so, this young but embittered girl, wanted to go back into service. I tried to talk her out of it, explaining that there was much need of nurses here and that we needed the sincerity and unselfishness that was hers to save us from indifference. I tried to tell her that behind this mask of business which she saw in the people back home there was a heart and a conscience for something beyond the needs of self. She couldn't see it. The life of civilians and the life of the men who had sacrificed didn't add up. The people back home by their actions were proving themselves unworthy of the men who had fought for them. This girl wanted to go back into service, not at some Army post where she would treat such conventional ailments as civilians suffer from. She wanted to be near the men who had been disabled by this war—the blind, the amputees, and those who have been wrecked in body and in mind. She couldn't live with herself unless she did.

She is working in one of those hospitals today, finding a fulfillment in her life which she once had, and almost lost, before returning to it again.

To my mind this girl is one of the finest examples of the American spirit. The faith she saw in our wounded she expects to find in us. She will not be satisfied with anything less than our awareness of, and our devotion to, the principles for which this flag stands. And until we do, she will help the men who really know in order to make up to them for our shortcomings.

The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks is foremost among the organizations who recognize the importance of this day. This flag evokes pride in the past, the need to work together in the present so that we may win through to the aspirations which are the future. It is red with courage, white with faith, and twinkling with the stars of the high goals we aim to reach.

We cannot and will not coast along on the momentum of America's achievements. What she has done in the past is fine. What she must accomplish in the future is even greater. We know that each one of us, in every generation, must add the motive power of individual work and faith to assist the forward progress of all.

Before our flag this day we renew our pledge to do our level best, day in and day out, to contribute to that way of life which we share, as Americans.

Rebirth of Distomo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to note that the committee for the rebirth of Distomo has achieved its purpose. A new community in New Jersey has been named Distomo. The new Distomo is located near the Atlantic City Airport and its citizenry is made up primarily of war veterans and their families.

Distomo was a Greek city which was ravaged and destroyed by the Nazis. In memory of the valor and honor of Greece, this living monument will grow in the name that symbolizes resistance against tyranny and symbolizes as well the indestructible quality of freedom.

Lamprey Eel Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED BRADLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 20, 1946

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include my broadcast to be put on the air over radio station WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; WMAM, Marinette, Wis.; and WDBC, Escanaba, Mich. This broadcast covers a problem which will be of great interest to all Great Lakes commercial fishermen:

On Wednesday, June 12, our Subcommittee on Fisheries of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee held a hearing on the subject of the lamprey eel manace. The committee went into the matter very carefully and as a result of that hearing I have sponsored legislation which we hope will receive the approval of the Congress and permit the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service to assist the State Departments of Conservation in the Great Lakes area in coping with this very serious menace with which our commercial fisherics are now faced.

In order to understand more about the lamprey eel, perhaps, it would be well to go back into its history a bit and the background of the constantly increasing menace that faces us. I have with me in the studio today Dr. John Van Oosten in charge of fisheries investigation on the Great Lakes for the Fish and Wildlife Service for a great many years and, Doctor, I wonder if you will be good enough to tell the radio audience something about the background of the lamprey eel.

Dr. VAN OOSTEN. I would be very happy to do so, Congressman BRADLEY. The sea lamprey eel is native in Lake Ontario and its tributary streams and in the Finger Lakes of New York. From Lake Ontario this lamprey spread to Lake Erie, undoubtedly through the Welland Canal, where it was first reported in 1921. It had reached the St. Clair River by 1930 and was first reported in Lake Michigan, off Milwaukee, Wis., in 1936. Later information, however, indicated that a fairly well developed spawning run had occurred in 1934 in the Clinton River, a tributary to the St. Clair River near Port Huron. The second important spawning run occurred in the Ocqueoc River, tributary to Hammonds Bay, Lake Huron, with which you are familiar, Congressman BRADLEY, since it's near your home. The sea lamprey is now well distributed throughout all of the Great Lakes except Lake Superior. Although the species was reported at varicus times in Lake Superior, we have so far been unable to verify these reports. Recently the lamprey was reported in Whitefish Bay. It was said that the individuals seen were small in size. Since the sea lamprey in its adult stage is a large individual, it appears most likely that the individuals reported for Whitefish Bay belong to a native species. The adult sea lamprey ranges from 14 to 30 inches in length, whereas the native forms rarely ever exceed 13 or 14 inches in length. For the information of those who are listening in, it might be well to mention briefly the characteristics of the sea lamprey. It may be recognized not only by its large size but also by the presence of two back fins which are separated. In the native lamprey, the back fin is continuous. Then, too, the sea lamprey has a blotched or speckled coloration, whereas the native variety have a uniform olive drab color. According to the reports received from fishermen throughout Lakes Michigan and Huron, the sea lamprey has become very abundant in the past few years particularly since 1937. One fisherman in Leland, Mich., for example, kept a record of the number of trout taken by him in April 1945. Out of 1,280 pounds of trout, some 1,095 pounds, or 85½ percent were marked. This same fisherman took in June 1945, some 1,200 pounds of trout of which 600 pounds or 50 percent were marked. According to the various reports received by me from 25 to 85 percent of the trout taken in various areas show lamprey marks. Unquestionably, as Congressman BRADLEY has stated, the sea lamprey is a menace to the Great Lakes fisheries, particularly the lake trout. Some method should be devised either to eradicate the parasite or at least to control it.

Mr. BRADLEY. Well, Doctor Van Oosten, I understand that some years ago a local sportsman's organization of my home town of Rogers City, working in conjunction with the Michigan Limestone & Chemical Co., experimented with the use of weirs and traps made of worn stone screen cloth and succeeded in making some very good catches in the Ocqueoc River, just north of Rogers City. Would you be good enough to comment on that as one possible means of controlling, if not completely eradicating, the lamprey eel.

Dr. VAN OOSTEN. According to the reports received from the Michigan Conservation Department some 3,366 sea lampreys were destroyed at the weir in the Ocqueoc River in 1944 and in 1945 some 4,608 individuals were destroyed.

Mr. BRADLEY. Now, Doctor, how many eggs would you estimate might be laid by the average eel?

Dr. VAN OOSTEN. Again, according to scientific reports from 25,000 to 65,000 eggs are produced on the average by the female sea lamprey. I have a record here of a sea lamprey taken in Escanaba, Mich., which was 20¾ inches long and which had 78,762 eggs. The average would, of course, be less since the average size of the adult sea lamprey is approximately 16½ inches.

Mr. BRADLEY. Dr. Van Oosten, incidentally, are those famous smelt streams adjacent Escanaba prolific spawning grounds for the lamprey eel and, therefore, might be fertile ground for some more of these weirs or traps?

Dr. VAN OOSTEN. So far as I know, Congressman, no sea lamprey spawning runs have been reported for the tributary streams of Green Bay, in which occur these large spawning runs of smelt. The nearest spawning run of the sea lamprey of any size insofar as I know is at Manistique, Mich., in the Manistique River. I, of course, see no reason

why the sea lamprey cannot eventually reach the streams in Green Bay and elsewhere now used by the spawning smelt.

Mr. BRADLEY. How many definite streams have been discovered that are prolific sources for spawning runs at this time; or in other words how many streams do you think should be attacked in any program designed to at least begin an effective control program of the lamprey menace?

Dr. VAN OOSTEN. Offhand I would say four or five streams. In about 20 other streams the sea lamprey has been found during the spawning season but large runs have not been reported so far for these streams. Undoubtedly the specimens that were taken are the forerunners of larger hordes to come.

Mr. BRADLEY. In other words, Doctor, with the increasing alarm based on the results obtained from commercial fish catches, it would seem prudent to expect a considerable increase in these lampreys that spawn so prolifically, if we do not attack all these streams as soon as possible wherever they have been discovered.

Dr. VAN OOSTEN. Undoubtedly, it is much easier to control the abundance of the runs in the stream if we attempt to eradicate them in the early history before the runs have become excessive in size, as they now apparently seem to be in the four rivers previously mentioned.

Mr. BRADLEY. Well, the thought occurs to me that if a stream the size of the Ocqueoc—even admittedly with experimental equipment which we may assume is not too efficient and can be greatly improved upon with further study—yielded 4,600 adult lampreys a year ago, and say they averaged about 50,000 eggs each, it is easy to see we have eradicated probably over 2,000,000 potential lampreys from that one single stream and, therefore, I am fully justified in introducing legislation to bring the Federal Government more effectively into the picture in being of assistance to the States in putting up a fair share of the cost involved, because our fisheries on the Great Lakes are a national asset and when a national asset is being destroyed, it seems to me that the States alone should not be called upon to preserve that national asset but rather does it become a Federal proposition in which there is certainly every reason to feel the Federal Government should assume its full share of responsibility in coping with this menace.

Dr. VAN OOSTEN. I am sure, Congressman BRADLEY, that the Fish and Wildlife Service is very happy to do everything in its power to cooperate with the States in controlling this pest. I am sure you appreciate that we have had no legal authority to do more than study it heretofore, because our appropriations and our functions, insofar as we operate on the Great Lakes, are confined solely to research and study and not to active participation in conservation measures. Therefore, if the Congress—recognizing, as you do, the Federal Government's responsibility to assist in the eradication of this lamprey menace—will give us the authorization and funds with which to work, I am sure the Fish and Wildlife Service will do everything possible to cooperate even more fully than we have been able to heretofore with your splendid Michigan State Department of Conservation.

Mr. BRADLEY. Dr. Van Oosten, that is exactly the thought I had in mind in introducing legislation to provide the authorization for your actual participation in the setting up of these weirs, or traps, or whatever new devices may be developed to more actively cope with this menace and I sincerely hope, even though it is late in this session of Congress, that action can be had; but I will say to you now, sir, that if this Congress should adjourn before it has an opportunity to act, and in the event an appropriation is not granted and in the further event that I am reelected this fall, I can assure you that immediately after the next Congress convenes, I shall certainly reintroduce this same legislation and press for action in the Eightieth Congress, which will convene January 3, 1947. Because, if I understand the picture correctly, the lamprey spawns the latter part of May and early June and, therefore, you are practically helpless in coping with the menace if you do not get your wiers and traps ready to operate before the spawning run starts.

Dr. VAN OOSTEN. You are absolutely correct, Congressman BRADLEY, because if we cannot secure that authorization, which is the legal authority for us to actively cope with this menace, and if we do not receive the funds with which to operate prior to that time, then we cannot begin to do anything until the spring of 1948; and so, I am very hopeful action will be had in this Congress on your legislation, or at least that action will be forthcoming very early next year. I am sure from the attitude of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee at our hearing that the committee will do everything it can to expedite this action which is so badly needed for assistance to the commercial fishermen on the Great Lakes.

Mr. BRADLEY. Now I see my time for this week is again drawing to a close. Today I have been privileged to bring into the studio, Dr. John Van Oosten, in charge of fisheries investigations and research on the Great Lakes for the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service. We have discussed the lamprey eel menace and what we hope will be a cure for it. Thank you very much Dr. Van Oosten.

Railroad Bill Protested

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER A. RAMEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1946

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter published in the New York Times of May 14, 1946:

RAILROAD BILL PROTESTED—PENDING LEGISLATION SEEN AS BREEDING UNFAIRNESS AND FINANCIAL SCANDAL

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Railroad reorganizations have long been a happy hunting ground for financial adventurers, and for political maneuvers in Washington, but a bill now pending in Congress (the so-called Wheeler bill, S. 1253) comes close to setting a high-water mark in vicious finance since the days when the Goulds and the Fisks plundered the Erie. Unless some attention is paid to it, another financial scandal will be added to the checkered history of railroad finance.

In the late 1920's and 1930's a great number of railroads were unable to pay their debts and their creditors went unpaid. These creditors were mainly bondholders, and the bulks of these bonds were and still are held by the saving banks, insurance companies and other institutions whose business it is to protect the savings of humble people. The plan of the Wheeler bill is certainly simple. Under it, bondholders and creditors of a railroad may be made to go unpaid, or to accept less than their claims, but the courts and the Interstate Commerce Commission are prohibited from impairing the position of stockholders who by this bill must be left in complete ownership and control. In plain English, creditors and bondholders can and will be sacrificed; stockholders, however, are to get the benefit of money taken away from the people who paid for and get first claim on the railroad property and its earnings. This is literally robbing Peter to pay Paul.

The type of interest which will profit by this amazing scheme is not hard to find. Every railroad man remembers the Van Sweringen manipulations in the 1920's, when a pair of remarkable operators, using a holding company, bought up at bargain prices the common stock of a number of railroads and thereby created an empire composed of a major part of the American railroad system, built on a comparative shoestring.

It is also common knowledge that during the past 10 years common stocks of railroads which were either actually or nearly without value were accumulated by a good many speculators, apparently as a flier in financial politics. S. 1253 looks suspiciously like the pay-off.

During the early 1930's many railroads whose earnings did not justify their financial structure and which defaulted on their bonds were put into reorganization under a carefully worked out amendment to the Bankruptcy Act. These reorganizations are now substantially completed. They were carried out by the Interstate Commerce Commission and by the Federal courts, and in a number of cases the plans have been passed on and approved by the Supreme Court of the United States. Where the common stock of a railroad was worthless, or nearly so, the courts and the Interstate Commerce Commission said so, and turned over the property and its control to its bondholders and creditors who had put in their good money, chiefly savings.

Just as the job of reorganization is about to be completed and for the first time in many years the weaker railroads of the country are about to be put on a solid financial base, capable of standing the stresses of the postwar era, along comes S. 1253, reported out on April 11, coolly providing that all railroad reorganization proceedings now carried on under the Bankruptcy Act "shall be forthwith suspended and discontinued." Also that the railroad managements, or the Interstate Commerce Commission, may cut down or modify the interests of creditors or bondholders (with their consent if it can be got, but without if the Commission is unable to get it) and that any such cutting down of the creditors must "not be adverse to the interests of the holders of any other class of the carrier's securities," that is to say, stockholders.

Senate bill 1253 is one of those pieces of legislation which ought not to be voted on until the public has a clear knowledge of who wants it, and why, and what it is all about. It affects billions of American savings, and the management of our most essential transport. It ought not to pass; and if passed it ought to be vetoed. As far as I can see, it will harm many thousands of Americans for the benefit of only a few, and it will pay large speculative profits to certain groups who have no possible right to them.

A. A. BERLE, Jr.

NEW YORK, *May 10, 1946.*

Watch for Red Scares Designed To Stampede Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, with the British loan and the 18-year-old draft coming up promptly, I hope Congress and the people are not to be subjected

to another "look out for the Reds" campaign.

If the next few days see scare headlines about "Red Yugoslav troops are marching on Trieste" or "Ominous Red troop movements are seen on Turkish borders," the people should know the cause.

The cause will be the use of tactics of mental terrorism by those who would replace calm decisions by the representatives of the people with commands from above.

Synthetic war scares manufactured in the Pentagon or the State Department do not serve America or the cause of peace.

If there is, at this late date, genuine alarm in this administration at the consistent imperialistic actions of the Russians, why does this administration keep supplying the wants of the Russian bear with goods paid for by American taxpayers?

The Middle Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 20, 1946

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Philadelphia Record under date of June 19, 1946, entitled "The Middle Way":

THE MIDDLE WAY

Representative MICHAEL J. BRADLEY, city chairman of the Democratic Party, seeks the survival and growth of his party in city, State, and Nation. It's natural. It's his job. To accomplish his aim he must be what politicians call a "practical" man.

He was practical and at the same time equally sound in principles Monday night, when he warned his party against the pitfalls of the extreme Tory right and the extreme left of communism.

BRADLEY pointed to the middle way of liberalism as the only possible way for the Democratic Party—and urged it to provide unfailing, dynamic leadership.

Bravo, Congressman BRADLEY!

This is the middle way the Record has so often urged upon all Americans who value their freedom.

Slavery is slavery whether imposed from the left or the right.

Representative BRADLEY understands the danger of American Commies and their traveling fellows. They use liberalism only to achieve their illiberal ends. They're on the side of the angels only to do the devil's work.

BRADLEY is not like some liberals who are so sloppy in their thinking they urge progressives to cooperate with Commie elements. In their mental daze, they say the Commies are industrious, aggressive, effective far beyond their size.

So are mosquitoes. Nobody talks about doing business with them.

It's just as silly for liberals to try to do business with Commies. Good liberal blood is drained off to fatten the Commie cause of ultimate tyranny.

And there is an acute danger from the right, as BRADLEY pointed out. A conservative Democratic party would be but a pale carbon copy of the Republican party. It would give the liberals no place to go but into the danger zone of the extreme left.

History has proved that the Democratic party can't lick the Republicans with conservative or reactionary policies. Hamlet really cannot be out-Hamleted.

But the Democratic party under Roosevelt, with its New Deal middle way of liberalism, licked the forces of reaction again and again.

That is the road on which the American people can achieve prosperity and security without paying for it with their freedom.

Belated Drive To Spur Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 20, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Evening Star of June 19, 1946:

BELATED DRIVE TO SPUR PRODUCTION
(By David Lawrence)

A belated drive to increase production has been begun by the Truman administration.

The drive will not succeed in its desired objective—to achieve a balanced economy—though it may, of course, to some degree augment the Nation's output of scarce goods.

For the truth is the Nation is headed toward the most severe economic depression in its history and the responsibility for it will fall squarely on President Truman, whose mistakes since VJ-day will cost the American people not only considerable unemployment but the hardships of inflation that could have been readily avoided. The controversy over keeping the OPA is just a propaganda smoke screen to hide the coming debate over who and what was responsible for the inevitable break-down.

The President has added several billions of dollars to the cost of production recently by his increases in coal and in railroad wages. An increase in freight rates is coming if only to compensate the railroads for their increased costs in coal.

STEADY OPA INCREASES

Worst of all, however, is the steady increase by OPA itself in prices which are the result of increased wage costs.

If the President had maintained wage control, the administration could have allowed wages to go up only as prices could be managed at the same time.

The pinch will come and unemployment will become widespread as soon as a large part of the public finds itself unable to pay the high prices that must be charged if the new labor costs are to be absorbed. A so-called buyers' strike will usher in the new depression. It will come after some of the present shortages have been overcome and much of the pent-up demand is satisfied. Economists differ as to when this will happen, but the uncertain period may begin sometime during the latter part of 1947.

The causes of the problem are simple. Wage increases have been or are being granted to organized unions involving about 14,000,000 persons. There are anywhere from 35,000,000 to 40,000,000 persons unorganized who work in white-collar jobs, agriculture, etc. These people with fixed incomes cannot afford to pay the new prices for goods. It really means they cannot pay the wage increases. Theoretically, the answer might be thought to be merely to increase production and bring prices down, which is an impossibility in many lines of business that have been saddled with the increases. There is no way, for instance, to increase the consumption of coal when oil and gas and other fuels are already competing. There is no way to increase to wartime levels the number of persons traveling on railroads when the airplane and bus and the auto are competing already for passenger business. And yet wartime wages are being paid.

The answer does not lie alone in subsidy by the Government, which would mean higher and higher taxes taken from wages and salaries.

The answer does not lie in increased production, because there is a limit to the demand for goods due to wartime shortages, and the question of what to do with surpluses will come up in a year or so and cause factories to shut down and unemployment to begin.

The answer does not lie in arguing about the OPA. Unless the President is willing at once to restore wage and salary stabilization and sign legislation curtailing strikes, the OPA might as well be abolished and a free market instituted. The sooner the public comes into contact with natural markets and the buyers' strike ensues, the sooner the reorganization of the American economy will be attained.

TRUMAN HAD HIS CHANCE

Mr. Truman had his chance when VJ-day came to do what England did—to retain all war controls and stabilize the situation. But he yielded to pressure and started playing politics with the wage problem. He let wages go uncontrolled and tried to hold down prices and, of course, failed. Now the inevitable collision between buyers and sellers is threatened.

The only way out of the dilemma is for rigid controls on both wages and prices and on work stoppages to be instituted at once—which President Truman lacks the courage to do. If he put on wage and salary control and ordered a regulation again like the Little Steel formula, white-collar workers could get increases in wages while organized workers were limited to increases already obtained under the formula. Then with purchasing power generally increased, business and industry could set for itself a program of quantity production that might conceivably reduce prices somewhat or at least arrest their upward rise. Likewise, plans could be laid for the sale of exportable surpluses.

Mr. Truman has the complete responsibility for what has happened because he has broken the price ceilings due to his political concessions to unions and he has ignored the forgotten man of the age—the white-collar worker and the farmer. They must pay the new prices caused by the acceptance of union wage demands ordered as a Nation-wide policy by the Truman administration in its handling of the automotive, steel, and coal industries and in railroad transportation.

The Feed Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 20, 1946

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am reporting, on behalf of the New England Congressional Delegation's Feed Committee, a further effort we have made now to meet the increasingly tragic conditions

now prevailing in New England, as well as in other Northeastern States, because of the existing feed shortage. The results of this shortage in our States are becoming worse hourly.

The delegation's efforts go back to meetings with officials of the Department of Agriculture in early May. Then on May 11, the delegation met with Secretary of Agriculture Anderson because it foresaw the situation now confronting us. Subsequently, on May 23, our subcommittee sent the following telegram to President Truman:

Shortage of stock and poultry feed in New England is now past the stage of crisis and is actually approaching a calamity. The destruction of poultry flocks is already widespread and increasing daily. Great numbers of valuable dairy cows are being slaughtered, and underfeeding of remaining herds is aggravating the already drastic shrinkage of milk and other vitally needed dairy products. The withholding of grain for essential feed of draft animals engaged in lumbering operations is curtailing production of lumber indispensable to the progress of the national housing program. These are the stark facts in the face of an abundant supply of oats and a sufficient corn inventory to tide over feeders until the incoming new crop. The failure of the Government to take immediate and effective action in this emergency means the destruction of food-producing flocks and herds, seriously threatening not only our own food supply but, also, our ability to fulfill our commitments to famine-stricken people abroad. Our producers are faced, in addition, with forced liquidation and bankruptcy of small businesses built up with years of hard work. This is an unfair, unreasonable, and unnecessary hardship upon them. We have used every effort to have the Department of Agriculture provide some solution in this crisis. The Department now offers no hope of any relief. This relief must not be delayed any longer. Therefore, we ask that you proclaim a state of emergency and make urgent recommendations that holders of feed grain ship to New England a supply sufficient to prevent this catastrophe.

This was reported to the delegation. The next day the other members of the delegation wired the President endorsing the request that he proclaim this state of emergency and make these recommendations to the holders of feed grain to meet the "immediate crisis" then confronting us.

Since then the committee has made constant efforts to locate feed which could be shipped into New England. Our present estimate is that approximately 800 carloads of varied feed is in or on its way to New England, but this must be considered against the estimated minimum requirement of 3,000 cars by June 30. At the present rate of shipments there is a possibility of getting another 800 carloads to New England. It is obvious that, if we receive this total amount, it will meet only one-half the basic requirements.

In the Department of Agriculture's June 1 crop report it is clear that New England poultry flocks were then reduced to a level as low as in other parts of the country, even though our flocks are used extensively as breeders for our sister States well into the West and the Central South. Since June 1 what was left of our flocks has been decimated.

We have been informed that there are supplies of oats and barley available in Canada and that there is also some wheat feed there. We have been told that the owners of these supplies would be glad to ship them to New England if the Canadian Government would lift the grain embargo or issue permits for this purpose.

We also understand that there is an available surplus in this country, but we know that it is not moving into New England in sufficient quantities to meet our minimum requirements. Therefore, believing that it is imperative that our Government act at once in cooperation with the Canadian officials, we have sent a letter to Secretary Anderson, signed by Senators AIKEN and HART, and Representatives ADAMS, SMITH, and myself, constituting this delegation committee. The letter is as follows:

As members of the New England Feed Committee of the Congress, we believe that you are fully aware of the critical conditions existing in the Northeast and that your Department is endeavoring to direct the shipment of grains to this feed shortage area.

However, the reports which we continue to receive from New England and the first-hand knowledge which we have gained through visits to our respective States indicate that the situation is still desperate in spite of the efforts of your Department to alleviate the need.

You may be sure that we appreciate your efforts in this direction, but our information indicates that unless we can obtain a thousand cars more of grain and feed than is now in sight within the next few weeks, the forced liquidation of foundation flocks of poultry will continue as will the reduction in the production of dairy products.

We have learned that there appears to be a plentiful supply of oats and other grain in eastern Canada. We understand that Canada is very reluctant to permit the export of such feed and grain and has an embargo on shipments to the United States. While we heartily concur in the cooperative effort of the surplus grain producing countries to supply the famine-ridden areas of the world and can readily understand the reluctance of Canada to permit the export of grain to another surplus producing nation, yet it appears to us that the shortage of dairy and poultry products in this country is likely to be acute before next spring if the slaughter of foundation flocks and the reduction of dairy herds continues at the current alarming rate.

Therefore, the purpose of this letter is to request you to use your best endeavor with Canadian officials to permit the export to the New England States of an amount of oats or other grain sufficient to check the further liquidation of flocks during the next 30 to 60 days.

Thanking you for your cooperation in this matter, we remain.

Unless we can obtain 1,000 more cars of feed than is now in sight within the next 2 weeks, the forced liquidation of our foundation flocks of poultry will continue, as will the reduction in the production of our dairy products.

On May 23 we telegraphed President Truman that our producers were faced with forced liquidation and bankruptcy of small businesses built up with years of hard work. That has now become a tragic fact. We then said, and I now repeat, that "this is an unfair, unreasonable, and unnecessary hardship upon them."

I want to make it emphatically clear that our requests are directed to surplus supplies in this country and Canada and that these requests do not interfere in any way with the program of famine relief. Over 5 weeks ago, the Department placed its reliance upon the normal trade channels to provide this feed for New England. This method of meeting the shortage has failed beyond any possible question. Our Government has recognized and exercised its authority to provide grain for export. It has used ingenuity in that field. In the face of the acknowledged desperate shortage of feed for what remains of our essential poultry and livestock, as well as the growing shortage of basic food for human consumption and vital byproducts for industrial use, we demand that equally vigorous efforts now be made by our Government to help us and our people.

The Flagrant and Promiscuous Use of World War II Discharge Emblem Should Be Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1946

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the indiscriminate and flagrant use of World War II discharge emblem is reducing the distinction and dignity for which this emblem was designed. The privilege of wearing the emblem is a mark of distinction for the veteran who served his Nation honorably during the last war, but when it is handed out to anyone who wants to buy it, or given away with the purchase of clothing without regard to whether the recipient is a veteran or not, it places the genuine veteran in the same class as those who have no right or privilege to wear it.

The Southwest Post, No. 27, of the American Veterans of World War II of Los Angeles in my congressional district have adopted an appropriate and timely resolution calling for legislation to curb the fraudulent use of the emblem for advertising purposes, and to restore it to its proper and rightful use. I have introduced such a bill, H. R. 6829, to accomplish this which I trust will have the early and considerate attention of the Military Affairs Committee so that the Congress can pass it during this session.

Following is the resolution referred to:

JUNE 8, 1946.

GORDON L. McDONOUGH,
Member of Congress,
Fifteenth District, California,
House Office Building,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McDONOUGH: At a meeting on June 6, 1946, the Southwest Post, No. 27, of Amvets, American Veterans of World War II, of Los Angeles, Calif., passed the following resolution which they wish to have published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"WORLD WAR II DISCHARGE BUTTON—MISUSE AND SELLING

"Whereas the selling of the discharge button has been mishandled by the present ci-

vilian population including leading jewelers, oil companies, and clothing stores; and

"Whereas the oil companies are giving away stickers of the discharge emblem to consumers; and

"Whereas children are attaching such stickers to their bicycles; and

"Whereas clothing stores are giving away two buttons with each purchase of clothing; and

"Whereas the discharge emblem can now be purchased in the form of tie pins and rings; and

"Whereas the discharge button can be purchased through the mail without definite proof of an honorable discharge; and

"Whereas the honor of wearing the discharge button shall not be lost by individual or collective greed, jewelers monopolies, ignorance, or indifference toward veterans of World War II; and,

"Whereas the integrity of the individual citizens that participated in the great conflict just ended want to guard very jealously that special privilege and distinction of honorable service to this country; and

"Whereas the present practices of selling or giving away the discharge button are unfair and a discredit to veterans of World War II, we urge you to investigate this matter and introduce legislation to revert the privilege of handling discharge buttons back to the original agencies, which are the United States Army and its component branches, United States Navy, United States Marine Corps, and United States Coast Guard recruiting or shore duty stations or separation centers accredited by the above-named agencies upon presentation of the dischargee of honorable discharge papers.

"*Resolved*, That the Southwest Post No. 27 of Amvets, American Veterans of World War II, goes down on record to see that you introduced Federal legislation to that end."

FIDEL J. GONZALEZ, Jr.,
Commander.

Attest:

JOHN B. JOHNSON, Jr.,
Adjutant.

National Jewish Welfare Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the extraordinary record of patriotic service rendered by the National Jewish Welfare Board in World War II. Following are excerpts from the record of the twenty-ninth annual meeting of the board, held in Washington, D. C., on Monday, May 6, 1946, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS CITATION, READ BY LT. GEN. J. LAWTON COLLINS, DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INFORMATION OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT

It is my privilege to read to you the citation which has been awarded to the Jewish Welfare Board by the Secretaries of War and Navy for the work that was done during the war:

"The War Department and Navy Department express to the National Jewish Welfare Board their appreciation for patriotic service.

"The National Jewish Welfare Board, member of the USO, with high devotion to the common purpose of victory, early dedicated itself to serving the religious, spiritual, educational, and welfare needs of the men and women in the armed forces and in war industries. Significant were the recruitment of chaplains, the recreational and religious programs in hospitals, and morale activities among veterans. Its mobilized resources in the great common effort made a contribution of exceptional aid in the successful prosecution of the war and in the preservation of the enduring values of American democracy.

"ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
"Secretary of War.
"JAMES FORRESTAL,
"Secretary of the Navy."

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT P. PATTERSON, SECRETARY OF WAR

Last December I had the pleasure of meeting with your Army and Navy Religious Committee, representing every phase of American Jewish religious life. The assistance which your committee furnished the War Department has been invaluable.

The committee procured for us a group of chaplains of whom both you and we are justly proud. Jewish chaplains were second to none in zeal, and in education their standards were unusually high.

Your chaplains served with distinction. Of all chaplains none had so difficult or demanding a task as those of the Jewish faith. Because they served a relatively small group that was widely scattered throughout the armed forces, the Jewish chaplains had no chance to rest. They served in the highest echelons where they aided in the formulation of policies and regulations and they served with high honor and courage in combat. The War Department and the fathers and mothers of America gratefully acknowledge the splendid manner in which all our Army chaplains labored to serve the moral and spiritual integrity of those to whom they ministered. Protestant and Catholic and Jewish chaplains were joined in a single spiritual effort on behalf of all our men.

It is my hope and wish that this fine work will be continued by bringing in to the Chaplains Corps new rabbis to serve the needs of our occupation troops. The morale and conduct of these troops must be carefully guided if we are to accomplish our purpose. Certainly none can labor to this end more effectively than the chaplains working in the armed forces.

Both in combat and in the enforcement of the peace, the soldier does not live on bread alone, nor is his strength measured solely by the arms he bears. Aggressors who discard all spiritual values and trample on all spiritual ideals can depend on brute force alone. But we, whose political and social ideas are based on the sacred character of the human individual, cannot wage effective war or establish enduring peace without spiritual aid. The things of the spirit to us are as important as guns and ammunition. The religious life of our soldiers has had and will continue to have a top priority.

Your board is founded on a firm recognition of that fact. You have worked and have sacrificed before and during and since the war to make sure that the things of the spirit should not be slighted in the concern for more material objectives. During the war you did your part so that our spiritual rearmament might keep pace with our physical rearmament.

Today, a serious danger to our enforcement of the peace is that, in a resurgence of the desire for easy living and the material comforts of life, we may forget the ideals for which we fought and the goal of universal peace in a united world for which we strive. Your board is an integral part of our defense against the threatening waves of gross materialism. The Nation depends on you to do your part. You are armed with varied experience in the means of maintaining morale and strengthening the will to strive for great goals. In wartime, you successfully performed a manifold mission for victory.

Your work was not religious alone. On the social side, through the United Service Organizations, you were joined with other great American groups which provided health, welfare, and recreation services for the Army—working to give the soldier something more than rows of barracks or muddy foxholes to live in. The USO, both at home and overseas, was one of our most potent morale weapons. To millions of men—far from home and the faces they knew—the USO was a magic phrase. The good that it accomplished cannot be measured in dollars and cents because it was concerned with the spirit of men.

The maintenance of the spirit and morale of our troops was as important and essential in winning the war as training and weapons and ammunition. The lonesome soldier, the depressed soldier, the bored soldier very quickly could become the beaten soldier. Fortunately for us, because of such organizations as your board, we had the USO.

Camp shows girdled the world as they sought out our men overseas. Smaller groups cheered the troops in our isolated defense outposts in this country and on nearby island bases. In our large cities and small towns, in training camps and in the hospitals for the sick and wounded, the USO was fighting the battle of morale. It was actually a part of the over-all battle of survival as a nation. It required endurance and the will to persevere until victory was won.

Most of the people in this battle of morale were not professionals. In America more than a million men and women—a great many of them recruited by your board—were engaged in it as volunteers and they gave from one day or one night a week up to every day and every night of the week working in USO facilities. They served the boys and girls of our armed forces wherever in America they might be.

USO assistance in the individual cases might be small, a cup of coffee at a railroad stop, a magazine to read while waiting in the station, a smile and a few minutes of conversation. Or it might be a major and more continuous service such as the 222 clubs the Jewish Welfare Board operated singly or with other organizations in this country, the Canal Zone, Hawaii, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, New Guinea, Alaska, and Brazil, or the great hospitality centers you operated on the European Continent after D-day.

Under the direction of its army and navy committee and its world-wide network of community committees, the Jewish Welfare Board rendered an infinite variety of services to men and women in uniform. Holiday meals by the thousands; special Jewish foods by the ton; vast quantities of gifts for the Jewish festivals; more than 6,000,000 pieces of Jewish cultural and religious literature; countless personal services and comfort articles—all these were part of the day-to-day efficient services of the Jewish Welfare Board.

In the total sum, our morale and recreation activities meant to our men and women of the armed forces that the American people were interested in them, were willing to devote time to helping them bridge the gap between life in the service and life at home. The USO joined the civilian and military fronts with a firm bond.

Both as a social force through the United Service Organizations and a religious force through its own committee on Army and

Navy religious activities, American Jewry's contribution to victory in the Second World War is a magnificent story. It is a story impossible to tell in terms of cold statistics. I had the privilege of seeing a good deal of that contribution as it was written in the heroism of chaplains on the battlefield, in a mighty measure of service to the armed forces at home and abroad, and in the outpouring of individual and community resources without stint.

The greatest testimonial of all to your work is written in the memories of our fighting men who saw it at first hand, who benefited from it in every corner of the earth. Thousands of them are daily returning to their homes, joining the millions already arrived—for the War Department has fulfilled its pledge of the fastest possible, most complete possible demobilization. They will not forget, I firmly believe, the motive that prompted and inspired your work.

Your contribution, and the contribution of every similar organization, was motivated by a spirit of brotherhood among the American people. The sacrifices of war drew no line of color or race or creed. That spirit of brotherhood must continue and be extended. Our armed strength and the world organization which we are striving to build will be ineffective for peace, if here at home and in our foreign relations we permit prejudices and hates to warp our attitudes toward those who possess and must develop the earth with us. Prejudice and hate, the weapons the totalitarian gangsters used in their conspiracy to subvert the world, must be eliminated if we are to rebuild it.

The Jewish Welfare Board and the other members of the United Service Organizations proved the spirit of brotherhood was one of the ingredients of victory. We must never forget it is an essential ingredient in an enduring peace.

LETTER FROM PRESIDENT TRUMAN

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 1, 1946.

Mr. FRANK L. WEIL,
New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. WEIL: It was a happy thought that prompted the National Jewish Welfare Board to adopt "From war to peace" as the theme of its first meeting since 1942.

Coming on the eve of the first anniversary of VE-day, the keynote of your meeting serves to emphasize what too many have forgotten—that the laying down of arms and the signing of an armistice do not of themselves bring peace, and that the effective transition from war to peace requires the same kind of national unity and consecration to duty as did the building of the arsenal of democracy and the winning of the war.

As the united instrumentality of the American Jewish community for war service, the National Jewish Welfare Board's worldwide program of services and activities on behalf of the welfare, religious, and morale needs of the men and women of the armed forces contributed substantially to victory. In training camps, on battlefields, in hospitals, and now in veterans' facilities the six-pointed star of the Jewish Welfare Board is a universally recognized symbol of unselfish service to the Nation.

In common with all who fought and died for victory, these Jewish men and women were motivated by unity of purpose and animated by faith in the American way of life. The best monument to their memory would be the kind of world to justify their faith and their sacrifice.

In planning how best your groups can facilitate the transition from war to peace, the annual meeting of the National Jewish Welfare Board will, I am confident, make a decided contribution to that end.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The Food Situation in South America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. TAFT
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the food situation in South America, by Hon. Herbert Hoover.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have had a generous welcome and excellent cooperation from Latin America. These countries fall into two groups, from a food point of view: those that export food and those that import food. A few, of course, import certain foods and export others. Our concern has been exclusively with the world crisis until the harvests in the Northern Hemisphere in September.

On April 19, I broadcast to Latin America an appeal that the exporting countries expand and accelerate their exports as much as possible, and that the importing countries drastically reduce their imports during the world crisis. This request was greatly aided by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, who addressed an urgent appeal to these nations. And the full information issued by the press has kept the leaders of these countries informed upon the world crisis.

The governments without exception requested that I explain the world situation to their people as an aid to them in measures they were taking to reduce imports and increase exports.

Colombia, Venezuela, Chile, Peru, and Uruguay have all reduced their cereal and fats imports to a minimum. Some of them generously offered to do without these imports during the critical months. Mexico, Ecuador, Chile, Peru, and Uruguay are increasing their exports of beans, rice, meat, fats, or sugar, as the case may be.

Brazil is normally the largest Latin-American importer of wheat—about 100,000 tons per month. She has reduced her imports during these critical months by over 40 percent and made available much larger than normal exports of corn, rice, and beans. Thus, she is making a double contribution.

The Argentine is one of the world's most important food-exporting countries. She suffered a partial crop failure, and her surplus this year, while considerable, is less than normal. Nevertheless, the Argentine during these months will supply 90 percent of Latin-American food exports. Although President Perón was inaugurated only 2 days before our arrival, he took time for an exhaustive discussion of the world famine situation. He went thoroughly into the contribution the Argentine could make, and the measures for making it effective. I have now received telegraphic word that President Perón has signaled his cooperation by a decree creating strong emergency measures to speed up exports to the utmost during the crisis.

During March, April, and May, the Argentine has exported an average of about 450,000 tons of cereals a month. Under these new emergency measures, I am in hopes the average during the next 3 months will rise to seven or seven hundred and fifty thousand tons a month, although our estimates are for a less amount. Argentina has undertaken to provide for the major needs of most of the importing South American countries during the critical months, thus greatly relieving the drain upon Canada and the United States.

As a result of these arrangements, we are now able to revise substantially our previous appraisals of the situation in these nations. All estimates are necessarily approximate, but they have been compiled upon a month-to-month basis after investigation by our staff and discussion with the governments concerned. It will be noted that the figures given below for requirements are 1 month later than those of shipments, about this time being required for delivery.

The estimates which we gave in a report on the world situation to President Truman on May 13 included an estimate that the importing Latin-American states would require a minimum of about 800,000 tons of cereals for the 4 months from June 1 until September 30, or about 200,000 tons per month during the remaining acute stage of the world food crisis. We are now able to reduce this requirement for these 4 months to about 420,000 tons, or an average of about 105,000 tons a month. The importing countries in Central and South America could effectively use more than this quantity, but they will willingly get along if further supplies are not available.

In the same report to President Truman, we estimated total possible exports of cereals and beans from these countries during the 4 months from May 1 to August 31 at about 2,150,000 tons. We now estimate the total possible shipments of cereals and beans during these 4 months at about 2,600,000 tons, with a possible increase beyond this from the Argentine of 300,000 tons.

The 5 months' balance sheet in our previous estimate showed net exports from Latin America, taken as a whole—that is, deducting total imports from total exports—of about 320,000 tons of cereals a month during the critical period.

Taking into account the decrease in requirements and the increase in supplies, our new 4 months' balance sheet shows a net export possible from Latin America of about 520,000 tons a month of cereals and beans, or a net total of about 2,120,000 tons during the 4 months, with still further possible increases. In other words, the cooperation of the Latin-American countries renders available about 800,000 tons more cereals and beans than we had previously estimated. There are still further possibilities from the Argentine. The changes in the situation of fats and oils are in the same favorable directions.

These nations are making a real contribution to closing the gap in supplies to the hungry world.

British Loan No Longer Even a Defensible Gamble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1946

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, the British loan proposal is assuming the proportions of a costly and tragic joke on conservative Members of the House. In favoring this loan they are not unlike a man voting for his own execution. The British Labor Party, to whom these funds will go, last week went just about all out in its denunciation of American capitalistic free enterprise.

A Wall Street Journal editorial discusses this action as follows:

OUR BRITISH CRITICS

One of its proponents told a congressional committee that the British loan was a gamble. Success would bring a very fruitful economic relationship between the United States and Great Britain. Failure would indeed entail grave consequences but unwillingness to take the chance would be equivalent to taking it and failing.

It seemed to us that was one of the most candid arguments made in behalf of the loan proposal. It was also one of the most persuasive and it seemed to be so regarded by many of the moderate opponents of the loan in Congress.

Last week there took place in Great Britain a series of events which raises the question whether this gamble is not now revealed as one at such terrifically adverse odds as to put it beyond the bounds of prudence.

The Labor Party, which is the dominant party with a mandate to govern for 4 more years, held a party conference at Bournemouth. The speakers at that conference included leaders of the Government. One was Herbert Morrison, Lord President of the Council. He was recently in the United States on a mission connected with the British food supply.

Mr. Morrison referred to "the muddle, the inflation, and then the smash" at the end of World War I and blamed capitalism. He later said:

"If, unhappily, a depression were to occur in the United States—which Heaven forbid—or if a world depression were to occur, we are preparing to avoid repercussions on the economic life of our own country."

The implications of that statement are pretty clear. They constitute a gratuitous comment by an official of one government on the domestic policies of another and resentment is justified. It would be hard to imagine a depression that would carry the American standard of living below that now prevailing in Socialist Britain. And if the time is here for one nation to protect itself against the internal policies of another, perhaps we should consider the effect on American economy of a British policy which insists on placing Socialist theory above production, which, for instance, takes over dairy farms as sites for model towns in a nation which is short of milk.

But Mr. Morrison's statement is something more than a chance to tweak the lion's tail in retaliation for pulling the Eagle's feathers. Its significance will be better appreciated if its background is known.

The statement harmonized with the whole tone of the party conference. Mr. Herbert L. Matthews reported to the New York Times that a "revealing feature of the debate was the surprising antagonism toward the United States as a capitalistic country." Even Mr. Ernest Bevin, Foreign Minister, considered a moderate and certainly one of the most independent members of the Cabinet, made a feeble defense of this country and then expressed the hope that capitalism here would not last forever.

It is as though Mr. Byrnes, the Secretary of State, and Mr. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, went before a gathering of Democrats and criticized the internal policies of Britain. Perhaps neither gentleman would do that—in any event, we hope not. But they certainly would not do it except under pressure. If there existed a strong anti-British sentiment and the two Cabinet officers needed support, they might cater to the popular mood. That is what Mr. Morrison and Mr. Bevin apparently did. It is inconcievable that they wantonly attacked American internal policies. But at this conference they were themselves under attack and they needed to placate.

It is certainly permissible to raise the question of whether any loan of any amount will bring the dominant thought in Britain in accord with a system which is denounced in terms hardly exceeded by the inspired press of Moscow.

There have been two views in this country of the British Socialist experiment: One is that is it hardly more than a sweeping reform of admitted economic and social evils. The other is that it is a revolution and that, after the manner of revolutions, it would fall more and more under the direction of extremists until it ran its course.

On the face of events at Bournemouth, there is support for the former view. The program of the Government was under attack from several directions, but in the end the party voted its support. Also alliance with communism was rejected.

However, the party endorsement was not won without concessions. There was the anger at capitalistic America and Government officials who must be trying to keep cordial relations apparently felt it necessary to cater to that feeling. There were promises of speedier measures for socialization. Mr. Bevin felt it necessary to exert himself to the utmost in defense of his foreign policy.

The picture at Bournemouth was not one of a government able, or even willing, to slow down and temper its drive toward socialization to accommodate itself to world economic commitments which look to free and unfettered trade and which therefore must be the antithesis of socialism. It was the picture of a government which, when confronted with any such choice, will listen to the extremists, and which will—indeed must, if it is to continue in office—unhesitatingly choose to push its Socialist program. A loan cannot fructify in any such soil.

It will be argued that this was the Labor Party and that, although it is now the dominant party, it does not represent all the people of Britain. There is precisely a point which should be understood.

The officials of the British Government went before this party conference and defended themselves. They were at more pains to make explanations to this unofficial party gathering than they have ever been to explain their aims to the elected representatives of the British people in Parliament. There were introduced at that party gathering certain condemnatory resolutions, and had any of them been passed there might have followed an upset in Government personnel. The spirited defense by Mr. Bevin of his spirited policy is a case in point.

The British Government has a mandate with 4 years to run, and a majority in Commons which apparently give it an unassailable position for that time. But the personnel of the Government can be called to account and put in peril by a party conference. There certainly are suggested uncomfortable resemblances to the one-party government in which a small active minority rules a nation.

Since World War I, the world has seen a series of these experiments in managed economy. And accompanying each of them there has been this campaign of denunciation directed at those nations which preferred to keep their institutions of parliamentary government and individual enterprise. But even those who foresaw Britain heading for something of the kind must now be startled at the lack of restraint that marked the utterances at Bournemouth of those charged with responsibility.

"Economic planning is the strong basis for true liberty," Mr. Morrison told that meeting.

There is not, so far as we know, one iota of evidence to support that assertion; there is plenty to deny it. But if Mr. Morrison believes it and if a majority of his countrymen believe it, that is certainly their business.

But the majority of Americans do not believe it. They reject the idea just as strongly as Mr. Morrison asserts it. Certainly their convictions ought not to be subjected to gratuitous attack; and, above all, it becomes sheer effrontery to demand that they finance the attack.

Disapprove Loan to Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1946

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 13, I was shocked to see printed on page 1, column 1, of the New York Times, the heading "Bevin unwilling to open Palestine for 100,000 Jews."

In a dispatch by its writer, Herbert L. Matthews from Bournemouth, England, it was reported that the Foreign Secretary, Ernest Bevin, stated among other things:

> Regarding the agitation in the United States, and particularly New York, for 100,000 Jews to be put into Palestine, I hope it will not be misunderstood in America if I say, with the purest of motives, that that was because they did not want too many of them in New York.

I then read, with disgust, this affront to the civilized people of the entire world, including the United States. This insult, especially to the people of our own city of New York, will not be countenanced. Mr. Bevin also spoke about the creation of another phase of anti-Semitic feeling in the British Army. I had been hopeful that the finding and recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee on Inquiry on Palestine, which consisted of six Britons and six Americans, and which was unanimous, would be quickly lived up to and that there would immediately be granted the 100,000 immigration certificates to the Jewish displaced persons in Europe for immediate entry into Palestine. The inquiry took about 4 months. Our President wholeheartedly hailed the recommendations of the committee and I thought that Great Britain would execute the findings and recommendations expeditiously. However, we then received a preliminary shock by the statements of the Prime Minister, who laid down certain conditions which were only for the purpose of delaying this matter, which is usually Great Britain's policy. As a result, the hopes and dreams of the tragic victims of the Nazis who are still alive became shattered, and it seems that there is no solution to this problem, which is a most important and humane one. These people are forced to wait indefinitely, and I say that they have suffered enough and that they must not suffer any longer.

If Great Britain is on the level, it must open the doors of Palestine now so that these innocent victims, who have suffered so much, whose families have been wiped out, and are now suffering, are permitted to enter Palestine, or their deaths will be charged to the policy of delay and neglect.

I call upon the President of the United States and our State Department to adopt a vigorous and aggressive policy in seeing to it that Great Britain does the right thing in this matter.

I also charge that the utterances made by the Foreign Secretary, Ernest Bevin, are false, are untrue, slanderous, and anti-Semitic. It is a blot upon Great Britain, which proclaims its policies are fair, but permits this dastardly and slanderous insult to the American people and especially to the citizenry of New York.

I was born and raised in New York City of Irish parentage. We have endeavored to respect each others opinions and religious beliefs and to help one another, regardless of what the other person's religious beliefs were. We will not stand for an insult such as that delivered by Mr. Bevin at Bournemouth, England.

We in the United States will not permit the seed of bigotry and intolerance to be planted here by any Englishman. We in New York City will see to it that the seed of bigotry and intolerance will not take root in our midst.

The time consumed for the creation of committees, the establishing of Cabinet committees, the negotiation of State Department officials means only delay and retards the admission of these displaced persons to Palestine.

Of course, in all fairness, I must admit that a duty rests upon all civilized nations wherever located to admit these displaced persons, whether they be of the Catholic, Jewish, or Protestant faith. They have all suffered under the tyranny of nazism. For that reason, I believe that there should be a modification of our own immigration laws to permit the admission of a larger number of persons from certain countries where the quotas are exceedingly small. This, especially in view of the fact that, during the war years, no immigration took place into the United States. I shall do everything possible to cooperate in supporting such legislation.

The history of Ireland has shown that Great Britain adopted a policy similar to the one it now shows in Palestine. For centuries the Irish suffered, were persecuted and only because of its willingness to fight for its justifiable rights, do we now see a free and independent Ireland. I trust that a repetition of this will not be necessary now and that Great Britain will live up to its solemn pledges. If it does not, it will be discredited and condemned by all righteous and fair-thinking people.

Great Britain defaulted in her World War I commitments and did not meet her obligations. Be that as it may, we know that one who is not morally responsible is, in most cases, financially irresponsible. Feeling the way I do and with just indignation, I call upon my fellow Congressmen of New York to join with me in opposing the proposed loan to Great Britain. I am interested in creating commerce and business between countries, but I am even more so interested in the saving of human beings. In view of the record of broken pledges, and violations of solemn obligations, it is important to consider whether such a government is worthy of a loan. I, therefore, appeal to my colleagues in the House of Representatives in considering this legislation to give great thought to what I have stated and trust that we will not approve the loan to Great Britain until such time as Great Britain demonstrates that it is honest and sincere and carries out its solemn obligation. When I see a record of 100,000 actual admissions of these displaced persons to Palestine, I shall have convincing proof that Great Britain is sincere and, at that time, I will be most willing to help it in obtaining this loan.

Enact the Hobbs Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 20, 1946

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, Congress still has the opportunity of passing some badly needed labor legislation. The Hobbs bill still has a chance to become law and I sincerely hope it receives consideration in the near future.

In last Tuesday's issue of the Washington Daily News there appeared an editorial which, under the leave granted me, I am inserting and which is as follows:

ENACT THE HOBBS BILL

The Hobbs antiracketeering bill, twice passed by overwhelming House votes, finally has been approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee. That should clear the way for at least one sound and urgently needed piece of legislation against abuse of labor's powers.

Enactment of this measure is essential because of a 1942 Supreme Court decision that the Federal Antiracketeering Act does not apply to unions which use threats and violence to compel employees to pay money to members whose services are neither wanted nor needed.

That was the famous Byrnes decision which brought from Chief Justice Stone, dissenting, the protest that its reasoning "would make common-law robbery an innocent pastime."

The Hobbs bill, a proposed Antiracketeering Act amendment, expresses the definite intent of Congress that union officers and members shall be liable to penalties if they practice robbery and extortion. Three weeks ago the Senate voted, 59 to 22, to write the Hobbs language in as section 7 of the Case labor bill. When President Truman vetoed the Case bill, he stated his full accord with that section's objectives, but said it should have stated clearly that it would not be made a felony to strike, to picket peacefully, or to take other legitimate action.

Had Mr. Truman analyzed section 7 more carefully, he would have found that it did—as the Hobbs bill does, for the wording is identical—just that. Nothing in it "shall be construed to repeal, modify, or affect" the rights guaranteed to unions by the Clayton, Norris-LaGuardia, Railway Labor, and Wagner Acts. Thus strikes, peaceful picketing, and other legitimate labor activities protected by these laws are specifically exempted from antiracketeering penalties.

The Case bill is dead, but the Hobbs bill has been rescued from that Senate committee pigeonhole where it gathered dust so long. It should now go speedily before the Senate for passage, and be sent to Mr. Truman.

Since he strongly favors its objectives, and since his one criticism when it came to him as part of the Case bill obviously was due to an imperfect understanding of its safeguards for honest labor, we think he surely will sign it into law.

Ambassador E. J. Kyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 20, 1946

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, our American Ambassador to Guatemala, Edwin J. Kyle, who, prior to his appointment a few years ago, served 30 years as dean of agriculture of Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College, is making a splendid record.

Prior to his appointment as Ambassador to Guatemala, he made a trip to Brazil and other South American countries, and, while in Brazil, Mr. Hubert Maness, our American consul at Manáos, Brazil, said this concerning him:

Dean Kyle is the only man I ever knew who could walk down the streets of a strange city in a strange country and not be able to speak the language of the people and yet make friends with everyone he passed.

As evidence of his popularity in his new post as Ambassador to Guatemala, Mr. Walter Lind, prominent agriculturist in Guatemala, recently stated that Ambassador Kyle was the type of ambassador they had been waiting for for over 50 years.

At this time, Ambassador Kyle is on a visit to the United States, accompanied by a group of prominent businessmen and agriculturists of Guatemala, and they have visited different sections of our country, and the press in several cities has paid him a deserved tribute, and under leave granted, two of same are submitted herewith, the first being an editorial from the Dallas News, of Dallas, Tex., entitled "Good Neighboring," and the other an editorial from the Des Moines Tribune, of Des Moines, Iowa, enentitled "Good Neighboring That Is Practical":

[From the Dallas Morning News of May 28, 1946]

GOOD NEIGHBORING

No higher tribute has ever been paid to any ambassador from the United States to a Latin-American nation than that which a spokesman for the Guatemalans paid Dean E. J. Kyle during the visit to the dean's former Texas workshop, A. and M. College. Carlos Dorion, speaking for the group that will tour agricultural sections of Texas under guidance of Dr. Kyle, said: "Dean Kyle has done more for us in Guatemala in the 6 months he has been there than any of your ambassadors you have sent in the past 100 years."

The Ambassador himself said that during his stay he has given less attention to diplomatic matters than to effort designed to better agricultural conditions and practices in that country, which is ideally suited to become a leading agricultural nation. That, surely, is diplomacy of the most fruitful sort, good neighboring in a form that will count for most. It will win and hold the friendship

of these southern neighbors, as less constructive effort could never do.

It is a matter of pride to Texas and to the great school which he served for so many years that Dr. Kyle should have accomplished so much in his diplomatic post in so short a time. As the fruits of his helpful efforts are evidenced in increased agricultural production and an improved economy in Guatemala, that country may ask his ambassadorial tenure be made permanent. But his accomplishment there may commend him for promotion to other responsible diplomatic posts.

[From the Des Moines Tribune of June 7, 1947]

"GOOD NEIGHBORING" THAT IS PRACTICAL

Our Ambassador to Guatemala, Edwin J. Kyle, is conducting a group of prominent Guatemalan businessmen and agriculturists on a tour in the United States.

The group is making it a point to see "outstanding agricultural operations" of widely varying kinds in different sections of the United States.

Naturally, Iowa is included. The group has been at Iowa State College, and will visit several farming districts.

This is excellent. Obviously, the bringing of people from different countries into real contact is a two-way street. There is just as much need for us North Americans to visit Central and South American countries, not just as tourists but really for the purpose of learning, as there is for Guatemalans to visit us.

There is another aspect of this particular visit that deserves, we think, some emphasis.

Ambassador Kyle, this country's diplomatic representative in Guatemala, is a unique kind of ambassador. He is the only man technically qualified in agriculture (unless we go back to somebody like Thomas Jefferson) ever plucked out of professional life and sent as ambassador abroad.

Since his background was that of dean at the big Texas Agricultural College, it is obvious that he is a trained transmitter of knowledge, as well as a possessor of it.

And Guatemala, like all the countries south of the Rio Grande, can at this stage of development wrap up practically all its major economic problems in the one word, "agricultural."

It certainly made sense to recognize that fact and to recognize also that every interest of our broad policy of good neighborliness would be well served by sending an ambassador who fitted that kind of situation.

It is an example that might well be followed in not a few other cases.

If our hemispheric good-neighbor policy, well grounded in morals as it is, needs any justification in terms of "hemispheric solidarity," we merely add that we can't think of any way in which the solidarity can be better advanced than by making our own friendship really helpful.

Plant Trees To Memorialize Our Service Men and Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1946

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, many people have advanced ideas as to how we can best memorialize the great and loyal service of the millions of young men and women who joined our armed forces and carried us to victory in the recent world conflict.

Just recently I read an article which appeared in the Times Region, a weekly newspaper published in my congressional district at Roseau, Minn., in which an excellent suggestion was made. The article, from the issue of April 18, 1946, follows:

TREES AS MEMORIALS

Over in Golden Valley Tore Njaa has proposed that a tree be planted for every lad in the service from that township. The trees could be planted at some public place to enhance the beauty of the location and add to the tree population. Plant them as a living memorial, is his urge.

That idea may not be original with Mr. Njaa, but it is, anyway, a practical one and one that has everything to commend it.

In Roseau County trees are beginning to have more value than they once had. The reason is that there are so many less of them—at least of the more desirable kind. The forested parts have been cleared out by hard work or by the help of fire. The desirable trees have gone with the less desirable.

Now the time is here when folks begin to look about for shade and for windbreaks that will do the trick best, and they will want them so they can plant where they desire them to grow.

Mr. Njaa's proposal could easily be made a part of our conservation program this spring. Planted with an eye to the future, generations following will get the enjoyment out of such work.

James Wheaton Mott

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1946

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JAMES WHEATON MOTT, late a Representative from the State of Oregon

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of JAMES WHEATON MOTT, I have lost one with whom I enjoyed a unique relationship. He served, and held my confidence, as my Representative to the Congress of the United States. When the Fourth District of Oregon was created, I became his successor as Representative for that portion of his old district which became the Fourth District. I had the privilege and honor of serving with him as a colleague in the House of Representatives. But, most important, I prized his good judgment, wise counsel, and friendship. The passing of JAMES WHEATON MOTT is a great loss to the people of his district and the State of Oregon, to the Members of the House, and the loss to this Nation of a statesman who served his country well in both war and peace.

When I came to Washington, I soon found that JIM MOTT was held in high esteem and regard by the Members of this body. I discovered that he had earned this position among his fellow Members because of their respect for his ability, his intelligence, and his achievements. I found him always ready to help and assist me with the problems of my district because he knew well the interests and needs of these people whom he had represented for 10 years. I discovered among the people throughout my district, the deep friendship, the fine regard, and appreciation for JIM MOTT which grows out of statesmanlike representation and service to the people.

JAMES W. MOTT had a high conception of the responsibilities and importance of his mission as representative of the people of Oregon. Though he attached great importance to his duties and obligations, he did not assume importance to himself. Justice and right always had an earnest and courageous advocate in JIM MOTT. He was well prepared by reason of long experience in public life in Oregon for his duties and place of leadership in the Congress of the United States.

He contributed greatly to the ultimate victory of this Nation in World War II by reason of his knowledge, sound judgment, vision as leader of the minority members of the Naval Affairs Committee. Having served as an enlisted man in the Navy during World War I, JIM MOTT knew the need for and the potentialities in power of a strong navy. At no time did he subscribe to the theories advocated prior to, and early in, the war that a big navy was obsolete. Without reserve, he gave freely of his time and effort toward the building of the strong, powerful Navy which was able to sustain itself through the task of overcoming a powerful enemy, with men, munitions, and supplies, over vast areas, and under the greatest hazards ever encountered by any navy in the history of the world. It was a signal tribute to his great contribution that the mooring basin at the Tongue Point Naval Base was dedicated in his honor to be known as the Mott Basin.

JIM MOTT was a public-spirited man. Throughout his long career of public service, it was always his aim to preserve and defend the rights of the people of Oregon and his constituents. Mindful though he was of the interests of his constituents and the people of Oregon, he always remembered that he was a Representative in the United States Congress, and that the interests of this great Nation and its people as a whole were paramount. In all of his activities, public and private, he was activated by a fine loyalty to the public good.

His record as a servant of the people speaks in eloquent tribute to him. I am sure that nothing I can say, and nothing in public acclaim, can add luster to the memory of this fine American citizen. His public career is one which we may, with pride, hold up before those who, in generations to come, seek to serve their fellowmen in this great Nation with the highest ideals of American citizenship.

JIM MOTT was a champion of the common average citizen, the man who reposes his trust in a Representative and knows that the trust will not be betrayed. JIM MOTT knew the needs of these people and respected this trust. At every quarter he fought diligently for them.

JIM MOTT was a man of vision, a man who looked into the future and saw a better and more productive land. He envisioned his district, the State of Oregon, and the great Northwest as a happier and a more abundant place for

living. He worked for better harbors, wider and deeper channels for our rivers, through and from which increasing commerce might flow. He worked that the angry flood waters of our rivers might be tamed to flow in their courses without hazard to the people.

He strove that these waters might be distributed to the dry and arid areas so that the land might produce more plentifully. The vast dams with turbines whirling to bring light out of darkness, to encourage new industry and production, and increase the strength and lessen the burdens of men, here again we have the expression of his vision and efforts.

In these things JIM MOTT lives on today and for generations to come. In the ships laden with commerce; the rivers tamed to useful purpose; the turbines whining with the eagerness of power; and in our irrigated lands with their quiet fruitfulness, here lives on the spirit of JAMES W. MOTT.

How To Preserve World Peace and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "How To Preserve World Peace and Security," from the June 15 issue of Capitol Gist, published in Washington at 100 C Street SE, and edited by Fred Burdick.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO PRESERVE WORLD PEACE AND SECURITY

Those in control of nations' foreign policies must not talk peace and war at the same time, but make their acts square with their words.

Governments must:

(1) Adhere to the principles of the San Francisco Charter;

(2) Support the United Nations wholeheartedly;

(3) Abrogate the sovereign right to wage war unilaterally;

(4) Prohibit alliances outside of the United Nations;

(5) End secret diplomacy;

(6) Cease practicing power politics;

(7) Diminish avarice;

(8) Concentrate military power in the UN police force;

(9) Take steps toward universal disarmament;

(10) Deal fairly and considerately with other nations;

(11) Practice the Golden Rule;

(12) Maintain a fact-giving free press;

(13) Establish an international bill of rights;

(14) Inaugurate worldwide peace education.

Lest these 14 points appear unattainable, adherence to points 1 and 2 will maintain peace.

Governments must deal with war causes and not merely consequences. World economic problems can be solved by restoring a full-production peace economy and world trade; not by destroying the energies, resources and wealth of nations in suicidal and senseless war. Democracy and justice stem from peace, not from war with its madness—its mass killing, wounding, crippling and burning of millions of innocent men, women and little children by atomic and incendiary bombs, deadly poison gases and disease germs. And what will future generations think of contemplated plans for starving millions of people by use of crop-destroying insects?

Historians—scrutinizing with the calm, dispassionate objectivity that comes with the march down the corridors of time—will classify extant war-mongers in the same category as Hitler and Mussolini; barbarous, short-sighted madmen governed by hatred, intolerance, arrogance, bellicosity and lust for power instead of by humanitarianism, magnanimity, altruism, foresightedness, and wisdom.

What the world needs most is a spiritual awakening. Every time one repeats the Lord's prayer one should keep in mind that "Our Father" refers to the father of all—people of all races and tongues. And "Thy Kingdom Come" expresses the desire for the coming of God's reign of peace, harmony, kindness, justice and world order. And "Thy will be done" means God's will and not that of individuals. The people of the world want practical steps taken toward realization of, "On earth peace, good-will toward men."

The Gimbel Plan for Surplus Property Disposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I sent to Lt. Gen. E. B. Gregory, Administrator of the War Assets Administration, enclosing copy of what is known as the Gimbel plan for surplus property disposal.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 20, 1946.

Lt. Gen. E. B. GREGORY,
Administrator, War Assets Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL GREGORY: In connection with the committee's investigation of surplus property disposal, the committee has received a great number of complaints from veterans and veterans' organizations that the policy of Congress to grant veterans a preference in the purchase of Government surplus property has not been and is not being effectively carried out.

The committee has received a plan proposed by Mr. Louis Broido, executive vice president of Gimbel Bros., Inc., of New York City, which has as its purpose the achievement of better service for veterans in acquiring Government surplus property, through using department stores in the major cities as distribution outlets, and granting a period of sales in such stores exclusively to veterans and at a substantial discount from the regular price.

The committee would appreciate your examination of this plan and your comments on it. The committee would also appreciate a statement as to any significant steps taken recently by the War Assets Administration to improve the service to veterans in acquiring Government surplus property.

You will recall that Mr. Broido testified before the committee at its public hearing on May 15, 1946, in connection with the sale of surplus Army truck by Gimbel Bros. department store. On that occasion, Mr. Broido, as an experienced merchandiser, offered various suggestions for the improvement of the disposal of surplus property. In considering Mr. Broido's plan for surplus disposal to veterans, it is my suggestion that you familiarize yourself with his views as expressed to the committee at that hearing.

Without passing judgment on Mr. Broido's plan, I am prompted to observe that from the committee's investigations, it appears that one of the major problems in carrying out the objective of Congress to give veterans a preference in the purchase of surplus property is the lack of an adequate distribution system for making sales to veterans on a retail basis. Mr. Broido's suggestion is obviously directed at bridging this gap, which must be done if the veteran's priority as to surpluses is to be anything more than an empty promise.

It is for this reason that I urge that you give Mr. Broido's suggestion early and careful consideration. It is also imperative that if anything along this line is to be done which would require legislation, it must be done almost immediately because of the pending adjournment of Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JAS. M. MEAD, *Chairman.*

THE GIMBEL PLAN FOR SURPLUS DISPOSAL

(Proposed to the Senator MEAD committee by Louis Broido, executive vice president of Gimbel Bros., Inc.)

THE PROBLEM

Congress has passed an amendment to the Surplus Property Act, giving veterans a special priority for practically all types of consumers goods. The problem is how to get these goods to the veteran. The War Assets Administration is undoubtedly developing plans for this priority to be effective. Since there are almost 10,000,000 veterans scattered all over the United States, and since these goods are scattered all over the United States, the problem is how to get the goods and the veteran together without undue expense to the veteran and undue traveling to the place where the goods are located. It is perfectly obvious that a veteran living in New York cannot buy half a dozen sheets located in Tennessee, nor can a veteran living in Florida purchase a passenger car located in Terre Haute, Ind., without hardship and expense. The priority is of no value unless it can be made practicable.

THE OBJECTIVE

The objective, therefore, must be to get the goods available to the veteran where the veteran is, with a priority, and at a cheaper price than the public generally pays.

THE PLAN

The essence of the plan is as follows:

Gimbel's experience has demonstrated that large department stores located in large urban areas, with their mass appeal, wide newspaper publicity at store contract rates, can reach the maximum of the population in the quickest time. In the Gimbel Co. alone the four stores located in the cities of New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Milwaukee, with their advertising, reach a population in the metropolitan areas of those cities of approximately 25,000,000.

It is proposed therefore:

1. That the consumer goods destined for the veteran be distributed through a syndicate or syndicates of department stores located in 25 to 30 principal cities of the country stretching from coast to coast. These sales, properly advertised, will reach practically the entire population of the United States. Every veteran is within easy reach or 1 day's mail reach of a large urban center. It is proposed that the veteran's

priority be applied at the retail level. In other words, the veterans in the district will get a priority of let us say 5 days to purchase these goods for cash or on the usual terms if the veteran qualifies.

2. That the veteran purchase these goods at a 20 percent discount, available to him upon proof of his identity and veteran status. At the time of the sale, there will be made out a credit slip or discount slip in the form of scrip or other proper form, which scrip would be used by the stores involved through the office of the managers of the syndicate, for cash redemption with the War Assets Administration, or to apply on purchases of future goods. The amount of the discount can be figured out, as this can all be covered by arrangements made with the War Assets Administration and the OPA for the purchase price of the goods, as well as for the retail selling price.

3. That when the veteran's priority is completed the remaining goods will be made available for sale to the general public. This will in each case probably require two advertisements, one for the veteran and a later one for the general public, which it is believed the stores will be willing to do. It could perhaps be covered in one advertisement with a notice to the general public that the veteran's orders will be filled first and then the public's orders. The stores would have to take a chance that if the veterans purchased all the available goods, there might be none left for the general public.

This plan has the great advantage of complete simplicity. It gives the veteran the priority and a lower price. It is strongly urged that the veteran is not nearly so much interested in buying the goods at the Government's cost, as he is in getting some price advantage. The Mead committee was very favorably impressed with this proposal. There would seem to be no reason why the proposal could not be directly worked out with the War Assets Administration without any change in the existing law. However, if the law requires some change, the Mead committee should push it and put it through. All that is needed is one demonstration to show the rapidity with which the surplus could be disposed of to the veteran. If the War Assets Administration will take one item which it has in large quantity, we will guarantee a syndicate distribution in 10 days with no loss or expense to the Government. The Government cannot possibly distribute by mail order or retail sale at the consumer level at any cost nearly approximating the amount of the discount which is here in question.

The writer stands prepared to discuss this matter further with responsible officials involved in the War Assets Administration or in the Houses of Congress or in the Administration. The plan has received wide and favorable comment and should be put into action at the earliest possible moment.

We would be prepared to make a test as a demonstration to responsible officials without any future commitment.

Respectfully submitted.

LOUIS BROIDO.

Dated: May 24, 1946.

Railroad Retirement Bill, H. R. 1362

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD O. McCOWEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1946

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, on August 30, 1944, I indicated my support and deep interest in the bill then pending to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. That bill, H. R. 4805, had been introduced by my distinguished colleague from Ohio, the Honorable ROBERT CROSSER. I urged in 1944 that the House give favorable consideration to the amendments embodied in H. R. 4805.

The bill that was pending in 1944 is now finally before us in modified form, and I am pleased to join what I hope will be a very large majority of the Members of the House in recording my support of the thoroughly sound proposals of the bill.

The railroad retirement system has been in effect now for more than 10 years. It has played a most important role in the lives of our Nation's railway workers. It not only has been beneficial to railroad employees, but it has been of great benefit to the railway companies throughout our country, and it has, without question, been in the public interest. It has increased the efficiency of the railway industry and it may be said in all fairness that the retirement system played no small part in enabling the industry to do such a magnificient job in handling the enormous war traffic during the critical period which began in December 1941.

The railroad retirement system has been responsible for the payment of more than a billion dollars in well-deserved benefits to almost half a million persons. At the present time, the Railroad Retirement Board is paying approximately $12,000,000 or more each month to annuitants and pensioners, many of whom would otherwise be attempting to continue in active employment, although superannuated, or dependent upon charity or very limited means of support in spite of long years of faithful service in the Nation's vital industry.

The past 10 years have proven beyond any question of doubt the wisdom of Congress in passing the original railroad retirement laws; and that period of time has also proven that the railway employees of the country who developed the program and urged its enactment by the Congress used sound judgment.

What I have said about the railroad retirement system also applies to the system of railroad unemployment insurance which Congress enacted at the suggestion of the railway employees of the country. This system of unemployment benefits has been successful and while it is somewhat out of date at the present time, its operation in past years has fully demonstrated that Congress made no mistake in accepting the recommendations of the railway employees of the country for establishment of the system.

The experience of recent years and a careful study must convince any student of the situation that action is now overdue for amending and liberalizing both the retirement system and the unemployment insurance system for the railroad industry.

The disability provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act have proven to be very inadequate. At the present time, an employee must have accumulated 30 years of service or be at least 60 years of age in order to draw disability benefits, and he must be totally and permanently disabled for any kind of employment. This means that many employees who become totally disabled after a considerable period of service, but less than 30 years, but who are not yet 60 years of age, can receive no annuities. There are many meritorious cases of men who have faithfully served in the railway industry for more than 25 years and who have paid into the retirement fund for all compensated service performed since 1937 and who under the present law cannot qualify for benefits. That situation should be corrected as is proposed in the original bill.

Another aspect of the disability question is of special interest. An employee, in order to draw a disability annuity, as I have said, must be totally and permanently disabled for any type of employment. He must not be merely disabled for his regular railway employment, but he must be physically or mentally incapable of performing any work in a gainful occupation. There are many cases of railway men, after performance of a great many years of service, who become unable to continue at work in their regular occupations or in any type of work that is at all similar. They have devoted the major part of their working life to the railway industry and are unable to obtain gainful employment in another line, due to their advanced years or lack of experience and training, yet because they are assumed to be still capable of performing some minor type of work, and even though such employment is not obtainable, they are deprived of benefits from the retirement system. The pending bill—H. R. 1362—would correct this situation.

What I have said about disability benefits is only one illustration of many that can be cited supporting the conviction that Members of the House should adopt most of the proposals contained in the original bill, with the exceptions of a very few. A study of the voluminous record of hearings held by the committee will convince anyone, I think, that most of the amendments supported by the railway employees of the country, endorsed by the Railroad Retirement Board, and presented by the original bill should have the overwhelming support of the House of Representatives.

Address by Hon. Henry A. Wallace, Before the American Veterans Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered before the first constitutional convention of the American Veterans Committee—AVC—at Des Moines, Iowa, Saturday, June 15, 1946, by Secretary of Commerce Henry Wallace. Mr. Wallace addressed the assembled delegates of the AVC who have

called national attention to their vigorous support of a broad program designed to achieve a more democratic and prosperous America and a more stable world. Mr. Wallace's address was one of the high points of their convention program and I am told that the members of the American Veterans Committee are deeply grateful for the guidance which Mr. Wallace offered at that time.

I am sure that Members of the Senate have been following with interest the reports in the newspapers, both in the news sections and in columns by featured writers, of the first convention of the AVC. The reports which I have read have indicated that it was a living example of real democracy.

I should like to add my congratulations to the AVC for the fine work that they have done and for the vital program which they are now preparing to implement. It is indeed encouraging to a Member of Congress to observe a young veterans group which is working for a better America, not merely with lip service, but with a far-reaching liberal program which its membership has overwhelmingly endorsed. These young men are aware of the problems which America faces in this crucial postwar period and they want something done about them.

I think the Members of Congress should think deeply about the position these World War II veterans occupy in our national life. They have fought a war, never sparing themselves in the effort to save the world from fascism. Today they are determined that this fight shall not have been in vain. After previous wars, they rightly assert, the old men came out again and took from them the victory and remade it in the likeness of the former world they knew.

I, for one, think that the Members of Congress would be repaying only a small part of the debt that we owe the men who have fought this war if we listened attentively to the program of this group, seeking not special privileges for veterans, but attempting to widen opportunity for all Americans, and improve conditions throughout our Nation so that America will be a land worthy of the men and the families of those who sacrificed so much for our Nation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If there is one basic characteristic about this first convention of the American Veterans' Committee, it can be found in these words which you have contributed yourselves about your own place in our national life—"citizens first and veterans second."

Now, as citizens in peace, you are still on the march. You are on the march for that kind of a world you fought for in war—and for which others of your comrades died. You have made a tremendous start. You are well on your way in your fight in peace. And whether you are practicing Republicans or Democrats, or just plain independents, yours is the fight of every progressive citizen in this country. For yours is the fight for real security at home and lasting peace abroad. I wish you good luck and good fighting.

Months ago I accepted with great eagerness your invitation to be here with you tonight. I did so because from the very beginning of your organization I have followed your every activity with the keenest of day-to-day interest and appreciation of what you were setting out to accomplish. Moreover, on many occasions, it has been my good fortune to have had numerous discussions with many of you about your progressive beliefs and desires.

In watching your growth I have found that you have practiced what you preached. You have constantly kept before you the needs not just of yourselves as veterans but the needs of all of the people of the country.

You have acted upon the belief that the general welfare was paramount to the welfare of any group or of any organization. And the record of your activities shows this clearly. This record shows that you know all of the problems involved in winning the peace of abundance that can belong to all of us.

As you know, and as I know, there are both immediate and long-term ends in this progressive program. These ends, in many ways, are inseparable. And it is difficult to say just which of these ends come first—whether it's a home or the continuation of price controls; whether it's a job, or an effective United Nations Organization that can give us real confidence in the future. But in all of these fields, your record rings true.

Wherever there was work to be done, for example, in the field of housing—whether it was an emergency shelter or a permanent home—you have given a stout hand to the job.

Thousands of veterans still need a place to live—just as do many thousands of other citizens. And these places to live can be had if enough of the people insist—with every democratic means at their command—that their National Government issues the proper priority to build homes at fair prices, and with fair monthly payments.

If, in some areas, this means further subsidies and more Government participation, then these things we must have. For surely, this is an investment which your Government can well afford to make in our future as a young and virile nation.

In this fight for housing, you have seen at first hand what the lobbyists of greed can do in distorting and undermining a national housing program designed to benefit the whole of the Nation. You have seen these lobbyists heeding the beck and call of the real-estate speculators. You have seen even how they have diverted critical building materials from a hospital or a housing project to build a race track.

You have seen the fires of economic pressure that these lobbyists have built whether on Capitol Hill in Washington or elsewhere in the Nation. You have seen them in action—and I applaud you of the American Veterans Committee for joining with others in building your own fires against these lobbyists of greed. You know that when need be, you fight fire with fire.

If you live in any sizable community, look about you when you go home from this convention. You will see in that community one or more housing projects in the midst of slums. And then recall all the arguments that were made against building these housing projects.

There were those who said that these projects were bad business and would not pay off. They used the old cliché that the poor always take slums with them. Yes, they even said that such housing projects were but another step toward a communistic way of life.

But instead of all of this, what do we find? We find that the projects are paying off. We find the benefits of simple things like gardens and playgrounds and plenty of sunlight. We find that the poor did not take their slums with them. And we find a decrease in juvenile delinquency, crime and disease in every area in which you find such housing projects.

You know these things. Just as you know that the need for decent housing lies not with the poor alone—that this need does not stop with the abolition of slums everywhere, whether in the cities or in rural areas. That is why you are contributing so much to developing a national housing program of benefit to all.

In the same spirit that you have fought as an organization to give this country a decent housing program, you also have joined with other friends of progress in fighting to save the OPA. You have done this because many of you have witnessed at first-hand the terrifying effects of inflation in China, in Greece, and in other countries that you fought to liberate. You have done this because you knew that the removal of price controls here at home—in the reconversion period—would bring inevitably the disastrous consequences of boom, bust, and chaos.

Looking further into the record of your activities in behalf of national progress, this fact is outstanding—the fact that yours was the only veterans organization that stood up and was counted in Washington in the fight for a full-employment bill.

As progressive-minded veterans, you made this fight because you well know that the veteran's preference in getting a job is of little value unless there are jobs for all. You know that a scarcity of jobs could only mean strife when the returning veteran replaced the nonveteran. You knew that job security for all can only be had by providing jobs for everyone wanting work and seeking work.

In this Congress, the progressive forces won the Employment Act of 1946. But this act, as you know, is only a basic declaration of policy. Now we must continue the fight to implement this employment act. We must provide the tools with which to do the job that needs to be done. And here, again, I know that you progressive veterans will not be found wanting.

In your own organization you have allowed no place for discrimination. And I am sure that you will fight against discrimination in every area of our national life. For you know that we must outlaw racial discrimination on the job—just as we must outlaw racial discrimination at the polls. You know that the one is as much a part of our economic insecurity as the other is a part of our political insecurity.

But the enactment of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Act, and the abolition of the poll tax, are only the beginnings of our efforts to achieve an economic as well as a political democracy. Those of us who believe in full democracy have many other jobs to do in implementing the Employment Act of 1946. We must fight for better health and better education for all—and social security for all—just as we have fought for better housing for all. And we must fight for a minimum-wage law just as hard as we fight for the conservation and development of all of our natural resources.

Those of you here tonight come from all parts of the country. Some of you came from the Valley of the Tennessee, and you have seen at first hand the great benefits given to the whole of the Nation by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

All of you know—from the example of TVA—that along the great stretches of river valleys elsewhere throughout the Nation there is the same work to be done. We need—and we must have—more river valley authorities. We need them for the sake of the soil, for flood control and the storage of water for irrigation, and for more and more rural electrification. We need them because—from the example of TVA—we know that the grass roots of our free-enterprise system get nourishment from this kind of sound and profitable development.

There are those, of course, who will tell you that the job is too big. They say—now that the success of the TVA is an accomplished fact—that TVA was a special instance. But to develop all of the great river valleys of the country as we developed the Valley of the Tennessee—this, they say, is just too big a job for us to undertake. They say that these are only beautiful dreams—impractical dreams, impossible of realization.

But these people speak with the same voice as those who scoffed at building 50,000 air-

planes a year—who scoffed at building the Burma Road—and who still scoff at winning the peace.

You know differently. You know that no job is too big. You have seen miracles performed. You helped perform them. And you now are ready to do miracle jobs in peace.

You may be young but you are practical. And you know that an investment in more river valley authorities like TVA would pay dividends both to private initiative and to the conservation of our national resources.

To get all of these things we need and must have to maintain our national progress, we also need the kind of political alertness and political action that you have shown as an organization.

I hope that when you leave this convention each and every one of you goes home a good politician—a good politician irrespective of the political party of your choice. And remember that the good politician is the one who knows and understands the science of government, so as to best serve his fellowmen—the one who knows and understands that politics just can't be left to the other fellow.

And when you get home, find out just who runs your community. Yes—do even more than that. Get into your precinct organization. Get in your political licks where they count the most. And don't forget that the city hall is just as important as Congress. If there are crooks in your city hall—or anywhere else in your local government—then get together and kick them out by your ballots and elect capable, honest men. For don't forget that many of the reins of national power are held by those who control the city halls.

You can take pride in ward politics—if you are an honest ward politician.

Also, keep your eye on your Representative and Senator in Congress, on how he votes, and to whom he listens. And if his votes are wrong, and if he listens to the wrong people, then get together and fight to replace him with some friend of the progressive cause.

I know that all of you here tonight will be active in our political life. I am also sure that many of you will soon be holding political offices in your counties, in your States, and in the Houses of Congress in Washington.

And in seeking office, I am sure that you members of the American Veterans Committee will still hold true to your slogan—"citizens first and veterans second." From your record up to now, I know that you will not be a party to making political capital out of any political witch hunt, just as I am sure that you will not seek to make political gain out of any form of prejudice.

We find these forms of prejudice all about us today, not only in our domestic life but in our international life. And these are the forms of prejudice that we must put aside. For in the complete structure of our world today, we cannot achieve a lasting peace by using such labels as pro-British or pro-Russian. As progressives, seeking security where it is to be found, we can only be pro-United Nations.

If we have any role to play, any destiny to fulfill, it is the role of the destiny of being a great people and a great national without any axes to grind, and without any coalitions to influence.

What we want in the world is what we want at home. What we want at home is a workable way of security and abundance between all groups in our social-economic life. We want the same thing in the world.

We are striving for a world without fear—without one people fearing another; without one nation fearing another; without one world fearing itself.

We are striving for a simple, honest solution to world problems. And surely you here tonight—you who have fought side by side with the soldiers of all of our allies—know what this means.

It means that peoples everywhere are tired of war. It means that peoples everywhere are searching for peace.

It means that peoples everywhere will demand that their leaders give them peace. And I, for one, believe that the peace we want is obtainable if we work unceasingly for that peace.

In talking to you here tonight, I must admit that I have been reassuring myself. Some people seize upon an opportunity such as this to offer a point-by-point program of action. Instead of giving you such a formalized approach, I have only tried to tell you what I believe in and what I hope you will work for.

I came here to be with you as a fellow progressive—as one who realizes that the work ahead of all of us is more challenging than the work any of us has known before. In this work, I bid you Godspeed.

Canadian-American Agreement for St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Montreal Gazette of June 10, 1946, entitled "It Is Inconceivable That It Should Be Accepted at Ottawa."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT IS INCONCEIVABLE THAT IT SHOULD BE ACCEPTED AT OTTAWA

DISQUIETING SEAWAY PACT CHANGE

Several important questions bearing on Canada's treaty relations with the United States, and on the Dominion's vital interest in a fair utilization of the water flows in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River waterway system, are raised by the basis on which the foreign relations committee of the United States Senate has approved the Canada-United States agreement for the St. Lawrence seaway scheme.

The majority approval of the committee was subject to a significant qualifying amendment—an amendment which evidently was exacted as the price of support from Middle West Senators for the seaway pact as a whole. The proposed change in the treaty, which still has to be passed by the Senate and House of Representatives, would leave to the sole discretion and control of United States authorities the volume of water to be diverted through the Illinois Canal from Lake Michigan. This is the so-called Chicago sewage diversion canal.

The diversion of Great Lakes water flows through this canal, periodically in excess of international conventions and treaty restrictions, has been a source of contention between Canada and United States for some years. The diversions affect the natural flows upon which both navigation and power facilities depend all the way from the head of the Lakes to Montreal. Excessive diversions seriously lower water levels required in canals and rivers, at docking areas, and for power development.

By the action of the Senate committee, approval of the seaway treaty has been made conditional upon giving the United States the unqualified right to step up the volume of canal diversion flow at any time, without consulting with Canadian authorities and without the latter having any right to protest or to move for reduction of the abnormal flow. This is entirely at variance with the seaway treaty provisions governing the terms and extent of the diversion flow, and stipulating the mutual interest and joint right of the two countries to control the flow by common agreement.

It is difficult to see how the proposed treaty change can effectively be adopted and incorporated in the treaty if, as, and when it is approved by Congress, unless the consent of Canada is first obtained to the alteration. Treaties negotiated between governments cannot properly be ratified with amendments on a unilateral basis by either of the legislative bodies concerned.

Should such a change be transmitted to Canada for endorsation, it is inconceivable that it should be accepted at Ottawa. Especially in view of the past history of the Chicago diversion canal, and the increased flows which have been taken from time to time in violation of treaty arrangements, it would be too great a risk for this country to vest sole discretion over the flows in American hands. The Government, Parliament, and public of the Dominion should keep a wary eye on the progress of the proposal advanced by the United States Senate committee, and be prepared to insist firmly on protection of recognized Canadian rights in the matter.

The desirability or otherwise of the seaway scheme is beside the point. Even the most ardent proponents of it would hardly be prepared to see it implemented on a basis which would work to the serious disadvantage of Canada, and jeopardize necessary water flows for the power developments at Niagara Falls and Beauharnois and the International Rapids project proposed as part of the seaway plan.

Editor of Daily News Corrects Mr. Sol Bloom on a Bad Guess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days, the public press has carried a number of new items publicizing the observations and recommendations which Subcommittee No. 2 of the House Foreign Affairs Committee has compiled in the form of a formal, printed report to the Congress and the country. After exploring and studying economic and political conditions in Russia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Italy, and 15 other countries during a 63-day trip last fall, our subcommittee felt the public was entitled to any information we were able to bring it on that area of the world from which so very little accurate and timely information is available.

After checking our findings over and over again for accuracy and adequacy we recently completed the preparation of this report and it is now ready for distribution as a public document. For some time approximately 50 copies of the report have been in the hands of members of the Foreign Affairs Committee. All that is now required is action

by the Foreign Affairs Committee authorizing its publication and distribution. It is hoped this action will be forthcoming early next week so that the many Members of Congress, State Department employees, War Department personnel, and others who have requested copies may have their requests granted.

Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that enterprising reporters succeeded in publicizing portions of this report before the committee had acted to provide for its publication and distribution it is now hoped that Members of Congress, especially, will read the complete report since sentences taken out of context do not always convey the same meaning as when they are read as part of the whole report. Our committee would also like to have made available to all who are interested the evidence upon which our findings and recommendations are based.

May I also add at this point, Mr. Speaker, that it has now been clearly established that none of the four members of our subcommittee was responsible for the fact that portions of this report appeared in the public press before the Committee on Foreign Affairs had taken action authorizing the Government Printer to print sufficient copies for all Members of Congress. Day before yesterday, Chairman BLOOM of our committee inaccurately stated that the gentleman from South Dakota had released these news dispatches. The following editorial corrects the record completely in this connection. I am sure, also, that Mr. BLOOM now realizes that he was in error in his earlier statement. He was apparently prompted by some misinformation which he had received.

Now that the editor of the Washington Daily News has corrected Mr. BLOOM's error and now that substantial extracts of the subcommittee report have been publicized, I would like to make it clear that our subcommittee of four believes that the information which we have collected should be made public property. We are happy to have our recommendations widely read and publicly discussed. We desire that this report be printed as a public document so that those desiring to study and evaluate the merit of its recommendations will have an opportunity to do so. Now that the misunderstanding has been cleared away, we hope there will be no attempt to suppress this information from the public. In these uncertain days, our group feels that the greater the amount of information which can be made available to a steadily increasing circle of citizens, the better we shall be able to map out a foreign policy protecting our peace and promoting our prosperity.

[From the Washington Daily News of June 20, 1946]

TAKE IT EASY, SOL

Chairman SOL BLOOM and others of the House Foreign Relations Committee have worked up quite a lather over what they describe as the "premature" publication of news about a subcommittee report on UNRRA and America's Russian policy.

What happened is that the enterprising Scripps-Howard reporter, Charles T. Lucey, got the information on what was in the report and wrote a couple of stories which were published in the News before other Capitol Hill correspondents could get their hands on a copy of the report.

Chairman BLOOM may have been embarrassed by having been deprived of the formality of issuing a release simultaneously to the press as a whole, and some of the other reporters may have been embarrassed by Mr. Lucey's "beat." But no harm has been done. The public was entitled to the information. And things like that will happen in a country which has a free press and resourceful reporters like Charlie Lucey.

Incidentally, Mr. BLOOM, you have been unfair in accusing Representative KARL MUNDT of "leaking" the story. Take it from us, SOL—and we know—Charlie got his information elsewhere. Not that it matters. All that matters is that Charlie's stories were accurate—which they were—as well as being the first in print.

Thus, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] now knows it was not the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] who released this report. The important thing now is not who did release it but how soon will it be made available to the Members of Congress and the public generally? There is a question which the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] can help answer accurately and promptly.

Views of Senator Walsh on International and Domestic Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID I. WALSH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some views I expressed on international and domestic conditions, in the form of an interview which was broadcast over the radio.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Question. What are the underlying causes of the serious differences among the nations of the world as to permanent world peace?

Answer. The serious differences among the nations are as to what shape and form the world of the future should take. It is now apparent that some of our allies espouse such a wide difference of political philosophies, such extreme ambitions, as to cause discouragement and disappointment to all the lovers of world peace. Power politics, economic and territorial ambitions, and distrust of each other's purposes have prevented much progress in bringing about assurances of a permanent peace.

The voices that cried out loudly during the war for freedom and justice as an essential basis for peace have become largely silent. Charity and justice as a prerequisite to world peace are almost forgotten words. Realizing that not only in union there is strength, but also that to succeed, the union must be of ideals as well as of numbers, the United Nations Organization has been set up in the hope and expectation that it would become an instrument for settling international differences without resorting to war.

Question. What would you say as to the progress that has been made by the United Nations Organization to date?

Answer. Regrettable disappointment exists over the progress made by this organization to date. Perhaps we expected too much. However, we must continue to give support and cooperation in a real effort to accomplish the objectives of this organization. It is worth while to recall the words of one of the American delegates to the San Francisco Conference in speaking of the United Nations Charter:

"None of its authors will certify to its perfection. But all of its authors will certify to its preponderant advantages. It is the only plan available for international cooperation in the pursuit of peace and justice. It is laden with promise and with hope. It deserves a faithful trial. America has everything to gain and nothing to lose by giving it support; everything to lose and nothing to gain by declining this continued fraternity with the United Nations in behalf of the dearest dream of humankind."

One of the weaknesses of the United Nations Organization is that any one of the major powers can veto the action of all the other nations or members of the organization. Russia has exercised this veto power twice. Friends and supporters who are sincerely interested in the success of the United Nations Organization are hopeful that the veto power may be eliminated sometime in the future.

Question. What relationship has the United Nations Organization with the final peace treaties resulting from World War II?

Answer. The functions of the United Nations Organization will be greatly affected by the treaties which must be made by the governments involved in the recent war. At this very time our Secretary of State is in conference with the representatives of other governments, and although this meeting begins with many misgivings and uncertainties as to the unity of purpose of the participants, we must hope and pray that a spirit of justice will permeate these deliberations. The present peace conference is expected to settle boundaries of the different nations in Europe, the extent and scope of the occupation of the defeated countries by the victorious countries, sovereignty, and reparations.

Question. What is the relationship of our present plans for national defense to the prospect for world peace?

Answer. The discouragement and uncertainty that prevail with regard to world peace is illustrated by the little sentiment in America to disarm or to reduce to prewar proportions our national defenses. Our Government, while greatly reducing the tremendous wartime strength of our Army and Navy, is nevertheless contemplating that these military units should be at least three times their prewar strength.

Question. What are the reasons for the present confused state of mind of the public in regard to domestic conditions?

Answer. Turning to domestic conditions, we find much confusion and slow progress being made in our efforts to transform our wartime economy into a peacetime economy. Our people, compelled to pay high prices, unable to obtain many of the necessities of life, almost forced to deal in black markets, are confused and unhappy. The reasons for the present disturbing conditions are many.

First and foremost, the basis of our present ills is the war itself. During the war we set up a war economy, which was concentrated wholly on the production of things which would contribute to the winning of the war. Production of the ordinary peacetime necessities was curtailed, and, as we began the work of reconversion, we were confronted with the problem of a limited supply of many consumer goods in the face of a pent-up demand. Added to this was the problem of supplying food and the necessities of life to the millions and millions of human beings throughout the world that are desti-

tute and dying of hunger as a result of the war. To this appeal we have responded and must continue to respond wholeheartedly. However, in our desire to help relieve the sufferings of other people, we should not allow our relief work to develop conditions in our own country that would lead to suffering and want here. The health and welfare of our people must not be lost sight of, as we extend a helping hand to suffering human beings elsewhere.

Admittedly, there have been breakdowns in production and distribution because the efforts of the Government to control prices have in some instances resulted in lessening production. While wages were increased somewhat during the war, at the end of the war the increased wages in many instances were not sufficient to meet the increased costs of living with the result that ensuing labor disturbances and strikes have retarded production.

Question. Are conditions at home likely to get back to normalcy soon?

Answer. The after-war problems are tremendous and difficult of solution. It is going to take time and a real effort to get back to normalcy. It took time after the First World War, which lasted several months less than 2 years. The ending of the war and the reconversion necessary to return to normal conditions have produced problems of gigantic proportions. There never was a time when it was more important to have clear thinking and to enact wise legislation than at the present time—clear thinking in order that we may make no mistakes that will make matters worse, and wise legislation in order that we may bring about much-needed remedies and reforms to relieve the present unsatisfactory conditions that prevail at home and abroad.

Question. What dangers do you observe as a result of present unsettled conditions?

Answer. The present situation throughout the world and here in America should prompt us to recall the philosophy upon which our institutions are based—that philosophy which has contributed so much to our progress and advancement. Discontent, want, insecurity, depressions, and wars create a state of mind that is fertile for indoctrination of false nostrums. Those leaders who question the wisdom and value of democratic institutions realize that the public is susceptible to blaming its economic troubles on the form of government under which it is living.

Political revolutions and wars are incubated at such times as the present and under such circumstances. The driving force of extreme economic and political measures in every land is the dissatisfaction with the status quo. Wherever and whenever millions of people live in insecurity and downright poverty, and regardless of whether free enterprise is responsible or not, as long as it is part of the existing conditions, it is on that system many place the blame.

In the United States we have less insecurity and downright poverty than anywhere else in the world. As long as this remains true, and as long as we make visible progress toward elimination of whatever distress we do have, the prospects for continuation of reasonably free enterprise seems secure. But, if we do not do some clear thinking and promote sound legislation, we may have, as the result of conditions, inflation and subsequent depression, accompanied by loss of confidence in our institutions. Under such conditions, we may well fear the American way of life may undergo some startling changes.

Question. What do you suggest to offset the possible trend for acceptance of false nostrums at this time?

Answer. Now is an appropriate time to recall the political philosophy that actuated the founders of our country to take up arms against the mother country, and also to enumerate the blessings that have resulted, and that we enjoy today, notwithstanding the postwar handicaps, hardships, and irritating conditions that exist.

We enjoy every advantage of varied climate and material resources of a vast territory. More than any other people we enjoy the benefits of amazing inventions that affect our everyday life. Unparalleled is America's record of material progress.

To what sources can we trace the existence and development of our stupendous growth and power? Foremost is the realization of how bounteous the Almighty has been to our people. In addition to our debt to the Supreme Being the other outstanding cause of our material welfare is the character of liberality and security marking the fundamental institutions established by the founders of the Nation. Equality of rights and opportunity, unmolested pursuit of happiness, free assembly, free speech, free press, free pulpit, free ballot, free enterprise—these are the foundations on which our political and social institutions have been built. It is the very same spirit that inspired these principles and the application of them that alone are the solution of our present and future social, civic, and economic problems.

Two words in the preamble of our Constitution, "establish justice" are the alpha and omega of Americanism. The future of America is embraced with these words. The future peace of the world is likewise embraced in these two words.

We should resolve to preserve and perpetuate the free institutions of our founders and we should also resolve to undertake a new and truly ambitious and achievable program by the substantial betterment of economic conditions in our social life.

National Science Foundation — Letter From James B. Conant, President of Harvard University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by President James B. Conant, of Harvard University, with relation to Senate bill 1850, being a bill to create a National Science Foundation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass., June 17, 1946.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: I am writing to you to urge upon you the desirability of prompt passage of Senate bill 1850. I can urge the passage of this bill as president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, since a canvass of the executive committee of that association showed an overwhelming majority in favor of this particular form of legislation to create a National Science Foundation.

Speaking both as an educator and a scientist, and as one who has had some experience with the application of science to national defense, I should like to go on record as stating that the establishment of a National Science Foundation by law is of the utmost importance to the welfare of the Nation. Unless action can be taken in this Congress, I fear that the long delay which will ensue will greatly retard the proper development of science in the United States.

A National Science Foundation established by Congress and properly financed is required in this highly industrialized age for three reasons:

1. To accelerate our progress in medicine.
2. To assist in the development and improvement of our industries.
3. As an integral part of our national defense program.

The importance of each of these three aspects of applied science to the national welfare needs no argument. What is sometimes not understood is the relation of the application of science in these three areas to progress in fundamental science on the one hand and the selection and training of young scientists on the other, but it can be demonstrated beyond doubt or question that only in the nation which is strong in fundamental scientific inquiry and is recruiting and training the best scientific talent can science be effective in the progress of medicine, industry, and national defense.

We have entered into an era in which further progress in scientific work is infinitely more expensive than it was a generation or two ago. Furthermore, we are in an era where it is more important than ever to the Nation to find and educate scientific talent in all economic and geographic groups. Because of the tremendously increased importance of science from the point of view of the welfare of the average citizen, and because of the expense, we can no longer count on our privately endowed universities and State-supported institutions to provide out of their funds for basic research and for the education of scientists. Federal funds must be spent to supplement what seemed adequate 50 years ago, but has become increasingly less adequate as each decade of the century moved us further into a highly scientific and industrial age.

Federal money spent through a National Science Foundation on basic scientific research and education is sure to pay rich dividends to the citizens of the country in the form of improved medical practice, public health measures, new industries, and adequate national defense.

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES B. CONANT.

H. R. 6719

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement made by Jack W. Hardy, national commander of the American Veterans of World War II before subcommittee No. 1, House Committee on the Judiciary, regarding H. R. 6719. The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Jack W. Hardy. I am national commander of Amvets (American Veterans of World War II). Our national headquarters is located at 1507 M Street NW, Washington, D. C.

Amvets was first organized as an unincorporated association in December of 1944, as successor to a group of far-flung organizations of veterans of this war.

I was elected to office at the first national convention of Amvets held in Chicago, Ill., October 12, 13, and 14, 1945. At that meeting there were only 127 delegates representing a membership of about 7,500. We now number 685 posts with a total membership of approximately 65,000 men and women who have served in the armed forces of the United States at some time since September 16, 1940, or are now serving, and, if discharged, have been honorably separated from the service. We have membership in 48 States and posts in 43 of these States.

Appended to this statement (appendix A) will be found a reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing the constitution and bylaws, and the declaration of principles of Amvets adopted at our first national convention. These documents, while not perfect, represent concrete evidence of the thinking of the rank and file of our organization. A certified financial statement is provided attesting the stability of Amvets (appendix B). To date our revenues have been derived exclusively from membership dues, and from no undisclosed sources. A national convention resolution prohibits acceptance of any contributions, the amount and source of which cannot be a matter of public record.

The legislative record of so young an organization is, of course, unimpressive, yet, while we have had no official recognition from the Congress, we have been able to voice our position on most current veterans' problems by insertion of statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Some significant Amvet entries in the RECORD are cited in appendix C.

Amvets has had, of course, the usual growing pains of a young organization in its formative period, but it has not been inactive in its position as advocate and defender of the rights of veterans and in honestly serving the American people as a whole. The outstanding part it has taken in the efforts to obtain housing and surplus property for veterans is well known, and it is accredited a member on the Veterans' Advisory Committee of both the War Assets Administration and Defense Housing Agency.

The role of a veterans' organization of today includes advising veterans what they should not do as well as what they should do to obtain their lawful benefits, and yet not transgress the law, nor place an undue burden upon the governmental agency administering the law. It is, therefore, necessary to maintain certain media of publicity to reach every individual of the organization. This requirement is met by publication of the National Amvet, the first and current copy of which has been appended to this statement (appendix D). Reprints and handbills are also sent out to the posts for advice to members and use in recruiting membership throughout the country. Samples of these are provided herewith as appendix E.

Since the introduction of our original bill of incorporation H. R. 6143, it has come to our attention that a bill will probably receive favorable consideration by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary which would establish a standard policy for the granting of Federal charters to nonprofit organizations. This bill, S. 2223, very properly sets minimum requirements for such corporations, and we have felt it desirable to ask the introduction of a clean bill meeting all of the requirements of S. 2223. It is for this reason that we are today asking your consideration of H. R. 6719 instead of H. R. 6143, which is the narrower bill and the one originally introduced.

Democratic processes have developed with the complexities of modern life to the extent where it has become practically impossible for the average citizen to present his views to the Congress except through the medium of some type of civic organization. Many of these organizations have deteriorated to the status of legislative "pressure groups" whose influence it is possible to neutralize only by use of equally integrated groups of fair-minded citizens.

Right thinking veterans of World War II deserve a veterans' organization of their own. They have recently emerged from the most terrible struggle in history, during which, in every part of the world, they found themselves applying the principles of democracy, as it has been taught them, to strange and alien circumstances. They have spent months and years reflecting upon the country and world they felt should be built upon the blighted philosophies and economies incidental to this war. If our American thought and philosophy is advancing and contributing something worth while to the world (as we think it is), we must provide these young men and women an equal opportunity to formulate, on the basis of their broadened experience, their honest principles and offer them equal sanctions to participate in our national life, and to aid in caring for their own sick and wounded and memorialize their own dead.

We veterans of World War II feel that the older organizations have done much to aid their younger brethren—and, indeed, many of us belong to the American Legion, VFW, or the DAV, but these affiliations tend to bend and model our principles to the older forms, which have been molded in the past to meet the problems of the past. We value their comradeship and do not doubt that we shall move through life shoulder to shoulder, but we feel the need and claim the right to an organization of our own, in whose halls we can debate unhampered our views of the community and the place of America in this contentious world.

And now, gentlemen, I would like to call your attention to some of the very real problems which lack of a congressional charter imposes upon our organization. For example, when one of our members dies, his former comrades in arms are anxious to see his remains interred with full military honors. This is often impossible because the War Department has advised us that only those organizations chartered by Congress or recognized by the Veterans' Administration are eligible to receive firearms for use at funerals and other ceremonial occasions from the War Department.

Then, too, there is the matter of representing veterans in claims cases before the Veterans' Administration. It is, and we think very properly so, extremely difficult to secure recognition. It is true that veterans organizations do not have to be chartered by Congress to secure recognition but the fact is that few, if any, organizations have been recognized that do not have congressional charters. Certainly the veterans of this war have a right to form an organization of their own, and surely it is only reasonable that these men and women should wish to be represented in the prosecution of their just claims by the organization in which they hold membership.

In asking that this bill granting a congressional charter to Amvets be passed, we are only asking that the veterans of Iwo Jima and Normandy be given equal status and recognition with those who fought at Chateau-Thierry and San Juan.

The Amvets—American Veterans of World War II—are newly emerged from the crucible. Their metal is true, without alloy. Their tones are clear. They carry their word in from the blazing battlefield and the surging main.

I'm certain you do not minimize the sincerity and motives of these young men. They have passed many mortal hours—even weeks and months—planning their world of the future. There was scarcely a man among them so shallow that he did not seriously reflect upon the future of our country and the world, as well as his personal future. And then, in the midst of jungle and facing enemy fire and treachery, he was thinking honestly. It is in this crucible that was fuzed the new steel that must bear the burdens of community and State of the next generation—an age which must be known to history for its triumph of freedom and democracy over tyranny and dictatorship.

We ask that you implement that struggle for American freedom of the future by exercise of your democratic function to examine and grant your approval of this young organization of straight-thinking Americans, who feel so deeply their responsibilities for the welfare of their country and the utter necessity to preserve it, with its honored traditions, inviolate from foreign ideologies bred on foreign soil and nurtured on lust for power and ignorance of the divine law of freedom of individual rights.

We all know the sweat and heartbreak persevered by our fathers to create the Nation we now enjoy. It is not by accident that the United States of America now bears the standard of hope before mankind. Shall we do our utmost to advance proudly this flag, that all may see that humanity is not lost, or supinely acquiesce to the wheedling "fifth columns" of dissension, graft, and fraud deliberately inspired by enemies of our faith?

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FORREST C. DONNELL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD several editorials, namely, one from the St. Louis Star-Times of June 13, 1946, one from the Southwest American of June 12, one from the Cedar Rapids Gazette of June 12, one from the Idaho Statesman of June 12, one from the Miami, Fla., News, of June 14, one from the New Orleans Times-Picayune of June 15, and one from the Kansas City Star of June 16, all relating to the bill providing for legislative reorganization, recently passed by the Senate, and now pending before the House.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Star-Times of June 13, 1946]

TOWARD A BETTER CONGRESS

Thanks to Senator LA FOLLETTE's skillful handling of the measure on the floor, the congressional reorganization bill escaped an expected stalling move by southern Democrats and was adopted by the upper House Monday by a vote of 48-to-16.

So far so good for a measure which is one of the most important under current congressional consideration, but the danger signals already are out in the House of Representatives. When Chairman ADOLPH SABATH, of the House Rules Committee, said Tuesday that his committee is "going to take plenty of time on this," it was as much as to announce that proponents have a fight on their hands not only to bring the bill to a

vote, but also to preserve some of its most important provisions.

The measure falls short of the modernization goals which many critics of Congress have urged. It dodges, for example, the evil of committee chairmanship based on seniority rather than merit. But it is a move in the right direction and there should be no stalling in the House.

[From the Southwest American, Fort Smith, Ark., of June 12, 1946]

STREAMLINED

We can expect and we will get a better job out of Congress if the House approves the reorganization bill passed Monday by the Senate.

More and more responsibility has been put upon Congress by the evolution of events in recent years. The machinery for meeting the responsibility has remained obsolete. The pay for the job has remained inadequate. The bill the Senate passed Monday is intended to meet both those needs for reform.

It is possible to dissent with logic from some of the provisions of the bill. The perfect legislation has hardly yet been designed. The general purposes and the principal provisions are, in our judgment, sound and promising.

Senators and Congressmen now draw pay of $10,000 a year. It is subject to income tax, just like everybody else's pay. Their cost of living is quite high. If you don't believe that, try staying in Washington a few days. They are called on for many contributions and incidental expenses which the private citizen is spared. House Members have to make a campaign every 2 years, Senators every 6 years, often at considerable cost. They have to maintain two homes, one in the home State, the other in Washington. The cold truth is no man can afford to be a Member of Congress unless he has independent means.

The pending bill would increase the pay to $15,000 a year. That will mean more to the Senators than to the House Members, because the House Members voted themselves, with Senate approval, $2,500 a year for expenses some time ago. The Senators wouldn't take it then for themselves, but agreed to the House Members getting it. So the pending bill would be a net raise of $5,000 for Senators and $2,500 for Representatives. That still won't be too much.

But even more important is the improvement in the legislative machinery. Congress is operated now, and has been for years, by too many committees with too many committee heads with too much power and too little qualifications aside from seniority. The pending bill attempts to correct that. It reduces the number of committtees sharply. It provides for more and better assistants for Members of Congress—one each to attend the nonlegislative duties which now take too much time of a Member, as well as technical assistants for committees and for the whole membership.

The final fate of the bill is yet in doubt. It took a long time to get the present system built up. It will not be easy to replace it with a new model. But the Senate action is hopeful.

[From the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette of June 12, 1946]

PROGRESSIVE STEP

Three cheers for the United States Senate for voting 49 to 16 to streamline its antiquated committee set-up, to increase Senate and House salaries from $10,000 to $15,000—a long overdue move—and to get the ball rolling for a general reorganization of Congress.

As we had anticipated, the bill had to plow through heavy seas in the form of opposition by some veteran southern Senators who should have been turned out to pasture long ago.

Senator MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, who is Acting President of the Senate at 77—which is 7 years beyond the time Supreme Court justices may retire—assailed the bill as "revolutionary—a measure which would tear down old landmarks and change the whole purpose of the Senate."

Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma used a little more logic in opposing the bill as a "hodgepodge of amendments."

Getting back to Senator MCKELLAR, may we ask just how this bill would change the purpose of the Senate? He's talking through his hat on that one.

What really irritates the Senator and others of long service is that they don't want to have to learn a new set of rules this late in the game. They know all the old rules by heart now. They know how to stifle legislation and how to log-roll it. They know every parliamentary trick in the book just because the rules haven't been changed for years.

To learn new rules would put them on equal footing with Senators who are new or who have considerably less experience. In other words, in their own minds, it would put them at a disadvantage.

Of course that isn't the fact at all. The new rules—long overdue—would be there for everyone to learn.

We hope the House will go along with the Senate, for it is far past time for Congress to bring itself up to date and make the changes that will enable the legislative branch to give the Nation better service.

[From the Idaho Statesman, Boise, Idaho, of June 12, 1946]

STREAMLINE THE CONGRESS

The Senate has passed a bill on to the House which we hope to see that body pass into law. And that is the measure which proposes to streamline Congress' committee set-up and give all Congressmen raises in wages as well as additional assistance in taking care of constituents' problems.

In brief, the measure proposes to pare the present 33 Senate committees down to 15; it increases House and Senate salaries from $10,000 to $15,000 a year; it sets up a congressional retirement fund; it grants each Member of Congress an $8,000 a year executive assistant to take care of the requests from the home State, it affords experts and technical assistants for each of the new committees; and it will continue to review all administrative work done by Congress with a view to further expediting and facilitating.

As it now stands, the measure should serve to speed up the deathly slow pace at which Congress legislates under its present cumbersome system of bandying measures about among committees and subcommittees for weeks, months, and sometimes years.

And it would not only make the remuneration for public service more attractive to abler men, but it would afford them an executive assistant who could handle most of the Congressman's individual constituency problems and thus leave him free for more statesmanlike endeavors.

Such a streamlining measure has always been gingerly regarded by Congress, since it lops off fat committee jobs and so much possible patronage from Members not pleased to relinquish either.

Now that the first step has been taken, by the Senate, we hope the House takes the next long stride and approves the streamlining bill. Any measure which will turn the wheels of Government a little faster and attract better men to Congress is badly needed in these politically turbulent times.

[From the Miami (Fla.) News of June 14, 1946]

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

The Senate's courage in voting to raise its salaries last Monday was not quite matched by its selfishness in accepting a thoroughgoing reorganization of the congressional system. In eliminating the proposed congressional director of personnel and maintaining 21 members on Appropriations Committees, the Senators chose patronage over efficiency and politics over the public's interest.

The heart of the La Follette-Monroney bill was saved, nevertheless. Thirty-three Senate committees were reduced to 15. The result should be an increase in efficiency and greater recognition of the will of the senatorial majority. The outlawing of appropriation bill riders, requiring lobbyists to register, and furnishing each Congressman an administrative assistant—these measures too should contribute greatly to legislative reform.

We hope the House will go along with congressional reorganization. The country can well afford to reward the right men for their service in the Congress.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune of June 15, 1946]

CONGRESS REORGANIZATION

By passing the La Follette bill the Senate completed its part of the program to take some kinks, creaks and lost motion out of the congressional machinery. One of the most promising features of the program is the reduction of 33 Senate committees to 15, and limiting each senator to two committee memberships. Fewer in number and less unwieldy the committees under this set-up could consume less of the time that the Senators should devote to dealing with legislation on the floor.

The bill allows each Senator an assistant and authorizes each committee to employ four nonlegislative experts, in compliance with the recommendations of the special joint committee on reorganization.

The Senators voted themselves a 50 percent increase in salary and a rather generous pension system, neither of which is undeserved if Congress really means to step up its efficiency. In a sense the legislation amounts to a deal whereby many of the cherished committeeships will be surrendered in return for the $15,000 salary and the pension at 62. The Senate, however, could not bring itself to relinquish its patronage by turning the selection and hiring of legislative employees over to a personnel director and civil service.

As a concession to better public service and in return for the better salary, the pension provision and the well-paid assistant for each member, Congress could well go beyond what the Senate bill provides. It could save the treasury several hundred thousand dollars a year by installing a voting machine in the House, where an enormous waste of time is caused by the long roll calls. That would be little enough to save out the several millions a year it will take to pay the higher salaries and pensions.

The House, which now has the bill, should write in that time and money saving amendment.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star of June 16, 1946]

MODERNIZING OUR CONGRESS

The Senate has now acted favorably on the legislative reorganization bill. The measure has yet to be considered by the House. But assuming both its acceptance by the second Chamber and its approval by the President, the country is about to see perhaps the first really comprehensive reorganization of Congress since our National Government was established.

This may appear to be largely a matter of mechanics. And, in one sense, so it is. The changes contemplated by the bill deal almost entirely with congressional procedures. That, of course, is why they can be effected through

legislative action and do not require any constitutional amendment. They neither enlarge nor diminish the powers of the legislature, as prescribed in our fundamental law. These changes, however, are designed to increase the effectiveness of Congress within the area of Government assigned to it by the Constitution, and thus at least roughly to restore the original balance of authority under our form of democratic rule.

In this sense the proposed legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 entails vastly more than a routine overhaul of one part of our governmental machinery. The provisions of the bill may seem technical. Actually, their combined purpose is to rescue not only Congress but the Nation from a dilemma which already has substantially altered the American system of government by checks and balances and which, if allowed to continue much longer, threatens to destroy it altogether. So regarded, a bill which thus far has attracted little attention becomes loaded with exceptional public interest and fraught with implications that transcend in importance many of the more controversial issues of our day.

The plain fact is that during the last quarter of a century or so the relative influence of the executive and judicial branches on the conduct of national affairs has grown tremendously, at the expense of the Legislature. Moreover, the rate of shift from a balanced government has constantly tended to accelerate. Because of the gradual beginning of this development, however, comparatively few Americans are as yet aware of the extent to which our traditional safeguards are being swept away by the decline in the effectiveness of Congress as an instrument of popular government.

It is not merely that the executive departments and other agencies responsible to the President have been permitted to flood the country with what is politely called administrative law, although such bureaucratic edicts have all the force of legislative statutes. Nor, again, is it simply that the Federal courts, exercising their broad rights of interpretation, have been more and more disposed to substitute judge-made law for congressional enactments. These are only symptoms of the real disease.

The executive and the judiciary have progressively usurped the law-making function of the legislature, at bottom, because Congress—as currently organized—is not equipped to perform it under existing conditions. The business of government must be carried on. If there is a legislative void, it is sure to be filled sooner or later by one of the other two main governmental divisions. And Congress, as if recognizing its present disabilities, has seemed increasingly inclined to delegate its basic—and exclusive—power to legislate.

The trouble goes still deeper. For Congress is supposed under the Constitution to maintain a watch over the executive and judicial branches. It has proved equally incapable of discharging this duty and for the same reason—faulty organization. Government today is a highly complex enterprise. It requires expert knowledge, for example, to determine whether the various agencies of administration are faithfully carrying out the policies laid down by statute.

In an earlier time, when the problems of government were fairly simple, Congress usually could muster from within its own membership the knowledge necessary to supply this supervision. But that possibility vanished long ago. Since the legislators did not have access to any professional assistance on a regular basis in Congress, they inevitably turned to the expert staffs made available to them by the executive branch. In so doing, however, they were taking advice from the very bureaucrats whose actions were under investigation. Naturally, except in the few inquiries where outside authorities were employed, they were able to find little wrong with the administration of their laws. The whole set-up was (and remains) ridiculous.

It should be noted that no one planned this subordination of Congress. No would-be dictator deliberately conspired to short-circuit the organ of our government most directly responsive to the public will. What happened was, in the main, the outgrowth of two factors—the immense expansion of the field of government in recent years and the attempt on the part of the legislature to handle its area with obsolete implements. The late President Roosevelt once referred to the philosophy of the United States Supreme Court as harking back to the horse-and-buggy days. He might, with far greater justification, have described Congress as operating in the ox-team era.

One of the most remarkable aspects of the situation is the virtual unanimity with which its cause has been diagnosed and the remedy for it proposed. Long before Congress itself took up the subject, independent studies had revealed the rapid decline of the legislative influence in our Government and had indicated the nature of the reforms needed, to halt and then reverse that trend. Some of these inquiries, like the one undertaken for the National Planning Association by Robert Heller, were extremely elaborate. But they all came to essentially the same conclusions.

A Special Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress spent about a year examining the problem. It, too, reached much the same verdict and the same prescription for treatment. It found that the present organization of Congress was "not competent to cope satisfactorily with the grave and complex problems of the postwar world." It proposed, accordingly, to reduce the number of standing committees in both Houses, define their jurisdictions (to avoid the current duplication and confusion), authorize each Member to employ a professional assistant, provide the committees with expert staffs, establish majority and minority policy committees for both Houses, strengthen Congress' control over the execution of its fiscal policies, improve the personnel of Congress by raising salaries and otherwise to bring the National Legislature up to date.

The bill last week received Senate approval by a decisive vote. Whether or not certain details of the measure still might be bettered, its over-all excellence can scarcely be disputed. If we continue to believe that our American interests are best served by preserving a healthy balance among the three principal branches of Government, this piece of legislation will surely rank among the most important introduced in many sessions of Congress. And the total cost of converting the Legislature into a modern machine for a modern age, as estimated by the joint committee, would come to only about $12,000,000 a year, even including a 50 percent increase in congressional salaries. We have spent more to modernize a battleship.

Grain Supply in New England

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a few photographs will portray clearly to the Members of the House the miserable story of inefficiency, ineffectiveness, and waste told by the combined operations of the Department of Agriculture and the OPA which have prevented dairy and poultry farmers in New England from securing feed for their livestock.

This morning's Washington Post contains a full page about the large amount of wheat—more than a billion bushels—now available in the United States, yet these photographs tell a far different story. One picture is headed "Famine relief needed here." It shows 200 dead chickens picked up on a farm at Chelmsford, near Lowell, Mass., on June 10. All had died of starvation when Albert J. Lupien, the farmer, was unable to secure grain for his flock. Similar conditions exist all through Massachusetts.

The second group of pictures is taken from a Springfield newspaper. It is interesting to note what has happened to an enterprising veteran who expected to build up a profitable business but Government manipulations have practically ruined him. The story is as follows:

With 1,400 of his flock of 2,000 ducks already dead of starvation and others doomed, because of the grain shortage, George A. Fenn, Jr., of 599 Tinkham Road, an ex-GI, has done everything within his power to try to save his flock. One picture shows ducks doomed to die. The goiter-like breast of the ducks is the crop filled with mud which they have eaten in desperation when unable to get anything of nutritious value. The upper picture shows Fenn with the pitiful pile of dead ducks he picked up from the yard and the bottom shows him digging a pool for ducks he hopes to save. Grain shortages throughout the area have hit all poultrymen hard but Fenn's case is the most drastic known in the area.

Unable to buy the necessary grain and feed for his ducks, George A. Fenn., Jr., 24, an ex-GI with combat experience in the European theater, have had his flock of 2,000 reduced to about 600 through starvation on his poultry farm at 599 Tinkham Road.

Desperately making every attempt to obtain feed for the ducks Fenn saw the first of his flock die about the first of May and each day since then he has lost between 10 and 100 a day. Of no food value the ducks have been buried on the farm, a task that Kenn has undertaken each day since the grain shortage became acute.

These photographs are backed up by the statement of the Lupien brothers that the situation as it now exists in Massachusetts can best be described as disastrous—directly and immediately to the poultry grower and indirectly and in the very near future to the consumer. The OPA has been yelling from the housetops that inflation was around the corner and that high prices are in the offing with the resulting black markets. An official of the Department of Agriculture in the State of New Hampshire has been quoted as saying that over 400,000 out of 1,100,000 laying hens in New Hampshire have already been killed because of the shortage of feed. In the case of the poultry industry, there may be no need to worry about a black market for the next 5 or 6 weeks due to the fact that poultry will glut the market. However, when that period is passed we will witness the worst black market that the country has ever seen in that connection.

Unless the Congress and the bureaucrats in Washington wake up and take

immediate action, they will be responsible individually and collectively for: First, excessively high prices; second, a terrific black market; and third, a collapse of the poultry and dairy industry in the New England States as well as some other Eastern States. We have all reached the point where we cannot produce eggs and keep poultry alive on a basis of promises.

The photographs which I have shown to you and the statements of the dairy farmers themselves are arguments which require action immediately from the bureaucrats and officials now in Federal office. Congress has given them plenty of power and the means by which feed can be secured and distributed to the farmers all over this country. It is high time that these officials wake up and do something to relieve this appalling situation.

OPA Causes Insulin Shortage

REMARKS
OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the black market created by OPA regulations is creating problems that are more serious than the meat shortage, desperate as that may be. The Omaha meat packers slaughtered only seven head of cattle last week, while at Chicago, Wilson and Armour companies slaughtered none. Practically all of the fat cattle slaughtered in the East has been in the black markets, which means that all of the offal, hides, and so forth, are not being utilized as heretofore.

This affects our leather industry, which is bad enough, and it also denies the high protein feeds used so extensively for livestock and poultry production throughout the country. But a more serious problem arises out of the waste of these byproducts when slaughtering is not done by legitimate slaughterers, capable of utilizing the entire animal. An example is our insulin supply, which is rapidly being exhausted. Our larger medical institutions, as well as individuals, are clamoring for insulin.

Johns Hopkins Hospital, in their desperation, telephoned Wilson Co. in Chicago pleading for a supply that is not available. Statistics indicate that we have 1,000,000 or more diabetics in this country—a great percent of them using insulin. Having once started using it, the patient must have insulin.

Insulin is a product made from the pancreas, known as sweetbreads when used as a food, from sheep or oxen, and is used hypodermically as a specific for diabetes. There is no other known relief or remedy.

Many diabetics live many years by continued use of insulin. If insulin is denied the patient the result is that he or she immediately begins breaking down physically, which proves fatal. I have been informed by competent physicians that people afflicted with diabetes using insulin will die within 30 days if the supply becomes exhausted.

Mr. Speaker, this proves what I have ofttimes said. Everytime the Government tries to solve one problem a dozen new ones are created. If several thousand people die during the next 30 days because of lack of insulin the OPA will be responsible.

Chester Bowles in his new book entitled "Tomorrow Without Fear," which is now selling for $1, sees America resting under responsibility of making the greatest contribution to the world because, as he says, "ours is the most powerful economy." It is unfortunate that Mr. Bowles does not see the dire needs within our own country, rather than a star-gazer as Mr. Wallace has always been, seeing the needs of everyone except his own countrymen.

There will be no relief from situations of this kind until the business of this country can again be carried on through legitimate channels of trade which is impossible under bureaucratic control.

Surplus Property—Statement by Senator Wiley and Newspaper Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Tuesday I testified before the Senate Small Business Subcommittee on Surplus Property regarding the War Assets Administration's failure properly to dispose of surplus property. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I ask further that an article in the New York Sun of May 29, 1946, written by Phelps Adams, also be included in the RECORD following my statement.

I may say that I intend to continue my efforts to expose the surplus-property mess until actions are taken to correct the conditions which I have outlined; namely, the shameless ignoring by WAA of the needs and requests of priority claimants, including veterans, schools, States, and municipalities. Several congressional committees are at work trying to clear up this surplus mess, and I earnestly trust that in the interest of public welfare their efforts will be rewarded with success.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE SENATE SMALL BUSINESS SUBCOMMITTEE ON SURPLUS PROPERTY, TUESDAY, JUNE 18, 1946

HOUSE-CLEAN THE WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION IN ORDER TO PROTECT PRIORITY CLAIMANTS FOR SURPLUS GOODS

Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the opportunity to testify before this committee. I wish that time would permit me to make an extended statement here at this time, but I know that you will understand that my committee assignments and other legislative tasks preclude other than a brief summary of my views on this situation.

I do, however, first want to add my own humble word of congratulation to you for investigating the WAA's fumbling of the surplus disposal program.

Why I am here

It is my belief—and I say this without any personal or partisan feeling—that WAA's administration of this program is a national disgrace and is crying to high heaven for full exposure in the broad daylight and for immediate correction. It is my belief that a worse scandal than Teapot Dome is involved in WAA's flagrant violation of the law with respect to priorities for veterans (including, of course, exservicemen trying to start new businesses and reopen old ones) and educational instittuions.

Mr. Chairman, these are no empty accusations or unfounded generalties. I have been in continuous correspondence with General Gregory for the last 3 months, focusing upon WAA's wretched handling of the disposal of surplus electronics and communications equipment. I have spoken on this matter on the floor of the Senate over a half-dozen times, in particular, on April 2, April 9, April 17, April 24, April 29, May 4, May 17, and May 27.

I have concentrated on the electronics problem because I regard it as crucial to our national defense and to our prosperity in this atomic age. The remarks which follow apply specifically only to the electronics problem, but I believe this problem is indicative of other situations existing throughout WAA.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask now that the full text of my correspondence with General Gregory on this subject be made a part of this committee's record, following my remarks. May I ask further that two articles written on this surplus scandal, by an able journalist, Mr. Phelps Adams of the New York Sun, be also made a part of this record.

Charges against WAA

Now what is the substance of my accusations against WAA? It can be summarized in one sentence. It is this: A commercial crowd has taken over WAA's electronics program and has ruthlessly operated it in a manner harmful to the best interests of our country.

1. This commercial crowd has thumbed its nose at the United States Congress (the Congress has legally required priorities for veterans, schools, States, and municipalities, only to have these priorities ignored by this commercial crowd which is bossing the WAA electronic program).

2. This commercial crowd has helped to sabotage the national defense of our country by denying to our schools, in particular, vital electronics materials with which to train young scientists.

3. This crowd has engaged in deceit and downright lying in its advice to General Gregory and, in particular, in the correspondence which it has handled with myself.

Examples of WAA fraud

Mr. Chairman, I could cite innumerable instances which have been brought to my attention substantiating these accusations but I believe the materials which I have asked be made a part of your committee record are proof enough of my allegations.

I do, however, want to cite two matters both of which involve relations between the WAA and the Congress.

1. That WAA has repeatedly written me in letters that an Office of Education Liaison agent has screened all declarations of surplus property in order to set aside materials requested by schools. Yet I am informed with absolute reliability that this very same liaison agent has been told in no uncertain

terms to "keep off the premises" of WAA, which means, in effect, that there is no such screening of materials needed by schools.

2. I was advised in a letter of May 23 from WAA that "all orders of priority claimants were being filled." This statement was apparently a deliberate untruth. At the very time this letter was written, there were piled up in the Electronics and Communications Branch of WAA thousands and thousands of veterans' certificates for priority for electronics goods, which had been unopened, unacknowledged, and unanswered by WAA, in addition to hundreds upon hundreds of schools' requests similarly not acted upon.

Priority requests could not possibly have been filled because under the WAA's manufacturer agent system (which incidentally involves grievous financial losses to the Government in expense accounts and opportunities for corruption), several depots do not even forward to Washington declarations of surplus property from which priority claimants' requests could even begin to be satisfied. How can Washington make sure that schools and veterans get surplus property which Washington doesn't even know about because it has not received surplus declarations?

Recommendations

Mr. Chairman, against lies, against deception, against disgraceful actions, such as I have indicated characterize WAA, the Congress must act with unremitting exposure.

The electronics officials who misadvised General Gregory about the true electronics situation should be exposed and removed.

The commercial crowd to which I have referred must be thoroughly housecleaned. Procedures must be established which will, in fact, satisfy the claims of veterans, schools, States, and municipalities.

The Office of Education Liaison Agent must be given full opportunity to screen surplus for schools, and must be given adequate clerical and stenographic assistance which I understand, he has been denied to date.

The Veterans' Administration should be brought into closer liaison with WAA so as to make sure no more run-arounds are given to our ex-servicemen who want to buy surplus.

So, too, the representation of small business in the WAA organization must be made strong and unified so that small business is allowed to buy surplus which has too often in the past been bought up by bigger outfits only.

I feel sure that this committee will be greatly instrumental: (a) in helping to correct the situations which I have indicated and (b) in establishing the surplus disposal program on an efficient, honest, and sound basis.

[From the New York Sun]

INQUIRY INTO WAA WASTE BEGINS—SLAUGHTER COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ALL CHARGES IN SURPLUS PROPERTY SALES

(By Phelps Adams)

A full-dress congressional investigation was being started today into charges voiced by both Democratic and Republican legislators that the administration's surplus property disposal program is a national scandal and a rotten mess.

Representative ROGER SLAUGHTER, Missouri Democrat, named as the chairman of a special investigating committee of the House of Representatives, instructed to deal with every phase of the multibillion-dollar program, said today that he anticipated calling his committee this week to begin the series of painstaking investigations which will precede the holding of public hearings this summer.

Faced by grave charges of maladministration, waste, inefficiency, gross disregard of the priority provisions of the law, internal dissension, discrimination among manufacturers' agents, and other irregularities savoring of scandal, top officials of the War Assets Administration were striving quietly to put their own house in order and to clear up some sorer spots before the investigation gets under way. While Lt. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory, War Assets Administrator, entered a blanket denial of all these charges recently and denounced as a mass of misinformation a story published in the New York Sun 2 weeks ago exposing some questionable operations of the Electronic and Communications Division of the WAA. The Sun learned today that the appearance of that story led immediately to a searching investigation conducted by the WAA's own compliance section, followed by at least two significant reforms.

PERSONNEL INCREASE

First among these was an increase of 150 percent in the personnel of the priorities section of our electronics and communications branch. This section was created to aid veterans and other priority holders in buying surplus property before it is sold in commercial channels, but this agency has been so undermanned and poorly equipped that it has served rather as a bottleneck through which priority purchasers must squeeze. According to Gregory's office, this section now has six employees, in addition to the chief, and henceforth will have 15 to cope with the 600 to 700 applications flooding in upon it each week.

Second, was the fact that the United States Army succeeded finally in getting 20,000,000 feet of telephone wire which it had demanded under its top priority, and which—after a month and a half—it had not received. This wire was reported as surplus to the electronics and communications branch of the Army Signal Corps.

The total quantity was 35,000,000 feet, and at the request of the Army Corps of Engineers, the entire amount was frozen for Army use. A private purchaser, working through another branch of the War Assets Administration, tried to buy 30,000,000 feet of this same wire, and to get it out from under the freeze order.

TUG OF WAR

By some mysterious process which Gregory's office is unable to explain, the Signal Corps suddenly decided that the wire should have gone to another WAA branch, instead of the electronics and communications branch, and corrected its declaration of the surplus property accordingly. Thus, the whole transaction was to have been taken out of the hands of the priorities section of the electronics branch, which had frozen the wire for Army use.

A bitter tug of war ensued, with the engineers on one end of the line and the private purchaser at the other. Under the law, the WAA had no alternative but to give the wire to the engineers, and while they scaled down total requirements to 20,000,000 feet, they were unable to get it. Shipping instructions on the first consignment of nearly 7,000,000 feet were requested early in April, and actually issued early in May.

Two weeks later, when the Sun's story was published, however, not one foot of this wire had yet been shipped to the Army; but 2 days after the story appeared, the first consignment was being loaded onto freight cars at Belle Mead, N. J., and the Army had won its long fight against some strangely devious practices inside the surplus property disposal agencies. The engineers will get the 20,000,000 feet they need, and the private purchasers will get the rest; while Gregory's compliance section seeks to fix responsibility for the attempted evasion of the law by persons inside the WAA.

TREMENDOUS TASK

This and other "misinformation" covered in the Sun's exposé is but a part of the mountainous pile of material confronting the Slaughter committee as it buckles down to the tremendous task of sifting and assaying the charges piling up, both in and out of Congress, against the WAA. In the office of almost every Senator and Representative are stacks of letters from veterans and other priority holders describing their own personal experiences in attempting to get the surplus property which the law declares that they should have, and which they cannot get.

Representative ROGER SLAUGHTER, Missouri, Democrat, named as the chairman of a special investigating committee of the House of Representatives, instructed to deal with every phase of the multi-billion-dollar program, said today that he anticipated calling his committee this week to begin the series of painstaking investigations which will precede the holding of public hearings this summer.

Among the charges which the committee will find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are those voiced by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, in a letter sent to Gregory this week, denouncing bluntly as a lie the General's statement that present WAA practices "have enabled us to fill promptly, from the Washington office, all orders of priority claimants." Senator WILEY declared that if Gregory would visit the priorities disposal section of the electronics and communications branch he would find in one office alone some 7,500 unfilled orders from veterans, educational institutions, States, cities, and other priority purchasers.

Resorting to the most colorful language yet used, Senator WILEY described the entire situation as a "rotten mess" and a scandal that "reeks with fouler odors than came from Teapot Dome"; he charged some of Gregory's subordinates in the electronics and communications branch with intentionally working "a fraud upon you and upon the American public in order to cover up their own apparent dereliction of duty and possibly to serve private interests"; and he suggested pithily that WAA might properly stand for "Wasted American Assets," or "Working Against America."

CHARGES AND COMPLAINTS

From the Democratic side come charges and complaints that—if not as colorful—are at least as serious as those spread upon the record by Senator WILEY. Representative JOE HENDRICKS, Democrat of Florida, will ask the Slaughter committee to investigate a number of specific instances of apparent maladministration in the WAA. Included among these are:

1. The handling of the entire stock of the Chicago Signal Depot—80 percent of which was turned over to a single manufacturer agent for disposal, despite the fact that only about 40 percent had been manufactured originally by that agent.

2. The sale of some 13,000 B–19 two-way radio sets, bought by the Government at a cost of $1,140 apiece for lend-lease shipment to Great Britain and Russia, and sold at $45 apiece, save in some scattered small-lot shipments, which brought $50.

This transaction already has been investigated by two congressional agencies but the information given to one investigator by WAA officials differs radically in a number of important respects from the findings of the other investigator, based on statements of WAA officials—and both are strangely at variance with the information given to the Sun by Gregory's office today. The contradictions in the WAA's own story about the sale of these sets has created so much suspicion and mystery that Members of Congress have abandoned all hope of obtaining a clear and connected story until the Slaughter committee can summon the officials involved, question them under oath, and subpena all necessary records.

MOVE FOR SCRAPPING

It appears, however, that one official was arranging to test the market for these sets by placing 25 of them on sale in a New York department store and was negotiating to this end in the expectation of obtaining upward of $100 apiece for them; and that while he was so engaged, another official arranged to dispose of more than 10,000 of them to a manufacturer agent, who, in turn, sold them, through another New York department store, and through various other outlets across the country, at the $45 price. It appears likewise that there was strong sentiment among other WAA officials for scrapping the sets at junk value of a few cents a pound.

Since each set consisted of two transmitters, two receivers, two antennas, dials, tubes, and some $400 worth of spare parts, the junk dealer who could buy and cannibalize them at scrap value would have stood to make a small fortune.

3. The opening of a large quantity of telephonic equipment to bids by private companies without advance notice to priority holders that such equipment was available. The result of this was that large companies bid the price of this scarce equipment up in some cases to levels above the regular market price, so that a veteran, owning a small telephone company in Florida and entitled to priority rights, could not fill his needs at a fair price.

CHICAGO VETERAN'S CASE

4. The strange case of a Chicago veteran who was lucky enough to find 2,600 very scarce radio tubes which would have enabled him to manufacture 2,600 radios, had not the WAA in Washington made a peculiar mistake. It found that the tubes had been sent to a manufacturer agent under a consignment numbered "Wash 46-388" and froze them for him under that number as required by law. The agent, it developed, had no such tubes in stock under that number.

Another search of Washington records had to be made. The WAA was very sorry, but the number on that shipment should have been Wash 46-709. It was a regrettable error, but the equipment would be frozen immediately under the correct number. Unfortunately, however, 3 weeks had elapsed and by that time the tubes had been sold to a nonpriority purchaser.

5. A disturbing repetition of the same mistake occurred in the case of a shipment of 10,000 radio tubes frozen under the number "Wash 46-13." The veteran was smart by this time. He bought the tubes, paid for them, then made a few long-distance telephone calls and an airplane trip. Again he found that there were no such tubes under that number.

WRONG NUMBER AGAIN

Again the WAA in Washington was very sorry, and managed to find that the correct number was "Wash 46-126." They were frozen for him and this time they were in stock in Seattle. The veteran asked that they be delivered to him in Chicago, but WAA officials told him that they already were en route to a manufacturer agent in New York.

This proved to be untrue, for the shipment did not leave Seattle until more than 2 weeks later, but they were sent all the way to the Atlantic coast at the taxpayers' expense, and the veteran had to pay for sending them back to Chicago.

6. The same veteran bought and paid for 175 R-100 radios, which were frozen in the hands of a manufacturer agent, but when he tried to collect them, while the freeze was in effect, he was told that they had been sold and no more were available. In this instance, he charges, the agent thus sold property which already had been sold and collected for by the War Assets Administration.

The particular veteran is a former Army major whose military service was intimately connected with surplus property disposal, and who therefore understands the entire procedure thoroughly. Other veterans, without his specialized knowledge, clearly have even less chance of getting the material to which the law entitles them.

PLENTY OF MATERIAL

Veterans, however, are no worse off generally than schools and colleges, which are entitled to priority privileges in the purchase of surplus property, and who look to the United States Office of Education for aid in dealings with the WAA. An official spokesman for Gregory boasted to the Sun today that an agent of the United States Office of Education works at all times in close cooperation with the WAA, screening declarations of surplus electronic property to find material needed by schools, and applying to the priorities section to freeze equipment for which any unfilled priority exists.

Upon investigation at the request of the Sun, however, the same spokesman later admitted that 1 week ago today the electronics and communications branch had presented that agent with a formal memorandum advising him that he no longer would be permitted to screen such declarations and obtain freeze orders without written authorization from his superiors in the Office of Education. Thus, while the Priorities Division personnel has been expanded in an outward show of kindness and good will toward veterans, schools, colleges, and other preferred purchasers, the hostility of WAA officials toward the priority provisions of the law is shown by their action in placing this new stumbling block in the path of the Office of Education—to be more deeply rooted than ever. Clearly, the Slaughter committee has no lack of material.

Civil Service Examinations for Wartime Employees Are Not Really Competitive

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have called the attention of the Members to what I believe to be a general departure from a true merit system in the Federal Government, caused by the policies of the Civil Service Commission. Again, I wish to reemphasize my conviction that this policy is being continued, because I have found that the Commission is giving the same examination to war-service employees whose salaries range from $1,400 to $3,500 per annum. This present Commission policy of giving the same examination to everyone, regardless of the duties being performed, is grossly unfair and unjust to the thousands of permanent civil-service employees who have been working for the Federal Government for more than 6 years.

This policy of the Civil Service Commission is just another device to secure permanent civil-service positions for war-service appointees, without such employees being required to take competitive examinations to measure their qualifications to perform their present jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD, following my remarks, a copy of a letter which I have sent to the Civil Service Commission concerning this problem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas.

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

JUNE 20, 1946.

Mr. HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President, United States Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MITCHELL: It has been called to my attention that the Civil Service Commission is now conducting examinations among war service appointees for the purpose of determining their eligibility to continue with the Federal Government in permanent positions. I am advised that at least one such examination has been given, namely, a clerk-typist examination.

For the purpose of clarifying the Commission's policy with respect to this examination and those which will follow it will be appreciated if you will explain the following:

It appears that the same clerk-typist examination as given to those who have CAF-2, CAF-3, CAF-4, CAF-5, CAF-6, and CAF-7 classifications. In other words, assuming an employee came into the Federal service in 1942 under a war-service appointment at CAF-2 and has been promoted to CAF-7 during the interim, he is given the same examination as one who has a CAF-2 classification, having entered the service in 1945. This policy appears to be unjust both for the CAF-7 and the CAF-2 employee, because it creates an arbitrary basis for determining an employee's eligibility for positions with a wide range of responsibility, calling for a wide variation of qualifications.

I am particularly disturbed because this, in effect, marks another step away from a true merit system, for if such a policy is followed in the future it is quite clear that an examination may be given in the professional field which would qualify one who passed to retain his war-service appointment, regardless of whether it was in the P-1 or P-8 classification. Another disturbing factor is the resentment of permanent employees who were forced to take examinations of much greater difficulty in securing their positions. Under your present policy, a war-service appointee who has been fortunate enough to be promoted rapidly (as is the general rule), is not compelled to take an examination which measures his qualifications for his present position.

Sincerely,

EDWARD H. REES.

Russia and the Atom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Washington Post of June 21 on Russia and the atom bomb.

The proposal that Russia has made to the Atomic Energy Commission of the United Nations is unintelligent and unrealistic. As now presented it shows no understanding of the world problems posed by atomic energy.

One can wonder if the proposal is a real or deliberate misunderstanding or whether the Russians have an unstated case for it. Unless they have, I agree with the Washington Post and think that it is shadow boxing.

It is unworthy of a great nation like Russia and contributes nothing to the peace.

Right at the beginning we made our mistakes in the handling of atomic energy. We waited too long to state our policy. We know that we are a peace-loving nation. We know we will never attack any other nation no matter what some of our newspapers say. But unfortunately, all the peoples of the world do not for a certainty know these things. We should not dismember our armed forces at this time, but neither should we rattle our sabers or the atomic bomb. The rattling of our sabers and the hum of our plants where we are manufacturing atomic bombs must be deeply disturbing to suspicious people.

All of this I admit but it does not excuse Russia for the proposal which she has just made on atomic energy.

Something better should come from a great nation whose loss has been so tremendous in manpower, in cities, and in raw materials.

Something better should come from a nation whose desire for peace, therefore, is, I am sure, as great as ours.

This is no time for shadow boxing. If there are substantial reasons for her proposal, Russia owes a clarification to the United Nations.

This is no time to insult the intelligence of the world.

RUSSIA AND THE ATOM

The Russian proposal for international control of atomic energy is profoundly disheartening. There is revealed in it neither the smallest understanding of the real imperatives which the atom imposes upon the contemporary world nor any disposition to accept the limitations of sovereignty which are indispensable to the establishment of any effective world system for peaceful atomic development. It is an obsolete and sterile formula, often tried and invariably found ineffectual, for the outlawing of ordinary weapons from the crossbow to poison gas, and wholly unsuited to the outlawing of so catastrophic a weapon as the atomic bomb, which has metamorphosed warfare into a form of mass suicide. All that Mr. Gromyko can be said to have done by introducing this proposal to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission is to open up a tragic vista of procrastination in which debate may go on interminably while mankind prepares its own immolation.

It is an interesting paradox that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics should have set before the Commission a proposal envisaging rigid retention of private and national property rights in atomic resources, while the capitalist United States should have proposed a far-reaching international socialization not only of all fissionable materials but of atomic production as well. In this, we think, lies the fundamental deficiency of the Soviet plan. For the plain fact is that a fatal atomic armaments race can be avoided only by vesting in some supranational body (whether the American-proposed atomic development authority or some other) absolute ownership of all the sources and production facilities of atomic energy and power to license private or national use of atomic materials for specified nondangerous purposes.

If there is private or national ownership of sources and production facilities, no nation will be able to live in security and every nation will be impelled to come as close as possible to evasion of international agreements. There will be no way of knowing that a plant ostensibly built to produce peaceful power is not secretly intended for the manufacture of weapons. There will be no way to tell whether uranium is being mined for beneficent or for bellicose purposes. Effective inspection will be a practical impossibility because it will necessarily be concerned with intent more than with actuality. If ownership of the uranium itself is vested in a world authority, no such dilemna will arise, for the mere mining of uranium by a national operator, regardless of intent, will be illegal. As the noted atomic physicist, Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, has put it, "things like the building of power plants, which make fissionable materials or which may make fissionable materials, things like the separation of isotopes to get explosive materials, these are jobs which are too easily diverted, too trigger-happy to be left in national hands."

In place of the security which could come from socialization of all the means of atomic production, Mr. Gromyko has suggested the feeble protection of a system of sanctions, not very different presumably from the "condign punishments" recommended by Mr. Baruch. The inescapable fact about such penalties is that they can be invoked only by turning to the very recourse they are designed to avoid—atomic war. Safety can be found not in pious renunciation of the use of atomic weapons but only in preventing production and possession of them. Once produced and put into national hands, they are inevitably explosive.

That the Russians should have resented the chary provisions of the Baruch plan respecting retention of our store of atomic bombs is understandable enough. We have no quarrel with their insistence that the manufacture of bombs be stopped and that all existing bombs be destroyed after an agreement has been signed. But to advance these proposals without the suggestion of anything constructive is the emptiest sort of shadow-boxing. The United Nations Commission will get nowhere if its members confine themselves to submitting proposals patently unacceptable to their fellow members. Perhaps it is to the small nations that we must now look for a realistic approach to the atomic problem. The magnitude of atomic energy demands magnitude of imagination and invention in channeling it for the benefit of mankind. New devices consonant with the atomic age, not antiquated conventions, must be contrived to contain a force so imperiously dynamic.

Bishop Sheil's Inspiring Address to American Veterans Deserves Wide Audience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the American Veterans Committee, composed of young men who fought for their country in the Second World War, held its first constitutional convention in Des Moines, Iowa, on June 14, 15, and 16.

Among the outstanding speakers who addressed the convention was the honorary chaplain, the Rt. Rev. Bernard J. Sheil, D. D., auxiliary bishop of Chicago, whose personal friendship I deem an honor and a privilege, and whose splendid work in youth leadership, and in other humanitarian endeavors, has insured his world-wide fame and esteem. His splendid address was acclaimed by all who heard him, and inspired the young veterans of this World War II organization to renewed faith and energy in behalf of their own organization and their country.

The motto of the American Veterans Committee is "Citizens first, veterans second," meaning that they believe their responsibilities as American citizens come before any claims they may have as veterans of their Nation's service. Their major premise is that what is good for the country as a whole is good for the veterans. Both the American Veterans Committee and Bishop Sheil are to be congratulated upon their patriotic and unselfish ideals. AVC fills a need among such organizations as the voice of young and progressive veterans of World War II.

Bishop Sheil's inspired address, which breathes the living spirit of American democracy, led the editor of the Chicago Times to devote a full page of the Times to the text in order that the millions of readers of that newspaper might read it; and I, Mr. Speaker, am inserting it in the RECORD in order further to diffuse this kindly and witty, good and godly man's words.

The text of Bishop Sheil's address follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY BISHOP BERNARD J. SHEIL, D. D., AT THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE IN DES MOINES, IOWA, ON JUNE 14, 1946

The theme of the American Veterans Committee: "Citizens first and veterans afterwards" is one of the most heartening signs of alert, informed citizenship that we have seen in America. It expresses the underlying unselfishness of the AVC. The veterans of the AVC will not form a separate and distinct body aloof from the Nation, with aims that may be widely divergent from those of the rest of us. They will not form a group that seeks its own ascendancy at the expense of other citizens of the country. They wish to reach their objectives with the other members of the community. They wish to achieve their aims only as an integral part of America. They know that veterans will live decently only if all citizens live decently. They realize that no lasting benefits can accrue to any organization, if it secures those benefits at the expense of the rest of the Nation. This approach should attract the highest type of citizen-veteran to your organization. And, if there was a time when the United States needed the support of enlightened citizens, that time is now.

It is a very strange world we dwell in; a turbulent world, restless and dissatisfied. It is a world of contrasts; of high principles and sordid compromises; of noble aspirations and of mean accomplishments. Jacques Maritain has said that the recent war was no more than a paroxysm in the liquidation of a civilization, compared to which the liquidation of Rome was but a minor episode. If indeed our civilization is being liquidated,

then it behooves us, as citizens of the world, to think of what kind of civilization we want to replace the old and obviously unsatisfactory one.

WE WANT A FRESH START

As citizens of the world, we wish to examine the basis upon which we shall build the new civilization. And we will find that basis in man. Specifically, we will find it in the traditional Christian concept of man, who is "* * * At the same time the beginning and the end of life in human society. Thus also the principle of its equilibrium." Thus Pope XII describes man, and all right-thinking men, whether Christian or not, accept this description. The Pope goes on to say, "Men established in their inviolable integrity as images of God, men proud of their personal dignity and of their healthy freedom, men justly jealous of their equality with their fellows in all that touches the most essential bases of man's dignity, men firmly attached to their land and traditions; that is what gives to human society its solid foundation and obtains for it security, equilibrium, equality, normal development in space and time."

Our disintegrating world has long given lip service to this concept of man. But how far its practice has been from its preaching can be seen from the horrible wars, the terrors, and the prolonged economic depressions that have marked the history of the world for the last 400 years.

We do not want the kind of world we have now. This kind has been eminently unsuccessful. We want a new world. We want a fresh start. We want another chance to make our world a place worth living in.

CITIZENSHIP IS EVERYDAY JOB

But what has all this to do with the members of the AVC, or with any other citizens? Everything. For, the people of the United States are placed in the providential position of being citizens in the richest and strongest and freest nation on the face of the globe. Nevertheless, there is work to be done in the United States; and in doing that work, we Americans can show the other nations how a new world can be built. It is the concerned citizens who can do something about our problems. And it is as a concerned citizen that I come before you today.

It is ultimately the intelligent citizens acting in concert who will build the good society. To do this we must keep alert and informed; we must be familiar with community affairs, with national and international affairs. The good citizen will not plead that he has no time, for all these affairs are his affairs.

Since the citizens determine the kind of government we have, we, the citizens, must elect men of vision and imagination to represent us—men of straight and steady judgment. We get just the kind of government we deserve. Being a citizen of a democracy is not a job for once a year, but for every day, for all the year. Being a citizen of this democracy is a special privilege which merits our most careful attention.

IRRESPONSIBILITY IS REPREHENSIBLE

Let us be specific. Where does the good citizen start his activity? We can start by actively interesting ourselves in the sort of men who are now in Congress. The present Congress is peculiarly inept. Important bills enter the congressional maw; and if they are by some chance passed, they leave the legislative Chambers in so emasculated a condition that their authors can hardly recognize them. Such was the fate of the full employment bill. Admittedly imperfect, but at least it was an effort to strengthen the economy of the Nation. The Congress, after great agony, brought forth a neat little dissertation which assured the population that our Government would be very pleased if everyone had a job. The present Congress firmly believes in walking straight up to, and then quickly around, every problem brought to its attention. No Congress has had so great an opportunity, and no Congress has been so pusillanimous in its side-stepping of issues.

The FEPC, one of the most vital pieces of legislation ever written, has languished in the House for these many months because it actually has the effrontery to espouse equality on jobs for Negroes, for Jews, for all men with necessary qualifications. Irresponsibility is always reprehensible, but irresponsibility on such an august level and in such colossal proportions stuns the mind.

FIRM BELIEVER IN AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

Again, the 65-cent minimum wage law is an equally vital law for the sharing of democracy in this country. But, it left the Senate 2 months ago; and the House Labor Committee has not yet seen its way clear to allowing this legislation to be put to a vote. It matters not that millions of ordinary people are hard put to buy milk, eggs, meat, and other basic foods on their insufficient incomes. The Congress of the United States seems to have forgotten that good citizenship cannot be reasonably expected of men who must consume all their energy in the battle for sheer existence. Yet, when antistrike legislation is called for, there is a flurry of activity. No longer somnolent, but in hysterical haste, our solons vie with each other in proposing ill-conceived antilabor plans. And the crippling Case bill is passed in record time.

I am a firm believer in the American Government. But I am also a firm believer in intelligent, deliberate, but reasonably speedy legislative action. I believe that Congress should be responsive to the legitimate desires of the people; and I also believe that this Congress is particularly unresponsive to those desires. There are extraordinary, exceptional men and women in Congress. But they are far outnumbered.

PLEADS FOR UNDERPRIVILEGED

The good citizen must also interest himself in the living conditions of our people. We have heard much of the high American standard of living. And it is true that, as a Nation, we enjoy ease and comfort undreamed of by countless millions in the world. But have you ever considered how many Americans actually share this standard? Have you seen the pig-sties many of our people dwell in? Have you seen the rat-infested, draughty, one-room cabins of our Negro citizens of the South; or, for that matter, have you seen the stinking holes, the windowless, airless, filthy habitations of our Negroes in the emancipated North? Have you seen the hovels of our Mexicans and Filipinos? Have you seen the bleak, dust-laden homes of mining towns; have you seen the vermin-ridden shacks of the tenant farmers; have you seen the dead slums of our great cities, the festering places of crime, disease, and anti-social behavior?

Do you know what dirt, squalor, endless noise and confusion do to the human being, whom God made a little lower than the angels? Have you ever considered the hopelessness, the frustration, the dreariness of life in our large cities, our tombs of living men? What happens to the souls of men who live in such surroundings every day of their lives?

ADEQUATE MEDICAL CARE NEEDED

Where is this mythical standard of living when medical care is needed? Adequate medical care is beyond the means of most Americans. When most of the people find such care beyond their financial reach, then it is the duty of the Government to provide a medical plan which respects the rights of the individual and which does not violate his conscience. Yet, some efforts of the Government have been met with frenzied charges of communism. And the American Medical Association rises in its musty might to slay the dragon of socialistic medicine. Hippocrates would surely be puzzled by some of the arguments for keeping medical care from the people.

And in the question of medical care, the veterans should make every possible effort to see that the sick and wounded of the recent war are cared for properly. No ex-soldier should have the slightest difficulty in obtaining the best medical attention available. The disabled veteran wishes only to take his place in society as a fit, healthy man. He wants to be a useful member of the community. The AVC and all veterans organizations should regard it as a solemn duty to see that all veterans are given the finest treatment the Nation can afford. Slipshod care of the sick is always unforgivable; but slipshod care for men who have given themselves so unstintingly would be national ingratitude.

SEVENTY PERCENT EARNED UNDER $3,000

Where is this mythical standard of living when you speak of labor? Where are the wealthy laborers of whom we heard so much? Over 70 percent of the American people in 1942, a prosperous year, earned less than $3,000 annually. In that same year 21 out of 100 Americans had incomes of less than $1,000. And in 1945, an even more prosperous year, there were 14,000,000 workers who averaged only 75 cents an hour.

Why is it always so hard to get something decent for the ordinary man? In great part the answer lies with a group of powerful men whose only wish is to take the ceiling off profits and to clamp the lid tightly on wages. They cry for a return to normalcy. This country has never been normal, economically speaking. The only time it will be normal is when all our people have a decent assured income; when all our people are able to live in the way their God-given dignity deserves. The normalcy our tycoons speak so nostalgically of is a perverted thing, when few are on the top of the economic heap and the rest of us are groveling on the bottom. Normalcy is impossible as long as profit alone remains the guide, the god, the despot of our economy.

THEY WEEP FOR PAST

They call for normalcy; they look for the halcyon days when you could hire men at any wage you chose; those days of economic innocence when you could fire men for any arbitrary reason and there were no troublesome unions to say you nay. They yearn for the time when all America trembled at their displeasure, when Presidents and Congressmen rigged laws to maintain the status quo. They weep for the days that are no more, when business was business, and there was no recourse to higher law.

They call for a return to free enterprise; to that enterprise under which monopoly and international cartels and mass depressions and all the other deadly fruits of a sick capitalism flowered. We all believe in free enterprise; but in an enterprise that is really free. We do not believe in an enterprise which is free to restrict production artificially, and to eliminate healthy competition by unhealthy means. We do not believe in an enterprise which is free to disregard its responsibility to its workers and the community at large. We want a free enterprise that seriously works to fulfill its obligations to its owners, to its workers, and to the Nation. We want a free enterprise that regards labor as a friend and a partner; and not as an enemy and a slave.

MAKE LABOR PARTNER IN BUSINESS

The time is ripe for making labor a partner in the management of business. If this is communistic, let me quote to you a statement of those well-known "Communists," the

American hierarchy of the Catholic Church: "* * * A contract between employers and employees would serve the purpose of individual and social welfare most effectively if it were modified by some form of partnership which would permit a graduated share in the ownership and profits of business and also some voice in its management." It is only natural that laboring men should participate in the decisions of the industries to which so much of their lives are devoted. Labor-management councils are a step in this direction. The same quotation of the bishops urges that labor should have a graduated share in the profits and in the ownership of business. There are several outstanding American industries which live up to these Christian principles, and none of them has suffered in any way.

Labor's demands are not excessive. They are not radical. What the worker fundamentally desires is to be treated as a human being. Is this communistic? Is this anything but human?

URGES CONTINUED PRICE CONTROL

In looking for the causes of our industrial strife, no one can deny that the first cause has been the increase in the cost of living. According to Senator MURRAY of Montana, the cost of living has risen 24 percent since 1941, and 12 to 15 percent since October 1942. But average weekly wages for all manufacturing have risen only 6.1 percent. Average weekly wages for January 1946 were actually 13.1 percent below those of January 1945. In the meantime, profits for business have been swelling beyond all proportion. Senator MURRAY says: "During the war period of 1942 to 1945, average annual corporate profits were approximately $23,000,000,000, or more than four times the average of the prewar 1936–39 period. And even after deduction of taxes, the annual average was more than $9,000,000,000, or two and a half times the comparable average for 1936–39."

In the face of this, the Price Control Act has been seriously crippled, and we have a scene of plain and ugly selfishness animating many of our manufacturers. Our clothing industry, which charges unconscionable prices for shoddy goods; the real-estate dealers, who demand and get fantastic prices from desperate men and women; the shoe manufacturers, who have been granted the license to increase the cost of cheaper shoes by 10 to 15 percent. We are subjected to the degrading tyranny of carrion who wax fat on our necessity. I should like to think that the opponents of the OPA are short-sighted and stupid, rather than malicious and selfish. But I sometimes wonder. The amended price control bill represents the triumph of naked greed over concern for the common good. The current increase in wages will vanish in the dizzy spiral of inflation. Unless OPA is strengthened, strikes and arrested reconversion will be the sure results.

MAKE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY WORK

Many men raise the Red scare of communism whenever plans for social improvement are proposed. But America has nothing to fear from communism if we have here a social order that regards man as "at the same time the beginning and the end of life in human society." People who are well fed, well clothed, and well housed are not interested in communism. If we make American democracy work, not only politically but economically and socially as well, we can conquer any ideology. Cardinal Lienart has pertinently said: "Ideologies and doctrines are destroyed not by force but by truth and by a better ideal under the condition, however, that this idea does not remain theoretical but is translated into the realities of the entire social life and the social order."

But the economic system is not the be-all and the end-all of life. It is of tremendous importance, but its importance derives primarily from the fact that it is a means to an end: which is to help man reach God. It is only too true that economic want militates against human well-being, and fills men with harassing preoccupations and anxieties. It seriously hampers his efforts toward achieving his union with God. There are exceptions, but for the majority of mankind, the consequences of material want are stunted lives and stunted souls. The continual fear and uncertainty of those whose daily bread is insecure, impede the growth of the soul. The most searing and crippling effects of economic insecurity are not in the bodies, but in the souls of men. That is why we fight for social justice. We wish to see an era of justice and charity so that men may more certainly follow the road to God.

CONDEMNS RACIAL BIGOTRY

Another problem still facing the thoughtful citizen is the explosive question of racial discrimination and prejudice. Our school children, like their elders before them, swear allegiance to the flag every day, and pray that our Nation will remain one and indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. What a mockery. Is this an indivisible Nation, with one part Negro, one part white? Is it indivisible with one part gentile and one part Jew? Perhaps a cynical smile plays about the Negro's lips as he recites the pledge, and he thinks of the lynchings by savage mobs of "superior" whites, the restrictive covenants, the second rate schools, the filthy hovels, the legal trick by which he is disfranchised in so many States of this Union, dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. And when the Jew recites the pledge, does he think sorrowfully of the lunatic fringe that would deny to him rights for which he has suffered and died?

When you think of these things, you begin to wonder if we Americans really do believe in these principles. It cannot be that we do believe. Belief in anything flows into action. Belief determines the habits of our life. In other words, we do not really believe in liberty and justice for all, but only for white, gentile Americans.

WE LIVE IN ONE WORLD

These are but a few of the problems facing us. Even if we go to work immediately to clear them up, we would find it impossible to solve them by ourselves. For we live in a world that is one; a world that is so interrelated that what happens in one country inevitably affects all other countries. Any further discussion of whether we should cooperate internationally is a criminal waste of time. We have no choice. We shall have one world or no world at all. This is the literal, stark truth. And those forces, either in this country or in any other country, which work to disunite the United Nations are the real international criminals of our day. They deserve only our contempt and opprobrium and most valiant opposition.

The United Nations Organization has been erected in a world that is already subject to the creeping paralysis of fear, suspicion, and international insecurity. But it is still an instrument of peace and order and tranquility. It is a fragile instrument, but freighted with the best hopes of all the world. It is a human instrument, but hovering over it, let us pray, is the spirit of God. It is the imperfect answer to the universal yearning for peace and safety. It can be the slaking of men's thirst for justice; it can be the allaying of men's hunger for the reign of law. But it can be none of these things, unless we realistically and wholeheartedly support it.

MUST SUPPORT UNITED NATIONS

We, the citizens of the United States, must support the UN if we wish to pursue our objectives of social justice in this country. We cannot go on our merry way, abandoning the world to its own devices. The world is too small a place now to allow this kind of madness. Physically, the world has shrunk. And whatever happens in one section has repercussions in another. Let us remember Hitler and Hirohito; for that matter, let us remember Marx. Our fondest hopes for a decent social order will never be realized unless we cooperate with other nations. If we succeed in building a society that is really just and human, the chances for such a society throughout the world are immeasurably increased.

ALL MEN ARE BROTHERS

Even more compelling than the physical reason for international cooperation is the moral reason: That all men are brothers, because God is our common Father. We cannot, therefore, remain stonily indifferent when our brothers in China, Poland, Austria, or even in Germany and Japan, are facing death by starvation. We cannot remain aloof when the innocent children of the world are suffering, for something which they do not understand and which they surely did not cause. We cannot be unconcerned when human beings anywhere, upon whom God lavished so much love, die in uncounted thousands because of famine, war, and drought. To relieve the famine in the world, we are asked to do very little. Unless we wish to go down in history as unbelievably callous, we had better do that little. If our voluntary program of famine relief does not succeed (and it is not succeeding), we should be willing to submit to rationing again. If rationing is the only way to bring food to the hungry of the world, let us graciously, with good will, accept it. It will be one of the most merciful actions we have ever done; and a solid proof of our love for our fellow men, of our unity in brotherhood.

It was of this brotherhood that Pius XII spoke when he said several years ago: "There is only one way of getting out of the meshes in which war and hate have wrapped the world; namely, a return to the solidarity, too long forgotten, a solidarity not restricted to these or those peoples, but universal, founded on the intimate connection of their destiny and rights." The atom bomb has made the words of the Pope even more apt today than when he first uttered them. If we do not live as brothers, we shall not live at all. The earth has drunk up the blood of our dead and wounded; it must, unless justice is to be frustrated, yield back this sacrifice in peace and brotherhood.

Let us, for God's sake and for the sake of humanity—let us heed this warning. Let us live as brothers; any other way of life will lead only to a common doom.

Amvets Warn That Veterans Attending Schools May Be Forced To Quit Because of the Rising Cost of Living

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

AMVETS WARN THAT VETERANS ATTENDING SCHOOLS MAY BE FORCED TO QUIT BECAUSE OF THE RISING COST OF LIVING

(By J. H. Leib)

In today's mail I received the following letter from Mr. Richard I. Moore, Michigan State Commander of Amvets; American Vet-

erans of World War II, which is self-explanatory and deserves serious consideration by the Congress. I quote:

AMVETS; AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II
MICHIGAN STATE DEPARTMENT
DETROIT, MICH., *June 19, 1946.*

Mr. J. H. LEIB,
Amvets; American eVterans of World War II, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOE: At a recent meeting of the Governors Veterans' Advisory Committee it was pointed out that student veterans were finding it difficult to get by on their subsistence allowances because of the rising cost of living and because of the possibility of the OPA going off. We believe that it may well reach the point where by next fall a veteran may not be able to live on his allowances and thereby find it necessary to drop out of school.

We would like to get some action on this matter before Congress adjourns and we are urging that an amendment to the GI bill be introduced raising the educational allowances to cover the situation.

Sincerely,

DICK MOORE,
State Commander.

Upon receipt of this communication I contacted the Veterans' Administration and was informed that they have given this matter no study whatsoever. In fact I was advised that it was a matter that must be decided by the Congress and not by the Veterans' Administration.

In this connection I desire to relate facts and figures relative to educational allowances, as follows:

Under Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, otherwise known as the GI bill of rights, a nondisabled veteran drawing no pension receives $65 per month if single, and $90 if married.

No benefits are given for children or dependents making it almost impossible for a married person to attend school.

The great bulk of veterans attending schools come under the GI bill and it is obviously becoming a terrific hardship to continue their education under existing economic conditions.

Veterans under this act are permitted to work on a part-time basis, up to and including 32 hours per week. However, many veterans have been unable to find employment while going to school.

According to official figures there are approximately 2,000,000 veterans who are presently unemployed and seeking jobs. Faced with this pool of unemployed veterans those attending schools are finding it difficult to locate part-time work.

Now under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, the story is somewhat different. The educational benefits under this law are exclusively for disabled veterans, and the payments per month are as follows:

Percent	Disability pension	Total subsistence if single	Total subsistence if married
10	$11.50	$105.00	$115.00
20	23.00	105.00	115.00
30	34.50	105.00	124.50
40	46.00	111.00	136.00
50	57.50	122.50	147.50
60	69.00	134.00	159.00
70	80.50	145.00	170.00
80	92.00	157.00	182.00
90	103.00	168.00	193.00
100	115.00	180.00	205.00

In disabled cases, if a pension added to educational subsistence allowances (single $65, married $90) is less than $105, the Veterans' Administration will make up the difference, thus making the minimum $105.

In addition, disabled veterans attending schools are permitted to work part time on the same basis as those under the GI bill.

Also they are given $10 for the first child and $7 for each additional one, and $15 for each dependent parent.

Amvets respectfully urges that the Congress and the Veterans' Administration look into this matter very carefully as soon as possible.

Relations With the Spanish Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

The members of the Third Order of St. Francis, Providence, R. I., heartily endorse the resolution adopted by the Holy Name Society of St. Augustine's Roman Catholic Church of Providence as follows:

"Whereas if Spain had not maintained neutrality during the World War, the Mediterranean life line to the British Empire and Russia, via Iran, would have been cut, the invasion of north Africa could never have taken place, and Germany and Japan would have met in India as planned, thus encircling the British Empire and Russia; and

"Whereas despite Nazi warnings, threats, and the sinking of a Spanish ship, the Spanish Government permitted 16,000 Frenchmen to flee through Spain and join the Free French in Africa; the same government evacuated 1,000 Sepharadic Jews to the haven of Spain from Axis countries; and

"Whereas through the intervention of the American Ambassador, the Spanish Government liberated 1,100 American airmen from internment in Spain and permitted them to return to their forces and also delivered to the American Embassy secret equipment from disabled American planes which the airmen had neglected to destroy; and

"Whereas Spain accorded to the Free French of north Africa full diplomatic standing and authority despite the protests of the Vichy regime and the threats of the German Government; and

"Whereas Portugal agreed to cede all the rights to the Azores to the United Nations, if Spain agreed to protect Portugal in the event of an Axis attack; Spain so agreed and stated, moreover, that it would fight to the death to protect herself and Portugal against invasion; and

"Whereas Spain helped the United Nations by cooperating with the experts of economic warfare who bought Spanish goods so that the Axis Nations could not buy them; Spain went to the extent of placing an embargo on the shipment of wolfram to Germany—an act of war against the Axis; Spain was not only neutral but adopted an attitude of cooperation with the United Nations short of actual belligerency, an attitude which the so-called neutrals, Sweden and Switzerland, never dared to adopt: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the President of the United States, the Department of State, the Congress of the United States, and the United Nations be, and the same are, hereby memorialized to adopt a policy of noninterference with Spain and the continuance of friendly relations with the Spanish Government; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Hon. Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; Hon. James F. Byrnes, Secretary of State; Hon. Edward R. Stettinius, permanent chairman of the United States delegation to the United Nations; Hon. Tom Connally, chairman of Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Hon. Sol Bloom, chairman of the House Foreign Relations Committee; Hon. Theodore Francis Green and Hon. Peter G. Gerry, Senators from the State of Rhode Island; and Hon. Aime Forand and Hon. John E. Fogarty, Members of Congress from the State of Rhode Island."

Constitution of the American Veterans Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 21 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the constitution of the American Veterans Committee, adopted at the constitutional convention of that organization in Des Moines, Iowa, June 14 to 16. The constitution of the AVC is typical of that group of World War II veterans in its high ideals and its emphasis upon democratic procedures. I believe that this group of young veterans has much to offer this country. The AVC has grown in recent months from a membership of 20,000 to more than 63,000 in 526 chapters in 44 States, and it is just embarking on a campaign for 1,000,000 members.

The Senator from Michigan and myself are cosponsors of legislation to grant a congressional charter to this organization. This newly adopted constitution serves to emphasize that this progressive group of World War II veterans should be given every opportunity to function nationally in their program for achieving a more democratic and prosperous America and a stable world.

I have secured from the Public Printer an estimate that the cost of printing the constitution of the American Veterans Committee will be $210, and that it will take up three and one-half pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Notwithstanding that, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the constitution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTION, AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE

PREAMBLE

We, as veterans of the Second World War, associate ourselves regardless of national origin, creed, or color for the following purposes:

To preserve the Constitution of the United States; to insure the rights of free speech, free press, free worship, free assembly, and free elections; to provide thorough social and economic security to all; to maintain full production and full employment in our country under a system of private enterprise in which business, labor, agriculture, and government cooperate; to promote peace

and good will among all nations and all peoples; to support active participation of this Nation in the United Nations and other world organizations whose purposes are to improve the cultural, commercial, and social relations of all peoples; to provide such aid to disabled veterans as will enable them to maintain the position in society to which they are entitled; to provide such financial, medical, vocational, and educational assistance to all veterans as is necessary for complete readjustment to civilian life; to resist and defeat all attempts to create strife between veterans and nonveterans; and to foster democracy. We dedicate ourselves to these aims, and for their attainment we establish this constitution.

Article I. Name

This organization shall be known as the American Veterans Committee, Inc., or such other name as may be adopted by the constitutional convention and approved by the proper authorities of the State of New York.

Article II. Organization

The several bodies constituting this organization shall be:

(a) The national organization which shall include:

(1) The national planning committee;

(2) The national administrative committee;

(3) The national officers;

(b) The State councils;

(c) The area councils;

(d) The chapters;

(e) Members at large.

Article III. Members

SECTION 1. The following persons shall be eligible for active membership regardless of national origin, creed, or color:

(a) Any person who serves or has served honorably on a full-time status in the armed forces of the United States at any time during the period from September 16, 1940, to the termination of the Second World War;

(b) Any citizen of the United States who serves or has served honorably on a full-time status in the armed forces of any of the other United Nations at any time during the period of such participation in the Second World War;

(c) Any person who serves or has served honorably on vessels of the merchant marine of the United States or honorably on active administrative duty in the United States Maritime Service for at least 60 days during the period from September 16, 1940, to the termination of the Second World War.

SEC. 2. Questions relating to interpretation of section 1 of this article shall be determined solely by the national planning committee.

SEC. 3. No member of this organization who shall have been accepted for membership under any bylaw adopted by this organization prior to the adoption of this constitution shall be deprived of his membership rights as a result of the adoption of this article.

SEC. 4. Active life memberships: Persons eligible for membership under section 1 of this article, who are recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor, or the equivalent award of any nation of the United Nations, shall upon application be awarded active life membership in this organization by the act of any chapter or of the national planning committee or the national administrative committee without at any time being subject to any financial obligations in connection therewith.

SEC. 5. Honorary memberships: A majority of the national planning committee only may award honorary membership in this organization to any person who has distinguished himself or herself in the performance of services to the people of the United Nations.

SEC. 6. No person shall be admitted to active membershp in this organization until he or she shall have subscribed in writing to the basic principles of this organization as set forth in the preamble to this constitution.

SEC. 7. A chapter member is one who is affiliated with a chapter of this organization. A member-at-large is one who has joined the organization but who has not become a member of any chapter or being a member of a chapter has terminating his membership with such chapter and has retained only his membership in the organization.

SEC. 8. No person eligible for membership of this article shall be denied the same unless previously ousted as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 9. A member may be suspended or ousted only if the member has deliberately engaged in activities which are contrary to the purposes of the organization or inimical to its welfare.

SEC. 10. No chapter shall oust any chapter member from membership unless such ouster is approved by two-thirds of the chapter members present at any regularly scheduled meeting following due notice of such contemplated ouster, and no member-at-large shall be ousted except by action of two-thirds of the national planning committee present at any regular or special meeting thereof following due notice of such contemplated ouster.

SEC. 11. No member shall be suspended or ousted from membership except after due notice and a fair hearing as shall be provided in the bylaws: *Provided, however,* That no such ouster of a chapter member shall become final until reviewed by the national planning committee.

Article IV. National convention

SECTION 1. The supreme power of this organization shall be vested in the membership represented at the national convention.

SEC. 2. The national convention shall be held at least once in each calendar year at such time and place as shall be determined at the previous convention, or, in the absence of such designation, at a time and place determined by the national planning committee.

SEC. 3. Delegates to the national convention shall be limited to four classes of persons:

(a) Chapter delegates.

(b) Chairmen of State councils.

(c) Members of the national planning committee.

(d) The elective national officers of this organization.

SEC. 4. (a) Elected national officers, members of the national planning committee, and chairmen of State councils shall each be entitled to one vote at the national convention, and shall not be entitled to hold proxy votes.

(b) Each chapter delegate, in addition to such proxy votes as he may hold, shall be entitled to a number of votes to be computed by dividing the total number of votes to which such chapter is entitled by the number of such chapter's delegates at the national convention.

(c) Members at large, as defined in article III hereof, not living in the area of jurisdiction of any general chapter, shall be entitled to vote by proxy in such manner as the national planning committee may determine.

SEC. 5. The national convention shall be governed by such rules and regulations as the delegates thereto, each having one vote for such purpose, may adopt.

SEC. 6. The number of delegates from each chapter shall be based on a delegate membership ratio to be determined for each convention by the national planning committee: *Provided, however,* That each chapter shall be entitled to at least 1 delegate, and that no chapter shall be entitled to more than 10.

SEC. 7. Chapter delegates to the national convention shall be elected by each chapter at a regular meeting thereof after due notice of the purpose of the meeting.

Article V. National officers and members of the national planning committee

SECTION 1. (a) The national convention shall elect a national chairman, a national vice chairman, and 16 members of the national planning committee, at least 5 of whom shall be deemed qualified by the convention's nominating committee, by reason of personal consent, to undertake the responsibility of serving on the national administrative committee.

(b) The delegates to the national convention from each of the eight regions hereinafter defined assembled in caucus at said national convention, shall nominate and elect a member of the national planning committee from the region represented by the said delegates. Said member shall be known as the regional vice chairman.

(c) The continental United States shall be divided into the following regions: New England: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut. Middle Atlantic: New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, Delaware, West Virginia, Washington, D. C. Southeast: Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Tennessee, Kentucky, Mississippi. Southwest: Louisiana, Arkansas, Texas, Oklahoma. East Central: Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois. West Central: Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota. Mountain: Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Arizona, Idaho. Coast: California, Nevada, Washington, Oregon.

SEC. 2. (a) The officers enumerated in section 1 of this article and the national planning committee shall serve for one term: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall prevent the reelection of any officer or member of the national planning committee.

(b) The word "term" as used herein shall designate the period from the adjournment of a national convention to the adjournment of the next succeeding national convention.

SEC. 3. (a) In the event of the resignation, death, or disability of the national chairman, the national vice chairman shall succeed to the office of chairman, and he shall act as national chairman in the latter's absence.

(b) A vacancy in the office of national vice chairman or on the national planning committee may be filled by any member receiving a majority of not less than one-half of the votes of the attending members of the national planning committee at any regularly scheduled meeting thereof or of any special meeting called for the purpose of filling such vacancy: *Provided, however,* That if such vacancy on the national planning committee shall be among one of the members elected in accordance with the provisions of section 1b, then such vacancy shall be filled by a member from the same region.

SEC. 4. A national treasurer, a national secretary, a national field secretary, and a national counsel shall be selected by the national planning committee.

SEC. 5. The national officers shall have such powers and duties as may be prescribed by the bylaws: *Provided, however,* That the national chairman shall be the chairman of the national planning committee and of the national administrative committee.

SEC. 6. (a) The national chairman and the national vice chairman shall serve on a full-time basis and shall be entitled to an annual salary of $8,000 and $7,500, respectively.

(b) The national secretary and the national field secretary shall serve on a full-time basis and shall be compensated for their services at rates to be determined by the national planning committee or the national administrative committee as the bylaws may provide, and the national council may be compensated in like manner for any official services rendered.

SEC. 7. The national planning committee or the national administrative committee, or

those to whom they may designate such authority, may from time to time appoint and employ such other officers, agents, or employees as may to them appear desirable, upon such terms as they may deem wise.

SEC. 8. There shall be a director of veterans affairs who shall be selected by the national planning committee and who shall, among other duties assigned to him, have full power to authorize qualifying members of the chapters of this organization to represent veterans and to handle veterans' claims before the Veterans' Administration. Such qualified members shall be authorized to render service to members in presentation of claims pursuant to laws and regulations without charge.

SEC. 9. All officers and members of the national planning committee shall have been members of this organization for a period of no less than 60 days prior to their election.

Article VI. National planning committee

SECTION 1. The board of directors of this organization shall be known as the national planning committee and shall consist of 25 members, of whom 24 shall be elected in accordance with the provisions of article V, section 1. The national chairman shall be a member of the national planning committee ex officio.

SEC. 2. The national planning committee shall have general power to manage and control the affairs, business, and property of this organization between national conventions.

SEC. 3. The national planning committee may adopt such rules and regulations for the conduct of its meetings and the management of the affairs of this organization as it may deem proper, and not inconsistent with law, the constitution, or bylaws of this organization.

SEC. 4. Regular meetings of the national planning committee shall be held quarterly. Special meetings of the national planning committee may be called at any time by the national chairman on his own initiative or at the request of any eight members of the national planning committee.

SEC. 5. After each national convention the national planning committee shall meet within 36 hours after adjournment of the convention for the purpose of transacting such business as may be necessary. Said meeting shall be held at the site of the convention.

SEC. 6. At least one-third of the members of the national planning committee shall constitute a quorum at any meeting of the national planning committee; but a less number may adjourn any meeting from time to time until the quorum shall be present.

Article VII. National administrative committee

SECTION 1. The members of the national planning committee shall elect five of its members willing and able to participate in frequent meetings at the national headquarters, who in addition to the national chairman and the national vice chairman shall constitute the national administrative committee.

SEC. 2. The national administrative committee shall be elected by a majority of not less than one-half of the national planning committee at its meeting next succeeding the national convention.

SEC. 3. Vacancies in the national administrative committee may be filled by a majority of not less than one-half of the national planning committee at any regular or special meeting thereof.

SEC. 4. All the powers of the national planning committee, so far as the same may be lawfully delegated, shall be vested in, and may be exercised by, the national administrative committee when the national planning committee is not in session: *Provided, however,* Than any action taken by the national administrative committee on matters of policy shall be subject to ratification by the national planning committee at its next regular meeting.

SEC. 5. Regular meetings of the national administrative committee shall be held at least biweekly. Subject to the foregoing, and such regulations as may be made by resolution of the national planning committee, the national administrative committee may fix its own rules of procedure and shall meet on such days and at such place or places as may be fixed by such rules. But, in every case, the presence of at least a majority of the members of such committee shall be necessary to constitute a quorum.

Article VIII. Special committees

SECTION 1. The national chairman, the national planning committee, or the national administrative committee, may from time to time appoint any standing or special committees which shall have and may exercise such powers as shall be authorized by resolution of the national planning committee or the national administrative committee.

The term of any such special committee shall be determined by the national administrative committee, whichever may authorize its existence: *Provided, however,* that the term of any committee shall not exceed the duration of the term in which it is appointed. Such committee shall designate a chairman and report through such chairman to the national administrative committee or national planning committee at such time as may be directed, and shall fix its own rules of procedure and shall meet when and as provided by such rules, but in every case, the presence of a majority of the committee shall be necessary to constitute a quorum.

Article IX. Organization of territorial units

SECTION 1. The territorial units of this organization shall consist of chapters, area councils, and State councils.

SEC. 2. State councils shall be chartered by the national planning committee or the national administrative committee and shall be composed of the chapters within their respective States, and shall have such powers as may be prescribed in the bylaws.

SEC. 3. Area councils shall be chartered by the national planning committee or by the national administrative committee and shall be composed of chapters within their respective areas of jurisdiction as from time to time defined by the national planning committee or the national administrative committee, and shall have such powers as may be prescribed in the bylaws.

SEC. 4. Chapters shall be chartered by the national planning committee or by the national administrative committee and shall be composed of such members as shall join such chapters.

SEC. 5. All charters heretofore granted are hereby affirmed.

SEC. 6. The minimum membership of any projected chapter shall consist of at least 10.

SEC. 7. No chapter shall be named after any living person.

SEC. 8. (a) Chapters in this organization shall accept for membership any member at large or any eligible applicant and shall make no distinction based on national origin, creed, or color.

(b) No member shall be a member of more than one chapter at any one time.

SEC. 9. Absolute discretion consistent with this constitution and the bylaws with respect to the granting of a charter to any Territorial unit shall vest in the national planning committee or the national administrative committee and the bylaws shall contain such provisions as may be necessary to insure democracy within such units and to provide for the fullest participation and representation of the membership therein.

SEC. 10. The national planning committee may, by a two-thirds vote of its members, revoke the charter of any Territorial unit for any of the following reasons:

(a) Deliberate attempts to obstruct or contravene the principles, purposes, and general policies of the organization as stated in the preamble.

(b) Fraudulent or illegal acts, calculated to destroy the credit or reputation of this organization.

(c) Protracted failure to hold regular meetings or to maintain a membership of at least 10 members.

SEC. 11. No charter shall be revoked except upon due notice to the Territorial unit involved and an opportunity for an adequate hearing and review.

SEC. 12. In the event of revocation of a charter, the assets of the territorial unit shall, after the payment of all debts, be appropriated by the national planning committee to be distributed among other territorial units in such manner as the national planning committee may direct, consistent with the provisions of law.

Article X. Auxiliary organizations

(a) A Women's Auxiliary of this organization is hereby created, and the national planning committee shall proceed forthwith to establish such regulations for its organization and activities as it may deem advisable to permit it to assist in the carrying out of the purposes of this organization.

(b) The national planning committee by a vote of two-thirds of the members assembled at any regular or special meeting may authorize the creation of and establish regulations for such other auxiliary organizations as it may deem advisable for the carrying out of the purposes of this organization.

Article XI. Dues and finances

SECTION 1. The revenue of the national organization shall be derived from annual membership dues and from such other sources as may be approved by the national planning committee or by the national executive committee.

SEC. 2. National dues, and the dues of all subordinate units, for each member shall become payable annually on the first day of the month in which such dues were originally received.

SEC. 3. For a member at large the national dues shall be $5 per annum.

SEC. 4. In the event that a member at large shall become a chapter member during the fiscal year, the national organization shall contribute the sum of $2 to such chapter: Such sum shall be credited by the chapter to the chapter dues of such member.

SEC. 5. For a chapter member the national dues shall be $3 per annum.

SEC. 6. The status of any member for the purposes of this article shall be determined as of the date when such member's national or chapter dues as the case may be become payable.

SEC. 7. A chapter shall collect national dues from each of its chapter members and shall remit the same promptly to the national treasurer.

SEC. 8. For a chapter member chapter dues shall be at least $2 per annum.

SEC. 9. Any chapter may fix chapter dues in excess of the minimum provided in section 8 hereof by a majority vote of its members.

SEC. 10. In no event shall any member be compelled to pay any dues or assessments to the organization or any of its Territorial units in excess of a total of $7 in any fiscal year.

SEC. 11. Any member at large or chapter member whose national or chapter dues are in arrears for 3 months shall be notified by the chapter secretary or the national secretary, whichever is applicable, and if such arrears are not satisfied within 1 month thereafter, such member shall be dropped from the rolls as a member in arrears without prejudice to reinstatement, and if a chapter member, notice shall be given to the national office.

Article XII. Public policy

SECTION 1. All public statements made and political and social actions taken in the name

of this organization shall be in consonance with the principles set forth in the preamble to this Constitution.

SEC. 2. All such statements and actions when initiated by a Territorial unit shall be identified as coming from such Territorial unit.

Article XIII. Endorsement of candidates

SECTION 1. Neither the national organization nor any Territorial unit shall endorse any candidate for public office; but this article shall not be deemed to prevent an unbiased presentation of the records of candidates nor to prevent the formation of or participation in any committee or organization endorsing or supporting a candidate for public office by members of this organization.

SEC. 2. Neither the funds of the organization nor of any of its units shall be used to support the candidacy of any person for public office.

Article XIV. Discrimination

Membership or office in or employment by this organization or any Territorial unit thereof shall in no way be conditioned upon the factors of national origin, creed, or color.

Article XV. Bylaws

SECTION 1. All presently existing bylaws consistent with this constitution or with any bylaws subsequently adopted shall continue in full force and effect unless amended or repealed by the national planning committee, the national convention, or by referendum.

SEC. 2. The national planning committee may adopt such bylaws consistent with the provisions of this constitution and with any bylaws adopted by the national convention or by referendum as it may deem necessary for the welfare of the organization.

SEC. 3. Bylaws adopted by the national planning committee may be amended or repealed by that body at any regular or special meeting thereof and any bylaw may be amended or repealed by the national convention or by referendum.

Article XVI. Initiative and referendum

SECTION 1. The national planning committee, the national administrative committee, or the membership by petition filed with the national secretary and signed by 2,000 members either personally or on their behalf by chapter chairmen signing on behalf of the total membership of their respective chapters and authorized so to do by a vote of a majority of each such chapter's members may initiate a referendum as to any of the affairs and business of the organization.

SEC. 2. Matters submitted to the membership by referendum shall be submitted by ballot to all chapters and members at large not living in the area of jurisdiction of any general chapter. A chapter ballot shall indicate its total membership and the total affirmative and negative vote of such chapter. A two-thirds' vote of the membership voting in a referendum shall be binding upon this organization.

Article XVII. Amendment of the constitution

SECTION. 1. This constitution may be amended by the national convention by a majority of the votes cast at the session of the national convention voting thereon, provided that the number of votes cast shall equal at least a majority of the total vote represented at such convention; or by referendum as provided in article XVI.

SEC. 2. No amendment shall be submitted to the national convention for its approval unless it shall have been previously approved by the national planning committee or shall be in the form of a petition filed with the national secretary and signed by 2,000 members either personally or on their behalf by chapter chairmen signing on behalf of the total membership of their respective chapters and authorized to do so by a vote of a majority of such chapter's members. Such petition shall be filed not less than 60 days prior to the date of the national convention.

SEC. 3. In the event that an amendment is proposed in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of this article, it shall be published in the national organ of this organization not less than 30 days prior to the date of the national convention.

Article XVIII. Reincorporation

The national planning committee by vote of two-thirds of its members is empowered to reincorporate this organization as a national corporation or as a corporation existing under the laws of any State and to dissolve the present corporation and upon dissolution to transfer the assets and liabilities of the present corporation to the new corporation, provided that all of the members of the present corporation shall become members of the new corporation and that all of the aforesaid shall be done only in accordance with law and the provisions of this constitution.

Article XIX. Nonprofit

No part of the earnings, income or funds of this organization shall enure to the benefit of any member or individual except that this organization may pay consideration for work, labor, or material furnished to it.

Crosses and Stars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Pilot, the official publication of the archdiocese of Boston:

CROSSES AND STARS

Sometimes old truths, when conveyed through a novel medium, take on a new freshness and conviction.

At the ninth annual dinner of the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, held Monday night at the Statler, a pageant was presented. In a darkened auditorium, a voice impersonated the spirits of three dead soldiers. One of them represented Jackie Epstein; the others were Callahan and Smith—Jew, Catholic, and Protestant. Each told how he died.

Epstein had been bringing supplies across a terrain murderous with Japanese fire. As he died, a Catholic priest tried to comfort him. Callahan, the second voice in the pageant, explained that the supplies Epstein got through at the cost of his life saved many of his comrades in the beleaguered company—but he, Callahan, was dead when they arrived. Smith had perished in the manner of his comrades, hating the dirtiness, the monotony, and the horror of war—but, since his love of liberty was stronger than his disrelish for its cost, Smith died with Epstein and Callahan.

In interludes of the narration, a white gleam from the balcony spot-lighted two crosses and the Star of David. In the finale, a light played on the wind-whipped stars and stripes of the American flag. And we do like to feel that the prettiest flag in the world is also the grandest, the most royal in its promise, the sincerest in its fulfillment.

Now something in our nature revolts at sameness. We'd weary of perfect weather if all days were sunlit from dawn to dark. We'd tire of the purest note a composer ever dreamed up—if the orchestra struck that note at the opening of the concert and held it all evening. And since few orations these days end without some reference to the "white crosses" of Normandy and Iwo Jima, audiences incline now to stir uneasily in their chairs when the dead of this war—and the debt we owe to their sacrifice—are mentioned.

That's a mistake. It's worse than a mistake. There are some "monotonies" we should discipline ourselves to endure. There are some memories which time should never be allowed to fade.

These "white crosses," whose mention is beginning to weary us, are grave markers. Star of David and the Cross of Christ, they indicate that here lies a soldier who died in battle. Epstein, Callahan, and Smith, battling it out on a bullet-riddled redoubt, weren't wondering whether Judaism is a race or a religion; Smith and Epstein weren't worrying about Vatican designs on American democracy. Their comradeship was annealed in a flame whose terror we comfortable civilians can only imagine—and we should thank God that that's as close as we came to it. Their comradeship was sealed in the grim, utterly impartial democracy of death. Together, in a completely democratic unison, their bodies will molder and dissolve. A few years from now you could uncover the graves and you'd find that death had dealt impartially with Jew and Christian, with white and Negro.

But we insist that their spirits live. And it's no irreverence to imagine—in the manner of that Monday evening pageant—that those spirits, if they could return like Hamlet's father, would beg us to learn the art of harmonious living together. Without for a moment subscribing to the nonsense that "one religion is as true as another" (because this has to mean that one religion is as false as another), it is a fact that Jew and Christian, White and Negro, we're all Americans. There's nothing in Judaism that prevents one from being an excellent American; nothing in any Christian postulate hinders the same effect. White skin; black, yellow, or green, are items of supreme insignificance—what counts is the willingness to accept the implications of the American code and integrate them into the pattern of our practical lives.

Let's keep talking about these "white crosses" and these "stars of David." Let's keep thinking about them. Let's make every day of our lives a Memorial Day. Then, perhaps, it may dawn upon us after a while that actually we do owe to these boys who died so tragically young the effort to practice in our daily living the comradeship they learned in the camps and took for granted in the hour when, on a flea-ridden Pacific atoll, they faced death side by side and in company entered the silence.

Child Welfare and Health Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted June 14, 1946, at the meeting of the executive committee of the Rhode Island Child Service:

Whereas the children of a nation constitute its wealth, its security, and its entire future; and

Whereas the present needs of the children of this and other countries require the devoted, skillful, and concerted attention of all our people; and

Whereas the great and gratifying progress made in the development of child health and welfare services in this country in the last three decades has been due in large measure to the vigorous leadership, wise counsel, and effective administration of the United States Children's Bureau: Be it hereby

Resolved, That the executive committee of the Rhode Island Child Service in attendance at its meeting the 14th day of June 1946 express their appreciation of the President's recent statement to the effect that the administration of welfare services should be raised to Cabinet rank; and be it

Resolved, That in the light of the Presidential order of May 16, 1946, transferring the major portion of the United States Children's Bureau functions and services to the Federal Security Agency, the President be urged to direct the Federal Security Administrator to conserve the integrity of services for children and to keep intact the services to crippled children, child-welfare services, and maternal and child-health services as now administered by the Children's Bureau, together with such other services to children as may later be authorized by the Congress, and that child-labor functions remaining in the Department of Labor be kept intact within one unit; it is further

Resolved, That we here record our firm conviction that only through such action will the best interests of the children of this and other nations be effectively guaranteed at this time in our history when our future lies so clearly in the hands of the oncoming generation; and it is further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives in the Congress from Rhode Island.

EDWARD L. LEAHY,
President.
CHARLES L. BURT,
Executive Director.

South Dakota Supplies a Generous Portion of Uncle Sam's Market Basket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the following 12 States comprise the region which is known as the North Central States area of this Republic: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Michigan, North Dakota, Nebraska, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. These States more than any other one contiguous group in the United States comprise the bread basket of America. They comprise the great productive farming area to which all the world is now looking for a large part of its sustenance in these days of shortages and famine.

It is therefore with pride that I call attention to the following editorial from the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus-Leader which comments upon a recent study released by George A. Starring, executive secretary of the Greater South Dakota Association. From a study of the following facts, it will be seen that South Dakota ranks near the top of the great food-producing areas of this universe. When the program of harnessing and utilizing the great waters of the Missouri River has been completed—it is now in the beginning stages of actual construction—the productivity of South Dakota will be even greater and America and all the world can share even more fully in the foods and fabrics raised in the Sunshine State.

SOUTH DAKOTA RATING IN FARM PRODUCTION

A few days ago the Argus-Leader printed some statistical information from the Greater South Dakota Association revealing the important and substantial position this State occupies in farm activities.

The GSDA now has assembled in brief form some of the high lights of the materials already presented, plus additional points.

Here are the 25 points, compiled by the GSDA, showing South Dakota's position in the North Central States:

1. Led in the reduction of farm mortgage debt, 1930–44.
2. Is first in the average value of livestock per farm.
3. Is first in the number of cattle per farm.
4. Led in the pounds of cattle produced in 1945.
5. Was first in 1945 in wool production per farm.
6. Is first in average number of acres per farm.
7. Was first in 1945 in value of rye produced.
8. Was second in the value of barley produced in 1945.
9. Was second in average harvested acreage per farm, 1934–43.
10. Was second in chickens produced per farm in 1945.
11. Is second in number of tractors per 100 farms.
12. Was third in gross State debt reduction, 1940–45.
13. Was third in value of flaxseed produced in 1945.
14. Was third in value of all sorghums produced in 1945.
15. Was third in the value of alfalfa seed produced in 1945.
16. Was fourth in average cash farm income per farm in 1945.
17. Was fourth in hog production per farm in 1945.
18. Was fourth in average value of corn production per farm in 1945.
19. Was fifth in value of oats produced in 1945.
20. Was fifth in value of all wheat produced in 1945.
21. Was fifth in 5-year average cash income per farm, 1941–45.
22. Is fifth in the number of automobiles per 100 farms.
23. Is sixth in value of land and buildings per farm.
24. Was sixth in value of sweet-clover seed production in 1945.
25. Was sixth in value of potatoes produced in 1945.

Material such as this is illuminating in the manner in which it assists South Dakotans in appreciating the value of their own State. The GSDA is to be commended for its leadership in presenting this information. And, in so doing, it supplies another potent reason why it should be supported and maintained.

The membership campaign of the GSDA, currently underway, provides an opportunity for South Dakotans to help promote and develop this work.

Legislative Reorganization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include several editorials from newspapers from Connecticut to California, commending the Congress for its efforts to improve its internal efficiency, and urging the House to follow the example of the Senate by approving the legislative reorganization bill at this session:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of June 13, 1946]

MODERNIZING CONGRESS

The La Follette bill to modernize the organization and operation of Congress has been passed by a surprising 3-to-1 margin in the Senate and sent to the House. To speed the much-needed measure toward passage in this session, certain of the more controversial items were eliminated on Senator BYRD'S motion, but the principal provisions of the reorganization proposed were readily approved by the upper Chamber.

Among the items in the omnibus bill as it went to the House were a consolidation of the functions of the overburdened standing committees, a reduction in their number from 33 to 15 in the Senate, and a limitation on the number of committees on which any Member may serve. Joint sessions of committees would be authorized, and they would be allowed larger staffs of clerical help and expert advisers. The variety of other items covered by the legislation includes a boost in salaries from $10,000 to $15,000, a pension system, provision of an administrative assistant for each Congressman, closer controls over revenue and expenditures, and closer liaison with the White House.

The urgent need for a streamlining of Congress has been increasingly apparent in recent years, and particularly in the present session. There have been repeated log jams of legislation that prevented even important measures from receiving the attention they deserved. The stop-gap draft legislation passed just before the expiration of the selective-service system is typical of the deplorable results of such time pressure. A complete renovation of the bogged-down committee system is at least a partial answer to the problem. More adequate staffs for Congressmen and for their committees should also greatly facilitate a more statesmanlike approach to legislation. The other provisions either conduce to the same end, or are desirable for other reasons.

It is ironical that the very delays that it is designed to correct in the future may prevent passage of the La Follette bill in this session of Congress. With a recess for the summer generally expected around mid-July, the measure must compete with appropriation bills, compromise legislation on the draft, and the controversial OPA extension for attention before that time. The measure passed by the Senate would provide the first general overhauling of congressional machinery in 25 years, at a time when the need is more acute than ever. It is to be hoped that the House will take time to follow the Senate's good example. To cope with the swiftly developing problems of 1946, we need something more efficient than the Congress of 1921.

[From the Journal-Every Evening of Wilmington (Del.) of June 12, 1946]

FOR BETTER GOVERNMENT

By the surprisingly large margin of 49 to 16 the Senate has approved legislation to reorganize and modernize the machinery of Congress. The result is gratifying in more ways than one. It paves the way to better and more efficient government and it also proved that the Senate is readier than most cynics had believed to overhaul its antiquated ways of doing business.

The bill does not, by any means, cover all the reforms that should be made. It does not, for instance, touch the jealously guarded system of seniority which elevates Senators to committee chairmanships solely on the dubious qualification of length of service. In order to secure its passage the bill's sponsors had to sacrifice a section ending the patronage system in appointing congressional employees.

However, the bill does provide a major overhauling of congressional procedure—the first since 1921. It would reduce the Senate's committees from 33 to 15, boost congressional salaries to $15,000, establish a pension plan for Members, impose curbs on deficit financing, and attempt to improve liaison between the White House and Capitol Hill. It would help the Members to make better use of their time by relieving them of many minor, time-consuming tasks, providing each Member with an administrative assistant, and allowing staffs of experts to the various committees.

These are all wise and needed reforms, and they will go a long way toward enabling Congress to cope with the mass of business which comes before it.

The measure now goes to the House for its concurrence and for action on amendments similarly decreasing the number of committees in that Chamber. The wisest course of the House to follow is to approve the legislation promptly after these amendments have been made.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of June 14, 1946]

AND NOW THE HOUSE

All eyes that are looking for the completion of congressional reform at the present session of Congress are now focused on Speaker SAM RAYBURN and the House Rules Committee. It is they who can transform into a reality the streamlining for which the Senate voted so overwhelmingly the other day. We are convinced that the rank and file of the House will vote for modernization of the agencies through which they must work, if they get a chance. The full responsibility of giving them that chance falls upon the Speaker and the gentlemen who control the rule-making function.

The success of the reorganization bill in the Senate may be traced in large measure to the strategy that was followed. One complete bill was submitted. Instead of being referred to a regular committee unfamiliar with its provisions, it was sent to the six Senators who had long studied the complicated task of overhauling our legislative machinery. It was that special committee headed by Senator LA FOLLETTE that quickly whipped the bill into shape and presented it to the Senate with such cogency that it could not be resisted.

Obviously, then, the same strategy should be followed in the House. In that body, too, are six men who sat through the extensive hearings of the joint committee and participated in preparation of that committee's excellent report. Only by referring the Senate bill to them for further study and filling of the gap left for the committee structure of the House will there be a fair chance of securing its enactment at the present session. If this strategy is followed, we are confident that Representative MONRONEY, vice chairman of the joint committee, will be able to pilot the bill through the House with skill equal to that of Mr. LA FOLLETTE on the Senate side.

Before this strategy can be put into effect, however, the Rules Committee and the Speaker must give their consent. We hope they properly sense the responsibility that is theirs. We hope they also realize the wrath that defeat of this vital measure would bring down upon their heads from an irate people intent on buttressing the machinery of democratic government. In this particular, the tide of progress, thank heaven, seems to be running strong. We doubt that any group can block these essential improvements in the long run. All that obstructionists standing in the way temporarily could expect to accomplish would be to bring discredit upon themselves.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of June 13, 1946]

A PROGRESSIVE SENATE

In passing, by a vote of 49 to 16, the bill to reorganize Congress, the Senate has confounded those who confidently predicted that the forthright recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress would produce little or no results at this session. Although modified in some respects, the measure as adopted by the upper Chamber is substantially in line with the report of the joint committee. Thus, it would not only reorganize congressional procedures so as to place a checkrein on deficit spending, compel registration of lobbyists, improve liaison between the legislative and executive branches, and promote more effective research and staff work, but would also reorganize 18 committee chairmen out of coveted jobs.

It was the committee reform aspect of the measure which constituted one of the more touchy issues. Yet the Senate voted to reduce, by consolidation and elimination, the number of Senate committees from 33 to 15. On another controversial issue, however—directly involving patronage "privileges"—the Senate backed down. This was on the provision to establish a merit system for appointment and promotion of congressional employees, to be administered under a central personnel department. The Senate bill calls for an increase in Members' salaries from $10,000 to $15,000 a year and for a retirement system based on contributions by the potential beneficiaries and requiring at least 6 years' service for eligibility to retire at 62. These pay and retirement benefits have long been overdue.

The Senate has left to the House the question of reducing the number of House committees. The joint committee recommended a reduction from 48 to 18, which would abolish 30 chairmanships. Simultaneous membership on different committees, too, would be limited. Opposition to these and other innovations tending to reduce traditional "rights" and prestige of the legislators already has been expressed by prominent Members of the House and a vigorous fight is predicted when the matter comes up there. It would be unfortunate if this first comprehensive effort since 1921 to modernize the national legislative machinery should fail for lack of careful consideration in the shuffle of a Congress rushing toward a July adjournment.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of June 14, 1946]

THE VITAL CONGRESSIONAL REFORM BILL

The congressional reorganization bill which the Senate has passed is probably the most important piece of domestic legislation, and undoubtedly the most significant governmental reform measure, to come before Congress in years. The overhauling is long overdue. The present congressional machinery was geared to conditions of an earlier day, when the Government's responsibilities were far fewer and simpler. Under today's conditions the antiquated procedure frequently bogs down. It is notoriously cumbersome, slow, and inefficient, with its conglomeration of committees and its outworn practices. Its rules permit serious abuses, such as the stifling of bills without according them due consideration and the exercise of excessive power by some Members in key positions. The existing legislative system is the most glaring weakness in our democratic processes.

The bill to modernize and streamline congressional operations is the outgrowth of more than a year's study by a joint committee of Congress headed by Senator LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, and Representative MONRONEY, of Oklahoma. Senator LA FOLLETTE hardly overstated the case when he said the legislation was necessary to avoid a constitutional crisis. Senator BYRD has stated a similar view in saying, "The failure or inability of the legislative branch to function efficiently constitutes one of the greatest threats now existing to our democratic institutions."

The provision which has, perhaps naturally, received the most public attention, although it is by no means the most important, is that for increasing the pay of Senators and Representatives from $10,000 to $15,000 a year. Since congressional salaries have remained unchanged for 21 years, while living costs have advanced and the special expenses of the Members have multiplied, the public should realize that they deserve an increase. We prefer $12,500 to $15,000, but we may have to accept the latter amount in order to get the bill passed.

Better compensation is essential to maintaining a high level of congressional representation. Recently a number of valued Members have resigned to accept more remunerative positions in private life. If that tendency should continue, the caliber of our Congressmen would be lowered and the country would suffer costly consequences.

The La Follette-Monroney bill also properly provides a retirement plan for Members of Congress. It permits them to contribute voluntarily 5 percent of their salaries to the Government's retirement fund. To be eligible for a pension, a Member would have to pay in that amount for at least 5 years, to have served 6 years or more in Congress, and to have reached the age of 62. This plan seems reasonable.

The most important of the numerous provisions are those for reducing the number of Senate standing committees from 33 to 15; expanding technical and administrative assistance for the legislative branch; tightening congressional fiscal controls; removing the necessity for acting separately on hundreds of routine matters, such as bills for damage claims, pensions, and building bridges; modifying Senate and House rules to expedite legislation, and abolishing special committees whose authority in many instances overlaps that of standing committees. These and other provisions constitute a thorough reorganization of the legislative machinery.

The Senate now has 33 standing and 10 special committees, with an average of six committee assignments to each Senator. It is impossible for Senators to devote the necessary time to all their committee work, or even to attend all important committee meetings. The La Follette-Monroney bill not only reduces the number of Senate standing committees by more than half, but also limits each one to 13 members, except the Appropriations Committee, which is allowed 21.

The logic of merging committee responsibilities is well illustrated in the consolidation of the Military and Naval Affairs Committees into a single Armed Services Committee. This is especially desirable in view of the President's recommendation for unification of the armed services.

The revision of fiscal procedure represents one of the most constructive reforms con-

tained in the bill. It provides for open hearings on all appropriation bills, allows opportunity for ample study of committee hearings and reports before floor consideration of appropriations, and requires estimates of receipts and expenditures for the ensuing year, with the stipulation that appropriations could not exceed estimated revenues, except after adoption of a concurrent resolution authorizing incurrence of the debt.

A long-felt need is met by the provision for an $8,000-a-year administrative assistant for each Member, to help take care of requests for constituents. This would serve the dual purpose of lightening the burden on Senators, enabling them to devote more time and attention to legislative matters, and of improving services to constituents.

Highly important also is the provision for additional expert and technical assistance for the new committees. It has often been remarked that the lack of adequate staffs of specialists seriously handicaps Congress in its dealings with governmental departments, which are well supplied with experts. When the departments appear before congressional committees, the use of specialists should not be so one-sided.

The Senate's approval of the reorganization by the surprising vote of 49 to 16 encourages the hope for favorable action by the House. The sooner this reform is completed, the better.

[From the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen of June 14, 1946]

VICTORY FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT

A Senate grown suddenly mild and tractable—if only for a time—passed Senator LA FOLLETTE'S legislative reorganization bill the other day and sent it on to the House. Few amendments, beyond protection of patronage control over Capitol employees, were attached to the legislation. Senator LA FOLLETTE reportedly had abandoned hope of action at this session, and for his last-minute victory he can thank Senator HOEY'S quick maneuvering as Presiding Officer at the time the measure came to a vote.

As a victory, and a considerable one at that, it is most of all a victory for good government. The "keystone of the arch," as the author has described it, survived Senate debate intact. Functions of the standing committees will be consolidated as directed by the bill; committees themselves would be reduced from 33 to 15, and additional help is to be provided for the staffing of both committee and congressional offices.

True, the La Follette bill had a conspicuous "sweetener." This is a provision which increases salaries in both Houses to $15,000 a year. In a time of salary and wage inflation the country will be less likely to criticize; anyhow, it seems to us, the provision is a sound one if Congress is to attract the caliber of statesmanship which thoughtful citizens have been demanding.

The real weight of the "keystone" is in the section of the bill which restricts the number of committees and reassigns their functions. Woodrow Wilson, in what was perhaps an understatement, called the committee system as it has existed "an odd device of disintegration." The system gave its poorest exhibition in wartime when duplication and confusion became an administrative scandal. The restricted standing committees will obtain additional research and "expert" personnel, while the Members themselves each will have the services of an $8,000 a year administrative assistant. The plaintive observation of Senator BRIDGES is all too pertinent in this last respect. "In my 10 years in Congress," he remarked as he voted for the La Follette bill, "I have seen man after man die from just one thing—overwork."

The House has its own version of the La Follette bill, a companion piece sponsored by Representative MONRONEY. It, in turn, would "streamline" the House. Quick action on this phase of legislative reform would be the best assurance to the people that Congress is serious about reforming itself.

[From the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette of June 1, 1946]

NOW FOLLOW THROUGH

Recommendations of a joint committee for the streamlining of antiquated congressional procedure at last have been placed before the Senate in bill form, after a painstaking study that was the first of its kind in 25 years.

The far-reaching bill includes some things that undoubtedly will receive near unanimous support and some that will be fought, but the sponsors were aware of that when they introduced it.

They will push for passage of the bill in its entirety, with the thought that the provisions that should be popular with Congressmen, such as the voluntary retirement program and the salary increase for Senate and House Members, will carry along those to which resistance would be stronger.

The bill represents a good start toward the ultimate objective of bringing congressional procedure up to date. But it does omit at least two possible provisions, probably because the joint committee felt that to include them would jeopardize the chances of the entire bill.

One of these is the revamping of the system of seniority which at present puts a premium on length of service rather than on ability, although in some cases, admittedly, the two go hand in hand. The other is an attempt to make over the powerful House Rules Committee which, for all practical purposes, is the House, since that committee can virtually determine on what the House will and will not act.

The reorganization of Congress is long overdue. That the attempt to reorganize has been so long in coming does not reflect to the credit of Congress. Passage of the bill will reflect partial credit because it will be only a partial job.

Congress is headed in the right direction but the job will be completed only when all of the outmoded practices are overhauled and kept up to date.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times of June 11, 1946]

CONGRESS NEEDS REORGANIZATION

The Senate's prompt action in passing the Congressional reorganization bill yesterday crossed up the skeptical observers and raised hopes for the measure to be enacted into law before Congress recesses thir summer.

In view of the record no one will seriously question the pressing need for this legislation as pointed out in a special committee report by Senator LA FOLLETTE, who introduced the bill in the Senate. The report urged action on the bill before the summer recess with the warning that Congress faces an imminent breakdown unless its machinery is modernized.

In large part this bill, as was the report of the joint committee, is the result of research by Representative MONRONEY (Democrat), of Oklahoma, who blames the inability of Congress to function properly on too many committees and on its inability to command the services of experts of its own choosing. The latter defect results in Congress being nose-led by experts employed by the various executive departments, each of which has an ax to grind.

The bill reduces the number of Senate committees to 16 from 38; of House committees to 18 from 48; and it forbids the creation of special committees. This latter provision is dubious, since such useful committees as that on un-American activities would be ruled out. Another special committee that did useful work, but could not have been created under the new set-up, was the Truman Committee on War Expenditures. True, some special committees such as the La Follette Committee on Civil Liberties have been so biased and prejudiced that they have done far more harm than good; but the rough must be taken with the smooth. In general, special legislative investigating committees have been a valuable arm of the Government.

The new committees are to be provided with research staffs, which are much needed, with administrative assistants, and with better legislative counsel so that bills may be better drafted.

One drastic provision is for registration of lobbyists, which will require the naming both of the agents and of the principals they represent, and the contributors to their funds. Full disclosure as to these pressure groups could not be objectionable to any legitimate interest. Not all lobbying is improper, by any means; some of the most valuable information Congress gets is furnished by those who are directly interested in the legislation before it. But Congress is entitled to know who favors or opposes legislation, and why. The public is also entitled to know.

The bill proposes an increase in congressional salaries to $15,000, and extension of civil-service pensions to Members of Congress, to take effect with the next Congress.

It hits at riders to appropriation bills, a vicious practice with no legitimate excuse.

There are other provisions designed for smoother operation of the Congress; and in general it seems to be a pretty good bill. Congress has not overhauled its methods since 1893, though some reforms of the House rules have been forced through. About the only change in the Senate has been adoption of an almost dead-letter cloture rule. It is time and past time something was done.

The House, according to Washington reports, has been waiting to see what the Senate would do on the reorganization measure. Since the Senate is willing to streamline the procedure, the House presumably will go along. In any event the Senate is now putting it up to the House to act and it is to be hoped that the House will not sleep on this opportunity.

An Approach to Progressive Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by the former Under Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Abe Fortas, at Southwestern College, Memphis, Tenn., June 3, 1946.

I recommend this speech to the Members of the House for close study. As Mr. Fortas says, "We cannot alone create a new and better order for the world, even if we had the genius and the will to do it. World peace and progress must of necessity be based upon compacts with other nations and other peoples, and particularly with the Russians. The critical issue for us in world affairs, then, is whether, without surrendering the essentials of justice and decency, we can arrive at a mutually satisfactory compact with other nations, and with Russia."

Mr. Fortas in his speech at Southwestern College has contributed some constructive thinking which I believe is in the right direction. The right direction for me is peace in the future and a democratic world.

Since I left Southwestern 16 years ago, I have followed its development with the keen interest and solicitude which affectionate remembrance inspires. I have seen Southwestern survive perilous turns in the road, and I have seen it grow stronger. I have watched the college become an integral part of the life of the community which it serves, sharing its activities, contributing to its culture, and commanding its allegiance and support.

An institution of higher learning in the South faces a peculiar challenge. It serves and is served by a culture which in economic and social terms is old, as we count age in this country. Here in the South we no longer have the virgin soil or the malleable institutions of a frontier land. A college of the South, therefore, cannot cut its cloth entirely to its own taste. A community pattern is here, always to be taken into reckoning.

But the existing pattern does not present the challenge. It is easy enough for an individual or a college to fit into the pattern of what is—or rather, what seems to be. The challenge is posed by a new kind of frontier—the frontier created by the technical revolution which our science and skill has brought about, and by the political, economic, and social revolution which is impending in this country and throughout the world. What is happening in the community of the South, of which Southwestern is a part, is change—drastic, revolutionary change. Upon the pattern of the past, the events of today and tomorrow, like jagged lightning, are beginning to trace their burning trail.

Indeed, I venture to say that the impact of the changes which lie ahead is likely to be felt first and most violently in the South. Perhaps that sounds paradoxical: that in this comparatively old civilization the shock of new facts will first and most violently be felt. But, if it is paradoxical, it is paradox which is world-wide. Throughout the world, the frontiers are no longer the new lands; they are the old civilizations. The Middle East of Biblical story, China, and Russia are now the outposts of mankind's struggle. Their ancient histories are being written anew in the sweat and hunger of their people, in the ugly degradation and the magnificent aspiration of man.

So, in the South and in our own delta country, there are rumblings and upheavals in the soil that has been so well tilled. Throughout our Southland, the cool, stately mansions of a few generations ago are crumbling, one by one. They were not built to withstand the tractor's earth-shaking violence. And at the same time the tenant's shack is being pulled into the dust. It was not built to withstand the volcanic eruption of man's aspirations, set loose by the powerful chemistry of man's knowledge of nature and man.

A new world is being born about us. How different is Memphis today from the city of 16 years ago. This great, thriving industrial metropolis is no longer a community of the storybook South. Many of the old and lovely folk-ways it has retained; but it has of necessity acquired some of the harsh aggressiveness which the machine exacts of its so-called masters. From the new economy, new folk-ways necessarily proceed. With economic change, social and political adjustments inevitably come.

And how different, too, is the world of today from that of 16 years ago. Today the world is in the grip of terrible famine. Today over the entire earth the specter of fascism, oppression, and violence stalks again, treading the very fields in which its victims, conqueror and conquered, lie side by side.

It is true that hunger was with us 16 years ago; it is true that in those days the ugly rise of fascism had become manifest. But the menace of these scourges now has a new and dreadful urgency; an urgency which arises from the fact that conflict today has a new horror; man's skill at human destruction has reached a point of ultimate perfection. And man's lack of wisdom to avoid the use of these weapons of destruction threatens the very existence of the human race.

Man's technology has so far outstripped man's sociology that we are like a child who knows how to kill but is completely ignorant of the sixth commandment. And in the application of our technical knowledge we have shown astounding genius. Buck Rogers is truly obsolete. But at the same time, in the application of the little that we know of the social sciences we are still retarded infants.

In our domestic economy we have the technical skills to produce a wealth of goods sufficiently great to raise the standard of living of all of our people, and, indeed, of a large portion of the people of the world. Our scientific and industrial genius is such that we can produce in stupendous volume food, clothing, shelter, machines, radios, and all the thousands of articles of comfortable modern living. But strangely, this amazing technical knowledge and ability seem to be greater menace than blessing, because we know that one of these days, sooner or later, they will result in gigantic unemployment which in turn will lead to social and political unrest.

In the world distances have been conquered. It is almost as easy to talk with Paris or London or Copenhagen as it is to talk with someone in New York. A long week-end visit to the British Isles or Latin America is not merely a possibility, it is now a moderately frequent occurrence. The wonderful things and the wonderful people of any nation in the world are accessible to any other nation in a matter of hours.

But in the world, as within our own country, these marvels of man's skill have resulted not so much in prideful joy as in trembling fear and suspicion. We know that the airplane that can transport the wondrous beauty of perishable flowers from one continent to another can also carry a load of deadly atomic bombs; and we know that it will carry bombs or flowers with equal precision and similar disdain.

The inescapable conclusion then is that man's social intelligence is woefully and perhaps fatally deficient. He is demonstrating a marvelous capacity to utilize good things for bad purposes and to fail fully to reap the benefits of his own invention.

It is in the international situation that we are all most sharply aware of the critical stage of this maladjustment. We see on the one hand a fearful race to exploit the death-dealing properties of atomic energy. We see on the other hand a clash of increasing bitterness between the two great powers of the world—the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. To many of our people this clash seems to be the prelude to the most devastating war that the world has ever seen, and to many it seems that to avert this war is a hopeless endeavor.

With these prophets of inevitable doom, I am unwilling to agree. We cannot and we must not admit that war is inevitable—whether it be the infernally destructive conflict of international warfare or the corrosive combat of domestic strife. It is true that domestically the problems seem simpler because they are primarily within our own control. Given the intelligence and the courage, there is no force outside of the boundaries of this country which makes impossible the solution of conflicts among our own people; between Negroes and whites, capital and labor, the rich and the poor.

But internationally we are not to the same degree masters of our fate. We cannot alone create a new and better order for the world, even if we had the genius and the will to do it. World peace and progress must of necessity be based upon compacts with other nations and other peoples, and particularly with the Russians. The critical issue for us in world affairs, then, is whether, without surrendering the essentials of justice and decency, we can arrive at a mutually satisfactory compact with other nations and with Russia.

There is no time to waste in arriving at an agreement with Russia. Our bitter, acrimonious conflict has reached the point where the United Nations is becoming little more than a Madison Square Garden in which the people of the various nations can watch the desperate fight for the championship of the world. In fact, if not in form, the United States and the Soviet Union have withdrawn from the United Nations. The formal withdrawal of Russia is now foreseeable.

We cannot, of course, bid for peace at any price. We will not, of course, give to Russia or anyone else a blank check. But we must not insist for ourselves that which we would deny to others. We must hope and insist that Russia will do all that she can to terminate the desperate and dangerous debate which is taking place. But, at the same time, we must make sure that we are doing our utmost to arrive at an agreement and to assure the peace and progress of the world.

I do not think that we have done all that can be done toward this end. I do not think that in the world of today the policy of our Government has provided the dynamic force toward the creation of a stable and beneficent world which is required of us because of our position as the greatest power on earth. And within our own country, I do not think that we can correctly say that we have done all that we should do to resolve the tensions and conflicts—economic and social—which exist among our own people.

I think that there is a common basic reason in both international and domestic affairs why we have not done all that might be done to avoid difficulty and disaster. We have allowed ourselves to be dominated by the single objective of maintaining the status quo. We have been afflicted by the malignant disease of status quoitis. We have allowed ourselves to slide into the position of the man who is determined to defend to the death a hovel of sticks and stones, unmindful of the fact that the foundations are crumbling and the waters of the ocean are seeping through.

We have been prosperous, comparatively secure, well fed, comfortably housed, and blessed with a large measure of the good things of life. Domestically, the years since 1933 have been years of prosperity—a volume of prosperity which has overwhelmed the growing cry for social and economic recognition of our people who are in an inferior status in our scheme of things. Internationally, our lot has been cast with those who have enough land, enough resources, and not too many enemies. Change has not appeared to be to our advantage. On the contrary, it has seemed to threaten the existing state of affairs in which we enjoy comfort and a relative degree of security.

We are, in short, the aristocracy of the world, fearful and naturally opposed to drastic revision. And within our own borders so many of us have been secure and prosperous that we, too, have become insensitive to the clamor for revision of those who are less fortunate, and whose ranks will grow with tremendous rapidity if and when there is another serious depression. We have shut our minds to the truism that the fortunes of those who have are dependent upon the welfare and the security of those who have not.

Internationally, our insistence upon the maintenance of the status quo, by and large, has come into sharp conflict with the assaults which the Russians have launched on the state of things as they are. In their eager search for ideological and physical security, for resources and power, the Russians have too often been rash and intemperate. They have felt that our insistence upon the maintenance of the status quo amounted to a policy of maintaining in power the degenerate states and governments of a Fascist era, whose primary objective, they assert, is to crush the Soviet Union.

I believe that the Russians grievously misconceive the motivation of our policy. I do not believe that we are deliberately supporting those bent upon the destruction of the Soviet Union. I do not believe that we are deliberately seeking to maintain in power the derelict representatives of European fascism. But on the other hand I do not believe that our policy as yet fully reflects the fact that titanic changes are taking place in the world; that the people are on the march; and that it is hopeless and reckless to seek to make a compact with them and the Soviet Union in terms of a world that no longer exists, or to seek to win their allegiance to a theoretically free way of life, based upon their ancient misery and degradation.

Perhaps the basis of a livable world may lie somewhere between the two; between the headlong, heedless rush of the Soviet Union to disrupt and dominate the world, and the steadfast, rockbound insistence of the United States upon the maintenance of the world as it is—or even as it was before the war. And I suggest that we are not justified in sulking in our tent and in blaming our failures on any other nation until we have adjusted our vision and our policies to the facts of the world of today and tomorrow—a world in which the people are on the march in a desperate search for a better life. We cannot and we will not agree to a world dominated by the Soviet Union or any other nation, but we cannot and we should not offer as our alternative the dismal prospect of degenerate governments and desperate peoples, cowering or blustering within the confines of their ancient walls.

Democracy does not demand this negativism. Democracy is not impotent. Democracy does not require that we offer to people only the impossible alternative of working out their own destiny, sink or swim.

This is not democracy and it is not liberalism or realism. And certainly in the world of today our insistence upon maintaining the drab and miserable status quo cannot compete with the dynamic promise—however unpleasant it may be to us—of communism. The people of the world are sick. We are like the physician who approaches them and says that he will give them enough food to keep them alive, and the Russians are like the physician who says that if they will take his prescription he will make them well and sturdy—better than ever.

In short, we must be willing to participate actively and aggressively in the making of a new world. We must be willing not merely to insist that the people of Fascist and semi-Fascist countries select their own governments. We must give positive help in the selection of progressive, democratic, and able governments which will operate in a free world for the advancement of their people. We must be willing not merely to send them food, laudable as that is; we must help them by loans, goods, skill and trade opportunities, to build up their own economies and improve the living standard of their people. We must not merely insist upon democracy's bill of rights. We must take positive measures to enable the people of these nations to secure the economic basis of democracy and to realize its full benefits in terms of a better and freer life. And we must not adamantly insist upon the preservation of familiar boundary lines upon the map, upon the sharp separation of people by those lines, or upon the divine right of ancient governments. We must not so cherish the customary as to refuse always to support that arrangement which is best for the people concerned. We must pitch our policy in terms of people, not of governments.

Nonintervention in the internal affairs of other people has its place in our foreign policy, but its place is not the devastated nations of the world in which we have already intervened by force and violence. We must put our weight in each instance behind those political arrangements which will accomplish the most for the people concerned, and behind those economic arrangements which will produce the best living for the greatest number. We cannot cling doggedly to the status quo because what exists today surely cannot survive and we are likely to be endangered by its crash.

It seems to me that our domestic problem and specifically the problem of the South must also be dealt with positively. We must be wise and bold enough to take affirmative measures before our problems overwhelm us. We must not fall into the trap of assuming that what is must be divinely right, and must at all costs be protected from change. We must seek a full understanding of the forces that are at work in this country, of the tremendous upsurge of the aspirations of the common man. We must realize that in this country of ours the democratic and constitutional promises of opportunity for liberty and the pursuit of happiness are not the exclusive possessions of a few. They are the rights of all.

On the economic front we must bring ourselves fully to accept the basic doctrine of Franklin Roosevelt: that the Nation as a whole has an inescapable responsibility for each of its people: a responsibility to afford them the opportunity to earn a decent livelihood on a scale which increases as the economy prospers. The laborer is worthy of his hire, and he who is willing to labor is worthy of an opportunity to earn his hire.

For what lies immediately ahead, each of us has an inescapable responsibility. Community problems and the problems of the world to a substantial degree come down to a question of the attitude of individuals and the relations of individuals, one with another. Responsibility and the challenge and the opportunity of an institution like Southwestern, strategically located as it is, are indeed great. The individuals who emerge from Southwestern are and should be the leaders in their communities, and that means that they have a responsibility to their town and country and the world. They are among the people who will bear the shock of active participation in the making of tomorrow's nation and tomorrow's world.

It is not necessarily the responsibility of Southwestern to participate in the front lines of the battles that lie ahead; but it is Southwestern's responsibility—and that of every institution of learning, every church, and every place in which men assemble—to help to prepare them to fight the good fight. That means that Southwestern must not and cannot devote itself merely to ar understanding of the past. It must attempt to read the future as it reads the past. It must deal with tomorrow's problems as well as those of yesterday. Its primary task and its great opportunity is to teach those who enter its walls the principles to which Southwestern has dedicated herself: of compassion, of understanding, and of justice; and by teaching them to understand—with compassion and fairness—to enable them to cope with the problems of an agonized world.

The South has produced more than its share of leaders in business, politics, education, religion, and the professions. Unhappily, most of them have felt it necessary to leave the South for their education and training, and once having left it, they have not returned. To a substantial extent, the South has been in the position which Scotland was reputed to occupy as the place from which England drew men and brains to rule the British Empire. This was good for the empire, but not very Scotch of the Scotch.

With vital and progressive education in the South; with a progressive and courageous attack upon its economic, political, and social problems; with a willingness to discard infatuation with the past and to rid itself of status quoitis, the greatness of the past and the promise of the future can be put to the service of the people and the world. This is a task in which Southwestern can substantially share. It has been firmly launched and dedicated to the service of mankind. It has devoted itself to the cause of understanding and cultivation of the spirit and conscience as well as the mind. Given the support of its community, given a cortinuation of the vigilant and sympathetic leadership that it has had under Dr. Diehl and his associates, it can assume an increasingly important role in the South and the Nation.

I cannot conclude this statement without telling you that of the many pleasant things that have come my way during the past years, I most highly prize the invitation to speak to you today. I feel a deep debt of gratitude to Southwestern; to Dr. Diehl, Dr. Kelso, Dr. Johnson, Dr. Davis, the Drs. Townsend, and to others who have meant so much to me, not only because of their precepts but by their example. And I feel, and shall always feel, the closest ties with this city and with its fine people. In particular, I hope that I may express my deep gratitude to Southwestern's good friend and my friend and benefactor, Hardwign Peres. His example, and that of his brother, the late Chancellor Israel Peres, have meant much to me during the strenuous years since I left school. And may I say, finally, that I shall always prize my association with this fine college, which, under the leadership of Dr. Diehl, has so well served its great purpose.

The Spruce Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I addressed the House on the subject of the Spruce Corporation. This is an organization which was formed in August of 1918 in the Pacific Northwest for the purpose of procuring airplane spruce for ourselves and our allies. I am advised that the original appropriation for this organization was in the sum of $23,500,000. Liquidation was undertaken in 1922 by court action and it has still not been terminated. Under the current appropriation bill it is provided that not to exceed $10,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of this agency until January 1947, when its functions shall be taken over by the War Department officers and employees, who shall receive no additional compensation for their duties.

I call this to your attention as a review of the facts and of the statements which I made during the consideration of this legislation when it was pending the other day.

However, it is my purpose today to call attention to an item which I have just noticed in connection with the operation of this corporation and which seems unwarranted to say the least. I am reading from the Corporation Supplement of the Budget for the fiscal year of 1947, on page 438. Under schedule B, entitled "Administrative Expenses," you will notice that there were four people employed in the fiscal year of 1945 and the same number estimated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946. These four consist of a president, receiving $7,152 per year, a secretary of the corporation at $6,600 per year, a stenographer and a chauffeur. Under the budget figure of actual expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, this chauffeur was paid the sum of $1,800 per year and for this year the sum of $1,450 for 7 months' service.

I have often wondered about the innumerable chauffeurs that I have noticed driving Government cars all over Washington, but this particular case is beyond my understanding. Here we have a Government corporation, whose reason for existence terminated on November 11, 1918, and 28 years later we find it still unliquidated, having two officers, a stenographer and a chauffeur. A chauffeur is a nice luxury to be able to afford, but I hardly think that the taxpayers of this country, or a Government corporation, are in a position to furnish one. It is interesting to note that a chauffeur is not provided for in the future. None should have been provided for in the past.

If this situation is any forerunner of what we may expect of the liquidation of the billions of dollars of agencies set up during this war, I am afraid that none of us shall live long enough to see it accomplished. I hope that is not the case.

Food Relief for Suffering Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

The following resolution was adopted at the one-hundred and fifty-sixth annual session of the Rhode Island Episcopal Convention, held in the Cathedral of St. John, Providence, R. I., on Tuesday, May 21, 1946:

"Whereas the good estate of peoples everywhere is a conscience obligation on Christians; and

"Whereas millions of people in Europe and Asia face death from starvation and exposure unless we send help: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*—

"1. That the Rhode Island Episcopal Convention of 1946 urges upon all citizens the moral obligation to sacrifice in the consumption of food needed by our brethren overseas;

"2. That we advocate the reestablishment of food rationing in this country if such a step is necessary for the relief of suffering Nations;

"3. That we commend in particular the opportunities for the exercise of Christian charity through the Emergency Food Collection on behalf of UNNRA, through the Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief, and through the Overseas Relief Center sponsored by the Rhode Island Council of Churches; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this action be brought to the attention of the congregations of the diocese and communicated to the Senators and Representatives of this State and in the Congress of the United States."

The Importance of Making English a World Language

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, on July 8, 1943, I inserted in my remarks a review of the work done by the Committee on World Literacy and Christian Literature, Frank Charles Laubach, Ph. D., director, in a war on world illiteracy through short phonetic alphabets. This Committee on World Literacy has caused the teaching of over 90 nationalities, previously illiterate, to read, write, and print their own languages.

On the 26th of April 1945, the Legislature of Oklahoma by unanimous vote memoralized Congress approving the plan of the World Language Foundation to abolish illiteracy, and among other things to make English a world language.

In support of this petition of the Oklahoma Legislature, I ask permission to insert as part of my remarks a letter recently written by the foundation to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor.

The plan to make English a world language was fully presented to the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from Oklahoma in the present Congress on February 3, 1945, and was unanimously approved and sponsored by them.

I trust that the Members of Congress will appreciate the importance of making English a world language and the efficacy of the plan proposed.

Increasing world production of goods and services means a world of abundance and means increasing the purchasing power of money paid for wages and correcting the instability of money by war inflation.

It means stabilizing peace proposed by the Charter of the United Nations.

It means human understanding and a feeling of genuine world good neighbor policy.

In this connection I would like to print in the RECORD, a letter from former United States Senator Robert L. Owen, who has long been an advocate and a pioneer leader in this program.

Senator Owen's letter to the Committee on Education and Labor of the Senate follows:

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: Making English a world language.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Accept my thanks for copy of letter written you by Hon. ELMER THOMAS, of Oklahoma, transmitting the memorial of the Oklahoma Legislature approving the global alphabet and the work done by the World Language Foundation.

I think it important to call your attention to the extreme pains taken to indicate the value of the global alphabet in accordance with the opinion of linguists and men with official and governmental responsibility.

The plan to make English the world language with the global alphabet has been submitted to the Senators and the Congressmen representing the State of Oklahoma in the present Congress. They unanimously indorsed it on the 10th of February, 1945. The memorial submitted to you from the State of Oklahoma, unanimously passed by the legislature April 26, 1945, was sponsored by a large number of linguists of distinction. The legislature numbered 581 public officials.

President Roosevelt submitted the matter to his representative, Jonathan Daniels, who received a report from a representative of the United States Office of Education, Dr. R. R. Lowdermilk, July 3, 1944. That report, favorable in principle, is now at Hyde Park. On the advice of that report, the plan was submitted to many universities and to very many linguists, including Mario A. Pei, New York, and 60 of his collaborators in the preparation of texts covering 14 languages.

I enclose three recent letters, one from Rev. Frank C. Laubach, Ph. D., who has taught over 90 nationalities to read and write their own language, in which he says:

"The Honorable Robert L. Owen informs me that he is endeavoring to secure the commendations of the global alphabet and the plan for teaching English by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor.

"I have repeated many times my judgment that the global alphabet is the best yet devised. I have great admiration for Robert Owen and am glad that he is not giving up his cause."

Dr. Shou Hsin Liang in his letter of June 7, 1946, says:

"I was pleased yesterday to have Dr. Meade read me 16 pages of the Chinese Phrase Book written in the global alphabet, and which I had no difficulty in interpreting as she read it. Considering that Dr. Meade has had no instruction in pronouncing Chinese and pronounced the Chinese words entirely from the global symbols, I consider this the best possible proof of the efficacy of the global alphabet in writing Chinese."

I have a letter of May 28, 1946, from Mr. E. C. Ropes, head of the Russian Division in the Department of Commerce, emphasizing the efficacy of the global alphabet as a means of enabling the people of Russia to understand the dialects of each other as printed, as follows:

"As you know, I have been engaged for over 20 years in studying all phases of the Russian situation, and have among other subjects been particularly interested in the languages, not only of the Slavs themselves, but also of the national minorities. In this connection, I have been impressed by the difficulty that arose from the lack of a common alphabet of all the nationalities inhabiting the U. S. S. R., a difficulty that has not been removed by the efforts of Soviet linguistic scholars to create and substitute new alphabets.

"Because of the importance of a common method of written and spoken intercourse between the nationalities of the U. S. S. R., I have been impressed by the possibilities offered by your global alphabet, which would readily remove many of the hardships now existing in such communication. After careful study, I believe that your global alphabet provides a quick and intelligent system for eliminating the language barriers that now exist in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, thus producing a cultural unity which, as an adjunct to the political and economic unity achieved during the war, can be of great value to all the inhabitants of the country.

"I wish you all success in publicizing the global alphabet, and in securing the adoption of this alphabet by many countries as promptly as possible."

The enthusiasm with which the work of Dr. Laubach teaching illiterates has been received on the Western Hemisphere is set forth in detail in chapter 8 of his recent publication of the Silent Billion Speak, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the instance of Hon. JERRY VOORHIS, of California. (See Appendix of the RECORD, p. A2906.)

I pray you, as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, to have a suitable response made to the memorial of the citizens of Oklhoma at this session of Congress, in order that it may be submitted to the authorities of the United Nations and the general assembly meeting in September, next.

Personally, I have given thousands of hours and employed many people, with the objective of making English a world language and making available to the world our printed record now available, teaching thousands of skills and occupations by which the American people create modern commodities and render service to each other.

I submit this petition to you in support of the principles of human brotherhood and in the name of Him who taught it.

With kindest personal regards.

Your friend,

ROBERT L. OWEN,
President, World Language Foundation.

OPA Is Wrong Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY L. TOWE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial published in the Herald-News, Passaic, N. J., under date of June 19:

WHITE SHIRTS AND STUFFED SHIRTS

Three weeks ago R. H. Macy & Co. advertised 20,000 white shirts, priced at $4.98. To the surprise of Macy's executives, no rush of buyers resulted. Two weeks later the department store offered white shirts of substantially the same quality, but priced a dollar lower, at $3.98. Even that offering brought no surging crowds, and a vice president of the store made the observation, "The sellers' market in white shirts is about over."

With high disregard of mercantile experience, the Office of Price Administration announced in Washington this week that low-priced men's shirts will go up from $2.50 to $4.50 if Congress abolishes OPA's maximum average price regulation by the end of this month.

The stuffed shirts who run OPA are simply trying to scare the public again, in order to keep their paralyzing hold on the economy of the country. When they say that women's $5.95 dresses will shoot up to $25, once maximum average price controls are lifted, they are talking through their hats. They don't know, nor do the manufacturers of the cloth know, what temporary levels may be reached.

If OPA was abolished and all its regulations tossed out—lock, stock, and barrel, with the exception of rent controls, which could be handled just as effectively by State legislation—there probably would be a flurry of high prices for several weeks or a month, but when the public refused to buy at such prices, and when industry (free of OPA's strangling grip) got into real production, prices would come down and goods would be available in quantity. Some prices would never reach their old lows, because of wage increases granted during the past year, but unhampered production and the efficiencies that tremendous volume make possible would bring prices down to what they should be.

Bills before both Houses of Congress propose abolition of maximum average price regulations. Their passage this month seems certain.

This is how OPA's maximum price regulation worked: The woolen mills of the Passaic area were compelled to keep their average prices down to a level 4 percent below the average prices of a basic period. But wages went up 40 percent, and material costs rose. So, to keep within the average set by OPA and keep operating, the mills were compelled to manufacture more light goods, which go into women's wear, and for which there is less demand, and to produce less heavy goods, which go into men's wear, for which there is more demand.

With the maximum average price regulation removed, the mills can swing into volume production of men's wear, to supply an eager market. What the OPA bureaucrats don't tell the public is that the price of each individual fabric still will be controlled by MPR order 163. Volume production with resultant economies will enable the mills to do business profitably.

Vermont Leads New England In the Production of Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, milk production is one of the vital questions of the day, in view of the great reduction of dairies due to the feed shortage. You will be interested to learn what Vermont has accomplished, as shown by the following statement appearing in the Evening Banner, Bennington, Vt., June 19, 1946, which I am including as an extension of my remarks:

VERMONT'S COWS LEAD NEW ENGLAND IN PRODUCTION OF MILK—BUT GRAIN FEEDING IN STATE SHOWS MARKED DECREASE, ACCORDING TO REPORT

Vermont cows led the New England area in average daily milk production as of June 1, according to the Federal Crop Reporting Service. Average output on that date, the estimate indicates, was 20.9 pounds, 1.1 pounds above the 10-year average for June 1, but 0.8 pound below the figure for a year ago.

Grain feeding in the State shows a sharp drop from the same time in 1945, reflecting the shortage of feeds, but is still a sixth heavier than the 10-year average. On June 1 this year the average producing cows received 4.2 pounds of concentrates, or a little more than a pound for each 5 pounds of milk produced. Last year the figure was 5.5 pounds per cow per day, while the 10-year average from 1935 to 1944 was 3.6 pounds.

As has also been true in the past, almost seven-eighths of the State's cows were in milk on June 1, a higher proportion than in other New England States where, although summer production is always high, more progress has been made toward leveling out the year's production by increasing the percentage of fall-freshening cows. The percentage of cows milking June 1 this year was 86.2, compared to 87.3 in 1945 and a 100-year average of 87.3. No other New England State had as many as 83 percent of its cows in milk on June 1 this year.

Milk production in New England as a whole averaged 20 pounds per cow, according to the June 1 reports of many New England dairymen, and although 4 percent below the June 1 average of 20.8 pounds last year, was 4 percent above the 10-year (1935–44) average for June 1. Milk production per cow increased 14 percent during May, or a little more than the 10-year average increase of 13.3 percent.

The feeding of grain and concentrates averaged 4.46 pounds per cow, 18 percent less than the average of 5.45 pounds reported on June 1 a year ago and the lowest for June 1 since 1942. The reported average is still above the 10-year average of 4.27 pounds. Many farmers have been unable to secure grain in desired quantities for feeding to dairy cows.

Milk production on June 1 was favored by excellent pastures which improved considerably with the warmer weather and adequate moisture supplies during May.

Demand for feedstuffs continued urgent through the month of May. Wheat millfeeds became more difficult to obtain because of the sharp reduction in output resulting from the shortage of wheat. Oilseed meals were also scarce although production was about equal to the large output of the past two seasons.

Prices for wholesale feeds at the Boston market on June 4 were from $10 to $14 per ton higher than a month ago with the exception of distillers dried grain which were unchanged. The average price paid by farmers of the United States for 16-percent mixed dairy feed on May 15 was $3.31 per hundred, 19 cents higher than on April 15, and 44 cents higher than a year ago.

Debts of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1946

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, while the debts of World War I and the proposed Anglo-American financial agreement are very different in their nature, because of the fact that "failure to pay the World War I debt" is at times brought forward as an argument against the acceptance of the Anglo-American financial agreement I present here a bare factual statement concerning the debts of World War I. The figures of debt and repayment show very clearly that Britain did make payments as long as world economic conditions permitted such payments and that Britain made payments to the United States after her own war debtors had ceased payment to her.

The facts are as follows:

Between the outbreak of war in August 1914 and June 1919, Britain contracted for approximately $12,000,000,000 worth of war supplies in the United States. Between 1914 and the end of 1933, Britain paid the United States on account of these goods approximately $10,000,000,000.

Of the $12,000,000,000, Britain paid $8,000,000,000 cash, and borrowed the remaining $4,000,000,000 from the United States Government, after the entry of the

United States into the war in 1917. Of that $4,000,000,000 borrowed $3,500,000,000 was in respect of munitions and war supplies such as were provided under lend-lease in World War II. Only $581,000,000 represented postwar deliveries.

Of this $4,000,000,000 credit, Britain paid altogether $2,000,000,000 to the United States, covering both interest and capital. If the British debt to the United States had been limited to the amount borrowed for nonwar purposes, repayment to the United States would have covered the credit nearly four times—$2,034,000,000 against $581,000,000.

At the conclusion of World War I, the inter-allied debt situation was as follows:

War debts owing to Britain, according to Balfour note of 1922, $7,800,000,000.

War debts owing to United States, $10,900,000,000.

Of which amount owing by Britain, $4,250,000,000.

The amount paid by Britain to the United States until payment ceased in 1933, was $2,034,000,000. The amount received by Britain from her own debtors in the same period was $346,000,000.

At the peace conference, and again in the Balfour note of 1922, Great Britain suggested that all war debts be canceled. This proposal was made in the belief that to carry these barren war debts into the peace years would be a serious obstacle to the recovery of world trade and a threat to the stability of world currencies. The United States declined to accept this suggestion, and Great Britain then undertook with its debtors not to obtain more from them—including reparations due to the United Kingdom from Germany—than the amount due year by year on the British war debt to the United States.

The disastrous effects of the 1929–33 crises and the increase in United States tariffs made it impossible for the former Allied countries to maintain the service on their war debts to the United States. In 1931 on the initiative of President Hoover, a 1-year moratorium was declared on all war debts and reparation payments.

After the expiration of the Hoover moratorium, Britain was the only major power to resume payment on her debt to the United States. Two series of discussions took place between the British and American Governments during which the British Government contended that, owing to severe world depression, to the prevalence of high tariff policies and to the default of her own war debtors, payments could not be continued on the previous scale. The instalment due in June 1934—after passage of the Johnson Act had made further token payments useless—amounted to approximately three times the total value of British exports to the United States for that year. Only after these discussions had broken down did Britain herself suspend payment.

Since 1931 all payments on war debts due to Great Britain have been in abeyance. There has at no time been any public demand in Britain for the resumption of these payments.

Communistic Pattern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a copy of an editorial which appears in the June issue of Labor Views published in Milwaukee. It indicates the pattern of the communistic line in this country, and puts the people on notice as to just what is happening in this beloved country:

IS THIS THE BEGINNING?

"Comes the revolution." That expression, facetiously uttered by the American people for many years burlesquing the Communist plans to overthrow our Government, is not the least bit funny today.

Too long have our people made light of or ignored the warnings of our patriots and statesmen against the machinations of political aggressors within our borders whose purpose it is to destroy the American constitutional form of Government.

And too long have our elected and appointed representatives condoned, and in some cases deliberately aided, the action of American Quislings.

There are ample reasons to become suspicious and alarmed at the plans and progress of un-American schemers, particularly those whose efforts have been in behalf of the Communist cause.

One need only analyze the sequence of events both at home and abroad since the V-days to see and understand the trend of these events.

The pattern of strikes, mostly CIO, in strategic American industries and the political aggression and intrigue in both Europe and Asia run parallel to Stalin's plans for Communist world domination as did Hitler's actions run parallel to Mein Kampf, the Nazi plan for world domination.

The wave of strikes which have plagued this Nation since VJ-day until America is in a virtual state of paralysis should have a sobering effect upon our people.

Is there any connection between this damaging wave of strikes and the Communist plan for world domination?

Are these paralyzing strikes being waged by the union leaders truly for the benefit of the workers for higher wages and better working conditions? Isn't it just possible that the Communists who have bored their way into places of leadership in many of our large unions are using the workers as pawns in their program to communize America? There are plenty of grounds to suspect that they are.

The progression of these strikes in vital American industries appears to follow a pattern designed to halt production of machines, materials, parts, and equipment necessary for the output of industrial, agricultural, and mineral products.

Were these strikes scheduled to follow one another in strategic order so as to at all times have one or more vital industries affecting our whole production shut down?

The Communist Daily Worker said in an article in the January 2, 1946, issue: "The main job is to prevent American imperialism from converting this period into preparation for another war."

The Communist Wisconsin CIO News of January 11, 1946, said, "Our developing wage struggle must be part of the same fight to stem imperialist forces."

Is the Allis-Chalmers strike waged by Communist dominated CIO Local 248 a part of the Communist Party plot?

Does it not appear that the CIO-PAC efforts and purpose are directly connected with this plot against American constitutional government and in line with Communist aggression in Europe and Asia?

In China, Russia arms the Manchurian Communists and promotes war against the Chinese National Government; in Japan, Russia promotes the Communist movement and organizes mob action; in Korea, the Kuriles, and other Asiatic nations Russian occupation forces forbid American and British forces from observing their action; and in Europe there is an iron curtain closing out the view of Russian activities in zones occupied by them and they fire upon our airplanes and mistreat our soldiers whenever they come into Russia's zones. What goes on in Iran?

One need only make serious study of Russia's actions in the UNO to prove to himself that Russia is attempting to stall every effort of the democratic nations to settle the peace agreements.

Are Russia's plots for Communist world domination and her efforts to stall American production and her actions and intrigues in Europe and Asia all tied into her plot to dominate the world?

The design and pattern are different to fit each case but in the over-all they dovetail.

Isn't it about time that the American people, particularly the workers, recognize that they are being led into the Communist trap?

Will the American people wake up in time to prevent accomplishment of the Communist objectives in America, or is it too late?

Is this the beginning of the revolution?

WILLIAM A. E. CHAPPELLE, Jr.,
Editor and Publisher.

Russia Is Deeply Indebted to Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, although it may not be generally realized, Russia is probably more deeply indebted to Detroit, Mich., than to any other city in the world—unless it be Washington, D. C. Over a long period of time and in many ways, Detroit and its industries have been cooperating with the U. S. S. R. in the development of manufacturing facilities and in the modernization and mechanization of the Red army.

In a large part the victories of the valorous Red army during the recent war were made possible by the productive power of Detroit and the production genius which Detroit industrialists made available to Russia. It is hoped that the people of Russia, generally, will be given an opportunity to know and to appreciate the great contributions which this typically American city has made to their welfare and security.

On June 12, in the Book-Cadillac Hotel of Detroit, the Michigan committee of the American Society for Russian Relief gave a dinner in honor of the Soviet Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Nikolai V. Novikov. In opening this dinner,

Mr. Allen B. Crow, president of the Economic Club, of Detroit, made an interesting and informative address which not only recounted the record of Detroit's contributions to Russia but which in its final three paragraphs contains some highly significant and important suggestions for developing a continuing friendship between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Mr. Crow wisely and rightfully recommends that the sharing of ideas between these two countries is of equal importance to the exchange of materialistic products if we are to come to understand and trust each other.

Mr. Speaker, for the record, I now call attention to the address given by Mr. Crow on June 12:

Distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, we are met tonight to honor and to help the official representatives of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as well as to extend our hands in friendship to every individual man, woman, and child in all Russia—our great ally in war, in victory, and, we trust, in our present undertaking to establish peace, freedom, and prosperity for all the peoples of the earth, under the United Nations organization.

The Russian language, history, and ideology are not easy for us here in America and in Detroit to understand. Since the English language and American history and traditions, I am advised, are now taught in all the schools of Russia above the fourth grade, our dinner program has not been printed in Russian, and our speakers have all promised to comply with the sign which, I am told, was posted on one of the battlefields of Europe that read: "English spoken here, but American understood."

Last week from this same platform in an address delivered before the Detroit Chapter of the Army Ordnance Association, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower told the story of the GI who had just received a 14-page epistle from his girl friend in America. Naturally, it took him a long while to read it. Meanwhile, his buddies gathered around with envious eyes. When the GI finally folded the letter, and put it into his pocket, next to his heart, they asked him with one accord, "Well, what does she say?" To which the GI beamingly replied, "She just says that she loves me."

Our purpose tonight is the same as that which was so eloquently expressed by the Honorable W. Averell Harriman, recently United States Ambassador to Moscow, when he addressed a similar meeting held in behalf of Russian relief in New York last March 19, 1946.

"Now of all times when serious differences have arisen with the Soviet Government, when ugly suspicions have been aroused, this program of the Society of Russian Relief gives all of us Americans the opportunity to contribute to the amelioration of the suffering of the people of Russia and to hold out our hands with visible proof that we desire in all sincerity to walk with them as comrades along the road to world peace, as we have marched with them as allies across the battlefields to victory in war."

Tonight, we have been invited to hear a story which will stir our hearts, so that we shall become even more ready and anxious to bind up the wounds and to provide new hopes and opportunities for all the children of Russia, the same as we want our own to enjoy here in America.

Whatever difficulties the representatives of our Government have had in Washington, in Moscow, at Yalta, Tehran, and at Potsdam, Detroit, the production center of the world, has for a long time spoken a language which Russia has clearly understood.

By way of introduction, it may be well, therefore, for us all, and for our distinguished guests, in particular, to be reminded of what Detroit has already contributed to Russia:

I. HOMES

Thousands of those who were born in Russia have come to Detroit to establish homes for themselves and for their children. These hold an honored place as citizens in our community because of the contribution which they have made to the upbuilding of Detroit and of America.

As to how many there are now of these, it is rather difficult to determine, until we know just how many of the countries of Europe are to be taken over, assimilated, absorbed, or dominated by the Soviet Government. Of this we are very certain, however, that not any very considerable number of those who have once established their homes in Detroit have any disposition to move back to Europe or even to Russia to live.

II. FORD MOTOR CO.

The contributions of the Ford Motor Co. to Russia began when the Russians sent their representatives to Detroit requesting Ford engineering designs as far back as 1924.

In 1926, Ford sent a group of five men to Russia to investigate and to cooperate in distributing, servicing, and improving Ford tractors and parts, since the Government of the USSR by that time had purchased many thousands of Ford tractors.

Further, the Russian Government specifically requested Ford cooperation in the training of service personnel and the giving of advice as to the location of parts depots and service centers. Also they wanted information on the use of various farm implements with which they were not familiar at that time.

Following this, 50 Russian technicians were sent to the Ford plant in Dearborn to study American motor vehicle manufacturing techniques.

In 1927, 2,400 Ford tractors were sent to Russia, with a group of men to service these tractors and to act as instructors to the Russians in tractor repair and maintenance work.

From 1929 to 1935 the Ford Motor Co. had a contract with the Soviet Government whereby the Russians agreed to purchase from the Ford Motor Co. a very substantial quantity of motor vehicles and of parts. For this the Ford Motor Co. agreed to assist them in the establishment of an automobile-manufacturing plant in Russia. That plant was to manufacture the model A type Ford cars and the AA trucks.

The Ford Motor Co. then provided the Russians with plant layout and complete engineering information on their products. They assisted the Russians in selecting and purchasing machine tools, and made it possible for them to borrow a large number of manufacturing men and engineers from their own and other modern industrial plants of the United States. Then men went to Russia to live and work for considerable periods of time to assist in starting manufacturing operations after the plant had been built.

That was the beginning, we believe, of modern automobile manufacturing procedure in Russia.

In December 1942 the entire Ford tire plant was shipped to Russia, under lend-lease by the Government of the United States, the original cost of which to build in 1938 was $5,600,000.

III. ALBERT KAHN

In 1929, Albert Kahn and associated architects were commissioned by the Amtorg Trading Co., to design a tractor plant for Stalingrad, consisting of four units, all to be designed on American lines with all materials to be purchased in the United States. It was further desired by the Soviet that Mr. Kahn as architect would send engineers and superintendents of construction to supervise this work.

In 1930 again Mr. Kahn was called upon to send 25 engineers and architects to Moscow to act as consultants, supervisors, and teachers for a designing trust just organized to design all industrial buildings, chiefly for heavy industry.

The group was authorized to form a trust organized on American lines, each unit to specialize along a definite line but all to be housed under one roof and to be closely coordinated. This Moscow office eventually grew to a staff of 1,000 workers.

The second year saw the opening of offices in various parts of Russia, all working under the same program, using the same set-up as to organization, and under a plan for standardization, rationalization, and specialization, all developed in the Moscow office by a council of Russian professors, and their own designing engineers together with the American contingent. The scheme eventually approved was called the "Roosky Americansky System," and consisted of a form of Russian-American design using the American standard system with American details applied to Russian materials.

As production rose and the value of closer attention to engineering textbook principles were observed, the cry was, "Teach us more details and shorter methods, not only in the design but also in the preparation of all shop work, shop details, precast concrete, reinforced-steel bending, and mill orders."

Standard methods and details were then prepared for all engineering branches and distributed to all the scattered designing trusts which were operating in Russia.

Work in the field also bore fruit. Here again was found the same eagerness to learn economical and speedy methods, and there was a demand for more field supervision and more instructions. Thus, you will see that any difficulties of language were largely overcome through the eagerness of the students to study and to apply the instruction of their teachers. When language failed, chalk and a blackboard were a splendid medium.

IV. JOHN K. CALDER

One of the Detroit engineers who had been engaged in large construction projects for various automotive and related industries throughout the United States, as superintendent for Bryant & Detwiler. He served from June 1928 to 1932 as vice president of the Russian steel trust and as chief engineer of heavy construction for the entire Soviet Union.

V. JOHN L. LOVETT

General manager of the Michigan Manufacturers Association, was sent to Russia in 1931 by that organization to negotiate a program whereby the tool manufacturers of Michigan and of other parts of the United States became willing to sell their machines, tools, and fixtures to the Soviet, and whereby the Soviet was able to establish a line of credit here in the United States in payment for such essential machinery as their expanding industrialization of their whole economy required.

VI. GENERAL MOTORS CORP.

General Motors' most direct contribution to the Russian war effort came at the critical time of the German siege of Stalingrad. The great need of the Russian armies for motorized equipment, particularly trucks, was recognized a year before, on June 21, 1941, when Germany first attacked Russia. With the Mediterranean closed by enemy action, only two practical supply routes were available: the northern route to Murmansk, and the long southern route to Iraq and Iran, some 14,000 miles.

General Motors was called upon to design, procure, box, and ship overseas two truck assembly plants to Iran, and, in addition, to supervise their construction and to assume full operating responsibility for these two

plants. One of these plants was set up in Andimeshk, 200 miles north of the port of Banar Sharpur, and the other at Khorramshahr. Each plant was to have a capacity of 2,500 trucks per day. While the contract for this undertaking was made with the War Department under lend-lease in January of 1942, it became evident that assistance would be required before the equipment could arrive and the plants could become established. Accordingly, a crew of General Motors technicians arrived in Andimeshk in the spring of 1942 and, with a few cranes borrowed from British engineers and with hand tools taken from the vehicle cases, set to work in the open desert under conditions which included temperatures of 140°, inadequate food and water supplies, and with local unskilled labor and improvised assembly lines, they put together more than 1,000 trucks before the plant itself was under way.

During the year and a half in which General Motors operated these two plants, probably the most critical period of Russia's war stand, these two plants assembled more than 30,000 trucks, which were driven from the plants over 800 miles of tortuous roads by Russian drivers, through Tabriz, and on to the defense of Stalingrad.

Ladies and gentlemen, the value of this timely contribution by a Detroit concern to Russia's later great offensive can never be measured, either by Russia or by any of her allies.

VII. HARRY FERGUSON, INC.

During 1944 and 1945 Russian agricultural engineers came to Detroit to study the methods of agricultural production which have been developed by Harry Ferguson, Inc. Through the cooperation of this Detroit firm, the Russian engineers were able to visit modern farms and agricultural colleges with their research laboratories in various parts of the United States and particularly in Michigan, in Iowa, and in Texas.

VIII. LEND-LEASE DURING WORLD WAR II

I might mention to you scores of other instances to show you how Detroit industrialists have generously cooperated during the past two decades and more in placing their know-how, their men, methods, machinery, materials, and money at the disposal of the Soviet Government to help promote the industrialization of Russia and to raise the standards of living for all the Russian people, both in peace and in war. Detroit's war record of contributions to Russia was so unparalleled in history, however, that I shall summarize this for you briefly.

Out of a total of approximately $9,500,000,000 worth of lend-lease munitions which were exported to the Soviet Union from the United States prior to October 1, 1945, the following items are especially worthy of mention at this meeting tonight since they were manufactured very largely within the Detroit area: 14,795 planes at a total cost of $1,652,236,000; 7,056 tanks at a total cost for tanks and parts of $478,398,000; 51,503 jeeps and 375,883 trucks at a total cost of $1,410,616,000.

In other words, there were planes, tanks, trucks and jeeps which were manufactured and shipped to Russia under lend-lease during World War II largely from the Detroit area, that cost the people of the United States a total of about $3,541,250,000.

Last Sunday we concluded here in Detroit the 10-day celebration of the National Automotive Industry Golden Jubilee, in observance of 50 years of progress in the automotive industry, together with the sesquicentennial of the raising of the American flag over the city of Detroit. At that great meeting held last Sunday at Briggs Stadium, the Honorable Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations organization, declared that the slogan "Hats off to the past and coats off to the future" adopted for Detroit and for the automotive industry, is also most timely at this juncture in international affairs for the entire world as well, as we unitedly face up to the responsibilities currently involved in winning the peace for all the United Nations.

This occasion tonight is highly significant in that it marks the first time that a Russian Ambassador has ever come to Detroit, the industrial heart of America. Here is the great melting pot, where the peoples from every land have come to make their homes and where they have joined their ingenuity, their ambitions, and their skills to produce the planes, tanks, trucks, guns, and other instruments of war, which when finally placed in the hands of all our armed forces and those of Russia and of all our other Allies brought victory over the might of those who attempted to strangle freedom around the world.

Now that victory has at last been won through these combined efforts, through our mingled blood, sweat, and tears, Detroit is again producing the automobiles, the trucks, the tractors, the refrigerators, the adding machines, the stoves, the vitamin pills, and a thousand other goods and services which we are again ready, willing, and able to share with Russia in exchange for their goods, services, and yes, their ideas, too, and in competition with the peoples of all the other United Nations, thereby making it possible in peace and in war for us all to attain new and higher standards of living, freedom and tolerance around the world.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are citizens of no mean city, assembled to do honor and to again pledge our aid to our great ally—in war and in peace. It is now my privilege, therefore, as your presiding officer, to present to you our chief executive, the Honorable Edward J. Jeffries, Jr., mayor of the city of Detroit, who will extend in our behalf our most cordial welcome to His Excellency Nikolai V. Novikov, his charming wife, and to the members of his staff on their first visit to Detroit.

Why Doesn't OPA Act?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DES MOINES, IOWA, *June 18, 1946.*
Mr. PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: I hate to bother you but I don't know just why and I don't know just what to do with the many customers to be served who buy egg cases.

About 6 weeks ago the OPA granted an increase on the basic price of lumber with no directive as to an increase in price of byproducts made from lumber, such as ends and centers for egg cases. The cause of this has made it impossible to secure the delivery of ends and centers as the mills are refusing to manufacture any as it is more profitable to them to sell lumber than it is for them to sell any lumber byproducts.

For this reason, it is making a hardship for many small dealers to secure supplies to keep on in business and also, it has been the policy, we believe, of the OPA to try to bypass the wholesaler and commission man on egg cases and they have tried to force direct purchases. This is all right in order to keep the prices in line provided it does not hurt anybody. However, it has had this effect. There are only 10 or 12 large purchasers who can buy in carloads and these 10 or 12 buyers create a monopoly on this egg business causing hardships to the small dealers who are not able to obtain cases and they have to sell to the large people, whereas, if the wholesalers were allowed to stock merchandise and reship, they could help the small produce dealers. This OPA ironclad rule is eliminating the small dealer due to his inability to secure egg cases.

In order to facilitate matters and in order to get ends and centers there has to be an increase in price. The suggested price has been to make the complete case for 38 cents mill and make ends and centers for 19 cents per set and the veneers for 19 cents per set. If this is promoted, we believe there can be a steady flow of this merchandise to the user and with an allowance in that price set-up there should be at least 8 percent for the wholesaler so he can take and deal out the egg cases to the small consumer. As I understand, the mill manufacturers are agreeable to this and will make an 8-percent allowance to the wholesaler for the handling and dealing out of egg cases.

We appreciate that you do not know the entire facts and that the OPA deviation to give you the run-around and cite certain things to show there has been an increase granted and all this and refer you to various maximum price regulations; however, we are giving you the true facts in the case, as we feel we are acquainted with what is necessary to produce and get merchandise to the ultimate consumer.

There will be a scarcity of perishable items unless something is done, and it is very important to take action on this, as any delay is going to cause some pronounced hardships, not only to the farmer himself who has to sell the eggs but to the consumer because of shortages of meat products.

I am sorry to have to bring this matter to your attention; however, this hard-headed action by the OPA is not in any way helping conditions to get merchandise to the ultimate consumer.

We hope you can see your way to take and help.

With kindest regards, I remain,
Yours very truly,

A. F. YOERG.

Resolution of Frederick W. Galbraith Post, No. 999, American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Frederick W. Galbraith Post, No. 999, of the American Legion, has adopted the accompanying resolution by unanimous vote. This post, which has a membership of a thousand men and women who served the country in both, or either, of the two most recent devastating conflicts, is the largest organization of veterans of the First and Second World Wars located on New York City's historic East Side, which is in the district I have the great honor to represent, as well as one of the finest posts of the Legion in New York County—Manhattan—and in the State of New York.

Due to the diligence and able leadership of City Marshal Abraham Rosenberg it has become an important civic group that wields a widely beneficial in-

fluence, standing first, always, for the rights of the veterans, anxious to secure the recognition from the Government they defended and from society generally that they richly deserve. Its patriotic and welfare work, together with its constant efforts to promote good citizenship, have made it an outstanding power among the forces laboring throughout the community for the public betterment.

Its first active commander, Robert Paterson, long a leader in veterans' circles in New York City, who twice was county commander of the American Legion of New York County, is the author of the resolution. While well known as a lecturer of considerable note and also as a writer, the sterling quality of his Americanism has been deeply impressive. In his continual efforts during the recent war to instill a hearty devotion to the cause for which we were fighting, the high plane of his endeavors to establish good will among all religions, races, and classes, as well as among the foreign-born who have taken advantage of the naturalization laws, was most warmly commended. Often speaking from the pulpits of synagogues and churches, and from the rostrums of educational institutions, his has been a patriotic service of admittedly great value.

This resolution Mr. Paterson introduced, which was so zealously adopted by Galbraith Post of the Legion, has met with the general approbation of other veteran organizations, endorsed with equal favor both by the Jewish war veterans and the Catholic war veterans of New York State:

Whereas there has been much public comment and discussion of the peace terms of the Second World War and the part the United States and its Territories will be expected to take in the affairs of the postwar world; and

Whereas a number of elements of the Nation have expressed desire for representation at the peace conference in order to voice the hopes of those elements in shaping the course of civilization hereafter; and

Whereas it is the belief of the veterans of the First World War who are members of the Frederick W. Galbraith Post, No. 999, of the American Legion that no one has better right to be heard in formulating the terms of peace than the men and women who actually fought the battles to bring victory, and that no commitment affecting the daily lives and well-being of the American people for whom they fought should be made without consulting them and gaining their approval; and

Whereas the settlement of nearly all wars until within recent times has been effected in large part, by, or with advice of, military and naval leaders who planned and led the campaigns which brought victory, but whose skill, according to the apparent disposition of certain sections of our society, now seemingly is required only for the hardships and suffering of battle, and unessential at the peace table where it seems to be thought negotiations should be left entirely to diplomatists, partisan politicians and advocates of economic theories who were not under fire and did not brave the dangers of warfare; and

Whereas a considerable number of patriotic Americans who participated in the First World War were again on active duty in the Second World War, so are veterans of both struggles in this tragic series of gigantic upheavals, and nearly all veterans of the first conflict served in some capacity in the second to render assistance to the Nation in any way that was possible on the home front: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Frederick W. Galbraith Post, No. 999, of the American Legion, That the President and Congress of the United States be requested to name to the Peace Commission representatives of the men and women who fought the battles to bring victory, and of those who fought for the United States in the First World War, waged in great degree against the same enemies in the last one, and that such representatives be given an equal voice and vote with representatives of political parties, business, industry and labor in settling the terms of peace and in determining the policies and commitments of our Nation for the future; and be it further

Resolved, That these representatives should be chosen from the recognized organizations of veterans of both world wars.

Security for Railroad Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the practical choice before us in dealing with social security measures for railroad workers is between the provisions in the bill reported out by the majority of the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and those of the original Crosser bill. The subject is complicated but it is of vital concern to millions and to the whole future of our social-security program.

There is one point which I would like to discuss and that is the merit of allowing a greater degree of social security for railroad workers than the community gives to the workers as a whole. The Crosser bill gives protection for those in the railroad industry beyond that provided for other workers by the general Social Security Act: (a) Survivors benefits for widows and dependent children which are 25 percent above those now provided by the Social Security Act, whereas the committee plan merely provides for equal benefits to these groups; (b) liberal benefits to those who after 10 years of service are totally and permanently disabled; (c) the benefits for unemployment are raised to a maximum of $25 a week for a maximum duration of 26 weeks. This is in line with the original Kilgore bill introduced in the Senate last summer and which after passing that body in a modified form has since been stalled in the House Ways and Means Committee; (d) sickness benefits to be paid for at the same rate as unemployment.

Are these benefits so unreasonable at this time as to constitute unfair class legislation favoring a special class at the expense of the general community? I do not believe they are for the following three reasons:

First. The Crosser bill provides that the cost of the benefits for retirement, survivors, and disability are to be borne jointly and equally by the railroads and the workers without any public subsidies. This is done by raising these contributions until by 1952 they are to amount for each party to 6¼ percent of earnings, or a total of 12½ percent. This should accumulate a fund adequate to meet all claims upon it. In this connection it should be realized that the amendments which Congress made in 1939 to the Social Security Act and the subsequent failure to increase the contributions of both parties above the initial 1 percent means that after the passage of time when the volume of benefits rises large and continuing public grants will be needed annually. I am not opposed to this practice, but I do want to point out that the greater benefits received by the railroad workers and their families will in large part be paid for by higher contributions by the railway workers themselves. To a large degree they are buying their own protection.

On the basis of a $3,000,000,000 pay roll, the increase in employers' contributions would amount to $75,000,000 a year more than those contemplated in the present act, but only seven and one-half million more than those provided in the committee's proposal. These figures do not, of course, include the question of unemployment. In view of these facts it would seem that the benefits provided are not unfair class legislation, if they are justified in themselves.

Second. It is not necessary for Congress to legislate on a universal scale to avoid class legislation. On the contrary, the Supreme Court in dealing with State laws restricting the hours of work for women long ago pointed out in the case of the Oregon 10-hour law and the California 8-hour law, that Congress could proceed upon an experimental basis, and deal with evils in certain sectors of our economy as they became manifest and pressing. Thus Congress has passed special legislation for agriculture, coal mining, ocean shipping, manufacturing, and so forth, as well as for workers in industry because it recognized specific conditions which it could only cope with by specific legislation. What is important, however, is whether any such legislation is fair in itself and whether the sum total of legislation produces a balance for the general good without singling out specific classes for unjust favors or injuries.

No such charge can justly be levied against the Crosser bill. The purposes sought are worthy, namely, more adequate protection against indigent old age, and total and permanent disability of the railroad worker; better benefits for the unemployed and, finally, financial protection against the costs and loss of earnings caused by sickness. These are benefits which all generous-spirited workers would like to see extended to all and not confined to any one group. We know, however, that as a practical matter it would be virtually impossible to amend the Social Security Act to bring it about. The change involved would be too great and the increase in contributions too sharp to enable this to be done. There is merit, however, in making an experimental start in these directions in one industry, the railroads, which already have a separate security system. These experiments can thus be tried out on a comparatively limited scale and if they

prove their worth, as I am confident they will, can be extended to industry as a whole. It is a common practice for industry when it wants to manufacture a new product to start a pilot plant. Here the new techniques can be tried out and the bugs or hindrances eliminated. The railways can be used for this same purpose in the field of social security. For an ounce of demonstration is worth a ton of theory.

Finally, it is generally felt that because of the essential nature of the railroad industry, the workers in that industry do not have the collective freedom of action which other workers enjoy. When the railroads were shut down for 2 days May 23–25, we had a taste of what a railroad shut-down could do to the country. Industry was paralyzed and in a few more days millions would have been out of work and sections of our big cities would have been close to starvation. Modern communities will not allow their lives to be destroyed like this. Whether or not the unions retain the legal right to strike, they will not in practice feel free to invoke such methods.

But if by one means or another, greater restrictions are imposed upon this group of workers than upon those in less essential occupations, it is only right that they should receive some additional protection as compensation. It would be unfair for the communities to take advantage of the fact that the workers cannot tie up transportation by forcing wages and working conditions down below the national level for similar work. On the contrary, the Nation should be willing to put this group first in its extension of social security. For this reason, therefore, I believe we can afford to be generous in the measure before us.

Lay Off the Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pella Chronicle, published at Pella, Iowa:

LAY OFF THE SCS

Friends of the Soil Conservation Service are put out by information that Ed O'Neal of the Farm Bureau Federation attempted recently in a hearing before a House committee in Washington to have appropriations for the 1947 SCS program cut to less than half of its needs and to have most of the functions of the technicians taken over by the Extension Service. It is hard to believe that rank and file Farm Bureau folks are party to this move.

We would like to shout loud enough to be heard in Washington that this is an asinine proposal. We suspect there are a number of motives not disclosed in it, among them and perhaps the most powerful, envy.

The people of Marion County and more recently of many Iowa counties where soils districts have been formed, have come to regard the Soil Conservation Service and the technicians employed as the greatest of benefactors, men intent on getting a great job done right without regard to the political, social, or organizational status of the applicant for assistance.

The soils men have developed a technique of teaching the individual farmer, by demonstration on his own or his neighbor's land how to farm his place right. There's no other way to teach these things. In this county one-fourth of the farmers have enlisted in this kind of farming—the boys have done an outstanding job. In 4 years they have made more progress than any other agency made by educational effort in all the years gone by. This thing can't be taught from a swivel chair. It has got to be taught on the land.

If the Members of Congress would go out into their home areas to see this work done on the land and talk to farm folks enlisted in the program as this district's congressman, PAUL CUNNINGHAM, has done, they wouldn't get the wool pulled over their eyes. Instead, they would administer a resounding rebuke to people who throw rocks at it and would lay some real money on the line to get the job done more quickly—and you can bet the boys who would do it would be with the Soil Conservation Service.

Rather than any curtailment of the Soil Conservation Service program or personnel our people are crying for more instruction and demonstration and planning. In some counties the program is barely started. At long last we have found a way to sell farm folks on proper land use. This is no time to emasculate that program. Let the Soil Conservation Service alone—it is going places and doing things.

Vermont Fights Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Boston Herald of Sunday, April 21, 1946. Vermont is not only interested in stream-pollution control, but has taken active steps in that direction, as indicated by the following editorial:

NEW ENGLAND FIGHTS WATER POLLUTION ON TWO FRONTS—VERMONT, RHODE ISLAND

Water pollution—which is the polite way of describing America's dirty habit of using its rivers for open sewers and any handy bit of ocean as a garbage and refuse dump simply because it is easiest—is being attacked on two fronts in New England in battles which may finally turn the tide against this menace to health and recreation.

MORRIS COHN PRESENTS FACTS

Vermont is tackling the problem of polluted inland waters on a State-wide basis, and Rhode Island is being rallied in an attempt to clean up Narragansett Bay.

The Vermont story is told in the current issue of the Outdoor Editor, official publication of the New England Outdoor Writers Association, by Percy Angwin, of the Barre Times, who reveals that a sportsman governor, an alert chamber of commerce, the State's women's clubs, farm groups, and health organizations finally have rallied behind the outdoor writers' howl against dirty water.

Morris Cohn, of Schenectady, N. Y., the man who cleaned up New York's Mohawk Valley and a recognized authority on sewage disposal, was imported to give a gathering of public officials and civic leaders the straight facts on pollution with no punches pulled.

They were told about disposal costs. They were advised that polluted streams are carriers of infantile paralysis. They learned how much the State was losing in tourist revenue; how much was being lost in reduced property values on polluted streams; how much was needlessly spent to purify drinking water; how many towns were making big outlays on swimming pools because they couldn't use their streams.

TWO COMMUNITIES BUILD DISPOSAL PLANTS

The first restoration step is to have every community in the State pass an enabling act to permit the erection of sewage disposal plants. Cohn has been named State consultant to map a clean-up by watershed areas, and laws are being drafted with teeth in them to bite both municipal and industrial offenders.

Two communities already have built disposal plants. Surveys are under way in several more. The city of Barre is installing a new system intended to combine both sewage and garbage disposal. The backers of the fight don't expect to end pollution this year or next. The job may take a decade or even more, but the start has been made and the way to finish it shown.

Rhode Island's problem is different. The State already has an antipollution law which has been through the courts, pronounced constitutional and even copied by several other States. But pollution continues through lack of law enforcement.

Here the task is that of rallying the State to demand enforcement of the law, and the opening gun has been fired by Harvey Flint, of Providence, through the Federated Rhode Island Sportsman. Flint makes about everything from streamer flies for striped bass fishing to boats from which to catch them, and sums the situation up as follows:

Practically all streams in Rhode Island are polluted by raw sewage, chemicals, dyes, oils, and other waste which are being carried into Narragansett Bay.

Management Wakes Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Bridgeport Post June 18, 1946:

MANAGEMENT WAKES UP

The generally violent opposition of the labor union movement to President Truman's proposed emergency labor legislation now finds its counterpart at the opposite pole. Ira Mosher, chairman of the board of the National Association of Manufacturers, denounces the President's program for the seizure of struck industries as nothing but the beginning of fascism and the very opposite of collective bargaining.

It was time, we think, that industrial leaders began to take notice of the kind of legislation which has been administration-sponsored. In the effort to correct admitted evils practiced by certain groups of union leaders (and the more progressive leaders of the union movement now openly acknowledge these evils and denounce them as a detriment to labor in the long run) the President boiled over, and offered Congress a bill so violent

and drastic in its methods as to amount to a fundamental change in the American theory of government.

Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, who alone of the Connecticut delegation voted against the President's emergency measure, pointed this out at the time. During war when our very existence as a Nation was in peril we refused to put strikers into uniform or to force them to work at the point of the bayonet under penalty of being branded mutineers.

We refused because this constituted involuntary servitude and we were fighting a war to end involuntary servitude (otherwise known as dictatorship) in other countries and to prevent the spread of that disease of the soul to our own.

The courage of Mrs. LUCE who voted "no" when the whole cry of voices was on the other side, is now vindicated and proved to have been something more than mere obstinacy or contrariness, by the fact that both labor and management alike are now seeing the dangerous trends involved in the President's proposed legislation—trends which Mrs. LUCE insistently pointed out at the time of her opposition vote.

It has taken management's spokesmen some time to realize that the bill which they thought would punish labor or put labor in its place, was equally deadly to management, to ownership, and to the whole theory of private enterprise in the United States. Settlements forced at the point of a gun by Government seizure are not voluntary settlements any more than compulsory labor in uniform is voluntary labor.

This muddled bill, conceived in anger, written in haste, fraught with danger, and inimical to the theories by which our country has maintained the liberties of its people all these years, ought to be thrown into the wastebasket.

Address of Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, the Surgeon General, United States Army, before the Disabled American Veterans, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., June 3, 1946:

It is an inspiration to be present at this occasion in honor of the members of the seventh class of national service officer trainees who are about to complete their academic training at American University.

The work the members of this class are taking up represents one of the most important phases of our postwar activities. I am sure it is a source of pride to all of us to see such a fine group of young men dedicating themselves to the service of their fellow veterans.

The Disabled American Veterans is to be commended for the support they have given this training program for national service officers. The Disabled American Veterans is also deserving of praise for their unfailing efforts in support of measures of benefit to the handicapped veterans.

I am deeply interested in what you have done and in your plans for the future. In a very real sense the rehabilitation program you are sponsoring is a continuation of what the Army Medical Department has been doing throughout the war. All our efforts have been aimed toward getting the disabled soldiers back into civilian life as self-sustaining and self-respecting members of the community.

Now that the war is over I am in a position to give you an over-all summary of certain phases of our activities along this line.

Throughout the war 15,000,000 patients were admitted to Army hospitals. In April 1945 we reached the peak of our world-wide lead with a total of 544,000. In this country the peak was reached in August 1945, with a patient census of 312,000. The total number of soldiers in the Army discharged for physical disability was 1,019,000. This includes 110,000 battle wounded, 391,000 for neuropsychiatric reasons, and 518,000 medical and surgical other than battle wounded. As we look back on the results achieved in the war the field of medicine made outstanding progress. The death rate from diseases was only 0.6 per 1,000 per year. In the last war it was 16.5. From a death rate of 24 in the last war the pneumonia figure was cut to 0.6 percent and meningitis was lowered from 38 to 4 percent.

Our program of preventive medicine was largely responsible for establishing this new health record. The American Army in this war was the healthiest in the world. Through the development and use of toxoids and vaccines fear of tetanus, typhoid, and typhus became a thing of the past. There were no deaths from these diseases among American soldiers who were inoculated against them. There were no cases of yellow fever, and we had only one death from tetanus in this war in which the individual was known not to have had proper immunization with tetanus toxoid—only one. Yet there were thousands of Germans who died of tetanus, and thousands of Japanese who died of tetanus, and there were untold thousands of civilians in all theaters who died of this disease.

Malaria at one time proved a more disabling enemy than the Japs. Through stringent control measures its incidence was cut to one-fourth of what it was in the early stages of the war. With practically all our quinine supply cut off when the Japs overran the Dutch East Indies we had to find a substitute. Atabrine, developed under the greatest difficulties, proved even more effective than quinine. It serves as a suppressive just as quinine does and also cures the malignant form of malaria.

DDT of course has played an important part in our battle against malaria. It has been highly effective against all insect-borne diseases. I have visited islands such as Saipan in my tours overseas where I did not see a fly or mosquito. DDT sprayed from airplanes had conquered them.

Surgery was responsible to a large extent for the saving of 96 percent of all the wounded who lived to reach a hospital as against 92 percent in World War I. This was done not by sulfa drugs, not by penicillin—they were aids to surgery—but by our American surgeon who was trained in our schools at home, the specialist who knew how to carry on his job. This was done by surgical treatment; by having a surgeon on the right job, in the right place, at the right time to care for the wounded.

In 1943 I saw surgery being done in north Africa. Every man was doing it his own way. Things were soon under control when standard procedures were established. That is the backbone of this medical service, deciding the best way to do a given thing and having every man do it that way instead of in his own way.

The surgery I saw later in Italy was very different from that in north Africa. All surgery was being done according to the standard procedures which had been established.

Behind the Fifth Army lines I saw surgical teams operating on the nontransportable chest and abdominal cases in tents 4 miles behind the front. The floor of those operating rooms was the ground over which the tent was pitched. Those cases were getting just as good care as an abdominal or chest case gets in Washington.

Among the many wounded from Normandy I saw in England was one man who had been shot through the abdomen on D-day plus three—that is, June 9. A mobile surgical team had put him in their truck and operated on him. I saw him on July 13. He was healed and on his way out of the hospital, although he had had a complete transverse lesion of the small intestine and perforations of the mesentery.

That was typical of the record of surgery overseas.

Surgery also played a big part in returning to duty in the theater 376,000 out of the 598,000 who were wounded and an additional 55,200 to duty in the United States.

All of this was accomplished by a medical organization that mushroomed up almost overnight. From September 1943 to the present time we shipped a total of 698,973 tons of medical supplies, kits, chests, and other medical items. In normal times such an operation represents a big job. In war times, with shortages of many items needed for the production of these supplies and the difficulties in getting the goods transported, I can tell you that the job was accomplished only by fighting almost every ton of equipment almost every mile of the way from raw materials to medical aid for a wounded man.

Penicillin is a good illustration of the problems that confronted us. Prior to 1943 the world had produced a total of only 1 pound of penicillin. Early in 1945 the original goal of 300,000,000,000 units a month or 15 pounds per day was passed. The original price of $20 per vial was cut to the present figure of approximately 76 cents for the same amount.

Atabrine was another source of worry. The Allied Nations lost 95 percent of the world's supply of quinine when the Japs took the Netherlands East Indies. Like penicillin, atabrine also introduced what seemed like insurmountable obstacles in the intricate processes of manufacture. It takes 2½ tons of chemicals to make 100 pounds of atabrine, a ratio of 30 to 1 in weight. Upon the surrender of Corregidor there were 35,000,000 tablets on hand and a yearly manufacturing capacity of 227,000,000 tablets. Through heavy pressure from the Medical Department production was boosted so that in 1944 three and one-half billion tablets were produced, bringing the cost down from $24 per 1,000 tablets in 1940 to $3 per 1,000 in 1944.

Blood plasma is an interesting item from a supply standpoint. The processing of blood plasma began in February 1941. Procurement averaged approximately 140,000 units of 250 cubic centimeters per month with an all-time high of 178,000 in October 1944. Whole blood shipments to Europe started in August 1944 and continued until May 1945 with a total shipment of 206,000 pints of type "O" blood. To the Pacific, 177,784 pints were flown.

At the beginning of the emergency there were only about 1,200 doctors in the Regular Army Medical Corps and a correspondingly small number of officers in the other corps of the Medical Department. At the peak of the war there were about 47,000 doctors in the Medical Corps, 15,000 Dental Corps officers, 2,000 Veterinary Corps, 2,000 Sanitary Corps, 61 Pharmacy Corps, and 18,700 officers in the Medical Administrative Corps. The peak number of nurses came to 57,000, hospital dietitians 1,600, and physical therapists 1,300. There were in addition some 535,000 enlisted men trained as medical aid men, technicians, litter bearers, ambulance drivers, clerks, and for other jobs; and some 15,000 Wacs and 75,000 civilians served in the medical department.

It was through the success of our operations in supply and personnel that we have been able to staff, equip and maintain our

system of Army hospitals. Overseas in all theaters there were 217 general hospitals, 196 station, 99 field, 91 evacuation, and 73 portable surgical hospitals. Including convalescent hospitals and centers there was a total of 692 hospitals overseas at the peak of our operations. There were 65 general and 13 convalescent hospitals in the Zone of the Interior.

In our hospitals in this country we have had over 34,000 neurosurgical cases; over 20,000 crippled hands; approximately 14,000 amputees; 1,200 blind; and 1,400 paraplegics—that is men who had suffered injuries to the spine. It used to be that paraplegic patients would get a urinary infection and die. The revolutionary treatment of paraplegic patients is the greatest advance in the history of neurosurgery. Their lives have been saved and they have been rehabilitated; many of them are doing useful jobs.

Figures grouped together like this sound a bit statistical. Yet behind each and every figure is a story filled with human interest—drama and heroism.

For example, take the mobile evacuation hospital. This unit usually was set up within 20 miles of the front line, often much closer. Shells frequently fell nearby. Yet such an establishment probably was superior to the average small city hospital in the United States. It had the best modern hospital equipment and necessary medical and surgical specialists. Not infrequently one of the latter would put away his surgical instruments and take up a pick-axe to dig a foxhole for himself.

A remarkable feature of such a hospital is the fact that it could move almost as fast as infantry which it supported with hardly any interruption of its routine. Take the case of one such hospital in Sicily. It was dumped on the shore at Licata at 10 a. m. By noon it was receiving its first patients. Two days later it was moved forward about 30 miles, and within 2 hours was receiving the heaviest run of patients in its history. Once its trucks arrived at a station only an hour and a half was needed for the tents to be set up, the beds made, the power plant for lights and X-ray to be put in operation, and the surgical supplies unpacked. Such speed was due largely to circus assembly methods. There were more than 500 stakes to be driven in setting up the tents. Each enlisted man drove exactly the same stakes in exactly the same positions at each stop. Each nurse made up the same beds with the same blankets. Each medical officer had his own appointed job, which never varied and sometimes consisted of stake driving.

It was hardest on the nurses. They wore GI clothes and heavy shoes. They slept in blankets on the ground whenever the position of the hospital was being shifted. When the unit first arrived in Africa they traveled 1,000 miles by jeep in the dead of winter. But these girls seldom "groused."

Just as I have given you a little insight into the workings of the evacuation hospital, I could talk by the hour on how much is back of anyone of those figures I cited a moment ago.

Anyone of you who took part in this war could supply sidelights on the meaning of these figures. Each one of you would illuminate the figures from a slightly different angle; each one would help to round out the picture of the world-wide operations of the Army Medical Department in this war. It all sums up to the biggest medical job ever performed by any country.

The fact you gentlemen have taken time from a crowded schedule to be here tonight is convincing evidence you are aware of our problems.

Right in this room tonight are nine men who are amputees—who have suffered the loss of a leg or arm. Others have been handicapped through war service by heart ailments, stomach wounds, and other disabilities.

The presence here of so many Members of Congress is the greatest encouragement these national service officer trainees could get in the jobs they have chosen. And that, I want to emphasize both to the Members of Congress and everyone here tonight, is the greatest single factor in rehabilitation.

I want to say a word about the spirit of the men who were wounded but did not pay the supreme sacrifice, in whom you men of this organization are most interested. This is the man I am interested in also, and have always been since World War I.

There has never been a spirit equal to the spirit of the wounded man in this war—his fortitude and will to do. He asked for no sympathy and he took none. He was resourceful and self-reliant. He had the stuff to lick the enemy. That was the mental frame of mind of that man when he became a casualty. That is what these men must maintain when they get back to civil life. They do not ask for charity or sympathy; they ask for an opportunity to be a man and to do a job or to get an education so that they can do that job.

Employment is the best form of rehabilitation. I don't mean just any kind of employment. After the last war some veterans were employed selling apples on the street—if you would call that employment. Now we know that a new era must prevail; and we must get this concept over to the public with irresistible force.

The right job must be found for each handicapped man. You men training for national service officers have shown foresight and judgment in your decision. You have chosen jobs for which you are fitted, jobs that will earn you the gratitude of the hundreds you will help, and jobs that will win for you the respect and admiration of all right-thinking Americans.

It is now up to all of us to see that the thousands of other veterans are given the proper guidance. I am happy to have had a part—if only a small one—building up the record of the Army Medical Department established of giving the soldiers in this war the best medical care any army ever received. But my conscience as a citizen will not be clear and I am sure yours will not until we have done all in our power to see that every veteran is employed in a job that will enable him to enjoy the American way of living.

The Congress has done well by the veteran. It may not compensate him adequately for his disabilities, but if the veteran has the will to do a job and to be a citizen—and he has—for God's sake, help him.

I thank you.

Progress With the Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. TRAYNOR
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Journal Every Evening, of Wilmington, Del., June 18, 1946:

PROGRESS WITH THE BRIDGE

Persistent effort on the part of advocates of the proposed Delaware River bridge near Wilmington obviously have convinced the Federal authorities that the project is not to be merely of local benefit but that it is a far-reaching enterprise. There was substantial evidence of this attitude yesterday in Congress, when the House passed a bill authorizing construction of the span by the State of Delaware.

The measure, which was introduced by Representative PHILIP A. TRAYNOR, now goes to the Senate, where it is backed by both of our Members of that body, JAMES M. TUNNELL and C. DOUGLASS BUCK. Joining in that support are the four Senators from New Jersey and Maryland. Representative CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, of New Jersey, joined with Representative TRAYNOR in advocating the bill in the House.

Early action on the measure in the Senate is expected, as it is understood assurance has been given that the War and Navy Departments are not opposed to the project. The Legislatures of Delaware and New Jersey acted favorably before the project was taken up with Congress. The Delaware Legislature authorized the highway department to construct a bridge (or tunnel) financed by a bond issue to be amortized out of the tolls.

And so favorable action by the Senate will clear the path for remaining preliminaries required before actual construction is started. There will be hearings by the Corps of Engineers of the War Department, after which the plans can be completed.

Building and operation of the bridge is a purely business proposition. Obviously it is so recognized, and there has been no thought of injecting politics into any consideration of the subject.

The American Army Abroad Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a most comprehensive article by the Associated Press in the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., May 26, which describes the size and location of American forces abroad today:

ARMY ABROAD "CUT TILL IT HURTS"—MAXIMUM FORCE OF 7,200,000 NOW REDUCED TO AROUND 800,000 SCATTERED THROUGHOUT AREAS WHERE UNITED STATES MEN WERE ACTIVE

The mightiest army that ever had to cross oceans to reach its objectives has dwindled to a point where "Yanks" in khaki are objects of curiosity in world capitals where once they outnumbered even the soldiers of the host countries.

The United States Army in the 45 months between December 1941, and September 1945, shipped 7,300,000 soldiers overseas and backed them up with 126,859,000 tons of equipment.

Today there are 350,000 officers and GI's in Germany, 200,000 in Japan, and a mere handful, possibly 250,000, scattered through outposts over the rest of the globe.

The War Department says its aim is to have by July 1 an Army of 1,550,000 men—797,000 of them overseas.

Because the presence of American troops enhances American prestige and serves psychologically to maintain orderly populaces and moderate governments, the amazing exodus of overseas forces in the last few months has reached a point, says one United States overseas general, "where it hurts."

FEW COMBAT TROOPS

Combat forces abroad are few in number. The American GI now is maintaining communications, shepherding soldiers' "brides"

who are en route to their demobilized husbands, guarding and attending to the thousand and one business details involved in disposing of Army property, watching over displaced persons and serving in other routine peacetime occupations.

In England and Scotland, for instance, where 1,530,000 GI's once stood poised on D-day, there now are 4,500 American soldiers. By June 1 there will be virtually none.

Gone are the war days. Gone are the days when the Army's shrinking pains were most acute. The booing, "We want to go home" demonstrations that spread from Berlin to Tokyo last winter are hardly remembered. The United States soldiery abroad now is chiefly of a professional or semipermanent status.

Most of the great United States installations in the foreign theaters have been abandoned. In Great Britain 1 of 73 American wartime hospitals is now in use; 1 of 137 airfields remains; 28 of the 30 supply depots are closed.

BILLIONS IN EQUIPMENT SCATTERED

Equipment worth billions of dollars has been scattered. Some has been returned to the United States; some has been transferred to welfare agencies, such as UNRRA, for distribution in needy countries; some has been sold in outright business deals in lands where the material lay, and some, rusted or rotten or unprofitable to move, was scrapped or abandoned.

This is what has happened to our Army in the various theaters as reported by Associated Press correspondents on the ground.

THE GENERAL EUROPEAN THEATER

When Germany surrendered a year ago there were 3,069,000 American soldiers in this theater. Today there are fewer than 400,000.

The United States Army in Europe at its VE-day peak had 17,000 aircraft, occupied 127,000 pieces of real estate, including 150 airfields, 200 hospitals, and hundreds of military camps.

It operated its own railroads, telephone networks, and pipe lines, even carried its own bridges. Its huge stock piles, which required 160 depots, were estimated at more than 8,000,000 long tons.

STOCKS DOWN 3,000,000 TONS

Now the United States Army in Europe has shrunk to less than 6,000 planes, 25,000 plots or buildings, including only 6 ports, 25 airfields, and 50 hospitals. Its depots hold only 5,000,000 long tons of stocks. Railroads and telephones are back in civilian hands.

A million long tons of surplus stocks in Europe were shipped out to the United States or other theaters, with another 500,000 tons yet to follow. This redeployment of goods represents $2,500,000,000.

To handle surplus stocks having possible resale value in Europe, the Foreign Liquidation Commission was set up. Already 2,248,000 long tons of stock, worth $1,518,300,000, have been turned over to the Commission, with 731,000 additional long tons, worth $743,200,000, marked for future delivery.

However, there were at least 500,000 tons of surplus stocks no one wanted to buy, such as ammunition and obsolete planes. The Army scrapped it. Among the costly armaments sent to the scrap piles were 7,000 planes, worth more than $1,000,000,000.

UNITED KINGDOM

United States commanders plan to close their remaining Army installations in the United Kingdom by the end of June.

FRANCE

Where once huge Sherman tanks rumbled over the cobblestones of French streets on their way to Germany, draymen's carts and occasional automobiles have the roads to themselves.

In the year that has passed since the Germans capitulated, the United States Army has concentrated on its French goal of close out and get out.

At one time there were 60,000 troops stationed in the area surrounding Paris. Now there are less than 10,000.

After VE-day 18 camps, each with a capacity of 18,000 troops, were established in France to speed soldiers to the United States or to the Pacific theater. All have been closed down.

The western base section itself, known as the close-out force, now has less than 38,000 under its command. The total at one time ran well into six figures.

The ports of Cherbourg and Marseille, through which hundreds of thousands of combat troops once poured, have been closed out. The Eiffel Tower, which served as a radio station for the American Army for 18 months, has been returned to the French. The Red Cross schoolhouse in Rheims, where the unconditional surrender of the German Army was signed, was returned to the French January 25.

Western base section officers say there never will be a complete close-down of American Army personnel in France so long as there is an American Army of Occupation in Germany.

Units which will remain in France for an indefinite period include the Air Force personnel at Orly Airfield in Paris, Graves Registration Command, Criminal Investigation Division, several Quartermaster Corps depots, and various Air Force commands.

Meanwhile the office of the foreign liquidation commissioner is disposing of surplus Army property almost as rapidly as it can be classified. As of April 26 more than $131,000,000 worth of property had been sold, of which more than $70,000,000 were transferred to UNRRA for use in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the Balkans. Another $10,000,000 worth was shipped to Belgium against that country's $45,000,000 reverse lend-lease credits.

ITALY AND THE MEDITERRANEAN

The United States forces in the Mediterranean theater, which numbered 756,000 at peak strength in August 1944, have dwindled "to the point where it hurts," Lt. Gen. John C. H. Lee said recently.

Because of the delicate Venezia Giulia situation the American officer declined, however, to disclose the actual size of the American force left in Italy.

It was estimated previously that redeployment would cut the Americans down to 20,000 men by April 1, comprising one division on occupation duty in Venezia Giulia—10,000 Air Force and 10,000 Service troops. It is believed generally that British troops far outnumber the Americans in Italy.

Lee said that in addition to the 88th "Blue Devil" Division assigned to Venezia Giulia, American troops would be needed in Italy until installations are handed back to the Italians and to guard surplus property.

A surplus property source estimated in April that "well over half" of the American equipment put up for sale already has been sold to the Italians for more than $100,000,000—about 60 percent of the original value.

The Americans, as they pull out of Italy, have handed back many installations to the Italians. The biggest of these, Naples, which grew to be one of the world's largest seaports at the peak of the Italian campaign, was turned back by stages starting last fall. Leghorn, however, still remains in American hands.

AUSTRIA

United States military forces in Austria have been reduced from a peak strength of approximately 200,000 men a year ago to about 20,000. The American Government has proposed that the occupation of Austria be cut to a bare minimum as soon as possible.

The 42d "Rainbow" Division, last division remaining in the country, is scheduled to be replaced by some armored units and Regular Army garrison troops.

AFRICA AND MIDDLE EAST

Remnants of the American Army lie scattered in tiny bands totaling 1,700 men in desert outposts and villages from Iran to Liberia.

The great African-Middle East theater now is manned by less than half a combat regiment of American officers and men. Their commanding officer, Maj. Gen. Henry S. Aurand, must keep the thin lines of communications operating between pinpoints through the western coast bases of Africa, from Liberia across the desert to Algiers, through Libya, Egypt, and Sudan, thence across to Turkey and the Asiatic countries of Iran, Iraq, and Arabia.

Thus, holding the smallest command in numbers of any major general, Aurand's troops cover the widest area of any single command.

The troops are guarding $250,000,000 worth of Army matériel until it is disposed of by sale, gift, or demolition.

Some $60,000,000 to $70,000,000 in stocks, principally in military installations used during the north African campaign, have been written off as unrecoverable. The surplus—trucks, radio, and weather stations, airports, planes, buildings, and heavy machinery—is for sale.

CHINA-BURMA-INDIA

There were approximately 250,000 American soldiers, most of them Air Force personnel, in this theater at the peak period at the war's end. Of these 175,000 were in India and Burma and 75,000 in China

All but 400 now have been sent home or to other theaters. The 400 will remain for a considerable period to close out business details in disposing of Army equipment and to handle claims against the Army.

Private sales of Army goods to Indians were halted when the press and the public complained of high prices, so an arrangement was made to turn over all stocks to the Indian Government.

The China theater command, as such, went out of existence May 1, leaving no American Army combat units in this country. The marines, however, still have air and ground units in north China.

The Army estimates that 5,000 soldiers remain in China.

Everything the Army owned in west China was sold to the Chinese some months ago for $67,000,000, about 50 percent of its estimated value.

KOREA

American forces landed in Korea September 8, 1945, with three divisions, and now occupy the island south of the thirty-eighth parallel with two divisions, the Fortieth Division having been inactivated and sent home. The exact number of United States troops now in Korea has not been disclosed.

The troops will remain until a Korean government is set up in accordance with the terms drafted at the Three-Power Moscow Conference.

JAPAN AND THE PACIFIC

United States Army strength in the Pacific last October totaled 1,690,000 men. Today, says Brig. Gen. M. J. Gunner, General MacArthur's chief of staff in charge of personnel, there are 393,000 men scattered throughout the area, including the Japanese occupying force.

The Air Force, which once had 196,000 men and 5,500 planes in the Pacific, now has about 50,000 men. One officer pointed out that the Eighth Army's judge advocate section, which has the task of bringing to trial hundreds of minor Japanese war criminal suspects, now has only five legally trained officers.

MacArthur once said the Army would have only 200,000 men in Japan by June 1. The duration of the occupation and the conduct of the Japanese are two factors which will determine how long and in what strength the Army will remain here.

Throughout other Pacific islands, however, demobilization and the dismantling of bases continue to reduce the Army's strength and usefulness. Some of the bases were purely military necessities and their loss will not be noticed. However, it will be necessary for some time to maintain American forces where American supplies and property remain, such as the Philippines, Okinawa, and the Marianas.

THE WESTERN PACIFIC

America's hard-won military bases along the 6,000-mile invasion road are being steadily rolled up, but the Army indicates it probably will be some time before the job is completed.

Two of the 10 major bases of Army forces, Western Pacific, were closed recently—Biak and Hollandia in New Guinea. Cebu in the Philippines, Finschafen in New Guinea, and the supply base at Sydney, Australia, are expected to be shut down prior to July 1.

A theater spokesman said, however, that three other major Philippine bases—San Fernando-La Union in central Luzon, Tacloban on Leyte Island, and Batangas in southern Luzon—will remain operative until the disposal of surplus property.

The remaining two—Manila and Okinawa—are regarded as of a permanent nature.

From peak strength of 575,000 officers and men in the theater when the Army was completing last details for the invasion of Japan personnel was reduced to 80,000 by April 1. The tentative figure for July 1 is 62,500 men, with further reductions depending on the disposal of surplus stock.

The spokesman said the Australian and Dutch Governments have purchased surplus supplies from bases closed in the Southwest Pacific. The Army has disposed of military stores in New Guinea totaling 470,000 tons, while 600,000 tons have been disposed of in the Philippines.

AUSTRALIA

American soldiers once numbered in the hundreds of thousands have dwindled to 100 officers and 100 enlisted men in all Australia.

Within a year of the arrival of the first Americans in Australia in November 1941, there were about 250,000 Yanks here, including Navy men. During the war years more than 1,000,000 passed through the city of Brisbane alone.

In 1943 GI's were spending about $200,000,000 a year in Australia; today the United States Government is spending about $1,000,000 a month here.

There are virtually no United States servicemen remaining in New Zealand.

Great quantities of surplus stores have been shipped back to the United States because an agreement could not be reached with the Australian Government on an equitable price, but an Army surplus estimated to have cost $35,000,000 still remains.

LATIN AMERICA

Acting Secretary of State Acheson said recently that the the United States was withdrawing its troops from some Latin-American bases ahead of schedule. The continued presence of United States troops in Central and South American countries has caused no diplomatic crises, he added.

Feed for Livestock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the following is a request for feed for livestock and an investigation of lack of feeds by Mr. Gilmore, of the Lowell Humane Society.

Mr. Gilmore called to request assistance on getting better and more feed for livestock in the district.

On June 12, the Lowell Sun carried an AP photo of Albert J. Lupien, Chelmsford, Mass., showing 200 chickens dead. Mr. Lupien has received letters of protest from all over the United States. The clippings were sent from Dayton, Ohio.

Mr. Gilmore states the reason for these chickens dying is from ingredients which include dried citrus pulp; naturally, malnutrition sets in.

Mr. Lupien raises 22,000 chickens, uses 500 tons of grain per year. He is now running two tons per week short and losing 100 birds a day. He has chicks that were hatched March 1946 and now in June they are puny pullets.

I am asking for an investigation of this matter immediately. I have taken this matter up before without proper results.

H. R. 6746

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include text of H. R. 6746, a bill I introduced on June 11, 1946, entitled "A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers for veterans in a free competitive economy":

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as "The Veterans Employment and National Economic Development Corporation Act of 1946."

STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES

SEC. 2. (a) The purposes of this act are—

(1) to create a corporate entity charged with the direct responsibility of promoting the interests of veterans who are unemployed, veterans who had no employment prior to their war service, veterans who have no particular occupation, disabled veterans, the dependents of disabled veterans and the dependents of those who gave their lives to preserve our country, so as to enable them to partially recoup losses in time, seniority, and opportunities, and in financial and technical advancement, sustained by them as a result of their service in the armed forces by aiding them in their establishment in gainful occupations and careers in business, industry, trades, professions, agriculture, foreign trade, scientific development, research and education under our system of competitive free enterprise without displacing others;

(2) to utilize wartime and unused facilities and surpluses throughout the Nation and abroad that are suitable and can be employed profitably to afford opportunities for unemployed veterans, to help reduce the backlog of demand for goods and services, and to help meet the shortages and increasing new demands throughout the world for American goods and services;

(3) to create profitable business, professional, and occupational self-sufficient opportunities for veterans toward reducing to a minimum the need for unemployment compensation and bonuses;

(4) to foster an ever-expanding economy and prosperity toward preserving our system of government, our freedoms and our national security by utilizing fully our veterans who were selected from the cream of the crop of American manhood and womanhood;

(5) to assist qualified veterans engaged in useful and profitable enterprises, services, professions, or trades in other countries thereby cultivating those countries to become increasingly our customers and friends;

(6) to stimulate profitable activity and to attract the investment of private risk capital in enterprises within marginal areas in industry, business, agriculture, service trades, transportation, education, foreign trade, and in scientific fields, toward increasing employment of veterans;

(7) to assist State, community, and private agencies in financing self-liquidating projects which will utilize profitably the services of unemployed veterans;

(8) to stimulate enterprises and projects where gainful work opportunities, occupational therapy, and self-reliant careers will be opened to disabled veterans;

(9) to invite public subscription to the funds of the Corporation in order that the people of the Nation will be partners in this enterprise;

(10) to stimulate the maximum utilization and development of abundant natural resources in all geographical areas within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, so as to afford opportunities for veterans and to enrich the Nation; and

(11) to facilitate the establishment of necessary, useful, and profitable new enterprises in the various communities of the Nation that will insure the veterans against unemployment in recessions or depressions and to assure the fullest possible development of all our Nation's peacetime resources to stimulate an ever-expanding base of our national economy for the increasing benefit of all our people.

(b) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize the Corporation created under section 5 hereof to itself engage in the operation of any plant, facility, or other business undertaking.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this act—

(a) The term "veteran" means any person who shall have served as a member of the armed forces of the United States during any war in which the United States has been engaged and who shall have been separated from such service under conditions other than dishonorable, and includes a dependent of a disabled veteran and a dependent of a person who died while serving as a member of the armed forces or as a result of injuries incurred or illness contracted while serving as a member of the armed forces.

(b) The term "Corporation" means the Veterans Employment and National Economic Development Corporation created under section 5 of this act.

FUNCTIONS OF CORPORATION

SEC. 4. The Corporation is empowered—

(a) To make loans to veterans who are engaged in agriculture or in a business, trade, or profession, or who desire to engage in agriculture or in a business, trade, or profession, for the purpose of enabling them to acquire facilities, including land and buildings, equipment, and supplies, or to obtain necessary working capital.

(b) To make loans to veterans or to other persons who furnish such assurances as the board of directors may require that the proceeds of such loans will be used in a manner which will furnish substantial employment opportunities for veterans through the establishment of new businesses, the expansion of existing businesses, the construction or operation of multiple tenancy industrial structures or the conversion of existing plants or other structures for such uses, the

furnishing of technical, research, business, accounting, or other services to small business enterprises, the conduct of industrial and other research designed to provide new and increased employment, or through other means.

(c) To make loans to municipalities or other public bodies for the construction of needed self-liquidating public works, where such municipalities or other public bodies furnish such assurance as the board of directors may require that such construction will furnish substantial employment to and otherwise inure to the benefit of veterans or their families.

(d) To make loans to educational institutions, including trade schools, where it is shown to the satisfaction of the board of directors that a shortage of facilities exists which impedes the educational program provided under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and that the proceeds of such loans will be used to make additional educational facilities available to veterans.

(e) To make loans to veterans or other persons who furnish such assurance as the board of directors may require that the proceeds of such loans will be used in the construction or acquisition of housing for veterans and their families.

(f) To render technical advisory service to applicants for and recipients of loans under this act, including the furnishing of information concerning business, vocational, and professional opportunities, methods, techniques, and other matters which, in the opinion of the board of directors, will contribute to the soundness of the projects or enterprises with respect to which loans are made. In rendering such services the Corporation shall utilize, wherever possible, the informational, research, technical, and other existing services and facilities conducted by other departments and agencies of the Government.

(g) To conduct such studies, investigations, research, and planning as may be necessary to enable it effectively to provide the advisory and other services authorized under paragraph (h) and otherwise to carry out its functions under this act.

(h) To perform, upon request of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, any of the functions or powers conferred upon the Administrator under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

(i) To cooperate with the War Assets Administration or its successor, and with agencies which own or are designated to dispose of surplus property, to make surveys from time to time, and to bring to the attention of such agencies the needs and requirements of veterans and any cases or situations which have resulted in or would effect discrimination against veterans in the purchase or acquisition of surplus property by them and in the disposal thereof by the agencies.

(j) To purchase any surplus property for resale to veterans, upon credit or otherwise, when in the judgment of the Board of Directors, such disposition will aid in carrying out the purposes of this act.

(k) To guarantee loans made by banks or other leading institutions, the proceeds of which are used for any of the purposes for which the Corporation is authorized to make loans under this section.

Loans made by the Corporation under this section shall be made upon such terms and conditions as the Board of Directors shall deem reasonable and necessary (a) to enable the Corporation to carry out its functions under this act without financial loss to the United States, and (b) to make certain that the proceeds of such loans will be used only for the purposes for which made and in a manner consistent with the objectives of this act.

CORPORATION

SEC. 5. There is hereby created a body corporate under the name "Veterans Employment and National Economic Development Corporation" (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation"). The principal office of the Corporation shall be located in the District of Columbia, but the Corporation may establish such branch offices in other places in the United States as may be determined by the Board of Directors.

CAPITAL STOCK

SEC. 6. The Corporation shall have a capital stock of $500,000,000, subscribed for by the United States through the Secretary of the Treasury, payment for which shall be subject to call in whole or in part by the Board of Directors of the Corporation. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $500,000,000 for the purpose of enabling the Secretary of the Treasury to make payment for such capital stock when payment is called by the Board of Directors. Receipts for payment by the United States for or on account of such capital stock shall be issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury and shall be evidence of the stock ownership by the United States.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

SEC. 7. The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors consisting of seven members, not more than four of whom shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The term of office of directors shall be 4 years except that (1) the terms of office of the directors first appointed shall run from the date of enactment hereof and shall expire, two at the end of the second year, two at the end of the third year, and three at the end of the fourth year; and (2) a director appointed to fill a vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or removal of a director prior to the expiration of the term for which he was appointed, shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term. The directors of the Corporation shall be paid compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum. The Board of Directors shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. The Chairman shall be paid compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum and the Vice Chairman shall be paid compensation at the rate of $11,000 per annum. A majority of the membership as constituted at any time shall constitute a quorum, and vacancies in the membership shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Board.

CORPORATE POWERS

SEC. 8. The Corporation shall have power to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed; to make contracts; to lease such real estate as may be necessary for the transaction of its business; to accept gifts or contributions of services, money or property, real or personal; to sue and to be sued, to complain and defend, in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal; to select, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary for the transaction of the business of the Corporation, without regard to the provisions of other laws applicable to the employment and compensation of officers and employees of the United States, except the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944; to define their authority and duties, require bonds of them and fix the penalties thereof, and to dismiss at pleasure such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents; and to prescribe, amend, and repeal, by its Board of Directors, bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its general business may be conducted and the powers granted to it by law may be exercised and enjoyed, including provision for such committees and the functions thereof as the Board of Directors may deem necessary for facilitating its business under this act. The Board of Directors of the Corporation shall determine and prescribe the manner in which its obligations shall be incurred and its expenses allowed and paid. The Corporation shall be entitled to the free use of the United States mails in the same manner as the executive departments of the Government. The Corporation, with the consent of any board, commission, independent establishment, or executive department of the Government, including any field service thereof, may avail itself of the use of information, services, facilities, officers, and employees thereof in carrying out the provisions of this act.

DEPOSIT OF CORPORATE FUNDS

SEC. 9. All moneys of the Corporation not otherwise employed may be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States subject to check by authority of the Corporation or in any Federal Reserve bank, or may, by authorization of the Board of Directors of the Corporation, be used in the purchase for redemption and retirement of any notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations issued by the Corporation, and the Corporation may reimburse such Federal Reserve bank for its services in the manner as may be agreed upon. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as depositaries, custodians, and fiscal agents for the Veterans' Employment and National Economic Development Corporation in the general performance of its powers conferred by this act.

OBLIGATIONS OF CORPORATION

SEC. 10. The Corporation is authorized and empowered with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to issue, and to have outstanding at any one time in an amount aggregating not more than 10 times the amount of its authorized capital stock, its notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations; such obligations to mature not more than 20 years from their respective dates of issue, to be redeemable at the option of the Corporation before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such obligations, and to bear such rate or rates of interest as may be determined by the Corporation. The notes, debentures, bonds, and other obligations of the Corporation may be secured by assets of the Corporation in such manner as shall be prescribed by its Board of Directors. Such obligations may be issued in payment of any loan authorized by this act or may be offered for sale at such price or prices as the Corporation may determine with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The said obligations shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed both as to interest and principal by the United States and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face thereof. In the event that the Corporation shall be unable to pay upon demand, when due, the principal of or interest on notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations issued by it, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and thereupon to the extent of the amounts so paid the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holders of such notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, is authorized to purchase any obligations of the Corporation to be issued hereunder, and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of the Corporation's obligations hereunder. The Secretary of the Treasury may, at any time, sell any of the obligations of the Corporation acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the

Treasury of the obligations of the Corporation shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States. Such obligations shall not be eligible for discount or purchase by any Federal Reserve bank.

EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION

SEC. 311. The Corporation, including its franchise, its capital, reserves, and surplus, and its income shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority; except that any real property of the Corporation shall be subject to State, Territorial, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed.

FORMS FOR OBLIGATIONS

SEC. 12. In order that the Corporation may be supplied with such forms of notes, debentures, bonds or other such obligations as it may need for issuance under this act, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to prepare such forms as shall be suitable and approved by the Corporation, to be held in the Treasury subject to delivery, upon order of the Corporation. The engraved plates, dies, bed pieces, and so forth, executed in connection therewith shall remain in the custody of the Secretary of the Treasury. The Corporation shall reimburse the Secretary of the Treasury for any expenses incurred in the preparation, custody, and delivery of such notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations.

DEPOSITARY OF PUBLIC FUNDS

SEC. 13. When designated for that purpose by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Corporation shall be a depositary of public money, except receipts from customs, under such regulations as may be prescribed by said Secretary; and it may also be employed as a financial agent of the Government; and it shall perform all such reasonable duties, as depositary of public money and financial agent of the Government, as may be required of it. Obligations of the Corporation shall be lawful investments and may be accepted as security for all fiduciary, trust, and public funds, the investment or deposit of which shall be under the authority or control of the United States or any officer or officers thereof.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE

SEC. 14. (a) There is hereby created an Interdepartmental Committee on Veterans' Employment and National Economic Development which shall be composed of a representative of each of the following Government agencies designated by the head thereof: The Department of State, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, the Veterans' Administration, the Retraining and Reemployment Administration, the War Assets Administration or its successor, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and such other departments or agencies as may be designated by the President. It shall be the duty of the committee to consult with and advise the Board of Directors, as the Board of Directors may from time to time request, upon matters relating to the exercise of the functions of the Corporation.

(b) The Board of Directors is authorized to appoint and consult with an advisory council to be composed of representatives of groups having an interest in the education, training, rehabilitation, or employment of veterans, including representatives of industry, labor, agriculture, education, and veterans' organizations. Members of the advisory council shall be paid compensation at the rate of $25 per diem, and shall be reimbursed for all necessary traveling, subsistence, and other expenses, while engaged in the business of the council.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 15. The Corporation shall make and publish a report quarterly of its operations to the Congress stating the aggregate loans made to each of the classes of borrowers provided for and the number of borrowers by States in each class, and showing the assets and liabilities of the Corporation.

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 16. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO ALTER, AMEND, OR REPEAL

SEC. 17. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Price and Wage Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter on the impossibility of maintaining effective price control without equally effective wage control and rationing. The letter was written to Senator WAGNER, of New York, by a businessman residing in my congressional district:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

The Honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: I have no ax to grind. My career as a businessman is almost finished. * * * I was in the grain business about 14 years, after which time I retired from the firm of Fraser-Smith Co. * * *

What I want to write about is the OPA. The Truman administration says it is fighting inflation but does everything possible to actually promote inflation. Price controls will not stop inflation unless you have wage control and rationing at the same time. This is fundamental. If we are not going to have wage control and rationing we cannot have price control, as without the other two factors price control is simply profit control. When the Government attempts to control profits that means the end of free enterprise.

The advocates of OPA say this control is only temporary, but it is not going to be temporary if the OPA has its way. They are getting more firmly entrenched and there will always be some excuse for continuing this operation. A free people cannot afford to risk their freedom or right to engage in business without Government dictation and regulation in times of peace—not for a year, not for a month, nor even for a week. Rather than run any risk at all of the freedom of enterprise being curtailed, the OPA should be liquidated by June 30.

I believe that 80 percent of the men in this country are for the liquidation of OPA. I also believe that 80 percent of the women are for continuation of the OPA. The attitude of the women is easily understood, for the reason that in their innocence they believe price control means no inflation. Due to the propaganda put out from Washington, you can hardly blame the women. They apparently do not know that the continuation of OPA without wage control or rationing is absolutely useless. If they understood that they would think the same as the men.

During the war, while wages were more or less fixed, the OPA was partially successful for the simple reason that the people were willing to cooperate. There was a war on and everyone was willing to submit to dictation, much of which, however, seems to me was unnecessary. Whether necessary or not, we were willing to cooperate with the Government in anything they wanted to do. Now the war is over, the people resent dictation from Washington, and as far as the OPA is concerned no one is going to pay any particular attention to their regulations. It was impossible to enforce prohibition, and it will be much more impossible for the OPA to enforce its regulations in peacetime. Practically everything will be, and for that matter is now, on a black-market basis. The OPA permits the manufacturers a small increase in the price of automobiles but black-market operators can make one or two hundred dollars a car, and it seems to me it would be much better to give the manufacturers that profit than the black-market operators. There is no question but what meat and a great many other products are being sold at over-ceiling prices at the present time. Any farmer in the Middle West has been able to obtain 20 cents a bushel over ceiling price for corn if he wanted to take the money. This has been true for a good many months.

The OPA is making crooks out of people who want to be honest. They have got to be crooks and do business on the black market or quit business. I would eliminate OPA for this one reason alone. There are enough crooks in the country now without compelling honest people to be crooked.

Businessmen tell me they cannot understand OPA regulations and do not know where they are at. They also say the OPA does not understand a lot of their own regulations. It is all confusion and will remain that way unless OPA is killed. Bowles and Porter make extravagant claims. If they had 100 times the brains and judgment they actually have they could not control the prices of goods to the consumers without wage control and rationing. Their whole attitude indicates an antagonism towards business, which is a very unhealthy situation. They seem to be willing to disregard the consequences of any actions they take. Big business can stand it for a while but not small business. Many factories in this country today are closed down because they cannot operate at a profit. Industry is too involved and too complicated and too interdependent. I know of a farm-implement company that is shut down owing to strikes in 54 factories which supply them with material. I understand that during the war 3,000 factories were engaged in manufacturing the parts for big bombers. If one factory fell down on the job it balled up the whole process. This simply illustrates the involved nature of our economy, and it is absolutely impossible to have it regulated from Washington if we are to have volume production.

In all the discussion concerning OPA one important factor has evidently been lost sight of and that is capital. In addition to institutional investors there are probably 15 or 20 million people who own stocks in different corporations. These people have as many votes as organized labor. This does not include what is generally designated as small business. The ownership of small business is usually closely held.

Today the people that are furnishing the money are investing it on the basis of 2½ percent on Government bonds to 4 percent on good preferred and common stocks. On this basis there is not much incentive to make investments. What business requires is a lot of money for expansion and the creation of new businesses. Full employment demands this. Up to this time investors have been furnishing the money. We are

still doing it, and there is plenty of money to be furnished to business, provided a reasonable return is allowed on the money invested. By a fair return I mean 6 percent to 10 percent. Investors are still furnishing the capital and plenty of it on the theory that larger profits will be obtained in the future than now prevail. The manufacturer's profit is an infinitesimal part of the cost of an article to the consumer. Most of the costs are represented by raw material, wages, and salaries. For instance, I know when I was in the flour-milling business we figured that if we could make 2½ cents on a 50-pound sack of flour we were doing fine. Why worry or even argue about profits. It's perfect nonsense.

If the OPA is going to make it impossible for business to earn fair profits capital will be withdrawn and then the capital will have to be furnished by the Government. This is probably what the economic planners would like to see come about. If, however, that occurs we will then have actual socialism, for that step would soon be followed by the Government's taking over business, as they have done in other countries. Therefore, I believe if our capitalistic system is to survive OPA will have to go unless you have wage control and rationing with price control. If you are not willing to bring this about a continuance of OPA will just lead to more confusion, inflation, and a strike of capital.

The basic years used by the OPA for their calculations are 1936–39, inclusive. As I understand it, OPA adds the higher costs of the present period to the costs of their basic period and gives business the same profit they had in the basic period. Inasmuch as over 80 percent of the industries of the country operated at a loss during that period I can't see a brilliant future for American industry as long as OPA is permitted to exist. In their basic period the country was in a depression for 1½ years.

If Bowles and Porter were supermen, they could not control prices. I cannot imagine anyone being so egotistical as to think they can control prices. Without wage control and rationing they simply have not the weapons. Even if they had these weapons, it could not be done without the cooperation of the people. Now that the war is over the people will not cooperate.

* * * * *

If Roosevelt had lived, I believe he would have held a line on wages and turned the production of peacetime goods over to industry without any dictation from Washington or any domination of industry by bureaucrats. Although before the war he lambasted business for political reasons, in the end his whole attitude toward business underwent a radical change, and he became a great admirer of our industrial system and the men who created it. The present administration sponsored a rise in wages when there was no justification for it. All through the war wage increases preceded a rise in the cost of living. There were continued strikes all during the war, delaying the war effort. How many American lives were lost as a result of these strikes no one will ever know. As a matter of fact, what we now have is organized labor dictation through government, and the people are getting decidedly weary of it. If any political party had the guts to destroy the labor racket, they would get 60 percent of the votes of union labor and practically all of the votes of nonunion labor. Most people believe in collective bargaining, but not in the labor racket as it exists today. By submitting to the labor dictation, with the consent of the legislative branch, the administration has started another inflation spiral which, if not stopped cold, will lead to disaster for everyone. It will be just one spiral of inflation after another until our money becomes worthless. Every country that has tried inflation has met with disaster. There is a mild flight from the dollar today. For instance, farmers would rather have their grain than the money.

What is the solution? As I see it, there are two choices: Either continue OPA with wage control and rationing—all three factors—or give industry a free hand. The thing has been so muddled and messed up that, in my opinion, there is only one solution: Give industry a free hand, preserve the profit system, and industry will swamp the country with goods in 6 months. True, there will be temporarily some inflation—perhaps a lot of it—but within a few months the black-market operators will see the avalanche coming, as the Germans and Japs saw it, and they will run for cover. It will be over by election time if this is done, but if it is not done it will be all over for the Democratic Party by next November. We have a marvelous industrial system. Our production during the war astounded the world. No one believed we could do it, but it was done, and the same businessmen who furnished the weapons to win the war in the short period of 2 years can do just as good a job in peacetime if given the opportunity.

Labor shows no indication of cooperating, so strikes must be outlawed for at least a year. Has the legislative branch of the Government the guts to do this? I think it has. I believe you are mostly hard-working, patriotic men trying to solve some very difficult problems. You are, however, and necessarily so, politicians, so I say to you politics must be put in cold storage for a year. After all, what is best for the country is the best politics.

At the same time you exterminate the OPA and permit industry a free hand, those 35,000 public-relations people you have in Washington can finish the job and give inflation the final knock-out. The OPA does not credit the American people with having any sense. They treat the people as though they were a bunch of children. Their actions would indicate they are laboring under the delusion that they have a monopoly on all the brains in the country. I believe in the good, sound sense of our ordinary citizens. Most people are not going to rush in and buy things they do not have to buy, as they realize that the longer they delay, the better quality merchandise they will get and at much lower prices. We have to recognize the fact that there are a good many people who now have money to spend who never did have much before the war. Unless these people are advised by proper propaganda, they are likely to rush in and buy merchandise and gobble up everything in sight, regardless of OPA and regardless of the prices they pay, as long as their money lasts. To educate these people and allay their fears of inflation is a proper job for the Government propaganda machine.

Obviously, the wise thing to do is to let industry prosper and keep taxes fairly high. Otherwise, the administration will run into some more deficits and the budget will not be balanced. Balancing the budget means nothing at all. It is just the first step. We have $275,000,000,000 indebtedness, and the thing to do is to create all the prosperity possible, keep taxes high, and pay off the debts of the country. In my judgment, they should be paid off at the rate of $25,000,000,000 a year for the next 10 years. We are in for a great era of prosperity if the economic planners don't spoil it. If the Government does not take advantage of the present opportunity to pay its debts, they never will be paid. It's a golden opportunity which this administration has muffed.

People generally do not think Truman is as much to blame for the present mess as the legislative branch of the Government. All during the Roosevelt administration the House and Senate raved against the dictation of the President. When Truman became President, he showed every indication of wanting the House and Senate to assume their constitutional right to make the laws. Both the House and Senate refused to assume this responsibility. I hear such remarks as this, "The legislative branch of the Government went to seed during the Roosevelt administration." It's high time the legislative branch returned to its constitutional duty of writing the laws and limiting the executive branch to its constitutional duty of executing the laws.

I wish to repeat, price control without wage control and rationing is simply profit control which strikes at the very heart of our liberties. If industry is given freedom of action competition will take care of inflation in a few months. I well remember how this happened at the close of the First World War. I was in the grain business. Wheat was selling from $3 to $4 a bushel. One day a little over a year after the armistice, about 11 o'clock in the morning, the news came out that Ford had cut the price of automobiles quite drastically. Inflation stopped almost instantly and deflation set in. As I recall it, the price of wheat was down almost 10 cents a bushel in 2 hours. Something like that will come again. In any event, competition will take care of inflation.

Very respectfully yours,

J. FRANK FRASER.

The Development of Atomic Energy Should Be Under Civilian Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of the McMahon bill for civilian control of atomic energy, which has passed the Senate and has been referred to this House. I am very much against the idea of the atomic energy legislation now being considered in the Military Affairs Committee, which appears to me to give the military too much control and bring into existence again the May-Johnson bill, which was considered earlier this session.

It is my hope that the House will set aside the recommendations of its Military Affairs Committee if what I have said proves to be the truth. With the United Nations Commission on Atomic Energy considering the Baruch proposal to establish a world development authority, I feel that the passage of the McMahon bill is necessary. Establishment of atomic control at home is an absolute prerequisite and we can no longer leave this most potent of the earth's forces unharnessed, and, in this direction, the McMahon bill makes the fullest provision for the national defense and security of this country and represents the unbiased judgment of the 11-man special committee of the Senate and has the unanimous approval of the Senate as a whole. It was adopted after months of hearing the views of outstanding leaders of science, industry, education, government, and other walks of life. It has been endorsed repeatedly by the President of the United States and has the wholehearted support of Hon. Bernard M. Baruch, United States delegate to the Atomic Energy Commission of the United Nations; Hon. Robert

P. Patterson, Secretary of War; Hon. James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy; Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Chief of Staff; and Admiral Chester A. Nimitz, Chief of Naval Operations. It makes possible—and this I think is tremendously important—the fullest development of the peacetime benefits of atomic energy for all the American people. Whatever is done or not done by the Congress will have an important effect on the international negotiations now taking place with respect to atomic energy. It is time for both parties to rise to a high and patriotic level of national and international statesmanship at this time and the best possible indication we could give for our desire for the outlawing of war and the development of atomic energy for peace would be the passage of the McMahon bill at the earliest possible moment.

Proposal for Solution of Serious Existing Problems Relating to Trade Between the United States and Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, with this extension of remarks, I am presenting in the RECORD a proposal by Dr. Charles Prince for an open and aboveboard commercial treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union. Dr. Prince was formerly employed as an expert on Soviet Russia by the United States Chamber of Commerce.

It is obvious that the whole future peace of the world depends primarily upon relationships between the United States and Soviet Russia. The policy presently being pursued by Secretary Byrnes is, in my judgment, under all the existing circumstances the one most likely to lead ultimately to the achievement of a genuine peace. It calls for an earnest attempt to secure the sincere cooperation of Russia in building and maintaining peace on the foundation of justice. It also calls for a decided firmness in our position on matters of principle.

One of the main problems that has afflicted American-Soviet relations has been secrecy. There is above all things a need that this curtain of secrecy be rolled up and dealings be placed upon a far more open and aboveboard basis. Few people realize that at the present time the Soviet Union is actually obtaining vast quantities of machinery, equipment, and other goods from the United States. This is happening because these things are being sold to Russia at prices far higher, sometimes many times as high, as could be obtained if the goods were sold at home. Some of the very largest corporations in the United States are participating in this lucrative trade, but the United States receives no quid pro quo whatsoever for these shipments to the Soviet Union. A fair, clearly developed, open and aboveboard commercial treaty with the Soviet Union would make it possible for America to insist on equality of treatment for Americans in Russia with that accorded to Russians coming to America for business or professional reasons, to insist that all our companies participate in such trade as is to be carried on and offers great opportunity for conditions to be made which would go far toward the advancement of the cause of true peace.

These are some of the considerations that lead me to urge that Members of the House give attention to the document by Dr. Prince, which follows:

THE CASE FOR EFFECTING A COMMERCIAL TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION

(By Charles Prince)

In its eagerness to reconstruct the devastated areas within the shortest possible time and in the hope of raising the standard of living of its people, the Soviet Government requires from the United States machine tools and basic means of production and the means of transportation and industrial know-how. Obviously, this phenomenon transcends economic and commercial factors as such and raises political issues of paramount significance.

On the basis of decrees issued by the newly established governments in Poland, Finland, Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, and economic treaties effected between these governments and the Soviet Union, it is safe to assume that commercial relations between the United States and those countries will be a manifestation of, and consistent with, our commercial relations with the Soviet Government. This state of affairs appears to be also a fait accompli in the five countries in the Far East earmarked as the Soviet "zones of security."

Presently, we propose to outline a feasible course of action toward the development of a national policy and program in the proffered commercial relations between the Soviet Union and the United States on a globalwise basis.

According to Soviet spokesmen, the announced plans of postwar reconstruction and development and of the measures being taken by the Soviet Goverment to effectuate them might be accelerated or retarded commensurate with the financial, economic, and technical assistance the Soviet Government will receive from the United States. Moreover, under the rigidly owned and controlled state monopoly, the fundamental objective of Soviet foreign trade is not large or small imports or exports as such, but only the exchange needed to achieve the complete and speedy technological, economic, and industrial independence of the U. S. S. R., preferably within the next 5-year plan period, 1946–50.

Moreover, the indubitable fact remains that the present commercial and trade relations between individual firms and private entrepreneurs in the United States, on the one hand, and the rigidly owned and controlled monopoly of domestic and foreign trade of the Soviet Union, on the other, tend to increase the urgency of effecting a bilateral agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States, which, in turn, would pave the way for future multilateral international trade agreements. It is of decided advantage to the Soviet government that we do not have a national commercial policy bearing on trade relations with the Soviet Union and/or with those countries that are now being integrated into the Soviet economy and are likely to remain within the Soviet sphere of influence for some time. The reason for such a position is both understandable and logical in view of the entangled political situation in Europe, and especially in the Near East and in the Far East. Failing to effect a coordinated course of action on the part of government, industry, and commerce, we are indirectly expediting Soviet penetration into those areas and are restricting foreign trade to a few large American corporations that can afford such large risks and control semimonopolies of given products.

PROJECTED TREATY IS CONSISTENT WITH THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

A commercial treaty envisaged herein should be effectuated in pursuance of the United Nations Charter, more specifically, on the basis of the projected Economic and Social Council. Article 71 of the Charter specifically provides that the Economic and Social Council may make suitable arrangements for consultation with nongovernmental organizations which are concerned with matters within its competence. Such arrangements would obviously include the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the National Foreign Trade Council, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Bankers Association, etc. The Charter provides "that such arrangements may be made with international organizations and, where appropriate, with national organizations after consultation with the member of the United Nations concerned." Before the machinery of the United Nations is set into motion, it is therefore incumbent upon responsible business leaders to discharge this responsibility on the basis of concerted action and to evolve a national policy concerning international trade.

Time is of the essence. Within the visible future it would seem that there will not be international trade relations between individuals living and producing in countries characterized by free enterprise and nearly perfect competition. On the contrary, in all likelihood international trade will of necessity be carried on between the government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the free entrepreneurs in the United States. Therefore, business leaders must exercise foresight and fortitude in formulating a national policy bearing on international commerce before the problems become complex and to obviate rigid governmental control of foreign trade of the United States.

PROJECTED TREATY IS CONSISTENT WITH THE BRETTON WOODS PLAN

To effect a bilateral commercial treaty would in no way affect adversely the Bretton Woods Agreement Act and its objectives. Apropos of the Johnson Act of April 13, 1934, prohibiting financial transactions with any foreign government in default on its obligations to the United States, special provisions have been incorporated in two congressional acts approved July 31, 1945, (1) Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, section 11, and (2) Bretton Woods Agreement Act, section 9. These provisions would legalize effecting a commercial treaty which would, in turn, reflect a national policy bearing on commercial relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. The transitional period provided in the agreement may extend longer than 5 years before the Bretton Woods plan will be put into operation on a globalwise basis, especially those functions which provide for eradication of exchange controls and resumption of multilateral international trade. On the contrary, the bilateral treaty envisaged herewith would expedite the consummation of the Bretton Woods agreements because such treaty would make provision or make it possible for many other European and Asiatic countries to avail themselves of the financial and economic agencies that will be established in pursuance of the Bretton Woods agreements.

Seemingly, from a long-range point of view the level of employment in the United States as such is not primarily dependent on international trade. Expanded international trade is highly desirable because it raises the

standard of living and the richness of living and because of the products and services which are exchanged, and is one of the most effective means of establishing better understanding between and among nations. This appears to be also one of the basic cores of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945.

Moreover, the Soviet government's failure to ratify the Bretton Woods Agreements before the date line, December 31, 1945, and its refusal to accept the invitation to participate in the International Conference on Trade and Employment scheduled to convene in the summer of 1946, are two more vivid illustrations of the validity of the thesis expounded herewith.

REASONS FOR EFFECTING A COMMERCIAL TREATY NOW

1. Government loans plus private bank credits

In testifying before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in July 1945, Leo T. Crowley, speaking in his dual capacity as Chairman of the Board of the Export-Import Bank and as the then Foreign Economic Administrator, indicated that Soviet Russia is likely to receive $1,000,000,000 of credit during the next year. But he also emphasized the importance of private financing in postwar trade relations between the U. S. S. R. and U. S. A. Speaking for the administration, Mr. Crowley stated: "We hope and believe that a large part of the necessary financing will be provided by private financial institutions. However, there are certain types of risks and certain large risks which private banks are not in a position to assume without governmental assistance and other risks which they are not prepared to assume at all." If Mr. Crowley is correct, it follows also that no combination of private firms in the United States, however financially powerful, will be in a position to cope with this gigantic credit arrangement without the guidance of a commercial treaty envisaged herein. Thus a consortium of private banks could and should supplement Government loans and credits that will be granted to the Soviet Union.

2. Protection of private property and patent rights in liberated areas and in the U. S. S. R.

An important aspect of international trade which requires immediate concerted action is the postwar settlement of property rights. The problem of restitution or indemnification of property seized, damaged, or destroyed during World War II is of such magnitude that even a partial clarification of this state of affairs can only be achieved through concerted action on the part of both business and government. This problem is all the more precarious in view of the fact that the Soviet government has sequestered and transplanted to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics huge quantities of properties that have belonged to private individuals and who are citizens of the countries that are now occupied by the Soviet armies. American investments are also at stake in these sequestered properties. It would be of decided service to the governments concerned if a tentative plan could be worked out for the compensation, restoration, or indemnification of property of the United Nations or of their nationals, prior to the formal peace settlement with countries like Rumania, Austria, Finland, Bulgaria, and Hungary and later with countries like China, Korea, Outer Mongolia, Manchuria, and Japan. It is a foregone conclusion that foreign trade with 15 countries that are now being integrated into the Soviet orbit will be supervised by the Soviets. This is an important aspect in view of the fact that a world-wide recognition of the right to private property lawfully acquired is indispensable to the conduct of international trade.

It should also be noted that the very nature of the Soviet planned economy is not conducive to respect of individual property rights; especially if the properties sequestered could be classified as "means of production" or used in the individual accumulation of profits. Consequently, some correlating agency could be established vis-a-vis a commercial treaty not only to effectuate a rational settlement of property rights but also to encourage expansion of international trade and investment.

In the absence of any oral or written understanding between the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union bearing on economic relations and commercial transactions, the question of patent rights, trade-marks, and copyrights has been a very serious source of disputes and entanglements. This anomalous situation still prevails.

Soviet laws do not offer any guaranty of protection to owners of patents, patent rights, and trade-marks registered with the United States Patent Office. The latest Soviet government decree dealing with inventions and patents was published on March 5, 1941, and is still in effect, subject to the regulations of 1942.

Like the patent laws of the United States, the Soviet law does not recognize foreign patent rights. The Soviet law makes no distinction between citizens of the Soviet Union and foreigners. Yet there is no provision whereby the inventor or the owner of a patent or the patent rights would or could collect royalties in the event the Soviet government actually manufactured and used his invention within the boundaries of the U. S. S. R. or, what is more important, exported that product to countries outside the U. S. S. R. Thus under the present circumstances an American inventor and owner of a patent has no recourse to recover royalties or compensation for his invention or patent right unless he had previously secured a patent right to his invention in the U. S. S. R.

It should also be noted that the very nature and structure of the Soviet economy precludes any guaranteed individual rights to an inventor or owner of a patent. Moreover, all industry, transport, and communications are owned and managed by the state through agencies especially established for those respective purposes. In addition, the Soviet government exercises a rigid monopoly of all foreign trade. Accordingly, there is but one potential customer for a new device, process, technique, or article, namely, the Soviet government. Hence no American inventor or owner of a patent or patent rights has any protection of or recourse for his rights similar to those in the United States. Obviously, the rights of citizens of the United States could not be protected other than through provisions to be incorporated in a commercial treaty, since neither the United States nor the Soviet Union is a signatory to the International Copyright Convention.

3. Establishing an adequate arbitration tribunal

In the absence of a national policy of concerted business action, Soviet agencies purchasing or selling in the American market are advantageously situated insofar as their trading and bargaining position is concerned. Hence, the Soviets are not too eager to effect a commercial treaty that would reflect an American national commercial policy. Suffice it to note that Soviet representatives already insist upon including a clause in contracts offered to American corporations to the effect that in case of potential dispute arbitration will have to take place before the Foreign Trade Arbitration Commission, appointed by the Presidium of the All-Union Chamber of Commerce, sitting in Moscow. This Arbitration Commission is guided by its own rules, and the American corporation or individual firm will bind itself in advance to agree that a decision of this Commission will be final and binding upon the signatories to the contract. As is known, this clause was also in use in some contracts executed by Amtorg Trading Corp. prior to World War II.

Permanent Arbitration Commissions appointed by the Presidium of the All-Union Chamber of Commerce are the established practice of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in handling disputes arising in Soviet internal and international trade. Moreover, the procedure of the Foreign Trade Arbitration Commission provides that there is no appeal. Consequently, in the absence of an international court of appeals or arbitration tribunal that is recognized by the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union, provision for arbitration of disputes could be made in the projected commercial treaty. Such provision, if scrupulously followed, would greatly enhance the mutual confidence without which international trade cannot prosper.

4. To obviate the probability of dumping and discrimination

The present practice on the part of some firms that exercise semimonopolies of certain goods and services to increase prices of commodities sold to Soviet purchasing agencies in the hope of covering the risk involved in commercial dealings with the Soviet government may prove economically unsound from a long-range point of view, because some of these goods are diverted from domestic markets. Obviously, such practices, if continued unabated, are also likely to be deterrent factors in our commercial relations with countries that will not fall within the Soviet sphere of influence both economically and politically because they will not be in a position, in all probability, to pay such high prices as the Soviets would be willing to pay. This is an obvious truism because the Soviet government per se owns the most far-reaching cartels and monopolies in the world.

Amtorg Trading Corporation (or any other designated Soviet purchasing agency) could monopolize—and if not restrained, certainly would—entire markets of certain products manufactured in the United States and disrupt normal channels of trade domestically as well as in foreign trade. Amtorg could also give preferential consideration to firms whose labor unions are controlled by the CIO rather than to those by the AFL. Regretfully this discrimination has already taken place in several instances. This would be a natural corollary of Amtorg's voluminous purchasing quantities of goods and services in the United States.

Moreover, in the light of cross-current dynamic political entanglements, it is conceivable, in fact probable, that the Soviets will buy huge quantities of goods that cannot be readily manufactured within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and thus begin at once to accumulate vast stock piles of raw materials and finished products. The probability of discrimination, dumping, and such other practices on the part of Soviet agents is within the realm of possibility. A commercial treaty could specifically provide against such mutually disadvantageous practices.

It should be noted that the planned-economy handling of Soviet foreign trade makes it easier for them to shift volumes of commercial transactions from one country to another without recourse to indirect methods of regulating trade exchanges with this or that foreign country. No country has had an evenly balanced trade with each of its trading partners, and Russia is no exception. When trade is not evenly balanced country by country multilateral trade practices prevail, a more desirable practice than balanced bilateral arrangements. And as far as available information indicates, there is practically no country with which the Soviet Union had an evenly balanced trade prior to 1941. However, this practice will become all the more pronounced henceforth not only within the boundaries of the greater Union of Soviet Socialist Republics but also in southeastern and central Europe, and especially in the Far East. It is, therefore, imperative to effect arrangements in the hope of forestalling such

planetary practices. An ounce of prevention is always worth more than a pound of cure. A commercial treaty would offer greater protection to foreign traders against discrimination and would obviate the necessity of vigorous dumping or underselling by the Soviet Union in the far eastern areas where the standard of living is even lower than that in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. That the Soviet Union will receive far-reaching preferential considerations in China is also evidenced by the Russo-Chinese Treaty signed in Moscow on August 14, 1945.

5. Dire need for exchange of information

During the past decade the Soviet government sent hundreds of Russian engineers and other trained observers to the United States; whereas, the number of Americans in the Soviet Union, both Government officials and private citizens, has proportionately been very negligible. This is but one of the many aspects of the anomalous situation that prevailed heretofore.

A commercial treaty would make specific provisions for Americans to have freedom of movement in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as well as in the European and Asiatic countries that are now occupied by the Soviet armies. This freedom of movement and travel should parallel those the Russians enjoy in the United States as well as in the countries that are occupied by the American and British armies. This would render the respective security zones accessible to both Americans and Russians and would afford an exchange of information and pave the way for reciprocal cultural privileges which are as vital as the commercial and trade relations; one would supplement the other. The projected commercial treaty between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America would also blaze the trail for a quid pro quo exchange of trained observers (scholars, students, technicians, correspondents, actors, artists, Government officials, scientists, etc.) and first-hand information, thus gradually reducing the deeply embedded tensions between the two formidable countries. Absence of a coordinated national foreign trade policy would tend to work to the interest of the Soviet Government but to the disadvantage of the United States.

Failing to effect a national policy on a quid pro quo basis, via a commercial treaty or through another cognately related mechanism, we would unwittingly be expediting Soviet Russia's penetration into the European vacuum and thus reduce the areas of free enterprise and private initiative to its lowest ebb.

In the interests of national welfare, American business leaders owe themselves an honest appraisal of the changed international scene and of the dynamic forces ceaselessly at work in it. Clearly, by now it appears to be a truism that precipitated government crises in Iran, Turkey, Syria, China, Spain, and elsewhere affect the businessman in Chicago, the industrial worker in Detroit, and the farmer in Middletown. Consequently, in effecting a commercial treaty with the Soviet Government, we would create opportunities of gaining first-hand information not only about the greater U. S. S. R. but also concerning the state of affairs in many other European and Asiatic countries whose far-reaching political and economic destinies are now being shaped by the Soviets.

In evolving a national policy bearing on commercial relations with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics we are in no way condoning the Soviet predatory activities in various parts of the world. On the contrary, our forthright attitude might minimize the areas of disagreement. Moreover, on the basis of recently published Soviet documents and official pronouncements it is reasonably safe to say that approximately one-fourth of the total foreign trade of the United States during the next few years will clear directly or indirectly through the channels of the Narkomvneshtorg.

6. Preservation of free enterprise system

Foreign trade is not necessarily a big business operation. Commercial transactions in foreign trade may be similar to wholesale transactions in normal times. All evidence seems to indicate that the next few years will not be normal insofar as foreign trade is concerned. Hence, the financial and exchange arrangements between the Soviet Government and a few American corporations that are now being effected may not be desirable from the point of view of national welfare and are simultaneously fraught with danger. For the Soviet Government would in all probability take advantage of growing competition between and among American business firms. Since the Soviet Government exercises a complete rigid monopoly of foreign trade, and in view of the fact that this rigid control of foreign trade will be extended in many counties in southeastern and central Europe and to a larger degree into the Far East, it will be in a strategic position to stifle free enterprise and free markets for vast quantities of goods and services. The risks involved are of such magnitude that only few corporations or a combination of private firms could undertake such business transactions. Moreover, the vast business community in the United States, represented by small and medium-sized firms, will not be able to participate in this coveted commercial arrangement with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics other than through a governmentally supervised agency that would organize a rational distribution of vast business transactions resulting from such a commercial treaty. Government aid to exporters and importers, reduction of tariff duties, supervision of cartels, reduction of monopolistic abuses of commodity agreements, revision of the Webb-Pomerene Act, and removal or reduction of other barriers would go a long way toward making foreign markets accessible to smaller manufacturers, exporters, and importers.

7. Exchange of products on a world-wide basis

In effecting a commercial treaty with the U. S. S. R., we are simultaneously also paving the way for improved commercial relations with 10 or more European countries, and, to a larger degree, with 5 or more countries in the Far East. Whether we like it or not, our hard-headed national interest and prudent business realism dictate that the sooner we effect such a commercial treaty with the Soviet Union the better for all concerned. Conversely, the longer we procrastinate with respect to such course of action, confusion will become all the more confounded to the detriment of American exports to those areas. Moreover, it is unlikely that the problems of Germany and China, with all their universal complexities, will approach solution within the visible future. This observation is evidenced by the reports of Mr. Byrnes and Mr. Molotov on their conferences in London and Moscow and Paris of the Council of Foreign Ministers.

A commercial treaty between the United States and the U. S. S. R., envisaged herein, would afford an opportunity for interchange of products between the U. S. S. R. and the United States vis-à-vis European countries as one of the means whereby the Soviet Union could purchase consumers' goods in the United States on short-term credits—ranging from 1 to 5 years. Reference is made to items that could be manufactured in European countries for which there have always been markets in the United States but not in the Soviet Union, and, conversely, articles produced in the U. S. S. R. (or raw materials) for which there are no appreciable markets in the United States but for which there are wide markets in European countries and in Asia. This multiangular relationship would allow the Soviet Union to expedite its reconstruction and development and to participate in the industrialization of countries in the Far East and in Europe.

PREWAR EXPERIENCE IS OF LITTLE AVAIL

Our commercial experience with the Soviet Union prior to 1941 can hardly be used as a measuring rod or as a criterion for establishing postwar commercial relations. Some of the reasons may thus be summarized:

(a) During the years 1936–40 United States total exports to the Soviet Union averaged $48,000,000 per annum, and United States total imports during the same period averaged $24,000,000 per annum. By way of contrast, the projected trade between the two countries during the postwar period is conservatively estimated by both Soviet and American spokesmen at $500,000,000 per annum during the next 4 or 5 years—the period of reconstruction. Hence, even if all of Russia's total exports were directed to the United States they would pay for but an infinitesimal fraction of the total imports from the United States.

(b) Prior to 1941 the United States Government and individual entrepreneurs neither recognized nor treated the Soviet Union as a great political and economic power in Europe, in the Near East, and in the Far East, a phenomenon which changes radically the very nature of postwar commercial relations between those two countries and challenges the character and theories of prewar international trade on a global-wise basis. This is due to the fact, among others, that prior to World War II there were not such vast areas wherein foreign trade is so rigidly controlled by a government monopoly and which, in turn, is a reflection of a planned economy system.

(c) In addition to the Bretton Woods agreements, the United States Government will in all probability extend credits to the Soviet Government through the Export-Import Bank of Washington, approximating $1,000,000,000, a new potent factor in international trade. To be sure, some reservation might be made in view of Russia's failure to ratify the Bretton Woods agreements on or before December 31, 1945, thus passing up the opportunity of being one of the charter members of the bank and fund.

(d) An agreement regarding commercial relations between the United States and the Soviet Union was recorded in an exchange of notes on August 4, 1937 (Executive Agreement Series 265), and was renewed on August 5, 1938, August 2, 1939, August 6, 1940, August 2, 1941, and August 1, 1942. Under the terms of the 1942 renewal, this executive agreement "shall remain in force until August 6, 1943. It shall continue in force thereafter, unless superseded by a more comprehensive commercial agreement, subject to termination on 6 months' written notice by either Government." During the lifetime of the lend-lease program (act of March 11, 1941) this agreement was practically inoperative.

(e) The huge industrial equipment and other material shipped to the Soviet Union under lend-lease arrangements will contribute immeasurably toward the reconstruction and development of the Soviet Union. This is especially true of the large quantities of industrial equipment, Liberty ships, and stock piles shipped to Siberia and now used in view of the use of the atomic bomb which hastened cessation of hostilities with Japan.

NECESSITY TO BROADEN PROVISIONS OF THE WEBB-POMERENE ACT

Many barriers to international trade are bound to result from the new phenomena as between an all-embracing government monopoly of foreign trade, on the one hand, and a country where the system of free enterprise and free market are basic cores of the whole national economy, on the other. To be sure, at the present juncture the application of the antitrust laws in foreign

trade is definitely uncertain. The principal reason is that the international business agreements and the commercial activities under the Webb-Pomerene Act, long unchallenged by enforcement authorities, are now subject to active investigation and prosecution by both the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. It will clearly require several years of active adjudication before the law regarding foreign trade practices is as well established as the law regarding domestic trade practices.

Obviously, large corporations can afford the risks involved in dealing with the Soviet Union. Accordingly, if combinations of private firms are permitted to effect commercial arrangements with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, without some kind of governmental supervision and concerted business action reflecting a national policy, we will thus be encouraging and strengthening the interlocking control of international cartels. They will, in turn, encounter difficulties with the antitrust laws and simultaneously interfere with the announced program of the Department of Justice in its prosecution of monopolies and cartels. Broadened provisions of the Webb-Pomerene Act and such other measures that might be necessary to take would be all the more desirable if they would be consummated after consultation with and in the interest of the vast business community as a whole.

According to the testimony of Assistant Secretary of State William L. Clayton, current American foreign economic policy is guided by the principle of a general opposition to cartels as devices for the regulation of world trade. Studies undertaken by the Department of State and other Government agencies are reported to have shown that the so-called normal operations of cartel arrangements have had undesirable and dangerous economic consequences. Private agreements of a restrictive character which fix prices, allocate markets, determine the conditions of technological interchange, and establish production quotas have operated to curtail the availability of goods and services to the consumer, to enhance prices, and to curtail employment and purchasing power. "We hope to achieve the concurrence of other governments in an agreement prohibiting participation of commercial enterprises in contracts and combinations which restrain international trade, restrict access to international markets, or foster monopolistic control in international trade." Whatever view one takes of these matters, it is obvious that many matters remain unsettled which might prove to be deterrent factors in the proffered expanded foreign trade.

PRESENT DANGEROUS PRACTICE OF PAYMENTS IN GOLD SHOULD BE CURTAILED

Soviet representatives in the United States have been trying to effect a revolving long-term credit approximating $1,000,000,000. They have asked for credits aggregating $6,000,000,000, extending over a period of 25 years, including a revolving fund. Failing that, the Soviet government could and would deliver gold bullion to the Treasury Department or through Federal Reserve banks, approximately $1,000,000,000 every 3 to 4 years during the next decade by drawing on their hoard and transferring the necessary manpower to gold mining. This practice is in effect now. Scores of American corporations are now doing tremendous business on a cash-and-carry basis with the Soviet government. What the Soviet government is primarily concerned with and is desperately in need of is delivery of "means of production," machine tools, all kinds of consumer goods in unlimited quantities, housing facilities, industrial know-how in unheard of dimensions in order to build up the industrial strength of the country and to raise the standard of living of the people.

Generalissimo Josef V. Stalin gave assurance to Eric A. Johnston, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, and to Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, that the Soviet Union meant to pay back the amount of the coveted $6,000,000,000 loan, and that if this loan should be agreed in principle the two Governments could work out the details about payment. From a realistic business point of view, Stalin's brief statement in itself is not enough of a guaranty that billions of American dollars will redound to the benefit of American national interests.

It should be noted that immediate regular imports into the U. S. S. R. would hardly be possible without initial long-term credits in order to help start off the whole economic apparatus of the Soviet Union, unless we are willing to accept vast quantitie of gold bullion which it may be hoped can be avoided lest the United States be faced with the prospect of remaining the world's dumping ground of gold. This is one of the reasons why it is of the utmost importance to immediately effect a written detailed understanding between the Governments of the United States and Soviet Russia.

CONCLUSION

The fundamental aim of Soviet foreign trade is not large or small imports and exports per se, but only the exchange needed to achieve the complete and speedy economic recovery, particularly the technological and industrial independence of the Greater U. S. S. R. within the next 5 years, 1945–50.

It is conceivable that within the visible future, after the political storms will have been somewhat allayed, the proffered commercial transactions between the United States, on the one hand, and the Government of the Greater U. S. S. R. on the other, will undergo radical changes. More importantly, the coveted business relations with the European and Far Eastern countries that are being integrated into the Soviet system as well as with the U. S. S. R. proper need not necessarily be limited to "big business" operations. On the contrary, government aid to exporters and importers, reduction of tariff duties, supervision of cartels, reduction of monopolistic abuses of commodity agreements, revision of the Webb-Pomerene Act, the financial facilities that will be made available through the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the removal or reduction of other barriers would go a long way toward making foreign markets accessible to small and medium-sized manufacturers, exporters, and importers.

A commercial treaty that is bilateral in form does not necessarily mean that it is bilateral in content, that is, it does not involve discriminatory practices or monopolistic arrangements; nor would it imply allocation of exports and imports of the Soviet state trading monopoly. On the contrary, A bilateral trade agreement envisaged herein would obviate the necessity of government supervision of American foreign trade in dealing with the Soviet Union.

Perish the thought of an armed conflict between the U. S. S. R. and the U. S. A. But the indubitable fact is that at this time when the United States becomes the dominant power in the Pacific, Soviet Russia becomes the dominant power on the Asiatic continent in addition to her becoming the dominant power in Europe. And it is a truism that power radiates its own influence and furthers its own interests. It is thus incumbent upon us to face the imminent divergent ideologies between a democratic United States and a collectivist Soviet Russia and to reduce the areas of grave conflicts of interest of universal magnitude. In the hope of preventing ideological rivalry from becoming all the more deteriorated, this proposal of a commercial treaty is submitted for consideration as a feasible method of resolving some of the major current difficulties and to effect a more cordial understanding between the two countries in the visible future. It is hoped that responsible business leaders would formulate a suggested national policy concerning commercial relations between the Soviet Union and the United States that could reasonably be incorporated into a commercial treaty or into another cognately related mechanism between the two countries.

SUGGESTED PROVISIONS TO BE INCORPORATED IN THE PROJECTED COMMERCIAL TREATY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION

1. Credits: Provisions for private financing and individual credits through a consortium of commercial banks within the framework of the terms of the loan and credit that the Government of the United States will grant to the Soviet Union.

2. Private property rights: Protection of and recourse to private property rights of American citizens who have had investments in European and Asiatic countries that are occupied by the Red armies. Provisions for protection of American inventors and owners of patents or of patent rights in the greater U. S. S. R.

3. Arbitration: Establishment of an arbitration tribunal duly recognized by both Governments to arbitrate disputes between American corporations or individual firms and the Soviet government. The decisions of this tribunal are to be final and binding upon the disputants.

4. Dumping and discrimination: Provisions against dumping and/or underselling by the Soviet government and by American-controlled cartels and monopolies. Safeguards against discrimination on a worldwide basis and restrictions against monopolistic practices which restrain international trade.

5. Exchange of information: American citizens — trained observers, businessmen, technicians, etc.—should have the freedom of movement and travel in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as well as in the European and Asiatic countries that are occupied by the Red armies, to parallel those the Russians enjoy in the United States and in the areas occupied by the American armies.

6. Free enterprise: Provisions against stifling free enterprise, private initiative, and free markets in those areas that are outside of but contiguous to the Soviet security zones—to create opportunities for small- and medium-sized firms engaged in foreign trade and for individual exporters and importers of goods and services.

7. Interchange of products: Establishing machinery in order to facilitate exchange of raw materials, manufactured products, and services between and among the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the European and Asiatic countries that are within the Soviet security zones, on the one hand, and the United States, on the other. This practice would tend to reduce the delivery of gold by the Soviet government to the United States in payment of its vast purchases during the next 4 or 5 years.

Commissioner of Federal Public Housing Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1946

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram to the President:

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
White House, Washington, D. C.:

Mr. President, the resignation of Philip M. Klutznick as Commissioner of the Federal Public Housing Authority is reported in today's press. In view of the fact that this agency is vitally concerned with providing housing for the millions of veterans who today still are homeless, Amvets (American Veterans of World War II) respectfully urge you to appoint to this important post an outstanding veteran of this war. It is our feeling that the individual selected should be not only a person of rare ability with a record of achievement in the housing field, but a veteran of World War II with a deep insight to, and understanding of, the problems being faced by returning service men and women at this time.

JACK W. HARDY,
National Commander, Amvets
(American Veterans of World War II).

Unheeded Warnings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on December 15, 1943, it was my privilege to address a large and public-spirited group of men and women in the progressive city of Roanoke, Va. The subject of that address was War Taxes and Postwar Trade. At that time I undertook to analyze the economic situation created by the war, ventured to make some prophecies concerning the duration of the war and the effect upon our postwar economy of the unparalleled destruction of property and the expenditure of borrowed money in its prosecution, and then I sounded some warnings concerning the disastrous results that would inevitably flow from the unchecked continuance of certain enumerated trends.

In the light of subsequent events during which some of my prophecies of 3 years ago were fulfilled and others are now on the way to fulfillment, I am taking the liberty of repeating some of the things I said in December 1943. In doing so it is my hope that the soundness of warnings concerning things which as yet are not accomplished facts will be tested in the light of our actual experience:

It goes without saying we are going to win this war, although we may not win it as quickly or as easily as some optimists now think. I have no inside information on how long the war will last, nor do I care to assume the role of a prophet; all I know is that those in charge of the fighting are of the opinion the major part of the conflict is in front of us and not behind us, and that we will be fortunate if we can knock Germany out of the war by the summer or fall of next year and Japan out of the war by the summer or fall of the following year. We have done a fine job on the home-production front but not the best of which we were capable. Notwithstanding a solemn no-strike pledge, there have been many injurious strikes, and new strikes are now occurring at the rate of 10 a day. On far-flung battle fronts the personal bravery and cooperative efficiency of the men in all branches of our military service have added new luster to the glorious record of the American fighting man. The sacrifices made by us on the home front, including the taxes we must pay both now and in the postwar era pale into insignificance when compared with the sacrifices of our boys on the fighting front. On Bataan they held their fox holes, knowing the promised relief would never come. From the frozen wastes of Attu to the tropical beaches of Guadalcanal and Tarawa, in Tunisia, Sicily, and Italy, they have advanced disdainful of the fact they had a rendezvous with death.

* * * * *

Inscribed upon the foundation of the Archives Building in Washington, which houses the vital records of our democracy, are two quotations from Shakespeare: "Study the past" and "What is past is prologue." We have no present problem the solution of which would not in large measure yield to a proper application of the fundamental principles of the founding fathers. In political science, as in religion, we proceed from the known to the unknown and bridge the gap by faith.

"By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went."

By faith Benjamin Franklin, on September 17, 1787, signed the Philadelphia Constitution, but in doing so remarked:

"I agree to this Constitution, with all its faults, if they are such, because I think a general government necessary for us, and there is no form of government but what may be a blessing to the people if well administered: and believe further, that this is likely to be well administered for a course of years, when the people shall become so corrupted as to need despotic government, being incapable of any other."

The faith of the founding fathers in the plan of union they formulated in Philadelphia was justified. Our representative democracy and plan of constitutional liberty has endured unchanged for a longer period of time than any given form of government has endured in any other country of the world. Under that form of government we have been the freest, the happiest, and the most prosperous people in the world. For a century and a half we have tenaciously clung to the fundamental principle that the two major functions of government have been to furnish certain public services, such as defense, police protection, education, etc., which of necessity must be nonprofit community enterprises, and to supervise competition between individuals and corporations but not enter into competition with them.

In 1930 our system of private enterprise was put to the severest test in its history. Our foreign trade was virtually gone, and our domestic commerce had become stagnated. Our banking system was threatened with bankruptcy, while millions of able-bodied workers walked the streets of our industrial cities unemployed. In the fall of 1932 the people wanted a change and got it in the manner prescribed by the Constitution, namely through the medium of the ballot box. Numerous reforms were proposed, some well-considered and others ill-advised. The proposals I deem to be ill-advised clearly sprang from a lack of faith in a just and proper division of power between the Central Government and the sovereign States, a lack of faith in the American system of private enterprise, and in some instances even a lack of faith in the efficacy of democratic institutions.

I hold no brief for the ruthless manner in which capital accomplished the industrial expansion from the latter part of the nineteenth century through the first quarter of the twentieth century. Tax laws, labor laws, and tariff laws were framed to give the maximum advantage to the industrialists, the maximum power to concentrated wealth, and a minimum share in a great program to agriculture and labor. But in attempting to correct recognized abuses we have conferred new powers upon labor without adequate safeguards against their abuses. Business has become so entangled in labor problems, tax problems, and Government red tape, production—the foundation of all real prosperity—has ceased to be the major concern. Without in any sense disparging the patriotism and loyalty of the American worker in this war effort, I share the general belief that the leaders of organized labor have in this emergency failed to measure up to the standard set by Samuel Gompers in World War I. It was that immigrant from London's east side, finding in this new land rare opportunities for the reward of personal effort, who said:

"Only development based on voluntary institutions holds promise of permanent progress, for such development is responsive to developing technology and cultural advance of individuals and group activity."

In my opinion, the production of war goods would have been stimulated and fewer problems created for the postwar era had we at the commencement of war spending in 1940 adopted suitable amendments to the Wagner Labor Relations Act and suspended the operation of the 40-hour week for the duration of the war.

Since the start of World War II in August 1939 to September 1943 hourly earnings in industry have increased 59 percent and weekly earnings 87 percent, while the cost of living has increased only 26 percent. The marked increase in weekly earnings over living costs accounts for a substantial portion of what is now called the inflationary gap between money available to be spent and goods available to be purchased, the total of which varies anywhere from $20,000,000,000 to $40,000,000,000 according to the varying estimates of what will go into private savings. In an address before the Roanoke Rotary Club last August I pointed out at length current factors in the inflation equation and the failure of the administration to successfully come to grips with the problem. At that time I indicated the need for a comprehensive system of wage and price control; a tax system that would siphon off a substantial portion of excess-purchasing power; a larger sale of Government bonds to private investors; and strict economy in war as well as peacetime expenditures to reduce the amount of deficit financing. Much of what I said on that occasion, but expressed in a more expert way, you will find in an article by Samuel Lubell, entitled "Higher Taxes or Else," published in the December 4, 1943, issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

The administration would have been on stronger ground in its recent subsidy fight in the House had it previously exercised the inflation controls mentioned above. I have always supported a limited subsidy program as an essential war measure where the subsidy was paid to the producer to stimulate production, but I have never believed in the soundness of using consumer subsidies as an indirect method of increasing real wages. It merely hides the price inflation that has already occurred, passing the difference to the national debt, to be financed by still more borrowed money, and giving no assurance that the first shot in the arm will not have to be followed by bigger and better doses until the subsidy program has become a major item of expense to all taxpayers.

With respect to governmental regulation of business, we all recognize the necessity of wartime control and accept such control as a proper contribution to an all-out war effort, although offering up a few prayers now and then for better administration. In fact, a major part of current regimentation grows out of the effort to control inflation, and in urging increased taxation to head off more regimentation, Mr. Lubell said:

"There isn't a single domestic war problem that would not be eased somewhat by the calcium and vitamins in a stiff dose of taxes."

But governmental interference with business did not commence with the war, and some fear it may not end with it. War has no virtue commensurate with its vices, but the necessity during this war period of extending governmental control into the life of the humblest citizen may prove to be a blessing in disguise. I am convinced that as soon as we are safely past the dangers of inflation in the postwar era, the American people will promptly repudiate leaders who seek to impose upon them Federal regimentation as a normal peacetime panacea.

The average citizen does not understand the part taxation plays in a free economy and in the preservation of the American system of free enterprise. He has not understood the full implication of the efforts made in recent years to use the taxing power, which Chief Justice Marshall said, in the famous case of *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, 'involves the power to destroy,' to accomplish social reforms, and, incidentally, before the imposition of current war taxes, some were led to believe they could get something for nothing from the Federal Government and that the debt created in the process would not be theirs to pay.

The reformers knew what they had in mind when they induced the Congress to pass the undistributed-profits tax, since repealed. That taxing device would have prevented all corporations from accumulating adequate reserves for purposes of expansion and would have struck a death blow to many closely held and highly successful corporations. Under the guise of raising necessary revenue, the Congress passed in 1934 an excise tax on dividends from corporations in the hands of the shareholder, and in 1936 made such dividends fully taxable. That system of double taxation was aimed at what was supposed to be concentrated wealth, but, as we now know, fell with great severity upon thousands of shareholders with very limited means. The present need for revenue is too acute to give up any sources of revenue now, but certainly in the postwar era that system of double taxation should be eliminated. Inheritance taxes, higher than in any democracy in the world, were proposed ostensibly for the purpose of raising revenue, but actually for the purpose of breaking up estates, liquidating family controlled enterprises, and forcing new business to look to the Government for financing.

The effort to place an arbitrary $25,000 limitation upon earnings after taxes was of the same pattern. The pressure applied to the Ways and Means Committee to tax the normal earnings of corporations 55 percent and excess profits from 90 percent to 100 percent did not grow solely out of desire for revenue. Some wanted to force corporations to turn to the Government, in the postwar era, for reconversion and operating funds. But if industry is to escape Government regimentation, that job must be done by private capital. Alfred P. Sloan says reconversion will cost General Motors $500,000,000. That company is willing to put it up if the Government, through war taxes, does not render it powerless to do so. Plant reconversion is not the only industrial problem in the postwar era. A cancellation of fifty or more billions of war contracts will be a postwar headache for many industrialists. Settlement of those claims must be prompt and fair.

High taxes is one of the inescapable burdens of making war.

"War," said Thomas Paine, "involves in its progress such a train of unforeseen and unsupposed circumstances that no human wisdom can calculate the end. It has but one thing certain, and that is to increase taxes."

In 1933 our total tax revenue was approximately $2,000,000,000. For the fiscal year of 1944 the tax yield is now estimated at approximately $45,000,000,000, which is exclusive of the approximately $10,000,000,000 to be paid in State and local taxes. In 1932 we had less than 2,000,000 individual income taxpayers. This year there are about 40,000,000. Since 1932 personal income taxes have been frequently increased, reaching this year the unprecedented rate of 19 percent on the first $2,000 of net taxable income, with an 82-percent rate on surtax net income in excess of $200,000, to all of which must be added a 5-percent Victory tax.

* * * * *

The present tax burden is heavy, but so is the present war debt. On any basis you figure it, we will end the war with a staggering national debt, and the necessity for the continuance of heavy taxation in the immediate postwar era. The only way our postwar economy can stand such taxation will be on the basis of a national income in excess of $100,000,000,000 per year. And the only way, in my humble opinion, we can hope to have such an income will be through giving full play to American inventive genius and technical skill in mass production—in a word, the American know-how under the tried American system of free enterprise. Pump priming won't do the job and Government spending on the present lavish scale is out of the picture, because, as our former colleague from Pennsylvania, BOB RICH, so often asked the House, "Where are you going to get the money?"

We must steadfastly repudiate the suggestions of left-wingers and theoretical do-gooders that our economy is mature, that it is static. What is past is prologue. Given the same opportunity, the American people who perfected the steam engine, and spanned a vast continent with steel rails; who built and consumed 75 percent of all the motor vehicles in the world, to say nothing of washing machines, mechanical refrigerators, radios, and a thousand and one other things that have given us the highest standard of living in the world, can go forward again to new horizons, changed in kind but not in degree.

"To him," said Thoreau at Walden Pond, "whose vigorous and elastic thought keeps pace with the sun, the day is a perpetual morning."

Hand in hand with the postwar restoration of our domestic commerce must go the restoration and expansion of our foreign commerce. If we are to sell abroad we must be willing to buy from abroad; else there will be no international trade on a mutually profitable basis. Our hoard of gold is useless while buried in the ground at Fort Knox. In addition to furnishing a backing for a sound currency, it must likewise be translated into international exchange and become the mainspring of an ample flow of international dollars. By that I do not mean that if there is to be an International Bank we are to furnish the major part of the capital while nations with unsatisfactory collateral are to do the major part of the borrowing.

* * * * *

The epoch-making Atlantic Charter and the mutual-aid agreements of our lend-lease plan clearly indicate the objective of those who, putting isolation behind them, have promised to the American people a postwar type of international cooperation calculated to make the peace we will win on the battlefield a lasting as well as a just peace.

* * * * *

With respect to access to raw materials, many of you no doubt recall the statement by William Hard in the December issue of the Reader's Digest, to the effect that a peace to be enduring must be endurable. Economic distress breeds discontent, and discontent often eventuates in violence.

This year we have enjoyed the greatest volume of export business in our history, amounting to more than twelve billions. About 80 percent of those exports moved under lend-lease agreements. Our highest peacetime exports were in 1929, when they amounted to over five billions. There is a very definite relationship between domestic prosperity and our foreign commerce. When we are prosperous we buy more from abroad, establishing international exchange which enables foreign countries to buy more from us. Many nations need our motor vehicles, electrical equipment, office machinery, and, of course, any surplus food that we can spare after the war. Under the stern lash of war necessity certain so-called backward nations, as India and China, are becoming industrialized. In the postwar era they will furnish, along with Latin America, new markets for us. In those markets we will meet the competition of the United Kingdom and Russia. It is essential to our future well-being to meet that competition in a just and friendly way.

Our postwar trade will likewise be influenced by the far-reaching changes in the debtor-creditor relationship of various nations. Prior to World War II, for instance, the British industrial budget was balanced by an income of about five billion a year from foreign investments. Most of those investments have been liquidated, either voluntarily or involuntarily, and the loss of that source of outside income must be replaced by increased production at home. During the period between World War I and World War II, about 70 percent of the dollars we spent for foreign goods and services, and on long-term investments, came back to us in payment for exports of United States merchandise. Most of the remaining dollars which we spent abroad in this way were used by foreigners to pay interest on their debts to us and to purchase services in the United States. But the dollars we made available to foreigners annually after we had fully embarked on a program of isolation and implemented it in 1930 with the highest protective tariff in our history, amounted to only 54 percent of those made available annually from 1922 to 1929. The contrast between single years is even more striking.

In 1929 the United States through purchases of goods and services and long-term investments supplied $7,400,000,000 abroad, and in 1932, when we reaped what we had sowed, only $2,400,000,000, or less than one-third of the prosperous year of 1929. Being the richest of all nations and with more dollars available for foreign purchasers than any other nation, this drastic decline in American dollars available to foreigners was a major factor in the disruption of all foreign trade. Exports of foreign nations, especially of raw materials, fell more rapidly than their imports, but to continue those imports, foreign nations drew upon their liquid reserves of gold and foreign currency and then adopted tariffs, embargoes, and other restrictive measures.

I do not place all the blame for disruption of foreign trade upon our own shoulders because the depression following World War I was world-wide, and many foreign countries had domestic dislocations as well as the dislocation of their foreign trade. But I trust we have learned the futility of exchanging consumable goods for gold, later to become sterilized and buried in steel and concrete vaults. If, in the postwar era, we are to have an export trade commensurate with full employment and a high standard of living, to say nothing of insurance against World War III, that may end civilization as we know it, we must import goods and services to create American dollars for foreign purchasers of our exports. Our major investments abroad should not be in bonds, but rather in the industrial development of friendly and cooperating countries like China, for instance. A higher standard of living in China could automatically provide a new and ever-expanding market for many of our export articles.

We must get away from the theory of high protection days when it was considered that our foreign commerce was profitable only when our exports exceeded our imports. That theory never was sound because it involved for us the accumulation of unusable gold and meant the end of our foreign trade when the other fellow ran out of gold. Our international bankers never showed to worse advantage than when they induced us to lend foreign customers about $7,000,000,000 with which to buy our goods. That was a subsidy program without parallel in international finance. True to the Shakespeare formula, we lost both the loan and the friend. On the assumption we had an inexhaustible supply of oil, copper, and other strategic materials, we kept out imports with high tariffs while exporting those products to every available market, taking gold in return. This war has made such an inroad into our available supplies of oil and copper neither would last for 20 years at the present rate of consumption.

It is entirely practical and feasible in the framework of rising domestic consumption to extend to foreigners a share of our domestic market without cutting into the market for domestic producers, offsetting any reduction in employment resulting from the competition of imports by increased employment in export trades. In the long run, dollars paid to foreigners for imports are spent by them on United States exports. In a word, we must fully implement in the postwar era the Hull principle of reciprocal-trade agreements, the full benefits of which so far have never been realized because of war conditions existing throughout the world long before we entered the struggle in December 1941.

A candidate for the Presidency says he is for international cooperation without commitments. It would be more to the point for him to have said: "I name hearts trumps in the international bridge game, but reserve the right to renege the first time trumps are led." Isolationism is not dead. It sleepeth—until after November 1944.

The House took pride in the passage of the Fulbright resolution on the subject of international cooperation, and the Senate took pride in the passage of the Connally resolution, which included section 4 of the Moscow Pact. What both House and Senate should have done was to frankly admit they had belatedly caught up with public sentiment in America on that vital issue.

Isolationists in both House and Senate were vigorously fighting the principle of reciprocal trade agreements long after the American press and all national polls showed public sentiment overwhelmingly in favor of that type of international cooperation. The earnest pleas of Cordell Hull that international trade on a live-and-let-live basis would promote international peace were ridiculed. Many of the boys fighting World War II are the sons of those who fought World War I—the sons of those who were promised in 1917 they would go forth to war to make the world safe for democracy. The fathers of the veterans of World War II are determined that their sons shall not be betrayed, as the veterans of World War I were betrayed. They will support a program for a just and lasting peace. They believe in the American system of private enterprise. They believe that system offers the best opportunity for postwar employment of the veterans of World War II. In the postwar era they will resist any further encroachment upon the rights of sovereign States. And, lest faith in God become the major casualty of the conflict, they will seek to implement the advice of Woodrow Wilson, who, in his last message to the Amercian people in the summer of 1923, said:

"If our civilization is to survive materially, it must be redeemed spiritually."

Joseph Wilson Ervin

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 28, 1946

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. JOSEPH WILSON ERVIN, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, when the Seventy-ninth Congress convened, I met Hon. JOSEPH W. ERVIN. His office was across the corridor from mine. During the year of our association he was more than a neighbor. I saw him nearly every day, and we visited frequently. I counted him among my best friends, and I have missed him greatly.

No one could know JOE ERVIN without recognizing his outstanding character, his complete integrity, and his devotion to duty. His district and his State suffered a great loss, but it was shared by the Nation.

The Need for United Nations Passports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 21, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my resolution now pending before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—House Concurrent Resolution 109—I insert in the RECORD a letter just received from Paris, France. The writer, Mr. Otto Feuer, was an inmate of the infamous Buchenwald concentration camp, through which place he guided me shortly after its liberation by American troops in the spring of 1945.

Together with Mr. Feuer's letter are some clippings from the Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

Both these clippings and the letter show the imperative need for some constructive solution of the problem of so-called stateless individuals in Europe. Under present policies, these individuals, no matter how well qualified, cannot be employed in such international organizations as UNRRA; also, under existing laws in most of the liberated and occupied countries they cannot obtain private employment because of the theory that this would deprive a citizen of any job given to someone classed as stateless.

United Nations passports giving these individuals a definite civic status would restore to them some part of the hope they must have felt during their years of imprisonment and terror for liberation into a world of bodily security and economic opportunity.

The public interest will be served by a wide knowledge and understanding of the facts regarding stateless and displaced persons as brought out by Mr. Feuer's communication.

VINCENNES (SEINE), FRANCE,
April 30, 1946.

DEAR MRS. LUCE: Certainly you will not remember me, the deportee who guided you through Buchenwald and is on the same picture with you in News-Week of May 29, 1945.

The impression you made upon me was else than that I got from most of the other personalities I guided and makes me hope that you will not be angry upon my citing you in the enclosed letter.

The letter to you has the purpose to revive in you the rememberance of Buchenwald in order to win your interest and activity for the matter of the survivors. Our matters needs good will, energy, and action of outstanding personalities, and I am sure you, with your qualities and relations, could do a big work. I am not so foolish to try to give you advice how to proceed; if you are interested you will find means and ways.

Please excuse, if my words sound demanding and urging; to be frank, I have the conviction that the political deportees of concentration camps are not only creditors of the Nazis and Germany, but of the world.

Please accept the expression of my most friendly greetings.

Yours very respectfully,

OTTO FEUER.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 11, 1946]

LETTERS FROM THE MAILBAG

WONDERS ABOUT REHABILITATION

To the EDITOR, EUROPEAN EDITION:

In the April 6 issue of your paper was an announcement in which UNRRA offered several jobs. As I urgently need a job and believing I had the needed qualifications, I presented myself. I could not speak to the UNRRA official whose name was given in the paper, but to his secretary. I introduced myself and was going to show her my certificates and letters of recommendation but she stopped me by putting the question: "What nationality do you have?" On my answer, "Italian," she replied: "UNRRA does not employ stateless people." When I added that I was a Jew who had spent 6 years in concentration camps, she shrugged her shoulders and told me how sorry she was.

Though I had not at all the impression that she was doing something on her own but believed she was only following regulations, I should like to have that absolutely clear, and that is the main reason of this letter.

UNRRA means United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and it is beyond question that UNRRA is doing a big job, and without it the catastrophe of those people and peoples whose sufferings were caused by Hitler's war would be much bigger. But I always understood that it was one of the main tasks of UNRRA, too, to take care of us who became displaced persons and stateless.

Rehabilitation means to give us normal human rights and I think the right of work is the first and most important right of men. UNRRA might have some technical reasons for this regulation, but how can any state in the world, any organization or anybody be supposed to give us this and other rights if the organization which should fight for us refuses us the right of working and admits us only as peddlers?

OTTO FEUER.

SAINT-MANDÉ, *April 8, 1946.*

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 21, 1946]

LETTERS FROM THE MAILBAG

UNRRA ON HIRING POLICY

To the EDITOR, European Edition:

I see in your Letters From the Mailbag that a question of nationality in the recruitment of UNRRA officers and workers interests you.

Consequently it may be useful for you to know that:

1. Stateless people are not normally recruited for work either in France or abroad. Very few exceptions have ever been made to this rule, and over the course of the last few months, UNRRA has had to turn down several useful applicants who had, for example, only Nansen passports.

2. Italian nationals as ex-enemy aliens, are recruited only: (a) If no national of a member nation of UNRRA can be found to fill the post; (b) if no national of a neutral country can be found to fill the post; (c) if permission of European Regional Office of UNRRA in London to recruit is obtained.

The above policy was established by the administration of UNRRA, Washington, since the beginning of UNRRA's activities.

A. MATAGNE,
Public Relations Officer, UNRRA, Paris.
PARIS, *April 18, 1946.*

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 26, 1946]

LETTERS FROM THE MAILBAG

ASKS UNITED NATIONS PASSPORTS

To the EDITOR, EUROPEAN EDITION:

I am sending the enclosed letter to Fiorello H. LaGuardia, Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration:

"The official statement of Mr. A. Matagne, UNRRA's public relations officer at Paris, in the European edition of the New York Herald Tribune, confirmed that there is a restrictive policy concerning the employment of stateless people. It is of no use to argue about necessity, sense and rightness of this regulation, and the matter in itself is of no decisive importance, but I want it to be understood that it is another symptom of the critical situation in which we all—that is, the stateless and homeless people—find ourselves, a situation which not only requires observation but immediate action by the responsible keymen. Protests, articles and letters will not do. It may be believed that we all have the ardent wish to disappear from the newspapers, to finish being objects for pity and sensation, but to become men with normal lives. It is poor consolation for us to know that all these restrictions and regulations were not originally created with the intention to hit us. But it is a fact that they surround us as the barbed wires of our concentration camps did, that they not only hamper our lives but leave to many of us only the choices of peddling, suicide, or becoming asocial elements.

"A proposal made by MRS. CLARE LUCE to create United Nations passports for educational purposes gave me the idea that you possibly might help us by asking for and urging UN to create such passports for all those stateless and homeless people. This passport should entitle us to settle and to work in each country belonging to the United Nations. That would be something like rehabilitation for us and would mean a present of the highest value. It would transfer us from refugees and liberated displaced persons into free men, and would enable us later to become loyal citizens of the selected country, with its approval.

"Hitler and his gang took care that not too many of us survived, so materially the problem would not be too big. I understand that the creation of such a regulation, which would have to be imposed by UN on its members, would mean to each of the countries concerned to submit a small part of its sovereignty, namely, to exclude a certain group of people from existing national immigration and working restrictions. UN's task to secure world peace will ask for more and bigger sacrifices of national sovereignty, and if the problem is considered from this point of view, it is only a chance to prove UN's effectiveness.

"It was exactly 1 year ago that I had the honor to guide Mrs. Luce through Buchenwald shortly after our liberation, and I am certain she never will forget what she saw. I, for my part, will never forget what she said:

"'As a human being I feel ashamed that such things could be done by human beings to human beings.'

"If this most decent opinion should be shared by the world and its responsible statesmen, would it be asking too much to make us this present, or should it be only considered as an actual proof of the good will of humanity?"

OTTO FEUER.
VINCENNES (SEINE), *April 25, 1946.*

A Baltimore-Equipped Hospital in Kiev—Address by Tech. Sgt. Leonard Bernhardt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which was delivered at a gathering in Baltimore, Md., by Tech. Sgt. Leonard Bernhardt, whom I had the privilege of meeting. He spoke extemporaneously and I was so impressed with his remarks on the occasion, and with his unusual record of military service, that I asked him to have prepared for me a copy of his address. Sergeant Bernhardt suffered terribly at the hands of the enemy, both in Germany and Russia. His story was one of the most gripping accounts I have heard of a veteran's experience.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF TECH. SGT. LEONARD BERNHARDT DELIVERED AT BALTIMORE, MD., MAY 27 AT A MEETING TO PROMOTE A BALTIMORE-EQUIPPED HOSPITAL IN KIEV SPONSORED BY BALTIMORE COMMITTEE FOR RUSSIAN RELIEF

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, in these critical days, it seems that any time anyone raises his voice, even mildly, with a word of praise for the Russians, he is immediately branded a Communist. I should like to set the record straight on that point. I am not a red—or a pink—or any of the shades in between. I'm just a human being talking about some fellow humans, talking about a people with whom we must learn to live if we're to enjoy the fruits of a peace so dearly purchased. But we can't have peace until the war is ended—or do you think it is?

There are three new patients in my ward at Cushing General Hospital, and although I must omit their names, I'm certain you'll find their military biographies quite interesting.

All three of these boys are horribly burned, disfigured for life; and three are under 21 years of age; all three were inducted into the Army after VE-day and sent to Germany in the occupation army.

One chilly evening early this year, Joe—let's call him that since it's not his name—threw a shovelful of coal into the stove in his barracks. The stove promptly exploded in his face. It seems that someone, inadvertently, of course, had mixed large quantities of black gunpowder with the coal. Pete was cleaning a storeroom one day at his airfield in Germany, and since the floor was greasy, he was using gasoline to swab it. Someone, quite by accident, flipped a lighted cigarette butt through an open window. No Purple Heart for Pete. Mike was driving an Army truck down a German road one night, and feeling sleepy, he pulled over to the side of the road to catch "40 winks." When he came to, the truck was an inferno. He tried frantically to get out—the doors wouldn't open. He crashed through the windshield and crawled out, more dead than alive. Later investigation showed that the door handles had been wired from the outside so that they couldn't be opened from the inside.

I don't know what these case histories mean to you. To me they indicate that the Nazis are still fighting—and with every weapon at their command. But they have still another form of warfare, far more effective than sporadic acts of sabotage, far more subtle—and much deadlier. I refer, of course, to propaganda.

When I returned to American control last year after a year in prison camp during which time I worked with an underground group, fought and was wounded with the Russian Army, I brought with me a great deal of propaganda material and information which I turned over to Intelligence and the Office of Strategic Services.

The Nazis, it seemed, worked on the time-proved principle of divide and conquer. Their propaganda ministry was feverishly engaged in grinding out reams of half truths designed to foment discord among the Big Three, even while the Axis was being crushed relentlessly from all sides. Let me give you a few examples.

Exhibit A: A leaflet dropped by the millions to front-line British troops by airplane, aimed at turning the English against both the Americans and the Russians. The headline read, "Moscow and Washington Have Already Decided the Fate of Great Britain.

"They want to reduce her to an unimportant 'Red island' on the fringe of a Soviet Europe. Uncle Sam takes Britain's riches, her gold and her investments under the clever lease-lend scheme. United States troops are in India and nearly 20 other British possessions, naval bases, and zones of interest.

"Communist Stalin takes the rest, starting with Iran, Iraq, north Africa, Finland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Italy, and Egypt. His agents are everywhere, undermining British influence, British prestige."

Exhibit B: A 200-page booklet, distributed by the millions to the Russians, containing reprints of political cartoons that appeared in American newspapers at the time of the Russo-Finnish campaign. Certain factions of the press played up strongly the rising tide of anti-Russian feeling, depicting Stalin and the Russian Bear as drooling, drunken, depraved ravishers of Finland—as beasts and vermin. The cause of wartime unity was not helped.

Exhibit C: A propaganda broadcast designed to turn America and Russia against England. This cleverly written broadcast which was beamed from Berlin and which I heard while I was with the Russian forces, purported to eavesdrop on a conversation between a Yank GI and a British Tommy. The accents and colloquialisms were perfect. The English soldier did most of the talking and his theme was "Winnie is a wise old man", Winnie, of course, being Winston Churchill. Please bear in mind that at that

time, the Red Army was pushing inexorably on Berlin and our own Battle of the Bulge was at its bloodiest pitch. The Tommy showed how, after World War II was won, England, through a series of incidents and maneuvers, would instigate a war between Russia and America. When we would ask Britain to come in on our side, she would demur, saying, "Sorry, old bean, but we took such a beating in the last one—guess we'll sit this one out."

America and Russia would go to war and because both Nations would be so powerfully matched, and because the supply lines of both Nations would be so greatly extended, the result would be a draw, a negotiated peace.

But not before 6, 8, or 10 years of bitter struggle, during which both sides would suffer such staggering losses in men and matériel, that generations would pass before either could again be considered a world power. But, in the meantime, Britain would have gotten fat and bloated, easily the strongest nation in the world, through the simple expedient of selling munitions and matériel to both sides. Clever?

In the face of all this, it was not difficult for me to understand an incident that took place at the hospital a short time after my return to this country last year, just 2 weeks after VE-day. I had decided to take a few snapshots of myself in my Russian uniform, and accordingly, I donned it one morning, complete from fur cap to black boots. It was only natural that a curious group of wounded fellow GI's congregate, for to most of them, this was their first glimpse of a Russian uniform. The boys were making their usual good-natured wisecracks about how I looked as Boris Cossack, Uncle Joe's chief adviser, when I overheard one of my buddies remark to another Purple Hearter: "Take a good look at that uniform, Frank; you'll be shooting at it soon."

And although this thoughtless remark did not reflect the opinion of the majority of GI's I have known, the effect, nevertheless, was quite startling. Here was a man who only a few short weeks before had been wounded in battle. A man who, figuratively speaking, had fought side by side with the Red Army against our common enemy. A man who could not sing too loudly his praises of Russian valor, for their fight was his fight, and brother was now fighting by the side of brother. And now, by some strange quirk of fate, here was this same man exclaiming with absolute assurance, "Take a good look at that uniform, Frank; you'll be shooting at it soon."

Should I have blamed my buddy? Should I have, when chances are good that had I not had the opportunity to live and fight with the Russians, those words might have been mine, not his. Yes, they might well have been mine, for with my limited knowledge, I would never have trusted the Russians. Why wouldn't I have trusted them? Simply because I wouldn't have known them—and not knowing is ignorance, and ignorance is the ideal spawning ground for blind, distrust-inspiring, warmongering propaganda.

You would be perfectly justified were you to demand of me on what basis I claim to know the Russians. Please don't misunderstand—I am neither expert nor authority. I'm just an American GI who got a quick look into a window whose shade had always been drawn before. I liked what I saw, and now I want you who have never had an opportunity to look through that window to take a quick glimpse with me before deciding whether or not you like the appearance of the room.

In order to give you my story, I'll ask you to go back with me a bit, back to June 30, 1944. On that day our box of six Liberator bombers became separated from the main formation in a cloud bank over Lake Balaton, Hungary. Upon emerging, we were jumped by about 80 German fighter planes. In the ensuing battle, all six American bombers were shot down in flames, but not, however, without taking over 30 of the enemy down with us.

I'll not recount here the moment of frantic horror in a burning plane 20,000 feet above the earth, nor will I give the details of the attack by a German fighter pilot while I dangled helplessly from my parachute, nor will I say much of the beating by Hungarian peasants while I lay burned and wounded on the cool, fresh soil. Such stories are legion.

My object in being here is to tell you about that Russian room. My first peek into it came in the prisoner-of-war hospital in Budapest. When I arrived there I found approximately 100 American airmen who had been shot down on previous missions. We were herded into a common room and put on a starvation diet. At that time, the American press was proclaiming in its boldest headlines that the union of the Big Three—America, Russia, and England—formed an invincible triumvirate. We were the right arm of God crushing Satan and his henchmen. We were a holy trio—the brotherhood of man united against a common tyrant. No force on earth could ever split us! Really?

Our introduction to propaganda came from our protectors, the German guards. "Why," they would ask, "do you Americans wait and pray so strongly for the coming of the Russians? You think they will help you win the war—but what if they do? They're barbarians, animals. You'll be fighting them soon." And although we scoffed, it wasn't long before some Americans began to believe this stupid line of reasoning, particularly after the Germans pointed out the differences in ideologies and religions.

A short time later, two Russian pilots who had been shot down were brought to the prison hospital. Their appearance on the scene was a fortunate event, for their personalities and actions served to dispell all the anti-Russian propaganda disseminated by our German friends. These two boys regarded "tovarich"—friend—not merely as a word to be mouthed without meaning but rather as a goal to be attained. They loved and praised the Americans. The first thing they did was to try to learn the English language. They were proud of their acquaintance with American customs, American culture, American history, and geography. They were our first contact with the Russians, but shortly thereafter Russian prisoners came streaming into the hospital. The battle line was approaching Budapest.

From that time to November 12, American and Russian lived together in perfect harmony. We shared each other's meager food, each other's misery and hopes for liberation.

On November 12, 1944, the order came through to evacuate all prisoners of war to Germany. The Red Army had all but surrounded the city of Budapest. In the meantime, I had made contact with the underground, and through them I was given a choice. Either be evacuated to Germany with the other American and Russian prisoners—or remain behind and work with the underground and "sweat out" the siege of the city. Being Jewish, I decided that the bombs and shells due to fall on Budapest would never approximate the fate of a Jew in Germany, so I remained behind, the only prisoner. I became the head of an underground group which was later credited by the Russians with destroying 4 secret airfields, 11 ammunition dumps, and over 20 troop trains and concentrations. I should like to give my praises here to—to those Hungarian and German patriots who so ably aided us in this work, grand people all, male and female.

On November 6, 1945, the dream I had dreamed so longingly became a reality. I was liberated by the Russians. Often, I had vowed that I would kiss the first Russian I saw, be he a bearded infantryman, a war-weary, begrimed paratrooper, or a mud-bedecked guerrilla fighter. It was quite by accident, I assure you, that it turned out to be a cute blond nurse. When they heard there was an American in the hospital, they came flocking to meet me, impelled, no doubt, by curiosity. They toasted me, they toasted our great leaders, they toasted our great nations—then we got down to serious toasting. We toasted the carburetors on lend-lease jeeps, we toasted the individual spark plugs on Studebaker trucks, we toasted the exhaust flame on Bell Airacobra fighter planes. I'll vouch, personally, for the way the Russians can toast.

But, liberation, for me, meant that the fight had to go on. Hitler had issued an order to his troops that the city was to be held until not a building was left standing. There isn't. No doubt you read about the siege of Budapest, perhaps the fiercest of the war, but all I will say about it now is that it was bitter beyond description.

Unfortunately—or perhaps, fortunately—my tour of duty with the Red Army came to an abrupt halt a few weeks later when a German sniper found my scalp. I was evacuated immediately through a series of Russian hospitals, and, I might add, the medical care and attention shown me was completely modern, with a maximum of professional skill and know-how. The Russians first sent me to a hospital at Dunaharesti, Hungary.

All along the route I noticed that at every railroad station and siding, there were huge piles of American matériel. The Russians loved to point out these piles to me and one of their ways of expressing their admiration and appreciation was to identify by name every American product encountered. They would indicate a truck and say, "Dodge, Studebaker, Willys, O. K." etc. Yes; they certainly admired our matériel. Let us quietly forget that they used that matériel at a cost of over 15,000,000 lives.

My first contact with the office of politik-commissar came at Dunaharesti. There was one attached to every Army unit, and it was his function to give the men a clear, concise picture of the war daily and interpret it in terms of Russian interest. In this manner, every soldier, from general down to private, had a constant source of information regarding the progress of the war and what each step meant to Russia. The result was that the Red Army soldier had before him at all times an ideal, not merely the thought of getting the job done as quickly as possible so that he could go home. Not once in my entire experience with our own forces did I receive any ideological indoctrination lectures.

From Dunaharesti I was sent to Soroksar and from there, to Kecskemet. At Kecskemet, I had a joyous reunion with the first Americans I had seen since November 12, 1944—that GI jive certainly sounded good. They were the crews of three American bombers that had made forced landings there after a rough mission, and together with the 30 other Americans, I really learned the meaning of Russian hospitality. At a banquet attended by the other Americans, I was made an honorary major in the Red Army in recognition of my underground activity, and was presented with a full major's uniform with the Order of the Guard pinned to the right breast. To end the ceremony, Major Zhigalkin, our host, kissed me on the mouth—and I couldn't help but think of that first Russian nurse I kissed. Life at

Kecskemet was living in a great big way. I was given my own villa and my every wish was answered before it could even be expressed. The other Americans fared equally well, being quartered five men to a villa and spending their days in eating, drinking, hunting, sight-seeing, etc. I recall a few incidents that may be considered typical. After a while, we tired of the Russian version of breakfast, consisting of tomatoes drenched in sour cream, hamburgers and cream, steak and French-fried potatoes, dill pickles, and washed down with quantities of tea and wine, and one of the Americans offhandedly remarked to our host that we'd like nothing better than an egg or two for breakfast. The next morning 31 Americans found over 300 eggs awaiting them at their mess. After a few days of this, we were only too happy to return to our hamburgers and sour cream for breakfast. Another time, at a banquet, our host insisted upon teaching us some Russian folk dances. Between never-ending toasts, we damaged our dignity and derrieres on the "kazutski," and were eager to call a halt to the proceedings when our host insisted upon learning some American folk dances. Suffice it to say that we were all at a loss as to what constituted an American folk dance until one enterprising GI took him in hand and taught him to boogie-woogie. Small wonder, then, why 31 Americans were reluctant to leave the Russians. As a matter of actual fact, it took a direct order from the United States Army to get them out.

What, then, does all this add up to? To me it means that for one brief span of time I fought, lived, and laughed with a people I had never known. And say what you will a people, when you fight side by side with them, you get to know them as in no other way. You see traits of character that only death and the horrors of war can bring out. You find women doing a man's work—unflinchingly and without complaint. Women snipers, women fighter pilots, women tank drivers, women doctors, nurses, but above all, women soldiers fighting by their men for the things that mean everything to them—freedom from tyranny and love of their land. You find men and women alike listening to their politikcommissar tell of the Crimean Conference, then see them toast with joy the promise of postwar unity between America and their own native land.

It would take weeks to catalog everything I saw and did with the Russians. I've tried to touch upon the lighter things, for the agony is written in blood on the pages of Russian history. In conclusion, I should like to debunk some of the more popular misconceptions shared by too, too many of us Americans. First, that the Russians are an ignorant, backward people. I never encountered an illiterate soldier. Russia has compulsory education, and her educational program is the most advanced in the world. In Russia, all that one needs to acquire a college education is the ability and the desire. The Government will pay the rest. Second, that the Russians are barbarians. I did see acts of barbarism perpetrated by the Russians, but to no greater degree than I saw them done by the American and British Armies. Third, that the Russians are a Godless people. They may be; I can only tell you what I saw. Many Russian soldiers wear religious medals into battle, medals of St. Christopher, Jewish mazuzahs. They wear them openly, proudly and without shame, and upon questioning them, I learned, to my own satisfaction, that freedom of religion prevails in Russia today.

When I look back upon the Russians, I see them as a people who are strong and hardy, sincere, well-informed, purposeful, and appreciative of help. They are plain and earthy, and in sum and substance, they are people. Yes, just plain Mr., Mrs., and Miss, subject to the same emotions, the same desires that any of us here have. Put them in any part of the earth it's the same—you have your little man, your common man—and he differs only in that he speaks a different tongue.

That is what I found when I looked through that window. I found, from personal experience, that two men—or two nations—need not share the same political or religious beliefs in order to get along in perfect harmony. That if two men—or two nations—approach each other with open hearts and open minds and with trust and understanding and sincerity, lasting peace will become, not a dream, but a reality.

No, I am neither expert nor authority—just a GI who has all he ever wants of war; an American who looked into a room and instead of finding a gun pointed at his head, found a person extending his hand and saying "Tovarich." I'd like to return that welcome and say to him, "Friend." In either language it means peace!

Cost of the British Loan

REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, with millions of veterans to be taken care of, and the need for more and better schools and hospitals all over the country, it is a crime that anyone would add further to our multi-billion-dollar national debt for the benefit of any foreign country.

Last week I discussed the British loan with several Members of Congress in the Republican cloakroom. From these conversations we found out that $3,750,000,000 was a lot of money. I had just figured out that this amount of money would encircle the earth 16 times with 1-dollar bills placed end to end. One Member said it would furnish enough 1-dollar bills to cover 280 acres. Another Member said it would make a stack of 1,000-dollar bills as high as the Empire State Building. While another said it would purchase 750,000 $5,000 homes or place a decent hospital in every county in the United States.

Our present national debt is approximately $272,000,000,000, or $2,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. Indiana's share of the national debt is about $6,855,592,000. Each congressional district will owe about $600,000,000 on the national debt. Each congressional district's share of the cost of the British loan will be about $8,400,000. The British loan will cost the Indiana taxpayers $95,978,288.

This British loan comes along at a time when our States and counties were about to get out of debt. But the New Deal will never let us get even. They propose to invest about $17,000,000,000 in foreign loans and international financing. They want to continually keep our nose to the grindstone to aid foreign countries.

The British loan will cost the following cities: New York City, $207,637,312; Chicago, $94,644,144; Philadelphia, $54,118,568; Detroit, $44,834,468; Los Angeles, $41,560,680; Cleveland, $24,839,804; Baltimore, $23,940,924; St. Louis, $22,861,748.

State's share of national debt and the British loan

State	Share of national debt	Share of British loan
New York	$26,958,284,000	$377,415,976
Pennsylvania	19,800,360,000	277,205,040
Illinois	15,794,482,000	221,122,748
Ohio	13,815,224,000	193,413,136
California	13,814,774,000	193,406,836
Texas	12,829,648,000	179,615,072
Michigan	10,512,212,000	147,170,968
Massachusetts	8,633,442,000	120,768,188
New Jersey	8,320,330,000	116,484,620
Missouri	7,569,328,000	105,970,592
North Carolina	7,143,246,000	100,005,444
Indiana	6,855,592,000	95,978,288
Wisconsin	6,275,174,000	87,852,436
Georgia	6,247,446,000	87,464,244
Tennessee	5,831,682,000	81,643,548
Kentucky	5,691,254,000	79,677,556
Alabama	5,665,922,000	79,322,908
Minnesota	5,584,600,000	78,184,400
Virginia	5,355,546,000	74,977,644
Iowa	5,176,536,000	71,071,504
Louisiana	4,727,760,000	66,188,640
Oklahoma	4,672,968,000	65,420,152
Mississippi	4,367,592,000	61,146,288
Arkansas	3,898,774,000	54,582,836
West Virginia	3,803,948,000	53,255,272
South Carolina	3,799,608,000	53,194,512
Florida	3,794,828,000	53,127,592
Maryland	3,642,488,000	50,994,832
Kansas	3,602,056,000	50,428,784
Washington	3,472,382,000	48,693,348
Connecticut	3,418,484,000	47,858,776
Nebraska	2,631,668,000	36,843,352
Colorado	2,246,592,000	31,452,288
Oregon	2,179,368,000	30,511,152
Maine	1,694,452,000	23,722,328
Rhode Island	1,426,692,000	19,973,688
South Dakota	1,285,922,000	18,002,908
North Dakota	1,283,870,000	17,974,180
Montana	1,118,912,000	15,664,768
Utah	1,100,620,000	15,408,680
New Mexico	1,063,636,000	14,890,904
Idaho	1,049,746,000	14,696,444
Arizona	998,522,000	13,979,308
New Hampshire	983,048,000	13,762,672
Vermont	718,462,000	10,058,468
Delaware	533,010,000	7,462,140
Wyoming	501,484,000	7,060,776
Nevada	220,494,000	3,086,916
District of Columbia	1,326,182,000	18,566,548

BRITISH LOAN WILL COST INDIANA $95,978,288

The British loan will cost the following cities in Indiana approximately: Indianapolis, $10,812,760; Fort Wayne, $2,839,480; South Bend, $3,309,404; Evansville, $2,696,344; Terre Haute, $1,751,288.

The British loan will cost the following counties in Indiana: Allen County, $4,335,324; Lake County, $8,091,924; Marion County, $12,786,732; St. Joseph County, $4,535,076; Vanderburgh County, $3,659,852.

What the British loan will cost Seventh District of Indiana

	Assessed valuation	Cost of national debt	Cost of British loan
Clay County	$21,307,285	$50,334,000	$704,676
Daviess County	21,368,330	52,200,000	730,800
Gibson County	29,780,100	61,324,000	858,536
Greene County	20,442,190	62,586,000	876,204
Johnson County	30,800,490	44,896,000	628,544
Knox County	43,708,170	87,730,000	1,228,220
Martin County	4,905,502	20,556,000	287,784
Monroe County	28,777,135	72,696,000	1,017,744
Morgan County	17,325,921	39,596,000	554,344
Owen County	8,937,614	24,316,000	340,424
Sullivan County	22,065,470	53,566,000	749,924
Total		569,800,000	7,977,560

What the British loan will cost Seventh District communities

Community	Share of national debt	Cost of British loan
Bloomington	$41,740,000	$584,360
Ellettsville	1,726,000	24,164
Vincennes	36,456,000	510,384
Bicknell	10,220,000	143,080

What the British loan will cost Seventh District communities—Continued

Community	Share of national debt	Cost of British loan
Oaktown	$1,586,000	$22,204
Wheatland	1,426,000	19,964
Sandborn	1,204,000	16,856
Monroe City	1,036,000	14,504
Washington	18,624,000	260,736
Odon	1,916,000	26,824
Elnora	1,598,000	22,372
Plainville	1,238,000	17,332
Montgomery	1,020,000	14,280
Brazil	16,252,000	227,528
Clay City	2,234,000	31,276
Princeton	15,572,000	218,008
Oakland City	6,136,000	85,904
Fort Branch	3,104,000	43,456
Owensville	2,376,000	33,264
Haubstadt	1,524,000	21,336
Francisco	1,222,000	17,108
Patoka	1,138,000	15,932
Hazelton	1,032,000	14,448
Franklin	12,528,000	175,392
Greenwood	4,998,000	69,972
Edinburg	4,932,000	69,048
Linton	12,526,000	175,364
Jasonville	6,836,000	95,704
Bloomfield	4,540,000	63,560
Worthington	3,458,000	48,412
Sullivan	10,154,000	142,156
Shelburn	3,232,000	45,248
Hymera	2,596,000	36,344
Farmersburg	2,010,000	28,140
Carlisle	1,748,000	24,470
Martinsville	10,018,000	140,252
Mooresville	3,958,000	55,412
Morgantown	1,448,000	20,272
Spencer	4,750,000	66,500
Gosport	1,458,000	20,412
Loogootee	4,650,000	65,100
Shoals	2,062,000	28,868

After checking these figures you can readily see why I am against the British loan or any other foreign loan unless it has proper security. I am opposed to bankrupting America in order to finance the world.

A Baltimore-Equipped Hospital in Kiev—Address by Prof. Lev. Ivanovitch Medved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 20 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I recently attended a gathering in Baltimore, Md., having for its purpose the establishment of a Baltimore-equipped hospital in Kiev, Russia. I was very much impressed by an address delivered by Prof. Lev. Ivanovitch Medved, a professor in the Medical Institute in Kiev, who had recently spent 2 months in this country. He gave us a most interesting story of his observations, and his conception of relations between the Soviet regime and our country. Because of the current interest in Russian affairs and our interest in them, I ask unanimous consent to have this address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY PROF. LEV. IVANOVITCH MEDVED, PROFESSOR, MEDICAL INSTITUTE IN KIEV

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, my countrymen in my motherland as well as myself are full of sincere gratitude to you, citizens of America, friends of the Soviet Union.

The peoples of my country highly appreciate the contributions made by the United States of America in the common cause of smashing German-Fascist invaders and Japanese imperialists.

We shall remember for many years the fact that during the hard years of the war you gave us the necessary material help.

The contributions of the peoples of the Soviet Union in the cause of destroying our common enemy are widely known.

The Red Army not only smashed and drove out the German-Fascist invaders from the territory of the Soviet Union but freed peoples of many countries of Europe from German-Fascist slavery.

The time when our troops met with the troops of our allies, on the battle line; that is when our forces joined the forces of the United States of America, England, and other countries will be remembered by democratic peoples for ages as the decisive step in achieving the complete victory over the German-Fascist invaders.

I have been in America for 2 months already. I visited many cities and various institutions, where I met with the Americans. I must express my gratitude for the cordial reception which was given my colleagues as well as myself everywhere. The people we dealt with very willingly made us acquainted with the practical and scientific achievements of America and shared their experience.

I have never been to America before. I had some previous impression of America and her people through literature, magazines, and newspapers and I am glad to say that much of what I have read about America and her people is correct.

First, I found Americans good, business-like, efficient, creative people. Second, I found that there are many sincere friends of the Soviet Union among the American people who wish happiness and prosperity to my people and sincere desire to strengthen the friendship between the peoples of the United States of America and of the Soviet Union.

I would like to tell you about our thoughts and hopes. At the present time reestablishing of our economy destroyed by the Fascists occupies the mind of the Soviet people. The damage caused to the Soviet Union is indescribable. It is enough to say that the damage done to the Ukraine alone, from which I have the honor to be a delegate on the fourth session of UNRRA, amounts to $285,000,000. Many of the cities have been completely destroyed and thousands of villages have been burned. Countless factories have been entirely ruined, electric stations have been blown up, mines have been flooded. The quipment of our factories is either destroyed or taken away. Some of our beautiful, ancient cities such as Poltava, Chernigov, Tarnopol, and others have been turned into ruins. In Kiev, the capital of the Ukraine, 42 percent of the homes have been completely ruined.

Millions of our people, including old people and children, have been killed and tortured by the Fascists. Many of the Soviet people have become cripples permanently.

Thousands of orphans have been left whose parents perished as a result of crimes of the Fascist invaders.

Thousands of schools, countless institutes, hundreds of hospitals, laboratories, museums, and other institutions have been destroyed. Much damage has been done to our agriculture.

The Ukraine people are still suffering great hardships. Many of them have been left homeless, without clothes and food, and our people now are trying to the best of their ability to heal the wounds of the war as rapidly as only practicable.

The Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. launched a new 5-year plan for restoration and development of the national economy of the U. S. S. R. for 1946–50.

For this period of time everything will not only be restored to the prewar level but will surpass this level. The output of the entire industry of the U. S. S. R. will be almost 50 percent above the prewar level in 1950; that will exceed the level of 1940. The agricultural output will exceed the prewar level by 27 percent; the national income by 30 percent. We shall again create well-off, cultural, happy life. We know our future. It will be wonderful—we shall create it through our efforts.

But our present conditions are still hard, and that is why we heartily thank all those who are extending the necessary help to us during our time of trial.

The Ukrainian people will keep our feeling of the deepest gratitude to the great Russian people, the peoples of our fraternal Soviet Republics, the Soviet Government, and Generalissimo Stalin for liberating from the Fascist slavery and for every day help which is being given us in rehabilitating our impaired economy.

The Soviet Republics allotted and assigned thousands of machines, tractors, more than a million head of cattle, seeds for our collective farms and for our peasants, equipment for our fabrics and building materials for our constructive work.

We are grateful to UNRRA for their help in furnishing us with food medicaments, equipment which amount to $189,000,000.

We are especially grateful to you for organization of individual help which was rendered by the population of the United States of America.

Your help is extremely important for us at present. We appreciate it as an act of high humanity, sincere friendly help to our people on the part of the American people.

The peoples of my country are alarmed over the calls for war by some reactionaries who are spreading their crazy ideas of war and are trying to obtrude them to the peoples of their own countries.

The idea of war is outlandish to my country; it is adverse to human nature in general, to all the democratic people throughout the world.

We all clearly realize that there are people, real defenders of lasting peace, who are thousand times more than warmongers. We are quite sure that the democratic peoples of the world do not wish another war and they will not allow it.

They are in a position to prevent war and they will be able to repress pro-Fascist reactionary forces that are trying to sow mischiefs among the peoples of the world and wish to enrich themselves at the expense of the blood of other people.

I know that your organization is a sincere adherent of lasting peace and friendship among the peoples of the world.

Permit me to express my sincere wish for success for your organization as well as for other democratic organizations in your far-reaching activity and in your struggle for lasting peace.

Permit me to wish personal happiness and social success to all the friends of the Soviet Union who are present here and for those who are not with us at this meeting.

Permit me to express my deep gratitude to you for your sincere desire to equip one of the hospitals in Kiev.

Long live the friendship between the peoples of the United States of America and the Soviet Union.

Disposal of Government Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Saturday I addressed a letter to Representative SLAUGHTER, chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate War Surplus Disposal, presenting further facts in my charges against the War Assets Administration's disgraceful handling of the disposal of Government surplus property. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this letter be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
June 22, 1946.

Hon. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER,
Chairman, Special House Committee To Investigate War Surplus Disposal, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is to supplement my letter to you of June 19, 1946, in which I forwarded to you the text of my statement of June 18 before the Senate Small Business Subcommittee on Surplus Property, containing my charges against the War Assets Administration's disgraceful handling of the surplus disposal situation.

The purpose of this letter is to offer further substantiation of the charges against the War Assets Administration which I have repeatedly made.

I believe that after reading these charges, together with my previous correspondence with General Gregory and my other statements on the floor of the Senate, you will agree with me that:

1. The WAA's ("Wasting American Assets") handling of the surplus program is more scandalous than Teapot Dome and is rife with political implications and interagency discrimination.

2. The time is long overdue for resignations in the WAA on the part of those men who have violated the public interest in wittingly or unwittingly serving private interests ahead of legally established priority claimants.

3. A full exposure of this whole rotten surplus disposal situation should be made.

URGENCY OF PROBLEM

This surplus situation is particularly urgent now because I understand that well over 100 ships are coming from the Pacific, loaded with millions and millions of dollars worth of electronics equipment, which, on the basis of previous WAA misconduct, will not go to priority claimants unless your own and the Stewart committee and Congress itself take a firm hand now in correcting WAA's abuses.

The situation is particularly urgent, too, because Comptroller General Lindsay Warren has just accused the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of a wretched system of accounting. The WAA (which was formerly a subsidiary corporation of RFC) has continued in effect the accounting system set up for it by RFC. Therefore, we may be virtually certain in assuming that whatever abuses are involved in RFC's lax accounting are equally bad in WAA's accounting and this involves untold millions of dollars of pubic funds.

Now to proceed with a substantiation of my charges.

SURVEY OF ELECTRONICS SALES

1. I have charged that priority claimants' requests for surplus electronics equipment have been disgracefully ignored. I should now like to present some figures which are necessarily only estimates but which have come to me from highly reliable sources and which I feel sure will be confirmed upon your committee's further investigation of this matter.

To date, total electronics (radio and radar) and communications (telephone, telegraph, and teletype) equipment valued at some $400,000,000 has been declared surplus. Around $200,000,000 of such equipment has been disposed of.

Of this amount, schools, colleges, and universities (which desperately need the equipment for training scientists and technicians, invariably under the GI bill of rights) have at the most obtained around $50,000 worth. Veterans have had delivery on an additional $50,000 worth. States, counties, and municipalities have secured around $20,000 worth, and Federal agencies have received around $2,000,000 worth. Thus the total amount of equipment secured by priority claimants is at the very most $2,120,000. I repeat that this is a most generous estimate. This, then, must be considered in the light of the fact that $200,000,000 worth of surplus has been disposed of. The important figure to note is that priority claimants got roughly $2,000,000 worth of equipment, while private commercial sources got $198,000,000 worth of equipment.

This is in spite of the fact that Congress has enacted and supplemented Public Law 457, Seventy-eighth Congress, designed to establish veterans' educational institutions, States, counties, and municipalities in a preferred status.

VIOLATION OF VETERANS' RIGHTS

2. I have charged that our veterans are being intentionally ignored by the WAA. To date, the total of veterans' unsatisfied preference certificates for electronic and communication equipment is around 20,000. Veterans' preference certificates are arriving at around 1,000 per week. These certificates are being opened, filed away, and forgotten.

VIOLATION OF SCHOOLS' RIGHTS

3. I have charged that the United States Office of Education liaison agent has been denied the opportunity to screen surplus equipment for schools although commercial companies enjoy this privilege when it is conducive to their private profits. (See also No. 8 herein.)

This is substantiated by the fact that since June 6 the duly accredited liaison representative of the Office of Education has been denied access to the WAA electronic records for the purpose of screening equipment needed by schools.

Based on screening of records prior to June 6, on Monday, June 17, 1946, Office of Education representatives delivered to WAA over 3,000 orders from schools. By the following Friday, an admittedly short period, only six orders had been processed by the understaffed priorities section; that is, requests to WAA regional offices to issue shipping instructions to manufacturer agents had been sent out in these cases. At this rate, it will take more than 9 years to fill the 3,000 back orders, not to mention other hundreds of back orders from educational institutions already on hand and unfilled.

POLITICAL DISCRIMINATION

4. I have hesitated to charge that there has been political discrimination or any partisan note in the handling of surplus property until I could relate some specific instances. However, I now understand that one of WAA's electronic officials has accused the Office of Education liaison agent of aspiring to be a candidate for Republican national committeeman from Kentucky. But upon a telephone inquiry to this office of education agent, I learned that he has been in Kentucky only once in his life and then for a few days on an official trip to Lexington, Ky., Signal Corps depot. I further understand that this same WAA electronic official has claimed that the United States Office of Education is loaded with Republicans.

Are these the reasons why the schools are being denied their proper priority for securing surplus: because WAA officials believe that the United States Office of Education has personnel with Republican sympathies?

WAA RED TAPE

5. I have charged that red tape is choking the WAA's handling of surplus property. This is illustrated by the fact that as a starter, in the case of a simple request for issuance of shipping instructions by a WAA regional office, no fewer than nine copies are made, most of which copies are completely unnecessary, useless and involve a needless expense to the Government, in my opinion.

UNDERSTAFFED PRIORITIES FACILITIES

6. I have charged that the priority section of electronics and communications branch has been denied adequate stenographic and clerical assistance. This is substantiated by the fact that not since last October has this section had more than two secretaries on hand at any one time and indeed for many weeks this section had no secretaries at all because of illness or official leave, resignation, or other reason. The WAA was apparently in no hurry to supply needed personnel. As a result of this lack of stenographic assistance, there are literally hundreds of letters in this section which have been answered by hand and which are stacked up awaiting typing. Other thousands have not even been answered in longhand.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXTRAVAGANCE

7. I have charged that there are gross administrative shortcomings in the organization of WAA. This is substantiated by the fact that numerous independent contractors who are employed as consultants at fees up to $35 per day, plus travel expenses, have been placed in administrative positions, above civil-service people. How many tens of thousands of dollars have already been lost to the taxpayers because these independent contractors have been placed in administrative positions at compensation up to $35 per day is a matter that should be investigated.

COMMERCIAL PREFERENCE

8. I have charged that a commercial crowd has taken over WAA's handling of surplus electronics disposition. This is substantiated in the case of one consultant employed at around $35 per day, an independent contractor, who, while available for consultation, wangled 130 receivers for his commercial company, which receivers should have been made available to the schools for instruction in radio courses.

Another instance which I should like to cite is that of another company which has been allowed to send its agents to a signal depot in order to evaluate Government surplus property. This value then becomes the official price tag at which the surplus is sold. At the same time, the Government is spending thousands of dollars in its own Electronic Evaluation Section in WAA, but is obviously bypassing that section. I am unable in spite of extensive inquiry to confirm that any Priorities Section representative was given a similar privilege of examining and valuing electronic equipment in Army depots.

MANUFACTURER-AGENT ABUSES

9. I have charged that the manufacturer-agent system is open to grave abuses. May I cite the instance of one manufacturer agent who sent in an expense account for May of $12,000 but made exactly zero sales for that month.

SITUATION BECOMING WORSE

10. I have charged that the electronics program is not only not being improved, as

General Gregory has tried to tell me in letters, but is instead deteriorating.

This is evidenced by the fact that June sales of surplus to schools, colleges, and veterans may not exceed $2,000.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the above, my dear Congressman, I know that you will see full reason for a thorough investigation of the electronics phase of the surplus disposition program. Such an investigation should involve testimony before your committee by working section chiefs who have been operating this system at first hand. It seems obvious that if you are to hear testimony of the higher officials, they will only be parroting words put into their mouths by subordinate officials, many of whom, as I have indicated, are grossly violating their responsibilities to the public welfare and are trying to cover up their own misconduct.

Assuring you of my desire to be of maximum service to your committee, and wishing you every success in your endeavors, I am

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

The Veto Power Under the United Nations' Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered on June 20, 1946, by Hon. James W. Gerard, former Ambassador to Germany.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For centuries, and especially after devastating wars, the nations have sought some sort of league or federation which would prevent wars.

Even the Indians of New York State had a successful league of the Six Nations.

Henry IV of France, who died in 1610, proposed a Christian Republic of 15 nations.

Cardinal Alberoni, who long ruled Spain, after his retirement to Rome published in 1730 a plan for a federation backed by a federal army to settle international disputes.

After the Napoleonic wars Russia, Prussia, and Austria formed a Holy Alliance with France as a forced recruit. Its objects and methods were vague and clothed in high-sounding phrases.

The League of Nations formed after World War I was dominated by a council with a concealed veto.

The Charter of the United Nations also contains a concealed veto—the Council must always contain Russia, Great Britain, the United States, China, and France. The unanimous action of these five powers is necessary to any act to repress aggression. Therefore anyone of these can veto any proposed action.

The Christian Republic of Henry IV was to consist of two delegates appointed every 3 years by 15 states.

The proposed league of Cardinal Alberoni gave no right of veto to any one state.

Veto or a denial of majority rule has proved fatal to states in history.

In the old Polish Diet any one member could prevent any proposed action by pronouncing the word "veto."

The Empress Catharine, in placing her favorite Poniatowski on the throne, insisted that the right of this liberum veto should be preserved, divining correctly that under it Poland would be incapable of action and would fall prey to the surrounding powers.

Curiously enough it was the Russians at San Francisco who insisted on the inclusion of the veto in the Charter of the United Nations, and the other nations, hypnotized into appeasement, weakly consented.

The United Nations under this Charter are poor, weak things, their delegates busily conferring and chattering, always subject to have one of the five great powers to prevent any action against any nation which might seek to dominate or conquer through the arbitrament of war.

I am delighted to read that our great national sage, Bernard Baruch, in his plan, proposes that there shall be no veto in all questions relating to the atomic bomb.

In a real congress of the peoples of the world there is no room for any veto by any one of five great powers.

At home we surrender part of our liberty to majority rule. If we seek the blessings of peace abroad, we must surrender part of our sovereignty to majority rule of the nations.

Rosy predictions have been made by those who drafted this Charter. But suppose, for instance, that Marshal Tito should attack Italy or seize an Italian city. A veto by Russia, his patron, could prevent any action, although all the other nations of the world should be ready to defeat this violence.

Our choice is plain—either we trust the majority of the nations and believe them ready to stop war and invasion or we must regard this so-called Charter as a nullity—a source of little diplomatic intrigue and jobs for faithful politicians.

The Need for Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which appeared in the Washington Post, of June 21, 1946, by David Silberman, of New York City, N. Y., showing the need for unity in the United States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A United States produced the guns, the tanks, the trucks, the planes, the ships.

A United States produced in its hour of need, Roosevelt, MacArthur, Eisenhower, Nimitz, and Marshall.

A United States produced the cooperation of labor and management, the patriotism and sacrifices of its peoples and the elimination of political bickering.

A United States produced victory.

A dis-United States produced the coal strike, the steel strike, the automotive strike, the railroad strike.

A dis-United States produced the conflict between Whitney, Johnston, and our President—the NAM against the OPA—Justice Jackson against Justice Black.

A dis-United States produced the conflict between labor and management—hasty emergency legislation—(the Case bill)—the OPA struggle—the political juggling for power.

A dis-United States is a great tragedy.

Please, everybody, Republicans, Democrats, labor leaders, and industrialist—you and I—get together and save this United States of America.

A United States is a great country.

DAVID SILBERMAN,
President, Charm Slide Fastener Corp., New York, N. Y.

Where Do We Go From Here?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PEHR G. HOLMES
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Weekly Bulletin of Leather and Shoe News:

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

What a patient lot we Americans are. For 9 months we have put up with shortages in practically everything necessary to our way of life while continuous struggling goes on between labor, management, and Government. To be sure grumbling may be heard in many corners yet we arrive nowhere.

We have ideas, systems, plans galore put forth by so-called experts of everything but so far without the success expected when each was launched.

Shoe production was at its peak for the first 4 months of the year but now a decided slow-down is noticed. Why? The shoe manufacturer says the material is not coming to him in the needed quantities. The leather man claims the hides are not reaching him in sufficient numbers or quality to produce what is needed. The hide man will show you figures that prove he is not obtaining the same large number of hides he was getting and had every hope of continuing receiving. Then the packers, large and small, say they cannot buy the cattle, as people not particular to Government regulations outbid them. The Government admits the presence of black-market activities but cannot seem to find any effective method of combating it.

We find a decided upward trend in the retail prices of shoes, particularly women's. Manufacturers state that they cannot continue to make the same low-priced shoes of years ago as ceilings do not allow for the increases in all costs during the past few years. After much delay increases are granted in the low-priced bracket as an incentive in this field. But now we await, week after week, from the same governmental agency but by another branch, an increase in the price of leather, an increase that could not have been taken into consideration in the shoe-cost raise.

During the war everything was fine. Money was no object. The theorists and experts had their desks to work at, the Government was the chief purchaser of all types of goods. The manufacturer cared little what wages he paid as this could easily be passed on in his price, the consumer took the scraps that were left and had the money to pay no matter what the actual worth.

Now that this is all over and the public is the chief purchaser once again it is not as simple. The theorists and the experts remain at their desks but it is not quite the same. Instead of the former concerted effort to attain a certain goal we now find

ourselves floundering back and forth at the whims of whoever can outshout the other, or should we say outinfluence each other in obtaining their individual aims from the people and legislators of this country.

The people have not been able to make up their minds, or to be painfully truthful have not had their minds made up for them, and until they do this confusion is certain to continue. Let us decide, we have three courses to follow: First, the continuation of the present unsatisfactory conditions by vacilliatory efforts of the Government to please everyone; second, a price administration law which will stabilize all parts of this Nation's life, including wages, and be rigorously enforced; third, an abolishment of all rules and regulations allowing for a free-for-all during which a great many will be hurt ending in a better balanced cost of living. The immediate future may not be too rosy, but let's face it unified and get it over with.

HAPPY?

It is easy to guess the reply that would have been obtained if a man had gone through South Street early this week and shouted, "Is everybody happy?" It would have been a loud "No."

Everybody was unhappy or made a good try at not being so. Tanners were not pleased because hides and calfskins were not found in anywhere near the allocation figures. Brokers were not in the mood to smile because their customers could not be satisfied. Shoe manufacturers were most displeased. Shipments of leather going to them were far below par and tanners waited for OPA to hand down a decision that was believed ready for signature a week ago.

The newspapers did not have reading matter suitable for a state of happiness. The beautiful future that was pictured during the days of the war was still a beautiful future to come some day. The houses that were to be twice as good as the prewar models, and half as expensive, turn out to be dreams on paper. The enormous output of automobiles, anticipated as high as 4,000,000 cars in 1946, may end around 800,000. The story is much the same on other merchandise.

Father's Day is exploited to the limit by all merchandisers. "Pa" will be handed a mess of something or other on that day if the family heeds the advice of the stores. The change is striking when one goes to certain stores. For instance, there is a Boston department store with a basement noted the country over. In years past a large volume was done in men's shirts at 60 cents to $1—usually seconds. Going through early in the week we noted quite a crowd of customers around counters offering seconds of white shirts at $3.95, OPA ceiling. Ties at $2.95 a sample were piled high; the past was filled with ties at less than $1—and so it goes throughout the basement and elsewhere in every store. Ceilings seem to vary in height as in houses, and if the line has been held it is not the line that the business world knew before the war or at the time of the war.

When it is considered that this Nation has everything to do with, except perhaps the right mental attitude, it is easily understood why nobody is happy.

WHAT IF—

What if the well-established meat packers defied price controls and went about buying, slaughtering animals, and selling meat as in 1936? Probably the black-market attorneys would try to bring action, for the black market would be injured. But as the former white and black markets competed for business the public would get more food and it might be unpopular to try to stop a better and more adequate supply.

Next, more hides and skins would be expected to come to tanneries and relieve the leather shortage and eventually the leather shoe scarcity. Such extra supplies, if sold freely and unrestricted as to price, would break the regulations. Barring the formal, old restrictions we should then return to free markets, the American way of liberty and freedom about which we have heard so much.

What if tanners were free to charge what they saw fit, and shoe manufacturers were also free? Then would be ousted that stagnation that exists today in trading and delivery.

It is difficult to believe that big, responsible white marketers would defy existing law of fixed ceilings. The relief in the recent past has been changes in quality grading.

It is not pleasant to contemplate the reports of the volume of black marketing, and one asks why this is permitted to be so extensive.

Many divisions of price-fixing have worked badly, and the longer used the worse they operate. There are attempts to justify ceilings until production becomes greater, in fact as time goes on leather production grows smaller.

Some day ceilings will vanish and obvious results follow to be ironed out by free competition. Why not face the change now instead of increasing trouble by further continuance?

Against Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Eli Louis Cooper:

[From the National Jewish Monthly]

A LAW AGAINST ANTI-SEMITISM—PREJUDICE CANNOT BE LEGISLATED AWAY, BUT A THREAT TO PUBLIC SECURITY CAN, SAYS AUTHOR IN FORMULATING STATUTE

(By Eli Louis Cooper)

(There have been many attempts to frame legislation that would outlaw anti-Semitism. But all have failed because of unconstitutionality. We therefore asked Eli Louis Cooper if the cause was hopeless. He said "No; it can be done." This article is the result. We invite the comments of our readers, especially lawyers. Mr. Cooper is director of community relations for the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League in Washington. He is a member of the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States and also a graduate of the Jewish Institute of Religion, where he was ordained a rabbi. He holds degrees in arts and law from the University of Pennsylvania.—Editor.)

Many able fighters in the battle against anti-Semitism lose sight of the fact that the battle is part of a war—the war to preserve democracy, to keep inviolate our heritage of moral, ethical, and religious values, to maintain our American way of life and its freedoms. They have permitted the larger struggle to be obscured, they cannot see the forest for the trees, and they have developed a strange psychology. These battlers are not willing to use any but perfect instruments in the fight. At first glance legislation seems to be an imperfect instrument.

Some conclusions should be stated at the outset. Legislation can outlaw anti-Semitic activity. It can retard its growth. It can overcome its effect. Legislation will not eliminate all the prejudice. It will not dispel all the bigotry. It will not wipe out the diseased social mind. But legislation can direct sound thinking. It can motivate good attitudes. It can promote reasonable group living in every community in the land.

CIVILIZATION IS BASED ON LAW

Our western civilization is based on law. So the suggestion was made early to invoke the law as a solution to the vexing problem. And the debate grew apace. But history does not wait for a decision on who wins the argument. The effective forces in the world have swung into action. In his last Christmas message, Pope Pius urged the outlawing of "all hate and persecution as one of the fundamental prerequisites for a lasting peace." He referred not merely to moral condemnation, but specified legislative proscription by all civilized countries. The Charter of the United Nations adopted at San Francisco, and the international agreements executed at the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace in Mexico, included as a legal principle the condemnation of hate and prejudice based on differences in religion. Prime Minister Attlee interpreted the Charter provisions as empowering the United Nations to take action against any state which persecuted Jews.

In October 1945 the Polish Government passed a law making anti-Jewish incitement criminal and providing for stringent punishment of violators. In England, the chairman of the executive committee of the Labor Party urged a measure to outlaw anti-Jewish as well as racial propaganda. This measure was to be in the form of a criminal libel statute. Its intention is to outlaw group libel, until now tolerated by English common law.

Recently the Central Conference of American Rabbis held an Institute on Race Relations. The institute adopted a statement urging legal enactments by states and nations prohibiting defamation on racial or religious grounds and establishing the right of private civil remedy.

The proponents of totalitarianism derided the ways of democracy. They scorned its lack of planning. They pointed to the inefficiency of many independent efforts to solve one problem. They attacked the freedom of social experimentation. They had no regard for natural developments under the impact of social forces. Once again we are about to see their philosophy disproved. The traditions of western life are grappling with the greatest single disruptive movement in its history. Our free society seems to be finding a method for control. The justification of the legislative approach is becoming more apparent.

THE PHILOSOPHICAL GROUNDS

Philosophically it is on firm ground. American institutions are reared on law as the regulating authority. The original expression of moral and economic principles as law is contained in the Bible. It became the cornerstone upon which our civilization rests. It was not shaken when the French Revolution brought a revolt against the religious character of civilized thinking. Reason was to become the substitute for religious authority. But when the United States was created a sovereign entity, the founders of this new Nation looked for basic principles by which to justify their action. They found them in the laws of nature and of nature's God. In the War Between the States the great moral issue of slavery rent our country in two. The lifeblood of our society was running out in bitter fighting. When the outcome was not yet clear, Lincoln fixed the basis for resolving the issue. It was a legal proclamation of the freedom of the enslaved. The fourteenth amendment to the Constitution set down the answer as law for all time. Three-quarters of a century have passed. Freedom in fact for colored Americans is still a long way from the guarantees provided by the law. But that law is the foundation upon which freedom is being

built. The structure is growing slowly. The firmness of what is being built is safe because of the foundation upon which it stands

The worst depression in the economic history of the Western World presented a mortal threat to our group life. The entire social structure was disintegrating. In a frenzy we looked in all directions for a solution. It was found in legal enactments. Laws were passed in the field of unemployment insurance, old-age pensions, collective bargaining rights, labor-management relations, money, bank and stock-exchange regulations, home and farm financing—to mention a few. These expressed again the moral and ethical principles of our civilization. Their expression was again in law. These economic problems have not been finally or completely solved. We are still groping for the full answer. But here again the structure of sound economic living is slowly being built. That structure is firm because of the foundation of the law upon which it stands.

PSYCHOLOGICALLY SOUND

Psychologically the approach is sound. Of course, prejudice, and hate cannot be legislated out of existence. But activities motivated by prejudice and hate can be outlawed. When that is done, the condemnation will attach also to the prejudice and hate that prompted them. Thus society will have asserted its disapproval of such motivation for action.

The Nazis used the law in an attempt to put the stamp of respectability on antisemitism. They tried to remove the hating or persecuting of Jews from moral condemnation. Before these attempts were made, it was not necessary to point out explicitly the social and moral evil inherent in anti-Jewishness. Now, after a score of years during which Nazi propaganda and Nazi political power sought to legitimize anti-Semitism, the thought has been widely broadcast and the impression has been created that antisemitism is an acceptable kind of thinking and activity. This is the sphere in which the Nazis have not suffered defeat. It is their only success which still can be undone.

We are here considering the impact upon one group—the Jews. The physical destruction of more than one-third of all of that group in the world intensified its concern over the problem. One thinker has viewed it in the perspective of all the peoples in the world. Raphael Lemkin in his recent book discusses the problem of attacks by warring powers on civil populations, and supplies a specific name for this practice—"genocide." He proposes an international legal prohibition of it in peacetime as well as in war; it shall be a violation of international law to engage in any action infringing upon the life, liberty, health, economic existence, or the honor of the inhabitants in a land. And the principle shall be enforced through the criminal law of each country.

Here is a new law for an old crime. Prior to the last war, this kind of warfare was regarded as against the law of civilized nations. By agreement, "civilized" warfare was limited to mortal combat between the armed forces of sovereign states. There was no specific legal enactment against war on civilians. No special principle of international law had been formulated. But it existed as an implied condition from what was legal warfare among the nations. It grew out of the rules which the nations had adopted in an attempt to "civilize" wars. Then the open, deliberate infringements by the Axis Powers of this implied limitation on war confused existing thinking and attitudes. It has now become necessary to enact a specific law, so that thinking may be clarified and a pattern created to shape broad human attitudes.

The same thing applies in the case of the Nazis' war against the Jews. Here also it has become necessary to enact a specific law. So that the impression of anti-Semitism as an acceptable program may be revoked. So that its evil character socially and morally may become clear to all. So that human attitudes toward it shall be sane again.

LAWS CAN BE EFFECTIVE

Uppermost in people's minds is a serious question: Is legislation against anti-Semitism practical? Can it, will it, be effective? It is no easy matter to get the laws onto the statute books. Is it sensible to expend the necessary effort? Will that accomplish anything? There were laws in Germany against anti-Semitism before the Nazis took over. Convictions were few and were rarely followed by punishment.

The doubt can be set at rest. Such legislation is practical. It will be effective.

Any legislation, to be effective, must carry the approval of the population. That approval may already exist when the proposal is made, or it may arise after adoption because it is acceptable to the people. In that case it is itself the stimulus for activating popular response. The minimum requirement is that it should not conflict with existing attitudes and emotions. In Germany, popular approval was absent. The legislation could not become acceptable because traditional prejudices and emotional attitudes were conditioned in favor of anti-Semitism. Any attempt to eradicate anti-Jewishness was in conflict with an ingrained point of view against the Jews. The theory and spirit of the rights of man had never really reached below the surface of social thinking in Germany as it had done in France. There are those who make out a case for the proposition that in Germany western civilization and the Judeo-Christian morality had never really penetrated below the surface. The intellectual and liberal veneer of Germany was brittle. At best it was characteristic of an insignificant minority. It had never even in theory become the ideology of the German masses.

In our country that situation does not exist. The American Creed is the psychological background of the vast majority of our citizens. It is rooted in the morality and ethics and religion founded on the Bible. It is saturated by the rights, freedoms, and equality guaranteed by the Constitution. In actual practice of realizing the principles, we frequently fall short. But these failures are not the result of general ingrained traditions or prejudices. The most recent poll on anti-Semitism in the United States indicated that perhaps 9 percent of the population are infected with the disease. This condition obtains after a dozen years of anti-Semitic propaganda. That propaganda was deliberately and most ably carried out with an expenditure of over half a billion dollars. Legislation against anti-Semitism can gain the potential support of the vast majority of our population. Its ideological foundation upon the American Creed is almost too obvious to need pointing out. Its value as an instrument for national welfare is easily demonstrable.

Such legislation could take the form of a criminal statute. It would state, first, that because of totalitarian attacks upon our counry we were compelled to wage the greatest war in our history, a war which would have destroyed us had we lost it.

Secondly, that our enemies made war, not only physically, but by means of propaganda, and that one of the chief vehicles of their propaganda warfare was anti-Semitism.

Third, that even though we won the struggle of arms, our public peace and security will continue to be endangered for many years to come by anti-Semitic propaganda and activity which is still effective among approximately one-tenth of our population.

Fourth, that this propaganda and activity are potential motivation for action and constitute a clear and present danger.

The statute would then make it a criminal offense to publish or disseminate any anti-Jewish material of any nature, or engage in any other way in anti-Jewish activity or propaganda, for the purpose of attacking, injuring, or infringing in any way upon the rights of any inhabitant or group of inhabitants in the United States; or for the purpose of interfering with the life, liberty, or pursuit of happiness of such inhabitants or groups of inhabitants or with their right to the peaceable enjoyment of the same.

In other words, the prohibition would be not of anti-Semitism but the use of anti-Semitism as an instrument for attacking or destroying our people, our government, or our way of life.

This statute should be enacted by both the Federal Government and by the States.

NO INFRINGEMENT ON FREEDOM

As anti-Semitism increased in the last few years, efforts were made to draft model statutes to outlaw it. These attempts were wrecked on the rocks of unconstitutionality. Most of the proposals were in the form of group libel laws. One sought to prevent dissemination of harmful propaganda through the mails. Another sought to ban such propaganda if it originated in a foreign country. All of them faced the likelihood of rejection on the ground of interference with the right of free speech.

The statute proposed here overcomes that difficulty. It would not infringe upon the constitutional guaranty of freedom of expression because it follows the expressed limitations of the Supreme Court decisions.

The Supreme Court has held that statutes which limit freedom of expression will be valid when the limitation is upon expression which threatens public peace and security; when that threat constitutes a clear and present danger; and when that danger is serious. The proposed statute has an explicit statement of the threat of anti-Semitic propaganda and activity in the United States to the public peace and security, of the clearness and present existence of the danger, of the seriousness of the danger, and of the facts upon which these statements are based.

The Court has held further that bona fide discussion of public issues must not be interfered with, and that great latitude is permitted for freedom of discussion so that many types of living, character, opinion and belief can develop; but that this latitude is not intended to protect a specific evil program. Under the proposed statute no one is barred from discussing any subject, including anti-Semitism. The statute does not ban even prejudiced or anti-Semitic statements except when made for the evil purpose specifically set forth.

HATRED THREATENS SECURITY

The existing rules of criminal procedure, particularly as to burden of proof and defenses, would be ample protection to the rights of the accused. The normal pressure of public opinion and the responsiveness of public prosecutors to community interests would be a sufficient control on the institution of actions. The common sense, regard for fair play and ordinary decency of American juries may be relied on for proper verdicts.

Meanwhile, anti-Semitism continues and the public is unaware of the insidious threat to our way of life. Again the Jews are a smokescreen for the larger attack on our democratic institutions. The secret aim is to extinguish all our moral, ethical, and religious values. The hidden purpose is to disintegrate our American way of life. The intention is to cancel all our hard-won freedoms. The ultimate goal is to destroy America. That is the danger which we are fighting. The proposed law is an instrument for fighting that danger. Philosophically, psychologically, and practically it is a valid instrument. Now is the time to create it. Time and experience in actual application will refine its form and its effectiveness.

The Railroad Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Progressive of June 17, relative to the remarks by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] concerning the recent railroad strike.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EDITOR RESERVES THE LAST COLUMN

Senator WAYNE MORSE, the Oregon Republican, is a stubborn citizen and a relentless foe—especially when he has been pushed around. At the time of the uproar over the railroad strike and President Truman's hysterical outburst before Congress demanding dictatorial powers to conscript labor, MORSE charged that the President's whole act was a phony because he knew hours in advance that the strike was to be called off at 4 p. m.—the very moment Mr. Truman was scheduled to deliver his message to Congress.

Administration spokesmen hastily took the floor to express righteous resentment at the Oregon Republican's slur on the President, but MORSE courageously refused to back down, insisting that he had the facts to prove his charge. If his accusation were true, certainly the principal reason advanced by the President for demanding power to draft labor had ceased to exist several hours before Mr. Truman asked for extraordinary authority to break the rail strike.

Senator MORSE rightly refuses to let the matter drop with the administration's indignant generalization that the Senator was insulting the President. He has now introduced a resolution calling for a complete investigation of what happened on that historic Saturday, May 25, the inquiry to "include an investigation of all charges that the administration knew or should have known several hours before the President's speech that the strike would not continue after 4 p. m."

In introducing his resolution in the Senate, with the usual silent treatment in the daily press, MORSE said he was "ready to prove my charge that the President did not fulfill his clear obligations to the public when he made his speech on Saturday, May 25 (demanding power to break the strike by drafting labor) in that he did not inform them that there was no danger of a railroad strike after 4 p. m., and that fact was well known by his advisers before noon on Saturday."

MORSE's story of what happened that decisive day makes absorbing reading, and because most of the press, which helped whip up the President's hysteria, has shown no interest in publishing it, I am here passing it on to you:

"I was and still am exceedingly critical of the conduct and bad judgment exercised by representatives of the brotherhoods and told them so, but the fact is that at 9 o'clock Saturday morning in my office I had a conference at the request of the brotherhoods with Ray T. Miller, counsel for the trainmen.

"I told him that the brotherhoods didn't have a leg to stand on. I advised him to proceed without further delay to notify the White House that the men would go back to work and that the brotherhoods would accept the recommendations of the President's own emergency board following which the railroads and brotherhoods could work out by negotiations in accordance with those recommendations and unsettled differences over working rules.

"Miller left my office, went directly to Whitney and Johnston, and communicated my advice to them, which they accepted. I was so notified by telephone.

"But when they tried to carry out the surrender, they found that they were unable to get a conference at the White House. Whitney and Johnston then went to Secretary of State James F. Byrnes to notify him of their intentions.

"Byrnes went from the State Department to the White House. I am reliably informed that he took the matter up with Steelman. Before noon on Saturday, Steelman notified Whitney and Johnston that the President had instructed him (Steelman) not to carry on any further negotiations in the President's name with Whitney and Johnston. The President took that position in spite of the fact that Whitney and Johnston had notified his advisers that they had no intention of going ahead with the strike.

"I appreciate the fact that the President was obviously angry and that he had cause to be angry, but he also had the obligation inasmuch as he had set the 4 o'clock deadline himself to do everything he could to consummate a settlement of the matter before he made his speech at 4 p. m.

"I am informed that at any time on Saturday the controversy could have been settled by the President or any of his advisers with his consent. I say that it was the President's public duty to try to complete the settlement before he came to the Capitol for his speech.

"Serious as the charge is, I repeat that the stage was all set for a great show Saturday afternoon and the President was careful to see to it that he did not negotiate with Whitney and Johnston which if he had done would have required drastic changes in his speech. That does not build up confidence in the President.

"The President's conduct in this respect has given many people here in Washington who know something about the surrounding facts of both the coal and the railroad cases—in the former case he permitted Government officials to carry on contract negotiations with the striking miners—that because Whitney and Johnston were in a very weak position, he sought to make an example of them. Such policies neither build public confidence nor future industrial harmony." M. H. R.

The British Loan

REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the discussion on the proposed British loan, it has been a matter of very great concern. I have given the subject serious study and am convinced that from a financial and economic standpoint it would be a bad bargain and a foolish venture. It is agreed by most everyone that the termination of deficit spending and a balanced budget is the only road to economic stability.

This loan will be borrowed money and will add to the national debt; it will increase the inflationary pressure; it will provide increased demands for already scarce merchandise, and will put further away into the future the day when veterans will be able to secure houses and greatly needed merchandise.

The Congress has a solemn obligation to preserve the value of our money and the value of our bonds, yet these loans and continued deficit spending definitely tend to lessen the buying power of the dollar and consequently lower the value of our bonds.

The late Lord Keynes is reported to have said to the House of Lords:

> The American Congress and the American people have never accepted any literal principle of equal sacrifice, financial or otherwise, between all the Allied participants.

It is about this statement I wish to address you today.

The United States spent more money in the war against Germany and Japan than Soviet Russia and the British Empire combined. American armies captured more German prisoners than the Russian, British, and French forces combined. Our war production was greater than the combined British and Russian output.

In all other phases of the war, excepting casualties, the American contribution excelled or compared favorably with that of our allies.

These are some of the outstanding facts shown by a survey of the allied war contributions according to published reports obtained mostly from the War and Navy Departments and the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

The purpose in presenting this data is to answer the argument that we owe them the money because they saved the United States in the recent war. British newspapers and public officials have repeatedly asserted that our sacrifices were not proportionate to Britain's.

According to the Treasury Department, the cost of the war to the United States, as of February 27, was $320,294,000,000. Expenditures of the United Kingdom, according to the British information service, were $94,000,000,000. The total for the British Commonwealth and Empire was more than $125,000,000,000, including $3,600,000,000 for India, more than $18,000,000,000 for Canada, $7,750,000,000 for Australia, and $1,700,000,000 for New Zealand. The figure for the Union of South Africa was not available. Russian war expenditures have not been announced, but total Soviet expenditures for all purposes, as reported in the official budgets, were approximately $190,000,000,000 for the years 1942–45, inclusive.

United States war expenditures included $46,040,000,000 worth of lend-lease aid, of which Russia received $10,801,000,000 and the British Empire $30,269,000,000. Reverse lend-lease received by the United States totaled $6,256,000,000, including $5,921,000,000 from the British Empire and $2,000,000 from Soviet Russia.

The mobilization totals for the principal Allies were:

United States, 14,000,000; British Empire, 12,000,000; Soviet Russia, 22,000,000; China, 5,900,000.

A more accurate comparison of the fighting effectiveness is afforded by the divisional figures on the western front. The United States had 60 divisions, Britain 14, Canada 5, France 11, and Poland

1. On VE-day the American Army was occupying about three-fourths of the front in Europe. Approximately 100,000 Australian troops served under General MacArthur.

Soviet Russia deployed a total of 1,500,000 against the Japs for less than a week in Manchuria just before VJ-day.

The casualties of the United States were 1,097,193; the British Empire 1,233,796. Consequently, in view of these facts, there is no just basis for the statement made by Lord Keynes.

It should be evident to everyone that we cannot afford to continue printing, spending, and lending money indiscriminately, however admirable the cause may be. Every time we spend a billion dollars of borrowed money we reduce the value of our dollar, and if we go on spending and lending and giving and losing, without regard to how we are going to pay back the money that we borrowed, it will not be long until the dollar will go as the currency of other countries that have overspent.

Approval of the proposed loan would start the United States down a financial road that is likely to lead to disaster.

Reorganization of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD five editorials commenting on the so-called La Follette-Monroney bill which was recently passed by the Senate and which proposes to reorganize the Congress. The editorials are from the Journal, of Providence, R. I., of June 17, 1946; the Courant, of Hartford, Conn., of June 16, 1946; the News, of Washington, D. C., of June 17, 1946; the News, of Buffalo, N. Y., of June 13, 1946, and the News, of Lynchburg, Va., of June 15, 1946.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence (R. I.) Journal of June 17, 1946]

STREAMLINING CONGRESS

The La Follette-Monroney bill, passed in the Senate by a vote of 49–16, aims to streamline the structure of Congress and enable it to handle more efficiently and expeditiously the volume of business and the multiplicity of problems that have been heaped upon it since the last revamping in 1921.

The reorganization of the committee structure of the Senate is described by Senator LA FOLLETTE as the "keystone of the arch of improving the efficiency of this body in discharging its tremendous responsibilities in the modern world." At present there are 33 standing committees and altogether the 96 Members of the Senate occupy 568 seats on the standing or special committees, or an average of 6 committee places for each Senator. There is one Senator who holds 10 committee assignments. Under the circumstances it is impossible for Senators to fulfill their assignments faithfully and intelligently on committees, where the legislative work is prepared.

The number of standing committees is to be reduced from 33 to 15 and special committees eliminated. For the first time in the history of the rules of the Senate it is proposed to define the jurisdiction of the standing committees. To make these committees more effective the bill proposes (1) to appoint to each committee four experts in the subject-matter field; and (2) to increase the staff and services of the Legislative Service of the Library of Congress. Committee procedure as regards hearings, meetings, and records is to be regularized and it is planned to expedite reporting and clarify understanding of measures submitted to the Senate by the committees. In conference committees, the rule is to be strengthened to confine them to matters in disagreement between the two Houses. Legislative riders to appropriation bills are to be outlawed. Because of obvious practical reasons, nothing was done to attempt to change the sacred seniority rights on committees.

To strengthen party government against the insistent pressure groups, the bill provides for the establishment of majority and minority policy committees in each House, to be chosen at the outset of each new Congress by majority and minority conferences and to consist of seven members each.

To bring the legislative and executive branches into closer cooperation and understanding, as was done by Secretary of State Cordell Hull and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the bill proposes the creation of a joint legislative-executive council to consist of the majority policy committee in both Houses, the President, and members of his Cabinet.

To keep an eye on the numerous agencies and bureaus which have been spawned, the reorganized committees of the Senate are charged with their oversight so that the delegation of power will be carried out in conformity with the intent of Congress.

To help Members of the House and Senate, it is proposed that they be assigned an $8,000 annually, nonlegislative, administrative assistant; that their pay be increased to $15,000; that they become eligible for a contributory pension plan; that they be relieved of the endless private bills.

The bill makes important fiscal changes. It would require open hearings on all appropriation bills. It would forbid reappropriation of unobligated balances except for continuing public works. It would provide for adoption of the annual Federal Budget totals by joint action of the revenue and appropriating committees of both Houses. It would provide that if total expenditures recommended exceed estimated total revenue, Congress would be required by record vote to authorize creation of additional Federal debt in amount of the excess. If it appears midway through the fiscal year that total appropriations are going to exceed the total approved budget figure, the bill provides that the President by proclamation shall reduce them by a uniform figure (with the exception of certain fixed charges) so as to bring total expenditures within the limit previously set.

The measure was written after more than a year of study, hearings, and deliberations conducted by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, and it is bipartisan in character. It would go far to modernize the operations of Congress, and the House is urged to follow the course of the Senate in supporting it.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of June 16, 1946]

OX-CART GOVERNMENT

There are disturbing reports that the La Follette-Monroney bill modernizing congressional machinery, passed in the Senate by a 49-to-16 vote, may meet the powerful opposition of such veteran congressional wheelhorses as Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas. The prospect for passage of the measure by the House of Representatives does not look too promising. Unless powerful pressure is exerted on the die-hards, the bill may be split up and allowed to die piecemeal in various committees.

The attitude of the House toward this desirable law is quite different from the celerity with which the Senate, without a roll-call vote, and without debate, voted to cut the number of Senate committees from 33 to 15 and of House committees from 48 to 19; to give Members of Congress a $5,000 increase; and to provide an administrative assistant for each Member. One of the more significant provisions in this bill provides for the creation of majority and minority policy committees in each House in order to crystallize party policy on major issues and to fix party responsibility for carrying out that policy.

In short, the bill as it now stands would, if passed, enable Congress to rid itself of many of the petty details on which it now fritters away so much of its time. Furthermore, it would vastly improve the coordination between the legislative and executive departments. Balanced against all these desirable improvements is the fact that the number of committee chairmanships would be greatly reduced, and some Members of Congress would serve on fewer committees than at present. It is apparently this feature that has aroused the opposition of those who by seniority have acquired powerful vested interests in the present set-up.

Congress has long been the target of public criticism for the muddling and inefficient manner in which it transacts the public business. This archaic structure, unreformed in more than 50 years, contributed greatly to the building up of the vast administrative machinery attached to the executive department under President Roosevelt. In any contest between these two branches of government, the executive department was always amply staffed with experts while Congress lacked both the expert advice and the time thoroughly to study some of the measures that were jammed down its throat.

Now, at long last, when relative efficiency is within the immediate grasp of that body, it would be most unfortunate if this bill were killed by the opposition of those who have a personal ax to grind. Public opinion should get behind this measure so that Congress will realize that it is necessary to get its own house in order. Oxcart machinery in Congress is hardly suitable for the atomic age, a fact that everybody seems to know except a powerful clique in the House of Representatives.

[From the Washington (D. C.) News of June 17, 1946]

DON'T CHEER YET

The Senate's 49-to-16 vote for the bill to reorganize Congress and make it more efficient has created some dangerous optimism.

Many citizens assume that it's now safe to expect an easy victory in the House of Representatives.

It is true, we think, that a majority of the House Members—probably a large majority—favors this bill. Most Representatives know, as well as most Senators do, how greatly Congress is handicapped by its old-fashioned methods, its cumbersome procedures, its overlapping and conflicting and too numerous committees, and its lack of adequate, independent facilities for fact finding.

It is also true that Representative MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, can do as fine a job of piloting the measure in the House as did Senator BOB LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, in the other branch—if he gets the opportunity.

But that's the trouble.

Legislative machinery in the House is pretty tightly controlled by men who owe

their power and prominence to the present system and are not eager to see it changed.

A little enthusiastic help from Speaker SAM RAYBURN, for instance, would go far to assure success for the congressional reorganization plan. But Mr. RAYBURN is very, very cool on this subject.

Then there's the Rules Committee—itself one of the outstanding examples of what's wrong with Congress. This committee can, and much too often does, use its power to bottle up bills to which its members have personal objections, no matter how good such bills may be or how widely favored in the country and in Congress as a whole.

Some of the Rules Committee's most influential members are even colder than Speaker RAYBURN to the La Follette-Monroney proposals.

So, we think, it is very much up to citizens who want a more efficient Congress to make their voices heard. If they don't, there is real danger that the bill won't reach the stage of debate in the House. Or that only those parts of it pertaining to more pay, more office help, and retirement benefits for Congressmen will be enacted, while the urgently needed reforms and improvements are buried.

[From the Buffalo (N. Y.) News of June 13, 1946]

SENATE VOTES TO GO MODERN

The unexpected and overwhelming success with which Senator LA FOLLETTE put his omnibus congressional reorganization bill through the Senate suggests that he and other advocates of legislative streamlining have hit upon a happy mixture of bitter and sweet with which to tickle the palates of their more tradition-ridden colleagues.

The bill, which the Senate passed without crippling amendments by a surprising vote of 49 to 16, calls for a number of fundamental, long-needed reforms. Among them are the consolidation of 33 standing committees into 15; the elimination of special committees; the strengthening of party government through the creation of majority and minority policy committees; the creation of a coordinated budget-control system such as Congress has never had before; important additions to available facilities for independent investigation and research on pending questions of national policy, and relief from such onerous congressional tasks as the enactment of private claim bills.

Many of these provisions, because they strike at various elements of privilege and prestige, were bitter pills for some Senators to swallow. With them, however, went a sugar-coating—congressional salary raises from $10,000 to $15,000, a pension plan for retiring Members, and a well-paid administrative assistant for each Member. To get his whole plan through Senator LA FOLLETTE had to yield only to a relatively minor series of amendments, including one to save the patronage system of appointing congressional employees.

Prior to the Senate vote, the reorganization bill appeared to have little chance of final enactment before next month's adjournment. Now its prospects depend largely on the reception it gets from the House Rules Committee, which has the power to rush it along under jurisdiction of the House Members of the joint La Follette-Monroney committee which drafted it, or to let it die on the vine by splitting its various sections among a number of standing committees. On its merits, the bill is entitled to clear sailing. It is the best move Congress has made in years to modernize the procedures of democratic government.

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News of June 15, 1946]

PAY OF CONGRESSMEN

Increase of pay for Members of the Congress from ten to fifteen thousand dollars a year is provided in a reorganization bill already passed by the Senate. This, the least important feature of the measure, whose purpose is to increase the efficiency of congressional action, is unfortunately the part that will attract the most attention, and receive the most criticism, some of it censure. The censure, the News believes is based largely in prejudice or on ignorance of the facts, and is unjustified and unfair.

Citation, in support of the increase, of the fact that a rather large number of veteran Members, several from Virginia, have resigned recently to accept more remunerative employment is not very impressive testimony in favor of the increase. Not a few of those who have resigned have accepted positions that pay them so well that the temptation could not have been resisted had the pay of Congressmen been fifteen, or even twenty thousand dollars. Some of them, furthermore, got their new jobs because they had been Congressmen and had acquired information and influence they otherwise would not have had. A better argument than that good men resign to get more pay is that good men often are deterred from offering for office because the pay is insufficient. The cost of living has increased greatly in the 21 years since the pay of Congressmen was raised to $10,000, and the cost of living in Washington more than in most places. Congressmen maintain two residences, one in Washington and one at home, and have to pay high for the former. Demands upon Congressmen are such that they have to spend money men and women in private life can avoid spending. Congressmen have to contribute to party campaign expenses and to a variety of causes others may help or not, as they wish, and usually with smaller contributions. Finally, every Congressman has to spend something at each election time for his own campaign, the expense being particularly heavy for those who have strong opposition recurringly, as many of them do. In short, those without independent means find the going rough on ten thousand a year, and many a good citizen is deterred by financial considerations from offering as a candidate.

Fifteen thousand dollars isn't too much. It is only a half or a third what that sum is to private citizens in many parts of the country. A Congressman who isn't worth that to his constituents shouldn't be a Congressman and should be retired.

The Hobbs Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. ANDREWS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely editorial published in the Washington Post of this morning, regarding the Hobbs bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOBBS BILL

President Truman is said to be disposed to sign the Hobbs bill if he is given assurance that it will not impinge upon the right to strike and to picket or upon any other right of organized labor. There can be little doubt that such assurance will be forthcoming, for the bill merely outlaws interference with interstate commerce by robbery and extortion. It is intended, of course, to put a stop to certain types of so-called picketing in which unions or racketeers disguising themselves as legitimate labor representatives beat up truck drivers and exact tribute from them for the privilege of hauling produce over the highways or unloading it at destination. But to stop this sort of lawlessness is no more an encroachment upon the rights of labor than to prevent other types of robbery and assault.

What we are utterly unable to understand is why the AFL and CIO put themselves in the indefensible position of fighting this reasonable legislation. When Congressman HOBBS first drafted his bill to close up the loopholes which the Supreme Court had punched into the Antiracketeering Act of 1934, union representatives objected because labor was singled out for special attention under a criminal statute. Mr. HOBBS asked if there would be any objection to the bill if its terms were made general. The answer was "No." Thereupon he modified the measure to penalize any robbery or extortion interfering with interstate commerce. No reference was made to labor, except to provide that none of the rights guaranteed by the Clayton, Norris-LaGuardia, Railway Labor and National Labor Relations Acts should be impaired. It is this measure which both Houses of Congress have passed and which the President, apparently, is about to sign. It cannot be thrown down without extending and open invitation to hoodlums to rob helpless victims under the false pretense of advancing the interests of labor.

Shortage of Silver for Manufacturing Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for many months past, numerous newspaper articles have come to my attention which refer to the current shortage of silver for manufacturing purposes. Unfortunately, a good many of these articles are so distorted and so intemperate that I find myself unwilling to read further than the captions.

My attention, however, has just been called to a statement on this subject which recently appeared in the Trade Union Courier, a publication which has the official endorsement of 1,700 labor unions in the Eastern States. The statement appears over the name of Robert S. Palmer, executive director of the Colorado Mining Association, on behalf of that organization and of affiliated Utah and Nevada groups. Mr. Palmer's statement is so fair in its approach to a difficult problem, so full of understanding of the special difficulties which today confront our silver-producing mines and our silver-using manufacturers, that I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SILVERWORKERS: DO YOU REALLY NEED SILVER?

Today the currencies of most of the world are in collapse, yet the strength of the United States dollar is everywhere recognized. One

of the principal reasons for that strength lies in the substantial stocks of gold and silver which the United States Treasury holds as backing for note issues and for the issuance of coinage. The mining West is happy over the important role it has played in the achievement of that fortunate position. The West is especially proud of the leading role it has played in the rehabilitation of silver—even though the West has benefited only modestly from that rehabilitation.

The West has received little credit for its leadership in respect to silver. In fact, our position has been continuously misrepresented by skillful propagandists. Our western Senators and the small number of Congressmen who represent us have been continuously maligned and vilified. "Twelve men against the Nation"; "Fattening on the Treasury"; "Greed unadorned"; "Levy on taxpayers, manufacturers, and other users of silver"; "Indefensible subsidy"—these are only a few samples of the vituperation which has been heaped upon us because of our leadership in connection with silver. Yet we bear no malice toward those whose conception of silver has been so short-sighted.

Now there is another crisis in silver. It is a manufacturing crisis. It is due to a 200-percent increase in the industrial use of silver since 1940, along with a 57-percent drop in domestic silver production and a virtual collapse in imports. During the war the West cheerfully cooperated in the enactment of special silver legislation, which provided silver from the United States Treasury for war production and for civilian manufacture. Here again our western position has been grossly misrepresented. In fact, while your industry prospered over 3,000 of our silver producing mines were shut down.

For months past we have again offered you our cooperation in the hope of terminating the present manufacturing crisis in silver. We have approached the problem in our customary western spirit of give and take—the only satisfactry method of solving such problems. Months ago, western legislators sponsored proposals which were intended to permit manufacturers to operate successfully on a large scale. Legislators representing silver-manufacturing centers submitted other proposals. After weeks of senatorial hearings a compromise was agreed upon. That compromise was endorsed by Senators from manufacturing States, by Senators from mining States, and by Senators who had no direct interest in the subject. But once more our western position is being misrepresented.

One of the accredited leaders of the silver manufacturing industry has publicly stated that the West has repudiated that compromise. That is not so—that compromise still stands as far as we are concerned. But it seems that a few die-hards are blocking its fulfillment, notwithstanding your need of silver and the gentlemen's agreement.

We in the West believe that the compromise which was agreed upon is fairer to the manufacturers than it is to us—but we have accepted it with good grace. What is the nature of that compromise which was unanimously agreed upon before a senatorial committee? It permits manufacturers to draw generously upon the Nation's monetary stocks of silver for a period of 2 years at 90.5 cents an ounce. That price is lower than the prices ruling in many of the markets of the world. We are not happy over that price. Nor do we like to see a diversion of the Nation's monetary stocks of silver into private industry. But we have agreed to that proposal and our agreement stands.

The compromise permits our western miners—during the same period—to sell their output to the Treasury at the same price at which manufacturers make their purchases from the Treasury. At the end of 2 years our miners will receive $1.29 from the Treasury—a price which we have sought for three-quarters of a century. That $1.29 price, we believe, is of major international importance to the United States. It has only modest significance to us, because our domestic silver production is at best a small part of the world's production or of the Treasury's monetary stock.

At the end of 2 years the manufacturing industry should be able to obtain adequate supplies from its customary channels—from Mexico, Canada, Peru, and the other foreign producing countries. It may even be able to obtain more silver than it can use—with correspondingly favorable prices. Until that time we in the West must compete against the poorly paid miners of South America and Africa. Thereafter, the Treasury's purchases from us at $1.29 will offer us the same protection that tariffs now offer to manufacturers.

Yes, we think the silver compromise is more than fair to manufacturers, but we will go along with it. Yet with this talk of repudiation we don't know where we stand. We are very doubtful if the manufacturing industry does. Congress is planning to adjourn in July and probably will not return until next December or January. If there is no legislation in this session, there can be no legislation for many months, if at all. In that event, manufacturers will have no other alternatives than to obtain the elimination of OPA ceilings on silver and to acquire their silver in a runaway market. Our western miners would undoubtedly receive much more than 90.5 cents—but we prefer stability to skyrocketing and possible collapse. We also want you to know where the responsibility will lie.

Won't you let your own leaders know what you think about the present compromise? Won't you let your Congressmen know? Won't you let me know also—by letter or telegram—confidentially if you so desire, at George Washington Inn, Washington, D. C.

COLORADO MINING ASSOCIATION
AND AFFILIATED UTAH AND NEVADA GROUPS,
By ROBERT S. PALMER, *Executive Director.*

The Labor Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I present for consideration a letter to the editor of the New York Times of June 24:

LETTERS TO THE TIMES—ANALYSIS OF LABOR PROBLEM—GENERAL STUDY ADVOCATED BEFORE NEW LEGISLATIVE STEPS ARE TAKEN

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Now that the Case bill has been rejected, it would appear that before any new legislative steps are initiated deep concentration of our labor-management problem is in order. Fundamental analysis rather than mere expediency in the approach to this human problem may uncover the source of difficulty.

Unfortunately, too many of the interested parties approach collective bargaining as an impersonal economic encounter. The human element which makes men tick is brushed aside sometimes callously and the frequent result is disruption of economic and social activities.

No panacea will ever come from the legislative function of creating new labor laws or in supplementing present laws. Any new laws should at best be contemplated as guides in the methodology which normally terminates in a labor contract. Legislation which is directed to the curtailment or restriction of long-recognized labor action, or management action for that matter, is doomed to failure.

Unionism has outgrown its former infant stature. It has reached its adult stature and has a personality which must be given proper recognition. Any interference with labor's essential ends will be met with a well-stocked arsenal loaded not only for defense but ready to initiate effective counterattack.

Where is the solution? It can be found in three words—confidence, cooperation, and charity. Where we find mutual confidence we are sure to find honesty, and honesty usually begets honesty. Both parties to a bargain must realize that free enterprise is a cooperative undertaking which permits both to exist. All agreements must embody justice, and from justice flows charity.

Only when those at the bargaining table respect each other as men can we rightly speak of the dignity of man. Too often we find that both parties arrive well armed with strategic plans for attack and well-thought-out plans for defense. On one side unionism is ready to seek out corporate weaknesses and on the other side corporations are sparring for an advantageous opening. Both are set to wield their blows at the propitious moment. The continuance of this maneuvering for position will result in everlasting conflict.

Labor and management can bring about the indissolubility of their relations only when both sides manifest intelligent understanding leading to mutual confidence, cooperation, and charity. Proper education and proper indoctrination in the problems facing both parties will ultimately result in the acquisition of the essential equipment needed for intelligent understanding.

NICHOLAS S. FALCONE
NEW YORK, *June 13, 1946.*

Henry C. Lytton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include editorial comment that has been published in many of the Nation's newspapers in tribute to a great merchant, philanthropist, and a stanch advocate of the American system of freedom of enterprise, Mr. Henry C. Lytton, of Chicago, who, on July 13, 1946, will be 100 years old.

Mr. Lytton is the last of the 14 pioneer merchants who founded Chicago's famous State Street mercantile section and even in his advanced years is still active in the management of his store, Henry C. Lytton & Co., the Hub.

Under unanimous consent, the editorial comment to which I have referred is included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in tribute to the achievements of this great American. The editorial comment follows:

PIONEER CHICAGO MERCHANT STILL ACTIVE IN BUSINESS AS ONE HUNDREDTH BIRTHDAY APPROACHES

Henry C. Lytton, Chicago pioneer merchant, will celebrate his one hundredth birthday on July 13, 1946.

To say a man has lived 100 years is simple. To realize it is something else. When Henry

C. Lytton was born, July 13, 1846, the war against Mexico was barely 2 months old. Lee was a colonel and Grant a captain of mule skinning. Gold would not be discovered in California for another 2 years, and the long trek of the numberless thousands across country had yet to come. The Nation was hardly more than the infant Henry Lytton was, 100 years ago.

One hundred years is a long time; 1861, the War Between the States found Henry C. Lytton 15, marching down Broadway carrying his older brother's rifle, fuming at not being old enough to go with the departing troops. He went to work instead, to earn 50 cents a week as a clerk in a law office. The following year he was earning $15 a week as a clerk in a wholesale drygoods house, then $18 as a bookkeeper in a clothing house. The West beckoned 19-year-old Henry, and he went to St. Louis—that bustling, overcrowded transfer point for travelers and freight between the East and West, the North and the South.

The late 1860's saw Henry back in New York discussing the future with his brother. Their conversations sent them off to Michigan with $3,000 in their jeans and determination in their eyes. There they established a business of their own.

1877, the Centennial year, was a banner year for the Nation. It was also a year of business panic and it found Henry Lytton bankrupt. He and his brother, driven to the wall, were able to pay their creditors only a third of what they owed. But Henry never forgot the remaining two-thirds. Years later he searched out and paid his creditors in full.

In the years, the affluent years that followed, Henry Lytton remembered the creeping feeling of despondency that engulfs those who have nothing. He had known hunger and never forgot its gnaw. Many Chicagoans still alive today remember the tons upon tons of coal Henry C. Lytton annually gave the poor. Lytton generosity also provided free ice during the hot summers. Many recall the horrid Chicago winter of 1899—the winter Lytton's new store was going up. They remember, too, how he stopped its store-like construction and made of it a shelter for the homeless. And how he fed and clothed them, many with new overcoats, until the arrival of spring. Henry Lytton has never forgotten the day he turned the key in his door in Grand Rapids, Mich., a bankrupt through no fault of his own. He has remembered well.

Yes, a hundred years is a long time and Henry C. Lytton has lived every one of his years. Lived in big ways and in kind, little ways. Ancient news clippings tell how he joined the postal clerks in their fight—all forgotten now—to keep out of uniform. That would have been 1899.

Henry Lytton was bankrupt in all but in his brain and a lesson well learned. Never again did he enter business with another. When his son, now dead, became of age his father made him a partner, but it was always Henry C. Lytton's company, lock, stock, and barrel, and none ever forget it.

In 1882, construction was ready to begin on the Panama Canal. That first project, too, was a failure. By 1882, Henry Lytton had earned and saved $12,000 and was again on his own. He took over a run-down store in Indianapolis which, by astute management, he turned into a going business. But his eyes were on Chicago.

In 1887—the year of the Triple Alliance, that bound Germany, Austria, and Italy together—Lytton set up shop in Chicago. Fifty-nine years ago, and he's been there ever since. His influence has been felt throughout the Nation. Scholarships, donated in perpetuity, half forgotten, are still financing the education of worthy students. For the wealthy Lytton could no more forget that he himself had had to leave the College of the City of New York for lack of funds than he could forget his empty purse of 1877.

Wars, floods, panics, prosperous times, and change have flowed by Henry C. Lytton. One hundred years. Men, great men, have come and gone. He remains. One of the original 14 founders of Chicago's State Street, he is also the last of them * * * and, nearing his hundredth birthday, he is still active in business as president of The Hub, one of Chicago's largest clothing stores, which he founded in 1887.

Floor-sweeper, clerk, bankrupt, millionaire, and patron of the arts. Philathropist, scholar, sage, and wit. That is Henry C. Lytton after 100 years. One hundred years. A long, long time.

Food and the OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLLA C. McMILLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mattoon (Ill.) Daily Journal-Gazette of June 7, 1946:

FOOD AND THE OPA

The Journal-Gazette wishes to commend the farmers of Cole County and all of central Illinois for their whole-hearted cooperation in the Government's request campaign to obtain grain to help meet the serious world shortage.

Despite many unpleasant features connected with the plan, the spirit shown by farmers in this rich agricultural region was magnificent. Now all we can do is hope that the grain will be handled properly so that it will serve the purposes for which it was intended, and that waste and graft so common in large-scale relief undertakings will be held at a minimum.

Success of this campaign—based largely on extra price inducements—has renewed the debate about whether OPA controls are having a beneficial or harmful effect on our food supplies. No one can deny that the premium prices quickly brought millions of bushels of grain out of storage and into the market.

Yet, there still is room to wonder about what would happen if the ceiling were removed from all foods. We'd all like to see the law of supply and demand functioning again, but the trouble with that system at present is that we have a tremendous demand with only a trickle of a supply. The two factors are far out of balance.

Take off all price restrictions, some people say, and prices may be high for 2, 3, or 6 months, but then competition will bring them back to normal. This might be true with many lines of manufactured goods, but food cannot be produced overnight, and there simply is not enough to go around as long as the demand remains so high.

Citrus fruits and strawberries, freed from ceilings, have provided classic examples of what can happen to food prices when there are no controls. Ceilings have been restored to citrus fruits, but it's too late now to do anything about the 1946 strawberry crop. We'll just have to remember this as the era when strawberries sold for 60 cents per quart—with some boxes only partially filled at that.

Furthermore, suppose that while we were waiting for supply and demand to grow into adjustment a lot of Americans were forced to use up all their savings. Would that condition invite continued prosperity or the greatest crash in our Nation's history? It took only a few months of uncontrolled inflation to wreck Germany after World War I.

Frankly, the Journal-Gazette does not pretend to know the answer to the price-control problem. We can see possible gains to be had by removing ceilings from luxury or nonessential items, but we are not willing to throw all caution to the winds and advocate the removal of controls from essentials.

And, in the final analysis, we believe the situation is so critical that the Government must retain the power to restore ceilings to any line should prices skyrocket beyond the limits of all reason after the lifting of restrictions.

Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAT ARNOLD
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article in the magazine section of the Christian Science Monitor of March 23, 1946, entitled "Health Insurance: Costly Experiment," by Elizabeth W. Wilson, who has spent 15 years studying the actual working of compulsory health insurance in various countries of the world.

This article portrays graphically the effect of governmental regimentation which is gradually becoming a menace to the principles of free government, and stifling individual initiative and opportunity.

HEALTH INSURANCE: COSTLY EXPERIMENT—IS GENERAL TAXPAYER READY TO MAKE UP ANY DEFICIT THE WORKER CANNOT OR WILL NOT PAY?

(By Elizabeth W. Wilson)

Politicians who tell the public that compulsory health insurance would cost only 3 percent of the insured worker's pay roll are overoptimistic. It would cost almost twice that. Moreover, these expenses would undoubtedly increase over the years and would be an important factor in ultimately raising the total cost of social insurance to about one-fourth of the pay roll, an eventuality which experts consider entirely possible.

Even in the early years of Government health insurance, the cash benefits—these include indemnification for wage loss for both temporary and protracted illness as well as certain minor benefits—would cost almost 2 percent of the pay roll. The medical benefits, which would include medical care, drugs, and a limited amount of hospitalization, dental care, and nursing, would cost twice that.

The proponents of compulsory health insurance have said that the $7 a month which the average worker, who makes about $2,100 a year, would be required to pay as his whole social-security tax would be only slightly more than his present medical expenses. There are several fallacies in this argument.

In the first place, the $7 a month would not cover all medical expenses. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill of May 1945, specifically provides that physicians, dentists, and nurses may require each patient to pay a small fee "with respect to the first service or each service in a period of sickness." The worker must realize, too, that there would be fewer free

clinics, since they would be ostensibly unnecessary once health insurance was inaugurated.

Because of the unavailability of personnel, the dental and home-nursing benefits "shall have such a restricted content as the Surgeon General shall determine." This means that if the worker or his family needed services outside the "content," he would have to pay for them.

Furthermore, "the maximum number of days in any benefit year for which any individual may be entitled to hospitalization * * * shall be sixty"; the Surgeon General may increase this number as funds permit. However, in the case of long-continued illness, the worker must pay.

Second, if the worker should not happen to like the insurance doctors in his neighborhood, he would probably follow the example of many of his British confreres and go to a private physician. Of course, he would have to pay this doctor's fee despite the fact he had paid for medical attention through his taxes.

Third, only about half of the expense of the system would be paid by the deduction from the worker's wages. The remainder would be met by a similar tax on the employer. This would amount, virtually, to a compulsory wage boost for the employee. Many economists believe that such a levy would so upset the economic system that, in the end, the worker will have to pay both his own and his employer's taxes.

This might happen in any one of a number of ways. The price of goods might go up, and his wages buy less. The employer might substitute machinery for some workers, and cut production to lay off others. Unemployment would result, and a wage cut would follow. Certain economists contend that the resulting wage plus the employer's tax would just equal the former wage. If such a contention is true, the worker will have to decide whether health insurance is worth 6 percent of his income to him. That is almost half again as much as he now pays—on the average—for medical attention.

In the fourth place, there is no guaranty that the cost would continue to be only about 6 percent of the pay roll. In Germany, the per capita cost increased sixfold in 45 years. In England, it almost trebled, 1921–27. This was caused by the liberalization of benefits and increased claims, many of which, experts say, were due to malingering. Since the proposed system for the United States would be fairly comprehensive from the outset, such a large increase in cost probably would not take place here. It is entirely possible, however, that the cost in, say, A. D. 2000 would be two or three times as large as that of 1950.

For instance, it has been estimated that the cost of the medical benefit plus the cost of the cash benefits paid to those in the first 6 months of illness would increase from something like $4,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000 a year. Worse still, during the same period, the cost of cash benefits paid to those who have protracted illnesses would mount from between $200,000,000 to $300,000,000 to more than $2,000,000,000.

Other social-insurance benefits will also become more and more expensive. Fifty years hence, aged workers, widows, and orphans will be receiving between $7,500,000,000 and $13,500,000,000 a year. In times of depression, the unemployed will get another $10,000,000,000. Formerly, the American worker pitied the German worker who, in pre-Nazi days, had almost 30 percent of his wages taken in taxes. It is not impossible that the American worker may ultimately pay almost 25 percent of his wage, either directly or indirectly, for social-security taxes alone. Already the benefits proposed for railroad workers would cost more than 20 percent of their wages—and no health insurance is included.

Of course, the proponents of the extension of social-security benefits say, "Let the general taxpayer make up any deficit that the worker cannot or will not pay." There are three cogent arguments against this. In the first place, only a part of the citizens of the United States would be included in a national system of health insurance. Today, only about half of the workers are covered by social insurance. Even under the expanded coverage of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill only about three-fourths of the population would be covered. Is it true democracy to use public funds to benefit only a certain class?

Second, the worker, who has already paid what he feels he can afford for social insurance, would be taxed further in his role of general taxpayer. It seems probable that any extension of personal income taxes will be made largely at the expense of the lower-income groups.

Finally, the general taxpayer may well become overburdened with taxes. The cost of the Federal Government alone will never, according to President Truman, fall below $25,000,000,000. There ought to be ultimately certain amortization charges. State and municipal governments will take another $10,000,000,000 at least. These definite government expenses would equal at least one-third the probable national income.

The worker should realize that it is not to his interest to drain off all excess income above running expenses and taxes from even the income-receiving class and business. From this excess, business is expanded and research, on which greater productivity depends, is promoted. The rise in the worker's real wage depends on the expansion of business and increase in his productivity. Without them, the ever-higher taxes will bear more and more heavily on the laborer. That is what Prof. T. N. Carver meant when he cautioned that it is important that the money raised "to provide social security should not be raised in such a way as to create social insecurity."

The Congress Should Approve Bipartisan Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 21, 1946

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, a number of recent events add to the assurances that a bipartisan foreign policy can be developed and adhered to by the United States. I refer, for example, to the appointment of the Honorable WARREN R. AUSTIN, of Vermont, a Republican, to be the American delegate on the United Nations Security Council. In approving this appointment the Christian Science Monitor, of June 7, says:

In naming WARREN R. AUSTIN to be the American delegate on the Security Council, President Truman is giving the United Nations real support. The United States could not put into the Council a representative with a higher total of knowledge, character, and devotion to the work of the United Nations.

The fact that the Vermont Senator is a leader in the Republican Party gives added utility to the appointment. For it helps to put American support of UN on a two-party, or more truly, on a nonparty basis.

The Memphis Press-Scimitar, June 6, also refers to this selection with approval:

President Truman's surprise nomination of Senator AUSTIN, of Vermont, to succeed Mr. Stettinius as American representative on the United Nations Security Council is a bell-ringer. For many reasons.

He is an exceedingly able man, with a wide grasp of international affairs and a deep interest in the United Nations.

As a respected Member of the Senate, he has built a reputation which will be invaluable when that body is considering United Nations issues.

Even more important is the fact that he is a Republican leader, sharing with Senator VANDENBERG a ranking position as party spokesman on foreign policy.

The President and Secretary of State Byrnes have put our foreign policy on bipartisan basis by using Senator VANDENBERG as a close adviser and member of the American delegations to international conferences. He will continue in that function when the Foreign Ministers' Conference resumes in Paris on June 15. With Senator VANDENBERG'S colleague, Senator AUSTIN, our representative on the Security Council, this bipartisan conduct of American diplomacy will be strengthened further.

These editorials are typical of the newspaper comments upon the appointment of a Republican to succeed Mr. Stettinius. Obviously there is universal approval of the appointment.

It is to be regretted that Congress has failed to take official notice of the trend toward a bipartisan foreign policy. No action by the legislative branch of the Government can be cited in support of these significant developments, although it is well known that an overwhelming majority of the Congress favor a bipartisan policy.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and I introduced on January 3, 1945, identical resolutions, House Concurrent Resolutions 3 and 11, to extend congressional approval to this policy. The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Hon. SOL BLOOM, assures us that a hearing upon our resolutions will be conducted soon.

A further indication of public interest in proposals of this kind is found in the statement of Joseph and Stewart Alsop appearing in the Washington Post on June 21 in support of measures to secure a better executive-legislative relationship. The statement follows:

A suggestion as to what can be done now is to be found in the excellent executive-legislative relationship in one isolated field—that of foreign policy. In part, the relationship is good here although it is bad everywhere else because Senators CONNALLY and VANDENBERG have actually participated in making foreign policy. But it is more important still that they have been given day-to-day information about the facts on which policy must be based. Members of the House and Senate have no easy way of learning the facts about national problems. Giving them the facts is vital. For when men are considering issues of deep national import, their disagreements are rarely irreconcilable if they all know all the facts.

An extension of the present system has been urged upon Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, in memoranda from his subordinates. If he accepts this advice, he will establish as a permanent organ of the State Department a body similar to the committee headed by Under Secretary of State Dean G. Acheson,

which had such success in winning congressional assent to the trade agreements and Bretton Woods bills. The body would be headed by a very high official to give it authority. But it would not be a mere lobby. It would be charged, rather, with keeping key Members of both Houses of Congress in constant touch with the impelling facts on which American foreign policy is founded. Thus good relations would be further promoted, and it would become easier for this country to act decisively in the foreign field.

To complete the job of basing our foreign policy upon bipartisan action the Congress should approve the concurrent resolutions which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and I submitted on the opening day of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The Technological Future of Latin-American Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a paper on the Technological Future of Latin-American Countries, by Philip W. Henry, at a conference held April 12–13, 1946, at Austin, Tex., Institute of Latin-American Studies, University of Texas.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In this brief review of the agricultural and mineral resources of the 20 Latin-American Republics, and the types of the inhabitants, there is a great field for technology, which discovers the best method of raising and processing crops, and the best method of producing and treating minerals, so that both agricultural and mineral products can be placed on the market at the lowest possible cost. But the accomplishment of this task will depend not only on technologists, but also on the ability of the people to establish governments competent to develop their natural resources. There has always been a great difference of opinion as to the most competent form of government. There is little doubt that the characteristics of the people in each country has much to do with the solution of this problem. It is interesting to know that Simon Bolivar had this in mind when he freed from Spanish rule the countries that we know now as Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia. In the constitutional convention held in Angostura (now Ciudad Bolivar), Venezuela, February 15, 1819, Bolivar, after criticizing in detail the form of government adopted by the United States, said: "It would be better to adopt the Koran than the form of government of the United States. * * * It has never even remotely entered my mind to consider a parallel between the position and nature of the two Republics as distinct as the Anglo- and the Hispaño-American. We must face the fact that our race is not European or North American; it is rather a composite of African (Moorish) and American than an emanation of European, for Spain itself ceased to be European by its African blood and character." [1]

The government recommended by Bolivar was to be divided into four branches: executive, legislative, judiciary, and supervisory. The president was to be popularly elected for life, the senate was to be hereditary—elected the first time by the constitutional congress—and the lower house elected by the people. When finally adopted, the constitution made no provision for the fourth branch of government—the educative and inquisitive supervision which was so much desired by Bolivar. What remained then was a constitution having much resemblance to that of the United States. Although Bolivar tried to have his form of government adopted by other countries he had freed, he was not successful.

Nevertheless, Bolivar was correct in pointing out that there is a difference in type between the people of South America and those of the United States. Although the present form of government in Latin-American countries, generally speaking, is similar to that of the United States, the fact that it has not fitted the characteristics of the people is indicated by the tendency toward dictatorships. For example, in Argentina, Rosas was dictator from 1829 to 1852—23 years; in Guatemala, Cabrera was dictator from 1898 to 1920—22 years; in Venezuela, Gomez was dictator from 1908 to 1935—27 years; in Mexico, Diaz was dictator from 1876 to 1911—35 years. Nevertheless, dictatorships have been the exception—not the rule—and the resources of the great majority of the Latin-American countries have been developed by domestic and foreign capital under governments duly established by democratic procedure.

A dictatorship is not necessarily vicious, for in certain countries and at certain times it has been the best form of government. The dictatorship of Diaz in Mexico was beneficial, for he limited his dictatorship to bringing about order after many years of revolution and disorder, which made it impossible for the Mexicans to attain a decent standard of living. With order established, it was possible, largely through foreign capital, to develop his country's metal and petroleum resources, railroads, industries, ports, and other public and private works. As a result, labor enjoyed a prosperity not known before. Henry Adams visited Mexico in 1894–95 during the Diaz regime, and wrote to a friend from Guadalajara: "Labor is scarce and everyone is employed. Mining, manufacturing, refining and all the usual signs of prosperity are rapidly increasing." From Cautla he wrote: "We have passed a week among the Mexican Indians in their huts, eating their tortillas and chili, sleeping in their beds, and intimate with their pigs, hens, burros, and babies. I think I now know something about their way of existence. Agriculture, manufactures are all splendidly successful and the poorest labor is well employed." Later, from St. Thomas he wrote: "Here in the Tropics they talk of nothing but sugar and coffee, low prices, ruin and discontent. I ought to except Mexico, where all is prosperity and satisfaction." [2] Ten years later (Diaz still president) I spent 4 months in a small Mexican village while making a railroad survey in the State of Vera Cruz, and found conditions similar to those pictured by Mr. Adams. And there were no bandits, which were plentiful before and after Diaz. Diaz, unlike some dictators, made no effort to tell his people what to do, but left that to their own good judgment and to the opportunities offered by domestic and foreign capital.

[1] Thomas Rourke, Man of Glory—Simon Bolivar; William Morrow & Co., 1942, p. 204.

[2] Letters of Henry Adams, 1892–1918; Houghton Mifflin Co., vol. 3, pp. 59, 63, 65.

Diaz in Mexico and Gomez in Venezuela realized that foreign capital would be required to develop their petroleum and other mineral resources. That has been true of most of the Latin-American countries as it was of the United States in early days when foreign capital helped develop her resources and loaned money to some of her States. Such investment of foreign capital brings about higher wages than that paid by local employers, as noted in a recent book on Costa Rica: "Big American companies, such as the United Fruit Co. and the highway contractors building the inter-American road, pay common laborers considerably higher wages than native Costa Ricans pay the hard-working coffee peon, and really excellent wages for skilled labor." [3] In my own experience I found that the development of petroleum in the State of Vera Cruz put up the wages of common labor, within a few years, to four times what it was before. This rise in wages was not relished by large landowners, who did not like to see their labor enticed to leave their employ.

A dictatorship like that of Diaz—no matter how benevolent to the mass of people—is sometimes followed by revolution and disorder. This was true in Mexico, for it was 20 years after Diaz before that country became tranquil in all her borders. The last serious revolt took place in 1929. When I visited Mexico in 1928 an armed car of soldiers was attached to the train between Laredo and Mexico City to protect the passengers from bandits. But revolution does not always follow a dictatorship, as witness the orderly election of the two presidents who followed the death of Gomez of Venezuela in 1935.

Most of the Latin-American dictatorships have been of the Diaz and Gomez type, where a free economic society, nevertheless, could exist, and where there was no effort to attack neighboring countries. This is quite different from the dictatorships of Hitler and Mussolini, which were aimed at full control of their own and other countries—politically and economically. But there is another type of dictatorship that may retard technological development, and that is a tendency toward "statism" where the state, instead of individuals, controls the economic forces of the country. There is trend in this direction even in the United States, where, in the past, it has been fundamental that the State was made for man and not man for the State. This trend has been illustrated by the New Deal in the United States, and by the type of socialism that has recently been adopted by the Labor Party in England, and which seems to be popular in France and other European countries. In South America there is a tendency toward statism, for Bolivia has asked that negotiations for tin be handled through the Government, and not directly with producers. Brazil has instituted measures for mica and quartz crystals which practically exclude private enterprise from taking a large part in international trade. In the United States there is a strong tendency to retain certain governmental controls which were originally adopted as war measures.

This tendency toward statism is nothing new, for it is modeled after the dictatorship of Louis XIV of France, who through Colbert, his finance minister, tried to manage all industry, even prescribing the number of threads to the inch in the weaving of cloth. The results of this policy on commerce and industry is summed up in the Encyclopedia Britannica: "This minute regulation probably accounts for the failure of the great trading corporations which he set up in 1664 for trading in India and in America, while the British and Dutch monopolistic trading companies, with their operations

[3] Costa Rican Life, John and Mavis Biesanz; Columbia University Press, 1944, p. 167.

untrammeled by the government prospered."[4] When Colbert, perplexed at the failure of his autocratic policy, asked a manufacturer what he could do to help industry, received the reply "Laissez nous faire" (Let us alone).[5] Thus came into being the term laissez faire, which has been applied to the economic policy which, in the past hundred years, has brought about in the United States the highest average standard of living ever known. So the technological future of the Latin-American countries will depend not only on their mineral and agricultural resources and their technological development, but also on their type of government. And this applies to the United States as well. * * *

But the end of the war finds the Latin-American countries better off financially, not only because of increased sales of products much needed by the United Nations during the war, but also by reason of the good-neighbor policy, which, through the construction of highways and other necessary works during the war, and through loans by the Export-Import Bank, has made possible the more rapid development of their natural resources than would have been possible under the pre-war days of peace. Therefore, the technological future of these countries will now depend upon their people and their governments to take advantage of the situation. And I believe they will rise to the occasion.

American-Hungarian Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution which will call to the attention of the Congress the hopes held by our American-Hungarians for peace and prosperity in the land of their origin:

Americans of Hungarian origin under the direction of the American Hungarian Federation in a mass meeting held on June 16, 1946, in New York City, unanimously agreed to ask our Government for a just peace for Hungary. By acclamation they have approved the following resolution:

"We, American citizens of Hungarian origin, at a mass meeting held on this day, June 16, 1946, after due consideration of all facts and in full realization of our obligations as citizens of the United States, ask our Government:

"1. To prevent the partition of Europe into zones of influence, either by granting to any great power political, military, or economic privileges, or by accepting facts accomplished during the armistice period which are incompatible with the freedom, independence, and sovereign rights of any nation.

"2. To assure to Hungary, separated today from western Europe, her traditional and rightful place in the family of the western democratic nations. In conformity with the Moscow Declaration (October 31, 1943), we ask for Hungary 'that political and economic security, which is the only basis for lasting peace.'

"3. To put fully into effect in the Hungarian Peace Treaty the principles of the Atlantic Charter and in particular to apply the ethnic principle without prejudice to Hungary in the drafting of her future frontiers. Border territories inhabited by Hungarians or Hungarian majorities should be returned to their motherland.

"4. To prevent persecution of minorities on racial basis, and forbid their expulsion and confiscation of their properties as has been practiced during the armistice period by Czechoslovakia. Minorities should be granted full minority rights under international guaranties.

"5. To restore Transylvania as an independent state within a Danubian federation. This is the only proper solution capable of establishing lasting peace between Hungary and Rumania.

"6. To relieve Hungary of the unbearable burdens of reparations and of occupation which prevent reconstruction and threaten the nation's survival.

"7. To expedite the conclusion of the Hungarian peace treaty without further unwarranted delay."

[4] Encyclopedia Britannica, vol. 5, p. 986.
[5] Encyclopedia Britannica, vol. 13, p. 598.

Extension of OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mrs. Josephine Chally, of Morris, Ill.

JUNE, 12, 1946.

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: Can't you do something about the betrayal of the people that is going on in Washington today?

Here in Morris, as well as other places, shelves are empty as well as meat counters and low-priced and working clothes.

We all know they are being held back in expectation of OPA being abolished. We all know what this selfish holding back augurs for the future.

People are saying by the dozens that they will go on a buyers' strike, of necessity, and sit in their homes and starve to death because wages won't buy a fraction of day-to-day needs.

I say of necessity, because this place, like the majority of places with factories, is a low-pay district. We worked through the war because we were told it would be unpatriotic to quit and seek higher-pay jobs, also we didn't strike for the same reason, and because we were promised more pay later on.

We're still making $23 base pay (women) and $29 (men). I have had people laugh at me for working through the war for these wages, and these people quote the hundreds and thousands in war bonds they possess. This puts us Morris people in an ugly mood.

Multiply this by thousands and see what condition the country is in today.

Too bad workers like us aren't publicized instead of railroad workers, miners, and people in the automobile industry, for about 92 percent of the workers make less than $50 a week, most of these really are around $25 a week.

So, why work, in order to go deeper in debt all the time for life's bare needs?

I do wish you could read this to your fellow Congressmen.

I don't wish to appear an alarmist, but you can see the picture of the future yourself with OPA abolished and strikes forbidden.

Sincerely,

JOSEPHINE CHALLY.

MORRIS, ILL.

Statehood for Hawaii—Asked by National Society Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD so as to include a resolution adopted recently by the Fifty-fifth Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, favoring statehood for Hawaii, as follows:

Whereas there are pending in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Congress of the United States bills to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and be admitted as a State in the American Union, to wit: H. R. 3463, introduced by Delegate FARRINGTON, of Hawaii; H. R. 3659, introduced by Representative HALE, of Maine; H. R. 3690, introduced by Representative LA FOLLETTE, of Indiana; and S. 1830, introduced by Senator KNOWLAND, of California; and

Whereas the question presented to the American people by these bills is Hawaii's right to statehood now; and

Whereas Hawaii was annexed as a Territory of the United States by mutual agreement between the former Republic of Hawaii and the United States, and such annexation has been of immeasurable value to the United States as well as the people of Hawaii; and

Whereas Hawaii and Alaska are the only remaining territories of the United States, the other 29 Territories which have been organized in the history of the Union all having been admitted to statehood; and

Whereas it was well understood when Hawaii was organized as a Territory that it, too, would be admitted as a State, the territorial form of government being necessarily only a transitory one, to be followed by a statehood as soon as the people of the Territory are capable of self-government; and

Whereas in the 48 years since annexation of Hawaii it has become a modern American community, with a sound economy and a healthy and literate people, who have shown themselves to be fully capable of self-government; and

Whereas the people of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question their loyalty and patriotism to the Government of the United States, as found by the statehood subcommittee of the House of Representatives on January 24 of this year in a report concluding that: "The Territory of Hawaii now meets the necessary requirements for statehood"; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior in December 1945, and the President of the United States in January of this year, unqualifiedly endorsed immediate statehood for Hawaii; and

Whereas the national society, Daughters of the American Revolution, under its act of incorporation, has among its purposes the "developing of an enlightened public opinion and affording to young and old such advantages as shall develop in them the largest capacity for performing the duties of American citizenship"; and "to foster true patriotism and love of country, and to aid in securing for mankind all the blessings of liberty"; and

Whereas the board of management of Hawaii State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, has overwhelmingly en-

dorsed statehood for Hawaii, and the members of Aloha Chapter, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Honolulu, T. H., have voted 4 to 1 in favor of working for statehood:

Resolved by the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, That this organization endorse, and it hereby goes on record as favoring, immediate action by the Congress of the United States to enable Hawaii to be admitted as a State.

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Territories of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Senate of the Congress, the Secretary of the Interior, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and the Governor of Hawaii.

Observance of Smyser Day at York, Pa.

REMARKS
OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, June 22, on the York fair grounds, York County, Pa., the Smyser clan held their bicentennial celebration. The Smyser family is one of York's oldest and largest families, which had its beginning in this country when Barbara Smeisser and her three children migrated to this country from Germany. The family has grown and prospered immensely. Approximately 3,000 members of the family and their friends were present. After a lengthy and extremely interesting program, the meeting adjourned by passing a resolution to hold a similar meeting on June 5, 2046.

The principal speaker on the occasion was Gen. Jacob Loucks Devers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that General Devers' address be printed as an extension of my remarks.

To be asked to speak at this reunion of the Smysers is an honor which is gratifying, indeed. But because York is my home town, and I know so many of you here so well, it is even more of a compliment, and I assure you that I appreciate it deeply.

With you, I regret the fact that this Smyser Day could not be celebrated a year ago—on the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Smyser family in York County. But we still had a job to finish, a year ago. We had just won a bitter war on one front, and final victory on another front was still just beyond our grasp. Today we can more fittingly celebrate Smyser Day—for we have emerged wholly victorious in war. Now, we have only to win the victory of final, lasting peace.

Two hundred and one years ago, Anna Barbara Smeisser and her family came to Pennsylvania and settled in what is now York County. Widowed by war in her native Germany, she brought her children to America to make a new life in the new world—and escape the troubled times of the Old World.

But then, as now, it was one world, and the times were troubled in America, too. Even then, the ocean was not wide enough to isolate us. In Europe, they called it the Seven Years War. Here, we called it the French and Indian War. But by any name it was the same war—and York County was threatened. The men of York responded as they have responded to every threat to their homes and country since that day—they mobilized for war.

The British sent General Braddock and his red-coats to the American Colonies to meet the French and Indian threat. In 1755 he marched across Pennsylvania to meet utter defeat near the French stronghold of Fort Duquesne. General Braddock himself was killed. Had it not been for some 2,000 provincial troops under a Col. George Washington—many of them from York County—that defeat might have had even more disastrous consequences.

But those American woodsmen under Washington knew how to fight Indians, and how to fight like Indians. They held their own—and covered the retreat of Braddock's battered red-coats.

Made bold by their defeat of Braddock, the Indians pressed more and more closely on York County, raiding and burning frontier farms. In 1756, 1,000 York County men—eight companies of militia—were under arms. When the Delaware Indians concentrated ominously at nearby Fort Kittanning the first sheriff of York County, Capt. Hance Hamilton, led a successful expedition against them. And 2 years later—when Fort Duquesne was finally taken—the men of York were there.

The men of York were there when the Revolution started, too. I quote from Carter and Glossbrenner's history of the first hundred years of York County:

"There is not a part of Pennsylvania wherein the love of liberty displayed itself earlier or more strongly than in the county of York. Military companies with a view to the resisting of Great Britain were formed in York while the people of the neighboring counties slept. In those days there were men here of broad breast and firm step, who feared no power and bowed to no dominion."

The first company in the Revolution from the entire State of Pennsylvania was the York Rifles—a proud organization whose military history antedates that of the United States, and will unquestionably endure as long as the United States. Let us hope that will be forever.

Under Capt. Michael Doudel the Rifles left York on the 1st of July 1775 and marched 500 miles to Cambridge, Mass. They were the first company to arrive there from west of the Hudson River and south of Long Island.

In a skirmish with British regulars a few days after their arrival they captured two red-coats and killed five, losing but one of their own men. But the man they lost went on to make a notable contribution to the winning of the war.

His name was Corp. Walter Cruise. Captured by the British, he was sent to England and confined for several months in the Tower of London. There his leather hunting shirt and his long rifle made him an object of much interest and curiosity. I might add that Walter Cruise, like all members of the York Rifles in virtually all of our wars, was a notable rifle marksman. His own weapon—the long rifle—although sometimes known as the Kentucky rifle because of its popularity in that State, was actually a Pennsylvania rifle, developed in York and Lancaster Counties.

When the York Rifles were organized, the first lieutenant of the company, Henry Miller, drew the figure of a British soldier on a barn door. He allowed no man to join the company who could not hit the nose of the red coat on the barn door from a distance of 150 feet.

There were groups in London much in sympathy with the American revolutionists, and it wasn't long before Corporal Cruise, a personable lad, was released from the Tower. Thereafter, he gave exhibitions of his marksmanship with the long rifle, in and around London.

British troops, in those days, were armed with muskets, and couldn't hit the broad side of a barn at 50 paces, much less shoot off a man's nose. When word got around about the sharpshooter from Pennsylvania, who swore that every man in his company, and every man in York County, could shoot as straight, recruiting for the British Army fell way off. In fact, it fell off so far that George III was forced to hire 53,000 more Hessians, to fight for him in the Colonies.

At the time of the Revolution, the population of York County was less than 25,000. But in April 1778, York County had 4,621 militiamen—almost one-fifth of her population! Hardly a man under 50 was to be seen on the streets of York.

York County produced more than her share of famous military figures in the Revolution. Henry Miller, lieutenant of the York Rifles, won the complete confidence of General Washington, became a colonel in the Revolution, and a brigadier general in the War of 1812. John Clark, also a lieutenant under Braddock, became a brigadier in the Revolution. The captain of the first military company organized in York, in December 1774, was James Smith, whom you all know as a signer of the Declaration of Independence, and who was promoted to the rank of colonel. The first lieutenant of that company was Thomas Hartley, who also became a colonel, a Member of Congress for 11 years after the war, and eventually a major general in the militia.

But York also saw other famous political and military figures of the Revolution. In the dark winter of 1777–78, when General Howe held Philadelphia, and General Washington was encamped at Valley Forge, York was the seat of government for the Colonies, and host to the Continental Congress. General Gage reported to the Congress in York after defeating Burgoyne at Saratoga. It was here that LaFayette and Von Steuben were given their commands, and Count Pulaski was authorized to form his Corps of Volunteers. Many of Pulaski's men were recruited in York.

With the end of the revolution, the people of York County were again free to enjoy the pursuits of peace. But not for long. Another world war gripped the globe—a whole series of wars. They were known in Europe as the Napoleonic Wars. When we were finally involved, we called it the War of 1812. But we were an active ally of Napoleon, just the same.

Because England was so heavily engaged with Napoleon in Europe, she had comparatively few troops to spare for the prosecution of her side issue with us. Our Regular Army, Navy, and militia, small as they were, sufficed us for about 2 years.

But when the enemy took Washington, and the night sky in York was lighted by the flames of our burning Capitol, six companies of volunteers were hastily organized. A company from York and a company from Hanover marched to help in the successful defense of Baltimore. Their contribution to the defense of our country must have been a thrilling experience. "By the dawn's early light" they could see with their eyes "that our flag was still there"—that the Star-Spangled Banner still flew over Fort McHenry.

Another generation of peace, and we were at war with Mexico. This was not a world war, but the world was at war, nevertheless. England and France were battling Russia in the Crimea.

But terrible as is a world at war, there is nothing more terrible than a civil war. Our War Between the States very nearly became a world war, as you know, for Great Britain was on the verge of entering it on the side of the Confederacy.

President Lincoln issued his first call for troops, to defend the Union, on April 15, 1861. On April 20, two companies from York,

the Worth Infantry, under Capt. Thomas A. Zeigle, and the York Rifles, under Capt. George Hay, marched to war. They were the first Pennsylvania volunteers to enter the service fully armed, fully equipped, and fully uniformed.

Captain Zeigle, who had been a sergeant in the Mexican War, became a colonel in the Civil War; Captain Hay, a brigadier general.

Forty companies from York, in all, fought in the War Between the States, in addition to innumerable individual soldiers. Gen. William B. Franklin, of York, commanded two divisions of the Army of the Potomac; his brother, Samuel R. Franklin, was a rear admiral. Horatio Gates Gibson, of York, a second lieutenant with Scott in Mexico, became a brigadier. The Eighty-seventh Regiment of Pennsylvania Volunteers, nine-tenths of its men from York, participated in 38 battles and skirmishes.

The greatest battlefield of that war lies not far from where we are gathered today. It is reliably reported that the first shot in the Battle of Gettysburg was fired by a York man. We do not know his name, but we do know that he was from York County, and we can honor his deed.

Just as the men of York rallied when Baltimore was threatened by an invader 50 years before, they rallied when Pennsylvania herself was threatened. As the rising tide of the Confederacy approached, prominent citizens all over the State—men who for reasons of age or physical disability had not been called up for military service—organized themselves into militia units and took up arms in defense of their homes. Company F of the Twenty-sixth Emergency Regiment was recruited in York by the Reverend Frederick Klinefelter, of York College. It was this company which offered the first opposition to the Confederate armies in Pennsylvania. They faced the entire Confederate corps commanded by Gen. Jubal Early, however, and were forced to retreat.

Following the War Between the States, we enjoyed the longest period of peace in our history, until the Spanish-American War. Again, a world war was narrowly averted. There were two other fleets at Manila the day Admiral Dewey faced the Spanish armada. One was German, one British. The Kaiser's warships, without explanation, suspiciously maneuvered themselves alongside the Spanish ships. Tension was high, for the Spanish and German strength, combined, greatly exceeded our own.

Then the British flotilla—with a band playing on the deck of each battleship—ranged itself alongside the American fleet, and the Germans sailed away. The tune those British bands were playing was the Star-Spangled Banner.

A generation later the Kaiser was ready—and we were not. Another generation, and Hitler was ready—and we were not.

I am not going to attempt to recite to you the contributions of York and York County to World Wars I and II. They were as notable as they were in all of the wars into which the United States of America has been plunged, and they are well known to all of us.

Equal to the contribution of York County in men-at-arms in World War II were the services of her busy industries, and of the thousands of men and women who devotedly stayed at their jobs in her shops and factories. Important, too, was the produce of York County's rich farms, which helped out of all proportion in feeding our armies and those of our allies, and which, right now, are playing so magnificent a role in feeding a hungry world.

That world today stands at a crossroads. The name given the forthcoming atomic-bomb test at Bikini—Operation Crossroads—is most appropriate. Our world—one world—has its choice, right now, of two avenues. One is broad and straight and smooth, and leads to peace. The other is narrow and winding and devious, and leads to war. Which will we choose?

The choice of the United States, this time, is doubly important, because we have emerged from the war the most powerful, the most influential nation in the world. Our choice will have immeasurable effect on the choice of other nations. I have mentioned the fact that, although all wars are tragic, the most tragic war is a civil war. Any future war, in this one world of ours, would be a fratricidal civil war. This Nation, and all nations, must choose peace.

But after each of our wars, we have chosen what we thought was the road to a lasting peace. And in a generation, more or less, we have found ourselves on a detour. That detour has invariably led us on the road to war.

How can we avoid that detour this time? Let us examine the steps which took us there the last time.

With our victory in World War I, we retired behind our oceans, and, by our withdrawal, scuttled the League of Nations. But those oceans have never protected us from world wars, not for 200 years. We have fought in five world wars. Only our great good fortune kept it from being seven world wars.

Today those oceans protect us less than ever. Let us, therefore, with our victory in World War II, honestly acknowledge our responsibilities to the world as a whole. Let us continue our leading part in the United Nations, and implement its great potential strength for peace with our determination to preserve that peace.

What else did we do, or not do, after World War I, which led us into World War II?

With the best intentions in the world, we disarmed. We reduced our Army and Navy to a pitiful size. But the rest of the world was not all of good intention as we were. Our very disarmament encouraged the dictators of Japan, and Italy, and Germany to arm. And not only to arm, but to wage war.

Fortunately for us, our allies, in some instances, were able to withstand their assaults for the more than 2 years it took us before we were ready to strike back. In any future war we will not have that protection. The enemy will strike suddenly, and he will strike at the United States first, because he cannot win any future war until the United States of America, the most powerful Nation in the world, is beaten.

I quoted you an historian of York County, who, writing of York County in the American Revolution, said:

"There were men here of broad breast and firm step, who feared no power and bowed to no dominion."

I believe the people of York County, and of Pennsylvania, and of all the United States, are still so minded. To none of us is the prospect of an America on her knees pleasing.

Then how may we discourage such an attack? We can discourage such an attack—I will go further and say that we can almost definitely prevent it—by never abandoning an adequate national security program.

George Fielding Eliot, the military commentator, affords us a striking illustration of the sort of national security we must have. We can no longer think in terms of defense, he says, because there is, as yet, no defense against an attack by rockets, for instance. Our only eventual salvation lies in potential offensive strength—immediately available offensive strength if it is proven necessary.

You are walking down the street, Mr. Eliot suggests, and you see ex-Sergeant Joe Louis standing on the corner with his hands in his pockets. Mr. Eliot and myself like Joe Louis, but, just for the sake of the argument, you do not like him. Do you walk up and hit him?

No, you do not. You do not hit him because you know your first punch will not knock him out. And you know equally that his first punch will do just that to you.

In World War II, V-2 rocket attacks upon our troops and the civilian population of Europe did not stop until our Army Ground Forces—infantry, armored, cavalry, and artillery—had penetrated to the heart of Germany, destroyed the Nazi armies, and captured the rocket-launching sites. Similarly, in any future war, rocket attacks or worse, on the cities, industries, and people of the United States itself would not be stopped until our Army Ground Forces could penetrate to the heart of the enemy homeland, destroy his armies, and capture his launching sites.

Therefore we must be strong enough, at all times, to do just that. President Truman has proposed to Congress a comparatively small Regular Army, Air Force, and Navy; a greatly strengthened National Guard and Organized Reserve Corps, and a General Reserve composed of male citizens who have received universal military training.

Such a program will do more than shield us from attack. It will make the voice of the United States heard with respect, when it is lifted in the councils of the peace, just as it was heard with respect when it was lifted in the councils of the war.

Such a program, some say, is not in keeping with American tradition. It is conscription. But neither is war in keeping with American tradition.

We are a peaceful nation. Yet we fought one war with a foreign power even before we were a nation—one to become a nation—and five since we became a nation.

Let us, therefore, mobilize for peace, and win the peace. Surely, if we can win seven wars we can win one peace.

Unification of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address given by Lt. Gen. J. L. Collins, U. S. A., general staff, before the members of the national security committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars recently at the Statler Hotel. General Collins spoke on unification of the armed forces. I think it appropriate that the cogent arguments in favor of unification contained in this address be extended in the RECORD for the consideration of the membership of the House, and I for one hope we will be given the opportunity to vote on this legislation without delay.

My interest in the matter of unification dates back primarily to my early service in the war. I went out to Hawaii right after Pearl Harbor as Chief of Staff for General Emmons, who relieved General Short in Hawaii. I stayed there for the next 6 months and had a very good opportunity to see something of the working together of the Army and the Navy out there in those hectic days after Pearl Harbor. Admiral Nimitz was in command and General Emmons and I met him and his Chief of Staff weekly for conferences.

Therefore, I have had some experience in working together with the Navy, all of which has been extremely pleasant in every way, shape, or form.

I then left Hawaii and took the Twenty-fifth Infantry Division and relieved the First Marine Division at Guadalcanal.

After the fighting was over I stayed on there for a number of months and went up through the Solomons campaign and then

was placed in command of the Seventh Corps for the invasion of Normandy. My corps was the one that took Cherbourg. We happened to be selected to make the breakthrough in Normandy, and had in front of us the great aerial bombardment near St. Lô. We chased the Heinies across Europe and were the first to break through the Siegfried defenses, captured Aachen, Cologne, and went on for the meeting with the Russians along the line of the Elbe.

I am stating this not in any boastful sense, but I want to give you the background that I have had experience with amphibious warfare, both in the Pacific and European theaters.

My specific interest in the matter of unification dates back to an instance that occurred on the beach at Guadalcanal one day after the fighting was over. I was talking with a navy man out there about some matters of supply. He said, "Well, General, your war, the Army's war, is over in Europe. This is the Navy's war out here."

Well, I just wondered. Then later, when I commanded a corps that went into Normandy, went along with a marvelous collection of ships of all kinds and made that landing in Normandy; a landing which had been preceded by a tremendous aerial bombardment; that had been covered by a wonderful air corps, supported by a crackerjack naval support force; I realized then, more than ever before, that there is no such thing as the Army's war or the Navy's war or the Air Corps' war. Just as Mr. Willkie said, there is "one world," so also there is "one war" in this modern era. It cannot be fought separately by Army, Navy, or Air Corps. It is one war.

I think one of the outstanding lessons of the war was the absolute need of unification of command in the field. We simply could not have gotten along as we did without that unity of command in the field.

It is rather interesting to know that everywhere throughout the world we had unity of command in the field. It is true that up until the last minute, at any rate, there was not unity of command for the final assault on Japan. The Navy was going to be in charge up to a certain point under Admiral Nimitz and then the command was to pass to General MacArthur. That was under the old principle of "paramount interest" that had been followed prior to this war. I am personally convinced that had we had to make a landing against opposition in Japan that we would have had to have unity of command there also, or there might have been some serious difficulties.

Now we believe that that principle of unity of command in the field is the thing that must be brought here to Washington so that we may have unity of direction of management of War and Navy Departments.

The next major lesson, it seems to me, from the war is that air power is the dominant factor in war, and will be from now on. Now mind you I speak as a ground officer. I am not an aviator, though I have always been enthusiastic about the air. It is my considered judgment that air power is the dominant factor in warfare. I mean air power as a whole. I am not speaking by any means about land air power nor naval air power. I say air power is the dominant factor in war. You cannot move without it, either on the sea or on the ground. The crossing from England through the channel would have been utterly unthinkable if we had not had complete domination of the air. The Navy might very well say that you could not have done it without domination of the sea also, and the chances are we could not. I give the Navy credit for that. I am not one of those that say they did not play their part, because they did and that leads to my next major lesson: The fact is that neither air alone nor the Navy alone nor the ground forces alone can win. It takes teamwork and, as I said originally, it takes unity of direction over those three main components to win victory in a modern war.

However, air power is here today, and the idea that the air should not reach its proper place in our national defense, I think, is unthinkable. The alternative therefore, it seems to me, to a unified department of all of our armed forces is a third department of air. Then you immediately begin to get into another problem: How much air is going to be placed under that department?

Now throughout the discussion of unification the Army has said consistently that the Navy should retain its sea-borne, carrier-borne, water-borne aircraft. We do feel, however, that all land-based aviation other than that which would be necessary for reconnaissance purposes for the fleet would be passed to this air arm. Otherwise, you have a duplication perhaps of two strategic bombing air forces. The country simply cannot afford it and that is all there is to it.

Aircraft costs too much money. Every time you see a flight of B–17's or B–24's going by, if you see about four of them up there together, you can say, "There goes a million dollars flying by."

Furthermore, it will be utterly needless, in my judgment, to have two sets of long-range bombers. The Navy says they do not want long-range bombers, but it is true at the end of the last war they had about 2,000 long-range bombers under Navy command and control, if I remember correctly, and they are now making plans for long-range scout planes that can carry many tons of bombs.

I do not know whether any of you have given any attention to a polar projection of the earth. If you have, you will note that the great land masses of the earth are gathered around the North Pole and it is only 5,000 miles from Moscow, we will say, or from London, or from Tokyo, to the northern part of the United States. If we are ever going to be attacked by these atomic bombs in the early days of a possible future war, they are not going to fly around the world to get here. The shortest way is right over the top, over the land masses up there and the frozen north. To me it is unthinkable that you would have one set of fighter aircraft to meet attacks coming in over the seas and another set controlled by somebody else to meet an attack coming over the land masses. Furthermore, we can only afford one set of strategic bombers. We should have unified command of all the air other than that actually needed to go along with the fleet to support the fleets' operations.

Now I would like to point out to you, from my own experience, the great capacity of the air to concentrate and the tremendous flexibility of air which is not generally understood. It has been charged that the Army air does not know how to support the landing operations and that we do not know much about close support of ground forces.

My division had close support from marine, Navy, and Army airplanes at Guadalcanal, with bombs dropped 300 yards out in front of our front line. They were dropped by Army fliers, Navy fliers, and by marine fliers. I want to emphasize that it does not take a different kind of a pilot to drop bombs out in front of a front line. The essential thing is to have the necessary technique and equipment to let the pilots know where to drop their bombs. The best procedure we discovered is to mark by smoke the spot where you want the stuff dropped and the pilots will put the eggs in there where you want them. If you know where you want them to go and designate that target on the ground by smoke, it does not make any difference what kind of a pilot he is, he will put it down there if he is good and these boys were all good.

Over in the European theater we had exactly the same results. We had nothing but Army fliers there. They supported our initial landings and did wonderfully well, and throughout our fight, all the way across Europe, we had constant and wonderful close support from our fighter-bombers right in front of our Infantry troops and furthermore right out in font of our armored units. I had at least one armored division in my corps constantly and sometimes two. We had an arrangement whereby we had radiomen right in the leading tanks of these units with very high frequency radio sets that could talk direct to the planes in the air. I normally attacked with three columns of tanks out in front of me and there were six close support airplanes in the air all the time that we were moving, out in front of these columns, picking up German tanks out there, German resistance, radioing back when they found something that was hot. They would rally in, through the ground radio stations which we had in corps, all the other fighter bombers around in the neighborhood that were doing nothing to come in, or we could call back to the fighter command and turn out a whole group to join the attack.

I have seen German equipment double banked for a mile and a half along the road after our break-through in Normandy completely burned out as a result of these air attacks. I have seen German equipment in a square in a little town in Normandy, a solid square of burned-out matériel which was done by our aircraft.

Another example of the flexibility and power of aviation is the great bombardment that preceded the Normandy break-through east of St. Lô. On July 25, 1944, we concentrated over 3,000 fighter-bombers, medium and heavy bombers, of which 1,800 were heavies, on a front of 8,000 yards which General Bradley had selected for the break-through. For an hour and forty-five minutes the bombers plastered the selected area. In the next 2 days, primarily as a result of this bombing, we were able to rupture the German position which we had been unable to pierce in 3 weeks of costly fighting. This led directly to the German defeat in France.

Now, after we made the break, the Air Forces then took out the bridges along the line of the Seine and the line of the Loire, thus isolating the battlefield for us so the Germans could not bring reserves against us. Before and after the break-through, the heavy bombers were attacking deep into Germany, attacking the refinery plants where they were making the gasoline, and the ball-bearing plants, and so on, and had done that job so wonderfully well that the German air force was kept on the ground except at night, and that is all.

During the whole time over there, I personally did not see more than one dozen enemy airplanes in the air in the daytime. Our forces had simply driven the German air into the ground.

Because of this tremendous flexibility, the varied ability of the air to concentrate both in close support of troops in advance of this operation and in a rapid movement across country, and against the productive capacity of the nation, and then in great quantities in front of troops trying to make a break-through, I say you have something there that is a tremendous power that can be used at sea or on land equally well.

It is unthinkable to me that that tremendous power should be kept as a subsidiary, either of the Army or of the Navy. It must be given a place of its own. The alternative to unification would appear to me to be the creation of a third department of air now. We would then have three different groups of advocates going before nine different congressional committees, pleading its own special case. I say it is about time that we set

up a single department where we can get the generals and the admirals and the airmen to think in terms of national defense from a broad standpoint and not from a localized traditional standpoint. It is time we developed, I say, a procedure and a program to get a single unified program of national defense.

Those, gentlemen, I think are the main points of the situation that I would like to emphasize. I want to say one other thing, however, before I stop and answer your questions, and that is, that it has been repeatedly said, "This is the Army's view of the thing." Let me remind you that the President of the United States has been the leading advocate of unification. It started when he was in charge of the Truman committee in the early days of this war when he began to preach unification, based on his experiences as head of that committee. The Army submitted recommendations to the Congress on a directive from the President of the United States. It is not something we thought up ourselves. It was something we did in accordance with the President's directive. but the thing goes back also to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which had appointed a committee of two admirals and two Army officers during the war, who traveled all over the world and took testimony from the leading admirals and the leading generals and the leading airmen, and that committee recommended unification. One of the admirals voted against it, that is, turned in a minority report but the committee, three out of four members of that committee, voted for unification. The outline of the plan which I submitted as a member of the War Department Committee to Congress last October was based on that study by the Joint Chiefs of Staff Committee. We eliminated from the Joint Chiefs of Staff proposals some of the things which the Navy objected to, trying to meet their objections. That is the genesis of the so-called War Department plan.

Outlook for the Rice Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Journal of Commerce, New York, N. Y., Monday, June 10, 1946:

INEPT REGULATION SEEN DISRUPTING RICE TRADE

(By Frank A. Godchaux, chairman, Louisiana State Rice Milling Co., Inc.)

ABBEVILLE, LA., June 9.—Unless some radical change is made in the Government program, the outlook for the rice industry in the United States is anything but bright. This applies to both the coming season and the more distant future.

The prospective crop is for the largest rice acreage that has ever been planted in the United States. With normal growing and harvesting weather, this acreage should yield 20,000,000 pockets or more. This is twice as much rice as we can consume.

The past season's crop was also large, but because of the Government allocation program our domestic market was very inadequately supplied and so were both Cuba and Puerto Rico—our two largest natural offshore outlets. These shortages produced strong buying pressure and this coupled with inadequate enforcement of Government regulations has resulted in rice selling at ridiculously high prices to consumers, especially in the heavy rise-consuming areas both on the continent and in Cuba.

It is common knowledge that a number of clean-rice buyers have found ways and means of purchasing large quantities of rice at far above ceiling prices and that millers from whom such purchases were made have in turn found ways and means of passing a large part of these extra profits to growers. Unless there is some radical change, the past season's operations will serve as only a rehearsal for more widespread violations during the coming season.

The know-how will become more general. This will mean that responsible millers and distributors who have tried to cooperate with the Government program will be forced to either follow the lead of the price evaders or discontinue operations. They can't hope to compete in either purchasing rough rice or selling clean rice at ceiling prices except for the surplus that evaders can't handle for lack of capacity.

A realistic approach to this situation requires a change in the Government policy. It requires, first, a program that can and will be enforced. Second, the premium and incentive for evasion must be removed. The remedy lies in allowing the domestic trade to purchase what rice they need and in allocating an adequate supply to Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Hawaiian Islands, and other insular possessions. These allocations to our natural offshore markets could be effectively controlled by a proper licensing program, if and when and where licensing becomes necessary.

Such a plan would not interfere with a proper relief program because there will be large amounts of rice from the 20,000,000-bag crop above these requirements that could and should be shipped for relief purposes and, furthermore, whatever rice is consumed in this country would release an equivalent amount of food in other commodities to be used for relief purposes.

In administering relief to hungry people, it is not necessary to cater to food preferences. Secondly, since supply and demand would be in balance, there would be no incentive or profit in domestic black market operations. In the third place, since Cubans would know they were going to get adequate supplies, there would be no occasion for secret bonuses. With these bonuses removed, there would be no hidden profit for the mills to pass back to the farmers, upsetting the rough rice market.

The most important benefit, however, would be that our domestic per capita rice consumption would be maintained or increased, clearing the way for a larger domestic distribution when conditions are normal and when most of our present export markets have been lost as they surely will be; thus, the farmers would secure the greatest long-range benefit from such a program.

If the present Government policy is followed, the result will be chaos in the distribution of this crop, and our domestic market, which is our largest and only certain outlet, will be further injured by lack of supply, further upsetting the economy of the rice producing states.

Peace Settlements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I take pleasure in inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD a column by Anne O'Hare McCormick in the New York Times of June 24:

ABROAD—THE SMALL NATIONS MAY CALL THE TURN

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

Simple people have presumed that the four Governments represented at the parleys in Paris desire the same thing—peace—and, therefore, that in the end their conflicting minor interests would be harmonized in the kind of settlement best calculated to serve their major interest. The logic of the simple is very simple, indeed. You could hear it expressed any day last winter in American lunch counters, English pubs, French queues, around the news kiosks in Rome, even in the shivering bread lines of Vienna and Budapest. The reasoning ran that the powers with the biggest stake had to get the world into running order, and so they would finally agree on a formula which they figured would accomplish that end.

This is why evidence that they cannot agree causes shocked dismay everywhere. Secretary Byrnes' renewed demand for a general peace conference to deal with issues the Big Four cannot settle; the cumulative effect of almost daily reports of small clashes between Russian and American occupation forces wherever they meet; violence in Palestine and the currents of antipathy it sets in motion in the United States and Britain; the serial story of divergences in Germany, Manchuria, Korea, the sessions of the United Nations; the querulous tone of the press in nearly all the Allied countries toward the other Allies, the crescendo of anti-British and latterly anti-American propaganda in Moscow, reaching a climax yesterday in Eugene Tarle's blast in Red Star comparing Hitler Germany to "fascist" America striving to impose a Pax Americana on the order of the Pax Germania—all this creates an atmosphere more prewar than postwar.

SENSELESS TERROR

To the ordinary citizen, waiting for a go-ahead signal and getting nothing but fire alarms, the picture is both frightening and senseless. The impotence of the omnipotent to achieve what they are supposed to want, solidarity and peace, doesn't make sense from any point of view.

The contest over Trieste is typical. A disarmed and beaten country like Italy can do little to influence the decision of the Big Four or rebel against it when it is made. Yugoslavia possesses force enough to stage a coup, but Tito could not move unless Russia is ready to risk war over Trieste, which seem to the last degree unlikely. But the Yugoslav and Italian interests are only incidental to the impasse.

The gravity and danger of the situation arise from the fact that all such disputes are now considered in terms of great power rivalry. This is absurd, because there is a solution of the Trieste problem which would fairly satisfy the reasonable claims of the nations most concerned and thus have a chance of enduring and serving the cause of peace. Trieste is the product of the spheres-of-influence idea. It is the spectacular proof that wherever these spheres meet they clash and that a world so delimited is a world on the brink of war.

It is impossible to admit that any such problem is big enough to imperil the peace. The same is true of the problem of Palestine, which is of a different order and tougher, but surely soluble on some terms if two big powers, in this case the United States and Great Britain, will cooperate in seeking a settlement. It can be argued that the Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry was accepted as a sign of cooperation, and that the disorder today is due to the failure to carry out the measures the Commission agreed on. Mr. Bevin's Bournemouth speech added fuel to the flame by intimating that no imme-

diate steps would be taken to act on the recommendation to open the doors at once to 100,000 immigrants.

THE LARGER SOLUTION

But it is clear to any impartial observer that there must be a larger solution to the problem than this temporary expedient. The number of refugee Jews in Germany has been swelled in recent weeks by the influx of thousands fleeing from unbearable conditions in Poland and the East. These people cannot be left in Germany, nor can all be settled in Palestine even if 100,000 are admitted. It would ease the lot of the homeless Jews and make it easier for the Arabs to recede from their negative position if the American and British Governments offered to receive a second 100,000 in this country and the British Commonwealth.

This would merely ease the immediate pressure. It should be followed up by vigorous action by the great powers, supported by the United Nations, to protect the rights of Jewish citizens wherever they choose to live. Not many survivors of these ghastly years will choose to live in Europe, and the long-term problem of Palestine can only be solved within the framework of a Middle Eastern federation either by partition of the country, a solution unacceptable to Zionists and non-Zionists alike, or by the collaboration of Jews and Arabs in a self-governing state.

In the present explosive atmosphere, few on either side will listen to the appeals of Dr. Judah L. Magnes, president of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, for a state that is neither an Arab state nor a Jewish state but the state of Palestine, the binational country of two equal peoples. But it is self-evident that the future of the Jews and their security depend on agrement with the Arabs. In this, as in all the problems that stall the big peacemakers, it may soon be the turn of the small nations. The impotence of the omnipotent it matched by the power of the apparently helpless, if they have the will and the wisdom to work out their own solutions.

Sound Economics, Like Charity, Should Begin at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, the farmer and the farm worker are the most forgotten people in this Nation today. Yet they are the most important, for they produce food, and no one can do without food. In addition to food they also produce most of the raw materials for our clothing—cotton, wool, flax, leather, and so forth, and the law says you can not go without clothing. So the farmer is the most important producer in our Nation and he gets the least consideration.

It is time this country waked up and began to realize that the farmer is not going to keep on being treated like a stepchild and continue to work 12 and 14 hours a day to raise the products from which our daily food and clothing come. He is tired of being short-rationed on the things he does not raise on his own farm and has to buy. He is tired of seeing the grain and feed he worked so hard to raise given away to people in foreign lands who do not even say thank you—yes; they give it away and the American farmer can not even buy what he needs to make his crop. He cannot buy lard, meal, flour, sugar for his daily food needs. He can't buy sow-belly or bacon or even fresh beef, and if he starts out to kill his own cattle and share them with his neighbor he must have an OPA slaughtering permit.

The farmer is told to raise bigger and better crops, but he cannot get the farm machinery or the fertilizer. And because of the low price of farm products at the farm and the high price of labor, he cannot get the work done by hand. He is told to raise more cattle, hogs, and chickens, yet he cannot get the feed. There is no cottonseed meal or cake, there is no corn, there are no oats, there are practically no mixed feeds for either chickens or animals and should he be lucky enough to find a few tons he will also find that the price has more than doubled and he cannot afford to feed it to the stock and sell his cattle, dairy products, and chickens at the present prices.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken this up with the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration, and the Office of Economic Stabilization, in fact, everybody in Washington whom I thought might be able to help, and they all tell the same thing. They tell me that, with the exception of sugar, there are no ration quotas. They tell me that the other commodities are in free supply. Well, I want to know, "free to whom, Europe?" The American farmer cannot even find meal, shortening, and meat to buy, much less get it free. Who is to blame for this shortage? Is it UNRRA? Is it OPA? Is it the black market? Is it the Department of Agriculture? Or is it just plain stupidity, giving away more than we can produce and feed our folks at home? Whoever is to blame, the facts remain that there are not enough of the essential food and feed items to take care of our basic requirements here at home and give away the quantities we have been giving away.

I firmly believe that sound economics as well as charity should begin at home. I am not at all averse to giving all the help possible to the undernourished and underprivileged people of the world; in fact, I am in favor of giving them all we possibly can. But—I say but—Mr. Speaker, we should not give to a bunch of ungrateful foreigners when our own people and our own farm animals and work stock are not getting enough to eat to permit them to carry on the work of raising the food they and the rest of the world need. You must have fuel for the boiler if you are going to raise steam. You must have food—adequate, substantial plain food, such as shortening, meal, flour, and sugar—for the farmer if he is to work to produce the much-needed crops. And he must have corn, oats, hay, and mixed feeds for his work animals if they are to pull the plows. We ship millions of tons of grain abroad, more goes into the manufacture of alcohol, yet we cannot get enough grain for the farmer to feed his good old plow mule. It is a travesty, Mr. Speaker. When are we going to wake up and face the facts of life?

Mr. Speaker, do not get me wrong. I want to do everything we possibly can to help the other people of the world, but we must first see to it that there are no shortages of necessary food and feed items for our own people, especially the farm people who are producing this food. I ask the Members of this Congress to join me in seeing that the actual necessities of shortening, meal, sugar, and dry salt meat are made available to the people of the farm. Give the American farmer the food and tools to work with and he will do more than his part toward feeding the rest of the world. The farmer is our most important producer, and yet he is the lowest paid and gets least consideration. Let us do something for our producers of food.

Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 24 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 5), 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, last Friday it was my intention to state my position on the silver rider which was attached to the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill. Because of the prompt and gratifying assent which the Senate accorded to that bill with the appended rider, I refrained from saying anything on the subject. However, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which I had intended to make be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, in addressing myself to the silver rider to the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill I cannot for a moment be unmindful of the fact that we are dealing with a matter of the greatest delicacy. For, under the law, silver and gold are the Nation's only two monetary metals, the two metals upon which the country's entire financial structure is based. From these two money metals our entire financial position stems, both domestically and internationally. In considering this silver rider, therefore, it is essential, in my judgment, for us to pause long enough to review briefly some of the background of these monetary metals and some of the effects which enactment of this rider may have upon our general monetary position, particularly upon our monetary position in respect to silver.

Now we are all aware of that school of monetary philosophy which denies that these metals play any important role in our financial structure. This school contains a good many distinct segments. There is the segment which would fortify our currency issues and our bank deposits through stock piles of wheat and iron and cotton and rubber. This, of course, is the Irving Fisher segment. Then there is the segment which believes that Government fiat—with some vague form of indirect currency redeemability—is sufficient to maintain the public's confidence in its money. This is the segment with which Marriner Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve System, identified himself when he spoke of the respect he would pay to monetary orthodoxy and referred to "bankers and people who have an idea that there is some mystical form of security in gold." The most extreme of these segments is, of course, that

which subscribes to pure, unabashed currency management. The arch priest of this group, it seems to me, is none other than Mr. Lenin, who once said that the most direct road to the destruction of capitalism is through the debauchment of its currency.

Fortunately, however, the monetary history of our country displays a deep-rooted belief in the redeemability of the public's money as the ultimate test of its soundness. That monetary history also displays a considerable degree of continuity in its monetary policy. Of course, since 1933 we have denied the right of redemption in gold to our people. But there are still many of us in this body who anticipate a restoration of that right sooner or later. Redemption with respect to silver has not yet been taken away from our people; and so every holder of the $2,200,000,000 of silver certificates that are outstanding can, upon demand, obtain from the Treasury approximately seventy-seven one-hundredths of an ounce of silver for each and every dollar. In fact, every holder of the $24,000,000,000 of Federal Reserve notes which are outstanding could, if he saw fit, demand silver certificates dollar for dollar, or could even demand the silver which backs those certificates. And so I say that we have retained a considerable measure of our traditional belief in redeemability as the ultimate test of the soundness of our money.

Now let me briefly review the degree of continuity which our monetary history also displays. In 1785 it was the silver dollar which the Articles of Confederation established as our basic money unit. The Mint Act of 1792, however, provided that "the money of the United States shall be expressed in dollars or units." It then fixed the content of the dollar at 371¼ grains of pure silver. It made no reference to any other dollar. It did fix the weight of gold in the eagle, however, thus establishing the bimetallic system at a ratio of 15 to 1. Under this act two kinds of money—our silver money and our gold money—were linked together. Both these forms of money enjoyed precisely the same privileges under the law. In simple terms, this law provided that 15 times as many dollars in the form of gold coins would be minted and turned over to those who brought gold to the mint as would be minted and turned over in the form of silver dollars to those who brought an equivalent amount of silver to the mint.

The ratio as between gold and silver which the Mint Act of 1792 established was extremely close to the ratio in the commercial markets of that day. This act, however, deliberately overvalued silver slightly in order that the Nation might attract adequate supplies of silver. In consequence of this deliberate overvaluation of silver we added to our silver stocks and lost some of our gold for some years, notably to France, whose bimetallic ratio was approximately 15.69 to 1 from 1803 through 1833. In passing it should be noted that the average of 39 annual commercial ratios from 1795—when the United States coined its first gold coins—to 1833 was 15.6 to 1.

Under the act of June 28, 1834, a new monetary ratio as between gold and silver was set at 16.002 to 1. This ratio not only corrected the previous slight overvaluation of silver, but actually overvalued gold slightly. In part this modification was for the purpose of encouraging gold mining along the Alleghany Mountains; in part it was associated with the controversy that centered around the Second Bank of the United States.

It is therefore abundantly clear that throughout the first third of the last century gold and silver coins constituted the standard money of this country. In that period the position of silver under our monetary system was superior to that of gold. Of course, in that day, as in ours, there were the monometallists, who believed in the use of only one metal as the metallic backing for our currency. There were the monometallists who believed that only gold could serve that purpose—and they are still with us. There were the monometallists who believed that only silver could serve that purpose. Secretary of the Treasury Ingham, who served under President Jackson, was one of these. Secretary Ingham said at that time that "the standard measure of property should be made of a metal sufficiently abundant to enter into general circulation, determining values in small as well as large transactions." Nevertheless the bimetallic system prevailed in theory and in fact in this country for the first third of the last century and it has prevailed in theory or in fact in this country for a considerable part of the last century, as it has prevailed in this century, down to the present day.

It is worth noting, Mr. President, that under the act of June 28, 1834, the standard money of this country was the gold dollar of 25.8 grains of gold, gross weight, or 23.2 grains of gold net weight, and the silver dollar of 371.25 grains, net weight. The weight of the gold dollar remained substantially unchanged for 100 years—until 1934—when it was fixed at 15$\frac{5}{21}$ grains, gross weight, or 13$\frac{71}{100}$ grains, net weight. The silver dollar has remained utterly unchanged for over 150 years, at 371¼ grains, net weight.

Of course with the chaotic conditions which followed the Napoleonic Wars, with the adoption of the gold standard by Great Britain in 1816—notwithstanding the existence of the bimetallic standard in our own country as well as in France and the Latin Union — and the subsequent economic changes which the progress of the industrial revolution was causing throughout the world, extraordinary stresses and strains were imposed on the monetary systems of that time. And thus many changes of one kind or another—major changes or minor changes—had of necessity to be made in the monetary mechanisms of that period. In Great Britain, for example, the Bank Act of 1844, which to some extent set the pattern for our own Silver Purchase Act of 1934, was enacted. This act authorized the Bank of England to maintain reserves of 25 percent in silver and under that authority Great Britain held part of her metallic reserves in silver until 1853.

In the 1850's and 1860's the increased production of gold added greatly to these stresses and strains. In our own country, for example, the act of February 21, 1853, greatly weakened our bimetallic system by closing the mint to the free coinage of silver in fractional denominations and by limiting the legal-tender quality of these coins to $5. It is worth noting that this act of 1853 coincided not only as to time, but also as to content, with the exclusion of silver from the monetary stocks of the Bank of England in that year. Many such coincidences are of course to be noted in the monetary history of our country—coincidences which sometimes suggest to me that, while we announced our political Declaration of Independence in 1776, it was not until 1934—when we enacted the Gold Act of January 30 and the Silver Purchase Act of 1934—that we actually announced our monetary Declaration of Independence.

In 1861 specie payments were suspended in this country and until 1879 we operated on a paper money, or greenback standard. In 1873, however, a major blow at the bimetallic system of this country was struck when the so-called Crime of 1873 took place. I will not labor the patience of the Senate today by dwelling upon that episode—which actually took us off the bimetallic standard—except to quote one of the loudest champions of the monometallic gold standard, the late Professor Kemmerer, who said, "It is no credit to the intelligence of Congress in monetary matters that its members should have enacted legislation of such important future consequences without realizing what they were doing."

Of course the Bland-Allison Act of 1878 and the Sherman Act of 1890 contained some slight lip service to our bimetallic past. But from 1879 to the outbreak of World War I—a period of 36 years—we operated on the monometallic gold standard. This, of course, is a much shorter period than we operated on the pure bimetallic standard, which caused the late Lord Keynes to once say that the monometallic gold standard is almost a parvenu in the monetary structure of the world. But even for most of the period from 1879 to 1914, the act of November 1, 1893—which in fact almost bestowed a kiss of death on our bimetallic standard—still asserted this Nation's fundamental adherence to the bimetallic principle. Let me quote that important declaration of national monetary policy which is still the law of this land:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals, and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts. And it is hereby further declared that the efforts of the Government shall be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetallism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States and in the payment of debts."

Of course there are those today who—like their predecessors of the past—seek to destroy the use of silver in our monetary system and to place us upon the monometallic gold standard which bankrupt Great Britain adopted in 1816 and which she is now no longer capable of maintaining. It would be my observation that today no group is more blind, more obtuse, or more pernicious in its support of this philosophy than the highly subsidized Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy. It is such groups as this which for years have unsuccessfully—and how unsuccessfully—struggled to remove silver from the monetary system of this country, and in so doing to smash the link which this metal provides with the bimetallic background of this country.

From 1893 until 1934, however, the prestige of Great Britain, that now bankrupt champion of the monometallic gold standard—was so great and the adherents to her monetary policy—including the United States—were so numerous that those who believed in the restoration of silver to its historic position in the monetary structure of the world were able to make little headway. But the Presidential silver proclamations from 1933 on, the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 and the Silver Purchase Act of July 6, 1939, again placed this country squarely back on the road to bimetallism. Certainly the purchases which the Treasury made frome 1934 to 1942 have given notice to the world in no uncertain terms that we again stand unalterably on the historic bimetallic principle.

Certainly the Treasury's present stocks of gold and silver—roughly $20,200,000,000 of gold and almost 3,000,000,000 ounces of silver—constitute further notice to the world that we will hold fast to that bimetallic principle and to that bimetallic system for all the years to come. Certainly those stocks should cause some reflection and some doubt on the part of those who believe in currency management, as to the uncertain and unreliable judgment of currency managers in a world of collapsing currencies. Certainly our impregnable monetary position provides due notice to a bewildered world that it would do well to come back to the sound path of currency orthodoxy which we have pursued

in this country, and in particular to the principle of redeemability of currency, even though our redeemability is indirect in the form of the Federal Reserve notes which are based on gold and only actual in the case of our silver currency.

But there is another statement of American monetary policy to which attention should be called at this time. That statement is contained in the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 and reads as follows:

"Sec. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States that the proportion of silver to gold in the monetary stocks of the United States should be increased, with the ultimate objective of having and maintaining one-fourth of the monetary value of such stocks in silver.

"Sec. 3. Whenever and so long as the proportion of silver in the stocks of gold and silver of the United States is less than one-fourth of the monetary value of such stocks, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase silver, at home or abroad, for present or future delivery with any direct obligations, coin or currency of the United States, authorized by law, or with any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, at such rates, at such times, and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem reasonable and most advantageous to the public interest."

And so, Mr. President, having briefly reviewed our monetary record of over 150 years, I cannot refrain from stressing the delicacy which is contained in this silver rider to the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill. Nevertheless, my approach to this important subject is one of complete good will toward the silver manufacturers who have sought this legislation and whose customary sources of supply have dried up. For my part, I am willing to extend to these manufacturers all possible assistance in meeting the problems which now confront them, because I believe it is essential to assist this part of American industry as we should assist industry generally in its efforts to reach maximum productive capacity. But I am totally unwilling to give my consent to this rider before reminding this body and the silver-using manufacturing industry that this legislation is strictly an emergency matter, that it has received consideration only because of the extraordinary circumstances which now confront that industry, these circumstances consisting basically of a grossly inflated industrial consumption of silver, on the one hand, and a collapse in our domestic silver production and our importations of silver, on the other.

During the war, Mr. President, an enormous expansion in the use of silver in connection with our military production took place. During the war an enormous increase in the use of silver for civilian purposes—essential, semiluxury, and luxury purposes—also took place. Early in 1942, therefore, unprecedented distortions in the customary flow of silver into industry arose. In the summer of 1942 the War Production Board found it necessary to institute certain controls over the importation, distribution, and manufacture of silver. In the fall of 1942 the War Production Board requested special legislation of the Congress in order that it might properly carry out its policies, policies with which we all agreed and which consisted of the fullest use of every ounce of silver from every source—even the United States Treasury—for military production and for the maintenance, within the appropriate limitations of the war economy, of a wholesome flow of silver into civilian production.

Between September 1942 and April 1943, Senators GREEN, MURDOCK, and MCCARRAN offered legislation to the Congress intended to implement the policies of the War Production Board. In July 1943 the Congress passed the so-called Green Act which contained features from all three of these proposals, an act which received the overwhelming support of every shade of opinion in the Congress. Under the policies of the War Production Board, Mr. President, and under the authority which was contained in that legislation the silver manufacturing industry attained an unprecedented prosperity, a prosperity which it had never previously approached in all the years of its activity. Fortunately the extraordinary prosperity of that industry has continued to this very day. Now in order to demonstrate the full scope of this silver rider, it is necessary for me to briefly sketch some of the factors which have led up to it.

In the 10 years from 1931 through 1940 net industrial consumption of silver in this country averaged less than 25,000,000 ounces annually. From 1941 through 1945 it averaged around 115,000,000 ounces annually. It is expected that this consumption will continue around this figure during the next 2 years. The annual details of that consumption are as follows (in millions of ounces):

1931	24.3
1932	14.4
1933	10.8
1934	11.4
1935	5.2
1936	19.1
1937	27.7
1938	20.1
1939	44.6
1940	44.4
1941	80.0
1942	115.3
1943	120.0
1944	125.0
1945	140.0

Immediately prior to the war and until the distortions of the war economy caused a change in the situation silver-using manufacturers ordinarily obtained the bulk of their silver from imports. As a result of the Presidential proclamation of 1933 with respect to silver, the similar proclamations of subsequent years, and the Silver Purchase Act of July 6, 1939, manufacturers obtained virtually all of their silver from imports. Of course, beginning late in 1942 and continuing to this date, the policies of the War Production Board caused a diversion into the manufacturing industry of the silver production of the mines of this country. Before the War Production Board instituted this policy and dating back to 1933, this domestically mined silver was customarily sold by our miners to the United States Treasury. This action of the War Production Board greatly assisted these manufacturers. The abstention of the United States Treasury, since the beginning of the war, from its customary purchase program under the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 has likewise greatly assisted the manufacturing industry.

I would like to call the attention of this body at this point, Mr. President, to the fact that there has been no protest to date from any western Senator over the present flow of our domestic production into manufacturing use, nor has there been any protest from any western Senator over the present inactivity of the Treasury in the markets of the world. Were the Treasury today making its customary purchases of this domestic production, and were it now making those additional purchases which are directed by the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, we would, indeed, be faced with a hectic silver situation, and the enemies of silver would quickly discover what the present status of silver truly is, both as to supply and demand and as to price.

Last December, Mr. President, the Green Act—which, of course, was strictly a war measure—expired and the manufacturing industry lost an important source of supply. Under the authority contained in that act, the manufacturing industry drew upon the Treasury's monetary stocks of silver to the extent of 173,000,000 ounces. This amount constituted approximately 45 percent of its entire consumption for the full years 1943, 1944, and 1945. Imports of silver have also declined sharply in recent years, to a level of approximately 50,000,000 ounces in 1945 as against 134,000,000 in 1941. The full picture in respect to imports since 1941 is as follows (in millions of ounces):

1941	134.3
1942	108.0
1943	62.8
1944	51.3
1945	49.7

Now, Mr. President, you will, of course, appreciate the fact that this Government has not accumulated its reserves of silver as a stock pile for the convenience of silver manufacturers. This Government has accumulated its silver for monetary purposes only, in order to maintain the redeemability of its $2,200,000,000 of silver certificates which are outstanding and in order to meet the public need for silver coinage. We may or may not be near the peak of demand for silver certificates. Whether or not we are near that peak—as a casual glimpse at the statistics of this aspect of the matter might suggest—will depend on many factors, such as the national income, the price level, and our fiscal and monetary policies.

But in respect to our issuance of fractional silver currency over the next 2 years there is little doubt whatsoever. The Treasury's program covering the issuance of half dollars, quarters, and dimes is now running at the rate of about 75,000,000 ounces of silver a year. In the next 2 years, that program will require a further depletion of the Treasury's stocks of silver amounting to 150,000,000 ounces. And yet the total amount of unmonetized silver which the Treasury now holds amounts to less than 225,000,000 ounces. The time has therefore come, Mr. President, when we must consider carefully the further dissipation of the Treasury's silver stocks. Within a few years we might easily find ourselves much closer to the bottom of the monetary barrel than some of us would like to believe.

Nor, Mr. President, can we draw much encouragement from the silver production of our mines during the past few years. As a result of the enlightened policies in respect to silver which this Government initiated in 1933 and later, the silver output of our domestic mines rose from approximately 23,000,000 ounces in 1932 and 1933 to about 72,000,000 ounces in 1937. It still hovered at close to 70,000,000 ounces in 1940 and 1941. But during the war, while the silver-using manufacturing industry was enjoying an unprecedented boom—its consumption in those years consisting of an approximate 350-percent increase over its average consumption from 1931 through 1940—the mine output of silver in this country faded away to less than one-half of its output immediately prior to the war. The detailed figures as to our mine production of silver from 1941 through 1945 are as follows (in millions of ounces):

1941	72.3
1942	56.0
1943	40.8
1944	34.3
1945	29.9

And so, Mr. President, coming from a section of the country which understands the importance of the mining industry of this country to the national economy, I must say that there is little in this legislation which arouses my enthusiasm. I do not relish the thought of further drawings upon our monetary stocks of silver by private industry. I dislike the temporary check to the fructification of our national silver policy which this legislation will cause. And so, Mr. President, I shall vote for this silver rider to the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill only because it is of important value to the manufacturing industry during a difficult transitional period, because at least it meets the minimum needs of our mining industry,

and because I have the patience to wait another year or two to witness the complete fulfillment of the farsighted policies in respect to silver which the Congress adopted in the 1930's. Mr. President, I urge speedy approval of the silver rider to the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill.

OPA Paradox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein certain newspaper articles, I present for consideration an article by Mark Sullivan entitled "OPA Paradox," published in the Washington Post, and an editorial from the New York Times of June 24:

[From the Washington Post of June 24, 1946]

OPA PARADOX

(By Mark Sullivan)

The controversy now coming to a climax can be made clear by the coincidence of two events within 48 hours. On Wednesday of last week, Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach, in an administration drive for continuing the Office of Price Administration without material change, told the country that unless this is done there may be "a new cycle of wage demands and work stoppages." The public read that, and then, 2 days later, read an announcement from OPA itself. The OPA announcement was of an increase of 34 cents a ton in the price of coal. With careful detail, OPA explained that the increase was caused by the wage raise which the administration granted to Mr. John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers. (On the same day and other nearby days OPA announced other price increases in many other commodities for the same reason, wage raises.)

Little wonder if the public is confused by contradictory attitudes of the administration. Here is the administration granting wage raises—in the past, at least, promoting wage raises as a policy. And here is an administration agency, OPA, granting price increases as a result of the wage raises. At the same time the administration clamors for continuation of OPA—in order to avert price increases.

In this situation Mr. Chester Bowles can find a reason why his campaign for continuation of OPA without material change has seemed unconvincing to some of the public and to many in Congress. He and OPA flood the country with propaganda in behalf of that organization. But the country does not hear from Mr. Bowles or any other administration source any propaganda against wage raises. Confusion on the part of the public is increased when it hears Mr. Bowles' efforts to keep OPA unimpaired supplemented by the Congress of Industrial Organizations, which is a beneficiary of and demander of the wage raises which make price increases inevitable. A strong stand by Mr. Bowles and the administration against wage raises and wage demands would be more convincing to the public than a thousand appeals for continuing OPA unimpaired.

What the public has seen, so far, is a serial alternation—wage raises followed by price increases, followed by more wage raises, followed by more price increases. It is like that wheel of fortune, in this case misfortune, of which the late Major Bowes on his amateur radio hour used to say, "round and round she goes, and where she stops nobody knows."

Recently Mr. Chester Bowles has seemed to realize the awkwardness of his position. Reports say he has proposed to national heads of the big labor organizations that they suspend or prevent more wage demands during the near future. Even if Mr. Bowles should get such an undertaking his position would still be awkward. He would be demanding strong, statutory limitations on price increases, by continuation of OPA unimpaired; but, as respects more wage demands, he would be relying on a voluntary undertaking by the labor heads.

Anyhow, the national heads of the big labor organizations are obliged to be wary about agreeing to such a proposal. As the Nation-wide labor unions are organized, the national heads are not able to make undertakings binding upon local and constituent unions. As a rule, it is not the national heads who make wage demands, it is the constituent unions. A similar undertaking was procured from the national labor heads by President Roosevelt in December 1941, that there should be no strikes during the war. But there were strikes, many of them, including prolonged and repeated ones in the basic coal industry.

The relation between wage raises and price increases is close and intricate. The effects of OPA actions on recovery of industry to full production are likewise close and intricate. The extremely complex problems involved are not answered, nor even illuminated, by slogans which merely demand that OPA be continued without material change. On these problems Congress has had the light of prolonged hearings by committees and debate on the House and Senate floors. What conclusion Congress comes to is entitled to consideration. It apparently intends to go reasonably far toward writing such an OPA measure as President Truman would not be justified in vetoing.

[From the New York Times of June 24, 1946]

PRICE CONTROL PROBLEMS

One error in the price-control extension bills passed both by the House and Senate was the attempt to prescribe too many details. The reason for this error is plain. Congress wished to leave as little as possible to the discretion of the OPA administrators because it had come to distrust the way in which this discretion was exercised. Yet by leaving in too rigid restrictions or directions the congressional conferees could inadvertently supply those administrators with plausible alibis for not doing an effective job.

The most important problem that the conferees have to decide is apparently still before them. This is the formula for orderly decontrol. The conferees are reported so far to have adopted only the Senate provision that price ceilings must be removed from any product whenever its supply equals its demand. Such a provision would in itself do no harm, but it is so vague as to be almost meaningless. Supply and demand are never equal except at a price; and they are always equal at some price. Chester Bowles, in his statement last week objecting to practically every amendment in either the House or Senate bill, by implication admitted this when, in condemning this amendment among others, he declared: "There is no sure way to test whether supply is in balance with demand except to consider what would happen to prices if ceilings were removed." In other words, by keeping a commodity's price permanently under its free market price, whatever that may happen to be, the OPA under this amendment could keep supply below demand, and hence could retain price control, indefinitely.

To prevent the OPA from returning 9 months or a year from now with a demand for still further price-control extension, some definite provisions should be made for a gradual and orderly tapering off of price control during the present extension. This might provide for reasonable discretion by allowing OPA to choose among several courses. It might be allowed to decontrol either by (1) decontrolling the specific commodities listed in the Senate bill, or (2) decontrolling all commodities being produced in excess of 1940–41 levels as provided in the House bill, or (3) decontrolling as far as practicable not less than 8 to 10 percent per month by value of all commodities at present subject to price control. These alternative courses could be set down as general guides for the OPA administrators rather than as rigid mandates. In this way a compromise could be reached between the House and Senate standards for decontrol at the same time as the OPA administrators would be left with more discretion than either set of standards now leaves them to deal with situations as they arose.

Monopolies and Small Business—Address to the Tennessee Pharmaceutical Association at Memphis, Tenn., June 13, 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 17, 1946

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, on June 13, I had the privilege of addressing the annual meeting of the Tennessee Pharmaceutical Association at Memphis, Tenn. About 500 members attended the meeting. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address I delivered:

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have this opportunity of addressing the druggists of Tennessee. I recall very pleasantly, when I was commissioner of finance and taxation a short time in 1939, the effort we made to work out a single tax plan to cover all operations of a pharmacy or drug store. Some day I hope this plan may be accomplished. It should be. I have known your excellent executive secretary, Tom Sharp, for many years and we have many mutual legislative interests.

My message today is not concerned exclusively with the pharmaceutical business. Your problems are about the same as those of every other type of independent business.

Business generally is entering a new phase in the postwar period which is fraught with danger to the independent enterprise system. That applies whether it be retailer, wholesaler, or manufacturer. Greater concentration is in the offing unless something is done to offset this trend.

The magnitude of this past war can be credited with some of this trend. It was bigger than any previous conflict and required far greater effort to meet the herculean task to win it. Research has brought about many new conceptions and inventions and with it extension and expansion of business generally. The earning power of the people has been tremendous and with it a demand for civilian goods undreamed of in past experiences.

In the First World War only about 25 percent of the productive capacity of the

country was employed in making war machines and ammunition. It was a tiny war in comparison. Consumer goods were little affected and when that war was over there were not the problems which now confront this country. Even automobiles were manufactured as also other heavy merchandise of every description.

World War II was decidedly different. Better than 60 percent of the production was consumed with the manufacture of war machines and destructive ammunition in that global conflict. Very little civilian goods were manufactured outside of medicines, foods, and wearing apparel, and even these were short in many instances. Despite this, however, druggists and other retailers have benefited during the war years and still are reporting increased sales and satisfactory profits.

MONOPOLY A DANGER TO SMALL BUSINESS

What the future holds in store is another question. That will depend largely on the aggressiveness of druggists and other independent enterprises as well as the extent to which monopoly in production and distribution does not override them. This is one of the biggest problems with which distribution will be concerned. The country cannot possibly benefit through concentration of production and distribution in the hands of relatively few corporations, yet that appears to be on the horizon if I see the picture clearly ahead.

As a member of the House Committee on Small Business and through personal study of monopoly and economics, I can see that the independent enterprise system will be subjected to the severest test it has yet experienced. The large corporations have plans for expansion into sundry fields of activity foreign to their own lines of business. Larger plants are under consideration to produce sundry and varied commodities wholly outside of their regular line of production.

Manufacturers are becoming wholesalers and retailers, thus operating on a vertical integration plan from producer to consumer. In other instances manufacturers are indulging in horizontal integration to control a large number of plants producing varied products kindred to their own line and sometimes entirely distinct from their business in the past.

Retailers in some instances are reversing the picture through vertical operations upward to the manufacturing stage. In other instances retail corporations are taking over retail groups thereby lessening opportunities for individual initiative. And from what has been exposed in the trial of the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. in the Federal court on charges of monopoly and violation of the Sherman antitrust law there is little chance for the single store merchant to compete notwithstanding his efficiency, if such operations are not curbed.

Some of these retail corporations operating nationally or over a wide area are even establishing "associate dealers." They are supposed to be independent operators yet are supplied and largely dominated by the company through which they are operating as lessee. This is taking place in the drug trade, oil filling stations, automobile accessory field, and the rubber manufacturing industries. They are not masters of their own business, but subject to cancellation, as has occurred, whenever the will of these large operators so determine.

This horizontal and vertical integration of business is one of the greatest evils confronting the United States and individual initiative. It does not take a vivid imagination to realize the ultimate outcome of this procedure. It will mean the concentration of business of all types, whether production or distribution, in the hands of relatively few corporations.

Let me give you a concrete illustration. Three of the largest rubber manufacturing companies operate some 1,600 stores supposedly to dispose of their own production. These are the Firestone, Goodyear, and Goodrich rubber companies. In the instance of the Firestone Co., it handles merchandise that competes with 17 different types of retail businesses, drug items included. The others operate on a like basis.

What is to stop them, for instance, from attacking one line of retail business with destructive prices to make it so hot for competing merchants that they cannot operate profitably? It is readily possible and probable they will destroy many single-line merchants. The latter have but one class of kindred merchandise to sell, and if they cannot realize a return above their operating costs they are doomed. What is to prevent vertical integrated companies of this type from attacking one line after the other?

They need no profit in any class of merchandise handled because they can absorb such losses in the sale of other merchandise. They can also operate such stores without any profit and pass the loss on to the manufacturing business in order to establish these stores to the point where they will pay their own way. In the meantime, however, the losses endured are deductible from their income-tax returns.

The single-line merchant has no such cushion on which to fall back. He must make his profits, build up a nest egg for his old age, educate his children, and buy insurance from the profits of the one store. He is powerless to combat this integration notwithstanding his efficiency and ultimately will be forced out of business. He can, of course, enter the employ of these large companies, as many already have, and thus make this a nation of clerks.

There is need to check the unfair competition which has been practiced in the past as illustrated in the case of some of the large chain stores. We need a law like that proposed by Congressman PATMAN of Texas, chairman of the House Committee on Small Business. Under H. R. 4200, secret price transactions in which some of the big operators have discriminatory price deals for the few which act detrimentally against small companies will be barred.

There is need for another bill—H. R. 4201—which seeks to amend the Internal Revenue Code to check the operations of stores by large corporations at a loss. These tactics enable the large corporations to enter any city, conduct stores without regard to legitimate merchandising methods, take a heavy loss and then charge off such losses on their income tax returns. That not only enables them to destroy competition to gain a monopoly but employs the Internal Revenue Act as a weapon to accomplish that result.

Any of these multiple store corporations can do the same thing and no doubt have by breaking into a market, sell at extremely low prices to create an impression on the public that through mass buying and distributing they can undersell the single store merchant. Whatever losses are suffered can be deducted from income tax returns or from stores elsewhere which have been profitable.

A vast number of stores in a system with large sales volume does not constitute efficiency. That is demonstrated by authentic figures which show that 38 out of 44 different lines of business the independents have a lower overhead per $100 of sales. The only reason they have been able to grow has been due to their ability to force price concessions or other considerations such as those outlined in the testimony of the A. & P. trial. The fact they require these discriminatory favors is "proof positive" as is said over the radio that they must depend on other considerations than fair retail prices to obtain a net profit over expenses.

THE EVIL OF GREAT CONCENTRATIONS

We must decide very quickly what sort of country we want to live in. This Nation was founded and built by men who believed in individualism. It has grown under a system carried on largely by individual capital. The increased concentration of economic power is dooming free enterprise. The present trend of great corporations to increase their economic power is the antithesis of meritorious competitive development. It is no accident that we now have big government, big labor unions, and big business. The concentration of great economic power in a few corporations necessarily leads to the formation of large Nation-wide unions. The development of the two necessarily leads to big bureaus in the Government to deal with them. Local economic independence cannot be preserved in the face of consolidations such as we have had during the past few years. The control of American business is steadily being transferred from local communities to a few large cities in which central managers decide the policies and the fate of the far-flung enterprises they control. Millions of people depend helplessly on their judgment. Through monopolistic mergers the people are losing power to direct their own economic welfare. When they lose the power to direct their economic welfare they also lose the means to direct their political future.

The records of the War Production Board show that approximately 75 percent of all prime war controls were handled by 100 corporations. Furthermore the large firms were not doing much subcontracting, and most of the subcontracts which they did let out went to other large corporations. In 1944 the large manufacturers, representing only 2 percent of the total in the United States, accounted for 62 percent of total employment.

The recent merger record is alarming. During the 3 years before 1944 there were 832 acquisitions of large major competitors. Some of them are: American Home Products, 33 acquisitions; Borden Co., 9 acquisitions; General Foods Corp., 8 acquisitions; Jones & Laughlin, 5 acquisitions; United States Steel Corp., 4 acquisitions; National Dairy, 331 acquisitions in 9 years.

Most of these were accomplished by purchasing the physical assets of their competitors. This is the recent device of avoiding the Clayton Act.

Let's see what's happening to our free competitive system. According to a report by the Federal Trade Commission, three companies control 78 percent of United States production in copper. In lead mining, four companies control 80 percent. In farm implements, six companies control 80 percent of manufacturing. In dry ice, two companies control 70 percent. In rubber tires, four companies sold nearly 93 percent of all tires sold during 1943. Four companies control 92 percent of the soap business. Similar situations exist in other industries.

The statistical evidence also shows that economic concentration has been rising steadily in this country for over four decades. In 1909, the 200 largest nonfinancial corporations owned one-third of the total assets of all nonfinancial corporations. By 1929, they had increased their ownership to 48 percent and by the thirties to 55 percent.

During the war, concentration was pushed up to even higher levels, primarily as a result of the fact that the military agencies awarded the great bulk of their prime contracts to a small number of giant corporations. The 100 largest corporations held no less than 75 percent of the active prime contracts which were outstanding in September 1944. Obviously, this meant an increase in concentration over prewar levels.

The extent of the wartime gains by big business is shown in recent information compiled by the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

Large firms, employing more than 500 workers, increased their share of manufacturing employment from 48 percent of the total in 1939 to 62 percent in 1944. Most of these gains took place in the very largest concerns—those employing more than 10,000 workers. These giant firms increased their share of manufacturing employment from 13 percent in 1939 to 31 percent in 1944.

In other words, we find that in 1944 large firms, with over 500 workers represenetly only 2 percent of all manufacturing concerns in the United States and yet accounted for 62 percent of the total manufacturing employment. And the largest of these large firms—those with 10,000 workers or more—represented only one-tenth of 1 percent of the total number of manufacturing concerns and yet accounted for 31 percent of the manufacturing employment.

The statistical evidence thus seems clear on these two points:

1. There has been a long-term increase in the position and power of big business in the United States.

2. During the war this trend was given a sharp upward boost as a result of the centralization of prime contracts.

As to the future, I think we may expect even further increases in economic concentration. On every side we see that large firms are using their war-swollen financial reserves to buy up small firms, many of which had been their competitors in peacetime years. If this does not mean the disappearance of the free-enterprise system, I would like to know what it does mean. From 1940 through 1945 there were some 1,000 recorded cases of acquisitions and mergers in manufacturing alone. Most of these have taken place in the last 2 years. The trend has moved almost straight up since VJ-day and now resembles the sharp upward sweep which prevailed after the last war.

A few examples will illustrate the widespread extent of the current merger movement. One large pharmaceutical house has absorbed 19 concerns since 1940, including two dairies, one coffee plant, and one bakery. Large liquor concerns have been very active in acquiring small distillers, and have also entered the winery field on a wide scale. Ten liquor companies acquired 37 small firms, or an average of nearly four acquisitions per company. Two of the largest liquor concerns between them gained control of 15 companies, consisting of eight distilleries, five wineries, one brewery, and one carbonated water firm. In specialty-food products, two nationally known concerns have acquired 15 small businesses since 1939. One large-scale dairy corporation has acquired 12 small companies in this period, including a brewery, a fishery, and a canning plant. A leading can-manufacturing company has acquired eight concerns, including firms in the chemical, fiber container, paper cup, bottle cap, can machinery, and plastic industries. In the petroleum industry one firm has absorbed six smaller concerns. Similar examples could be cited for most of the Nation's other industries.

REMEDIES FOR SITUATION

This obviously raises the question of what can be done about the situation. We all know that economic concentration leads inevitably to some form of collectivism—to facism, socialism, or communism. It is a historical fact that every industrial nation which has become highly concentrated has succumbed to one or another of these forms of collectivism. In this connection I would like to call your attention to the abundant evidence which is now being compiled on the vital role played by big business in the development of fascism in Germany, Italy, and Japan.

There is no reason whatsoever for assuming that the United States is a special case and can automatically escape this historical trend. Therefore, if we wish to prevent collectivism in this country and preserve the free enterprise system, we must take positive steps. To just sit back and let this process of concentration continue in the future as it has in the past will be to sign the death warrant of the free enterprise system.

In my opinion the Congress of the United States should put into effect a four-point program in addition to the other measures I have mentioned.

First. It should strengthen the antitrust program of the Federal Government. This means several things. It means adequate staff and personnel for the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission to do a real job. In this connection, I might point out that the Sherman Act has been on the statute books for 56 years and yet, because of inadequate appropriations and lack of enforcement, economic concentration, as has already been noted, has risen steadily throughout this entire period. The antitrust acts are still on our books, but economic concentration is higher than ever before in our history.

In addition, we must strengthen the antitrust program by closing the loopholes now existing in the antitrust laws. The most important loophole is the one which permits big business to buy up small firms, without any governmental restraint or review, as long as they purchase only their assets and not their stock. Senator O'MAHONEY and I have introduced a bill in the Congress which would make the acquisition of assets subject to the same legal provisions which now relate to the acquisition of stock.

Second. The vast amount of usable Government-owned surplus plants and facilities should be disposed of to independent, competitive businesses rather than to monopolistic corporations. The Federal Government now has the means, in the form of this surplus property, to put the tools of production into the hands of businessmen who will use them to produce more and more goods at lower and lower prices. Frankly, I personally do not know what the situation is in regard to the disposal of these Government-owned facilities. And I do not think that anybody else in Washington has the answer. The disposal agencies should be prevented by Congress from selling most of this valuable equipment to big business.

Third. The Government should promote its small business program with the utmost vigor. One way to prevent the growth of big business is to encourage small business. Small firms are traditionally aggressive and enterprising. They have aptly been termed the "yeas in the economy." They create employment and production by putting new products on the market and selling them at low prices.

At the same time small business faces many serious problems. Studies have shown that from one-third to one-half of small businesses which are in a sound financial condition experience difficulty in obtaining loans from banks. Small business is traditionally in need not only of financial but also of scientific, technical, and management assistance. The Federal Government has embarked upon a peacetime program to provide these various types of aid to small business. This program should definitely be expanded and enlarged.

Fourth. Finally, I propose that a study be made by a congressional committee of the best ways to meet this big business problem. I do not think that at the present time we have all the answers. Economic concentration is an extremely complicated problem. It takes a wide variety of forms in different industries.

The solution will not be easy, but I feel that Congress should explore all of the possible solutions which are consistent with the free enterprise system and the democratic way of life. The best business and economic minds in the country should be put to work in developing, for the consideration of Congress, practical and concrete solutions to this problem. This work should get under way immediately. Time is as important now in the winning of the peace as it was in 1942 in the winning of the war. Every passing day more than three formerly independent manufacturing firms are swallowed up by big business. Concentration has reached such heights that we can no longer afford the luxury of merely talking about the problem. We must have action. But that action must be intelligently guided. It is for that reason the Small Business Committee of the House is going into the problem and hopes to obtain from the business and economic world the best ideas which can be developed for the solution of this—the Nation's No. 1 domestic problem.

The British Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Hamilton Fish, of New York, before House Banking and Currency Committee on Monday, June 3, 1946:

Every argument advanced for the British loan applies equally to loans for Soviet Russia, France, and other foreign nations. Even the sponsors of the British loan without collateral assert the chances of repayment are slim. We would be giving away our national heritage for a mess of pottage—throwing the Treasury doors wide open to the world. It amounts to pipe-lining or syphoning our wealth into Europe.

Judging from the past the British loan will not be repaid. Certainly there is no assurance of repayment. What right has Congress to give away the people's money without their consent? Every poll taken shows 80 to 90 percent of the people against it. Why—because of common sense, sound judgment, and patriotic motives. I anticipate that numerous Members of Congress will be defeated on election day and possibly in the primaries for voting for this fraudulent loan which is nothing more than a camouflaged continuance of the lend-lease. I know in New York State that it will be a vital issue in the congressional campaign and that a number of veterans' organizations are already sharpening their political knives.

The giving of billions of our money to foreign nations without the consent of the American people is bound to be a paramount issue this fall.

Are the Members of Congress and the people back home to remain silent in peacetime as the administration shovels and pitchforks billions of our people's money into England, Russia, and other foreign nations?

President Truman said "I think Great Britain is entitled to the type of government that Britain wants." Certainly, but that is not the issue. Shall we contribute to help end capitalism, nationalize industry, and destroy private enterprise? Are we to finance Laski's Social Revolution in England and to spread

world communism by loans to Soviet Russia? I see no reason for the United States being forced to pay billions for the right to trade in any part of the British Empire. It would be bad in precedent and principle and would not pay off under any circumstance. We need not worry over our trade with India or Egypt as it is doubtful if they will remain long as a part of the British Empire.

How can we prevent or head off inflation, reduce taxes, or balance the Budget if we finance Europe by virtual outright grants? Let's stop the hypocrisy and fraud upon the people and call these loans by their right name—gifts or grants. Loaning money is a poor road to international friendship.

The British export-import trade has reached a level of $3,500,000,000, or considerably higher than anticipated when a loan was first sought. Britain is already grabbing up the trade and commerce in Argentina due to our fantastic interference with her domestic affairs. We are financing Great Britain our keenest competitor. By loaning or giving away our money we develop competitive industries in England—steel, cutlery, pottery, farm equipment, including most industrial production, to undersell and eliminate our American products from the world markets and probably to help encroach on our own and thereby eventually shut down our own mills and factories. Most economists believe that there will be a world-wide economic depression and financial panic in 5 years, after production has gone beyond consumption, both in America and Europe. In that event there will be no interest payments in 5 years and probably never. To that extent I submit the British loan is a fraud on the American people. We are all hot and bothered about paying the miners a welfare fund of seventy millions, or increasing the pay for our own wage earners, but we rush in to become an international Santa Claus and distribute billions of our people's money without their consent, to Britain and Soviet Russia, to promote socialism and communism, and to increase cutthroat competition for our own export trade, in South America, Europe, and the Far East.

We charge our own war veterans 4 percent on their small loans, but the administration is seemingly willing to lend billions without collateral at 2 percent to foreign nations and even the 2 percent does not begin for 5 years. By that time the Labor Party may be out of power and the new cabinet may repudiate the entire loan.

I do not blame the British for taking all the easy money that they can get out of us. The blame is on the administration and the Congress for jumping at the British bait of free trade and making suckers out of the American people without their knowledge or consent. We start by being Uncle Sap and end up by being Uncle Shylock.

The New York Times of May 20 published a dispatch from its Rome correspondent revealing a secret agreement between Great Britain and Soviet Russia giving Russia a free economic hand in the Balkan nations in exchange for the Soviet's approval of a large measure of British control over Italian trade and commerce. This secret agreement is positive proof that Great Britain is looking after its own commercial interests and does not care a tinker's damn about opening up or extending any world markets to us, which is the heart of our loan agreement. As Mr. Eric Johnston stated it before the Senate committee: "Our system can only flourish and grow in an expanding world economy * * * We want an expanding economy and the British loan is part of that expanding economy."

I hope the House committee will not report this loan agreement until it has checked on the British-Soviet secret agreement on Italy and the Balkans.

Old-Age Pension Legislation Needed—We Should Borrow From Great Britain in Order To Help the Old Folks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, announcement was recently made that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives was going to submit some proposed legislation which would be of help to our aged citizens. All of us will be very grateful for this proposed action. Some of us have hoped for several years that we would be able to vote for such legislation.

In this morning's mail I received a communication from H. H. Borgen, one of my well-known constituents at Duluth, Minn., dealing with this very subject. There is certainly need for legislation that will increase payments to our aged people. For years they have been receiving very inadequate assistance and with the increased cost of living, they find it increasingly difficult to eke out an existence on the meager payments that are made them. Mr. Borgen says in part:

It is hard to understand that Congress knowing the situation of the old folks will refuse to act; such acting by Congress seems almost inhuman.

Congress is there to serve the people. Congress is always ready to dish out money, domestic and foreign except to the 10,000,000 fathers and mothers of our own Nation. Distinguished persons are sent out to investigate conditions all over the world, but nothing is mentioned about our own people, that cannot earn anything.

Prices are now doubling on everything, but no increase is proposed for our old folks.

Whether or not you agree with everything Mr. Borgen says, he is certainly right about the policy of the administration to do everything that can be done in foreign countries and overlook our own people.

Just now we are considering the British loan and I think it in order to say that I agree with Mr. Borgen in his views to the effect we had better do something for the people at home.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I have another letter from one of my constituents which gives some very pertinent information and which information will be more than helpful to the Ways and Means Committee. This letter reads as follows:

I want to tell you about our case during the depression in 1932. Mr. Blank did not work for 6 years, and had three small children. Then he got into steel plant so we managed to pay for our five-room house.

Now he is 65 and has to go off his job. He will get $35 a month from social security and is allowed to make only $14.99 each month besides. We still have tax to pay, coal to buy, live, and at the price of food is now, and a little for clothing—can you tell us how we are going to do it?

After looking over the conditions described in this correspondence, do you not think, Mr. Speaker, that it is perfectly proper to suggest that we apply to Great Britain for a loan in order to help some of our own people here who are entitled to a little gratitude from those who are active in running the affairs of state? I know, Mr. Speaker, that this idea of giving away our public funds to other countries makes the "do-gooders" very popular in the other countries. The other countries will no doubt give them gold medals, diamonds, bracelets, and other gifts, including perfume and fine raiment. I am opposed to this British loan, Mr. Speaker, because those who advocate it ought to do something for the American people—just for a change. Great Britain has tremendous resources in this country. It was not long ago that Philip Murray or some CIO leader, appealed to the labor government in Great Britain to help settle the General Motors strike at Detroit, Mich. He did so because Great Britain owns a lot of General Motors stock. If we make this loan to Britain, then the first thing we know Great Britain will buy up all of our automobile factories and perchance move them to London and put the boys over here out of business.

Seriously, it occurs to me that those people in the United States who are anxious to carry on these financial dealings and make loans to Britain, ought to have a chance to do so rather than to ask the United States to make this loan direct. I would advocate a loan drive so that all of our people who want to invest their money in bonds could subscribe for a loan to Britain so that they could loan their money direct to the British Empire and make this proposition a private financial transaction. That would be better than to have the United States Government make a direct loan. In this way, everybody would be pleased and happy and Great Britain would get what she wants.

Don't Blame OPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal, dated June 19, 1946, and entitled "Don't Blame OPA":

DON'T BLAME OPA

The speculation now is not whether inflation will come but how bad it is going to get. The alarm of that unidentified Government economist concerning the present price spiral merely points up what anyone who ventures out upon the street knows—that, relentlessly, it is taking more and more money to get less and less.

Despite this, Congress appears determined to put the OPA through the grinder. Whatever is left, if anything, will be hardly more than a shadow of a price-control agency. Even now, with subsidies being terminated and with industries granting wage increases on the basis of price-boost pledges, the OPA has lost much of its vigor.

But let's remember that the OPA is not to blame for the surge of higher prices now hitting us all. The Washington correspondents are too prone to say, for instance, "OPA is ordering an 11-cent increase in price of a pound of butter." Yes, "OPA is ordering * * *." But the writers neglect to explain that the increase is a direct result of Congress' refusal to continue the Federal subsidy to butter producers, and that without that subsidy and without a price boost there just wouldn't be any butter. How, then, can we blame the OPA?

Tremendous pressure has been exerted on the agency either to give or go down. Attempting to save something of itself, it has given—but the cry is for more and more. The OPA has not deserted the Nation; on the contrary, it is the one being deserted.

By whom? Answer that question yourself.

OPA and the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable propaganda on the subject of OPA, and if one were to believe all that is said in favor of retention of this agency, the impression is gained that all of the people are unanimously for keeping it.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting two letters from constituents who are frank and honest as to their reactions about the effectiveness of OPA as presently administered:

KENOSHA, WIS., *June 14, 1946.*

Congressman LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
First Congressional District, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

AN APPEAL FROM A WORRIED HOUSEWIFE

DEAR SIR: I am leaving the house this morning in a very discouraging frame of mind—in search of food.

Not being faced with this particular problem, you probably do not realize what it means to plan meals for a family of five these days. My husband does manual labor—a great deal of heavy lifting, etc., and the meals he has been served these past weeks are not conducive to continued good health. Here, for instance, is part of our menu for the week:

Meat, once this week, which by the way was slipped to me from behind the counter by my butcher when no one was looking.

Breakfast: Orange juice, 2 slices of toast with butter used sparingly, and tea. Bacon once this week. Canned fruit just not available, and fresh fruit almost as bad.

My husband carries his lunch, which this week has consisted of cheese and/or egg sandwiches, dill pickles and/or tomato, cake or cookies.

Dinner last night: Soup, cheese and tomato sandwiches, salad, and dessert. Dinner the night before, fried potato cakes, pork sausage (which we definitely do not like at any time), salad, and dessert.

For a laboring man I do not consider the continual serving of wieners and sausage (which seem to be plentiful—but why) the basis of a healthy meal after a hard day's work.

This morning I am completely out of butter, and if I am not successful in obtaining the customary ½- or ¼-pound it will make for interesting sandwiches for tomorrow's lunch.

In this, what used to be "this grand country of ours," it is hard to believe that we are being denied bread, butter, and meat, the really essentials of proper eating. It was horrifying to read of the bread lines in Europe. It is more horrifying to actually have them here.

With the thousands of letters our Congressmen receive daily, and the many important issues facing them, it is probably wishful thinking on my part to hope that my letter will reach your attention. However, feeding a family properly is important to housewives, and I am sure this problem is facing all housewives of today.

Sincerely yours.

(MRS.) MABEL J. BRITTLE.

P. S.—As a precautionary measure, my shopping list today includes a bottle of vitamin tablets.

RACINE, WIS., *June 7, 1946.*

Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: After reviewing my personal record of expenditures for groceries, including meats, for the past several years, I felt it advisable to inform you of the actual costs per month and the trend which shows that present, we are paying out 55 percent more for food during 1946 than we paid during 1940.

	Per month
1940	$40.25
1941	44.31
1942	50.28
1943	54.56
1944	52.00
1945	58.13
1946	62.40

There has been no change in the number in our family during this time and consequently is comparable for each year as to the volume of food consumed.

With all of the black markets that we hear about and the difficulty to obtain sufficient food for one's family, it seems to me that we certainly could be no worse off without the OPA than we are with its controls.

I, for one, certainly want to get as much for my money as it is possible to get, and I think that if OPA were abolished that prices would level off after the supply caught up with the demand.

I also believe our labor laws need revising so as to make unions as responsible as employers under collective-bargaining agreements. I believe that strikes against public utilities, against essentials to daily life such as food and fuel delivery, against public transportation and against Government itself should be barred by law, and that a workable and permanent system of mediation and arbitration should be established to guarantee fair settlements in these areas if collective bargaining fails.

Sincerely,

E. G. SHERIFF.

The Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 18, 1946

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it may not be inappropriate at this time to quote what Daniel Webster had to say in 1847 in reference to the Supreme Court of the United States:

The American people, if they are wise, will ever cherish it as their most valuable possession, since its duration will be coexistent with that of the Constitution, of which it is the sole interpreter. The decisions of this tribunal have in general commanded public respect and inspired public confidence. Great talents and great learnings have adorned its bench. Some of its judgments on questions of great magnitude have manifested unsurpassed ability. Let us hope that its future may resemble its past, and that the same learning and dignity, the same integrity and firmness, which have characterized its decisions in times past, may also distinguish them in times to come.

Flour Millers and Bakers Have Common Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I know that it will be of interest to the Members of the House to read the views of Harry A. Bullis, of Minneapolis, on the wheat, flour, and bread situation which critically confronts this country. Mr. Bullis is one of the leading authorities in the milling industry, and his remarks, which follow, generally reflect the opinions of millers.

WHAT THE MILLER SEES AHEAD

(Comments of Harry A. Bullis, president of General Mills, Inc., in Chicago, Ill., Monday, June 17, 1946)

The unprecedented shortage of wheat flour in the United States today is the result of a combination of factors stemming from World War II, and the lack of foresight on the part of the Federal administration in Washington during the past crop year.

The flour shortage and the current regulations limiting domestic use of wheat and requiring 80-percent extraction flour greatly overshadow any other considerations and factors affecting the milling and baking industries today. They completely dominate the current, short-time view. However, at the same time that the miller and baker are exerting every energy to improve current conditions, we should be studying the long-time picture to ascertain where our industries are headed after the present acute shortages have been ended.

The short-term outlook is certainly not encouraging. The immediate prospects for high production in the milling and baking industries are not good.

Looking back to the beginning of the crop year 1945–46, we had sufficient wheat in this country to take care of all normal domestic requirements, plus the 400,000,000 bushels of wheat later committed for export for relief feeding in Europe and Asia, and plus a reasonable carry-over on July 1, 1946. These supplies, however, were dissipated because tremendous quantities of wheat were allowed to be fed to animals during the crop year.

During the war, our fighting armies in the field needed meats, fats, and dairy products, so the conversion of grain to these products was a desirable policy. During these years our grain crops were sufficiently generous, and our carry-over sufficiently large so that we could pursue such a program without endangering future supplies.

An entirely different economy came with VE-day, bringing a reduction of the number

of fighting men in the field and the obligation of feeding millions of liberated peoples. The call was for more grain products, particularly wheat. If at this point, or shortly thereafter, the price relationship had been altered between wheat and meat, wheat would have been removed from the feed-grain category. Had this been done, we would not have been in our present position of having to strain our economy in meeting our obligations to the starving people of the world.

Administration action, War Food Order 144, and subsequent changes came too late. They also failed to get to the root of the difficulty, and rather than curbing the feeding of wheat to animals they curbed the consumption of wheat products by humans and created still more difficulties in meeting our foreign commitments.

Under the regulations recently proposed by the Department of Agriculture for the coming year, the maximum domestic production for the milling industry would be 85 percent of last year. As you are well aware, June will not approach the 75 percent allowed under current orders. The following months, under new crop conditions, will see a marked improvement, but unless the new crop is utilized more efficiently than the crop just past there is the possibility of another deficit necessitating cut-backs prior to the 1947 harvest. This will depend mainly on the quantity of wheat available this year, and on whether animal feeding of wheat is greatly reduced. Unless this is done, we can be sure that this year's experience will be repeated.

The Government crop report of June 1 estimates that another bumper crop is in sight for this year. Although it is 100,000,000 bushels under the record-breaking crop of last year, it is still considerably in excess of our long-time average.

As of July 1, 1945, wheat supplies totaled 1,404,000,000 bushels. For the coming crop year the wheat supply, that is the crop plus carry-over, is now estimated at about 1,100,000,000 bushels The winter wheat crop is practically assured and is now estimated at 775,000,000 bushels. Actual harvesting yields indicate that the final figure may be even higher. Spring wheat is estimated at 250,000 bushels. Good growing conditions can increase this figure, but on the other hand, lack of proper moisture could easily make the total out-turn fall below the June 1 estimate, which is arrived at by using the estimated acreage as of March 1 based on a 79-percent condition as of June 1.

Therefore, using the estimated supply of 1,100,000,000 bushels as of July 1, we go into the new crop year with prospects of approximately 300,000,000 bushels less than we had last year.

Secretary Clinton Anderson's preliminary budget of 1946-47 wheat usage is as follows:

	Bushels
Domestic food	450,000,000
Export	250,000,000
Feed	150,000,000
Seed	85,000,000
Industrial usage	2,000,000
Total	937,000,000

Because of the bonus program, the wheat carry-over as of July 1 this year obviously is going to be reduced below its normal level. Unless a similar program is instituted next year, the carry-over on July 1, 1947, will almost surely be sharply higher than on July 1, 1946, due to the natural inclination of the producer to carry some wheat on the farm from one year to the next as insurance against crop failures. Therefore, available wheat flowing into commercial channels may be somewhere in the neighborhood of 50,000,000 bushels less than the actual production of the 1946 crop. With the wheat production this year approximately 1,000,000,000 bushels, it would appear that available supplies for domestic consumption or export will approximate 950,000,000 bushels. The seed figure cannot be reduced if we are to plant a crop in 1947.

This close adjustment between requirements and available supplies indicates a difficult period ahead which may force further adjustments in the use of wheat for domestic use and export.

We realize we have been called upon to make sacrifices, but sacrifices, if they will bring a speedy end to the present world famine situation, must be accepted in good faith. The duration of these sacrifices depends on one major factor—the size and utilization of the world-wide crop.

However, there is reason to hope that we may be at the darkest point today. For some weeks, the prospect for North American wheat and other cereal crops has been improving.

While reliable world production statistics are not available, it is certain that in Europe and in other areas of war devastation, additional acreage is being tilled more intensively this year than last. Furthermore, with the present attractive world prices, there is the maximum incentive for increased production in the Argentine, Australia, and other surplus-producing countries. We can also hope that in this year of need, Providence will provide the necessary favorable growing conditions. Droughts in the Mediterranean Basin and in parts of the Southern Hemisphere have already been broken.

So I can state that, until the final crop outcome is known, we still have the possibility of a substantial increase in the amount of wheat flour available for domestic use during the coming year.

It would also appear that it has been demonstrated to practically everyone that the required milling of 80 percent extraction flour does not add any net supply of wheat for famine relief. The reduction in the millfeed supplies for our animal population simply results in farmers feeding at least an equivalent amount of additional wheat to their livestock. Actually, aside from other disruptive influences, the direct feeding of this wheat is not as efficient as the feeding to livestock of the bran and other feed fractions now being included in our flours and breads. If by this fall, the balance between wheat supplies and minimum demands has been improved by increased world production, with all logic pointing to the desirability of eliminating the 80 percent extraction order, there is reason for hope that a concerted effort of our industries might bring this about.

When the turn comes, and high-quality ingredients are available in adequate quantities, the baking and milling industries will face the greatest opportunity they have ever enjoyed. This seems certain; the principal uncertainty is how long we will be obliged to wait. In the interval, this is the most dramatic time we have ever had to bring home to the public the vital place which wheat and bread play in human nutrition. When the chips are down, the call is for bread. There can be built at this time a foundation upon which, in the future, the prejudice against and neglect of enriched white bread and other baked goods can be overcome. Today, bread is in the headlines. This is the time to point out to the American public the great value and importance of bread as a food. Anything that we as a combined industry do to drive home this appreciation of bread, will be money and effort well spent to insure our rightful share of the consumer's food dollar for the future.

The attitude of the consumer, and primarily the housewife, toward bread and other baked foods in the years of plenty beyond this crisis, will in large measure determine the growth and prosperity of the milling and baking industries. Whenever the housewife is doing her shopping and planning meals for her family, she asks herself three questions: First, "Will they like it?"; second, "Is it good for them?"; and third, "Does it cost too much?"

Answering the third question first, Does it cost too much? bread certainly does not cost too much. Generally speaking, the greatest advantage of bread is its economy. Actually it provides more food value per dollar than any other common food.

In answer to the question, Will they like it? normally all people like bread and other bakings. Children, in particular, instinctively love bread and naturally make bread and milk a principal part of their diet. But it is possible to improve the quality and variety of baked foods so that at all ages the preference for them will be increased. Regardless of restrictions and shortage of ingredients that reduce output, it is most important that the baker protect the quality of his baked foods. He must not be fooled by the fact that the consumer today will take what he offers her, seemingly without criticism. The industry should remember its experience during World War I, when substitutes were used and the per capita consumption of bread took a nose dive and never did come back. Governmental authorities are even now advocating even longer extraction of flour and the addition of potatoes, soybeans, barley, oats, and other substitutes.

I hope the millers and bakers will present a united front against any further debasing of our products. In particular, I believe that both bakers and millers should seek the earliest possible termination of the 80-percent flour extraction order. This order, by forcing mill feed into flour and preventing the maintenance of uniformity controls, coarsens bread and makes the production of other superior baked products far more difficult. It affects the keeping quality of both flour and baked goods. Our own tests have shown that, even among those who say they like high-extraction bakings, there is a definite tendency to tire of them and to eat progressively less and less. At this critical time in the history of the baking and milling industries, it is vitally important that both industries be able to give the public the very best products that we are capable of making. We definitely believe that the continuance of 80 percent flour through another crop year will endanger the place of baked foods in the future American diet. It is vitally important that all possible steps be taken now to place baked foods in the best position to compete for the consumer's favor with the many other foods which she will be able to buy and serve when all foodstuffs again become freely available.

The last question which the housewife asks—"Is it good for them?"—is the place where white bread in the past has suffered most. For many years the public at large, and women in particular, have tended to hold white bread in low regard. It was considered primarily a fattening food which had been robbed of vital food elements. The fact that it was such an old and universal food made it the target of food faddists. The enrichment program, which bakers and millers have so well supported, has during the past 5 years materially helped the situation. The current publicity being given to bread and wheat as lifesavers will further help to overcome these false prejudices. But millers and bakers alike will have to continue for many years to preach the doctrine of enriched white bread before the battle is finally won. This is a challenge to all of us.

Looking into the future, there is every reason to believe that the percentage of flour consumed in the form of commercially baked products will continue to increase, and the percentage converted by the housewife at home will continue to decrease. During and following World War I, this trend was accelerated. It continued throughout the period between the two wars, and was further accelerated during World War II. With the modern tempo of life, the tendency toward smaller families, more eating out, and more emphasis on the saving of labor in the home,

there is every reason to believe that it will continue for a long time to come. In consequence, millers and bakers have an increasingly common interest.

The total market for food in the United States is larger today than it has ever been, and that market is still expanding. Despite strikes and dislocations and temporary declines, industrial production will increase to higher and higher levels. Both the public at large and business enterprise have far greater reserves of liquid cash than ever before. Consumer income is expanding, and in the next few years bids fair to be at least twice as high as it ever was in a peacetime year before the war. When the current restrictions are ended, we will have a market prospect before us which will offer greater potentials than we have ever had in the past.

While today's picture is not pleasant, there is much reason to hope and believe that, with the coming of the new world harvest, we will definitely have passed the peak of our problems. We can hope for an increase in the availability of wheat flour above present indications, and we can even hope for the elimination of the 80 percent restriction if we work intelligently and effectively toward that end. We have an opportunity, during these dark days when bread is in the headlines, to place it in a permanently higher position in the public mind. Then when restrictions are wholly removed, we will have a far larger and richer market to serve than ever before.

The future is a challenge. We should approach it with a positive mental attitude. We should drive straight ahead with courage, clear thinking, clean sportsmanship, and high faith in the firm belief that this is the way we can best serve the peace of America and the world.

OPA Hamstrings Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the letter which follows is a copy of a communication recently addressed to Chester Bowles by a prominent automobile dealer in Minnesota:

MORA MOTORS,
Mora, Minn., June 1, 1946.

CHESTER BOWLES AND PORTER OPA COMBINATION,
Washington, D. C.

Destroyers of production and operators of the most damnable thing that was ever forced upon a nation with the capacity to produce that we have:

You hamstring and hog-tie the men who are making incomes. They are the ones who pay your wages and the wages of 14,000,000 Government blood suckers on your OPA and other agencies.

You have done the Government absolutely more harm than good, and I would venture to state that most of the letters received on keeping these agencies operating are sent in by the people working in them. If they only knew what a shameful position they hold they would quit their job forever.

How do you and your hang-overs from WPA expect this country to get out of the red with your wonderful planned economy. Wake up before it is too late, or maybe you don't get around the country to hear what the score is. Probably it is a good deal safer in Washington for you than it would be out here in the wide open spaces.

Keep on taking the profit off the dealer so he can't make any income so he won't pay any income taxes so your income will be stopped. Boy, I never thought of that before. Maybe that is the best way to get rid of this administration.

Yours very truly,

HUGO HOLMSTROM.

Copies to Minnesota Senators and Representatives.

Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse today hold sway behind the iron curtain and they present issues which we in America must face realistically. Our victory in this war was hailed as joint enterprise of the major Allied Powers with the help of our innumerable smaller allies who fought so valiantly in this victory to secure freedom from the forces of Fascist oppression. But we now find that some of our very same allies have been reduced to a vassalage greater even than that which they suffered under the Nazis and that terror grips these small states which live behind the iron curtain.

Since this war still continues in an over-all sense until the final signing of the peace treaties, we must recognize that there is a joint responsibility, or at least there should be a joint responsibility on the part of all the allies who participated in this victory. Yet Russia today, has perpetrated a reign of terror upon the helpless people of the zones she occupies in eastern Europe, stretching from the center of Germany north to Finland and south to Yugoslavia and Bulgaria.

America's traditional humanitarian instincts are deeply shocked by some of the reports that have come forth from behind the iron curtain. Both Catholics and Protestants alike report merciless persecution, starvation, rape, evacuation, robbery, and death. The following reports should be of interest to all people. They were secured by members of the Catholic and Lutheran clergy who were eye witnesses to these events in eastern Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Austria.

TERROR STALKS CHRISTIAN MARTYRS

As the Russian troops marched into Poland they were permitted to plunder only within limits but—according to their own words—in the German territories they were allowed to let their cruelty and caprice have free reign.

In cities and villages unarmed citizens—merchants, laborers, land owners, peasants, and even members of the Lutheran and Catholic clergy—were struck down by a shot in the back. There were no trials held for the murderers of these innocent victims of the war. In one village, on the Neisse River, all churches of the Lutherans and Catholics alike were taken over by the Soviet Army and used as stables. The clergy were stripped of everything, even their shoes, and were informed they were a useless group to society, that if they wished to survive they would have to make their own way, but that they could not receive help from the members of their congregations. Some of the clergy in Danzig were arrested by Russians and sent to concentration camps where many of them died. Protestant deaconesses of the Lutheran (Evangelical) Church and Catholic nuns as well as many girls ranging from the age of 8 to women of 80 were raped. The Red soldiers stood, officers first, in long lines before their victims. During the first night many of the women were raped as often as 50 times. The women who defended themselves fiercely were either shot or abused in so shocking a fashion that they collapsed completely and were physically unable to struggle further.

Dr. Austin J. App writes in a bulletin that—

A prominent Lutheran pastor from the United States recently returned from Germany and in a prominent Protestant publication states that bands of irresponsible bandits in Russian uniforms pillage and rob the trains. Women and girls are violated in sight of everyone.

Similar reports pour in from Austria where John Dos Passos, a correspondent for Life, reports:

The Viennese tell you of the savagery of the Russian armies. They came like the ancient Mongol hordes out of the steppes, with the flimsiest supply. The people in the working-class districts had felt that when the Russians came that they, at least, would be spared. But not at all. In the working-class districts the troops were allowed to rape and murder and loot at will. When the victims complained, the Russians answered, "You are too well off to be workers. You are bourgeoisie."

Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland report like terror wherever the Soviet Army has penetrated, where Christians have died as martyrs whether they be Protestant or Catholic, defending the sanctity of their home and family.

Is this the liberty, the freedom from fear we promised? No; this is terror in its worst form.

We of America have every reason to stand appalled and shocked by these reports. I have seen a number of these reports and could go on hour after hour giving factual eyewitness accounts of what has taken place behind the iron curtain. Yet as long as Russia pursues her policy of isolation, we cannot penetrate to bring relief or help to these people. We must appeal to our State Department to make representations to the Soviet Government to prevent any such outrages from occurring in the future. The only other thing we can do is to raise our voices in the fervent hope that we of America guard our priceless heritage of freedom, and that our Constitution and our people stand as a bulwark for our liberty, against any such alien philosophy based upon unsound economic theories such as we have become familiar with during the past few years, and which is being foisted off upon the American people.

Resolution of Mississippi Valley Conference of State Highway Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

MISSOURI STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT,
Jefferson City, Mo., June 20, 1946.

Hon. A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
Ellsinore, Mo.

DEAR MR. CARNAHAN: Attached hereto you will find a copy of a resolution passed by the Mississippi Valley Conference of State Highway Officials at its annual meeting in Chicago, on March 16, 1946. This conference includes 16 States in the Mississippi Valley area.

The fact that all highway revenue available in Missouri will be required to match Federal aid highway grants makes it particularly important that we be relieved of any expense not properly chargeable to highway funds.

This matter is being presented for any action you may wish to take.

Yours very truly,

C. W. BROWN,
Chief Engineer.

Whereas in recent years the United States Army engineers have adopted a policy of placing upon the States the financial burden of relocating highways and structures in connection with their conservancy and waterway projects, and since such expenditures by the States are actually subsidies to Federal flood control and foreign to highway purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this conference protest this policy, and respectfully request the Congress to correct the inequity of this practice.

International Shipping Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement made by me as an American representative to the twenty-eighth session, International Maritime Conference, on Monday, June 17, 1946, at Seattle, Wash. The following is taken from the Provisional Record of the Conference for that date:

Mr. WELCH (Government delegate, United States of America). Recently you heard the Honorable Lewis B. Schwellenbach, delegate representing the Government of the United States, express from this platform his views with regard to the Director's report. In the course of his statement Mr. Schwellenbach said that the portion of the report dealing with the allocation of shipping and with the question of subsidies was not material or relevant to the success of this Conference. I speak likewise as a delegate of the United States Government and also as a Member of Congress who for 20 years has been closely identified with the formulation of our merchant marine policy. It is my considered opinion that discussion of such matters is not only improper but goes beyond the competency of this Conference.

Ten years ago the United States Congress wrote into law what has been interpreted as the magna carta of the American merchant-marine policy. Title I of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 sets forth a positive declaration of policy in the following words:

"It is necessary for the national defense and the development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine (a) sufficient to carry its domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of the water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign water-borne commerce at all times, (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, (c) owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable, and (d) composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine."

That act was passed in our national interest. Its provisions laid the foundation for that great wartime fleet which, only a few years later, was to serve in the interest of all here present. I have no hesitancy whatsoever in telling you that, were it not for the foresight of Congress in 1936, we would have been incapable of supplying the millions of tons of ships that were so badly needed to win the war. I regret I am impelled to state to those who are making extravagant and unfounded charges as to our aims and objects with reference to our merchant marine and attempting to direct our future policy that without our merchant marine, in all probability they today would be taking orders from Berlin and Tokyo, instead of criticizing our policy. The act of 1936 was so designed and it has been so administered that it never has been and never could be used to the detriment of any foreign nation or any foreign steamship operator. Subsidies authorized in the act serve only to equalize certain low costs of operation under other foreign flags. That is our national policy enacted by Congress as a part of the law of our land. We are unalterably opposed to any change in that policy.

As one step in carrying out this official policy, the United States has participated in and actively supported international maritime conferences of the kind now being held here in Seattle. While the United States has taken the lead in establishing minimum standards that are much higher than those of many other maritime nations, it has strongly encouraged other maritime nations to elevate their own standards to higher levels. The days of slavery and forced labor by shanghaiing and crimping men to man the ships of the world's merchant marines are long since past, and all nations having maritime interests should aim to establish minimum standards following the American policy. In fact, the agenda of these international maritime conferences are keyed primarily to the accomplishment of such a policy.

In these postwar days, when the hearts of men and the actions of progressive nations are being directed to the development of international understanding and good will, the part to be played by men who man the ships sailing the seven seas as ambassadors of international good will is more important than at any time in the world's history. It is therefore imperative that every maritime nation increase its merchant marine standards to the highest possible level in order to attract young men of sterling character to their merchant marines. This is to be best accomplished by raising standards to a level that will encourage them to make the merchant marine service a career.

It is probably true that more good can come to the cause of international understanding and good will through the world's merchant marines than through any other single agency of international communication.

I sincerely hope that every nation with maritime interests will participate in future conferences of this kind, that standards throughout the world will be constantly raised to higher levels, and that thus a long step will be taken forward in comity between nations.

Presidential Reorganization Plans

REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has reported favorably resolutions disapproving the President's proposed Reorganization Plans Nos. 1, 2, and 3. These resolutions may be considered in the House this week.

In this connection I wish to state that on June 1, 1946, I addressed a letter to the President suggesting that the proposed plans are unauthorized by law in that they exceed the powers granted him in this connection under applicable legislation.

I pointed out that neither the First War Powers Act nor the Reorganization Act of 1945 appears to authorize the creation of new agencies or new executive departments but that nevertheless the proposed plans appear to provide for both as well as for the making permanent of certain temporary agencies and for the continuation of temporary functions contrary to express limitations embodied in the Reorganization Act.

I indicated that if my interpretation of the law was correct, it seemed clear that enactment into law of the proposed reorganization plans by the failure of both Houses of Congress to express disapproval within the statutory period would have no legal effect in the matters referred to.

In other words, results cannot be lawfully accomplished, Mr. Speaker, by the negative action of the Congress which the Congress has itself declared can only be accomplished by its affirmative approval.

I suggested that under the circumstances, the proposed plans might call for reexamination and revision in order that they may conform to existing law.

I also inquired as to the contemplated reduction in administrative cost, if any or all of the proposed plans become law, having in mind the fact that the Reorganization Act of 1945 recites that Congress expects the authorized reorganization "to accomplish an over-all reduction of 25 percent in the administrative costs of the administrative agency or agencies affected."

Brief replies received from the President under date of Juné 7 and from the Attorney General under date of June 18 make it clear to my mind that although the proposed plans have been before the Congress since May 15 they did not have and have not yet had the consideration

either by the President or by the Attorney General that they should have had prior to presentation to the Congress. The specific question raised from the legal standpoint has not been passed upon. No answer is given as to contemplated savings.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the RECORD copies of my letters to the President and to the Attorney General under date of June 1 and June 8 together with replies thereto dated respectively June 7 and June 18:

JUNE 1, 1946.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Consideration of your proposed 3 reorganization plans 1, 2, and 3, submitted to the Congress as House Documents Nos. 594, 595, and 596, respectively, raises certain questions in my mind.

The Reorganization Act of 1945 pursuant to which the plans are submitted recites that Congress expects the authorized reorganization to "accomplish an over-all reduction of at least 25 percent in the administrative cost of the administration agency or agencies affected." I should appreciate being advised as to the reduction in administrative costs contemplated if either or all of the three reorganization plans become law.

Section 5 (A) of the same act provides in part as follows: "No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of

"(1) Abolishing or transferring any executive department, or the functions thereof; or

"(2) Or of establishing any new executive department; or

"(3) Continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence, or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

"(4) Continuing any function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise, or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made, or beyond the time when the agency in which it was vested before the reorganization would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

"(5) Authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress; or

"(6) Increasing the term of any office beyond that provided by law for such office."

Many of the agencies and functions dealt with and affected by the proposed plans owe their existence to Executive orders issued under the First War Powers Act approved December 18, 1941, authorizing the President to "make such redistribution of functions among executive agencies as he may deem necessary, including any functions, duties, and powers hitherto by law conferred upon any executive department, commission, bureau, agency, governmental corporation, office, or officer, in such manner as in his judgment shall seem best fitted to carry out the purposes of this title [to expedite the prosecution of the war effort]: *Provided further,* That the authority by this title granted shall be exercised only in matters relating to the conduct of the present war."

The latter act in section 5 of title I also provides that "Upon the termination of this title all executive or administrative agencies, governmental corporations, departments, commissions, bureaus, offices, or officers shall exercise the same functions, duties, and powers as heretofore or as hereafter by law may be provided, any authorization of the President under this title to the contrary notwithstanding."

It also provides in section 401 of title IV that "Titles I and II of this act shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate."

It would appear that neither the First War Powers Act, nor the Reorganization Act of 1945 permitted the creation of new agencies or any new executive department. It appears nevertheless that the proposed reorganization plans provide for both as well as for the making of many temporary agencies permanent and the continuation of functions contrary to the limitations contained in the Reorganization Act of 1945.

If this interpretation be correct, it would appear clear that enactment into law of the proposed reorganization plans by the failure of both Houses of Congress to express disapproval within the statutory period can have no legal effect in the matters referred to. In other words, results cannot be lawfully accomplished by the lack of disapproval by the Congress, which the Congress has itself declared can only be accomplished by its express approval.

If my interpretation is correct, it seems to me that the reorganization plans call for reexamination and revision in order that they may conform to existing law.

I should greatly appreciate hearing from you in this connection.

Sincerely yours.

R. B. WIGGLESWORTH.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 7, 1946.

Hon. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIGGLESWORTH: Your letter of the 1st has been referred to the Attorney General for specific reply.

These three reorganization plans went through all the legal procedure necessary to implement them and I am very sure that the Attorney General wouldn't recommend something to me that is illegal.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

JUNE 8, 1946.

Hon. TOM C. CLARK,
The Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I have received a letter from the President dated June 7, 1946, advising me that my letter addressed to him under date of June 1, 1946, in reference to the three pending reorganization plans has been referred to you for specific reply.

I hope very much that this matter can receive your prompt attention.

Sincerely yours.

R. B. WIGGLESWORTH.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1946.

Hon. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I have your letter of June 8, 1946, and a copy of the letter dated June 1, 1946, which you sent to the President, with respect to the three reorganization plans recently submitted by the President to the Congress under the Reorganization Act of 1945.

The questions raised by you are now being studied, and I will communicate further with you when consideration of the matter has been concluded.

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely yours.

J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
Acting Attorney General.

Transference of Jews Into Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

MAY 30, 1946.

Hon. JAMES FRANCIS BYRNES,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am very much concerned over the disposition of the 100,000 displaced Jews in the displaced persons' camps in Europe.

I will appreciate it if you will advise me of the policy of the State Department in this matter, and of the action taken to carry out the recommendation of President Truman that the British Government grant 100,000 certificates for the immediate entry into Palestine of these displaced Jews.

Each day of delay brings to these people new hardships. Many of these people are dying, and many others among them, deeply distressed by their continuing suffering, are on the verge of suicide.

Further delays and failure to carry out promptly President Truman's recommendation might give the impression that the Department of State is not conforming wholeheartedly in practice to the position taken by President Truman. The very act of linking the recommendation that 100,000 Jews be admitted immediately to Palestine with the other recommendations of the Anglo-American Committee report in a complicated procedure of consultations seems difficult to reconcile with President Truman's statement of April 30, in which he established a distinction between that recommendation which he endorsed for immediate action, and those long-range recommendations of the report which, he stated, should be taken under advisement. It also appears to constitute a departure from the position taken in your statement of last October, in which you declared that this Government would not support a final decision which in its opinion would affect the basic situation in Palestine without full consultation with both Jews and Arabs, but nevertheless urged the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews to Palestine, in line with President Truman's request to Prime Minister Attlee.

I know that it is not the intention of the Department of State to disregard the position taken on those occasions by the President and by you. But the situation is so acute that you will readily understand the grave concern of many people in this country about the apparent retreat of the Department of State from that position and its seeming acquiescence in further delays in actually admitting the 100,000 Jews into Palestine.

Since, in its statement of May 22, the Department of State reaffirmed that the President's statement of April 30 controls its attitude in this matter, I wonder whether you could give me any indication as to the likelihood that the 100,000 people will be actually moved to Palestine in 1946, independently of whatever further consultations and procedural or substantive questions might arise in regard to the determination of the future status of Palestine.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Majority Leader.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 7, 1946.

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: I have received your letter of May 30, 1946, concerning the transference of 100,000 Jews into Palestine.

I have noted carefully your comments relative to the urgency of this matter. President Roosevelt and President Truman have both assured Jewish and Arab leaders that they would be consulted before any basic change was made in the Palestine situation. The President has never varied from that statement and, in view of the urgency of the problem has, therefore, directed the State Department to inaugurate immediate consultations with Jews and Arabs. At the same time he directed discussions with the British Government. I know that you will appreciate that this matter involves more than the decisions of this Government, and I wish to assure you that the Department is making every effort to facilitate such a decision.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

OPA No Bar to Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article by Blair Moody that appeared in the Detroit News of June 20, 1946, concerning the high production rate in the United States. As Mr. Moody clearly points out, the first quarter of 1946 turned out by far the largest production in the Nation's peacetime history. It was more than twice as great as the "average" year of 1939 and almost twice as high as the "fabulous" year of 1929. Certainly the charge that price control is crippling industry cannot be true; for as Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record":

PRODUCTION AT RECORD HIGH ANSWERS CRITICS OF OPA—CHARGES THAT CEILINGS "CRIPPLE" INDUSTRY UPSET BY RESERVE INDEX

WASHINGTON, June 20.—Do price controls cripple production? As zero hour approaches for OPA, those in Congress intent on restricting the law so severely that the Administration says it would be destroyed, say "Yes."

They present from business and agricultural sources evidence that scores of producers, unable to make a profit at ceiling prices, have turned to making something else—or nothing.

In many instances, and in some rather broad areas, this evidence is unquestionably valid. It reflects in part President Truman's precipitate haste after VJ-day in ripping out prematurely other controls supporting the anti-inflation line, and in part the delays at OPA, which failed to make promptly the ceiling adjustments required by the President's action.

But on a national basis the evidence is clear that price controls have not crippled production.

The Federal Reserve Board's index of industrial production, which is impeccably nonpolitical and has never been questioned, gives production in April, the last available figure, at 164 percent of the 1935–39 average. April was 2 percent below March, due principally to the coal strike.

NATIONAL PRODUCTION

In the first quarter of 1946, the gross national product—official measure of what the country is producing—was $183,000,000,000.

This was, of course, down from the peak production of wartime in the second quarter of 1945, when the rate—under price and other controls—was two hundred and six billions a year.

But the first quarter of 1946 turned out by far the largest product in the Nation's peacetime history.

It was slightly more than 50 percent higher than the banner year of 1941, when the comparable total was one hundred and twenty billions.

It was more than twice as great as the "average" year of 1939, when the total was eighty-nine billions.

It was nearly twice as high as 1929, once considered fabulously prosperous, when the product was only ninety-nine billions.

Even when adjusted for price changes, these facts demonstrate pretty clearly that production has not been "crippled" by price control.

Of course, they should not be twisted to the conclusion that price control should therefore become permanent.

If the economy is held reasonably stable until production catches demand—if it is not disrupted or destroyed meanwhile by sharp inflation—then price controls not only will not be needed, but the economy will function better without them. Then we can get back to free enterprise without danger of wrecking it in the process.

Nor should over-all production totals be accepted complacently as an over-all whitewash of the administrative blunders of OPA, which in some instances have been serious and inexcusable.

HERE'S THE QUESTION

But the question before the country today is whether to do this it is necessary to write into the law "protection" against administrative errors so drastic as to risk a spin into the very race between living costs and wages that the Nation has been struggling throughout the war to escape.

Wilson Wyatt warns that the House and Senate bills, now in conference, would break his program to furnish homes to veterans at reasonable prices. Herbert Hoover is reported about to issue a protest against removing controls from meat, because its higher prices would suck away grain needed to feed the starving. Fiorello H. LaGuardia—no pal of Hoover's—says the same.

Detroit's Representative RABAUT beat Secretary of Commerce Wallace to the punch by 2 days with the warning that a boom-bust cycle would catch thousands of small businesses with swollen, high-price inventories—and ruin them.

These are but samples of the complex impact of a real spiral of prices. They are beyond the obvious first effect of higher grocery bills, squeezing of fixed income familes, demands for higher wages.

No man is wise enough to predict exactly the ultimate result of removing or undermining price controls prematurely.

It is not necessary to be convinced beyond argument that an inflation would wreck the capitalistic system and play into the hands of the Communists.

It is necessary only to know that this danger, and lesser, but still very great dangers, face the country if Congress fails to act wisely now, and that faulty administration, when and if it exists, must and can be corrected.

When the danger is so great, why take the risk?

Shall It Be Legitimate Business or Black Market?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members of the House, and particularly for those who claim that legitimate packers are able to buy cattle in competition with black-market operators, I am including with these remarks a news item which appeared in the Austin (Minn.) Daily Herald for June 19, 1946, which should convince the most enthusiastic supporters of OPA that the policies of this agency and Chester Bowles, have virtually forced the Hormel Co. of Austin out of the business of slaughtering cattle. Every legitimate slaughterer in the country is faced with the same situation. Consumers are forced to pay black-market prices for meat, as a result of Government policies. I am convinced that the only way to kill the black market in meat and restore its distribution through normal and legitimate channels at fair prices to consumers, will be to remove OPA controls. Black-market operators demand that controls be continued. They have made hundreds of millions of dollars in their operations under the OPA, but under such illegal traffic, legitimate business is being destroyed, law-respecting consumers cannot secure meat, and the rank and file of the people are rapidly losing faith in the integrity of their Government. The black market in meat far exceeds the bootleg dealings in liquor during the 1920's. The Herald news item follows:

BECAUSE OF OPA'S RULES ONLY 294 CATTLE KILLED IN WEEK AT HORMEL'S; MEN GET REGULAR PAY, WORK 5 HOURS—OLSON HITS BACK AT CHARGES MADE AGAINST PACKERS

The Hormel Co. here killed 294 cattle last week, with a need and a desire and a capacity for 3,700 cattle. No man was laid off work, however, because of the steady, year-round Hormel employment plan. The men of the beef division received their regular weekly pay check even though they worked an average last week of only 5 hours. The record of last week is similar to that of this week and of the previous weeks or 1946.

The Hormel Co. put the cause of its heavy reduction in beef cattle operations squarely upon OPA regulations.

"The OPA limits the price we can pay for cattle and the price of beef we get from the purchaser," said J. L. Olson, vice president of the Hormel Co. in charge of the beef division. "But the law of supply and demand permits a higher price to be paid for cattle than the OPA regulation and a higher price for beef charged to the consumer.

"We follow the OPA regulations. The black-market operator follows the law of supply and demand. We get misrepresented and charged with other reasons for our actions than the very plain one that we are obeying OPA rules. The legitimate packing industry which obeys the rules is being discredited by OPA officials and other political supporters of OPA. Any charge leveled at us for not buying cattle is a red herring

dragged across the trail that leads to the bootleg, or noncompliance, operation."

One charge that has been leveled in St. Paul and Chicago is that the packers are not buying cattle so that they can reduce employment costs. The Hormel operation refutes this as none of this company's men has been laid off.

"We are very anxious to get cattle so that we may supply our customers all over the country with beef," Mr. Olson said. "It is impossible to spread 294 cattle among 29,000 customers. It is about time that these charges that the legitimate packing industry is deliberately not buying cattle that it could buy with profit be understood by the public as the humbug that they are."

Moscow's Loan to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of June 22, 1946:

MOSCOW'S LOAN TO POLAND

There was a trace of the smug self-satisfaction attributed to the cat who had eaten the canary in the statement made by Polish Ambassador Oscar Lange as he left the State Department after a courtesy call on Acting Secretary Dean Acheson prior to his departure for a consultation visit to his Government in Warsaw.

Ambassador Lange told his interviewers that Poland is "no longer interested" in the $90,000,000 loan blocked by action of the State Department early last month in consequence of refusals or evasions of the Polish Government to comply with terms on which the extension of the loan had been based. Those breaches of agreement included such matters as failure to publicize the terms in the Polish press, censoring of news dispatches of American correspondents in Warsaw, and refusal to make known trade arrangements with other nations. Behind those specific derelictions, however, was the more fundamental failure of the Warsaw government to live up to the Yalta Agreement promising free elections and respect for American investments in Poland. The Warsaw regime having failed to heed the warning of the American Ambassador, the State Department suspended loans and credits to Poland early in May.

Ambassador Lange now informs us that Moscow has extricated his government from its economic difficulties by granting it financial aid much greater than that which we promised to extend. This Soviet assistance includes cancellation of indebtedness incurred by Poland in the latter's rearmament, indemnification of losses through Britain's failure to return Polish gold reserves, and an open credit account for purchase by Poland of goods in world markets essential to national reconstruction.

The logical deduction from such munificence from Moscow is that Soviet Russia cannot be adjudged as needing the vast loans and credits which it has sought from this country for more than a year. Originally pitched at $6,000,000,000, the request is reported to have been reduced to around $1,000,000,000. But why even that figure? Our State Department currently is questioning Moscow on reported plans for supplying Argentina with machinery, trucks, and other scarce equipment in return for Argentine products. The Department's interest in this deal has been intensified by the possibility that much of this might be material furnished to Russia by the United States, which would, of course, violate the lease-lend agreement made during the war. But Moscow high finance may not be deterred by such "judicial niceties" in economics any more than it seemingly is in politics and diplomacy.

The Voice of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Omaha Morning World-Herald of June 13, 1946:

THE VOICE OF NEBRASKA

Harold E. Stassen, the vigorous and likable left-winger who wants the Republican Party to nominate him for President, took a terrific shellacking in the Nebraska primary election.

It was made plain, beyond possibility of dispute, that the rank and file of his party in this State dislike and distrust his brand of political philosophy. They want the Republican Party to go Republican—at last, after having experimented disastrously in succeeding national campaigns with a tepid dilution of New Dealism.

And so, Mr. Stassen, for all his appealing personality, was knocked clean out of the ring.

Governor Griswold, his running mate, was knocked out along with him. And largely because, we believe, he had clambered onto the Stassen platform. It was a decision disastrous to Governor Griswold that brought Mr. Stassen to campaign for him.

Even without Stassen to help him, HUGH BUTLER would probably have won out in his bid for renomination. He was a convention first choice. As politics go, he was entitled to a second-term nomination. His record as a Senator had been in line with the sentiments of his party members in Nebraska. Governor Griswold, on the other hand, having been thrice elected to his present office, was making a bold bid for the Senator's job.

There is not, we believe, the difference between Griswold's popularity and BUTLER'S that the primary returns seem to indicate. Both are well known, well liked. Each is strong in his party. In a purely personal contest Griswold would have made a better showing.

But Stassen's advent switched a lifeless, good-natured contest between two good men to a pitched battle over issues. Within a comparatively few days the tide of the campaign was deflected powerfully to support of HUGH BUTLER'S stalwart and uncompromising republicanism, and equally in pronounced opposition to Mr. Stassen's ambition to lead his party in 1948.

Because there was every early indication of a very close result, the landslide that swept Dwight Griswold off his feet must have come to him as a stunning surprise. So it did to the experts and guessers who had not sufficiently evaluated the quality of Nebraska Republicans when it comes to a decision on basic principles.

The Nebraska decision will have Nation-wide repercussions. "All eyes were on Nebraska," it was widely reported. Harold E. Stassen, as his powerful newspaper supporter, the New York Herald Tribune said, had "staked his hopes" on the Nebraska contest. The result was "nervously awaited." Tension may relax.

It is well that Nebraska, when it did speak, spoke so decisively. Its voice, raised thus early, should have a marked influence on Republican decisions in other States, and with this an influence in the 1948 convention.

Many citizens in both parties are hoping for a square-toed contest in 1948 between a mongrel New Deal-CIO-PAC-City Bosses Party on the one hand, and a genuinely and courageously Republican Party on the other hand. They want a count of noses on the radical reactionism of the present administration as against a conservatively progressive opposition that does not hesitate to call a spade a spade.

They want this because they believe that, within the next 2 years, the final decision must be made as between extreme leftism and a return to a representative constitutional Government devoted to the fundamental principles of our democratic society.

Nebraska on Tuesday pointed the way toward such a line-up.

Controlling the Atom Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include three editorials on atomic-bomb control which appeared in the Washington press last week:

[From the Washington Post]

M'MAHON BILL

(By Ernest Lindley)

In its treatment of the McMahon bill to control atomic energy, the House Military Affairs Committee appears to be more military minded than either the War or Navy Department.

The McMahon bill, in its original form, bore the earmarks of draftsmen who had phobias about the military. Under the leadership of some of the atomic scientists, an issue was made of military versus civilian control of atomic energy. Thus stated, it was a false issue. The May-Johnson bill, to which these scientists objected strenuously, did not prescribe military control. It permitted the appointment of military and naval officers to various positions, including the administrator and deputy administrator. It also contained strong provisions for safeguarding atomic information of military value.

The original McMahon bill went much farther in the other direction. It could properly be called a bill to exclude the military altogether from association with atomic energy. It also made entirely inadequate provisions for safeguarding the secrecy of valuable information.

But these serious defects in the McMahon bill were overcome before it was reported out by the Special Senate Committee on Atomic Energy. The Atomic Energy Commission of five and its key employees are to be civilians. But liaison with the Army and Navy is provided for; and suitable security clauses have been inserted. The War and Navy Departments said they were satisfied. The bill sent to the House had the unanimous endorsement of the Special Senate Committee on

Atomic Energy and not a vote was cast against it on the floor of the Senate.

Very good arguments can be made for tying the armed forces a little closer to the Atomic Energy Commission. The appointment of military men to one or two of the five places on the Commission would not mean military control; nor would the designation of a military man to be head of the Commission's division on military applications of atomic energy. These are decisions which might well be left to the discretion of the President. They are decisions which should be affected not only by the personal qualifications of the men available but by the international situation.

The United States has already presented a plan for the international control of atomic energy. Whether favorable consideration of this plan in other countries would be encouraged or discouraged by the presence of one or two military men on our national commission to control atomic energy is an open question. The effect might be nil.

As, or if, an international control system substantially like that proposed by the United States goes into effect, our national control system will be modified accordingly. This is stipulated in the McMahon bill as well as in Bernard M. Baruch's presentation to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission.

We do not know whether Russia will agree to an effective system of international control. Nor do we know what, if anything except to collect all the information they can lay their hands on, the Russians are doing about atomic energy within their own country. The possibility must be faced that lack of Russian cooperation will compel the United States to continue to pay serious attention to atomic energy as a weapon. In that event, the military and our National Atomic Energy Commission may have to be interlocked more closely than the McMahon plan contemplates.

As it passed the Senate, however, the McMahon bill provides for the essential minimum of liaison between the Atomic Energy Commission and the military. It is the product of extended public discussion and debate. Secretary of War Patterson and Secretary of the Navy Forrestal have both endorsed it. Mr. Patterson has testified that it is superior in certain important respects to the earlier May-Johnson bill drafted at the War Department.

The sensible course for the House is to take the bill unanimously passed by the Senate. A national policy on atomic energy was needed last fall when Mr. Truman asked for prompt action. It would be especially unfortunate if tinkering with the bill by the Military Affairs Committee should cause further delay.

RUSSIA AND THE ATOM—MR. GROMYKO'S PROPOSAL

(By Barnet Nover)

Although the Gromyko plan, like the Baruch plan, emphasizes the imperative need of international action to control atomic energy, any other resemblance between them is purely coincidental.

In substance and spirit the two plans are about as far apart as the Poles. This may be because, while we put all our cards face up on the table, the Russians, being horse traders from away back, are asking for far more than they hope to get, while offering far less than they are really prepared to give.

We can only hope that this is the case and that in due course the Russian attitude will be substantially modified.

Yet as matters stand now, the gulf between the Russian and American views on this all-important matter of atomic energy control is so wide and deep as to make it dubious whether any reasonable compromise between the two plans is possible.

This is not merely because the abolition of the great power veto, insofar as it relates to atomic energy control, is central in the American scheme, while its retention is the very cornerstone of the Russian plan.

This difference of opinion regarding the veto is merely the symptom of a basic difference in the attitude and approach of the two Nations toward this problem.

The heart of the Baruch plan is the atomic development authority that he, following the suggestion of the authors of the Acheson-Lilienthal report, would set up and which would possess supranational rights with respect to the ownership, management, and control and inspection of atomic raw materials and plants. It would be given sole and exclusive rights to conduct research in the field of atomic explosives, and its agents would have the full right of unlimited inspection.

Nothing resembling such a proposal is to be found in the Russian plan. To be sure, the rules for the development of atomic energy would be laid down by international agreement. But the execution of those rules would be left to the individual nations and the entire scheme would operate under the aegis of the Security Council of the United Nations with its rules of procedure—including the great-power veto—unmodified in any particular.

It has been argued with great force and cogency that in insisting on the abolition of the veto in the atomic charter, Mr. Baruch is pinning his hopes on a phantom.

"The problem of what to do with a great power which violates a sovereign agreement was thoroughly considered in drafting the Charter," points out Mr. Walter Lippmann. "The conclusion of those who studied the problem was the same as that reached by the authors of the American Constitution: that no great and sovereign power will sign an agreement saying that the other nations may make war against it, and yet that no agreement can prevent them from waging war against it if they think they must and believe they can."

So far as it goes, this point is well taken. But it does not go far enough. The fact is that the veto applies to much more than the prevention of the punishment of a treaty violator when one of the five great powers decides against punishment.

The veto, as the experience of the Security Counsel has demonstrated, can be used and has been used as an instrument of delay, obstruction, and obfuscation.

It is for this reason that it must be eliminated at least with respect to anything involving the control of atomic energy.

The Russian plan consists of two parts. The first is a treaty outlawing the atomic bomb. Under it the signatories would also be pledged to destroy all atomic bombs in their possession within 3 months after that treaty had gone into force. And they would each promise, within 6 months of that development, to "pass legislation providing severe punishment for the violation of the terms of this agreement."

Such a treaty would have about as much value as the Briand-Kellogg Pact which it so greatly resembles.

Furthermore, atomic energy development would be carried out not by a supranational body, as is provided for in the Baruch plan, but by the individual nations. To be sure, the Russian scheme provides for the establishment of two committees to go into a host of special questions connected with the problem of atomic energy development, among them measures to forbid the production of atomic bombs, "measures, systems, and organization of control in the use of atomic energy" and "the elaboration of a system of sanctions for application against the unlawful use of atomic energy."

But all these things would be discussed and acted upon after the outlawry convention had been approved, and the discussions and agreements would follow the rules of the Security Council. This means that Russia, or any other great power, could use its veto power to blackmail the others into accepting its own point of view.

The Russian plan cannot for one moment be seriously considered. It asks for everything and offers nothing.

[From the Washington Daily News]

RUSSIA ASKS TOO MUCH

It is vital to the future of civilization that there should be international agreement for control of atomic energy. But control must be control, without reservations or exceptions starting with the sources of raw materials and going through all the processes of manufacture, which is the proposal of American Delegate Baruch.

So long as any nation can conceal its activities from the rest of the world there will be no guaranty against misuse of atomic energy or of any other weapon of destruction.

We would not think of enacting a liquor-control law under which the big saloonkeepers would have the right to bar police from their premises. Russia is asking much more than that.

Under her counter-proposal to the United Nations Atomic Energy Committee Russia would have us destroy the atomic bombs we have, promise not to make any more, but tell her how to make them. On top of that, she is telling us not to ask her any embarrassing questions about what she does with the secret.

That is like putting your head on a block, handing a sharp sword to a dangerous man, and then going to sleep. For Russia has been acting and talking dangerously ever since VE-day.

If the United Nations is to control atomic energy, that control must be absolute, foolproof and crookproof. There must be no favorites, exceptions, reservations, vetoes, back doors, iron curtains, or under-the-counter business. The law, when written, should apply to everbody.

Until there is that kind of agreement that secrets and the know-how, which we have, should be kept where they are safe—in our hands and in no others.

The door is wide open to a meeting of hearts and minds on this crucial issue. It should be kept open. But let's keep our powder dry. Nothing should be given away until a real agreement is reached. Nor should the urgency of the problem blind us to the ugly fact that an agreement with a hole in it could be fatal to mankind.

Ceiling Price on Feed Barley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BOONVILLE MILLS CO.,
Boonville, Mo., June 20, 1946.

HON. MAX SCHWABE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SIR: We have conducted a poll to find out the opinions of our farm customers. The majority of them feel that you fellows in Washington aren't doing much of anything

toward the good of our country. Small business and farmers are tired of trying to operate under OPA and Government orders. These are being issued so fast and amended so regularly that we hardly know what to do or expect.

An example is directive No. 122 issued by the Office of Economc Stabilization. This permits USDA to buy feed barley at the malting barley ceiling, which we are not allowed, and allocate it to the New England and West Coast States at the feed ceiling which is fifteen cents a bushel less. We, in the Midwest, who are in just as precarious a position, so far as feed is concerned, will be called upon to help pay this subsidy of 15 cents a bushel which will benefit only the farmers and feeders in these States. This is the worst piece of class legislation that has ever been perpetrated on the people of the Midwest area.

Yours very truly,

R. E. CASANOVA,
Manager.

The Job Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of June 22, 1946:

THE JOB SITUATION

Despite the recent rash of strikes the postwar job situation in America is encouraging. According to Robert C. Goodwin, Director of the United States Employment Service, the unemployed now total only 2,310,000, including 930,000 veterans. This is a large number, but in relation to the whole economy it is far from startling, especially since official estimates indicate that it represents the peak of idleness and that from this point on continued improvement can be expected.

If there had been no serious strikes, of course, the picture would now be better than it is, for the work stoppages not merely imposed on those already holding jobs, but also delaying opportunities for those just entering the market for gainful employment. Regardless of this, however, it is a measure of the Nation's remarkable economic capacity that it has been able to shift from war to peace without suffering the wrench of much greater joblessness. On VJ-day no one could be absolutely sure of the outlook; indeed some authorities, including Government spokesmen, considered certain factors in the picture to be so doubtful that they warned of the possibility of 8,000,000 unemployed by this summer.

The fact that current unemployment actually amounts to little more than a quarter of that figure is particularly striking when read against the background of our extremely rapid demobilization. Up to now some 11,500,000 men have been discharged from the armed forces. Of this total only 930,000 are seeking jobs. All the rest are either employed or going to school or not looking for work. In short, the VJ vision of a huge army of idle veterans has not materialized. What has happened is that our economy has been resilient enough to absorb the bulk of them. Not only have a great many women and overage war workers withdrawn from the labor market, but new avenues of employment, have been opened, and in Mr. Goodwin's judgment, if no entirely unforseen events occur, the situation should now become progressively better.

Considering the enormous pent-up domestic and world demand for all sorts of durable and nondurable goods, this prospect of high employment seems almost inevitable. We can be reasonably certain of it, however, only on a short-term basis. Whether there will be a boom of 5 or 10 years and a terrible bust after that will depend largely on the nature of the policies to be followed by labor, management and Government from here on out—a fact that must temper any optimism of the moment.

Amendment of Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, the twenty-eighth session of the International Labor Conference which convened in Seattle on June 6 has done me the honor of selecting me as its president. The Conference is now sitting and will continue to sit for some weeks and I feel it my duty to be in attendance upon the Conference as much as possible. I shall not, therefore, be present in the House during most of the next few weeks.

Among the matters which will be decided upon in my absence is the question of amending the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemploymcnt Insurance Acts. If I were present in the House when the bill H. R. 1362 is voted upon, I should vote against the committee substitute and in favor of the original Crosser bill, H. R. 1362, with the amendments respecting coverage of maternity benefits which the author of the bill has told me he will sponsor. In my absence I shall arrange for a pair in order that my vote may have some weight in the final decision.

I favor the original Crosser bill because I believe that sound systems of retirement, permanent disability, and unemployment and sickness insurance are a vital necessity for this country. I am in hearty agreement with the late President Roosevelt's message of January 11, 1944, in which he asked us to explore the means for implementing an economic bill of rights. You will recall that that bill of rights included, in addition to other important rights, "the right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health; the right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment." Without adequate implementation to the economic bill of rights we shall be unable to avoid those periodic depressions which, unless mitigated, will continue to endanger the foundations of our democracy.

The committee substitute for the original Crosser bill attempts an inadequate remedy for every major problem faced squarely by the Crosser bill. It is inadequate on permanent and total disability; it is inadequate with respect to survivor benefits; it is inadequate with respect to railroad unemployment insurance; it is inadequate with respect to sickness insurance. Finally, it attempts to make a drastic rearrangement in the policies which this Congress has long adopted and followed for the assessment of the costs of these various systems of social insurance. I have heard only two reasons advanced for opposition to the Crosser bill. One is that it increases the burdens on the railroads. For my own part, I have no doubt about the ability of the railroad industry to prosper if we maintain a sound economy, as we can if we pay appropriate attention to these social matters which are so vital. The second reason for opposing the Crosser bill is the allegation that Congress by enacting that bill would put the railroad workers into a highly preferential category. In favoring the Crosser bill I am not favoring any measure which I would not be willing to extend to every worker in the United States. The idea that we should not deal fairly with the railroad workers at this time but should delay it until we are prepared to extend some uniform treatment to all is, in reality, a plea for doing nothing at all. I wish we could make more rapid progress toward the improvement of social security generally, but for various reasons we are not doing so. The opportunity is present for making the railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance systems perform more effectively the functions for which they were designed. I can think of no reason for failing to proceed to the perfection of those systems.

Ceiling Prices on Meat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

EUGENE, MO.

DEAR MR. SCHWABE: When will they ever do away with the OPA, or, at least, get someone in there with some sense enough to know that we farmers can't keep on producing this livestock for meat at the present ceiling price?

We live here in a grain-deficient area, that is, we don't raise enough grain to fatten out our livestock, and all the grain we buy is what they call black-market prices.

I am now feeding 35 hogs and paying $1.90 per bushel for corn, which is overceiling, but when I ship my hogs in a couple of weeks I will take $14.80 in St. Louis, or about 14 cents here after shrink and shipping costs are paid.

Anyone with common sense knows it will not pay out. So far I have kept up my feeding operations as a patriotic duty to help feed this country and the rest of the world, but unless some changes are made soon I will do as thousands of other farmers have

already done—ship out my sows and boar and quit.

If labor can get a raise of 18½ cents an hour, why isn't the farmer entitled to something, too?

Our cattle will have to be shipped off the grass this summer, because the price we have to pay for grain and the price we get for beef just simply doesn't figure out any profit.

And after all we farmers are entitled to make a profit.

I have already cut my laying hens to about 250, and other years I had 400.

I think if they would take the price controls off livestock and let it be a case of supply and demand, we farmers could take care of our own business, then if as hogs are scarce as now the price would go up, and it would be an inducement for the farmer to raise them, then when they would become plentiful the price always will react and the farmer would trim his herd a little.

Anyway, that's the way the country was run for all the time before the New Deal was invented.

It's just a case of too many regulations by people that don't understand what they are doing.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT LIMBACH.

Needed: A Power Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on June 20, 1946, entitled "Needed: A Power Policy":

NEEDED: A POWER POLICY

An investigation by Congress of electric-utility lobbying against public power, called for by Senator MURRAY, ought to be forthcoming. Eleven power companies in the Southwest have just won a signal victory in Congress in their campaign to prevent the water resources of the Nation from being developed and utilized for the people of the United States. It would be interesting, and the public has a right to know, by what means Congress was induced to reverse itself in this matter, and who paid the lobbying bill.

The Nation needs a water-power policy, but Congress has enunciated one from time to time only to recant under pressure from the utilities—which is worse than having no policy at all, for it is a policy of confusion. The immediate issue, which caused Senator MURRAY to call for an investigation, Speaker RAYBURN to declare that Washington is "seething with utility lobbyists," and Senator HILL to charge the power companies with a "widespread, vicious, and unprincipled lobbying and propaganda campaign" against TVA and similar developments—including MVA—is one on which Congress has shown just such a futile vacillation.

The United States Government owns the Denison Dam in Texas and the Norfork Dam in Arkansas, and is joint owner with Oklahoma of the Pensacola Dam. Each of the dams has a power plant. The three power plants are unconnected. If one area has an unusually dry season, and there is not enough power to fill requirements, while another has a surplus of power, the first area has to go short of electricity while the second area wastes it. It is just plain horse sense to connect the power plants so that shortages and surpluses can be leveled out. That is what the Interior Department is trying to do.

Congress had already laid down the policy for the disposition of the power. It was to be disposed of in a manner to provide the most widespread use and at the lowest practicable rates, with preference given to public bodies and cooperatives. TVA operates under an identical mandate from Congress.

To carry out Congress's orders, the Interior Department set up a Southwestern Power Administration for Louisiana, Arkansas, and parts of Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, and asked for $23,000,000 to get it started. SPA would build lines connecting the power plants, and it would build transmission lines and sell the power wholesale as directed by Congress, selling to private utilities what was left over after preference had been given, as Congress required, to publicly owned distribution agencies.

The Southwestern power companies were not satisfied with getting their share. They wanted a monopoly of the power, and they didn't want to have to bid for it. They wanted to dictate the price by being the only possible buyer. If they could prevent SPA from building transmission lines they would have everything they wanted. The publicly owned distribution agencies couldn't afford to build transmission lines, but the private utilities could. They would have a monopoly on the public's power, at their own price. If they couldn't get that, they wanted to kill the project.

The House Appropriations Committee cut the $23,000,000 request down to $3,298,000, the House increased that sum to $7,500,000, and now the Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended that the appropriation be reduced to zero—a recommendation which is now before the Senate. Senator THOMAS, of Oklahoma, explains that "the committee was against * * * socialization of power lines. * * *" This leaves congressional water-power policy, as of today, firmly entrenched on both sides of the question, or on neither side—who could possibly tell which? It does not speak too well for the long-range responsibility of our highest deliberative body.

The utilities have won a battle. They have made Congress look confused and futile. The public will bear the cost—in electric bills to pay for the lobbying, and in public power wasted or turned into private profit rather than public benefit. But if Senator MURRAY's advice is heeded, and a thoroughgoing investigation is undertaken, the lobbyists may lose the war. It is of the most fundamental importance; for the natural resources of the country can never be developed to their maximum usefulness until Congress lays down a coherent water-power policy and abides by it.

Research and Uses of Coal Are Important; Mines and Mining Subcommittee To Hold Hearings; Newspaper Article Explains New Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, recently Chairman SOMERS, of the Mines and Mining Committee, appointed a subcommittee on coal, composed of Representatives KELLEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; HEDRICK, Democrat, of West Virginia; LANDIS, Republican, of Indiana; ROCKWELL, Republican, of Colorado; and myself as chairman.

We have planned, at the earliest practical date, to hold hearings in reference to the production, uses, and new activities in the field of coal. Coal development and research is vital. I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the Appendix in the RECORD of May 8, in which they will find an extension of remarks, beginning on page A2679, in further reference to this subject.

In connection with expansion of coal uses, I include the following article by Calvert L. Estill, well-known newspaperman, and staff correspondent of the Martinsburg (W. Va.) Journal:

GLAMORIZED COAL DUST

CHARLESTON, June 21.—Rocket ships, molten-metal bullets, radar, and messages to the moon capture the popular imagination as they loom above those vast "new horizons" the politicians love to talk about; yet there are other shapes on the horizon, not so glamorous, but perhaps portending more good to humanity than some of the widely advertised wonders.

One such shape is made up of coal dust which is itself an unlovely thing, but the power it has to make life pleasanter is glamor personified. Coal dust has yielded a wealth of beauty and utility in plastics: it has filled the medicine chest with everything from old-fashioned aspirin to brand new sulfa drugs; it has clothed man from top to toe; and has ornamented women whether they dealt at Woolworth's or Tiffany's.

And now the black dust is ready to enter a new field: the furnishing of direct power for locomotion and for spinning the wheels of industry. A coal-dust burning engine has been developed which operates on the same principle as the jet plane. It may, in time, revolutionize rail and road transport, drive great ships across the ocean, supply the motive power for automobile and airplane.

A B. & O. BABY

About a year ago the able president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., R. B. White, who was chairman of a group representing railroads and coal companies which had raised money for research into better utilization of coal to offset competition from other fuels, selected a top-flight research man, John I. Yellot, to design and build a new type of engine—the coal turbine.

He has done the job assigned him. The new engine should soon be ready to roll—and roll with three or four times the efficiency of present steam locomotives. Powdered coal under pressure burns at hellish heat, shooting expanding gases against the blades of a turbine. That's the power plant, which has only one moving part.

The fuel is only a fraction as expensive as Diesel oil or gasoline. The turbine uses the same lump coal that feeds the fires of steam engines, but it grinds that coal as fine as talcum powder. It uses no water, and it can run for 1,000 miles without refueling. There are no cinders, and not much more smoke than comes from a corn-cob pipe.

BEHIND THE ENGINE

Behind the engine powered by a coal turbine will come a string of cars in which many of the fittings will have a close connection with the same coal dust that furnishes motive power. The cover on the seats in the chair car will be fabrics coated with tough plastic which looks like leather and feels like leather, but is scuff-proof and crack-proof and easy to clean.

Lamp shades and standards will be of plastic, in rich colors and beautiful designs. Table tops will have a percentage of coal, and

plastic trim will be used widely. Wiring to the lights and to the push button which summons the porter will be plastic-coated.

In the diner, there will be dishes that bounce like ping-pong balls if dropped, and that won't crack, break, or warp. Color combinations will be endless. Coal, through the magic of chemistry, will add to the comfort and health of the traveler in a thousand ways and designs.

STAKE IN THE FUTURE

West Virginia has a great stake in the pioneering of the broad new horizons. Her vast stores of coal will be used as raw materials instead of just a fuel to burn to produce heat and power in an indirect way. And the State is in a position to take full advantage of her opportunities.

Two Members of Congress from West Virginia have been appointed on a subcommittee of the House Mines and Mining Committee to study production and uses of coal. They are JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of the Second District, and E. H. HEDRICK, of the Sixth. RANDOLPH, as chairman of the group, has already announced that hearings will be held as soon as possible on new uses, especially in the field of plastics.

Experiments have already proved that gasoline can be profitably extracted from coal, but if the coal turbine is able to do all the things its designers think it will do, gasoline extraction from coal may soon be as obsolete as ancient isinglass. Coal, in powdered form, will be used directly, instead of generating steam, to turn the wheels of industry.

There are at least two signboards pointing toward the new horizons for this great coal-producing State. One says power, and the other plastics. West Virginia undoubtedly follow both paths.

South Dakota Rates High Among All Food-Producing States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in last Friday's RECORD I inserted a study in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revealing some of the great contributions South Dakota has made to the food supply of the United States and of the world. At this time I desire to call attention to the following tabulation which supplies additional information on the same subject.

Today's review of South Dakota's vast productivity is found in an editorial taken from a recent issue of the Daily Argus-Leader, published in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., as follows:

ANOTHER FINE REVIEW OF STATE'S RATING

The greater South Dakota association continues to present figures to show that its State is truly great.

Because these statistics are so illuminating and so impressive, it seems worth while to place much emphasis on them. In a compilation received yesterday, the figures on South Dakota's rating are presented in a different form. The information is not in addition to that already reviewed, but it is in a more effective form.

Here is South Dakota's rating in the 12 North Central States:

Ranks first:
1. In the reduction of farm-mortgage debt, 1930–44.
2. In the average value of livestock per farm.
3. In the number of cattle per farm.
4. In the pounds of cattle produced in 1945.
5. In 1945 wool production per farm.
6. In the average number of acres per farm.
7. In the value of rye produced in 1945.

Ranks second:
1. In the value of barley produced in 1945.
2. In the average harvested acreage per farm, 1934–43.
3. In chickens produced per farm in 1945.
4. In the number of tractors per 100 farms.

Ranks third:
1. In gross State debt reduction, 1940–45.
2. In value of flaxseed produced in 1945.
3. In value of all sorghums produced in 1945.
4. In the value of alfalfa seed produced in 1945.

Ranks fourth:
1. In average cash income per farm in 1945.
2. In hog production per farm in 1945.
3. In average value of corn production per farm in 1945.

Ranks fifth:
1. In the value of oats produced in 1945.
2. In the value of all wheat produced in 1945.
3. In 5-year average cash income per farm, 1941–45.
4. In the number of automobiles per 100 farms.

Ranks sixth:
1. In the value of land and buildings per farm.
2. In the value of sweetclover seed produced in 1945.
3. In the value of potatoes produced in 1945.

These statistics reveal progress and substance. In addition, the GSDA presents some figures showing South Dakota's splendid participation in the purchase of Government E bonds.

Our total purchases of these bonds amounted to $167,813,829. (And our total purchases of all types of war bonds was $384,474,651.)

South Dakota's comparative showing in the E bond purchases was excellent. There were no assigned quotas in the first two campaigns but there were in the others.

Here is our performance, as compared to the Nation as a whole, in respect to the percentage purchases of the assigned quotas:

	United States	South Dakota
	Percent	*Percent*
Third War Loan	82	112
Fourth War Loan	106	144
Fifth War Loan	101	130
Sixth War Loan	115	134
Seventh War Loan	99	112
Victory Loan	111	145

All of this material should contribute much to the pride of South Dakotans in South Dakota.

Mr. Speaker, an interesting concomitant of South Dakota's great record in farm production is the final table in the above editorial showing that South Dakota has ranked far above the national average in all of the war-bond drives. South Dakota's productive soil and friendly communities are peopled, Mr. Speaker, by thrifty and patriotic people.

It should also be pointed out that South Dakota's record of holding on to the war bonds which have been purchased is also well above the national average. Very few of our citizens are redeeming their bonds for cash—having an abiding faith in South Dakota our citizens also have an abiding faith in the future of the great Republic of which South Dakota forms an important part.

Letter From the Mayor of Zanesville, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. P. W. GRIFFITHS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of a letter written by the mayor of Zanesville, Ohio, to Mr. Wilson W. Wyatt.

The mayor expresses rightful indignation for the run-around misinformation, and noncooperation of the field office in Columbus. Here is a city that offers 100-percent cooperation in solving the veteran housing and what do they get? Nothing. Surely it is time for action and as the mayor's letter proves evidently action and homes must not be in the present program of this administration.

The letter is as follows:

ZANESVILLE, OHIO, *June 20, 1946.*

WILSON W. WYATT,
Administrator-Expediter,
National Housing Agency,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WYATT: Complying with your request of April 5, 1946, I carefully selected a group of able men to serve as the mayor's veterans emergency housing committee. I called this group of men together and explained to them the purpose of the committee. They very enthusiastically agreed to serve and do everything that was humanly possible to help eliminate the shortage of housing accommodations for returning veterans.

This committee felt that before any plans were formulated, they should have a meeting with your representatives and discuss with them the quickest and best ways that the purpose for which the committee was formed could be accomplished. I arrange this meeting and a group of the committee went to Columbus, Ohio, and met with your representatives.

Your representatives informed the members of the committee that Zanesville was one of the most backward and uncooperative communities in the State, apparently because our financial institutions were able to take care of the needs of our community without asking unnecessary assistance from established Government agencies, particularly FHA. They were also informed that about the only and by far the quickest way to be able to get materials and build homes for the veterans was to form a corporation and build a group of houses to sell the veterans.

The information that this committee had received from your representatives seemed like a large responsilibity for them to assume. However, acting in good faith, the committee accepted this responsibility, and laid the ground work for the forming of a nonprofit corporation to erect a group of homes for returning veterans.

The veterans' emergency housing committee then organized, with each member of the committee serving as the chairman of a subcommittee made up of members outside the main committee. Plans for forming the corporation were made so as to spread the

membership as far as possible, making this a community project. A registration of the returning veterans was made to establish their needs. The necessary financial arrangements were made. A survey of the available property was made both within the city limits and adjacent thereto. Contractors were contacted and pledged, either as a group or as individuals, that they would give their undivided attention to this work so that it would be completed quickly and economically. Organized labor pledged full cooperation to help in every way that it could help. The committee thought that it had made a great deal of progress and that actual construction would soon be under way.

A second meeting with your representatives in Columbus was then arranged and held. On that occasion the committee sought assurance that if the corporation set-up was perfected, the necessary building materials would be made available promptly. The committee was informed then that there was no need to organize a corporation and, in fact, that the organization of the corporation would not speed the availability of materials. Nonplused, the committee interrogated your representatives as to what assurances could be given regarding deliveries of materials, either under a corporate set-up or individual veteran applications. To this the reply was given that in either event the necessary priorities would be granted but that the same would be in effect only to grant a license to hunt for materials. Adding insult to injury the committee was told that its purpose was to publicize and create a desire for homes as if there was not an overwhelming hue and cry for homes for veterans everywhere. The committee was further told the many bottlenecks existing, the steps contemplated to break them, the many subterfuges resorted to in securing goods through black markets, and the terrific amount of commercial and nonhousing construction in progress everywhere.

It should be apparent that the committee has now been clear around Robin Hood's barn and is now back exactly where it started. Despite all your plans we are experiencing the same inept and disorganized attention which has been accorded this important problem for many months; directives mean nothing, commercial building continues unrestrained, black markets flourish, local suppliers are bypassed, and a powerful Federal Government is defied. Through it all the veteran remains the forgotten man. His service to his country avails nought in the face of the dollar appeal of speculator and the demands of commerce and of industry, whether necessary or not.

A swelling chorus arises from our thousands of veterans, crying out, "How long must this go on?" As they see roadside stands, plant renovations, filling stations, and store remodeling materializing on every side, all taking their portion of needed supplies, they realize how short is the memory of the country to which they gave their full measure of devotion and service. If they must be sacrificed on the altar of procrastination and political expediency, they would like to know it and to have the truth straight out, rather than to find it after months of deception and double talk.

I realize on your shoulders is a grave burden but it is one which you have assumed. You and you alone have it in your power to cut the knots that bind us from the solution of veterans' housing. Let's get on with the job. Call an end to this shilly-shallying and put our productive abilities into the right channels.

We can house our veterans if we will. My committee still wants to do the job. What I want to know is, Do you want it to work and will you make it possible for it to work—right now? What is the advice you want me to give my committee? Should I tell them they are stymied again by governmental red tape and buck-passing and might as well resign, or can I tell them how you will get them the materials they must have? I await your answer. So do the veterans of Zanesville and Muskingum County.

Yours truly,

WM. G. WATSON,
Mayor of Zanesville, Ohio.

Midwest Demands Favorable Action on St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project Before Adjournment of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, while we are beginning to talk about the adjournment of Congress some of the rest of the folks are also beginning to discuss that subject. The people of the Midwestern States are all interested in having Congress pass pending legislation authorizing construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. They want that done before there is an adjournment and so far as I can see there is no valid reason that should prevent that procedure. Legislation has been pending for almost 18 months now and it will break nobody's back if just a little nod from the administration leaders calls up this St. Lawrence project and has it passed.

The records will show that the rivers and harbors bill and the flood-control bill are both ready for action in the Senate and that they will undoubtedly be called up also any time over there and will undoubtedly pass without a dissenting vote. When either of those bills is called up for passage, there is nothing more natural or nothing more free from superstition than a motion by some friend of the American people to add the St. Lawrence seaway and power project legislation as an amendment to one of those bills. This would be the most natural thing in the world. It can hardly be doubted that there would be much, if any, opposition.

ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT REPORTED ON JUNE 13 IN THE SENATE

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 13, 1946, page 6772, contains the following:

Report by Mr. HATCH; from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Senate Joint Resolution 104. Joint resolution approving agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; authorizing the investigation through the Department of State and with Canada of the feasibility of making the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes, together with minority views of Mr. WHITE; with an amendment. (Rept. No. 1499.)

Those who are interested in the proposed legislation will readily understand that the St. Lawrence seaway and power project deals with the same type of development that we find in order in connection with all measures pertaining to the improvement of rivers, harbors, and so forth. There would, therefore, be nothing unusual to consider this measure, which seeks to deepen the 14-foot channel in the St. Lawrence River, for two purposes: First, so that oceangoing vessels can travel from the Atlantic Ocean to the western point of navigation on the Great Lakes where they can arrive safely at Duluth, Minn.; second, this improvement will develop tremendous electric power output by the building of a dam at Massena, N. Y., which is of particular concern to the people of New York State and New England. Almost everybody worth while on the North American Continent has advocated this development. The list includes five Presidents, none of whom could have been wrong in advocating development that would add to the wealth of America and be beneficial to our domestic economy.

COST OF THE PROJECT

In the old-fashioned days the selfish interests that were always able to block this project shed crocodile tears about the enormous cost of this project to the American taxpayer. When tears failed them, they developed a wailing habit which would make a child with the colic sound like a muffled drum beating a mile under the earth's surface.

But seriously, no one needs to worry about the fantastic protest of these selfish interests who opposed the seaway because of cost. Nearly all of those same interests are in favor of the British loan of about $4,000,000,000, more or less. They want that loan acted on favorably by Congress and they are making every effort in that direction. Now, here is my proposition to them: Let us borrow back $200,000,000 of the loan to Britain and use the money to do something for America just for a change. By doing this we would reduce our loan to Britain about one-fourteenth, or thereabouts, of the amount of money that our "do-gooders" want to hand out to Great Britain. I figured it out once that we could build 14 projects like the St. Lawrence project for just about the same amount of money that we are going to hand out to Great Britain. So I think we ought to take one-fourteenth of that money and give the taxpayers of America a little value received. When we spend $200,000,000 dollars as our share of the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project then we are doing something which will bring back to us many, many dollars more than the amount we invested. For example, when you spend $1 in developing the St. Lawrence project the American people have a permanent improvement which will bring back $10 in dividends for every dollar invested. It is really one of the greatest self-liquidating projects in the universe.

REPORT OF SENATOR CARL HATCH

I have before me a committee print of a subcommittee document known as the report of a subcommittee to the Committee on Foreign Relations on Senate Joint Resolution 104, dealing with the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. This document was submitted on May 1, 1946, to the chairman of the Committee on

Foreign Relations. I quote from page 56 of this document wherein the favorable report of the subcommittee of the committee says:

The proponents established the fact that this seaway is not designed to take away traffic from existing transportation facilities; its main purpose is to help meet a part of future needs. It is authoritatively estimated that the tonnage volume of United States postwar foreign trade may double the tonnage that was handled in prewar years.

* * * * *

From the evidence presented it seems clear that traffic on the seaway is not going to cripple the railroads.

Of course it is almost universally true in connection with every rivers and harbors improvement in the United States that statistics show such improvement has increased railroad tonnage and made a greater volume of railroad freight possible. Just as the building of the port of New York made it possible for railroads to serve an economic purpose, so will the development of the St. Lawrence project increase the potential prosperity of the railroads of America. No one wants to haul rock and fill up the harbor of New York.

The enormous amount of hydroelectric power which will be available when this project is completed will make it possible for New York State and New England to have electric power comparable in cost with other sections of the country so that the industrial prosperity of this section of the United States will be greatly enhanced. This northeastern section of the United States, if it is to keep its industrial and manufacturing plants, instead of having them moved to some other section of the country, needs this cheap electric power which can only be obtained by the Northeastern States when the St. Lawrence project is developed. If the people in this section do not get this cheap electric power, then they are going to keep on losing their factories.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT ADJOURN UNTIL IT APPROVES THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT

All of this comment, Mr. Speaker, points to one conclusion, namely, that Congress should not adjourn until the Senate of the United States adds this project to the flood-control bill or to the rivers and harbors bill and acts favorably on the same. The measure will then come to the House of Representatives where courageous, forward-looking, and Nation-minded Representatives of the people of the United States will lay aside sectionalism and carry out the mandate of the people for the development of our natural resources. The largest single project on this subject pending now is the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and I feel certain that the Members of the House of Representatives will measure up to their responsibilities and do their duty. This matter has been entirely too long delayed. Had it been completed, it would have contributed to our efficiency in successfully carrying out the program of winning World War II. Should the safety of the American people again be threatened sometime in the future, we can undertake now no project that will more greatly promote our national safety and well-being than the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

The Rice Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Believing our representatives and many of our customers would like to have a general picture of the present rice situation, we give you below the complete text of a talk our chairman, Mr. Frank A. Godchaux, was asked to make to the New Orleans Association of Commerce recently. This talk was well received by the association and by the public at large. It gives you a comprehensive picture of the problems the industry faces and recommends a radical change in the Government rice program.

We also include a reprint of an article the New York Journal of Commerce requested Mr. Godchaux to write. These two together will give you the views of the man who has been in the forefront of all developments in the rice industry for 45 years. Reading them will require some time but they are worth it to those who want to understand what is now going on in one of our country's important industries and the unfortunate effect the Government's control program is having and will have on our country's economy unless a more realistic policy is adopted:

"Mr. Morvant, members of the New Orleans Association of Commerce, I am glad to talk about something else than schools for a change, but it is hard to separate Louisiana progress from education. I have now spent 45 years in the rice business. I went into it for the same reason you went into your business. I was trying to make a living out of rice.

"I was like the sergeant when two privates asked his opinion on the subject which seems most absorbing to soldiers. One private said to the other that a girl's greatest attraction was her hair and the other insisted it was her teeth, and they asked the sergeant what he thought. His answer was: 'I think the same as you boys only I don't lie about it.'

"The truth is that we are all in business to make money, but we hope we have learned enough, from our own and the experiences of the past, to know that our individual chances are better when prosperity is general and that it is neither good sportsmanship nor good business to try to make profit by the misfortunes or shortcomings of others. In fact, the fewer unfortunates and delinquents a community has the better the chances are for those who are ambitious to succeed. You see, I just can't keep from putting in a plug for education.

"I got into the rice business the day I came home from school, because my dad had sold me on his idea that it had a future and all it needed was for farmers to learn more about how to grow it and for millers to learn how to convert it into a marketable product with more appetite appeal, and then create a desire on the part of the American people to have it on their tables. Little did I realize what a task this would be.

"He said there was a job open as manager of Planter's mill in Abbeville and if I had any fight in me he and his associates would give me a trial, and I am still fighting. Dad knew about the work that was needed but he couldn't know how the alphabet would be distorted in the thirties and forties. He couldn't know about the NRA, the OPA, the WFA, and the MPR's. I, and my son, and our fellow industry workers had to learn about these ourselves, and I imagine you as businessmen of New Orleans have had some experience with them also.

"In spite of these distortions of the alphabet and of the law of supply and demand as well, I still believe that the rice industry has a future in Louisiana and if given a chance can make a greater contribution to the general economy of our State than any other single product, and strange to say even with the progress that has been made we still need exactly the same things we needed 45 years ago.

"Many new and better varieties of rice continue to be introduced. Farmers are still learning more about making land produce larger and better rice crops. New harvesting methods are being introduced, the chief of which is the combine. Millers are adapting themselves to these new methods of harvesting. Our company alone spent more than a million dollars during last year on equipping mills for modern production. Experiments are going on in preserving natural vitamins in rice and in artificially fortifying it. While we are still among the smallest per capita rice consuming nations in the world our domestic market is responding to our efforts toward popularizing rice as a staple food instead of a luxury or dessert as it is in most sections of the United States.

"Under the stimulus of war and postwar needs, we now produce annually in the United States from nineteen to twenty million pockets of rice, of 100 pounds each. Our prewar national consumption of between eight and nine million pockets means that on the basis of today's production we have a surplus of some 10,000,000 pockets. Before the war we had an outlet in South and Central America for large quantities of rice. Today they have an exportable surplus of from five to seven million pockets. Cuba requires from four to four and a half million pockets annually, Puerto Rico will take from two to three million, Canada uses a half million and the Hawaiian Islands normally consume about 750,000 pockets, leaving a surplus in the Western Hemisphere of from seven to eight million pockets even if we get all of Cuba's business, which we can't do under normal conditions when it is possible to transport rice from the Orient. It is necessary for us to have large tariff preferentials in order to get any of Cuba's business at all during normal times because of oriental price competition.

"It follows that we must either find a market for at least half of our present production or we must cut our production to correspond with the demand. This may sound like a discouraging picture but it is not necessarily. Under proper Government cooperation the outlook would be reasonably good.

"It is obvious that we must depend largely on domestic consumption for our main rice outlet. If we were permitted to do so we could, under present conditions, make rapid strides toward increasing both our table and our manufacturing consumption of rice in the United States. Allocating more rice for domestic consumption would not necessarily mean less food for hungry people in other nations.

"It is only a matter of what items of food we ship and what we retain in this country. The more rice we retain for domestic consumption the more of other foods we can ship for world relief.

"I maintain that it is the function of our Government to consider the economy of our own country in formulating their relief program. Leading economists have told us that the greatest service we can render to the world it to keep our country prosperous. The more prosperous we are, the more relief we can provide for others.

"It is bad economy and unnecessary to ship rice from the United States to the Orient, where 95 percent of the world's rice is grown and where there isn't a chance for us to de-

velop any outlet for our rice when conditions are normal. It would be more reasonable for us to furnish them with other commodities, even though they prefer rice. There may be some chance of developing an outlet in normal times for other food commodities but not for rice. If our present program is one of relief any wholesome food will keep hungry people from starving anywhere in the world regardless of their past eating habits.

"Rice growing is of vital importance to the economy of large sections in four of our States—Louisiana, Arkansas, Texas, and California—with Louisiana as the principal rice-producing State. It was not long ago that the prairie lands of southwest Louisiana were selling at only a few dollars per acre. While this land was exceedingly fertile it was not adapted to the growing of the usual staple crops such as corn and cotton and it was therefore used largely for grazing and with no important feed crops to supplement the cattle industry returns were very meager, but when someone experimented with growing rice, they found the land characteristics, the climate, and the temperature combined to make this section a natural rice-producing area. Whole trainloads of wheat farmers moved from Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and other wheat-growing States, bringing their families, farm equipment, and even farm animals with them. There was a real migration smacking of the California gold-rush days and land values climbed and kept on climbing.

"They had the same experience in large portions of the States of Arkansas and Texas. In Arkansas, especially, with the introduction of rice, land values jumped from $2 to $5 per acre to more than $100.

"Farmers have always found it profitable to let rice fields lie out every other year or else plant them in row crops during alternate years. During recent years with the introduction of better breeds of cattle in the rice section of Louisiana, combining rice and cattle growing has become increasingly profitable. One industry supplements the other perfectly and the two combined produce more income in Louisiana than any other agricultural crop. Rice byproducts furnish an important part of the much needed feed crop and grazing cattle on rice lands produces a better rice crop the following year. If it is necessary for farmers in these sections to convert to other crops, it will mean a serious economic loss to them and there will be even more reasons for our being considered the country's economic problem No. 1.

"Our Government's handling of our lend-lease and relief program has to my mind been very unsatisfactory and unwise. We have apparently adopted the policy of obligating our country to furnish so much food of given items and permitting whatever may be left to be sold on the domestic market. The information I have indicates that other nations consider their own country's need first and ship their surpluses wherever they are needed. I have no objection to cutting down on our rations to feed the hungry wherever they exist but, in deciding what we will ship and where, I insist that the economy of this country should have primary consideration.

"Even worse judgment has been exercised in the making and carrying out of governmental regulations. They were very correct in appointing industry advisory boards with whom Washington officials could consult, but they were incorrect in ignoring the recommendations of these boards. My son is a member of the rice millers' advisory committee. This committee has been practically unanimous in its recommendations but these recommendations have gone unheeded and regulations have been issued on pure theory by people who apparently knew nothing about the needs of the industry. An example is the moisture content of rough rice. They established 17-percent moisture as the basis for maximum rough rice prices when the regulations of Government agencies showed clearly that they know 17 percent moisture rice is unsound, and all these agencies refuse to purchase rice with this degree of moisture. As a result, large quantities of the past season's crop were made unfit for consumption in the United States under our pure-food regulations, and therefore had to be exported. In addition to this, because farmers could get the maximum price for rice with this high moisture content, they harvested their rice in such a wet condition that miling yields were greatly reduced, which meant that large quantities of rice were lost in the milling process.

"The enforcement of regulations was even worse. In the beginning, responsible millers undertook to conform with both the spirit and the letter of the regulations. As always occurs, there were some with less at stake and less responsibilities who began to find loopholes through which they could get a personal advantage. The millers' advisory committee brought these to the attention of Washington authorities. Nothing was done about them and technical violations became so general that it was almost suicidal for responsible companies to conform with these regulations. This lack of enforcement has transferred the advantage from the efficient to the unscrupulous. Premiums on evasion became so great that large quantities of rice were diverted into black-market channels at ridiculous prices to the consumers. This situation became so bad that from December on our company withdrew from the rough-rice market and began closing down our mills. The alternatives were to get into the black market or quit, and we chose to quit.

"As long as our boys were fighting we offered and sold to the Government hundreds of thousands of pockets more than we were required to offer them, as our part in the national effort, but with the war over we feel very strongly that it is time for our Government to so formulate its relief and rehabilitation program that it will keep American industries in a healthy condition and will lay the groundwork for industrial prosperity when conditions are normal.

"A group of hunters were in a mountain cabin the night before the opening of the deer season. One of them to be sociable spoke to the guide and said, 'Old Timer, what's the weather going to be like tomorrow? Will it be fit for hunting?' 'Don't know, boy,' he replied. 'Used to be a man could always jedge about the weather. Now the Government has took it over and you can't tell what the hell it will do.'

"Even now we have no objection to working under Government regulations if those regulations are so made that they contribute to the building of our industries and providing those regulations are so enforced that legitimate and responsible firms will not be undermined by unscrupulous evaders of both the spirit and the letter of these regulations. If we are going to have Federal control in our industries, intimate knowledge of these industries is required and strict enforcement is essential.

"I agree that Federal control was necessary during our emergency and it is the Federal Government's responsibility to make international trade possible at all times. The rice industry requires support through tariff adjustments if we are to produce more than we can consume domestically, but the greatest contribution they could make to the rice industry at this time would be by permitting the industry itself to increase domestic consumption when it can.

"The beginning of our troubles was back when the theory of scarcity prevailed, when pigs were killed to keep them from growing up and when cotton was plowed under so it couldn't produce. It is a well-known fact that for hundreds of years there has been hunger and starvation in India and China and in many other parts of the world. These conditions existed while we were destroying potential food and I claim that it would have cost this country less and would have stimulated industry more and would have provided more labor for our millions of idle, if our Government has increased consumption, instead of discouraging production, by feeding the hungry in other nations then. In other words, full production was as important to the United States then as it is now and it is just as vital now for our international program to be based on the policy of keeping our industries healthy and in the case of rice this principle requires that sufficient rice be allocated to our domestic trade from the crop that is now being planted, to permit us to stimulate both table and manufacturing consumption.

"As I said before, the United States is among the smallest per capita rice-consuming nations in the world. Our normal consumption is around 6 pounds but this is not spread evenly. A number of States consume less than a pound while in Louisiana we consume 45 pounds per capita. Other States range in between; the difference being largely habit and accessibility. We now have approximately 140,000,000 people. For every pound that we increase our per capita consumption, we would use another 1,400,000 pockets that would otherwise be surplus when conditions are normal.

"The beer industry in the United States now uses around 1,000,000 pockets of rice against 9 or more millions of other grains. Rice is highly desirable for brewing and this industry alone offers a possible outlet for all of our prospective surplus. Also, rice is becoming increasingly popular in prepared items of consumption such as baby foods, many prepared cereals, canned dinners, dog foods, etc. All these uses could be greatly stimulated now under proper Government allocation of our food resources for relief purposes.

"I am not talking about the Government making a pet out of the rice industry; I am urging a principle of procedure under which the national economy would receive prime consideration in the formulating of our relief program at this time, and what I know about the policy of other nations indicates that this is the procedure they follow. Many people have been urging this policy in the United States but without apparent results. We need to continue to urge it.

"This reminds me of a doctor's waiting room where every chair was filled, with some patients standing. Random conversation was exchanged for a time and then silence fell. Everyone was waiting and waiting and waiting. Finally, an old man stood up wearily and remarked, 'Well, I guess I'll go home and die a natural death.'

"It is my impression that your New Orleans Association of Commerce has been an important factor in bringing about improvements for the public good and that your interests extend beyond the city. This is as it should be. While New Orleans is our largest city and has many problems peculiar to itself, your over-all welfare is inseparably bound with the welfare of the State and Nation as a whole. Your best policy is one of cooperation with the country, and I am glad that your organization seems to recognize this. If any good is to come out of this meeting, it will come from your aid toward getting rice from the growing crop allocated to the domestic trade in sufficient quantities to permit the people of the rice industry to stimulate the per capita rice consumption of the United States now while we can. In urging this action on your part I believe I am joining with you in your desire to have industry removed as rapidly and as completely as possible from Government controls. It is a step toward free enterprise which is the base on which the American people have built the greatest industrial nation on earth and this principle has fostered more individual initiative and has made life more worth while than any other system that has yet been conceived by man."

Enemies of Price Control Have No Alibi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the June 22, 1946, issue of the Chicago Sun:

ENEMIES OF PRICE CONTROL HAVE NO ALIBI

While the fate of price control hangs in the balance, its enemies are cooking up an alibi to be used in the event of a slight case of murder. The people are told that if inflation really gets going it won't be the denaturing of OPA that is to blame. Wage increases are cited as the real cause, or the Federal deficit, or the strike, or the decline in saving, or something else.

We doubt that the people will be fooled. They know that the recent wage increases were granted to compensate for the increase in living costs that had already taken place, not for whatever higher prices may be yet to come. It is perfectly true that the administration blundered, along with many others, in attempting to abandon wage control too soon, but the error was corrected with the adoption of a new stabilization policy last January, and most wage increases have been held fairly well within that pattern.

High consumer demand can be traced to the accumulation of war savings and to the huge volume of employment which today stands at an all-time peak rather than to an illusory opulence of individual workers.

The alibi, then, won't hold water. If price control blows within a few months of victory in the struggle for full production, it will be because the people could not muster the political power to hold the line. It will be because the incentives for boom-and-bust were politically more effective than the incentives for stabilized prosperity. It will be because Congress listened to the special interests which want a boom instead of the mass of the people who want protection against the violent fluctuations of the business cycle. Neither Congress nor the businessmen who have undertaken to cut OPA's throat will find the murder—if such it turns out to be—profitable in terms of public respect and confidence. Nor can they, in the long run, pin the crime on somebody else. We think they'd better let the victim live.

The "Gimmies"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting herein a timely editorial from the Elkhorn Independent, Elkhorn, Wis., on a subject which is highly important to this country. It is encouraging to know that prominent newspaper people are aware of what is transpiring in this country so far as paternalism in the Federal Government is concerned:

THE "GIMMIES"

If ever a disastrous and weakening disease fastened itself upon a free people, this affliction known as the "gimmies" is probably the most infectious and dangerous. The "gimmies" is nothing more or less than the idea that all one has to do is to ask, and a generous Federal Government will shower down with blessings that range from free lunches in the schools to cash for not raising crops.

How and where it started is not exactly known, but this generation has certainly absorbed so many of the germs that the handouts have come to be expected and we'd probably feel hurt if any of them are shut off.

Many billions of dollars have been distributed from Washington for various aids during recent years. We have had new schoolhouses, athletic fields, post offices, highways, and a million other things, with the help of the Federal Government. And that's nice; but—

Where do you suppose the money comes from? You'd never guess, because the feeling that one is getting something for nothing is so utterly intoxicating. But brace yourself for a shock—you're paying it when you pay your taxes. No wonder they're high, you say?

The blunt truth is that we have been bribed with our own money, lulled into a false sense of prosperity through the operation of a well-considered plan to wean the people away from their home rule and make them dependent upon a strong central government. When the time arrives that folks look to the Federal Government for everything they need or desire, that is the time that statism has arrived and all that is required is for some demogog to ride a white horse down Pennsylvania Avenue and we have been completely transformed from a democracy of freedom to a thoroughly managed economy.

We have the glowing example, only 15 years old, of this same road that was traveled by Germany. Who can say that we are not a long way down that road today?

The antidote for this type of poison is to let each community stand on its own feet. Let each State live by its own resources. And then tell our Federal Government through our representatives in Congress to climb out of the Santa Claus garb and quit its dishonest masquerading.

Achievements of Four Hundred and Forty-second Infantry Inspired 1945 Pulitzer Prize-Winning Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 24, 1946

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a newspaper editorial by Hodding Carter, of the Greenville (Miss.) Delta Democrat-Times, that won the 1945 Pulitzer prize for the best newspaper editorial of the year. His theme is the motto and the achievements of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Infantry Regiment, made up of Americans of Japanese ancestry, many of whom came from Hawaii. The editorial follows:

"GO FOR BROKE"

Company D, a combat unit once stationed in Leghorn, Italy, is composed altogether of white troops, some from the East, some from the South, some from the Midwest and west coast.

Company D made an unusual promise earlier this month. The promise was in the form of a communication to their fellow-Americans of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Infantry Regiment and the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion, whose motto is "Go for Broke," and it was subscribed to unanimously by the officers and men of Company D.

In brief, the communication pledged the help of Company D in convincing "the folks back home that you are fully deserving of all the privileges with which we ourselves are bestowed."

The soldiers to whom that promise was made are Japanese-Americans.

In all of the United States Army no troops have chalked up a better combat record. Their record is so good that these nisei were selected by Gen. Francis H. Oxx, commander of the military area in which they are stationed, to lead the final victory parade.

So they marched, 3,000 strong, at the head of thousands of other Americans, their battle flag with three Presidential unit citation streamers floating above them, their commander, a Wisconsin white colonel, leading them.

Some of those nisei must have been thinking of the soul-shaking days of last October when they spearheaded the attacks that opened the Vosges Mountain doorway to Strasburg.

Some of them were probably remembering how they, on another bloody day, had snatched the Thirty-sixth Division's lost battalion of Texans from the encircling Germans.

And many of them were bearing scars from those two engagements which alone had cost the nisei boys from Hawaii and the west coast 2,300 casualties.

Perhaps these yellow-skinned Americans, to whose Japanese kinsmen we have administered a terrific and long overdue defeat, were holding their heads a little higher because of the pledge of their white fellow-soldiers and fellow-Americans of Company D.

Perhaps, when they gazed at their combat flag, the motto "Go for Broke" emblazoned thereon took on a different meaning. "Go for Broke" is the Hawaiian-Japanese slang expression for shooting the works in a dice game.

The loyal nisei have shot the works. From the beginning of the war, they have been on trial, in and out of uniform, in Army camps and relocation centers, as combat troops in Europe and as front-line interrogators, propagandists and combat intelligence personnel in the Pacific, where their capture meant prolonged and hideous torture. And yet they have not satisfied their critics.

It is so easy for a dominant race to explain good or evil, patriotism or treachery, courage or cowardice in terms of skin color. So easy and so tragically wrong.

Too many have committed that wrong against the loyal nisei, who by the thousands have proved themselves good Americans, even while others of us, by our own actions against them, have shown ourselves to be bad Americans.

Nor is the end of this misconception in sight. Those Japanese-American soldiers, who paraded at Leghorn in commemoration of the defeat of the nation from which their fathers came, will meet other enemies, other obstacles as forbidding as those of war.

A lot of people will begin saying, as soon as these boys take off their uniforms, that "a Jap is a Jap," and that the nisei deserve no consideration. A majority won't say or believe this, but an active minority can have its way against an apathetic majority.

It seems to us that the nisei slogan of "Go for Broke" could be adopted by all Americans of good will in the days ahead. We've got to "shoot the works" in a fight for tolerance. Those boys of Company D point the way.